

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 2nd, 2015 at 7:05 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

LunaRoja said:

Hello,

Why is the rainbow body accomplished from Naro Kacho practice different from the rainbow body accomplished through togyal? I am not clear on why there is a difference.

Malcolm wrote:

It isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 2nd, 2015 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

conebeckham said:

I've not taken LamDre, but is it true that there are actual "ritual transmissions" for completion stages, etc., or are they merely graduated instructions?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. The path empowerment for candali yogas, etc., the Nairatmya blessing for the practices connected with third and fourth empowerment.

conebeckham said:

Very interesting, thanks! Shangpa has "empowerments" for each of the six yogas, as well as empowerments for Chagchen Ga'uma, Khacho Karmo, the 3 LamKhyers, and Deathlessness of Body and Mind as well. I think there are a few similarities between these systems....

Malcolm wrote:

Lamdre has some extra transmissions of guru yoga, but beyond that, not much in terms of empowerments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 2nd, 2015 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

merit will accomplish this perhaps faster and better, IMHO

Malcolm wrote:

Merit will let you sit more still?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 2nd, 2015 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

conebeckham said:

I've not taken LamDre, but is it true that there are actual "ritual transmissions" for completion stages, etc., or are they merely graduated instructions?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. The path empowerment for candali yogas, etc., the Nairatmya blessing for the practices connected with third and fourth empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 2nd, 2015 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Pero said:

No but it's implied. If people "should strive to attend in person" it means that people generally don't strive to attend in person (since there's the possibility of webcasts).

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see it that way.

ChNN said there is no difference, however, some teachings he won't webcast.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 2nd, 2015 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

conebeckham said:

Frankly, it saddens me that we even have to have these discussions about "broadcast" and "Recorded" empowerments. People should strive to attend in person, physically, some sort of complete Wangkur, for a practice, or with a guru, with which/whome they feel a connection.

Pero said:

What saddens me is that you think that we attend webcasts because we're taking the easy way.

Malcolm wrote:

He didn't say that...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Mirror and Dust: different?

Content:

DesertDweller said:

Yes, and I naturally lean towards Yogacara; still, my understanding was that they were synthesized early on.

EDIT: On second reading I'm not sure I understand what you mean by "separate" continuums and how this relates to Yogacara.

EDIT 2: And isn't Chinese Yogacara rather distinct from classical Yogacara?

Malcolm wrote:

Separate as in distinct and unique. This is why my karma does not ripen on you and yours does not ripen on me. The reason we share the common perception of a universe is due to similarities in traces.

No, not really, Xuan Tsang was very much in the Indian model.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As the Yogasūtra says:

Sthira-sukham asanam

Asana is steadiness and comfort.

dzogchungpa said:

tirthika.jpg

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I have the transmission for that, that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Mirror and Dust: different?

Content:

DesertDweller said:

Thank you Astus, Dan, Wayfarer et al for these really useful replies. I'm glad I brought this up here.

But here's something else:

I know this will sound funny but, if the objective world is an illusion or fabrication, then how do we understand "individual minds"? In other words, "who" or "what" are you Astus, Dan, Wayfarer, Muni? You "exist" for me only in relation to my mind, which is all I know. But from your perspective, I myself am part of the illusion of the objective world. But reality is nondual. I guess the question is, how do we explain "my mind" and "your mind"? I know in the Absolute sense they cannot be found, but how does that work "on the ground"?

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of "nondual" discussed in Buddhadharmā; nondualism ala yogacara, the absence of an external world, aka mind-only and nondualism ala madhyamaka, i.e. that absence of existence and nonexistence. The former school argues that minds are separate continuums. Madhyamaka accepts the existence of separate continuums conventionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

repeat: tregcho/togal is the swift and effortless path; someone here might say it's so hard to make the vision come; well because you can't make them... as long as you can sit still, you're good... and the more you practice the easier it gets, like anything else.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is the sitting still part that most people have trouble with. When we say "effortless" here, we actually mean that all effort impedes the path, whether physical, verbal or mental. Thus, it is not nearly as "easy" a path as some people imagine.

Hence yantra, etc.

Crazywisdom said:

Ganapuja. Very very important

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but I mentioned yantra because it is helpful in allowing one to sit very still. As the Yogasūtra says:

Sthira-sukham asanam

Asana is steadiness and comfort.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And as I have written elsewhere, logic and inference are not authorities in Vajrayāna, scripture is. The Abhibodhikramopadeśa of Master Āryadeva states:

At the time of the ultimate view of secret mantra,
the direct perception by the mind and sense organs
as well as inferences are not authorities;
the profound scriptures and intimate instructions are authorities.

Astus said:

That clarifies it then for me why there aren't really works discussing the functioning of Vajrayana in a way that other Buddhist methods are usually discussed, describing the various mental elements and conditions at work. And thank you for the previous responses as well, you're really helpful.

Malcolm wrote:

There are actually, but first you have to be ripened even in order to see such books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is why it is very important to understand and follow the proper ritual procedures if one is both a master of Vajrayāna as well as a student of Vajrayāna. One's very realization is at stake.

dzogchungpa said:

Do the scriptures say what the proper ritual procedures for a webcast are?

Malcolm wrote:

No, and this is of course is the reason most Lamas think the idea of giving deity transmissions via webcast is controversial. For example, ChNN gives what he calls "don dbang" i.e. meaning empowerments, which involve no ritual objects via webcast, but he will not give full fledged empowerments via webcasts. Garchen Rinpoche on the other hand frequently gives traditional empowerments via webcast. In my opinion, as long as one is participating in real time, then either way is not really an issue. That being said, attending in person is always better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

fckw said:

What has not been touched in this discussion yet is that there might be causal and

subtle energies being involved in an empowerment that naturally cannot be recorded.

dzogchungpa said:

You mean zapping? I keep bringing it up but nobody seems to be interested.

Malcolm wrote:

CHNN to a student who complained that she could not feel any "vibration" during his transmissions:

"I am very sorry I could not give you any vibration....he he he"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

smcj said:

So on the student's side, what is necessary to receive it? Faith in the guru. This is above and beyond what the 5 senses can perceive. What kind of faith? That the guru holds the lineage for the empowerment and has summoned the deity to be present and accessible at that place and time via himself. As Malcolm said, afterwards the guru dissolves the mandala and the empowerment is over. Somebody showing up late doesn't get it even if they get bonked with all the various implements, etc.

So a Chinese soldier guarding an empowerment would not receive it. Nor would a student that had a closed mind and refused to believe that something metaphysical was occurring. And "occurring" is the operative word here. It is a window into the metaphysical, which closes at the end of the empowerment.

Malcolm wrote:

All that is necessary to receive the empowerment is one) a guru with the lineage; two) interest in the practice; three) willing participation in the rite (as it is occurring), just as in any other kind of ordination rite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Astus said:

I think I understand that for empowerment to happen the described procedures have to be followed, as that is the definition of what an empowerment is. Similarly to marriage that is defined in a specific way by the law, and regardless of how people live or what they do, they are not married as long as the correct procedure was not followed. However, people can do the same things both with and without a marriage certificate. That is, one can still live together and have children without marriage, while it is said that without empowerment one cannot practise Vajrayana effectively. So, the disciple must obtain something during empowerment that makes him different from the

uninitiated. That is why I first of all try to analyse from the perspective of the receiver and ask the question of what is transmitted from master to student. Everything delivered through the five senses can be obtained from a recording as well. The methods of the practice and the precepts to follow can also be learnt from other sources. What makes the recipient of a correctly performed empowerment different from the one who did not receive it when they both engage in the same practice and uphold the same precepts? Is it perhaps related to the knowledge that "I have the empowerment" in the former that is missing from the latter person?

Malcolm wrote:

The difference between the former and the latter is that the former is like a field that has been tilled, fertilized and planted; whereas the latter is like field that has not been tilled, has not been fertilized and not been planted.

A person who has received an empowerment is termed "ripened", whereas those who have not received empowerments are termed "unripened." If one has not been ripened, one is not a candidate for the liberating instructions.

And as I have written elsewhere, logic and inference are not authorities in Vajrayāna, scripture is. The Abhibodhikramopadeśa of Master Āryadeva states:

At the time of the ultimate view of secret mantra,
the direct perception by the mind and sense organs
as well as inferences are not authorities;
the profound scriptures and intimate instructions are authorities.

This being the case, the Mahāmudratilaka Tantra states:

There is no siddhi for one who lacks empowerment,
just there is no butter from churning sand.

If one pridefully expounds the tantras and agamas
without empowerment,

immediately upon death master and disciple
go to hell even if siddhi has been attained.

So, you see, for Vajrayāna the issue of proper empowerments is not really something that depends on reason and inference. It depends on scripture and intimate instructions. And understanding that intellectuals might argue with such ideas, again Āryadeva writes in the Abhibodhikramopadeśa:

In evil future times,
without relying on profound scriptures and intimate instructions,
those who prioritize the twin reasonings of validation and proofs
will each grasp their own philosophy as sublime;
satisfied with a mere hidden meaning
and without any interest in the ultimate profound view,
again they make refutations,
destroying themselves and others.

So when it comes to Secret Mantra, the tantras are the definitive authority. Also the rites must be properly performed, as the The Great Commentary Tantra of the Mayajala states:

Akaśagarbha, you should listen!

All of the tantras like mine
endowed with nondual wisdom,
like wishfulfilling gems, wish-granting trees
and excellent vases
are proper places for devotion.
Even one [tantra] has inconceivable power
through different methods,
yielding accomplishment in the same way.
However, there is no accomplishment with defective rituals.
This is why it is very important to understand and follow the proper ritual procedures if
one is both a master of Vajrayāna as well as a student of Vajrayāna. One's very
realization is at stake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are very clear and specific signs for each Vajrayāna system that will let one know
whether one is qualified to give Vajrayāna teachings, apart from one's guru telling one to
go teach.

fckw said:

I am aware that there are these criteria. However, 1) I did not know that for example the
3. vision is regarded as a required preliminary to teach Dzogchen, 2) often the traditional
descriptions are either very lofty (e.g. various siddhis being mentioned) because they
only mention the highest class of practitioners and may not even talk about the vast
majority of lower class practitioners, and also because the language they use is often
hard to understand. That is, unless you have a master telling you in more accessible
words what is actually meant.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, one should not give Vajrayāna empowerments until one has reached strong
heat on the path of application. But these days, well...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The technical qualification for being able to truly give Dzogchen teachings is having
attained the third vision. But this is rather rare and so these days, many people are
giving Dzogchen instruction who have only entered the second vision.

fckw said:

Thanks, did not know that, very illuminating!

Malcolm wrote:

There are very clear and specific signs for each Vajrayāna system that will let one know whether one is qualified to give Vajrayāna teachings, apart from one's guru telling one to go teach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out

Content:

fckw said:

"Us"? You are referring to whom exactly? Dharma practitioners in general? Westerners? Western dharma practitioners?

What about such a qualification: "Having practiced the dharma for, let's say, 40 years, having read old Dzogchen texts in original old Tibetan and translated them with the guidance and support of high ranking lamas, plus a reasonable degree of realization, plus permission and support from high-ranking Tibetan lamas to do so." Would that qualify a Western teacher to give out pointing out instructions for Dzogchen? Or do you prefer to receive them from a 18 year old Tibetan "Tulku" who happened to have inherited such a title from his father?

Malcolm wrote:

The technical qualification for being able to truly give Dzogchen teachings is having attained the third vision. But this is rather rare and so these days, many people are giving Dzogchen instruction who have only entered the second vision.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The misconception which Astus has is the notion that an empowerment is merely communicating information received through the five senses, thus for him there is no difference between an empowerment and a recording of an empowerment, it is merely information. While it is true that information is being communicated through the five sense, that is not all that is happening, there are samadhis involved on the part of both the master and the students at the same time, there is the dependent origination which needs to be actively created between the master and the student at the same time, particularly in the lower empowerments; there are the samaya vows conferred and received and the agreement to follow them (Whatever you say boss, all that I will do....), and so on — all of the things which I have now explained exhaustively.

Astus said:

Yes, my basic assumption is that what benefits one on the path must be learnt, understood and experienced personally. So for the disciple what can have any effect for him is what he visualises during the empowerment, not what the master.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, the master must do his job, before the disciple can do their job, and if the master has finished the empowerment and dissolved the mandala, it is too late.

Astus said:

You say it is the rite that matters, and it can be completed only when both the master and the student works together at the same time. But isn't the very point of performing the rite is to benefit the disciple? The question then is how the presence of the master and what he visualises affects the disciple. How can one enter a mandala that is mentally created by another?

Malcolm wrote:

At the most basic level, it is simply a question of procedure: in order for a master to confer an empowerment, he must first create himself in the form of that mandala or deity, as well as create a front-created mandala or deity (from which one actually receives the empowerment) before he can introduce students to that mandala in the form of a series of guided visualizations, which he does through a series of verbal instructions and visual cues, which include mantras and mudras.

If the steps above are not taken, no empowerment will be have been conferred. That is just how it is. For example, if on an assembly line you do not assemble the parts in the proper way, your product will not work. So it is with an empowerment: if the procedures of the ritual are not carried out properly and in their correct order, the empowerment will not be valid.

If the master conferring the empowerment has not himself received the empowerment, the empowerment will not be valid. If he has not done the basic retreats, or at least received permission from his own guru to give the empowerments, the empowerment will not be valid, and the master will himself have broken his own samaya regarding revealing secrets to those who have not been ripened by empowerment (you may ask whether I am breaking samaya by discussing this — the answer is no, because I am not discussing specific details of Vajrayāna practice). If he omits parts of the ritual of the empowerment, the empowerment will not only not be valid, it will not have taken place at all.

Empowerments are very precise formula of ritual procedures which are designed to give transmissions into very specific practices in a structured way. Thus if the structure of the empowerment is violated, the transmission does not happen. Therefore, the idea that a recording of a mere part of an empowerment (the activities for disciples) can serve as an empowerment is a deeply mistaken idea on the part of anyone who holds it. Not only will there be no master conferring the empowerment; since there is no master, the conditions for the creation of the mandala/deity are absent, thus there is no

mandala/deity. If there is no mandala/deity, there is nothing into which the student may be initiated. Therefore, the empowerment depends on the creation of the mandala/deity, the mandala/deity depends on the samadhi of the master, and the master's ability to confer the empowerment itself depends two things: a) he himself has received the transmission and b) he has either done the retreats for that practice or been commanded by his own guru to confer the transmission.

In addition there are ten things a master must know to be qualified to give empowerments. This can be looked up elsewhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 11:36 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

So what is the least difficult path then? Are they all equally difficult?

Again, I understand this is not really a well-posed question, but I've often wondered about it.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayana in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism

Content:

David Reigle said:

"I have but one answer which I have tried to formulate in various ways in this book, on the basis, invariably, of a study of the Pāli canon and of the Nikāyas in particular, that is: the Buddha does not deny the Upaniṣadic ātman; on the contrary, he indirectly affirms it, in denying that which is falsely believed to be the ātman."

asunthatneversets said:

A conclusion of this nature requires quite a bit of extrapolation and conjecture, there really is no evidence that Śākyamuni affirmed the Upanisadic ātman via negation. In fact the Pali Canon states in no uncertain terms that "right view" is a freedom from extremes.

The buddhadharma is not apophatic theology.

Will said:

Reigle is giving some of Bhattacharya's views; for evidence one needs to study Bhattacharya's book.

Malcolm wrote:

It's the same old tired evidence trotted out by Zenmar, blah blah blah....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

repeat: tregcho/togal is the swift and effortless path; someone here might say it's so hard to make the vision come; well because you can't make them... as long as you can sit still, you're good... and the more you practice the easier it gets, like anything else.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is the sitting still part that most people have trouble with. When we say "effortless" here, we actually mean that all effort impedes the path, whether physical, verbal or mental. Thus, it is not nearly as "easy" a path as some people imagine.

Hence yantra, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 8:33 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I was thinking more along the lines of "not hard".

Malcolm wrote:

Compared to sūtra, Vajrayāna methods are not hard.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 7:59 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Heh. Practice what really hard in retreat, snark master?

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever your main practice is. If it is Dzogchen, then Dzogchen; if it is the two stages, then practice that. Both, practiced hard, will cause you to realize Buddhahood in this life, or in the bardo.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, but I was asking about the easiest way. Are you saying these ways are equally easy? I don't know that much about Dzogchen but I believe there are various methods so are

they all equally easy? I'm actually curious about this. Also, keep in mind that I'm not concerned with speed of attainment here, except inasmuch as it relates to ease of attainment.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, these two systems are equally easy, if you define "easy" as getting out samsara with rapidity compared to other paths — this is the criterion by which they are described as "easy."

For example, a common person, or so it is said in Dzogchen texts, would need to spend a minimum of twelve years in strict retreat to achieve Buddhahood in this life; the best practitioner, six months.

Like anything else, you get out what you put in.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism

Content:

David Reigle said:

“I have but one answer which I have tried to formulate in various ways in this book, on the basis, invariably, of a study of the Pāli canon and of the Nikāyas in particular, that is: the Buddha does not deny the Upaniṣadic ātman; on the contrary, he indirectly affirms it, in denying that which is falsely believed to be the ātman.”

Malcolm wrote:

Oh Yawn...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Heh. Practice what really hard in retreat, snark master?

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever your main practice is. If it is Dzogchen, then Dzogchen; if it is the two stages, then practice that. Both, practiced hard, will cause you to realize Buddhahood in this life, or in the bardo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

mutasuk said:

Buddhahood in Sutra, Tantra and Dzogchen is Bodies+Wisdoms+Activities. The way that manifests in these specific paths is different but the state is the same.

dzogchungpa said:

This might be a little off topic, but what is the easiest way to achieve this state, if one is not concerned about the way it manifests?

Malcolm wrote:

Practice really hard, in retreat, and ignoring this advice, "The Vajrayana path is basically achieving enlightenment while having fun."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: All Shambhala Publications profits to Nepal today (April

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Does anyone know what percent of the price, roughly, would be profit for Shambhala?

Malcolm wrote:

60%

dzogchungpa said:

Interesting, I didn't realize it was that high.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you buy directly. In general, the list price is a 40% markup in a book store, 50% if they are B&N, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: All Shambhala Publications profits to Nepal today (April

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Does anyone know what percent of the price, roughly, would be profit for Shambhala?

Malcolm wrote:

60%

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out

Content:

philji said:

I have noticed a couple of western teachers offering dzogchen teachings and pointing out instructions. One of these is a well respected author and has a long background in dharma. I am wondering what it is that enables one/ permits one to give pointing out instructions?

Malcolm wrote:

One decides that one is a Dzogchen master either out of delusion or because one has really developed one's practice, and then one goes to town.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Brief members bios - please contribute!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Many years ago I was affiliated with TOPY.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, now it all makes sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Brief members bios - please contribute!

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Funny random anecdote on the David Tibet thing Loren: I remember having a copy of As The World Disappears by Current 93, which had song titles and other stuff written in Tibetan. At the time I worked with this zany character, ex-monk with a mischievous sense of humour who worked as night auditor and asked him to translate...so technically Current93 was involved one of my first experiences with Vajrayana too;)

Malcolm wrote:

Many years ago I was affiliated with TOPY. The first time I heard thighbone trumpets was on PTV's Force the Hand of Chance, circa 1984.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Yes that was I expecting, this answer from you.

mutusuk said:

Malcolm's answer was correct. The Bönpos do not say otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so it is Reynold's error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Well the indivisibility of pure appearance and primordial purity as described in Guhyagarbha seem to suggest a result very different than the dissolution of the appearance in the completion stage as described in the usual HYT.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? The result of HYT is the state of union, mahāmudra, the union of the so called illusory body (pure appearance) and luminosity (primordial purity).

Crazywisdom said:

Yeah, according to tantras like Kalacakra. The mother tantras emphasize to the exclusion of everything else it seems if you hear the lamas tell it the clear light... the union of form is something to me it seems like a higher realization... I look forward to being corrected if its wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure where you got this idea, but it is wrong. There is no real difference between the Buddhahood explained in mother tantras and the father tantras. But this is the bon forum so we should probably discuss this elsewhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

a related point i've read and heard is that the nine yanas are all steps leading further along to the final ninth and the ninth divides up further also ; I believe Longchenpa might have made this argument;

Malcolm wrote:

This applies only to Nyingma and Bon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Well the indivisibility of pure appearance and primordial purity as described in Guhyagarbha seem to suggest a result very different than the dissolution of the appearance in the completion stage as described in the usual HYT.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? The result of HYT is the state of union, mahāmudra, the union of the so called illusory body (pure appearance) and luminosity (primordial purity).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Amida Is A Real Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It then follows that you grant Amitabha the same level of conventional reality you grant yourself.

Yuren said:

Indeed.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have no problem granting that it is a real place where people take rebirth, just as you took rebirth here in this world system.

Yuren said:

No, the idea that we can reduce Sukhavati to a metaphor is actually the more modern POV. Definitely not. The idea that buddhakṣetras, of which Sukhavati is but one, are actual physical places purified by bodhisattvas as part of their path is pervasive in Mahāyāna Buddhism.

It is common place in Chan Buddhism to interpret the Pure Land as an expedient expression for the Pure Mind; and to interpret Amitabha as our "self nature". Let me know if you need me to point to specific Chan texts. But really, even if you pick a Chan text at random, you will probably find that kind of interpretation in it, if there is a mention of Amitabha. There are some exceptions such as Hanshan Deqing perhaps, but they are the exception and not the rule in the Chan Buddhist tradition. And this is not an arbitrary method of interpretation, either, it has support in the Sutras. In Mahayana Buddhism, the Vimalakirti Sutra advocates that "When the mind becomes pure, the Buddha land also becomes pure," while the Avatamsaka Sutra asserts that "One should contemplate the nature of all things in the Dharmadhatu, and realize that they are all created by the

mind,” and that “The mind, like a skillful painter, paints all sorts of skandhas” - so there is support for that interpretation, and then there is the Contemplation Sutra's own statement that Sukhavati is "not far away" and that "the mind creates (Amida) buddha" - So whether it is a physical place or not, it remains true that it is mind-only.

Malcolm wrote:

Varying levels of understanding understand different things on different levels, none of which are necessarily in contradiction. Thus, one can understand Mt. Potala, Avalokiteśvara buddhafield on outer, inner, secret and ultimate levels without having to choose one as better or worse, more true or less true. The same applies to the buddhafields in the ten directions. They are both literal places, as conventionally real as this world system is, their purity or impurity are also functions of the purity or impurity of the mind, as is the purity or impurity of this world system and so on. So, we can have our cake and eat it too — but to maintain that Sukhavati is merely a metaphor, and not a real place, that is an extreme of denial.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Amida Is A Real Buddha

Content:

Yuren said:

First we should ask ourselves what we mean by "real". What is real? Is the keyboard in front of you real? Why? Because it's there, out there, right, how could it not be real? Then when you dream, a keyboard can appear in your dream. And again, it's out there. You can touch it, type on it. But then you wake up and the keyboard vanishes. So was the keyboard real or not? And if it wasn't, what guarantees that the keyboard you're typing on at this very moment is any more real?

Malcolm wrote:

It then follows that you grant Amitabha the same level of conventional reality you grant yourself.

Yuren said:

The next word you have to reflect upon in that question is "buddha". What is a Buddha? When you say: is he a real buddha? You have to understand the word Buddha. The Diamond Sutra says that if you see forms, you are not seeing the true buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the true buddha is the dharmakāya, who, in response to the needs of sentient beings spontaneously produces the two rūpyakāyas.

Yuren said:

I would say that the "literal place" idea is the one that is truly modern.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the idea that we can reduce Sukhavati to a metaphor is actually the more modern POV.

Yuren said:

The "mind only" interpretation is thousand years old. But the idea that Amida is a guy living in a place called Pure Land, this brutal literalism, is definitely modern, and influenced by Christianity.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely not. The idea that buddhakṣetras, of which Sukhavati is but one, are actual physical places purified by bodhisattvas as part of their path is pervasive in Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Apart from the Gelugpas, all Madhyamaka approaches, including Nāgārjuna's clearly underline the need to negate all four extremes in the ultimate, not merely one.

BuddhaFollower said:

Negation of all 4 extremes is done simply by understanding non-arising?

Is that right?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not if you are an ordinary person. If you are an ordinary person, you must go through step by step and analyze all four extremes. Having ascertained through analysis that a phenomena existing through the four extremes does exist in the relative, one then applies that analysis to the ultimate, finding that also that there is nothing which can be found in the ultimate existing by way of the four extremes. Then, as Khenpo Ngalo states: Likewise, the mind free from the trio of arising, ceasing and abiding, existence and nonexistence, and being and nonbeing, is naked in the emptiness free from proliferation. In one's experience, the unceasing stream of mere clarity and mere awareness is empty at the time of being clear and clear at the time being empty — do not grasp clarity or emptiness. Rest wholly, nakedly and freely in the state that is free from extremes, without divisions, inexpressible and beyond thought. Finally, rest free of concepts [had de chad de] without grasping in mere inexpressibility. This means that having completed one's analysis one simply rests in the nature of the mind as one finds it, without modifying it in anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 7:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek Dzogchenpas,

Question:

- Does the person who comes through the Sutra Path achieve Buddhahood? -
- Does the person who comes through the Tantra Path achieve Buddhahood? -
- Does the person who comes through the Dzogchen Path achieve Buddhahood? -

Our Yongdzin Rinpoche:

The name is the same, but is Buddha the same or not?

The answer is no.

No they are different. If you say that you will receive a lot of criticism, but it does not matter, it is explained according our Dzogchen way.

Mutsug Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

They are all Buddhas, but the difference lies in the degree and kind of their omniscience. This is noncontroversial.

What is controversial is asserting that Dzogchen results in a buddhahood that is higher than highest yoga tantra. Chogyal Namkhai Norbu asserts there is no difference between the Buddhahood realized through practicing Dzogchen and the Buddhahood practiced through the two stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

None of this changes my basic point that the passage in question concerns the four reliances (dharma, meaning, wisdom, definitive meaning), not the equivalence dharmatā = tathāgata, which is not found in the Indian version of the text.

Astus said:

The Chinese translation is from the early 5th century. Is there actually an original

Sanskrit anywhere, or you call the Tibetan Indian? Still, it was not the only quote.

Malcolm wrote:

If it's missing in the Tibetan text, it was not there in the Sanskrit original. But we can do a passage by passage comparison if you like. But it should be in another thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Sakyas say tummo or physical karmamudra for attaining Buddhahood while alive.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually this not true — where did you hear this?

BuddhaFollower said:

Then correct.

Malcolm wrote:

You forgot serving the guru. It is stated in Lamdre that those of the best capacity realize mahāmudra through serving the guru without meditating at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

None of this changes my basic point that the passage in question concerns the four reliances (dharma, meaning, wisdom, definitive meaning), not the equivalence dharmatā = tathāgata, which is not found in the Indian version of the text.

Astus said:

The Yamamoto translation says,

"Being based on Dharma means nothing other than basing oneself on the Mahāparinirvāṇa of the Tathagata. All Buddhist teachings are none but "Dharmata" [essence of Dharma, essence of Reality]. This "Dharmata" is the Tathagata. Hence, the Tathagata is Eternal and Unchanging. Any person who says that the Tathagata is non-eternal does not know "Dharmata"."

Mark Blum's translation (p 194, BDK Edition):

"the dharma to be taken as one's refuge is none other than this mahaparinirvana of the Tathagata. As the dharma of all buddhas, it is the dharmata, the nature of reality. And as the dharmata, it is what the Tathagata is. This is why the Tathagata is a permanently abiding presence without change. If someone were to say that the Tathagata is impermanent, that person would not understand, he has not seen the nature of reality."

Here's my simple version from the same 40-fascicle Dharmaksema translation (T12n374, p401c3-5):

依法者。即是如來大般涅槃。一切佛法即是法性。是法性者即是如來。是故如來常住不變。若復有言如來無常。是人不知不見法性。

Relying on the Law is [relying on] the Thus Come One's Great Parinirvana. All Buddha Laws are the Law-nature, the Law-nature is the Thus Come One, so the Thus Come One is eternal and permanent. If it were said that the Thus Come One is impermanent, that person would not know and would not see the Law-nature.

But to further clarify this section, a little later the sutra says:

Yamamoto:

"Basing oneself upon Dharma means basing oneself upon "Dharmata"; not basing oneself on man refers to the sravaka. "Dharmata" is the Tathagata, and the sravaka is the created. The Tathagata is Eternal, but the sravaka is non-eternal."

Blum:

"The dharma to take refuge in is the reality of dharmata; the person not to take refuge in is a sravaka disciple. The reality of dharmata is a tathagata; a sravaka disciple is a created phenomenon. A tathagata is permanently abiding; a created phenomenon is impermanent."

So, it is not really discussing differences between teachings, it turns it into the difference between unconditioned and conditioned. Same happens with the other three seals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Sakyas say tummo or physical karmamudra for attaining Buddhahood while alive.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually this not true — where did you hear this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Sherlock said:

Dharmata is not buddhahood.

Astus said:

"Dharmata is the Tathagata. Hence, the Tathagata is Eternal and Unchanging."

(Nirvana Sutra, ch 8, p 84)

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, the passage you citing is referring to reliance on the Dharma (among the four reliances). It says in full in the Sanskrit -- > Chinese -- > Tibetan translation:

"Relying on the Dharma" is the parinirvana of the Tathāgata. The Dharma of the Buddha is the dharmatā of Dharmas. So-called "dharmatā" is the Tathagāta. That being so, the Tathāgata is permanent and unchanging. Any person who says the Tathāgata is impermanent, that person has not seen nor known dharmatā

The Tibetan translation direct from Sanskrit however however reads a little more clearly: Dharmatā is the parinirvana of the Tathāgata. The Tathāgata is permanent, stable, and eternal. This is the dharmatā of all the Buddhas. Whoever sees the Tathāgata as impermanent, they do not know dharmatā."

So it is not really clear that the Nirvana Sūtra makes the bold declaration that dharmatā = tathāgata. It seems that the sutra is actually saying that the permanence, stability and eternity is the dharmatā, or real nature, of all buddhas. That is a much different message than the one you want to present. In fact, I would just say that the Chinese translation upon which you are relying is embellished and somewhat inaccurate and whenever someone reads something in it, they need to check it against the Tibetan translation direct from Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 30th, 2015 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Amida Is A Real Buddha

Content:

plwk said:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

So, not all Shin Buddhists regard Amida as a metaphor after all.... why am I not surprised

What do you think folks?

Is the video's presentation a sufficient way to convince our 'own people' firstly, not to

mention from other Buddhist traditions and further on to non Buddhists?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course Amitabha is a real Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quite well. Mundane happiness is the result of virtuous karma; suffering the result of non-virtue, supreme happiness means nirvana.

Challenge23 said:

But you just said that the Dharma will grant you freedom from suffering which is not the same as happiness. Are you saying that the result of the Dharma is not nirvana? Or are you saying that supreme happiness is not happiness? I swear I'm not trying to be pedantic here. I'm trying to pin down exactly what you are saying here.

Malcolm wrote:

Happiness is are those conditions in which there is an absence of suffering. Supreme happiness is nirvana, in which there is a total absence of suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quite well. Mundane happiness is the result of virtuous karma; suffering the result of non-virtue, supreme happiness means nirvana.

Challenge23 said:

Then where does the happiness come in? How your point squared with the Four Immeasurables?

The Four Immeasurables said:

May all beings have happiness
and the cause of happiness.

May they be free of suffering
and the cause of suffering.

May they never be dissociated from
the supreme happiness without suffering.

May they remain in boundless equanimity
free from both attachment to relatives
and hatred of enemies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Huh?

Crazywisdom said:

TD is a big wonky looney.

Malcolm wrote:

Do tell...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Sherlock said:

Why are you so enamoured with Chogyam Trungpa when you have no possibility of receiving teachings from him? Did he authorize any of these students to teach Mahamudra or Dzogchen in their entirety?

Tony Duff is also a student of Trungpa and presents himself and Trungpa as very traditional BTW.

Crazywisdom said:

Can't wait to slap his ass around good.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:
Sherlock said:
Nature of mind = dharmata

Dharmata is not buddhahood.

If you are a Buddha there are very precise descriptions of what you can do, even in the Hinayana canon. The 6 abhijnas, the twin miracle, seeing the results of karma etc.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, given that the sūtra Astus cites clearly states that not even tenth stage bodhisattvas can actually see the buddhadhātu/tathāgatarbha, he can hardly defend his position that seeing the nature of the mind equals buddhahood on that basis of that sūtra.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 9:25 PM
Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have
Content:
Sherlock said:
I thought it says Bodhisattvas on the bhumis can see it when taught by the tathatgatha?

Malcolm wrote:
I dont think so.

Anyway, the term translated into Tibetan through the Chinese as sangs rgyas kyi rang bzhin, buddhanature, seems to be a Chinese gloss on the Sanskrit term buddhadhātu. Perhaps the buddhadhatu (sangs rgyas kyi kham) morphed into buddhanature because of the Sanskrit --> Chinese --> Tibetan route of the expanded version. The term buddhaprakṛti, buddhanature does not seem to be an attested Indian term. I am not going to say one hundred percent it does not exist, but if it does, it is rare and does not carry the meaning we normally associate it with in English. The term buddhadhatu, however does exist in the Indian text.

The term sangs rgyas kyi rang bzhin appears a total of 679 times, 176 times in the first volume, the rest in the second of the Chinese to Tibetan version.

In the Sanskrit to Tibetan version, the term tathāgatarbha shows up 69 times; where as in the Chinese version it shows up 32 times, but only in the first volume, it is absent from the second volume entirely. Buddhadhātu shows up 20 times.

As for your question, as above, the Indian version states:
Son of a good family, bodhisattvas of the tenth stage can see only a general approximation of the tathagātagarbha that exists in their bodies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Sherlock said:

Astus quotes from the dubious chapters of the sutra.

Dan74 said:

Why are they dubious? I thought you said Mahayana sutra is a common ground we can proceed with..?

Sherlock said:

A large section of the Chinese translation by Dharmaksema has never been found by Chinese who visited India nor found by Tibetans. Modern archaeologists found fragments of the core chapters in Sanskrit all over Asia but never these dubious chapters. This has been discussed here before.

Malcolm wrote:

The dubious chapters are in the later portion of the text, according to Hodge. The larger one is in Tibetan, translated from Chinese.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Sherlock said:

Anyway even assuming this quotation is a legit indian source, it does not say that ordinary people can see Buddhadhatu.

Śravakas and pratyekabuddhas can't see it, and they are already more advanced than ordinary practitioners. And it is referring to Bodhisattvas on the Bhūmis who can see it when a tathagatha explains it. So you need to be on the bhūmis, this corresponds with the Prajñāpāramitā quotation by Nubchen.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, not even bodhisattvas on the stages can see buddhanature/tathāgatagarbha. This is why this sūtra refers to buddhanature as the tathāgataguhyagarbha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

According to the other thread you believe recognizing nature of mind is Buddhahood.

Astus said:

"When one sees the Buddha-Nature, one attains unsurpassed Enlightenment."

(Nirvana Sutra, ch 9, p 93)

Malcolm wrote:

Given that the buddhanature is a synonym of dharmakāya, it is also no surprise that in this sūtra (Chinese version) the Buddha states:

Son of a good family, buddhanature can be seen by only a buddha, and not a śravaka [arhat] or a pratyekabuddha.

Astus said:

"Although innumerable Bodhisattvas may well perfectly practise the paramitas [spiritual perfections], they might only reach the stage of the ten abodes ["bhūmis"] and yet may not be able to see the Buddha-Nature. If the Tathagata speaks, they may see to some extent. When these Bodhisattvas have seen all, they will say: "Oh, wonderful, O World-Honoured One! We have been repeating birth and death and have been worried by selflessness. " O good man! Such Bodhisattvas may well reach the stage of the ten soils ["bhūmis" - stages of Bodhisattva development], and yet they cannot clearly see the Buddha-Nature. How could sravakas and pratyekabuddhas well see [it]?"

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because not even a tenth stage bodhisattva can see the dharmakāya since they still have very subtle knowledge obscurations, that is until they are on the second half of that stage.

The Indian version states:

Son of a good family, bodhisattvas of the tenth stage can see only a general approximation of the tathagātagarbha that exists in their bodies.

Astus said:

...

The Buddha-Nature that one has is the deepest and the most difficult [thing] to see. Only the Buddha can know it well. It is not within the reach of sravakas and pratyekabuddhas."

(Nirvana Sutra, ch 12, p 110-111)

Malcolm wrote:

This merely harms your case that seeing the nature of the mind (dharmatā) is Buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[Yes, heat on the path of preparation/application is a conceptual mind, it is a samadhi on an inferential emptiness.

The point I am making here, however is a little different. When TKF states that an inference becomes a direct perception, this is nonsensical, it is impossible.

Given that this is the case, how is it that the path of seeing, which develops directly from the path of preparation, is a non-conceptual mind, but you claim that a non-conceptual mind cannot arise from a conceptual mind. Could you please clarify?

A conceptual mind can never produce a nonconceptual mind — it is impossible. The mind (sems) is always with concepts (rnam par rtog pa).

The path of seeing arises from a cessation of concepts about the four extremes. To paraphrase Shantideva:

When neither an entity nor a nonentity remain before mind, at that time since there is no other possibility, the mind is pacified.

Thus, this avoids the ridiculous notion that conceptual minds produce nonconceptual minds, or that inferences transform into direct perceptions.

Tsongkhapa said:

Good luck with trying to develop a non-conceptual realisation of emptiness without a conceptual experience - you'll be the first person in the history of Buddhist practice who has been able to do it.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not understanding the point — an inference cannot turn into a direct perception. All an inference will allow you to do is recognize something you have not seen before.

But even here, since the realization of emptiness at the first bhumi is nonconceptual, when you are realizing it, are you aware of it during the path of seeing? Or is it something you post-facto conceptually recognize that you have experienced? If it is as in the first case, then how is the first bhumi nonconceptual? And if it is the second case, then there is a missing link in your account, because we all clearly agree as long as one has not attained the Mahāyāna path of seeing, our notion of emptiness is strictly a conceptual inference.

It is for this reason there is a big debate which approach to emptiness one takes: the generic approach to emptiness of all three vehicles, the emptiness of inherent existence, or the special emptiness of Mahāyāna, the freedom from all four extremes (which alone can produce the Mahāyāna path of seeing). Apart from the Gelugpas, all Madhyamaka approaches, including Nāgārjuna's clearly underline the need to negate all four extremes in the ultimate, not merely one.

This has direct bearing on the mind of a Buddha. The mind of a Buddha cannot have concepts because the mind of a Buddha is never separate from state of equipoise on reality — a Buddha is in equipoise 24/7/365. The mind of a buddha is a nonconceptual

stream of clarity and emptiness that is unsullied by any remaining obscurations. A Buddha response to the wishes of sentient beings spontaneously, like a wishfulfilling gem, without any intention or thought at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

People make this claim, but have nothing with which to back it up, making truly lame excuses like Rongom that the path is so fast one does not have have time to accumulate merit to manifest the qualities of the bhumis (which are actually measures of qualities and not realizations). Generally, I like Rongzom, but sometimes he makes very unfounded and rash assertions.

Sherlock said:

Malcolm you yourself mentioned thod rgal bas before:

But have you ever met one? In any case, vyukrantikas (thog rgal ba) are considered those above the path of seeing. Now I have met people I think are above the path of seeing, but none of them ever claim to be vyukrantikas.

I think like you said, at the end of the day, you prefer Sakya Pandita, that's great I guess. IMO Rongzom and Nubchen had access to sources that later Tibetans didn't have so I believe them when they are talking about Chan. Not that I practice Chan of course.

Malcolm wrote:

Stage skippers are people who jump from say the fourth bhumi to the seventh, or the seventh to the ninth, not the first to the tenth.

The realization of Buddhahood depends on the two accumulations — people who think otherwise are merely fantasizing.

Nyangral basically supports Ba Salnang's account of the Samye Debate, FYI.

I think we need to be careful about claims that Nub was a Chan practitioner — I think it is very doubtful, he is too late.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

cloudburst said:

Just to clarify, can you give a definition for first and second order cognitions? As of this discussion, I am assuming that they relate to direct and indirect cognitions.

In another discussion, you specified that the heat stage of the path of preparation was a conceptual mind. I agree.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, heat on the path of preparation/application is a conceptual mind, it is a samadhi on an inferential emptiness.

The point I am making here, however is a little different. When TKF states that an inference becomes a direct perception, this is nonsensical, it is impossible.

cloudburst said:

Given that this is the case, how is it that the path of seeing, which develops directly from the path of preparation, is a non-conceptual mind, but you claim that a non-conceptual mind cannot arise from a conceptual mind. Could you please clarify?

Malcolm wrote:

A conceptual mind can never produce a nonconceptual mind — it is impossible. The mind (sems) is always with concepts (rnam par rtog pa).

The path of seeing arises from a cessation of concepts about the four extremes. To paraphrase Shantideva:

When neither an entity nor a nonentity remain before mind, at that time since there is no other possibility, the mind is pacified.

Thus, this avoids the ridiculous notion that conceptual minds produce nonconceptual minds, or that inferences transform into direct perceptions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since when can an inference turn into a direct perception. This like claiming that if I look at smoke long enough, eventually I will see fire.

Tsongkhapa said:

You generate a generic image of emptiness using valid reasons. The first moment is an inferential cognizer and the second and subsequent moments are direct perceivers.

Malcolm wrote:

This is precisely backwards. There is no way a second order cognition can transform into a first order cognition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

This is according to sutra, but according to Tantra, one can attain enlightenment in three years and three months. Many of Je Tsongkhapa's disciples did this.

Malcolm wrote:

One can even attain awakening in six months. The three years, three month thing is a figure from Kalacakra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you somehow imagine that conceptually meditating on emptiness will get you to the first bhumi, let alone Buddhahood?

Tsongkhapa said:

Sure! How else are you going to get experience of emptiness? Tsongkhapa is very clear on this point. We first need to develop an inferential cognizer of emptiness which will later turn into a yogic direct perceiver. Without conceptual experience of emptiness we will never have a direct, non-conceptual experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Since when can an inference turn into a direct perception. This like claiming that if I look at smoke long enough, eventually I will see fire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Sherlock said:

I am not a Chan person, I just follow Nubchen, Rongzom, Longchenpa, Jigme Lingpa, ChNN

Malcolm wrote:

If one can achieve Buddhahood in a single life via Chan there is no reason to follow Vajrayāna at all, let alone Dzogchen.

You have yet to produce your sutra citations.

Sherlock said:

One can go from 1st bhumi to 10th with Chan. It is based on having achieved 1st bhumi already if not then it is like other sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

People make this claim, but have nothing with which to back it up, making truly lame excuses like Rongzom that the path is so fast one does not have time to accumulate merit to manifest the qualities of the bhumis (which are actually measures of qualities and not realizations). Generally, I like Rongzom, but sometimes he makes very unfounded and rash assertions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Sherlock said:

I am not a Chan person, I just follow Nubchen, Rongzom, Longchenpa, Jigme Lingpa, ChNN

Malcolm wrote:

If one can achieve Buddhahood in a single life via Chan there is no reason to follow Vajrayāna at all, let alone Dzogchen.

You have yet to produce your sutra citations.

Sherlock said:

One can go from 1st bhumi to 10th with Chan. It is based on having achieved 1st bhumi already if not then it is like other sutra.

The citation is translated in SMS Level 1 text, 2008 edition.

Malcolm wrote:

What section?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Sherlock said:

I thought 1st bhumi used to be quite common?

It's more of the progress through the other bhumis that takes 3 kalpas.

On the other hand there are some sutras that say you can instantly go from 1st to 10th bhumi which Chan quotes.

Malcolm wrote:
Sūtras such as?

Sherlock said:
Nubchen just says "the prajnaparamita" so I assume its one version of the Prajnapanita.

Malcolm wrote:
Where does Nubchen say this. Then it is easy find out if the citation really exists in the PP sūtras.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 3:07 AM
Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have
Content:
Sherlock said:
I am not a Chan person, I just follow Nubchen, Rongzom, Longchenpa, Jigme Lingpa, ChNN

Malcolm wrote:
If one can achieve Buddhahood in a single life via Chan there is no reason to follow Vajrayāna at all, let alone Dzogchen.

You have yet to produce your sutra citations.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:55 AM
Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have
Content:

Challenge23 said:
Please forgive me, but I'm a little confused.

If actual buddhahood doesn't happen in the desire realm, then how does any Buddhist method work at all, especially Vajrayana which promises Enlightenment in one desire realm lifetime?

Malcolm wrote:
As to your first question, if you are common Mahāyāna practitioner, you are already know the path is long and so you do not practice with the expectation of achieving buddhahood in this lifetime.

As to your second, Vajrayāna has special methods.

Challenge23 said:

Ahh. That makes more sense. And I didn't see your clarification that you were speaking exclusively about sutrayana practice. I apologize. Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course Chan people think this is all bullshit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Sherlock said:

I thought 1st bhumi used to be quite common?

It's more of the progress through the other bhumis that takes 3 kalpas.

Malcolm wrote:

path of accumulation to 8th bhumi two incalculable eons; 8-10, one incalculable eon.

Sherlock said:

On the other hand there are some sutras that say you can instantly go from 1st to 10th bhumi which Chan quotes.

Malcolm wrote:

Such as?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Sherlock said:

I thought 1st bhumi used to be quite common?

It's more of the progress through the other bhumis that takes 3 kalpas.

On the other hand there are some sutras that say you can instantly go from 1st to 10th bhumi which Chan quotes.

Malcolm wrote:

Sūtras such as?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:44 AM
Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have
Content:

Challenge23 said:
Please forgive me, but I'm a little confused.

If actual buddhahood doesn't happen in the desire realm, then how does any Buddhist method work at all, especially Vajrayana which promises Enlightenment in one desire realm lifetime?

Malcolm wrote:
As to your first question, if you are common Mahāyāna practitioner, you are already know the path is long and so you do not practice with the expectation of achieving buddhahood in this lifetime.

As to your second, Vajrayāna has special methods.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:37 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Well, I know this is a Mahayana board, but there's a whole section of the book of the twos in the Anguttara Nikaya about happiness or sukham in Pali. It might just be marketing though.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:30 AM
Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have
Content:

BuddhaFollower said:
What about KDL?

Malcolm wrote:
Through sutrayāna, I should have clarified.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:19 AM
Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point still stands, however, no one attains Buddhahood in the desire realm.

smcj said:

Sakyamuni? Padmasmbhava? Bodhidharma?

Malcolm wrote:

The latter two were emanations, I don't know if Bodhidharma was a Buddha or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

smcj said:

Unless someone is some kind of emanation (which cannot be externally ascertained), we can assume that having been born in the desire realm, we are very much beginners on the path.

Statistically? Yes. Specifically? No, regardless of whether or not you retroactively deem someone an "emanation".

Malcolm wrote:

The point still stands, however, no one attains Buddhahood in the desire realm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A promise of happiness underlies all successful marketing.

dharmagoat said:

Doesn't the Buddha promise happiness too?

Malcolm wrote:

He does not make promises of that kind. But what he does say is that if you follow the Dharma, you can discover total freedom from suffering. If you want to call that happiness, ok. But it is more like describing absence of disease as health.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

I'm going to stick with tantra.

Can accomplish whole path in 1 lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is what we practice, but we study sūtra to understand what it is that tantra is seeking to accomplish so rapidly, and also so that we maintain a correct Madhyamaka view. To some extent the latter is not strictly necessary, because even Yogacarins attain full awakening through the sadhana method even though in post-equipoise their view is a little extreme. This being so, there is much hope for both gzhan stong pas and their mirror image, the Gelugpas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

smcj said:

The point being that, unless we can see someone's individual karma, we do not have enough data to know how those types of teachings apply to a specific case.

Malcolm wrote:

Unless someone is some kind of emanation (which cannot be externally ascertained), we can assume that having been born in the desire realm, we are very much beginners on the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

I assume these 3 incalculable eons have to be perfect practice as well?

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this assumes the practitioners of the highest capacity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This discusses conceptual analysis, not meditation.

Greg said:

Do you hold that conceptual analysis is never "meditation?"

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, it is only a post-equipoise exercise. One should not engage in conceptual analysis in equipoise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

smcj said:

Even then it takes three incalculable eons, Chan is no shortcut.

Ah yes, but nobody knows whether or not somebody has already put in 2.9999 eons of work into it already!

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it takes two incalculable eons achieve the eighth bhumi. It takes another eon after that to attain full awakening. Moreover, actual buddhahood does not happen in desire realm, but rather in Akanistha Gaṇḍavyuha in the presence of the Sambhogakāya. Only emanations appear to attain buddhahood here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Bakmoon, read this thread:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=4704&start=0>

Bakmoon said:

That thread deals quite a bit with Tantra, but you don't need Tantra to attain a nonconceptual realization of emptiness. Sutric meditation can also lead to it.

Sherlock said:

Sutrayana takes kalpas to get nonconceptual for most people, unless you have high capacity for Chan.

Malcolm wrote:

Even then it takes three incalculable eons, Chan is no shortcut, they just pretend that since everything is empty, paths and stages do not matter because they are not ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Conceptual meditation on emptiness is a necessary precursor to non-conceptual meditation on emptiness though.

Malcolm wrote:

How can a conceptual meditation turn unto a nonconceptual meditation?

Bakmoon said:

It occurs as it is described in the Kashyapa Parivarta Sutra which says: For example, two trees are dragged against each other by the wind and from that a fire starts, burning the two trees. In the same way, Kashyapa, if you have correct analytical discrimination, the power of a noble being's wisdom will emerge. With its emergence, correct analytical discrimination will itself be burned up.

Malcolm wrote:

This discusses conceptual analysis, not meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Conceptual meditation on emptiness is a necessary precursor to non-conceptual meditation on emptiness though.

Malcolm wrote:

How can a conceptual meditation turn unto a nonconceptual meditation?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

anjali said:

My goodness. Who would have thought that the phrase, "Drop your mind," would be controversial? This seems like a tempest in a teacup.

Tsongkhapafan said:

What's in a word? everything! Everything is mere name, so we need to be very precise in terms of how we use words to convey meaning. 'Drop your mind' is a bit too throwaway from my point of view. Is he encouraging us to abandon conceptual thoughts (bad idea),

or deluded conceptual thoughts? (good idea). The difference is very important.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you somehow imagine that conceptually meditating on emptiness will get you to the first bhumi, let alone Buddhahood?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For the purposes of an empowerment there are three kinds: a drawn mandala, a powder mandala and a body mandala.

With respect to the first two, there is a procedure of setting out the mandala, i.e. preparing the site, laying it out, coloring it and so on. With respect to the last it is based completely on the samadhi of the master conferring the empowerment, whereas the other two are supports for the samadhi of the master, but primarily as a aid to students of lesser capacity.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, then the question is, in what sense does one "enter" any of these mandalas? The only real explanation of this I see in what you said has to do with "dependent origination" but honestly, for me, this doesn't explain much.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, first what happens is that master leads you to the eastern door, etc. I thought you were paying attention during the empowerment? Or did you just enjoy watching HHST sit there more?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A promise of happiness underlies all successful marketing.

dzogchungpa said:

OH SNAP!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

DesertDweller said:

Still, someone should probably ask the Rinpoche. Otherwise don't be surprised if the issue doesn't disappear.

Malcolm wrote:

People's misunderstandings will never disappear completely. This is why the same questions are raised again and again, and the same answers given, again and again.

dzogchungpa said:

Maybe the real question that needs to be answered is: "What is a mandala?"

Malcolm wrote:

For the purposes of an empowerment there are three kinds: a drawn mandala, a powder mandala and a body mandala.

With respect to the first two, there is a procedure of setting out the mandala, i.e. preparing the site, laying it out, coloring it and so on. With respect to the last it is based completely on the samadhi of the master conferring the empowerment, whereas the other two are supports for the samadhi of the master, but primarily as a aid to students of lesser capacity. Whichever the case may be, the mandala is in any case created and then dissolved at the end of the rite. After that it is up to the students to do the daily practice themselves.

So for example, the Vajrakilaya empowerment you attended with HHST has been dissolved — it no longer exists in that space, in that place. The minute HHST was done with the rites of conferring the empowerments, he began to finish the Ganapuja (empowerments are actually a branch of ganapuja activities), offer tormas and in the end he dismissed the wisdom beings in the front created mandala and the vase mandala and dissolved his self-creation thus ending the rite completely apart from the dedication of merits, aspirations and benedictory prayers.

The only sense in which we can say that mandala continues is in the mandala of students who attended the empowerment. But until you yourself do the retreats, and so on, you cannot give that empowerment to someone else. That mandala does not exist on the video as a living entity. It cannot practice the sadhana, it also cannot grant empowerment, etc.

The misconception which Astus has is the notion that an empowerment is merely communicating information received through the five senses, thus for him there is no difference between an empowerment and a recording of an empowerment, it is merely information. While it is true that information is being communicated through the five sense, that is not all that is happening, there are samadhis involved on the part of both the master and the students at the same time, there is the dependent origination which

needs to be actively created between the master and the student at the same time, particularly in the lower empowerments; there are the samaya vows conferred and received and the agreement to follow them (Whatever you say boss, all that I will do....), and so on — all of the things which I have now explained exhaustively.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

DesertDweller said:

Why such resistance, though? There is obviously confusion about the issue that could be cleared away with a simple question. It's not some minor technical issue but something which could apparently lead to serious obstructions for the many people who seem to have interpreted his words as meaning that recorded empowerments are possible. Anyway, I hope somebody does ask him when they see him, that's all.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly — and no disrespect intended towards Garchen Rinpoche — it does not really matter what his answer is.

For example, let us say some one claims "Oh, there is God in Buddhadharma, I heard my guru say so" and even goes so far as to find a quote where this or that guru says there is God in Buddhism. This does not mean that this is correct, or that there is fact the doctrine of God in Buddhadharma, or that we need to take that statement literally.

Let us say for example, that someone claims "My guru says that there is no rebirth and no karma in Buddhism" and even goes so far as to find a quote where this or that guru says there is there is no rebirth and no karma in Buddhadharma. This does not mean that this is correct, or that there is fact no doctrine of rebirth and karma in Buddhadharma.

This is why, in the end, even what one's guru says must be subjected to scrutiny, it must be measured against what is taught in the tantra and the authoritative opinions of masters of the past. If someone who one regards as a guru teaches something that does not correspond with Buddhadharma, one must ignore those statements. Since we subject all the Buddha's words to scrutiny, why should we not do the same with respect to what our gurus say? Why should we abandon our critical thinking merely because we think our guru is a Buddha? We should not.

In particular, when confronted with novelties such as the assertion that people can receive empowerments from recordings of past empowerments, people must use common sense in addition to reason. Who is making this claim? Why is this claim being made?, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Religious transference: Nichiren Buddhism and Catholicism

Content:

nichirenista said:

I should probably clarify that I wasn't consciously attracted to Nichiren Buddhism because I consciously thought it was similar to Catholicism. Here is what attracted me to Nichiren Buddhism: The idea that I could get what I want by chanting for it, which is most definitely NOT taught in Catholicism...

Malcolm wrote:

It is also not taught in Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

DesertDweller said:

Still, someone should probably ask the Rinpoche. Otherwise don't be surprised if the issue doesn't disappear.

Malcolm wrote:

People's misunderstandings will never disappear completely. This is why the same questions are raised again and again, and the same answers given, again and again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

WeiHan said:

Is there a similar thread asking if Bikkhu and Bikkhuni ordination can be obtained from recording?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not, because no one would be so stupid as to imagine they could receive an ordination from a recording. I already addressed this point as well.

WeiHan said:

I was just curious why people so liberally leverage such scrutinizing questions on Vajrayana practices but ignore that other yanas have similar practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is because most people really do not understand the process of empowerment, even people who have been following Vajrayāna for years — so they get strange ideas in their heads, indulge in fantasies, and generally invent very many strange practices. It

has been happening for a long time, which is why Sapan wrote the Three Vows to begin with.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Sherlock said:

Malcolm could you answer this question? Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

The Union of the Sun and Moon Tantra states:

After that, “Nonconceptual Great Muni” made offerings with offerings of non-attachment to the Teacher, Mahāvajradhara; petitioned with a melody of non-invocation, held a thought of non-abiding, rose from the seat that was not laid out, donned a garment that was not fabricated, invoked with a song that was not intoned, and requested with words that were not spoken. Having arisen before those with faith that clears the darkness, in this way he made a request to the teacher with the words of the song of the vajra:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

WeiHan said:

Is there a similar thread asking if Bikkhu and Bikkhuni ordination can be obtained from recording?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not, because no one would be so stupid as to imagine they could receive an ordination from a recording. I already addressed this point as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma is about how things are, and how things are is sarvadukkham.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I'm not an expert on either Shambhala or Ray, but from what I understand this is not the Shambhala view, and if I am not mistaken, for Ray the Shambhala view is fundamental.

Malcolm wrote:

A promise of happiness underlies all successful marketing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

narraboth said:

Even the recording contains all activities that the guru has done or prepared, the actual mandala has gone by the time when students watch or hear it. Unless whenever you watch or listen to the recording, the mandala re-generated, but that doesn't make sense. Live-stream empowerment is different: if the guru includes certain students in the mandala with his visualisation, no matter the student is sitting in the Gumpa, outside of Gumpa, another building or another country, there is a actual mandala AT THAT TIME so it is possible. In non-real-time case, even the guru visualise the uncertain students all in the current mandala, there still won't be that mandala at the time when those people hear it; when there was a mandala and the guru visualised them in, those people do not aware anything thus could not create any link. So it is illogical, not just against the text, for any empowerment that needs a mandala or object to be given with non-real-time recording.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

narraboth said:

However, it is totally possible that whenever a student watch a video or hear an audio of empowerment from a truly great master, if he or she generates genuine faith, the master and deity will appear in front of him or her to grant blessing. It will certainly create a link with that deity and master, but it is not the same thing as receiving empowerment in an actual mandala.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

narraboth said:

Can it still be called 'empowerment'?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

narraboth said:

Well, if the empowerment people receive in guruyoga by their prayer and visualisation also an empowerment, then why not.

Malcolm wrote:

As you state below, the empowerments in Guru Yoga are a path empowerment one is

authorized to do by having properly received empowerment in the first place.

narraboth said:

Whilst it is actually required that students receive 4 empowerments in actual mandala before they can practice guruyoga, although nowadays many masters just give glung of guruyoga no matter what.

Malcolm wrote:

And this is not a correct practice.

narraboth said:

I still think there is a difference between them. I mean, I personally think if people practice guruyoga without actually receiving 4 empowerments, it would be more like a blessing+practicing. Guruyoga is called path empowerment, you can't have path without base. I guess same apply to the case here.

Malcolm wrote:

Exactly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 7:15 PM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, a master has to create the mandala: there is the master's creation of himself as the mandala, the front created mandala, the mandala in the vase and so on and so forth.

Once the ritual has finished, all these mandalas and so on are dissolved so they do not exist anymore since they are not being maintained by the master's visualization, having been dissolved. I explained all of this already in the other thread on this point.

Not only that, but the recording generally only covers the activities for the disciple. All the activities that the master has to do before conferring the empowerment are not recorded.

Thus the recording is incapable of doing recreating these things since a recording has no mind, no volition and so on.

Astus said:

What the master visualises and does before the empowerment does not show for the receiver either when he is present physically or when it is through a live broadcast. How is it any different for the person watching a recording? Whether the master followed the prescribed procedure to give the empowerment or not, it cannot be known by the receiver. Whatever is received by the disciple exists only as physical sensory perception, so anything beyond that does not have any role in receiving the empowerment. But if you say it does, then what and how?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the point. The point is whether the rite is complete or not with all its parts.

A master does a sadhana, creates a mandala, invites the students into that mandala and closes the mandala.

If the master does not do the sadhana before hand, creating the mandala, even if he reads the portion of the initiation text meant create the students as the mandala, it won't happen. The master must be visualizing himself as that specific deity for which he is giving the empowerment having already properly performed the sadhana himself, before he can give the empowerment. Likewise, during the empowerment, the master must visualize all the students in the form the deity, he must summon the wisdom continuum of that deity to merge with the visualized form of the students he has visualized as the deity, make it firm, and then bestow the various blessings of body speech and mind will maintaining all of this visualization continuously. Also the student from their side must try their best to follow and do the described visualizations at the same time the master is doing them.

Finally, and importantly, at the end of the ritual the master dissolves the mandala completely. Once he finishes his sadhana, the mandala has been dissolved. One cannot receive empowerment into a mandala that has been dissolved, just as one cannot enter a house that has been constructed and then dismantled.

For example, while one can watch a video of a house being constructed and dismantled, one will never be able to enter that house at any time while one is watching the recording. If one the other hand you are there for the raising of the structure, you can enter the structure until it has been dismantled. Likewise, in terms of receiving an initiations, if you are present for the master's creation of the students as the mandala, then you can enter that mandala, but if you are not present in real time, then it does not work. Why? Because the master and the student have to be engaged at the same time in the process of the giving and receiving the empowerment, they have to be in the mandala together. This is impossible with a recording.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So if I received a proper empowerment from Garchen Rinpoche, and then he said watching recordings of some of his empowerments can function as an empowerment, I should take that to be true, right?

Even so you have to check whether what your guru says accords with the Dharma, and if not, you need ignore it. Otherwise, one is just becoming someone who has blind faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One can either follow what the Buddha taught in valid tantras, or one can follow the opinion of the crowd, really, its your choice.

dzogchungpa said:

Aren't you supposed to view your guru as a Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

This presumes you have received a proper empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Some of you people are, understandably, ignorant of what an empowerment entails, what makes an empowerment valid and does not constitute a valid empowerment. It is not something which is subject to the shifting opinions of this or that Tibetan.

Johnny Dangerous said:

That is only true if people accept that you are the sole authority on the subject Malcolm, no offense.

Malcolm wrote:

I suggest you in particular read Sakya Pandita's Three Vows.

One can either follow what the Buddha taught in valid tantras, or one can follow the opinion of the crowd, really, its your choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Hey Malcolm,

Is there any difference in terms of power or at least ease for the master between empowering one student and one thousand?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, their capacity for visualizing each person as the deity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 9:02 AM

Title: Re: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Some of you people are, understandably, ignorant of what an empowerment entails, what makes an empowerment valid and does not constitute a valid empowerment. It is not something which is subject to the shifting opinions of this or that Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 7:19 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Sherlock said:

Practicing what the guru teaches is the best offering, so when we do guruyoga, sing SoV and dedicate at the end, we are offering.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because the context of the original teaching of SOV was as an offering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 5:42 AM

Title: More on recorded empowerments, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, who ever said it was otherwise?

Astus said:

Then there is no difference between a live broadcast and a recording in terms of visual and auditory impressions. Maybe even mass empowerments are similar as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a difference, as I told you.

For example, a master has to create the mandala: there is the master's creation of himself as the mandala, the front created mandala, the mandala in the vase and so on and so forth.

Once the ritual has finished, all these mandalas and so on are dissolved so they do not exist anymore since they are not being maintained by the master's visualization, having been dissolved. I explained all of this already in the other thread on this point.

Not only that, but the recording generally only covers the activities for the disciple. All the activities that the master has to do before conferring the empowerment are not recorded.

Thus the recording is incapable of doing recreating these things since a recording has no mind, no volition and so on.

Really, there is no chance a recorded empowerment can actually confer empowerment, it is just not possible.

You see, this is why when people like yourself, who really have zero understanding of Varjayāna weigh in in such topics, your words are a best ignorant and at worst misleading.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is never the case, it is more like a stamp and its impression. A recorded empowerment can never be a stamp, it can only be an impression. In this case, an inert impression. A student, who receives an empowerment, is an animate living person upon whom an impression has been made, and when they have realized the meaning, they too can make impressions on others.

This is essentially why, for all who reading, the idea that one can receive an empowerment from a recording is a corrupt idea that will destroy lineages if people take it seriously.

Astus said:

How does the stamp meets the wax? Isn't it through the five outer senses?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, who ever said it was otherwise?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

You seem to be saying that misery needs to be instilled in us before we can practice the Dharma. Is that correct?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am saying it is already there. If you are not recognizing it, it is because you have not

really understood what suffering is.

dharmagoat said:

For those that already recognise the hopelessness of saṃsāra and are suffering, might a degree of positivity in the message be encouraging?

Malcolm wrote:

Sachen Kunga Nyingpo says:

If one carefully reflects on the absence of happiness wherever one is born in saṃsara's three realms, whatever one does will become Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

You seem to be saying that misery needs to be instilled in us before we can practice the Dharma. Is that correct?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am saying it is already there. If you are not recognizing it, it is because you have not really understood what suffering is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Can the message be something between the two extremes of negative and positive? A middle way, perhaps?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. The Saddharmasmṛtyupasthāna Sūtra states:

Hell beings experience the flames of hell.

Pretas experience hunger and thirst.

Animals experience eating one another.

Humans experience short lives.

Asuras experience conflict and violence.

Devas experience unconcern.

There exists no happiness
in saṃsara, even the size of a pinpoint.

Vasubandhu says:

The childish, like a hand,

do not see the suffering of the conditioned, like a hair.

The Āryas, like an eye,

always flinch because of them.

Maitreyanatha says:

Just as there is no sweet smell in feces, there is no happiness in the five migrations.

Nāgārjuna says:

The gentle regret this samsara,

the source of many sufferings of

impoverishment due to desire, death, illness, aging and so on.

Also one must hear about its flaws.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when you have medicine that tastes really bad, you have to convince people the disease is worse, that's all.

dharmagoat said:

That sounds like a recipe for even more suffering. A double dose of negativity.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if all you want is someone beaming positive messages at you, try another religion.

Dharma is about how things are, and how things are is sarvadukkham.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

WeiHan said:

What assumes a type of mental connection that is bound by time?

Astus said:

That the mental state of the person giving the empowerment influences the receiver's mind, as if there were a direct connection between two mind-streams.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is never the case, it is more like a stamp and its impression. A recorded empowerment can never be a stamp, it can only be an impression. In this case, an inert impression. A student, who receives an empowerment, is an animate living person upon whom an impression has been made, and when they have realized the meaning, they too can make impressions on others.

This is essentially why, for all who reading, the idea that one can receive an empowerment from a recording is a corrupt idea that will destroy lineages if people take

it seriously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

smcj said:

Sorry, there really is no sugar that will mask the taste of rebirth and karma -- it a very strong medicine for a strong disease.

Malcolm, I think I'm just as right wing/hardcore about this subject as you are, but I disagree with your approach. You can't leave people at the bottom of a cliff and say that there is a door to Dharma at the top of the cliff. You've got to give them a way to get there. Simply abandoning them like that could very well be breaking the bodhisattva vow.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when you have medicine that tastes really bad, you have to convince people the disease is worse, that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

smcj said:

You cannot be a Dharma practitioner and yet reject rebirth. Do we really have to have this conversation yet again?

I doubt that someone like Trungpa rejected rebirth in his own practice, yet he did not make a huge issue out of it with his students. If so, then how he chose to guide his students towards Dharma is limited only by his own realization and upaya/skill. Thus there is room for acceptance or rejection of what he did, but based only on how one sees his attainments, not on how much latitude a realized teacher has on guiding their students towards Dharma.

For me, he was not my teacher, so I feel no need to formulate an opinion about whether he was realized enough to use his discretion to adapt things the way he did. But I acknowledge that there is room for that type of thing within the tradition--if needed and by a fully realized teacher.

You do realize that he participated in Dagara initiations with an African teacher named Malidoma Patrice Somé?

He is very open minded, maybe too much so. He has not limited his open-mindedness to the teachings coming from Tibet. That may or may not be a good thing. Personally I leave my comfort Zone at the edges of the Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Anyway, teachers like this are not for me. And apart from these things, I really don't have an opinion. People are free to follow whatever they want and whoever they want.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I think I need to make it clear again that I am not talking about rejecting rebirth, but rather finding ways to accommodate it.

WeiHan said:

Do you mean evidence for rebirth? Or how it fit into your world view?

dharmagoat said:

Being introduced to it in a way that does not incline one to reject it.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, there really is no sugar that will mask the taste of rebirth and karma -- it a very strong medicine for a strong disease.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

You are just having a knee-jerk reaction to one thing he said somewhere though, again, he may departs somewhat from traditional views i'm sure, but he is hugely far from a materialist or secular Buddhist etc.

Malcolm wrote:

I am never said he was either. I simply don't like the way he phrases "rebirth" in his talks and later works as if it is some initiation process. He uses that language over and over again in many places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot be a Dharma practitioner and yet reject rebirth. Do we really have to have

this conversation yet again?

dharmagoat said:

It is not the same conversation. Your response is the same, that is all.

I think I need to make it clear again that I am not talking about rejecting rebirth, but rather finding ways to accommodate it.

Malcolm wrote:

One can either accept it or not. There is no way to "accommodate it" without a great deal of conceptual proliferation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

You are just having a knee-jerk reaction to one thing he said somewhere though, again, he may depart somewhat from traditional views i'm sure, but he is hugely far from a materialist or secular Buddhist etc.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that he participated in Dagara initiations with an African teacher named Malidoma Patrice Somé?

Johnny Dangerous said:

"...of particular impact in my study with Malidoma was an all-night 'earth burial' which, through its initiatory death and rebirth process, allowed my life to crumble and then arise in a way that established earth and the 'body work' once and for all, as the core of my spiritual life"

Malcolm wrote:

—— Touching Enlightenment

If you look around, you will discover that Malidoma Patrice Somé is fervent advocate of sacrificing animals. I can't say that this was part of Ray's initiation (though I would be surprised if it was not). We all know how the Buddha felt about animal sacrifice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you only have one lifetime, and you want to dedicate yourself to the benefit of sentient beings, it is better done in service as a doctor, nurse, fire fighter, aid worker, etc. rather than pretending to oneself that one is a Dharma practitioner.

dharmagoat said:

Not that they are not mutually exclusive.

As Dharma practitioners, we each do what we can. To think that someone is either a fully-fledged Dharma practitioner or not one at all does seem rather... dualistic.

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot be a Dharma practitioner and yet reject rebirth. Do we really have to have this conversation yet again?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But if incarnation is viewed as a sort of metaphor

Case closed.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Have you read his books? If not, then no, case not closed..unfortunate use of terms maybe, but you can't know his views from one little snippet of text.

Unless he's revised his views, he's definitely not what you are implying here at all, you think he believes in Dharmapalas..but takes a materialist view of rebirth?

Malcolm wrote:

Ray is very influenced by shamanism. One can have an animistic view of the world and yet not accept rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But if incarnation is viewed as a sort of metaphor

Case closed.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Have you read his books? If not, then no, case not closed..unfortunate use of terms maybe, but you can't know his views from one little snippet of text.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. I understand that in his books he presents a normative view. It is what people actually teach their students that is more salient, for me at any rate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

So, Malcolm, what are your thoughts on Dr. Reggie Ray as a teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have any opinion about Ray at all, apart from a bit of discomfort about his having decided to introduce brand new "Tibetan" "dharmapāla" he calls "Ritrö Gonpo" based on some vision he had of Kit Carson Peak and an interview where he seemed to dismiss the importance of teachings on rebirth and karma.

More here:

<http://www.soundstrue.com/store/the-protectors.html>

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'd guess you are misreading the rebirth and karma quote..he is quite far from a 'secular Buddhist' or something similar, even a cursory reading of his books will show that. In fact, he often goes off on tangents about how a big part of what Vajrayana changes for westerners is our de-sacralized, materialist worldview. I think he purposely makes his presentation accessible to people who might be waffling, but in terms of his own views he seems pretty solidly like any Vajrayana practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

But if incarnation is viewed as a sort of metaphor

Case closed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If one does not accept rebirth, one has no motivation to practice Dharma, except as an ego trip. It is that simple.

dharmagoat said:

I don't see how a person dedicating to the benefit of all beings what they perceive as their one-and-only life can be considered an ego trip.

Malcolm wrote:

If you only have one lifetime, and you want to dedicate yourself to the benefit of sentient beings, it is better done in service as a doctor, nurse, fire fighter, aid worker, etc. rather than pretending to oneself that one is a Dharma practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

smcj said:

....I solved the dilemma by understanding what was going to make my practice move ahead, and choosing my practice over my doubts.

The underlined part is what most people don't see. Only now am I getting to the point where I can try to say how that is so for myself, and doing it very badly. If you have a coherent presentation of that understanding, I think people would be interested.

Malcolm wrote:

If one does not accept rebirth, one has no motivation to practice Dharma, except as an ego trip. It is that simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

He is providing a way to engage with Buddhadharma for those that may otherwise dismiss it.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the common apology for such sentiments, but I have never accepted it as valid.

dharmagoat said:

That is understandable if you have never experienced the dilemma yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

On the contrary, I solved the dilemma by understanding what was going to make my practice move ahead, and choosing my practice over my doubts. Then of course, over time, I also discovered the clear rational for why it is irrational to believe that mind stream can arise from material causes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

He is providing a way to engage with Buddhadharma for those that may otherwise dismiss it.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the common apology for such sentiments, but I have never accepted it as valid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Thanks, Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

... an interview where he seemed to dismiss the importance of teachings on rebirth and karma.

dharmagoat said:

Which interview is this? Could you provide a link?

Malcolm wrote:

Some interview, it was several years ago. He said:

The whole belief in past lives is something that Buddhism inherited from Indian Tradition.

And I think, as with many things in Asian Buddhism, we need to take a critical look at this and see...you know, the Buddha said to his own students "...anything that I teach you, don't take it at face value, don't believe it just because even I said it-- you have to look at it and evaluate it within your own framework and see if it makes sense. And if it doesn't make sense, dump it, get rid of it." And I think that incarnation, ah...

reincarnation, as a literal teaching, I don't find it helpful for anybody because it takes your focus away from this life. But if incarnation is viewed as a sort of metaphor for the

fact that we humans are on some kind of extremely long spiritual journey that happened before we were born, and it's going to keep on going, then I think it's helpful." Personally, I think such sentiments are misguided.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

So, Malcolm, what are your thoughts on Dr. Reggie Ray as a teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have any opinion about Ray at all, apart from a bit of discomfort about his having decided to introduce brand new "Tibetan" "dharmapāla" he calls "Ritrö Gonpo" based on some vision he had of Kit Carson Peak and an interview where he seemed to dismiss the importance of teachings on rebirth and karma.

More here:

<http://www.soundstrue.com/store/the-protectors.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 28th, 2015 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are a number of levels at work here, but the most fundamental is that when you receive an empowerment, you are in fact receiving a number of vows, refuge vows, bodhisattva vows as well as vows of secret mantra. It is not simply "instruction."

dzogchungpa said:

This is interesting. I don't know about secret mantra vows, but can't you take refuge and bodhisattva vows by yourself?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a Mahāyāna system for going for refuge and generating bodhicitta on one's own if one cannot find a master. It is also not at all clear that when one goes for Mahāyāna refuge in this way, one is adopting the five vows of a lay person as well as the bodhisattva vows.

But, one cannot self-ordain as a novice, or a monk, nor can one confer upon oneself any empowerment.

In general one should receive the three vows from a master and then enhance them by renewing them daily. Unless of course you are a very high Dzogchen practitioner like so

many people we see on Buddhist internet boards who have transcended the need for mundane things such as paying attention to the state of their vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anyway, this is a stupid conversation — you cannot receive empowerments from a recording of an empowerment, period. End of story. Just like you cannot receive monks vows from a recording, and so on. People who think they have received an empowerment from a recording are just deluding themselves and received nothing whatsoever. Even if they recite mantras and practices they think they have received from a recording there will be no benefit whatsoever, in fact the opposite will be the case.

If you want to receive a vow, any vow, you have to do it in the proper way, and receiving them from a recording cannot be construed as proper at all.

Dan74 said:

Malcolm, could you elucidate why this is so? Or point me to a resource??

From my non-Vajrayana perspective I can easily see how in some instance face-to-faces interaction with a teacher who knows your heart is indispensable, but a lot of other instruction can be received in various formats. What mechanism in empowerments makes it work when it is live and fail when it isn't?

/
dan

Malcolm wrote:

There are a number of levels at work here, but the most fundamental is that when you receive an empowerment, you are in fact receiving a number of vows, refuge vows, bodhisattva vows as well as vows of secret mantra. It is not simply "instruction."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Buddhas' minds are non-conceptual but they do possess the five all-accompanying mental factors as this is the valid basis upon which mind is imputed. They have omniscience and therefore they also possess the object ascertaining mental factors.

Malcolm wrote:
and what is your citation for this?

Tsongkhapa said:
You know I can't give my citations because of the TOS, however, I will quote Dharmakīrti's definition of mind which is 'that which is clarity and cognising'. Buddhas have minds, minds cognise, cognition requires mental factors, ergo, Buddhas have minds with mental factors. Bliss for example is experienced by mental factor feeling.

Buddha are not like stones.

Malcolm wrote:
Of course you can give your citations. But I meant from Sutra.

When one says that a Buddha has jñāna, but not vijñāna, this does not mean a Buddha is inert, it means the opposite.

Cognition for an ordinary sentient being requires mental factors, but a Buddha's jñāna does not require mental factors.

For example there is a sutra passage cited in the Yogācārabhūmi viniścayasamgrahani that states:

"Bhagavān, how should the mental factors of the tathāgatas be known?"

"Mañjuśrī, the mind (citta, sems), intellect (yid, manas) or consciousness (vijñāna, rnam shes) of tathāgatas are indeed not differentiated in discerning wisdom, but the mind of a tathāgata arises without formations, and should be known to be like an emanation."

"Bhagavān, it being the case the dharmakāya of the tathāgatas is free from all action of formations, on the other hand, do mental factors arise without the action of formations?"

"Mañjuśrī, it is due to past cultivation of method and wisdom.

Mañjuśrī, one awakens [from sleep] because of the power of past formations, but though there are no formations for arising in the concentration on cessation, one arises [from concentration] only through the power of past formations. Just as like the mental factors of sleep and the concentration on cessation, the mental factors of the tathāgatas should be known to be formations of past cultivation of method and wisdom."

"Bhagavān, do the emanations of the tathāgatas have minds or not?"

"Mañjuśrī, Though they do not have minds, they are also not mindless, because minds are neither independent nor dependent."

In other words, the mind of a tathāgata is like an emanation, it appears to function in all the ways that a mind functions, but in reality, there are no present active formations happening. Everything that seems to happen in the mind of a Buddha is based on some past cultivation of method and wisdom on the path.

So Buddhas seem to have minds, but in reality, all they have is wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 6:33 PM

Title: Re: What kind of mind do Buddhas have

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Buddhas' minds are non-conceptual but they do possess the five all-accompanying mental factors as this is the valid basis upon which mind is imputed. They have omniscience and therefore they also possess the object ascertaining mental factors.

Malcolm wrote:

and what is your citation for this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: Dharmata teachings.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

but they do have two kinds of omniscient wisdom (sarvajñāta jñāna).

BuddhaFollower said:

Which is synonymous with dharmakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

Both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Dharmata teachings.

Content:

fckw said:

Does anyone know what sort of practices he teaches? Apparently his background is Nyingma.

dzogchungpa said:

BTW, today he said that the only thing he has been teaching for the last ten years, which he is going to keep teaching for a very long time, is "Drop your mind".

Tsongkhapa said:
Become like a plank of wood - not very constructive!
Buddhas have minds.

Malcolm wrote:
What they have is jñāna, not vijñāna, it's a little different a "mind (citta)."

Buddhas do not have thoughts, they do not minds (citta) or mental factors (caitta), but they do have two kinds of omniscient wisdom (sarvajñāta jñāna).

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 5:20 AM
Title: Re: Dharmata teachings.
Content:
fckw said:
Does anyone know what sort of practices he teaches? Apparently his background is Nyingma.

dzogchungpa said:
BTW, today he said that the only thing he has been teaching for the last ten years, which he is going to keep teaching for a very long time, is "Drop your mind".

Malcolm wrote:
Well, that makes for short Dharma talks. རང་སེམས་བབས་ཡོད་ཅིང་

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 3:59 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World
Content:
DesertDweller said:

Yes, we already know that is your view. But the question, which you haven't really answered, is how do you know that the Rinpoche doesn't think otherwise? It doesn't seem that you really do know. Can anyone clarify?

Malcolm wrote:
Garchen Rinpoche is a very traditional lama, who would never advocate that one can actually receive an empowerment from a chunk of inanimate metal and plastic that makes noise and projects an image.

He himself never said that this was a possibility.

Anyway, it cannot be done. It does not depend on this or that lamas opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

DesertDweller said:

Take for instance the issue of recorded empowerments, which I think were deemed acceptable by Garchen Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

Um no...this was an example of enthusiastic over reach on the part of some of his students in one center. Many "innovations" happen this way.

Anders said:

I don't pay close attention, but last time i checked the quotes seemed to indicate the contrary.

How was it established it was students overreaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Because, in the end, when the Khenpo at the center where those students were making that assertion was pressed on the issue, he would not confirm that this in fact was Garchen Rinpoche's point of view.

Anyway, this is a stupid conversation — you cannot receive empowerments from a recording of an empowerment, period. End of story. Just like you cannot receive monks vows from a recording, and so on. People who think they have received an empowerment from a recording are just deluding themselves and received nothing whatsoever. Even if they recite mantras and practices they think they have received from a recording there will be no benefit whatsoever, in fact the opposite will be the case.

If you want to receive a vow, any vow, you have to do it in the proper way, and receiving them from a recording cannot be construed as proper at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Kalachakra Tantra

Content:

EarthMudra said:

so is the Kalachakra Tantra considered Pure Vision?

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by pure vision?

EarthMudra said:

it was taught by the Buddha. I guess that answered my question. Thanks Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Vajrayāna practitioner, then yes you think it was taught by the Buddha. The tantra itself was not actually written down at first, only much later, and there are a couple of versions a long one which we do not have, and the short one which we do have.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Sakya lam-rim text?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Will you have an Abhidharma course soon?

If I have the money I am interested in participating.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh I don't know. Abhidharma takes about a year, twice month. And that is just a course in how to read the book, not a detailed, cover every point course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 27th, 2015 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Sakya lam-rim text?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Same.

Malcolm wrote:

PM me your facebook ID's. I closed the group and am in the process of trimming it down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 26th, 2015 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Healthy sex life as a householder

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing to do with Buddhist Vajrayāna practice, FYI — this is a new age trip based on physical bliss. The aim of Vajrayāna is connate bliss, which is beyond any

physical sensation.

Saoshun said:

Do you think you can have physical orgasm for couple days and months? New age do not touch this realm because they use spirituality to hijack woman into sex as excuse. There are various ways to attain body-samadhi which is beyond bliss which is nice state to transform body channels to more subtle things and siddhis, I don't know if this is Vajrayana view, I have only my personal experience. Also practices like this are not only exclusive to Vajrayana, any decent practice with time you develop (with proper instructions) experiences that suppress physical orgasm. (consider having orgasm couple days and months and just having it for couple seconds)

Malcolm wrote:

If it is physical, it is not that interesting, it is just mundane, and this is addressed and dismissed in the tantras such as the Hevajra Tantra:

The first bliss is the hero,
supreme bliss is the yoginī,
the bliss of intense pleasure is certain for all,
the true knowledge is from the method of their pleasure.
The pleasure of of bliss is slight,
supreme bliss is more than that,
the bliss beyond bliss is free from attachment,
the remaining one is the connate.
The first is the desire to touch,
the second is the desire for pleasure,
the third is the perishing of passion,
therefore, the fourth can be meditated.
Supreme bliss is called existence,
the bliss beyond bliss is called nirvana,
the middle is mere bliss,
the connate is free of these.

Without desire, and not without desire,
nothing perceived in the middle,
Here there is no method and wisdom,
the appearance of true reality,
can't be described by another, the connate
cannot be found anywhere,
but one can understand it in dependence on the Guru,
time and method, and from one's merit.
YMMV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 26th, 2015 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakyong has integrated the Shambhala teachings into the Buddhist path over all, rebranding their lineage as Shambhala Buddhism.

smcj said:

Does it still end up at Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, but rather than Shambhala teaching being a separate path, they are now integrated. So there is a Shambhala ngondro, etc., all culminating in Gesar practice, the so called Werma sadhana, along with other practices authored/revealed by CTR

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 26th, 2015 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Kalachakra Tantra

Content:

EarthMudra said:

so is the Kalachakra Tantra considered Pure Vision?

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by pure vision?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 26th, 2015 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Healthy sex life as a householder

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Just to clarify, though, must the partner also be a Vajrayana practitioner?

Malcolm wrote:

For a Vajrayāna practitioner, yes. Reduces the pool of choices a bit though...

Lazy_eye said:

Also, would you say the answer you gave is consistent with all schools of Buddhism

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I think so. In addition, no minors, spouses partners of others, crazy people. Sex is normal, but it must be conducted responsibly and with care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 26th, 2015 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Healthy sex life as a householder

Content:

duckfiasco said:

What does having a healthy relationship with sex mean to you as a householder?

Malcolm wrote:

It means having a woman I like, in my bed, consensually, in a long term relationship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 26th, 2015 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: Healthy sex life as a householder

Content:

duckfiasco said:

What does having a healthy relationship with sex mean to you as a householder?

Jetavan said:

Fortunately, all the answers are in the "Kamma Dhamma Sutta". Unfortunately, this sutta was considered irrelevant by the early bhikkhus and was not written down.

Fortunately, the upasaka/upasika oral transmission of this sutta has continued into the 21st century. Unfortunately, I cannot share it with anyone just yet. Fortunately, look for it in 2017, at a bookstore near you.

Saoshun said:

If someone wants to have fulfilled sex life I suggest to use tantric methods to prolong orgasm for couple days to couple months and it will develop high level samadhi, but it's need big discipline and already at least medium level achievement of meditation, empty mind, clean prana/chi channels.

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing to do with Buddhist Vajrayāna practice, FYI — this is a new age trip based on physical bliss. The aim of Vajrayāna is connate bliss, which is beyond any physical sensation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 26th, 2015 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

smcj said:

In that presentation what, if anything, comes after Shambhala? Or is it presented as a path to full enlightenment?

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakyong has integrated the Shambhala teachings into the Buddhist path over all,

rebranding their lineage as Shambhala Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 26th, 2015 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

pael said:

If it isn't can they be monk or holder of 5 vows?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 26th, 2015 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Dōgen lived in Japan in the 13th century,

Malcolm wrote:

What I meant was that Dogen did not seem to think that his Shikantaza was innovative or his own approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... in Soto Zen, for example, "Just sitting" is considered Buddhahood itself.

dharmagoat said:

Could this be a later development in Ch'an/Zen?

Malcolm wrote:

Dogen didn't seem to think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, in Kagyu mahāmudra practice, you have to develop one-pointedness first, then non-proliferation, then one taste, etc. Whereas in Soto Zen, for example, "Just

sitting" is considered Buddhahood itself.

dharmagoat said:

I suspect this is an oversimplification of Soto Zen.

"One taste" does occur in the Zen literature, as far as I am aware.

Malcolm wrote:

Talk to some Soto folks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

dharmagoat said:

What do you base that on? I ask so that I may get a better idea of why it is so unlikely.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two places where the term mahāmudra is used; the first is in Yoga tantra, where it refers primarily to the form of the deity. The second is in anuttarayoga tantra where it is described as the siddhi of mahāmudra, an accomplishment, the attainment of Buddhahood.

In other words, the term arises solely in connection with Vajrayāna practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

Sherlock said:

What makes you even think there is a direct link between Chan and Mahamudra?

dharmagoat said:

The similarity is plain for everyone to see.

Malcolm wrote:

How so? Mahāmudra (as in four yogas of mahāmudra) as practiced in the Kagyu tradition is a gradual approach based as much on the Bhavanakrama as it is the dohas; Chan/Zen is always a sudden approach.

In other words, in Kagyu mahāmudra practice, you have to develop one-pointedness first, then non-proliferation, then one taste, etc. Whereas in Soto Zen, for example, "Just sitting" is considered Buddhahood itself.

DG, have you ever received teachings on any of this? It just seems to me that you are

engaging in a lot of proliferation around these issues.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But given that the term "mahāmudra" never appears in any sūtra...

dharmagoat said:

Is it possible that Mahāmudra was a development of Chinese Mahāyāna that made its way back to India and was then appropriated by Vajrayāna without an acknowledgement of its origin?

Malcolm wrote:

Not a chance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

DesertDweller said:

Take for instance the issue of recorded empowerments, which I think were deemed acceptable by Garchen Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

Um no...this was an example of enthusiastic over reach on the part of some of his students in one center. Many "innovations" happen this way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

qwerty13 said:

This is offtopic, but can somebody explain me in simple way what is the difference between sutra mahamudra and Zen/Chan buddhist practice? Both have prajnaparamita as essential text, but we cant say that Zen/Chan practitioner is actually mahamudra practitioner, or am I wrong?

Malcolm wrote:

In the end it boils down to whether mahāmudra is merely the nature of the mind, in which case there is no difference; or whether mahāmudra is a specific result, a siddhi, of a specific kind of practice, in which case there is a huge difference.

But given that the term "mahāmudra" never appears in any sūtra...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

As far as I know, Dr. Ray does not refer to his approach as 'modernist', so it would seem that the use of this term is a red herring as far as this thread is concerned.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm, I don't think anyone did use it with respect to RR...I was addressing another issue which you introduced with your enthusiasm for "innovation."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

DesertDweller said:

So what do we mean by "modernism"?

Modernism: A Roman Catholic movement, officially condemned in 1907, that attempted to examine traditional belief according to contemporary philosophy, criticism, and historiography.

Malcolm wrote:

Remove the "Roman Catholic", and you get my meaning.

Modernism: A movement that attempts to examine traditional belief according to contemporary philosophy, criticism, and historiography.

This is deeply incompatible with Vajrayāna.

Hence we can speak of Buddhist Modernism, people like Stephen Batchelor, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

I'll read his book, I'm curious enough. The difference between orthodoxy and modernism seems to be mostly about presentation and differences on focus IMHO.

Malcolm wrote:

In Vajrayāna there is no such thing as modernism. There is the lineage, and how the lineage presents the teachings. The lineage is unalterable and without a lineage there is

no Vajrayāna to speak of.

Zen, for example, is a sūtrayāna teaching, and this while there is rhetoric about the lineage of patriarchs, ancient buddhas and so on, there is not a universally held idea that the lineage is something inviolable or absolutely necessary. Plenty of people practice Zen without the kind of guru devotion that characterizes Vajrayāna. Also these days many people practice Zen who really do not believe that Zen was actually passed down in a lineage from the time of the Buddha. There is more room for so-called "modernism" in Zen.

But in Vajrayāna, the Vajrayāna teachings are held to come directly from Buddha Vajradhara to our gurus. There is truly little point in trying to practice Vajrayāna if you don't believe this. The second thing is that one should have faith that one's root guru is actually a Buddha, or at least one should try to develop that sincere conviction over time. If one does not have this conviction, it is very difficult to make progress in Vajrayāna practice; but if one has this conviction, it becomes very easy.

Since there is no way to modernize this essential feature of Vajrayāna, Vajrayāna will always resist modernization.

For example, there is a well known story about how Naropa displayed a mandala in the sky to Marpa, and asked Marpa to whom he would prostrate, the guru or the mandala, Marpa, thinking that he saw his guru everyday, but never saw such miraculously manifested mandalas, chose to prostrate to the mandala...big mistake that cost Marpa his family lineage...

So, Mahamudra in the modern world is an impossibility, if by that one means, how can Mahamudra be adapted to fit modern society — it can't, we can only adapt ourselves to Mahāmudra, mahāmudra cannot be adapted to suit us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

It is religious orthodoxy that I avoid, not tradition. I always been inspired by the line of innovators within the Kagyu tradition of Tibetan Buddhism, Tilopa, Nāropa, Milarepa, Marpa...

Malcolm wrote:

How can you possibly believe that these four masters were innovative in any way at all?

dharmagoat said:

Okay, maybe those four can't actually be called 'innovators', but they were transmitting a system that was new to Tibet at the time.

Malcolm wrote:

You Mean Marpa? Vajrayana had already been wide spread in Tibet for 200 years by the time Marpa went to India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dharmagoat said:

It is religious orthodoxy that I avoid, not tradition. I always been inspired by the line of innovators within the Kagyu tradition of Tibetan Buddhism, Tilopa, Nāropa, Milarepa, Marpa...

Malcolm wrote:

How can you possibly believe that these four masters were innovative in any way at all?

Tilopa (Prajñābhada) was a Nalanda educated Pandita, as was Naropa. Marpa was a faithful student of Naropa, and Mila was his student in turn.

None of these masters innovated a thing.

Not only this, but Tilopa and Naropa are not just a "Kagyu" masters, though these days people certainly seem to have this misconception. They are shared also with Sakya, Gelug and old Kadampa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Ray seems like a good guy to me. If you can ignore Waylon Lewis, this is actually a pretty interesting interview:

Malcolm wrote:

Investigating a Vajrayāna teacher for twelve years seems like a good idea in this case...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 25th, 2015 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

cloudburst said:

It seems you are over-reaching here, RJ simply states that the 5DL was critical of the

Panchen's interest in the Kagyu and their doctrines. The article itself concerns the fact that there is a debate over whether or not the Ganden mahamudra has any connection with Kagyu at all. Many Gelugpa believe that the mahamudra practices of Je Tsongkhapa were transmitted directly from Manjushri, therefore being critical of the Panchen regarding interest in Kagyu doctrines does not necessarily imply any criticism of so called Sutra Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps. You need to follow up and look at Samten Karmey's article where he reviews this issue. It seems pretty clear to me that the Fifth was very influenced by Sakya in this regard. [He was from a Sakya family, wrote important texts on Lamdre and Naro Khachod, etc.].

cloudburst said:

I'm interested, thanks. Do you have the title of the article?

Malcolm wrote:

It is in the footnotes of the first article.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

cloudburst said:

It seems you are over-reaching here, RJ simply states that the 5DL was critical of the Panchen's interest in the Kagyu and their doctrines. The article itself concerns the fact that there is a debate over whether or not the Ganden mahamudra has any connection with Kagyu at all. Many Gelugpa believe that the mahamudra practices of Je Tsongkhapa were transmitted directly from Manjushri, therefore being critical of the Panchen regarding interest in Kagyu doctrines does not necessarily imply any criticism of so called Sutra Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps. You need to follow up and look at Samten Karmey's article where he reviews this issue. It seems pretty clear to me that the Fifth was very influenced by Sakya in this regard. [He was from a Sakya family, wrote important texts on Lamdre and Naro Khachod, etc.].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World

Content:

DesertDweller said:

Well, that's an interesting point. Why do you think he might feel that way?

dzogchungpa said:

I don't know, maybe Malcolm can explain it to us.

Malcolm wrote:

He probably means it is not necessary to become an expert on scholastic arguments in the Kośa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Wandering in Samsara

Content:

godhead said:

I am very anxious to know as to dzogchen is a part of BUddhism or not?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Dzogchen is part of Buddhadharma.

godhead said:

If yes then how does it contradict direct words of Guatam Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't, not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

cloudburst said:

Malcolm, in another thread you wrote: This sutra mahāmudra of the Panchen Lama was very controversial in Gelug, and still is, to some degree. The 5th Dalai Lama was very opposed to it, in fact.

This seems doubtful to me as the Panchen Lama was a guru of the Fifth. Do you have any support for this claim?

Malcolm wrote:

See Roger Jackson's article in Changing Minds: Contributions to the Study of Buddhism and Tibet in Honor of Jeffrey Hopkins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Gaden mahamudra (kagyu/gelug mahamudra)

Content:

qwerty13 said:

I have been reading book "Kagyu/gelug tradition of mahamudra" from here and there and there is one thing that I find difficult to understand. The mahamudra practices that are given in the root text (The main road of triumphant ones) contain two mahamudra methods, sutra and tantra. However nowhere in the text or in the related commentary there is anything said about receiving "pointing -out" instructions. Kagyu traditions have sutra mahamudra and there is a lot of talk about receiving pointing out instruction from qualified teacher.

But nothing is said about receiving pointing-out instructions in context of Gaden mahamudra practice. Why is this? Are they unnecessary here? I thought these are necessary in sutra mahamudra practice.

Malcolm wrote:

The text is the pointing out instruction. It is not a direct introduction like what you receive in Dzogchen. Nor is it an introduction such as you receive in the four empowerments. Of course the fact that the text says:

Meditate next on a profound path of guru-yoga and, after making hundreds of very strong, fervent requests, dissolve your visualized guru into yourself.

This automatically means you must be someone who has received niruttarayoga tantra empowerment. There is no guru without a such an empowerment, so how can one speak of guru yoga? Guru Yoga is a method exclusive to higher tantra, the name of which is not encountered in lower tantra much less sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Yuren said:

No offense meant but Malcolm's orthodox catechism reminds me why I never want to get involved with Tibetan Buddhism, at least its institutional form.

To answer OP's question, Reginald Ray created an audio course on Mahamudra, he even gives Ground Mahamudra Transmission in it.

Malcolm wrote:

Ground Mahāmudra transmission? What a joke! You already have ground mahāmudra, how can someone give you something you already have!

Yuren said:

The idea that transmission cannot work remotely is of course mere superstition.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that you can receive transmission from a recording is complete nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

...why wouldn't they seek out a qualified spiritual guide and learn at their feet instead of practising 'internet Dharma'?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, because it is much easier to surf the web while listening... and less obtrusive than surfing the web on your smart phone...

dzogchungpa said:

Oh snap!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

...why wouldn't they seek out a qualified spiritual guide and learn at their feet instead of practising 'internet Dharma'?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, because it is much easier to surf the web while listening... and less obtrusive than surfing the web on your smart phone...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Yuren said:

The orthodox catechism of Malcolm reminds me why I never want to get involved with Tibetan Buddhism, at least its institutional form.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, because our own concepts are just so much better and effective...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The special view of Lamdre is called the inseparability of samsara and nirvana. This view can only be meditated upon after one has received the cause Hevajra empowerment. It is meditated upon prior to engaging in the meditations of the creation and completion stage. The way this is meditated is through thirty-two examples which establish phenomena as mind, mind as an illusion and illusion as natureless. Not only this but there is an inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the path and also an inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the result.

M

WeiHan said:

Hi Malcohlm,

I have received Lam Dre but there are just some subtle points which I cannot make the connection and it is not apparent in the teaching. Regarding the above paragraph, do you mean the 32 examples are a method to meditate on the inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the basis. And then there is a method to meditate on this same view when on the path which is called the inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the path. And then the final fruition, realizing the view in actuality is called the inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the result?

I just need the above general clarification. Thanks in advance.

Malcolm wrote:

it is a bit complicated to summarize.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 24th, 2015 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not only this but there is an inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the path and also an inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the result.

M

WeiHan said:

Hi Malcolm,

inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the path
inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the result.

What does the above mean?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to take Lamdre and find out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

sherabpa said:

I read you yourself recently advising someone to pay close attention during the vase initiation of Vajrakilaya given by HHST, I think it was. But yeah, I agree it is possible to miss the empowerment entirely while being physically present.

Malcolm wrote:

I advised them to pay careful attention through all four empowerments...

dzogchungpa said:

Yes, starting tomorrow!

Malcolm wrote:

Vajradhara in person:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

sherabpa said:

I read you yourself recently advising someone to pay close attention during the vase initiation of Vajrakilaya given by HHST, I think it was. But yeah, I agree it is possible to miss the empowerment entirely while being physically present.

Malcolm wrote:

I advised them to pay careful attention through all four empowerments...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The only way to extract the butter of mahāmudra is to take the milk of the nature of the mind and churn it with the two stages. Other than that, there is no way to realize mahāmudra.

sherabpa said:

What then is the purpose of guru yoga in Sakya? If it is not to enter directly into the wisdom of mahamudra during empowerment, without any need for the two stages, what purpose does it serve? Is it not the case that the two stages are only for those who do not attain mahamudra in the actual empowerment.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Yoga can produce a wisdom that resembles the wisdom produced by the two stages, indeed, but really, this is only for the people of highest capacity or who have developed their capacity through much practice. And of course, to be qualified to practice guru yoga, one should have received all four empowerments in a proper way.

Sadhana practice is indeed for those who do not manage to attain buddhahood during the empowerment. People misunderstand empowerments, thinking they are merely a method of introducing this or that practice. Actually, empowerments are meant to cause people to attain buddhahood; failing that, they practice sadhanas with the two stages and guru yoga.

The reality of it is however that very few people in history have attained buddhahood during an empowerment, or even the bhumis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

sherabpa said:

Thanks for responding.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course this ignores the important point that Naropa was already a Vajrayāna practitioner by the time he met Tilopa.

sherabpa said:

Implying this was a prerequisite for his receiving the wisdom blessing of Tilopa. This transmission was not a practice based on previous initiations, but a wisdom empowerment. All that was needed was his devotion to Tilopa. According to Situ, there are many examples in India and Tibet of such transmissions. However, this method was apparently a specialty of Gampopa.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the cause empowerment tills the field which makes the student a proper basis. The idea all the previous Varjayāna training and practice that Naropa had undergone had no bearing on his time with Tilopa is simply ludicrous. For example, Amyezhab records in his history of Cakrasamvara, that following his meeting with the old lady who had eighteen characteristics of ugliness, since Naropa doubted whether she was a dakini or not, he did an accomplishment retreat of seven hundred thousand near essence mantras of Cakrasamvara to confirm this. Thus, the idea that Naropa was not a very advanced Varjayāna practitioner when he met Tilopa really is not correct nor is the idea that his previous practice had not prepared him for his time with Tilopa. Also Tilopa aka Prajñabhadra, realized Mahāmudra through the two stages of Cakrasamvara having received it from his guru, Antarapa.

Yes, I am aware that there is a Kagyu tradition that Tilopa was an emanation which is found in Gampopa's brief bio.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Is that HYT?

Can we classify the result as Mahamudra?

Malcolm wrote:

Lamdre speaks about a basis, a path and a result.

The basis is the ālaya cause continuum — this is exactly the same thing Kagyus call "ground mahāmudra." It is nothing more nor less than the nature of the mind.

In Lamdre, when ālaya, aka the inseparability of clarity and emptiness, is approached via sūtra methods in the Triple Vision teachings, one meditates upon it via śamatha and vipaśyāna. In the beginning, in terms of śamatha, one uses an external object, a blue flower, then a blue cloth or the sky and finally, one focuses inwardly on the naked clarity of the mind itself. In terms of the vipaśyāna, one establishes that the appearances are mind, the mind is illusory and dependently arisen, and finally that dependent arising is natureless and free from all extremes. When one is capable of resting in the naked clarity of the mind in conjunction with the insight that this clarity is empty and free from extremes, this is called the union of śamatha and vipaśyāna. However, this is merely a sutrayāna meditation and will not lead to Buddhahood in a single lifetime no matter how good a meditation it may be. As the Nalendra Khenpo, Ngawang Lodo states in his Lamp of the Path of Freedom and Omniscience:

In one's experience, the unceasing stream of mere clarity and mere awareness is empty at the time of being clear and clear at the time being empty — do not grasp clarity or emptiness. Rest wholly, nakedly and freely in the state that is free from extremes,

without divisions, inexpressible and beyond thought.
But this is not the state of mahāmudra nor is it the realization of mahāmudra.

The special view of Lamdre is called the inseparability of samsara and nirvana. This view can only be meditated upon after one has received the cause Hevajra empowerment. It is meditated upon prior to engaging in the meditations of the creation and completion stage. The way this is meditated is through thirty-two examples which establish phenomena as mind, mind as an illusion and illusion as natureless. Not only this but there is an inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the path and also an inseparability of samsara and nirvana of the result.

Then there is the path method continuum, which is equivalent to so called "path mahāmudra" in the Kagyu system. This refers to the practice of the creation and completion stages.

Finally, there is the result mahāmudra continuum. This refers to the buddhahood that is the result of the two stages. This is equivalent to the result mahāmudra in the Kagyu system.

Now, it may be wondered, "Are these three continuums the same or are they different?" These three continuums are merely names for phases of a single continuum, much like the way Maitreyanath distinguishes between sentient beings, bodhisattvas and buddhas by labeling them respectively impure, pure/impure and pure. And as Jetsun Rinpoche points, the natural perfection of the qualities of buddhahood in the all-basis cause continuum or so called ground mahāmudra does not contradict transformation.

So you see it is not simply enough to realize the nature of the mind and call that "mahāmudra." In order to achieve a result, a path is called for. The only way to extract the butter of mahāmudra is to take the milk of the nature of the mind and churn it with the two stages. Other than that, there is no way to realize mahāmudra.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 9:19 PM
Title: Re: practicing alone
Content:
BuddhaFollower said:
Malcolm, how does Lamdre correlate with Highest Yoga Tantra?

Malcolm wrote:
Lamdre is an intimate instruction on the practice of the Hevajra Tantra.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

sherabpa said:

Pardon me if I missed it, but I don't think anybody mentioned what Situ Panchen says about the situation.

On the point of whether there is a paramitayana mahamudra, he says there are two positions on it from 'our tradition' and neither one is official. The first is that the sutra system is for those who are not suitable to receive empowerments (for whatever reason) and so, by practicing paramitayana, it would prepare them to receive empowerments later on. This is nevertheless called 'sutra mahamudra'. Apart from the name, this is unobjectionable.

The second view is that the wisdom of paramitayana is itself the same as mahamudra. This is the controversial one since it destroys the distinction of paramitayana and mantrayana. Go Lotsawa is a good example of someone who asserted the second view, saying that Gampopa was able to produce mahamudra in people who had not attained empowerments and he provides a couple of scriptural citations to defend against Sapan's criticism.

Situ Panchen does not say whether he think Gampopa held either position but allows for both.

Situ Panchen also points out, perhaps more importantly, that 'empowerment' does not simply mean going through a ritual of some kind, but is essentially the guru's blessing of the transference of wisdom (ye shes pho ba'i byin labs). In this respect, the fourth initiation, that of mahamudra, can occur outside of what is normally understand by the term 'empowerment', i.e. a ceremony involving the four initiations, and indeed Tilopa's initiation of Naropa is an example of this kind of empowerment. Equally, one can sit through any number of elaborate ceremonies, but not have received empowerment, e.g. like a cat or dog. Sapan's claims about mahamudra and empowerment seem to overlook this detail.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course this ignores the important point that Naropa was already a Vajrayāna practitioner by the time he met Tilopa. As to your second claim, this is only possible if you sit there like a stone, and or refuse to participate at all, having something like a picnic instead, watching the ritual like a baseball game or as a form of entertainment, the way some non-Buddhist Westerners these days attend Kalacakra empowerments.

Go Lotsawa's opinion is noted, but it is just that, an opinion by a scholar who lived many centuries after Gampopa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Astus said:

The difference between the purely sutric method and the Mahamudra method lies in whether there is pointing out the nature of mind or not, as mentioned above.

Malcolm wrote:

There are so many problems with this, I do not have time to even go into it. But according to you then, this instruction from Prajñāpāramita is mahāmudra: There is no mind in the mind, but the original nature of the mind is luminous

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Astus said:

As noted earlier, tantra uses an indirect method with deity yoga and the channels to reach buddha-nature, while Mahamudra goes there directly. .

Malcolm wrote:

This completely false. You really have no idea what you are talking about now. In Vajrayāna, pointing out the nature of the mind, the all-basis (ālaya) and recognizing it, is the foundation for creation and completion stage practice. Mahāmudra is not just the nature of the mind.

If it were as you say, we would have examples of Indian Mahāsiddhas who attained buddhahood on the basis of merely meeting someone and having a discussion, but we don't, training gradually in śāmatha and vipaśyāna.

What we do have are examples of mahāsiddhas, very many in fact, who attained awakening and realized mahāmudra during the process of receiving the four empowerments. We have many other examples of mahāsiddhas who, having received the four empowerments, practiced the two stages and swiftly realized mahāmudra and so attained buddhahood. We have no examples of any Indian mahāsiddhas who did either based on a mere conversation, or through merely practicing śāmatha and vipaśyāna, whether sprinkled with pithy saying from the dohas or not.

So I guess, Tibetans must have much higher capacity than Indians, because according to you, these vaunted Tibetans are capable of realizing Mahāmudra based on sutrayāna conversations, sprinkled with dohas, merely practicing śāmatha and vipaśyāna. But the reality is, no one realized mahāmudra without practicing the two stages, including Gampopa.

Astus said:

Also, the fourth empowerment is generally equated with the pointing out instruction

Malcolm wrote:

Which pointing out instruction? Whose? What precise text? If you intend the means of pointing the "sūtra" mahāmudra system, for example, in Bokar Rinpoche's famous condensation of the 7th Karmapa's long Mahāmudra text, this is in no way shape or form equivalent with the fourth empowerment.

Astus said:

As above, the specialty of Gampopa's Mahamudra is the direct introduction without empowerment.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a direct introduction, it is a gradual introduction, that takes many sessions, like all sutra-based systems. You yourself admitted that Gampopa's "mahāmudra" was "sutra" mahāmudra.

Now, when it comes to essence mahāmudra, there is an empowerment (the descent of the wisdom vajra empowerment) based in Indrabhuti's famous text, the Jñānasiddhi, and this is in fact a direct introduction, just like the fourth empowerment.

All I can conclude from this discussion, Astus, is that you are not really very clear on the difference between "pointing out instructions", which is gradual, and "direct introduction," which is immediate.

Further, what you seem to fail to understand is that in actual practice, in general the Kagyus all practice creation and completion stage, combine the four yogas of mahāmudra with the completion stage, and practice the main practice of essence mahāmudra, Guru Yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 9:35 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

DesertDweller said:

I'm not at all interested in finding a lama, becoming a disciple in the Vajrayana tradition, etc. As I said, I'm coming from a Chan/Zen background and am merely interested in learning "about" Mahamudra as a sort of comparative activity and "enhancement" to my Zen meditation. My ideas about Mahamudra were essentially informed by various comments I have seen from Zen practitioners and teachers to the effect that Mahamudra is sort of like "Tibetan Zen" and is worth "looking into". Taigen Dan Leighton, for example, in his introduction to his translation of Master Honzhi, notes what he perceives to be the great similarities between Silent Illumination meditation and Mahamudra. Others have recommended various Mahamudra books as useful ways of

looking at Zen from a different angle that is essentially the same. Now this is what I've been hearing. As to whether Mahamudra and Zen are really the same in essence is something that I'm not qualified to answer with any authority, though to be honest, based on several descriptions of Mahamudra that I have read, I really can't see much difference. I know that Tantric practitioners will squirm at such a statement, and it may open up a whole 'nother can of worms, but that's my honest impression. As for empowerments, etc, as a non-Vajrayana practitioner I can't say I'm at all convinced by the assumption that the highest enlightenment isn't possible without 'em, based on Sutra methods alone. I have nothing against Tantra, but I won't buy into the polemic that it offers some sort of enlightenment that isn't available to someone who just follows the Diamond Sutra, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't squirm, we just understand that you are looking at sugar rather than tasting it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 8:33 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

That's where you'd be completely wrong Cone. Don't be so sectarian.

Many people think that Je Tsongkhapa was a great scholar but he was also a great Yogi.

Conebeckham said:

I never said he wasn't a great Yogi. Let me ask you, though--is your Mahamudra tradition that called the "Kagyu/Genden Tradition" or "Kagyu/Geluk" tradition? Or is it that which your New Kadampa tradition calls "Mahamudra Tantra, and which is "ONLY" the result of Highest Yoga Tantra? The Clear Light Mind of Bliss that realizes Emptiness, as I believe it's described?

Malcolm wrote:

It, Genden Mahamudra, begins with the First Panchen Lama, but claims to depend on an oral transmission through Gyalwa Ensapa — which may very well be true, since Samten Karmey found an eighty folio book in Bhutan titled "The Genden Miraculous Volume" that consisted of pithy instructions which comes through Ensapa, a text which seems not to have survived in Tibet.

This sutra mahāmudra of the Panchen Lama was very controversial in Gelug, and still is, to some degree. The 5th Dalai Lama was very opposed to it, in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 8:27 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It does not in any way shape or form go beyond Prajñāpāramita, and since there is no empowerment, there is no experiential view to be cultivated. As Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso told me, and as you can confirm by reading Kongtrul, sūtra mahāmudra was invented for those Gampopa deemed unready for Secret Mantra.

conebeckham said:

Malcolm--Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso is one of my teachers, and in fact one of my Mahamudra teachers. I will partly confirm your claim--Khenpo-la specifically told me that Sutra Mahamudra wasn't even a "term" until Kongtrul's time, if I recall.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not true, Sakya Pandita definitely rejects a so called "sūtra mahāmudra", and his teacher, Jetsun Rinpoche states quite clearly:

Having accepted Secret Mantra as Dharma,
without possessing the ripening path abhisheka
and separated from points of the liberating path method,
because one does not meet a Lord of Secret Mantra;
also leave Mahāmudra Dharma and go!

conebeckham said:

But the techniques Gampopa used, guiding some students based on instructions without an explicit empowerment, was not felt by Khenpo-la to be "incorrect."

Malcolm wrote:

It is not incorrect, it just wont lead to the realization of actual mahāmudra sans empowerment no matter how fantastic a meditation it is.

conebeckham said:

Khenpo-La himself referred to Maitripa's tradition, and Saraha's instructions. He noted that both of these Mahasiddhas were indeed Tantrikas, but he felt that did not mean that the paths they outlined, and the paths that Gampopa drew from, must be preceded by empowerment.

Malcolm wrote:

If it is not preceded by empowerment, then you can be certain that it will not result in Mahāmudra realization, which is something very precise and specific. And indeed, those mahasiddhas are in accord with that view, as Brunholzl himself also admits.

conebeckham said:

In fact, much of what Gampopa drew from, for this "guidance system," was from the Kadam, as I said earlier, and Brunholzl fleshes this out more completely.

Malcolm wrote:

That is interesting, but it does not change the basic facts. Kagyus in general tend to rely on three authors to argue their claim that there can be a mahāmudra that does not depend Secret Mantra methods, but when you actually examine the texts of what those

three authors say — Vajrayāna practitioners writing about Madhyamaka — it is a very slim and contrived argument. And of course Sapan addresses this issue as well. And BTW, this idea is not universally embraced by all Kagyus. For example, the Drikungpas do not really take this approach to mahāmudra at all.

conebeckham said:

Most Kagyupas, in fact, recognize Gampopa as an innovator. All the Kagyu Lamas I've talked with, about this issue, will readily admit this. With pride.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, why not? He was innovative, it is not so much Gampopa that is the problem as it is how he was variously interpreted — for example, Lama Shang. But for sure, Gampopa's system was unknown to Milarepa, Marpa, Naropa, Tilopa and so on.

And, for what it is worth, these issues need to be hashed out again and again...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Malcolm,

Are you are saying Mahamudra is the term for Buddhahood that is the result of Highest Yoga Tantra's 4 empowerments, 2 stages and/or guru yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in essence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Greetings friends.

A question: while it goes without saying that having a teacher is always best, is it possible to study and practice Mahamudra on one's own, at least until such a time as a teacher can be found? Is it a discipline which requires empowerments, etc.? If it is possible to practice without a teacher, what are some helpful resources available online?

Any insight on this will be most appreciated.

Here's the OP's question again.

I intuit the answer here is something like "sure, you can practice Shamatha , but hey,

find a teacher".

I don't think (correct me if i'm wrong) the OP really had in mind whether or not he could achieve Mahamudra, or receive blessings in Vajrayana sense by practicing some techniques from Barth's manual or similar. I had to study Vajrayana writings, get empowerments, and ask lots of questions for a year before I even could properly contextualize what "Mahamudra" even means..still not even sure I get some of the nuances behind how the term is used. I believed in the beginning it was simply a type of meditation - and I am assuming that this is how the OP is framing it, since he is not a Vajrayana practitioner.

So it begs the question, what (if any) usefulness could be gleaned from that kind of practice without a teacher? Further, since some of those techniques (following breath, just sitting etc.) have equivalents in other (sutra) Buddhist traditions, and are certainly publicly taught to those without initiation, bot within Vajrayana and outside of it, why would this be different than practicing those?

Basically, to move the thread along...should he not practice at all if he's not going to find a teacher? That is what it sounds like people are saying in places, if that isn't what people are saying, then can the message be clarified for the sake of the thread?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is no, it is not possible to study and practice Mahāmudra on one's own. Hell, not even the Dharma in general can be practiced without a teacher. Studied, yes; practiced, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Mahamudra can only exist in the minds of students who have fully committed themselves to the vajrayana path alone...

Trungpa

Malcolm wrote:

It's nice to know that Trungpa and I have the same point of view on this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, which "prajñāpāramitā" is he discussing? The practice of prajñāpāramita? Or the

result, Prajñāpāramita?

Astus said:

Gampopa writes: "Setting the mind this way is the unmistakable method of practicing wisdom awareness." (p 249) and where he gives the list of all those things he beings with: "When one is endowed with the meaning of emptiness, there is not a single thing which is not included in this path." (p 252) In the commentaries by Ringu Tulku and Thrangu Rinpoche they both talk about resting in the natural state as taught in Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Settling mind in what way? In which path is everything included? How is this path introduced, can you just look it up on the internet?

Astus said:

The difference between sutra and tantra in terms of Mahamudra are quite practical: "According to Mahamudra teachers, the sutric Mahayana approach uses external phenomena as the object of vipashyana meditation, whereas the tantric Mahayana approach of Mahamudra uses the mind itself as the object."
(<http://www.lionsroar.com/meditating-on-the-mind-itself/>).

Malcolm wrote:

How is that possible? Have these teachers never heard of Yogacara? And even here, why make a distinction between the tantric Mahāmudra approach and the sūtra Mahāyāna approach if in reality they are both "mahāmudra"?

Astus said:

Also,

"Gampopa said that there are three different paths with different practices, but these three paths have the same nature. These are taking inference as the path, taking blessings as the path, and taking direct experience as the path. Taking inference as the path refers to, for instance, the various reasonings set forth in the Madhyamaka that show that all things are neither single nor multiple. Taking blessings as the path refers to, for instance, meditation upon the body of a deity or the practices involving the subtle channels and subtle energies. Taking direct perception as the path is mahamudra. Mahamudra is pointed out to us, and we recognize it, become accustomed to it, and take direct experience as the path.

We can also classify the different paths into three groups: the paths that abandon the ground, paths that transform the ground, and paths that recognize the ground. The first path of abandoning the ground is the vehicle of transcendent action of the sutra vehicle, in which some things are abandoned and others are remedies for those things to be abandoned. The second path, transformation of the ground, refers to the practices of the Vajrayana in which we purify our body and mind by meditating on our body being a deity. Our body is thus transformed into the pure body of the deity, and our mind is transformed from discursiveness into wisdom. In the third path, recognizing the ground,

is mahamudra. We know that we do not need to abandon or transform the ground; rather, we know it as it is. When we know the ground as it is, we recognize all appearances as the magical display of the mind. Thus, mahamudra is a matter of using direct perception as the path. This is also called the quick path."

(Thrangu: Essentials of Mahamudra, p 78-79)

Malcolm wrote:

Drogmi Lotsawa states that the difference between sūtra and tantra is that tantra uses direct perception as the path. This direct perception is the basis of all Secret Mantra meditation and is the experiential view introduced in the very beginning during the empowerment, this is why Secret Mantra is a quick path. But there is no separate means of introducing this experiential view outside of the empowerment, there is no mahāmudra that exists outside of Vajrayāna.

Astus said:

As for the so called Sutra Mahamudra (that actually stands for Gampopa's Mahamudra):

"The meditation of Sutra Mahamudra essentially consists of resting one's mind, free of mental activity, in the state of nonconceptual wisdom. This is the fundamental definition of Sutra Mahamudra: mind resting in the state in which it experiences the dharmadhatu, which is the expanse or nature of all things. This resting is essentially a nonconceptual wisdom beyond all elaboration, or the unity of clarity and emptiness. In this context, one meditates in the following way: The object of one's meditation is luminosity free of any projections; the perceiving subject is the lack of mental engagement; and one meditates without mental engagement. There are many extensive explanations on meditating without mental engagement, found primarily in the teachings of Maitripa and Sahajavajra.

The Sutrayana approach to Mahamudra is seen as a very profound method because it does not require any of the sophisticated and complex tantric rituals, deity yoga visualization practices, or samayas. It is a simple sutra approach, yet it conveys the direct transmission of the tantric essence of awakening."

(Dzogchen Ponlop: Wild Awakening, 31-32)

Malcolm wrote:

It does not in any way shape or form go beyond Prajñāpāramita, and since there is no empowerment, there is no experiential view to be cultivated. As Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso told me, and as you can confirm by reading Kongtrul, sūtra mahāmudra was invented for those Gampopa deemed unready for Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Vasana said:

Regardless of whether one can practice Mahamudra without the empowerments and

introduction, you can at least, as this thread has mentioned , realize Prajnaparamita, which in turn will lead to 'anuttara-samyak-sambodhi' as mentioned in the Mahāprajñāpāramitā Mañjuśrī parivarta Sūtra.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but only after one has progressed through the five paths and ten stages, and that takes at minimum three incalculable eons, two just to reach the level of the eighth bhumi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

conebeckham said:

...guard our samayas...

Malcolm wrote:

Have to have received an empowerment to even have those.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

conebeckham said:

People talk about "causing oneself harm" by trying to practice Tummo from a book, etc., but the harm of mistaking pith instructions can be potentially as damaging, I think.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as for example the vast wasteland of the clueless leading the blind on the internet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well, Dzogchen, at least in theory, also does not rely on the "two stages" --at least in some presentations. Right? I grant you, it's "tantra," and not sutra, and no one ever claimed it was.....but it is an example of a "Vajrayana path" that, at least in theory, relies on Pith Instructions, Pointing Out, etc., sometimes even without the elaborations of The Four Empowerments and the Two Stages.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen absolutely relies on empowerment, which is why it is considered part of Secret Mantra. This why The Mind Mirror Tantra states:

Where will there be accomplishment without relying on the empowerments of secret mantra? For example, it is like a boatman without a paddle, how will one be able to cross to the other side? If the empowerments are fully obtained, all secret mantras not accomplished will be accomplished.

Further, as we know, guru yoga is indispensable in Dzogchen.

conebeckham said:

I just don't see the value in getting hung up on defining whether or not a valid path can be ascribed to Sutra, Tantra, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you be pretty upset if you bought a cd advertised as being the music of a virtuous bass player, and found out it was really bass kazoo they were talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

conebeckham said:

Moi? No, I just read stuff.

This is an endless "debate," actually, and all I can say is that I trust the words of my Gurus, and the methods they have transmitted.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem, dear Cone, is that you actually cannot practice sūtra mahāmudra even if you wanted to. You have received too many empowerments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

conebeckham said:

Quoting from "When the Clouds Part," Brunnholz, who quotes from Kongtrul's Treasury of Knowledge:

...In the Tatvavatara composed by the master Jnanakirti, it says: "Another name of mother Prajnaparamita is Mahamudra because it is the very nature of nondual wisdom." Thus, (Kongtrul) not only explains that the prajnaparamita taught in the sutras and the Mahamudra of mantra are synonyms, but he also explains these conventional terms: "As for those of highest capacities among the persons who exert themselves in the paramitas, when they perform the meditations of calm abiding and superior insight, even at the stage of ordinary beings, this grants them the true realization characterized by having it's origin in Mahamudra."

Kongtrul also goes on to note that important sources of this tradition came from the Kadampa lineage, in particular Atisha's "Pith Instructions on the Two Armors of Connate

Union Mahamudra." Brunnholzl also notes Karmapa Mikyo Dorje's statement that this system of guidance is based on Atisha's Bodhipathapradipa. However, Mikyo Dorje says: "Nevertheless, in the approach of practice of most heart sons (of Gampopa), the instructions in Mahamudra are taught in such a way that they are preceded by conferring an empowerment. Thus, they hold (Mahamudra) to be the approach that is common to sutra and tantra."

This can be found in Brunnholzl's text, beginning on p. 155. He continues the discussion about Sutra sources.

Malcolm wrote:

This is akin to saying, "Vajravārāhī is another name for Prajñāpāramitā, therefore, I can practice Vajravārāhī without empowerment and I will achieve exactly the same result whether I have the empowerment or not." So are you willing to accept the consequence? If not, then you have to explain the difference between mahāmudra and Vajravārāhī. Why can't there be a "sūtra" Vajravārāhī if there can be a "sutra mahāmudra?"

conebeckham said:

Brunnholzl also refers to Sahajavajra's Tattvadasakatika as a source for the blending of Sutra and Mantra. And of course Maitripa's tradition of "Amanasikara" is seen as the core of Kagyu Mahamudra. Sahajavajra's position is that the "Sutra approach adorned with pith instructions" is inferior to the Secret Mantra approach, but superior to a "straight paramita" approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, as I said KB just rehashes Dieter-Matthis' book. Also for example, the Rigpa Rangshar tantra equates Dzogchen with Prajñāpāramitā, so now are we going to say that if we merely practice sutrayāna śamatha and vipaśyāna and sprinkle it with some pithy quotes from sems sde, this constitutes a "sūtra dzogchen"? C'mon...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 23rd, 2015 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

dharmagoat said:

The important point in this thread is that there has been shown to be a system of Mahāmudrā that does not require empowerments as a prerequisite for practice.

Malcolm wrote:

No such system exists.

conebeckham said:

Read Brunnholzl's latest book on the Uttaratantrashastra and it's connection to Mahamudra for some interesting, and varied, opinions on this matter.

Malcolm wrote:

KB just goes over the same ground that Deiter-Matthis did in his book on the Go Lotsawa's treatment of the Uttarat Tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If someone asserts there is an actual mahāmudra result outside of the practice of the two stages or guru yoga, that person is mistaken, regardless of their title, position or rank.

Astus said:

Well, that one was Gampopa. See how in the Jewel Ornament of Liberation he included all practices within prajnaparamita

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=111558#p111558>.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, which "prajñāpāramitā" is he discussing? The practice of prajñāpāramita? Or the result, Prajñāpāramita? For example, Vajrayāna is included in Mahāyāna, but this does not mean that the methods of Secret Mantra are found in common Mahāyāna. There is no fault in saying that reality called prajñāpāramita and the reality called "mahāmudra" are the same, but one indicates the result of practicing sūtra, and the other indicates the result of practicing Niruttara tantra. Even though mahāmudra is indeed mentioned in Yoga tantra, it does not mean the same thing as the term "mahāmudra" discussed for example by Saraha in his commentary on the Buddhakapala Tantra, and so on.

Astus said:

If the introduction to the nature of mind occurs outside the context of having received the four empowerments, that instruction does not go beyond prajñāpāramita meditation — which is a perfectly fine practice, but it is not mahāmudra. It is something like calling an ordinary geshe a "buddha" in order to arouse faith in his disciples.

...

However, meditating on the intimate instructions of mahāmudra divorced from completion stage practices and or the intense devotion of guru yoga is a slow path even if one has received the four empowerments in a proper way. If one has not received the four empowerments at all, the idea that one is going to realize mahāmudra is a completely hopeless fantasy, like wishing for a stone to be saturated with water because one leaves it in a pond.

If the view and the conduct are identical, how could the result be different because of the empowerments/guru yoga? Although, as above, all the empowerments and guru yoga are included in resting in the natural state, at least according to certain Mahāmudra teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

The intellectual view of sūtra and tantra (freedom from extremes) are identical, but their methods are different, their conduct is different and so on.

Since there is no method of directly introducing this so called "natural state" that can be found in sūtra, one must depend on the methods taught by the Buddha in the tantras. And if one must depend on the methods taught by the Buddhas in the tantras, for what reason can one claim that is beyond or outside the Vajrayāna?

There is only one ritual taught in common Mahāyāna that bears on our discussion in a real sense — that is the ritual of generating relative bodhicitta. Apart from that, the other rituals in Mahāyāna such as the recitations of dharanis and so in do not bear on our discussion.

Secondly, since there is no method in common Mahāyāna for introducing or generating ultimate bodhicitta at all, how can one claim there is a method in sūtra for introducing mahāmudra? Even the word "mahāmudra" does not exist in any sūtra. If you claim there is such a method of introducing mahāmudra outside of a Vajrayāna context, in what sūtra is it taught, what Indian master composed the method?

You might claim, suchness is the same whether we are discussing prajñāpāramitā or mahāmudra, and to that I will readily agree — but the issue is not about reality per se, it is about how that reality is realized, what method is used and where that method comes from. Even the results of sūtra and tantra are not the equivalent. For example, there is no discussion in sūtra of the seven limbs of the three kāyas — this is purely related to the result, mahāmudra. Just as for example, one can find only four wisdoms in sūtra, but there are five wisdoms mentioned in Vajrayāna, in sūtra the word "Vajradhara" is never heard, and likewise, the term "mahāmudra" does not occur even once. If you are going to say there is mahāmudra in sūtra, why stop there? Why not say there is a sutra connate bliss, a sūtra Dzogchen, a sūtra tummo, a sūtra consort practice, none of which require empowerments?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

dharmagoat said:

The important point in this thread is that there has been shown to be a system of Mahāmudrā that does not require empowerments as a prerequisite for practice.

Malcolm wrote:

No such system exists.

dharmagoat said:

It would depend on whose scripture you believe. This is where it becomes an interschool squabble.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you see this is the problem, because there are actually no scriptures which support such a notion. The controversy arose only in the 12th century when people asserted, without any basis at all in the tantras or the sūtras, that there was such thing as a) a mahāmudra that exists in sūtra b) a mahāmudra that is independent of Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Whose instructions? Which ones?

Astus said:

Wangchuk Dorje, Dakpo Tashi Namgyal, Tsele Natsok Rangdrol, Traleg Kyabgon, Khenchen Thrangu, Tsultrim Gyamtso, Tenzin Palmo, Ken McLeod.

Malcolm wrote:

If someone asserts there is an actual mahāmudra result outside of the practice of the two stages or guru yoga, that person is mistaken, regardless of their title, position or rank.

If the introduction to the nature of mind occurs outside the context of having received the four empowerments, that instruction does not go beyond prajñāpāramita meditation — which is a perfectly fine practice, but it is not mahāmudra. It is something like calling an ordinary geshe a "buddha" in order to arouse faith in his disciples.

If the introduction to the nature of the mind happens on the basis of the four empowerments, that introduction can swiftly lead to the realization of mahāmudra, especially because that introduction is based on the example wisdom the disciple experiences during the ritual of the four empowerments at certain points. When that subsequent introduction is combined with completion stage practices such as kumbhaka or the intense devotion of guru yoga, mahāmudra can be realized rapidly. However, meditating on the intimate instructions of mahāmudra divorced from completion stage practices and or the intense devotion of guru yoga is a slow path even if one has received the four empowerments in a proper way. If one has not received the four empowerments at all, the idea that one is going to realize mahāmudra is a completely hopeless fantasy, like wishing for a stone to be saturated with water because one leaves it in a pond.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

dharmagoat said:

The important point in this thread is that there has been shown to be a system of Mahāmudrā that does not require empowerments as a prerequisite for practice.

Malcolm wrote:

No such system exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

DesertDweller said:

It does sound like purely interschool squabbling to me, and squabbling over semantics. None of which is of interest to me. But you guys can feel free to knock yourselves out.

Malcolm wrote:

It is in fact an important point. For example, if you go to a store and buy a Gucci suit, but you later find out that you have been sold a cheap knockoff, you will not be happy. Likewise, if you receive some information about Dharma somewhere, and then find you have been misled, you will not be happy.

In general, you cannot practice the mahāmudra instructions of the Indian mahāsiddhas without a teacher. Even something like Gampopa's own system of the four yogas of Mahāmudra cannot be practiced without personal guidance from an experienced teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

These two ideas — that there is such a thing as mahāmudra in the sūtras, and that there is a mahāmudra path independent of Vajrayāna — are meritless delusions.

Astus said:

Do you think that the mahamudra instructions regarding seeing the nature of the mind are incorrect?

Malcolm wrote:

Whose instructions? Which ones?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 8:22 PM
Title: Re: The Great Mantra
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:
-----OM MA TRI MU YE SA LE DU -----

Malcolm wrote:
The depicted mantra is actually,
A ṃ hūṃ ā a dkar sa le 'od a yang ṃ 'du

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 6:54 PM
Title: Re: practicing alone
Content:
dharmagoat said:
It sounds a lot like interschool squabbling to me.

Don't we just follow the line of our chosen school? For the purposes of this thread it is
Kagyü Mahāmudrā.

Malcolm wrote:
The forum is labeled simply Mahāmudra, not Kagyu Mahāmudra. I checked before
responding.

dharmagoat said:
So has this become a Gelug/Sakya vs. Kagyü thing?

Malcolm wrote:
I don't really think of it that way. Just because Sakya Pandita says something does not
mean it has to be accepted. One must do one's research and see if what he or anyone
says about anything has merit.

These two ideas — that there is such a thing as mahāmudra in the sūtras, and that there
is a mahāmudra path independent of Vajrayāna — are meritless delusions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 6:47 PM
Title: Re: Sarvastivada Abhidharma and Theravada Abhidharma
Content:
daverupa said:

I'm trying to remember where I read, recently, the idea that perhaps the Sautrantikas didn't have an official Abhidhamma. I mean, everyone has abhidhamma in terms of their interpretation of Dhamma (up to and including Dharma; the Sautrantikas had some wild ideas despite not having official Abhidhamma books, to say nothing of the craziness of radical Theravadan momentariness & Sarvastivada 'time always exists' silliness...), but not all of the old schools came together to make a Scholastic Abhidhamma for themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Sautrantikas measured the ideas of other schools in terms of whether they were justified on the basis of the Agamas or not. Where they were, they left them alone, where they were not, they criticized them. The Abhidharmakośa is a collection of mainly Sarvastivadin doctrines, the bhaṣyam is a critical commentary on those.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 6:45 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

dharmagoat said:

It sounds a lot like interschool squabbling to me.

Don't we just follow the line of our chosen school? For the purposes of this thread it is Kagyü Mahāmudrā.

Malcolm wrote:

The forum is labeled simply Mahāmudra, not Kagyu Mahāmudra. I checked before responding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 6:36 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

"practicing Mahamudra" without a teacher...

Malcolm wrote:

...does not exist.

Mahāmudra is not a practice, it is a realization, a realization that comes from either practicing the two stages or guru yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 6:34 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

...churning water will never produce butter.

Malcolm wrote:

Nor will grinding stone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 6:33 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Astus said:

From a teaching by <http://www.samyeling.org/about/buddhism-and-meditation/teaching-archive-2/mingyur-dorje-rinpoche/vajrayana-and-empowerment/> (underlines added):

Within the Secret Mantra Vajrayana path there are two divisions. The first one is the path of skilful means and the second is the path of liberation. If we explain further what the path of skilful means is, there are various methods through which to realize directly our nature of mind. It is revealed to us through these various types of practice.

Malcolm wrote:

If it is a Secret Mantra Vajrayana path, it depends on empowerment.

Astus said:

The Vajrayana path can be divided into three sections. There is the development stage, completion stage and path of liberation (kyerim, dzogrim and drollam). Within these three paths one can decide whatever one likes to do, whatever one is feeling positive towards. But the best actually is the path of liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

If it is a Secret Mantra Vajrayana path, it depends on empowerment.

Yes, this is a mistaken tradition that cannot be defended in anyway whatsoever.

You mean you cannot accept the Dakpo Kagyu teaching of the white panacea, the method independent (and superior) of tantra, the path of liberation?

Correct, it is a completely mistaken teaching of Lama Shang.

Johnny Dangerous said:

you can use Mahamudra techniques, but their result and function would be like sutra meditation

If the techniques provided in Mahamudra cannot produce the results promised, how can they be even called Mahamudra?

Malcolm wrote:

The techniques for realizing mahāmudra are just the two stages and guruyoga, apart

from that, there are no other techniques for realizing mahāmudra at all.

Johnny Dangerous said:

As for the actual basic methods, although there are many ways of asserting mahamudra, there are two when divided according to the sutras and tantras...

The former refers to the ways of meditating on voidness as directly indicated in the expanded, intermediate and brief (Prajnaparamita Sutras). The supremely realized Arya Nagarjuna has said, "Except for this, there is no other pathway of mind leading to liberation." Here I shall give relevant instruction on mahamudra in accord with these intentions of his and discuss the methods that lead you to know the mind, face to face, in keeping with the exposition of the lineage masters.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as mahāmudra in the sūtras. The term does not occur in sūtra at all, so how can it be a result in sūtra? This is just calling prajñāpāramitā "mahāmudra, but it is not real mahāmudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 6:25 PM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Mahamudra realisations depend upon the blessings received by relying upon a qualified Vajrayana spiritual guide through the practice of Guru Yoga, therefore it is impossible to gain realisations without having a Guru and without receiving a Highest Yoga Tantra empowerment and practising the two stages sincerely.

Malcolm wrote:

At least we agree on something.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Astus said:

From Mahamudra the Moonlight (2nd edition):

"On the other hand, if one follows venerable Gampopa's system in elucidating Mahāmudrā alone, it is not necessary to bestow the empowerment upon devotees. "

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is a mistaken tradition that cannot be defended in anyway whatsoever. Many

have tried, none have succeeded, and this is why everyone who wishes to actually realize Mahāmudra has received empowerment and practiced the two stages, including Gampopa, and especially Tilopa, Naropa, Maitripa, Saraha, Shavaripa, you name it, all the Mahasiddhas of the past.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Medicine buddha sadhana "Drop of Ambrosia"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you have the empowerment, you have the lung for the sadhana.

topazdreamz said:

Why do you say this? Is it generally understood that if one has the empowerment, one has the lung for any given practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Because during the empowerment the guru recites all the main parts of the sadhana to create the disciple in the form of the deity, as well as the refuge and bodhicitta that we recite with the master, and he gives the transmission of the mantra and so forth.

So yes, in general, if you have the empowerment, you have the lung.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I don't really see the contradiction Malcolm. He seems to be saying that it is of greater benefit to practice Ngondro is one is going to practice Mahamudra, but also saying that sutra level Mahamudra meditation instruction is available in some sense without them.

Since some teachers seem to teach "sutra Mahamudra", whether they class it as that or not, to me it stands to reason that one is better off doing that than doing nothing at all, whether or not they choose to undertake Ngondro or other tantric practice, get empowerments etc. This is doesn't seem unusual, for basic meditation instruction to be offered independent of any tantric practice. Granted the manual goes beyond that, but part of it is just basic shamatha etc. instruction..and the parts of the manual that go beyond that are labeled as such.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot practice Guru Yoga in a real sense without empowerment. Ergo, it is a

Vajrayāna path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Medicine buddha sadhana "Drop of Ambrosia"

Content:

ratna said:

Since Garchen Rinpoche gave the empowerment from Namchö, the Stream of Lapis would indeed be appropriate. But I think it would be better to receive oral transmission for the sadhana.

R

qwerty13 said:

Yes, the reading transmission would be important for this practice. Well, I just have to keep my eyes open for that opportunity. I really, really love this sadhana.

Malcolm wrote:

If you have the empowerment, you have the lung for the sadhana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 22nd, 2015 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: practicing alone

Content:

DesertDweller said:

I've been looking at Peter Barth's manual

[http://www.mahamudracenter.org/MMCMemberMeditationGuide.htm#_Toc420995709], and it has actually cleared up quite a lot of confusion, the first being the status of Mahamudra as a complete path in itself, independent of ngondro, tantra, etc:.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course this person directly contradicts himself on the same page: He says: Certainly, Mahamudra can be practiced independent of the path of tantra or in conjunction with the path of tantra, however one chooses.

In the Kagyu lineage and other lineages of Tibetan Buddhism, the ordinary preliminaries are taught prior to meditations of the type included in this manual. These include reflection on and awareness of (1) the precious human existence, (2) impermanence, (3) cause and effect or karma, and (4) the prevalence of suffering (samsara). In addition, special preliminaries are taught as a foundation to tantric Mahamudra and tantric Dzogchen practice. These include (1) refuge and bodhicitta, (2) Vajra Sattva purification, (3) mandala offering, and (4) guru yoga. Dzogchen has its own set of preliminaries which in some schools include reflection on and awareness of the illusory body and the practice of heat yoga (tummo). Interestingly, practices similar to these are advanced

practices of the Kagyu and Gelug/Kagyu lineages.

In any case, preliminaries are indispensable to the practitioner. It is commonly noted by teachers that the preliminaries are in no way less important than the main body of teachings. In fact it is said that the preliminaries are (1) helpful at the outset to get one to turn to the dharma, (2) helpful on the path to get one to persist in dharma practice, and (3) helpful at the end to help one complete realization. Thus, their importance should be underscored. Several excellent texts are now available for those who want to follow the Tibetan traditions within the context of individual lineages. Serious students should refer to these.

Vajrasattva is a Vajrayāna practice; mandala offerings and guru yoga are practices unique to niruttarayoga tantra. Without receiving empowerment into a mandala such as Hevajra, Cakrasamvara and so on, there is no Mahāmudra to speak of, much less realize. He declares first that Mahāmudra is an independent path, and then second that that Vajrayāna practices are indispensable for Mahāmudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 21st, 2015 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

After the high lama of Khyungpo Yundrung Palri, Chime Rigzin Rinpoche's mind departed into the dharmadhātu (bon dbyings), his remains remained just like that for the length of four weeks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 21st, 2015 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: dalai lama refuse rebirth vs bodhisattva vow

Content:

Simon E. said:

He didn't say that he wouldn't be reborn at all.

He said this may be his last birth as the Dalai Lama.

tobias said:

ok,

but how do you interpret that? I mean it is not but point to call this rebirth "Dalai Lama" as long as it's the rebirth of Buddha Chenrezig.

Malcolm wrote:

It means he is putting an end to the political institution of the Dalai Lama.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 21st, 2015 at 8:04 PM

Title: Kalacakra war prophecy

Content:
Malcolm wrote:
please see my post on the issue:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=17283#p249776>

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 21st, 2015 at 6:52 AM
Title: Re: Did the 84 mahasiddhas practice Ngöndro?
Content:

Gyurme Kundrol said:
If this can be realized, really what use is Ngondro?

Malcolm wrote:
To realize this.

Gyurme Kundrol said:
but just keep our intention towards supreme enlightenment as pure as possible.

Malcolm wrote:
But isn't this a modification? And if you need this, then you need the rest of it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 21st, 2015 at 12:08 AM
Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
"Rainbow body" is a name for what happens when the elements of body reverts back to their original nature as pristine consciousness as a result of the process of Dzogchen practice or completion stage practice. A key point of Vajrayāna is that there is no buddhahood that is not grounded in the body. Hence, the attainment of rainbow body, or the body of light, is regarded as proof that a practitioner has attained buddhahood. This is never mentioned in sūtra because sūtra has no methods of practice that involve the body as a vehicle for awakening.

Saoshun said:
Okay I agree, but the same things happen in samadhi but samadhi is stepping stone so I guess there must be master or guru who can relate to this point well.

Malcolm wrote:

Rainbow body is a result cultivating a very specific set of practices all of which involve skill in samadhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 21st, 2015 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

Tenso said:

What is the difference between mahayana sambhogakaya and rainbow body?

Malcolm wrote:

The Mahāyāna Sambhogakāya is visible only to 8th stage bodhisattvas on up. While lesser rainbow body is only observable through the sign of the shrinking of the body after death, the so called great transformation body, rainbow body attained while still alive, is visible to everyone. Only a small handful of practitioners have achieved this result. Most practitioners of Vajrayāna, regardless of tradition, attain Buddhahood during the bardo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 20th, 2015 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Did the 84 mahasiddhas practice Ngöndro?

Content:

Challenge23 said:

So yeah, Vajrasattva. Not a fan.

Malcolm wrote:

You just need to do more of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 20th, 2015 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

Saoshun said:

Rainbow body is not enlightenment but definitely high level of achievement in form of skandha.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, no. Rainbow body is the attainment of buddhahood.

Saoshun said:

If we look in the sense of skandhas it's skandha of form which was transformed into light so it cannot be counted as enlightenment as it's pretty logic. When you exhaust skandha of form you can dissolve and consciously be reborn which is great for bodhisattva path

These so-called 'transmutations of vijnana' are only changes of appellation and not a change of substance. - This argument of Hui neng is hard to beat.

But I trust your knowledge Malcolm and hope you can explain why this should be considered as Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

"Rainbow body" is a name for what happens when the elements of body reverts back to their original nature as pristine consciousness as a result of the process of Dzogchen practice or completion stage practice. A key point of Vajrayāna is that there is no buddhahood that is not grounded in the body. Hence, the attainment of rainbow body, or the body of light, is regarded as proof that a practitioner has attained buddhahood. This is never mentioned in sūtra because sūtra has no methods of practice that involve the body as a vehicle for awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 20th, 2015 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

Saoshun said:

Rainbow body is not enlightenment but definitely high level of achievement in form of skandha.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, no. Rainbow body is the attainment of buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 20th, 2015 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: who is an advanced buddhist and who is a beginner?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But you do admit conventionally there is a person who practices a path, has realizations, manifests qualities and attains buddhahood correct?

muni said:

Conventional is, but not without absolute.

I again must say, Tsoknyi Rinpoche makes it clear.

Malcolm wrote:

So what is the point of saying, "It is "the one having" these qualities which isn't."

When you make such statements, you are then forced to contradict yourself because you then have admit, "Conventional is."

Which all then results in nothing but pointless verbiage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 20th, 2015 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: who is an advanced buddhist and who is a beginner?

Content:

muni said:

Yes. It is "the one having" these qualities which isn't.

Malcolm wrote:

Even conventionally?

muni said:

I find this explanation giving a contemplative light on how the idea of "a one" arises as an entity/identity:

<http://www.tsoknyirinpoche.org/1431/the-four-egos-part-two-of-two/>

Malcolm wrote:

But you do admit conventionally there is a person who practices a path, has realizations, manifests qualities and attains buddhahood correct?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 20th, 2015 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Depended arising

Content:

Rroman said:

Can someone help me with the concept that the Buddha never taught karma.

Malcolm wrote:

That would be impossible — the Buddha mostly definitely taught karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 20th, 2015 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: who is an advanced buddhist and who is a beginner?

Content:

muni said:

Yes. It is "the one having" these qualities which isn't.

Malcolm wrote:
Even conventionally?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 19th, 2015 at 9:47 PM
Title: Re: Karma
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Satire Alert.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 19th, 2015 at 9:40 PM
Title: Re: who is an advanced buddhist and who is a beginner?
Content:
muni said:
Even 10th level bodhisattvas "Take Refuge" from their own ignorance, subtle though that may be.
I found these levels and stages always a bit confusing.

Malcolm wrote:
Bhumis measure qualities, not realization.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 18th, 2015 at 9:39 PM
Title: Re: Did the 84 mahasiddhas practice Ngöndro?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
All practice is preliminary. Preliminary to what? Buddhahood.

dharmagoat said:
Would "ngöndro" be better translated as "initial practices" rather than "preliminary practices"?

Punya said:
I have heard ngondro described as a foundational practice and not something to be "got out of the way". As has been discussed elsewhere on DW it is not that unusual to complete more than one ngondro.

Malcolm wrote:
Literally, sngon du 'gro translates pūrvaṃgamaḥ, "what goes (gama) before (purva)."

Preliminary means "before the threshold."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 18th, 2015 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Mantra Recitation - Do You Do Enough?

Content:

PorkChop said:

I can't imagine how you guys do it with really high numbers of full-body prostrations.

EarthMudra said:

I'm going to have to work on my prostrations. Eek. When I do them I do them mentally but need to do physical also. Have not done enough.

I wonder how many prostrations, mental and physical Lama Tsongkhapa did altogether??

Malcolm wrote:

Millions, from what I understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 18th, 2015 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: who is an advanced buddhist and who is a beginner?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha awoke countless eons ago, even the path of the bodhisattva recounted in the jataka tales, which shows the conduct of a bodhisattva who had achieved patience for the nonarising of phenomena, was just a display for showing the path.

This is the Mahāyāna POV. The Hinayāna POV is a different.

Saoshun said:

Ma anussavena.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have to accept it, but this how it is taught in Mahāyāna. As the Lotus Sūtra states:

The devas, humans, and asuras in all the worlds all think that the present Buddha, Śākyamuni, left the palace of the Śākyas, sat on the terrace of enlightenment not far from the city of Gayā, and attained highest, complete enlightenment. However, O sons of a virtuous family, immeasurable, limitless, hundreds of thousands of myriads of koṭis of nayutas of kalpas have passed since I actually attained buddhahood.

Given that this a board devoted to Mahāyāna, one would assume that Mahāyāna

teachings would be considered normative here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 18th, 2015 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: who is an advanced buddhist and who is a beginner?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

It is worth noting that the Buddha didn't have Buddhism on his path to becoming enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

It is worth noting that the Buddha was already a Buddha and that his twelve deeds from birth to nirvana were merely a display for showing the path.

dharmagoat said:

But what of his previous births? He did not have Buddhism as such to guide him.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha awoke countless eons ago, even the path of the bodhisattva recounted in the jataka tales, which shows the conduct of a bodhisattva who had achieved patience for the nonarising of phenomena, was just a display for showing the path.

This is the Mahāyāna POV. The Hinayāna POV is a different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 18th, 2015 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: who is an advanced buddhist and who is a beginner?

Content:

Saoshun said:

The less information about buddhism you gather the more advanced buddha you are.

dharmagoat said:

It is worth noting that the Buddha didn't have Buddhism on his path to becoming enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

It is worth noting that the Buddha was already a Buddha and that his twelve deeds from birth to nirvana were merely a display for showing the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 18th, 2015 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Did the 84 mahasiddhas practice Ngöndro?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All practice is preliminary. Preliminary to what? Buddhahood.

dharmagoat said:

Would "ngöndro" be better translated as "initial practices" rather than "preliminary practices"?

Malcolm wrote:

In general there are common and uncommon practices of Ngondro.

The practices of the common ngondro are reflecting on precious human birth eight freedoms and ten endowments, the faults of samsara, death and impermanence, and karma, in some order or another. Everyone must meditate on these.

After that, in sūtra, the main practice is the six perfections.

In Vajrayāna, one must practice prostrations in order to prepare the body for meditating the two stages; one must go for refuge and generate bodhicitta, likewise, one must purify with Vajrasattva. One must accumulate vast amounts of merit with mandala offerings which is a part of guru yoga. And one must supplicate the guru. It really does not matter much how much of these one does. What counts is that one does them with full attention as much as possible. You should practice each of these practices until you experience the signs associated with them, which can be learned from the texts so I won't mention those here. Don't focus on numbers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 18th, 2015 at 7:39 PM

Title: Re: Did the 84 mahasiddhas practice Ngöndro?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All practice is preliminary. Preliminary to what? Buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

maybay said:

Generally on a forum like this, the problem is not competing definitions, but a basic lack of understanding, and everyone thinking they are doctors without completing their due diligence.

Malcolm wrote:

The prescription for that is Abhidharma studies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: How a skeptical anchorman became a Buddhist

Content:

Simon E. said:

Criticisms of "appeals to authority" are meaningless in terms of the Vajrayana..such critiques apply only to mundane authority.

dharmagoat said:

Why is this?

Could you (or someone else) please explain this further?

Malcolm wrote:

The Great Commentary Tantra of the Mayajala states:

The Dharma of sophists who
do not understand scriptures is impure.

Also, scripture precedes
whatever the rishis know.

Just as the blind guessing with their feet
run into a ravine,

it is difficult for those who prioritize
inference not to stumble.

The Abhibodhikramopadeśa of Master Āryadeva states:

In evil future times,
without relying on profound scriptures and intimate instructions,
those who prioritize the twin reasonings of validation and proofs
will each grasp their own philosophy as sublime;
satisfied with a mere hidden meaning
and without any interest in the ultimate profound view,
again they make refutations,
destroying themselves and others.

And:

At the time of the ultimate view of secret mantra,
the direct perception by the mind and sense organs
as well as inferences are not authorities;
the profound scriptures and intimate instructions are authorities.

The Dhyānottara-pāṭalakrama Tantra states:

This great ocean of Secret Mantra
cannot be realized through
examples, authorities, arguments,
inferences or discerning wisdom.

The Abhidhānottara Tantra states:

The yogin who does not know the scriptures
is a Buddhist tīrthika.

Never forsake the scriptures.

Never forsake the Three Jewels.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: What is Authorisation?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly it means you claim that some lama tapped you on the shoulder. Sometimes it means you are actually qualified.

Astus said:

You mean there are no papers and procedures - besides those given by educational institutions - in Tibetan Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. In general, in the past, if your guru asked to you teach or lead students, then you would. If he did not, theoretically you wouldn't dream of arrogating yourself to the position of teacher.

In the past, being a Dharma teacher was a professional occupation that was preceded by many years of training. In the West all kinds of people, both qualified and unqualified, Tibetan and Western, hang out a shingle and seek to lead students.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

And worldly people's things exist. [/list] [/i]

Malcolm wrote:

Not so fast, Kimosabe:

Chandra himself states this passage means:

Since the existence of mundane entities is also established without investigation, everything is established.

In other words, we only accept unexamined mundane entities as "existent". Once they have been examined, we cannot find their existence in anyway, inherently or otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

undefineable said:

Possibly my impression has more to do with the impossibility of understanding what enlightenment is with as much recognition as one understands what samsara is. For example, I think I once read one or two passages like the ones you quoted () but wrote them off as mere metaphors, to be returned to at a much later date in case I was wrong. But it doesn't still have to be as simple as 1-100 simultaneous localised mind-body complex[es], right?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no limit to the number of nirmanakāyas the Sambhogakāya emanates.

undefineable said:

OK - I raise you "any substantive links (not just any overlaps) between the awareness of any individual -including a fully enlightened Buddha- and anything outside his/her/its own mind" {A Buddha's an "it" after the death of his or her last body, right?!} This still sounds confused and confusing, but then that's partly my point.

Malcolm wrote:

What kind of substantive links did you have in mind? Please define them.

A buddha, technically speaking, is the dharmakāya. The Ārya-aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā Sūtra states:

Those who are attached to the tathāgata as a form or a name are childish and have corrupted discerning wisdom... the tathāgatas are not to be seen as the rūpakāya; the tathāgatās are to be seen as the dharmakāya.

The dharmakāya is ultimate, and therefore is unconditioned and permanent. It is only confusing when you mistakenly identify a buddha as the rūpakāya, a material body.

undefineable said:

I was already talking about awareness rather than particular experiences, although I'm aware that this distinction can get tricky __ .

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by awareness as opposed to an experience? Is the latter permanent whereas the former is transient? If not, then what is the difference between awareness and experience if both are transient?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Did the 84 mahasiddhas practice Ngöndro?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Ngondro was present in Dzogchen tantras, apparently Sakyas never had it until very recently though so it might not have been part of the Indian sarma tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

Sakyas did not have a separate ngondro text, as such, but they always had preliminaries. The idea of counting them all 100,000 at a time seems to be a relatively recent innovation. In the past, when doing a retreat one typically did each for a week or a month, depending on one's time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Sherlock said:

Sachen and Sakya Pandita also were guided by Manjushri.

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently Sachen did not understand that "If grasping arises, one does not have the view" actually meant, "If grasping to inherent existence arises, one does not have the view", but grasping to existence is ok.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

He was guided along the path by Manjushri himself.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are to believe Khedrup Je's bio.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Interesting sunglasses

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

<http://www.dharmaco.com/products/dharma-police>

Malcolm wrote:

It can never replace this:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

there is a conventional continuum that continues even after parinirvana

undefineable said:

The Buddhist approach to assertions such as parts of one's mind literally also being parts of others' minds has always looked rational rather than mystical to me; i.e. the approach seems to be that there are no such overlaps, even (or except?) in the case of Siamese twins fused at the brain (although parts of their mental lives would of course be identical at a moment-to-moment level). What I've never found was anything to rule out the kind of 'fuzzy edges' that tend to be associated -rightly or wrongly (or more likely both)- with Buddhist doctrine, especially with [lack of] teachings on paranirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

Refer to the teachings on the three kāyas, parinirvana is not real, it is a display.

undefineable said:

When I first discovered Buddhadharma, I actually liked the idea of a mental continuum surviving parinirvana, but dropped it because I didn't find any teachings to back it up. Since you make the whole thing sound so cut-and-dried, maybe you could share a link a quote for this idea unless it's only available in secret teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

The Suvarṇaprabhāṣottama Sūtra: The Buddha never passes into nirvana
and the Dharma never declines,
but parinirvana is shown
in order to ripen sentient beings.

And:

One can count the drops
of all the water of the oceans,
but the lifespan of Buddha Śakyamuni
cannot be counted by anyone.

The Nirvana Sūtra states: Aging and illness do not exist for me.

Also my lifespan is inexhaustible.

The Saddharmapundarika Sūtra states: When sentient beings perceive and think
this world is on fire because of the end of the eon,
at that time, this buddhafiield of mine
will be entirely filled with devas and humans...
though my buddhafiield will exist forever,
others will see always sees this as burning because of the end of the eon.

And:

Son of a good family...in order to benefit the world, through the power of aspiration, I

have been born as a human in this Jambudvīpa in order to properly explain this class of Dharma. Know that after my parinirvāṇa, in order to benefit sentient beings and out of compassion, I will be born as a human in order to very properly explain this class of Dharma.

Thus, there is actually no parinirvāṇa at all. At least, not for Mahāyānis.

And of course, all that arises from causes and conditions is empty.

OK - Take the example of the pure power of awareness regardless of any object of consciousness. At a level that most here will recognise, it would be hard to find evidence -or even 'points of entry'- for the notion that there is an awareness without an object of consciousness, let alone for the notion (much as I wrote on page 1) that this awareness is somehow held in common. However, if you assert that there are never any substantive links between the 'aware nature' aspects of an individual's mind and anything outside that mind -even after all the structures that hold together the sense of being an individual (ego, duality[, etc.]) have been removed-, then you also assert a defining characteristic as far as I can see - A self-enclosed 'unit of reality' instead of 'vast emptiness'.

But I never made such an assertion. I merely stated a basic Abhidharma definition: "all phenomena" are included in one aggregate, one sense base, and one element. All of my dharmas therefore, are unique to me in the sense that "I" am but a designation on a collection of aggregates. The basic definition of the material aggregate includes all sense organs and sense objects. The sounds, smells, sights, and so on, all sense objects in other words, are not part of my mind, per se, since they are material, and they are external to my physical sense organs (which is only half of the material aggregate). Material aggregates may and do interact, for example, if you can see, hear, smell, taste, or touch someone else's body, their body is part of your material aggregate and vice versa. People with meditative capacity can observe the minds of others. I have never read in any sūtra and tantra that Buddha was able to "project" himself into the mind of another sentient being or influence another with his thoughts. His ability read the thoughts of others however is undisputed.

Of course, the Buddha had a lot of definite things to say about samsara, but was far more cautious in defining enlightenment,

Buddha defined Buddhahood quite well in a number of places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Sherlock said:

Tsongkhapa knew very well his interpretation of Madhyamaka was not the one he learned while he was a Sakya student.

It came from his dreams.

The interpretation he learned as a Sakya student is simply that of all Indian and Tibetan

masters before him, and which is still dominant in Sakya today. So are you going to say that they are all wrong?

Malcolm wrote:

This is how the introductory verses to the Essence of Eloquence is understood in Gelug, as essentially saying that no one apart from Nāgārjuna and son, Candrakīrti, Shantideva and Atisha had rightly understood Madhyamaka and that everyone else was mistaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: What is Authorisation?

Content:

Astus said:

It is mentioned <http://www.charliemorley.com/full-bio/> that there was an authorisation given to teach. What form, if any, does such an authorisation take in Tibetan Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly it means you claim that some lama tapped you on the shoulder. Sometimes it means you are actually qualified.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 17th, 2015 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Denying the validity of conventional appearances is tragic and a big mistake that Gorampa made.

Malcolm wrote:

Where does Gorampa deny the conventional validity of appearances? He merely asserts that when a conventional entity is investigated it cannot be found at all upon analysis. He says:

Therefore all those objects and everything defined on those from the perspective of appearing to a mundane mind is said to be the meaning of defining the relative through the perspective of the conventional.

And:

The characteristic of the ultimate truth: since the noble's equipoise is beyond cognitive range of ordinary beings, also dualistic vision subsides because of immaculate wisdom, ultimate truth is asserted to be never seeing any extreme of existence and non-existence, permanence or annihilation and so on.

And:

That being so, when seen by a human eye consciousness, regardless of what is seen or not seen by the eye consciousness of the other five kinds of living beings, apart from conventional water appearing to that eye consciousness the others are not perceived, Ultimately there is no also perception of water itself. Your apportioning the substance

into six parts is wasted effort of grasping at things.

That being so, although it has been much boasted that “It is necessary to define the relative as an appearance to non-analytical mind” ultimately it appears to have been defined through an analysis with reason, therefore, there has been a degeneration in the [Gelugpa] presentation of the relative of the prāsangika madhyamaka system.

And:

Although the mere I, the perceived object apprehended by innate self-grasping as “I am” existing conventionally is the prāsangika madhyamaka system, the [Gelugpa] assertion “The mere I exists conventionally even though it is not found to be the same as, different than or both [the same as and different than] the aggregates when its sameness or difference is sought to be established” is very invalid because when it is sought like that even the mere I is necessarily found to be non-existent.

And:

That mere I itself conventionally is the agent of action and also is the experiencer of ripening in this system defined by the power of appearing to mind of the relative subject because to the mind of a mundane person, the mere I appears as the agent of action and the experiencer of a result, i.e. “I did an action”, “I experienced a result.”

And:

Prāsaṅgika and Svatantrika do not differ in the presentation of the conventional because the Prāsaṅgikas also accept autonomous arguments in the presentation of the conventional.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: Should it be dry-cleaned?

Content:

Lingpupa said:

Amidst all the profundity that gets discussed here, this question may seem almost banal. But it still matters.

I have been wearing a ngagapa shawl on appropriate occasions for some time now. Now although, of course, I know very clearly which teacher told me that I should wear it and why, I can no longer in fact remember where I acquired it. And what with usage, the cat sleeping on it (sorry, it wasn't intended) and so forth it could maybe do with a clean. So I have to wonder whether it is colour-fast and can be washed (perhaps at low temperature) in ordinary water and washing agent, or whether I have to take it to the dry cleaner.

I know that the type that I have is not uncommon, so I'd very much appreciate it if anybody who reckons that they have **exactly** the same kind of shawl and has gone as far as to wash it can let me know whether the colours run in a water wash or not.

Picture attached, and thanks in advance. Shawl reduced.jpg

Malcolm wrote:
Do not wash, dry clean.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 7:55 PM
Title: Re: Meaning of Vajrayana Buddhism
Content:
Sherlock said:
Then Dzogchen is to Vajrayana as non-gradual Mahayana is to gradual Mahayana.

You don't need to be cigcarba to practice, but Dzogchen is a more direct path than 2 stages. Self-liberation vs transformation. This is what Karma Chagme and Namkhai Norbu say, I'm sure more masters say the same.

Malcolm wrote:
So called self-liberation (rang grol) just means being free from grasping, no different than the fourth of the parting of the four attachments, "If grasping arises, one does not have the view."

I have studied and practice both Vajrayāna and Dzogchen side by side, and I have still yet to find that Dzogchen results in freedom from grasping more effectively than Vajrayāna. They are just different means for different sorts of people.

I also have not noticed that Dzogchen practitioners rapidly increase in realization at a pace swifter than say Vajrayogini practitioners or Hevajra practitioners, or Vajrakilaya practitioners.

There is also the fact that Dzogchen tregchö, Kagyu Mahāmudra, the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana (Sakya) all have the same point — sustaining an unfabricated awareness in all activities and at all times. If one can do this, that is self-liberation.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 7:48 PM
Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa
Content:
Tsongkhapafan said:
All this talk about Madhyamikas having no position is nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:
If I had a proposition, I would be at fault;
as I alone have no proposition, I alone am without fault.
—

I guess Nāgārjuna was just talking a load of nonsense then.

Tsongkhapafan said:

No, his meaning is - if I had an actual findable position, I would be at fault, but since my position is mere imputation, I alone am without fault.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Dhama Wheel posters, not so much.

Malcolm wrote:

I have always found it is better to just be consistent in tone and style. Sooner or later people stop taking it personally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

the term "all phenomena" is a technical term which covers the material aggregate, the mental consciousness and mental objects. It does not include other sentient beings.

undefineable said:

Whaat?

You seem to be depicting an infinite number of pan-multi-universes/realities/whatever, each of which is the everlasting mind-stream of a sentient being {'Everlasting' because absolute separateness puts enough of a cordon around a mind-stream for it to appear as a 'thing-in-itself' - This reality, then, consists only of a single individual, a view better known as Solipsism __ I'm getting lost - No wonder everyone here advises regular Buddhist coaching!

Malcolm wrote:

Appearances are sometimes deceptive, especially when people read things into them that are not there, for example, mistaking mist for smoke and thinking there is a fire.

Sarvadharmas, in this context, refers to the phenomena proper to a given "person" formed from a unique set of causes and conditions, some of which are shared, and some of which are not. For example, the container universe is a condition we all share, karma is not a condition we all share, karma is unique and individual, even when its ripening appears to be collective, for example, just as cherries tree blossom at the same time in the spring, but every tree is a unique and distinct individual arising from its own set of causes and conditions.

The inseparability of the two truths means merely that empty things arise from empty causes, like for example, separate and distinct empty mind streams. So 'things' -even emptiness itself- are empty, but other supposed truths -like separateness/distinction- are not empty at all? Again, why don't people just make all this clearer, rather than leaving the water muddy as they usually do?[/quote]

One of the conventional rules of causation is homogeneity — wheat from wheat seeds, corn from corn seeds, apples from apple seeds and so on. In regards to human beings, we all have our unique set of causes and conditions that both enforces our clade (human) at the same time that it provides us with our individual capacities in intelligence, vision, strength, health, longevity and so on.

Mindstreams are also unique in the sense that karma that I perform will not ripen on another, nor will the karma of others ripen on me.

And of course, all that arises from causes and conditions is empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

undefineable said:

I do wish the dharma could just put up neon sign (like with the Three Seals) saying "There is an ABSOLUTE and ETERNAL separation between each individual mind".

Malcolm wrote:

It is not like that — however, every mind stream arises from its unique set of causes and conditions which in turn enforce the uniqueness of not only every mind stream, but every conventional entity that can be considered to be composed of parts.

undefineable said:

The question is, is there still an absolutely-separate mind in paranirvana? If so, why? And why would anyone need that like anything-but a kick in the head after all the trouble of getting there?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a conventional continuum that continues even after parinirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 7:19 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

All this talk about Madhyamikas having no position is nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:

If I had a proposition, I would be at fault;
as I alone have no proposition, I alone am without fault.

I guess Nāgārjuna was just talking a load of nonsense then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Ayu said:

In other words:

"While you accept real dependent entities,
I do not accept them even conventionally.
For effect, I say they exist even though they do not.
Taking the perspective of the world, I speak of a self." (Page 231)

It is not so easy to put the Gelug position into a box, or to refute it, because (as quoted)
there is no position.

Thanks for this nice conversation.
Good night.

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty easy to put Gelug's in a box, because Tsongkhapa is very clear. Here, Chandra
is addressing Hinayāna realists.

If you did a little deeper, you will find it is exactly as we say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Ayu said:

This sounds somehow invalid comparing to what I have learned about LamRim BRING
BA (the onla German translation)

Malcolm wrote:

Elizabeth Napper's book on Dependent Origination covers this point extensively.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Ayu said:

No.

Maybe we should clarify, which "Gelugpa" view we are talking about.

The Prasangka Madhyamaka position is: the conventional phenomena are mere appearances and they "exist" only as that.

The view Tsongkhapa is fighting for in this discussion is not the view of Che Tsongkhapa, although their names sound quite similar.

heart said:

I mean the Gelug tradition no disrespect, but I left Dharamsala after the few months I spent there with exactly the impression Malcolm sum up above.

/magnus

Ayu said:

I heard an intense lecture about this topic. It is easy to misunderstand. It would be too long to quote here, but I recommend reading and meditating LamrimChenMo, Part Two (of Part 3) "Insight". At the end it comes out, the conventional phenomena are mere illusion. This does not mean, they would not exist at all, but they do not exist either. "Not existent and not non-existent". That is the fact about Tsongkhapa's teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, one of the key points of disagreement with Tsongkhapa is his formulation in Lamrim Chenmo that in the four-fold negation, the first negation, not existent, means only "not existent ultimately", and that that second negation, not nonexistent means "not nonexistent relatively" and since the third and fourth negations are double negatives they are to be considered superfluous.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

IN some places, yes Cone, definitely.

conebeckham said:

OK. But am I correct that Tsong Khapa's followers often qualified Nagarjuna and Chandra's word "Existent" with the word "inherent" when it was not explicitly there?

Also, Malcolm, what are the Tibetan terms for this "inherent"? dngos.?

Malcolm wrote:

Inherent existence (svabhāva) is either ngo bo nyid (older translations) or rang bzhin (more recent translations).

And yes, followers of Tsongkhapa often patch the word existence (bhāva, dngos po) with "sva", leading to the aforementioned criticism leveled by Gaden Chopel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna states very clearly the former is to be included in the latter, in no uncertain terms.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That's just an interpretation of his words. Tsongkhapa interprets it differently.

conebeckham said:

That's the position of followers of Tsong Khapa, yes. But can you point to "inherent" in Nagarjuna (or Chandra's) texts themselves?

Malcolm wrote:

IN some places, yes Cone, definitely. The end of the chapter I cite above states: Thus, whatever exists through inherent existence, that cannot be accepted as not existing later, because its nature is immutable; because of that, there will be a view of permanence from the view 'it exists'. That existent 'previous produced earlier, but presently non-existent' is a view that existing existents perish; therefore, it will be an annihilationist view. As such, why? There will be many faults for the view 'is and is not' in existents, because of that, that statement 'existents are without inherent existence', is seeing the truth, is the middle way, that is ultimately established.

But the main flaw that can be seen in the Gelugpa view is that they jump through hoops trying to preserve conventional phenomena, seemingly without realizing the purpose of Madhyamaka is not to defend relative truth but rather to realize the reality which relative truth conceals (that there is no reality at all).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna states very clearly the former is to be included in the latter, in no uncertain terms.

Tsongkhapa said:

That's just an interpretation of his words. Tsongkhapa interprets it differently.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is how Buddhapaṇi interprets Nāgārjuna's words:

If there is an existence, it is counted as an inherent existence or dependent existence. Because of that, if there is inherent existence and dependent existence, existence will be established. Also when there is no inherent existence, at that time there is also no dependent existence. There is no description of an existence not included in inherent existence and dependent existence. Where will that existence be alone without becoming inherently or dependently [existent]?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

No, I don't mean that emptiness is a thing. Perhaps I should have said that emptiness is a phenomenon, an existent.

Matylda said:

Even phenomenon or existent, how could unborn and free of 4 extremes be called or labeled in such way? If it is phenomenon etc. then isn't it just like any other category of things?

Tsongkhapa said:

Existence isn't an extreme for me, only inherent existent is.

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna states very clearly the former is to be included in the latter, in no uncertain terms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

I do not think the inseparability of the two truths can be described.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it can. As Gorampa points out:

“Matter is empty...” removes the extreme of the imputation of existence. “Emptiness is matter...” removes the extreme of the imputation of non-existence. “There is no other emptiness apart from matter; there is no other matter apart from emptiness...” shows the inseparability of the two truths.

muni said:

Yes they can be described, as well by form-emptiness, emptiness-form but not the experience. Since the experienter and the experience are not two.

Buddha remained silent.

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on what kind of experience you are talking about. Buddha remained silent for a while because he thought no one would understand him.

But it is useless talk about experiences we have not had, for example, awakening. It is like someone talking about California who has never been to California. Don't get me wrong, it is ok to say "I have heard California is nice, I would like to go there. I have a book written by someone who has been to California, and it is supposed to be quite good. In this book and in these reports I have heard this and that."

But too much of the conversation around here winds up with people making pompous proclamations as if they really have experienced awakening, when in fact they are just reciting things they have heard, and even then, often their understanding of what they have read and heard is inaccurate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

I do not think the inseparability of the two truths can be described.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it can. As Gorampa points out:

“Matter is empty...” removes the extreme of the imputation of existence. “Emptiness is matter...” removes the extreme of the imputation of non-existence. “There is no other emptiness apart from matter; there is no other matter apart from emptiness...” shows the inseparability of the two truths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

Malcolm wrote: he is not making a statement that ultimately there are no sentient beings besides oneself.

I never said that. By the union or inseparability of the two truths there is no one (subject) clinging to other (object). And therefore how nature is, is not individual but is so experienced in separation of the two truths.

Malcolm wrote:

The inseparability of the two truths means merely that empty things arise from empty causes, like for example, separate and distinct empty mind streams.

muni said:

It does not include other sentient beings.

Certainly not, the separation is by the individual mind.

Malcolm wrote:

This admits there is an individual mind that separates.

muni said:

The ego arises from that in which there is nothing to label. As this habitual tendency to ego-belief solidifies, names are formed as father and mother, child and possessions, enemy and friend, objects of the senses and so forth. In this way ego-belief and labelling delude you into the six realms. Guru Rinpoche

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Indeed, but still this is not a statement there is some Mind (capital M) of which everything is nondually composed, and that if we just realize that unity, that is buddhahood. It is not like that.

Guru Rinpoche's statement in this respect refers to one's subjective experience from yogacara point of view. His statement does not mean that there are not conventionally speaking, infinite myriads of sentient beings, the traces of all of whom sustain the appearance of the container universe. Minds have no form, but they generate appearances based on traces; minds have no form, and yet they are sustained on their own individual sets of causes and conditions — hence we say that they are empty. The inseparability of the two truths means that we do not reject appearances, for example, sentient beings, and we do not imagine that they arise due to any other reason than arising from conditions, which means they are empty, just as we are. It certainly does not mean that as soon as we cease looking at a mountain it ceases to exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Matt J said:

This is also posited in Vedanta. The idea is that the "mind-stuff", or citta, goes out and takes the form of the world, created vrittis made out of citta.

The holo-deck is actually supported by dreams and dream research. Looking at brain imaging, many of the same areas of the brain that relate to perception are activated in dreams that are activated in the waking state. B. Alan Wallace has explained that being awake is like dreaming with constraints (i.e. the "external" world) and dreaming is dreaming without such constraints.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference of course is that in Advaita, everything is made of Brahman, an ultimate substratum. This kind of ultimate substratum is rejected by every Indian and Tibetan Buddhist school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 16th, 2015 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

Woopsee! When Guru Rinpoche say others are the biased perception of ego (ego = an imagination as an entity existing on itself) then this is also Advaita? The Avatamsaka is Advaita? All seems to be that Advaita these days. Lol!

All phenomena are not same as mind but not different. Longchenpa?

I am not rejecting the conventional existence of beings, not clinging to emptiness, be sure. Actually this turns again to the inseparability of the two truths.

Malcolm wrote:

When Guru Rinpoche describes "otherness" as a biased perception, he is referring only the appearances of rtsal energy of the mind — he is not making a statement that ultimately there are no sentient beings besides oneself.

The Avatamsaka does not deny the separate continuums of sentient beings either.

As I explained before, the term "all phenomena" is a technical term which covers the material aggregate, the mental consciousness and mental objects. It does not include

other sentient beings. It is a very misunderstood term, leading to strange solipsistic interpretations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, what does this have to do with other sentient beings?

Other sentient beings are in misperception other beings, and so other than me (me = that what I think I am). Other sentient beings (all) are very necessary means to realize our own Nature in which, they are not so "other sentient beings".

Even "others" are biased perception of the individual mind, on our path they all are means to recognize our own nature. It depends completely on own perception, own mind only, how all appears and how all is.

I just see this here;

"The mind is like an artist

The mind created the aggregates.

All the world systems in existence

Have been drawn by the mind".

Malcolm wrote:

It seems your point of view is no different than Advaita.

Vasubandhu and so on go through very detailed arguments which prove the conventional existence of others minds despite the fact that container universe is "mind only."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 7:06 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

"It is said in the Great Perfection teachings that one cannot become enlightened through a contrived mind; rather, the basic mind is to be identified, in relation to which all phenomena are to be understood as the sport of the mind ".

-The Dalai Lama

Malcolm wrote:

All phenomena, chos thams cad, refers to one skandha (the material aggregate), one āyatana (the mental sense base) and one dhātu (the dharmadhātu, Hinyāna style, which contains all mental factors and the unconditioned dharmas). These are all understood in Dzogchen sems sde specifically to be the sport of the mind.

muni said:

When we identify ourselves as a phenomena we see only other phenomena and all is very solid real, including what we habitually learned to call our mind-body with which we then identify. Then again the metaphor mirror(Mind) and its' reflections(phenomena). In this selfless unsubstantial mirror-like Mind is no thing, no form out there.

Malcolm wrote:

Is it really necessary to confuse things by bringing Dzogchen concepts into the mix? Especially amongst a population that is not necessarily practicing Dzogchen?

Further, what does this have to do with other sentient beings? This has only to do with the container universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

To all,

This discussion seems to have gone into an endless loop. Additionally, from the recent posts even civil discussion seems to have been lost. It seems time to let it drop.

Best regards and wishes to all,
Jeff

Malcolm wrote:

Sometimes when people are offensive without realizing it stronger words are required to alert them to their breach of manners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 9:57 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Many people experience delusions that directly contradict Buddhadharma, your's is just one more.

Jeff said:

I do not at all think it contradicts Buddhadharma. That is my point, which the Rinpoche (or at least the translator) seems to share.

Malcolm wrote:

You dont understand Buddhadharma because, unfortunately, you are ignorant of its basic principles. You are recalcitrant, and clearly have no interest in understanding the subject at hand. it us a pity since you merely cut yourself off from true knowledge, preferring instead your own delusions. Cest la vie.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

That was the nature of the question, the relative connection "framework". Why I have recently posted the question (multiple times) about the computer network analogy. Malcolm is the only one who has really voted. Stating that in Buddhadharma there is no mind to mind connection, that the mind is limited to the physical body.

I was asking if everyone else agreed with that because as I have stated many other traditions have such capability/connection framework.

asunthatneversets said:

Study the two-truths, it would resolve the seeming contradictions and inconsistencies you feel you're encountering.

Right now you're struggling with your attempts to reconcile these issues through a neo-nondual type approach where you're forced to posit some sort of universal substratum, and that view is refuted by the buddhadharma, for good reason.

If you simply made an effort to comprehend how conventional designations and relative cognitions relate to ultimate truth (i.e., their emptiness), then you'd undoubtably resolve these issues you are struggling with.

Jeff said:

Think of it more like a shared consciousness that is the Form component of emptiness, just as we all seemingly exist in the same multi universe. I have no doubt relative to emptiness.

The struggling component comes from the groups description of Buddhadharma that is in contrast to what is directly experinenced by many relative to mind-mind contact/connection.

Malcolm wrote:

Many people experience delusions that directly contradict Buddhadharma, your's is just one more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

As Garchen Rinpoche said: Ultimately, there is a single ground within which all beings are one. Because we are connected to all beings on the ultimate level, we can pervade them with love. They can actually receive our love.

Now back to your regularly scheduled program.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is what Garchen's translator said for him, who knows what Garchen actually said (in Tibetan, he does not speak English).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Malcolm, I in no way am attempting to impose Advaita Vedanta concepts on Buddhadharma.

Bakmoon said:

But the actual position you are laying down is a textbook example of Advaita Vedanta. Can you name any substantial difference between your view and that of Adi Shankara?

Jeff said:

On why traditions say that it is located in the heart... That is because the unified field or light body is based in the heart. Additionally, I will stand in agreement with the sutra quote. The mind is as vast as the entire cosmos. The body itself is a direct mapping to all that exists (or the entire cosmos). This is also part of the true meaning of the Dharmakaya and Sambhogakaya.

Best wishes,

Jeff

Bakmoon said:

You misunderstand that passage from the Avatamsaka. If you look at the entire passage it is clear that it is a collection of descriptions of the nature of the powers and activities of the various Bodhisattvas. Specifically, it says:

They are able to shake infinite worlds in the ten directions by spiritual powers; their minds are

broad, being equal to the cosmos. They know various explanations of truth, they know how many sentient beings there are, they know the differences among sentient beings, they know the birth of suffering, they know the extinction of suffering; while knowing all acts are like reflected images, they carry out the deeds of bodhisattvas. They sever the root of all subjection to birth.

Everything in this passage is a description of the many spiritual powers wielded by the Great Bodhisattvas, and immediately after saying their minds are "broad [and] equal to the cosmos" it describes the extent of their knowledge of sentient beings. It is clear from context that the meaning of the passage is that the Great Bodhisattvas mind is broad and equal to the cosmos in terms of the scope of its abilities, not that the mind IS the cosmos.

Malcolm wrote:

I already tried to explain it to him, it is hopeless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Is not the nature of a discussion to present various positions? As with the sutra I provided, I think it shows a very reasonable counter point.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, you don't understand the sūtra's meaning, not to mention the fact it is not a reliable translation by any means.

Jeff said:

Are you now also saying that the Avatamsaka Sutra is unreliable and I have mistaken the very clear meaning (that I agree with)?

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that you a) do not understand the meaning of the passage b) that the translation is any case not accurate and has been a topic of criticism for many years due to its lack of accuracy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Is not the nature of a discussion to present various positions? As with the sutra I provided, I think it shows a very reasonable counter point.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, you don't understand the sūtra's meaning, not to mention the fact it is not a reliable translation by any means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

Due to thoughts linked to habitual patterns,
The myriad things arising from the mind
Appear to people as external.
They are no external phenomena
It is the mind that arises as the myriad things.
Body, activities, dwelling, and such
I declare that all these are only mind.
Lankavatara.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, external phenomena are considered mind-only in this sutra, but not other sentient beings.

Jeff said:

A perceived body is external phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: The 12 great Deeds Questions

Content:

Aemilius said:

Hi !

I have never heard of Svetaketu as a past incarnation of Buddha Gautama.

Malcolm wrote:

No confusion, Svetaketu was the bodhisattva's name while residing in Tushita heaven.

<http://huntington.wmc.ohio-state.edu/public/index.cfm?fuseaction=showThisDetail&ObjectID=30030924>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

Due to thoughts linked to habitual patterns,
The myriad things arising from the mind
Appear to people as external.
They are no external phenomena
It is the mind that arises as the myriad things.
Body, activities, dwelling, and such
I declare that all these are only mind.
Lankavatara.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, external phenomena are considered mind-only in this sutra, but not other sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Without entering Secret Mantra, there is no way around the "many eons" because the Paramitayāna just takes that much time.

Jeff said:

Agreed on the Secret Mantra concept.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, you don't even know what you are agreeing to, since you are not a practitioner of Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are imposing such concepts on Buddhadharma, a subject about which you know little.

Unknown said:

On why traditions say that it is located in the heart... That is because the unified field or light body is based in the heart. Additionally, I will stand in agreement with the sutra quote. The mind is as vast as the entire cosmos. The body itself is a direct mapping to all that exists (or the entire cosmos). This is also part of the true meaning of the Dharmakaya and Sambhogakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Your understanding of the citation in question is quite simply mistaken. You don't know what it means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Matt J said:

If minds are individual, then they must have two things: 1) location and 2) boundaries.

Where is the mind located and what are its boundaries?

muni said:

Whether equipoise or thinking, depends how seen. All is Mind. Reflections are in the mirror, inseparable.

Malcolm wrote:

"All" here refers to the skandhas, dhatus and āyatanas. It does not really include the minds of others apart from oneself.

It means all of one's sense organs, sense objects, and sense consciousnesses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Matt J said:

If minds are individual, then they must have two things: 1) location and 2) boundaries.

Where is the mind located and what are its boundaries?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is located in the body. Its boundaries are the sense organs.

Jeff said:

Now there we definitely disagree... Repeating an earlier post to define my position...

From the Avatamsaka Sutra...

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm. Jeff, Mahābodhisattvas in general means bodhisattvas on the tenth bhumi.

In any case, this passage does not contradict my assertion that conventionally speaking, the mind is located in the body and its boundaries are the sense organs. All Buddhist traditions agree that mind is located in the center of the body mass, approximately at the heart. Someone might object and say, "What about when it says that when looking for the mind it cannot be found inside the body, outside the body and so on...", this is also true, but conventionally speaking we understand the mind to be located in the "heart".

Sooner or later you are going figure out that you are trying impose Advaita Vedanta concepts on Buddhhdharma, and you will realize that it does not work. Then you will have to decide which you like better and than follow that path. But they are not reconcilable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Seeing thing correctly means that one does not have relative obstructions to that view.

Malcolm wrote:

Seeing correctly means that one sees that things are empty by nature, not in an intellectual sense that we are discussing here, but in the sense of having realized emptiness. And that is just the start, because one still has to eliminate eons worth of affliction and knowledge obscurations, and outside of Vajrayāna, that takes eons practicing the path, even as a realized person.

Jeff said:

Fair enough on the Buddha point, I should have said "more like" or "potential". As one clears away the heavy obstructions, it is easier to notice one's true (or underlying nature). There is nothing to "know" or "learn", just crap to clear away.

Malcolm wrote:

And that takes many eons.

Jeff said:

I agree that realization is what counts, not reading a book or intellectualizing...

On many eons... Guess that depends on your approach... But, if one is worried about it... They are definitely on the "many eons" approach...

Malcolm wrote:

Without entering Secret Mantra, there is no way around the "many eons" because the Paramitayāna just takes that much time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Of course there is such a thing as emptiness, it's the ultimate nature of phenomena. The ideas that people are expressing here that conventional and ultimate truths don't exist is just plain weird and contrary to the valid cognizers of ordinary beings and Yogis. I think it's a nihilistic view - but just because something is merely imputed doesn't mean that it doesn't exist, in fact, that's how it actually does exist. Mere imputations are existent phenomena, and existent phenomena are those things and non-things that are apprehended by valid cognizers.

Matylda said:

Do you mean that emptiness is a thing? even if you call it ultimate nature.. how it can be a thing? I guess it was just uncontrolled use of words...

Tsongkhapafan said:

No, I don't mean that emptiness is a thing. Perhaps I should have said that emptiness is a phenomenon, an existent.

Malcolm wrote:

You understand that emptiness is defined as unconditioned in Mahāyāna, correct?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: The theory of how empowerments work?

Content:

Anders said:

@Malcolm,

Your posts here suggest that there are some ways that get more out of empowerments than others. Is that a general rule? Different tips for different empowerments?

Malcolm wrote:

Taking empowerment is a practice. When you understand this, your Vajrayāna experience will be more rich.

Anders said:

Can you expand a bit on that, as if to a somewhat dimwitted person ()? I think I am missing some parts here to really make sense of that.

Malcolm wrote:

I cannot really elaborate on that here in this kind of forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Matt J said:

If minds are individual, then they must have two things: 1) location and 2) boundaries.

Where is the mind located and what are its boundaries?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is located in the body. Its boundaries are the sense organs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Seeing thing correctly means that one does not have relative obstructions to that view.

Malcolm wrote:

Seeing correctly means that one sees that things are empty by nature, not in an intellectual sense that we are discussing here, but in the sense of having realized emptiness. And that is just the start, because one still has to eliminate eons worth of affliction and knowledge obscurations, and outside of Vajrayāna, that takes eons practicing the path, even as a realized person.

Jeff said:

Fair enough on the Buddha point, I should have said "more like" or "potential". As one clears away the heavy obstructions, it is easier to notice one's true (or underlying nature). There is nothing to "know" or "learn", just crap to clear away.

Malcolm wrote:
And that takes many eons.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 10:54 PM
Title: Re: How a skeptical anchorman became a Buddhist
Content:
Simon E. said:
At least one well known Lama used to recommend Jesus and Mary as Yidams for Christians.

I am not commending this. Just sayin'.

Malcolm wrote:
It is a little strange, honestly.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 10:45 PM
Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Malcolm, what would you say was going on in the incident described by Tsultrim Allione here:
<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=50&t=7186&p=172682e#p172682?bump>

Malcolm wrote:
She had a nice experience.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 10:35 PM
Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:

Jeff said:
But, that traps on into a limited relative view that one needs "eyes" to see and such is not the case.

Malcolm wrote:
As long as one is an afflicted person, one will see through one's eyes, smell through one's nose and so on.

Jeff said:

Rather than relative and absolute views... It is more like there is absolute with relative obstructions to that view...

Malcolm wrote:

There is no absolute. Ultimate truth just means seeing things correctly.

Jeff said:

One is an unbounded Buddha, not trapped to any form with eyes (or limited "mind"), but very often one's view is heavily obstructed.

Malcolm wrote:

This is total contradiction in terms. If one were an unbounded Buddha, one's view could never be heavily obstructed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

I totally agree that no individual mind/delusion is mingling. That is why I have attempted to introduce the "local" concept, but the computer network analogy also works. Do you agree that the computer network analogy/Internet is a reasonable one?

Also, probably better if we don't try to venture into what Hindus believe.

Malcolm wrote:

What is observed in the phenomena of abhijñā, knowing the minds of others, are conceptual thoughts, mental entities marked by characteristics in the minds of another. When our minds become free from such conceptual thoughts, our minds cannot be perceived by others any longer. For example, there were a group of devas fond of a certain monk, with whom they were friends. One day they became alarmed because they could not perceive him in the three realms anymore. They went to the Buddha, who told them that this monk had become an arhat and was in a samadhi of cessation, and therefore, since his mind was free from any characteristics while in that state, they could not perceive his mind. This how the abhijñā of knowing the minds of others works. This is why only a mind which embraces a characteristic can be known to a yogi who has such capacity.

Jeff said:

Makes total sense. But what we are discussing is the inverse. How a yogi with such capacity can know the mind (or contact) the mind of one that is yet obstructed?

Malcolm wrote:

That is the point, such obstructions make the mind visible, such a mind has effluents, outflows, etc.

For example, the eye has the capacity to see from a distance, likewise, these abilities are called "eyes."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

If Form = Void/Emptiness and Emptiness/Void = Form, is not everything possible within Buddhadharma.

Mind is clear and pristine, there are no "boundaries"... Is that not correct?

Malcolm wrote:

You are conflating ultimate and relative truth. In ultimate truth, there are no minds, no buddhas, no sentient beings, no connections, no relations, no objects, etc.

Relative truth, on the other hand, is defined by what works. If you try to use a car as a space craft, you will not get very far. If you try to prove that all minds have a common substratum, your argument will fail for all kinds of reasons. If you try to prove that one mind can directly influence another, again, your argument will fail for all kinds of reasons no matter what you may have been led to believe.

Jeff said:

So does that mean that you also do not agree with the computer connected analogy?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a false analogy. It is not how minds work, that is how brains work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

I totally agree that no individual mind/delusion is mingling. That is why I have attempted to introduce the "local" concept, but the computer network analogy also works. Do you agree that the computer network analogy/Internet is a reasonable one?

Also, probably better if we don't try to venture into what Hindus believe.

Malcolm wrote:

What is observed in the phenomena of abhijñā, knowing the minds of others, are conceptual thoughts, mental entities marked by characteristics in the minds of another. When our minds become free from such conceptual thoughts, our minds cannot be perceived by others any longer. For example, there were a group of devas fond of a certain monk, with whom they were friends. One day they became alarmed because they could not perceive him in the three realms anymore. They went to the Buddha, who told them that this monk had become an arhat and was in a samadhi of cessation, and therefore, since his mind was free from any characteristics while in that state, they could not perceive his mind. This how the abhijñā of knowing the minds of others works. This is why only a mind which embraces a characteristic can be known to a yogi who has such capacity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

If Form = Void/Emptiness and Emptiness/Void = Form, is not everything possible within Buddhadharma.

Mind is clear and pristine, there are no "boundaries"... Is that not correct?

Malcolm wrote:

You are conflating ultimate and relative truth. In ultimate truth, there are no minds, no buddhas, no sentient beings, no connections, no relations, no objects, etc.

Relative truth, on the other hand, is defined by what works. If you try to use a car as a space craft, you will not get very far. If you try to prove that all minds have a common substratum, your argument will fail for all kinds of reasons. If you try to prove that one mind can directly influence another, again, your argument will fail for all kinds of reasons no matter what you may have been led to believe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: The theory of how empowerments work?

Content:

Anders said:

@Malcolm,

Your posts here suggest that there are some ways that get more out of empowerments than others. Is that a general rule? Different tips for different empowerments?

Malcolm wrote:

Taking empowerment is a practice. When you understand this, your Vajrayāna experience will be more rich.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

An example of direct Connection Master*student is Devotion (not a devotion by one to one). Then when Aware, liberating guidance is available to push out of “the locked state of idea-being”. And then we are open mingling.

Malcolm wrote:

Merging one's mind with the guru's mind is a symbolic act. It does not mean that the guru's mind merges with your mind in reality, at least, not in Buddhadharma.

Maybe some Hindus believe this. In Buddhadharma is simple means that one is resting in the same state that the guru's mind represents.

muni said:

No individual mind (delusion) is mingling at all. It is actually symbolic meant since Nature is been recognized, same Nature as the Guru. Absolute truth is dependence-emptiness, so not my Nature and your Nature and his, her..

Malcolm wrote:

Glad we agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

muni said:

An example of direct Connection Master*student is Devotion (not a devotion by one to one). Then when Aware, liberating guidance is available to push out of "the locked state of idea-being". And then we are open mingling.

Malcolm wrote:

Merging one's mind with the guru's mind is a symbolic act. It does not mean that the guru's mind merges with your mind in reality, at least, not in Buddhadharma.

Maybe some Hindus believe this. In Buddhadharma is simple means that one is resting in the same state that the guru's mind represents.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no universal mind, so your term "local" is useless.

Jeff said:

Yes, you have been very clear in your perspective of how Buddhadharma is not capable of doing certain things. It seems that muni has some different perspective with his "interconnectedness" concept. Since that would appear to imply that all minds are connected, it raises the question of "how all minds are connected" or "the broader framework for such connections to exist".

Malcolm wrote:

It has nothing to with my perspective, it has to with what Buddha taught.

It is well established by the Buddha that one mind is not capable of influencing another mind directly — in order words, a Buddha cannot exercise his will on the mind of another.

But you don't seem very interested in what the Buddha taught and instead seem more interested in evangelizing your distinctly non-Buddhist concepts here. And I have to question why you would be interested to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Because in the example, one mind would be affecting another. If there was not some form of overlap or connection, how would one reach/contact the other mind?

muni said:

Oh very easy by interconnection.

Then Sambhogakaya energy.

The individual mind cannot do such at all. Such is not its' domain but discussion can lead to the wish to practice to realize beyond the limited individual "mind" and so not trust that limited mind or identifying with it.

Interdependence-emptiness. Nothing individual apart and on its' own is other than deluded.

Malcolm wrote: Buddhas and bodhisattvas are unable to influence the minds of others — if they were able to influence the minds of others we all would have woken up eons ago and there would be no samsara.

Guidance, while we have to recognize. No Buddha or Bodhisattva can do it for another.

Jeff said:

I would agree that the individual (or local) mind does not have the capability. But with your "interconnection", it sounds like you believe it is possible and all minds are interconnected in some manner. Is that the case?

Buddha's do not "give". They can only introduce and share additional room to allow one to "drop". The individual sentient being still must be willing to drop the obstructions.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no universal mind, so your term "local" is useless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Astus said:

A story by Ven. Shengyan (<http://chancenter.org/cmc/1985/05/15/esoteric-and-exoteric-buddhism/>):

In Taiwan, I have a disciple who has been practicing with me for quite sometime. He has a good command of English, so when a certain Tibetan rinpoche was scheduled to lecture, he was asked to translate. He was very nervous. He had never practiced Tantra, and was afraid that he wouldn't understand what the rinpoche said. In a quandary, he finally decided that if he didn't understand, it was the rinpoche's responsibility to make him understand. With this thought he went to sleep. The rinpoche came to him in a dream, placed his hand on the disciple's head, and said, "You don't have to be nervous.

You will understand everything I say tomorrow. You don't have to worry." He had a wonderful feeling when the rinpoche touched him. The next morning it was the rinpoche who woke him up. My disciple immediately prostrated to the rinpoche and thanked him for entering his dream. Curious, the rinpoche asked, "What happened last night?" The disciple told him, and after a few more questions from the rinpoche, he concluded that it might not have been the rinpoche but a "yidam," a Dharma protector, who came to him.

Later I asked him if he had ever dreamed of me. He said, "Yes, indeed, many times." Then I asked if he thought that it was me who had entered his dreams. He said, "No, because Shih-fu doesn't have a yidam." So then I said to him, "O.K., I will go and find myself a yidam so that the next time you dream of me, you will be sure that it is my yidam that is entering your dream." My disciple objected, "But in Ch'an there is no such thing as a yidam."

Jeff said:

Thank you for the story Astus. Does that mean that you disagree with Malcolm and such is possible in the Buddhadharmā?

Malcolm wrote:

Why don't you try reading the paragraph immediately before these two:

In both traditions it is natural for a practitioner to have unusual physiological and psychological reactions — seeing, hearing, or even dreaming things out of the ordinary. A Tantric practitioner will take what he has seen, heard, or dreamt as signals that the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas are recognizing his practice. A Ch'an practitioner may also have such experiences, but they are not emphasized and are not taken as signals or signs of anything in particular.

Of course, the above statement is also inaccurate. A "Tantric" practitioner will do no such thing. Every practice as specific experiences that are outlined, including dreams, and when a practitioner has such experiences described in the text, it is taken as an indication that their practice is moving ahead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: The theory of how empowerments work?

Content:

fckw said:

@Malcolm: What do you mean by "taking path empowerment every day"? Isn't this just another way of stating: practice this tantra every day? Or are you referring to a special part of the Hevajra-Tantra?

Malcolm wrote:

I am referring to practicing the Hevajra sadhana everyday in which one takes the four empowerments in an elaborate way everyday.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: How a skeptical anchorman became a Buddhist

Content:

Anders said:

Now the traditional Buddhist may argue that such a thing will never happen for the materialist due to his wrong view on rebirth (or even lack of right view on it), but this is a bit beside the point here imo....

Malcolm wrote:

Not, it is exactly the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 7:15 PM

Title: Re: Sakya lam-rim text?

Content:

kirtu said:

Malcolm is correct - but until fairly recently "Clarifying the Sage's Intent" had not been published or was not available.

Malcolm wrote:

I am currently doing a lecture on this text and providing a chapter by chapter translation as we go along. I will cover the first of the six perfections on Saturday, 10:00 EST, April 18th. There have been three previous sections that interested parties may listen to.

Those who are interested may join the facebook group:

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/sakyapandita/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 7:02 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Ok, then could you describe how the guru visits them in this "dream state" (which is in their mind)? If one is manipulating someone's perceptions in their mind, does that not constitute affecting them and directly disagree with what Malcolm stated earlier?

Malcolm wrote:

You might see a guru in your dreams, but it is still your dream and not them "visiting" you in some real sense.

Jeff said:

I think this issue with our discussion may simply that in the nomenclature used here (Buddhism), higher level discrimination is simplified down to one big "Wisdom" category.

Malcolm wrote:

I think the problem with our discussion is that you don't seem to really understand the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Because in the example, one mind would be affecting another.

Malcolm wrote:

This idea is rejected in Buddhadharma. The only way my mind can influence another mind is that another person chooses to listen to what I say, or responds to some physical act I perform.

Jeff said:

So you are saying that my proposed experiment is theoretically impossible? No such thing as remote (energetic) contact and transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, that is what we have been saying to you now for several pages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

And thank you for finally agreeing that Buddhas and bodhisattvas can access and know the minds of others. Now we just need to just get the rest of the group to agree to such a concept.

Additionally, understand how that knowing is really the same as being with or "in" the local mind stream of the sentient being. With such "focus" of a high level being creating the void effect I described earlier.

asunthatneversets said:

Curious why you seem to be so enamored with this whole mind reading/interaction

business?

Jeff said:

Not interested in mind reading at all. The topic goes more to the ability (and how) of gurus, Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and Dakini's to "help". Why such tantric (energy) practices lead to faster realization.

Malcolm wrote:

I suggest you properly study Vajrayāna under a qualified master. Then you will find all your questions answered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Because in the example, one mind would be affecting another.

Malcolm wrote:

This idea is rejected in Buddhadharma. The only way my mind can influence another mind is that another person chooses to listen to what I say, or responds to some physical act I perform. It is the same for the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 7:29 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

And thank you for finally agreeing that Buddhas and bodhisattvas can access and know the minds of others.

Malcolm wrote:

"Finally agreeing"? We were never in disagreement about knowing the minds of others. You should look up the word "abhiññā". "Access" provides a problem. Buddhas and bodhisattvas are unable to influence the minds of others — if they were able to influence the minds of others we all would have woken up eons ago and there would be no samsara.

Jeff said:

Now we just need to just get the rest of the group to agree to such a concept.

Malcolm wrote:

They already agree.

Jeff said:

Additionally, understand how that knowing is really the same as being with or "in" the local mind stream of the sentient being. With such "focus" of a high level being creating the void effect I described earlier.

Malcolm wrote:

When one sees a tree, one is not "in the tree", it is the same with knowing the minds of others, one sees the concepts of others much in the manner of the way ordinary people watch tv.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

So, I would like to theorize an experiment for the group...

If it could be done, would remote energy interaction be considered as experimental proof that minds overlap? Something that could be consciously perceived (energy, vibrations, temperature change or visions). As I have stated is possible for someone at the 7th bhumi.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously man, no one here, including you, is a seventh stage bodhisattva. If you think you are, you need psychological help.

Jeff said:

I was making no such statement. I was asking a theoretical question as to whether the group would consider that as proof.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no substratum, minds do not "overlap." The reason why Buddhas and high bodhisattvas can know the minds of others, know past lives, etc. is because the nature of everything is emptiness and therefore while there is no universal substratum there is also no impediments because everything is empty. And since everything is empty, Buddha's wisdom is unimpeded in all directions and times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

So, I would like to theorize an experiment for the group...

If it could be done, would remote energy interaction be considered as experimental proof that minds overlap? Something that could be consciously perceived (energy, vibrations, temperature change or visions). As I have stated is possible for someone at the 7th bhumi.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously man, no one here, including you, is a seventh stage bodhisattva. If you think you are, you need psychological help.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Ok, so you are saying that it is a definitional/title thing regarding "benefit for oneself" rather than really any sutra saying that a Buddha worries or cares about oneself?

My position is that appearance to those dwelling on the Bhumis, is really the broader energy/light interaction that I have previously described. Additionally, my position is that a Dakini is also sometimes the Sambhogakaya body and directly interacts with high level practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

The Śrī Maladevi sutra states:

In that respect, the dharmakāya of the tathāgatagarbha is definitely released from the sheath of afflictions. Bhagavān, the so called "tathāgatagarbha" is tathāgata's wisdom of emptiness that cannot be seen by śravakas and pratyekabuddhas. Dharmakāya is just the total realization of emptiness. Nothing more.

Further, The Trikāya Sūtra states:

Kṣitigarbha, tathāgatas are endowed with the three kāyas: the dharmakāya, the sambhogkāya and the nirmanakāya...In that regard, the dharmakāya is visible to the tathagātas. The sambhogakāya is visible to bodhisattvas. The nirmanakāya is visible to ordinary persons on the stage of devotional practice.

Kṣitigarbha, for example, clouds are produced on the basis of an empty sky; rain is produced on the basis of clouds. Likewise, the sambhogakāya appears on the basis of the dharmakāya, and the nirmanakāya appears on the basis of the sambhogakāya.

Jeff said:

Yes, the Dharmakaya being the total realization of emptiness and also being the basis that the sambhogakaya appears on is what I meant by a stable bubble in emptiness (for

the sambhogakaya).

Malcolm wrote:

Why don't you just properly study with a teacher rather than grasping at straws?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Ok, so you are saying that it is a definitional/title thing regarding "benefit for oneself" rather than really any sutra saying that a Buddha worries or cares about oneself?

My position is that appearance to those dwelling on the Bhumis, is really the broader energy/light interaction that I have previously described. Additionally, my position is that a Dakini is also sometimes the Sambhogakaya body and directly interacts with high level practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

The Śrī Maladevi sutra states:

In that respect, the dharmakāya of the tathāgatagarbha is definitely released from the sheath of afflictions. Bhagavān, the so called "tathāgatagarbha" is tathāgata's wisdom of emptiness that cannot be seen by śravakas and pratyekabuddhas.

Dharmakāya is just the total realization of emptiness. Nothing more.

Further, The Trikāya Sūtra states:

Kṣitigarbha, tathāgatas are endowed with the three kāyas: the dharmakāya, the sambhogkāya and the nirmanakāya...In that regard, the dharmakāya is visible to the tathagātas. The sambhogakāya is visible to bodhisattvas. The nirmanakāya is visible to ordinary persons on the stage of devotional practice.

Kṣitigarbha, for example, clouds are produced on the basis of an empty sky; rain is produced on the basis of clouds. Likewise, the sambhogakāya appears on the basis of the dharmakāya, and the nirmanakāya appears on the basis of the sambhogakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

So your position is that a buddha (having a Dharmakaya) is "worried about their own benefit"?

Malcolm wrote:

No. I already explained it as did cone, the dharmakāya is termed "for one's own benefit" because one can only see it when one becomes a buddha. Only buddhas can see the dharmakāya, as has been said now several times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Where in sutra does it say for one's own benefit?

Malcolm wrote:

Everywhere.

Jeff said:

With the realization/formation of the Dharmakaya there is no "one who is worried about their own benefit"? They have dropped all such desires and attachments or there would be no such Dharmakaya. What sutra really says such a thing?

Best wishes.

Malcolm wrote:

Very many. This is because the dharmakāya only appears to buddhas, where as the sambhogakāya appears to high bodhisattvas and the nirmanakāya to everyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Thank you for pointing out that the Form Kayas are for the benefit of others, can you please explain how the Sambhogakaya "helps" with the benefit of the others? This seems to be impossible for most here as they believe that the mind cannot be affected by a buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

The sambhogakāya gives rise to the nirmanakāyas in all the different world systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Where in sutra does it say for one's own benefit?

Malcolm wrote:

Everywhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

it works like this...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it really doesn't. This is just some fantasy you are having.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Vajrayāna/Dzogchen

Content:

Sherlock said:

Zhangzhung Nyen gyud is Bon Dzogchen from a prior age before Garab Dorje.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, I have my doubts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

I guess that I have my answer. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

We have three dimensions, body, voice and mind. The Buddha's have three kāyas. The nirmanakāya exist because ordinary sentient beings cannot have contact with the

sambhogakāya at all because of the afflictions they possess. When they remove those afflictions, then they can see the Sambhogakāya, but this takes many countless eons lifetimes of practice. Finally, when they become a Buddha, they can see the dharmakāya.

Therefore, all transmissions for ordinary people like ourselves occur on an external physical way, through speech and symbols. If we happen to realize the meaning of what is being taught, this is referred to a "mind transmission", but it is not really a transmission in the sense of a message communicated and a message received mentally. It is more in the sense of a message communicated through words and symbols whose inner significance is then realized directly. Anyone who tells you that there is some actually mind to mind transmission in Buddhadharma at the level of our impure perception is either lying or they have no idea what they are talking about.

Buddhas cannot communicate liberation into the minds of others. If they could, there would be no sentient beings left. The Buddha said famously, we cannot wash away suffering, he cannot remove it with his hand, nor can he make us liberated, but he can teach us a path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

On putting it in words... In your tradition, is there no such thing as mind-mind transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by mind to mind. What do you mean by mind to mind.

Jeff said:

Direct transmission. Without the need for talking/oral communication. Often sometimes called energy or light transmission.

Malcolm wrote:

Transmission of what, baseball scores, stock tips?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Your response seems to imply that you believe that a guru or bodhisattva cannot directly impact (or know about) other sentient beings. Is that correct?

Malcolm wrote:

It implies no such thing. And what does the abhijñā of knowing the mind of another have to do with the question?

Jeff said:

Then how does a guru or bodhisattva impact other sentient beings? How do they access the mind of the being if there is not some medium of overlap?

Malcolm wrote:

Why does there have to be a medium of overlap?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

On putting it in words... In your tradition, is there no such thing as mind-mind transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by mind to mind. What do you mean by mind to mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Your response seems to imply that you believe that a guru or bodhisattva cannot directly impact (or know about) other sentient beings. Is that correct?

Malcolm wrote:

It implies no such thing. And what does the abhijñā of knowing the mind of another have to do with the question?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 13th, 2015 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Jeff"]

On the translation, is there another version that you would prefer to discuss on the point?/quote]

Jeff, you really need to take a course in Yogacara so you will not be misled by

theosophical edits of deprecated translations.

The ālayavijñāna is personal and individual, as anyone who has studied these texts any Buddhist primary language knows.

I can't even be bothered to explain this in detail because it would take much too long. However, you should educate yourself if possible:

http://www.bdk.or.jp/pdf/bdk/digitaldl/dBET_T1593_GreatVehicleSummary_2003.pdf

This text explains very precisely what the ālayavijñāna is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 13th, 2015 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?

Content:

Jeff said:

Suzuki and Goddard translation.

Malcolm wrote:

Suzuki and Goddard translation.

hahahahahahaha....

No wonder you are so misled. That piece of crap should be burned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 13th, 2015 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Meaning of Vajrayana Buddhism

Content:

Sherlock said:

Dzogchen is to Vajrayana as Vajrayana is to Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is nonsense. Dzogchen has no methods that allow one to attain awakening faster than one lifetime. As Zhigpo Dudtse pointed out, he looked far and wide for cig car bas, but apart from Saraha in India, and Lingrepa in Tibet, he could not find any. Neither of these two persons were Dzogchen practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 13th, 2015 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Meaning of Vajrayana Buddhism

Content:

Anders said:

The very quick summary, as I understand it:

Vajrayana exists for two reasons:

- *To provide a different and wider array of means for liberation that allows for more people to get there.

- *To provide radically faster means to Buddhahood than traditional mahayana.

This traditionally involves bonding with a Yidam (fully awakened deity) via a guru and, through these bonds and their blessings, transform affliction into wisdom (as opposed to abandoning affliction with wisdom).

Beyond this, there are also Mahamudra and Dzogchen who focus less on the yidam part (guru devotion still mandatory) and more on being introduced to one's nature by the guru and work with this as a speedy means to buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra and Dzogchen are part of Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 13th, 2015 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Sakya lam-rim text?

Content:

Luke said:

Does the Sakya school have its own lam-rim text? Or do they generally just use other schools' lam-rim texts?

Malcolm wrote:

Clarifying the Muni's Intent by Sakya Pandita is our Lamrim text.

The other texts mentioned above are not lamrim texts since they have no account of refuge, the six perfections, ten stages, three kāyas and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 11th, 2015 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: Tsok restrictions

Content:

yan kong said:

I've been going to a small practice group a little bit in the nyingma pema lingpa lineage led by a Bhutanese loppon. I've received no empowerments or initiations or anything from anyone, I'm certainly in the sutrayana area of practice.

Thing is the last time after the teaching on the four noble truths we chanted from a chod practice text (and when I say chanted I mean the loppon tried to teach us the basic rhythm of the text, it didn't seem like an actual practice). Additionally they invited me to one of their Tsoks.

So my question is, should I be doing any of this having received no initiation or empowerment of any kind?

tomamundsen said:

AFAIK, there are no restrictions to tsok. All beings are invited.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, those without samaya cannot participate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 11th, 2015 at 6:29 AM

Title: Re: Does one need initiation to recite Vajrasattva mantra?

Content:

Punya said:

Because there is no initiation for Vajrasattva outside of Nyingma texts that come from India.

I'm curious what you mean by this Malcolm.

I'm aware of a number of Vajrasattva sadhana in Nyingma which I understand are derived from terma. I'm having trouble framing the question but what is the relationship between the initiation itself and the particular sadhana that a student is then expected to practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Guhyagarbha is that ultimate source of Vajrasattva initiations in Nyingma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 11th, 2015 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Does one need initiation to recite Vajrasattva mantra?

Content:

kirtu said:

I do not remember a Vajrasattva empowerment of any kind in Sakya...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it does not exist.

Challenge23 said:

Interesting. Are you comfortable with speculating with why that is? I was under the impression that all of the schools had the same basic empowerments (such as Medicine Buddha and Vajrasattva) and ceremonies and differed mostly in regards to some of the more advanced concepts and how the basics are presented. For example, all of the schools have a Ngondro but the number of repetitions and exact wording differ from school to school.

Malcolm wrote:

Because there is no initiation for Vajrasattva outside of Nyingma texts that come from India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 11th, 2015 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

dharmagoat said:

So as I read it, the scriptures are the authority, but careful understanding of them is required to make them effective.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct. This is the main reason why my posts generally are supported on citations.

dharmagoat said:

I think we are on the same page now.

Malcolm wrote:

It is also important to provide citations, because if for example, one has not understood something correctly, and uses a citation to support it, another may come along and point out to you why you have made an error.

It is a simple generosity, and you have no idea how much time I spend looking up citations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 11th, 2015 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

dharmagoat said:

So as I read it, the scriptures are the authority, but careful understanding of them is required to make them effective.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct. This is the main reason why my posts generally are supported on citations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 11th, 2015 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Kalacakra war prophecy

Content:

shaunc said:

Even if I was to accept this prophesy as 100% accurate. My question is how will this affect my life or my dharma practise now.

Will said:

Many Kalacakra initiates prepare now to help the Ruler of Shambhala defeat the barbarians at the time of the war. How do they prepare? One must ask a Kalacakra initiate.

Malcolm wrote:

If you receive the empowerment and maintain your samaya, this is sufficient to be reborn in Shambhala at that time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 11th, 2015 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

dharmagoat said:

The Bhāvanākrama continues:

With an understanding of the meaning so differentiated, one should meditate on the reality of the pure state and not on its apparent aspect. If one meditates wrongly and fails to clear away all doubts, one will not achieve perfect awareness. As a result, the meditation becomes fruitless, like the meditation of the radical dogmatists.

What is this referring to?

Malcolm wrote:

This translation is a little strange.

After that, based on the meaning differentiated in that way, one should meditate on the true meaning and not on that which is not the true meaning. If one grasps that which is not [the true meaning], one's meditation will be incorrect and since one's doubt will not be removed, also right knowledge [samyagjñānam, one of the eight limbs] will not arise. Therefore, since one's meditation does not become meaningful, it is similar with the meditation of non-buddhist (mu stegs pa, tīrthikas)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

dharmagoat said:

The Bhāvanākrama continues:

With an understanding of the meaning so differentiated, one should meditate on the reality of the pure state and not on its apparent aspect. If one meditates wrongly and

fails to clear away all doubts, one will not achieve perfect awareness. As a result, the meditation becomes fruitless, like the meditation of the radical dogmatists.
What is this referring to?

Malcolm wrote:

Which translation are you using, and which of the three Bhāvanākramas? I need to look at the Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

dharmagoat said:

The Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla explains:

At the outset one should seek to develop wisdom by listening [to the dharma], for it enables one to grasp the meaning of the authoritative scriptures. Then, with analytical intellect one differentiates between the apparent and the ultimate meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is perfect. Of course, one must listen only to a qualified teacher of Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Also, one should understand that in Vajrayāna, direct perception and inferences are not authorities. The Abhibodhikramopadeśa of Master Āryadeva states:

At the time of the ultimate view of secret mantra,

the direct perception by mind and sense organs

and inferences are not authorities,

but the profound scriptures and intimate instructions are authorities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Does one need initiation to recite Vajrasattva mantra?

Content:

kirtu said:

I do not remember a Vajrasattva empowerment of any kind in Sakya...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it does not exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Hearing other sect's lectures is negative?

Content:

ShakuShodoo said:

The title is very elucidative of this question of mine.

Let us say that I stick to Karma Kagyu tradition...

If I go to a Ch'an monastery, hear it's Masters teachings and seek pearls of wisdom...will I be doing something negative?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Unknown said:

If the scripture is a statement of an earlier Tibetan scholar, they dismiss it [saying]: "One who says something like that is a nihilistic fool." If the scripture is identified as a statement of the Buddha, Nagarjuna, and so on, they patch it with words like "The statement 'does not exist' means 'does not truly exist'" and "Is not nonexistent' means 'is not conventionally nonexistent,'" so that it fits with their own desires. In fact, the only difference is that if they direct refutations at the Buddha, they fear being labeled evil persons with evil views, [whereas] if they are able to refute earlier Tibetans, they are labeled heroic scholars.

Malcolm wrote:

Beautiful words...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Contradictions in the Mahayana Sutras?

Content:

Dan74 said:

One could of course go on to even more egregious statements, but yes, the Venerable is spreading misinformation.

//_

dan

Malcolm wrote:

People like this dude do not deserve the title "venerable" as there is nothing venerable about him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: Contradictions in the Mahayana Sutras?

Content:

frankc said:

Ven Dhammavuddho has some videos on youtube talking about some contradictions in the Sutras and giving some criticisms of the Mahayana teachings. Curious to know how a Mahayana Buddhist would explain and defend against the criticisms and contradictions he is talking about. Here are four short videos of an interview with him talking about Mahayana.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vkhclyrq8Hs>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nKO0mM48Hj8>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=os8ZtNjE4zA>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JsHpUnUT1Us>

Malcolm wrote:

He has no idea what is he talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Yes, of course, but when we are talking about "Buddhism" in a general way, Theravada is relevant. Even though Vajrayana may not teach a "gradual path," it would be incorrect factually to say that the notion of a gradual path is un-Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna does teach a gradual path, it is just much faster.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Actually, Tsongkhapa would say that teaching that the ultimate nature of phenomena is lack of inherent existence is Nagarjuna, Aryadeva and Chandrakirti's true intention.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not why other scholars fault Tsongkhapa. They fault him for other things, novel interpretations and internal contradictions in his later writings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

That's obviously different from simply having a high regard for the Buddha, or being drawn to aspects of his teachings. But is that degree of confidence a prerequisite for refuge, in your view?

Malcolm wrote:

There are three kinds of refuge, fear, faith and compassion. The first is hardly refuge at all. One cannot take refuge without faith in the Buddha and his teachings, even if you mouth the words. However, even mouthing the words without faith sets up a cause for the arising of faith even if very weak.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The irony of my answer seems to have been lost...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Motova said:

Even if you were to sit on his lap there would be a delay.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm....?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

oldbob said:

Please to remember that webcast transmission (an officially accepted means of transmission) is not / not simultaneous, but is delayed by several minutes.

dzogchungpa said:

Is it really that much? I didn't know that.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not true. Sometimes, the video buffering can be a bit delayed, but the audio only is very much on track all the time. So people who are super neurotic about digital lag times can elect to follow audio only. Actually, they should really sit in Rinpoche's lap so there is virtually no time between when the air crosses his vocal cords and the sound hits your ear -- who knows, in those microseconds you might miss the transmission...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Hi Malcolm,

How is a "reliable person" defined according to Buddhadharma?

Malcolm wrote:

It would be the Buddha or his disciples. Really, what we are talking about here is citational or scriptural authority. The Samdhinirmocana Sūtra states:

As such, the reasoning of a valid proof is the authority of direction perception; the authority of inference, and the authority of trustworthy citations which is valid through the five valid characteristics.

Those five valid characteristics are:

The characteristic of being supported on a direct perception, the characteristic of being supported on a direct perception which is the basis for that, the characteristic of the application of example in one's own reasoning, the characteristic of perfectly establishment and the characteristic of a scripture proven to be completely valid.

You should look into this sūtra for a more detailed explanation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 10th, 2015 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: How India Is Squandering Its Top Export

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Then of course there is this lovely little poem written by the Muslim Mahmud al-Kashgari about the invasion of Khotan in the early 11th century:

We came down on them like a flood, We went out among their cities, We tore down the idol-temples, We shat on the Buddha's head!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I've personally never heard anyone say that we should accept the Buddha's teachings just because. In fact, Buddhist epistemology (in contrast with some Hindu epistemologies like Nyaya) rejects the claim that scriptural and traditional authority themselves can serve as valid sources of knowledge apart from inference.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just not factual. There are three sources of authority in Buddhadharma: direct perception (pratyakṣa), inference (anumana) and testimony of reliable persons (śabda).

Bakmoon said:

I thought that in Buddhist Pramana testimony is considered to be a subclass of inference rather than a totally independent source of knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a totally independent source of knowledge, and indeed Dharmakīrti for example spends an entire chapter devoted to proving why we can for example accept the Buddha as an authority.

But we also have this from the Pabbakotthaka Sutta:

"Excellent, Shariputra. Excellent. Those who have not known, seen, penetrated, realized, or attained it by means of discernment would have to take it on conviction in others that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation; whereas those who have known, seen, penetrated, realized, and attained it by means of discernment would have no doubt or uncertainty that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

dharmagoat said:

They may ask the question "how is the doctrine of the Buddha superior to all other teachings?"

"Because it is" seems a poor answer.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the answer of course. Only the Buddha has properly identified suffering, the cause of suffering, the cessation of suffering and the path. That is why Buddhadharma leads to liberation and other Dharmas do not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I've personally never heard anyone say that we should accept the Buddha's teachings just because. In fact, Buddhist epistemology (in contrast with some Hindu epistemologies like Nyaya) rejects the claim that scriptural and traditional authority themselves can serve as valid sources of knowledge apart from inference.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just not factual. There are three sources of authority in Buddhadharma: direct perception (pratyakṣa), inference (anumāna) and testimony of reliable persons (śabda).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Vajrayāna/Dzogchen

Content:

shanehanner said:

What are the Dzogchen preliminaries?

Malcolm wrote:

You should learn those from a teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: How India Is Squandering Its Top Export

Content:

Caodemarte said:

In response to the complaint that it was a bit lazy to not specify errors in fact and tone in the cited article I should note (and I really thought I would not have to):

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks for replying.

Caodemarte said:

I doubt it was intended this way but the error in tone is pretty glaring.

Malcolm wrote:

One can't have an error in tone.

Caodemarte said:

In terms of fact, and respectfully, Bodhgaya is not like the Vatican or a Jewish congregation run by Protestants. It is not the organizational or religious HQ of Buddhism or of any Buddhist group. Almost all religions have pilgrimage sites.

Yes, actually it is. Bodhgaya should be administered by an international coalition of Buddhist organizations.

In Buddhism, there is no one fundamental text that all must believe in with a requirement from God for all able believers to perform a pilgrimage to one site as a fundamental duty (let alone a Buddhist equivalent of the Kaaba in Mecca). It is simply incorrect to say that "Bodhgaya is to Buddhists what Mecca is to Muslims."

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, Bodhgaya is more to Buddhists than Mecca is to Muslims — there is no encouragement in the Koran for Muslims to worship at the Kaaba, per se. An ancient pilgrimage site, the Kaaba, eventually became associated with the house built by Ibrahim.

The Buddha, on the other hand, clearly stated that all Buddhists should try to visit the four memorial spots, the site of his birth, awakening, first teaching and nirvana.

Caodemarte said:

"In fact the demise of Buddhism in India is attributable to both the country's major religions, with Islam in effect finishing off what Hinduism began." would seem to be an unforced error or an interpretation, but not a fact.

Malcolm wrote:

Try reading "The Hardships and downfall of Buddhism in India by Verardi. In this book, he recounts a long history the decline of Buddhism in India. Hindu hostility to Buddhism in the Post-Gupta period is well documented, and supported by anecdotal reports of conflicts between Mahasiddhas and their Hindu enemies.

That Muslims delt the death blow to Indian Buddhism in the 12th century is beyond dispute.

Caodemarte said:

"...so Buddhists in Bangladesh, Indonesia, and other places that suffered foreign invasion, or in small, poor countries like Bhutan, might rejoice in China's emergence as a superpower" because China has a lot of Buddhists. Well, no. You could argue that Indonesian Buddhists are mostly Chinese and that some of them take pride in China's rise, but that is hardly because of shared religious values. I guess you could say this is not an error of fact because of the word might, but c'mon.

Malcolm wrote:

DKR is making a rhetorical point, i.e., that marginalization of Buddhists in border countries might well cause them to look north in the growing showdown between China and India.

Caodemarte said:

"Western secular political correctness is on display..." No, Indian policy or sign writing could never be cited as "Western secular political correctness."

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it can — but here again, you are getting caught up in DKR's rhetoric of irony — he knows very well that indignant Indians will react just as you have.

Caodemarte said:

He certainly was quite willing to burn books (except the Quran) or anything that he could not steal, but the motivation given in the article is suggestive of another legendary story about the library at Alexandria, but in any case seems off in this case.

Malcolm wrote:

Considering that reports indicate that the library burned for six months, it seems completely apropos.

Caodemarte said:

The idea that that the Indian government is trying to whitewash history to avoid offending Muslims, especially this one, makes no sense to anyone familiar with Indian politics (please examine why Modi could not get a US visa until recently).

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that a Mosque abuts the Bodhgaya stupa and it broadcasts its call to prayer loudly and insistently five times a day. There are quite a number of groups who, since Bodhgaya was "rediscovered" in the 19th century, have decided to attach themselves to the Mahabodhi Temple.

But it is a place for Buddhists — not Hindus, not Muslims, etc. In general, the sentiment of the article is correct. The Buddhist epoch in Indian history is most important, and yet most Indians these days know more about the history of England than they do Indian history during that point in time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

btw, since we are just going around in circles, the above is my last response to this issue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: How India Is Squandering Its Top Export

Content:

Caodemarte said:

I found this article very bad in tone and content. Its many inaccuracies on history and Buddhism (no, Bodhgaya for Buddhists is not the equivalent of Mecca for Muslims) really stand out when the article accuses India of "hiding the truth." I assume the publisher is responsible for the headline comparing Buddhism to a good for export and bears responsibility for that.

Malcolm wrote:

Inaccuracies such as?

Bodhgaya is one of the four main places Buddha told those who follow Buddhadharma that they should visit during their lifetime, the others being Lumbini, The Deer Park and Kushinagara. Of these four, Bodhgaya, Vajrāsana, the Bodhimaṇḍa is the most important.

Frankly your dismissal of the article seems rather lazy since you do not bother to list any so called "inaccuracies."

Buddhadharma was India's best and most enduring export besides which all others pale.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: How India Is Squandering Its Top Export

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

This article is spot on!

http://www.huffingtonpost.in/dzongsar-jamyang-khyentse/how-india-is-squandering-_b_7008922.html

Malcolm wrote:

indeed...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Conditioned phenomena are intrinsically contaminated and contaminating, that is the point of the passage. That is also Candragomin's point.

This is why sense objects are given up in Hinayāna and Mahāyāna — they are contaminated and contaminating.

Fruitzilla said:

Whoops, I'd better go looking for another tradition then.

Malcolm wrote:

You won't find such a tradition in Buddhadharma outside of Vajrayāna.

Of course, from the standpoint of the emptiness of all phenomena, phenomena are regarded as pure in Mahāyāna, however, this does not apply to people who are not awakened. If you still experience afflictions, this means for you phenomena are contaminated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

That all (afflicted) emotions are painful I can understand. Phenomena being contaminated by themselves, and not by our relationship toward them, isn't anything I've come across before this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

Abhidharmakośa:

There are contaminated and uncontaminated phenomena.

Condition phenomena apart from the path are contaminated. Why? They increase contamination.

The material aggregates consists of the five sense organs and five sense objects. All of it is contaminated. Also all mental objects, apart from cessation, space and path dharmas, are contaminated.

This is basic Buddhadharma everyone should know.

Fruitzilla said:

Apart from the strange reasoning and the protestant tone I don't see how this is different from what I stated.

Malcolm wrote:

You said:

Phenomena being contaminated by themselves, and not by our relationship toward them, isn't anything I've come across before this thread.

Conditioned phenomena are intrinsically contaminated and contaminating, that is the point of the passage. That is also Candragomin's point.

This is why sense objects are given up in Hinayāna and Mahāyāna — they are contaminated and contaminating.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

That all (afflicted) emotions are painful I can understand. Phenomena being contaminated by themselves, and not by our relationship toward them, isn't anything I've come across before this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

Abhidharmakośa:

There are contaminated and uncontaminated phenomena.

Conditioned phenomena apart from the path are contaminated. Why? They increase contamination.

The material aggregates consists of the five sense organs and five sense objects. All of it is contaminated. Also all mental objects, apart from cessation, space and path dharmas, are contaminated.

This is basic Buddhadharma everyone should know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Yes, but this is an erroneous way of seeing the self. Self is not empty of self, it's empty of inherently existent self, otherwise you are negating what exists. You seem to have a problem with conventionally designated things having a conventionally designated nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Things have no natures, conventionally or otherwise. Look, we can say water is wet, but actually, there no water that possesses a wet nature. Water is wet, that is all. There is no wetness apart from water and not water apart from wetness. If you say a given thing has a separate nature, you are making the exact mistaken Nāgārjuna points out in the analysis of movement, i.e., it is senseless to say there is a "moving mover." Your arguments are exactly the same, you are basically saying there is an "existing existence."

Tsongkhapa said:

The self appears, how does it appear, what is its basis for appearance? Of you say that it is not the aggregates, then likewise, then the parts of a table are not the basis for the table's appearance. In both cases we are discussing an identity: self, table. I'm not saying that the aggregates are not the basis for the appearance of self, I'm saying the aggregates are not the self.

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are contradicting yourself, as anyone can plainly see who can read English.

Tsongkhapa said:

Of course the parts of the table are the basis for designating table, but 'table' is the possessor and the parts of the table are the possessions of the table, and as Nagarjuna says, possessor and possessed cannot be one and the same.

Malcolm wrote:

This is precisely because of the above point I referenced. Nāgārjuna clearly shows that characteristics/natures are untenable.

Candrakīrti points out that the possessor does not exist at all, but for the mere purpose of discourse, we allow conventionally the idea that there is a possessor of parts even though no possessor of parts exists. This mistake that we indulge in can act as an agent, for example a car, we can use it as such, but it is empty of being a car — an agent is as empty of being an agent as its actions are empty of being actions.

Tsongkhapa said:

Phenomena do not have intrinsic characteristics even conventionally, so your insistence that they do indicates to me that you have not properly studied the great Indian Madhyamaka masters. Arthakriya, functionality, is not proof of nature-possession.

You've erected a strawman. I have not said at any point that phenomena possess intrinsic characteristics, but they do exist and they do have imputed characteristics and

an imputed nature.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, you have fallen for a pyramid scheme.

Tsongkhapa said:

The taste of tea is different to the taste of coffee because it's a different karmic appearance arising from different causes and conditions. Tea and coffee are different and hold their own natures conventionally.

Malcolm wrote:

And thus you fall again into the trap of realism — where do coffee and tea hold their nature? From their own sides? No, according to what you just said they owe their flavor to karmic appearances and therefore have no nature of their own at all.

Tsongkhapa said:

Conventionally phenomena exist and have their own natures, everyone knows that.

Malcolm wrote:

No, conventional phenomena appear, and because no one knows they they cannot be established according to any of the four extremes (not merely like illusions) they are illusions and they become objects of false cognitions, aka relative truths.

Tsongkhapa said:

To deny something that exists is nihilism, despite what others have said on this thread. You seem to be denying the valid conventional nature of phenomena, therefore this is tantamount to nihilism. This conventional nature is not intrinsic yet it exists and is apprehended by valid cognition.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot accuse someone of nihilism when they have not advanced the existence of something. Likewise, you cannot accuse someone of stealing merely because they have found an empty bank vault. Your assertion is like accusing someone who discovers a theft of the crime itself even though they are innocent. As Nāgārjuna states: If I had a thesis I would be guilty, but since I alone have no thesis I alone am innocent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Vajrayāna/Dzogchen

Content:

Konchok Namgyal said:

You cannot correctly practice Dzogchen without vajrayana, the paths leading to dzogchen are only through vajrayana.

everyone want to practice dzogchen but doesnt want to do the work to get there and there are alot of false teachers of dzogchen.

without the Ngongdro, the blessings and the purification practices, any attempts at Dzogpachenpo are worthless !

Malcolm wrote:

Lots of false teachers?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 9th, 2015 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Seriously tough, the stuff about sense objects being poisonous in themselves sounds quite silly to me, and certainly not something I can remember reading or hearing about in my (admittedly not very broad) exposure of Mahayana. And no, I've never heard of Candragomin.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a fundamental point of view about conditioned dharmas (apart from path dharmas) in general shared between Hinayāna and common Mahāyāna, i.e. the second seal:

All contaminated phenomena are suffering.

Now, I understand that basic Buddhadharma is not very popular around here of late, but who can argue with the second seal?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Therefore it follows that for you an illusory elephant is not empty of being an "elephant" because it bears the characteristics of an elephant (trunks, tusks, etc.) upon which one may impute the conventional designation elephant.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Correct. There is an appearance of elephant. That is the basis by which worldly people understand elephant as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is fast track to making yourself a laughing stock — can you ride an illusory elephant? If not, than how is an illusory elephant not empty of an elephant?

Tsongkhapafan said:

Tables hold their own nature? How, where? In their parts or separate from them? Your conclusion does not follow from your premise. A collection of parts designated a "table"

is still empty of being a table even though it can be used as one, just as a collection of aggregates is empty of a self even though it can be designated one.
A collection of aggregates is never designated as a self

Malcolm wrote:
Of course it is.

Tsongkhapa said:
- the self is not the body and not the mind. Self is imputed on the basis of body and mind. Chandrakirti and other Prasangika scholars refute that the aggregates are the self even conventionally.

Malcolm wrote:
No one said the aggregates are "the self", even conventionally. Nevertheless, when you see your body, you designate it TKfan and when someone says injurious words to you, your mind reacts as if your self has been injured. But in reality, this is only because you have designated this collection of parts "TKfan." But TKfan is empty of TKfan.

Tsongkhapa said:
The self is not empty of self because it appears and can perform the function of self.

Malcolm wrote:
The self appears, how does it appear, what is its basis for appearance? Of you say that it is not the aggregates, than likewise, then the parts of a table are not the basis for the table's appearance. In both cases we are discussing an identity: self, table.

Tsongkhapa said:
Similarly, the basis, body is not empty of body because it appears and can perform the function of body.

Malcolm wrote:
You are just repeating the same mistake over and over again. It does not matter whether we are talking about a self, table, body, mind, or anything else designated or imputed onto a collection of parts.

Tsongkhapa said:
Not so. No phenomenon has a findable nature other than emptiness but that doesn't mean that conventionally they don't possess the nature of their imputed objects and can perform the function of those objects.

Malcolm wrote:
Phenomena do not have intrinsic characteristics even conventionally, so your insistence that they do indicates to me that you have not properly studied the great Indian Madhyamaka masters. Arthakriya, functionality, is not proof of nature-possession.

Tsongkhapa said:
They do and this is why table is not empty of table.

Malcolm wrote:
They do not [possess the nature of their imputed object], and this is why tables can function as tables. Tables function as tables solely because we designate a collection of parts a table and use it as such. There is no table at all apart from our imputation. The table is empty of a table because a table is solely an imputation from our side. The collection of parts we are designating as a table has not been table from its own side ever and will never be such a table, and therefore is empty of the table we are imputing.

There is no table in absence of the parts either, since there is no basis upon which to impute the table.

Your argument suffers from being conned by the pyramid scheme of realism — the idea that you can just keep borrowing from someone else to pay off your previous investors. Your argument suffers from a hidden flaw of unconsciously resorting to parabhāva, gzhan dngos, dependent existence, which is just a form of inherent existence, svabhāva, rang bzhin.

The only way to correct your error is to accept your investment is a sham and accept your losses. Otherwise, you become like Bernie Madoff, constantly borrowing and making more and more inflated claims to rope in new investors.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 10:55 PM
Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
We were not talking about afflictions, we were talking about sense objects. In the common Mahāyāna and Hinayāna they are something strictly to be given up.

srivijaya said:
In what sense could they said to be given up. The sense objects appear in all cases, so it must be more to do with attachment towards them than their mere arising?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, and in the lower vehicles, the way of dealing with attachment is much the same as how one relates with poison, as the citation from Candragomin illustrates.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 10:52 PM
Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa
Content:
Ayu said:

Maybe from personal angle of view, it makes sense. But that is only perception and naming. As long as it is not clearly defined what is "table" in objective sense, I cannot agree. What more than a name is "table"? Where to find the own nature of it, if you try to consider it beyond a certain perception?

For a man it is a table, for a dog it is a shed, for a fly it is an airport, for an animalcule it is a wide country.

It is no table, if viewed dispassionately.

Tsongkhapa said:

What makes table different from chair? Conceptual designation, function, characteristics that are merely imputed by mind. There is no objective table, but there doesn't need to be for a table to have the merely imputed nature of table. Table has the nature of table and chair has the nature of chair CONVENTIONALLY. Of course no nature can be found upon investigation other than emptiness, I'm not saying it does, but any normal person knows the difference between a chair and a table and the function of each, therefore table is not empty of table and chair is not empty of chair.

We don't have to be talking about the ultimate nature of these things all the time.

Malcolm wrote:

The minute you say that something is not empty, you are talking at the ultimate level. Here tables are empty of tables, but are used as such because a collection of parts is designated as such. If you say that tables are not empty of tables then you have to account for where the table holds a table — if you claim that tables are not empty of being tables because they are being designated as such, tables in fact are still empty of tables because the designation "table" is not a table either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Dan74 said:

In this medium I find it best to assume that the other poster has the best intentions possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Also, the very efforts made by some to defend the Dharma could be damaging its reputation, particularly in the West.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha stated that Dharma can only be destroyed from within when his teachings are not properly studied and practiced.

Damage to the reputation of the Dharma can only happen if people do not study and practice properly. If people who are completely unqualified to do so pick up the banner of "Dharma teacher" and mislead people down a false path not taught by the Buddha, then the reputation of the Dharma will be damaged. But if we follow the advice of Sakya Pandita there will be no problem at all:

In brief, since that which has been spoken by the Buddha, gathered by the compilers, meditated by siddhas, explained by paṇḍitas, translated by the translators and known to scholars to be taught by the Buddha, it is necessary to hear, explain, meditate and practice that.

If a teaching which is the opposite of those should arise, since it was not a doctrine of the Buddha, one should not listen to it, explain it, meditate on it nor practice it even if it seems very profound. Although there are other non-buddhist and false teachings that seem to be very good, leave them aside because they are not the doctrine of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

smcj said:

My Gelug mentor put it to me this way; the poisonous afflictions are never to be indulged in--and that is true in all forms of Dharma. In Vajrayana they are transmuted into wisdom. The analogy used was that the anti-venom from a rattlesnake bite is made from rattlesnake venom. If you are bitten you want the anti -venom. You don't want to get bitten again!

Just so when the poisonous afflictions arise you want the medicine of the wisdoms that are made from the afflictions, not more afflictions!

Malcolm wrote:

We were not talking about afflictions, we were talking about sense objects. In the common Mahāyāna and Hinayāna they are something strictly to be given up. In Vajrayāna they are something to be used. When we say that Vajrayāna is a path of nonrenunciation (and if anyone has doubts about this I suggest they go talk to HH Sakya Trizin, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and so on) we are not saying that it is a path in which one indulges one's afflictions. We are saying that it is a path in which one does not seek to give up sense objects in order to control afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Question: does there exist an appearance of a table or does there exist a table which appears?

Tsongkhapafan said:

To please Michael (and advance the discussion), there exists a mere appearance of table, but table is not empty of table because conventionally it has the characteristics of table. It is empty of inherently existent table, i.e., table is merely a conceptual imputation upon a the valid basis of imputation for table, the parts and the collection of parts. It is not an independent phenomenon as it appears to be.

The definition of element is that which holds its own nature, and this refers to any phenomenon. Table is a phenomenon that holds its own nature. What is its nature? Conventionally it is table and not non-table, so it is incorrect to say that table is empty of table as this is tantamount to saying that conventionally there is no table.

Malcolm wrote:

Therefore it follows that for you an illusory elephant is not empty of being an "elephant" because it bears the characteristics of an elephant (trunks, tusks, etc.) upon which one may impute the conventional designation elephant.

Tables hold their own nature? How, where? In their parts or separate from them? Your conclusion does not follow from your premise. A collection of parts designated a "table" is still empty of being a table even though it can be used as one, just as a collection of aggregates is empty of a self even though it can be designated one. It follows that if tables are not empty of tables then persons are not empty of persons, selves are not empty of selves and you have in one mistaken argument turned the whole of the Buddha's teaching on its head. According to you we must accept that the self actually exists merely on the basis of being designated upon the aggregates, which violates on the basic four seals, "All phenomena are not a self." Such a conclusion is not acceptable to Vasubandu in the Refutation of the Pudgala much less Nāgārjuna, Aryadeva, Bhaviveka or Candrakīrti. Nāgārjuna states:
All living beings are causes and results.
There are no sentient beings at all.
Empty dharmas are entirely produced
from dharmas strictly empty;
dharmas without a self and [not] of a self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

oldbob said:

Everything Malcolm writes is exactly correct, and it is clear that he has a greater understanding of these things, than I do.

There seems to have been a previous robust discussion of this issue, expressing many different viewpoints.

Malcolm wrote:

The only viewpoint that matters in this respect is ChNN's and he has made himself abundantly clear on this issue innumerable times to anyone who has ears to hear him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: The theory of how empowerments work?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

OK, I'll make sure to pay close attention to what HHST has to say in a few weeks.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if he is giving the major two empowerment of Vajrakilaya, then pay special attention during the vase empowerment's eleven sections.

Othewise, try to receive the Hevajra empowerment, then practice it for a few years, taking the path empowerments everyday. You will definitely understand the principal experientially.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Lots of good discussion--but directing this back at the original poster's question: In what way is a hermit's lifestyle, for instance, not deemed renunciation, and in what way is a strict retreat, with a certain amount of austerity, a Vajrayana practice? How are the ideas of austere retreat and the Path of Sensory Pleasures, etc., compatible?

Malcolm wrote:

When you are in retreat you are practicing the creation and completion stages, using all sense objects, real and imagined, as a support for your practice and personal enjoyment.

conebeckham said:

Right, so it only appears as if one is "being austere" from the outside. In reality, Milarepa was having one helluva party, 24/7/365!

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, as illustrated by the story of the geshe who was frustrated when local deities were impatient with him to finish up his tormas offerings so they could go enjoy Milarepa's very abundant tormas. This geshe made elaborate tormas with many costly offerings, but when he arrived at Milarepa's cave to see what the fuss was about, all he saw was water sitting in shards of pottery.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Lots of good discussion--but directing this back at the original poster's question: In what way is a hermit's lifestyle, for instance, not deemed renunciation, and in what way is a strict retreat, with a certain amount of austerity, a Vajrayana practice? How are the ideas of austere retreat and the Path of Sensory Pleasures, etc., compatible?

Malcolm wrote:

When you are in retreat you are practicing the creation and completion stages, using all sense objects, real and imagined, as a support for your practice and personal enjoyment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: The theory of how empowerments work?

Content:

Luke said:

Hello, could anyone recommend a book which describes the theory of how empowerments work?

I have considered reconnecting with Vajrayana, but first, I want to read some things which will give me more of the necessary background information which I lacked before.

Malcolm wrote:

Put concisely, empowerments arrange a dependent origination between the cause, one's five aggregates and so on, with the result, the five buddha families and so on.

dzogchungpa said:

Could you put it a little less concisely? I'm kind of obtuse.

Malcolm wrote:

Take an major empowerment, pay very, very close attention to what is being said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

heart said:

Actually there is nothing in the word "renunciation" that suggest that you should avoid exposure to sense objects. That is just one possible interpretation. If you accept that for example that "all activities" are a cause of suffering, then under what stone will you avoid suffering?

Malcolm wrote:

renounce:

renounce |ri' nouns| verb [with obj.]

formally declare one's abandonment of (a claim, right, or possession): Isabella offered to renounce her son's claim to the French crown.

- refuse to recognize or abide by any longer: these agreements were renounced after the fall of the czarist regime.
- declare that one will no longer engage in or support: they renounced the armed struggle.
- reject and stop using or consuming: he renounced drugs and alcohol completely.
- [no obj.] Law refuse or resign a right or position, especially one as an heir or trustee: there will be forms enabling the allottee to renounce.

renunciation:

renunciation |ri,nənsē' āSHən|

noun

the formal rejection of something, typically a belief, claim, or course of action: entry into the priesthood requires renunciation of marriage | a renunciation of violence.

- Law a document expressing renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Mahayana meditation does not actually make use of sense objects the way Vajrayana does.

Anders said:

Maybe not, but neither can it be characterised as a necessarily renunciate path.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, it absolutely can.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 8th, 2015 at 12:09 AM
Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?
Content:

Anders said:
This gets to be a boring assertion in the long run, since this is also the classic assertion mahayana makes about hinayana.

Malcolm wrote:
It is completely different. Why? Because in common Mahāyāna it is only permitted to use sense objects if you have no attachment to them. The examples of Aryadharmā, Sadāprarudita and so on are examples of āryas on the stages, not common people.

In your example you cite the following:
Manjusri said, "All defilements are equal [in reality]. I have realized that equality through right practice.
But who is Mañjuśrī? A bodhisattva of the tenth stage.

As for this assertion:
The whole point of emptiness in Mahayana is that there is nothing to renounce or be rid of since affliction is empty and samsara and nirvana are not two.
Secret Mantra and Paramitayāna share the same view, where they differ is in method. There is no method of practice in Paramitayāna for ordinary people to practice by taking desire into their path. It simply does not exist. Hence Candragomin, a quintessential Mahāyāna author writes:
Objects and poisons are alike, pleasing just when first tasted...
Moreover, in Mahāyāna one meditates on desire, anger and ignorance via antidotes. This is not the case in Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 11:36 PM
Title: Re: The theory of how empowerments work?
Content:
Luke said:
Hello, could anyone recommend a book which describes the theory of how empowerments work?

I have considered reconnecting with Vajrayana, but first, I want to read some things

which will give me more of the necessary background information which I lacked before.

Malcolm wrote:

Put concisely, empowerments arrange a dependent origination between the cause, one's five aggregates and so on, with the result, the five buddha families and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

heart said:

English is not my first language but it seems quite obvious that we give up (renounce) ignorance when we abide in wisdom, even if it is effortless. Also, so far I haven't met any vajrayana training that doesn't involve training the mind in renunciation, including Dzogchen. For example the first four lodjong's in the Vima Nyingtik.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say there was no preliminary sense of renunciation in Vajrayāna. What I said was is that Vajrayāna is not a PATH of renunciation.

This is the logic. We understand that samsara is a terrible place. We wish to be free of it. We look around, and we see that the path of renunciation is not effective in this day and age because our afflictions are too strong. This is why the tantra says things like the Vajrapañjara-tantra:

Created by passion, the worldly
shall be liberated by the same passion.

Or the Guhyasamaja:

The passionate desiring wisdom
always rely on the five desire objects

The method of doing this, of practicing a path of non-renunciation, is to practice creation stage and completion stages. Likewise, through the method is a little different in Dzogchen as the Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva states:

This nectar of bodhicitta, one's vidyā,
for example, is like a divine precious jewel
that warms when left in a cold place,
cools when left in a hot place,
and gives light when left in a dark place.

In the same way, if one possesses the meaning of realizing
this self-originated vidyā,
afflictions become the companions of wisdom,
even though afflictions arise
they do not obscure when they are under the power of wisdom.

And:

If the king of secret mantra is practiced, afflictions turn into wisdom. For example, when a lamp is lifted in an empty house, darkness turns into light; likewise, when the lamp of wisdom is raised, ignorance transforms into vidyā. When the realization of reality has arisen in one's continuum, all afflictions arise as the companions of wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: How can long-life prayers benefit lamas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is a kind of dedication of merit.

Luke said:

Ah. So long-life prayers are only effective when they are recited after the completion of a main practice (mantra recitation, sadhana, puja, etc.)?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I would not say that, but generally that is when they are recited in practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

anjali said:

One way to look at renunciation is as giving up the causes of suffering. Sense enjoyments are not the cause of suffering per se.

Malcolm wrote:

For Hinayāna they are the cause of craving, which itself is the cause of samsara. Even in Mahāyāna sense objects are regarded as poisonous, for example Candragomin writes: Objects and poisons are alike, pleasing just when first tasted. Objects and poisons are alike, their result is unpleasant and unbearable. Objects and poisons are alike, causing one to be clouded by the darkness of ignorance. Objects and poisons are alike, their power is hard to reverse, and deceptive...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

heart said:

In vajrayana renunciation is achieved by wisdom and you renounce the whole of samsara, not just some particular bad spot, all of it. So true renunciation is actually freedom from manipulating the world according to your desires and fears. So, in

vajrayana renunciation is on an other level, or at least it should be.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Here, when we say that Vajrayāna is not a path of renunciation, we mean that, unlike Sūtrayāna, we can use all objects of the sense for our own enjoyment.

heart said:

We use the objects of the senses vividly aware of our true condition which is natural renunciation of ignorance. Rigpa is the renunciation of ignorance.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

We use the objects of the senses as offerings to ourselves as the deity.

Rigpa is not renunciation of anything. Rigpa is the antithesis of ma rigpa, just as a light, without renouncing darkness, dispels it utterly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: How can long-life prayers benefit lamas?

Content:

Luke said:

I like the idea of reciting long-life prayers for lamas, but can they actually benefit the lamas we pray for? If so, how?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a kind of dedication of merit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Bob:

It is very straight forward — Rinpoche has stated countless times that if you are not actually participating during a webcast, you do not receive transmission and you do not receive the lung for whatever text he is teaching. The occasional lag time during the streaming is not an issue as long as you are actually participating in a webcast while it is happening, live.

Your anecdote regarding Jigme Lingpa is irrelevant.

Motova said:

What does participating while receiving a lung mean exactly?

Wanting the lung and paying attention?

Malcolm wrote:

It means you have to be listening to the teachings, not multitasking and surfing the internet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Simon E. said:

What is contained in the Sutras is only one part of what constitutes the Vajrayana.

dharmagoat said:

Has wrath ever been described as an enlightened quality elsewhere in the Vajrayāna literature?

Malcolm wrote:

Wrathful deities are wrathful out of their compassion for stubborn sentient beings who are addicted to samsara, much like a parent who yells at children who are playing in the road. Wrathful teachers are the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Bob:

It is very straight forward — Rinpoche has stated countless times that if you are not actually participating during a webcast, you do not receive transmission and you do not receive the lung for whatever text he is teaching. The occasional lag time during the streaming is not an issue as long as you are actually participating in a webcast while it is happening, live.

Your anecdote regarding Jigme Lingpa is irrelevant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What people need is the Dharma spoken by the Buddha, not hallmark affirmation cards.

dharmagoat said:

I agree.

People need the Dharma spoken by the Buddha, not by self-appointed dharmapālas.

Malcolm wrote:

The tongue, the Buddha said, is like a two-bladed axe, as likely to cut the speaker as the spoken to

Therefore, you should refrain from commenting, since no one appointed you to speak about the Dharma and you have no recognized qualifications to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Dan74 said:

"To do good, to refrain from evil, this is the teaching of 10000 Buddhas."

And as the story goes 'a child of 7 knows this, but a man of 70 doesn't know how to do it. That's what we need the Buddhadharma for - wise action is not easy.

Malcolm wrote:

Refrain from all evil,

perfect [all] virtues,

thoroughly tame one's mind:

this is the teaching of the Buddha.

One is supposed to avoid evil (pappa, sinful) actions because they lead to birth in lower realms. One is to engage in virtuous (kusala) actions because they lead to birth in higher realms. One is to tame one's mind, because this is the path to liberation.

But here there is no mention of being a "good person." The goal of Buddhadharma is not to become "a better person." The goal of the Dharma is to transcend our afflictive state so that it is no longer necessary to engage in positive actions to maintain a birth in higher realms and avoid negative actions which lead to rebirth in lower realms. As long as one is driven by the three poisons, it is not possible to be a truly "good person."

For example, even though we practice the six perfections in order to attain buddhahood with the motivation to become buddhas for the benefit of all sentient beings, as you

note below, bodhisattva activity may not be considered the actions of a "good person" when viewed from outside.

Secondly the practice of the six perfections is actually for one's own benefit, not directly for the benefit of others. The four means of conversion on the other hand are directly for the benefit of others. One should understand this distinction well.

For example, the Buddha gave his horse and ornaments to his father, Śuddhodhana, when he self-ordained. The golden bowl given to him by Sujāta was left in the Nairāṇja rather than being given to some poor local villagers. Buddha's disposition of his wealth does not conform to either conservative notions of wealth preservation nor does it conform to liberal notions of social justice. He gave away his horse and gear to his father who did not need them, and left his golden bowl in a stream while there villagers just a stone's throw away who were suffering crushing poverty.

As Sakya Paṇḍita explains:

If wealth of the higher classes was given to the lower classes by the Bhagavan, although slight beneficial conditions for this life would occur, since it would become a cause of lower realms because of not requesting liberation, the Bodhisattva decided he would not give his wealth away.

Or there is the Jataka tale of how the Buddha in his past life as Viśvaṃtara gave away his wife and children to be brahmin's servants when practicing the perfection of generosity — such acts hardly conform to our modern liberal notions of the "good person."

So we really must not allow such tepid notions as "Buddhism is just about being a good person" to go unchallenged.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

You seem to be forgetting that sila is the foundation of samadhi and prajñā, and sila is, in essence, 'being a good person.'

Malcolm wrote:

Śīla does not make one a "good person" in the Kantian moral sense that permeates our understanding of what a "good person" is.

One practices śīla in order to pacify afflictions to create the basis for developing concentration.

Kim O'Hara said:

More importantly, you are ignoring the fact that everyone has to start somewhere and that (often) the starting point is "I like what I know of this path." Without this preliminary orientation - far earlier than going for refuge, which you claimed was the beginning - the individual will not get far enough along the path to even know what taking refuge means. It is unfair and counterproductive to be too rigorous about any over-simplified teaching in those very early stages. Newcomers need accurate advice, sure, but most of all they need support and encouragement.

Malcolm wrote:

What people need is the Dharma spoken by the Buddha, not hallmark affirmation cards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Paul said:

I am very interested in the Longsal Longde teachings that are being given soon, however I am in the middle of some other teachings going on at the same time. If I watch the retreat mainly via replay, will I still be able to practice what is being taught, or do I need to be there live for it all? Is there some part I HAVE to see live?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, replays are for being reminded, not for transmissions of lungs or even teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Jesse said:

The end result of wisdom, concentration and ethics does lead to being a good human being and also liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

The end result of Buddhadharma is to transcend distinctions like good and evil and so on. "Being a good person" has never been the point of Buddhadharma and never will be. If all you want is to be a "good person" it is better to follow Confucius or Jesus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Vajrayāna/Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

It might be so that Dzogchen is an integral part of Vajrayana and the 9th vehicle. My

statement that it's moving to a generic mindfulness practice is not a reflection on the teachings in the scriptures but how it appears to me among some who follow the Great Perfection, both on- and offline. That is, when it is simplified to the point of "just stay in the natural state". I assume you have noticed this trend as well.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many people who may imagine they are "following Dzogchen teachings" who are doing nothing of the kind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: is vajrayana budhism a path of renunciation or isn't it?

Content:

heart said:

In vajrayana renunciation is achieved by wisdom and you renounce the whole of samsara, not just some particular bad spot, all of it. So true renunciation is actually freedom from manipulating the world according to your desires and fears. So, in vajrayana renunciation is on an other level, or at least it should be.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Here, when we say that Vajrayāna is not a path of renunciation, we mean that, unlike Sūtrayāna, we can use all objects of the sense for our own enjoyment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 7th, 2015 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist MEME. My Favorite

Content:

Simon E. said:

No..actually it is nothing at all to do with Buddhadharma...neither in content nor intention.

Kim O'Hara said:

That's a bit harsh, Simon. The Buddhist path certainly is about "learning how to live [one's] life" and does discourage identification of oneself "as a Buddhist" and places more importance on being a good (wise, compassionate, etc) person than on "being a good Buddhist or knowing Buddhist doctrine".

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha's path starts with refuge. For example, in the Kalmas sutra:

As if, venerable sir, a person were to turn face upwards what is upside down, or to uncover the concealed, or to point the way to one who is lost or to carry a lamp in the darkness, thinking, 'Those who have eyes will see visible objects,' so has the Dhamma

been set forth in many ways by the Blessed One. We, venerable sir, go to the Blessed One for refuge, to the Dhamma for refuge, and to the Community of Bhikkhus for refuge. Venerable sir, may the Blessed One regard us as lay followers who have gone for refuge for life, from today."

The Buddhist path does not in any sense discourage one from thinking of oneself as a "buddhist".

The idea that the Buddha placed more importance on being a "good person" than on the three trainings of śīla, samadhi and prajñā, and the three prajñās of hearing, reflection and meditation is really a very strange and misleading idea. Being a good person will not free one from samsara, which after all is the point of the Buddha's teachings, i.e., to become free from samsara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 6th, 2015 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Vajrayāna/Dzogchen

Content:

Sherlock said:

You mean the klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma does actually say 100,000 times of each practice Malcolm? Or does it state things in terms of time?

How old is Sakya ngondro?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I mean that the recitations of refuge, bodhicitta, mandala offerings are present. The vajrasattva section explains that one should do 100,000 or more.

Other than Vajrasattva it does not specify a number.

The Sakya Ngondro is very modern, like 20th century modern.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 6th, 2015 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Opinion on this matter

Content:

antiquebuddhas said:

Then what is the point of doing good Karma.

Malcolm wrote:

Attaining a precious human birth in future lives so one can attain liberation if you don't manage it in this one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 6th, 2015 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: tantric sex real or form of abuse?

Content:

Berry said:

Does this mean that you are knowledgeable about skilful means and the actual practice of tantric sex yourself, srivijaya ?

Malcolm wrote:

I know this is addressed to another, but I will answer — the answer is yes, I have had extensive instructions on this practice, both in assemblies and personally, and so I know what I am talking about.

The term "tantric sex" is a misnomer derived from New Age marketing and teachers. What happens in mudra practice is not recognizable as "sex" as it is normally thought of.

There are very many requirements, the age of the practitioners being among them, 16-26 for both parties, for example.

I already mentioned that both partners must be qualified anuttarayoga practitioners, stable creation stage meditation, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 6th, 2015 at 8:48 PM

Title: Vajrayāna/Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Astus commented in a now locked thread:

Vajrayana is just catching up with Dzogchen being removed from preliminaries and other rituals to turn into another form of mindfulness practice.

This represents a total misunderstanding of what Dzogchen is and what Vajrayāna is.

Dzogchen is not separate from Vajrayāna in any way shape or form. Dzogchen is a part of Vajrayāna Secret Mantra as even a cursory examination of the basic texts of the tradition will indicate.

Further, Dzogchen may not necessarily involve the four hundred thousands famous to us, in fact one of the earliest presentations of that sequence of practice is to be found in the klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma tantra, which forms the foundation for most of the Nyingthig cycles from the Khandro Nyingthig onward. Moreover, there are a series of preliminary practices in Dzogchen that are indispensable such as the separation of samsara and nirvana, semzins, and so on.

Empowerment is absolutely necessary in Vajrayāna. Dzogchen Atiyoga is merely one of three inner tantra divisions. It is not in any way separate from Vajrayāna at all. Not only,

they are hardly "another form of mindfulness practice."

Stick to Zen, Astus, you are out of your depth when commenting on Tibetan Buddhism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 6th, 2015 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Ayu said:

- Svatantrika view ("the object is real, but not independent"). They investigated only the dependency of the conditions of an object.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhavaviveka says:

If there is an autonomous argument, it is only necessary to establish that the given phenomena appear in common to the proponent and opponent because at that time the given phenomena has not been established in common appearance."

On other words, all that is needed is an agreement that indeed a table appears before both parties. They needn't agree on anything else. Thus when Bhavaviveka rejects Buddhapalita's dialectical argument in favor of a procedural argument, he is not saying that we need to accept that there is a seed established by an intrinsic characteristic, he is merely saying that we admit only that we both perceive a seed which then can be analyzed, in this case, of whether it is reasonable that there is arising from self.

The reason why Candrakīrti rejects Bhavaviveka's insistence on a procedural argument rather than a dialectical argument stems from the following:

When the eye and so on is grasped as a given phenomena of the relative, it is not established for the proponent; and when the eye and so on is grasped as a given phenomena of the ultimate, it is not established for the opponent.

In this case, since there is a fundamental disagreement in terms of the basis where one is arguing from, Candrakīrti insists that the opponent merely needs to be overthrown with a dialectical argument. But one thing it is important to bear in mind, Candrakīrti does not go at great lengths to expand his views on this subject in the Prasannapāda. Moreover, Candrakīrti certainly accepts procedural or autonomous arguments when presenting the conventional.

Thus there is no difference in these Madhyamikas Madhyamaka, but there is a difference in how one should debate opponents, and that is all. Gorampa states in his Moonrays:

Therefore the essential point of the difference between Prāsaṅgika and Svatantrika is defined upon whether autonomous arguments are accepted or not accepted in the context of investigating reality, i.e. it is actually in the context of rejecting the arising of

the four extremes that autonomous arguments validity or invalidity is negated or proven.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 5th, 2015 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

oldbob said:

I would obtain the list of the 25 and write to each of them to see how they respond.

Happy Easter / Passover!

ob

alpha said:

Who these people are is not public knowledge.

As far as i know none of them are instructors.

Malcolm wrote:

Jim, Elio, Adriano, Steve Landsberg, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 5th, 2015 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: tantric sex real or form of abuse?

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

Is this really so difficult? Any sexual situation that does not involve informed consent is abuse.

Any one asked to take part in karmamudra practices should think long and hard about what they are getting into. Lamas (or whoever) who are seeking karmamudra partners need to be 100% sure that their partner knows what it will entail and will suffer no negative psychological or other damage from engaging in the practice.

If those conditions can not be satisfied then the practice is of no benefit, surely, and is harmful.

TaTa said:

I think this nailed it

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such a thing as karmamudra practice without consent, since the mudra must be an experienced Vajrayāna practitioner who has empowerments, possesses samaya, and has stability in the creation stage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 5th, 2015 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

michaelb said:

I've seem that both Malcolm and TKF have visited this page since the last post but neither has chosen to advance the discussion, which is a bit disappointing...

Malcolm wrote:

The ball is in the other court.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 5th, 2015 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: tantric sex real or form of abuse?

Content:

tingdzin said:

If one thinks that real Vajrayana lamas (admittedly increasingly rare) are just ordinary beings, one has never really interacted with one. Further, one should not attempt to practice Vajrayana if one's ideas about such things are so fixed, and one values one's own socially-conditioned notions over the search for experiential truth.

The long threads that inevitably result from sexual topics on this forum show that for most people, even in the so-called liberated West, sex is still an uncomfortable topic; this is one reason these practices were traditionally kept secret. A certain amount of personal and spiritual maturity is required.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 4th, 2015 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: emptiness wisdom, conceptual understanding, stepping sto

Content:

smcj said:

People should be aware that Tibetans scholarship always goes back to the roots and reinterprets the classics. So a Tibetan scholar may go back to an Indian source and say, "What he was really trying to say was..." That "new" interpretation may be at odds with contemporaneous commentary, hence your point. My point is that if the "new" interpretation(s) are made from a vibrant and alive tradition producing enlightened beings, then those interpretations are validated by the enlightened awareness of the modern 21st century masters that hold them. To me there is absolutely no need for a forensic study of Dharma. YMMV

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that there is actually no basis for the whole discussion based on Indian texts; it is very much like the false distinctions made between "svatantrika" and "prasangika"

— these are later categories created by Tibetan scholars with no basis in the Indian texts at all. There were never any "svatantrikas" and "prasangikas" in India, only madhyamakas. I am not a follower of "Prasangika", I am just maintain that the Madhyamaka understanding of emptiness is the best. If there is a "great madhyamaka", then it the Madhyamaka of freedom from extremes, as defined by Atisha in his Bodhimārgapradīpapañjikā:

The suchness known by madhyamikas
is free from the four extremes:
not existent, not nonexistent,
not both and neither.

The suchness realized by madhyamikas
is free from the four alternatives:
permanence, annihilation,
both and neither.

Beyond such extremes as existence and nonexistence,
free from permanence and annihilation,
liberated from consciousness and objects of consciousness,
this is a text of the Great Madhyamaka.

We all take it for granted that no one in Tibetan Buddhism attains awakening based on practicing sūtra — that is what tantra is for. But I think these later, and novel, Tibetan interpretations of sūtra doctrines are a distraction, especially when they are not actually found in the writings of Indian masters.

In fact, the whole three turnings trip really comes from a Korean Yogacara master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 4th, 2015 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Dema said:

Is there any truth to this?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is all more or less true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 4th, 2015 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: emptiness wisdom, conceptual understanding, stepping sto

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I'm not sure I understand. By "sūtras of the definitive meaning", do you mean sūtras that satisfy Vasubandhu's criteria?

Malcolm wrote:

By any criteria at all. I find this remarkable in light of the fact that there is whole industry

in Tibetan Buddhism dedicated to proving that tathāgatagarbha sutras are sutras of definitive meaning. What is amazing is that they have no support at all for their contentions based on the very texts they are using.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 4th, 2015 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: emptiness wisdom, conceptual understanding, stepping sto

Content:

smcj said:

But as I have pointed out elsewhere, the Indians hardly took notice of the three turnings, and never turned them into a major hermeneutical topic, nor a rhetorical topic, unlike Chinese and Tibetan scholars in certain quarters.

So the Chinese and Tibetan scholars are less-than the Indian scholars?

Malcolm wrote:

smcj retracted this response while I was writing a reply, so since I spent half an hour working on this I feel compelled to post it anyway

They are less authoritative than Indian scholars by definition.

And as I pointed out, among Chinese and Tibetan scholars, there is absolutely no agreement at all as to what sutras belong to the third turning and what sutras belong the second turning and no one in India, so far as we know (in Tibetan sources at least) ever compiled a list of them.

The clearest definition I have been able to find is from the widely cited commentary on the Āryākṣayamatinirdeśa Sūtra, the Āryākṣayamatinirdeśaṭīkā by Vasubandhu where he says:

Any sūtras that are explained in order to cultivate the characteristics of the noble path or realize the characteristics of the noble path are called "sutras of provisional meaning" because they teach a path which leads to nirvana. Any sūtras called "an entry into the result" are any sūtras that are taught in order to realize the result that has not been accomplished, those are the sutras of the definitive meaning.

Any sūtras called "entry into karma and deeds" are sutras which teach that engaging in virtuous karma produces a pleasing experience and engaging in nonvirtuous karma produces displeasing experience. Those are the sūtras of the provisional meaning. Any sutras said "to be taught in order to exhaust karma and affliction," sutras, which in order to exhaust karma and to exhaust afflictions, teach many methods of exhausting those, are sutras of the definitive meaning... etc.

Vasubandhu gives four other criterias for provisional and definitive sūtras, such as the difference between whether phenomena are taught to be afflictive or pure; whether samsara is to be regard with revulsion or is to be regarded as nondual with nirvana; whether topics are taught in words, letters, and so on such as the jatakas, etc or whether it is a sutra that teaching the profound that is difficult to see and comprehend, the selflessness in phenomena and the imperceptibility of the nature of emptiness; and

finally, whether there are many words and meanings with much discursiveness or whether there is very little discursiveness and emphasis on instructions on samadhi.

In Indian texts, in terms of whether given sutras are considered provisional or definitive little or no attention is paid to them in terms of when they were taught by the Buddha — instead all that counts is their content.

Related to this is the fact that there is not one single sūtra or Indian text that links the tathāgatagarbha doctrine to sūtras of the definitive meaning, not a single one! Not even the tathāgatagarbha sūtras themselves. Don't you find this to be amazing?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Alcohol

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Alcohol has many listed health benefits, tobacco has none.

dzogchungpa said:

I think tobacco might help some people keep their weight down, not that I'm recommending it.

Also, nicotine might have some benefits:

e,g, <http://discovermagazine.com/2014/march/13-nicotine-fix>, although there are better ways than smoking or chewing tobacco to use it now.

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of unhealthy things one can do for vanity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: tantric sex real or form of abuse?

Content:

Jesse said:

So is tantric sex really a method of attaining enlightenment or is it a form of abuse?

<http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/i-was-a-tantric-sex-slave-1069859.html>

the above article makes it pretty clear to me.

Jeff said:

Not specifically responding to the article, but there is very definitely a male-female energy loop dynamic that can be created. Kind of like natural polarities that create a "purification loop". This natural loop technique is used in many traditions. This issue/concern is that a tantric master can create such a purification loop without

actually engaging in physical sex.

Best wishes.

Malcolm wrote:

Jeff, this has nothing to do with Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: tantric sex real or form of abuse?

Content:

smcj said:

This is what I somehow doubt. That it has any legitimate uses.

Malcolm is right about the issue of samaya with this subject. However I think a history lesson is not breaking samaya.

Lama Tsongkhapa's started the Gelug tradition as a reformation movement against what he saw as the corruption of the Vajrayana in his day, this practice

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, you have no sources for this assertion. It is not true. He never started a reformation. This is just a western myth.

smcj said:

So even the most conservative of the Vajra Masters see the practice as legitimate, but obviously the potential for misuse and misunderstanding is off the charts..

Malcolm wrote:

If someone wishes to learn about these practices, all they need to do is attend Lamdre, which is given every other year, on average.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: emptiness wisdom, conceptual understanding, stepping sto

Content:

smcj said:

Malcolm's position is, as best as I can tell, that the 2nd Turning is definitive...

Malcolm wrote:

Malcolm's position is that the third turning is a restatement of the second to eliminate doubts about the second and does not in fact refer to any specific sūtras per se identified by when they were taught by the Buddha during his career as some later scholars hold (since all these scholars have wildly different ideas about which sūtras these are and there is no list in any Indian source which indicates which sūtras are to be regarded as provisional and which ones as definitive).

The second turning and the third turning are doctrinally indetical.

smcj said:

The Bhagavan, beginning from the nonexistence of the inherent existence of all phenomena, beginning from their absence of arising, absence of ceasing, being peaceful from the beginning, being parinirvana by nature, turned a second very amazing wheel of Dharma with the form of the description of emptiness to those who had correctly entered into the Mahāyāna. This wheel of Dharma was surpassable, circumstantial, of provisional meaning and became a basis of dispute.

The Bhagavan, beginning from the nonexistence of the inherent existence of all phenomena, beginning from their absence of arising, absence of ceasing, being peaceful from the beginning, being parinirvana by nature, turned a third very amazing wheel of Dharma possessing fine distinctions to those who correctly entered into all vehicles. This wheel of Dharma is unsurpassable, not circumstantial, of definitive meaning and indisputable.

Malcolm wrote:

The sole difference between these two turnings is that in the former case, emptiness was taught, and in the latter case, fine distinctions were taught, but the doctrine of both turnings begin "from the nonexistence of the inherent existence of all phenomena, begin from their absence of arising, absence of ceasing, being peaceful from the beginning, being parinirvana by nature." One might also add, that the third turning was intended for everyone.

All phenomena refers to all conditioned and unconditioned phenomena, FYI.

But as I have pointed out elsewhere, the Indians hardly took notice of the three turnings, and never turned them into a major hermeneutical topic, nor a rhetorical topic, unlike Chinese and Tibetan scholars in certain quarters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ucchedavāda, strictly speaking, means asserting that something once existent is destroyed. Since we never once asserted the existence of something, we cannot be accused of asserting that something becomes nonexistent, and therefore, we are free from the charge of being a "chad pa smra ba ", aka an ucchedavādin.

Tsongkhapafan said:

So now you are denying that table has any kind of valid existence at all? When you investigate it is true that you do not find a table within the parts of table. The table that we normally see is not one of the parts, not the collection of parts and is not separate from the parts, however there is an appearance of table to mind and that table exists.

The table that exists is the one that is merely imputed, or the table that is mere name. The inherently existent table (the one that we normally see) does not exist but the one that is mere name and that is one nature with the emptiness of table does.

Denying the valid existence of table is nihilism. It is negating that which does exist.

Malcolm wrote:

Question: does there exist an appearance of a table or does there exist a table which appears?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Have you met ONE person...

Content:

abandon-all-belief said:

...that has actual knowledge on their previous lives?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, more than one in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: tantric sex real or form of abuse?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is a topic which involves samaya, and those with samaya should refrain from its discussion.

Knotty Veneer said:

I hear what you are saying but I would be careful Malcolm. You could be accused of trying to shut down debate on this, and by extension, attempting to silence people who have been abused. Karmamudra practices can and have been used as excuses by perpetrators of sexual abuse against women. Samaya considerations should not stand in the way of justice for those abused.

I do know that people have also made false accusations against lamas. And this is reprehensible. But I think, in the end, it is the lesser of two evils. We cannot have a veil of holy silence drawn over this.

Malcolm wrote:

Two separate issues altogether: the issue I am addressing is what is unsuitable for people who hold samaya.

The issue of people promising spiritual rewards in exchange for sex is a completely

separate one.

However, the article Jesse posted is full of misinformation and misconceptions. I am not talking about June Campbell's allegations, since I have no way of verifying her claims about her relations with Kalu Rinpoche as true or false. One point however is that Kalu Rinpoche was not a monk, and was under no obligation to be celibate.

I am talking about the information with which the article is framed:

The idea is to "drive the semen upwards, along the spine, and into the head". The more semen in a man's head, the stronger intellectually and spiritually he is thought to be. This entirely silly and not true.

Knotty Veneer said:

More than that, he is said to gain additional strength from absorbing the woman's sexual fluids at the same time as withholding his own. This "reverse of ordinary sex", said June Campbell, "expresses the relative status of the male and female within the ritual, for it signals the power flowing from the woman to the man".

Malcolm wrote:

This is also false information.

Knotty Veneer said:

She then asked them how it relates to the fact that there are no female Buddha images, or to why in Tantric sex images the woman always has her back to the viewer,

Malcolm wrote:

This is also false on three points — Samantabhadri is an example of a female buddha, Tara is an example of a female buddha, as is Prajñāpāramita, as Vajrayogini, Yeshe Tsogyal, Mandarava, etc. There are many yidams where the male deity has its back to the observer, with the mother deity acting as the main deity. The third point is that images of father and mother deities are not "Tantric sex images."

In Vajrayāna there is no such thing as "tantric sex." There are some yogas that might resemble sex to people who do not have instructions or samaya. But we don't talk about them. If people want to learn, they can seek out a qualified teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: Alcohol

Content:

Adamantine said:

For some people, latent addictive tendencies within neurotic mind may attach to alcohol, and then this is a big obstacle for them if they are practicing Dharma, and should abstain. For some people, latent addictive tendencies within neurotic mind may attach to internet use, sex, idle chatter, etc. etc. It may really not be the same issue for any two people.

Although alcoholism is found in my family, I've never had an issue with it. I may drink casually with friends once or twice a month, but never to the point of drunkenness. I may take a small amount of some tantric "medicine" that involves whisky more regularly. I certainly take some alcohol at the times of tsok offerings. To impose a strict rule on myself never to drink any alcohol would be artificial and useless, maybe harmful. However, I have relatives that should never even have a drop, because it arouses inner demons, and they always get into trouble, or create it. These things are relative, and we need to know our own situation with clarity.

M.G. said:

This seems to be the view of most of my Buddhist teachers and friends. Though I've noticed they reject the idea of moderation and relative harm potential when the topic turns from alcohol to tobacco!

Malcolm wrote:

Alcohol has many listed health benefits, tobacco has none.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Lotus Sutra discussion

Content:

sherabzangpo said:

I didn't get to the colophon. That clears it up, since it's a collection. Thank you! He lived from 1235–1280.

Given Chogyel Phagpa's political status, it also makes me wonder whether the commentary was not a somewhat 'political' reaction to Chinese political and Buddhist influence in Tibet and Mongolia. The main question though is why he doesn't reference the Tengyur commentary. Perhaps he was even reacting against it (after all it was translated from Chinese at the least), if it had been translated by his time, which presumably it had been, if it was quoted just 10-20 years after his death by the 3rd Karmapa.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps he thought it was an inauthentic commentary or a forgery. Other than that, I have no idea.

sherabzangpo said:

Actually Malcolm, what's your take on the authorship?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not listed by Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen, but it is listed by the Karmapa and Ngorchen.

This probably means it was translated into Tibetan from Chinese during the Sakya period of rule in Tibet, and perhaps it was attributed an Indian author to establish it as authentic.

sherabzangpo said:

I suppose I could safely attribute it to 'Prithivibandhu/Kuiji' for the moment and refer to it as 'Sri Lankan/Chinese'.

Malcolm wrote:

You can always say "the commentary attributed to..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: tantric sex real or form of abuse?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is a topic which involves samaya, and those with samaya should refrain from its discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: tantric sex real or form of abuse?

Content:

Jesse said:

So is tantric sex really a method of attaining enlightenment or is it a form of abuse?

<http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/i-was-a-tantric-sex-slave-1069859.html>

the above article makes it pretty clear to me.

Malcolm wrote:

The article above is fraught with so much misinformation and misconceptions that it is useless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

His mistake is the same as TKfan's assuming that tables are designated on tables,

rather than tables being designated on parts.

Tsongkhapa said:

That's a strawman. I never said that tables are designated on tables, you assumed this. Table is imputed on basis of imputation for table and the basis of imputation and the table are never the same, they can't be. Possessor and possessed are always different. Furthermore, saying that tables are empty of tables is a negation too far - you are denying the mere imputation table that actually exists and that's nihilism.

conebeckham said:

What, exactly, is this "basis of imputation for table" if it is not table?

Malcolm wrote:

What TKF stated was:

A table is not empty of being a table because it is conventionally a table - that is what appears to a valid cognizer apprehending a table that is merely imputed upon the basis of table.

He assumes that thing cannot be empty of themselves (intrinsically empty) because he believes this would destroy their conventional value. But this is not a proper Madhyamaka view as we can see from the citation of Candrakīrti above, where Candrakīrti clearly states that there are no possessors of parts, they are unreal, they are simply designations.

The profound point in all of this is that Candrakīrti maintain that rather than a consciousness taking rebirth, which is the position of Bhāvaviveka, what takes rebirth is the mistaken habit of "I-making," which conventionally can act as an appropriator of the aggregates and also can engage in and experience the ripening of actions even though the 'I' does not exist and is not real — it can act and behave as if it were real, in much the same that we drive cars that we have designated upon parts which however, are unreal when they are sought for.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

His mistake is the same as TKfan's assuming that tables are designated on tables, rather than tables being designated on parts.

Tsongkhapa said:

That's a strawman. I never said that tables are designated on tables, you assumed this. Table is imputed on basis of imputation for table and the basis of imputation and the table are never the same, they can't be. Possessor and possessed are always different. Furthermore, saying that tables are empty of tables is a negation too far - you are

denying the mere imputation table that actually exists and that's nihilism.

WeiHan said:

That is not nihilism. Reasoning in that way does not deny dependent arising of appearance.

Malcolm wrote:

Ucchedavāda, strictly speaking, means asserting that something once existent is destroyed. Since we never once asserted the existence of something, we cannot be accused of asserting that something becomes nonexistent, and therefore, we are free from the charge of being a "chad pa smra ba ", aka an ucchedavādin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

His mistake is the same as TKfan's assuming that tables are designated on tables, rather than tables being designated on parts.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That's a strawman. I never said that tables are designated on tables, you assumed this. Table is imputed on basis of imputation for table and the basis of imputation and the table are never the same, they can't be. Possessor and possessed are always different. Furthermore, saying that tables are empty of tables is a negation too far - you are denying the mere imputation table that actually exists and that's nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:

I said it appeared that is what you are saying. You read your own language, and you will see.

We are not denying the existence of the imputation "table," that imputation is clearly being made. We are saying, like Candrakīrti, that no table can be found when the basis for imputing a table, it's parts, is examined. We are saying, like Candrakīrti, that there is no actual thing that possesses parts, for example a self. And if there is no possessor of parts, there are no parts that are possessed, correct? Thus a composite thing is empty of the designation it is being designated with. The designation does not come from its side, it comes from the side of the one making the imputation, right? How is a thing designated? It is designated on the basis of an appearance. An appearance of what? An appearance of parts. Does the thing exist in its parts? No. Does it exist separate from those parts? No. Does it exist in one of those parts? No. Therefore, the thing is just a designation and it is not real. When we say something is not real, this means it is empty. What is it empty of? Itself. There is no table, there is no car, and so on. There is no self that possesses the five aggregates, nevertheless, a self is imputed upon the five

aggregates. When the five aggregates are examined a self is not found with the aggregates, separate from them or in any one of them. Hence we know that the self does not exist. It is a mere imputation on a collection of parts. All composite phenomena are the same.

Things like tables, cars and selves are empty of themselves because when their basis of designation is examined, they are not found in their respective bases of designation or separate from them. When something is not found, it is called "nonexistent." In this case, it is not the nonexistence of something which once existed and then became nonexistent, according to mundane convention; in this case the thing sought for was never there from beginning, it never even arose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 3rd, 2015 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

WeiHan said:

However, from TD, according to his argument, if table is empty of table and can still function as a table, then table which is empty of car can then function as a car too. He is kind of saying if there is no some essence of a table there, then anything can happen randomly base on mental designation.

Malcolm wrote:

A table does not possess the parts of the car, so it won't work as a car, even you try to drive it.

A table is still empty of a table, however, because when the parts of a table are examined, a table cannot be found.

There does not need to be any essence of a table for a collection of parts to be designated table. Whether the table or car is a conventionally valid table or car purely depends on whether that table or car works or not, whether it is functional [arthakriya, don byed].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

His mistake is the same as TKfan's assuming that tables are designated on tables, rather than tables being designated on parts.

WeiHan said:

Malcolm,

Is dependent origination the right explanation? Table is empty of car doesn't mean that the table will appear as a car and exhibits the dependently originated appearance of functioning as a car. This is refutation of the fourth lemma of negating non-arising- that thing arises without a cause.

Malcolm wrote:

No, here we are just talking about how things are designated on their parts according to their conventional appearance to a non-deluded mind. For our friends TD and TKF, it appears, based on their statements, that tables appear to a conventional valid cognition automatically.

According to Candrakirti, things are designated upon parts they tentatively "possess". If the thing functions, it is conventionally valid; if not, it is conventionally invalid, for example, the attempt to fill a horse with gas instead of hay.

Knowing that things are not real, are intrinsically empty, while still acting in accordance with worldly convention is the path if a follower of the middle way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tenzin Dorje said:

If a table is empty of being a table, it follows that a table is as empty of being a table as a car is [empty of being a table]. It follows absurdly that one could validly impute anything on any basis of designation.

As a matter of fact, if you need a car to go to town, what don't you just impute a car on the table that's in the living room?

kirtu said:

Oh come on! The imputation has to be on a valid basis - Gelug Presentation 101.

Kirt

conebeckham said:

I think he's trying to argue that, Kirt, isn't he? A car and a table are both valid bases--they are both conventionally-appearing phenomena, after all. His mistake is in denying the worldly conventions of non-examined appearing phenomena. If I could drive my table to work, I would--but alas, my table has no engine, wheels, gas tank, etc. On the level of convention, I cannot register my table with the DMV. I can, however, eat dinner on my car. If I must!

Malcolm wrote:

His mistake is the same as TKfan's assuming that tables are designated on tables, rather than tables being designated on parts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Lotus Sutra discussion

Content:

sherabzangpo said:

It is actually by Chogyal Phagpa, it is found in volume 15 of the Sa skya bka' 'bum. That's strange, I was pretty sure it was listed as Sachen Kunga Nyingpo.. I found it on TBRC. Perhaps there's two commentaries? Or mistaken attribution? I would give the TBRC references but internet here is slow...

The question in terms of how this Sakya commentary (or commentaries) relates to the Commentary in the Tengyur is about when it was translated. It has no date and no translator, so it's hard to determine (and also makes its 'Sri Lankan' authorship look more suspicious), but it does seem to have a dedication prayer which seems to be by a famous Chinese-sponsored (and/or favored) Tibetan king, Miwang Tobgyel something or other, who lived in the 1700s, which indicates that he had probably had something to do with the translation... It would seem likely that he of all people might have been a 'Chinese Buddhist', so it all makes for a curious Holmes-like story...

Malcolm wrote:

It is by Chogyal Phagpa, as the colophon to the text states. Sachen's works are confined to the first two volumes, of the SKB, Phagpa's works are the final three volumes.

The commentary on the Lotus in the Tengyur is very late. Dan Martin states, "Sa'i-rtsa-lag is the Tibetan form for the name of the Sinhalese commentator Prthivibandhu (active during the reign of King Gopāla; 685-720 ce)." It was translated from Chinese, as the title indicates —དམ་པའི་ཚེས་ལྷན་རྒྱུ་རྒྱུ་ལྷན་པའི་བླ་མ་གྱི་ཐུགས་བརྒྱུད་པ་. This text by Sa'i-rtsa-lag is mentioned by the Third Karmapa, so it was translated into Tibetan no later than the late 13th-early fourteenth century.

There is another text attributed to Sa'i-rtsa-lag, the Pañcaskandhabhāṣya, translated in the Imperial period.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Ayu said:

And hence the charge that Gelugpas are crypto Svatantrikas, as well as being upside down gzhan stong pas.

Everybody should beware of charging ancient masters of anything. To say "I don't really understand it" would be better.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a charge leveled by ancient masters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which position still leaves you a realist, believing that there are inherently existing natural laws that govern physical phenomena. In other words, you accept that physical phenomena exist by virtue of intrinsic characteristics, a common tenet among Hināyāna schools.

Astus said:

I only make a difference between various interpretations. If we say there is a shared physical world then there are certain rules. If we say that perception is the reality we have, then independent laws are nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are squirming, having boldly declared no such phenomena as siddhis or ṛddhi-patti can exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: How does 18 early Buddhism School Related to Mahayana?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

To make it more clear to you, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen (12th century) writes:

Further, the bodhicitta of Vairocana in the second chapter of the Guhyasamāja states:

Free from all phenomena;
skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas,
and subject and object abandoned;
because phenomena are equally without self,
one's mind, having never arisen from the beginning,
is naturally empty.

In dependence upon which, Master Nāgārjuna wrote the Bodhicittavivaraṇa.

Now, the late Indian and Tibetan tradition have long held that Nāgārjuna I and the siddha Nāgārjuna, the disciple of Saraha, are one and the same person. I personally do not subscribe to this belief, holding instead that there are at the very least two authentic Nāgārjuna's.

Be that as it may, it is a fact that the Bodhicittavivarana is a tantric work associated with Guhyasamaja, and specifically is a commentary on the above passage. I erred above when I stated it concerned the abhisambodhi of Akṣobhya. The Dohakośa of Saraha was written to comment upon that, being this following statement, Jetsun Rinopche writes:

In addition to that, the bodhicitta of Akṣobhya in the second chapter of the Guhyasamāja states:

In the ultimate, phenomena
of the three realms are meditated as being unreal,
the existents meditated as unreal
are not meditated as objects of meditation;
therefore, the real and the unreal
are not objects of meditation.

In dependence upon which, Saraha wrote the Dohakośa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

WeiHan said:

But we can also see at a different angle. If how the external world sentient beings lived in depends on their karma, then there isn't any objective physical laws. It becomes unnecessary to differentiate that supernormal phenomena can only happen in mind realm but not in physical realm since after all physical realm is a reflection of what is in the mind. In other words, you don't have to say that Buddha can only manifest supernormal abilities in some beings mind stream and not in the physical realm because there are fixed physical laws (this is your previous position), we just have to say "some beings have the karma to see Buddha manifesting supernormal abilities while others don't have the karma.

Astus said:

Yes, some beings perceive one thing, others perceive something else. The problem with supernatural occurrences within the physical realm was raised regarding the original topic of this thread. And there I also wrote that powers exist on the spiritual level. If we say that the world is what we perceive it to be, that it is formed and governed by our mind, then that is the spiritual realm.

Malcolm wrote:

Which position still leaves you a realist, believing that there are inherently existing natural laws that govern physical phenomena. In other words, you accept that physical phenomena exist by virtue of intrinsic characteristics, a common tenet among Hināyāna schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tenzin Dorje said:

If a table is empty of being a table, it follows that a table is as empty of being a table as a car is [empty of being a table]. It follows absurdly that one could validly impute anything on any basis of designation.

As a matter of fact, if you need a car to go to town, what don't you just impute a car on the table that's in the living room?

Malcolm wrote:

Your reason is specious. We don't need to speak of a car being empty of a table at all because we do not (in worldly convention) impute tables on the parts of a car, nor a car on the parts of table. Nevertheless, a table is empty of being a table since when its parts are examined no table can be found, likewise a car is found to be empty of a car since no car can be found when its parts are examined.

The emptiness of cars, tables and selves are alike in so far as the parts upon which cars, tables and selves are imputed are all equally found to be empty respectively of cars, tables and selves. In other words, no car can be found when its parts are examined, no table can be found when its parts are examined, no self can be found when its parts are examined, meaning that anything designated on parts is merely an empty designation with no underlying reality at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 6:52 PM

Title: Re: How does 18 early Buddhism School Related to Mahayana?

Content:

Aemilius said:

You can take this approach to other dharma texts too, I suppose, like Dharmapada/Dhammapada.

And say that Dharmapada is actually a collection of oral instructions of Mahamudra precepts, or oral instructions on the six bardos/intermediate states, etc...

One day I actually found a verse in Dh. that is similar to the famous Six Essential Words on Mahamudra by Tilopa.

Words are empty in themselves, Dharma teachings are empty of inherent nature.

Thus Dharmapada can become Tantra and vice versa.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in this case there is a very clear tradition that associates this text with Guhyasamaja.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 11:56 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Lotus Sutra discussion

Content:

sherabzangpo said:

Also, it turns out there are some native Tibetan commentaries, but I've only found one, by Sachen Kunga Nyingpo...

Malcolm wrote:

It is actually by Chogyal Phagpa, it is found in volume 15 of the Sa skya bka' 'bum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

srivijaya said:

Interesting to read this thread and see what various teachings say is to be negated, or otherwise. In looking at all possible modes of existence/non-existence Buddha proffered no position at all. He never said one was right or the other wrong, or entered into any speculation. "A 'position,' Vaccha, is something that a Tathagata has done away with. What a Tathagata sees is this: 'Such is form, such its origination, such its disappearance;... (<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.072.than.html>) So a view which asserts two truths, one a non-existent "convention" and the other an existent "ultimate", is really saying "both exists and does not exist" - which was described by Buddha as not leading to "disenchantment, dispassion, cessation; to calm, direct knowledge, full Awakening, Unbinding."

I don't think that Buddha refused to engage with this or that view because he didn't like them or thought that they were not refined enough. The problem was in clinging to any kind of view.

Bakmoon said:

This is actually one of the differences between the Gelug understanding of Prasangika Madhyamaka and most non-Gelug understandings (e.g. Gorampa's view). For most non-Gelug Madhyamaka, it is understood that Prasangika Madhyamaka has no actual position of their own but use reductio ad absurdum arguments starting from the positions of others. Within Gelug, it is understood that one can have a position of one's own.

Malcolm wrote:

And hence the charge that Gelugpas are crypto Svatantrikas, as well as being upside down gzhan stong pas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

conebeckham said:

A table is most certainly empty of being a table. The idea that we "graft an inherent existence of table" onto the table is just further conceptual elaboration, and needless.

Tsongkhapafan said:

A table is not empty of being a table because it is conventionally a table - that is what appears to a valid cognizer apprehending a table that is merely imputed upon the basis of table.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement presumes by it's language that tables exist from their own side to act as a basis for imputation.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Table is the opposite of non-table.

Malcolm wrote:

This an incorrect use of apoha, or exclusion. A table is identified as a table because of all things that are not tables, such as pots and so on.

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's senseless to refute the existence of table (which is what you are doing when you say that table is empty of table). What it is empty of is inherently existent table - that is the table that we normally see: a table that exists outside the mind and that can be found upon investigation.

Malcolm wrote:

A table existing outside the mind is a table that exists from its own side.

Tsongkhapafan said:

This does not exist but the conceptual designation 'table' does indeed exist and function.

Malcolm wrote:

If a table that exists outside of the mind does not exist, as you here admit, this means tables are empty of being tables.

Tsongkhapafan said:

The distinction between table and inherently existent table is an important one because otherwise you cannot distinguish between the table that is apprehended by self-grasping ignorance and that does not exist and the table that exists as mere imputation.

Malcolm wrote:

A table that exists as a mere imputation is table that is empty of a table since that table exists as a mere imputation.

Tsongkhapa said:

Of the cart, Chandrakirti says:

[VI.158] Indeed it is not established by the seven ways,
Either in thatness or for the worldly;
But from the point of view of the worldly without analysis
It is imputed here in dependence upon its parts.

[VI.159] It is a part--possessor and a component- possessor.
For living beings a cart is called an `agent',
And for beings it exists as a taker.
Do not destroy conventionalities known to the world.

Do not destroy conventionalities known to the world by saying that table is empty of table!

Malcolm wrote:

Candra says directly after the citation you produced:

How can that which does not exist through seven aspects,
be said to exist? The existence of this will not be found by the yogin.
Since he rests with ease in reality,
here, the proposition of that [chariot, etc.] is also asserted.
If the chariot is not real, at that time,
nothing has parts, nor are there any parts.
For example, just as when the chariot is burned there are no parts,
the parts are [burned] when the possessor of parts is burned with the fire of intelligence.
So here, the reality is that tables, chariots, selves and so on are empty of themselves
because they cannot withstand analysis, also their components cannot withstand
analysis, and when subject to ultimate analysis they cannot be found. Nevertheless,

A table is precisely imputed on its parts which are empty of being "a table" — it is for this reason that tables are empty of being tables, since they are composed of parts upon which a table is imputed and in which a table will never be found.

When a convention is subject to analysis is it naturally destroyed in the process of analysis in just the same way that a hammer shatters a pot. If you interpret Candra the way you do, you disallow any ultimate analysis — but what Candra states is the following:

"Just a cart is designated in dependent on wheels and so on, wheels and so on are appropriated on that basis, but the chariot is not an appropriator, in the same way, because the self (a mundane convention that is not negated in relative truth), like a chariot, is asserted to be an appropriator."

Candra here makes an important point about all this — the chariot is not an actual

appropriator, why? Because it is merely designated on some parts, a wheel and so on. Likewise the self is not a real appropriator because it is designation on some parts. Nevertheless, in terms of the mundane convention in the relative, we do not negate chariots, selves and so on, even though chariots, selves and so on are not real, being mere designations on the basis of some parts. But your mistake is to assume that a chariot is being designated a chariot on the basis of a chariot, and this is utterly wrong.

Candra continues:

The five aggregates, the six elements and the six sense bases are the appropriations of that self because a self is designated on the basis of the five aggregates and so on, just as the wheels and so are the appropriations of the chariot

The self is conventionally asserted to be an appropriator of karma, merit, aggregates and so on, because it is designated on the basis of the five aggregates. As we see above, however, there is actually no self that can act as an appropriator since such a self does not exist, being a mere imputation.

He then continues:

Just as this presentation of the appropriated and the appropriator is a presentation of mundane convention, likewise, it is explained "This action and agent is to be accepted like the chariot." The appropriated is the action, this also is the agent. The so-called "appropriated", the aggregates and so on are the action, and the self is presented as a so-called "agent."

Because this is not real, this is not stable,
this is not unstable, this neither arises or perishes.
Here there is no permanence and so on,
there is neither sameness nor difference.

Though this self designated upon the aggregates is not stable, it is also not unstable. In that respect, if the self is unstable, at that time:

The appropriated are not the self,
those are produced and perish.
How could the appropriated
turn into the appropriator?

In the same way:

There is no production from the unproduced,
for consequently there will be a fault here,
the self will either be a product
or will be produced without a cause.

Thus, there is a contradiction with the śāstra. Because of that, if the aggregates are the self, if it comes to be possess arising and perishing, also it is not asserted as having arising or perishing. Therefore, the consequence that the aggregates "are not the self" will be valid. Because of that, the instability of this [self] is not valid, nor its stability.

Therefore, it is perfectly accurate to say that the self is empty of the self, chariots are empty of chariots, tables of empty of tables. What ever is designated on parts is empty of itself because it is mere designation that cannot be found upon analysis of the parts upon which it is designated. If it were only empty of inherent existence, then selves, chariots, tables and so on could be found in the basis of investigating their parts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Samaya and switching traditions.

Content:

Dragon said:

If you have received DI and consider yourself a Dzogchen practitioner, but go to see different teachers in different traditions, is that considered "switching?" I am going to see The 17th karmapa and the Sakya Trizin this weekend. Both are giving empowerments. I was hesitant attending because of the empowerments (I was looking just for being able to see them in person and listen to them teach, but these were the only ones I could afford to attend and that were close in terms of travel). So what do I do? Is it bad to attend? Do I just not participate in the empowerments then and sit there quietly when the time comes? Or since my intention is to go to broaden my learning and listen to great masters teach as a dzogchen practitioner, it is not considered "switching" since AGY is my practice that unifies everything? I see many dzogchen practitioners signing up to go to other empowerments like I am about to do, so I thought it was normal? Isn't it limiting to see all schools differently anyway and not "as one" when you are practicing dzogchen anyway? Buddha is Buddha is Buddha. What's the big deal?

Malcolm wrote:

Unify everything in Guru Yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Samaya and switching traditions.

Content:

Lucjan said:

Nobody has yet posted here any understanding of what the Dzogchen samaya actually is.

Malcolm wrote:

I agree with your statement.

The point of the four Dzogchen samayas is they cannot be broken (which is why they are referred to as the four unbreakable samayas) since they refer to four aspects of one's basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: What beliefs are prerequisite for practicing Zen?

Content:

Astus said:

The Lotus Sutra is quoted mainly because of how the dragon girl transformed to a buddha as an example of sudden enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

Which this does not show since she was already a high bodhisattva on the stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Thanks for your explanation Malcolm, much appreciated. I haven't read Gendun Chopel but I take it his view is Shengtong?

Malcolm wrote:

No, Gendun Chopel was a very brilliant Gelug Lama who questioned a number of Tsongkhap's views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 2nd, 2015 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Incidentally, while Nubchen does list ten reason's that the [ston mun] simultaneist path (Chan) is superior to the [tsen min] gradualist path (Madhyamaka), view is not among them. What are the ten? The difference in method, mode of entry, conduct, samadhi, addressing conceptuality, purifying obscurations, accomplishments, accumulations, realizing the two truths and benefitting others.

On the other hand, this is a moot point, because all Tibetan Buddhists are Vajrayāna practitioners. However also in Mahayoga and Anuyoga Nubchen identifies a gradual and sudden approach, with the latter coming from Padmasambhava's man ngag lta ba phreng ba.

Also an interesting tidbit is Nubs assertion that Vimalamitra demonstrates dying in Tibet, but in the future lives in India and not China. And another is that he identifies 12 reasons that Mantra is superior to Chan and Madhyamaka, including view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 1st, 2015 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: What beliefs are prerequisite for practicing Zen?

Content:

Dan74 said:

I know I am potentially opening a can of worms because of the seeming difference with our Vajrayana brothers and sisters, but I wanted to have a good look at this question in the light of classical and modern teachings of all traditions loosely referred to as Zen (ie Chan, Seon, Rinzai and Soto). Of course personal experience at Zen centres are welcome, but lets not let it devolve into a tug-o-war of opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

It is useful to remember that most people practicing Chan/Son/Zen in the old days were people already well trained in Buddhadharma.

Ancient scholars often understood stories on multiple levels, without one contradicting the other in their minds, despite seeming contradictions in ours.

For example, Rahu is used as a metaphor in the Kalacakra tantra for certain practices that lead to the cessation of ordinary concepts, but the Kalacakra also contains elaborate calculations for calculating eclipses on the presumption that the outer world mirrors the anatomy of the human body and vice versa, with the added assumption that a powerful enough yogin could control external eclipses by controlling his body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 1st, 2015 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

Sherlock said:

But in any case, non-Nyingmapas have maligned Hashang for centuries without really studying his view, this should stop.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Would you care to clearly elucidate this view? If it involves abandoning conceptual minds because they are regarded as harmful then Hashang's view is wrong and even dangerous.

Malcolm wrote:

What Sherlock is saying is that in general, since the appearance of a history about the arrival of Śāntarakṣita and Padmasambhava to Tibet called the sba bzhed i.e., " The Narrative of Sba ", sometime between the late 9th and early 12th century, many Tibetan scholars such as Sakya Pandita have held views about Chan Buddhism in general based on what is reported in that text.

Sherlock's point is that there is more than one report about the positions of Hashang

Mahayana and in his opinion, those following the Narrative of Sba are giving consideration only to a very one sided point of view of Hashang's actual views, and that Hashang has become a strawman that Tibetan schools use to attack each other with.

In other words, what Sherlock is questioning is whether or not Sba gsal snang's reporting on Hashang's views are actually factual. Many modern scholars think the entire episode was entirely fabricated for political reasons.

Later Nyingmapa's have also expressed hostility at the Sba bzhed literature because it contradicts later terma biographies on many details, such as asserting that Padmasambhava was the actual son of the King of Oddiyāna and so on.

Of course there are some problems with Nubchen's account as well since he has Bodhidharma traveling to Tibet and arriving with one shoe in his hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 1st, 2015 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: How does 18 early Buddhism School Related to Mahayana?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know, I have the book. But he is mistaken. It is actually a commentary on a specific portion of the Guhyasamaja Tantra, the abhisambodhi of Akṣobhya.

Aemilius said:

I support Lindtner. In Bodhicittavivarana there is a clear argument against the cittamatra views, like those expressed in Lankavatara sutra.

Furthermore, there are some active persons who want to make Nagarjuna seem like a sravakayanist, and who with this hidden intention reject this important work, because it is mainly or solely about the Bodhicitta.

Malcolm wrote:

I am just sharing with you what the text is actually about. There are other texts by Nāgārjuna on Mahāyāna, like the Ratnavali and Suhrlakṣa, which prove that Nāgārjuna was a Mahāyānist.

But there are 300 works in the bstan 'gyur attributed to Nāgārjuna, and it is impossible they are all by him.

The tradition that the Bodhicittavivarana is associated with the Guhyasamaja Tantra is well established, considering the term "bodhicitta" in that tantra is used as a term for ultimate reality. The author who wrote it was the siddha Nāgārjuna who was a disciple of Saraha I, there is really no doubt about this. This text is a prominent text in the Arya tradition of Guhyasamaja.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 1st, 2015 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

WeiHan said:

However, the Buddha's teaching held that whatever outer physical environment we experienced is also a result of our karma (which is somewhat a mind thing). ... If the Buddha can influence the mind of certain people so that he seem to witness a supernatural phenomena from his perspective in the outer world. It is almost the same as saying that the Buddha can influence change in the physical law since whatever physical laws that the world obeys depend on our mind and karma (as for the example of hell and heaven which I given).

Astus said:

And we arrive at the problem that if the Buddha can change others' karma then he can liberate them as well by the same power. Since nothing like that happened, and the whole point of the teaching is that everyone has to accomplish it on one's own, changing others' karma is not possible.

Malcolm wrote:

If the first were true, the second would not necessarily follow since liberation is freedom from afflictions, not freedom from karmavipaka.

In any case the Buddha has already instructed is that he cannot remove our suffering, nor can he hand us liberation, he can only instruct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 1st, 2015 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Ayu said:

If you, michaelb, don't sense the existence to be inherent: congrats. All people are individually different.

michaelb said:

The point is more that 'inherent existence' is not the problem, or certainly not the whole problem. If you just negate inherent existence you are still left with the 'thing' you haven't negated. To use your examples the rose and the table (without their inherent existence) are still there for me to prick my finger on or bump into, and still there to be objects of my clinging.

Tenzin Dorje said:

Aaah! I think I finally understood your view. (yes, I try)

I say although a table is empty of inherent existence, or is empty of being an inherently existent table, it is not empty of being a table. A table is empty of being a horse, a car, a cup, but is not empty of being a table because a table is found by conventional valid cognition. But it is empty of being inherently existent [table] because it is not found by a mind of ultimate analysis.

You say a table is empty of being a table, do you not ?

Malcolm wrote:

Two problems here:

One, tables are empty of being tables. If tables were not empty being tables, conventional tables could withstand analysis, and so too could all things made of parts, such as persons. A table appears/exists, and a table is imputed on its parts, like persons, but it cannot be found to withstand ultimate analysis. In the process of analyzing a table, also the table ceases to be apprehended. This principle is well established even in lower tenet systems such as Abhidharma, where the cognition of a pot ceases the moment it is broken into shards, and so on.

Second, this perspective — that the appearance/existence of conventionally imputed tables can withstand ultimate analysis while their inherent existence cannot — makes it difficult to practice the creation stage, since our so called conventional valid cognition perceives impure appearances and not pure appearances of the mandala and so on. The latter requires training and purification.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 1st, 2015 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Nichiren Buddhism Vs. Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

rory said:

For sure Tendai is closest to TB.

Rory

Malcolm wrote:

No, Shingon is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: How does 18 early Buddhism School Related to Mahayana?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Nagarjuna, who lived two or three centuries before Asanga and Vasubandu, is at least in

one place criticizing the Yogacara view, (found that in Christian Lindtner's Master of Wisdom, Writings of Nagarjuna).

.

Malcolm wrote:

You are referring to the Bodhicittavivarana, this late tantric text is associated with the Guhyasamaja Tantra — I have no idea why Lindtner imagines it is by Nāgārjuna I, there is no chance that it is.

Aemilius said:

His grounds sound reasonable for holding it a work of Nagarjuna. Lindtner explains his justifications for two pages in the above mentioned book.

In the earlier editions of Lindtner's Master of Wisdom there was also a translation of Akutobhya. It is most unfortunate that he has decided to remove Akutobhya from his collection of translations of Arya Nagarjuna's works.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know, I have the book. But he is mistaken. It is actually a commentary on a specific portion of the Guhyasamaja Tantra, the abhisambodhi of Akṣobhya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

Sherlock said:

Nubchen's works were lost to Tibetans until quite recently, the last 80 years or something, and even when they were rediscovered not many people read them.

Malcolm wrote:

Regarding this, actually, we know that Lochen Dharmashrī had a hand written manuscript of the bsam gtan mig sgron, as well as the Jonangpa Jetsun Kunga Nying po (Taranatha). So it seems that this text actually circulated among elite Tibetan scholars all along.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: "Buddhism" vs. "Buddhadharma"

Content:

Dan74 said:

So only what is put forward by the enlightened can be of any benefit? Maybe we have different notions of 'benefit'.

Malcolm wrote:

Only what is put forth by awakened people is the Dharma. Of ordinary people like you and I start pretending that we can alter the Dharma to suit this or that purpose, this is called "Corrupting the Dharma."

Perhaps the tag 'Buddhist' is more likely to lead people to Buddhadharma? Why worry about the trademark?

It is not a question of being concerned with trademarks, it is a question of honesty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Ayu said:

Yes, but aren't you discussing about who is able to change the karma? Only the person who owns this certain karma can change it in longterm view, isn't it?

As far as I understood, a Buddha or a teacher with siddhis can give a little nudge to the better direction - which might be a great relief. But he cannot change the karma from outside.

Malcolm wrote:

No. I was just answering Astus' question. Karma is unerring, but it is no means something that must ripen in a certain way. For example, the heavy karma of bodhisattvas must ripen, it does not ripen as being reborn in lower realms, but instead, as the Karmavibhanga states:

The one endowed with this Dharma completely purifies in this life even the karma that results in birth in the three lower realms through pain in the eye, ear, nose, tongue or a pain in the head, being afflicted by a pain in the limb or the heart, or being afflicted by a contagious disease, pain in the abdomen, or when traveling to other lands, being killed, bound, beaten, abused, struck, criticized or vision in a nightmare.

Thus karma is unerring, but not immutable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Kadampa Buddhism

Content:

Dema said:

I have been going to a Kadampa temple that's in the area. I really like it and the people and the temple are very nice. but you really need to be a temple supporter to do anything there. or everything cost 5 bucks and for 3 months it like 110 bucks and i dont have that. So if anyone practices this schooling. maybe some books i can read that might help? i would like to get a bit more deeper in the the noble truths

thank you
Dema

Malcolm wrote:

You should check the TOS:

The discussion of or linking to material from groups and individuals that promote them, such as Geshe Kelsang Gyato's New Kadampa Tradition or Tsem Tulku Rinpoche's Kechara are not welcome and will be removed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: "Buddhism" vs. "Buddhadharma"

Content:

Dan74 said:

I'd also beg to differ with JD that Buddhadharma becomes nonsensical if rebirth is thrown away.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it does. The Buddha's whole outline of the path of liberation automatically becomes gibberish without rebirth.

Dan74 said:

I know I don't share many members' distaste for Secular Buddhism. It is not my path, but I see much good on it that people can bring to their lives and lives of those around them.

Malcolm wrote:

Secular Buddhism is a contrivance of the ignorant, and being a product of ignorance, cannot benefit anyone at all.

Dan74 said:

Essentially Humanism with some of the Dharmic techniques thrown in makes the best framework an atheist can embrace and if it was truly embraced, the world would be a much better place and Buddhadharma would be the next natural step, I believe.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be much better if so called Secular Buddhists would leave the term "Buddhist" off their "faith" and replace it with something more honest and apropos, such as "Humanism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: "white metal" mandala plate turning my wrist grey

Content:

Ayu said:

Hello summertime

I saw this phenomenon also when people rubbed their silver coloured mandala sets. It was silver-colour and I don't think it is good to have this on the skin regularly.

I heard, people fixed their sets with transparent varnish.

Also I saw beautifully painted mandala sets. The ornaments were painted with vivid colours. Maybe you'd like to paint it like that.

summertime said:

I'd be concerned about the varnish or paint coming off on my arm, too. Do you happen to know what kind of varnish it is that would be used for this?

Malcolm wrote:

Copper is considered a precious metal, but so called "white metal" is not. Get yourself a copper mandala plate. It will be non-toxic, and of superior material since you cannot afford silver or gold.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 7:00 AM

Title: Re: "Buddhism" vs. "Buddhadharma"

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Could the Buddha's teachings of rebirth and karma be provisional?

Might it be a mistake to interpret them as absolute truths?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha himself defined wrong view as rejection of karma and rebirth in many places. They may be part of relative truth, but I would hardly characterize them as provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: "white metal" mandala plate turning my wrist grey

Content:

summertime said:

Hi, Just recently starting mandala offerings with one of those fancy looking "birthday cake" stacked plates with the auspicious symbols on the side. The vendor told me it was made of "white metal." I'm curious if anyone knows what that is, and why it might be making my wrist turn grey after a while when I rub the plate with it. Anyone else encounter this issue? My main concern is maybe there's lead in the plate. In case it is something in the plate reacting with something on my skin, I'm going to try to be more careful about washing not just my hands but my wrists also.

Malcolm wrote:

Get a copper mandala plate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, an idea that you subscribe to by insisting that there are immutable physical laws.

Astus said:

Isn't karma immutable?

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is unerring, but it is not immutable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

rtogs pa - avabodha This is usually the term rtogs renders in order to communicate "realize."

Tenzin Dorje said:

True. Why then go against what you yourself say is usual translation?

Malcolm wrote:

Because here I do not think rtogs is being used to translate, or has the same sense as 'avabodha'. It is a clumsy way to translate the passage.

Tenzin Dorje said:

Plus, I've indicated a number of translations (such as ascertain, know, understand, and so forth) and since you know what rtogs pa is, we don't need to argue on the translation. It is exactly like the fact that there is no need to argue on the term of "compassion" when we know the Buddhist definition, function, divisions of it, on the pretext that its Latin etymology of it as to do with "to suffer with..."

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the term rtogs renders any number of Sanskrit terms — in general in Tibetan "rtogs pa" actually means "understand" or "know" (shes pa). When it is used in

the sense of "realize", it is being used in the sense of avabodha, but here it is not being used in that sense of avabodha.

A self-sufficient substantial entity would be an inherent existence, from our POV. But Tsongkhapa argues that is not the basis of negation, instead it is the inherent existence which is different than existence. From our point of view, existence is the coarse object of negation[...]

In fact, we say the basis is either phenomena or a person. The subtle object of negation is the same in both cases, though.

It doesn't matter, the subtle object of negation is not the actual object of negation in Madhyamaka, Candrakīrti only introduces it as a formality.

Still, I don't understand what you mean by 'existence is the coarse object of negation'. No one perceives inherent existence, which is a philosophical abstraction. People do perceive existence, and that is what is negated through Madhyamaka analysis because that is what people perceive. But negating existence is not enough, one must also negate nonexistence, both and neither. When one is an ārya, however, one does not need to proceed through the four-fold negation.

The Sakyas maintain that the difference between Bhāvaviveka and Candrakīrti is pedagogical only.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashīla

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, what it amounts to is the very Chinese Buddhist idea, later widely adopted by Kagyus and Nyingmas, that there were very clear sets of sūtras that could be distinguished by the turning to which they belong.

Nubchen asserts that Hashang depended on these definitive sūtras, and that Kamashīla depended on provisional sūtras.

But here, Nubchen is showing evidence of influence from Chinese Buddhism. It is really nothing more profound than this.

This is fine, but the reality of it is that the Indians never gave any importance to idea of three turnings at all. I don't either, which is why I find Nubchen's notion that Hashang's teachings are higher than Kamalashīla's based on which turning of wheel to which they supposedly adhere to be a completely bogus proposition, DOA. Understandable, but DOA. Accepting Nubchen's POV on this means accepting the distinction between the three turnings as understood in Chinese Buddhism and I simply do not think that is a particularly valid way of understanding sūtras.

narraboth said:

As a Chinese who started from Chinese Buddhism study, I don't think the idea of 'three turning of wheel' was that popular in our tradition. We do say 'five periods' based on Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra: 'Just like from the milk the yogurt is made, from

yogurt the raw butter is made....' However, it's not really about which period is superior in view. For example, the first period is âvatamsaka period, the sutra is surely a Mahayana text, just Chinese suggested that it's direct and unrefined as fresh milk, not everyone can digest it.

We do have Sandhinirmocana Sūtra translated though, but I think it's more emphasized by Yogācāra school (in China) rather than Zen school. In Zen school, at least after Song dynasty, the most important sutra is Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra. So I am not sure if Chinese give three turnings much importance at all. My feeling as a Chinese is that Tibetan emphasize it more than anyone.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not saying it is popular in the Chinese tradition, I am saying that its source is Chinese.

The idea of ranking sutras in terms of provisionality and definitiveness comes primarily from the Chinese commentary in the Samdhinirmocana Sutra. Chinese Buddhism indeed has a number of schemes where the Buddha's teachings are ranked according to when he is supposed to have taught them, but the source of the idea of three turnings of the wheel elaborated in this way is this commentary that I mentioned by Won-ch'uk, the 'phags pa dgongs pa zab mo nges par 'grel pa'i mdo rgya cher 'grel pa in three volumes. Since this concept is virtually absent from Indian sources, it must be from Chinese sources.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I said influence, you said control, there is a world of difference between these two words.

Astus said:

What form of influence do you mean?

Mental influence was already discussed a bit in this thread
<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=275349#p275349>.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, the traces in the minds of sentient beings are sufficiently strong that they can influence the minds of others in terms of what appearances they see.

A classic example of this is the story of the lady who meditated upon herself as a tiger, causing the other villagers to see a tiger instead of her.

Then there is the famous example of the goddess of the Ganges who transformed herself in the form of Śariputra, and him into her form, much to his dismay.

There is the story of the nāga princess who changed her gender to male also, etc., etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Astus said:

...the idea that there is an independent realm of objects beyond/behind experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, an idea that you subscribe to by insisting that there are immutable physical laws.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You put too much faith in the delusion known as "relative truth," Astus.

Astus said:

Are you on the position that ultimate truth contradicts and/or negates the relative? That dependent origination is something else than emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimate truth is the object of a nondeluded cognition, relative truth is the object of a deluded cognition. Deluded and nondeluded cognitions are mutually exclusive.

Anything that dependently originates that is said to be empty, it is true.

But this does not mean that when someone has the ability control the element of air, etc., they cannot fly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 31st, 2015 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so finally you admit it, your view is realist and materialist, as I have been maintaining for some time.

As far as your contention goes that minds cannot influence other minds, this is merely an assertion on your part, and not something you have proven.

Astus said:

As WeiHan pointed out, I don't reject supernatural powers. But I reject being a materialist.

If one mind can control another, how come buddhas cannot make everyone enlightened? Then one person could make another think (and feel, and do) whatever that one wants, rendering the other a mere puppet.

Malcolm wrote:

I said influence, you said control, there is a world of difference between these two words.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Wait, mass and energy are real? They impose hard, factual limitations? How you can escape the charge of substantialism by making this assertion?

Astus said:

Causality is still accepted as the way phenomena function, isn't it? It's not just anything goes and things appear out of nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakīrti was walking through the halls of Nalanda, reading a book. He accidentally bumped into a pillar. A clever student spied this and said "Ha, that pillar is not very empty is it!"

Candra stopped, and without a word passed his hand right through the pillar, much to the students astonishment, and then continued on his way..

You put too much faith in the delusion known as "relative truth," Astus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Astus said:

That is, within the realist/materialist view there is no place for magic. Only in the realm of subjective experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so finally you admit it, your view is realist and materialist, as I have been maintaining for some time.

As far as your contention goes that minds cannot influence other minds, this is merely an assertion on your part, and not something you have proven.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

None of which really explain from a scientific point of view how this mysterious interaction between mind and body works.

Astus said:

Scientifically there are no non-physical objects to investigate or establish a connection with. Otherwise the duality of mind and body in Buddhism is only a conventional term as all phenomena are within the experiential realm and distinguished as form and names as a way to talk about categories of experiences. If we begin to analyse such conventions in Buddhism then we gradually end up with mind-only and emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

But you asserted as a hard fact that these phenomena [iddhi-pattis, siddhis, etc.] could never be real in a physical sense, which means you must be harboring some residual realism.

Astus said:

The four elements are clearly properties of material entities.

They are called material entities because they exhibit such properties and are experienced with the first five consciousnesses. Supposing a noumenal substance, independent object, beyond the phenomenal level is either a conventional approach or a substantialist philosophy.

Malcolm wrote:

It's odd that you take refuge in tenet systems, and yet harbor residual realism.

Astus said:

Yes, supernormal phenomena are not part of our everyday physical reality, not part of what is commonly called physical - the area of study of physics - and cannot be explained with physical laws.

Malcolm wrote:

But according to you, that does not matter because such laws are merely conventions and are not real in any substantial sense.

Astus said:

They can happen only if conceived within a subjective experiential realm where one doesn't have to account for the conservation of mass and energy (small becomes big, one becomes many, etc.). In other words, the mechanism of supernormal powers cannot be logically described within the confines of the general laws of this physical reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Wait, mass and energy are real? They impose hard, factual limitations? How you can escape the charge of substantialism by making this assertion?

Astus said:

But if you say that buddhas and ordinary beings as well can perform such abilities in the common physical world, then - as referred to before - there are a number of questions not yet answered, beginning with the first post of this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

The common physical world is either substantially real or it is not. If it is not, then there should be no problem accepting such things as iddhi-patis even if they do not normally conform to conventional expectations of 20th century humans. There are certainly plenty of anecdotal evidence of yogis who leave their footprints and handprints in rocks and so on in the Himalayas and certainly plenty of people, even westerners who have observed such events. It is rank substantialism to claim that such events are impossible because some imputed "general laws of this physical reality."

Astus said:

But despite all these things, you have no provided any reason at all that suggests that your acceptance of rebirth is rational and your rejection of iddhi-patis and so on is also rational. Your acceptance of former is actually irrational because you reject the latter. I do not reject supernormal powers. What I find problematic is the idea that they exist within the physical context.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, and you have this problem because you have realist tendencies, not unlike Sarvastivadins. The abhijñās are one thing, of course these are mental abilities, the iddhi-pattis/siddhis are something else again, they are not just mental abilities, though they come from having developed powers over the mind, having done so, they lend the ability to have power over matter, which according what you state above, is either a convention or mind-only.

Astus said:

But instead of answering for the questions and problems pertaining to the view that they manifest as ordinary physical phenomena, there are only evasive responses and irrelevant comments.

Malcolm wrote:

And you have continually engaged in self-contradictions and demonstrated that you are at base a realist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: "Buddhism" vs. "Buddhadharma"

Content:

Challenge23 said:

The impression I've gotten from reading people who use the term is that "Buddhadharma" is based upon a highly specific form of Buddhism that is literal and traditional. For example, a "Buddhist" might hear the story about Milarepa flying from point A to point B and think that it was a metaphor, an exaggeration, or any of the myriad interpretations that would end with, "Milarepa didn't really fly from point A to point B". However, someone who believes in "Buddhadharma" would believe that Milarepa did, in fact, fly from point A to point B and anyone who disagrees with them are ignorant.

It reminds me a great deal of the difference in Christianity between Christians and Born Again Christians.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case. What is the case is that when someone explicitly claims that rebirth, karma and so on are interpretable, when for the Buddha they were clearly ideas he took literally, that person has fallen into wrong view. They may even erect a whole "Buddhism" around this idea, but it will never be Buddhadharma.

Challenge23 said:

Other than exchanging "Milarepa flying from point A to point B" with "rebirth" or "karma" and "ignorant" with "wrong view", I'm not sure where we part ways here. Do you disagree because of the analogy between Buddhadharma and Born Again Christianity? Having grown up with non-denominational and Pentecostal Christians I can tell you it is quite accurate. Both groups believe that their respective sources are the ultimate and final authority, both groups believe that what is in those sources is literally true, and both groups believe that one should reorganize their lives based upon what is in their respective sources upon pain of horrible consequences (really the only difference between Avici Hell and the Christian Hell is that Avici is almost eternal but the Christian Hell is eternal). With that said, I do freely admit that BA Christianity is evangelical (meaning there is a drive to convert others), while Buddhadharma is most definitely not.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the point:

However, someone who believes in "Buddhadharma" would believe that Milarepa did, in fact, fly from point A to point B and anyone who disagrees with them are ignorant.

This is the point:

However, someone who believes in "Buddhadharma" accepts rebirth, karma, etc., and anyone who disagrees with them is ignorant [about the real nature of Buddha's teachings.]

It is not fundamentalist thing — it is about accurately understanding what the Buddha taught and then deciding whether or not one can accept what he taught. If you can't, then please do not try to twist the Buddha's teachings into something that corresponds with your prejudices.

Further, "Buddhisms" tend to focus on one aspect of Buddha's teachings, they can never encompass the whole of it. I am a Tibetan Buddhist because I follow that path and system, but there is more to Buddhadharma than Tibetan Buddhism, there is Chan, Pure Land, etc. Sometimes "Buddhisms" are distortions of the Buddha's teachings, like Secular Buddhism and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Sherlock said:

Khenpo Zhenga reemphasized Indic studies and freedom from extremes.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe to Nyingmapas. Gorampa's view is the official view of the Sakya school, and Shenga studied with Sakya khenpos.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

narraboth said:

"The works of some other Sakya lamas which criticized Tsongkhapa or seemed at odds with those views were banned from publication entirely within Tibet and were only preserved secretly and re-published openly from Bhutan after 1959."

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily the works of Shakya Chogden.

narraboth said:

Not sure what those 'works' are and how he defines 'Tibet'. I recently read some letters that Papongka Dechen Nyingpo sent to some Chinese, one of them is chairman Liu, the head of Kham province at that time (during ROC's ruling 1912-1949, Tibet and Kham are two different provinces). He suggested Liu to support monastery but be careful about textbooks that contained wrong views, and he said that some people printed and published those wrong view books including Gorampa's commentaries in Dege, which is very bad for Buddha dharma etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, a Sakya named Jamyang Lama at Derge gathered all the extant manuscripts of Gorampa's works and had them carved into block prints.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

tingdzin said:

Well, Guenther discussed this in short pieces a long time ago, and the OP might find what he had to say useful. I don't want to stick my head into the (useless) argument besides that.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, what it amounts to is the very Chinese Buddhist idea, later widely adopted by Kagyus and Nyingmas, that there were very clear sets of sutras that could be distinguished by the turning to which they belong.

Nubchen asserts that Hashang depended on these definitive sutras, and that Kamashila depended on provisional sutras.

But here, Nubchen is showing evidence of influence from Chinese Buddhism. It is really nothing more profound than this.

This is fine, but the reality of it is that the Indians never gave any importance to idea of three turnings at all. I don't either, which is why I find Nubchen's notion that Hashang's teachings are higher than Kamalashila's based on which turning of wheel to which they supposedly adhere to be a completely bogus proposition, DOA. Understandable, but DOA. Accepting Nubchen's POV on this means accepting the distinction between the three turnings as understood in Chinese Buddhism and I simply do not think that is a particularly valid way of understanding sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Since these appearances are inseparable from emptiness and are ultimate truths, and they have a non-conceptual realisation of ultimate truth, they also have a non-conceptual realisation of appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

Changing appearances are ultimate truths? Since when?

Tsongkhapafan said:

Conventional truths are manifestations of the self-grasping mind. In truth, all phenomena are mere name or mere appearance, and this mere name is one nature with the ultimate truth of phenomena, not its conventional nature. For a Buddha, forms are ultimate truths because there is no contradiction between how they appear and how they exist.

Malcolm wrote:

You still have not explained how impermanent things are ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It follows then that since rebirth manifests in the material realm, you therefore must also come up with an explanation for it according to natural science. ... The mind clearly interacts with matter every time rebirth occurs. How is this possible? How can a nonmaterial entity interact with a material one?

The material realm is what is within the experience of the five senses. Can the mind be seen, heard, smelt, tasted or touched? Does it have a form, a colour, a spatial or temporal existence? It does not. How could then we say it manifests as a physical object?

No said it manifested as a physical object, merely that it appropriates physical objects, namely a body, in a material realm, in our case, the *kāmadhātu*.

On the connection between mind and matter, there are the 18 dhatus, abhidharma literature and yogacara works.

None of which really explain from a scientific point of view how this mysterious interaction between mind and body works.

That is, the four elements are solidity/extension, cohesion/fluidity, heat and motion, so they are what is experienced by consciousness and not a separate realm.

The four elements are clearly properties of material entities.

Nevertheless, various experiences are categorised differently, thus the distinction between name and form, feeling and concept, etc. In other words, instead of choosing either that body and mind are one or two, the Buddha taught the five aggregates.

Four aggregates are strictly mental, one of them is strictly material (the *rūpa skandha*, the material aggregate), comprised of the four elements, out of which the five sense

organs are made. Of the four mental aggregates, three of them are mental factors, caittas; while one is the mind, citta/vijñāna/manas.

The Buddha also regularly uses the older Indian term for mind and body, i.e. namarūpa, which in particular refers to the period of time of development in the womb after conception and before the sense organs develop.

That's why regarding superpowers I take the position presented in the Vimalakirti Sutra, that it depends on one's perception, and there is no such power that could be demonstrated for everyone, thus my distinction between physical and spiritual powers. You have not addressed my objection in the slightest, you have not explained to us how it is that consciousness, which is a non-material entity, functions through the sense organs via patches of atoms located on the various physical structures in their respective locations such as the eye, and so on.

Moreover, in the citations you provided, no one doubts that the five abhijñās are mental experiences, but so is the taste of my coffee. Your contention however was that such things as levitation, manomayakāyas, and so on were simply subjective experiences of adepts, were not part of physical reality, and solely the domain of fantasy — even though of course Buddha, and other mahasiddhas displayed these miraculous events to others present.

But despite all these things, you have not provided any reason at all that suggests that your acceptance of rebirth is rational and your rejection of iddhi-pāṭis and so on is also rational. Your acceptance of former is actually irrational because you reject the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: "Buddhism" vs. "Buddhadharma"

Content:

Simon E. said:

It wouldn't be arrogant at all to see that the Buddha was addressing not merely those who were not his followers, but followers of another teacher whose authority unlike his own, was based on tradition, particular interpretations of scriptures, specious reasoning etc. It would simply be a statement of fact.

dharmagoat said:

And now that the Buddha's teaching is based on tradition, particular interpretations of scriptures, etc., his advice no longer applies?

Malcolm wrote:

People always forget that at the end of this sutta, it is said:

"Marvelous, venerable sir! Marvelous, venerable sir! As if, venerable sir, a person were to turn face upwards what is upside down, or to uncover the concealed, or to point the way to one who is lost or to carry a lamp in the darkness, thinking, 'Those who have eyes will see visible objects,' so has the Dhamma been set forth in many ways by the Blessed One. We, venerable sir, go to the Blessed One for refuge, to the Dhamma for refuge, and

to the Community of Bhikkhus for refuge. Venerable sir, may the Blessed One regard us as lay followers who have gone for refuge for life, from today."
And having gone for refuge, they now are taking it on conviction in someone else that there is a path, and a result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: "Buddhism" vs. "Buddhadharma"

Content:

dharmagoat said:

These two terms are used interchangeably by some, yet are given distinct meanings by others.

These days the term "Buddhadharma" seems to be reserved for the more historical interpretations of the Buddha's teaching, whereas the modern term "Buddhism" is applied to all interpretations, except perhaps the more unconventional ones.

To be a "Buddhist" means to be an adherent of "Buddhism". What exactly is "Buddhism", and how is it different from "Buddhadharma"?

In a changing world, how does "Buddhadharma" earn its special status?

Challenge23 said:

The impression I've gotten from reading people who use the term is that "Buddhadharma" is based upon a highly specific form of Buddhism that is literal and traditional. For example, a "Buddhist" might hear the story about Milarepa flying from point A to point B and think that it was a metaphor, an exaggeration, or any of the myriad interpretations that would end with, "Milarepa didn't really fly from point A to point B". However, someone who believes in "Buddhadharma" would believe that Milarepa did, in fact, fly from point A to point B and anyone who disagrees with them are ignorant.

It reminds me a great deal of the difference in Christianity between Christians and Born Again Christians.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case. What is the case is that when someone explicitly claims that rebirth, karma and so on are interpretable, when for the Buddha they were clearly ideas he took literally, that person has fallen into wrong view. They may even erect a whole "Buddhism" around this idea, but it will never be Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: "Buddhism" vs. "Buddhadharma"

Content:

Simon E. said:

But the heart of Buddhadharma remains experiential, as it has has been. Under the guidance of one who has walked that experiential path further than have we.

dharmagoat said:

We are actually in agreement... I think.

The thrust of my argument all along has been that the spirit of Buddhism (the Buddhadharma?) is by nature experiential, and not theoretical.

That the theory can be a source of obstacles.

Malcolm wrote:

No, theory is not an obstacle, the wrong theory is an obstacle. The eight fold path begins with correct view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: "Buddhism" vs. "Buddhadharma"

Content:

dharmagoat said:

While it is true that this discourse was addressed to the non-Buddhist Kalamas, it would be arrogant to assume that it doesn't apply to Buddhists too.

Malcolm wrote:

The Pabbakotthaka Sutta:

I have heard that on one occasion the Blessed One was staying in Savatthi, at the Eastern Gatehouse. There he addressed Ven. Shariputra: "Shariputra, do you take it on conviction that the faculty of conviction, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation? Do you take it on conviction that the faculty of persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation?"

"Lord, it's not that I take it on conviction in the Blessed One that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation. Those who have not known, seen, penetrated, realized, or attained it by means of discernment would have to take it on conviction in others that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation; whereas those who have known, seen, penetrated, realized, and attained it by means of discernment would have no doubt or uncertainty that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation. And as for me, I have known, seen, penetrated, realized, and attained it

by means of discernment. I have no doubt or uncertainty that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation."

"Excellent, Shariputra. Excellent. Those who have not known, seen, penetrated, realized, or attained it by means of discernment would have to take it on conviction in others that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation; whereas those who have known, seen, penetrated, realized, and attained it by means of discernment would have no doubt or uncertainty that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed and pursued, plunges into the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal and consummation."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Nun's ordination

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I'm no scholar, so I don't understand the importance of whether they will be considered as Mulasarvastivada Bhikṣunis by other schools. What is the significance of this? Why does it matter?

Are we likely to see ordination of nuns in this format taken up by the other schools?

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first point, as far as I know, these mixed Sangha ordinations are in themselves somewhat controversial to begin with.

As to your second question, I honestly don't know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Nun's ordination

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

In any case.... how much of a deal is it to the Tibetan schools whether or not they would be considered to have their vows coming from the Dharmaguptaka line or the Mulasarvastivadin line?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the school.

tellyontellyon said:

Do people here think their status as fully ordained nuns would be respected? From the

article I quoted above, the Karmapa seems to be saying that as the vows come mainly from the monks, even in the dual ordination, so they should be considered nuns in the Mulasarvastivadin line.

Malcolm wrote:

I think their vows will be respected, but I am not really sure they can be considered Mulasarvastivada Bhikṣunis. But, the Karmapa can do as he sees fit.

I think it nevertheless will be considered controversial. But controversy never prevented anyone from doing anything in Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: Nun's ordination

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

His Holiness points out that there have been nuns given ordination in Tibet, even though these isolated ordinations didn't end up with a bhikṣuni sangha being formed, so this a historical precedent for nuns being ordained by monks alone even in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

It is considered a broken ordination, even when it was performed, and was highly controversial. Such ordainees cannot themselves ordain novices in turn.

tellyontellyon said:

...so I don't think we just just rely on what has been done in the past.

Malcolm wrote:

The consensus has come down this: in order for there to be an order of nuns in Tibetan Buddhism, they must receive a living lineage from other nuns. Luckily, this still exists in Chinese Buddhism, in the Dharmaguptaka order. The main difficulty here is that these nuns are not and never will be Mulasarvastivadin nuns. But on the face of it, that is not what these women care about (i.e. which order into which they are ordained), they want to be bhikṣunis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Understanding a Passage from Chandrakirti

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I have a question about how Madhyamakavatara 6.36 is understood. It reads:
Reasonings prove that arising from self and other
Are illogical in suchness.

Since they also prove that arising is illogical conventionally,

On what basis do you speak of “arising”?

But if arising is refuted conventionally as well as ultimately, how should this be understood to avoid refuting dependent arisings on the level of appearances? I am particularly interested as to how this passage is understood outside of Gelug, especially according to the understanding of Gorampa.

I would like to note here before anything else that I'm not asking this as a polemic and I certainly don't want this to turn into a debate thread about whether Gorampa or anyone else is right or wrong. I'm just trying to grow in understanding here.

To me it seems that the text requires some kind of qualification, but I can't see how the text can really be qualified without doing serious violence to the plain meaning of the text.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Candra's own commentary on this passage, what is being refuted is arising through intrinsic characteristics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are a couple of minor deities included in the Yogini cycle for common siddhis.

WeiHan said:

You mean like for example those in the 13 Golden Dharmas, like Kurukulle from Hevajra etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

Similar.

WeiHan said:

Do you know if one has to be vegetarian if one practices Tara-Kurukulle (one of the 13 Golden Dharmas) since it is not a anutarayoga practice?

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is actually an anuttara practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

However, my doubt is that if even mundane siddhis can be easily attained thru this practice, then why does the Sakya need the other Golden Dharmas which bundled together with this practice in the well known "13 Golden Dharmas"? For example, since VY is effective gaining wealth, then do you still need a Red Jambala?

Yogini is a practice for excellent siddhi, the other deities in the 13 are mostly for common siddhis.

WeiHan said:

I saw this quote in your blog

Loppon Rinpoche said:

This alone is the extracted essence of all my Dharma cycles. Since that great Guru did not propagate this intimate instruction, he did not allow me to. It is very important that you emphasize this, practice it secretly, and you will obtain the supreme siddhi of mahāmudrā in this life, and also there is no doubt that whatever ordinary things you wish can be accomplished with the intimate instructions.

Doesn't it also brings "whatever ordinary things you wish" as the Gelug's teaching taught?

Malcolm wrote:

There are a couple of minor deities included in the Yogini cycle for common siddhis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tenzin Dorje said:

rtogs

Malcolm wrote:

rtogs pa - pratividdhā

rtogs pa - prativedha

rtogs pa - pratyavagama

rtogs pa - avagamana

rtogs pa - avabodha

rtogs pa - vijñāta

rtogs pa - veditvā

rtogs pa - upaparīkṣaṇā

rtogs pa - upaparīkṣā

rtogs pa - upalakṣyatva

rtogs pa - avabodha This is usually the term rtogs renders in order to communicate "realize."

Otherwise, comprehend is better here compare for example:

Sautrantikas present realizing consciousnesses and non-realizing consciousnesses. A wrong consciousness, such as the consciousness apprehending a blue snow mountain, would be a non-realizing consciousness. According to Tsongkhapa, all consciousnesses realize their appearing object. The reason is that we can remember an appearing object of a wrong consciousness, and if there was no realization in the 1st place, one wouldn't be able to remember having seen such and such.

against

Sautrantikas present comprehending consciousnesses and non-comprehending consciousnesses. A wrong consciousness, such as the consciousness apprehending a blue snow mountain, would be a non-comprehending consciousness. According to Tsongkhapa, all consciousnesses comprehend their appearing object. The reason is that we can remember an appearing object of a wrong consciousness, and if there was no comprehension in the 1st place, one wouldn't be able to remember having seen such and such.

Tenzin Dorje said:

Or I simply didn't get why you meant by 'existence'. Please, explain, because geluk usually posit the quality of being 'self sufficient substantially existent' as the coarse object of negation.

Malcolm wrote:

A self-sufficient substantial entity would be an inherent existence, from our POV. But Tsongkhapa argues that is not the basis of negation, instead it is the inherent existence which is different than existence. From our point of view, existence is the coarse object of negation, and that is what is negated in Madhyamaka analysis generally, it, non-existence, both and neither in that order, unless one is an ārya, then one can dispense with the turn by turn negation of the four extremes. The purpose of negating the third extreme is not made irrelevant because it is double negation, as Tsongkhapa argues, but simply because there are those such as Jains and so on who maintain that there are things that are both existence and non-existent.

Tenzin Dorje said:

Do you assert that a Buddha doesn't know all objects of knowledge ?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

While there are significant differences in the way the question of a Buddha's

omniscience is handled in Sakya and Gelug. I am not qualified to discuss it, having never studied it in any detail.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 30th, 2015 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

Sherlock said:

Vajrayogini was not one of Tsongkhapa's core practices.

Why do Gelugpas prefer it to his heart practices?

Malcolm wrote:

More to the point, Tsongkhapa rejected the whole exegetical foundation around which Yogini practice is elaborated, the ultimate secret category of mother tantras, called 'gsang mtha', based on the oral tradition of commenting on the intention of the Cakrasamvara Tantra that comes from Naropa exclusively through the Guru Abhayakirti (the elder Phaimthing) and through Mal Lotsawa and Sachen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: The Gelug/Kagyü Tradition Of Mahamudra

Content:

shazan said:

...is there something that I am missing?

Malcolm wrote:

Direct introduction?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

If it's better than gradual common Mahayana as recognised masters have acclaimed and 3 kalpas is the upper limit for the very best practitioner then what's left is that it's either easier and/or it takes a non-highest capacity practitioner less time to achieve the result but still adhering to the three kalpas time-frame. If someone is going to take 25 kalpas to reach buddhahood via the gradual method then non-gradual may take them 20 instead etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite honestly, until a complete and adequate translation of the relevant chapters are produced by someone, Nubchen's actual line of reasoning will remain opaque.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

Sherlock said:

ChNN agrees with Nubchen that ningradual Mahayana is superior.

Malcolm wrote:

Superior exactly how? In what way is it superior? If the view is the same, and the path is the same, what precisely is the superiority of Hashang's perspective to Kamalashila's perspective?

You can't just toss these things out there with no reasons to back them up, otherwise, I will have to suspect you of being a sock puppet of Link and Zelda, and that just does not seem possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

Sherlock said:

Claiming Chan is a wrong view is something later Tibetans came up with.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. The account of the defeat of Hashang comes from the Ba bshed, which is contemporary with Nubchen.

Even so, Nubchen argues that Mahāyoga is superior to Chan.

Also, their view was the same. They both had Madhyamaka views as far as I know.

Sherlock said:

Well, is it in the Ba shed fragment from Dunhuang? Ba shed was revised to make the account of Shantaraksita being detained seem less offensive from the version in Dunhuang, probably other things too.

Mahayoga is of course superior to sutra but Chan (at least 9th century Chan) is actually a superior mode of practice to Kamalashila's way even if their view of the ultimate was the same.

The gradual Mahayana path's meditation is pretty similar to Hinayana with the addition of bodhicitta motivation?

But in any case, non-Nyingmapas have maligned Hashang for centuries without really studying his view, this should stop.

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot really say that Hashang's method of practice is superior. Does Hashang's method mean that the three incalculable eons for practicing the bodhisattva path are not necessary or bypassed? If your answer is no, then how is it superior since the path in general is still gathering the gradual accumulations of merit and wisdom through the six perfections? It turns out to be a mere rhetorical superiority. If your answer is yes, than what is the use of Vajrayāna?

Gradual Mahāyāna is nothing like Hinayāna — why would you say such a thing? Have you never studied the Sutrālamkāra, Ratnavali, etc.?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tenzin Dorje said:

Still, to come back to our topic, Je Tsongkhapa asserts that a wrong consciousness realizes its own appearing object. For instance, ignorance realizes not inherent existence (because it is a non-existent and a non-existent can not be realized) but the appearance of inherent. The appearance of inherent existence is the appearing object of ignorance (a wrong consciousness and a conceptual consciousness). As to whether ignorance has a conceived object, it is not clear, but if it has so, it is a terminological division of 'conceived object' because it is non-existent.

According to Tsongkhapa, and that's where it becomes interesting, others schools (including Svatantrika-Madhyamikas) can not properly answer the question "what does ignorance realize ?" because it can not realize a non-existent such as inherent existence, where he answers "it realizes its own appearing object, the appearance of inherent existence". It is indeed Tsongkhapa's understanding that a unique tenet of Prasangika is that 'a wrong consciousness realizes its own appearing object, and is valid in regard to it'.

Malcolm wrote:

Not sure what Tibetan term you mean by "realize", so your point is rather obscure to me because of it.

Tenzin Dorje said:

In this way also, the omniscient mind of a Buddha directly realizes the appearance of

inherent existence that is in the continuum of sentient beings. This shows it directly realizes mental images that are the appearing objects of conceptual consciousnesses in the continuum of sentient beings. Now, as you pointed out, I don't know whether Prasangika apart from Tsongkhapa would hold this. I leave that up to you, and it'll make the 'debate' interesting

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the response is that sentient beings do not differentiate between existence and inherent existence. Because this is so, while it is true that Candrakīrti indeed identifies a subtle object of negation, inherent existence, the actual object of negation is the coarse object of negation, existence, because that is what sentient beings actually perceive and are actually deluded by.

Also, the problem with Tsongkhapa's hermeneutics here involve the fact that he is basically stating that while buddhas have no conceptual apprehension of their own, they apprehend the conceptual apprehensions of sentient beings, and that seems like a very strange position. The general position of Candrakīrti seems to be:

The peaceful kāya manifests like a wishfulfilling tree,
is nonconceptual like a wishfulfilling gem,

always existing for the benefit of the world until migrating beings are liberated,
this [kāya] appears free of proliferation

Meaning it is not necessary for buddhas to apprehend the concepts of sentient beings since they act effortlessly without concepts on the behalf of sentient beings like wishfulfilling gems and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The term parabhāva = dependent existence. The term pratīyasamutpāda = dependent origination.

Candra's definition of dependent origination, "...production through the meeting such and such an assembly of causes and conditions is what is called "dependent origination."

Sherab said:

I was expecting more than just definitions as a response to my request for you to elaborate on your objection.

My argument is really quite straightforward.

Assume in the simplest of case that B arise from A. The process of B arising from A is dependent origination. Because of B arising from A, the existence of B is a dependent existence.

What I am arguing here is that dependent existence is inextricably linked to dependent origination. Dependent existence has no meaning without dependent origination in the context of the discussion of my objection to infinitely regressive causal chain.

Continuing with the simple example of B arising from A:

(1) dependent existence per Nagarjuna - Inherent existent $S \rightarrow T \rightarrow U \rightarrow V \rightarrow W \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow A \rightarrow B$ (simple causal chain with an inherently existing S as the beginning)

(2) infinitely regressive dependent existence - <no beginning> $\rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow A \rightarrow B$ (simple causal chain without beginning)

Note that in causal chain (2) there is no inherent existence anywhere in the chain. That is why it is different from causal chain (1) which starts off with an inherent existence, or in your own words, an unconditioned cause.

As a reminder, I have no problem with dependent existence per Nagarjuna. I have problem with infinitely regressive dependent existence.

Unless existence in the tetralemma is defined to cover inherent existence, dependent existence per Nagarjuna AND dependent existence from a beginningless causal chain, there is no true freedom from extremes.

Nagarjuna's definition of existence excludes dependent existence from a beginningless causal chain and since you follow Nagarjuna's definition of existence, the extreme of dependent existence from a beginningless causal chain is not negated.

Did the Buddha negate the extreme of dependent existence from a beginningless causal chain? Yes. But you cannot do this with the tetralemma if the definition of existence excludes dependent existence from a beginningless causal chain.

Malcolm wrote:

You apparently choose to ignore Nāgārjuna's statement, "Where is there an existence not included in inherent existence or dependent existence (another species of inherent existence)."

The process of b arising from a is not dependent origination. There are no single causes in the chain of dependent origination, which is why dependent existence is rejected by Nāgārjuna as species of inherent existence. Dependent origination means arising from a combination of causes and conditions. For example, a sprout arises not merely from a seed, but from soil, moisture, warmth and so on.

The point is that Nāgārjuna is rejecting dependent existence in favor of dependent origination. I really do not see why it is so hard for you to understand this. Since we are just going around in circles, I am going to stop this here. I won't respond to this thread anymore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

WeiHan said:

For example, In the Sakya's teaching, disciple was chided for blaming the efficacy of the mantra while it is their own fault for not concentrating well during the mantra recitation.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is must be the case.

WeiHan said:

On the contrary, in the Gelug teachings, it promises that even reciting the mantra with weak concentration will bring results and it is the only mantra that has this advantage in this degenerate age.

Malcolm wrote:

The root tantra states that reciting the mantra of the Vajra Queen has certain efficacies, but no where does it say that one may do so with distraction.

WeiHan said:

The Gelug teaching also make comparison with other tantra and practices so as to illustrate the supremacy of this practice while the Sakya teaching do not...

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this is not true.

WeiHan said:

However, my doubt is that if even mundane siddhis can be easily attained thru this practice, then why does the Sakya need the other Golden Dharmas which bundled together with this practice in the well known "13 Golden Dharmas"? For example, since VY is effective gaining wealth, then do you still need a Red Jambala?

Malcolm wrote:

Yogini is a practice for excellent siddhi, the other deities in the 13 are mostly for common siddhis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tenzin Dorje said:

(Again, what I say is exclusively Prasangika, it's a unique tenet of the Middle Way Consequence school)

Malcolm wrote:

Correction, it is a unique tenet of Tsongkhapa's interpretation of Prasangika.

Since Garamapa lists more than 150 points of contention with Tsongkhapa's presentation of Prasangika Madhyamaka, it is really much better if you qualify your presentation with Tsongkhapa's interpretation since many of his unique interpretations are unknown to Indians as well as Tibetans. I understand that devotees of Tsongkhapa consider this to be a feature, whereas detractors of Tsongkhapa consider these innovations to be bugs in his view.

I myself am not expert enough in Tsongkhapa's writings to say much about them with certainty, but in general, I have personally found Garamapa's criticisms of Tsongkhapa's views regarding sūtra and tantra well founded. On the other hand, I generally accept Tsongkhapa's criticisms of Jonang view as having merit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 12:30 PM

Title: Re: Nun's ordination

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, it just does not work like that. The Mukasarvastivada bhikshuni ordination is dead and cannot be revived.

Indrajala said:

Their loss then. They have access to scriptures which are supposed to be buddhavacana and would resolve the issue at hand immediately, but then maybe that's too easy a solution for a debate stretching back centuries, as it would make the parties concerned look bad.

Malcolm wrote:

In genral, tibetan vinayadharas are quite resistant to mixing amd matching vinayas.

Tnere simply is no precedent for such a revival in the Mulasarvastivada literature. This is why the Karmapa is having nuns ordained according to the Dharmaguptaka lineage.

Fortunately the Karmapa is satisfied it is intact and valid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 12:21 PM

Title: Re: Nun's ordination

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such text in the Mulasarvastivada Vinaya. If there were, the question of

ordaining bhikshunis would not be an issue and the Tibetans would have restored the bhikshuni ordination six hundred years ago or more.

Indrajala said:

In today's world where Tibetans have access to Indian literature not included in the Tibetan canon, perhaps they can refer to such texts in their discussions and easily resolve their dilemma.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, it just does not work like that. The Mukasarvastivada bhikshuni ordination is dead and cannot be revived.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 12:13 PM

Title: Re: Nun's ordination

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No. Otherwise Tibetans would have done this long ago.

Indrajala said:

I don't know if the following scripture is available in Tibetan, but it does state the following:

《大愛道比丘尼經》：「阿難復問佛言：『便當令比丘作[比丘尼]師耶？』佛言：『不也。當令大比丘尼作師。若無比丘尼者，比丘僧可。』」

Mahāprajāpatī Bhikṣuṇi Sūtra: "Ānanda further asked the Buddha, 'Is it then permissible for a bhikṣu to act as a master [to a bhikṣuṇī]?' The Buddha said, 'No. It should be that a great bhikṣuṇī acts as master. If there are no bhikṣuṇīs, then the bhikṣu sangha is permitted [to carry out the ordination].'"

Elsewhere in the Chinese canon the following convention is established:

《沙彌尼離戒文》：「佛告諸弟子：汝慎莫妄度沙彌離，女人姿態難保悅，在須臾以復更生惡意，……自非菩薩、阿羅漢，不可度尼。」

Sūtra on Śrāmaṇerī Precepts (沙彌尼離戒文): "The Buddha spoke to the disciples, 'You must be careful not to carelessly ordain śrāmaṇerī -s. It is difficult to guard against delighting in a woman's charming presence. In a moment one will further produce unwholesome thoughts. ... If one is not a bodhisattva or arhat, ordination of nuns may not be carried out.'"

Thus it is understood in the absence of any living lineage of bhikṣuṇīs, a bhikṣu has the right to ordain new bhikṣuṇīs, but the presiding preceptor should be a bodhisattva or arhat.

I believe a similar understanding exists in Theravada, which legitimized Ajahn Brahm's decision to ordain bhikkunis despite protests from the Thai sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such text in the Mulasarvastivada Vinaya. If there were, the question of ordaining bhikshunis would not be an issue and the Tibetans would have restored the bhikshuni ordination six hundred years ago or more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 10:56 AM

Title: Re: Nun's ordination

Content:

yan kong said:

Nuns lineage? Did they not revive the Theravadin nuns ordination in Sri Lanka?

Indrajala said:

In the absence of any living lineage of bhikṣuṇīs, a bhikṣu has the right to ordain new bhikṣuṇīs.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Otherwise Tibetans would have done this long ago. This issue has been under discussion since at least the 15th century among Tibetans, and the general consensus has been there is no way to revive the Mulasarvastivada bhikshuni vows.

For example Gorampa Sonam Senge addresses this issue in his sdom gsum kha skong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Since these appearances are inseparable from emptiness and are ultimate truths, and they have a non-conceptual realisation of ultimate truth, they also have a non-conceptual realisation of appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

Changing appearances are ultimate truths? Since when?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

Sherlock said:

Still, it seems some memory of his claim that Hashang Mahayana's view was fine seemed to have survived among Nyingmapas. Even Jigme Lingpa doesn't say that Hashang's view is wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

Much of Nubchen's texts was incorporated into the Kathang De nga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: Hashang's view is higher than Kamalashila

Content:

Sherlock said:

Claiming Chan is a wrong view is something later Tibetans came up with.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. The account of the defeat of Hashang comes from the Ba bshed, which is contemporary with Nubchen.

Even so, Nubchen argues that Mahāyoga is superior to Chan.

Also, their view was the same. They both had Madhyamaka views as far as I know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: Nun's ordination

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

The Karmapa has indicated that he is going to start the process of giving nuns full ordination:

<http://kagyuoffice.org/gyalwang-karmapa-makes-historic-announcement-on-restoring-nuns-ordination/>

This is a link to the thread in the Kagyu forum:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=50&t=18685&p=269756&hilit=nuns+ordination#p269756>

My question is about how this discussion is developing across the other schools of Tibetan Buddhism. Although the Karmapa is taking a lead on this issue, it is not only a Kagyu issue and relates to all schools of Tibetan Buddhism?

Does anybody have any news or feedback about this issue?

I myself am looking forward to the full ordination being available to all nuns in the Tibetan traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the problem is that they will not be Mulasarvastivadin bhikṣunis, since that ordination never even reached Tibet and died out in India. They will be Dharmaguptaka bhikṣunis, which is not our tradition. It is fine, but we have to be clear what is actually happening. We will have an odd situation where bhikṣus will be ordained according to one Vinaya, and bhikṣunis according to another.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Xuanzang and Kuiji on Madhyamaka

Content:

Will said:

Lusthaus paper:

https://www.academia.edu/11698064/Xuanzang_and_Kuiji_on_Madhyamaka

Malcolm wrote:

The last sentence of the paper states:

In comparison to Mādhyamikans, Yogācāras are realists.
30+ pages to tell us what we already know!!!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Perhaps I was not clear, what I am asking is, what does 'meeting' mean here?

Malcolm wrote:

"Meeting" means "come together."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Candra's definition of dependent origination, "...production through the meeting such and such an assembly of causes and conditions is what is called "dependent

origination."

dzogchungpa said:

I haven't been following this discussion, and maybe I am showing my obtuseness, but what does it mean for an assembly of causes and conditions to "meet"?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that such a meeting produces an effect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

You said "Any dependent existence is an inherent existence. No matter how far back in time one imagines, at the start there will be an unconditioned cause." I took this to mean that there is a beginning to a casual chain (even though it is just an appearance). But you are now saying that there is no beginning to a causal chain. So which is your position?

If a logical fallacy such as infinite regression applies to secular reasoning and does not apply to reasoning involving the Buddha Dharma, how can there be any certainty that the Dharma is correct (other than direct experience)?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the case of dependent existence, not in the case of dependent origination. My position has been the same all along, which is why, if you examine, I rejected your two typologies of dependent existence. The term dependent existence itself is the problem. This is why I rejected your assertion that dependent origination was a type of dependent existence.

Sherab said:

Please elaborate so that I can understand your objection.

Malcolm wrote:

The term parabhāva = dependent existence. The term pratītyasamutpāda = dependent origination.

Candra's definition of dependent origination, "...production through the meeting such and such an assembly of causes and conditions is what is called "dependent origination."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One point — you might have to abandon the atomist framework of western science in order to discover other rational means of investigation.

Challenge23 said:

In regards to other rational means of investigation, are you referring to any type of method involving internal inquiry?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I was referring to using other frameworks to understand the nature of matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Astus said:

My orientation towards the topic of supernatural powers is materialist because the idea that they manifest within the material realm requires that. Natural science is what analyses matter, so physical phenomena falls within that area of study.

Malcolm wrote:

It follows then that since rebirth is manifests in the material realm, you therefore must also come up with an explanation for it according to natural science.

Astus said:

Rebirth is the continuation of the mind-stream, and since mind is non-physical it is out of scope for material investigation.

Malcolm wrote:

The mind clearly interacts with matter every time rebirth occurs. How is this possible? How can a nonmaterial entity interact with a material one? What sound reason can you possibly have for rejecting all paranormal phenomena apart from the one that is the most paranormal of all, i.e., a nonphysical entity [a mind] appropriating physical matter [a body].

Surely you must admit that if the mind, a nonphysical entity according to you, can appropriate matter, such as a body and make obvious changes to it, it ought to also be able to make changes to other phenomena by paranormal means and be capable of other paranormal capabilities such as the ability to know other minds (other phenomena of a similar kind).

So why do you hold onto the belief that non-physical entities can supernaturally interact with physical matter in the case of rebirth, and yet reject all other kinds of

"supernatural powers" of the mind where the mind interacts with or influences physical matter?

If you state it is because the Buddha taught rebirth in the sūtras, well, the Buddha also taught the abhiññās and the iddhi-pāṭis as well. Why accept a literal interpretation of a supernatural feat [rebirth] explained by the Buddha in one place, and yet reject all other literal interpretations of supernatural feats explained by the Buddha. If you want irrational, your POV is the most irrational of all. And you have no other basis for accepting rebirth other than the fact that it was taught by the Buddha. You certainly do not accept rebirth because you have recall of your past lives, Astus — or do you?

Astus said:

And for more than a hundred years experts of material sciences were unable to find any sound basis for supernormal powers, and not one person could actually https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_prizes_for_evidence_of_the_paranormal anything paranormal so far, I cannot see any basis for accepting such claims.

Malcolm wrote:

Did it ever occur to you they were examining the wrong people? So far your arguments amount to the same thing as the proverbial frog in the well.

Astus said:

It is another matter that even if there were such powers they would have nothing to do with the path of liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not true they have nothing to do with the path of liberation — on the bodhisattva path their cultivation is considered indispensable.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

As far as I am concerned, other than teachings pointing to the inexpressible, all teachings are provisional with a pragmatic objective. So we get words like unconditioned, unmade, unborn etc., being used provisionally because actual descriptors are not available in our language. I would argue that words like beginningless are similarly provisional.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously, Sherab? That is an extremely lame answer: "It is not about emptiness so therefore I can dispense with it as I see fit, even if it means accepting a first cause in contradiction to every principle indicated by the Buddha's teaching of dependent

origination."

Your argument is not only unreasonable, it is not even grounded in the texts. It seems you have forgotten the dictum that the ultimate is to be understood on the basis of the conventional truth, in order that nirvana may be realized.

So, I leave you here to your rampant proliferation and hope that someone, somewhere, some day can penetrate that formidably hard carapace in which your brain is trapped with no means of escape.

Sherab said:

You said "Any dependent existence is an inherent existence. No matter how far back in time one imagines, at the start there will be an unconditioned cause." I took this to mean that there is a beginning to a casual chain (even though it is just an appearance). But you are now saying that there is no beginning to a causal chain. So which is your position?

If a logical fallacy such as infinite regression applies to secular reasoning and does not apply to reasoning involving the Buddha Dharma, how can there be any certainty that the Dharma is correct (other than direct experience)?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the case of dependent existence, not in the case of dependent origination. My position has been the same all along, which is why, if you examine, I rejected your two typologies of dependent existence. The term dependent existence itself is the problem. This is why I rejected your assertion that dependent origination was a type of dependent existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Gyurme Kundrol said:

If you show it off you attract people who just want to take it from you. In the same way, showing off Siddhi is likely to attract so called "students" who just want power.

Astus said:

It seems we should all feel sorry for film stars, celebrities, politicians, business people, bankers, and in general the rich and powerful.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh indeed, they have the unique suffering of having to defend their wealth, power and position.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Both you and Astus thus far have demonstrated only that you are basically materialists in your orientation towards these questions.

Astus said:

Isn't it you who claim that powers are physical phenomena, like in Harry Potter and Lord of the Rings? How is it anti-Dharma to ask for physical evidence then? And you call it materialism if I say that such powers are not physical manifestations, therefore cannot be observed in any ordinary, natural or scientific way, but rather spiritual. Is the reference to mental phenomena a materialist view?

Malcolm wrote:

I told you where you can find evidence of these things Astus. If you don't want to make the effort to travel to places where there are siddhas, what can I say?

As to your contention that these things are merely mental experiences, well, that does not save you from my charge that your orientation towards these questions is basically materialist. I am surprised in fact that you still accept literal rebirth, or is rebirth just another "spiritual experience", like recall of past lives, knowing the minds of others, seeing into deva realms and so on and so forth?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

WeiHan said:

Base on the above, that LTKP do not believe that enlightenment is without any conceptualisation...

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa never issues a retort to Gorampa since the latter was born ten years after the former passed away.

In that respect, Tsongkhapa must have found this hard to understand — The Buddhāvataṃśka Sūtra states:

The buddhas do not engage in thought;
though they have no concept about teaching,
through blessings they appear to teach.

Or the Śraddhā-balādhānāvātāra-mudrā Sūtra:

Mañjuśrī, likewise, in order for the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksambuddha to fully ripen sentient beings, he produces infinite deeds at the same time in all the infinite worlds in the ten directions, but while the tathāgata indeed is without thoughts and is without concepts, nevertheless, because he possesses such unmixed qualities there is no impediment to displaying such effortless deeds

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which rational means did you have in mind? Define "rational means."

dharmagoat said:

Looking for evidence in one's own experience, looking for evidence in the wider world, considering its plausibility empirically.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you really only have two options:

- a) mind is based on matter
- b) mind is not based on matter

If a) is true, there should be evidence to prove that matter produces consciousness.

If b) is true, one will never find evidence to prove a no matter how hard one tries.

Now then, the Buddha clearly divides all of reality, material and mental, into six major divisions called dhātus, earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness. Outside of these six things there is nothing else. All phenomena are composed of some mixture of these six entities. All insentient phenomena are composed of the five elements; all sentient phenomena also include consciousness as part their make up.

Now, in terms of personal experience, there is only one way you can confirm rebirth for yourself that is through developing the abhijñā of recalling past lives and the abhijñā of being able to know the minds of others. Failing the development of these two skills in meditation, one is left with inferences.

The materialist, yes Carvaka, perspective, is to reject inference as a valid form of knowledge, as well as testimony of reliable witnesses.

There is no further point to this discussion. Either you develop these abilities through meditation or you accept rebirth in the third valid form of knowledge accepted by the Buddha, testimony of reliable witnesses. Both you and Astus thus far have demonstrated only that you are basically materialists in your orientation towards these questions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who says Buddhadharma demands belief in phenomena that defy investigation? What kind of investigation are we talking about here?

dharmagoat said:

From the point of view of someone with one foot in Bodhidharma and one foot out, the phenomenon of rebirth is extremely elusive, defying attempts to investigate it by rational means.

Malcolm wrote:

Which rational means did you have in mind? Define "rational means."

One point — you might have to abandon the atomist framework of western science in order to discover other rational means of investigation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I thought that was the great mystery, the hard problem within all traditions of human thought.

Malcolm wrote:

It may be a great mystery in the West, it is not such a great mystery at all in Buddhadharma.

dharmagoat said:

I would say that this is why Buddhadharma attracts the interest of so many scientifically minded people. It prescribes a course of investigation that purports to solve the mystery of mind, while at the same time demanding belief in phenomena that defy investigation. There is a catch.

Malcolm wrote:

Who says Buddhadharma demands belief in phenomena that defy investigation? What kind of investigation are we talking about here?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Jikan said:

I would like to be convinced that later Tibetan Madhyamika does not do this. Can anyone here help me out?

Malcolm wrote:

Later Tibetan Madhyamaka introduces a whole set of concerns never imagined by Indians. The school that most closely adheres to the traditional Indian tradition in Madhyamaka studies is Sakya following Rongton and Gorampa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I resist that degree of certainty. Consciousness cannot be understood, let alone reduced to a physical phenomenon.

Malcolm wrote:

If you think consciousness cannot be understood, why bother even trying to discuss such issues? You are wasting your time and mine.

dharmagoat said:

You understand consciousness?

I thought that was the great mystery, the hard problem within all traditions of human thought.

Malcolm wrote:

It may be a great mystery in the West, it is not such a great mystery at all in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I resist that degree of certainty. Consciousness cannot be understood, let alone reduced to a physical phenomenon.

Malcolm wrote:

If you think consciousness cannot be understood, why bother even trying to discuss such issues? You are wasting your time and mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

As far as I am concerned, other than teachings pointing to the inexpressible, all teachings are provisional with a pragmatic objective. So we get words like unconditioned, unmade, unborn etc., being used provisionally because actual descriptors are not available in our language. I would argue that words like beginningless are similarly provisional.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously, Sherab? That is an extremely lame answer: "It is not about emptiness so therefore I can dispense with it as I see fit, even if it means accepting a first cause in contradiction to every principle indicated by the Buddha's teaching of dependent origination."

Your argument is not only unreasonable, it is not even grounded in the texts. It seems you have forgotten the dictum that the ultimate is to be understood on the basis of the conventional truth, in order that nirvana may be realized.

So, I leave you here to your rampant proliferation and hope that someone, somewhere, some day can penetrate that formidably hard carapace in which your brain is trapped with no means of escape.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Astus said:

Still, no living weather controllers or others to show yet.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there are, the TGIE always has a weather controller on staff, I simply don't know his name. If you go to Tibet and look for some ngakpas, I am sure you will find someone who will satisfy your curiosity.

Khetsun Zangpo, though recently deceased, was also employed in this capacity by the Tibetan Govt. in Tibet between 1955 and 1959. Apparently, his abilities are well documented in Tibetan.

But you are just an armchair skeptic, lazily waiting from someone to show you a video you can scoff at.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Sherlock said:

The main point of Carvaka is not caring about rebirth.

dharmagoat said:

False. Read some stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

It is one of the leading arguments of this school.

They held that all of existence can be reduced to the four elements of air, water, fire and earth. All things come into existence through a mixture of these elements and will perish with their separation. Perhaps the most philosophically sophisticated position of Indian Materialism is the assertion that even human consciousness is a material construct. According to K. K. Mittal, the ontology of the Lokāyata is strictly set forth as follows:

1) Our observation does not bring forth any instance of a disincarnate consciousness. For the manifestation of life and consciousness, body is an inalienable factor.

2) That body is the substratum of consciousness can be seen in the undoubted fact of the arising of sensation and perception only in so far as they are conditioned by the bodily mechanism.

3) The medicinal science by prescribing that certain foods and drinks (such as Brāhmighrta) have the properties conducive to the intellectual powers affords another proof and evidence of the relation of consciousness with body and the material ingredients (of food). (Mittal 47)

Just exactly how is your point of view different than the above?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Astus said:

What you cited were stories of two deceased people

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently you don't read well, I cited twice one master who had this capacity, someone I knew personally, someone who I watched die, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

It does follow if from the Buddha's perspective there are infinite regressions and he cannot explain their existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite the contrary, he does:

Where this exists, that exists, with the arising of that, this arose.

Sherab said:

What I am arguing here is that for someone to think that infinite regression is acceptable, then he must be assuming that it is also acceptable to the Buddha. If so, then for such a person, he can no longer argue for an omniscient Buddha.

I don't accept infinite regression and I don't think that for a fully enlightened Buddha there is such a thing as linear infinitely regressive phenomena. So for me, I can still argue for an omniscient Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Your argument is senseless and supposes that the Buddha argues for first causes, which he explicitly rejects. This is why we frequently see such statements by the Buddha as "beginningless samsara" and "samsara without a beginning." According to you, when the Buddha makes such statements he is lying or by making such statements, he is proving he is not omniscient.

For example, the Ārya-saddharmasmṛtyupasthāna Sūtra states:

In beginningless samsara,
recall the result of positive deeds is happiness,
the result of negative deeds
is likewise suffering,
arising like causes and results,
but do not engaged in false thinking.

Whatever is made by a past cause,
likewise it's result will be obtained.

You directly contradict the teaching of the Buddha by rejecting infinite regression of causes because of your conflation of the unsuitability of infinite regress in logical argumentation with the fact that any series of conditioned causes and effects must be beginningless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Sherlock said:

You find it hard to accept rebirth because you find a materialist conception of consciousness more convincing than the Buddhist account, no?

dharmagoat said:

Equally convincing, hence the dilemma.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not equally convincing at all. Since you don't seem to understand the Buddhist objections, might I suggest you read Nagel's take down of physicalism? Your assignment is to read *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False*

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

What's your take on Ud 8.3 where the Buddha said that because there is the unmade, freedom from the made is possible.

Malcolm wrote:

The fourth seal is "Nirvana is peaceful."

This just means that cessation (absence of causes) is possible. There are only four unconditioned phenomena recognized in Mahāyāna Buddhism — space, the two cessations and emptiness.

Sherab said:

I can accept that space is a phenomenon but space as understood in Buddhism seemed very simplistic compared to space as understood in modern science, assuming it can be understood at all.

However, I find it hard to think of cessation and emptiness as phenomena. If you say the state of cessation or the state of emptiness, then yes, I would think the label phenomena makes sense especially if the adjective unconditioned is to be applied.

Malcolm wrote:

Here, the term dharma [phenomena] means bearer of characteristics. That is all a "phenomenon" is. The term "phenomena" for "dharma" is very inadequate, but it is what we have.

Space and the two cessations, as well as emptiness, all are known through their characteristics.

Space is simply the absence of obstruction, and of the two cessations, the first is nirvana, cessation due to insight. The second cessation is simple absence of a cause for arising.

These three things make up the classic trio of unconditioned dharmas [there is also a kind of conditioned space, which is defined as a cavity. But that is not what is being discussed here].

Quite honestly, you need to familiarize yourself with how these things are defined in Abhidharma if you ever hope to understand them in a Mahāyāna context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

Actually, this would mean that the Buddha can never claim omniscience because there is always something beyond his range.

Malcolm wrote:

Your last statement does not follow. Merely because you cannot fathom this kind of acceptable infinite regression does not necessarily entail that it is beyond the comprehension of a Buddha's omniscience. Buddhas are omniscient about the three times, there is no limitation on it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

My suggestion to you is that you get up off your ass, go to Tibet and meet a weather controller, since they still exist there.

dharmagoat said:

And while you are there, invite along some unbiased and reliable witnesses and record a video so that the rest of us can assess it for ourselves. Seriously.

Malcolm wrote:

I have already seen, I don't need to go. As I pointed out, my teacher was employed in Dharmashala for many years as one of the official weathermakers for the TGIE. He was

famous for this, well known in the Tibetan community, personally employed for this function by HHDL before he left Dharmashala in the mid '80's for health reasons. He was regularly hired by local farmers in India to make the weather go their way, and even staved off a drought in southern California in the late '80's where he was hired by a friend of mine who owned some Avocado orchards.

But the real point is that you and Astus have turned western conventional truths into ultimate truths by asserting that what you take to be laws of physics and so on to be immutable.

I doubt even if you saw someone control the weather that you could actually see it, recorded or otherwise, similar to a preta being unable to see the liquid in a glass as water.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

Sure, but it is possible that while achieving buddhahood without receiving Buddha Dharma is nearly impossible, there is still the possibility that out of a gazillion beings subjected to gazillion causes and conditions, over a gazillion kalpas, there could be that one being where all the causes and conditions are perfectly aligned at one moment in time for that being to achieve buddhahood truly all by itself. This is just simply the law of statistics.

Malcolm wrote:

No, such a person would be a pratyekabuddha since they will not have gathered the accumulations necessary for full buddhahood, and second, in order to become a fully awakened buddha, one must have generated supreme bodhicitta, there is no other way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, if this were the case the path would be suffering because it is impermanent.

What the first seal states is: "whatever is conditioned is impermanent." The second seal states: "whatever is contaminated is suffering."

Just because the citta moments are impermanent does not entail they are contaminated.

Sherab said:

What's your take on Ud 8.3 where the Buddha said that because there is the unmade, freedom from the made is possible.

Malcolm wrote:

The fourth seal is "Nirvana is peaceful."

This just means that cessation (absence of causes) is possible. There are only four unconditioned phenomena recognized in Mahāyāna Buddhism — space, the two cessations and emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is because you are blind to it. I already pointed out to twice a master who definitely exhibited the ability control the weather. At this point, I have to concluded you are just too locked into the "scientific" worldview to be open to any such experiences.

Astus said:

What you cited were stories of two deceased people who have supposedly had the ability to change the weather. Stories like that and even more fantastic we have a lot from all over the world. For instance, canonised Catholic saints have performed various miracles, and there are thousands of them, including many from the 20th century. And while in all practical matters the veracity of such stories are at least irrelevant and not much different from superhero films, if someone claims for whatever reason that powers like levitation and weather changing exist, it is not a strong argument to say that only those with faith can perceive supernormal events. Although saying that actually fits what we briefly discussed with Anders here that experiences of siddhis are a matter of mind set, and that matches what I have said from the beginning that powers are not physical but spiritual. Similarly, if I were to argue that there are pegasi, I would have to provide some evidence for that, and excusing the lack of proof would not make my argument any stronger, even if I called unbelievers materialists.

Malcolm wrote:

My suggestion to you is that you get up off your ass, go to Tibet and meet a weather controller, since they still exist there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

Explain how tathagatas can be an infinite regression.

Malcolm wrote:

Every tathāgata must have a predecessor from whom they receive a prediction and in front of whom they generate bodhicitta.

Sherab said:

Presumably, Nagarjuna does not know about how Samantabhadra Buddha became a Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Also Samantabhadra was once an ordinary sentient being, believe it or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you do not give rise to faith in the Buddha's teachings, your bodhicitta will never have a chance to develop. As the Avatamska says, faith in the mother of all good qualities. Faithlessness is negative mental factor. You should examine this.

dharmagoat said:

Thanks Malcolm.

Indeed I do. The odd thing is that I did once have faith, but upon examining that faith I came to the conclusion that much of it was delusion.

Malcolm wrote:

You should understand that all that matters is what is conducive to your path. If accepting rebirth is conducive to your path, accept it, and don't look back, spend time rationalizing, obsessing mind/brain relations and so on.

What should matter most to a bodhisattva is attaining Buddhahood, the rest is just a distraction or an obstacle.

You should discard faithlessness as you would avoid poisonous food.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

Explain how tathagatas can be an infinite regression.

Malcolm wrote:

Every tathāgata must have a predecessor from whom they receive a prediction and in

front of whom they generate bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When the obscuration of affliction and knowledge are eliminated, falling back into samsara is impossible because the stream of cittas is not longer adventitiously contaminated, so how could it become contaminated again? But the Buddha has assured us that liberation is a permanent state of affairs. Your objection was actually a non-sequitor.

Sherab said:

That which is impermanent is suffering. What is a citta that is not impermanent?

Malcolm wrote:

No, if this were the case the path would be suffering because it is impermanent.

What the first seal states is: "whatever is conditioned is impermanent." The second seal states: "whatever is contaminated is suffering."

Just because the citta moments are impermanent does not entail they are contaminated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/mar/25/iceland-construction-respect-elves-or-else?CMP=fb_gu

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I didn't quite say that I could "freely express bodhicitta". Instead, I was reserving the possibility that the compassion experienced by people such as myself was genuine bodhicitta. But, as you point out, if the aspiration to endure over many lifetimes for the benefit of beings is missing, then it is not the bodhicitta of the bodhisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

Patrul Rinpoche states: It is usual for tears to flow from one's eyes now and again because of biased good will and compassion.

Even though a fool reifies this as bodhicitta, such things are never supreme bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I don't think anyone 'wants' to be a bodhisattva, it simply presents itself as a way of life to those that have the inclination to follow it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and no. There are two kinds "inclination" as you call it — natural and developed. Everyone has the former, but in order to possess the later, one must formally enter the Mahāyāna path. The way to do that is to receive the bodhisattva vows.

dharmagoat said:

I know I have the inclination, but I feel my way has become blocked. I can't believe what I don't believe.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an obstacle well described in Mahāyāna teachings. As Sakya Pandita states:

Bodhicitta is damaged when one is ignorant of the qualities of the buddhas and bodhisattvas, and makes no effort to seek out such qualities for oneself. The antidote for those is cultivating devotion, enthusiasm and so on as much as possible.

If you do not give rise to faith in the Buddha's teachings, your bodhicitta will never have a chance to develop. As the Avatamska says, faith is the mother of all good qualities. Faithlessness is negative mental factor. You should examine this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 7:27 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Anders said:

I must admit, I find this 'my compassion is better than your compassion' distasteful. It may be 'correct', but the spirit of the topic feels somewhat violated at this point.

Malcolm wrote:

But Anders, there are grades of compassion discussed in Mahāyāna Sūtras: compassion towards persons, compassion towards phenomena and limitless compassion [which indeed is the sole province of bodhisattvas on the stages].

Moreover, Dharmakīrti clearly enunciates the principle that compassion itself does not have the power to bring about liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Astus said:

Buddhism today can spread because it promises help with mental problems like stress and such, not because people are interested in the true nature of reality and similar abstract issues. So, if there were actually supernormal powers that people could learn, it would definitely be a big thing. But it's just not happening.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because you are blind to it. I already pointed out to twice a master who definitely exhibited the ability control the weather. At this point, I have to concluded you are just too locked into the "scientific" worldview to be open to any such experiences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

Can it be clarified what the three humors are? I was always under the impression that illness comes from having harmed others.

Malcolm wrote:

Wind, bile and phlegm, or to give their proper Sanskrit names, vata, pitta and kapha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Dharma, illnesses arise from the three humors, which in turn arise from the three afflictions, which in turn arises from the innate grasping to self.

Luke said:

If this is true, then why did the 16th Karmapa die of cancer? Surely he did not suffer from the three afflictions or from innate grasping for a self!

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Abhidanottara Tantra:

...to some he appears to have gone to great awakening,
to others, victorious over the enemy Māras,
to some, he has the nature of a child,
to others, old and infirm,
to some as ill and dying,
to some he appears as Buddha Vairocana,
to others as Tāra, Pandaravaśinī and so on...
He tames migrating beings having displayed
such emanations as these.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 27th, 2015 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Karmapa awarded honorary PhD

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

With any luck he'll be able to assist in the finding of HHDL XV and pass the torch back as soon as possible.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? HHDL has indicated that he is the last.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and evolution

Content:

Aemilius said:

The Lotus Sutra exists, and it has been taught, in the context of the buddhist view of existence. Thus in modern times you easily read into it meanings that did not exist there originally.

dharmagoat said:

I think it is fair to say that the misogyny did exist there originally. We frequently encounter passages in the Buddhist canon that are disparaging of women.

Malcolm wrote:

Oddly enough, the purpose of such passages is to appeal to women sick of living in patriarchal cultures. The actual point of such passages is to say to women, "If you aspire to be born here, when you are born here you will no longer suffer any gender discrimination because indeed there won't be any."

In reality, these sūtras appealed very widely to women. It is only a modern judgement that they are misogynistic, arising from not understanding the culture in which such sentiments were being expressed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When the obscuration of affliction and knowledge are eliminated, falling back into samsara is impossible because the stream of cittas is not longer adventitiously contaminated, so how could it become contaminated again? But the Buddha has assured us that liberation is a permanent state of affairs. Your objection was actually a non-sequitor.

The reason there is an infinite chain of cittas is that cittas are relative and conditioned, each one is an effect as well as a cause. In this case the infinite regression is a reasonable inference, just as Nāgārjuna specifically allows that an infinite regression of tathāgatas in the past is also reasonable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Thank you for taking the time to write this, Malcolm. It has helped to make your position clearer to me. While I still feel that it is a somewhat stiff and inflexible view... It is more like an XML scheme. An XML schema that does not work is automatically not an XML schema.

I am willing to accept that it is one built on sound logic.

It is built on knowledge of the Dharma. But thanks.

I acknowledge that what I endorse can not rightly be called "Buddhadharma", or even "Buddhism", but I am hopeful that it can still bring benefit to those that have no choice but to adjust the traditional teachings to fit their own specific needs, without compromising the source from which it came.

Malcolm wrote:

The traditional teachings can't be adjusted. Core concepts like rebirth, dependent origination, karma, samsara, liberation are all essential and interrelated concepts which are vital for the very identity of Buddhadharma as a set body of practice and belief.

People can try to adapt the teachings to their life however they see fit, however, this approach, unfortunately, does not go beyond spiritual materialism.

The teaching best suited for people who cannot accept Buddhadharma is the teaching of the four brahma-viharas, described in the Kalamas sutta among other places. Here, Buddha does not pretend that the four brahma-viharas are a path of liberation, but recommends their cultivation to everyone whether they accept rebirth or not. This however is not Buddhadharma per se because the four brahma-viharas are common to all Indian religions and not the sole province of Buddhadharma. In fact the four brahma-viharas are termed "the vehicle of gods and men" precisely because they only assure higher rebirth in samsara and or happiness and contentment in this lifetime.

But let us not confuse the cultivation of such compassion and love in the four brahma-viharas with bodhicitta. They are not the same thing. While the latter indeed does depend on the former, without the sincere wish to attain full buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings and the career that entails, the former will never become the latter. Bodhicitta, the wish to become a buddha for the benefit of all sentient beings, is the defining feature of the bodhisattva path, just as emptiness is the defining doctrine of Mahāyāna.

So are the brahma-viharas and śamatha meditation beneficial for everyone, no matter what they believe? Yes, very much so. Should this be called "Buddhism"? No, because these two things are common to all Indian religions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

by rejecting rebirth, you automatically destroy any bodhisattva vow you might have made.

kirtu said:

To me, this is too much. Some people will sincerely take the Bodhisattva Vows and sincerely practice but may have issues with so-called transcendental issues. That's okay IMO because if they are practicing sincerely they will develop good roots and purify their minds over time and over lifetimes. We should probably refrain from being dogmatic. Some people will be attracted to practice via so-called "secular" Buddhism.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Someone has to hold the line and insist that things be called by their proper names. It might as well be me since what I observe these days is intense wishywashiness in the name of "compassion", when it is really just marketing to increase membership in Dharma centers and increased book sales. Cynical? Yes. True? Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who ever said that lifting tons of heavy rocks was possible for someone who had gained control over the four elements? Attaining control over the four elements does not mean omnipotence. You are venturing into lala land here. Why don't you study the matter and actually find out what these things actually mean.

On the other hand, when the Buddha levitated to the height of fourteen palm trees to prove a point, this means he had gained control over the four elements. And in fact he had forbid monks who had mastered siddhis to demonstrate them.

Astus said:

A few tons of rocks are nothing compared to the powers displayed openly for everyone in the Vimalakirti Sutra and others. Influencing the weather is significantly more difficult then lifting weight.

Vsm. quotes the Patisambhidamagga (p 378):

“What is success through the sciences? Masters of the sciences, having pronounced their scientific spells, travel through the air, and they show an elephant in space, in the sky ... and they show a manifold military array”

I.e. it is no problem to have even an army in the air.

Malcolm wrote:

The latter are examples of conjured illusions, not actual armies and elephants.

Astus said:

In the Samannaphala Sutta (DN 2 / D i 77) the stock passage includes: "he even touches and strokes with his hand the sun and moon, mighty and powerful as they are".

Although I think it is noteworthy that the process begins by the creation of the mind-made body that performs the supernormal powers.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the manomayakāya is a mental body with intact and completely sense organs that can move here and there and even has autonomy. There is an entire sūtra detailing it in the Majjhima Nikāya.

But that is merely one kind of power, and the iddhi-pattis are not confined to the manomayakāya

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are not a Mahāyānist, by rejecting rebirth, you automatically destroy any bodhisattva vow you might have made. You can't imagine that you will ever go through the rounds of rebirth necessary to accumulate the merit and wisdom necessary to become a Buddha with the three kāyas because you don't accept rebirth, you don't accept the bodhisattva path, and so on. It is joke for you to pretend you are Mahāyānist, seriously.

dharmagoat said:

What if someone were to act exactly as a Mahāyānist does, fulfil the bodhisattva vow inasmuch as it applies to the present lifetime, and keep quiet that they were unable to honestly believe in literal rebirth?

Malcolm wrote:

The bodhisattva vows has two parts, aspirational and engaged.

The aspirational part means generating the motivation to become a buddha for the benefit of all sentient beings. That requires generating an enormous store of merit and wisdom and that cannot be achieved in a single lifetime by virtue of the methods of common Mahāyāna.

A person who does not believe in rebirth is someone who has an obscuration such that they cannot even take refuge in the Dharma, let alone develop the compassion needed to generate the bodhicitta to undertake the long series of rebirths in samsara needed to gather the two accumulations in order to become a buddha.

Whatever kindness, love and compassion you have is still kindness, love and compassion but as it is not kindness, love and compassion attended with bodhicitta, it does not have the force to counter afflictions and so on. It is mundane. Still good, but not a path Dharma.

Since you do not believe in the goal and path of a bodhisattva how could you aspire to practice it? Perhaps you have confused the popular concept of a compassionate person as being a "bodhisattva" with the actual bodhisattva described in Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna.

The engaged part means practicing the six perfections for three eons or more until you have progressed through the paths and stages and entered Buddhahood. Apart from these two, there is no other bodhisattva practice. Vajrayāna may, if one holds the vows perfectly, shorten this time frame to one or several lifetimes at most, but even here, bodhicitta is still tied with the idea of undertaking rebirths for the benefit of sentient beings in order to attain buddhahood.

Even in the Hīnayāna teachings, rebirth is not an optional belief since the four sorts of āryas described in Hīnayāna texts are defined with respect to how many lifetimes it will

take such and such a person to achieve arhats ship from the time they enter the stream, and moreover, where they take rebirth before hand. The Buddha's Dharma is inextricably tied up with rebirth as a key and vital concept. Without rebirth, the path has no meaning, there is no liberation to speak of, there is no reason to eradicate the afflictions that cause rebirth and so on. The negative consequences of rejecting rebirth and yet still claiming to practice Buddhadharma are so numerous that I can only barely begin to write them down here.

You see, this is why I make a distinction between "Buddhisms" and Buddhadharma. You can practice your secular "Buddhism" all you like, but it will never be Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Simon E. said:

So basically, as Malcolm has suggested your motivation is to substitute a different understanding from that of the Mahayana?

dharmagoat said:

I am asking my fellow Mahayanists to find it in their hearts to make room for the more rational among us.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not a Mahāyānist, much less a follower of the Buddhadharma — by rejecting rebirth, you automatically destroy any bodhisattva vow you might have made. You can't imagine that you will ever go through the rounds of rebirth necessary to accumulate the merit and wisdom necessary to become a Buddha with the three kāyas because you don't accept rebirth, you don't accept the bodhisattva path, and so on. It is joke for you to pretend you are Mahāyānist, seriously.

You are, sadly enough, deluding yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, secular "Buddhism" is not a valid interpretation of what the Buddha taught, aka Buddhadharma...

dharmagoat said:

Your opinion is one of many. Should we conduct a poll?

Malcolm wrote:

Be my guest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I already pointed out, very few people develop the level of concentration needed to develop the abhijñās, for example. But some people do.

Astus said:

Why are those few not known? The living ones. If they can control the four elements then they should come forward. It would definitely be a greater sensation than the discovery of radio waves. And it could definitely upset the current physicalist worldview. But again, there must be some excuses for them to stay hidden, like the Masters of the Ancient Wisdom in the Himalayas.

But they don't stay hidden. They are right there in plain sight for anyone who wants to go see them. My guru worked as the weather controller in Dharmasala for many years, in the open, and no secret was made of the fact. He was not hiding out.

Actually, it would take only one proper master of elements to demonstrate that there are other ways to raise tons of rocks than heavy machinery. Why don't we see any?

Malcolm wrote:

Who ever said that lifting tons of heavy rocks was possible for someone who had gained control over the four elements? Attaining control over the four elements does not mean omnipotence. You are venturing into lala land here. Why don't you study the matter and actually find out what these things actually mean.

On the other hand, when the Buddha levitated to the height of fourteen palm trees to prove a point, this means he had gained control over the four elements. And in fact he had forbid monks who had mastered siddhis to demonstrate them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you do not accept rebirth, if you do not accept karma, then you may be practicing some species of secular "Buddhism," but you are not practicing Buddhadharma.

dharmagoat said:

I disagree, and will continue to campaign that what you describe as "secular Buddhism"

is one of many valid interpretations of what the Buddha taught.

(Remembering too, that the issue is with literal rebirth, not rebirth per se. Karma is indisputable, but is open to interpretation.)

Malcolm wrote:

No, secular "Buddhism" is not a valid interpretation of what the Buddha taught, aka Buddhadharma. It actually corresponds with what the Buddha specifically taught as wrong view, *ucchedavada*, i.e. advocacy of annihilation, denial of future lives and rejection of karma.

There is no form of meaningful rebirth outside of the serial appropriation of the addictive aggregates.

Further, and I will remind you, so called secular "Buddhism" is definitely not compatible with Mahāyāna view, since the very denial rebirth (there is only one kind, literal) renders the bodhisattva vow meaningless. Since this is a Mahāyāna forum, where the bodhisattva vow is indispensable, I would suggest that your proselytizing is at best inappropriate and at worst a violation of TOS.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

You are making a huge assumption in arguing that by looking back at where a thing come from, you will never come to a point beyond which you cannot find a cause. Theists will disagree with you and say that all causal chains when traced back will lead to the Creator God. Your assumption that there is no inherent cause on any causal chains is just as huge as the assumption of theist that there is an inherent cause, a first cause, at the beginning of all causal chains.

Whereas if you take the straightforward meaning of Nagarjuna's statement that is without an inherent existence there can be no dependent existence, it then follows that since inherent existence is unreasonable, so is dependent existence. This is so much simpler and tighter. No need for mental gymnastics as well.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not an assumption, it is simple observation that all causes that we can observe are themselves effects.

"[W]ithout an inherent existence there can be no dependent existence, it then follows that since inherent existence is unreasonable, so is dependent existence."

Correct. Therefore, as I pointed out before, there is no need to posit then that dependent origination is some kind of existence. This idea that you have advanced

therefore is unnecessary, and you yourself have explained it to your own satisfaction in words that differ substantially in no way from mine, i.e., "...without an inherent existence there can be no dependent existence, it then follows that since inherent existence is unreasonable, so is dependent existence."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 7:47 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Online I work toward my cause in the most generous, harmless, compassionate, kind, peaceful and joyous way that I am able. I participate in the wider world in the same way. I practice Buddhism as much as any of you.

Malcolm wrote:

If you do not accept rebirth, if you do not accept karma, then you may be practicing some species of secular "Buddhism," but you are not practicing Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, you are actually supporting a positivist theory of reality, which holds that physical laws are inherently real and impose inherent limitations which cannot be overcome. This is why I claim you have succumbed to physicalism.

Astus said:

How do you account for the lack of people who can perform supernormal powers, even though there are many who study and practice such methods? In fact, all those people who just want meditation out of Buddhism should have some experiences with siddhis, not to mention a perhaps even larger number of people who directly aim for higher powers. On what reasons can one accept the existence of magic as a physical force?

Malcolm wrote:

Magic is your word, I don't use it.

As I already pointed out, very few people develop the level of concentration needed to develop the abhijñāas, for example. But some people do.

And as far as the control over the four elements go, that is not "magic", that is learning how to control the four elements. When one learns how to control them within one's body, one can gain control over them externally. I have met people who can, for example, control the weather, and were employed in that position by the Tibetan Gvt. for many years, i.e., my guru Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje:

He was able to control the weather quite well really, which is why he kept his job for so many years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Simon E. said:

Can I put a direct question to you Dharmagoat..you are under no obligation to answer of course, and if the mods see it as inappropriate then they will of course take action.

What is your motive vis-a-vis this discussion forum.. Is it to explore Buddhadharma, or is it to dissuade others from an interest in it ? To promote something else in fact ?

Malcolm wrote:

At the end of the day, he is just another materialist trying to adapt Buddhist meditation to a materialist world view.

dharmagoat said:

... So that rational Westerners may be better able to digest the essential teachings of the Buddha and thereby derive greater benefit for themselves and for the world as a whole.

Malcolm wrote:

They won't understand the essential teachings of Buddha since they won't accept rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

From my discussion with Malcolm and Bakmoon, it would appear that there are two species of dependent existences, one based on Nagarjuna's verse mentioned by Malcolm where dependent existence need to start of with inherent existence (call this species 1) and one were most forumers are comfortable with, namely an infinitely regressive dependent existence (call this species 2).

Bakmoon said:

This second species isn't dependent existence though. Dependent existence (parabhāva) refers exclusively to this first sense. That's just how this term has been used historically.

Sherab said:

In my earlier post, I mentioned that "dependent origination is used to negate existence in the four extremes. But dependent origination as an existence is not abandoned. In other words, reliance on freedom from the four extremes does not abandon the view of existence based on the view of dependent origination. "

Bakmoon said:

Within the Gelug understanding it's true that dependent origination can be said to merely exist (I'm not going to debate the validity or non-validity of mere existence) but that's a red herring here because dependent existence isn't the same thing as dependent origination. Dependent existence doesn't refer to conventional causation, but to an existence that depends on an intrinsic existence.

Malcolm wrote:

"Mere existence" is an imputation of existence upon an appearance, but it not really an "existence" per se since it is merely an imputation and is understand that such a mere existence does not exist from its own side (i.e. independently or inherently).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But there is such a explanation, you merely seem immune to understanding it.

Astus said:

And that explanation is what?

Malcolm wrote:

Research kashina meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense Astus, your post shows no such things, quite the opposite, it merely shows that you do not take such things literally, and this is normal for those who subscribe to physicalist view of reality. But then, we already know that Zen people are throwing away rebirth, tossing out karma, reducing the Dharma to mindfulness techniques to make us better programmers and managers. In fact, the departure of many Zen and Vipassana teachers from Buddhadharma has hastened rise of so called secular "Buddhism".

Astus said:

I don't subscribe to physicalism, never did in my life. I simply have a logical and an evidential problem with powers.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence your innate adherence to the physicalist world view.

Astus said:

The logical is that even in Buddhism there is no explanation for how the human body could multiply or levitate,

Malcolm wrote:

But there is such a explanation, you merely seem immune to understanding it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, people are not properly cultivating dhyāna. But we have modern examples of people, like Dipa ma, who have. There are also a lack of experienced teachers, like Dipa ma's teacher.

And I still think it is a pity that you are going down the secular "buddhist" road.

Astus said:

There is no shortage of accounts of special powers both within and outside Buddhism. But I have not yet heard of any living teacher of some credibility to claim it for him/herself (e.g. Ajahn Sumedho, Hsing Yun, Chokyi Nyima), although they are often accepted as enlightened masters. Scientists cooperate with several meditation teachers to investigate its effects, but there is no record of siddhis.

I don't see how secular it is that you see. I have had this view of magic for a while now (see this from 2012: <http://eubuddhist.blogspot.in/2012/09/buddhist-magic.html>). And as I quote there, it is not without precedent that superpowers are not taken literally in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense Astus, your post shows no such things, quite the opposite, it merely shows that you do not take such things literally, and this is normal for those who subscribe to physicalist view of reality. But then, we already know that Zen people are throwing away rebirth, tossing out karma, reducing the Dharma to mindfulness techniques to make us better programmers and managers. In fact, the departure of many Zen and Vipassana teachers from Buddhadharma has hastened rise of so called secular "Buddhism".

Pity you never met Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 26th, 2015 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Astus said:

Taking the position that anyone who practises the right type of meditation can manipulate the physical world in a supernatural way raises numerous questions, beginning with the apparent lack of anyone who can actually perform them. Common excuses, like that the Buddha has forbidden it, or that it is a distraction for practitioners, seems to have no relevance in thousands of well known Buddhist stories where we can read about the Buddha, his disciples and later yogis do all sorts of wonderful things. But if you have some explanation for that, please share it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, people are not properly cultivating dhyāna. But we have modern examples of people, like Dipa ma, who have. There are also a lack of experienced teachers, like Dipa ma's teacher.

And I still think it is a pity that you are going down the secular "buddhist" road.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 25th, 2015 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

So if you follow the meaning of existence (inherent and dependent (species 1)) per Nagarjuna, an infinite regression of dependent existences (species 2) is not abandoned. This could explain why like Garfield reading Nagarjuna, concluded that dependent existences that are part of infinitely regressive causal chains are all there is.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you grotesquely misread Nāgārjuna.

Sherab said:

But you have not explained (to my satisfaction anyway) why dependent existence in this quote of Nagarjuna "If there is no inherent existence, where will there be dependent existence" includes dependent existence that is infinitely regressive. You mentioned about shunting of inherent existence. But I argued (with Bakmoon) that shunting inherent existence to infinity effectively means that there is no inherent existence along any part of the causal chain. And that throws a wrench in Nagarjuna's argument that dependent existence needs inherent existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Any dependent existence is an inherent existence. No matter how far back in time one imagines, at the start there will be an unconditioned cause. Therefore, dependent existence is altogether impossible. Don't blame me, BTW, for your inability to understand what Nāgārjuna is saying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 25th, 2015 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

Perhaps, in the milieu that Nagarjuna was in, people thought that all existing things came from God, an inherent existing thing. So Nagarjuna argued that there is no inherent existing thing nor any thing that dependently originated from the inherent existing God.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in the milieu that Nāgārjuna was in, to which he responding, was a specific milieu in which people thought that all things exist (Sarva asti) and were thus called Sarvastivādins. They asserted that things existed by virtue of intrinsic characteristics, and that further all things existed in the three times simultaneously.

Sherab said:

So if you follow the meaning of existence (inherent and dependent (species 1)) per Nagarjuna, an infinite regression of dependent existences (species 2) is not abandoned. This could explain why like Garfield reading Nagarjuna, concluded that dependent existences that are part of infinitely regressive causal chains are all there is.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you grotesquely misread Nāgārjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 25th, 2015 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: siddhis--why aren't they used more?

Content:

Luke said:

If siddhis are real, as many practitioners of Tibetan Buddhism claim, then why aren't lamas visiting hospitals daily and blasting out the miracles and healing tons of people all the time?

If siddhis are real, then I say, "Great! Then find the local cancer ward and get to work!"

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot remove the karma of other sentient beings.

According to the Dharma, illnesses arise from the three humors, which in turn arise from the three afflictions, which in turn arises from the innate grasping to self.

The greatest miracle of all is when someone realizes selflessness because of the Dharma. Who needs demonstration of a siddhi greater than this? The others are just tricks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 25th, 2015 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent origination is not dependent existence.

My reply remains the same.

Sherab said:

In the most simple of cases, a dependent existence can lie in a causal chain that starts off with a thing possessing inherent existence (species 1) or it could sit on a causal chain that is infinite regressive (species 2).

Malcolm wrote:

I am objecting to term dependent existence. There is no such thing. Nāgārjuna states

Existence cannot arise from existence,

existence cannot arise from nonexistence,

nonexistence cannot arise from existence,

nonexistence cannot arise from nonexistence

where then can there be arising?

Therefore, arising, existing, and so on are all merely conventions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 25th, 2015 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

In my earlier post, I mentioned that " dependent origination is used to negate existence in the four extremes. But dependent origination as an existence is not abandoned. In other words, reliance on freedom from the four extremes does not abandon the view of existence based on the view of dependent origination. "

Malcolm wrote:

See my previous post. Reply unchanged.

Sherab said:

I am surprised. You normally read posts quite carefully.

Malcolm wrote:

You said in your first post:

Sherab said:

From my discussion with Malcolm and Bakmoon, it would appear that there are two species of dependent existences, one based on Nagarjuna's verse mentioned by Malcolm where dependent existence need to start of with inherent existence (call this species 1) and one were most forumers are comfortable with, namely an infinitely regressive dependent existence (call this species 2).

Malcolm wrote:

You said in your second post:

From my discussion with Malcolm and Bakmoon, it would appear that there are two species of dependent existences, one based on Nagarjuna's verse mentioned by Malcolm where dependent existence need to start of with inherent existence (call this species 1) and one were most forumers are comfortable with, namely an infinitely regressive dependent existence (call this species 2).

I replied:

Dependent origination is not dependent existence.

My reply remains the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 25th, 2015 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

In my earlier post, I mentioned that " dependent origination is used to negate existence in the four extremes. But dependent origination as an existence is not abandoned. In other words, reliance on freedom from the four extremes does not abandon the view of existence based on the view of dependent origination. "

Malcolm wrote:

See my previous post. Reply unchanged.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 25th, 2015 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan language--indispensible in Tantra?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sanskrit mantras are preserved with perfect accuracy in Tibetan texts. Whether they are pronounced well by Tibetans is another matter altogether.

Shamati said:

Ok. But what about the scriptures? Are the different canons preserved in their original languages? I thought there are many scriptures that are only preserved because of Tibet

Malcolm wrote:

The sūtras and tantras are preserved in Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 25th, 2015 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

In my earlier post, I mentioned that dependent origination is used to negate existence in the four extremes. But dependent origination as an existence is not abandoned.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is. Dependent origination is not dependent existence.

Sherab said:

In other words, reliance on freedom from the four extremes does not abandon the view of existence based on the view of dependent origination.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it does. Why?

Whatever arises in dependence does not cease, does not arise, does not go, does not come, is not annihilated and is not permanent, is not different and is not identical. In these eight negations no existence, apart from falsely imputed existence, is possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 24th, 2015 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Why is Tulku system only found in Tibetan Buddhism?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I remember that episode--"As the sands through the hourglass, so are the lives of our rebirths." Remember when Nicole confronted Serena, after the baby was born? "He's NOT the Yangsi! He's NOT!! It's my son!!! MINE!!!"

Good times.

Good times.

May any merit generated by on-line discussion

Be dedicated to the Ultimate Benefit of All Sentient Beings.

Malcolm wrote:

I have a question about this, do you think dzogchungpa passes the Turing test? If not, can one dedicate the merit of a bot?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 24th, 2015 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Why is Tulku system only found in Tibetan Buddhism?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm, thanks for that. Are you aware of any sources that show how it "spread" to the other schools/lineages?

Malcolm wrote:

Like most fads spread, they saw it on TV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 24th, 2015 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Why is Tulku system only found in Tibetan Buddhism?

Content:

PadmeSamadhi said:

One more information is: Karmapa started this.

conebeckham said:

Well, it's true that Karma Pakshi was the first generally-recognized Yangsi, but there are accounts from the prior century of Tibetan Lamas claiming to be the rebirths of prior Tibetan masters, in the Kadam lineage. There's at least one female incarnation line noted, though short-lived, in the 12th century, as well!

Further, the "Tulku System" as it exists now, with the Labrangs, inheritance, etc., was a later development, and didn't start with the second Karmapa. I don't know when it actually developed, but it, like all things "tulku-system-related," must have been retrospective. I'm not sure there's clear documentation regarding the development of the institution.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it began with the third Karmapa in the 14th century and really began taking off in the 15th, and by the 16th was in full swing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 24th, 2015 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Bakmoon said:

If one just cuts out the middle step and tries to negate all conceptuality within the mind then the result is a totally blank mind that doesn't have any insight at all.

srivijaya said:

I guess that comes down to the kind of meditation one practices. With Shamata & Vipassana this should not occur. I also don't think it's wise to set out in any way to forcefully negate conceptuality. Like you say, a blank mind is no help at all. We get plenty of that in deep sleep.

Malcolm wrote:

One need not negate conceptuality, one needs to merely remove its foundation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 24th, 2015 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We do not see independent origination because that which originates non-dependently is not empty, it exists inherently.

srivijaya said:

Theoretically, but in practice this is exactly what beings see and act upon.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that we do not see anything that arises from itself, other or without a cause. Everything that we see arise we see arising from a cause. All instances of arising that we observe are instances of causal arising.

srivijaya said:

So I guess I completely agree when you say "The view of emptiness is not a view".

Malcolm wrote:

When we investigate causal arising, we are then led to inquire about inherent existence and so on. But no one sees a flower and thinks, "That flower is real because it exists inherently", they think only, "That flower exists, therefore it is real" and do not take it any further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Mahāyāna sūtras
Content:
coyote said:
I have a few related questions:

Does this apply to Vajrayana also?

Malcolm wrote:
Vajrapani compiled the tantras.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 10:24 PM
Title: Re: Mahāyāna sūtras
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
The traditional account is that they were compiled by Mañjuśrī and Avalokiteśvara on a mountain in south India in a bodhisattvas council.

PorkChop said:
Malcolm, thanks for providing that (again) and fixing my earlier misunderstanding (Avalokiteśvara not Maitreya). I was curious, do you know where I could read more about this account?

Malcolm wrote:
Buton's History of Dharma has a summary of it. It is not extensive, BTW, in general.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 10:24 PM
Title: Re: Where to start?
Content:
Ihrjordan said:
So say I had interest in Dzogchen Buddhism and already have a good knowledge of Theravada, how would any of you advise me to start my journey into practicing and studying Dzogchen? Books I should read, Temples in Massachusetts, practices I can do etc etc Thanks :)

Malcolm wrote:
You should contact Dzogchen Community in Conway, Massachusetts.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 9:39 PM
Title: Re: Mahāyāna sūtras
Content:

coyote said:
Dear all,

I would like to know about the traditional accounts of the origin of Mahāyāna sūtras.

Malcolm wrote:

The traditional account is that they were compiled by Mañjuśrī and Avalokiteśvara on a mountain in south India in a bodhisattvas council.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

srivijaya said:

The "why" element still stands though - ie. why cultivate views, which are in any case subsequently abandoned.

Malcolm wrote:

The view of emptiness is not a view since there is nothing in and no emptiness to see. What one does to "see" emptiness is eliminate all views, one by one in turn. There are basically only two views: 1) "it is" and 2) "it is not." But for formal completeness 3) "it is and it is not" and the reverse 4) "it neither is nor is not" are added because some people would argue the third position is the phase of coming into being. No one argues for the fourth position in truth.

This is why the Śāntideva verse I provided for you earlier is crucial:

When neither an entity nor a non-entity remain before the mind...

srivijaya said:

I suppose it's fair to say that everyone has views of one kind or another, so why not deconstruct a few of the more erroneous ones in the mean time.

Malcolm wrote:

All views are variations of only two views, "it is" and "it is not".

srivijaya said:

My concern would be that in imparting an ontological framework,

Malcolm wrote:

There is no ontological framework. Merely the deconstruction of views. We perceive dependent origination. We are able to perceive dependent origination because that which originates dependently is empty. We do not see independent origination because that which originates non-dependently is not empty, it exists inherently. But we see no

examples at all of any thing which which inherently exists, we may therefore conclude that everything we see is empty, like a dream, illusion, mirage and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Is this Tibetan?

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

The image looks like a crude depiction of Padmasambhava/Guru Rinpoche. The text is tibetanized Sanskrit and translates as Vajra Guru.

Whether it is from Tibet or another Himalayan region I wouldn't be able to tell.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an initiation card.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He is saying that a dependent existence just offloads inherent existence onto another thing.

Sherab said:

How did the offload occur?

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent existence merely shunts inherent existence onto the cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 10:07 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

I take it that Nagarjuna was saying that the starting point of a chain of dependent existences must come from something inherently existing. Since inherently existing thing is non-functional, it could not possibly start a chain of dependent existences and therefore there can be no dependent existences if inherent existence is an impossibility.

The consequence of accepting this argument is that acceptance of infinite regression of a causal chain is no longer tenable. Even the idea of beginninglessness of something, say the universe, is no longer tenable. I have no problem with this as I never accepted infinite regression as an explanation. I guess those on this forum who accepted the

view of infinite causal chain or something beginningless will have to contend with Nagarjuna's argument.

Bakmoon said:

An infinite regress of causes is only a problem if you assume that all causation must derive from a cause that possesses its own innate power to produce an effect. If one particular effect can follow from one particular cause without being produced by an intrinsic power, then in principle there should be no problem with an infinite chain of them.

Malcolm wrote:

Provided these causes and conditions are merely conventions...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: I do not accept reality

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

What is your definition of existence?

Malcolm wrote:

At the outset of this chapter, chapter 15, Nāgārjuna states:

It is not reasonable for inherent existence [svabhāva] to arise from causes and conditions;

an inherent existence that arises from causes and conditions would have been produced,

How can this be correct?

Inherent existences are unfabricated

and do not depend on others.

If there is no inherent existence,

where will there be dependent existence [parabhāva]?

Having already defined dependent existence (parabhāva) as a species of inherent existence (svabhāva), Nāgārjuna states:

Where is there an existence not included in inherent existence or dependent existence?

If there were inherent existence or dependent existence, existence would be established.

An existence that is not an inherent existence is therefore impossible. So, my definition of existence is that "existence" as such is a mere convention and nothing further. Much like a self.

Sherab said:
Thanks for the clarification.

I take it that Nagarjuna was saying that the starting point of a chain of dependent existences must come from something inherently existing. Since inherently existing thing is non-functional, it could not possibly start a chain of dependent existences and therefore there can be no dependent existences if inherent existence is an impossibility.

The consequence of accepting this argument is that acceptance of infinite regression of a causal chain is no longer tenable. Even the idea of beginninglessness of something, say the universe, is no longer tenable. I have no problem with this as I never accepted infinite regression as an explanation. I guess those on this forum who accepted the view of infinite causal chain or something beginningless will have to contend with Nagarjuna's argument.

Malcolm wrote:
He is saying that a dependent existence just offloads inherent existence onto another thing.

However, this does not refute the infinite regression of dependent origination in any way.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 5:57 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
The ālaya does not store memories, it only stores traces (vāsanā) or bijas.

Sherab said:
I am curious. Where are memories of past lives stored so that certain beings (such as enlightened beings or beings who displayed the ability to recollect past lives) could 'retrieve' them?

Punya said:
I had a chance to ask a respected Nyingma khenpo yesterday about memory. He said memory is relative and while memories from the defiled mind do not fit into the alaya, memories from the neutral mind do. This seems to be consistent with what Traleg Rinpoche said.

He also said memories (from the neutral mind) do carry on into the next life and that this was as habitual imprints left on the alaya.

Malcolm wrote:
I would need a source from him to accept this. What is his source?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

srivijaya said:

One may completely accept the doctrine of the two truths - the emptiness of inherent existence etc. and nevertheless be subjected to the forces of desire and aversion with little means to stem an habitual reaction to them. I think this is mainly because the underlying ignorance is not the intellectual ignorance of not knowing a doctrine, rather something more fundamental.

Malcolm wrote:

The underlying ignorance is a knowledge obscuration, not just an afflictive lack of knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Consciousness, name and form

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Interesting. Is that a Dzogchen thing or just standard Buddhism or what?

Malcolm wrote:

The notion that the ālayavijñāna is accompanied by a vāyu is even found in Buddhist Ayurveda. Candarānanda's commentary on the Aṣṭāṅgahridayasamhita states:

First, the moment the male's semen and the female's blood, free from the defects of vata, and so on, a consciousness possessing karma and afflictions accompanied by the five very subtle elements of space and so on (which are objects of yoga beyond the range of sense organs) gather and fuse in the uterus, it is called fertilization in the uterus.

What I was specifically referring to was a doctrine which comes from the Vajramāla Tantra, which is a commentary tantra on the Guhyasamāja. And a major source for the functioning of the five or ten vāyus in Vajrayāna completion stage practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Deity practice realization?

Content:

PadmeSamadhi said:

I'm not sure if I am asking this correctly, but here it goes:

-When a person achieves the realization of a deity practice?

If someone give me an empowerment, that I practice that for many years and how do I know I have when that realization happened?

I read you could even have one or more siddhis related to that deity, but siddhis may come earlier.

What do we have to realize anyways? What we can not fail so this works?

Thanks in advance.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to ask this question of a qualified guru in the lineage in which you practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: what is the best realm from which to help beings?

Content:

Simon E. said:

We are not bodies as containers for souls. We are a whole. We arise as a whole. We are awakened as a whole. All aspects of being ..' coarse ' or subtle arise together.... in great Emptiness.

dzogchungpa said:

As somebody once <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.15.0.than.html>: If consciousness were not to descend into the mother's womb, would name-and-form take shape in the womb?

Malcolm wrote:

The mahaprāṇavāyu from which the ālayavijñāna is inseparable contains the four elements within it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Traditional Buddhist Cultures and "sexual misconduct"

Content:

tingdzin said:

Rory,

Could you supply us with some sources for documentation of gay marriage in Ancient Rome? Not that I disbelieve you, but I've never read about this. Also, some Asian cultures such as Thailand are miles ahead of the West in tolerating varied expressions of sexuality, and have been for years -- it's not something they are "learning" from enlightened Westerners. It's more a matter of people knowing how to mind their own business, which everyone in the West seems to be forgetting.

Malcolm wrote:

Look at the epigrams of Martial, Tacitus writes about the same sex marriages of Nero, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 23rd, 2015 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Why is Tulku system only found in Tibetan Buddhism?

Content:

Plat said:

It's not found in in any other type of Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Because it is a Tibetan innovation. That being said, the idea of kings and so on being reincarnations is quite an old idea in Buddhism, likewise too the idea that famous scholars are reincarnations, and so on.

What is different about the Tibetan system is that it has become a means of transferring property and political authority from one generation to another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 22nd, 2015 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

LastLegend said:

It's like conditioned existence/dependent existence is inherently to exist. If it's not inherently to exist, it cannot exist at all. Because it's inherently to exist, this inherency cannot go extinct and is not caused and conditioned, by the virtue of its definition 'inherent.' It cannot exist forever either(eternalism) because it's inherently caused and conditioned. So dependent existence is inherent/inherent existence. Inherent existence is no other than dependent existence; if it is some separate independent other/entity, we again establish a self.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is what Nāgārjuna is saying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 22nd, 2015 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Letters from self recognized tulkus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have met plenty of so called western tulkus recognized by this or that Tibetan and not one was something special.

kirtu said:

Perhaps you have not seen their positive qualities for 1 or 2 of them.

Remember that by his own account Dezhung Rinpoche was acted like a silly boy until one day when he was 15.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone has positive qualities. I simply have not met any recognized western tulkus (quite a few actually) I would consider remarkable people. On the other hand, I have met many western Dharma practitioners who are not tulkus that I consider very remarkable. That is my experience, Kirt. If you want to chalk it up to my lack of observational skills, that's ok with me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 22nd, 2015 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan language--indispensible in Tantra?

Content:

Shamati said:

Isn't Nepal & Bhutan countries who adhere to vajrayana buddhism but don't speak Tibetan? How do they do it in those countries? Do the mantras & texts still exist in Sanskrit?

i think it's very difficult to first chant along with a language completely different from European languages while remembering the meaning & simultaneously visualizing a deity.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhutanese is a language closely related to Tibetan, and has the same script and religious texts. The main difference is dialect and accent.

Nepal has Newari Buddhism, which is done practiced in Sanskrit.

Shamati said:

I understand that newari Buddhists are descended from the same mahasiddha tradition of Nalanda that was adopted in Tibet, but that they still use Sanskrit? wouldnt the mantras etc used in that tradition be closer to the 'original' of India? Have they preserved important texts in the original language there?

I think that eventually there will translation into at least English but that it will take time & be done gradually by great masters who have natural authority in choosing correct words.

Malcolm wrote:

Sanskrit mantras are preserved with perfect accuracy in Tibetan texts. Whether they are pronounced well by Tibetans is another matter altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 22nd, 2015 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan language--indispensible in Tantra?

Content:

Shamati said:

Isn't Nepal & Bhutan countries who adhere to vajrayana buddhism but don't speak Tibetan? How do they do it in those countries? Do the mantras & texts still exist in Sanskrit?

i think it's very difficult to first chant along with a language completely different from European languages while remembering the meaning & simultaneously visualizing a deity.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhutanese is a language closely related to Tibetan, and has the same script and religious texts. The main difference is dialect and accent.

Nepal has Newari Buddhism, which is done practiced in Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 22nd, 2015 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

paël said:

Is it allowed to want rebirth in Sukhavati? Or in body in which you can practice Dharma easily?

Malcolm wrote:

Sukhavati is not part of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 22nd, 2015 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If there is attachment to samsara, there is no renunciation.

paël said:

How one is attached to samsara?

I thought buddhism is for ridding of greed, hatred and delusion. Is that nirvana? Does it require reincarnation-doctrine, whether it's true or otherwise?

Malcolm wrote:

Being attached to samsara means merely wanting to have a better place of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 22nd, 2015 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

OK, now it all makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:

A citation for you. The Jātakamālaṭīkā states:

If one obtained the concentration [dhyāna] called "clear recollection," this is shown to be the cause of recalling past lives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Sherab said:

What then is the mechanism for recollection (retrieval method) of past lives (data) by a Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

The mechanism for recalling past lives is abhijñā.

dzogchungpa said:

And the mechanism for abhijñā is?

Malcolm wrote:

Samadhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Sherab said:

What then is the mechanism for recollection (retrieval method) of past lives (data) by a Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

The mechanism for recalling past lives is abhijñā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

In other words, reliance on freedom from the four extremes does not abandon the view of existence based on the view of dependent origination.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact it does. If there existence, there cannot be arising from conditions.

Sherab said:

What is your definition of existence?

Malcolm wrote:

At the outset of this chapter, chapter 15, Nāgārjuna states:

It is not reasonable for inherent existence [svabhāva] to arise from causes and conditions;

an inherent existence that arises from causes and conditions would have been produced,

How can this be correct?

Inherent existences are unfabricated

and do not depend on others.

If there is no inherent existence,

where will there be dependent existence [parabhāva]?

Having already defined dependent existence (parabhāva) as a species of inherent existence (svabhāva), Nāgārjuna states:

Where is there an existence not included in inherent existence or dependent existence?

If there were inherent existence or dependent existence, existence would be established.

An existence that is not an inherent existence is therefore impossible. So, my definition of existence is that "existence" as such is a mere convention and nothing further. Much like a self.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

srivijaya said:

The above 3 quotes are essentially saying the same thing, which is the same as the view I have encountered in scholarly Prasangika presentations, which don't indicate any obvious correlation to direct insight.

Malcolm wrote:

This because you haven't incorporated the path framework of Mahāyāna into your understanding. Simply put, on the path of preparation there is a stage called "heat",

which is a conceptual meditation which resembles the insight realized on the path of seeing. This in turn leads to a stage called "peaks", where one's samadhi peaks and nearly becomes the yoga pratyakṣa on emptiness of the path of seeing. There is a further stage called patience, where one turns away from all rebirth in the three lower realms as a result of the previously cultivated samadhi, and finally the stage called "highest mundane dharmas", which immediately precedes attainment of the path of seeing.

There are no other approaches within the Mahayana. This is the Mahāyāna path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Dan74 said:

I must've missed it, I will reread the thread when I have the time. However, misgivings from some people do not necessarily make a sutra inauthentic, it seems to me. What is the right test, do you think? As far as I can tell, it is venerated in the Chan tradition and it would be disrespectful (and unwise) to dismiss it due to a few minor passages.

Malcolm wrote:

It is missing in the Tibetan canon [well, it was until the Qianlong Emperor sponsored its translation in Tibetan in the 18th century], for one thing. While this is not a definitive indication, it is an important one. Second, there is no mention of it or citations of it in any secondary Indian literature.

Dan74 said:

Incidentally, I recall reading a Charles Muller translation of the Sutra of Complete Enlightenment with commentaries by Master Kihwa, a 14th Century monk, who queried parts of the Sutra as being correctly rendered. To my way of seeing it is quite possible that parts of a sutra may have been corrupted at some stage in transmission, but that is no reason to dismiss the whole.

Malcolm wrote:

Likely another wholly Chinese pseudographia. I don't have problems with pseudographia as long as they are more or less in line with the Dharma as a whole, but when confronted with such a text, it should be evaluated in terms of how it corresponds with accepted teachings. When it states things that are wholly out of line with the Indian tradition, then I leave those things aside and ignore them.

Dan74 said:

The 5 pungent herbs.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a Chinese cultural and medical classification, not an Indian one. In the Vinaya, as well as Mahāyāna sūtras of verified origin, when garlic is mentioned in group, it is

mentioned with onion and spring onions/leeks/wild garlic (the exact plant here is a little uncertain, but it belongs to the allium family), never in a group of "five pungent herbs." This classification is unknown in India.

Dan74 said:

This isn't something that bothers me personally, you are welcome to your opinions and any scholarship you bring to the discussion is appreciated, but it is a question of respect and etiquette. In the Chan forum, the discussion should be framed by Chan teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

May I suggest you move the thread then to a forum where it seems more appropriate since the OP was not really asking about Chan at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Sherab said:

In other words, reliance on freedom from the four extremes does not abandon the view of existence based on the view of dependent origination.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact it does. If there existence, there cannot be arising from conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 8:56 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Dan74 said:

I don't think it is appropriate here to reject scholarship on the provenance of Mahayana sutras which have been accepted by Tibetan tradition and then assert that Surangama Sutra which has been accepted by the Chan tradition, is inauthentic. This takes Tibetan tradition as the standard, which is fine, but not when you are in the Chan forum.

Perhaps it is more reasonable to suppose that the Sutra takes a skillful approach to overstate its case in order to impress upon the readers that they should not consume these herbs, as other sutras also assert?

Malcolm wrote:

The standard is actually the Indian tradition, not the derivative Tibetan and Chinese traditions.

As to the second point, I have already shown how the text in question contradicts other Mahāyāna sūtra which all accept as authoritative. It is also well known that this text, the

Śūranagama Sūtra, has experienced a long and contentious history in China over the question of its authenticity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The ālaya does not store memories, it only stores traces (vāsanā) or bijas.

Sherab said:

I am curious. Where are memories of past lives stored so that certain beings (such as enlightened beings or beings who displayed the ability to recollect past lives) could 'retrieve' them?

Malcolm wrote:

Why should they be stored?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

not even in your Brahmajala Sutra.

Astus said:

<http://www.ymba.org/books/brahma-net-sutra-moral-code-bodhisattva/brahma-net-sutra/secondary-precepts>:

3. On Eating Meat

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, my error.

But it is definitely not part of the bodhisattva vow traditions of Mañjuśrī or Maitreya.

Your source does contain one inaccuracy, the Brahmajala Sūtra in the Tibetan canon is from the Āgamas and is more or less that same text found in the Dīgha Nikāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, there is no Mahāyāna vow not to eat meat which is connected with the bodhisattva vows. The Buddha mentions the faults of eating meat in many sūtras, but never made it a vow that one should not.

seeker242 said:

This is exactly what I'm talking about. That isn't true. It's only true after you dismiss the sutras that prohibit it. You dismiss sutras based on your own traditions acceptance or non acceptance of them. But like I said before, Tibetans don't have a monopoly over Mayahana. No Korean Buddhist would ever say such a thing. Why? Because the sutras clearly prohibit it.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no vow against eating meat. Even if the Buddha says we should not eat meat, there is nevertheless no bodhisattva vow prohibiting it, not in the tradition of Manjushri, not in the tradition of Maitreya and not even in your Brahmajala Sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

srivijaya said:

What kind of wisdom though?

Malcolm wrote:

Jñāna.

When one correctly apprehends emptiness, there is no support left for conceptual thought to rest upon, so it dissolves into itself, right on the spot.

"Correctly apprehends", seems more like direct insight in this case, than analytical deconstruction. I can see how that would work.

That analytical deconstruction leads to direct insight, when that is achieved, the analysis is discarded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Gyurme Kundrol said:

Where you find people with a strong belief, you will find that the poisons are quick to follow if that belief is in any way, shape, or form challenged or disregarded. Lots of people who believe in rebirth have lots of attachment to this life, whereas there are people who hold no such belief who have little or no attachment, so I also don't think these two things are always directly causally related..

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose of understanding rebirth is to understand what it is that following the path is freeing us from. That is all. As Mañjuśrī said to Sachen:
If there is attachment to samsara, there is no renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

seeker242 said:

Alright, but my point was that just because Tibetans don't accept it as valid, doesn't mean it's invalid. No one sect or tradition has a monopoly over what is or is not Mahayana. Things like vegetarianism are a good example of that. Chan Buddhists abstain from eating meat and Tibetans don't. That doesn't invalidate chan buddhisms stance on eating meat nor does it render it not Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

It has already been pointed out to you that the status of the Śūraṅgama Sūtra is not certain even within Chinese Buddhism and it has been subject to much controversy, unlike say the Prajñāpāramita or the Lankāvatāra sūtras.

That Tibetans eat meat is a Tibetan cultural thing. It has nothing to do with the Dharma and there is really no justification for meat-eating that can be found in Mahāyāna sutras. Avoidance of eating meat is well known in Mahāyāna sutras such as the Mahāparinivāna, Lankāvatāra, and so on. Many Tibetan Buddhists have been and are vegetarian.

In general, if one is following common Mahāyāna one should not eat meat unless one is ill. On the other hand, there is no Mahāyāna vow not to eat meat which is connected with the bodhisattva vows. The Buddha mentions the faults of eating meat in many sūtras, but never made it a vow that one should not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 21st, 2015 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We can say that it is accepted by some Chan masters as authentic and we can at the same time deny it is authentic, which is to say it is not a sutra spoken by the Buddha, nor a sutra which he gave permission to one his disciples to speak, nor did he confer his blessings upon anyone to speak it.

We can therefore also understand that some Chan masters will assert various things said in that sūtra and feel under no obligation to take them or it seriously since we do not accept the sūtra in question is authentic.

seeker242 said:

Sure, because you are a Tibetan Buddhist, not a Chan one. The exact same thing can be said about Theravada Buddhists not accepting Tibetan sutras. Obviously, Theravada Buddhists feel no need to obligation to take things like Buddha Nature seriously. Why, because they don't accept those sutras as authentic words of the Buddha. Does that make those Buddha nature sutras invalid or inauthentic for everyone else? Of course not...To assert that it does would be ridiculous.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that both Tibetan Buddhists and Chan Buddhists are followers of Mahāyāna. We both generally accept the same Dharma, we both generally accept that same set of Mahāyāna sūtras which can be confirmed to be of Indian origin. The differences in the basic sūtras we both accept are trivial.

There are a few sūtras in the Chinese canon which were not translated into Tibetan because even during the 8th and early ninth century there was uncertainty as to their validity. Many Mahāyāna sūtras were translated into Tibetan first from Chinese sources and only later were revised with respect to Sanskrit manuscripts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The other he mentions is the effect it has on the mind. He does not mention all of the reasons in this short talk.

No such effects are mentioned in any sūtra what so ever. If there is a problem with alliums, it is purely because of the breath, and the idea that it stimulates sexual desire. The latter however seems a little iffy. Even if it does, who would want you reeking of garlic?

seeker242 said:

You didn't say this? Could have fooled me. Your name is Malcom right?...

You basically have defaulted to the position that any text that calls itself a sūtra should be accepted as such

False. You are now misrepresenting what I have said, which is obvious to anyone. It is simply a fact that this sutra is already accepted as such in Chan Buddhism. To say it's not a sutra, is patently false. To say the sugranama does not mention, what it clearly mentions, is also patently false. As well as ridiculous.

Malcolm wrote:

We can say that it is accepted by some Chan masters as authentic and we can at the

same time deny it is authentic, which is to say it is not a sutra spoken by the Buddha, nor a sutra which he gave permission to one of his disciples to speak, nor did he confer his blessings upon anyone to speak it.

We can therefore also understand that some Chan masters will assert various things said in that sūtra and feel under no obligation to take them or it seriously on such subjects since we do not accept the sūtra in question is authentic and since it conflicts with what authentic sūtras say on the subject, in this case, of consuming garlic.

Now I think we have reached this point in the discussion:

I have nothing further to add for the time being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What I said exactly was:

There is no Indian sūtra of confirmed provenance that makes similar claims about garlic attracting ghosts (rather the opposite is the fact) or rebirth in hell. This therefore can be understood as a Chinese cultural idea in a sūtra without an Indian origin.

While indeed the Lankāvatāra tells us to avoid garlic and so on, there is no mention of spirits and so no.

You see, I was very precise in what I was delineating.

I also said:

I am sorry, but there is no mention of negative mental effects of garlic in any authentic Mahāyāna sutra.

seeker242 said:

The Surangama is a sutra and it says these things, whether you think it's unreasonable or not, whether you think it should be followed or not, isn't relevant to the question of whether or not garlic is mentioned in the sutras. It clearly is.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that garlic was not mentioned in the sūtras. You are now misrepresenting what I have said, which is obvious to anyone.

You basically have defaulted to the position that any text that calls itself a sūtra should

be accepted as such, whether or not it was spoken by the Buddha. This ludicrous. If you wish to accept that it is valid Buddhavacana, that is fine with me. But I do not accept it as such, and while there may be a good many things of merit in that text, the bit about garlic is absurd.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

plwk said:

...the Sūtra in Forty-Eight Chapters...

Forty-Two you mean?

And whilst we are at it, <http://www.acmuller.net/articles/1998-03-apocrypha.html> may interest some...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I rejected the statement primarily because it is unreasonable, because it is in clear conflict with what other sūtras (everyone agrees are authentic Mahāyāna sūtras) as well as the Mūlasarvastivada Vinaya say about garlic and so on.

Whether sūtra in question is an authentic sūtra or not is a very distant secondary consideration for me.

seeker242 said:

Alright. Although, earlier you said with regard to negative effects of garlic "No such effects are mentioned in any sūtra what so ever." Well, the Surangama is a sutra and it mentions it, so to say "No such effects are mentioned in any sūtra what so ever" isn't true. You could say it's unreasonable, because it is in clear conflict with what other sūtras say, but even if that is the case, it's still a sutra nonetheless. You can call it crazy and ridiculous, but you can't call it not a sutra. Chan masters are used to being called crazy and ridiculous, that's nothing new.

Malcolm wrote:

What I said exactly was:

There is no Indian sūtra of confirmed provenance that makes similar claims about garlic

attracting ghosts (rather the opposite is the fact) or rebirth in hell. This therefore can be understood as a Chinese cultural idea in a sūtra without an Indian origin.

While indeed the Lankāvatāra tells us to avoid garlic and so on, there is no mention of spirits and so no.

You see, I was very precise in what I was delineating.

I also said:

I am sorry, but there is no mention of negative mental effects of garlic in any authentic Mahāyāna sūtra.

The latter statement is to be understood in the light of the former, since I already laid out what I consider to be "authentic", i.e. a Mahāyāna sūtra of confirmed Indian origin.

Neither the Brahmajāla Sūtra, nor the Śūraṅgama Sūtra, nor the Sūtra in Forty-Eight Chapters can be considered authentic Indian texts. We can also toss in the Vajrasamādhi Sūtra for good measure.

If the teachings in these texts conform to what we know to be taught in authentic sūtras, then those teachings can be accepted — but if there are teachings in those texts which do not conform, then those teachings should be ignored, such as the idea that garlic will send one to hell for eating it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

srivijaya said:

It's still not clear why there needs to be a connection between an intellectually acquired ontological world view and experiential gnosis.

Malcolm wrote:

In Madhyamaka, the analytical deconstruction of views gives rise to wisdom.

srivijaya said:

Whilst the nod is given to some kind of direct unconditioned experience, the exact minutiae of "what actually exists" and what "does not" and the interpretation of these two positions is still hotly debated.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Madhyamaka.

srivijaya said:

Even in lower form jhanas all discursive thoughts, views and opinions are abandoned, in fact they need to be.

Malcolm wrote:

What is not abandoned is conceptual thought. Each of the form realm dhyānas is characterized by a conceptual object as well as mental factors associated with that dhyāna, likewise, the four formless realm āyatanas are characterized by a conceptual object, which is why the Buddha rejected them as liberation.

srivijaya said:

So why the insistence that views are necessary?

Malcolm wrote:

In order to understand emptiness, freedom from views, one must understand dependent origination, which is also freedom from views. That which originates in dependence does not exist according to any of the four extremes, therefore, whatever dependently originates is empty by nature. For this reason, Nāgārjuna praised dependent origination as the pacification of proliferation. He likewise maintained that those who understand emptiness incorrectly were like those who handled a snake at the wrong end or applied vidyāmantras incorrectly. He called such people incorrigible.

When one correctly apprehends emptiness, there is no support left for conceptual thought to rest upon, so it dissolves into itself, right on the spot. It for this reason then that Shantideva states:

When neither an entity nor a nonentity
remain before the mind,
at that time, since there is no other aspect
there is nothing to perceive, total peace.

The point is not to have a view, the point is go beyond views — but the road there is narrow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Punya said:

1. My understanding is that the ālayavijñāna has the capacity to store memories. So what you are saying seems to be that memories for ordinary beings (without getting into bardo discussions) get erased at the end of each life. On the other hand the seeds (bījas), which I read as karmic propensities (possibly mistakenly), continue on to the next life. Why does one continue and the other not?

2. Is the manas where (for want of a better word) the I making occurs?

Malcolm wrote:

The ālaya does not store memories, it only stores traces (vāsanā) or bījas.

The kliṣṭa-mānovijñāna, the afflictive mental consciousness, generates the sense of "I" in the Yogacara scheme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Punya said:

Sure that's basically the body but there's a bit more to I making than just the body, isn't there? Did you mean that the I making is useful for functioning in the human realm (even though it would better to stop the cycle altogether)?

Malcolm wrote:

I mean that use the notion of "I" to do everything. That delusion of 'I' is an agent, capable acting and receiving the results of action, even though it does not exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Simon E. said:

The onus is on those who affirm those texts that are unique to the Chinese Canon to show that their authority extends beyond the purview of Chinese Buddhism.

seeker242 said:

No it isn't because the discussion is about chan buddhism, chan masters and a chan sutra. The opinion that it's inauthentic outside of chan buddhism is irrelevant. It's just as irrelevant as Thanissaro Bhikkhu claiming the Buddha never taught Buddha Nature.

Malcolm wrote:

I rejected the statement primarily because it is unreasonable, because it is in clear conflict with what other sūtras (everyone agrees are authentic Mahāyāna sūtras) as well as the Mūlasarvastivada Vinaya say about garlic and so on.

Whether sūtra in question is an authentic sūtra or not is a very distant secondary consideration for me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am sorry, but there is no mention of negative mental effects of garlic in any authentic Mahāyāna sūtra. There is a chapter of the Chinese Surangama Samadhi sūtra in the Tibetan canon, chapter ten, where it says that if one eats garlic, it increases desire, if one eats it raw, it increases hatred, but that is all.

I am not questioning Master Sheng Yen's knowledge of the Chinese canon. But I don't think there is any reason to accept what the Chinese Surangama Samadhi has to say at all. I don't consider it an authentic Mahāyāna sūtra. Just because a chapter of it is included in the Tibetan canon does not guarantee its authenticity. There are several texts included in the sutra and dharani section of the Tibetan canon whose authenticity is disputed. This is one of those texts.

PorkChop said:

Not to be a pest, but AFAIK, the

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C5%9A%C5%ABra%E1%B9%85gama_Sam%C4%81dhi_S%C5%ABtra is a separate text from the

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C5%9A%C5%ABra%E1%B9%85gama_S%C5%ABtra.

The first is considered an Indian sūtra according to

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C5%9A%C5%ABra%E1%B9%83gamasam%C4%81dhis%C5%ABtra,_The_Concentration_of_Heroic_Progress, the later was the one that caused controversy even as far back as the 8th century, with the Emperor of Japan. The former doesn't seem to involve this topic, as I can't find anything related to "onion", "garlic", "pungent", or even "vegetable" in the sūtra.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I was referring the Śūraṅgama Sūtra, there is a chapter of it in the Tibetan canon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 9:30 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

seeker242 said:

That's not relevant. For example, if someone has not taken a vow to abstain from killing, there is still a negative effect from killing regardless. The negative effect it has, is the reason why it's a precept to begin with.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is relevant. Of the five lay vows, only the vow against intoxication is prohibition rather than a natural non-virtue like killing, taking what is not given, lying and sexual misconduct. Likewise, the monastic vow against consuming garlic is a vow of prohibition, as are most of them, and so therefore, no non-virtue is accrued when they are engaged in by novices and lay people.

On the other hand, there is no vow forbidding malice, envy and ignorance, the three

mental natural non-virtues because hinayāna precepts apply only to physical and verbal actions, nevertheless, indulging in these three results in negative karma and ripening. Likewise, harsh speech, gossip and calumny are natural non-virtues, but there is in fact no vows against them, because the Buddha judged it would be too hard not to break these and because there is natural negative consequences.

Most of the monastic vows therefore are vows of prohibition only and are not natural non-virtues. Thus there are no negative consequences if lay people do not follow precepts meant for the ordained. Otherwise, for example, sleeping with your wife would become a downfall.

seeker242 said:

Chan Master Sheng Yen just doesn't know what he is talking about? Sorry, I can't believe that. It's highly unlikely that he doesn't know what he is taking about. He's a well regarded monastic Chan master. He's also a scholar with a Ph.D in Buddhist literature. He knows what he's talking about when it comes to the sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sorry, but there is no mention of negative mental effects of garlic in any authentic Mahāyāna sutra. There is a chapter of the Chinese Surangama Samadhi sūtra in the Tibetan canon, chapter ten, where it says that if one eats garlic, it increases desire, if one eats it raw, it increases hatred, but that is all.

I am not questioning Master Sheng Yen's knowledge of the Chinese canon. But I don't think there is any reason to accept what the Chinese Surangama Samadhi has to say at all. I don't consider it an authentic Mahāyāna sūtra. Just because a chapter of it is included in the Tibetan canon does not guarantee its authenticity. There are several texts included in the sutra and dharani section of the Tibetan canon whose authenticity is disputed. This is one of those texts.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

seeker242 said:

Precepts do come from taking vows but I think it's obvious that the surangama and Hsuan Hua are speaking to the benefit of keeping these vows and the drawbacks of breaking them, regardless if one has formally taken them or not.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot maintain a vow one has not taken, nor can one break it.

seeker242 said:

The other he mentions is the effect it has on the mind. He does not mention all of the reasons in this short talk.

Malcolm wrote:

No such effects are mentioned in any sūtra what so ever. If there is a problem with alliums, it is purely because of the breath, and the idea that it stimulates sexual desire. The latter however seems a little iffy. Even if it does, who would want you reeking of garlic?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

seeker242 said:

[

So indulging and clinging to sense pleasures won't send you towards hell realms? Yes, it will... Breaking the precepts won't send you towards hell realms? Yes, it will... Allowing anger to overcome your mind won't send you to a hell realm? Yes, it will... The idea that those things won't...is patently ridiculous.

Malcolm wrote:

Precepts come from taking vows. If you have not taken a given vows, you cannot break the precept to which it is connected.

For example, fully ordained Mulasarvastivadin monks who eat garlic and who are not ill are considered to have committed a downfall of duration. Eating onion or spring onions is considered an offense. Why? Because one should not enter a temple after eating these things.

But in Vinaya, the reason is given that sick monks are allowed to eat these things because there is no question that they will be going to a temple. If a monk eats these things, in the case of garlic, he should not enter a temple for a week, in the case of onions, for three days and the case of spring onions, one day. It is a downfall punished by brief period of banishment. But there is certainly no mention of going to hell and such things can easily be purified.

And as far as we are concerned, none of us here are ordained bhikṣus, so really, the idea that eating garlic is going to send one to hell is ridiculous. Not only this, but the Lankāvatara states exactly the opposite of what is stated here in this sutra about spirits: Since the bhūtas will become terrified

yogis should not eat meat.

Likewise, yogis should avoid

various things such as

meat, garlic, onions and alcohol,

garlic and spring onions.

Yes, garlic is mentioned twice in this passage. Again, no mention of hell for eating garlic. One can infer from the passage however that it upsets local spirits and frightens them because of the smell, which is of course why garlic is used to repel spirits in Ayurvedic medicine and in many Buddhist texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

seeker242 said:

I also would not go so far as to say it's just a Chinese Cultural influence. It's a prevalent idea in traditional Hindu medicine also, specifically regarding a "Sattvic diet" or "yogic diet". Garlic and onions are both rajasic and tamasic according to Hindu Ayurveda, and are forbidden to yogis because they root the consciousness more firmly in the body, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Garlic is one of the main medicines we find in all Ayurvedic formulas used to repel spirits. Having actually studied both Tibetan and Indian materia medica (given my profession as a Doctor of Tibetan Medicine), I am quite certain of this. Also the origin story of garlic and onions is the same in Tibetan medicine and Ayurveda, since the former adopts much of the latter.

Second, there is no classification of foods by the three gunas in classical Ayurvedic treatises such as the Caraka Samhita, the Aṣṭāṅgahriḍaya Samhita and so on. Foods are classified by their effect on the three doshas — in this case, garlic, for example, removes kapha and vata, among other effects.

The notion of the "sattvic" diet comes from the Bhagavad Gita where all tastes apart from the sweet taste are defined as rajasic. Tamasic food is all old, wilted, etc., foods.

Ironically, milk, butter, cream, yogurt and so on, as well as honey, etc., are all considered sattvic [vegan freakout here].

seeker242 said:

Sure, it sounds crazy to say "you will go to hell if you eat onions". But it seems to me to have a much deeper meaning than that. Master Hsuan Hua was a Chan master. Chan masters are notorious for saying things that have a deeper meaning than what appears on the surface.

Malcolm wrote:

The only food that will send you hell is meat you have killed for yourself or requested be killed for yourself. We are not Jains and Hindus who define their paths partially in terms of pure and impure foods which we may eat. Granted, if you practice lower tantras, you

need to be vegetarian and avoid alliums, but this is because this is conduct attractive to Hindus, and so it is merely as skillful means.

There is no deeper meaning. The idea that eating garlic will send you to hell is patently ridiculous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And you thought Avici hell was the worst...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

seeker242 said:

That's just him telling you what the sutra says.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Indian sūtra of confirmed provenance that makes similar claims about garlic attracting ghosts (rather the opposite is the fact) or rebirth in hell. This therefore can be understood as a Chinese cultural idea in a sūtra without an Indian origin.

While indeed the Lankāvatāra tells us to avoid garlic and so on, there is no mention of spirits and so no.

seeker242 said:

And what does the Surangama Sutra actually say? He is not doing a commentary on the Lankavatara or some Indian sutra, his commentary is specifically on the Surangama and that's what the Surangama says. The quote I posted above is directly from it on page 230. See link below. Master Hsuan Hua is not the one who wrote this. Whether people think that is right or wrong, correct or incorrect, or just flat out crazy, isn't relevant as to where this idea comes from. It doesn't matter if it's a "Chinese cultural idea in a sūtra". My point was that yes, it's in the actual sutra and Hsuan Hua is telling you what that sutra says and what he says is an accurate commentary.

http://www.buddhanet.net/pdf_file/surangama.pdf

Malcolm wrote:

It is still just a Chinese cultural idea. It is crazy to believe that a) garlic attracts spirits b)

that eating it will send you to hell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Corporate "Mindfulness".

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I didn't say they were 'creating drones', that's a strawman if I ever heard one. What I was saying is that many large companies are employing mindfulness to (among other things) increase productivity...that is simply true, not conspiracies, and IMO it is, or could be contrary to the purpose of mindfulness in a dharmic sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the mindfulness of a sniper is definitely counter the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reincarnation

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Did Kongtrul study the Abhidharma?

Malcolm wrote:

In detail, he also studied tenet systems, and if you do not study these, you won't really know what he is referring to in the passage above.

dzogchungpa said:

So much studying! What's an obtuse guy to do?

Malcolm wrote:

It will make you less obtuse, that is the purpose of study. There are three prajñās, study/listening is the first.

Otherwise, there is a spot reserved for you in this hell:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reincarnation

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Did Kongtrul study the Abhidharma?

Malcolm wrote:

In detail, he also studied tenet systems, and if you do not study these, you won't really

know what he is referring to in the passage above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Sherlock said:

How to study Abhidharma?

I understand generally the 5 skandhas, 18 dhatus, 12 ayatanas, and how e.g. each one of the 5,18,12 can be divided into different categories, but do I need to remember like all the different factors of each one?

Malcolm wrote:

By studying Abhidharma you will understand:

1. Skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas
2. Mental factors and general causality
3. Dependent origination and Buddhist cosmology
4. Karmic causality
5. Affliction
6. Hinayāna paths and stages
7. The knowledges
8. The concentrations
9. Refutation of the person

If you do not study Abhidharma, it is very hard to understand these things accurately. You should understand it as a detailed commentary on the four truths of nobles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Serially connected" = connected in a series.

A "given series" means an instance of a series.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, now it all makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Study Abhidharma, then it will all make sense. Until then, I doubt it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Berry said:

I'm glad its not just me that finds the often repeated candle example really puzzling!

Malcolm wrote:

There are eight examples of causes and results being neither the same nor different, for the purpose of educating the obtuse.

Berry said:

"Educating the obtuse?"... could you be implying that I'm stupid, by any chance ?

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna understood that there would be people who would be slow to understand the principle that causes and their effects are neither the same nor different, and thus he provided eight examples for their benefit. Just as he provided eight examples of illusion so that people could understand the nature of relative truth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In any case, consciousness exists in a series of single moments, so unlike a candle flame, it does not give rise to more than one subsequent moment of consciousness in a given series. As Nāgārjuna points out, the aggregates are serially connected.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I guess I'm pretty obtuse. What do you mean by "a given series" and "serially connected"?

Malcolm wrote:

"Serially connected" = connected in a series.

A "given series" means an instance of a series.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Convention" means words and meanings, being able to understand what relatively true as opposed to false.

srivijaya said:

So he's definitely in favour of an intellectual grounding in the two truths, in order to experience that which is beyond discursive intellect. How does that work in Dzogchen? One hears a lot about direct introduction.

Malcolm wrote:

Go to a Dzogchen master and find out. That is the only way it works.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Bardo and rebirth

Content:

umbra said:

Sorry, is Mahayana not Tibetan Buddhism? Which forum are you referring?

Redfaery said:

.....the one specifically labeled "Tibetan Buddhism?" What you're looking for isn't even Mahayana at all. It's Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna is a subset of Mahāyāna, called uncommon Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Berry said:

I'm glad its not just me that finds the often repeated candle example really puzzling!

Malcolm wrote:

There are eight examples of causes and results being neither the same nor different, for the purpose of educating the obtuse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 20th, 2015 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

An analogy is using the last candle to light the next candle. One cannot say that two flames are different, nor can one say they are identical, but they do exist in a continuum, a discrete series.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I don't see why one can't say they are different, and furthermore I don't know what you mean by saying they exist in a continuum. I have never understood why Buddhists like this candle example. The flame of a candle can be used to light any number of other candles, and does not need to become extinguished in the process, so this does not explain the thing that is actually mysterious, at least to me.

Malcolm wrote:

The example comes from Nāgārjuna's Verses on Dependent Origination:

Words, butter lamps, mirrors, seals,
fire crystals, seeds, sourness and echoes.

His Commentary on the Verses of Dependent Origination states:

Likewise, just as a butter lamp is produced from a butter lamp; the reflection of a mirror produced from a likeness; a seal impression from a seal; fire from a fire crystal; a sprout from a seed, saliva caused by sour fruit and an echo from a sound. Also those can easily be understood to be neither the same nor different.

In any case, consciousness exists in a series of single moments, so unlike a candle flame, it does not give rise to more than one subsequent moment of consciousness in a given series. As Nāgārjuna points out, the aggregates are serially connected. He says: Those [aggregates], called 'serially joined', not having ceased, produce another produced from that cause; although not even the subtle atom of an existent has transmigrated from this world to the next.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 19th, 2015 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Punya said:

But it is a useful delusion, just like the delusion of a car allows us to use one.

In what way is it useful?

Malcolm wrote:

it is useful for eating, drinking, having conversations, procreation etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 19th, 2015 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The general rule, as stated by Nāgārjuna is:
Without relying on convention
the ultimate will not be comprehended;
if the ultimate is not comprehended,
nirvana will not be obtained.

srivijaya said:

How would he define convention? Is it a scholarly grounding in the tenets etc?

Malcolm wrote:

"Convention" means words and meanings, being able to understand what relatively true
as opposed to false.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 19th, 2015 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

PorkChop said:

don't think he was always like that though. I think this side of him came out when he
taught the Shurangama Sutra (arguably his favorite), almost like a wrathful emanation.

Malcolm wrote:

I think this is because he was angered by that fact that this sūtra has been dismissed by
western academics as a Chinese pseudographia.

He also did not like Tibetan Buddhism very much and thought it was pretty corrupt.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 19th, 2015 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Sakya Trizin - Chakrasamvara Body Mandala - Boston 4/201

Content:

alexprice said:

It has just been announced that the following will take place after the Body Mandala
empowerment on Sunday April 13th

Malcolm wrote:

That should read Sunday, April 12th.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 19th, 2015 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

seeker242 said:

That's just him telling you what the sutra says.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Indian sūtra of confirmed provenance that makes similar claims about garlic attracting ghosts (rather the opposite is the fact) or rebirth in hell. This therefore can be understood as a Chinese cultural idea in a sūtra without an Indian origin.

While indeed the Lankāvatāra tells us to avoid garlic and so on, there is no mention of spirits and so no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 19th, 2015 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?

Content:

srivijaya said:

I would like to ask contributors for their opinion on the following question:

How crucial is it to establish a correct ontology of the two truths within Mahayana Buddhism. Is it a prerequisite for spiritual advancement and enlightenment - and if so, why?

I'm deliberately not being specific as to the exact definition of any those terms, as they may vary from person to person, as I'm more interested in the general rule.

Malcolm wrote:

The general rule, as stated by Nāgārjuna is:

Without relying on convention

the ultimate will not be comprehended;

if the ultimate is not comprehended,

nirvana will not be obtained.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 18th, 2015 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Kaccāni said:

I have an understanding of that. I simply refuse the soul-like notion that has apparently been introduced in this thread. \

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha taught rebirth without making recourse to a self that undergoes rebirth.

There are a variety of ways of explaining this, but in essence, the most profound way of understanding this is that the habit of I-making appropriates a new series of aggregates at death, and so it goes on and on until one eradicates the knowledge obscuration that creates this habit of I-making. In the meantime, due to this habit of I-making, one continues to accumulate affliction and karma which results in suffering for infinite lifetimes, just as one has taken rebirth in samsara without a beginning.

But no soul-concept has been introduced in this thread, not at all. The sentient being I was in a past life is not identical with me in this life, even though I suffer and enjoy the results of the negative and positive actions that sentient being and all the other sentient beings engaged in who make up the serial chain of the continuum which I now enjoy. But when I die, all trace of my identity will cease since my identification with my five aggregates as "me" and "mine" is a delusion, and that identity, self, soul, etc., exists merely as a convention and not as an ultimate truth. When the habit of I-making that drives my continuum in samsara takes a new series of aggregates in the next life, it is unlikely I will have any memory of this lifetime, and my habit of I-making will generate a new identity based on the cause and conditions it encounters in the next life.

It is important to understand that this "I" generated by the habit of I-making does not exist and is fundamentally a delusion. But it is a useful delusion, just like the delusion of a car allows us to use one.

An analogy is using the last candle to light the next candle. One cannot say that two flames are different, nor can one say they are identical, but they do exist in a continuum, a discrete series.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 18th, 2015 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Bardo and rebirth

Content:

silver surfer said:

I'm fully open minded, fully.

Malcolm wrote:

You say you are open minded, then claim:

Dreams, they happen in the brain.

You don't sound very open minded to me, you sound like you accept the current physicalist account of consciousness as being an epiphenomena of the brain, and have read this idea into the sūtra citation you mention above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 18th, 2015 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Kaccāni said:

So this is a sermon that is obviously directed at an audience that still believes in a concept of soul, attempting to illustrate to them the principle of emergence, arguably for the purpose of getting beyond the "beginning" that initiates craving.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not a sūtra directed at monks who still believe in a soul or an atman. This is a sūtra directed at monks who understand that there is no person to be found in the five aggregates.

The Buddha defined the four types of awakened person by virtue of the number of lifetimes it would take before they entered nirvana, for example, it would take a stream entrant to attain nirvana (seven), arhats achieve nirvana in this lifetime.

Stream entrants by definition are free from the fetter of believing in a self or an atman.

You really need to study harder.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 18th, 2015 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Cyclic Existence vs Total Liberation

Content:

tomschwarz said:

...my answer was "yes" and it follows the question from dear garudha:

After liberation, is it possible to return to cyclical existence ?

is that not true that my answer follows and addresses the question on a gross level?

Malcolm wrote:

Your answer does not follow since if there was a return to samsara after liberation the path to liberation would be pointless. Of course you have citation or reason to support your mistaken answer.

I will not be replying further in this thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 18th, 2015 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Redfaery said:

[

I'd like to ask you, Malcom, were individuals who had used the "incorrect orifice" in lay life prohibited from ordaining, or did the rule only apply to monks? Because if it was the latter, it frankly seems much more like a "no sex, PERIOD" rule.

Malcolm wrote:

The rule only applies to lay people. Sexual misconduct for an ordained person is any sexual activity at all that involves penetration or being penetrated.

People are not prohibited from ordaining unless they are intersexed, voyeurs or they are men who like to swallow semen. In the case of the latter, since the male and female ordained sanghas were segregated, one can understand that men with active sexual interests in other men in a celibate male community is problematic. However, while there certainly is sexism in Buddhism historically, there is almost no discussion of the issue of same sex attraction at all, apart from how it impinges on male ordinands.

Redfaery said:

I'd also like to point out that if there was a bar against gay men, historically that would make sense (sadly) due to much higher levels of homophobia.

Malcolm wrote:

The concept of "homosexual", "gay" and "lesbian" does not exist in Tibetan culture. They did even have a word for it, until modern times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 18th, 2015 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

jmlee369 said:

As for the Tibetan traditions, owing to Vasubandhu's influence, homosexual acts are likewise considered misconduct by various Tibetan commentators.

Malcolm wrote:

No, In Vasubandhu, using an incorrect orifices is considered misconduct (anus, mouth), whether the orifice belongs to a man or a women is never made an issue. Tibetans follow suit.

jmlee369 said:

I find it slightly disingenuous to claim that there is no scriptural support originating from India for such a position.

Malcolm wrote:

There isn't such support. What you have produced are criticisms of wrong orifice and wrong partner. My observation above stands.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 18th, 2015 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Cyclic Existence vs Total Liberation

Content:

tomschwarz said:

the answer is yes. time has no beginning. so if the path to liberation is 1) possible 2) a realm of no return, then statistically speaking all beings would already abide in that realm))) like a fish trap.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not follow on any level, neither is it in accordance with citation, nor does it conform to reason.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 18th, 2015 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not have a problem with it. Maybe there is some sūtra composed in China which says such a thing, but there are no such sūtras in the Tibetan canon.

There are certain restrictions in Vinaya on paṇḍakas that I know of such as: people who can only be aroused through voyeurism (and these are not even necessarily "gay" people), intersexed people and men who enjoy swallowing semen are barred from becoming ordained. Otherwise, the Buddhist sūtras and tantras really do not have much to say about paṇḍakas.

In Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine one's gender preference is biologically determined by various factors during conception and pregnancy, for the most part.

yan kong said:

My point I think was that this thread need not descend into a debate on the master's controversial views on the matter as most threads about him have the subject at least brought up.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no debate, he was wrong, and that is the end of the story.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Oh em gee, is that Ayu?

Malcolm wrote:

That is all of us...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Cyclic Existence vs Total Liberation

Content:

garudha said:

After liberation; is it possible to return to cyclical existence ?

Malcolm wrote:

No. If so, it would not be liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Ayu said:

... 13 years when I was kind of Hindu. ...

Malcolm wrote:

It was just a phase...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Simon E. said:

Hsuan Hua also assured his followers that same sex practices lead to hell states.

BrianG said:

How would he know?

yan kong said:

I would just like to put out there that there is already a lengthy debate thread on Master Hua's views on homosexuality which I'm sure can easily be found via the handy search box.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not have a problem with it. Maybe there is some sūtra composed in China which says such a thing, but there are no such sūtras in the Tibetan canon.

There are certain restrictions in Vinaya on paṇḍakas that I know of such as: people who can only be aroused through voyeurism (and these are not even necessarily "gay" people), intersexed people and men who enjoy swallowing semen are barred from becoming ordained. Otherwise, the Buddhist sūtras and tantras really do not have much to say about paṇḍakas.

In Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine one's gender preference is biologically determined by various factors during conception and pregnancy, for the most part.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: The Almighty Holly Father Padmasambava

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Heh, Bodhisattvas never abandon sentient beings..unless of course, they stink..in which case, all bets are off.

I know I have seen initiations where you are not supposed to consume these a certain amount of time before hand, some that specify "no meat garilc onion" etc..I always assumed it was a winds and channels thing in the Vajrayana perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

These initiations are grounded in lower tantra where conduct which resembles that of brahmins is important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Kaccāni said:

I see no need to introduce a concept of multiple lives beyond that which can be experienced.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha found it important, indeed his realization was predicated on it.

Kaccāni said:

Can you please give me a couple of sources that illustrate this importance?

Best wishes

Kc

At Savatthi. There the Blessed One said: "From an inconstruable beginning comes transmigration. A beginning point is not evident, though beings hindered by ignorance and fettered by craving are transmigrating & wandering on. What do you think, monks: Which is greater, the tears you have shed while transmigrating & wandering this long, long time — crying & weeping from being joined with what is displeasing, being separated from what is pleasing — or the water in the four great oceans?"

"As we understand the Dhamma taught to us by the Blessed One, this is the greater: the tears we have shed while transmigrating & wandering this long, long time — crying & weeping from being joined with what is displeasing, being separated from what is pleasing — not the water in the four great oceans."

"Excellent, monks. Excellent. It is excellent that you thus understand the Dhamma taught by me.

"This is the greater: the tears you have shed while transmigrating & wandering this long, long time — crying & weeping from being joined with what is displeasing, being separated from what is pleasing — not the water in the four great oceans.

"Long have you (repeatedly) experienced the death of a mother. The tears you have shed over the death of a mother while transmigrating & wandering this long, long time — crying & weeping from being joined with what is displeasing, being separated from what is pleasing — are greater than the water in the four great oceans.

"Long have you (repeatedly) experienced the death of a father... the death of a brother... the death of a sister... the death of a son... the death of a daughter... loss with regard to relatives... loss with regard to wealth... loss with regard to disease. The tears you have shed over loss with regard to disease while transmigrating & wandering this long, long time — crying & weeping from being joined with what is displeasing, being separated from what is pleasing — are greater than the water in the four great oceans.

"Why is that? From an inconstruable beginning comes transmigration. A beginning point is not evident, though beings hindered by ignorance and fettered by craving are transmigrating & wandering on. Long have you thus experienced stress, experienced pain, experienced loss, swelling the cemeteries — enough to become disenchanted with all fabricated things, enough to become dispassionate, enough to be released."

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn15/sn15.003.than.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 7:19 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

TheSynergist said:

However, the idea that these "5 pungent plants" can result in bad rebirths and ghost attacks is quite a development.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, garlic is a main ingredient in herbal formulas for repelling attacks by bhūtas, nāgas and so on.

But generally, one is to avoid eating it and onions because they grew from the drops of blood of Rahu mixed with amrita which fell to the earth when Rahu was decapitated. But because Rahu's blood was mixed with amrita, these plants are also medicinal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

TheSynergist said:

Let me just say that I very much appreciated the discussion about Nāgārjuna. I myself wasn't sure if Nāgārjuna authored all the texts that are attributed to him and now I'm not alone in my skepticism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a core body of texts called the collection of reasonings, another collection called the four praises, and then the Ratnavali and the Suhrillekha, which all generally accept are composed by Nāgārjuna I.

Then there are the texts authored by the siddhi Nāgārjuna who likely lived in the early 8th century, the disciple of Saraha senior.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Master Hsuan Hua on garlic, onions, etc.

Content:

TheSynergist said:

I recently stumbled across Master Hsuan's commentary on the Shurangama Sutra, which contained this gem:

1) Do you think it's a good idea to abstain from the five pungent plants?

Malcolm wrote:

In the Lankāvatāra is recommended that one desist from eating garlic, and also in the lower tantras. Also Mulasarvastivadin bhikṣus and bhikṣunīs were supposed to avoid eating it, apart from as medicine for various complaints.

It probably has to do with the prohibition of garlic among Brahmins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Bardo and rebirth

Content:

umbra said:

I have read that there are practices one can do while alive, and techniques to employ in the Bardo-state, that gives the ability to choose the next incarnation, but no details ever seem to be given. What are the specific techniques and practices that gives one control to pick the next rebirth?

Malcolm wrote:

No details are ever given because these are Vajrayāna practices which require empowerments and authorization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Gyurme Kundrol said:

Unfortunately just putting your foot down and saying "If you don't believe, you aren't practicing Dharma!" is going to turn lots of people off from Dharma. This is exactly what religious institutions do and it's what is driving westerners out of religions by the millions.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to follow your own ideas, that is fine. I prefer to follow the advice of Mañjuśrī: If you have attachment to this life, you are not a Dharma practitioner. And will continue to recommend that other people understand and follow this advice.

Loren said:

I agree with you but not everyone is Sachen Kunga Nyingpo and an emanation of Manjushri. We do have to start off with where we are with our own understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and for that, Atisha's three kinds of persons is a useful place to start.

In order to understand how to become a Dharma practitioner, we need to understand how it is that we are not, and then correct those deficiencies. We should not congratulate ourselves on being Dharma practitioners merely because we have taken an interest in Dharma and gone to visit some Lamas, and maybe even do a little meditation or mantra. If our goal is this life's happiness, we are not practicing Dharma no matter who we are or what high teachings we have taken. Ironically, this is true even if we accept rebirth, have received Dzogchen and Mahamudra teachings, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

yan kong said:

Forgive my gross ignorance, but is this the idea of an enduring, unchanging ego of some kind in Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

When tathagātagarbha is not correctly understood, then it becomes an incorrect view of self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reincarnation

Content:

Gyurme Kundrol said:

Unfortunately just putting your foot down and saying "If you don't believe, you aren't practicing Dharma!" is going to turn lots of people off from Dharma. This is exactly what religious institutions do and it's what is driving westerners out of religions by the millions.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to follow your own ideas, that is fine. I prefer to follow the advice of Mañjuśrī:

If you have attachment to this life, you are not a Dharma practitioner.

And will continue to recommend that other people understand and follow this advice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 17th, 2015 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We have a body of work, recognized by everyone, east and west, as being Nāgārjuna's authentic work. There are other texts which are under dispute and have been for centuries. Irrespective of the merits of Dharmadhātustava on its own, we really cannot accept it as representative of Nāgārjuna's oeuvre or of his thought even if generations of Indians and Tibetans have accepted it as such.

dzogchungpa said:

These sweaters are just so unravelly, aren't they?

Bakmoon said:

Yes, but the point of a sweater is to wear it, not to pull it apart on purpose.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I already mentioned this, to no avail apparently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reincarnation

Content:

Loren said:

I don't know. Even a practitioner of lowest capacity can practice the Dharma. (Although I think Queen Maya (don't know if she was middling, or highest) was, like Rahula, very lucky.) She was able to practice the Dharma in the god realm because of The Exalted One.

Malcolm wrote:

If someone's aim is the happiness and so on in this life, they are not even a practitioner of the lowest capacity since they are not following nor practicing the Dharma, even if they go for refuge to the Three Jewels. Their refuge is like trying to hire the Three Jewels as body guards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reincarnation

Content:

Kaccāni said:

I see no need to introduce a concept of multiple lives beyond that which can be experienced.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha found it important, indeed his realization was predicated on it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In the context of sutrayāna, which is under discussion here, one's intellectual view must be in accordance with one's in meditation.

In Vajrayāna, the view is experientially introduced, and having a correct intellectual view is less important. In that post I was speaking from the perspective of Vajrayāna. In this post, I am speaking from the perspective of sūtra.

dzogchungpa said:
OK, now it all makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:
Sūtra is based on analysis, whereas Vajrayāna is based on empowerment, that is where the differences lay.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 10:09 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reincarnation
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
"If one is attached to this life, one is not a Dharma practitioner."

If your goal is to simply end suffering in this lifetime, you are not a Dharma practitioner.

Jesse said:
You really shouldn't make such comments so haphazardly.

Malcolm wrote:
It was a very deliberate comment, not haphazard at all.

If you are only interested in ending suffering in this life, this means you are only interested in happiness in this life. If this is the case, whatever else you may be, you are not a Dharma practitioner.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 9:29 PM
Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
We have a body of work, recognized by everyone, east and west, as being Nāgārjuna's authentic work. There are other texts which are under dispute and have been for centuries. Irrespective of the merits of Dharmadhātustava on its own, we really cannot accept it as representative of Nāgārjuna's oeuvre or of his thought even if generations of Indians and Tibetans have accepted it as such.

dzogchungpa said:
These sweaters are just so unravelling, aren't they?

Malcolm wrote:
Well, this is why we have darning needles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Sherlock said:

But the whole path of Buddhadharma depends on reincarnation being the problem to solve.

Anders said:

That is not strictly true. The problem to solve is suffering.

The end of rebirth is central to this because of the implications that to take birth again will inevitably keep lead to suffering, going on indefinitely.

But the end of rebirth is not the central issue per se. And suffering in this life is as relevant as the next.

Sherlock said:

If you don't believe it you are not really taking refuge in the Buddha.

Anders said:

According to whom? If this in IYHO, you should say so.

Malcolm wrote:

"If one is attached to this life, one is not a Dharma practitioner."

If your goal is to simply end suffering in this lifetime, you are not a Dharma practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Letters from self recognized tulkus

Content:

tle said:

Reason, I do like your gradual way of breaking the news to them and will ask around for a psychiatrist who's willing to take the time.

Malcolm wrote:

A psychologist, unless they are in fact a buddhist, will not have the proper background to deal with this delusion. Plus, this is not Tibet or India where the soft approach will have much impact. I have seen a number of self-proclaimed tulkus lead their followers down pretty sordid roads. So, speaking as a westerner who has been in the Dharma for half of my life, and most of my adult life, it is better to nip this in the bud with a direct and decisive approach. Even, then, it is relatively easy to get some Tibetan to say you are

a tulku if you happen to display an aptitude for Dharma, and a bit of cash.

For example, i have no memory of any past lives. But I can infer that I was some kind of practitioner in my past life due to the ease with which I met the Dharma and gurus in this life. But I am not a tulku, nor would I permit anyone to give me such a recognition for a couple of reasons.

i have met a number of very sad individuals who have been very damaged by this fantasy, and others who used this fantasy to defraud others, and yet others who in my opinion use this idea that they are a tulku or emanation to expand their influence with the naive.

This is not Tibet or India, where there is a proper structure for educating and training reincarnated lamas, as well as a cultural precedent for it. Every western Tibetan Buddhist has a past life connection with Tibet, so it is better to emphasize this, but discourage the idea that someone is a tulku. As you know, to be a real tulku you should be recognized when quite young.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, there is a way of understanding tathāgatagarbha that does not conflict with the main body of Buddhist thinking, and there is a way of understanding it that causes one to have wrong view.

dzogchungpa said:

Like, say,

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=8318&p=101573#p101573>:

What does it matter if you believe in tathāgatagarbha which is described in so many tathāgatagarbha texts as a self (though, perish the thought, not the SAME self as advocated by the Hindus -- actually, if someone is really, really honest with themselves, they will admit it is impossible to differentiate the sat cit ananda of the Hindus from the atman, sukha, nitya, śuddha of the uttaratantra)?

?

Malcolm wrote:

In the context of sutrayāna, which is under discussion here, one's intellectual view must be in accordance with one's in meditation.

In Vajrayāna, the view is experientially introduced, and having a correct intellectual view is less important. In that post I was speaking from the perspective of Vajrayāna. In this post, I am speaking from the perspective of sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Sherlock said:

You said he was second Buddha earlier

confused

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I did. Refer to Domsum about poetic license.

"...even common Geshess are referred to as Buddhas,
what is permissible for poets
is not acceptable to scholars..."

or something like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

smcj said:

We have a body of work, recognized by everyone, east and west, as being Nāgārjuna's authentic work. There are other texts which are under dispute and have been for centuries. Irrespective of the merits of Dharmadhātustava on its own, we really cannot accept it as representative of Nāgārjuna's oeuvre or of his thought even if generations of Indians and Tibetans have accepted it as such. It does not necessarily mean it conflicts with Nāgārjuna's thought, but when this text is interpreted in such a way that to clearly does conflict with Nāgārjuna's thought, one cannot say, "This is how I am reading the Dharmadhātustava, and therefore this is what Nāgārjuna also maintained."

For example, there is a way of understanding tathāgatagarbha that does not conflict with the main body of Buddhist thinking, and there is a way of understanding it that causes one to have wrong view.

As I said, I find it difficult to believe the Dharmadhātustava is by the same Nagarjuna. And no, it is not the type of scripture that authenticates itself. If it does not come from an enlightened mind it is not "Dharma". My point being that if someone like Karmapa III sees it as Dharma, then based on his credibility that is good enough for me to accept it regardless of the authorship issue. It's like having a co-signer. At that point it could be traditionally credited to Bozo the Clown for all I care.

Malcolm wrote:

There is all kind of valid Dharma that does not come from people who are quote unquote "enlightened". Even Nāgārjuna was only a first stage bodhisattva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Western Tulku and adequate training.

Content:

kirtu said:

However ultimately Wyatt (and every other western "tulku") have to find the energy and direction from their own inner resources.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, just like normal people, since that is what they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

smcj said:

The original reason I brought this up was to make the point that it really doesn't matter one way or another. The somewhat muddled history hasn't limited anybody's practice in the last 1,000 years! That being the case, what possible difference does it make?

Malcolm wrote:

It matters when someone makes a claim asserting that it represents Nāgārjuna's thought, since he is the second Buddha.

smcj said:

Nagarjuna's "Reasonings" stand on their own merit. It is a case where the work validates itself, just like Shakespeare's plays are not dependent on who wrote them. His "Praises" are another issue.

Other types of teachings are more dependent on being validated by the source. However if (as is the premise of my position) later generations of yogis that have realization confirm the value of the scripture then you can say it receives authentication that way, much like Shakyamuni giving his stamp of approval on something that Ananada said. Therefore the historicity of the source need not be the only source of validation. The validation can be confirmed by a modern master--but only by a master, not an academic.

Malcolm wrote:

We have a body of work, recognized by everyone, east and west, as being Nāgārjuna's authentic work. There are other texts which are under dispute and have been for centuries. Irrespective of the merits of Dharmadhātustava on its own, we really cannot accept it as representative of Nāgārjuna's oeuvre or of his thought even if generations of Indians and Tibetans have accepted it as such. It does not necessarily mean it conflicts with Nāgārjuna's thought, but when this text is interpreted in such a way that

to clearly does conflict with Nāgārjuna's thought, one cannot say, "This is how I am reading the Dharmadhātustava, and therefore this is what Nāgārjuna also maintained."

For example, there is a way of understanding tathāgatagarbha that does not conflict with the main body of Buddhist thinking, and there is a way of understanding it that causes one to have wrong view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

smcj said:

The original reason I brought this up was to make the point that it really doesn't matter one way or another. The somewhat muddled history hasn't limited anybody's practice in the last 1,000 years! That being the case, what possible difference does it make?

Malcolm wrote:

It matters when someone makes a claim asserting that it represents Nāgārjuna's thought, since he is the second Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Western Tulku and adequate training.

Content:

kirtu said:

I remember the biography of Dezhung Rinpoche saying the younger Khons in the US not being very interested in the Dharma, which is sad.

Remember that HE Dezhung Rinpoche died in 1987. That observation applied to what is now the middle generation in the US and is no longer valid.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed , Kirt, there are a number of Phuntsog Phodrang Dungseys presently being trained in India. This is actually one of the main reasons HHST and HHJS agreed on the rotational system of Trizins, so all their training would not be wasted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Letters from self recognized tulkus

Content:

ReasonAndRhyme said:

What I never did was directly confront people in the style Malcolm suggested.

Malcolm wrote:

People ask me sometimes, or proffer their idea, and I have two answers:

"I am not an awakened person, so don't ask me", followed quickly by, "You probably are not a tulku, and even if you are, you probably should abandon the idea and be happy you are just a normal, regular person who is no one special."

I have met people who were convinced they were tulkus and one hundred percent miserable that no one had recognized them as such. I have met plenty of so called western tulkus recognized by this or that Tibetan and not one was something special.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Letters from self recognized tulkus

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

What if some of the children really are tulkus?

Malcolm wrote:

Then their qualities will manifest without or without recognition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 16th, 2015 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Letters from self recognized tulkus

Content:

tle said:

I decided when I joined this forum that I wouldn't identify myself so that I could speak my mind.

If you're thinking I'm some famous person you're mistaken. Many of the letters I receive have my name misspelled; which goes to show just how important I am lol.

Someone suggested in PM to refer them to someone else, and give them the run around until they give up. Immediately people who cannot be reached, but have an address to mail to, came to mind. What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you are a famous person, that is not the point, the point is why would people bother sending you such letters?

In general, my opinion is that you just be direct with them and encourage them to give up this delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 15th, 2015 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So, when I said there is no common ground, this is perhaps a bit of an overstatement, but what I really mean is that Śāntarakṣita is not basing himself on the treatises of the Yogacara masters.

Tom said:

This is still a huge assumption. It is likely that many of the ideas/arguments of Vasubhandu can be traced through to Śāntarakṣita and Kamaliśīla. Research on this to be published in the not too distant future.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but I am not seeing it. For example, in the Madhyamakālaṃkāravṛtti, there are exactly nine reference to paratantra, for example. Kind of surprising for such a lengthy commentary on an ostensibly Yogacara System, but there are a number of important passages from the Lanka and so on.

So I will wait and see this research.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 15th, 2015 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Letters from self recognized tulkus

Content:

tle said:

Because of my affiliations I get quite a few letters from around the USA from people who want to be recognized as the reincarnation of this lama or that.

I used to send replies explaining that neither I, nor someone I know, is qualified to recognize this or that lama's reincarnation, the second coming of Jesus, or whatever.

The responses tended to lead to more letters and people showing up at the temple to prove they had miraculous powers so I stopped replying. Every month I usually have a few of these letters to shred, or more often emails to delete, to protect the privacy of people I recognize probably have a mental illness.

This isn't entirely unique to the Western world. In Asia it tends to be parents bringing in toddlers and explaining elephant dreams.

I'd like some outside perspective on this phenomenon as I have been receiving more than one letter a day for the past 2 weeks from a "reincarnation" of protector deity we practice here and their following of 2 or 3 students. They must have spent \$40 on postage alone and they just seem to want validation, but I can't give them that.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, who are you to be receiving such letters?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 15th, 2015 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Nyingma Khenpo in S.F. area 3/21/15-3/22/15

Content:

smcj said:

Sat: Dependent Arising, Emptiness & Modern Life

Sun a.m.: Samadhi & Dzogchen

Sun p.m.: Vajrasattva

<http://www.dechenrang.com/event.html>

I don't know him or what flavor of Nyingma he represents, but Khenpos are generally pretty reliable as scholars and Nyingma Khenpos are rare.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the flavor of my guru , Khenpo Jigmr Phutsog, who was truly an amazing master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 15th, 2015 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

daverupa said:

Well, as sure as one can be about history, I'm sure you meant.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure there was not a factory of pandita's churning texts branded "Nāgārjuna", just as I am equally sure there were at least two persons named Nāgārjuna who wrote texts whose identities became conflated, first by Indians, and later, by Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 15th, 2015 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism loses all purpose if you don't believe in reinc

Content:

Matt J said:

I think this is clearly covered in the Kalamas Sutta.

The Buddha runs through the options, Pascal-wager like, and bets that his path which leads to the end of a "hate-filled" mind works in any event:

"Suppose there is a hereafter and there is a fruit, result, of deeds done well or ill. Then it is possible that at the dissolution of the body after death, I shall arise in the heavenly world, which is possessed of the state of bliss.' This is the first solace found by him.

"Suppose there is no hereafter and there is no fruit, no result, of deeds done well or ill. Yet in this world, here and now, free from hatred, free from malice, safe and sound, and happy, I keep myself.' This is the second solace found by him.

"Suppose evil (results) befall an evil-doer. I, however, think of doing evil to no one. Then, how can ill (results) affect me who do no evil deed?' This is the third solace found by him.

"Suppose evil (results) do not befall an evil-doer. Then I see myself purified in any case.' This is the fourth solace found by him.

Emphasis added.

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/soma/wheel008.html>

Malcolm wrote:

This not a liberation teaching.

If someone wishes for liberation as taught by the Buddha, then they must understand the teaching of karma and rebirth as it is taught by the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 15th, 2015 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

smcj said:

Your analogy is not apt — it is not like there was a Nāgārjuna factory punching out texts branded "Nāgārjuna".

You sure about that?

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I am.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 15th, 2015 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

smcj said:

Like I said, I don't care.

I accept the Dharmadhatustava as authentic Dharma with no need to resolve the authorship question. I also don't care that Henry Ford had no part in producing the Mustang, yet I have no problem accepting the Mustang as an authentic Ford product.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara of Asanga is authentic Dharma, but I do not accept its ultimate conclusions;

Abhidharma is authentic Dharma, but I do not accept its ultimate conclusions. Dharmadhātustava is an authentic Dharma text, but I certainly don't think we need to accept the claim it is a work of Nāgārjuna's and therefore consider it an authority that we need to take into account in order to take stock of Nāgārjuna's actual views on this and that.

The point is that it is not representative of the thought of Nāgārjuna I, and when it is conflated with Nāgārjuna I's works, it creates interpretive problems and headaches that simply are not necessary and obscure things.

Your analogy is not apt — it is not like there was a Nāgārjuna factory punching out texts branded "Nāgārjuna".

As a text, it is important, especially in a Vajrayāna context, but it should be treated on its own, and not as an emblem of some hidden or esoteric allegiance to the tathāgatagarbha school on the part of Nāgārjuna numero uno.

It is important to understand that Nārōpa thought it was a valid text of Nāgārjuna I, and to understand how that may have shaped his attitude towards things (less radically than you imagine), and so on. But clearly, despite Atisha's enthusiasm for it, he clearly understood it in light of Candrakīrti's approach to Madhyamaka. In other words, we need to understand this text, its importance in formation of certain ideas because it was attributed to Nāgārjuna without conflating the text with Nāgārjuna's actual works.

I have really tremendous respect for KB's scholarship, but somehow, I think he has an emotional relationship with gzhan stong that causes him to err in his estimation of certain texts, even when he writes very clearly on textual issues and brings out facts that very clearly contradict and repudiate the claims that gzhan stong scholars make.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 15th, 2015 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

smcj said:

That is because Nāgārjuna I did not write it. The author of the Dharmadhātustava is the same Nāgārjuna who wrote the Bodhicittavivaraṇa and the Pañcakrama.

I'm working off of Brunnholzl's book where he cites Candrakīrti as having listed the "Praises" (the collection) as being authored by Nāgārjuna, and Atisha specifically credits the Dharmadhātustava to him. Since you disagree, and since this is way way over my head, I'll let you contact Brunnholzl about it directly.

But like I said, I find it difficult to believe it's the same guy too. The point of my post being that I really don't care!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Candra lists the praises, but does not detail this one. The earliest reference we

have to the Dharmadhātustava being a composition of Nāgārjuna is by Dharmamitra (9th century, disciple of Haribhadra) in his Abhisamayālaṃkārikāprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstraṭīkā prasphuṭapadā-nāma. Naropa considers it to be a composition of Nāgārjuna's, as does Atisha and Jagaddalanivāsin. However, a commentary on Hevajra Tantra, likely composed in the 12th century, cites a passage from the Dharmadhātustava, saying only that "some ārya said,"..." — this indicates to me some doubt in Indian circles as to the veracity of the source.

So while of course there is a late tradition that this text was composed by Nāgārjuna dating from the ninth century (Dharmamitra), the absence of any reference to it all in earlier Madhyamaka sources, especially Candrakīrti, indicates it cannot be accepted as part of Nāgārjuna's oeuvre. David Ruegg has also cast doubt on its composition, wondering at the fact that significant portions of it are reproduced in Atisha's Dharmadhātudarśanagīti which is included in the rgyud section of the bstan 'gyur, but I think Atisha was just riffing on it.

Given that the fact that 10th-11th century Indians like Naropa and Atisha accepted the Mulamadhyamaka-kārikas and the Pañcakrama side by side as the work of the same Nāgārjuna, I think we can understand that they did not know how to distinguish the authentic works of Nāgārjuna from works by later authors of the same name.

Then there is the fact that the Dharmadhātustava was not translated into Tibetan until the 11th century ((like the Bodhicittavivarana and so on) by Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita and Lotsawa Tsultrim Gyalwa, and I think we can understand this text was probably composed in early ninth century by the siddha Nāgārjuna. Also, if you examine carefully, you will find only that Candrakīrti mentions four praises as being authentic, these are the Lokakīṭa, Nirupamya, Acintya and Paramārthastavas. This does not mean these four are in fact compositions of Nāgārjuna, merely that they are a restricted list accepted by the middle period Madhyamikas (we can exclude the Madhyamakapradīpa, because Bhāvya and Bhāvaviveka are different people).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 14th, 2015 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Would this simile be acceptable: 'knowing is to mind as illumination is to light'?

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, what Śāntarakṣita is attempting to point out is that mind is a knower intrinsically, that its capacity for knowing is an innate quality. This is somewhat in distinction with the idea that it is the meeting of a sense organ with a sense object that gives rise to a consciousness of a given object.

One should contrast this with Candarkīrti and Śāntideva's critiques of rang rig to fully understand the issue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 14th, 2015 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: How does 18 early Buddhism School Related to Mahayana?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Nagarjuna, who lived two or three centuries before Asanga and Vasubandu, is at least in one place criticizing the Yogacara view, (found that in Christian Lindtner's Master of Wisdom, Writings of Nagarjuna).

.

Malcolm wrote:

You are referring to the Bodhicittavivarana, this late tantric text is associated with the Guhyasamaja Tantra — I have no idea why Lindtner imagines it is by Nāgārjuna I, there is no chance that it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 14th, 2015 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

anjali said:

=

Somehow, though, the phrase "knowing inherent to consciousness" doesn't quite explicitly capture the self-knowing dimension of that inherent knowing.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not know itself, that exactly Śāntarakṣita's point. It is just an inherent knower. If this knower knew itself, it would be susceptible to refutations leveled by Śāntarakṣita against such a self-knower because it would become an object, viz this rebuttal:

Due to the characteristic of rang rig being a mere entity of clarity, if there is an object that becomes the knower while it is being known, since this will consequently harm your claim for two aspects, you also cannot make such an assertion.

In other words, rang rig is merely a term for the clarity of consciousness, just as clarity is merely a term for the rang rig of consciousness. But it is clear from all of the places where Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla deal with the problem of rang rig, they reject the idea that it is a knower that is capable of taking itself as an object — which is the classic madhyamika objection to rang rig. Thus Śāntarakṣita is redefining rang rig for his own purposes as the mere clarity of consciousness in order to differentiate consciousness from insentient phenomena such as rock, chariots, and walls. This must be understood to be distinct from the svasamvedana proposed by the Pramāṇavārttika and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 14th, 2015 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

anjali said:

Hmm. Why the "[intrinsic]" in the above quotes? Is that your take on how "reflexive" should be understood? Or is it part of the actual quotations?

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you did not notice this sentence:

malcolm said:

...it is probably bad practice to define Śāntarakṣita's "rang rig", "svasamvedana" as either a "self-cognizing cognition" or a "reflexive knower", it is probably better to understand it as "intrinsic knowing", since that fits with how it is being defined above. Taking a look at Śāntarakṣita's definition of svasamvedana, it takes the form of: The nature of X is Y.

In this case, The nature of X (intrinsic clarity) is Y (the reflexive knowing of consciousness).

X and Y aren't the same thing, in the same sense that mind and the nature of mind are not the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not talking about the nature of the mind in that sense. However, from a Madhyamaka point of view, one cannot separate a thing from its nature, for example, fire and heat are not two separate things, clarity and consciousness too are not separate things. Here, clarity, the nature of consciousness, is the knowing inherent to consciousness, which is what distinguishes consciousness from inert things like rocks, bricks and walls.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 14th, 2015 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no common ground with Yogacara and Shantarakṣita either.

Greg said:

"No common ground" seems a bit of an overstatement to me, based on the fact that Śāntarakṣita 1) famously claimed in the MA that one should "ride the chariots of the two systems" and 2) he accepts self-cognizing cognition at the level of saṃvṛiti-satya.

Malcolm wrote:

Your second statement should be examined first — which svasamvedana is

Śāntarakṣita advocating?

What Śāntarakṣita says in fact about svasamvedana in the root text is only:

Because a tripartite nature cannot be accepted
in the nature of one partless [entity],
such a reflexive knower
is not an entity that has an action and and agent.

Śāntarakṣita's auto-commentary states:

"Though a reflexive [intrinsic] knower is imputed in relative truth, it cannot withstand an analysis into one or many", thus [the issue] has been settled.

He then defines an acceptable svasamvedana:

That being the case, the nature of intrinsic clarity that does not depend on another clarifier is the reflexive [intrinsic] knowing of consciousness.

Kamalaśīla's Madhyamakālaṃkārapañjikā supports this saying:

The concise meaning is that the function of reflexive [intrinsic] knowing is only to be the opposite of inert substances such as chariots, walls and so on. It is a convention for a clarity that does not depend on anything.

And:

Due to the characteristic of reflexive [intrinsic] knowing being a mere entity of clarity, if there is an object that becomes the knower while it is being known, since this will consequently harm your claim for two aspects, you also cannot make such an assertion. So this is quite a bit different than what most people take svasamvedana to mean. BTW, given this context, it is probably bad practice to define Śāntarakṣita's "rang rig", "svasamvedana" as either a "self-cognizing cognition" or a "reflexive knower", it is probably better to understand it as "intrinsic knowing", since that fits with how it is being defined above.

Then, Śāntarakṣita states:

One should know that external entities
do not exist based on mind-only;
based on this approach [tshul]
one can truly understand the absence of a self.

And comments:

Based on the approach of mind-only, it is easy to understand the absence of nature [niḥsvabhāva] of I and mine, apprehending subject and apprehended object and so on, asserted as external to a concomitant mind. Since this approach is the non-existence of self-origination, that mind is also understood to be without nature. When this middle path free of all extremes is understood, the freedom from having a nature of one or many is truly understood as the absence of a nature.

In terms of the two approaches, it is true that Śāntarakṣita states:

Having mounted the chariot of the two approaches,
holding the reins of reasoning,
in just that way therefore, they
will obtain the Mahāyāna.

But it never clearly specified that he is combining Asanga and Nāgārjuna's system. In his auto-commentary, all that is said about this is a citation from the Lanka: The Mahāyāna is included in two approaches. The brief explanation follows:

Five dharmas, three natures,
eight consciousnesses,
and two selflessness
encompass the entire Mahāyāna.

Kamalaśīla's Madhyamakālaṃkārapañjikā does however state pretty clearly that the two approaches are Madhyamaka and Yogacara. He expands on the list given in the Lanka as well.

But which Yogacara is Kamalaśīla referring to? It is pretty clear that Śāntarakṣita is not basing himself upon the Yogacara of Asanga and so on that, but rather the Yogacara of the Lanka and other related sūtras.

So, when I said there is no common ground, this is perhaps a bit of an overstatement, but what I really mean is that Śāntarakṣita is not basing himself on the treatises of the Yogacara masters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 14th, 2015 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is still not a positive affirmation, and also, Della Santina has it a little wrong. The controversy is over how to negate non-Buddhists, which Bhavaviveka started by rejecting Buddhapalita's consequential argument when the latter rejected Samkhya origination from self.

Vajrasvapna said:

I was not talking about the definition of the absolute, both groups defined ultimate truth like emptiness through logic. However, a group accepted that it is possible to express and elaborate on ultimate truth while the other denies this possibility:

"The Indian Svitantrikas who followed Bhavaviveka admittedly differed slightly with respect to what may be termed their ontological interpretations of Buddhist doctrine. Nevertheless, the mode of argument favoured by them was generally uniform.

They believed that the principles of formal logic were not irrelevant to the demonstration of the Madhyamaka philosophy to an opponent. They employed syllogisms whose members were commonly admitted to be established by valid instruments of cognition. The Prasangikas rejected this practice because they maintained that on the occasion of ascertaining the nature of the ultimate truth, neither the subject of inference nor the reason exist for the Madhyamaka. Hence, they concluded it was inconsistent for the Madhyamaka philosophy to admit independent syllogisms, when the ultimate truth was investigated." p. 92 in 'Madhyamaka Schools in India' by Peter D. Santina,

Malcolm wrote:

This still does not amount to a "positive expression of the absolute".

In order to understand the difference between Bhavavivka and Candra, you have to refer to the argument I mention above. Basically, Buddhapalita states:

Therein, some existents cannot arise from themselves because the arising of those would be purposeless and because arising would be without end. Thus, arising would not be necessary for existents existing in and of themselves. If although [such things] exist, [they] still arise, and because there will never be non-arising, that is not desirable there. Therefore, something existent does not arise from self.

Bhavaviveka rejects this because this argument is not formed as a proper syllogism that an opponent would accept. It is a consequence, not a syllogism. He says of this that it is insufficient to turn someone away from the Samkhya view. He says:

[A]nother explains "existents cannot arise from themselves because the arising of those would be purposeless and because arising would be without end." That is not reasonable because no reason [hetu] and example is mentioned, because the faults stated by others will be not dispelled...."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 13th, 2015 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: How does 18 early Buddhism School Related to Mahayana?

Content:

usnisha said:

if Yogacara is originated from Sarvastivada (Asanga and Vasubandhu are from Sarvastivada), From which school Madhyamaka is originated?

Aemilius said:

From Vasubandhu in Abhidharmakosa it seems evident that Yogachara had existed long before the time of Asanga and Vasubandhu. Because Vasubandhu often calls Yogacharins the Ancient Masters. The meaning is that Yogachara was the ancient school when compared to the Vibhassa of Sarvastivada, which was then modern and that Vasubandhu was commenting on.

It is quite certain that the Three turnings of Dharma existed originally, because the Sravakayana had to include a strained explanation for it in their Canon, (i.e. that they all refer to the four noble truths!)

I think that Yogacara and Madhyamaka both originated from the Buddha himself.

Asanga was not a Sarvastivadin, some scholars think that he may have been a Mahishasaka in his youth. Vasubandhu converted to Mahayana due to the influence of Asanga.

usnisha said:

I am quite confused now, Asanga the one who popularize yogacara isn't it ? how is he related to Mahisasaka?

if it is originated from Buddha himself, there should be a trace either from Mahasanghika or Staviras, or maybe from Licchavi Vimalakirti (Vimalakirti is not a bhiksu, but a Highly realized being) or other Boddhisattvas that manifest in human being during the Buddha's lifetime.

and more Interesting if yogacara is originated from ancient time, is it related to Master Patanjali a non-Buddhist and theosophy follower? Patanjali is the one who popularize yoga (= name is similiar), and from my understanding, yoga is a kind of philosophy in india.

Malcolm wrote:

Personally, I see a lot of influence from Samkhya in Yogacara theory.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 13th, 2015 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: How does 18 early Buddhism School Related to Mahayana?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

'Mahayana' is not a school of Buddhism - there are many different 'schools' within Mahayana. Theravada (= Way of the Elders) is much more like a single school. The history and ancestry of the Buddhist lineages is a very complex topic which is made very difficult by the fact that many of the early schools left very few traces of their existence.

There is information on the question, but it takes research and reading to get to it. In terms of popular books which give an outline, I would recommend Buddhism: Its Essence and Development by Conze which is a standard text.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna schools in India are Madhyamaka and Yogacara, and arguable, Tathagatagarbha.

usnisha said:

if Yogacara is originated from Sarvastivada (Asanga and Vasubandhu are from Sarvastivada), From which school Madyamaka is originated?

Malcolm wrote:

It has been argued that Nāgārjuna was a Sammitiya, and this also makes some sense since the only version of karma that Nāgārjuna admits to liking is the theory of karma is that school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 13th, 2015 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

I was talking about the Independent Syllogism: "It is after all our fundamental contention that the essential difference between the Prasatigika and Svatantrika schools lies in their acceptance or non-acceptance of the independent syllogism on the occasion of establishing the ultimate truth. It is, therefore, not our purpose to investigate in detail the ontological considerations which were entered into by Svatantrika philosophers inasmuch as they belonged to the Yogacara or Sautrantika schools. It is our aim in this study to concentrate upon the difference between the Prasatigika and Svatantrika schools with respect to the mode of argument which they adopted in order to explicate the Madhyamaka philosophy." p 75 in 'Madhyamaka Schools in India' by Peter D. Santina.

Malcolm wrote:

That is still not a positive affirmation, and also, Della Santina has it a little wrong. The controversy is over how to negate non-Buddhists, which Bhavaviveka started by rejecting Buddhapalita's consequential argument when the latter rejected Samkhya origination from self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 13th, 2015 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

The idea that Shantarakshita separates the two truths is not really correct, because even on the relative level he claimed that everything is not truly existent. The difference, in fact, is that he used positive affirmations to express the absolute...

Malcolm wrote:

He asserts that while some say that the ultimate is non-origination, he prefers to describe it as inexpressible. But this is not a "positive affirmation to express the absolute."

This is all Śāntarakṣita says about the ultimate:

Therefore, the Tathāgatas have said

all phenomena have not arisen

because it corresponds with ultimate truth —

this is called "the ultimate truth."

Due to the absence of arising and so on,

nonarising and so on are impossible.

Due the negation of that [nonarising],

words for it are not possible.

He states quite clearly and plainly that nonarising was taught by the Buddhas because it corresponds with ultimate truth. He then further examines nonarising and establishes it too is impossible in absence of something which arose, and that impossibility is inexpressible, there are no words for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 13th, 2015 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no common ground with Yogacara and Shantarakṣita either.

PorkChop said:

Because in the ultimate sense he was a Madhyamika?

The idea of using Yogacara to explain the conventional and Madhyamaka for the ultimate does have a sort of elegance.

Malcolm wrote:

Śāntarakṣita makes absolutely no use of the key Yogacara concepts, the imagined nature, the dependent nature and the perfected nature, or for that matter, ālayavijñāṇ. The term "Yogacara" Madhyamaka, a misnomer, is a Tibetan appellation, it is not an Indian one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 13th, 2015 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

smcj said:

Off topic; but there are many who assert there were indeed two separate Nāgārjuna: (i) the Siddha Nāgārjuna and (ii) Ācārya Nāgārjuna.

Though their sentiments and expositions are not antithetical at all, not sure how you came to that conclusion.

Have you read it? It reads like a text by Asanga.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not really read like a Yogacara text at all either, it reads like a Vajrayāna text, which is in fact what it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 13th, 2015 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

smcj said:

Let me use a personal example: I find it very very difficult to believe that Nagarjuna wrote "In Praise of Dharmadhatu" (Skt: Dharmadhatustava).

Malcolm wrote:

That is because Nāgārjuna I did not write it. The author of the Dharmadhātustava is the same Nāgārjuna who wrote the Bodhicittavivaraṇa and the Pañcakrama.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 11th, 2015 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: How does 18 early Buddhism School Related to Mahayana?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

'Mahayana' is not a school of Buddhism - there are many different 'schools' within Mahayana. Theravada (= Way of the Elders) is much more like a single school. The history and ancestry of the Buddhist lineages is a very complex topic which is made very difficult by the fact that many of the early schools left very few traces of their existence.

There is information on the question, but it takes research and reading to get to it. In terms of popular books which give an outline, I would recommend Buddhism: Its Essence and Development by Conze which is a standard text.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna schools in India are Madhyamaka and Yogacara, and arguable, Tathagatagarbha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 11th, 2015 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

PorkChop said:

Malcolm,

Sorry to butt in, but does that quote lend credence to the idea that there's a common ground between Yogacara masters like Asanga & Vasubandhu and Indian Madhyamikas, prior to Śāntarakṣita?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all.

PorkChop said:

Oh well. Guess I'll just stick with Śāntarakṣita then. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no common ground with Yogacara and Shantarakṣita either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 11th, 2015 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

PorkChop said:

Malcolm,

Sorry to butt in, but does that quote lend credence to the idea that there's a common ground between Yogacara masters like Asanga & Vasubandhu and Indian Madhyamikas, prior to Śāntarakṣita?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 11th, 2015 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

TheSynergist said:

Seriously? It's hard to think of people more obsessed with worshiping the Buddha than Mahayanists. This is a point I allude to in my recent post, where I talked about how later scriptures play up the Buddha's (yes, the flesh and blood Buddha's) God-like qualities.

Also, bear in mind that the traditional Mahayana account posits that the historical Buddha did in fact teach the Mahayana Sutras, a point Malcolm likes to emphasize.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyānists don't worship the Buddha, we respect the Buddha, we are devoted to the Buddha. The Buddha of the Mahāyāna does not have "god-like" qualities anymore than the Buddha of the Hinayāna. He has the same powers, fearlessnesses, and so on. If there is a distinction to be made, it is in the understanding of what a Buddha's omniscience covers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 11th, 2015 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Unknown said:

(V)irtually all early Indian Yogacara masters (such as Asanga, Vasubandhu, Sthiramati, and Asvabhava), if they refer to the term tathagatagarbha at all, always explain it as nothing but suchness in the sense of twofold identitylessness. Thus, all Indian

Madhyamikas (except for Nagarjuna in his Dharmadhatustava) and virtually all classical Yogacara masters up to the tenth century were not willing to openly embrace the tathagatagarbha teachings as anything other than emptiness...

Malcolm wrote:

When the Clouds Part, BrunnholzL.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 11th, 2015 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

TheSynergist said:

Just to elaborate on this point, while we might think that uncritically accepting tradition is preserving history, it's not.

Further elaborating, in reference to the Sujato post: later narratives emphasize the "awesomeness" of the Bodhisattva/Buddha (e.g., they are perfect embodiments of pure compassion, they spend aeons and aeons of lifetimes preparing for Buddhahood, they don't suffer, they received a promise of Buddhahood under a previous Buddha, they are unambiguously omniscient, etc.). The earliest narratives, by contrast, emphasize their humanity and ordinariness (e.g., Gautama had to be encouraged to teach by a Brahma, he had to be badgered by his friend into seeing the last Buddha into a past life, he admitted to be unenlightened in past lives, he didn't describe himself as a bodhisattva in past lives, the extent of his "all-knowingness" is vague/limited, etc.). Sometimes we just conveniently ignore the early narratives (even Theravadins do this). When we do try to harmonize the narratives, by saying that the later ones are just developments of the early ones, it seems pretty clear that we're prioritizing the later ones --- we're interpreting the early ones in light of the later ones, and hence we have all these explanation like the Buddha's apparent suffering, hesitation and imperfections were only part of a show to teach ppl (e.g., the Lalitavistara Sūtra's idea that the Buddha's life was a play). Well, ok, we can do that, but can we really say we are serious about preserving the history in the early sources? Not really.

Malcolm wrote:

The Mahāyāna narratives are simply different than the Hinayāna narratives, and that is really all there is to it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 10th, 2015 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Don't 'get infected by' Buddhism

Content:

Simon E. said:

To whom ?

I knew already that Evangelical Christians are convinced that Buddhists are damned. I

would have thought that was common knowledge. Why give that view the oxygen of exposure ?

Malcolm wrote:

Oxygen rusts things...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 10th, 2015 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: Sakya Trizin - Chakrasamvara Body Mandala - Boston 4/201

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Khenpo Migmar on HH Sakya Trizin's upcoming visit to Boston:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 10th, 2015 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

rory said:

Your logic is faulty; if x didn't exist there naturally is nothing vs. epigraphy, accounts, pottery, etc that x existed.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that the Hittites mention an Akagamunaš in the 14th century BCE, who is the ruler of Achaeans?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 9th, 2015 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Soul Retrieval course pt 2: The Five Natural Elements

Content:

M.G. said:

I'm not familiar with Bon teachings in this area. Hope this isn't a naive question, but what is meant here by "soul?"

Malcolm wrote:

Life force, mainly.

Motova said:

What's the difference between Bon's force and Star Wars' force?

Malcolm wrote:

One's from an ancient culture, the other from a science fiction movie? Plus, there is not "dark side of the bla".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 9th, 2015 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Soul Retrieval course pt 2: The Five Natural Elements

Content:

M.G. said:

I'm not familiar with Bon teachings in this area. Hope this isn't a naive question, but what is meant here by "soul?"

Malcolm wrote:

Life force, mainly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 7th, 2015 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since you are Irish, and a fan of mythology, does it not strike you as interesting that the myth of the founding of the five counties in Ireland has an exact parallel in the Mahābharata, down to the name of the queen?

dzogchungpa said:

Is this what you are talking about?

<https://www.amazon.com/Destiny-King-Midway-Reprint-Series/dp/0226169766> The Destiny of a King examines one of the "little" epics within the Mahabharata—the legend of King Yayati, a distant ancestor of the Pandavas, the heroes of the larger epic. Dumézil compares Yayati's attributes and actions with those of the legendary Celtic king Eochaid Feidlech and also finds striking similarities in the stories surrounding the daughters of these two kings, the Indian Madhavi and the Celtic Medb. That definitely strikes me as interesting. Is there an explanation?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Georges Dumezil has the most convincing explanation of these issues, his comparative mythology is based on linguistic diffusion and he focused on the tripartite social structure of Indo-European societies — seminal texts of his included Mitra and Varuna, and so on. See also Puhvel, Jaan. Comparative Mythology. Baltimore 1987.

Destiny of a King is indeed also one of his seminal and important books.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 6th, 2015 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

rory said:

The Iliad is a bardic poem, shaped, re-shaped over centuries. There was a Troy and some memory of an event but no proof that Achilles, Paris, Helen of Troy existed.

Malcolm wrote:

And likewise, no evidence that they did not. Since you are Irish, and a fan of mythology, does it not strike you as interesting that the myth of the founding of the five counties in Ireland has an exact parallel in the Mahābharata, down to the name of the queen?
[/quote]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 5th, 2015 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Indrajala said:

Prior to that the Chinese it seems were unaware of a Tibetan people existing, even though they were in contact with various peoples on the Tibetan plateau, which suggests the Tibetan ethnogenesis is perhaps from around the sixth century CE.

Malcolm wrote:

You really need to read Kapstien's The Tibetans. In particular, you need to look into the Old Tibetan Chronicles:

<http://otdo.aa.tufs.ac.jp/archives.cgi>

The idea that Tibetans sprang into being in the 6th century is absurd.

Indrajala said:

"Tibetans" are not people from all over the Tibetan plateau. For example, the people of Gyalmo Rong are not Tibetan, speak a language that is not related to Tibetan, even though they are "Tibetan" Buddhist. There were many peoples on the Tibetan plateau. Then of course there were the Zhang Zhung people in Western Tibet. I am sure you have read Beckwith.

I'm simply wondering when the first evidence of "Tibet" and "Tibetans" appears. As my area is Sinology, I can say that Chinese records, which were unparalleled in the first millennium CE, do not suggest a coherent body of self-identifying Tibetans existed in any great number until perhaps the sixth or early seventh century. The Tang history states first contact was made in 634.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this actually has no bearing on Tibetan history. For example, Kapstein notes:

The ascendancy of the Pugyel Dynasty began sometime before 600, when Takbu Nyazi [grandfather of Srong bstan sgam po], the Yarlung ruler, became locked in conflict with the Takkyawo, the lord of the Zingpo, whose fiefdom was close to the region of modern Lhasa. The Old Tibetan Chronicle, which is our major source for these legendary events, and represents the standpoint of the Yarlung princes, describes Takkyawo as a thoroughly evil tyrant, doing all within his power to thwart the counsel of the good..

And so on it goes, describing a war in which Srong bstan sgam po's father Namri Löngtsen takes control of Central Tibet from Tsang to Kongpo.

Then of course, the Tibetans began looking outward at the world, seeking to establish legitimacy through marriage. Srong btsan sgam po had three wives, one from China, one from Nepal and one from Zhang Zhung, the three major powers on his borders.

Indrajala said:

My main issue is that the Chinese records never seem to mention a Buddhist presence in the Yarlung empire, indicating minimal Buddhist activities in Tibet. If there had been Buddhist activities, they would have been mentioned, since Chinese accounts of other foreign countries like Japan and others always mention that they have Buddhism. Hyechao's remarks are a supporting piece of evidence for my conclusion. I do not primarily derive my conclusion from Hyechao's remarks, which you seem to be suggesting.

Malcolm wrote:

When you say "Yarlung empire", what period do you mean? 625-675, 675-725, 725-775, 775-825, 825-875? This is a 250 year period. I would expect more precision from someone so concerned with dating things.

It is entirely fair to say that we do not have enough evidence about the period of 625-700 to say conclusively whether there was much in the way of Dharma in Tibet at that time, though it is probable that Wencheng had a contingent of Chinese monks with her.

We do know that the princess of Jincheng [d.739], married to Me Agsom in 710, as Kapstein recounts, "...appears to have played a major role in promoting Chinese learning, as well as the Buddhist religion, to which she was deeply devoted."

It is however preposterous to assert that in the period from 775 to 825 there wasn't an explosion of interest in Buddhism with literally hundreds of sūtras and śāstras being translated into Tibetan at a furious pace.

Indrajala said:

...A text's contents can be based on the inherited word of the Buddha, but can still be largely comprised of later concepts and ideas. I personally don't think this is an issue.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out to you was the case in the Illiad. Anachronisms do not indicate a late original date of composition. In the other hand, since one cannot, as it were separate the milk from the water in the case of these texts, it is better to err on the side of caution, no?

Indrajala said:

After WWII its secrecy was set aside and the living lineage made a public appearance. The tradition is flourishing today and you can buy several books on the subject and even almanacs from major bookshops in Japan.

Malcolm wrote:

That's cool.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 5th, 2015 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Indrajala said:

Perhaps you unaware, but Chinese dynastic histories detail various peoples they classified as Qiang 羌, which generally referred to areas around Gansu, Qinghai and (non-Han Chinese) Sichuan. What is now Central Tibet was made up of Western Qiang peoples. These accounts are not really studied or translated in English.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you should translate them into English, time permitting, to allow us all to see what is present there.

Indrajala said:

So, apart from external sources and oral traditions there are no records of early Tibet. It might very well be that there was no Tibet before the sixth or early seventh century. My basis for saying this is that the ethnogenesis of Tibet is described in the Tang history. See the following:

<https://wenyanwen.blogspot.com/2014/05/tibetan-ethnogenesis-in-tang-history.html>

The Qiang tribes were the predecessors of the people who would later self-identify as

"Tibetan" (Tubo 吐蕃 in Chinese), in which case you are discussing a diverse variety of peoples, unless you mean records of the Tibetan plateau region, in which case you can still indeed find many observations and records in Chinese histories.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is actually quite late and does not predate Tibetan records.

Indrajala said:

In my recent reading of the Tang dynasty history, which was initially compiled in 945 and revised in 1060

Malcolm wrote:

<https://wenyanwen.blogspot.com/2014/05/tibetan-ethnogenesis-in-tang-history.html>

Indrajala said:

Actually the more interesting conclusion one draws from looking at Chinese sources and Dunhuang materials is that it seems the Yarlung empire did not have much Buddhism to begin with. The kings might have sponsored sanghas and built a few temples, but how far any of it influenced Tibetan society is an interesting question.

Malcolm wrote:

And one likely to remain unanswered unless we build a time machine.

Indrajala said:

The Chinese histories I've looked at don't seem to mention any Buddhism existing in Tibet, and bear in mind there were many diplomats travelling through Tibet to the capital and back. The Tibetan state during the Yarlung/Tang period consecrated peace treaties with oaths that included animal sacrifices. Not very Buddhist at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, the Yarlung kings were required to maintain their relationship with Bonpo priests. There were even Bonpo animal sacrifices made in Lhasa under the reign of the Fifth.

Indrajala said:

This should lead to doubts about later sources describing a flourishing Buddhist kingdom with Buddhist kings. The credibility of such traditional histories held suspect, one can ask further questions about the motivations of their authors.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it just means that Buddhism usually does not supplant native religions in a single generation, or even four, as in the case of Tibet. Of course, by the eleventh century, a mere 158 years after the collapse of the Yarlung Dynasty, even Bonpos are for all intents and purposes Buddhists, which suggests that the penetration of Buddhism into the population between 842 and 1000 was fast and thorough. It is well known, even according to Tibetan records, that the penetration of Buddhism into the populace prior

to 750 was limited and tenuous, and after the reign of Srongtsen Gampo, Buddhism in Tibet was propped up by Chinese monks until they were kicked out in the early 8th century, only to be invited back during the reign of Trizon Detsen.

Indrajala said:

Just as there are no documents from Persia or China describing Tibet prior to the 6th century CE, and the Chinese records there are, are quite limited in scope and only cover the extreme western portion of Tibet, near modern Ladakh.

You're incorrect. The Chinese records detail contacts with peoples from all over the Tibetan plateau.

Malcolm wrote:

"Tibetans" are not people from all over the Tibetan plateau. For example, the people of Gyalmo Rong are not Tibetan, speak a language that is not related to Tibetan, even though they are "Tibetan" Buddhist. There were many peoples on the Tibetan plateau. Then of course there were the Zhang Zhung people in Western Tibet. I am sure you have read Beckwith.

There are five traditional tribes described in Tibetan culture — this is what I mean by oral tradition — who lived in various regions of Tibet. The tribe that may be described by the Chinese as the Qiang are known in Tibetan as the Dong (ཁོང་). There were also the Dru (འབྲུ་), the Dra (དྲ་) and the Go (གོ་) and the Ga (ག་).

Tibetans themselves also preserve records of all of their kings going back to the first king of Tibet, Nyatri Tsanpo, roughly 128 BCE. Unfortunately, the earliest of these records themselves are rather late, found in Dunhuang.

Indrajala said:

The Korean monk writing in Chinese, Hyechao, passed the extreme western portion of Tibet during the mid-Yarlung period, and made a few observations. I shall not reproduce his remarks as the last time I did you and many others reported taking personal offense.

Malcolm wrote:

Your reproduction of his remarks that was not offensive, it was your delight in them that was offensive. Anyway, do you have any idea how far extreme western Tibet is from central Tibet? Ngari is 900 miles from Lhasa. Leh is something like 1200 miles from Lhasa through rugged mountains, obviously not impossible to traverse, but at that time, they were separate kingdoms.

What he was describing is present day Baltistan, where today there are Tibetan speaking Muslims who write Tibetan in a Persian derived script.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balti_people, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balti_language

So saying, that Hyechao passed through what is present day Baltistan in the eighth century, and using this as a measure for the state of Buddhism in the Yarlung valley during his time period is rather like traveling to Scotland in the 4th century and noticing

there aren't any Christians and assuming there must not be much Christianity in the British Isles as a whole (a false conclusion).

Indrajala said:

Something indeed must be from the Buddha. I just haven't seen any solid criteria for determining what is and isn't.

This is where perhaps later śāstra material is useful as it can argue for the truth of Buddhist concepts rather than taking scripture on faith. I find Abhidharma rather useful too as it lays out metaphysics and explains it all quite coherently and systematically, and it generally makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't need Abhidharma merely to not "take the scriptures on faith." On the other hand, faith is a necessary faculty, part of the 37 bodhipakṣadharmas.

On the other hand, Abhidharma confirms that there is core of Buddhist thought and discussion that is ancient, which predates the writing of all canons.

Indrajala said:

Shingon still has their system which goes back to Amoghavajra.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but outside of Shingon, it has no uses, correct?

Indrajala said:

My point is that Buddhists can and will adopt and integrate fields of knowledge and arts which have little to do with liberation from saṃsāra. Secular scholarship is already widely accepted and funded by Buddhist organizations.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they can, bodhisattvas need to become expert in the five sciences, according to Maitreyanatha, but not at the expense adhyatmavidyā.

Indrajala said:

Well, I am not complaining about Japanese scholarship, am I?

Japanese scholarship is just as secular as western scholarship, if not more. They deconstruct things as well. The main difference though is that they focus on the facts of texts and archaeology rather than debating opinions back and forth.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know. I was not born yesterday.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 5th, 2015 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Sherlock said:

Care about Western scientific knowledge to some extent yes (it is embarrassing that Tibetan monks don't even know where Tamil Nadu is for example, when they were educated in India/Nepal), but a concern with the origins of Buddhadharma according to Western historiography is not important at all and likely deleterious. .

Malcolm wrote:

If you asked them in Hindi, they would like respond immediately and accurately.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 5th, 2015 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

daverupa said:

[

It's sad wherever this approach is seen, Mormon or New Ager or Mahayanika or Theravadan or anyone at all...

Malcolm wrote:

And what do you do when face with the Buddha's recounting his past lives in the Pali canon? Just ignore it? Or rationalize it away as a "later strata".

One of the problems with text critical studies pursued in this way is the assumption that texts are like geological strata and can be dated accordingly. This is a huge error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 5th, 2015 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

smcj said:

The practice of Buddhism is emic. The study of Buddhism is etic. One path culminates in enlightenment. The other path culminates in tenure.

Malcolm wrote:

The two most misused terms in Buddhist studies these days.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 5th, 2015 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are a lot of areas in Tibetan Buddhist studies where there is simply little or no evidence at all (like for example, the period prior to 1000), and yet people love making up theories all the time.

Indrajala said:

Yet you just said... There is evidence for the first century or two of Buddhist history, it is embedded in texts that are considerably later, that is all.

Surely evidence about early Tibet could be embedded in later texts?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by early. Pre 7th century? Not a chance. Tibetans managed an unparalleled cultural lobotomy. Even the Bonpos have no texts that truly date earlier than the early 11th century. So, apart from external sources and oral traditions there are no records of early Tibet. Separating out what might be truly pre-Buddhist material from the Buddhist era is very difficult. Namkhai Norbu has offered some theories in this respect, having to do with cultural differences between Indian and Tibetan rituals found in Bonpo liturgies, but in reality, pre-Buddhist Tibet is a matter for archaeologists now, like John Vincent Belleza.

When it comes to the imperial period, yes, there are lots of text circulating around that can be used to mine for evidence, there is also the Dunhuang collection, which has many important text, none probably dating earlier than the 10th century though. There are of course many interesting facts one could glean, but even here, did Lang Darma suppress the Buddhist monasteries? Or did he merely subject them to taxation? Why was he assassinated? There are things we might answer if we were given to speculate, but they would remain speculative.

Indrajala said:

The truth is there's absolutely nothing from the Buddha's time, but at least with early Tibet you have Dunhuang and Chinese sources. There is no Persian or Chinese document from the fifth century BCE describing the state of religion in Magadha.

Malcolm wrote:

Just as there are no documents from Persia or China describing Tibet prior to the 6th century CE, and the Chinese records there are, are quite limited in scope and only cover the extreme western portion of Tibet, near modern Ladakh.

Indrajala said:

There is evidence for the first century or two of Buddhist history, it is embedded in texts that are considerably later, that is all.

Good luck trying to decipher it from everything else. On what grounds does one even discern what is from the Buddha's time and what isn't? What criteria do you use? These are questions scholars are asking. Your statement here would never fly with most present day Indologists and Pali experts.

Malcolm wrote:

Something must be from the time of the Buddha, for example, in the Agamas and Pali Canon — unless of course you take the extreme skepticism of someone like Atwood seriously. That said, we have a record of the sayings of a person called the Buddha. One either accepts that record is generally accurate, or not. If you don't, chances are you are not going to make much a Dharma practitioner.

Indrajala said:

No one is going to attain awakening by reading your articles, nor are they going to attain awakening by reading Wedemeyer's book mentioned above, no matter how intellectually interesting they may be.

Nobody is going to attain awakening through astrology, yet historically many Buddhists found it quite useful and worth keeping.

Malcolm wrote:

There seem to have been a number of such systems — for the most part they are all lost, no one uses them. In Tibetan Buddhism, they have Kālacakra for calendar making, and 'byung rtsi for day to day — these survive mainly because in the first case, it sets the religious calendar for the year, and in the second case, it is the main means through which monasteries prescribe rituals for lay people to purchase.

Indrajala said:

What's more, scholarship on Buddhism has become more of an exercise in knowing the opinions of other westerners about this or that thing than it is knowing in depth the thing itself.

I actually will agree on this to an extent. This is why I much prefer Japanese scholarship, which is very much soaked in textual studies as it is the direct heir of Edo period scholasticism.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Well, I am not complaining about Japanese scholarship, am I?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 5th, 2015 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

daverupa said:

text criticism.

Malcolm wrote:

Text criticism can only tell you what is in one text as opposed to another version of the same text, it might show progressive development, for example, then again, it might not. Text criticism, for example, can tell you nothing about the actual conditions under which a given text was produced. It is a very brittle method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 4th, 2015 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see very much science in modern academic writing on Buddhism. I do see lots of theories, uses of various interpretive methodologies, and so on, most of which are employed to create a framework in which the author's speculations are made to seem less speculative.

Indrajala said:

Who are you talking about exactly? I agree that there is a lot of speculation in certain areas like early Buddhism where there is zero period evidence to work with, but when it comes to Tibetan or Chinese Buddhist histories, we have lineage records coupled with secular histories and archaeology sometimes to back things up.

Malcolm wrote:

Why don't you give *Making Sense of Tantric Buddhism: History, Semiology, and Transgression in the Indian Traditions* a spin. It is an interesting book which, while itself speculative in many respects, does a pretty thorough job of reviewing the scholarship on Tantric Buddhism and India, its problems and so on, including addressing many of Sanderson's contentions about possible intertextualities between Shaivites and Buddhists.

There are a lot of areas in Tibetan Buddhist studies where there is simply little or no evidence at all (like for example, the period prior to 1000), and yet people love making up theories all the time.

Indrajala said:

I don't even see this much level of agreement, especially with the new skepticism you are so taken with.

If you want to talk about Tang dynasty Buddhist history, there is plenty of contemporary evidence, Buddhist or otherwise, to work with, but there's zero period evidence for the first century or two of Buddhist history, which is a problem if we're going to base a

discussion on evidence. Scientific research and discussion depends on evidence.

Malcolm wrote:

There is evidence for the first century or two of Buddhist history, it is embedded in texts that are considerably later, that is all.

Indrajala said:

... like the presence of Greek astrological terms in Indian astrology, but they don't necessarily prove anything beyond this.

Does it occur before or after Alexander, and why would that be significant? You need to ask the right questions to be able to prove a theory (or disprove it).

Malcolm wrote:

That is irrelevant.

Indrajala said:

I don't feel threatened at all. But one thing I do know is that secular scholars such as yourself are not writing about Buddhadharma, not are you writing for those who follow Buddhadharma. Whatever your and their interest or agendas may be, it has nothing to do with Buddhadharma at all.

That's painting a lot of individuals with a very large brush. Quite unfair I would say, and an indication you really don't know what you're talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

But I do read what you and many other secular scholars write, like Donald Lopez for example, and I can say with great confidence that you are not writing about Buddhadharma. You are all writing about a corpse you call "Buddhism". No one is going to attain awakening by reading your articles, nor are they going to attain awakening by reading Wedemeyer's book mentioned above, no matter how intellectually interesting they may be.

My statements are completely fair, and are based on having studied Buddhadharma as well as what passes for scholarship on Buddhism for as long as you have been alive. My skepticism about scholarship on Buddhism is well earned. What's more, scholarship on Buddhism has become more of an exercise in knowing the opinions of other westerners about this or that thing than it is knowing in depth the thing itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 4th, 2015 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

History is one of the humanities, it is not a science.

Indrajala said:

It is not a science, but historical research is supposed to be done in a scientific manner whereby one tests theories against evidence, which in effect can and will refute earlier theories.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see very much science in modern academic writing on Buddhism. I do see lots of theories, uses of various interpretive methodologies, and so on, most of which are employed to create a framework in which the author's speculations are made to seem less speculative.

Indrajala said:

If you have two authors writing about the same historical epoch or event, it is highly unlikely they will draw the same conclusions or have the same perspective of events. Sure, but they might very well agree on the same facts: dates and general events. History evolves as time goes on and new evidence or ideas are presented. It isn't static, which is a strength, not a weakness.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't even see this much level of agreement, especially with the new skepticism you are so taken with.

Indrajala said:

History is not the discipline of "dating" the past (that's what Archaeology is for), but it definitely is the art of explaining the past, and more importantly, putting the past into context for the modern day.

Your understanding is problematic here. History is very much about dating the past, so as to establish a chronological narrative which is necessary to properly understand how events and trends unfolded. Archaeology can be quite useful in this regard, but dating can be done also through analysis of texts or even linguistics. For instance, the appearance of a foreign loanword in a language can be used to help date a historical event.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all very tendentious and is not scientific in the least, it does not lead to certainty about anything. These things really cannot be tested or proven. For example, when did the Sanskrit word "hingu" (Ferula asafoetida) become "shing kun" (ཤིང་ཀུན) in Tibetan? 1st century CE, 6th? 8th? What about རྩྭ་ (Sanskrit jati or nutmeg)? Loanwords can show trade relationships and intellectual exchanges, like the presence of Greek astrological terms in Indian astrology, but they don't necessarily prove anything beyond this.

Indrajala said:

This why the goals and aims of historians of Buddhadharma should be very different than the goals and aims of those who seek to write histories of Buddhism. The former are concerned with giving context to the Buddhadharma for those who live in the

present day and age, where the latter merely seek to write down, as best they can, and without hope for much accuracy, a progression of events and persons. Believe what you want, Malcolm. Many more scholars of Buddhism with many credentials and linguistic abilities are fortunately not so emotionally invested in sacred religious narratives. You might feel threatened by secular scholarship, but not everyone is.

Malcolm wrote:
[/quote]

I don't feel threatened at all. But one thing I do know is that secular scholars such as yourself are not writing about Buddhadharma, not are you writing for those who follow Buddhadharma. Whatever your and their interest or agendas may be, it has nothing to do with Buddhadharma at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 4th, 2015 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What scholars write in books about events that happened hundreds and thousands of years ago is one thing and what actually happened is another, and never the twain shall meet.

Indrajala said:

This is what I mean by anti-intellectual sentiments.

Malcolm wrote:

History is one of the humanities, it is not a science. There is no such thing as a "scientific" approach to history, unless you are a Marxist. One may utilize the sciences in the service of composing a history, but this still does not make History a science. It is a humanity. This definition of the humanities from Stanford is instructive:

The humanities can be described as the study of how people process and document the human experience. Since humans have been able, we have used philosophy, literature, religion, art, music, history and language to understand and record our world. These modes of expression have become some of the subjects that traditionally fall under the humanities umbrella. Knowledge of these records of human experience gives us the opportunity to feel a sense of connection to those who have come before us, as well as to our contemporaries.

If you have two authors writing about the same historical epoch or event, it is highly unlikely they will draw the same conclusions or have the same perspective of events.

These days of course, many historians like to believe that they have pinned their subjects to the drying board, and have successfully mounted them for display. But of course, nothing is further from the truth. In the end histories are "just so stories", no matter from what perspective they are written.

Indrajala said:

History has its limitations, but unless you have some better approach for chronologically dating and explaining the past, I'm listening.

Malcolm wrote:

History is not the discipline of "dating" the past (that's what Archaeology is for), but it definitely is the art of explaining the past, and more importantly, putting the past into context for the modern day.

This why the goals and aims of historians of Buddhadharma should be very different than the goals and aims of those who seek to write histories of Buddhism. The former are concerned with giving context to the Buddhadharma for those who live in the present day and age, where the latter merely seek to write down, as best they can, and without hope for much accuracy, a progression of events and persons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 4th, 2015 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: The Lankavatara Sutra and the Consequences of Eternalism

Content:

TheSynergist said:

Thank you very much for your responses, Jeff and Malcolm.

Malcolm, if I'm understanding your interpretation/translation correctly, it sounds like there are two parallel axes of development --- the one for śravakas (and Pratyekabuddhas?) deals with the eradication of afflictive emotions by way of penetrating the emptiness of self, culminating in a "samadhi" sort of experience. However, this does not permanently free one from future births due to the absence of insight into two-fold emptiness...The Bhumi path of the Bodhisattva, by contrast, involves the emptiness of all phenomena and hence leads to true liberation. Would this be a more or less correct interpretation of the Sutra?

Malcolm wrote:

More or less.

TheSynergist said:

Would this Sutra then suggest that Arhants will eventually be reborn? I vaguely remember reading (perhaps on this forum?) that, according to Dzogchen, those with lesser forms of Enlightenment eventually get reborn at the dawn of a new Aeon.

Malcolm wrote:

This sūtra explicitly declares that arhats are woken out of the samadhi of cessation by Buddhas and enter into the bodhisattva paths and stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 4th, 2015 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Indrajala said:

If scholars come up and demonstrate that the supposed history of lineage accounts are full of errors, anachronisms and so on, then much doubt will be cast on the legitimacy of the lineage and consequently the purported realization of present representatives will likewise be called into question, if not entirely dismissed. This might be cause for anti-intellectual sentiments as scholars have the potential to completely undermine a living lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

What scholars write in books about events that happened hundreds and thousands of years ago is one thing and what actually happened is another, and never the twain shall meet.

Indrajala said:

There is similar to Vinaya ordination lineages. A legitimate ordination requires ten pure bhikṣus. If one of them is impure (i.e., has failed to confess every transgression against the Vinaya prior to the ordination ceremony), then the ordination is illegitimate and any sort of "precept essence" is not produced or transmitted. In order for someone to be legitimately ordained, every single generation of ten presiding bhikṣus back to the Buddha would have had to have been pure with the ceremonies done according to specifications outlined in the relevant literature. It goes without saying that it is doubtful it was always done properly with completely pure bhikṣus present during every ordination. In the absence of legitimately ordained bhikṣus, then the whole notion of the sangha still being a superior field of merit is undermined.

Malcolm wrote:

This is perhaps the reason that the Sangha Merit field in Mahāyāna is not the Bhikṣu Sangha, but rather the Sangha of tenth stage bodhisattvas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 4th, 2015 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: The Lankavatara Sutra and the Consequences of Eternalism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I checked the sutra in question in the Tibetan translation. It is not exactly the six and fifth bodhisattva bhumi. Here is another passage which clarifies things:

It is talking about equivalent stages of the eradication of afflictions in this case.

Other than the view of the abhisamaya of the śrāvakas abandoning fully the afflictions on the sixth or fifth stage, the latent afflictions are not abandoned and they have

inconceivable deaths and transmigrations. They proclaim "My births are finished, I abide in brahmacarya, my work is finished", uttering the lion's roar. Having said that, after they become thoroughly familiar with the absence of self in persons, their minds turn a period of nirvana.

What is here being stated is that that śrāvakas abandonment of active afflictions is equivalent to that of the fifth or sixth bhūmi, but that they do not abandon latent afflictions and are thus subject to inconceivable deaths and transmigrations.

Another section, dealing with bhūmis, states:

Beginning with the sixth stage, bodhisattva mahāsattvas, śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas enter into the concentration on cessation. On the seventh stage, mental moment by mental moment, the bodhisattva mahāsattvas enter into a concentration that eliminates the characteristics of all things, but the śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas do not. The śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas' concentration on cessation falls into the characteristics of an apprehended object and apprehending subject through possession of ideation. That being the case, if the characteristic of the absence of the different dharma's they obtain and the characteristic of diversity were to become non-existent, it would not be proper — on the seventh bhūmi one is to concentrate on one mental moment after another. They enter into concentration without comprehending the intrinsic characteristic of the virtue and nonvirtue of all phenomena. That being the case, such a one who enters into concentration is not skilled in entering into concentration on one mind moment after another.

The point is the comparison with the concentrations, abandonments and so on of śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas with bodhisattvas on the stages. It is not an assertion that śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas are traversing the stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 4th, 2015 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: The Lankavatara Sutra and the Consequences of Eternalism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think that here "stage" refers to bodhisattva bhūmis. This is a really outdated translation much in need of revision.

TheSynergist said:

I was recently reading from the Lankavatara Sutra:

Again further, Mahamati, there are five groups of people, each of whom attains its own [spiritual] insight. What are the five? They are: (1) the group of people whose insight belongs to the Sravaka-vehicle; (2) the group of people whose insight belongs to the Pratyekabuddha-vehicle; (3) the group of people whose insight belongs to the Tathagata-vehicle; (4) the group of indefinite character; and (5) the group of people to whom no insight is possible.

Mahamati, how does one know the group of people whose insight belongs to the

Sravaka vehicle? There are people the hair of whose body will stand on end when they know and realise the nature of the Skandhas, Dhatus, Ayatanas, and [what is meant by] generality and individuality; their intellect will leap with joy on knowing and practising what belongs to appearance and not on practising what they know of the uninterrupted chain of causation, —such ones, Mahamati, are said to be of the group whose insight belongs to the Sravaka vehicle. Having had an insight into their own vehicle, they abide at the fifth or the sixth stage where they do away with the rising of the passions, but not with the habit-energy; they have not yet passed beyond the inconceivable transformation-death, and their lion-roar is, "My life is destroyed, my morality is established, etc."; they will then discipline themselves in the egolessness of persons and finally gain the knowledge of Nirvana.

Again, Mahamati, there are others who, believing in such things as ego, being, vital principle, nourisher, supreme spirit, or personal soul, will seek Nirvana in them. Again, Mahamati, there are still others who, seeing that all things exist by depending upon causes, will recognise in this the way to Nirvana. (64) But, Mahamati, as they have no insight into the egolessness of things, there is no emancipation for them. This, Mahamati, is where those of the Sravaka-vehicle and the philosophers make the mistake in their insight by regarding non-deliverance as deliverance. Therefore, Mahamati, you ought to discipline yourself in order to escape this wrong view.

I'm a bit confused by this passage --- it introduces those on the Sravaka vehicle as being able to ascend to the 5th/6th bhumi, and eventually discipline themselves to gain Nirvana. Then it discusses those Sravaka disciples with incorrect eternalistic views, seeking nirvana in soul/god etc, and says they will not gain emancipation because they don't have the knowledge of the egolness of all things. Does this passage mean to suggest that those with wrong eternalistic views can still rise to the 6th Bhumi? Is there any other Mahayana Sutra that attempts to place ppl with eternalistic views on the Bhumi scale? I assumed that having at least some insight into 2-fold emptiness was a prerequisite for even the 1st bhumi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 4th, 2015 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

LastLegend said:

If Chan is nothing more than what you just described there, then there should not be any real Chan practitioners today. How you do explain the surviving Chan today?

Astus said:

What practice is it you call Chan? What doctrine?

Anders said:

Ah come on. You're eelwriggling now.

The point is valid - If that is all there is to Chan, it wouldn't have the lifeblood of realisation in its lineage that it has.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, it is pretty clear what Astus is up to. Next he will start attacking Vajrayāna lineages. Then, once he has satisfied himself that lineage is just a bunch of hokum, he will set himself up as a guru, indiscriminately mixing mahāmudra and Chan teachings.

Say it ain't so, Astus, come on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 3rd, 2015 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

LastLegend said:

There is a forum here called Chan. Why do you think that is?

Astus said:

My point is that it is not easy at all to tell what Chan practice and doctrine actually is.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is, just read Nubchen Sangye Yeshe if you have any doubts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 3rd, 2015 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: 8th bhumi bodhisattvas suffering in subsequent births?

Content:

TheSynergist said:

If Buddhas don't suffer, doesn't that kinda cheapen their compassion? Like, can we really call an individual being reborn to help others "compassionate" if he/she isn't suffering for it?

Malcolm wrote:

The karuna of those who are not suffering is infinitely sublime because having gained their own solace, they turn toward the welfare of others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 3rd, 2015 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

And as I pointed out to you, neither his son nor his grandson follow his views of Madhyamaka.

His new incarnation does though.

Malcolm wrote:

Which one?

smcj said:

So, given what you say above, I have to confess to being a little puzzled why you have been carrying out this campaign, which has lasted for several years. What did you hope to prove?

But my main point is that the presentation that D.R. makes is not a tirthika view. Place it however you may wish within the school, but it belongs there as one valid presentation of Dharma. Before I started making noises about it the culture here at DW dismissed anything like his presentation as a Hindu heresy. And, to be quite frank, the monks at Nalanda 1,000 years ago would probably have seen it that way too. But quite frankly I don't care about what the Hindus teach or what the monks at Nalanda might have thought, so it doesn't bother me at all. Evidently it didn't bother D.R. either.

Malcolm wrote:

No one every said gzhan stong was a hindu heresy — well, the Sakya master Rendawa did (Tsongkhapa's teacher)— but another Sakya master, Rongton, rejected that charge as too harsh, stating that gzhan stong was a transitional view between Yogacara and Madhyamaka.

Some masters at Nalanda would have liked the gzhan stong view just fine, masters like the false-aspectarian Yogacara master Ratnakarashanti for example (upon whose writing gzhan stong is in fact largely based, even if this is unacknowledged.)

The main difference between the Indians and people like Dudjom Rinpoche is that the former made no effort to try and locate their view in the so called three turnings, because in fact the Indians simply did not understand the three turnings in the way it was later interpreted by generations of Chinese Buddhists, as well as Kagyus and Nyingmapas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 3rd, 2015 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

The fact that he is at all discounted here is something of a shock to me.

Malcolm wrote:

But he isn't discounted at all. But he was not the only amazing Nyingma Lama with a large following in the late 20th century. However, his being the head of Nyingma was only relevant in the exile community.

You also seem to be confused about the difference between institutional curriculum and individual authors. And as I pointed out to you, neither his son nor his grandson follow his views of Madhyamaka.

So, given what you say above, I have to confess to being a little puzzled why you have been carrying out this campaign, which has lasted for several years. What did you hope to prove?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

We just say that gzhan stong is not definitive.

I have never said that it is definitive. I have said that I think, based on an admittedly small sampling, that Great Madhyamaka is the norm in Nyingma circles these day. But always I've said that YMMV and you can do as you please.

Malcolm wrote:

And I have told you several times, based on my much larger sampling, that your conclusion is flawed because your dataset is too small.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

Nice of you to mention that at this late date.

Malcolm wrote:

You were not paying attention, I have mentioned this several times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

I think some history is necessary here for people. Yes it is true that the Nyingmapas did not historically have a single "head of the Nyingma lineage", and that Dudjom R. was appointed as such for refugee purposes. But the same can be said of the Karmapa. Historically he was the head of the Karma Kagyupas, but the other Kagyu sects did not see the Karmapa as "the head of the Kagyu lineage". If the Karmapa was 2 years old, to if the Chinese had captured him, someone else would have been appointed to the role.

So really Dudjom R. and the 16th Karmapa had parallel roles in the late 20th century. And since I saw both of them on tour I can tell you that all the Nyingma lamas in California revered him just as much as the Kagyus revered the Karmapa. So what Dudjom R. wrote may not jive with the culture of this website, but he was not a minor

figure in the Nyingma tradition in the late 20th century. So if you don't want to recognize his authority, go ahead. But you might want to check your internet understanding of Dharma against a real live Nyingma lama now and then. How else are you going to check your understanding against anything other than this echo chamber?

Malcolm wrote:

No, Dudjom Rinpoche was anything but a minor figure for the Nyingma Tradition in the late 20th century. He was a giant, of this there is no question at all. But you are conflating two separate issues here, and another thing which has seemingly escaped your attention is that neither his son, Dungsey Trinly Norbu, nor his grandson, Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche are adherents of gzhan stong. So what do you do with that fact?

The two separate issues you are conflating are: 1) the person of Dudjom Rinpoche as the guru of the present generation of middle aged and even senior Nyingma masters 2) the actual so-called orthodox position of the Nyingma school.

The latter lies in the works of Rongzom, Longchenpa and Mipham, and no one else: among these three, Longchenpa is the most important. And yes, I have talked about this issue with several living, breathing Nyingma Khenpos over the years (definitely more than you), all of whom regard Dudjom Rinpoche as one of their gurus, and hold him in great esteem, but they don't all hold gzhan stong as the definitive view: some of them do, some of them don't, most of them think gzhan stong is quite irrelevant to Dzogchen, or so they told me.

The reality of it is, these days the lineages that have adopted gzhan stong as their view are the Karma Kagyu and the Jonangpas. However, given how much Gelugpa education the present Karmapa has had, I wonder if he will continue the relatively recent (i.e. 19th century) adoption of gzhan stong by the Karma Kagyus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

Tell that to Dudjom Rinpoche. He seems to be totally ignorant of it. Poor guy, evidently he didn't know his ass from a hole in the ground.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure that Dudjom Rinpoche was quite aware of it, even if you are not. As I have pointed out to you, the translator Kawa Paltseg refers to "freedom from extremes" as Great Madhyamaka, as does the Sakya Gongma, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltzen. Also the Gelugpas like to call Tsongkhapa's version of Madhyamaka, "Great Madhyamaka".

So in reality, all three major trends of "Madhyamaka" in Tibet refer to themselves as "Great".

M

smcj said:

And your point being...what? That somehow Dudjom Rinpoche's magnum opus is an epic fail because he declines to give lip service to other usages of the term? Really? REALLY?

Malcolm wrote:

No, my point is that your campaign to somehow enshrine Dudjom Rinpoche's perspective as the definitive view of Nyingma is an epic fail. His perspective is definitive for those Nyingmapas who choose to follow it, just as Mipham's is for those Nyingmapas who choose to follow it.

I will point out, however, that Dudjom Rinpoche's book is not used as part of the curriculum at Namdroling Monastery in South India (Palyul), not is it part of the curriculum at Larung Gar in Tibet (the largest Nyingma Institution in the world), nor is it on the curriculum of Mindroling in North India, nor Dzogchen Monastery, nor Kathog, nor Dorje Drag nor Sechen. It forms no part of the curriculum at the six main Nyingma monasteries, so how can it be regarded as definitive by anyone?

This is not to say it is not a wonderful book, since it is, but it does not trump Mipham, Longchenpa and Rongzom.

Now, I have wasted enough time with you on your obsession, and frankly I have better things to do.

Best,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

Tell that to Dudjom Rinpoche. He seems to be totally ignorant of it. Poor guy, evidently he didn't know his ass from a hole in the ground.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure that Dudjom Rinpoche was quite aware of it, even if you are not. As I have pointed out to you, the translator Kawa Paltseg refers to "freedom from extremes" as Great Madhyamaka, as does the Sakya Gongma, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen. Also the Gelugpas like to call Tsongkhapa's version of Madhyamaka, "Great Madhyamaka".

So in reality, all three major trends of "Madhyamaka" in Tibet refer to themselves as "Great".

If you wish to see how it is used by the Sakyapas, I refer to to my blog post here:

<http://www.sakyapa.net/2010/04/great-madhyamaka-of-sakya-masters.html>

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Written texts from the 3rd, 4th, and 5th Chan Patriarchs

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because after all, McRae is even more authoritative than Bodhidharma.

Astus said:

It depends on the topic. Texts attributed to Bodhidharma are good for studying Chan, McRae's works are good for studying Chan history.

Malcolm wrote:

Personally, I have always found McRae's works to be highly speculative, and in the end, not really that informative. The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism and so on are well written and interesting, but not very nutritious.

He was also not a practitioner. So frankly, this needs to be born in mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Heart Sutra...

Content:

Jeff said:

Best wishes.

Malcolm wrote:

You should find a proper guru.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

Malcolm has already told you many times that the term "Great Madhyamaka" has been used in different ways by different teachers.

You do realize that's nothing more than a red herring, right?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a red herring, it is simply factual. Gzhan stong pas do not own the brand Great Madhyamaka™, as much as you would like them to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

Incidentally, the primary source for Kongtrul's commentary on Uttaratantra is Rongton's commentary. Rongton was not a gzhan stong pa. But he wrote the definitive commentary on the text, which is why Kongtrul follows it.

Thanks. When I get to Kongtrul's commentary I will try to keep that in mind. The only thing I have by Rongzom is "Establishing Appearances as Divine." (You did mean Rongzom, right?) If I survive the Uttaratantra I might give it a shot.

Malcolm wrote:

Rongton, A 15th century Sakya Lama, not Rongzom, an 11th century Nyingma Lama.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

The Uttaratantra continues: By his own former wishing prayers and the power of the virtue of the gods
Brahma appears without deliberate effort.
So does the self-sprung illusory kaya.

He moves from [Tushita] and enters the womb, feet born, and goes to his father's palace. He enjoys amusement and then seeks solitude, undergoes austerity, and defeats all evils.

[In Bodhgaya] he finds great enlightenment and shows the path to the citadel of peace. The Muni, having shown [these deeds], becomes invisible to those of no karmic fortune. I'm just now reading the Uttaratantra while making effort to understand it. Before I just skimmed it. I'm not going to say I understand it even on a superficial level yet. But those quotes do seem suggestive of....?

The edition I'm reading has Kongtrul's commentary next, then Khenpo Tsultrim's. That above quotes are from the root text. Given who wrote the commentaries, when I get to

them I'm sure the spin will be an "empty-of-other" spin.

Malcolm wrote:

By his own former wishing prayers
Based on his own prayers, correct?
and the power of the virtue of the gods
And based on the desires of others, correct?
Brahma appears without deliberate effort.
This the metaphor.

So does the self-sprung illusory kaya.

Likewise, the nirmanakaya buddha arises from his own past aspirations as well as the needs of other sentient beings, and he therefore appears without "deliberate effort." You are reading way too much into "self-originated".

This is not a gzhan stong vs. blah blah issue — this is standard Mahāyāna.

Incidentally, the primary source for Kongtrul's commentary on Uttaratantra is Rongton's commentary. Rongton was not a gzhan stong pa. But he wrote the definitive commentary on the text, which is why Kongtrul follows it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

smcj said:

Here's a weird quote from the Uttaratantra:

...

So it seems there is room for Jeff's interpretation. But it does seem un-buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

SMCJ,

This metaphor does not supports Jeff's statement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 1st, 2015 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Written texts from the 3rd, 4th, and 5th Chan Patriarchs

Content:

Astus said:

McRae's

Malcolm wrote:

Because after all, McRae is even more authoritative that Bodhidharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 1st, 2015 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: The Eleven Nations of North America

Content:

PorkChop said:

Going back to the original article, I remember criticizing it on facebook when it came out because of it's depiction of Texas (the only culture I really knew well enough to comment).

For starters <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tejano> is its own brand of Latin culture, which is neither homogenous with the Chicano culture of California, nor Mexican culture south of the border. Texas culture also has a huge influence from German and Czech settlers, which did a lot to not only influence the Europeans who settled in the state, but the Latin culture there as well. You don't really need to look further than the number of German town names dotted throughout the state: Boerne, Fredericksburg, New Braunfels, Pflugerville, Schulenberg, Groesbeck, Gruene, etc to see how many settlements there were. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kolach> and <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Klobasnek> (also often referred to as kolaches) are popular breakfast foods throughout the state. The accordion playing of the Europeans found it's way into Texas' own blend of Latin music, also referred to as https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tejano_music (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-mQbV2zO2U>). Similarly, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tex-Mex> is it's own distinct kind of food as well.

I can see differences between the major metropolitan areas in Texas (San Antonio vs Dallas for example), and between the rural areas (Lubbock vs Hallettsville for example) but the commonalities are a lot stronger than say, between Dallas-Fort Worth and West Virginia (2 areas linked in that article).

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, you mean to say that Texas is not a "homogenous barbarism?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 1st, 2015 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: The Eleven Nations of North America

Content:

maybay said:

I think the point about barbarism is that it lacks culture. It is simply a collection, of, for instance, people, legal entities, systems, ideas, all caught up in a fear-driven revolutionary turmoil that makes any sense of dignified progression or composition impossible.

Dezhung Rinpoche spoke of barbarism, or Rachmaninoff "America! What madness." barbarism: absence of culture and civilization.

Malcolm wrote:

Defining the US that way is clearly wrong. It's an offensive characterization. One cannot separate people from culture.

maybay said:

culture |'kəlCHər|

noun

1 the arts and other manifestations of human intellectual achievement regarded collectively: 20th century popular culture.

- a refined understanding or appreciation of this: men of culture.
- the customs, arts, social institutions, and achievements of a particular nation, people, or other social group: Caribbean culture | people from many different cultures.
- [with modifier] the attitudes and behavior characteristic of a particular social group: the emerging drug culture.

Malcolm wrote:

In the case, it is the customs, arts, social institutions, and achievements of the United States in their entirety that are being described as a "barbarism" via the adjective "homogenous."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 1st, 2015 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: The Eleven Nations of North America

Content:

kirtu said:

I am not classifying all Americans as a group and have never done that.

I *AM* saying that American culture is a form of barbarism, causes people to be prone to violence, causes people to be competitive unnecessarily, causes people to be calous, etc. Because these are the primary messages in US culture.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no culture apart from its people.

kirtu said:

However this is not true of all people in the US.

Malcolm wrote:

That's like saying that Jewish culture is based greed and venality, but not all Jews are like that.

kirtu said:

But during their lifetimes I would wager that almost all Americans fall prey to some sort

of extremest violent, comparative or callous mindset because of the daily and yearly pounding of these drums.

and describing us a homogenous barbarism.

My characterization of the US as a homogeneous barbarism refers to the near universal obsession of Americans with power.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have said, we live in different countries.

kirtu said:

All French people are bigots. All Indians are stupid. All Blacks are lazy. All Jews are greedy. All Muslims are terrorists.

I never said any of that and my assertion that American culture is a barbarism is absolutely not the same.

Malcolm wrote:

I think so — it is gross stereotyping.

kirtu said:

It's also factually inaccurate that I am "constantly bashing" the United States or Americans.

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are being disingenuous.

kirtu said:

But this is one of the actions that people in the US do in fact take when they feel backed into a corner or just want to strike out at a person and attack them.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not attack you. I commented on the sentiment of your statement. Apparently, you need to learn to distinguish between an opinion about a public statement you have made, and a statement about your person. They are not the same thing.

kirtu said:

...let me as a person partly of American Indian heritage...

Malcolm wrote:

We are all from Africa, we all come from displaced peoples.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 28th, 2015 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: The Eleven Nations of North America

Content:
kirtu said:
[

On what logical basis can you make the deduction that I am expressing a "racist sentiment"? Mr. Smith, you *MUST* provide a reasoned explanation because otherwise this is public character assassination and I will pursue legal remedies against you.

Malcolm wrote:
You are classifying all Americans as a group of people, and describing us a homogenous barbarism. In my book, that is racist, no different than the attitude of White Europeans towards Indians and Africans.

All French people are bigots. All Indians are stupid. All Blacks are lazy. All Jews are greedy. All Muslims are terrorists. All Americans are barbarians — what is the difference between these statements?

By the way, I did not say YOU were a racist, I expressed the opinion that the sentiment of your statement is racist, so you have no basis for a case.

I have no wish to fight with you, but I do tire of your constant bashing of Americans.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, February 28th, 2015 at 10:36 PM
Title: Re: The Eleven Nations of North America
Content:

kirtu said:
As I clearly stated, this is support for an argument that Malcolm has repeatedly made (that the US is composed of multiple cultures originating in various forms from the founding of the US). I disagree with this thesis. American culture is only concerned with power and its exercise.

Malcolm wrote:
Total BS.
Code: #
And power is exercised as a result of the violent and unpredictable nature of American society.
Dude, There is much less violence in the US than there was even in the 1980's.

kirtu said:
The US is frankly a psychopathic society. While psychopaths rule the world, psychopaths are nurtured here and are very common in US society.

Malcolm wrote:

You are totally tripping, my friend.

kirtu said:

I frankly don't see how Americans can deny this (and in fact they don't - I just saw the producer of "House of Cards" talk about exactly this just a few minutes ago on CBS).

Malcolm wrote:

Americans can deny it because it is not true. Hyperbole by the producer of an American show adapted from a BBC show which comes from a novel originally written about a murderous MP hardly constitutes proof of your position.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 28th, 2015 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: The Eleven Nations of North America

Content:

kirtu said:

What are you talking about? What exactly is the "racist sentiment" that you refer to?

Kirt

the United States, which I view basically as a monoculture (or really more of a homogeneous barbarism)

Malcolm wrote:

If you barbarism, look a Nazi Germany, Soviet Union, ISIS etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 28th, 2015 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: The Eleven Nations of North America

Content:

steveb1 said:

OP wrote: "the United States, which I view basically as a monoculture (or really more of a homogeneous barbarism). North America *is* multinational, composed of at least four major cultures (Mexico, which has more than one culture, the lower 48 barbarism, and Canada"

Seems a bit judgmental, particularly in regard to Mexico, which is a culture in wildly barbaric disarray whose government sends and deliberately encourages its poorest, least educated citizens to illegally immigrate to the U.S., to the detriment of both cultures, but especially of the U.S., whose resources are inadequate to handle these waves of illegal colonization. To dismiss the U.S. simply as "the lower 48 barbarism" is inaccurate and itself looks like a form of barbarism.

Malcolm wrote:

It is actually a racist sentiment.

kirtu said:

What are you talking about? What exactly is the "racist sentiment" that you refer to?

Kirt

the United States, which I view basically as a monoculture (or really more of a homogeneous barbarism)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Four axioms with which bullshit is brewed. The amount of presumptions and assumptions in the following four points is astonishing, and self-serving.

Astus said:

Regarding the mentioned criticism of academic studies, please consider

McRae's Rules of Zen Studies

(Seeing Through Zen, p xix-xx)

1. It's not true, and therefore it's more important.

The contents of Zen texts should not be evaluated using a simpleminded criterion of journalistic accuracy, that is, "Did it really happen?" For any event or saying to have occurred would be a trivial reality involving a mere handful of people at one imagined point in time, which would be overwhelmed by the thousands of people over the centuries who were involved in the creation of Zen legends. The mythopoeic creation of Zen literature implies the religious imagination of the Chinese people, a phenomenon of vast scale and deep significance.

2. Lineage assertions are as wrong as they are strong.

Statements of lineage identity and "history" were polemical tools of self-assertion, not critical evaluations of chronological fact according to some modern concept of historical accuracy. To the extent that any lineage assertion is significant, it is also a misrepresentation; lineage assertions that can be shown to be historically accurate are also inevitably inconsequential as statements of religious identity.

3. Precision implies inaccuracy.

Numbers, dates, and other details lend an air of verisimilitude to a story, but the more they accumulate, the more we should recognize them as literary tropes. Especially in Zen studies, greater detail is an artifact of temporal distance, and the vagueness of earlier accounts should be comforting in its integrity. While we should avoid joining a misguided quest for origins, we should also be quick to distinguish between "good data" and ornamental fluff. Even as we ponder the vectors of medieval polemics.

4. Romanticism breeds cynicism.

Storytellers inevitably create heroes and villains, and the depiction of Zen's early patriarchs and icons cripples our understanding of both the Tang "golden age" and the supposedly stagnant formalism of the Song dynasty. If one side is romanticized, the other must be vilified, and both subjects pass incognito. The collusion between Zen romanticists and the apologists for Confucian triumphalism—which has Song Neo-Confucianism climbing to glory on the back of a defeated Buddhism—is an obstacle to the understanding of both Chan and the Chinese civil tradition. The corollary is this: Cold realism eliminates dismissive misapprehension.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Astus said:

On Shenhui and Huineng (p 55):

"Shenhui set up his own lineage hall in imitation of Puji, even as he worked to establish the transmission from Bodhidharma to Huineng (and then implicitly to Shenhui himself) as the sole lineal succession of Chan"

Malcolm wrote:

Evidence?

Astus said:

On the historical Huineng (p 68):

"It is probably fair to think of the historical Huineng as a reasonably conventional Chinese monk, whose teachings differed only slightly if at all from those of other members of the Northern school."

Malcolm wrote:

Probably?

Astus said:

On Shenhui's knowledge of Huineng's life (p 67):

"if the matter had been known to Shenhui, who was a master storyteller dedicated to promoting Huineng's identity as sixth patriarch, he certainly would have included it in his writings. We have good evidence to show that in the late 730s Shenhui was ignorant of most of the details of Huineng's life."

Malcolm wrote:

That evidence being?

Astus said:

On the Platform Sutra (p 60):

"The Platform Sutra appeared in about 780, over a century after the events it describes were supposed to have taken place. Many scholars have struggled to identify the contents of some "original" or "core" version of the text that might date back to Huineng himself, but the utter failure of these attempts has only confirmed the late provenance of the text as we have it. Barring some miraculous discovery, we must consider the text as we first discover it, in its Dunhuang version."

Malcolm wrote:

]

Irrelevant.

Astus said:

On Huairang and his connection to Huineng (p 82-83):

"In the case of Huairang, the little that is known about his biography definitely undermines the historicity of the filiation between him and Huineng. First, Huairang's epitaph was written in the year 815, some seventy years after his death, at the request of two of Mazu's disciples, so it can hardly be used to suggest that the connection between Huineng and Huairang was historical rather than legendary. In addition, the paucity of detail concerning Huairang's biography—he is said to have been a mountain practitioner who did not "open the Dharma" to others— suggests that he was historically insignificant. And, needless to say, nothing like the story introduced above occurs in the epitaph. In fact, the Transmissions of Treasure Grove [Temple] (Baolin zhuan), the Hongzhou school's important contribution to the "transmission of the lamp" genre of Chan literature, written about 801, describes Huairang's enlightenment as having been gained under the guidance of the Northern school monk Lao'an. Actually, none of the men traditionally recognized as Huineng's most important successors—Huairang, Qingyuan, Yongjia Xuanjue, and Nanyang Huizhong—are mentioned in the Dunhuang version of the Platform Sutra."

Malcolm wrote:

Again irrelevant.

Astus said:

"Ultimately, our main conclusion would be that Mazu had a typically variegated life of religious training, so that even if the interaction between Huairang and Mazu was historical in some sense—and it would be rash to deny this possibility out of hand—this would not be enough to make Mazu Huairang's successor, let alone a direct second generation successor to Huineng."

Malcolm wrote:

Again, quite irrelevant to your main contention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 6:57 AM

Title: Re: Sam Harris on Charlie Hebdo

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.democracynow.org/2015/2/26/who_is_bankrolling_the_islamic_state

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Sam Harris on Charlie Hebdo

Content:

Dan74 said:

Islam, given the circumstance of the recent times, the cultural shifts, etc has become a convenient flag for the anti-establishment radicals to rally under and we may well see more people converting and joining the cause.

Malcolm wrote:

Dan, seriously, this is just nonsense. Wake up and smell the roses. ISIS may be many things, but a convenient flag under which anti-establishment radicals might convene is hardly one of them. It may have a flattened, synchronic view of Islamic history, it may have left behind nuances of centuries of Islamic jurisprudence, but one thing people can hardly claim is that they are not Muslim in the fullest sense of the word. They just happen to subscribe to Wahhabism, and their execution of their Wahhabi values are completely consistent with the origins of Wahhabism in the late 18th century, you know, like when Ibn Saud and his men slaughtered 5,000 Shiites in a single day in Karbala in Iraq in 1801.

Dan74 said:

In 1801, the tomb of Hussein bin Ali (Prophet Mohammad's grandson) in Karbala was destroyed by the army of Abdullah bin Saud, causing anger among the Shiite Muslims.[1] Additionally, many people in Islam's holiest cities of Makkah and Madinah were killed and Prophet Mohammad's Mosque was damaged by his army in the same year. As a result, the Ottoman authorities found themselves in a situation that they had to punish the Saudis for their crimes because the Ottomans were the then-official ruler of the Arabian Peninsula. The guardian of Islam's religious places was the Turkish-Ottoman Caliph in Constantinople, Mahmud II.[1] He ordered that an Egyptian force be sent to the Arabian Peninsula to defeat Abdullah bin Saud and his allies. In 1818, an Egyptian army led by Ibrahim Pasha (Mohammad Ali's son) completely destroyed Abdullah's forces and took their capital, Diriyah in Najd. Abdullah bin Saud was captured along with two of his Wahhabi supporters. They were then sent to prison in Constantinople. Abdullah and his two followers were publicly beheaded for their crimes against holy cities and mosques.[1]

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abdullah_bin_Saud

The sole difference between then and now is that there was an Ottoman Empire to put down the Wahhabis, and force their very Calvinist interpretation of Islam into the deserts of what is now Saudi Arabia.

The fact is that it is Wahhabi/Salafi money fueling ISIS, mainly from the Saudis. The other point is that the Sunnis in Iraq are, in reality, barely more than 25 percent of the total population (Kurds have always been counted as Sunni for some bizarre reason), and yet they have had an uninterrupted reign of terror in Iraq since the 1979 and actually from well before that, dating back to the Hashemite Kingdom.

In reality the Sunnis in Iraq has historically behaved little better than White South Africans under Apartheid or Southern KKK fanatics towards the majorities under their rule.

For example, many people have claimed that burning apostates is unlawful under Islam — well it isn't.

Dan74 said:

Haykel...explained he was specifically referring to two groups of people who declare ISIS unIslamic: Muslims he says are “just ignorant” of Islam’s legal and political history, and Christians who engage in what he called “the Christian tradition of interfaith dialogue” and declare Islam a “religion of peace.”

Haykel singled out CNN talk show host Fareed Zakaria as an example of the former, who recently said that ISIS’s public execution of a Jordanian pilot by burning him to death — which at least one prominent Muslim cleric in the Middle East also decried as “away from humanity, much less religions” — is “entirely haram,” or forbidden in Islam. “That’s actually factually wrong — the burning apostates is in the [Islamic] legal code,” Haykel said.

...

Still, Haykel said his frustration with people of faith who try to disavow religious extremists is not limited to Islam.

“[They] present Islam as ‘Oh, Islam is a religion of peace,’” Haykel said. “Well, what does that mean? I mean, Christianity is sometimes a religion of peace, and sometimes a religion of war, depending on what time we’re talking about. There’s no such thing as a religion of peace.”

Malcolm wrote:

<http://thinkprogress.org/world/2015/02/20/3625446/atlantic-left-isis-conversation-bernard-haykel/>

And these days we can included Buddhism in the "sometimes a religion of peace, and

sometimes a religion of war" given what has happened in Śrī Lanka and Burma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

daverupa said:

This sneaky description is a very deficient caricature of scholastic endeavor with respect to early Buddhism. You must imagine a monolithic edifice to throw your criticisms against, but the reality on the ground does not conform to your wish.

Malcolm wrote:

I qualified my description:

...and in the case of people like Jayarava, etc., I see no such interest at all. They merrily hack away...

I was characterizing deficient scholastic endeavor, not all scholastic endeavor.

Sherlock said:

I really recommend Wedemeyer's work on revealing how Western conceptions of tantric history were often based on little more than hearsay and speculation in Victorian times (!) being repeated as dogma

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, now if we could just extend his analysis to the rest of Western scholarship on Buddhism....

daverupa said:

You keep trying to have your cake and eat it too, Malcolm...

Malcolm wrote:

I will have my cake and eat it too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Sherlock said:

I really recommend Wedemeyer's work on revealing how Western conceptions of tantric history were often based on little more than hearsay and speculation in Victorian times (!) being repeated as dogma

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, now if we could just extend his analysis to the rest of Western scholarship on Buddhism....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It's not the object that matters so much, it is the subject. Even your "absolute" sweater which does not use any yarn at all is going to be perceived differently by different kinds of persons and beings, if it is perceived at all. Unfortunately, most people who claim to be wearing the absolute sweater just wind up running around naked, like the proverbial emperor.

dzogchungpa said:

I guess it's all just a bunch of yarn(s), in the end.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, including the one's written by academics. I guess you would call those "letter sweaters."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Now that you mention it, I guess I was thinking of the absolute sweater.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not the object that matters so much, it is the subject. Even your "absolute" sweater which does not use any yarn at all is going to be perceived differently by different kinds of persons and beings, if it is perceived at all. Unfortunately, most people who claim to be wearing the absolute sweater just wind up running around naked, like the proverbial emperor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the mature point of view is that all lineages have their own narratives, which

are to be given respect, even if there is some disagreement about the particulars. That way, everyone's sweaters remain whole, even though they might require darning from time to time.

dzogchungpa said:

For me, there is no sweater higher than truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, so how are you going to ascertain the truth of any of these varying accounts? For example, which is more true, a human's perception of liquid as water, or a preta's perception of liquid as puss and blood?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I guess the Sakyas don't understand the sweater thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, it is not that. Sakyapas have a completely different line of transmission than the Kagyus. The Kagyu line is Naropa, Maitripa, Marpa, etc. The Sakya line is Naropa, Phaimthing brothers, the translator Sherab Tseg, Mal lotsawa, Sachen, etc.

Note, that the order I give above it not as sequential as it seems. Not only was Marpa held to be a disciple of Maitripa, from whom the main stream of the Sahaja Mahamudra tradition so held to come from (bypassing Naropa entirely), but also Marpa is held to have encountered Naropa personally.

Mal Lotsawa was not only a direct disciple of Sherab Tseg, but he also received all of the transmissions for Cakrasamvara and Vajrayogini directly from the elder Phaimthing.

Now, it is true that some Sakyas have expressed doubt over whether Marpa directly met Naropa in person, but what should Kagyus care about what some Sakyas think? Likewise, some Sakyas have expressed doubts about whether the Mañjuśrī Lama Tsongkhapa encountered through the mediumship of Lama Umapa was authentic or not, but again, why should Gelugpas care about what some Sakya guy thinks? For example, Taranatha roundly criticizes the Padma Khathang literature in the introduction to Padmsambhava's life story as told by his Indian Guru, Buddhaguptanatha. But why should Nyingmapas care about what some Jonangpa guy thinks? Likewise, Dudjom Rinpoche claims that Lamdre really comes from the Heruka Galpo tantra, a tantra of Yangdag, but in reality, why should Sakypas care what some Nyingmapa guy thinks? You see, it goes on and on like this.

A final example, I have shown really quite well that the three turnings of the wheel doctrine favored by Nyingmas, Kagyus and Jonangpas really has been employed in a

way completely without any consistency with what the Samdhinirmocana Sūtra actually says about it, and have pointed out that in Indian texts there was a complete lack of interest in this idea, and that the source of making fine distinctions about them all stem from a Korean commentary that was translated into Tibetan in the early ninth century. Even though I am very firmly convinced that the way Longchenpa, the Third Karmapa, Buton, Dolbupa, and so on have used this brief statement as a hermeneutical key for unlocking the meaning of the sutras (albeit in very distinct ways) is based on a total mistaken understanding, still, in reality, what do Kagyus, Nyingmapas and Jonangpas care about what some Sakya guy has to say about it? It is sufficient merely to say Kagyu, Nyingma and Jonang hold the three turnings of the wheel as very important; the Gelugpas maintain that the second turning is definitive; and the Sakyapas think that the three turning of the wheel doctrine is totally misunderstood, and even so, it is not very important at all, and that if you assert that it actually refers to three historical epochs in the Buddha's teachings, you wind up with all sorts of knotty contradictions that turn the Buddha into a liar.

In general, the mature point of view is that all lineages have their own narratives, which are to be given respect, even if there is some disagreement about the particulars. That way, everyone's sweaters remain whole, even though they might require darning from time to time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 27th, 2015 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

PorkChop said:

The burden of evidence seems to be a bit unfairly weighted against the traditional accounts. I can think of 3 or 4 examples off the top of my head where speculation by an academic is based on little more than opinion, but is taken as law for discounting traditional accounts that were historically significant.

Malcolm wrote:

It is kind of like scholastic arbitrage, their profit is made off the margins of history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 26th, 2015 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Anders said:

This is typical of so much shoddy scholarship. Putting an = between 'uncertainty' and 'obvious fabrication'.

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

There is a perverse amount of cynicism running through contemporary academia that seems to both reflect mainstream ideologies and to drive these assumptions.

Malcolm wrote:

It is mostly self-serving cynicism, since it creates controversy, reputations, book sales, as well as salaries (which are admittedly hard to come by).

A sweater can be unravelled by pulling a single strand of yarn. But anyone who wants to wear a sweater understands there is no purpose in unravelling it. Destroying a sweater defeats the value of the garment. Likewise, if you poke and pull enough doubt may be cast on any narrative, but these narratives are the protective garments of traditions, and unravelling them is destructive. As Emerson famously observed, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 26th, 2015 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Vajrayana is not Tibetan Buddhism (and vice versa)

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

The author is not someone I would regard as an authority on the subject but the first half of his post (at least) agrees with my own knowledge ... not that I'm an authority on the subject, either.

His basic points are (1) that Tibetan Buddhism is (logically enough) the Buddhism developed and practiced in Tibet, (2) that Vajrayana (aka tantric buddhism) is an important strand within Tibetan Buddhism but most Tibetan Buddhists do not practice it, instead following a more accessible form of Buddhism (which is still, of course, Tibetan Buddhism), and (3) that Vajrayana developed in India and spread to many other countries, so Tibetan Vajrayana is not all of Vajrayana.

I'm not sure if that is much clearer than the blog post but I hope it helps.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

As to point two: virtually all Tibetan Buddhists, apart from small children, have received major empowerments, and thus hold three vows. They are therefore Vajrayānists.

As to point two, it may be the case that Vajrayāna historically spread to Śrī Lanka, Java, China, etc. But apart from Japan, the only place where Vajrayāna is practiced as a primary form of Buddhism is Tibet, Mongolia and the Himalayas, and in communities in India and abroad started by Tibetan exiles. Some might want to include Tendai under the rubric of Vajrayāna but I would not since Tendai subordinates Vajrayāna to sūtra. Shingon however is a Vajrayāna tradition. Its presence outside Japan is very negligible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 26th, 2015 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So now you have moved from a tentative Huineng maybe existed to a full on "Huineng was invented."

Astus said:

On Huineng there is this work: <https://books.google.co.in/books?id=zTCoXPEXWNwC>.

As I have said before, in the earliest sources there is only the name and nothing else. It was Shenhui who created the story of Huineng first and then it was further developed by later generations.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, Shenhui created the story of Huineng? You are absolutely certain that he was not reporting an oral history not written down beforehand? You are certain?

Astus said:

There is evidence enough to tell that Shenxiu - later labelled as the founder of the Northern School - was the first Chan teacher to gain fame and he was recognised in the imperial records as well. Then Shenhui launched an attack on the disciples of Shenxiu by fabricating the transmission story of the robe to Huineng. Then other factions came up with their own versions of how the transmission happened, as shown in for instance Adamek's <https://books.google.co.in/books?id=dKgl-jPvHiUC>.

Malcolm wrote:

You have connected two things in a non sequitur a) The first Chan teacher to gain fame and he was recognised in the imperial records as well b) attack on the disciples of Shenxiu by fabricating the transmission story of the robe to Huineng.

The third thing you introduce is a contemporary source which offers an alternate version. Ergo, there is more to the story than you want to admit.

Astus said:

On the other hand, there is a clear narrative, and clear history. Just accept it and move on. That helps the tradition of Zen. The opposite undermines it. Is that what you want? Yes, there is a story of transmission developed over a thousand years and debated by numerous factions. There is hardly any clear narrative unless we believe in a single account of our chosen lineage, in other words, we stick to a sectarian bias and accept whatever that group wants us to believe. How can that be called living up to the ideal of realising the nature of mind?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

It may have been debated in numerous different factions, but so what? That merely shows that a) there was a guy named Huineng, b) he transmitted Chan and was a patriarch c) was sufficiently important that people took a stake in various oral histories that surrounded him.

It does not mean however that Huineng never existed, was never an important lineage master, and that all lineages of Chan/Zen surviving today do not come from this single root.

Let me give you another example — the famed Mahāsiddha, Naropa. There are two versions of his story, the Kagyu version where it is reported by Gampopa that Naropa realized mahāmudra, and the Sakya version where it is reported that Naropa did not realize mahāmudra (despite the fact that Naropa's Vajrayogini is among the most profound Sakya transmissions). There are some other differences between the early Sakya accounts of Naropa and Gampopa's account, but the key point is this: Tilopa is recorded by both traditions as having commanded Naropa to give up the accouterments of a Pandita and to adopt the accouterments of a yogi. He was also ordered by Tilopa to desist from debates. Upon his return from his years of study with Tilopa, Naropa took up residence near Nalanda. Some tīrthikas were giving the four gate-keepers of Nalanda a run for their money and the king asks Naropa to intercede. Naropa agrees but finds he is unable to adequately debate the Hindus (perhaps because his scholarship was rusty from his years of serving Tilopa). Tilopa arrives to save the day, and scolds Naropa for his disobedience. The key difference between these two early accounts is that in the Sakya account, Tilopa is recorded as having predicted that Naropa himself will be unable to realize Mahāmudra for disobeying his guru. Therefore, in the Sakyapa tradition it is a matter of record that Naropa did not realize Mahāmudra. In the Kagyu tradition it is a matter of record that he did. Which tradition is correct? Who cares? One follows the tradition to which one belongs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 26th, 2015 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

So in our tradition we never dispute the authenticity of texts or lineage accounts?

Malcolm wrote:

Not in the tradition one is practicing, no.

Berry said:

Why? Isn't that rather like not disputing texts in a religion which becomes fundamentalist?

Malcolm wrote:

Let me put it to you this way — if you wish to question the validity of the sūtras and

tantras, go ahead. But I don't think it will help your practice very much.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 26th, 2015 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

So in our tradition we never dispute the authenticity of texts or lineage accounts?

Malcolm wrote:

Not in the tradition one is practicing, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 26th, 2015 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

daverupa said:

Have what reversed? Both quotes seem to me to be saying about the same thing; I'm sorry to be dense, here.

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying to Astus is that there is a clear narrative and a clear history that names Huineng as the sixth patriarch. Just accept it and move on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 26th, 2015 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

daverupa said:

Elsewhere you've stated

Malcolm wrote:

I am writing for a different history, you know, then one we actually received from our tradition.

daverupa said:

So, is

there is a clear narrative, and clear history. Just accept it and move on. That helps the tradition

a basic summary statement you'd agree with for all general cases of secular/communal/academic Buddhist history vs. any given traditional Buddhist narrative about it?

Malcolm wrote:

You have it reversed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 26th, 2015 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: PP verses by Aryadeva

Content:

Will said:

My guess is the three forms of prajna are the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a translation error, Sparham did not follow the commentary. In the commentary it makes it clear that

Remain in equipoise taking a firm position (bca' gzhi) atop the tripartite revelation
Should be read as follows:

The three prepared bases (bca' gzhi) are body, speech and mind. The meaning of teaching/discourse [bka'] is the Prajñāpāramitā that has the nature of the three liberations. Equipoise is upon that.

He has inexplicably disregarded the instrumental after bca' gzhi, or his version of the manuscript has an error where the instrumental was written as a genitive. Anyway, the line should read:

Rest in equipoise upon the teaching with the three prepared bases.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: The Original Vinaya

Content:

Jetavan said:

Has any scholar produced a reconstruction of the "original vinaya" (however short a text that might be)?

Malcolm wrote:

There cannot be a single original Vinaya since Buddha ordained many different groups of monks in many different places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? You are proposing a speculation, "...instead they probably made up two fake disciples to connect Huineng with later generations" as a fact, "...there is no lineage

from him."

Astus said:

Let's start with how Huineng was invented by Shenhui only to connect him to Hongren and establish a lineage separate from those of the so called Northern School, i.e. the disciples of Shenxiu.

Malcolm wrote:

So now you have moved from a tentative Huineng maybe existed to a full on "Huineng was invented."

Astus said:

The earliest version of the Platform Sutra, written after the death of Shenhui, does not even mention Nanyue Huairang, who was later mentioned as the teacher of Mazu Daoyi in order to connect Mazu to Huineng. So, I could say that not only the name of Nanyue was added to the lineage of Huineng, but Huineng himself was added to the lineage of Hongren, both by people who wanted to establish their own authority. This is not to say that there might not have been people with names like that, however, it is clear that the lineage connections are later creations. That is, Huineng was not an outstanding disciple of Hongren and all we know about him from fairly contemporary sources is his name, and Nanyue was not a disciple of Huineng and besides his name we know nothing about from the earliest sources - and that source is actually the stele of Mazu.

Malcolm wrote:

Then why do you say "However, it is clear that the lineage connections are later creations." Why is that clear, because you did not find another ancient book in which to confirm this? It seems to me that you are jumping to a lot of conclusions based on an astonishing lack of evidence for them.

Astus said:

So, yes, we can only speculate if they existed at all or not. What we can know is that the stories and their places in the lineage are creations of later generations, and such lineages were made up in order to claim authority.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually you cannot know that, you can however speculate all you like.

On the other hand, there is a clear narrative, and clear history. Just accept it and move on. That helps the tradition of Zen. The opposite undermines it. Is that what you want?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You conflate two things here: the Platform Sutra and the Sixth Patriarch.

Did Hui-Neng live? Yes? No?

It does not matter if all the details in the book about Hui-neng's life are "correct."

Astus said:

Yes, based on the available texts there was such a person, although there is nothing else known about him besides his name. Heze Shenhui was the first to claim that Huineng was the true heir of Hongren and not Shenxiu. However, no later lineages derive themselves from Shenhui - who might have been a disciple of Huineng - instead they probably made up two fake disciples to connect Huineng with later generations. So, even if Huineng might have existed, there is no lineage from him. On the other hand, it was the Platform Sutra that propagated Huineng as the true heir and made him the one true Sixth Patriarch.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? You are proposing a speculation,"...instead they probably made up two fake disciples to connect Huineng with later generations" as a fact, "...there is no lineage from him."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Last year I got into debate with Jayarava on this forum. When I disagreed with him that Ian Stevenson's research into children with past-life memories had been discredited by the Sceptic Association, he told me 'I might as well be a Jehovah's Witness'. By then, I had already decided I didn't have regard for his writings - I think they're tendentious and tend towards materialism.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, he absolutely subscribes to wrong view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

buddhology is forensics, lineage and tradition are living and breathing.

Astus said:

Tradition is the idea that certain patterns of thinking and activity are inherited through time without change. Historical research includes investigating such claims, looking

into the origin and development of traditions. For instance, through findings in the 20th century it has become obvious that the Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch is a later creation and not an account of actual events and teachings. Since all living Zen lineages originate from the Sixth Patriarch, and lineage is the single basis of authority in Zen, it is not at all irrelevant whether the tradition has a historical validity or not, exactly because lineage is a powerful argument only as long as it can be perceived as true.

Malcolm wrote:

You conflate two things here: the Platform Sutra and the Sixth Patriarch.

Did Hui-Neng live? Yes? No?

It does not matter if all the details in the book about Hui-neng's life are "correct."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Kaccāni said:

For the sake of understanding, I rather go with something non-invasive like "deconstruction" instead of destruction or dissection. However, there are other professions ...

Best wishes

Kc

Malcolm wrote:

But that is actually the point, their purported dissections are destructive of their own understanding as well as that of others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Reiki

Content:

Vasana said:

Is abhisheka the only way to establish a connection?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Vasana said:

What about Puja?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Vasana said:

I agree that reiki is not a Vajrayāna system in it's self, just that it utilizes syllables, one of which i still maintain as a variation of Hrih.

Malcolm wrote:

It has no more value that Hrih, i.e. the English letters, HRIH, from a Vajrayāna perspective.

It is best not to conflate systems. Of course, now, someone is going to fabricate a Vajrayāna Reiki, invent an empowerment for it and so on, it is only a matter of time...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

daverupa said:

This sneaky description is a very deficient caricature of scholastic endeavor with respect to early Buddhism. You must imagine a monolithic edifice to throw your criticisms against, but the reality on the ground does not conform to your wish.

Malcolm wrote:

I qualified my description:

...and in the case of people like Jayarava, etc., I see no such interest at all. They merrily hack away...

I was characterizing deficient scholastic endeavor, not all scholastic endeavor. For example, scholars like Richard Saloman and Collette Cox, among others, these are real scholars, characterized by restraint and measure. Contrast their work with the reconstructions of Schopen, and I think you can clearly see the difference. It is obvious that Jayarava is just a Schopen fanboy, and Sujato's objection to Schopen equally applies to this so called "peer-reviewed" scholar, Jayarava Atwood:

If we were to accept Schopen in his more radical moods we would be rendered incapable of saying anything about the Buddha or his teachings, and would be left with no idea as to why there were, in the later periods, such widely spread religious schools claiming inspiration from a common Teacher, sharing a similar lifestyle, and borrowing wholesale each other's scriptures, at the same time as vigorously arguing with each other over what the scriptures mean.

<https://sujato.wordpress.com/2011/01/22/the-ironic-assumptions-of-gregory-schopen/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Sam Harris on Charlie Hebdo

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Noam Chomsky starting from around 4:39

Unknown said:

Unfortunately, ISIS, the Islamic Caliphate, is now...almost...a representative of Sunni...a large part of Sunni Islam...that's an utter tragedy.

Malcolm wrote:

Earlier, starting around 3:47, he blames two main causes for the rise of ISIS, 1) Allied disruption of Iraq that lead to sectarian violence 2) Saudi Wahhabi funding.

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Reiki

Content:

Vasana said:

So long as a condensed form of the Hrih syllable exists as a Reiki symbol, then the corresponding Buddha-family, Dakini and activity will always be an energetic part of the process.

Buddhas' emanate in the form of light-rays and the syllables and mantras are invocations and attunements of such.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case. For a person who has not received abhisheka there is no connection, no dependent origination has been established, and so on.

Reiki is not and never will be a Vajrayāna system of any kind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

daverupa said:

False dichotomies are boring.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a false dichotomy — forensics is dissection. You only do that to corpses. One does not dissect living things, unless one is seeking to remove some illness from them

in order to save their lives.

One might argue that Buddhology is just such a kind of surgery, but in general, in surgery, the surgeon has to be interested in saving the patient, and in the case of people like Jayarava, etc., I see no such interest at all. They merrily hack away at the body of Dharma, trying to remove what they perceive to be problems and inconsistencies, blind to the problems and inconsistencies they themselves are introducing — this is, in all cases, because they have not received a proper education in Dharma, and properly followed a master. There is no one more sad than a putative Dharma practitioner who has no master.

One can try to couch the various approaches in the modern historiography of Buddhadharma in "neutral" distinctions such as "etic" and "emic", but these terms are merely subtle insults — at least the way the terms are commonly misapplied in Buddhology these days.

In terms of so called "Early Buddhism", this is merely a hypothetical Buddhism, a largely speculative project of reconstruction. No one ever practiced, practices or can practice such a thing as "Early Buddhism" because there is actually no such thing and there never was such a thing. One can only practice the Dharma one has received from a teacher in the present day along with its traditions and lineages and that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anyway, the point is that no amount of study of Buddhist "history" will get you any closer to the Dharma.

Astus said:

At the same time Buddhist schools are happy to establish their authority on historical claims and they regularly transmit stories about events supposedly happened in the past. The very idea of lineage is a claim for historical origins. If it is irrelevant to understanding the Dharma, why not leave all those out?

Malcolm wrote:

buddhology is forensics, lineage and tradition are living and breathing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Jayarava also seems quite eager to point out that all of these issues have been glossed

over by scholars, like when he says in his reddit post "...I realised that many flaws in Buddhist doctrine are plastered over with collusion between Buddhists practitioners and scholars. There's a kind of loose conspiracy to present Buddhism as smooth, when it is in fact lumpy." but far from being something that's ignored, this 'lumpiness' of the texts is in fact the primary thing that these textual scholars investigate. None of these scholars claim that these early canons are these pristine texts that have been perfectly and accurately preserved.

daverupa said:

Indeed, the discussion of early Buddhism is well-underway & the underlined portion above is already well in-view by scholastics... which leaves us with Jayarava's strawman: exposed and loose, wafting away right in front of us.

Malcolm wrote:

Anyway, the point is that no amount of study of Buddhist "history" will get you any closer to the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Differences between Vajravarahi practice in Kagyupa scho

Content:

conebeckham said:

these were also eventually passed to Rechungpa as well, from a Mikyo Dorje--not the 8th Karmapa, though.

Malcolm wrote:

Rechungpa's dates are 1085-- 1161. Nyang ral, born in 1124, would have been 37 when Raschung passed. Nyang had a student called man lung pa mi bskyod rdo rje, birth dates unknown, so it is possible that Raschungpa received this transmission from this Mikyo Dorje. Nyang's lineage, the five deity mandala, has the mantra found in the Siddhirajñī text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: Differences between Vajravarahi practice in Kagyupa scho

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm, that's interesting--from the titles, it would seem those texts relate to Gyalwa Gyamtso, perhaps? I seem to recall Jalandara from a lineage prayer....

Malcolm wrote:

Gyalwa Gyatso also has no named text in the bka' 'gyur nor the bstan 'gyur.

However a quick search shows that one version of Gyalwa Gyatso uses the mantra in

the Siddhirajni text. Another version, in the bcom ldan 'das 'phags pa 'jig rten dbang phyug rgyal ba rgya mtsho'i sgrub dkyil dbang chog dang bcas pa thar pa'i lam chen zhes bya ba found in the Sakya Rgyud sde kun btus shows the mantra in given in the first text I described above. So it seems that this form of Avalokiteśvara practice got its nickname in Tibet.

The rgyud sde kun btus lists two different lineages for the practice.

First, goes from Vajradhara, to Avalokiteśvara, Padmavajra the junior, Jalandhara, Vajrapani, Maitripa, Vajrapani, Sumatikirti, Rechungpa, etc. — I think this is the one practiced in Kagyu.

The second, from Amitabha, to Avalokiteśvara, Mitrajoki, Śrīputra, Minyag Dragpa Rinchen and so on. This one does not have an important lineage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Differences between Vajravarahi practice in Kagyupa scho

Content:

conebeckham said:

I will have to take your word for that, and I do find it interesting. There are so many different sadhanas and practice cycles associated with Cakrasamvara and Vajrayogini/Varahi, I can't imagine anyone being accomplished in the details of all-- though of course, if one is truly accomplished in one, that suffices. Knowing the details of the individual methods is an interesting side-line, and one I find fascinating and inspiring, personally.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, there are two related texts in the bstan 'gyur that have mantras with ha ri ni sa:

dpal thugs rje chen po'i dbang bskur ba'i man ngag rab tu byed pa zhes bya ba attributed to Jalandhara and supposedly translated by a Tibetan, Prajñākīrti from the oral transmission by the Indian Vajrapāṇi (Gya gar phyag na rdo rje) of Matripa's hand written copy of the text.

The other example is 'jig rten dbang phyug gsang ba'i sgrub thabs termed an oral lineage from Siddhirajni, no listed translator.

And there are no Sarma tantras with these mantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Differences between Vajravarahi practice in Kagyupa scho

Content:

conebeckham said:

Also, in Kamtsang, the "arrangement of the mandala" differs greatly between Vajrayogini and Cakrasamvara.

Malcolm wrote:

The full mandala of Yogini has 37 deities. The full mandala of Cakrasamvara has 62 deities. What is the difference? The absence of the heroes. When you subtract the 25 heroes from 62 you come up with 37. Then of course, the essential or mandala of great bliss of Cakrasamvara is Cakramsavara/Vārāhī and the four core dākinīs, Lāma and so on. When you are dealing with just the core deities of Vārāhī, then you have Vārāhī, Lāma, etc. Or you can take it down to one deity, like Naropa's Khecari. But all in all, even the single deity Naropa's Khecari actually contains the entire 62 deity Samvara mandala.

Incidentally, any mantra with ha ri ni sa in it has a Nyingma origin since that mantra is entirely absent in any Sarma tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Sam Harris on Charlie Hebdo

Content:

Bakmoon said:

They think of the world of Muslims as being one tribe and the West as being another tribe...

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Sam Harris on Charlie Hebdo

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'll agree there to some extent, it certainly seems it could do with some sort of reformation..

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Islam as a whole needs a great internal reformation.

Johnny Dangerous said:

But really, what is the conclusion to draw from this sort of sentiment anyway 'be scared of Islam'. I always see people post stuff likenthis as if there's some grand point to be.made...there are alot of moving parts to this debate and simply harping on what's wrong with Islam.strikes me as very short sighted....it cannot describe all.the conditios responsible for modern Jihad movements.

Malcolm wrote:

Wahhabism, that is all the conditions required. When you examine the history of this movement, you will see the roots of ISIS and so on.

Johnny Dangerous said:

BRIEF HISTORY 1741- 1818

Abd al-Wahhab's advocacy of these ultra radical views inevitably led to his expulsion from his own town -- and in 1741, after some wanderings, he found refuge under the protection of Ibn Saud and his tribe. What Ibn Saud perceived in Abd al-Wahhab's novel teaching was the means to overturn Arab tradition and convention. It was a path to seizing power.

Ibn Saud's clan, seizing on Abd al-Wahhab's doctrine, now could do what they always did, which was raiding neighboring villages and robbing them of their possessions. Only now they were doing it not within the ambit of Arab tradition, but rather under the banner of jihad. Ibn Saud and Abd al-Wahhab also reintroduced the idea of martyrdom in the name of jihad, as it granted those martyred immediate entry into paradise.

In the beginning, they conquered a few local communities and imposed their rule over them. (The conquered inhabitants were given a limited choice: conversion to Wahhabism or death.) By 1790, the Alliance controlled most of the Arabian Peninsula and repeatedly raided Medina, Syria and Iraq.

Their strategy -- like that of ISIS today -- was to bring the peoples whom they conquered into submission. They aimed to instill fear. In 1801, the Allies attacked the Holy City of Karbala in Iraq. They massacred thousands of Shiites, including women and children. Many Shiite shrines were destroyed, including the shrine of Imam Hussein, the murdered grandson of Prophet Muhammad.

A British official, Lieutenant Francis Warden, observing the situation at the time, wrote: "They pillaged the whole of it [Karbala], and plundered the Tomb of Hussein... slaying in the course of the day, with circumstances of peculiar cruelty, above five thousand of the inhabitants ..."

Osman Ibn Bishr Najdi, the historian of the first Saudi state, wrote that Ibn Saud committed a massacre in Karbala in 1801. He proudly documented that massacre saying, "we took Karbala and slaughtered and took its people (as slaves), then praise be to Allah, Lord of the Worlds, and we do not apologize for that and say: 'And to the unbelievers: the same treatment.'"

In 1803, Abdul Aziz then entered the Holy City of Mecca, which surrendered under the impact of terror and panic (the same fate was to befall Medina, too). Abd al-Wahhab's followers demolished historical monuments and all the tombs and shrines in their midst. By the end, they had destroyed centuries of Islamic architecture near the Grand Mosque.

But in November of 1803, a Shiite assassin killed King Abdul Aziz (taking revenge for the massacre at Karbala). His son, Saud bin Abd al Aziz, succeeded him and continued the conquest of Arabia. Ottoman rulers, however, could no longer just sit back and watch as their empire was devoured piece by piece. In 1812, the Ottoman army, composed of Egyptians, pushed the Alliance out from Medina, Jeddah and Mecca. In 1814, Saud bin Abd al Aziz died of fever. His unfortunate son Abdullah bin Saud, however, was taken by the Ottomans to Istanbul, where he was gruesomely executed (a visitor to Istanbul reported seeing him having been humiliated in the streets of Istanbul for three days, then hanged and beheaded, his severed head fired from a canon, and his heart cut out and impaled on his body).

In 1815, Wahhabi forces were crushed by the Egyptians (acting on the Ottoman's behalf) in a decisive battle. In 1818, the Ottomans captured and destroyed the Wahhabi capital of Dariyah. The first Saudi state was no more. The few remaining Wahhabis withdrew into the desert to regroup, and there they remained, quiescent for most of the 19th century.

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alastair-crooke/isis-wahhabism-saudi-arabia_b_5717157.html

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Sam Harris on Charlie Hebdo

Content:

Fa Dao said:

It doesnt matter how I define it..it is clearly defined in the quran and hadiths...

Johnny Dangerous said:

Violence against non believers on a similar level is also in the Torah/Old Testament....it is something othe than just the holy books, believing religion and politics are somehow mutually exclusive motivations is naieve.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, the problem with the Koran is that there is no "new testament."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 23rd, 2015 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Differences between Vajravarahi practice in Kagyupa scho

Content:
Lingpupa said:
Dear Malcolm,

I can well imagine that you'd like the last word, and that's fine with me. However, from the practitioner's point of view, the situation is really quite simple.

Vajravarahi/Vajrayogini plays a part in the two practices of which I have the longest experience. Both of them are from the Kagyu tradition, neither of them is particularly obscure. In one of them she is called Vajravarahi, has a sow's head, and has one mantra. In the other, she is called Vajrayogini, does not have the sow's head, and has a slightly different mantra. I'm sure you appreciate that it would be completely wrong to interchange either the appearances or the mantras between these practices. For my money, that makes the two occurrences slightly different.

If you want to argue that they are nevertheless identical (which was the original poster's question, as I recall, although somebody seems to have manipulated the threads), while being somewhat different, then please be my guest.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference lies in whether the essence and near essence mantras are combined, as in the Om gsum mantra, or whether they are kept separately, as in some other sadhanas and transmissions.

The main point however is that we have two basic forms of one deity. For example, there is a Cakrasamvara in his Sahaja form, 12 armed form, up to a thousand armed form. They are all different forms of the same deity. Likewise, whether we are talking about Naro Dakini, Indradakini (Vārāhī), Maitri Dakini, or Vajravārāhī they are all different forms of the same deity.

In the sadhanas we have in the bstan 'gyur we frequently see this:

/bod skad du/rdo rje phag mo'i sgrub thabs/dpal rdo rje rnal 'byor ma la phyag 'tshal lo/

/bod skad du/rdo rje rnal 'byor ma'i sgrub thabs zhes bya ba/rje btsun dpal rdo rje phag mo la phyag 'tshal lo/

In Tibetan: Vajravārāhīsadhana. Homage to Vajrayoginī.

In Tibetan: Vajrayoginīsadana. Homage to Lady Śrī Vajravārāhī

Or in the Khyāvajravārāhyabhidhanāta-tantrottara-vārāhī-abhibodhiya-nāma

Arising in the center of that is the queen,

Vārāhī, Vajrayoginī.

My point being is that these two terms are both used for the same deity, regardless of minor differences in mantra formation or appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 23rd, 2015 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Differences between Vajravarahi practice in Kagyupa scho

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Always, they both come from the Laghusamvara Tantra.

Lingpupa said:

Sure. But Vajravarahi has the sow's head, Vajrayogini generally not. Whether you call them the same or close but different is up to the way you want to define your terms. It's not very important.

You can argue by that method that she is the same deity as Chakrasamvara. Maybe she is, maybe she isn't - but they look different. The rest is little games.

So not always in every case, just many.

Malcolm wrote:

The presence or absence of the sow's head is not relevant. What is relevant is that the mantras are the same, the source tantra is the same, and so on.

Also, Yoginī is the essence of Cakrasamvara. When one practices Yoginī, Samvara is included automatically. The arrangement of the mandala is the same, the manner of the abhisamaya is the same, based on the Yoginīsaṃcārya Tantra, so on and so forth.

Also, when in union with Cakrasamvara, Vajravārāhī is never pictured with a sow's head, as she is always, say, when she is the consort of Hayagriva in Nyingma Tantras.

This is why I am willing to allow that Vajravārāhī in Nyingma is not necessarily interchangeable with Vajrayoginī in Sarma — the Vajravārāhī mantras in Nyingma tantra are not similar at all with the Yoginī/Vārāhī mantras from the Laghusamvara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 23rd, 2015 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: Differences between Vajravarahi practice in Kagyupa scho

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In gSar ma, they definitely are interchangeable.

Lingpupa said:

Perhaps. Maybe even often. But not quite always.

Malcolm wrote:

Always, they both come from the Laghusamvara Tantra, and no distinction is made

between Yoginī and Vārāhī, Vajrayoginī is Vajravārāhī and vice versa. The only difference between them is the source of the lineage, but not the nature of the deity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 23rd, 2015 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Spirit Guides in Buddhism

Content:

M.G. said:

Is there a formal differentiation between a "spirit" and a worldly dharmapala? (Other than the latter being tamed into protecting the dharma.) That's not meant sarcastically, btw.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, a dharmapāla, as opposed to a lokapāla, is an awakened nonhuman manifesting in a wrathful form to protect the Dharma. A lokapāla is a worldly being who has been bound to protect the Dharma. It is important to make this distinction since it is at the root of the dharmapāla crisis in Gelug.

M.G. said:

This is an important enough point that I'd like to ask for one clarification.

Is the English phrase "worldly dharmapala" generally understood as synonymous with "lokapala?" When I used the term "worldly dharmapala" I intended to convey the idea of a dharma protector that is not enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

"loka" means worldly.

Unless one is a powerful yogi, one should not rely on unenlightened beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 23rd, 2015 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Spirit Guides in Buddhism

Content:

M.G. said:

Is there a formal differentiation between a "spirit" and a worldly dharmapala? (Other than the latter being tamed into protecting the dharma.) That's not meant sarcastically, btw.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, a dharmapāla, as opposed to a lokapāla, is an awakened nonhuman manifesting in a wrathful form to protect the Dharma. A lokapāla is a worldly being who has been bound to protect the Dharma. It is important to make this distinction since it is at the root of the dharmapāla crisis in Gelug.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Spirit Guides in Buddhism

Content:

Barsook said:

Are there spirit guides in Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

No, definitely not.

M.G. said:

Wouldn't this depend on how one defines the term "spirit guide"?

I know of one serious practitioner who claims to have received a direct warning about a planned action from one of the dharmapalas. To my mind, this could be construed as guidance from a spirit.

Malcolm wrote:

Since when are Dharmapālas "spirits", two, since when do Dharmapālas take interest in the affairs of mortals? Third, how are we to know whether this guidance was from a dharmapāla or a māra masquerading as a dharmapāla?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Spirit Guides in Buddhism

Content:

Barsook said:

Are there spirit guides in Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

No, definitely not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Differences between Vajravarahi practice in Kagyupa scho

Content:

togg said:

Are Vajrayogini and Vajravarahi identical?

(And happy Losar!!!)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact they are the same deity, same mantra, etc.

Lingpupa said:

Almost. Not interchangeable under all circumstances.

Malcolm wrote:

In gSar ma, they definitely are interchangeable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Sherlock said:

Jayarava is also on the fringes of academia at best.

Malcolm wrote:

He is not an academic and has no training at all in Buddhology or in a traditional Buddhist curriculum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Indrajala said:

So much for an academic discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

What is the use of a discussion predicated on outlandish assumptions and pure speculation which has no basis in fact?

Further, what place does an "academic" discussion harmful to the very root of Dharma have on a forum devoted to Dharma?

There are plenty of places where those more interested in "history" and philology than Dharma can chew the fat.

Indrajala said:

Critics of Early Buddhism have adopted a rhetoric of scepticism in order to dismiss the notion of authenticity. Their arguments are apparently intended to be hard-nosed and unsentimental, but when examined closely they are reminiscent of arguments by denialists of various types, such as those relating to the harmful effects of tobacco, creationism, or the reality of man-made climate change. Just as sceptics characterise the search for authenticity as “Protestant Buddhism”, it seems appropriate to describe this form of scepticism as “Denialist Buddhism”.

Malcolm wrote:

What Sujato fails to point out here is just how much of this "skepticism" purely conjectural and speculative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 8:09 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I take it you are not a Mahayana Buddhist Jayarava?

Malcolm wrote:

He is not a follower of Buddhadharma at all, anymore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Jayarava said:

But I do adduce reasons in an earlier essay. My bad for not linking to it. I can sum that argument up for you in a few quick words. Pratītyasamutpāda says:

imasmim sati idaṃ hoti, imass' uppādā idaṃ uppajjati;

imasmim asati idaṃ na hoti, imassa nirodhā idaṃ nirujjhati. (My emphasis)

None other than Nāgārjuna points out the problem with any version of karma that requires effects to ripen after the conditions have ceased:

tiṣṭhaty ā pākakālāc cet karma tan nityatām iyāt /

> niruddhaṃ cen niruddhaṃ sat kiṃ phalaṃ janayiṣyati // MMK_17.6 //

Which translates as:

"If the action remains until the time of maturation, then it would be eternal
If it ceases, being ceased, how does it produce a fruit?"

Now, Nāgārjuna has a particular solution in mind when he makes this criticism. And Indrajala has already pointed out that other Buddhist sects had their own solutions. Which goes to show that this is not something I've simply made up. It was a problem widely acknowledged in the Buddhist world and many solutions were proposed, and

polemics were written criticising them all by Buddhists of different sects. Far from being a shocking modern discovery, this is a boring 2000 year old argument. Though in my view it was never settled satisfactorily.

So I'm sorry that you felt the need to go on the offensive, but you are simply mistaken. The facts are very much on my side. Does this change your mind at all?

Bakmoon said:

How is this a contradiction? Just because the earliest texts don't give an explicit formulation of how the process of Karma works in regards to time doesn't mean that there is a contradiction. It just means that the texts never discuss the matter.

Malcolm wrote:

It is just more of Jayarava's Adharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Jayarava said:

And this is the problem with basing your opinions on translations instead of original texts. There really is a contradiction, but the translation you were reading hid it from you. A bit deceptive, eh?

Malcolm wrote:

It still does not necessarily mean what you intend it to mean. It does not indicate that Buddha's birth mother, who supposedly died when shortly after he was born of a caesarean section, was the "mother" referenced in the passage.

Jayarava said:

None other than Nāgārjuna points out the problem with any version of karma that requires effects to ripen after the conditions have ceased:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, ultimately. Still, Nāgārjuna accepts karmic ripening conventionally, and even presents his favored presentation of how karmas ripen, the position of the Sammitiyas.

Jayarava said:

Now, Nāgārjuna has a particular solution in mind when he makes this criticism. And Indrajala has already pointed out that other Buddhist sects had their own solutions. Which goes to show that this is not something I've simply made up. It was a problem

widely acknowledged in the Buddhist world and many solutions were proposed, and polemics were written criticising them all by Buddhists of different sects. Far from being a shocking modern discovery, this is a boring 2000 year old argument. Though in my view it was never settled satisfactorily.

Malcolm wrote:

See above.

Jayarava said:

So I'm sorry that you felt the need to go on the offensive, but you are simply mistaken. The facts are very much on my side. Does this change your mind at all?

Malcolm wrote:

That facts are not on your side.

One, your reading of that sutta passage involves a large number of unfounded suppositions.

Two, your reading of Nāgārjuna conflates relative and ultimate. What Nāgārjuna opines is the idea that the effects of actions are "imperishable", even after the action itself has ceased. In other words, he presents the āvipraṇāśa, his preferred theory. This chapter is sole place in the whole of the MMK where he expressed an preference of opinions.

Now, you might personally feel that Karma and dependent origination are in contradiction, but it is slipshod to invoke Nāgārjuna in defense of your theory, since Nāgārjuna, strictly speaking, ultimately negates arising altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

frank123 said:

My apologies for sounding like a broken record but i am just trying to get my head around that at some time in the future Dzogchen will be the only practice remaining on earth. Surely if it spreads across the whole globe so widely would it be accurate to say that the essence of the teachings will remain but there will not be cultural 'baggage' so to speak remaining.

For example Tibetan terminology will not be so important, the name Dzogchen wont be used to describe our true nature etc but the main essentials will still be intact. I know we cant know for sure but does this outcome seems most probable?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anachronisms in a text do not necessarily point to a late, original composition — case in point, the Illiad.

Certainly the Illiad is filled with anachronisms, nevertheless, the basic facts presented in the Illiad have been born out by archaeological findings.

Then of course there is the issue of whether something some scholar judges to be anachronistic is actually anachronistic.

Bakmoon said:

Anachronisms do not demonstrate that the entirety of a text is late, correct. But they do indicate that the particular example of the text which contains them is.

Malcolm wrote:

And that of course says nothing about the antiquity of the given text in question, merely the example presented.

In any case, everything that Jayarava presents is nothing but one huge ego-flamed speculation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, at that time, Dzogchen too will have vanished. And when we say life span of ten years, it does not mean everyone has a life span of ten years, it means that there is such violence, that the average lifespan is ten years.

For example, we live now in an age where the life span for humans is considered to be a one hundred. This does not mean everyone lives to a hundred, or that one cannot live longer, etc.

dzogchungpa said:

So what will the average lifespan be when everything but Dzogchen is gone?

Malcolm wrote:

One assumes 100 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

alpha said:

If rinpoche's claim is based on kalachakra prophecies than this could only happen in the very distant future, more like thousands of years from now. Because first the islam has to dominate the world and be destroyed and only then we can talk about the right conditions for vajrayana and dzogchen to flourish again or so i understood it.

Malcolm wrote:

More like 450 years from now, that is when the Kalacakra war is supposed to happen. But I don't think this idea is based at all on Kalacakra, but rather a prediction in the srga thal gyur tantra, where it says that Dzogchen teachings will continue to spread until the time when the lifespan decreases to ten years, at which point it will disappear. Given that the notion that the Śākyamuni's Dharma supposed to last 5000 years before it disappears and so on, we can see the inference that Dzogchen will be the last surviving system of Dharma.

dzogchungpa said:

So at that time Dzogchen will be transmitted and practiced by people under the age of 10?

Malcolm wrote:

No, at that time, Dzogchen too will have vanished. And when we say life span of ten years, it does not mean everyone has a life span of ten years, it means that there is such violence, that the average lifespan is ten years.

For example, we live now in an age where the life span for humans is considered to be a one hundred. This does not mean everyone lives to a hundred, or that one cannot live longer, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Indrajala said:

Then of course there is the issue of whether something some scholar judges to be anachronistic is actually anachronistic.

It all comes down to evidence. You can contest anything, but in the absence of evidence it means nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

And you can propose anything, even an anachronism, but in the absence of evidence it means nothing.

As far as Jayravava's article goes, there is at least one instance of playing fast and loose with the facts. He writes: I've also discussed the contradictory biographical traditions in the suttas (see The Buddha's Biography). There are at least two biographies of the Buddha. In one he is a unmarried youth when he leaves home and his mother is still alive. In another he is a man of 29 whose mother died in childbirth. The youth is found in the Pāli version of the Ariyapariyesana Sutta and the 29 year old in the Chinese counterpart of the same text. Both stories cannot be true and we have no objective way of knowing which is. All we have is a general historical principle that Buddhist stories become more elaborate over time (there is clear evidence of this in the accurately dated Chinese translations). Thus, we usually assume that a less elaborate version of a story is (relatively) earlier than the same story in a more elaborate version.

However, this is incorrect. There is no specific mention of Buddha's mother in this sutta. There is this, however:

"So, at a later time, while still young, a black-haired young man endowed with the blessings of youth in the first stage of life — and while my parents, unwilling, were crying with tears streaming down their faces — I shaved off my hair & beard, put on the ochre robe and went forth from the home life into homelessness.

For example, my father remarried, and has a wife who is not my mother. But I often refer to them as my "parents" out of convenience, though only one of them is actually my parent.

Thus, when Jayarava claims that there are two conflicting bios in the canon, when his claim is closely examined, it is at best a reach based on how he wants to read the term "parents" and "youth". Thus, Jayarava is conjuring up contradictions where none are to be seen, in this case.

Then there is this:

There is the fundamental incompatibility of karma and pratīyasamutpāda. The former demands effects long after conditions have ceased, and the latter forbids it.

This is nonsense, it almost bears no rebuttal since he adduces no reasoning to buttress his absurd claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History

Content:

Indrajala said:

I personally agree that the traditional narrative is highly problematic, which is evident when you see anachronisms in literature which is supposed to represent the teachings of a historical Buddha and early sangha (like mention of writing in the Ekōttarikāgama).

Malcolm wrote:

Anachronisms in a text do not necessarily point to a late, original composition — case in point, the Illiad.

Certainly the Illiad is filled with anachronisms, nevertheless, the basic facts presented in the Illiad have been born out by archaeological findings.

Then of course there is the issue of whether something some scholar judges to be anachronistic is actually anachronistic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

alpha said:

If rinpoche's claim is based on kalachakra prophecies than this could only happen in the very distant future, more like thousands of years from now. Because first the islam has to dominate the world and be destroyed and only then we can talk about the right conditions for vajrayana and dzogchen to flourish again or so i understood it.

Malcolm wrote:

More like 450 years from now, that is when the Kalacakra war is supposed to happen. But I don't think this idea is based at all on Kalacakra, but rather a prediction in the srga thal gyur tantra, where it says that Dzogchen teachings will continue to spread until the time when the lifespan decreases to ten years, at which point it will disappear. Given that the notion that the Śākyamuni's Dharma supposed to last 5000 years before it disappears and so on, we can see the inference that Dzogchen will be the last surviving system of Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 21st, 2015 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Differences between Vajravarahi practice in Kagyupa scho

Content:

togg said:

Are Vajrayogini and Vajravarahi identical?

(And happy Losar!!!)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact they are the same deity, same mantra, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 20th, 2015 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Did Tibet ever use the Indian calendar?

Content:

Indrajala said:

The Tibetan calendar is calculated on the basis of the Kālacakra Tantra.

It seems though the popular calendar commonly used by Tibetans is very similar to the Chinese lunar calendar. Losar for example just happened, whereas Caitra or Vaiśākha, which are regarded as the start of the year on the Indian calendar, won't be until April or May.

According to Henning's site, there's multiple calendars in use:

<http://www.kalacakra.org/calendar/tibcal.htm>

However, the month commences from the new moon, as in the Chinese calendar you mention above.

There is a precedent for this in India. If I recall, the calendars of the south have the month commence from the new moon, which is called the amānta method, whereas if it commences from the full moon it is the pūrṇāmānta method. The amānta method is generally understood as occidental and not native to India originally.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetan calendar, while calculated astronomically on the basis of the Kālacakra (specifically the Vimalaprabha), is applied according to the system of 'byung rtsi, i.e. elemental calculation, which originates some time in the 11th century and derives from "China", roughly speaking.

There are two main systems of calendar making in Tibet, Phuglug and Tshurlug; the former is followed by most Tibetans; the latter, by the Karma Kagyu. The Tshurlug new year is one month earlier than the Phuglug system.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 20th, 2015 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Did Tibet ever use the Indian calendar?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Does anyone know if Tibet ever used the Indian calendar based on the 27 or 28 nakṣatras? The month commences from the full moon and has its name derived from which nakṣatra the full moon is nominally abiding in that night. On the Chinese lunar calendar this would be day 15 (day 1 is the new moon). According to this model, the new year will commence on April 3rd or lunar 2/15, which is always the nakṣatra Citrā (as a month name it is Caitra).

If you convert the Chinese lunar calendar into the Indian one used by Amoghavajra in

the eighth century it looks like this:

<https://1.bp.blogspot.com/-yZipCVPd4X4/VKTR5xagwZI/AAAAAAAAAC5M/OvUY1SHtmLI/s1600/T1299%2Btable%2Band%2Blandscape-page-001.jpg>

It became widely used in astrology and Mijiao/Shingon, especially in Japan, but was never mainstream in either China or Japan. How about Tibet?

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetan calendar is calculated on the basis of the Kālacakra Tantra. However, the month commences from the new moon, as in the Chinese calendar you mention above.

The Tibetans make full use of the nakṣatras based on both the Chinese and Indian systems. For example, the fourth Tibetan Month, Saga, is a corruption of Vaisakha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 18th, 2015 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: series of rebirths

Content:

garudha said:

That which has a beginning also has an end.

If someone says "this is/was my final birth" it follows that there must have an original birth.

Q: is there any mention of liberated ones recalling their original or first birth ?

Malcolm wrote:

No, because there is no beginning to birth, only and end.

There is a saying, "samsara has no beginning, but it has an end, nirvana has a beginning, but it has no end."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 17th, 2015 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: The Eleven Nations of North America

Content:

steveb1 said:

OP wrote: "the United States, which I view basically as a monoculture (or really more of a homogeneous barbarism). North America *is* multinational, composed of at least four major cultures (Mexico, which has more than one culture, the lower 48 barbarism, and Canada"

Seems a bit judgmental, particularly in regard to Mexico, which is a culture in wildly

barbaric disarray whose government sends and deliberately encourages its poorest, least educated citizens to illegally immigrate to the U.S., to the detriment of both cultures, but especially of the U.S., whose resources are inadequate to handle these waves of illegal colonization. To dismiss the U.S. simply as "the lower 48 barbarism" is inaccurate and itself looks like a form of barbarism.

Malcolm wrote:

It is actually a racist sentiment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Chat about Buddhism vs. Buddhadharma

Content:

Simon E. said:

You are moving firmly into the area of 'prapanca' imo.

dzogchungpa said:

Horrors.

I beleive it was Richard Hayes who first suggested that 'prapanca' is just the Buddhist word for 'bullshit':

<http://www.buddha-l.org/archives/2008-February/009389.html>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I like that. The definition of ultimate truth is "emptiness free from the four extremes of bullshit."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Chat about Buddhism vs. Buddhadharma

Content:

Herbie said:

So there may arise potential conflict between "this buddhisms" doctrines or teachings and the expression of "awakened people".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for example, the conflict between Hinayāna and Mahāyāna, and the conflict between Yogacara and Madhyamaka, and so on. A great deal of the hermeneutics in Buddhism involves negotiating the disparity between "buddhisms" and Buddhadharma.

Herbie said:

"awakened" or "awakening" seems to be the key concept.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Buddhadharma means "The realization and teaching of those who are awake."

Herbie said:

So the question as to the difference between "Buddha dharma" and "Buddhism(s)" has just been shifted to the question of identifying "awakened people" and since the ways of expression of "awakened people" cannot be determined by any buddhism how can "awakened people" be identified?

Malcolm wrote:

That is something we all have to work out on our own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, your upāya is indeed inconceivable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

daverupa said:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/kn/ud/ud.6.02.than.html> as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Given Dzogchungpa's ecumenical tendencies (there is a cure for that, BTW), I thought it was apropos.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Buddhisms" may contain Buddhadharma or not. It really depends on whether a given school of "Buddhism" produces awakened people or not.

dzogchungpa said:

How can you tell if a given school produces awakened people or not?

Malcolm wrote:

Matthew 7:16

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Can you specify/define what "buddhadharma" stands for?

"Buddha Dharma" is a) the realization of a buddha and his or her expression of that realization.

Herbie said:

OK, thanks.

But then those who claim that "Buddhism" or "all kinds of Buddhism" are not "Buddha Dharma" should have that knowledge directly from a Buddha and should have been able to understand the expression of that Buddha meaning exactly this. Because if they have that knowledge from a "buddhist" teaching (a teaching of any kind of "all kinds of Buddhisms") then "Buddha Dharma" would be included in "Buddhism" and would not be different from "Buddhism".

Malcolm wrote:

"Buddhisms" may contain Buddhadharma or not. It really depends on whether a given school of "Buddhism" produces awakened people or not.

In other words not everything branded as "Buddhism" is Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Herbie said:

For me buddhism is manifesting in buddhists, buddhist traditions and institutions and the terms that stand for the concepts of the buddhist system of thought. Therefore I take the term "buddhadharma" as a synonym for "buddhism".

Malcolm wrote:

They are not— the various kinds of "Buddhisms" may elect to disinclude various aspects of Buddhadharma and often do.

Herbie said:

From your perspective you are certainly right.

But I understand my term "buddhism" as the heading for all "kinds of buddhisms". Also when I am exploring I rely on my 5 senses therefore I have to take the 2 terms as synonyms. Otherwise I feel I would indulge in some sort of speculation.

Malcolm wrote:

You have another sense, the mind.

Herbie said:

Can you specify/define what "buddhadharma" stands for?

Malcolm wrote:

"Buddha Dharma" is a) the realization of a buddha and his or her expression of that realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: The Mahayana idea of karma and vegetarianism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Madhyamaka stance, represented by Bhavaviveka, is that eating meat that is pure in three ways is permissible since there is no consciousness in the flesh of an animal who has been dead for some time

daverupa said:

...but there is consciousness in the flesh of an animal who has been dead for some lesser time?

Malcolm wrote:

Dave, the point eating meat not pure in three ways mean that you are somehow involved in afflicting suffering and engaging in killing. Basically, what Bhava is saying, is that a) because you were not involved in killing, seeing or ordering meat killed for you, you were not involved in killing b) since it takes a while to dress meat, but the time the (pure in three ways) meat reaches you, there is no fear of being involved in the animals suffering since its consciousness has long since departed its body, whether it is 30 seconds, 10 minutes, half an hour or three days.

daverupa said:

Also, how does this difference of opinion you mention relate to the following passage in the Surangama Sutra:

I use my spiritual power of compassion to provide you with illusory meat to satisfy your appetite.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not relate at all — this text never existed outside of China. We have some evidence that Indian Mādhyamikas more or less absolutely disregarded Yogacara and Tathāgatagarbha sūtras, or where they did give them attention, it was only to explain how their followers had utterly misunderstood them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: The Mahayana idea of karma and vegetarianism

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

While some Mahayana masters continue using a Hinayanist view to explain karma and blame people for eating meat.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with your statement here is that meat-eating is not prohibited in Hinayāna.

The Madhyamaka stance, represented by Bhavaviveka, is that eating meat that is pure in three ways is permissible since there is no consciousness in the flesh of an animal who has been dead for some time, and thus one is not responsible for their suffering at all. Those who follow the Yogacara Sūtras and Tathāgatagarbha Sūtras disagree with this point of view vehemently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 13th, 2015 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Herbie said:

For me buddhism is manifesting in buddhists, buddhist traditions and institutions and the terms that stand for the concepts of the buddhist system of thought. Therefore I take the term "buddhadharma" as a synonym for "buddhism".

Malcolm wrote:

They are not—the various kinds of "Buddhisms" may elect to disinclude various aspects of Buddhadharma and often do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 13th, 2015 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Ati yoga deity sadhana

Content:

narraboth said:

Can you quote what did Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche actually say about 'no transformation to diety'?

Malcolm wrote:

He has given over 500 retreats, he has made this statement literally thousands of times.

narraboth said:

That doesn't mean people outside of his sangha would know what and how exactly he said.

Malcolm wrote:

"if there is any transformation at all, it is anu level..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 12th, 2015 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If Jeff wants to believe that his esoteric Christianity has the same message as Buddhadharma, that is his trip, and his conceptual confusion — but we should stop wasting our time with this.

Sherab said:

When a non-Buddhist takes the trouble to come onto a Buddhist forum to present his view, I usually will respond to show where I disagree with them. When his reply does not address my points, that would mean that he has no reply to my response and is now arguing for arguing sake. At that point, I will disengage since he is either being evasive or intellectually dishonest.

Jeff said:

Sherab,

Is there some point that I have not responded to? Also, I consider myself a follower of Buddha and have stated many times before that in my experience I have found his teachings to be correct. While the OP was about a Christian perspective, we could also be having this discussion with certain taoist and Kashmir Shaivism lineages. A Primordial lineage is a primordial lineage. The challenge in these discussions is that the group seems to be limited to text or verbal descriptions. With the clarity to directly perceive energy/light/transmissions it would be easier to demonstrate the relative lineages.

Best,

Jeff

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Jeff, you are a perennialist, holding that all the world's religions hold the same essential truth. Most of us here are exclusivists, holding that the truth was only held and expressed in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 12th, 2015 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Jeff said:

Anyone who has realized emptiness knows that there is nothing that was "created" in the first place.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no teaching of śūnyatā, emptiness, outside of the doctrine of Śākyamuni Buddha. Even where the term "emptiness" be used, it is not the emptiness taught by the Buddhas of the three times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 12th, 2015 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If Jeff wants to believe that his esoteric Christianity has the same message as Buddhadharma, that is his trip, and his conceptual confusion — but we should stop wasting our time with this.

Jeff said:

Malcolm,

I did not start this thread and have responded in the context of the OP. If you are not interested in the OP, why post here?

Best,
Jeff

Malcolm wrote:

Because someone might read your posts and become confused.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 12th, 2015 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Jeff said:

Thank you for acknowledging that in these contexts refuge is similar to the concept of surrender.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not acknowledge that.

Jeff said:

Also, I completely agree that Buddha does not equal Jesus. As I have stated a few times before primordial Buddha is equivalent to the Holy Father.

Malcolm wrote:

You are hopelessly confused about Buddhadharma because you read someone else's hopelessly confused misinterpretation of what "adibuddha" means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 12th, 2015 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Sherab said:

In Buddhism, any surrender is only expedient and temporary. The final goal is liberation from all dependencies, i.e., true independence. And you take your place as a Victorious One and become a source of refuge for others who have yet to achieve liberation.

In Abrahamic religions, surrender is absolute and eternal, and any free will you have is subject to the free will of Big Daddy.

Jeff said:

Where do you come up with that? Remember the most high is not some Zeus like old man. A couple of actual quotes from the bible for you...

Psalms 82:5-6

5 They know not, neither will they understand; they walk on in darkness: all the foundations of the earth are out of course. 6 I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High.

John 14:10-12

10 Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I speak to you I do not speak on My own authority; but the Father who dwells in Me does the works. 11 Believe Me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me, or else believe Me for the sake of the works themselves. 12 "Most assuredly, I say to you, he who believes in Me, the works that I do he will do also; and greater works than these he will do, because I go to My Father.

Sherab said:

Christians like to claim that the creator is beyond space and time. Since the created are created within space and time, the created will always be lower than the creator. If you think that you can be equal to the creator, your Christian friends will think that you have come under the influence of Satan. So Big Daddy still rules over you whether you like it or not. Your free will is an illusion.

In Buddhism, the belief in a Creator God is considered as irrational. The Buddha himself taught that there is no Creator God. The Buddha taught that the Creator God is deluded in thinking that he (the Creator God) is a creator of the world and the beings therein.

When we follow the path shown by the Buddha, we will one day become Buddha ourselves. We will become equal to the teacher, Buddha. We will be truly free and independent.

Malcolm wrote:

If Jeff wants to believe that his esoteric Christianity has the same message as Buddhadharma, that is his trip, and his conceptual confusion — but we should stop wasting our time with this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 12th, 2015 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Ati yoga deity sadhana

Content:

narraboth said:

Can you quote what did Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche actually say about 'no transformation to deity'?

Malcolm wrote:

He has given over 500 retreats, he has made this statement literally thousands of times.

narraboth said:

3. ati: generate directly from rigpa yeshe

Malcolm wrote:

He would still consider this anuyoga because there is generation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 12th, 2015 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Jeff said:

"Buddha alone shows the path to liberation"... No other hope and no other way... That is the definition of surrender to Christ.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, well, you take refuge in Jesus. I will continue to take refuge in the Buddha. However, please do not confuse these two, your refuge is not mine, mine is not yours.

Jeff said:

On paths to liberation...

1 John 1:12-13

12But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:13Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

Just remember that the most high is emptiness, not the Zeus guy that everyone here is so attached to. Is not a buddha sort of a "son of emptiness"?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not god.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 12th, 2015 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Jeff said:

In Refuge, does not "one give them-self over to something"? Also, are you saying that nowhere in Dharma texts does it talk about "yielding or giving up power or control". Dropping things like anger and fears?

Malcolm wrote:

Dropping anger and fear gives one control; becoming free of the three afflictions gives one the eight kinds of mastery.

When one takes refuge in the Buddha, one is not giving oneself over or surrendering to the Buddha. One is recognizing that Buddha alone shows the path to liberation. When one takes refuge in the Buddha's Dharma, one is recognizing that Buddhadharma alone is the path to liberation. When one takes refuge in the Aryasangha, one is recognizing that the Aryasangha alone can aid one on the path to liberation.

dzogchungpa said:

Re surrender, have a look at chapter 3 of "Cutting Through Spiritual Materialism".

Malcolm wrote:

Can you tell me which Tibetan word is used for "surrender"? I have never encountered it used in a Tibetan or Indian Dharma book and I have read thousands.

I don't read basic Dharma texts in English very often anymore, though I do recall from when I did that Trungpa was definitely into the concept of surrender. I think those

Tibetans like their Western students to "surrender"; but I think it has a bit more to do with the Cakravartin model of defeating and then converting people to the Dharma.

There is an idea of entrusting oneself (gtad pa) to the Three Jewels or the Guru, but that is a bit different in my view.

For example, when I entrust my money to a bank for safe keeping I do not surrender to the banker. When I entrust myself to the Three Jewels or my guru for the shelter of refuge, I am not surrendering to them. When someone "surrenders" they are placing themselves at the mercy of another. That is not how I understand my relationship with the Three Jewels nor my Gurus — that is a despotic model, quite common in Christianity, Judaism and Islam, and perhaps even Hinduism, but I think it is pretty foreign to Buddhadharma, no matter what Tulku Urgyen and Tsoknyi Rinpoche translators may have said when translating for them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 12th, 2015 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Jeff said:

Sounds like the key is surrender.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the key is victory. The word surrender is never used in Dharma texts. Through taking refuge, one becomes victorious over both samsara and nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 10th, 2015 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: The Mahayana idea of karma and vegetarianism

Content:

daverupa said:

Can you pick something out from that site that's pertinent here? So far, the Ven.'s summary statement, while trenchant, seems to be in the ballpark.

Astus' comments suggest the same.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement:

According to such texts, the bad karma you accumulate by eating meat is not due to your meat-eating leading more animals to be killed...

Is directly contradicted by the Buddha here, in the Lanka:

If people were to refrain from eating meat, Mahamati, animals would not be slain. For the majority of innocent beasts are slaughtered for the sake of money; few are killed for other reasons.

daverupa said:

...rather, it's because the bad karma entailed in the slaughter of the animal you are presently eating is somehow magically present in the meat itself and will attach itself to you by virtue of your eating it

Malcolm wrote:

Such a sentiment is not found in those Mahāyāna texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 10th, 2015 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: CG Jung was indeed a Fascist. Discuss.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Fascism started out as a left wing movement. Mussolini was the editor of the Socialist newspaper Avanti for 15 years, a life long socialist, until the Socialist Party in Italy split over participating in WWI against Germany.

Sherab Dorje said:

Started out as, but then developed into a proponent of Corporatism.

Malcolm wrote:

So did communism, look at China.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 10th, 2015 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: CG Jung was indeed a Fascist. Discuss.

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Greg, I agree that we just cannot afford to tolerate fascism in any form -- and I agree that it is far better to err here on the side of caution.

But Jung is dead. However gross his political sympathies were, his writings are not fascist, nor supportive of fascism -- even though fascists may well want to hijack them for their own purposes, just as they have tried to hijack Nietzsche and dozens of other intellectuals. In any case, I honestly do not know what could be gained by exhuming Jung's (already fairly rotten) corpse and putting a 'fascist scum' sticker onto it. There are far more dangerous -- and living! -- characters running around to deal with, aren't there?

Sherab Dorje said:

The discussion has gone beyond Jung and into the realm of defining how Fascism (or

Fascist movements) develop. If anything Jung is a great example of how easily one slides back and forth between conservatism and Fascism. He also is a shining example of how conservatives share many more commonalities with Fascists, than democrats.

Malcolm wrote:

Fascism started out as a left wing movement. Mussolini was the editor of the Socialist newspaper Avanti for 15 years, a life long socialist, until the Socialist Party in Italy split over participating in WWI against Germany. In reality, fascists and communists are more similar than they are different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 9th, 2015 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: CG Jung was indeed a Fascist. Discuss.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Greg, it is time for you to put this on:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 9th, 2015 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: CG Jung was indeed a Fascist. Discuss.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It was pretty genuine, a lot of intellectuals like Louis Ferdinand Celine and so on were enthusiastic fellow travelers on the Right who were worried about the rise of communism.

Sherab Dorje said:

I am talking about popular support, not "thumbs up" from right wing intellectuals and heads of industry. Don't confuse the twenty teens with the nineteen thirties.

I am not confusing them in the slightest. I am pointing to similarities. Of course we do not have the backdrop of WWI and the general despair associated with that debacle (16 million dead, 21 million wounded) but what you fail to understand since you are a safe distance from this phenomenon, is that Fascism was never defeated in Europe.

Franco continued to rule until he died in 1975. Salazar ruled until 1968 and was then followed by Caetano until 1975. Greece had the junta. Etc...

Even in the "democratic" countries of Italy and Germany power was still concentrated in the hands of Fascist and Nazi supporters. France had a defacto military dictatorship under de Gaulle until 1969. Winston Churchill (another military officer) until 1955 and don't even get me started on the so-called "Communist" regimes.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I understand quite well that Fascism never died in Europe.

But my point is simply that like anything, both right and left had their "millions of supporters."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 9th, 2015 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: CG Jung was indeed a Fascist. Discuss.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Before Hitler came to power, Mussolini was the darling of the European right, who saw in Fascism a coherent response to Bolshevism. Hitler was able to cash in the European Right's enthusiasm for Fascism, without it, the Vichy Republic could not have happened, not to mention Franco, and so on.

Sherab Dorje said:

Again, I do not disagree with you in general, but you still have not answered the question as to whether their appeal was genuine or contrived.

Malcolm wrote:

It was pretty genuine, a lot of intellectuals like Louis Ferdinand Celine and so on were enthusiastic fellow travelers on the Right who were worried about the rise of communism.

Sherab Dorje said:

Seeing how it worked here in Greece I would wager heavily on the contrived option. Movements like these need to be bankrolled and encouraged/advertised. Who does the bankrolling and encouragement? Mr average Joe Blow? I personally saw Golden Dawn go from an extreme and unknown fringe group to parliament in a matter of 4-5 years. Keep in mind that Golden Dawn has existed since 1985. Their direct ties with the (then) ruling New Democracy party and various high-flying business men are common knowledge here in Greece.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't confuse the twenty teens with the nineteen thirties.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 9th, 2015 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Herbie said:

Either this is your belief or you are joking.

Sherab Dorje said:

Oh... another rebirth denying "Buddhist"?

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not as Herbie introduced himself the following way:
I have joined this forum because I am interested in unconventional linguistic expressions and corresponding psycho-philosophy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 9th, 2015 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Believing in a Christian God

Content:

Redfaery said:

Still, I'm pretty inclined to think that he runs a paradise, just as other gods of desire do. I've seen how faith in him has inspired members of my family and others around me to do truly compassionate things. I mean, I cannot imagine that my grandfather is not in the Christian God's heaven right now. There is simply no other place where he'd be.

Malcolm wrote:

Or he is just a rgyal po spirit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 8th, 2015 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: The Mahayana idea of karma and vegetarianism

Content:

Boomerang said:

It's quite simple. There is no need to rationalize why one eats meat. By compassion, it is quite clear that one should refrain from eating meat unless by eating meat you are really saving the animal, but that's not the case most of the time.

What if you could purify the dead animal's karma by eating it and reciting a mantra?

Malcolm wrote:

Such methods do exist in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 8th, 2015 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: The Mahayana idea of karma and vegetarianism

Content:

plwk said:

Has Bhante Dhammanando accurately described on the Mahayana view of karma in the practice of vegetarianism? What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

No, he has not. He has made a botch of it.

<http://www.shabkar.org>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 8th, 2015 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: CG Jung was indeed a Fascist. Discuss.

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Yes, but I think those that actually supported him (ie were not bullied, harangued, threatened and beaten into supporting him) were an extremely small minority.

Malcolm wrote:

Before Hitler came to power, Mussolini was the darling of the European right, who saw in Fascism a coherent response to Bolshevism. Hitler was able to cash in the European Right's enthusiasm for Fascism, without it, the Vichy Republic could not have happened, not to mention Franco, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 8th, 2015 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: CG Jung was indeed a Fascist. Discuss.

Content:

steveb1 said:

Like millions of Europeans, Jung saw in Hitler more than a mere demagogue, but a real promise and potential - a dynamic force for progress and unity.

Sherab Dorje said:

What absolute nonsense. Millions of Europeans stood against Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, etc... from day one. Millions of Europeans saw him as a threat from the very beginning. You are just engaging in apologetics.

Malcolm wrote:

Well the truth is that millions of Europeans saw "...a real promise and potential - a dynamic force for progress and unity." And millions of other Europeans "...stood against Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, etc... from day one. Millions of Europeans saw him as a threat from the very beginning."

So you are both right.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 8th, 2015 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I came to the conclusion that the "modern academic critical approach to historiography" with regards to Buddhist texts and the history of Dharma in India is fatally flawed because it is shot with conjecture through and through and rife with speculation.

dzogchungpa said:
Not to mention all the disgruntlement.

Malcolm wrote:
Guys like Davidson and Lopez are definitely disgruntled.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, February 8th, 2015 at 2:00 AM
Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
Bodhicitta is a term that etymologically means enlightened mind, so, again, the text states that only the enlightened mind can be the cause of Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:
No, here it means cittopāda, "generation of the thought."

Also the term bodhicitta does not really mean "enlightened mind" per se. One, bodhi means "awaken", not illuminate. Second, here citta means thought, hence the term "bodhicitta" in this sutrayāna context means "the thought to awaken." Hence the passage means tending to that thought to awaken through proximity and effort, one attains any of three results of the path.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, February 8th, 2015 at 1:34 AM
Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
There are all kinds of things wrong with that...but mainly the piling of conjecture on top of speculation...

Adamantine said:
I guess part of the fun of the dharma chat-room wheel-of-existence is that over time you may get to see someone who once argued against a view you expressed, eventually come to share it. I recall arguing this very point on Esangha, and at the time you appeared to strongly support the modern academic critical approach to historiography as being the most valid in some way. Or maybe I misunderstood you then, or am misunderstanding now. . .

Malcolm wrote:
I came to the conclusion that the "modern academic critical approach to historiography" with regards to Buddhist texts and the history of Dharma in India is

fatally flawed because it is shot with conjecture through and through and rife with speculation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 8th, 2015 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: CG Jung was indeed a Fascist. Discuss.

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm bumping this old thread because I was recently reminded just deeply Jung and those who take inspiration from him (Campbell, Bly, &c) are associated with certain trends in Dharma practice. And because I forgot to rebut the categorical claim made above that there is no evidence for Jung's fascist-ness, which is documented in McLynn's biography, Carl Gustav Jung. Here's a summary from an LA Times review of the book:

Jung was profoundly anti-Semitic. The facts concerning his thorough-going prejudice against Jews has become one of the most contentious issues in Jungian scholarship today. McLynn addresses it clearly and straightforwardly. In explaining how some analysts deal with Jung's collaboration with the Nazis, he writes that others "in a kind of version of 'politics should have nothing to do with sport,' say that it is beyond the competence of a psychotherapist, even one of genius, to decide on what is right and wrong in politics, and that Jung followed the correct therapeutic procedure in trying to remain above the fray. But the issue of the society [Society For Psychotherapy, of which Jung was president] and the journal [Zentralblatt, the journal sympathetic to Nazi policies edited by Jung] will not go away. Many of the post-1934 articles in the Zentralblatt go far beyond routine Swiss bourgeois anti-Semitism and contain virulent attacks on the Jews coupled with eulogies of Hitler [while he was still in power]. . . . Jung knew all about the later articles and did nothing. Since he could not claim ignorance, as these articles were edited in Switzerland, he tried after World War II, to shift the blame onto C.A. Maier [his deputy editor], claiming that he did all the editing."

McLynn paints an even darker picture of Jung's Nazi sympathies when he discovered that "in 1936 Jung threatened resignation as president [of the Society For Psychotherapy] when the Dutch tried to prevent Nazi sympathizers joining the society. As a calculated snub to his critics, in the same year he appointed Hermann Goering as co-editor of the Zentralblatt. . . ."

<http://articles.latimes.com/1997/oct/12/books/bk-41812>

Malcolm wrote:

The movie about Jung made him out to be an absolute ass.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Again, from Jackson's introduction: Unfortunately, there is very little way of knowing

whether a particular text attributed to a particular siddha—even if that siddha was a historical figure—actually was written by that siddha, so the notion of a “corpus” of texts unambiguously belonging to a specific figure must be regarded with considerable suspicion....

Jackson must be REALLY disgruntled.

kirtu said:

It's just Jackson taking the critical academic stance. There's really nothing wrong with that.

BTW - what is this intro from?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of things wrong with that...but mainly the piling of conjecture on top of speculation...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Jackson must be REALLY disgruntled.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, since he is interested in generating historical narratives rather than merely receiving them. People who set out to write history are usually pretty disgruntled.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

conebeckham said:

This is tangential to this thread, but: Ghantapa didn't trace his lineage of Cakrasamvara from Saraha, if I recall. I think Luipa did trace back to Saraha, via Savaripa.

Malcolm wrote:

Ghantapāda both traces his lineage to Luipa, and he was also a direct disciple of Vajrayogini, hence I said, "directly and indirectly."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I don't know what Saraha was smoking when he taught the Cakrasamvara Tantra Mandala to Nāgārjuna, or wrote the commentary on the Buddhakapala Tantra.

Sherab Dorje said:

I'm not even going to pretend to understand what you are trying to say here!

Malcolm wrote:

What I mean is that the largely disgruntled scholars in the Western Academy pride themselves on iconoclasm and seek out [and often interpolate] examples of iconoclasm in their studies of Indo-Tibetan Buddhism. Of course, while Saraha is mostly famous to us as the author of various Dohas, he was also great tantric master who is responsible for the promulgation of a number of tantric mandala traditions, Cakrasamvara not least among them, of which he stands at the head. In other words, Saraha was the person who first promulgated Cakrasamvara among humans in this epoch and so all lineages of Cakrasamvara practice must in some way or another trace their lineage to him directly or indirectly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Jeff said:

I apologize if there was confusion in my above meaning. I had meant it is the context of reaching/realizing. Regarding the universe manifesting what is needed, I had meant the combined cause and effect of the needs of sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not surrender to the flows of cause and effect. One sees reality, emptiness, suchness, etc.

Buddhas indeed respond to the needs of sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Jeff said:

Malcolm,

It is a matter of perspective. "Full Buddhahood" requires one to surrender to the flows of cause and effect.

Malcolm wrote:

No, "full buddhahood" means being free from causes and effects.

Jeff said:

Or you could say that that the universe manifests a buddha and the kaya form relative to the need.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you couldn't.

Jeff said:

You are taking my above statement out of context. I was describing the process of getting there, not the state itself.

And, yes... I could.

Malcolm wrote:

You said, "...requires one to surrender to the flows of cause and effect."

No.

As for your other statement, the universe does not "manifest" a buddha...etc. The universe is something composed of defiled, conditioned phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Jeff said:

Malcolm,

It is a matter of perspective. "Full Buddhahood" requires one to surrender to the flows of cause and effect.

Malcolm wrote:

No, "full buddhahood" means being free from causes and effects.

Jeff said:

Or you could say that that the universe manifests a buddha and the kaya form relative to the need.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you couldn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

This false consequence is often bandied about, but it is not convincing. Why is this so?

1) What is awakening? It is the direct perception of suchness, the dharmadhātu, etc.

This is the direct cause of buddhahood. When that suchness is directly perceived (first bhumi, etc.), it is no longer possible to return to a state of ignorance about it just as a seed singed by fire can no longer produce a sprout.

Although it appears to be, a seed is not an unchanging entity. After a long time, it may lose the ability to germinate, besides, it only becomes a sprout under certain conditions, water, appropriate soil and light. However, if the sprout is really a 'result', then why it is not static and can grow into a plant or tree? On the other hand, if you throw the seed on fire; it becomes dust. The dust, in turn, continues an interdependent transformation process.

Malcolm wrote:

And this reply is just a non-sequitar.

Vajrasvapna said:

In other words, a consciousness singed by wisdom is no longer capable of giving rise to afflictive ignorance. The proximate or indirect causes of buddhahood are the trainings in the paths and stages.

Your argument does not contradict my statement, causality exists only in a conventional manner; because of interdependence.

Malcolm wrote:

Causality does not exist because of interdependence. Interdependence exists because of causality.

Vajrasvapna said:

And wisdom itself burns the stains of the luminous mind as in this quote attributed to Nagarjuna explains: Just as the stains on a fireproof cloth

That is sullied by various stains

Are consumed when the cloth is placed in fire

While the cloth itself is not,

Likewise the stains of the luminous mind

Are consumed in the fire of wisdom;

They are not luminous.

All the sutras on emptiness

Taught by the Victor

Counteract negative emotions;

They do not harm that element [of luminosity].

Malcolm wrote:

And this luminous mind to which Nāgārjuna (maybe, since the Dharmadhātustava is a very late text and is unattested in the Madhyamaka texts even as late as Candrakīrti and Śāntarakṣita) refers, is this itself relative or ultimate? In any case, regardless of your answer, the same text observes:

When one is free from the snare of afflictions
in essenceless saṃsāra,
because of that there is buddhahood,
which turns into the ambrosia of all embodied beings.

In the same way, from all seeds
arise a result that resembles the cause,
what wise person would be able to prove
there is a fruit without a seed?

So, on the contrary, "Nāgārjuna" argues in this text that indeed buddhahood arises from causes. He further says:

Just as without a seed of sugar cane,
sugar cannot be produced.
When someone tends the sugar cane seed,
from proximity and effort,
molasses, sugar, and refined sugar
will arise from that,
Having tended bodhicitta,
from proximity and effort
there is arhatship, the realization of conditions, (i.e. pratyekabuddhahood) and
buddhahood
arising and produced from that.

Vajrasvapna said:

So you believe that the ālaya is a truly existing entity, since it is the cause of enlightenment?

Malcolm wrote:

The ālaya is empty and from the perspective of the ultimate, it is the dharmadhātu; it is clarity and from the perspective of the relative, it is the ālayavijñāna — these two are inseparable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 6th, 2015 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

The text of the Diamond sutra states that bodhisattva accumulate merit with detached actions, keeping their minds free of concepts of a truly existing entity. Although the text of the Diamond sutra does not say it directly, what is implied is that the Buddha body of merit is already present, the sambhogakaya; so actually the bodhisattva not accumulate any merit. An example, if you have a covered sculpture, the fact that you go slowly discovering the sculpture does not mean that the body of the sculpture was not already there. So bodhisattva will gradually revealing the body of merit already present.

Malcolm wrote:

Is Buddhahood a state one realizes, or a phenomena one passively observes? If Buddhahood is something that already exists within a sentient being, there is no reason for the experience of samsara. The Uttaratantra is very profound, but understood incorrectly, it is results on one adopting a tirthika view of atman. Viewed another way, it becomes a definitive teaching on the nature of reality. It really depends on how it is understood.

Omniscience has causes and conditions. Even you admit it this in your example. Reality is already there, but unless one removes obscurations to perceiving it, it will never be perceived. Reality is not buddhahood. Buddhahood is the result of seeing reality fully.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 6th, 2015 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

Another way to prove it, if Buddhahood is produced by cause and effect, this means that enlightenment would be conditioned, so it would not be a permanent state and liberation would not be possible.

Malcolm wrote:

This false consequence is often bandied about, but it is not convincing. Why is this so?

1) What is awakening? It is the direct perception of suchness, the dharmadhātu, etc. This is the direct cause of buddhahood. When that suchness is directly perceived (first bhumi, etc.), it is no longer possible to return to a state of ignorance about it just as a seed singed by fire can no longer produce a sprout. In other words, a consciousness singed by wisdom is no longer capable of giving rise to afflictive ignorance. The proximate or indirect causes of buddhahood are the trainings in the paths and stages.

2) Second, the state of perfect buddhahood, unsurpassed perfect complete awakening (anuttarasamyaksambodhi) is itself defined through the eradication of the two obscurations: the afflictive obscuration and the knowledge obscuration. When these two are eradicated it is not possible for someone to possess them again. Even if their

consciousness remains a relative conditioned entity, it is a pure relative conditioned entity characterized by unimpeded knowledge of unconditioned reality. The mind, a conditioned relative entity, does not disappear at buddhahood. If it did, that would be nihilism; nor does it turn into an unconditioned entity itself, because that would involve a contradiction in kind — a conditioned entity cannot become an unconditioned entity and vice versa — as well as eliminating the possibility that there is a continuum between a sentient being and Vajradhara. This is the reason that Sachen Kungpa Nyingpo states in his Nyagma when defining the *ālāya* cause continuum:

"Tantra", because it is the garland of self-knowing from a sentient being through buddhahood, the uninterrupted awareness of the mind itself.

Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen further notes on this passage:

Because all concepts and suffering are complete in the meaning of *ālāya*, it is the cause continuum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 6th, 2015 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I think the Saraha quote is pretty definitive, irregardless of what Jackson would like to believe.

dzogchungpa said:

Yeah, that Jackson is a real nut. Again, from his introduction: If there is a type of negation in Saraha, Kanha, and Tilopa that seems rather less mitigated by paradox or multiple levels of discourse, it is that related to the three siddhas' attitudes toward social and religious convention, which are aptly summarized by Groucho Marx's famous claim, in *Horse Feathers*, "Whatever it is, I'm against it." In all three collections of dohas, but especially those of Saraha, there hardly is an Indian personage or practice of social or religious importance that is not subjected to mockery or critique. In the first fifteen verses of his *Treasury*, Saraha takes on, in succession, brahmin ritualists (S1–2), who are denounced for their pointless recitations and sacrifices; mendicant ascetics (S3–5), who are mocked for their deceit, hypocrisy, and greed; Jain renouncers (S6–9), who are ridiculed for their obsession with physical austerities; Buddhist monastics (S10), who are chastised for their dress-up games, their intellectualism, and their attempt to desiccate the mind through meditation; Mahayanists (S11), who are described as sophists and verbal gymnasts; tantrikas (S11, 14), who are said to be obsessed with mantras, mandalas, and mystic initiations and practitioners of all kinds (S14–15) who are lampooned for believing that offering lamps or food, going on pilgrimage, or immersing themselves in sacred rivers can purify them of defilement. In other places, Saraha criticizes the self-deception of the alchemists (S51), the absurdities of devoted meditators (S19–20, 22–23, 33, etc.) and the pretensions of scholars (S68, 76, 93) and makes evident his distaste for distinguishing pure and impure on the basis of caste (S46, 56b). Saraha also repeatedly addresses his listener as a "fool" and refers disparagingly to "bestial" or "childish" people who simply don't understand what is right in front of them. In a similar vein, but less extensively, Kanha and Tilopa, at various points in their

dohas, criticize intellectuals (T8), scholars of sacred literature (K1, 29), people who make offerings to deities and visit pilgrimage spots (T19–21), and tantric ritualists obsessed with “chants, oblations, / and mandala rites” (K29). The social and religious outlook of all three is perhaps best captured in Saraha’s injunction: “Throw off / conventional nonsense” (S55).

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I don't know what Saraha was smoking when he taught the Cakrasamvara Tantra Mandala to Nāgārjuna, or wrote the commentary on the Buddhakapala Tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 6th, 2015 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: How does movement arise?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="LastLegend"]I don't think "meditation" is even mentioned in Sutras (correct me if I am wrong). /quote]

You are quite wrong. There is reams of material in the sūtras on meditation [bhavana], concentration [dhyana] and samadhi practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 6th, 2015 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, here is a point. Buddhahood is synonymous with omniscience, but as Kamalashila points out, omniscience must arise from causes otherwise it would arise at all times in anyone.

Vajrasvapna said:

Kamalashila was right, Buddhahood continually arise in all beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Kamalashila's point is rather the opposite, in fact. The sūtra you cite would have been unknown to him, since it never existed in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 6th, 2015 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Vairocanābhisambodhi Tantra states: Guhyapati, there are two forms of the deity: pure and impure. The pure form has the nature of realization, free from all

characteristics. The impure form possesses characteristics such as color and shape.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Sherlock said:

I don't have the book with me now but I think it was in "Four Contemplations of Dzogchen Semde".

Also another point is maybe that the idea of "nongradual realization" came up in response to practitioners who thought Buddhahood was something created?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, here is a point. Buddhahood is synonymous with omniscience, but as Kamalashila points out, omniscience must arise from causes otherwise it would arise at all times in anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Sherlock said:

The way ChNN quoted that semde text, it seems like it is used as a general reference to students who don't necessarily go through every stage sequentially and sometimes make big leaps but get complacent. He said rimgyispas are better students.

Malcolm wrote:

Which retreat are you referring to?

Anyway, it was a more general question not in reference to any specific teacher's teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Sherlock said:

Well, what about the idea of thodrgalpa and rimgyispa? Thodrgalpas are not cigcarbas but they proceed erratically compared to rimgyipas.

Malcolm wrote:

But have you ever met one? In any case, vyukrantikas (thog rgal ba) are considered

those above the path of seeing. Now I have met people I think are above the path of seeing, but none of them ever claim to be vyukrantikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 7:30 PM

Title: Gradual vs. Nongradual

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Having studied widely amongst the four schools, one often comes across controversies about gradual paths vs. nongradual paths, but in all my years I have never met anyone who could claim they woke up nongradually. Is nongradual realization merely a polemical fantasy?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 7:05 PM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

Adamantine said:

No, but then why the need to disrobe, just convention?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I think it mostly convention. A Vajrayāna practitioner is supposed to follow his or her pratimokṣa vows according to the conventional perception of others. Thus, if they conventionally commit a defeat, well, this is also a breakage of samaya, since one of the samayas is to uphold the lower trainings. The karmic effects of the latter might be purifiable through Vajrasattva, but not the public's perception of you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 11:18 AM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

Adamantine said:

Is it indeed considered possible to purify one's break of vinaya vows using Vajrayana methods?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Adamantine said:

But it isn't possible to purify a Parajika with Vajrayana methods? I'm just confused on that point I suppose. Because Tibetan monks still have to disrobe in that case.. Is it that it's possible to purify in an ultimate sense, but according to conventional custom one must still disrobe?

Malcolm wrote:

Is there something excluded from all faults and downfalls?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 10:08 AM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

Adamantine said:

Is it indeed considered possible to purify one's break of vinaya vows using Vajrayana methods?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

Buddhism is hard to understand. Maybe I should switch from the Green Tara mantra to the Vajra Guru mantra.

Adamantine said:

I'm not sure how that relates to Sherab Dorje's provocation, but if you do aspire to meet and study with a realized Buddhist tantric master, reciting the Vajra Guru mantra with pure heartfelt aspiration would be good *temdrel* (auspicious interdependent connection) and it could help you develop the right causes and conditions for that meeting.

Boomerang said:

I meant that I don't understand Madhyamaka, so I should recite the Vajra Guru mantra to find teacher to help me understand.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you should recite the heart sutra. Also, there are many online resources which will help you understand Madhyamaka — but you might want to start with all that "lowly" dualistic stuff first, like Abhidharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is unlikely that Virupa was anything other than the rough and tumble, tīrthika defeating Mahāisiddha the legends recount:

dzogchungpa said:

You really seem to identify with Virupa.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, sure, he was one of the most important Mahāisiddhas and also the patron saint of drinkers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 5th, 2015 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Speaking of "Tantric Treasures", here's a passage from Jackson's Introduction: The figures found in these lists are generally acknowledged to be "Buddhists." Certainly, the legends surrounding them and the words attributed to them have influenced countless Buddhists in India, Nepal, and Tibet for a thousand years; but in their original setting, it is not always easy to separate them out—whether in terms of terminology, rhetoric, or practice—from similar figures in non-Buddhist, especially "Hindu" traditions. They seem quite closely related to Saivite ascetics like the Pasupatas and Kapalikas; tantrikas like the Kashmiri Saivas and Bengali Saktas; or the wonder-working Nath siddhas and Rasa siddhas. More broadly, there are general similarities between ideas and practices found in Buddhist siddha writings and those of other Indian yogic and ascetic communities—from such "textualized" movements as those reflected in the Yoga Sutra of Patanjali and the Samnyasa Upanisads to such seemingly timeless and "unwritten" groups as the Nagas, Kanphatas, and Aghoras. Nor can their possible connections with similar sorts of groups in, for instance, Persia, central Asia, or China be overlooked; the resonance, and possible historical connections, between Indian siddhas and Chinese Chan masters or Taoist immortals suggest an especially intriguing, if uncertain, path for further research. What is more, it is entirely possible that, as suggested long ago by Agehanada Bharati, most of the siddhas actually were pre- or nonsectarian wandering yogins, who appropriated various religious terms without intending to promote a particular religion—yet willy-nilly were appropriated by those very sectarian traditions that they resisted or ignored.

Malcolm wrote:

It is unlikely that Virupa was anything other than the rough and tumble, tīrthika defeating Mahāisiddha the legends recount:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 4th, 2015 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Nirrtix said:

Anyhow, I am curious about this.

odysseus said:

It's a NO – it's not possible.

Nirrtix said:

I am also curious about what many of you think about how some think about the Hindu belief that Buddha is an Avatar of Vishnu.

odysseus said:

Well, for me – it's an honour by the Hindus.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, the way they put it is that Buddha was an avatar sent to deceive the asuras by teaching them a false doctrine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 4th, 2015 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Herbie said:

What I find most fascinating about these opinions, views and discussions is that the participants seem to believe that there is objectivity involved in terms to which there is no correlate that could be seen, heard, tasted, smelled or touched.

Malcolm wrote:

If anything is objective, the realization of buddhas and bodhisattvas is objective. That is what is under discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 4th, 2015 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

I feel that Hinduism is like an alternate form of the Sravaka path, the difference being that they don't follow Buddha's teachings.

daverupa said:

Did you just say "non-Buddhist Buddhism"?

Malcolm wrote:

I think one can say that the path presented in such texts as the Yoga Sūtras is in many respects similar to the path outlined in the Agamas/Nikayas, but since the view is based in the Sāṃkhya system, it does not lead to the same result. Indeed, Sāṃkhya occupies a position very much like Abhidharma in Hinduism. Very few people practice it literally, but its core concepts are pervasive, especially in nondual Hindu systems like Advaita and Shaivism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 4th, 2015 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

Yup. Where Buddhism teaches bodhicitta, Hinduism teaches "know your place and don't complain." In that context, bodhicitta is only developed by happenstance.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not developed at all unless you decide to become a Buddha for the benefit of all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 4th, 2015 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

2. Never said Buddhism and Hinduism are the same thing. Never said they had the same goal. I only said that ineffable nondual realizations can't be qualified and contrasted, because contrasting them implies they can be described, and nonduality is indescribable.

Paul said:

The part in red is where you make your mistake. You incorrectly say that because something non-dual it is beyond description and discussion and then you conflate two different nondualisms simply because they are non-dual. As has been shown extensively, what is being referred to as being 'non-dual' in Buddhism and other systems is completely different. There is zero reason to conflate them.

Boomerang said:

I said nonduality is beyond scriptures, and Malcolm responded by quoting scriptures. This is what I mean by confusing nonduality with a concept of nonduality. We'll have to

agree to disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

I am confused about neither.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 4th, 2015 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What are the spiritual goals of Buddhadharma?

Mahayana Buddhism = Bodhisattva

Advaita Vedanta = Stop reincarnating

The spiritual goal of Mahāyāna Buddhadharma is buddhahood, the attainment of the three kāyas. Bodhisattvas are those who strive for this goal in order to liberate all beings from samsara. In the process, all afflictions that cause rebirth in samsara are eliminated and power over birth is attained at the eighth bhumi.

From the point of view of Buddhadharma, Advaitans never achieve cessation of rebirth because they do not eradicate the innate clinging to atman, therefore, no matter how profound their samadhi or understanding may be, it is not a cause of freedom from samsara, and at best they attain rebirth in the unconsciousness deva realms.

Boomerang said:

I agree with that. To put it another way, I feel that Hinduism is like an alternate form of the Sravaka path, the difference being that they don't follow Buddha's teachings. So I think Advaita Vedanta is valid the same way Theravada Buddhism is valid.

Malcolm wrote:

It is good that you noticed that relative bodhicitta is absolutely lacking in the Hindu path. Second, you only need to understand ultimate bodhicitta is lacking in the Hindu path, and once having understood that, you will understand why even Advaita will not lead to cessation of rebirth, thus rendering it lower than Hinayāna Buddhism, which does lead to the cessation of [afflictive] rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 4th, 2015 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

It is difficult for some to understand the difference between nonduality and a concept of

nonduality. For such people, it's probably best for them to follow one religion and actively avoid syncretism. I'm very grateful to be a person who hasn't encountered that difficulty. However, I don't really see my views as syncretic. I'm able to hold contradictory views, because I understand that no concept possesses inherent truth or falsity. I never realized how far out that is until I participated in this thread.

Sherab Dorje said:

So you have realised non-duality and are thus capable of mixing and matching and then coming here and preaching to us? And, I never really "took refuge" in a Hindu god. I see them as benevolent entities who have mastered a certain paradigm of spirituality. My overall spiritual goals are more in line with Buddhism than Hinduism.

So you are neither a Buddhist nor a Hindu yet you know that Buddhism and Hinduism are the same thing?

Boomerang said:

1. Never preached anything. If in doubt, re-read the thread.
2. Never said Buddhism and Hinduism are the same thing. Never said they had the same goal. I only said that ineffable nondual realizations can't be qualified and contrasted, because contrasting them implies they can be described, and nonduality is indescribable. Again, re-read the thread.

Love.

Malcolm wrote:

Nondualisms are quite describable. If they weren't, you would not know about them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 4th, 2015 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

And, I never really "took refuge" in a Hindu god. I see them as benevolent entities who have mastered a certain paradigm of spirituality. My overall spiritual goals are more in line with Buddhism than Hinduism.

Malcolm wrote:

What are the spiritual goals of Buddhadharma?

Boomerang said:

Mahayana Buddhism = Bodhisattva

Advaita Vedanta = Stop reincarnating

Malcolm wrote:

The spiritual goal of Mahāyāna Buddhadharma is buddhahood, the attainment of the three kāyas. Bodhisattvas are those who strive for this goal in order to liberate all beings from samsara. In the process, all afflictions that cause rebirth in samsara are

eliminated and power over birth is attained at the eighth bhumi.

From the point of view of Buddhadharma, Advaitans never achieve cessation of rebirth because they do not eradicate the innate clinging to atman, therefore, no matter how profound their samadhi or understanding may be, it is not a cause of freedom from samsara, and at best they attain rebirth in the unconsciousness deva realms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 3rd, 2015 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

philji said:

Can anyone explain why it is that in the Theravada tradition they strictly follow vows including not eating after noon, not touching money etc whereas Tibetan monks do not except in certain occasions. Is it that the Bodhisattva and tantric vows take precedence?

Ayu said:

For the sake of understanding better this topic, I asked a tibetan buddhist novice nun (from Austria) yesterday.

She said, no, there are not different rules in Theravada and Mahayana - at least not to an considerable extent. The reasons why all the tibetan monks and nuns are eating dinner, for example, or wearing sweaters under their robes in winter and all this, are individually. Some have exeption because of health issues, or other reasons.

Mainly you can see that the rules are accomodated to the certain circumstances.

For sure these ordained confess regularly and hold the right view to the best of their capacity.

In my point of view this doesn't reduce the respect they deserve to the slightest.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are different rules, Theravadins do not have a system of Mahāyāna ordination, Tibetan Buddhism does; Thervada does not have a system of Vajrayāna vows, Tibetan Buddhism does. The receipt of these higher vows alters how the lower vows are practiced. Please Sapan's Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes or Kontgrul's Buddhist Ethics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 3rd, 2015 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

And, I never really "took refuge" in a Hindu god. I see them as benevolent entities who have mastered a certain paradigm of spirituality. My overall spiritual goals are more in line with Buddhism than Hinduism.

Malcolm wrote:
What are the spiritual goals of Buddhadharma?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, February 3rd, 2015 at 8:03 PM
Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
Boomerang said:

I agree. I knew the conversation was over after Malcolm responded to my statement that nonduality is beyond scriptures by...quoting scriptures. I strongly disagree with his belief that nondual realizations can be qualified and contrasted. Nonetheless, I feel that he deepened my understanding of what it means to take refuge in the Buddha, and I'm grateful for that.

Malcolm wrote:
Sure they can — you just have not looked deeply enough into the differences between what Hindus mean by nonduality (advaita) and what Buddhists mean by nondual (nondual) — and this is why it is puzzling to you. You are, in essence, a victim of bad translations and ignorant commentators since you are not reading these things in any primary language.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, February 3rd, 2015 at 5:30 AM
Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

I thought it was an outgrowth of Theosophy.

Sherlock said:
Exactly. Theosophy is late Victorian New Age; Perennialists are the right-wing end of the spectrum who didn't like the other Theosophists. Today, a lot of support for perennialism still mainly comes from the right, Evola-reading "Traditionalists".

Malcolm wrote:
I always associated perennialism with Aldous Huxley and Huston Smith, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, February 3rd, 2015 at 5:07 AM
Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
Sherlock said:
Perennialism is bullshit.

Boomerang said:

Good for you. Now let's try to stay on topic. The thread isn't titled "Let's take potshots at other religions."

Sherlock said:

Perennialism is not a religion. It comes from the fevered dreams of right-wing New Agers who don't want to be with the other New Agers.

Malcolm wrote:

I thought it was an outgrowth of Theosophy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 3rd, 2015 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Perennialism is bullshit.

Boomerang said:

Good for you. Now let's try to stay on topic. The thread isn't titled "Let's take potshots at other religions."

Malcolm wrote:

What you seem to be failing to understand is that if you have gone for refuge to the Buddha, you have eschewed other refuges. If you go for refuge to other gods having once gone for refuge to the Buddha, Dharma and Sangha, you void your refuge in the Three Jewels including losing all the vows that come with going for refuge, you return to the state of an ordinary person, and the virtue that you perform is no longer elevated by refuge in the Three Jewels.

Buddhadharma is a path, and aside from the fact of whether the goals of Buddhadharma and Sanatana Dharma are the same(they're not), one cannot tread two paths at the same time. One must walk on one or the other. One cannot walk on both. It would be very much like trying to stand on two horses at the same time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 3rd, 2015 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

daverupa said:

Boomerang, you seem to have an inability to recognize some simple facts on the ground with respect to the Dhamma; your attempt to be inclusive and syncretistic is perhaps laudable, but at the same time tragically misguided, ensuring that you're bound for

inaccurate understandings.

Malcolm wrote:

It's tragic, really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 3rd, 2015 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

In the end, what I learned from this conversation is that it's easy for Hindus to see Buddhism as valid, but the reverse is less common. It was a splendid opportunity for spiritual growth, and I thank you all for participating with me.

Malcolm wrote:

Hinduism is "valid" as far as it goes for the attainment of worldly ends and mundane happiness, but in general those who follow Buddhadharma do not think that Hindu means to liberation actually result in liberation.

Boomerang said:

Uh huh. Swami Vivekananda said that although Buddhism and Jainism deny the importance of God, they teach their practitioners to become God, which is just as good in the end.

Love.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm... no. The Buddha taught people how to become buddhas. Mahāvira taught people to starve themselves to death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 3rd, 2015 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

In the end, what I learned from this conversation is that it's easy for Hindus to see Buddhism as valid, but the reverse is less common. It was a splendid opportunity for spiritual growth, and I thank you all for participating with me.

Malcolm wrote:

Hinduism is "valid" as far as it goes for the attainment of worldly ends and mundane happiness, but in general those who follow Buddhadharma do not think that Hindu means to liberation actually result in liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 2nd, 2015 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Loving kindness

Content:

philji said:

Thanks Malcolm. Is there a translation that is useable?

Malcolm wrote:

I generally translate byams pa as love, i.e. the wish for another to have happiness. If you love someone, you want them to be happy, correct?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 2nd, 2015 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Loving kindness

Content:

philji said:

What would be the closest tibetan word(and literal translation),for Metta. Is it Jampa ?

Malcolm wrote:

yes, རྒྱལ་པོ་ or byams pa, pronounced jampa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 1st, 2015 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

philji said:

I am really enjoying and gaining knowledge about this whole issue, which was my original intention in posting. However I do feel that being mndful of not making fun of and not slandering the sangha is very , very important something maybe we need to be mindful of here.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to keep in mind that Jeff was deeply disappointed by his experience with the monastic Sangha in Asia — he wrote about it constantly.

Part of the post removed as an ad hom argument. Participants can look up Indrajala's prior posts and/or blog to look into his views and biases, if they wish to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 1st, 2015 at 7:13 PM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

lama tsewang said:

i dont think its a good thing to make fun of the teachings

Indrajala said:

No, I'm serious. What is a pāyattika and what is the result to be experienced if not confessed?

Malcolm wrote:

Hell.

However, you do realize that if you are practitioner [and in general all Tibetan monks are], you confess all your misdeeds and downfalls of the three vows daily with Vajrasattva?

Moreover, the bodhisattva approach to following the vows can be flexible as the Buddha states in the Ārya-vinayaviniścayopālipariṣcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

The training of a bodhisattva who has entered into Mahāyāna is said to be modifiable.

The training of those in the śravakayāna is said to be unmodifiable.

This sūtra also clarifies other issues you seem to be obsessed with.

So again, while it is important to receive and maintain the three vows, the flexibility towards pratimokṣa vow in the Mahāyāna approach to the vows that is not present in the Hinayāna approach to the pratimokṣa vow, in addition to the fact that Mahāyāna vows constitute a separate and more important class of vows, even while taking the pratimokṣa vows as a foundation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 1st, 2015 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

Indrajala said:

Edit 7 [...]

Malcolm wrote:

You are going to have to explain to me how eating dinner is evil and unwholesomeness.

Indrajala said:

My point is really that almost nobody really believes in things so dogmatically...

You are quite wrong — however, the Buddhas have also provided many means of purifying infractions of vows, especially in Vajrayāna, because in this degenerate age the lower vows in general are very hard to maintain purely.

... Edit 8 [...]

Malcolm wrote:

A Mahāyānist in general should be consuming food with the motivation to achieve buddhahood for the benefit of sentient beings — so as long as that is the case, there is no problem with eating dinner, whether lay or ordained.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 1st, 2015 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

Indrajala said:

So, as a monk or even layperson it is actually quite risky, if you really believe in the words of the vinaya, to suggest that "Mahāyāna Bhikṣus needn't be so concerned with these details, since their motivation for practice is more important than adhering to this or that rule."

Malcolm wrote:

As Nagolo Khenchen states in his *The Lamp of the Path of Freedom and Omniscience*: Therefore, even though one takes life and does not practice celibacy, such actions can be permissible, but engaging in these actions for one's own benefit through desire, hatred and confusion is not permitted for anyone. Likewise, making offerings to the Three Jewels and making donations to beggars by stealing the property of the greedy, lying in order to protect sentient beings against being killed and so on, calumny to separate others from nonvirtuous friends, using harsh speech to place those in the Dharma with forceful methods who cannot be swayed with gentle speech, protesting hidden flaws by giving instruction and so on, are permitted.

As I said, the general POV in Tibetan Buddhism is that the ten nonvirtues are permissible if they are to benefit others.

Indrajala said:

So, you state, "One's abiding in a state of virtue or non-virtue derived from receiving any of the three vows is not dependent upon whether anyone else knows about it or not. It is dependent upon whether or not one has taken proper efforts to guard one's vows carefully." However, the whole meaning of "guarding one's vows" and what exactly that is supposed to require is a topic with many diverse opinions historically, and some positions would suggest being incorrect is literally going to send you to hell (wrong view and all that).

Basically, most people just make up their own mind on such issues regardless of what scriptures and Buddhist theorists say, and hope to get on in life.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, nothing you cite contradicts anything that I have said — and more to the point, it does not contradict the general TIBETAN BUDDHIST point of view on the matter.

Indrajala said:

...some positions would suggest being incorrect is literally going to send you to hell (wrong view and all that).

Malcolm wrote:

This would be the general Tibetan Buddhist viewpoint. The Bodhicaryāvatara states:

Those who wish to guard their discipline

must guard their minds strictly.

If one does not guard the mind,

one will not be able to fully guard one's training.

Drunk wild elephants

do not cause as much harm as

the harm of Avici caused

by the unrestrained elephant of the mind.

If the elephant of the mind is always restrained

with the rope of mindfulness,

all fears will not exist

and all virtue will come into one's hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 31st, 2015 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Second, this is how it is explained by Vasubandhu.

Indrajala said:

No. I'm simply saying you have your own interpretation, and it is not definitive nor the final word on the matter. .

Malcolm wrote:

It is obviously not merely my opinion, since I provided a quotation from Sapan, Vasubandhu, etc. You on the other hand have provided no citations at all, so we can truly say you are merely voicing your own subjective opinion without any reference to any established authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 30th, 2015 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In reality it does work out like that, if you happen to believe in karma.

Indrajala said:

This is just your interpretation of karma. It is a subjective religious belief.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a secular humanist forum, this is 1) a Mahāyāna Buddhist forum 2) The Tibetan Buddhism subforum.

Second, this is how it is explained by Vasubandhu.

Now, you might have decided that Buddhadharma is a bunch of religious nonsense, and have no further interest in it apart from getting a degree in Buddhology so you can feed yourself, but I think it is fair to say that most of us participating here take these "subjective religious beliefs" quite seriously.

Indrajala said:

As far as lunch and dinner are concerned, since all Tibetan monks are Mahāyānists, Mahāyāna Bhikṣus needn't be so concerned with these details, since their motivation for practice is more important than adhering to this or that rule.

What a convenient way to move around the goal posts. Here you are preaching the need to guard one's vows carefully, but then make a convenient exception.

Malcolm wrote:

In his discussion of the pratimokṣa vows of Mahāyāna system, Sapan states:

Here, these observances that are concerned with the elements of evil and unwholesomeness are mostly kept as in the Disciple's system, while certain desireless offenses are treated in accord with that of bodhisattvas.

Behavior that, in the view both systems, would cause worldlings to lose faith is strenuously guarded against; a lapse is allowed in the Individual Liberation discipline if the Great Vehicle if it induces worldlings to virtue.
-- Rhoton, 2002, SUNY, pg. 46.

In other words, bhikṣus eating dinner is not an issue for a Tibetan Buddhist monastery. Handling gold and money is not an issue as long as it is for the benefit of the Dharma, so on and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 30th, 2015 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One's abiding in a state of virtue or non-virtue derived from receiving any of the three vows is not dependent upon whether anyone else knows about it or not. It is dependent

upon whether or not one has taken proper efforts to guard one's vows carefully.

Indrajala said:

Meanwhile in reality it doesn't work like that. Monasteries serve lunch at 12:00pm on the dot and dinner in the evening.

Malcolm wrote:

In reality it does work out like that, if you happen to believe in karma.

As far as lunch and dinner are concerned, since all Tibetan monks are Mahāyānists, Mahāyāna Bhikṣus needn't be so concerned with these details, since their motivation for practice is more important than adhering to this or that rule. Nevertheless, the act of receiving the three vows in itself is a virtue, and one should endeavor as best one can to uphold the three vows, and purify one's downfalls immediately and daily. This is how we practice vowed conduct in Tibetan Buddhism. I don't really care how they do it in other schools, but this question was posed in the Tibetan Buddhist forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 30th, 2015 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

Indrajala said:

Precepts are just social conventions.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Tibetan Buddhist point of view, based on how we read the Abhidharmakośa:
Morality, good conduct, action and discipline
-- Abhk 4:16a-b, Pruden

Thus the vows are actually a form of action which has results — positive ones when followed, negative ones when broken.

One's abiding in a state of virtue or non-virtue derived from receiving any of the three vows is not dependent upon whether anyone else knows about it or not. It is dependent upon whether or not one has taken proper efforts to guard one's vows carefully.

Phil, you need to read Kongtrul's Buddhist ethics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 30th, 2015 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Monastic vows

Content:

philji said:

Can anyone explain why it is that in the Theravada tradition they strictly follow vows including not eating after noon, not touching money etc whereas Tibetan monks do not except in certain occasions. Is it that the Bodhisattva and tantric vows take precedence?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is rather large Mahāyāna literature devoted to the comportment of Mahāyāna bhikṣus, one of which can be read in Chang's Compendium of Ratnakuta sutras. In this literature, the Buddha makes it very clear how the conduct of a Mahāyāna bhikṣu contradicts the conduct of a bhikṣu who has not entered Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 7:03 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It will also depend on how much of ChNN's work one has actually read — for example, there are detailed refutations of nonbuddhist tenets in his Precious Vase, in the section on the view.

muni said:

Since Awaken masters' action-speech is for our inner awakening. If these tenets keep us conditioned, dual, it's a blessing to throw a light on it.

Malcolm wrote:

The entire point of studying these tenet systems is to remove our doubts, and therefore, our concepts. The purpose of such study is not to increase our concepts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 6:37 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

muni said:

Since many consider Chogyal Namkhay Norbu Rinpoche as their master, I like to share this quote. How this text will be perceived depends on the variety of us.

Malcolm wrote:

It will also depend on how much of ChNN's work one has actually read — for example, there are detailed refutations of nonbuddhist tenets in his Precious Vase, in the section on the view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 6:26 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Ayu said:

It has a very different message than what was said some time before in this thread. I think, especially as a buddhist it is important to cultivate tolerance on one side - and stability in practice on the other hand.

Malcolm wrote:

I never entertained the notion that followers of Buddhadharma should not learn from teachers of other schools. While we have a rich analysis of the tenets of others schools, sometimes they seem a little like parodies of them. So it is useful to hear a Yoga master teach on Samkhya and Yoga, an Advaita master teach on Advaita and so on.

Nevertheless, one does this in order to understand how these tenets are different from Buddhadharma, in addition to understanding their commonalities.

For example, I myself spent six weeks learning Yoga, the Yoga Sutras, Samkhya and so on from a well respected disciple of Krishnamacarya a couple of years ago. It was a valuable experience because now I can say that I really understand the system of the Yoga Sūtras, Samkhya, and so on, and how they are distinct from Buddhadharma. To study with a tirthika teacher is not the same as going for for refuge in something other than Buddhadharma. As bodhisattvas, we are supposed to study everything, particularly adhyatmyavidyā, the inner sciences. Of course, the classical inner sciences in Dharma are Prajñāpāramita, Madhyamaka and so on, but we can also consider the study of non-Buddhist tenet systems to be part of that study. Of course there is a danger, if one is not discerning, that one will become confused — but as long as one is clear about where one's refuge lies, there there will not be a problem in the end.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 5:40 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

M.G. said:

... I was thinking about whether there might be practical things of value members of one tradition could learn from the other. I actually do have one Hindu friend who studied meditation with a Buddhist teacher, simply because the quality of instruction was so high.

Kim O'Hara said:

That's a good question and it's one that I would answer in the affirmative. For instance, I have been going along to yoga classes recently for the physical training in much the same way your friend went to Buddhism for meditation. The (very small) bit of Hinduism in the yoga is not any obstacle to my Buddhist practice at all. Nor was the Taoism in the Tai Chi which I took up a few years ago, for that matter.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no problem with learning anything. Just don't forget where your real refuge lies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dreambow said:

So what if Advaita can be traced back to the 8th century? You can still say its based on Shankaras direct experience of awakening. I don't believe he is necessarily copying anyone....anymore then some say Buddhism is based on Jainism and subsequent 'scriptures as I believe the Buddha and Mahavira were contemporaries.

If a great teacher is speaking from his own enlightenment, whether you call it empty or a plenum, it matters little about influence. Its just what it is.

Malcolm wrote:

Clearly you are not a practitioner of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Why not? He is a high lama from an ancient Karma Kagyu tulku lineage.

Doesn't mean I am interested...

Adamantine said:

Thought treasures were more of a Nyingma specialty

Malcolm wrote:

These days Karma Kagyus are Nyingma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Please quote me a master who has spent time seriously studying Hindu tantra and Buddhist tantra (i.e. studios and retreats in both) whp says their fruit is the same. This guy seriously studied both and is very clear that they are different:

<http://www.byomakusuma.org/Ratnashri/RatnashriBio.aspx>

Adamantine said:

Interesting dude.. is Karma Thinley Rinpoche qualified to validate a terma cycle?
<http://www.biomakusuma.org/Ratnashri/RatnashriTerma.aspx>

Malcolm wrote:

Why not? He is a high lama from an ancient Karma Kagyu tulku lineage.

Doesn't mean I am interested...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I am not a scholar, but what I meant was that I have seen reputable scholars cast doubt on the idea that the historical Buddha explicitly taught a two truths doctrine. I can look up references if you like. Maybe I'm wrong, is it a slam dunk that he did?

Malcolm wrote:

It all depends on what you mean by "reputable."

In any case, it is a certainty that Buddha taught the two truths in Mahāyāna,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I am not a scholar, but what I meant was that I have seen reputable scholars cast doubt on the idea that the historical Buddha explicitly taught a two truths doctrine. I can look up references if you like. Maybe I'm wrong, is it a slam dunk that he did?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So, yes, AFAIC, it really is about what can be expressed words, and this is why the Buddha taught two truths, not merely one.

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, it's not clear to me that the Buddha taught two truths, but you can believe what you like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, as you know, I am not a big fan of Advaita. And the Dakshinamurti stotra specifically rejects emptiness, so really, why should I or anyone connected with Buddhadharma take it or Ramana seriously at all?

anjali said:

I can only answer for myself. Emptiness is not the only aspect of the Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is the essence of Buddhist realization.

anjali said:

To the extent that I recognize any aspect of the Buddhadharma in another teaching, to that extent I respectfully take it seriously.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, the Buddha said that whatever is well-spoken is his teaching. We are here concerned about that which is not well-spoken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, maybe it's not about what can be expressed in words.

Malcolm wrote:

As Nāgārjuna famously points out:

The ultimate meaning cannot be explained without relying on convention;

nirvana cannot be attained without realizing the ultimate meaning.

So, yes, AFAIC, it really is about what can be expressed words, and this is why the Buddha taught two truths, not merely one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I guess it depends on what you meant by "take seriously", but you seemed puzzled

by the fact that someone connected with Buddhadharma would take RM seriously, and I thought they could explain it to you.

Malcolm wrote:

I am deeply puzzled by this — I can only conclude it stems from some sort of wishful thinking that is propped up on perennialist tendencies [god, now I sound like a marxist].

I see no evidence at all from anything that Ramana said or wrote that his view is anything other than stock Hinduism of the Advaitan variety. I have no doubt he was a remarkable person, but at this point, since he died 65 years ago, longer than most of us have been alive, why would I accept anything that anyone says about him that differs from what is found in his texts?

I guess I do not understand what is profound in Ramana's teachings. I find the Buddha profound, I find Nāgārjuna profound, etc. But when I read the works of Hindu masters I always find them to be a bit off in one regard or another. So, admittedly, I find it really hard to understand why people who have been introduced to the teachings of Buddhadharma find Ramana profound.

Seriously, I find Vasubandhu more profound than Ramana. In the case of Dzogchen, it is particularly hard to understand why people find Advaita profound given that Śāṅkara is named in the Rīg pa rang shar tantra among the sixty wrong views to be rejected, and given that Advaita is refuted in Santaraksita's Tattvasamgraha and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

LastLegend said:

But since it's Mahayana we are not trying to attain any result.

Malcolm wrote:

Speak for yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Adamantine said:

What's more, for us Buddhists it is good to remember that there are plenty of nonvirtuous people in Buddhist clothes, and many virtuous people in non-Buddhist clothes.

Malcolm wrote:

To quote the Buddha:
Though an Indian trumpet flower has wilted,
it is unrivaled by other common flowers.
Though one of my followers has broken his discipline
he is unrivaled by common tīrthikas.
— Daśacakraṣṭigarbha-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

LastLegend said:

This meaning is the reason the Tathagata always says, 'You monks! Know that my expounded Dharma is like the bamboo raft. The honored Dharma must be relinquished, how much more so what is not the Dharma? [/i]

Malcolm wrote:

People who give up rafts in the middle of a flood often drown...

LastLegend said:

Yes.

That's why we should not go near the flood much less get on the raft.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm....it's a little for that....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In point of fact, even the virtue of tīrthikas is not a cause for liberation because their virtuous is not transformed by the fact of taking refuge, so it remains ordinary, what need to mention bodhicitta or samaya which are entirely lacking outside the Buddhadharma.

Adamantine said:

Yes, I think I address it a bit on the following post ^^^. I agree, but I also think it helpful to address the positive qualities of other traditions and point out that some of the virtuous practices could in fact be adopted. . not just always belittle them as inferior heretics. For some people's karmic imprints, they will be attracted to these other

traditions in this life. . if in dialogue with them, we make aggressive and bombastic claims of their tradition being inferior, or negative, etc. they may develop negative impressions of the Buddhadharma which would be bad imprints for them to carry in future lives. If we are more open and generous, but still honest and clear, they may have positive impressions that could lead them to the Dharma more readily in this or future lives. HH the Dalai Lama seems to do a great job of this, no?

Malcolm wrote:

I have not belittled anything. I have merely pointed out that the ideas and notions about liberation and freedom between Hinduism and Buddhism are not even slightly commensurable.

For example, if you have a mountain in the east, and another in the west, do you tell someone that by climbing a mountain in the east, they will ascend the same peak as the mountain in the west?

All I have said is that Hinduism and Buddhism have a different basis, therefore the path is different and the result is different. I have not instructed anyone which mountain they should climb — merely that one cannot climb two mountains at once, and also that one cannot expect to reach the peak of one mountain by climbing another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

LastLegend said:

This meaning is the reason the Tathagata always says, 'You monks! Know that my expounded Dharma is like the bamboo raft. The honored Dharma must be relinquished, how much more so what is not the Dharma? [/i]

Malcolm wrote:

People who give up rafts in the middle of a flood often drown...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 29th, 2015 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Adamantine said:

No, it doesn't make that claim, of course. But it seems that Jigten Sumgon encouraged being open to virtuous practices from any tradition, which has precedent, and is relevant to the OP.

Malcolm wrote:

The OP asked if you could a Buddhist AND a Hindu at the same time.

I replied no, and there is nothing in your reply to him that addresses that issue.

In point of fact, even the virtue of tirthikas is not a cause for liberation because their virtue is not transformed by the fact of taking refuge, so it remains ordinary, what need to mention bodhicitta or samaya which are entirely lacking outside the Buddhadharmā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

LastLegend said:

Nagarjuna would say don't know don't care if asked who is conquering who what? Upon my own analysis, I can't reach definite conclusion or assertion about who or what.

Malcolm wrote:

Fortunately, in this respect, we do not depend on our own analysis, but rather, the Buddha's teaching. The Parinirvana Sūtra states:

One who seeks refuge in the Buddha
is a true upāsaka
and should never seek refuge
in other gods.

If one seeks refuge in the sublime Dharma,
be free from thoughts of harm and killing.

If one seeks refuge in the Sangha,
do not associate with tirthikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Adamantine said:

On another note, this article is interesting re: Jigten Sumgön's views on 'outsider' traditions: <http://dgongs1.com/2015/01/21/one-for-the-islamophobics/>
Jigten Sumgön's general approach to spiritual views, conducts, and practices is one that attempts to perceive something in terms of what its nature is. In this sense he acknowledges that (1.19) there exists much that is virtuous by nature to be practised in [the systems of] the non-Buddhists too. This stands in contrast to a general opinion according to which "the complete view, conduct, and practise of the non-Buddhists is only something to be abandoned."

One of Jigten Sumgön's most basic positions is simply that whatever is virtuous by nature has a joyful result. Such virtue, however, is not confined to the realm of

Buddhism alone. As he had pointed out in vajra-statement 1.1, the Buddha did not “invent” his own Dharma, but revealed the ultimate true nature as it is — and that nature exists as it is, independent of whether someone reveals it or not. Therefore, whoever acts in accordance with that nature will receive the respective appropriate results, no matter whether that person is a Buddhist or not, or whether that person has realised “the definite meaning that perceives the truth” or not. In fact, Rigdzin Chökyi Dragpa explains that even animals will enjoy the joyful fruits if they are “temporary [in] possession of ... virtuous things to be practised,” such as loving kindness for their offspring.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not mean that tīrthikas have the same realization as those who practice Buddhadharma — it merely means that whoever practices virtue experiences rebirth in higher realms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...why should I or anyone connected with Buddhadharma take it or Ramana seriously at all?

dzogchungpa said:

Why don't you ask Elio and Adriano?

Malcolm wrote:

Why would I?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ramana's statement was not qualified. It was a blanket assertion "Silence (of whatever kind) is the perfect upadesha...", and since this is clearly a defective statement, I don't agree with it. It had no context, unlike the silence of Vimalakirti — whose silence was an answer itself.

anjali said:

Ramana's statement had context, I just didn't provide it. The context is the guru-disciple relationship, and the highest "teaching" of a realized master.

It's from http://bhagavan-ramana.org/ramana_maharshi/private/tw/tw569.html. Specifically, the quote is from discussion about the Dakshinamurti Stotra, Brahma's four sons (who were seekers) and Siva (as their guru). They desired guidance for realisation of the Self. They were the best equipped individuals for Self-Realisation. Guidance should be only from the best of Masters. Who could it be but Siva - the yogiraja. Siva appeared before them sitting under the sacred banyan tree. Being yogiraja should He practise yoga? He went into samadhi as He sat; He was in Perfect Repose. Silence prevailed. They saw Him. The effect was immediate. They fell into samadhi and their doubts were at an end.

Silence is the true upadesa. It is the perfect upadesa. It is suited only for the most advanced seeker. The others are unable to draw full inspiration from it. Therefore they require words to explain the Truth. But Truth is beyond words. It does not admit of explanation. All that is possible to do is only to indicate It.

To provide additional context regarding silence (Talk 231): Silence is never-ending speech. Vocal speech obstructs the other speech of silence. ... The silence of Dakshinamurti removed the doubts of the four sages. Mouna vyakhya prakatita tatvam (Truth expounded by silence.) Silence is said to be exposition. Silence is so potent. For vocal speech, organs of speech are necessary and they precede speech. But the other speech lies even beyond thought. It is in short transcendent speech or unspoken words, para vak.

Also Silence is ever-speaking; it is a perennial flow of language; it is interrupted by speaking. These words obstruct that mute language. There is electricity flowing in a wire. With resistance to its passage, it glows as a lamp or revolves as a fan. In the wire it remains as electric energy. Similarly also, silence is the eternal flow of language, obstructed by words. What one fails to know by conversation extending to several years can be known in a trice in Silence, or in front of Silence - e.g., Dakshinamurti, and his four disciples. That is the highest and most effective language.

Of course, you probably don't care what Ramana has to say on the subject of silence. The point of all this was that the silence of a realized master is the best of upadesas for disciples who can hear it.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, as you know, I am not a big fan of Advaita. And the Dakshinamurti stotra specifically rejects emptiness, so really, why should I or anyone connected with Buddhadharma take it or Ramana seriously at all?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, it amazes me that people think view does not matter when it comes to awakening, or that awakening does not have causes and conditions.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, perhaps you can explain what you meant by
<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=15030&p=209120#p209120>: The Dzogchen perspective is that a liberation based on causes and effects is incoherent.

Malcolm wrote:

Why do you assume I am always speaking from a Dzogchen point of view?

On the other hand, even the Prajñāpāramita sūtras maintain that all phenomena are in a state of liberation from the beginning. Awakening is realizing that. Such a state of liberation may not depend on causes and conditions, but awakening to that fact is gradual and depends on causes and conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dreambow said:

Malcolm, I think it's best not to have an overly narrow outlook. I believe when Ramana Maharshi mentions silence, he means to quieten the mind. He says 'iru' be or just be. Of course this message is for the ripe only. Just as the Buddha said his message was for those 'with only a little dust in their eyes'

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, it amazes me that people think view does not matter when it comes to awakening, or that awakening does not have causes and conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Silence has a context. ...

anjali said:

No doubt. The knowing silence of a Buddha is not the ignorant silence of a sentient being. From what I can tell, you don't take issue with the words per se of the quote by Ramana on silence, but with how they are understood?

Vimalakirti's knowing silence was an answer to Manjushri's question, and was therefore a teaching. From a certain perspective, Vimalakirti's silence is the true and direct upadesa, as all other verbal teachings merely point to that knowing silence. Also, Vimalakirti's silence was the only answer that could be considered free of fault or defect. ("If you open your mouth, you are mistaken.") Thus, Vimalakirti's knowing silence is the perfect upadesa.

Malcolm wrote:

Ramana's statement was not qualified. It was a blanket assertion "Silence (of whatever kind) is the perfect upadesha...", and since this is clearly a defective statement, I don't agree with it. It had no context, unlike the silence of Vimalakirti — whose silence was an answer itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="monktastic"]When a Nyingmapa does more or less the same to all of Theravada, it's because we're right.

And so it goes.[/quote]

I forgot to mention, Theravadins are not generally interested in buddhahood, rather, they tend to be interested in arhatship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

monktastic said:

Somehow it's hard (or just not fun?) to accept that the same might be true for other traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I accept that is true — but what I do not accept is that the basis, path and result of Advaita, or any other nonbuddhist tradition is the same as the basis, path and result of the Buddhist tradition.

I don't need to tell nonbuddhists their result is included in ours. The result they are seeking is completely different than buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, it is hard to take any of this stuff literally.

Malcolm wrote:

Faith is the mother of all good qualities...

— Buddhāvataṃśka Sūtra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Compare with Vimalakīrti:

Mañjuśrī, when something is baseless, how can it have any root? Therefore, all things stand on the root which is baseless.

dzogchungpa said:

I don't know about this Vimalakīrti, but here's something from ChNN: Through Dzogchen we can really understand what God is and we don't have to worry if there is a God or not. God always exists as our real nature, the base, for everybody.

Malcolm wrote:

It is hard to take this literally when Vimalakīrti's commentary on the sūtra that gyur states:

"Great" means that the Great Perfection is free from a basis; but because it is a basis, it is convention for abiding; because it is a path, it is convention of expression; and because it is a result, it is convention of nature.

This seems very consistent with Vimalakīrti's statement:

Mañjuśrī, when something is baseless, how can it have any root? Therefore, all things stand on the root which is baseless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

daverupa said:

Basically (& allegedly, though really it's well-demonstrated) Vedānta lifts/steals/creatively acquires quite a bit from Mahāyāna, and then goes off the rails with it while trying to hide that fact. Good times.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, it is the case that Gaudapada rather indiscriminately borrows various kinds of arguments from Mādhyamaka and Yogācāra in his refutation of sātākāryavādins [Sāṃkhya, etc.] and asātākāryavādins [Vaiśeṣika and so on]; but since he does so without reference to dependent origination and emptiness, and with reference to brahman, etc., he, and his followers like Śaṅkara, indeed "go off the rails."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be enlightened, but not teach Buddhism

Content:

Konchok Namgyal said:

Dipankara was fully enlightened Buddha and did not teach.....

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

anjali said:

Care to elaborate which parts you disagree with? Here is the quote reformatted for easier discussion. Feel free to slice and dice.

Silence is the true Upadesa (teachings).

It is the perfect upadesa.

It is suited only for the most advanced seeker.

The others are unable to draw full inspiration from it.

Therefore they require words to explain the truth.

But truth is beyond words. It does not admit of explanation.

All that it is possible to do is to indicate it.

Malcolm wrote:

Silence has a context. In this case, we have to examine Ramana's silence in the context of his speech:

The seer and the object seen are like the rope and the snake. Just as the knowledge of the rope

which is the substrate will not arise unless the false knowledge of the illusory serpent goes, so the

realization of the Self which is the substrate will not be gained unless the belief that the world is

real is removed.

http://www.sriramanamaharshi.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/who_am_i.pdf

This is the meaning of Ramana's silence. Compare with Vimalakirti:

Manjusri, when something is baseless, how can it have any root? Therefore, all things stand on the root which is baseless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

Manjusri replied, "Good sirs, you have all spoken well. Nevertheless, all your explanations are themselves dualistic. To know no one teaching, to express nothing, to say nothing, to explain nothing, to announce nothing, to indicate nothing, and to designate nothing - that is the entrance into nonduality."

Then the crown prince Manjusri said to the Licchavi Vimalakirti, "We have all given our own teachings, noble sir. Now, may you elucidate the teaching of the entrance into the principle of nonduality!"

Thereupon, the Licchavi Vimalakirti kept his silence, saying nothing at all.
How is this any different than what I've been saying the whole time about nonduality being beyond words?

Malcolm wrote:

Superficially, it is not — but when you penetrate the Vimalakirti-nirdesha a little deeper you find:

Vimalakirti: Manjusri, when something is baseless, how can it have any root? Therefore, all things stand on the root which is baseless.

This the meaning of Vimalakirti's silence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I remain unconvinced that Ramana's silence is Vimalakirti's.

anjali said:

Of course. Aside from whether Ramana's silence is Vimalakirti's silence, taken at face value, do you disagree with the quote?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as a matter of fact, I do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Then the crown prince Manjusri said to the Licchavi Vimalakirti, "We have all given our

own teachings, noble sir. Now, may you elucidate the teaching of the entrance into the principle of nonduality!"

Thereupon, the Licchavi Vimalakirti kept his silence, saying nothing at all.

anjali said:

Who could ask for a better teaching on nonduality?! As Ramana Maharshi has said, "Silence is the true Upadesa (teachings). It is the perfect upadesa. It is suited only for the most advanced seeker. The others are unable to draw full inspiration from it. Therefore they require words to explain the truth. But truth is beyond words. It does not admit of explanation. All that it is possible to do is to indicate it. "

Malcolm wrote:

I remain unconvinced that Ramana's silence is Vimalakirti's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is, in two notable places in the Pali canon:

"'Everything exists': That is one extreme. 'Everything doesn't exist': That is a second extreme. Avoiding these two extremes, the Tathagata teaches the Dhamma via the middle: [

This is precisely the so called "nondualism" discussed in Mahāyāna.

anjali said:

Indeed. By way of comparison, here is an exchange between Vivekananda and Ramakrishna, who are as "Hindu" as it gets: NARENDRA [Vivekananda] (to a disciple present:) "'Worldly people, who are engrossed in sense-objects, say that everything exists— asti. But the Mayavadis, the illusionists, say that nothing exists— nasti. The experience of a Buddha is beyond both 'existence' and 'non-existence'

RAMAKRISHNA: "This 'existence' and 'non-existence' are attributes of Prakriti. The Reality is beyond both."

Malcolm wrote:

What Ramakrishna says above is a pure Advaitan spin on Samkhya. He is referring here to the Advaitan interpretation of Purusha, aka Brahmin.

So no, Ramakrishna does not "get it", as it were. There is no reality beyond the extremes of existence and non-existence, and this of course is the meaning of the famed silence of Vimalakirti in the non-duality chapter:

When the bodhisattvas had given their explanations, they all addressed the crown prince Manjusri: "Manjusri, what is the bodhisattva's entrance into nonduality?"

Manjusri replied, "Good sirs, you have all spoken well. Nevertheless, all your

explanations are themselves dualistic. To know no one teaching, to express nothing, to say nothing, to explain nothing, to announce nothing, to indicate nothing, and to designate nothing - that is the entrance into nonduality."

Then the crown prince Manjusri said to the Licchavi Vimalakirti, "We have all given our own teachings, noble sir. Now, may you elucidate the teaching of the entrance into the principle of nonduality!"

Thereupon, the Licchavi Vimalakirti kept his silence, saying nothing at all. As we can see, this passage reflects the Buddha's teaching on the inexpressibility cited in the Sutta Nipata.

Further, the Samputa Tantra states:

Not empty, not non-empty,
there is also nothing to perceive in the middle.

Thus we can see that Ramakrishna's statement does not correspond to the Buddha's teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I respect Bhiku Bodhi, but he is very off base in this article because he lumps Mahāyāna together with Advaita.

daverupa said:

Well, he lumps up any school of thought which speak of non-duality of any kind, and then discusses how non-duality is simply not presented over the course of the threefold training.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is, in two notable places in the Pali canon:

"'Everything exists': That is one extreme. 'Everything doesn't exist': That is a second extreme. Avoiding these two extremes, the Tathagata teaches the Dhamma via the middle: [

This is precisely the so called "nondualism" discussed in Mahāyāna.

Also:

One who has reached the end

has no criterion [3]

by which anyone would say that —

for him it doesn't exist.

When all phenomena are done away with,[4]

all means of speaking

are done away with as well.

Please compare these two statements with what I have written above.

daverupa said:

This isn't to say that Mahayana and Advaita are discussing the same non-duality, but perhaps this thread demonstrates how the use of that ideation causes certain problems vis-a-vis presenting the Dhamma accurately to e.g. Advaita folk, and perhaps indicates a different tack to be taken.

Malcolm wrote:

The issue is that some western scholars, mainly David Loy, decided to label Mahāyāna a form of nondualism because the term "nondual" is used on occasion, and indiscriminately conflated this with Advaita, Kashmiri Shivism and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I respect Bhiku Bodhi, but he is very off base in this article.

daverupa said:

Specifically...?

Malcolm wrote:

Specifically because he lumps Mahāyāna together with Advaita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Buddhist texts say advaya, not advaita. "Not two" instead of "nondual"

<http://www.byomakusuma.org/Teachings/MadhyamikaBuddhismVisAVisHinduVedanta.aspx>

Boomerang said:

Advaita means not-two in Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually it means "not-twoness", the tā suffix causes it to have a slightly different meaning that advaya, "nondual".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

Yes, these are all my personal opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

These are not my personal opinions — they are the opinions of very many generations of Buddhist scholars and yogis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

The nonduality (brahman) realized by Advaitans is not the same nonduality (śūnyatā) realized in Buddhadharma. Brahman and śūnyatā are not the same thing at all. Advaitans such as Shankara reject śūnyatā completely, as well as rejecting dependent origination and so on.

The concept of Advaita's nonduality is not the same as Buddhism's concept of nonduality. It's wise for a teacher to discourage a student from mixing both together. Mixing them would likely lead to confusion. Still, none of this has any bearing on nonduality itself. Nonduality is beyond "this is" and "this is not," like those scriptures I quoted earlier say.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "nonduality" that stands alone by itself, somewhere else, or even here.

As I said before, "nondual" is a technical term in Buddhadharma that has many uses. Principally speaking, it refers to an individual's state of consciousness free from subject and object or it refers to the absence of relative dualities such as samsara/nirvana, being/nonbeing, pure/impure, nondual/dual, etc. In the latter case, this absence of dualities itself is predicated on emptiness free from extremes.

Even so, nonduality is a meaningless expression without reference to plurality, so even nonduality cannot bear analysis. For this reason Nāgārjuna, when commenting on his Praise of the Three Kāyas states when commenting on this line, "Not one, not many, becoming the basis for the very abundant benefit of myself and others."

For "not one, not many..." and so on, one and many means one and many i.e., both are nondual. Many means plural. Conventionally speaking "I prostate" to that which is the dharmakāya, neither one nor many. If it is asked "For what reason do we say though it is not one, it is also not many?" Due to that, since it is said "non-arisen from the beginning", that which never arose from the beginning cannot have a phase of being one or many; like space, its nature is completely uninterrupted. Since all phenomena arise in the same way, therefore, what arises where? That which becomes a form of diversity is not seen by anyone, i.e. just as grains of rice arise from rice seed, likewise, whatever arises from emptiness is not permanent nor annihilated. Why? Free of all concepts, the victors see that to be empty and illusory.

The point I am trying to get you to understand is that "nonduality" spoken of by the Buddha, Nāgārjuna, Asanga and so on is nothing like the nonduality spoken of by Shankara, etc. Now of course, many speculate — on the basis of Gaudapada's Agamasāstra's fourth section — that Shankara was influenced by Mahāyāna Buddhism. If so, Shankara surely spends a lot of time in his commentary on the Brahma Sutras trying to prove that he is not influenced by Mahāyāna.

In the above comment, an important point must not be overlooked. Here Nāgārjuna is equating all phenomena's mode of arising with the mode of arising of the non-arisen dharmakāya — which is to say that phenomena do not arise. It is the perception of the nonarising of phenomena which leads to the ultimate attainment of the dharmakāya. That perception of the nonarising of phenomena is the perception of emptiness.

Moreover, Nāgārjuna invokes the principle of likeness of causes and effects — i.e. just as rice arises from rice seed, likewise, just as emptiness is neither permanent or annihilated, whatever arises from emptiness is neither permanent or annihilated, the Buddhas perceive that to be empty and illusory, without any vikalpa, conceptuality or imagination.

There is no permanent substrate which accounts for the arising of phenomena ultimately, and relatively, all phenomena arise because of cause and conditions — dependent origination — rather than from a creative principle such as Īśvara and so on.

Then of course there is also the fact that Advaita heavily depends on Sāṃkhya, the Sāṃkhya notion of puruṣa as we can see in the Tattvabodhi and other texts, this is yet another reason why the principle of nonduality in Buddhadharma and Advaita are not commensurable and so do not lead to the same realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

Maybe I should clarify. The reason I think Advaita Vedānta and Mahāyāna Buddhism's

systems are somewhat compatible is that Mahayana Buddhism has the concept of Buddha-nature. I've given some quotations that show similarity between descriptions of Buddha-nature and of the self in Advaita.

Malcolm wrote:

Such equations between tathāgatagarbha and the atman of the tīrthikas are explicitly rejected by the Buddha in the Lankāvatara sutra and so on.

Boomerang said:

But anyways, the conceptual systems aren't what really matter. It's nonduality the matters, because nonduality can't be objectified. And if it can't be objectified, you can't say that one nonduality is different than another.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you can say that understandings of the term "nondual" are not commensurable. "Nondualism" in Buddhadharma is predicated on dependent origination. Madhyamaka is the ultimate nondual teaching of the Buddha. However, without the view of dependent origination it is not possible to realize emptiness.

Boomerang said:

Some people think that I'm cherry picking scriptures, but the main reason I think it's possible to be Hindu and Buddhist is that they have a commonality beyond scripture: ineffable nondual realization.

Malcolm wrote:

The nonduality (brahman) realized by Advaitans is not the same nonduality (śūnyatā) realized in Buddhadharma. Brahman and śūnyatā are not the same thing at all. Advaitans such as Shankara reject śūnyatā completely, as well as rejecting dependent origination and so on.

Boomerang said:

I read a scientific paper on people who've had non-symbolic realizations in a variety of traditions. The study showed that people who have only had one realization tend to be dogmatic, and view their realization as the ultimate and only true enlightenment. The first realization gives you a grounded feeling like you've seen the most real reality there could ever be. For people who have had several realizations, that feeling of certainty gets blown out the water, and in turn, they are more open-minded to different theories of enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out, there is only one realization in Buddhadharma that is worth a damn, and that is the realization of emptiness aka śūnyatā. The realization of śūnyatā between a bodhisattva and a buddha is only a matter of degrees, but not substance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Bhikkhu Bodhi said:

One of the most challenging issues facing Theravada Buddhism in recent years has been the encounter between classical Theravada vipassana meditation and the "non-dualistic" contemplative traditions best represented by Advaita Vedanta and Mahayana Buddhism. Responses to this encounter have spanned the extremes, ranging from vehement confrontation all the way to attempts at synthesis and hybridization. While the present essay cannot pretend to illuminate all the intricate and subtle problems involved in this sometimes volatile dialogue, I hope it may contribute a few sparks of light from a canonically oriented Theravada perspective.

daverupa said:

Some interesting context, helpfully pointing out some areas where Mahayana & Advaita Vedanta are more in-line with each other than with Theravada. It's an interesting whirl.

Malcolm wrote:

I respect Bhiku Bodhi, but he is very off base in this article.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be enlightened, but not teach Buddhism

Content:

Simon E. said:

But not all non Buddhist teachings contradict all Buddhadharma. Perhaps you can give examples of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas giving teachings that contradict Dependent Origination for example...

Malcolm wrote:

There are common teachings, such as the four brahma viharas and so on, then there are uncommon teachings such as dependent origination, emptiness and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

smcj said:

You know, Kalu Rinpoche did not speak English.

No he didn't. But he was extremely conversant with the various presentations on emptiness and was generally thought of as a major Shentongpa. That quote is entirely in keeping with his style of teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

No one conversant with Buddhist teaching would maintain the possibility that

something could both exist and not exist at the same time. Hence, it must be an error of translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

monktastic said:

<http://www.iol.ie/~taeger/mahamud/mahamud.html>

The third Karmapa, (Rangjung Dorje), wrote a prayer of aspiration for the realization of Mahamudra in which he said, "It is not existent because even the Buddha could not see it, but it is not nonexistent because it is the basis or origin of all samsara.(6).and nirvana.(7)." It does not constitute a contradiction to say that mind neither exists nor does not exist; it is simultaneously existent and nonexistent.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a contradiction, this is why it is rejected explicitly by the Buddha and by Nāgārjuna. The four extremes are existent, nonexistence, both and neither. Nāgārjuna rejects these in many texts, as does the Buddha in many sutras.

monktastic said:

(Emphasis mine). What I pasted is a direct quote from Kalu Rinpoche. At the very least, the fact that we can so easily refute masters from our own tradition gives me some indication of how seriously to take refutations of others.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, Kalu Rinpoche did not speak English.

I am often amazed at how often bad translations are given canonical status.

To sum up — it is a specific point of fact that in Buddhadharma all four extremes are refuted. It is impossible for a mind to both exist and not exist. Do you really want a citation blizzard?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

Advaita doesn't teach that everything ultimately comes from one source.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact it does. At the level of māya, Advaita supports creation of the universe by Íśvara.

Boomerang said:

I'm not going to give you a crash course in Advaita. I've been doing that for 2 days now and it hasn't done much. If you want to understand the difference between relative reality and absolute reality, message me and I'll recommend some books.

Malcolm wrote:

It may surprise you to know that I have in fact taken teachings from actual Advaitans. I do understand the difference between what Advaita [e.g. Shankara] says on a relative level and what it says on the ultimate level. Both perspectives are dissatisfactory from a Buddhist POV. Neither, from a Buddhist POV is predicated on dependent origination.

Boomerang said:

I already said that there can be no objectivity in a nondual reality, but I don't think you understood.

Malcolm wrote:

I did understand. It is a dodge. The Advaita POV is summed nicely in "One without a second." In Buddhadharma on the other hand, "nonduality", depending on which nonduality one is speaking of, is a subjective experience confined to a person's mindstream. Of course there is an objective nonduality, called "śūnyatā". Śūnyatā is rejected by Advaita [e.g. Shankara].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

Advaita doesn't teach that everything ultimately comes from one source.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact it does. At the level of māya, Advaita supports creation of the universe by Íśvara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Then of course there is the issue of refuge, which I brought up above. Hindus might think they can take refuge in Shiva and the Buddha, for example. But a real Buddhist would never make this mistake.

Boomerang said:

You're certainly entitled to that opinion, and I have no desire to change your mind. I'm only participating in this thread so that everyone knows that it is possible to be Hindu and Buddhist, regardless of what some people may think. Personally, I never took refuge in Shiva, but I do pray to Ganesha, as he's a popular symbol of nonduality in Advaita Vedanta.

There are scriptures that say Buddhists can only take refuge in the Buddha. I have no problem with that, because every symbol of nonduality is a symbol of Buddha's wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

You did not address the issue I raised.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

I cannot be objectified. I neither exist nor do I not exist...

Sherab Dorje said:

Fourth extreme, according to Nagarjuna.

monktastic said:

Well shoot, I guess someone should have told Kalu Rinpoche (sorry, can't use quote functionality on this device). Or maybe it's just impossible to speak about without falling into a trap.

<http://www.iol.ie/~taeger/mahamud/mahamud.html>

The third Karmapa, (Rangjung Dorje), wrote a prayer of aspiration for the realization of Mahamudra in which he said, "It is not existent because even the Buddha could not see it, but it is not nonexistent because it is the basis or origin of all samsara.(6).and nirvana.(7)." It does not constitute a contradiction to say that mind neither exists nor does not exist; it is simultaneously existent and nonexistent.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a contradiction, this is why it is rejected explicitly by the Buddha and by Nāgārjuna. The four extremes are existent, nonexistence, both and neither. Nāgārjuna rejects these

in many texts, as does the Buddha in many sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The only resemblance between Advaita and Buddhadharma is that we both seek to solve the same problem — avidyā. What we understand vidyā to be is completely different.

Is Buddhist nonduality something that humans are able to perfectly describe through language? Is Advaita nonduality something that humans can perfectly describe through language?

First of all, the way the term is used in Buddhadharma and Advaita are very different.

For example, the Tarkajvāla, a famous commentary on Nagarjuna's MMK states:

Therefore, that which is the inner earth element, that is the external earth element, that is the meaning of nondual.

Or:

When that yogin dwells in the experience of nonconceptual discerning wisdom [prajñā] and experiences nonduality, at that time, ultimately, the entire reality of objects of knowledge are as follows, of the same characteristics, like space, appearing in the manner of a nonappearance since their characteristics are nonexistent, therefore, there isn't even the slightest thing that is not empty, so where could there be emptiness? Since there are no mental discriminations, there is no conceptual clinging of mutual dependence."

Or the Kaumudī, a famous Buddhist tantric commentary, states:

Because of the absence of inherent existence, the nondual essence of all phenomena is emptiness.

It also is understood, as Dzogchenpa point out, as a consciousness devoid of subject and object, as the Ḍākinīvajrapañjara[-mahā]tantrarājasya pañjikā[-prathamapaṭala-]mukhabandha-nāma

One is a nondual consciousness.

Two is an apprehending subject and an apprehended object.

These quotes are not exhaustive, but they show that "nondual" in Buddhadharma is really quite different than Advaita.

Boomerang said:

Thank you for the quotations. Here's a quotation from one of my favorite Advaita websites. It's quite similar to your final one:

Reality is you, whole and complete non-dual consciousness. This is the essence of Vedānta's teachings.

The ways Buddhism and Advaita use the term consciousness aren't exactly the same, but similarities like this are what I'm talking about when I say I can see the same nondual core in both religions. And that's why I'm Buddhist and Hindu. The two religions have more similarities than their attitude toward avidya. You clearly know much more about Buddhism than me, but I think I know more about Advaita than you. Otherwise you wouldn't have even used that last quotation, or made that earlier statement about Advaita positing absolute existence after I said existence and non-existence are mithya.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that in Buddhadharma, nondual consciousness is subjective and personal, not objective and universal. You can't simply cherry pick what you like.

Then of course there is the issue of refuge, which I brought up above. Hindus might think they can take refuge in Shiva and the Buddha, for example. But a real Buddhist would never make this mistake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

This also shows that you don't understand Advaita Vedanta. I don't mean to sound condescending, but you're simply mistaken.

Malcolm wrote:

Mistaken about what? That the view of Buddhadharma and the view of Advaita are not commensurate?

The Dakshinamurti itself criticizes the view of emptiness.

Deham pranam api indriyanyapi chalaam,
Budhim cha soonyam vidhu,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Sherab said:

In Advaita Vedanta, non-duality meant being one. In Buddhism, non-duality simply means not two and not being one.

Boomerang said:

Your understanding of Advaita Vedanta is faulty. I've been speaking against this understanding for a few days now, for example, in this post:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=18560&start=80#p268881>

The way Advaita Vedanta works, a student will be taught a series of concepts which progressively introvert the mind. When one concept has done its job, it will be discarded and replaced by another. The student's mind becomes subtler and subtler until eventually all ignorance falls away and nonduality is realized. The people in this thread are picking out individual concepts that are used in the Advaita sadhana, and confusing them to be the whole system.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, I cited the Dakshinamurthi for you in full and it is clearly at odds with Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

60 Commentaries on philosophies constitute a thick jungle in which a roaming mind may easily get lost, in its own delusion. Therefore, true seekers of Brahman should, through right efforts, come to experience the Real Nature of the Self.

61 For him who has been stung by the cobra of ignorance, the only remedy is the knowledge of Brahman. Of what use are the Vedas and the scriptures, mantras and medicines to such a victim of poison?[/i]

With that, I don't think there's much more I can contribute to the thread. Love to all.

Malcolm wrote:

Once again, here Advaita and Buddhadharma are absolutely incommensurate, and as I pointed out, it is only Hindus who imagine that Advaita and Buddhadharma are talking about the same thing, i.e., knowledge of Brahman.

The only resemblance between Advaita and Buddhadharma is that we both seek to solve the same problem — avidyā. What we understand vidyā to be is completely different.

Boomerang said:

Is Buddhist nonduality something that humans are able to perfectly describe through language? Is Advaita nonduality something that humans can perfectly describe through language?

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, the way the term is used in Buddhadharma and Advaita are very different.

For example, the Tarkajvakla, a famous commentary on Nagarjuna 's MMK states:

Therefore, that which is the inner earth element, that is is the external earth element, that is the meaning of nondual.

Or:

When that yogin dwells in the experience of nonconceptual discerning wisdom [prajñā] and experiences nonduality, at that time, ultimately, the entire reality of objects of knowledge are as follows, of the same characteristics, like space, appearing in the manner of a nonappearance since their characteristics are nonexistent, therefore, there isn't even the slightest thing that is not empty, so where could there be emptiness? Since there are no mental discriminations, there is no conceptual clinging of mutual dependence."

Or the Kaumudī, a famous Buddhist tantric commentary, states:

Because of the absence of inherent existence, the nondual essence of all phenomena is emptiness.

It also is understood, as Dzogchungpa point out, as a consciousness devoid of subject and object, as the Ḍākinīvajrapañjara[-mahā]tantrarājasya pañjikā[-prathamapaṭala-]mukhabandha-nāma

One is a nondual consciousness.

Two is an apprehending subject and an apprehended object.

These quotes are not exhaustive, but they show that "nondual" in Buddhadharma is really quite different than Advaita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

60 Commentaries on philosophies constitute a thick jungle in which a roaming mind may easily get lost, in its own delusion. Therefore, true seekers of Brahman should, through right efforts, come to experience the Real Nature of the Self.

61 For him who has been stung by the cobra of ignorance, the only remedy is the knowledge of Brahman. Of what use are the Vedas and the scriptures, mantras and medicines to such a victim of poison?[/i]

With that, I don't think there's much more I can contribute to the thread. Love to all.

Malcolm wrote:

Once again, here Advaita and Buddhadharma are absolutely incommensurate, and as I

pointed out, it is only Hindus who imagine that Advaita and Buddhadharma are talking about the same thing, i.e., knowledge of Brahman.

The only resemblance between Advaita and Buddhadharma is that we both seek to solve the same problem — avidyā. What we understand vidyā to be is completely different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

smcj said:

The thing is, smcj, you do not need to diss Nagarjuna at all: insofar as I know, all Shengtongpas do claim to follow and be in perfect accord with Nagarjunian Madhyamaka. You would be the first one to disagree.

From "Progressive Stages of Meditation on Emptiness" by Khenpo Tsultrim, p.66:

This non-conceptual Wisdom Mind is not the object of the conceptualizing process and so is not negated by Madhyamaka reasoning. Therefore, it can be said to be the only thing that has absolute and true existence.

(formatting mine)

Nagarjuna's Madhyamaka is provisional and Great Madhyamaka is definitive according to Dudjom R. You guys have to stop holding up Nagarjuna as definitive if you're going to accept the supremacy of the 3rd Turning as does Dudjom R.

Malcolm wrote:

But I don't accept the three turning scheme the way you, Dudjom Rinpoche, Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso and so on present it at all. I prefer another scheme, in my opinion more profound, which is taken from the Sandhividyākarana-tantra:

The pleasing single vajra word

becomes many different [words]

from the perspective of the mentalities of trainees.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You say:

Boomerang said:

You and Malcolm are arguing against a straw man Advaita.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you say:

In a nondual reality there can be no such thing as objective existence.

This is the Advaita we are arguing against:

This world is unreal like the image of a city in the mirror, it exists inside. Due to the power of Maya it looks as if it is manifested outside like in dream we see things outside ourselves. Salutations to Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor, who, at the time of self realization, makes one aware that Atma is without second (i.e. one).

Like a tree inside a seed this world is not manifested initially. Later on it gets manifested due to Maya in space, time and various forms. Salutations to Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor who like a magician, through his yogic powers, transforms it by his own will.

Who inspires to discriminate between the real 'I' and its imagined, unreal meaning; who imparts direct knowledge of 'You are That' as said in Vedas to his dependents; without direct connection with whom, it is impossible to cross this ocean of birth and death, salutations to Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor. ||3||

Who emanates from eyes and other sense organs like the light of a lamp kept in a vessel with multiple pores; by whose grace, I know that this light only illumines the entire world, salutations to Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor. ||4||

Those who consider themselves as body, life force, sense organs, dynamic intelligence or nothing are deluded like women, kids, blinds and dull-minded. Who ends this great anxiety due to the play of Maya, salutations to Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor. ||5||

The unborn, unaware self is properly covered due to Maya like Sun and Moon eclipsed by Rahu. It shines forth once all barriers are removed. Who makes it realize that you are one with that slept self, salutations to Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor. ||6||

Self is ever present in various stages of body like childhood, etc., various stages of mind like waking, etc. and unattached. Who always resonates like 'I am That', who reveals himself happily and beautifully on remembering, salutations to Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor. ||7||

Self sees this world in many forms of himself like action and cause, servant and owner, teacher and disciple, father and son, etc. By whose power, Maya; Self looks to be wandering in dream and waking, salutations to Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor. ||8||

Whatever is seen in this moving and non-moving world is made up of eight forms of Shiva - Earth, Water, Fire, Air, Space, Sun, Moon and Self. On contemplation, there is nothing beyond him, salutations to all pervading Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor. ||9||

'You are Self of all' is realized by your worship, listening about you, thinking over you, meditating and singing for you. You, the almighty God, are experienced with all your

unstoppable grandeur, in eight forms. Salutations to Sri Shiva in the form of preceptor. ||10||

— Dakshinamurti Stotram

<https://sites.google.com/site/vedicscripturesinc/home/srishankaracharya/dakshinamurtistotram>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

smcj said:

As in a non-duality, yes.

Sherab Dorje said:

So if one posits an objectively existent reality (ultimate or relative), then can one be said to be expressing a non-dual view? Somehow, I think not.

smcj said:

Lol, tell that to a Vedantan.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and thus this is a crucial distinction between Buddhism and Vedanta in general. There may be some Buddhists who err in reifying the ultimate indeed, but they are rescued by the fact that there are higher views than those that reify the ultimate as "real" and eventually they will graduate to those when they accumulate sufficient merit to see the error of extreme views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 25th, 2015 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

smcj said:

but it's a Great Madhyamaka

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmadhyamaka is a term that has a complicated history. Gzhan stong does not have the trademark on it.

For example, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltzen writes in his Great Song of Experience:

Freedom from extremes is beyond knowledge, expressions and objects,

Madhyamaka, Cittamatra and so on,

expressions in words are proliferations...

That view of Great Madhyamaka

is bliss without delusion because it is not a proposition.

This was written 100 years before Dolbupa was even born. In fact the Gelugpas also refer to Lama Tsongkhapa's view as Great Madhyamaka and so on.

Of course, if you examine, you will find the early Nyingma, Kadampa, Sakya and Kagyu uses of the term more consistent with how the term is used in Indian texts. For example Atisha writes extensively about Mahāmadhyamaka. So what does he say? In his Bodhimārgapradīpapañjikā-nāma, his autocommentary on the Lamp of the Path of Awakening, the foundation text for all Lam Rim:

To explain the essence of Master Nāgārjuna's teaching, that is comprehended to be the great madhyamaka [dbu ma chen po] beyond existence and nonexistence, the meaning of Prajñāpāramitā, and it is also taught the same way in the texts of other scholars. As such, it is the intention of Guru Bodhibhadra, and Jetsun Kusulupa. That nectar of Ārya Nāgārjuna satisfied Āryadeva, Candrakīrti, Śāntideva and Bodhibhadra, and a little of it was also sprinkled on me. With four great arguments all phenomena are proven to be nonarising — one should abide in the philosophical conclusion of the great madhyamaka through following the masters of the past.

One never finds the term "great madhyamaka" being used by the Yogacara authors.

One place where the term is used, and I believe is in fact its origin, is that it is used frequently to describe the completion stage in tantric commentaries. But again, its description is not out of line with mainstream Indian Madhyamaka. For example, in the Śrīhevajranāmatantrārthasamgraha:

"After that, explain the meaning of the great madhyamaka free from all extremes...."

Or in the Śrīsaṃputatilaka-nāma-yoginītantrarājasya ṭīkā-smṛitisaṃdarśanāloka-nāma:

"Full expansion of qualities" means buddhahood comes from Mantrayāna and great madhyamaka.

Or the Bhagavadd-hevajrasādhana-abhisamayakramāarthaprasanna-nāma:

Meditate upon the great madhyamaka

free from all signs.

Or the Śrī-kālacakropadeśayogaṣaḍaṅgatantrapañjikā-nāma:

The nature of completion is called "great madhyamaka".

The Śrī-ḍākārṇavamahāyoginītantrarājasyaṭīkāvoḥitaṭīkā-nāma:

"Madhyamaka" is the essential Dharma and the great Madhyamaka of the Mahāyāna free from the four extremes is the awakening of the fortunate.

Or the Samājābhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti:

Having manifested the great madhyamaka that is immaculate like space...

The Upadeśaniścaya-nāma-śrīguhyasamājavṛtti states:

The neutral recitation is meditating body, speech and mind in the state of great madhyamaka — beyond all extremes of signs, because it isn't anything at all, it is called "neutral".

The Āryamañjuśrīnāmasaṃgītiṭīkāśārābhisamaya states:

"Due to being free it is like a reflection" — a mere reflection to which there is freedom from clinging, or even being free from the mere designation "reflection" is the great madhyamaka free from the four extremes. For which it is also said:

The diversity is not permanent,
nor is its annihilation proposed;

neither permanent nor annihilated,
also not both —
liberated from all four extremes
that is the reasoning of a mādhyamika.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 25th, 2015 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="smcj]Since the transcendent (beyond cause and effect) Wisdom Mind is unborn and never comes into existence it is not subject to the same deconstruction and can be said to be real.

[/quote]

From a Madhyamaka perspective, something that never comes into existence is a nonexistent, and cannot be considered real by Madhyamaka definitions. It is therefore also not immune to Madhyamaka analysis. In this respect too, "wisdom mind" is no different than all the other phenomena that do not arise (which is all of them), and therefore are not real.

The classical Tibetan refutation of gzhan stong is the Madhyamaka refutation of the unconditioned in the MMK:

If arising, abiding and perishing are not established, the conditioned is not established. If the condition has never been established, where will the unconditioned be established?

The classical Tibetan refutation of the charge of "rang stong" is the following statement from the MMK:

If there were some thing subtly not empty, there would be some thing to be empty, but as there is no thing that is not empty, where is there some thing to be empty?

Finally, the rejection of that the world has a nature:

Whatever is the nature of the tathāgata, that is the nature of the world.

As tathāgata has no nature, also the world has no nature.

In reality, following the opinion of Rongtong Sheja Kunrig, gzhan stong is a kind of transitional view between classical yogacara and madhyamaka, and is in fact little more than a variant of the false-aspectarian yogacara mainly promulgated by Ratnakarashanti.

When I spoke with Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso, he did not admit, nor was I pressing the point, that Advaita and gzhan stong were identical: the point was that both systems were structurally similar only in that they asserted the relative was completely unreal and the ultimate completely real. Even though he agreed with this characterization, he strongly emphasized at that time that despite this similarity, Advaita does not have buddhahood as a result. I add this just so you are clear about what I asked, and what he replied.

The other thing that plagues gzhan stong is that unlike classical Indian Madhyamaka, of which two clear trends can be observed — gzhan stong, being largely a Tibetan innovation, has a plethora of interpretations.

Finally, as to the term "mahāmadhyamaka". As I have pointed out several times now, the earliest use of the term in a Tibetan text is by the Nyingma author Kawa Paltseg, the translator from the early 9th century. In his Explanation of The Stages of the View he refers to Mahāmadhyamaka as:

Freedom from the two extremes in the ultimate
is asserted to be mahāmadhyamaka

The of course we have Naropa's statement in the Abbreviation of the View, translated by Marpa Lotsawa, which paraphrases the Hevajra Tantra:

That thing, samsara,
that is nirvana,
that is mahāmadhyamaka.

Now, I am not very sure why some Kagyus have abandoned the view of Naropa and Marpa, but it sure seems that they have, because the above sentiment is impossible in gzhan stong, where nirvana is by definition empty of samsara, not identical with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 25th, 2015 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

monktastic said:

I have heard it suggested that there is indeed more than one realization that can be appropriately called "nondual," and which feels absolutely final. The idea that "because they're both nondual, they are the same insight," or that they give rise to the same degree of freedom, is no longer so obvious to me.

For someone like me, the best way to evaluate whether two insights are the same, or whether one is "higher" than the other, is to ask people who feel that they've experienced both. For example, among people who have experienced the insight that "I am a separate body in a world of other bodies," and "the world and I are one," nobody seems to consider the former a deeper insight. This gives me some confidence.

If there are people who have experienced both "all is Brahman" (or "there is only Brahman"), and "even Brahman is empty," then maybe I can learn something about which of those views is more "accurate" (despite the fact that this word itself means progressively less along the path). I have come across a few individuals (both from a Vedanta background and a Buddhist background) who supposedly have experienced both insights, and their thoughts about whether these insights are the same (and just being expressed from different angles), or one is more freeing, is informative to my practice.

I'd rather not share much about what I learned (for a few reasons), but thought I'd share that this was something interesting for me to investigate.

Boomerang said:

I wouldn't really recommend asking an awakening person to describe their personal experiences. There are some things that can't be explained in words. Could you use words to explain what it's like to experience smells or hear sounds? Furthermore, a person could tell you one thing one day, have a deeper awakening, and then completely change their tune.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm, no, not in Buddhadharma. The content of awakening is the same between a first stage bodhisattva and a buddha — the only things that differentiates the awakening of bodhisattvas and buddhas is that a bodhisattva still has obscurations of affliction and omniscience to remove, and a buddha does not. Otherwise, there is no difference in the emptiness they realize. They realize the same emptiness.

For this reason, for example, Maitreyanatha describes sentient beings, bodhisattvas and buddhas respectively as impure, impure/pure, and pure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 25th, 2015 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Isn't the main point to take away here that both traditions acknowledge that their methods - interred in philosophical language or not- are merely conditional devices to hook disciples in the right direction, but which shouldn't be confused with the actual realization/destination which is beyond the capacity of language (or conceptual mind) altogether?

I've heard that Hindus tend to fall away from the fruit in the direction of Eternalism, and Buddhists in the direction of Nihilism.. Of course the proper way of Buddhadharma is beyond either extreme.. But realistically, most of us here are falling in one direction or another.. Let's take stock and look at this soberly.

Boomerang said:

That sums up my opinion. Once nonduality is realized, it becomes apparent that none of the conceptual tools used up to that point are inherently true or false. That's why I feel comfortable saying that Advaita Vedanta and Buddhism are both legitimate even though they disagree on various points. Nagarjuna and Shankara were both masters of skillful means.

Malcolm wrote:

"Nonduality" in Buddhadharma is the simple fact that the two predicates of things, "existence" and "nonexistence", are false. That is all and nothing more.

That is not how Shankaracarya understands "nonduality", which is that the nondual

state is "one without a second", i.e. existent.

Given that this is so, "nonduality" in Buddhadharma and Advaita are not even remotely commensurate.

Those who think so either do not understand a) Buddhadharma b) Advaita c) Both. In general, it is usually Advaitans who do not understand Buddhadharma who make the mistake of equating the treatment of nonduality in Buddhadharma and Advaita. One thing is for sure, the ancient Indian Buddhist masters were not confused about this distinction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 25th, 2015 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

smcj said:

So he predicates the entire question on the idea that, according to Dzogchen, there is a some sort of ultimate ground of being that is not dependent on the minds of being.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he doesn't. But since you don't understand Dzogchen, you remain immune to correction on this critical point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 23rd, 2015 at 1:04 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Boomerang said:

I see no difference between the Advaita concept of Brahman/Atman and the Buddhist concept of Dharmadatu/Buddha-nature.

Malcolm wrote:

This means you have not understood what "dharmadhātu" means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 20th, 2015 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Single Son

Content:

naljor said:

Hi all,

where can I find Tibetan text of short version of the Single Son of all the Buddhas tantra or English translation?

Malcolm wrote:

There are many short versions - do you mean the one from the Khandro Nyinthig?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 20th, 2015 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

conebeckham said:

དོན་མཉམ་ or "samanyartha" are the words I believe we're discussing.

Malcolm wrote:

These are unreal, if that is what he means, then no.

cloudburst said:

yes, don spyi.

I was confused when you wrote

malcolm said:

Can the vajra master give the student an "introduction to the nature of mind" and have it be a qualified instance of that, even if the insight generated in the student is only one that is a generic image?

This is precisely what is called "the example wisdom."

Malcolm wrote:

I was answering yes to "Can the vajra master give the student an "introduction to the nature of mind" and have it be a qualified instance of that..."

It is not a universal, since universals cannot be perceived experientially since they do not exist.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Sources for 'Early Mahayana'

Content:

Indrajala said:

The Brahman heartland was the Kuru-Pañcāla region highlighted in red. Gandhāra, Bactria and much of what is now Afghanistan was not. The northwest (referring to these latter regions) was especially cosmopolitan after Alexander, having plenty of Greek and Persian influences and peoples, many of whom were to adopt Buddhism and not use Sanskrit initially. If these had been Brahmanical strongholds as you misunderstand them to be, then they would have used Sanskrit from the start. However, we find

Buddhists using languages like Bactrian and Gāndhārī instead. There are inscriptions of refuge verses found in Bactrian fashion using Bactrian script:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not talking about Bactria [Afghanistan], I am talking about Pakistan, around the Indus river valley east. In other words, the eastern side of the the Hindu Kush.

I never said either that Buddhists began using Sanskrit from the beginning, merely that a push to Sanskritize is evident from the beginning.

The Sarvastivadins wrote their canon down in Sanskrit, and this more than anything accounts for the widespread adoption of the Sarvastivada Abhidharma by most schools who were not connected with the proto-Theravada.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Sources for 'Early Mahayana'

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We see a move towards Sanskritization even during the Buddha's day. For example, there is a passage [I believe it is the Majjhima Nikāya] recounting how two Brahmin disciples of the Buddha derided another monk who only knew vernacular for being unable to distinguish between long and short vowels when he recited the Sūtras.

Indrajala said:

Even if that is referring to Sanskrit phonetics, it isn't a historical record, and was probably inserted much later on because too many monks were not reciting things in the desired fashion.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is a historical record, don't be daft — your assertion that it is an interpolation is entirely arbitrary.

Indrajala said:

These two earned the censure of the Buddha for sure, but we can see the roots of Sanskritization even in the Nikayas from this example.

The Pali cannon is also a late period development (see Schopen quote above), and according to Norman it was a translation of something else.

So, your point doesn't stand.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course the points stands, because the same story is preserved in other canons.

Indrajala said:

When the Sarvastivadins set their canon down, they set it down in Sanskrit for the obvious reason I stated — it was the language of the educated all across India.

Was it Sanskrit from the first day or did they adopt it later on?

Malcolm wrote:

It was set down in Sanskrit, from day one.

Indrajala said:

In particular, if you hold that Sarvastivada come from the region of what is now Pakistan and the Punjab, this is the traditional homeland of the Vedas and according to the accounts you follow, a Brahmanical stronghold.

You misunderstand the geography. Let's look at the map:

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't. Let's look at a map — https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indo-Aryan_migration_hypothesis#mediaviewer/File:Early_Vedic_Culture_%281700-1100_BCE%29.png

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

prsvrnc said:

“In the original mahamudra tradition, the earliest masters literally sang the disciples into enlightenment with poems called dohas. The mind's natural condition was directly pointed out by the master, who then gave instructions to negate any artificial activity during meditation. Realization of the mind's awakened wisdom was a consequence of these pointing-out and nonmeditation instructions. This is ESSENCE MAHAMUDRA.

Later in the tradition, mahamudra practitioners first learned to refine the ordinary mind through mastering traditional generation-stage and completion-stage tantric practices, and then they took up mahamudra either concurrent with or following completion-stage practice. This is TANTRIC MAHAMUDRA.

Still later in the tradition, practitioners first refined the ordinary mind through mastering standard concentration and special insight meditation, and after some degree of mastery had been achieved, mahamudra was then introduced. This is SUTRA MAHAMUDRA.

Thus, mahamudra can be a sutra, tantra, or essence practice, depending on which practices are used to refine the coarse and subtle levels of the mind before essence

instructions are given to address the very subtle mind.”

^^ AHH, I think this does clarify my Q. Mahamudra, then, I think singularly refers to realization at level of very subtle mind. in other words, a direct cognition of emptiness at level of first arya brumi, then, is not a mahamudra realization, even though it is realizing the nature of mind on one level.

Malcolm wrote:

From where are you taking the above quote? The person who wrote it seems to be unaware that the dohas are the songs of realization gained through practicing the two stages. Mahāmudra in reality only refers to the result of the two stages or guru yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Ayu said:

If somebody feels to have a good connection to Hinduism, is it possible to practice it together with Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

I already answered this question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

conebeckham said:

དོན་མཁྱེན་ or "samanyartha" are the words I believe we're discussing.

Malcolm wrote:

These are unreal, if that is what he means, then no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan language--indispensible in Tantra?

Content:

Konchok Namgyal said:

It was explained to me like this :

Even though you should do these practices in Tibetan you should also understand what it is you are saying.

The blessings flow through the language much as they do through the lineage.

especially the Mantras, the intonation and vibration of them effects body, speech and mind.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a translator, you should practice in Tibetan.

If you are with a Tibetan Lama doing a group practice, you should practice in "Tibetan", even if it sounds awful (it does).

If you are by yourself, you should practice in English, because just as mantras pronounced improperly will only delay your practice; just as mumbling your sadhanas will delay your practice; chanting liturgies in phoneticized "Tibetan" only results in making sounds which at best only vaguely resemble Tibetan, sounds which you do not understand, nor will be understood by anyone who is a Tibetan speaker, and thus you will merely cause obstacles for yourself.

This does not mean one should not take pains to learn Tibetan, which is the only proper way to learn how to pronounce it. This does not mean that certain prayers like the seven line prayer, the Migtsema, the short Barceh Lamsel and so on should not be recited in Tibetan — of course they should -- it is easy to learn how to properly pronounce a few lines of Tibetan. This does not mean one can practice a chod liturgy in English (attempts have been made but they all suck). But as a general rule English speakers who do not know Tibetan should practice in English apart from the above noted exceptions, that at least is my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

According to your understanding, is that initial experience mediated by means of a generic image?

Malcolm wrote:

In the sense that words are abstractions, I suppose so. The words indicate the meaning of that experience.

cloudburst said:

We may have a different understanding of the meaning of generic image... for example, in my understanding, even example clear light in the mind of a tantric practitioner on the path of accumulation would be mediated by a generic image.

Since you said the experience of the word empowerment itself was the example wisdom, I am wondering if you believe this experience itself is mediated by a generic image, in a way similar to the experience of a yogi's example clear light.

thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

What is the underlying Tibetan or Sanskrit word you are using for "generic image"? What I am saying is that the example wisdom is a pratyakṣa, not an analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Does that include initial recognition being through means of a generic image?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between the fourth empowerment and direct introduction. They both involve inductions of specific experiences.

The fourth empowerment is an introduction based on the induction of a specific experience in the student, likewise, so is direct introduction.

Though it is called the "word empowerment", the actual fourth empowerment is not truly contained within words such as "this is like space...", etc. But when combined with this or that specific experience, the fourth empowerment/direct introduction introduces the student to the nature of their minds experientially, and then it can be called the word empowerment because the nature of that experience has been described to them in a way that they understand the experience that they have had. That experience itself is the example, wisdom, not the words.

cloudburst said:

According to your understanding, is that initial experience mediated by means of a generic image?

Malcolm wrote:

In the sense that words are abstractions, I suppose so. The words indicate the meaning of that experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan language--indispensable in Tantra?

Content:

Lobsang Damchoi said:

Would like to pose a question--this is primarily for Westerners who do solo practice of

the higher tantras on a regular basis, but I'm interested in anyone's views: your genuine gut feelings, as well as whatever advice you may have received from teachers.

Is it a really serious disadvantage to one's personal progress and realization if one practices in the vernacular? I know lamas frequently mention the blessings of using Tibetan. But, IMHO Westerners have something that may compensate in some measure: a strong, almost visceral connection to the sound of Sanskrit. (At least it seems to be true in my case.) And Sanskrit is, after all, the original for most of the tantras we practice. If one is going to learn a 2nd, 3rd or 4th language for dharma practice, why not Sanskrit (if it's a practical alternative based on surviving sources)?

Also, is it really practical, where there are many complex referents and highly detailed imagery, to expect that the Tibetan will have the same practicality and power as one's native language?

In a recent book the author compared doing tantric sadhanas in a non-Tibetan language to being blind -- is it really that bad? Should I hand in my tantrika card until I'm fluent in Tibetan?

Malcolm wrote:

You should practice in the language you understand, rather than be a parrot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Sources for 'Early Mahayana'

Content:

Indrajala said:

The custom towards adopting Sanskrit was initially localized around the more heavily Brahmanical areas.

Malcolm wrote:

We see a move towards Sanskritization even during the Buddha's day. For example, there is a passage [I believe it is the Majjhima Nikāya] recounting how two Brahmin disciples of the Buddha derided another monk who only knew vernacular for being unable to distinguish between long and short vowels when he recited the Sūtras. These two earned the censure of the Buddha for sure, but we can see the roots of Sanskritization even in the Nikayas from this example.

When the Sarvastivadins set their canon down, they set it down in Sanskrit for the obvious reason I stated — it was the language of the educated all across India. In particular, if you hold that Sarvastivada come from the region of what is now Pakistan and the Punjab, this is the traditional homeland of the Vedas and according to the accounts you follow, a Brahmanical stronghold.

Plus, a very large proportion of monks in the time of the Buddha were bhramins, and so on and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Nirrtix said:

Even if a sort of blend of the beliefs?

Jetavan said:

<http://threeroyalwarriors.tripod.com/index.html>.

Malcolm wrote:

Thus is a very strange website, based on some serious misconceptions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between the direct introduction of Dzogchen and the fourth empowerment, none whatsoever.

M

cloudburst said:

Does that include initial recognition being through means of a generic image?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between the fourth empowerment and direct introduction. They both involve inductions of specific experiences.

The fourth empowerment is an introduction based on the induction of a specific experience in the student, likewise, so is direct introduction.

Though it is called the "word empowerment", the actual fourth empowerment is not truly contained within words such as "this is like space...", etc. But when combined with this or that specific experience, the fourth empowerment/direct introduction introduces the student to the nature of their minds experientially, and then it can be called the word empowerment because the nature of that experience has been described to them in a

way that they understand the experience that they have had. That experience itself is the example, wisdom, not the words.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 18th, 2015 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Malcolm, it seems that you are saying that vidya is the same as example wisdom.

Mother's Lap said:

How does example wisdom correlate/differ with vidya?

Malcolm wrote:

It is the same.

cloudburst said:

Further, example wisdom is an insight, by means of a generic image, into the nature of the mind generated through the introduction by a vajra master.

prsvrnc said:

Can the vajra master give the student an "introduction to the nature of mind" and have it be a qualified instance of that, even if the insight generated in the student is only one that is a generic image?

Malcolm wrote:

This is precisely what is called "the example wisdom."

cloudburst said:

would this be a fair assessment of what you are saying?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between the direct introduction of Dzogchen and the fourth empowerment, none whatsoever.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 17th, 2015 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, the point is that 'Buddhist' and 'Hindu' are words, and you're arguing about what

people should take them to mean.

Malcolm wrote:

They are signifiers that indicate where you find your refuge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 17th, 2015 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot go for refuge to the Buddha and also go for refuge to some other god.

Sherlock said:

You can make offerings to different deities but taking refuge in the three jewels means you recognize that there is no other way to liberation except Buddhadharma. If you think some other path leads to liberation and you go after that, then you break your refuge vows.

Ayu said:

I heard long Lamrim-lectures about the meaning of taking refuge to Buddha, taking refuge to Dharma & taking refuge to Sangha. I never heard this excluding statements. Maybe my ears were closed, but this sounds rather christian like: "You should not have any god besides Me." (?)

Malcolm wrote:

It says in the Vinayakārikā:

If who has gone for refuge to the Buddha
should serve one with a different aspect,
the lucidity of their minds shall become disturbed,
and based on that where can there be a result?

The Parinirvana Sūtra states very unambiguously:

One who seeks refuge in the Buddha
is a true upāsaka
and should never seek refuge
in other gods.

If one seeks refuge in the sublime Dharma,
be free from thoughts of harm and killing.

If one seeks refuge in the Sangha,
do not associate with tīrthikas.

Ayu said:

In our course there is one follower of Kriya-Yoga as Lamrim-student since four years. Our Geshe doesn't force her to convert. She attends also initiations and is like a full member of our sangha.

But I suppose, she didn't take refuge, because her heart beats for Kriya Yoga, it's her home.

Malcolm wrote:

Without taking refuge, you cannot enter Mahāyāna, let alone Vajrayāna. If this person never took refuge, she never received bodhisattva vows, and never received samaya, and in short, never received an initiation or an empowerment at all. Of course, what is likely the case is that she took refuge, etc., but damages her refuge continually through confusion. This common, which is why the Buddha spoke about it and why it is reflected in the Vinakarika I cited above.

Ayu said:

On the contrary I heard it is rather dangerous to cut off all your own roots to follow buddhist path in an artificial manner. One should keep in contact with ones own roots and all the aspects of ones being.

Malcolm wrote:

It is one thing to respect the religion of your ancestors, it is quite another to be confused about refuge.

The issue of Gorakṣanātha was raised. It is true he is counted among the 84 siddhas. It is said he was raised in a Buddhist family and later converted to Shaivism. It is a little unclear what his story is. But this anomaly sheds light on Hathayogapradipika's criticism of the Buddhist siddha Nagabodhi, showing that in such yogic circles there was definite tension between Hindus and Buddhists.

In the example of Mahasiddha Virupa, it was unclear to everyone whether he was Buddhist or Hindu. In order to find out, he was dragged in front of the King of Benares. When it was ascertained he was a Buddhist, he was condemned to death, bound in chains and flung into the Ganges. Houdini-like, he escaped. There are other episodes in his biography which illustrate that Buddhist siddhis circulated among non-Buddhists as part of their vrātya, their yogic discipline, to challenge their own realization. In another episode of Virupa's life, after having been invited to be the leader of a royal panel of non-Buddhist panditas, when it was discovered the book to which he prostrated was the Prajñāpāramitā in 8000 lines, the king (a different one) ordered him to bow to a Shiva linga. Virupa replied that it was inappropriate for an elder brother to prostrate to the younger, and warned the king that it was not going to go well. The king insisted that Virupa prostrate to this linga, and after he prostrated to it, it shattered, eliciting a complaint from Shiva himself. Virupa was so skilled at conversion through magical displays, eventually Avalokiteshvara interceded and asked Virupa to cease terrifying people with his powers.

We can understand from all this that it is not appropriate for those who have sought refuge in the Three Jewels to seek refuge elsewhere. So the answer to the question "Can one be a Buddhist and a Christian", "can one be a Buddhist and a Hindu", "can one be a Buddhist and a religious Jew" is no. Just as one cannot serve two kings, but must bear allegiance to one above any other, likewise, one cannot belong to Buddhadhama and so some religion and expect any kind of result from the former, as it clearly states in the Vinaya stanza above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 17th, 2015 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Major empowerments

Content:

Punya said:

I can't really explain the context of this but if someone asked you to supply a list of any major empowerments you have received what are they likely to mean? What would normally constitute major and minor empowerments?

I assume Kalachakra and Lamdre are major empowerments but can someone give some examples in each of the main Tibetan traditions?

Thanks Punya

heart said:

In the Sarma tradition it seems it have to be a 2 day empowerment to be considered major. This is not really the case in the Nyingma tradition, it is a lot more complex matter.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

A dbang chen in gsar ma and snying ma are the same. Guhyagarba is one example, there are many others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 17th, 2015 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:

Nirrtix said:

Even if a sort of blend of the beliefs? I know that some beliefs in Buddhism you can believe in god or gods, both are Karma based, and have some similar teachings.

I know this may seem like an odd idea, but Thich Nhat Hanh a Zen Mon wrote Living Buddha Living Christ, and thought both were compatible. I believe it is on the Buddhist side at least.

Anyhow, I am curious about this.

I am also curious about what many of you think about how some think about the Hindu belief that Buddha is an Avatar of Vishnu.

thank you,
Nirrtix

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot go for refuge to the Buddha and also go for refuge to some other god.

The Hindu idea that Buddha is an avatar of Vishnu is a pernicious legend, since it portrays Buddha as emanating solely for the purpose of tricking the asuras and leading them astray.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 17th, 2015 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

So Sarma 4th empowerment also leads to a buddhahood that does not return to the cause?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 17th, 2015 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is the practice of the an example wisdom introduced at the time of empowerment. This leads to buddhahood in one life, or seven or at most sixteen.

The level of insight experienced in Vajrayāna completion stage practices involve the experience of levels of mind more subtle than is possible in sutra meditation of plain śamatha and vipaśyāna, which is another reason why it is more rapid than sutra meditation.

Mother's Lap said:

How does example wisdom correlate/differ with vidya?

Malcolm wrote:

It is the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 17th, 2015 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There really is no mahāmudra that can be spoken of outside of tantric practice. Sutra mahāmudra is using dohas to illustrate and prepare one for the true result mahāmudra realized via the practice of the two stages. The word "mahāmudra" does not occur in even one single sūtra.

Sherab Dorje said:

The term "Sutra Mahamudra" is normally used to delineate the gradual approach from the sudden.

As for Mahamudra, some say that it is equivalent to Tathagatagarbha, and there's plenty of mention of that in the Sutras.

But this leads me to ask the question: Do you believe that the nature of mind can only be uncovered via Tantra? Do you think that the level of insight needed to experience the state, does not exist in Sutta and Sutra techniques?

Malcolm wrote:

The term "sūtra" mahāmudra, according to Kongtrul and even Gampopa himself, is used for the teaching given to those people who are incapable of practicing Vajrayāna for this or that reason but who are nevertheless interested in Mahāmudra. They are taught śamatha and vipaśyāna, the experience of which is clarified by quotes from dohas, etc.

But without the example wisdom as well as the profound dependent originations arranged by the guru at the time of empowerment, this sūtra mahāmudra cannot go beyond the common practice of the six perfections.

There are many terms for the state of buddhahood in various systems. The meaning is the same, but the means differ, and the length of time to the result as well.

The means of realizing mahāmudra is the two stages and or guru yoga. It is the practice of the an example wisdom introduced at the time of empowerment. This leads to buddhahood in one life, or seven or at most sixteen.

It takes three incalculable eons at minimum to progress to buddhahood via the sūtra path.

The level of insight experienced in Vajrayāna completion stage practices involve the experience of levels of mind more subtle than is possible in sutra meditation of plain śamatha and vipaśyāna, which is another reason why it is more rapid than sutra meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 17th, 2015 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Being introduced to the nature of mind -- ?

Content:

prsvrnc said:

Here is another question I'll look for (to get the specifics with regard to): How does one distinguish between the nature of mind that is felt to be realized during an initiation and the Mahamudra "introduction to mind" that is given separately? (Yes, perhaps the latter is also a form of an "initiation" — I'm just trying to get the vocab and references, straight.)

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference. Some schools, notably the Sakyapas, maintain that such direct introductions however merely reinforce the example wisdom introduced during empowerment.

prsvrnc said:

I think something that is related is the fact that shamatha and vipashana are cultivated one time around relative to sutra teachings, and then another pass of the same type of cultivation occurs when tantra is officially entered. This correlates with generation and completion stage respectively. The nature of mind is identified twice, so to speak -- one time with the course level of mind, upon which one becomes an arya bodhisattva and enters the first ground; the second time is with the subtle mind of clear light at the end of the isolation of mind wherein one enters path of seeing in tantra and achieves the illusory body. So, Mahamudra is going to be practiced differently, depending upon what level of "nature of mind" one is intending to access -- i.e., whether with the course or subtle mind.

Malcolm wrote:

There really is no mahāmudra that can be spoken of outside of tantric practice. Sutra mahāmudra is using dohas to illustrate and prepare one for the true result mahāmudra realized via the practice of the two stages. The word "mahāmudra" does not occur in even one single sūtra.

prsvrnc said:

Can the vajra master give the student an "introduction to the nature of mind" and have it be a qualified instance of that, even if the insight generated in the student is only one that is a generic image?

Malcolm wrote:

This is precisely what is called "the example wisdom."

prsvrnc said:

My guess is that being introduced to the nature of mind isn't necessarily a one time occurrence but probably has a decisive start but occurs repeatedly until... well, buddhahood. But that is just my educated guess.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a one time occurrence, in a real sense, that must be repeatedly cultivated until buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 16th, 2015 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Spirits - are these considered to be formless beings?

Content:

mutsuk said:

yep, sorry, 'byung po indeed

Malcolm wrote:

Here, however the direct translation of 'byung po as elementals is a little misleading. They are not spirits like undines, salamanders and so so connected with the element water, fire, etc. They are rather autochthonic entities, that is the sense of "bhuta" here.

They are formless in that they do not have physical bodies, though the rich representation of them, especially in Tibetan astrological and medical paintings, represents an attempt to show their class by giving them recognizable attributes.

As tingzin notes there is a bit of slippage between the term deva and lha, but when classified in Tibetan medicine and Ayurveda, the deva-bhutagraha is still a formless spirit which causes the person affected to wear white, be obsessed with purity, to speak in Sanskrit and so on. There are many such "deva" possessed people in Hindu ashrams and yoga centers around the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 16th, 2015 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Sources for 'Early Mahayana'

Content:

Indrajala said:

Johannes Bronkhorst, Buddhism in the Shadow of Brahmanism Handbook of Oriental Studies (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 46.

He suggests that it was the mundane matters related to dealing with brahmanized royal courts that is what drove Buddhists to adopt the language of a community often hostile to them:

They did not do so because they liked Sanskrit, or because they liked the Brahmins whose language it was. Nor did they do so for some inherent quality that this language supposedly possesses. They did so because they needed to defend their interests at the royal courts in Sanskrit. They had to use Sanskrit at the courts because Brahmins had been able to secure themselves a central place at the courts by way of their indispensable skills, not because rulers had supposedly "converted" to Brahmanism. This, as far as I can see, is the most plausible explanation of this otherwise puzzling change of language.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not puzzling in the least. Buddhists in India switched to Sanskrit because it was the language of educated persons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 16th, 2015 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Sakya Trizin - Chakrasamvara Body Mandala - Boston 4/201

Content:

alexprice said:

Lama Migmar and the Sakya Institute for Buddhist Studies are happy to announce this special event in the Boston area on the weekend of April 11-12, 2015.

For the first time in the West, HH Sakya Trizin Rinpoche will bestow the Chakrasamvara Body Mandala empowerment on the afternoon of Sunday April 12. This event is restricted to those who have already received the Chakrasamvara major two-day initiation from HH or another a Sakya-lineage lama. If you attended the Chakrasamvara initiation with HH in Boston in May 2011, you are qualified to attend. Registration for this event is now open at <http://sakya.net>.

Malcolm wrote:

It has to be the Ghantapada five-deity major empowerment, not just any Chakrasamvara major empowerment. Not even Luipa or Krishnacarya's tradition will count.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 16th, 2015 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Spirits - are these considered to be formless beings?

Content:

prsvnc said:

How are spirits classified in Tibetan Buddhism?

asunthatneversets said:

What we usually think of as "spirits" in the west are called bhutas in India... I'm not sure what the Tibetan translation of that term would be.

mutsuk said:

This is 'byung ba in tibetan (elemental forces).

Malcolm wrote:

'Byung po, i.e. Elementals

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 16th, 2015 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Vijnana vs. Rigpa

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I always seem to get into trouble when I post something from SDR.

Malcolm wrote:

Revise that to:

I always seem to get into trouble when I post something.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 16th, 2015 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Vijnana vs. Rigpa

Content:

alpha said:

Yes.All of that.

In my case it was.

Every day goes by i look at myself and say:"Nope.I am none of that".

Maybe i got it all wrong...who knows...

Malcolm wrote:

If you cultivate love, compassion and bodhicitta, you have not gotten anything wrong.

Without these three things, Vajrayāna is just an ego trip.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 15th, 2015 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Vijnana vs. Rigpa

Content:

alpha said:

It's a personal opinion based on what i have been doing so far.

I feel like an old person who coming to the end of his life is full of regrets.

I just feel like i wasted my time.

Malcolm wrote:

You regret what you have been practicing? Dharma is a waste of time?

???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 15th, 2015 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Vijnana vs. Rigpa

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Rachmiel, I was thinking about this thread and it occurred to me that you might find the following teachings useful:

<http://www.tersar.org/teachings-4/teachings-archive/>

alpha said:

Totally depressing and hopeless

Malcolm wrote:

What and why?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 15th, 2015 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Contradiction in Mahayana philosophy

Content:

White Lotus said:

after the five senses are dissolved it is seen that there never were five senses,

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm....can't dissolve what never was....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 14th, 2015 at 6:42 PM

Title: Re: Pema Khandro?

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 14th, 2015 at 9:36 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Jikan said:

I don't particularly see how this practice differs from someone eating meat from an animal that is specifically killed for him or her.

.

Malcolm wrote:

It isn't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 14th, 2015 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

None. My point is that it's overly reductive to define the goal of the Buddhist path solely in terms of the ending of birth. If that were the case, a rock would also have met the (single) criterion; it was never born to begin with.

The way I see it -- and I realize this likely reflects lack of understanding on my part -- the goal of the Buddhist path is nirvana, and what brings about nirvana is the ending of ignorance. The ending of samsaric birth is a concomitant result; we are reborn into samsara as a result of ignorance, so when ignorance is overcome, the rebirth cycle stops.

It's a question of putting things in the right sequence.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to put in the Buddha's perspective — what is samsara? Rebirth. What causes rebirth? Ignorance. What ends ignorance? Awakening. What is the result of awakening? Nirvana. What is nirvana? The end of samsara. What is the end of samsara? The end of rebirth.

When the mind was thus concentrated, purified, bright, unblemished, rid of defilement, pliant, malleable, steady, & attained to imperturbability, I directed it to the knowledge of recollecting my past lives. I recollected my manifold past lives, i.e., one birth, two... five, ten... fifty, a hundred, a thousand, a hundred thousand, many eons of cosmic contraction, many eons of cosmic expansion, many eons of cosmic contraction & expansion: 'There I had such a name, belonged to such a clan, had such an appearance. Such was my food, such my experience of pleasure & pain, such the end of my life. Passing away from that state, I re-arose there. There too I had such a name, belonged to such a clan, had such an appearance. Such was my food, such my experience of pleasure & pain, such the end of my life. Passing away from that state, I re-arose here.' Thus I remembered my manifold past lives in their modes & details.

"This was the first knowledge I attained in the first watch of the night. Ignorance was destroyed; knowledge arose; darkness was destroyed; light arose — as happens in one who is heedful, ardent, & resolute.

"When the mind was thus concentrated, purified, bright, unblemished, rid of defilement, pliant, malleable, steady, & attained to imperturbability, I directed it to the knowledge of the passing away & reappearance of beings. I saw — by means of the divine eye, purified & surpassing the human — beings passing away & re-appearing, and I discerned how they are inferior & superior, beautiful & ugly, fortunate & unfortunate in accordance with their kamma: 'These beings — who were endowed with bad conduct of body, speech & mind, who reviled the Noble Ones, held wrong views and undertook actions under the influence of wrong views — with the break-up of the body, after death, have re-appeared in the plane of deprivation, the bad destination, the lower realms, in hell. But these

beings — who were endowed with good conduct of body, speech, & mind, who did not revile the Noble Ones, who held right views and undertook actions under the influence of right views — with the break-up of the body, after death, have re-appeared in the good destinations, in the heavenly world.' Thus — by means of the divine eye, purified & surpassing the human — I saw beings passing away & re-appearing, and I discerned how they are inferior & superior, beautiful & ugly, fortunate & unfortunate in accordance with their kamma.

"This was the second knowledge I attained in the second watch of the night. Ignorance was destroyed; knowledge arose; darkness was destroyed; light arose — as happens in one who is heedful, ardent, & resolute.

"When the mind was thus concentrated, purified, bright, unblemished, rid of defilement, pliant, malleable, steady, & attained to imperturbability, I directed it to the knowledge of the ending of the mental fermentations. I discerned, as it had come to be, that 'This is stress... This is the origination of stress... This is the cessation of stress... This is the way leading to the cessation of stress... These are fermentations... This is the origination of fermentations... This is the cessation of fermentations... This is the way leading to the cessation of fermentations.' My heart, thus knowing, thus seeing, was released from the fermentation of sensuality, released from the fermentation of becoming, released from the fermentation of ignorance. With release, there was the knowledge, 'Released.' I discerned that 'Birth is ended, the holy life fulfilled, the task done. There is nothing further for this world.'

"This was the third knowledge I attained in the third watch of the night. Ignorance was destroyed; knowledge arose; darkness was destroyed; light arose — as happens in one who is heedful, ardent, & resolute.

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.019.than.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 14th, 2015 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

The sutras I've looked at (Avatamsaka for instance) don't seem to present Buddhahood as oblivion.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because the Mahāyāna perspective on Buddhahood does not present parinirvana as a total cessation of a Buddhas' continuum. Cessation and annihilation, btw., are entirely different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 14th, 2015 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

A rock or other inanimate object is not subject to rebirth, so is it a Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

This a pretty silly question but...

Does a rock or an other inanimate object have a mind? No. Therefore, upon what basis could they awaken?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 14th, 2015 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, absolutely. Look at the number of references in the Pali canon where, upon attaining arhatship, arhats declare with joy, "this is my final birth..." and so on.

Lazy_eye said:

Indeed, they do make these declarations, but the non-occurrence of future births could be seen as a product of the Dharma's primary goal: the cessation of dukkha.

daverupa said:

The fact of there being arahants without psychic powers showcases that knowledge of the cessation of dukkha is not co-extensive with knowledge of individual past lives or knowledge of the falling & re-arising of beings according to kamma generally; it can be an inferential claim & not necessarily a psychic-knowledge-claim.

Malcolm wrote:

It nevertheless is the point of declaring that one will not again take rebirth.

The cessation of dukkha means there are no more causes for it to arise. Birth and death are the primary forms of dukkha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 14th, 2015 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

...therefore, can we say that the happiness of an arahant or buddha consists only of knowing no future lives will occur?

Malcolm wrote:

Considering that even arhats are under the power of ripening karma from past lives, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

It seems to me (and please understand that I'm just a rather low-level student of the Dharma), that the significance of rebirth is directly linked to the meaning of nirvana. Nirvana is described in the suttas as "the highest happiness"; we also see it referred to as "permanent freedom" and so on. But does this "highest happiness" consist solely of the knowledge that one will never undergo another birth?

If so, it would be hard to argue with your statement.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, absolutely. Look at the number of references in the Pali canon where, upon attaining arhatship, arhats declare with joy, "this is my final birth..." and so on.

Lazy_eye said:

A materialist could achieve "nirvana" by coming to terms with the eventuality of death.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence the moral and intellectual poverty of the so-called "Secular Buddhist" approach.

Lazy_eye said:

Of course, this in itself is a complicated question, because most people don't desire oblivion at all; we fear death and desire further life. So part of Buddhism's appeal, for at least some secular Westerners, might be that it helps us with the suffering created by that fear (and the related desire). I'm not saying there aren't potential problems with this approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence Dharma Lite(tm)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is a slight problem here — links consciousness — sensation are all results, results of what? craving, addiction and becoming are causes, but causes of what?

We can see in this life that craving leads to addiction, which leads to sad outcomes, but that is all — and that is not uniquely Buddhist.

Lazy_eye said:

Well, I would argue this is sufficient to make a reasonable inference as to the general principle, thus providing a basis for developing śraddhā -- i.e., the conviction that the Buddha's path is indeed the way to the ending of dukkha.

Malcolm wrote:

But this is not why people come to Dharma. Most people come to Dharma because they have heard that meditation will make them more calm and relaxed. It is "accidental" if they wind up Buddhist, because Yoga very much claims the same things as Buddhism, reduce clinging, becoming more calm, ending rebirth, etc.

Lazy_eye said:

What would you identify as being uniquely Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

His view of and method for liberation from the cycle of rebirth we know as samsara.

Without rebirth, and Buddha's specific view of rebirth, it just isn't Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No.

MalaBeads said:

That might be the first time I actually understood the Loppon's role.

Thank you, Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

You are quite welcome.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

..There is a long tradition in Western discourse about the benefits of not clinging to the things of this life.

There are other approaches being free of clinging to this life found in nonbuddhist contemplative traditions.

Lazy_eye said:

In Buddhism, though, non-clinging is understood within the context of dependent origination -- is anything like that found in the other contemplative traditions you mention?

Malcolm wrote:

Samkhya presents a kind of dependent origination which collapses when it is discovered that one is clinging to what is not the self because of mistakenly making differentiations in what is not self due to the transformation of the three gunas. A species of this view is presented in the Yoga Sutras and much of the language of the Yoga sutras is shared with so called "Early Buddhism."

Lazy_eye said:

I guess we are asking the question "what is uniquely Buddhist about Buddhism"? It seems to me that it must be the knowledge gained by the Buddha during the third watch of the night.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha understood the view of dependent origination through recalling his past lives in the second watch. In the third watch he applied it through to the three realms and finally entered Vajropama samadhi.

Lazy_eye said:

If we accept the "three times" interpretation of D.O., then at least part of the process is observable in the present lifespan. To say nothing of other interpretations that see the twelvefold chain as just one particular presentation of idapaccayata.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is a slight problem here — links consciousness — sensation are all results, results of what? craving, addiction and becoming are causes, but causes of what?

We can see in this life that craving leads to addiction, which leads to sad outcomes, but that is all — and that is not uniquely Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 7:20 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Doesn't one have to know, understand and be receptive to Mahayana doctrine in the first place in order to be compelled by bodhicitta?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Just as for me, what compelled me was hearing about Mahāyāna emptiness. I accepted the view of emptiness long before I accepted the other parts of the Buddhas teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

So, in effect, you had developed a strong conviction in karma and rebirth, and a concern about your well-being in future lives, before taking refuge. Everything up to that point was preparatory -- allowing the conditions to develop that eventually resulted in your taking refuge.

Malcolm wrote:

More or less.

Lazy_eye said:

Do you think this is somewhat unusual for a Western practitioner or is it actually more common that I am making it out to be?

Malcolm wrote:

I know many others for whom philosophy was their doorway in, like me. For others still, it was Mahāyāna bodhicitta that drew them, and so on.

Lazy_eye said:

Well, Hume taught selflessness and impermanence. Suffering is obvious to everyone. So what makes Buddhadharma compelling?

What makes you think Buddha's explanation of the cause of suffering are compelling to westerners? What about them is empirically verifiable?

The practice of non-clinging ("letting go") leads to reduction in dukkha; clinging invariably leads to suffering in the shorter or longer run.

Malcolm wrote:

And there is a long tradition in Western discourse about the benefits of not clinging to the things of this life.

Lazy_eye said:

Understanding anicca and anatta helps with the practice of non-clinging.

Malcolm wrote:

There are other approaches being free of clinging to this life found in nonbuddhist contemplative traditions.

Lazy_eye said:

On a related note, good sila and cultivation of the brahmaviharas leads to happier states of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

These are found also in the Yoga Sutras.

Lazy_eye said:

I'm not very familiar with Hume other than what I learned in high school ("if you drop the ball there's no guarantee it will hit the ground"). Did he teach not-self and impermanence in ways similar to the Buddha, and did he provide a practice or a path?

Malcolm wrote:

His teaching on the non-existence of the self is strikingly similar.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

I didn't say anything about a one lifetime model, though. My claim was that anicca, anatta, dukkha and the causes of dukkha can be observed within the scope of one lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Hume taught selflessness and impermanence. Suffering is obvious to everyone. So what makes Buddhadharma compelling?

What makes you think Buddha's explanation of the cause of suffering are compelling to westerners? What about them is empirically verifiable?

Frankly, I came to the Dharma because of hearing the Heart Sutra, and then taking an interest in Madhyamaka. It was only later, after having studied Buddhadharma for some time that I really absorbed the fact that I was a suffering sentient being and formally

took refuge and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Personal responsibility, compassion and kindness are the hallmarks of a real Dharma practitioner.

Lazy_eye said:

Agree, but these qualities are important in the other major religions too. In and of themselves they don't provide a reason to choose Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in the same way.

Lazy_eye said:

The question of faith is crucial — why do we have faith in the Buddha? He taught a path where we are responsible for our own liberation.

We all have a number of choices available: faith in Jesus, faith in Mohammed, faith in Buddha. There has to be some reason for making the choice, otherwise faith rests on an unstable foundation. Because there's always the possibility that one's faith might have been misplaced. After all, there are devout Christians and devout Muslims, though from a Buddhist standpoint they are wrong. From their standpoint Buddhists are wrong. How can we know? And the stakes are higher in monotheism: a Christian might end up in the Buddhist hells due to wrong view, but not permanently.

My argument would be that the Dharma does offer a reasonable basis, because what the Buddha said about dukkha and its causes can be verified empirically. So we proceed from there.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually we cannot "empirically" verify the of the cause of dukkha, because dukkha is caused by karma, and karma itself is caused by affliction. There is no dukkha that is not caused by karma. There are no means by which dukkha may be measured. Liberation itself is defined as freedom from affliction, and that too cannot be measured, so there is nothing at all "empirically verifiable" in Buddhadharma. The idea that there is, is a hangover from an earlier period of Western perceptions of Buddhism.

You might argue, Buddha said that the cause of dukkha is clinging, but here clinging itself is just affliction which gives rise to an action that results in suffering. If you restrict yourself to a one lifetime model, there is no reason to select Buddhadharma over a secular twelve steps program...

Empirical verification depends on the observable quantification of a data set. No one

has ever empirically verified that Buddhadharma

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

LastLegend said:

It can be faith based. It can be based on rational approach, but this one is grasping firmly to wanting to know. One firmly believes the truth of the physical world based on the 5 senses. I think we are taking truth for granted here. We are acting like we are going to die if we can't know. Well we can't know anyway. Can we draw a certain complete conclusion/understanding about our nature and nature of reality using rational thinking?

Lazy_eye said:

I don't know.

All forms of Buddhism, as far as I know, stress the importance of trusting the Buddha. There are even some suttas which say, essentially, that trust and affinity for the Buddha can lead to stream entry even if one hasn't perfected sila. So I'm not denying its importance.

I'm just saying that since established faiths already exist in the West, faith may not be the most likely entry point into the Dharma. After all, if you already have that capability, why not just go to church? Logistically it's a lot easier -- there are plenty of churches everywhere but Buddhist centers or temples can be hard to find. I recall even the Dalai Lama has said that the locally established religion should be a good choice for most people.

So the appeal of the Dharma to (some) Westerners must in many cases be due to some other, distinctive qualities -- not the faith aspect specifically, since that can be found elsewhere.

Malcolm wrote:

The question of faith is crucial — why do we have faith in the Buddha? He taught a path where we are responsible for our own liberation. This is why Dharma appeals to the West. Personal responsibility, compassion and kindness are the hallmarks of a real Dharma practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 12th, 2015 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Indo-Tibetan sutra commentaries?

Content:

Will said:

Were such shastras written? In the prajaparamita group, not counting the short ones like Heart sutra, did any Tibetan or Indian write a comprehensive line by line

commentary on the 8K or 18K or 25K sutras?

How about the Avatamsaka or Lotus or Maharatnakuta - any full commentaries on these?
Any other sutra commentary examples?

Malcolm wrote:

Not line by line, but definitely there are comprehensive commentaries on the long PP sutras by Indians.

And there is an eight volume commentary on the Abhisamālaṃkāra by Yagton, the longest, most comprehensive commentary on Prajñāpāramita ever written before or since.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 11th, 2015 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Why doesn't DJK accept offerings?

Content:

maybay said:

Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche, great lama, but won't accept offerings. Why not? Does he feel like we're projecting something onto him. Isn't that what happens anyway?

How should I feel about something like my own birthday? Should I call blind ritual and get tough about being used as a moral pivot for my sister's party-going? Buddhist, Lama, thoughtful reserved people. We're like pillars of society. Why reject that? I don't get it.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure he will accept offerings, just make it to one of his charitable organizations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 10th, 2015 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

In terms of my temple metaphor, you and Simon (and a few others) seem to want to barricade yourselves inside a section of the temple and stop anyone else changing it - but you are inside, with your 20th century western baggage, and that changes it already.

Malcolm wrote:

The essence of the Dharma lies in how it is practiced and explained. Of you change the explanations and practices of the awakened, you are no longer practicing Buddhadharma. There is no reason to change anything, and the Dharma is not changed merely because it is being practiced 2500 years after the nirvana of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 10th, 2015 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The result of afflictive karma is always suffering. Suffering is always painful, whether mental or physical.

Greg said:

That is not what is at issue.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it is. Illnesses are a part of suffering. For example, the Buddha clearly states in the Cula-kamma, that illness in this life is a karmic result of physically harming others. There are also plenty of examples from the Avadanas and so on where specific deformities are taught to be the result of karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 9th, 2015 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

LastLegend said:

Not all pain is directly related to karma but all indirectly related to karma. Having this karma physical body, one is subject to pain, heat, cold, stress, sickness, old age, and death.

Paul said:

This. Pain is due to a body, a body is due to karma (and karma is due to ignorance).

Greg said:

As I understand it, you are asserting that the sutra passage is merely asserting that karma is always an indirect cause of physical pain insofar as it precipitates having a body in the first place, but it can also sometimes be a direct cause of physical pain. But that reading doesn't really make sense, because karma is never a direct cause of physical pain without some kind of mediating cause (eg a bile disorder). So it doesn't make sense to list it with those other causes as if it was just one possible cause among several.

Malcolm wrote:

The result of afflictive karma is always suffering. Suffering is always painful, whether mental or physical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 9th, 2015 at 11:14 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Qianxi said:

There's a sutra (<https://suttacentral.net/en/sn36.21>) about the possible causes of pain: bile disorders, phlegm disorders, wind disorders, an imbalance of the three, change of climate, careless behaviour, assault, and karma. The implication being that previous karma is only one of several possible explanations for physical pain.

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu asserts the Sautrantika position that disturbances of the elements of the body, which in turn comprise vatta, pitta and kapha, are vipaka.

Greg said:

Vasubandhu's assertion seems to be clearly at odds with SN 36.21.

Malcolm wrote:

In your opinion, not in mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 8th, 2015 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

That's a fair comment, but I (at least) am willing to persist since, in the larger scheme of things, this kind of dialogue is how we will (ever so slowly) fashion a Buddhism for the modern Western world.

Malcolm wrote:

I think the Buddhadharma we have is perfectly fine. As long as we rely on it, everything will be just fine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 8th, 2015 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

That level of knowledge, sure. But can we know for sure why child X was born deaf or child Y was born into a family of drug-users and criminals?

And if we can't, then all we can do is respond as best we can to the circumstances we find in front of us - using our knowledge of the workings of karma to guide our present and future actions.

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of what kind of family one is born into, wealth, poverty, class, etc., this is

definitely solely a result of karma. The Buddha says in the Ārya Āyusman Nanda Garbhāvākraṇṭi Nirdeśa:

Then, the Bhagavan said this to Āyusman Nanda, “Nanda, when a sentient being wishes to enter the womb, if causes and conditions are perfect, a body will be appropriated.

However, if [the causes and conditions] are not perfect, a body will not be appropriated.

If one should ask that sentient beings does not possess the conditions, it is as follows.

Though a man and a woman have the mental factor of desire, and the intermediate state aggregate is present and seeking a womb, should that male and female have sexual intercourse too soon or too late or not have intercourse at that one time; or should there be some diseases in the body of either [the male or the female], there will be no ‘entry into the womb’. If family line of the male and the female are noble and their merit is great, but the intermediate state aggregate has small merit, or should the the intermediate state being have a noble family line and great merit, [65] but the male and female have small [merit] or though they both have merit, but if the accumulation of karma is not mutual, then there will be no ‘entry into the womb’.”

In terms of birth defects and so on, this can be karmic; this can also be a result of various factors in the pregnancy, genetic defects, etc. Without clairvoyance it is difficult to know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 7th, 2015 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

I would therefore prefer to set the question aside, as we were advised to by the Buddha, since it's un conjecturable.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so. Why? Affliction --> action --> suffering.

Kim O'Hara said:

If I'm correct in my belief that we can't know the workings of karma, then all we can do (as good Buddhists) is to respond as skillfully and compassionately as possible to whatever situation we see in front of us.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course we can know the workings of karma — the Buddha spend a significant amount of time teaching about it. In essence it may be summed up the following way:

Affliction --> action --> suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 7th, 2015 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What we are talking about is that fact that the painful sensations that ripen on the body are result of negative deeds in the past, etc.

Qianxi said:

There's a sutra (<https://suttacentral.net/en/sn36.21>) about the possible causes of pain: bile disorders, phlegm disorders, wind disorders, an imbalance of the three, change of climate, careless behaviour, assault, and karma. The implication being that previous karma is only one of several possible explanations for physical pain.

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu asserts the Sautrantika position that disturbances of the elements of the body, which in turn comprise vatta, pitta and kapha, are vipaka. Assaults can only be result of previous karma, such as when Buddha informed Angulmala that his being beaten by the mob was a ripening of his past karma. If you do not have the karma to be assaulted by someone, they can never harm you no matter how hard they try. Change of climate too can be a result of karma, because the appearance of the container universe is a reflection of our karma. If course, careless behavior, such as injuring one's toe, this I would not say is a direct result of karma.

In Alexander Berzin's

http://www.berzinarchives.com/web/en/archives/sutra/level4_deepening_understanding_path/types_phenomena/overview_cause_effect/transcript.html (also http://www.berzinarchives.com/web/en/archives/sutra/level4_deepening_understanding_path/types_phenomena/causes_conditions_results.html) of Vasubandhu's list of five kinds of result one is "Man-made results (skyes-bu byed-pa'i 'bras-bu, Skt. purushakaraphalam)"

Qianxi said:

Man-made results are what we usually associate with physical cause and effect. I banged my foot against the chair and the result of that is that I experience pain. There's a karmic cause for why I would feel unhappy and why I experience banging my foot, but the actual cause and effect relationship of the banging of the foot and the pain is a man-made result.

Malcolm wrote:

He goes on to say that unhappiness resulting from pain is always the result of karma rather than 'man made'

Qianxi said:

If we experience unhappiness, it is definite that it is the result of destructive behavior – and that's at least a five or six hour discussion of why that is the case, but we don't have time for that. It's one of the basic principles of karma.

Malcolm wrote:

I'm not very convinced by the distinction between 'pain' and 'unhappiness', but it's interesting that that seems to be the position.

Sherab Dorje said:

And still nobody has answered why some people are affected by these "other factors" while others are not.

Malcolm wrote:

I think the answer is that everyone is affected by non-karmic factors all of the time.[/quote]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 7th, 2015 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...Yes, this all described in detail in the Kosha

daverupa said:

I'm not so sure it's well-described, however:

Malcolm wrote:

It is a pretty good indicator. The happiness we are experiencing in this life is a result of positive karma we did in the past; the suffering, the result of negative karma. Likewise, the positive karma we cultivate in this life will bear fruit as happiness in future lives; the negative karma, as suffering. It is unerring.

daverupa said:

But one can then read:

AN 3.61 said:

“Bhikkhus, I approached those ascetics and brahmins who hold such a doctrine and view as this: ‘Whatever this person experiences—whether pleasure, pain, or neither-pain-nor-pleasure—all that is caused by past deeds...

daverupa said:

which seems to suggest otherwise. So this discordance is not as eye-roll-worthy as you might think, especially since kamma is not the sole causal factor that affects beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Dave, what the Buddha is criticizing is the following:

When I ask them this, they affirm it. Then I say to them: ‘In such a case, it is due to past deeds that you might destroy life, take what is not given, indulge in sexual activity, speak falsehood, utter divisive speech, speak harshly, indulge in idle chatter; that you might

be full of longing, have a mind of ill will, and hold wrong view.'

This a kind of determinism, and is not what we are talking about. What we are talking about is that fact that the painful sensations that ripen on the body are result of negative deeds in the past, etc. You can consult the Koshabhaśyam where Vasubandhu states "the essential element of vipaka is sensation...A sensation, the result of retribution of a bad action, is painful." In fact, Vasubandhu goes on to say that mental suffering is not actually a karmic ripening, per say, but arises from the physical ripening of karma on the body such that it produces a state which gives rise to mental suffering.

Rather than making wild and inappropriate accusations about how the Tibetan Buddhist understanding of karma differs from "the early material", have the humility to admit that you know very little about anything concerning Tibetan Buddhism and that you are not very interested to learn. The fact is that such things as the antarabhāva and so forth are grounded in sutras in the Agamas, making it just as "early", to invoke your favored interpretive fetish, as any thing in the Pali Canon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 6th, 2015 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

It might be illuminating for Malcolm or others who have had extensive contact with Tibetan or other Buddhist cultures to tell us what they have observed in terms of attitudes towards the disabled, to what extent those attitudes are informed by belief in karma-vipaka, and to what extent Buddhists are or are not helping to promote acceptance, tolerance and equal rights.

Malcolm wrote:

I have never observed anything but kindness towards disabled people, have never heard any talk about their being "at fault" for their disability. On the other hand, I have heard many Tibetans describe their own suffering in this life as a result of their own misdeeds in past lives, quite cheerfully and without any rancor.

Hell, even the Tibetan penal system in Lhasa took karma into account, assuming that in many cases it was pointless to administer a punishment for this or that crime, because the criminal was going to suffer in future lives for crimes committed in this life. This attitude lent itself to rather lenient treatments of many kinds of crimes. See Rebecca French's book on Tibetan law and jurisprudence.

I think that part of the issue is that people raised in western cultures spend a lot of time dealing with issues of "guilt", and spend a lot of time trying to avoid feelings of guilt.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 6th, 2015 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

I agree that interdependent co-origination may be invoked as a meta-perspectival bulwark in such respects (it can be used to explain pretty much anything at a highly abstract and generalized level), but the specifics remain open to debate.

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent origination [not interdependent] and karma are two separate topics, often conflated together.

Concordiadiscordi said:

I would rather look to recent developments in the sciences and disciplines of non-linear complexity for sophisticated insights into the precisely contingent and often ambiguous nature of concrete causal dynamics/operations

Malcolm wrote:

None of them go beyond, "Where this exists, that exists, with the arising of that, this arose", etc.

Concordiadiscordi said:

Spiritually conservative justifications for disability and inequality founded upon vague notions derived from arcane texts and hearsay qualify as nothing but assumed dogma.

Malcolm wrote:

First, there is nothing vague about the Buddha's teaching on karma, it is very precise. Positive actions lead to positive results for oneself in this life and future lives, negatives actions lead to the opposite.

You either believe in Buddha's teachings on karma or you don't. If you don't, it is hard to consider yourself a follower of Buddhaharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 6th, 2015 at 10:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is a pretty good indicator. The happiness we are experiencing in this life is a result of positive karma we did in the past; the suffering, the result of negative karma. Likewise, the positive karma we cultivate in this life will bear fruit as happiness in future lives; the negative karma, as suffering. It is unerring.

daverupa said:

Just to be comprehensive:

MN 57 said:

Puṇṇa, there are four kinds of action proclaimed by me after realising them for myself with direct knowledge. What are the four? There is dark action with dark result; there is bright action with bright result; there is dark-and-bright action with dark-and-bright result; and there is action that is neither dark nor bright with neither-dark-nor-bright result, action that leads to the destruction of action.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this all described in detail in the Kosha

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 6th, 2015 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

SD said:

I was not engaging in, nor would I engage in, discrimination against people with special needs.

Kim O'Hara said:

Good! That is the most important thing here.

If you can also say that you do not and would not compound someone's suffering by telling them that it was all their own fault because they did something wrong in a past life, we have no disagreement over speech or behaviour.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to understand how karma is understood in Tibetan Buddhism, read chapter four of the Abhidharmakoshaśāstra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 6th, 2015 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Maybe a reason life-to-life karma is often portrayed as non-linearly in the suttas.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is not presented nonlinearly in the suttas. The effects of karma do not dissipate until they ripen.

There are various factors which indicate whether a given karma will ripen in this life, or another, or are long delayed (such as karmas of a being in the rupadhātu created in the kama-dhātu which cannot ripen in the rūpadhātu and so on).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 6th, 2015 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

The point is that the statement in question is (from POV of the nikayas) a misinterpretation

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not a "misinterpretation", it is an understanding that is found in the sutra I cited for you.

Lazy_eye said:

-

It simply doesn't stand up to scrutiny. Our present lives are not necessarily a reliable indicator of our subsequent lives;

Malcolm wrote:

It is a pretty good indicator. The happiness we are experiencing in this life is a result of positive karma we did in the past; the suffering, the result of negative karma. Likewise, the positive karma we cultivate in this life will bear fruit as happiness in future lives; the negative karma, as suffering. It is unerring.

Lazy_eye said:

we could be living non-virtuously yet still find ourselves reborn in a happy destination because the negative kamma hasn't ripened yet, or because there is some positive kamma that continues to exert influence.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as everyone who has bother to study the subject in detail knows.

Lazy_eye said:

A person might accrue heavy "death-proximate" kamma at the very end of a virtuous life, with the vipaka manifesting in the next. You just don't know.

Malcolm wrote:

Such a person would be a fool, and obviously not know the difference between cultivating positive karma and avoiding negative karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 6th, 2015 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Wrong sutta, buddy. I was referring to the

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.136.nymo.html>. You are quoting from the <http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.135.nymo.html>

As the titles suggest, the Maha presents a fuller exposition of the subject:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am aware of that fact. The point is that the statement you are criticizing is justified on the basis of the words of the Buddha from a sutra you accept as valid. Just admit it, and move on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 6th, 2015 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

The debate is not between "Buddhists" and "materialists." As Zhen Li and others have shown in their posts, a strongly deterministic view of karma is at odds with the nikayas. The statement "if you want to know your past life, look at your present circumstances, if you want to know what your future life will be, look at your present life" directly contradicts the <http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.136.nymo.html>.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in fact it does not:

2. "Master Gotama, what is the reason, what is the condition, why inferiority and superiority are met with among human beings, among mankind? For one meets with short-lived and long-lived people, sick and healthy people, ugly and beautiful people, insignificant and influential people, poor and rich people, low-born and high-born people, stupid and wise people. What is the reason, what is the condition, why superiority and inferiority are met with among human beings, among mankind?"

3. "Student, beings are owners of karmas, heirs of karmas, they have karmas as their progenitor, karmas as their kin, karmas as their homing-place. It is karmas that differentiate beings according to inferiority and superiority."

And:

"Here, student, some woman or man is one who harms beings with his hands or with clods or with sticks or with knives. Due to having performed and completed such karmas, on the dissolution of the body, after death, he reappears in a state of deprivation... If instead he comes to the human state, he is sickly wherever he is reborn. This is the way that leads to sickness, that is to say, to be one who harms beings with one's hands or with clods or with sticks or with knives.

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.135.nymo.html>

This is exactly the intent of the statement, "if you want to know your past life, look at your present circumstances, if you want to know what your future life will be, look at your present life."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 4th, 2015 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Sherlock said:

Genetic or developmental defects are negative karma ripening.

Really, what is so objectionable about this idea?

Sherab Dorje said:

To a Buddhist it is not objectionable. To a materialist on the other hand...

Kim O'Hara said:

What worries me about it, as one who tries to be compassionate, is how people may act as a result of believing that developmental disabilities are the result of negative karma.

To say that X deserves his/her disability and therefore shouldn't receive any special consideration or help is a failure of compassion.

"That's his/her karma and s/he just has to deal with it."

Does that sound at all familiar?

I've heard similar things far too often.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a statement of fact, we are all owners of our own karma.

Kim O'Hara said:

...the person in front of me is a suffering human being and the only response I can justify is compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

Ants are also worthy of compassion, they also are bearers of their own karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 3rd, 2015 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Arjan Dirkse said:

For me karma is a word for cause and effect, nothing more, nothing less.

Disease or developmental disabilities do not have some misdeed from a previous life as their cause, the cause is in most cases just a genetic or developmental defect, or just bad luck (although there are conditions like lung cancer or obesity which can be caused by the actions of the patient). To link all ailments with some kind of "sin" is toxic and irrational. I wish Buddhism would be rid of it.

Malcolm wrote:

The words for cause and effect are hetu and phala.

Vipaka however is a very specific kind of effect of a very specific kind of cause, namely "karma", which is in fact a positive, negative and neutral volition with corresponding positive, negative and neutral results (vipaka) in this life or some future lifetime which does not dissipate until it meets its cause for ripening, or someone attains liberation, whichever comes first.

If Buddhism were to jettison the teachings of the Buddha because someone finds this or that teaching of the Buddhas uncomfortable, dissatisfactory or not to their liking, it would no longer be "Buddhism" but would become something else instead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 3rd, 2015 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

For example, I've come across the idea that karma is the cause of all observable phenomena in the universe multiple times.

Malcolm wrote:

In general we hold to the simple principle that the present universe and everything in it down to the smallest observable particle arose as a result of the combined karma of all the sentient beings it contains.

The variety of the world comes from karma

-- Vasubandhu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 2nd, 2015 at 11:55 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...giving what is beneficial [lit. medicinal]... Those ten factors result in many illnesses, this karma results in many illnesses.

xabir said:

Sorry I'm confused here. Why is giving what is beneficial a karma resulting in many illnesses?

Malcolm wrote:

It was a typo, should be "not beneficial".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 1st, 2015 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Seems to me that any statement to the effect that "this disability was caused by non-virtuous conduct" (or other specific cause) clearly represents an attempt to delineate the precise workings of kamma, something only a Buddha would know.

Malcolm wrote:

The Karmavibhanga states:

Brahmin child, there is karma that results in a short life. There is karma that results in a long life. There is karma that results in many illnesses. There is karma that results in few illnesses. There is karma that results in an unattractiveness of complexion. There is karma that results in beauty.

There are many such teachings where the Buddha indicates that karma is involved in directly involved in illnesses, some we would term "genetic" illnesses. The Buddha continues:

In that respect, if it is asked what are the karmas resulting in many illnesses, there are ten factors that result in many illnesses: striking out with fists and palms etc.; believing it is proper to strike out with fists, palms, etc.; praising striking out with fists and palms, etc.; inflicting pain on one's father or mother; inflicting pain on an ārya; being happy when an enemy is afflicted with illness; being unhappy when an enemy recovers from an illness; giving what is beneficial [lit. medicinal], eating food without permission to eat. Those ten factors result in many illnesses, this karma results in many illnesses. Therefore, we can see from this that martial artists should be very careful.

Anyway, there are numerous statements by the Buddha about karma being the cause of physical defects and illness. You can accept this or not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 1st, 2015 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism's view on developmental disabilities

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Actually, the Buddha argued that it is well known by the world that there are simply biological causes for some things.

It is an incorrect view to hold everything to be the result of karma. Only in a round about metaphorical way can you say everything is a result of karma. Now we don't rely upon theories of bile, but the principle of a biological (non-intentional) cause for diseases is the same.

Sivaka Sutta said:

There are cases where some feelings arise based on bile [i.e., diseases and pains that come from a malfunction of the gall bladder]. You yourself should know how some feelings arise based on bile. Even the world is agreed on how some feelings arise based on bile. So any brahmins & contemplatives who are of the doctrine & view that whatever an individual feels — pleasure, pain, neither-pleasure-nor-pain — is entirely caused by what was done before — slip past what they themselves know, slip past what is agreed on by the world. Therefore I say that those brahmins & contemplatives are wrong. ...

Bile, phlegm, wind, a combination,
Season, uneven, harsh treatment,
and through the result of kamma as the eighth.

Malcolm wrote:

And the cause of vata, pitta and kapha respectively are rāga, dveṣa and moha. Therefore, the indirect causes of all disease are the three afflictions. Also the three doṣas in turn are the condition for the arising of three kleśas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 30th, 2014 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Lojong: A Vajrayana Practice

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The seven points of mind training require Guru Yoga as a preliminary, etc. The instructions generally assume that one is practitioner of Secret Mantra.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I didn't realize this. I see Lojong taught at what seems to be a sutra level of instruction though..isn't that also the case?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, take this from Gyalsey Thogme's famed commentary of the seven points of mind training:

First, the preparation: having started with going for refuge and generating bodhicitta, offer supplications to one's deity and Guru...

And:

The supreme method is endowed with four yogas.

First, the yoga of gathering accumulations is when suffering arises for oneself: if suffering arises for oneself, since the thought arises "I will be glad if this suffering does not exist", at that time if you do not wish suffering and wish for happiness, think "This is a sign of breaking the cause of merit." One must make offerings to the three jewels, praise the Sangha, offer tormas to elemental spirits, and so on, in brief, having made an effort to gather accumulations through the three doors of body, speech and mind, go for refuge and create bodhicitta, offering mandalas to the Guru and the Three Jewels and so with fervor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 30th, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Saoshun said:

Shunyata concept I think is before buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 29th, 2014 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Lojong: A Vajrayana Practice

Content:

Jikan said:

If so, then what to make of Norman Fischer's approach to lojong?

<http://www.shambhala.com/training-in-compassion.html>

or rather, more generally, the penetration of this practice outside of a Vajrayana context?
Is it still the same practice, or...?

Malcolm wrote:

As with everything, it is more effective when it is combined with guru yoga and so, the experience arise more rapidly and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 29th, 2014 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: "Did Machik Really Teach Chod?" by Sarah Harding

Content:

sherabpa said:

blo sbyong is actually mixed with Vajrayāna.

Interesting claim; there are arguably some vajrayana affinities in the 7 points of mind training with vajrayana, but apart from that, I don't see anything in Geshe Langthang's lojong or the Sakya Parting from the Four Attachments. Even in the don bdun ma, there is no initiation or anything of that nature. Could you elaborate?

Malcolm wrote:

The seven points of mind training require Guru Yoga as a preliminary, etc. The instructions generally assume that one is practitioner of Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 28th, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Karma Fruit of Worldwide Abortions

Content:

Dan74 said:

This discussion may be of interest too, seeing that it takes a more compassion and less rigid position than many of the posts here seem to imply:

....

But then again, it may be more satisfying to just stick to our soapboxes...

Malcolm wrote:

First we have to decide whether abortion is himsa or ahimsa. Abortion can hardly be called ahimsa, can it? In fact abortion is the deliberate harming of one sentient being by another, in this case the harming of a child by its mother.

Every sentient is deserving of the same level of compassion no matter what they have done or what class of sentient being they are.

On the other hand, Mahāyāna ethics are more important than rigid adherence to the letter of a vow. But to undertake an action on the basis of Mahāyāna ethics, self-interest has to be absolutely absent from one's thinking.

Because abortion is himsa, harming a sentient being, it cannot be condoned by those who follow Buddhadharma in general. On the other hand, there are always special cases where there may be greater harm in prohibiting an abortion than permitting one, such as examples of severe birth defects, threat to the life of the mother and so on, impregnation through rape, incest, and so on.

So, in general, the position of Buddhadharma is that abortion is harming another sentient being as well as taking life. In general it is not only a serious breach of pratimokṣa vows to have an abortion or to encourage someone to have an abortion (and in the case of monk, results in a defeat), but it is also serious bodhisattva downfall to

either have an abortion or to encourage someone to have an abortion apart from special instances.

On the other hand, there is the political fact of separation of church and state, which is necessary in any functional so-called "democracy". Though as a follower of Buddhadharma, I am personally opposed to abortion, I am also opposed to legislating religious doctrines into law. So it is something I leave to the courts and legislature to decide as a matter of social policy.

And finally, just because we followers of Buddhadharma are opposed to abortion in a general way does not mean we should adopt the angry and confrontational rhetoric of the "pro-life" movement. We should have compassion for everyone, since that's what we Mahayanis aim to do, i.e have impartial compassion for all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 28th, 2014 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Karma Fruit of Worldwide Abortions

Content:

Berry said:

So are you saying that if I sympathise with another woman having an abortion after she was beaten and raped by someone who murdered her parents, that I will "bear the karma of all the abortions that have ever been performed during their lifetime, and this leads them to have shortened lives, and so on " i.e. my lifetime ?

Malcolm wrote:

Sympathizing with someone for being raped and beaten is one thing. Taking a human life is another. If you approve of an abortion in only a special case, than you only bear the karma of that special case, and in this case it is also a weak karma, since it will likely be attended with regret and so, which prevents it from being a perfect karma.

Berry said:

That appears to be rather a mistaken and speculative viewpoint when reading what the Buddha had to say in this sutta which was already mentioned earlier in the topic:

Malcolm wrote:

The workings of karma are explained in many sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 27th, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Trekchod

Content:

Saoshun said:

Can someone make hierarchy or list of trekchod practices?

Malcolm wrote:

There is only one practice, the four cho zhags.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 27th, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

kirtu said:

In general only high lamas give empowerments in Sakya. However I know of one Sakya khenpo in the US who is not the head of a lineage who does in fact give empowerments as well as a Sakya lama (a khenpo) in Europe who also gives empowerments. But basically in Sakya almost all the time only high lamas (basically certain members of the Khon family or lineage heads of the Ngor or Tsar lineages) give empowerments. In other words Sakya khenpos do not generally give empowerments.

Malcolm wrote:

And one should remember that the khenpos of Ngor are all from four traditional families, Luding, Thartse, Phande and one other whose name escapes me. Lama Kunga from SF is from the Thartse branch.

The khenpos of Tshar lineage also usually do give empowerments, but then there is also the Chogye Trichen incarnations as well as the Zimwok incarnations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 27th, 2014 at 9:49 PM

Title: Lojong: A Vajrayana Practice

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I've even read Mahayana Lojong trainings - a number of em in fact...which involve visualization of sectioning one's body, turning it into Nectar etc...It seems to be common enough. One in particular I can remember is in the context of Tonglen, but the visualization is not so far off from Chod or the Kusulis accumulation near as I can remember, just with no yidam involved.

Malcolm wrote:

blo sbyong is actually mixed with Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 27th, 2014 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: "Did Machik Really Teach Chod?" by Sarah Harding

Content:

conebeckham said:

there's no contradiction here between the question she poses and the genuine

"authenticity" of the Lujin practice.

Jikan said:

Agreed completely, and I hope I didn't imply otherwise in my posts in this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

You are all forgetting that so called lus sbyin, aka kusuli accumulation offering, has its roots in the Hevajra Tantra:

Having given the gift of the body
afterwards begin conduct.

The practice was already widespread. Machilk's tradition merely "Tibetanized" it with nice melodies and a big drum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 27th, 2014 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Karma Fruit of Worldwide Abortions

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

For all?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that. What I am pointing out is that fact that everyone who agrees with abortion and supports it bears the karma of all the abortions that have ever been performed during their lifetime, and this leads them to have shortened lives, and so on. I don't think it is a very strong karma, honestly, because most people have sincere regrets about it, and very few people feel satisfaction from the action.

But if you are opposed to abortion, then you are free from this consequence, even weak ones.

Collective ripening only befalls those who have engaged in similar actions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 26th, 2014 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Karma Fruit of Worldwide Abortions

Content:

Will said:

Kim, Most parts of the buddhadharma I know nothing about, so I am hoping that some deep practitioner will know of some guru or teaching that goes beyond Vasubandhu's mainly individual understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu does describe collective karma in two ways, one he mentions the example

of a soldier. If a group of one hundred soldiers kills a person, everyone on is that group bears the weight of the action times the number of people who participated in it, or even approved of it.

Secondly, an example of collective karma is our world. It came about because we all have similar actions, leading to not only the formation of this world, but our birth upon it.

"The variety of the world comes from action."

Thus, the action of killing, abortion being killing, leads to shortened lives, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 23rd, 2014 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Dakini question

Content:

drodul said:

To which Buddha family does Sengdongma, the Lion-faced Dakini, belong?

Malcolm wrote:

Akṣobhya family.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 20th, 2014 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Frugal living

Content:

Tenso said:

Many people here as Buddhists will agree that living a frugal life is the way to go. The thing is that there are many people who spend their entire lives being frugal and end up being very miserable in old age, then they say they could of done this or that in their younger days.

My question is, is it better to have a steady work life and being able to do things one will enjoy or is it better to be a frugal cheap Buddhist who has never worked much in their lives and end up being unsatisfied wishing they could of made more money allowing them to enjoy their lives more? Not talking about having enough money to afford material possessions but having enough to travel the world, experience new and different things etc.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha himself does not recommend this for lay people. Quite the opposite, he encouraged lay people to work hard and be prosperous. A wealthy lay Sangha is a Sangha that can support the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 20th, 2014 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The term "non-abiding nirvana" does not exist in sūtras, true, but it is a concept used to explain how nirvana explained in Mahāyāna sutras is different than Hinayāna nirvana.

...

Which I showed exists in the sutras such as the Lotus and so on, not merely in the Maitreyan corpus.

Astus said:

The term is not in the early sutras and it is used in Yogacara works to explain the state of the buddhas. That is, before Asanga there was no such explanation for what the sutras contain, and the sutras themselves don't actually specify.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they do.

Astus said:

The criticism of Hinayanist nirvana-as-total-cessation is present in Mahāyāna everywhere.

Yes. And the idea of total cessation is rejected even in the Nikayas, not only in Mahayana sutras. It is actually among the set of questions not answered by the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, it is prevalent in many śrāvaka texts. The criticism leveled by Mahāyāna are not the words of the Buddha, but rather the teachings and understanding of his śrāvaka disciples. Please understand this distinction.

Astus said:

Since when were Buddhas ever inactive in Mahāyāna?

They do talk of parinirvana, and what people should do after the Buddha's demise, how stupas should be revered, etc. What sutras do you know that discuss the buddhas activities after their parinirvana? Besides the Lotus Sutra that does not actually say that as mentioned above already.

Malcolm wrote:

The Lankāvatara, for example, which clear indicates that the actual Buddha is the sambhogakāya, and the nirmanakāya appears here just for show.

Astus said:

This is not what happened at all. No matter which Mahāyāna path one follows, one still has to gather the two accumulations via the bodhisattva path.

I see a significant difference between ideas that one should stay a bodhisattva indefinitely and that one can reach buddhahood even in this life. I don't see early Mahayana sutras emphasising that one should become a buddha, rather they talk about being a proper non-returning bodhisattva, someone who realises that there is actually nothing to attain, thus could become a buddha any time but chooses not to. Such a choice is nonsense if a buddha is simply a better bodhisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Bodhisattvas vow to become Buddhas to teach others. That is the best way to assist sentient beings. To do that, they embark on a career that lasts eons in order to gather the merit and wisdom necessary to do this. This is all detailed very explicitly in the Ratnavali, chapter three.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 20th, 2014 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

Dan74 said:

As I recall the great spat between yourself and several Zen teachers at E-Sangha came about initially due to their position on non-permanent nirvana, on nirvana as an extreme, are you now upholding the view you were previously fighting against? Or have I misunderstood?

Malcolm wrote:

You misunderstood. They were talking about a temporary nirvana.

And that is not what the argument was about, actually. The argument was "are Zen priests the equivalent of bhikṣus?" The reason is that Zen priests seem to feel they are entitled to all the privileges and recognitions to which a bhikṣu is entitled. My point of view was and is that they are lay bodhisattvas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 18th, 2014 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

Mkoll said:

Essentially, to answer the question posed by the OP in the subject of the first post, the Mahayana opinion of Theravada is that it is not the complete teaching of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this point of view is stated quite unequivocally by Nāgārjuna in the Ratnavali.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 17th, 2014 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

TRC said:

However, the interesting point of why Sariputra is the butt of the joke here is actually based on a misapprehension, and this is the misunderstanding that Sariputra was the author of the Abhidharma, in which the Heart Sutra is clearly critiquing. Of course the Abhidharma was a later addition and not reflective of the early suttas and at times quite at odds with them (dharma's having substantial existence, etc). So this again is an example how prejudices can become reinforced over time and then become as if fact, based on misapprehensions.

Malcolm wrote:

In the Sarvastivāda, the dominant intellectual tradition in Indian Buddhism, Śariputra is indeed the author of some of the seven seminal Abhidharma texts.

Again, in the Mahāyāna sūtra, the Buddha indicates that he did not teach everything fully, not that what he taught in those śrāvaka sūtras was false.

TRC said:

As you correctly point out LastLegend, "of course Sariputra understood", there is no doubt. However, others studying the Heart Sutra obviously read this misunderstanding into it, as we can see here by Malcolm's response.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you familiar with the Vimalakīrti Nirdeśa sūtra? If so, you should be really offended, since you seem to enjoy taking offense at Mahāyāna.

TRC said:

While we are on the subject of the heart Sutra, who is considered to be the author?

Malcolm wrote:

Why, the Buddha, of course. It is through his entering samadhi that Avalokiteśvara was empowered to speak on his behalf.

TRC said:

Also, I'm still waiting a sound rebuttal explaining how the Kaccayanagotta Sutta is not directly pointing to the emptiness of all phenomena, that practitioners of early Buddhism aren't supposed to be able to realise.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a teaching on dependent origination, not directly about emptiness. And since the dependent origination being discussed is the dependent origination of a person's continuum, explicitly it only concerns the selflessness of persons and not the

selflessness of phenomena. It primarily concerns the notion of the permanence or annihilation of the self, two extremes the world is addicted to. This is why the preface to the famous passage states:

By & large, Kaccayana, this world is in bondage to attachments, clingings (sustenances), & biases. But one such as this does not get involved with or cling to these attachments, clingings, fixations of awareness, biases, or obsessions; nor is he resolved on 'my self.' He has no uncertainty or doubt that just stress, when arising, is arising; stress, when passing away, is passing away. In this, his knowledge is independent of others. It's to this extent, Kaccayana, that there is right view.

In fact the passage is cited by Nāgārjuna in the chapter 15 of the MMK, his take down of Sarvastivāda substantialism, the notion that underneath appearances there is a prakṛiti, an unchanging nature which never changes, leading to the doctrine that all effects exist in their causes because of their misunderstanding of the Buddha's statement "everything exists in the three times."

The idea that this passage points to the heart of Madhyamaka is an idea advanced primarily by David Kalupahana. But we have very good reason to disregard Kalupahana's understanding because he completely disregarded Buddhapaṇita and Candarakīrti's identification of which passages were stated by the opponent and which passages were to be considered Nāgārjuna's.

This passage is cited by Nāgārjuna because it cannot be rejected by his śrāvaka opponents, not because it is an end all be all statement that is the heart of Madhyamaka. There are many more salient passages in Mahāyāna sūtras which are much more explicit than this passage detailing the "middle way." He cites it because both schools hold it to be the Buddhavaśana, and that is all.

In my opinion, your view of the the śrāvaka canon has been completely influenced by Madhyamaka [this is very common these days, since the Pali commentarial literature totally lacks any discussions of profound emptiness]. It is a pity you don't recognize that your own understanding of the śrāvaka canon actually comes from Mahāyāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 17th, 2014 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

TRC said:

Still perpetuating the myth I see. Firstly though, you still have not addressed the quote from the Heart Sutra that refers specifically to the aggregates and consequently the falsehood it depicts of an arahant's realisation. Secondly, as has already been quoted by a more balanced Mahayana practitioner in this thread, it is quite evident that emptiness of all phenomena is penetrated and understood in the early discourses. In fact it goes to heart of the Madhyamika view, that of the middle way between existence and non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha's teachings are one thing, what śrāvakas realize is another.

TRC said:

So here it is again:

"By & large, Kaccayana, this world is supported by (takes as its object) a polarity, that of existence & non-existence. But when one sees the origination of the world as it actually is with right discernment, 'non-existence' with reference to the world does not occur to one. When one sees the cessation of the world as it actually is with right discernment, 'existence' with reference to the world does not occur to one."

See, this is pointing directly to all phenomena ("the world") as empty. It's extremely explicit, it doesn't come more direct!

Malcolm wrote:

This was addressed already by a previous citation of the Buddha:

Mahāmati, also others rouse a mind that wishes for nirvana having perceived that all things depend on a cause. However, Mahāmati, because they do not perceive the selflessness in phenomena [for them] there is no freedom.

TRC said:

And here is the Buddha now pointing directly to his doctrine (not Nagarjuna's – his MMK was a commentary on the Buddha's already established understanding of emptiness) on which he's realisation of the middle way is founded on, which is of course no less than dependent arising.

Malcolm wrote:

No one is questioning the Buddha's realization.

TRC said:

So from the same <http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn12/sn12.015.than.html> we have:

"'Everything exists': That is one extreme. 'Everything doesn't exist': That is a second extreme. Avoiding these two extremes, the Tathagata teaches the Dhamma via the middle: From ignorance as a requisite condition come fabrications. From fabrications as a requisite condition comes consciousness. From consciousness as a requisite condition comes name-&-form. From name-&-form as a requisite condition come the six sense media. From the six sense media as a requisite condition comes contact. From contact as a requisite condition comes feeling ..."

Malcolm wrote:

Again:

Mahāmati, also others rouse a mind that wishes for nirvana having perceived that all things depend on a cause. However, Mahāmati, because they do not perceive the

selflessness in phenomena [for them] there is no freedom.

TRC said:

So basically who cares about the commentarial texts when you have a good grasp of the early discourses? It's all there (well for those who want to see at least), why would you rely on second-hand interpretations?

Malcolm wrote:

It is clear that the śrāvakas did not understand selflessness of phenomena from Buddha's teachings in the Nikayas/Agamas.

TRC said:

Also, you still haven't addressed whether Zhiyi goes on to warn of getting stuck on the seventh bhumi, nirvana. Perhaps you don't know?

Malcolm wrote:

I have not read the text in question. I generally confine myself to studying Indian texts and their Tibetan commentaries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 17th, 2014 at 10:53 AM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

TRC said:

Now you mention the Prajñāpāramitas. It seems to me, at least from my reading of the Heart Sutra, that it has a very fundamental and gross misinterpretation and misrepresentation of the awakening of the arahant. That is, it is evident that Avalokiteśvara proceeds to lecture Sariputra on the emptiness of the aggregates.

Malcolm wrote:

I assume you are referring to the various statements in Mahayāna that śrāvakas do not realize emptiness of phenomena. Indeed, the Buddha states in the Lankāvatara sūtra: Mahāmati, also others rouse a mind that wishes for nirvana having perceived that all things depend on a cause. However, Mahāmati, because they do not perceive the selflessness in phenomena [for them] there is no freedom.

And:

Mahāmati, because liberation has a single taste, the abandonment of the obscuration of affliction of pratyekabuddhas and śrāvakas might not be a difference, but they do not abandon the knowledge obscuration. The knowledge obscuration is purified through the difference of seeing the selflessness in phenomena.

Now then, on the other hand, the Buddha is not at fault here, because as Candrakīrti famously states in his auto-commentary on the Madhyamakāvatara:

Someone might think, "If the selflessness of phenomena is taught in śrāvakayāna, the teaching of Mahāyāna would be pointless." That line of thought should be understood to contradict reason and citation. The selflessness in phenomena is not the only Mahāyana teaching. If it is asked why, there are the bodhisattva stages, the perfections,

aspirations, great compassion and so on, as well complete dedication, the two accumulations and the dharmatā of inconceivability, As it is said in the Ratnavali:

The aspirations of bodhicitta
and the total dedication of practice
is not explained in the śrāvakayāna,
so where will bodhisattvas [be explained]?
The topic of the bodhisattva practice
are not explained in [their] sūtras,
but are explained in the Mahāyāna sūtras.
Therefore, they are upheld by the wise.

In order to clarify the selflessness of phenomena it is also reasonable that it is a teaching of Mahāyāna because it is held that it is extensively explained. The selflessness of phenomena is only briefly indicated in the śrāvakayāna. As the Ācārya said:

You have said that there is no freedom
without realizing signlessness;
therefore, you have taught that fully
in the Mahāyāna.

One can object, "But Candrakīrti says the selflessness in phenomena is taught the śrāvaka canon." Indeed he does say this, but I must point out that not even the names "selfness of persons" and "selflessness of phenomena" are ever heard in śrāvakayāna commentarial texts. Who has ever heard of something that can be understood without it being given a name? The fact that these two emptinesses are not identified in the commentarial literature of the śrāvaka canon is sufficient evidence to show that even the idea of two-fold emptiness is completely foreign to their understanding of Dharma. If they cannot even name it, how can they realize it? It is like assuming that someone will arrive at a destination they have never heard of, which is not on any map, and has no identifying features, and to which they have no intent to go — in short, even if they arrive in such a place they will not recognize it as a destination at all and will continue to move on since they are not looking for such a place to begin with.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 17th, 2014 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Very simply put, Mahāyāna regards nirvana as an extreme to be avoided.

TRC said:

So nirvana is an extreme to be avoided? Why would Zhiyi be saying this then:

“As for the dharma of nirvāṇa, there are many paths of entry into it.
However, if we discuss those which are crucially essential, they do

not go beyond the two dharmas of calming and insight.”

Meditation Essentials by Kalavinka Press

Going by this and other conflicting and self-contradicting opinions I’ve read, it seems to me Mahayana doesn’t really have a clear position about nirvana, and yet here it is dispensing its ill-informed definitions of what the Buddha described as nirvana in the early discourses.

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is something to be attained, in the sense that of course all afflictions should be ultimately eradicated (this occurs at the seventh bhumi), it is however not a state in which a bodhisattva should remain, and thus it is also an extreme to be avoided, as the Buddha points out in the Prajñāpāramita sutras and as Asanga also points out in the Mahāyānasamgraha. The Ārya-mahābherihārakapariivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

"Kāśyapa, apart from the present intentional words are "parinivana of the tathāgata", the tathāgata is permanent, stable, peaceful, eternal and is not annihilated even in parinirvana...though to some he shows the parinirvana he is not annihilated."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 17th, 2014 at 6:58 AM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Very simply put, Mahāyāna regards nirvana as an extreme to be avoided. Thus the way nirvana is explained by the Buddha in Mahāyāna is markedly different than the way he explained it to śravakas. Therefore, the nirvana explained in Mahāyāna sutras, an extreme to be avoided, is different than the nirvana explained in the Agamas and Nikāyas, where it is presented as the ultimate desiderata.

Dan74 said:

I've never come across Nirvana described as 'an extreme to be avoided', Malcolm. Could you share some relevant sutra quotes please?

Malcolm wrote:

Āryaṣṭadaśasahasrika-prajñāpāramitā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

...and never remain in either samsara or nirvana

Asanga remarks in the Mahāyānasamgraha.

"Totally abandoning the conceptuality of a bodhisattva who has not seen the truth, totally abandoning both extremes of samsara and nirvana, totally abandoning the apprehension that it is sufficient merely to abandon the obscuration of affliction..."

Dan74 said:

I remember the sravaka's or arahat's attainments described in these terms, as ultimate quiescence and not the true Nirvana, but the issue here AFAICT is

1. do these descriptions accurately represent the Theravada or Pali Canon position?
2. is this the description of Mahayana Nirvana or is there another notion of Nirvana in the Mahayana?

Malcolm wrote:

It is, when a Buddha experiences parinirvana, according to that Hinayāna schools, that's it for Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 17th, 2014 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: How do defilements etc originate from primordial purity

Content:

jules said:

ok so the question would then be how does the non-recognition come about from pure awareness?

Malcolm wrote:

Initially this awareness is not self-aware. This is all very carefully explained in the explanation of the basis in Dzogchen. But you need to learn this from a teacher in the proper way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 17th, 2014 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: How do defilements etc originate from primordial purity

Content:

jules said:

how do ignorance, defilments, adventitious stains, bad karma etc arise from primordial purity. it seems illogical.

Malcolm wrote:

It is fairly straightforward and logical — though the mind is primordially pure, when it does not recognize it's own primordial purity it becomes entrapped in duality of self and other, and then the afflictions, karma and so on ensue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 16th, 2014 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

TRC said:

Very simply put, Mahāyāna regards nirvana as an extreme to be avoided. Thus the way

nirvana is explained by the Buddha in Mahāyāna is markedly different than the way he explained it to śrāvakas. Therefore, the nirvana explained in Mahāyāna sutras, an extreme to be avoided, is different than the nirvana explained in the Agamas and Nikāyas, where it is presented as the ultimate desiderata.

Clarence said:

Are there any other differences between Mahayana and Shrivakayana in how they view Nirvana besides whether or not it is a desirable result? Do their definitions of Nirvana differ or just the way they view "it"?

Malcolm wrote:

Differing definitions of Nirvana exist among various śrāvaka schools, as well as between Mahāyāna and śrāvakas in general. Madhyamaka, for example, maintains that nirvana is emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 16th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but you have no proof for this, indeed, no proof that there is an "early" Mahāyāna when it comes to sūtras. The term "non-abiding nirvana" does not exist in sūtras, true, but it is a concept used to explain how nirvana explained in Mahāyāna sutras is different than Hinayāna nirvana.

TRC said:

Here we have nirvana which is beyond all concepts and you're dividing it up into the nirvana of Hinayana and the nirvana of Mahayana. For real ... dividing up the indivisible? Do you not see the absurdity of this line of reasoning in regards to Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

Very simply put, Mahāyāna regards nirvana as an extreme to be avoided. Thus the way nirvana is explained by the Buddha in Mahāyāna is markedly different than the way he explained it to śrāvakas. Therefore, the nirvana explained in Mahāyāna sutras, an extreme to be avoided, is different than the nirvana explained in the Agamas and Nikāyas, where it is presented as the ultimate desiderata.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 16th, 2014 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

Astus said:

Where this discussion has started was that I have stated that early Mahayana favoured staying a bodhisattva

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but you have no proof for this, indeed, no proof that there is an "early" Mahāyāna when it comes to sūtras. The term "non-abiding nirvana" does not exist in sūtras, true, but it is a concept used to explain how nirvana explained in Mahāyāna sutras is different than Hinayāna nirvana.

Astus said:

and one of the reasons for that was the lack of the concept of non-abiding nirvana of buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Which I showed exists in the sutras such as the Lotus and so on, not merely in the Maitreya corpus.

The criticism of Hinayanist nirvana-as-total-cessation is present in Mahāyāna everywhere.

Astus said:

Once buddhas got the same active position as bodhisattvas, the goal has moved to attaining buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

Since when were Buddhas ever inactive in Mahāyāna?

Astus said:

Then almost everyone started to regard the bodhisattva path too long and arduous and various means to attain buddhahood swiftly occurred.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not what happened at all. No matter which Mahāyāna path one follows, one still has to gather the two accumulations via the bodhisattva path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 15th, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: the lesser yogi and the greater yogi

Content:

Astus said:

So, the chapter actually tells us that on the one hand the Buddha eternally abides in no birth, that is the ultimate reality that can be seen by anyone who practises correctly. On the other hand, the longevity is the result of the merit from the bodhisattva cultivation that eventually expires. Or, the two sides actually stand for the same, that is, suchness as the Buddha's true nature.

Malcolm wrote:

What is nirvana actually? It is the cessation of afflictions that cause rebirth in the three realms.

Since the merit cultivated on the bodhisattva path is limitless, its effects will be limitless. Or are you saying there is some limit to objectless dedications and so on that is not mentioned in the sūtras.

In short, it is very clear that in Mahāyāna the nirvana enjoyed by the Buddha does not entail the absolute cessation of his continuum. Further, there are the five certainties of the Sambhogakāya, and in terms of the two rūpakāya, the Sambhogakāya is definitive, whereas the nirmanakāya shows up here and there like the illusion of an illusionist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 14th, 2014 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Which Buddhist tradition has treated women the best?

Content:

rory said:

So are any women the heads or hold top positions in either Sakya or Nyingma. I pointed out that in modern Japan there is equal opportunity at the entry running a temple level, but once it comes to top power positions, it's all male.

Malcolm wrote:

HE Jetsun Kusho is the most senior woman in Tibetan Buddhism.

rory said:

H.E. Sakya Jetsun Chimey Luding Rinpoche, the highest and most thoroughly trained female Buddhist teacher in the West, was born into the Drolma Podrang, or Tara Palace of the Sakya Khon family in 1938, the year of the earth tiger. She began her dharma studies at the age of five. His Holiness Sakya Trizin was born when she was six years old. According to the tradition in her family, she took novice ordination when she was "old enough to scare crows away" at the age of seven. When she was ten years old, she made her first retreat. She meditated on the form of Vajrapani known as Bhutadamara, and in one month completed one million recitations of the short mantra, HUM VAJRA PHAT, and one hundred thousand recitations of the long mantra. In her eleventh year, her father, Kunga Rinchen, sent her on her first teaching assignment. She spent the fourth through the tenth Tibetan months among the nomads on the northern plains of Tibet, giving transmissions and teachings on Phowa, or transference of consciousness, as well as conducting tormas offerings, performing lhasang, or incense offerings, and giving other teachings and empowerments. The third woman in the history of Tibet to have transmitted the Lam Dre (the Path and Fruit) teachings, a fully accomplished guru and lineage holder, she is known for her teachings on Vajrayogini and is considered an emanation of that yidam of enlightened feminine energy.

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.sakya-retreat.net/sakya_he.html

There are very few Sakya lineage holders. She is one of them. Her younger brother has two sons, her own son and brother, as well as her brother in law, of her cousin, HH Dagchen Rinpoche, and a couple of the grandchildren are the others.

Of course she has no say or interest in the monastic community, because she is a layperson. She has been acting as a lineage holder in the Sakya school since she was a teenager and gave the Lamdre teachings at Sakya.

The Sakyas have always trained promising young women to be lineage holders. There have been many such women in the history of the Sakya School right down to Drogmi Lotsawa's own disciples in the 11th century.

There is the Shugseb lineage. This is a women's lineage connected with the Longchen Nyinthing once headed by Shugseb Jetsunma:

She was nominally connected with the Drugpa Kagyus, but Shugseb is considered an independent lineage.

rory said:

She founded the Shugseb nunnery, which is South west of Lhasa. There she established a firm body of disciples, lineage of teachings. She also encouraged the women to become ordained and be accomplished and mastered in Dzogchen realization. Her firm and main seat Shugseb and its nuns became a great example for all the female practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.drukpa-nuns.org/index.php/shugseb-jetsun>

There is also Khandro Rinpoche:

rory said:

Her Eminence Mindrolling Jetsün Khandro Rinpoche was born as the eldest daughter of Kyabje Mindrolling Trichen Gyurme Künzang Wangyal, the 11th throne holder of the renowned Mindrolling lineage, one of the six main Nyingma lineages of Tibetan Buddhism. Throughout its history, some of the greatest masters of their time have been born within the Mindrolling lineage including the unique lineage of female masters known as the Jetsünma line, a remarkable Mindrolling tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.khandrorinpoche.org/jetsun-khandro-rinpoche/biography/>

There are others too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 14th, 2014 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"History" is a uniquely western concept.

daverupa said:

Reams of Chinese texts demonstrate the opposite.

It is pretty useless for understanding Buddhadharma.

History is addressed by all who approach the Buddhadharma; there are various approaches to history, however, a text-critical approach being one. The Mahayana approach is different; but, history is not Western, and narratives about the past permeate Mahayana, put to great effect. It is hardly without use here.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that accounts of the past ineluctably fix facts in time in a material way is based on a uniquely Western point of view. That perspective really is not found in Indian and Tibetan thinking. I can't speak to Chinese culture, but I rather doubt it. Annals are not history, in the way in which we now understand the term and use it. When we say something is "historical", we mean that "it happened just that way."

Text critical approaches don't tell us nearly as much you imagine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 14th, 2014 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

daverupa said:

Instead of seeing texts as historical documents with a context in the spread and development of Buddhism from the historical Buddha, Mahayana takes the texts as factually describing a trans-historical source that encapsulates the historical Buddha within a different context that relativizes history into a broader cosmological scheme.

Malcolm wrote:

"History" is a uniquely western concept. It is pretty useless for understanding Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 14th, 2014 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Which Buddhist tradition has treated women the best?

Content:

Tenso said:

My vote for the most pro woman tradition in Buddhism will go to Japanese PL. I'm reminded of the story when Honen encounters a hooker and teaches her the path of nembutsu who then goes on to dedicate her life to it and attains birth. And this was also in ancient samurai Japan when women had zero rights. Is there any other tradition that can beat that?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, Yeshe Tsogyal being raped by bandits and converting them to Dharma in the process. The number of realized women and women lineage holders in Tibetan Buddhism far outstrips any other tradition.

Loren said:

Nyingma or all the traditions?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know about Gelug or Kagyu, but there have been many outstanding women masters in both Sakya and Nyingma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 13th, 2014 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Which Buddhist tradition has treated women the best?

Content:

Tenso said:

My vote for the most pro woman tradition in Buddhism will go to Japanese PL. I'm reminded of the story when Honen encounters a hooker and teaches her the path of nembutsu who then goes on to dedicate her life to it and attains birth. And this was also in ancient samurai Japan when women had zero rights. Is there any other tradition that can beat that?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, Yeshe Tsogyal being raped by bandits and converting them to Dharma in the process. The number of realized women and women lineage holders in Tibetan Buddhism far outstrips any other tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 13th, 2014 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: No one will be turned away

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I imagine this is because when Khenpo Jigphun came here 1993, he returned to Tibetan with more than \$80,000 and some people criticized him heavily for this.

dzogchungpa said:

I find that kind of strange, it's not even that much money. Was he criticized for being overly aggressive in soliciting offerings or what?

Malcolm wrote:

He was criticized for coming here just to raise funds. Khenpo Jigphun wound up being the target of a lot of misplaced jealousy in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 13th, 2014 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Why is Oral Sex Considered Sexual Misconduct?

Content:

WuMing said:

I think all of the Tibetan Buddhist schools regard oral and anal sex as inappropriate. This goes back to the Indian Buddhist tradition, e.g. the Abhidharmakosha (not entirely sure anymore about that text), or Ashvaghosha and Atisha. In Tibet one finds it in Gampopa's Jewel Ornament of Liberation which is the Kagyu tradition. In Patrul Rinpoche's book Words of my perfect teacher one can find it as well (Nyingma).

The reason might be that having sex using these inappropriate body parts (mouth or the anus) can only come from desire.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it has more to do with hygiene. Tulku Urgyen was once heard to remark "Why would anyone want to put their mouth there?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 13th, 2014 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Furthermore, if what you say is the case, how do can you reconcile that with the fact that Śakamuni Buddha in fact attained Buddhahood eons and eons ago?

Astus said:

And the Nirvana Sutra has a similar chapter as well on the Buddha's adamant body. I don't see why there is a need for reconciliation. It is one of the first examples of transferring the eternal dharmakaya to an eternally active buddha, although it still says that Shakyamuni never goes extinct (nirvana), that is, it is either this shore or the other.

Malcolm wrote:

However, you grandly claimed a few posts ago that non-abiding nirvana was a "late" development. But we see here that the Buddha taught it. So?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 13th, 2014 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Such teachings as this are the basis for the term "non-abiding nirvana."

Astus said:

No question about that, that from one developed the other. My point is rather that first it was the bodhisattva that was perceived as a being possessing the active force to stay in samsara, while buddhas eventually attained parinirvana, although before that they did teach and were superior to bodhisattvas. The Mahaprajnaparamitasutra says that once a bodhisattva attained irreversibility, he has a choice whether to stay with beings until the end or go for buddhahood. However, if buddhas were superior and could have also stayed with beings, then choosing to remain a bodhisattva is indeed pointless. Nevertheless, Mahayana has a number of such bodhisattvas who intentionally stick around, although interestingly (or logically) some of them are regarded as buddhas in Vajrayana (e.g. Chenrezig and Kuntuzangpo).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Astus, I understood your point and dispute that this is the case.

The shift in bodhicittas account for this. Furthermore, if what you say is the case, how do can you reconcile that with the fact that Śakamuni Buddha in fact attained Buddhahood eons and eons ago? Doesn't the Saddharmapundarika say in fact:
Inconceivable tens of billions of eons ago
which cannot be measured,
I attained supreme awakening,
and I have also been explaining the Dharma...
I have demonstrated nirvana,
describing the method in order to tame sentient beings,
but at that time I never passed into nirvana,
but have been teaching Dharma here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 13th, 2014 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very rash assertion — you are posting the opinion of one modern scholar as a fact when he himself in the very quote you cite is clearly guessing. This exemplifies exactly what is wrong with modern Buddhology.

Astus said:

I don't see how it is incorrect what the quote says. Can you find the term in a PP sutra or early Madhyamaka? Just did a quick search for it (無住涅槃) in the Great PP Sutra (大般若波羅蜜多經) and no match. Then I continued and found the followings (Taisho volume, number of texts): 16 (2), 18 (2), 19 (7), 20 (4), 25 (3), 26 (2), 30 (1), 31 (8), 32 (3), 33 (5), 34 (2), 35 (2), 36 (1), 38 (1), 39 (3), 40 (5), 42 (2), 43 (3), 44 (2), 45 (4), 46 (1), 48 (1). Here's a guide to what the various volumes contain:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taish%C5%8D_Tripitaka.

Malcolm wrote:

The term is mentioned in the Mahāyānaprasādaprabhāvana

The Āryaśālistambaka-mahāyānasūtraṭīkā by Nāgārjuna, preserved in the bstan 'gyur mentions it twice.

In any case, let us suppose that the technical term "non-abiding nirvana" is first found in the Maitreyan corpus. It is irrelevant that term is not found Madhyamaka since the treatises of Nāgārjuna are almost wholly focused on faults concerning the view and at this time notion of the Buddha having achieved Buddhahood in the distant past. In the perfection of wisdom sutras and so on the idea of the dharmakāya manifesting an illusory form body to help sentient beings is fully present. For example the PP in 8000 lines states:

The Tathāgata is not seen in the rupakāya. The Tathāgata the dharmatākaya. Son of a good family, dharmatā does not come or go. Son of a good family, likewise, the Tathāgata does not arrive or leave. Son of a good family, for example, an illusionist's host of elephants, horses, chariots or infantry soldiers do not come or go. Son of a good family, in the same way the form of the Tathāgata does not come or go. Such teachings as this are the basis for the term "non-abiding nirvana."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 12th, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Soap-Bubble said:

P.S. One nice argument here was connected to thodgal and how mandalas and deities spontaneously manifest.

Malcolm wrote:

They do not spontaneously manifest — they manifest only with great effort, diligence and understanding. If they spontaneously manifested everyone would see them all the time and without any causes or condition and without any progression or order. But this does not happen, which is why the visions are laid in the order that they are.

Likewise, one only moves through the following progression, first one can see the nirmanakāya, then the sambhogakāya and in the end, dharmakāya -- this is the same whether one is a common Mahāyāna practitioner or a Dzogchen practitioner. The path of Dzogchen is not in reality something other than a Mahāyāna path. It is a Mahāyāna path practiced according to techniques and methods not shared with common Mahāyāna, and so therefore is part of secret mantra, as Dzogchen tantras proclaim again and again. There is no Dzogchen outside of Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 12th, 2014 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: No one will be turned away

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Interesting.

I just received a Vajrakīlaya empowerment from Khenpo Sodargye and at the end it was announced that he had taken a vow not to receive any offerings on his tour of the States, so no offerings were made.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I imagine this is because when Khenpo Jigphun came here 1993, he returned to Tibetan with more than \$80,000 and some people criticized him heavily for this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 12th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Astus said:

As I have posted above, the option for non-abiding nirvana (and the trikaya doctrine) is a somewhat later development.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very rash assertion — you are posting the opinion of one modern scholar as a fact when he himself in the very quote you cite is clearly guessing. This exemplifies exactly what is wrong with modern Buddhology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 12th, 2014 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The reality is that there are three different kinds of bodhisattva motivations spoken of in the sūtras, king-like, captain-like and shepherd-like. There really is no evidence to suppose that the shepherd-like motivation existed first, and the other two were taught

later. The way this is taught in the Mahāyāna itself is that the King-like bodhicitta is for those with average capacity, with the shepherd-like motivation being for those of best capacity.

Astus said:

My knowledge is limited, but I have not yet encountered those three kinds of motivations in East Asian Buddhism, only Tibetan. Could you specify in what sutras, or even shastras (preferably those already translated to English) it is explained?

Malcolm wrote:

They are nicknames for the bodhicittas respectively of the path of accumulation, the seventh bhumi and the eighth as presented in the Sutra-alamkara.

They are very commonly discussed in Tibetan Literature, and the nicknames seem to originate with Gampopa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN himself has said many times there is no such thing as "pure Dzogchen."

Soap-Bubble said:

I was making a distinction between the simplified body of practices and the state. Which one do you think ChNN refers to?

Malcolm wrote:

Even the "state", whatever you mean by that, is not "pure" Dzogchen. Buddhahood might be "pure" Dzogchen.

But as long as we are on a path, our Dzogchen is not "pure."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Soap-Bubble said:

I believe that this tendency of "pure dzogchen"

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN himself has said many times there is no such thing as "pure Dzogchen."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

the motivation of the bodhisattva path is infinitely superior to the motivation to become an arhat

Astus said:

By "bodhisattva career" I meant the aeons of walking the path and even delaying buddhahood intentionally. There is a difference between how buddhahood is interpreted in early and late Mahayana, and it is early Mahayana that focused on becoming a bodhisattva, while late Mahayana is focused on attaining buddhahood as soon as possible.

Malcolm wrote:

If you accept that there is such a thing as an "early" or "late" Mahāyāna, I imagine you could contrive such an explanation. The reality is that there are three different kinds of bodhisattva motivations spoken of in the sūtras, king-like, captain-like and shepherd-like. There really is no evidence to suppose that the shepherd-like motivation existed first, and the other two were taught later. The way this is taught in the Mahāyāna itself is that the King-like bodhicitta is for those with average capacity, with the shepherd-like motivation being for those of best capacity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: No one will be turned away

Content:

Ayu said:

If somebody has deep devotion s/he should not be forced to say: "I cannot attend the teaching, because it is too expensive."

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand people do forget that Milarepa had to say just that....and more than once.

Sherlock said:

He paid with his labour.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't you remember the episode where he had no money to give Marpa, and Dagmema gave him a piece of turquoise for the fee? When Marpa found out he was livid and threw Milarepa out.

The of course there is the famous examples of Drogmi and Rwa. They both had set fees for teachings, this much for the empowerment, this much for the intimate instruction,

this much for the sadhana explanation and so on. In Tibet, prior to the institutionalization of Vajrayāna lineages, the habits of gurus were to set fees. Don't you recall that Longchenpa was depressed he could not attend the Vima Nyinthig empowerment given by Kumararaja? So Kumararaja secretly gave him the empowerment fee so he could attend. The Dorje Gotrab root text specifies it should not be given to anyone who does not fork over gold. ChNN joked about this, when he first gave the lung for the whole text.

After Vajrayāna was institutionalized then it became common for teachings like the Nyingthig Yazhi, Lamdre and so on to be freely given. But even here, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa stated that while he was able to attend the Rinchen Terzod for free, he never received any instructions on the practices it contained because he could not afford to pay for them. So the perception that Dharma was free or sponsored in Tibet is somewhat true, and also somewhat false. It is more complicated than most people realize.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: No one will be turned away

Content:

Ayu said:

If somebody has deep devotion s/he should not be forced to say: "I cannot attend the teaching, because it is too expensive."

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand people do forget that Milarepa had to say just that....and more than once.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Which Buddhist tradition has treated women the best?

Content:

Dan74 said:

In Tonga I'm told, every (extended) family used to have a matriarch, typically an old unmarried aunt, who would be consulted on all important decisions and mediate in all the disputes. But the Christian missionaries saw an end to such a prominent role for women. Hooray for Western civilisation!

Malcolm wrote:

This is actually how things are in Tibet. The brother's sister wields all the matriarchal power.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

it makes them the Sravaka vehicle. I shouldn't need to defend that notion on this forum.

Astus said:

That's right, sravakas are important. If one can save oneself, that's already great. I think that those of us exposed to Mahayana teachings (sutra and tantra) can be a little fooled by the rhetoric about how superior the bodhisattvayana is. Although here I might add that the majority of popular Mahayana lineages don't emphasise the bodhisattva career, instead they promise buddhahood in this life or the next.

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose of becoming a buddha is to help others. The purpose of becoming an arhat is to help yourself. There is nothing wrong with the latter, but it cannot be compared with the former. Therefore, whether one attains buddhahood in this life, the next left, or in three incalculable eons, the motivation of the bodhisattva path is infinitely superior to the motivation to become an arhat.

Further, the bodhisattva path is emphasized in Vajrayāna, without bodhisattva motivation is not possible to attain buddhahood. Quite frankly, of all the Mahāyāna traditions out there today, Tibetan Buddhism emphasizes bodhicitta the most.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

daverupa said:

I don't seek to have the Mahayana view defended, but I do want it clearly stated.

The foundation isn't just Nikayas/Agamas, it's Agamas + certain other Mahayana texts that are the actual baseline foundation. The claim about Ni/Ag being the foundation snagged my mind a bit as it passed because saying that they are foundational is incomplete, and thus inaccurate: the practical foundation employed by Mahayana folk necessarily encompasses more than that (as does Theravada, but in quite different ways).

So, the picture I see emerging from this discussion is that the e.g. Agamas aren't foundational on their own, they are incorporated with other texts which then as a group comprise the practical Mahayana foundation. Thus, Early Buddhism forms part of the foundation for both, and other things make up the remainder of the textual mass in each case.

Malcolm wrote:

The whole edifice of the Buddha's teaching in the Agamas are the foundation for Mahāyāna. It does not mean that there are no teachings in the Agamas that are regarded as contextual/provisional, to be applied or not as the situation may warrant it. The same is the case with the relationship between Mahāyāna and Secret Mantra — the whole of Mahāyāna and the Agamas are the foundation upon which Secret Mantra rests, but this does not mean that there are no teachings in the Agamas and Vaipulya sūtras that are regarded as contextual/provisional to be applied or not as the situation may warrant it. For example, the 37 bodhipakṣadharmas, found in the Agamas and Vaipulya sūtras, are also found in Tantras. Mandalas are, from one point of view, little more than exercises in reciting various parts of Abhidharma in the form of deities.

One way to look at it is that the Agamas are the milk, the Vaipulya sūtras are the cream, and the Tantras are the butter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I think you misunderstood the "foundation" bit.

daverupa said:

Can you expand? Malcolm says, at least in cases of Vinaya, that this foundation is to be superseded as necessary.

Malcolm wrote:

I was specifically referring to personal liberation vows and where they are contradicted by bodhisattva vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I would hazard an answer by saying that things exist in a findable way in the sense that one can perceive appearances, but not further. I say this based on my own understanding of Acariya Dhammapha's subcommentary on the Atthasalini in which he says that there is nothing apart from the properties of a dhamma.

Malcolm wrote:

These properties, I assume he is using the lakṣhana (Skt. Lakṣana) are precisely the kind of realism criticized by the Buddha in Mahāyāna as dharmātman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Bakmoon said:

My point is that it is misleading to say that the Mahayana path is not a part of the Theravada tradition because many people would understand that to mean that the Theravada tradition doesn't have a set of Bodhisattva teachings rather than understanding it to mean that the Bodhisattva path as presented in the Theravada tradition is different from the Mahayana teachings on the same.

Malcolm wrote:

The Mahāyāna path is not part of the tradition of Theravada. Theravada may have teachings on the path of the bodhisattva, but they are not commensurate with the teachings on the bodhisattva in Mahāyāna in anyway.

For example, in Theravada bodhisattvas are barred from stream entry, in Mahāyāna they can achieve streamentry, and so on, the list of differences is endless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I thought that it is the position of Je Tsongkhapa that the object of negation is only intrinsic existence and not mere existence. I understand that outside of Gelugpa this position is seen as non-standard, but I think it's a bit harsh to say that saying that phenomena merely exist is a rejection of the emptiness of phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you understand what "mere existence" means?

Bakmoon said:

I can't give a perfect definition of it, but from looking at how the term is used in the context of Je Tsongkhapa's writings I take it to mean that it is a conventional kind of existence different from intrinsic existence and is not findable under rational analysis.

Malcolm wrote:

Is any kind of existence findable from the perspective of Theravada teachings?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not all of a piece.

When we examine the purpose of merit accumulation, we can ascertain the differences.

There are significant differences between how the bodhisattva path is understood by the Nikaya schools and how it is understood in Mahāyāna.

Devotionalism in Mahāyāna and the Śrāvaka schools is not a path, as it is Vajrayāna.

Bakmoon said:

I agree.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna bodhicitta simply does not exist in the Agamas, nor does the Mahāyāna path.

Bakmoon said:

That's true of the main body of the Four Nikayas for example, but the Bodhisattva path is talked about somewhat in the latter portions of the Khuddaka Nikaya in the Jatakas, Cariyapitika, and the Buddhavamsa, and it is talked about in more detail in the classical commentaries, both on these texts, and in several commentaries on the main Suttas such as in the commentary on the Samannaphala Sutta and the Ghatikara Sutta.

Bodhicitta isn't specifically identified under a single name and doctrine, but I think the concept is there in the commentaries. For example, Acarya Dhammapala in his commentary on the Cariyapitika writes:

The aspiration, made by one endowed with these eight factors, is in denotation the act of consciousness (cittuppaada) occurring together with the collection of these eight factors. Its characteristic is rightly resolving to attain the supreme enlightenment. Its function is to yearn, "Oh, may I awaken to the supreme perfect enlightenment, and bring well-being and happiness to all beings!" It is manifest as the root-cause for the requisites of enlightenment. Its proximate cause is great compassion, or the achievement of the necessary supporting conditions. Since it has as its object the inconceivable plane of the Buddhas and the welfare of the whole immeasurable world of beings, it should be seen as the loftiest, most sublime and exalted distinction of merit, endowed with immeasurable potency, the root-cause of all the qualities issuing in Buddhahood. Simultaneous with its arising, the Great Man enters upon the practice of the vehicle to great enlightenment (mahaabodhiyaanapa.tipatti). He becomes fixed in his destiny, irreversible, and therefore properly gains the designation "bodhisattva." His mind becomes fully devoted to the supreme enlightenment in its completeness, and his capacity to fulfill the training in the requisites of enlightenment becomes established. For when their aspiration succeeds, the Great Men correctly investigate all the paaramiis with their self-evolved knowledge which prefigures their future attainment of

omniscience. Then they undertake their practice, and fulfill them in due order, as was done by the wise Sumedha when he made his great aspiration.

Like the aspiration, great compassion (mahaakaru.naa) and skillful means (upaayakosalla) are also conditions for the paaramiis. Therein, "skillful means" is the wisdom which transforms giving (and the other nine virtues) into requisites of enlightenment. Through their great compassion and skillful means, the Great Men devote themselves to working uninterruptedly for the welfare of others without any concern for their own happiness and without any fear of the extremely difficult course of conduct that great bodhisattvas must follow. And their nature is such that they are able to promote the welfare and happiness of beings even on occasions when they are merely seen, heard of, or recollected, (since even the sight, report, or thought of them) inspires confidence. Through his wisdom the bodhisattva perfects within himself the character of a Buddha, through his compassion the ability to perform the work of a Buddha. Through wisdom he brings himself across (the stream of becoming), through compassion he leads others across. Through wisdom he understands the suffering of others, through compassion he strives to alleviate their suffering. Through wisdom he becomes disenchanted with suffering, through compassion he accepts suffering. Through wisdom he aspires for nibbaana, through compassion he remains in the round of existence. Through compassion he enters sa.msaara, through wisdom he does not delight in it. Through wisdom he destroys all attachments, but because his wisdom is accompanied by compassion he never desists from activity that benefits others. Through compassion he shakes with sympathy for all, but because his compassion is accompanied by wisdom his mind is unattached. Through wisdom he is free from "I-making" and "mine-making," through compassion he is free from lethargy and depression.

There is also a passage from the Buddhavamsa which describes how the Buddha in his previous incarnation as Sumedha took the Bodhisattva vow, but I'll have to take some time to find the passage.

Malcolm wrote:

Such discussions also exist amongst the Sarvastivadins, for example the Abhidharmakosha discusses the career of the bodhisattva. But this is really not the same as the Buddha's teaching on the bodhisattva path in Mahāyāna. For one, the concept of an awakened bodhisattva is never found in any Theravada texts at all.

Not only that, but unlike the śravaka schools, in Mahāyāna there are specific rites to undertake bodhisattva vows and commitments to which one must adhere. In other words there is a Bodhisattva vinaya that is distinct from the śravaka vinaya and supercedes where the former contradicts the latter. It is probable that śravaka understanding the bodhisattva path was influenced by Mahāyāna sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I thought that it is the position of Je Tsongkhapa that the object of negation is only intrinsic existence and not mere existence. I understand that outside of Gelugpa this position is seen as non-standard, but I think it's a bit harsh to say that saying that phenomena merely exist is a rejection of the emptiness of phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you understand what "mere existence" means?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 11th, 2014 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Best Yidams to Remove Obstacles

Content:

Clarence said:

Which Deity would you recommend to remove obstacles?

Many thanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on the obstacle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 10th, 2014 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... things like tathāgatagarbha, Mahāyāna bodhicitta, two-fold emptiness, gathering the two accumulations, the bodhisattva path, the nature of buddhahood and omniscience. What the Buddha taught in uncommon Mahāyāna Secret Mantra on top of the framework of common Mahāyāna is the special method to realize Buddhahood in a single lifetime.

daverupa said:

With Theravada, there's merit donations and merit-as-currency, protective charms, devotionals and venerations, the Jatakas housing Bodhisattva Path ideations alongside comparisons of Bodhisattva with Buddha... it's all of a piece, Malcolm. Theravada brings the same sort of stuff to the Agama/Nikaya table as does Mahayana, which is to say, stuff not already on the table.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not all of a piece.

When we examine the purpose of merit accumulation, we can ascertain the differences.

There are significant differences between how the bodhisattva path is understood by the Nikaya schools and how it is understood in Mahāyāna.

Devotionalism in Mahāyāna and the Śrāvaka schools is not a path, as it is Vajrayāna.

Mahāyāna bodhicitta simply does not exist in the Agamas, nor does the Mahāyāna path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 10th, 2014 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Off topic: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Not quite the same, as I believe in the Mahayana Arya Sangha is defined as people who have realized emptiness to some degree, and are on the bhumis (maybe i'd have to verify the bhumis thing) not even a thing in Theravada. Though I did not know that was the case in Theravada.

Bakmoon said:

In the Theravada the eight kinds of Ariyas refers to the Sotapanna, Sakadagamin, Anagamin, and Arahant, each divided into path and fruit. I'm not sure how this maps up with the ten Bhumi model, but in the Theravada school one must attain Nirvana in order to become a Sotapanna, which seems to line up with the path of seeing, although I'm not totally sure how the details on that work.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not line up with the ten Bhumi model because what is seen and what is abandoned by seeing differ.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 10th, 2014 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This kind of emptiness was not taught by the Buddha in the Agamas and Nikayas, but was only taught by the Buddha in Mahāyāna sūtras.

daverupa said:

This is saying that the Sravaka stuff is not a foundation; so there seems to be a disagreement on this matter among Mahayana folk?

Malcolm wrote:

The foundational teachings the Buddha provided in the Agamas/Nikayas are things like 12 links of dependent origination, the four truths of nobles, skandhas, āyatanas and dhātus, liberation from samsara and so on. What the Buddha taught in common

Mahāyāna on top of the framework provided in the Agamas and Nikayas were things like tathāgatagarbha, Mahāyāna bodhicitta, two-fold emptiness, gathering the two accumulations, the bodhisattva path, the nature of buddhahood and omniscience. What the Buddha taught in uncommon Mahāyāna Secret Mantra on top of the framework of common Mahāyāna is the special method to realize Buddhahood in a single lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 10th, 2014 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Celibacy & Enlightenment

Content:

sdw said:

Just a note: 'Lay' does not mean non-celibate, it means a person who is not ordained, or not part of the clergy, an amateur as opposed to a 'professional'. One would not refer to great Lamas such as Dud'jom Rinpoche, for example, as 'lay'.

Malcolm wrote:

One would refer to them as upāsakas, laymen. In this context, when it comes to the difference between being an upāsakaḥ as opposed to a bhikṣu or śramaṇera, the former is "lay," the latter are ordained. Thus both are clergy, but one are lay clergymen and the other are ordained clergymen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 10th, 2014 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Obviously this doesn't mean that Theravada lines up with everything in the Madhyamaka tenet system, as there are a lot of important differences in how these teachings are laid out and in particular a lot of differences in how the two truths are understood, and emptiness is explained in much more detail in Madhyamaka texts, but I do think it's fairly clear that the Theravada school (at least in its classical formulation in the commentaries as opposed to the later abhidhamma manuals) accepts the emptiness of all phenomena in addition to the emptiness of persons.

Malcolm wrote:

I am afraid you have not understood the "emptiness of phenomena" because you state: Phenomena are real in that they arise, yes, but not real in the sense of possessing intrinsic existence.

What is the emptiness of phenomena? The emptiness of phenomena is the absence of extremes in phenomena such as arising, ceasing, existence, nonexistence, permanent, impermanent and so on. This kind of emptiness was not taught by the Buddha in the Agamas and Nikayas, but was only taught by the Buddha in Mahāyāna sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 10th, 2014 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 10th, 2014 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Here's a quote from Douglas Duckworth I pulled from the Nirvana wiki:

The Lesser Vehicle does not result in the practitioner becoming a complete buddha; rather, the aim is to achieve a personal nirvana that is the total extinction of existence.

The Great Vehicle, however, does result in becoming a complete buddha. A buddha remains actively engaged in enlightened activity to liberate beings for as long as samsara remains. Thus, those who accomplish the Great Vehicle do not abide in samsara due to their wisdom that sees its empty, illusory nature. Further, unlike those who attain the nirvana of the Lesser Vehicle to escape samsara, they do not abide in an isolated nirvana due to their compassion. For these reasons, in the Great Vehicle, nirvana is said to be “unlocated” or “nonabiding” (apratiṣṭhita), staying in neither samsara nor nirvana.

The above covers the big differences as I understand them, which includes the central role of Bodhicitta in full enlightenment.

Kasina said:

Fascinating.

Within Theravada, criticism is oft thrown at those who claim nibbana as a state outside of all existence.

What's your take on that?

Malcolm wrote:

Nonabiding Nirvana simply means that a Buddha never actually remains in the nirvana for ever, always acting on behalf of sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Sherab said:

Personally, I highly doubt that Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche intended the first interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

what I "said" originally when I started the thread was a quote from ChNNR. Why don't you respond to that?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no need to.

gad rgyangs said:

ok I'll take that as agreement with what he is saying.

Malcolm wrote:

We do not understand him the same way, hence I responded to you, but not the original citation.

In order to be a Dzogchen practitioner, rather than a Dzogchen intellectual, you must always do three things: take refuge in the Buddha, maintain ultimate bodhicitta, and dedicate your merit. This is the essence of the practice of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

he is clearly separating the "essence of the teachings" from the "culture or tradition" (buddhism) and stating that one must understand "the true meaning of a teaching through one's own culture" or you may confuse "the external form of a religious tradition and the essence of its message"

Malcolm wrote:

I am sorry, but I do not believe that he is saying that the essence of Dzogchen is separate from Buddhadharma.

gad rgyangs said:

here he is clearly saying that you do not have to be a buddhist to practice dzogchen, and to insist otherwise is "limited thinking" and can "create serious obstacles to true knowledge"

Malcolm wrote:

No, but by becoming a Dzogchen practitioner one becomes a practitioner of Buddhadharma. There is no way around this. Dzogchen is Prajñāpāramita, etc. It is not Paramshiva, Brahman, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

all you have said so far is basically "it can't be what he really thinks because it is different from what I think"

Malcolm wrote:

I haven't said anything of the sort. I have not been responding to what ChNN says, rather I am responding to what you say.

gad rgyangs said:

what I "said" originally when I started the thread was a quote from ChNNR. Why don't you respond to that?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no need to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

all you have said so far is basically "it can't be what he really thinks because it is different from what I think"

Malcolm wrote:

I haven't said anything of the sort. I have not been responding to what ChNN says, rather I am responding to what you say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

this thread being another example that even long term practitioners (gad rgyangs is one, isn't he?) either apparently fail to understand that absolutely crucial term (if mutsuk is right) or at least cannot properly express what they understand.

gad rgyangs said:

the only things I have said about rigpa are: it is an awakening. the recognition it gives is unmistakable, unshakable, and irreversible. I also said it is knowledge of our real nature or condition. I don't think any of these statements are controversial, but if any of it is unclear I would be happy to try and clarify.

Malcolm wrote:

The experience of rigpa is reversible, even if you have developed some rigpa in this life, when you die, who knows where you will end up in the next life?

Oh, sure, you can argue that the mind is not affected by any of the six realms, being inherently pure, but it is frankly stupid to claim that recognition of your state is realization. No Dzogchen tantra states that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

getting back to topic:

although i started this thread with very clear quotes of Namkhai Norbu, people are arguing with me as if they were my opinions. Go figure.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps that is because there are some people who think that you have not presented to the totality of Rinpoche's view with this citation edited from a talk translated into another language (from Italian to English) a quarter of a century ago.

gad rgyangs said:

then it should be simple for you to provide a counter-quote from a more recent publication of his in which he repudiates what he said in the quote I posted.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you are presenting this citation in its proper context, and I don't think one can encapsulate all of Rinpoche's thoughts into an internet soundbite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

And it seems there is no easy way out: can we honestly understand the world of the Tibetan metaphor without any 'fusion of horizons'?

Malcolm wrote:

Please be precise, which metaphors are you talking about? At this point people are complaining about putative unspecified abstractions. For example, I don't what metaphors you are referring to as "Tibetan metaphors".

treehuggingoctopus said:

I did mention the subject-object split, but I think you can take pretty much any term from the twilight language of Dzogchen/Tantra - rig pa, for instance, this thread being another example that even long term practitioners (gad rgyangs is one, isn't he?) either apparently fail to understand that absolutely crucial term (if mutsuk is right) or at least cannot properly express what they understand.

Or the shes pa vs rnam shes vs ye shes trio, especially when explained in terms of their English 'equivalents', i.e., awareness, consciousness and wisdom.

For a still better effect try explaining the Atiyoga section of Precious Vase to a newbie to Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to understand these terms it is simple:

shes pa is jñāta, rnam shes is vijñāna, and yeshe is jñāna, perhaps best way to to understand this is that latter two are subsets of the first, as is clearly explained in the sgra thal gyur tantra.

rig pa (vidyā, vedana) is a function of shes pa.

These are not metaphors, they are technical terms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I am saying rigpa is an awakening, which would be the same for any being anytime anywhere, "realization" as you are using it seems to be a buddhist cultural construct.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not qualifying rigpa here in any. Your statement is equivalent to saying "the mind is awakening". It is a meaningless statement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

You think rigpa means realization.

where did I say that exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

Several places above. Read your own posts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Once you recognize your real nature, there is no turning back, or rather falling back (asleep).

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you can -- this why Vimalamitra's "vidyā that apprehends characteristics" is defined as clear non-conceptual consciousness [shes pa] contaminated by many cognitions, so it is in fact very possible to turn back, fall away — people do it most of the time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, rigpa is not precisely awakening at all. This is a total misconception, and this misconception is why there are so many flakey screw ups who think they are Dzogchen masters.

gad rgyangs said:

recognition of our real condition does not make one a "Dzogchen Master", especially

since even people who have never heard of "dzogchen" or even "buddhism" have that condition, and may recognize it outside those traditions.

One cannot state that rigpa in its unripened state for example, is awakening. The whole reason that basis is called "the basis" is because it has yet to be realized, that is why it is called "the basis."

rigpa is knowledge of the basis, experientially. The rest is optional.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa is just a name for the mind — sometimes that mind knows its own state, sometimes it doesn't. When one has that kind of experience one is merely a practitioner on the path, slowly improving, applying one's understanding to the introduction.

Realization is when that knowledge is permanent and not fleeting, leading to the abandonment of the two obscurations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

mutsuk said:

I am who I am. You are just fantasizing about rigpa without a clear understanding of what it is. Rigpa is not an awakening. You are mixing plenty of levels.

gad rgyangs said:

I am speaking about awakening. If you don't like the term "rigpa" then you can call it something else, but what I am talking about is precisely what is called "rigpa" in the Dzogchen tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa is not in itself awakening. This is why "unripened vidyā" appropriates bodies for rebirth, as Vimalamitra clearly explains. Vidyā is just a name for the nature of the mind, which is why Vimalamitra describes vidyā as "knowing (rig) and clear (gsal)."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

define "realization"

Malcolm wrote:

See above: realization = rtogs pa = avabodha (awakening).

gad rgyangs said:

and rigpa is precisely awakening. The rest is gravy, take it or leave it as one wishes.

Malcolm wrote:

No, rigpa is not precisely awakening at all. This is a total misconception, and this misconception is why there are so many flakey screw ups who think they are Dzogchen masters.

One cannot state that rigpa in its unripened state for example, is awakening. The whole reason that basis is called "the basis" is because it has yet to be realized, that is why it is called "the basis."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

that (non-regressive knowledge of Buddhahood (Bodies and Wisdoms)) is precisely an example of cultural metaphor, found in India, Tibet and points east. It is also, for virtually (or actually) everyone who believes it, just a theory. If you can produce someone who fits this description, please do, I'd be most interested to speak with them.

Malcolm wrote:

So buddhahood is a cultural metaphor? Then so is rigpa and your argument then becomes entirely self-defeating.

gad rgyangs said:

nope. rigpa is a name for something that is not culturally conditioned, since it would be the same for any sentient being from any culture, not only on this planet, but anywhere in any dimension.

Malcolm wrote:

The same goes for Buddhahood. Anyway, rigpa is just a name for the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

rigpa is not an understanding, it is precisely an awakening.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the progression is introduction --> recognition --> realization, not recognition --> realization.

You are missing a step. These three steps is very precisely detailed in many Dzogchen tantras and treatises.

gad rgyangs said:
define "realization"

Malcolm wrote:

See above: realization = rtogs pa = avabodha (awakening).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:
rigpa is not an understanding, it is precisely an awakening.

mutsum said:

Then you strictly have no understanding what rig-pa is. Not one inch. Sorry to say.

gad rgyangs said:
so say you. and you are who exactly, to be telling people what they do or do not understand?

Malcolm wrote:

She is comparing what you say with what the texts say and finds your presentation inconsistent with the textual tradition, therefore, she is telling you that she thinks you have no idea what you are talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:
that is precisely an example of cultural metaphor, found in India, Tibet and points east.

mutsum said:

No it precisely is not. Bodies and Wisdoms are the way the Fruit manifests itself.

It is also, for virtually (or actually) everyone who believes it, just a theory.
It is a theory for people who do not practice. During the practice of the path, you have signs indicating that one experiences Bodies and Wisdoms, this is why Thögel is so crucial to Dzogchen. If you can produce someone who fits this description, please do, I'd be most interested to speak with them.
Yongdzin Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:
And Norbu Rinpoche.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:17 PM
Title: Re: Which Buddhist tradition has treated women the best?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Nonsense — Yeshe Tsogyal was prolific. There are many, many texts attributed to her.

Astus said:
Attributed to her as a terma? I don't consider that the same as being the actual author, although it is not negligible that she stands as an example of a female master.
This is also not so: Niguma, Sukhasiddhi, Siddhirajni, Laxminkara, etc., are just a few of the women authors whose works are prominent in Vajrayāna, who are also considered founders of lineages.
Machig is a historical person, and there is no reason to believe she did not author much of what has been attributed to her.
More recently there is Sera Khandro, Tara Lhamo and so on, twentieth century female authors.
They may be rare, but you are overstating the case by a considerable margin.
What level of use/importance do the writings (not the transmissions) of those four Indian female authors carry? What I could gather with a brief search is that the actual founder of the Shangpa Kagyu was Khyungpo Naljor, a male monk, who studied with two of the four yoginis. Don't get me wrong, I'm not saying that this is all irrelevant, but it seems to me that women had no better situation in Tibet than anywhere else. And even if there were some Indian woman siddhas, in their society they were not recognised as anyone important.

Malcolm wrote:
You are confusing institutions with lineages.

The founder of a Vajrayāna lineage is not the Tibetan who collected some Indian teachings and started an institution, but the awakened master who had the capacity to directly communicate with Vajradhara and pass that transmission along. These four women had that capacity which is why they all stand at the heads of lineages of Vajrayāna transmission.

These four women, five when including Macig, were recognized as important in their

own milieu, which is why we have their teachings and texts with us today, which are regularly cited and commented upon to the present day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

that (non-regressive knowledge of Buddhahood (Bodies and Wisdoms)) is precisely an example of cultural metaphor, found in India, Tibet and points east. It is also, for virtually (or actually) everyone who believes it, just a theory. If you can produce someone who fits this description, please do, I'd be most interested to speak with them.

Malcolm wrote:

So buddhahood is a cultural metaphor? Then so is rigpa and your argument then becomes entirely self-defeating.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

rigpa is not an understanding, it is precisely an awakening.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the progression is introduction --> recognition --> realization, not recognition --> realization.

You are missing a step. These three steps is very precisely detailed in many Dzogchen tantras and treatises.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

And it seems there is no easy way out: can we honestly understand the world of the

Tibetan metaphor without any 'fusion of horizons'?

Malcolm wrote:

Please be precise, which metaphors are you talking about? At this point people are complaining about putative unspecified abstractions. For example, I don't what metaphors you are referring to as "Tibetan metaphors".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

although i started this thread with very clear quotes of Namkhai Norbu, people are arguing with me as if they were my opinions. Go figure.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps that is because there are some people who think that you have not presented to the totality of Rinpoche's view with this citation edited from a talk translated into another language (from Italian to English) a quarter of a century ago.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

mutuk said:

This is not enough, you are mixing recognizing rigpa and realization.

gad rgyangs said:

define "realization"

Malcolm wrote:

She is saying you are confusing a shes pa, an understanding (jñatā), with a rtogs pa, an awakening (avabodha).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

It is interesting to note that this is so much a red flag topic that few people in the thread actually respond to the issues gad rgyangs pointed out in his second post...

Malcolm wrote:
It was addressed by kyle with an avalanche of nos.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 9:58 PM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?
Content:
MalaBeads said:
(who btw, I disagree with).

.

Malcolm wrote:
With what are you disagreeing?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 8:57 PM
Title: Re: Which Buddhist tradition has treated women the best?
Content:
Astus said:

As far as I'm aware, there is not one school or tradition that has a female lineage, nor is there any outstanding (or even not so outstanding) treatise by a woman author.

Malcolm wrote:
Nonsense — Yeshe Tsogyal was prolific. There are many, many texts attributed to her.

Astus said:
All the founders, thinkers and leaders are men. Some may cite here Machig Labdron, however, she is not much more than the legendary transmitter in Tibet of a practice that was only later canonised by male teachers (we are talking about women's social status here, not "religious stories of the past").

Malcolm wrote:
This is also not so: Niguma, Sukhasiddhi, Siddhirajni, Laxminkara, etc., are just a few of the women authors whose works are prominent in Vajrayāna, who are also considered founders of lineages.

Machig is a historical person, and there is no reason to believe she did not author much of what has been attributed to her.

More recently there is Sera Khandro, Tara Lhamo and so on, twentieth century female authors.

They may be rare, but you are overstating the case by a considerable margin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I would like to add a bit to what Dan74 said in terms of the Pali texts teaching the emptiness of phenomenon in addition to the emptiness of persons. One of the clearest Suttas on this subject in my opinion would be the Phena Sutta, in which the Buddha talks about the emptiness of the five aggregates:

Malcolm wrote:

The emptiness of the five aggregates is just the emptiness of the person. The emptiness of phenomena is more than that, and includes the emptiness of unconditioned dharmas and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

What ChNNR is saying is that we, as westerners, need to find ways to express with our own metaphors the essential thing that is called "dzogchen" (not the cultural tradition, but the meaning of the word "dzogchen", the natural state). We can either mine the western tradition for metaphors that are either pointing to the same thing or are at least amenable to appropriation, or invent new ones. Probably both.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is not saying that, and I have heard him explain many times when doing deity yoga, for example, we need to use the images that come to us because they are connected with transmission.

but maybe you want a yidam that looks like this:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I've got time.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, he used to give old Tibetan Lamas a hard time for not giving serious teachings to Tibetan Lay people, then he discovered that a lot of Tibetan lay people are

not interested in Dharma, just blessings. He once speculated that Garab Dorje might be the same person as Zhangzhung Garab, but now, he has abandoned that idea, etc. He used to insist that people only call him Norbu, now he pretty much insists that people use his proper title, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

it means that there is no method of experiential introduction in sutra.

Astus said:

You mean the lack of empowerment outside Vajrayana? So it's not that you disregard insight meditation, elements of what is used in Dzogchen, Mahamudra and Lamdre, is it?

Malcolm wrote:

The key difference between sutra and tantra is empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Also ChNN's own views have changed over the years, he was much less conservative when those books were edited out of talks he gave in Italian.

dzogchungpa said:

Can you be more specific about how his views have changed?

bump

Malcolm wrote:

It's too long to discuss.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Dzogchen consists of one thing essentially: recognition of the natural state/our real

condition/rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

All of Buddhadharma consists of this. Dzogchen is no different.

You are making a tempest in a teapot with this whole business of "culture", focusing on the wrong thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

because it is an intellectual based on analysis, it is not experientially equivalent with Mahāmudra and Dzogchen.

Astus said:

I think I don't fully understand what you mean here. Is it that Madhyamaka does not include experiencing emptiness, or is it that their practice results in something different than what they actually teach?

Malcolm wrote:

it means that there is no method of experiential introduction in sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Bye.wa

Content:

pemachophel said:

So is bye.wa.chu.sum, 13 times 10 million, i.e., 130 million?

Malcolm wrote:

yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As far as tregchö goes, there is really no difference between tregchö, Kagyu Mahāmudra and the meditation the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana — all three have the same point and all three depend on the experiential view imparted during

empowerment.

Astus said:

Thank you for your answers. You did not mention anything about the view reached in Madhyamaka, as I take the unity of samsara and nirvana here means Lamdre. Is that because you take it to be a purely intellectual thing, or for some other reasons?

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamaka is philosophically the same as the view of Mahāmudra and Dzogchen, but because it is an intellectual based on analysis, it is not experientially equivalent with Mahāmudra and Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 7th, 2014 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In the end, I am afraid that the Sakya master, Dezhung Ajam (a disciple of Adzom Drugpa) was right, many people who claim to be Dzogchen practitioners are like people whose bodies are separated from their heads — in other words, their "Dzogchen" is just intellectual theory. Sadly, we see many such discussions in the internet in various forums by various people that are completely ungrounded. These people, sadly, merely block their own realization. What a pity.

Clarence said:

Apologies for ignoring the rest of your excellent post at the moment but I would like to focus on this for now. Based on the above, what would you recommend people do then? Of course, do what their Lamas tell them to do but besides that? Focus on Tantric practice and forget about Dzogchen?

I am genuinely curious as your opinion holds a lot of weight to a lot of people here.

As usual, many thanks,

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a person in the DC, you should go through the precious vase, step by step and practice everything in it, even if you have no intention of pursuing SMS — then you will have a solid basis for understanding the rest of the teachings.

If you are someone following another master, do your ngondro and whatever else he or she tells you to do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 7th, 2014 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I don't see ChNNR denying in those quotes, or anywhere else, that Dzogchen first appeared within Buddhism, so I'm not sure why you are arguing as if he did?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not arguing with CHNN. I am pointing out that people often use ChNN citations to reinforce their own intellectual trips, taking them out of context, removing them from the thousands of other things he has said over the years.

Also ChNN's own views have changed over the years, he was much less conservative when those books were edited out of talks he gave in Italian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 7th, 2014 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

Astus said:

1. If Dzogchen necessarily includes teachings on the channels and such, does it mean that (a) public books on Dzogchen are actually sutra level teachings on emptiness and mindfulness, (b) whoever teaches/practises Dzogchen without deity yoga and/or togal only uses the name Great Perfection but not the real transmission, and (c) semde and longde, since they don't have togal as far as I'm aware, are not really Dzogchen or just preliminaries?

Malcolm wrote:

Some public books with the name Dzogchen in the title are just sutra level teachings on emptiness and mindfulness, but politeness restrains me from naming which ones.

Sems sde at minimum requires introduction through the so called empowerment of the potentiality of vidyā (of which there are 18 connected with the dohas of 18 ancient masters), and is part of the completion stage of Mahāyoga and Anuyoga — the bodhicitta texts do not actually give much detail on the method of practice, being mainly concerned with theory and view. So called sems sde is primarily about the basis. Because the basic texts of sems sde provide little information on how it is to be practiced, there are three different systems of Sems sde practice in Tibet, each with its own preliminaries. For example, the Nyan lugs systems of Sems sde requires the regular four uncommon foundations and so on.

Longde requires initiation into the system of Ngondzog Gyalpo, and is connected with that yidam.

Astus said:

3. If the teaching on the natural state is no different from the Prajnaparamita sutras - that is, you seem to agree to the unity of Dzogchen, Mahamudra and Madhyamaka in

terms of the ultimate view - is it your understanding that Dzogchen is a unique way because of its togal instructions and nothing else?

Malcolm wrote:

There are a number of things which make Dzogchen distinct, thögal is one, but there are others, the explanation of the generic basis is another, the specific preliminary practices related to thögal such as 'khor 'das ru shan and so on are others, and the general requirement for some kind of introduction either through the fourth empowerment of Mahāyoga, the ati yoga empowerment found in Anuyoga or the empowerment of the potentiality of vidyā.

As far as tregchö goes, there is really no difference between tregchö, Kagyu Mahāmudra and the meditation the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana — all three have the same point and all three depend on the experiential view imparted during empowerment.

I also want to point out that like the rest of Vajrayāna, Dzogchen practice, path and realization completely depends on the Guru. Guru Yoga is absolutely central to Dzogchen. Without guru yoga and devotion to a realized master, no progress at all is possible in Dzogchen, none whatsoever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 7th, 2014 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Summary of Tendai esotericism/Taimitsu

Content:

Malcolm/Claim 7 said:

As I understand his texts, he basically argues that only Mantrayāna leads to Buddhahood in this very body, a position also maintained in Tibetan Buddhism.

jake said:

Yes, Kukai does make the claim that those with sufficient capacity can be students of the Mantra vehicle and achieve Buddhahood in this very body. I assume this is your proposed definition for what makes a teaching “superior.”-see claim 2. (Though I suggest it is a problematic definition though remain open to the point it may be my [lack of] understanding that is problematic).

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that other teachings do not have this capacity, that is what Kobo Daishi is claiming, consistent with a long tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 7th, 2014 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there was an interesting post here for a few minutes that then got erased that was saying that it was not accidental, because of all the religions of this planet, only Buddhism had a basic perspective that was a fertile ground for Dzogchen to appear in. It is a very interesting question if that is the case or if other religions or philosophies could have birthed the Dzogchen view, or did in fact give rise to similar understanding? For example, is Heidegger's *Seinsfrage* a step towards Dzogchen in a western tradition? Are some of Meister Eckhart's late sermons expressing what amounts to a Dzogchen view? I don't think these are easy "yes" or "no" questions (although I expect an avalanche of "no"s any minute...)

In any case, the quotes from Namkahi Norbu are pretty clearly saying that one does not even have to be a "Buddhist" to practice Dzogchen, in which case the cultural phenomena called "Buddhism" becomes a kind of chrysalis from which Dzogchen emerges but is perhaps not needed once it does so. That is not to say that those still attached to the cultural forms have not fought, and do not fight, tooth and nail to stop the butterfly from emerging and leaving behind the casing...

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen teachings are not something found outside of Buddhadharma for the simple reason that they are a Dharma that was taught by the Buddhas no amount of intellectual posturing can change this fact. Does this mean that someone has to sign up with a card that says "Registered Buddhist" like it is a political party? No, of course not.

These days a sort of intellectual "Dzogchen" is very fashionable — but it generally arises from a misconstrual of the Dzogchen tradition divorced from the matrix in which it emerged, the religious culture of Tibet from the 9th to the 12th century. During this four centuries, Dzogchen teachings were gradually promulgated in the context of Secret Mantra. One thing that ChNN also says is that there is no such a thing as "pure Dzogchen." What he means by this is that there is no practice of Dzogchen divorced from the rest of the Buddhist path (Bonpos are just Buddhists with a differing historical narrative regarding the origins of their teachings). He also states in very plain language that the result of Sūtra, Tantra and Dzogchen are the same — the same buddhahood. He never makes this claim with regard to Christianity, Hinduism, Taoism and so on. Of course another intellectual fashion of the current day is that imagine that somehow there are teachings equivalent to Dzogchen in schools outside of Buddhadharma. This assertion is laughable. Beyond this, Dzogchen texts themselves take great pains to site their own teachings within the horizon of Buddhadharma, and outside the horizon of the teachings of this and that tīrthika school.

The only thing radical about Dzogchen in the end is that a few people might have the capacity recognize their own stated and live in that knowledge 24/7 obviating the need for any further path — but those of us who did not recognize that state and entered into delusion must labor away at our two obscurations, even though, as it is clearly stated in the Prajñāpāramitā that when we reach the final result we will realize that there was nothing to accomplish and nothing to remove all along. In the meantime however, we soldier on because while we are under the the power of karma and afflictions there is a basis of purification and a reason for purification. This is recognized also in Dzogchen

teachings, thus the reason there are so many purifications practices, purification practices for body, speech, mind and so on. The entire first chapter of the Dimension of Sound (sgra thaḥ gyur) tantra consists of nothing but purification practices, including creation stage and completion stage practices, and the entire first volume of Vimalamitra's commentary to this text consists of nothing more than elaborating all these practices in detail.

As to the notion that direct introduction is sufficient, this is a gross error of understanding. As the famed Semde master Zhigpo Dudtse points out, the only chigcharwas (instantaneous realizers) he knew of were Saraha and Lingje Repa (neither of them even Dzogchen practitioners), but that while he had sought out some other examples, he did not know of any while not ruling out the possibility that they existed. But it seems these days everyone is a chigcharwas. Further, if you are not practicing the profound teaching of thögal, one has no way of working with pure vision apart from the two stages. It is for this reason then that Tregchö is always combined with deity yoga in Dzogchen practice. As such, the practice of most so called Dzogchen practice is no different than what the Sakyapas, Gelugpas and Kagyus do, even though Nyingma sadhanas are gussied up with many fancy high sounding words. The plain reality is that most people do not have the capacity or time to practice Dzogchen in a serious way. This being the case, for example, ChNN strongly advises everyone to practice the short thun, which is an anuyoga sadhana combined with ati guruyoga. He explicitly says no one can remain in samadhi (contemplation) all the time, and so therefore, in order to do something useful, we have all these secondary practices which support samadhi, which create a container for it.

As to the importance of tradition. There is no Dzogchen without lineage. A Dzogchen book without a live transmission is like a cellphone without a battery, it won't receive any calls. Dzogchen, as ChNN says again and again, does not live in a book, it lives in the transmission between teacher and student. That transmission is oral, symbolic and experiential. All of the different methods of empowerment, elaborate and so, are all methods of communicating that knowledge orally, symbolically and experientially. That knowledge is no different than what is communicated through the four empowerments of the Sarma schools. While the four Dzogchen empowerments may be more detailed, and in some sense they may be a bit more profound in details, a beginner cannot comprehend this. Without a great deal of understanding of Vajrayāna, the teaching of Dzogchen is completely opaque.

The teaching of Dzogchen is not confined to paeans of praise about our natural state. It consists of detailed instructions about the human body, its channels, functions and so on, all of which require ripening through empowerment. If Dzogchen were only about our natural state, it would not go beyond the Prajñāpāramita sūtras.

As one of the Dzogchen tantras puts it — Mahāyoga is the ground, Anuyoga is the sky, and Atiyoga is the sun and moon which illuminates both. Dzogchen is called the pinnacle not because Mahāyoga and Anuyoga are unnecessary, but because, as Rongzom points out, it is needed for making other practices fruitful. This is not different than the Lamdre contention that the experiential view of the inseparability of samsara

and nirvana that comes from empowerment must be meditated prior to engaging in the two stages.

In the end, I am afraid that the Sakya master, Dezhung Ajam (a disciple of Adzom Drugpa) was right, many people who claim to be Dzogchen practitioners are like people whose bodies are separated from their heads — in other words, their "Dzogchen" is just intellectual theory. Sadly, we see many such discussions in the internet in various forums by various people that are completely ungrounded. These people, sadly, merely block their own realization. What a pity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 7th, 2014 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

He knew I hadn't.

Malcolm wrote:

Where is this Sakya Lama?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 7th, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

You are absolutely right. I love dharma, but somehow it is very difficult to accept that i might never have a family and become a mother, i am really sorry to bring that up.

Malcolm wrote:

Why would you never have a family or be a mother? One can be a householder and a Dharma practitioner.

quince said:

I didn't find a partner. I know one can practice and have a family, otherwise all practitioners would be monks and nuns, right?

Malcolm wrote:

I see. Well, I cannot help you with that. But if you are interested in the Dharma, it provides everything you need.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Prayer to the Dzogchen Masters

Content:

Punya said:

The asian practice of sponsoring the teachings so they are really cheap to attend is also worrisome for the same reason although I know others disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

It is very excellent if someone sponsors a teaching. This creates a lot of merit for everyone. Since this generally is not our custom in the west, however, the system of fee for service was invented. But it is not the best way.

Also the sponsorship system is loaded with potential abuse, since sponsors always get preferential treatment of one kind or another. This is true everywhere, even in Dzogchen Community.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

You are absolutely right. I love dharma, but somehow it is very difficult to accept that i might never have a family and become a mother, i am really sorry to bring that up.

Malcolm wrote:

Why would you never have a family or be a mother? One can be a householder and a Dharma practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

I haven't received any major empowerment, which is good, because I would have broken the vows many times.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you are not really qualified to do the Sakya Ngondro anyway — no wonder you are having obstacles in your practice. The Sakya Ngondro practice depends on having received the cause Hevajra Empowerment. You cannot even practice the refuge practice without this empowerment.

However, you should not feel you are not qualified to receive major empowerments. It is not hard to maintain one's vows, one does so by reciting Vajrasattva 21 times every day. There is tremendous blessing from the vows. It is better to receive them and break them, then to have never received them at all.

You can however meditate on the topics of the Three Visions, and you can do any of the other kinds of the Dharma practice such as making offering, reciting sutras like the Heart Sutra and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Powa hole in the skull and Guru Yoga

Content:

frank123 said:

Is it possible to develop Powa signs like the hole in the posterior fontanelle from practicing Dzogchen Guru yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

Ayu said:

How does spiritual practice disturb a nice & calm life? One can do it all nicely and calmly

quince said:

Well as i said ever since i started the ngondro all i have is this obstacles and this is meaningless.

Malcolm wrote:

Samsara is a bigger obstacle than Ngondro. Let me ask you as question, have you received any major empowerments such as Hevajra and the like, and if so from whom?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Summary of Tendai esotericism/Taimitsu

Content:

Queequeg said:

Ah.

I'm curious - my reading of this is that there isn't any disagreement about Kukai's views on esoteric v. exoteric paths. However, there is a question about the relative merit of the various teachings of the Buddha themselves ie. are we to read Kukai's 10 stages as asserting relative merit of the texts associated with the various states of Mind? Or does Kukai's judgment stop short of that?

Malcolm wrote:

As I understand his texts, he basically argues that only Mantrayāna leads to Buddhahood in this very body, a position also maintained in Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

Yes, why?

Malcolm wrote:

Today I just finished the rough draft of the very long commentary on the Ngondro according to the Sakya school.

I also did a Sakya ngondro. You should finish your ngondro. However, perhaps you have not done enough Vajrasattva. This commentary states that if you recite 400,000 then you really purify everything. Why? Because in the Kali Yuga, you have to do four times as many mantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Summary of Tendai esotericism/Taimitsu

Content:

Queequeg said:

Nothing much here except a comment from the peanut gallery...

I think it's possible that there's merit to both Indrajala's and Jake's views...

My reading of Kukai - in translation by Hakeda coincides with Jake's arguments. That said, based on my knowledge of medieval sectarian rhetoric, at least from the Tendai side, Kukai's 10 Stages was certainly interpreted as a judgment of the relative merit of the various sutras, with an unmistakable bias attributed in favor of the esoteric books. I'll add, though, Kukai seems to have been walking a very fine line...

I suspect that modern scholarship on Kukai may not coincide with the manner in which he was interpreted by Shingon sectarians in the past. Japanese medieval sectarianism

in general, especially when aristocratic patronage was on the line, drew out the worst in everybody. The almighty ¥ has a way of causing us to degrade ourselves... Is that better or worse than pride and attachment to one's creed? I haven't been able to parse that one out yet. (trying to lighten the mood, boys.)

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree. Kobo Daishi was clearly an advocate of the superiority of Mantrayāna.

Queequeg said:

LOL. You mind elaborating on exactly what you disagree with? So, you're saying Jake's wrong? Or that Tendai did not interpret Kukai as passing judgment. Or that you disagree with my suspicion...?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with Jake's arguments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Summary of Tendai esotericism/Taimitsu

Content:

Queequeg said:

Nothing much here except a comment from the peanut gallery...

I think its possible that there's merit to both Indrajala's and Jake's views...

My reading of Kukai - in translation by Hakeda coincides with Jake's arguments. That said, based on my knowledge of medieval sectarian rhetoric, at least from the Tendai side, Kukai's 10 Stages was certainly interpreted as a judgment of the relative merit of the various sutras, with an unmistakable bias attributed in favor of the esoteric books. I'll add, though, Kukai seems to have been walking a very fine line...

I suspect that modern scholarship on Kukai may not coincide with the manner in which he was interpreted by Shingon sectarians in the past. Japanese medieval sectarianism in general, especially when aristocratic patronage was on the line, drew out the worst in everybody. The almighty ¥ has a way of causing us to degrade ourselves... Is that better or worse than pride and attachment to one's creed? I haven't been able to parse that one out yet. (trying to lighten the mood, boys.)

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree. Kobo Daishi was clearly an advocate of the superiority of Mantrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

Ngondro is turning me upside down and no support.

But i will try taking small parts of Parting from the 4 attachments to work. Thanks for the idea.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you practicing under a Sakyapa teacher?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

I just can't do it. I can't help anyone. i don't have the strenght to even continue my own simple practice. i cant apparently purify my bad karma. my life, work is too intense busy.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, start from the beginning, four thoughts, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

It's all too complicated. And sad. Just want it all gone.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not at all complicated. Do you wish to be free of samsara and save sentient beings or not?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

If i lack devotion what could i do... I did everything that Lama told me. Do i have to struggle for lacking devotion?

Malcolm wrote:

If one lacks devotion, but there is no real fault in the teacher, then you must examine your own mind. In any event, the best thing to do is continue with your practice. You

have not finished gathering accumulations.

It is also fine if you take teachings from other qualified teachers, either in your lineage or from some other lineage.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 6th, 2014 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

Ayu said:

@Malcolm: I wrote "in my point of view". There are not only good teachers out there in this world and a little bit scepticism seems to be healthy, sometimes. I'm sorry to say that.

Malcolm wrote:

Since it is very difficult to find a perfect teacher these days, the instruction is to find one whose qualities outweigh their faults by a large margin. This is not hard.

As long as one chooses one's teachers with reasonable care, then the fault of lack of devotion can only come from one's own side.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Lama and trust

Content:

quince said:

Hi, i was wondering how much you seek the advise of your Lama? I mean do you ask him for advice for your personal life not related to dharma practice?

Also, did somebody here doubted their Lama judging by the condition of sangha members around you?

Do you think faith is possible without trust? Can one change Lama in the middle of ngondro? Anyway i dont see him anymore he would hardly remember me. He closed our center here. Wouldnt be a big deal to change, would it?

I would really appreciate your input. I dont trust my Lama anymore and i cant continue with ngondro and i still have mandala offering and Guru yoga to do. Stopping practice feels very bad, but i just cant force myself to continue. Cant stop neither. Please advice.

Ayu said:

In my point of view my ngöndro is not only connected with the lama but also especially with the Buddhas. It is possible to "change" the teacher and also to have more than one lama.

And it is quite good to continue a practice when hindrances occur - if it is really dharma practice.

(Edit:) And however it is possible. On the other hand dharma practice should not be a stress.

Malcolm wrote:

One's gurus is the only connection with the Buddhas one has, therefore they are even more kind the Buddhas.

However, there is an instruction by the founder of the Jonang monastery, Chöje Kunpang: "Sometimes, one meditates on a Guru in whom one has no faith, dissolve all gurus in whom one has faith into him. Sometimes, one meditates on a Guru in whom one has faith, dissolve all Guru in whom one has no faith into him. One should have the faith that all of one's Gurus are the same."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 8:27 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I am just using Kongtrul's text, as cited a few posts back, but he doesn't provide specific references to the original sources for those quotes.

In any case, I have no problem, personally, with a Three Turnings schema, even if it does not originate with the Indian texts. I rely on Rangjung Dorje, mainly, for such explications. I know there's some polemic content in Kongtrul, as well, but I have no problem with that either.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have a problem with it either, per se, but I do think it makes for some very sloppy and groundless hermeneutics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, this is just not true. It is found only in one, the Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra.

Including Nagarjuna, if I recall.
Nope. Nagārjuna wrote nothing ...

conebeckham said:

Kongtrul cites Nagarjuna's བསྟན་ཚུལ་. Which I know you'll find problematic. He also cites Aryadeva's རྣལ་འབྱོར་སྟོན་པ་བཞི་བརྒྱ་པའི་བསྟན་བཅས།

Malcolm wrote:

Cites it how? It is well known that some consider the dharmadhatustava to be a "third turning" text but there is no internal evidence in the text itself to presume that this is so. The 400 only has one mention of the word 'khor lo, and it refers to a fire wheel. I would really need to see the citations in question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

lorem said:

Just the whole idea of the three turnings is pretty central to everything I've ever been taught.

Malcolm wrote:

It is important to the Nyingmapas and the Kagyus. It is not important at all to the Sakyapas since early on the Sakyapas have found the whole idea of the interpretation of the three turnings as being applicable to different phases of the Buddha's teaching career in clear contradiction with statements by Maitreya and so on as well as with reason. I am not sure whether the Gelugpas pay it much mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Enthogens: Intoxicants?

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

Well, we might all be kidding ourselves into believing all sorts of things. For instance, who is to say that you have not merely been deluded into believing your own opinion? This polemic could be rallied against anybody without getting us anywhere. I still do not agree with you.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that I am following the opinion of the Buddha, while you are merely following your own intellectual fabrications.

Concordiadiscordi said:

Hmmm... whatever puts you to sleep at night...

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you know very well you cannot produce even a single statement by the Buddha where he extols the value of any kind of drug for the path. However, he uses people who use datura frequently as examples of delusion.

Now, given that this is a Buddhist website, it should be obvious to you that even people who have a lot of experience with various kinds of drugs are most likely to flat out disagree with you about the usefulness of drugs on a Buddhist path.

As far as the broad majority of people here are concerned your point of view about this topic is confusion steeped in ignorance wrapped in conceit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Enthogens: Intoxicants?

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

Well, we might all be kidding ourselves into believing all sorts of things. For instance, who is to say that you have not merely been deluded into believing your own opinion? This polemic could be rallied against anybody without getting us anywhere. I still do not agree with you.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that I am following the opinion of the Buddha, while you are merely following your own intellectual fabrications.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Enthogens: Intoxicants?

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

I don't agree with your assessment, Malcolm.

All paths are equally boundless and inexhaustible, but one can only see so far as the eye of one's practice will permit. Hence, it is not necessarily the case that entheogens promise little more than a dead end for Buddhist practitioners; rather, you have merely ceased to recognise their potential relevance for your practice.

Malcolm wrote:

You can disagree if you like, but I have met a lot of drug addled people who are just kidding themselves into believing they are practitioners of anything that resembles the

path of the Buddhas.

The belief that taking drugs is part of the path of awakening is deeply rooted in ignorance. People who persist in this belief are most ignorant of the ignorant and are truly likely to take rebirth in the animal realm, at best.

Now, if you are a practitioner who occasionally trips for fun, but understands this as merely a distraction, well, then there is no real problem as long as you don't hurt anyone.

Of course, habitually taking drugs is definitely a violation of the vow against being intoxicated — there is simply no way around it.

Whatever is meditated with confusion
causes the attainment of confusion by the confused.
— Jñānasiddhi by Indrabhūti

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

lorem said:

Seems like something to ask someone like Karma Thinley Rinpoche or another Tibetan. I bet you could have an interesting talk with them about it.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans rarely study these things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is not an assignation of sutras, nor does it belie my general point, which is that this sutra, the Saṃdhinirmocana merely clarifies that the second turning because it was a subject dispute.

conebeckham said:

Fair enough, but the "Three Turnings" notion is supported in several original Indian source texts.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, this is just not true. It is found only in one, the Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra.

conebeckham said:

Including Nagarjuna, if I recall.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Nagārjuna wrote nothing about it.

conebeckham said:

But it seemed you questioned the entire "Three Turnings" Scheme....

Malcolm wrote:

I do, because there is nothing substantive about it at all in Indian texts. It is only mentioned once in the entire Yogacarabhūmi. Other than that, the Yogacarins totally ignore it.

The Indians really did not discuss the issue of the three turnings at all, especially not the Indians you would most expect, namely the Yogacara authors, Maitreya, Asanga, Vasubandhu, etc. Not even the later Yogacara authors bring it up.

The only sustained discussion of the issue is the massive commentary on the Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra preserved in the bstan 'gyur by the Korean master Wen Tshegs (Wönch'ūk, 613-696). He starts his text saying:

The sovereign of Dharma taught the wheel of Dharma in three aspects. The first of those was turned in the Deer Park in Varanasi for those who were devoted to the śrāvakayāna, and the causes and results of nirvāṇa were fully taught. This is the Dharmawheel of the four noble truths.

The second was the teaching of the Ārya Prajñāpāramitā in sixteen gatherings such as Vulture Peak and so on to those who were devoted to the Bodhisattvayāna.

The third, the teachings of the Saṃdhinirmocana sūtras and so on in pure buddhafiels such as Padmagarbha and so on and impure buddhafiels, to those devoted to all yānas, is the Dharmawheel of the Mahāyāna of the definitive meaning. This is to be known as the intention of the teaching of the doctrine of the Tathāgata.

Since there is nothing like this statement by any Indian scholar in any extant text, I must conclude that certain Tibetan scholars (whether they know it or not) rely solely on a 7th century Korean Buddhist discussion of this issue in order to justify their classification of this and that class of sūtras as definitive or provisional. But in reality these justifications cannot be made the basis of the extant Indian source texts in both sūtra and śāstra. Of course, not having studied this 1000 folio, three volume text in detail, I cannot say whether it presents Indian sources for this idea or not. But I didn't see any citations of Indian masters when during the several times I have done close words searches on the text when he discusses the three turnings.

Interestingly this text defines the Avatamsaka and the Prajñāpāramitā [under the influence of the Avatamsaka] both as part of the third turning, but it defines the Nirvāṇa Sūtra as the second turning. He further states that the second vehicle only removes imputation [vikalpana], whereas the third turning clarifies the three svabhāvas, and so on.

Given that he defines the Nirvana as second turning and provisional and given that he devotes only a single sentence to a discussion of tathāgatagarbha, I think it is safe to conclude that for Wen Tshegs, tathāgatagarbha is part of the provisional second turning. It would be interesting to understand how it is that the ten Tathāgatagarbha sūtras came to be regarded by some Tibetans as the essence of the third turning given this fact, because there is surely no evidence from Indian sources that they are to be treated as such.

See this link about Wen Tsheg's text and how it came to be translated into Tibetan:

<https://journals.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/index.php/jiabs/article/download/8793/2700>.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Enthogens: Intoxicants?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Once this is understood, then they are nothing more than recreational drugs, intoxicants.

lorem said:

For Buddhists I would say the majority yes. Other religions use them as "tools". Of course this is a Buddhist forum but to straight label something is kind of rude. My father-in-law was in Native American Church and consumed peyote pretty regularly and it was not recreational.

malcolm actually said:

Once this is understood, then they are nothing more than recreational drugs, intoxicants.

If one is a Buddhist practitioner, they are a dead end. YMMV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Enthogens: Intoxicants?

Content:

Kunzang Tobgyal said:

Hey Malcolm,

What do you think about the idea of one ayahuasca trip being the equivalent of twenty years of therapy? Do you think from a therapeutic point of view it could be helpful?

Malcolm wrote:

Not a big fan of either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 5th, 2014 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Enthogens: Intoxicants?

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

Indeed, I feel that it may be largely due to our deep entrenchment in the materialistic worldview that such ordeals as are entailed by entheogens are typically conceived of as exotic by most.

Malcolm wrote:

Having taken everything, you name it, I have ingested a lot of it (Acid, Mushrooms, buttons, DMT, Ecstasy,,etc.) entheogens only offer one insight, the mind is not an immutable entity. Once this is understood, then they are nothing more than recreational drugs, intoxicants.

If one is a Buddhist practitioner, they are a dead end. YMMV.

Shouldn't there be a great drug thread, like the rebirth and vegetarian thread?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 4th, 2014 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Sherab said:

Is example wisdom from rnal 'byor mngom sum while actual wisdom is from rang rig mngom sum?

Malcolm wrote:

No, an example wisdom is not a yogapratyakṣa, that exists in the path of seeing on up, but it is nonconceptual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 4th, 2014 at 10:08 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, when it comes to gzhan stong. However, the notion of the three turnings of the wheel and the way the sutras are divided up appear to come from the Chinese tradition via this commentary I mentioned.

In any case I am of the understanding that this presentation is not of Indian origin, but of a later Tibetan development, which is good enough for me. They need not have studied it at Nalanda for me to accept it.

This presentation, as above, is apparently a Chinese idea.

conebeckham said:

From the མདོ་སྟོན་དཀོངས་པ་པེས་པར་འགྲེལ་བའི་མདོ་:

"First, the four truths,

In the middle, the absence of characteristics,

Finally, the turning that excellently and thoroughly distinguishes [the provisional from the definitive. And the completely false from the actual and genuine.]"

Is that not an Indian text?

Malcolm wrote:

This is not an assignation of sutras, nor does it belie my general point, which is that this sutra, the Samdhinirmocana merely clarifies that the second tuning because it was a subject dispute.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 4th, 2014 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As Drogmi Lotsawa says, sūtra relies intellectual analysis, whereas Vajrayāna relies on direct perception.

Sherab said:

Can one has direct perception before reaching the path of seeing?

Malcolm wrote:

Below the path of seeing, example wisdom; above the path of seeing, actual wisdom. Both can be directly experienced. But an intellectual analysis is never an example wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 4th, 2014 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Enthogens: Intoxicants?

Content:

seeker242 said:

However, Buddhism is not like that.

Sherab Dorje said:

Or more to the point: Buddhism is not Shamanism.

lorem said:

Monday night (Dec 1) His Holiness did say that Tibetan Buddhism kept some of Bon and vice-versa. So there may be an argument for shamanistic traditions present in "Tibetan Buddhism"

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL meant things like smoke offerings, rituals like thread crosses, prayer flags, ransom rites, and so on, mundane rites for health and prosperity and harmonizing the environment. Also some Bonpo gods were converted into protectors like Dorje Legpa and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 3rd, 2014 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Sherlock said:

I think Dudjom Tersar actually has limited popularity in the culturally Tibetan areas. Longchen Nyingthig is still the most popular terma cycle across Kham, Dudjom lamas are not especially famous there.

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Tersar is wide spread in southern Tibet like Konpo, Po, Pemakod as well as Bhutan and in the exile community.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 3rd, 2014 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

you have for several years pushed this idea that the gzhan stong is the official view of the Nyingma school.

smcj said:

True. That has been, and as of this posting still is, my understanding. That could change in a couple of months when I have a chance to check in with my teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out to you, that understanding is false. For example, in the largest Nyingma Monastery in the world, Lharung Gar in Golok Sertha, Mipham's presentation is considered to be the modern representative of Nyingma view. In modern day Dzogchen monastery, both in and out of Tibet, as well as Namdrol Ling in South India, whose curriculum is studied? Khenpo Shenga's, who was totally opposed to gzhan

stong and who preferred Gorampa. So your perspective is skewed and uninformed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 3rd, 2014 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

It was meant to impugn his presentation of Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

First, you have no idea what I "meant" since you are not in my mind. So it is pretty damn rude for you to make this comment.

The term was meant to point out that his presentation not part of the main trunk of the presentation of Nyingma view (i.e. Rongzom, Longchenpa, Mipham).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 3rd, 2014 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. I have made that clear for many years. When someone practices Vajrayāna, intellectual constructs like Madhyamaka are of little use. As Drogmi Lotsawa says, sūtra relies intellectual analysis, whereas Vajrayāna relies on direct perception.

smcj said:

I am a regular poster here, and I have never heard you say that before. It is my understanding as well. The internet lends itself to discussion of Madhyamaka and such, not so much to Vajrayana perception, and so I think that there is an over emphasis on these discussions. It is a flaw of the medium.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have not been paying attention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 3rd, 2014 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Unknown said:

The term "outlier" is not an insult. I think you are getting a little hysterical about all of this.

It is a pejorative.

Malcolm wrote:
It certainly is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 3rd, 2014 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

Ngapa Yeshe Dorje was a yogi and did not care about intellectual topics like Shentong, same with KDL.

So it is possible to be a yogi and not care about Madhyamaka or Shentong, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. I have made that clear for many years. When someone practices Vajrayāna, intellectual constructs like Madhyamaka are of little use. As Drogmi Lotsawa says, sūtra relies intellectual analysis, whereas Vajrayāna relies on direct perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 3rd, 2014 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

SMCJ, you are merely demonstrating your lack of knowledge and history.

Maybe I don't know my ancient history so well. But in the more recent history, like the last 24 hours, you've called the guru to several of your gurus an outlier. How's that work? Were they mistaken when they took him to be their guru? When you do your lineage prayers, isn't he someone you pray to?

Malcolm wrote:

The term "outlier" is not an insult. I think you are getting a little hysterical about all of this. The agenda is all yours, i.e, you have for several years pushed this idea that the gzhan stong is the official view of the Nyingma school. Well, it is among one of several Madhyamaka interpretations current among Nyingmapas, but it is by no means the main one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 3rd, 2014 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Smcj, have you actually received any Dzogchen teachings before and practised them? If not why do you keep wanting to talk about Dzogchen?

smcj said:

No, I do not have a Dzogchen practice. However I am a Shentongpa, as was Dudjom R., and that perspective is regularly dismissed in these discussions, mostly due to Malcolm's conservatism. That is not what I understand to be the normal presentation among Nyingma lamas. It is his own pet project to roll back Buddhist tenets to what was accepted in ancient India. I believe people are being misled by this overly conservative agenda.

As everyone here can see, Malcolm has issues with Dudjom's presentation.

Not really. Dudjom Rinpoche is the guru of several of my gurus.

So therefore your own gurus should be outliers too, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, people tend to make up their own minds about what Madhyamaka view they are going to follow, but in general, Ngapa Yeshe Dorje was a yogi and did not care about intellectual topics like Shentong, same with KDL. Otherwise, not one of the many other Nyingma Lamas I have studied with are shentongpas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 3rd, 2014 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

That is not what I understand to be the normal presentation among Nyingma lamas.

Malcolm wrote:

Um, how many Nyingma lamas have you actually studied with?

The fact is that Nyingma monasteries tend to follow whatever Madhyamaka view is dominant in their region. Nyingmapas from Amdo like Shabkar and Jigme Lingpa in general follow Tsongkhapa's presentation, as is still the case today. Nyingmapas from Central Tibet (Mindroling and Dorje Drak) also tend to follow the Gelug presentation since these monasteries are very close to Gelug spheres of influence. Dzogchen Monastery follows Sakyapa approach since they follow Khenpo Shenga and his famous 13 treatises presentation. Phalyul tries to follow Mipham, but Mipham is very similar to Sakya. Nyingmas from Kongpo like Dudjom R, and Khathok monastery tend to follow Shentong, because a) Rigzin Tsewang Norbu was from Khatok and it was from here that he spread Shentong spread into Kagyu anyway.

SMCJ, you are merely demonstrating your lack of knowledge and history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... The Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva states:

The sugatagarbha exists intrinsically in all sentient beings. That exists just as sesame seeds are permeated with oil. Its basis — it is based on the material aggregate. It's location — it is located in the center of the heart.

Sherab said:

Since the sugatagarbha exists intrinsically in all sentient beings, and since it is based on the material aggregate, and since there exists the formless realm, therefore beings in the formless realms in reality have some kind of material or form?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the Dzogchen tradition formless realm beings are considered to have subtle material bodies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

Dudjom R. did not simply make stuff up that was not part of the tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

Did it ever occur to you that Dudjom Rinpoche is an outlier? Because in point of fact, his book is not part of the main curriculum of Nyingmapa Khenpos — it is more influential among westerners.

Lotus_Bitch said:

What texts and who's commentaries are studied in Nyingma shedras?

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily Khenpo Shenga and Mipham.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

Dudjom R. did not simply make stuff up that was not part of the tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

Did it ever occur to you that Dudjom Rinpoche is an outlier?

smcj said:

Nope. I saw how well regarded he was during his life. Plus, usually people that are called "head of the lineage" are pretty mainstream. The thought never crossed my mind that he was anything other than a standard bearer for the tradition. (At least you didn't call him a tirthika!)

Malcolm wrote:

By outlier, I mean someone whose views are not actually standard. In fact, the Nyingmapa curriculums are either developed around Mlpham or around Khen Shenga's 13 treatises.

smcj said:

As everyone here can see, Malcolm has issues with Dudjom's presentation.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. Dudjom Rinpoche is the guru of several of my gurus.

smcj said:

In fact my impression that Dudjom R is out of step with Longchenpa comes from Malcolm, not my own reading. (Malcolm is more conservative than Dudjom.)

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this is an error of interpretation on your part.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

Dudjom R. did not simply make stuff up that was not part of the tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

Did it ever occur to you that Dudjom Rinpoche is an outlier? Because in point of fact, his book is not part of the main curriculum of Nyingmapa Khenpos — it is more influential among westerners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 8:27 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

True existence itself is an object of conceptuality, so this reasoning is very unsound.

Sherab said:

As I understand it, all nouns refer to two possibilities, the entity itself (ngo bo) and the conceptuality of the entity itself (snang ba). [The words within () are what I think are the equivalent in Tibetan.] To say then that true existence itself is an object of conceptuality is to pre-conclude that true existence only exists as a conceptuality. I don't think this is valid.

Also just because true existence as understood by a conceptuality appears as an impossibility, does not mean that true existence cannot exist in a way different from what is understood by a conceptuality. One gets a sense of this when one enters into the world governed by the laws of quantum physics.

Malcolm wrote:

Such a true existence is cognitively closed to us and exists as a mere speculation.

There is no such thing as a cognition in absence of a subject and an object.

When the Buddha taught that "not seeing" is the real seeing, I thought that there are two possible ways of understanding this. One is that he was talking about not seeing an object. The other is that he was talking about a seeing that is not the usual seeing, i.e., he was talking about a seeing that does not require a separation into a subject and an object that some people labelled as "non-dual" cognition.

He was talking about being in a state free from extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

So Dudjom R. had no problem utilizing the 3 Turning paradigm to explain and define how Dzogchen is superior to the other yanas. Since he saw it as appropriate, so do I.

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, following the interpretation of the three turnings as explained by a Korean master, but never by any Indian master, including Maitreya, Asanga, and so on and so forth.

smcj said:

I thought you said earlier that he followed the explanation of Kongtrul R.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, when it comes to gzhan stong. However, the notion of the three turnings of the wheel and the way the sutras are divided up appear to come from the Chinese tradition via this commentary I mentioned.

smcj said:

In any case I am of the understanding that this presentation is not of Indian origin, but of

a later Tibetan development, which is good enough for me. They need not have studied it at Nalanda for me to accept it.

Malcolm wrote:

This presentation, as above, is apparently a Chinese idea.

smcj said:

BTW, for anybody that doesn't know, when Tibetans come up with some way of looking at this stuff they are obliged to go back and re-interpret the major authors as if to say, "See, this is what they meant all along." So you'll have completely divergent interpretations of what should be standard texts. Nagarjuna and Asanga will be quoted and interpreted completely differently depending on who is grinding the ax at the time. That's just the way Tibet was.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is to understand who influenced whom, when and why. For example, Longchenpa states that Prasangika is the definitive view (as did Jigme Lingpa), but the third turnings sutras, by which he understood the ten tathāgatāgarbha sūtras, were the definitive sūtras. The ironic or interesting thing, is that the way Dzogchen texts treat the tathāgatagarbha is totally at odds with how it is treated in these ten sutras. So it becomes clear that Longchenpa used the sūtra tathāgatagarbha doctrine in order to defend the validity of the Dzogchen tantras. Also of interest is that tathāgatagarbha does not really get mentioned much in the so called sems sde or klong sde, as far as I can determine. There is an interesting passage in the srog 'khor lo (wheel of life): If one becomes stuck in limitations, it is the sugatagarbha.

On the other hand the Mind Mirror of Samantbhadra states:

The diverse miraculous display arises from state of inseparability, the ultimate sugatagarbha.

This in fact has a secret meaning. If you have received complete Dzogchen teachings, you will understand it, if not then I am sorry.

But reconcile this passage with the way sugatagarbha is taught in sūtra — The Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva states:

The sugatagarbha exists intrinsically in all sentient beings. That exists just as sesame seeds are permeated with oil. Its basis — it is based on the material aggregate. It's location — it is located in the center of the heart.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

So Dudjom R. had no problem utilizing the 3 Turning paradigm to explain and define how Dzogchen is superior to the other yanas. Since he saw it as appropriate, so do I.

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, following the interpretation of the three turnings as explained by a Korean master, but never by any Indian master, including Maitreya, Asanga, and so on and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: i can't stop whinging and backstabbing

Content:

straightpunk said:

taranaki, new zealand

Malcolm wrote:

<http://fpmt.org/centers/new-zealand/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Check out google, there are several dharma centers. You may have to take a drive to Auckland from time to time for teachings, but in general FPMT has many online offerings as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Bye.wa

Content:

pemachophel said:

In the Nithartha on-line Tib-Eng dictionary, it gives "11 million" (JV) for bye.wa.sa.ya. When I just look up sa.ya, it says "million." If I just look up bye.wa, I don't get anything. My question is, what does bye.wa.gsum mean? 33 million?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

30 million.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a cognition in absence of a subject and an object.

smcj said:

So you're saying non-dual awareness is a fiction?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what one means by nondual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The problem really is what does not (sic) mean to be omniscient? To have realized the dharmakāya? If the dharmakāya is some truly existent wisdom mind that cannot be cognized by anyone...

smcj said:

I think the idea is that it cannot be cognized in a dualistic way, meaning taken as an object by a subject.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a cognition in absence of a subject and an object.

smcj said:

...then it should always arise at all times in everyone without error.

I've heard that idea put forward before. In fact, isn't it standard Dzogchen perspective?

My personal spin is that enlightenment, when achieved, is retroactive. Once you become enlightened you can see that it was there all along. The story of Asanga and Maitreya comes to mind, where after 12 years of meditation Maitreya finally appears to Asanga. Asanga asked him where he'd been all that time, to which Maitreya replies, "I've been here the whole time. You just couldn't see me." Nice parable.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Dzogchen teaching make a clear distinction between the basis (the time of non-realization) and the result.

The real issue which causes argument is whether tathagatāgābha, a.k.a., the dharmakāya at the time of the basis, is something that is naturally perfected or something which requires development. In general, the Sakyapas for example argue that the natural perfection of the qualities of awakening in the person does not conflict with transformation in the same way the natural presence of the quality in milk which produces butter does not mitigate or render unnecessary the process of transformation which produces butter (churning). Longchenpa for example argues that while the two accumulations have always been perfected, they need to be reaccumulated in the same sense that a gem that has been lost in a swamp needs to be polished in order to

restore its former luster.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

True existence itself is an object of conceptuality, so this reasoning is very unsound.

smcj said:

Could be a little awkward. I like this take on it better:

Malcolm wrote:

Our nature, suchness, does not arise; therefore, it does not cease. This is what it means to be deathless, that which is beyond arising and ceasing, suchness is indestructible.

The problem really is what does not mean to be omniscient? To have realized the dharmakāya? If the dharmakāya is some truly existent wisdom mind that cannot be cognized by anyone, then it should always arise at all times in everyone without error.

If not, then it suggests that omniscience, like everything, else, arises from causes. The difficult question is this: If omniscience arises from causes, why does it not cease?

Various answers to this problem have been tendered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

Madhyamaka has jurisdiction over the phenomenal universe. Shentong jurisdiction is that which cannot be taken as a subject by consciousness, the unborn, etc.

That is a patent fallacy. Gzhan stong simply says the three kāyas are innate, however this is the implication of traditional Madhyamaka as well. When it comes down to it, gzhan stong really does not offer anything that cannot be found in traditional Madhyamaka.

Khenpo Tsultrim, the go-to guy for Shentong in modern day Karma Kagyu, has this to say:

Progressive Stages of Meditation on Emptiness, p.66: This non-conceptual Wisdom Mind is not the object of the conceptualizing process and so is not negated by Madhyamaka reasoning. Therefore, it can be said to be the only thing that has absolute and true existence.

It is important to understand that this true existence does not mean that it can be conceptualized. If it were even the most subtle object of the conceptual process, it could be refuted by Prasangika reasoning. The non-conceptual Wisdom Mind is not something that even supreme wisdom (Skt. prajna) can take as its object. Anything that can be an object of consciousness, however pure and refined, is dependently arising

and has no true existence.

Malcolm wrote:

True existence itself is an object of conceptuality, so this reasoning is very unsound.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

You won't hear that from the sects that accept the 3rd Turning of the Wheel as being definitive over the 2nd Turning.

.

Malcolm wrote:

There is basically a single mention of three turnings of the wheel in the sūtras, found in the Samdhinirmocana sutra. All it says there is that the wheel turned for Mahāyānis is the meaning to be understood by all yānas, nothing more and nothing less. Why does it say this? Because Mahāyāna was disputed by the Śravakas, so the Buddha turned the Mahāyāna wheel a second time so there would be no mistakes or ambiguity. It really is just an Ekayāna teaching.

I really don't know where some Tibetans got the idea that it referred to Yogacara literature, but there is absolutely no justification for that interpretation that can be derived from Indian commentaries in the bstan 'gyur. I know this because I have looked for this doctrine there extensively. There is virtually nothing about the three turnings of the wheel to be found in the bstan 'gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: mala broke

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The best thing for mālas is fifteen pound braided fishing line. It will not break even after many years of use. For example, one mala I have was restrung with this kind of line in 1994. It is still fine.

Do not use monofilament line. etc.

Also it is easy to find this kind of line in yellow, red and so on.

M

lorem said:

Cool. I restrung my wrist mala with monofilament and yeah much stronger but no longer

works as wrist mala--but good for counting when i was at work.

Why the braided line?

Malcolm wrote:

It is more flexible and it is stronger.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Independent Research on Chogyam Trungpa

Content:

Jikan said:

I'd like to know if there's a sober assessment out there someplace.

Malcolm wrote:

I haven't seen one. He is either lionized or demonized.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: mala broke

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The best thing for mālās is fifteen pound braided fishing line. It will not break even after many years of use. For example, one mala I have was restrung with this kind of line in 1994. It is still fine.

Do not use monofilament line. etc.

Also it is easy to find this kind of line in yellow, red and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Independent Research on Chogyam Trungpa

Content:

Jikan said:

I think Trungpa was more influential to the institutionalization of Buddha Dharma in the US than HHDL was until the early 1980s, and made a deeper impression into US culture at that time than HHDL did at that time.

.

Malcolm wrote:

CTR certainly made an big impression in pop culture, but his arrival in the US was

nothing like Padmasambhava's arrival to Tibet. And I still think over all HHDL has had a more lasting impact, and even arguably an earlier one through Thurman, Hopkins, etc.

In the end, CTR produced Shambhala, which is a silo, like most Dharma centers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Benefits of anthropomorphizing elements and aggregates?

Content:

anjali said:

Two seemingly different approaches (deity yoga vs direct looking), both involve transformation/training in pure vision, and both are effective if properly practiced. Am I missing something? KTR mentions the path of means. Is this distinction I'm exploring in the two different approaches really about the difference between path of means and path of knowledge?

Malcolm wrote:

This is the path of self-liberation. Great if you can do it...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: i can't stop whinging and backstabbing

Content:

Punya said:

My apologies for whatever part I played in your decision to attend this group's session straightpunk. We can't talk about nkt here but I did have this to say in relation to another group recently.

straightpunk said:

Thanks for the quote, no need to apologize, you didn't know what class i was attending and i still felt good getting out there and doing it with all my anxiety issues and so forth, which i actually overcome with (among a few other things) the help of your encouragement to do something that might help with my progress.

Malcolm wrote:

Where do you live?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Benefits of anthropomorphizing elements and aggregates?

Content:

anjali said:

It seems that the same realizations are necessary in both approaches. If this is a correct assessment, is there any reason to believe that one method is particularly more efficacious than the other?

Malcolm wrote:

The sūtra approach never works with pure vision. Hence the efficacy of the Vajrayāna approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: Independent Research on Chogyam Trungpa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Total hyperbole. HHDL is far more influential and important in the spread of Dharma in the US than Trungpa will ever be.

Jikan said:

He surely is now.

Malcolm wrote:

He always was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 30th, 2014 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Benefits of anthropomorphizing elements and aggregates?

Content:

anjali said:

Is it really necessary to anthropomorphize the elements (or aggregates, or afflictions) as deities to learn to recognize the elements as not separate from our buddha-nature?

Take, for example, the affliction anger and it's Buddha, Akshobhya. (Sangye Chenma is Akshobya's consort.) How does visualizing Akshobhya and doing self-generation/completion practice benefit the practitioner more than just directly arousing a sense of anger and investigating it's emptiness, and learning to experience it as an expression of the mind's nature--without the deity yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

Deity yoga cuts our afflictive relationship with the five aggregates and so on. That is why it is necessary, even for Dzogchen practitioners. This is because we cannot remain in a state of instant presence 24/7. Therefore, we use the path of transformation until we can.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 30th, 2014 at 7:31 AM
Title: Re: i can't stop whinging and backstabbing
Content:

straightpunk said:
What center was this?
It wasn't at a center, there are no centers here, it was just a class that has been coming to town for the last four months or something. It is called "Modern Buddhism & Meditation for a Happier Life". It's the best thing i could find without having to drive forever.

Malcolm wrote:
This an NKT sponsored course. Run a search on New Kadampa Tradition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 30th, 2014 at 6:15 AM
Title: Re: i can't stop whinging and backstabbing
Content:

straightpunk said:
So i finally went to a community Buddhist teaching, it was very Tibetan but modernized i think. The teaching started off with this Buddha prayer meditation where the lady turned on a tape and sung, this was very uncomfortable and almost had me running out of the room, but i managed to keep an open mind and not be so judgy. After that we moved on to the teaching of some old monk (i can't remember his name) and the teaching of how anger solves nothing and patience is the antidote. It was all very relevant to me, also all about how it leads to talking about people to other people (backstabbing).
It was reassuring and good to talk to other people about these things, i threw some questions out there which i got some nice answers. The actual talking with real life people about Buddhism and these situations was great and don't regret it at all, but i don't think i got much more out of it than i have out of books and probably this forum as well...probably less
I will look out for other classes and attend them if i can, and i would love a teacher, but when asking about finding a teacher at the end of the class it doesn't sound like i would have much luck.

Malcolm wrote:
What center was this?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 30th, 2014 at 4:59 AM
Title: Re: Independent Research on Chogyam Trungpa

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm looking for recommendations for history or biography assessing Trungpa Rinpoche's impact on Buddhism in North America, North American culture overall, or Buddhism overall. It's not hard to find observations like this one:

Sam Bercholz said:

To see Trungpa Rinpoche is a very difficult thing because we only see this person who walked this land and taught, gave hundreds of talks, and so on. In terms of a wider perspective of history, Trungpa Rinpoche's arrival into North America in 1970 is equivalent to Padmasambhava's arrival into Tibet hundreds of years before that ... Trungpa Rinpoche's arrival in America, and what he did in those seventeen years is one of the most incredible things in Buddhist history.

Jikan said:

http://www.chronicleproject.com/stories_131.html "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I don't doubt it. I'd just like to see an assessment coming from an outsider looking in, with more of a birds-eye perspective. Preferably something that has survived peer-review.

Thank you in advance for any recommendations.

Malcolm wrote:

Total hyperbole. HHDL is far more influential and important in the spread of Dharma in the US than Trungpa will ever be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 30th, 2014 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Benefits of anthropomorphizing elements and aggregates?

Content:

lorem said:

Okay sacred outlook. The Vidyahara, The Heart of the Buddha

Reflection.

EDIT

Some books to read for people who are interested. Thanks guys!

Malcolm wrote:

Something like that, but I more had in mind a text by the great Dzogchen master, Shabkar Tshogdrug Rangdrol that definitely should be translated, The Emanational Volume of Pure Vision, part of his Cycle of Nine Emanational Books that exists in four

volumes in his collected works.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 30th, 2014 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Benefits of anthropomorphizing elements and aggregates?

Content:

lorem said:

The victors, the peaceful and wrathful deities.

<https://www.amazon.com/Magic-Dance-Thinley-Norbu/dp/0877738858>

Is the OP question why don't we just work with the elements directly?

Malcolm wrote:

It is because they are the impure vision. Even in Dzogchen it is necessary to work with pure vision.

lorem said:

tag nang? What Tibetan word for pure vision are you using here?

Malcolm wrote:

dag snang.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 30th, 2014 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Benefits of anthropomorphizing elements and aggregates?

Content:

lorem said:

The victors, the peaceful and wrathful deities.

<https://www.amazon.com/Magic-Dance-Thinley-Norbu/dp/0877738858>

Is the OP question why don't we just work with the elements directly?

Malcolm wrote:

It is because they are the impure vision. Even in Dzogchen it is necessary to work with pure vision.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 30th, 2014 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Benefits of anthropomorphizing elements and aggregates?

Content:

Astus said:

Buddhas are perfectly enlightened beings. Ordinary beings are made of elements and

aggregates. That all beings are made of buddhas is a statement connecting the beginning (samsara) with the end (nirvana). It is not that one should see a toenail as a buddha with arms, legs and a golden aura.

Malcolm wrote:
Not in sūtra...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 30th, 2014 at 1:54 AM
Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra
Content:
Punya said:
By what mechanism can a cognitive error continue or manifest? And as far as I can tell, you haven't answered my last question. (Sorry I have to go out now but I'll be back later to read your answer.)

Malcolm wrote:
Through the mechanism of grasping at a self.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, November 29th, 2014 at 11:30 PM
Title: Re: Teachers and credentials (OT: Before teaching...)
Content:

lorem said:
I listen to Malcolm. Although I did allude to the fact that if he has concerns about the Gandenpas seeing Dorje Setrap as a wisdom protector he should talk to someone authoritative in the Geluk tradition and have it clarified.

Malcolm wrote:
There is nothing to clarify on this score, HHDL even states that Setrap is a mundane protector of the gyal po class, like Pehar, to whom he is subordinate, or Ta'og.

lorem said:
Okay then I will need to search for where he states this. And if so it is interesting that it has not been clarified.

Malcolm wrote:
It has been clarified — Setrab is the wrathful emanation of Brahma, so it is not possible for him to be a wisdom protector. The Dalai Lama spoke about this in several lectures concerning protectors, clarifying that even if it is held that Setrab is an emanation of Amitabha, it is no more appropriate to regard him as a wisdom protector than it is to regard the Gyalpo Ku-nga as wisdom protectors, who are held to be emanations of the five Buddha families.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 29th, 2014 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Retreat: English or Tibetan?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

didn't the tibetans translate the sadhanas in the sadhanamala and other sources from sanskrit into tibetan? why would it be better for a native english speaker to do them in tibetan?

Malcolm wrote:

If one is interested to improve one's Tibetan, recite it in Tibetan. If you don't care about improving your Tibetan, recite it in English.

Aesthetics are a secondary concern.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 29th, 2014 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Retreat: English or Tibetan?

Content:

Losang Rabjor said:

Hello,

I am about to enter into my first retreat and although I can read Tibetan and do my short sadhana in Tibetan, the long version is a bit difficult to follow.

Would it be smart to do the long sadhana in English or try to push through with the Tibetan version?

I was told by a friend that doing the long practice in Tibetan would be of better use because doing the sadhana four times a day would greatly speed up my familiarity with the long practice. Any ideas? What about starting the retreat in English and slowly transitioning to the Tibetan version?

Thanks ahead of time for your input.

Malcolm wrote:

If you understand the visualizations, then do it in Tibetan. Even better, before your retreat, translate it into English, then do it in Tibetan.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 29th, 2014 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Punya said:

Malcolm said: Sentient beings are cognitive errors propelled through birth after birth by the root obscuration of I-making.

The Gelugpas (and maybe others) say it is the "mere I" that continues from life to life and that this "mere I" is not the "I" in this life eg Johh who lives in Britain and is a university professor etc etc or the "I" of the previous life eg Maria who lived in Spain and is a catholic nun etc etc. What does this "mere I" (or whatever other label is appropriate) consist of (the term cognitive errors doesn't make any sense to me), what is the "I" in the "mere I" that needs to be abandoned (its obviously much more subtle than the "I" of this life) and how is it explained that the "mere I" takes its specific karmic propensities from life to life and not some other "mere I"s propensities.

Malcolm wrote:

Sentient beings are a cognitive error in the sense that the "mere I" is the mistaken habit of "I making", i.e. a sentient being is nothing more nor less than this cognitive error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 27th, 2014 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Before teaching to somebody...

Content:

lorem said:

I listen to Malcolm. Although I did allude to the fact that if he has concerns about the Gandenpas seeing Dorje Setrap as a wisdom protector he should talk to someone authoritative in the Geluk tradition and have it clarified.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing to clarify on this score, HHDL even states that Setrap is a mundane protector of the gyal po class, like Pehar, to whom he is subordinate, or Ta'og.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 27th, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Book recommendations about rebirth, reincarnation

Content:

Greg said:

Nonetheless, the names of the Kings and so forth did appear to beings at one time.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that Buddhas cannot know conventional things independently of the sense cognitions of sentient beings must be false because those cognitions themselves are relative.

Greg said:

But Buddhas do not know the hair color of the son of a barren woman because there is nothing to know. The thing in question is utterly nonexistent, having never even appeared. How is karma across lifetimes any different?

Malcolm wrote:

It is clearly different in so far as a) the Buddha clearly taught such ripening was unerring and b) your analogy is clearly false. Intentions (karmas) are obviously not like barren women.

Greg said:

As for your second point, that is like saying sky flowers have no intrinsic nature that prevents them from blooming in the sky. It is an essentially meaningless assertion that explains nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is that you are looking for a medium of transference, and Madhyamakas in general reject that there is one, apart from a dharma called a nondissipation (avipraṇāśa, chud mi za ba, which Nāgārjuna states as an opinion he prefers and defends), which functions like a debt. For example, when you borrow money or incur a debt, there is no actual medium that conveys that debt from one moment to the next. But when you owe a debt, everyone agrees that you must pay up when it is demanded of you. When it is paid, the note still exists, even though it can no longer be enforced. Likewise, when one engages in a karma, even though the act itself has ceased, a dharma called a nondissipation is created. This is why the Buddha says:

"The action of corporal beings does not dissipate even in hundreds of eons."

Nāgārjuna himself states:

Emptiness and non-annihilation,
samsara and impermanence,
the Buddha explained
the phenomena [chos] of nondissipation of karmas.

Even though karmas cease upon acting, their effect do not dissipate unless this nondissipation is removed by the path, or by moving into a dhātu where a given nondissipation is left behind because it can function in that sphere.

And this all comes about because karmas, like everything else, have no inherent nature. For which reason Candrakīrti simply says that karmas ripen because there is no nature which prevents their ripening due to fact of nondissipation.

Thus karmas are not like barren women, and do engender progeny called nondissipation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 27th, 2014 at 10:19 AM

Title: Re: Book recommendations about rebirth, reincarnation

Content:

Greg said:

How can you have saṃvṛti that only appears to aryas? Isn't the definition of saṃvṛti that it is the false perception of the deluded?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing is outside the omniscience of a buddha, including relative truth. They have the capacity to know the karma of others. They have all six abhijñās, so of course they know the karma of sentient beings.

Greg said:

Saṃvṛti is by definition the false perception of the deluded, and nothing else. The omniscience of a buddha includes the saṃvṛti that sentient beings perceive--because that is the only thing saṃvṛti is. Sentient beings are not having false perceptions of the workings of karma across lifetimes, so there is nothing for the omniscience of a buddha to know. The fact that karmic action at a distance can't be accounted for in prasaṅgika is clearly a weak point in the system.

Malcolm wrote:

As for the first point, well, this obviously not the case despite the definition of saṃvṛti — for example, when the Buddha says "When so on so live in such and such time, his clan name was x, the king's name was Y...", such information is not available to ordinary people. If we accept what you are claiming, someone at some time must have this idea in their minds in order for it to be known by the Buddha, thus you are placing firm restrictions on what a Buddha may know. A Buddha knows all things both in terms of their nature and their characteristics.

Secondly, karma has no intrinsic nature which prevents its ripening at a time in the future. Therefore, this is not weak link you suppose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 27th, 2014 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Ancient continents, a topic for meditation

Content:

lorem said:

I could be wrong but with him the knowledge just arose, the transcendental wisdom as such, the seeing was there.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, you are wrong. When the Buddha was engaged in recalling his past lives, he had not yet woken up. Through remembering his past lives, he understood karma and dependent origination. Through applying the view of dependent origination he attained buddhahood.

lorem said:

Okay go halvesies. To recall past lives means he was already bodhisattva (first bhumi?). Different than us pondering.

Malcolm wrote:

No, even Hindu meditators can recall many past lives without being realized people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 27th, 2014 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Book recommendations about rebirth, reincarnation

Content:

Greg said:

How can you have saṃvṛti that only appears to aryas? Isn't the definition of saṃvṛti that it is the false perception of the deluded?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing is outside the omniscience of a buddha, including relative truth. They have the capacity to know the karma of others. They have all six abhijñās, so of course they know the karma of sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 27th, 2014 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Book recommendations about rebirth, reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The prasangika perspective on karma is that it is like a debt.

In terms of rebirth, what takes rebirth is the habit of imputing an unreal "I". This habit not only can create karma but can receive its ripening, just as by using the imputation car we can both drive it and crash it.

Karma is likened to a debt. This is Nagārjuna's preferred relative truth version of karma. Also Candrakīrti accepts this.

Greg said:

Still, that is just a another, alternate metaphor, not an explanation. When it comes to

saṃvṛti, my understanding is that prasaṅgikas simply accept the conventions of deluded beings as dependently arisen mere appearances. But an action performed by a sentient being in one lifetime, which comes to fruition three lifetimes later, is not something that appears to anyone. So how can it be differentiated from an utter nonexistent like the son of a barren woman?

Malcolm wrote:

But such karma does appear to someone, i.e, buddha or someone with similar capacity of wisdom. It may not appear to you, but relatively speaking, many things do not appear to you which appear to others of higher or more refined faculties.

The actual dharma in question is called an avipranaśa, an "indestructable".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 27th, 2014 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Book recommendations about rebirth, reincarnation

Content:

Greg said:

I never felt like I encountered a persuasive explanation of karma & rebirth from a Prasaṅgika perspective. At the level of saṃvṛti, karmic seed and ripening separated by lifetimes does not appear. At the level of paramārtha it does not exist. Therefore, like the horns of a rabbit, it must be completely wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

The prasangika perspective on karma is that it is like a debt.

In terms of rebirth, what takes rebirth is the habit of imputing an unreal "I". This habit not only can create karma but can receive its ripening, just as by using the imputation car we can both drive it and crash it.

lorem said:

Isn't potential?

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is likened to a debt. This is Nagārjuna's preferred relative truth version of karma. Also Candrakīrti accepts this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 27th, 2014 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Book recommendations about rebirth, reincarnation

Content:

Greg said:

I never felt like I encountered a persuasive explanation of karma & rebirth from a Prasaṅgika perspective. At the level of saṃvṛti, karmic seed and ripening separated by lifetimes does not appear. At the level of paramārtha it does not exist. Therefore, like the

horns of a rabbit, it must be completely wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

The prasangika perspective on karma is that it is like a debt.

In terms of rebirth, what takes rebirth is the habit of imputing an unreal "I". This habit not only can create karma but can receive its ripening, just as by using the imputation car we can both drive it and crash it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 27th, 2014 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Ancient continents, a topic for meditation

Content:

lorem said:

I could be wrong but with him the knowledge just arose, the transcendental wisdom as such, the seeing was there.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, you are wrong. When the Buddha was engaged in recalling his past lives, he had not yet woken up. Through remembering his past lives, he understood karma and dependent origination. Through applying the view of dependent origination he attained buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 26th, 2014 at 8:26 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

It may not be "for common consumption" as a teaching, but it isn't hidden info either, at least not the basic presentation...it exists in a number of non-restricted books and teachings AFAIK.

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, it is something connected with empowerments. So it really should not be discussed so much in a public place, regardless of how many books it may be published in.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'd say the cats out of the bag on that one, since we could immediately find available teachings on Google, i've heard podcasts that discuss it, etc. Are you suggesting we just stop talking about it?

Malcolm wrote:
Yeah, pretty much.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, November 26th, 2014 at 8:23 AM
Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?
Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

It may not be "for common consumption" as a teaching, but it isn't hidden info either, at least not the basic presentation..it exists in a number of non-restricted books and teachings AFAIK.

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, it is something connected with empowerments. So it really should not be discussed so much in a public place, regardless of how many books it may be published in. As Sachen states:

In general, Secret Mantra makes dependent origination into the path. Since all dependent originations are arranged at the time of the empowerment, in the beginning it is very important to obtain completely the four empowerment from the guru. That empowerment is not merely a symbol, not merely an introduction and not merely a blessing.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, November 26th, 2014 at 8:12 AM
Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?
Content:

odysseus said:

Otherwise, no comment about Malcolm ´s elite club aspirations. lol

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna is not an elite club, anyone can join, but it once having joined, there are many things that ought to be kept secret and for very good reason. Things like the arrangement of the five aggregates into the five families and so on are not principles that are for common consumption. As I said, if you are really interested, take it seriously, find a qualified master such as HH Dalai Lama, HH Sakya Trizin, HH Karmapa, etc., or someone whom they have appointed as a person qualified to lead students on the Vajrayāna path and begin your studies in the proper way.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, November 26th, 2014 at 8:08 AM
Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?
Content:

odysseus said:

OK, just please leave my scepticism aside for now, untill I find a teacher to properly clarify this. But for now, this direct comparison seems to me an impossibility right now. Yes, I see the connotations, but I won't take these assertions for granted just like that.

Malcolm wrote:

Look, if you want to understand these things, you need to find a teacher, receive empowerment, take it seriously.

You clearly don't have any knowledge of Vajrayāna, which is fine, but your objections are coming from a place of complete ignorance about it. There are many teachings in Vajrayāna which are not shared with common Mahāyāna. Rather than flatly saying that well informed people are wrong, use a little humility and understand that you don't know everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 26th, 2014 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

odysseus said:

Nice schematic. But to me it looks like another way of putting everything into analytical order, like a mathematical equation.

To add it up, it's another misinterpretation of the Dhyani Buddhas.

Come up with something better before anyone can convince me that there's an obvious logical relationship between the five heaps and the five transcendent buddhas.

BTW, who said there's now 5 poisons? There's the notion of 3 poisons only (wanting, anger and unknowing). And what is Padma- and Karma-buddha-family really?

jmlee369 said:

From the Gelug Lama Chopa:

དོར་ཇེ་ཀུའི་ཀླུང་ཚུལ་གྱིས་བཞུགས་པའི་ཕུང་པོ་རྩ་མ་དག་བདེ་གསལ་གསུང་།

dor je kyil trung tshül gyi zhug päi phung po nam dag de sheg nga

Sitting in the vajra-position, enhaloed by a five-colored rainbow.

Totally pure, your skandhas are the five sugatas

Is Panchen Losang Chokyi Gyaltsen authoritative enough of a source, or do we need to pull up the text of the Guhyasamaja Tantra for you?

Malcolm wrote:

This person obviously has no knowledge of Vajrayāna, so why are you risking your samayas by trying to inform someone who has not been ripened?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The other thing which comes to mind is exactly why pursue another path, if one has reached the culmination of the first, unless the second path is more profound?

M

Karma Dorje said:

Sorry, missed this earlier. We have discussed this on other threads and in person: my view is that there is much that is explicit in Buddhadharma that is either implicit or missing in other paths. As such it is the most complete and direct approach to realization. Because emptiness is discussed explicitly and at length, it avoids many of the pitfalls of other paths that emphasize the awareness aspect.

For someone who has reached the goal of any of these paths, I think we can agree that all that remains is working for the welfare of others. Some bodhisattvas have renovated their own tradition, others developed new religions in places where there were none. Still others bring the view of realization to paths that either lack it completely or where it has become obscured.

Why continue to practice another path alongside one that is already complete?

Pretty much any symbol system can be used to convey the path by a mahasiddha (and many may have been the projects of prior bodhisattvas in the first place).

One can form connections to countless beings that may not have the karma to practice Buddhadharma directly and thereby hook them into eventual practice of a liberating path.

Certain practices (for example bhakti) can aid in character development.

The associated beings propitiated may bring particular temporal benefits.

Incorrigibility is entertaining.

I am sure that's not an exhaustive list, but this is the gist of why I continue to practice more than one path at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, your comments are rather self-defeating then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

The concept of Moksha in the Hindu Religion is mainly of two types. These are personal

and impersonal. Moksha is defined as the loving, eternal union with God and considered the highest perfection of existence. In Advaita philosophy Moksha is union with the oneness which Advaita advocates.

Malcolm wrote:

First, Advaita is not union with oneness. The Advaita model is that oneself is Brahmin, and always has been, described through the four Mahāvakyas:

Consciousness is Brahman

I am Brahman

That thou art

This Atman is Brahman

Son of Buddha said:

Ramanuja, an 11th century hindu philosopher, believed in the principle of vishishtadvaita (qualified non-dualism). According to Ramanuja, the individual soul is not identical with god. So, a devotee may worship god even after liberation or moksha. Moksha can be attained through bhakti (devotion), which involves the constant remembering of god or the surrender of the individual self to god.

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly — in this philosophy, everything is part of Brahman and Brahman in the form of Ishvara is part of everything. Thus they refer to three principles which are all part of Brahman: Ishvara (Parabrahman), the sentient beings (chit-brahman) and the insentient Universe (achit-brahman). Ishvara and the personal self are identical. While not the best source, it tallies with my personal studies, thus Wiki states:

Rāmānujā chooses to take the position of universal identity. He interprets this passage to mean the subsistence of all attributes in a common underlying substratum. This is referred to as samānādhikaranya. Thus Rāmānujā says the purport of the passage is to show the unity of all beings in a common base. Ishvara (Parabrahman) who is the Cosmic Spirit for the pan-organistic body consisting of the Universe and sentient beings, is also simultaneously the innermost self (Atmān) for each individual sentient being (Jīvā). All the bodies, the Cosmic and the individual, are held in an adjectival relationship (aprthak-siddhi) in the one Ishvara.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vishishtadvaita> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

So the idea that each individual can attain a personal "Enlightenment" is something that can be found in Hinduism

Again, it is not exactly like that. Irregardless of the beliefs of the masses, the dominant philosophy of the six darshanas is Vedanta, and among the forms of Vedanta, Advaita is the dominant form.

Son of Buddha said:

There are no differences between one Buddha and another in terms of realization; there are differences in terms of aspirations, and so on., which give rise to differences in sentient beings karmic connections with this buddhfield and that, and so on. In short,

everyone who becomes a Buddha starts out as a sentient being, and there is a unique rosary of clarity that continues from the time of being a sentient being through the attainment of Vajradhara which forms the relative basis for Buddhahood.

But doesn't this type of view impute a individual self upon Buddhahood? essentially the individual self(person) is actually the one who is attaining Buddhahood, wouldn't this make the individual person/self the "attainer" and Enlightenment just a "object" that is attained by the person/self?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Relatively speaking, the Buddha states many times "When I attained awakening...", "Before I attained awakening" and "After I attained awakening" and so on. Ultimately of course there is no one who attains buddhahood, etc., and as Haribhadra points out in the Aloka Prajñāpāramitā commentary, the entire path, from beginning to end, is illusory. So this is why we must understand this through the two truths. For this reason it is said that the basis is the two truths, the path is the two accumulations, and the result is the two kāyas.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Isn't this the same Idea as the Hindu notion that everyone has an individual soul or personality that will attain Moshka?

Malcolm wrote:

Hindus don't really have that idea.

Son of Buddha said:

also doesn't this create a duality between Buddha's? Do Buddha now all have different individual personalities? I was always taught that there is no difference between Buddha's and the only reason they have individual names is because we gave them different names to distinguish one Buddha manifestation from another, but to view them as different "Buddha's" is to create a duality in Enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no differences between one Buddha and another in terms of realization; there are differences in terms of aspirations, and so on., which give rise to differences in sentient beings karmic connections with this buddhfield and that, and so on. In short, everyone who becomes a Buddha starts out as a sentient being, and there is a unique

rosary of clarity that continues from the time of being a sentient being through the attainment of Vajradhara which forms the relative basis for Buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Matylda said:

I am very reluctant to write about it, but yes indeed there is such thing within zen tradition. However it is reserved for "graduate" priests, so to say... And there is clear vision of dharmakaya, sambhogakaya and nirmanakaya as well, what is done mostly in 100day retreat which is a requirement to perform certain rituals later. Rereat may or may not be strict, however the room of the retreat person by no means could be entered by anyone else. Due to certain visual set up of special altar etc. As for the lineage... its origin is mostly tendai, some lineages come from shingon and for example in soto zen it is reserved for people who did receive dharma transmission and have sizeable training already.

Dharma transmission includes things like abhisheka and proper procedure including the use of abhisheka water, empowering the water, mantras mudras etc. etc. and taking the proper form at that time... I mean non-human form..

Malcolm wrote:

This is Mantrayāna.

Matylda said:

Well,still I guess it is not vajrayana practice...

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, then these are proper Mantrayāna practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well, is the "Nature of Consciousness" itself dependently arisen? Or not? Does it belong to the subset, even if it is not?

Sherab said:

I understand it, ye she is not dependently arisen.

Malcolm wrote:

that depends on which ye shes...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

For me, the choice of heeding decades of personal instruction from my guru

There are clearly distinctions between one contemplative discipline and another. They are not anywhere nearly as yawning a chasm as intellectuals make them out to be.

Malcolm wrote:

Asserting that one's guru is/was awakened is of course a desiderata for any disciple, but you can understand our reluctance to accept this merely on your word, having never met the fellow in question, and given that your reportage is completely at odds with centuries of discourse and polemics on both sides by masters also supposedly realized in each of their respective traditions. The choice one faces is do we believe what you assert, or do we believe our own tradition?

M

Karma Dorje said:

I am not suggesting that you should accept anything at all on my say so. I am merely stating what my incorrigibility stems from. You can believe whatever you like this week. I think you overstate the usefulness of polemics against other contemplative disciplines to beginners on the path, who by and large don't want to hear what they view as mere dogmatism, particularly when there is quite obviously so much in common with other paths.

Malcolm wrote:

First, I was not suggesting you were incorrigible, that was pointed at someone else.

It is not polemics that are the point, but freeing ourselves of conceptual constructs and their pitfalls, clearly identified. The point is not to criticize others, though this point is often lost, the point is to clearly set out the view to be realized in relief, by examining the views to be discarded one by one, step by step, lower to higher, beginning with annihilationism then all views of self and all realist views, until we discover the true meaning of freedom from proliferation ourselves.

Most of us have neither sufficient faith that devotion to a guru can be our sole remedy, no matter how realized they are, nor are we sufficiently intelligent that we can avoid erroneous views without study. Therefore, for the plodders amongst us, like myself, a careful program of study in what are incorrect paths and correct paths, lower paths and higher paths, slower paths and faster paths is a necessity, not just a desiderata. In the meantime, we cultivate the best we can, devotion to gurus we do have, since this indeed is the fastest way to liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

For me, the choice of heeding decades of personal instruction from my guru

There are clearly distinctions between one contemplative discipline and another. They are not anywhere nearly as yawning a chasm as intellectuals make them out to be.

Malcolm wrote:

Asserting that one's guru is/was awakened is of course a desiderata for any disciple, but you can understand our reluctance to accept this merely on your word, having never met the fellow in question, and given that your reportage is completely at odds with centuries of discourse and polemics on both sides by masters also supposedly realized in each of their respective traditions. The choice one faces is do we believe what you assert, or do we believe our own tradition?

The other thing which comes to mind is exactly why pursue another path, if one has reached the culmination of the first, unless the second path is more profound?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

lorem said:

1) If you were a higher-level bodhisattva you could just enter the mandala of a deity, i.e. Tilopa and most likely Lama Shang.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

lorem said:

2) You do the practice with the permission of the lama to habitualize yourself until you get the empowerment and then it will ripen--hopefully into full bloom because of the prior "heavy lifting".

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. You and the lama in question just go to lower realms, as is clearly taught by the Buddha in the Mahāmudratilaka tantra among others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Those of incorrect understanding are the tirthikas i.e. all views grasping to extremes and grasping to a self.

lorem said:

Okay so you mainly are referring to Hinduism and Jainism.

I was referring to the idea of a collective unconsciousness, which I guess is more new-age then nondual.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Buddhist perspective, there is no such thing as a collective unconscious. This is just more transpersonal bullshit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The real problem is that people who come to Buddhadharma do not properly study these non-buddhist tenets, and in doing so, often unwittingly import these views into their practice, for example, imagining the basis (gzhi) is something Brahmin and so on, and concluding the Dzogchen, for example, has the same meaning as Advaita.

lorem said:

Might be clearer to say Nondualism schools are not Dzogchen. There are of course other schools also but I feel a lot of what you're saying is referring to the modern nondualism/neo-buddhist. (??)

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is a part of Buddhadharma. It's basic theory is the same as the rest of Buddhadharma, i.e, suffering arises because of the false grasping to a self.

For example, the Tantra of Self-Arisen Vidyā states:

Further, samasara is as follows:

false view and eternalist view.

The false vehicle is as follows:

held to be three hundred and sixty beliefs in a self.

And:

Likewise, the countless views of a self are included in two. Those are included in both

the eternalist view and annihilationist view. Countless views of self come from those two. Likewise, son of a good family, because you have avoided entering a false path, I have summarized the views of a self and demonstrated them.

And:

The true Dharma is free from a self,
free from the extremes of the taints
of afflicted minds and so on.

And:

...since there is no appropriation, a self does not exist.

And:

All the objects and conditions of the six consciousness
depend on grasping something;
if there is no one-sided grasping, there is bliss
free from objects grasped as "mine",
empty of phenomena grasped as a self,
and liberated from objects grasped as permanent.

The Tantra of Self-Liberated Vidyā states:

If one conceives of a self, it is a delusion of Māra.

And:

The one great root māra
is the concept that grasps a self.

The Union of the Sun and the Moon Tantra states:

"Beyond extremes" is not apprehending a self in things.

And:

Those of incorrect understanding are the tirthikas i.e. all views grasping to extremes and grasping to a self.

Etc., I could go on and on....but I won't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

lorem said:

Please define "maintain a tenet system". Thx.

Malcolm wrote:

Those who have an organized set of views and doctrines about liberation and so on, as opposed to those who are without a tenet system, i.e, the uneducated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quite frankly, all of my studies, with Tibetan lamas fluent in Sanskrit educated by Indian Paṇḍitas in the six darshans at Varanasi and with Hindu teachers, have done nothing but reinforce my conviction that the mountain Hindus are climbing is a complete different mountain than the one the Buddha pointed out that we should ascend.

When there are discussions about things like the basis, suchness and so on, some people who are incapable of seeing the ultimate distinctions between Buddhist and tīrthika views keep on introducing their confusion into these conversations necessitating again and again a rehash of the same points. Not for them, of course, because they are clearly incorrigible, but for the benefit of those who are beginners or who have not had the benefit of a solid education in Dharma yet.

smcj said:

You seem passionately insistent that they are different, yet you never articulate what that difference is. You'd do yourself and everyone else a favor by explaining your understanding of the situation.

Malcolm wrote:

You yourself can carefully study Yoga, Samkhya, Advaita, Nyāyā, Vaiśeṣika and Mimamsa and compare them with Vaibhaṣika, Sautrantika, Yogacara and Madhyamaka as I have done.

I have done the heavy lifting, why should I do it for you?

But in reality it boils down to this. There are basically two kinds of views among tīrthikas: eternalist and annihilationist. Among those who follow Buddhadharma there are the three realist tenets, Vaibhaṣika, Sautrantika (one can include the views of the other Nikaya schools here) and Yogacara (a species of nondual realism), and then there is Madhyamaka, the sublime Middle Way, the crown jewel of the Buddha's teaching.

The real problem is that people who come to Buddhadharma do not properly study these non-buddhist tenets, and in doing so, often unwittingly import these views into their practice, for example, imagining the basis (gzhi) is something Brahmin and so on, and concluding the Dzogchen, for example, has the same meaning as Advaita.

As far as rebutting these incorrect views, I have in fact done so for years, at length, in many places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Jikan said:

Hi Malcolm,

It might also be helpful for beginners to clarify just what is meant by the term "tirthika" in Buddhist discourse, because it's easy for an outsider looking over my shoulder (like the one looking over my shoulder a few minutes ago) to suspect that this is a straw-man term without historical basis. How would you rebut such a comment?

I'd always been thought that "tirthika" indicates a category in which certain kinds of positions may be lumped, not necessarily a specific school of thought or social institution or tradition

many thanks

edit:

for context, I think this issue is more extensive than one might expect... here's an example of a newly-relevant-again thread

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=16819> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

It means literally "ford-crosser" and is a term applied to non-Buddhists who maintain a tenet system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If there is visualization of oneself as a deity, or you invite a deity in front of you, than this is exactly what yidam practice is.

Astus said:

Do you mean that visualisation practices like those found in the Pratyutpannasamadhi Sutra and the Amitayurdhyana Sutra count as yidam practice?

Malcolm wrote:

I clarified this — and no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Astus said:

I did not mean yidams are used in practice by followers of Zen or other schools, it's just that I did not see people questioning the validity of it (except for some I have only heard of who despise Tantric/Tibetan Buddhism for some reason, but they are hardly if ever known among Western Buddhists).

Meido said:

Exactly. Again, my only statement was that Zen does not negate the existence of ishta-devata (meaning, that it does not negate the validity of such practices...which is what I took the OP's assertion to be). Shumon Mujintoron is one text that devotes some discussion to a Japanese Zen (Rinzai) view of Tendai and Shingon practices in particular, and it clearly asserts their validity as Buddhadharma (though naturally within its own hierarchy of traditions).

I am not completely unfamiliar with yidam practice. I mentioned the Marici blessing amulets only as an example of everyday Zen engagement with deities that figure in such practices (and mostly because I was literally working on their prep at that moment). The ceremony for empowering these involves mantra, mudra and embodiment as the deity. But I do not call this yidam practice, and since Zen generally doesn't use kanjo but rather takes seeing nature to be the necessary entry into practice, I do not call such things "Vajrayana", whatever their origins.

Sorry for Zen distraction in the Tibetan forum. Had meant to express support, actually.

~ Meido

Malcolm wrote:

If there is visualization of oneself as a deity, or you invite a deity in front of you, than this is exactly what yidam practice is. However, the difficulty lies in how this transmission is communicated from one generation to another. If there is no need for empowerment, i.e., if the idea is that one can simply pick up a text, recite mantras, perform mudras, and so on, this really does not qualify.

I appreciate your expression of support, and understood it as such, but in order to prevent confusion these distinctions must be made.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes of course, Astus, this was never disputed.

Astus said:

Just meant as an extension of Meido's response.

Malcolm wrote:

As above, one cannot consider blessing protective amulets as falling under the heading of Vajrayāna practice, much less Yidam deity practice.

Actually, the term yi dam lha (iṣṭadevatā) is comparatively rare in Indian tantras, is more common in Indian commentaries, while of course it is ubiquitous in Tibetan writing. Nevertheless, my point was that a yidam is a path. That path is not common to common Mahāyāna such as Zen, while of course there is nothing barring anyone from practicing any of the divisions of tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Beginning a Ngöndro

Content:

Dharmaswede said:

Dear Malcolm,

Is this translation finished? If so, is it available?

Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jens

Malcolm wrote:

I am in the process of translating the Sakya Ngondro commentary. It has a very extensive section on the four common preliminaries.

I am very nearly done with the translation, and it should be ready for publication sometime next year. Not sure who is going to publish it but since it is being sponsored directly by HH Sakya Trizin, I am sure there will be no problem finding a publisher. When it is published, it will likely be about 350 pages long.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Astus said:

From the perspective of East Asian Mahayana - to what Zen belongs to - the validity of Vajrayana is rarely if ever questioned. There is even a "Secret Teaching Division" (volumes 18-21) in the

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taish%C5%8D_Tripitaka that includes all kinds of Tantric texts. In China many Vajrayana works were translated, especially during the Yuan (Mongolian) dynasty, as the court favoured Tibetan Buddhism. In Japan the Shingon school has existed since the 9th century. So, Tantric teachings and methods

are recognised as valid in Mahayana beyond Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes of course, Astus, this was never disputed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Oh look, another thread on Hinduism vs. Buddhism on Dharmawheel! How positively scintillating.

Malcolm wrote:

This turn in the conversation is not about Buddhism vs. "Hinduism", it is about the fact that the tīrthikas are not talking about the same thing we are, do not have the same understanding of the basis we do and do not share the same result we achieve, not to mention their path and ours is completely different.

I understand that you have a different point of view, but I do not agree with your point of view on this score in anyway.

Quite frankly, all of my studies, with Tibetan lamas fluent in Sanskrit educated by Indian Paṇḍitas in the six darshans at Varanasi and with Hindu teachers, have done nothing but reinforce my conviction that the mountain Hindus are climbing is a complete different mountain than the one the Buddha pointed out that we should ascend.

When there are discussions about things like the basis, suchness and so on, some people who are incapable of seeing the ultimate distinctions between Buddhist and tīrthika views keep on introducing their confusion into these conversations necessitating again and again a rehash of the same points. Not for them, of course, because they are clearly incorrigible, but for the benefit of those who are beginners or who have not had the benefit of a solid education in Dharma yet.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hence, unconsciousness devas as well as the four kinds of formless beings have no sensory experience at all.

We really have no way of examining the consciousness of beings in other realms than animal realm and human realm.

Ambrosius80 said:

Sure we do, abhijñās.

There are so many problems with this theory...but I don't have time to address them. I have justified each of my claims with reasoning, quotes from Buddhist texts, and using science as help. Lets turn the tables: prove to me that you have formed your own point of view after observation and analysis, instead of just reading from books and blindly believing what you have been told. I can guarantee that whatever reasoning you provide, I in turn will find a flaw in it. Why is that? Because there is no correct or wrong point of view, just different outlooks on the same issue. I see no reason to continue arguing like this, considering so far we have had almost exactly the same beliefs, but have used different methods to approach them.

Malcolm wrote:

We do not have anything like the same beliefs. You assert that consciousness is a form of matter, asserting that is composed of electrons (how many, — one, two, three, etc.?). The Buddha asserts that consciousness is a dhātu separate from the four elements and space. The Buddha asserts that matter such as it is, is a mental reification, you assert matter is real, and forms the basis of consciousness and so on, thus your view does not even reach Yogacara, let alone Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: Translation Award for Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi

Content:

Zhen Li said:

There also just aren't as many western Mahayana monks as compared to Theravadan ones. The Zen folks translate their Zen writings sometimes, and Tibetan folks translate what matters to them (i.e. not usually non-Vajrayana Mahayana texts like Sutras in Tibetan).

Malcolm wrote:

Ahem....

<http://84000.co> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

You will find many Mahāyāna sutras here, more "every" day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually there is one consciousness that acts through them serially. When you

study the dhātu chapter of the kośa carefully you will observe that this is case. These six are just names for one consciousness when it acts through a given sense.

Ambrosius80 said:

But still, without our senses, we would not be conscious.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence, unconsciousness devas as well as the four kinds of formless beings have no sensory experience at all.

Ambrosius80 said:

As for my theory, I have never denied the possibility of a network of electrons forming outside a brain, anchoring to something other than brains, or even forming to another dimensions.

Malcolm wrote:

There are so many problems with this theory...but I don't have time to address them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Guhyasamaja traces its line to Śakyāmuni Buddha. Kalacakra was taught by the Buddha in the Dhanyakataka Stupa at Amaravati at the same time he taught Prajñāpāramitā at Rajagriha.

Vajradhara is the sambhogakāya, all nirmanakāyas are emanations of the sambhogakāya.

Bakmoon said:

Thank you for your correction Malcom. I think I remember something about the Kalacakra lineage now that you mention it.

I've heard in other places that the Guhyasamaja Tantra was received by the Mahasiddha Indrabhuti from Vajradhara. Is this referring to a different lineage of the Guhyasamaja Tantra or something?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the story runs that Buddha intuited that Indrabhuti I was interested in the Dharma, so he flew there. Indrabhuti said "I am very interested in practicing Dharma but I need a method of awakening that will not require me to give up my duties as a king and husband (he had 500 wives)." Legend then has it that the Buddha bestowed upon him the Guhyasamaja empowerment during which Indrabhuti fully awakened.

Most people do not understand that abhiśeka is a method of awakening. It is only if someone does not awaken fully or at all during the empowerment that it is necessary to practice sadhana.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

The same as saying one dharmakaya for all Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

It's really not the same thing at all.

Why? Because when it is said there is only one dharmakāya it means that realization of all Buddhas is the same, not that the continuum of all sentient beings is the same; just like saying that the nature of all fires is heat; nevertheless, every buddha's continuum is distinct and separate. This is not the case with Advaita which insists there is only one purusha for everyone, i.e. that the continuum of all sentient beings is the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

Malcom, is it possible to explain a bit of what distinguishes guru veneration from guru yoga? While observing samaya of course. I feel your explanation may help help my practice. You can't have the second without the first I suppose. I think it would be fair to say that veneration is one part of guru yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is a practice connected with the vajra body.

Of course there are other kinds of gurus, but for this reason and that devotion to them will not constitute a rapid path for realizing mahāmudra or dzogchen in one lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

For sure the Therveda that is popular in the west seems to have been scrubbed of

syncretic and esoteric elements. A lot of times when I see people reference Theraveda, it almost seems like what they are talking about is actually (usually western) Pali Canon text criticism version of it, rather than as it's practiced anywhere else.

Bakmoon said:

As a practicing Theravadin myself I find this tendency to be rather annoying. It reeks of protestant Christianity in its mindset and methodology simply being transplanted into Buddhism which to me just seems like a disaster. I think textual criticism can help shed light into certain circumstances, but as the saying goes "when all you have is a hammer, the whole world looks like nails."

Plus, all of the Anuttara Yoga Tantra lineages I've ever heard of trace themselves back to the Buddha Vajradhara or to Samantabhadra Buddha, not to Shakyamuni Buddha, so I don't see what the big deal is.

Malcolm wrote:

Guhyasamaja traces its line to Śakyāmuni Buddha. Kalacakra was taught by the Buddha in the Dhanyakataka Stupa at Amaravati at the same time he taught Prajñāpāramitā at Rajagriha.

Vajradhara is the sambhogakāya, all nirmanakāyas are emanations of the sambhogakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

[qsubset of anything. Paramatman is jiva freed from confusion.

Malcolm wrote:

Is there one parātman or many? If there is one, it is transpersonal, if it is many, then what is the difference between Saṃkhya and Advaita?

In reality, Shankara argues there is in reality only one purusha, not many, as in the Saṃkhya system. He makes this abundantly clear in his Yogasutra commentary, as did Ramaswami when he taught us the Yoga sutras, confirming everything I thought about Advaita. Also his teacher of Advaita was the Sankaracarya of Kanchi, the old one, Chandrashekarendra Saraswati, not the new one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are mistaken sense perceptions for consciousness. They are not the same thing.

Ambrosius80 said:

But according to Buddhist belief, there are six forms of vijñānas; eye consciousness, ear consciousness, nose consciousness, tongue consciousness, body consciousness and mind consciousness. Psychedelics distort most of them, if not all. "Consciousness" is formed by all of them together.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually there is one consciousness that acts through them serially. When you study the dhātu chapter of the kośa carefully you will observe that this is case. These six are just names for one consciousness when it acts through a given sense.

In any case, the formless realm beings have no brain, so according to you, they cannot be conscious, much less exist.

Of course, if you just want to make up your own Dharma that's fine, but we won't have anything left to discuss since I am a follower of Buddha's Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

lorem said:

Okay so you are saying the guru practice at the beginning of Jamgon Kongtrul's The Great Path of Awakening is actually a veneration because it is lacking some elements of the full guru sadhanas?

Malcolm wrote:

Kongtrul indicates that at the beginning of practicing mind training, one should do guru yoga as a preliminary. However, he does not detail how that is to be done.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

BrianG said:

Since we've established that Theravadian esoteric practices don't come from Vajrayana

sources, I don't see why that would matter.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Yoga is a very specific practice, with a very specific theory, with a very specific source. Calling some kind of guru veneration "guru yoga" indicates a lack of understanding of what the yoga in "guru yoga" means.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Ambrosius80 said:

Nowadays we know as a fact that consciousness is linked to the brain, as is evident when scientists have studied the effects of psychedelic drugs on humans, for example. The visions and hallucinations are caused because the drugs affect certain areas of the brain. That's why they are also called consciousness-altering drugs.

Malcolm wrote:

You are mistaken sense perceptions for consciousness. They are not the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

BrianG said:

You left out guru yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

Which requires an HYT empowerment.

BrianG said:

HYT is a Tibetan classification, and has no meaning outside of Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is only taught in the Guhyasamaja tantra on up.

It is not actually a Tibetan classification, the classification into four tantras comes from the Vajramāla tantra, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

This is the gist of the matter. You reject any Tibetan author that suggests anything of the sort. You have a right to do that. However since this is a public forum it is appropriate to voice dissenting opinions backed by authoritative quotations.

Malcolm wrote:

There aren't any Tibetan authors that do say anything of the kind. They all take great pains to distinguish their views from tīrthika views like Advaita. There are many westerners however who do not understand what they are reading and thus jump to incorrect conclusions, and therefore conflate tīrthika views like Advaita with Buddhadharma, such as yourself. Even the gzhan stong pas (especially the gzhan stong pas) go through great lengths to distinguish their view from the views of non-Buddhists such as Shankara. You do a disservice to them everytime you assert the contrary (based on no evidence whatsoever). Even the Bonpos spend a great deal of time differentiating their views from Advaita and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

smcj said:

So evidently Kongtrul disagrees with you, as do others.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually he does not, you just do not understand what he is saying.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

That depends entirely on who is teaching, but of course they are not equivalents. They each derive from their own particular context. However, the terms point to the same basis.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they do not. The basis in Dzogchen and Mahāmudra teachings is not transpersonal, it is personal.

Karma Dorje said:

What is the Sanskrit term you are taking as "transpersonal"? The basis of tantric and vedantic path is always personal.

Malcolm wrote:

Brahmin is transpersonal. In others words, all jivātmans (personal selves) are just subsets, if you will, of parātman (ultimate or transpersonal self). The distinction between the two is merely apparent in other words.

This is not compatible with Dzogchen or Mahāmudra, let alone Buddhadharma, on any level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

BrianG said:

You left out guru yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

Which requires an HYT empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The basis in Dzogchen and Mahāmudra teachings is not transpersonal, it is personal.

smcj said:

Since you are authorized to teach about Dzogchen you are 100% entitled to put forward that position. There is plenty of commentary to support it and anyone that wants to see it that way is not in error to do so. However as has been discussed in another thread there is no consensus to that effect, specifically among later tibetan authors.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't understand the later Tibetan authors, sorry to say. The only lack of consensus is among westerners who really do not have a grasp of difficult tantric subjects, written in intentional language (i.e. coded), who are also unfamiliar with the broad range of the textual tradition and rely on tiny slices of translations of varying qualities and differing terminologies with which to form their views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Secret Mantra is something very specific. None of these Thai practices bear any relationship to Secret Mantra.

BrianG said:

The protection chakra/body mandala I posted above has a Sri Lankan version as well.

So what you're saying is that these practices weren't derived from previous Vajrayana practice. Which is what I thought was likely due to the region's long history of Vajrayana practice(archaeological evidence supports Hevajra practice reaching it's historical peak during the Khmer empire).

That means there must have been a separate esoteric transmission just for SE Asia, which doesn't make much sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, what I am saying is that these practices have no clear cut path to the presence of Vajrayāna SE Asia. They are not Vajrayāna practices, whatever else they may be.

The exoteric practice of protection amulets, protective visualizations and so on are wide spread in the Indian culture sphere. That does not make them related to Vajrayāna or even lower Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

BrianG said:

My guess is that you are probably resistant to this being called "tantric", due to the lack of an empowerment. Fair enough. Perhaps "derived from tantra, but not tantra" is more accurate.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so. Calling these things "tantric" comes from an ignorant and anachronistic use the term from the early 20th century. In other words, the term really has no meaning. There was never any tradition in India that called itself "tantric". There are many traditions in India that followed manuals (tantras), from Ayurveda (in whose texts is found the the earliest use of the term) to Yoga, Kauala, so on and so forth.

Secret Mantra is something very specific. None of these Thai practices bear any

relationship to Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: The state of Buddhism in the world

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and lots of "political education" too, more of that than Dharma education, that is for sure.

Indrajala said:

In any case, the PRC is a lot more easy on Buddhist institutions in general than ever before. That's my point. There's no religious freedom of course.

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on where you are and of what value your monastery is to tourism. It is business, it is not support for Tibetan Buddhism in Tibet for Tibetans. It is for the bourgeois entertainment of curious Chinese tourists. And this phenomena happens in cycles, as it has since the early '80's. A period of relative relaxation, then a crack down, etc. People still flee Tibet to study in India because frankly, they can get a better education in Dharma, though arguably, if they are fortunate to come from a wealthy family, they can get a better secular education in China at this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: The state of Buddhism in the world

Content:

Indrajala said:

They're also even paying for monasteries to be renovated in Tibet (a Tibetan Sakya monk in Nepal told me this)..

Malcolm wrote:

\

For tourism in historic regions.

Indrajala said:

He also mentioned pensions and healthcare support for monastics.

He was pretty honest. He said Sakya monks and monasteries don't get any heat from the authorities, and in fact are getting a lot of material support from the government, especially in recent years.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and lots of "political education" too, more of that than Dharma education, that is for

sure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: The state of Buddhism in the world

Content:

Indrajala said:

They're also even paying for monasteries to be renovated in Tibet (a Tibetan Sakya monk in Nepal told me this)..

Malcolm wrote:

\

For tourism in historic regions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

BrianG said:

... which certainly has Tantric elements -

Malcolm wrote:

This has more to do with Ayurveda and Yoga than Vajrayāna. It is more accurate to say that certain kinds of Thai Buddhism have yogic elements, rather than "tantric" elements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no brain at the time of conception, but in order for there to be conception, a consciousness seeking rebirth must be present. Further, consciousness is not "born", one can find no origin for it at all., like all conditioned things, each stream of consciousness is beginningless.

Ambrosius80 said:

But this just supports my theory about the quantum teleportation of electrons. When one being dies, the electrons in its brain could well end up in the brain of a few weeks old fetus in the womb. There is no beginning or end to this cycle, just one candle lighting another on its last light. I am not saying that its is the brain which "creates" consciousness, I am saying that brain is the vessel that holds it in our bodies as it travels around. And there may be other ways than brains to "store" consiousness.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not how the Buddha taught it. Consciousness is a serially arising monadic entity. It appropriates a physical basis. Its seat is the in center of the body, not the brain.

Ambrosius80 said:

Karma means intention and what follows from intentions.

In other words, a causal event chain. I think we both have the same idea about karma, but just use different words to express it.

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhadharma, cause and condition is distinct teaching from karma. The way it is taught is as follows: first cause and condition is taught, then dependent origination, then karma, and finally affliction. They should be understood in this order. If you want to understand this all properly, you need to read the Abhidharmakośabhaṣyam by Vasubandhu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Jikan said:

Does it follow that the brain, the central nervous system and the rest of the body are epiphenomenal to consciousness, and not the reverse?

Malcolm wrote:

Even if a zygote is formed, without consciousness and its attendant praṇā-vāyu, the zygote will not quicken and develop.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

mikenz66 said:

Here are some references to Tantric practices in Thailand, etc.

<http://www.dhammadawheel.com/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=10503> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

<http://www.dhammadawheel.com/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=6599> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Mike

Malcolm wrote:

None of this is "tantric". To be a "tantric" practitioner, one must be introduced the path by empowerment (abhiśeka).

BrianG said:

There are empowerments -

<http://www.lersi.net/lersi-mask-initiation/>

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a qualified Vajrayāna abhiśeka, this is a blessing. It is not a path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha nature does not "come to be", it is innate.

Ambrosius80 said:

In other words born at the same time with consciousness, which is upheld by the brain.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no brain at the time of conception, but in order for there to be conception, a consciousness seeking rebirth must be present. Further, consciousness is not "born", one can find no origin for it at all., like all conditioned things, each stream of consciousness is beginningless.

Ambrosius80 said:

Up to a point, yes. But there are many things science cannot explain, rebirth, karma, rainbow body, etc.

Karma as a word means a causal event chain.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma means intention and what follows from intentions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

That depends entirely on who is teaching, but of course they are not equivalents. They each derive from their own particular context. However, the terms point to the same basis.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they do not. The basis in Dzogchen and Mahāmudra teachings is not transpersonal, it is personal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

mikenz66 said:

Here are some references to Tantric practices in Thailand, etc.

<http://www.dhammadownload.com/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=10503> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://www.dhammadownload.com/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=6599> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Mike

Malcolm wrote:

None of this is "tantric". To be a "tantric" practitioner, one must be introduced the path by empowerment (abhiśeka).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Mkoll said:

I'm not an scholar or certified expert of Theravada, but from my somewhat extensive study there is no recognition of the existence of Yidams because that concept is foreign to Theravada. Similarly, it's like asking why Theravada doesn't recognize the existence of something like guru yoga. They simply aren't present.

BrianG said:

Certain sects of Theravada Buddhism in Thailand practice guru yoga. This may have even been common before the reforms of King Mongkut, in an attempt to make Thai Buddhism seem "modern" to avoid colonization by the west.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is a very specific practice which comes from anuttarayoga tantra, it does not even exist in Yoga tantra. That said, since anuttarayoga tantra did exist at one time in Thailand, etc., it is possible some kind of degenerate guru yoga tradition persisted in Thailand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 1:42 PM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

The OP's questions are only being partially and indirectly addressed so far. Here they are again, numbered for ease of reference:

Samanthabhadra said:

(1) Why do Theravada and Zen Buddhists do not recognize the existence of Yidams? (2) Are these Yidams symbolic creations of the human mind or do they literally exist? (3) Did the historical Buddha taught the Vajrayana Tantra? (4) If not then is Vajrayana really Buddhistic?

Kim O'Hara said:

(1) seems to have been answered by Meido, saying that Zen schools do in fact recognize the existence of Yidams. No response on Theravada, though.

(2) hasn't been answered at all.

(3) has been answered in the negative by Mkoll, with some dissenting responses.

(4) hasn't been answered at all.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

The answer to two is no and no. The answer to four is yes. Meido's answer is problematic, and I am not sure what he imagines a "yidam" is, blessing protection amulets is not a path. A yidam is a path. 3 was answered in the following way "not in the Pali canon"; but Pali canon is not inclusive of all that the historical Buddha taught (whose history is the salient question here).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 12:25 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Jikan said:

Yes, but Brahman is said to have the characteristics of sat-chit-ananda. (being-consciousness-bliss)

Does suchness have those same characteristics?

Karma Dorje said:

Empty essence, cognizant self-nature, compassionate responsiveness.

Of course, we can continue to play comparative religion here, but what's the point. Isn't it against the ToS?

Malcolm wrote:

Sat cit ananda really are not equivalents to essence, nature and compassion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

anjali said:

It's not possible to know Nirguna Brahman as a separate entity.

Sherab said:

If by this, Nirguna Brahman is a some all encompassing consciousness, then I have a problem with it.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is what Nirguna Brahman is. Not only is it all-encompassing, nothing but it exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Ambrosius80 said:

The consciousness of living things is basically electrons rushing through axons in the brains...

Malcolm wrote:

This is not really compatible with Buddhadharma.

Ambrosius80 said:

I don't see why, as the two are not conflicting each other in any way. I am just giving a theory how buddha-nature comes to be.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha nature does not "come to be", it is innate.

Ambrosius80 said:

The way I see it, when religion begins to compete with science or the other way around, things tend to crash and burn. As His Holiness has stated many times, Buddhism and science are so similar they can work together just fine.

Malcolm wrote:

Up to a point, yes. But there are many things science cannot explain, rebirth, karma, rainbow body, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 8:29 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Ambrosius80 said:

The consciousness of living things is basically electrons rushing through axons in the brains...

Malcolm wrote:

This is not really compatible with Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 8:24 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Samanthabhadra said:

Why do Theravada and Zen Buddhists do not recognize the existence of Yidams?

Meido said:

Just to point out that this is not so when it comes to Ch'an/Zen.

~ Meido

Malcolm wrote:

Chan/Zen schools don't really use iṣṭa-devatās, as they do in Shingon or Tendai, or Vajrayāna in general, it is not part of your path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 7:08 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Mkoll said:

Malcolm's answer is coming from someone partial to Vajrayana.

An answer from someone partial to Theravada, like me, is that Vajrayana Tantra teachings are not part of Theravada teachings: it's not mentioned in Theravada texts,

AFAIK. Simple as that.

Malcolm wrote:

And neither is Mahāyāna, hence my answer.

Mkoll said:

Right, your answer could only come from someone more partial to Vajrayana than Theravada or Mahayana (edit) in that it's part of the Vajrayana "party line," if you will.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but it is also true, from our perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Renouncing Theravada

Content:

Jata Bharadvaja said:

Hello everybody, I've recently been at what I can only describe as a cross road really. I've slowly lost faith in the Theravada tradition, I've been seeing and reading about things such as monks owning pubs selling alcohol, doing fortune telling, magic tricks, barely meditating (if at all), getting into fist fights, doing sing song chanting etc.

Sherab Dorje said:

Damn dude, if that's the reason you want to leave the Theravada tradition I predict that your stay with Vajrayana will be even briefer! Everything you just listed is part of our daily practice!

Malcolm wrote:

Everything but the fist fights, this is Mahāyāna after all...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Mkoll said:

Malcolm's answer is coming from someone partial to Vajrayana.

An answer from someone partial to Theravada, like me, is that Vajrayana Tantra teachings are not part of Theravada teachings: it's not mentioned in Theravada texts, AFAIK. Simple as that.

Malcolm wrote:

And neither is Mahāyāna, hence my answer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?

Content:

Samanthabhadra said:

Why do Theravada and Zen Buddhists do not recognize the existence of Yidams?

Malcolm wrote:

Lack of merit and pure vision.

Faith in Buddhadharma is rare.

Faith in Mahāyāna is rarer still.

Faith in Vajrayāna is even more rare than that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 23rd, 2014 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

The only thing that surprises me is that so many people have convinced themselves that they actually know exactly what everything is and how it stands.

Malcolm wrote:

I just know what the Buddha and my gurus have taught. YMMV.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 22nd, 2014 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Sherab said:

Did the Buddha said anywhere that suchness is dependent arising? Or emptiness is dependent arising?

Malcolm wrote:

Āryāṣṭadaśasahasrika-prajñāpāramitā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Dependent origination should be known as emptiness.

Ārya-mahāvajrameruśikharakūṭāgāra-dhāraṇī

Due to being imputed, imputation is also empty. Due to arising from causes and conditions, dependent origination is also empty. Due to being generated by adventitious causes and conditions, production is empty of self. In that respect, dependent

origination is empty of intrinsic characteristics. Whatever is empty of intrinsic characteristics is characteristicless. Whatever is characteristicless, that is suchness. Whatever is suchness, that is unmistaken suchness. Whatever is unmistaken suchness, that is isn't anything other than suchness. Whatever isn't anything other than suchness, that is samadhi. Whatever is samadhi, that is realization. Whatever is realization, that is emptiness. Whatever is emptiness, that is sublime insight. Whatever is sublime insight, that is calm-abiding. Whatever is calm-abiding, that is complete freedom [vimokṣa]. Whatever is complete freedom, that is the middle way. Whatever is the middle way, that is without a first limit and without a second limit, cannot be apprehended, is not an apprehender, is not annihilated, is not permanent, does not arise, does not cease, is without thought, is without concept, is not independent, is not dependent, does not come, does not go, is without total affliction, without purification, does not cohere, does not separate, that is sublime insight. Whatever is sublime insight, that is without aggregates, without elements [dhātus], without sense organs, without sense gates [āyatanas], without objects, is not designated as an object, is without karma, without the result of karma — whatever is without karma and without the result of karma, that is unsurpassed perfect awakening.

Here we can clearly see the Buddha stating that since dependent origination is empty, it is without characteristics, and whatever is without characteristics is suchness.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 22nd, 2014 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

Matt J said:

One might argue this is saguna Brahman (with gunas, or characteristics), not nirguna Brahman (without qualities, or characteristics).

Malcolm wrote:

Suchness is emptiness. Brahmin is not empty.

As the Buddha states in the Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā:

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

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 22nd, 2014 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of secular ethics it is well established that enlightened self-interest the best approach, i.e., in securing the needs of others, one secures one's own needs. The old,

"I'll scratch your back, then you scratch mine."

Sherab Dorje said:

Okay, so according to this theory criminal fraternities are ethically sound.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. Mutually helping each other secure needs and wants is what enlightened self-interest means. As one expands one's sphere more people and beings are included, until in this model, every beings needs and wants are met since it is recognized we inhabit the same sphere and all of our wellbeing depends on everyone else's.

In practice, it does not work out that way, because people are not so enlightened that working in their own self-interest actually functions this way — this the great weakness in the secular ethical model. Sooner or later selfishness trumps insight. Nevertheless, this is a working theory in secular ethics.

There are other secular ethical models, such as Kant's moral imperative and so on, which do not require belief in rebirth or religious authority of any kind. Western ethical philosophy is quite rich, and can't be reduced to the catechistic moralism of Christianity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 22nd, 2014 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

lorem said:

Wouldn't that be giving up on yourself and other sentient beings? (Who want's to get to the top? The only place is down)

Sherab Dorje said:

If there is no life (for me) after this one, then why would I give a damn?

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of secular ethics it is well established that enlightened self-interest the best approach, i.e., in securing the needs of others, one secures one's own needs. The old, "I'll scratch your back, then you scratch mine."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 22nd, 2014 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Hairs

Content:

???? said:

How Tibetans cope with the problem of hair loss?

What traditional possibilities exist? Proper diet, or special herbs?

How to do to hair stopped falling out?
and what to do to appeared more of them?

Malcolm wrote:
reduce salt intake, oil the scalp, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 21st, 2014 at 11:51 PM
Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra
Content:

lorem said:
EDIT I believe in rebirth but don't think you totally need to to practice the path.

Malcolm wrote:
You totally need to [accept rebirth] to practice the path. Otherwise, there is no point at all to the Buddhist path, none.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 21st, 2014 at 10:43 PM
Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra
Content:

Jesse said:
i I think rebirth is hard for people to accept mainly because;

1. it's extraordinarily hard to grasp it intellectually, if it's possible at all.
2. If you meditate on it and view it through a detached viewpoint -- "Who is there to be reborn?" Will likely be most peoples response.

All thing's are inter-dependently arisen, yet all those arisen thing's are still empty, not one thing has a self, so this delusion that we are independent beings of some permanent nature is why rebirth is hard to grasp.

All sentient beings are just made up of empty non-self stuff, yet we still exist. So essentially I think you could say we are that empty non-self stuff, and at the same time nothing at all, we are phantoms. Phantoms will continue to arise, and cease thinking they were something other than empty inter-dependent stuff.

ps. I think my brain melted writing that.

Malcolm wrote:
Sentient beings are cognitive errors propelled through birth after birth by the root obscuration of I-making.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 21st, 2014 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

It is important to recognize that every traditional form of Buddhism carries with it a distinct and in many areas mutually exclusive presentation of the relationship of all the others. Buddhisms are not the same. Yet Dzog Chen and the Forest Monk Tradition are very different yet surprisingly on the same track.

Malcolm wrote:

Both Dzogchen as well as Thai Buddhism (apart from Buddhadasa) accept rebirth as integral to Buddhadharma.

Leo Rivers said:

Doesn't Samsara recognition, the Bodhisattva Vow, the practice of the path of calming and insight and a recognition of the empty nature of self and phenomena comprise sufficient credentials?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha in numerous places considers rejection of rebirth (punarbhava) to be a wrong view. It is considered a wrong view in all Buddhist traditions worthy of the name.

Leo Rivers said:

Egads, the Perfection of Wisdom insight as presented nuked the Abhidharma.

Malcolm wrote:

No. The Prajñāpāramitā, and the school that developed around it, merely clarified the notion of emptiness on top of the basis of Buddha's Abhidharmapitika.

Leo Rivers said:

And explanations of turnings of the wheel really don't much please or invite everyone to gather under one tent.

Malcolm wrote:

First, the three turnings teaching was not important in India, judging from the lack of discussion about it by Indian masters. If you carefully read the Saṃdhinirmocana, the first turning is for śravakas, the second turning for Mahāyanis, and the third turning, which is merely a recapitulation of the second, is for everyone. In reality, the third turning teaching is actually an Ekayāna teaching, which is why it garners so little attention from Indian commentators.

Leo Rivers said:

Finding a "core Buddhism" which all agree certifies a Buddhist as a Buddhist is an idea that holds water only if you don't run the numbers. But I will avidly give an open ear and

mind to any efforts in this regard.

Malcolm wrote:

There are certain tenets of Buddhhadharma that are constant in all streams of Buddhhadharma. Rebirth, dependent origination, karma and so on are such tenets, whether we are talking about Theravada or Sarvastivada or Dzogchen and Mahamudra, as well as everything in between.

Leo Rivers said:

On "MATERIALISM"

Many people bring the word "materialism" unwittingly with the Marxist or AntiMarxist emotional baggage to spiritual discussions.

Malcolm wrote:

When I use the term materialism, I am referring the followers of the rishi Brihaspati, the Carvaka school, specifically, and generally, to all those who imagine that upon their physical death their mind stream utterly ceases having no further causes and conditions which can support it.

Leo Rivers said:

The 5th Century Greek physical theory of Democritus of atomos "indivisible", and re-contexted in India means and seems to mean one thing.

Materialism as (politically and rhetorically) depicted in the Pali suttas as being a sub-set of annihilationism/ucchedavada and later Marxist anti-religionist "materialism means and seems to mean another.

Malcolm wrote:

One who denies rebirth is an ucchedavadin and a materialist. Marxists also reject rebirth, etc. They are also ucchedavadins. There are many stripes ucchedavadins. Also, the ancient Carvakas wrote much of the political literature of ancient India (Kautilya, for example).

Leo Rivers said:

I am not a Marxist. Their "materialism" isn't truly scientific. It is politics. As an atheist I am not anti-religion. My "atheism" is a secondary issue to someone who believes all the phenomena witnessed in the cosmos are the outcome of natural processes, cause and effect. Sound familiar?

Malcolm wrote:

The rejection of rebirth amounts to a rejection of karma, among other things, such as the serial ripening of actions performed now on a serial, albeit impermanent, mind stream in the future. There is really no way to reconcile rejection of rebirth with the Buddha's Dharma. Further, the rejection of rebirth entails that consciousness newly arise, as indicated by your term "new beings", etc., again, completely inconsistent with the Dharma the Buddha taught in all vehicles, not merely one.

It is fine if someone does not believe in rebirth, but I question whether they can truly call

themselves followers of the Buddha. You ask, "Doesn't Samsara recognition, the Bodhisattva Vow, the practice of the path of calming and insight and a recognition of the empty nature of self and phenomena comprise sufficient credentials?"

Without rebirth, there is no samsara worthy of the name, there is no cyclic existence, no 'khor ba, there no possibility that one, having been born a human being, can take rebirth in a higher realm or a lower realm, at death one simply ceases. One's birth as a human being is merely random and not connected with any accumulation of merit and so on.

Without rebirth, the bodhisattva vow is just empty verbiage, "From now until I reach the bodhimaṇḍa, the seat of awakening...", etc. Moreover, secular altruistic ethics are just fine, and are certainly more appropriate for people who do not have a deep felt faith commitment to the Dharma. There is thus no need to flatter oneself that one is a "secular" bodhisattva. Certain kinds of beliefs, such as the belief that one's consciousness is extinguished either at nirvana, in the case of śravakas, or at death, in the case of materialists are deeply incompatible with the bodhisattva aspiration.

Without rebirth, there is no transcendent insight to speak of because the purpose of insight in Buddhadharma is to burn away the traces of affliction which cause one to be reborn in samsara again and again and to cultivate omniscience in order to benefit other sentient beings from now until we reach the bodhimaṇḍa. This is the only reason we are cultivating insight into emptiness. David Hume recognized the empty nature of self and phenomena. But his insight is mundane and not transcendent, it neither eradicates obscurations nor does it lead to gathering the accumulation of wisdom, pristine consciousness (jñāna). His thought is not Buddhadharma, because Hume, at the end of the day, was a materialist. There is no point in even mentioning śamatha, because śamatha is simply one-pointedness of mind, and even animals have it.

My point is simple, physicalism, materialism, etc., whatever one wants to call it, is not compatible with Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 21st, 2014 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?

Content:

frank123 said:

I have heard various teachers of Buddhadharma use terms like deathlessness and indestructible etc to talk about our nature. What makes this not eternalism? what is between eternalism and nihilism?

Malcolm wrote:

Our nature, suchness, does not arise; therefore, it does not cease. This is what it means to be deathless, that which is beyond arising and ceasing, suchness is indestructible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 20th, 2014 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: Ornament of the Great Vehicle Sutras

Content:

Will said:

At last, a clear translation of the Mahayana-sutra-lamkara! Dr. Doctor and the Dharmachakra Trans. Committee have done a wondrous thing.

Paul said:

Which of the Doctor brothers did this?

Will said:

Still have not read too deeply into it, so the only quibble I have is the use of 'wakefulness' for jnana. The conventional use of wisdom or knowledge or understanding conveys the flavor better. Yes, they are probably trying to point out how the 'awareness' of this type of jnana is so very different from conceptional notions, but being 'awake' hardly conveys anything to non-buddhas.

Paul said:

I think 'wakefulness' is used because it is used in the Rangjung Yeshe Books texts as a term for mind essence, ie Chokyi Nyima Rinpoche's 'Present Fresh Wakefulness'.

Malcolm wrote:

Wakefulness (bodhatā) for jñāna is a huge stretch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 20th, 2014 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Ornament of the Great Vehicle Sutras

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

There may be so-called "Buddhists" who have doubts about or even reject rebirth, but there is no valid Buddhadharma that does.

Transfer of Merit accomplished by social transactions plants the seeds of wholesome transformation in the aggregate basis - this means every new being picks up discursive awareness within a global field in which everyone who has ever lived life's karma is spoken for.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just annihilationism. "Every new being" means that in your view there are beings that pass out of existence, this is just a view of self, albeit, an annihilationist/physicalist view.

It is definitely not what the Buddha taught.

Leo Rivers said:

In fact, in that there is no self, it is only the illusion of a self that admits a choice of

conduct for ill or good will.

Malcolm wrote:

The view you espoused above is just a view of self, an annihilationist/physicalist view.

Leo Rivers said:

It is working as a finite being, not going into quiescence, that is the sacrifice of self [the self benefit of enjoying complete peace] for others. Remember - a secular Buddhist treats Buddhist models as provisional, man made things amenable to re-working, identical in process to natural sciences.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such things as "secular Buddhism" — merely false views and correct ones. In this respect, the view espoused above is an annihilationist/physicalist view. Therefore, false.

Leo Rivers said:

It is not rejecting principles that you are really objecting to, I suspect. It is rejecting the divine [unquestionable and final] basis of those principles. I do not deify the man Gautama any more than I deify Einstein.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually it is your rejection of these basic principles which I find objectionable — not in so far as you are not entitled to them, but in so far as that you amazingly think your rejection of these principles can be included within the meaning sphere called "Buddhadharma" as something other than delusions.

Specifically, in the context of the text under discussion, its authors would find your claim that your views are found within Buddhadharma a very curious claim, since they are clearly actually Lokayati/Carvaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 20th, 2014 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Ornament of the Great Vehicle Sutras

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

All pre-Modern Buddhisms likely accept re-incarnation. For me the Bodhisattva Vow to practice to benefit all beings makes personal reincarnation irrelevant - who caused my pre-birth circumstances or inherits my consequences is beside the point. The point is to transform the basis of my character and the mutually experience world of karmas.

Malcolm wrote:

The bodhisattva vow is predicated on the principle of person rebirth or reincarnation. Without rebirth, there is no karmic world, so to speak, because there is no karma-vipaka.

Further, without rebirth, there is no way to accumulate the two accumulations

necessary to achieve buddhahood, nor is there any point in making such an aspiration.

There may be so-called "Buddhists" who have doubts about or even reject rebirth, but there is no valid Buddhadharma that does. So called "Buddhists" are those who at least nominally follow Buddhadharma, but when people reject the very basic principles upon which Buddhadharma is founded, what is the point of calling them Buddhists, much less followers of Buddhadharma?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 18th, 2014 at 11:02 PM

Title: Rebirth (Collection thread)

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

I kind of think of myself as An Old Testament Mahayanist.

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty strange self-perspective coming from someone who rejects rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 18th, 2014 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Four reminders in the Mahayana?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Reading Indestructible Truth by Reginald Ray, I came across this, and found it intriguing:

Reginald Ray in Indestructible Truth said:

...[in the Mahayana]the four reminders evolve into 1) a view of the sacredness of being 2) the immanence of death in the midst of life as a blessing 3) Karma as a vehicle for compassion, and 4) Suffering as ego's response to the energy of awareness.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Is this Ray's own extrapolation of the notion of the evolution of the Four Reminders into the Mahayana path, or is this a traditional teaching on them I have missed? It jives with me for sure, but I have never seen these notions specifically presented as coming from the Four Reminders.

Malcolm wrote:

This is Ray's own trip.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 18th, 2014 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Machig Lapdron: Shakyamuni Bodhisattva?

Content:

lorem said:

Yeah sambhogakaya beings can appear to samsaric beings just not in their sambhogakaya form.

Malcolm wrote:

That means sambhogakāyas cannot appear to ordinary beings, hence nirmanakāyas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Pringle said:

So just to clarify my own thinking with regards to the three types of Dukkha

1) Dukkha Dukkha - This would be the suffering caused by pain, such as 'ouch i just stubbed my toe'

2) Viparinama Dukkha - This is the suffering of change due to all things being impermanent, as such even if something is giving us pleasure now, such as being in a relationship, then this will ultimately end up as suffering like when the relationship ends

3) Sankhara Dukkha - The suffering all condition phenomena. This is due to the very nature of 'things' as being part of conditioned phenomena. So even though this really tasty food gives me pleasure now, because of the impermanence inherent in the food, it is not a lasting pleasure, and as such will only result in suffering once the taste goes due to my craving the food.

so how far of the mark am I? I get the feeling im possibly getting Viparinama and Sankhara dukkha slightly confused, but not sure where the confusion lies. They both seem very similar to me, in the sense that its due to the impermanence of things that cause the suffering (due to the attachment/craving to things).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are getting these two confused. The third is the fact that things just fall apart and so therefore cannot be considered a source of happiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

@Malcolm

The claim is that Buddha's are omniscient....so there for they are aware of _any illness_

for _any_ sentient being (Buddhist or non- Buddhist).....and they have the medication for any of these illnesses....?

Malcolm wrote:

Right. What is your question?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 10:29 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

Malcolm, this is your quote "All benefit that comes to us is the blessings of the Buddhas".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because the buddhas only wish the best for sentient beings, it is therefore any benefit that befalls them is a blessing of the buddhas.

brendan said:

This is also a quote, "Yes, and there is nothing Buddhas can do about that"...So how can there even be a cognition of a wish?

Malcolm wrote:

There may be nothing Buddhas can do to intervene when sentient beings are blindly acting out of affliction and cause themselves needless injury, nevertheless, even though samsara is a terrible place, it is still possible to generate roots of virtue. All positive things that sentient beings do generate such roots, and the Buddhas teach only virtue, therefore, all positive things that happen to sentient beings are a blessing of the Buddhas because the Buddhas bless all roots of virtue as such. Every teaching, every word, which encourages sentient beings to generate virtue is the word of the Buddha, and it does not matter in which religion or secular philosophy it is found — all of them are the teaching of the Buddha, the ultimate root of such teachings come out of the very basis which gives rise to Buddhahood itself, cultivating the root of virtue and generating compassion for sentient beings. Buddhas have limitless compassion so of course they automatically "wish" the benefit of sentient beings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

Malcolm, this is your quote "All benefit that comes to us is the blessings of the Buddhas".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because the buddhas only wish the best for sentient beings, it is therefore any benefit that befalls them is a blessing of the buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

Malcolm, Buddhas are beyond doctors.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas are called "great physicians" for the very reason I state. And like doctors who can only treat patients who do what they say, Buddha can only help sentient beings who follow the path that they teach. As it is said:

The munis do not wash sins away,
nor remove suffering with their hands.

brendan said:

Malcolm, not doing what they say and not following the path is also a illness.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and there is nothing Buddhas can do about that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

Malcolm, Buddhas are beyond doctors.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas are called "great physicians" for the very reason I state. And like doctors who can only treat patients who do what they say, Buddha can only help sentient beings who follow the path that they teach. As it is said:

The munis do not wash sins away,
nor remove suffering with their hands.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

Read the accomplishments. Anyway you are a moderator so I'm sure you are aware of the claims of what Buddhas have accomplished.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe you should read them more carefully.

brendan said:

Malcolm, Buddhas are said to be able to manifest as anything...or as many atoms in the universe.

There is still suffering...and thanks for all your hard work and time in translating.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and nevertheless because of our own afflictive and karmic obscurations not only are we unable to see them, but we still continue to suffer.

For example, a person with jaundice cannot see white things as white, only as yellow and so on. Buddhas offer us the medicine to cure this condition, but if we do not take it, then like the sick person who does not follow their doctor's instructions, then we have only ourselves to blame for not getting well.

In the end, brendan, we are responsible for our own liberation, there are no Buddhas to lift us out of samsara like mewling kittens being moved to a safe place by mother cat. This does not mean however that Buddhas are not all around us, benefitting us all the time in ways we cannot or will not perceive.

All harm that comes to us is a result of our afflicted vision. All benefit that comes to us is the blessings of the Buddhas — if we train with this attitude, then our attitude will improve remarkably.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Useful Events Website: dharmalist.org

Content:

Punya said:

Congratulations to all involved. May the dharma flourish!

(No reason why Dharma Wheel and Dhamma Wheel couldn't be listed there as well.)

Malcolm wrote:
They will be.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 12:55 AM
Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth
Content:

brendan said:
Read the accomplishments. Anyway you are a moderator so I'm sure you are aware of the claims of what Buddhas have accomplished.

Malcolm wrote:
Maybe you should read them more carefully.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 14th, 2014 at 12:53 AM
Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth
Content:

brendan said:
So why did you suggest I pray to Tara.

Malcolm wrote:
Very simply put, taking refuge in sublime beings such as Buddhas and tenth stage bodhisattvas is meritorious because they are pure, uncontaminated and free of all afflictions. This alone eliminates traces of obscuration.

brendan said:
Mahayana Buddhas apparently have accomplished the 10 Bhumis the 6 Perfections etc...im sure you know the stages of accomplishments in 10 Bhumis as you are a translator.

Malcolm wrote:
Do you suppose that perfecting dānapāramitā, the perfection generosity means that you have removed all the poverty there is in the three realms? Of course it does not mean that. Śāntideva addresses this qualm in the Bodhicaryāvatāra where he points out that the Bodhisattva perfected the perfection of generosity through his wish to give all virtuous things to everyone, not because he was actually able to do so. Mahāyāna is based on one's intention.

Since you are someone who has entered Mahāyāna already, it is really better if you go back to the beginning and study the teachings under a qualified teacher in a proper way. This cynicism, doubt and lack of faith is harmful to you.

brendan said:

Not to mention what the other Bhumis of Vajrayana and Dzogchen...their accomplishments are said to be for more advanced.

Malcolm wrote:

The bhumis in Vajrayāna are merely subtle refinements in omniscience, that is all, there are no special powers that Vajradhara as that a buddha on the eleventh bhumi lacks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 13th, 2014 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

The claims are that Buddha/Dharma does eliminate all suffering (or course via Dependent Origination)...but considering the claims..moving the goal posts (lack of a better term) seems a very appropriate term.

Malcolm wrote:

Can you present such claims, something found in a sūtra, for example?

brendan said:

Considering the claims of Vajradhara, Garab Dorje, Buddhas etc..at what point is their view of Dependent Origination and their claims of accomplishment not poetic licence and machism.

Malcolm wrote:

Which claims? Can you bring them forward?

BTW, you have seemed awfully disappointed in Buddhadharma now for many years, and for some strange reason, you seem to only comment on my posts.

brendan said:

They clearly claim they can eliminate suffering albeit via dependent origination...so if they can do it why not just do it....why all the torture? It seems more like poetic license and machoism. Not disappointed just find the hypocrisy a bit funny..sorry for replying to some of your posts.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not correct. Buddha taught that one can eliminate one's own suffering through understanding dependent origination. He never claimed to be able to remove the suffering of others. In fact, he stated in many places in both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna sutras that he had no ability to remove the suffering of others. So, you are perceiving a hypocrisy where none exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 12th, 2014 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

Yes, of course. As long as sentient beings are afflicted, they will continue to suffer. Who could expect anything else. It is not the Buddha's fault that sentient beings continue to cultivate afflictions. No one ever claimed the Buddha was able to remove the suffering of sentient beings through fiat.

It's just Dependent Origination to suit one's point of view. What's the point of being omniscient having achieved limitless compassion, kindness etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas are omniscient, not omnipotent. The criteria for even being able to meet Buddhadharma are rather slim, themselves requiring long stores of merit.

brendan said:

So what is Vajradhara or Garab Dorje or the Mahayana Buddhas doing this very instant!

Malcolm wrote:

Helping some sentient being somewhere. Does this mean they are surgically removing that being's suffering? No, of course not. Are they teaching Dharma? Yes, since that is primary way Buddhas help sentient beings in samsara.

brendan said:

They claim they have perfect omniscience (so they know exactly what is happening this very instant), they claim they have perfect compassion, kindness, generosity etc (so they have the tools to help any sentient being). They claim they can remember every one of their past lives (so they clearly know all the problems).....so what more to practitioners have to do.

Malcolm wrote:

They have to practice the path, just as the buddhas before them did.

brendan said:

Next you will be suggesting I pray to Tara lol.

Malcolm wrote:

It would probably be more beneficial for you than making disappointed complaints about Buddhadharma on the internet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 12th, 2014 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

The claims are that Buddha/Dharma does eliminate all suffering (or course via Dependent Origination)...but considering the claims..moving the goal posts (lack of a better term) seems a very appropriate term.

Malcolm wrote:

Can you present such claims, something found in a sūtra, for example?

brendan said:

Considering the claims of Vajradhara, Garab Dorje, Buddhas etc..at what point is their view of Dependent Origination and their claims of accomplishment not poetic licence and machism.

Malcolm wrote:

Which claims? Can you bring them forward?

BTW, you have seemed awfully disappointed in Buddhadharma now for many years, and for some strange reason, you seem to only comment on my posts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 12th, 2014 at 6:28 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

How can anyone claim they have achived the 3rd Noble Truth?.....There is still suffering....so claiming that suffering has ended seems silly.

Also space is limitless so how can suffering end?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a claim that all suffering ceases, merely that one's suffering can cease.

brendan said:

I understand that...and there is still suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. As long as sentient beings are afflicted, they will continue to suffer. Who could expect anything else. It is not the Buddha's fault that sentient beings continue to cultivate afflictions. No one ever claimed the Buddha was able to remove the suffering of sentients beings through fiat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 12th, 2014 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Dalai Lama Quotation: No Crazy Wisdom Masters

Content:

Jikan said:

In the mid-1990s, someone referenced the current Dalai Lama as saying that he knew of no contemporary crazy wisdom masters. I've never been able to track this reference down or verify it. Here's as close as I've come.

<http://www.tricycle.com/letters/letters-editor-winter-1993?page=0,1> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Does anyone have anything that might clarify what HHDL had to say on this issue, when he said it, and what the context was? Many thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

http://info-buddhism.com/Questioning_Advice_of_Guru_Dalai_Lama.html "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 11th, 2014 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Half Of Brits Say...

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Siddhartha Gautama, surely?

Malcolm wrote:

Strictly speaking, from a Mahāyāna point of view, they start with the Dharmakāya, which transcends time and space. Nevertheless, from a relative point of view Śakyamuni began our present dispensation and he is the teacher of all who follow Buddhadharma in whatever form it may be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 11th, 2014 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

brendan said:

How can anyone claim they have achieved the 3rd Noble Truth?.....There is still suffering....so claiming that suffering has ended seems silly.

Also space is limitless so how can suffering end?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a claim that all suffering ceases, merely that one's suffering can cease.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 11th, 2014 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Thanks for the response, I don't doubt people find you entertaining or informative, i've certainly learned a lot from your postings and answers myself.

I still wonder though, if you are truly as blunt in person re:Dharma as you are online, or is the context too different to even say?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 11th, 2014 at 9:41 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Jikan said:

I

Following up on Johnny D's question: do you think the idea of being "straight up" works internationally?

Malcolm wrote:

One just has to be honest and transparent, warts and all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 11th, 2014 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quite frankly, people either have the merit to see the truth of the Dharma, or they don't. All attempts at proselytizing Dharma are doomed to failure. Therefore, the best way to be with people about the Dharma is to be straight up.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Do you teach in person, as in group Dharma talks, etc. or just online Malcolm?

If so, i'm curious how people react to your "straight up" style in person. Sorry if the question is invasive, just trying to be "straight up" myself.

I also find the above a strange statement, in that most folks I know, and myself have seen our views transform as time goes on..in fact, I think i've seen yours change even in the time i've been here, or at least you changed your views on things like whether you call yourself a "Buddhist" or not.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't call myself a Buddhist, but for the convenience of others I am a "Buddhist". I practice Buddhadharma.

I have taught both online as well as in person settings. As far as I know, people like listening to me blather on about the teachings because they continue to ask me to teach. Believe it or not, people find me not only informative, but also extremely entertaining. I don't promote myself very much because there are many people out there with much more merit than I who are much better teachers because of it. I also don't often accept such invitations mainly because I am busy trying to make a living as text translator (oral translators get all the glory, but we do all the work) and as a doctor of Tibetan Medicine so I don't have so much time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 11th, 2014 at 9:11 AM

Title: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Jikan said:

I think this is relevant for a Buddhist board because people come here for Buddhism, whether they're interested in learning on the Dharma's terms or on their own (for now).

Malcolm wrote:

You can't learn Dharma on your own terms. It just doesn't work.

The point of the Dharma is to a) overcome the ignorance that is rooted in self-grasping so that b) one can help sentient beings achieve buddhahood.

If a doesn't happen, b never will. Therefore, it is best to be clear what Dharma is and what it is not.

Jikan said:

I agree on all these points. I can confirm that trying to learn Dharma on my own terms was a disaster for me, and I'm thankful to the people who skillfully set me right.

The question remains: how to best engage with people who have enough interest in Buddhism to show up on a discussion board with the word "Buddhist" in the banner, but are either just starting out or are heavily laden with--shall we say--unrealistic expectations?

Malcolm wrote:

Quite frankly, people either have the merit to see the truth of the Dharma, or they don't. All attempts at proselytizing Dharma are doomed to failure. Therefore, the best way to be with people about the Dharma is to be straight up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 11th, 2014 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Jikan said:

I think this is relevant for a Buddhist board because people come here for Buddhism, whether they're interested in learning on the Dharma's terms or on their own (for now).

Malcolm wrote:

You can't learn Dharma on your own terms. It just doesn't work.

The point of the Dharma is to a) overcome the ignorance that is rooted in self-grasping so that b) one can help sentient beings achieve buddhahood.

If a doesn't happen, b never will. Therefore, it is best to be clear what Dharma is and what it is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 10th, 2014 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

I am actually fairly convinced we all have our little moments of heresy. I do, for sure. The ego is a tricky bastard. No wonder newcomers reject, and vehemently so, such dogmas as rebirth. Please note that the fact they keep talking about it means there may be some space for realignment. If they kept their mouths shut there would be none.

[snip]

Hence we really should be careful when we post, and be particularly attentive to the way we post. If arrogance is a shortcoming of those heretical newcomers, it is at the very least as often our shortcoming as well. And if we want to help, we must do it properly, otherwise the whole thing will tragically backfire.

Jikan said:

I'd like to underscore the importance of these two points. Really, this is the rationale for keeping an online Buddhist discussion board going (first point), and a caution with regard to being helpful about it (second point).

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma is relatively straight forward. If you study properly, you can easily understand it. If you don't well, we often see the results of that here online.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 10th, 2014 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Jikan said:

What about people who haven't been taught, or who have studied a bit on their own but have become convinced they don't need to be taught--or worse, that becoming a student would hinder their progress? These are people who have serious aspirations and must be approached with respect, even though their expectations have created some obstacles for learning.

Malcolm wrote:

Their arrogance outweighs their "serious" aspiration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 9th, 2014 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Tilopa's Six Advices

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Malcolm, If Samaya only truly comes with HYT empowerment, what are the "commitments" often attached to (presumably non-hyt) jenangs..are those not the same thing functionally as samaya?

Malcolm wrote:

There are samayas associated with the yoga tantra, but you do not receive them from a jenang, but only an abhisheka associated with that class. A person without a full HYT or YT empowerment does not possess them. A Jenang in general only comes with bodhisattva vows and a commitment to practice a mantra.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I have to admit at this point in my early Vajrayana "career" I do not get how relationships with the guru works exactly...

Malcolm wrote:

You received empowerment from a Guru. You then work with the transmission you received. If you have questions, you go and ask. Guruyoga is a special practice of highest yoga tantra, like mandala offerings. It is a way of summoning the blessings of the guru and integrating them with your mindstream. It exists in an indirect way as the master of the family in deity yoga.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I think you guys are being too hard on Rachmiel. As a newer practitioner I found some of the more hard-nosed "it must be like X or it's useless" advice I got on here was really counter productive..no offense, I know you guys know what you are talking about, and I appreciate the sentiment.. but your bedside manner really leaves something to be desired for someone new to the path, or someone having doubts about this or that etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Simple texts like the one that is the subject of this thread would never be bandied about in such a reckless manner. Doing so ruins the potential impact of the text, and its blessings, not to mention that fact that it is something that someone should hear in a proper way from a guru. Such behavior really contradicts the principles of Secret Mantra in general, to which this text belongs, since it comes from the Secret Mantra portion of the bstan 'gyur.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I've also been under the impression that plenty of people, including historical dudes, have more than one guru...so not sure how/why it would matter that Rachmiel has more than one teacher, is it just his reluctance that you're jumping on?

Malcolm wrote:

This does not apply to me. I have more than one guru, many more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 9th, 2014 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

it may seem a small thing, but when you use a locative construction like "in samsara" it cannot help but bring a whiff of reification. You know very well samsara is not a place that a sentient being finds itself in, its a state of mind. So wouldn't it be better to say "I am just as deluded that there is happiness in my samsaric mind"? Thats harder to say perhaps because its owning your state of mind rather than projecting, but it has far more potential for change. Its much easier to imagine a state of mind changing than a universe.

Malcolm wrote:

Pointless quibble.

It is a state, thus locative is perfectly appropriate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 9th, 2014 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As Maitreya says, there isn't even a pinprick of happiness in the three realms.

M

gad rgyangs said:

wow, must be gloomy at your house.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. I am just as deluded that there is happiness in samsara as the next guy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 9th, 2014 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Queequeg said:

Does a Buddha experience happiness?

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of Mahāyāna, buddhas experiences only pleasurable mental sensations, i.e., bliss, and no painful physical sensations. A Buddha is also totally free of clinging. All painful feelings of the body are the ripened result of negative karma. Buddhas have no obscuration of karma. All pleasurable feelings of the mind are the ripened result of positive actions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 9th, 2014 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Tilopa's Six Advices

Content:

rachmiel said:

This is well-suited for my style of learning, though I wish I could have a bit more direct contact with him.

Sherab Dorje said:

I can only begin to imagine what Tilopa would have done to you if you went and said this to him. It would probably make Naropa's beating with a sandal look like childs play!

rachmiel said:

What issue do you think Tilopa would have had with what I said?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing, he just would not have you as a student. But this does not mean other teachers won't. And they will even cater to your expectations and neurosis out of their compassion. Whether that will benefit you of course, depends on the teacher, and how well they can help you see through the very neurosis that prevents you from making deep bond with a guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 9th, 2014 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimate truth however is just the object of a correct cognition, that is how it is defined, that is all it is. When sentient beings do not have that, they suffer; when they do they don't.

gad rgyangs said:

I have never seen a sentient being that didn't suffer at least some of the time, regardless of what kind of cognitions they have or don't have. It is part of the job description.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, being a sentient being involves suffering. The question before is whether suffering [duḥkha] can be considered pervasive, extending even to conditioned phenomena. The Buddha thought so, and labeled this the suffering [duḥkha] that pervades the conditioned [saṃskāraduḥkhatā]. He identified the suffering of change [vipariṇāmaduḥkhatā] as any pleasant condition such as health, happiness, and so on that was impermanent. Why? So that people could understand what duḥkha was. As Maitreya says, there isn't even a pinprick of happiness in the three realms.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 9th, 2014 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The secret name of the suffering of change is sukha.

gad rgyangs said:

then its a truly delicious masochism.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you are attached to happiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 9th, 2014 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that our sense cognition are automatically perceptions of "suchness" has been refuted many times by the Buddha in many sutras, so no need to repeat them here.

gad rgyangs said:

suchness is not dependent on one's cognitions or one's recognition in any way. That's the beauty of it. true and false cognitions are just clouds passing in the sky.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimate truth however is just the object of a correct cognition, that is how it is defined, that is all it is. When sentient beings do not have that, they suffer; when they do they don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

all anyone ever experiences is ultimate truth, they just don't recognize it.

Malcolm wrote:

Just that nonrecognition is relative truth because it is by definition a false cognition grounded in ignorance.

gad rgyangs said:

...which is itself already ultimate truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not really, not according to the definition. But you know this, and you have your problems accepting Buddhist teachings and have for years, as anyone who follows your posts knows.

The idea that our sense cognition are automatically perceptions of "suchness" has been refuted many times by the Buddha in many sutras, so no need to repeat them here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

If happiness is interspersed with dukkha, another level of dukkha will be our gut feeling

that the happiness we are enjoying is bound to end, that it is not consummate and perfect, that simultaneously there are endless beings who lack that happiness, etc.

gad rgyangs said:

If dukkha is interspersed with happiness, another level of happiness will be out gut feeling that the suffering we are undergoing is bound to end, that it is not consummate and horrible, that simultaneously there are endless beings who lack that suffering, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Any being who possesses afflictions which causes rebirth in samsara is suffering by definition even if they are experiencing the most intense possible mundane bliss. Why? Because they will inevitably exhaust their merit and take rebirth in lower realms.

The secret name of the suffering of change is sukha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Tilopa's Six Advices

Content:

lorem said:

But I still think he was right. If you have a genuine need for it the dakinis and dharmapalas will help.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they will not. If you are not a Vajrayāna practitioner (meaning that you maintained your samaya), they will not even heed you, let alone help you.

M

lorem said:

I think samaya though may be a little more complicated than just a definition. Case by case. I think that's why exceptions are allowed.

There is an online teaching by HH Holiness that might clarify a little but I know you hold your view on samaya.

EDIT Not everything is as it appears

Malcolm wrote:

They are not my views. In any case, you can also read Kongtrul's Buddhist Ethics, where different approaches to samaya are evaluated and harmonized, but not one claims that one can hold samaya without an HYT empowerment of some kind. Empowerment is the

sole entryway to Vajrayāna, this has been proclaimed in one voice by all the scholars of India and Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Tilopa's Six Advices

Content:

lorem said:

But I still think he was right. If you have a genuine need for it the dakinis and dharmapalas will help.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they will not. If you are not a Vajrayāna practitioner (meaning that you maintained your samaya), they will not even heed you, let alone help you.

M

lorem said:

I think samaya though may be a little more complicated than just a definition. Case by case. I think that's why an exception was allowed for H H Trijang Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

Without empowerment, you cannot receive samayas. You need to read Sapan's Three Vows and Tsongkhapa's commentary on the Vajrayānamūlapatti. If you have no samaya, no wisdom protector from the tantras will give you aid, though of course, worldly protectors found in sūtra, etc., will.

I don't know what exception you are referring to regarding Trijiang Rinpoche.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

My question (not a rhetorical one!) was: is the suffering that we experience as we are resting in rigpa dukkha?

Malcolm wrote:

Dukkha is dukkha, it does not go away with awakening. Even if our dukha vanishes (and it can), there is still the dukha of others — and this the basis of Mahāyāna, the reason why in Mahāyāna there is the notion of a non-abiding nirvana where awakened people do not simply check out in a nirvanic cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Tilopa's Six Advices

Content:

lorem said:

But I still think he was right. If you have a genuine need for it the dakinis and dharmapalas will help.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they will not. If you are not a Vajrayāna practitioner (meaning that you maintained your samaya), they will not even heed you, let alone help you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Malcolm, the question I was trying to ask is: When we are resting in rigpa, there is no dukkha, right? Mahasukkha and dukkha cannot co-exist, can they?

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe for as long as it takes for an ant to crawl up the bridge of our nose.

Otherwise, who are we kidding? Well, ourselves for one, and definitely others.

The reality is that as long as we have impure vision, we are witnessing and experiencing suffering, both of ourselves and others. What is the basis for compassion in every Buddhist practice? The suffering or dukha of sentient beings. Does having pure vision mean having a fantasy about everything being pure? No, even if we have pure vision 24/7 we still must keep in mind that sentient beings including ourselves are under the power of affliction and karma.

Will we live forever? No. Will we get sick, die, etc. Yes. Will we be suffering? By definition, yes. Even if we are able to go beyond it through meditation, the very fact of conditioned existence is that it is suffering from top to bottom. Dzogchen is not a get out of jail free card. Dzogchen is the path of seeing how ignorance creates this state we live in, and then how to escape it. This is one of the reasons why in Dzogchen the prison metaphor is used so often.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Here is your "Dzogchen tawa"

treehuggingoctopus said:

What about the nonconceptual one?

Malcolm wrote:

It's no different than sūtra, in this respect. Only the path is different, but not the basic principles, as the Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra indicates:

If someone does not dwell in words and does not dwell in names,
that is Prajñāpāramitā,
the transcendent state of buddhahood.

And:

Migrating beings are led with the noose of the method
to prajñā through concrete objects.

Therefore, it is the Prajñāpāramitā.

The vast dhatū of Samantabhadra
arises in the dharmatā of unceasing play.

The dhātu of prajñā, the transcendent state,
lacks attachment, the nature of grasping.

Since it is nonconceptual, it is beyond speech and thought.

For example, like a magical apparition in the sky,
it is said to be free from the Dharma of expression.

Also the Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra:

Therefore, prajñāpāramitā cannot be spoken of, thought of, or expressed; not arising,
unceasing, beyond thought, clearly knowing pure beneficial conduct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

What about the Dzogchen tawa?

Malcolm wrote:

Here is your "Dzogchen tawa"

The generic basis is called "the basis of delusion" [28b]
because of ignorance and contamination.

Further, the object of knowledge itself appears tainted
because memory and thought arise in the mind.

The essence itself is contaminated by concepts
because the grasping aspect of the six minds is unceasing.
Further, dharmakāya is bound by apprehension
due to being associated with subtle atoms.

Further, luminosity forms traces
due to the impure perception of the four conditions

And:

Having been joined with the ripening of karma,
one takes bodies good and bad,
one after another like a water wheel,
born into each individual class.
Having crossed at the ford of self-grasping,
one sinks into the ocean of suffering
and one is caught by the heart on the hook of the three lower realms.
One is bound by oneself; the afflictions are the enemy.

— String of Pearls Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

all anyone ever experiences is ultimate truth, they just don't recognize it.

Malcolm wrote:

Just that nonrecognition is relative truth because it is by definition a false cognition grounded in ignorance. Thus, while pretending to disagree, you actually agree.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Queequeg said:

Is it correct to understand that "sentient being" is a technical term? If yes, what is the Sanskrit/Pali term?

Malcolm wrote:

Sattva/satta

Queequeg said:

Can you explain how things possess the two natures? My understanding is that

dharma are empty, and so whether they are seen as they truly are or not is really located in the mind. Is there a sense in which the perception of thing is really the subject and object "meeting" half way?

Malcolm wrote:

Things have relative nature, how they appear as objects of [deluded] perceptions of an ordinary person; they have an ultimate nature, which is what an ārya perceives in equipoise, and what a buddha perceives at all times.

Candrakīrti's explanation in the *Madhyamakāvatāra*, Introduction to *Madhyamaka*, can be perused with great profit.

No offense, but I find the writings of the Chinese masters too obtuse and round about in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Queequeg said:

Is it possible for a dharma to simultaneously be defiled and undefiled? What I mean by that is, and I don't mean to offend by this example, a śramaṇa and an deeply deluded person encounter a beautiful deity who is teaching Buddhadharma. The Śramaṇa sees the deity as a teacher and benefits from the teachings; the deluded person is overcome by lust for the deity compounding their delusions.

Or is that example flawed? Can you point out how.

Malcolm wrote:

Let me ask you, do you know what a path dharma is? If you don't, please review the 37 bodhipakṣa dharmas.

Queequeg said:

Is it possible to be a sentient being and not suffer, or is that an inherent quality of a sentient being?

Malcolm wrote:

As long as sentient beings have afflictions which motivate actions, they will suffer. However, when a sentient being is free of those afflictions, they are not really called sentient beings anymore. They are called āryas. Freedom, mokṣa, means being free of afflictions that cause rebirth in saṃsāra, that is all it is. For as long as one takes afflictive rebirth in saṃsāra, for that long one will experience suffering.

Queequeg said:

Am I correct to understand that the ordinary person's experience is wholly exclusive of the ultimate truth? Is the obscuration something that blocks experience of ultimate truth, or is it something in the constitution that precludes the capacity?

Malcolm wrote:

Ordinary people never experience ultimate truth, if they do, they are not longer ordinary, having become āryas. Ultimate truth can be reasoned out, and inferred, and this is why it can be realized. However, ultimate truth is just the object of a correct cognition, just as relative truth is likewise the object of a false cognition. Since ordinary sentient beings never have direct correct cognitions, they never experienced ultimate truth, ever, even though all things possess two natures, one relative, the other ultimate. But if someone does have a direct intuition of ultimate truth, that person has become a first stage bodhisattva [in the original Indian ten stage system, not the later Chinese 52 stage system].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Tilopa's Six Advices

Content:

rachmiel said:

Thanks for clarifying that.

lorem said:

It's empowerments that Lama Zhang didn't think you needed. He would watch an empowerment and then imitate it with results.

Malcolm wrote:

You will note that Lama Zhang does not have a lineage, nor a surviving school. Yes, his texts survive, but mainly as a curiosity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Tilopa's Six Advices

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"conditioned existence" is not reducible to 'suffering', despite what some buddhist traditions may say.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean, "...despite what the Buddha said."

Good luck with that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Response: it very much depends on what you mean by identical. Fire and water are identical in so far as they are both conditioned, they are not identical in so far as their properties are concerned.

Jikan said:

OK. Let's assume we have a dozen ordinary sentient beings, then. What do they have in common? Their afflictions--they are all equally afflicted (equal in kind), but unequally afflicted (unequal in quality).

But let's assume that one out of those dozen is not ordinary at all, but is a realized being. What differentiates that being from the other eleven, if anything? If different, what is the nature of that difference? If the same, are all twelve equally realized or equally samsaric or...?

I'm putting it this way because I think the divergences in view we see in this thread go back to these questions, and a little more clarity wouldn't hurt.

Malcolm wrote:

This is elementary, this is why the Uttaratāntra states:

Wayward common people

see the opposite of the truth;

while tathāgatas are without proliferation,

unmistaken about how things are.

Respectively, the impure, the pure and impure,

and the very pure,

are called sentient beings, bodhisattvas

and tathāgatas.

Thus the difference between sentient beings, bodhisattvas and buddhas is their respective insight in the nature of reality, and that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 8th, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Jikan said:

I agree with Queequeg that there's a lot more going on in Zhiyi's discussion of the Four Truths than just emptiness--and that the "lot more" is the most interesting part. I just wanted to highlight that it was there and not negated in the perfect teaching.

A few questions follow from that. First: Are beings who have completely realized the perfect teaching identical to those who have not realized it--who don't "get it"?

If not, what differentiates beings who have fully integrated the view of the perfect teaching from ordinary sentient beings who are stuck to the wheel--reproducing it in themselves and through their actions?

If they are already identical, then what?

{I'm not calling Queequeg out with these questions--I mean them for everyone to discuss or not.}

Malcolm wrote:

Response: it very much depends on what you mean by identical. Fire and water are identical in so far as they are both conditioned, they are not identical in so far as their properties are concerned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Different Kinds of Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Phase four comes about when Rigzin Tsewang Norbu a Nyingma abbot, tertön and scholar who lived in the 18th century sought to revive Kalacakra and received Kalacakra from the Jonangpas surviving in central Tibet. He passed them onto Situ Panchen, who established both the gzhan stong view as well as the Dro system of Kalacakra at Palpung.

The basis difference among these different species of gzhan stong has to do with how whether one follows in the footsteps of Jonang, or Shakya Chogden.

M

conebeckham said:

Well, The current interest in Shentong is almost entirely due to the writings of Kongtrul, so I'd say that is Phase Five--in some sense, the phase we are currently in. Of course, he was disciple of Situ Panchen at Palpung. When it's taught these days, Kongtrul's texts and commentaries are the ones that are most often used in the Kagyu lineage, at least.

But I believe, also, Khyentse Wangpo was a Shentongpa, was he not?

Also, Kongtrul is considered to be the Tulku of Jetsun Taranatha (amongst others, of course).

It would be interesting to explore further any relationship between the presentation of Shentong and the Tantric view espoused in Kalacakra, too.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but Kongtrul largely follows Shakya Chogden, and not Dolbupa and Taranatha, even though he gives lip service to both of the former, what he actually presents is more consistent with Chogden.

Some people might say that Khyentse was a gzhan stong pa, but I wouldn't. His take on the treatises of Maitreya is that they concerned luminosity and the treatises of Nāgārjuna concerned emptiness. Since these two are actually synonymous from a Sakya point of view, I don't think you can call Khyentse a gzhan stong pa. He instead presents the Sakya position in a text called The Madhyamaka Instructional Manual that Harmonizes the Two Traditions, "meaning Nāgārjuna and Maitreya.

When considering the point of view of Maitreya, he states that in this system, the wisdom at the time of the basis, the luminous original nature of the mind, is the basis of samsara and nirvana. He says:

"The non-recognition of that, which manifests the appearances of dualistic delusions along with their latent traces, is this connate ignorance that is the root of the samsara. Therefore, it is very important to cut the root of this and and dissolve it into the dharmadhātu."

He identifies this wisdom or pure consciousness, the luminous nature of the mind, as the dharmadhātu. In reference to the much discussed moon metaphor, he states:

"The luminous original nature of the mind free from free from dualism is clear like a moon disc, is non-conceptual and exists in one's heart."

He never discusses this in terms of the three natures and so on, which is characteristic of gzhan stong in general, and the basis for most criticism of gzhan stong, incidentally.

When he does talk about gzhan stong, he discusses it in a series of texts I call "Three Madhyamaka views." he says:

The is the position of the great omniscient Jonang pa is discussed briefly, ultimate truth is without arising or perishing, unconditioned and beyond dependent origination. Relative truth has the character of arising and perishing, depends on cause and conditions and is conditioned.

When he presents the Sakya view, it is identical to his presentation in The Madhyamaka Instructional Manual that Harmonizes the Two Traditions.

So while Khyentse was broadminded, and so on, his own views are in line with the Sakya Gongma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 7:14 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Queequeg said:

What is the view of the Mahayana Mahaparinirvana Sutra in Indo-Tibetan circles?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends. Those who follow classical Madhyamaka tend to regard it as a secondary text. The main interpretation of it found in the Uttarantra is what is followed by most Tibetans. There is a lot of debate about how that former text is to be understood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 7:06 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Queequeg said:

Is it a false assumption that the Buddha's spiritual struggle took place at a particular historical time and place in which there was, more or less, this idea of the cycle of samsara? I have a very hard time imagining that his teachings would have arisen without the particular circumstances of his lifetime. Certainly possible.

Bakmoon said:

Just because something is developed within a particular context doesn't automatically mean that it is limited to that context.

Malcolm wrote:

This would have to suppose that this thing that is developed can be distinguished from its causes and conditions... and that's not possible, right? That's basic madhyamika.[/quote]

Buddha notes that he did not invent the Dharma, but that he merely rediscovered it. Causes and conditions were favorable for a Buddha to arise to teach that Dharma, but principles like the 4NT are universal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

existence is purity, bliss, self, and eternal.

Queequeg said:
Have you encountered this doctrine before?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, in nonbuddhist schools who suffer from wrong views.

There are many eternalist positions in Chinese Buddhism that would never have come to pass if the Chinese understood the range of nonbuddhist views in India. But because they did not, many of these eternalist doctrines developed with Chinese Buddhism, especially with regards to the tathāgatagarbha teachings.

Whether you are accurately reflecting Chih I's views is another matter altogether but claiming that existence is pure, etc., is laughable and shows that a bit of study of Abhidharma might be in order here.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 7:01 AM
Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth
Content:
Queequeg said:
existence is purity, bliss, self, and eternal.
Good luck with that.
What do you mean?

Malcolm wrote:
What I mean is that existence [bhāva] impure, suffering, nonself and impermanent. Seeing the impure as pure and so on is a large part of the fact that sentient beings are caught in samsara.

So good luck with the conceptual proliferation that existence is purity, bliss, self, and eternal.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 6:33 AM
Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth
Content:

Queequeg said:
On the dukkha of fabrication - If there is no one around when a tree falls in the forest, does it make a noise?

Malcolm wrote:
Whether there is someone around or not, the impermanence of trees, rocks, houses,

planets, suns, galaxies and universe is all suffering of the conditioned.

As to your other point, that idea that all one's activities while a common sentient being are buddhaactivities leads to such corruptions as the Japanese Buddhist involvement in WWII.

While it is certainly true that Buddhas only see other Buddhas, we can't even perceive most sentient beings, let alone any Buddhas. Why? We have impure vision because we are contaminated with afflictions.

Queequeg said:
existence is purity, bliss, self, and eternal.

Malcolm wrote:
Good luck with that.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 4:46 AM
Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth
Content:

Bakmoon said:
There's another point I'd like to make as well. You say:
As for the three aspects of dukkha - it doesn't alter my point - all three aspects have to do with subjective experience.
Just because something is subjective in the sense of being experienced doesn't mean that it is subjective in the sense of being purely a matter of personal opinion. If this weren't the case that would mean that one couldn't say anything objective whatsoever about anything involving the mind. If someone were to claim that it is not objectively true that emotions exist because they are part of personal experience, would anyone take them seriously? It can be objectively true that something is a part of experience, and that doesn't make it any less objective.

Malcolm wrote:
Another additional point is that they are the truths of nobles, not noble truths, because this is the truth that all awakened people see regardless of where they are on the path and regardless of which bodhicitta aspiration they have formed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 4:12 AM
Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth
Content:

Queequeg said:

As for the three aspects of dukkha - it doesn't alter my point - all three aspects have to do with subjective experience.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the third form of suffering has nothing to do with personal experience, it has to do with fundamental nature of conditioned phenomena that are phenomena which belong to the path. In other words, only dharmas that belong to the path are conditioned-undefiled. All other conditioned phenomena are defiled by definition, hence they are dukkha.

Queequeg said:

Calling everything Dukkha is not an attempt to describe the world in the manner of scientific inquiry.

Malcolm wrote:

When you are sick, you go to a doctor, he finds the cause. Since there is a cause, the illness can be pacified. There is a treatment for it.

The four truths of nobles are precisely such a heuristic. When you are a sentient being, you are suffering. The Dharma explains why, and how to remove it, promising that one can transcend the causes of that state.

However if you don't take your medicine nor listen to the Buddha, your illness will not be cured nor will you ever be free of suffering.

Queequeg said:

As such, it's not that the True Aspect of Reality (Paramartha Satya) is essentially dukkha, but because of a fundamental nescience, our experience of the True Aspect of Reality is dukkha. Maybe I'm missing something, but I don't think any of you fine pious folk would disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no way an experience of ultimate truth causes suffering. But ordinary people never have that experience, that is why they suffer. When they do have that experience, as bodhisattvas in the first bhumi, their suffering still exists, but for them it is now like a dream or an illusion. Further, they can then eradicate the obscurations to full buddhahood.

Queequeg said:

My understanding is that this is accounted for in the acknowledgment of Pratyekabuddhas who come to right view without Dharma taught by the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Pratyekabuddhas always have come into contact with a buddha's teaching, but they aspire to achieve nirvana in a place where a buddha has not taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Different Kinds of Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Phase four comes about when Rigzin Tsewang Dorje, a Nyingma abbot, tertön and scholar

mutsuk said:

You mean Kah thog Rig 'dzin Tshe dbang nor bu (1698-1755), right ?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that was a typo...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Different Kinds of Shentong

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Besides the Jonang school, the Kagyu school also has Shentong teachings, and also some Nyingmapas follow some form of Shentong (I've heard in some places that Ju Mipham was a Shentongpa for example, but I don't know how true that is). Could someone give a summary of how Shentong is presented and what the major differences between them of Shentong are in these different traditions?

Malcolm wrote:

The origins of gzhan stong lie in the master Tsan Kawoche. He received teachings on the six limb yoga of Kalacakra from Somanatha (though apparently the translator was not good, and he did not understand Sanskrit). The lineage of instructions of this view eventually came down to Dolbupa, who gave the first formal voice to gzhan stong teachings. They were very popular for roughly 150 years and stimulated a lot of controversy because of Dolbupa's very literal reading of many passages in sutra and tantra and unique approach to Buddhist history.

His views were hotly contested by many scholars in Sakya especially, and also in Gelug.

This is phase one.

Phase two begins with Shakya Chogden, a Sakya scholar (15th century) who took a revolutionary (for Tibet) approach to Madhyamaka and tried to reconcile the views of the Yogacara and Madhyamaka, in some of his writings declaring them both definitive.

This is phase two.

Phase three consists of Jonang Taranatha's reply to various formulations of gzhan stong view, as well as rejecting arguments against Dolbupa in particular.

This is phase three.

Phase four comes about when Rigzin Tsewang Norbu a Nyingma abbot, tertön and scholar who lived in the 18th century sought to revive Kalacakra and received Kalacakra from the Jonangpas surviving in central Tibet. He passed them onto Situ Panchen, who established both the gzhan stong view as well as the Dro system of Kalacakra at Palpung.

The basis difference among these different species of gzhan stong has to do with how whether one follows in the footsteps of Jonang, or Shakya Chogden.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: can buddhist smoke american spirit organic cigarettes

Content:

LastLegend said:

I will not argue, I will smoke and I will quit one day. I don't care what you say or what anybody says. Can you be more Zen than that?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you like inhaling Lead and Polonium 210 and spreading it around for other people to inhale, go for it —, but it hardly seems like bodhisattva activity to me to knowingly spread radioactive contaminants where other people can inhale them.

LastLegend said:

How many people are exposed to radioactivity in cigarettes?

According to the American Lung Association, there are about 48 million adult smokers in the U.S., and 4.8 million adolescent smokers. This means that the U.S., population, directly exposed to radioactivity in cigarette smoke, is approximately 53 million.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 80 percent of adult tobacco users started smoking as teens; 35 percent had become daily smokers by age 18. Thirty nine percent of adult smokers smoke one pack of cigarettes per day, and 20% smoke more than a pack a day.

Smoking is the number one cause of preventable death in the U.S., with 443,000 deaths, or 1 of every 5 deaths, in the United States each year. And, there are 123,000 lung cancer deaths annually attributed to smoking cigarettes. Nearly 1 of every 5 deaths is related to smoking, more than alcohol, car accidents, suicide, AIDS, homicide, and illegal drugs combined.

In addition to smokers, those exposed to secondhand or side-stream smoke have been shown to risk disease as well. In some studies, it has been found that side-stream or secondhand smoke is two to five times more concentrated in some carcinogens than the mainstream smoke inhaled by a smoker. Each year, approximately 3,400 nonsmoking adults die of lung cancer as a result of breathing the smoke of others' cigarettes. Environmental tobacco smoke also causes an estimated 46,000 deaths from heart disease in people who are not current smokers. Secondhand smoke contains over 4,000 chemical compounds, including 69 known carcinogens such as formaldehyde, lead, arsenic, benzene, and radioactive polonium 210.

How does radioactive material get into a cigarette?

The tobacco leaves used in making cigarettes contain radioactive material, particularly lead-210 and polonium-210. The radionuclide content of tobacco leaves depends heavily on soil conditions and fertilizer use.

Soils that contain elevated radium lead to high radon gas emanations rising into the growing tobacco crop. Radon rapidly decays into a series of solid, highly radioactive metals (radon decay products). These metals cling to dust particles which in turn are collected by the sticky tobacco leaves. The sticky compound that seeps from the trichomes is not water soluble, so the particles do not wash off in the rain. There they stay, through curing process, cutting, and manufacture into cigarettes. Lead-210 and Polonium-210 can be absorbed into tobacco leaves directly from the soil. But more importantly, fine, sticky hairs (called trichomes) on both sides of tobacco leaves grab airborne radioactive particles.

For example, phosphate fertilizers, favored by the tobacco industry, contain radium and its decay products (including lead-210 and polonium-210). When phosphate fertilizer is spread on tobacco fields year after year, the concentration of lead-210 and polonium-210 in the soil rises.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.epa.gov/radiation/sources/tobacco.html>

So I guess it really depends on how much you care about yourself and how much you care about others.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

From having attended his retreats, read his books, watched his videos I can say that the only kinda sorta problem I have with Anam Thubten's approach is that he tends to use

carrots to inspire his students. Enlightenment is the biggest and juiciest. Ground of being could be another.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is our actual state. Buddhahood is the full realization of that state. The path is the slow integration of that state into our experience until we are done.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Queequeg said:

You might even find compelling resolutions to problems that have persistently surfaced over the centuries in Buddhist discourse.

Malcolm wrote:

Such as?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Then you may not have taken the Buddha's teachings entirely to heart.

Queequeg said:

How is something like that constructive?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a question we should be constantly asking ourselves.

Queequeg said:

...The whole world is marked by suffering/suckiness. What does that mean precisely, except that one is proposing a universal framework in which to subjectively view everything. Dukkha, Dukkha, Dukkha... Take everything and see it as this single flavor of suck. Problematize everything. Why? Because you can't have a solution without a problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Three kinds of suffering were identified by the Buddha: the suffering of suffering, the suffering of change and the suffering of the conditioned. The first refers to the actual experience of pain and misery, etc. The second refers to the impermanence of all positive circumstances. The third refers to the very impermanence of condition

phenomena itself. Do you see anything left out?

Queequeg said:

...what he was selling only really is effective if you agree to see things the way he wants you to see them.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence my comment about whether or not you have really taken the Buddha's teachings to heart, no excuses, no ifs, ands or buts.

Queequeg said:

I'm not an expert on Pali or Sanskrit, so I have no idea if dukkha actually refers to a quality of subjective experience, but the term "suffering" certainly does.

Malcolm wrote:

Dukha has its roots in the notion of a wheel that does not turn properly on its axle.

Queequeg said:

If everything is suffering, then photosynthesis is suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is — it is part of the suffering of the conditioned and the suffering of change.

Queequeg said:

We're considerably expanding the meaning of suffering when we characterize a process in a plant as suffering. How about convection currents in the ocean? That's suffering, too? How about atomic fusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, all conditioned phenomena apart from path dharma are suffering or conducive to suffering — this is why the Buddha says "all contaminated phenomena are suffering".

Queequeg said:

Bringing all this under the category of "Suffering" is then redefining this term that is commonly understood to refer to a particular mode of experience into a reference to the perpetual motion of everything. But that's not really what the Buddha was talking about - he was addressing people's experience of the perpetual motion, and specifically addressing the dissatisfaction in having to deal with all this change.

Malcolm wrote:

However you want to translate dukkha is fine, but generally, it is translated as "suffering", which means "to bear from below", with the obvious allusion. When you look at the Monier-Williams, it has a range of meaning of uneasy, uncomfortable, unpleasant, difficult, pain, sorrow, trouble, etc. Whether you call it suffering, pain, etc., it has the same meaning — there is no happiness anywhere in the three realms. The only way to be truly happy is to be free from afflictions that cause rebirth in samsara.

Queequeg said:

If you don't start out thinking this is suffering, though, there is no suffering to neutralize.

Malcolm wrote:

And so worldly people continue to take rebirth in samsara because they do not recognize suffering as suffering.

Queequeg said:

There are plenty of people who never expected anything of life and wouldn't call it suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

"Ignorance is bliss".

A so called "Buddhist" school that abandons the core tenets the Buddha taught is no longer Buddhist.

Where did the Buddha demand faith in rebirth? I don't recall it.

A number of places, do your research.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

monktastic said:

What was this about? Eckhart Tolle?

"[Candice O'Denver] is not an eckhart, or a hafiz, or a maharshi."

"I have no idea, but these three are clearly spiritual geniuses."

(Links redacted in advance to That Forum That Shall Not Be Named)

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, yes, sure, in their respective traditions, of course. I did not mean that I personally derive any spiritual sustenance from these people.

Once again, context is everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

This was before he actually met K, I think.

Malcolm wrote:

Considering how he reacted to Krishnamurti, we can only imagine how he would have

reacted to Eckhart, but I doubt it would have been good.

dzogchungpa said:
Nice.

I do believe a certain Gemini once said that Eckhart was clearly a spiritual genius.

Malcolm wrote:
That was not me. I have never read him.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 4:58 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
This was before he actually met K, I think.

Malcolm wrote:
Considering how he reacted to Krishnamurti, we can only imagine how he would have reacted to Eckhart, but I doubt it would have been good.

The point of course is that the one person's opinion of another persons the former does not know is rather hollow and not really indicative of anything about the latter.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 4:20 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
treehuggingoctopus said:
(Btw, while I am generally inclined to believe that it is much better to leave the core Dzogchen terms untranslated, it may be worth recalling here that Tillich took Urgrund from Boehme who had taken it from Eckhart and other Rheine mystics. And if you read Eckhart closely, his Urgrund is not quite the Absolute of an eternalist. Nor is his 'being' necessarily 'real' in the sense Prasangikas find offensive. Just saying.)

dzogchungpa said:
From http://www.chronicleproject.com/shenpen_hookham.html: I remember telling Trungpa Rinpoche at Samye Ling, at a personal interview, that I didnt know anything about Buddhism, so what should I read. He suggested I read Krishnamurti and Meister Eckhart.

Malcolm wrote:
Funny, considering his opinion of Krishnamurti...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

And for those who lack that fundamental trust but need to obtain, or discover, or even experience, *Something* that comes with emphasis and a capital S, the disappointment will probably not be ecstatic, alas.

Thanks for the quote - which also shows that as far as Anam Thubten's notion of Urgrund goes, he is far from having fallen prey to an eternalist heresy, doesn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

You will note that I never supposed that AT held such a view, merely that he naively uses a term from Christian theology which should not be used in Dzogchen specifically, and Buddhism in general.

treehuggingoctopus said:

I wasn't accusing you - or anybody else, for that matter - of claiming that AT holds eternalist views. Just happy to know he does not.

(Btw, while I am generally inclined to believe that it is much better to leave the core Dzogchen terms untranslated, it may be worth recalling here that Tillich took Urgrund from Boehme who had taken it from Eckhart and other Rheine mystics. And if you read Eckhart closely, his Urgrund is not quite the Absolute of an eternalist. Nor is his 'being' necessarily 'real' in the sense Prasangikas find offensive. Just saying.)

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, it is not the GERMAN that has the negative connotations, it is the ENGLISH that does.

"Urgrund" in German, as I understand it, does not necessarily have the same connotation as "ground of being" does in English. I am making a comment about English usage. The term "ground of being" really is not attested to before the translation of Tillich into English.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

And for those who lack that fundamental trust but need to obtain, or discover, or even experience, *Something* that comes with emphasis and a capital S, the disappointment will probably not be ecstatic, alas.

Thanks for the quote - which also shows that as far as Anam Thubten's notion of Urgrund goes, he is far from having fallen prey to an eternalist heresy, doesn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

You will note that I never supposed that AT held such a view, merely that he naively uses a term from Christian theology which should not be used in Dzogchen specifically, and Buddhism in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 2:01 AM

Title: The Truth of the First Noble Truth

Content:

Queequeg said:

So here is the problem I have with the First Noble Truth -it must be taken as an irreducible claim, along with a number of further assumptions, none of which I'm not entirely convinced about. "birth is suffering, aging is suffering, illness is suffering, death is suffering; union with what is displeasing is suffering; separation from what is pleasing is suffering; not to get what one wants is suffering; in brief, the five aggregates subject to clinging are suffering"

Malcolm wrote:

Then you may not have taken the Buddha's teachings entirely to heart.

Queequeg said:

For one, suffering here is a qualitative, subjective characterization, which while a compelling one to an extent, is not necessarily true for everyone. There are many people who, though not enlightened by Buddhist standards, have reflected on their life, settled in equanimity, and come to a conclusion about all this - "Its life." Neither good, nor bad. It just is what it is. With that conclusion, they go on living in many different ways, taking the joys and sorrows, triumphs and tragedies, in stride. With the First Noble Truth undermined, the rest of it falls apart.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all just a mass of suffering.

Queequeg said:

We can add a footnote and say that suffering is a technical description of the unpleasant experience of perpetually changing circumstances, but that's still undermined by, "Its life." This is not even to mention people who have come to understand their own consciousness through the discoveries of neuroscience which is presenting a pretty compelling case that consciousness and everything that we think we are is a meta phenomena of brain circuitry. In this kind of context, "Life is Suffering",

seems like an arbitrary assertion.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha did not say "life is suffering", he said "sarva dukkham", everything is suffering.

Queequeg said:

Some thinkers have posited that you can't have Buddhism without belief in this model of samsaric existence. I don't agree. Notwithstanding, a teaching that falls apart when certain unprovable assumptions are set aside is at a severe disadvantage in a claim to Truth. I don't think all Buddhist schools of thought are susceptible to this problem.

Malcolm wrote:

A so called "Buddhist" school that abandons the core tenets the Buddha taught is no longer Buddhist.

Queequeg said:

I previously referred to Nagarjuna and how he opened questions about the Four Noble Truths. He does a delicate dance in the Madhyamikakarika concerning people who use sunyata to undermine the Four Noble Truths. Maybe some people better versed in Madhyamika thought can correct me, but his response is appeal to the middle which is a dialectic tension settling on what amounts to the four noble truths as an expedient means (upaya). Are upaya Truths with a capital T? There's a whole body of discourse on this, and as best I can tell, there is no categorical answer Yes or no. Its "Yes, but..." or "No, but..."

Malcolm wrote:

He addressing the idea of inherency, not suggesting that it is all "upaya".

Queequeg said:

And then without even going deep into all the vertiginous logic of Madhyamika, we have pithy doctrines like "Samsara and Nirvana are coextensive." or "There are not two worlds, pure and impure." What does that mean for the Four Noble Truths?

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna address this as well "Samsara and nirvana, these two do not exist, instead, Nirvana is thorough knowledge of samsara."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Interview with Khenchen Rigdzin Dorje

Content:

lorem said:

Okay from Golden Letters looks like Dzogchen showed up in Tibet 3,600 years ago.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is what Bonpos believe, but since there are no Bonpo historical texts that can

be dated earlier than early 11th century, (which make claims about things which happened four millennia ago) Bon claims about this are highly problematical.

In any case, this kind of thing comes down to a question of belief and religious authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 5th, 2014 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Help identifying prayer, Garchen Rinpoche Vajrakilaya 20

Content:

kng said:

Hi dharma friends

I would like to ask for your help in identifying prayer that is being sung from 02:25:25

Code: #

<http://www.ustream.tv/recorded/27098978>

I would be very happy to have text of that prayer but I will be also very thankful for only identifying it.

Thank you

heart said:

Melody sounds like the dewachen prayer

(http://www.tibetanlanguage.org/images/Free_Study_Aids/dewachen_prayer.pdf "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;), but it is translated to english and probably longer.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The Drikung in the US seem to use that melody all over the place.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

lorem said:

For anyone who ever stumbles on this thread we do love others and their religious beliefs.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, we have a soft spot in our hearts especially for those who engage in animal sacrifice (we do actually, but not for the practices themselves, but because such practices are filled with ignorance and lead people to lower realms).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Sherlock said:

Monism is eternalism, one of the mundane views Padmasambhava warned against in Garland of Views.

Malcolm wrote:

Pshaaaw, that is that old-fashioned Dzogchen, who would want anything to do with that? We like this new-fangled Dzogchen even if it is just warmed-over Hinduism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

This is a monistic presentation of reality. In some quarters this is heresy to the hilt. Q.E.D.

Malcolm wrote:

It really isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa, Tathagatagarbha, and "True Self"

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

full glass.jpg

I really don't know why people are wasting their time and energy.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed, I'm out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa, Tathagatagarbha, and "True Self"

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

The False Self is the imputation of various false concepts to the True Self(saying the

True self is an object, or personality)SO if one believes the True Self to be an object the size of the thumb....ect then This is called the false self/unholy self.

Malcolm wrote:

This terminology simple does not exist in this sutra and is of your own invention.

Son of Buddha said:

Glorious Great Seal Drop Tantra

Malcolm wrote:

This passage, from chapter seven of the Mahāmudratilaka tantra, concerns the completion stage and is not to be taken literally.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

But that doesn't mean that contemporary Nyingma orthodoxy (as per the Big Red Book) doesn't embrace it.

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. Since you don't read Tibetan texts, you really don't have any idea what "Nyingma" orthodoxy is. And it would be Rongzom, Longchenpa and Mipham, in that descending order.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

So what then differentiates your view from Advaita Vedanta or Samkhya yoga?

smcj said:

Little.

Malcolm wrote:

Thats' why I think you really do not understand Dzogchen, nor gzhan stong for that matter, much less Yogacara, Madhyamaka and so on.

But it is ok to be an eternalist, it's better than being a nihilist.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 6:34 AM
Title: Re: About the demon Mara
Content:
pemachophel said:
Thanks Malcolm for posting this.

Malcolm wrote:
Sure, this is an excellent little text, I mean to publish it some day.

Sherab Dorje said:
Do you mind if I steal it and translate it into Greek?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, since it is not complete. It is just a fragment.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 6:32 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
My dilettante's understanding is that this is a fairly modern interpretation/presentation of Dzogchen. If you want to stick with a more classical presentation that's ok too.

asunthatneversets said:
What is the basis for this theory of Atiyoga modernity leaning towards gzhan stong?

smcj said:
Well for one thing the whole "empty of other" view, regardless of sect, seems to have been a Tibetan development. It seems to have gained traction in the last few hundred years. Guy Newland has some YouTube videos that go over all that.

Malcolm wrote:
gZhan stong became popular in Karma Kagyu in the 18th century in eastern Tibet because Situ Panchen was disciple of the abbot of Kathog, Rigzin Tsewang Norbu, who advised the former to adopt gzhan stong because it was more positive and therefore it would extend Situ Panchens' life. Because it was adopted by this powerful Karma Kagyu lama, gzhan tong was revived at Palpung near Dege, where Kongtrul studied. But of course this was not the gzhan stong of the Jonangpas, but was a rather modified version largely influenced by the Sakya master Serdog Panchen.

gzhan stong is not a heresy per se. It is regarded by many people as a mistaken way of presenting the two truths of Madhyamaka via the three natures of Yogacara.

Personally, I don't care what sutrayāna view people hold (Yogacara or Madhyamaka), because that is not the view with which Vajrayāna practitioners attain realization. The view Vajrayāna practitioners attain realization with is the experiential view inculcated during empowerment. It really does not matter much what one's intellectual predilections are (unless you are a Gelug, then it matters very much, as far as they are concerned) when it comes to Mahāyāna tenets (Yogacara or Madhyamaka) since they are somewhat irrelevant to the actual practice of Vajrayāna.

The real point in all of this is that there are some people who follow gzhan stong views who reify jñāna as something which truly exists, and this deeply contradicts Dzogchen view, as indicated by the opening passages of the Unwritten Tantra states:

Hey, hey, apparent yet non-existent retinue: listen well! There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated pure consciousness; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, wisdom does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway.

But you really cannot understand this without studying and practicing under a real master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

I understand Malcolm's resistance to all this. He sees it as a classic heresy.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think it as a heresy at all. I just think that you really don't understand Dudjom Rinpoche's perspective at all because you have an emotional adherence to a philosophical view common these days among Karma Kagyus.

For example, the doctrine of tathāgatagarbha is found in both sūtra and Dzogchen. However, if you compared the actual doctrine of tathāgatagarbha in Dzogchen compared to that of sūtra you would scratch your head in astonishment.

Even though the teaching of tathāgatagarbha in Dzogchen radically goes beyond how it is presented in sūtra, nevertheless, the tathāgatagarbha sutra citations are used (especially by Longchenpa) as a preliminary step for preparing (intellectual) people to understand tathāgatagarbha in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

As you know, since we have already discussed it elsewhere, Dudjom R. said that Madhyamaka was great for an intellectual approach to emptiness, and Great Madhyamaka/Shentong was good for discussing emptiness from a meditational/experiential perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

But it is still sutra.

smcj said:

According to D.R., Great Madhyamaka is not subject to intellectual analysis the way Prasangika Madhyamaka is, and is approached through faith. If you wish I will find the quote. It is a Google search away. But since you know about it already I don't see the reason to make the effort.

Malcolm wrote:

Have you actually examined the presentation of the two truths through the three natures advanced by gzhan stong pas? It is utterly absurd to claim that gzhan stong is immune from the charge of being an intellectual tenet system. If faith in gzhan stong is required, it is because very few people actually understand it, despite the legions of people who claim allegiance to it.

smcj said:

here is no "direct introduction" in Shentong.

Malcolm wrote:

That makes it intellectual and analytical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained this to you as well. He is not saying that the gzhan stong presentation of Madhyamaka is equivalent to Dzogchen. He is actually saying it is deficient and inferior.

smcj said:

Well, he does continue, and it is a little more nuanced. p.300 continues...:

Therefore, the conclusive intention of the the Two Promulgators actually abides without contradiction in the nature of the Great Perfection. This intention comprises the unaltered intention of the "Collection of Madhyamaka Reasoning", which consist of the commentaries on the intermediate promulgation by the sublime and supreme

Nagarjuna; and his [Collection of Eulogies} including the "Eulogy to the Expanse of Reality", and the commentaries by the regent Maitreya, the sublime and supreme Asanga, and his brother [Vasubandhu] and so forth, which together form the intention of the final [promulgation]. If one were to ask why this is the case, it is because these masters did not claim anything other than the profound abiding nature of natural reality, and because the Great Perfection itself is none other than that.

(underlining mine)

In the footnotes it says the "Two Promulgators" are Nagarjuna and Asanga. Also I believe "Eulogy to the Expanse of Reality" has been translated into English as "In Praise of Dharmadhatu", which is a Shentong book.

As a Karma Kagyu I interpret what he just said to be akin to Kongtrul's position that any understanding of Shentong has to be predicated on an understanding of Madhyamaka, meaning that phenomena need to be seen as self-empty before you can see them as "images on the magic mirror".

Malcolm wrote:

1) It is not so simple to say that Dharmadhātustava is a 'gzhan stong' book, just like one cannot declare the Uttaratantra a "gzhan stong" book. For example:

Having abandoned concepts and investigation,
the absence of the inherent existence of phenomena itself
is meditated as the dharmadhātu.

2) It is also not erroneous to state that the reality the Buddha describes in the sutra is the same reality presented in Dzogchen.

3) Therefore, your attempt to prove that Dudjom R's presentation subsumes his understanding of Dzogchen under gzhan stong is not proven, far from it.

What is at stake here is how that "natural reality" is to be experienced and realized. All approaches to the middle way in sutra, no matter whether you take Nāgārjuna or Maitryanatha's approach are analytical and intellectual, that is the problem with sprosbral, gzhan stong, dge lug madhyamaka and so on — they are all analytical, philosophical approaches to reality. This is ultimately the difference between sutra and tantra, as the great translator Drogmi pointed, the view of sutra is intellectual, the view of mantra is experiential. Even if gzhan stong were the most refined, most detailed, highest, most sublime approach to sūtra, it would be still be intellectual and analytical and therefore quite coarse and inferior compared to the experiential view of mantra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out to you, when it comes to the nine yānas, each yāna has it's own view.

smcj said:

Yes! On pages 294-300 he goes through the lower 8 yanas and their views. What I just quoted on p. 300 is his view of Dzogchen specifically as juxtaposed with--and superior to--the lower 8 yanks. That view is what makes Dzogchen superior! (Hence the title of the chapter: Superiority of Atiyoga.)

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained this to you as well. He is not saying that the gzhan stong presentation of Madhyamaka is equivalent to Dzogchen. He is actually saying it is deficient and inferior.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, Dudjom Rinpoche followed his own teachers in this respect, and he embraced the Karma Kagyu presentation of gzhan stong when it comes to the view of Madhyamaka.

smcj said:

Exactly. Like I said before; it is a more modern development.

Malcolm wrote:

What you are conflating however is Dudjom R.'s sutrayāna views with his Vajrayāna views. As I pointed out to you, when it comes to the nine yānas, each yāna has it's own view. In the Bodhisattvayāna Madhyamaka is considered the highest view. Then of course we can disagree about what Madhyamaka means, but it is very plainly stated in all Dzogchen texts that the view of Dzogchen surpasses the views of the eight lower yanas.

So while Dzogchen masters can argue about the various merits of this or that interpretation of Madhyamaka, in the end their view will be Dzogchen and not Madhyamaka, no matter whether they prefer gzhan stong Madhyamaka (Dudjom R, Kongtrul), Gelug Prasanga (Jigme Lingpa) or Pre-Gelug Prasanga (Longchenpa, etc.) Gorampa (Khenpo Shenga, etc.) and the views of the eight lower yanas will always be subordinate to the view of Dzogchen in their eyes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

From "The Big Red Book", the chapter on "Superiority of Atiyoga" (a.k.a. Dzogchen), p.300:

Now concerning this natural expression of the Great Perfection: The Sugata, during the intermediate promulgation of the transmitted precepts (a.k.a self-emptiness) did not reveal the structure of the fundamental reality, though he did extensively teach the inconceivable, abiding nature without referring to symbols of elaborate conception. And, during the final promulgation (a.k.a other-emptiness), though he did reveal the structure of the fundamental reality, he did not teach the characteristic path through which it is actualized.

(formatting mine)

So yes, Dudjom R. did not claim that his Great Madhyamaka/Shentong view was a path. It was just a view.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what this passage means. It is not a reference to so called rang stong and gzhan stong.

It is a reference to the fact that tathagātagarbha teachings (a vital part of Dzogchen), according to Longchenpa, are part of the so called third turning of the wheel (a turning so important that it garners virtually no comments at all from the Indian authors preserved in the bstan 'gyur).

However, as I have pointed out, when the sole source (Samdhinirmocana sutra) for the notion of three turnings is actually examined, it is merely a restatement of the doctrine of the second turning in unequivocal terms.

However, Longchenpa never explains the tathagatagarbha according to the gzhan stong system, and he clearly explains the three own natures as belong to cittamatra which he considers inferior to Madhyamaka.

When he treats the issues of Madhyamaka and the tathāgatagarbha, he clearly states in the sgrub mtha' mdzod that Prasanga Madhyamaka is the definitive view of Mahāyāna and that the Tathāgatagarbha sūtras are the definitive sutras.

Of course, Dudjom Rinpoche followed his own teachers in this respect, and he embraced the Karma Kagyu presentation of gzhan stong when it comes to the view of Madhyamaka.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

lorem said:

Sky-gazing. Yell PHAT really loud and forceful then rest

alpha said:

No,... dont do that.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously. This place is becoming like a sandbox for children.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

Of course. But his Great Madhyamaka/Shentong view was his presentation/interpretation for discussing meditational experiences. He said that self=emptiness was for intellectual applications. He did not limit his Great Madhyamaka interpretations to Mahayoga and Anuyoga meditational experiences. It is his Atiyoga positions too.

Malcolm wrote:

It was his presentation for sutra level meditational experience only. The funny of course is that the meditation experience under discussion is actually identical to the so called rang stong experience. It is only is post-equipose intellectual discussion that one differentiates these two approaches (which actually have no validity outside the gzhan stong presentation).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

Dudjom Rinpoche had a preference for shengtong, but clearly, as was quoted in my post: he distinguishes the view of Dzogchen from sutra.

smcj said:

Of course.

He was an adherent of shengtong on the level of sutra only.

So you're saying that he backtracked to Yogacara with his Dzogchen view? Care to cite?

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that there are different interpretations of sutra level Madhyamaka. His preference is gzhan stong, just as Jigme Lingpa's was Tsongkhapa's view. However, in terms of their ultimate view, both Dudjom Rinpoche and Jigme Lingpa were

Dzogchenpas.

You are suffering from an idea promulgated amongst many non-Nyingmapas that there is no difference in view between sutra and tantra, and that the view of sutra that you have is the same view that you apply in tantra. But this is not true in the Nyingma school, where each of the nine yanas has its own view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa, Tathagatagarbha, and "True Self"

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Provisional, according to you.

Malcolm wrote:

Provisional according to the the Buddha in the Akṣayamati-nirdeśa sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa, Tathagatagarbha, and "True Self"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What sense does it make to establish suchness as a "self", someone's identity?

Son of Buddha said:

I didn't establish the True Self as someones Identity, nor do the Sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, the term "true self" as opposed to the "false self" does not occur in any Buddhist text. It is a pop Hindu terminology.

Son of Buddha said:

So if Substantial means that which is truly real, Truly existent, not illusory, Then yes Enlightenment/True Self is Substantial.

Malcolm wrote:

Substantial in this case means self held by non-Buddhists immediately preceding the passage you cite:

"...The self maintained by vulgar children is held to be the size of a thumb, the size a white mustard seed or the size of an atom. Since such a self was not mentioned by the Tathāgata, even though he explains that there is no self in phenomena, it is not that

there is truly no self. The "self" is any dharma that is true, pure, permanently existing, independent, unchanging and undying, that is what is called "self", just as that great physician is skilled in using milk as medicine."

So, here the Buddha is not teaching a substantial self like the some other nonbuddhists do, as I said before.

The other important point is that Buddha taught selflessness in order to tame nonbuddhists. If you run around saying that Buddha taught a self, then how will nonbuddhists be able to distinguish the self they taught from the suchness as the real nature of phenomena? This is why even still, despite what provisional texts like the Nirvana sutra say, the central teaching of the Buddha is selfless of persons and phenomena.

People who run around saying that Buddha taught "enlightenment" as the "true self" really do a disservice to sentient beings who have not been cured of wrong views of the self. In fact the Buddha did not teach self or selflessness as a definitive teaching.

The Nirvana sutra's use of the term "self" is a play on words, where the meaning of atman as a transmigrating self (rejected by the Buddha) is contra posed with the meaning of atman as "nature" (emptiness, suchness, etc.). If however, one suggests that the meaning of this is all the qualities of Buddhahood fully exist from the beginning with the continuums of sentient beings, rather than as an inherent potential, then your position is no different than non-buddhists who assert a substantial self.

And anyway, we have already seen that the the Buddha defined self as jñāna, meaning the nature of consciousness itself.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

From p.8 of the "Early Buddhism and Mahayana" thread:

dzogchungpa said:

Was Dudjom Rinpoche a gzhan stong pa?

Malcolm wrote:

He was a gzhan stong pa, yes. But not really in the same way that Dolbupa was.

Yes, of course Dudjom R. promoted the Kongtrul version of the gzhan stong view, but that has nothing to do with Dzogchen. There is no "gzhan stong" Dzogchen. There is only Dzogchen, and it has its own view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

lorem said:

Just real quick what are the metaphysical thoughts Buddha said not to try to ponder?

Mkoll said:

Since no one's answered you, I'll give it a go from my more Theravada-inclined perspective. I'm aware this is the Nyingma forum, and I'm not sure if the Nyingma tradition also upholds these teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it does. A total of three hundred and sixty incorrect positions are listed in such text as the Rigpa Rangshar, but only sixty of them are presented explicitly.

Mkoll said:

Further, samasara is as follows: [53/b]

false view and eternalist view.

The false vehicle is as follows:

held to be three hundred and sixty beliefs in a self.

Three hundred are explained to be in the dhātu:

sixty are explained in the following way:

1) the Samkhya who speak falsely

2) the Vaiśeṣikas who advocate intrinsic causation

Kumārila the great and the advocates of deviation

holders of the treatises of Aviddhakarṇa

the Guhyas who rely on five fires

6) those who burn their bodies with sesame oil soaked ignited cotton

7) (and of) trident asceticism.

8) (There is) the asceticism of offering and gatherings

9) The asceticism of removing the flesh from the body

10) the conduct of appearing like a dog

Likewise, through a slight clairvoyance,

of how the blessings of the buddhas appear,

there is the practice of false asceticism.

The partial views are like so:

the view of a creator

taking the creator as the path

13) those who show the meaning of eternalism

14) those advocate unchanging permanence

15) those who advocate conditional permanence

16) those who advocate the cause as permanent

17) those who advocate the result as permanent

18) those who assert the path depends on permanence

- 19) those who assert conduct as eternal [54/a]
- 20) those who assert annihilation in which there is no ultimate eternity
- 21) those who have the aspect of eternalists

- 22) those who place importance on inauthentic evil mantras
- 23) those who place importance on fortune-telling and divination
- 24) those who place importance on insignificant magic
- those who rush into debate
- those who practice asceticism
- 27) those who are attached to this world
- 28) those who are attached to their own activities
- 29) those who wear wool
- 30) those who wear cotton robes of invincibility
- 31) those who make insignia important
- 32) those who advocate depending on actions
- 33) those who refute others with their knowledge
- 34) those who advocate annihilation without a cause
- 35) those who advocate total voidness
- 36) those who advocate the view of the interrupted cause and interrupted result
- 37) those who advocate the interrupted path and interrupted wisdom
- 38) those who advocate great permanent annihilation
- 39) those who advocate the annihilationism of path, the permanent annihilation of the result
- 40) those who advocate the annihilationist view of false thinking
- those who advocate the great void of annihilation.

- 42) There are the Vedantins advocating secrecy
- 43) the tīrthikās who deviate in equal ways
- 44) the tīrthikās of mental appearances
- 45) the tīrthikās who grasp deluded vision
- 46) tīrthikās who generate hatred
- 47) tīrthikās whose claim mind has shape [54/b]
- 48) tīrthikās who say grasping is meaningless
- 49) tīrthikās of deviant claims,
- 50) tīrthikās who say permanence is meaningless,
- 51) Kani and 52) Mātsarya
- 53) Bhasira and 54) Kaśīśa
- 55) Saṃbhira and 56) Dhasiṅg
- 57) Kati and 58) Sangha
- Śaṅkari and 60) Dheśaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:
—Thig-le kun-gsal chen-po'i rgyud

Malcolm wrote:
<http://greatmiddleway.wordpress.com/2014/11/02/the-ground-of-all/> [/quote]

There is a reason why sems sde is considered inferior to man ngag sde.

Some Dzogchen tantras assert that the youthful vase body exist in the human body with tiny little eyes and so on. As I said, it is not easy to understand Dzogchen (not least of all because there are three main traditions, and each tradition has its own tantras and lineage, etc.) and differentiate veiled rhetorical statements like the one cited here from the actual core of the teachings. Then of course, you have to ferret out why Longchenpa cites this text in his ngal gso skor gsum and so on. It is not sufficient to cherry pick a citation from a book loaded onto the web without attribution.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 4:22 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:

alpha said:
Does this mean that Elio has erroneous views ?

Malcolm wrote:
I didn't say that.

alpha said:
Ok.You didnt ...
But do you agree with his views from the paragraph above ?

Malcolm wrote:
Not %100, mainly because it is a somewhat incomplete explanation and lacks important nuances, such as the fact that all the appearances of Mt. Meru, houses, trees, etc., arise from ignorance, from NOT recognizing one's basis.

In any case, getting at such nuances is really impossible here since a) a lot of people are just invested in their own trips and do not want to really understand Dzogchen b) they should really be understood from a qualified teacher.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 3:54 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

alpha said:

Does this mean that Elio has erroneous views ?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

At the risk of being a bore and reposting the same quotes over and over:

Malcolm wrote:

You are just repeating over and over again your misconstrual of teachings you have never received and never practiced.

Over and out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

As I have already written, there are many Dzogchen masters that have a different presentation/intepretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, they don't. But you really do not understand what you are reading because you are not very familiar with this tradition.

smcj said:

Well, be that as it may, you do. And elsewhere here at DW you've admitted that Dudjom R. held a Great Madhyamaka/empty of other view of Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

I did no such thing. Dudjom Rinpoche, like Jigme Lingpa (an adherent of Tsongkhapa's interpretation of Madhyamaka) before him, did not conflate his preferred interpretation of Madhyamaka with Dzogchen and there are very important reasons for this.

Dudjom Rinpoche, like Jigme Lingpa, Longchenpa and so on before him, states very clearly that tenets like Madhyamaka and so on obscure the meaning of Atiyoga when he introduces the superiority of Atiyoga in the big red book.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

As I have already written, there are many Dzogchen masters that have a different presentation/intepretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, they don't. But you really do not understand what you are reading because you are not very familiar with this tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

...

Malcolm wrote:

SMCJ, you simply do not understand what you are reading,

I will leave you this this statement by one of the most important masters of the Dzogchen tradition, Nyima Bum (12th century):

As such, because the basis, one's unfabricated mind, arose as the essence of the sole reality, there is no need to search elsewhere for the place etc., i.e. it is called self-originated pristine consciousness [ye shes].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Interview with Khenchen Rigdzin Dorje

Content:

lorem said:

Even Dolpopa and Tsongkhapa. Does it really matter from the side of a practitioner? I actually like Dolpopa's view but Tsongkhapa's rings true also. I've never thought it nihilistic as such. Just not conceptually available and who can describe the undescrivable. Can't be put into words.

asunthatneversets said:

Tsongkhapa and Dolbupa represent both the main gsar ma views; (i) gelug, and (ii) gzhan stong. The rnying ma view that Khenchen Rigdzin Dorje is discussing is (iii) spros bral, which is different from Tsongkhapa's Gelug and Dolbupa's gzhan stong.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh?

Most Madhyamakas before Tsongkhapa's time were spros bral pas, and the Sakya school still is representative of that view, as is Mipham and Khenpo Shengga (who both studied Madhyamaka with Sakyapas).

I would not say that the main gsar ma view is represented by Gelug and Jonang approaches, since the Kagyus in general (Karma, Drugpa, Drikung, etc.) are all over the place when it comes to how they understand Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

Something existed before sentient beings and mind entered the scene.

Malcolm wrote:

Short answer, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Malcolm's said:

Any way, sutras do not require lungs.

lorem said:

Yes I agree but seen several instances of Gelukpa giving them.

Recording is still up for debate IMHO.

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first point, there is a lung for the whole of the bka' 'gyur and the bstan 'gyur, even so, sūtras do not require a lung to be read. Tantras, on the other hand, generally do, or at least one has to have had a major empowerment otherwise you are not supposed to even look at them, much less things like vajras and bells.

As to the second point, one cannot receive a lung from a recording. Why? Because mantras and so on cannot be transmitted this way. Believing that you can receive a lung from a recording is similar with believing that you can get light from a lamp without plugging it into a wall. There is no direct living connection with the source. This is why lungs and empowerments from recorded media are not valid means of transmission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

lorem said:

The MP3 recording I feel is up for debate. Was Sutra yes. Was a lung. I was participating.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot received a lung from a recording. Any way, sutras do not require lungs.

A lung is an authorization to read; no one needs permission to read a sūtra or even to recite the dharanis found therein.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

Does Buddhism discuss -- or even acknowledge -- that which is not of mind? Does it have a cosmology, an explanation for the nature of all that is?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean. Buddhism maintains that the universe comes about again and again because the collective karma of all sentient beings.

In terms of the actual nature of things, Mahāyāna Buddhism explains that everything is empty, without self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And the nature of that which is not our minds ... is Buddhism interested in that?

Not sure what you mean.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa, Tathagatagarbha, and "True Self"

Content:

Anders said:

So basically, no good reason other than "The Buddha said it."

Malcolm wrote:

But the Buddha did not say it, because the Buddha, as Trungpa correctly observes, never taught any self that could be substantially established and merely used the term "self" as a rhetorical device.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need to point to a moon that is right in front of your face. In other words, your approach is too intellectual. It is not grounded in experience. Animals have choiceless awareness, that is not what we are trying to discover.

rachmiel said:

What **are** we trying to discover?

Malcolm wrote:

The nature of our minds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

lorem said:

I would kneel down before His Holiness the Dalai Lama and Karmapa and swear that I received transmission of the Golden Light Sutra from Ven Kirti Tsenshab Rinpoche in the

awake and dreaming states from MP3 audio.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a sūtra, it does not have a formal transmission as in Vajrayāna.

lorem said:

I just remember H E Garchen Rinpoche saying that no matter what anyone thought on this subject to please leave his students alone or something similar.

Malcolm wrote:

No one is hassling Garchen Rinpoche's students and I personally have nothing but the highest respect for Garchen Rinpoche, having received empowerments from him in person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Jikan said:

We thought it appropriate that Khenpo's email should basically have the last word.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it was an evasion, and I can understand why, since the correct answer is actually no, one cannot receive an empowerment from a recording.

Privileging someone's answer because of their title, in absence of any clear scriptural precedent or reasoning is pretty lame.

T. Chokyi said:

It would follow then that you can't give or receive a transmission in the dream state either, yet Nyala Rinpoche Rigdzin Changchub Dorje told CHNN when CHNN asked for transmission that he had been given the transmission already by dream, it was given in a dream before they met, only thing is CHNN had his own doubts about receiving it that way why? because it was not "his dream". CHNN gives this true story many times during Open Webcast as you know.

Malcolm wrote:

The key difference, of course, is that a recording is an inert pattern stored on a hard disk somewhere, and Chanchub Dorje was a fully realized person. The Buddhas see sentient beings as Buddhas, but we still need to do our own work and wake up to our own nature. The Buddhas cannot "give" us empowerments that we are not aware of. Empowerments are not given, they are received. That means active participation by two people at the same time. And as you know, ChNN himself has stated numerous that empowerments and introductions and even lungs cannot be received from recordings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa, Tathagatagarbha, and "True Self"

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

As we can see, we do not need to take the Buddha literally on the point of the self, because if we did, we would be left with the negative consequence that we should all have all the perfect qualities of buddhas and bodhisattvas present fully formed in our mind streams. Anyone can see this is not so.

This naturally pure basic constituent of a one-gone-thus, ultimate truth, thusness, has no previously existent flaws of afflictions to be removed because freedom from all adventitious defilements. from. the start is its nature, And similarly it does not have the least factor of qualities of purification to be set up because the status of the ultimate qualities of the powers and so forth being spontaneously established from the start and being indivisible is its nature.

The Buddha Nature is the very nature of all living beings, for the Buddha this nature is Fully realized(Pure Enlightenment with no flaws nor marks of the 3 poisons, greed anger or ignorance)

For Samsaric beings This very nature(Buddha Nature) resides in all of us in its pure "form" naturally perfect(our true nature our true self), yet it is obscured by adventitious defilements that make up and constitute a living samsaric being.

So what it comes down to is (1) Enlightenment in its perfect state with no defilements obscuring it.(BuddhaHood) and (2) Enlightenment in its perfect state with defilements obscuring it(Samsaric beings)

The thusness that itself abides as the fruit of purification in a buddha abides as the basis of purification in sentient beings, and the thusness that itself abides as the basis of purification in sentient beings abides as the fruit of purification in a buddha because with respect to the thusness of sentient beings and of buddhas there is not the slightest difference of entity, just as there is not the slightest difference in entity in the space pervading all of where there are and are not clouds. Hence, the naturally pure thusness is, due to the person, together with defilement and also without defilement and is, due to the person, the basis of purification and also the fruit of purification. Consequently, it is necessary to become skilled in the profound essentials of flawless non-contradiction.(Dolpopa)

Malcolm wrote:

What sense does it make to establish suchness as a "self", someone's identity?

Nāgārjuna:

Whatever is the nature of the Tathāgāta,
that is the nature of the world;

Since the Tathāgata has no nature,
the world too has no nature.

You can say, as Candrakīrti does, that this naturelessness is a nature, you can say that tathāta, śūnyatā, dharmatā, etc., are all pure, free of affliction from the beginning, etc. But since they are not substantially established, calling them a "self" is merely a Buddhist rhetorical device to frame the substantially established self of the non-Buddhists as a falsity.

Son of Buddha said:

So Trungpa is perfectly in accord with the Buddha because the way some people these days present the teachings of the Buddha in the Nirvana sūtra is quite distorted, presenting the teaching of the Nirvana Sutra in the manner of the worldly interpretation of permanence, bliss, self and purity and leading others astray.

M

Define what the worldly interpretation of this view is?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

As above, that the self taught in the Nirvana sūtra is a substantially established self, rather than a mere rhetorical device.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Polygamy / Polyandry & Buddhism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

So what's the conclusion? Is Polygamy and Polyandry acceptable in Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Completely acceptable. Buddha had many wives, and in some parts of Central Tibet, several brothers will marry one woman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

A pointer needs to signify on some level for the pointee, or it is of no use. If you point at the moon, I need to have a clue that you are pointing to ... the moon, rather than pointing arbitrarily, to nothing that I can see/feel.

Malcolm wrote:

Then for you it is useless to discuss this on the internet. You need to find this out directly from your teacher. If it is important to you, then you will make the effort, otherwise, you are wasting people's valuable time.

rachmiel said:

Woah! Your pointer doesn't happen to speak to me. Plenty of others do. If I'm wasting your valuable time, please feel free to not invest any more in this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need to point to a moon that is right in front of your face. In other words, your approach is too intellectual. It is not grounded in experience. Animals have choiceless awareness, that is not what we are trying to discover.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

What I meant was: I didn't understand Malcolm's pointer. "Don't correct thoughts" doesn't do anything for me, it just sits there.

Malcolm wrote:

That is what it is supposed to do (the mind), it just sits there without being altered or corrected in anyway.

rachmiel said:

A pointer needs to signify on some level for the pointee, or it is of no use. If you point at the moon, I need to have a clue that you are pointing to ... the moon, rather than pointing arbitrarily, to nothing that I can see/feel.

Malcolm wrote:

Then for you it is useless to discuss this on the internet. You need to find this out directly from your teacher. If it is important to you, then you will make the effort, otherwise, you are wasting people's valuable time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

Good one!

What I meant was: I didn't understand Malcolm's pointer. "Don't correct thoughts" doesn't do anything for me, it just sits there.

Malcolm wrote:

That is what it is supposed to do (the mind), it just sits there without being altered or corrected in anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

Please elaborate.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, when sitting in meditation, you hear someone mowing the lawn, you don't try to block out the sound, you do not try to focus on your breath for example, to lessen the distraction, you don't follow the distraction of the lawn mower, you just sit there without trying to change your thoughts or block your thoughts. In other words, you leave your mind unmodified. When you do so the distraction of the sound of the lawn mower will disappear.

For example, you smell nice incense in the shrine room, you do not you don't try to block out the smell, you do not try to focus on your breath for example, to lessen the distraction, you don't follow the distraction of the scent, you just sit there without trying to change your thoughts or block your thoughts. In other words, you leave your mind unmodified. When you do so the distraction of the scent will disappear.

etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

How does one "leave mind alone?"

Mind is all we see, know, experience ... right?

Malcolm wrote:

You don't try to correct your thoughts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Sapan and Gampopa

Content:

lorem said:

Why do he and others hold the view that pointing out instructions are valid only if one has abhisheka?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what he is saying. He is saying that pointing out instructions do not have the ability to ripen one to practice mahāmudra in absence of a proper Abhisheka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa, Tathagatagarbha, and "True Self"

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Chapter 11 Nirvana Sutra

Malcolm wrote:

States the following:

Child of a good family, "buddhanature" is ultimate emptiness. Ultimate emptiness is "wisdom." In that respect, "empty" is not perceived to be either empty or not empty. Through discerning wisdom [prajñā] all that is empty, not empty, permanent, impermanent, suffering, bliss, self and non-self is seen. "Empty" is all samsara. "Not-empty" is parinirvana. Samsara is in the range of the selfless, "self" is parinirvana. To see everything as empty; but not see what is not empty is not "the middle path." To not see everything as in the range of the selfless, but not see the self is not "the middle path". "The middle path" is buddhanature.

Of course, now we need to understand what wisdom, jñāna, is according to this text. After giving a description of various samadhis, the Buddha then earlier in the text:

"Wisdom" is to be understood as the buddhanature that exists in all sentient beings".

Further, when we consider the four categories of permanence, bliss, self and purity, the Buddha states:

For the worldly there is permanence, bliss, self and purity. Also for the transcendent

there is permanence, bliss, self and purity. Worldly Dharmas are expressible, but meaningless. Transcendent Dharmas are expressible and also meaningful.

If it is asked why that is so, since Worldly Dharmas possessing four distortions, the meaning cannot be realized. If it is asked how so? Their perception is distorted, their mind is distorted and their view is distorted, and because of these three distortions, the worldly see bliss as suffering, see the permanent as impermanent, see the self as not a self, and see the pure and impure, thus these are distortions. Because of distortions the worldly speak the words [permanence, bliss, self and purity] but do not understand the meaning.

In that respect, if it is asked what the meaning is, the selfless is "samsara"; self is the "Tathāgata"; impermanent is the śravakas and pratyekabuddhas; permanent is the dharmakāya of the Tathāgata. Suffering is all tīrthikas; bliss is parinirvana; impurity is conditioned phenomena; purity is the pure dharmas of the buddhas and bodhisattvas. Therefore, this is undistorted.

As we can see, we do not need to take the Buddha literally on the point of the self, because if we did, we would be left with the negative consequence that we should all have all the perfect qualities of buddhas and bodhisattvas present fully formed in our mind streams. Anyone can see this is not so.

So Trungpa is perfectly in accord with the Buddha because the way some people these days present the teachings of the Buddha in the Nirvana sutra is quite distorted, presenting the teaching of the Nirvana Sutra in the manner of the worldly interpretation of permanence, bliss, self and purity and leading others astray.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Appears to be this:

[http://www.tbrc.org/#!rid=O2MS813%7CO2MS813C2O0183\\$W2MS813](http://www.tbrc.org/#!rid=O2MS813%7CO2MS813C2O0183$W2MS813)

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, but not everyone has access to TBRC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

What is the name of the Tibetan text, and is it available online somewhere?

Malcolm wrote:

This is from the section on the view I cited. Enjoy.

The passage is on the third page at the very end of the section on view, right before he quotes Sakya Pandita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Good enough for me. Is it Seize questions à un maître dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

no clue, i read it in Tibetan

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The view established intellectually we need to establish consciously in dependence upon one's capacity of knowledge and on convention. The way of establishing that is the system of Prasanga Madhyamaka commented upon by the great being Nāgārjuna and his followers. There is no system of view better than that.

--ChNN, Questions and Answers on the Great Perfection

treehuggingoctopus said:

Malcolm, is the text you are quoting from available anywhere? Has it been published?

Malcolm wrote:

In French only.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your primordial state [basis] is yours.

alpha said:

If the primordial base is individual to each sentient being how is it possible that methods like hum sgrub of dorje drollo work and why do they work ?

Or why do we come across so many expressions in the dzogchen tantras like the essence of all the sugatas is none other then the essence of your own primordial state? If is none other is shared which is heresy. Is there a way of thinking about individual bases without falling into the error of thinking about it as an separate entity ? I know it is empty but if is empty then it can only be shared and empty.

Malcolm wrote:

The essence of all fires is heat. That does not mean all fires are the same.

The basis is not an entity at all, which is the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I understand that you have a kind of nominalist, anti-"mystical" bent but, honestly, when I read this passage, from "On The Nature Of Samantabhadra: A Conversation with Chögyal Namkhai Norbu", the epilogue to "The Supreme Source": Question: But if all beings are Samantabhadra, can we say that there are infinite Samantabhadras?

Answer: We could also think that there are infinite Samantabhadras, but when we are in the state of Samantabhadra, what does "infinite" mean? This is already a limited viewpoint. The true condition is beyond numbers. If we think in terms of an "individual being" this means that we are limiting, and consequently everything becomes complicated. If we want to understand, then we must not limit.

Question: In every tantra there is a dialogue, such as the dialogue between dharmakaya and sambhogakaya in the Kunjed Gyalpo tantra. What is the real meaning of this?

Answer: It is a way of communicating knowledge. The transmission of knowledge comes from the state of rigpa that has never been stained and has never been hindered. This is the Adibuddha, or "primordial Buddha," Kunjed Gyalpo.

Question: Is the state of Adibuddha, or Kunjed Gyalpo, something universal, present in all beings?

Answer: The state of Kunjed Gyalpo is knowledge, and in knowledge there is not even the concept of "one and two," otherwise we have already entered into dualism. Also the

concept of "individual" presupposes dualistic vision. But Samantabhadra is beyond all this, isn't he?
it just doesn't seem to be the same view.

Malcolm wrote:

Your primordial state [basis] is yours. Your rigpa is yours. It does not belong to someone else, was not created by Samantabhadra, God, Chance, or anything else. As long as one persists in reifying the basis, for that long one will never understand Dzogchen teachings.

BTW:

The view established intellectually we need to establish consciously in dependence upon one's capacity of knowledge and on convention. The way of establishing that is the system of Prasanga Madhyamaka commented upon by the great being Nāgārjuna and his followers. There is no system of view better than that.

--ChNN, Questions and Answers on the Great Perfection

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Shang Rinpoche dharma transmission and lecture in Melbou

Content:

Ayu said:

In the Lamrim teaching from Che Tsongkhapa (11th century)

Malcolm wrote:

Late 14th, early fifteenth, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Put another way, all fires are similarly hot, but there is no "ground of fire" from which all fires arise.

dzogchungpa said:

It is kind of interesting how they're all so similar though, don't you think?

Malcolm wrote:

Similar causes and conditions result in similar effects. If you see your real nature, the

six realms are the six dhatus of Samantabhadra, if you don't, the six dhātus of Samantabhadra are the six realms. As Nāgārjuna states in the MMK:
Samsara is not a little bit different than nirvana,
nirvana is not a little bit different than samsara;
whatever is the limit of nirvana,
that is the limit of samsara.
A little difference between those two
does not even have the slightest existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If there is a mind for every sentient being, there is a basis for every sentient being. This is why the basis is defined as being beyond one or many. It is beyond being one, since there is a diversity of sentient beings; it is beyond being many, since the basis is generic, and exists the same way in each sentient being.

dzogchungpa said:

So, basically, you're saying that "the basis" is just a way of referring to the fact that sentient beings are sentient?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis [primordial state] is a way of describing how we become buddhas by recognizing our real state or sentient beings by not recognizing that state, as well as describing how our real nature is whether we recognize it or not.

As described above, the term "ground of being" was coined by Tillich as a term for God. Hence it is not a proper term to be used in Buddhadharma at all.

Put another way, all fires are similarly hot, but there is no "ground of fire" from which all fires arise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As a marginalia in the rig pa rang shar tantra states:

"The original basis" is undetermined and can appear in any way. It is not impeded in anyway, has no fixed nature, its essence is unchanging, it is unperturbed by nature, the luminosity of wisdom. Also that light is able to appear as everything and is capable of performing functions. It is empty of a self and what belongs to a self, the dharmin of unchanging emptiness is not determined in clarity. Further, the ultimate essence that

does not change in a defined instant is beyond words.

This is a perfect definition.

"Dharmin" means the subject of a reasoned discussion. A "defined instant" means an instant predicated on having arising, ceasing and abiding (and such instants are rejected even in Yogacara).

So it means here that the basis, one's own unfabricated mind, has no fixed form or nature and is essentially timeless since time is also not established.

dzogchungpa said:

I still don't understand what "not determined in clarity" means. Also, it doesn't say the basis, which I assume = the ultimate essence, is timeless but rather that it is "beyond words". Also, while we're at it, there's one of these bases for each sentient being, right?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that the emptiness of the mind is not fixed in the clarity of the mind.

The whole passage concerns a definition of the original basis, thog ma gzhi.

If there is a mind for every sentient being, there is a basis for every sentient being. This is why the basis is defined as being beyond one or many. It is beyond being one, since there is a diversity of sentient beings; it is beyond being many, since the basis is generic, and exists the same way in each sentient being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As a marginalia in the rig pa rang shar tantra states:

"The original basis" is undetermined and can appear in any way. It is not impeded in anyway, has no fixed nature, its essence is unchanging, it is unperturbed by nature, the luminosity of wisdom. Also that light is able to appear as everything and is capable of performing functions. It is empty of a self and what belongs to a self, the dharmin of unchanging emptiness is not determined in clarity. Further, the ultimate essence that does not change in a defined instant is beyond words.

This is a perfect definition.

dzogchungpa said:

It might be perfect, but I don't understand it. What do the phrases "the dharmin of unchanging emptiness is not determined in clarity" and "the ultimate essence that does not change in a defined instant" mean?

Malcolm wrote:

"Dharmin" means the subject of a reasoned discussion. A "defined instant" means an instant predicated on having arising, ceasing and abiding (and such instants are

rejected even in Yogacara).

So it means here that the basis, ones own unfabricated mind, has no fixed form or nature and is essentially timeless since time is also not established.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: About the demon Mara

Content:

pemachophel said:

Thanks Malcolm for posting this.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, this is an excellent little text, I mean to publish it some day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As a marginalia in the rig pa rang shar tantra states:

“The original basis” is undetermined and can appear in any way. It is not impeded in anyway, has no fixed nature, it’s essence is unchanging, it is unperturbed by nature, the luminosity of wisdom. Also that light is able to appear as everything and is capable of performing functions. It is empty of a self and what belongs to a self, the dharmin of unchanging emptiness is not determined in clarity. Further, the ultimate essence that does not change in a defined instant is beyond words.

This is a perfect definition.

dzogchungpa said:

It might be perfect, but I don't understand it.

Malcolm wrote:

It is referring to your own unfabricated mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

I'm glad to hear that you have been able to maintain a strong relationship with your Guru all these years while seeing him so infrequently. Knowing that this is possible for

another person makes me think it could work for me.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really necessary to have a close personal relationship with one's teacher. It is useful however to travel now and again to serve him or her. As the Mahāsiddha Virupa states "The guru is the profound path."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: About the demon Mara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

From Replies to Nyang Tingzin Zangpo:

Again Guru Rinpoche said:

"There are as many Dharma practitioners as stars in the sky, but few are without the obstacles of māra, like the sun and moon. If one is without the obstacles of māra, it would be easy to attain liberation in a single year. Therefore, necessary to recognize māra and overthrow him.

In the beginning, when one is staying in the city of samsara's suffering, also one's faith in Dharma is slight; carried away by the "māra of laziness", one is angry at enemies, loving to friends, one thinks of mutual satisfaction, one is distracted by mundane activities, one is not mindful of death. Because of the activities of deluded appearances one remains in procrastination. That is called "māra".

The method of overpowering that māra is to seek out a qualified Guru, the cause of unimpaired faith. Meditate on death and impermanence, the cause of unimpaired diligence. Having established one's priorities, flee towards the Dharma.

At that time, māras turning one's thinking in the wrong direction will arise. Some will manifest as one's kin and companions, "Don't practice Dharma" they will say and will cause obstacles by various means. Some will manifest as terrifying enemies or manifest as competitors and property. Since the human life of deceptions is exposed, slipping away day after day, and in the end one sinks deeper into the mire of samsara. To subdue it, having entrusted one's mind to the jewel of the Guru, it is necessary to have the resolve not to seek advice from secular counselors. [8/a]

When one arrives in the presence of the Guru, the māra who accompanies doubts arises. The sign of his entry is to not perceive the qualities of the Guru. Even subtle faults are perceived. Incorrect views regarding his practice of interpretable deeds arise.

Thinking it is necessary to go to hell after giving whatever donations were received to the Dharma is a māra. To subdue it, develop the thought of the Guru as a Buddha.

At that time, the māra of turning away from Dharma arises. One will think of women, wealth, business, be deceitful and hoard. The sign of the entry of that māra is one will give up one's Dharma clothes, companions, and Dharma practice. One will not wish to

listen to Dharma. One's behavior will be mundane and one will have attachments and aversions. One will be greatly attached to evil alcohol. One will turn one's back on the teachings of the Buddha. To subdue it, develop perseverance towards the Dharma, sublime of the sublime. One should be diligent whatever profound Dharma to which one is inclined. Remain very far away from women and irreligious activities. It is important to think about the liberation accounts of one's predecessors.

At that time, the māra of being jaded about hearing different Dharmas will arise necessarily. The sign of his entry is one speaks proudly "I made this request for this Dharma." There isn't an intellectual understanding because one has not understood the meaning. Because one understands empty words alone, one explains secret words in public. Despite whatever profound meaning is explained, one thinks "I have heard it before" and certain knowledge does not arise. One does not reach perfection in Dharma, that is called a māra. To subdue it, one must engage in hearing and contemplation as before again and again, and truly integrate the meaning of Dharma.

At that time, māra of seeking many qualities enters. Since one understands qualities, māra is disguised as benefactors and students. On their arrival, one doesn't engage in practice. One becomes conceited about one's learning, and one sees oneself as important. One becomes attached to wealth. Obstacles preventing one from traveling the path of Dharma are created. The method of subduing it is, stay in mountain retreat for a long time, and change all other activities which will not realize the Dharma.

At that time, the māra of tenets will arrive. Having arrived as a Dharma of five poisons with the biases of oneself and others, give up the jealousies of tenets, train in unbiased pure vision.

At that time, when meditating on the deity, the māra of having doubts about the deity enters. Concepts about taking and putting down the deity, and is it good or bad arise. [9/a] Wishing to subdue demons with power, with completing the approach, hurrying the activities, practicing subjugation and evil mantras, to tame the māra of animosity with the wisdom deity, whatever deity one meditates, do not meditate with or without characteristics, but develop only the inner radiance of awareness and be steady in one's commitments of the three doors.

If one is freed from that māra, once again when one is meditating the channels and winds, the māra of introducing obstacles to practice arises, creating obstacles to spiritual practice, even slight suffering is unbearable. One stops that practice and later one is apprehensive of doing it. For that, meditate on the faults of samsara and one will be free from obstacles.

If one is free from that, again, enhancing great bliss, the dākinī māra arrives. Having accepted mantra, the woman bears children. Since one cannot care for them, various non-virtues occur. Cut the snares of attachment to her, what one does not have one needn't protect.

If one is free from that, when meditating emptiness, the māra of emptiness arising as an

enemy occurs. “Nothing is accomplished” and one confuses good deeds and misdeeds. One will have not faith in the Three Jewels. One will not arouse compassion for sentient beings. For that, one should increase virtue and purify misdeeds. One should train in pure vision, devoted faith, dependent origination and inseparable emptiness and compassion.

Further, the māra of compassion arising as an enemy is that without oneself being liberated one rushes to help migrating beings, and delay in accomplishment, etc., occurs. So to avoid that, develop aspirational bodhicitta and be relaxed about engaged bodhicitta.

If one is free from that, the māra of predictions arising as an enemy occurs. Impersonating one’s deity or Guru, when such predictions occur in one’s experience or in dreams as “Help migrating beings!” and “One will become accomplished if one has helped migrating beings”, etc., for that dissolve the wisdom being, if it remains clearly, it is the deity or Guru. But if it does not remain clearly, it is a māra and an obstacle. One should determine that with certainty.

If free from that, because the māra of ascetic conduct arises as an enemy, one wanders continually in towns, some are drunks, others show crazy behavior, others are lewd, behavior which is not correspond with the sublime Dharma occurs. To counter act that, [10/a] stay in one place, meditate on candali, be impartial towards the eight dharmas.

Otherwise, the obstacles of māra while one has not obtained perfect Buddhahood are endless, and also the explanations which follow. Having given up material things, if one practices one pointedly, no kind of obstacle or māra will affect one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No. Dzogchen does not assert an underlying monistic 'ground of being'.

smcj said:

You may be right. But you've got to admit that a lot of the time it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck.

Malcolm wrote:

No, but it is true that a lot of westerners spend a lot of time surgically altering swans into ducks.

As a marginalia in the rig pa rang shar tantra states:

“The original basis” is undetermined and can appear in any way. It is not impeded in anyway, has no fixed nature, it’s essence is unchanging, it is unperturbed by nature, the luminosity of wisdom. Also that light is able to appear as everything and is capable of

performing functions. It is empty of a self and what belongs to a self, the dharmin of unchanging emptiness is not determined in clarity. Further, the ultimate essence that does not change in a defined instant is beyond words.
This is a perfect definition.

The problem with most of these conversations about the Dharma on the internet, is that we are looking at these teachings, especially a teaching like Dzogchen, through an incredibly narrow aperture, assuming that the one glint we see of the teachings represents the whole.

We are also in a time where foreign teachers try to communicate with students using terms in English without an educated background in Western Philosophy, and Theology and so imply things they have no intention of implying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 8:00 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

rachmiel said:

A quick zoom over to Wikipedia revealed this:

Some Mahayana and Dzogchen traditions of Buddhism, however, do assert an underlying monistic 'ground of being' or tathagatagarbha, which is stated to be indestructibly present in all beings and phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Dzogchen does not assert an underlying monistic 'ground of being'. This is why Dzogchen spends so much time refuting such a ground.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

Kongtrul was famous for being a Shentongpa. I think what he said should be assumed to be from the "empty of other" perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what he says should be understood from the Dzogchen perspective, since it is about Dzogchen. Kongtrul did not subordinate his understanding of Dzogchen to gzhan stong. If anything, it is the opposite.

smcj said:

As I posted earlier in this thread: Jamgon Kongtrul "Treasury of Knowledge: Book 1 'Myriad Worlds'" p.204:

What is the fundamental nature of the original, primordial ground of being, before buddhas appear by realizing it and before sentient beings appear by not realizing it? To answer this, the tradition of Great Perfection states that...

For those reading this that are not familiar with that particular book, it is Kongtrul's dissertation on the different cosmologies for the universe. He starts with Mt. Meru and the like, and ends up with a description of "how the universe is" from the Dzogchen perspective. The above quote would be hard to characterize as anything other than Great Madhyamaka/Shentong, and it is specifically predicated on Dzogchen. So I don't buy that he saw Dzogchen as being anything other than an "empty of other"/Great Madhyamaka/Shentong perspective.

Kongtrul is one authority. He is not the only authority. Other equally prestigious authorities disagree. That's 100% ok. The only "correct way to see it" is whatever way a qualified teacher decides a specific student needs to hear about it. I know of teachers that tell one student one thing and another student something else entirely. You're not going to get that kind of customized presentation here on the internet. But in any case, like it or not, the "empty of other" school of thought does exist within Tibetan philosophical tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

The term "ground of being" appears nowhere in the text.

The text uses the term "ye thog gzhi", i.e. "primordial, original basis."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

Kongtrul was famous for being a Shentongpa. I think what he said should be assumed to be from the "empty of other" perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what he says should be understood from the Dzogchen perspective, since it is about Dzogchen. Kongtrul did not subordinate his understanding of Dzogchen to gzhan stong. If anything, it is the opposite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Jikan said:

Malcolm, going back to the OP here for context:

When this teacher is using the phrase "ground of being," is he simply using an inappropriate term to translate something (ka dag, say)? Or do are you saying this is a symptom of a misunderstanding on this teacher's part--that he's slipped over into eternalism?

Malcolm wrote:

As for the first part, definitely yes; as for the second, possibly — it rather depends on what he understands about Vedanta in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So is this referring to Dharmadhatu or Dharmakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

ka dag = dharmakāya of the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

smcj said:

From Jamgon Kongtrul "Treasury of Knowledge: Book 1 'Myriad Worlds'" p.205:

The primordial purity of the original ground is the domain of a practitioner of the path (of Great Perfection) who is free from the erroneous biases of conceiving (the ground) in various artificial ways and who has the correct (understanding) of the ground a primordial purity.

Malcolm wrote:

Ka dag is simply defined as emptiness free from extremes as he says here:
(The primordial purity of the ground) wholly transcends words, concepts, and formulations, and surpasses the limitations of existing or not existing.

smcj said:

The nature of the ground is primordially pure.

Malcolm wrote:

I.e. it is emptiness free from extremes.

Existing neither as cyclic life nor perfect peace, it remains primordially empty.

smcj said:

Personally I like the english word "premise" better than "base" or "ground", but that's just me.

Malcolm wrote:

The word is sthana (basis, support) in Sanskrit, not pratijñā (premise)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Btw, I have heard Anam Thubten use the word "brahman" in this context.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans are also not immune to misconceptions. Sad, considering how carefully Dzogchen texts dismantle Advaita, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "ground of being" described in any Buddhist text. The term is not appropriate in Buddhist discourse, and was imported into Dharma by mistake.

The term is a Christian theological term coined by Paul Tillich.

I wrote elsewhere on this site:

In terms of the origins of the term, it was indeed coined by Tillich to show that "God must be called the infinite power of being which resists the threat of nonbeing."

[Systematic Theology, Vol. pg. 64] You can see why such borrowing is tempting, "The ground of being has the character of self-manifestation; it has logos character"

[Systematic Theology, Vol.1 pg. 158]

A large problem for people who are approaching Dzogchen is that they fall back into

classical western philosophical categories. Indeed, Günther wrote once that Dzogchen essentially is not different than Parmenides's theory that whatever was contingent as non-being and whatever is permanent is being. Tillich writes:

"The Orphics, the Pythagoreans, Anaximander, Heraclitus, and Parmenides were driven to their philosophy by the awareness that the world they encountered lack ultimate reality. But only in Plato does the contrast between existential and the essential being become an ontological and ethical problem. Existence for Plato is the realm of mere opinion, error, and evil. It lacks true reality. True being is essential being and is present in the realm of eternal ideas, i.e., in essences. In order to reach essential being, man must rise above existence. He must return to the essential realm from which he fell into existence, In this way man's existence, is standing out of potentiality, is judged as a fall from what he essentially is. The potential is the essential, and to exist, i.e., to stand out of potentiality, is the lost of true essentiality...In God there is no difference between essential and existential being. This implies the split is not ultimately valid and that is has no relevance for the ground of being itself. God is eternally what he is. [Systematic Theology, Vol.2 ppg. 21-22]

Examining this kind of presentation that the term "ground of being" arose out of, it is easy to see why those who are not trained in Indo-Tibetan scholastics as well as Western Philosophy will be very attracted to terms like "ground of being" in relationship to the term "basis" or gzhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Samaya in Vajrayāna

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

how far do you take that?

I strive to keep samaya, especially since many people have their own feeling about tibetan buddhism and vajrayana it is better to do so. but what about things like images of one's yidam on the home shrine? or books on the bookshelf?

Malcolm wrote:

I do not allow people without empowerment in my shrinerroom.

I keep my images covered when common people are around as much as possible.

HE Ratnavajra gave me an image once with explicit instructions never to show it to someone who had not had the empowerment itself. So I largely try to observe this principle myself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Practice of Setrap

Content:
lorem said:
EDIT:

about Shri Devi. 2 armed Queen of War Sickle Is Sarasvati and Marpa 4 armed Vetali is Lakshmi.

I guess in dharmakaya all the same but that would be saying 6-arm, 4-arm, and Bernagchen are all the same. (Chenrezi, Samantabhadra, Vajrapani)

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, they are. Their aspect only differs in terms of their appearance to us based on our own deluded perceptions and needs.

But in reality the wisdom continuum of buddhas are all the same.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 12:26 AM
Title: Samaya in Vajrayāna
Content:
lorem said:
Okay. Makes sense. Berzin's samaya is to clarify. Our's is not. I dig that.

EDIT: But as Buddhism comes to the West it may change. Internet society very open about things and the whole social justice aspect very strong in psyche/culture(?)

EDIT 2: Yes. Four-faced Mahakala could not be shown, only in Brahmin form, but Geluk changed that.

Malcolm wrote:
As for the second point, no, the Gelugp's didn't change that. One still should never display the form of Caturmukha Mahākala.

Samayas don't change just because the teachings are brought from one culture to another — for example, the samayas did not change their character because Tibetans imported Vajrayāna from India. Therefore, we should not expect them to be mutable just because we live in the West.

Samayas are something taught in the tantras. Regardless of what others may do, I encourage people to follow them according to how they have been understood.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 12:03 AM
Title: Re: The tantric vow not to disparage women
Content:

lorem said:

They are totally set out in detail on the Berzin site. Not secret.

EDIT: you visit someone and they have thangkha uncovered or see shrine basically know pretty much everything about their practice (to some extent just making a point)

Malcolm wrote:

Right, nevertheless, they are actually secret and should not be discussed, just as pictures of yidams and so on should not be exposed to those without empowerment and so on.

Some people actually care about samaya, though these days, most seem to think it is optional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 30th, 2014 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: The tantric vow not to disparage women

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We are not really supposed to talk about tantric vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 29th, 2014 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Yeti-Bigfoot

Content:

reddust said:

I know this a silly question. I was wondering what the Tibetans think of their Bigfoot called Yeti?

Malcolm wrote:

"Yeti" is the Tibetan name for the very rare Himalayan brown bear, and that is all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 29th, 2014 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Practice of Setrap

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Some say Palden Lhamo is worldly, others say otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

Śrī Devi is a wisdom protector.

Konchog1 said:

While on the topic, is there a difference between all the Sri Devis? For example, the Sri Devi popular among the Gelug, and the Sri Devi of Marpa? Are they the same deity or different?

Malcolm wrote:

Same devi, different manifestations. All wisdom devatās have the same continuum, i.e., the dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 29th, 2014 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Practice of Setrap

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Some say Kalarupa is worldly, others say otherwise.

Some say Palden Lhamo is worldly, others say otherwise.

As for oracles, I have heard the same. I have also heard that worldly protectors like Pehar don't have oracles because they are too powerful, and entering a medium's body would kill the person.

lorem said:

Damchen is Manjushri.

Palden Lhamo is 10th level bodhisattva

Nechung Oracle is Pehar.

Konchog1 said:

I had heard Nechung was Dorje Drakden, a minister of Pehar.

Similar to how Palden Lhamo has no oracle, but there is an oracle for the Tenma goddesses in her retinue.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tenma are worldly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 29th, 2014 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: Practice of Setrap

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Worldly or not is an interesting issue.

Some say Kalarupa is worldly, others say otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

Kalarupa is a worldly manifestation of Yamantaka.

Konchog1 said:

Some say Palden Lhamo is worldly, others say otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

Śrī Devi is a wisdom protector.

Konchog1 said:

As for oracles, I have heard the same. I have also heard that worldly protectors like Pehar don't have oracles because they are too powerful, and entering a medium's body would kill the person.

Malcolm wrote:

Pehar has oracles.

Very confusing.

Konchog1 said:

As for Setrap,

Malcolm wrote:

Setrap has an oracle, therefore, worldly. Setrap was introduced by Nyan Lotsawa, it is a new school protector, no relationship nor samaya with Guru Rinpoche.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 29th, 2014 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Practice of Setrap

Content:

qwerty13 said:

I give you more background. Once I started to seriously think about dropping this practice I felt pain around my heart area and various other locations in my body. Nothing very serious, but I really felt for a moment that everything is not right. It's not like little painful tingling, but worse, more like something turning painfully couple of times inside my heart area. I had to stop for a moment to let the feeling go away. After the pain went away, I felt myself little weak for a couple of minutes. But after that I started to feel that I am returning to "normal" state. This may not be entirely related, but Alexander Brezin says in his web archive that if one disparages one's teacher or breaks up with him/her in a negative way (negative way: not keeping polite distance, but just running away with remorse) then it can cause autoimmune diseases, mental and physical suffering.

So that came to my mind when I was feeling these symptoms.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Setrap is a gyalpo. People who do Gyalpo practices often suffer from anxiety, paranoia and in particular, snying lung.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 24th, 2014 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No he is not calling for the slaughter of actual children, this is not his intention. All protector cycles have prayers with imagery just as violent. It is part and parcel of the rhetoric of violence that permeates the religious imagery of protector practices and smad las rites in general. I could cite (and won't) innumerable gore-filled examples where samaya breakers and their off-spring are subject to just as fierce imprecations.

Vajrasvapna said:

A prayer to harm the persons who break their vows is something other than a prayer to cause harm to innocent children and servants. The children were a threat to Buddhism or just to the power of the Dalai Lama and his order?

Malcolm wrote:

The prayer was directed not at people, but spirits causing people to act against their samaya, hence the reason it was addressed to Tsi'u mar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 19th, 2014 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Sherab said:

In short you are merely saying that the conditioned and the unconditioned being mere conventional designations are in the end illusions or unreal. And so, sentient beings, the tathagatagarbha and even the trikaya are all illusions or all unreal. That is rather extreme don't you think?

Malcolm wrote:

It is less extreme than the converse, i.e., that sentient beings, tathāgatagarbha and the three kāyas are true existents or real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 19th, 2014 at 9:55 AM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, I don't see what 'atmaparamita' could mean then. Here is Mipham's description of it, from "Gateway To Knowledge" Vol 4: Transcendent sublime identity is the attainment of the transformation into the very wisdom that encompasses all of existence and peace, the nature of all phenomena. This transcends the extreme of provisional insubstantiality-differentiated from the substantial existence of self in terms of the mere non-existence of self-and in so doing, utterly quells all such conceptual complexities.

This great identity is the wisdom body of space-like equality, which exercises mastery over all phenomena. It is the transformed locus of the entire unfathomable and matchless ocean of undefiled qualities such as the ten powers and the ten masteries. It is the sublime basis for spontaneously accomplishing the two benefits.
('atmaparamita' = "transcendent sublime identity")

Malcolm wrote:

The transcendent sublime nature is the attainment of the transformation into the very wisdom that encompasses all of existence and peace, the nature of all phenomena. This transcends the extreme of provisional insubstantiality-differentiated from the substantial existence of self in terms of the mere non-existence of self-and in so doing, utterly quells all such conceptual complexities.

This great nature is the wisdom body of space-like equality, which exercises mastery over all phenomena. It is the transformed locus of the entire unfathomable and matchless ocean of undefiled qualities such as the ten powers and the ten masteries. It is the sublime basis for spontaneously accomplishing the two benefits.[/quote]
('atmaparamita' = "transcendent sublime nature")

"Identity" is a little different than a "self", even so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Translating "atma" as "self" in this context is a misfortunate error when in fact the term simply means "nature" in this context as numerous usages prove.

dzogchungpa said:

So, what would you say the difference between "self" and "nature" is in this context?

Malcolm wrote:

"A self" is a bearer of identity, a nature is something like heat for fire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Oh your right my bad I posted the wrong thing.....

Queen Srimala Sutra

13. Intrinsic Purity of the Mind

"Lord, samsāra is based on the Tathāgata-garbha. It was with reference to the Tathāgata-garbha that the Lord pointed out and explained, '[It is] without limit in the past.' Since there is the Tathāgata-garbha, there is reason for speaking of 'cyclical flow' (samsāra).

Therefore the Tathāgata-garbha is the support, the holder, the base of constructed [Buddha natures] that are non-discrete, not dissociated, and knowing as liberated from the stores [of defilement]; and furthermore is the support, the holder, the base of external constructed natures that are discrete, dissociated, and knowing as not liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

Samsara does not equal conditioned phenomena. Why? Because if it did, there could be no pure conditioned phenomena such as path dharmas. People frequently confuse these two things much to their detriment. In other words, all conditioned phenomena are impermanent, but not all conditioned phenomena are impure.

Furthermore, indeed all conditioned phenomena are intrinsically pure, and it is just this intrinsic purity of the mind that sutras refer to as tathagātagarbha. It is this purity which is the basis for all buddhaqualities. Translating "atma" as "self" in this context is a misfortunate error when in fact the term simply means "nature" in this context as numerous usages prove. Tagathāgarbha is indeed pure, permanent, blissful, and a nature, but it is not a thing per se., it is also not a "self" and using that term and applying too tathāgarbha is just confusing. Further, claiming it is source of impure conditioned phenomena is also a category error. On the other hand, rhetorically samsara can be "based" on tathāgarbha since the non-recognition of one's real state does result on wandering in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The term "ground" (gzhi, sthana) is much misunderstood.

dzogchungpa said:

Could you clarify its meaning for us?

Malcolm wrote:

From a version of introduction to my forthcoming book:

...the generic basis [spyi gzhi], which is initially defined by Vimalamitra in the section on the nidānas as “one’s own unfabricated mind” [rang sems ma bcos pa]. This crucial point made in the text should not be ignored, for it would appear that Vimala’s stance contradicts the modern tendency to interpret the generic basis as a transpersonal entity of some kind, leading to the proposition that “the universe is an intelligent entity” and so on.

And:

...what is intended by the term “original basis” [ye gzhi] is a pristine empty cognizance or nous. By the use of the term ye shes as a key descriptor for the basis, Dzogchen texts are referring to a noetic potentiality of consciousness which is innate even when defined as “originally pure” or empty, for otherwise it would become very difficult to account for the arising of buddhas and sentient beings in the second topic, the arising of delusion.

And:

The third hard question is the issue of the temporality of the basis. Since time does not apply to the original basis, we must regard the use of terms such as “original,” “primordial” and so on as indicating a state in which time is irrelevant, rather than an actual conventional historical epoch or starting point existing countless infinities of eons ago. From such a perspective the placing of the original basis on a temporal spectrum is therefore a didactic myth. The net effect of this understanding is that the basis is the state of phenomena as they appear, in that all phenomena, both external and internal, appear out of an empty noetic potential.

And

dzogchungpa said:

Having defined the basis, what is being described is a description of reality just as it is. Buddhas are those who unerringly recognize this, and specifically, the idealized buddha known as Samantabhadra recognizes this not only in absence of a teacher, but without ever becoming a sentient being.

Malcolm wrote:

And:

The third topic defines sugatagarbha as no other than the basis present in sentient beings. In other words, the sugatagarbha defines how the basis is instantiated in sentient beings, and how vidyā exists in the body.

And:

Only the seventh position is considered to be flawless, in that the basis is defined as “great originally purity” (ka dag chen po):

Dharmatā, original purity, is free from all proliferation. Since it is unaffected by

ignorance, it is free from all obscurations.

In reality, the basis really just refers to the union of the two truths:

The Mahāyānapathakrama by Subhagavajra states: So called “tantras” are tantras because of connection, and further, because they connected the basis, the method and the result. When divided, there are two kinds— tantras of words and tantras of meaning. Words are sounds. There are three in meaning— the tantra of the basis, the tantra of method and the tantra of the result. Now then, the tantra of the basis is the nature of the two truths; the method is the two stages; and the result is the two kaṃyas, the dharmakāya and rūpakāya. Therefore, since the result is obtained when the method is cultivated in dependence on the basis, a tantra is so called because it connects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

conebeckham said:

"Beyond dualistic experience, reality's original nature

Is free from all formulation, the innate character of luminosity."

Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo

Malcolm wrote:

Right the innate characteristic of gsal ba is spros bral, but that does not make gsal ba a "source".

The term "ground" (gzhi, sthana) is much misunderstood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Brahmans held that self was the 5 aggregate body and that 5 aggregate body was permanent.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is a completely incorrect misrepresentation of what "brahmins" held.

Son of Buddha said:

No its not, it was common teachings back in the Buddhas day which is why the Buddha spent so much time teaching that the 5 aggregates were not self.

Malcolm wrote:

People in general tend to believe that the body is the self -- however, at this times, brahmins held many beliefs, traditionally numbered 62.

Son of Buddha said:

Malcolm

There is no difference between this view and the view of Advaita, which holds that Brahman, not ever non existent, uncreated, unconditioned, permanent, bliss, eternal, pure, True Self, etc. is the ground for phenomena.

So.... and the View of Advaita is considered to be copied straight from Buddhism (even hindu rivals at that time pointed that out)

Malcolm wrote:

This does not address the problem that I pointed out. Also, Gaudapada did not copy Buddhist views so much as borrow Buddhist arguments to refute the dualist views of other nonbuddhists. Shankara of course hotly rejected the idea that he was borrowing Mahāyāna and there is little resemblance between what is actually taught in Mahāyāna and Advaita.

Son of Buddha said:

In reality created, conditioned, impermanent, non-eternal and so on phenomena cannot have an uncreated, unconditioned, permanent ground (because a series is impossible, etc., all the faults which belong to positing a permanent creator, etc.) Those Buddhists who hold such a view have erred into eternalism.

So maitreya was an eternalist?

Maitreyas Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes say:***

"Not existent, and not non-existent,"

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a citation affirming any sort of a ground at all.

Son of Buddha said:

and moreover the thought of all the statements in a great many stainless texts of the middle way of being devoid of the extremes of existence and non existence is that:

*Since all dependently arisen conventionalities do not really exist, when one realizes this, one does not fall to an extreme of existence and is released from the extreme of superimposition.

* Since the ultimate noumenon that is beyond dependent arising is never non-existent, when one realizes this, one does not fall to an extreme of non-existence and is released from the extreme of deprecation.

Malcolm wrote:

These are not citations asserting some existent, permanent ground.

Son of Buddha said:

There is no problem, Samsara is beginningless As is Enlightenment. I stated Enlightenment is the ground and foundation for Samsara not that Enlightenment created samsara, For as long as Enlightenment has been the illusion of Samsara that mirrors Enlightenment has been. (the unconditioned/conditioned aspects of samsara is taught in the Queen Srimala Sutra)

Malcolm wrote:

The "ground" of samsara is ignorance, not enlightenment. It may be the case that there is no suchness to discover outside of samsara, but in that case, this does not make suchness a "ground" per se out of which phenomena arise. The root and basis of samsara is just the non-recognition of how things are. But this does not mean that there is some unconditioned enlightened pleroma out of which the phenomena of samsara and nirvana are produced.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Brahmans held that self was the 5 aggregate body and that 5 aggregate body was permanent.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is a completely incorrect misrepresentation of what "brahmins" held.

Son of Buddha said:

In the Buddhist Sutras the Tathagatagarbha is said to be the ground/foundation for all phenomenon, not ever non existent, uncreated, unconditioned, permanent, bliss, eternal, pure, True Self, beyond dependent arising, what is truly real and not illusion and permanent Wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between this view and the view of Advaita, which holds that Brahman, not ever non existent, uncreated, unconditioned, permanent, bliss, eternal, pure, True Self, etc. is the ground for phenomena.

In reality created, conditioned, impermanent, non-eternal and so on phenomena cannot have an uncreated, unconditioned, permanent ground (because a series is impossible, etc., all the faults which belong to positing a permanent creator, etc.) Those Buddhists who hold such a view have erred into eternalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhaqualities may be inherent in the dharmakāya, but only buddhas can see the dharmakāya, just as only buddhas can see tathagātagarbha. Thus one cannot evade the two accumulations, whether it takes three incalculable eons as in common Mahayāna, or on one lifetime, as in Secret Mantra.

Astus said:

That may be so. But it would be hard to find any existing Mahayana school of the common type. Tiantai, Huayan and especially Chan teaches a sudden path, while Pure Land teaches liberation in the next life. Only those who deny buddha-nature, i.e. the followers of Xuanzang, talk about a minimal three aeons.

Malcolm wrote:

They can teach whatever they like, but all the schools you mention are sutrayāna schools and are thus common Mahāyāna, teaching no methods not found in sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Astus said:

[Practically speaking, since the buddha qualities are inherent, it becomes possible to skip aeons of accumulating merit, so we have all the "enlightenment in this body" teachings as the mainstream of Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhaqualities may be inherent in the dharmakāya, but only buddhas can see the dharmakāya, just as only buddhas can see tathagātagarbha. Thus one cannot evade the two accumulations, whether it takes three incalculable eons as in common Mahayāna, or on one lifetime, as in Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 17th, 2014 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

kirtu said:

It would be less difficult in an academic paper because it can be treated from a religious studies perspective. You are a smart man. You can figure it out.

Malcolm wrote:

I have other more pressing things to do, and I don't write academic papers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 17th, 2014 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I would have to explain too many details, many of which are bound by samaya (for example, how to explain to an outsider the ritual language of extreme violence found in so many protector petitions?).

cloudburst said:

How would one explain this? People seem relieved that it is just a prayer to a protector, but the fifth Dalai Lama would have believed this to be a real entity who could be influenced by his prayers, just like a warlord. Given this, isn't it just as disturbing that this religious man is calling for children to be slaughtered? How can we understand his intention?

Malcolm wrote:

No he is not calling for the slaughter of actual children, this is not his intention. All protector cycles have prayers with imagery just as violent. It is part and parcel of the rhetoric of violence that permeates the religious imagery of protector practices and smad las rites in general. I could cite (and won't) innumerable gore-filled examples where samaya breakers and their off-spring are subject to just as fierce imprecations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Mahakala Practice Mahayoga

Content:

lorem said:

I would give them the benefit of the doubt but hard for me to check accuracy when I can't read the sources but thought they were holding to a Sakya/academic view.

Malcolm wrote:

I give them the benefit of the doubt, but in a project as large, and given that it is only one person, it is not surprising that there are errors here and there, and some of them are rather large especially when writing about non-Sakyapa art.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

Greg said:

I don't think the point is particularly to change Nichols' or Sperling's mind, I think the point is to have a published correction in a reputable source that is accessible to everyone. Plenty of people would be persuaded by this.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a reputable source. You would need someone like Thurman for that.

M

Greg said:

Thurman has his own credibility problems, but yes an academic would probably be ideal. However, if the Times published your letter to the editor, that would be worthwhile.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously, I am not the right person for the job.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

Greg said:

I don't think the point is particularly to change Nichols' or Sperling's mind, I think the point is to have a published correction in a reputable source that is accessible to everyone. Plenty of people would be persuaded by this.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a reputable source. You would need someone like Thurman for that.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

kirtu said:

Yes it is. If the academics get something egregiously wrong it is in fact the job of translators and Dharma teachers to correct the issue. You could publish a paper in something like the Journal of Buddhist Ethics along with a few other translators/Western Dharma teachers. Or you could write an article concerning the misinterpretation and publish it in a magazine like Tricycle. But this kind of misinterpretation needs to be addressed.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry Kirt, but no. Here is why -- I spent years correcting Dogyal advocates and so no — did I convince anyone of anything? No.

Further, in order to correct someone like the writer of the op-ed, I would have to explain too many details, many of which are bound by samaya (for example, how to explain to an outsider the ritual language of extreme violence found in so many protector petitions?).

And as far as correcting Sperling goes, that also is just a waste of time since he won't listen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 6:27 PM

Title: Re: Mahakala Practice Mahayoga

Content:

cck123 said:

Hi,

i got a jenang for an Six armed Mahakala from Rinchen Terdzo (ThukChen Pema GyuTrul Drawa Cycle, not Shangpa Chagdrupa) and thought this should be an Mahayoga/Anuttarayoga empowerment.

On Himalayanart.com there is mentioned that Six armed Mahakala is a Kriyayogatantra practice, which would mean that there a very different commitments for practicing/reciting the Mantra.

Can you help me with some info? Do i need to be vegetarian for reciting the Mantra? Or are there no commitments with jenang?

Best wishes

Chris

Malcolm wrote:

It is highest yoga tantra. Himalayan art has many errors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 8:27 AM

Title: Re: Re Tsen God

Content:

pemachophel said:

Anyone know anything about a Protector named Tsen God (not God)?

Malcolm wrote:

Btsan rgod just means wild brtsan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 8:13 AM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

Jikan said:

We're talking about an article in a book from 1996, right?

1996?

Surely this has been corrected in the scholarship already.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Jikan said:

If so, then Buddhist Studies is an anemic discipline indeed.

Malcolm wrote:

Just spread very thin...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sperling conflates two distinct epochs in the Fifth's life, disturbances in Tsang that also tally with disturbances caused by Dogyal, and the events of Tsang war in 1640.

Moreover, Sperling does not state to whom he sent these instructions, but it is clear when the letter is read in full it was sent to Tsi'u dmar. Now of course it is too late, because this misinformation now shows up on many web sites.

kirtu said:

But since your fingers are not broken you can inform Kristof and Sperling (and in the later case in an academic forum) of the errant reading.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
Not my job.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 5:57 AM
Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama
Content:
Jikan said:
We're talking about an article in a book from 1996, right?

1996?

Surely this has been corrected in the scholarship already.

Malcolm wrote:
Nope.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 5:01 AM
Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama
Content:

Greg said:
According to Sperling it is 5DL's report of the instructions that he sent to a military force directing them to attack Tsang. Hard to see how that is purely rhetorical.

Malcolm wrote:
It is not such a letter. It is a letter of petition to Tsi'u dmar po to quell disturbances in Tsang.

It states:

"Pleased to composed a letter of vajra words of the Yakṣa Tsi'u dmar po, the general of the arrogant ones appointed by the great master of Glorious Oddiyāna, the union of all the buddhas, as the protector of the doctrine and the profound treasures in the valleys surrounded by the Himalayas, headed by the temple of Zab Yangs Migyur Lhundrup (Samye)..."

It ends with:

"Please pacify all the negativities of this time such as the illness, wars and famines

of Pur rgyal and Tibet, and increase happiness,
fully increase the doctrine of scripture and realization,
effortlessly accomplish the wishes of me, the Vidyādhara..."

etc.

As I said, these lines are rhetorical.

This kind of scholarship is very irresponsible on Sperling's part.

Greg said:

It certainly looks less bad if it is in fact a supplication to a dharmapāla and not an actual directive to smash babies off of rocks. And that is certainly extremely sneaky and misleading of Sperling to phrase things the way he did. But the fact that he actually did orchestrate a military campaign is probably enough for Kristof's point to stand.

Malcolm wrote:

By 1660 (the date of the above cited letter), the Fifth was firmly in control of Tibet.

Sperling conflates two distinct epochs in the Fifth's life, disturbances in Tsang that also tally with disturbances caused by Dogyal, and the events of Tsang war in 1640.

Moreover, Sperling does not state to whom he sent these instructions, but it is clear when the letter is read in full it was sent to Tsi'u dmar. Now of course it is too late, because this misinformation now shows up on many web sites.

In 1640, he was only 23 and fully controlled by the regent, Sonam Chophel, who waged war against the King of Tsang in the Fifth's name.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

Greg said:

According to Sperling it is 5DL's report of the instructions that he sent to a military force directing them to attack Tsang. Hard to see how that is purely rhetorical.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not such a letter. It is a letter of petition to Tsi'u dmar po to quell disturbances in Tsang.

It states:

"Pleased to composed a letter of vajra words of the Yakṣa Tsi'u dmar po,the general of

the arrogant ones appointed by the great master of Glorious Oddiyāna, the union of all the buddhas, as the protector of the doctrine and the profound treasures in the valleys surrounded by the Himalayas, headed by the temple of Zab Yangs Migyur Lhundrup (Samye)..."

It ends with:

"Please pacify all the negativities of this time such as the illness, wars and famines of Pur rgyal and Tibet, and increase happiness, fully increase the doctrine of scripture and realization, effortlessly accomplish the wishes of me, the Vidyādhara..."

etc.

As I said, these lines are rhetorical.

This kind of scholarship is very irresponsible on Sperling's part.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 16th, 2014 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Mindfulness is powerful, But keep religion out of it

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So he's an expert on Dzogchen too? Anything else?

Malcolm wrote:

He was a student of Tulku Orgyen's. His affection for Dzogchen has been consistent, despite the fact that his materialism is utterly at odds with Dzogchen view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 15th, 2014 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Taking and giving/Tonglen/Chöd/New Age

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

Perhaps it isn't possible to gauge the value, significance, purpose, or reach of tonglen.

Malcolm wrote:

The supreme training of bodhicitta,
the bodhicitta of exchanging oneself with others,
is said to be the essence of the teachings.

-- Sakya Pandita

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 15th, 2014 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: claim about Fifth Dalai Lama

Content:

drodul said:

Nicholas Kristof writes in a recent column that the Fifth Dalai Lama ordered children to be massacred in 1660 (<http://mobile.nytimes.com/2014/10/09/opinion/nicholas-kristof-the-diversity-of-islam.html?referrer=> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; .) What, if anything, is he talking about?

Malcolm wrote:

It's purely rhetorical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 15th, 2014 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dude....

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oil_reserves_in_Iraq " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Most of oil in Iraq is controlled by Kurds or Shiites, that is all there is to it.

Son of Buddha said:

Even the oil fields in shiite area DO NOT BELONG to the shiites, the oil is ran through a PIPELINE, to oil refineries to be processed from benzine for commercial use these refineries are almost exclusivly under sunni control.. Saddam set it up this way to keep the Sunnis in control of everything.

The actual refined product never touches shiite hands.....even the crude oil never touches shiite hands cause it goes down the pipeline to the Sunnis.

Which is why the largest oil refinery in Iraq is the Bajji oil refinery in Sunni control.

Malcolm wrote:

The Shiites control that oil, and that is a fact. It is how the Iraqi Gvt. (Shiite) makes its money. The refinery you mention? Also controlled by Iraqi Gvt. until a few months ago.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 14th, 2014 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

A reasonable exit from Iraq was given and he didn't blow it, Iraq was stable for many years and they were properly set up to take care of themselves..... the fact is the blame rests solely on the Iraqi Gov, which has a 250,000 standing Army with tanks, heavy armored vehicles and airforce, and yet they lost half their country to 5000 invaders with pickup trucks.

Malcolm wrote:

Obama did blow it, he did not listen to his advisors for political reasons (responding to the American populace's war fatigue); the Iraqi Govt. was and is a joke, and the proof of this is that the Iraqis let go of half of Iraq to a brigade of bandits in pickup trucks.

Son of Buddha said:

Your joking right?

It doesn't matter what advisors told Obama cause Mr Obama was only responding to the Iraq government demand that all American troops be out of their country by 2011, only thing Obama did was accept the Iraqi governments demands for FULL sovereignty and the end of all US occupation of Iraq..... of course this also worked out for Obama cause he got to play it off as if he was the one who caused all of the American troops to be brought home. When in fact it was the Iraqi gov's demands.

Yes the Iraqi gov is weak..... But they are a sovereign nation and it was about time the US treated them like one..... THEIR elected gov as a sovereign nation voted and said we want all American troops out of our country by 2011..... it doesn't matter if it was right or wrong choice....it was their choice....and it was about time for their choice to be honored

Malcolm wrote:

It was a short sighted decision, Obama blew it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 14th, 2014 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Geographically the Sunnis control most of the oil in Iraq(baji).

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Sunni are mostly located away from the oil regions.

Son of Buddha said:

The vast majority of the oil fields are the northern Sunni triangle, the southern oil fields in the Shiite areas have their oil run through pipelines that must be sent to the northern

refineries for processing.....hence the largest oil refinery in Iraq is the Sunni controlled Baiji oil refinery on route cherry near what was FOB Summeral.

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oil_reserves_in_Iraq "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Most of oil in Iraq is controlled by Kurds or Shiites, that is all there is to it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 14th, 2014 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Appropriateness of openly discussing sunyata

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I think it would be very inappropriate to talk about the teachings of emptiness with someone who doesn't have the correct background to understand it correctly. One should understand dependent origination first. I also think that to begin learning Madhyamaka one of the first things to go over and establish very clearly is the meaning of prajnapiti, meaning provisional designation or imputation. I think that explaining emptiness in terms of prajnapiti is the best way to lay it out for a beginner because it allows you to lay out the meaning of different teachings in a very explicit way, and it is easy to use prajnapiti to describe emptiness in a way that is clearly distinct from both absolutism and nihilism, even to a beginner.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends, I learned about emptiness (via the "Heart Sutra") before I knew what dependent origination was, and it filled me with tremendous joy. In, fact, experiencing joy upon hearing of emptiness is a sign described the Prajñāpāramita sūtras of someone who has previously entered the Mahāyāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 14th, 2014 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddha Sakyamuni's Negative Karma

Content:

haha said:

No doubt Buddha does not have any negative karma.

But

Even though there is no negative karma (in relation to Sakyamuni Buddha's mental continuum), other people to whom he interacted in his past and present lives were not free from negative emotions. It seemed that those people to whom he had not positive

relation they suffered from jealous, hatred, anger with him. How could that be the skillful means? Many people at the time of Sakyamuni Buddha became envious with his fame and because of that they tried to defame him. Even tried to hurt him physically. How could it be the skillful means?

Karma related with his own mental continuum
Karma related with other people's mental continuum

Malcolm wrote:

The sutra above actually discusses how Devadatta's actions are related to the Buddha's skillful means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, there is a solution after all...fielding an all-women army:

A women fighter explained "This is not a myth but reality. I personally met IS fighters face-to-face. Women fighters infringe on their psyche. They believe they won't go to paradise if they are killed by women. That is why they flee when they see women. I saw that personally at the Celaga front. We monitor their radio calls. When they hear a woman's voice on the air, they become hysterical."

<http://www.ibtimes.com/syria-kurdish-women-protection-units-wage-battle-against-isis-kobani-1703501> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/syria-isis-jihadis-terrified-fanatical-kurdish-women-soldiers-who-will-deny-them-place-paradise-1468887>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Geographically the sunnis control most the oil in Iraq(baji).

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Sunni are mostly located away from the oil regions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

A reasonable exit from Iraq was given and he didn't blow it, Iraq was stable for many years and they were properly set up to take care of themselves..... the fact is the blame rests solely on the Iraqi Gov, which has a 250,000 standing Army with tanks, heavy armored vehicles and airforce, and yet they lost half their country to 5000 invaders with pickup trucks.

Malcolm wrote:

Obama did blow it, he did not listen to his advisors for political reasons (responding to the American populace's war fatigue); the Iraqi Gvt. was and is a joke, and the proof of this is that the Iraqis let go of half of Iraq to a brigade of bandits in pickup trucks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is really a political one, not a military one. If NATO chose to, they could douse these people with overwhelming force. However, it would cause WWII because inevitably NATO troops would clash with the 100,000+ Iranian troops that are already in Iraq.

Kirtu said:

Where are you getting 100,000 Iranian troops in Iraq? The BBC and Guardian are reporting 2000 troops specifically to fight IS. This may be the revenge of Saddam Hussein (Saddam Hussein may have been correct that Iran wants to end Iraq as a political entity). However if Iranian troops are there only to combat IS then there is no reason why this would inevitably cause a confrontation with NATO troops.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I mispoke — I mean on the border. However, there are clear Iranian interests at stake because the Shiites control most of the oil in Iraq. If anyone has a stake in oil in Iraq, it is Iran.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Nemo said:

Allowing war profiteers to subvert your good intentions into meaningless mass murder is not skillful either.

You are letting a man with a hammer fix your car. There will be lots of banging and it will sound like something is getting done. But if you know anything about cars it's dumb.

Malcolm wrote:

There are always war profiteers, there always has been, there always will be — it is the nature of the chaos of armed conflict itself.

I am not letting anyone do anything — I voted for Obama the first time because he promised us a reasonable exit from Iraq — but he blew it, and this is the price we are paying now.

Anyway, I vote Green and will continue too for the foreseeable future.

Still, we have no solutions for a situation that is growing increasingly worse by the day.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 7:19 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Nemo said:

I'm so tired of wars...

Malcolm wrote:

Me too...

Karma Dorje said:

Then perhaps it is best not to promote it on a public board, no matter how well-intentioned you may be. You don't influence policy posting here, but your authority as a Buddhist expert may confuse some/many who read your point of view but don't understand the nuance. Worse it can bring out negativity or give cover to negativity in others who do not have as firm a grasp on their own emotions. It's hard to see anything positive come out of promoting military action on a Buddhist forum even if you are correct in your estimation of what is necessary to do.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think positing a pacifist stance in regards to the present mideast situation is skillful. It is easy to say "No war!!!"

But when people are being killed by truly evil people, who have nothing but evil intentions in their hearts even towards their own, well, what can we do? Throw up our hands and claim it is not our problem?

The problem is really a political one, not a military one. If NATO chose to, they could douse these people with overwhelming force. However, it would cause WWII because inevitably NATO troops would clash with the 100,000+ Iranian troops that are already in Iraq.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddha Sakyamuni's Negative Karma

Content:

Mkoll said:

That's one point of view, but it is not the Mahāyāna point of view.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't leave us hanging in suspense! What is the Mahayana POV?[/quote]

The Mahāyāna POV is that a Buddha is completely free from karmāvarana, the obscuration of karma. In the Ārya-upāyakaśālya-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra, The Buddha explains that even though tathāgatas have no karmic obscurations which can be karmavipaka, they demonstrate karmavipaka otherwise sentient beings will not be able to relate to them. He says:

Because of causes and conditions, an acacia thorn pierced the Tathāgata's foot. That too is the Tathāgata's skillful means, but is not the ripening of karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Buddha Sakyamuni's Negative Karma

Content:

haha said:

@ Queen Elizabeth II

Thank you for the link.

Towards the end of the commentary it is indeed stated emphatically:

Kammapiṭikaṃ nāma Buddhāpi na muñcati.

The Buddha was surely not free from the connection with that deed.

Kammapiṭikaṃ evarūpaṃ Lokattayasāmim-pi na vijahati.

The Lord of the Three Worlds surely could not abandon the connection with that deed.

And the moral is, of course, that neither can we, so we had better be careful about the deeds we choose to perform.

Malcolm wrote:

That's one point of view, but it is not the Mahāyāna point of view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Nemo said:

I'm so tired of wars...

Malcolm wrote:

Me too...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Such distinctions are lost on most people who have not made a special study of the ecology movement.

The very fact that Murray Bookchin was an old left radical has crippled the growth of the Green Party in the US, since most of his followers are in control of it, and they talk more about labor rights than the environment.

Sherab Dorje said:

Like I said: armchair conservative.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, just a follower of Naess, but as Naess said "The front is long...", meaning that there is a lot of room for different points of view in the ecology movement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I traveled to Turkish Kurdistan during the peak of the Turkish military crackdown on the

PKK. It was not a pretty sight.

Malcolm wrote:

The PKK are Marxist-Leninists. No wonder the US would not help them, and giving credence to Nemo's contention, may even have organized black ops against their commanders.

Sherab Dorje said:

Were Marxist-Leninists. Read the ROAR articles I linked to <http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=47&t=17682&start=60#p256992>. Haven't been Marxist-Leninists for a long time now. You may even be pleasantly surprised to see what they have become (vibra-massage model armchair).

Malcolm wrote:

Such distinctions are lost on most people who have not made a special study of the ecology movement.

The very fact that Murray Bookchin was an old left radical has crippled the growth of the Green Party in the US, since most of his followers are in control of it, and they talk more about labor rights than the environment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I traveled to Turkish Kurdistan during the peak of the Turkish military crackdown on the PKK. It was not a pretty sight.

Malcolm wrote:

The PKK are Marxist-Leninists. No wonder the US would not help them, and giving credence to Nemo's contention, may even have organized black ops against their commanders.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Nemo said:

We needed Turkish bases for Iraq. We had to do some favours. Just like how right now Canadian special forces are on the ground spotting for American airstrikes. What

happens and what is in the news are different things Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

You did not clarify whether you were talking about Turkish Kurds or Iraqi Kurds. Nevertheless, this is merely hearsay at this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Nemo said:

That is a nice story, but I was a medic.

In the Canadian Armed Forces, not the US Armed Forces.

In regards to ISIS doubling down on failed policies is not a way out. Bringing only murder by aerial bombardment to the table is ludicrously simplistic. And as you see with the Turks completely ineffective. I am in favour of not releasing the dogs of war until there is a real plan. Murder first ask questions later has only created more problems. Destroying grain storage facilities is sick. We will starve more kids than ISIS will behead.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I am not in favor of continuing the US policies w/regards to the Middle East of the past 70 years either.

I have also agreed that arial bombardment is ineffective and have pointed out that Americans generally do not want to be involved in another war in Iraq, hence the Obama Administration's "strategy".

But I also recognize that NATO/UN should not allow these folks free reign.

Incidentally, your strategy of isolating ISIS hoping they will run out of food, armaments and spare parts will also result in famine, etc. You think they will feed children first? Unlikely.

As far as there being a US program to assassinate Iraqi Kurdish commanders, I won't believe it until I see some proof.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Actually you do, for military vessels. That's why you don't see Russia (for example) cruising around the Mediterranean with aircraft carriers. They limit their outings to the Black Sea.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because they require Turkey's permission to pass through the Bosphorus Straights.

But the US does not need to ask any one for permission to sail the Mediterranean Sea. Landing in ports is a different matter.

Sherab Dorje said:

Etc... So, you see, my armchair is situated uncomfortably close to the reality of ISIL. A 45 minute boat trip away, to be exact.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, so you really think that without NATO you are safe? Greece and Balkans have been on the front line of the conflict between the West and the Middle East for centuries. If the shit really hits the fan, it is back to NZ for you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And supporting US foreign policy is the favorite pastime of armchair conservatives...

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a conservative, I am not a republican, I am not a democrat. I am a registered Green.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Nemo said:

The Kurds will be very reluctant to accept our help. When I was in we were spending huge amounts of resources to assassinate their commanders.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, I don't know what planet you live on.

Nemo said:

Eventually more murder is not the answer Malcolm. Americans were always the most blood thirsty. Body counts were more important than strategy. 22 American soldiers are committing suicide daily. Drowning in guilt from all the murder. It has to stop. More of the same failed policies is evil.

Malcolm wrote:

Allowing ISIS to continue unchecked is also evil. So what do you suggest? Passivity?

BTW, the suicide rate for US soldiers was 20 a day until 1999. However, suicide rates amongst soldiers who never deployed to Iraq is higher than those who did deploy.

Nemo said:

Among key findings: while suicide rates for soldiers who served in Iraq and Afghanistan more than doubled from 2004 to 2009 to more than 30-per-100,000, the trend among those who never deployed nearly tripled to between 25- and 30-per-100,000.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/03/03/suicide-army-rate-soldiers-institute-health/5983545/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

But anyway, it is quite obvious that the US wants Syria for two reasons:

1. Oil

Malcolm wrote:

I have already rebutted this objection.

Sherab Dorje said:

2. Sea access to the Middle East via the Mediterranean (without having to ask for favors/permission from anybody). It is much easier and cheaper for them, plus they don't run the hazard of being flanked by Iran.

Malcolm wrote:

We already do not have to ask any one permission to sail in the Mediterranean. It is part of international waters.

Sherab Dorje said:

Coz really, all of this (plus the bases in Turkmenistan) seems to me to just be part of the grand plan to encircle and destroy Iran.

And you reckon that American foreign policy is not pro-active?

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, American foreign policy is hapless and bumbling. There is no grand design. But vilifying the US is the favorite pastime amongst armchair radicals...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Turkish Kurds are claiming that the Turkish state supports ISIL. Thing is that Turkey's unwillingness to support the Kurds in Kobane will open a new chapter in their civil war. "Funny" thing is that Kemalists, that tried so hard to crush Kurdish Nationalism as personified by the PKK, will now become friends with the PKK, united against their common enemy the (until now liberal Islamicist) Justice and Development Party.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is what they claim. Pretty much of a CF all around. This, frankly, is why at this point the UN really needs to get involved. NATO ought not try to handle this alone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

On the basis of this, it would mean that Iraq and Syria would be united with the common denominator being occupation and administration by the US (military).

I suggest you examine the history of the Ba'ath party in Iraq and Syria and their (failed) attempt at creating a Pan-Arabic state. That is what I was referring to.

Of course, if the US had offered air support and anti-tank weapons to the only secular force in the region (apart from Assad): the Kurds of Kobane,

We did, do and will do — the main problem in Kobane is the Turks refusing to allow Kurds into Syria to fight ISIS, as far as I understand. Airstrikes are out of the question now because ISIS is in the town.

But, obviously, the US wouldn't want to be seen supporting democratically minded, autonomous, secular forces, would they? That would be completely out of character.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/oct/09/turkey-isis-syria-kobani-control-jack-kirby> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The main problem is that the Turks want Assad deposed, etc., and refuse to get involved without such assurances. In short, it is a political clusterf, not really a military problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

At this point, national boundaries are a little besides the point since at one time the Ba'athists were intent on uniting Iraq and Syria anyway.

Sherab Dorje said:

Under American rule?

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? Again, the real question is what should be done?

The Obama administration has mounted an ineffective campaign of arial bombardment because there really is no will on the part of the American people to be entrenched in another war in Iraq.

On the other hand, the hawks in the Pentagon, Panetta, and others insist that we have no choice.

The Saudis and Turks seem happy to sit idly by.

The Israelis cannot get involved because it will ignite WWIII.

So, again, anyone have any solutions other than merely flogging the dead horse of US Governmental turpitude?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Greg: do you want the US to put troops on the ground?

Sherab Dorje said:

Are you asking me if I want the US to invade Syria too?

Malcolm wrote:

There are a couple of approaches — the pacifist approach, advocated by Geoff and Nemo, which will allow ISIS to murder lots of people without any restraint; the interventionist approach in which ISIS is stopped but there of course will be more killing or ???

At this point, national boundaries are a little besides the point since at one time the Ba'athists were intent on uniting Iraq and Syria anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Nemo said:

Did you also notice that both the sources Karma Dorje is quoting are former soldiers Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am very familiar with both citations, for years.

As far as I can tell, you and Geoff are advocating "hands off," just allow ISIS to do their thing.

Greg: do you want the US to put troops on the ground?

It seems to me the US will be criticized for whatever it does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

How is it a conspiracy theory to point out that some people are getting extraordinarily wealthy from the constant war preparation?? Where is the money going?

Malcolm wrote:

If you imagine that it is an intentional plan by some nefarious cabal, that is a conspiracy theory.

Karma Dorje said:

How is it a conspiracy theory to point out that the Iraq War was waged with 9/11 as a pretext despite Iraq having no connection with the attack nor any WMD??

Malcolm wrote:

I agree with you of course that the Al Qaeda connection and WMD threat was a pretext, and a shallow one at that. This why I opposed the Iraq war (both of them).

It was Bush family personal business waged on a global scale. We ought to make it illegal for two members of the same family to serve as president in the same generation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, it should be noted that most of the countries where there is intense political instability are in regions of the world where animal sacrifice is still deeply ingrained in the culture.

Sherab Dorje said:

They still practice animal sacrifice here in Greece, just with a Christian veneer. Here on Lesbos the main one is held in honour of a local form of the Archangel Michael (in his role as general [Taxiarchis] of the heavenly forces) who is considered the protector of the island.

Taxiarchis.jpg

It is a unique icon as Orthodox Christians do not use statues or sculptures at all (unlike the Catholics). It is said to be moulded from clay mixed with the blood of the monks that were slaughtered in the monastery by pirates during the period of the Ottoman occupation of Greece.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot of political instability in Greece.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

It was never the point to pay for the war with oil. Why do that when you can simply tax the middle class and/or print money? They weren't looking to steal the reserves outright. They wanted a non-OPEC oil producer with sufficient reserves to keep the taps on and smooth out oil shocks. When you measure cost, it is a zero sum game. If the US gov't is out USD \$1.1 trillion then someone else has it on their balance sheet. So who is this? It's a simple matter of cui bono to understand the war rationale. As the 'Rebuilding America's Defenses' paper lays out, 9/11 provided the pretext for a muscular expansion of hard power into a region important for access to petroleum.

Malcolm wrote:

More conspiracy theories. I don't it.

Sorry, this is too much like conspiracy theory thinking to me. I don't believe this. There is no US policy of perpetual war.

Surely you can distinguish de facto policy from stated aims. The US arms budget dwarfs the rest of the world many times over and has since WW2. It has constantly been in use.

<http://www.infoplease.com/timelines/militaryoperations.html> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

The military budget was vastly reduced under Clinton. Yes, there are hawks in the US government, but there after the cold war ended, we began to wind down our military until 9/11.

When you are talking about control of the world's resources, you don't just sort of bumble along and react.

Yes, often we do. We have bumbled along without clear planning and foresight and have done exactly what you suggest, from Iran/Contra to 9/11.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

If it was just Kristol, it would be of little consequence. You need to look at the important players:

Malcolm wrote:

All you have done is pointed out a Republican set of policies. Republicans do not represent all of us. Therefore, once again I reject your claim that these policies are US policies in toto. They represent a portion of thinking in the right wing of our political spectrum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, while the ISIS folks are pernicious and should be stopped dead in their tracks by an international coalition, there really are more pressing issues at stake, such as climate change and so on. What is required all around is a perspective grounded in what is good for the biosphere as a whole, not merely we human beings who inhabit it.

Sherab Dorje said:

All these issues are related.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, but it won't be solved by coddling or ignoring petroleum-poor Iraqi Sunni militants who want to relieve Shiites and Kurds of the reserves they hold. In fact, it will just make things worse all around, as far as I can see.

Given that oil in addition to deforestation and coal are three main causes of climate instability, it strikes me that we need a world wide hydrocarbon policy that works to every country's advantage.

On the other hand, it should be noted that most of the countries where there is intense political instability are in regions of the world where animal sacrifice is still deeply ingrained in the culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

One doesn't need a clearance to analyze why an organization operates the way it does. Particularly when you can look at steering documents like the a Project for a New American Century penned by the very people driving US policy. Outside of the bubble of the US education system and the media echo chamber it is pretty clear what is going on. The question is really whether one agrees with it or not.

Personally, I don't agree with it and hence I have remained an expat for forty plus years.

Mkoll said:

Sure, one can analyze and speculate all one wants.

Sherab Dorje said:

Or one can just go with the hook, bait and sinker option.

Malcolm wrote:

This is what one side always says of the other. Hardly a position born of equanimity.

In reality, while the ISIS folks are pernicious and should be stopped dead in their tracks by an international coalition, there really are more pressing issues at stake, such as climate change and so on. What is required all around is a perspective grounded in what is good for the biosphere as a whole, not merely we human beings who inhabit it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

One doesn't need a clearance to analyze why an organization operates the way it does. Particularly when you can look at steering documents like the a Project for a New American Century penned by the very people driving US policy. Outside of the bubble of

the US education system and the media echo chamber it is pretty clear what is going on. The question is really whether one agrees with it or not.

Personally, I don't agree with it and hence I have remained an expat for forty plus years.

Malcolm wrote:

Kristol and so on may have driven the Bush administration's policies, but they hardly have been driving American policy for the past forty years.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

The fifth largest proven reserves at 140 Billion barrels? Easily accessed and easily processed light sweet crude unlike offshore and tarsands oil? Dismissing this component of the calculus for war is curious but not serious.

Malcolm wrote:

Iraq, pre war, produced 2 million barrels a day. Now it is producing 2.8 per day roughly, earning Iraq \$89 billion dollars last year.

US investment in the war? Well, the first one sanctioned Iraqi Oil on behalf of Kuwaitis — so that was money tossed away.

The second one? The DOD spend 757.8 billion. Brown University reported that the war cost 1.1 trillion. Well, as you can see, Iraq does not pump enough oil to pay for the US adventure there.

Karma Dorje said:

The policies are very much predicated on Pax Americana which of course hearkens to the Pax Romana. I don't understand why you would argue this uncontroversial point.

Malcolm wrote:

I contest it because I do not think this point of view about the goals of American foreign policy is correct.

Karma Dorje said:

The USSR was an ally during the war and Stalin wanted friendly relations with the West that were rejected by the UK and US after the war as they thought they could better expand their spheres of influence by an adversarial relationship.

Malcolm wrote:

That is one reading of history, there are others.

Karma Dorje said:

The same thing played out after Castro's revolution in Cuba. The US has had a policy of perpetual war preparation and war since WWII.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, this is too much like conspiracy theory thinking to me. I don't believe this. There is no US policy of perpetual war.

Karma Dorje said:

I would argue that there have been few things as foolish and wasteful in humankind than a cold war that need not have been, but for the imperial impulse and the greed and power hunger of a few American and British men.

Malcolm wrote:

As if there was no imperial impulse and greed on the part of Stalin and Mao...

Karma Dorje said:

And so it goes in samsara, the rapacity and aggression that the US has advanced its cause by all these years have now hollowed out its middle class, offshored its jobs and left it heavily in debt. Quel dommage.

Malcolm wrote:

Or, the partition of the global economy caused by the cold war created a climate where the US was the main player, since everyone owed us money and we had the infrastructure to meet the world's industrial needs until the '70's.

There are a lot of ways to look at these historical events.

I still maintain that our foreign policy is and has been reactive for the most part, rather than proactive, unlike communist countries like USSR and PRC, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 11th, 2014 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Once they own the oil then it is no longer foreign, cf Iraq.

Malcolm wrote:

There is not enough oil in the ground there to make it worth it. The notion that we went to war (twice) in Iraq for oil is basically ludicrous.

Sherab Dorje said:

As for the second, again, no. We are not interested in global hegemony, our nation collectively is basically interested only in maintaining our own materialist living standard.

And the only way to guarantee this is through global hegemony.

Malcolm wrote:

People in the US, unlike say the British Empire or Rome, do not think of ourselves in imperial terms. Rightly or wrongly, we make think we are the best country in the world, but in reality, we, as a nation, have no interest in empire building.

Sherab Dorje said:

The US is selfish, but unlike what people who have no experience with our nation or people think, we are not proactive in our policy, but reactive. 200 years of US Foreign Policy shows this.

I disagree. I think that US foreign policy has been very proactive, especially from the closing term of WWII and onwards.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Again, our foreign policy was motivated in reaction to the spread of Communism, that is all. Our present global position is an artifact of that. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, US policy has been floundering in a cesspool of indecision and bad decisions. The red threat gave us a focus. In its absence, we don't know what to do.

In reality, the true "imperialism" coming from the US is corporate hegemony, but actually, the corporations owe now more allegiance to the US than any other nation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 11th, 2014 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Which all points to the fact that, here on planet earth, the US is doing everything possible to destabilise the Middle East in order to (ultimately) grab its oil reserves and achieve global hegemony.

Malcolm wrote:

As for the first item, no. US energy policy is aimed at freeing ourselves from dependence on any foreign oil. Hence fracking.

As for the second, again, no. We are not interested in global hegemony, our nation collectively is basically interested only in maintaining our own materialist living standard. The US is selfish, but unlike what people who have no experience with our nation or people think, we are not proactive in our policy, but reactive. 200 years of US

Foreign Policy shows this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 4th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Mkoll said:

So you're absolutely, 100% certain?

Malcolm wrote:

I have verified to the best of my ability that the statements made the Buddha in Mahāyāna sutras actually apply to śravakayāna texts, otherwise, I would not waste my time defending Mahāyāna. I have done so using inference and textual study, as well as having been a practitioner for half of my life [I am 52, I started practicing Dharma, not just studying it, when I was 26]. Thus I am as certain that Buddha taught Mahāyāna as you are that he didn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 4th, 2014 at 12:57 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are also very important differences between the awakening of hinayāna practitioners and mahāyāna practitioners, but you seem to want to erase all of this. Well, that is a mistake.

Mkoll said:

Do you know that via personal experience?

Malcolm wrote:

Personal experience (direct perception) is not the only criteria of valid knowledge. There is also inference and valid testimony. In this case I am basing myself on valid testimony of the Buddha's statements.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 4th, 2014 at 12:27 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

You are skipping the point I made. These levels and stages, realizations however many folds are beside the point. Buddha has cut a path beyond this from the start. The sangha is not the whole story there are several stories of yogis who got enlightened from one

instruction. So doctrines and stages has its place but it's not of universal application.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha was the one who taught the paths and stages to begin with, both in Hinayāna and Mahāyāna.

There are many levels to awakening, awakening, bodhi. There are also very important differences between the awakening of hinayāna practitioners and mahāyāna practitioners, but you seem to want to erase all of this. Well, that is a mistake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 3rd, 2014 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Understanding Buddhism without Western Materialism

Content:

Hickory Mountain said:

Or, taking a different angle on my inquiry, what aspects (as specifically as possible) of a Buddhist worldview come into conflict with a Western materialist worldview?

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth, rebirth, rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 3rd, 2014 at 1:41 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

retrofuturist said:

Greetings Malcolm,

Malcolm wrote:

...it is a downfall to study Hinayāna texts at the expense of Mahāyāna studies, for example.

retrofuturist said:

What is a "hinayana text"? How is that defined?

Is it the suttas/agamas, or is it the works of authors of particular schools? Or both? etc.

Maitri,

Retro.

Malcolm wrote:

It means the sutras in the agamas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 3rd, 2014 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even here, however, when this fault is committed if one criticizes Vajrayāna with hostility the fault is great; if one criticizes Mahāyāna with hostility the fault is medium; if one criticizes the śravakayā, the fault is minor.

TRC said:

I really don't think most contemporary Mahayana/Vajrayana practitioners would buy the double-standard prescribed here.

Malcolm wrote:

They [Vajrayāna practitioners] would had they properly studied the commentaries on Vajrayāna samaya written by our lineage masters. These criteria are not my invention.

As far as Mahāyānists go, had they properly studied Buddha's Mahāyāna Sutras they would have seen in such texts as the Bodhisattva Vinaya that it is a downfall to study Hinayāna texts at the expense of Mahāyāna studies, for example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 3rd, 2014 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

It's obviously relevant. Why? Because Suttas have discussions about luminosity and discussions about all sorts of stages or accumulations. So does Dzogchen, a Mahayana thing. So from a method standpoint, all this Mahayana bluster about bhumis and accumulations is dispensable. If Dzogchen points out luminosity as innate and away from two accumulations and so do Suttas, then buddhas qualities are accounted for not via accumulations but via the innate. Thus, Moggallana and Sariputta's having fallen short of Buddha's level is nothing to do with Mahayana and only to do with their failure to grasp the import of luminosity. In fact, Mahayana also fails to understand this import which is why Dzogchen goes higher in bhumis. This is the most important area for a Buddhist to scrutinize. It's the deepest topic in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

The clarity of the mind is certainly important, but don't mistake the clarity of the mind discussed in the suttas for the luminosity of Mahāyāna.

All the suttas say about luminosity is that the clarity of the mind is not affected by afflictions, nothing more and nothing less.

Even the suttas however maintain that Buddha qualities arise as a result of the merit of length of eons of the Buddha's career as a bodhisattva.

All you have done here is support the fact that Mahāyāna has a more profound analysis of emptiness as well the luminous nature of the mind, none of which are required for stream entry — the only requirement for which is the understanding and realization of the selflessness of the person, not even an understanding of the selflessness of phenomena is required for stream entry in Hināyāna, whereas for Mahāyāna stream entrants, aka first stage bodhisattvas, it is indispensable to realize two-fold emptiness. Even if a hināyāna stream entrant realizes twofold emptiness, this still does not equate with a bodhisattva's realization of the same because a hināyāna stream entrant by definition lacks bodhicitta.

In short, CW, you are confusing and conflating many things, and are creating a kind of goulash out of the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 3rd, 2014 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

For dZogchen two accumulation happens at time of initiation. When luminosity is introduced. Then this is whole path. Suttas have this.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is not even a mention of the two accumulations in the agamas And nikayas. Why? Because in Hinayana, the Bodhisattva is held to be an ordinary sentient being, lacking all qualities of wisdom until he attains buddhahood under the bodhitree.

So, in fact your contention is simply incorrect.

Crazywisdom said:

One doesn't need two know about any of that at time of intro.

Malcolm wrote:

That is completely irrelevant to the present conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 3rd, 2014 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The corresponding texts could have been recorded by different disciples hearing a discourse by the Buddha; further more, disciples can even hear completely different discourses being spoken by the Buddha at the same time with the same tongue. Hence, the single vajra word is heard differently by different disciples, as the Guhyasamaja tantra states.

Bakmoon said:

I'm willing to accept the possibility of corresponding texts being independent recollections of the same event. I've been open to it since the beginning which is why I prefer to use the term common source rather than proto-text, to leave the door open to such a scenario.

My major point is this: Even in this case, there is still a common source between these two corresponding texts, and that common source is the Buddha himself rather than a proto-text.

If the corresponding texts are the result of a proto-text dating prior to sectarian division then one can conclude that the proto-text dates back prior to the split, but if the corresponding texts are independent compositions referring to a single event then one can make the much stronger and more solid conclusion that the texts actually date from the time when the Buddha was still in living memory. In both of these cases, that of independent texts and that of descent from a proto-text, the final conclusion is that the source of these texts, whether it be a proto-text or the Buddha himself, can be conclusively dated prior to the splitting between the sects.

Comparative methodology uses the split between the sects as the boundary of the absolute latest the common source between texts must date to, leaving the possibility of them being composed well before that, which in any case, allows one to date a large portion of common material in the Nikayas/Agamas to significantly prior to 100 BCE.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha could emanate a hundred different emanations and teach a hundred different people a hundred different things at the same time. For this reason, the attempt to confine Buddhist agamic/nikaya sutras to single events in history is fraught with all kinds of problems. Not to mention that fact that like any teacher, the Buddha, I am sure, would teach the same general thing again and again to different groups of students (or even the same group) in the same place. The notion that two similar texts in the nikayas which clear differences necessarily begin in a single historical event is hugely speculative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 3rd, 2014 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

TRC said:

No, quite simply you disagree with Ray, is all this amounts to.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha's statements about Hināyāna in Mahāyāna sutra can be read by all who care to learn Sanskrit, Chinese or Tibetan. The same goes for Indian Mahāyāna masters who wrote about the issue extensively.

TRC said:

He as a Vajrayana practitioner has a different view point and clearly he does not believe that the eighteen early schools are Hinayana.

Malcolm wrote:

In his persona as a western scholar, Ray also does not believe that either Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna are Buddha's word in general (what he actually believes I have no idea). His academic writings clearly show that he accepts the Western academic consensus that Buddha did not teach Mahāyāna, Secret Mantra or Vajrayāna irrespective of his personal adherence to these traditions in his own practice.

TRC said:

Furthermore, to think that when Ray wrote his publication that he was not aware the early Indian Mahayana texts claimed the early schools were Hinayana, would be negligible to nil.

Malcolm wrote:

He is certainly aware of these things, that he chooses to ignore them renders his opinion very fanciful.

TRC said:

Therefore, Ray is quite deliberately making a strong statement by disagreeing with them. Why would he do that? Perhaps with the benefit of hindsight, he is seeing through the sectarian rivalry that gave birth to the 'Hinayana' term. Seeing it for what it is – sectarian rivalry and the subsequent incorrect evaluation of Theravada being equivalent to Hinayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and so therefore, Ray is wrong, no ifs and ands or buts. He might be attempting to redefine the term, but to claim that the Buddha of the Mahāyāna canon did not use the term hinayāna to refer to those schools who eschewed the bodhisattva path is clearly an exaggeration at best.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 2nd, 2014 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

For dZogchen two accumulation happens at time of initiation. When luminosity is

introduced. Then this is whole path. Suttas have this.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is not even a mention of the two accumulations in the agamas And nikayas. Why? Because in Hinayana, the Bodhisattva is held to be an ordinary sentient being, lacking all qualities of wisdom until he attains buddhahood under the bodhitree.

So, in fact your contention is simply incorrect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 2nd, 2014 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Buddha actually demonstrated to Moggallana how limited Moggallana's abhijna was.

Emptiness as presented in the nikayas and agamas is not as in depth as Buddha's teaching of emptiness in the Perfection of Wisdom. Not only does the Buddha explain this in Mahayana, he also explains this in the Hevajra tantra, the Samputa tantra and Kakacakra, what need to mention Dzogchen?

The Buddha discusses the nature of an Arhats awakening in many Mahayana sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 2nd, 2014 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

The search doesn't go back far enough. So I can't find it. So I ask what makes this a concrete thing that Arhats are sixth Bhumi. There are lamas who say this, but based on what?

According to this Arhats are 8th Bhumi. <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bh> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return
false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return
false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;ūmi (Buddhism)

Malcolm wrote:

Both Arhats and 8th stage bodhisattvas are free from the klesha obsuration, but similarity ends there. They are not equivalent in terms of qualities, merit and many other factors, not to mention the fact that Arhats do not realize emptiness free from extremes,

as Gorampa clearly explains.

Crazywisdom said:

That's what I mean. So says, Gorampa or some other Tibetan guy. Is there a sutra or Maitreya book that says how far Arhats go? So far we have the Mahayana scholars pinning the tail on the donkey. And there's nothing in the Suttas that indicates they don't realize emptiness free from extremes. This is a Mahayanist fiat based on a debate with a subject that posited permanent bits in the aether. As far as qualities, Buddha was a big proponent of Mahamoggallana's qualities for example.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha, in the Pali Canon, demonstrated Moggallana's abhijñā was quite limited compared to his own, Moggallana asked Buddha where his mother had taken rebirth.

The simple fact is that profound emptiness is not taught anywhere in the śrāvaka texts.

Btw, it is the Buddha who explains the differences in the awakening of Arhats and bodhisattvas on the stages, not merely Mahayana scholars like Nagarjuna, though that should suffice for those who practice Mahayana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 2nd, 2014 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

daverupa said:

I'm basically framing Mahayana as an Abhidhamma, now, or rather heap of various Abhidhammas. Why not?

Malcolm wrote:

That is simply not an accurate portrayal of Mahayana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 2nd, 2014 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

The search doesn't go back far enough. So I can't find it. So I ask what makes this a concrete thing that Arhats are sixth Bhūmi. There are lamas who say this, but based on what?

According to this Arhats are 8th Bhūmi. <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhumi> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;ūmi_(Buddhism)

Malcolm wrote:

Both Arhats and 8th stage bodhisattvas are free from the klesha obsuration, but similarity ends there. They are not equivalent in terms of qualities, merit and many other factors, not to mention the fact that Arhats do not realize emptiness free from extremes, as Gorampa clearly explains.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 2nd, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

You know some Mahayanists say the Arhat is 10th not 6th Bhumi.

Malcolm wrote:

No one says this.

Crazywisdom said:

You yourself said there was a Sakya lama who Put Arhats at 10th Bhumi

Malcolm wrote:

I never said this, and there is no Sakya master who makes such a claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 1st, 2014 at 4:58 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

There are also a few seemingly Theravada -leaning folks...

daverupa said:

Well, I labored for a long time under misapprehensions of common ground. Don't worry, Malcolm and others have seen to it. It's a linguistic happenstance, apparently.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a common ground, four noble truths, dependent origination, rebirth, karma and so on. Mahāyāna has all of this, and in addition, it also details the bodhisattva path, profound emptiness, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 1st, 2014 at 4:56 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, the content is similar, but not parallel. Which suggests different communities collected different traditions of what the Buddha said, and organized them later on.

Bakmoon said:

Just to be clear, you are making the point here that the corresponding texts could have been composed by two different disciples hearing a discourse by the Buddha, correct? I don't want to misrepresent your position.

Malcolm wrote:

The corresponding texts could have been recorded by different disciples hearing a discourse by the Buddha; further more, disciples can even hear completely different discourses being spoken by the Buddha at the same time with the same tongue. Hence, the single vajra word is heard differently by different disciples, as the Guhyasamaja tantra states.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 1st, 2014 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

You know some Mahayanists say the Arhat is 10th not 6th Bhumi.

Malcolm wrote:

No one says this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 1st, 2014 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Are stream enterers "bound" to be liberated within seven lifetimes? If so, what "binds" them to this fate?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha stated it so in several suttas:

http://www.accesstoinight.org/lib/study/into_the_stream.html

Sherab Dorje said:

Can a stream enterer not develop a Bodhisattva motivation after entering the stream? If not, why not?

Malcolm wrote:

This is an interesting question and is a subject of some debate. The general Theravadin view is that once you have gained stream entry, nothing can turn you aside from the liberation of an arhat within seven lifetimes.

Sherab Dorje said:

Is there any evidence of a Bodhsattva choosing to achieve personal liberation at some point during their "career"?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because of the harsh castigation of such people in Mahāyāna sutras.

Sherab Dorje said:

Is there any evidence that shows that a stream enterer cannot divert from the Arhat path onto the Bodhisattva path?

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, this is a subject of much discussion.

Sherab Dorje said:

We hear of Arhats being "turned on to" the Bodhisattva Path, so it seems their fate is not written in stone.

Malcolm wrote:

This is only after they enter the samadhi of cessation.

Sherab Dorje said:

Isn't the awakening of an Arhat congruent with one of the Bodhisattva stages anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

Only in terms of the elimination of the klesha-avarana. No accumulation of merit is required for the awakening of stream entrants — arhats. Gathering merit in Hinayāna is primarily a job of lay people to attain higher rebirth in samsara. There is no sense one accumulates merit to attain awakening, but the attainment of stream entry itself is considered in Theravada to be the highest merit.

In Mahāyāna merit is accumulated in order to attain the rūpakāya of a buddha. Wisdom is accumulated in order to realize the dharmakāya of a buddha.

Further, while arhats and seventh stage bodhisattvas are equal in terms of elimination of kleśas, they are not equivalent in merit; a seventh stage bodhisattva not only surpasses an arhat in merit, but also in realization. However, even someone who newly has entered Mahāyāna surpasses an arhat in merit, merely for having the actual wish to attain complete buddhahood in order to liberate all sentient beings.

Moreover, there are clear differences in the content of awakening of the Hinayāna path of the seeing and the Mahāyāna path of seeing — this in fact is the subject of the Abhisamaya-alāṃkara, which details the hidden intent of the Prajñāpāramita sūtras.

Sherab Dorje said:

So who here can say, based on experience, that the Sravakayana is not just another stage on the Mahayana path anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to contextualize the Hinayāna path in relation to the Mahāyāna path, that is fine with me, but I don't think that sits well with Theravadins who generally argue that the awakening in Theravada is every bit as profound and deep as awakening in Mahāyāna. Mahāyānists of course, disagree.

Sherab Dorje said:

I guess that's why the Vajrayana talks about not denigrating followers of the Shravaka and Pratyekabuddha Yana. Right?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote][quote]

The sixth root samaya, not to criticize the yānas means that one should not engage in criticizing any of the yānas with hostility, even non-Buddhist teachings. It basically means saying "this or that yāna is not Dharma," this or that is not the teaching of the Teacher, this is not Vinaya, this is not the word of the Buddha, etc. It means that Vajrayānists must accept all of the Hinayāna, Mahāyāna and Secret Mantra canon as our own [it also means that those who have taken Vajrayāna samaya and nevertheless maintain that Mahāyāna sūtra and tantras are not actually the teaching of the Buddha have completely broken their samaya]. It does not however mean that we are forbidden from distinguishing higher paths from lower paths and so on. Even here, however, when this fault is committed if one criticizes Vajrayāna with hostility the fault is great; if one criticizes Mahāyāna with hostility the fault is medium; if one criticizes the śravakayā, the fault is minor. And of course, any Vajrayāna practitioner should recite Vajrasattva daily in case she or he makes some mistake without realizing it.

As long as we never make the claim that Hinayāna is not capable of liberating a person, we are free from samaya fault of criticizing Hinayāna, even if the term itself means "inferior" vehicle. But if someone says to someone "You will not be able to become liberated through following a Hinayāna school such as Theravada, etc." this indeed is samaya downfall.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 1st, 2014 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

TRC said:

I don't know of any Theravadin who would say that the Buddha did not teach compassion and wisdom. It's absolutely fundamental. If they are Theravadins, then they have not been within a mile of the Pali discourses. They simply could not form this view

if they had. Are you sure that this is not a misunderstood view from the Mahayana that you are projecting onto Theravada practitioners? I have seen similar comments before from Mahayana quarters, which could only be described as ill-informed.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, Buddha universally teaches love and compassion.

TRC said:

I think there is another myth that should be dispelled pronto too: Mahayana practitioners do not have a monopoly on motivation for the liberation of other beings (Dan74 has already alluded to this). I know all the rhetoric that gets plastered around about the superior motivation of Mahayana, but it has absolutely no bearing to the reality on the ground. It is just not borne out on a day to day basis, and this is really the ultimate test. Quite simply the proof is in the pudding, and I see no evidence of this. If anyone has actual evidence, in the here and now, of the results of the superior motivation of Mahayana practitioners over and above those who are being referred to as Hinayana practitioners, please present it. If you can't, then it just remains in the rhetoric and sectarian posturing basket IMHO.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference lies in the understanding of the motivation for practice, and the consequences which follow the achievement of final nirvana. In short, it is generally held in the Hinayāna schools that once someone enters parinirvana, their stream ceases. They simply are not there.

There is the second issue, already raised, that if someone attains stream entry, within seven lifetimes they will achieve nirvana, permanent cessation.

TRC said:

So to tie this back into the discussion, the term/label Hinayana (toward Theravada) is simply incorrect. And because it is incorrect it is therefore a pejorative term. This is where the offense is because it does not apply to the Theravada tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not incorrect because the aspiration to the path of arhatship or pratyekabuddhahood satisfies all of the criteria by which a given path is labeled hinayāna. In short, if your goal is to become an arhat, you are a hinayāna practitioner.

TRC said:

The words of a mature Vajrayana practitioner support this view:

"... 'Hīnayāna' refers to a critical but strictly limited set of views, practices, and results. The pre-Mahāyāna historical traditions such as the Theravāda are far richer, more complex, and more profound than the definition of 'Hīnayāna' would allow. ...The term 'Hīnayāna' is thus a stereotype that is useful in talking about a particular stage on the Tibetan Buddhist path, but it is really not appropriate to assume that the Tibetan definition of Hīnayāna identifies a venerable living tradition as the Theravāda or any other historical school ..."

Ray, Reginald A (2000) Indestructible Truth: The Living Spirituality of Tibetan Buddhism, p.240

Malcolm wrote:

Ray is quite simply wrong — no ifs, ands or buts. All "eighteen" śravaka schools are routinely termed "hinayāna in Indian Mahāyāna texts. These descriptions have very little to do with criteria established by Tibetans (unlike, for example, the distinction between so called prasanga and svatantra, gzhan stong/rang stong, etc. in Madhyamaka). Tibetans are merely following Indian Mahayānistas in their taxonomies.

Even the presentation of the bodhisattva path amongst the śravaka schools is presented from a hinayāna perspective, with a goal to discourage people from forming that aspiration, with a view that the path of the arhat is more practical, more attainable, and involves less suffering for the practitioner.

To put it plainly, all Tibetan Buddhists belong to a hinayāna, or śravakayāna school, Mulasarvastivada. If their practice is based solely on Vinaya, or Abhidharmakośa, etc., and their goal is to become an arhat or a pratyekabuddha, they are hinayāna practitioners.

To make it even more plain — it is the aspiration or bodhicitta to become an arhat or a pratyekabuddha which is labeled "hinayāna," that and various schools which present that as the ideal path. It is considered especially negative for bodhisattvas to abandon Mahāyāna bodhicitta out of depression or defeatism and turn towards the bodhicitta of arhats or a pratyekabuddhas. But it does happen, as in the case of people who take bodhisattva vows, but then give up Mahāyāna for this reason or that and enter Theravada.

The day that someone can show me that the primary aspiration of Theravada and most Theravadins is to become a fully awakened buddhas with thirty major and eighty minor marks, with all the ten powers, four fearlessnesses and the eighteen unique qualities of a Buddha, then at that time I will cease to consider Theravada a hinayāna school like the Mulasarvastivadins, Dharmaguptakas, and such extinct schools as the Mahasamghikas, and so on.

But thus far, no one has ever demonstrated to me that Mahāyāna bodhicitta exists in Theravada in general. The issue is not really about love and compassion — we understand that Arhats have limitless love and compassion for sentient beings for as long as they are not in a state of cessation. But when they enter cessation, they abandon sentient beings and that is their primary flaw, among other flaws well described even by such authors as Vasubandhu in the Kośa, such as the possession of non-afflictive ignorance and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 30th, 2014 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

conebeckham said:

There most certainly CAN be the use of channels and winds in Mahamudra, in some way, even in a path that does not utilize deity yoga or the stages of creation and completion.

Astus said:

The only point I wanted to bring to this topic with mentioning Mahamudra was about the development of Buddhist philosophy in India. The gradual integration of Vajrayana to a monastic environment resulted, among other things, in the "blending of Sutra with Tantra". It also seems to me a natural evolution of things that there appeared some who were critical of Vajrayana and, according to their claim, they superseded even HYT.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a claim made by some Tibetans only.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 30th, 2014 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Mkoll said:

TBH, it really doesn't bother me much. I understand the context in which the term is used and I'm used to seeing it.

I'm just saying I think it'd be better off for Buddhists as a whole not to use the term.

But clearly I'm in the minority here.

Malcolm wrote:

You will likely convince most followers of common Mahāyāna not to use that term. But the term Hinayāna is very much built into the way Tibetan Buddhists talk about Buddhism in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 30th, 2014 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Mkoll said:

I think the issue is the term itself. You wouldn't like to see people call Mahayana/Vajrayana "The Apocryphic Vehicle". And I wouldn't like to see people calling Theravada "The Inferior Vehicle".

They're both bad terms because in reality, there are very few of us who even live perfectly up to the ideal of Buddha's teaching that is shared in common between Theravada, Mahayana, or Vajrayana. Moreover, neither term is true. So belittling any

other school via giving it a derisive label really has no place anywhere but sectarian rivalry.

Malcolm wrote:

Unfortunately, when asked the question why it is preferable to desire to be a buddha over an arhat or a pratyekabuddha, the answer is that the awakening of an arhat or a pratyekabuddha is inferior to that of a buddha and so is their path. Likewise, when answering the question of why one would choose Vajrayāna over Mahāyāna even though the result and motivation is the same, again the answer is that the Mahāyāna path is inferior to the Vajrayāna path.

And from the perspective of Dzogchen, all the eight lower yānas are inferior, mostly in terms of lack of directness in the time it takes a beginner to realize complete buddhahood.

So there you have it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 30th, 2014 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, what do you mean by a "direct" Mahāmudra path? What are its characteristics, and so on. Then we will see whether or not it is part of Vajrayāna or not.

Astus said:

Direct in the sense that it does not require empowerments or other practices, only the instructions of the teacher pointing out the nature of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, this is not just not true Astus, the basic practice of this approach to Mahāmudra is guru yoga. It may not involve the two stages per se, but it does involve practices such as Vajrasattva, mandala offerings and so on which are characteristic of Vajrayāna practice, i.e., there is still purification and gathering accumulations. And more importantly, there is the practicing of integrating one's mind with the mind of the Guru based upon so called "direct introduction."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

conebeckham said:

Just guessing but I assume Astus refers to what Kagyupas call the Thar Lam path of Mahamudra, from Saraha, Savari, and Maitripa....that of, for example, the Gangama Upadesa, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, perhaps. But I wanted to see what Astus thought. Thar lam Mahamudra is still Vajrayāna since it involves Vajrasattva, Mandala offerings, Guruyoga and so on., all of which are unique Vajrayāna practices which are indispensable to that path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

since everyone he cites was already a well schooled Vajrayāna master, his argument is quite weak.

Astus said:

If they were competent Sutra and Tantra teachers, wouldn't that rather strengthen the validity of their assessment of the direct Mahamudra path?

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, what do you mean by a "direct" Mahāmudra path? What are its characteristics, and so on. Then we will see whether or not it is part of Vajrayāna or not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But the fact of the matter is that Maitripa promulgated a cycle of Vajrayogini teachings which is preserved to this day in both Kagyu and Sakya. Saraha wrote a famous commentary on the Buddhakapala tantra, and is credited with being the first master to promulgate the Cakrasamvara tantra and so on. Maitripa also bestowed many empowerments and teachings on Marpa.

Astus said:

They don't exclude each other. Kagyu has a large number of Tantric teachings besides Mahamudra, just as Gampopa taught both path of means and path of liberation. What the mentioned article attempts to show is that "not-specifically-Tantric" Mahamudra existed already in India, and those who taught it considered it beyond both Sutra and Tantra like Gampopa.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, and since everyone he cites was already a well schooled Vajrayāna master, his argument is quite weak.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Jikan said:

I've heard the esoteric practices of Japan referred to as Vajrayana in everyday speech more than once.

Malcolm wrote:

But it is not accurate and the term never once occurs in any tantras considered Yoga tantra on down; whereas the term guhyamantra occurs in all kinds of tantras down to the Susiddhikara, generally considered to be the root tantra of the kriya tantras. It even occurs in Vinaya texts, PP in 8000 lines, Avatamska, Ratnakuta collection, and so on. The term guhyamantra, like vidyāmantra, is found in texts much earlier than what Western academics consider to be the "tantric" phase of Indian Buddhism (post 8th century).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, Astus. First, there is no such thing as a "sahajayāna" — this is fabricated term. Maitripa taught standard Vajrayāna, as did these other masters, complete with creation stage and completion stage.

Astus said:

A number of teachings by the mentioned Indian masters show something else. See for instance:

http://www.academia.edu/5614409/Mathes_2006_Blending_the_Sutras_with_the_Tantr
as_The_Influence_of_Maitripa_and_his_Circle_on_the_Formation_of_Sutra_Mahamudr
a_in_the_Kagyu_Schools

Malcolm wrote:

This is how Kagyus want to understand things, attempting to justify their "sutra mahāmudra".

But the fact of the matter is that Maitripa promulgated a cycle of Vajrayogini teachings which is preserved to this day in both Kagyu and Sakya. Saraha wrote a famous commentary on the Buddhakapala tantra, and is credited with being the first master to

promulgate the Cakrasamvara tantra and so on. Maitripa also bestowed many empowerments and teachings on Marpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Why would stream entry be an obstacle to Mahayana motivation?

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that if you make the bodhisattva aspiration, according to conventional Theravadin doctrine, you are denied stream entry, and must remain a normal afflicted person. In their system, a bodhisattva can only become a realized person in their last lifetime, when they become a sammasambuddha.

Sherab Dorje said:

Quite the contrary. I believe that habituation of the mind stream via intentional action overrides the effect of a five minute ritual and cutting a couple strands of hair.

Malcolm wrote:

The rite is merely symbolic, refuge is in the heart. The intent to go for refuge indeed can shut the door to lower realms, especially Mahāyāna refuge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Sherab said:

The doctrines of radical Muslims are actually mainstream.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so.

<http://lettertobaghdadi.com>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Astus said:

Didn't what could be called Sahajayana, i.e. Mahamudra teachings, come later, as a further development from Vajrayana? Because it seems to me that it's distanced itself from the energy system established in HYT, and moved closer to established sutra teachings. Well, at least some teachers taught that way ((Saraha), Maitripa, Jnanakirti, Sahajavajra).

Malcolm wrote:

No, Astus. First, there is no such thing as a "sahajayāna" — this is fabricated term. Maitripa taught standard Vajrayāna, as did these other masters, complete with creation stage and completion stage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Jikan said:

Very banal historical question that may be relevant: when did the word "vajrayana" actually come into use? What did it describe when it did come into use?

Malcolm wrote:

mid-8th century, highest yoga tantra practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Anders said:

Thanks a lot. Is the principle basically similar then to how the lotus position facilitates firmness of mind, or how one can regulate the mind by regulating the breath? That is to say, basically re-arranging bodily energies to effect the mind. Emphasis on principle, as I imagine the permutations, both theoretical and practical, go a lot further than this.

Malcolm wrote:

The Vajrayāna view is that vāyus of the body are the mind, basically.

kirtu said:

And what are vāyus?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Literally, vāyu means wind in the trio of nāḍī, vāyu and bindu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, Vajrayāna is usually understood to indicate HYT, whereas guhyamantra includes lower tantra.

Indrajala said:

You said, "However, you will find that among all the four main Tibetan Buddhist schools, in general this is view that is understood."

Does this equally apply to all Indian forms of Vajrayāna as they existed in India?

Malcolm wrote:

You mean amongst all followers of the niruttaratantras?

Yes, I think so. For example, commentary tantra of the Guhyasamaja, the Sandhivāyākaraṇa states:

Bodhicitta becomes vāyu,
its form exists in space,
it is the life of all sentient beings,
it is the nature of the five with ten names,
renowned as the twelve links,
its nature becomes three,
the bodhicitta called "vāyu"
this is the chief of consciousness.

Further, another commentary tantra, the Vajramālā, makes it very clear that even between the births, the all-basis consciousness is also inseparable with the mahāprāṇavāyu.

In other words, Vajrayāna texts treat our consciousness in terms of its embodiment in a manner very distinct from lower tantra and sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Anders said:

Thanks a lot. Is the principle basically similar then to how the lotus position facilitates firmness of mind, or how one can regulate the mind by regulating the breath? That is to say, basically re-arranging bodily energies to effect the mind. Emphasis on principle, as I imagine the permutations, both theoretical and practical, go a lot further than this.

Malcolm wrote:

The Vajrayāna view is that vāyus of the body are the mind, basically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not including Shingon, nor lower tantra. However, you will find that among all the four main Tibetan Buddhist schools, in general this is view that is understood.

Indrajala said:

You should state such things as otherwise your blanket statements are highly problematic.

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, Vajrayāna is usually understood to indicate HYT, whereas guhyamantra includes lower tantra.

The term vajrayāna primarily shows up only in niruttarayogatantras. So actually, my statement is perfectly accurate and not at all a blanket term, it is highly focused and precise.

Go ahead, do a word search for rdo rje theg pa here and see what titles emerge:

<https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/xml3/xml/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Personally i believe that the important distinction is not the reference to Theravada vs non-Theravada traditions but that concerning motivation. There are plenty of people following Mahayana traditions with a hinayana motivation and there are plenty of Theravadins following their path yet holding a Mahayana motivation.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot have a Mahāyāna motivation if one has not generated it. That means, for Theravadins, permanently eliminating their chances for stream entry, according to their own concepts. If one is someone who is genuinely generated the Mahāyāna intent for awakening, one won't be interested very much in Theravada naturally.

Sherab Dorje said:

Personally i don't buy the whole "taking refuge as a guarantee against rebirth in the three lower realms" schtick.

Malcolm wrote:

You consider the Buddha's teachings "schtick"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 29th, 2014 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It means that in Vajrayāna,...

Indrajala said:

That is rather essentialist and not really nuanced, as if "Vajrayāna" is a single entity.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not including Shingon, nor lower tantra. However, you will find that among all the four main Tibetan Buddhist schools, in general this is view that is understood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 28th, 2014 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Sroglung?

Content:

Katharina108 said:

Two years ago I suffered a terrible shock trauma related to violence. Since then I have often panic attacks at night or during daytime. It is so terrible, I can not even move. It is a huge pressure and tightness in my chest. In particular, sound is a very big trigger. When I hear a loud noise, such as the banging of a door or people yelling, suddenly I can suffer from immense fear and panic attacks. I can relive my source experience I had and I don't feel frightened. It is not that I try to suppress my memories at all. Now I have this kind of physical condition of these panic attacks. They can have all kinds of objects: Noise, bad news etc and they are very irrational. Even though I know this, it is like a terrible condition, that I can't stop and just 'happens'. Before my traumatic experience I did not have any problems and I never experienced these sensations. I don't want to take western drugs. I think it may be a heavy lung condition. I read this article:

<http://www.rinpoche.com/teachings/causes.htm> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return

false; and the symptoms I have are described as 'srog-dzin lung'.

What is the common treatment for this? Is it the same as what people sometimes call lung disease or is it another kind of disorder?

I am thankful for every input,
Kath

Malcolm wrote:

Common treatments include massage, herbs such as Agar 35, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 28th, 2014 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna treatment of embodiment.

Anders said:

Could you give a quick rundown on this?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that in Vajrayāna, the key to awakening lies in human anatomy, not in philosophical speculation. It means that all the qualities of the basis, path and result are complete in the human body, and do not need to be gathered elsewhere. It means that, according to Vajrayāna, that the mind is a function of the body and its anatomy. It means that the classic dualism of namarūpa does not mean that nama and rūpa are inherently different, as philosopher's like Dharmakīrti would have it, but rather than there is no state in mind is dissociated from matter. In this respect, Vajrayāna is monistic, though of course in practical discussion, the substance dualism of sūtra dominates even Vajrayāna discussion, obscuring this point for the most part. But when you read texts like the Khandro Nyinthig, or the rdo rje lus sbaś bśhad by Yanggongpa, it becomes clear that the dualistic approach to mind/body in sūtra and abhidharma is abandoned by Vajrayāna in so far as it explains all of samsara and nirvana are present in the body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

TRC said:

keeping their war economy ticking along as well as more covertly and surreptitiously realising their larger geopolitical agendas.

Malcolm wrote:

War economies only work if you have someone to sell arms to (France and Britain in the two World Wars, for example). In this case, our government has no buyers in the region, apart from Israel. Iraq "buys" weapons from us, but we will never see a penny from those arms that we've "sold" them. All this costs the US Taxpayer billions.

Karma Dorje said:

Yes, but the people in power obviously don't care about the US taxpayer. One can't understand what is happening there by thinking that the American oligarchs have the best interests of the American people at heart. The war economy is a way of transferring wealth from the middle class to the wealthy. The US doesn't need to export to accomplish this. They simply need to use all the weaponry they have been producing and replace what they have expended.

Malcolm wrote:

It not all a conspiracy, contrary to popular belief.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni

Content:

Jesse said:

I've always felt when saying Buddhas are omniscient, it makes it feel like an un-attainable goal. (enlightenment.) because seriously, omniscience is in the realms of a god, not normal people. It just makes Buddhism feel pretty pointless eh?

kirtu said:

Omniscience isn't attained until after the 10th bhumi.

So we can develop compassion, lovingkindness, generosity, patience, ethical discipline, etc. to a maximum in this body. That is doable and certainly not pointless.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Factually, tenth stage bodhisattvas are basically omniscient, despite having a slight obscuration. This is why Maitreya states that the wisdom beyond the ninth bhumi is a stage of buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

daverupa said:

And, for what it's worth, a comparison of motive appears: "Save All Beings" <--> "A Shower Of The Way" } similar, and yet different. Maybe some hay is to made here, ecumenically.

Malcolm wrote:

You misunderstand then — "becoming a buddha to benefit all sentient beings" means becoming a buddha in order to show all sentient beings the way to buddhahood. It does not mean "saving" sentient beings in any sort of Christian sense. An arhat entering cessation can inspire by example, but cannot benefit beings beyond his or her lifespan. A buddha on the other hand can always emanate nirmanakāyas.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

TRC said:

I don't mean the production of arms necessarily for profit, but the huge permanent industrial military complex that the US is now dependent on, and which is fact one of the driving factors keeping America engaged in conflict. That's the war economy I'm referring to.

But yeah you're right, it is a massive cost to the tax payer, and that's the paradox that this dependency has become (as all dependencies are). It's the monkey on America's back that has its roots back in the cold war 1950s and is now hugely detrimental to the US nation (and the world) on so many levels. That's greed, hatred and delusion for you though.

Malcolm wrote:

The US is engaged in conflicts for many reasons, and a lot of them go back to the failed policies of the breakup of the British Empire, like this one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

It's not an assumption. It's a matter of public record. The US trained the fighters that would later become ISIS in Jordan.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a bit of an exaggeration — yes, a few dozen men trained in 2012 by the US in

Jordan later joined the Islamic State, but you make it sound as if the whole command structure of IS was trained by the US and that is not true. Actually, the command structure of the IS is composed mostly of former Baathist officers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Understanding why ISIL beheads

Content:

TRC said:

keeping their war economy ticking along as well as more covertly and surreptitiously realising their larger geopolitical agendas.

Malcolm wrote:

War economies only work if you have someone to sell arms to (France and Britain in the two World Wars, for example). In this case, our government has no buyers in the region, apart from Israel. Iraq "buys" weapons from us, but we will never see a penny from those arms that we've "sold" them. All this costs the US Taxpayer billions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The knowledge obscuration is necessary for buddhahood, since dharmakayā means omniscience.

garudha said:

Not clear. Do you mean something like "Enlightenment can only occur in the context of ignorance", perhaps you're simply (perhaps justifiably) glorifying dharmakayā, or are you saying that a Buddha is personally not Omniscient?

Malcolm wrote:

No, what I mean is that in order to attain buddhahood, one must remove two obscurations, the kleśa-avarana and the jñeyā-avarana, respectively, the obscuration of affliction and the obscuration of knowledge. Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas, as well as seventh stage bodhisattvas, have completely removed the former; only Buddhas are completely free of the latter.

I think that most of the confusion you are expressing in this thread is a result of not having properly studied the nature of three kāyas. There are any number of resources you can consult to further educate yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

plwk said:

<http://www.tbsa.org/arahant.htm>

Jikan said:

From that article:

In brief, a Theravada Buddhist can become a Buddha, or a Pacceka-Buddha, or an Arahant according to his choice. So Theravada Buddhism is for all three paths and not for the path to Arahantship only.

According to at least one contemporary Theravada source, there are some who indeed aspire to Buddhahood among those who identify as Theravada Buddhists. It's for this reason that I stated above that the term "hinayana" doesn't correspond directly to contemporary Theravadin practitioners, regardless of what the doctrine has had to say in the past. (what this means for the direction of Theravada doctrine and practice is a separate issue--perhaps a good topic for a thread at our sister site, DhammaWheel.)

Malcolm wrote:

I already addressed this issue. Theravada is a Hinayana school, despite the fact Theravadins can choose to become Mahayanists if they like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 10:02 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

plwk said:

<http://www.tbsa.org/arahant.htm>

Jikan said:

From that article:

In brief, a Theravada Buddhist can become a Buddha, or a Pacceka-Buddha, or an Arahant according to his choice. So Theravada Buddhism is for all three paths and not for the path to Arahantship only.

According to at least one contemporary Theravada source, there are some who indeed aspire to Buddhahood among those who identify as Theravada Buddhists. It's for this reason that I stated above that the term "hinayana" doesn't correspond directly to contemporary Theravadin practitioners, regardless of what the doctrine has had to say in the past. (what this means for the direction of Theravada doctrine and practice is a separate issue--perhaps a good topic for a thread at our sister site, DhammaWheel.)

Malcolm wrote:

I already addressed this issue. Theravada is a Hinayana school, despite fact Theravadins can choose to become Mahayanists if they like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni

Content:

garudha said:

If Arhats, Pratyekabuddhas, and the Bodhisattvas are in the "incomparable rightly completed enlightenment",

Malcolm wrote:

The citation does not say that. You are not reading it correctly.

garudha said:

Yes I was taking bits out of context. Thanks for your statement. I have now gone over it again...

1a. I tried to read the Sutra from my own preconception of what it's trying to convey.

1b. I then find, within the text, contradictions which tell me my preconception is incorrect.

2a. I tried to read the Sutra from my how I imagine it would read if my preconception is incorrect.

2b. I then find, within the text, contradictions which tell me my preconception is correct.

Yes, I comprehend that Arhats & Pratyekabuddhas must contemplate the "nescience entrenchment" which should be eliminated, purified or to become nonexistent.

The purification of this "central channel" results in Buddha-hood, as I have heard, so I do not deny that Shakyamuni Buddha's true-state is inconceivable to me.

Therefore I must defer judgement. However; I personally doubt that this "central channel" can be cleansed via mind-only learning alone. I think the whole-body-including-brain must be in a healthy condition for real progress to occur. I therefore view any experience of non-duality - which does not take into account the whole being of a person - as much a head trick for all the good striving for it would do.

I sincerely believe that cleaning the floor is as decent a meditation, on the road of progress towards "non-duality", as cleaning out ones karma.

Malcolm wrote:

The knowledge obscuration is necessary for buddhahood, since dharmakayā means omniscience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Jikan said:

That's an interesting passage, but it doesn't necessarily speak for itself. How does it rebut (does it rebut?) what I have been arguing? How is it warranted as evidence for this purpose? Help me understand what you're trying to say here.

Malcolm wrote:

It's obvious what dave is saying: following the Mahāyāna path is the wrong way to get to Rajagriha, and the Buddha does not approve that Mahāyāna message, but he is not responsible for us wayward Mahāyānists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Jikan said:

Yes, precisely: and who (or what) intercedes in this case? (still referring to the same parable): Buddhahood, in one way or another.

Malcolm wrote:

A buddha, not an abstract principle, "buddhahood".

Jikan said:

The doctrine that Buddha is leading all beings to the state of Buddhahood saturates East Asian Dharma. It's not so uncommon to see it in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism either.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, arhats, etc. Also. The criticism is two fold; one hinayāna practitioners have an inferior motivation; two, the Hinayāna canon does not teach the Mahāyāna path.

Jikan said:

That's why I say that the distinctions among the yanas, which vary by tradition, are just provisional or conventional distinctions.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, knowing that the canon of the Śravakas will not lead to complete awakening, who would follow it? This is why the distinction is extremely important and should be emphasized. Who wants to hang out in the cessation of samadhi for incalculable eons?

Jikan said:

Sure, but what do you make of the parable of the magic city in the same sutra?

Malcolm wrote:

I addressed by pointing out the fact that arhats need to being roused from samadhi to enter Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Mkoll said:

You believe the Buddha wrote those texts?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I believe that the Buddha spoke the Mahāyāna, like all sutras, however, they were written down much later.

Mkoll said:

That's a red herring anyway. I'm not talking about the tactfulness of words used in ancient texts, I'm talking about the tactfulness of words used actively by modern people now, in 2014.

Malcolm wrote:

Not a red herring, it is actually very much to the point — the point being is the division of teachings into Hinayāna and Mahāyāna is very much a mainstream part of how Buddhism is explained in Mahāyāna, where the aspiration to awaken without including the aspiration to achieve full Buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings is considered inferior [hina]. There is really no way around it. We can say "śravakayāna" and "pratyekabuddhayāna", but in this case what is the difference? In śravakayāna and pratyekabuddhayāna there is no motivation to awaken beyond considering only one's own benefit. When we compare the two, the śravakayāna and pratyekabuddhayāna motivations are inferior to the motivation of the bodhisattvayāna, hence śravakayāna and pratyekabuddhayāna constitute the hinayāna, and that is all there really is to it. One try and explain it all away with speculations about textual history, but in reality, those of us with commitment to Mahāyāna understand things in this way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni

Content:

garudha said:

If Arhats, Pratyekabuddhas, and the Bodhisattvas are in the "incomparable rightly completed enlightenment",

Malcolm wrote:

The citation does not say that. You are not reading it correctly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Mkoll said:

Notice how I use the words "publicly" and "public"?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a Mahāyāna forum, correct? The term is used pervasively by the Buddha in Mahāyāna texts, correct? So you would prefer us to use euphemisms?

Basically, the terms śravakayāna and pratyekabuddha yāna are equated by the Buddha again and again with hinayāna.

We can use the term "mainstream" if you like, but this is still just a euphemism for the term hinayāna.

Basically, "hinayāna" is the Buddha's term for śravakayāna and pratyekabuddhayāna. So take it up with him.

Mkoll said:

Saying "mainstream" or "śravakayāna" instead of "hinayāna" would be more tactful.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you tell the Buddha to be more tactful in his Mahāyāna texts. What was he thinking?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Mkoll said:

Notice how I use the words "publicly" and "public"?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a Mahāyāna forum, correct? The term is used pervasively by the Buddha in Mahāyāna texts, correct? So you would prefer us to use euphemisms?

Basically, the terms śravakayāna and pratyekabuddha yāna are equated by the Buddha again and again with hinayāna.

We can use the term "mainstream" if you like, but this is still just a euphemism for the term hinayāna.

Basically, "hinayāna" is the Buddha's term for śravakayāna and pratyekabuddhayāna. So take it up with him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Mkoll said:

A tactless term with pejorative connotations that those who know better shouldn't use publicly, unless their goal is to increase sectarianism and division between people.

Wikipedia said:

The word Hīnayāna is formed of hīna (हीन):[5] "little," "poor," "inferior," "abandoned," "deficient," "defective;" and yāna (यान):[6] "vehicle", where "vehicle" means "a way of going to enlightenment". The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary (1921–25) defines hīna in even stronger terms, with a semantic field that includes "poor, miserable; vile, base, abject, contemptible," and "despicable."

...

According to Jan Nattier, it is most likely that the term Hīnayāna post-dates the term Mahāyāna, and was only added at a later date due to antagonism and conflict between bodhisattvas and śrāvakas. The sequence of terms then began with Bodhisattvayāna, which was given the epithet Mahāyāna ("Great Vehicle"). It was only later, after attitudes toward the bodhisattvas and their teachings had become more critical, that the term Hīnayāna was created as a back-formation, contrasting with the already-established term Mahāyāna.[11] The earliest Mahāyāna texts often use the term Mahāyāna as an epithet and synonym for Bodhisattvayāna, but the term Hīnayāna is comparatively rare in early texts, and is usually not found at all in the earliest translations. Therefore, the often-perceived symmetry between Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna can be deceptive, as the terms were not actually coined in relation to one another in the same era.[12]

According to Paul Williams, "the deep-rooted misconception concerning an unfailing, ubiquitous fierce criticism of the Lesser Vehicle by the [Mahāyāna] is not supported by our texts." [13] Williams states that while evidence of conflict is present in some cases, there is also substantial evidence demonstrating peaceful coexistence between the two traditions.[13]

Mkoll said:

I like Mr. Williams' idea of "peaceful coexistence." Using the term "hinayana" in public does not move towards that end.

Malcolm wrote:

This all presumes that these speculations by Nattier have any merit.

The term hinayāna is used over and over again in the Mahāyāna canon to describe

pejoratively the goals, motivations and practices of those who aspire to the awakening of śravakas and pratyekabuddhas. It occurs in the PP Sutra in 8000 lines, repeatedly in the Ratnakuta collection, in the general sutra section of the bka' 'gyur, as well as many tantras.

Contrary to popular PC sentiment, the term is used over and over again in Indian Mahāyāna commentarial literature.

In order to understand Indian Mahāyāna you have to understand the use of the term hinayāna and how it is universally used.

If you are a not a Mahāyāna practitioner, you don't need to pay the term any heed. If someone is interested to read Mahāyāna, they are simply going to have to deal with the presence of this term in our canon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni

Content:

garudha said:

Do you find significant fault with the statement "The Mind if all Buddhas is Eternal Buddha" ?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not as it Śakyamuni were one thing and dharmakāya was another. All three kāyas are inseparable.

But the The Lion's Roar of Queen Srimala sutra mentions Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas are in the incomparable rightly completed enlightenment which is the absoluteness of the One Vehicle.

garudha said:

"Lord, the Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas ...

Malcolm wrote:

This passage does not mean what you think it means. It is stating that arhats and so on mistake their realization for a final realization, but that nevertheless, their path is included in the "ekayāna". It is basically the same sentiment as in my signature. All Dharmas are included in the Dzogchen Teachings, but Dzogchen is the supreme teaching which surpasses them all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Dancing with Women in Buddhist Temple

Content:

plwk said:

It is clearly a dance during what is known as a feast offering, in which singing and dancing are encouraged at a certain point in the ritual.

Ah...is this standard for all feast offerings to use such music & dancing or upon discretion of the presiding umze or lamas?

Malcolm wrote:

It is at the discretion of whoever is in charge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni

Content:

garudha said:

So (indirectly) this sutra states that there is a possible enlightenment which does not involve seeing the Tathagatagarbha. What do you make of these "Self-Enlightened" ones who have not seen and what could their attainment be like ?

Malcolm wrote:

These are pratyekabuddhas, and they do not realize complete buddhahood.

garudha said:

"Lord, the Tathagatagarbha is neither self nor sentient being, nor soul, nor personality. The Tathagatagarbha is not the domain of beings who fall into the belief in a real personality, who adhere to wayward views, whose thoughts are distracted by voidness. Lord, this Tathagatagarbha is the embryo of the Illustrious Dharmadhatu, the embryo of the Dharmakaya, the embryo of supramundane dharma, the embryo of the intrinsically pure dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

So it seems, to me, that Tathagatagarbha refers to Eternal Buddha.

[/quote]

Tathāgatagarbha is a synonym for the unrealized dharmakāya, etc. As I said, the mind of all buddhas is the dharmakāya. They have no other mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Jikan said:

...which is to say that, in the end, there is no "hinayana," just slower and faster practitioners, or rather practitioners with more or less capacity in this lifetime. That may sound triumphalist, but there it is.

Malcolm wrote:

No, as I explained, there is a Hinayāna, because it has to do with the motivations of the practitioner.

Without intercession, there is no way an arhat will enter Mahāyāna, for example. It is not like an arhat enters cessation and then suddenly realizes his or her path is incomplete.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Jikan said:

Am I alone in thinking that contemporary Mahayana Buddhism makes a much bigger deal out of the distinctions among vehicles than earlier Buddhists did? and maybe a bigger deal than it need be?

I think Shakyamuni was on the right track in the Lotus Sutra, when he taught that while there appears to be a multiplicity of vehicles to suit the needs of deluded beings, there's really only one vehicle: the Buddha vehicle

Malcolm wrote:

The ekayāna teaching is taught from the the point of view of Mahāyāna; but it does not address the individual bodhicittas of śravakas, and so on. It may be the case that in the end that arhats are woken up from the samadhi of cessation and set on the bodhisattva path, but it does not mean that there are those who think the path of the bodhisattva is too difficult, egotistical, and so on., and who therefore select a lesser awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: What is "hinayana"? What is it not?

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm not comfortable with the habit of using the term "hinayana" to describe the practice & doctrine of Theravadin practitioners, because it doesn't always correspond. It's not adequate. This has been discussed a bit already in this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna describes a motivation behind one's wish for awakening. Simply put, if your

actual motivation for awakening does not included the desire to become a Buddha for the benefit of all sentient beings, that motivation is hina, inferior. Not only this, it also describes a view of emptiness, an attitude towards śīla that prioritizes the benefit of others over concern for the "purity" of one's discipline, and so on.

Now, just as a Mulasarvastivadin (like all Tibetan Buddhist, upasakas to bhikṣus) can be a Mahāyānista, so can a Theravadin.

But Theravada proper is still a Hinayāna school, as is Mulasarvastivada, because one cannot obtain buddhahood through that school's teachings and because the bodhicitta to become a buddha does not exist in its canon. Yes, it is true that there is an extracanoncal approach to the Bodhisattva path borrowed from Mahāyāna, but even here it is constrained by a variety of concepts such as the idea that one can only be a bodhisattva if one is predicted by a Buddha and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Dancing with Women in Buddhist Temple

Content:

plwk said:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

What do you think people?

Malcolm wrote:

It is clearly a dance during what is known as a feast offering, in which singing and dancing are encouraged at a certain point in the ritual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

kirtu said:

The list of countries I provided are successful social democracies. They have bottled and harnessed the capitalist genie in order to keep it working for the people rather than creating a tyrannical economic system where lower classes are deprived of opportunity and in some cases the bare necessities of life (as we see in North Korea on the one hand and in the US currently).

Malcolm wrote:

All boats rise in a high tide. When the oil economy that is propping up the world economy tanks, it will be a different story for everyone...

BTW, I know people in Norway, and all other countries you mention, it is not the cup of tea you imagine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

kirtu said:

That's a juvenile response. You introduced the incorrect strawman "so you prefer" etc. Your assertion is nonsense.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Kirt, I don't include the economies you mention under the rubric of "planned" economies. Now, there is no need for you to get all hostile about the fact that I consider all the economies you mentioned to be free market economies. As I said, "free" does not mean "unregulated".

A genuine Socialist economy will be planned to the teeth — and history shows these economies are abject failures.

An unfortunate fact of Social Democracies (and the US is no exception here) is that they permit corporations to externalize many social costs of running their business onto the public sector, which appears to keep prices low, but in reality just cause a mess to be cleaned up later.

Now, I understand you have a deep hatred for the country in which you live, and I feel sorry for you in this respect — it must be painful to be so unhappy, feeling forced to live in a country you despise so deeply. I wish you the speediest possible exit to the country of your choice, where you may enjoy the kind of prosperity everyone deserves, merit permitting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you prefer always failing planned economies then? Because you can't show me one that has not catastrophically failed.

kirtu said:

I absolutely can: Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria and Switzerland. There are other nations as well. Since WW2 the economies of these nations have not failed. They have been through difficult times but haven't collapsed. They keep capitalism under control rather than let it run rampant.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that they were planned economies.

Ummmm yes you did, the above statement was in response to this statement of mine:

I see, so you prefer always failing planned economies then? Because you can't show me one that has not catastrophically failed.

"Free" does not mean "unregulated".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

kirtu said:

I absolutely can: Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria and Switzerland. There are other nations as well. Since WW2 the economies of these nations have not failed. They have been through difficult times but haven't collapsed. They keep capitalism under control rather than let it run rampant.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

These are not planned economies by any standard. They are well-regulated free market economies. Venezuela, Cuba, Pre-capitalist Russia, China, former Soviet Bloc countries etc. are what I have in mind when I mention "planned economies" When talking about planned economies, I am not sure we are discussing or mean the same thing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni

Content:

garudha said:

According to Doctrine of Buddhism such feelings are non-existent and cannot be apprehended.

asunthatneversets said:

That should say: "According to Doctrine of Buddhism such feelings are ultimately non-existent and cannot be apprehended."

However if we grasp at the ultimate then all we end up doing is advocating for a nihilist view.

Jigme Lingpa calls this type of view 'being sealed by a definitive view of emptiness', it can potentially be a major deviation if uncorrected.

garudha said:

Ahhh! You found the perfect book for me. Thanks so much

Malcolm wrote:

You have to understand, the dharmakāya is the mind of the Buddha, that is nondual by definition. As it says in the Avatamska:

The owner of the pure nondual dharmakāya
tames all migrating beings who abide in dualism
with the thunderous clouds of emanations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Markets require proper regulation.

kirtu said:

The Nov 2007 collapse proved that regulators generally don't know what they are doing. Other incidents (Madoff for example) have demonstrated this as well.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you prefer always failing planned economies then? Because you can't show me one that has not catastrophically failed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is a difference between a regulated market and planned economies. The former fail when regulations fail, as in the 2007 debacle; the latter always fail.

Markets require proper regulation.

What I am skeptic of is that notion that economies can be planned. Many have tried, all have failed.

kirtu said:

French mixed market economy has been through many changes but France is still around. 5th largest economy last time I looked. China still does *not* have an unconstrained market economy and is 2nd. The US with the 1st largest nominal economy and close to unconstrained markets (certainly the worship of that) failed in November 2007 resulting in a substantial loss of wealth, millions of people lost everything as a result (including me) and the de facto slave class in American, a class with virtually no economic opportunity, swelled. I personally will be voting with my feet when I recover.

While Marxism did fail, the Marxist criticism of capitalism is basically valid. Capitalism can only lead to cycles of boom and bust (*a fact acknowledged by all economists I know). The difference is that capitalist economists since the Keynes Revolution have articulated a philosophy and method to contain that damage and manage the cycles. This was overturned by Chicago School fanatics who are essentially running the economy of the US at the behest of Ayn Randian fanatics in Congress and in the Fed. More recently Nassim Nicholas Taleb has demonstrated the weakness of impotence of statically driven economics under the condition of an unusual event. Taleb is a student of Mandelbrot (who was also one of the teacher's of many of the Chicago School and who was certainly associated with the Chicago School through the 60's) and was a very successful mathematical financier who focuses on unusual or Black-Swan events in his speculation.

You could respond that modern finance has used (Taleb would say overused) statistics to minimize risk but they have used other mathematical models as well (causing the infamous Black-Scholes collapse in the 90's). While professors Merton and Scholes rightly won the Nobel Prize for their achievement in pricing, most people using their tools and other tools in financial mathematics don't know what they are doing and are just turning a crank (called sausage machine mathematics). Market economies are also open to collapses which is one reason that social democracies keep it under control.

Kirt

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Communalism and non-Marxist species of socialism are not necessarily so, but the willingness of Marxists to resort to violence generally supplants other non-aggressive socialisms unless those socialisms are supported by a healthy market economy.

kirtu said:

Which is the actual case in all social democracies. However your skepticism regarding religious communism is excessive. In fact your skepticism regarding all forms of communism is also. Otherwise the Indian state of Kerala would not exist (indeed, by American standards it is not supposed to exist but nevertheless does [admittedly a friend of mine from Kerala dismisses the local Communist party there as just another political party like the Democrats ...]).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Having been to Kerala, yes, the Communist Party there is mainly regarded as a nuisance. They are just as corrupt as any other party in India.

As far as religious Communism goes, Communism is sort of a religion.

What I am skeptic of is that notion that economies can be planned. Many have tried, all have failed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni

Content:

garudha said:

Therefore: there is no enlightenment that could be attained by samsaric beings because (i) there are no differentiated samsaric beings (ii) there are no differentiated Buddhas (iii) there are no defilements to cleanse.

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of Buddha (nondual), yes; from the point of view of sentient being (dual), no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Dudjom Lineage Rigdzin Dupa: First English Translation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

still wondering why no one ever sent me a copy of this since I made a donation for

it...anyway, NBD.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni

Content:

garudha said:

Now this is a big problem for me because you're implicating that sentient beings -- whose minds are NOT in a state of constant non-dual awareness---...cannot achieve effortlessness until they attain this mythical "non-dual awareness".

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, they cannot. Why? Because they are conditioned by affliction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 25th, 2014 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Bodhisattva's remorse

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Any practice we engage in has to be premised on spontaneity, and not based in feelings/thoughts of hope and fear.

Malcolm wrote:

Any practice we do should be based on the motivation of attaining awakening for the benefit of others. Only Buddhas truly act spontaneously, we are not capable of that.

Sherab Dorje said:

I believe that we are capable of spontaneous acts of love, generosity, compassion, etc... Our enlightened nature sees to that. Now it is, of course, true that our negative habitual tendencies can override this natural display, and that cultivating the right motivation helps us habituate our behaviour in a positive direction, but to say that only Buddhas truly act spontaneously is a gross exaggeration.

Malcolm wrote:

In this respect "spontaneous" means free from objects. We are not capable of that, not even a bodhisattva on the stages is capable of that, since they have a very subtle obscuration that causes them to have dualistic perception, albeit on a very subtle level.

Our compassion, etc., no matter how "spontaneous" it is, is always tainted with objectification.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 25th, 2014 at 10:19 PM
Title: Re: Historical Buddha
Content:
Bakmoon said:
but in a debate context it does

Malcolm wrote:
Not really, but anyway, if your goal is to become a samyaksambuddha, you will not find any path to realize that result in any Hinayāna canon.

The reasonings supporting this position may be found in Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra, chapter 1.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 25th, 2014 at 10:16 PM
Title: Re: Historical Buddha
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Nonsense, Mahāyāna sutras began to be written down around the same time as Hinayāna sutras, i.e. during the first century BCE and probably earlier.

Bakmoon said:
What about the fact that the Mahayana Sutras often talk about matters in the Sravakayana texts but the converse is never happens? If all the texts are records of the same person teaching that seems rather odd coincidence to me. .

Malcolm wrote:
As it says in the Guhyasamaja, the single vajra word is heard variously by different disciples.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 25th, 2014 at 8:17 PM
Title: Re: Inequality
Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:
Well, I'm happy to have you share your views on the matter. However, what you wrote doesn't in the least mean that socialism/comunism are unavoidably materialist.

Malcolm wrote:
Communism/Marxist Socialism is based on the theory of dialectical materialism.

Communalism and non-Marxist species of socialism are not necessarily so, but the willingness of Marxists to resort to violence generally supplants other non-aggressive socialisms unless those socialisms are supported by a healthy market economy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 25th, 2014 at 9:59 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I hope you are not asking someone to justify the Mahayana view on what constitutes "Hinayana" on a Mahayana site.

daverupa said:

Certainly not. It simply needed clear saying, which Malcolm has accomplished. Please remember this thread is his creation; the discussion has played out in relatively short order, and is now a handy reference going forward.

Malcolm wrote:

At least we don't slaughter each other like the Shiites and Sunnis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 25th, 2014 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

But only one is incomplete? That's the assessment I'm asking about, not contemporaneity.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna teaches the entire path of full awakening, profound emptiness, and so on, features lacking in all Hinayāna canons (which teach only the awakening of an arhat, superficial emptiness, and so on and so forth) blah blah blah, things you don't believe anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 25th, 2014 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

We're not using the historical Buddha and that Dhamma which was preserved by the early Sangha as our foundation for learning & practice & assessment of teachings since the Dharma they [the monastics] preserved from the Buddha was not complete.

Ah, well then. How has this been assessed?

Malcolm wrote:

By our tradition, which asserts the Mahāyāna canon is a teaching which is contemporaneous with the Hinayāna canon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 25th, 2014 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

either we're using the historical Buddha and that Dhamma which was preserved by the early Sangha as our foundation for learning & practice & assessment of teachings, or we're not.

Malcolm wrote:

We're not, since the Dharma they [the monastics] preserved from the Buddha was not complete.

daverupa said:

we can nevertheless say what isn't early enough to be considered a candidate for inclusion in the earliest historical strata...

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, Mahāyāna sutras began to be written down around the same time as Hinayāna sutras, i.e. during the first century BCE and probably earlier.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 25th, 2014 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

That would be true if it were only the structure that is parallel. But in fact the contents are in fact parallel.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the content is similar, but not parallel. Which suggests different communities collected different traditions of what the Buddha said, and organized them later on.

Bakmoon said:

The bulk of Sutras found in each Agama and Nikaya have a parallel Sutra in that collection's counterpart, many of these parallel Sutras have significant textual differences,

Malcolm wrote:
Exactly...

Bakmoon said:
The available evidence points towards the common ancestor model

Malcolm wrote:
No, I don't think so:
Interestingly, built into the traditional account of the First Council is the story of one monk who arrived late. He asked the others what he had missed. When they told him how they had formalized the Buddha's teachings, he objected. He insisted that he himself had heard the Buddha's discourses and would continue to remember them as he had heard them.
http://www.lindaheuman.com/stories/Tricycle_Magazine_Whose_Buddhism_is_Truest.pdf

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 24th, 2014 at 7:58 PM
Title: Re: Historical Buddha
Content:

Bakmoon said:
In my personal experience some kinds of Buddhist communities there really isn't nearly as clear of a line dividing the traditional Buddhists and secular Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:
Sure there is: the line is rebirth and its acceptance.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 24th, 2014 at 7:56 PM
Title: Re: Historical Buddha
Content:

Bakmoon said:
The copy model is just contradicted by the textual evidence in front of us.

Malcolm wrote:
Not if the copy was a copy of a canonical taxonomy rather than content, this would lend the illusion of an ur-canon from which there was deviation, when in fact no ur-canon ever existed, contrary to legend.

Bakmoon said:
Of course there are limits to inference, that's why there's a difference between reasonable inferences and unreasonable ones. To reject the use of reasonable

inference based on evidence in accepting a position on the grounds that it isn't a definitive proof is to me a very radical skepticism which in any case isn't the point. For most things in life isn't sensible to demand absolute incontrovertible proof, but that doesn't mean that we therefore know almost nothing. Is the common source model absolutely 100% certain? No, but that's where all the evidence points, and it certainly makes the common source model a very sensible and reasonable conclusion based firmly on the evidence, and certainly not mere "...[S]peculative conjecture."

Malcolm wrote:

But instead, here we see that in the case of the origin of the Hināyāna canons, there is very little evidence. So what you are left with a sort of forensic analysis that in the end can tell you nothing at all about the decomposing corpse on the ground in front of you, except perhaps how it died.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 24th, 2014 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Where have I claimed that? I think that we can use comparative methodology to say that some parts are older than others, but I never claimed to be able to definitively put anything back all the way to the time of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Going to play that card, eh? That simply means you don't think anything reported in the Pali Canon was said by the Buddha.

Bakmoon said:

Like I mentioned before, about 80% of the Suttas in the Majjhima Nikaya are also found in the Madhyama Agama. Are you claiming that it is reasonable to suppose this is because the collection that became the Madhyama Agama simply copied texts from the Majjhima Nikaya?

Malcolm wrote:

It is reasonable to suppose that when one group of redactors decided to give this and that name to sections of their canon, other groups of redactors chose to model their redaction likewise.

Bakmoon said:

If so, then why aren't the texts the same as in the Majjhima Nikaya? They are the same in terms of substantive content, but textually many of them are quite different.

Malcolm wrote:

Because what was borrowed could merely have been an organizational scheme, not every text within that scheme.

Bakmoon said:

I suppose it is possible that just before the Canons were written down in Sri Lanka and the surviving Gandhari texts were penned that there was a massive borrowing of texts between them and then both the Sri Lankans and the Gandhari's decided to add and subtract a good amount of material all at once from their borrowed texts, but that sounds a lot more speculative and conjectural than saying that the reason why the texts have both strong similarities and significant textual differences is that they are descendents from a common source.

Malcolm wrote:

If you follow Salmond's reasoning, the notion that there was one ur-canon creates more questions than it answers.

Bakmoon said:

2) Like it or not, there is a very large difference between propositions which reasonably inferred from the evidence at hand and propositions which are not. If just after hearing a gunshot person A is found shot in a room with a gun with the fingerprints of person B who was found near by, unless there is some evidence to the contrary, we reasonably can infer that person B shot person A, and this certainty is sufficient to sentence a person to prison.

Malcolm wrote:

This kind of reasoning has put quite a large number of innocent people on death row. Whoops! There are clear limits to inferential reasoning.

Malcom said:

Not all, the ordination lineages all sprang from different people, Mulasarvastivada from Rahula, Theravada from Upali, and so on.

That's true of the ordination lineages of individual persons, but there were several different schools of Buddhism in India, each associated with their own canon. The Vinaya Pitikas of these schools indicate that it took time for them to split up. The Vinayas and the Dipavamsa (which is basically just an addendum to the historical material in the Theravada Vinaya) agree that there were different schools and they split up over time, although they disagree about which groups split from which and in what order.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Why accept any of these accounts as veridical, since they, like the speculations of western scholars, are all contradictory?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 24th, 2014 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

That's moving the goal posts. I never claimed that it is possible to make a detailed non-speculative layering of the entire canon. You made the claim that all we can know about the Pali Canon is that it dates to about the first century BCE, and everything beyond that is "...[S]peculative conjecture.":

Malcolm wrote:

You have been asserting from the start that some parts of the tripitika are definitely the Buddha's own words and some parts are not.

Bakmoon said:

We can reasonably know a lot about the texts prior to the first century BCE. By comparative analysis, we know that those Suttas which have parallels in the Agamas must date at the very latest to the point which the two transmission diverged.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we cannot really know this. For example, it is possible that at one point or another one group borrowed the terminology for their canon from another group and included different sets of texts. There is no reason to assume a common origin for each canon at all — that is a conjecture, which however reasonable it may seem, cannot be proven.

Bakmoon said:

Since the Theravada, Dharmaguptaka, and Sarvastivadin texts have so much overlap, we must conclude that the common core must date at the very latest to the time before these three schools separated, and that is significantly earlier than 100 BCE.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure we can theorize there is a common core, as above. The common theory is that there was the first council, and all Hināyāna sutras were compiled there. In general, one does not dispute this account. However, did this really happen in this way? We simply don't know beyond the assertion that it happened.

Bakmoon said:

The different Vinayas of these three schools disagree about exactly who split from who in what order, but it is quite clear that the point when all three were one was much earlier than 100 BCE.

Malcolm wrote:

Not all, the ordination lineages all sprang from different people, Mulasarvastivada from Rahula, Theravada from Upali, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 23rd, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Name of the practice associated with the Guhyagarbha Tan

Content:

kirtu said:

There is also a 100-deity practice. I mention it because as I have seen it introduced, the practice is not obviously associated with Shitro (i.e. one could practice it without doing what most people associate with Shitro practices).

Kirt

Bakmoon said:

Could you explain the distinction please? I always thought that Shitro refers to the use of the 100 deities as a body mandala, but from what Malcom said it is also a Deity Yoga practice with the 100 deities as the mandala. What's the difference between Shitro and the 100 deity practice?

Thank you for your time.

Malcolm wrote:

Shitro is not necessarily a body mandala, for example, the Shitro practice connected with the Gongpa Zangthal cycle of teachings. Two mandalas are taught in Guhyagarbha, the peaceful mandala, which is very similar to Guhyasamaja, and a wrathful mandala. They can be practiced together or separately. In the Guhyagarbha major empowerment, they are granted on two separate days and are separate empowerments. In terma systems, they are generally granted on the same day.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 23rd, 2014 at 7:02 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

the Illiad, and the Odessey...

Malcolm wrote:

are not oral traditions and never were. They are written accounts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 23rd, 2014 at 6:58 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

In the early years when the stories and teachings were just passed down through plain speech rather than chanted texts and the Sutras were first being composed, the texts could very well have been open to including new material for a time before becoming set.

Malcolm wrote:

This is conjecture.

Bakmoon said:

At any rate, you still haven't given me how your traditional understanding can give a parsimonious explanation of texts that have been transmitted with significant variances.

Malcolm wrote:

Different students understand different things and repeat them accordingly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 23rd, 2014 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

The only reasonable conclusion to draw from this is that a substantial number of such variant Sutras are not different Sutras spoken by the Buddha at different times, but in fact variants of an original Sutra which has undergone editing, either through memory, interpolation, or through expanded explanation (like you mentioned, these began as oral texts, and a distinctive feature of oral texts is that they remain open and flexible to change over time).

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, the reality is that oral transmissions tend to resist change more readily than texts. Case in point, the Vedas.

As for the differences, who is to say that Buddha did not teach this in one way to one group of folks, and another way to another group of folks?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 23rd, 2014 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcom said:

Or, you can conclude that different groups of monks preserved different sets of sutras, some of which match, and some of which don't. There is no reason, for example, to presume that agamic sutras describing the bardo are not as ancient as other sutras merely because they are not found in the Pali canon — indeed, there is no reason to suppose that Buddha did not teach the antarabhāva merely because the antarabhāva is not well described in the Pali canon. This is merely one example.

Bakmoon said:

I have two point to make in response to this.

Malcolm wrote:

You are objecting to something I am not claiming. My assertion is that you cannot claim that this set of suttas is earlier than some other. I am asserting you cannot layer date these canons successfully.

Bakmoon said:

2) Nowhere have I claimed that the Pali Canon is somehow privileged vis a vis the other early canons. It is merely one of the Canons that has been passed down to today. If something seems to be a later addition into the Pali Canon as demonstrated by comparative analysis with the other early Canons then I personally don't regard it as being Buddhavacana. Similarly I do not automatically reject things only found in the Sutras from the Agamas. Since you brought up the convenient example of the antarabhāva, I might as well mention my take on it.

I have no problem with an antarabhāva. I think that a lot of these kind of distinctions are just about how you write up your definitions, so what one group might call the antarabhāva another might classify as just being part of the life it comes after. A lot of it is semantics. I personally think there is something like an antarabhāva whatever way you want to classify it or call it just from how rebirth is described, near death experiences, etc... I honestly don't know if the Agamas have anything to say on it, but if they do and there is evidence to indicate that it is of sufficient antiquity, then I would be willing to treat the antarabhāva as being buddhavacana.

Malcolm wrote:

When it comes to the Śrāvaka canons, my main point that we have very little reason to reject this part of the canon in favor of that part of the canon [as does daverupa for example] on the basis of some supposed antiquity that we can only conjecture about.

These texts are rooted in oral transmission, as you mention, they were recited by professionals who selected portions of sutra, abhidharma and vinaya to recite. They were written down. We do not have any proof or evidence of when the Agamas were written down Sanskrit for example, but it was definitely post-Ashoka. The unique conditions of the Pali canon meant that it was preserved to modern times in a more or less complete

way, and we can clearly identify those parts that were committed to writing in the first century BCE and those parts that were added later. Because of the desolation of Indian Buddhism first by Turks, later by Hindus and Muslims, we have a much less complete record of the canon as it stood, also hampered by the fact that Tibetan Imperial policy decreed that there was little point in further translating Hinayāna texts beyond those sutras that had been translated already --thus the vast majority of Hinayāna material in Sanskrit that was translated into Tibetan is the Mulasarvastivadin Vinaya. China lucked out in so far as much that was translated into Chinese was translated fifth century and earlier, when India was still largely dominated by Buddhists politically.

For example, the Sarvastivadins considered the Abhidharmapitika was something embedded with the Sutra pitika, being the focus of advanced discussions of the Dharma by the Buddha. In this respect, then, Abhidharma was something to be extracted, a basket with a basket, there are other organization schemes as well. Its expression was the treatises attributed to Arhats concerning various topics. In other words, for whatever reason, different sets of vinaya lineages preserved different traditions about the origin, content and authorship of Abhidharma traditions. We have very little evidence apart from similar and dissimilar texts, and we cannot now understand the precise conditions that lead to the various discrepancies we find in origination legends and so on.

People imagine they can nail down Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna too, but this is equally fraught. I have been studying Buddhist texts, both in the western academic tradition for nearly thirty years and as a practitioner of Vajrayāna for 25. I have decided for myself, based on reading many thousands of books and articles that at this point, that the academic tradition in the west about Buddhism (the burgeoning hermeneutic around that so influential on people like David Keightley) largely consists of western academics who spout opinions as unfounded certainties, when in fact their work largely consists of conjectural reconstructions which cannot be grounded in anything anyone truly can regard as factual.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 23rd, 2014 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There were many groups of monks, we cannot assume they did not hold different oral transmissions. This accounts for differences as well as similarities.

Bakmoon said:

Of course they had different oral transmissions. That's the whole basis of comparative methodology. But the point is if you trace the oral transmissions back, they cross and have a common source, and you can conclude that material which is found in several different oral transmissions must be from before the different oral transmissions

divided.

Malcolm wrote:

Or, you can conclude that different groups of monks preserved different sets of sutras, some of which match, and some of which don't. There is no reason, for example, to presume that agamic sutras describing the bardo are not as ancient as other sutras merely because they are not found in the Pali canon — indeed, there is no reason to suppose that Buddha did not teach the antarabhāva merely because the antarabhāva is not well described in the Pali canon. This is merely one example.

Bakmoon said:

If you look at the Pali Nikayas and the Chinese Agamas, the similarities are literally undeniable. Just look at how they are organized for example: There is a Digha Nikaya, Majjhima Nikaya, Samyutta Nikaya, and an Anguttara Nikaya, and in the Agamas there is a Dirgha Agama, Madhyama Agama, three Chinese translations of the Samyuktagama, and two translations of the Ekottara Agama. The titles are literally translations of each other.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, but this does not mean that every single text spoken by the Buddha was preserved at the first council. What I am suggesting is that there has always been so called "extra-canonical" teachings, i.e., sutras that for one reason or another were not collated during the first council but which were variously preserved by differing groups of monks in different geographical locations. When emissaries returned from the first council, monks merely added their own traditions their canon and this accounts for differences in the various Sravaka canons. Further, other differences may be accounted for by differences in memory, and so on.

Bakmoon said:

If you actually look inside of them you find that the individual Suttas and Sutras match up in terms of content. I highly urge interested readers to take a look at Suttacentral.net for themselves. They've listed all of the parallels and such that you can see for yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a point of contention.

Bakmoon said:

One of these is from the Pali Majjhima Nikaya, and the other is from the Chinese translation of the Madhyama Agama. Do you really mean to tell me that it is mere "conjectural speculation" to say that these two texts are almost identical because they stem from a "putative original" text?

Malcolm wrote:

No, what I mean to tell you is that it is entirely conjectural to imagine that the Sutta Nipatta is "early" and that various suttas in the Digha Nikaya are "late", and so on.

Of course, we one can try to conjecture which suttas were taught early in the Buddha's career, and which were taught later in his life, but this is also a difficult thing. A lot of suttas have no location given, and we only have a general idea of where Buddha went and at what time in his career.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are missing my general point, there is really no effective way to layer date oral transmissions. We have an event in Buddhist history (as far as the Pali canon is concerned), i.e. it was committed to writing in the first century BCE. We can speculate many things about the written texts we find there, but it is all speculative conjecture. It is not "history".

Bakmoon said:

You have stated the underline portion several times but you have failed to make an argument in favor of it. It is a bare assertion. Can you make an argument to back up this point? Why do the principles of textual analysis not work for oral texts?

Malcolm wrote:

Simply put, there is nothing to which a date may be assigned.

Bakmoon said:

And it was not just the Pali canon that was written down. The Sarvastivadin, Dharmaguptaka, and many other canons survive in large fragments. These schools separated prior to when these were written down, and when we compare these texts, they have material in common. From this we can deduce that the material held in common must date prior to the separation.

Malcolm wrote:

There were many groups of monks, we cannot assume they did not hold different oral transmissions. This accounts for differences as well as similarities.

Bakmoon said:

And there is also internal evidence we can use. Different parts of the Pali canon have different dialectical variants, some of which are very similar to the colloquial speech found in the area of Maghadha, and others with a distinct influence from Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

This only tells us about this body of texts in the 1st century CE, it tells us nothing about a putative "original" canon.

Bakmoon said:

We can see different parts of the Canon with different features, and some texts seem to reference or comment on others. Furthermore, these internal correspondences can be line up with the comparative analysis and we find that the chronologies match. It may not be as certain as digging up manuscripts complete with dates, but we can have reasonable certainty about some of the dating.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we really can't, not beyond conjectural speculation.

Bakmoon said:

Also a matter to consider is to see how the material in the texts matches up with what we know archaeologically from the period. The Nikayas/Agamas give a clear depiction of what life was like back then. It depicts India as being a collection of various states vying for power with one another, a barter economy, and many other such things. Remember that the Buddha passed into Parinirvana at a transitional time in the history of India when things were undergoing great social change. The fact that the texts aren't filled with anachronistic portrayals of daily life also can be used to establish validity. Just because we don't have absolute certainty about absolutely everything we say doesn't mean that the entire thing is baseless speculation. There is such a thing as reasonable inference.

Malcolm wrote:

According to people like Schopen, the texts are filled with anachronisms.

But this all avoids the point I am making, we are really not in a position to say which portion of the body of texts first written down in the first century BCE is older or which is younger. Of course, you can use conjecture, and you can claim it is reasonable, but your reasonable conjecture is easily negated by someone else's reasonable conjecture. If nothing else, the history of Buddhology is nothing more than the story of one reasonable conjecture being negated by another reasonable conjecture.

Your assumption is based on a materialist approach to text criticism. Other [i.e. traditional] historical approaches fully accept that Buddha taught the Vibhanga and so on in toto.

How is it materialism? I gave a carefully presented argument with premises and conclusions as why the Abhidhamma doesn't date back to the time of the Buddha himself, and instead of criticizing the initial premises or finding a flaw in the deduction from them, the response is "Your argument comes from materialism."

The fundamental principle upon which you base your argument is material texts, none of which materially date earlier than the first century BCE, and were all written down at the same time, so you have nothing more and a series of conjectures you have formed which stands in contradiction to the traditionally asserted origin of the texts themselves. If there is a flaw in my initial premises, then let it be pointed out. If there is an error in my

deductions from said premises, then let my reasoning be refuted. But if neither the premises nor the deductions are flawed, then my argument ought to be accepted. You have basically claimed that your argument stands solely on inference, what is "reasonable", but those reasonable inferences are also predicated on a series of judgments about Indian history that are themselves conjectures.

And since we are examining the validity of comparative and internal textual analysis, let's examine the validity of these traditional historical approaches. I have explained how comparative and internal textual analysis works and its methodology. What is the methodology of the historical approach you are using?

I accept the traditional accounts as they stand and operate from those sets of premises. The Theravada tradition puts the Abhidhamma back to the time of the Buddha, but I think the Sarvastivadin tradition says it was composed by latter disciples, not the Buddha himself. If your approach is to simply follow a chronology passed down by tradition the issue becomes "Do we follow the Sarvastivadin account, the Theravada account, the Dharmaguptaka account, etc..."

[/quote]

The Abhidharma and the Abhidhamma Pitika cannot be equated. They are separate traditions coming from separate schools.

If you are a Theravadin, you follow the Theravadin account of the origin of Abhidhamma, if not then not. It is really quite straight forward and involves no conjecture at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are making a fundamental error that most people grounded in TEXT make, i.e, assuming that we can analyze what were orally transmitted teachings that were organized before they were written down into bodies of knowledge as if they were TEXTS.

Bakmoon said:

First of all, just because something is transmitted orally doesn't mean that it is not a text. It's just an oral text rather than a written text. It's a strange use of terminology for most people, but especially in India which has a long tradition oral memorized transmission they work very much like written texts.

Can you back up your claim that orally transmitted texts cannot be analyzed? The principles of textual analysis are rather basic postulates such as "If two textual transmissions have material in common, it is most likely derived either from a common source" or "If text A is commenting on text B, then B is older and A is younger". Sure, they are used most often in written texts, but can you demonstrate that there is a fundamental difference between oral texts and written texts that renders this

inapplicable? You have asserted this claim and done nothing to back it up.

Malcolm wrote:

You are missing my general point, there is really no effective way to layer date oral transmissions. We have an event in Buddhist history (as far as the Pali canon is concerned), i.e. it was committed to writing in the first century BCE. We can speculate many things about the written texts we find there, but it is all speculative conjecture. It is not "history".

Bakmoon said:

The underlined part doesn't make sense to me. It is true that the Vibhanga and its analogues is based on the Suttas taught by the Buddha combined with explanations and definitions, but that just means that the Vibhanga and its analogues is based on what the Buddha said. It doesn't mean that the Vibhanga and its analogues were spoken by the Buddha, much less the entire Abhidhamma pitika.

Malcolm wrote:

Your assumption is based on a materialist approach to text criticism. Other [i.e. traditional] historical approaches fully accept that Buddha taught the Vibhanga and so on in toto.

Bakmoon said:

That's an argument from silence.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is clearly described in the canon that there are three pitikas, not merely two. But according to the modern approach, the third pitika does not exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Let me ask you, do you think Abhidhamma was taught by the Buddha. If not, why?

Bakmoon said:

Do I believe that the Abhidhamma Pitika was spoken by the Buddha? No. The clearest reason for this lies in comparative analysis of the different early canons. There are large differences in content in the canonical Abhidharmic literature of the various early schools. If you look to the portions that actually do match up with one another you find that much of the material in the Vibhanga and its analogues is held in common between the different traditions, and that material is simply a collection of several of the more comprehensive suttas from the Nikayas and Agamas fleshed out with more stock

passages, lists of synonyms, and definitions.

As you get further away from this common core material in Abhidharmic literature, the level of textual differences increase between the different versions in different canons. The common sense explanation for this is that the Vibhanga and its analogues are earlier than the other material in the Abhidhamma. And also, if the earliest material is simply a modification of already existing Suttas, it stands to reason that it was composed after these Suttas. From plain common sense, it seems that the Abhidharmic literature developed over time as a systematization and a refinement of earlier material, so no, I don't think it goes back to the Buddha himself.

Malcolm wrote:

You are making a fundamental error that most people grounded in TEXT make, i.e, assuming that we can analyze what were orally transmitted teachings that were organized before they were written down into bodies of knowledge as if they were TEXTS.

The second thing that is telling is that you reject the account of the origin of ABHIDHAMMA because its origin legend (i.e. Buddha taught to the devas and summarized it for Śāruputra) is not shared with Saravastivadins and so on, who have a very different Abhidharma tradition. This rejection is grounded on a tradition of materialist text criticism that originates with Baruch Spinoza, more or less, which generally rejects all so called "supernatural" accounts.

Moreover, you contradict yourself here: "if the earliest material is simply a modification of already existing Suttas" and "I don't think it goes back to the Buddha himself".

Even if Abhidhamma is a compendium of passages from sutta, an interpretive scheme, if you hold those suttas were taught by the Buddha, then Abhidhamma goes back to the Buddha. And further, there is no reason to imagine that Buddha did not himself indicate what sort of interpretive scheme should be applied since we have a clear tradition that Buddha taught three pitikas, not merely two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I simply operate with a different understanding of history than what is accepted by people like daverupa, who basically default to a western materialist read of history.

Bakmoon said:

How is it materialism to use comparative and internal analysis to date texts? I think a lot of it is plain common sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Let me ask you, do you think Abhidhamma was taught by the Buddha. If not, why?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Since both Daverupa and I accept historical methodology,

Malcolm wrote:

I also accept historical methodology, it just happens to be a different history and a different method.

Bakmoon said:

I'm sorry, I think I phrased that rather sloppily. I didn't mean to imply that you reject historical methodology. By historical methodology there I meant the use of comparative and internal textual analysis to date texts.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I simply operate with a different understanding of history than what is accepted by people like daverupa, who basically default to a western materialist read of history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Do you mean to say that according to Tantra, it is wrong to learn Sutra as the basis of one's understanding because it is complete? I always thought that in those schools which teach that Tantra has a distinct view that it is a modification and an expansion of the teachings of Sutra, not a simple rejection and replacement.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not wrong to learn sutra, but since each Vajrayāna system is complete within itself, a practitioner does not necessarily need to become expert in the MMK, Cittamatra, Abhidharma and so on.

Someone who plans to be a teacher on the other hand needs to learn all these things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Since both Daverupa and I accept historical methodology,

Malcolm wrote:

I also accept historical methodology, it just happens to be a different history and a different method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

How is it different from the Theravadins who pray the to four kings and so on for protection?

Berry said:

Do they ? Which prayer is that, then ?

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.32.0.piya.html>

Berry said:

In fact, asking someone to protect you is not necessarily theistic.

Mmm, maybe not if one asks another human being for protection from an angry husband - but its theistic if you're asking an invisible deity.

Malcolm wrote:

Then even Theravada is theistic:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.32.0.piya.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

But Mahayana Buddhism treats the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas very differently than how a theist thinks about God

Berry said:

As far as I'm aware, there are Mahayana Buddhists who pray to deities, Buddha's & Bodhisattvas to protect them & look upon them favorably in times of difficulty. How is this different to the prayers of a theist ?

Malcolm wrote:

How is it different from the Theravadins who pray the to four kings and so on for protection?

In fact, asking someone to protect you is not necessarily theistic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 22nd, 2014 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Śravaka canon is not the standard by which Mahāyāna is to be judged, if anything, it is actually quite the opposite. Those teachings in the Śravaka canon which are contradicted by the Buddha in Mahāyāna are to be set aside.

Bakmoon said:

That's only true for someone who has already accepted the validity of the Mahayana scriptures. For someone who has not yet accepted their validity and is still examining them such an argument is a bare assertion.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as is accepting Buddhadharma in general as valid compared with say the claims of Islam.

Bakmoon said:

Just because something is incomplete doesn't mean that it can't be used as a standard of teaching and interpretation. In Vajrayana the Sutra path in general is seen as being an incomplete system for the attainment of Buddhahood as well. What would the response be if someone came into a shedra and refused to study the Bodhicharyavatara or any of the other Sutra level Shastras claiming that it is wrong to take Sutric texts as the basis of understanding because Sutra is incomplete? I have the sense it wouldn't go over well.

Malcolm wrote:

They would tell you you are in the wrong place, not that your assertion is necessarily false. Shedras are for training teachers, they are not places where everyone must go. If you are a teacher, you must have a broad understanding. If you are a tantric practitioner you only need to understand the system you are practicing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 21st, 2014 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

So, this is what I mean, Bakmoon. Do you see the difference?

Malcolm wrote:

Different history, different facts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 21st, 2014 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I already mentioned this in my first post, but I think it really is a good example so I'll use it again. I think that the Prajnaparamita Sutras and the Madhyamaka Shastras are very much in accordance with the early scriptures. They don't contradict any doctrines of the Nikayas/Agamas and they fit very nicely with the underlying worldview of the scriptures.

Malcolm wrote:

The Śravaka canon is not the standard by which Mahāyāna is to be judged, if anything, it is actually quite the opposite. Those teachings in the Śravaka canon which are contradicted by the Buddha in Mahāyāna are to be set aside.

Otherwise, as Nāgārjuna notes in the Ratnavali, the Śravaka canon is incomplete and one cannot realize buddhahood through following its teachings since there is no presentation of the bodhisattva path, two-fold emptiness and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 21st, 2014 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Name of the practice associated with the Guhyagarbha Tan

Content:

Bakmoon said:

What is the name of the practice associated with the Guhyagarbha Tantra? For example, the Chakrasamvara Tantra is associated Chakrasamvara, the Hevajra Tantra is associated with Hevajra, so what is the practice that goes with the Guhyabarbha Tantra? I know that Zhitro is based on the same Mandala but I sort of have the impression that Zhitro is a body mandala rather than a self generation practice? Or does the Guyhagarbha Tantra not have a self generation deity yoga practice associated with it?

Malcolm wrote:

Zhitro.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 20th, 2014 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Is Tibetan Buddhism world-denying?

Content:

Jikan said:

So, what do you think? Fair assessment or no?

Malcolm wrote:

Utterly clueless when it comes to Tibetan Buddhism...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 18th, 2014 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, as I said, I have followed a well-planned, nutritionally balanced vegetarian diet (for years), and it is not good for my health. I just happen to be one of those persons who need some amount of animal protein my diet.

gad rgyangs said:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19562864>

It is the position of the American Dietetic Association that appropriately planned vegetarian diets, including total vegetarian or vegan diets, are healthful, nutritionally adequate, and may provide health benefits in the prevention and treatment of certain diseases. Well-planned vegetarian diets are appropriate for individuals during all stages of the life cycle, including pregnancy, lactation, infancy, childhood, and adolescence, and for athletes. A vegetarian diet is defined as one that does not include meat (including fowl) or seafood, or products containing those foods. This article reviews the current data related to key nutrients for vegetarians including protein, n-3 fatty acids, iron, zinc, iodine, calcium, and vitamins D and B-12. A vegetarian diet can meet current recommendations for all of these nutrients. In some cases, supplements or fortified foods can provide useful amounts of important nutrients. An evidence-based review showed that vegetarian diets can be nutritionally adequate in pregnancy and result in positive maternal and infant health outcomes. The results of an evidence-based review showed that a vegetarian diet is associated with a lower risk of death from ischemic heart disease. Vegetarians also appear to have lower low-density lipoprotein cholesterol levels, lower blood pressure, and lower rates of hypertension and type 2 diabetes than nonvegetarians. Furthermore, vegetarians tend to have a lower body mass index and lower overall cancer rates. Features of a vegetarian diet that may reduce risk of chronic disease include lower intakes of saturated fat and cholesterol and higher intakes of fruits, vegetables, whole grains, nuts, soy products, fiber, and phytochemicals. The variability of dietary practices among vegetarians makes individual assessment of dietary adequacy essential. In addition to assessing dietary adequacy,

food and nutrition professionals can also play key roles in educating vegetarians about sources of specific nutrients, food purchase and preparation, and dietary modifications to meet their needs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 18th, 2014 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if you eat meat as a regular part of your diet, it might be a good exercise to ask yourself why.

Malcolm wrote:

Because I become ill if I don't, having tried to to refrain from eating meat countless times, including eating a so called "balanced" vegetarian diet, I simple get ill. I am more susceptible to infections, colds, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 13th, 2014 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Dudjom Lineage Rigdzin Dupa: First English Translation

Content:

miranda said:

@ Pema Tsultrim

I am based in France, and would like to order a copy of the Dudjom RD , for which I received wang and lung from Tulku Teglo. I send several mail on your website with no answer. I suggest to add 20\$ for the shipping charge (which is usually around 15\$) please let me know if it is ok for you and I shall send the 40\$ as donation on your website.

Waiting to read from you soon, PM or here...

Jean-Marc B

Tsultrim T. said:

Jean-Marc,

If you dont hear anything soon let me know and I might be able to arrange for a copy to be sent to you.

Malcolm wrote:

I also paid for a copy, but no copy was forthcoming...anyway, it is not a big deal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 12th, 2014 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

But I do know the role of the guru.

Malcolm wrote:

Well please explain it to us then, so we can see where you are coming from, shel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 12th, 2014 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Bodhisattva's remorse

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Any practice we engage in has to be premised on spontaneity, and not based in feelings/thoughts of hope and fear.

Malcolm wrote:

Any practice we do should be based on the motivation of attaining awakening for the benefit of others. Only Buddhas truly act spontaneously, we are not capable of that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

Motova said:

Alcohol and sex is trumped by picking a successor who spread aids around the sangha and raped a person. Why would a realized person pick someone as number two who would do such things? Speaking as someone who is totally new to Buddhism and Tibetan Buddhism, after reading about number two I totally avoid any of Chogyam Trungpa's material because I have zero confidence in who he was.

Malcolm wrote:

CTR is not responsible for Thomas Rich's actions.

Motova said:

He is responsible for putting a severely deranged person in a seat of authority who was capable of many gross actions. If you don't have any ability to stop this, then you shouldn't be put on a throne and be called a guru. If he was supposedly enlightened enough to frak, drink alcohol, and snort coke without any attachment then you'd think he'd be able to appoint a virtuous regent. Number two is where it all comes down to; it's the highlight of his dharma career. If Thomas Rich was his best student, then that says a lot about CTR's abilities and teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Dylan, it is a long complex story. What matters is this:

According to Diana Mukpo, wife and widow of Trungpa, he ultimately became disillusioned with Tendzin as his heir, and during his final illness he called Tendzin "terrible" and "dreadful", and indicated that he would have gotten rid of Tendzin had he a suitable candidate with which to replace him.[24] Rick Fields, the editor of Vajradhatu's publication the Vajradhatu Sun, wrote that he resigned from his editorial position after Ösel Tendzin and the Board of Directors stopped him from publishing news of the events.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/\" onclick=\"window.open\(this.href\);return false;\" data-bbox="114 259 730 292">Ösel_Tendzin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/\)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

Motova said:

Alcohol and sex is trumped by picking a successor who spread aids around the sangha and raped a person. Why would a realized person pick someone as number two who would do such things? Speaking as someone who is totally new to Buddhism and Tibetan Buddhism, after reading about number two I totally avoid any of Chogyam Trungpa's material because I have zero confidence in who he was.

Malcolm wrote:

CTR is not responsible for Thomas Rich's actions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

TRC said:

Well my response would remain the same regardless of who made the claims.

Malcolm wrote:

I think we already established the Vajrayāna is not your cup of tea.

TRC said:

What has that got to do with it?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

You are not following Mr. Dangerous. Alcoholism is not necessarily a moral issue. It is classified as a disease.

The question is not about morality but consensus. Is there a consensus among Buddhist practitioners that a realized person may be an alcoholic? I will venture to guess that there is not. How about you?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a consensus among Vajrayāna practitioners that mere appearances, alcoholism included, may not bear any relation to a person's actual realization. We don't really care what other Buddhists might think. Given that this is the case, there is really no common basis for a discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

TRC said:

Well my response would remain the same regardless of who made the claims.

Malcolm wrote:

I think we already established the Vajrayāna is not your cup of tea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Whether or not all his interactions with people were positive is hardly the point. He was a realized person. He cannot be judged on the same standard as everyone else.

TRC said:

Well I happen to think he can. And in fact I'm going to set a higher standard of judgment if he claimed to be realised.

Malcolm wrote:

He, as far as I know, never made any such claim at all. But other high Lamas such as

Dudjom Rinpoche, Dilgo Khyentse, and so on have made such claims on his behalf.

Then of course there is Drugpa Kunley, Do Khyentse, etc., many Tibetan masters that would hardly externally match your standards of moral conduct for that matter Virupa, Tilopa, Padmasambhava and so on also wouldn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The perhaps the dissonance belongs to you, and not to them. Have you bothered to consider this?

TRC said:

I have no dissonance about Trungpa, that's the point. I don't need to reconcile the paradoxes that exist which others seem to need to. He gave some profoundly deep teachings, which had good results in certain circumstances. His addictions and proclivities led to less than good results in other circumstances. I can accept both dimensions without having to shoehorn it all into being a skilful teaching method, and that all his outcomes were positive - as they clearly weren't. It's others that need to do that.

Malcolm wrote:

Whether or not all his interactions with people were positive is hardly the point. He was a realized person. He cannot be judged on the same standard as everyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

A requisite of giving up is having first tried.

Malcolm wrote:

What you seem to be looking for is a quote by CTR along the lines of "I use womanizing and drinking as Dharma methods..."

Of course, you will not find such a quote. But you can certainly find many statements by him which indicate that like his teacher, Khenpo Gangshar, he was interested in pushing his students beyond their limitations. For example, we know that Khenpo Gangshar actively encouraged monks and nuns to leave retreat, have sex, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

then why did he never say so himself?

Malcolm wrote:

He did say so himself, many times, just read any of his discourses on the role of the guru.

boda said:

Trust on this level means one cannot maintain one's ego. One cannot maintain one's basic existence as "myself." This self has become completely dedicated, it has completely opened up in surrendering to the world created by the guru. The world that the guru creates is not particularly a pleasant one. It might be very unpleasant, horrific. It might also be beautiful at the same time. The reason the world created by the guru tends to be an irritating one is that the guru goes beyond the role of spiritual friend at this point and begins to act as a dictator. He minds your business completely; he minds every inch of your life. Your guru has the ability to do such a thing, because he knows every inch of your life, of your state of consciousness. He knows the tiniest fragments of your subconscious gossip, he knows all the little freckles in your mental functions. The guru has a complete understanding of all this. Therefore you are highly exposed, fully exposed. For this reason, the tantric tradition is considered very dangerous. The traditional format is that you can either make love to your guru as a divine being or kill him. The analogy is that of a snake in a bamboo tube. When you put a snake in a bamboo tube, the snake has to face either up or down. Relating with the guru is very powerful, too powerful. It is too much having somebody mind your business in that fashion. From that point of view, it is extremely

Malcolm wrote:

Trungpa, Chogyam (2010-09-28). *The Lion's Roar: An Introduction to Tantra* (Dharma Ocean Series) (Kindle Locations 930-940). Shambhala Publications. Kindle Edition.

boda said:

Maybe I need reading glasses but I don't see where it says he used his drinking or womanizing as a teaching method.

Malcolm wrote:

I give up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 9:02 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

People do a lot of things for reasons other than teaching, and with no methodology

whatsoever.

TRC said:

Yes this is the point that people get confused about. Because they can't reconcile the paradox of Trungpa's more profound teachings with his obvious fallibility and (self-) destructive behaviour, they prefer to characterise this behaviour as a skilful and premeditated teaching method, to help ameliorate their dissonance.

Malcolm wrote:

The perhaps the dissonance belongs to you, and not to them. Have you bothered to consider this?

TRC said:

Obviously Trungpa was suffering. His alcohol addiction was an overt manifestation of craving/clinging, which is of course the immediate cause of suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

He would never have denied that he was an ordinary, suffering person:

The guru is immediate. For one thing, he is a human being like yourself. He has to eat food and wear clothes like you do, so it's a direct relationship. And the fact that the guru has basic human survival needs makes the situation more threatening. Do you see what I mean? It is more threatening because you can't dismiss the guru as being outside of our thing, someone who can survive without our human trips. The guru does thrive on human trips. If we need food, the guru also needs food. If we need a love affair, the guru also needs a love affair. A guru is an ordinary human being, but still powerful. We begin to feel personally undetermined, because the guru minds our trips too closely and too hard.

Trungpa, Chogyam (2010-09-28). The Lion's Roar: An Introduction to Tantra (Dharma Ocean Series) (Kindle Locations 3136-3140). Shambhala Publications. Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

then why did he never say so himself?

Malcolm wrote:

He did say so himself, many times, just read any of his discourses on the role of the guru.

boda said:

Trust on this level means one cannot maintain one's ego. One cannot maintain one's basic existence as "myself." This self has become completely dedicated, it has completely opened up in surrendering to the world created by the guru. The world that the guru creates is not particularly a pleasant one. It might be very unpleasant, horrific.

It might also be beautiful at the same time. The reason the world created by the guru tends to be an irritating one is that the guru goes beyond the role of spiritual friend at this point and begins to act as a dictator. He minds your business completely; he minds every inch of your life. Your guru has the ability to do such a thing, because he knows every inch of your life, of your state of consciousness. He knows the tiniest fragments of your subconscious gossip, he knows all the little freckles in your mental functions. The guru has a complete understanding of all this. Therefore you are highly exposed, fully exposed. For this reason, the tantric tradition is considered very dangerous. The traditional format is that you can either make love to your guru as a divine being or kill him. The analogy is that of a snake in a bamboo tube. When you put a snake in a bamboo tube, the snake has to face either up or down. Relating with the guru is very powerful, too powerful. It is too much having somebody mind your business in that fashion. From that point of view, it is extremely

Malcolm wrote:

Trungpa, Chogyam (2010-09-28). The Lion's Roar: An Introduction to Tantra (Dharma Ocean Series) (Kindle Locations 930-940). Shambhala Publications. Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

You're answering a different question, Malcolm, which is your prerogative.

I asked how you knew that it was a "teaching method." If you know what a teaching method is, and you know that Chogyam Trungpa used alcoholism and womanizing as a teaching method, explain how you know this. Or you can answer a different question if that's easier for you.

Malcolm wrote:

I explained this to you — I know many, many of his direct students. He would often times use sexual situations as a teaching method, as well as alcohol. He even used LSD etc.

Trungpa used any method he could to reach people who were hard to reach. He also used these to create situations so that people could go beyond their limitations, which after all is the job of a real teacher of Dzogchen and Mahamudra.

For example, sometimes he would randomly have his driver pull into a stranger's driveway, and have the student get out and knock on the door, he did many things like this all the time. He would burst into people's rooms in the middle of the night at his seminars, and if you were sleeping alone, without a partner, he would demand to know why and then fix you up with someone.

In any case, it hardly matters now what he did. He has passed on, and a teacher like him will not be seen again for a long while.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 6:46 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The quality of a tree should be known by its fruit, not buy the appearance of its bark.

TRC said:

Perhaps the quality of a tree should be known by all its characteristics, not just the ones we have a preference for.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know about you, but when I eat fruit, I don't care much about the appearance of the tree as long as the fruit tastes good.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

What do you mean in saying that Trungpa "uses the methods he does"? Are you suggesting that his drinking and womanizing was a method in his teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, most definitely.

boda said:

How do you know? Please explain yourself, if, you can.

Malcolm wrote:

I know because I know many of his students. For them, his womanizing and drinking helped them go beyond the limitations of spiritual materialism and concretely understand the meaning of Dharma. His students are some of the best Dharma practitioners there are in Tibetan Buddhism. A great many of them have a concrete understanding of Dzogchen and Mahamudra.

The quality of a tree should be known by its fruit, not buy the appearance of its bark.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

What do you mean in saying that Trungpa "uses the methods he does"? Are you suggesting that his drinking and womanizing was a method in his teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, most definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Turning water into wine(Chogyam Trungpa)

Content:

boda said:

In my experience there is not even a consensus on what "the Buddhist Dharma produces,"

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is such a consensus — Buddhadharma, practiced properly, leads to the reduction and elimination of afflictions which cause birth in samsara, i.e. freedom.

In Mahāyāna, one can also traverse the path to omniscience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Jikan said:

Further, we should avoid rejoicing in the works and accomplishments of those who make their business on the ten nonvirtues

Malcolm wrote:

I guess we start with Hollywood then...

Sherab Dorje said:

Or ourselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Is there an echo in here...?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Jikan said:

Further, we should avoid rejoicing in the works and accomplishments of those who make their business on the ten nonvirtues

Malcolm wrote:

I guess we start with Hollywood then...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 10th, 2014 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In order for the world to be a pure land, we do not have to do anything except realize it as such. But there is no way to create an outer material utopia.

Sherab Dorje said:

I do not think that ending starvation and malnutrition is utopian in the slightest. We have ample resources to do so. Utopian would be to believe that every single person on this globe can live an American middle class lifestyle. This is just not going to happen. Anyway, I did not talk about a utopian situation, I specifically stated "somewhat better". Ending starvation and malnutrition (something that is 100% possible) will make the world "somewhat better". If you really want to create such a place, then you have to convince every person to strictly avoid the ten nonvirtues. Since you cannot force others to avoid the ten nonvirtues, all you can do is start with yourself. You won't see me disagreeing.

Malcolm wrote:

Greg, there are a number of obstacles to this happening: 7 billion in fact.

There is no way to effect such an outcome without establishing a command economy, and we know where that leads:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 10th, 2014 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

We make this world, not God, not chance, not fate. We make it, through our actions.

We can make it somewhat better, we can make it somewhat worse or we can transform it into a Pure Land. It is 100% up to us.

Malcolm wrote:

In order for the world to be a pure land, we do not have to do anything except realize it as such. But there is no way to create an outer material utopia.

If you really want to create such a place, then you have to convince every person to strictly avoid the ten nonvirtues. Since you cannot force others to avoid the ten nonvirtues, all you can do is start with yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 10th, 2014 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: time for a long sleep.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Don't waste this precious human birth now that you met the Dharma.

Jesse said:

Often times it doesn't feel very precious, more like a curse, after a curse after a curse.. That's how depression is though.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the most precious possession you have, not easily gained, and easily lost. Use it well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 10th, 2014 at 11:11 AM

Title: Re: time for a long sleep.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Don't waste this precious human birth now that you met the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 10th, 2014 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya schools & Precept Schools

Content:

Christopherxx said:

Thanks Malcolm

I know you are really knowledgeable about dzogchen and probably the other traditions within vajrayana.

Do these vehicles/traditions ordain under the vinaya of their regions or do they have precepts or vows or?

You mentioned two systems of commitments

I am guessing the two sets of bodhisattva vows are the brahma net sutra and the asanga set?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Bhramajala sutra system is largely the as Asanga's and it does not exist in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 10th, 2014 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya schools & Precept Schools

Content:

Christopherxx said:

From what I have been able to gather the Tibetan monks ordain under and follow a version of the vinaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Mulasarvastivada vinaya.

Christopherxx said:

Chinese monks (Although I am not sure which schools) ordain under and follow the vinaya. If someone could fill us in on which Chinese schools that would be cool.

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmaguptaka.

There are two traditions of bodhisattva vows followed in Tibet, Madhyamaka and Yogacara.

There are also two general systems of tantric commitments as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

To tell you the truth, personal preferences are based on habit, which is based on karma anyway, which ultimately arises from ignorance, so...

Malcolm wrote:

Only negative karma arises from ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

I must have been confused.

Malcolm wrote:

People who follow Wiki to the exclusion of other sources usually are.

daverupa said:

So actually, I accept your term "historical", but the scare quotes must be included.

Malcolm wrote:

Padmasambhava was a historical person.

His name appears in the colophon of many texts in the collection of ancient tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Indrajala said:

There's more to life than religious pursuits.

Malcolm wrote:

Now that you are no longer a bhikṣu, indeed. But for a bhikṣu, there is nothing beyond religious pursuits.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

The historical Buddha is a communal fact (else e.g. the Etruscans are apparently just a hypothesis, since all ancient history is just speculation, at that point). It is the historical guy.

Malcolm wrote:

So is Guru Rinpoche (a communal fact), just not in your community. He is also a "historical" guy, a Buddha, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Mkoll said:

Kamma is intentional action

(<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an06/an06.063.than.html#part-5>:

"Intention, I tell you, is kamma. Intending, one does kamma by way of body, speech, & intellect."). You could have chosen to follow Zen or Chan Buddhism. You could have waited until you found a Theravada or Nyingma teacher. You could have even chosen to not find a Buddhist sect at all. But you didn't. You made a series of choices and acted (intentional actions) on them and that led to you following Kagyu.

What you've written so far here gives me the impression of being overly deterministic.

Malcolm wrote:

He means karma-vipāka, and it is not overly deterministic — if he had the karma to follow Theravada, etc., he would have met them first, etc. It's about connections, tendrel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 7:27 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

Wayne Verrill said:

I apologize for the long delay in responding to the last post under this topic, but the matter has just come to my attention. The actual title of Sonam Tsemo's book appears on Volume 3, page 146, line 3 in the Sa-skya bKa'-'bum edition and on Volume 1, page 574, line 3 of the Lam-'bras Tshogs-bshad edition. The translation of this section is in the Epilogue on page 531. The actual Tibetan term is rnal-'byor mig, which literally translates as Yoga Eye. The fact that this is the title is confirmed by many commentators who refer to the root text by this name. Since Yoga Eye is a bit awkward in English, I took the liberty of changing it to Yogini's Eye, justified on the basis of the Hevajra Tantra being identified as a Yogini Tantra (see pages 290-297 in the translation). This issue was actually referred to on page 5 of the Translator's Introduction. .

Malcolm wrote:

It's "eye of yoga" as the Tibetan bears out, and it is not the common title of the text, rgyud sde spyi nram is the common title. The full title of course is rgyud sde spyi'i nram par gzahag pa bzhugs so.

The line in question says "rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par gzhag pa rnal 'byor mig", i.e. " The General Presentation of the Divisions of Tantra is the eye of yoga...", etc.

So I have to disagree with your contention that "Eye of Yoga" is the title in that line, rather, it is a descriptive of what the text is supposed to do, i.e. provide an eye on yoga.

Further, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen refers to this text simply by the name rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par gzhag pa in the the rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par gzhag pa dang rgyud kyi mngon par rtogs pa'i stong thun sa bcad.

The Hevajra Tantra is not merely an Yogini Tantra, it is also a yogatantra, for this reason Loppon Rinpoche explains that Hevajra is non-dual tantra based on this passage from Vajrapañjara:

The Hevajra yogatantra
was explained by the Victor first.

Later the yoginītantra
similarly is for the conversion of women.

Loppon Rinpoche adds:

True, it may be called “dākinītantra”. That does not contradict a nondual method and discriminating wisdom tantra because discriminating wisdom tantra is necessary in nondual tantra.

When Lowo Khenchen [rgyud sde spyi rnam gsal byed sogs, pg. 18], defines the reason for the name rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par gzhag pa, he states, " Loppon Sonam Tsemo's composition has four synonyms: 1) The tantra division 2) the general presentation 3) an introduction to all tantras 4) the eye of yoga."

However, that does not justify "the yogini's eye" as a title. In fact, the formal title given in the colophon is actually, The General Presentation of the Tantra Divisions, an Introduction to all Tantras.

If you were to retitle the book, The Eye of Yoga would be a better choice, in my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Academics don't take practicing Buddhists seriously, especially Tibetan Buddhists.

dharmagoat said:

Understandable really. Devotion and objectivity are poles apart.

Malcolm wrote:

The real problem is that non-practicing academics do not really understand the meaning of Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Which is why I (a non-academic) asked daverupa this question back on page 2.....is valid and interesting, especially for those that emphasise the practice of Dharma, rather than its scholastic study. I would be interested in knowing how you reconcile the two poles of scholarship and practice, when they come to the point of conflicting. ...and never got an answer. Anybody else supporting an academic standpoint can also feel free to answer.

Malcolm wrote:

Academics don't take practicing Buddhists seriously, especially Tibetan Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

Sorry, I couldn't remember if it was your translation or not.

Malcolm wrote:

It's good to keep track of these things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

Rongzompa:

Now then, in the sravaka system, phenomena do not have the nature of a self. Since is also asserted there is no identity existing in any phenomena, all phenomena are established to be empty and without self, but nevertheless since [all phenomena] are asserted as the nature of subject and object, the category "natureless" is not understood.

Since in the yogacāra system the nature of subject and object are not asserted, the natureless is established; at that time there is no difference between naturelessness

and emptiness and selflessness. Nevertheless, since they assert the dependent, arising from cause and conditions, the category of “established as non-arising” is not understood.

Since in the madhyamaka system the ultimate is understood as free from proliferation, non-arising is established. At that time there is no difference between non-arising, naturelessness, [67/b] emptiness and selflessness. Nevertheless, since they assert a true relative truth, the category of “established as homogenous” is not understood.

Since in the system of secret mantra asserts the two truths to be inseparable, homogeneity is established. At that time there is no difference between homogeneity, non-arising, naturelessness, emptiness and selflessness. Nevertheless, due to anxiety about not being able to practice uniform behavior and not being able to remove that anxiety quickly, for that purpose they undertake ascetic hardships. Therefore, the category “all phenomena are established to be non-dual” is not understood.

Because the system of dzogchen understands four things for all phenomena— understanding what is to be abandoned; understanding what is to be taken up; understanding what can be left in equanimity; and understanding what can never be actualized, it establishes all phenomena as non-dual. At that time there is no difference between non-duality, homogeneity, [68/a] non-arising, naturelessness, emptiness and selflessness. Since that is so, because this establishment of all phenomena as non-dual is the heart of all intimate instructions, therefore, [dzogchen] is “the heart of all intimate instructions”

Malcolm wrote:

When you cite my translations, you should credit me with them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Greg said:

I'd be interested to hear what people think about the idea that a general survey of "Indian Buddhist Philosophy" can dispense with vajrayāna thought completely.

Malcolm wrote:

A bad one.

Greg said:

What would you include, at a minimum?

Malcolm wrote:

All kinds of things, Vajrayāna treatment of embodiment, the impact of the Indian medical tradition on meditation and yoga practices, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Tantric and late Indian Buddhist philosophy

Content:

Greg said:

I'd be interested to hear what people think about the idea that a general survey of "Indian Buddhist Philosophy" can dispense with vajrayāna thought completely.

Malcolm wrote:

A bad one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And I could care less about rightist interpretations of Buddhist social structures.

Malcolm wrote:

The relationship of the monastic Sangha is not the same as the political relationship between a ruler and the people.

Sherab Dorje said:

Yes Malcolm, you're right!

Malcolm wrote:

The point being that the notions of power in political analysis do not actually apply the relationship of the monastic Sangha and the laity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And I could care less about rightist interpretations of Buddhist social structures.

Malcolm wrote:

The relationship of the monastic Sangha is not the same as the political relationship between a ruler and the people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Lay people are "subordinate" because their highest merit depends on their support of the Sangha without whom they do not enjoy the same chance for higher rebirth and so on.

Buddha makes it very, very clear, that the ideal is to become ordained and that lay people are inferior.

Sherab Dorje said:

You completely missed my point.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually I did not. I chose not to address it because I could care less about leftist interpretations of Buddhist social structures.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And, it also depends on on the laity having a subordinate and supporting position since the Sangha is not self-supporting and never was.

Sherab Dorje said:

Subordinate? Are you sure about that? It seems to me that when you are dependent on somebody for your survival, then they are not subordinate to you, quite the opposite actually. They have power over you.

Malcolm wrote:

Lay people are "subordinate" because their highest merit depends on their support of the Sangha without whom they do not enjoy the same chance for higher rebirth and so on.

Buddha makes it very, very clear, that the ideal is to become ordained and that lay people are inferior.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

kirtu said:

It was quite successful in the Western world for some 1700 or so years...

Malcolm wrote:

It never went over so well in the US, the Calvinist roots of American culture had little use for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Actually , I just remembered that Buddhism proposes the most radical form of social and economic levelling: the monastic sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

It is actually a meritocracy: your place and authority are determined by your years in. And, it also depends on on the laity having a subordinate and supporting position since the Sangha is not self-supporting and never was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Of course it is. Somehow I find it difficult to believe that a world full of Buddhas would have social inequality.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you see a world full of Buddhas? It is easy to make an aspiration, far more difficult to carry it out effectively.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Zhen Li said:

...there's no levelling impulse in it naturally outside of the equality of everyone in Buddha Nature.

Sherab Dorje said:

Gee, is that all? I have to disagree though, there are countless examples of oaths taken by Buddhas and Bodhisattvas to place everybody on the same level of enlightenment. It doesn't get more "leveling" than that.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but that is not a "social" leveling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

So your view is that there is no way to parse stratification? It seems, despite academic opinion in general, that academic work nevertheless is making inroads here.

Indrajala said:

In this case are we talking about actual early Buddhism or how the early sangha was portrayed and understood by well-developed Buddhist sects centuries after the Buddha's death?

Malcolm wrote:

He feels that we can analyze the Pali Canon/Agamas and ferret out an accurate representation of early Buddhist life. So do you actually, which is why you spend so much time railing against contracts and saunas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

In all these arguments people continually forget about the influence of current karma in order to justify the status quo (ie samsara). karmic outcomes are not fixed, they can be changed, otherwise our view of karma does not differ from the largely fatalistic "Hindu" view.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what kind of outcome, i.e., ripened results we are talking about. For example, we cannot fix the outcomes of some dominant results, i.e., being born in a place frequently afflicted by famine. We cannot alter our lifespan, we have limited control over our health (we all age, sicken and die). If we are born with defective sense organs, there is nothing we can do about this. If we are born as an animal, hell being or a preta, there is nothing to be done about it until we have exhausted that karma.

If one is a born as a deva or an asura, there is little motive to practice virtue.

If you are a human being, you can do something about the circumstances of your life, up to a point.

But most humans , ignorant of the force of karma, just continue to spiral into lower realms. So, it may not be the case that karmic outcomes are "fixed", but they might as well be considering the very little that people do to change such results by practicing virtue in this lifetime.

BTW, even hearing the name Bhaisajyaguru Buddha comes about as a result of past karma...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Inequality comes from one's karma, and that's the end of it.

Sherab Dorje said:

And it is sustained by karma, and that's the end of that.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, one's own and no one else's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Inequality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Inequality comes from one's karma, and that's the end of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And then there are people like Witzel who are better scholars.

Indrajala said:

The relations between Mesopotamia and the Indus Valley Civilization are difficult to ascertain and clarify.

One good book in part addressing the subject is The Shape of Ancient Thought by Thomas McEvilley.

Malcolm wrote:

We can understand that they engaged in a great deal of trade, like all ancient peoples.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Indrajala said:

Malati J. Shendge,...

Malcolm wrote:

...has very little mainstream academic support for her theories.

Indrajala said:

Indian academia is a rough place.

Malcolm wrote:

And then there are people like Witzel who are better scholars.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Indrajala said:

Malati J. Shendge,...

Malcolm wrote:

...has very little mainstream academic support for her theories.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to Schopen, there is no evidence, so your statement is rather meaningless.

Indrajala said:

To clarify, the earliest evidence for monasteries we have is late. Schopen:

The earliest “monasteries” that are known in India – and none of these are pre-Aśokan – are not “monasteries” at all. They are either only barely improved, unorganized, natural caverns or caves, or poorly constructed and ill-organized shelters built of rubble and other cheap materials. Communities living in these environments could not have produced our elaborate vinayas, nor would they have had any use for them. Since such communities had no steam rooms (jantāka), for example, how could they possibly have generated elaborate rules governing their construction and use?

Gregory Schopen, “The Good Monk and His Money in Monasticism of 'the Mahāyāna

Period'" in Indian Monastic Buddhism Collected Papers on Textual, Inscriptional and Archaeological Evidence (New Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited), 1-2.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this is entirely speculative. For example, the Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu clarifies that jentākas [bsro khang] are to be built by lay people for monks. Jentākas are not hard to construct. They are round. They are built by lay people. They do not need to be permanent structures. They are part of Indian health culture. They are mentioned in Ayurvedic texts such as the Caraka Samhita, the Jivasūtra, and so on. So I put it to you that when he claims the early Sangha had no access to jentākas he is full of it, and is ignoring the evidence in front of his face. A stream bath does not have to be built of marble to be effective.

Indrajala said:

Look, when it is reported in Vinaya that monks can use leather shoes if they travel to the Himalayan regions, we do not need to have a sample of carbon-dated leather shoes found in Magadha or somewhere else to understand that some monks wore leather sandals even during the time of the Buddha.

That's not what scholars are really looking for. They're wondering about the monastic steam rooms and legal financial contracts as outlined in Vinaya literature when there is no evidence monks, in the Buddha's time at least, had such bathing facilities or the Magadha economy was mature and literate enough to merit the use of ecclesiastical financial contracts.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course monks has access to bathing facilities. They bathed, just like other human beings. Honestly, this kind of thing really lacks common sense.

I have already voiced by objection to the specious notion that there was no literacy in India during the time of the Buddha.

Indrajala said:

There are some very serious self-imposed limitations when one decides that archaeology is what we are going to base our understanding of the life and time of the Buddha.

As I'm sure you understand, the concern is really that the literature as we have it seems to reflect a post-Buddha time period, especially with respect to financial transactions, literacy, complex monastic facilities (steam rooms, etc.) and so forth. We might speculate that some of it really goes back to the Buddha's time, but who knows.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Given that we do not really have much archaeological evidence at all from the post-Harrappan, pre-stone working era of Indian civilization [roughly 1500 BCE to around 250 BCE, it is little facile to claim what primitive Viharas were like and what facilities were provided by their lay hosts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 8th, 2014 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But Schopen's perspective is really nonsensical since there is plenty of evidence in Sutra as well as Vinaya to paint a portrait of what life was like during the time of the Buddha. There simply is no good and valid reason to discount it.

Indrajala said:

It doesn't necessarily correspond well with archaeological evidence.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Schopen, there is no evidence, so your statement is rather meaningless.

Look, when it is reported in Vinaya that monks can use leather shoes if they travel to the Himalayan regions, we do not need to have a sample of carbon-dated leather shoes found in Magadha or somewhere else to understand that some monks wore leather sandals even during the time of the Buddha.

Deciding that every detail of what is in Vinaya and Sutra must be corroborated with some plastic artifact is absurd, really absurd.

There are some very serious self-imposed limitations when one decides that archaeology is what we are going to base our understanding of the life and time of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Indrajala said:

He complains that the consensus is, as Schopen has argued, that we cannot know anything with certainty about early Buddhism given the sheer lack of evidence

Malcolm wrote:

But Schopen's perspective is really nonsensical since there is plenty of evidence in Sutra as well as Vinaya to paint a portrait of what life was like during the time of the

Buddha. There simply is no good and valid reason to discount it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot do that without some serious conjectural speculation.

Indrajala said:

The chronology of Buddhism is largely established based on historical and literary evidence.

Malcolm wrote:

And very little of that conflicts with traditional accounts of the chronology of Buddhadharma, until we come to guys like Schopen, etc.

Indrajala said:

Sometimes it is pretty straightforward to make time frames given purported prophetic references to historical figures, such as Kaniṣka (c.78-144) of the Kuṣāṇa dynasty in northern India.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, sometimes it is.

Indrajala said:

The early history of Buddhism is problematic of course.

Malcolm wrote:

That is the subject at hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

plwk said:

Basically, we have no accurate records of the historical Buddha.
Not even from the Jains' and Brahmins' sides huh...

Indrajala said:

We need to first establish the textual chronology.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot do that without some serious conjectural speculation.

Even more to the point, one cannot date the accuracy of information merely based on when it seems to appear in some written form. Allow me to give you an example — the first collection of Appalachian old world ballads compiled in the 1920's. It turns out that the orally transmitted Appalachian versions of many ballads are in fact earlier than the versions of the same ballads as recorded by Sir Walter Scott, published in 1803. For example, Barbara Allen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

plwk said:

Basically, we have no accurate records of the historical Buddha.

Not even from the Jains' and Brahmins' sides huh...

Malcolm wrote:

It's pure academic nihilism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And hence for modern scholars, there is no historical Buddha, not even Shakyamuni, which is why some folks (J. Atwood, for example) seriously propose his non-existence.

Indrajala said:

We can assume he existed, but say nothing beyond that given the lack of evidence from that period. Once you understand the evidence-based chronology of Buddhism, you see the earliest possible reference to Buddhism in history is Aśoka's (r. 268–232 BCE) edicts, and even this is contested by some.

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks Jeff, I have understood the "evidence" based approaches to Buddhist history for many years. I understand all the arguments and so on.

I think that the methodology of the Schopens and Bronkhorsts of the world is inadequate, and because they are not practitioners, of little value to those practicing Buddhadharma. It is precisely this "contested by some" that reinforces my conviction that Buddhology just a collection of conflicting opinions. Of some idle interest occasionally, but not worth talking seriously — a means of distraction for professors who earn a living from teaching survey courses on religion to undergrads.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Heart Sutra -- why study it?

Content:

longjie said:

Pratyekabuddhas do not seem to have their own turning in the Samdhinirmocana Sutra. According to the relevant sutra passage, the first turning is for the sravakas, the second turning is for the bodhisattvas, and the third turning is for all vehicles.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, which is why it is surprising that Asanga makes the equation that he does, which was my point — the paltry sources in the Indian canon that do treat the subject of the three turnings do not do so with anything approaching doctrinal consistency. It therefore really too much to claim that the idea of the three turnings of the wheel really was an important doctrine in the Indian Mahāyāna scene since there are fewer references to it than there is to the idea of tathāgatagarbha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Indrajala said:

Basically, we have no accurate records of the historical Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

And hence for modern scholars, there is no historical Buddha, not even Shakyamuni, which is why some folks (J. Atwood, for example) seriously propose his non-existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

I'm not going to provide a bulwark to the whole field of history and textual criticism in the face of fundamentalist incredulity, Malcolm.

I know historical facts are threatening to the whole endeavor of Mahayana/Vajrayana simply because they demonstrate the lack of historicity vis-a-vis the historical Buddha, but while the M-V-Dharma experiences this threat, and Traditional Theravadan Commentary does as well, the Dhamma remains unmolested.

In any event, your "all or nothing" strawman is fallacious, as I already mentioned. Parsing stratification is not as simplistic or random as you want to portray it.

Malcolm wrote:

Your historical "facts" are merely a bunch of suppositions supported on nothing.

Texts are not like sedimentary layers of rock, though many imagine that is how it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that we cannot deduce from some inferred sedimentation that DN 14, for example, is a spurious sutra and that therefore, the six past buddhas to which it refers are not historical.

daverupa said:

We sure can.

Malcolm wrote:

You can speculate all you like, but speculations are not facts. The fact is that we have a text, and a wide tradition that holds that the Buddha taught on the existence of six prior Buddhas. We can consider these earlier Buddhas historical in just the same we we consider the Buddha historical.

Otherwise, the consequence is that we cannot trust any of the information in the sutras at all, or worse, we must place ourselves in the hands of modern self-appointed "experts" upon whose speculations it will be decided for us what sutras are to be considered valid and what are to be considered spurious.

It is exactly this kind of "scholarship" which is basically harmful to Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

Make a thread about DN 14; we can discuss it's use of the term 'bodhisatta' and how this use seems to have additional layers of meaning that are missing from the term elsewhere in the Canon.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all completely speculative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So if I understand what you are saying, we are to understand DN 14 as a later interpolation that does not represent the voice of the Buddha in any way shape or form, that this sutta is entirely a fabrication?

daverupa said:

The earliest texts are stratified, and reflect ~150+ years of permutation; the "all-or-nothing" approach is of course untenable, but that's a strawman built on a false dichotomy.

Malcolm wrote:

That begs the question, a text is one thing, information another. What I am saying is that we cannot deduce from some inferred sedimentation that DN 14, for example, is a spurious sutra and that therefore, the six past buddhas to which it refers are not historical. Either the Buddha taught on the existence of six past Buddhas (and many more actually, such as Dipamkara) or he did not. If he did not, the sutra and all reference to six past Buddhas must be regarded as interpolations as you have already suggested. But the fact is that you cannot give a rational account for the sophisticated and exhaustive presentation of the six past buddhas apart from your rather tepid suggestion that some author or authors within 150 years of the Buddha entirely fabricated the six past buddhas based on a misunderstanding of their own language and cultural references. Seems rather far fetched to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Heart Sutra -- why study it?

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

In the 3th turning teachings, the Buddha taught about a no-conditioned self...

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually he didn't. For example, in the *Yogācārabhūmi viniścayasaṃgrahāṇī*, Āryāśaṅga considers that the three vehicles being discussed by the three turnings are really śrāvakayāna, pratyekabuddhayāna and the mahāyāna, he then quotes the relevant section of the *Samdhinirmocana* that is the sole mention of a three turnings of the wheel in all the sūtras of the bka' 'gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

The problem is that traditional accounts show historical development, including the Buddhavamsa, including even the Nikayas & Agamas. Your suggested approach seems to require that this be ignored altogether, with blinders and earplugs if necessary.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not a problem at all. Further, attempts at forming a chronology for this or that text are completely speculative.

We only know this as a historical fact: some three hundreds years after the Buddha's parinirvana, his teachings were written down. This included both Mahāyāna and Hinayāna scriptures.

The reason they were written down, according to all traditional accounts, is that there was some fear that future generations would be unable to maintain them as oral transmissions and so they were committed to text.

It's entirely natural for narratives to be edited and otherwise subjected to some kind of organization, but that organizational activity tells us almost nothing about the contents of the information being organized or how old it might be.

When it comes to such things as the four or seven Buddhas prior to Śākyamuni, while it is true in the MN of Ñāṇamoli/Bodhi, isisattamassa is read as "best of seers" at M i.386, it cannot be denied that DN 14 presents a coherent account of the seven past Buddhas. So if I understand what you are saying, we are to understand DN 14 as a later interpolation that does not represent the voice of the Buddha in any way shape or form, that this sutta is entirely a fabrication?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

The point is whether historical methods render any accurate information, because it is on this basis that the phrase 'historical Buddha' has meaning in the first place - the OP, here, and thus directly to the point.

Now, I consider that historical methods do render accurate information. You seem to think otherwise, calling it a flawed materialist enterprise. So, it seems you must - to avoid hypocrisy - conclude that historical methods in general are flawed, their conclusions are thereby flawed, and therefore that e.g. history is a mere materialist hypothesis.

Malcolm wrote:

I think that there is a certain approach to history which is rooted in such materialism,

and I think modern Buddhology more or less has fallen into that ideological perspective, pretending, as it does, that it will present us with a more objective account of Buddhadharma than has already been presented in traditional accounts like the Buddhavasmsa, for example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

None?

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, no.

Mediterranean history is not really relevant to our aborted discussion, AFIC, that is why I did not respond to Lazy Eye's query.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

One can easily see the "seventh sage" references in the early materials as being an Indian colloquialism for 'the best'...

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, this is one of the most far-fetched theories I have yet seen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 7th, 2014 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Historical Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you don't consider Vipassi, Sikhin, Kanakamuni, etc. to be "historical buddhas"?

daverupa said:

Nope.

Malcolm wrote:

Then we really have no common basis for a discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 11:56 PM

Title: Historical Buddha

Content:

daverupa said:

Malcolm wrote: daverupa wrote:

The historical Buddha

Which one?

There's only the one, Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you don't consider Vipassi, Sikhin, Kanakamuni, etc. to be "historical buddhas"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Purpose of Monkhood/Nunhood and the Monastic Sangha

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

This is the perfect time for a master like HH to establish as Samye in America.

Malcolm wrote:

I think Tarthang Tulku has already done that:

<http://www.odiyan.org> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In actuality, someone becomes interested in Dharma, decides academia is the best place to learn about it, and over the course of time, as their expertise in and appreciation for the opinions of other Buddhologists increases, their faith in Dharma decreases.

dzogchungpa said:

What, in every case? I'd have to see some actual evidence before I accept that that is in fact typical.

Malcolm wrote:

I said it was a common pattern, I did not say it was universal — though it is more likely to be found among those who originally were interested in Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna.

Add this to the fact that Buddhology these days is dominated by people like Gombrich, Schöpen, Bronkhorst and so on with no practical interest in the subject at all...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

He denies that he cares about personal transformation and awakening, or that personal transformation and awakening are possible? I haven't seen that, but I haven't read everything he's written. From what I have seen, he seems sincere in his Buddhist aspirations.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many ex-Buddhist Buddhologists, Tibetologists and so on — it is a common pattern. In actuality, someone becomes interested in Dharma, decides academia is the best place to learn about it, and over the course of time, as their expertise in and appreciation for the opinions of other Buddhologists increases, their faith in Dharma decreases.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Mkoll said:

And unfortunately, here, many of those translations are marred by the imperfect understanding of the scholars who produce them.

That can be true. However, perhaps what you call "imperfect" may often have less to do with the technical skill of the translator and more to do with their colored interpretation. The only way around it is to learn the source language for oneself. Nonetheless, it is still useful to have other translations and perspectives for comparison.

Malcolm wrote:

Imperfect includes both lack of skill in the source language as well as "interpretation".

In the world of Tibetan studies, I am often amazed as the slipshod work for which people receive PhDs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Indrajala said:

The very fabric of the Vinaya, for example, is stained with the eight worldly dharmas: an

obsessive preoccupation with presenting a pure image to the laity so as to secure material and social resources.

kirtu said:

This is of course one of your two fundamental theses (the other being that Westerners are culturally incurable of understanding concepts outside of their primary cultural core [a sort of deeply misguided Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis]).

You have fundamentally misunderstood monasticism and the sangha. Furthermore you have transferred themes from your culture dealing with scarcity and acquisition of resources (the whole economic obsession) onto the sangha. These are apples and oranges issues.

.... have empowered people politically, financially and socially,

See - this is what I'm talking about. These are all primarily English language cultural obsessions. Even the French and Germans don't have quite the same obsessions.

Even the Dutch present this stuff differently. They just don't have the same focus (and you would expect the French to come pretty close in fact). Power structures, resources - you have reduced the sangha to a cargo cult.

It would be one thing if you came from a 2nd or 3rd world culture with definite scarcity and extreme secularism (Americans born and raised in the US will never see this about themselves although 3rd culture Americans raise these issues almost whenever we meet one another - and America is at the top of the heap of the unfortunate societies burdened by actual economic scarcity and occasional life-threatening uncertainty) but you come from a very mild social democracy where true scarcity hasn't been an issue since the great Tommy Douglas began the transition of Canada to a modern nation. Perhaps these issues really reflect your intense focus on the common issues discussed in English speaking academia? This is not a personal attack. Each of our fundamental orientations need to be examined in the light of Buddhadharma because they are all relative truth at best (until we can transform our minds into true wisdom).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhologists could care less about personal transformation or awakening — this is extremely clear. Instead, they obsess about contracts and inscriptions carved in stone, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Mkoll said:

You seem to believe that you must valiantly defend Buddhism against "academic fundamentalism."

Malcolm wrote:

I am not defending Buddhism, I am criticizing the belief that the meaning and value of Buddhadharma can be accessed through an academic tradition largely devoted to forensic dissection.

Mkoll said:

Of course that's a foolish belief. And I think few people hold it, including academics. Even someone with a mediocre knowledge of Buddhism should be able to understand that it's a living path of practice.

But that doesn't mean academic study is something that should be treated with "pointed disdain." Some of it can be quite useful if you aren't on a crusade against it.

Malcolm wrote:

To the extent that translations are produced, and that is about the extent of it. And unfortunately, here, many of those translations are marred by the imperfect understanding of the scholars who produce them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Purpose of Monkhood/Nunhood and the Monastic Sangha

Content:

kirtu said:

However his comments regarding monasticism, aspects of which were often stated in various threads seemed to me to be off. In particular he seems to think that the main purpose of monasticism is social.

Malcolm wrote:

A warning tale to people who take Buddhology more seriously than Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Mkoll said:

You seem to believe that you must valiantly defend Buddhism against "academic fundamentalism."

Malcolm wrote:

I am not defending Buddhism, I am criticizing the belief that the meaning and value of Buddhadharma can be accessed through an academic tradition largely devoted to forensic dissection.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 6:45 AM
Title: Re: buddhist authority structures
Content:

Mkoll said:
That's a strawman.

Malcolm wrote:
No, honestly, that's what seems to pass muster these days — if it isn't carved on a rock or a pillar somewhere, it is not counted as historically valid in the Buddhist studies world.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 6:30 AM
Title: Re: buddhist authority structures
Content:
Mkoll said:
This one: the "Lord Buddha" that Emperor Asoka was referring to when he had his edicts carved into solid rock in the 3rd century BCE. One of those edicts reads:

Malcolm wrote:
I see, so your "Lord Buddha" has to have his title carved on a pillar, in other word, he must be grounded in some impermanent plastic artifact.

Mkoll said:
What is that supposed to mean?

Malcolm wrote:
Just what it says, i.e., your Buddha must be established by a stone pillar with his name carved in it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 5:17 AM
Title: Re: buddhist authority structures
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
critical thinking, discernment and intellectual honesty are also a path, the difference being that the narrative is always evolving to include new insights and information.

Malcolm wrote:

Intellectual honesty, critical thinking and discernment? That's what you think the academic study of Buddhism is predicated upon? I sure don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: English Tantric Texts

Content:

Christopherxx said:

Malcom do you mind me asking why that is.

How does it avoid the trap of just staying in samsara and not progressing?

Malcolm wrote:

The proper way to enter Vajrayāna is through receiving empowerment. There is no other way. You can read this or that book, but without having taken proper empowerment, Vajrayāna texts will not benefit you and can actually give rise to wrong views that will cause you much problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: English Tantric Texts

Content:

Christopherxx said:

Here in the west we want to study, see the merits of something.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna cannot be approached this way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: English Tantric Texts

Content:

Christopherxx said:

So a while ago I started the post "English Mahayana Sutras" and Sherab Dorje did an absolutely incredible post listing all the major Mahayana sutras and links to them for download in English.

I was hoping I could get some kind of similar amazing posts for tantras and the like. I am really trying to dig in here

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to study Tantras, you must first find a master, receive the required

empowerments, only then should you look at tantric texts. And only then after a sufficient amount of training under a qualified master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Do you believe that historical methods tell us anything that is reliable and worth knowing?

Malcolm wrote:

Histories are like kaleidoscopes — they present only a distorted and necessarily limited view of any given subject. There is no such thing as a comprehensive history, much less a true one.

Lo rgyus on the other hand, narrative accounts, serve a contextual purpose for a practitioner to orient themselves within a given stream of practice, and present the origin of a transmission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

...logic is valued as well as is the ability to correctly perceive transactional reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The only thing about "transactional reality" we need to perceive is that it is fundamentally predicated on delusion.

gad rgyangs said:

but your claim for the veracity of the sutras is a claim made in transactional reality, so it too must be predication on delusion, no?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. The only value relative truth bears is whether it can be adventitiously employed for the purpose of [an imputed] liberation or not. Otherwise, it is of no interest nor bearing on the path.

For this reason and this reason alone do we take interest in "logic", the two truths and so on., "history", etc. History, as we can all see, is a completely malleable subject. People who take it very seriously will find in the end that it is about as satisfying as candy in a dream.

For this reason it is far better for people who are practicing a given path to just accept the narrative proper to that path and to ignore others. Since western academic research on Buddhist "history" has no bearing on the path, it is a subject that should be treated with pointed disdain by serious practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

...logic is valued as well as is the ability to correctly perceive transactional reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The only thing about "transactional reality" we need to perceive is that it is fundamentally predicated on delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, because it so much better to be slaves to an ever evolving academic fundamentalism...

gad rgyangs said:

you don't have to be an academic to wake up and smell the coffee.

and even within the buddhist traditional world-view, logic is valued as well as is the ability to correctly perceive transactional reality. There is no way to apply logic and correct perception of conventional reality and still believe that the sutras are accurate transcripts made in real time of someone preaching, except willful stubbornness.

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever said they were made in real time? That is not even an assertion of traditional Buddhist accounts. The sutras were written down, all of them, at a much later time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

rory said:

I really don't understand the rationale here against scholarship. I think everyone here would be laughing if they read a forum where Christians denied the need for biblical scholarship and they didn't need to understand that the gospels were not literally

written by John, Mark, Luke etc..

gad rgyangs said:

how DARE you compare Buddhist fundamentalists with Christian fundamentalists! Christian fundamentalists are confused retards, while Buddhist fundamentalists are fundamental because they know their religion is the One True Faith. Sheesh, its like apples and oranges. Only an idiot would believe that the bible is the unedited word of god, whereas everybody knows that every sutra was spoken verbatim by the Buddha exactly when and where it says he did!

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, because it so much better to be slaves to an ever evolving academic fundamentalism...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

[then there's the section about the pilgrimage of Sudhana who cannot be regarded as a historical figure according to Western methodology.

Malcolm wrote:

But he is a historical figure from a Mahāyāna buddhist pov.

Lazy_eye said:

To come at this text with the goal of seeking historical details about the life and times of the Buddha would be patently absurd.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all.

Lazy_eye said:

My point is that a reader with a historicist outlook is most likely going to be mystified or put off by a text like this, which operates on such a large, multidimensional plane; such a person will more likely find the nikayas appealing.

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, you mean that people whose framework is based on a largely materialist outlook on history will find the nikayas more appealing...but they won't in fact since the Nikayas also contain much material which cannot be accounted for in such a materialist framework, such as Buddha having discussions with Indra, Brahma and so on.

Lazy_eye said:

The ahistorical elements that I'm referring to in the sutras

<http://www.urbandharma.org/pdf/AggannaSutta.pdf>, but to a far lesser extent, whereas Mahayana really brings them out in a big way.

Malcolm wrote:

All that is clear here is that westerners apparently need to alter Buddhist history to make it fit their largely materialist historical worldview.

Of course now we have largely veered off topic because of the suggestion that our structures of authority in Buddhism are predicated on false historical claims.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Not at all. I'm not interpreting anything here, just pointing to obvious differences in narrative mode.

Large parts of the Avatamsaka sutra are not "going on" at any definable time and place. They are happening, in effect, in all times and places, with innumerable Buddhas giving teachings to innumerable sentient beings. This is quite different from the typical nikayan text in which a specific person, Shakyamuni Buddha, went on his alms round on a particular day, met so and so, and delivered this or that teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

The Avatamsaka Sūtra was taught by the Buddha at a very specific time and place, under the bodhitree, after he woke up. It is the first sutra he taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Mkoll said:

This one: the "Lord Buddha" that Emperor Asoka was referring to when he had his edicts carved into solid rock in the 3rd century BCE. One of those edicts reads:

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so your "Lord Buddha" has to have his title carved on a pillar, in other words, he must be grounded in some impermanent plastic artifact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Many of the Mahayana sutras do not. Their mode is ahistorical and atemporal, in effect unifying the "three times". I've been delving into the Avatamsaka this week, for instance, and the idea of coming at it the way one would approach an historical record is simply ludicrous; it's an altogether different kind of text.

Malcolm wrote:

This is merely your interpretive overlay predicated on view of history based largely on an unconscious Western materialist outlook.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

daverupa said:

The historical Buddha

Malcolm wrote:

Which one?

Mkoll said:

I'm quite certain daverupa is talking about Gotama/Shakyamuni/Siddhartha.

Malcolm wrote:

Which one of those?

My point of course being that there really does not exist one sole authoritative narrative by which we may pretend we have found the "true" Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

daverupa said:

The historical Buddha

Malcolm wrote:

Which one?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Indrajala said:

I try to remain unattached to views...

Malcolm wrote:

On the contrary, you have very strong views, which you present to anyone who will listen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Indrajala said:

If your religious authority is founded on false premises (like the Vinaya being the historical decrees of the Buddha), and modern scholars have demonstrated such premises to in fact be false, then the academy is ignored at one's own peril.

Malcolm wrote:

It has not been demonstrated by anyone that the pratimokṣa was not actually taught by the Buddha. The most one can say is that various different schools present slightly different versions of it.

What one can say is that specific procedures of ordination were not necessarily established by the Buddha directly since they in fact vary from sect to sect — but this fact does not require modern scholarship to recognize since this has been recognized for a long, long time within the tradition by people well studied in the traditional histories of Buddhist schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 5th, 2014 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But they are largely irrelevant to a Dharma person who is not really concerned with what outsiders think.

Indrajala said:

Speak for yourself.

The great thinkers of Indian Buddhism clearly cared a lot about how others thought, especially figures like Dharmakīrti.

Malcolm wrote:

He was primarily concerned with proving that the Buddha was an authority. Everything in his intellectual project was subordinated to that aim. I doubt much if he cared what Hindus thought at all, actually.

In practice, polemics, like propaganda, is usually constructed for one's followers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 4th, 2014 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Dan74 said:

Sure for an academic paper to get some traction, it should be evidence-based. But evidence can come from a variety of sources. Suttras, commentaries, biographies and other traditional narratives are also possible sources of evidence, if what is studied is how the tradition sees itself. In any case, it is important to distill one's core inquiry - what truly matters to me and why?

Indrajala said:

There are two primary approaches in the field: emic and etic. The former accommodates the traditional perspective quite fine.

Malcolm wrote:

These two approaches exist if you are cultural anthropologist or a linguist.

But they are largely irrelevant to a Dharma person who is not really concerned with what outsiders think. The terms themselves are biased in so far as the so called "etic" approach is considered "scientific" blah blah blah.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 3rd, 2014 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

conebeckham said:

There are problems with any institutions, and any authority structures.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, as one will find when burdened with the mundane tasks of running a religion department.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 3rd, 2014 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Kayas

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

]Well, if your teacher explained these passages and texts in this way (ie that Great Bliss refers to sexual union), then who am I to question it?

conebeckham said:

Great Bliss does not refer to "Tantric Sexual Union." .

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not, it refers to nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 3rd, 2014 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: buddhist authority structures

Content:

Dan74 said:

You want to tear it down? First turn towards your own aversion, Indrajala. Then tell us again.

Malcolm wrote:

He can't very well make a career in a modern academia (which has proven itself hostile to any version of Buddhist history which does not match the narrative they wish to push in Western colleges) without tearing Buddhadharma down, now can he?

If someone wants to make a career as a Buddhist academic, there are a number of things which are not allowed. First and foremost, one is not allowed to actually give traditional narratives any credit whatsoever.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 3rd, 2014 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

he misunderstands the role of a guru in Dzogchen teachings.

Mkoll said:

That seems to be correct. I hadn't spent much time on Dharma Wheel before I figured that the guru (I prefer "teacher") was an essential component of the Vajrayana tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

The word is guru, actually, i.e. one who is heavy with qualities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 3rd, 2014 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Mkoll said:

That's a great passage. for sharing.

Malcolm wrote:

But it has nothing to do with Dzogchen.

Mkoll said:

True. Nonetheless, it's a great passage and I'm glad he shared it.

Malcolm wrote:

The user in question seems to have some issues with authority. Thus, he misunderstands the role of a guru in Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 2nd, 2014 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Mkoll said:

That's a great passage. for sharing.

Malcolm wrote:

But it has nothing to do with Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 1st, 2014 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Anybody know what exactly is meant by the term ordinariness?

Thanks!

PS According to this quote any practice this is based in the hope of gaining happiness, or on the fear of continued suffering, is Black Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. "If any teaching you study, reflect upon, or expound becomes an effective remedy against your disturbing emotions..."

Here, there is a clear reference to afflictions. All suffering comes ultimately from afflictions.

What it means is that if you are practicing Dharma out of the eight worldly Dharmas, this is not really Dharma practice at all and will not liberate you from afflictions.

Sherab Dorje said:

Hmmmm... seems to be a fine line we are drawing here. The eight worldly include the fear of suffering and the hope of happiness. Are you saying that what makes it definitive is the fact that it starts with the aim of overcoming the afflictive emotions, rather than the aim to overcome suffering? That overcoming suffering is a consequence, and not an aim?

Malcolm wrote:

First, the translation is a little off: it is not happiness and suffering, it is *bde ba* and *mi bde ba*. Here we can understand it is not *sukha* and *dukha*, but more like *sparsā* and *asparśa*, things we want to have contact with and things we want to avoid contact with.

The whole point of the Buddhist path is to attain permanent *sukha*, which is the absence of *dukha*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 31st, 2014 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Karma in Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, *tathāgatagarbha* was a minor school in India, and it was not taken up with any vigor by so called Yogacarins.

Vajrasvapna said:

The Buddha taught the teachings about no-self and emptiness as a antidote to the tendency of people to cling to a illusory conditioned self.

In the 3th turning teachings, the Buddha taught about a no-conditioned self, that is birthless, deathless and eternal.

Malcolm wrote:

No he didn't. The only place in sutra where a "third turning" is mentioned is the *Samdhinirmocana sūtra*, which has no mention of such an unconditioned self — the idea that Buddha taught such a self just Hinduism in drag.

The three turnings of the wheel are also mentioned by Maitreya in the *Sūtrālamkāra*, but he asserts they were all turned at the same time, not one here, then one there, then another one later on.

Though many generations of scholars in Tibet have concluded that the *tathāgatagarbha sūtras* are part of the "third turning" there is certainly no evidence in the Indian canon

that this is so at all. There are actually very, very few references to "a third turning". It has to do with the question of how the dependent nature shifts from being conditioned to being unconditioned [i.e. the absence of the imagined in the dependent is the perfected: see Mahāyānasamgraha by Asanga]. In short, there is an unresolved inner contradiction in the way the Yogacara three natures is presented that forces them to be a realist school.

Your statements do not make logical sense to me.

Blame Asanga.

buddha, from the root "buddh", to know, and "dha", absolute, infinite.

Some Tibetan lamas like that kind of logic. If you have in mind the teachings on interdependence, this etymological logic makes some sense.

It is complete nonsense. It cannot be defended in any way. The way most Tibetans etymologize "sangs rgyas" is that "sangs" means to cleanse or purify, additionally "sangs" also means to wake up; and rgyas means "to expand" or "fully". So it means to remove or cleanse afflictions and to expand wisdom, or more simply, "fully awaken".

Budh simply means to awaken; dha means that possessor of that, hence Buddha simply means "the one who has awakened".

Sorry if you were offended, but I tend to call things as I see them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 31st, 2014 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Anybody know what exactly is meant by the term ordinariness?

Thanks!

PS According to this quote any practice this is based in the hope of gaining happiness, or on the fear of continued suffering, is Black Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. "If any teaching you study, reflect upon, or expound becomes an effective remedy against your disturbing emotions..."

Here, there is a clear reference to afflictions. All suffering comes ultimately from afflictions.

What it means is that if you are practicing Dharma out of the eight worldly Dharmas, this is not really Dharma practice at all and will not liberate you from afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 31st, 2014 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra, dzogchen, & nibbana!

Content:

Christopherxx said:

Hi Malcom,

Can you elaborate a bit? I am sure there will be many people that will view this post either now in the present or in the future. Maybe some just for one moment of their Buddhist exposure. And who knows maybe a good description will help them in their path.

I am sure many will not go out and buy books, etc. So there is something to be said for giving an effort to help in a skillful way.

Your both obviously quite well read and intelligent. Time to share and help others with what you've been shared and helped with?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to receive teachings from a teacher who is qualified. Only then will you understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 31st, 2014 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra, dzogchen, & nibbana!

Content:

Christopherxx said:

So recently there has been a lot of information that seems to be going around the same area.

Ajahn Amaro has been describing nibbana as "Awareness" and that seems to be how a lot of masters describe dzogchen's rigpa with Buddhahood being omniscience applied to that?

Malcolm wrote:

It's really not the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Karma in Buddhism

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

Why you think that so? Could you give me any proof that what they says is wrong?

Malcolm wrote:

Just take this spurious etymology:

buddha, from the root "buddh", to know, and "dha", absolute, infinite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Karma in Buddhism

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

Now you are conflating the Tathāgatagarbha and Yogacara schools.

To me, without the Tathāgatagarbha teachings Buddhism become a nihilistic philosophy.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, tathāgatagarbha was a minor school in India, and it was not taken up with any vigor by so called Yogacarins.

In my perception, Yogacara is a psychological view of the teachings of Prajnaparamita, together with the teachings of Maitreya. It is not a contradiction of the teachings of Nagarjuna.

Yogacara is a realist school. Their position forces them to assert that jñāna is real.

The qualities of wisdom are also mere perception. Some people cling to that experience believing they are real, but they are like illusion also.

It has to do with the question of how the dependent nature shifts from being conditioned to being unconditioned [i.e. the absence of the imagined in the dependent is the perfected: see Mahāyānasamgraha by Asanga]. In short, there is an unresolved inner contradiction in the way the Yogacara three natures is presented that forces them to be a realist school.

In fact, you misunderstand what I said, let me explain more clearly: I said that the logical method used by Madhyamikas are not compatible with Dzogchen; but depending on how you interpret the different schools, they vision may or may not be compatible with Dzogchen.

It is not the method they are referring to; they are referring the conclusion.

The method of Dzogchen is the direct introduction to mind, one example is how Patrul Rinpoche was introduced by Do Khyentse Yeshe Dorje to the nature of his mind. And its language is similar to Yogacara. In same way, Mahamudra language is similar to Madhyamaka.

Mahāmudra and Dzogchen both make equal use of terminology from Yogacara. Your distinction is dubious at best.

Why you think that so? Could you give me any proof that what they says is wrong?

[/quote]

All kinds of things, from the fake Sanskrit equivalents they supply to incorrect translations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Anders said:

The certainty with which he pronounces his conclusion bears no correlation at all to the flimsiness of his argumentation.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps it is because his argument is so flimsy. Anyway, why would any regard Bronkhorst a greater authority on the Buddha's intent than Nāgārjuna?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The emptiness he taught is the emptiness of dependent origination.

dzogchungpa said:

From Bronkhorst's "Buddhist Teaching in India": The main conclusion to be drawn is that we are not likely to learn much about the teaching of the Buddha from the doctrine of conditioned origination. In its classical form it is not part of the original teaching of the Buddha.

Don't get mad.

Malcolm wrote:

He is presenting his opinion. I don't agree with his opinion. It is unfounded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anyway, as you and I have discussed before, I do not think that the various liberations bandied about by this and that school are even commensurate with one another. That is to say, I don't think non-Buddhists and so on are necessarily in the same mountain range as Buddhadharma, much less climbing the same mountain.

Anders said:

Clarifying assumptions of commensurability would probably go a long way in a lot of these comparative discussions.

I am curious as to how you square off such incommensurability with pronouncements like Samantabhadra claiming even the worldly paths as his vehicles.

Malcolm wrote:

Amazing, wielder of the vajra,
though my vehicles are inconceivable,
they are included in two categories:
samsara and nirvana.
Further, samasara is as follows:
false view and eternalist view.

And:

Likewise, the countless views of a self are included in two. Those are included in both the eternalist view and annihilationist view. Countless views of self come from those two. Likewise, son of a good family, because you have avoided entering a false path, I have summarized the views of a self and demonstrated them.

While the actual content of different non-buddhist vehicles is mistaken, one can understand that impulse to follow them is an impulse towards liberation from the same tantra:

[S]ince a person living in a nirmanakāya buddhafiield of a buddha has set lamps he sees a Buddha from the five lights of wisdom through a slight clairvoyance and experiences five fires.

But since they have no idea what they are experiencing:

He then prepares a log of sandalwood with sesame oil and sets five heaps of fire; and even burns his own body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The reason why I do not express doubt about whether there can be realization of the same ultimate truths by those who do not follow Buddhadharma is that if such people did have the same realization as the Buddha and his followers, they would teach exactly what Buddha and his followers taught, i.e. dependent origination, emptiness and so on.

dzogchungpa said:

So if you decided that the Buddha did not in fact teach emptiness, which I believe was actually your position at one point, then you would hold that his realization was necessarily inferior in some way?

Malcolm wrote:

I never held that Buddha did not teach emptiness. He clearly did teach emptiness even if you only accept Hinayāna sutras as being valid. The emptiness he taught is the emptiness of dependent origination. He also taught freedom from extremes in the

Hinayāna sutras even if the full ramifications of that were only fully explicated in the Prajñāpāramita.

Regardless of my past doubts about the authorship of Mahāyāna sūtras, I have always held them as being exemplars of Buddha's intention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

He taught according to the needs, desires and predispositions of his students. This included having many Hindu students in India right up until his poor health prevented travel.

Malcolm wrote:

Allow me to illustrate a point. For example, I studied Yoga and Samkhya with Ramaswami. If someone should ask me to teach a course on the Yoga Sutras, then I would. I would present its point of view to those students who were interested in it.

When pressed, would I claim that I followed the version of liberation presented in that text? No, of course not, no more than Ramaswami, when pressed, admitted that he was an Advaitan, even though his guru, Krishnamācarya was a Vaiśnava in the Ramanuja tradition (Viśtādvaita).

If I am teachings Ayurveda, I teach Samkhya; when teaching Tibetan Medicine, I teach Buddhadharma. I think that the latter is more profound than the former. But Samkhya has its uses, even if its ultimate view is a problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no awakening outside of Buddhadharma. The best we can hope for those following the yānas of devas and humans is a higher rebirth and eventual contact with the Buddhadharma.

Karma Dorje said:

If there is one thing you like to do, it is to make sweeping and emphatic claims. After watching several of your volte-face, I can't help but wonder why you don't take a more aporetic stance.

However, you have your disposition and I have mine. As I said, there is precious little

chance of either of us convincing the other of our respective positions.

Malcolm wrote:

There were some things which I hold as deep convictions: dependent origination, emptiness, rebirth and karma. I also deeply hold the conviction that apart from the Buddha and his followers, liberation as understood and taught by the Buddha is not achievable outside of his path. You can examine my posts for the past 20 years, and you will see that I never vary from these points. People like to make a big deal out of some superficial "volte faces" I have shared with you all, but in reality the core of what I understand to be unique about Buddhадharma has not changed in 20 years and will not change since it arises out of my experience of the teachings, as an examination of my posts will show.

The reason why I do not express doubt about whether there can be realization of the same ultimate truths by those who do not follow Buddhадharma is that if such people did have the same realization as the Buddha and his followers, they would teach exactly what Buddha and his followers taught, i.e. dependent origination, emptiness and so on. Since they don't teach Buddhадharma, I question the claim that they have realized what the Buddha realized. I don't think there has ever been anyone on this globe who has ever had realization superior to the Buddha's total perfect awakening, not in any Hindu sects, not in any Jain sects, much less traditional Chinese religion, Islam, Christianity, or Judaism. I do not think they even have partial realization.

Of course there is mundane wisdom in all of these non-Buddhist traditions, no one denies that. But when it comes right down to realizing the nature of reality, as the Rig pa rang shar points out:

As such, also the three hundred and sixty views can be gathered into four categories.

Further those can be included in eternalism and annihilationism.

Those also can be included in meaningless nihilism.

This is the extent of the worldly views.

and:

Likewise, the countless views of a self are included in two. Those are included in both the eternalist view and annihilationist view. Countless views of self come from those two.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

monktastic said:

I'll share a crazy idea.

If a tradition claims that realization simply cannot be had without a connection to its

lineage, then perhaps those who were destined to attain a little realization anyway will not be bothered by this claim that seemingly contradicts their own experience.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the claim that is being advanced. The claim that is being advanced is that Dzogchen refers to the result brought about through a specific path, the Dzogchen path. Mahamudra is a path brought about through its path [principally the two stages]; and Prajñāpāramita through its path [the six perfections].

These three results may be the same in essence, but the reason for the difference in name is that the paths used to reach this result are different.

On the other hand, Buddhism does claim that outside its purview there is no liberation at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...those modern perverts who think that Buddha taught a self and what pertains to a self...

dzogchungpa said:

Such as?

Malcolm wrote:

Its a pretty inclusive statement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Absolutely *any* symbol system can be used by a realized teacher to wake their students up.

Nonsense. You have absolutely no evidence that this is the case. In order to prove this, you would have to produce someone who achieved at minimum stream entry through a non-Buddhist "symbol system". Such a person never existed.

In whatsoever Dhamma and Discipline, Subhadda, there is not found the Noble Eightfold Path, neither is there found a true ascetic of the first, second, third, or fourth degree of saintliness. But in whatsoever Dhamma and Discipline there is found the

Noble Eightfold Path, there is found a true ascetic of the first, second, third, and fourth degrees of saintliness.
Mahāparinibbana sutta.

The Buddha repeated this statement many times in earlier sutras.
Right view proceeding from yogi pratyakṣa can inform any approach.
How are you defining yogic pratyakṣa?

As I have said repeatedly, Buddhist dharma is more explicit and has more methods than any other system I have seen/practiced. However, not everyone has a karmic connection to it. If we can use the traces of sentient beings to hook them into their own awakening, we should. This is the point of infusing other systems with the energy of practice and realization.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no awakening outside of Buddhadharma. The best we can hope for those following the yānas of devas and humans is a higher rebirth and eventual contact with the Buddhadharma.

Does this mean we should stop teaching Yoga Sutras, etc.? No, of course not. But after a certain point it has to become clear to any practitioner where they have confidence and faith. If someone is really a Shaivaites, Vaishnava or even a follower of Franklin Jones, what need would they have to follow Buddhadharma? They've chosen their refuge. It is not our job to change that. But we should not, in a rush to ecumenicism, erase the distinction between Buddhadharma and Sanatanadharma. They do not point to the same reality, they do not have the same assumptions about karma, rebirth and liberation, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

That's not the general Hindu view, if one can even say such a thing exists with the plethora of viewpoints comprised under the rubric "Hindu". Vicara is not intellectualization.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, provide your account of what liberation is in Hinduism as you understand it, and how it is attained. Then we will stack it up against what the Buddha taught and see how it measures up.

One of the difficulties here of course is that even the Buddhist idea of what constitutes rebirth is complete different than the Hindu idea. Ideas about whether karma are also totally different. The notion of a self of course has to be addressed, since this concept is refuted in Buddhadharma (apart from those modern perverts who think that Buddha taught a self and what pertains to a self), and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

conebeckham said:

...and there are some Buddhists, apparently, who think the intellect is sufficient for an experiential understanding of emptiness.

Just sayin'...

Malcolm wrote:

The point of course is that in Dharma, a correct conceptual understanding of emptiness is required to realize emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Some people think realization can come about through meditation alone [this is the Hindu view in general].

dzogchungpa said:

Really? That's the Hindu view in general? Did you take a survey or something?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there are some Advaitans who think you can just intellectualize your way to liberation...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

"All authority of any kind, especially in the field of thought and understanding, is the most destructive, evil thing. Leaders destroy the followers and followers destroy the leaders."

Paul said:

That's dumb. These are not 'destructive, evil' people...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the poor guy has no idea what he is waffling on about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Ivo said:

The Dharmapalas can not be made to act on behalf of selfish intentions, but they will respond to someone with pure samaya who has legitimate concerns, even if this practitioner is still a samsaric being (and thus have a mixed motivation). If that was not the case, then only Buddhas would have been able to invoke them (absurd), and there would have been no point in any dharmapala practices, actually. The motivation of a practitioner on the path is always flawed, since there is still samsaric vision. But the intention to subdue gross violence through wrathful means is a legitimate one in Vajrayana, especially when we are requesting the Dharmapalas for help and not trying to liberate beings ourselves without the proper capacity or qualifications.

Malcolm is right that Dza Rahula should be invoked by all means necessary. As for wrathful yidam practices, these will work only if those doing them are qualified. I have my doubts that requesting a monastery to do that could be effective. At this point in time there are not many such practitioners, H.H. Sakya Trisin is certainly one of them, Chatral Rinpoche most definitely. Making a formal request to Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche about this however is the easiest option, IMHO, although I am pretty sure that he is already doing something about it. A real master performing Kilaya lower activity or something similar can do more than a thousand monastics mumbling mantras and waiting for the tea break.

My personal opinion is that ISIS is a very valid threat to the Dharma, in every possible sense. However this should not be an "us vs. them" situation, although I admit that it can very easily become just that. That's why there is a lot of merit in Greg's posts too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

What we are talking about is whether realization is possible without having the specific conceptual frameworks of Buddhist dharma. I think that Buddhism provides a particularly clear conceptual framework and corpus of methods to discover the natural state. However, I don't believe those conceptual frameworks to deal with our confusion are of themselves a necessary precursor to realization.

You are free to choose whose opinions you value. I will continue to follow the words of my guru, as they accord with my experience after putting them into practice. Anyway, I know there is little chance of common ground on this issue at this time.

Malcolm wrote:

Your Guru was a Buddhist monk correct? A Nyingmapa correct? Someone who spent some time as a Hindu renunciate and then moved on to become a Buddhist practitioner?

This is hardly a ringing endorsement for your view that liberation, freedom from rebirth in samsara, is something your teacher held was possible outside of Buddhadharma.

Some people think realization can come about through meditation alone [this is the Hindu view in general]. But this is definitely not the Buddha's teaching. The Buddha's teaching is that view informs meditation.

Right view is at the head of the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

“All authority of any kind, especially in the field of thought and understanding, is the most destructive, evil thing. Leaders destroy the followers and followers destroy the leaders. You have to be your own teacher and your own disciple. You have to question everything that man has accepted as valuable, as necessary. [...] To be free of all authority, of your own and that of another, is to die to everything of yesterday, so that your mind is always fresh, always young, innocent, full of vigor and passion. It is only in that state that one learns and observes. And for this a great deal of awareness is required, actual awareness of what is going on inside yourself, without correcting it or telling it what it should or should not be, because the moment you correct it you have established another authority, a censor.”

— J. Krishnamurti

Malcolm wrote:

Krishnamurti is not an authority on Dzogchen, or even Buddhadharma. His opinion is completely irrelevant to the topic at hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Karma in Buddhism

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

I believe Tibetan interpretation of Yogacara is incorrect...

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a Tibetan interpretation. It is the presentation of Yogacara which is found in the

Yogacara section of the Tarkajvala of Bhavya.

Vajrasvapna said:

Khenchen Palden Sherab Rinpoche and Khenpo Tsewang Dongyal Rinpoche also have similar view with my "As Mipham Rinpoche states, to believe that tathagatagarbha is a substantially existent thing would contradict the teachings of both Nagarjuna and the Prajnaparamita Sutras. From Mipham's perspective, there is no contradiction between tathagatagarbha and Nagarjuna's teachings

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are conflating the Tathāgatagarbha and Yogacara schools.

Vajrasvapna said:

nor is there any contradiction between the teachings of Asanga and Nagarjuna; nor is there a contradiction between Rangtong and Shentong schools of thought.

Malcolm wrote:

Karl B identifies two kinds of presentations of the three natures. The one presented by Bhavya he terms type 1. The one presented in gzhan stong and in a couple of very late Indian texts he labels type 2. He admits that all the so called classical Yogachara authors, Asanga, Vasubandhu, etc., use the type 1 scheme.

Vajrasvapna said:

In my perception, Yogacara is a psychological view of the teachings of Prajnaparamita, together with the teachings of Maitreya. It is not a contradiction of the teachings of Nagarjuna.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara is a realist school. Their position forces them to assert that jñāna is real.

Vajrasvapna said:

It is curious that despite the Tibetans claim that prasangika represent the view of Dzogchen, Manjusrimitra states that logic is not really satisfactory:

Malcolm wrote:

You are not really understanding what it is about "Prasanga" that Longchenpa, for example, claims to be consistent with Dzogchen. It is not that the means of analysis that is the same, it is the conclusion, i.e., freedom from extremes.

Vajrasvapna said:

Some writers, like Namkhai Norbu, say Manjusrimitra was a scholar of Yogacara and so he used the terminology of this school to explain Dzogchen. I found no Manjusrimitra's

biography, except this

one: <http://www.dharmafellowship.org/biographies/historicalsaints/manjusrimitra.htm>.

It says he was not a scholar of Yogacara, but an anti-Yogacara: "The Mahapandit Manjusrimitra represented the classical, scholastic tradition of Madhyamaka. He was the uncontested head of the great monastic University of Nalanda, and thus representative of a long historical scholarly line that considered itself the pinnacle of orthodoxy. He viewed anything to do with Yogacara as a false doctrine". If true, then it makes nonsense to say that he was just using the term from a school that he advocated earlier.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything on that website should be viewed with suspicion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

Transmission may be necessary, but the cult of the guru is sorely mistaken in assuming that their preferred methodology is the only viable mode of transmission for attaining the Way, or Great Perfection.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen tradition itself asserts a Guru is necessary:

The virtuous mentor is like a precious jewel which produces everything.

— Soaring Great Garuda

Without an authentic master, like the scripture of a monkey, the basis and path will be erroneous, indeed one will be seized by conceptuality.

Therefore, like applying ferrous sulfate to gold, the precious master should be paid with a gem of inestimable value.

— The Inner Potentiality

The commentary to this runs:

For example, like applying ferrous sulfate to gold, a guru obtains the empowerment and agamas of the authentic lineage. The guru moistened by the experience of realization and who is diligent in the meaning possesses the qualities that are praised in the collections of the teachings. If one should meet a guru who is devoted to compassion and is diligent with teaching, he should be seen as teacher who is a great treasure. Make a request that corresponds with the collection of the teachings and please him with a positive attitude. Request the teachings, and thoroughly ascertain the view. One must understand the deviations and obscurations from beginning to end, and one must comprehend what is the point of the meaning.

It is thus axiomatic that in order to practice Dzogchen, one must find a qualified guru and follow that person until one has realized the goals of the path. There is really

nothing to discuss with regard to this. People who express opinions contrary to what is stated in the tantras and agamas of Dzogchen about the absolute necessity of following a qualified master are merely expressing their ignorance. By persisting in such opinions, they merely widen the gulf between themselves and the possibility of finding such a qualified master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Now in turn, unless you can assure us that in fact you are speaking from detailed knowledge of having experienced and realized both paths, how can your perspective be anything other than a speculation based on your own suppositions or someone else's opinion?

Karma Dorje said:

Actually, relying on the words of an enlightened guru is not merely someone else's opinion-- it is buddhavacana.

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, someone else's opinion. Further, a guru's words are only buddhavacana to the extent that they correspond with the Dharma, as Sakya Pandita makes very clear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I am not saying it appears similar on first glance. I am saying that after years of practicing advaita vedanta and Shakta tantra with a guru, it's clear to me that there is little substantive difference between the resultant contemplations while the symbologies can diverge widely. Equally, it is clear that there are considerably more methods to work with in Buddhist dharma and it is in general more direct.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the contemplations that are important, it is the view brought to contemplation that makes the difference. For example, there is no actual difference between the Hindu Nirvikalpa samadhi and Vajropama samadhi in terms of its content, but the fact that one is accompanied by insight and the other is not makes the difference between whether it is mundane or liberative.

Karma Dorje said:

Have you experienced the Hindu nirvikalpa or sahaja samadhi and compared the two or are you speculating based on texts?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not speculating, I am reporting what it is stated in the authoritative texts of the Buddhist tradition. Now, you may not feel that these texts are authoritative, but for me they are and that is the end of it.

When we talk about "insight" we are talking very specifically about the Buddha's experience of Vajropama samadhi and what he reports and teaches. This kind of non-conceptual samadhi, the samadhi of cessation merely creates causes for rebirth in this or that loka, like all mundane samadhis and dhyanas unless one has attained the path of seeing.

Now in turn, unless you can assure us that in fact you are speaking from detailed knowledge of having experienced and realized both paths, how can your perspective be anything other than a speculation based on your own suppositions or someone else's opinion?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the contemplations that are important, it is the view brought to contemplation that makes the difference

dzogchungpa said:

How do you know that?

Malcolm wrote:

buddha said so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I am not saying it appears similar on first glance. I am saying that after years of practicing advaita vedanta and Shakta tantra with a guru, it's clear to me that there is little substantive difference between the resultant contemplations while the symbologies can diverge widely. Equally, it is clear that there are considerably more

methods to work with in Buddhist dharma and it is in general more direct.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the contemplations that are important, it is the view brought to contemplation that makes the difference. For example, there is no actual difference between the Hindu Nirvikalpa samadhi and Vajropama samadhi in terms of its content, but the fact that one is accompanied by insight and the other is not makes the difference between whether it is mundane or liberative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Anders said:

In either case, the territory is your own mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily so. Take Samkhya for example. Your own mind [manas] is regarded as being inert and non-sentient. The whole Buddhist project, according to a Yoga-Samkhya perspective is just involvement in prakṛiti, at the expense of realizing puruṣa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and I don't agree since this assumes that one cannot examine a map to understand the layout of two distinct geographical regions.

Karma Dorje said:

Except that in this case you are talking about two maps that use different landmarks to portray a single territory, not a single map of two regions. Unless one has actually walked the terrain by both routes, it seems pointless to me to merely use one map to invalidate the other. But this is obviously not a discussion that we can resolve one way or another.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't think I agree, the basis and result posited are different, despite that what may at first glance appear to similar terrain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ajātivāda was borrowed from Mahāyāna into Advaita by Gaudapada.

But since it is not grounded in dependent origination, even Gaudapada's presentation misses the point.

Anyway, as you and I have discussed before, I do not think that the various liberations bandied about by this and that school are even commensurate with one another. That is to say, I don't think non-Buddhists and so on are necessarily in the same mountain range as Buddhādharma, much less climbing the same mountain.

Karma Dorje said:

Yes, it all hinges on how much the ideas about liberation matter compared with the realization that arises from contemplation. From what my guru taught and what I have seen in my own experience, the conceptual structures really don't need to be compared with a view to a single correct doctrinal viewpoint, as correct doctrine for each being is a factor of his or her own traces and predisposition.

I think one needs to receive the Mahāvākyas from a lineage teacher and practice them to realization before one can comment on their topography relative to Buddhist dharma. I don't think that treating Advaita strictly as an intellectual position is of much use.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and I don't agree since this assumes that one cannot examine a map to understand the layout of two distinct geographical regions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: A small victory, still more questions than answers

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

You finished the full 111,111 repetitions of the 100 syllable mantra?

Challenge23 said:

My teacher stated that he only wanted 100,000 but other than that, yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Considering that you have had countless past lifetimes, it is a bit much to expect that 100,000 mantras is going to remove the negativity of all of that. However, there are specific signs of accomplishing the practice. If you have those signs, then you have really accomplished the goals of the practice. Counting a number is really not the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Sönam said:

As far as Buddha's teaching is about cessation of suffering, it is the only dharma doing so ... and it cannot be compared to any other dharma. Doing so is a fallacy.

Karma Dorje said:

I think much too much is made of doctrine. Any symbol system can be used by a siddha to wake people up, including Christianity. It's just that some are more direct than others and some (like Christianity) put a lot of unnecessary doctrinal obstacles in the way.

It is certainly not a fallacy to compare Buddhist dharma with other very similar systems like ajātivāda advaita vedanta, or better yet to practice either or both. Everyone likes to think they have a monopoly on Truth. It creates a lot of unnecessary division.

Malcolm wrote:

Ajātivāda was borrowed from Mahdyamaka into Advaita by Gaudapada.

But since it is not grounded in dependent origination, even Gaudapada's presentation misses the point.

Anyway, as you and I have discussed before, I do not think that the various liberations bandied about by this and that school are even commensurate with one another. That is to say, I don't think non-Buddhists and so on are necessarily in the same mountain range as Buddhadharma, much less climbing the same mountain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: 13 Bhumi model?

Content:

zenman said:

Which school uses the 13 bhumi model? Any good sources/books on this?

Malcolm wrote:

It comes from the mother tantras. In general the path section of Kongtrul's Buddhist Encyclopedia should have something on it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Dan74 said:

OK, for me this thread was about using non-Buddhist methods in with Buddhist methods, not following two religions. I gave some examples of folks who did follow Buddhism as well as Christianity and it might be worth giving them a look, but this is not something I identify with, nor have I given it any attention so far.

Malcolm wrote:

It is axiomatically impossible to be both a Christian, in the sense of accepting Jesus as your lord and savior, and a Buddhist.

Dan74 said:

On the other hand, what I've said in this thread is simply that various aspects of other traditions (and for that matter psychology, etc) can be helpful on our path to liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

For example?

Dan74 said:

Whether or not one attends the mass, taking to heart Jesus's teachings and being inspired by his example, is following aspects of Christianity, though one may not call oneself a Christian, nor accept Jesus as lord and saviour.

Malcolm wrote:

That's a stretch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Will said:

Concord paraphrased: What I question is whether such a teacher or guide would necessarily have to be flesh and blood?

Paul said:

Interestingly, in the Zhang Zhung Nyengyud lineage, the first master of the lineage was a deva called Lhabon Yongsu Dagpa and the second was a naga, Lubon Banam. Everyone after that was a human.

Malcolm wrote:

well, depending on how the lineage is counted, also prior to Dzogchen spreading in human dimensions, there were vidyādhara for the nāgas and so on as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The only people who disagree that Dzogchen is the most direct path are people who honestly have no idea what Dzogchen is.

dzogchungpa said:

What do you mean by direct in this context?

Malcolm wrote:

immediate, direct, personal experience of your real state, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Will said:

Concord paraphrased: What I question is whether such a teacher or guide would necessarily have to be flesh and blood?

No, but the realms of the non-physical are chock full of bad entities that delight in impersonating Sages and great Gurus. An 'ordinary' human guru has a lineage and disciples that can attest to his qualifications, in addition to your own impressions. The non-physical 'guide' has only your unenlightened self and the assertions from it to help you appraise him.

Malcolm wrote:

This is based upon the fact that ordinary people can only interact on the nirmanakāya level. Therefore, coarse physical contact with a human guru is a necessity for all of us who were not born high bodhisattvas on the stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

LastLegend said:

Dzogchen has a unique way to access it?

Jikan said:

This one.

Dharmakaya is Dharmakaya, realization is realization in whatever school you might practice in.

Dzogchenpas claim that the difference is in the time it takes someone to realize it by

different means (Dzogchen being the fastest). And yes, different schools disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

The only people who disagree that Dzogchen is the most direct path are people who honestly have no idea what Dzogchen is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Jikan said:

"Buddhahood is the goal" is the theme in common between Ekayana teachings and Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, Tibetan Buddhism has a whole subscribes the Ekayāna ideal since there is but one result to attain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Keeping Precepts your experience

Content:

duckfiasco said:

Precepts are very difficult for some people.

Malcolm wrote:

Most people can refrain from taking life, lying and stealing.

Sexual misconduct and drinking alcohol, that is a little harder.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Sadhana of Mahamudra (Trungpa)

Content:

Jikan said:

Some time ago I paid a visit to a local Shambhala center, and joined in the practice of the Sadhana of Mahamudra. There was a brief instruction prior. It seems to me that there's a lot going on in this sadhana that no introduction can cover. I'd like to understand this practice better so that next time I have the opportunity to join in, I'll be able to participate more fully.

Does anyone have any audio materials available on this practice that are unrestricted

they may wish to make available to me?

Many thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

It's an anuyoga Hūṃ sgrub. Apart from details, that is the main point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Konch said:

Well.. According to Dzogchen history if Im not mistaken, Garab Dorje first received the dzogchen teachings not from a human teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje was a nirmanakāya, awakened from birth.

Konch said:

Dudjom Lingpa also comes to mind in this case due to the colourful nature in which he received the dzogchen teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Lingpa has many gurus when he was young.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

My personal conviction is that no single tradition, school, lineage, or method may lay claim to an exclusive monopoly on the Great Perfection.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is the name of the result of a specific path, just as Prajñāpāramita is the name of the result of a different specific path, and Mahāmudra the name of the result of yet another path.

If you want to realize Buddhahood under the name of Dzogchen, you need to receive teachings on it and practice that path. Dzogchen is something very specific and very precise and the instructions to realize its path is not found in other schools. It is not a question of whether the Buddhahood in Dzogchen is the same or different than

Buddhahood realized in sutra or tantra, it isn't. But the path is quite different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point greg, is that you entered the thread with a patronizing:

Sherab Dorje said:

Instead of looking to subjugate the negativity of others, one would probably be better off in trying to overcome their own mental poisons.

Really? And here is me thinking that was the whole point of Mahayana Buddhist practice: identifying and dealing with ones own flaws. Then, we spent three pages trying to keep the page on topic.

Checking ones motivation before engaging in (especially wrathful subjugation) practices is not off-topic in the slightest.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Greg, we were discussing a Vajrayāna practice.

Edited out personal remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

The myriad things surely cannot be exhausted by books and humans alone?

Malcolm wrote:

"gcig shes kun grol"

Knowing one thing liberates all things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your point was irrelevant, actually.

Sherab Dorje said:

I'm not interested in having to wring complete answers out of you Malcolm. The show is all yours.

Malcolm wrote:

The point greg, is that you entered the thread with a patronizing:

Sherab Dorje said:

Instead of looking to subjugate the negativity of others, one would probably be better off in trying to overcome their own mental poisons.

Malcolm wrote:

Then, we spent three pages trying to keep the page on topic.

Edited out personal remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Yes, well, I think I'm about finished here.

Mkoll said:

Maybe if you were arguing in a different sub-forum, you'd have a good case. But coming from a relatively less biased observer (less biased since I don't practice Tibetan Buddhism though that also means more ignorant of it), it seems as though Malcolm's list confirms the opposing argument.

Sherab Dorje said:

Even if one has the qualities in the list then... But STILL one needs the correct motivation on behalf of the practitioner. Somebody may qualify based on the listed qualities, but I may "target" them because their dog crapped on my lawn rather than... in which case...

I fail to see how my reasoning is incorrect and instead of answers I am given smoke screens, so I'm finished here, mainly coz there is nothing left to learn.

Malcolm wrote:

Your point was irrelevant, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

Do you deem it absolutely necessary to establish a direct relationship with a living guru of explicitly human form in order to engage the Way of Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. You cannot receive transmission from a book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

irrelevancies snipped

Malcolm wrote:

I disagree with your assumptions about people's motivations. But usual, you must have some magic crystal you examine which allows you to know with certainty what other people are thinking.

Sherab Dorje said:

Yes,well, I already explained my hypothesis, but you did not answer my question. The question is (maybe I didn't phrase it clearly): Do you believe that ego-centred motivation destroys the efficacy of a practice?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what you mean by "ego-centered".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

irrelevancies snipped

Malcolm wrote:

I disagree with your assumptions about people's motivations.

Edited out personal remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

ngodrup said:

Therefore, the original post is reasonable.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, of course it is.

ngodrup said:
Every day at dusk, without fail, Jamdrak would perform a short subjugation ritual and throw a torma-an offering cake, which symbolized a weapon-toward the east.

"Rinpoche, why do you do this every day?" Jokiyab asked him.
"Oh dear!" the master explained. "From a country in the east, an evil force will rise up. It will utterly and completely destroy the Buddha's teachings in this snowy land of Tibet and leave the country in pitch-black darkness. This force cannot be stopped, but merely trying to stop it brings more benefit than if I were to chant the ritual for the peaceful and wrathful deities one hundred times and light ten thousand butter lamps. When I throw this torma, I imagine hitting the demon square in the head. It won't help, though; no one can repel this demon. Nevertheless, simply by trying, I will accumulate great merit and purify obscurations on the path to enlightenment."

Malcolm wrote:
— Blazing Splendor, pg. 178

We already know from the Kalacakra that at some point the mlecchas will take over the most of the world. Then we know what happens when Rudracakravartin magically defeats them in 2430.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 1:41 AM
Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
You may believe as you wish.

Sherab Dorje said:
There are two separate points being made here, which one are you responding to?

Malcolm wrote:
Both.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I mean they (Christians) are continuing their mission of trying to destroy Islam in Afghanistan and Iraq, for example, and are currently re-establishing their mission to destroy Judaism in Europe (again). Actually the Jews had an infinitely better time under the rule of the Muslim Ottoman Empire than they ever did under a Christian Empire. But this is an aside, since they are not attacking Buddhists I shouldn't care right?

Malcolm wrote:

You can care if you choose to, but such people are not included in the zhing bcu tshang ba'i bstan dgra, so it would be inappropriate to apply wrathful rites to such people. What is a zhing bcu tshang ba'i bstan dgra, an enemy of the doctrine in whom ten domains are complete? They are someone who would

- 1) Harm the teachings
- 2) Despise the Three Jewels, Buddha, Dharma and Sangha
- 3) Plunder the Sangha
- 4) Despise Mahāyāna
- 5) Harm the person of the Guru.
- 6) Attack Vajra siblings
- 7) Cause obstacles in practice
- 8) Has total lack of love and compassion
- 9) Lacks samaya
- 10 Has false views about the result of karma.

I think it is fair to say that the extremists in IS fit the bill. It's not about Islam per se. It is about these kinds of people in general no matter what tirthika religious group they belong to. That worldly protector some Gelugpas are fond of also fits the bill for such wrathful actions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ordinary aggressors simply do not warrant such rites since they are no threat to the Dharma.

Sherab Dorje said:

All ignorant aggression is a threat to Dharma. An attack on any sentient being, is an attack on that beings enlightened nature. An attack on the Triple Gem.

Malcolm wrote:

Greg, the requisites for being considered a subject worthy of being the object of a wrathful rite are pretty specific. Attacking an ant mound just does not qualify that anteater for being the object of such a rite.

Further, the point is that such rites, conducted by people such as H Sakya Trizin and so on, have the power to liberate the consciousness of those demonic beings into the dharmadhātu. This is why we have so many such rites in Tibetan Buddhism in all four schools. They are not there merely for their symbolic value.

Sherab Dorje said:

Again though, what people are failing to see, and what I have been talking about from the very beginning, is that with an ego-centred motivation (and here you were just trying to justify an ego-centred motivation by camouflaging it with the term Dharma) the protector practice is bound to fail.

Malcolm wrote:

You may believe as you wish.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Please note: if people do not want this thread to end up locked and deleted (like almost every thread that even remotely touches on the subject of Islam) due to sweeping Islamophobic prejudicial remarks then they would do well to refrain from them.

Malcolm wrote:

While Muslims are not ipso facto bad people (quite the contrary), it must be recognized that Buddhism and Islam can barely coexist on the same planet — not because of Buddhist intolerance, but because of the systematic Islamic intolerance of other religions, specially the Salafis. The Saudis have been exporting Salafism for years.

Please keep in mind that Muslims wiped Persia clean of Zoroastrians within the space of 250 years, systematically forcing conversions and so on.

"Allah commanded us, by the mouth of His Prophet, to extend the dominion of Islam over all nations."

— History of the Parsis: including their manners, customs, religion, pg. 15; Dosabhai Framji Karaka, 1884.

Thus far, I see nothing to indicate that this fundamental mission statement has changed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

IS has threatened to destroy a major Buddhist heritage site. They are self-proclaimed enemies of Dharma.

Ukrainian and Israeli nationalists have declared no such program, therefore, there is no reason to petition Dharmapalas to defeat them.

Sherab Dorje said:

Exactly. So because some here see it as a personal threat to their illusory sense of self, they react panic stricken wanting to lash out at a perceived enemy, but since the others (Ukrainian and Israeli nationalists) are not a personal threat, they don't care: self-centred egotistical motivation.

Malcolm wrote:

Threatening the Dharma threatens all sentient beings since the Dharma is the only source of refuge in samsara. Sponsoring wrathful pujas to counter the power of demonic human beings bent on destroying the Dharma is nothing but compassionate and benefits all sentient beings, including the demonic humans who are the object of such pujas.

Ordinary aggressors simply do not warrant such rites since they are no threat to the Dharma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Vajradhara-title

Content:

zenman said:

What is the meaning of the title Vajradhara as in Vajradhara Chogyam Trungpa? Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

It is Vidyādhara and it means "bearer of knowledge".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

IS has threatened to destroy a major Buddhist heritage site. They are self-proclaimed enemies of Dharma.

Ukranian and Israeli nationalists have declared no such program, therefore, there is no reason to petition Dharmapalas to defeat them.

Will said:

What about many Muslims being active now in destroying, opposing and being hostile to Buddhism everywhere? Why confine the Dharmapalas work to just one group?

Jikan said:

I've found the Muslims in my neighborhood and workplace to be supportive of my Buddhist activities--quite the opposite of destroying, opposing, and being hostile to them. The only opposition I've had has been from the most conservative corners of the "megachurch" movement, and from (weirdly enough!) the author of a recent book on "contemplative pedagogy." not sure what that was about.

I bring it up because it's important to be very careful indeed with the blanket generalizations.

Malcolm wrote:

I would imagine Will was talking about Talibans in Afghanistan and so on. But nevertheless, we will always be kaffirs...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 26th, 2014 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

IS has threatened to destroy a major Buddhist heritage site. They are self-proclaimed enemies of Dharma.

Ukranian and Israeli nationalists have declared no such program, therefore, there is no reason to petition Dharmapalas to defeat them.

Will said:

What about many Muslims being active now in destroying, opposing and being hostile to Buddhism everywhere? Why confine the Dharmapalas work to just one group?

Malcolm wrote:

They are under surveillance

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 26th, 2014 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And that is why the wrathful practices will fail, because (in this case) they are motivated by selfish egotistical concern. By hope and fear. That is why you don't hear anybody asking for practices to overcome the slaughter of innocent Palestinians, or the genocidal actions of Ukrainian nationalists, etc... because they don't feel that these are a threat to their own personal well-being. Well, sorry to be the one to inform you but protectors are not in the business of fortifying ego.

Malcolm wrote:

IS has threatened to destroy a major Buddhist heritage site. They are self-proclaimed enemies of Dharma.

Ukrainian and Israeli nationalists have declared no such program, therefore, there is no reason to petition Dharmapalas to defeat them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 26th, 2014 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

aparajita said:

So, moving right along, does anyone have any suggestions about who might be most effective in performing these practices?

Malcolm wrote:

HH Sakya Trizen, Chatral Sangye Dorje, HH Taklung Tsetrul, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 26th, 2014 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

aparajita said:

I've been thinking of starting a gofundme to raise funds for sponsoring 1,000,000 Dorje Drollo mantras (or maybe Guru Drakphur,) 1,000,000 Vajrakilaya mantras, and 1,000,000 Singhamukha mantras (with the appropriate number of activity mantras too), and a large number of protector offerings. Maybe Palden Lhamo? I'm just guessing here, but it seems like the mamos would be particularly effective in dealing with people who follow a harsh, paternalistic religion (maybe?).

Malcolm wrote:

Not Magzorma, rather Rahula is the appropriate dharmapala for this purpose.

aparajita said:

I'm curious as to why. PM me if that's a better option than replying on here.

Malcolm wrote:

Because Rahula is the Dharmapala for destroying enemies of the Dharma, and IS certainly fits the bill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 7:20 PM

Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL

Content:

aparajita said:

I've been thinking of starting a gofundme to raise funds for sponsoring 1,000,000 Dorje Drollo mantras (or maybe Guru Drakphur,) 1,000,000 Vajrakilaya mantras, and 1,000,000 Singhamukha mantras (with the appropriate number of activity mantras too), and a large number of protector offerings. Maybe Palden Lhamo? I'm just guessing here, but it seems like the mamos would be particularly effective in dealing with people who follow a harsh, paternalistic religion (maybe?).

Malcolm wrote:

Not Magzorma, rather Rahula is the appropriate dharmapala for this purpose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: Dual citizenship

Content:

Seishin said:

I think that is a bit of confusion with terminology. UK does allow dual nationality (my wife and several friends and family members have dual nationality). A "British Subject" isn't the same as "British citizen" https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_subject " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Gassho,

Seishin

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Dual citizenship

Content:

kirtu said:

Not so. The US went all in on dual citizenship in the late 70's. Many nations permit dual citizenship like those weaklings the UK, Sweden, France and Switzerland. Ironically Holland and Germany stepped back from dual citizenship during the 70's although Germany now permits some forms of dual citizenship (technically Holland does too again but it's more restricted certainly than Germany or the US). The weak/strong country concept you are advancing is nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:

The UK does not permit you to be a dual citizen. They simply don't recognize that you have abandoned your citizenship unless you make a specific declaration to a British authority even if you for example renounced your allegiance to Britain by becoming a US citizen.

kirtu said:

That's not what the Her Majesty's

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/261499/bn18.pdf says:

THE LAW IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

1. A person is a dual national if he or she holds more than one nationality or citizenship at the same time. There are normally no restrictions, in United Kingdom law, on British nationals having the citizenship of one or more other countries as well. So you will not need to give up any other nationality if you become British (but see paragraphs 2 - 4 below). Similarly, if you are a British national and you acquire another nationality, you will not normally lose your British nationality. However, special rules apply to British protected persons and certain British subjects (see Note 1).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Note one says:

If you are a British subject, you will lose that status automatically if you acquire any other nationality or citizenship (unless you are a British subject by connection with Ireland). If you are a British protected person, you will lose that status on acquiring any other nationality or citizenship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Dual citizenship

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

The U.S. allows her citizens to have dual-citizenship (if they so choose) with about 60 different nations:

Mkoll said:

I've heard that a US citizen who leaves still has to pay taxes to the US gov't, no matter where one goes. Is that true?

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. They have to pay taxes to the US when their income in that foreign country exceeds a certain amount, which is fairly high.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Dual citizenship

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

The U.S. allows her citizens to have dual-citizenship (if they so choose) with about 60 different nations:

<http://www.immihelp.com/citizenship/dual-citizenship-recognize-countries.html> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I knew about Israel because I have some family members that have done that, but didn't know that Iran was allowed.

Malcolm wrote:

sort of, this is what the State Department says:

Also, a person who is automatically granted another nationality does not risk losing U.S. nationality. However, a person who acquires a foreign nationality by applying for it may lose U.S. nationality. In order to lose U.S. nationality, the law requires that the person must apply for the foreign nationality voluntarily, by free choice, and with the intention to give up U.S. nationality.

So in a case where another state grants one citizenship through marriage and so on, one can be a "dual citizen", but the website also stipulates that such a person when traveling must enter and leave using their US passport.

It also says:

The U.S. Government recognizes that dual nationality exists but does not encourage it as a matter of policy because of the problems it may cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

M.G. said:

@Malcolm - That was a very informative answer.

Are there historical evidences of practitioners studying under, say, both Vajrayana and Hindu gurus?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. The Natha tradition grew out of Hindu-Buddhist syncretism and many Nathas followed Buddhist gurus even though they may have begun as Hindus, such as the Indian Buddhaguptanatha, Tārānatha's teacher.

M.G. said:

Interesting. Were aspects of Hindu yogic practice actually adopted by Buddhists and seen as conducive to liberation? Or was it more along the lines of learning worldly rites?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really possible to explore this in a simple post. However, the long and short of it is that the highest Buddhist tantric systems present the body in a way entirely different than lower Buddhist schools such as Theravada and general Mahāyāna, or even lower tantra. In lower schools, things like the three kāyas and so on are exteriorized, but in the highest tantric systems they are understood to be implicit in the very structure of the body itself. The way the body is understood in Hindu systems is really not the same, so no, I do not think one can say that aspects of yoga as understood by Hindus were adopted by Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

kirtu said:

Not so. The US went all in on dual citizenship in the late 70's. Many nations permit dual citizenship like those weaklings the UK, Sweden, France and Switzerland. Ironically Holland and Germany stepped back from dual citizenship during the 70's although Germany now permits some forms of dual citizenship (technically Holland does too again but it's more restricted certainly than Germany or the US). The weak/strong country concept you are advancing is nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:

The UK does not permit you to be a dual citizen. They simply don't recognize that you have abandoned your citizenship unless you make a specific declaration to a British authority even if you for example renounced your allegiance to Britain by becoming a US citizen. Anyway, Kirt, this is off topic.

Traditionally, as you know, you cannot serve two kings, as the metaphor goes, and that was the point. You cannot have refuge in Dharma and also have refuge in Christianity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

kirtu said:

I personally have denied that one could benefit from the dharma of gods and men but I was wrong. Some/most people can benefit as long as they are secure in refuge in the Buddhadharma. So Hindu mantras and some practices, for example, can have a place. See Mipham's Verses to the Eight Noble Auspicious One's for example. This includes a constrained invocation of Shiva and Ishvara.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Who ever said there was no benefit in the Dharma of gods and humans? It assures birth in higher realms, as mentioned above.

If you bothered to read the thread carefully you will note that we addressed the issue of mundane practices from Hinduism already.

Weak countries may let you have citizenship in two nations, but if you are a US citizen, you cannot be a citizen of another country, unless you are a minor, but at some point you have to choose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Sönam said:

The fact is that there is more buddhists than follower of buddhadharma ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Ironic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Bug in "The Practice of Dzogchen"

Content:

Sönam said:

Yes, it seems they are unequipped to answer ... we have asked the right for a publication they hold the copyright, and it tooks months before they contact their agency in Paris for they contact us.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Snow Lion was sold to Shambhala in May 11, 2012. But I am sure they were in negotiations for a long while before hand. Hence, their lack of response, I imagine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 25th, 2014 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

duckfiasco said:

We cannot allow our warm and fuzzy feelings obscure the fact that Buddhadharma is something very precise and specific. It is not a method of "becoming a better person", nor is it a method of "resolving our unresolved issues", nor is it a practice of "mindfulness", nor is it a method of "becoming more compassionate", and so on. All of these things reduce Buddhadharma to the level of pop self-help manuals. Nor should we negate the very real benefits Buddhism has for ordinary beings to be happy in this world, which can engender faith in them to pursue the path to its completion.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't negate it, but we don't use mundane benefits to to sell the Dharma. If our motivation for practicing Dharma is merely to be happier in this life, then we are not practicing Dharma at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 24th, 2014 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Dan74 said:

So let me get this straight - a Buddhist who is inspired by stories about Jesus's life and some teachings which help him cultivate kindness, forbearance and compassion, is wasting his time and getting further away from liberation?

I see plenty of potential for people to be inspired by all sorts of stories, teachings, day-to-day occurrences. There is Dharma in all sorts of places if one knows how to see.

Malcolm wrote:

Dan, what is the topic of the thread? "Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices", right?

So, essentially, we are not talking about whether Jesus is an inspiring character for someone, our warm feelings about St., Francis of Assisi and so on.

We are talking about a technical issues, e.g, for example, whether one ought to sincerely attend a Catholic Mass, looking for redemption, as a Buddhist. In other words, we are discussing the appropriateness of someone who claims to follow Buddhадharma who also asserts that Jesus Christ is their lord and savior.

Someone who has taken refuge in the Three Jewels cannot at the same time take Jesus Christ as their lord and savior. They may imagine that they can, but all they succeed in doing is ignorantly destroying their refuge in the Three Jewels.

This is also the case with teachings such as emptiness and dependent origination. For example, I heard HH Dalai Lama, that bastion of ecumenicalism, state in 2005 in Tucson, AZ, that emptiness was not the business of Christians and that he generally felt that Christians ought to mind their own business. Emptiness, he said, was the business of followers of Buddhадharma, and that is was inappropriate for Christians to be interested in it. Why? Because Christians believe in ex nihilo creation, souls, and so on. Ex nihilo creation and dependent origination are mutually incompatible. One does not need to be a Buddhist to see this, as Lucretius said, ex nihilo nihil fit, "nothing comes from nothing" (but we leave all similarity with epicurean materialism here).

It's a little different with Hinduism and Buddhадharma. There are many mundane rites Buddhists can avail themselves of from Hinduism, and have done so for millennia. Even so, it is inappropriate for those who have taken refuge in the Three Jewels to take refuge in Brahma, Shiva or Vishnu and so on because the latter are mundane gods who have not realized the nature of reality and are themselves trapped in samsara, like Jesus, Allah, Jehovah, etc.

We cannot allow our warm and fuzzy feelings obscure the fact that Buddhадharma is something very precise and specific. It is not a method of "becoming a better person", nor is it a method of "resolving our unresolved issues", nor is it a practice of "mindfulness", nor is it a method of "becoming more compassionate", and so on. All of these things reduce Buddhадharma to the level of pop self-help manuals.

If someone from outside the Dharma wants to enter the Dharma he or she must leave their previous refuge behind. You cannot have two feet in two boats (try it, it is really, really difficult), you cannot serve two masters, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 24th, 2014 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Unknown said:

These are just a few qualities I've observed in some followers of other religions that I could do well to improve in.

Malcolm wrote:

BTW Dan, there are decent people everywhere. That does not take a religion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 24th, 2014 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

M.G. said:

@Malcolm - That was a very informative answer.

Are there historical evidences of practitioners studying under, say, both Vajrayana and Hindu gurus?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. The Natha tradition grew out of Hindu-Buddhist syncretism and many Nathas followed Buddhist gurus even though they may have begun as Hindus, such as the Indian Buddhaguptanatha, Tārānatha's teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 24th, 2014 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Dan74 said:

Malcolm,

It has validity because in practice many of us are contaminated by spiritual materialism, lack of patience and perseverance. It is a false dichotomy because it doesn't always apply.

As for worldly dharmas, have you transcended worldly Dharmas, Malcolm? Are you sorted, free of neuroses, joyful, resourceful, disciplined, reliable, kind and forgiving, humble, hard-working and undemanding? These are just a few qualities I've observed in some followers of other religions that I could do well to improve in.

Of course we have the Paramitas and wonderful teachings on them. But for some people other teachings may actually resonate better, work better, because of their karma, their strong affinity with another wisdom tradition. I don't think you or I can honestly say that this is wrong, that this cannot be productive and conducive to liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

"Are you sorted, free of neuroses, joyful, resourceful, disciplined, reliable, kind and forgiving, humble, hard-working and undemanding."

Yes, for the most part. Though like any ordinary person I have my strongly afflicted moments.

Those "some people" are not followers of Buddhadharma. They follow other paths.

I can say that other paths are not conducive to the "liberation" we practitioners of Buddhadharma hold to be liberation since this liberation is very clearly defined by the Buddha. Liberation or freedom means being free from afflictive emotions which cause rebirth in samsara. That freedom cannot arise through other paths which encourage a view of soul or a self, or through philosophies which negate the truth of rebirth and karma.

It is true that people have their karmic propensities and are more attracted to this or that religion — it is not our job to interfere with their lives; but the sorrow of samsara is that sentient beings are confused about what will bring them ultimate happiness.

I would suggest strongly that anyone who feels that liberation, as defined in Buddhadharma, can be attained by any other means than realizing the nature of dependent origination and emptiness has not really understood the meaning of the Buddha's teachings on any level.

In other words Dan, other "wisdom" traditions are mundane paths that are not conducive to liberation. They are paths of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 24th, 2014 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?

Content:

Dan74 said:

I've seen these sort of discussions get a little heated in the past, because some people feel strongly that our practice should be kept pure and focused under the guidance of a realised master rather than shopping around spiritual materialism style. This view certainly has some validity but I'd add that this is a false dichotomy.

Malcolm wrote:

How can something "have some validity" and yet be "a false dichotomy?"

Dan74 said:

At the end of the day, whatever inspires us and guides us to relinquish all that is unwholesome and to cultivate all that is wholesome, to grow in clarity and wisdom is Dharma, regardless what label it comes with.

Malcolm wrote:

Some Dharma is the Dharma of gods and humans, it isn't liberating, but it certainly can cause people to take higher rebirth in samsara because in general it encourages people to avoid the ten non-virtues.

Unfortunately, non-Buddhist Dharmas (and here we really are only talking about religions in which rebirth is accepted) also are contaminated with incorrect views, so whatever wisdom they lead to will only be mundane and contaminated. As the Buddha pointed out, there is no liberation outside of his Dharma and Vinaya. Someone might point out that there so called independent Buddhas (pratyekabuddhas) but it is held that they do not teach, remaining silent about their realization, hence the Buddha's statement, repeated by him in many sūtras through out his life remains true.

In terms of mixing practices, there is not much point. Someone might respond that Tibetan Buddhism is a mixture of Buddhism and Bon, but this is really a huge overstatement, while it is true that Buddhists adapted some worldly rituals into a Buddhist framework, such as smoke offerings, and various mundane rites to appease spirits and so on, by no means do they form an essential core of Tibetan Buddhism, since they are palliative rites designed to relieve temporary problems. Buddhism has never had a problem with people continuing to use such practices within the framework of Dharma — we can see this when Buddha instructs Ānanda to rely on brahmins to conduct the Buddha's funerary rites. However, just as you cannot be a citizen of two countries, you cannot have two refuges. One cannot, for example, take refuge in Buddha and Jesus. In other words, there is no reason for a Buddhist who is a former Catholic to take communion since a Buddhist understands that a) there is no such thing as original sin and b) that sins in general cannot be eliminated by washing with water, eating a wafer, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 24th, 2014 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: The Genre of the Western Buddhist Advice Book

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Kalama Sutra. Kalama Sutra everywhere.

Like dude, even the Buddha said to like, you know, do your own thing and believe whatever you want man.

Malcolm wrote:

Right man, (toke), unless you know like someone else is telling you to, then you better not believe it man, cause (toke) you shouldn't believe anything (this s#it is awesome, cough).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 24th, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Accepting Yourself

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buy overcoming afflictions and attaining omniscience.

dzogchungpa said:

Where can one buy these overcoming afflictions and attaining omniscience of which you speak?

Malcolm wrote:

Coming soon to Walmart, steeply discounted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 23rd, 2014 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Accepting Yourself

Content:

Jesse said:

I think we all have aspects of ourselves we dislike. For a long while I have been trying to accept parts of myself that I truly hate. Things like anger, conceit, sexual impulses, greed, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Why would you accept afflictive emotions? They are afflictive and are the root cause of suffering.

Either you renounce them, transform them or self-liberate them. But you certainly don't accept them. That way just leads to further rebirth in samsara.

M

Jesse said:

I think mainly because we all have a tendency to think we're bad people because we have these afflictions, when that's not really the case. What I meant is to accept that they are a part of me, without feeling like they define me.

Malcolm wrote:

We do bad things, non-virtuous things, because we are afflicted. Afflictions are never a part of oneself but they do define us as sentient beings. If you want to stop being a sentient being and start being an awakening being you have to deal with your afflictions via one of three paths I mentioned.

Why am I a sentient being and not a Buddha? Because I am subject to afflictions. How do I become a Buddha? Buy overcoming afflictions and attaining omniscience. How do I begin? By setting out on one of the three paths, depending on my capacity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 23rd, 2014 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Accepting Yourself

Content:

Jesse said:

I think we all have aspects of ourselves we dislike. For a long while I have been trying to accept parts of myself that I truly hate. Things like anger, conceit, sexual impulses, greed, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Why would you accept afflictive emotions? They are afflictive and are the root cause of suffering.

Either you renounce them, transform them or self-liberate them. But you certainly don't accept them. That way just leads to further rebirth in samsara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 23rd, 2014 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What does anyone expect? Paltrul Rinpoche said:

These days have become a time when charlatans are more marketable than the sublime.

Crazywisdom said:

Rinchen Dorje was the drupon in Arizona. He did a six year. Neither he nor Garchen are charlatans. I don't think any drupons are charlatans. I think they have become lax about who they let in. Maybe they need the money.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing in my post which could have led you to infer that I was talking about anyone in Drigung.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 23rd, 2014 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

bryandavis said:

I also think the more "strict" a retreat the better.

Malcolm wrote:
Why? Are you speaking from personal experience?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 23rd, 2014 at 2:39 AM
Title: Re: Appropriateness of openly discussing sunyata
Content:
Gyurme Kundrol said:
...because either you are a fully qualified Guru who can teach the profound teachings to people totally accurately, gauge their readiness, and lead them to realization or you are not.

Malcolm wrote:
I guess there aren't any shades of grey in your world view.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 22nd, 2014 at 11:40 PM
Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
What does anyone expect? Paltrul Rinpoche said:
These days have become a time when charlatans are more marketable than the sublime.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 22nd, 2014 at 9:24 PM
Title: Re: The Genre of the Western Buddhist Advice Book
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Dharma Lite™

Jikan said:
As part of a research project, I'm working my way through a number of advice books, particularly having to do with meditation and mindfulness (think Kornfield, Kabat-Zinn, et al). I've noticed that many of them share a set of formal characteristics, as though no nominally Buddhist meditation manual can make it into print without hitting a certain number of these marks:

*short sentences, paragraphs, and chapters; extensive use of familiar quotation;
minimal use of literary or technical diction; "easy reading"

*encouraging, hand-holding tone; pitched to beginners (all of them, pitched to beginners)

*appeal to science and/or clinical psychology

*simultaneous appeal to "modernity" and to ancient precedents (ancient sages across traditions agree...)

*quotations from Castaneda, Thoreau, Jung, the Christian desert fathers... appeal to a kind of universalism (attention is trans-cultural, the breath is trans-cultural)

*appeal to simplicity, as defined against ritual practice

*contradiction: relies on Buddhism as a source of authority or legitimacy, while simultaneously distancing itself from Buddhist traditions and practices beyond a select few

I'd like to know if others are familiar with these texts and might like to offer more particulars, or correctives to what I've put together here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 22nd, 2014 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Israel, Palestine, Antisemitism

Content:

Jikan said:

It's true that there is no consensus among contemporary Jews on many aspects of the topic of Israel. This is in evidence in the writings of such well-regarded thinkers as Judith Butler, for instance--it's not necessary to go to the whackaloon fringes of the interwebz to support this claim.

That said, given that this is a discussion board committed to Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhism, it's not at all clear why or how this thread is relevant. Let's find a way to swing the discussion out of the gutter and back to the Dharma, or it'll be locked for good.

Malcolm wrote:

Kill this thread. Despite my complete lack of enchantment for Abrahamic religions, such conversations are worse than useless because apart from expressions of compassion for all involved, what is there really for Buddhists to discuss?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 21st, 2014 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Heart Sutra -- why study it?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... the first bhumi ... was rather common in India, actually.

dzogchungpa said:
How do you know that?

Malcolm wrote:
Oral communication from various lamas.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 21st, 2014 at 2:34 AM
Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL
Content:
aparajita said:
This might be an odd question, but does anyone know of any practices that would be effective in helping to rid the world of the group that calls itself ISIL?

Malcolm wrote:
Dorje Drollo.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 21st, 2014 at 2:24 AM
Title: Re: Heart Sutra -- why study it?
Content:
Lazy_eye said:
Could you elaborate a little? I don't have much expertise, but my impression was that most Mahayana paths are spread out over aeons and the ten stages must be completed. And even the first stage is out of reach unless one has renounced the worldly life.

Malcolm wrote:
The Heart Sutra leads to the first bhumi, which was rather common in India, actually.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 21st, 2014 at 2:24 AM
Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine
Content:
AlexanderS said:
What makes you say that?

Malcolm wrote:
It is the most sacred place to all three religions, ergo, it is the one that will most likely be the object of a terrorist attack.

AlexanderS said:
For me it makes less sense that anyone would nuke a place that is sacred to them. I

can't see anyone other than religious nutcases being mental enough to use nuclear weapons in the modern world.

Without being that knowledgeable about Islam, I was under the impression that their most sacred place is Mecca.

Malcolm wrote:

The dome of the rock is in Jerusalem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 21st, 2014 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

AlexanderS said:

What makes you say that?

Malcolm wrote:

It is the most sacred place to all three religions, ergo, it is the one that will most likely be the object of a terrorist attack.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 21st, 2014 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Heart Sutra -- why study it?

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Are you referring specifically to Vajrayana, or is this also true in the sutra schools?

Malcolm wrote:

Both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 21st, 2014 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Will said:

While I have no sympathy for and am hostile to the Jihadists, the choice of a homeland by the Jews is odd. They had other offers and there was even a small counter-Zionist group working for a non-Jerusalem centered nation.

It is curious that Islam has sacred turf - Mecca - as do the Jews of Israel. Revering a sacred site is normal in all religions, but Buddhists have not, for example, made the

Bodhi Tree into a site for nation building.

The priority of sacred dirt for the two groups, to the point of armed conflict, is sad and ridiculous. So I see no peaceful resolution at all - for now and the next century - at least.

Malcolm wrote:

Ever, that place is going to be the the site of the first use of nuclear weapons since WWII, you mark my words. It's all going down in flames.

AlexanderS said:

What place will be nuked? Mecca, Jerusalem or Bodhgaya?

Malcolm wrote:

Jerusalem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 21st, 2014 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Heart Sutra -- why study it?

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

The Heart Sutra is a beautiful, profound text, conveying the highest wisdom. But that wisdom is far beyond the attainment of most ordinary practitioners...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not. It is easily attainable if you have the right teacher and the right path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Sherab said:

I am perfectly fine when the evidence presented by science contradicts Buddhist teachings, I just accept it. I don't see how that necessarily will make me a materialist.

Malcolm wrote:

It means you accept science as your ultimate arbiter of what is true or not. This is fine, but it means you accept science as ultimate truth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Sherab said:

Like certain Christians, Muslims do not accept the evolution of man. As mentioned before, they have no problems with science as long as there is no conflict with their religious teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

But they accept the evolution of everything else.

Sherab said:

That is beside the point. I mentioned that the true colour of an adherent to a religion will show when science conflicts with its religious teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

So in your case, are you a materialist? I ask because there are any number of Buddhist teachings which are in conflict with science.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Sherab said:

Like certain Christians, Muslims do not accept the evolution of man. As mentioned before, they have no problems with science as long as there is no conflict with their religious teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

But they accept the evolution of everything else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

M.G. said:

@Malcolm (or any other knowledgeable person) - Tibet had a sizable Muslim population. Are there recorded instances of Tibetan Buddhists converting to Islam or Tibetan Muslims converting to Buddhism or of there having been cultural norms, rules, reactions, or stereotypes regarding such conversions?

Malcolm wrote:

There was a small group of Muslim butchers in Lhasa, but that is about it. And no, there was not much conversion either way. Muslims never convert to other religions, or very rarely so, because they can be killed for doing so by any other Muslim.

There is a fair amount of forced conversion in Lhadak, mainly in the form of bride theft.

In a Muslim world, everyone but Muslims are second class citizens at best.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Dan74 said:

The Islamic world produced advances in science (eg Alhazen), mathematics (eg Omar Khayyam), arts , architecture and technology which in their time completely eclipsed any parallel developments in Europe. Not just the zero, but words as familiar to us as algorithm and algebra are Islamic imports.

Sherab said:

Adherents to a religion normally do not have problems with science as long as there is no conflict with their religious teachings. It is when there are conflicts that we see the true colour of a religion and its adherents. In this regard, I think Buddhism and Buddhists are much more open.

Malcolm wrote:

Islam is actually very science-postive. They regard scientific advances as evidence of God's hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Unknown said:

Three more Tibetans have died of untreated gunshot wounds after Chinese authorities fired on peaceful protesters last week in Sichuan Province and refused to treat the dozens who were injured and detained, according to sources Tuesday.

The bodies of the three, all members of the same household, were returned to their families on Monday after they succumbed to their injuries at the detention center in Loshu township in the Kardze (Ganzi) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture.

Two protesters had previously died at the detention center on Sunday, one committing suicide in protest against "torture" at the hands of Chinese authorities and another dying of untreated wounds, exile sources had said.

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.rfa.org/english/news/tibet/wounds-08192014131944.html#.U_OqTwfWFTU.facebook

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Will said:

While I have no sympathy for and am hostile to the Jihadists, the choice of a homeland by the Jews is odd. They had other offers and there was even a small counter-Zionist group working for a non-Jerusalem centered nation.

It is curious that Islam has sacred turf - Mecca - as do the Jews of Israel. Revering a sacred site is normal in all religions, but Buddhists have not, for example, made the Bodhi Tree into a site for nation building.

The priority of sacred dirt for the two groups, to the point of armed conflict, is sad and ridiculous. So I see no peaceful resolution at all - for now and the next century - at least.

Malcolm wrote:

Ever, that place is going to be the the site of the first use of nuclear weapons since WWII, you mark my words. It's all going down in flames.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Dan74 said:

Ok, your post started informative and ended... well, disappointingly, to be polite. If Islamic contributions disappeared we would likely be set back scientifically, mathematically in terms of the arts, etc by centuries. Nevermind the barbaric hubris behind the nonchalant dismissal of an entire culture.

Malcolm wrote:

My point is really simple — Islam is not your friend, regardless of whether you have Muslim friends or not. At best, under an Islamic govt., you will be forced to pay a substantial tax just to live in your home as non-Muslim. As a Buddhist, you will probably be killed.

Dan74 said:

Hebrews and Canaanites? So you take the Bible as a historical account of what actually happened? But if you do, you would know that Hebrew prophets condemned their people for not killing the Canaanites and intermarrying with them and accepting their gods.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed. Just as modern radical Islamic leaders condemn the faint of heart among the "faithful" for not bring Jihad to our doorsteps.

Dan74 said:

We, as humanity, are heirs to all of our culture, with its sublime beauty, sweeping achievements as well as its excesses and horrors.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree.

Basically, the best thing the American Revolution brought about was a form of government in which people were protected from religion. There may be disadvantages to our secular Western society, but our freedom from religion is our greatest strength as a culture. Cultures that are wholly grounded on a religious or ethnic basis are destined for obsolescence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Dan74 said:

Ok, you are shifting the argument, Malcolm. So you accept that Islam has made fundamental contributions including algebra? Yes, the Jains had mathematics but the Islamic mathematicians didn't 'steal' Jain work, but developed and advanced their own.

Malcolm wrote:

But they did so on the basis of the numerical system, etc., developed in India. So called "arabic numerals" come from India. Further, most of the contributions of Islamic culture, apart from their own poetry, music and so on, lay in the area of transmitting the knowledge of the Hellenistic world to Europe. Even the Islamic system of medicine is called Unani, which is a corruption of Yavana, i.e. Ionian — Greek.

Dan74 said:

As for killing the apostate, it was a rule much more honoured in the breach, if you check Islamic jurisprudence. Medieval Islamic literature and poetry was indeed much more rich and free than its European counterpart perhaps because apostasy and heresy laws were not applied anywhere near as zealously as the Church and its Inquisition applied theirs.

Malcolm wrote:

That really depends on where you were in the Islamic hegemony, and at what period of history. Georges Bataille has a good analysis of the economic biases that drove the Islamic expansion. In fact they are very nearly the same biases which drove the spread of Christianity and later, corporate capitalism. And your assertion is fallacious — the Zoroastrians were driven from Persia where they were not slain:

Until the Jihad, in the mid 7th century Persia (modern-day Iran) was a politically

independent state, spanning from the Aegean Sea to the Indus River[3] and dominated by a Zoroastrian majority.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persecution_of_Zoroastrians

People should remember the vanished Zoroastrian civilization of Persia before claiming that Islam "treated" non-Muslims better than Christians treated pagans.

In fact, all three Abrahamic religions are fundamentally pernicious which is why the site of their origin is such a total mess and has been for millennia, ever since one band, the Hebrews exterminated another band, the Canaanites.

As far as I am concerned, if Islam and its "contributions" were lost to history like the Zoroastrians, it would be no great loss for humanity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Dan74 said:

a better track record than Christianity

Hieros Gamos said:

That's hardly a ringing endorsement.

Dan74 said:

Well, we've all had our ups and downs. But I find the increasingly common criticism and sometimes even wholesale dismissal of everything Islamic facile at best and ignorant at worst. So many people are simply clueless about the fundamental contributions Islamic cultures have made.

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Dan74 said:

Algebra and algorithms were imported from India by way of the Arab world.

I don't think so, Malcolm. Both words come from Al-Khwarizmi's massive treatise.

Conner and Robertson in their Mactutor History of Mathematics archive describe the contribution the following way:

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_mathematics#Jain_Mathematics_.28400_BCE_.E2.80.93_200_CE.29

Dan74 said:

Cool, but lets be fair to Islam, hard as it is, in the current climate. Until very recent history it actually had a better track record than Christianity in many many ways.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh nonsense. All these Abrahamic religions are predicated on ethnic cleansing. As far as I know, Islam is the only religion in the world where it is an incumbent duty for the faithful to kill apostates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 20th, 2014 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Sherab said:

One's world view is very important. It informs and directs one's motivation, attitude and behaviour. Buddhism recognizes this and that is why the eightfold noble path starts with right view.

The worldview of Christianity/Judaism in my opinion has in general been more subdued than in the historical past because of the progress of science and the liberalization of thoughts. So to an important extent, the worldview of these religions have been forced into a retreat. The same however cannot be said of Islam. It has yet to go through the same process. Perhaps given time, it will. Meanwhile, the worldview of Islam in its current form presents a huge obstacle to the resolution of the Middle East problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, the Islamic world never had an intellectual movement comparable with the Enlightenment, no Spinoza, no Locke, etc. The fact of the matter is that a crypto-atheism lies at the heart of enlightenment thought. There is quite a good book on this called Nature's God: The Heretical Origins of the American Republic.

Dan74 said:

I am not sure this is a fair assessment (and btw I don't recall a Buddhist equivalent of Enlightenment either).

The Islamic world produced advances in science (eg Alhazen), mathematics (eg Omar Khayyam), arts , architecture and technology which in their time completely eclipsed any parallel developments in Europe. Not just the zero, but words as familiar to us as algorithm and algebra are Islamic imports. If anything, there hasn't been a sociopolitical

development akin to Western democracies with responsible government, but we can see it function pretty well in Indonesia and sort of Turkey, while Buddhist countries aren't doing so well (Thailand, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, etc).

Note that many countries adopted representational participatory democracies without developing them by themselves, like Japan, for instance.

Malcolm wrote:

Algebra and algorithms were imported from India by way of the Arab world.

Dan74 said:

If anything, there hasn't been a sociopolitical development akin to Western democracies

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is because of the Enlightenment, especially the Scottish Enlightenment, and it's atheist impulse drove it. Such a movement could only happen because of the Reformation.

I never said that Buddhist countries had comparable developments; they could not without abandoning key features of our religion. In fact, most of the conflicts between so called Buddhist modernists and traditionalists has exactly to do with whether people place more value on Enlightenment values or Awakening values.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 19th, 2014 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Towards a resolution in Israel and Palestine

Content:

Sherab said:

One's world view is very important. It informs and directs one's motivation, attitude and behaviour. Buddhism recognizes this and that is why the eightfold noble path starts with right view.

The worldview of Christianity/Judaism in my opinion has in general been more subdued than in the historical past because of the progress of science and the liberalization of thoughts. So to an important extent, the worldview of these religions have been forced into a retreat. The same however cannot be said of Islam. It has yet to go through the same process. Perhaps given time, it will. Meanwhile, the worldview of Islam in its current form presents a huge obstacle to the resolution of the Middle East problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, the Islamic world never had an intellectual movement comparable with the Enlightenment, no Spinoza, no Locke, etc. The fact of the matter is that a crypto-atheism lies at the heart of enlightenment thought. There is quite a good book on this called Nature's God: The Heretical Origins of the American Republic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 19th, 2014 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Quick Question Regarding Tibetan Buddhism.

Content:

RickThunderclees said:

Good morning everyone! Had a quick question:

I'm taking a break from reading up on teachings and am exploring the history of different Buddhist traditions. Each tradition is equally beautiful in its own accord and completely fascinating to me. I've been practicing now for over 10 years and it's been nice just objectively reading about each form and tradition. But I've come to the Tibetan form to ask this specific question because I know someone will know the answer.

I've discovered that the first appearance of Avalokiteśvara is in the Lotus Sutra. I questioned this, and did some digging and haven't found otherwise. I assumed the Lotus Sutra was written way after the Tibetan tradition, but this isn't the case. Supposedly the sutra was finished by 200 AD. How did this sutra not make it into Tibetan Buddhism? Is it studied at all within the tradition? You'll have to explain this to me like I'm 5 years old because I really am ignorant of most of Buddhist history, outside of the story of Shakyamuni.

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

The Lotus Sutra is indeed in the Tibetan tradition. It is not a subject of independent study however and there are no schools formed around it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 19th, 2014 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

“Tibetan Buddhism designed by the CCP”

By Woesser

Not long ago, several important incidents took place in succession: 1) Because of a minor explosion at the end of October 2011, of the originally over 300 monks only 6 are now left in Karma Monastery in Chamdo County, Kham, TAR. 2) At the end of 2012, Drongna Monastery in Driru County, Nagchu Prefecture, TAR was closed down, all monk residences were sealed and many monks arrested; subsequently, the Tarmoe and Rabten monasteries of Driru County were also closed down. 3) In December 2013, an official government notice was issued to the famous Labrang Monastery in Sangchu County, Gannan Autonomous Prefecture, Gansu Province, requesting to expel all non-local monks studying at the monastery within a three months period.

At the end of 2008, I wrote several essays: “Patriotic Education’ in Tibet”, “Another Cultural Revolution is Quietly Sweeping across Tibet’s Monasteries”, “Behind the Curtain of ‘Legal Education’”, “The Intentions Behind Transforming Monasteries into Tourist Attractions”, “The ‘Clean Up’ of Lhasa that is Hidden from the Outside World”. It is evident that the encircling and annihilation of Tibet’s monasteries is continuously moving forward, becoming more and more far-reaching. Just as I wrote at the end of 2008, “the local Party authorities are currently launching the cruelest and most bitter clean up of Tibetan monasteries since the Cultural Revolution. In the Chinese media, none of these “black box operations” are ever mentioned. Another Cultural Revolution is currently sweeping across Tibet. In 1966, Buddhist temples and statues were smashed and monks and nuns expelled, leaving behind a forlorn field of ruins. Now this second Cultural Revolution will completely eradicate any genuine monks and nuns, leaving behind nothing but the shell of monasteries and monks and nuns who are bound to lose their courage and conscience.”

If we have not already forgotten, we must remember how on October 4, 2008, the three main monasteries in Lhasa – Drepung monastery, Sera monastery and Ganden monastery – were attacked by military police in the middle of the night, monks – almost entirely students of Buddhism coming from Gansu, Qinghai, Sichuan, or Yunnan provinces (officially called “the four Tibetan provinces”) – were arrested at their residences. They were sent to Gormo military prison and repatriated to their hometowns after the Beijing Olympics; none of them were allowed to ever return to the monasteries.

It has always been true that more than half of the monks in Lhasa’s three main monasteries were not locals. This is a 500-year-old tradition, existing ever since the establishment of these three main monasteries, and it is the tradition of 2000 years of Buddhism. This, indeed, also includes monasteries of Chinese Buddhism that have always been inhabited by monks from all across the country. Today, Chinese monasteries have remained the same, monks from different counties and provinces reside there to study, but the monks of Lhasa’s three main monasteries have been expelled and imprisoned by military force. This has hardly ever happened in the history of Tibetan Buddhism, it only started occurring frequently in modern times under the rule of the CCP.

If we have not already forgotten, we must remember the official Tibetan document that appeared on the website of the local authorities at the end of 2008; it was a decision issued by the head of the Kardze Autonomous Prefecture targeting all 18 counties of Kardze Prefecture, stating that the local authorities will carry out the following steps against 10-30% of the monasteries whose nuns and monks participated in the protests: any religious events will be forbidden, the movement and actions of nuns and monks will be strictly controlled; all nuns and monks inside monasteries must once again “officially enrol”, all monks and nuns who do not pass the “patriotic education” examination will be expelled, all monks residences will be demolished. As for those who participated in the protests, in minor cases they will be sent back to their hometowns, in severe cases they will be imprisoned.

Starting from 2011, work groups have been stationed inside over 1700 monasteries in the TAR, employing over 7000 members of staff. Altogether, the official number of registered monks and nuns is 46,000; does this mean that each official stationed in a monastery is responsible for 6-7 monks? The problem is that in Karma Monastery, the birthplace of the Kagyu school of Tibetan Buddhism, for example, officials currently outnumber monks. So does this mean that the goal of this movement, launched by Chen Quanguo and now already experiencing the third change of shifts, is to step-by-step decrease the amount of monks and eventually close down all monasteries?

Meanwhile, the authorities of “the four Tibetan provinces” are equally encircling and attacking the over 150,000 monks and their monasteries. It is impossible that all these local cadres are simply imitating what officials in the TAR do; no, these are clearly the hard-liner policies coming from the highest level. In fact, it is the continuation and implementation of Mao Zedong’s “Tibet Policies”. Mao once said: “We must also reform all monasteries. After successful reform, there will be a time when the number of lamas is greatly reduced... how should we reform monasteries, you should think of a solution.” (May 7, 1959, Guidelines After Putting Down Tibet’s Revolt). This so-called solution seems to be the model that we can observe in today’s Karma and Drongna monasteries and also in Lhasa’s three main monasteries, it is a model of Tibetan Buddhism designed by the CCP.

Lhasa, January 2014

<http://highpeakspureearth.com/2014/tibetan-buddhism-designed-by-the-ccp-by-woeser/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 19th, 2014 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Appropriateness of openly discussing sunyata

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

It's Sutra stuff, there are no limitations on discussing it as far as I know.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact it is a breach of bodhisattva vows to discuss emptiness with those who are not mature enough to handle it or who object to the idea.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Thanks for educating me.

I wonder though, how does this apply to public teachings? I've been to public teachings where emptiness is the subject, and a few people in the audience really do not like it, or find it uncomfortable somehow, find it unacceptable...does this mean teachers are at

constant risk of breaking their Bodhisattva vows, unless they somehow vet people who come to teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

I remember HHDL saying that Christians for example, should mind their own business when it comes to emptiness, it is not their school. I think basically, unless some one shows up to a teaching, one does not discuss the Mahāyāna view of reality, but instead one emphasizes dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 18th, 2014 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Help Choosing a School

Content:

Gnosis984 said:

Any suggestions, ideas, any help at all would be most appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

A teacher is more important than a school. Find a teacher you trust.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 18th, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Appropriateness of openly discussing sunyata

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

It's Sutra stuff, there are no limitations on discussing it as far as I know.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact it is a breach of bodhisattva vows to discuss emptiness with those who are not mature enough to handle it or who object to the idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 18th, 2014 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Lamas and Gifts

Content:

twiz said:

Does a Lama only accept gifts when they are filled with good intentions and from the heart?

Are they able to determine when one is just doing it because they are suppose to/want merit, and reject it (in a polite manner)?

Curious as to how much they may understand one's intentions.

Malcolm wrote:

No.

No.

As to your third question, it depends on how well they know you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 16th, 2014 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Dharma should not have a price on it

Content:

LastLegend said:

I can only speak for Vietnamese Mahayana.

Dharma should be free always.

Malcolm wrote:

In Vajrayāna stated in the tantras themselves that a fee for the initiation and teachings should be set.

LastLegend said:

In form of money? Or other offering?

Malcolm wrote:

Gold, usually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 16th, 2014 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Dharma should not have a price on it

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Haven't we had this argument before? If somebody can remind me of the thread we had it in, then we won't need to repeat it (again).

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, it is a Buddhist board, and all our discussion take rebirth again and again, and will until they exhaust their karma...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 16th, 2014 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Dharma should not have a price on it

Content:

LastLegend said:

I can only speak for Vietnamese Mahayana.

Dharma should be free always.

Malcolm wrote:

In Vajrayāna stated in the tantras themselves that a fee for the initiation and teachings should be set.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Dharma should not have a price on it

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is the principle we should employ, as Kenpo Ngalo states in his commentary on Ngondro:

Never arriving with empty hands is a critical point of dependent origination. In particular, when that guru confers empowerment and explains Dharmas, since all the compassion and blessings of all the buddhas of the three times and ten directions along with all the bodhisattvas exist in that sublime guru, the guru is inseparable with all the buddhas. Even bringing him a morsel of food has greater merit than making many hundred of thousands of offerings to others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Zhen Li said:

The anagarika ordination is ancient, not modern.

As far as I know, it's a modernist invention, but the term is used to refer to a renunciant in general. Like gomin, the name doesn't tell us anything...

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Pandita, writing in the mid-13th century, states in his famous summary of Mahāyāna, Clarifying the Muni's Intent (thub pa'i dgongs gsal):

Further the Ārya Sthaviravādīns assert a so-called “gomin upāsaka” since it was stated that “It has been heard from a oral tradition of the Ārya Sthaviravādīns that “A lay person who has accepted the eight limbs for as long as they live is called a gomin upāsaka”... Since the Vinaya Sūtra is a text of the Mūlasarvāstivādīns, neither the brahmacārī nor the gomi [upāsaka] are mentioned. Therefore, that is the reason these two rites do not occur.

So, the tradition is not a modernist invention, and Sakya Pandita [educated by 30 Indian Panditas and fluent in both written and spoken Sanskrit] was clearly familiar with the term in the usage I have supplied.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 14th, 2014 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Anagarika is a fairly recent phenomenon, popularised by Anagarika Dharmapala, so the idea that there's a continuity between that and Gomins (which aren't actually described anywhere as requiring eight vows) is very unlikely in my opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not true. I just have not had time to pull the reference because I am on the road. The anagarika ordination is ancient, not modern.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 14th, 2014 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Teacher as Buddha?

Content:

tle said:

I think the requisite of seeing the empowerment lama as a Buddha is different depending on your level of accomplishment.

A regular person would see them as a truly existent Buddha.

A seasoned person might see them as a Buddha dependent on factors.

Perhaps there's other meanings to this also. It's not uncommon for tantric rules and teachings to have multiple levels of meaning.

Personally I see the empowerment lama, the teaching, the deity, the Buddha, the vows, the views, the effort I make, etc. all being aspects of the same karmas or on a deeper level the potential of all beings to become a Buddha. I like my current view of things because it allows me to retain my independent thinking so if it turns out I joined a bad cult I can back out without feeling I've broken my relationship to the Triple Gem. That is the really the only issue with seeing a teacher as a Buddha after all.

Malcolm wrote:

If you find you are taking teachings from a Lama who is not qualified, you can simply leave them and move on. There is no fault.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 14th, 2014 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Teacher as Buddha?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'm a little confused about this in practical sense. As far as I know, I have received no

HYT empowerments (two Chenrezig initiations), and yet at least one of my practices has guru yoga as preliminary practice as part of the sadhana..additionally, unless i'm mistaken in what I was told, guru yoga is supposed to be a part of deity sadhana practice period it was there in the initiations themselves...unless I'm not understanding what "guru yoga" actually is, but I think I am. If this is inappropriate to answer publicly, no problem.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are practicing Avalokiteśvara and Mahāmudra indeed, the sadhana has a kind of guru yoga worked in it. If you are practicing Tsembupa Avalokiteśvara, this is actually an HT practice and presumes that prior to receiving the instruction you have received both a major empowerment of some kind as well as at least a jenang into Avalokiteśvara. The King's tradition Avalokiteśvara major empowerment is often used by HH Sakya Trizin for giving this instruction.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 14th, 2014 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: reading recommendations on sound, light, rays

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

The out-of-print Sacred Tibetan Teachings on Death and Liberation by Giacomella Orofino contains extracts from the Union of Sun and Moon Tantra and the Bon The Oral Transmission of Zhang Zhung.

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/168469738/Giacomella-Orofino-Sacred-Tibetan-Teachings-on-Death-and-Liberation> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" false;

Malcolm wrote:

This tantra (nyi zla kha sbyor) has very little on sounds lights and rays. Indeed, the 17 tantras as a whole have very little on the subject. There are texts in the Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud however that have extensive teachings on the subject, and some of the terma cycles also have a bit more on the subject.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 14th, 2014 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is also no celibate ordination in the Tibetan tradition of Mahāyāna. Celibate ordinations are strictly the domain of Vinaya.

Mkoll said:

Really? I had no idea!

So lamas, geshe, tulku, etc. don't have to be celibate?

Are their bhikkhus in Tibetan Buddhism or do they go under a different name? They don't have to be celibate either?

Malcolm wrote:

Lamas and tulkus can be bhikṣus, or novices, or upāsakas. Geshe are generally always bhikṣus.

In other words, in the Mahāyāna tradition of India and Tibet there is no separate celibate ordination. The celibate Mahāyāna ordination is an innovation of the Japanese Tendai school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 14th, 2014 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

kirtu said:

Ah - you possess vinaya identity.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, I am a full Mulasarvastivada upāsaka, having received that ordination from Luding Khenpo Sr. in 1996.

kirtu said:

Sorry, my lamas are Mulasarvastivada monks. The lineage follows the Mulasarvastivada tradition (primarily). Just for me though I have no such restrictions on maintaining practices or vows strictly from within one lineage and will accept whatever is offered by whatever tradition freely.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said one could not do this. I wouldn't bother since there is no need to add anything to our lineage. If someone wants to be celibate, they can simply take the full upāsaka ordination with the intention to follow brahmacarya. If they wish to wear robes or follow the vows of a dge tshul, they may. If they later change their minds about being celibate, they also may, without needing to change anything. If you become a dge tshul however, it is a different matter, and deciding to become non-celibate requires relinquishing one's status as part of the ordained sangha.

kirtu said:

Slipping in the Theravada insinuation is complete nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? I was referring to the fact that Mulasarvastivada fast day vows (upavastha) are different than Mahāyāna fast day vows.

kirtu said:

The only fast vows I have taken and can retake freely are the Mahayana fast vows.

People are different and some people find these vows to be necessary. What others do is not so relevant.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with taking fast day vows, but there is no tradition of taking them "for life". They only last a day and a night, whether they are based on the pratimokśa or bodhisattva vow system. There is also no celibate ordination in the Tibetan tradition of Mahāyāna. Celibate ordinations are strictly the domain of Vinaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 14th, 2014 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Has your memory deteriorated since practicing Buddhism?

Content:

januarysprings said:

As thoughts lesson, one merges into awareness etc has your memory deteriorated or anything else?

What to do?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, one's memory improves as a result of practicing Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 14th, 2014 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

kirtu said:

We don't have to. For vinaya purists we can borrow it from the Theravada which you mention later yourself ...

Malcolm wrote:

The Anagarika ordination can only be received from a Theravadin bhikku. It cannot be received from a Mulasarvastivadin bhikṣu. So we can't really "borrow" it because that

ordination does not exist in our lineage.

Further, you cannot specify that you are taking the fast day vows "for life", those vows last one day and one night, i.e. dawn to dawn. You can retake it everyday if you want, but...most people are not going to do this. Especially considering that the Mahāyāna fast day vows are more important in our tradition and further, pratimokśa vows are not as important as bodhisattva vows.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 13th, 2014 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: reading recommendations on sound, light, rays

Content:

anjali said:

Hello all,

I'm looking for any English reading recommendations discussing the energy of awareness and it's manifestation as sound, light and rays. Recommendations can be anywhere from detailed scholarly expositions to pith instructions.

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

You will find this primarily in descriptions of the bardo. The Bonpos have extensive explanations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 13th, 2014 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The gomin ordination simply does not exist in our lineage. It does exist in the Theravada. It may have been practiced in India, but it was never part of the Mulasarvastivadin school, to which we (all Tibetan Buddhists) belong.

Mkoll said:

Hi Malcolm,

Can you describe what this gomin ordination is in Theravada? I've never heard that term used. Perhaps there's another name for it?

Malcolm wrote:

Anagarika. I believe gomin is what they call this ordination in Mahāsamghika.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 13th, 2014 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Sorry, I am not familiar with this terminology. Is this gomin as in cowherd? Or is it a Tibetan term?

Malcolm wrote:

As in Candragomin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 13th, 2014 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

kirtu said:

The 24 hr vow tradition does exist. One could then extend that by oneself by taking the vow daily for a period. There are people who do this - this much is not an innovation.

Malcolm wrote:

That is called upavaśaka and the vow is taken only for a day and a night. But this is not the gomin ordination.

kirtu said:

Gomin ordination: Chod did not exist before Machig nor was nyungnye practiced before Bhikkshuni Palmo created it.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by Chö. If you mean the practice of the offering the body, then this certainly existed prior to Machigma, and is found in such Tantras as Hevajra and so on. What is unique about Chö is primarily Machig's introduction of the use of melody and the Chö damaru, and her explanation of the four māras. And you forget that father lineage Chö does not have these things and comes from Padampa.

As far as the the nyungnye (smyung gnas), there are various kinds of fast rites connected with deities one can find in the Tengyur.

kirtu said:

Gomin ordination may not be introduced to the Mulasarvastivadin vinaya but it may still become a common practice.

Malcolm wrote:

It can't. We do not have that ordination. We cannot rewrite Vinaya to include it.

There are basically eight kinds of ordained people in Mulasarvastivada: lay men and women, lay fast day participants (male and female), male and female novices, and male and female fully ordained persons. However, since there was never any fully ordained bhikṣunis to ordain women with the special probationary vows in Tibet, the Mulasarvastivadin bhikṣuni ordination was never introduced to Tibet and this is why there are no fully ordained Mulasarvastivadin bhikṣunis today, nor has there been any for a thousand years.

Of course, if someone wishes to take the Gomin ordination in Theravada, there is nothing to stop them. But they cannot receive it in Tibetan Buddhism, they must go to Theravada.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 12th, 2014 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

kirtu said:

So the gomi genyen tradition has already been revived and there is some expression of it in Europe?

Malcolm wrote:

The Gomin Upāsaka ordination does not exist in Tibetan Buddhism. It is not part of the Mulasarvastivada tradition.

kirtu said:

Okay - but to me this is a bit of wiggling (wiggle to the left, wiggle to the right) Kongtrul *does* discuss it in his Encyclopedia (Buddhist Ethics) and it was practiced in India (and you are always pointing back to Indian Vajrayana).

And anyway it *does* exist in the form of the 8 vows taken for a 24 hr period (so not gomi genyen per se because that would be for a longer period esp. to include for life).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

The gomin ordination simply does not exist in our lineage. It does exist in the Theravada. It may have been practiced in India, but it was never part of the Mulasarvastivadin school, to which we (all Tibetan Buddhists) belong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 12th, 2014 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: Wagner and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Wagner...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 12th, 2014 at 3:09 AM
Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication
Content:

JKhedrup said:

The Gomin Upāsaka ordination does not exist in Tibetan Buddhism. It is not part of the Mulasarvastivada tradition.

Sorry, I thought Kirt was giving me Gomi Genyen as his rendition of "full Genyen". Our director, who received this, used this term "full Genyen", so I am assuming it is what the translator used when Geshe Jampa Gyatso transmitted it. He does not remember the name in Tibetan though I think I could look it up.

From what he told me today when I inquired it is a lifelong celibacy vow in addition to the normal Upasaka vows.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, sometimes the upāsaka ordination is given as a kind of probationary vow with the understanding that one will try to behave like a dge tshul.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 11th, 2014 at 11:55 PM
Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication
Content:

JKhedrup said:

Do you mean gomi genyens? A person observing the eight vows of a layperson for extended periods (beyond a day) or also for life

Yes, and in the specific case that comes to mind, it was for life. It was given by (the late) Geshe Jampa Gyatso in Italy to, I believe, a group of several European students.

kirtu said:

So the gomi genyen tradition has already been revived and there is some expression of it in Europe?

irt

Malcolm wrote:

The Gomin Upāsaka ordination does not exist in Tibetan Buddhism. It is not part of the Mulasarvastivada tradition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 11th, 2014 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Mind, Clear Light and the Five Aggregates

Content:

whitetiger said:

Greetings,

I hope I'm posting this question to the proper forum. I have a question about what's often translated as "Clear Light," "Radiant Light" or "Inner Radiance" in Tibetan Buddhism, particularly in the Bardo Thodol. The Clear Light is the subtlest level of mind and purest awareness, and the "meeting of mother and child lights" results in Buddhahood. Correct? But is the Clear Light distinct from and beyond the five aggregates, or is it part of them? If it's distinct from the five aggregates, does this mean it never incarnates and only new aggregates are born in each life (with the Clear Light untouched by any of it)? If that is the case, does that explain why the idea of "reincarnation" (as in, same self born again and again) is a fallacy and yet there is a pure awareness that is nevertheless present?

Finally, is the Clear Light the same as "universal mind" which is indivisible and one with all (i.e. no "your clear light," "my clear light," etc. I know it's crude but I don't know how else to put it)? Does it appear to be divided only when obscured by or tied to an individual consciousness (e.g. an individual person, a Bodhisattva, immortal, god, Buddha, etc.)?

Hope someone can help me understand.

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, you must understand that all four schools, Sakya, Kagyu, Nyingma and Gelug treat the notion of "clear light" rather differently.

You are mixing two presentations in your post above, Gelug and Nyingma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 11th, 2014 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

That's almost 500 years AFTER the original formation of the historiographical approach proposed by Herodotus.

Malcolm wrote:

And Herodotus, as we know, was largely regarded as a fraud.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 11th, 2014 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I also mentioned other Nalanda luminaries in this thread such as Shantideva, Gunaprabha and Shakyaprabha. Would you consider their influence similarly limited?

Zhen Li said:

There simply isn't evidence that any individual writer (or simply text, since many, including Shantideva, are possibly the product of multiple authors and redactors) had the sort of influence in Indian Buddhism that they did in Tibetan Buddhism. We simply aren't privy to that data - and to what extent eminent scholars were respected in India in the second half of the first millennium may be questioned as well, it may also be questioned as to what extent the pantheonisation of eminent scholars in Tibetan Buddhism is a later development also, but thankfully we have a relatively clear picture of the influence of Atisha in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Nāgārjuna comes to mind, as does Maitryeanatha. These two writers were extremely influential on Indian Mahāyāna. Vasubandhu's Kośa more or less eclipsed the study of other Abhidharma texts on the continent. The texts Indian translators chose to encourage their Tibetan and Chinese protégés is a very clear indices of what texts they though important and influential. So for example, Atiśa was an avid enthusiast of Candrakīrti, and within 70 years of Atisha's death in 1052, everything that was attributed to Candrakirti, whether sūtra or tantra, was translated into Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No. All accounts hold that Shantideva vanished into the sky while reciting the wisdom chapter of the Bodhicaryāvatara.

Zhen Li said:

Well, for instance, there is an account in Arts of Asia, Volume 36, p. 127. But I believe I heard the account first by word of mouth from a Kagyu Lama. But like I said, there are

multiple accounts, i.e. that after he disappeared he was seen with a wife, or with Nagarjuna, etc. But if textual sources are all that matter to you, then I'm afraid I'm out of luck.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, there really aren't multiple accounts. And there is no account of Santideva hanging out with Nāgārjuna. I think you must have him confused with another siddha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 11:14 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Kalacakra war prophecy

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm: intimidation will happen through illusions.

Dates differ, so it could be 400 years away.

It could happen through mind made illusions. I recall a story about a Tibetan siddha who, as some of the Chinese soldiers approached, made them see something fearsome (I forgot what) and they turned and ran. So if scores of future bodhisattva siddhas have this power, then it could work, if focused on the leadership of the barbarian military.

Malcolm wrote:

The war with the barbarians happens 1800 years after the conquest of mecca.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 10:12 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Kalacakra war prophecy

Content:

Will said:

At present I do not see how the barbarians would be intimidated, other than through dying.

Of course, Shambhala super weaponry of 300 years hence could produce a non-lethal, but profoundly painful weapon. Something like that is being developed now. So paralysis or sleep or total confusion could be effective in rendering the barbarian war machine ineffective. Let it come to be!

Malcolm wrote:

My statement above is based directly on the relevant passage from the Kalacakra root tantra, as well as the Vimalaprabha commentary which are both translated above,

Will said:

So does my notion of non-lethal weaponry not fit your idea of the war? Or do you mean some sort of Shambhala siddhis will produce scarifying illusory visions and dreams that will cause the barbarians to forgo war? Clarify please.

Malcolm wrote:

The passage is pretty clear, intimidation will happen through illusions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Kalacakra war prophecy

Content:

Will said:

At present I do not see how the barbarians would be intimidated, other than through dying.

Of course, Shambhala super weaponry of 300 years hence could produce a non-lethal, but profoundly painful weapon. Something like that is being developed now. So paralysis or sleep or total confusion could be effective in rendering the barbarian war machine ineffective. Let it come to be!

Malcolm wrote:

My statement above is based directly on the relevant passage from the Kalacakra root tantra, as well as the Vimalaprabha commentary which are both translated above,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: Does Arhat w/o remainder have any existence in Cittamatr

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I would understand it to mean that according to some Yogacarins when arhats enter the final samadhi of nirvana, they are done. There is no possibility for them to enter Mahāyāna and achieve Buddhahood.

zed said:

But it can't be because they have utterly ceased to exist. (?)

Shakya Chogden is saying that Cittamatrins accept that the buddha-essence exists at the time of no remainder. So there must be something there.

Just the bare alaya, perhaps, purified of all the contaminated seeds that cause rebirth in samsara, but lacking any of a buddha's positive qualities as well as any means by which that they could be manifested ?

I am aware that Shakya Chogden holds some unconventional views on Yogacara, but I

really don't know whether this is one of them or not.

Malcolm wrote:

No they don't utterly cease, but they remain in a non-afflictive samadhi of cessation forever...and never aid anyone...[according to this idea]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Kalacakra war prophecy

Content:

Will said:

Around 300 years from now, forces from Central Asia will destroy an Islamic army and thus usher in an era of peace.

Malcolm wrote:

I have ascertained an important point about this. The passage that clarifies everything about this is as follows:

Also the illusory form will war on the Barbarians in the land of Mecca.

Taktsang Lotsawa's states:

[T]hough it appears that life is taken and so on, the passage is saying that there is no war involving the misdeeds of taking life and so on.

My footnote to this passage states:

This passage, wrongly interpreted, could damage interfaith exchanges between Buddhists and Muslims. This passage has been understood by earlier scholars up to the present as indicating that the "war" with the Barbarians in Mecca will be fought in a concrete external sense (See Wallace, 2004, pg. 61), in addition to its inner sense without clarifying the non-violent nature of this war. However, PN, pg. 50, states, annotations in italics, "(For the most part, the four divisions of the Cakrin's army is an emanation), Also the illusory form (the Cakrin) will war on the Barbarians (in the manner of establishing them in the Dharma through intimidation) in the external land of Mecca; but there is no war (in the manner of taking the lives of Barbarians)." Waldo, pg. 56, 2005, erroneously translates ma kha, i.e. Mecca, as mkha', i.e. space.

So yes, there is a war, but no lives will be taken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

I'll exit this discussion now.

Malcolm wrote:

Good idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One understands the latter by understanding how it is the former is false. After all, didn't Nāgārjuna quip:

Indrajala said:

And yet the ultimate is understood, i.e., dependently originated, on the conventional. Emptiness is likewise empty, as Nagarjuna explained. To remain attached to the ultimate is as problematic as to be attached to the conventional.

Malcolm wrote:

The conventional only persists as an object of cognition until it has been analyzed. According to your understanding, the conventional is capable with withstanding analysis. It isn't since it is merely the result of mistaken cognitions.

Indrajala said:

No, there isn't. Not for a serious practitioner. And certainly not for a real bhikṣu. A bodhisattva, as I said, needs to understand reality and operate within it so as to benefit others. This is the purpose behind acquisition of the the pañca-vidyā.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

As has been pointed out, Buddhology is not part of the pañcavidyāsthana — and further, bodhisattvas do not expend their energy destroying people's faith in Mahāyāna etc. You cannot be a bodhisattva and a Buddhologist. It simply cannot be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is, actually. The only thing that prevents it from being so is affliction.

Indrajala said:

If only life were so simple we could remove all afflictions within a few hours of practice.

Malcolm wrote:

It is simple, but it is not easy.

Indrajala said:

That's all just fiction based on loosely real events. Not history.

Malcolm wrote:

It is history, not "just fiction".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Does Arhat w/o remainder have any existence in Cittamatr

Content:

uan said:

I don't have a reference handy, but I thought according to the Mahayana view, that eventually the (a) Buddha will go and awaken the Arhats and lead them to Buddhahood. But from what is just being discussed, that won't happen, ever. Or is it only for some Arhats and not others. I could be totally wrong in my understanding as well.

Malcolm wrote:

That is one Mahāyāna view, Madhyamaka.

uan said:

What would the Dzogchen perspective be?

Malcolm wrote:

Same as the Madhyamaka view, there are no icchantikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which is predicated on deluded cognitions.

Indrajala said:

Conventional reality and ultimate reality are two sides of the same coin.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a misunderstanding.

Indrajala said:

Without understanding the former, the latter is not understood.

Malcolm wrote:

One understands the latter by understanding how it is the former is false. After all, didn't Nāgārjuna quip:

Since the Jinās have proclaimed Nirvana alone to be true,
what wise person does not imagine the rest to be false?

Indrajala said:

There's more to life than Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there isn't. Not for a serious practitioner. And certainly not for a real bhikṣu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Oh nonsense. If you study the rnam thars of siddhas and bodhisattvas and emulate their examples you cannot possibly go wrong.

Indrajala said:

If only life were so simple and straightforward as that.

Malcolm wrote:

It is, actually. The only thing that prevents it from being so is affliction.

Indrajala said:

Quite frankly, the Schopenh and the Bronkhorsts of the world will just be footnotes in someone else's fashionable academic book in a hundred years. Meanwhile, people who have no idea about anything these sorts of academics wrote or said will still be gaining siddhi and waking up without the dubious benefit of any of their scholarship.

Just because you don't find any benefit in their works doesn't mean the rest of us will not.

Malcolm wrote:

In the end, you will not. Someday you will wake up from the slumber of Buddhology and devote yourself to what is important.

Indrajala said:

You have to recognize at some point that your academic interest in history is not a path. There is no subject called "history" in the pañcavidyāsthana.

That's probably due to cultural reasons. Indian scholars never really valued history so much, which is why they seem to have produced so little of it in the classical periods.

Malcolm wrote:
[/quote]

They produced a great deal of it actually, Ramayāna, Mahābharata, Puranas, etc. But their tradition of history did not grow out of the very Mediterranean anxieties of the Greeks and Romans. Their historiographical sense is quite removed from that of Greco-Roman culture.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:52 AM
Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication
Content:

Indrajala said:

Your statement presumes there is some objective external historical reality out there waiting to be verified by scholars.

Malcolm wrote:
There is a conventional reality.[/quote]

Which is predicated on deluded cognitions.

Indrajala said:

You mean the sūtras, śāstras and Dharma histories are not sufficient evidence of this? There's more to the study of history than religious texts.

Malcolm wrote:
[/quote]

Sure, but that has nothing to do with the Dharma. For example, the title of this thread (not created by you) is "Vinaya is a later fabrication", but this statement is obviously nonsense. Trying to prove that Vinaya for example does not date back to the Buddha because of the insertion of some anachronisms in this or that text no more proves that Vinaya is a "fabrication" than the now disproven contention that Troy in the Illiad never existed. And quite frankly, none of your so called anachronisms have been proven to be such.

All you have really succeeded in showing is what I have maintained in the past, i.e., Buddhology is a tangled ball of conflicting and ever-shifting opinions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:45 AM
Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication
Content:

Indrajala said:

I think studying Buddhist societies which purportedly cultivate the pāramitās, yet evidently do the opposite at times or a lot of the time, is quite instructive. If one does not study the past, then one is doomed to repeat the mistakes of one's predecessors.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh nonsense. If you study the rnam thars of siddhas and bodhisattvas and emulate their examples you cannot possibly go wrong. And since you cannot control the acts of afflicted people, what society does, any society, is largely outside the control of any individual member.

Quite frankly, the Schopens and the Bronkhorsts of the world will just be footnotes in someone else's fashionable academic book in a hundred years. Meanwhile, people who have no idea about anything these sorts of academics wrote or said will still be gaining siddhi and waking up without the dubious benefit of any of their scholarship.

You have to recognize at some point that your academic interest in history is not a path. There is no subject called "history" in the pañcavidyāsthana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Sherlock said:

...going on Jayarava's course.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh right, the reincarnation of the "Buddha was a solar myth" theory of some in the nineteenth century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Sherlock said:

Useful how?

Does it help you complete any of the 6 paramitas?

Indrajala said:

Is that the only measure in which something can be useful?

Discernment of reality as it was or is is a useful aspect of wisdom in my reckoning.

The study of history is a lot of fun and quite enlightening. You get to see how Buddhism

actually worked out in real life in the past for real life people.

Malcolm wrote:

As to your question, since the six perfections included pretty much everything meaningful there is to practice and cultivate as a Dharma person, yes.

Your statement presumes there is some objective external historical reality out there waiting to be verified by scholars.

You mean the sūtras, śāstras and Dharma histories are not sufficient evidence of this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For this reason, Buddhology is basically useless for Buddhists.

Indrajala said:

Naw. I'm into Buddhology, a Buddhist monk and I find the methodologies useful.

I've written a ton of stuff for my blogs and site on all manner of Buddhist subjects for the purposes of edification and so forth (using Buddhological methods).

Sherlock said:

Useful how?

Does it help you complete any of the 6 paramitas?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it might not have any value for the perfections, but certainly Buddhological will definitely help one gather the six imperfections.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For this reason, Buddhology is basically useless for Buddhists.

Indrajala said:

Naw. I'm into Buddhology, a Buddhist monk and I find the methodologies useful.

I've written a ton of stuff for my blogs and site on all manner of Buddhist subjects for the purposes of edification and so forth (using Buddhological methods).

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't edify anyone. It is a lot of wasted talent better put towards translating sūtra, śāstra and commentaries. And a lot of it is just you pontificating about the opinions of other scholars. In other words, it is largely discursive and intellectual, but it has no value for the path. Moreover, it does not help anyone at all.

But you are still young and have (some) time to waste of youthful pursuits. However as Candragomin points out:

Just like the flame of a lamp that is stirred by a strong wind,
there is no certainty this life remains for an instant longer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

Academia does not strictly equal secular materialism.

Malcolm wrote:

It's method is informed by it and largely caters to it.

For this reason, Buddhology is basically useless for Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

The basic reality at the moment is that there's no evidence that Magahda in the fifth century BCE had writing. The Buddha's sangha was illiterate.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a reality, that is a groundless supposition concocted from your imagination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Does Arhat w/o remainder have any existence in Cittamatr

Content:

uan said:

I don't have a reference handy, but I thought according to the Mahayana view, that eventually the (a) Buddha will go and awaken the Arhats and lead them to Buddhahood. But from what is just being discussed, that won't happen, ever. Or is it only for some

Arhats and not others. I could be totally wrong in my understanding as well.

Malcolm wrote:

That is one Mahāyāna view, Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Does Arhat w/o remainder have any existence in Cittamatr

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I would understand it to mean that according to some Yogacarins when arhats enter the final samadhi of nirvana, they are done. There is no possibility for them to enter Mahāyāna and achieve Buddhahood.

uan said:

Is that a bad thing?

Separate from the above question, is there a point where the arhat consciously makes that choice, or is it a result of a wrong view they are unaware of?

Malcolm wrote:

According to the promulgators of this view, it is an inferior awakening. Hence the term "hinayāna".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 9th, 2014 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

With respect to specimens of pre-Aśoka writing, there are no reliably dated items available.

Educate yourself:

<http://indology.info/papers/salomon/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return
false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so what? Really, it is quite impossible that Indians did not have writing at the time of the Buddha.

Apart from the fact that this paper is the usual collection of conflicting opinions that

Buddhologists are so fond of reciting, your cited paper states:
Can we believe that these dynasties with their legendary riches, and the remarkable intellectual and cultural life of India in the time of the Buddha and Mahāvīra, existed in a totally illiterate sphere?

...Even given the very different cultural role of writing in India as compared to many other ancient civilizations, it is hard to conceive that practical affairs such as the keeping of records and accounts in a fabulously wealthy empire like that of the Nandas could have been kept in order without any form of writing at all, or at least without some alternative system of memory-aids like the Inca quipu . Thus one is tempted to think along the lines of William Bright (cited by Falk, p.290) of some type of writing that was "perhaps used for commercial purposes, but not for religious or legal texts."
My answer is no. The simplest explanation, of course is that Indians used writing only for business, and that even these records vanished easily because of the dampness of the climate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Does Arhat w/o remainder have any existence in Cittamatr

Content:

zed said:

As I understand, he is saying that in Cittamatra, the dharmadhatu of the meditator's own continuums, i.e., the pole of experience that is luminous and aware, is taken as a the support for meditation (dmigs rten), so when that continuum is severed, as in the case of nirvana without remainder, there is no more gotra. But bodhisattvas never sever their continuums; they transform (or gradually reveal) the gotra as the dharmakaya.

In Madhyamaka, on the other hand, it is asserted that an arhat's continuum at the time of nirvana without remainder is not severed. Although the delusional obscurations (nyon bsgrib) have been eliminated, some (or all) knowledge obscurations remain embedded in the alaya.

Reasonable interpretation? Or am I all screwed up?

Malcolm wrote:

I would understand it to mean that according to some Yogacarins when arhats enter the final samadhi of nirvana, they are done. There is no possibility for them to enter Mahāyāna and achieve Buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

the discovery recent find of Tamil-Brahmi, possibly dating the 600-500 BCE, casts considerable doubt on the common assumption among Buddhologists that writing did not exist in India during the time of the Buddha.

daverupa said:

3rd or 2nd Century BCE, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tamil-Brahmi#The_script, so what is that, about 300-100 BCE? I heard about

<http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/tamil-nadu/article2408091.ece>, but...

Mr. Mahadevan described the dating as “interesting” but said “multiple carbon-dates are needed” for confirmation. “If there are several such cases, history has to be re-written because up to now, the scientifically proved earliest date is from

Tissamaharama in southern Sri Lanka, where a Tamil-Brahmi script is dated to 200 BCE.”

If there is scientific evidence that the paddy is dated to 490 BCE, “we have to sit up and take notice, and wait for confirmation,” Mr. Mahadevan said.

“It is premature to revise the Tamil-Brahmi dating on the basis of a single carbon date, which is governed by complicated statistical probabilities,” Dr. Subbarayalu said.

And, why no records of writing tools and their proper use and care, among the various allowables, at the early strata?

Malcolm wrote:

Writing does not spread over a whole continent for different languages in a single generation. It is a process that takes centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Does Arhat w/o remainder have any existence in Cittamatr

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What he is saying is that according to this presentation, such an arhat is effectively an icchantika, and has severed their natural gotra by entering into parinirvana.

zed said:

Which I take to be utter non-existence and consistent with the standard Cittamatra presentation of nirvana without remainder. Right?

I guess it makes sense, given that the natural gotra is held to be the special feature of the six ayatanas. If there are no more ayatanas, then there can no longer be a natural gotra.

Am I right in thinking that only False Aspectarian Cittamatrins assert that all beings possess buddha-essence, which is the truly existent natural purity of the mind?

If so, what do True Aspectarians assert is the buddha-essence? Obviously (?) it cannot be something that is possessed by all beings.

Thanks, Malcolm, for your input.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is better to put it in terms of classical Yogacara. For example, Dharmamitra states in his Prasphuṭapadā commentary on the Abhisamayālaṃkāra:

This one the Mahāyāna Madhyamikas describes as difficult to have realization, but the Yogacarin assertion that the icchantika (rigs chad pa) 'burns the seed' slanders tathagātagarbha.

If you run a search on the term rigs med pa, rather than rigs chad pa, you will find very ample discussion of the concept in the Yogacarin section on the Tengyur.

For example, Muncandra's Sūtrālaṃkāravṛttibhāṣya states:

If one lacking gotra generates [bodhi]citta, the seed will not "take".

But it is important to keep in mind that the concept of agotra and icchantika comes from the Tathagatagarbha and Yogacarin stream of sutra, specifically the Lanka and the Nirvana. They are a little different from each other. But they are both rejected by Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

tingdzin said:

Again in my opinion, someone who is truly intellectually supple and does not have an ego-investment in one side or the other should be able to argue both sides. And anyone who has the capability to do that but has not come to some supra-intellectual understanding of the Buddha's teaching already has probably missed the boat.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out once, there is no consensus about anything in Buddhology, it's just a stew of conflicting opinions by scholars in disagreement with each other for a hundred years.

This one says this, that one says that, etc. Vast and confident inferences are made on the basis of a few surviving inscriptions, or the absence thereof.

Schopen, and Jeff, make one of the most basic faults described in archaeology — to whit — pots are not people. Moreover, in a climate like India's, wood structures do not survive much less kutis. The whole argument that there was no organized monastic Sangha prior to Ashoka must be laughed at, since we clearly have evidence in the Vinaya.

For example, as to the charge of anachronism, let it be pointed out that the Illiad contains many, many anachronisms. Nevertheless, it also contains a record of a war that was actually fought in the place where the text says the war at Troy was fought.

It is well known everywhere, and in all traditions, that Buddha's teachings were not written down until a very late date. Many people assume that this is due to the absence of writing in India at that time, but the discovery recent find of Tamil-Brahmi, possibly dating the 600-500 BCE, casts considerable doubt on the common assumption among Buddhologists that writing did not exist in India during the time of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Does Arhat w/o remainder have any existence in Cittamatr

Content:

zed said:

But since the dharmadhatu (= buddha-gotra) pervades all that exists, then Shakya Chogden seems to be saying that in Cittamatra an arhat without remainder has no existence whatsoever.?

Malcolm wrote:

What he is saying is that according to this presentation, such an arhat is effectively an icchantika, and has severed their natural gotra by entering into parinirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

By no account is this true. You have either erred or been misled.

Zhen Li said:

Sorry, not all accounts. But it is among the various legends about Santideva - some he has a wife, others he lives with Nagarjuna.

Malcolm wrote:

No. All accounts hold that Shantideva vanished into the sky while reciting the wisdom chapter of the Bodhicaryāvatara.

I think you've confused Shantideva with some other siddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Zhen Li said:

As for Santideva, if you would kindly provide a quotation as to what you are referring to, I would appreciate that, but I am unsure what value in practice he held for [non-

householder] monasticism at large, considering the fact that by all accounts he became a householder in his later life.

Malcolm wrote:

By no account is this true. You have either erred or been misled.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

rory said:

Blood Bowl hell

Malcolm wrote:

This is a Chinese invention. There is no such hell listed among the eighteen classic hells mentioned in Indian sutras and shastras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

rory said:

Actually the ancient Greeks and Roman intellectuals scoffed at the thought of taking their myths literally and they were the great innovators of Stoicism, Pyrrhoism, Pythagoreanism, Platonism, Aristotelianism, Epicureanism (which indeed is the ancient basis for materialism) etc These currents travelled to India, but you all seem entirely unaware!

Malcolm wrote:

Standard Western bias at work here again...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Jikan said:

Spinoza's an early materialist, sure, but his claims on history are limited to very particular texts and histories in the Tractatus, which is primarily a philosophical document.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but that is not the point -- he is making a broader claim about any scripture and all "supernatural" explanations, as well as an argument for the primacy of secular history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

rory said:

Well said Ven. Indrajala but this entire conversation reminds me of Harnack in the 19th century and the development of the historical-critical method! Pretty astounding this needs to be replayed for educated Buddhists in the 21st century

gassho

Rory

Malcolm wrote:

The development of the historical critical method begins with Baruch Spinoza's Tractatus theologico-politicus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

Perhaps you feel threatened by secular scholarship.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. I simply recognize that Buddhology has severe limits and is basically useless for practitioners. As practitioners, we have our own sense of history and it is more important than what Buddhologists think or believe.

Indrajala said:

This isn't for everyone of course, but then academic literature is not that widely read. I would guess that less than one or two percent of Buddhists in the world know about Schopen, Nakamura, Hu Shi or Lamotte, nor would most really care if you gave them their papers to read. Secular scholarship really only appeals to intellectuals, be they professionals or otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem, quite frankly, is that their ideas are in the air, and a lot of Western Buddhists teachers, for example, Rita Gross comes to mind, who teach a version of Buddhist history derived primarily from Buddhology to people who are primarily practitioners (in this case Vajrayāna) for whom such a view of history is at odds with their practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Chokgyur Dechen Lingpa's short prayer

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Okay, I'll give it a try. I recite the Migtsema in Tibetan for that reason.

I like your translation the best too. So the mara is singular? Tamer of the mara, not tamer of the maras?

Malcolm wrote:

The name in Tibetan is singular, bdud 'dul means "Māra Tamer, or Demon Tamer. But it can be construed as plural, just as a Lion Tamer tames lions. A Demon Tamer tames demons.

Glad you like it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Chokgyur Dechen Lingpa's short prayer

Content:

Konchog1 said:

I'm comparing the Lotsawa House and FPMT versions of The Prayer to Guru Rinpoche for Removing Obstacles and Fulfilling Wishes

Which do you think is the better translation?

Particularly the first line, དུས་གསུམ་སངས་རྒྱལ་གྱི་ཅེ་མེད་པོ་ཆེ།

The Buddha of past, present and future vs. The embodiment of all buddhas of the three times

Seems it could go either way.

I want to start doing this prayer regularly but I want to be sure I recite a correct version.

Thank you.

Lotsawa House: <http://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/chokgyur-dechen-lingpa/removing-obstacles-and-fulfilling-wishes> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

FPMT: <http://www.lamayeshe.com/index.php?sect=article&id=299&chid=1362> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return
false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return
false;"

Malcolm wrote:

This is my rendition:

དུས་གསུམ་སངས་རྒྱལ་གྱི་ཐུ་རྩེ་མོ་ཆེ།

dü sum sangye guru rinpoche

To the Buddha of the three times, Guru Rinpoche,

དངོས་གྲུབ་ཀུན་བདག་བདེ་བ་ཆེན་པོའི་ཞབས།

ngödrub kün dak dewa chenpö shyab

to the lord of all siddhis, venerable Great Bliss

བར་ཆད་ཀུན་སེལ་བདུད་འདུལ་དྲག་པོ་རྩལ།

barché kün sel düdul drakpo tsal

to the one who removes all obstacles, Powerful Fierce Tamer of Māra,

གསོལ་བ་འདེབས་སོ་བྱིན་གྱིས་བརྒྱབ་ཏུ་གསོལ།

solwa deb so jingyi lab tu sol

I offer a supplication, please grant your blessings.

བྱིན་པ་གསང་བའི་བར་ཆད་ཞི་བ་དང་།

chi nang sangwé barché shyiwa dang

Pacify all outer, inner and secret obstacles.

བསམ་པ་ལྷན་གྱིས་འགྲུབ་པར་བྱིན་གྱིས་རྫོབ་པ།

sampa lhün gyi drubpar jingyi lob

and bless me so that my wishes are effortlessly accomplished.

Reciting the Tibetan is better, then you are reciting Guru Rinpoche's words, the actual words of the Sambhogakāya, not the paltry words of some translator like me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the assumptions upon which you base your research are founded on the naive secular materialism of the late 17th and early 18th century Enlightenment thinkers such as Spinoza.

Indrajala said:

My personal approach is not materialist. I'm comfortable accepting the reality of mysticism and supermundane experiences having their roles to play in the development of history, especially in the case of Buddhism where visions and religious experiences are quite common, even expected. That being said, modern academic work demands an evidence based approach, so attributing historical processes to subjective unseen forces, or deferring to the testimonies of prophets and mystics just doesn't cut it. I'm sure you understand why.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because Buddhology is materialist in its viewpoint and methodology.

Indrajala said:

The evidence approach yields a lot of results. It isn't conclusive, but nevertheless it is a productive approach. Believing in rebirth because there is evidence for the phenomena is probably more reliable than believing in the testimony of someone you have developed faith in.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no scientific evidence for the phenomena. Stevenson's "science" was not at all rigorous.

Indrajala said:

As for Schopen's contention that monastic communities are all post-Ashoka, he hasn't a shred of proof for this.

He's basing his arguments on literary evidence and archaeological developments. There might have been small communities, but not the well-developed monastic systems we see described in middle-period vinaya literature.

Malcolm wrote:

Just how many bhikṣus ordained under the Buddha?

Indrajala said:

There is no reason to assume that Ananda, for example, never experienced frostbite in the Himalayas and that this story is necessarily a fabrication. The world was colder then. India was cooler and wetter at that time than it is now, especially after five centuries of increasing deforestation.

If you want to believe in the story, go for it.

Malcolm wrote:

We have no reason not to believe it.

Indrajala said:

But the problem with the approach you have decided to follow is that it is cynical, and assumes that everything is a fabricated lie.
I've never framed it in those terms. It is more a matter of "fiction". Buddhist literature is largely fictional...

Malcolm wrote:

fiction |'fikSHən|

noun

literature in the form of prose, esp. short stories and novels, that describes imaginary events and people.

- invention or fabrication as opposed to fact: he dismissed the allegation as absolute fiction.
- [in sing.] a belief or statement that is false, but that is often held to be true because it is expedient to do so: the notion of that country being a democracy is a polite fiction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I'd rather read the Vinaya itself than his work to form an opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

This indeed strikes the heart of the issue. Much of modern opinion in Buddhology is formed and preserved by people who read other people's opinions and then repeat them. For example, Jeff often repeats the opinions of Bronkhorst and Schopen as if they were gospel truths.

People really need to understand the Buddhology is not the study of Dharma. It is the study of something invented by Buddhologists themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

So, it isn't so binary, Malcolm. There's a lot of middle ground between being a secularist materialist, and completely accepting as literal truth everything your Buddhist scriptures of choice say.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the assumptions upon which you base your research are founded on the naive secular materialism of the late 17th and early 18th century Enlightenment thinkers such as Spinoza.

You are suggesting for example, by invoking scientists like Stevenson and Sheldrake that "Science" is the arbiter of truth for Buddhists.

This, in my opinion, is the wrong way to go about it.

For example, one might conclude from archaeology that Indians had no temples prior to meeting the Greeks. But in fact we know that they did because 1) such structures get mentioned 2) when Indians first tried to work stone (perhaps under Greek influence) with engineering principles based on wood construction, with obvious limitations on heights and sizes of structures. But this shows of course that Indians were quite used to building large wooden structures.

As for Schopen's contention that monastic communities are all post-Ashoka, he hasn't a shred of proof for this. We know that by the time of Ashoka there were so many people representing themselves as Buddhist monks that he felt compelled to disrobe many many thousands of mendicants. Moving camps do not leave much trace. It is like asserting that there are no communities on the high plains of Tibet because the nomads there live in tents. But in fact there is a sophisticated culture there, complete with economic standards, trade, large mobile monasteries and so on.

There is no reason to assume that Ananda, for example, never experienced frostbite in the Himalayas and that this story is necessarily a fabrication. The world was colder then. India was cooler and wetter at that time than it is now, especially after five centuries of increasing deforestation.

But the problem with the approach you have decided to follow is that it is cynical, and assumes that everything is a fabricated lie.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 8th, 2014 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

Such binary thinking I find problematic.

Malcolm wrote:

You think now that you can have your cake and eat it too, but you will find out that it is not so easy. In the end I predict that you will settle for secularist interpretation of Dharma (Buddhism lite tm) that rules out all "supernatural" elements, including rebirth and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am not so sure. Because if one was a Buddhist (Mahayana particularly) one would accept this.

If one does not accept this, then one has to dismiss HUGE portions of the Pali and Sanskrit canons as utter fakery. It is a slippery slope.

Indrajala said:

There's another option: read it as religious literature meant to convey truths, ideas, values and so forth.

That's what I do.

Malcolm wrote:

Then clearly you are not reading these texts as they were intended (regardless of who you think authored them), and are repurposing them for your own use. This is fine, but just be clear with people what you are up to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Then obviously Jeff does not accept the Buddha is omniscient or has the capacity to have such special knowledge.

Indrajala said:

Is there a third option? Like later individuals put words in the mouth of the Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

You can't have it both ways, i.e. that the Buddha has the capacity to know the future, including future actors, but arbitrarily decide that this and that is an example of a later author's interpolation.

In other words, if you are going to be a secularist, you will have to go the whole way, following in the path of people like Jayarava Atwood, Richard Hayes and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am not so sure. Because if one was a Buddhist (Mahayana particularly) one would accept this.

If one does not accept this, then one has to dismiss HUGE portions of the Pali and Sanskrit canons as utter fakery. It is a slippery slope.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is a problem. This is why I suggested to Jeff that the roots of his present line of inquiry were to be found in the secularism of Spinoza.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

JKhedrup said:

And why do you imagine that it is impossible that Buddha cannot know the future nor predict such and such a person will born here or there?

This is a characteristic of the fully enlightened Buddha. The ability to penetrate perfectly past and future lives, and individual karmas of each and every sentient being. I am sure V.I. knows this.

Malcolm wrote:

Then obviously Jeff does not accept the Buddha is omniscient or has the capacity to have such special knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you are a heretic, but I don't think there is any wisdom or truth in your quest for secular "historical" knowledge.

Indrajala said:

I find it quite edifying and rewarding. It might not work for everyone of course.

Pursuit of the truth is, in my opinion, a worthy path.

Malcolm wrote:

In the end, you will just sit around with other scholars over the gutted corpse of what you imagine to be "Buddhist History", sucking its bones and licking your chops, satisfied with a job well done. Then you will die have wasted your life in pursuit of "truth" that is useful to no one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

The intention behind Buddhist scriptures was to convey truths and ideas, not describe historical events. They might be loosely based on earlier true events at best.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, Jeff. The intent of Buddhist scriptures is precisely to communicate historical events, as well as truths and ideas.

Indrajala said:

Assuming the author had the same stūpa in mind, the historical Buddha is positioned in what is now modern northern Pakistan near the Afghanistan border, which is far from Magadha in what is now largely Bihar state in India. Kaniṣka was famous and influential enough to merit having a prophecy about him on the part of the Buddha in canonical literature (recall that the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya was in use in Nālandā). Again, this just illustrates the fact that Śrāvakayāna literature is full of anachronisms which demonstrate it to be ahistorical and fictional.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, a few weeks on foot. Totally possible.

And why do you imagine that it is impossible that Buddha cannot know the future nor predict such and such a person will be born here or there?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One has to understand that Dharma history and secular history do not have the same aims. The point of the latter is to explain the sources of living lineages; the point of the latter is strictly forensic analysis, like examining a corpse.

Indrajala said:

In any case, I prefer the evidence based approach. Call me a heretic, but it just strikes me as truer than religious understandings of history.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you are a heretic, but I don't think there is any wisdom or truth in your quest for secular "historical" knowledge.

I think that the scholars like Schopen could really care less if Dharma survives as a living tradition or not. In my view, this negates the value of their contributions completely.

You really do need to read Spinoza's Tractatus. In it you will find the root of your present enterprise, and you will understand it has nothing to with the survival of Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

[

Historical is in written with the intention of constituting accounts of events that actually took place.

Malcolm wrote:

Then the documents in question fit your definition of "historical document".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

My view of history is likewise secular, simply because the evidence based approach works best in the study of history. It doesn't explain everything, but produces a solid working model upon which you can build on. Mystical experiences and magic, which I don't actually deny, are difficult to fit into an evidence based approach to history as they're too subjective.

Malcolm wrote:

One has to understand that Dharma history and secular history do not have the same aims. The point of the latter to explain the sources of living lineages; the point of the latter is strictly forensic analysis, like examining a corpse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

[They're not historical documents and should not be understood as such.

Malcolm wrote:

They are indeed historical documents. For example, you can read many conflicting accounts of the Second World War, does this mean that those documents are not "historical"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

You really have no argument against my assertions.

Malcolm wrote:

I have many, actually, but I have better things to do with my time.

If you wish to be a disciple of Spinoza, that is fine with me, but it is not Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, Sujato's point, one I fully agree with, is that it is hasty to make assumptions about a body of literature one has not thoroughly examined.

Indrajala said:

You can extract what you need from it to prove your point: like the development of banking protocols by the sangha administration, etc.

If you're going to attack Schopen, actually cite his work and something you disagree with.

Malcolm wrote:

As to your first point — like economics, much of what passes for fact in the Academy follows from the kinds of assumptions one makes. In the case of Schopen, his assumptions largely stem from a materialist view of history.

There is no need — qualms about Shopen's approach to Buddhist history have frequently been voiced by his colleagues in the Academy, largely due to his limiting insistence that everything must be tied to some archaeological find.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I don't have Schopen's work as I left it behind due to flight weight but if I did I'd check the Bibliography and body of work to see if he quotes Kunkyen Tsonawa's Vinaya commentary "Rays of the Sun".

Indrajala said:

Schopen's point is to reconstruct the chronological development of Vinaya literature in India, not propound the practical and useful qualities of the monastic system as understood by Tibetans.

Malcolm wrote:

Hard to do if you haven't read it all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

They are full of fictional stories.

Malcolm wrote:

And you divined these accounts are fictional based on what supernatural faculty?

Or, as is so often the case, is this merely an expression of your opinion on the matter?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

Do you realize how enormous the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya literature is?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I look at it frequently in my job as a scholar and translator of Tibetan texts. It is very difficult and has lots of obscure terms.

In other words, Sujato's point, one I fully agree with, is that it is hasty to make assumptions about a body of literature one has not thoroughly examined.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la

Content:

Mkoll said:

So it's not a title:

Malcolm wrote:

I have two Tibetan titles, loppon (ācharya) and sman pa (doctor).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la

Content:

WuMing said:

So it's not a title, it's his name? Or is it some kind of species of which Malcolm is the only member?

Now I'm more confused.

Namdrol is his Dharmaname and la is a Tibetan honorific to show respect.

Mkoll said:

Ah, much clearer now, thanks.

So Malcolm, how did you get your Dharma name?

Malcolm wrote:

I received my refuge name from HH Sakya Trizin, Kunga Namdrol aka Vimuktānanda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

Indrajala said:

This observation is actually applicable to Buddhist sanghas. The orthodox ideal is subverted to acquisition and retention of internal power, which is not merely for personal status, but actual real life acquisition of resources and funds from the laity. The vinaya literature constantly illustrates an obsession with maintaining outward purity to keep the offerings rolling in, whereas internally these same authors of the literature

were drafting sangha-banking regulations for their own gain. Archaeology and history also reveal they were hardly following the śramaṇa model, where you wander the world, learn, teach and try to gain wisdom in the process..

Malcolm wrote:

Considering that Schopen bases all of his opinions about such things in the Vinaya as preserved in Tibetan, do you have sufficient skills in Tibetan to read what he read to ascertain what he says? Because I will tell you, I frequently check the opinions of Western academics, as well as their Tibetan translations, and quite frankly they often perform rather poorly and suffer from inadequate exposure and experience both with the language (since many of their published pieces are graduate level work) and with the subject matter itself. Graduates programs train Western students of Buddhist studies to prioritize the opinions of western professors over traditional sources, much as you do. Indeed, Buddhist Studies in the West has largely become a game of reading the work of Westerners in reference to their often superficial forensic analysis of this corpus of texts. Really, it's a pity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Similarly, much of the Vinaya commentarial literature, at least that I have read, is extremely practical and plausible with regard as to how these systems developed back to the Buddha's time.

Indrajala said:

This is an emotional argument and not one based on historical evidence.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is based on historical evidence, the text itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: The Sin of Slandering the Dharma by Jacqueline Stone

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I do not understand sentiments such as these to be anything other than harmful to the Dharma.

M

Indrajala said:

Better that sympathetic Buddhists start addressing such questions than hostile outsiders seeking to undermine Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Tirthikas cannot undermine Buddhadharma, Buddha made it plain only we can do that.

Giving into the Western Academic forensic narrative of Buddhist History is simply buying into a version of Buddhism that never existed anywhere on the ground.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

rory said:

libel.

Malcolm wrote:

Libel is very hard to prove in the United States.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I also do not dismiss V. Indralajala's ideas without considering them. He knows well that I bought Schopen's book in India and read it. I don't quote from it because it was too heavy to carry back in the plane. Some points were interesting, but hardly definitive. I'd rather read the Vinaya itself than his work to form an opinion.

Indrajala said:

Ideally one reads both the original material alongside text critical works by modern scholars. The results can be disenchanting for some (like seeing how banking procedures were introduced by rich monks in India and then attributed to the Buddha), but nevertheless the historical truth is desirable.

Malcolm wrote:

Debt is a concept one finds even in the Rig Veda and so on. It is highly unlikely that "banking", much like writing, is a post "Buddha" institution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 7:28 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

rory said:

I have no interest sitting around swapping personal opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

That is all academic scholarship is, a bunch of personal opinions.

Indrajala said:

When it comes to scholarship, the evidence based approach is a lot more reliable than the faith-based one.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on your goals: if your goal is to get a job as an academic writer and teacher, you have to kowtow to the Spinozaists in Buddhists studies. If you wish to understand the Dharma itself, then a faith-based approach is a desideratum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 7:24 PM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:

JKhedrup said:

My suspicion is that many who dismiss the entire Vinaya Pitaka haven't even read it.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, Gregory Schopen.

Indrajala said:

How silly. Read his papers. He's clearly read the Vinaya literature in great detail.

Gregory Schopen. Indian Monastic Buddhism Collected Papers on Textual, Inscriptional and Archaeological Evidence. New Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.

Schopen's work contains much that is interesting and informative, but little that could be called inspiring. His writing is characterized by wit, scandal, and good yarns. Unfortunately, it is not always characterized by consistency, and we should examine some of his fracture lines. He rests his arguments heavily on the authority of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, a text he cheerfully admits to not having fully read.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://sujato.wordpress.com/2011/01/22/the-ironic-assumptions-of-gregory-schopen/>
" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 10:39 AM

Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication

Content:
rory said:
I have no interest sitting around swapping personal opinions.

Malcolm wrote:
That is all academic scholarship is, a bunch of personal opinions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 4:58 AM
Title: Re: The Sin of Slandering the Dharma by Jacqueline Stone
Content:
nichirenista said:
In today's world, particularly the West, the image of a Buddhist monk being militant, and of some being "armed to the teeth" and ready to attack rivals, is unimaginable, if not shocking.

Malcolm wrote:
I am not so sure about that:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 4:56 AM
Title: Re: Vinaya is a later fabrication
Content:

JKhedrup said:
My suspicion is that many who dismiss the entire Vinaya Pitaka haven't even read it.

Malcolm wrote:
For example, Gregory Schopen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 3:04 AM
Title: Re: The Sin of Slandering the Dharma by Jacqueline Stone
Content:
rory said:
Well it turns out the Vinaya is a later fabrication...

Sherab Dorje said:
Source?

rory said:
Malcolm: Just as I was rightly chastised for not calling Ven.Khedrup by 'Venerable' ; you

need to address Ven. Indrajala as 'Venerable, calling him 'Jeff' is gross disrespect.'

Malcolm wrote:

I have to do no such thing.

Whoever chastised you for not calling Khedrup "Venerable" is wrong.

In the blog article you quote, Jeff states:

This effectively undermines any claim by living Buddhist traditions to having the true tradition of the historical Buddha. This is unlikely to be easily accepted, but nevertheless it is increasingly the consensus of specialist scholars in the field of Buddhology, like Bronkhorst as quoted above. Secular scholarship in any case is effective at challenging Buddhist beliefs about their own textual and lineage histories, though few Buddhists seem to really appreciate and accept this.

I do not understand sentiments such as these to be anything other than harmful to the Dharma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: The Sin of Slandering the Dharma by Jacqueline Stone

Content:

rory said:

Well it turns out the Vinaya is a later fabrication...

Sherab Dorje said:

Source?

rory said:

here you go: This is Ven. Indrajala's blog, duly footnoted with the latest scholarship

[https://huayanzang.blogspot.com/2014/08/anachronisms-in-buddhist-](https://huayanzang.blogspot.com/2014/08/anachronisms-in-buddhist-sravakayana.html)

[sravakayana.html](https://huayanzang.blogspot.com/2014/08/anachronisms-in-buddhist-sravakayana.html) " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

"Again, [Gregory]Schopen remarks that the “earliest 'monasteries' that are known in India – and none of these are pre-Aśokan – are not 'monasteries' at all. They are either only barely improved, unorganized, natural caverns or caves, or poorly constructed and ill-organized shelters built of rubble and other cheap materials.”⁸ This would therefore mean that any mention of the Buddha or his contemporaries residing in any vihāra of notable scale would be anachronistic. In fact, Bronkhorst quoting Schopen points out that the earliest references to a vihāra system appear “only in Kharoṣṭhī records of a little before and a little after the Common Era, about the same time that the first indications of permanent monastic residential quarters begin to appear in the archaeological record for the Northwest, and this is not likely to be mere coincidence.”⁹

Most vinaya literature providing complex rules and regulations for running monastic institutions can be understood as a much later development by clergy with quite different lifestyles from their predecessors. Consider for example how the Buddha is quoted in sūtra suggesting a śramaṇa does not sleep under the same tree twice¹⁰ with the clearly later vinaya literature which regulates living arrangements in large monasteries with slaves and taxed peasants (the vinaya recognizes the institution of slavery, which is why slaves cannot join the sangha).

Malcolm wrote:

Schopen's scholarship is not at all definitive when it comes to these issues for many reasons. He just happens to be Jeff's latest scholastic infatuation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So you believe that hereditary religious leadership is better than the tulku system? Or do you prefer the Gelug model?

PS The Dalai Lamas are tulku, are they not?

Malcolm wrote:

I think the Gelug model is best for the West.

HHDL is a tulku, however, the Fifth Dalai Lama's recognition was fraudulent, according to his autobiography, and every one from the 8th to the 13th was selected by a lottery operated by the Qing dynasty Ambans.

M

Sherlock said:

Well, the 5th didn't pick the belongings of the 4th correctly. Maybe it was the 4th's recognition that was politically motivated to cement relations with the Mongols and the 5th really was a continuation of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd.

Malcolm wrote:

Who knows? Why speculate? What we know is that despite the fact that the 5th's recognition was fraudulent, he was a great master, one of the most important in Tibetan history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Ley Lines

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Similarly, one cannot but be moved by visiting the Yarlung Valley in central Tibet.

Thanks Malcolm, would you say that pilgrimage can be of particular benefit for Buddhists?

Malcolm wrote:

Absolutely.

tellyontellyon said:

I'm interested in what you said about 'power places', what is the Buddhist understanding of what makes these places powerful?

Malcolm wrote:

Just as there are places in the body which have more functions than others, there are also places on the earth where there is more "function" than others.

tellyontellyon said:

Do you think that practicing in a power place is better, or could it also be a place to encounter obstacles/demons etc? Is it a good idea to meditate/practice in non-Buddhist spiritual centres/power places? e.g. some of the neolithic sites?

Malcolm wrote:

Practicing in ancient sacred sites has plusses and minuses. Sometimes local guardians in these places can be very heavy and strong, hard to placate. But the plus side is that one can have deeper experience. Also places where great siddhas have meditated have power. For example, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu stated to me personally in 1992 that if one does six days of good quality practice at Khandroling (located in Western Massachusetts) this is equivalent to doing six months of retreat in other places.

tellyontellyon said:

I know there are guardian and protector deities that we often see statues of in monasteries etc. are these particularly needed in the power places?

Malcolm wrote:

We have to distinguish between local guardians and Dharmapalas. Usually, some guardians one sees will be representations of powerful worldly Guardians like Nyenchen Thangla, the Tenma, and so on., as well as the four directional Kings and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 7th, 2014 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Music time

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Malcolm wrote:

Joe Strummer bought me a pint once.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Ley Lines

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

is there evidence that they are aligned or arranged in lines or patterns from site to site.

Malcolm wrote:

108 stupas were erected in Tibet on the pattern of the body of a giant ogress.

tellyontellyon said:

Also, do you think that some places are just more 'spiritual' or somehow more conducive to spiritual practice than others?

Malcolm wrote:

Some places are clearly more powerful than others. For example, once Oḍḍiyāna and Shambhala (modern day Pakistan and Afghanistan) were major sites of Buddhadharma, boasting a high civilization. Now they are places of incredible violence.

Power places are places where both positive influences as well as evil influences can be heightened.

Similarly, one cannot but be moved by visiting the Yarlung Valley in central Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: The Sin of Slandering the Dharma by Jacqueline Stone

Content:

rory said:

Well it turns out the Vinaya is a later fabrication...

Sherab Dorje said:

Source?

Malcolm wrote:

She has fallen for Jeff's arguments about Vinaya. She has no idea that thousands of lines of teachings of the Buddha are contained within Vinaya, that it is not just a

collection of 200 some odd rules.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: The limit of compounded phenomena

Content:

anjali said:

...therefore, none of the upper level stuff exists either.

Malcolm wrote:

Other than conventionally. In Vajrayāna, it is understood that everything that appears is an appearance of pure consciousness [jñāna, ye shes].

anjali said:

As a practitioner, I totally get that everything that appears is an appearance of pure consciousness, and that that pure consciousness is empty. In terms of analysis, though, this issue of indefinite decomposition is still left unresolved. In doing a little research, the view that,

Malcolm wrote:

...we break pots into shards, shards into gross particles, gross particles into subtle particles

anjali said:

seems to be a Vaibhasika view. From p. 53 of Buddhist Philosophy: Losang Gonchok's Short Commentary to Jamyang Shayba's Root Text on Tenets, By Daniel Cozort According to the Vaibhasikas and perhaps some Sautrantikas, the basic elements that comprise gross objects are so-called "indivisible particles. " These tiny or "subtle" particles are for them the principal units of impermanent physical entities, the "building blocks" for gross objects. Hypothetically, these particles are indivisible because they are too minute to be physically subdivided. They are too small to have directions, so that we could not say they have sides to the north, south, east, or west. Vasubandha (and others) demonstrated that gross objects can't be made up of subtle particles. Essentially, the classical argument is that spacial objects must be composed of spacial parts. And because spacial parts are always extensive, they can always be further divided.

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu's analysis ends at mind. Candra's ends at the impossibility of establishing even mind.

But it not the case that any Buddhist analysis of particles is carried out ad infinitum

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: The limit of compounded phenomena

Content:

anjali said:

...therefore, none of the upper level stuff exists either.

Malcolm wrote:

Other than conventionally. In Vajrayāna, it is understood that everything that appears is an appearance of pure consciousness [jñāna, ye shes].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: The limit of compounded phenomena

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point which I mentioned holds true: when the particle one is decomposing ceases to be perceived through analysis, that perceived absence is the emptiness of that particle.

anjali said:

Agreed. As practitioners we only need to analytically decompose a particular form into enough parts such that the original form is no longer perceived.

Still, wouldn't you also agree that we can shift the level of analysis from the original form to its parts, and demonstrate that they too are empty through further decomposition? And that we can, at least theoretically, continue to do that indefinitely? Otherwise we would eventually arrive at partless parts, no?

Malcolm wrote:

well, we break pots into shards, shards into gross particles, gross particles into subtle particles, and then subtle particles disappear under analysis, because it turns out they are impossible since they are defined as partless. What are particles composed of? Nothing, as far as anyone can tell. So they are either real or unreal. Madhyamaka suggests that in the end they are unreal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: The Sin of Slandering the Dharma by Jacqueline Stone

Content:

nichirenista said:

No. I choose to follow the only correct Buddhist path. No one forces it on me.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, a committed sectarian, as I said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

kirtu said:

As I said, using the verb "believe" (or in this form "think" in this context) is not relevant. I have no idea why HHPR recognized him.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe HHPR was hoping that Segal would remember where his past incarnation found all that terma paint.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

kirtu said:

I quoted the relevant sections to you when we had this discussion on eSangha.

Malcolm wrote:

That was years ago.

kirtu said:

Ok. Although I think using the verb "believe" misses the point.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

So you think Steven Segal is a true blue Nirmanakāya?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

kirtu said:

I was startled when a Sakya lama said to me flat out that tulkus were nirmanakayas.

Malcolm wrote:

He can believe whatever he wants. I'll do the same.

kirtu said:

The Red Book (history of the Nyingma, Dudjom Rinpoche) talks about the purposes of

tulkus in several places.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not talking about the purpose of Tibetan reincarnations.

kirtu said:

The basic job of a tulku is to benefit beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes of course. I don't really believe most of the people recognized as tulkus are emanations of the Sambhogakāya. You can if you like, it is up to you, not me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: The Sin of Slandering the Dharma by Jacqueline Stone

Content:

nichirenista said:

I politely disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, you are a committed sectarian, you have to disagree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 6th, 2014 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: The Sin of Slandering the Dharma by Jacqueline Stone

Content:

nichirenista said:

I've read several sources where Nichiren says only his practice is the valid practice in the age of Mappo.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but it is obviously nonsense, the product of a febrile imagination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 5th, 2014 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Sectarianism is a poison.

Content:

Jikan said:

This is how I've been taught, and the limited experience I've had has borne this position out.

Am I wrong on this? Is there a time and a place for sectarian polemic?

for reference, see:

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=59&t=17254> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return
false;

Malcolm wrote:

There is never a place for blind bias. There is always a place for reasoned analysis and critique.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 5th, 2014 at 7:39 PM

Title: Re: The limit of compounded phenomena

Content:

anjali said:

Which leaves us in a infinite regress situation.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a limit to how far you can decompose a particle. The point is that Madhyamaka and Yogacara reject the limit proposed by Sautrantika, i.e. partless particles. The point which I mentioned holds true: when the particle one is decomposing ceases to be perceived through analysis, that perceived absence is the emptiness of that particle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 5th, 2014 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Jikan said:

I think Sherab Dorje raised an interesting issue some time back that I'd like to bring us back to: the question of whether or to what degree the tulku system as developed in Tibet offers an efficient way to identify and train teachers and leaders when resources are scarce. Thoughts on this?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily. Two major schools of Tibetan Buddhism do not operate this way: the largest, Gelugpa and as well as Sakya.

kirtu said:

You are on thin ice here as both Gelug and Sakya recognize and train tulkus. Neither are completely devoid of tulkus although the relationship with the recognition can be different. You in fact note this wrt Sakya sub-sects. Your example wrt the office of the Dalai Lama is strained at best. In fact Gelug tulkus can indeed be sought (other than the Dalai and Panchen lamas).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Most so called "Sakya" tulkus are Nyingma reincarnations trained in Sakya through circumstances of region. The Zimog tulkus of Nalendra are a notable exception to this. As I said most of the Sakya tulkus come from East Tibet, which is very removed from Central Tibet. Even here, Sakya in Derge belongs to Ngor, not Tshar, and Sakya monasteries in east Tibet were under the administration of Ngor. Of all four schools, Sakya has the least number of tulkus.

AFA Gelug is concerned — there may be an effort to find Tulkus, but the administration of Gelug is in the hands of educated geshes, not reincarnations, for the most part.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 5th, 2014 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: The limit of compounded phenomena

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

It is around the same point as the statements that anjali transcribed. Maybe anjali remembers the time mark?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is not a material thing, so it cannot be divided in the same way as a finger.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 4th, 2014 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: The limit of compounded phenomena

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

In the video he is explaining the statement: form is emptiness, emptiness is form. He seems to be talking only in regards to physical phenomena having a limit, at another point he explains that mind can be reduced indefinitely.

Malcolm wrote:

What precisely does he say?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 4th, 2014 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Commentary on the 51 Mental Factors?

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

Thank you, Malcom.

I have located a beautiful translation of the work suggested by you. Naturally, you are quite correct in recommending a direct return to the original beast, for what could be more rewarding than to cultivate one's own unique mode of understanding by grappling with the very source itself? However, I still wish it were possible to locate a manuscript in which most of the grappling had been done for me - a highly delusive notion, but a notion nonetheless!

Malcolm wrote:

It is really not that difficult a subject: there basically four groups of mental factors; universal, positive, afflicted and negative.

10 you cannot be without. All positive minds in samsara consist of 22 mental factors (10 universal, ten positive, plus vitarka and vicara), the minimum number of mental factors and afflictive mental state can have is eighteen, and so on.

The mental factors operate in groups, not individually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 4th, 2014 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: The limit of compounded phenomena

Content:

anjali said:

As best I can make out, here is what Khenpo said from 37:29-39:16...

But this is not your mind, this is your cut finger. So, eventually become empty. Do you understand that? Ok. If you understand that, that is emptiness.

This analysis doesn't seem right.

Malcolm wrote:

Fundamental to the analysis of the two truths is that when an object is subject to ultimate analysis, it does not remain as an object of cognition. What he is saying, perhaps not so well, is that at a certain point there remains no object at all which can be identified as a finger, no finger remains before the mind to be apprehended as such. That objectless state of mind is called "recognizing emptiness".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 4th, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Commentary on the 51 Mental Factors?

Content:

Concordiadiscordi said:

Greetings.

I am currently seeking a decent commentary on the 51 mental factors listed within the yogācāra abhidharma. Even better would be a commentary on the 100 dharmas of

Vasubandhu. I am currently in possession of three fine works on the subject (viz, "Know Your Mind" by Sangharakshita, "Living Yogacara" by Tagawa Shun'ei, and "Shastra on the Door to Understanding the Hundred Dharmas" by Master Hua), but I am wondering whether there might not be a single volume containing a balanced, comprehensive, systematic exposition of the 51 mental factors (or the 100 dharmas) which is neither too abstruse and pedantic nor too vague and simplistic. Scholarly tomes such as "Buddhist Phenomenology" are certainly not what I am looking for in this case, and neither are watered-down introductory texts intended for general audiences. On the contrary, what I am looking for is a penetratingly detailed analysis crafted specifically for the serious practitioner, preferably authored by a seasoned practitioner.

All in all, I am looking for something thorough, rigorous, detailed, comprehensive, systematic, and genuinely insightful... yet pragmatically geared and practically informed.

Critical but real.

I might be asking too much, but it is worth a shot.

I am hoping that somebody might be able to point me in a promising direction!

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Abhidharmakoshaḥ by Vasubandhu, Why settle for anything less?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 4th, 2014 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: What is Blessing?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Blessing" here just means the power of one person to inspire another to follow the path in some way. That's all. There is no Dharma called "blessing", no magical force called "blessing". If there was, the Buddha, being compassionate, would have blessed us all into nirvana long ago.

Astus said:

That makes sense. Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

I should add, it can also be the power of an object such as a statue, book, incense, stupa, etc., to induce the same effect. But again, there is no Dharma called "blessing", no magical force called "blessing".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 4th, 2014 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: What is Blessing?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Byin rlabs means quite literally "conferral [rlabs] of power [byin]."

Byin is defined in Tibetan as "the ability or power to transform the minds and vision/appearances of another."

The word Byin rlabs is defined in Tibetan as "the power to remain in any subject of the Dharma of the Noble Path."

Astus said:

Thank you. Does that mean then that a blessing is inducing insight/realisation/enlightenment in another being directly (instead of through giving instructions)? If so, what is being communicated/transferred between one being/thing to another? What connection exists at the time of receiving a blessing?

Malcolm wrote:

"Blessing" here just means the power of one person to inspire another to follow the path in some way. That's all. There is no Dharma called "blessing", no magical force called "blessing". If there was, the Buddha, being compassionate, would have blessed us all into nirvana long ago.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 4th, 2014 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

sherabpa said:

Yet nobody says the lower tantra path is as easy as the higher tantra path. Lack of difficulties is precisely one of four superiorities of tantra over paramitayana, and by implication of the higher over the lower paths. There is superior and inferior, but not effective and ineffective, and superior means the four superiorities.

Malcolm wrote:

superior = more effective

inferior = less effective

higher = more effective

lower = less effective

easy = more effective

difficult = less effective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 4th, 2014 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

sherabpa said:

When he says that only Guyhamantra is appropriate for the present times...

Malcolm wrote:

Here, Guhyamantra does not mean lower tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 4th, 2014 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Teacher as Buddha?

Content:

Will said:

If one has confidence in the buddhadharma and cultivates according to what is there taught - such as 'guru is the Tathāgata himself', then one does so. It has nothing to do with being 'in secret mantra'.

Malcolm wrote:

Will, you can either choose to understand special emphasis and necessity of a guru as explained in secret mantra, or you can argue with it. It's up to you.

Will said:

I prefer to choose a third way; ignore secret mantra and 'understand special emphasis and necessity of a guru' as taught in Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you can if you like, but the fact is that the relationship with a guru is different in secret mantra than it is in Mahāyāna. It is a much more potent relationship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 3rd, 2014 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Teacher as Buddha?

Content:

Will said:

If one has confidence in the buddhadharma and cultivates according to what is there taught - such as 'guru is the Tathāgata himself', then one does so. It has nothing to do with being 'in secret mantra'.

Malcolm wrote:

Will, you can either choose to understand special emphasis and necessity of a guru as explained in secret mantra, or you can argue with it. It's up to you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 3rd, 2014 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Teacher as Buddha?

Content:

Will said:

Mahayana also posits the guru as Buddha, as in this quote from Avatamsaka Sutra, ch. 39:

As for the good spiritual guide, he is just the Tathāgata himself.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, while it is true that in Mahāyaṇa and even in Hinayāna, the idea of a guru is to be found, nevertheless, it is only in secret mantra that one is to regard one's (qualified) teacher as an actual Samyaksambuddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 3rd, 2014 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

But Shingon has yogatantra too which is said to bring Buddhahood in one life?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed. But unless you are a priest, your practice is mainly confined to the liturgical practice of reciting a few mantras and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 3rd, 2014 at 7:35 PM

Title: Re: The limit of compounded phenomena

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I am interested to hear peoples opinions and especially to see some scriptural quotes that verify/contradict this.

Malcolm wrote:

He is perfectly correct. Since particles cannot be established since they do not bear ultimate analysis, there comes a time when under analysis they cannot be found at all. The chapter refuting permanent functioning phenomena in the 400 Verses demonstrates this very well.

Sherab Dorje said:

I wasn't doubting that he was correct, he is a khenpo after all, I was just looking for

scriptural verification/contradiction. I imagine there would be other schools/traditions, that may care to disagree.

Thanks for the info.

Malcolm wrote:
Not in Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 3rd, 2014 at 9:39 AM
Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Loppon Rinpoche states:

Therefore, followers of the Pāramitāyāna do not accomplish [awakening] in this degenerate age, but followers of Secret Mantra do accomplish [awakening] in this degenerate age. The Herukābhyadaya also states:
If one upholds Śrī Heruka,
There will be accomplishment in the decadent age.

There is no Śrī Heruka in lower tantra.

sherabpa said:
The lower tantras belong to Secret Mantra, and hence siddhis are attained. As Sapan says in sdom gsum 3.262:
Nonetheless, on the level of action tantra accomplishment may be obtained by meditating on a painted image of the deity: pleased by one's observance of austerity and cleanliness the Buddha will bestow his attainments.
Now I believe it is said somewhere that only through anuttaratantra will one attain mahamudra siddhi in a single lifetime. Supposing that is true, this is quite different to saying the lower tantras are ineffective, or pointless.

Malcolm wrote:
The Samputa states:
None of the eighty four thousand Dharmaskandhas have any result since the true state of the body is not understood. Since the true state of the body is not taught outside of highest yoga tantra, etc., well then, I leave you to your own conclusions.

Now then, Ngorchen does clarify in his commentary on kriya tantra that the most a person can aspire to with kriya tantra practice is the tenth bhumi:
"The result accomplished in one life of anuttaratantra is only the perfect Buddhahood of

the three inseparable kāyas; here, having relied on the three paths, one can manifest the tenth stage in this [life] and with that support, Buddhahood can be accomplished." He also explains that even so, the path of kriya tantra is quite slow: But in kriya tantra, because there is no teaching of taking siddhis apart from (40/a) inviting and creating the deity in front, the speed with which the result is accomplished is slight. The difference with Pāramitāyāna is very important, in that in [Pāramitāyāna] not even taking siddhis from a deity invited in front is ever taught. Further, the difficulty with kriya tantra is that it is very precise and requires absolute adherence to ritual purity and so on. This is quite difficult to maintain unless you are in a place like Koyasan, etc. For all of these reasons then it is safe to say that for the most part we can consider kriya tantra ineffective in this day and age (which was my point), which also explains why outside of Shingon and Tendai, no one practices it anymore. There is also the consideration of which yuga a given teaching is most effective or needed, and in this yuga, the kali yuga, annuttarayoga tantra is a desiderata.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 3rd, 2014 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: The limit of compounded phenomena

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I am interested to hear peoples opinions and especially to see some scriptural quotes that verify/contradict this.

Malcolm wrote:

He is perfectly correct. Since particles cannot be established since they do not bear ultimate analysis, there comes a time when under analysis they cannot be found at all. The chapter refuting permanent functioning phenomena in the 400 Verses demonstrates this very well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 3rd, 2014 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: What is Blessing?

Content:

Astus said:

What is the definition of blessing (any and all types)? What dharma is it? What are its qualities and conditions?

Malcolm wrote:

Byin rlabs means quite literally "conferral [rlabs] of power [byin]."

Byin is defined in Tibetan as "the ability or power to transform the minds and vision/appearances of another."

The word Byin rlabs is defined in Tibetan as "the power to remain in any subject of the

Dharma of the Noble Path."

So that is your answer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 3rd, 2014 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So you believe that hereditary religious leadership is better than the tulku system? Or do you prefer the Gelug model?

PS The Dalai Lamas are tulku, are they not?

Malcolm wrote:

I think the Gelug model is best for the West.

HHDL is a tulku, however, the Fifth Dalai Lama's recognition was fraudulent, according to his autobiography, and every one from the 8th to the 13th was selected by a lottery operated by the Qing dynasty Ambans.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Jikan said:

I think Sherab Dorje raised an interesting issue some time back that I'd like to bring us back to: the question of whether or to what degree the tulku system as developed in Tibet offers an efficient way to identify and train teachers and leaders when resources are scarce. Thoughts on this?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily. Two major schools of Tibetan Buddhism do not operate this way: the largest, Gelugpa and as well as Sakya.

The Gelugpas appoint their leaders and teachers through education, not tulku lineages, with the notable exception of the Panchen Lama, who is the head of Tashi Lhunpo monastery. The Dalai Lamas are not monastic heads, but actually part of the Drepung Monastic system.

The leadership of Sakyapas is held in the Kohn family lineage. The abbacy of Ngor (a

subsect of Sakya) is circulated among the scions of four families. It is only in the smallest of the Sakya subsects, Tshar, and Eastern Tibetan Sakya monasteries where tulkus play a significant role in the leadership of monasteries.

The leadership of Mindroling likewise is held in an old family, and is not tulku based.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Teacher as Buddha?

Content:

Mkoll said:

1) Is this belief common to all the Tibetan schools? Is it part of Shingon? I don't know much more about Mahayana than Vajrayana but I don't think it is part of the beliefs of any of their schools, is it?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not common to Shingon, because it is a practice restricted to the highest tantras.

Mkoll said:

2) How does one believe that one's teacher is a Buddha? What is the correct mindset? For example, does one believe they are fully enlightened like the historical Buddha was? Or is there some other approach?

Malcolm wrote:

You understand that the impure appearance of one's root guru as an ordinary person is due to one's own flaws and afflictions, but that in their real nature, they are actually Samyaksambuddhas and you accept their words as such.

Actually, it is very unlikely that any one of us meeting Gotama Buddha today would be able to see him as being a Samyaksambuddha. We would see an old North Indian guy dressed in ragged robes followed around by people of similar mien.

Anyway, this practice only applies to qualified people from whom one has received empowerment into a highest yoga tantra mandala. If you have not received such an empowerment, then there is no reason to follow this practice.

Mkoll said:

3) This one is kind of unrelated, but: Are all Tibetan schools Vajrayana Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen existed in India, and is found in the tantras, unlike the tulku system.

Sherab Dorje said:

If I remember correctly, a certain tulku whose teachings I have been following the past few weeks, stated quite clearly, a number of times that the Dzogchen teachings/method did not originate from India, but from one of the current day -stans: Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan...

So...

But now we digress.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen was brought to Tibet from India by way of Vajrāsana. This is clearly stated in the early Dzogchen annals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

First, my authority is not Tibet, my authority is sutra and tantra. I do not have to accept Tibetan cultural practices as authoritative, I don't eat Tsampa, drink Chang, or herd yaks.

Sherab Dorje said:

So the tulku system is on par with eating tsampa and herding yaks...

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that it is a cultural practice.

Sherab Dorje said:

Greg, the tulku system started in Kagyu, than spread to other schools. It is not a universal thing in Buddhism, it never existed in India, and it does not need to exist in the West.

Neither did/is Dzogchen, you reckon we should get rid of that too?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen existed in India, and is found in the tantras, unlike the tulku system.

Sherab Dorje said:

I can understand your attachment to it...

I am not attached to it. If I was attached to it I would not be calling for its reformation. I am just not averse to it.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not averse to it. If Tibetans want to continue the tulku system, they are free to.

Some of their reincarnations might even be real ones, like ChNN — but most will be chosen and "blessed" as tulkus.

Sherab Dorje said:

But the point is that there is a sufficient amount of corruption in the system to call the whole system into question.

This is our fundamental point of disagreement.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, we disagree on this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The tantric texts do not call for abolishing of the tulku system though, do they? They are all situated within the same framework: Tibetan Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Considering that the tulku system does not come from tantras, why would they even mention it?

Sherab Dorje said:

They are all situated within the same framework: Tibetan Vajrayana. Please don't cherry pick.

Malcolm wrote:

First, my authority is not Tibet, my authority is sutra and tantra. I do not have to accept Tibetan cultural practices as authoritative, I don't eat Tsampa, drink Chang, or herd yaks.

Greg, the tulku system started in Kagyu, then spread to other schools. It is not a universal thing in Buddhism, it never existed in India, and it does not need to exist in the West. I can understand your attachment to it, but it really is something which is a cultural practice of Tibetans and not really something which has a strong foundation in sutra and tantra.

This does not mean that there are no reincarnations, or that no one can recognize a reincarnation with accuracy. But the point is that there is a sufficient amount of corruption in the system to call the whole system into question. As long as there is no clearly defined criteria by which a tulku may be recognized, then I am afraid it is just a matter of faith whether one accepts someone as a reincarnation of a master or not.

This is why I bring up the examples of NKT. For example, according to them, <redacted> is Sakya Pandita's reincarnation. According to your logic, since this is the opinion of Trijang Rinpoche, I should accept it, or at least not dispute it. Can't you see how crazy your point of view is? according to your point of view, I should accept that a worldly spirit is the reincarnation of one of the most important Sakya masters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The tantric texts do not call for abolishing of the tulku system though, do they? They are all situated within the same framework: Tibetan Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Considering that the tulku system does not come from tantras, why would they even mention it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

conebeckham said:

I am not certain we can infer that all those things are the result of the Tulku system. Sometimes, in fact, I think they exist despite it.

Sherab Dorje said:

Maybe, maybe not. Personally I would prefer an overhaul of the tulku system rather than its being scrapped just because it has some flaws. Like I said earlier: this is samsara, it is flawed by its very nature (Kongtrul's opinion, in his autobio, is worth a look.....)

Thank you. I will track it down and read it.

Is this the one you mean: "Enthronement: The Recognition Of The Reincarnate Masters Of Tibet And The Himalayas" or is it this one: "The Autobiography of Jamgon Kongtrul: A Gem of Many Colors"?

Malcolm wrote:

The real problem with tulku system is that it is a Tibetan cultural artifact, and not

something which can be found in sutra or tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

This is yet another clumsy attempt by you to deflect the conversation away from the real subject, in order to cover up your own logical flaws and egocentric concerns.

Malcolm wrote:

If there is a flaw in my logic, prove it. Otherwise, your comments are baseless ad hominem remarks with no substance.

Sherab Dorje said:

I have, you are unwilling to admit them and that is why this conversation continues to drag on for no reason at all. I have pointed out what pure view entails and how preferring "one" over "another" has nothing to do with pure view and everything to do with egotistical concern and dualising (like, dislike, believe, don't believe, is tulku, is not tulku, etc...).

I have admitted that the tulku system is flawed and shown how the idea of tulku cannot (unfortunately, and as much as I personally would like it to be able to) be separated from the system that recognises tulku.

You have responded by trying to start a bun fight over a certain controversy (notice how I did not take the bait?). Now whilst the example does highlight some of the flaws in the system, at the same time it also shows how the system can, does and has worked in a positive manner, for over 800 years.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

Well, you have not shown any such flaws, and moreover, you have only succeeded in proving that tulku system is inane by referring to pure vision. The tulku system only works in a world where there is higher and lower, pure and impure. Once you have decided that you are going to trot down the path of "pure vision", well, now you have no reason to ban <redacted> and NKT here at all. According to "pure vision", the pope is as much a Buddha as the HHDL or the HHK, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

This is yet another clumsy attempt by you to deflect the conversation away from the real subject, in order to cover up your own logical flaws and egocentric concerns.

Malcolm wrote:

If there is a flaw in my logic, prove it. Otherwise, your comments are baseless ad hominem remarks with no substance (countdown to thread meltdown begins now...)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 2nd, 2014 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

conebeckham said:

Tulkus are GREAT!

The Tulku System sucks.

Malcolm wrote:

it seems our friend Greg does not want to distinguish between the two. I for one think nirmanakāyas are excellent. But developing a whole bureaucracy predicated in the principle of "recognitions", as we have seen throughout Tibetan history is fraught with manipulation, fraud and abuse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: What is considered a teaching from the Upadesha cycle?

Content:

bryandavis said:

So a revealed cycle can have maya, anu, ati ect. as part of its corpus but upadesha would only refer to the ati aspect of the practices?

Is upadesha then direct personal experience of any of these paths given in pith to students who have the capacity to get it in a less unelaborated way?

Or is upadesha the method that points directly to rigpa without any secondary methods?

Malcolm wrote:

Upadesha just means "intimate instruction" from upa, meaning "close", and desha, meaning "to instruct". The inference is that these are instructions one hears at the feet of one's guru in an intimate setting. There are all kinds of upadeshas.

Also upadesha is translated two ways into Tibetan gdams ngag and man ngag. The former meaning oral advice, that latter means secret advice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body

Content:

Tod said:
Hi, friends,

after the very detailed explanation of Gyurme Kundrol, I have a question as to what is considered a teaching from the Upadesha cycle.

All the Longsal teachings of Namkhai Norbu are called "upadesha" in their name, although they display many different methods. Not to name all, but there are very different ones, like Mandarava with it's Tsa Lung, not a Dzogchen teaching in itself maybe; Saltong, combining Tsa Lung, Semdzins etc; Todgal, and so on.

And what about a teaching like "The Upadesha of Introduction to the State of Ati", which has a method from Semde, but then explains also Tregchod?

Thanks for clarifying.

Tod

Malcolm wrote:
Longsal Khandro Nyinthig contains teachings from Anuyoga such as Jñāna Dakini and Mandarava (which are really all part of one cycle) as well as the three series of ati yoga.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 9:59 PM
Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
at least we should refrain from cultivating aversion.

Malcolm wrote:
You do realize that now we are going to comb your every post for examples of aversion?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 9:57 PM
Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
And, yes, doubting the veracity of the recognition of the Karmapa tulkus(or any other tulku teacher other than your own) is a condemnation of their capacities.

Malcolm wrote:
Therefore, according to your own reasoning, you yourself must accept that HH Karmapa, Orgyen Thrinly Dorje, is the real Karmapa. And if you don't, you are condemning him. Moreover, you are asserting that the late Shamarpa was wrong in not accepting Tai Situ's candidate. Not only that, but you are equally asserting that Tai Situ is wrong not to

accept HH Karmapa, Thrinly Thaye Dorje, as being the real Karmapa.

The only solution for you then is that you must regard both Karmapas as the same and take teachings from them both.

Basically what you are saying is that we all must accept all tulku recognitions on faith without question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Accepting that ChNN is the reincarnation of Adzom Drugpa does not entail that I must accept all or even any other recognitions of reincarnations.

Jikan said:

following this to its conclusion: one may well have reason to believe someone is a reincarnation of someone else, but this has nothing to do with the question of the political institution of reincarnation-recognition. I think this distinction is getting lost in the shuffle of this conversation for some parties.

if you have a precious human rebirth now, it follows that at some time in lives previous you'd done something right. Is it necessary to have an enthronement ceremony for each of you in order to take this at face value? Accepting this premise but rejecting the "tulku system" as a social construct are not contradictory positions.

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, if we accept that Tibet fell because of the non-virtue of its rulers, for the most part who were they? High tulkus.

ReasonAndRhyme said:

So Tibet was a theocracy then?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The entire (reliable) translation of Longchenpa's commentary on Guhyagarbha is available for free on the internet. It is ludicrous therefore for anyone to restrict commentaries on it.

Jikan said:

I'm interested in finding this one, but it seems my google skills aren't up to the task. If anyone could please point me in the right direction, I'd appreciate it very much. Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://vajrayana.faithweb.com/guhyagarbhatantra.pdf>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

They are still both tulku though. Ratified through the tulku system. And earlier you stated that you have no doubt that ChNN is a tulku.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN did not believe in his own status as a tulku for many years.

He only accepted that he was the tulku of Adzom Drugpa later on in life based on some circumstances.

The reason why I accept that ChNN is an actual reincarnation of Adzom Drugpa has to do with those circumstances — primarily, ChNN wrote a commentary, and later on, when he finally got a copy of Adzom Drugpa's collected works, he found a text identical to the one he had written himself in that collection, the same for over a hundred folios. He explained all this in 1992 at the first SMS retreat at Tsegylgar.

Further, the master that recognized him as the tulku of Adzom Drugpa was his own uncle, the one who attained rainbow body, not Yeshe's predecessor.

But the tulku system is just religious politics, completely and totally worldly in my

opinion.

Sherab Dorje said:

So, really: You want to have your cake or do you want to eat it? Make up your mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Accepting that ChNN is the reincarnation of Adzom Drugpa does not entail that I must accept all or even any other recognitions of reincarnations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

I wish All dharmic texts were free,that's what the Buddha wanted.

Malcolm wrote:

That is true only of sutra. It is completely not true of tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Strangely enough, not being enlightened and all, the only thing we are capable of doing is offering opinions. In my opinion the whole tulku system is a worldly system.

Except when it is being applied to your teacher and his son?

Malcolm wrote:

Yeshe's enthronement at the monastery of his predecessor is a completely worldly affair.

ChNN himself was never in line to head a monastery. He would have wound up being a disaffiliated teacher whether in the East or the West.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

conebeckham said:

Hard to believe, but perhaps that's not their chief goal...

Son of Buddha said:

Providing Dharma at a reasonable price so all people who are interested in it can learn it should be their chief goal.

Malcolm wrote:

If someone cannot cough up a 100 bucks for a rare text someone has gone through considerable trouble to translate then they don't really need it or want it.

Sutrayāna is different than Vajrayāna on this score. Eventually, whole Kenjur will be online, for free. This does not mean however that all books should be free. Even the Kenjur is not free -- 84000 is paying a lot of money to have those sutras and tantras translated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

PS I tend to agree with Lord Jigten Sumgons analysis of karma where the actual act itself, regardless of intention/motivation etc... produces effects too. So...

Malcolm wrote:

Another opinion, one that is not supported in the classical Indian texts, but whatever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Being a tulku is not just a high worldly position.

Malcolm wrote:

It is simply a matter of opinion. In my opinion the whole tulku system is a worldly system. Your opinion is different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What sort of karma causes anyone to have a high position in samsara?

Sherab Dorje said:

It's not just a high position. It is a high Dharma oriented position. At the very least they will receive a really good Dharma education. That's MUCH more than what most of us

will encounter in this lifetime. So it seems to me that even being falsely recognised as a tulku requires craploads of merit.

Malcolm wrote:

It is just a high worldly position.

Whether the person is a Dharma person or not depends on the qualities of the person in the chair, and not the chair itself.

There are a lot people with Dharma in their mouths but not in their hearts. "Dharma" words are not necessarily Dharma.

For example, if we accept that Tibet fell because of the non-virtue of its rulers, for the most part who were they? High tulkus. So you see, these institutional positions are actually quite worldly and there is a huge amount of writing by the people in these position of monastic authority bemoaning the fact that these positions are just worldly fetters that prevent them from practicing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As far as pure vision goes, if someone has the idea that even one person is not a fully awakened buddha, their vision is not pure.

Sherab Dorje said:

Exactly. In which case EVEN if you were to see your teacher as a Buddha then the only thing you are doing is indulging in dualistic egotistical speculation: He is a Buddha, He is not a Buddha. They are real tulku, they are not real tulku.

So what is it going to be? Pure vision or aversion/attraction?

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, greg, I don't think other teachers much. What I do know is that my primary teachers are Buddhas. YMMV.

Sherab Dorje said:

You are also not obligated to put one up on the pedestal, while burying the other. So why do it?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't. I used the Karmapas merely as an example. I don't really think about them very much.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Jikan said:

I can't speak for Malcolm, but I'd argue that if someone has concrete evidence that a recognition was made purely for material or political reasons, and not for the qualities of the one recognized, and that person judges that incarnation to be totally false, then that person isn't making egotistical speculation. That person is making an informed judgment. Not all judgments are rational, nor are they all speculative-egotistical, nor are they all matters of faith.

Sherab Dorje said:

Consider this though: What sort of karma would lead to one being enthroned, as a child, as a false tulku? What kind of karma is generated by the child after having been thrust into this role?

Malcolm wrote:

What sort of karma causes anyone to have a high position in samsara?

As for the second question, that really depends on whether they behave virtuously or non-virtuously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Lower tantra a) is not effective in this day and age.

sherabpa said:

Wait, is anyone saying lower tantra is not effective because it was originally intended for Shaiva followers, lower castes etc?

I can see how one might conclude that the lower tantras are less effective than the higher tantras, but I cannot see that they are ineffective.

Sonam Tsemo says in the Tantra Sets Presentation that the lower tantras are distinct from paramitayana in that they have blessing and gazing/smiling at the deity, which makes them more similar to the higher tantras than to the paramitas. But nothing is said to be ineffective.

I guess I am asking - what does effectiveness mean here?

Malcolm wrote:

Loppon Rinpoche states:

Therefore, followers of the Pāramitāyāna do not accomplish [awakening] in this degenerate age, but followers of Secret Mantra do accomplish [awakening] in this degenerate age. The Herukābhyadaya also states:

If one upholds Śrī Heruka,

There will be accomplishment in the decadent age.

There is no Śrī Heruka in lower tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I think the point Malcolm makes is a pertinent one. From the Vajrayana POV, it is important to view one's Vajra Master as enlightened. This becomes even more essential with regards to Highest Yoga Tantra.

Sherab Dorje said:

While this is true, at the same time, this does not mean that one does not view other teachers with pure vision too. I can understand if Malcolm considers ChNN a Buddha, but that does not mean he has the right to judge others as false incarnations. Then his view is just reduced to egotistical speculation.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not judge anyone as a false incarnation. In other words, for example, I have no faith in the two Karmapas as incarnations of the 16th Karmapa. But my lack of faith in them as reincarnations has no bearing on whether they are the actual incarnations of the 16th or not. Just to clarify, I have 0 connection with the Karma Kagyu lineage, for whatever reason, just like I have 0 connection with the Gelug lineage.

As far as pure vision goes, if someone has the idea that even one person is not a fully awakened buddha, their vision is not pure. So, if we are going to take about pure vision, we really need to be clear what we mean.

I have no obligation to regard teachers other than my own as Buddhas. I am not even obliged to have pure vision of them (other than the same we try to imagine all sentient beings are buddhas in the context of the universe as a buddhamandala). I have no obligation to regard people who are not my teachers as anything more than ordinary worldly people with no special qualities worth mentioning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Norwegian said:

Malcolm said there's no way of giving an objective verification, and that it is all 100% faith based. So asking for objective evidence in that case is rather difficult...

Sherab Dorje said:

There is actually no objective verification of anything. All verification is based on a majority of subjective opinion. So why would it be different for tulku? Why do we, in this case, call it faith and in other cases objective verification?

Malcolm wrote:

You can falsify a chemistry experiment, but not a tulku recognition. As for the latter, you either believe it or you don't.

In the case of ChNN, I believe it. In the case of both Karmapas, I don't believe in either one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

zenman said:

Medieval beliefs. Surely there are no buddhas teaching at every dharma center. It is entirely misleading to spread such beliefs. I've seen the fruit of this when it is realised that the guru isn't a buddha after all.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't need to believe someone else's guru is an actual Buddha, just your own. That is all that matters. If you cannot believe your root Guru is a Buddha, then you have no business taking any kind of Vajrayāna teachings and more to the point, the Vajrayāna teachings you do take will not be effective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is %100 percent faith -- there is no objective way of verifying any of it. So just admit it and be happy.

Sherab Dorje said:

Objective? That's a strange term coming from you Malcolm! So I guess that a tulku admitting that they had memories of their past life when they were still a child but that over time the memories faded so that now they have little recollection of their previous life is not objective. So what would be an objective source of evidence then?

Malcolm wrote:

I have always made a distinction between falsifiable phenomena and non-falsifiable phenomena. Frankly, even though, from a Buddhist perspective, all children have some memory of past lives due to the activation of clairvoyance from the eighth month of pregnancy onwards, accepting this idea is based on faith, indeed even rebirth is just something you have to have faith in, %100.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

heart said:

Well, many tulkus seems to be verified by dreams great masters have. I am not really sure I would call that just faith.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

%100 percent faith. Why? well, if you accept the testimony of such a master it is based on faith, %100.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just admit it Greg, it is all %100 faith based.

Sherab Dorje said:

I wouldn't say 100%. Having talked to a tulku and seen and read some accounts it seems to be more than just faith. Some do display specific/extraordinary qualities. Of course there is nepotism and (like I said) politics involved, which means that there it also has a strategic component, thus we are talking about a deviation from the ideal of faith. That in itself means that it is not 100% faith. There is some cunning in there too. Plus, of course, other more objective factors. Maybe even some virtue.

Malcolm wrote:

It is %100 percent faith -- there is no objective way of verifying any of it. So just admit it and be happy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

zenman said:

Procedure meaning a process done by some or many experienced lamas who investigate and either reject or confirm it? I'd think that this is more a matter of perception, intuition and discrimination (as in the ability to discern the quality of subtle vibration) than procedure, if it means something like I explain here. Yes? No?

Sherab Dorje said:

Procedure like: This lama is responsible for making the final decision regarding candidates, in the event that this lama is not in the position to make the decision, then the responsibility lies with this lama, etc...

Or: A candidate will be considered valid on the basis of this, this and this criteria, if they do not satisfy the aforementioned criteria then they will not be eligible...

Procedure. You see there is property and wealth involved too, many times, not just a title. Or the future of a lineage may depend on the "right" candidate being found. So, as we all well know quite well, whenever money, wealth and power comes into things then politics arise. Since they are bound to arise, if there is a set procedure (which there isn't) then this acts as a check to the politics. Even if there are politics involved, if there is a procedure in place then at least the politics are executed in a relatively smooth and conflict-free fashion.

But there is no set procedure, and intuition is a little difficult to verify objectively. And anyway, just because two (or more) intuited results conflict, doesn't mean that all of them are incorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

Just admit it Greg, it is all %100 faith based.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 31st, 2014 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Klesha obscurations and Knowledge obscurations. Bodhisattvas on the bodhisattvas have these.

zenman said:

Bodhisattvas on the bodhisattvas? A typo?

Malcolm wrote:

yes, on the bodhisattva bhumis, as opposed to ordinary bodhisattvas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 30th, 2014 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

...why do these disagreements exist?

Because there is no clear cut procedure.

zenman said:

Procedure meaning a process done by some or many experienced lamas who investigate and either reject or confirm it? I'd think that this is more a matter of perception, intuition and discrimination (as in the ability to discern the quality of subtle vibration) than procedure, if it means something like I explain here. Yes? No?

Malcolm wrote:

A "reincarnation" means the rebirth of someone who has some portion of the two obscurations remaining. An "emanation" is someone who is in fact an expression of the compassion of a fully awakened Buddha who may manifest as an ordinary person externally, but internally has all the full mature qualities of a Buddha. How do you tell the difference? In Vajrayāna it does not really matter, since you are supposed to regard your guru as an actual buddha in every respect.

zenman said:

Great! A clear explanation What are the two obscurations of the reincarnations?

Malcolm wrote:

Klesha obscurations and Knowledge obscurations. Bodhisattvas on the bodhisattvas have these.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 30th, 2014 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Recognising reincarnations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A "reincarnation" means the rebirth of someone who has some portion of the two obscurations remaining. An "emanation" is someone who is in fact an expression of the compassion of a fully awakened Buddha who may manifest as an ordinary person externally, but internally has all the full mature qualities of a Buddha. How do you tell the difference? In Vajrayāna it does not really matter, since you are supposed to regard your guru as an actual buddha in every respect.

zenman said:

These two quotes lead me to consider a subject that I've pondered a few times before: the differences in recognitions of lamas reincarnations. I recall this matter has come by a few times before but I can't remember which cases exactly.

I'm not familiar with what emanations and reincarnations mean, have to do some googling on those, unless someone could easily explain it for me.

Anyway, my main question is, based on these two messages below as well as other similar cases, that there are disagreements on recognitions of the reincarnations. My intention is not to argue about this but to analyse why do these disagreements exist?

Thanks for the input all.

Karma Jinpa said:

... a letter from Namdroling monastery: Kyabjé Drubwang Pema Norbu's reincarnation has been found!!!

All Palyulpas and Nyingmapas in general should rejoice; a great being---an emanation of Vajrasattva and reincarnation of Vimalamitra---has returned to tame beings once more! reincarnation of Vimalamitra

Malcolm wrote:

He can't be a reincarnation of Vimalamitra since Vimalamitra, according to legend, attained 'pho ba chen po, and still lives at Wutai Shan.

He would be an emanation of Vimalamitra. As the legend has it, Vimalamitra returns to Tibet every one hundred years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 30th, 2014 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Religions vs Communist Party in China

Content:

Will said:

Or is it so closely watched and/or infiltrated that Chinese Buddhism in China is just a sham?

Malcolm wrote:

Very likely.

Will said:

Your 'Very likely' is just a speculation, right? My guess would be the same, but I would like to hear from any Chinese Buddhism followers who know from 1st hand or have heard reliable testimony about the facts. Of course, they may endanger themselves when they share such facts publicly. So silence is 'very likely' too.

Malcolm wrote:

During the 90's, many Vietnamese temples, even in the US, were infiltrated by monastic spies from Vietnam. It became a real problem for them.

The fact is that monks in monasteries in China are little more than museum guards. Their standard of education in Dharma is very poor, and they are forced to spend a lot of time in political education classes. Tibetan Monasteries are also forced to waste time on political education classes. If you want high quality Chinese Dharma you must go to Taiwan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 30th, 2014 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Religions vs Communist Party in China

Content:

Will said:

Or is it so closely watched and/or infiltrated that Chinese Buddhism in China is just a sham?

Malcolm wrote:

Very likely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 29th, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Re 21 Taras

Content:

pemachophel said:

Narraboth,

Sorry, I can't answer your questions although they are good ones. I hope someone addresses them in a knowledgeable way. In my case, I'm working on a Dakini sadhana (sorry, can't say which one) which includes visualization of the 21 Taras around the periphery of the central Dakini. The text says to visualize the 21 Taras in terms of color, hand implements, expression, etc. clearly and precisely but doesn't say how exactly. When I asked my Teacher Who gave me this practice which of the various versions of the 21 Taras to use, He said to use this one. That's what spurred my OP.

When I did Yumka Dechen Gyalmo, I was not given this lay-jor of the 21 Taras. I hope some day to receive it in the context of Yumka.

Malcolm wrote:

If you received the transmission of Tara from ChNN, you received this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 29th, 2014 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Restricted Publications-An Effective or Ineffective Tact

Content:

yegyal said:

I was actually referring to SofB's description of book costs more than anything. It seems that this became a thread dedicated to a different topic since my last post.

Malcolm wrote:

I know, and I agree with you %100. As a translator I can tell you we survive solely on sponsorships. There is no money in translating books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 29th, 2014 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

yegyal said:

One of the reasons that Sanskrit titles are included at the beginning of Tibetan translations of Indian texts is to remind the reader of the kindness of the translators. This notion seems to be lost in the fray of these discussions about the cost of Dharma books. Elizabeth Callahan has been working on this book for years and people are talking about how much profit can be made selling bound up copies of ink on paper. That shows very little understanding of the value of the work. Of course, none of this would even get to the point of being published if there wasn't a sponsor supporting her. In fact, that's why all those books are available in Tibetan, because sponsors took it upon themselves to have them printed and made available for a nominal price. Even TBRC is funded by sponsors. So all this talk about things being free or available is all because of somebody else footing the bill. So rather than complaining about the costs of books like this, maybe you should appreciate how cheap it really is. What's dinner and a movie cost these days? Is that really worth more to you than being able to read the scriptures of your chosen religion?

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but the issue here is not cost, it is restrictions vs. lack of restrictions, and the reality is that restricting books is a little fatuous.

Personally, making books like khrid ye shes bla ma and so on expensive automatically restricts them. Setting a high price for important tantric texts is a more effective strategy than making people fill out questionnaires and signing oaths.

Anyway, as I already pointed out, well trained students will not purchase books for which they do not have transmission/permission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 28th, 2014 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Melody of Dharma No. 13

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.hhthesakyatrizin.org/pdfs/Melody_of_Dharma_13.pdf

This volume contains our translation (Khenpo Migmar Tseten and myself) of an important never before translated text by Mahāsiddha Virupa.

Enjoy!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 28th, 2014 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

Anders said:

Maybe those lamas aren't thrilled with the Tibetan situation either and reckon that at least in English, it can be 'done right'...

Malcolm wrote:

The reason why these books are available in Tibetan is because the Tibetan Buddhist Lineage Heads want these books out there so that they won't die. Every book on TBRC has a database entry through which any text can be restricted by tradition of they so choose. There are many books on TBRC that in fact are restricted by tradition.

When Tibetan lineages send books to TBRC they do so knowing full well that they are openly making these texts available.

Now, Sherapa has brought up the point of samaya — and this is a valid point. If you are a practitioner, and take lineage seriously, it is better to get permission to read this or that text if you are interested in it. This is the proper approach. On the other hand, a text like Zabmo Nangdon is a general text on tantric anatomy, so in fact anyone who has received HYT empowerment is qualified to read it.

Even then, the Shambhala "restriction" pages are kind of ludicrous because anyone can just lie if they want to get the book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?

Content:

LastLegend said:

I am willing to hear the explanation why Vajra methods can take people to full Buddhahood? What rational explanation behind this?

Malcolm wrote:

A realized master directly introduces a willing and interested student to their own state through different kinds of experiences. Rinse, repeat. This is the shortest explanation. There are many more complicated discussions. The essence of them all is that Vajrayāna has the method of taking the result as the path. Dzogchen is also a little different than this.

uan said:

That's a great way of stating it. Could you expand a bit on how Dzogchen is a little different?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen takes the result as the basis, and the basis is practiced as the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?

Content:

LastLegend said:

I am willing to hear the explanation why Vajra methods can take people to full Buddhahood? What rational explanation behind this?

Malcolm wrote:

A realized master directly introduces a willing and interested student to their own state through different kinds of experiences. Rinse, repeat. This is the shortest explanation. There are many more complicated discussions. The essence of them all is that Vajrayāna has the method of taking the result as the path. Dzogchen is also a little different than this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?

Content:

Dan74 said:

I agree with Jikan that it is fraught with danger to use a Kagyu master's teachings in response to a Soto Zen teacher, as they are coming from different initial assumptions and often different terminology. The (apocryphal?) story of Hashang Mahayana, the Ch'an monk who debated with Vajra masters and lost, is a great case in point when two traditions meet but not much contact takes place. Another one is the case of Kalu Rinpoche and Seung Sahn.

Malcolm wrote:

The Samye debate was not a debate between Vajrayāna masters and Hashang. Kamalashila was debating a strictly sutrayāna point of view grounded in standard Indian

Mahāyāna. Not all Tibetans agree that Kamalashila won the debate either.

If you want to read a Dzogchen master's treatment of 8th century Northern School Chan, then you need to read Nubchen Sangye Yeshe's "Lamp of the Eye of Dhyāna". One of the interesting things about this text is that it cites scores of Tibetan Chan masters, not just Chinese masters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

From Nyingmapa point of view, Chan/zen affirmation are correct...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not so fast, Kiomosabe, for one thing, the type of Chan Tibetans were exposed to was a Northern School variant. It is very hard to make a case that 10th century Tibetan doxologies apply to the Vajrayāna influenced Zen of the Kamakura period, or even Sung Dynasty Chan.

Secondly, Nubchen makes it very, very clear that while Chan (as known in Tibet) follows the definitive Mahāyāna sutras, it is not as direct or efficient as Mahāyoga, and addresses the seeming contradiction here in so far as the fact that Chan is supposedly a "sudden" path, whereas Mahāyoga is gradual. And of course, he clearly places Atiyoga as the pinnacle of all.

Third, the idea that one can "realize" Dharmakāya without achieving full buddhahood is somewhat absurd. Sure, we call the emptiness aspect of the mind "the dharmakāya" of the basis, but this does not mean we have realized the result dharmakāya even though there is no substantial difference between the dharmakāya of the basis and the dharmakāya of the result.

It is very interesting to examine Nubchen's detailed and nuanced arguments. It is true that Thuken wrote about Chan in 18th century China, but he dismisses it as Yogacara in a short summary fashion. While it is true that Longchenpa and Jigme Lingpa comment briefly on Chan, there is no Tibetan whose treatment of the Chan/Gradualist debate is more authoritative than Nubchen's.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?

Content:

Jikan said:

According to Vajrayana. Your mileage may vary in some Mahayana schools.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no common Mahāyāna school, including Chan/Zen, that works with the body method the way it is worked with in Vajrayāna. Further, all common Mahāyāna schools are paths of renunciation.

Tendai is in a sort of bizarre situation, for it is the only school in which distinct elements of Vajrayāna are present, but nevertheless are subordinated to a sutrayāna exegetical framework.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?

Content:

zenman said:

When I get this clear, then I'll get back to the topic.

Malcolm wrote:

Put succinctly there are two kinds of emptiness, the emptiness of persons and the emptiness of phenomena. Hinayāna paths such as Theravada and so forth do not realize the emptiness of phenomena, only the emptiness of persons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Arhats only have knowledge of "one-fold" emptiness, so they have full knowledge of the emptiness of self but lack (or have incomplete) insight into emptiness of phenomena.

zenman said:

Is that a view that is upheld by all or most buddhist trads? Doesn't onefold emptiness mean the same as that the "I" disappears for good and hence anatta/no-self is realised?

Malcolm wrote:

This is the point of view of Indian Mahāyāna and virtually all its descendants.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 24th, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Gotrab deity picture origin

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

rdo rje go khrab, vajra armor, is a generic name for all kinds of practices, not just one practice or lineage of practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body

Content:

Jesse said:

How does onerainbow....?

Malcolm wrote:

You received Dzogchen teachings on a complete way from a realized master. Then you practice diligently, devoting yourself to little else in this lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Tarot as divination tool

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Mipham's dice divination practice published as Mo: Tibetan Divination System does not require empowerment or retreat:

https://books.google.ca/books/about/Mo.html?id=c6Z8Kqdf6LoC&redir_esc=y "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

The results are quite precise, including what practices one should do in the event of problems. This level of detail is not possible with Tarot.

Motova said:

I have this book! Are you saying I can practice Mo using this book with absolutely no guidance? If so, where is this information coming from?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to do the retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Tarot as divination tool

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for starters he wrote any number of very interesting books.

dzogchungpa said:

Any in particular that you recommend? I've always been daunted by the vastness of his output.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a good bio of him called *Perdurabo*, which makes no attempt to whitewash his career or person at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Tarot as divination tool

Content:

Mkoll said:

I agree with Vajrasvapna about Crowley. I've read of others who have lost their minds or come close to it by delving too deep into his work.

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, you don't really know anything about him.

Mkoll said:

And why any Buddhist would admire him is beyond me.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for starters he wrote any number of very interesting books. For another he was in the employ of the British Secret Service for decades, using his masonic credentials as a cover. Beyond that, he was a world class mountain climber and all around adventurer. Even further, he studied Vipassana in Burma and Yoga in South India., etc.

He is one of the all-around most interesting people of early 20th century.

Having said all that, however, it doesn't mean I think AC taught a valid path, etc. AC was interesting, but still a worldly person in every respect. His "wickedness" however is totally overstated and silly:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Clouded perception

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are not responsible for other's reactions.

Sherab Dorje said:

That is not 100% true. If I said to somebody that they should go make love to their mother and the person gets angry and upset, it is quite obvious that I have acted as a cause or condition for their reaction. If, on the other hand, I engage in Right Speech, and the person gets angry or upset, then my responsibility (ie my acting as a cause/condition) for their reaction is reduced drastically (maybe even to zero).

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree Greg, I also don't care enough about this issue to bother mounting a counter argument.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: Hello board and admins

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Take me to your leaders...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Tarot as divination tool

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

It is very difficult to understand how a Buddhist might recommend something from a black magician, known for the practice of animal sacrifice.

Malcolm wrote:

In general I think Tarot and WET is a waste of time for Buddhists.

AC was not a "black magician". He may have on one or two occasions experimented with animal sacrifice (a practice he in general abjured).

In fact, he was one of the few westerners in his day who had any real understanding of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 7:27 AM

Title: Re: Tarot as divination tool

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

You know, you could make things easier and just add that to your signature.

dzogchungpa said:

I don't think you can put images in a signature.

Malcolm wrote:

This is veering awfully close to a metadiscussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 7:22 AM

Title: Re: Tarot as divination tool

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The best deck was and remains the Thoth Tarot of Crowley.

dzogchungpa said:

Why do you say that?

Malcolm wrote:

Crowley was a genius.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 7:00 AM

Title: Re: Tarot as divination tool

Content:

emptydreams said:

Okay this is going to be a weird question.

I have the ability to use tarot cards to take a peek into decision making situations, the same way how some Lamas use Mo divination.

How do I get the cards 'initialized' in a Buddhist way? I rarely use the cards except when my intuition (which is very strong) starts being muddled. Usually the cards' answers are the same as my intuition. Can i bring them along to tsog or request a Lama to bless/cleanse them?

hope this isnt too weird of a question...

Karma Dorje said:

These are not a Buddhist divination technique. They have their own context in the tradition of Ceremonial Magic that should be respected.

My advice is not to mix up the traditions into a porridge, but rather if you are going to use

Tarot do so according to the context that produced it.

Jetavan said:

I believe tarot cards originated as a type of playing card, and were later adopted for divination by occultists in general, not limited to ceremonial magickians. There's at least one set of tarot cards based on <http://www.aeclectic.net/tarot/cards/buddha/>.

Malcolm wrote:

My theory about the origin of playing cards and ultimately Tarot is that they originated in the small initiation cards used central Asia for initiations.

The best deck was and remains the Thoth Tarot of Crowley.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 6:32 AM

Title: Re: Am awareness itself meditation

Content:

avisitor said:

I believe there is no object to attain in meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

That would be the standard Mahāyāna view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Clouded perception

Content:

Qing Tian said:

Question: How can I exercise Right Speech when I cannot anticipate all possible reactions to what I say?

Malcolm wrote:

You are not responsible for other's reactions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Am awareness itself meditation

Content:

avisitor said:

"Naturally occurring timeless awareness

Malcolm wrote:

What is being described is rang byung ye shes, which can be translated a number of ways such as "naturally occurring timeless awareness", "spontaneous pristine gnosis",

"self-originated primordial wisdom" and so on.

avisitor said:

I am sorry but where does it say it is a state of meditation or in any way related to meditation??

I don't contend the translation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a state of meditation. It is a transcendent state, quite beyond meditation and a meditator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Am awareness itself meditation

Content:

avisitor said:

"Naturally occurring timeless awareness

Malcolm wrote:

What is being described is rang byung ye shes, which can be translated a number of ways such as "naturally occurring timeless awareness", "spontaneous pristine gnosis", "self-originated primordial wisdom" and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Gotrab deity picture origin

Content:

heart said:

I have seen it before, there is also a short sadhana. This is what is written in the beginning of the translation: "sngags 'bum rdo rje go khrab Adamantine Armor, mantras for protection and for repelling obstacles, revealed by Dorje Lingpa"

The DC booklet contains a full translation of at least one of the texts by Dorje Lingpa from this terma. So both practices can be correct.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The Dorje Lingpa tradition has no visualization in the main text. The image is from a later terma, Ratna Lingpa, I think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 22nd, 2014 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: ACLU: UN to Confront USA on Persistent Racial Discrimina

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

The U.S. like most countries has a long way to go toward ending discrimination, but in what other country could a half-black, half-white, son of a man from Kenya become president for two terms? I won't mention names of countries, but can you imagine very many other countries electing a man or woman to prime minister or president where they are originally from Turkey, Iran, Congo, etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 21st, 2014 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Uninterrupted motivation to practice mindfulness

Content:

Dan74 said:

A good point. The trouble is, as I see it, that most of the time it is not so much akusalacittas, but habitual mental patterns that occupy our minds. The technique of mindfulness is to help us break out of these habits and attend to the matter at hand with complete attention and a fresh seeing.

Malcolm wrote:

Dan,

One, we have to make a distinction between *smṛti* and *smṛtyupasthāna*. The former is a mental factor, the latter is "Close placement of mindfulness", familiar to us as the four foundations of mindfulness.

Secondly, *smṛti* is always accompanied by *saṃprajāna*, i.e. attentiveness. These two always work in a pair.

The point is that we cannot have a mind where *kusalacaittas* and *akusalacaittas* are present at the same time -- it's impossible

This is why even simple exercises of mindfulness, the mundane kind, are useful. For example, mindfulness it is often described by the Buddha means when eating one knows that one is eating, when walking, one knows that one is walking, when wearing pants, one knows that one is wearing pants. Before you can have "right mindfulness" of the kind that TRC is describing, you have to develop mindfulness.

But more to the point, when you have the presence of the mental factor of *smṛti*, the mental factor of *vīrya*, diligence, is automatically present. Why? Because the *kusalacaittas* always work in company, where one is found all the other nine are to be found as well.

Moreover, when the ten *kusalacaittas* are present, it is impossible for the *akusalacaittas*

to arise in the mind, including the three afflictions referenced above. So therefore, as long as one is mindful and attentive even in an ordinary way, this eliminates the possibility for the akusalacaittas and the afflictive cittas to arise.

So the answer to the question is, by understanding how mind and mental factors function the motivation to practice mindfulness arises merely by understanding how the mind works and taking opportunity of this knowledge. It does not have to be this formal, academic, intellectual trip.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 21st, 2014 at 5:51 PM

Title: Re: CHNN Shang Shang publications - Password?

Content:

vajraheart said:

Hi,

I just received several download links for restricted items that I ordered from the Shang Shang store of CHNNR. After downloading the files, when attempting to open them I am prompted for a password, but was never sent one in the email. Where do I get the passwords to open my files? Thanks...

Malcolm wrote:

They will send you one, but it might take a day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 21st, 2014 at 2:36 PM

Title: Re: Uninterrupted motivation to practice mindfulness

Content:

TRC said:

I have to disagree with your characterisation of mindfulness as being “nothing more profound” than “not forgetting to put your pants on” Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Mindfulness is simply a mental factor.

Of course there are different objects of mindfulness, but the act of being mindful is the same in so far as it is a mental factor associated with all positive minds. Mindfulness is always beneficial, since it is a kusalacaitta. This does not make mindfulness profound however.

The point here of course is to point out that we are always being mindful of something, unless of course we are distracted by the akusalacaittas, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 21st, 2014 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Uninterrupted motivation to practice mindfulness

Content:

SeekerNo1000003 said:

Hi,

One thing bothers me a lot lately & that is the lack of a continuous motivation to practice mindfulness.

It bothers me that I am distracted most of the day & too lazy to do anything about it.

I imagine that this is normal & motivation becomes more continuous as we continue to practice. On the other hand, I've experienced sudden rises in determination as far as other things are concerned (e.g., finding a solution to a problem that remained unsolved for too long).

In the case of practicing mindfulness more consistently, it feels to me that a simple insight of some sort may be missing...

I'm curious have you ever had any breakthroughs or insights that helped you get into gear in the practice of mindfulness? Could you kindly share with your experience?

Malcolm wrote:

Mindfulness means not forgetting to put your pants on before you step out the door. It is really nothing more profound than this, but it is very useful to have.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 10:39 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

smcj said:

Upon sober reflection...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I did ask you if you were high.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

smcj said:

Part of what he was talking about was wishing for validation of the teachings, to make them something more than stories and ideas, to make them something you can know you can rely on.

Malcolm wrote:

The practice of Dzogchen has the ability to eradicate the two coarse obscurations [i.e.

the obscurations of affliction and knowledge] even in ordinary practitioners below the path of seeing because it permits ordinary practitioners to encounter their real condition even though they are not what one would be normally considered "enlightened" [i.e. the path of seeing/the first bodhisattva stage and beyond].

The path of Dzogchen is really quite extraordinary precisely because of its benefits for normal, everyday people.

Of course, one still must continue to practice and attain awakening in order to deal with the two subtle obscurations which remain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

smcj said:

I believe that the points that I was making were entirely in keeping with the traditional Nyingma approach to Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

How would you know? Not all Nyingma teachers teach Dzogchen or have a deep understanding of Dzogchen, much less a deep practice of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow body question

Content:

Fa Dao said:

sorry if am a little dense..just want to make sure I understand you correctly..this is serious shit, ya know?

3rd level=Awakened person=you just Know?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, one, if you reach the 3rd vision, this assumes you have had instructions on all four visions. So yeah, once you hit the third vision you also enter the first bhumi and the path of cultivation, and you are guaranteed buddhahood from that point on in the bardo at minimum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow body question

Content:

Fa Dao said:

ok..so in that slow dissolution does one just Know how to do that? Is it an intrinsic part

of the process? or are there specific practices when one does reach that level? I am not asking for any specific details of course, especially in an online forum, just asking for future reference..

Malcolm wrote:

Once you hit the third vision you are an awakened person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow body question

Content:

Fa Dao said:

my question is simple..does rainbow body just happen spontaneously when one reaches the 4th vision as described in Longde/Thogal/Yangti texts? or does one just know what to do when they reach that level? or are there specific practices that one does when they reach that level?

Malcolm wrote:

The fourth vision is described as a gradual process.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

uan said:

Hi Malcolm, I thought this thread would be a better place to follow up on a response you made (just so we don't go off topic on the Western Buddhist thread). I was hoping you could clarify a couple things.

Malcom wrote

uan wrote:

Based on that, is there a reason you would be presently incarnated here, rather than having attained rainbow body in the bardo or in a pure nirmanakāya buddhafiield?

When you wake up in the bardo, you also generate emanations. Maybe I am one of those. In terms of the rainbow body, whether it's attained at death or afterwards in the bardo/a pure nirmanakāya buddhafiield, is that a mark that a practitioner has entered on the Bhumis or is it a mark that one has attained full Buddhahood? Does awaken mean realized or enlightened - and are those two terms describing different things or not? My understanding, which is likely to be incorrect, is that "realized" meant a person was at least on the 1st Bhumi, while "enlightened" would mean full Buddhahood. Your insight would be appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:
Generally, speaking here we mean buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 2:00 AM
Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities
Content:
boda said:
I think this often springs from the notion that newcomers must be protected from wrong views or whatever.

Malcolm wrote:
No, we are just tired of arguing with obstinate materialists about what the Buddha actually taught.

boda said:
Who on the forum is a materialist?

Malcolm wrote:
well, lets see, there was A108, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 1:26 AM
Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities
Content:
boda said:
I think this often springs from the notion that newcomers must be protected from wrong views or whatever.

Malcolm wrote:
No, we are just tired of arguing with obstinate materialists about what the Buddha actually taught.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 12:31 AM
Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities
Content:
martin123 said:
I can honestly say that of all the forums i have visited(not just Buddhist forums) Dharmawheel is the most heaviest in atmosphere.What is heavy(in a negative sense) about wisdom and compassion?something worth considering.

boda said:
It reeks of self-importance.

Sherab Dorje said:
What reeks of self-importance?

Malcolm wrote:
DW

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 12:26 AM
Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?
Content:

Crazywisdom said:
Dzogchen is nothing like the lottery. Dzogchen is not reserved only for the mahasiddhas. If you listen, contemplate and practice the teachers words, you can have that realization in one life.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 11:57 PM
Title: Re: Recent tragic events and the West vs Russia situation
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
MOSCOW (AP) — A top pro-Russia rebel commander in eastern Ukraine has given a bizarre version of events surrounding the Malaysian jetliner crash — suggesting many of the victims may have died days before the plane took off.

The pro-rebel website Russkaya Vesna on Friday quoted Igor Girkin as saying he was told by people at the crash site that "a significant number of the bodies weren't fresh," adding that he was told they were drained of blood and reeked of decomposition.

The Malaysia Airlines Boeing-777 was shot down Thursday, killing all 298 people aboard. The plane was flying 10,000 meters above an area where Ukrainian forces have been fighting separatist rebels. Each side accuses the other of downing the plane.

U.S. intelligence authorities said a surface-to-air missile brought down the plane, and U.S. Ambassador Samantha Power told the U.N. Security Council in New York on Friday that the missile was likely fired from a rebel-held area near the Russian border.

Girkin, also known as Strelkov and allegedly a former Russian military intelligence agent, said he couldn't confirm the information. But it's sure to add to the intense emotions surrounding the crash, with the rebels accused of shooting down the plane.

Girkin said "Ukrainian authorities are capable of any baseness."

He claimed that a large amount of blood serum and medications were found in the wreckage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

smcj said:

I think my response to Zoom was better than yours. You are welcome to try it again.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you high?

smcj said:

No, Gelug/Kagyu.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, and so your interest in the Dzogchen forum is?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

smcj said:

I think my response to Zoom was better than yours.

Malcolm wrote:

I was being sarcastic because his comment was not serious. In fact, none of his comments have been serious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

smcj said:

I think my response to Zoom was better than yours. You are welcome to try it again.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you high?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

smcj said:

You guys make too much of a big thing about Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

No we don't. Dzogchen is our path. It is not yours, and that's ok.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Recent tragic events and the West vs Russia situation

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

What I find deeply disturbing ...

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing that governments do is disturbing, or rather, it's all disturbing on one level or another.

Karma Dorje said:

Why are you correcting me when I am saying what *I* find disturbing? If you don't find it disturbing, that's up to you.

Malcolm wrote:

it was an observation spurred by your comment, not a correction...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Diet in relation to Rainbow Body

Content:

zenman said:

I read the book Incarnation by Tulku Thondup. Fascinating stuff, a very good book. So many have attained the rainbow body that it kind of surprises.

My question is a specific one: What has been the role and content of the diet of these people who have attained rainbow body? I am especially interested in the changing situation of the need for food. I suppose most if not all of them have been vegetarians. What have they eaten? Does anyone know?

Malcolm wrote:

Probably very few of them were vegetarians. But they all practiced what is known as Chulen or rasāyana, which is an important secondary practice for attaining rainbow body.

And slowly, they would have reduced their dependence on food.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 8:27 PM

Title: Remember 1988?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Navy Missile Downs Iranian Jetliner

By George C. Wilson

Washington Post Staff Writer

Monday, July 4, 1988; Page A01

A U.S. warship fighting gunboats in the Persian Gulf yesterday mistook an Iranian civilian jetliner for an attacking Iranian F14 fighter plane and blew it out of the hazy sky with a heat-seeking missile, the Pentagon announced. Iran said 290 persons were aboard the European-made A300 Airbus and that all had perished.

"The U.S. government deeply regrets this incident," Adm. William J. Crowe Jr., chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a Pentagon news conference.

The disaster occurred at mid-morning over the Strait of Hormuz, when the airliner, Iran Air Flight 655, on what Iran described as a routine 140-mile flight from its coastal city of Bandar Abbas southwest to Dubai in the United Arab Emirates, apparently strayed too close to two U.S. Navy warships that were engaged in a battle with Iranian gunboats.

The USS Vincennes, a cruiser equipped with the most sophisticated radar and electronic battle gear in the Navy's surface arsenal, tracked the oncoming plane electronically, warned it to keep away, and when it did not fired two Standard surface-to-air missiles.

Navy officials said the Vincennes' combat teams believed the airliner to be an Iranian F14 jet fighter. No visual contact was made with the aircraft until it was struck and blew up about six miles from the Vincennes; the plane's wreckage fell in Iranian territorial waters, Navy officials said.

Iranian vessels and helicopters searched for survivors, but there was no indication last night that anyone survived what apparently is the sixth worst aviation disaster. Iranian television broadcast scenes of bodies floating amid scattered debris.

It was the first time any U.S. military unit had shot down a civilian airliner. It occurred almost five years after a Soviet fighter pilot shot down an off-course Korean Air Lines Flight 007, killing 269 people.

Iran accused the United States of a "barbaric massacre" and vowed to "avenge the blood of our martyrs."

President Reagan in a statement said he was "saddened to report" that the Vincennes "in a proper defensive action" had shot down the jetliner. "This is a terrible human tragedy. Our sympathy and condolences go out to the passengers, crew, and their families We deeply regret any loss of life."

Reagan, who was spending the Fourth of July holiday at Camp David, said the Iranian aircraft "was headed directly for the Vincennes" and had "failed to heed repeated warnings." The cruiser, he said, fired "to protect itself against possible attack."

News of the downing of the plane began with sharply conflicting accounts from Iran and from the Defense Department of what had transpired in the Persian Gulf. Early yesterday, Tehran broadcast accusations that the United States had downed an unarmed airliner.

The Pentagon at first denied the Iranian claims, declaring that information from the fleet indicated that the Vincennes, equipped with the Aegis electronic battle management system, had shot down an attacking Iranian F14 jet fighter. But after sifting through more detailed reports and electronic intelligence, Reagan directed the Pentagon to confirm there had been a tragic case of mistaken identity in the war-torn gulf.

Crowe, in his hastily called news conference at the Pentagon, also backed up the skipper of the Vincennes and faulted the Iranian airline pilot. Crowe said the Airbus had flown four miles west of the usual commercial airline route from Bandar Abbas to Dubai and that the pilot ignored repeated radioed warnings from the Vincennes to change course.

Why and how the Vincennes mistook the bulky, wide-bodied Airbus A300 for a sleek, supersonic F14 fighter plane barely a third the transport's size will be the subject of "a full investigation," Reagan promised. A military team under the command of Rear Adm. William N. Fogarty of the U.S. Central Command will leave this week to begin that investigation, Defense Department officials said.

The shootdown of the Airbus represents the biggest loss of life on the strategic waterway since the U.S. warships began escorting Kuwaiti tankers in and out of the Persian Gulf last July. Pentagon officials then said the increased U.S. naval presence would have from a "low to moderate risk" of provoking confrontations with Iran.

But in the past year, although the United States and Iran are not in a formal state of war, there have been a series of brief but fierce sea battles in the gulf between the two countries' military forces. Vigilance and readiness among U.S. forces intensified after the near-sinking of the patrol frigate USS Stark by an Iraqi fighter-bomber on May 17, 1987, in a missile attack that killed 37 sailors.

Yesterday started out as another sea battle, and ended with what the Vincennes commanders misinterpreted as a "Stark profile" attack on the high-tech cruiser. Crowe in his briefing and other Navy and Defense Department officials offered a detailed version of how the shoot-down occurred.

At 2:10 a.m. EDT, the Pentagon said, three Iranian Boghammar gunboats fired on a helicopter that had flown off the Vincennes on a reconnaissance mission. The helicopter flew back to the cruiser unscathed. The Vincennes and a smaller warship, the frigate USS Elmer Montgomery, a half-hour later closed on the gunboats and put them under fire with 5-inch guns, sinking two and damaging the third.

At 2:47 a.m. EDT, the Iranian Airbus with almost a full load of passengers took off from Bandar Abbas, a big Iranian naval base on the northern coastal elbow of the Strait of Hormuz. The field at the base is used by civilian and military aircraft and recently had become the center for Iran's dwindling force of F14s, a twin-engine, two-place fighter that the United States sold to Iran during the rule of the shah.

Two minutes after the Airbus took off, the far-reaching radars of the Vincennes Aegis cruiser saw the plane was coming its way. The skipper of the ship, operating under liberalized rules of engagement that call for U.S. captains in the Persian Gulf to fire before being fired upon to avoid another Stark disaster, warned the approaching aircraft to change course, according to the Pentagon.

The Vincennes and most airliners are equipped with identification of friend or foe (IFF) electronic boxes that query each other across the sky to establish identities. The Vincennes' IFF questioned the Airbus IFF via telemetry, but received no response. A response would come in radio pulses that would be deciphered and displayed as an identifying number on the ship's combat information center consoles.

Failing to raise the Airbus by IFF, the Pentagon said, the Vincennes broadcast its warnings by voice radio, using the emergency UHF and VHF channels that aircraft crews would hear if they followed standard practice of monitoring those frequencies. Crowe said three warnings were sent over the civilian emergency channel and four over the military one, called "Guard." The Pentagon said the Vincennes could have issued the warning over the air traffic control channel but did not.

"The suspect aircraft was outside the prescribed commercial air corridor," Crowe told reporters. Defense Department officials said later that the Airbus was four miles west of commercial air corridor. "More importantly," Crowe continued, "the aircraft headed directly for Vincennes on a constant bearing at high speed, approximately 450 knots."

Without becoming specific, Crowe said there were "electronic indications on Vincennes" that led the U.S. crew to conclude the approaching airliner was an F14. "Given the threatening flight profile and decreasing range, the aircraft was declared 'hostile' " at 2:51 a.m. EDT. The airliner at that crucial moment was on a course of almost due south, 185 degrees, and descending toward the Vincennes from an altitude of 7,800 feet, according to Crowe. Visibility was no more than five miles, Crowe said.

Three minutes later, at 2:54 a.m. EDT, the Vincennes launched two Standard surface-to-air missiles from its deck. The missiles whooshed toward the twin-jet airliner, which was nine miles away and not visible to the naked eye because of the haze hanging over the gulf. The Standard missiles homed in on the heat of the quarry's engines and at least

one of them exploded when it pulled abreast of the Airbus. Such a missile hit usually slices an aircraft apart and turns it into a fireball of burning fuel.

"At least one hit at an approximate range of six miles," Crowe said. "We do have some eyewitness reports that saw the vague shape of the aircraft when the missile hit, and it looked like it disintegrated."

Asked if the Vincennes' skipper had been prudent or impetuous by firing at a plane he could not see, Crowe replied: "The commanding officer conducted himself with circumspection and, considering the information that was available to him, followed his authorities and acted with good judgment at a very trying period and under very trying circumstances Not only was he following this aircraft and concerned about it," but he also "was engaged on the surface with Iranian units."

Crowe said it was "logical" for the skipper to assume an aircraft that was coming down from the sky at high speed and would not respond to radio warnings was putting the Vincennes "in jeopardy."

At another point in the news conference Crowe broadened his defense of the Vincennes skipper, declaring "the No. 1 obligation of the commanding officer of a ship or units are the protection of his own people. We deeply regret the loss of life here, but that commanding officer had a very heavy obligation to protect his ships, his people. We've made that clear throughout the Persian Gulf mission"

Crowe, who used a chart of the Strait of Hormuz that displayed the approximate positions of the vessels and the route of the airliner, said he did not have enough data to explain fully why the multiple kinds of detection gear aboard the Vincennes mistook a wide-bodied jetliner for a fighter.

But he noted that the Vincennes' radar was focused on a plane coming at it head-on, reflecting a smaller dot on the console screens than would be the case from a side view. Also, he said, no Air Force Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) or Navy Hawkeye sentry planes were aloft over the Strait of Hormuz to provide additional identification data to the Vincennes at the time of the shootdown.

Navy leaders said Iranian commercial aircraft had flown over U.S. warships in a threatening manner at least eight times before the Stark was hit by two French Exocet missiles fired by an Iraqi jet. Ever since the Stark attack, skippers in the gulf have been less tolerant of such apparent threats.

Asked if the skipper of the Vincennes would have held his fire under the interpretation of the rules of engagement followed before the Stark was attacked, Crowe replied: "I don't know. Certainly the rules of engagement would not have been as specific as the authorities granted him." He said another review of the rules of engagement would be part of the general investigation of the shootdown.

Crowe said there were "fundamental differences" between the actions of United States

in this incident and the Soviet Union in the downing of Korean Air Lines Flight 007, which strayed into Soviet airspace on the night of Sept. 1, 1983, during a flight from Alaska to Japan. The Soviet airspace was not a war zone like the Persian Gulf, Crowe said, "and there was not combat in progress" as was the case yesterday. "It was at very high altitude" and no Soviet warnings were issued.

"In the Persian Gulf," Crowe said, there is very little time or maneuver room when ships are put at risk. "We're fighting in a lake."

Staff writer Molly Moore contributed to this report.

© Copyright 1996 The Associated Press

[Back to the top](#)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

Dan74 said:

But more importantly here on fora, there are clearly people seem to spend an inordinate amount of time arguing over the doctrine, which I suspect is detrimental to other aspects of practice, would you agree? So I was simply trying to say that there isn't one uniquely correct way of looking at this. That's all.

Malcolm wrote:

I have found that arguing about things between lineages is not productive, say Chan and Highest Yoga Tantra, or even between Kagyu and Sakya, for example.

Why? Partially it has to do with the way different schools perceive themselves. If you tell a Chan practitioner that Chan is not the apex of buddhadharma, they will think you are crazy. If you tell a Vajrayāna practitioner that one can attain Buddhahood by common Mahāyāna in less than three incalculable eons (and that includes Chan), they will think you are crazy. Similarly, if you tell Theravadins they are following Hinayāna they get all offended and huffy. If you try to insist to Vajrayānists that Theravada does not fall under the criteria of what we define as Hinayāna, you will get blank stares.

On the other hand, if one wants to go and understand why Chan considers itself the apex, or why Vajrayānists consider Theravada Hinayāna, and so on, then one should do so with an open mind.

Then of course there is the issue of conflicting assumptions — a lot of long time Mahāyānists and Vajrayānists, as we know, claim to be unconcerned with the assertion

that their texts and so on are not really products of Buddha speech as traditionally defined (that is spoken, by permission, or blessed). This also raises complexities. Then there is the difference of canons -- for example, frequently Chinese Buddhists will cite the Shurangama Samaadhi 2, for the sake of convenience. This sutra, whether authentic or not, simply is not read in the Tibetan Canon and so therefore, will not be felt of much authority by Tibetan Buddhists. It is certain that it existed, but unlike many other sutras, for whatever reason, the Tibetans chose not to translate it into Tibetan because perhaps they doubted its authenticity.

Then of course there is the modern pro-atman interpretation of the Dharma, grounded far more in the Coomaraswamy, Grim, and modern early 20th century authors, than traditional discourse, AFACT, represented by our own Son of the Buddha, and elsewhere, Zenmar (aka Ardent Hollingsworth), who right or wrong, represent a vocal minority on virtually every Buddhist forum I have been on in the past 20 years.

Finally, there are the out and out "Buddhist" skeptics such as the Triratna Order's Jayarava Atwood and Richard Hayes. What possible interest they have in Dharma anymore is totally beyond me, since people like they seem bent on tearing Buddhism down completely, but whatever. They seem to emanated out of the forensic trend of Buddhist historical scholarship, but of what use this is for the practice of Dharma is totally mystifying.

All of this leads to a rather complex maze of issues and assumptions one has to navigate on a heterogeneous forum such as this. And most people do not have the long view I have, since they have not participated on these forums of and on. How many folks remember alt.buddha.short.fat.guy?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

ZOOM said:

I never heard that even one of all the Westerner Dzogchen practitioners (no matter if they are in an official lineage, have an official teacher, got direct "empowerment" or instruction from the teacher) ever attained rainbow body.

This poor success rate for Westerners (0.000%) seems very disconcerting and leads to a lot of questions.

In case that I am misinformed, I would be happy if someone could point out some rainbow body success stories of Westerner students to me!

Thank you very much!

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, I guess Dzogchen just doesn't work for westerners. Better move along, nothing to see here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Recent tragic events and the West vs Russia situation

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

What I find deeply disturbing ...

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing that governments do is disturbing, or rather, it's all disturbing on one level or another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Recent tragic events and the West vs Russia situation

Content:

Dan74 said:

But the West, who have removed and installed regimes as they saw fit from Iran to Central America, and in the past annexed huge swathes of land from Hawaii to Mexico, hardly has the high moral ground.

Malcolm wrote:

The Monroe Doctrine, formulated during an era when the US was under constant threat from European Colonial powers. That was amended by Teddy Roosevelt's big stick policies.

Dan74 said:

I don't think Putin is the power-crazed despot, Western media portrays him to be. His thinking, as far as I can make out, is to push back and re-establish Russia as a power to be reckoned with. A Russia that will protect its national interest and throw its weight around if needs be, rather than being pushed around by the West, as it is perceived domestically. Russia has always focused on its local scene - Chechnya, Abkhazia, Ukraine, which it sees as its legitimate sphere of influence after the loss of the Warsaw Pact states. I think much of what we see is a product of the West trying to contain Russia (just like China) and maintain hegemony over world affairs.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I can tell, Russia is interested annexing the whole of the Ukraine, which Russians regard as properly a part of Russia.

This is a screw up of massive proportions on the part of the Russians.

Dan74 said:

I am seriously worried about where this is all heading...

Malcolm wrote:

No where. Russia's lost the moral high ground, despite the Ukrainian Nazis and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Is Western Buddhism an (ethnic) identity-based Buddhism?

Content:

Jikan said:

We're way off topic, but that can be sorted out in a moment.

Question for Malcolm et al: define "early age" for the purpose of this conversation.
what age of taking an interest might indicate such a thing?

Malcolm wrote:

Kungfu came on when I was 10, Cutting Through, etc. at 16. I have self-identified as a Buddhist since then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Is Western Buddhism an (ethnic) identity-based Buddhism?

Content:

uan said:

Based on that, is there a reason you would be presently incarnated here, rather than having attained rainbow body in the bardo or in a pure nirmanakāya buddhafiield?

Malcolm wrote:

When you wake up in the bardo, you also generate emanations. Maybe I am one of those.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

kirtu said:

It is the case that for most people it is easier to attain Arhatship

Malcolm wrote:

This just really is not the case, kirt. But far be it from me to sway you from your superior knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

It might be time to sit back, keep an eye on whether or not the changes we are in the process of implementing make DW a place you want to spend time, or if they don't after some time, make your decision accordingly.

Announcement July 18th, 2014 said:

2. People are free to question the teachings and traditional interpretations in Open Dharma subforum as has mostly been happening. Questions about a practice, a teaching or belief are appropriate in the specific subforum where the practice belongs, but criticisms belong in Open Dharma only and should be done sensitively, where possible with reference to the appropriate teachings. For example, do not challenge the core Dharma concepts and principles of Pure Land Buddhism in the Pure Land subforum and the same goes with the other specific traditions as well.

Malcolm wrote:

This means you have decided to change nothing. This means that criticism of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna will proceed unchecked. This means that you are WILLINGLY providing a harbor for adharma. Why you all fail to understand this is somewhat astonishing. The fact that some of you possess samaya and still are willing to aid and abet those mārās who would criticize Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna is even more astonishing still.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Teyes was mostly hands-off, especially at the last stages. Besides, there was a sudden tightening of policy which can be called a power grab in all reasonableness IMHO.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, there was no grab. At that point I had totally stepped down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It was never mandatory to believe in rebirth on e-sangha, it was forbidden to argue against it.

Sherab Dorje said:
Same thing.

Malcolm wrote:
No, not the same thing at all.

Sherab Dorje said:
It's different, no one is arguing with him.
Yes, this is true, but this is a discussion forum after all and the example was to highlight the necessity of the repetitive reinforcement of basic principles. ie You missed the point.

Malcolm wrote:
Sorry, but you miss the point — i.e. ChNN does not have to deal with argumentative people when reiterating basic points. He reiterates basic points again and again because new people come again and again. Here, it is not new people coming again and again, it is old people with the same old axes to grind, often from E-Sangha.

Sherab Dorje said:
It would be a lot easier to manage, and the level of conversation would be more elevated if people did not feel entitled to argue with every basic aspect of the teachings regardless of forums. For example the user TRC feels completely at ease being confrontational in every forum, the same goes for Alfredo.
Okay. So if they are breaking the Terms of Service by being unnecessarily disruptive you report them and they get warned, suspended and banned.

Malcolm wrote:
That is the problem, people get reported, a moderator handles the report, and often nothing happens because as long as no one uses expletives, for whatever reason the moderation style here is "let the \$#!% fly", for example, the tactless pillorying of the late Rachel Olds.

Sherab Dorje said:
The tulku system as it is present in Tibet has no precedent in sutra and tantra. It is relied upon heavily in Kagyu and Nyingma, less so in Gelug, and almost non-existence in Sakya outside of east Tibet.
Really? Coz I am sure that it would have some precedent in tantra.

Malcolm wrote:
It has no precedent in sutra or tantra. You can listen to ChNN state this quite clearly today since you do not believe me. The Tulku system started with Karma Pakshi.

Sherab Dorje said:

I seem to remember a couple of predictions by Guru Padmasambhava being thrown around.

Malcolm wrote:

The tulku system has no precedent in sutra and tantra. Yes, in the Mañjuśrī mulakalpa there are some predictions of rebirths of bodhisattvas in Tibet such as Gampopa, and in the Padma Khathang there are lists of predictions about where this terma is concealed and by which of the 25 disciples it will be revealed in a later incarnation, and so on, but there is no precedent for system of reincarnated lineage heads like you have in Nyingma and Kagyu exclusively. The fact that it is not bound by some canonicity is why there can be disputes over the recognition of the Karmapa, for example. There is no clear guide in sutra and tantra which regulates how reincarnations are recognized/selected, trained, appointed, succeeded and so on. For this reason then, the recognition of Steven Segal as a minor tulku generated some controversy in the West. Many people really could not and still cannot understand why he was recognized by Penor Rinpoche — it was not for money, I can guarantee that. Since it is not really a part of sutra and tantra, the recognition of tulkus merely boils down to the opinion of this or that master. If someone follows that master, they are likely to give credence to the reincarnations he recognizes.

Sherab Dorje said:

So who has the say about the orthodoxy of the tulku system then? Who's orthodoxy (tradition) are we going to follow?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

The tulku system is an embedded feature of Tibetan culture, religious life, politics and economics, but it is a deeply ingrained custom, it is not a system which is grounded in sutra and tantra. That being said, it is an integral feature of many lineages in Tibet such as Gelug (Drepung, Ganden, Sera), Drikung, Drugpa, Karma Kagyu etc., Palyul, Khathog, Dorje Drag, Dzogchen, Shechen and so on, as well as Dzongsar, as well as Bon monasteries also.

Thus, even though the tulku system does not have the orthodox and canonical backing of say bodhisattva vows or samaya, it is a deeply embedded part of Tibetan religious culture, and at this point, I would say Tibetan religious culture could barely function without it, which is why the Chinese are so keen on regulating it.

Unfortunately, due to the highly subjective nature of recognitions, it is difficult to say there is an "orthodox" position on the issue of recognitions. Sometimes reincarnations are recognized in dreams, sometimes, by divinations, sometimes, as in the case of the Dalai Lamas of late 18th and 19th centuries, by drawing lots; sometimes by predictions of the dying Lama like the 13 Dalai Lama or the 16th Karmapa (if you follow Tai Situ's version), etc. Sometimes by tests, and in the case of 5th Dalai Lama, even though he failed the tests, the regent proclaimed to the Kashag that he passed them all and successfully recognized the belongings of the 4th.

The buddhology of tulkus is still being worked out by Tibetans. The only books I know that attempts to work out this buddhology is Tulku Thondup's INCARNATION: The History and Mysticism of the Tulku Tradition of Tibet. It is an attempt, but I have to say, it is a little scanty. There is also Enthronement: The Recognition Of The Reincarnate Masters Of Tibet And The Himalayas. This book makes it eminently clear that the rite of enthroning a tulku is basically the same as the rite of consecrating a statue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Jikan said:

How is it that so many recent DW posts get derailed into discussions of moderation policy and practice instead of Dharma? Surely that is an obscure and boring topic for most of us.

Fruitzilla said:

Well, basically because it is a power grab. IIRC it's about the same thing that happened on e-sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

There was no power grab on e-Sangha. Teyes was always the owner of the board. We always served in our various capacities at his pleasure.

There is no power grab here happening here, just an honest discussion of what is appropriate and inappropriate for a board of this type which great out of a discussion started by Sherlock.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Ukraine says Malaysian Airliner shot down, 295 dead

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, well, Russia has a lot of answering to do...

Norwegian said:

Usually planes don't suddenly explode in mid air with debris falling down, so I think we can rule out the crash theory.

As for being shot down, that's the only legible solution. And that Ukraine would shoot down the plane makes no sense. However, we do know that pro-Russian separatists are in the area where the plane crashed, we do know that they have issued warnings before that they consider the airspace above where they are located as theirs, and we also do know that they have bragged about having BUK missiles in the past. These are just the

kind of missiles you need to shoot down a commercial airliner, which has an altitude that is far beyond what "regular" missiles (which what most rebels and terrorists are in possession of) have.

This cached link shows the pro-Russian separatists in that area tweeting an image of the BUK missiles:

https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache%3ANF6E5FCKFNEJ%3Ahttp%3A%2F%2Ftwitter.com%2Fdnrpress%2Fstatus%2F483248037629018112 " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; -- and I say cached, because they have now deleted that image.

And earlier today, on Russian social network VKontakte (a sort of Russian Facebook), a leader of the pro-Russian separatists bragged about having shot down a Ukrainian military plane over the exact same town as the Malaysian airliner crashed down into. There has been no Ukrainian military plane crashing down there today, only the Malaysian airliner - ergo it was a misunderstanding of gigantic proportions. This post on VK have since been deleted...

And now US intel confirms that indeed a missile have been fired at the airliner: "A senior U.S. official said one radar system saw a surface-to-air missile system turn on and track an aircraft right before the plane went down. A second system saw a heat signature at the time the airliner was hit, the official said. The United States is analyzing the trajectory of the missile to try to learn where the attack came from."

The pro-Russian separatists are now intending on sending the discovered black box of the airliner to Moscow.

This is a tragedy that easily could've been avoided if people had made the right choices. And I really do wonder what Putin is thinking right now...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Mkoll said:

The purpose of this sub-forum is to openly permit important and challenging discussion on the Dhamma. By establishing a particular forum as a "Free-For-All", albeit one where members must still be nice to each other, we aim to keep other areas of the site free from vociferous debate...

Malcolm wrote:

The problem, as I see it, is that Dhammwheel is more heterogeneous than Dharma Wheel. Secondly, debates tend to spill over into all forums here. Third, this forum is more heterogeneous and it is not as tightly run a ship as Dhammawheel. You have to recall, they all learned their mod skills at E-Sangha and basically transferred the Theravadin forum from E-Sangha to there. ESangha was also a much more tightly run

ship than DW is at present. We also had a lot more mods.

My approach to this issue is to mark of dangerous shoals and navigate past them all together, rather than use up the man hours necessary to sound shallow water so we don't constantly run aground, i.e., as I have said several times, shutter this forum rather than trying to fix it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

smcj said:

I am personally of the opinion that Dzogchen has been over-marketed here in the West.

Malcolm wrote:

That's true. And even worse it is marketed as just another meditation technique. Just look at the latest cover of Shambhala Sun:

smcj said:

I do not doubt the validity of anything about it, just that it has pandered to many of our cultural preconditions and thus has gotten an undue amount of attention.

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of people use Dzogchen to sell their teachings, without really teaching Dzogchen at all.

smcj said:

The reason there are 9 yanas is because one size does not fit all. The best medicine is the one that cures the sickness you have got, not the most powerful or famous medicine.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, the best Dharma for you is the one you want to practice. Dzogchen is a high teaching. That does not mean it is not a path. It is a path. And it can be practiced by any interested person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Motova, you seriously misunderstand my point. My point is solely that it becomes a

problem for practitioners and for Dharma in general when people who are nominally "buddhists" take refuge science rather than Dharma. There are a lot of negative consequences one could list. We can start with most obvious one, the denial, of rebirth, which the Buddha clearly defines as a wrong view.

Motova said:

I get what you're saying. But using science and taking refuge in science are two different things. There are people with the karma capable of using science/technology to complement their practice of the Dharma, without having to give up refuge.

Malcolm wrote:

I agree, in principle. On the other hand, sometimes the tools we use shape how we think, i.e., to a hammer, everything is a nail, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

smcj said:

But from what you've said elsewhere based on your E-Sangha experience those discussions spilled over to the other forums.

Malcolm wrote:

Constantly.

The goal here should be to limit opportunity for Adharma speech.

Inevitably someone is going bring up the point of who decides what is Adharmic speech.

Well, this is a Mahayāna/Vajrayāna forum, so right there, questioning the authenticity of Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna should be off limits. It does not mean of course that anyone should be expected to accept Vajrayāna, or for that matter Mahāyāna, but criticisms of these traditions should not be allowed.

In general. DW should be a forum devoted to the promulgation and positive growth of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. How can that happen if we allow random people to engage in slanderous criticism of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna? Somehow it is a major sin to refer to Theravada as a Hinayāna school, but no one blinks even once when the authenticity of Mahāyāna sutras and tantras are questioned or even denied.

Anyway, I think everyone gets my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Mkoll said:

I'm not convinced, but I don't know much about inter-Mahayana relations so I can't say for sure. However, and this is putting it lightly, I do know for certain that Theravada has a different presentation of Dhamma than Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

And they have their own forum, don't they?

Mkoll said:

Well, I've come closer to your side of the fence on this issue since we've started talking about it. I could see a valid argument for certain topics of debate (like the legitimacy of the four concepts I mentioned) being anathema to the forum as a whole because they only serve to increase the hindrance of doubt.

Malcolm wrote:

Classically speaking, debate in Dharma is meant to clarify one's understanding of Dharma because one wants to understand the Dharma with more precision. The purpose of debate in Dharma has never been to fault Dharma teachings and replace them with some post-modern revision. But because of the way we conduct political discourse in the West, we extend that to religious discourse. Then because we have this idea of "free speech", we are offended by the notion that some lines of conversation might be considered non-virtuous from the perspective of Dharma. In other words, we constantly confuse political speech with Dharma speech thinking that it should be the kind free for all we might find in the Hyde Park Speaker's corner.

What I am pointing out is that this "open dharma" forum violates the very TOS of DW by its very nature because of the kind of speech that is built into the forum itself. As I mentioned before, it provides a natural platform for adharma.

Classically speaking, in ancient India, debate was lead by qualified masters who taught students how to think more clearly and precisely about the Dharma. It has never been a free-for all as we find here. The purpose of this debate was to lessen the students' conceptual doubt and to sharpen their thinking. But that does not happen here. Mostly, it becomes the default forum for what are essentially non-virtuous discussions.

In ancient India, if tirthikas wanted to debate with us, they were sent to the gatekeepers, expert Panditas like Naropa, etc., whose job it was to debate all comers, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist. Well, we don't have that kind of capacity here. We are not a Buddhist university. There are no panditas here.

In the end, the goal should not be to have lots of users, or lots of controversial conversations. The goal at DW should be to have meaningful, edifying discussions about Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

Punya said:

waking up in the bardo do as well? (but not saying that's easy).

Malcolm wrote:

Achieving Buddhahood in the bardo is much easier than in this life. Why? It is because in the bardo state we have seven times more clarity. Buddha Vajrasattva states in the Victor's Speech Tantra

After that, in the bardo of rebirth the present unobstructed awareness with complete sense organs has seven times more clarity.

kirtu said:

But one's negative emotions are also unimpeded thus making it difficult unless one has a very high level of clarity already.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

For this reason we have Dzogchen teachings, which make waking up in the bardo relatively easy. Of the 21 capacities of Dzogchen practitioners listed the Rig pa rang shar tantra it is only the last three or four who need to take rebirth in a pure nirmanakāya realm in order to attain buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

kirtu said:

It is more easy to become an Arhat than attain rainbow body.

Malcolm wrote:

This is really not the case. Who ever taught you this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

What do you propose: like e-sangha where it was mandatory to believe in rebirth? A list of topics people are allowed/not allowed to debate and discuss? According to which

traditions criteria?

Malcolm wrote:

It was never mandatory to believe in rebirth on e-sangha, it was forbidden to argue against it.

Sherab Dorje said:

How many times has he given the lung for the tun, etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

It's different, no one is arguing with him.

Sherab Dorje said:

Like you stated in the sangha poll, this is not a sangha. There is no teacher. So obviously anything more than recycling the basics, requires sending a member to find a teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be a lot easier to manage, and the level of conversation would be more elevated people if did not feel entitled to argue with every basic aspect of the teachings regardless of forums. For example the user TRC feels completely at ease being confrontational in every forum, the same goes for Alfredo.

Sherab Dorje said:

And let's look at this idea of "traditional". Traditional according to which tradition and who? You claim a traditional approach yet, if I remember correctly (and please correct me if I am wrong) I have heard you express doubts/objections regarding the tulku system. Well, doesn't that make you non-traditional or a reformist of types? So according to the orthodoxy of your own position, you should not be allowed to take part in discussions on this forum.

Malcolm wrote:

The tulku system as it is present in Tibet has no precedent in sutra and tantra. It is relied upon heavily in Kagyu and Nyingma, less so in Gelug, and almost non-existence in Sakya outside of east Tibet.

I never said the tulku system was completely bad, merely that it was rife for opportunity for abuse. I never stated that there were no authentic tulkus, merely that many so called tulkus are tulkus only named for economic reasons or political reasons. ChNN just finished discussing this issue not 15 minutes ago. I have also expressed my doubt about whether this system is appropriate for continuing the teachings in the West.

Sherab Dorje said:

Discussion and questioning (to a reasonable degree) are a valid tool for learning

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what happens in the so called open dharma forum; and as in e-Sangha, the

acute skepticism found here tends to spill into other forums. This is why we shuttered the equivalent forum on esangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Jikan said:

That's how learning happens. It can be ugly and uncomfortable working with people at the level of their own affliction, and acknowledging and working with one's own affliction under the guidance of a teacher. I'm thankful I've had teachers who are willing to keep prodding me.

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that this forum, the open dharma forum, is not a teacher. It is place where people come and share their own confusion and increase that of others.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Mkoll said:

I will concede that certain points are most certainly adharmic such as outright rejection of: the Buddha's existence, his enlightenment, karma, or rebirth. Someone going on like this on a Buddhist forum is probably trolling. However, polite questions regarding these things coming from a newbie who is clearly amenable to learning and is not here to preach their own adharmic views is different.

Malcolm wrote:

We have a beginners forum for those questions.

Mkoll said:

Also, when you talk of "incorrect presentations of Dharma", we enter another gray area. Each of the traditions has a different presentation of Dharma and who is to decide what is correct or incorrect? Not only that, but each practitioner has their own approach and own perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

Not grey at all. We have different traditions for many reasons, but in general, when it comes to general Mahāyāna, I have no true quibbles with any of the great Mahāyāna traditions, traditional Chan/Zen, Pure Land, etc.; Kagyu, Sakya, Nyingma, Gelug, Jonang,

etc.

Mkoll said:

In the end, what you are suggesting is an increase in censorship of those people posting adharmic views, a change in the structure of the forum, and a change in the way moderators do their job. It's not a small change.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is pretty easy to see which kinds of arguments are not appropriate in this or that forum. For example, if a Theravadin comes to the general Mahāyāna forum and claims that the Mahāyāna sūtras were not taught by the Buddha, well, this is inappropriate. If a Mahāyāni goes to Dhammawheel for example, and insists that Mahāyāna sūtras be accepted as Buddha's speech, they will be laughed off the forum.

But if you a forum devoted for the sole purpose of debating the very validity of Buddha's teaching, what use does this serve but to further Adharma. For example, the Buddha did advise us to check his teachings the way a goldsmith checks gold, but not because Buddha doubted that what he was teaching was gold. He knew that his teachings were gold. So when we are checking the Buddha's teachings for its "gold content", we are doing so because we want to find gold, not because we want to find pyrite. But the way that kind of forum works is that we begin from a posture of no trust, we assume from the outset that what we are being handed is pyrite, and not gold. We then spend all of our energy in trying to prove this shiny substance in our hand is not gold, and even when we find out it is not pyrite, still we are not sure it is gold. This is the incorrect way of understanding the Buddha's teaching on testing his doctrine like a goldsmith tests gold. Even more to the point, when it comes to Vajrayāna, you had better make damn sure you have already decided the teachings are gold, because after you enter Vajrayāna, if you decide the teachings are not for you, then you can have real problems and obstacles.

Moreover, such a forum just gives a safe haven to those who harbor all sorts of wrong views about the Dharma in general, and Vajrayāna and Mahāyāna in particular. In a free for all zone, no one can prevent someone from slandering Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. This forum, the "Open" Dharma forum, is just such a haven. While not all the threads in this forum are pernicious, there a great number that are very pernicious for one reason or another. It is because of the nature of the forum that this is so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

ZOOM said:

You just have to do the minimum of training your guru requires & pay your membership fee and your guru will take care that you will be enlightened after death?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, in Vajrayāna in general, after receiving empowerment, as long as one scrupulously maintains samaya, liberation is guaranteed in seven lifetimes.

ZOOM said:

I mean, it has to be your guru who takes care of it...otherwise people wouldn't believe adamantly that you have to have a guru or you won't attain enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no means of entering any Vajrayāna path without a Guru — ergo, no Guru, no path, no awakening by means of that path. That is why the Guhyasamaja Tantra states: The Guru is the Buddha, the Guru is the Sangha, likewise, the Guru is the Sangha, the Guru is great glorious Heruka.

ZOOM said:

Because, you can learn from books as well as you can learn from your guru.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot receive transmission from a book. Having made an effort to receive transmission and the precious oral instructions which are not contained in any book from the mouth of the Guru, then one can rely on books as a supplement.

ZOOM said:

Many books are compiled out of speeches of gurus and reading those speeches does not lead to a worse learning success than hearing the speeches directly standing in front of the guru.

Malcolm wrote:

First, you must have a connection with the lineage. That means you must have a guru. And even so, quite frankly hearing the teachings directly has the quality of transmission, of being in the same state at the same time as the teacher. You just do not get that with a book. It is much better to have received the reading transmission of the Dharma text you wish to follow so that you have a living connection with that teaching. There are many Dharma texts you really are not allowed to read without such transmission. There are many Dharma texts that have one to one transmissions.

For mantra, it is indispensable to have the reading transmission, in other words, you cannot successfully practice any mantra without first having received the lung, the sole exceptions being the mantras of Avalokiteshvara, Tara, Mañjuśrī, Śakyamuni and some others. But for deities like Vajrayogini, Kalacakra, etc., it is indispensable.

ZOOM said:

And hearing the speeches of the guru is all that most students get concerning their communication with their guru. Only the few who practically live with their guru get more.

Malcolm wrote:

A realized guru's job is to teach through body and voice. For example, everything that a teacher like Chogyal Namkhai Norbu (and HH Dalai Lama, HH Sakya Trizin etc.) does is a teaching, the way he walks, dresses, eats, laughs, smiles, frowns, goes to the bathroom, washes, sleeps, wakes up, i.e., the way he lives and the way he dies.

It is important to make time to spend attending one's guru. But you do not have to spend your life doing so. Even so, serving the guru is an important part of practice, and the fastest, most excellent way to earn merit.

In reality all a guru can do is show one the path. There is nothing a guru can do more than that. There is nothing you can do more than receive their transmission and practice. You practice, and when you have questions, you ask. That's it. His or her job is to give transmission, your job is to apply transmission and realize what they have realized.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 7:23 PM

Title: Re: Using the Dharma to Quit Smoking

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We use the Dharma to stop suffering. Smoking is a kind of suffering. Therefore, one absolutely should use the Dharma to stop smoking.

As to smoking itself -- smoking causes craving which gives rise to addiction. Sensation conditions craving, contact gives rise to sensation.

You must avoid all conditions where you encounter tobacco in any form, and all people who use it. It is also useful to cultivate an extreme aversion to tobacco.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 3:18 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dharma

Content:

Mkoll said:

If you don't want to read this kind of stuff, don't read this sub-forum! It's that simple.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, I just don't understand why a Dharma practitioner would support a forum devoted to adharma. People are always droning on about "Right Speech" here, but has it not occurred to anyone that incorrect presentations of Dharma is the essence of adharma; that rejecting rebirth is adharma; etc.?

Why would we wish to provide a platform for the promulgation of adharma? It is out of

some notion of preserving "free speech"? Adharmic speech is not free, it is binding, it causes bad karma and providing a platform for its promulgation is also a cause of bad karma.

Seriously, I wish people would use their heads a bit more and understand that our thoughts and our words have consequences. What we choose to permit on this forum and what we choose not to, also has consequences. This is why, much to the anger of many, we chose to eliminate "the abandon all hope ye who enter here" forum, the so called debate court.

You really should understand that so called Open Dharma forum is really just an Adharma forum. it should be shuttered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 2:45 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Alfredo said:

For example, the Dalai Lama has stated that if a Buddhist belief is ever disproven by science (e.g., the flat earth), then the Buddhist thing to do would be to follow science.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, as I pointed out to James, this is really not what HHDL says, which is why I disagreed with the statement, "as written and as presented". But of course people who do not actually read what HHDL says tend to naively present this citation much in the same way as the Kalamas Sutta is naively presented. The source of the citation is The Universe in a Single Atom:

His Holiness, The Dalai Lama said:

My confidence in venturing into science lies in my basic belief that as in science so in Buddhism, understanding the nature of reality is pursued by means of critical investigation: if scientific analysis were conclusively to demonstrate certain claims in Buddhism to be false, then we must accept the findings of science and abandon those claims.

Malcolm wrote:

Dalai Lama (2005-09-13). The Universe in a Single Atom: The Convergence of Science and Spirituality (Kindle Locations 48-50). Crown Publishing Group. Kindle Edition.

This citation comes on the second page of the preface, which is why it is so widely cited. But the context for HHDL's statement is found here:

His Holiness, The Dalai Lama said:

As I see it, science falls within the scope of the first truth in that it examines the material bases of suffering, for it covers the entire spectrum of the physical environment—" the container"— as well as the sentient beings—" the contained." It is in the mental realm—

the realm of psychology, consciousness, the afflictions, and karma—that we find the second of the truths, the origin of suffering. The third and fourth truths, cessation and the path, are effectively outside the domain of scientific analysis in that they pertain primarily to what might be called philosophy and religion.

Malcolm wrote:

Dalai Lama (2005-09-13). *The Universe in a Single Atom: The Convergence of Science and Spirituality* (Kindle Locations 1248-1252). Crown Publishing Group. Kindle Edition.

So you see, the first quote may only be properly understood when it is given its full context, provided later on in the same book. I.e. HHDL is saying that when it comes to things like cosmology, physics and biology, the material basis of suffering, Buddhists should defer to science, as this falls under the rubric of suffering, or in other words, conventional truth of deluded persons. However, the third and fourth truths are part of ultimate truth, and are beyond science, according to HHDL. This leaves the second truth in a funny position. It might seem to some that since HHDL is saying here that the second truth concerns mental phenomena which are under the domain of scientific analysis, but since he clearly states that cessation and the path are beyond the domain of science altogether, this really leaves only psychology within the realm of scientific analysis; karma, affliction and consciousness are outside this domain because these three things are precisely what the third and fourth noble truths are concerned with.

So it is important to understand the citation properly.

Some words by Dungsey Thrinley Norbu are appropriate here:

The reason Buddha did not predominantly teach science is that beings are already attached to materialism and reality, so they can become distracted by material ideas. Instead of only increasing materialism, Buddha taught how to believe in karma, how to develop good karma, and how to purify karma to go beyond karma on the path of enlightenment. Buddha taught beings to have faith in sublime beings because ordinary beings do not know the right direction; they can only know through faith in sublime beings who can show them the correct path. This kind of teaching is so much more powerful than ordinary materialism because it shows how not to create negative karma and how to create positive energy until attaining enlightenment. Spiritual ideas cannot be compared to the material ideas of science, and Buddhist spiritual ideas cannot be changed to accommodate scientific ideas. In Buddhism, the sciences that are taught are never totally material, because they are connected with spirituality, since they are understood to be reflections of the mind and do not deal solely with material existence.

Since modern science generally deals with material existence, people often mistakenly think that it is important for them to know more about it. By miscalculating that a material rather than a spiritual orientation will help them sustain themselves and prosper within their immediate lives, they become more concerned with materialism than with spirituality. This is the antithesis of a spiritual point of view. Since the mind does not end, it is the mind's development of spiritual qualities that is important, and these qualities endure from one life to the next throughout the succession of one's lives. Norbu, Thinley (2011-05-26). *A Cascading Waterfall of Nectar* (Kindle Locations 3243-

3255). Shambhala Publications. Kindle Edition.

OK. I hope this clears that up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 2:16 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Why should I tell them they can't hold these views or discuss them?

Malcolm wrote:

We are not telling them that they cannot hold these views or discuss them. They can do both, elsewhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 2:15 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

smcj said:

Maybe David Snyder should open a third website for secular Buddhists?

Malcolm wrote:

Right, he can call it "Training Wheel: A forum devoted to fingerpainting on Dharmabooks."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 2:11 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

Dan74 said:

As for presenting 'unadulterated Dharma', the way I see it, this forum is not a master, it is a place of discussion. The forum isn't presenting anything, it is providing a space for people to discuss the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna Dharma. Not everything people want to call "Dharma" in order to sell a book, make a buck and gain followers.

Dan74 said:

There would be no consensus on what this 'unadulterated Dharma' constitutes on a number of issues among the many schools that make up this forum,

Malcolm wrote:

This is why we have different fora devoted to traditional Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna SCHOOLS.

Dan74 said:

even if it were desirable to enforce such a thing. But the ethos of the forum, if I understand correctly, is not to be a mouthpiece of someone's take on 'unadulterated Dharma' but a forum for inclusive discussion of the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Much of what passes here for discussion does not merit the appellation "Dharma".

Dan74 said:

What would be desirable, IMO, is for the more experienced and knowledgeable members such as yourself, to share their experience and knowledge, to cite sources and (gently) correct misunderstanding or wrong views when they arise. That's how people learn.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, it isn't working. That's what FAQs are for.

Dan74 said:

They don't learn by the mods coming down on questions because we are tired of hearing them after decades on the Interwebs. They don't learn if we crush them with our superior attitude and patronising tone (not pointing at you or anyone, but many of us, including myself, have been guilty of it at times). They will just think Buddhism is full of jerks. They will likely not understand the air of exasperation and not even hand-wringing over the direction of the forum.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't crush anyone with superior attitudes. I just answer questions -- but then having to put up oceans of irrelevancy over and over again means that discussions here rarely rise out of the explaining basic concepts to people (who really ought to know better) again and again.

Dan74 said:

What's going to work for the folks who come here with an open mind is a patient sincere generous attitude from more experienced people and for the folks with a closed-mind, well, we should be patient as well - closed mind is not a permanent condition, however, they should be kept within the ToS so as not to disrupt the flow of discussion and recurring themes/memes can be amalgamated so as not to clog up the forum, IMO. Of course, you know all this.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is not happening. We have people in the Dzogchen forum again questioning why a Guru is needed for Dzogchen, etc., when by now it should be %\$^#%^& axiomatic in Dzogchen and Vajrayāna that this is indispensable. There are many more interesting questions that could be answered, if we were not constantly having to deal with argumentative naifs who disrupt fora after fora, conversation after conversation, even the ones they themselves start.

Dan74 said:

But do you have concrete suggestions, Malcolm? Do you think posts that question certain tenets have no place on the forum?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course that is what I think.

Dan74 said:

Do I understand you correctly? So Batchelor goes, IMS probably goes, a bunch of Zen teachers like Nishijima, Brad Warner, certainly Nonin, who believes in impermanent Buddhahood, maybe a whole lot more who at one time or another have said something heterodox, maybe Ajahn Sumedho, because he generally talks of rebirth in the present moment context?

Malcolm wrote:

There are whole forums devoted to Bathchelor, the secularized brand of Vipassana IMS promulgates, Warner, Nonin and so on. What use is bringing all that here?

Dan74 said:

To me as a Seon practitioner this preoccupation with perfect doctrine is putting the cart before the horse. AFAIAC, our view should be right as much as is necessary for practice, everything else can actually be counterproductive, clogging up the mind with more proliferations, expectations, creating more divisions, aversions, cravings, etc. KISS and learn things as you go, on a need to know basis. But I know that this view is not necessarily shared by other schools. Maybe I should push to close all those 'unnecessary' threads that detract people from practice and mold the forum to be sparse and minimalist like a Zen monastery? I don't think so. Different strokes for different folks and I am glad it's like this.

Malcolm wrote:

This is supposed to be a forum devoted to MAHAYANA and VAJRAYANA, but over and over again, we cannot even lift the conversation out of arguments about rebirth, karma, and so on. When was there a substantive conversation about the bodhisattva path that was not disrupted almost immediately by someone who wants to go and revision the Buddha's Dharma? Honestly, it is a problem. Generally speaking, the most successful conversations here are rarely about Dharma, but rather worldly topics like peak oil, politics, and these sorts of things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 1:55 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

You say there is no place for secular buddhism on this forum, are you advocating the ban of secular buddhists and or secular buddhist discussions?

Didn't you yourself have untraditional views not more than a month ago?

It seems to many people want to be the sanctioned dharma police.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such a thing as Secular Mahāyāna. How could there be?

Eliminating secular buddhism from this forum would not have any negative effect on the forum, and a very salutary effect. There are plenty of places on the internet where people of such persuasions can theorize and proliferate to their little heart's content about the children of barren women (i.e. the result of so-called secular buddhism).

How can a forum supposedly devoted to MAHAYANA and VAJRAYANA even put up with such nonsense?

As far as my decision to abandon the western text critical approach to the history of Mahāyāna sūtras, that has been a long time coming. I finally realized that giving credence to the whole edifice of western text criticism which is based on unfounded theories and speculations was nonvirtuous and harmful to my practice as well as that of others. But if you carefully examine the content of my posts over many years, you will see that I have always emphasized a so-called traditional approach to Dharma explanation, teaching and practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 1:41 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

Ivo said:

...because the Guru is just our own twisted samsaric perception of the buddha nature. He/she is as external, or internal, as you want him/her to be, but never absolutely so.

ZOOM said:

I agree with your view.

Good insight into the true meaning of the guru!

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen point of view of about gurus is taught in The Magical Dimension of Sound Tantra, the root tantra of all Dzogchen teachings:

Gurus of perfect characteristics
are the source of all qualities,

the ones who sustain the basis of perfect awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 12:43 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

E-sangha had such a forum once, we closed it because in fact it just became a source of constant attacks on the Dharma, like we see occurring here time and time again. The whole idea that there is an "open" Dharma is completely wrong-headed. This forum should actually be shuttered.

Alfredo said:

What I hear you saying is that, as a fundamentalist / traditionalist, you are offended by modernist interpretations of Buddhism, and feel they should be banned from the site, or at least made to wear a funny hat.

Karma Dorje said:

There is no monolithic "fundamentalist/traditionalist" viewpoint. What is being suggested is that in a board dedicated to Mahayana and Vajrayana, each of the traditions comprised under this rubric should be evaluated and respected on its own terms. Pure Land schools should be respected according their own scriptures and modes of interpretation. Zen, Chan, Nichiren, etc. should similarly be respected as those who uphold each of these traditions represents.

Nyingmas should not come here to try to undercut Gelukpa points of view and vice versa. How can one construe this as a monolithic position and equate it with a Buddhist Taliban as has been done on other threads? What the traditionalists have been suggesting is that the only way to respect the plethora of Buddhist traditions is respect the viewpoints *grounded in the traditions* of each in the respective forums. This so-called Buddhist modernism is really a way of dismissing all of the Buddhist traditions and replacing them with a Rorschach blot of quasi-scientific speculation. There is no lineage for this, there are no scriptures and there is no dharma of realization. It's simply discursiveness and idle chatter.

One can't go onto a medical forum and just make stuff up according to one's own viewpoint. One would quite rightly be called a quack and a nuisance and be banned in short order. I have no problem with a separate Skeptical Buddhism forum dedicated to these issues. I have a huge problem with having to read topic after topic where conversation degenerates to this lowest common denominator of belief argued by those interlocutors with the least grounding in scripture and meditative training and the least openness to what the traditional perspectives have to offer.

Mkoll said:

The threads you're describing, including this one, are in the Open Dharma sub-forum. I'll copy-paste the description of it below, with my own emphasis added:

No holds barred discussion on the Buddhadharma. Argue about rebirth, karma, commentarial interpretations etc. Be nice to each other.
If you don't want to read this kind of stuff, don't read this sub-forum! It's that simple.

Now, I could understand a gripe about threads being in the wrong sub-forum. But looking through them briefly, I don't see any polemical threads that stand out. The mods do a good job of sequestering that kind of stuff here. And if you have a problem with where a thread is, maybe you can contact a mod about it.

~~~

TLDR: Complaints about the no holds barred discussion, argument about rebirth, kamma, etc., or "untraditionalist" views in the Open Dharma forum are unwarranted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 12:36 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Motova said:

It doesn't matter, science won't go away. You might as well make the best of it. I never said the terrible shit stopped.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, we work with circumstances as best we can. But it does not mean we remain passive and silent.

Motova said:

Are any of us going to have a serious impact on scientific theory or method in our lives? Unlikely. You can yell as loud as you want. I'm not saying I will have any impact, but it's a means of relieving suffering and supporting the Dharma. If it's here to stay, why not use it? That's what it comes down to. I can still achieve enlightenment while using science as a means to acquire merit, there's nothing wrong with it if you do it skillfully. If I had been born in Asia maybe I could have been a monk, a thangka painter or sculptor. But that's not really in the cards now.

Malcolm wrote:

Motova, you seriously misunderstand my point. My point is solely that it becomes a problem for practitioners and for Dharma in general when people who are nominally "buddhists" take refuge science rather than Dharma. There are a lot of negative consequences one could list. We can start with most obvious one, the denial, of rebirth, which the Buddha clearly defines as a wrong view.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 12:15 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

As a discussion forum get fairly large, there is bound to be a diverse set of views. There will be some who want a hard-line certain Dharma-view / their interpretation only, some that will want something more toward a secular view, etc. And that is fine as long as everyone is cordial. Here and at Dhamma Wheel too, we sometimes get complaints that we are allowing too many secular views to be expressed. And then we also get complaints from the opposite side that we are being Dharma-police and not allowing other views and interpretations.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi David:

I guess, speaking as a traditionalist, there really isn't room for views of Dharma in a forum that imagines itself dedicated to Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna that are not grounded in the tradition itself. This is especially true of a Vajrayāna forum where the lineage and lineage explanations absolutely vital. But beyond that, like the point I made in another thread, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna, like the Śrāvaka schools, are grounded in hearing, reflection and cultivation, i.e. the three prajñās, whereas the so called "secular Buddhism" is just based on an intellectual interpretation of Dharma that is not grounded in the three prajñās. Instead it is based on the three vikalpas [conceptualities] reading, proliferation and attachment to views. Really, in a forum dedicated to Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna, there should be no place at all for so called "Secular Buddhism". Why? Because there is no Dharma in "Secular Buddhism".

Dan74 said:

Forgive me if I am getting this wrong, Malcolm, but weren't you espousing quite a different approach not that long ago to the point of rejecting the label "Buddhist"? I wasn't following closely, so I may be getting this wrong. But if not, I am glad you weren't booted out of the place. We all go through changes, our views change, positions change, it is sensible, IMO, to not allow the board to be derailed or overtaken by modern/divergent interpretations but ban them altogether? I don't think so. It would not be the compassionate thing to do, even if one were certain the view is wrong. And how many of us truly have this certainty about all our current positions?

Malcolm wrote:

I follow Dharma. not "Buddhism", precisely for the reason that I do not not think everything called "buddhism" these days is Dharma. That is part of my discarding the label "buddhist" that many people ignored, though i made it plain at the time.

The compassionate thing to do is to present unadulterated Dharma for those who are interested. That is necessarily based on hearing the dharma from realized lineage teachers, and studying authentic teachings of the Buddha, which here, on this forum,

also includes Mahayana sutras and tantras and treating them with proper respect., as well as the treatises of the sublime masters of India, Tibet, China, Korea and Japan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 12:05 PM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

Ivo said:

Zoom, you have some very valid points. I don't know why no one is explaining here that the attainment of the rainbow body is generally a product of the very special practice of Togyal - a practice which requires much effort and which, in order to be brought to this particular conclusion needs to be done in strict retreat. Very few practitioners are actively and seriously engaged in Thogyal at this point in time. The rainbow body does not result from regular contemplation/resting in Rikpa, even if this is authentic. Other attainments result from that and they are described very extensively in the Dzogchen literature.

And, strictly speaking, the Guru does not do it for you, in the bardo or anywhere else, because the Guru is just our own twisted samsaric perception of the buddha nature. He/she is as external, or internal, as you want him/her to be, but never absolutely so.

Malcolm wrote:

It is easier to bring it conclusion in the bardo.

Of course, having met a path, it is up to you follow, as the Buddha said "i cannot wash away your misdeeds with water, nor remove your suffering with my hand, but i can show you the path to liberation."

Nevertheless, without a realized teacher of Dzogchen, it is difficult to make any progress on the path Of Dzogchen. If one does not have confidence that one's teacher is really a buddha, well, one will not make much progress on the path no matter how much one practices this or that technique.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 8:39 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Motova said:

It doesn't matter, science won't go away. You might as well make the best of it. I never said the terrible shit stopped.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, we work with circumstances as best we can. But it does not mean we remain

passive and silent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 8:34 AM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Alfredo said:

What I hear you saying is that, as a fundamentalist / traditionalist, you are offended by modernist interpretations of Buddhism, and feel they should be banned from the site, or at least made to wear a funny hat.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not offended by them, I pity those who hold them. But I feel that their confusion has many other places where it can be spread, and does not need to be coddled here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

ZOOM said:

Is the answer that you have to be the member of an old Dzogchen lineage or that you have to be the student of an accomplished Dzogchen teacher?

No, because if that was the reason then every member of an old Dzogchen lineage or every student of an accomplished Dzogchen teacher would attain rainbow body.

But this is not the case.[/u][b]

Malcolm wrote:

Every practitioner that I know who follows an authentic teacher will attain total realization either in this life, the bardo or in the natural nirmanakāya buddhafiels.

This is what my teachers state, this is what the tradition states.

And yes, you need to be the student of a realized master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 8:28 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

ZOOM said:

Yes, and the only way to know if someone is approaching or attaining enlightenment are visible signs as those I was already talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the only way to know whether someone is approaching or has attained awakening.

Such signs are actually for those who lack faith and require miracles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Motova said:

How would you improve science Malcolm (the theory, goal and method)?

If scientific development were up to you, would you just halt it?

Malcolm wrote:

If it were up to me, I would regulate scientific research in accordance with Dharma ethics.

The point here is that science is not an activity carried out by awakened people, which is why so much of it is perverted.

But what I am really talking about is the pervasive tendency to subordinate Dharma to science that we see in so many practitioners.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

As a discussion forum get fairly large, there is bound to be a diverse set of views. There will be some who want a hard-line certain Dharma-view / their interpretation only, some that will want something more toward a secular view, etc. And that is fine as long as everyone is cordial. Here and at Dhamma Wheel too, we sometimes get complaints that we are allowing too many secular views to be expressed. And then we also get complaints from the opposite side that we are being Dharma-police and not allowing other views and interpretations.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi David:

I guess, speaking as a traditionalist, there really isn't room for views of Dharma in a forum that imagines itself dedicated to Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna that are not grounded in the tradition itself. This is especially true of a Vajrayāna forum where the lineage and lineage explanations absolutely vital. But beyond that, like the point I made in another thread, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna, like the Śrāvaka schools, are grounded in hearing, reflection and cultivation, i.e. the three prajñās, whereas the so called "secular Buddhism" is just based on an intellectual interpretation of Dharma that is not grounded in the three prajñās. Instead it is based on the three vikalpas [conceptualities] reading, proliferation and attachment to views. Really, in a forum dedicated to Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna, there should be no place at all for so called "Secular Buddhism". Why? Because there is no Dharma in "Secular Buddhism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

ZOOM said:

Visible results are the name of the game.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really. The name of the game is waking up, attaining buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings. It does not matter much if it happens in this life, the bardo or the next life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

ZOOM said:

books or gurus!

Malcolm wrote:

The way things work in Vajrayāna Dharma is that we do not make assertions about the teachings unless they are backed up in the words of the Buddha, which are found in Dzogchen and other kinds of tantras.

A guru is indispensable in Dzogchen teachings, as well as all other Vajrayāna teachings. Without a guru, there is no path. Without a path, there is no result, much less rainbow body. Without a Guru we cannot receive the transmissions for the books in which Dzogchen teachings are recorded. So a Guru is indispensable as the root of the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Alfredo said:

It seems to me that what we're talking about here is not an issue of Protestant Buddhism, but of a clash between fundamentalist and modernist approaches to Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no modernist approach to Dharma. If it is not traditional, i.e., based on hearing the teachings from qualified masters, like a seal and its imprint, it really isn't Dharma at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

Punya said:

waking up in the bardo do as well? (but not saying that's easy).

Malcolm wrote:

Achieving Buddhahood in the bardo is much easier than in this life. Why? It is because in the bardo state we have seven times more clarity. Buddha Vajrasattva states in the Victor's Speech Tantra

After that, in the bardo of rebirth the present unobstructed awareness with complete sense organs has seven times more clarity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 6:28 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

ZOOM said:

The only Dzogchen practitioners we can be sure that they achieved something meaningful at all in their training are those attaining rainbow body during life or at death.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you really need to study the teachings a bit more before making such confidence pronouncements.

All these grades of practitioners are described in detail by the Buddha in such tantras as the Self-Arisen Vidya Tantra and so on, where the whole process is very precisely described, how many days they remain in the bardo of dharmatā, how many emanations they will have after achieving liberation in the bardo and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Is Western Buddhism an (ethnic) identity-based Buddhism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It makes sense when discussing people with affinities for Tibetan Buddhism. The Chinese started suppressing Buddhism right way, it reached the height of suppression between 1959-1968, then was suppressed until the early 80's. Meanwhile the refugee community in India was really in dire straights, so many people who were Tibetan practitioners in their past life, such as myself, were born into western families so we could meet the Dharma again with freedom and endowment to practice.

Mkoll said:

So are you claiming to recollect your past life as a Tibetan practitioner, Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, but I am sure it is the case for many, many reasons I won't bore you with. Suffice it to say, in my last lifetime, I was a practitioner from the Derge region of Eastern Tibet. Educated in Sakya, practitioner of Dzogchen, just like now.

I will share with you however that when I was in Central Tibet, I had past life memories, not very precise in detail, but vivid. This is when we were on our way to Samye and being in Samye. I remembered the place. Not Deja vu, something much stronger. Most specifiially I remembered how the mountains looked in the Yarlung Valley, among other things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Is Western Buddhism an (ethnic) identity-based Buddhism?

Content:

Nemo said:

Chinese invade Tibet in 1950, give the reincarnated 20 years to grow up in the West. Western Tibetan Buddhism should start flourishing in the 1970's with a huge influx of new students but by 1980 that should start slowing down to a trickle. Now they would likely be born in Asia. It is quite possible that Tibetan Buddhist centres will become museums when that initial influx starts passing on in another 30 years. I don't think many Sanghas will be growing now unless they are selling something that is not genuine Dharma.

Perhaps my reincarnation based identity theory is too Buddhist for some.

uan said:

Is that how rebirth in Buddhism works? I don't know if it's too Buddhist for some, or not Buddhadharma at all.

Mkoll said:  
I'd go with the latter.

Malcolm wrote:

It makes sense when discussing people with affinities for Tibetan Buddhism. The Chinese started suppressing Buddhism right way, it reached the height of suppression between 1959-1968, then was suppressed until the early 80's. Meanwhile the refugee community in India was really in dire straights, so many people who were Tibetan practitioners in their past life, such as myself, were born into western families so we could meet the Dharma again with freedom and endowment to practice. And yes, I was definitely a Tibetan practitioner for many lifetimes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

uan said:

The question is, how would someone in the West know a translation or interpretation is wrong? They need to rely on the translators, but which one? Places like DW provide a place where the translations can be held up in the light of day to by people with the knowledge of Dharma from the source(s) and of the West, and who can provide a lingua franca for better understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, those of us who are in the Dharma must emphasize to interested newcomers the essential import of engaging in the three prajñās of hearing, reflection and cultivation. There is no prajñā identified as "reading".

In order to hear the Dharma one must go to a qualified kalayānamitra [lit. good friend], a virtuous mentor, and begin the process of hearing the Dharma.

As I stated above, Dharma is a Aural Lineage. The Aural, or Hearing lineage, is much more important, relatively speaking, than the texts. The texts must be understood on the basis of the hearing the Dharma taught by a qualified teacher. Without that essential act of hearing the Dharma taught by a living, qualified teacher, one's understanding of the Dharma is sure to be bent askew right from the start.

Once we decide to rely on a qualified mentor, then we will be able to know when our own or other's understanding of the Dharma is correct or incorrect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha



Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

I think we only have two choices: we can try to go back to the past (or stay in it, like the Amish) or we can tackle the messy but stimulating process of working out an approach to the dharma which adapts to, and benefits people in, the society we live in. We will just have to do our best not to lose or distort anything essential.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

It is really simple — you find an awakened teacher, you respectfully ask for teachings. You apply them. If you have extra time in your life, then you also study a lot. If you don't, you mainly focus on practice.

But Dharma is not something that is "worked out" — it is essentially a tradition grounded in hearing. You cannot learn Dharma from books. It must be heard. Then you apply it. This is the only proper way to approach the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

ngodrup said:

How many dzogchen yogis are free of the eight worldly concerns and spend a significant portion of their life in solitary retreat?

Malcolm wrote:

The same could be said of many so called "Dzogchen teachers".

Anyway, whether your corpse shrinks or you wake up in the bardo, your body still reverts to the five lights of pure consciousness [ye shes].

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

My hearing of of the Dharma would depend very much on where I was born. The fact that I have entered the Dharma in this life at an early age pretty much guarantees I was a Buddhist for a long time, in many life times.

Emakirikiri said:

On this note it's said that Dzogchen practitioners of average capacity that do not recognise in the bardo of dharmata are then transferred to the five Pure Lands and

attain Enlightenment. Does this mean that we were less than average Dzogchen practitioners in our past lives or that this is the first time we have properly entered into Dzogchen in our continuum?

Malcolm wrote:

Capacity here is related to diligence, that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Why do only very few practitioners attain rainbow body?

Content:

ZOOM said:

Why do only very few Dzogchen practitioners attain rainbow body compared to the high number of Dzogchen practitioners in the world?

Malcolm wrote:

There are 21 types of capacities of practitioners. Only the best of the best attain great transference body, i.e., rainbow body in this life. Virtually all others attain it in the bardo, or failing that, in a pure nirmanakāya buddhafield.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 18th, 2014 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Science, in its present iteration, is reductive and destructive.

Science is clearly not a panacea, has actually done nothing to remove the total amount of suffering in the world [in fact it has increased it substantially] and so on.

catmoon said:

What a perfectly ridiculous thing to say. Without scientific advances you'd be illiterate, diseased, and have a life expectancy of 28 years. You would never have heard of the Dharma or Buddha either.

Malcolm wrote:

Even with scientific "advances" people are still illiterate, have short life spans, and suffering from many diseases that did not exist even 100 years ago.

BTW, most life expectancy stats are factor in infant mortality — remove that, and we still

tend to live into our 70s and 80s. After all Buddha lived to be 80, and that was not considered unusual at all.

My hearing of of the Dharma would depend very much on where I was born. The fact that I have entered the Dharma in this life at an early age pretty much guarantees I was a Buddhist for a long time, in many life times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 17th, 2014 at 7:20 PM

Title: Re: "Protestant" vs Traditional/"Orthodox" approaches to Dha

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Hi, Sherlock,

I'm not going to disagree (not yet, anyway! ) but do you distinguish between approaches coming from Protestantism as opposed to the scientific method as opposed to historical research techniques as opposed to the (European) Enlightenment philosophical tradition and, if so, how?

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

They are all of a piece.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Complete Tegal Instruction in Unrestricted New Book

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

I'm sure she will find the teachings again.

Malcolm wrote:

Then why paint such a condemning picture?

Crazywisdom said:

Her students will not. She received Longchen Nyingthig. Her students received Earth Visions.

Malcolm wrote:

I really don't think they have many students.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Complete Tegal Instruction in Unrestricted New Book

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

I'm sure she will find the teachings again.

Malcolm wrote:

Then why paint such a condemning picture?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

If Rinpoche gives the lung for the 6 lokas at the end of the upcoming Massachusetts retreat will one be able to practice the 6 lokas and incorporate Vajrasattva into the practice? or is Vajrasattva with six lokas part of the Longsal Ngondro only and need the specific lung? Apologies if it sounds like I'm repeating myself.

Malcolm wrote:

The Longsal Ngondro is something very specific, it is not the same thing as the retreat he gave recently, though in essence it is the same.

frank123 said:

I was studying the Paris retreat from 2006 where the 6 lokas incorporates Vajrasattva. So would a 6 lokas lung be suffice to do the practice from this retreat?

Malcolm wrote:

No Idea. At this point you really need to ask the boss.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Complete Total Instruction in Unrestricted New Book

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

No. They did not. They completely misunderstood the teachings. They might have seen bindus but they did not understand the part about not conceptualizing them and not concretizing or universalizing them.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you know them personally, or are you basing your opinion merely off of their books? Also, doesn't it strike you as a bit unkind to refer to Rachel Olds in such a condemning way? Speaking strictly for myself I would prefer to think that she will take a human birth again, in a Dharma family.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Complete Tegal Instruction in Unrestricted New Book

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

She's going to go into the bardo thinking she's supposed to see "essence... nothing, not nothing" When she sees the deities, she'll freak out and be in hell.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so. She understood what chos nyid mngon gsum was well enough, this alone is enough to prevent rebirth in lower realms forever.

Crazywisdom said:

That might be the case for someone who doesn't misrepresent dharma and teach a bastardized path. Chos nyid mngon gsum is only path of application. Even a first bhumi bodhisattva can be reborn in hell, like when The Bodhisattva killed the boatman. And that was considered a righteous killing.

Malcolm wrote:

As ChNN states, again and again, whoever has the experience of chos nyid mngon gsum will never take rebirth in lower realms again, cf. sgra thal gyur tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Afflicted people make guns. Afflicted people do science. See the problem? It is the one I have been talking about.

Mkoll said:

And afflicted people practice Buddhism.

I don't see the problem.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is when they practice the path. Unlike all other phenomena, the path, while conditioned, is unafflicted. Why? Because it comes from the wisdom of awakened people and, at least in Vajrayāna, is transmitted by awakened people. Science, on the other hand, is afflicted knowledge transmitted by afflicted people about afflictive phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Dan74 said:

Are you suggesting we ban science?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not, Dan. What I am pointing out, all other distractions aside, is that the benefits of science are not nearly as great as some of its enthusiasts imagine, that in fact there are long range harmful effects of our present, scientific industrial culture. What I am also suggesting the reason for this is that science is not derived from wisdom.

But this is not even the main point — the main point is that science is taken as more authoritative than Dharma. For example, Wayfarer constantly refers to a scientist to defend rebirth (without notable success), not masters like Nāgārjuna and so on. Perhaps he feels that people are more likely to listen to a scientist than an ancient masters?

Amazingly, I see more impassioned defense of science here than Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 7:08 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

TRC said:

Science and Technology aren't the problem. Greed, hatred and delusion are the problem. Stop blaming Science!

Malcolm wrote:

Right, guns are not the problem, it's people. You really do need to read In Absence of the Sacred.

Mkoll said:

Who makes the guns? People.

Why do people make guns? Defilement.

That's not to say guns aren't a problem, but they aren't the root of the problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Afflicted people make guns. Afflicted people do science. See the problem? It is the one I have been talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 9:17 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

TRC said:

Science and Technology aren't the problem. Greed, hatred and delusion are the problem. Stop blaming Science!

Malcolm wrote:

Right, guns are not the problem, it's people. You really do need to read In Absence of the Sacred.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Dan74 said:

That said, there will always be individuals in all walks of life who don't care about anything and anyone other than themselves and who can work with no regard to ethical consequences of their work. My impression is that they are a tiny fringe, generally hidden in some secret military laboratories and every scientists I've had dealings with has been very conscious of the big picture.

Malcolm wrote:

I would argue that on the contrary, it is institutionalized and wide spread. As you say "corporate sociopathy".

Dan74 said:

But going after science because its discoveries has been misused is pretty pointless and misguided, I think. We should go after the polluters, the governments that don't protect our interests and the natural heritage that we should be custodians of, rather than destroyers. We should go after the culture of consumerism and corporate sociopathy. Science is knowledge and sure enough knowledge can be a dangerous thing. But the genie is out of the bottle and there is no use trying to shove it back in or throw stones. Best to be constructive and learn to use it wisely.

Malcolm wrote:

Another "people kill people" argument.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Complete Total Instruction in Unrestricted New Book

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

She understood what chos nyid mngon gsum was well enough...

dzogchungpa said:  
Just out of curiosity, how do you know that?

Malcolm wrote:  
Because they received the teachings, and knew what they meant.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 5:40 AM  
Title: Re: Dharma & Science  
Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:  
It's not your forum, and not your call to interpret how that rule gets implemented. I'm willing to listen to concrete complaints personally, but mostly what I have is general hand-wringing from a small group of users who feel that DW somehow is "attacking them" on both sides of the debate due to simply not seeing the larger picture.

Malcolm wrote:  
Did I ever say DW was attacking me? No, never.

What I said was the DW does not live up to its advertising as a forum for Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. One assumes that means that Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna should be the main focus of conversation, not endless reruns with the same people who deny rebirth, who insist that Dharma must conform to science and so on.

Johnny Dangerous said:  
There are endless reruns of all sorts of conversations on here, what do you expect, a Mahayana loyalty pledge? Do you expect us to actively censor heterodox views that don't break the ToS?

Malcolm wrote:  
I think you ought to be a forum for Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna as you claim to be. Instead it is "Buddhism is whatever the hell I think it is" quite often.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 5:29 AM  
Title: Re: Dharma & Science  
Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:  
It's not your forum, and not your call to interpret how that rule gets implemented. I'm willing to listen to concrete complaints personally, but mostly what I have is general hand-wringing from a small group of users who feel that DW somehow is "attacking them" on both sides of the debate due to simply not seeing the larger picture.



Malcolm wrote:

Did I ever say DW was attacking me? No, never.

What I said was the DW does not live up to its advertising as a forum for Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. One assumes that means that Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna should be the main focus of conversation, not endless reruns with the same people who deny rebirth, who insist that Dharma must conform to science and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

If Rinpoche gives the lung for the 6 lokas at the end of the upcoming Massachusetts retreat will one be able to practice the 6 lokas and incorporate Vajrasattva into the practice? or is Vajrasattva with six lokas part of the Longsal Ngondro only and need the specific lung? Apologies if it sounds like i'm repeating myself.

Malcolm wrote:

The Longsal Ngondro is something very specific, it is not the same thing as the retreat he gave recently, though in essence it is the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

With regard to the problems and conflicts between science and Dharma, science is not a wisdom tradition, its practitioners not necessarily wise. We can understand that this because it is technology, which we all understand to be a product of science [after all, how often have I been chided in the past two days for using technology while criticizing science as the be all and end all?] that has plunged this world into a human-made crisis of epic proportions, a fact which no one seems willing to acknowledge. Somehow, we are supposed to imagine that science in its own little unassailable domain, exempt from criticism because of its touted "benefits". Dharma on the other hand, is also assigned its domain, restricted to moral issues, but when it comes down to things like the four or five elements, etc., we are supposed to dismiss these as archaic, obsolete, "unscientific" doctrines.

Dan for example, says "...are we to blame Tibetan herbs because they can be harmful if used incorrectly?" Gee Dan, you are making a perfect argument for the NRA, since after all, it is people that kill people and not guns. As I pointed out already, most of the ills of the world today, the pollution, the over-population, the manufactured toxins in our environment, GMO crops, the extinction crisis, etc., are all a result of science that is not

guided by wisdom. These days, most people understand that the proliferation of guns is not a good thing. Why is it so hard for these same people to understand that at present, in the hand of confused people science is more dangerous than any gun.

Science and Dharma should not be kept in their own domains, on the contrary, science should be subordinate to Dharma, that is to say, a follower of Dharma needs to evaluate science and technology according to its impact on the world. This is rarely done in any systematic way, and this is largely because the moral fiber and wisdom of the world-wide Post-Industrial Civilization is very weak.

Beyond this are the obvious tensions between science and Dharma that have already been pointed out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

there will continue to be a "secular Buddhism".

Malcolm wrote:

We should not even have to put up with this for one second. Supposedly this forum is "...on Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhism". I don't see where "Secular Buddhism" even has a place here at all. They have their own forums, named as such.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

My own experience of things is that the rhetoric on this has gotten to a place where it's creating it's own vortex of malaise, bad feelings, and general back-and forth about who is properly Buddhist and who is not. While I have my own opinion about the arguments themselves, I hope those of you going polemic about this on either will periodically question what level of this kind of debate is actually beneficial, and if and when it reaches a point of dragging things here downhill.

Malcolm wrote:

It has reached the point where the ability to talk here is stymied by two things) 1) constant referral to the Pali Canon when in fact discourse should be grounded in Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna texts 2) the inability to conduct a conversation about Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna without it being sidetracked by skeptics. These two facts have lead to an exodus of more traditionally minded users, if you haven't noticed. The third

issue is that people who really have no idea what they are talking about are allowed to waffle on and one for months without being curbed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Complete Tegal Instruction in Unrestricted New Book

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

She's going to go into the bardo thinking she's supposed to see "essence... nothing, not nothing" When she sees the deities, she'll freak out and be in hell.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so. She understood what chos nyid mngon gsum was well enough, this alone is enough to prevent rebirth in lower realms forever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But here, on DW, it really seems that the general tone of this board is that where Buddhadharma is contradicted by "Science", well, this is what we have to follow.

Mkoll said:

Your perception of the "general tone of this board" is based on the personal outspoken views of whatever select members you have in mind.

"We" don't have to follow anything of the sort.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, it is really simple — whenever someone posts something about some traditional topic, be it authorship of Mahāyāna, etc., by far and away the consensus always comes down in favor of secular scholarship. Someone recently suggested that the TOS of the board be changed from: Do not be disruptive. Dharma Wheel is an environment for the discussion of Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhism.

To:

Do not be defensive of tradition. Dharma Wheel is a secularizing, science-based, unevenly regulated environment for the dissection, dissolution and eventual replacement of Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhism with a new secular philosophy stripped of all inconvenience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Mkoll said:

I really don't understand how religious fundamentalists can spit on science while using as their medium to do so a computer and the internet.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very facile observation, and specious to boot. What I pointed out, and am pointing out is that science is not based in the perceptions of awakened people. It is based in the lowest common denominator, ordinary perception.

But here, on DW, it really seems that the general tone of this board is that where Buddhadharma is contradicted by "Science", well, this is what we have to follow. We can beat up Buddhist teachings all we like, but god forgive that anyone should question the sacred cow "Science" which is such a cornucopia of "benefits".

Jikan said:

Malcolm, do you think this view pertains to DW's users in plurality, or its team members, or...?

I see forceful arguments being made against the putative Dharma-science connection by more than one voice in this thread and elsewhere.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is a general tone, some members reflect that tone more than others. But this board is hardly perceived as being devoted to upholding traditional Buddhist values. In general, the primary standard-bearers of Buddhadharma here are the Tibetan Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Mkoll said:

I really don't understand how religious fundamentalists can spit on science while using as their medium to do so a computer and the internet.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very facile observation, and specious to boot. What I pointed out, and am pointing out is that science is not based in the perceptions of awakened people. It is based in the lowest common denominator, ordinary perception.

But here, on DW, it really seems that the general tone of this board is that where Buddhadharma is contradicted by "Science", well, this is what we have to follow. We can beat up Buddhist teachings all we like, but god forgive that anyone should question the sacred cow "Science" which is such a cornucopia of "benefits".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Dan74 said:

Utility is only one aspect. I would actually start with understanding. You practice Tibetan medicine. I suspect that at some stage, knowledge of Tibetan plants has been used to poison people. At some other stage, some quacks probably practiced it inappropriately with disastrous consequences. Should all the books have been burned then? Should people have railed against it as doing "nothing to remove the total amount of suffering in the world"? I think not.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is not "is this this scientific technique of analysis good or bad?" The point is that many people who post here subordinate the Dharma to science, arguing incorrectly that HH Dalai Lama actually holds such a position as well. They then immediately then bring up the utility argument "The benefits of science" argument, if you will. Then, if anyone should even venture to suggest that science, as it is being used today, is actually pernicious and harmful, they immediately bring up the "well this computer and internet was brought to you by science, so shut up." These people have apparently never read *In the Absence of the Sacred: The Failure of Technology and the Survival of the Indian Nations* by Jerry Mander.

Dan74 said:

As for science being "reductive and destructive", it can be, usually in its infancy it is because when starting from nothing, a simple reductive model is the best you can do. In its maturity it progresses to more complex models.

Malcolm wrote:

As opposed to Buddhadharma, which begins from a place of maturity and wisdom, and is never destructive, never requires adaptation, never requires any change whatsoever, since it is the highest point of human knowledge possible.

Dan74 said:

No, knowledge can be abstract and specific and one kind can inform the other. The prevailing ignorance, like the example you describe, is hardly the fault of science. And I wholeheartedly agree with you about the importance of being connected with the place you live. I can do better, get my hands dirtier more often and contribute more positively to our local environment. But again, this is at best tangential to the topic at hand.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not tangential at all. We live in a society of heads without bodies, we are more alienated and disconnected with our world (as it rapidly disappears before our eyes,

being transformed into wasteland) than at any time in history. Our civilization has produced the greatest harm to the planet we have ever seen. All of this is result of our brimming confidence in science and the technological solutions it proposes, each one of which has brought more sorrow to us than the last. All of this is a result of our collective abandonment of the wisdom traditions of our elders, our sacred traditions, our sense of sacred place, etc.

Dan74 said:

But I think you are not serious with your dismissal. Abjure all technology, give up all new materials, build your own house from basic materials and no help from powertools, sell your car, grow your own food, live like a true Luddite and you will have some credibility as far as a philosophical position on technology is concerned. But that still doesn't touch science. Science, first and foremost, is about understanding. Do you really want to close the door on scientific understanding of the material world?

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, the Luddites were not opposed to technology per se, they were trying to prevent the destruction of artisanal cottage industry weaving.

Second of all, my specific criticism is focused on the idea that scientific knowledge can supersede Dharma or that Dharma is can be understood in the manner which those who do "science" are accustomed to looking at things. Why, because as a said science is not based on wisdom, it does not even discover wisdom, it just discovers material intricacies, it is very detailed and so on, but its meaning is very, very coarse and not at all profound. There is nothing profound in science at all.

It is not possible now to live the way you suggest.

Anyway, it is you who are conflating issues, not me. I presented this premise:

Science operates from a lowest common denominator approach to evaluating knowledge. It is predicated on the perceptions of confused sentient beings, not the perceptions of awakened people.

Please examine your statements in light of my statement there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Dan74 said:

This might be a starting point for those who are interested:

[http://undsci.berkeley.edu/article/whatisscience\\_01](http://undsci.berkeley.edu/article/whatisscience_01)

Malcolm wrote:

How patronizing...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Dan74 said:

But this has nothing to do with your argument.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it has a lot to do with my argument — you are now making a utility argument for science. I think that is a poor argument. There is not nearly as much utility in science as you want to believe.

The point about knowledge of place is that most of the knowledge you are talking about is just abstract, it has nothing to do with where people live, how they live, and so on. We live in a world where children do not know that eggs come from chickens.

Dan74 said:

but it's a great approach, it imbues us with fascination and respect as nature's secrets reveal themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Science, in its present iteration, is reductive and destructive.

Science is clearly not a panacea, has actually done nothing to remove the total amount of suffering in the world [in fact it has increased it substantially] and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Dan74 said:

...while our worldview has been so enriched both by our understanding of the Universe, genetics, biology, particle physics and quantum mechanics.

Malcolm wrote:

Dan, I am going to ignore your other statements, since they are rhetorical flourishes for the most part that don't bear any need of reply.

However:

How many plants can you name which grow where you live, which ones are edible, poison, or neither? What are their medicinal properties?

How well do you know the movements of stars in the sky?

How connected are you actually with the place where you live?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Is Western Buddhism an (ethnic) identity-based Buddhism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is really only true of the Vipassana folks.

Jikan said:

I was going to pose a related question:

Is there such a thing as a Western Buddhism, that is, a single one? It seems to me that some of what is swept into the category "WB" corresponds to the criticism made in the OP, but there's a great deal of diversity elsewhere in the same category. Maybe even contradictions.

One reason these discussions can get so prickly: it's very difficult to generalize about these issues intelligently

Malcolm wrote:

Oh definitely there is a "Western Buddhism"; it is characterized by a commitment to secularism, scientism, and a psychotherapeutic approach to meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Is Western Buddhism an (ethnic) identity-based Buddhism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is really only true of the Vipassana folks.

Seishin said:

I would say mostly rather than only, in my experience at least (I'm not sure about the rest of the world). But could this be because vipassana (and anapanasati) is being pegged as the "scientific" practice??

Gassho.

Malcolm wrote:

Probably.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:49 PM



Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Unknown said:

On Monday, during the telephone interview, Ms. Woesser gave a dire assessment of the situation in Tibetan regions, where more than 120 people have set themselves on fire as a political protest in recent years, unnerving Chinese officials.

“The current situation hasn’t changed, and the oppression still has not been relaxed,” she said. “As for what will happen in the future, it’s difficult to predict. On the one hand, the authorities’ policy of guilt by association is very harsh, and also the current tactic of control is one of micromanagement. The entire Tibetan area is under a management grid. On the surface, it appears that the situation had been easing up from such strict control, but it hasn’t. The Lhasa that I know is still under tight control.”

Malcolm wrote:

[http://sinosphere.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/07/15/tibetan-activist-on-her-latest-house-arrest/?\\_php=true&\\_type=blogs&ref=world&\\_r=0](http://sinosphere.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/07/15/tibetan-activist-on-her-latest-house-arrest/?_php=true&_type=blogs&ref=world&_r=0)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.callofthewhitecrane.blogspot.com/p/petition-for-jailed-tibetan-singers.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Is Western Buddhism an (ethnic) identity-based Buddhism?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I know I take a risk at presenting this, but I thought this quote COULD foster a measured, kind discussion on the issue of lack of multi-ethnic participation in Western Buddhism. Hopefully any discussion will be free from false accusations (without apologies), one line missives, tit for tat claims etc.

The below I think is a response to some people objecting to specific Buddhist practice spaces for People of Colour or specific ethnic groups. Larry Yang argues that Western Buddhism is identity-based Buddhism, as Western teachers trained in Asia did not feel culturally comfortable in that paradigm and wanted to establish a space where people like them could practice:

Larry Yang: Ironically, identity-based retreats were long in the making because when the teachers of the European-American mainstream sangha came back from Asia to teach, they didn’t go to the existing Asian temples or venues that were already in North America. They started the mainstream centers we know today because they didn’t see

themselves reflected in these Asian temples. They didn't hear their life stories, they didn't hear the relevance to how these teachings actually dissolved their particular suffering in their particular life. This is the exact same reason that the identity retreats have been formed. Even in our expression of difference, we're the same. There is something that still completely connects us. The point of these retreats is to garner a strength of practice to enable us to see beyond the differences.

<http://www.thebuddhadharma.com/web-archive/2011/11/9/forum-why-is-american-buddhism-so-white.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Malcolm wrote:

This is really only true of the Vipassana folks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

bryandavis said:

Thanks for any reply. Still trying to figure out how to navigate with in the DC.

.

Malcolm wrote:

In the end, since you will hear many different answers from students, it is always better to ask Rinpoche himself personally. The reason you will hear many different answers is that Rinpoche has given many different answers to different students at various times in different circumstances.

In general, this ngondro practice can be practiced if you have the lung of the text, and Rinpoche often uses methods of introduction which are from Longsal such as the Yeshe Zangthal. He will give the lung if requested.

But when you have questions and are really not sure, it is always better to ask him directly.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Thanks for clarifying that.

There is no need for there to be a conflict between science and Buddhism. I can't see any reason why the Buddha, and Buddhists, would oppose the means of enhancing life

expectancy, providing communications technology, optimising food crops, and developing many new means of livelihood, to mention but a few aspects. Scientific medicine alone has done immense amounts to reduce human suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

As HHDL puts it in the book from which you draw your quote:

Buddhism draws the critical division differently— i.e., between sentience and non-sentience— because it is primarily interested in the alleviation of suffering and the quest for happiness. In Buddhism, the evolution of the cosmos and the emergence of the sentient beings within it— indeed, effectively everything within the purview of the physical and life sciences— belong within the domain of the first of the Four Noble Truths, which the Buddha taught in his initial sermon. The Four Noble Truths state that within the realm of impermanent phenomena there is suffering, suffering has an origin, the cessation of suffering is possible, and there is a path to the cessation of suffering. As I see it, science falls within the scope of the first truth in that it examines the material bases of suffering, for it covers the entire spectrum of the physical environment—“ the container”— as well as the sentient beings—“ the contained.” It is in the mental realm— the realm of psychology, consciousness, the afflictions, and karma— that we find the second of the truths, the origin of suffering. The third and fourth truths, cessation and the path, are effectively outside the domain of scientific analysis in that they pertain primarily to what might be called philosophy and religion.

Dalai Lama (2005-09-13). *The Universe in a Single Atom: The Convergence of Science and Spirituality* (Kindle Locations 1243-1252). Crown Publishing Group. Kindle Edition.

You see here, rather than saying this or that topic falls within science's domain, he claims that science falls within a specified subset of the Buddhist analysis of the existential problem facing all sentient beings, suffering.

It is true that modern medicine has had some impact on the area of the first kind of suffering, the suffering of suffering, it has had no impact on the second kind of suffering, the suffering of change, and in fact it can be argued that suffering of change is more endemic than ever before in what we know of human history. No only that, modern science has vastly increased the means of inflicting the suffering of suffering, as we see in the wars we have been having in the Middle East and during the 20th century. So, advances in technology are not really so rosy in fact, and do not actually add up to more happiness for human beings and other kinds of creatures.

A great deal of what we call "science" is merely technology, and great deal of science that is done has no practical use at all. For example, most of the scientific knowledge we have about the cellular processes of the human body are not at all valuable in medical cures, and the vast majority of synthesized drugs are derived from plants whose properties have been known for centuries by indigenous healers. Moreover, many of the diseases we now can cure are diseases that are a product of our technological and very toxic industrial civilization, diseases which were rare or non-existent even in the not so distant past. One thing I will grant is that in the area of surgery, surgical technology has been able to advance a great deal in the past 170 years, but primarily due to two factors, antibiotics and anesthesia.

In other words, the scientific revolution has created ten problems for every one that it has solved, from global warming to increased pollution of the biosphere, to an unprecedented extinction event that is ongoing and so on.

So forgive me for not placing any confidence at all in the confused perception of ordinary beings, whose thrashing efforts to free themselves from suffering merely bring more problems and pain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The pity is that the topic of Buddhist relics is very interesting and worthy of discussion, but the topic itself was poisoned by the OP's confrontational and close-minded perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:41 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I would like to know if you disagree with that statement from the Dalai Lama 'If scientific analysis were conclusively to demonstrate certain claims in Buddhism to be false, then we must accept the findings of science and abandon those claims.' Yes or no?

Malcolm wrote:

I disagree with HHDL on this point, as written and as presented. You have to bear in mind that the way the Gelugpa school defines conventional truth is in terms of how it corresponds with the deluded perceptions of worldly beings. HHDL is a Gelugpa and presents these issues from that framework.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

nichirenista said:

I suppose what I'm ultimately trying to do is define the term "relic."

Malcolm wrote:

Shariram, relics, are the small pellet—like secretions found in the ashes of Buddhist

saints when they are cremated.

Crazywisdom said:

They look like pearls. These are but one kind.

There have been many Kagyu masters whose eyes, tongue and heart fused in cremation.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not really a relic, per se.

Crazywisdom said:

Some manifested bija on their teeth. Some manifested mandalas in their skulls, mantras on bones, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Those are not shāriram, but are called "gdung", bone relics. They are a bit different than shariram and are not the kind of relics on display at the Maitreya Relic Tour,

Another form of relic is the remains of the saint, like the hair or even the robe. These carry very powerful blessings.

No doubt, but these things are not described in sutra and tantra per se.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:04 AM

Title: Re: Thinley Norbu Rinpoche's Sole Panacea

Content:

nickhol said:

I just read Thinley Norbu Rinpoche's new Sole Panacea: A Brief Commentary on the Seven-Line Prayer to Guru Rinpoche That Cures the Suffering of the Sickness of Karma and Defilement. Its a must read.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it dispenses very nicely with the scientific materialism that forms the dominant culture of today.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism, r/atheism, Human Rights...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Modernity has yet to come to terms with desire, hatred and ignorance.

There is nothing particularly noble about "modernity" (read, post-Hegelian Western culture) and nothing especially difficult about living in a so called modern culture.

Sentient beings are still the same — afflicted by the three poisons — and Buddhadharma is still relevant to that state of affairs and always will be.

Queequeg said:

I certainly did not suggest modernity is noble or that living in it is particularly difficult. However, short of some catastrophic decline of modern civilization, these are the conditions human being will be living in, the context in which they will have to come to terms with desire, hatred and ignorance. I didn't even come close to suggesting that Buddhadharma is not relevant today. In fact, I think my whole argument is that it IS relevant.

That said, would the Buddha, if he were to appear today, be counseling someone in breathing meditation using the example of a blacksmith's bellow? No, more likely he'd be referring to spin class.

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty sure the Buddha would call a dashboard a dashboard, even though no one has really used horse drawn wagons for a hundred years in the US and England.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

nichirenista said:

I suppose what I'm ultimately trying to do is define the term "relic."

Malcolm wrote:

Shariram, relics, are the small pellet—like secretions found in the ashes of Buddhist saints when they are cremated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 7:35 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Wayfarer said:

No, I definitely and emphatically do not reject belief in rebirth. Ian Stevenson spent 30 years researching children who recalled their previous lives. He said, and I fully accept, that this evidence suggest the truth of re-birth. And he was a scientist - but not a materialist. Science and scientific materialism are different things. You need to get some clarity around that.

Malcolm wrote:

I have a lot of clarity around this issue, thank you very much. Science operates from a lowest common denominator approach to evaluating knowledge. It is predicated on the perceptions of confused sentient beings, not the perceptions of awakened people.

Buddhadharma on the other hand is predicated on the perception of awakened people, not confused people — you need to get some clarity around that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I don't think there are \*any grounds whatever\* to accuse this contributor of 'scientism' or 'materialism' on the basis of what he has written here. He is asking honest questions and wrestling with honest doubts. I regard such accusations as ad hominem and would suggest that they are dropped.

Malcolm wrote:

I would suggest that your observation is out of place and inaccurate, so I will ask you not interfere further unless you have something value to add. You are over-moderating.

I would also point out the person in question made defamatory remarks about the Buddhist tradition, implying it was preposterous because it does not fit with what he understands as "scientific".

In other words, it is ok, in your view, to make defamatory remarks about Buddhadharma since it is not "scientific", but it is not ok to call people on it when they make such remarks from a scientific materialist perspective. In other words, we, who follow Buddhadharma, are barred from defending our tradition, according to you, if its traditions contravene "science".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Technology is one thing. technology is not a truth claim, scientism like yours however is.

M

nichirenista said:

The earlier statement was that science is for confused people. My response is that science is what has allowed us to have computers and communicate via the Internet. I'm not making a so-called truth claim here. This is fact.

Similarly, the relics are either those of the historical Buddha who lived 2500 years ago in India, or they are not.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say science was for confused people, I said that your criteria of a truth claim is based on the ordinary perceptions of confused people.

Saying this or that is a "fact" is another kind of truth claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 7:02 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Wayfarer said:

But I also don't think that religious practitioners ought to say that they are in possession of some facts which over-rule science in regards to matters in which scientific measurement obviously holds sway.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you reject rebirth then, since as far as science is concerned, brains = minds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 6:59 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

nichirenista said:

What was shaken was my faith in the integrity of certain Buddhist leaders. It's disillusioning for me to see that representatives of other traditions make outrageous claims that almost certainly would not stand up to scientific verification. I'd thought Buddhism was above that.

Malcolm wrote:

Science takes the vision of ordinary confused human beings as the benchmark for truth claims. Buddhadharma takes the wisdom vision of awakened beings as the bench mark for truth claims.

You have made your choice.

nichirenista said:

You can thank science for enabling you to communicate with me now through your computer via the Internet. You can thank science for lighting up the room where the relics were displayed and powering the sound the monk used to speak to the group assembled at the event.

Yes, I've made the choice to acknowledge something most people on this thread



apparently won't accept: my opinion on the matter ultimately has no bearing. Either the relics are historically/archaeologically real, or they aren't. My personal perspective is not the deciding factor.

I hope those of you who are posting that I am insensitive will take a look at the how insensitive you are being to me. There is no need to attack me.

Malcolm wrote:

Technology is one thing. technology is not a truth claim, scientism like yours however is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

nichirenista said:

What was shaken was my faith in the integrity of certain Buddhist leaders. It's disillusioning for me to see that representatives of other traditions make outrageous claims that almost certainly would not stand up to scientific verification. I'd thought Buddhism was above that.

Jesse said:

Lol. There's lots of things which are true that science can't verify. There's more to reality and life than can be measured, and while it's fine and all that you've chosen logic over dogma, don't go throwing materialistic beliefs like it's the defacto stance of science.

Malcolm wrote:

He has just chosen a different dogma, that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

nichirenista said:

What was shaken was my faith in the integrity of certain Buddhist leaders. It's disillusioning for me to see that representatives of other traditions make outrageous claims that almost certainly would not stand up to scientific verification. I'd thought Buddhism was above that.

Malcolm wrote:

Science takes the vision of ordinary confused human beings as the benchmark for truth

claims. Buddhadharma takes the wisdom vision of awakened beings as the bench mark for truth claims.

You have made your choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't sound to me like there is much Buddhadharma in your Buddhism, but rather, a whole lot of materialism.

nichirenista said:

Ironical that I'm the one who was accused of being insensitive.

I leave you to bask in your spiritual superiority to me....

Malcolm wrote:

It is not about superiority -- you might as well chant Namu Mickey Mouse, based on your own stated belief I've read that scientific studies have revealed that chanting (no matter the religion) is good for mental health because the rhythm of chanting corresponds with that of the pulse of brain activity. Such ideas really have nothing to do with Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

nichirenista said:

Science speaks for itself. A relic either is or isn't literally from the historical Buddha. My attitude is not the deciding factor. No religious faith on my part was necessary in appraising the historical verifiability of the Venus of Willendorf.

I'm not Nichiren Daishonin and this isn't the 1200s. Heck, I'm not even Japanese. I'm a "white ethnic" raised in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States of America -- where one of our greatest freedoms is the freedom of expression. My reasons for chanting are different from Nichiren's (I like the scientific view), and I'm aware that he believed things that I don't. I find his beliefs and history to be beneficial to study -- but from a historical, scholarly standpoint.

I suppose what I'm saying is that mythology is different from science, and I wish the advertisement for this event would have made it clear that this event was within the realm of "Buddhist mythology." But I think I have to accept that maybe it wasn't advertised that way because some people believe it is scientifically, literally true that the relics are from the historical Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't sound to me like there is much Buddhadharma in your Buddhism, but rather, a whole lot of materialism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 15th, 2014 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism, r/atheism, Human Rights...

Content:

Queequeg said:

[

As a whole, Buddhism has not come to terms with modernity.

Malcolm wrote:

Modernity has yet to come to terms with desire, hatred and ignorance.

There is nothing particularly noble about "modernity" (read, post-Hegelian Western culture) and nothing especially difficult about living in a so called modern culture. Sentient beings are still the same — afflicted by the three poisons — and Buddhadharma is still relevant to that state of affairs and always will be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist "relics"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The term is "sharira". The Buddha's remains from his cremation were divided into eight parts and placed in Stupas.

Buddhist masters have been producing shariraṃ in all traditions for centuries. The understanding of shariraṃ is highly developed in Tibetan Buddhism, especially in the Dzogchen teachings, where many different kinds of shariraṃ from different parts of the body, indicating different levels of practice are detailed by the Buddha in texts such as the Brilliant Relics Tantra and so on. For example, in the Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra, Buddha states:

After my nirvana

in order to generate the devotion of migrating beings

place the relics in a statue.

Place these major classes of relics

in statues of my form.

The Buddha teaches in the Bhadrakalpika-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Making a small offering to the relics of the Sugata in nirvana has limitless qualities.

Kuśalamūla-paridhara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

The transformation of his relics,

is just like my nirvana,

the relics of the Sugata sNying po Tshogs,

those will transform.

The Arya-sarvadharmaguṇavyūharāja-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

At a place of stupa containing relics or a temple, make offerings with incense, scents, various flowers and various pennants.

nichirenista said:

I hesitate to start this thread because I don't mean to seem disrespectful, much less sacrilegious. So, let me state upfront that this is an honest, sincere question....

<http://www.maitreyarelictour.com> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return  
false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I attended the loving kindness tour a few days ago, which is a part of the Maitreya Project through the Foundation for the Preservation of the Mahayana Tradition. I was completely caught off guard. When I saw the word "relic" in their advertisements, I thought in terms of archaeology. I didn't know about the concept of "relics" in the Tibetan tradition. I came to feel that these are relics in the same way that the bread was the body of Jesus in my Catholic childhood. Symbolically.

To be honest I'm almost at a loss here. I will refrain from posting my more blunt thoughts on the topic, for fear of offending some people. But I suppose my questions would be as follows: 1. What is the general consensus of the relics on this tour? Do people actually believe that they have relics from the historical Buddha? (It would seem to me that something that rare and valuable would be displayed at the Smithsonian behind lock and key, under video surveillance, and under the careful watch of a security guard nearby. Not casually displayed at the local Masonic Temple, where any average Joe from off the street could wander in and then place the relics of the historical Buddha on his head!) 2. Have such relics ever been verified by any scientist?

I'll be a little more blunt, though hopefully tactful and not disrespectful. Truth is that it was a very disillusioned and disappointing display for me. I guess I would like to know that there are other Buddhists out there who don't believe in this either....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 12:10 PM

Title: Re: Are Karma and Rebirth Real?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Again, you make many sweeping statements without any attribution or justification. When asked for justification, you offer bad interpretations of scholastic Buddhist texts, reading things into them which aren't there and coming to conclusions which the texts don't justify.

(I am starting to appreciate why certain levels of teaching were traditionally kept secret....)

Andrew108 said:

This is pretty bad. I have enough of this attitude.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, i think this evaluation of your posts is entirely justifiable in many ways.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 11:21 AM

Title: Re: Are Karma and Rebirth Real?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Of course, I agree, but as you say, it gets to a point where it is unseemly to refer to advanced teachings as a basis for making unsubstantiated and sweeping claims about Buddhist fundamentals..

Malcolm wrote:

You seem to be suffering from the misapprehension that it is always inappropriate to cite higher texts when they support teachings found in lower yanas.

Finally, if you don't mind, i will cite any text i deem appropriate in support of any point i wish to make.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: Are Karma and Rebirth Real?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The teachings are not something to be debated about for sport.

Wayfarer said:

I don't think it is much use referring to advanced texts in trying to reason with someone who demonstrates no understanding of the basics. For someone whose understanding is basic, basic texts are all that is required.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that A108 was refuting teachings which are found in Dzogchen teachings, of

which he professes to be a practitioner, as well as Abhidharma in favor of Theravadin presentations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body

Content:

Gyurme Kundrol said:

since in the ultimate nature such an intention or aspiration, or even such a thought is literally not needed.

Malcolm wrote:

Correction, does not exist.

But Dzogchen practice is predicated first of all on vidyā, rigpa, knowledge. Without that experiential knowledge we call "rigpa" all these nice Dzogchen words are empty of meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Dzogchen attitude is quite unique. Very special. The idea of wanting to have rainbow body or wanting to achieve enlightenment doesn't fit.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess, according to you, that ChNN is a fool then for having stated countless times that he hopes he can achieve rainbow body, that he wants to achieve rainbow body. I guess his attitude is not Dzogchen at all.

M

Andrew108 said:

That's an unfortunate projection on your part. ChNN has stated countless times that we need to go beyond dualistic vision. It is our fixation to the dualistic state we find ourselves in that is blocking the manifestation of realization. When our spiritual aims become part of this dualistic vision then our practice will fall short.

Malcolm wrote:

You are changing the subject. Address the issue at hand. How do you reconcile what you have stated with ChNN's stated desire to attain rainbow body?

You have basically stated that anyone who desires to achieve rainbow body is a fool.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It seem to me that the best explanation of rebirth is that present actions have consequences for those coming later.

Malcolm wrote:

This is clearly not the intention of the teachings on rebirth in Dzogchen, of which there are very, very many.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Vasubhandu asserted Antarābhava-skandha.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha asserted the Antarābhava-skandha.

Andrew108 said:

Vasubhandu used reasoning to argue the existence of antarābhava-skandha.

Malcolm wrote:

He also cites a sūtra when explaining the teaching on the bardo.

Considering that the bardo is an incredibly important topic in Dzogchen, since this where most people are going to attain liberation, how can you possibly call yourself a Dzogchen practitioner, and yet spend so much time and effort rejecting the teachings in the antarābhava? As the Buddha states in The Union of the Sun and Moon Tantra (an important tantra belonging to man ngag sde):

The place entered by all sentient beings  
who do not possess this instruction  
is called “the bardo of existence.”

The doorway to the path of the places of samsara,  
for example, is turning like a water wheel.

Having separated from the body of ordinary flesh and blood,  
one has an illusory mental body,  
which has two names since it incorporeal.

And the Self-Liberated Vidyā Tantra states (a tantra belonging to man ngag sde):  
After people of average capacity  
have died and left this world, passed through the bardo  
and have been born in buddhafiels of half-visible emanations,  
they are free from all paths of samsara.  
So you see, the teachings about the bardo are incredibly important for Vajrayāna and  
Dzogchen practitioners. The teachings are not something to be debated about for sport.

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 1:22 AM  
Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body  
Content:  
Andrew108 said:  
It seems to me that their craving has increased rather than decreased.

Malcolm wrote:  
How would you know? You are not them. You are not in a position to judge anyone's  
practice apart from your own.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 1:20 AM  
Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
[quote="Andrew108"]If you contact a Dzogchen master and tell them that you want to  
achieve rainbow body what do you think they would say? /quote]

Do this practice, then do this practice, then this one, then you if you are diligent you  
gave the possibility of attaining rainbow body.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 1:16 AM  
Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body  
Content:

Andrew108 said:  
Dzogchen attitude is quite unique. Very special. The idea of wanting to have rainbow  
body or wanting to achieve enlightenment doesn't fit.

Malcolm wrote:  
I guess, according to you, that ChNN is a fool then for having stated countless times



that he hopes he can achieve rainbow body, that he wants to achieve rainbow body. I guess his attitude is not Dzogchen at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

uan said:

There are people who follow Buddha Dharma who cling to the idea that they need to call themselves Buddhists. Eventually, following Dharma, we grow beyond needing to identify as Buddhist or anything really. As an example, and I clearly don't speak for Malcolm, but iirc, he used to identify as a Buddhist, but he doesn't anymore, though he allows himself to use that identifier for the sake of simpler interactions with people who still cling to needing to call people "Buddhist". Though perhaps he's back to being a Buddhist? I don't know.

Malcolm wrote:

I practice Buddhadharma, call me what you will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

What is the intermediate state aggregate?

Malcolm wrote:

Antarābhava-skandha, means the five aggregates of a being in the bardo [antarābhava].

Andrew108 said:

So you are going with Vasubhandhu's assertion.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am going with the Buddha's teaching in the sūtra cited above. But when it comes to choosing between Abhidhamma and Abhidharma, I will pick Abhidharma every time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Citation, Andrew.

Andrew108 said:

In the Mejung Chapter 23. The Marvelous Primordial State: The Mejung Tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

And so you conclude from these citations that one ought not wish for freedom from suffering? That the entire Buddhist path is mere foolishness? That the wish to attain awakening (bodhicitta) should be given up, eschewed?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There is another key concept in Dzogchen which is something like 'those who wish to achieve are the ones who will never achieve'.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh really, in what Dzogchen teaching is this taught? Citation please.

Andrew108 said:

It's outlined in Kunjed Gyalpo, Mejung. Nubchen writes about it as does ChNN.

Malcolm wrote:

Citation, Andrew.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

What is the intermediate state aggregate?

Malcolm wrote:

Antarābhava-skandha, means the five aggregates of a being in the bardo [antarābhava].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

From Bikkhu Thanissaro's presentation on re-birth:

Malcolm wrote:

Why don't we properly ground this discussion in Mahāyāna Sūtra for a change?

Then, the Bhagavan said this to Āyusman Nanda, “Nanda, when a sentient being wishes to enter the womb, if causes and conditions are perfect, a body will be appropriated. However, if [the causes and conditions] are not perfect, a body will not be appropriated. If one should ask how is it that a sentient being does not possess the conditions, it is as follows. Though a man and a woman have the mental factor of desire, and the intermediate state aggregate is present and seeking a womb, should that male and female have sexual intercourse too soon or too late or not have intercourse at that one time; or should there be some diseases in the body of either [the male or the female], there will be no ‘entry into the womb’. If family line of the male and the female are noble and their merit is great, but the intermediate state aggregate has small merit, or should the intermediate state being have a noble family line and great merit, [65] but the male and female have small [merit] or though they both have merit, but if the accumulation of karma is not mutual, then there will be no ‘entry into the womb’.”

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There is another key concept in Dzogchen which is something like 'those who wish to achieve are the ones who will never achieve'.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh really, in what Dzogchen teaching is this taught? Citation please.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dharma

Content:

Alfredo said:

Okay, look--as far as anybody knows, Buddhists have disagreed with one another since day one.

Not over key issues like rebirth.

There is no "core" that represents Buddhism to everybody, and never has been.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth, dependent origination, infallibility of karmic causes and effects, etc. These are

core Buddhist tenets that represent all Buddhists until the 1970's. Then all of a sudden we have this pernicious movement to take Buddha's teachings out of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 7:07 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

boda said:

Y'all are not following. If different interpretations of the world around us is dangerous to Buddhism then ALL interpretations which are not agreeable are dangerous. There's no reason why Hindu interpretations, for example, would be any less dangerous than Batchelorian interpretations. Yet Buddhism has survived Hinduism from the very beginning, and indeed more to the point, Hinduism has survived Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha pointed out that only people who could destroy Buddhism was Buddhists. Batchelor is happily leading the way with his incorrect views about what the Buddha taught.

Andrew108 said:

Buddhists have to believe in rebirth right? So it would seem it will be Buddhists (those who believe in literal rebirth) that will destroy Buddhism and not secularists like Batchelor.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all, A108 — Buddha had in mind people who say things like "rebirth is not necessary for Buddhism" and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism, r/atheism, Human Rights...

Content:

Wayfarer said:

There is a sense in which traditional Buddhism could be fatalistic - as the world was illusory, and as beings suffered due to their own karma, and so on

I think that sense of 'engaged Buddhism' is a counter to that...

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing here to counter, this is just a Buddhist matter of fact. It is not fatalistic at all. All beings make their own karma, both the good and the bad.

I can no more change your karma than you can change mine. But as human beings, we can act with compassion, and perhaps inspire others.

However, please do recall the Buddha watched the Vajjians enslave all his relatives...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Learning Sanskrit

Content:

coyote said:

I know that Buddhist Sanskrit is different to classical Sanskrit

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really that different. Buddhist texts merely have their jargon. But in general there is no such thing as "Buddhist" Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism, r/atheism, Human Rights...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dalai Lama's concept of universal responsibility can form such a basis...

Jikan said:

Hi Malcolm,

Would you please help us see the connection here? I'm not at all familiar with this concept, and I don't think I'm the only one. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

When we understand we have a universal responsibility to assure everyone's happiness, there is no need even to mention human rights, since they will automatically be satisfied.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 7:22 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

boda said:

Y'all are not following. If different interpretations of the world around us is dangerous to Buddhism then ALL interpretations which are not agreeable are dangerous. There's no reason why Hindu interpretations, for example, would be any less dangerous than Batchelorian interpretations. Yet Buddhism has survived Hinduism from the very beginning, and indeed more to the point, Hinduism has survived Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha pointed out that only people who could destroy Buddhism was Buddhists.

Batchelor is happily leading the way with his incorrect views about what the Buddha taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

boda said:

And I pointed out that there are wildly divergent interpretations, of the same raw material. Buddhism has survived for millennia surrounded by all the divergent interpretations. OBVIOUSLY, you could not be more wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

None however that flat out negate the importance of rebirth for understanding and practicing Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

uan said:

But you do encourage defending the dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, and that means understanding Dharma as properly as possible and following a qualified master until you are a master yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism, r/atheism, Human Rights...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dalai Lama's concept of universal responsibility can form such a basis...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

uan said:

We don't need to defend the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course we do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 11:25 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Again whose? Modern feminism ala Sarah Palin?

Virgo said:

She's a feminist?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

So she claims.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 11:07 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Again whose? Modern feminism ala Sarah Palin? Robin Morgan? etc.

boda said:

How about we settle for any variety that disfavors dowry killings, acid throwing, rape, or the forced prostitution of young girls.

Malcolm wrote:

That's not feminism, that is basic human decency.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Khyentse on the importance of Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Nice.

What's nice about it?

His affirmation of the benefits of practicing the Mahayana as a basis for the Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sorry, but this following statement is very silly:

Those who skip the Mahayana path and go straight to the Vajrayana path are obvious from a distance by the gleam of their oily hair. They have at least four malas around their neck, and they love to talk about power and magnetizing wealth. Their view often seems

to be founded on a rather superstitious cast of mind.  
These kinds of put-downs are simply not necessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So then you should specify which version of rebirth you hold to.

Malcolm wrote:

The one taught in Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

boda said:

I can agree that anyone against modern feminism is a dribbling idiot.

Malcolm wrote:

Whose modern feminism?

boda said:

Men's of course.

Malcolm wrote:

Again whose? Modern feminism ala Sarah Palin? Robin Morgan? etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Stephen Batchelor says that there are four key components of Buddha's teachings that are unique and not a part of the culture of the time. These are the for unique views (here I am quoting SB):

- "1. The principle of "this-conditionality, conditioned arising."
2. The principle of the Four Noble Truths.
3. The practice of mindful awareness.
4. The power of self-reliance."

Not so bad if you take these on and perfect them. I mean if you live them and they



become part of a lived experience. More than enough there to keep the dharma pure.

Malcolm wrote:

He is mistaken.

Samkhya also explains a kind of conditioned arising, the idea of escaping from suffering, mindfulness and self-reliance. So Batchelor is quite wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

boda said:

I can agree that anyone against modern feminism is a dribbling idiot.

Malcolm wrote:

Whose modern feminism?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The first sentence of the quote shows that Abhidhamma is not idealist.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the Abhidhamma of Theravada is realist. It is the lowest tenet system alongside Vaibhāṣika and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Believe it or not there are many Buddhists who reject the idea of objective existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, yes; conventionally, no.

Andrew108 said:

Ultimate here is an imagined ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. Imagination has nothing to do with it.

Andrew108 said:

In the texts I have been studying ultimate is unconditioned or baselessness. This baselessness is present.

Malcolm wrote:

Which texts are those?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Khyentse on the importance of Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Nice.

Malcolm wrote:

What's nice about it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

People, let's all try to be a little more simpatico, shall we? We're trying to have a sangha here.

Malcolm wrote:

We are? Not me, this is not a Sangha (not for me at any rate) — this is internet board.

Sangha are those who share refuge, that is not the case here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 11th, 2014 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

Jikan said:

boda: you forgot to mention that I'm an ugly white dude who hasn't yet completely shaken his working-class (or "redneck" if you prefer) accent.

Malcolm wrote:

True, from a Buddhist perspective, at this point to be an Asian male Buddhist who is a serious practitioner and has means to afford teachings is really the top of the food chain in the Buddhist world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Isn't there a kind of beauty in equality and the acceptance of views that we might disagree with?

Wayfarer said:

Two different things there. Certainly in a pluralist society a range of views are to be tolerated, and individuals have a freedom of conscience, and so on.

But it doesn't override the requirement of discerning the truth and attaining the correct view. Not all views can be correct, and to say they are is simply subjectivism and relativism. Everything is then simply a matter of opinion. Which is perilously close to where we are in many respects.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why as Buddhists we follow śabda-pramāṇa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It's easy to criticize and it's hard to accept different views from ones own. Seems like the world is full of conflict. But aren't all these views adornments of the natural state? Isn't there a kind of beauty in equality and the acceptance of views that we might disagree with? There is such a instinctive impulse to divide and draw lines and we do so because we think we have responsibility for the preservation of a particular set of teachings. We are damaging these teachings by being so close-minded. Very hard to see this but open hand is better than a closed fist.

Malcolm wrote:

First, A108, one must distinguish between a right path and wrong path; then one must distinguish between a higher path and a lower path.

Part of that is distinguishing right view from wrong view. That is why we train in tenet systems. Somehow, some people believe that secular views such as those advanced by

scientists and western philosophers should be exempt from being graded by the traditional tenet system. However, the fact is that all western science, philosophy and religion falls under the category of either non-Buddhist eternalism or annihilationism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I've never seen Batchelor or his fans shy away from a debate. Indeed, challenging what they see as the "status quo" of traditional Buddhism seems to be part of their *raison d'etre*.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically it is the difference between this:

And this:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Believe it or not there are many Buddhists who reject the idea of objective existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, yes; conventionally, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

For those who believe in literal rebirth, can you explain how it happens? What are the mechanics of it? What is the reasoning that convinces you that there is literal rebirth?

boda said:

It's better that we don't know the mechanics of it, because if we did know the

mechanics we would start manipulating the system. That's what our species does, we manipulate our environment in order to take advantage. That rarely turns out well. Indeed, look at the condition of our environment.

If we knew the mechanics of rebirth we might manipulate it to be reborn as a rockstar, or someone important, like an actor. Then there would be too many actors in the world and everything would be all out of balance.

Malcolm wrote:

We do know the mechanics. However, the things you describe require merit and so on, and given that merit is not something most people are interested in accumulating, there is no danger that higher rebirths will become overstocked, if you will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: essential tremor

Content:

saraswati said:

Interesting that Malcolm says it is linked to wind. I don't know much of Tibetan medicine but years back I've self-diagnosed as having a Vata imbalance according to Ayurveda.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is a vata/rlung condition connected with the nervous system or so called "white channels".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The pure heart of Buddhism is found only in the lineage of realization. Without that lineage, a lineage which frankly has not existed outside of Mahāyāna for many centuries, there is no pure heart of Buddhism.

dzogchungpa said:

What about Daniel Ingram?

Malcolm wrote:

If he is an Arhat, I am a samyaksambuddha with 32 major and 80 minor marks...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

In Abhidhamma there are irreducible ultimate dhammas or ultimate objects of right knowledge and these are separate from conceptualised conventionalities. These ultimate dhammas are universal and unchanging. They do not depend on concepts and are uncovered by analysing the conventional. These ultimates are naturalistic. They are laws that are the same everywhere and at every time. They are independent of mind's conceptualizing. I think science and dharma uncover these paramattha. And in that sense dhamma is naturalistic.

Nibbana is also an ultimate in that it is the law of 'unconditionality'.

Malcolm wrote:

Considering that Abhidhamma belongs to a Śravaka school, it comes as no surprise that its point of view is realist and negated by higher Buddhist teachings such as Madhyamaka, Dzogchen and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Jikan said:

...the pure heart of Buddhism,

Malcolm wrote:

The pure heart of Buddhism is found only in the lineage of realization. Without that lineage, a lineage which frankly has not existed outside of Mahāyāna for many centuries, there is no pure heart of Buddhism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Wayfarer said:

How about we say that 'science is generally in the realm of samvriti-satya' (conventional truth). That would appear to offer a way of accomodating science without having to declare that it is necessarily in conflict with Dharma (which belongs in the realm of paramartha satya.)

I also feel compelled to refer once more the well-known book by the Dalai Lama on philosophy of science, The Universe in a Single Atom. That book is not the least 'anti-science' whilst showing a clear grasp of the distinction between science as method, and scientific materialism as an attitude.

Malcolm wrote:

The Madhyamaka definition of conventional truth is simply functionality ( arthakriya ), thus the rites of shamans for making rain are as conventionally valid as predicative models in science so long as they function. Of course, if you are convinced they do not function you will not resort to them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Are these the warning signs of a cult?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[http://www.globalvt.org/?page\\_id=72](http://www.globalvt.org/?page_id=72)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is that Buddhists are so worried about being perceived as "modern", many of them have lost sight of their roots — the awakening of the Buddha and all that entails — and rush to shed anything in Dharma that seems pre-modern to their sensibilities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Are these the warning signs of a cult?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Which tradition does the group belong too?

Malcolm wrote:

NKT

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: essential tremor

Content:

Jikan said:

Thank you both for the helpful information. I'm glad to know that the forms of self-medication I've picked up along the way (I've also been advised to imbibe gently but consistently) have some validity.

Malcolm wrote:

There are also a number of effective herbal formulas you can take, pm me and we can talk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: essential tremor

Content:

Jikan said:

I was diagnosed with this some time ago. Basically, it means my hands & feet shake, and my voice sometimes sounds a little strange. I don't have Parkinson's. I just wiggle a little. It's inconvenient and sometimes embarrassing when I have trouble gripping something, or if my handwriting gets out of control. My grandfather had it too. He was able to use a tablesaw until he was about 85 years old, but it was scary toward the end.

There's not much that conventional medicine can offer on this except the usual things (stay healthy, avoid caffeine, manage stress, &c).

I'd like to know if anyone has any insights on this. with this and the migraines, you might understand why the vajra armor practice has a very strong appeal for me.

many thanks in advance.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a systemic wind disorder of the nervous system.

There are all kinds of things you can do to manage. daily self-massage, a little good wine everyday, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I think this is the problem. Perhaps it is this Mahayana view of rebirth - with the idea of bardo. I'm wondering what is the scriptural basis for bardo?

Malcolm wrote:

Ārya-laṅkāvatāra-mahāyāna-sūtra

Nandagarbhāvākṛāntinirdeśa

Karmaprajñapti



etc.

Andrew108 said:

These Sutras are all about the primacy of consciousness. This is why I have been unsure about your posts. Earlier suttas are more focused on the primacy of kamma. O.k so that is why there has been a disconnect.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case. The Karmaprajñāpti is about karma.

Nandagarbhāvākṛāntinirdeśa is about how conception and development in the womb takes place. For example:

If the father and mother are of noble social class, or endowed with great merit, but the intermediate existence being's merit heap is small; or if the intermediate existence beings' social class is noble, or is endowed with great merit, but the father and mother's merit is small, or even though both are endowed with merit, when past actions to mutually meet together are not accumulated, there cannot be entry into the womb. In this case, merit of the father and mother can be an external condition determining whether conception can occur or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

daverupa said:

So is patisandhi-citta your "rebirth-linking consciousness"?

Andrew108 said:

Yes that's it. And this consciousness is said to be generated by kamma (productive kamma) immediately after death. It seems that some types of kamma in Abhidamma texts are close to what I have called an 'objective condition'.

Malcolm wrote:

No, all karma is subjective in so far as all karma is mental volitions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I think this is the problem. Perhaps it is this Mahayana view of rebirth - with the idea of bardo. I'm wondering what is the scriptural basis for bardo?

Malcolm wrote:

Ārya-laṅkāvatāra-mahāyāna-sūtra  
Nandagarbhāvākṛāntinirdeśa  
Karmaprajñapti

etc.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 3:28 AM  
Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?  
Content:  
Andrew108 said:  
I've explained that I am looking at the Abhidharma texts.

daverupa said:  
So is patisandhi-citta your "rebirth-linking consciousness"? Because if you're already reading that stuff and it feels acceptable, please note that the answer to your question is in there too.

But a lot of Mahayana accepts Bardo between births, while in Theravada there's no time at all between them, so the discussion is bound to get out of alignment.

Malcolm wrote:  
All of Mahāyāna...

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 3:21 AM  
Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?  
Content:  
Jikan said:  
I'm not clear on what you mean by consciousness, Andrew108.

Malcolm wrote:  
Neither is he.

Andrew108 said:  
Neither are you. Less of the Ad homs. I've explained that I am looking at the Abhidharma texts. So instead of the popcorn why not contribute?

Malcolm wrote:  
It is definitely the case that I am not clear on what you mean by consciousness; and that is because you are not clear on what consciousness is.

As far as participating, I have provided all of these answers for you in the past, but still you persist in asking questions so:

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

@Jikan...Consciousness in the context of my last few posts is the rebirth-linking consciousness. I'm looking at the Abhidharma texts. It is stated quite clearly that this rebirth-linking consciousness requires prior cause or kamma that is the result of action. It is said that this type of Kamma (productive kamma) that is responsible for generating the rebirth-linking consciousness exists prior to that consciousness and that "during the course of existence it produces other resultant cittas and the continuities of kamma-born materiality, such as the sense faculties, sexual determination, and the heart-base." The heart-base is quite interesting in itself and could be a separate topic of discussion.

So it seems that kamma exists as an objective condition as the result of action prior to the manifestation of the consciousness. In this case it is not that consciousness contains within it all types of kamma.

Jikan said:

Sorry, I'm even more confused now. Rather than ask you to explain your explanation, would you please tell me what it is you're reading so I can get a sense of where you're coming from?

thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Andrew missed the part where karma was defined by the Buddha as volition, and the effects of volition body and speech.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Prayer

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

It amounts to a distinction without a difference, brother Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an important distinction, actually.

Crazywisdom said:

Buddha wakes up the hearer sangha with his light.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and then they have to begin on the bodhisattva path at the beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm not clear on what you mean by consciousness, Andrew108.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither is he.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Prayer

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

A one-returner on the Arahant's marga-phala will take rebirth in a pure land, too.

Common with Pure Land sutras..., but okay. The point I'm making is the explanation of the nature of the three kayas that is unique to mengagde relates to the manner in which a realized being emanates as one of the form kayas.

Malcolm wrote:

A never returner, you mean, and the five pure abodes, at the summit of the form realm, are not pure lands.

A Dzogchen practitioner who does not wake up in the bardo will take rebirth in buddhafiield of Vajrasattva, Ratnasambhava, etc., for 125 years year each. At the end of 500 years, they will attain full buddhahood. This does not occur for pure land practitioners, arhats, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I've been studying the materials. Especially the Abhidharma texts. In the text that Sherab linked to it says:

"At the moment of conception, productive kamma generates the rebirth-linking consciousness and the kamma-born types of materiality constituting the physical body of the new being."

So here there is no mechanics of descent of consciousness into a womb. Here it is kamma that that is generating consciousness. kamma here means prior cause or prior action. So consciousness here is not an isolated force or energy that somehow is disembodied and then dives into the conception. Rather it is portrayed as having a prior cause rooted in the material/conscious being of others.

Malcolm wrote:

Not "others", plural; an other, singular.

But in any case this is not definitive for Mahāyāna. Instead, you should examine such texts as the Nandagarbhavikranti sutra, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Prayer

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Take rebirth in a Pure land is not mengagde proper, IMHO.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is. It is the result that the most average practitioners will experience. After 500 years of training in each of nirmanakāya buddhafiels, they will attain buddhahood. This is very precisely described in the 17 tantras as well as the unsurpassed secret cycle, by Longchenpa and many others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Mkoll said:

I see there was no point in making the effort of a serious post so...

?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Instead of posting links please explain how you see it happening.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? This has been done countless hundreds of times for you and others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Can consciousness travel distances? How does the consciousness that leaves the body actually leave the body? How does consciousness move distances? And when consciousness descends into the womb I would imagine the speed of the descent is quite fast. How fast? These are some of the questions I ask myself.

You might think that I am trolling here or that this topic is boring. But for me, rebirth and how it actually happens (if it happens) is very interesting. It would be great if some clarity could be shed on the subject. What I have been given so far are links. Since those who hold to literal rebirth do so very seriously, then they must have seriously questioned the concept. And after investigating they must have come up with reasoned arguments to support their belief. So lets hear them. What we have been getting so far is that you HAVE to believe in rebirth. Belief without reason is not quite right. So please put forward the reasoning that supports your belief in literal rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

If you would only study the Dharma, A108, then you will find these answers. For example, a bardo being (gandharva) is unobstructed by coarse matter — they travel throughout the universe merely by thinking, "I want to go there".

All these things will be answered for the person who carefully studies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Prayer

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

One has to be aware of the level of teaching the teacher is giving. At one level, i.e., the vajrayana level, particularly outer tantra, there is a real buddhaland where Vajrasattva presides.

Malcolm wrote:

This is also part of men ngag sde

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Mkoll said:

Belief is a word I try to avoid because it is too loaded. I prefer the description of "safeguarding the truth" in the Canki Sutta:

MN 95 said:

"If a person likes something... holds an unbroken tradition... has something reasoned through analogy... has something he agrees to, having pondered views, his statement, 'This is what I agree to, having pondered views,' safeguards the truth. But he doesn't yet come to the definite conclusion that 'Only this is true; anything else is worthless.' To this extent, Bharadvaja, there is the safeguarding of the truth. To this extent one safeguards the truth. I describe this as the safeguarding of the truth. But it is not yet an awakening to the truth.

Mkoll said:

Rebirth is an integral of the Buddha's teachings and I've chosen to be a disciple of the Buddha. That's reason enough for me to listen to what he says about it and think about it. And I've come to the point where I agree with it, "having pondered views". As for how rebirth happens and the mechanics of it, I think that subject is <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an04/an04.077.than.html>.

There's a <http://dhammawheel.com/viewtopic.php?f=16&t=41> and a <https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=5678> about rebirth. I'm sure you'll find alternative perspectives there.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, after a point on E-Sangha, we just shut this kind of conversation down because it is completely boring and not edifying at all...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: still new...questions on mindstream

Content:

twiz said:

I've had what seemed like vivid dreams that included a rinpoche who gently introduced me to this path. Recently a dream involved a very high lama/rinpoche. I feel incredibly blessed.

Malcolm wrote:

It means you should make an effort to meet this teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

For those who believe in literal rebirth, can you explain how it happens? What are the mechanics of it? What is the reasoning that convinces you that there is literal rebirth?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 8th, 2014 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

uan said:

We can replace the mind of the observing scientist to the mind of the observing Buddhist practitioner. We talk of Buddha and enlightenment as if we know what those actually are....

Malcolm wrote:

We do. At base, awakening means being free of afflictions that cause rebirth in samsara. Omniscience is the knowledge of all modes that lead to that liberation as well as the essence of all phenomena.

uan said:

from non realized teachers

Malcolm wrote:

My [main] teachers are awakened, I don't know about yours.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 7th, 2014 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Doctors, please read

Content:

Reibeam said:

I have some chudlen from Shang Shung which is for these practices, but If I get some chudlen from Siddhi Energetics (I am interested in this company in general as a source)



can that be used with these practices?

I saw an old thread where you said you could use almost anything, but is there any difference in function between them on a physical level? There seem to be many formulations with different uses.

Malcolm wrote:

As for your first question, yes, they can. As to your second, yes, also this is true, there are chulens for specific ailments. But in a general way it is not necessary to go down that road.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 7th, 2014 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Prasutagus said:

I also didn't include an exhaustive list of responses, but rather a list of the most common I've heard over the years. I also didn't nuance science versus scientific materialism versus scientism as most people don't make those distinctions.

Malcolm wrote:

The vision of science corresponds to those with impure, afflicted vision. What else is there to say?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 7th, 2014 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Perhaps this is the time for me to admit my continued affection for the Pali canon. But (as a matter of some interest) what do you identify as a crucial part of the Mahayana path which depends on supernatural intervention?

Malcolm wrote:

"Sariputta, when I know and see thus, should anyone say of me: 'The recluse Gotama does not have any superhuman states, any distinction in knowledge and vision worthy of the noble ones. The recluse Gotama teaches a Dhamma (merely) hammered out by reasoning, following his own line of inquiry as it occurs to him' — unless he abandons that assertion and that state of mind and relinquishes that view, then as (surely as if he had been) carried off and put there he will wind up in hell.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.012.ntbb.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 7th, 2014 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Christianity, which starts with a virgin birth and goes on from there.

Malcolm wrote:

The Lord of the Three Worlds, [55] revered by all the worlds, now judged that the time had come. On the fifteenth day, during the full moon, while his future mother was observing the poṣadha precepts during the constellation of Puṣya, the Bodhisattva moved, fully conscious and aware, from the fine realm of the Heaven of Joy to the womb of his mother.

— Lalitavistara sutra

<http://read.84000.co/browser/released/UT22084/046/UT22084-046-001.pdf>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 7th, 2014 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Buddhism, on the other hand, gets along fine without miracles.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you have not read many suttas then...

catmoon said:

Well that's sort of the point you see. Lots of Buddhists have no interest in miracles, routinely avoid the more phantasmagorical writings and do just fine.

Malcolm wrote:

It means they have not understood the path very well, especially the Mahāyāna path.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 7th, 2014 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Dharma & Science

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Buddhism, on the other hand, gets along fine without miracles.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you have not read many suttas then...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 7th, 2014 at 11:13 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

Alfredo said:

some things would never have occurred to him to question.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? There were well developed schools of materialists during the time of the Buddha, skepticism was a popular position at that time in India and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 7th, 2014 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

You can practice all of the semzin and rushan practices actually.

Inge said:

Including the secret separation of samsara and nirvana? Oral instructions are needed for those, according to The Precious Vase.

Malcolm wrote:

All, the inner and secret rushans are completely described in the PV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://freetibet.org/stoptorture/surv.php>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://freetibet.org/news-media/na/tibetan-killed-chinese-fire-upon-protesters>

Unknown said:

Monday, 23 January 2012

Norpa Yonten who was killed as Chinese forces opened fire  
Chinese security forces opened fire on Tibetan protesters, killing at least one man, earlier today.

Free Tibet is aware of more than 30 others who have been injured, many of them shot, after a large gathering in Draggo (also known as Drango) was fired upon. It is not known why the Chinese opened fire.

The situation is still ongoing.

Tibetans shot

The dead man has been named as Norpa Yonten (right), a 49-year-old lay person from Norpa village, Norchung township in Draggo County. His body has been taken to the nearby Draggo monastery.

At least one other person has been taken to the monastery with gunshot wounds. Locals are fearful to take the injured to hospital in case they are arrested.

Tibetans are reportedly travelling to Draggo and large crowds are gathering in the grounds of the monastery.

Arrest of Tibetans

It is still unclear what sparked the protest. There are reports that Tibetans around Draggo were arrested this morning on suspicion of distributing leaflets and posters calling for freedom and the protest was a response to these arbitrary detentions.

There are also claims that it was in response to celebrations marking the Chinese New Year which many local Tibetans had decided to boycott due to the growing unrest.

The protesters were heard to call out for freedom for Tibet and the return of the Dalai Lama.

Internet access is now banned in Draggo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Opinions on the Consequences of Chinese Occupation of Ti

Content:

Osho said:

As have I Malcolm, as have I.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you must have never stepped off your tour bus or talked with any Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Can lamas choose a suitable yidam for you by divination?

Content:

lelopa said:

So i can't see the difference between this and some yidam-practices....[/b]

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

It is a Yidam practice, very common among Karma Kagyus (though the origin of the practice is Nyingma via Karma Pakshi).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

You can practice all of the semzin and rushan practices actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

Yes i am,would it be appropriate for me to practice it without remembering if i received the lung?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it would not, AFAIK. You need to send ChNN an email and ask him to give the lung during the next retreat.

frank123 said:

Ok,thanks for the clarification.So just to be clear i can practice the purification of 6

lokas from the precious vase?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: How Tibetans feel about the occupation of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

Yes i am,would it be appropriate for me to practice it without remembering if i received the lung?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it would not, AFAIK. You need to send ChNN an email and ask him to give the lung during the next retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

Does ChNN only give the lung for the purification of the 6 lokas during a retreat on the 6 lokas? or does he give it at the end of other retreats?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Every retreat

frank123 said:

I have been attending webcasts and practicing Guru yoga.Would it be safe to say then i received the lung for the vajrasattva and the purification of the 6 lokas and i can study the retreat on this and practice it?I just want to be sure because i don't consciously remember receiving the lung and i'm not comfortable not knowing.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you talking about the Longsal Ngondro?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 7:20 PM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

Does ChNN only give the lung for the purification of the 6 lokas during a retreat on the 6 lokas? or does he give it at the end of other retreats?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Every retreat

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 9:58 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Osho said:

That's non different in Tibet except that for some reason Tibetan Buddhism is quite the fashion right now with affluent folks.

Malcolm wrote:

The situation on the ground in Tibet is very serious and not this Disney land of religious freedom and happiness you want to paint.

Osho said:

With all due respect.

What we hear on DW from some posters does not necessarily correspond with what can be seen and experienced in China.

Disney Land is a good analogy.

Chinese tourists are flocking to Buddhist and Daoist sites and the more affluent and mobile are hitting Tibet.

It's a win win situation as some of those tourists stick around and begin a more serious interest.

Every 'western Buddhist' here on DW started out as a 'faith tourist'.

It's all good.

Malcolm wrote:

Your facile apologetics are useless here. I have been there, i have seen with my own eyes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

I have ordered the previous vase and i am studying a recording of Vajrasattva and the purification 6 lokas retreat. Is this a different practice than the one in the previous vase, if so do i need a lung for the Vajrasattva and the 6 lokas practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you do need the lung for this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 4:56 AM



Title: Re: Direct introduction and purification of the 6 lokas

Content:

frank123 said:

.is that true?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. This is true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 6th, 2014 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Doctors, please read

Content:

Reibeam said:

I'm trying to learn the long Mandarava practice.....can that be practiced without taking the chudlen pills?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Reibeam said:

I have transmission for the chudlen that is used with the amitayus practice, but I don't think I have the correct transmission to take it with the Mandarava practice as I am guessing they are different.

Malcolm wrote:

You have permission.

Reibeam said:

Also, I do not have a lung or personal instruction for the tsalung or kumbhaka that is used in the Mandarava practice. Is that needed to do the chudlen or is it an additional part that I can apply after receiving instruction which will hopefully be taught in the United States in the near future.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an additional part for which you need transmission.

Reibeam said:

I am just wondering what is the best way to go about learning this practice in a precise way? Rinpoche seems to say to start with the long practice first before doing the simple one so I want to make sure I am approaching it in the right way.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, you do the essential practice, and slowly try to learn long practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 5th, 2014 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

theanarchist said:

Ah, now you accuse people who make such claims of lying and making it up to badmouth the great People's Republic.

Indrajala said:

I can't verify claims of torture.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.amnesty.org.uk/blogs/countdown-china/chrb-tibetan-dies-torture-suffered-prison-lawyers-detained-exposing-black-jail> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

There are many more documented incidents like this one. Just open your eyes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 5th, 2014 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Indrajala said:

[

Even if that's true, they still let you, a white American, enter Tibetan areas and study "Tibetan medicine".

Malcolm wrote:

While our class had wide access to Amdo (2009), the class that followed us (2012) was on a very restricted visa and nearly was not allowed to go at all.

Indrajala said:

Your own experiences undermine your claims of extreme oppression.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they don't at all. First of all, we were not in the TAR, we were in Xining. We were allowed to go to Lhasa, but only as a tour group where we were chaperoned around the Barkor like all the other western tourists.

But you realize all you are doing is just defending the oppression of Tibetans in their own lands, you are defending extrajudicial killings, imprisonment, torture and everything else that goes along with racist oppression.

Indrajala said:

Tibetan lamas are teaching Chinese people all over China. You can buy Tibetan religious gear in Guangzhou. It ain't a museum specimen. There's apparently a Sakya teacher with a big Dharma center in Shanghai who is also building a retreat center!

Malcolm wrote:

That is not Tibetan Buddhism for Tibetans, that is "Tibetan" Buddhism for Chinese consumption. The two are not the same in any respect at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 5th, 2014 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Indrajala said:

Is China really repressing Tibetan culture when they allow a white American associated with Tibetan Buddhism to hang around Tibetan regions to study Tibetan medicine?

Malcolm wrote:

The way Tibetan Medicine is taught within the PRC is that all the religious, i.e. Buddhist, elements of Tibetan Medicine are stripped out.

The Chinese are happy have museums of Tibetan culture, that is exactly where they like it, in museums, not as a living entity.

Indrajala said:

And that just feeds into an endless cycle. The Chinese would only let up AFTER things have cooled down, not before. Any risk of rioting and the state losing face and they'll not release any pressure.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans will resist forever, even if it takes them 500 years. The Chinese will give up to kill them all before they will give up their desire to regain their independence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 5th, 2014 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Indrajala said:

I keep hearing from Sakya monks at least that you can in fact ordain, practice and do your own thing in Tibet. You just stay out of politics and you're left alone.

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on where you are in Tibet. In central Tibet, it is not possible.

There, religious activities are very strictly controlled. Any monastery that gets too popular, or too big, gets throttled very quickly anywhere one is in Tibet. There are spies everywhere. During the 2008 riots, Chinese used provocateurs to incite looting using this as an excuse for cracking down. Lhasa is heavily patrolled and non-Chinese tourists are not allowed to travel there freely, and never without a "guide".

And incidentally, I was not in China Tibet as a "tourist". I was there studying Tibetan Medicine.

Indrajala said:

If Tibet was really "burning" you wouldn't have Tibetan monks returning freely to Tibet from Nepal and numerous Chinese nationals over the years staying in this gonpa amongst a high number of Tibetan monks in exile. The Chinese embassy as far as I know doesn't care about their citizens hanging out here for extended periods.

Malcolm wrote:

The Han are free to come and go pretty much as they please. It is not the same for all Tibetans.

Indrajala said:

I'd rather that the Chinese not crack down on political activism, but political activism in Tibet (and China) tends to end up in riots in the streets. Arguably peaceful protest is increasingly a thing of the past in the west, too. Look at all the riots in Europe in the last few years. Freedom is one thing, but rule of law and safe streets are preferable as well.

Malcolm wrote:

When the rule of law is insufferably oppressive, there is only one thing to do — i.e. resist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 5th, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The situation on the ground in Tibet is very serious and not this Disney land of religious freedom and happiness you want to paint.

Indrajala said:

Three or four Tibetan monks from here just went back to Tibet last year. No problems I hear. There are several Chinese nationals staying in this gonpa, too. One Chinese monk too. There's a heap of Tibetan texts sitting up in the library recently printed and shipped out of Lhasa.

It ain't the seventies in Tibet now.

Malcolm wrote:

Printing of books does not equal freedom to practice in an unfettered way. I have been to Lhasa. There is no religious freedom there. It is just a Buddhist museum, a tourist attraction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 5th, 2014 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Osho said:

That's non different in Tibet except that for some reason Tibetan Buddhism is quite the fashion right now with affluent folks.

Malcolm wrote:

The situation on the ground in Tibet is very serious and not this Disney land of religious freedom and happiness you want to paint.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 4th, 2014 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

Prasutagus said:

I didn't say they were.

I actually think he works are a significant contribution and evolution of Dharma. What he has done had to happen at some point: a nihilistic and agnostic extrusion of dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 4th, 2014 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor is influential in the evolution of Dha

Content:

Prasutagus said:

What he has done had to happen at some point: a nihilistic and agnostic extrusion of dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

His books are not Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 4th, 2014 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

LastLegend said:

Buddhists who practice meditations are the minority. For example, Vietnamese Buddhists are advised to follow 5 precepts and recall a Buddha or Bodhisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

In order to receive the five precepts, you need a preceptor.

LastLegend said:

They also/might attend teachings given by monks. For example, monks would discuss a particular subject relevant to people's lives, then allow some time for questions and answers.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. The role of the kalyānamitra is precisely this — to instruct and encourage people in the practice of the six perfections and the four modes of conversion, the essentials of the Mahāyāna path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 4th, 2014 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

LastLegend said:

I am not undermining guru-relationship. I feel there is a pressure for people to have a live teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

One needs a living teacher, this is very clearly stated in many sutras.

LastLegend said:

If you need special guidance and are practicing a meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

No, just in general. The Mahāyāna path is based on having a teacher. The examples of this are numerous. For example The Saṃcaya-gāthā states: Just as a group of patients rely on medicine to be cured,

one should unwaveringly rely on a virtuous mentor.

The Gaṇḍāvyuha sūtra states: Young Manibhadra, bodhisattvas who correctly adhere to the virtuous mentor do not fall into lower realms; they realize the uniformity of all phenomena; they are shown the paths of bliss and misery; they are instructed in the conduct of Samantabhadra; they are shown the path to the city of omniscience; they are carried to the place of omniscience...

And:

The virtuous mentor comprehends incorrect actions, correctly turns one away from

shameless places, extracts one from the city of samsara...Child of a good family, since one always thinks in that way, serve virtuous mentors.

The Ratnamegha-sūtra states: Now then, since the qualities of virtue will increase and nonvirtue will decline if one relies on the guru, the preceptor [mkhan po, upādhyāyaḥ] will generate the thought of teaching those with greater or lesser hearing, or those with discipline or corrupted discipline.

These are merely a few of very many citations from the sūtras about why it is important to rely on a kalyānamitra, a virtuous mentor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 4th, 2014 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

LastLegend said:

I am not undermining guru-relationship. I feel there is a pressure for people to have a live teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

One needs a living teacher, this is very clearly stated in many sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 4th, 2014 at 7:39 PM

Title: Re: All Truth Claims Cannot be True

Content:

tobes said:

I'm saying: in contemporary India, the idea of universal brotherhood/cosmopolitanism is quite prevalent...

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, but what about the sisters?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 4th, 2014 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Is DW a sangha?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One does not take refuge in mundane refuges if one is a follower of Dharma. If one does, one breaks one's refuge to Buddha, Dharma and Noble Sangha.

David N. Snyder said:

One can take Refuge in the Three Gems in the ideal state of referring to the Buddha, Dharma, and noble Sangha and then also use the term in the conventional sense to refer to the community of Buddhists. It's just a word, no big deal, imo.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I did not contest that. I was addressing the general confusion there is about who is a refuge and what Sangha means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 4th, 2014 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Is DW a sangha?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

"Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha are three precious jewels in Buddhism, and the most important of these is Sangha. The Sangha contains the Buddha and the Dharma. A good teacher is important, but sisters and brothers in the practice are the main ingredient for success."

Thich Nhat Hanh, Tricycle 2008

Malcolm wrote:

The Pāramitā-Mahāyānists assert Buddhahood possess the nature of the three kāyas; the Dharma as Mahāyāna; the Sangha is only the ārya bodhisattvas.

— Sakya Pandita

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 4th, 2014 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Is DW a sangha?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

To each his own, but I personally prefer the inclusive-liberal-modern, community definition.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not take refuge in mundane refuges if one is a follower of Dharma. If one does, one breaks one's refuge to Buddha, Dharma and Noble Sangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Is DW a sangha?



Content:

Ayu said:

The normal people cannot be sangha. To a sangha you take refuge.  
I would not like anybody taking refuge to me as an ordinary person.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not exactly the case. There is the Sangha of Refuge and the Sangha of practitioners. The former has no faults, former has many.

Ayu said:

Yes, you're right, it is said like this. But one should not really take refuge in the sangha of practitioners.

And on this board there must be many people, who are no practitioners at all. Not yet at least.

That's why I voted "No", whatever the OP might think what a Sangha is.

Malcolm wrote:

I voted no as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Is DW a sangha?

Content:

Ayu said:

The normal people cannot be sangha. To a sangha you take refuge.  
I would not like anybody taking refuge to me as an ordinary person.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not exactly the case. There is the Sangha of Refuge and the Sangha of practitioners. The former has no faults, former has many.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Indrajala said:

I think the real concern is less about Tibet and more about Xinjiang. The latter has the potential to become another Afghanistan or Chechnya if certain elements acquired firearms. Just look at the spat of killings and bombings around China within the last year.

Malcolm wrote:

The Muslims there will get arms -- China is sitting on a powder keg.

Indrajala said:

Tibet is linked to Xijiang geographically and politically. Any move towards independence on the part of Tibetans is likely to be regarded as an encouraging example which Xinjiang dissidents could emulate and capitalize on. The same level of policing, if not more, is likely active in Xinjiang, too, though Tibetan activists either overlook this or are unaware of it.

Malcolm wrote:  
Everyone is aware.

Indrajala said:  
Human Rights activists do have a point that heavy policing causes a great amount of suffering amongst the common people, but it is a lot more complex than that. There's also the point that "Human Rights" are way with which western countries bully their opponents, like China and Russia. To be a Human Rights violator is tantamount to being a monster, even though the purported monster is acting logically albeit in a morally questionable fashion.

Malcolm wrote:  
People who violate human rights, whatever nation they come from, are monsters.

Indrajala said:  
What is instructive in this discussion and others on this forum is that really nobody has conceded, as far as I recall, the additional element of Xinjiang in the China-Tibet issue.

Malcolm wrote:  
It merely shows that China's grasp on its colonies is slipping after years of oppression of these regions.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 8:16 PM  
Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation  
Content:

Indrajala said:  
That's different from saying Tibetan culture is being oppressed and eradicated.

Malcolm wrote:  
But Tibetan culture is being systematically oppressed and eradicated. This is what you refuse to see. Take the nomads for example:

<http://freetibet.org/news-media/pr/un-holds-china-accountable-forced-settlement-tibetans-nomads> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The Nomads are an integral part of Tibetan culture, historically, 60 percent of all Tibetans lived in nomadic communities.

Indrajala said:

If they didn't exercise such measures, perhaps there could be rioting again, or worse. In some situations the state has to implement measures to ensure public safety. The PRC doesn't want to have to deal with this again:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2008\\_Tibetan\\_unrest](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2008_Tibetan_unrest) "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

If things got out of hand the Indians for example could take advantage of the situation and start covertly arming Tibetans (this is a real danger, and if you know anything about geopolitics in this part of the world, you know this sort of thing actually happens).

Perhaps you might be pleased seeing Tibetans rising up in arms against the Chinese state (I hope you wouldn't rejoice in the violence), but I don't think you'd like the consequences. Think of the religious fundamentalists next door in Xinjiang itching for a fight.

Malcolm wrote:

So you excuse state violence but condemn resisting totalitarianism?

You do realize that the Chinese just outlawed Ramadan?

Indrajala said:

It isn't good guys versus bad guys.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, it really is.

Indrajala said:

A lot of non-Tibetan Tibetan Buddhists in India, Nepal and Bhutan practice Tibetan Buddhism without being sympathetic necessarily to Tibetan nationalism. In fact, I know many who dislike all such politics in their religion and thus have nothing to do with it.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know a single Tibetan who agrees with the Chinese occupation of Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 7:47 PM

Title: Re: Yeti-Bigfoot

Content:

kirtu said:

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/paulrogers/2014/07/02/abominable-news-yeti-identified-as-ancestral-polar-bear/>

From Forbes: Samples of hair believed to be from the abominable snowman are actually from an ancestor of the polar bear.

The discovery raises the possibility that stories of an undiscovered giant primate living in the Himalayas may be based on large and aggressive, but reclusive, bears.

Bryan Sykes, a human genetics professor at Oxford University, and Michel Sartori, director of the Lausanne Museum of Zoology, formed the Oxford-Lausanne Collateral Hominid Project to test the stories of 'anomalous primates' from around the world.

They and their colleagues analysed 57 samples of hair allegedly from creatures including the Himalayan yeti, sasquatch (Bigfoot) from North America, almasty from Russia, orang pendek from Sumatra, and migyhur from Bhutan, submitting 36 of them to DNA testing.

But, as they report in Proceedings of the Royal Society B, most were from horses, dogs and in one case a human, or were not hair at all.

Two of them, however, closely matched the DNA from a polar bear fossil found on Svalbard, an island in the Russian Arctic, dating back 40,000 years to the Pleistocene period, when much of continental Asia was covered with glaciers.

One of the samples, a golden-brown tuft, came from an animal shot in Ladakh, India, in the 1970s, the other, reddish-brown hair was found in a bamboo forest high in Bhutan described as a migyhur nest.

....

The hairs are either from a new bear species, a colour variant of polar bears or a hybrid of polar bears and brown bears, the researchers concluded.

....

OTOH, their Bigfoot sample was ruled out completely. These results are being hailed as a win for cryptozoology.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Yetis are just a kind of alpine brown bear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 10:34 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

yegyal said:

I know a European couple that ran a hotel in Lhasa for many years, not sure if they still do, but they had lots of first hand experience with this sort of thing. For one, every hotel and guest house has at least two watchers posted their to keep an eye on, i.e. follow

guests. And I'm just talking about foreign tourists here, not Tibetan. They had cops coming in regularly to install "bugs" in the rooms of people they deemed suspicious. And the owners themselves had heavily armed security forces bust through their door on more than one occasion for little more than things they were talking about on the phone. So not only were they constantly listening in on their phones calls, they even had somebody who understood their particular language. So, there's no reason to doubt the above guidelines. I have spent a fair amount of time in Tibet and I have had run ins with the police everywhere I have gone. Nothing serious, but they make sure you know that they are watching you and take down you're info. More specifically, I have spent time in Ngaba, which is ground zero for the immolations. And the military presence and harrassment there made it look like the West Bank, and that was before they started. So again, Jeff, I don't where you come up with this nonsense you spew about how good Tibetans have it and how lax the Chinese gov't is, but it just shows your complete ignorance on this subject. Not to mention the callousness of being a pro-China troll on the Tibetan Buddhism section of this site.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://humanrightsinchina.wordpress.com/2012/04/06/woeser-and-invisible-tibet/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Tsering Woeser (1966, Lhasa) is a courageous Tibetan writer, who offers unique perspectives on the complexities of Tibet today. The daughter of Communist Party members, her father an officer in the People's Liberation Army, Woeser was educated, and writes, in Mandarin Chinese.

Following literary studies, she was posted to Lhasa as editor of the journal Tibetan Literature and began to uncover her true heritage. In *Tibet Above* (1999), Woeser published poems exploring her Tibetan identity. Her next book, *Notes on Tibet* (2003), addressing cultural and political issues more directly and critically through portraits of Tibetan lives, was banned; she lost her job and all social benefits but resolved to use words as her weapon and to record Tibet's past and present.

Moving to the greater anonymity of Beijing, she used the internet to publish increasingly explicit commentaries on the arrest and torture of Tibetans – the appealing literary qualities of her writing conveying her message all the more effectively. Woeser's concern with Tibetan culture continued in articles on contemporary painting, film and literature, and in groundbreaking books including *Forbidden Memory: Tibet During the Cultural Revolution* (2006), which combines her father's photographs of the period with eyewitness accounts she gathered through interviews.

During the mass demonstrations against Chinese rule and violent crackdown in 2008, Woeser's blogs became the main source of information for the world. Relaying details

from her contacts in Tibet, she posted daily reports on the protests, human rights abuses and extrajudicial killings.

Woeser has undergone house arrest and harassment, her websites have been closed down, her movements are restricted and her life under constant surveillance, but she continues to write about Tibet from inside China. Woeser is honoured for her courage in speaking for those who are silenced and oppressed, for her compelling combination of literary quality and political reportage, for recording, articulating and supporting Tibetan culture, and for her active commitment to self-determination, freedom and development in Tibet.”

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 8:41 AM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

AIR said:

Do you believe that the hostile culture on this forum...

Malcolm wrote:

This presumes one agrees the culture on this forum is hostile. Frankly, I don't agree...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Unknown said:

PRC eased off on religious persecution some years ago, throughout the PRC, Tibet included.

Malcolm wrote:

You clearly have no idea about what is going on in Tibet these days. There was some easing up East Tibet, but that too has passed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Osho said:

[

There are two sides, at least; to all political issues but far too often on DW it's the special pleaders and propagandists who seek to stifle other voices.

Malcolm wrote:

You want propaganda?

<http://highpeakspureearth.com/2014/a-fake-potala-palace-and-the-myth-of-princess-wencheng-by-woeser/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Osho said:

Tibetan religious 'in exile' could as easily 'go home' and find a decent living these days.

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds like a really love fest in Lhasa

Not so long ago, the Lhasa security bureau issued a notice to all hotels, specifying:

“...Registration process for people required to report to the authorities: inspect and verify the guest’s ID – report to the authorities – verification by Public Security Bureau – registration – check into hotel – check out of hotel – register time of departure – register the check out time of all guests required to report to the authorities (people from within Tibet: Kham, three eastern counties in Nagchu Prefecture, Biru county, Sog county, Baqen county; people from outside TAR: Qinghai, Gansu, Yunnan, Sichuan, Xinjiang (except for Chinese)). People from the five Tibetan provinces and Xinjiang (except for Chinese) who come to Lhasa on pilgrimage, visit relatives, treat an illness, travel, engage in business etc, have to have their IDs checked and need to report to the local police bureau within 10 minutes after registration (telephone number: 6823809); the local police bureau needs to also within 10 minutes verify whether the person can check in. In case of any violations such as failing to report, registering more than one person under one ID, not having registered according to the regulations, having checked into a hotel without registration, registering under a different name, holding an expired ID card etc. people will be severely punished in accordance with the respective laws and regulations, which will have serious consequences and the hotel may be closed down.”

<http://highpeakspureearth.com/2014/tibetans-walking-out-of-the-flames-towards-lhasa-by-woeser/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Or your posts about how Tibetans don't wash...

Indrajala said:

I understand that traditionally they did not wash regularly, as was the case in Ladakh up until recently. I heard there that some elderly Ladakhis have never actually been immersed in water fully.

In any case, I believe hygiene and sanitation are important. Their absence spreads preventable diseases.

Malcolm wrote:

I do believe the subject of the thread is "How Tibetans really feel about the occupation", not "What Jeff Thinks About Tibetan Hygiene".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you are.

Indrajala said:

No, I can't be qualified as pro-Chinese because I side with Japan on a lot of issues on their side of Asia.

Malcolm wrote:

With respect to the Tibetan question, you most certainly are pro-Chinese.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

More pro-China apologetics...

Indrajala said:

Even if I did identify as pro-China (I'm not),

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you are.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

smcj said:

And so is Hong Kong, but such was not always the case.

Indrajala said:

I don't think anyone would characterize the handover to China as a new occupation by the PRC.

Malcolm wrote:

More pro-China apologetics...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

Prasutagus said:

Unrelated to any particular posting but apropos to this topic...

... dropping in here from the outside, I get this sense of deep tension on the board. This is one of the things I find a little jarring. Walking in from the outside there's clearly some history and some unresolved stuff that would take years for a noob to figure out after reading countless past posts. This is a little strange to me, as I know a wide spectrum of Buddhists in my real life, including one's that might be considered political adversaries - and we don't roll like that. That's the type of vibe I'd really be uncomfortable with in sangha space...

-P

Malcolm wrote:

well, it's not a Sangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

Jikan said:

Who gets to define it?

Malcolm wrote:

I think Buddha already did a pretty good job, along with Nāgārjuna and Maitreya, as well

as their followers.

To elaborate:

Mahāyāna was taught at the same time as Śrāvakayāna.

The practice of Mahāyāna is predicated on the two kinds of bodhicitta.

The path of Mahāyāna is based in the practice of the six pāramitas.

The result of Mahāyāna is the two or three kāyas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

Jesse said:

What's wrong with thing's that bring the community closer rather than further apart? I don't see why it's embarrassing.

Malcolm wrote:

Never mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously dude, this whole trend is embarrassing.

Sherab Dorje said:

Which trend?

Malcolm wrote:

The mea culpa confessional trend.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

tobes said:

I wonder if anyone has taken up the idea posed in the OP, of taking stock and reflecting on where you are personally (ethically) with respect to posting on DW?

It's always easier to find faults in others isn't it?

To get the ball rolling on this, I will confess my own bad habits (which I will endeavour to iron out):

1. As I have already pointed out (and has been pointed out for me) I am attracted to the most controversial threads. Why? I am attracted to arguments, especially juicy ones. Sometimes I cannot resist entering such a discourse, even though it may not be wise, skillful or compassionate.
2. I often post a reply too quickly, without sufficiently reading and reflecting on what the other person has written.
3. I sometimes come to the forum looking for mental stimulation (hence 1 & 2) - an internet fix of half entertainment/half learning.
4. I make crass sociological generalisations (especially to my partner) about where Buddhism is at, on the basis of threads that come up here.
5. I try to write simply, clearly and honestly, but it often comes across as verbose.
6. I like to bring heavy duty philosophy to bear on topics that may not warrant it.

More to come.....

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously dude, this whole trend is embarrassing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: Stuart Hameroff's view of consciousness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, I read some articles on his website where he explicitly states that he advocates panpsychism based on platonic principles.

In the Penrose-Hameroff model of "orchestrated objective reduction" ("Orch OR"), OR quantum computation occurs in cytoskeletal microtubules within the brain's neurons and links cognition with proto-conscious experience and Platonic values embedded in spacetime geometry. The basic idea is that consciousness involves brain activities coupled to self-organizing ripples in fundamental reality.

<http://www.quantumconsciousness.org/penrose-hameroff/fundamentality.html> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Sherab said:

"In philosophy, panpsychism is the view that mind or soul (Greek: ψυχή) is a universal feature of all things, and the primordial feature from which all others are derived. The panpsychist sees him or herself as a mind in a world of minds." Wikipedia.

It seems that you misinterpreted " Orch OR ... which links cognition with proto-conscious experience and platonic values embedded in spacetime geometry" to be the same as "mind or soul is a universal feature of all things. "

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently you did not read the preceding paragraph in the paper linked to:

It is argued here that the physicalist premise alone is unable to solve completely the difficult issues of consciousness (e.g. experience, binding, pre-conscious conscious transition, non-computability and free will) and that to do so will require supplemental panpsychist/pan-experiential philosophy expressed in modern physics. In one such scheme proto-conscious experience is a basic property of physical reality accessible to a quantum process associated with brain activity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 9:33 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

kirtu said:

And traditionally the first Sakya retreat begins with Vajrapani Buttadhamara which is a lower tantra practice if I am not mistaken...

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Bhutadamara practiced in Sakya comes from the Vajrapanjara tantra, so it is HYT.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

smcj said:

Ok, for the sake of discussion let us concede the point--at least for the moment. (That is not how it has been presented to me.) What then are the implications?

Malcolm wrote:

Lower tantra a) is not effective in this day and age. B) lower tantra is not effective for barbarians, indeed the Cakrasamvara tantra explicitly states that if you want liberation,

and you are a barbarian, you better rely Yogini.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Actually the particular point we were discussing is whether you can make the claim that Shaiva/Shakta equates to lower castes, which it clearly does not.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not making the claim, I am point out how Indian Buddhists schematized the conversion roles of the four classes of Tantra, and they clearly equate the worship of Siva etc., with lower castes. Do recall that most of the people who were writing these texts were upper class Indians, not necessarily from Buddhist families.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Indian texts refer to Candalas explicitly. Anyway, the main point is that Indian commentators identified HYT has being for Shaivaites and lower cast people who liked booze, meat and sex.

Karma Dorje said:

You mean the Indian Buddhist tantric texts, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is what we are talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Non-vedic...

Karma Dorje said:

You are reading too much into this. Shudras are part of the vedic fold as illustrated in the

Purusha Sukta, just not twice-born. Even outcastes like Candala are part of the vedic society, fulfilling roles that are considered ritually unclean. This reference to non-vedic people is to people from the Tibetan plateau that are not practicing the Vedas at all.

Malcolm wrote:

The Indian texts refer to Candalas explicitly. Anyway, the main point is that Indian commentators identified HYT has being for Shaivaites and lower cast people who liked booze, meat and sex, and lower tantra for the successively higher casts who are more constrained by ritual purity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Going to the region of the Brahmaputra, he discovered hosts of men and women apparently engaged in non-Vedik practises, swilling wine, eating flesh and engaging in sexual intercourse. All were naked, their eyes reddened with liquor. Yet all were enlightened. Going to Buddha, Vashishta asked how this could be. Buddha is made to reply: "Vashishta, listen! I will speak of the highest path of Kula by knowing which a man takes the form of Rudra immediately!" He then speaks of the practice of Mahachinachara. By this method, all the Hindu gods became enlightened.

<http://www.shivashakti.com/rudrayam.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Karma Dorje said:

Where is the reference to lower castes and outcastes? This merely refers to pancamakara practice in the Tibetan or Arunachal Pradesh region (Mahachina) in the higher reaches of the Brahmaputra, not lower castes in India.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-vedic...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dont conflate Hinduism/Indian religion as it exists now with Hinduism as it existed in the 8-11th century.

Karma Dorje said:

I am not conflating anything, adhikara according to bhava is present in the earliest Shaiva/Shakta tantras (for example Rudrayamala) and consistent throughout all scriptures. It is intrinsic to this tantric system. Do you have an actual source for Shaiva/Shakta being associated with and practiced primarily by lower and outcastes or are you just speculating based on reports from Tibetans? There is no evidence of this within the Shakta systems themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Going to the region of the Brahmaputra, he discovered hosts of men and women apparently engaged in non-Vedik practises, swilling wine, eating flesh and engaging in sexual intercourse. All were naked, their eyes reddened with liquor. Yet all were enlightened. Going to Buddha, Vashishta asked how this could be. Buddha is made to reply: "Vashishta, listen! I will speak of the highest path of Kula by knowing which a man takes the form of Rudra immediately!" He then speaks of the practice of Mahachinachara. By this method, all the Hindu gods became enlightened.

<http://www.shivashakti.com/rudrayam.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Shiva temples are the only temples where all castes may enter. Other kinds of temples have caste restrictions, reserved only for the twice born castes.

But the real point is that Candalas and so on like to drink alcohol and eat meat, and so HYT is formulated to attract them.

Karma Dorje said:

That's not true of all the Vaishnava temples I know of, from Rameshvaram to Vrindavan. I can't think of any major temple that has such restrictions. Can you point to a source for this?

Certainly within Shaiva and Shakta sources it is not true that alcohol and meat were included to attract people habituated to their use. In fact, it was specifically prohibited for them as their character would fall into pashubhava. The pancamakara are only to be used by those with virabhava disposition. I can't speak to HYT and the reasons it was included, but certainly in terms of the Shaiva/Shakta tradition this wouldn't make much sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Dont conflate Hinduism/Indian religion as it exists now with Hinduism as it existed in the 8-11th century.

Anyway, what follows is clearly a description of a Kaulacarya rite, in his General Presentation of The Divisions of Tantras, Sonam Tsemo writes:  
Additionally, the passion-filled followers of Mahādeva imagine the result to obtain is Maheśvara as a saṃbhogakāya. Having receive the complete empowerment in their own system, they train in the intimate instruction of vase breathing, the intimate instruction of the garuda, and so on. Having gathered at the special time, when doing the ritual, the males are seated on the right , the females seated on the left, lighting nine floating butter lamps in the middle, likewise those burn, the tips are turned down, and having placed them in the water, also mothers, sisters, etc., are enjoyed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But the real point is that Candalas and so on like to drink alcohol and eat meat, and so HYT is formulated to attract them.

conebeckham said:

So, if this is the case, is HYT really "transgressive" as so many would like to think?

Malcolm wrote:

For Buddhists born in the upper classes, sure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

unless Shakta Shaivas = lowest castes.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, yes.

Karma Dorje said:

Source? Samayacara is an almost exclusively Brahmin formulation and is the dominant Srividya lineage. Same goes for Saktism at the time of Abhinavagupta et al in Kashmir. Kapalika and Kulacara were outside the varna system altogether and would have all varnas represented in a single circle.

Malcolm wrote:

Shiva temples are the only temples where all castes may enter. Other kinds of temples



have caste restrictions, reserved only for the twice born castes.

But the real point is that Candalas and so on like to drink alcohol and eat meat, and so HYT is formulated to attract them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Stuart Hameroff's view of consciousness

Content:

Sherab said:

Ignoring Deepak Chopra, I find Stuart Hameroff's view in this video quite interesting.

Malcolm wrote:

But panpsychism is contra Buddhist principles.

Sherab said:

You seems to be reading into Stuart's view in the same manner as Deepak Chopra.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I read some articles on his website where he explicitly states that he advocates panpsychism based on platonic principles.

Sherab said:

In the Penrose-Hameroff model of "orchestrated objective reduction" ("Orch OR"), OR quantum computation occurs in cytoskeletal microtubules within the brain's neurons and links cognition with proto-conscious experience and Platonic values embedded in spacetime geometry. The basic idea is that consciousness involves brain activities coupled to self-organizing ripples in fundamental reality.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.quantumconsciousness.org/penrose-hameroff/fundamentality.html> "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Indian Buddhist texts clearly describe how the different tantra series were taught for the purpose of the conversion of different casts. Highest Yoga Tantra was taught in order to appeal to the lowest castes.

M

udawa said:

So presumably us westerners are a modern variant of the 'lowest caste'?

Malcolm wrote:

The four tantra sets are also related to the four yugas, with HYT being connected with the Kali Yuga and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

unless Shakta Shaivas = lowest castes.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Anyway as Sanderson points out, Vajrayana was only a skillful means to condition Shakta Shaivas to recognize fundamental Mahayana principles.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you kidding? This is common knowledge for centuries.

Anders said:

Wait, what? Can you expand on that?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Indian Buddhist texts clearly describe how the different tantra series were taught for the purpose of the conversion of different casts. Highest Yoga Tantra was taught in order to appeal to the lowest castes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Stuart Hameroff's view of consciousness

Content:

Sherab said:

Ignoring Deepak Chopra, I find Stuart Hameroff's view in this video quite interesting.

Malcolm wrote:

But panpsychism is contra Buddhist principles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Dark Ages aren't that "dark"

Content:

Sherlock said:

Nevertheless, people still got on with their lives, many still learned to read (although they read less Classical poets and more Christian authors), moreover a lot of the corruption and abuse of power that people in late Imperial Roman society (the downside to living in a large empire where corruption was endemic) had to endure was gone.

Indrajala said:

While I concede that the last century of Rome was rather disagreeable for most plebs, the reality is that the Dark Ages ushered in a period of great violence.

Malcolm wrote:

Ahem...the Roman Empire wasn't completely violent??? At least 40 percent of its population were slaves.

Indrajala said:

It allowed for the rise of forces like the Vikings,

Malcolm wrote:

Those are my peeps you are talking about, bub...

Indrajala said:

Roman Britain in the Dark Ages went from having relative security to being pillaged and attacked continually.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, the Romans in Great Britain were a really nice bunch of people, so understanding and kind:

Boudica (/ˈbuːdɪkə/; alternative spelling: Boudicca), also known as Boadicea /boʊdiˈsiːə/, and known in Welsh as Buddug [ˈbɨðɨg][1] (d. AD 60 or 61) was queen of the British Iceni tribe, a Celtic tribe who led an uprising against the occupying forces of the Roman Empire.

Boudica's husband Prasutagus was ruler of the Iceni tribe. He ruled as a nominally independent ally of Rome and left his kingdom jointly to his daughters and the Roman

emperor in his will. However, when he died, his will was ignored and the kingdom was annexed as if conquered. Boudica was flogged, her daughters were raped, and Roman financiers called in their loans.

In AD 60 or 61, while the Roman governor Gaius Suetonius Paulinus was leading a campaign on the island of Anglesey off the northwest coast of Wales, Boudica led the Iceni as well as the Trinovantes and others in revolt.[2] They destroyed Camulodunum, which is modern Colchester. Camulodunum was earlier the capital of the Trinovantes, but at that time was a colonia—a settlement for discharged Roman soldiers, as well as the site of a temple to the former Emperor Claudius. Upon hearing the news of the revolt, Suetonius hurried to Londinium (modern London), the twenty-year-old commercial settlement that was the rebels' next target.

The Romans, having concluded that they did not have the numbers to defend the settlement, evacuated and abandoned Londinium. Boudica led 100,000 Iceni, Trinovantes and others to fight the Legio IX Hispana and burned and destroyed Londinium, and Verulamium (modern-day St Albans).[3][4] An estimated 70,000–80,000 Romans and British were killed in the three cities by those led by Boudica.[5] Suetonius, meanwhile, regrouped his forces in the West Midlands, and despite being heavily outnumbered, defeated the Britons in the Battle of Watling Street.

The crisis caused the Emperor Nero to consider withdrawing all Roman forces from Britain, but Suetonius's eventual victory over Boudica confirmed Roman control of the province. Boudica then either killed herself so she would not be captured, or fell ill and died. The extant sources, Tacitus[6] and Cassius Dio, differ.[7]

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boudica> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Indrajala said:

This new trend in history studies to take the "dark" out of Dark Ages is really problematic.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that the dark ages happened because the Roman Empire over extended itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 3:01 AM

Title: How Tibetans really feel about the occupation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

Am I mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

Completely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Who is included in the Sangha in which we take refuge in

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Hmm. So then would the Buddha gem only be Shakyamuni and all the other Buddhas be grouped under the Sangha gem?

Malcolm wrote:

Different refuge trees group things differently, it depends on tradition. Generally however Buddhas would be grouped around the Guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Who is included in the Sangha in which we take refuge in

Content:

Karinos said:

in my humble opinion it very much depends on your personal Dharma practice ...

For example if you already do intensive yidam practice - you'd practice pure vision, in which all beings are Buddhas (Yidam) already, there is no impure or unworthy object of Refuge, everybody is perfect Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Not when you are taking refuge...during refuge everyone becomes Buddha in the form of whatever deity you are practicing, but in the beginning oneself and all sentient beings are in their ordinary form.

Of course, there are some refuge supplications where one begins through recognizing one's vidyā as the object of refuge, but that is only in Atiyoga.

Karinos said:

so, are you saying that for the purpose of taking Refuge while doing any sadhana I should abandon purevision and for few minutes pretend to see my vajra brothers and sisters as well as other sentient beings as ordinary ?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

As far as pretend, it is your pure vision that is pretend, and not the other way around. Remember a sadhana is a way of practicing the whole path of Buddhahood in a single session. So normally we start as ordinary being, raise bodhicitta, gather merit and wisdom and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That doesn't happen in India, where, apparently, they understand the importance of venting toilets.

Indrajala said:

lol. If they even have a toilet.

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty much everywhere I have been, there have been, running the whole gamut, from noisome to sanitory, just like in China.

I find it amazing that when it comes right down it, your primary criteria for whether a country is well run is the state of their toilets.

It is a significant marker that you really don't have much understanding of China if you think their sewage systems are "modern" or even existent anywhere outside of large cities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And sewage systems? What a joke. Chinese sewage systems are appalling. The Chinese apparently do not understand that one should vent toilets with the result that in the evenings modern buildings smell like appalling sewers because of the gas that rises out of the sewer systems directly into people's apartments.

Indrajala said:

They're working on it. It isn't a perfect country. The Chinese at least have long-term plans, which includes increasing the standards of living of everyone. They've gone a long way. Still a long way to go, but they're making that effort.

Malcolm wrote:

Face it Jeff, Todd is right -- you have not really seen very much of China at all and so you really do not what what you are talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And sewage systems? What a joke. Chinese sewage systems are appalling. The Chinese apparently do not understand that one should vent toilets with the result that in the evenings modern buildings smell like appalling sewers because of the gas that rises out of the sewer systems directly into people's apartments.

Indrajala said:

They're working on it. It isn't a perfect country. The Chinese at least have long-term plans, which includes increasing the standards of living of everyone. They've gone a long way. Still a long way to go, but they're making that effort.

Malcolm wrote:

That doesn't happen in India, where, apparently, they understand the importance of venting toilets.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

No bridges, modern hospitals, electrical grids, sewage systems, etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans did just fine without all these things until 1959.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The reason why there is self-immolation is because there is no freedom for Tibetans to practice their religion and be educated in their own language.

Indrajala said:

In the PRC if you don't know Mandarin like it was your native language then don't count on getting a professional job. Everyone in China's borders is expected to learn Mandarin, even the Cantonese who often dislike the northerners and are upfront about it.

If the Tibetans don't learn to read, write and speak fluent Mandarin, they'll be basically unable to secure professional employment in the nation they belong to.

This is not how you encourage economic opportunities for an ethnic minority. How are you going to train Tibetan engineers and chemists? In Tibetan? No, they need to learn Mandarin and learn it well.

If Tibetans don't learn Chinese, they'll lack skills necessary for success in secular society (unless you propose they learn English), and then they'll complain they're being economically disenfranchised.

Malcolm wrote:

Language is culture, and you CLEARLY do not value Tibetan civilization on any level at all, apart from the interest it serves your study of what western academics think about Buddhist history. When Tibetans don't speak Tibetan, they won't be Tibetan anymore, which is clearly China's agenda with all ethnic groups over which it asserts hegemony.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You have never been to the Tibetan cultural regions, so you really have no clue how things are for them. None whatsoever.

Indrajala said:

I've met a lot of Tibetans in my time in Asia. I sometimes meet some who come and go freely out of Tibet, too. I met one eminent Lama in Singapore. He spoke Chinese. Nice guy. He was visiting Singapore and planned to head back to Tibet in a bit.

Some who leave Tibet tell me they left simply because they wanted to visit Bodhgaya or see the Dalai Lama. They're not escaping the police as far as I know, and they regularly talk to their families (who are clearly not in prison) via WeChat. I know others who basically seem to pursue economic opportunities by going to India (free English lessons, job training, a way to get to the west or a developed country on the fast track...).

I'm well aware the Chinese don't fool around in Tibet, but I have to seriously doubt if it is really "on fire" as some suggest.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, you really do not have a clue.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

You can practice Tibetan Buddhism in China.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. Not with any real freedom.

Indrajala said:

Freedom to do what? Self-immolate? Yes, that's prohibited, and for good reason too.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason why there is self-immolation is because there is no freedom for Tibetans to practice their religion and be educated in their own language.

You have never been to the Tibetan cultural regions, so you really have no clue how things are for them. None whatsoever.

Until you have been, you have nothing worth saying about the issue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 1st, 2014 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

You can practice Tibetan Buddhism in China.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. Not with any real freedom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

Chinese have just as much access to consumer delights as we do:

Malcolm wrote:

Bread and circuses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Everything the Chinese government does is a trojan horse.

Indrajala said:

Conversely I've never seen you write anything positive about China ... past or present.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because all we have ever discussed is the present political situation in China regarding Tibet and India, or Chinese Buddhist developments upon Indian Mahāyāna.

In terms of Chinese people themselves in China, I have always found them friendly, but fearful. Given that my interests are pretty much confined to Indo-Tibetan Buddhism, I don't have much more than a tangential interest in China. I was more interested in Sino-Japanese Buddhism when Shingon perked my interest back in the day. But that was a long time ago. I have read many of the classics in translation with more than passing interest, and have found authors like the neo-confucians Chu Hsi and Wang Yang Ming engaging. But I was never so interested in China as to learn Chinese, etc. I appreciate classical Chinese culture, literature, and art, what I know and understand of it, and recognize that Chinese cultural influences made an indelible stamp on Tibetan culture, in much the same way it did on Japanese culture, or British culture on American and Canadian culture, etc.

But I really don't don't have much to say about China in general since it is not my continued area of interest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your commitment to a Communist regime is nothing short of appalling.

Indrajala said:

I'm not committed to them.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you are. You never spare a bad word for Tibet and India and constantly tout China as an example of a good government for the region.

Everything the Chinese government does is a trojan horse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

Hands down China despite its police state is a lot nicer and more humane to its poor despite what western and Indian propaganda would say.

ReasonAndRhyme said:

Even if that were true, would that, in your opinion, justify a chinese invasion of Arunachal Pradesh?

Indrajala said:

No, not at all. I'm just saying that push comes to shove and China forces India into a corner they might demand as a concession Arunachal Pradesh.

Malcolm wrote:

They have already gone down that road. There are massive craters in Arunachal in the ground from artillery that was exchanged on both sides during one of their unofficial conflicts. The Chinese backed off. But they constantly push. There are regular incursions by the Chinese in Pemakö for example. One only hopes that the Chinese aggression does not go too far.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

But things are now improving under Chinese influence. If Nepal really becomes friendly, then their infrastructure and energy problems could be quickly fixed. Nepalese people are not crying out for human rights.

Impunity has continued for human rights violations, including for thousands of unlawful killings, disappearances, abductions, and torture that occurred during the war. Violence and insecurity plague some areas of the country, where armed groups operate largely with impunity. Severe poverty remains a serious concern; and women, lower castes, and ethnic minorities continue to face discrimination.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.amnestyusa.org/our-work/countries/asia-and-the-pacific/nepal> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Your commitment to the Exile Tibetan cause despite not being Tibetan is noteworthy.  
Your commitment to a Communist regime is nothing short of appalling.

Quite Frankly Jeff, when it comes to the issue of India and Tibet, you are basically trolling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

Hands down China despite its police state is a lot nicer and more humane to its poor despite what western and Indian propaganda would say.

Malcolm wrote:

I have also been to China, and the picture you paint is distorted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

Arunachal Pradesh would do fine under China.

ReasonAndRhyme said:

So for you "24/7 electricity and proper plumbing" are of higher value than human rights and freedom of religion? You really need to sort out your priorities.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, that does not exist in Nepal. In fact, there are regular shortages of everything, much worse than ever before. I have friends who have maintained a house in Katmandhu since the '80's., not Buddhists, and they report that Nepal just gets worse and worse in everyway since the old king died and the Chinese have spread their influence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

In fact, as Nepal slowly becomes a client state of China things have been improving.

Malcolm wrote:

That just goes to show how little experience you have in Nepal, even if you have spent a fair amount of time there in the past few years. Things were much better under the old king, the one who was murdered.

Indrajala said:

Arunachal Pradesh would do fine under China.

Malcolm wrote:

Your continued apologetics for China are nothing short of amazing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: New China map shows Arunachal Pradesh as part of Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

Geographically Arunachal Pradesh might be considered part of the geographic expanse of Tibet, so their claim isn't bogus.

Malcolm wrote:

Geographically and ethnically, Arunachal Pradesh was what was classically referred to as "Mon" by the Tibetans. The Tibetans recognized it as region culturally and ethnically separate from themselves.

Their claims is as bogus as including the greater Tibet on their maps as part of China.

Dude, I honestly wonder sometimes if the PRC cuts you a check.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities

Content:

tobes said:

It would be great if members could use this thread to reflect a little on where we're at at the moment, and where we might aspire to go. If there is a gap, what might the cause be, and how could it be bridged?

Malcolm wrote:

The gaps are 1) education 2) experience 3) traditions 4) faith.

tobes said:

That should not be the case.

Malcolm wrote:

When has it ever been otherwise on a religious forum?

tobes said:

What I'm saying is that I'm not convinced that this ought to be the basic culture of an online Buddhist community.

Malcolm wrote:

It will always be the basic culture of a forum composed of people who value their own opinions higher than that of others.

tobes said:

i.e. first instinct in reading, replying etc would be to be supportive. We're all practicing a tough way which is afar from mainstream culture. An online forum for Buddhists should be a resource for friendly support, where every poster from the most enlightened to the least enlightened finds some dharma friends to lean on. Get a bit of encouragement, advice etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Correcting wrong views such as negation of rebirth, karma, etc., is supportive.

And in fact there is more supportive posting than unsupportive posting at DW. You just happen to be most attracted to the controversial threads.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Who is included in the Sangha in which we take refuge in

Content:

Karinos said:

in my humble opinion it very much depends on your personal Dharma practice ...  
For example if you already do intensive yidam practice - you'd practice pure vision, in which all beings are Buddhas (Yidam) already, there is no impure or unworthy object of Refuge, everybody is perfect Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Not when you are taking refuge...during refuge everyone becomes Buddha in the form of whatever deity you are practicing, but in the beginning oneself and all sentient beings are in their ordinary form.

Of course, there are some refuge supplications where one begins through recognizing one's vidyā as the object of refuge, but that is only in Atiyoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 9:36 AM

Title: Re: The realm of wordly protectors?

Content:

Luke said:

Which realm do the worldly protectors belong to?

haha said:

Generally, they belong to Caturmaharajika or Four Guardian Kings. For example, nagas are under the control of Virupaksya. There are many tree spirits and wealth related deities who are under the control of Vaishravana. so on.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is really not the case. There are many worldly guardians who do not fit this scheme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 9:34 AM

Title: Re: The realm of wordly protectors?

Content:

Luke said:

Which realm do the worldly protectors belong to? Are they devas, asuras, or hungry ghosts? Often on English pages, they use words such as "goddess" or "spirit" or "deity" so it's often not clear how they correspond to the six realms of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

They are generally very powerful pretas.

kirtu said:

Do they then suffer privation like the other pretas?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Not all pretas suffer privation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 29th, 2014 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Can someone translate this Tibetan script?

Content:

grandeur said:

Is someone able to read this and translate this to English?

Thanks in advance!

Malcolm wrote:

It looks like:

Sra ram Oṃ pa tī gram

tu ra ba nā ma sa

Or

མ་རྩ་ལྟོ་པ་ཏི་གམ་  
ཏུ་ར་བ་ན་མ་ས

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 29th, 2014 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Cups are dependently arisen as are their contents. Emptiness is a concept about this dependent nature. Emptiness isn't a property of the cup.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not a concept about cups. Cups are empty. Just like everything else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 29th, 2014 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Can someone translate this Tibetan script?

Content:

grandeur said:

Is someone able to read this and translate this to English?

Thanks in advance!

Malcolm wrote:

Its not really Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 28th, 2014 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, common Vajrayāna teachings hold that appearances are really just mental factors, events triggered by traces which are activated in the ālayavijñāna.

Dzogchen maintains however that appearances are the rtsal of wisdom, not mental factors. Everything we perceive as external is the five lights of wisdom misconstrued as



the external elements because of the imputing ignorance and so on.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, but I still don't see what that would have to do with, for example, saying that beings in the formless realms have physical bodies.

Malcolm wrote:

That has to do with other issues specific to Dzogchen, such as the assertion that all sentient beings have the four lamps, which requires that they have eyes, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 28th, 2014 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, this is something I don't understand. You have said that the view of Vajrayana in general is that there is nothing "out there", so what do words like "matter" even mean in this context, if there are only appearances?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen has a slightly different take on things in this respect than common Vajrayāna.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, so can you explain that? This is very interesting to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, common Vajrayāna teachings hold that appearances are really just mental factors, events triggered by traces which are activated in the ālayavijñāna.

Dzogchen maintains however that appearances are the rtsal of wisdom, not mental factors. Everything we perceive as external is the five lights of wisdom misconstrued as the external elements because of the imputing ignorance and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 28th, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

...you mean when you are claiming they are physical you are falling into dualistic error.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it means that in Padmsambhava's Dzogchen there is no entity called "consciousness" which can be found separate from the five elements. Khenpo Ngachung points out that it is a special tenet of Dzogchen to hold that there are no realms where beings do not have physical bodies, including the so called "formless

realms".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 28th, 2014 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata realisation Poll

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting to note we have three fully deluded people who think they have fully realized emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 28th, 2014 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Anyway as Sanderson points out, Vajrayana was only a skillful means to condition Shakta Shaivas to recognize fundamental Mahayana principles.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you kidding? This is common knowledge for centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 28th, 2014 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, this is something I don't understand. You have said that the view of Vajrayana in general is that there is nothing "out there", so what do words like "matter" even mean in this context, if there are only appearances?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen has a slightly different take on things in this respect than common Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 28th, 2014 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

If you say so. I'm not willing to contradict my teacher in whose realization I trust, and upon whom my realization depends. My teacher explained the vayu and bindu is just a

visualization or a kind of reflection. Keyword is refined. It's at the level of consciousness which is beyond physical. Whatever fine matter is in the bardo being it lost its connection to the corpse.

Malcolm wrote:

I do say so. Refined means processed through digestion, in this case, the lungs.

Yes, these things are just a visualization WHEN WE ARE visualizing them for the purpose of gtummo and so on. But there is no point to HOLDING THE BREATH if the vāyu is not just the element of air in the body.

Sam, you have clearly not understood the distinction between how we visualize things when we practice and how they naturally exist in our karmically developed body.

In Dzogchen the distinction between matter and consciousness is abandoned as an error. This is very clearly explained by Padmasambhava in the Khandro Nyinthig: After first being created by the energy [rtsal] of wisdom, in the middle, as it was not recognized that the body of the refined part of the assembled elements actually is the five wisdoms, since this was not realized through intellectual views, the non-sentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it. Here, it is actually five wisdoms to begin with; in the middle, when the body is formed from assembly of the elements through ignorance grasping onto those [five wisdoms] also, it is actually the five wisdoms. The five aggregates, sense organs, and afflictions also are actually the five wisdoms. In the end, one transcends accepting, rejecting, proofs, and negations since those are realized to be real. As such, the sign of non-duality is [the body] disappearing into wisdom without any effluents because the critical point of the non-duality or sameness of the non-sentient and the sentient was understood according to the Guru's intimate instruction.

This is why it is crazy to deny that the nāḍīs, vāyus and bindus are not physical. When you claim they are non-physical you are just falling into a totally dualistic error.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....HmMMM

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

View does not necessarily mean doctrine, and if Aryadeva means to say doctrine I have to disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

What he specifically says is:

If seen correctly, the supreme place,

if seen partially, excellent destinations,

therefore, the wise always develop their intelligence

contemplating their inner nature.

Chadrakirti adds:

If there reality is seen correctly with knowledge of the ultimate, the supreme place, nirvana, is obtained. If seen partially, i.e., a little, there is the excellent place of devas and humans. Why? If wisdom sees completely, one attains nirvana, if not completely, then an excellent place. The wise must always engage their intellects on the inner nature.

So what is this ultimate Aryadeva speaks of?

Though existence, non-existence, both  
and neither are taught,  
are not all "medicines"  
from the perspective of an illness?

Candra notes:

Because the teaching of existence, nonexistence and so on are for engaging the mind on the inner nature, whatever is shown to be without either, that demonstrates the ultimate.

Thus, realization proceeds from one's view and is measurable according to how complete or incomplete that view is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....HmMMM

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As Aryadeva notes, realization comes from one's view.

dzogchungpa said:

Did he prove that?

Malcolm wrote:

Considering he was a bodhisattva on the stages, I would say yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Isn't he blue?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, so it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But you also must understand that the human form is the primordial form of all sentient beings.

dzogchungpa said:

This is an interesting statement, but I'm not sure what it means. Can you explain a little more?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that the Adi Buddha has one face and two hands, two legs and looks like a human being. Accordingly, this is the primordial form of all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

...

Malcolm wrote:

The central channel is physical. Period.

But you are free to believe whatever you like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Legend? Are you implying that might not be literally true?

Malcolm wrote:

Legend:

1 a traditional story sometimes popularly regarded as historical but unauthenticated

dzogchungpa said:

If it's in the Vima Nyingthig, what more authentication do you want?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't need anymore than that, but I am not everyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Dra Thalgyur was originally taught when and where? Another eon, another planet.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to the legend presented in the Vima Nyinthig, by Nangwa Dampa in a the first eon, etc., up to the present time.

dzogchungpa said:

Legend? Are you implying that might not be literally true?

Malcolm wrote:

Legend:

1 a traditional story sometimes popularly regarded as historical but unauthenticated

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Dra Thalgyur was originally taught when and where? Another eon, another planet.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to the legend presented in the Vima Nyinthig, by Nangwa Dampa in a the first eon, etc., up to the present time.

Crazywisdom said:

Dzogchen is currently taught on 13 worlds.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, thirteen buddhafiels, yes.

But you also must understand that the human form is the primordial form of all sentient beings. This is very clearly explained in the cycle of Dzogchen teachings called Gongpa Zangthal.

IN any case, this is not really appropriate to discuss in public.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

They are channels of light. Light channels.

Malcolm wrote:

CCD was only referring certain channels, not all channels.

Crazywisdom said:

He was also referring to the main three.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he wasn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Dzogchen is like that, symbolized by the ancient alien masters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

They are channels of light. Light channels.

Lotus\_Bitch said:

This alludes to the elements in their refined form? "Form" as in the elements which comprise the rupa skandha.

Malcolm wrote:

All the channels form during gestation. If you read the tantras this is very clearly explained. This is why in Kalacakra the periods of gestation are described, as well as the sgra thal 'gyur and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

They are channels of light. Light channels.

Malcolm wrote:

CCD was only referring certain channels, not all channels.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 26th, 2014 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts

Content:

rachmiel said:

Everything is transient.

Malcolm wrote:

Apart from the ultimate, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 26th, 2014 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

The ultimate truth is recognizing that the oasis is actually a mirage.

rachmiel said:

"More" ultimate imo: no oasis, no mirage, no ultimate truth. Just ... \_\_\_\_\_  
(pure experience) .

Malcolm wrote:

Experience is not ultimate since it is transient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

daverupa said:

Form derived from the four great elements can be nonphysical, as I edited, so translating 'rupa' as 'matter' begs the question.



Malcolm wrote:

No, there is nothing non-physical that is derived from the four great elements, hence in this context, "matter" is the correct rendering. Where rūpa means the object of the eye, there "form" is just fine.

Further, the Abhidharmakośaṭīkālakṣaṇānusāriṇī clarifies:

If it is asked what nāma is in the sutras that analyze nāmarūpa, [nāma] is the four aggregates that are non-material, i.e., vedanaskandha up to vijñānaskandha. If it is asked what rūpa is, anything which is rūpa is all of that which is the four great elements or uses the four elements as a cause.

Further, when we come to Mahāyāna sources, the Āryānandagarbhāvākṛāntinirdeśa states:

Whatever is consciousness, that is called "nāma".

Or the Āryānantamukhapariśodhananirdeśaparivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

All phenomena are described by the conventions name [nāma] and sign [nimitta].

Therein, whatever is a sign, this is the four great elements termed as rūpa. Whatever is nāma, that is the four aggregates designated as ārupa..."

In general, we can understand that nāmarūpa also refers to the moment after conception during gestation, prior to the development of the six sense organs — the period roughly up to the 19th week of gestation. For example, the

Vyaktapadāsuhrillekhaṭīkā states:

If it asked what is name and form, after the time of conception in the mother's womb, it the non-material aggregates such as sensation and so on, and the material aggregate of the elements and their products.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, in the Vibhanga, it is clearly stated that the four mental skandhas are considered nāma, and the material aggregate, rūpa, is considered made up of the substances of the four great elements.

daverupa said:

Something along different lines can be found:

SN 12.2 said:

And what, bhikkhus, is name-and-form? Feeling, perception, volition, contact, attention: this is called name. The four great elements and the form derived from the four great elements: this is called form. Thus this name and this form are together called name-and-form.

daverupa said:

There's no reason to consider that namarupa needs to encompass the aggregates, especially since sankhara already happened in the dependent origination chain &

vinnana isn't part of namarupa, while in addition 'contact' is based on the sense spheres which follow namarupa in the chain.

Namarupa is not mental(ity)-material(ity), and there is no implicit substance dualism in the term.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is an implicit substance dualism in the term.

"Feeling, perception, volition, contact, attention: this is called name. The four great elements and the matter derived from the four great elements: this is called matter. "

Nāma covers mental events; rūpa, matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I think that the Buddhist conception of 'substance' is different to the modern one, on the grounds that their idea of momentary dharmas, is that they are moments of experience. They are neither, therefore, 'self-existent', nor really objective, in the way that materialist atomism conceives of them.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddhist conception of substance are you talking about? I was referring the Vaibhaṣika concept of dravya.

In any event, Jayarava is clearly wrong when he claims that Buddhism in general does not propose a kind substance dualism. It is implicit in the term nāmarūpa. For example, in the Vibhanga, it is clearly stated that the four mental skandhas are considered nāma, and the material aggregate, rūpa, is considered made up of the substances of the four great elements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There is nothing wrong with perceptions in and by themselves. As you know it is the grasping and craving that goes along with perceptions that is the problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Perceptions, in and of themselves, are conditioned, afflicted phenomena, unless they are connected with the path dharmas.

Andrew108 said:

What you are doing here is creating an ultimate that no one can get or that is so far away that to even bring it to mind is to create more clinging and more frustration.

Malcolm wrote:

I am reporting the ultimate that is described by the Buddha in many sūtras. I am not creating anything.

Andrew108 said:

I think that is the problem I've found with your approach over the years. You are not giving space or allowance for a natural fact - the fact that things are released in themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, and yet sentient beings like you and I continue to suffer, take things personally, wander in delusion -- so obviously this "fact that things are released in themselves" is not very useful.

Andrew108 said:

I find the picture you paint of 'the ultimate' to be essentially a personal projection rather than natural invariance.

Malcolm wrote:

Blame the Buddha, it is his Dharma I report, not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts

Content:

rachmiel said:

What I meant was could you speak a bit more about the "non-conceptual, unconstructed ultimate truth" you mentioned in the context of Buddhist teachings.

I understand the ultimate truth of two truths to be simply:

Everything is empty of inherent existence: impermanent, dependent on causes and conditions.

This is something that can be expressed quite clearly.

Malcolm wrote:

That is the enumerated ultimate, i.e., it is conceptual, verbally formulated, a construction.

rachmiel said:

It seems like you're talking about another type of (take on) ultimate truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimate truth is inexpressible, as the Ārya-pitāputrasamāgamana-sūtra states:

Whatever is ultimate, that is inexpressible.

Ārya-sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatārajñānālokālaṃkāra-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

Mañjuśrī, so-called "emptiness" is an expression for stopping clinging to the non-empty, but, Mañjuśrī, it is said a dharma called "empty" is never perceived in the ultimate, it is a proliferation.

As Śāntideva clearly points out:

The ultimate is not within the experiential sphere of the mind,  
the mind is described as relative.

rachmiel said:

One that's closer to the notion of an ultimate ground, Brahman: beyond thought and mind. Yes? No?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not that.

Please read any good commentary on the Bodhicaryāvatara concerning this verse for more clarification.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

I'm not interested in promoting or defending Buddhist traditional beliefs. I assume that's what most can't understand. I try to follow the truth wherever it might lead, because I value truth more than \*meaning\*, or traditional beliefs.

Malcolm wrote:

You are just following delusion. You will not find any truth, much less meaning, with your present methodology. You will just die alone, confused, and afraid. What a waste of a precious human birth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

And it seems we are back to the Buddha having a mistaken belief that he couldn't teach successfully.

Malcolm wrote:

If you would like to think that Buddhas have mistaken beliefs, I guess I am not the one to shake you of that notion, as mistaken as it is.

shel said:

Arhats and bodhisattvas are beyond my experience. Are they beyond yours?

Malcolm wrote:

I have met Buddhas and count them as my teachers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

Not sure if this is within the topic bounds but his students didn't understand, and therefore none of their descendant students understood... so why is lineage so important in Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously, some of Buddha's students did understand since they became arhats and bodhisattvas as a result of his teaching. Not sure what your conceptual block is about this. It seems you just have random shifting objections to whatever anyone says to you, hence the reason why people think you are merely trolling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 6:58 AM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Jayarava said:

The question then is, "What is a dharma?" For early Buddhist texts and through the early and middle Abhidharma period dharmas are events, not entities or substances.

Malcolm wrote:

"Event", "entity", and "substance" are not mutually exclusive terms; i.e. substantial entities are involved in events. This is most certainly the Vaibhāṣika perspective.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 12:49 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Lotus\_Bitch said:

If I may so myself sir, this demonstratively portrays a selectively narrow account of the "early Buddhist texts"! Here, the Buddha describes the 10 powers of a Tathagata:

Malcolm wrote:  
Oh yes, but this isn't "early"

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 12:15 AM  
Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm  
Content:

kirtu said:  
As it is now, the Olcott design is easily recognizable world wide.

Malcolm wrote:  
Who cares?

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, June 25th, 2014 at 12:08 AM  
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts  
Content:

Andrew108 said:  
Both truths - relative and ultimate are conventional. Or within the realm of the conventional.

Malcolm wrote:  
As conceptual constructs the two truths are relative. There is however a non-conceptual, unconstructed ultimate truth.

rachmiel said:  
Please speak a bit more about this. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:  
There isn't anything really more to say. The non-enumerable ultimate truth is inexpressible, can only be realized, not discussed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So called secular Buddhism or Buddhist Modernism is a lot about going back to these early Buddhist texts and taking them very seriously. We know quite a lot about which texts are early or not.

heart said:

Are you saying there are older Buddhist text than the Gandhāran texts or are you just repeating your favorite assumptions?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It just text critical materialism, that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Poll to end Polls

Content:

Anders said:

I am missing some options here. Where is neither yes, no, nor maybe? Or neither yes, no, nor maybe nor not neither yes, no, nor maybe?

I don't think this poll is representative. All we've learned from this is the agenda of the OP imo.

Malcolm wrote:

All of those options are built into the poll, it is quite exhaustive...

You see, neither yes, no, nor maybe is covered by not selecting anything.

"neither yes, no, nor maybe nor not neither yes" is covered by voting no.

It just depends on your dialectical fortitude...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Both truths - relative and ultimate are conventional. Or within the realm of the conventional.

Malcolm wrote:

As conceptual constructs the two truths are relative. There is however a non-conceptual, unconstructed ultimate truth.

Andrew108 said:

It's not difficult to experience an ultimate truth. We are experiencing them all the time.

Malcolm wrote:

No, A108, this is false. The definition of an ultimate truth in Madhyamaka is that it is an object of a truthful cognition. In general, our cognitions are not truthful, that is to say the objects we apprehend are not apprehended with truthful cognitions. Thus, it is completely wrong to say that we are experiencing ultimate truths all the time. Making such claims undermines the path, and causes foolish sentient beings like you and I to imagine that our deluded perceptions are veridical when in fact they are false and merely lead to suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm

Content:

kirtu said:

He's right about that...

Malcolm wrote:

Well then...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm

Content:

Alfredo said:

as does every Buddhist group that flies the Buddhist flag (created by Col. Olcott).

Malcolm wrote:

Which is of course why I won't fly one.

kirtu said:

Oh come on! Practically everyone except for the Japanese and Koreans fly the Olcott created flag. And he ditched the Theosophists anyway.



Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, won't do it. One day I had a very interesting conversation with Norbu Rinpoche about this. He basically said to me that the so-called "Buddhist" flag was politics that had nothing do with the Dharma; that if there was a true Buddhist flag is was the victory banner (dhvaja).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 9:51 PM

Title: Poll to end Polls

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well should we?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....HmMMM

Content:

Alfredo said:

as does every Buddhist group that flies the Buddhist flag (created by Col. Olcott).

Malcolm wrote:

Which is of course why I won't fly one.

This is the real Buddhist flag:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Music time

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

Sherlock said:

Dzogchen teachings come from Buddhas.

Personally I voted Nikayas/Agamas, Mahayana Sutras.

AFAIK, the tantras largely don't come from the historical Nirmanakaya Shakyamuni, except some "kriya tantra" texts. They come from Sambhogakaya Buddhas and are timeless in a way that the Sutras are not.

Malcolm wrote:

Sutras, while situated in the career of Śakyamuni, are also timeless. For example, the Lalitavistara sutra mentions that it was taught by Buddhas in the past.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

Vajraprajnakhadga said:

assuming we clear away the obscurations of dualistic mind

Malcolm wrote:

Assuming...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

One thing which is absolutely definite is that belief in literal rebirth isn't the first requirement for a Buddhist now and neither was it then. The teachings once practiced may uncover experiences of rebirth or they may not. But you don't have to start from that belief.

Malcolm wrote:

Keep convincing yourself...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

Vajraprajnakhadga said:

As a Dzogchen practitioner I can only laugh at this poll. The Dharma is all around you. It does not need to come from "the Buddha".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it does. This is why the Union of the Sun and Moon tantra states without equivocation:

If the history is not explained,  
there will be the fault of lack of confidence  
in this discourse of the definitive secret meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

Sherlock said:

Dzogchen teachings come from Buddhas.

Vajraprajnakhadga said:

Yes, but not from Shakyamuni Buddha or "the Buddha" as the poll puts it.

Malcolm wrote:

I deliberately left that vague. For example, the Dzogchen tradition definitely includes Śakyamuni as one of the 12 buddhas who are connected with Dzogchen transmission, beginning with Nangwa Dampa who lived in the first minor eon of this great eon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm

Content:

tobes said:

I'd like to take a more open ended position...

Malcolm wrote:

What's the point? Her writing is total crap.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 11:50 AM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm

Content:

Wayfarer said:

And I don't dismiss 'entheogens' as a valid path to awakening. They won't keep you there, but they sure provide a glimpse (about which, see <http://www.techgnosis.com/chunkshow-single.php?chunk=chunkfrom-2005-05-23-1747-0.txt>, Erik Davis). And a glimpse is a more than many get.

kirtu said:

This thing is totally ridiculous. Drugs are certainly not a valid path to awaking. They will just enmire you deeper in samsara. And they could really fry your brain too, depending.

Kirt

Son of Buddha said:

The Mahavarocana tantra advocates drug use.

I personally dislike the idea though.

Malcolm wrote:

Why do you think this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 6:36 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

This does not inspire confidence. He had thoughts and ideas that were clearly false.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, you are sure they are false?

shel said:

I'm following your lead here, dude. Okay, so he couldn't teach what he understood. Is that better?

Malcolm wrote:

No, at first, he do not teach what he realized. Then, later he made the attempt. Now we get to argue about what it all means because we have not realized it for ourselves. When we do, there will be no arguments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Whatever actually developed out of that should certainly be subject to critical examination, but honestly I think many people are too eager to just dismiss [theosophy], in many cases without even really knowing anything about it.

Wayfarer said:

Seconded. This forum is so dissappointingly parochial at times. ('Who are those funny people with those strange ideas?')

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is so disappointing when someone who has actually taken the time to read something gives it a poor rating...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

This does not inspire confidence. He had thoughts and ideas that were clearly false.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, you are sure they are false?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

So not only did he think at one time that no one else could understand, despite knowing that he understood, he taught this via prose and verse.

Malcolm wrote:

Could you please rewrite this sentence so it is intelligible?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm

Content:

heart said:

I find K extremely dreadful in that film, haven't drunk a drop I promise.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Are you kidding, watching that made me want to get drunk immediately just to get that old geezer's wheezy voice out of my head...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

You're saying that the meaning of the story is merely that the Buddha decided to teach after a God talked him into it? Is that always what the story meant?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, considering that the account is consistent across all canons.

shel said:

Looked at critically, it appears from this that the Buddha said things that he did not really mean.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, the Buddha did not say this to anyone. He remained silent until Mahābrahma requested that he teach. In this passage, Buddha is merely reporting his thinking at the time, and obviously, had he decided not to teach, we would not be having this conversation.

shel said:

At that time he uttered these verses: [393]

“Profound, peaceful, stainless, lucid, and unconditioned—

Such is the nectar-like truth I have realized.

Were I to teach it, no one would understand,

...

It appears that more than just meanings change over time.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, "At that time he uttered those verses" means when he was teaching the sūtra, i.e.:

“Thus listen here, monks, to this vast sūtra,

Taught in times past by all the thus-gone ones

For the welfare of all the worlds.

Listen, one and all, to this great discourse.”

He was summarizing the section he had just taught in prose in verse in what we understand as chapter 25.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

You're saying that the meaning of the story is merely that the Buddha decided to teach after a God talked him into it? Is that always what the story meant?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, considering that the account is consistent across all canons.

shel said:

Looked at critically, it appears from this that the Buddha said things that he did not really mean.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, the Buddha did not say this to anyone. He remained silent until Mahābrahma requested that he teach. In this passage, Buddha is merely reporting his thinking at the time, and obviously, had he decided not to teach, we would not be having this conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

The Hindu God of creation Brahma?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not that Brahma.

Pero said:

Wow really? Which one then? (actually didn't know there were different Brahmas..)

Malcolm wrote:

The chief the class of gods called Mahābrahmas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

The Hindu God of creation Brahma?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not that Brahma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

ReasonAndRhyme said:

As of now 37 people have participated in the poll, out of 4990 registered users. That is less than 1%. I wonder what people mean when they speak of a "silent majority"?

Malcolm wrote:

If there are 5000 people, that means that 500 read semi regularly and 50 people participate. E-Sangha had 50,000 people at it's height, about 5000 read it semi-regularly, and about 500 people participated in discussions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

In a word, the Buddha realized emptiness, right?

In any case, I think pretty much all religious traditions hold immutable truths, which are beyond human conception. In Christianity, for instance, God's mind is reported to be beyond our comprehension, if I'm not mistaken.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not say it was beyond human comprehension, otherwise he never would have realized it, no?

shel said:

Buddha then added:

Even were I to teach, others will not understand.  
???

Malcolm wrote:

But he did indeed decide to teach when Great Brahma pointed out that there were some who would understand, and so he taught, that is the point of the story.

Again, the point is that Dharma is not some evolving set of meanings. Dharma springs from the realization of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....HmMMM

Content:

Malcolm wrote:



Maintaining an open mind does not mean giving quackery like HPB's a break.

Karma Dorje said:

I think HPB's point in *Isis Unveiled* that the scientific world view was looking to supplant the infallibility of the Church is well taken. Whatever one's take on the perennial philosophy is or her fanciful accounts of mediumship, that book was certainly a touchstone for esotericism in the time it was written. Much of it is actually a pretty fun read. It opened doors to a lot of people who were looking for something outside the established norms of the day.

And after all, some of our most enduring and transformative literature is fiction.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, it is fun, if completely impenetrable by anyone without a degree in comparative religion. If you can't bedazzle them with your brilliance as the saying goes...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

In a word, the Buddha realized emptiness, right?

In any case, I think pretty much all religious traditions hold immutable truths, which are beyond human conception. In Christianity, for instance, God's mind is reported to be beyond our comprehension, if I'm not mistaken.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not say it was beyond human comprehension, otherwise he never would have realized it, no?

What I pointing out is that Dharma is not some evolving set of meanings which adapt culture to culture, period to period, and so on. Dharma is not grounded in conditioned entities, it is grounded in the Buddha's realization of reality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....HmMMM

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Everyone has to make choices about what they want to spend their time on, but it doesn't take any time at all to keep an open mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Maintaining an open mind does not mean giving quackery like HPB's a break.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

deff said:

people could accept Mahayana as a genuine tradition leading to realization without attributing its texts to the historical Buddha

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but that is not the aim of the question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

Buddhism is not going to change just because some of the ideas don't measure up to your notions of rational.

Everything changes. Isn't that a primary Buddhist tenet? Belief systems, of all kinds, adapt in order to remain relevant or they fade away into the abyss of meaninglessness. Is Buddhism becoming less patriarchal as time goes on, for example? That seems to be a shift that follows cultural trends, and it's a good trend, or at least I think it is. It's probably just the nihilist in me that makes me value equal rights.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha expressed his realization in the following manner as recounted in the Lalitavistara-sūtra:

Profound, free from dust, luminous, unconditioned,  
I have attained the deathless Dharma.

The means to realize that have been revealed for different people in different ways depending on their inclinations and capacities (which is why we have three yānas), but the essential meaning the Buddha realized is not subject to change, is eternal and constant. It is hard to explain, which is why the Buddha then added:

Even were I to teach, others will not understand.

I think I will remain silent in the forest

But then, as we know, Great Brahma asked the Buddha to teach because there were some who would understand.

My point is that there is nothing we need to adapt. Buddha realized an eternal truth, not subject to change. As I said, while different epochs and persons may require different means to realize that truth, the fundamental realization of the Buddha is immutable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

but honestly I think many people are too eager to just dismiss it, in many cases without even really knowing anything about it.

Malcolm wrote:

Drink deeply then, and be sated:

<http://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/sd/sd-hp.htm> "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

narraboth said:

Yes, but that specific ritual claims that the lineage is from Padampa Sangye, and no Nyingma master was mentioned (at least from what I remember).

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, however, the system of gtor ma empowerments does not exist in the new tantras at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 24th, 2014 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

One shouldn't be too quick to dismiss theosophy and related teachings, in my opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

Have you actually read Isis Unveiled, The Secret Doctrine or Voice of Silence?

HPB was an interesting person, and a lot of interesting people were connected with Theosophy. Quite frankly, however, Theosophy itself is a very strange thing, the original New Age. Most of the present New Age movement has roots in Theosophy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

daverupa said:

Surely integrating a bit more subtlety was possible without vague hand-wringing over "confusing".

Malcolm wrote:

In the moment it was conceived, no. It was not possible. And definitely not after it was posted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Obscuration.

Astus said:

Is that different from ignorance? If so, how?

Malcolm wrote:

Ignorance is an obscuration. Even tenth stage bodhisattvas have it, though at that point it is very sheer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts

Content:

Astus said:

What is there to stop one from this realisation?

Malcolm wrote:

Obscuration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, since Shangpa transmissions exist in other schools than Kagyu. Then there is the fact that they all, for the most part, pass through another Nyingmapa, Thangthon Gyalpo.

Don't get me wrong, I am not dissing Shangpa, it is just that gtor ma empowerments do

not exist in the New Tantras at all.

narraboth said:

I remember there's a torma based mother tantra dbang of chod, black troma, said to be from Padempa Sangye lineage, in collection of sadhana. (for its length it looks like a jin rlab, but I think the name is dbang) Don't know if it has any link to Nyingma tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

The collection of sadhanas contains both gsar ma and rnying ma transmissions, weighted heavily towards the former, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 7:00 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

daverupa said:

It's a matter of phrasing questions to include/exclude nuance. The way a poll is written says a lot.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. However, this is not a scientific poll, but just a broad poll to capture a snapshot of where people's allegiances are.

I mean really: do we need to drill down to the level of

Majjihma Nikāya

Samyutta Nikāya

Anguttara Nikāya

Khudakka Nikāya

Digha Nikāya

Perfection of Wisdom sūtras

Tathagatgarbha sūtras

Yogacara sūtras

Miscellaneous sūtra

snying ma tantra

gsar ma tantra

bka' ma

gter ma

etc????

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 6:38 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

JKhedrup said:

The results are a little surprising in that they reveal a "quiet majority" of posters on the board.

Malcolm wrote:

After Will's attempt at a similar poll, I noted that a number of people objected that they they could not select which canon they found valid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 6:31 PM

Title: Re: All Truth Claims Cannot be True

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He writes:

Western universalism first achieved full-blown expression in the Romantic movement which swept Europe in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. There are four key moments, each of which directly involves India and her dharmic traditions: 1) the 'discovery' of the Orient as a spiritual and cultural, as well as material, resource; 2) the use of Sanskrit to bolster Western racial identities, especially German ones; 3) the development of a narrative of history as the unfolding of a 'universal' World Spirit manifesting exclusively in the European and American nations as opposed to Asian ones (a narrative promulgated largely by one man: Hegel); and 4) the export of this narrative back to India, with the effect that Indians came to feel a profound need to reinterpret their own past in the light of the now overwhelmingly powerful Western 'universal' myth.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism (Kindle Locations 5096-5102). . Kindle Edition.

In Discussion Hegel's theory of history, which underlies both capitalist and communist globalization:

The Spirit is thus explicitly Western. Other cultures are either thrown away in history's dustbin, if they belong in history at all, or forced to emulate the West. Otherwise, they are trampled. World history and philosophy are seen as one single development, and the World Spirit is a single progressive movement in a linear trajectory.

His books are well worth reading, provocative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 5:53 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
bump

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 11:02 PM  
Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm  
Content:  
Wayfarer said:  
Which tradition did Krishnamurti explore in full?

Andrew108 said:  
The various streams of thought within Theosophy. That was the tradition he grew up with.

Malcolm wrote:  
Theosophy is a "tradition" now, is it? [Rather than a hodgepodge of 19th century silliness and cultural misappropriation]

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 10:51 PM  
Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux  
Content:  
Alfredo said:  
I'm not sure how to answer the poll. Some portions of the Nikayas.

Malcolm wrote:  
None of the above then.

daverupa said:  
Hmm.

Malcolm wrote:  
The point of poll is to find out what a broad sweep of people think.

So, it seems only natural that one who only accepts a portion of the Nikayas/Agamas should answer none of the above, because there really isn't space to have a super nuanced poll.

I already excluded Abhidhamma, Vinaya, Jatakas, etc., since these are already widely regarded as extra-canonical by various traditions.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 10:40 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Anders said:

I don't know what you lay into the word 'speculative'...

Speculative:

1 engaged in, expressing, or based on conjecture rather than knowledge: discussion of the question is largely speculative.

Malcolm wrote:

Speculation is not a valid form of knowledge. However, direct perception, inference, and testimony are.

So that is the reason you seek. That is the why I reject the contention that rebirth is "speculative" since it can directly perceived, inferred, and known through Buddha's testimony.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

Alfredo said:

I'm not sure how to answer the poll. Some portions of the Nikayas.

Malcolm wrote:

None of the above then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

I think you're muscling Anders into a position he doesn't hold - where has he said that he rejects anumāna?

Clearly there are inferences to be made in either direction; his point seems to be that 'knowing' on this matter hinges on śhabda, and if one is not enlightened, it is 'speculative' in the sense that we have to take on trust or faith that the person who makes the claim is in fact enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

However, Dharmakīrti has already shown us the way by which we may take Buddha as an authority on this and other matters without recourse to scriptures based on the fact



that Buddha's awakening is a provable proposition. And if we can accept Buddha as an authority on this and other matters, it means that śabda is not speculative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Looking for a good translation of 21 Praises to Tara

Content:

Dharmaswede said:

There are quite a few out there, and I would be most grateful if members would like to share their favorite versions.

Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jens

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is always mine...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 12:30 AM

Title: Sutra Tantra Poll Redux

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Another angle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The second statement "guided by evolution" is a fallacy. Evolution does not guide anything.

ovi said:

OK, you're right, guided by natural selection. Feeling better now?

Malcolm wrote:

Natural selection does not select.

My fundamental point however is that your belief that consciousness evolves from matter is not consistent with what the Buddha taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It's not seen just as a superstition. It's seen as being speculative. There is a big difference.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and this is a symptom of the materialist world view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I already answered this question. To recap — only materialists insist that the only valid perception is a direct perception. They negate inference and testimony as sources of pramāṇa, valid perception.

However, rebirth can be inferred, it is also described in detail in many hundreds of sutras, not to mention directly perceived by those with sufficient yogic facility.

Andrew108 said:

Where did you get the idea that materialists only accept direct perception? Inference and trusted testimony are incredibly important for so-called materialists. It's just that inference needs to be backed up with evidence or eventually be testable. Scientific enquiry thrives on inference.

Malcolm wrote:

The rejection of inference and testimony has a rich history in materialism, starting with the Carvakas.

We are at the same place today, since the special instrumentality of yogically sharpened senses are not falsifiable according to empirical standards of ordinary perception. Therefore, all the wisdom and knowledge of our tradition is just so much superstition according to modern science.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

ovi said:

Consciousness came into existence through form, guided by evolution, this is where the ignorance came from.

Malcolm wrote:

This is faulty for two reasons: one, the first statement is not consistent with Dharma, and rejected by Buddhadharma. This is the very kind of materialism that Buddha rejects.

The second statement "guided by evolution" is a fallacy. Evolution does not guide anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Anders said:

I think you lay too much at the feet of materialists here. There are many non-materialists who would disagree with this assertion.

Either way, whether it is speculative, Pramana, or whether Pramana can be speculative, I think is perhaps too off-topic for this.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth can only be speculative for you if you do not accept inference and testimony as valid forms of perception. So for you, it is speculative. For me, it is not.

This also leads the negative consequence that for you, liberation is also speculative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Sorry I thought your position was that belief in rebirth is essential?

Malcolm wrote:

You misunderstood. Literal birth is not speculative.

Anders said:

Surely that depends on the person?

Barring direct knowledge, how can literal rebirth not be a matter of speculation?

Malcolm wrote:

I already answered this question. To recap — only materialists insist that the only valid perception is a direct perception. They negate inference and testimony as sources of pramāṇa, valid perception.

However, rebirth can be inferred, it is also described in detail in many hundreds of sutras, not to mention directly perceived by those with sufficient yogic facility.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Mkoll said:

I claimed that loving-kindness in conjunction with the rest of the Path can result in liberation. You missed the caveat that I clearly made. Here's your post and my response that started this whole conversation. And here, I'll make the caveat even more clear for you this time so that, hopefully, you won't miss it again.

Malcolm wrote:

Then why pose agreement as an objection?

It's not loving kindness and the rest of the path. Loving kindness is not the path [out of samsara]. The Yoga Sūtras, for example, have a beautiful presentation of the four brahma-viharas. The Yoga Sutras however, do not present a Buddhist path in any sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Poll on Faith in Sutras

Content:

pensum said:

I did vote no Will. And as i just mentioned in my previous comment, you wrote "by Buddha" which by convention refers specifically to Shakyamuni, not to other buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

But in fact they are Śākyamuni Buddha's teaching. Why? Because those teachings appear through Śākyamuni Buddha's permission and blessing, just as for example, in the Prajñāpāramitahridaya, when Ārya Avalokiteśvara explains things to Śāriputra.

pensum said:

Be careful for you are on a slippery slope there my friend. For that still only refers to those sutras describing situations in which Sakyamuni was present or gave explicit permission or blessings. So one still must be precise as to which sutras are being referred to. But more importantly if you get too loose in regards to interpreting "Śākyamuni Buddha's permission and blessings" then your entire argument on that other 80+ page thread is nullified, as any lineage holder could be said to have such permission and blessings; in which case it would make no difference whether they were

accurate transcripts of teachings actually spoken or attended by Shakyamuni or simply composed by another person long after the fact.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it's not a slippery slope at all.

A lineage holder does not have the same authority, for example, as a Vimalakirti, and so on.

These different types of teachings as Buddhavacana are well established. For example, we have suttas in the Pali canon taught by Śāriputra or Dhammadinna, wholly on Buddha's permission.

Of course, we are merely talking about \_sutras\_, of which there are a finite number. When it comes to tantras, well, that is a whole 'nother game.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Is there anyone home?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Anyway, I'm just trying to point out that scholars have different opinions on this issue.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, just like different scientists have different opinions about climate change.

But we know what the majority think, and have thought since the time of the Buddha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Lazy\_eye said:

So jettisoning rebirth, it seems to me, necessarily forces a reinterpretation of the goals of Buddhism, to the point that it's hard to see how it can be called Buddhism any more.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

shel said:

No, he's talking about submission, not merely deferring to an authority. Many Westerners defer to you as some sort (I don't know much about you) of authority, for example. Clearly deferring to an authority is not a problem in the West.

Malcolm wrote:

You will have to ask Shamati what he or she means by submission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

You can negate literal rebirth both conventionally and ultimately. When I say literal rebirth I am talking about an individual's disembodied consciousness both experiencing the bardo, and their individual karmic imprints during the bardo, and then descending into the womb during conception. This is reasonably easy to negate both conventionally and ultimately.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by "an individual's disembodied consciousness"? If you mean Sati's heresy, i.e, that an integral unit of consciousness takes rebirth, then yes, that it just a atman theory. If you mean however that after this life, based on on karma and afflictions, there is an appropriation of a new set of aggregates, well, this cannot be rejected without rejecting the whole of the Buddhas teachings.

Andrew108 said:

Then you haven't explained how you can hold to some practices, such as sexual practices and drinking alcohol, that seem to directly contradict Buddha's teachings and still say with a straight face that your view of these practices is rooted in Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

They are also the Buddha's teachings.

Andrew108 said:

What if this denial of literal rebirth has the same function?

Malcolm wrote:

You are not the Buddha, and you are not teaching tantras. There is no such "denial of literal rebirth" in any Buddhist tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Is there anyone home?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is why it is so easy to make the mistake.

Sherab Dorje said:

And why it should be avoided like the plague.

Malcolm wrote:

Unfortunately, it is a deeply grounded blindness that has affected us from beginningless time until now. And even now, even though we may not intellectual believe that we have a self we operate as if we have one because we still have the knowledge obscuration. Even Arhats do not completely realize selflessness, they realize only the selflessness of persons.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Sorry I thought your position was that belief in rebirth is essential?

Malcolm wrote:

You misunderstood. Literal birth is not speculative.

I never said you have no right to call yourself a Buddhist. I said that your views about this and that are not grounded in Buddhadharma.

Are you sure about that? Isn't that what sparked the thread with Dharmagoat?

Quite sure.

Now about my views not being grounded in Buddhadharma - definitely some of my views are my own. That's normal right? But I do think that you can provide a logical argument against literal rebirth that is in some way grounded in Buddhadharma.

You can negate rebirth ultimately, but not conventionally. Then again, you can negate everything ultimately — suffering, the origin, cessation, the path and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Is there anyone home?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So you can see how this 'flow' is 'atman-like ' without being ' atman '.

Malcolm wrote:

More importantly, you can see how this flow can be mistaken for an atman without an atman being present.

Andrew108 said:

Yes that is true. But there is only a hair width of difference. Like a chain being mistaken for a rope or thread.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why it is so easy to make the mistake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Shamati said:

Westerners have a problem with submission. It contradicts the egalitarian foundation of the modern democratic ideal and I think this is a very large part of culture and discourse in Europe and USA.

shel said:

Hello Shamati,

This is interesting but it's not clear exactly what you are suggesting. Are you for instance suggesting that within religious hierarchies all people are NOT equal and DO NOT deserve equal rights and opportunities?

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty sure they mean that we have a problem with the idea that someone else might know better than ourselves...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Is there anyone home?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So you can see how this 'flow' is 'atman-like ' without being ' atman '.

Malcolm wrote:

More importantly, you can see how this flow can be mistaken for an atman without an atman being present.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Literal rebirth is speculative. You have said that it is essential.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I have not implied that anywhere.

Andrew108 said:

But again and again you are saying that I have no right to call myself a Buddhist.

Obviously I find that difficult to accept. I guess that is why this discussion continues.

Perhaps it's time to agree to disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said you have no right to call yourself a Buddhist. I said that your views about this and that are not grounded in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Simon E. said:

Suffering can and should be alleviated by medicine and therapies

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of Dharma, as long as we are operating under the influence of the afflictions, whether we think we are happy or not, healthy or not, we are suffering.

I think everyone can agree to this as a basic definition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Mkoll said:

Sheesh, you give a new definition to "shadow-boxing": creating shadows to fight with.

Malcolm wrote:

On the contrary, several people here, including you, have claimed that Brahma-viharas can result in liberation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There are many Buddhists who view literal rebirth as speculative. Consider the following quote from Ajahn Sumedho:

Malcolm wrote:

Then they have not understood the Buddha's teachings completely, including Ajahn Sumedho.

anjali said:

For most of us, literal rebirth probably is speculative, if we take "speculative" to mean "based on conjecture rather than [direct] knowledge." Nevertheless, I do believe in literal rebirth because some masters I have great faith in have said it's true based on their personal experience.

Also, I don't think people have really come to terms with what it is that is "reborn." Unless practitioners can come to some understanding of the nature of the knowing quality of the mind, the notion of rebirth will always be problematic.

Just tossin' in my 2 cents to this "energizer bunny" thread.

Malcolm wrote:

There are three forms of valid knowledge in Buddhadharma — direct perception, inference and testimony.

For us, rebirth is one of the latter two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Simhamukha

Content:

alpha said:

How would one know that the obstacles one faces are in fact due to the eight classes ?

Vajrasvapna said:

Some signs are negative dreams, feelings of being persecuted or of a negative presence, fatigue and lack of energy. If the main obstacles that you experience are women, then it

is likely that there is a predominance of female spirits; otherwise, a predominance of male spirits.

Malcolm wrote:

These things are not certain. If you want to \_know\_ for certain, then mo or calculation is the surest bet. Otherwise, you can become very paranoid and fearful, seeing ghosts under the bed everywhere.

In Tibetan Medicine and astrology, we deal with provocations all the time. In fact, when we are diagnosing an illness, we only suspect provocations when a treatment that ought to respond to a treatment is not responding at all.

Diagnosing provocations is a very specialized part of both Tibetan medicine — it can be done through pulse and through urine.

I know many practitioners who assume every problem is a problem with spirits -- this is really sad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There are many Buddhists who view literal rebirth as speculative. Consider the following quote from Ajahn Sumedho:

Malcolm wrote:

Then they have not understood the Buddha's teachings completely, including Ajahn Sumedho.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Simhamukha

Content:

alpha said:

How would one know that the obstacles one faces are in fact due to the eight classes ?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, concretely it is difficult to know without some kind of divination or calculation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

uan said:

Those "materialists" are actual human beings, and those human beings do have Buddha Nature at their core.

Malcolm wrote:

What exactly do you think Buddhanature is?

uan said:

If Buddhadharma is the ultimate dharma, and if a person is ultimately a Buddha at their essence beneath all the layers of obscurations, then it's quite easy to see how any one person can cling, even at a subconscious level, to Buddhism. It's not too difficult to find similar examples in other areas of people having major inconsistencies in their lives. As Emerson said "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am willing to allow that of course the "instinct" to awaken comes from our inherent buddhadhātu -- that is a sensible explanation.

I was not talking about someone new, but rather, someone who decides in the end that they do not accept the Buddha's teachings on karma and rebirth for whatever reason, and yet persist in identifying themselves as Buddhists and so on.

Aren't they new to Buddhism though? We talk about incalculable eons, impermanence, rebirth, etc, and yet 20, 30, 50 years makes something not new? Isn't that a "materialist" view?

Well, it really depends on which relative scale you would like to apply. From that point of view, such people's rejection of the core truths of Dharma arise from traces that are countless eons in the making. Such a sad waste of precious human birth.

Isn't it possible, within the Buddhist schema, to live 100s of lifetimes and still be "new" to Buddhism, even if you were a Buddhist in all those lifetimes, or at least had heard of Buddhism? I don't ask this as a rhetorical question, I'm genuinely curious.

As I said, it really depends on the scale we are discussing.

It's really no big deal that they do this. I mean, which is the bigger deal, that they do this, or that others need to go on about how wrong they are to continue self-identifying as Christians?

I didn't say it was "wrong", I said I didn't really understand why someone (in this case a convert to Dharma) would bother maintaining an identity as Buddhist, having rejected

Buddha's core teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Buddhist wisdom is existential. I don't consider it contains wisdom at a metaphysical level. It's not a doctrine that brings benefit just by itself as a 'complete thing' just by itself.

Malcolm wrote:

Not sure what you mean by "existential" or "metaphysical".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ok Humpy Dumpty.

Andrew108 said:

It's an important point. Although may be you don't see it. If Buddhism sets itself up in opposition to Science then it will die. Science is not completely formulated - it's an ongoing field of knowledge. This is how Buddhism needs to be. It needs to work itself out in people's experience. It needs to continue to offer relevant ways to view and overcome suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma is complete. As a product of the Buddha's wisdom, it offers a complete path of freedom and omniscience. Buddhadharma is not a result of experimentation and revision with new data.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I mean, of course, we all understand that suppression of afflictions through śīla and samadhi will prevent us from engaging in actions that will result in suffering, but what about the suffering we are presently experiencing?

I am all ears if anyone has any real suggestions.

oushi said:

Seeing emptiness of the past, the present, and the future eradicates suffering from the present moment.

I am quite disappointing. Seriously you didn't know about that?

Malcolm wrote:

That requires the realization of the first bhumi — and then only when one is established in āryan equipoise. Otherwise, one suffers just like everyone else, the difference being that one knows that it is fundamentally like a dream.

We on the other hand react to suffering as if it is quite real, since we are under the grip of the deep-seated delusion of self-grasping — at least I am, I do not know about the rest of you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Buddha's teachings are not complete.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually they are.

Andrew108 said:

They are not complete because we have to work through them. Work them out. If we say they are complete then all we need to do is believe them and we will get the results. In this case Buddhism dies. Never gets into the heart. Becomes ornamental.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok Humpy Dumpty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 7:04 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Buddha's teachings are not complete.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 7:03 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Mkoll said:

Thank you for doing the work, xabir. And better than I would have, I might add.

As you can see, Malcolm, loving-kindness can be used as a basis (along with the rest of the Path <--- this should go without saying) for not only non-returning, but arahantship as well.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not really understanding what the Buddha is saying here.

Dhyāna is not a path out of samsara by itself (this is one of the Agamic Buddha's discoveries), but it can be used as a support for the path.

Loving kindness is not a path, but can be used as a support for the path.

Śīla is not a path, but can be used as a support.

Where did I ever suggest otherwise?

What I said was that the four brahma-viharas are not paths, and the Kalamas sutta does not teach a path out of samsara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 7:35 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Lazy\_eye said:

It seems to me that if we are going to define dharma as "strictly that which the Buddha alone taught, and which is not found in any other religion," then we would have to say the only real dharmic teachings are not-self and dependent origination.

That would also mean that karma is not a Buddhist teaching, as it is found in other sramana movements that preceded the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

There is Dharma, then there is Buddhadharma. Buddhadharma is superior to other Dharmas (so we believe) because it liberates from samsara. But Buddhism, a Dharma religion, shares common features with other Dharma religions as well. Other Dharmas

also assert that rebirth occurs because of karma and klesha and so on, and that liberation too comes about from the eradication of karma and kleshas.

It is important to understand the difference between mundane Dharma and Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 7:31 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

uan said:

Therein lies the value of practicing Buddhism, even if it's incomplete. We talk like we all believe in rebirth but really? Do we really? For the vast majority of Buddhists, it will take incalculable lifetimes to reach Buddhahood. Yet we act as if people don't get it quite right in this lifetime, it's a bust, a complete waste of time.

Malcolm wrote:

The whole point of what I am saying is that one should not expect to gain any definitive result in this lifetime. I am saying that one should practice for the next life, always.

uan said:

You mentioned you don't understand how a person can be attracted to Buddhism without believing in rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I definitely did not say that. What I said was:

Shamati said:

on the other hand I dont really understand why a materialist, who have no faith in spiritual existence or realities would want to cling to buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this has puzzled me for years too. I have never understood it.

I was not talking about someone new, but rather, someone who decides in the end that they do not accept the Buddha's teachings on karma and rebirth for whatever reason, and yet persist in identifying themselves as Buddhists and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but the four brahmaviharas are not a liberative path — that is why the Buddha



called them, as well as the practice of the ten virtues, "the vehicle of humans and devas" since they only lead to higher rebirth and not out of samsara.

Mkoll said:

By themselves, you are correct, they are not sufficient for liberation. But, along with the rest of the Eightfold Path, loving-kindness can be used as a basis, a meditation object if you will, for the attainment of non-returner in the Theravada tradition. Please see the <http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.1.08.than.html> for the evidence of this.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not see this as saying that metta leads to the path of a non-returner, but rather, it is contrasting a mundane path with a transmundane path.

Buddha does this frequently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The point being that there are tangible fruits, here and now, from Buddhist practices, even if one does not subscribe to a right view (ie if one is an essentialist or a nihilist). MBT is a perfect example of the advantages of Buddhist practices, even without a Buddhist view.

Malcolm wrote:

The loving kindness and compassion are not buddhist practices per se. Neither is moral discipline. This is saying nothing more than if you are a nice, ethical person, your life will better. Laudatory, but not Buddhist per se.

Anders said:

So what? That Buddhism shares these factors of goodness with other religions doesn't make them any less Buddhist or any less worthwhile. They are what the Buddha taught - That makes them straight up 'Buddhism per se'.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but the four brahmaviharas are not a liberative path — that is why the Buddha called them, as well as the practice of the ten virtues, "the vehicle of humans and devas" since they only lead to higher rebirth and not out of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Lets repeat again what buddhism is about. It is about identifying craving and clinging and then having that craving and clinging dry up...

Malcolm wrote:

This might prevent the arising of future suffering in a future time, but will not put an end to suffering in this here and now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism does not teach a way not to suffer in this life. Where did you ever read this? Buddhism teaches us that we are suffering, why, that there can be an end, and how to arrive at that end. But there is no guarantee in Buddhism that if you practice Dharma you will "suffer less in this life" -- especially considering the three kinds of suffering.

Sherab Dorje said:

There is if you reach enlightenment in this lifetime, that's what the whole Vajrayana deal is about, ain't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course if you become a buddha or an arhat in this life, you will cease suffer. Apart from that, no, you will not cease to suffer. Instread

When I say that "Buddhism does not teach a way not to suffer in this life" what I mean is that Buddhism does not provide any means of eradicating suffering apart from full buddhahood. Certainly even bodhisattvas on the paths and stages still experience suffering since, they possess the twin obscurations on the lower bhumis. Granted, Bodhisattvas on the pure stages do not experience suffering, but then they have conquered death.

So, exactly in what way does Buddhadharma teach a way not to suffer in this life short of attaining some āryan realization?

I mean, of course, we all understand that suppression of afflictions through śīla and samadhi will prevent us from engaging in actions that will result in suffering, but what about the suffering we are presently experiencing?

I am all ears if anyone has any real suggestions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Poll on Faith in Sutras

Content:

pensum said:

I did vote no Will. And as i just mentioned in my previous comment, you wrote "by Buddha" which by convention refers specifically to Shakyamuni, not to other buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

But in fact they are Śākyamuni Buddha's teaching. Why? Because those teachings appear through Śākyamuni Buddha's permission and blessing, just as for example, in the Prajñāpāramitahridaya, when Ārya Avalokiteśvara explains things to Śāriputra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Anders said:

"I suffer [in this life]. Buddhism teaches a way to not suffer [in this life]. It also seems to be the best path for this. Therefore I practise Buddhism." Not hard at all. Nor even untrue.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism does not teach a way not to suffer in this life. Where did you ever read this? Buddhism teaches us that we are suffering, why, that there can be an end, and how to arrive at that end. But there is no guarantee in Buddhism that if you practice Dharma you will "suffer less in this life" -- especially considering the three kinds of suffering.

Whatever suffering you experience is the ripening of past actions not even the buddha's can prevent. The goal of Buddhist practice is to awaken and end the cycle of birth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The point being that there are tangible fruits, here and now, from Buddhist practices, even if one does not subscribe to a right view (ie if one is an essentialist or a nihilist). MBT is a perfect example of the advantages of Buddhist practices, even without a Buddhist view.

Malcolm wrote:

The loving kindness and compassion are not buddhist practices per se. Neither is moral discipline. This is saying nothing more than if you are a nice, ethical person, your life will be better. Laudatory, but not Buddhist per se.

My objection is that people are constantly putting this forward as evidence of tangible fruits of Buddhist practice when they are not even Buddhist practices at all per se, and do not, in any way whatsoever address the issue of suffering.

I don't know what "MBT" is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 19th, 2014 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Poll on Faith in Sutras

Content:

pensum said:

I don't really understand the purpose of your question for, even within the traditional canon, many sutras themselves clearly state that they were not taught by the Buddha but by someone else, for example

Āryasaṃvṛtiparamāṛthasatyanirdeśanāmamahāyānasūtra in which it is Manjushri who is specifically requested to give teachings. (It's a very worthwhile read by the way, and is available at <http://read.84000.co/#!ReadingRoom/UT22084-060-008/12> )

Will said:

We also read that "through the blessing or empowerment of Buddha" such & such bodhisattva spoke. Thus "in some manner or form."

pensum said:

But this is why i picked that specific sutra for in it the retinue specifically requests the Buddha to call Manjushri so that they might see him. Buddha does nothing more than call Manjushri to join them, and refuses to ask or command Manjushri to teach. And then they ask to hear him not recount the teachings of Shakyamuni but rather those of Ratnaketu: Then the divine son Lord of Peace and Calm bowed to the Blessed One and said, with joined palms, "Blessed One, all of us would like to listen, so please ask Mañjuśrī Kumārabhūta to teach."

The Blessed One replied, "Divine son, you yourself should make that request."

So the divine son said, "Mañjuśrī, it would be wonderful if you could give us a Dharma teaching similar to what is taught in the buddha realm of the blessed one, the Thus-Gone Ratnaketu."

And as pointed out above other sutras were composed or transcribed by others such as Huineng. So i, and it would appear others as well, find the wording of your poll question to be too vague.

Malcolm wrote:

The teaching of one buddha is the teaching of all.

The platform sutra is misnamed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Poll on Faith in Sutras

Content:

pensum said:

I don't really understand the purpose of your question for, even within the traditional canon, many sutras themselves clearly state that they were not taught by the Buddha but by someone else, for example

Āryasaṃvṛtiparamārthasatyanirdeśanāmamahāyānasūtra in which it is Manjushri who is specifically requested to give teachings. (It's a very worthwhile read by the way, and is available at <http://read.84000.co/#!ReadingRoom/UT22084-060-008/12> )

Malcolm wrote:

This is an example of the Buddha teaching through granting permission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Poll on Faith in Sutras

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Come on Malcolm, everybody knows Huineng penned the original Platform Sutra. Let's not kid ourselves. Then it developed over a 500 year period.

Malcolm wrote:

The development of the platform sutra is not relevant to the discussion.

It is one thing to have Mahāyāna sutras that transcend time when taught in Akaniṣṭha by the Sambhogakāya to an emanated retinue -- quite another when they feature retinues like Śāriputra (who passed a few months before the Buddha), and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The Brahma Viharas are a Buddhist practice too, and the assurances were in regards to positive circumstances in this life too arising as a consequence of right ethics.

Malcolm wrote:

You are missing the point — they are not a transcendent practice, they do not transcend samsara, therefore, they do not eradicate suffering.

daverupa said:

Neither does mere Sila on it's own, nor mere guarding of the sense gates, yet these comprise essential steps along the Gradual Training. You expect far too much, given the context, while ignoring the rather dense Dhamma teaching they did receive, all things considered.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am merely pointing out that people invest far more in the Kalamas account than is warranted, given its context. People constantly misuse this sutta, a minor text in every respect, lacking importance until it was seized upon in the 20th century as some putative confirmation of Buddhist agnosticism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Poll on Faith in Sutras

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

No. The Platform Sutra comes to mind here.

Malcolm wrote:

No what?

Are you claiming that Śariputra transcends space and time?

The "Platform sutra" is not really called that. Not in the sense of the Indian usage of the term. The Chinese term "jing" has a broader usage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The Brahma Viharas are a Buddhist practice too, and the assurances were in regards to positive circumstances in this life too arising as a consequence of right ethics.

Malcolm wrote:

You are missing the point — they are not a transcendent practice, they do not transcend samsara, therefore, they do not eradicate suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since the very definition of suffering in Buddhism is predicated on endless birth in samsara, Buddhadharma as a path simply makes no sense absent that understanding.

Sherab Dorje said:

Anders said: "for the sake of the fruits it can offer in this life alone." Enlightenment is not the only fruit of Buddhist practice. The "assurances" taught to the Kalamas demonstrate that quite clearly.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not teach the Kalamas a path -- he taught them the four Brahma Viharas and nothing else — which are common with Hinduism — resulting only in higher birth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Hello!

Content:

Ed1980 said:

Keen to completely avoid the NKT. I hope I'm in the right place!

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed you are...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Poll on Faith in Sutras

Content:

Jikan said:

I voted "yes" because Buddha isn't limited by time & space.

Malcolm wrote:

Audiences, however, are...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Shamati said:

on the other hand I dont really understand why a materialist, who have no faith in spiritual existence or realities would want to cling to buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this has puzzled me for years too. I have never understood it.

Anders said:

If I had to guess, I'd say it is because you seem not to appreciate that pursuing freedom from suffering could be worthwhile for the sake of the fruits it can offer in this life alone.

Malcolm wrote:

Since the very definition of suffering in Buddhism is predicated on endless birth in samsara, Buddhadharma as a path simply makes no sense absent that understanding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Dan74 said:

As for Western Zen, my teacher was very traditionally trained in Korea, and even there, lineage is not very important. Lineage, as we know, is not a guarantee.

Malcolm wrote:

That just illustrates an important difference between Zen and Vajrayāna — in Vajrayāna, lineage is everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

How's this for a dilemma: If we accept the veracity of all Mahayana Sutra without applying (modernist text) critical analysis then what happens in the case of Sutra who's content contravenes some of the four seals. Sutras that preach Atman theory, for example. I give this example, as the question occurred to me during a discussion I was having in another thread.

- THIS IS NOT AN INVITATION TO START (yet another) DISCUSSION ON SELF vs NON-SELF (again) -

Malcolm wrote:

I have pointed out before that the four seals are not an adequate test for determining Buddhist vs. non-Buddhist for the simple reason that Pudgalavadins are clearly Buddhists who advocate a doctrine of self (the inexpressible person who is neither the same as nor different from the aggregates).



Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 7:36 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

tobes said:

That's simply the argument given across 81 pages: that every scholar and most western practitioners uncritically accept the hegemonic view that the Mahayana sutras were later developments. In other words, when anyone reads sutras, they read them in that way.

Malcom's argument is that we need to overturn this hegemony.

The fact that there is a hegemony to be overturned clearly implies that we ought not take things at face value; we ought to find some other (more traditional) way of engaging.

Malcolm wrote:

Tobes, quit playing with words.

Otherwise, you are quite right, there is a lens through which every one introduced to Buddhism in the West reads Buddhism and that lens was originally polished in the late 19th century.

That lens consists primarily of the assumption that writing was unknown in India at the time of the Buddha and that all references to writing are proofs of post-Hellenic developments.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 7:32 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Wayfarer said:

Perhaps a lot of what you say is actually context-dependent. It depends on the point you are trying to make, to those you are speaking to at the time. You adopt a certain position for argument's sake, and then pursue it.

Would that be a fair assessment?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I still stand by what I said then, and what I said yesterday. Even A108 is a Buddhist, just a Buddhist whose views of reality are not consistent with Buddhism. This does not mean I would ever deny these people access to as much of the teachings as they can stomach -- it also does not mean that I am willing to cut them slack when they start

advocating changing the teachings to suit whatever biases and preconceptions about reality that they hold.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 8:58 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

By explicitly working on early Indian Prajnaparamita...

Malcolm wrote:

Your statement betrays you right here...

If Prajñāpāramita is the Buddha's teaching, how can there be "earlier" and "later"?

At this point the narrative is so embedded in our thinking, we don't even question it.

You also need to understand that I am pretty much confining myself to historical scholarship.

Sociology, anthropology and so on of Buddhist cultures are relatively new fields, and are often not undertaken by people with serious skills in Buddhist literature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 8:56 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

Now we have the admission, that although there might in fact be a large percentage of scholar-practitioners, all of them, somehow, disavow their Buddhist beliefs for a quasi materialism which implicitly informs all of their work.

Malcolm wrote:

Jesus Tobes, have you ever read any of the stuff that these people write?

dzogchungpa said:

You mean stuff like this: <http://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/11125112>?

Malcolm wrote:

Funny you mention that, she asked me a number of questions about the text she was working on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

Now we have the admission, that although there might in fact be a large percentage of scholar-practitioners, all of them, somehow, disavow their Buddhist beliefs for a quasi materialism which implicitly informs all of their work.

Malcolm wrote:

Jesus Tobes, have you ever read any of the stuff that these people write?

They all adhere to the text critical method which is the consensus view of Buddhist textual evolution in the academy.

For example, our own dear and beloved Huifeng doesn't believe a single word of Mahāyāna was taught by the Buddha. Neither does Jeff aka Indrajala, and I dare say, neither do you. Forget about all these fancy rationals, dreams, visions, and so on. Basically, the simple fact is that most of us who follow Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna don't actually believe that the scriptures we purport to follow were indeed taught by the Buddha in any form at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Interview with the Arahāt

Content:

duckfiasco said:

But I suppose that's why I don't subscribe to the thousands of lifetimes to do anything worth a fart model of some schools.

Malcolm wrote:

That would be common Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

For what it's worth, <http://dhammaloka.org.au/files/pdf/authenticity.pdf> covers a Buddhist Modernism that is pro-rebirth, involves practitioner-scholars, etc., so please note that so far this recent conversation is a rather one-sided characterization of what this sort of approach involves.

Malcolm wrote:

If you accept certain Western historic claims, it might be satisfying for some. But it is still very much a "Protestant Buddhism" with a "Scientific Buddha" at the heart of the quest.

Of course, according to them, I would fall in the denialist camp.

I would not characterize this as "modernism" but more like a different sort of fundamentalism. It is an attempt at setting down a scholastic, "Early Buddhist" fundamentalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Shamati said:

on the other hand I dont really understand why a materialist, who have no faith in spiritual existence or realities would want to cling to buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this has puzzled me for years too. I have never understood it.

Mkoll said:

I would guess that it is the fear of death that we all share. Sometimes, people become more religious or spiritual later in life as old age, sickness, and death roll in. And who can say what changes of heart may take place in a materialist on their deathbed.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess, what I don't understand the most is people like Batchelor who clearly want to revise Dharma with rebirth out of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Shamati said:

on the other hand I dont really understand why a materialist, who have no faith in spiritual existence or realities would want to cling to buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this has puzzled me for years too. I have never understood it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think that scholar-practitioners are taken very seriously.

mutsuk said:

I can assure you that Matthew Kapstein is taken very, very seriously in academic circles. However, I had no idea he was a practitioner and actually I suspect he is not. But his research work is definitely worth the reading.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Mutsuk:

Kapstein is a brilliant guy, there is no doubt he is taken quite seriously. But as you know I am making a different point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

TocharianB said:

Aren't Janet Gyatso and David Germano both scholar-practitioners?

Malcolm wrote:

They are both extremely knowledgeable in their fields. I am not aware that they are serious practitioners. They probably be offended if they were asked.

TocharianB said:

In my understanding, the majority of American scholars of Tibetan traditions in particular are devoted to Vajrayana, e.g. John Makransky, Matthew Kapstein, Jose Cabezón, Jeffrey Hopkins, Jakob Dalton, Anne Klein, Gregory Hillis.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think that scholar-practitioners are taken very seriously.

TocharianB said:

The same cannot be said for scholars of Theravada and East Asian traditions, of course, but I'm a little confused why you're painting all of academia with the same brush, especially American scholars devoted to Tibetan Buddhism, who tend, in my limited experience, to be very engaged students of the dharma. Is the new generation of scholars at UVA, who mostly haven't gotten around to publishing yet, more secular than generations past?

Malcolm wrote:

The requirements for the study of religion in all academic programs is the same — you must subordinate traditional narratives for the academic ones, or seek to explain the traditional narratives in otherizing terms.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Simhamukha

Content:

alpha said:

What is the difference between Dorje Drollo and Simhamukha in terms of actions and removing obstacles ?

It seems that in general the preferred choice for removing obstacles related to spirit possession, black magic, provocations is Simhamukha although as far as i know DD is much more powerful but don't know in what way powerful ,so i've been told.

Malcolm wrote:

Drollo is meant for controlling the eight classes in general.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Dan74 said:

To my way of seeing, the trouble is not with too little faith but with too much corrosive doubt, the papanca borne of too much hair-splitting and intellectualising relative to practice. I've been fortunate to meet several practitioners to whom this entire debate would be completely irrelevant. Not because they are so adamant that the traditional accounts are exactly right, but because their strong practice root has rendered such hand-wringing entirely beside the point.

Malcolm wrote:

My main point is that the traditional accounts have been supplanted by a modern narrative of uncertainty. This can be beneficial to no one who practices these traditions.

In Western Zen, lineage is simply not as important as it is Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Historical Changes in Ritual Implements & Shrine Set-up

Content:

Jikan said:

On two occasions, I've been able to see mid-19th century photographs of Tibetan Buddhist practitioners and some of their implements (one was on display years ago at the University of New Mexico, USA; the other at George Mason University, USA). It seems to me that there have been some small but significant changes in the size and shape of some articles of practice, which seem to be increasingly standardized today. For instance, the chodpas I've seen photographed in practice over a hundred years ago might have much smaller and differently-accoutred damaru than one might expect to see someone using today--or not.

I'm wondering if these changes reflect easier manufacturing processes today compared to pre-industrial Asia, or changes in attitude/expectation toward practice implements, or something else entirely--or if I'm completely off the reservation in my reading of these images.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

There has been some modernization and stream-lining of practice articles since the 1970's. And in general, quality has declined.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 1:01 PM

Title: Re: The Buddha from Babylon

Content:

plwk said:

The Lost History and Cosmic Vision of Siddhartha Gautama

After reading the excerpts from this <http://www.buddhafrombabylon.com/>, I have no idea on what to make out of it.

Maybe, those of you who have bought/read this book or the excerpts do?

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so this is reverse of the Lost Jesus in India trope, i.e. the Lost Buddha in the Middle-East.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

Saddha isn't harmed by history.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you are a Theravadin, and your "history" is written by people who prefer Pali terms to Sanskrit ones, of course not. You folks already have an agenda to discredit Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 11:30 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Mkoll said:

Can you provide a reference? This thread is almost 80 pages long.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=16491&p=239338&hilit=sujato>

Mkoll said:

I'm sorry but one quote from one scholar about one Buddhist school is hardly proof of your words: "Scholars have no idea where the eighteen schools came, and so on".

It would be presumptuous of me to expect you to go out of your way to provide more numerous and solid references for your claim.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not likely to happen. I have been reading academic Buddhist literature for the better part of three decades, I worked for a Buddhist book store at one time, and also Wisdom Pubs as their retail manager in 1990-1. I have maintained a familiarity with the latest and greatest of academic literature especially where it concerns Mahāyāna — when I tell you that it piles speculation on assumptions in absence of actual facts, I mean it. When I tell you that I have observed a number of interpretive fads amongst western scholars, I mean it. Even if there are closeted Buddhists in academia, they certainly cannot write books from the perspective of their faith. Instead, they must accommodate the western scholastic set of assumptions and prejudices about the history of Mahāyāna whether they buy them or not (but they largely seem to). The one thing it all boils down to is that according to the current state of knowledge of the origins of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna, western scholars simply have no clear idea where these traditions are from and how they arose.

But we do. Why? Because we have clear accounts of the rise of these teachings; which teacher brought out which tantras (Nairatma, Hevajra; Saraha, Cakrasamvara, Garab Dorje, the Dzogchen Tantras, and so on). In general we consider that Nāgārjuna revealed



Mahāyāna. And that is all a practitioner of these systems really needs to know.

Their approach does not lead to a living wisdom tradition that will never be obsolete.  
Their approach leads to dead knowledge in a book, soon obsolete.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

many more Buddhologists are now also practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

Very few of those are Mahāyānist in any identifiable way — at most they are Mahāyāna "sympathetic".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Kunzang said:

Malcolm,

Do you think your former self that more-or-less accepted the academic view of Mahayana origins would have been persuaded by the type of reasonings you're using now if someone had presented them to you?

Malcolm wrote:

I would have to admit that is all guesses, mostly conflicting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: The Three Skyes

Content:

Nirvan said:

Hello brothers and sisters

Could some of you give here some explanations of the 3 Skyes (namkha sum - nam-mkha' gsum), important notion in the Dzogchen teachings ?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

It is something you need to receive directly from a qualified teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

So due to

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=16491&p=239338&hilit=sujato#p239338> you consider "almost everything we read by scholars etc." to be a supported claim? This has "taken care of it"?

Malcolm wrote:

This is merely a drop in the bucket of similar speculative confusion that I have encountered in people like Vallee -Pouissin, Davidson, Snellgrove, etc., et al. over the past 30 years or so. Like many people, I gained my first real introduction to Buddhism by taking a course at a college (with Malcolm David Eckel). He told me then he was glad he was a Christian, because Buddhism as a religion to follow never made any sense to him, despite his interest in Madhyamaka.

Pretty much every suggestion of origin, or attempt to pin something down in Buddhist history is met with a chorus of confusion and counter claims.

I seriously considered becoming a Buddhologist, but after seeing how the work of people like Janet Gyatso, Hallisey, Van de Kuip, Germano, etc., turned out, and how destructive, or if you prefer, deconstructive the approach of the western academy towards Buddhadharma is, I have decided to eschew its conclusions as non-productive and sterile speculations. In other words, there will be no living tradition of Buddhadharma flowing out from Western Academia.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Therefore, I have concluded that the traditional accounts are indeed more satisfying.

dzogchungpa said:

I don't find the traditional accounts even slightly satisfying.

Malcolm wrote:

They are that we have, unless, like western Academic scholars of the history of Buddhism, you make a (meager) living inventing and then selling new narratives.

The problem with Buddhadharma in the West is not too much faith, it is too little faith. Not in my case.

Lack of faith is not obvious. But it definitely begins with deciding that traditional Buddhist narratives are just "myths", and dissatisfying ones at that.

BTW, I am not judging anyone personally — people are free to believe whatever they wish, AFAIC. But I have come to the conclusion that some approaches to the Dharma are more virtuous than others, so I am following my own advice in this respect. Everyone else is free to do as they please.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Mkoll said:

Can you provide a reference? This thread is almost 80 pages long.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=16491&p=239338&hilit=sujato>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Given the fact that the whole edifice of the western historiography of Buddhism is consists of a house of cards

daverupa said:

This is yet to be demonstrated, even this many pages in.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I took care of that pages ago by pointing out that Scholars have no idea where the eighteen schools came, and so on. Almost everything we read by scholars, unless it is grounded in some plastic fact like inscription, and so on, is entirely speculative fabrications, and at this point in my life, I find them less reasonable to take seriously on any level at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The people most attached to views here are those who are committed to historiography of Buddhism as promulgated in the western academy, or their pet view of the brain, etc.

I have also come to understand that "Buddhist Modernism" arises out of this destructive analysis, the only thing "Buddhist" about it is its name, but like the Holy Roman Empire that was neither "holy", nor "Roman", nor an "empire", Buddhist modernism is neither "Buddhist" nor "modern" at all.

As for myself, I am not attached to any particular story — I have simply, and finally come to understand that western Academic scholarship on Buddhadharma is destructive to that Dharma, not merely for one reason, but for very many. Therefore, I have concluded that the traditional accounts are indeed more satisfying. They involve less clinging, less proliferation, are more inspiring, and generate more genuine faith. The problem with Buddhadharma in the West is not too much faith, it is too little faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

e-Sangha-like questing for hardline orthodoxy, I wouldn't hesitate even a second..

Malcolm wrote:

E-Sangha was only hardline about one thing really — rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 11:20 AM

Title: Re: A bunch of questions about empowerment, deities and prac

Content:

LolCat said:

Thank you for all the responses people, they were really helpful.

Malcolm wrote:

Recite refuge and bodhicitta. Then recite whatever mantras you have received, focusing on the sound.

Eventually, you will be able to find the correct sadhana and receive instruction. For now, it is excellent if you can maintain the stream of recitation daily.

LolCat said:

I think I do have the correct sadhana right now:

<http://www.garchen.net/resources/Amitabha%20FINAL%20FINAL.pdf> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Would it be okay for me to continue this practice without a teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely. You do your best.

You will eventually find someone who can give you instruction, or you will find the book, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: A bunch of questions about empowerment, deities and prac

Content:

LolCat said:

Thank you for all the responses people, they were really helpful.

Malcolm wrote:

Recite refuge and bodhicitta. Then recite whatever mantras you have received, focusing on the sound.

Eventually, you will be able to find the correct sadhana and receive instruction. For now, it is excellent if you can maintain the stream of recitation daily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 10:25 AM

Title: Re: A bunch of questions about empowerment, deities and prac

Content:

Alfredo said:

6. Since mantras can be pronounced in different ways, depending on local phonology, and have evolved somewhat over time, this lends support to the suggestion that they are derived from particular cultures.

Malcolm wrote:

Mantras are the speech acts of awakened beings — they can be in any language. But they must have been pronounced first by a buddha for a given purpose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: A bunch of questions about empowerment, deities and prac

Content:

Alfredo said:

11. No one really "gets" bodhicitta until they are enlightened!

Malcolm wrote:

This is not correct.

Compassion is the cause of bodhicitta, bodhicitta is the cause of buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 10:21 AM

Title: Re: A bunch of questions about empowerment, deities and prac

Content:

LolCat said:

10. What is the difference between Metta and Boddhicitta?

Malcolm wrote:

Metta is love. [Mahāyāna] bodhicitta is the wish to attain complete buddhahood for the benefit all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: The practices of the base of santi maha sangha

Content:

thewhiterussia said:

Dear people,

According to the instructions for the practices of the base level of santi maha sangha one day of practice corresponds to four thuns. Does anybody know how long is one thun supposed to be?

Many thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Traditionally, three hours, practically, two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 15th, 2014 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

own, which is utterly amazing to see repeated over and over here.

Malcolm wrote:

Given the fact that the whole edifice of the western historiography of Buddhism is consists of a house of cards, it is not surprising it is challenged over and over. What you have are a few phenomena caked in modern speculations which are utterly unsupported. This is case of the whole of Buddhist studies in the west. Not merely studies of Mahāyāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 14th, 2014 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sönam said:

Easy one ... Buddhist version does not reject evolution theory, it includes it in a more complete process.

pueraeternus said:

The Buddhist version of the origin of the human race is that we devolved from deva beings due to the three poisons, our bodies and mind becoming grosser and grosser, etc. This contradicts scientific evolution.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 14th, 2014 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sönam said:

[

Dzogchen view does not say that we come from deva ...

Malcolm wrote:

Norbu Rinpoche subscribes to the origin of humanity described by the Buddha. It is not in Dzogchen tantras, but it also does not contradict Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 14th, 2014 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

North American is Tsiu Marpo. Ocean is Marutse.

Karinos said:

Hi, and which one for Europe please? thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Pramoha

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 13th, 2014 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And if a vidyādhara tells you that you should regard sutras as the actual words of the Buddha, or the termas as the actual words of Padmasambhava you will react how?

dzogchungpa said:

I'm curious, did Sakya Pandita think that one should regard termas as the actual words of Padmasambhava?

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Pandita was skeptical of the nascent treasure tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 13th, 2014 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I see no contradiction in having faith in the transmission of a living rigdzin and at the same time recognizing the reality of the complexities of text transmission over centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

Even though your very notion of a vidyādhara is derived from a textual tradition in which you have no confidence?

gad rgyangs said:

my notion of vidhydhara is derived from sitting in front of ChNNR. I find all kinds of interesting things in sutras, I just dont think they fell out of the sky onto my roof.

Malcolm wrote:

And you know that ChNN is a vidyādhara exactly how? And if a vidyādhara tells you that you should regard sutras as the actual words of the Buddha, or the termas as the actual words of Padmasambhava you will react how?



M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 13th, 2014 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I see no contradiction in having faith in the transmission of a living rigdzin and at the same time recognizing the reality of the complexities of text transmission over centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

Even though your very notion of a vidyādhara is derived from a textual tradition in which you have no confidence?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 13th, 2014 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is what the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna traditions clearly maintain. There is no reason for practitioners of these traditions not to simply accept these accounts, and every good reason to do so.

M

gad rgyangs said:

so, basically you reject the highly plausible text critical explanation in favor of fairytales, and provide no justification beyond "just because".

Malcolm wrote:

Your stance is not different, you accept the text critical explanation just because you cannot imagine anything else to be the case.

You basically do not have any faith in the tradition, which is fine — but then you are left holding a bunch of teachings in which you have no confidence nor reason to believe that they will do anything other than provide you with a few hours of entertainment. Otherwise, if you actually have confidence in the teachings, you cannot really say why you do apart from your own conceptual admiration of them since you certainly cannot believe they come from an awakened source. This is the inevitable consequence of accepting the text critical version of the history of Buddhist sūtras and tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 13th, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

OK, so whats your alternative, fully demonstrable, explanation for the state of the texts?

Malcolm wrote:

They were taught by the Buddha, and then squirreled away by nāgās, devas, yakṣas, tenth stage bodhisattvas, etc., until they were again promulgated by Nāgārjuna.

M

gad rgyangs said:

and this is demonstrable how exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

This is what the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna traditions clearly maintain. There is no reason for practitioners of these traditions not to simply accept these accounts, and every good reason to do so.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 13th, 2014 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

As it happens, I noticed the relationship between the 8000 & the 25000 on my own by comparing them. Yes, its that obvious, even to a non-specialist.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, why not? They are both Prajñāpāramita sutras, the basis message is the same. Even some of the words are the same. In the Agamas/Nikayas there are countless places where the Buddha uses the same phrases over and over again. This does not mean that your contention that one is merely a padded out version of the other is supportable in anyway. It is merely your conjecture based upon your idea of sutra composition.

gad rgyangs said:

OK, so whats your alternative, fully demonstrable, explanation for the state of the texts?

Malcolm wrote:

They were taught by the Buddha, and then squirreled away by nāgās, devas, yakṣas,

tenth stage bodhisattvas, etc., until they were again promulgated by Nāgārjuna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 13th, 2014 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

As it happens, I noticed the relationship between the 8000 & the 25000 on my own by comparing them. Yes, its that obvious, even to a non-specialist.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, why not? They are both Prajñāpāramita sutras, the basis message is the same. Even some of the words are the same. In the Agamas/Nikayas there are countless places where the Buddha uses the same phrases over and over again. This does not mean that your contention that one is merely a padded out version of the other is supportable in anyway. It is merely your conjecture based upon your idea of sutra composition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 13th, 2014 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, I'm assuming you've read all that. Yet, as little as 6 months ago you said:

Malcolm wrote:

No, of course not.

dzogchungpa said:

So, with all due respect, WTF?

Malcolm wrote:

With all due respect, I realized I was wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:  
its as plain as the nose on anyone's face. you're just being stubborn.

Malcolm wrote:  
No, it is not as plain as the nose on anyone's face.

Let me ask you — the Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā is 12 volumes long. Have you actually read it? The Pañcaviṃśatisahasrika-prajñāpāramitā is three volumes long. Have you actually read it? Or are you just relying what some western scholar you read decided?

We talk about these texts as if we have infinite familiarity with them, utterly lacking any humility, when in reality most of us have barely read 0.01 percent of the sutras, let alone the tantras. And yet we confidently make proclamations about their authorship based on the latest western intellectual fads.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 11:28 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
To answer Dante's question about whether the Buddha taught the PP in 100,000 lines, one day, 25 on a different day and so on -- it is not necessary to think this way.

gad rgyangs said:  
i would hope not. a better way to think would be to acknowledge what even a cursory examination of the texts show: that the 25000 was created at least in part by taking the text of the 8000, breaking it apart, and inserting other material in between.

Malcolm wrote:  
That is what some people think. But that is merely a supposition. There is no proof that this is the case.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 10:55 PM  
Title: Re: Critical thinking and Dharma  
Content:

Andrew108 said:  
If someone takes a path based on faith and belief then they shouldn't question liberation or someone else's claims to be liberated.

Malcolm wrote:  
This is a total non-sequitar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

But it seems we're slowly edging towards a position on hermeneutics which is really quite at odds with one of the most persistent themes in many Mahayana traditions (and indeed, many of those sutras ): the intractable gap between concepts/language and reality. And in doing so opening up a new position which seemingly holds that there are two types of concepts/language - one in which the intractable gap is generated, and the other in which language/concepts is reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhāvatamska states:

From one single melodious word of the victors,  
all the infinite gates of Dharma arise.

And:

The tathāgatas fully attain the accomplishment of speech that is without center or periphery in order that all realms of sentient beings may understand it with a single tone

The gap between reality and language is a problem only for us. There is no such gap for Buddhas? Why? Because the Buddhas are free from concepts. So their acts of speech are similarly free from any conceptual restraint that would differentiate their content from describing reality just as it is.

To answer Dante's question about whether the Buddha taught the PP in 100,000 lines, one day, 25 on a different day and so on -- it is not necessary to think this way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 11:34 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Davidson relates:

Malcolm wrote:

One whom no one should really take seriously. He has a huge chip on his shoulder.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 11:29 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

I can't verify the veracity of your claim that the Yogini's Eye was mistranslated, since I don't read Tibetan. However, Haribhadra had a different idea. Davidson relates:

Malcolm wrote:

Not the whole thing, just that passage (as well as the title, which exists nowhere in the text). This is verifiable since Loppon Rinpoche brings up the issue again in Introduction to Dharma. Unfortunately, Jeff Schoening did not translate the whole of it, and the section which mentions the compilation at Vimalasambhava is absent from the translation of his at present, so you will have to be content with my meager effort presented already above (If I only give a citation of the Sanskrit title, without referring to another translator, you are to assume I translated it myself, usually on the spot from the text in question.)

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 11:21 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

I agree that they have ignored this - but I don't see how satya-vacana is going to give you some essentialist or realist account of language. Why is it that now the finger pointing the moon is taken to be the moon?

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that their speech has blessings and power because of the truth of their realization. That realization is what lends "essence", if you want to call it that, to their speech. I have personally observed such speech acts on the part of realized teachers.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 11:14 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Of course. When I said "sutras don't have to be taught by the nirmanakaya Buddha", I was referring to the rupakaya of a Buddha in his earthly emanation. But the

Sambhogakaya can emanate as many nirmanakayas as the situation needs.

Malcolm wrote:

But there is no tradition of this, so this is merely your fabrication and rational.

pueraeternus said:

Not for me. I am not limited that way.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you just make up whatever suits your fancy.

pueraeternus said:

Allied to the mythology of the preaching of the dharma is the problem of the recitation of the Mahayana scriptures immediately after the demise of the Buddha. ...

Malcolm wrote:

Which Sapan resolves by point out that there is no contradiction between the two (compilation by Vajrapani and Ananda).

But the one thing all these masters have in common is that they, unlike you, understand that all these sūtras were spoken by the Buddha during his forty year teaching career, before his parinirvana.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 11:08 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Thanks. I forgot about this sutra. It seems the Buddha forgot about the Mahasamghikas and other sects when he cast his eye into the future? I wonder what reasons Malcolm will give here?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha has the capacity to know events, both specific and general, in the future. That is why he is termed "omniscient in the three times".

M

pueraeternus said:

But still he missed out 15 other sects? What about the Mahayana traditions?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to examine the dream of King Kṛkin (who lived during the dispensation of Buddha Kāśyapa) which predicts the eighteen schools occurring during the dispensation of Śākyamuni Buddha.

Anyway, why are you arguing against Buddha's omniscience? Do you have a point? Do you not accept it? Do you think any phenomena within the three times is closed to a Buddha's eye? Are you merely trying to bust my balls?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 11:03 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Then is Sonam Tsemo wrong, erroneous? In his Entryway to the Dharma:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not very precise. For example, in the Bodhisattvacaryāvatāravivṛttipañjikā we see:

'..such as the Carvaka assertion of annihilation, the assertion of our own Vaibhaṣikas that the conditioned and the unconditioned are mutually exclusive, the Sāṃkhya assertion that all things are the same in the original nature as the three guṇas, and also the Tīrthikas who advocate permanence...'

For the most part we see Indian masters differentiating the two terms. The single place where I see the term mu stegs pa applied to rgyang 'phan pas in the bstan 'gyur is the Āryalaṅkāvatāra-nāma-mahāyānasūtravṛttitathāgatahṛdayālaṃkāra. Otherwise, in hundreds of places the term mu stegs pa (tīrthika) is applied to eternalists and the term rgyang 'phan pa (carvaka) strictly applies to nihilists.

However, it is true that as catch-all term, Tibetans tend to lump all non-buddhists under the heading mu stegs pa. But it is not an accurate description.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 12th, 2014 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Critical thinking and Dharma

Content:

underthetree said:

My difficulty is with manipulating history, conceptually, to make things hang together.



Malcolm wrote:

That is essentially what one is doing when one invents visionary encounters, dreams and visions to account for Mahāyāna sutras which have no basis in any traditional account.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Tirthika (Skt. tīrthika; Tib. ལུ་རྟེན་པ་, mutegpa; Wyl. mu stegs pa) — a proponent of non-Buddhist views.

From <http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Tirthika>

According to this definition by Mipham Rinpoche Carvaka are tirthika: The tirthikas' views embody the gross, simplistic view of eternalism, considering that phenomena are not momentary and the simplistic view of nihilism, the belief that although phenomena are caused, they themselves do not generate their own effects—there are no past nor future lives—or that actions will not give rise to karmic results.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but not according to Padmasambhava's man nag lta ba phreng ba, Candrakīrti's Madhyamakāvatāra and bhaṣyam, the Tarkajvala of Bhavya, the Pramāṇavarttika of Dharmakīrti and so on.

So either the translation is incorrect, or Mipham is mistaken.

Guru Rinpoche lists four types of non-buddhists: *phyal ba*, *rgyang 'phen pa* (Carvaka), *mur thug pa*, and *mu stegs pa*. The last, used for eternalists, is well known to translate the term "tīrthika" i.e. ford-crossers, referring to their belief in rebirth.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Critical thinking and Dharma

Content:

underthetree said:

This is my difficulty with the whole thing. I find it extremely hard to believe the above scenario.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because you are limiting the Buddha's capacity with your conceptual mind.

underthetree said:

Conversely, I have no trouble at all believing in that the Mahayana was taught by Lord Buddha as mind-treasure, as revelations.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a fiction modern Mahāyānists have invented. But this not the tradition we have. The tradition we actually have is that Mahāyāna was recovered as an earth treasure by Ārya Nāgārjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Do you mean Cārvāka? Tīrthika typically refers to Jains though it came to include Hindus as well, i.e. those that do not accept the words of the Buddha.

Sherab Dorje said:

Carvaka are Tīrthika too since they subscribe to the nihilist position.

Malcolm wrote:

Greg:

Carvakas are not tīrthikas [mu stegs pa]. Tīrthikas are eternalists; carvakas are nihilists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

But the Lotus Sutra of this world would certainly be taught by a different Buddha, at a different, time, place and retinue. And since you said that the conditions does not have to be same, etc, then it is quite clear that the Hevajra in this world was taught after the 4 tenet schools have arisen, since that would be the appropriate condition for the tantra to actually mention the 4 schools. Hence we have internal evidence that the Hevajra was really taught later, via visions, illusory bodies, etc.p[./quote]

This is not evidence for that. One, it was taught to Virupa by a human women in person, the Nirmanakāya Nairatmya, not in a dream. Secondly, it was taught by the Buddha in the morning of his awakening when he conquered the four māras. Further, the longest version of it was taught eons ago by Mahāvajradhara.

Since Buddhas are indeed omniscient concerning the three times, there is also no

contradiction that the Buddha could teach on the four tenets before they arose. And since the retinue the Buddha taught the Hevajra too on the morning of his awakening is not specified apart from Vajragarbha and the net of dākinīs, we can also assume they understood what the Buddha was teaching about in the two sectioned version of the Hevajra tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

So there is no contradiction at all in the same sūtra or tantra being taught in a different manner, with different topics when taught to different people in different epochs.

Of course - proof that sutras don't have to be taught by the nirmanakaya Buddha, can be taught later, etc.

When a sūtra or tantra is taught to an ordinary human being, it needs to be taught by a Nirmanakāya, as we see from account of Virupa's awakening. Virupa was not yet even a first stage bodhisattva when he met Nairatmya, so he could not possibly have perceived her in any other form than the one she presents to him as a two armed, one faced human being.

I am not saying that such persons reject the sutras and tantras are taught by the Buddha. Let me repeat myself again, since you are obviously deaf to this: the sutras and tantras are indeed taught by the Buddha, but the Buddha is not limited to his nirmanakaya form 2500 years ago in India.

Sure, but when a sutra says "When the Buddha was residing in Vaisali attended by Śāriputra, etc." we are to understand it happened within the 80 year span of the Buddha and not in some vision.

Because of his all-pervasiveness and supreme skillfulness, he can manifest in the mindstream of sentient beings teaching in various forms and methods, even after his rupakaya entered parinirvana. In this, I would say that my position on this is stronger than yours, since I am not constrained by historical facts.

But you are so constrained by the historical references to various places and events mentioned in many Mahāyāna sutras. I am specifically referring to sūtras that say things like "When the Bhagavan was residing at Vulture Peak or Vaisali, etc."

The second thing constraining you is that there is no Indian tradition at all which suggests what you suggest, i.e. that Mahāyāna sutras were produced piecemeal in visions by later yogins. This is just a modern rational invented by you latter-day Mahāyānists who have basically accepted the idea that Mahāyāna was not actually taught by the nirmanakāya Śākyamuni Buddha. Why do you use this rational? It is because you fundamentally accept the account of the appearance of Mahāyāna as it is presented by western scholars from the time of Max Müller onward.

But back to your question - it seems that personages such as Sonam Tsemo, Kongtrul, and other illuminaries can argue and disagree with each other on the finer points of the origin stories of sutra, but this never hindered them from high attainments.

As I pointed out to you, exhaustively, there really is no such disagreement. Sonam Tsemo, Sapan, Buton, Kongtrul and others have basically provided more or less the same account over the years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Two points about this. 1. There's basically universal agreement that in any Buddhist tradition, language does not objectively reflect or refer to reality. Thus the problematic of language games runs deep through Buddhism, and often becomes a very central and prominent soteriological/philosophical issue. Surely you would not dispute this. If this were really true, then how do you deal with acts of true speech? For example, in the Śatasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitābṛhaṭṭikā we find:

"When an irreversible bodhisattva sees a city on fire, he says "May the fire be pacified". When the fire is pacified through the blessings of true words, you can know that one as being irreversible."

The only way to get outside of this is to either cease using language (which I suggested, and in some respects is a plausible yogic response) or to run with some alternative theory of language/meaning ala Panini, which would be very antithetical to any orthodox Buddhist view.

I think that thus far Western analysis of classical Buddhist attitudes towards language have ignored the role of satya-vacana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Thanks. I forgot about this sutra. It seems the Buddha forgot about the Mahasamghikas and other sects when he cast his eye into the future? I wonder what reasons Malcolm will give here?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha has the capacity to know events, both specific and general, in the future. That is why he is termed "omniscient in the three times".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

He does. In the Yogini's Eye, he says: Some scholars say that the Mahayana Sutras were compiled in the southern region called Vimalasambhava in a gathering of 900 million bodhisattvas. However, this is in great error as [this gathering] never took place.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Verril has translated this passage incorrectly. I give the correct translation above, which is confirmed in another one of his works, which I also produced. "Yogini's Eye" is Verril's title for the General Presentation of The Divisions of Tantra. The passage is "...de'ang skyon chen po ni med do", "also a great error that is not", the error is asserting 90 million, rather than one. Here is my rendering again:

"When some masters say that the Mahāyāna sūtras were compiled after ninety million bodhisattvas gathered in the southern direction at Vimalasambhāva although there is no great fault in that position,

Further proof of my reading is that Sakya Pandita, Sonam Tsemo's nephew states in his Great History of Dharma:

"It is reputed that "One million bodhisattvas gathered at the southern royal palace, Vimalasambhava, where Mañjuśī compiled the sūtras, Vajrapani compiled Abhidharma, and Ajita Maitreya compiled the Vinaya in the language of Mahāyāna."

He then describes how statements in the sutras which describe both Vajrapani and Ānanda as the compiler of the teachings are not in contradiction. Later Buton, Rinchen Drup gives this account, then Kongtrul.

If Sapan thought it completely wrong, he would have rejected it outright — as we have plenty of examples of his doing so. Sonam Tsemo presents it in two different works which I produce above. The point is that this account is generally accepted in Tibet from an early period.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

underthetree said:

I've always just taken the texts at face value.

Malcolm wrote:

Continue to do so...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Isn't Tsui Marpo a Tibetan spirit subdued by Padmasambhava? Why and how is he the protector of North America? Since when?

Malcolm wrote:

Since never, it was my error in assuming that Yava Rukshi was a name for Tsi'u Marpo.

Konchog1 said:

And while we're at it: If there are Tsen, Mamos, Gyalpo etc. all over the world, why the focus on Dakinis in Tantra? If they have to be female spirits why not Mamos or Yakshinis? PM me if you don't want to derail the thread further.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of dakinis, wisdom and worldly. The focus is on Wisdom...

Konchog1 said:

Why isn't the focus on . . . wisdom Mamos instead?

Malcolm wrote:

There is — Palden Lhamo, Ekajati, Mazar Gyalmo, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Critical thinking and Dharma

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Malcolm I would be interested to hear your opinion on the Lotus Sutra: faithful record of a teaching of the historical Buddha, or much later composition by one or more "samsaric beings"?

Malcolm wrote:

It's a record of the Buddha's teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Isn't Tsui Marpo a Tibetan spirit subdued by Padmasambhava? Why and how is he the protector of North America? Since when?

Malcolm wrote:

Since never, it was my error in assuming that Yava Rukshi was a name for Tsi'u Marpo.

Konchog1 said:

And while we're at it: If there are Tsen, Mamos, Gyalpo etc. all over the world, why the focus on Dakinis in Tantra? If they have to be female spirits why not Mamos or Yakshinis? PM me if you don't want to derail the thread further.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of dakinis, wisdom and worldly. The focus is on Wisdom...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Critical thinking and Dharma

Content:

Jikan said:

Are you claiming that the Buddha Dharma is an invention of samsaric beings and, therefore, leads only to continued entanglement in affliction, shel?

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to be a bit of trend around here....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Critical thinking and Dharma

Content:

shel said:

Lets not forget that the teaching has limits, and indeed, was forged within human limits.

Malcolm wrote:

The teaching has no limits other than the total liberation of migrating beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 11th, 2014 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

...this modernist attitude is harmful to one's practice.

I respectfully disagree. I have the "modernist attitude" you are objecting to, and my

practice is quite healthy--at least insofar as my faith and confidence goes.

Malcolm wrote:

I thought so too, then I examined my mind [once again, for the n-millionth time] and my attitudes towards the teachings...and I discovered two things — 1) the modernist suppositions I was entertaining really have no support at all 2) and therefore, they are pure prapañca 3) and thus I resolved to abandon them.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

underthetree said:

I'm genuinely (and respectfully) curious, Malcolm: what exactly caused this volte-face?

Malcolm wrote:

I realized, as I explained above, that this modernist attitude is harmful to one's practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot maintain that the sūtras are "satya-vacana", truthful speech, while maintaining that their origins are lies.

underthetree said:

'Lies' is an awfully strong statement. I would guess that, for many centuries, what you call lies have merely been accepted as literary conceits. There is a vast difference.

Malcolm wrote:

I really cannot remember any master referring to the origin story of Mahāyāna a "literary conceit". This is a modern concept about the origin of Mahāyāna. A literary conceit is nevertheless a pretense, and thus a falsehood. Hardly what one would call "satya-vacana".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

The ancient Mahayana masters have contrasting opinions on what is correct or



erroneous. Even the fanciful story about 900 million bodhisattvas compiling the Mahayana sutras in Vimalasambhava was not accepted by every master (eg. Jamgon Kongtrul).

Malcolm wrote:  
Kongtrul accepts this.

pueraeternus said:  
Sorry - it should be Sonam Tsemo, one of the five founding masters of the Shakyas. So as we can see, even when such masters don't see eye to eye on origin stories, their progression in the dharma was not hindered.

Malcolm wrote:  
He does not exactly reject it; he reports it in his Introduction to Dharma:  
"The Mahāyāna, so some assert, was compiled by ten million bodhisattvas at Vimalasvabhava in the south. Some advocate other means. Some [say] it is the same as the manner of the śrāvakas [your position]."  
And in his General Presentation of the Divisions of Tantra he says:  
"When some masters say that the Mahāyāna sūtras were compiled after ninety million bodhisattvas gathered in the southern direction at Vimalasambhāva although there is no great fault in that position, but both Secret Mantra and the uncommon Mahāyāna were compiled by Vajrapāṇi. As it is explained in the Prajñāpāramitā Treatise Commentary by master Vasubandhu through Ārya Maitreya's request to the bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi [55/b] "...this prajñāpāramitā heard by me is promised to the retinue."  
Although one cannot reject compilation in different locations, it also cannot be proven."  
In general, however, we can understand that Sonam Tsemo does not have your idea, which is that Mahāyāna was not actually taught by the Buddha at all.

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 11:02 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:  
dzogchungpa said:  
Malcolm, please. When you posted this:  
<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=14929&p=202388#p202381>  
was your attitude premised on the idea that lineage just simply does not matter?  
Was it a reflection of the materialism in our culture?

Malcolm wrote:  
To the former question, no.  
To the latter question, yes.

dzogchungpa said:  
Were the blessings you had received insufficient?

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly — the blessings I have cultivated were not sufficient.

I have since decided the whole approach to Dharma represented in that post written six months ago, opinions held for many years, since the early 90's, were frankly held up on baseless suppositions derived from my early Buddhist studies.

One cannot maintain that the sūtras are "satya-vacana", truthful speech, while maintaining that their origins are lies.

These present statements function to remedy in some small way my past error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, there is no contradiction at all, since when this tantra was revealed to Mahasiddha Virupa by the nirmanakāya ḍākinī, Nairatmya, it was in a time and a place where the four tenet systems had arisen. It is not the case that sūtras and tantras are engraved on golden plates somewhere and that their words are somehow eternal. As has been pointed out to you already,

pueraeternus said:

Oh, so Nairatmya would alter the contents of the tantra to suit Virupa's understanding? This would make the whole origin stories irrelevant and unnecessary.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not make the origin stories irrelevant nor unnecessary. For example, when the Saddharmapundarika sutra was taught, the Buddha states that it was taught in the very distant past by a Buddha called Candrasūryapradīpa. But I don't think we need to assume that the words are identical in every respect, nor was the assembly the same, nor were the conditions the same, and so on. He adds:

Immeasurable buddhas in the present and future  
Will also teach this Dharma  
With various skillful means.

Indicating that the Saddharmapundarika sutra will be taught in the future by many Buddhas.

So there is no contradiction at all in the same sūtra or tantra being taught in a different manner, with different topics when taught to different people in different epochs.

For example, the main point of the Hevajra tantra is that it presents the method of

realizing the continuum of Vajradhara in the form of Hevajra, not that it mentions the four tenet systems, as well as the four divisions of tantra.

"the single vajra word is heard differently by beings of different capacities".

The meaning of the words can mean differently or have deeper layers to those of greater capacity, but the words would still be the same.

No, actually, that is the point. When citation this is taken from explains that one words is heard as different words by different people. It is called the "array of speech".

Many have advanced in their practice of tantra, even when they disagree with the varying origin stories of this sutra or that tantra.

Like who? Can you name even one modern person who has "advanced in their practice" even though they reject the sutras and tantras were actually taught by the Buddha?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

orgyen jigmed said:

But when I have very recently posed the same question to CNN whether the Tsen Yava Rukshi, Tsiu Marpo and Jagpa Melen are the same deity with a different name, he simply said: "No, not the same even though they all belong to the same powerful class of Tsen..." he then continued: " see, I am not you and you are not me!"

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting, I never asked him, I merely assumed. Thanks for clearing that up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What classic intellectual nonsense.

tobes said:

What classic avoidance of the issue.

Malcolm wrote:

Satya-vacana, "truthful speech" has nothing to do with language games. Even the idea of language games can only be predicated in an age where speech has become largely deceptive and false.

It used to be the case that speech had more power, when less people lied, and actually engaged in the practice of satya-vacana.

These days people have such little regard for satya-vacana that they don't care whether the scriptures they follow are examples of satya-vacana or not.

What a pity.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

The ancient Mahayana masters have contrasting opinions on what is correct or erroneous. Even the fanciful story about 900 million bodhisattvas compiling the Mahayana sutras in Vimalasambhava was not accepted by every master (eg. Jamgon Kongtrul).

Malcolm wrote:

Kongtrul accepts this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, I don't see why you couldn't. You only have to have confidence that the practice is effective, and that could be based on many things. Are you saying that, e.g., if I don't take the stories about the origins of the Mahyana sutras literally I can't practice wholeheartedly? Frankly, I would find that ridiculous.

Malcolm wrote:

This kind of attitude is premised on the idea that lineage just simply does not matter, all that matters is techniques. It is very much a reflection of the materialism in our culture.

But this attitude is not conducive the entry of blessings, I am afraid, which is necessary for realization.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Tradition claims that Shakyamuni taught Hevajra during his earthly time (to subdue the four maras), but in the subjugating chapter, he said that one should study the Vaibhasika, then Sautrantika, then Yogacara and then Madhyamaka. These schools didn't exist at all 2500 years ago, and would have made absolutely no sense to who ever was taught the tantra back then. This is just an example of the many anachronisms that are all over the place, especially in the later Mahayana tracts.

Malcolm wrote:

The source of this idea comes from the Śrī-vajramālābhīḥhānamahāyogatantra-sarvatantraḥṛdaya-rahasyavibhaṅga by Paṇḍita Alambakalaśa. After listing the various deva realms and so on where each of the five classes of tantra were taught he states:

After that, for the purpose of subduing the four māras, the large great tantra of Śrī Hevajra and explanatory tantra of the short one were taught here in Magadha in this Jambudvīpa.

This does not mean it was taught to an ordinary assembly, as we can see, since the this paṇḍita clearly states the compilers of the tantras are either Vajrapāṇi or Mañjuśrī, and because the petitioner of the Hevajra is Vajragarbha, a tenth stage bodhisattva. At the time of the taming of the four Māras, there was no ordinary Sangha at all.

Further, there is no contradiction at all, since when this tantra was revealed to Mahasiddha Virupa by the nirmanakāya ḍākinī, Nairatmya, it was in a time and a place where the four tenet systems had arisen. It is not the case that sūtras and tantras are engraved on golden plates somewhere and that their words are somehow eternal. As has been pointed out to you already, "the single vajra word is heard differently by beings of different capacities".

Tantras like Cakrasamvara were never taught to a bhikṣu sangha nor by Śakyamuni, but only in the 24 places, where they are still taught by the Nirmanakāya in the form of Cakrasamvara, just as Guru Rinpoche, Śakyamuni's emanation, is still teaching the rakṣasas in Camara on Zangdog Palri.

pueraeternus said:

...how can we rely definitely on traditional origin stories and claim that it has any influence on one's dharmic progression?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, because in fact the tantras themselves maintain it is so, as the Union of the Tantra of the Sun and Moon states:

If the history is not explained,  
there will be the fault of lack of confidence  
in this discourse of the definitive secret meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

when you watch a movie, do the characters in the movie need to attain liberation from Samsara?

Malcolm wrote:

In the movie they do.

gad rgyangs said:

but there's no one "in" the movie. its just flickering colors and shapes on the screen.

when you meet beings in a dream, do they need to attain liberation from samsara?

Malcolm wrote:

In the dream they do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

But if one can enter the language game of the text

Malcolm wrote:

Language games are the problem.

tobes said:

Then you should refrain from reading, writing and speaking.

{Insert massively over quoted Wittgenstein phrase >>>“Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent.”}

Malcolm wrote:  
What classic intellectual nonsense.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 9:02 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:  
tobes said:  
But if one can enter the language game of the text

Malcolm wrote:  
Language games are the problem.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 9:00 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:  
gad rgyangs said:  
As far as most Buddhism is concerned, human life has no meaning except as an opportunity to study Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:  
Correction, human life has no meaning apart from the chance to attain liberation from samsara. Samsara is the limitation, not Dharma.

gad rgyangs said:  
when you watch a movie, do the characters in the movie need to attain liberation from Samsara?

Malcolm wrote:  
In the movie they do.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 7:51 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:  
gad rgyangs said:  
As far as most Buddhism is concerned, human life has no meaning except as an opportunity to study Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:  
Correction, human life has no meaning apart from the chance to attain liberation from samsara. Samsara is the limitation, not Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Yeah, Traktung Khepa or Traktung Yeshe Dorje, from Michigan. He's considered to be a tulku of Do Khyentse Yeshe Dorje per Thinley Norbu Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

No, per himself. His association with DTR was very subsequent to his proclamation of his own tulkuship. I have observed the development of Kirkpatrick's self-mythology for 20 years on the internet. The DTR relationship is rather late.

But this is off-topic, and if people choose to believe Kirkpatrick's claims about himself, that is their business and none of mine.

dzogchungpa said:

I take it you don't recommend him then?

Malcolm wrote:

I recommend that when anyone decides to make a Dharma connection with someone, they take some time to investigate the person they wish to make a connection with.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Yeah, Traktung Khepa or Traktung Yeshe Dorje, from Michigan. He's considered to be a tulku of Do Khyentse Yeshe Dorje per Thinley Norbu Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

No, per himself. His association with DTR was very subsequent to his proclamation of his own tulkuship. I have observed the development of Kirkpatrick's self-mythology for more than 20 years on the internet. The DTR relationship is rather late.

dzogchungpa said:

Is he worth checking out? Who is he supposed to be the tulku of?

Malcolm wrote:

He proclaimed himself a tulku of Do Khyentse Yeshe Dorje. He and his wife originally appeared on the internet as "Khepa and Acala".

And one of the reasons Khepa has never had an interest in meeting with Tibetan



teachers is because it's very important in terms of our work in this time and place that we not take on some of the unnecessary cultural trappings of Tibetan Buddhism. We're American Buddhists.

Khepa: We are American Tantric Buddhists. We are not Tibetan Tantric Buddhists. So there was a long period where I decided I did not want any contact with any other teachings. I wanted to teach purely what was given to me through Terma and through vision. Now it's been eight years, and our community is very well established. So now I'm entering a completely different phase where I'm actually quite interested in meeting and talking with Ngakpa Chogyam, who's Scottish, but he teaches a very traditional Tibetan line of Dharma transmission.

<http://crazywisdom.net/assets/khepa-and-acala-interview.pdf> "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I have no idea if he is "worth checking out". He has a nice farm. His wife likes to write and record Buddhist devotional folk music. He pissed off a guy name Namkha Rinpoche who then went on to develop a large Sangha in Europe. They used to be associated with the Aro people. He eventually studied with Dungsey Thrinley Norbu. He claims to be a tertön.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 7:30 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

Konchog1 said:

That's the problem with prophecy. What does red face mean? It's not red skin. Red face.

Black face means a person is angry, so red face could mean a country of lustful people. Or something else entirely.

Malcolm wrote:

It very clearly means Tibetans; since they used to smear their faces with red pigment.

At any rate, for more than a thousand years educated Tibetans have understood the term རྩོད་དམར་ཅན་, "red faced" to refer to themselves. Why? Because the Kaṃsadeśavyākaraṇa explicitly refers to Tibetans as "the red-faced" ones.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Yeah, Traktung Khepa or Traktung Yeshe Dorje, from Michigan. He's considered to be a tulku of Do Khyentse Yeshe Dorje per Thinley Norbu Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

No, per himself. His association with DTR was very subsequent to his proclamation of his own tulkuship. I have observed the development of Kirkpatrick's self-mythology for 20 years on the internet. The DTR relationship is rather late.

But this is off-topic, and if people choose to believe Kirkpatrick's claims about himself, that is their business and none of mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

maybe we can learn from all of them, since no one perspective can capture the whole of the nature of reality and the meaning of life."?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you and I part ways here — as far as I am concerned, Buddhadharma offers the only complete solution to the problem of suffering; the rest are palliative at best.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Quite honestly, I can't take this story as a literal account of historical events and furthermore, I can't believe that the author(s) of this text did either. In all seriousness, do you?

Malcolm wrote:

Why not? I have observed my teacher involved in personal interactions with Guru Rinpoche. I did not perceive Guru Rinpoche, but he certainly did. When you read the autobiographies of Dudjom Lingpa, Thangthog Gyalpo, etc., they have multiple experiences that ordinary people like us do not have.

I regard the Mahāyāna sutras to be the record of those teachings taught directly by the Buddha to people whose vision was much more expansive than ours.

dzogchungpa said:

I thought you were saying that the events described in the Mahayana sutras were ones that ordinary people could see. Is that not your position?

Malcolm wrote:

No, what I said was that the Nirmanakāya is the only buddhakāya that ordinary people can see. I never said that all of his deeds were able to be witnessed by everyone. We have the example Sunakṣatra, who, while able to see the Buddha's radiance, was

convinced the Buddha was an ordinary human being, with no special powers at all, no special insight.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Lazy\_eye said:

One prong is that it's faddish and speculative.

The second prong is that it's harmful to a practitioner's conviction.

You've also made it clear that it's this second concern which is the primary motivation for your new stance against scholarship. You used to find the scholarship worthy of consideration, and you even agreed with some of its findings, but now you reject it because you saw it has a pernicious undermining effect on belief in the validity of the Mahayana dharma.

So I am wondering what your response would be if somebody presented scholarship that was not speculative, but nevertheless weakened your conviction. Would you still reject it on those grounds? Or would you change your beliefs, for instance by abandoning Mahayana in favor of the sravaka path?

And along the same lines, if there are practitioners here who do not think the historical Buddha taught what is in the Mahayana sutras, would you advise them to become sravakas?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have a stance against scholarship -- that is a gross mischaracterization.

What I oppose are the biases and demonstrably unsupported assumptions which underlie the construction of a fabricated history which the Buddhological academy has been constructing and still is constructing for Mahāyāna for more than 100 years. And the traces that it has created are very strong, and present obstacles to many people's practice.

The only honest thing they can say is this: X text appears in Chinese here, here and here; and in Tibetan here; and in some Central Asian fragments we think date to here. And that is all, nothing more.

Those are the empirical facts, the only "truth" they can muster.

I understand the fascination with mysteries and puzzles, but in reality, there is almost nothing of use in western historical Buddhist writing that is of any benefit to practicing Mahāyāna Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Quite honestly, I can't take this story as a literal account of historical events and furthermore, I can't believe that the author(s) of this text did either. In all seriousness, do you?

Malcolm wrote:

Why not? I have observed my teacher involved in personal interactions with Guru Rinpoche. I did not perceive Guru Rinpoche, but he certainly did. When you read the autobiographies of Dudjom Lingpa, Thangthog Gyalpo, etc., they have multiple experiences that ordinary people like us do not have.

I regard the Mahāyāna sutras to be the record of those teachings taught directly by the Buddha to people whose vision was much more expansive than ours.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Lazy\_eye said:

The alleged "speculativeness" of Western scholarship is something of a red herring in this discussion, it seems to me. Would you welcome the scholarship of Nattier, Schopen and so on if it was demonstrably non-speculative?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but it isn't.

Lazy\_eye said:

But if it was, you would welcome it? What would you do then about the problem of doubt, which you cited earlier as being your main motive for rejecting the current scholarly consensus about the provenance of Mahayana sutras?

Malcolm wrote:

There would not be doubt.

As I have pointed out, the current scholarly consensus is based on speculations and assumptions. And there isn't really even a consensus, it is more like a series of one intellectual fad after another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Lazy\_eye said:

The alleged "speculativeness" of Western scholarship is something of a red herring in this discussion, it seems to me. Would you welcome the scholarship of Nattier, Schopen and so on if it was demonstrably non-speculative?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but it isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

tingdzin said:

Dear Reibeam,

This quote (about horses on wheels and red men ) has been discussed both here (I think) and on the previous incarnation of this website. It is probably bogus. To my knowledge, no one has ever been able to find a Tibetan source for it. If you know of one, please tell us.

Malcolm wrote:

The most likely source for it is a prediction which shows up first in Loppon Sonam Tsemo's Chos la 'jug pa'i sgo byed:

"The Vimalaprabhakaripṛcchā states that 2500 years after the parinirvana of the teacher, the sublime Dharma will spread in the land of the red faced ones.

There are three related texts which must be read to understand this more clearly, the Vimalaprabhakaripṛcchā-sūtra and the Arhatsaṃghavardhanavyākaraṇa and the Kaṃsadeśavyākaraṇa.

It seems that the notion of 2500 years is a mistake.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Both Ārya Nāgārjuna and Maitreya Bodhisattva both insist that Mahāyāna is indeed was spoken by the Buddha himself.

daverupa said:

Speculative, ad infinitum apparently.

I wonder just how much history you'll call speculative; only those parts that infringe on Mahayana narratives? Or are there other areas?

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of history is speculative, the further back you go, the more speculative it becomes.

But people even radically disagree about the events of 25 years, or even 10.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

underthetree said:

What worries me about the need to accept the Mahayana sutras as spoken by the Buddha himself is that it seems to undermine, quite radically, both the sangha and the dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

How could it? Both Ārya Nāgārjuna and Maitreya Bodhisattva both insist that Mahāyāna is indeed was spoken by the Buddha himself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

I want to emphasize again, however, that we must not ignore textual stratification; the Nikayas, while early and containing even earlier material, are relatively late organizations of material; the previous ninefold system can still be discerned here and there, aside from being explicitly described in the Nikayas themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Speculative.

daverupa said:

Part of these processes of developmental editorial efforts includes e.g. deva-realms increasing, the single reference to Metteya in the DN, and so forth. Clear stratification, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Speculative.

daverupa said:

...a very clear understanding of how the Dharma has spread since the Buddha's parinirvana.

This is at odds with the prevailing academic consensus, which would need to be argued against, rather than simply counter-asserting Para-H-{M/I}.

Malcolm wrote:

Consensus does not equal knowledge. I am arguing against "the prevailing academic consensus" by pointing out that it is built on a tissue of speculation and conflicting hypothesis (which generally seemed to pulled out of thin air).

daverupa said:

Hardly true at all. The Agamas and Nikayas reflect their contemporary milieux...in ways the Mahayana texts simply do not reflect the historical Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, speculative. You have no possible way of knowing this.

daverupa said:

If one criticizes Mahāyāna as being a late production, inevitably one will be lead down the path of destroying the Dharma in general. One can't start at Mahāyāna, then stop at Abhidhamma. One can't start at Abhidhamma, but stop at the Dīgha Nikāya and so on. In the end, since the focus of text criticism is strictly forensic, once the autopsy is over, there is very little left of a corpse to bury.

Slippery slope fallacy. How utterly disappointing to hear from you.

Malcolm wrote:

But we see this at work already.

daverupa said:

Buddhology is of no use ... Further, I have seen more than one former practitioner travel down the road of Buddhology/Tibetology, etc., and completely lose their faith and interest in practice altogether. Why? Because they begin to prioritize what they learn in the academy over what they have learned from their gurus, and their spiritual development comes to a grinding halt.

If you're using the Dharma as a yardstick, you're right. But the Dhamma is still practicable - in every sense of that word - at the end of the process you describe, a practice based on the historical Buddha. It's simply a clear & necessary result given

modern academic work on the matter.

Malcolm wrote:

Your "historical Buddha" will not survive academic forensic study, and neither will your "Dhamma".

daverupa said:

Ultimately, calling modern historical techniques and results into question can be perfectly reasonable, but asserting religious texts' alternatives as wholly superior is to make a claim without any evidence, and it does indeed look like fundamentalist pushback.

Malcolm wrote:

And therefore, you propose that erecting the authority of ordinary persons over the authority of āryas is the solution. However, this is the root of the problem, and if Buddhists begin to accept this sort of authority, Buddhadharma will be destroyed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

valid knowledge about the very tradition that one is practicing?

Malcolm wrote:

Which sort of "valid" knowledge are we talking about? My point about western scholarship of the origins of Mahāyāna is that it is constructed on speculations and suppositions which amount to nothing more than the mess of prapañca we see illustrated in Sujato's review of the different theories of the origins of Mulasavastivada school shows.

For example, when you have such a mess of theories, where is the "valid" knowledge therein contained.

Schopen's work, for example, is interesting because he chooses to focus on material evidence of Buddhism in India. Fine, but when he starts speculating, as he does throughout his books, and saying things like "the Buddha is made to predict..." and so on, we have left the grounds of confirmed evidence and entered the realm of hypothesizing.

My point is that Buddhists are not going to learn more about Buddhism by reading the speculative fantasies by which Buddhologists and Tibetologists earn their meager salaries. They are merely going to fill their head with the prapañca of conflicting theories



and intellectual fashions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 11:30 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

The evidence is found once we examine and internal and external circumstances (no record of Mahayana teachings until much later, anachronisms, etc), which we have been discussing for the last 10-20 pages.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not presented a single piece of evidence to back your claims, so convinced you are of the modern academic story of the origins of Mahāyāna.

And we would agree. That's not the point, however. There is no statement within these Mahāyāna sutras that we are to regard them as being the teachings from the Sambhogakāya, since that only happens in Akaniṣṭha Gandavyuha anyway.

The Sambhogakaya is capable of emanating illusory nirmanakaya bodies.

Indeed, who show up in space and time and can be seen by those who are not on the bodhisattva stages. But there are not infinite supreme nirmanakāyas like Śākyamuni, there is but one at a time in a given world system. But in general, Mahāyāna sutras are not taught in Akaniṣṭha Gandavyuha.

In other, words, when a Mahāyāna sutra begins with "Thus have I heard, the Bhagavan was dwelling Vaisali, etc., we are to understand that these are the words of Śākyamuni Buddha, located in a historical time and place.

We don't have to - and it is still buddhavacana since those teachings conform to the four seals, etc.

We are to have such understanding; if your understanding fails you because you have bought into Buddhist modernism, I am sorry but that is your problem. It's a pity that it causes you to invalidate the very texts you claim to follow.

The sutras and tantras themselves indicate when they were taught and where. In general, the tantras are not the Nirmanakāya's teachings at all.

Really? So what does Tibetan Buddhism say about who taught the anuttaratantras, such as Hevajra?

It depends on the tantra. Some were retaught by Śākyamuni, most are not.

Oh I see. So a generally-accepted emanation of Avalokiteshvara (among Tibetan Buddhists) says something that doesn't gel with the traditional story, and he gets no pass as well?

From some, yes; from others, no. DTR's real point is that the conventional deluded perception of ordinary persons is not authoritative. This also applies to academic opinions about the genesis of Mahāyāna, etc. Unfortunately, the opinions you have presented us are predicated precisely on the perspective of unawakened secular

persons with impure vision.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 9:52 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

You do realize you're preaching fundamentalism?

Malcolm wrote:

What I am actually doing is opposing the new secular "Buddhist" orthodoxy.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 9:00 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

I don't mean to be harsh with this term 'magic'; perhaps 'metaphysical history' will suit you, in that pleas are made to metaphysical realities...

Malcolm wrote:

You will find this throughout Buddhadharma.

daverupa said:

In any event, this simply needs to be distinguished, and it means that you must hold a view contrary to the linked academic discussion I've already provided. It may not be strictly ahistorical, but it is certainly parahistorical.

Malcolm wrote:

It is neither. The view I am elucidating is a specific historical view, grounded in a very clear understanding of how the Dharma has spread since the Buddha's parinirvana.

daverupa said:

...unfortunately, the same procedural approaches which describe Mormon accuracy in their claims also describe Mahayana accuracy in its claims.

Malcolm wrote:

This applies to the Agamas, the Pali Canon and so on as well.

daverupa said:

It really does boil down to this baseline, as far as I can tell. Worth the threadcount, at least, for succinctness in the future.

Malcolm wrote:

If one criticizes Mahāyāna as being a late production, inevitably one will be lead down the path of destroying the Dharma in general. One can't start at Mahāyāna, then stop at Abhidhamma. One can't start at Abhidhamma, but stop at the Dīgha Nikāya and so on. In the end, since the focus of text criticism is strictly forensic, once the autopsy is over, there is very little left of a corpse to bury.

In short, Buddhology is of no use to practitioners at all. It does not provide us with a solid sense of history; it does the opposite; it does not provide us with tradition, it does the opposite; it is not grounded in wisdom, but rather the rank conceptuality of ordinary people who are for the most part NOT practitioners and have no interest in transforming their lives with the Dharma. Further, I have seen more than one former practitioner travel down the road of Buddhology/Tibetology, etc., and completely lose their faith and interest in practice altogether. Why? Because they begin to prioritize what they learn in the academy over what they have learned from their gurus, and their spiritual development comes to a grinding halt.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

Malcolm, you write for magic and for secrets, and against history. It's simply descriptive to say so.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an inaccurate descriptive.

I don't write "against" history. None of the theories that western academics have produced are anything more than speculations and suppositions.

I am writing for a different history, you know, then one we actually received from our tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Pero said:

Yes well, how important is Mount Meru to one's spirituality?

anjali said:

From a tantric point of view, "Mt. Meru" is very important for one's spiritual practices. Because of my yogic background prior to coming to Buddhism, I've always taken Mount Meru to symbolically represent the spinal sushumna nadi, central axis of the body.

Malcolm wrote:

The central axis of the body is the aorta. Not the spine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhisattva Maitreya...

magic

Ārya Āsanga was a third stage bodhisattva and received teachings in person from Maitreya Bodhisattva, nothing magical about it at all.

...the Buddha taught Mahāyāna at the same time he was also teaching Śrāvakayāna. historically invisible

On the contrary, we have the evidence of the existence of the Mahāyāna sūtras themselves. There isn't a single bit of proof that they were composed later. None. Zero. Zilch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Pero said:

Yes well, how important is Mount Meru to one's spirituality?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are doing mandala offerings, it is very important:

The ground is anointed with scented water and strewn with flowers, adorned with Meru, the four continents, the sun and the moon; by perceiving this as a buddhafiield and offering it, may all migrating beings enjoy a pure field.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Adi said:

but frankly it seems a waste everyone's time.

Adi

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly A108's, but it is his choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

Either the Buddha taught Mahayana in magic ways, taught it in historically invisible ways, or didn't teach it.

Malcolm wrote:

We reject all three.

Bodhisattva Maitreya clearly teaches that the Buddha taught Mahāyāna at the same time he was also teaching Śrāvakayāna.

This is not magic, nor is it historically invisible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Here is a beautiful example of just what a useless waste of time Western writing on Buddhist history can become:

The uncertainty around this school has fuelled a number of hypotheses. Frauwallner's theory is that the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya was the disciplinary code of an early Buddhist community based in Mathura, which was quite independent as a monastic community from the Sarvāstivādin of Kaśmīr (although of course this does not mean that they were different in terms of doctrine). Lamotte, against Frauwallner, asserts that the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya was a late Kaśmīr compilation made to complete the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya.<sup>2</sup> Warder suggests that the Mūlasarvāstivādin were a later development of the Sarvāstivāda, whose main innovations were literary, the compilation of the large Vinaya and the Saddharmasmṛtyupasthāna Sūtra,<sup>3</sup> which kept the early doctrines but brought the style up to date with contemporary literary tastes.<sup>4</sup> Enomoto pulls the rug out from all these theories by asserting that Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin are really the same. Meanwhile, Willemen, Dessein, and Cox have developed the theory that the Sautrantikas, a branch or tendency within the

Sarvāstivādin group of schools, emerged in Gandhāra and Bactria around 200 ce. Although they were the earlier group, they temporarily lost ground to the Kaśmīr Vaibhāṣika school due to the political influence of Kaṇiṣka. In later years the Sautrantikas became known as the Mūlasarvāstivādins and regained their earlier ascendancy.<sup>5</sup> I have elsewhere given my reasons for disagreeing with the theories of Enomoto and Willemen et al.<sup>6</sup> Neither Warder nor Lamotte give enough evidence to back up their theories.

[Sects & Sectarianism, Sujato]

Don't get me wrong here, of course this book is well written and has a lot of interesting information, but passages like the above clearly illustrate the absurdity of much of what has been written by "Buddhologists".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I'm curious, what do non-western Buddhist scholars say about the rise of Mahayana these days?

Malcolm wrote:

Look in Kongtrul, Dudjom, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

I have shown that there is a problem with traditional presentations on this issue, using scriptural basis (i.e. the traditional presentation is not supported when we look at the scriptures), so I am not merely "making things up".

Malcolm wrote:

You have not shown this at all.

pueraeternus said:

This is because you and your camp thinks that anything that is transmitted via visions, dream transmissions, etc are pious forgeries.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no problem with teachings received in dreams and visions, etc. There is simply

no record of Mahāyāna sūtras being received in this way. To make this claim is a claim made in absence of any evidence whatsoever.

pueraeternus said:

"Words of the Buddha" does not have to be from the lips of the nirmanakaya Buddha 2500 years ago.

Malcolm wrote:

And we would agree. That's not the point, however. There is no statement within these Mahāyāna sutras that we are to regard them as being the teachings from the Sambhogakāya, since that only happens in Akaniṣṭha Gandavyuha anyway. In other words, when a Mahāyāna sutra begins with "Thus have I heard, the Bhagavan was dwelling Vaisali, etc., we are to understand that these are the words of Śakyamuni Buddha, located in a historical time and place.

pueraeternus said:

Oh yes - these contradictions are especially problematic if you think that the nirmanakaya Buddha said all of these contradictory things during his lifetime. It makes a lot more sense to consider that the late tantras were revealed much later when the socio-political ground has changed so much that new teachings needed to be given to suit the times, excessive brahmanical-influenced obsession on purity needed to be countered by antinomian praxis, etc. And this can be resolved by not editing any sutra or tantra, but by merely not forcefully locking them into a specific time of origin that makes no sense whatsoever.

Malcolm wrote:

The sutras and tantras themselves indicate when they were taught and where. In general, the tantras are not the Nirmanakāya's teachings at all.

What is under discussion here is not Buddhist tantras such as the Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha, which are taught constantly throughout the three times.

pueraeternus said:

In fact, I showed that confusion does indeed arise when we take the traditional account uncritically.

Malcolm wrote:

You have indeed shared your confusion.

pueraeternus said:

Then the Dalai Lama must be a terrible person to inflate his self-importance and diminish trust in tradition when he said that he no longer believes in Meru Cosmology.

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL said that he rejected Vasubandhu's presentation of Meru Cosmology. However, Dunsey Thinly Norbu spares no words in condemning the materialist, indeed, what he calls nihilist, perspective which informs the rejection of the Buddha's teachings on this score.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 8th, 2014 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

The entire field of Mahāyāna studies in Western academia takes a forensic approach to the whole thing. It is all completely predicated on the notion that Mahāyāna sūtras could not have possibly been taught by the Buddha. I should have thought this was obvious to everyone.

There simply isn't that level of consensus; and the philological scientism which is so disparaged here has been under unceasing critique for decades.

Malcolm wrote:

Who are you kidding, Tobes?

There is not one Western Buddhist scholar in the academy that I can think of who has ever once defended any traditional account of the rise of Mahāyāna, save perhaps Robert Thurman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 8th, 2014 at 4:13 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since the academic view of Mahāyāna is that it was not taught by the Buddha, I would say it is singular, narrow, grounded in a materialist paradigm of history, "scientific" (what a laugh), modernist, self-interested (publish or die), and definitely not sympathetic.

dzogchungpa said:

Didn't you used to share that view? Was your view, then, narrow, etc.?

Somehow, that wasn't the impression I got.

Malcolm wrote:

I used to use the same kinds unfounded rationalizations we see PE use — i.e. that the Mahāyāna sūtras came from visions, dreams, and so on.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

You know that the buddhist tradition is heterodox.

Malcolm wrote:

"Heterodox" if you are a Hindu, perhaps.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Sometimes he says he has no need for faith othertimes he says it's essential.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have need for faith, but that is because I have unshakable faith in the view based on my study and practice. Those who do not have that, well, they need faith to continue. It is very important. The Ratnālokaśūtra states:

Like a mother giving birth, faith goes before,  
produces and increases all qualities,  
removes fears and crosses rivers;  
faith shows the way to the city of bliss...

But I would say that it is the my faith in the Buddha's teaching, even where I did not fully understand it, that allowed me to grow in my understanding of the Dharma.

So yes, sometimes I say I don't need faith, that means "blind faith".

But lack of faith is damaging to one's practice, since faith is defined as "clarity about an object". Lack of clarity about the teachings, lack of clarity about one's practice, all of this comes about from the "lack of clarity" we term "lack of faith".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

There is a reason why this has been fundamentally ignored for 20 pages: it serves the

dialectic well to consider "the academic view" as a singular, narrow, materialist, scientific, modernist, self-interested, anti-Buddhist perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

Since the academic view of Mahāyāna is that it was not taught by the Buddha, I would say it is singular, narrow, grounded in a materialist paradigm of history, "scientific" (what a laugh), modernist, self-interested (publish or die), and definitely not sympathetic.

tobes said:

That way, something can be posited which is a viable alternative - "the real, authentic, faith filled, guru sealed" perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

Textual forensics do nothing to assist people's practice.

To the extent that people learn how to read classical Chinese, Tibetan and so on, in universities (though often not that well), then Buddhist studies programs in Western academia have some purpose.

tobes said:

What is has to do with the truth and reality of contemporary Buddhist scholarship is a vastly different matter!

Malcolm wrote:

The only thing useful in contemporary Buddhist scholarship is the production of translations. That's about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

In a very unsatisfactory way. And you didn't address my earlier remarks about the apparent ineptitude of the countless arya-bodhisattvas. How do you reconcile that?

Malcolm wrote:

This has also been adequately addressed.

pueraeternus said:

False accusation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the inescapable consequence of your position that the Nirmanakāya did not teach

Mahāyāna.

pueraeternus said:

I already said many times the Buddha did preach the Mahayana sutras, but not in his earthly lifetime and only later when people are ripe to receive the deep training and higher teachings, via visions, illusory bodies, dream transmissions, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

So you speculate, but have no actual evidence of.

pueraeternus said:

You have demonstrated nothing viz a viz Maitreya's quote, only that it contradicted what was said in the Samdhinirmocana.

Malcolm wrote:

Maitreya does not contradict the Samdhinirmocana at all.

pueraeternus said:

My whole point in this is that taking your fundamentalist view will only expose us to the kind of criticism we don't want to face, since the wide variance demonstrated in the vast Mahayana canon accumulated over the millennia cannot fit into a "the flesh and blood Buddha said all of these during his 80 year lifespan" basis.

Malcolm wrote:

My whole point is that rejecting Maitreya's position that Mahāyāna was taught during the lifetime of the Buddha exposes us to the present criticism that we already suffer, which is that Mahāyāna was not taught during the Buddha's lifetime and therefore it is not valid Buddhavacana.

pueraeternus said:

Be lucky that it is me pointing out these glaring contradictions, not someone who have absolutely no faith in the Mahayana dharma or out to destroy us.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not pointed out any contradictions — you have invented some fantasies, that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

DJKR doesn't seem to think that the western academic approach is necessarily harmful to Mahayana, and I have to say that I agree with him.

I do too. I think the wholesale rejection of "Western academic Buddhism" is mistaken (and I am as staunch a critic of "materialism" as anyone). If any academic has a "materialist agenda" it is really not that hard to detect, but to write off the entire field of academic Buddhist studies is another thing altogether.

Malcolm wrote:

The entire field of Mahāyāna studies in Western academia takes a forensic approach to the whole thing. It is all completely predicated on the notion that Mahāyāna sūtras could not have possibly been taught by the Buddha. I should have thought this was obvious to everyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Nevertheless, there were teachings superior to this, for this also gave rise to criticism, needed interpretation, and became an object of controversy. So the Blessed One, with an explicit intention, turned the wheel a third time for the sake of the followers of all vehicles....

Malcolm wrote:

This reading is not correct.

pueraeternus said:

Why were there no known champions of the second and third turning until much later when Nagarjuna and Asanga appeared in the scene?

Malcolm wrote:

This qualm has been addressed.

pueraeternus said:

Oh no - I am not discrediting the Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually you are, even though that is not your intention. How? By agreeing with the objections to Mahāyāna posed by its opponents. I.e., by agreeing that Mahāyāna arose later, you are explicitly agreeing that it was not taught by the Buddha. No matter what your excuses are, opponents to Mahāyāna will insist on seeing it this way. In order to rebut this contention, Maitreya states that Mahāyāna arose at the same time as Śravakayāna, as I have already demonstrated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

Reibeam said:

Instead of making a new thread, maybe one of you on this thread knows. I have read the DC books and listened to a number of retreats that speak of Guardians and am left with one question. In relation to ones of specific parts of the world in the Medium TUN book chNNr gives very little description for Oceania and North America and says those people living in that area should find out the details about the specific Guardian in their own country. Where do I look and who do I ask to find out more about the North American one? i read a short article in the Mirror, but that is all i can find. Please PM me if that is more appropriate. Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

North American is Tsiu Marpo. Ocean is Marutse.

Reibeam said:

So the name in the TUN book is just another name for Tsiu Marpo?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

Reibeam said:

Instead of making a new thread, maybe one of you on this thread knows. I have read the DC books and listened to a number of retreats that speak of Guardians and am left with one question. In relation to ones of specific parts of the world in the Medium TUN book chNNr gives very little description for Oceania and North America and says those people living in that area should find out the details about the specific Guardian in their own country. Where do I look and who do I ask to find out more about the North American one? i read a short article in the Mirror, but that is all i can find. Please PM me if that is more appropriate. Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

North American is Tsiu Marpo. Ocean is Marutse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Clarence said:

I might have missed it, but what brought about your change of opinion? I know you have

done many 180's but I wonder what caused this particular one?

Malcolm wrote:

The recognition that doubting the word of the Buddha, even on a subtle level, causes negative traces.

dzogchungpa said:

Feel free to ignore this, but in all seriousness, I would like to hear more about this recognition. Did you have some kind of epiphany, or was it more of an intellectual thing or what?

Malcolm wrote:

I recognized that with this perspective comes a subtle lack of faith which is not good for one's practice. Lack of faith is one of the six afflicted mental factors that accompanies all afflicted minds in samsara. So it was a recognition of my own state of mind. I understood that if this affects me, then it affects others.

All non-virtuous actions come from afflictions. I understood that by maintaining the view that Mahāyāna sutras were products of later authors, not the Buddha, there was no way to avoid the contamination of subtle traces of lack of faith in the Buddha's teachings. These subtle traces cause obstacles in one's practice and life. Of course, if one is not a Mahāyāni, then there is no problem. But if one has taken bodhisattva vows, and so on, lack of complete confidence in the origin of Mahāyāna sutras is destructive to those vows.

Further, the whole western academic edifice around the diffusion of Mahāyāna is contaminated by a materialist world view. It is a house of cards built on suppositions and speculations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Clarence said:

I might have missed it, but what brought about your change of opinion? I know you have done many 180's but I wonder what caused this particular one?

Malcolm wrote:

The recognition that doubting the word of the Buddha, even on a subtle level, causes negative traces.

Clarence said:

Thanks. That makes sense but how do you then deal with some of the contradictions in the teachings themselves? Or is that all explained through the vehicles and the qualifications of the students?

Malcolm wrote:

The Sandhivāyākaraṇa-tantra states:...the pleasing single vajra word becomes many different [words] from the perspective of the mentalities of the trainees.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Apocryphal Treatment for Conze's Heart Problems, JOCBS

Content:

plwk said:

Utilizing Nattier's theory of the text's history...

It's better to forget such nonsense. It won't help anyone understand anything about the Dharma. People like Nattier should not be regarded as authorities on any level.

If some further elucidation on this is possible, for the sake of us who are unfamiliar, the reason(s) for this statement?

Utilizing Nattier's theory of the text's history...

Malcolm wrote:

It means that there is absolutely not a shred of evidence that Nattier's theory is correct. And it is useless for practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Minjeay said:

How many books did it take to make you realize this?

Malcolm wrote:

None at all.

Minjeay said:

Hundreds of wars and fights outside seem to contradict you, though.

Malcolm wrote:

They confirm merely that selfishness is also innate to human beings and that we struggle with these two competing impulses in our psyches.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think that great kindness and compassion is the sole province of Buddhists. I am perfectly convinced that great kindness and compassion is innate to human beings.

dharmagoat said:

As is enlightened mind?

Malcolm wrote:

All sentient beings have the capacity to wake up. Whether they actually meet the Dharma and do so, on the other hand, is something else entirely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 11:49 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Oh yes it does, my quote earlier abundantly confirms.

Malcolm wrote:

It really does not not.

pueraeternus said:

The commentarial tradition then failed to notice that the Samdhinirmocana sutra stated.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be silly.

pueraeternus said:

Again more nonsense - Paramarthasamudgata spoke of how the three turnings were done sequentially and said this 3rd turning was "the most marvellous and wonderful that ever occurred in the world. It has no superior nor did it contain any implicit meaning nor occasion any controversy", and then asked what merit would be accrued should this sutra be believed, copied, disseminated, etc. Buddha (in effect) said the merit is incalculable. This is quite obvious the entire exchange, and even the entire sutra was ascertained by the Buddha himself.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not prove your contention on any level.

pueraeternus said:

it is quite obvious now "simultaneous" does not mean the vehicles are taught at the same time on this planet.



Malcolm wrote:

Of course it does. Only someone who is completely blind could "see" otherwise.

pueraeternus said:

Oh yes it does - don't be obstinate.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it really does not.

pueraeternus said:

Ludicrous - the Buddha was referring to the "essential non-existence of things" - he was making a point and reference to the ultimate. Of course there is the second turning at that time, since that is the first time the Buddha taught the prajnaparamita. However, since even the 2nd turning was provisional and subject to controversy, the Buddha turned the wheel a 3rd time.

Malcolm wrote:

Not because the second turning was provisional in fact, but because it needed to be reaffirmed as definitive.

pueraeternus said:

This is really common sense (again), if they were really tasked to preserve the Mahayana canon, they would have done it immediately after the parinirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

This objection has been addressed several times. Long and short, the Mahayāna was of no interest to the śrāvakas, so they did not preserve it.

pueraeternus said:

How can Bhayva blame them then?

Malcolm wrote:

He doesn't — he simply recognizes that śrāvakas had no interest in preserving Mahāyāna.

pueraeternus said:

Oh - perhaps they are deficient in their faith in the Buddha's words? Or perhaps they are really just apologists and tried to shore up support for their chosen vocation, hence the selective focus? You said that we should take each Mahayana sutra as the word of the flesh and blood Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

For a Mahāyanist, I find it odd that you so strenuously argue to discredit it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 11:38 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

So why do you take the word of a 10th level Bodhisattva over the word of the Supreme Buddha of our eon?

Malcolm wrote:

Because you have proven incapable of demonstrating any of your understanding is actually validated on the basis of what the texts actually say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: Apocryphal Treatment for Conze's Heart Problems, JOCBS

Content:

Huifeng said:

Utilizing Nattier's theory of the text's history...

Malcolm wrote:

It's better to forget such nonsense. It won't help anyone understand anything about the Dharma. People like Nattier should not be regarded as authorities on any level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 10:56 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Clarence said:

I might have missed it, but what brought about your change of opinion? I know you have done many 180's but I wonder what caused this particular one?

Malcolm wrote:

The recognition that doubting the word of the Buddha, even on a subtle level, causes negative traces.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 10:54 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

But Dharma is required to develop the capacity for great kindness and compassion, which makes us considerably more able to help.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. I don't think that great kindness and compassion is the sole province of Buddhists. I am perfectly convinced that great kindness and compassion is innate to human beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 9:57 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="dharmagoat"]

Even if this were so, we do not kill beings to ease their suffering\*, we care for them as much as we are able.[quote]

Sure, but Dharma isn't required for that. Simple kindness is sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

No-one needs to rule out the possibility of buddhahood in a single lifetime, no matter what the odds.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need for Buddhas or Buddhahood at all, if there is only one lifetime.

Anders said:

You are skipping steps here.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. If there is only one life, the suffering of all beings ends with death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

No-one needs to rule out the possibility of buddhahood in a single lifetime, no matter what the odds.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need for Buddhas or Buddhahood at all, if there is only one lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Pero said:

I'm sorry but it's a bit funny you've started to insist on accepting the traditional accounts on sutras while you deny traditional accounts of tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am including those too. kama, terma, etc.

Pero said:

So you no longer think that the 17 upadesha tantras of Dzogchen and the rest were written by someone in the 11th (?) century?

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are termas, of course, but I see no reason not to accept the traditional narrative of their concealment and rediscovery.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Tarkajvala states:

Not long after the Bhagavan's parinirvana, the śravakas were totally attached to the teaching for themselves. For that purpose, when the compilers compiled whatever they were able, since they could not retain the Mahāyāna discourses, they did not gather them at all. The nāgās and so on who rejoiced in the Sugata, gathered them all and were requested to keep them in the nāgā world, the deva world, etc. From there, because they were retained, the one predicted by the Buddha, Ārya Nāgārjuna, gathered them and spread them very widely in the human world.

dzogchungpa said:

Does it say how Nagarjuna "gathered" them?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, but you might say that Nāgārjuna is the first terton.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

There is no doubt that the three turnings are as the Samdhinirmocana sutra states, as it specifies 3 different times, each vehicle higher than the previous. The sites of the first 2 turnings are common knowledge. The third one not sure, but certainly timewise, it is later than the 2nd turning. This is crystal clear from the sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it doesn't. Not at all.

pueraeternus said:

This shows that your assertion on what Maitreya meant when he said "simultaneous" as incorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is very clearly stated in the commentarial literature what "simultaneous" means, it means that when he was in Śravastī, he taught both Śrāvakayāna and Mahāyāna, when he was Kapilavastu, he taught both, and so on.

pueraeternus said:

Why is it not reasonable? The Buddha ascertained that it is the case,

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did no such thing. He did not even speak the passage, Paramarthasamudgata did.

pueraeternus said:

and I have showed that if we don't assume the Mahayana sutras are spoken by the flesh and blood Buddha, that he delivered those teachings post-parinirvana, etc, then we have no problems.

Malcolm wrote:

Apart from the problem the very statement "simultaneous" is meant to rebut.

pueraeternus said:

The Samdhinirmocana citation I provided early does state different locations and times.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in fact it does not.

pueraeternus said:

And the fact that the 3rd wheel was turned because the 2nd wheel suffered "controversy", is another fact that shows that the 3rd was turned later than the 2nd.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not a warranted conclusion. In order to establish this, you would have to

able to say for certain whether this sūtra was taught after the Prajñāpāramita, but as there is absolutely no difference in the statement of the text concerning the content of the second and third turning, your contention cannot be verified at all.

For example, in the 25,000 PP, the Buddha replies to Subhuti's declaration that the Buddha had turned a second wheel of Dharma:

Subhuti, because of the essential non-existence of things, this is also not a second turning of the wheel, it is also not the first turning of the wheel.

pueraeternus said:

A bunch of arhats preserved the Sravaka canon much better, maintaining the transmission immediately after the parinirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

As did Āryabodhisattvas. All these questions have been previously addressed. Further, the Buddha predicted obstacles for Mahāyāna in the 25,000 and elsewhere: "Subhuti, many obstacles will arise for this Prajñāpāramita..." and so on.

pueraeternus said:

Contrast this with bodhisattvas, who are supposed to be vastly superior in every way, having the Mahayana canon in such piecemeal fashion and all over the place?

Malcolm wrote:

The Tarkajvala states:

Not long after the Bhagavan's parinirvana, the śravakas were totally attached to the teaching for themselves. For that purpose, when the compilers compiled whatever they were able, since they could not retain the Mahāyāna discourses, they did not gather them at all. The nāgās and so on who rejoiced in the Sugata, gathered them all and were requested to keep them in the nāgā world, the deva world, etc. From there, because they were retained, the one predicted by the Buddha, Ārya Nāgārjuna, gathered them and spread them very widely in the the human world.

In fact, the whole "three turnings" thing is so unimportant to Indians, there is no a single Indian commentarial voice on the issue. There exists solely a Korean commentary and a Tibetan commentary in the bstan 'gyur that deals with the issue at all. As we have seen, the Korean commentary attempts to define a temporal sequence, the Tibetan commentary does not make any such attempt.

On the other hand, there are many voices which deal with Maitreya Bodhisattvas statement that Śrāvakayāna and Mahāyāna arose together.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

How are you approaching the history of the rgyud bzhi, nowadays?

Malcolm wrote:

An edited terma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: when and where ? Chöd wang and lung

Content:

Happy Thunderbolt said:

I think you might be misinterpreting Tulku Dakpa.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no specific dwang for this practice. It only needs a lung.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

materialism is always changing in response to new proofs. It's not a completed project.

Malcolm wrote:

It's also not based on wisdom, but rather, concepts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 6th, 2014 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Pero said:

I'm sorry but it's a bit funny you've started to insist on accepting the traditional accounts on sutras while you deny traditional accounts of tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am including those too. kama, terma, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

and this is why Mahayana requires a position contra Buddhist Modernism with its textual criticism, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not say that text criticism was immoral, what I said was that if one accepts the text critical version of Buddhist history and one is a Mahāyāni, then one necessarily accepts that the texts one is following are not authentic. That is an immoral position for a Mahāyānist to take.

This is obviously a problem for Indian Mahāyānists because they again and again voice the sentiment that Mahāyāna sūtras need to be accepted as historical Buddhavacana, i.e. that they come from the time with the Buddha had not passed into parinirvana.

I think it is simply more practical for practicing Mahāyānis to accept the classical Indian Mahāyāna position about the authorship of the sūtras. We then avoid all the complications of later and earlier sutras, blah, blah, blah.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Berry said:

"You are wrong, I am right". ... "I like this, I don't like that" .... we tend to express these opinions a lot on the internet!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that's what we do on the internet.

As well as pictures, videos, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

As you point out, religious labels count for very little. While I no longer identify as a Buddhist, I still consider the bodhisatva ideal to be the highest aspiration.

Malcolm wrote:

One lifetime is a little short to accomplish this goal.

dharmagoat said:

But not necessarily too short, and I intend to die trying. Although it is most likely that not all beings are going to find enlightenment in one human lifetime.



Then again, is the goal really necessary? Can one be motivated by the aspiration without being fixed on the goal?

Malcolm, you make an important point. I need to think more on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhicitta is the aspiration to attain buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings. If there is no rebirth, it is rather pointless as an aspiration no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Maitreya can't have meant that the 2 vehicles was taught at the same time, because in the Samdhinirnocana, it is explicitly mentioned that the dharma wheel was turned 3 separate times - first at Benares the four noble truths, then the Buddha later turned it a second time proclaiming alaksanadharmacakra (Madhyamaka) for the Bodhisattvas, then finally because even the second turning was provisional, he turned the wheel the third time for the ultimate teaching (Yogacara). So you see, even the Buddha himself segregated the 3 sets of teachings into 3 distinct temporal periods.

Malcolm wrote:

While it is certainly true that many people have understood it this way, for example, the Korean master Wan tshig (sorry, did not dig up his actual Korean name): Indeed that Dharma of the Buddha is profound, nevertheless because there are many methods of guidance and ways of introducing it, not only one, the Sovereign of the Dharma taught three Dharma wheels. Among those the first the demonstration of cycling in the forests where wild animals roam who constantly perish and the causes and results of nirvana to those who are to enter into the Śrāvakayāna. This is called "The Dharmawheel of the four truths". Second, is teaching the Ārya-prajñāpāramita to sixteen gatherings at Vulture Peak and so on to those who are to enter the Bodhisattvayāna. This is called the Dharmawheel of characteristiclessness. The third is the teaching of the Samdhinirmocana and so on to those in the pure buddhafiels such as Padmagarbha, and the impure ones to those are to enter all vehicles called the "Mahāyāna of the definitive meaning".

This is not completely certain. There is no record in any other sutra or commentary of where these sites may be. In any case, even if we accept Wan tshig's statement at face value, it still means that the Mahāyāna arose at the same time as the Śrāvakayāna because it was taught during the lifetime of the Buddha.

Moreover, there is no certain statement in the citation itself that this is the case. In his General Division of Tantras, Loppon Sonam Tsemo responds to the above assertion:

If it is true those three Dharmawheels were turned for different inclinations, to claim “...they were turned in stages in different countries” is not reasonable. If it is asked how it is not reasonable, it is because scripture and reason are contradicted, the objections of the *śrāvakas* will not be rejected, the *Sugata* will come under criticism and so on. Because there will be many such faults, it is not reasonable. He ultimately answers this qualm with the citation from the *Sutralamkāra*:  
Not predicted earlier, arising at the same time.

As the *Sandhivākarana-tantra* too states:

Non-conceptual, undisturbed,  
...the pleasing single vajra word  
becomes many different [words]  
from the perspective of the mentalities of the trainees.

A single statement of the *Bhagavan*’s will appear as many different Dharmas to many different trainees at the same time. That also does not contradict the citation of the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* explained above. Although that citation does state different Dharmas, it does not state different locations or different times. Since that is so, teaching different Dharmas to trainees with one statement made at the same time is called “the array of speech,” and demonstrating many different bodies in different locations at the same time are the beneficial deeds with an array of bodies.

pueraeternus said:

Since logically if the these turnings were done during the Buddha’s earthly time, then we would have seen the movements started during his lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily, since the *Mahāyāna* was not collated by the *Śrāvakas*, but rather by the *Mahābodhisattvas* as indicated in such *sūtras* as the *Tathāgatācintyaguhyanirdeśa*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

If trying to make sense of things is pure speculation, then I am guilty as charged.

Malcolm wrote:

What it means is that you are indulging in pure fantasy, at this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 9:48 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Nonsense. The Samdhinirmocana's teaching on alayavijnana (sarvabijaka), trisvabhava and the three turnings (especially the very important chapter 7) are hallmarks of Yogacara.

Malcolm wrote:

In the passage in question, no mention is made of the ālayavijñāna, trisvabhava, etc. Read it again, closely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

"Because it is self-evident;"

Malcolm wrote:

The term "self\_evident" occurs nowhere in the text itself or the commentarial glosses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 9:45 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

So you see, even the Buddha himself segregated the 3 sets of teachings into 3 distinct temporal periods.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, the Samdhinirmocana does not state that. Read it again — closely this time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

As you point out, religious labels count for very little. While I no longer identify as a Buddhist, I still consider the bodhisatva ideal to be the highest aspiration.

Malcolm wrote:

One lifetime is a little short to accomplish this goal.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 10:39 PM  
Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
Love and compassion are not unique to Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 10:15 PM  
Title: Re: Practicing Together and lungs  
Content:  
Reibeam said:  
Hello All,

Question about group practice:

If a number people were planning to get together and do chNNr's Green Tara practice and everyone but two people had received introductory transmission and the Green Tara lung from chNNr, but had done Tara practices before from other teachers would it be okay for them to participate in a group practice setting and do chNNr's Green Tara practice?

Both of these folks are intending on receiving transmission from chNNr eventually. I don't want to discourage them from coming to an event, but although it is a peaceful practice (obviously no action mantras during this gathering) It requires a lung so I am not sure what to do other than do another Tara practice that everyone has authorization for.

Thanks in advance for any advice,

R

Malcolm wrote:  
You will get various answers, but if people are interested, let them come.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 9:44 PM  
Title: Re: Is Nirvana Worth It?  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
But this contradicts the very sutra he is citing

Astus said:  
Maybe not. As your quote says: "there is the appearance of many kinds of reflected images in the circle of a mirror".

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that none of those images are happening in the mirror.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Anders said:

What Maitreya is basically saying is that your insistence on accepting the literal historicity of the Mahayana sutras is not in fact necessary for the Mahayana to be valid.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not what he is saying. What he is saying is that whoever wins the result is a Buddha, and whatever he or she explains will be Buddhavacana. Muncandra explains: That being the case, the Mahāyāna is proven to be the word of the Buddha. If it is asked how, the person who comprehends the stages, the perfections and the meaning of no arising and cessation, that person is called "a buddha". Since all the words that person explains are the word of a buddha, Mahāyāna is proven to be the word of the Buddha. This statement should not be taken as an argument for the ahistoricity of Mahāyāna, because that is not the intent. What it is in fact is a criteria for establishing the authority of the Guru. Maitreya first established that Mahāyāna is historical as I show above.

He also proves that without Mahāyāna there would be no Śrāvakayāna, since without the bodhisattva path there would be no Buddha. Muncandra continues:

If there is no Mahāyāna, there will be no Śrāvakayāna. If it is asked why, if Mahāyāna does not exist, the path of accomplishing Buddhahood, the accomplishment of Buddhahood will not exist. If Buddhahood was not accomplished, then also since the Hīnayāna will not be explained, then this Hīnayāna that appears like that also will not be the word of the Buddha.

The eight points that Maitreya illustrates are to be take together as a whole argument, i.e. Mahāyāna is the word of the Buddha because 1) it was not predicted to be false 2) because it arose at the same time as the Śrāvakayāna 3) because it is outside the range of intellectuals and because it not perceived in texts of tīrthikas 4) because it is proven 5) because it exists 6) because it does not not-exist 7) because it is a remedy for the afflictions and 8) because the words are not to be taken literally (i.e. they require interpretation).

We have to accept the historicity of the Mahāyāna because we have the example of the Buddha! That is the whole point of these eight reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 11:56 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He means it is contemporary with and not later than the Śrāvakayāna, which is the Śrāvaka contention about Mahāyāna.

pueraeternus said:

He may have meant that the Mahayana is still preached nonetheless...

Malcolm wrote:

May have meant? No, Maitreya meant that Mahāyāna was taught at the same time as Śrāvakayāna — the commentarial voice on this is univocal.

pueraeternus said:

He also said that even if the Mahayana sutras were taught by someone besides Shakyamuni, it is still buddhavacana, since the eternal truth is self-evident.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a different issue altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 11:54 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

And if the flesh and blood Buddha really did preach the second and third turnings, why would anyone even contest that the Yogacara teachings are the epitome of his dharma? He said so himself in the Saṃdhinirmocana...

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not say any such thing in the Saṃdhinirmocana. What Paramarthasamudgata states is that the essencelessness, non-arising, non-cessation and so on is the definitive teachings for all vehicles, but not one word about Yogacara, etc. In other words, in this sūtra, the Buddha reaffirms the second turning as the definitive statement of his teaching. This renders it definitive.

pueraeternus said:

He planned to reveal the later phase of his teachings once the ground is fertile via visions, dream transmission, illusory bodies, etc, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

You are indulging in pure speculation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

If it means going against the advice set down by the Buddha himself, then I apologise to him alone.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't recall anyone asking you to apologize for anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: The Angulimala story is fake

Content:

odysseus said:

A hardened murderer can become a monk, but will not become enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

Your reasoning is?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

My point is, as always, that the entirety of the Buddhist path is meant to address the existential problem posed by constant rebirth in samsara. Our whole practice, regardless of yāna, is meant to address this sole fact.

smcj said:

Or, along the same lines, you can think of it this way: Even if someone has multiple wonderful meditation experience, sees life in a whole new way, is widely honored and praised for his spiritual accomplishments, is thought to be an authority on interpreting the Dharma, and seemingly reaps the fruits of all the potential benefits that practice has to offer in this life, if he is later reborn in an unfavorable situation then all that hoopla meant absolutely nothing --right?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, which is why Nāgārjuna quips that the fruits of generosity are enjoyed in lower realms...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Is Nirvana Worth It?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In the Sūtrālaṃkāravṛttibhāṣya, Sthiramati cites the Buddhābhūmi sūtra:

"Though there is the appearance of many kinds of reflected images in the circle of a mirror, those do not exist in the mirror, they do not enter the mirror and do not form in the mirror...

dzogchungpa said:

Maybe this is a question of the meaning of "image", or possibly of "mirror" or "in". I think that in ordinary English we would indeed say that images exist in the mirror and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that when the eight consciousness transform into wisdom, in the Indo-Tibetan tradition in general, it is understood there are no operations of consciousness one could liken to a sentient being's mind in a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Is Nirvana Worth It?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever the case may be, Buddhas do not have operations of vijñāna. They do not possess the eight consciousnesses because all the traces that constitute the ālayavijñāna are exhausted, thus there is no basis for the arising of the other seven.

Astus said:

It seems to me that there are only some differences between consciousness and wisdom. For example, there are various mental functions going on according to Xuanzang:

.

Malcolm wrote:

But this contradicts the very sutra he is citing:

In the Sūtrālaṃkāravṛttibhāṣya, Sthiramati cites the Buddhābhūmi sūtra:

"Though there is the appearance of many kinds of reflected images in the circle of a mirror, those do not exist in the mirror, they do not enter the mirror and do not form in the mirror. In the same way, though there is the appearance of many kinds of reflected images of the mirror-like wisdom, the reflections do not exist in the mirror-like wisdom, those reflections do not enter into the mirror-like wisdom and do not form in the mirror-like wisdom.

He adds:



When the eye consciousness is supported on form, there is the aspect of blue, yellow and so on and there is no conventional discrimination of the individual perceptions. In the same way though the forms of the objects of knowledge appear in that circle of wisdom, since there is no discrimination and no concept of the aspect and perception "this is blue, this is yellow", it never faces them.

As Vasubandhu states in the Sūtrālaṃkārabhāṣya:

[The mirror like wisdom] does not face them because it is imageless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Metaphor for the skandhas

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Works for me.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, so is there anything that would correspond to jñāna in this metaphor?

Malcolm wrote:

No, since the skandhas only present contaminated phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Is Nirvana Worth It?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas don't have minds. They have wisdom.

Astus said:

The four/five wisdoms/knowledges are the eight consciousnesses without the two hindrances, or in other words, a non-attached mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever the case may be, Buddhas do not have operations of vijñāna. They do not possess the eight consciousnesses because all the traces that constitute the ālayavijñāna are exhausted, thus there is no basis for the arising of the other seven.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Is Nirvana Worth It?

Content:

oushi said:

Mind is a shape, not an actually existing entity. There is a small confusion here. When we talk about the mind, self, intention we see it as an added component of the body-

skandhas thing.

Astus said:

When I say mind, it means the mental aggregates. There is no mind besides the aggregates in Buddhism. Intention (cetana), for instance, belongs to the fourth aggregate (samskara).

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas don't have minds. They have wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Sönam said:

Why some peoples accept annihilation at death as being obvious? Honestly I do not understand that pov, as all goes in the sens of a non-cessation (mind being the forerunner and is prior to matter, and so on) ... some are quite intricate.

ovi said:

Because scientifically speaking, mind isn't prior to matter.

Malcolm wrote:

Scientifically speaking, there simply is no basis for that claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Metaphor for the skandhas

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

This is from the section of the Abhidharmakosabhasyam where Vasubandhu explains the order of the skandhas: Matter is the pot, sensation is the food, ideas are the seasoning, the samskaras are the cook, and the mind is the consumer. We have a third reason for the order of the skandhas.

(La Vallée Poussin, Pruden translation)

I find this a rather charming image, but I'm wondering if this is actually a good way to think about the skandhas. I would be happy to hear what the learned members of DW think.

Malcolm wrote:

Works for me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

ovi said:

I never posted something along the lines of Rebirth doesn't exist, Buddha was wrong 111!

Malcolm wrote:

My point is, as always, that the entirety of the Buddhist path is meant to address the existential problem posed by constant rebirth in samsara. Our whole practice, regardless of yāna, is meant to address this sole fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

TRC said:

I know the Mahayana sutras trump the Nikayas/Agamas, but just wanted to point out that it does directly contradict the Śālmalivana-sutra, and maintains the point that the Buddha held nothing of importance back in regards to the Holy Life.

heart said:

The "Holy Life" means being a monk/nun, right?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it does. Specifically, it is a translation of the term "brahmacariya".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

TRC said:

I know the Mahayana sutras trump the Nikayas/Agamas, but just wanted to point out that it does directly contradict the Śālmalivana-sutra, and maintains the point that the Buddha held nothing of importance back in regards to the Holy Life.

Malcolm wrote:

If your idea of the holy life is just to attain the state of an arhat, of course I agree.

If your aim is to practice the bodhisattvayāna and become a buddha however, the Buddha does not explain this in the canon the śrāvakas left for us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

There is certainly contradiction in the idea that Vajrapani is the collator of sutras - he is clearly not since the early Mahayana sutras specifically stated that the Buddha ordered Ananda to memorize the sutras, and never was Vajrapani asked. This is just a very late tantric idea.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tathāgatācintyaguhyānirdeśa, part of the Ratnakuta collection, is the main sources for this claim. As this sūtra was translated into Chinese in by Dharmarakṣa in 280, it is clearly not a "late tantric idea".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

The eight points brought up by Maitreya also covers this (in Vasu's bhasya):

"Because it is self-evident;" even if the universal vehicle was taught by some enlightened being other (than Sākyamuni Buddha), that also proves it to be buddha-word, since a buddha is anyone who becomes perfectly enlightened and then teaches such (a vehicle)."

So we can see that the Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra is trying to cover all bases. Even if Maitreya says "simultaneous", what does he really mean?

Malcolm wrote:

He means it is contemporary with and not later than the Śrāvakayāna, which is the Śrāvaka contention about Mahāyāna.

pueraeternus said:

And please don't say that Abhayakaragupta or Bhavya should know better because they are Indian Mahayanists - that doesn't fly since we know Indian Mahayanists could not come to agreement with each other on many many other fronts.

Malcolm wrote:

Indian Mahāyānistis disagreed with each other over only two major issues, the question of the view [Madhyamaka or Yogacara] and the question of definitiveness [second or

third turning]. Apart from this, there was broad agreement in terms of the path.

pueraeternus said:

There is little need to appeal to "western academic biases" as a scapegoat...

Malcolm wrote:

I am not doing that. I am saying that people treat the Indian Mahāyānis as if they were idiots. We are so heavily conditioned by our own cultural heritage with regards to Buddhist studies, it general never occurs to us once to that the western academic narrative might be incomplete, wrong, etc.

pueraeternus said:

since many of us can read for ourselves the Mahayana sutras and see that there are a lot of internal contradictions and logical incongruities if we were to take the stance that the flesh-and-blood Buddha did speak those sutras 2500 years ago.

Malcolm wrote:

For example? And if this is the case, how is that the flesh and blood Buddha would not censure these teachings as being distortions of the Dharma? Certainly Theravadins censure Mahāyāna sūtras as fakes and forgeries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And my point is that we have to preserve the Dharma in the face of all those people who think that they can cherry pick the Dharma.

dharmagoat said:

Preserve the Dharma in its traditional forms by all means. That is essential.

But why be threatened by those that are selective in their beliefs? What harm can they do the Dharma that has survived unadulterated for 2500 years?

Malcolm wrote:

Who said I felt threatened?

As to your other question, it is when Buddhists start importing wrong views that Dharma will degenerate. Only Buddhists can destroy the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Lazy\_eye said:

My point is that even a partial embrace of Buddhist teachings is better than falling into that kind of thinking. If nothing else, Buddhism provides moral principles and a framework for living a virtuous life. Engaging dhamma even on those limited terms is better for most people's well-being than nurturing an amoral or cynical outlook.

Malcolm wrote:

And my point is that we have to preserve the Dharma in the face of all those people who think that they can cherry pick the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Like I said, he is seldom there in the earlier sutras. His position in the early Mahayana sutras are the same as his namesake in the Agamas - that of a divine dharmapala. And in the Agamas and early Mahayana sutras, as far as I know, he is never there as an interlocutor.

Malcolm wrote:

It is very clear that the bodhisattva Varjapani is indeed the same person described in the Prajñāpāramita and in the Agamas, appearing as a guardian of the teachings here and there as an interlocutor — there is no contradiction whatsoever. In Vajrayāna, Vajrapani is considered to be the general of the dharmapālas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

And how would Abhayakaragupta know what happened during the First Council? Why would non-tantrikas take his words as definitive?

Ananda was present in many of the major Mahayana sutras, as already quoted earlier - the prajnaparamitas, vimalakirtinirdesa, etc. How do you explain this?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course Ānanda was present during the teaching of many Mahāyāna sūtras, this is not under dispute.

The point is that Abhayakaragupta is making is that the first council was not a convention for collecting all the teachings of the Buddha. The point he is making is that the first council had an agenda that was limited in its scope.

As an Indian Buddhist, he had access to sources and traditions we do not have. Abhayakaragupta is as likely to know what actually happened during the first council as we are. And Abhayakaragupta's perspective is a confirmation of earlier opinions voiced by those such as Maitreya and Bhavya.

We know a very great deal about what the Theravadins think about these issues. We know a very great deal about what western academics think about these issues. We know almost nothing about what Indian Mahāyānists think about these issues — but in general, Western Mahāyanists, including Tibetan Buddhists, tend to defer to the latter two groups when it comes to Mahāyāna history and ignore our own historical traditions. I think that is detrimental to Mahāyāna in general.

Mahāyāna proclaims five certainties: time, place, teacher, teaching and retinue, i.e. always; Akaniṣṭha; the Sambhogakāya; Mahāyāna; Buddhas and bodhisattvas, both emanated and the continuums of others. By contrast, the Śravakayāna is limited in its scope in terms of time, place, teacher, teaching and retinue. Nevertheless, Mahāyāna taught by the nirmanakāya is a localized and temporal instantiation of those teachings, and there are good reasons why the Mahāyāna narratives of their spread ought not be ignored.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rejecting rebirth is embracing nihilism, just affirming a truly existent self is embracing eternalism.

Lazy\_eye said:

Annihilationism, as presented in the suttas, seems to be defined with reference to the Carvaka:

...

One might subscribe to part of this ("the sense-faculties scatter into space", etc) while rejecting some other parts ("generosity is taught by idiots", "there is no fruit of actions"). It is not clear at all that failure to uphold rebirth means embracing annihilationism as defined in this context.

Malcolm wrote:

Simply put, it means that one embraces the view that there is no result of action, there is no karma, etc. We can understand the general point that Carvaka view was greatly

exaggerated by their opponents, but in general, the salient point is that they taught that death was the annihilation of the person. Anyone who does not accept rebirth subscribes to this view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Lazy\_eye said:

Well, it seems to me that this is exactly what the Buddha told his disciples. He said you have all the teachings...

Malcolm wrote:

No, in fact for we read in the Śālmalivana-sutra \*: Ānanda, I comprehend even more Dharma than however many leaves there are in this śālmali grove, but I have not taught them to you. Since that many were taught for a purpose, you must not be regretful, but you should also not be without desire [to hear them].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. What I said is that the Mahāyāna was not compiled by Ānanda. It was compiled by Vajrapani, etc.

Whatever was entrusted to Ārya Ānanda, that was employed by the śravakas for the worldly, and not for the purpose of compiling the Dharma.

pensum said:

So all the Mahayana sutras entrusted to Ananda, including the Prajnaparamita, are not actually Mahayana sutras? But whatever the case, the very fact that such texts were "employed by the sravakas" would seem to contradict your earlier statements, that the sravakas had no serious interest in them and did not practice them. Or is that statement just a ploy to create a further divide between the Sravaka and the Mahayana? (such dubious motive, to my mind, would then further undermine the trustworthiness of a sutra with such motives)

Malcolm wrote:

"Whatever" is a restrictive. Abhayakaragupt is telling us that the goal of the first council was to compile what they thought was useful, not to compile everything. Ananda was not present at many teachings, as he was Buddha's attendant only a bit later in the Buddha's career. He certainly is not present in such major Mahāyana sutras such as the Avatamska, and so on.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Lazy\_eye said:

embracing nihilism, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Rejecting rebirth is embracing nihilism, just as affirming a truly existent self is embracing eternalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

changing our convictions...

Malcolm wrote:

I have never, ever changed my conviction about the necessity to accept rebirth in all the years I have been participating in online discussions. While I have of course changed my opinions about many other things, this is one thing I have never wavered from for an instant as any review of my posting history will reveal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

ovi said:

Rejecting the notion of self is a common thought in the psychedelic community and the fact that there is suffering does not depend on the idea of rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

The end of suffering very much depends on right view.

ovi said:

Frankly, you don't understand upaya. You would rather have people abandon Buddhism completely because they don't fully understand it...

Malcolm wrote:

In the contrary, I want people to understand Buddhism so they can gain the results of the path. Whatever they choose to believe is one thing; what the Buddha actually taught is quite another. We owe it the Dharma not to turn the teachings into a free for all.

ovi said:

..even though the vast majority of Buddhists who have full faith in rebirth and retribution fail to achieve liberation until death, that is they fail in fully understanding it.

Malcolm wrote:

Whether in this world, during the bardo or in the next world, liberation is liberation.

ovi said:

I do hope that it is more important for us to lead others to liberation than to actively work against their wellbeing.

Malcolm wrote:

One can not even begin to imagine one is leading others to liberation if one is not capable distinguishing right view from wrong view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. What I said is that the Mahāyāna was not compiled by Ānanda. It was compiled by Vajrapani, etc.

pensum said:

So by implication, are you now claiming that all the Mahayana sutras which were passed on by Ananda are fakes or that someone took literary license and switched the credit from Vajrapani to Ananda (hence falsifying them and drawing the validity of the entire corpus into question)? Or is Ananda merely one of Vajrapani's pen names?

Malcolm wrote:

Not claiming anything of the kind. I am also not engaging in conspiracy theories or speculations. I am reporting what various Indian masters opine based upon the sūtras that they read.

For example, Sakya Paṇḍita, while not an Indian master, opines that there is no contradiction between Vajrapani and Ānanda being the compilers of the sūtras.

I will leave it for others to engage in speculations and theories about this issue. As for myself, I am content to regard Guhyapati Vajrapani as being the primary collator of the Buddha's sūtras and tantras, as that is the role to which the Buddha appointed him.

Thus, there are three main considerations we need to understand:

- 1) The Śrāvakayāna and Mahāyāna arose at the same time, per Maitreyanatha
- 2) The collators of the Mahāyāna were the major bodhisattvas, Mañjuśrī, Vajrapani and

so on per Bhava and so on

3) The person who is represented by "Thus have I heard..." is Vajrapani per Abhayakaragupta

This is our Mahāyāna tradition.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 7:24 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

ovi said:

One can dispel the wrong notion of self and be liberated from suffering in this lifetime without making use of rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, you can't. Buddha lists acceptance of rebirth as being among the features of right view. People who do not understand this simply do not understand Buddha's Dharma and that's all there is to it.

ovi said:

I don't see how it prevents realization in this lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot have any realization while one is operating under the influence of wrong view.

Frankly, you simply do not understand what the Buddha is saying in the Kalamas sutta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 7:07 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?

Content:

Simon E. said:

It seems to have become almost axiomatic that those who quote the Kalama Sutta seem to ignore, or be unaware of, the fact that the Kalamas were not followers of the Buddha, and that he was telling them pointedly that their teacher would not give them the means to realise Nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't help matters that it is billed as Buddha's Charter of Free Inquiry. It is a minor sutta, of no traditional significance at all.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 6:53 PM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:  
"you have a mind"  
... then are you saying that the mind is possessed by a person?

Malcolm wrote:  
Conventionally, yes — just like I have a face, a hand, a mouth, and so on.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 6:52 PM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:  
PadmaVonSamba said:  
the arising of mind is the result of awareness.  
.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:  
No, awareness is a characteristic of a moment of consciousness.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 6:42 PM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:  
ovi said:  
, however, according to the Kalama Sutta, achieving a high level of realization in this lifetime does not depend on believing in rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:  
The Kalamas sutra implies nothing of the sort. It states that people who practice the four brahma-viharas will be "free from hatred, free from malice, safe and sound, and happy" and that is it. This is not a level of realization at all. It states at most that one "...shall arise in the heavenly world, which is possessed of the state of bliss."

In other words, the teaching in the Kalamas is not a path. It does not lead from samsara. It leads merely to temporary, samsaric happiness and that is all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 6:32 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Vajrapani mentioned in the early Agamas is a yaksha...

As is Vajrapani in Mahāyāna sūtras. He is called "Guhyapati" because is he the master of the Guhyakas.

He is also seldom mentioned in most sutras and in the early Mahayana sutras, he is almost never there. Only in the much later phase of Mahayana does he appear with any regularity.

All these sutras mention him:

Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā

Pañcaviṃśatisahasrika

Aṣṭasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā

Aṣṭadaśasahasrika-prajñāpāramitā

Daśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā

Prajñāpāramitānayaśatapañcāśatikā

Pañcaviṃśatika-prajñāpāramitāmukha

In the Akṣobhyasya-tathāgatasyavyūha he is referred as the yakṣapati. The Lalitavistara states he is a yakṣa. The Mahāparinirvāṇa calls him the Yakṣarāja. The Gaganagañjaparipṛcchā calls him Vajrapani the yakṣa, as does the Vikurvāṇarājaparipṛcchā. The Vimalaprabhakaripṛcchā explains that he is the Yakṣarāja, the son of the yakṣa lord, Vaiśravaṇa. The Dānapāramitā calls him the Mahānāyakaḥ, the great chief of all the yakṣas, as does the Nīlāmbaṛadharavajrapāṇi-rudratriviṇaya-tantra, the Vajrapāṇinīlāmbaravidhivajrādaṇḍa-tantra, the Śrī-vajracandacittaguhyatantra and the Śrī-vajracandacittaguhyatantrottarottara, the Vajrabhūmitricaraṇi-rājakaḥpa-nāma, the Saptatathāgatapūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra, the Bhagavānbhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya-pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra, Mahāmañivipulavimānaviśvasupratīṣṭhitaguhyaparama-rahasyakaḥparāja-nāma-dhāraṇī, etc.

Vajrapani is just Vajrapani, whether in the Agamas/Nikayas, Vinaya, or the Vaipulya sūtras.

In short, Vajrapani is a tenth stage bodhisattva born among the Yakṣas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 10:55 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherlock said:

Incidentally I don't see what's wrong with the term "sravakayana". Calling it "Mainstream" lends weight to the the idea that Mahayana is somehow heterodox. Sravaka/Savaka on the other hand is used in the Sravakayana texts themselves and is used in the earliest Mahayana texts to distinguish it from the Pratyekabuddhayana and Bodhisattvayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, it is a bit of a joke.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 10:10 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Why would this be a problem? Since the Mahayana encapsulates the three vehicles, why is it shocking that they have a common foundational basis?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not shocking that they have a similar foundation. But my point is that your basic point of view establishes the Mainstream canon as being more authoritative than any Mahāyāna text ever could be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 10:08 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Such as Vajrapani not even mentioned in many of the early Mahayana sutras and that Ananda was specifically appointed to memorize and propagate sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Since you accept the Mainstream canons as being more authoritative the Mahāyāna, it could not have escaped you that Vajrapani is mentioned in the Pali Canon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Only one concern: what if the traditional Buddhist standpoint is under-represented?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, completely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I am interested in discussing the issues faced by Buddhists (and ex-Buddhists) like myself who are struggling to engage with Buddhism in its existing forms, but are not interested in rejecting the teachings of the Buddha. The discussion may provide an insight into what form a new dharma derived from the Buddhadharma might take, but it would be entirely speculative.

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty hard to reject birth and not reject the Buddha's teaching, since the very idea of right view is predicated on accepting rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Adi said:

Since you are a person who has renounced Buddhism and revoke their refuge vows, I'd say yes, there could be quite a bit of harm possible.

dharmagoat said:

The alternative would be to not have been upfront about my relationship with Buddhism.

Adi said:

Besides that, though, if those kinds of profound changes have come about then those other forums are surely a better place to find those of like mind who share the same goal.

dharmagoat said:

No profound changes, just a gradual progression.

I am actually primarily interested in what like-minded Buddhists can contribute to the idea. I won't find that on a non-Buddhist forum.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, there are forums like the Secular Buddhist forum where you will find people of similar ideas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I would like to see the generation of a new dharma that derives from the Buddhadharma but does not attempt to challenge, change or replace any of the traditional forms. Any discussion that leads in this direction is a means to this end.

Malcolm wrote:

There are entire forums devoted to that already.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 7:00 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We merely provide the glass of koolaid. It is up to them to drink it or not. We certainly don't waterboard them with it.

Mkoll said:

Crude, but it gets the point across.

ovi said:

You can't expect people to all agree on the same preference for flavor. You might blame renouncing Buddhism on something such as past karma and be indifferent to it, I blame it on lack of upaya.

Malcolm wrote:

You can't even get people to agree on a brand.

But when you present a brand, you need to include all the ingredients on the label so people may make intelligent, informed choices about what they are buying. You certainly don't sell something to someone saying, well, this tastes good, but ignore the ingredients, they are not important, since they might have a nut allergy and go into anaphylactic shock.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 6:18 AM



Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

ovi said:

So you renounce Buddhism because people on the internet don't agree with you?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it would appear he has discovered that he does not in fact agree with the Buddha's Dharma in the end.

But we should respect his wish not to make a public discussion of this since it is a private matter.

ovi said:

Aren't we supposed to liberate beings from suffering, in accordance with their current abilities? Is there any point to try to preserve something called a Dharma that doesn't liberate people?

Malcolm wrote:

We merely provide the glass of koolaid. It is up to them to drink it or not. We certainly don't waterboard them with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

ovi said:

So you renounce Buddhism because people on the internet don't agree with you?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it would appear he has discovered that he does not in fact agree with the Buddha's Dharma in the end.

But we should respect his wish not to make a public discussion of this since it is a private matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is your pet theory but it really does not make any sense. A plant turning towards

the sun does not indicate the plant is any sense aware of the sun, or that there is awareness in a plant.

PadmaVonSamba said:

No, but a plant extending its roots specifically toward a source of water indicates intentional action.

Malcolm wrote:

No, absolutely not.

PadmaVonSamba said:

What I was getting at before, in responding to a previous post is that while you cannot really prove that all appearances are anything but illusions, or that your entire lifetime of existence is nothing but a brief dream you have been having, there is still awareness of that illusion, awareness of that dream.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because you have a mind. Minds are aware.

PadmaVonSamba said:

...rebirth does not depend on any notion of a continuous physical body or brain.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because minds are not dependent on bodies or brains.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

So your own personal confidence in the the validity of the Mahayana is based on...what?

pueraeternus said:

That it agrees with the dharma seals...

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, his acceptance of Mahāyāna is based on their containing the same instructions as the Mainstream canon, the doctrines they share in common. However, this bears the reverse consequence that he accepts the Mainstream canon as being the authority by which Mahāyāna compositions (as he must consider them) can be validated as Buddhist teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

After 25 years of study and practice I renounce Buddhism and revoke my refuge vows.

Malcolm wrote:

What a pity.

dharmagoat said:

Do you mean that sincerely?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

After 25 years of study and practice I renounce Buddhism and revoke my refuge vows.

Malcolm wrote:

What a pity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As has been pointed out to you any number of times, awareness is just a characteristic of consciousness.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Suggested, but not proven.

Since there are things which respond intentionally (meaning not merely "randomly") to their environments,

yet possess nothing that is regarded as consciousness,

and since awareness does not depend on sensory function,

it is obvious that awareness precedes consciousness.

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is your pet theory but it really does not make any sense. A plant turning towards the sun does not indicate the plant is any sense aware of the sun, or that there is awareness in a plant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

What support is there that he taught Mahayana sutras during his earthly time?

Malcolm wrote:

Upon what evidence is the conclusion that he didn't based?

pueraeternus said:

Via the absence of any Mahayana materials in the earliest collections. For example, if the Mahayana were taught on the onset with everything else, the various Abhidharma texts of the many Sravaka schools would have made copious references to Mahayana sutras, since Abhidharmic texts are exegetical works on the sutric canons. And please don't repeat the canard about Arhats not privy to the Mahayana sutras (disproved).

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say they were not privy to them. I said that the Mahāyāna canon was not their domain, meaning, it was not their path, nor a path they were interested in promulgating. They were interested in freedom in this life, not in buddhahood three incalculable eons hence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

We have several Agamic collections in the Taisho, along with abhidharmic works of various sects - none of them have any materials related to Mahayana. Malcolm said earlier that even Mahayana authors acknowledged that the Mahayana sutras were not gathered during early phases of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. What I said is that the Mahāyāna was not compiled by Ānanda. It was compiled by Vajrapani, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Is Nirvana Worth It?

Content:

Astus said:

If and when someone agrees that the whole of samsara from hells to heavens is painful and unsatisfactory, liberation from it is the logical choice. But when nirvana is presented as not only the end of all the inconvenient things in life, but the end of all the good things as well, how could enlightenment be desirable?

Malcolm wrote:

When one understands that the "good" things are just the suffering of change...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

And at this point, you are just speculating, and with no viable or even vaguely plausible evidence.

Malcolm wrote:

As are you.

pueraeternus said:

Nonsense. So far, I have provided internal evidence within the Mahayana sutras (note I did not rely on any scholarly arguments, but pointed to what the Mahayana sutras themselves say) and pointed out that if Ananda and the other sravakas were indeed taught by the Buddha on these sutras 2500 years ago, it would be impossible for the First Council collection to not have these recited and gathered. Neither you nor heart have given a viable response against those points raised.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I have. Unlike you, I am not willing to engage in speculation as to why this was the case, given that Maitreya insists Mahāyāna is contemporary with what we term the "śrāvaka canon" right at the beginning of the Sūtrālaṃkāra.

Further, the Vajrapāṇyabhiṣeka tantra and the Tathāgatācintyaguhyānirdeśa mahāyāna sūtra clearly maintain that Vajrapāṇi is actually the collator of the sūtras.

Abhayakaragupta states in the Āryāṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāvṛttimarmakaumudī:

In the same way, the Tathāgatācintyaguhyānirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra explains the compiler of "the separate and continuous explanations" and so on is the the lord of the tenth bhūmī, the Mahābodhisattva Vajrapāṇi, empowered to protect the rūpakāya and the dharmakāya of the tathāgatas after [the Buddha's] departure and where he is individually entrusted with the teachings in Vajrapāṇyabhiṣeka-sūtra. Whatever was

entrusted to Ārya Ānanda, that was employed by the śravakas for the worldly, and not for the purpose of compiling the Dharma. The Bhagava's demonstrated of parinivana here. Because Ārya Vajrapani converts all worlds, he desired to compile the Prajñāpāramita and so on, after which he said "Thus have I heard..." and so on to the assembly of Mahābodhisattvas such as Ārya Maitreya and so on. Just as he heard it from the teacher, afterwards he recited it and in that same way others heard it from him. Thus Vajrapani is the compiler.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

So why wasn't this material preserved by the Shravakas?

Malcolm wrote:

Sadly, we can only guess, and guesses are no substitute for knowledge. So in fact we do not know. As I have said, we can either go on the accounts of the Indian Mahāyāna masters in recounting the history their tradition or not. It is a personal choice.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, and only one of those choices is virtuous, right?

Malcolm wrote:

If one is a practitioner of Mahāyāna, expressing doubt that it is the teaching of the Buddha is indeed a non-virtue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

So why wasn't this material preserved by the Shravakas?

Malcolm wrote:

Sadly, we can only guess, and guesses are no substitute for knowledge. So in fact we do not know. As I have said, we can either go on the accounts of the Indian Mahāyāna masters in recounting the history their tradition or not. It is a personal choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

What support is there that he taught Mahayana sutras during his earthly time?

Malcolm wrote:

Upon what evidence is the conclusion that he didn't based?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Sure but that doesn't mean the inherency of awareness cannot be refuted. Awareness is dependently originated just like any other conditioned phenomena is. To use Nāgārjuna's logic; if you can have awareness without objects, then you can have objects without awareness. Obviously you cannot have objects without awareness, and therefore you cannot have awareness without objects, meaning awareness is dependent and therefore without inherency and entirely refutable.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Awareness is self-evident.

The fact that you are "aware that you are aware" makes the fact of awareness itself an object of awareness.

And objects can and obviously do exist without any awareness of them, because all events are the results of causes, and causes are quite often functioning without any awareness of them at the time they are functioning.

.  
.   
.

Malcolm wrote:

As has been pointed out to you any number of times, awareness is just a characteristic of consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just to add a point:

Simultaneous.

The commentary on this line states:

In reply to the claim, "When the śrāvakayāna was explained by the Bhagavan in Śravastī

and so on during the time of the śrāvakas, at that time Mahāyāna was not explained. Since the Dharma called "Mahāyāna" arose after the Buddha's parinirvana, the Mahāyāna is not a Dharma of the Buddha", it is stated "because it arose simultaneously". When the Bhagavan was in places such as Śrāvastī and so on explaining the śrāvakayāna as the minor vehicle, since he explained the Mahāyāna at that time in those places, it is proven that the Mahāyāna is the speech of the Buddha."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

PorkChop said:

He's merely advocating accepting the traditional historical paradigm regarding Mahayana sutras...

Malcolm wrote:

Precisely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Malcolm, let's say the western academics have it right and that none of the Mahayana sutras were spoken by the historical Buddha. Are we then to reject them and become Theravadins?

Malcolm wrote:

What I am contending is that there is no basis whatsoever to lend support to their claims that Mahāyāna is a later development. Especially since Maitreyanatha rejects this claim in the Sūtrālaṃkāra stating:

Not predicted and simultaneous.

What I am saying is that we have our own historical tradition and it is time to start honoring it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

And at this point, you are just speculating, and with no viable or even vaguely plausible evidence.



Malcolm wrote:

As are you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherlock said:

I think people should remember that these academics' arguments are all hypotheses. Hypotheses which are mostly unfalsifiable (unless you have a time machine or can remember past lives). As practitioners of Mahayana, we can formulate our own hypotheses subject to the same criteria (falsifiable only by time-travel or recollection of past lives) and it is better for not only our practice but the credibility of Mahayana as a whole.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for some reason, people think that following the traditions we have less reasonable than the academic supposition that Buddha never taught Mahāyāna. The mind boggles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

[

And the Buddha totally had no issues teaching Arhats bodhisattva doctrine and practices (as we can see so clearly in the Mahayana sutras), so your reasoning that Mahayana sutras were not recited in the First Council due to different domains is asinine - the Buddha didn't hesitate to teach Arhats bodhisattva doctrine, so if he really taught it when he was flesh-and-blood 2500 years ago, the Arhats would have totally no problem reciting and gathering them.

Malcolm wrote:

So here again, you are putting the śravakas as the authority which defines the validity of the Mahāyāna.

Obviously, we cannot get the Buddha's input on why the first council did not recite his Mahāyāna sūtras because he was not present. And, we do not need to assume every sūtra taught by the Buddha would have been gathered and recited there. This is the fundamental flaw with your thinking. You assume that if it was taught, it must have or should have been recited and the first council, which as far as anyone knows, had no bodhisattvas present. The point Bhava is making is that the first council only recited sūtras relevant to the attainment of the fruit of an arhat, not a bodhisattva or a buddha.

We know that the different groups have different sets of sūtras. The net effect of your implicit supposition is that only the sutras that all groups have in common can be regarded as what the Buddha actually taught; whereas, any sutras this or that group has which are not reflected in the whole collection of all canons must therefore be fakes. This is extremely bad reasoning.

pueraeternus said:

Of course - there is absolutely no good reason why the Mahayana sutras were not recited if they were really taught during the Buddha's earthly life, because even if the Arhats were of a smaller denomination, they were certainly part of the prime audience in many sutras, especially the prajnaparamitas. And the fact that the Buddha instructed Ananda to memorize and preserve the sutras destroys your (and whatever Indian master you favor) contention that only Manjushri and the bodhisattvas preserved the Mahayana canon.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not, for the reasons given above. We have no certainty whatsoever that all the sutras the Buddha taught were recited at the first council. Why? Because even different Mainstream canons contain different sets of sūtras.

At base, what should be contested is the supposition that the first council was a comprehensive review of all of the Buddha's teachings. What is our authority for believing this?

Remember, Indian Mahāyāna authors (despite your opinion that they were "asinine" in their belief that the Mahāyāna was not recited at the first council because the bodhisattva path did not concern trainees for arhatship and so on), they were Indian Buddhists, highly educated in their literature, to which they had far more access than we do today.

That is your problem. You think they are pious forgeries when they are not spoken by the flesh-and-blood Buddha, I beg to differ. Why? Because I follow the Mahayana doctrines and its trikaya doctrine - that's why!

This explains nothing. The sambhogakāya does not teach ordinary flesh and blood people like ourselves for the simple fact that we are not 8th stage bodhisattvas. We, if we are even so lucky, can only see the nirmanakāya. But according to you, the Mahāyāna sūtras are not even the teachings of the nirmanakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Dan74 said:

But to us, to people who are already aware of the scholarship, to reject it because its findings are inconvenient, is intellectually dishonest.

Malcolm wrote:

The scholarship on the subject tells only that which we have already known for centuries: Mahāyāna sūtras were not recited during the first council, but began to be written down about the same time as the Agamas and Nikāyas.

We can see that the two most seminal authors in Mahāyāna, Nāgārjuna and Maitreya, both defended the validity of Mahāyāna in the face of Mainstream Buddhist attacks.

These are the only facts about them which we have at our disposal.

There are traditional accounts about how Mahāyāna was preserved. Those accounts clearly tell us that the Mahāyāna sūtras were all authored by the Buddha personally.

Then there is the point of view of western academics about the origin of these texts, which itself is purely speculative. It clearly tells us that not one of these texts was authored by the Buddha, that in effect it is an impossibility.

The net effect of following the latter position is that Mahāyāna is invalidated, the bodhisattva path and so on. The net effect of following the former position is that the Mahāyāna is validated, the bodhisattva path and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Dan74 said:

I don't see this dichotomy as necessary, Malcolm, as I've already tried to suggest. I agree with you that we cannot know for sure whether the scholars are right, but in the absence of this certainty, I am left with the Sutras themselves. And what they contain is enough for me to respect and even revere them, but most importantly to put them to use.

Malcolm wrote:

The dichotomy is necessary precisely because of how western academia has framed the reception of Mahāyāna. We are no longer in the phase where Mahāyāna is merely a curiosity for Sanskritists. We are in a period where many hundreds of thousands of westerners like ourselves are embracing Mahāyāna. Therefore, the authenticity of the lineage is important.

Dan74 said:

I fail to see the preoccupation with the origin (which is unverifiable) as helpful to practice. If the Dharma is true, many realised masters followed in Shakyamuni's footsteps and I have no problem learning from them, if that's what the Sutras are.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, you entirely are missing my point. I know very well that origins are not verifiable. I am talking about which narrative is the most useful to bring to our practice of Mahāyāna. One that disempowers our tradition (the western academic narrative) or the one that bolsters our practice (the traditional narrative).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

The point is, for karma to happen "to" someone...

Malcolm wrote:

...there just has to be the conventions "karma", "ripening" and "person".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

But I will not grant you the possibility that you can listen, think, read and write about a Buddhist discourse, somehow free or outside of the contemporary structure of language.

Malcolm wrote:

I never suggested that one could. This is actually the issue I am raising, viz., it is precisely the contemporary framing of Mahāyāna history that I find destructive to our tradition.

Most people's encounter with Mahāyāna starts with a survey course book, in which is maintained that Mahāyāna was never taught by Śakyamuni in person, but rather at best it consisted of pious fictions, or possibly visions, by anonymous groups of people in various parts of India.

But when for example, Buton Rinchen Drup maintains that that the Mahāyāna was collated by bodhisattvas on Mt. Vimalasvabhava, this is met with derision and sneers by those who consider themselves Mahāyānists precisely because the majority of Western Mahāyānists have bought into the western academic version of Buddhist history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Arhats and Bodhisattvas

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is impossible for someone to have generated bodhicitta to experience the fruit of an arhat, i.e. cessation, indeed, it is against the very principles of the bodhisattva path to do so.

pueraeternus said:

Not true - bodhisattvas can fall from their path into Arhathood from the 1st to 7th bhūmis. So bodhicitta (which they need to fully blossom before they enter the 1st bhūmi) is no guarantee until the pure bhūmis.

Malcolm wrote:

Citation please?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

So? You said only a handful of Arhats spoke in the sutras, so I countered that likewise only a handful of Bodhisattvas really speak in Mahayana sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Hundreds actually.

pueraeternus said:

It's a good question, but it has been answered already — the bodhisattva path is not the domain of śrāvakas.

Nonsense - then why did the Buddha preach to them the bodhisattva path, and even asked Ananda to preserve and propagate them?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the Sangha contained both śravakas and bodhisattvas.

Really. Already given that answer in my previous post.

Right, so we have four or five regularly appearing śravakas in the sūtras, as opposed to hundreds of bodhisattvas in the sūtras, and you still wonder at why the bodhisattva pitika was not recited at the first assembly?

Then sadly, those Indian masters didn't give a good explanation. Sorry.

Works quite well for me.

My goodness, you have actually become a Sravakayanist.

What a strange world we live in where the idea that the words of the Buddha might be pious forgeries is lauded as virtuous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 9:36 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So not many at all. A mere handful, apart from those in the audience.

pueraeternus said:

Don't be specious. By this logic then there are also very little bodhisattvas since only at most a handful of them really speak in the Mahayana sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

The bodhisattva retinues are often described as being beyond number, but never the śrāvaka Sangha.

pueraeternus said:

The fact that most of these Mahayana sutras include 1250 arhats in the audience, shows that they were indeed part of the targeted audience (and not merely as passive listeners) and hence the question that if the Buddha really spoke of these sutras during his earthly time here, why didn't the arhats propagate them?

Malcolm wrote:

It's a good question, but it has been answered already — the bodhisattva path is not the domain of śrāvakas.

pueraeternus said:

Again, don't be specious. Those "four or five" (actually some Mahayana sutras had more arhat interlocutors) already is more than enough to prove my point.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, which ones?

pueraeternus said:

Let me give you a few examples to dispel these notions of yours:

Malcolm wrote:

It's not my notion. It is prescribed by many [to use your definition of many] Indian masters, not only one.

pueraeternus said:

I prefer the understanding that the Mahayana is indeed the teaching of the Buddha, revealed to later Buddhist savants through visionary encounters, direct yogic encounter

via siddhis, dream transmissions, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

I used to be satisfied with such apologetics. But now I find them pale and dissatisfying. In the end they are simply an admission that Mahāyāna is not the actual teaching of the Buddha. Some people might be fine with that story, but I am not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 8:10 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

Where are all these scholars interpreting and translating Buddhist texts purely in this critical fashion and purely to publish and make a buck?

Malcolm wrote:

Publish or die...

tobes said:

I would say the trend is starkly opposite: most works occur out of sincere and genuine interest in what those texts might have to teach us. Very often they are scholar-practitioners. If not, they have committed a huge amount of time and energy to bring Buddhist thought into the contemporary epoch. I don't think it is possible to do this without a genuine effort to pursue an understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Many of the academic scholars of Buddhism that I know are ex-practitioners.

tobes said:

Moreover, unless you have a time machine and can go back to the discourses themselves, there is no other possibility than, as you put it: "examining the dharma through different Western/modern/post-modern intellectual lenses." The point is, those lenses are already there in the language we use, and the conceptual frameworks we deploy in interpretation, whether we are aware of them or not. If there is a way to put them down, so to speak, and interpret 'on faith' could you explain how this may be possible?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, we just accept the received tradition and leave it at that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can either assume that the reason for this is as described by Bhava...

Wayfarer said:

Where is this account to be found?

Malcolm wrote:

Tarkajvala.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

How many arhats, exactly? In which sutras?

pueraeternus said:

Prajnaparamita sutras (eg. Subhuti), Suramgamasamadhi (eg. Sariputra, Mahakasyapa), Vimalakirti (e.g. Sariputra, Mahakasyapa, Purna, the whole team), Lotus Sutra (need I say more?)

Malcolm wrote:

So not many at all. A mere handful, apart from those in the audience.

pueraeternus said:

You're quite sure?

Oh yes, I am sure that the Buddha didn't intend only "Samantabhadra, Mañjuśrī, Guhyapati, Maitreya and so on" to compile the Mahayana sutras, since he directly gave instructions to Ananda to memorize and preserve many. And the fact that Arhats were present, many spoke and many rejoiced, and Ananda asked "what shall this wonderful sutra be called?", shows that the Buddha didn't intend to exclude them.

Malcolm wrote:

Many, as we see, is four or five. Ānanda of course was not an arhat while Buddha was alive.

But we are talking about compilers of these texts. Ananda did not hear all of the sūtras the Buddha taught. He did not compile them all. For example, in the Ānanda sutra, the Buddha states:

Anything the Bhagavan taught before, he [Ānanda] does not hold those. It is not



reasonable to say "Teach them again to him" because they reside in some other bhikṣus. Thus it is not established at all that Ananda was even the sole compiler of the Mainstream Canon. Bhava argues there were several compilers.

pueraeternus said:

Of course he appears in many Mahāyāna sūtras, but Ananda was not the compiler of Mahāyāna.

He was. The Buddha said so in many Mahayana sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

There is only one such statement as far as I can tell, found in the Mahākaruṇāpūṇḍarīka sūtra. Buddha here asked Ānanda to gather whatever the Buddha said.

However the Tathāgatācintyaguhyānirdeśa-sūtra asserts that Vajrapani is the compiler of all the sūtras of the Buddhas of the Bhadrakalapa.

Despite this contradiction, it is definitely the case that Bhava has a rather lengthy discussion about the issue of the compilation of the sūtras and he rejects the notion that they were compiled by the śrāvakas.

pueraeternus said:

Oh, but he and other Arhats appeared in plenty of the early Mahayana sutras - that itself would be more than sufficient for the teachings to be gathered during the First Council.

Malcolm wrote:

Here is a fact. The Mahāyāna sūtras were not recited at the first council, and everyone agrees this is so, including all Mahāyāna authors we know of who wrote on the subject. . You can either assume that the reason for this is as described by Bhava, or you can simply go with western historiography which denies Mahāyāna is the actual teaching of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

So all history is strictly speculative, except your own historical perspective?

Malcolm wrote:

History is a story told about the past. That's all. The story told by western academics about Buddhadharma, especially Mahāyāna is harmful to it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Astrological conflicts

Content:

kng said:

Thank you for your answers. I would like to ask one more question, is it necessary that I hang out lungtas by myself or is it ok to ask some monastery or sangha friend to do it for me?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally you would do it yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but this is incomplete. "Later" does not mean it was taught later. "Later" means that it appeared later. Rinpoche has explained the principle of how Buddha's teachings arose and spread many times using the example of the Heart Sūtra.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I guess I haven't heard those explanations, but I don't think "what Buddha Shakyamuni taught orally to people was something like sutric Buddhism. It was not even the sutric Buddhism of the Mahayana Sutras" requires any interpretation. You are framing this as an issue of virtue, and I am happy to follow Rinpoche's lead here.

Malcolm wrote:

Please be my guest. But you are following the wrong lead.

Rinpoche clearly states (and so many times) for example that the Heart Sutra is an example where the text is taught through Buddha's permission, in this case by Avalokiteśvara. Or he uses the example of the Dharma drum which through Buddha's blessing automatically resounds with Dharma teachings. Or he gives the example of the Sambhogakāya. As I said, what you've seized upon is incomplete. What in fact he is criticizing is the desire by some Lamas to prove that all the Tantras were taught by Śākyamuni Buddha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

From "Dzog Chen and Zen":

ChNN said:

Furthermore, since the Buddhist schools all have a rather limited vision, whenever they speak of a given Buddhist teaching, they try to associate it, for example, with a specific saying or statement of the historical Buddha Shakyamuni. This is a very limited way of looking at things. The principle is not that. If that were the principle, it would be more than sufficient to follow something like the Theravada tradition of sutric Buddhism, because what Buddha Shakyamuni taught orally to people was something like sutric Buddhism. It was not even the sutric Buddhism of the Mahayana Sutras; we know very well that Mahayana Buddhism later.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but this is incomplete. "Later" does not mean it was taught later. "Later" means that it appeared later. Rinpoche has explained the principle of how Buddha's teachings arose and spread many times using the example of the Heart Sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherlock said:

Mahayanis have always been involved in textual criticism and analysis from at least the first translators in China. There is just no need to subscribe to Protestant assumptions when analysing texts.

Malcolm wrote:

Precisely, or subscribe to historical revisionism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

'Apart from a requisite condition, there is no coming-into-play of consciousness.'

This is how this 'ethical hedonist' understands it.

Malcolm wrote:

So, what is the requisite condition of the mental consciousness (mano-vijñāna)?

Andrew108 said:

'If one is asked, 'From what requisite condition does consciousness come?' one should

say, 'Consciousness comes from name-and-form as its requisite condition.'

Malcolm wrote:

You forgot the other part of the citation. Sloppy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

...if the Arhats were indeed in the audience in the Mahayana sermons (as they are clearly shown doing in said sutras), then the early Buddhists would have known and we would have seen clear evidence of it in the earliest materials.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so — we see in the sutras that the śrāvakas were constantly in a state of doubt about Mahāyāna. This is true even today, even more so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

So the evidence is actually fairly consistent that Mahayana is late. Malcolm, however, suggests going an a-historical a-evidentiary route, and with respect to an attitude like that, evidence simply has nowhere to land.

Malcolm wrote:

All the evidence you can produce is strictly speculative. But since you don't care about Mahāyāna, it's not really your concern anyway. But to clarify, I am rejecting the Western academic revisionism in the historical presentation of Buddhadharma. My perspective however, is not ahistorical. It's just a historical perspective you do not like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, though the arhats were present at Mahāyāna teachings, it was not the path they were on, and not the path they wanted to preserve since they did not have the bodhisattva motivation. Thus, they compiled only the teachings they found relevant for nirvana and ignored those which treated the Bodhisattva path and did not memorize

them or recite them.

pueraeternus said:

Mere apologetics and highly unconvincing - because based on the amount of Mahayana sutras, that would mean that the arhats ignored 70% of what the Buddha taught.

Malcolm wrote:

As indeed they did.

pueraeternus said:

And furthermore, they were heavily engaged in doctrine discussions in many of the Mahayana sutras. If they were indeed not interested, then why would they engage in the first place? They would just stand one side and look at their nails.

Malcolm wrote:

How many arhats, exactly? In which sutras?

pueraeternus said:

And besides, the Buddha himself never said anything like what Bhava suggested.

Malcolm wrote:

You're quite sure?

pueraeternus said:

Being omniscient, why would he preach to them Mahayana sutras if he knew they were not receptive?

Malcolm wrote:

In order to imprint traces on their minds. Not only is the Buddha omniscient, he is loving.

pueraeternus said:

According to many Mahayana sutras, Ananda certainly heard, knew and was instructed by the Buddha to disseminate said doctrines.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course he appears in many Mahāyāna sūtras, but Ananda was not the compiler of Mahāyāna. So he did not recite these texts at the first council the reasons already stated.

Further, for example, the Ratnakuta collection has 49 sutras. Ānanda appears in only thirty of them. Ananda appears nowhere at all in the Avatamska. He appears nowhere in the higher tantras with exception of the Śrī-buddhakapāla-nāma-yoginī-tantrarāja; and very few of the lower tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I am not a scholar so I don't even know the names of those treatises, let alone their contents, but do they speak with one voice about the origins of the Mahayana sutras?

Malcolm wrote:

The assertion that the bodhisattvas like Mañjuśrī and so on are the compilers of Mahāyāna was commonly held by Yogacarins, Madhyamakas as well by Vajrayana authors in such texts as: Āryāvikalpapraveśadhāraṇīṭikā [Mañjuśrī, etc.]; Prajñāpāramitāmātrkāśatasāhasrikābrhacchāsanapañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāmadhyaśāsanāṣṭādaśasāhasrikālaghuśāsanāṣṭasamānārthaśāsa; Bhagavatyaṃnāyānusāriṇī-nāma-vyākhyā [Vajrapani]; Madhyamakahrdayavṛttitarkajvālā [mentioned above]; Āryamanjuśrīguhyatantrasādhanasarvakarmanidhi-nāma-ṭikā; Vimalaprabhā-nāma-mūlatantrānusāriṇī-dvādaśasāhasrikālaghukālacakratantrarājaṭikā.

These six texts are the only ones I can find in a quick search for the key words "compiler" and "Mahāyāna" in the Kengyur and Tengyur; but I am sure there are others that may discuss the issue in slightly different terms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 31st, 2014 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We simply need to rely on the authoritative Indian treatises.

dzogchungpa said:

How do we know which ones are authoritative?

Malcolm wrote:

The one's deemed authoritative enough to expend the effort translating.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

heart said:

That said I think the Mahasamgika's could certainly represent a clear link to Mahayana.  
/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Why? Maitreya clearly states in the first chapter of the Sūtrālaṃkāra that Mahāyāna was taught during the Buddha's own lifetime, and it is not a later development.

There is no need to rely on these speculative academic contrivances. We simply need to rely on the authoritative Indian treatises. It is high time Mahāyānis threw off the burdensome shackles of western historiography.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Isn't Bhava about 1000 years after the Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

The last I checked, Gregory Schopen was about 2500 years after the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Astrological conflicts

Content:

kng said:

Hi everyone

During the last webcast Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche mentioned, that if someone has a difficult year from astrological point of view, he can use lungtas to be able to overcome those difficulties. Somehow I can not understand how this is supposed to work. I mean, I put some prayer flags with auspicious symbols and good wishes on trees and assuming that I did this on appropriate day, I shall be able to overcome problems and otherwise not? Seems a little bit odd to me.

Malcolm wrote:

One, Tibetan "astrology" is not astrology in the sense you understand it. The term in Tibetan is "calculation", so here we are calculating the cycle of the phases in the five elements— wood, fire, earth, metal and water— through the year, through the month and through the day.

Tibetan elemental calculation is very general, and it serves only as a sort of weather report, i.e., when rain is predicted, it may not necessarily rain in your area, but you are wise to bring an umbrella. It is the same with elemental calculation, if it indicates that this or that person will have obstacles in a given year, it is sound to make do practices to prevent this.

Lungta flags are blessed by you, and there is a mantra, so there is a definite connection between your energy and the flags themselves. They also harmonize the five elements of a place because they are consecrated to do so. Whenever you see them, you should also recite that mantra, since it increases their benefit for you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Arhats and Bodhisattvas

Content:

Astus said:

It reminds me of the common criticism found in the popular versions of Mahayana (e.g. Zen and Tantra), that the common path of the bodhisattva, as it is actually presented by most of the sutras, takes too long and it is too difficult. What hardly anyone dares to consider is that those popular versions actually teach sravakayana under the pretence of "buddhahood in this life". Also, both Zen and Tantra are famous for emphasising discipleship (sravaka-hood). So, I'd add to Bhikkhu Bodhi's quote that hardly anyone wants to take the bodhisattva path, and all the arguments against Theravada are practically valid against the same people who use them.

Malcolm wrote:

"Buddhahood in this life" means completing the two accumulations which lead to both freedom and omniscience.

It is impossible for someone to have generated bodhicitta to experience the fruit of an arhat, i.e. cessation, indeed, it is against the very principles of the bodhisattva path to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

'Apart from a requisite condition, there is no coming-into-play of consciousness.'

This is how this 'ethical hedonist' understands it.

Malcolm wrote:

So, what is the requisite condition of the mental consciousness (mano-vijñāna)?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:



Wayfarer said:

The issue is, whether there is 'the consciousness' that 'goes' from life to life. Sati is rebuked for saying that there is. But the fact that there isn't something the same that goes from life to life, doesn't solve the problem of karma. If there is no agent, then to whom does karma accrue? There is clearly continuity in that sense. After all, if you say there is no karma, then you're a nihilist. So how does karma not pertain to agent?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no continuous agent, no atman, which transfers from this world to the next world [or even from this moment to the next], but the aggregates are serially connected, as Nāgārjuna shows in the Pratītyasamutpāḍakarikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

how is it that none of that survived in the First Council?

Malcolm wrote:

These sūtras were not compiled at the first council.

In the Madhyamakahrdayavṛttitarkajvālā, Bhava reports:

Mahāyāna was spoken by the Buddha because it does not contradict the Dharma seals, one is introduced to the sūtra canon of the noble truth; because the afflicted are truly seen to be tamed; and because it does not conflict with dependent origination — all of those said to be "spoken by the Buddha" are found in Mahāyāna. Further, also each of the eighteen schools each introduce their own canon, but there are a great many mutual contradictions [between them]. The profound and vast methods of benefitting others in Mahāyāna are not introduced at all in the sutra canon of the śravakas.

Mahāyāna introduces the bodhisattva training appearing in seven hundred topics.

Because the teaching of emptiness does not contradict the Dharma itself, therefore, the Dharma seals are not contradicted. Due to this, Mahāyāna was spoken by the Buddha because the compilers of the basic [texts], Samantabhadra, Mañjuśrī, Guhyapati, Maitreya and so on, compiled them. The compilers of our basic [texts] were not the śravakas because Mahāyāna discourses are not their domain.

In other words, though the arhats were present at Mahāyāna teachings, it was not the path they were on, and not the path they wanted to preserve since they did not have the bodhisattva motivation. Thus, they compiled only the teachings they found relevant for nirvana and ignored those which treated the Bodhisattva path and did not memorize them or recite them.

Bhava reports a citation from a text called the Śālmalivana-sutra \*:

Ānanda, I comprehend even more Dharma than however many leaves there are in this śālmalī grove, but I have not taught them to you. Since that many were taught for a purpose, you must not be regretful, but you should also not be without desire [to hear

them].

In response to the qualm that Ānanda heard all of the sūtras:

If it is said "Ārya Ānanda comprehended all of the sūtras", with respect to that, the Uttama sūtra\* states: "There is not even one bhikṣu holding the number of Dharmas held by Śakra, the king of the devas." Since that is so, Ānanda did not hold all of the Dharma. Therefore, the vast teachings of the Buddha are not seen in that authentic compilation Ānanda demonstrated and compiled authentically.

Bhava continues in this vein for quite some time. The point is that a) arhats did not preserve all the teachings of the Buddha b) Ānanda did not know all of the sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I would simply insist that the hermeneutical framework of Mahāyāna sūtras has already been provided by the Buddha in those very same sūtras

So, you are saying that "the Buddha taught them" is not hermeneutics, it is simple fact, while the hermeneutics taught therein are valid, etc. because of this authorship by the historical Buddha, in the same way that the Nikayas are valid because of their authorship -- because the historical Buddha taught the content.

Parsing anything about this - such as e.g. that the Nikayas are stratified and not wholly Buddhavacana, or that Mahayana is wholly later... all of that, to any historian, text-critical examiner, etc, the reply is that

Adopting the western text critical view of Mahāyāna sūtras is not virtuous.

Do I understand correctly?

Indeed you do. Indeed, Theravadins should adopt precisely the same attitude —why?

Because these days even the Pali Canon is coming under attack from the very same forces who initially caused Mahāyāna to fall into disrepute.

In short, it is not virtuous to regard teachings in the Agamas/Nikāyas and well as the Mahāyāna canon to be anything other than taught by the Buddha. I am not insisting that of adherents of the Mainstream canons necessarily must accord validity to Mahāyāna canon; or those who are adherents of common Mahāyāna necessarily must accept Vajrayāna — they should remain a place free of judgement. But for those of us who are Mahāyānis and Vajrayānis, well, it is better for us to simply accept all these teachings as the teachings of the historical Buddha where it is so indicated, unless there are absolutely compelling reasons to believe otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 8:14 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I think the idea of 'a visionary encounter with the Buddha' is perfectly real.

Malcolm wrote:

We have no evidence that the Mahāyāna sutras were received this way. My point is that all of these kind of speculative apologetics exist to satisfy a bias against Mahāyāna texts endemic in Western Academia, and sadly, a bias that persists even amongst the majority of those who term themselves Mahāyānis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

I think there is a huge difference between being text critical in the narrow philological sense, and simply recognising that reading any kind of literature necessarily involves some kind of hermeneutical framework.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed — I am pretty sure I did not condemn hermeneutics. I would simply insist that the hermeneutical framework of Mahāyāna sutras has already been provided by the Buddha in those very same sutras, and where it has not, by such authors as Nāgārjuna, Maitreya, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 7:08 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, if the Mahayana sutras were actually spoken by the Buddha, why were they rejected by mainstream Buddhists, who apparently constituted the majority of Buddhists in India?

Malcolm wrote:

Because they were not preserved by Śravakas, but rather by Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra.

smcj said:

Well that's a whole different take on the subject! I can go along with that!

Malcolm wrote:

This is the traditional account.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

Your criteria for authorship is far too narrow.

His criteria for credible authorship of authentic Dharma is too narrow.

But Malcolm knows this. He could argue my position better than I have. He is being loyal to what he sees as the interests of the Mahayana. Mistakenly so in my opinion, but at the same time understandably so.

pueraeternus said:

More like he is having a midlife crisis. He should be well beyond the stage where he needs to wrestle with sraddha issues. I don't get it.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not wrestling with any issues. I simply realize that adopting the western text critical view of Mahāyāna sūtras is not virtuous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I just want to remind everyone that today is the first day of the sacred month Saga Dawa (according to Tibetan astrology).

As such, it is said that the effects of positive and negative actions are vastly multiplied.

dzogchungpa said:

Did the Buddha teach Tibetan astrology too?

Malcolm wrote:

No, that would be Mañjuśrī.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, if the Mahayana sutras were actually spoken by the Buddha, why were they rejected by mainstream Buddhists, who apparently constituted the majority of Buddhists in India?

Malcolm wrote:

Because they were not preserved by Śravakas, but rather by Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

There is no surprise that fundamentalists of other creed denounce everything but their own. We don't even need to consider them since most of their minds are already closed to our path in this lifetime. We do need to exemplify the broad-mindedness, reasoning and virtue that accompanies those who walk the Buddhist path. We show by example, display the wondrous store of the Buddha's treasure to all and teach those who would come and listen. Closing our minds just because there are other closed-minded people out there is hardly skillful means.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not condemning anything. I am not denouncing anything. My message is quite positive. The Mahāyāna Sūtras are the words of the Buddha. Let those who do not believe this go their own way peacefully as I will mine.

Exemplifying broad-mindedness, reasoning and virtue does not entail denying the authorship and authenticity of our own core canon, which sadly, 90 percent of Western Mahāyānists do without even realizing it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: Khyenri style of painting

Content:

dzoki said:

There is an updated page on Khyentri style of thangka painting on himalayanart, I found I really like this style. If I had the money I would have a whole set of thangkas painted in this style (that would be a hell lot of thangkas ), but then I found out it ceased to continue as a tradition. Have there been any attempts to revive this style? I am asking here since, as I understood this style was mainly tied to Sakya school.

<http://www.himalayanart.org/search/set.cfm?setid=83> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I think this style continues to dominate Central Tibetan painting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Faith must lead towards prajna. The dog's tooth example merely shows that single-mindedness can lead to absorption and samadhi, and that (hopefully) leads to understanding and direct vision of dependent origination, emptiness, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

If one does not have faith in the authorship of the Dharma one is following, it will not lead to prajñā, but only to confusion and more doubt.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 5:36 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

They can't. That's the point. But since they have, they have validated the texts and practices upon which they relied, proving that the tradition indeed came from an enlightened source, whether it be Sakyamuni or another enlightened being. The proof is in the taste of the pudding.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you are still left with the quandry: following the teaching in the sūtras produce the results predicted in the sūtras, upon what basis can you accept part of the text to be true, and yet doubt the attribution of the text. If the tradition is effective, if what the texts say are true, of what use is it to say "This tradition is effective, it produces the results which it claims, nevertheless, even though the words of the text are true, the authorship is false." For that is what you are saying here , no more, and no less.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But this is not how the text comes to us. These are all rationalizations to explain away the discomfort which arises from the fact that one has not accepted the Mahāyāna sūtras as being the actual speech of the Nirmanakāya, which is how they are presented, i.e. as the words spoken from the mouth of the Buddha .

pueraeternus said:

Oh - so now we are to uncritically accept at face value every Mahayana sutra word for word?

Malcolm wrote:

We are to merely accept that they were spoken by the Buddha.

pueraeternus said:

How do you think the Buddhist nitārtha/neyārtha textual hermeneutics came about? Go down this road and you will find yourself contenting with a mass of contradictions that ultimately leads to collapse of the very faith you are trying to protect.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say we should not apply the hermeneutical strategies which come from the sutras themselves, as well as various commentaries upon them, such as the Abhisamayālaṃkāra. It is high time, as Western Mahāyanists, that we should be guided by what the sūtras and commentaries on those sūtras say, rather than the opinions of Buddhologists.

There is actually no reason whatsoever to doubt that Mahāyāna sūtras are the actual words of the Buddha. Not one, apart from the fact that some 19th century westerner scholars decided this was the case and we have blindly followed their lead ever since without once questioning the wisdom of this.

There is - even early Buddhists denounce the new fangled sutras as heresy. All internal evidence from Sravakayana texts point to the Mahayana as a later development.

Yes, they did indeed reject Mahāyāna sūtras, eliciting Nāgārjuna's response in the Ratnavali and Maitreya Bodhisattva's response in the Sūtrālaṃkāra. But the fact that Śravakas rejected the Mahāyāna sutras does not tell us anything at all about them. It certainly should not be taken as evidence that the Mahāyāna sūtras are not the Buddha's own words. But most Westerners are dependent upon philologists who were biased towards the Pali canon as being the "authentic" Buddhism of the Buddha. And quite frankly, they have constructed a picture of Buddhism that we inherit and generally buy into without second thoughts. The entire history of Mahāyāna studies in the Academy begins from the premise that Mahāyāna sūtras are later literary fabrications. But it is just a premise, one with no supporting facts whatsoever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Nonsense - just because a text was written down hundreds of years later after the

Buddha's time on this planet does not mean that it did not come from an awakened or inspired source.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so if you think that Mahāyāna sutras were not actually spoken by the Buddha, who is the awakened or inspired source to which you refer?

pueraeternus said:

They may not be spoken by the flesh-and-blood nirmanakaya Buddha, but they are certainly spoken by the Sambhogakaya or even Dharmakaya Buddha. Or perhaps the Buddha inspired someone to enlightened speech (ala Subhuti), and thus a sermon is given. Or a yogi obtained visions of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas in assembly, and promptly wrote it down after emerging from samadhi. Etc, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

But this is not how the text comes to us. These are all rationalizations to explain away the discomfort which arises from the fact that one has not accepted the Mahāyāna sūtras as being the actual speech of the Nirmanakāya, which is how they are presented, i.e. as the words spoken from the mouth of the Buddha, i.e. thus have I heard...

There is actually no reason whatsoever to doubt that Mahāyāna sūtras are the actual words of the Buddha. Not one, apart from the fact that some 19th century westerner scholars decided this was the case and we have blindly followed their lead ever since without once questioning the wisdom of this. We have basically decided that the wisdom of philologists is what we should follow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Nonsense - just because a text was written down hundreds of years later after the Buddha's time on this planet does not mean that it did not come from an awakened or inspired source.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so if you think that Mahāyāna sutras were not actually spoken by the Buddha, who is the awakened or inspired source to which you refer?

pueraeternus said:

Why are you all of a sudden struck by such fundamentalist tendencies?

Malcolm wrote:

I have concluded that denying that Śākyamunu Buddha is the author of the Mahāyāna



sūtras constitutes abandoning the Dharma. I have concluded therefore, it is very non-virtuous, and not in the interest of those who claim to be Mahāyānists. Such positions only serve the forces which wittingly or unwittingly seek to unravel the Buddha's Dharma from within.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

No. The only fact that matters, and it is a fact, is that we have enlightened teachers today. Maybe they are not fully enlightened, but are sufficiently so that they are proof positive of the viability of the Path and the validity of the Teachings. Everything else is of no consequence.

Malcolm wrote:

If they are awakened , how could they become so on the basis of texts which are just literary fictions, not matter now edifying?

As the Tantra of the Union of The Sun and Moon states:

If the history is not explained,  
there will be the fault of lack of confidence  
in this discourses of the definitive secret meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

Actually I'm even more speculative; that the historical Sakyamuni intended the said developments to occur. That's a little Issac Asimov "Foundation Trilogy" sic-fi speculative, but it is how I see it.

And I'm not so sure tradition dismisses it.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that we have some texts. They are records of the Buddha's teaching. Either they are or they are not. That is the only fact that matters.

I choose to believe that they are. I recommend that others do so. It will help their practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I finally understood that my former position is one which ultimately harms Mahāyāna Dharma. Since my practice comes first, I changed my mind.

smcj said:

I am largely in agreement with your former position, and do not see it as harming the Mahayana. However you are welcome to change your mind as you see fit.

Malcolm wrote:

My former position was purely speculative, it is not grounded in fact or tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Kunzang said:

Did I misunderstand your former position? If not, what has prompted this shift, if you don't mind talking about it? It seems a pretty radical turnaround.

Malcolm wrote:

I finally understood that my former position is one which ultimately harms Mahāyāna Dharma. Since my practice comes first, I changed my mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: NamDak SaLing closing

Content:

DechenNamdrol said:

Hello all.

I am immediately closing my centre in Calgary, Alberta and ceasing all activities due to a threat of violence made against me, a handicapped father of two young children, by a man who masquerades as a Dharma practitioner.

I wish you all the best. I won't be posting anything further.

Malcolm wrote:

Time for Simhamukha my friend.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 2:34 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

pueraeternus said:

By taking textual analysis into consideration, we can still be reasonable to most people and have a chance to convince them that the Mahayana teachings adhere to the dharma seals.

Malcolm wrote:

No, taking this position means that we have no faith at all in the Mahāyāna path since it does not come from an awakened source.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 2:05 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

pueraeternus said:

We have to accept the fact that some texts are indeed edited later, have textual corruption, are obviously apocryphal, etc. It is inevitable for a canon that is so vast and sprawling. Then we have to look at the soteriological value of such texts and determine if it is still of dharmic value. But to deny that is so just because of our "faith" is exactly the wrong thing to do.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that from this point of view, the entire Mahāyāna canon is apocryphal, at least as far as Theravadins etc. are concerned. It is not desirable to admit this position. One fundamentally invalidates the Mahāyāna by following this view.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 2:04 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, it all comes down to faith or confidence or whatever in the end, right? You think it's insufficient to say "I have faith in this group of texts." but it's sufficient to say "I have faith in the Buddha and I have faith that the Buddha said what's in these texts."? I don't think there's any real apologetic advantage there. Why do you have faith in the Buddha in the first place? Who are you hoping to convince anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I am not trying to convince anyone of anything, I learned long ago that is useless.

dzogchungpa said:

You think it's insufficient to say "I have faith in this group of texts." but it's sufficient to say "I have faith in the Buddha and I have faith that the Buddha said what's in these texts."?

Malcolm wrote:

When confronted with a claim "X teaching in Mahāyāna is contradicted by x teaching in the Agamas", if you take the view that the Mahāyāna sūtras were not taught by the Buddha, you have no choice but to admit the Agamic teaching is the definitive one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

Don't you reject Mt. Meru cosmology, which in fact the Buddha taught?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't reject Meru cosmology. It is an Indo-centric map of the ancient world in which Meru clearly lies in the middle of Central Asia, undoubtedly Tibet. I do not necessarily accept the way the Koshā presents it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

Yes, motivated by ascribing them to Sakyamuni as the symbol of validity.

Malcolm wrote:

So now we are speaking the motivations of what we presume to anonymous authors? Seems a stretch to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

There are so many ways to cut it - so easy to turn it around and declare that the Mahayana teachings represented a deeper, more profound teachings that surely is the

provenance of the Buddhas. And if others insist of the primacy of textual history, we just say "oh that is a viewpoint limited to time and space, we have to go beyond that.... blah blah blah"

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very weak apologetic. You are still admitting that the Mahāyāna teachings portray historical events which did not happen, conventionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

Because otherwise, we are fundamentally admitting we do not know the source of such teachings.

I don't have a problem with that.

Malcolm wrote:

I do.

smcj said:

Likewise I don't believe the Naga story about Nagarjuna, yet I accept it as authentic Dharma. It is an appropriate elaboration on Sakyamuni's original teachings, the appropriateness being validated by Nagarjuna's own realization. It is an extension of Sakyamuni, not Sakyamuni's personal teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree. And I don't think it serves our purposes in Mahāyāna take this perspective.

People with realization can add to Dharma, and have done so. People that have not been able to gain realization should not alter even one letter of it. That is why contemporary people that have failed at Dharma should not be the ones leading the charge to change it. That is taking the teachings of enlightened awareness and making them the teachings of ignorant unawareness.

smcj said:

Did Sakyamuni teach the 6 Yogas of Naropa? I don't think so. Dzogchen? I don't think so. If you say Vajradhara taught them, ok. (Vajradhara being the enlightenment of Sakyamuni as seen from the Vajrayana perspective.) But that means that the history of it will show up some time after the Parinirvana, when it comes back down to the human realm. If you say that Sakyamuni could still teach after the Parinirvana, then that is the same as saying later authors could, based on their own realization, contribute to the Canon. It is saying the same thing two different ways.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

The Mahāyāna sūtras place themselves within the 80 year lifespan of the Buddha. If we take your route, we are openly admitting that Mahāyāna teachings are not the teachings of the Buddha. Therefore, this is a bad way to go. Vajrayāna also suffer too.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

PorkChop said:

I'm with you on the idea of holding firm that the teachings themselves come from Shakyamuni; the issue I bring up is how to go about doing this in the most defensible position available. The ability to defend this position is integral given the vested interest others have of shooting down Mahayana/Vajrayana teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

The best approach is to simply discuss the teachings with the understanding that Buddha actually taught themselves himself as we Mahāyānists have been doing for the past 2000 years and ignore what outsiders think. People become interested in Mahāyāna because they have the merit to do so, not because of some evangelism on the part of Mahāyānists. People can either believe what faithless academics say, "The Mahāyāna teachings are not the words of the Buddha" or they can believe what all of our realized masters say: "The Mahāyāna teachings are the words of the Buddha."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

I consider Dzogchen, Mahamudra, the tantas and such as authentic Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and they can be traced back with precision to Vajradhara, apart from those few lower tantras the Buddha himself taught.

smcj said:

I feel no qualms whatsoever about not tracing them back 2,500 years to Sakyamuni.

Malcolm wrote:

Teachings such as Kalacakra were taught directly by the Buddha, even if they were set down later by the Shambhala Kings.

smcj said:

They produce enlightened beings. They come from enlightened beings. Those enlightened beings came from practicing the Dharma that Sakyamuni taught. That makes them authentic Buddhism, regardless of whether or not Sakyamuni's specifically articulating those teachings in the flesh.

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that we cannot regard those teachings in Mahāyāna sūtras which the Buddha taught to be truly valid, unless in fact we believe the Buddha indeed taught them, where and when it is said he taught them. Because otherwise, we are fundamentally admitting we do not know the source of such teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

The strength of Buddhism lies in the idea that generation after generation has been able to produce realized beings. Their realization may not equal Buddha's but it is still realization nevertheless. What they have to say is by definition Dharma. End of controversy. Anyone that feels the need to have had Sakyamuni personally teach something is showing a karmic bias towards Shravakayana. That's their karma. Let them follow it.

Malcolm wrote:

The strength of the Dharma lies on its lineage and origin being authentic. Otherwise, it is fabrication.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Historicity of Yeshe Tsogyal

Content:

mutsum said:

Great! Thanks for the reference! We can even see that her toponymic affiliation is even given (as mKhar-che(n) bza'). It's indeed a good reference outside the gter-ma tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

I thought so. I think it must be the earliest known textual reference to her. Yes, it is late, but it is from the corpus of a Tibetan family known for their very strict adherence to their Dharma traditions, whose lineage of Kilaya traces back to Guru P.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

Try standing behind the Nagarjuna story as literal history. Then you'll be laughed at.

Malcolm wrote:

No more so then someone will be laughed at for believing Abhidharma was taught to Buddha's mother in the deva realms.

smcj said:

The definition of Dharma needs to be made clear. It is the speech on an enlightened being.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the case of the Mahāyāna sūtras, if not Buddha, then who? Some anonymous enlightened being we do not know? This undermines the entire validity of the lineage.

smcj said:

Any other position is handing the academics the authority to decide what is authentic Dharma or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Academics have no such authority nor will they ever for as long as we insist that our sūtras are the actual words of the Buddha, either in person, by blessing or by permission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

The classic example is the fairy tale that sea serpents kept a secret text written by Sakyamuni at the bottom of the ocean in a time capsule for 1,000 years waiting for Nagarjuna to be born so they could give it to him.

Malcolm wrote:

But as must be clear to you for years, I actually believe in Nāgas, Yakṣas, Gandharvas, Kinnaras, Mahoragas, and so on. So I have absolutely no problem with the idea that Nāgārjuna recovered the Prajñāpāramita from the Nāga dimension.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

This is a dangerous veer towards fundamentalism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is actually an embrasure of "fundamentalism."

pueraeternus said:

One of our primary tasks as Mahayanist is to attract beings and convert them to the dharma. We cannot do this if we petulantly insist on the historicity of wildly contradictory sutras and tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

You call it "petulant", I call it "essential". We cannot attract anyone to Mahāyāna teachings if we front with "Well, Buddha did not really teach this, but..." By this strategy we are explicitly agreeing that our texts do not carry the weight of authority of the Mainstream Canon. It's just a simple fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

What you are essentially saying is, "I recognize that these texts were not actually taught by the Buddha at the time they were said to have been taught. Nevertheless, I like what they say." One's objection to the refutation of their validity as the Buddhavacana will therefore be groundless and toothless. You have already admitted by this that the Mainstream canon is authoritative, and that the Mahāyāna canon is not.

I disagree on the grounds that tracing the historicity to Sakyamuni is not the criteria for "authoritative".

Malcolm wrote:

You can disagree all you like, and yet when you say the "Buddha said" and someone replies, "not he didn't because Gregory Schopen blah blah blah...", etc., how will you respond? Well, "Buddha didn't really teach that, I agree. But some later Buddhist wrote a book and put it in the mouth of the Buddha, so it is just as authoritative."? You will be laughed at.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Understanding of karma

Content:

kng said:

"For example in dzogchen teaching, which is somehow different from other buddhist teachings, we do not say that, for example for meeting the teaching of Buddha we need to have some good causes, some merits etc., we need to do something good during many lifetimes and then as a result we meet this high teaching, that can help us to free ourselves, to become liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

Berkhin has a little misunderstanding here. We say that people who meet Dzogchen (and Dharma in general) are fortunate, why are they fortunate? Because they have the merit to meet the teachings. Why do they have that merit, because of positive actions performed over countless lifetimes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I think the origin of the Mahayana Sutras is from 'visionary encounters' with the Buddha which could be understood as 'seeing the dharma by penetrating its meaning' or as 'insight into the true meaning of the Buddha's teaching through Prajñāpāramitā.' These insights were then codified into the Prajñāpāramitā sutras, amongst others.

Understood thus, I have always thought that these texts were the authentic word, even if not literally remembered and spoken in the same way as the early texts.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this theory merely opens the door for criticism. It depends on a twist of interpretation. What you are essentially saying is, "I recognize that these texts were not actually taught by the Buddha at the time they were said to have been taught. Nevertheless, I like what they say." One's objection to the refutation of their validity as the Buddhavacana will therefore be groundless and toothless. You have already admitted by this that the Mainstream canon is authoritative, and that the Mahāyāna canon is not.

Instead it better to simply insist, "This is the sūtra that we read, if you do not read this sūtra, it is better for you to be neutral, than run the risk of abandoning Dharma." In this way one's point of view is unassailable when it comes to explicating points where the

Buddha's teaching in Mahāyāna sūtras surpasses or seem to contradict those teachings found in the Mainstream canons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Sherab said:

I think I have problem...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you can ground your understanding in the Nikayas, I prefer to ground it in Mahāyāna. I consider it more authoritative.

Sherab said:

Taking the Buddha as one who has an overall view of all things, I don't consider what the Buddha said in great vehicle sutras as more authoritative than what he said in the small vehicle suttas.

It is possible that one interpretation of what the Buddha said is more authoritative than another interpretation, but resorting to authority is my last resort for understanding what the Buddha said.

The Buddha said many things and unless one is as awakened as the Buddha himself, practically whatever he said would be interpreted by one's intellect. What is important as far as I am concerned is the consistency of interpretation (understanding) of one aspect with other aspects of the Buddha's teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

You can choose to ignore the Saṃdhinirmocana, if you like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 10:34 PM

Title: Historicity of Yeshe Tsogyal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Mutsuk wrote:

Of course we have no trace of Yeshe Tsogyel before quite late in the tibetan history and there is not a single mention of her in the Dunhuang documents if I'm not mistaken. We have a record of Tsogyal outside the Nyingma Milieu which dates to the mid 12th century, i.e., there is a mention of her oral instructions concerning Vajrakīlaya in the Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen's collected works:

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04134\\$W22271](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04134$W22271). The text

from 793-794 mentions that it is advice given to her on Guru Rinpoche's departure from Tibet.

Thus, we can see here that the Khon tradition clearly mentions her. It's very unlikely that Jetsun Rinpoche would be following the lead of Nyangral, given how stringent Sakyapas are about lineage, and how dubious they were about the nascent gter ma tradition. In my opinion, we can safely say that this advice was included in their ancestral teachings.

Therefore, I personally see no valid reason whatsoever to doubt the historicity of a Tibetan woman named Yeshe Tsogyal who was Padmasambhava's companion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 8:33 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Dan74 said:

I am wondering though why on a Mahayana forum this dualistic parable would hold any sway?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, because the nondual is ultimate, but we still function in the relative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Sherab said:

I think I have problem...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you can ground your understanding in the Nikayas, I prefer to ground it in Mahāyāna. I consider it more authoritative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

smcj said:

Also, if I remember correctly, the nirvana of an Arhat is likened to a flame going out - you can't tell where the flame went. In other words, you can't tell where the mind of an Arhat goes when he attains nirvana.

That's not a Mahayana perspective. A Mahayanaist would understand the Arhat to have

a continuation. In fact, the Mahayana perspective says that after a long while the Arhats are roused out of their sleep by the blessing of the bodhisattvas so they can continue on with the practice of the Mahayana.

And yes, that's not something I'd like to try to say on Dhamma Wheel.

Mkoll said:

I wouldn't be offended. If an arahant has put an end to suffering for themselves, I doubt they'd mind helping others do the same.

Or do I have that wrong? Do Mahayana schools believe the arahant has made an end to suffering for themselves?

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats have made an end to suffering, but have, in the Mahāyāna analysis, mistaken the samadhi of cessation for the ultimate fruit of the path. The Buddha teaches in the Lankāvatara that eventually, arhats are roused out of their samadhi and set on the Bodhisattva path, where after three incalculable eons, they attain full buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We followers of Buddhadharma must confidence in the authenticity of our core canons. That confidence can only arise if we are confident in the lineage and authorship of these canons.

Anders said:

Are you saying then that confidence in the Mahayana hinges on the belief that the mahayana sutras were spoken by the historical Shakyamuni Buddha? And that you think such a belief is most ideal for modern mahayana buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is not only ideal, but essential. I am not insisting of course that this be some kind of entry bar for becoming a Buddhist. But it is a little strange to claim that one is taking refuge in the Dharma, the speech of the Buddha, and then on the other hand, consider virtually all of the teachings that constitute Mahāyāna to be little more than fabrications, no matter how pithy or profound. In Mahāyāna, we do not accept the Agamas or Nikayas to be authoritative in a way in which Mahāyāna sūtras are not. But denying the authorship of Mahāyāna to the Buddha, we are depriving ourselves of the very basis which to respond to Theravadins and so on, because in affect, we are accepting their view of our own texts.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 4:13 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:  
Anders said:  
the evidence is so overwhelmingly to the contrary.

Malcolm wrote:  
Would you like to trot out that evidence?

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 4:01 AM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:  
....what is your opinion of this?  
Can a person be a Buddhist relying only on what can be achieved through direct experience?  
...

Malcolm wrote:  
A Buddhist cannot achieve anything without right view.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 1:23 AM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
The mind never ceases to continue, not even in the state of awakening.

Sherab said:  
I am not sure about this. I remembered that there is a story about how Mara (or was it a Deva?) boasted about how he could know the mind of anyone but when challenged by the Buddha to find his (the Buddha's) mind, he failed. Also, if I remember correctly, the nirvana of an Arhat is likened to a flame going out - you can't tell where the flame went. In other words, you can't tell where the mind of an Arhat goes when he attains nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:  
According the Mainstream Buddhist schools it is indeed the case that the stream of consciousness experiences total cessation in parinirvana; but not according to the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna where the Buddha rejects this as a misunderstanding of his

teachings. As Sachen Kunga Nyingpo puts it, the garland of of moments of clarity continue from sentient being-hood through the state of Vajradhara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The body.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Yes, constantly.

Malcolm wrote:

Death, according to the Buddha is the break up of the aggregates, i.e. when mind and body separate. Since the mind does not die, then we can say that what dies, ceases to continue is the body. The mind never ceases to continue, not even in the state of awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Simon E. said:

As to "if its not historically true its more important "...the mind boggles at the sheer frigging nonsense that clever people can take seriously.

Anders said:

If, for example, the encounter dialogues in Zen are not historical reports, then they were manufactured for a religious purpose.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not sūtra.

We followers of Buddhadharma must confidence in the authenticity of our core canons. That confidence can only arise if we are confident in the lineage and authorship of the these canons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Anders said:

I think it weakens Buddhism if it can formulate no religious response to academic findings. I don't wish to see Buddhism sticking its head in the sand, catholic style, insisting that dinosaurs were put in the ground to test our faith and so forth.

Malcolm wrote:

The religious response is not to cater to Western Academia by giving credence to their "findings" with such devices as the one you propose. No, it is not sufficient. It is just a back-handed way of saying, "Well, yes you're right, but..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 6:50 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

So I agree with Malcolm: if you want to be "happy" in this lifetime, ethical hedonism is 100% the way to go, and maybe a little Buddhist practice

Meditation in the morning, Xanax or a joint and a couple of shots of vodka in the evening?

Malcolm wrote:

Dude!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

LastLegend said:

Well death is real. I think we can all agree on this.

PadmaVonSamba said:

The death of....what?

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

The body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:



PadmaVonSamba said:

The reality of a physical universe is valid when it comes to suggesting the existence of a lineage of teachers,  
....but not for "materialists" for whom it is a view 'so deeply ingrained'.

Malcolm wrote:

Just what are you on about? Are you interested in having a discussion or are you just interested in mocking people? What's your problem?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

It is possible to go beyond the dualism of comfortable vs. uncomfortable.

Malcolm wrote:

Not without first cultivating right view.

PadmaVonSamba said:

...then you are essentially saying that since (according to you) nobody has attained perfect tranquility and peace of mind in a thousand years, then nobody has cultivated right view.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that. What I said is that, if one follows the Theravada school's reckoning of things, there has not been an arhat for more than a thousand years. I never said anything at all about bodhisattvas.

Even someone with only mundane correct view however, can attain perfectly tranquility and peace of mind — it's called *śamatha*. Even Hindus have this. The cultivation of *śamatha* does not depend on right view at all. Someone who has no faith in rebirth whatsoever can achieve *śamatha*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

It is possible to go beyond the dualism of comfortable vs. uncomfortable.

...

Malcolm wrote:  
Not without first cultivating right view.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 4:35 AM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:

Wrong view is not just active disbelief, it also includes well considered agnosticism on the issue, which by definition is a form of ignorance.

daverupa said:  
The Buddha did not tell these fine folk that a well-considered agnosticism was a form of ignorance. He instead taught them how to use such an agnosticism to attain four assurances here and now, and even with agnosticism in play he is able to call those who successfully employ this gambit those with 'mind thus free from hostility, free from ill will, undefiled, & pure'.

Malcolm wrote:  
Nevertheless, it is. An agnostic by definition cannot enter the beginning of the path. The four brahmaviharas are not a path.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 4:15 AM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
Without rebirth, there is such thing as "liberation"

Anders said:  
Surely full freedom from suffering in this life can qualify as "liberation" even if it is not a liberation from the endless rounds of samsara?

Malcolm wrote:  
There can be no full liberation from suffering for one with wrong view, even in this life.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 2:58 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:  
smcj said:  
To me it is only when somebody starts trying to publicly legitimize their rejection of the teachings that I've got a problem, and at that point I'm right with you.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and those people ought to just be ignored. It does no good to argue with academic skeptics like Jeff, materialists like Andrew, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Norwegian said:

As Nagarjuna points out:

" Even though an individual may have practiced well,  
with a wrong view

All that matures will be unbearable. "

-- Suhrllekha ["Letter to a Friend"]

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Ok, well I get it then, I think I took your words to mean something else, thanks for the clarification.

Malcolm wrote:

Just to reinforce the point:

Bhikku Bodhi said:

The Buddha includes belief in rebirth and kamma in his definition of right view, and their explicit denial in wrong view.

Malcolm wrote:

So, the point is that someone who has wrong view is automatically barred from liberation. Wrong view is not just active disbelief, it also includes well considered agnosticism on the issue, which by definition is a form of ignorance.

This is why I consider it so tragic that so many people out there are interested in the Dharma, but their very beliefs, or lack of it, bar them from experiencing the true fruits of practice. The most they can expect is a higher rebirth, which sadly, they do not even believe in. Worse, if they meditate incorrectly, develop the higher dhyanas and so on,

they can take rebirth in formless realms from which they will never escape for literally millions and millions of years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

JD, can you tell me the difference between Buddhist mindfulness and say Hindu mindfulness, or even secular mindfulness?

Johnny Dangerous said:

No, I don't have your background, and thus I can't do that. I can however wonder what exactly you are trying to convey re: accessibility and right usage of Buddhist teachings in this thread, which is what I'm asking.

There is nothing particularly "Buddhist" about the kleshas for example, they are discussed in all Indian spiritual paths.

Sans rebirth, what is it that makes any discussion about the kleshas more interesting from a Buddhist perspective than say for example, the plethora of psychologies out there, considering that kleshas and so on are not unique to Buddhism?

I'm not approaching the question from an academic standpoint, nor do I imagine are most practitioners, nor most people who MIGHT become practitioners. All I am asking is why you would want someone to be an ethical hedonist rather than a Buddhist, albeit one whose opinions you might think are nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said ethical hedonist could not crib teachings of the Buddha and so on that suit them. But liberation is just not in the cards for them. Buddha never said that someone who did not accept rebirth could attain stream entry, let alone Arhatship. Forget about Bodhisattvas and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

e]

Whose talking about restricting access to the teachings?

I dunno, what ARE you talking about then, declarations of faith, simply refuting incorrect

views on doctrine, or what? Is there a purpose behind telling someone they should just be an ethical hedonist? I'm unclear on your actual position..especially as someone who not too long ago declared their desire to distance themselves from the "Buddhist" label.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I did not say someone should be an ethical hedonist, I said it would be better to be an ethical hedonist.

Actually, a "Buddhism" sans rebirth is just ethical hedonism.

Not by a longshot. Even given the obvious ethical quandaries that can be involved with "secular Dharma" - which I recognize, Buddhist meditation, and even a bit of the Buddhist understanding of emotion and mind works wonders for non-Buddhists..hopefully that's non-controversial right?

Malcolm wrote:

JD, can you tell me the difference between Buddhist mindfulness and say Hindu mindfulness, or even secular mindfulness?

There is nothing particularly "Buddhist" about the kleshas for example, they are discussed in all Indian spiritual paths.

Sans rebirth, what is it that makes any discussion about the kleshas more interesting from a Buddhist perspective than say for example, the plethora of psychologies out there, considering that kleshas and so on are not unique to Buddhism?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Man, I really do not get this.

You don't think it's better for people to have access to teachings that decrease afflictive emotions, regardless of worldview? I sure do.

Malcolm wrote:

Whose talking about restricting access to the teachings?

Johnny Dangerous said:

It seems like the only real issue is when people want to say "the Buddha didn't believe in rebirth" and similar, thinking of Sam Harris here among others...beyond that, I WANT those people to have access to the teachings, and be welcome in Dharma centers etc. without needing to make some sort of declaration of faith - unless they plan on taking refuge of course.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this does not address my point, which is, there are plenty of wonderful ethical systems out there which can bring people peace and improve their lives immeasurably. Actually, a "Buddhism" sans rebirth is just ethical hedonism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it would be better to be an ethical hedonist. Why? If rebirth wasn't the case, the statement you cite from the Dhammapada would have no meaning.

Anders said:

Why should it be better?

Are you saying that liberation in this lifetime is not worth it for the sake of this lifetime? That there are higher means of happiness in this lifetime only than full freedom from suffering?

Malcolm wrote:

Without rebirth, there is such thing as "liberation". If you have your needs and wants met, that's enough. This is why said it would be better to be an ethical hedonist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Macolm, I'm sympathetic to what you're saying, but what exactly do you mean by "the teaching of the Buddha"? For example, is the Aro gTér the teaching of the Buddha? Is Michael Roach's stuff the teaching of the Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

I was actually talking about the teachings in the bKa' 'gyur in general as well as the Nyingma rgyud 'bum. As far as termas go, well, what I had in mind was more like standard traditional termas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherlock said:

Do we have to accept that tantras also come from Shakyamuni Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

No, we should just accept they they were taught by a Buddha, such as Vajradhara, for example. However, some of the lower tantras were directly taught by the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Anders said:

If rebirth wasn't the case and perfect freedom from suffering was nevertheless an option for the remainder of one's singular lifetime, that would still be plenty good reason for a Buddha to teach. Cf the dhammapada:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it would be better to be an ethical hedonist. Why? If rebirth wasn't the case, the statement you cite from the Dhammapada would have no meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Three things are required to turn the tide of Buddhist modernism, especially of the academic variety:

1) We must resist the temptation to fall under the spell of text criticism. The text critical approach is forensic and speculative. It proceeds from Western hermeneutical prejudices founded in a materialist notion of what a "text" is. It also is born out of a Western idea of historiography. Text criticism, used as a means of discerning the origin of Buddhist texts and its developments, results in nothing more than speculative conjectures being taken as facts by the reading public, and by many Buddhists as well. These speculative conjectures harm the foundations of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna in particular, which are seen as modifications or corruptions of an ur-canon.

2) We must resist the attempt to erect science as our final authority in all matters of cosmology, theories of consciousness, etc. While not disregarding modern science and so on, we must insist that domain of Buddhadharma is necessarily outside of scientific inquiry. The origin of Buddhadharma is the awakening of the Buddha. There is no way the mundane sciences can either enhance our understanding of Dharma nor can it replace the Dharma.

3) We must insist that on fact the Buddhist canon, all sutra, tantra and Vajrayāna

originate with the Buddhas in general, and Śākyamuni Buddha in particular. We must take into consideration that the very survival of Buddhism as a living tradition depends on the integrity of the origins of the teachings. In particular, we must insist on the necessity that the timeless teachings of the Buddhas transcend mundane concerns about space and time, existing as a remedy for the suffering of all sentient beings, wherever they may be. Therefore, the teachings of the Buddhas, whether directly, by permission or by blessing should be accepted as they are at face value as the teaching of the Buddha. It is only in this way that the integrity of the Buddhist tradition will be preserved. This is not to say that all Buddhists must accept all canons as being of equal value. We need to recognize that all the Buddha's teachings have value for different people at different stages in their evolution on the path.

Therefore, engaging with people addicted to text criticism or historical analysis of Buddhist texts, or who have aim to replace key concepts in Buddhadharma with concepts drawn from the mundane sciences should be considered extraneous distractions and such people's qualms and objections must be ignored, because trying to deflect or negate such misguided criticisms of materialists, made by non-practitioners, or Theravadin practitioners is completely useless. If they say Mahāyāna is not the teaching of the Buddha, we must insist that it is. If they claim the Vajrayāna teachings are not the teaching of the Buddha, we insist that it is. If they claim that termas are not the teaching of the Buddha, we insist that they are and leave it at that. Many long, stupid conversations will be blunted in the beginning by a simple statement "This is a teaching of the Buddha. If you don't think so, you are welcome to your opinion but I am not interested in discussing it with you further." Such discussions are not useful for anyone's practice, their's, if they have one, or ours. Further, we create much non-virtue and negative traces by engaging in such discussions. So it is time to just stop.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Hello from Texas

Content:

DharmaCloud said:

Hello everyone.

I'm a self-proclaimed "book buddhist" who has tried (really?) to engage in a practice for many years. Too many excuses to throw out there for that one, but as I often have, I'm once again stepping back onto the path.

I'm hoping to engage in lively discussions and be part of a community in the dharma. Once again moving from the distractions, I hope to use the encouragement of seeing others on the path to spur my own practice.

This time I hope to lay down my unhealthy ego, the one that causes me to seek perfection in my attempts to be in a better place. I am trying to accept where I am and start from here.



Malcolm wrote:  
Find a teacher.

The victor, the owner of the best of all qualities, has said:  
“Rely on the Buddha, Dharma and the virtuous mentor .”

— Samcayagathas

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

When rebirth is debated it should be kept in mind that rebirth is something to be overcome. It is something that needs to be seen as false.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is the point of Buddhadharma, overcoming rebirth. Not merely as a concept, but in actuality. You seem to be proposing the only thing we need to overcome is the idea of rebirth. Well, materialists don't need to since they have no idea of rebirth. Maybe they are already liberated. At death, poof, nirvana.

The point is, A108, without rebirth, there is no need for Buddhadharma per se.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 11:07 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

How totally hypocritical to say that a scientific view

...

Malcolm wrote:

I wan't talking about science per se. I was talking about western materialism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There has not been an Arhat for more than a thousand years...

Vajraprajnakhadga said:  
How do you know this?

Malcolm wrote:  
Please read my previous response to this post. This is a tradition that is universal in Theravada.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 8:09 AM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:  
Every bit of your "true buddhism" is based on material references, on written texts...

Malcolm wrote:  
No, my Buddhism is based on a living lineage of realized teachers going right back to the Buddha.

PadmaVonSamba said:  
So, you are saying they are figments of your imagination?

Malcolm wrote:  
You know, if you do not believe that the Buddha's teachings have passed down to us in an unbroken lineage through realized masters; which present those teachings to us faithfully, that's your problem, not mine.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 8:07 AM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
There has not been an Arhat for more than a thousand years...

PadmaVonSamba said:  
So you say.  
Prove it.

Malcolm wrote:  
There are various schemes, but let us suppose that we take the Theravadin scheme. According to Buddhaghosha, circa 5th century, when a thousand years have elapsed from the Buddha's parinirvana, it will no longer be possible to become a stream entrant, let alone an Arhat.

If you are interested in this kind of thing, look at Jan Nattier's synopsis of these issues in Once Upon a Future Time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

How many people are there who argue about whether or not there is a next life when they haven't yet got freedom in this life?

Peace of mind, total contentment,  
these are all possible right now.

If you attain them in this life,  
whether another life follows this one or not doesn't really matter at all.

...

Malcolm wrote:

And if you don't, the point is critical. There has not been an Arhat for more than a thousand years...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 7:02 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Every bit of your "true buddhism" is based on material references, on written texts...

Malcolm wrote:

No, my Buddhism is based on a living lineage of realized teachers going right back to the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Honen's One-Sheet Document

Content:

Luke said:

In Part 7, Rev. Ishikawa talks a bit about the views of some of Honen's main students, such as Bencho. He also mentions that he feels that there is very little information about Pure Land Buddhism available in English (this is part of his motivation for making

these videos). Perhaps more Pure Land texts will be translated into English in the future...

One thing these videos have given me is just the opportunity to see how a Pure Land Buddhist priest thinks and acts. Rev. Ishikawa is very knowledgeable and rational, so this is what impresses me the most. He doesn't have any overdone "Praise Amitabha! Hallelujah, brothers and sisters!" type of attitude that I had always expected Pure Land priests to have.

Malcolm wrote:  
Ippen is an interesting character.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 2:09 AM  
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?  
Content:

Andrew108 said:  
For some people it is important. For me it's not meaningful. If you want to follow Buddha's teachings then it is best to slowly divest yourself of concepts regarding Buddhist teachings.

asunthatneversets said:  
This makes no sense. Seems to be a misinterpretation of what it means for wisdom to be free of concepts.

Andrew108 said:  
When you sit back and think thank goodness I don't have to be a Buddhist anymore, maybe you relax a bit. When you sit back and think thank goodness I'm a Buddhist, maybe you relax a bit. As a practitioner you realize both are an equality. When you do this are you a Buddhist or are you someone who has understood something about the invariant condition we all find ourselves in?

Malcolm wrote:  
The point is not whether one is a Buddhist or not; the point is whether one understands Buddhadharma or not. People who reject rebirth and yet continue to call themselves "Buddhists" do not understand Buddhadharma.

I don't know you personally, but from everything you have written, I would say that you are someone who has some intellectual understanding of Buddhism, but I really don't think you grasp the meaning of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 1:31 AM  
Title: Re: Understanding of karma

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes agreed, but if Dzogchen accepted a conventional view of karma then one would think that one needs to accumulate vast stores of merit and purify oceans of negativities.

Malcolm wrote:

Khenpo Ngachung, someone who attained the pinnacle of Dzogchen realization in the last century, and then wrote of his experiences states:

In any system of sutra or tantra, without gathering the accumulations and purifying obscurations, Buddhahood can never be attained. Though the system of gathering accumulations and purifying obscurations is different, in this respect [dzogchen] is the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Physicalism? Not really.

Malcolm wrote:

Really.

Andrew108 said:

If I say that immaterial mental phenomena cannot exist independently of material phenomena you would take me as a physicalist. But I am not making any assertions as to what matter is apart from saying that it is interdependently originated.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-sequitur -- what is at issue of your views of consciousness, not your views of matter.

Andrew108 said:

On the other hand you are asserting that the immaterial (consciousness) has characteristics and functionality separate from the physical. It's characteristics do not depend on a physical base but are innate to it, part of it.

Malcolm wrote:

Andrew, your notion of the relation between consciousness and matter is a one way dependency: i.e. consciousness depends on matter, period.

Andrew108 said:

But I wonder how you can say this? What for example are the actual qualities of an immaterial rainbow if the rainbow is absolutely immaterial?

Rongzom says:

"If an immaterial phenomenon existed, for example a mirage, it would be empty of causes and empty of movement. In the very moment of engaging a mirage designated by convention, the phenomenon of emptiness does not depend upon the mirage."

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure that Rongzom says this, citation please, so I can look at the Tibetan text. I am not sure what the translator means by "immaterial".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of karma

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Really? Dzogchen accepts a conventional view of karma?

Malcolm wrote:

Very much so, as Garland of Pearls Tantra [one of seventeen tantras] states:

One is placed in the dungeon of name and matter  
in the castle of the three realms,  
tortured with the barbs of ignorance and so on,  
oppressed by the thick darkness of samsara,  
attached to the salty taste of desire,  
bound by the neck with the noose of confusion,  
burned with the hot fire of hatred,  
head covered with pride,  
setting a rendezvous with the mistress of jealousy,  
surrounded by the army of enmity...  
tied by the neck with the noose of subject and object, [29b]  
stuck in the mud of successive traces  
and handcuffed with the ripening of karma.  
Having been joined with the ripening of karma,  
one takes bodies good and bad,  
one after another like a water wheel,  
born into each individual class.  
Having crossed at the ford of self-grasping,

one sinks into the ocean of suffering  
and one is caught by the heart on the hook of the three lower realms.  
One is bound by oneself; the afflictions are the enemy.

The whole purpose of practicing rishan, especially outer rishan, is to eliminate the causes of birth in the six lokas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I suspended my world view for 24 years. That's how many years it took for me to overcome the belief in literal rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

And so now you have become an evangelist for replacing Buddha's own teachings with physicalism, and promulgating that as the Dharma.

Pretty sad, dude.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of karma

Content:

kng said:

For those who would wish to participate in discussion, without having to watch the video, maybe you could suggest some sources from which to study karma or give overview about karma from the point of view of nine vehicles.

Malcolm wrote:

The point of view of karma in the conventional is the same for all nine vehicles. In other words, Dzogchen does not deviate in any significant way from the standard presentation of Karma given in chapter 4 of the Abhidharmakośa.

There is no karma in the ultimate, so in that respect too, the point of view of all nine vehicles is the same.

The treatment of karma absolutely does not change from one vehicle to the next.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I had thought what made the merit and wisdom accumulations more powerful was that they were done in most cases in the aspect of the self-generation. For example, one generates as Yamantaka before blessing the inner offering, and emanating goddesses to offer it to the merit field etc. as to do so in one's ordinary form would not be possible.

.

Malcolm wrote:

As I understand it, what makes the merit accumulation more powerful is that you are making offerings to the Guru above all. The wisdom accumulation is more powerful because it is done with a mantra based on the the example wisdom of the time of empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that the only thing preventing many people from waking up is the rigid resistance I see among many westerners, who think they are interested in Buddha's Dharma, to what the Buddha's Dharma actually teaches. This is why many people follow a "Buddhism" of their imagination, rather than Buddhadharma.

Andrew108 said:

It is as you say. The Pali suttas are full of mentions of literal rebirth. But we also know that Buddhism has been modified and developed over the centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Buddhadharma has never been modified. Over the centuries however, more of the Buddha's teachings have been revealed, to help people cope with evolving circumstances.

Andrew108 said:

In the Samadhanga Sutta Buddha says:

"If he wants, he recollects his manifold past lives,[3] i.e., one birth, two births, three births, four, five, ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, one hundred, one thousand, one hundred thousand, many aeons of cosmic contraction, many aeons of cosmic expansion, many aeons of cosmic contraction and expansion, [recollecting], 'There I had such a name, belonged to such a clan, had such an appearance. Such was my food, such my experience of pleasure and pain, such the end of my life. Passing away from that state, I



re-arose there. There too I had such a name, belonged to such a clan, had such an appearance. Such was my food, such my experience of pleasure and pain, such the end of my life. Passing away from that state, I re-arose here.' Thus he remembers his manifold past lives in their modes and details. He can witness this for himself whenever there is an opening."

So we should take this literally right?

Malcolm wrote:

It is intended literally. There is nothing here to dispute, conventionally speaking.

Andrew108 said:

But one wonders how could it be possible? How could all these memories survive so many lives when there were lives where we didn't have language or developed senses capable of recording and storing that information. Why was it that the Buddha couldn't talk about the evolution of species or what life was like on other planets. It seems that life on other planets was much like life on this one?

Malcolm wrote:

Life in Sukhavati for example, is nothing like life on this one.

Andrew108 said:

How does this memory survive after brain death? What is it about consciousness that enables it to contain so much information and why is that information not ordinarily available to us? Then there is a kind of folkism here where memory is seen like a serial display and that one needs only rewind to uncover past events. It seems if you develop the jhanas then that is the kind of capacity you will have. The way you remember things will be serial.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, for ordinary beings, the shock of being unconscious at the moment of conception is said to render our past life memories unavailable. Bodhisattvas in their last life however are conscious through the entire process of conception, gestation and birth.

When one enters into the concentration of recalling past lives, indeed one starts with this life and that starts with the present and works one's way back.

Memory is serial because consciousness is serial. Memory, as I already explained to you from Candrakirti, is not different than the consciousness that experienced the event. So the process consists of recalling every serial sense impression from beginningless time.

Consciousness is empty, there is nothing preventing consciousness from recalling all of its past objects other than our present obscurations. Just as there is nothing preventing karma from ripening because karma too is empty.

But if you try to understand these things in physicalist terms it will never make any sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The teachings have to make practical sense.

Malcolm wrote:

They do, but first you have to understand their context. The context of Buddhadharma is to be liberated from rebirth in samsara.

Andrew108 said:

Have to be applicable right now.

Malcolm wrote:

They are.

Andrew108 said:

Shouldn't isolate an individual.

Malcolm wrote:

They don't.

Andrew108 said:

Shouldn't enable the forming of inside-outside identity making.

Malcolm wrote:

Tell that to the Buddha, i.e., "Outside of my Dharma and Discipline..."

Andrew108 said:

Should bring a measurable benefit to the practitioner and others.

Malcolm wrote:

They do.

Andrew108 said:

Have to be absolutely useful and relevant.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing more relevant than eliminating the traces that cause rebirth in samsara.

Andrew108 said:

All of these amazing effects of the teachings are available when the metaphysical aspects are dropped in favour of direct experience.

Malcolm wrote:

The direct experience of deluded beings is delusion.

Andrew108 said:

So many buddhists are in denial about their behaviour.

Malcolm wrote:

Here is a mirror, take a look at your reflection.

Andrew108 said:

Thinking that being buddhist and being in receipt of wonderful teachings is enough. It is not enough.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed, but abandoning the Buddha's Dharma and replacing it with physicalism is not the right approach.

Andrew108 said:

There needs to be an absolute benefit to the practitioner's life.

Malcolm wrote:

There is only one absolute benefit, liberation. If someone does not begin with right view, which incidentally includes rebirth, karma and so on, there will be no benefit at all to a person's life.

The fact is that the only thing preventing many people from waking up is the rigid resistance I see among many westerners, who think they are interested in Buddha's Dharma, to what the Buddha's Dharma actually teaches. This is why many people follow a "Buddhism" of their imagination, rather than Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 7:16 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There is also the issue of petty sectarianism where other views can't be tolerated and are seen as being a threat.

Malcolm wrote:

I am afraid that you seem to subscribe to the view, "Buddhism is whatever I think it is". Well, to a large extent these days that that is true. But Buddhadharma is not "whatever

we think it is".

Andrew108 said:

Since the logic is not there, it should be perfectly acceptable for a Buddhist to not accept rebirth. They should not have to feel excluded or de-valued because of their agnosticism or reasoned disbelief.

Malcolm wrote:

I have never insisted that people accept rebirth as a personal belief. I have insisted that people understand how Buddha's teaching of rebirth is critical to understanding Buddhadharma properly. I have also insisted that if we discard rebirth, the Buddha's Dharma ceases to have any more meaning than any other secular self-help system. Without the teaching of rebirth, the Buddha's Dharma is no more than a set of moral platitudes. It ceases to be a path of liberation, and becomes a mere palliative for life's ailments, rather than a cure.

This I have unwaveringly maintained literally for years, as anyone who remembers E-Sangha can attest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 6:25 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I honestly thought that the practices of generating as the deity, and things like illusory body, clear light and tummo were the uncommon features of Highest Yoga Tantra. I especially thought the generation stage created extraordinary causes to achieve the form body. I am a little worried I misunderstood something here. (Which is totally possible!)

Malcolm wrote:

All these things are uncommon, JK, but in a sadhana, the merit and wisdom accumulations are completed even before you start in on the main section. And the main section of the sadhana is nothing or nor less than a reenactment of Buddha's awakening and deeds through nirvana.

Yes, it is true that creation stage is a cause for realizing the rūpakāya, just as the completion stage is a cause for realizing the dharmkāya. But superior even to the the two stages is guru yoga, which along with mandala offerings are truly unique to anuttarayoga tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The same applies to text critical scholarship of Buddhist texts. It destroys Buddhadharma. I really want nothing more to do with this contemporary approach to Buddhadharma.

dzogchungpa said:

Are we to just ignore it then?

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty much, AFAIC. It does nothing to help one's practice or realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

From my limited perspective, it appears to me that the real danger inherent in all of this is that by adhering to this western materialist view that is so deeply ingrained in our culture, we are simply piling trace upon trace in our mindstreams that will make it ever more difficult for us to meet the Dharma in future lives, much less have faith in it.

This is sad.

The same applies to text critical scholarship of Buddhist texts. It destroys Buddhadharma. I really want nothing more to do with this contemporary approach to Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I have heard some lamas explain it that Vajrayana also establishes causes for achieving the form body of a Buddha, it allows us to start doing that right in this life. This is part of the reason for its swiftness.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a very good explanation. The rupakāya comes from the punyasambhara, the merit accumulation. Also this exists in common Mahāyāna, right from the start. It is the means of accumulating merit that set Vajrayāna apart, like mandala offerings (in particular) and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Concerns about Commercializing Buddhism in the West

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

<http://tuttejior.wordpress.com/2014/01/31/tutte-wachtmeister-how-to-monetize-the-dharma/>

smcj said:

298 pages. Hardback. \$34.95

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, one of those x-buddhist hacks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Arjan Dirkse said:

Religions all compete in the market place of ideas, most of them and their denominations claim to have the superior path.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna is the uncommon Mahāyāna path because it uses methods which the Buddha did not teach in Mahāyāna sūtras. The Buddha taught that, unlike in common Mahāyāna, it is possible for a beginner, someone at the beginning of the path of preparation, to attain complete buddhahood in a single lifetime by following Vajrayāna. These teachings are stated by the Buddha, Padmasambhava, and so on, not by simple people like me.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Concerns about Commercializing Buddhism in the West

Content:

catlady2112 said:

I read in some earlier posts of people who went to a (Buddhist Geeks?) conference and said there was an overemphasis on how to market yourself in order to get students.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously? That is corrupt. Such people will merely send themselves to hell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Tantras themselves say they are the pinnacle of the dispensation,

theanarchist said:

Yeah, but they also say that they are for disciples of higher/highest capacity. Means, only for a small minority of all people who come in contact with dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the tantras do not say this. What the tantras say is that only \_fortunate\_ people meet the Vajrayāna stream.

theanarchist said:

And the fact that a lot of people follow vajrayana, but very very very few of them indeed attain liberation in this one life...

Malcolm wrote:

The tantras divide people in three categories basically, best, medium, average. They provide all necessary methods for attaining buddhahood in this life, or the bardo, or taking rebirth in a buddhfield such as Sukhavati.

theanarchist said:

So yeah, anyone can follow vajrayana, but not everyone can or will attain liberation in the that fast manner.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna texts promise that if one maintains ones samaya well, one will attain full buddhahood within seven lifetimes. Compared to the three incalculable eons at minimum to practice the common Mahāyāna path, this is fast, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

theanarchist said:

[

Why should they be offended? In Theravada leading all other beings to liberation is indeed not on the program.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as is the case with all the so-called Mainstream schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Honen's One-Sheet Document

Content:

Luke said:

I have watched the first five videos just out of curiosity. They don't make me want to practice Jodo Shu, but they have given me a better understanding of this tradition and of Japanese language and culture. Rev. Ishikawa seems like a very kind and joyful person. If anybody thinks that Buddhism is only about misery and suffering, they should take a look at Rev. Ishikawa!

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is only about escaping misery suffering; but if someone thinks there is even a microgram of happiness in samsara, they are pretty deluded. However, people on the path have good reason to be happy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Needless to say, for those who have no faith in Vajrayāna, Vajrayāna is not a vehicle at all, much less the fastest one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

plwk said:

I used to agree with some like Malcolm that this 'foundation' may not be necessary but after having read this thread and some others, I can now see the wisdom and acute urgency of this statement.

Malcolm wrote:

I used to have that feeling, I no longer do. Quite the opposite in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: 21 Years from the Dharamsala Conference

Content:

kirtu said:

How does the square with the pervasive drug culture in the US?

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, people in Britain snort so much coke it in the WATER supply.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: 21 Years from the Dharamsala Conference

Content:

kirtu said:

Due to misfortune I had to move to Baltimore in late 2012. The entire region is a nest of rampant drug activity.

Malcolm wrote:

Like every working class city in the US with a ruined economy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 7:16 PM

Title: Re: Excellent online resource for Colloquial Tibetan

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Some of the speakers have terrible Chinese accents.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

kirtu said:

Then by your admission, Central Tibet was some ruled in some way by the Gelug during the time of the 5th Dalai Lama to the 6th, then there was a 40 year period (this would overlap with the life of the 6th and the 7th), then from some point during the life of the 7th the Gelug rule again in some form up to the 13th. Is that correct?

Malcolm wrote:

I was very precise. The government established by the Fifth collapsed when when Lozang Khan invaded, and Desid Sangye Gyatso was assassinated by Lozang Khan's wife (a former mistress of his) in 1705 (I said 1704, but oh well). The Desid never allowed the Sixth to rule.

Central Tibet remained without any effective government at all, apart from warlords, until Pho lha nas, an aristocrat from Tsang, ruled Tibet from 1727-1748 with Qing backing.

The seventh was installed by the Qianglong emperor in 1751. The Kashag itself was a creation was a creation of the Qianglong emperor.

Please get your facts straight, Kirt. I expect better from you. The Central Tibetans were ruled by the Qing, so they could not be a theocracy either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 6:28 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No one refers to Europe as a THEOCRACY during the middle ages. No one. I defy you find even one serious historian that labels Medieval Europe so.

uan said:

I defy you to find even one serious historian that labels Medieval Europe as a single country.

Malcolm wrote:

That my friend, is my entire point. Tibet was never "Tibet", Tibet is Ü, Tsang, Ngari Korsum [Formerly known as Zhang Zhung], Guge, Amdo, Chamdo, Kham, Nangchen, Golog, Nyarong, Gyalmo Rong, Lhodrag, Kongpö, Pö, and a plethora of other small kingdoms and regions like Mustang, Lhadak, Dolpo, Jyathang and so on, with huge ethnic diversity — for example, the people in Gyalrong speak a language that is not even Tibetan, though they are Tibetan Buddhists. You are talking about a vast region, historically tied together by religion rather than ethnic identity, much like Medieval Europe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

kirtu said:

Your characterization of the brief rein of the 5th Dalai Lama is correct. The rest was an obfuscation. Although a specific Mongol group invaded and disposed the 6th Dalai Lama, it appears that the Gelugs were more or less in charge of Central Tibet at least through the beginning of the rule of the 13th Dalai Lama. This was enforced at least nominally from Beijing.

Malcolm wrote:

No that is not correct. There were two separate secular regimes over a period of 40 or so years, before the 7th was installed.

kirtu said:

Yes, people do. Europe was characterized as having heavy theocratic influence at least

until the French Revolution. The period 1789-1848 was this inflection point in Western and Central Europe.

Malcolm wrote:

No one refers to Europe as a THEOCRACY during the middle ages. No one. I defy you find even one serious historian that labels Medieval Europe so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Also, let us not forget that the post-Industrial Revolution, capitalist system of the West, while perhaps "democratic", has led to an unsustainable strain on the earth's resources and a pollution crisis that is destroying the planet.

Malcolm wrote:

If this is the case, then the "West" is the whole world.

In fact everybody on the whole planet has bought in industrialization. The West coast of the US and Canada experiences the pollution from China's factories.

Quite frankly, there are no players who do not participate willingly in the Global economy. I know it is fun to point fingers at the US, but in reality, the environmental degradation we are experiencing was caused by all countries who industrialized.

This East/West thing is really misguided — ya'll need to read Edward Said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Stop crying and make your position more clear. I haven't invented anything.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you have.

Andrew108 said:

You are the one implying consciousness has potential and is supported by warmth.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by "potential"?

Andrew108 said:

So why wouldn't I assume that you understand consciousness to be self-sustaining and therefore not without energy?

Malcolm wrote:

A moment of consciousness is not self-sustaining, like everything else it is sustained on causes and conditions, they are simply not physical causes and conditions. Unless of course you eliminate the formless realm, in which case there would only be two dhātus rather than the standard three.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: 21 Years from the Dharamsala Conference

Content:

kirtu said:

Logic please. Mexico is not considered the West

Malcolm wrote:

Yes it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: 21 Years from the Dharamsala Conference

Content:

kirtu said:

You can also just take up the "fearful and mistrusting" assessment with Noam Chomsky, Carol O'Connor and others who have said exactly the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have often pointed out, you live in a different country than I do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: 21 Years from the Dharamsala Conference

Content:

kirtu said:

It has been the most violent society in the West

Malcolm wrote:

You clearly have never been to Mexico.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

kirtu said:

No you said that the majority of Tibet was actually small kingdoms and said nothing about how they were actually governed. Central Tibet was ruled by the 5th Dalai Lama for 50 years but that Gelug rulership fell apart after his death (which is inaccurate, BTW).

Malcolm wrote:

It's perfectly accurate. Why you don't you look up the period between Desrid's assassination and the kidnapping of the sixth, and the the ascension of the 7th? Tell me who ruled Tibetan during this period.

kirtu said:

Tibet was very much a kind of theocracy where the aristocracy vied amongst themselves and with lamas to secure power...

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds very much like Medieval Europe, but no one calls this a "theocracy":

Europe was very much a kind of theocracy where the aristocracy vied amongst themselves and with clergy to secure power...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: 21 Years from the Dharamsala Conference

Content:

kirtu said:

If you grew up in the US, you additionally grew up in a fearful, violent and mistrusting society (albeit one that does not recognize that it is fearful, violent or mistrusting).

Malcolm wrote:

hahahahahahaha.

You have such a strange view of the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

ReasonAndRhyme said:

I'd find it much more interesting to hear historical arguments why Tibet was or was not a theocracy.

Malcolm wrote:

Been there, done that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Very fine quote indeed from RM.

Malcolm wrote:

And this?

Andrew108 said:

Maharshi: The real Self is continuous and unaffected.

Malcolm wrote:

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Substantial cause? Yes causality is an invariant. But there needs to be a 'substantial' cause. I fail to see how disembodied consciousness can be classed as 'substantial'.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because for you, if it is not listed on the table of elements, or composed thereof, it does not exist. Ergo, you are a materialist, not a follower of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

So what do we make of how Buddha treated poor Shariputra in the Mahayana sutras?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha, in Mahāyāna sutras, was acting out of his infinite and omniscient compassion. Not only that, while Śariputra may seem like a foil against which many unkind tricks were played, Śariputra in fact is a very high bodhisattva on the stages, a player in the drama of the Mahāyāna sutras.

I think that until I am at that level, I will refrain from criticizing the other vehicles.

Of course, when we openly discuss the fact that Vajrayāna promises the ideal practitioner full buddhahood replete with the two accumulations in a single life, it is natural that others might feel criticized or that we are making "triumphalist claims", but we are not. There isn't even one single Mainstream sutra or Mahāyāna sūtra that suggests that full buddhahood can be attained in a single life, so what need to mention the complete absence of the methods of doing so? Moreover, the Mainstream Sūtras do not detail the path of the bodhisattva, so people who wish to embark on the career of a bodhisattva must learn that from Mahāyāna sūtras. The Mainstream sūtra teachings have one goal primarily, to guide people to the four fruits of the śravakas path.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Science is indispensable and if used wisely brings many material benefits.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but it is not profound.

Crazywisdom said:

What do you mean by profound?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not lead to liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dharmagoat said:

... For that matter, I am grateful to everyone who has posted intelligently on this subject, regardless of their perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess that leaves me out, since according to Andrew, I am not "logical".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

We have good reason to disparage the smaller goal.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, disparaging the other yanas is a violation of our samaya.

Crazywisdom said:

Disparaging is too strong a word. I admit. The Mahayana sutras do disparage poor Shariputra, I'm afraid. Vajrayana is a species of Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

As the samaya of the Amitabha family states:

"I will uphold the sublime Dharma,  
the outer, inner and secret yānas".

Therefore, if we Vajrayānists criticize or berate other yānas, we break our samaya -- not in the sense of a root downfall, no, but in the sense that we are not honoring our commitment to the Padma family which is related to the teachings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 11:58 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

We have good reason to disparage the smaller goal.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, disparaging the other yanas is a violation of our samaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood



Content:

smcj said:

Ahem, in order to avoid a different kind of shit storm we say "Mainstream Buddhism" around here instead.

I thought we were supposed to use "Shravakayana". I know HHDL just differentiates between Pali and Sanskrit texts.

In any case we do try no avoid pejoratives.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, that is also considered pejorative. They want to be Mainstream Buddhism, because in point of fact there were never that many Mahāyāna Buddhists in India anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

uan said:

That was a non answer. But it does arise out of a real understanding of how non answers function.

Malcolm wrote:

Look, you made a gross inaccurate generalization. For one, the vast majority of Tibet, for most of its history, was divvied up into small kingdoms held together by a network of trade, family relations as well as monastic ties.

While it is true that the Great Fifth took control of Central Tibet and Tsang, his consolidation fell apart after his death completely. in 1704. It was another 50 years before a Dalai Lama was the nominal ruler of Central Tibet and Tsang. Even here, principalities like Sakya in Western Tsang maintained their independence. During much of the 19th century, Lhasa was controlled through Manchu Ambans.

So my point is, your contention has no substance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

uan said:

Their culture was a theocracy and was centered around supporting that theocracy. A

theocracy is not Dharma. Samsara existed in Tibet and permeated all levels of their culture, just like any other culture.

Malcolm wrote:

You really have no understanding of Tibetan history or culture.

uan said:

Would you care to elaborate?

Their culture was a theocracy and was centered around supporting that theocracy

Malcolm wrote:

This statement is complete nonsense. It cannot arise out of a real understanding of how Tibetan culture functions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 5:43 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Hinayana

Malcolm wrote:

Ahem, in order to avoid a different kind of chaotic and unpleasant situation we say "Mainstream Buddhism" around here instead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it merely proves that a text from the Agamas was translated during late eighth or early ninth century into Tibetan. Virtually no one reads that text, and no one regards it as being particularly authoritative.

santa100 said:

But that's the question I posed to you and which you continue to evade. Please provide reference to back up your claim that the Agamas is less "authoritative" to your sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it merely proves that a text from the Agamas was translated during late eighth or early ninth century into Tibetan. Virtually no one reads that text, and no one regards it as being particularly authoritative.

santa100 said:

But that's the question I posed to you and which you continue to evade. Please provide reference to back up your claim that the Agamas is less "authoritative" to your sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Well for example, in Mahāyāna sūtras, it very clearly explains that the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī actually attained samyakasambuddhahood countless eons ago. If it is the case that in Mahāyāna they accepted the statement in the Dhātubahuka-sūtra as authoritative, how is it that Mañjuśrī could appear as a disciple of the Buddha? For example, in the bKa' 'gyur, the translated words of the Buddha, the Ārya-mañjuśrīnāmāṣṭaśataka praises Mañjuśrī in the following words:

You are a Buddha, a pratyekabuddha,  
and you are the Primordial Buddha.

How can this be possible, if the Dhātubahuka-sūtra is to be regarded as definitive?

Further, to underscore the point that Mahāyāna sūtras are more definitive for Mahāyāna followers than Mainstream Buddhist Sūtras, consider the following from the Ārya-sandhinirmocana-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

At first, since the Bhagavan demonstrated the aspects of the four noble truths to those correctly participating in the vehicle in the deer park called Rṣivadanam, the amazing Dharma wheel he turned first was amazing, a corresponding Dharma had not been turned in the past by any deva nor any human. However, that Dharma wheel that the Bhagavan turned was surpassable, contextual, of provisional meaning, and a basis for contention. The Bhagavan turned a second very amazing Dharma wheel with the aspects beginning with the absence of inherent existence of phenomena, and beginning with their nonarising, noncessation, peace from the beginning, and intrinsic parinirvana to those correctly participating in the Mahāyāna. However, that Dharma Wheel turned by the Bhagavan too was surpassable, contextual, of provisional meaning, and a basis for contention. The Bhagavan then turned the third very amazing Dharma Wheel perfectly differentiating for those correctly participating in all vehicles beginning with the absence of inherent existence of phenomena, and beginning with their nonarising, noncessation, peace from the beginning, and intrinsic parinirvana. This Dharma Wheel turned by the Bhagavan is unsurpassable, not circumstantial, definitive in meaning, and not a basis of contention.

Here you can see that Mahāyāna sūtra, the teaching of the Mahāyāna is clearly defined as definitive. while the teaching of the Mainstream Buddhists, the Agamas and so on are defined as provisional in meaning, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

smcj said:

And just because this is the "Mahayana/Vajrayana" forum doesn't give you the right to say that.

If not here, then where?

santa100 said:

No, not here. This is the General Dharma > Exploring Buddhism section, not Vajrayana section. Saying any elitist claim about Vajrayana here in this section is extremely misleading to those who are new to Buddhism. I see a site admin currently viewing this, if he disagrees, I will shut up.

Malcolm wrote:

I answered a direct question put out to the forum. I am sorry you don't like the answer, but the answer I provided was the correct one from a Vajrayāna perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

For example the claim made above, Buddha does not say which discourses, or which language. It is mere assumption he refers only to Pali. Buddha did not speak Pali.

santa100 said:

But that's irrelevant. The fact that you have the exact equivalence in the Agamas and the Tibetan prove that this is universally accepted by all Buddhist schools.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it merely proves that a text from the Agamas was translated during late eighth or early ninth century into Tibetan. Virtually no one reads that text, and no one regards it as being particularly authoritative in the Tibetan tradition. Your mistake is assuming that we value the Agamas as highly as you do. While we respect all the Buddha's teachings, we really do not spend much time with Mainstream Buddhist primary texts, as we have very few Agamic sutras in our canon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

By your words you have shown this to be so. You have also demonstrated huge ignorance about Vajrayāna texts with your tempest in a teapot here.

santa100 said:

And you've also demonstrated a distorted view of Vajrayana text, even the basic Tibetan equivalence of MN 115 I have repeatedly provided.

Malcolm wrote:

Not everything in the Tibetan Canon is Vajrayāna; there are Mainstream Buddhist texts like Vinaya, Abhidharma and so on, as well as their commentaries, and a few scattered

sūtras from the Agamas, but very few indeed; Mahāyāna texts like the Prajñāpāramita, Avatamska and so on, as well as their commentaries; and Vajrayāna texts like Kalacakra, Hevajra, Manjushri Namasamgiti, etc., and their commentaries.

The interpretive rule is simple — where a Mahāyāna text contradicts a Mainstream Buddhist text such as the one you cited, the Mahāyāna text takes precedence. Where a Vajrayāna text contradicts a Mahāyāna text, the Vajrayāna text takes precedence.

It is that simple. Because you do not understand how those of us in Tibetan Buddhism are trained to understand our own canon, you have made several erroneous assertions that I have kindly and patiently corrected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

santa100 said:

And just because this is the "Mahayana/Vajrayana" forum doesn't give you the right to say that.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it does.

santa100 said:

I have no problem with Vajrayana. I do have a problem with the the wild claim that Vajrayana as the fastest vehicle above all other schools and that it will make one becomes a Fully Enlightened Buddha in a single lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, that is exactly what Vajrayāna texts state without reservation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

if it is true that the self is not a thing but a process ... then it is also true that the tragedy of the ego dissolves because, strictly speaking, nobody is ever born and nobody ever dies. "

Malcolm wrote:

The self isn't even a process, it is just an innate imputation.

pensum said:

Which is precisely what Metzinger describes in his self-model theory.

Malcolm wrote:  
Yes, Hume had the same idea.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 3:38 AM  
Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood  
Content:

smcj said:  
But in any case good fences make good neighbors.

Malcolm wrote:  
It would appear TRC and santa100 have boundary issues.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 3:16 AM  
Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood  
Content:

JKhedrup said:  
There is a whole thrust of literature that the Tibetans call རྟོག་ཆེན་ བཀའ་རྒྱུ་བས་ or "Proving Mahayana as the Buddha's Word". The philosophy is worth looking at for those interested in the basis and defense of Mahayana philosophy. I once had a list of works and passages of this genre but have now lost it, which is a shame.

jiashengrox said:  
Ven Khedrup, I am not sure if we are suggesting the same thing, but try Chapter 1 or 2 of The Ornament of Mahayana Sutras. I remember there is a whole Chapter in the treatise dedicated to proving the words of the Mahayana to belong to the Buddha. Otherwise, The Chapter 1 of Mahayanasamgraha gives a summarised explanation, with Vasubhandu's bhasya.

Malcolm wrote:  
Its the subject of chapter one.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 3:11 AM  
Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood  
Content:

santa100 said:  
I'm so so glad that I participated in this thread for I have presented the most vivid proof that Vajrayana cannot be the best and fastest vehicle above all other Buddhist schools.!

Malcolm wrote:  
In your imagination.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 1:34 AM  
Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood  
Content:

santa100 said:  
Well, then you must agree that Vajrayana is not the fastest vehicle above all other Buddhist schools that enable one to become a Fully Enlightened Buddha, SammaSambuddha!

Malcolm wrote:  
There are no means by which one may become a buddha, gathering the twin stores of merit in a single lifetime and eliminating the two obscurations outside Vajrayāna. I am sorry, but such a teaching does not exist in any sūtra.

santa100 said:  
I'm for all the Buddhist schools Mahayana and Theravada that challenge the absurd elitist Vajrayana claim here.

Malcolm wrote:  
Glad you finally revealed your anti-Vajrayāna bias. As Nāgarjuna said while addressing critics of Mahāyāna:  
Since the teachings of the Tathāgata are not explicit,  
they are not easy to understand.  
Since one vehicle and three vehicles are taught,  
one should guard oneself with equanimity.  
Through equanimity one will not commit a misdeed,  
through aversion there will be a misdeed and there will be no virtue,  
therefore, hatred towards the Mahāyāna  
is not reasonable for one who desires their own welfare.  
Those of you who cannot endure it when you see someone speak openly of Vajrayāna principles should apply Nāgārjuna's advice in kind.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 1:30 AM  
Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood  
Content:  
Crazywisdom said:  
N

Yes, the bodhi of a Buddha and an Arahant are the same. The Pali sources, at least, do seem to say this. But Buddha differs from Arahants in two respects: He was first to teach dharma, and by virtue of this, teaches it the best.

Malcolm wrote:

That quite depends on what you mean by "bodhi".

Crazywisdom said:

Buddhadharma is really and truly THE most amazing phenomena in the history of the universe. How it makes us feel, how it transforms us and empowers us is something wondrous. All of Buddhism is very special and unique. Practitioners, whether high or low are all so so very very precious. Even to think of awakening once is such a precious moment, not just for oneself but in the history of sentient beings. Even one thought has so many karmic ripples.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

uan said:

Their culture was a theocracy and was centered around supporting that theocracy. A theocracy is not Dharma. Samsara existed in Tibet and permeated all levels of their culture, just like any other culture.

Malcolm wrote:

You really have no understanding of Tibetan history or culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

JKhedrup said:

If it did, both sides would just be collecting negative karma back and forth I think. When I was in Thailand I put aside my views and respectfully learnt what I was taught by conservative Dhammayutika Nikaya Theravada masters. I am glad I didn't push the envelope because I wouldn't have learned nearly as much and would have upset people.



Malcolm wrote:

Of course. It would be like going to Dhammawheel and insisting that people were wasting their time with Theravada and the Pali canon. Practicing any of the Buddha's teachings is never a waste of time.

What is a waste of time is when sectarian Theravadins like TRC come here and try to shove the Pali Canon down our throats.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But not necessarily the supreme authority of any of the Mainstream Buddhist canons. For example, in Tibetan Buddhism, the doctrine of the three kinds of nirmanakāyas comes from the Sutrālaṃkāra attributed to the Maitreya Bodhisattva. Because this text is by a tenth stage bodhisattva, it is considered to Buddhavaśana. Likewise, the Three Bodhisattva Commentaries on the Tantras are considered in the same light since they are authored, according to tradition, by tenth stage Bodhisattvas.

santa100 said:

Since you keep saying "Mainstream Buddhist", please define exactly what you mean. Per the cross references I have provided with the Chinese Taishos and the Tibetan, please be explicit on what exactly is and is not included in that "Mainstream Buddhist" source of yours.

I have no problem with the Bodhisattva comy. but you will have to reconcile it with your own Tibetan and the Chinese Taisho equivalences of MN 115 source I have provided, which was the Buddha's own words. I don't know about you, but I'd place my bet with the Buddha's teaching in

<https://books.google.com/books?id=lt7kFLVNONcC&pg=PT377&lpg=PT377&dq=That+bhikkhu%E2%80%99s+statement+should+neither+be+approved+nor+rejected&source=bl&ots=hnUHIu->

[hvM&sig=ElhMoutbuf01Si4LZtgovpV2e8Q&hl=en&sa=X&ei=p2B9U5TTD63KsQSDjIDwBA&ved=0CCYQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=That%20bhikkhu%E2%80%99s%20statement%20should%20neither%20be%20approved%20nor%20rejected&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=lt7kFLVNONcC&pg=PT377&lpg=PT377&dq=That+bhikkhu%E2%80%99s+statement+should+neither+be+approved+nor+rejected&source=bl&ots=hnUHIu-hvM&sig=ElhMoutbuf01Si4LZtgovpV2e8Q&hl=en&sa=X&ei=p2B9U5TTD63KsQSDjIDwBA&ved=0CCYQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=That%20bhikkhu%E2%80%99s%20statement%20should%20neither%20be%20approved%20nor%20rejected&f=false)

Malcolm wrote:

Mainstream Buddhism refers to the canons of the Theravadins, Sarvastivadins and so on, what are often called the Śrāvaka canon. The Chinese canon combines both the Agamas and the Vaipulya [aka Mahāyāna] sūtras together. There are indeed a few scattered Śrāvakayāna sūtras in the bKa' 'gyur in the mdo sde section, but in any case, these are not considered as authoritative as Mahāyāna sūtras,

As pointed out to you, now for the third time, I have not, and no one has said, that there can be two SUPREME nirmanakāyas in a given world system, but there is nothing

forbidding anyone to obtain the same result as the Buddha himself in this world system during the dispensation of Shakyamuni's Dharma. Such persons therefor are nirmanakāyas, known as "nirmanakāyas through birth" because they have fully completed both stores of wisdom and merit and are completely free from the two obscurations. Nirmanakāyas are Buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

santa100 said:

...all schools believe in the authority of the Sutta Pitaka.

Malcolm wrote:

But not necessarily the supreme authority of any of the Mainstream Buddhist canons.

For example, in Tibetan Buddhism, the doctrine of the three kinds of nirmanakāyas comes from the Sutrālaṃkāra attributed to the Maitreya Bodhisattva. Because this text is by a tenth stage bodhisattva, it is considered to Buddhavaśana. Likewise, the Three Bodhisattva Commentaries on the Tantras are considered in the same light since they are authored, according to tradition, by tenth stage Bodhisattvas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Do Tummo-practitioners describe this?

Content:

zenman said:

Copied from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tummo> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; by Kurt Keutzer

Kundalini yoga in the Natha Sampradaya and Vajrayana in Tibetan Buddhism both take their origin from the Mahasiddhas who were active in India from the 8th century to the 12th century. Kundalini yoga practices formed the core of the teachings of a number of these Mahasiddhas and are strongly represented in both Tibetan Buddhist practices and contemporary kundalini yoga practices. Kundalini yoga was spoken of as "Candali yoga" by these Mahasiddhas and became known as gTummo rnal 'byor in Tibet. Candali yoga was a key practice of the famous Tibetan yogin Milarepa.

How does this claim fit in the picture?

What little I've heard or read of tummo, they have to do with breathing, moving attention and visualising in the central channel in the spine. I don't mean to be a drag Malcolm but what you say is a major surprise for me. If spine practices nor kundalini energy are utilised what do they/you guys do then? No specific information needed, just general remarks with slight explanations, please.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no meditation related to the spine, for the third time.

Yes, caṇḍali yoga involves kumbhaka.

In general the spine is considered to be a major subsidiary channel.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a statement that they will achieve buddhahood in a single life in Sukhavati.

Astus said:

The 11th vow:

"If, when I attain Buddhahood, humans and devas in my land should not dwell in the Definitely Assured State and unfailingly reach Nirvana, may I not attain perfect Enlightenment."

Later in the Larger Sutra:

"Sentient beings who are born in that Buddha-land all reside among those assured of Nirvana."

Also:

"However hard you may practice in this life, it can only be for a short while. In the life to come you will be born in the land of Amitayus and enjoy endless bliss there. Being forever in accord with the Way, you will no longer be subject to birth-and-death and be free of the afflictions caused by greed, anger and stupidity. If you wish your life to be as long as a kalpa, a hundred kalpas, or ten million kalpas, it will be just as you please. You will dwell in effortless spontaneity and attain Nirvana."

Shinran's collection of quotes regarding enlightenment in the Pure Land:

<http://www.amidanet.com/kgss-e.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

None of these citations assure buddhahood in a single lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Astus said:

The Pure Land path is the easy method of guaranteed buddhahood in one life.

In the <http://www.amidanet.com/amida-sutra-b.htm>:

"sentient beings born in that land all dwell in the Stage of Non-retrogression, and will not fall again into an evil realm, be born in a border-land or in the state of debased people or mlecchas. They always enjoy visiting pure lands of other Buddhas. With their excellent vows and practice advancing and developing every moment, they will unflinchingly realize the highest, perfect Enlightenment."

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a statement that they will achieve buddhahood in a single life in Sukhavati.

Astus said:

The <http://www.amidanet.com/contemplation-sutra.htm> says about birth on the lowest level of the lowest grade:

"Because he calls the Buddha's Name, with each repetition, the evil karma which he has committed during eighty kotis of kalpas of Samsara is extinguished. When he comes to die, he sees before him a golden lotus-flower like the disk of the sun, and in an instant he is born within a lotus-bud in the Land of Utmost Bliss. After twelve great kalpas the lotus-bud opens. When the flower opens, Avalokiteshvara and Mahasthamaprapta teach him with voices of great compassion the method of extinguishing evil karma through the realization of Suchness of all dharmas. Hearing this, he rejoices and immediately awakens aspiration for Enlightenment."

The 19th vow in the <http://www.amidanet.com/larger-sutra-1.htm>:

"If, when I attain Buddhahood, sentient beings in the lands of the ten quarters, who awaken aspiration for Enlightenment, do various meritorious deeds and sincerely desire to be born in my land, should not, at their death, see me appear before them surrounded by a multitude of sages, may I not attain perfect Enlightenment."

And vow 46:

"If, when I attain Buddhahood, bodhisattvas in my land should not be able to hear spontaneously whatever teachings they may wish, may I not attain perfect Enlightenment."

Malcolm wrote:

These three statements have nothing to do with buddhahood in one lifetime. There is a very strong Amitabha tradition in Tibetan Buddhism, it is an important practice for millions of Tibetans. Karma Chagme has the mostly beautiful aspiration prayer for birth

in Sukhavati and there are several important commentaries written on these topics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

TRC said:

Lastly, it seems that many here are upset because I dare question the veracity of the grandiose claims of the Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Your rudeness in starting a sectarian feud is inappropriate when I was merely answering someone's questions.

TRC said:

You obviously don't like being challenged on this. However, if you continually make grandiose and provocative claims on a public forum (even if it is in response to a question), people are going to question them, and I believe they have a right to question them. I'm sure others feel this way too, so you may need to get used to it.

Malcolm wrote:

What is even more inappropriate is the fact that you come here your "Mainstream" Buddhist biases and expect us to accept them as definitive. This is a Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna forum. It is not a Theravada forum. Go back to Dhammawheel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

TRC said:

Notice also the absence of any polemic and sectarian rhetoric written into the Pali Canon? That's because its content was established pre-sectarianism. The Lankavatara Sutra was written post-sectarianism. Do you see the relevance here?

Malcolm wrote:

Who are you kidding? There is plenty sectarian rhetoric in Mainstream Buddhism, it just happens to be aimed at tirthikas such as the Jains, and so on.

TRC said:

I maintain that the quantification and the sectarian comparative determination of levels of awakening cannot be verified, and the labels attached to them are just loaded concepts.

The whole exercise of claiming highest, fastest, most profound, etc is puerile and silly and bears no resemblance to the reality on the ground.

Malcolm wrote:

What a laugh. When it comes to the tīrthikas you excuse the exact same thing in the Pali Canon that you accuse us of.

The worldly are bound by desire,  
desire itself brings liberation.

This contrary meditation  
will not be understood by Buddhist tīrthikas.

— Hevajra Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Dan74 said:

My sense is that Zen (or Seon that I've been taught) can be a direct path and very fast if one has the right karma, but most of us don't and so teachers take that into account. Not having practiced Vajrayana, I can only surmise that it has a somewhat different toolkit which may sometimes help cut through a lot of garbage, and sometimes not. Just like any other school, really. I recall John Blofeld saying that Zen was too hard for him, that he was too dull (he ordained with Ven Hsu Yun) and he switched to Vajrayana. Go figure!

Malcolm wrote:

It's a completely different understanding of the path, meditation, the body, and so on than sūtrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The causes need to be somewhere and they need to be active without a physical body. That is, they must have potentiality and function by themselves or in and of themselves. If someone asserts a literal interpretation of rebirth then it is impossible not to imply that some substance with energy and potentiality continues and directs itself towards taking another material form.

Malcolm wrote:

Andrew, this is your limitation. In any case, it is karma that accounts for rebirth.

Andrew108 said:

If you don't take a literal view of rebirth and see rebirth as the experience of becoming in this life only...

Malcolm wrote:

...then you have abandoned the Buddha's teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Also, there are the different "grades" of lotuses, which has always confused me a bit. How are these grades determined?

Malcolm wrote:

By your karma and merit. Some take rebirth in Suhavati and never see Amitabha's face. In some respects, Sukhavati is like taking a nap from sasmara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Do Tummo-practitioners describe this?

Content:

zenman said:

Oh, OK. I thought tummo was all about that. Well... are any vajrayana practices concerned with breathing in the spine and kundalini?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

if it is true that the self is not a thing but a process ... then it is also true that the tragedy of the ego dissolves because, strictly speaking, nobody is ever born and nobody ever dies. "

Malcolm wrote:

The self isn't even a process, it is just an innate imputation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I think there have been scientific discoveries...which are indubitably profound

Malcolm wrote:

I really don't agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Science is indispensable and if used wisely brings many material benefits.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but it is not profound.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

TRC said:

Why would the Buddha, the founder of the movement teach such a lowly level of awakening (I.E. the Arahant)?

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, Buddha differentiates the bodhi of a buddha and the bodhi of an arhat.

Secondly, Buddha taught according to the needs of the disciples he had in front of him. They compiled a canon. He taught other things to devas, brahmans, kṣatriyas, etc. He even says so himself in the Mainstream sūtras, but he does not state what he taught them.

And Buddha was not the founder of Buddhadharma. Buddhadharma has existed for eons and eons in many different expressions. Sometimes there is a monastic Sangha, sometimes there isn't a monastic Sangha and so on.

Moreover, the Buddha explains in the Lankāvatara sūtra that he is not even the definitive



buddha.

In any case, if you want to understand the difference between the bodhi of an Arhat and a Bodhisattva, you should read Maitreya's Abhisamayālaṃkāra, which explains the Prajñāpāramitasūtras treatment of the bodhi of arhats and so on.

Dan74 said:

Malcolm, in the light of what we know today about the development of Buddhism, a literal belief in all of the above is somewhat naive, don't you think?

I ask myself how this discussion is relevant to my practice and I come up empty-handed. There is much that you say that is actually very useful but these sectarian threads, what purpose do they serve?

Malcolm wrote:

So you are including the idea that Sakyamuni was not the founder of Buddhadharma among those literal beliefs that are naive? You believe there is no difference between the awakening of an arhat and a Buddha? Which exactly are the naive beliefs to which you refer?

As for the thread — this thread was not a sectarian thread until others chose to make it so. I was merely answering a question.

Dan74 said:

The only good reason I can see for the Vajra claim is to increase Vajra practitioners' determination, but it just seems to lead to pride, resentment and wrangling...

Malcolm wrote:

You don't understand Vajrayāna, and as I already told you, if you really wanted to understand it, you'd have to take Vajrayāna teachings, and that comes with some commitments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Well stated.

I should add I think that in some cases a rigorous scientific training produces very sharp and intelligent Buddhists, much more capable of debate of the finer points than I am. However, in a number of cases it also seems to lead to a dichotomy of world-view which seems to be troubling or frustrating for some people, both from the POV of their Buddhist practice and their daily life. They are difficult worlds to reconcile, though for those more intelligent than I, it sure may be possible.

Malcolm wrote:

They cannot be reconciled. To adapt a statement by Rongzom to the present conversation; the words of Buddhadharma are simple and easy to understand, but the meaning is very profound and hard to realize; the words of science and so on are very detailed and intricate, but the meaning is as rough and course as a pile of dust.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: Supreme Nirmanakaya

Content:

reddust said:

Malcolm said: In Mahāyāna, and especially Vajrayāna, it is considered possible for there to be more than one nirmanakāya during a given Buddha's dispensation. However, it is only possible for there to be one supreme Nirmanakāya during any given dispensation in any given world system.

Why is it not possible for there to be two Supreme Nirmanakaya when the Dharma is still being taught? Is it because a Buddha has no ignorance, aversion and craving so there is nothing to see?

Malcolm wrote:

It is because only one Buddha at a time may demonstrate the deeds of discovering the path, and so on. However, this does not preclude others from reaching the same level of realization the Buddha himself attained.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: chNNr New York Retreat

Content:

Bhusuku said:

Can't seem to find any infos on this one, so I'm wondering... is this a new Longsal teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, AFAIK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

PorkChop said:

This is where the paths diverge. It's not empty rhetoric as there's an actual training method being described. It's also described in Chapter 26th of the Avatamsaka, known as the Chapter on the Ten Grounds, but I don't have a complete translation to work with.

Nagarjuna talks about the equivalency (of Arhats, Pratekyabuddhas, and 8th Bhumi Bodhisattvas) a lot in his commentaries.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not right; the paths diverge in the generation of bodhicitta. Arhats do not form the bodhicitta to attain full buddhahood. While there is also a Bodhisattva path in Mainstream Buddhism, which as I mention before, it is not detailed in Mainstream Buddhist sūtras. As Nāgārjuna points out in the Ratnavali:

Ignorant blind people cannot bear  
this Mahāyāna the Buddha taught;  
the great path of awakening  
that has the nature of merit and wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 6:42 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

TRC said:

You "think." And that is the crux of the problem. Speculating and making claims about things which cannot be determined. As these claims can never be determined, it is just irresponsible and provocative to make them. It creates disharmony and is divisive.

Malcolm wrote:

It all depends on what one accepts as authoritative.

In general, here, we accept Mahāyāna sūtras as authoritative. Therefore, when someone comes along and complains that common ideas found in Mahāyāna are "speculative" and "cannot be determined", when in fact they can by recourse to examining the foundational texts of our tradition, this itself "creates disharmony and is divisive".

In fact, the person disrupting this thread, clearly out of a sense of self-righteous indignation, is none other than you. Your comments are clearly out of place since I was merely responding to a person's question. The claims made in the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna traditions may enrage you, as they clearly do, but you should go be enraged somewhere where people will be sympathetic to you.. Because certainly, your comments are not welcome here, they add nothing to the conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 6:31 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

TRC said:

Why would the Buddha, the founder of the movement teach such a lowly level of awakening (I.E. the Arahant)?

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, Buddha differentiates the bodhi of a buddha and the bodhi of an arhat.

Secondly, Buddha taught according to the needs of the disciples he had in front of him. They compiled a canon. He taught other things to devas, brahmans, kṣatriyas, etc. He even says so himself in the Mainstream sūtras, but he does not state what he taught them.

And Buddha was not the founder of Buddhadharma. Buddhadharma has existed for eons and eons in many different expressions. Sometimes there is a monastic Sangha, sometimes there isn't a monastic Sangha and so on.

Moreover, the Buddha explains in the Lankāvatara sūtra that he is not even the definitive buddha.

In any case, if you want to understand the difference between the bodhi of an Arhat and a Bodhisattva, you should read Maitreya's Abhisamayālaṃkāra, which explains the Prajñāpāramitasūtras treatment of the bodhi of arhats and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 6:20 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I don't really see this discussion as a contest. Posters here are free to hold whatever beliefs they like and I am not interested in conditioning anybody. What has kept me in the discussion is the hope that Malcolm can furnish some amazing logic or description that gives belief in rebirth a solid foundation. I don't think he has been able to do this.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem here, Andrew, is not my logic, but rather, your commitment to materialism. It is just as Dharmakīrti points out: if the "opponent" is committed to materialism, the conversation can go no further. In order to have a true debate there must be some commonly agreed upon principles. You and I have no commonly agreed upon principles concerning the matter that we have been discussing.

Andrew108 said:

This idea of warmth for example is very weak. Where would the 'warmth' come from in the bardo for example?

Malcolm wrote:

The diaphanous body of the gandharva, of course.

Andrew108 said:

It's about belief and to that end how that belief supports real results. Initially many Buddhist practitioners take on Buddhist beliefs with enthusiasm, imagining that they

open up a way of seeing the world that is new and insightful. After some time these beliefs become more restrictive and practitioners understand that to continue they must submit.

Malcolm wrote:

Not, really. One sees that the Buddha's own logic makes sense and so continues down his path.

Andrew108 said:

I'm not alone in my scepticism of rebirth. Posters here might of heard of Stephen Batchelor but I wonder if they have read the sceptical views of Glenn Wallis (who claims not to be a Buddhist whilst holding a PhD in Buddhist studies)?

Malcolm wrote:

Glenn Wallis adds nothing of interest to the conversation. Such people merely wish to destroy Dharma, create a "Franken-Dharma" fashioned out of bit and pieces of the corpse of Buddhadharma they have left for dead. There are a lot of people who hold PhD's in Buddhists studies, this means that they are might be good at languages [though this is varies with the person] and writing book reports and not much else, necessarily. It does not mean that they are insightful, or that they have a deep understanding of the subject about which they write.

Andrew108 said:

Anyway I don't think the discussion is going to continue or that I really want to put my effort into presenting the 'other side'. If Malcolm or others can put forward a logically coherent case for how it is consciousness gets reborn then I might chip in.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I have, the problem is that you don't accept the basic terms of the discussion because of your intellectual commitment to nonbuddhist materialism.

Andrew108 said:

My own bias is that if you understand Madhyamaka and you practice contemplation in which results lead to reduction of kleshas then you have no need for the beliefs around rebirth and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

For materialists, there are all kinds of contemplations out there Andrew, even some materialists in Ancient India were contemplatives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 10:28 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Mainstream Buddhist sūtra nor Mahāyāna sūtra that asserts full

buddhahood can be realized in a single lifetime. This is strictly a Vajrayāna claim.

PorkChop said:

Would the [http://www.bdk.or.jp/pdf/bdk/digitaldl/DBET\\_T0848\\_Vairocana\\_2005.pdf](http://www.bdk.or.jp/pdf/bdk/digitaldl/DBET_T0848_Vairocana_2005.pdf) be considered a Vajrayāna Sutra?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Moreover, he assumed the appearance of vajradharas and the bodhisattvas Samantabhadra, Padmapāṇi, and so on, and proclaimed everywhere in the ten directions the Dharma of the pure words of the mantra path so that [all the steps from] the initial generation of the [bodhi-]mind up to the ten stages may be progressively satisfied in this lifetime, the seeds of the karmic[ally determined] lives of the varieties of sentient beings who have been born and nurtured by karma may be eradicated, and there may also occur the sprouting of [wholesome] seeds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 8:37 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is based on the commentary, which clarifies...

...This is strictly a Vajrayana claim

santa100 said:

As you've said, it's the comy's interpretation, not the Buddha's own words. At best, it's still a life time work, not the Satipatthana sutta's attainment in 7 days.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the attainment of an Arhat, not even that of a first stage bodhisattva. It is completely different.

And no, King Indrabhuti and many other siddhas attained buddhahood merely through receiving empowerments.

Anyway, your mind is made up. You have decided that Mainstream Buddhist sutras are the most authoritative. I respect that and wish you all the best of luck.

santa100 said:

Sakya Pandita...

Malcolm wrote:

...says:

If one who possesses the three vows understands the profound points of the two stages, it is said that in this life, the bardo

or within sixteen lifetimes,  
that one will accomplish perfect buddhahood.  
Incidentally, there are many other such citations from the tantras, but I don't have time  
to dig them all out for you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Guhyasamaja states:... accomplish[buddhahood] in this life  
the "buddhahood" in brackets is your own note? If not, still says nothing about  
SammaSambuddha as I have requested. Also, please provide URL.  
<http://asianclassics.org/reader.php?collection=kangyur&index=416>

It is based on the commentary, which clarifies that "in this lifetime" refers to attaining  
the state of Buddha Mahāvajradhara.

Sri-devikali-namastasata:...

Please provide full context with URL to make sure this talks about sentient beings  
instead of the Buddha himself.

<http://asianclassics.org/reader.php?collection=kangyur&index=639>

Sri-candraguhyatilaka-nama-mahatantraraja:...

Please, for crying out loud, one doesn't even have to be a Buddhist Noble disciple to  
master the siddhis.

So, yes, please continue, there's still nothing about being the "fastest" nor  
SammaSambuddha as repeatedly requested.

Ummm, actually, "all siddhis" means both the common siddhis as well as the supreme  
siddhi, buddhahood.

In general, in order to accomplish Buddhahood, it takes three incalculable eons. So  
when a text says that this can happen in a single lifetime, that is fast. There is no  
Mainstream Buddhist sūtra nor Mahāyāna sūtra that asserts full buddhahood can be  
realized in a single lifetime. This is strictly a Vajrayāna claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 6:57 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

santa100 said:

Please understand that I'm in no way trying give you a hard time. But in order to engage  
in an informative, fair and objective discussion, we need to support our claims with  
backup literatures and proper sutra references. So far, I have not seen the appropriate  
sources to support your claim that Vajrayana is indeed the "fastest" vehicle that helps

one to become a Fully Enlightened Buddha (SammaSambuddha). On my part, I have provided 2 sources straight from the Buddha's teaching in the Tipitaka: one is the proper way to handle peoples' claims and the other is the impossibility of 2 Fully Enlightened Buddhas in the same world-system  
( <http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=16555&start=40#p235723> )

Malcolm wrote:

The Guhyasamāja states: Because of this, lords of Dharma,  
ornamented with an ocean of wisdom  
arising from the three inseparable kāyas,  
accomplish [buddhahood] in this life.  
Śrī-devikālī-nāmāṣṭaśataka: Omniscient and self-knowing,  
also the twelve bhumis of buddhahood  
are rapidly produced in this lifetime.

Śrī-candraguhyatilaka-nāma-mahātantrarājā The great bliss of all siddhis  
will be accomplished by this in one lifetime.  
Sarvatathāgatacittaguhyajñānārthagarbhavajrakrodhakulatantrapinathārthavidyāyogasi  
ddhi-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra In this one lifetime, sambuddhahood.  
Do you really need me to continue?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

santa100 said:

All I see there is the key phrase "every sentient being is fully shown", which says nothing about the claim you said Vajrayana as the best vehicle for one to attain Fully Enlightened Buddha state (SammaSambuddha) and more importantly, nothing that contradicts the Buddha's teaching in MN 115 that "It is impossible, it cannot happen that two Accomplished Ones, Fully Enlightened Ones, could arise contemporaneously in one world-system—there is no such possibility".

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained to you that there can only be one supreme nirmanakāya in any given world system. But this does not preclude variegated nirmanakāyas, as I have already explained.

santa100 said:

Again, nothing about Vajrayana and nothing about the fastest way to attain Fully Enlightend state.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is axiomatic that Vajrayāna makes such claims. Do you really want me to dig out



the Vajrayāna citations about variegated nirmanakāyas and the rapidity of Vajrayāna? Is it necessary? I can, if it will make you happy.

I am not trying to convert anyone, I was merely answering a posed question. I really do not see why people are getting so up in arms over this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Only a Buddha is completely free from all afflictive obscurations.

Should be "Only a Buddha is completely free from all non-afflictive obscurations."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

But still you have repeatedly stated that it has energy...

Malcolm wrote:

No, you stated it for me, and since then, have not wavered from your mistake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So far we have Malcolm saying that consciousness is massless, yet supported by warmth...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because in living bodies, there is warmth, in dead bodies, there is none. It's a simple empirical observation.

Andrew108 said:

So after death what is consciousness supported by?

Malcolm wrote:

It takes new body, as has been endlessly explained to you.

Of course not all realms of rebirth are material, so in those "places" consciousness is sustained on karma alone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Dan74 said:

Does the Bodhisattva not have to attain liberation from delusion? So does the Vajra path speed that up?

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats are liberated from affliction, according the Sarvastivadins, Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas still possess a non-afflictive ignorance. Only a Buddha is completely free from all afflictive obscurations. Further, according the Lankāvatara, Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas are roused from the samādhi of cessation in which they enter at their death, only to begin on the bodhisattva path. There are also differences in the depth of emptiness taught in the Mainstream Canon, i.e. the Agamas and Nikayas.

So, yes, the Vajrayāna does speed up the process, because unlike common Mahāyāna where emptiness is the result, etc., Vajrayāna experientially introduces the wisdom to be realized right at the very beginning.

Since someone asked, I have answered.

Granted, in order gain the satisfaction of Vajrayāna claims, one must do the practice very perfectly and study and practice under a qualified guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Dan74 said:

Unique - I haven't seen it yet.

Malcolm wrote:

Without fully studying Vajrayāna, you won't. And you cannot really study it without entering it. And you cannot enter it without making commitments, hence it is secret and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

santa100 said:

So I'm not sure which particular Mahayana or Vajrayana source you're referring to (please provide sutra references and related backup literatures) that contradicts the Buddha's teaching in the Tipitaka.

Malcolm wrote:

The Avatamska sūtra, volume nga, folio 147a, Lhasa:

Oh Jinaputras, when the samyaksambuddha, the unsurpassed dharmarāja, manifests with an unceasing manifestation of Dharma, the entire dharmadhātu is entirely filled with the cloud of dharmakāya, and truly shows a cloud of kāyas according to the inclinations of sentient beings. In this way, each and every sentient being is fully shown a cloud of kāyas being born; each and every sentient being is fully shown a cloud of nirmanakāyas; each and every sentient being is fully shown a cloud of kāyas of blessings; each and every sentient being is fully shown a cloud of rūpakāyas; each and every sentient being is fully shown a cloud of full accomplished variegated kāyas; each and every sentient being is fully shown a cloud of punyakāyas; each and every sentient being is fully shown a cloud of jñānakāyas; each and every sentient being is fully shown a cloud of unconquerable strong kāyas; each and every sentient being is fully shown a cloud of fearless splendid kāyas.

The Lanka states:

In delightful Akaniṣṭha,  
beyond the pure abodes,  
the true Buddha becomes a Buddha;  
an emanated one becomes a Buddha here.

So you see, there is no reason any number of persons cannot become Buddha here on Jambudvīpa, because Buddhas do not, according to Mahāyāna, actually attain buddhahood here anyway.

It is true that teaching of the variegated nirmankāya is more thoroughly taught in Vajrayāna texts, but it is present in Mahāyāna as well, as you can see from the above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Dan74 said:

The Buddha in Satipatthana Sutta says :

...

Of course there is a condition, "if". And to maintain the the Four Arisings for a week certainly requires a karma that is accumulated over some serious practice. But the same thing can be said about keeping the samaya. So yes, one lifetime, provided you've cultivated for x lifetimes that enables you to meet the right guru and keep the samaya... No?

Malcolm wrote:

There are no methods for attaining full Buddhahood in Mainstream Buddhism, even

thought a limited version of the bodhisattva path is taught.

Dan74 said:

This claim is hard to believe, since the Buddha is not really known for making such a distinction. The Suttas are about liberation, and according to them the arahats attain full release. Of course one can believe that there is something higher and beyond, but this is a belief, and one based on latter developments. I take it no one here surpassed arahatship?

But considering that most of us are not going to, and seeing that the Buddha taught that release is possible in this lifetime too, I think it takes the wind out of the Vajra claim. As far as I can make out, the speediest path is the one that one is ready to commit to fully, and the one with the right teacher and Sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

No one doubts that the Mainstream Buddhist path brings about freedom, in the sense of full freedom from afflictions, that is the awakening of an arhat or a pratyekabuddha. But that is not the awakening to which Vajrayāna refers. The awakening to which Vajrayāna refers is the full buddhahood that results from gathering the two accumulations as taught Mahāyāna. The bodhisattva path is not detailed in any of the Mainstream canons. For the Mainstream canons, it is extra-canonical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Dan74 said:

The Buddha in Satipatthana Sutta says :

...

Of course there is a condition, "if". And to maintain the the Four Arisings for a week certainly requires a karma that is accumulated over some serious practice. But the same thing can be said about keeping the samaya. So yes, one lifetime, provided you've cultivated for x lifetimes that enables you to meet the right guru and keep the samaya... No?

Malcolm wrote:

There are no methods for attaining full Buddhahood in Mainstream Buddhism, even though a limited version of the bodhisattva path is taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Jamyang\_Tsering said:

Just for the record, if your search for quick enlightenment why not to try Zen!

## 28. Open Your Own Treasure House

Daiju visited the master Baso in China. Baso asked: "What do you seek?"

"Enlightenment," replied Daiju.

"You have your own treasure house. Why do you search outside?" Baso asked.

Daiju inquired: "Where is my treasure house?"

Baso answered: "What you are asking is your treasure house."

Daiju was enlightened! Ever after he urged his friends: "Open your own treasure house and use those treasures."

Malcolm wrote:

Awakening and Buddhahood are not the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if your only standard is Mainstream Buddhism, such as Theravada or Sarvastivada, this is true. However, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna has a different understanding of the issue, which is more authoritative for those who follow that teaching.

santa100 said:

I'm not sure what you mean about Mainstream Buddhism. I have cited the sources from the Tipitaka, the Three Baskets that all schools of Buddhism recognize and study. It's not something only the Theravada studies, but the Mahayana and Tibetan schools do too. Please see the cross references <https://suttacentral.net/mn115> and <https://suttacentral.net/an4.180>. So I'm not sure which particular Mahayana or Vajrayana source you're referring to (please provide sutra references and related backup literatures) that contradicts the Buddha's teaching in the Tipitaka.

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahāyāna, and especially Vajrayāna, it is considered possible for there to be more than one nirmanakāya during a given Buddha's dispensation. However, it is only possible for there to be one supreme Nirmanakāya during any given dispensation in any given world system.

As for Tripitika, do you mean the Tripitaka according to the Mainstream Schools, or are you including the Mahāyāna sutras and tantras in that designation?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I have to keep repeating myself because you are not understanding the implications of what I am saying. If consciousness is self-sustaining after death or even supported by 'warmth' (as per Malcolm) then it has energy. If it has energy it can be measured. That is it. We don't need to enter into a philosophical debate about the nature of energy. Just that consciousness, as described by Malcolm who claims to accurately represent the Buddhist view, has characteristics that should be measurable.

Malcolm wrote:

The warmth of a body inhabited by consciousness is measurable, but the consciousness that has a appropriated that series of aggregates is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So far we have Malcolm saying that consciousness is massless, yet supported by warmth...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because in living bodies, there is warmth, in dead bodies, there is none. It's a simple empirical observation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

JKhedrup said:

However, from the headline of a thread, we can see what is written is an answer, from a Vajrayana POV, to a very specific question.

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you for reminding people of this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

TRC said:

It has more to do with the practitioner than the path.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and no.

There is no means for realizing total buddhahood in Mainstream Buddhism, not in Theravada, not in Sarvastivada nor in Dharmaguptaka, the only three Mainstream Buddhist schools left.

In Mahāyāna, total Buddhahood takes a minimum of three incalculable eons, for the best practitioner.

In Vajrayāna, total Buddhahood can be realized in a single lifetime by the best practitioner, but even if you do not practice, as long as you maintain your vows perfectly, one will achieve total Buddha within seven lifetimes.

You can either accept or reject these accounts as you wish. There is really nothing to argue about. Incidentally, I am merely reporting the assertions made in these schools. Whether one accepts these assertions or not depends upon one's own inclinations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 7:28 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

santa100 said:

Bottom line is, though many masters from various schools claimed their attainment of "Buddhahood", per the suttas' teaching, it doesn't mean they have attained "Fully Enlightened" Buddha state for the Dispensation is still around. If they meant the state of Savakabuddha or Arahantship, then any Buddhist school would be just as good provided that its practitioner puts in their best effort to cultivate virtues, meditation, and wisdom (as mentioned from my previous post

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=16555#p235263> )

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if your only standard is Mainstream Buddhism, such as Theravada or Sarvastivada, this is true. However, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna has a different understanding of the issue, which is more authoritative for those who follow that teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 7:25 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Could it be the last vestige of faith?

Malcolm wrote:

That does not really answer the question. It is not a question whether science is "honest" -- indeed, there is as much faith and zeal among scientists in scientific endeavor as there is in evangelical Christians. The question is, can you reconcile what you truly have faith in, i.e. science, with the Buddha's teachings? Unlike Andrew, for example, I don't think that science has gotten at what consciousness is, they don't have the math for it, consciousness cannot be mathematically modeled. I don't think that science will ever be able to get at consciousness because consciousness is not a physical process, in the end, even though nama and rūpa do interact. But the interaction is strictly one way, consciousness interacts with matter, matter does not interact with consciousness. Our brains, our physical eyes, our body are all, in essence, inert matter, conventionally speaking (forget about going into higher Buddhist teachings like Dzogchen where matter is merely the reified luminosity of consciousness). Chemical processes do not amount to consciousness. There is no experiment that can produce consciousness. Consciousness cannot be created in a lab. There is no way to verify experimentally what consciousness is at all, that is, not by any means known to western science. But there is a means to know these things and it involves personally developing the skills to verify the Buddha's teachings on such issues. It's not hard, per se, you just have to be dedicated, and do the work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have any evidence the Buddha was even awakened?

TRC said:

Oh come on, is that the best you can do?

Malcolm wrote:

That is the point, the evidence is the hundreds of biographies of masters in Tibet who achieved Buddhahood or the bhumis.

The evidence we have for Vajrayāna is the same evidence we have for the Buddha, the reports of their close disciples.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood



Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Fundamentally, speaking, according to Vajrayāna texts, the extraordinary difference in time is due to the fact that Vajrayāna practices use the body as the vehicle for liberation, as well as other special methods, that allow a very serious practitioner to gather the two accumulations that normally require three eons in a single lifetime.

M

TRC said:

Using the "body as the vehicle for liberation." Yeah that's right. Kind of like what the Buddha was saying

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/an/an04/an04.045.than.html>

"Yet it is just within this fathom-long body, with its perception & intellect, that I declare that there is the cosmos, the origination of the cosmos, the cessation of the cosmos, and the path of practice leading to the cessation of the cosmos."

But hold on, that's not a 'vajrayana' practice, just 'sutrayana'. Perhaps the differences between the practices aren't really as different as the rhetoric likes to make out.

Malcolm wrote:

It is completely different.

TRC said:

So Malcolm, do you have any actual evidence that the vajrayana path is really quicker, that are not just claims and boasts?

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have any evidence the Buddha was even awakened?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: gDangs And mDangs: Differences In Meaning?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

A few other questions:

Which is the proper Wylie transliteration for 'dang', in the context of the three energies: dang, rol pa and rtsal [gdangs or mdangs]? Because I have seen both used in that context.

Which [gdangs or mdangs] is the vital essence (dang) spoken of in Tibetan medicine?

How about this third term 'dwangs'? Is dwangs simply an orthographic variant of one of the above terms?

When Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche makes a statement such as "The dang of emptiness is rigpa", which variant [gdangs or mdangs] is he using?

Malcolm wrote:

- 1) gdangs
- 2) mdangs, it is a translation of ojas.
- 3) dwangs ma is the nutriment, it means refined essence.
- 4) gdangs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, why do you even believe there is such a thing as awakening? What reason do you have to believe such a state is even possible?

dharmagoat said:

Because I have experienced the very beginning of the process (who hasn't?). It is natural to expect more to follow.

Malcolm wrote:

And you consider this sufficient to accept Buddha was an awakened person, yet you disbelieve when rebirth is central to his teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

People of a scientific bent will need to ask themselves whether they actually believe there is such a thing a awakening.

dharmagoat said:

And if the answer is 'yes', what then?

Malcolm wrote:

Why do you believe such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is that there are folks here who take it on faith that Buddha was a buddha, and yet spend endless energy trying to prove that the awakening Buddha taught is not what he really meant. I mean, doesn't it strike you as odd to on the one hand accept that the Buddha was buddha on faith, and then spend all this effort refuting the Buddha's own teaching?

dharmagoat said:

Who truly appreciates the breadth and depth of the Buddha's skillful means?

Malcolm wrote:

Um, this is a total non-sequitar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

Weren't you fine with the Bhutanese booting out the Nepalis, where Nepalis born in Bhutan were selectively identified and ejected from the country (i.e., discrimination by a Buddhist state)?

Malcolm wrote:

I am fine with illegal Mexican immigrants being deported from the US, why should I not be fine with illegal Nepali immigrants being deported from Bhutan?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

of course it only seems reasonable that now various skillful means ought to be developed for those with a scientific bent.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need. People of a scientific bent are still just deluded sentient beings. There are sufficient means for everyone already.

People of a scientific bent will need to ask themselves whether they actually believe there is such a thing a awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

What troubles me is this idea that any rearrangement of the teachings merely serves to "cater to our biases", instead of, as Andrew describes it, "speaking to our condition as we find it now". The difference seems to be lost on you, which is unfortunate.

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, why do you even believe there is such a thing as awakening? What reason do you have to believe such a state is even possible?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Buddha speaks directly to our condition in the Kālāma Sutta. Through following this teaching and other definitive teachings we become the 'reliable witness'.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha is talking to a group of non-Buddhists in that text. He then leaves them the "ngondro" of the four brahma-viharas. But he does not teach them any path at all, for the four brahma-viharas are not a path since they do not lead out of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

Besides there are countless gateways to the Dharma so who is to say that attempting to disprove the Buddha isn't one of them?

Malcolm wrote:

A much misunderstood point. There are 84 thousand doors to dharma because there are 21,000 doors for addressing the three afflictions, and the three afflictions combined.

In other words, all doors to the Dharma involve addressing the three poisons and nothing else. So they can be included in four, or, since the root of the three poisons is self-grasping, there is only one, since all Dharma practice bears on that point. And why you would want to remove self-grasping? Because it is the force that causes us to take rebirth in samsara again and again. Mainstream Buddhism, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna all stem the desire to eradicate this single root.

pensum said:

So the tradition itself provides the standard for those who do not surrender to faith so easily and first require sound logic and empirical evidence which they can see with their own (unawakened, fleshy) eyes.

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is that there are folks here who take it on faith that Buddha was a buddha, and yet spend endless energy trying to prove that the awakening Buddha taught is not what he really meant. I mean, doesn't it strike you as odd to on the one hand accept that the Buddha was buddha on faith, and then spend all this effort refuting the Buddha's own teaching?

It seems to me that such people really ought to start from beginning:

- 1) What does "buddha" mean?
  - 2) Having discerned what "buddha" means, do I believe in this state?
  - 3) Was Buddha actually a buddha?
- etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point here, Jeff, is whether their behavior is reprehensible to you.

Indrajala said:

Of course I feel it is wrong to kill, harm and imprison innocent people, but I also recognize that if the Chinese leadership plays their cards wrong then there are a lot more lives than the Tibetans at stake. You seem to think that idealistically if they just did the right thing everything would work out for the best and Tibetans would forgive and forget, but Chinese civilization has many centuries of experience which renders their political thinking cold and calculating because the alternatives haven't always worked out in the past.

Malcolm wrote:

No "buts", Jeff. It is either acceptable or it is not.

Indrajala said:

Their position is really ugly because they inherited territories that were conquered by Mao in earlier decades which were never really part of China. Nevertheless, they have to govern them in the face of hostile neighboring states (India) and now non-national threats (Jihadists). On top of that by virtue of ruling Tibet they have a threatening deterrent against their neighbors which ensures relative peace (India is unlikely to push China into a war, and avoiding war is desirable). In the real world peace is established by having a threatening deterrent against potential enemies. You can be virtuous and

honorable, but your enemies don't have to be and probably won't be.

Malcolm wrote:

India is "hostile" because of absurd PRC claims about where their border is. China made their enemies all on their own.

Indrajala said:

Buddhist ethics in the realm of geopolitics are problematic because if you try to be the good guy you can easily end up shot in the back by those who don't play by the rules, and then those whose welfare you were charged with suffer tremendously because you failed your job. Classical Buddhist literature comments on how hard it is being king because you have to commit misdeeds in the course of your duties.

Malcolm wrote:

Understood. Kings and leaders are fools.

Indrajala said:

In any case, I doubt most members on this forum really understand what I am saying because they have a religious belief that China is the model Devil that everyone loves to hate. Almost nobody here is trying to see things from their side. It is just a lot of finger pointing and condemnation, which is reflective of how activists operate in the Tibetan Buddhist scene it seems. As I said, this is really simplistic and doesn't really help to solve the issues at hand.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Jeff, I don't hate China. I have been there on more than one occasion. I understand why they do what they do, but I will never see things "from their side" because what they are doing is wrong, just as I don't see things from the side of the US Govt., I don't see things from the side of the Mexican Govt. w/regards to Chiapas; or the Israeli Govt. w/regards to Palestine; or the Myanmar Regime w/regards to the Rohingyas (which is more of an issue having to do with border security than anything else, and the Rohingyas are caught in the middle), Japanese Govt. w/regards to ethnic Koreans in Japan and so on.

In other words, I think it is deplorable when Buddhists apologize for atrocity, discrimination, etc., for any reason.

I don't have a personal stake in the Tibetan Nationalist cause, I have never been active in it, never demonstrated. I actually got a good report card from the Party Secretary in the school (we all did) when I was in China for not stirring up anti-Chinese sentiment amongst Tibetans I came into contact with while doing my internship and so on. But Tibet is an important place. It is environmentally important, politically important, and so on to the whole world, not just the Chinese.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm's point is that the Buddha asserted literal rebirth...

Malcolm wrote:

literally thousands of times, even if you only accept the Mainstream canon (Nikayas/Agamas).

Andrew108 said:

The problem we have is not that we doubt the Buddha's realization and overcoming of suffering, but we doubt that there was a 'reliable witness' to report all of what the Buddha would/could have said if we or someone like us, had been there.

Malcolm wrote:

But you must doubt it. You are merely taking Buddha's realization and overcoming of suffering on blind faith Why can't you see this defect in your own thinking: to wit; you claim to accept the Buddha was a realized person, and yet you reject everything the Buddha says about the terms of how he came to be a realized person. Do you not see the internal contradictions in your own statements?

Andrew108 said:

So the sutras we have need to speak to our condition as we find it now. That is the definition of 'reliable witness'.

Malcolm wrote:

You really do have the strangest ideas. A reliable witness is someone whose testimony is beyond reproach, not someone who caters to our biases.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Finally. It is like pulling your teeth to get you to admit that Chinese policies towards Tibetans are inhumane and savage.

Indrajala said:

My ongoing point has been that despite moral judgments, their behavior is predictably politically amoral because that's often how politics works. Their behavior might be reprehensible to many, but they're acting logically, and the leadership seems to feel that their policies are warranted. Human rights and so on are very alien concepts to much of the world, but then from the Chinese perspective the west just uses "human rights" to bully their opponents and justify acts of unwarranted violence against innocent people.

So in their minds why care about human rights?

Malcolm wrote:

The point here, Jeff, is whether their behavior is reprehensible to you.

Indrajala said:

There is no political stability at stake for the PRC if they left the Tibetans alone to do their thing.

Do you think India wouldn't try to get the Tibetans on their side? What about the border control and Xinjiang? If Tibet gets autonomy, so should Xinjiang, and Xinjiang is easily another Afghanistan in the making. These would presumably be issues apparent to China's leadership.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans do not have a good relationship with Muslims in general. So China would have no worries on that score. In fact, if China eased up on Tibetans, supported their national culture, education, gave them education in Tibetan as their primary language will sponsoring CSL programs, as well as TSL programs for Han immigrants into Tibet, etc., if the Chinese stopped discriminating against Tibetans for jobs, and so on, and did a 180, the Tibetans would happily be part of a New China, and would probably even gladly join the PLA and fight Muslim terrorists. Really, I think most of your opinions come from have very little familiarity with Tibetans inside Tibet. But right now the Chinese have given the Tibetans NO reason to have a stake in Chinese security on any level. You have no idea about the resentment that Tibetans inside Tibet have against exile Tibetans, nor the piles of shit Tibetans from Tibet get from exile Tibetans in places like Dharamsala.

Indrajala said:

If the Chinese Govt., had an ounce of sense they would bring back HHDL, restore Tibet, restore Tibetan culture, and turn Tibet into their new best friend.

Have you been reading the idealist Thurman?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Nope, but it is just plain common sense — you catch more flies with honey than vinegar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

LionelTeo said:

What is most important is everyone becomes a better person at the end is all that matters.



Malcolm wrote:

One does not need Buddhism to become a better person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

kirtu said:

However just following Cittamatra in some form is sutric. But if you take a Cittamatra POV of emptiness for tantra, then that is tantra. Someone like Mipham Rinpoche \*may\* have then teased out the results of tantric practice following the Cittamatra in his writings.

Malcolm wrote:

We already know what happens when Cittamatrins practice Vajrayāna, they become Virupa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I was talking about tha mal gyi shes pa. Which is very close.

asunthatneversets said:

Sems and tha mal gyi shes pa are only 'close' in the same sense that gold and pyrite are 'close', in appearance. However they are not 'close' at all in fundamental characteristic or constitution.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the sense that thoughts (citta) are contaminated consciousness, and "ordinary mind" is an untainted consciousness, i.e. ye shes. So the difference is more like gold in gold ore and refined gold, rather than a substantial difference. The shes pa is the same in both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

The apparent contradiction is due to the fact that I attribute the Buddha's teaching of literal rebirth to skillful means on his part. But that is a point of contention that I feel it

best not to elaborate on.

Malcolm wrote:

There is actually no evidence that this is the case. There is piles of evidence that Buddha took rebirth literally himself.

dharmagoat said:

Then maybe I don't have complete faith in the Buddha after all. Arrgh!

Malcolm wrote:

My advice is that you should practice as if you accept rebirth. A Buddhist version of Pascal's wager, as it were.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

The apparent contradiction is due to the fact that I attribute the Buddha's teaching of literal rebirth to skillful means on his part. But that is a point of contention that I feel it best not to elaborate on.

Malcolm wrote:

There is actually no evidence that this is the case. There is piles of evidence that Buddha took rebirth literally himself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Praṇā and warmth are the supports for consciousness.

Andrew108 said:

But it has energy. Warmth? What do you mean warmth? If it had no mass how could it have warmth? Bizarre.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness does not have warmth, warmth is a support for consciousness, as is lifeforce.

The preceding moment of consciousness, i.e. the mental organ (manendriya) acts as the support for consciousness the same way that a son becomes the father of another; a fruit, the seed of another.

The preceding moment of consciousness is as massless as the following moment? So how does a massless mental organ exist? The examples you give all have mass.

Well, "organ" is not a completely adequate translation of indriya. Indriya really means "faculty" or power. The mental organ is not an organ like cakṣuendriya, for example, i.e. the eye faculty.

No substrate is necessary, according to Madhyamakās. The Yogācāra sūtras propose the ālayavijñāna to account for memory, continuity and so on.

But a mental organ is necessary or is the mental organ something that is made at the same time as the following moment of consciousness?

No, the mental faculty (lets not call it an organ since that is really not the right term) is the immediately preceding moment of consciousness.

The point here is that the mental organ and the moment of consciousness can't exist at the same time. So one must precede the other and therefore you have continuity based on a continuing mental organ and moment of consciousness. Here continuing mental organ is no other than functional 'substrate' for continuing moment of consciousness. There is a continuing mental faculty in as much as this moment of consciousness always arises on the basis of the previous moment; the immediately antecedent moment of consciousness is always the mental faculty.

Seeds and sprouts cannot exist at the same time, still, sprouts come from seeds, and produce other seeds all in good time, when there is proper cause and condition.

So this doesn't accord with Madhyamaka reasoning or the definitive teachings of Buddha.

It obviously corresponds with Madhyamaka teachings since Candrakīrti instructs us that the functions of memory and so on are worldly conventions, and as such should not be examined. Or did you just choose to ignore the citation about memory taken from his commentary on MAV 6:75. Ultimately, of course, it cannot bear analysis -- but then, neither can any conventional phenomena. Still, since we are deluded, in the refined sense of not being free from grasping at self, for us conventional truth is where we live. Consciousness is driven by thirst for existence.

So it has that kind of characteristic? How does it know to strive for existence? Or is it like a seed striving to find the light? Is it instinctive? If so then how can a massless thing like consciousness also have instinct and striving?

As before, consciousness is that which knows objects. When it is contaminated, it experiences craving.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha framed his entire teaching in terms of rebirth. If this is discarded, then Buddha's teachings collapse like an old house.

dharmagoat said:

I have complete faith in the Buddha...

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently you don't because you say:

I do not believe in past lives...

This is fine, you do the best you can. Practice the four brahmaviharas, if you do, then in this life you will be more relaxed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

LionelTeo said:

the subconscious mind...

Malcolm wrote:

...does not exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

dharmagoat said:

There is a fundamental contradiction in Buddhism:

The Buddha is known as an independent thinker and innovator. We are encouraged to emulate him, yet are obliged to follow his teaching without question and without making any compensation for the enormous social and cultural changes that have occurred over the 2000+ years since it was written down.

Malcolm wrote:

You are obliged only to understand what the Buddha himself meant by suffering, the cause of suffering, it's cessation, and the path.

Despite all the enormous cultural changes, there is one thing that is still true: there is suffering because of karma, and there is karma because of affliction.

The Buddha framed his entire teaching in terms of rebirth. If this is discarded, then Buddha's teachings collapse like an old house.

There is no point in teaching a path to nirvana if there is no rebirth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

oushi said:

There is always this small chance that Buddhas true path was lost long time ago, and we are only juggling with ideas created by fanatic believers.

Malcolm wrote:  
I don't believe this.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 10:17 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

T. Chokyi said:  
Secondly, you might want to address directly what Dzongar Khentse Rinpoche has to say or not say about who is Buddhist or not.

Malcolm wrote:  
As Sakya Pandita points out, and as Dzogzar Khyentse, A Sakya educated man, knows, acceptance of the four seals is not sufficient to be called a Buddhist. Why? Because the largest monastic school in India, the Pudgalavadins, believed in an inexpressible self that was neither the same as nor different from the aggregates which underwent rebirth.

Instead Sapan opines that in order to be called a "Buddhist" one must have taken refuge in the Three Jewels, be training on the path [implicit in going for refuge] or have realized the fruit of the path.

T. Chokyi said:  
"Buddhist" as you know, is a label. It is a word describing something you yourself said you weren't not that long ago...  
when you had a kind of "realization" about that...

Malcolm wrote:  
Well, what I am is a follower of Buddhadharma. One of the reasons that I eschew the label "Buddhist" for myself is that I am not any particular kind of Buddhist. The term "Buddhist" in many ways is too limiting. I have met "Buddhists" who imagine that because they are Buddhists they cannot take teachings from teachers in other streams of Dharma outside Buddhadharma. I personally have no problem with it. That is why I follow Dharma, and Buddhadharma in particular. All Dharma religions, incidentally, accept rebirth.

However, I have also found that conventionally, it is easier to resort to the term Buddhism and Buddhist in common conversations with others.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 9:59 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

Secondly, you might want to address directly what Dzongar Khentse Rinpoche has to say or not say about who is Buddhist or not.

Malcolm wrote:

As Sakya Pandita points out, and as Dzogzar Khyentse, A Sakya educated man, knows, acceptance of the four seals is not sufficient to be called a Buddhist. Why? Because the largest monastic school in India, the Pudgalavadins, believed in an inexpressible self that was neither the same as nor different from the aggregates which underwent rebirth.

Instead Sapan opines that in order to be called a "Buddhist" one must have taken refuge in the Three Jewels, be training on the path [implicit in going for refuge] or have realized the fruit of the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Chinese policies towards Tibetans are brutal and crimes against humanity.

Indrajala said:

I agree, but when you're rich and powerful your "crimes against humanity" are seldom punished (recall Bush and Blair).

Malcolm wrote:

Finally. It is like pulling your teeth to get you to admit that Chinese policies towards Tibetans are inhumane and savage.

Indrajala said:

...there are millions of lives at stake and the political stability for the PRC.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no political stability at stake for the PRC if they left the Tibetans alone to do their thing. And that they do not do. There is no necessity for the Chinese Govt. to act with such swift brutality against a people who are culturally averse to organized military violence. If the Chinese Govt., had an ounce of sense they would bring back HHDL, restore Tibet, restore Tibetan culture, and turn Tibet into their new best friend.

Indrajala said:

I don't think "we" can change China's policies. Do you think "we" can? I don't think dozens of years of activism has done much to change their minds.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it has made the Chinese Govt. very uncomfortable, which is why they keep

shifting their policies towards Tibet. So this signals to me that the pressure of international criticism of the policies of the Chinese Govt. with regards to Tibet are in fact effective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

Indeed, it is a pretty safe assumption that rebirth was widely accepted amongst his audience, and even among the general population in 13th century Japan. Luckily several of his most famous texts are dedicated to the notion of life-and-death, which i personally find to be rather profound and inspiring reads.

Malcolm wrote:

You will note however he does exercise some attention to refuting those who reject rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

[http://www.religiondispatches.org/archive/science/3631/for\\_buddhism\\_\\_science\\_is\\_not\\_a\\_killer\\_of\\_religion](http://www.religiondispatches.org/archive/science/3631/for_buddhism__science_is_not_a_killer_of_religion)

Malcolm wrote:

Big problem with this article:

This cosmology held until the 16th century, when European explorers arrived in India with a new religion and a new cosmology. The Earth, these visitors insisted, is not flat or disc-shaped, but is instead an enormous ball. This idea met with stiff resistance from the natives.

Actually, this is false. Indians understood the earth was a round ball, as explained in the Surya Siddhanta.

T. Chokyi said:

it peels away all the claptrap

Malcolm wrote:

This is offensive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

saraswati said:

Ah, thank you very much Malcolm.

Do all the schools of Tibetan Buddhism share the same interpretation? I must say I haven't tuned in to the subtle differences between the vows I have heard chanted. (So far I have been to Gelug and Kagyu centres.)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes they do. The shepherd-like vow is considered the most superior, but the king-like vow the most practical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Here is a random sampling, running a quick word search on the pdf you provided from Shasta Abbey. From these samplings you can Dogen was a follower of Mainstream Buddhism, and took the idea of rebirth quite literally.

pensum said:

Thanks Malcolm. I am familiar with those passages (and others). It is interesting that out of the thousands of pages that Dogen wrote he does not appear to have ever penned a sustained treatment of rebirth. Focusing instead on actual practice here and now in this life, he merely makes the occasional passing reference to rebirth in order to spur one's practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Why would he have to? He was in a monastic environment training educated monks, not lay ignoramuses. However the Karma chapter can be understood as just that. Context is everything in understand the authors of these texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

What I see in this thread is the general theme of "China is really bad and needs to be nicer to Tibetans" which is far too simplistic and fails to address a number of details and geopolitical concerns.



Malcolm wrote:

Chinese policies towards Tibetans are brutal and crimes against humanity. Stating that we who live in Western countries have nothing to say against the Chinese Government's treatment of Tibetans because our governments, yours included, are engaged in various nefarious deeds is a non-sequitar. It sounds just like the Chinese Government's justification of their treatment of Tibetans because we in the US and Canada drove our native peoples here to the brink of extinction.

Your geopolitical concerns are just excuses. You never once condemn the Chinese Government for their actions, you merely say "I don't condone them". That is not a condemnation.

Indrajala said:

This doesn't justify anyone's misdeeds, but to really come to viable solutions for the human suffering in Tibet requires a bit more developed ideas that factor in everything I've attempted several times to outline above (particularly long and short term strategic issues).

Malcolm wrote:

The first step is to recognize that what the Chinese Government is doing and has been doing to the Tibetan people is a crime against humanity. Until you cross that bridge, you just continue to apologize for Chinese geopolitical concerns. It's like saying, "Well, there is abuse in Tibetan monasteries, but you have to understand the situation, and because of this and that reason, we really can't change it, so the little kids should just suck it up and try to assimilate."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Well I for one am trying to combat it with reasoned argument and analysis. If we can't do that then what is the point of being here?

Malcolm wrote:

You think you are alone? The reasoning is very simple. The Buddha demonstrated a path to awakening which involve certain assumptions. If those assumptions are true, so is the Buddha's path, and the Buddha's awakening is validated. If not. then not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

saraswati said:

I am somewhat confused with this idea of reaching Buddhahood in this very lifetime:

I've learned that part of Vajrayana is taking the Bodhisattva vows, where we pledge to \*not\* take up Buddhahood asap but to postpone it until all beings are liberated. If this is so, how does it fit in with the fast path to Buddhahood? Or is it the case that Vajrayana is not always a Bodhisattva-based approach?

Malcolm wrote:

There are three different types of bodhisattva vows: like a king, like a captain, and like a shepherd.

The king-like bodhisattva vow involves the wish to achieve buddhahood as soon as possible, in order to guide others to that state, like a king ruling a country.

The captain-like bodhisattva vow involves the wish to achieve buddhahood at the same time as all other sentient beings, like a captain arriving in port at the same time as his passengers.

The shepherd-like bodhisattva vow involves attaining buddhahood only after all sentient beings have attained buddhahood, like a shepherd who only rests after his flock is safely penned for the night.

Vajrayāna uses the first of these. In other words, our bodhisattva vow states " May I attain the state of Buddhahood in order to place all other sentient beings in that state."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

So if you do come across the chapter you mention please pass it along, as obviously i'd be interested in reading it.

Malcolm wrote:

Here is a random sampling, running a quick word search on the pdf you provided from Shasta Abbey. From these samplings you can see Dogen was a follower of Mainstream Buddhism, and took the idea of rebirth quite literally.

The kesa, from ancient times, has been called 'the garment of liberation', for it can free us from all our obstructions, be they from the karmic\* effects of our past deeds, from our defiling passions, or from the effects of our rebirth in one of the six worlds\* of existence.

What we call the three temporal periods are the three time periods in which we receive the retribution from our good and evil acts. These are, first, the

retribution experienced in one's present life; second, the retribution experienced in one's next life; and third, the retribution experienced in some later future life. Through your practice of the Way of the Buddhas and Ancestors you learn, first off, to clarify what the principle of karmic retribution in these three time periods is. If you do not do so, you will make many errors and fall into false views. You will not just fall into false views, you will also give rise to evil ways and undergo suffering for a long time. By failing to continue developing your good roots, you will lose much spiritual merit and will have long-standing obstructions on your path to enlightenment. The karmic retribution experienced in these three temporal periods comes from both good and evil acts.

Right view is a gate to what the Dharma illumines, for by means of it we can realize the Saintly Path and exhaust the stream of rebirths.

Right thought is a gate to what the Dharma illumines, for by means of it we eliminate all discriminatory judgments, as well as any lack of discernment.

Right speech is a gate to what the Dharma illumines, for by means of it we will recognize that all names, voicings, and words are simply like vibrations.

Right livelihood is a gate to what the Dharma illumines, for by means of it we rid ourselves of all our evil ways.

Right action is a gate to what the Dharma illumines, for by means of it we arrive at the Other Shore.

Right mindfulness is a gate to what the Dharma illumines, for by means of it we do not intellectualize all thoughts and things.

Right concentration is a gate to what the Dharma illumines, for by means of it we can attain the meditative state that is beyond scattered thoughts.

It is clear that the desire to be reborn within the human world is something longed for even by a Lord Yama. Once someone has been reborn as a human being, he or she should forthwith have their head shaved, don the kesa of the Three Treasures, and take up the study of the Way of the Buddha. These are the merits of being within the world of humans, which surpasses the other five worlds of existence. But to be born in the human world and then to wantonly seek out the path to political power or some other worldly career, vainly spending one's life as a toady to ministers and kings, wrapping oneself up in fantasies and dreams, only to proceed in later times towards pitch darkness without anything to rely upon, that is folly indeed! Not only have you received the body of a human being, which is hard to come by, but you have also encountered the Buddha Dharma, which is hard to encounter. You should forthwith cast aside all your involvements and quickly leave home life behind in order to study the Way. Rulers and ministers, along with their wives and children, their relatives and households, are encountered everywhere,

but the Buddha Dharma, like the rare udumbara blossom, is hard to meet up with. In short, when impermanence suddenly arrives, there is no ruler or minister, friend or relative, spouse or child, or any precious treasure that will save us, for each of us simply returns to death's Yellow Spring alone.<sup>24</sup> What follows along with us is simply our good and bad karma. When we are about to lose our human body, our feelings of regret for our human body may well be deep indeed! So, while we still have our human body, we should quickly leave home life behind. Just this alone will be the true Teaching of the Buddhas of the three temporal worlds.

When all bodhisattvas who are bound to be reborn one final time are about to descend from the Tushita Heaven to be born in the land of Jambudvīpa,\* they invariably proclaim the one hundred and eight gates to what the Dharma illumines for the sake of the celestial multitudes in the Tushita Heaven, and thereby pass on the Teaching to those celestial ones, for this is the invariable method of Buddhas.

After darkness has come before our eyes, we should, right off, strive to recite the Three Refuges, not shirking from this even during our entering the intermediate world or our next birth. In this way, we should thoroughly expend life after life and, in age after age, reverently recite Them.

Once you have given rise to the intention to seek enlightenment, even though you are spinning about through the six worlds\* of existence, being born through any of the four modes of birth, the very causes and conditions of your spinning will become your heartfelt practice of enlightenment.

We do not know how many rounds of birth and death we have already spent returning again and again to various useless delusions, even while possessing this wisdom. It is like rocks covering up a jewel: the jewel is unaware that it is covered up by rocks and the rocks are unaware that they are covering up a jewel. When human beings recognize this jewel, they seize upon it. This is not something that the jewel expectantly awaits nor is it something that the rocks have been waiting for, and it does not depend on a spiritual awakening on the part of the rocks nor is it something that the jewel thinks about. That is to say, even though a human being and wisdom are unaware of each other, the Way is invariably overheard by the person's wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It's a problem that so many people find their Buddhism on the shelves of Barnes and Noble's.

Sherab Dorje said:

Don't be so judgmental, we all have to start somewhere. The problem is where do we go from there. I have run into my fair share of bogus teachers too (as have you, I imagine). Some compassion is needed at this point, as the lemmings rush towards the cliff.

Malcolm wrote:

What I am implying is that when one goes into a Barnes and Noble's, one sees books of various authors, and there is no guide to which authors are more legit, less legit and so on. Then people read a book, they like what it says, and they decide to make a Dharma connection with the author. It's a bit of a crap shoot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

frank123 said:

I'm new to Buddhism and exploring various traditions and schools. I'm wondering if it takes incalculable eons to reach buddhahood through sutra approach what makes it possible to achieve buddhahood in one lifetime through vajrayana methods? why is there such a vast difference in time? seems so extreme.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna etc., are paths of renunciation.

Vajrayāna is a path of non-renunciation.

Mahāyāna has no special methods.

Vajrayāna is the vehicle of methods.

Mahāyāna has no system of coordinating the basis, the five aggregates, with the result.

Vajrayāna is the vehicle with the basis, the five aggregates is coordinated with the result through the empowerment rites.

Mahāyāna is a causal vehicle in that they practice creating the causes for awakening for three or more, i.e. the cause is taken as the path.

Vajrayāna is the resultant vehicle because here, the result, the three kāyas, is taken as the path.

Mahāyāna and so on are for people of lower intelligence.

Vajrayāna is for people of sharper intelligence.

Mahāyāna is for people who have less afflictions and can easily give up desires and so on.

Vajrayāna is for people who are highly afflicted and cannot easily give up desires and so on.

Mahāyāna is the practice for past ages when the five degenerations were not so rampant.

Vajrayāna is the practice for this age, when the five degenerations are very rampant.

And so on. These are the usual reasons given in Vajrayāna texts.

frank123 said:

Thank you for the reply.

There is such a fast difference between three incalculable eons and one human lifespan, even if the methods are faster etc. I am still perplexed with this extraordinary difference in time.

Malcolm wrote:

Fundamentally, speaking, according to Vajrayāna texts, the extraordinary difference in time is due to the fact that Vajrayāna practices use the body as the vehicle for liberation, as well as other special methods, that allow a very serious practitioner to gather the two accumulations that normally require three eons in a single lifetime.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 10:28 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, in another chapter Dogen states very strongly that rejecting literal rebirth impugns the four kinds of realized persons, i.e., stream entrants and so on.

Lindama said:

I have never heard it discussed in Zen.

Malcolm wrote:

You may have never heard it discussed in Western Zen circles you are familiar with -- Dogen on the other hand, strongly criticizes those who discard it.

pensum said:

However, Dogen's views on life and death are somewhat more nuanced than that found in typical discussions of "literal rebirth"; to wit, this excerpt from the Bendowa, the first chapter of Dogen's Shobogenzo: Question: Someone has said, "Do not reject life and death. There is an

easy shortcut to freedom from life and death. This is knowing that the essence of the mind is eternal. This means that although this body is born and inevitably progresses towards death, this mental essence does not perish. If you understand that this mental essence that is not subject to arising and ceasing resides in my body is the original mental essence; and so, while the body takes a temporal form but is always inconstant, born here and dying there, this mental essence is eternal and does not change in past,

present, and future. To know this is to be free from birth and death. For those who know this, the birth and death they have known up to now vanish, and they enter into an ocean of the mental essence. Entering this ocean, they have wonderful virtues like the Buddhas and Tathagatas. Even if you know this now, because your body is the result of former delusive actions, you differ from the sages. Those who do not know this principle turn in the cycle of life and death eternally. So you only need to know this principle of the eternal mental essence. If you sit in vain you waste your whole life. What can you possibly hope for?"

Does this view conform to the Way of the Buddhas and Ancestors?

Answer: This view is not the Buddha Dharma at all. It is the Senika view which is skewed outside of the Way. This skewed view says: "In our body there is a ghostly intelligence and it is through this that, as conditions occur, we have the capacity to distinguish between like and dislike, right and wrong, pain and stimulation, and suffering and pleasure. When the body dies, this ghostly intelligence is released from here and is born some place else. Therefore, though it seems to die here, it is born there, it is immortal and eternal." This is that view skewed outside the Way.

If you learn about this and think it is the Buddha Dharma, it is sillier than holding a tile or pebble and thinking it to be golden treasure. This foolishness is beyond anything to compare it to and is an embarrassment. The National Master Huizhong of Tang China strongly warned against this view. Those who hold this delusive view think that "the mind is eternal and that appearance is transitory" and equate this with the wonderful Dharma of the Buddhas and think that they have broken free from life and death; but this is the original cause of life and death. Isn't this shamefully silly? This is nothing but a deluded view skewed outside of the Way. Don't let your ears touch it.

Still, I need to address this issue, and so I will now rectify this delusion out of compassion. Understand that in the Buddha Dharma body and mind are single; nature and form are spoken of as not-two. This is known throughout both the Western heavens and Eastern lands and is beyond any doubt. In a school that talks about eternity, the myriad things are all eternal and body and mind is undivided. In a school that talks about cessation, all things are ceasing and nature and form are not divided. How can you say that the body ceases while the mind is eternal in contradiction to this true principle? You must further realize that life and death itself is nirvana. We cannot talk about nirvana without life and death. It is wrong to think that the view that "the mind becomes eternal when it is free from the body" is the Buddha's wisdom that is free from life and death, when the mind that thinks this is itself arising and ceasing and is not eternal. Could this be relied upon? Understand thoroughly that the singleness of body and mind is always upheld in the Buddha Dharma. And so, how could the mind go off from the body to be eternal when the body arises and perishes? If you say that body and mind are sometimes one and sometimes not, this would mean you are saying that the Buddha's words are false. To think that birth and death can be avoided is guilty of despising the

Buddha Dharma. Caution is needed here.

The Buddha Dharma, especially the Lineage that speaks of "the Dharma Gate of the totality of the nature of Awareness as the vast array" of the total world of events and experiences does not divide suchness from appearance, nor arising from vanishing. Even bodhi and nirvana are nothing but this nature of Awareness. All things and appearances without exception are totally and only this single Awareness and are embraced without disarray. The various Dharma Gates are all equally this single Awareness. This is how the nature of mind is understood in the Buddha Dharma. How can you divide this into body and mind or life and death from nirvana? You are already a child of the Buddha so do not listen to madmen who preach views that are skewed outside of the Way.

(this translation by Ven. Anzan Hoshin roshi and Ven. Yasuda Joshu Dainen roshi at <http://wwwzc.org/dharma-text/bendowa>  
another English version is available from Shasta Abbey  
<http://www.shastaabbey.org/pdf/shobo/001bendo.pdf> )

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 10:22 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

rory said:

I'd love if you could explain to me, if you follow Yogacara philosophy how can Vajrayana be a quick path? Supposedly it takes 3 aeons to extirpate the seeds, so how does it work?  
gassho

Rory

Malcolm wrote:

Who said i follow Yogacara? Certainly not me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Tom said:

Diamondsutra,

I would like to know exactly what you know is made up.

dzogchungpa said:

Apparently the sutra is silent on this question.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a problem that so many people find their Buddhism on the shelves of Barnes and



Noble's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

China is by no means a Buddhist nation.

Indrajala said:

It is a secular state with many many Buddhists. More Buddhists than any other country in the world.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand this. However China destroyed a Buddhist country, one Buddhist through and through. It's different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

China is also partly a Buddhist nation and there's a massive ongoing Buddhist revival there. There's statistically more Buddhists in China than all Tibetan Buddhists in the world combined probably.

Malcolm wrote:

China is by no means a Buddhist nation.

Perhaps, however, if enough Chinese people become Buddhists, Tibetan Buddhists in particular, they will realize that China's policies towards Tibet are environmentally unsound, racist, and criminal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fastest way to buddhahood

Content:

frank123 said:

I'm new to Buddhism and exploring various traditions and schools. I'm wondering If it takes incalculable eons to reach buddhahood through sutra approach what makes it possible to achieve buddhahood in one lifetime through vajrayana methods? why is there such a vast difference in time? seems so extreme.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna etc., are paths of renunciation.

Vajrayāna is a path of non-renunciation.

Mahāyāna has no special methods.

Vajrayāna is the vehicle of methods.

Mahāyāna has no system of coordinating the basis, the five aggregates, with the result.

Vajrayāna is the vehicle with the basis, the five aggregates is coordinated with the result through the empowerment rites.

Mahāyāna is a causal vehicle in that they practice creating the causes for awakening for three incalculable eons or more, i.e. the cause is taken as the path.

Vajrayāna is the resultant vehicle because here, the result, the three kāyas, is taken as the path.

Mahāyāna and so on are for people of lower intelligence.

Vajrayāna is for people of sharper intelligence.

Mahāyāna is for people who have less afflictions and can easily give up desires and so on.

Vajrayāna is for people who are highly afflicted and cannot easily give up desires and so on.

Mahāyāna is the practice for past ages when the five degenerations were not so rampant.

Vajrayāna is the practice for this age, when the five degenerations are very rampant.

And so on. These are the usual reasons given in Vajrayāna texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

I've never condoned such killings.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so now you change your tune -- first it was, "I have no idea if there is..." to "I don't condone..."

Well it is good you don't condone it, since a Buddhist monk is forbidden to condone the killing of any human being, otherwise, they commit a parajika.

Indrajala said:

I'm just saying things are not going to change and passive-aggressive resistance against an unforgiving authoritarian state is not going to solve much, especially when that state is largely left unchallenged by other world powers. Not even your country the USA with all its talk of human rights and liberty will lift a finger to really help Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Our leaders meet with HHDL regularly, and disregard China's temper tantrums over the issue. Tibet has major sympathy in the house and senate. And, you have to remember, the US did not even recognize China diplomatically until 1972.

Indrajala said:

What exactly do western converts to Tibetan Buddhism do other than condemn China and maybe protest, meanwhile buying Made-in-China products?

Malcolm wrote:

We keep people aware of what the Chinese are doing to Tibetans and to Tibetan Buddhism.

Indrajala said:

Are you willing to arm yourself and launch a guerrilla campaign in Tibet to "drive out" the Chinese from the Tibetan homeland? How about at least helping to pay for it?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not. I do not believe that armed struggle will result in anything other than the annihilation of Tibetans forever.

Indrajala said:

Even if you insist on non-violence, self-immolation and international awareness campaigns clearly have had little effect.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course we insist on non-violence. Actually the proof it is having effect is the increased brutality of Chinese security forces against Tibetans.

Indrajala said:

China is still in control of Tibet and nobody is stopping them.

Malcolm wrote:

The non-virtue of China's destroying a Buddhist nation will do them in. We just don't know how long it will take before China's karma ripens. Sadly, it will be bad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

daverupa said:

This means that one can be a Buddhist without accepting rebirth as described by this or that source text, since one simply accepts that it's to be seen, not that it's to be seen as X right now, first, before beginning, otherwise I'm a faker or something equally silly.

Malcolm wrote:

Then Buddha certainly wasted his time talking to a lot of folks about rebirth who had not seen it for themselves, didn't he?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Lindama said:

]I have never heard it discussed in zen.

Malcolm wrote:

You may have never heard it discussed in Western Zen circles you are familiar with -- Dogen on the other hand, strongly criticizes those who discard it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:19 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Prasutagus said:

This is amazing really. Epic.

I've never seen someone theoretically committed to dharma practice so dead set at proving it's foundations are invalid, and to be so dead sure about it.

Maybe that's a new practice these days. Point out all the ways Buddhism is f'd...

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha once remarked that the Dharma could never be destroyed from without, only from within. This is how the Dharma is destroyed, i.e., when people who are nominally Buddhist set out to destroy the foundations of Buddhist teaching.

Epic indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:13 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Geshe Sonam's uncle was thrown in jail for 6 months due to too many calls coming to his cellphone from India. There was no charge laid, no trial, he was just sent to jail.

Geshe la's cousin endured similar treatment for sending back and forth photos of HH Dalai Lama on Wechat.

I really wonder how you don't hear this information considering it is widely known in the HP Tibetan community.

Indrajala said:

I agree it is morally wrong to arbitrarily imprison people, but do you think responding to such treatment with aggressive protesting or passive-aggressive resistance will make the Chinese authorities change their ways when there is negligible international pressure for them to stop?

Malcolm wrote:

That is why people who live outside of Tibet must continue to voice their opposition to atrocities committed by the PRC against Tibetans. If people are silent, the Chinese will merely take this as assent. This is why HH Dalai Lama is so important, he is living testament to the 55 years of utter brutality to which Tibetans have subjected in their own land.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

JKhedrup said:

It was the second such incident to be reported in recent days from the TAR's Chamdo (in Chinese, Changdu) prefecture. On Feb. 28, Chinese authorities detained and fatally beat another monk after finding him in possession of banned writings and videos.

Malcolm wrote:

Or would you like more proof of Chinese oppression of Tibetan people, Jeff? Because really, there is bucket loads. Far more examples of Chinese authorities beating, torturing, raping and killing Tibetans than there is of sexual abuse in Tibetan monasteries in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

What do you mean by non-material? Do mean that it has no mass?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, consciousness has no mass. It is not composed of the four elements, nor by anything in the table elements.

Andrew108 said:

Does this mean that it is 'on' and has energy? What is the source of this 'on' state? What sustains it?

Malcolm wrote:

Praṇā and warmth are the supports for consciousness.

Andrew108 said:

How can a preceding moment act as a support and organ for mental consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

The preceding moment of consciousness, i.e. the mental organ (manendriya) acts as the support for consciousness the same way that a son becomes the father of another; a fruit, the seed of another.

Andrew108 said:

Surely there must be some underlying continuity?

Malcolm wrote:

No substrate is necessary, according to Madhyamakās. The Yogācāra sūtras propose the ālayavijñāna to account for memory, continuity and so on.

Andrew108 said:

Also how can memories be recalled if the preceding moment acting as support is no longer present?

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakīrti weighs in:

"The consciousness of the memory is not different than the consciousness (experiencing the object) by which an object is experienced, as has already been explained. Why? Because the memory isn't a different thing. Since there was an experience, the memory arises with the object since the consciousness recalling that experience is not different than the experience. Since whatever is encompassed by the consciousness of the experience is encompassed by the consciousness of the memory, it is said "I saw". This is also a worldly convention and is not something to examine,

since it is worldly convention of those who possess deluded objects."

Andrew108 said:

How is it that we can hold thoughts and experience connectedness between moments if the preceding consciousness is always changing?

Malcolm wrote:

See above.

This also accounts for rebirth, why, when this body breaks up, the series of consciousness can appropriate a new series of aggregates through one of the four modes of birth.

Why would this account for rebirth? How does consciousness actually appropriate aggregates?

[/quote]

Consciousness is driven by thirst for existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

I do not have a positive opinion about the Western Buddhist teachers, I remember of a certain lama who, after I commented about my health, began making accusations about my 'bad karma'. I never saw any Asian teachers have such an attitude, they are always friendly and benevolent.

Malcolm wrote:

Well you should not infer that all Western Buddhist teachers are cut from the same mold that "lama".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

Actually, I just express myself in a way that was not clear what I meant, but this debate was positive, because I learned how to express myself better. I do not believe that karma is just a Buddhist or a Hindu theory, all religions and materialistic philosophies speak of causality somehow. Buddhist philosophy explains karma in order to help people to achieve enlightenment, then it seems to me to be something dangerous to use karma in other context.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha used karma to explain why some people are born rich, others poor, why some

are famous, others not, why some are healthy, others ill, and so on. The point of teaching about karma is that afflictions cause karma, all karma, even positive karma, is rooted in affliction -- which is why positive karma, aka, merit, is exhaustible (unless it is dedicated with a dedication free from the three wheels).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course Buddhism is a tradition of reason. We do not accept things merely on blind faith. On the other hand, we also accept śabda pramāṇa, which mean that once we have accepted the Buddha as an authority, we now can accept what he says in the sūtras as being true. Prior to accepting the Buddha actually shows the way to nirvana, of course one can be skeptical.

Vajrasvapna said:

The problem is that different Buddhist scripture make different statements, then each person must develop their own understanding of the Buddhist scriptures, avoiding intolerance.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why one must rely on a qualified teacher, to make things clear to one.

Vajrasvapna said:

Because they can then understand that also their practice can help alleviate their disease. Reduction of bile diseases comes from reducing anger, etc. It really works. I have health problems and the reason I still alive are my practices of meditation and mantra recitation, only medical treatment would not suffice. However it is because of my poor health I became interested about Buddhism, then my poor health ended up being something auspicious.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this a good thing for you. As it say in mind training teachings, suffering is our friend.

Vajrasvapna said:

This is why I consider using karma to accuse someone

Whoever suggested that?

It is a very common practice among Western Buddhist teachers, maybe someone should go and tell that to them.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, I have never ever heard any teacher of any merit whatsoever treat karma in the way in which you describe. Maybe you or someone you know had a bad experience with an unqualified western teacher.



Vajrasvapna said:

To add to what I said about the vision of Mahayana about karma, the ideas of Yogacara school, if understood correctly, expression well as karma works from the individual point of view...

Malcolm wrote:

Khenpo Palden Sherab was an awesome lama, someone for whom I have great respect, but nothing you are saying is really brand new to me. Each teaching has its specific context. You cannot expect people who are not Vajrayāna practitioners, for example, to cultivate pure vision in the Vajrayāna sense of the word because they have not been ripened by empowerment nor granted liberating instructions.

Karma is always taught subsequent to dependent origination, for while dependent origination explains the how and why of being reborn; karma explains the what and where of being reborn.

It is fine to say this is all an illusion, a mirage, its unreal, and so on. But it is also necessary to recognize, such as you do, then we need to deal with all these unreal conditions like illness, floods, death, meals, sleeping, waking and so on, and we have to bear in mind that we generally deal with them, 99.999 percent of the time as if they are real. For example, if you are shot, you not sit on your cushion reciting mantras, telling yourself that it is all unreal and it will go away. Not only does one's own karmic traces have the ability to generate appearances for oneself, but also the karmic traces of others can do so as well, as Shabkar points out in Flight of the Garuda. Given this situation, we have to be practical and understand and remind ourselves that having a profound view and realizing it are totally different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The idea of consciousness and rebirth are extremely precise.

Andrew108 said:

Go on then. Describe them precisely.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness is one of the four non-material aggregates. It is the knower and perceiver of objects. The six consciousness are supported on their respective sense organs; five are supported upon their respective material organ, the eye and so on; the sixth consciousness is supported on its organ, the mental organ, which is in fact the immediately antecedent consciousness. This also accounts for rebirth, why, when this body breaks up, the series of consciousness can appropriate a new series of aggregates

through one of the four modes of birth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Sönam said:

Holy crap! what a cloudy lemonade ...

Sönam

Andrew108 said:

It seems cloudy because the idea of consciousness and rebirth is cloudy. May be you could add something to the discussion?

Malcolm wrote:

The idea of consciousness and rebirth are extremely precise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

kirtu said:

No, the Chinese ruling class holds all the cards.

Indrajala said:

They're not omnipotent. The geopolitical situation in the region brings with it a lot of limitations. India would be at an advantage if China let its guard down for instance.

Malcolm wrote:

Poor China, always has to defend itself against its enemies...boo hoo.

Indrajala said:

It doesn't indicate they're being oppressed if they can leave and return unsupervised. The lines of communication are not necessarily cut either. Again, WeChat is used to constantly communicate with family back home.

Malcolm wrote:

Where everything they say is constantly being monitored. So they speak in codes and so on. Really, your level of apology for the PRC is astonishing compared with your bile vented towards Indians and Tibetans in general. So much for equanimity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Clarence said:

I am surprised no one got back to the THREE drupons that got stroked out of the retreat. If we follow traditional paradigm, there are some serious Samaya issues going on there.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily.

Clarence said:

Could you elaborate? I always heard strokes in comparison with practice means Samaya issues. Of course, nowadays, with all the diabetes, strokes are a lot more common.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the kind of stroke. Whether there is a provocation involved or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Clarence said:

I am surprised no one got back to the THREE drupons that got stroked out of the retreat. If we follow traditional paradigm, there are some serious Samaya issues going on there.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 11:04 PM

Title: World's largest hydropower project in Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The cascade of dams planned for the Yarlung Tsangpo river and its tributaries – including one three times the size of the Three Gorges Dam – threatens an already fragile environment

<https://www.chinadialogue.net/article/show/single/en/6781-World-s-largest-hydropower-project-planned-for-Tibetan-Plateau>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Vajrasattva practice books/articles

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Recommend some good ones. I know the basic stuff, just would like pointing to some good commentaries or similar.

Malcolm wrote:

At some point my translation of the Sakya ngondro text will be out, this has a comprehensive section on Vajrasattva practice,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All of these questions are answered in the texts.

No they are not.

Yes, actually they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

I'm basically suggesting everyone be realistic and broad minded rather than simply saying what China is doing is wrong and they should stop because we feel they should.

The actual options available to the parties involved are actually quite limited.

Malcolm wrote:

I suggest you apply that attitude towards India and Tibetan Monasteries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All of these questions are answered in the texts.

My advice to you is to start over at the beginning. You have gotten yourself completely stuck in a morass of vapid intellectualism.

Andrew108 said:

If rebirth were to be established scientifically...

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth can never be established scientifically because it cannot be verified by ordinary persons directly in anyway other than inferentially.

...

Andrew108 said:

All of these issues are ignored.

Malcolm wrote:

All of these issues have been addressed. You simply do not find the answers satisfactory because you accept and have faith in a different authority than the Buddha. You have faith in science and accept, without personal verification, the claims that scientists make about this or that phenomena.

It is a good thing to know with what one agrees and with what one disagrees. What you have come to discover is that you fundamentally do not agree with the Buddha's own teachings on liberation, the purpose of liberation and the results of liberation, in toto. That must be a sad thing for you, considering all the years you have put in studying and practicing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Therefore, you are pro-China and anti-Tibet.

Indrajala said:

No.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely. We are all well aware of the the real politik goals of China, and why they do what they do. You have offered no special insight to that in anything you have posted anywhere. Instead, while libeling Tibetan monasteries for systematic child abuse with little proof, when it is pointed out to you that Chinese have a systematic policy of the cultural annihilation of Tibetans which includes systematic forced abortions and sterilization, you aver and ask for similar proofs (and there is plenty, entire movies in fact). Your sentiments are not nearly as opaque as you seem to think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I can tell, you do not regard the Buddha as a special witness, and consider him to be an ordinary man, just like anyone else.

Andrew108 said:

I don't regard the Buddha as a special witness because there are contradictions in what he is reported to have said. Also there are historical/cultural reasons why he might have said what he said. It seems that he was working with circumstances within his own cultural milieu just like us ordinary folks.

Malcolm wrote:

Hogwash. This is your weak argument. The Buddha's essential message is entirely consistent through Mainstream Buddhism, Mahāyāna and all Vajrayāna teachings including Dzogchen. Beings take continual rebirth samsara, dying here, reappearing there for as long as they are under the control of the three afflictions produced by self-grasping. When that self-grasping is eradicated, beings stop taking birth in beginningless samsara. Dependent origination exists solely for the purpose of explaining that process and how to end that process. It is not, as it is commonly misapplied today, to be taken as a general commentary on external phenomena such as the formation of galaxies and so on, though it can of course be applied to such external phenomena as well. The primary reason Buddha taught dependent origination was so that people would stop asking him who they were in past lives. So his reply is fundamentally: our origin is rooted in affliction, which is the cause of karma, and karma is the cause of suffering. When we remove those afflictions, we cease creating karmas, the cause of suffering. This process occurs for living beings from beginningless time. All valid Buddhist traditions accept this. This is the Dharma of the Buddha we are taking refuge in. If someone does not accept this, they are not really taking refuge in the Dharma, I am sorry to say.

Andrew108 said:

Then in terms of direct perception - I guess you are talking about yogic direct perception. I'm not sure this is really reliable. There are some meditators who have claimed to be able to access past lives but who really knows?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I was talking about common direct perception.

Andrew108 said:

Then inference based on logic. Well according to you I don't really need that because it's enough to take the words of the Buddha as gospel. And if I don't then I'm not Buddhist. The logic you have put forward I regard as being weak. It's such weak logic that the only thing you can do is say that I have to base my conviction on what the Buddha is said to have said.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually what I said was that the phenomena under discussion, rebirth, liberation and so on cannot be verified by the perceptions of ordinary persons, such as scientists engaged in empirical research. I fully allow that things like rebirth, liberation, and so on can neither be proven nor disproven by means available to empirical research. These things are non-falsifiable. Buddha addresses this issue in the Eastern Gatehouse Sūta I

previously cited above.

Andrew108 said:

But anyway I have agreed with you that I can't call myself Buddhist. So I'm no longer a Buddhist because I don't accept a literal interpretation of rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say you could not call yourself a Buddhist, I said the views you enunciate are not Buddhist and are not consistent with what the Buddha clearly taught in Mainstream Buddhist texts, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna as well.

Andrew108 said:

You might also read the Gendun Chopel book that Lopez published. In it there are some interesting passages regarding appeal to authority.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it does. The most interesting one is that he points out that in the end, one is the only authority for oneself. But the promise of Buddhadharma is that if you bother to do the work, instead of relying on intellectual reason, as you do, you will personally verify the claims the Buddha has made about rebirth, liberation, etc. As for myself, I have verified enough of the claims of the Buddha and the awakened masters that have followed, including our mutual guru, ChNN, to have confidence in the other claims put forward by the tradition.

Look, if you wish to hammer out your own doctrine with logic and reason, be my guest. But don't conflate it with Siddhartha's intent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

bryandavis said:

This kind of thing can happen even in a very traditional setting. I feel by me sharing this I am able to let a bit off my chest so to speak, since I was in the retreat. As well just put it out there that a long term retreat is a serious decision and when entering one you really have to be a very stable person all ready ( that should be obvious but it shocking how it is not )

...

These things need serious reflection before entering. They need concerned, compassionate, caring helpers and assistants along the way. And they need reality checks when things flare up. Maybe for at least the lay practitioners a mental health screening would have been helpful in my situation! There is so much shit that comes up

being alone with one self, as Malcom pointed out with the axe example!

Reintegrating after that much time is diffiuct. Reinegrating after psychological dissapointments is even more challenging. Not letting your "spiritual" world get completely crushed and being able to maintain the veiw though out insance circumstances is greater still.

Anyhow, sorry if there was not much point in all that, I just wanted to share and say it can happen anywhere, even in a seemingly perfect traditional situation.

Bryan.

Malcolm wrote:

Sharp weapons are generally not permitted within a retreat precinct because things like the following happen: when my teacher, Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje, was nearly done with his first three year retreat, he had what is called a "chod nyams", a chod experience where he saw his leg as a huge side of meat. So he took a knife he had brought with him into the retreat, and cut a huge chunk of his leg out for his ganapuja. The next morning his attendant found him lying in a pool of blood, nearly dead. His retreat master told him that he could not leave, but anyhow they brought a doctor, patched up his leg, and he remained in the retreat. Now, you have to understand that the Throma retreat manual specifically forbids bringing anything sharp with you into the retreat.

My point is that retreats are serious business and a lot of things can go wrong, and do go wrong. Luckily my experience was pretty peaceful, but then I did my retreat alone without companions, so it was not complicated by the presence of others.

I don't think any knowledgable person here imagines that what happened at DM is impossible in other situations. I remember hearing that in one three year retreat in the US, a very disturbed woman tried to burn down the house the the retreat was being held in, back in the '80's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Minjeay said:

I really don't get why things like these seem to be so hard to understand for persons who talk a lot about religion, and buddhism, while learning what wholesome acts are, and what non-wholesome deeds are, is one of the basic teachings you can even find in Theravada buddhism, though in this system they don't put emphasis on those teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

That is an entirely false claim.



Minjeay said:

Mahayana did build up the whole system around those teachings, and still when negative things happen you will see most buddhists just stand besides someone being raped and just debating about the karma of the persons involved.

Malcolm wrote:

That is an entirely false claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I have preferred to use Buddhist logic to question a Buddhist belief.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist logic only works if you accept the parameters of Buddhist logic. I think you need to study Dignaga and Dharmakirti a little more thoroughly before you can say you were using "Buddhist" logic to question a Buddhist tenet.

So what are the parameters of Buddhist logic, or "pramāṇa"? They are that there are three valid forms of authority: direct perception, inference, and testimony of special witnesses, such as the Buddha.

Dharmakirti's entire project is to prove that Buddha is a special witness, without recourse to sūtras and so on. If one can show that indeed the Buddha is a special witness, then it follows that one can heed what the Buddha says without reservation. You should get Jackson's book "Is Enlightenment Possible" which deals with this very issue, and includes a logical defense of rebirth.

As far as I can tell, you do not regard the Buddha as a special witness, and consider him to be an ordinary man, just like anyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the Buddha is merely telling people if they practice the four immeasurable, love, compassion, etc., it is good for them. But he never says anywhere they are sufficient for liberation.

dzogchungpa said:

If memory serves, Gombrich, in "What the Buddha Thought", attempts to demonstrate that the Buddha did indeed view them as sufficient for liberation. Just sayin'.

Edit:

I think this is basically his argument:

<http://www.ocbs.org/images/documents/gonda.pdf>

Malcolm wrote:

Basically his argument is extremely thin in the face of traditional Buddhist exegesis which flatly denies that the four brahma-viharas lead to nirvana. Dharmakirti is one such author, Gombrich mentions another on the first page of his rather diffuse and not to the point treatment, Bhikku Bodhi.

You can follow non-Buddhist scholars exegetical treatment of Buddhist concepts if you like, I will continue to prioritize how they were understood within the tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:18 PM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

there are real strategic reasons for China's inability to grant freedom to the Tibetans. The welfare of over a billion people rest on these strategic concerns being addressed.

Malcolm wrote:

Therefore, you are pro-China and anti-Tibet. Case closed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 10:44 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

They seem not to understand that Dharma is not a pick and choose sort of thing. It is not a supermarket of ideas in which one can shop and take home and create one's own recipe.

Once again we disagree. Of course they are allowed their own recipe, however they then take responsibility for how the pudding tastes. And as they say, the proof is in the taste of the pudding.

But beyond that, people evolve. I personally have seen your online presence change greatly over the years. If Dharma really is a multi lifetime project then people have to pick up where their predecessor left off. You can't demand everyone's karma have the same starting point, or disallow them their own progress.

Johnny Dangerous said:

P.S.:

This thread is somewhat confusing, as I specifically remember Malcolm arguing passionately (and convincingly, IMO) not that long ago for Steven Batchelor's right to be called "A Buddhist" -care to comment Malcolm? Has your opinion changed, or am I missing some nuance or qualifier here?

Personally, I don't fig "Dharma Lite" much, and I think the Buddhist worldview with Karma and Rebirth removed turns nonsensical for the most part..however I don't think believing this way makes someone "not a Buddhist" at all - we should respect people's evolution somewhat I think - as SMCJ says . Wherever I might want to pick apart their worldview, I have "secular Buddhist" friends who certainly walk the walk in the way the live, and have been greatly helped by their "incomplete" version of Dharma.

On the other hand, I DO question materialist-leaners who spend a lot of effort trying to prove the Buddha did actually mean what he said..and I assume that is maybe part of the tension in this thread, and with this subject in general, which let's face it..is ubiquitous.

Malcolm wrote:

People can all themselves anything. That is not the point. Someone can call themselves a buddhist and yet enunciate views that are not consistent with whta the Buddha taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

conebeckham said:

You know, I know plenty of folks who have completed 3 year retreats, both here in the West, and in Asia. None of them were even close to as extreme as this situation with Ian and Christie. That this sort of thing happened at all, has to be laid at the feet of those responsible, and those responsible need to take responsibility. GMR clearly bears a part of this burden, I feel. He has not taken responsibility for this. Frankly, neither has Christie, and I am afraid that is because she has been damaged.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, kicking delusional people out of a retreat without first getting them some professional counseling was definitely a huge and tragic error. Had the DM board taken a gentler approach, this may never have happened. They could have been told they should be in separate retreat cabins and seen now that worked out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Samaññaphala Sutta in fact talks explicitly about recollection of past lives as being such a fruit...

Wayfarer said:

Right, I concede that...it was a poor choice on my part. However there are places where the visible benefits of 'the fruit of practice' are discussed. It always seems to me to be a better approach to those who have reservations about 'the next life' to approach it in those terms.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for those people who find it difficult to commit to a path, I would never actually say "You do not believe in rebirth, so you cannot attend this or that teaching". What I say is "Suspend judgement about rebirth for now, and see if Buddhist practice is helping you transform and change."

But here we are not talking to such people. Here we are talking to people, mainly one person, who is intent on promulgating physicalism as correct view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

I made no assertion of personal realization, just expressed my opinions on Buddhist philosophy, if you disagree, fine. I believe that Buddhism is a tradition of reason, as is attributed to Buddha himself: 'You don't have to believe what I say with blind faith.'

Malcolm wrote:

Of course Buddhism is a tradition of reason. We do not accept things merely on blind faith. On the other hand, we also accept śabda pramāṇa, which mean that once we have accepted the Buddha as an authority, we now can accept what he says in the sūtras as being true. Prior to accepting the Buddha actually shows the way to nirvana, of course one can be skeptical.

Vajrasvapna said:

"There is only one cause to all diseases  
it is the ignorance  
That does not realize selflessness.

Like a bird flying in the sky

is not separated from its shadow,  
Sentient beings, even when living in happiness  
Are never separated from disease because of ignorance.

Ignorance produces attachment, hatred  
And closed-mindedness  
The three mental poisons are the particular cause  
That manifests wind, bile and phlegm humors.

Malcolm wrote:

As a doctor of Tibetan Medicine [Shang Shung, 2009], I can tell you that when patients ask me to explain the three humors to them, and they are Buddhist, then of course I explain to them that the ultimate cause of their illness is the knowledge obscuration of self-grasping, which in turn produces the three afflictions, which in turn produces the three humors. Why? Because they can then understand that also their practice can help alleviate their disease. Reduction of bile diseases comes from reducing anger, etc. It really works.

Vajrasvapna said:

This is why I consider using karma to accuse someone

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever suggested that?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

tobes said:

There is little that is coherent, settled or unified in all of that - it is a terrible and fallacious endeavor to reify all of that contestation into either a crass ontological materialism or a metaphysical realism or some bizarre and unfounded version of both - which either defeats or is defeated by 'the dharma'.

Malcolm wrote:

One thing that there can be no doubt about; people who are interested in Buddhism often cannot reconcile the ideological underpinnings of logical positivism, the bedrock of scientism, with Dharma. That is the point. Therefore, they seek to discard keystone Dharma tenets which they feel are not relevant to them (Andrew108 illustrates this for us perfectly), whilst maintaining whatever they are interested in: meditation, etc. They seem not to understand that Dharma is not a pick and choose sort of thing. It is not a supermarket of ideas in which one can shop and take home and create one's own recipe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:30 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

That passage I quoted from the Kalama Sutta, is also elaborated in the Samaññaphala Sutta, which deals with the 'fruits of the contemplative life visible in the here-and-now'.

I am trying to take a middle path approach. The middle path is neither believing nor disbelieving, but suspension of judgement. That suspension of judgement is quite a hard discipline in its own right. If you lived in such a way that your mind didn't jump to conclusions or reach judgements about things that were not apparent, it would be quite a different kind of life.

Malcolm wrote:

Incidentally, in this text, it is the agnostic position the Buddha finds the most worthy of criticism:

"When this was said, Sañjaya Belatthaputta said to me, 'If you ask me if there exists another world [after death], if I thought that there exists another world, would I declare that to you? I don't think so. I don't think in that way. I don't think otherwise. I don't think not. I don't think not not. If you asked me if there isn't another world... both is and isn't... neither is nor isn't... if there are beings who transmigrate... if there aren't... both are and aren't... neither are nor aren't... if the Tathagata exists after death... doesn't... both... neither exists nor doesn't exist after death, would I declare that to you? I don't think so. I don't think in that way. I don't think otherwise. I don't think not. I don't think not not.'

"Thus, when asked about a fruit of the contemplative life, visible here and now, Sañjaya Belatthaputta answered with evasion. Just as if a person, when asked about a mango, were to answer with a breadfruit; or, when asked about a breadfruit, were to answer with a mango: In the same way, when asked about a fruit of the contemplative life, visible here and now, Sañjaya Belatthaputta answered with evasion. The thought occurred to me: 'This — among these brahmans and contemplatives — is the most foolish and confused of all. How can he, when asked about a fruit of the contemplative life, visible here and now, answer with evasion?'

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

That passage I quoted from the Kalama Sutta, is also elaborated in the Samaññaphala Sutta, which deals with the 'fruits of the contemplative life visible in the here-and-now'.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sorry but I must disagree. The Samaññaphala Sutta in fact talks explicitly about recollection of past lives as being such a fruit:

"With his mind thus concentrated, purified, and bright, unblemished, free from defects, pliant, malleable, steady, and attained to imperturbability, he directs and inclines it to knowledge of the passing away and re-appearance of beings. He sees — by means of the divine eye, purified and surpassing the human — beings passing away and re-appearing"

But it never says "if there is no world after death, if there is no fruit of actions rightly & wrongly done, then here in the present life I look after myself with ease — free from hostility, free from ill will, free from trouble." The passage simply does not exist in that text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dharmagoat said:

If there is no world after death, if there is no fruit of actions rightly & wrongly done, then here in the present life I look after myself with ease — free from hostility, free from ill will, free from trouble.

It would seem that it is those who believe in rebirth that have the problem.

As I have long suspected, Buddhist belief can be a curse.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the Buddha is merely telling people if they practice the four immeasurable, love, compassion, etc., it is good for them. But he never says anywhere they are sufficient for liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

The point I am trying to make here is regarding whether you're required to believe in the phenomenon of re-birth in order to consider yourself Buddhist. Belief in rebirth is a very controversial question, as I have pointed out before - it is taboo in Western culture, on religious and scientific grounds. But it has always been controversial to some people. That is why I referred to the passage above, 'if there is no world after death, if there is no fruit of actions rightly & wrongly done, then here in the present life I look after myself with ease — free from hostility, free from ill will, free from trouble.' That kind of proviso is found in many places in early Buddhist texts. So I am saying, I think you can live according to Buddhist principles, and realize the benefits of them, without necessarily

accepting beliefs about re-birth, or at the very least suspending judgement about it.

Malcolm wrote:

Many texts? How many? I don't think so. That text is merely teaching the four brahmaviharas to non-Buddhists because whether they believe in rebirth or not, the practice of the same leads to birth in higher realms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Well, I part company there. 'Having to believe certain things' is what made me leave the Christian church. And I say that, even though I accept the reality of Samsara.

My advice to the sceptic would be: to observe the principles and the discipline that Buddhism entails and to keep an open mind. 'Keeping an open mind' does not require 'theorizing about the ultimate nature of things' or speculating on alternative explanations of Buddhist philosophy based on science. It's a lot more basic, in my view.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of forcing people to believe this or that. But there are certain understandings that it is crucial to have if one wishes to make progress in Dharma practice. Rebirth is one of those understandings. Why? Because the whole point of Buddha's teaching was free people from samsara. What is samsara? The <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn15/sn15.003.than.html> explains it beautifully:

From an inconstruable beginning comes transmigration. A beginning point is not evident, though beings hindered by ignorance and fettered by craving are transmigrating & wandering on. Long have you thus experienced stress, experienced pain, experienced loss, swelling the cemeteries — enough to become disenchanted with all fabricated things, enough to become dispassionate, enough to be released.

For those who have it, the Anamattaggasamyutta is indispensable reading.

" The heap of bones one person leaves behind  
with the passing of a single aeon,  
would form a heap as high as a mountain,  
so said the Great Sage.

This is declared to be as massive  
as the tall Vepulla Mountain  
standing north of Vulture's Peak  
in the Magadhan mountain range.

"But when one sees with correct wisdom



the truths of the noble ones —  
suffering and its origin,  
the overcoming of suffering,  
and the Noble Eightfold Path,  
that leads to suffering's appeasement —  
then that person, having wandered on,  
for seven more times at most  
makes an end to suffering  
by destroying all the fetters."  
SN 15:10

Simply put, not one can study Mainstream Buddhism seriously and not come away understanding the crucial and central role rebirth places in the Buddha's teachings.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 6:00 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Wayfarer said:  
I don't much like that idea that in order to practice Buddhism, certain beliefs have to be held.

Malcolm wrote:  
Certain understandings need to be arrived at; without which one cannot really consider oneself well trained. Acceptance of rebirth is one of those understandings.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 5:45 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Prasutagus said:  
Following this thread for some time, and going back to Malcolm's original post from (shudder) Tricycle, I have to ask:

Why is a marriage between Buddhism and science something that's even an issue? We're talking about two conceptual systems with radically different interests and goals. One is to cultivate inner qualities to eliminate suffering of self and other. The other is to understand the functioning of the physical world in its various forms. Why this push to certify or qualify Buddhism by extruding it through a scientific lens?

Also, it's interesting that the original (shudder) Tricycle article was about Buddhism offering a correction to the scientific materialism of modern science.... while ironically, much of this thread has been a defense of Buddhist world view against materialistic

critiques.

In the end, these are both conceptual constructs-- Buddhism and science. We really don't need to be overly rigid about either them, and allow some space between them. In the Buddhist philosophical tradition one traditionally interpolates between various different tenet systems, again, without any drama. That flexibility is possible here as well. There's really no reason to shoot down Buddhism for what science finds, for science for what Buddhism finds. We can be a little pliant, committing to a world view that says something contrary to what scientists might claim, simply for its spiritual efficacy. We can also be a little pliant ignoring what the abhidharma says about cosmology when looking at NASA pics of Iapetus.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, we do not need to abandon the Meru cosmology system in toto at all. In reality, even Ptolemy called people who lived north of Pamirs "Kurus". Despite the fact that Vasubandhu's presentation reached a highly formalized picture of the world. In reality, the main outline in the Meru cosmology can be understood as reasonable when it is understood that four continent Meru cosmology actually roughly maps to the known continents from an India centric point of view, taking India as Jambudvīpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Because as Malcolm points out, you can't be flexible with the dharma. You have to submit to it. That's the basic point he is making. Submission is the name of the game. Many Western practitioners forget how important that is.

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to get anywhere with Dharma, you must fit your life into the Dharma. You cannot fit the Dharma into your life. It simply does not work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

If you have a better solution I'm all ears.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Tibetans should continue to resist, just as the Vietnamese did, until the Chinese are finally driven out of their lands.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, your solution is that Tibetans should just forget they had a country, Tibet,; a language, Tibetan; and a religion, Buddhism.

Indrajala said:

The Jews never forgot they once had Israel, nor did they lose their religion or heritage.

Malcolm wrote:

The last point is not true. Jewish people have had their heritage stripped from them time and time again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

kirtu said:

So the plan is cultural genocide. And you are seemingly acting as an apologist for this.

Kirt

Indrajala said:

Seemingly to you, but this not what I am doing.

I'm recognizing the reality and suggesting an alternative approach to what is generally presently advocated.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, your solution is that Tibetans should just forget they had a country, Tibet,; a language, Tibetan; and a religion, Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am well aware of Chinese expansionist history. But it will never happen that Tibetans will ever identify as "Chinese citizens".

Indrajala said:

Even if that turns out to be true, the majority Han Chinese born and raised on the plateau will call themselves Chinese citizens from Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

No they won't. The Han on the plateau hate living there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first point-- that will never happen.

Indrajala said:

Perhaps you are unaware of Chinese expansionist history. The peoples living in what is now Fujian for example used to be seen as barbarians and they themselves did not identify with Chinese civilization. However, the southward expansion of Chinese states eventually saw to their forced assimilation over time. Now almost everyone in Fujian would identify as a Zhongguoren 中國人. The same can be said of places like Harbin in the northeast.

Malcolm wrote:

I am well aware of Chinese expansionist history. But it will never happen that Tibetans will ever identify as "Chinese citizens". Unlike you, I have talked to highly educated young Tibetans in Tibet. They understand perfectly the situation they are in, and they will never give in. You simply don't understand Tibetans nor Tibetan culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All of the problems in the world today have but a single cause, lack of virtue. One cannot hope to solve the problem with a proper understanding of its causes. One cannot remedy a problem without applying an antidote consistent with the condition.

Indrajala said:

You said yourself you can't fix saṃsāra.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, one cannot fix samsara, but this does not mean that one must be a coward.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, what they have is virtue on their side.

Indrajala said:

And is that triumphant idealism supposed to just give hope or actually solve the problem?

Malcolm wrote:

All of the problems in the world today have but a single cause, lack of virtue. One cannot hope to solve the problem with a proper understanding of its causes. One cannot remedy a problem without applying an antidote consistent with the condition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

anjali said:

This raises a question I'm curious about: if one doesn't believe in rebirth, just how far can one go on the Path?

Presumably since one doesn't have Right View, then one can't follow the Path to fruition. Yet, I'm curious what specific obstacles will arise along the way preventing one from successfully following the Path to completion? For example, would lack of belief in rebirth naturally preclude one from having successful direct introduction (in the Mahamudra/Dzogchen traditions)? Or, in the Zen tradition, would it prevent one from successfully seeing one's original face? Or, would it naturally prevent one from developing boundless compassion? Or...? (FYI, I'm fully in the rebirth camp, although that has no relevance to my question.)

Malcolm wrote:

What ChNN says about this issue in Crystal is that those who do not believe in rebirth can relax a little bit in this life; while those who do believe in rebirth can progress to total liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What isn't working is China's oppression of Tibetans.

Indrajala said:

Really? The Tibetans don't got guns anymore, or commando training from the CIA.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what they have is virtue on their side.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

LastLegend said:

4) A ship, in honour of the professor on Gilligan's Island let us call it "The Minnow", is in continual use. But each night a few parts are secretly removed and replaced by identical ones. The original removed parts are secretly reconstructed. Over the years, The Minnow continues to sail and have its license renewed. After 3 years the boat is entirely reconstructed, and the two identical ships are docked next to each other. Which one is The Minnow? (those who know their Plato will recognize this last one as Theseus's paradox)

I don't know what this all about. But one of them is The Minnow because it's named Minnow.

conebeckham said:

Spurious argument. Everyone know the Minnow had been lost. The Minnow had been lost.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so, the Minnow was not lost, but rather, beached.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

False comparisons. The PRC does not plan to systematically kill off the Tibetans. They plan to assimilate them and make them self-identify as Chinese citizens, just as many Mongolians, Manchurians and so on came to do.

Does anyone believe the present approach to the Tibetan issue is actually working or will work?

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first point-- that will never happen.

What isn't working is China's oppression of Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

If bending a knee to an authoritarian government saves more lives than doing otherwise, how can you argue it is wrong if you support non-violence?

Malcolm wrote:

This appeasement approach resulted in the Holocaust, that's why.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

What I wrote above wouldn't be out of place on a politics forum.

Malcolm wrote:

This isn't a politics forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

Clearly this passive-aggressive approach isn't working and never has. It only lends political will to more aggressive measures and attempts at sinicization of Tibetans. One option on the table for the Chinese is to try and make all the Tibetan children into Mandarin speaking self-identifying Chinese citizens. It would solve their problem in Tibet regardless of how the rest of the world would see it (and let's be realistic nobody would give enough damn to do anything about it as business would carry on as usual).

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm...you cannot get an education inside Tibet in Tibetan anywhere BUT the monasteries. Why do you think the Chinese are cracking down so hard on Tibetan Buddhism?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan m

Content:

Indrajala said:

Trying to fight them as a subjugated people with passive aggressive acts like self-immolation just provokes them, no matter how such acts can be morally justified. It really accomplishes nothing and makes the situation worse.

Malcolm wrote:

If you were in their shoes you would feel differently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

as i mentioned in my earlier post i can't even figure out what you guys and gals are arguing about. .

Malcolm wrote:

Any discussion of so called secular or modernist "Buddhism" quickly degenerates into a discussion about rebirth, and usually only rebirth. Why? Because rebirth is not falsifiable by any means accessible for ordinary persons who have not developed sufficient skills. It is instructive to read the <http://www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/nanamoli/wheel390.html>. Here we discover the Buddha talking about his own rebirth, how others take rebirth after their bodies break up and so on.

What is interesting about the second one, is that it is a response to a disciple, the famed Sunakṣatra [ legs pa'i skar ma ] who claimed:

Now on that occasion Sunakkhatta, son of the Licchavis, had recently left this Dhamma and Discipline.[1] He was making this statement before the Vesali assembly: "The recluse Gotama does not have any superhuman states, any distinction in knowledge and vision worthy of the noble ones.[2] The recluse Gotama teaches a Dhamma (merely) hammered out by reasoning, following his own line of inquiry as it occurs to him, and when he teaches the Dhamma to anyone, it leads him when he practices it to the complete destruction of suffering."

The Buddha clearly criticizes the idea that he, the Buddha, hammered the path with logic, that is was not born of true insight. This of course is one of the reason's why I find the constant appeal of physicalists like Andrew and so on so pale. For them, everything must be "logical". But the Buddha states:

when I know and see thus, should anyone say of me: 'The recluse Gotama does not have any superhuman states, any distinction in knowledge and vision worthy of the noble ones. The recluse Gotama teaches a Dhamma (merely) hammered out by reasoning, following his own line of inquiry as it occurs to him' — unless he abandons that assertion and that state of mind and relinquishes that view, then as (surely as if he



had been) carried off and put there he will wind up in hell.

In other words, by impugning the Buddha's knowledge born of concentration and insight, it does not turn out well for the person who does not abandon such views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It is very difficult to know that "as long as "I" am bound by affliction, then "I" conventionally speaking, will take rebirth." It's difficult because in many ways your belief comes before experience. You can't know it because you already believe in it. And that is added to the other points of the debate that we have been having.

Malcolm wrote:

I accept śabdapramāṇa explicitly, the Buddha's śabda in particular, as it proper, for example, the Pabbakotthaka sutta relates:

"Excellent, Sariputta. Excellent. Those who have not known, seen, penetrated, realized, or attained it by means of discernment would have to take it on conviction [śraddha] in others that the faculty of conviction [śraddha]... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed & pursued, gains a footing in the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal & consummation; whereas those who have known, seen, penetrated, realized, & attained it by means of discernment would have no doubt or uncertainty that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed & pursued, gains a footing in the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal & consummation."

Here, the Buddha is clearly stating that those of us who are not stream-entrants and so on, need to take it on faith that the five faculties and so on lead to liberation. You prefer accept the śabda of scientists. That's fine, but it is not Buddhist.

This afflictive I-making is not an intellectual belief, and it cannot be routed out through merely imagining it does not exist. It reasserts itself at every turn, at every reaction, in almost everything we do. It is the root of samsara. It cannot be eradicated through intellectual analysis and so on. The point is that for as long as one in thrall of this, for that long ones' continuum will not be liberated.

Definitely agree that it's not possible that just by imagining something not existing you make it so it doesn't exist. Conventional reality comes and shocks you out of that. But then you can't really imagine the positive of that to be true - which is something happening (like rebirth) happening because you believe that it will happen.

Honestly, I would prefer that it didn't. Then, of course, I could just pursue a worldly life, with worldly goals and motivations, and when I die, that would be it.

Again, reality tends to have the final word.

Indeed.

Buddhist Modernism or Secular Buddhism are more focused on contemplation or the inner life of being a Buddhist rather than only the doctrinal aspects.

Total nonsense. These people are concerned only with the benefits meditation practice might have for them in this life. They have no bodhicitta, how could they? They do not believe in Buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 20th, 2014 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

How then is this "rebirth" any different from, let alone contradictory to, any process as seen from a Western scientific perspective? As you have defined it here, any disagreement is merely due to using the term "rebirth" and could be avoided by simply using "process" or "evolution".

Malcolm wrote:

The physicalists imagine that when the brain dies, so does an "individual's" stream of consciousness.

pensum said:

1) A seed falls from a tree. The tree dies, is ground up and left to decompose. The seed is planted in the soil created by the decomposition of the tree, and a new tree grows. Is the new tree the old tree reborn?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

pensum said:

2) Two trees stand in a field, a tall one and a short one. The tall one is chopped down. When the stump is dug up, it is discovered that the roots were connected and the little one was just the offshoot of the tall one. So, has one chopped down the original tree or merely pruned it?

Malcolm wrote:

One has chopped down the parent.

pensum said:

3) Two apples fall from the same tree. Are these two individuals or the tree itself?

Malcolm wrote:

They are all distinct individuals, each bearing their own characteristics.

pensum said:

4) A ship, in honour of the professor on Gilligan's Island let us call it "The Minnow", is in continual use. But each night a few parts are secretly removed and replaced by identical ones. The original removed parts are secretly reconstructed. Over the years, The Minnow continues to sail and have its license renewed. After 3 years the boat is entirely reconstructed, and the two identical ships are docked next to each other. Which one is The Minnow? (those who know their Plato will recognize this last one as Theseus's paradox)

Malcolm wrote:

The one licensed as the Minnow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I'm glad to hear it. Perhaps you could describe in more detail the connection between the brain and consciousness. I will add here that for science, the actual production of consciousness is still a matter of debate. What isn't debated is the location of consciousness and therefore cognition.

Malcolm wrote:

The brain necessary for coordinating the five senses. The interaction of consciousness, sense organs and the body with its organs is nothing new.

However, the mano-indriya (the organ of mind) is clearly defined as being non-material. So there you have it.

Andrew108 said:

Liberation isn't really happening for those who take on rebirth as a belief. But if they see rebirth and DO directly in experience then why not? Although I would suggest that direct seeing of rebirth (is it possible or not) is more a result of realization than the cause of realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth is clearly possible, if you accept Buddha at his word. If you don't, well what can I say?

At first we are scared by rebirth and then later we are comforted by it. All the while we miss the main point of the teachings. That's the problem.

I don't find rebirth comforting at all. Quite the opposite. It does not scare me, I simply know that as long as "I" am bound by affliction, then "I" conventionally speaking, will take rebirth. I.e. the continuum I now call "mine" will not have fully relinquished the innate clinging to 'I', and it will continue in samsara. An empty dharma produced by

other empty dharmas.

This afflictive I-making is not an intellectual belief, and it cannot be routed out through merely imagining it does not exist. It reasserts itself at every turn, at every reaction, in almost everything we do. It is the root of samsara. It cannot be eradicated through intellectual analysis and so on. The point is that for as long as one is in thrall of this, for that long one's continuum will not be liberated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

I felt that is what you were doing with me although you never asked me where I stood.

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't responding to you as person, I was responding to what was written.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, hate to disappoint, but rebirth was not a dominant belief during the time of the Buddha. This is a common misconception which comes from not carefully studying the history of Indian thought.

dharmagoat said:

Could it be described as a "common belief" then?

Nevertheless, belief in an afterlife was the norm, was it not?

Malcolm wrote:

Not sure how common it was, really. For example, the first person the Buddha met after awakening was an Ājīvika ascetic, someone who definitely thought the Buddha had something, but since the Ajivikas were materialist ascetics, he was not really interested in Buddha's teachings. On a side note, in the Ashokāvadana, Ashoka is portrayed as ordering the executions of 18,000 Ajivikas because he saw a portrait of the Buddha which cast him in a negative light.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Unfortunately it is necessary to accept rebirth in order to follow the Dharma as taught by the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Presumably that is the one we want to follow, no?

dharmagoat said:

The Dharma as taught in the time of the Buddha, that is. When reincarnation was the predominant belief.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, hate to disappoint, but rebirth was not a dominant belief during the time of the Buddha, it was but one among many beliefs. This is a common misconception which comes from not carefully studying the history of Indian thought.

For example, many brahmins did not believe in rebirth. They performed rituals in order ensure \_worldly\_ happiness and success by making proper sacrifices and so on. It is not clear at all that rebirth is part of early Vedic religion.

Here is the cliff notes version:

The origin and development of the belief in transmigration of souls are very obscure. A few passages suggest that this doctrine was known even in the days of the Rigveda, and the Brahmanas often refer to doctrines of re-death and rebirth, but it was first clearly propounded in the earliest Upanishad—the Brihadaranyaka. There it is stated that the soul of a Vedic sacrificer returns to earth and is reborn in human or animal form. This doctrine of samsara (reincarnation) is attributed to the sage Uddalaka Aruni, who is said to have learned it from a Kshatriya chief. In the same text, the doctrine of karma (“actions”), according to which the soul achieves a happy or unhappy rebirth according to its works in the previous life, occurs for the first time and is attributed to the theologian Yajnavalkya. Both doctrines seem to have been new, circulating among small groups of ascetics who were disinclined to make them public, perhaps for fear of the orthodox priests. These doctrines must have spread rapidly, for they appear in the later Upanishads and in the earliest Buddhist and Jain scriptures.

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/266312/Hinduism/59824/The-Upanishads>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

Then in light of the above what exactly what is "it" that is reborn, etc.? Especially in light

of karma and dependent origination.

Malcolm wrote:

Read my reply to Andrew -- the aggregates of this life are serially connected with those of the next, cf, Nāgārjuna above; nevertheless, nothing transfers from this life to the next which could be described as an agent or a self. Nevertheless, there is rebirth, there is karma and the ripening of karma, all of which take place with out any substantial or real agent or actor.

pensum said:

Once that has been laid out then i might be able to sort out whether modern Western perspectives are actually all that different or not, or if the apparent disagreements are really just false assumptions from either side.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be ridiculous -- these issues have been discussed to death on these boards, all the players here understand the terms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

one can't be saying someone isn't a Buddhist for example, and then that someone may say back to the one saying they aren't Buddhist, something like "I've been a Buddhist for 26 years".

Malcolm wrote:

It is quite obvious that your intention was to label me a pecha thumper. I don't care. When people say things that are clearly at odds with Buddhadharma, it is quite right to question whether they are Buddhists. When so called "Buddhists" advocate the Carvaka materialist view, they are not Buddhists, but instead are promulgating false views. The denial of rebirth is one of the two fundamental false view the Buddha describes, it is the view of non-being. Nāgārjuna describes this view as being very pernicious in more than one place.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

Can you explain that experience she had? Do you care to talk about the implications of such a delog?

Andrew108 said:

Evidence is not the type of word we can use here. The implications of someone having an out of body experience and being able to see things that they are not supposed to know about poses certain logical problems. First of which is how do we see without eyes? Second is how does the information about the object travel from the object to the one perceiving the object? I would guess that light and photons have to be involved somewhere? So again how can something new be seen when there is no organ to perceive it and where there is no light doing the illuminating. The obvious answer (to me anyway) is that it is seen in the 'mind's eye' and that it must either be a repressed memory or a deduction that is being visualized.

I'm going to presume that you hold another view of this, so could you offer a rational explanation that can counter the explanation I have put forward?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, such a person has a mental body with all sense organs intact (manomaya-kāya), as described by the Buddha in many places.

Basically, Andrew, the reason why I question whether you are actually a Buddhist, despite your emotional allegiance to Buddhism and time put in pursuing Buddhist studies, is that your physicalist views cause you to contradict the Buddha's own words at every turn.

Instead asking us to reevaluate our beliefs in terms of how they line up with scientific theories of mind and cognition, I think it is time for you reevaluate whether you really have faith in the Buddha's teachings and whether they really serve your purpose any longer.

From everything I have seen you say, you would be happier as a Taoist, quite honestly. They have no theory of rebirth. They value naturalism and non-contrivance, they have a quasi theory of emptiness, sort of, they sort of have dependent origination, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: China expands new measures to directly control Tibetan monas

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Chinese authorities in Yulshul (Ch: Yushu) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Qinghai Province, in the Tibetan province of Kham has begun implementing new repressive measures introduced in late 2011 to directly control and manage Buddhist religious institutions in Tibet.

<http://www.tchrd.org/2014/05/china-expands-new-measures-to-directly-control-tibetan-monasteries>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

PorkChop said:

Once rebirth (and any sort of post mortem experience) is explicitly denied, bodhicitta loses a lot of its actual meaning. Not only is the multi-lifetime career of a bodhisattva rendered null and void, but so is the idea that Buddhas always continue to work tirelessly to relieve the suffering of sentient beings (a foundational tenet of Mahayana). If this one lifetime is it, you might as well be a social worker, get involved with greenpeace, or join the peace corps you'd do a lot more good.

Malcolm wrote:

It is true many people mistake compassion, which does not have the force to lead to buddhahood, with bodhicitta, the aspiration to become a buddha to benefit sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

ovi said:

I'm not criticizing those who do believe in rebirth, I just don't think it's necessary in order to be a Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth is necessary for understanding both the Mainstream Buddhist path as well as the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna paths.

Frankly, if you say you don't accept rebirth, you are basically saying that you don't really accept the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I do sometimes wonder if DM is so far gone as to be a (dangerous) cult, and what it'd be like if it was in 'communion' with mainstream Buddhism.



5heaps said:  
easily one of the top 3 sanghas in the US

Malcolm wrote:  
Who are the other 2?

5heaps said:  
then again most centers are very low quality, so thats not hard

Malcolm wrote:  
That is a pretty serious criticism. Upon what do you base it? Have you been to most of the Sanghas in the US?

5heaps said:  
there are some problems, as there always are, but the caliber of people there far exceed the majority of dharma students in general. its basically a bunch of psychologists, architects, singers, artists, bankers, scientists, business ppl, studying dharma together

Malcolm wrote:  
Sounds like any number of Sanghas in the US, not only three. Pride is fine, arrogance, well...

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 8:12 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
The main point is that rebirth, dependent origination and karma are keystone doctrines of the Dharma, and need to be understood in that respect.

Andrew108 said:  
Yes this is the main point that you want to make. But you haven't really established logically why a literal interpretation of rebirth is valid.

Malcolm wrote:  
Sure I have -- the Buddha taught literally. Anyone who spends even a little bit of time with Buddhist texts can hardly dispute that literal rebirth is a central concern of the Buddha's.

Andrew108 said:  
1. You said that rebirth happens because of alayavijnana - afflicted consciousness acts as a store. You then said everyone accepts this. Not everyone accepts that there is alayavijnana not even conventionally. Prasangika for one does not accept alayavijnana.

Malcolm wrote:  
Gelugpa Prasangikas do not accept the ālayavijñāna, however Candrakirti does.

Jayananda, the Indian Pandita who translated the Madhyamakavatara with Batsap into Tibetan explains in his commentary on the MAV, that ālayavijñāna is a name for consciousness which has emptiness, i.e. the ālaya, as its object. Further I already explained to you what Candrakirti holds to take rebirth, the habit of I-making. Eliminate the knowledge obscuration of the habit of I-making, all birth in samsara ceases. Even tenth stage bodhisattvas have a subtle knowledge obscuration of self-grasping, while being Buddhas in practically every other respect.

Andrew108 said:

2. You cannot explain how it is that consciousness creates another moment of consciousness to the extent that consciousness can 'exist' or at least be functional when there is no physical support or external object. You would have to assert continuity. If you assert continuity then you are asserting some kind of essence - or at least something acting as an essence.

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna writes in the Pratītyasamutpadahridaya

Although the aggregates are serially connected,  
the wise are to comprehend nothing has transfers

As to consciousness being "non-functional" when there is no physical senses or objects -- I agree, without physical senses, even all the traces stored in the ālayavijñāna will remain unripened. For example, four kinds of formless realm beings only have a single concept during their entire lives, i.e. the concept of "everything is consciousness", etc. They cannot have any other concept since they have no sensory input at all. However, their lifespan, lasting hundreds of millions of years is supported on karma, merit and jivendriya, the organ of lifeforce.

Andrew108 said:

3. The brain is more important than you take it to be. When the brain has problems it seems consciousness also has problems. If there were some underlying consciousness then you wonder how all of these problems like memory loss could occur? When someone's conscious experience is effected there can be seen corresponding damage within the brain. Strong logic that the brain and consciousness are intimately linked. Nearly all philosophers today accept consciousness to be brain-based.

Malcolm wrote:

I never ruled out a relationship between consciousness and the brain. If you think so you are mistaken. What I don't accept that that brain produces consciousness.

Andrew108 said:

4. Nihilists 2,500 years ago were a different breed than the nihilists today. And still today teachings on rebirth have a positive value. Especially for those who would be prone to act without a care for their actions.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, the materialists of 2,500 years ago use more or less precisely the same arguments to negate rebirth as materialists today. So they have not advanced that much.

Andrew108 said:

5. You don't believe in reincarnation but you do believe in rebirth. Many have taken the rebirth notion and use it to justify their bias for a transmigrating consciousness. They have also said that you can control this transmigrating consciousness and direct it. One may also use it to achieve liberation. You don't accept that though because you don't believe in a transmigrating consciousness or reincarnation.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you were to read back on some of my posts, you would see that I think the distinction that some try to make between reincarnation and rebirth is dubious. In English they are in fact synonymous. However, the modern convention is to treat them differently, one as a soul/atman based interpretation of migration through samsara, the other interpretation of migration in samsara absent a soul or self. As Buddhist, I think the latter is correct and the former to be mistaken.

Andrew108 said:

6. Rebirth means becoming. That is how it fits into the DO model. Thinking of it in these terms is an effective remedy for those who are prone to ignore conventional truth and to assert a kind of inertness. It is a natural law. Becoming. But we still have no logical proof that this becoming is personal to us - that we will personally continue to become again and again for as long as it takes for us to become Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth happens at two places in the twelve links of dependent origination, it happens at the link of consciousness, and it happens at the link of birth. The links 3 — 10 are the links of this life. Becoming is everything we do in this life, which provides the karma which informs the next life. Nāgārjuna again:

The first, eighth and ninth are affliction;

The second and the tenth are action.

Also the remaining seven are suffering.

Twelve dharmas are gathered into three.

Two arise from three.

Seven are produced from two,

That is the wheel of existence,

it is turned again and again.

Andrew108 said:

7. Middle way teachings are subtle and easily misunderstood. Understanding emptiness isn't by itself something that liberates, but on the other hand one wonders how an understanding rebirth would lead to liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna again:

All migrating beings are causes and results.

There are no sentient beings at all.

Empty dhammas are entirely produced  
from dhammas strictly empty;  
dhammas without a self and [not] of a self.

In other words, liberation ensues from understanding rebirth in terms of rebirth and dependent origination. Buddha's own liberation, according to the Majjhima Nikaya was brought about because he recalled more than 90,000 of his past lives, and through doing so, understood the principle of dependent origination. In the first watch, he reviewed his own past lives, in the second watch he reviewed the samsaric travails of other beings. In the third, he watch he understood dependent origination and the four noble truths, and at that point, became the Buddha. In the  
<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.004.than.html>:

"When the mind was thus concentrated, purified, bright, unblemished, rid of defilement, pliant, malleable, steady, & attained to imperturbability, I directed it to the knowledge of recollecting my past lives. I recollected my manifold past lives, i.e., one birth, two... five, ten... fifty, a hundred, a thousand, a hundred thousand, many eons of cosmic contraction, many eons of cosmic expansion, many eons of cosmic contraction & expansion: 'There I had such a name, belonged to such a clan, had such an appearance. Such was my food, such my experience of pleasure & pain, such the end of my life. Passing away from that state, I re-arose there. There too I had such a name, belonged to such a clan, had such an appearance. Such was my food, such my experience of pleasure & pain, such the end of my life. Passing away from that state, I re-arose here.' Thus I remembered my manifold past lives in their modes & details.

"This was the first knowledge I attained in the first watch of the night. Ignorance was destroyed; knowledge arose; darkness was destroyed; light arose — as happens in one who is heedful, ardent, & resolute.

"When the mind was thus concentrated, purified, bright, unblemished, rid of defilement, pliant, malleable, steady, & attained to imperturbability, I directed it to the knowledge of the passing away & reappearance of beings. I saw — by means of the divine eye, purified & surpassing the human — beings passing away & re-appearing, and I discerned how they are inferior & superior, beautiful & ugly, fortunate & unfortunate in accordance with their kamma: 'These beings — who were endowed with bad conduct of body, speech & mind, who reviled noble ones, held wrong views and undertook actions under the influence of wrong views — with the break-up of the body, after death, have re-appeared in the plane of deprivation, the bad destination, the lower realms, in hell. But these beings — who were endowed with good conduct of body, speech, & mind, who did not revile noble ones, who held right views and undertook actions under the influence of right views — with the break-up of the body, after death, have re-appeared in the good destinations, in the heavenly world.' Thus — by means of the divine eye, purified & surpassing the human — I saw beings passing away & re-appearing, and I discerned how they are inferior & superior, beautiful & ugly, fortunate & unfortunate in accordance with their kamma.

"This was the second knowledge I attained in the second watch of the night. Ignorance was destroyed; knowledge arose; darkness was destroyed; light arose — as happens in

one who is heedful, ardent, & resolute.

"When the mind was thus concentrated, purified, bright, unblemished, rid of defilement, pliant, malleable, steady, & attained to imperturbability, I directed it to the knowledge of the ending of the mental fermentations. I discerned, as it had come to be, that 'This is stress... This is the origination of stress... This is the cessation of stress... This is the way leading to the cessation of stress... These are fermentations... This is the origination of fermentations... This is the cessation of fermentations... This is the way leading to the cessation of fermentations.' My heart, thus knowing, thus seeing, was released from the fermentation of sensuality, released from the fermentation of becoming, released from the fermentation of ignorance. With release, there was the knowledge, 'Released.' I discerned that 'Birth is ended, the holy life fulfilled, the task done. There is nothing further for this world.'

"This was the third knowledge I attained in the third watch of the night. Ignorance was destroyed; knowledge arose; darkness was destroyed; light arose — as happens in one who is heedful, ardent, & resolute.

Andrew108 said:

Teachings on emptiness do contain definitive aspects that once understood in direct experience do lead to liberation - they are definitive and that is not just my point of view. Consider the following from Nagarjuna:

...

Here Nagarjuna is questioning this assumption you have of present unenlightenment and future liberation. Future liberation here is seen as a convention since by what are beings bound?

Malcolm wrote:

I agree that rebirth is a convention. So is the attainment of Buddhahood. As Haribhadra points out, the path from beginning to end is an illusion. So what? We still have to travel it.

Andrew108 said:

Milarepa sang:

Not separating appearance and emptiness

This is mastery of the view.

Malcolm wrote:

This master became a master because of his terror of rebirth in lower realms.

Andrew108 said:

So why cling to conventional beliefs if liberation is your target?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of clinging to conventional beliefs -- it is a question of understanding that if one does not achieve liberation in this life, then due to innate I-making, etc, one will continue to take rebirth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not a unique teaching of the Buddha, Hume understood it; Hindus teach emptiness. The four nobles truths are predicated on an understanding of rebirth.

ovi said:

From my understanding, Hinduism talks about atman, I could be wrong though.

Malcolm wrote:

Some do, but Hinduism is a vast field, and there are many permutations. It is never really accurate to say "Hindus believe..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Receiving Empowerment: Crash Course

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you had the intent to take them, you recited them in Tibetan following His Holiness, and so you took them. The refuge and the bodhisattva vows would have been just about the first thing you recited, apart from perhaps a Lama dgongs su sol....

The main point is that you received permission to practice Tara, which is what you wanted after all, no? Email me off line if you would like the sadhana to practice.

M

Motova said:

I didn't recite anything in Tibetan until the Guru Rinpoche empowerment because I simply had no idea. Luckily a friend beside me told me I should, so I tried to copy it as best as I could.

Also there were a couple of kids going back and forth to their moms and I had the pleasure of being in the middle of the that and crying babies while HHST was explaining the visualizations. And on top of that I had no idea what the syllables I had to visualize looked like in any of the empowerments....

Malcolm wrote:

Well, go to Montreal, it will all be in English there...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The proof that consciousness could be rooted in material processes can only be shown by the generation of a sentient being through means which do not involve biological reproduction.

ovi said:

How about evolution, the origin of life itself?

Malcolm wrote:

That does not support the idea that consciousness is rooted in material processes. There is no basis at all for an inference that this planet is the only planet upon which sentient beings may be found.

ovi said:

For me, the notion of rebirth does not matter; one can uphold it, deny it or neither.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that rebirth is a keystone teaching of the Buddhas. Through recollecting his past lives, according to Mainstream Buddhism, the Buddha came to understand the principle of dependent origination (which by the way was not conceived in any fashion at all related to external phenomena).

ovi said:

I consider the Kalama Sutta the charter to free inquiry and I think that whatever skillful means I use to attain liberation that is in accord with the Teaching is correct in this sense.

Malcolm wrote:

The Kalamas sutta is the most miscited text on the whole of the Pali Canon. It is not a charter for free inquiry. Not that free inquiry is forbidden in Buddhism, for it is not. But the Kalamas is not a charter for it. It principally concerns teaching the four Brahma Viharas to people who may or may not accept the principles of rebirth, dependent origination, so on and so forth.

ovi said:

Furthermore, I did bring the Dharma into discussion with suitable people, but knowing that none of them actually believe in any sort of afterlife and it would be a hindrance for them, I did not bring up the issue. Instead, I try to lead the discussion towards dependent origination, emptiness, virtues/bodhicitta and The Four Noble Truths, what truly make Buddhism unique.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not a unique teaching of the Buddha, Hume understood it; Hindus teach emptiness. The four nobles truths are predicated on an understanding of rebirth.

We can understand that emptiness is not a unique teaching of the Buddha because for formless āyatana, "all is emptiness", etc.

ovi said:

Sure you can make use of rebirth, but maybe some can understand why sometimes it's useful not to.

Malcolm wrote:

The main point is that rebirth, dependent origination and karma are keystone doctrines of the Dharma, and need to be understood in that respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Receiving Empowerment: Crash Course

Content:

Motova said:

I had no idea what was going on.

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, no one ever has any idea what is going on in the very first initiation they take. How could they? But with time you will learn. Taking initiations is a skill acquired through repetition. The first initiation I ever received was from HHST, I had no idea what was happening, other than that I could not sit still for longer than a minute, and I really had no comprehension of what he was doing, and it was all in English.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

xabir said:

But you seem to be suggesting here that there is appearances and then there is the mind that cognizes those appearances?

dzogchungpa said:

I'm not an expert, but otherwise wouldn't the vedana skandha, for example, be part of the vijnana skandha?

Malcolm wrote:

Vedana skandha, like saṃjñā skandha, is actually a mental factor (caittas). They both



are named "skandha" for their special power in keeping sentient beings bound to samsara. As objects, they are part of the dharmāyatana/dhātu, along with the saṃskara skandha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

xabir said:

But you seem to be suggesting here that there is appearances and then there is the mind that cognizes those appearances?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally speaking, there are outer objects and sense organs for those objects, presented in the scheme of the twelve āyatanas.

Andrew, Daverupa and so on do not accept higher Mahāyāna tenets, so it is pointless to bring them up here. They consider Mainstream Buddhism more authoritative.

We are talking about what are the minimum tenet requirements of Buddhist view. That necessarily involves privileging Mainstream Buddhist tenets, since they are shared by everyone (with qualification).

This part of the conversation is a sidetrack from the main point — the necessity for maintaining rebirth, dependent origination and karma as mutually related keystone doctrines of Buddhadharma, contra a modernist approach to Buddhism which would abandon these in favor of some sort of materialistic framework.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But these things are not consciousness, they are experienced by consciousness.

daverupa said:

So consciousness is to be understood apart from its content? This seems to get in the way of rise-fall contemplation... e.g. dependent on sense-sphere and sense-content, sense-consciousness arises.

This is in accord with all six senses; it is the case for the All.

Malcolm wrote:

There are cittas and caittas, no? Caittas belong to the dharmāyatana/dhātu, the object of the manāyatana/manodhātu

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Receiving Empowerment: Crash Course

Content:

Motova said:

Did I receive empowerment?

Malcolm wrote:

You received the permission to practice Green Tara, a jenang. You went for refuge, you took bodhisattvas vows with one of the greatest living masters in world. Rather than being disappointed you should be rejoicing.

Even if the whole thing was in english from beginning to end, you still would not have received anything more than that. So count yourself as fortunate.

A jenang does not typically have an elaborate mandala, BTW.

Motova said:

Thanks Malcolm, I get your point. I don't like to be a cry baby, it's just not what I expected.

I had no idea what was going on. How could I have taken bodhisattva vows without even understanding I was taking them? I knew that they would be occurring during the empowerment/transmission because you mentioned so and I had the intent to take them, but when I think of taking vows I think of active participation in the moment.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you had the intent to take them, you recited them in Tibetan following His Holiness, and so you took them. The refuge and the bodhisattva vows would have been just about the first thing you recited, apart from perhaps a Lama dgongs su sol....

The main point is that you received permission to practice Tara, which is what you wanted after all, no? Email me off line if you would like the sadhana to practice.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The fact that blind people who are blind at birth do not dream in images is well established. This is logical proof that consciousness relies on a material base to operate. So.....mental consciousness needs a brain. It's clear and logical.

Malcolm wrote:

Not even slightly. In the case of the five senses, it is generally the case that we consider that consciousness operates through them. But if you propose the brain as material basis of consciousness, just where in the brain is? The whole brain? This can't be the case because if it were, then modifying any part of the part of the brain would modify consciousness -- certainly we can stimulate mood, arousal, fear, etc., by stimulating the brain in this way that. But these things are not consciousness, they are experienced by consciousness.

Andrew108 said:

What is also clear (to me) is that afflicted consciousness must be a 'special type' of consciousness because it doesn't have a specific physical basis. It seems that those proponents of afflicted consciousness view the preceding moment of this consciousness to give rise to subsequent later and different moments of the same consciousness. In effect it is consciousness being both the cause and the result of itself - like riding on your own shoulders. I have doubts about this - I am agnostic about this. I view this as a convention that has weak logic underpinning it. I view a literal interpretation of rebirth as being a convention and under-pinned by weak logic.

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are referring *klṣṭa-mānas*. In fact it does not give rise to itself, but takes as its object the other six consciousnesses, according to the Yogacara model.

Andrew108 said:

There are Sūtric references to this type of consciousness. I regard these references as not definitive (given the argument that I have used previously) and that belief in rebirth has historically been an important device that may have now served its purpose (for certain types of practitioners). Although who knows?

Malcolm wrote:

Neyārtha simple means "interpretable". Nitārtha means "requires no interpretation". There are different uses of these terms in different context. For example, the Avatamska-sūtra refers to itself as the "definitive sūtra for practice". The Akṣayamatinirdeṣa-sūtra establishes that any sūtra which talks about pretty much anything other than emptiness is provisional. I agree with the latter sūtra, of course. However, it does not work to say "science is based on natural laws" for that too is provisional. There are no more natural laws than there are persons, living beings, selves and so on. You cannot have it both ways. You must either stick to your proposed ultimate perspective in which there is no cessation, no arising, no going, no coming and

so on, or come down to earth.

Andrew108 said:

I think if you look at a country like Thailand where belief in rebirth is the consensus you can see it both helps and hinders.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think the Buddha's teaching rebirth hinders anyone. I see it as being salutary in every respect.

Andrew108 said:

There have always been debates and contra-positions within Buddhist traditions. One might say with a certain amount of certainty that there has never been an orthodoxy. So why try to establish one?

Malcolm wrote:

There has never ever been a debate as to whether rebirth was factual or not within the Buddhist tradition until the late 20th century and now in the 21st century, when number of unconscious materialists (unconscious in the sense of being unaware of how ingrained their "scientific" materialism was) became fascinated with Buddhist meditation but could not accept rebirth due to their prior conditioning by logical positivism. For example, a fellow like Buddhadasa could never have even imagined negating rebirth without exposure to western science which occurred because the King of Siam, educated at Harvard in the 19th century, ordered the educational system in Thailand to adopt a western curriculum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who says people born blind never dream in images?

pensum said:

Actually blind people don't dream in images. I went to a talk by Ryan Knighton who wrote a book about his experience of losing his sight and i was surprised to discover that even when a sighted person loses their sight, over time they eventually lose visual memory and the visual component of dreams as well. In fact, Ryan made the point that the blind community don't consider someone truly blind until they no longer have visual dreams. (this is his book: <https://www.amazon.ca/Cockeyed-A-Memoir-Ryan-Knighton/dp/0143051857> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;")

dzogchungpa said:

Interestingly, I recently learned that blind people can experience phosphenes.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this is why in Dzogchen teachings there are thogal techniques even for blind people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who says people born blind never dream in images?

pensum said:

Actually blind people don't dream in images.

Malcolm wrote:

Never, ever?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Receiving Empowerment: Crash Course

Content:

Motova said:

Did I receive empowerment?

Malcolm wrote:

You received the permission to practice Green Tara, a jenang. You went for refuge, you took bodhisattvas vows with one of the greatest living masters in world. Rather than being disappointed you should be rejoicing.

Even if the whole thing was in english from beginning to end, you still would not have received anything more than that. So count yourself as fortunate.

A jenang does not typically have an elaborate mandala, BTW.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Matt J said:

While true, some models work better than others. For example, I would prefer the modern Western medical model over the Medieval Western 4 humors theory as the Western model appears to allow people to live longer.

Malcolm wrote:

Western medical model misses a lot that Unnani Tibb and Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine models don't.

In reality, I, as a physician of Tibetan Medicine, have been able to address conditions [dramatically in some instances] allopaths don't know what do about since they do not have a model to account for many conditions, so they are left untreated by allopaths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

If consciousness contained seeds or habitual tendencies or traces of any kind, then those born blind would be able to dream in images because the traces from previous lives (countless) would be present. But since there is no eye faculty there is no eye consciousness. Would these blind people experience the visions in the bardo? Obviously not. What does this tell you about consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

Who says people born blind never dream in images?

When a person is in the bardo, they have mind-made body with complete faculties, so of course they would experience the visions in the bardo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?

Content:

Matt J said:

How is rebirth unscientific? For that matter, even reincarnation?

Malcolm wrote:

You have to ask those who think it is, people like Andrew108.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm, you haven't debated. My main contention is that consciousness cannot be a stream.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it can be a stream.

Andrew108 said:

If you assert that one moment of consciousness gives rise to the next moment of consciousness

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't assert a single cause for a moment of consciousness. The rest of your refutations are therefore invalid.

Andrew108 said:

In essence what you are doing with rebirth is giving primacy to deluded consciousness by saying that that is where and what the self is and that is why rebirth happens.

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that rebirth happens because a deluded consciousness apprehends a self, in line with some Madhyamakas, since Bhaviveka actually claims that consciousness is what takes rebirth. Other Madhyamakas state that what takes rebirth is the deluded habit of I-making. In any case, no Madhyamaka negates rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

CHNN always stresses respect...

Malcolm wrote:

He also stress respecting the teachings and not importing foreign things into them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So it is necessary consequence that a proper Buddhist view includes rebirth; people who say otherwise are quite simply deluded about what the Dharma is.

pensum said:

and yet... Being reborn in the three dimensions of existence,

All is just a name and a magical illusion  
( rDo rje sems dpa' nam kha' che  
ch.30, Kunjed Gyalpo, pg. 170 in Supreme Source)

Malcolm wrote:

So? This illustrates nothing contradictory at all my fundamental point, which is that as long as one is under the influence of affliction, one will continue to take rebirth in samsara, despite the fact it is a mere name and an illusion.

Moreover, there is nothing in this statement you produce which says anything even slightly different than Prajñānpāramitā in general.

Incidentally, the notion that recognizing "the nature of the mind" is adequate is really a pity. A lot of yogis crash and burn on that one. In fact, recognizing the nature of the mind is not even the path. It is the basis (khregs chod). It is upon that recognition (now we are in Dzogchen land), that one practices the path (thod rgal). And in the case of the bodhicitta text you cite, the path is the two stages, the bodhicitta texts themselves describe the result of the two stages and nothing more. Even ChNN maintains that this is so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

oushi said:

Rebirth is something that requires understanding, not belief, because it takes place here and now through intention. Intention creates new karma, and is the result of old karma. This is the vicious circle of samsara. Some may believe that this intention can transmigrate to another body after death, but even if it doesn't, the problem and techniques used to break this cycle stays the same. If we manage to break it, and the entire old karma is burned, then there is liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need to burn all of our old karma, so to speak. We merely need to interrupt its causes for ripening.

oushi said:

If we attack someone personally, an intention to defend will arise in him. This is not helping anyone, quite contrary, it's creating more karma. There is no understanding, learning and relief during a battle.

Malcolm wrote:

This isn't a battle, this is yet just one more illustration of how Buddhism will either be practiced as the Buddha intended, or be changed into a "non-Buddhism", by abandoning keystone teachings such as karma, rebirth, and so on.



What I have pointed out repeatedly, and few people seem to hear, is that Buddha's model of liberation was elaborated in terms of how many rebirths one would undertake in the desire and form realms before one attained nirvana upon achieving stream-entry.

This is just talking about achieving freedom. We have not even begun to talk about the Mahāyāna path of attaining omniscience, but here we are, having a discussion amongst people of supposedly Mahāyāna persuasions who do not seem to have even the most basic concept of freedom in Buddhism means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Consciousness cannot exist without an object.

Malcolm wrote:

The Kevaddha sutta directly contradicts your thesis, as do countless numbers of Mahāyāna sutras, as well as all of the Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It has already, look at Rigpa, Shambhala, Dzogchen Community, etc.

Minjeay said:

Oh wey, poor, poor traditionalist buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't complaining, merely acknowledging a fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I don't think Malcolm is claiming that the Buddha's realisation was just rebirth.

But the texts detailing his enlightenment do depict him acquiring knowledge of rebirth, along with the noble truths.

Personally, I think it's okay to admit that one doesn't know, but I don't think confident scepticism should be employed prior to fully satisfying oneself of the opponent's arguments.

pensum said:

Malcolm, Dzongsar Khyentse and others have however claimed that accepting rebirth is a necessary condition for being a Buddhist. And yet not even Dharmakirti, let alone they, can present a sound, cogent argument for rebirth or its necessity. Whereas the nature of mind is readily accessible, provable without recourse to any external agent, by its very definition fundamental and hence its realization can be said to be infallible.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem, pensum, is that awakening is not merely understanding the nature of the mind. This is more along the lines of neo-advaita, and those folks. What is necessary for awakening, as described the Buddha, is an insight into dependent origination which causes one to relinquish fetters than bind one to samsaric rebirth.

For example, when reading the

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.135.than.html>, one cannot come away with anything other than the conclusion that Buddha really meant rebirth quite literally when the subject came up.

Or here, where the Buddha discusses cosmology:

"There will be a time, monks, when this world comes to an end.[32] And at that time, beings are generally reborn in the heaven of the Radiant Deities.[33] There they live, made of mind, feeding on joy, radiating light from themselves, traversing the skies, living in glory, and thus they remain for a very long time. When the world comes to an end, monks, these Radiant Deities rank as the highest. But even for the Radiant Deities change takes place, transformation takes place.

— <http://www.accesstoinight.org/lib/authors/nyanaponika/wheel238.html#book-10>

So it is necessary consequence that a proper Buddhist view includes rebirth; people who say otherwise are quite simply deluded about what the Dharma is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

for no one has yet presented consciousness independent of matter...

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did, they are called formless realms...

pensum said:

Okay, then what is the proof for the existence of such formless realms?

Malcolm wrote:

In this case we must rely on śabda pramāṇa, the testimony of reliable witnesses, the generations of awakened people who have experienced such an "sphere" of existence through the four formless āyatana. Why? Because such phenomena are not within the purview of those who have not developed sufficient meditative ability. The same is true of rebirth. Until you yourself attain the abhijñā of recalling past lives, you have to take it on the word of the Buddha, etc., that you have past lives.

So in this case you either accept the authority of the Buddha or you don't. There is nothing sophistic about it. You either accept that ordinary sentient beings with their ordinary powers of cognition are not capable of perceiving certain things or you don't.

In fact, the arguments of materialists that consciousness is a mere epiphenomena of brain function are quite weak and unconvincing. This is not to say that our cognitions are not moulded by our nervous system, because of course they are. That is a necessary consequence of taking a human, animal or so on body. The proof that consciousness could be rooted in material processes can only be shown by the generation of a sentient being through means which do not involve biological reproduction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

for no one has yet presented consciousness independent of matter...

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did, they are called formless realms...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 7:30 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

Furthermore, because a specific material cause is cannot be pinpointed does not lead to the conclusion that there is no material cause, merely that the cause remains inconclusive, unknown or inaccessible.

Malcolm wrote:

One can make the reverse argument for consciousness "because a specific non-material cause for matter is cannot be pinpointed does not lead to the conclusion that there is no non-material cause, merely that the cause remains inconclusive, unknown

or inaccessible."

Its a very vague argument.

If mind and matter arise mutually, or are coemergent, this still does not point to a material cause for mind.

It would not point to a unique cause, but still to a necessary causal factor, for in such a case without matter there would be no consciousness.

In any case, we are talking about the stream of individual consciousness.

<http://www.unm.edu/~rhayes/rebirth.pdf> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

pensum said:

Just wondering but how does one prove conclusively that consciousness does not have a material cause?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, exactly what is the material cause of consciousness? Andrew, among others for example, seem to think it arises in from the brain.

pensum said:

Or that consciousness and matter arise mutually or are coemergent?

Malcolm wrote:

If mind and matter arise mutually, or are coemergent, this still does not point to a material cause for mind.

pensum said:

As this would require presenting consciousness without recourse to any material body or related to any physical sensation or process such as seeing, hearing, thinking. And this evidence would also need to be presented to a pure consciousness independent of any physical sense, such as sound (word), image etc. which seems a tall order.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness without feature,  
without end,

luminous all around:

Here water, earth, fire, & wind  
have no footing.

Here long & short

coarse & fine

fair & foul

name & form  
are all brought to an end.  
With the cessation of [the activity of] consciousness  
each is here brought to an end."

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.11.0.than.html> "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 5:15 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Andrew108 said:  
I understand it and I am very happy with it. Since you can't prove rebirth, not even logically...

Malcolm wrote:  
Of course rebirth can be proven logically once one understands how the Buddha structured the five aggregates.

It is a simple procedure:

Either consciousness has a material cause or it does not have a material cause.

If consciousness has a material cause, then there is no rebirth.

No material cause can be found for consciousness.

If consciousness does not have a material cause, it must have another kind of cause, i.e. a non-material cause. In which case the first moment of consciousness of this life must arise from the previous moment of consciousness of a past life, much as the present moment of consciousness one is experiencing now must have arisen from a previous moment of consciousness.

This is the basic logic used by Dharmakirti to refute materialists.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 1:31 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

JKhedrup said:  
God forbid we should correct anyone. After all, "Buddhism" is like a Montessori school, its not whether you are right or wrong, its how you feel when you did it...

This also points to this alarming new trend of Buddhist students never wanting to have a teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

We live in a society where people trust their peer group more than their elders.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

Oh I buy it alright. I'm just trying to allow for other people to practice as they please without criticism.

Malcolm wrote:

God forbid we should correct anyone. After all, "Buddhism" is like a Montessori school, its not whether you are right or wrong, its how you feel when you did it...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Prasutagus said:

I am just encountering more and more Buddhists that seem to not believe in rebirth and who also don't a problem with any of the logical ramifications of that position. I'm curious how one does that.

Malcolm wrote:

They don't understand the ramifications of their point of view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

I still say that "I just don't buy it" is a completely fine position to take. That's a person's prerogative.

Malcolm wrote:

The question is not what a person's prerogatives are; the question is at what point do our personal biases and convictions render our "Buddhism" a "non-Buddhism?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The descriptions of rebirth are provisional.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are definitive, nges don, they require no interpretation.

If "provisional" means "for some people, these descriptions are not meaningful", then even buddhahood is provisional, even emptiness is provisional. The consequence of your belief is nihilism, both epistemic as well as moral.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

External object is something that is not consciousness itself. If you say that when we die, one moment of consciousness results in another moment of consciousness then you are asserting that consciousness is both cause and effect and that consciousness has potential that is self-generating, self-sustaining.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not, and no one contends that consciousness is self-generating in the manner in which you suggest here. Consciousness is reflexive and can take itself as an object, as in memory, it is also accompanied by a plethora of mental factors, each of which can function as an object for it. Consciousness can be sustained merely through conceptuality, for example, the formless realm beings who are sustained on such ideas a "consciousness only", "Its all emptiness" etc.

Andrew108 said:

Rebirth is an important concept but what has happened is that it has been over elaborated to become an idea that suggests consciousness can move between lives supported by its own energy.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this has not been suggested at all. A given stream of consciousness has attendant factors which support it, with or without a physical body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I agree with what you have written here. I am a Buddhist in every possible sense. It is only when rebirth is mentioned that I tend to take an agnostic position or actually more these days I take the position put forward by some Theravadan practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the ones that go through lots of complicated arguments to try and prove the Buddha just didn't mean what he said on the subject.

Andrew108 said:

What I don't think is right is the pushing of a Buddhist orthodoxy (or any kind of orthodoxy) that says you have to believe in things being a certain way because if you don't then you are not a Buddhist. Or worse when posters imply that one has limited capacity because of not accepting certain things. I mean some practitioners are of the belief that natural phenomena are 'mind phenomena'. Which is their choice.

Malcolm wrote:

Dear boy, there is such a thing as "right view". The most basic element of right view is not rejecting rebirth. After all, the Buddha arrived at the doctrine of dependent origination through recalling more than 90,000 of his own past lives. He very clearly describes this in the Majjhima Nikaya. If you don't accept the Buddha at his word, who will you accept?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Consciousness can't exist without an external object. In the absence of perceiver and perceived what consciousness can exist? In short, consciousness cannot exist as a thing in itself and by itself.

Malcolm wrote:

What are you defining as an external object, something belonging only to the five external material dhātus (rūpa, etc.)?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

ovi said:

I do think that if you reject certain parts of Buddha's teaching you abandon the teaching, but that is because if you consider the Kalama Sutta, you don't have to and if in this



context you do take some things as unreasonable, you do abandon the teaching. There have been schools who have called themselves Buddhist, yet talked about true existent selves. Not abandoning the teaching has been a useful protection against degeneration for 2500 years and hopefully, it will continue to be so. If the Buddha himself said that you don't need to belief in rebirth to follow the Dharma, how can others criticize you for that?

Malcolm wrote:

The Kalamas sūta merely extols the benefit of the four brahma viharas. The latter are not causes of liberation.

ovi said:

All it takes is to realize that Mahayana isn't only necessary to accomplish others' goals, but also your own, that of ultimate enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

There will be no ultimate awakening for someone who rejects the very foundation of Buddhist liberation, i.e., the freedom afflictive rebirth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

ovi said:

Because of that, I don't think the idea of rebirth is useful or necessary to spread the Dharma today, but I'm fine with those who make use of it. The end result is the same, liberation from suffering, realization of emptiness and attainment of full Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sorry, but the notion of rebirth is absolutely critical. Without it, the Buddhist model of liberation is completely useless and makes no sense. Emptiness, absence of self and so on can be found in Western Philosophy, so who would need Buddhism in absence of rebirth? No one, that's who.

ovi said:

If by using analytical meditation or other techniques you understand that emptiness, liberation and bodhicitta are definitely worth realizing, what is the point of lack of faith?

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhicitta is a meaningless sentiment without rebirth.

ovi said:

The only thing constantly doubting and trying to understand things in terms of your own categories and assumptions leads to is downfall.

Malcolm wrote:  
Hence the necessity of rebirth in Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 9:15 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:  
Sherlock said:  
I don't think what I've written is neurotic.

Malcolm wrote:  
In my opinion, Western students express a lot of neurotic anxiety when the term "faith" is broached.

Sherlock said:  
My point is that you don't need to present sraddha/dad pa in terms of "faith" especially to modern people who might be on-the-fence.

Malcolm wrote:  
I don't see much reason to cater to the neurosis of modern people.

Sherlock said:  
I could be wrong, but for beginners, ChNN seems to say that the bare amount of dad pa is that you recognise that there is some value to his teachings and that you try to practise them.

Malcolm wrote:  
Yes, ChNN's approach is perfectly fine. But the fact is that people who get neurotic about the word faith have all kinds of faith in all kinds of things -- it is merely misguided.

As I said, faith in a mental factor, one of the five faculties.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 9:10 PM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:  
Andrew108 said:

"When form is found not to exist, do not cling to the existance of mind!"

"When mind is cognized as existent, do not cling to the non-existence of form."

HH9K

Malcolm wrote:  
Yes, of course, and I will add when mind is cognized a existent, do not cling to the non-

existence of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm, in Dzogchen rebirth is always dgongs pa can.

Malcolm wrote:

First the term is "ldem dgong".

Second, this is not factual. This is not factual with respect the Nikaya teachings either.

For example, there are four types of liberated persons the Buddha mentions in the Agamas/Nikayas: stream entrants, once returners, never returners and arhats (such as the Buddha).

The only people who achieve total freedom in this life in these teachings are Arhats.

Stream entrants must take rebirth in the desire realm for seven lifetimes and so on.

In the case of Dzogchen there are three opportunities to achieve liberation: in this life (only those with the highest capacity), in the bardo (medium down to high average) or in other buddhafiels after taking rebirth there. This is all detailed in such tantras as the Rig pa rang shar and so on.

So it is not the case that rebirth is an teaching with a concealed intent. It is to be taken at face value, as the Buddha taught it in hundreds of places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I can dig up more quotes from Malcolm that confirm this view that there is a transmigrating consciousness. He has stated his position on this many times. You would be hard put to find a TB scholar who disagrees with the view of transmigrating consciousness. They have the Tulku system after all.

Malcolm wrote:

Andrew, you are clearly not understanding the point. There is no transmigrating consciousness, no atman, no unitary consciousness which remains the same through all time. No Tibetan Buddhist teacher maintains that there is.

There is a stream of momentary afflicted consciousnesses, i.e. one moment of consciousness exists in this life (you can even calculate how many such moments a

person who lives for a hundred years will have i.e. a moment of consciousness lasts for seven nano seconds) at the moment of death, it perishes, giving rise the next moment of consciousness in the bardo, where the stream continues for some time, and then, at a certain point, another moment of consciousness 'descends into the womb' i.e. appropriates a new series.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It means that consciousness descends into the womb, in the case of human being, joining with the spermatozoon and oocyte at the moment of conception.

Andrew108 said:

I guess you will say that this is not a description by you of transmigrating consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

No. It is not.

This is a description by the Buddha of the first link of dependent origination (of this life) in the Mahānidāna sūta.

Andrew108 said:

I know the Pali cannon treats this issue differently than other traditions and again there are differences of view within those schools that hold the Pali cannon to be definitive. You can see Buddhadasa Bhikkhu's analysis of Paticcasamuppada and compare that with the descriptions of the same thing within the Tibetan schools. You might come to the conclusion (as I do) that taking a literal view of rebirth (as many do) can be a gross oversimplification.

Malcolm wrote:

The Theravada view is that one take rebirth in the next world immediately upon dying in this one without any bardo at all. Of course, then they have to go through great lengths to explain away what Buddha meant by the gandhabba, but that is their problem.

Anyway, supposedly you are a Dzogchen practitioner. You should understand then that the model of rebirth followed in Dzogchen teachings in the Sautrantika/Yogacara model, as described in the beginning of the third chapter of the Abhidharmakoshaśāstra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherlock said:

Faith/confidence is developed through practice IMO.

Malcolm wrote:

Faith is a mental factor, as well as being the very first of the 37 adjuncts of awakening. We don't really need to bring a lot of neurotic anxiety to bear on the word. Having faith IS having confidence in something.

Faith is also one the ten positive mental factors, so if you are experiencing faith, you cannot be experiencing a negative mind. This is why people of faith, whether it be in Dharma, Krishna, or Karl Marx in general are more positive than people who have no faith at all.

Of course, when you have faith, in order for it be effective in taking you out of samsara, from the perspective of Dharma, the object is important. Having faith in a teaching is good, having faith in a teacher is better. Of course, it does not start as perfectly formed, it requires cultivation — but without faith, no path is possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Beginning a Ngöndro

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Mind if you do what? Start another thread? Have at it, by all means.

Does anyone here know of other texts, either classical or contemporary, that deal specifically with the Four Reminders? Any other treatises on Ngöndro? Feel free to mention transcripts of a certain lama's teachings --- Khenpo Karthar Rinpoche's Ngondro Commentary available thru Namse Bangdzo is particularly good if you need specifics on Karma Kagyu, now that I think about it...

Malcolm wrote:

I am in the process of translating the Sakya Ngondro commentary. It has a very extensive section on the four common preliminaries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

He is talking about the first of the five indriyas on the path. sraddha. Without sraddha, the path is impossible. In English, the first definition of faith is "complete trust or confidence in someone or something".

You need that if you are going to practice a path.

Yes, however people differ as to what may initially inspire confidence in them. For some it is history, for others it is meeting a teacher, for the next guy it is philosophy, etc. For people like us that part is completely individual karma.

Plus as one progresses there is a positive feedback loop. So there's a bit more to than just what you said.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, in order to start on the path, you need to know one clear thing, you are suffering, you want a way out and you have confidence that the path leads out of suffering. The Ratnālokaśūtra states:

Faith goes before, like a mother giving birth,  
producing and increasing all qualities,  
removes fears, and crosses rivers,  
faith shows the way to the city of bliss...

So first of all, to set out on the Buddhist path, you need faith. Until you have faith, you are not on the path in any meaningful way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Sherlock said:

I like how in English, ChNN usually talks about the first of the Five Faculties in terms of "interest" and "confidence" rather than faith. I don't know if it's an accurate translation, but it seems to be a good upaya. You don't necessarily have to have faith in the beginning, in him or the teaching, the fact that you are attending his retreat or watching the webcast means that you have some level of interest. As you do practice more and more you gain confidence in the teaching (and in him, although he is self-effacing and never says that).

Malcolm wrote:

He is talking about the first of the five indriyas on the path. *śraddha*. Without *śraddha*, the path is impossible. In English, the first definition of faith is "complete trust or confidence in someone or something".

You need that if you are going to practice a path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 7:08 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm, you have talked about transmigrating consciousness many times.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you did not understand what I was saying.

Let's put it this, no consciousness transmigrated from yesterday until today, but still you have memories, and so on. You account for this continuity by imagining that consciousness is located in the brain. I don't. Therefore, for you rebirth is impossible, while for me it isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The equivalent concept in Theravada would be bhavanga citta.

And no, since Madhyamakas also accept a serial continuity of consciousness.

Andrew108 said:

If we are talking about rebirth then I guess the term to use in the Theravadan context would be patisandhi. This notion is quite different from the idea of disembodied consciousness moving between births.

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever said an integral consciousness moved from one life to another? That is not consistent with what the Buddha taught.

A serial continuity of consciousness means exactly what the patisandhi concept in Theravada is talking about.

Conventionally, the Buddha often states in many suttas so and so disappears from this world, and appears in the next. But when we really dig down, we discover the real point is that there is a "rosary" of moments of conscious each one the cause of the next, each one the result of the previous one.

The point is that if someone does not believe in rebirth, karma and so on, there is little point in their studying or practicing any form of Buddhism whether Theravada, Zen or Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Ground consciousness? Don't you just love Yogachara? It's almost like you are saying that you have to be a Yogacharin to be a Buddhist. Something I would disagree with.

Malcolm wrote:

The equivalent concept in Theravada would be bhavanga citta.

And no, since Madhyamakas also accept a serial continuity of consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, you just have to accept that there is a stream of afflicted consciousness which continually appropriates aggregates until it is no longer afflicted.

Andrew108 said:

Ah the 7th consciousness. That which you can't really do much about. The one that stays with you until you reach level 7 on the bodhisattva scale. So that is the thing I have to believe in. O.k.

Malcolm wrote:

That would be the eighth, ālayavijñāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

. . . some Lamas like KDL would recite the empowerment mantras from the extended seven line prayer, for example. . .

dakini\_boi said:

What is the "extended seven line prayer"?

Malcolm wrote:

It is the one that has the request for the four empowerments amended to it.



Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 12:54 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Andrew108 said:

We are training all the time to see the self as illusory. Materialism doesn't locate a self in the material. That's a fact. But to be a genuine Buddhist I now have to believe in an afflicted self that takes rebirth.

theanarchist said:

Nope, (at least according to mahayana) you have to believe in the two truths. Relative and absolute truth, what their properties are (and are not) and how they are connected.

Andrew108 said:

There are lots of different yanas and there is always something to believe in. However the experience of not finding self is fundamental.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that there is no innate self is not particularly Buddhist, for example, David Hume figured that out all on his own. But his notion of the absence of self is not liberative.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 12:53 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation means freedom from rebirth. Anyone who does not accept rebirth cannot seriously practice any Buddhist path since liberation in Buddhism is predicated on freedom from rebirth in samsara.

saraswati said:

Last week I heard a talk where it was said that Tulku Ugyen Rinpoche gave pith instructions to people from a variety of religious backgrounds, including Catholic monastics, and many such people experienced <...>. Thus, it seems to me that explicit belief in some important Buddhist ideas isn't totally necessarily for progress on the Buddhist path. But it may stop being able to label such people as Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

TUR even gave direct introduction to materialists. It's called creating positive traces so that people in future lives will have the opportunity to meet with the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who does not accept rebirth cannot seriously practice any Buddhist path since liberation in Buddhism is predicated on freedom from rebirth in samsara.

Andrew108 said:

So I have to believe that a conditioned 'self' gets reborn in order to be liberated from conditioned 'self'?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, you just have to accept that there is a stream of afflicted consciousness which continually appropriates aggregates until it is no longer afflicted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation for them is irrelevant. Any practice that they do will necessarily be for this life.

Andrew108 said:

Of course practice has to be for this life. Why practice for later? Liberation is freedom from suffering rather than a transcendent state.

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation means freedom from rebirth. Anyone who does not accept rebirth cannot seriously practice any Buddhist path since liberation in Buddhism is predicated on freedom from rebirth in samsara.

Andrew108 said:

You need to say explicitly why I can't be a Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

You can be a "Buddhist", it just doesn't make much sense since you disagree with the very foundation of Buddha's teachings, i.e. serial afflicted rebirth.

Andrew108 said:

Seriously, what can you get that I can't?

Malcolm wrote:

You don't need to worry about that, its none of your concern. As far as you are

concerned given how you have defined the mind elsewhere, when you die, with the the death of your brain your cognition is extinguished, and your mind as well, .

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

pemachophel said:

Is poti lung wang something like ka-tad? Malcolm, can you explain ka-tad in terms of lung, ti, and wang?

Malcolm wrote:

Its the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Ordination in Mahayana

Content:

Huifeng said:

While you mention "... in Japan, say...", the Mahayana tradition also covers China.

Malcolm wrote:

And Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

ngodrup said:

I received a "Potri wang" one time in which the Lama used a computer hard drive.

pensum said:

Ah, we forgot to mention this type earlier, so perhaps Malcolm will be so kind as to explain exactly what a guidance manual empowerment ( pod khrid dbang ) is and its purpose.

Malcolm wrote:

A poti lung dbang is part of a larger empowerment used to grant permission to read and transmit a text (usually the root text of the cycle) without having to go to the effort of actually doing so. In this case then, some Lamas like KDL would recite the empowerment mantras from the extended seven line prayer, for example, and give an

abhisheka for a text in this way, in a very condensed way, he would call this the dpe dbang. He actually did this for whole collections of texts such as the Rinchen Terdzod and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I think a materialist can have a keen appreciation of the value of life.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Andrew108 said:

A materialist for instance has no need to reject the 4 thoughts or the principle of dependent origination. Nor do they have to disavow themselves of the view of karma. They would see the 12 links as referring to personal causality. Rebirth is a bit of a problem. At most I think I would say that I am agnostic. Reduction of kleshas is high on the agenda of a materialist who appreciates Buddhist practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation for them is irrelevant. Any practice that they do will necessarily be for this life.

Andrew108 said:

Remember too that materialists have developed democratic political philosophies.

Malcolm wrote:

My critique of physicalism is confined to the fact that it makes no sense whatsoever for people who reject rebirth to consider themselves Buddhists, since of necessity they automatically the liberation which the Buddha taught.

Andrew108 said:

But anyhow when it comes to Buddhist practice, being a materialist is not a problem at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Materialists can benefit from the four brahmaviharas and a bit of shamatha. But that's about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Indrajala said:

With respect to materialism, I acknowledge that it is incompatible with the basic premises of the Buddha's teachings, though that being said I think we should be sympathetic to our contemporaries who express an interest in Buddhist philosophy yet have lingering reservations given their propensities towards materialism and/or logical positivism. Most of us are educated with materialism as the default worldview.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I feel sorry for such people, standing at the window with their nose pressed to the glass.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Regardless of whether one chooses a faith based or more intellectual approach, whether one is a MENSA member or a simple farmer, the guidance of a teacher is essential for a proper practice of Buddhism.

Indrajala said:

I don't think that's universally true.

Malcolm wrote:

It is universally true.

Indrajala said:

While book learning, doubt, questioning and analysis are laudable, without guidance of a teacher to use those things to bring pressure to bear on the delusions, there is a danger that Dharma becomes merely an intellectual or soteriological pursuit rather than a process of transformation.

That's an unfair assessment. You can transform yourself for the better through reading and implementing what is found in the sūtras, with or without a teacher supervising you.

Malcolm wrote:

I have never observed that this is really the case. What I have seen is a lot of autodidactic Buddhists puff themselves up with arrogance. It is a pity because their ego prevents them from connecting with an authentic practice lineage.

Indrajala said:

A lot of intellectuals...

Malcolm wrote:

...have their heads firmly planted where the sun never shines.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Varahamihira lived squarely in the six century. Vasubandu, the fourth. It is not unreasonable to understand that prior to Varahamihira there was sophisticated knowledge of math and astronomy amongst Buddhists. Calendar making is an important thing.

Indrajala said:

Again this suggests to me many Buddhists in India accepted the flat earth Mt. Meru model as literally true. They had accurate knowledge of astronomy, but not cosmography and geography.

Malcolm wrote:

The Surya Siddhanta, as well as one of Vedas, asserts it is a ball.

Indrajala said:

You say "Indian Buddhists" -- do you mean all of them?

Malcolm wrote:

From third century onward, at the very least. Secular arts did not seem to be much of a concern until well after Ashoka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

smcj said:

Or you could skip all that, open your mind, and posit the possibility that The Buddha actually saw the Truth as it pertains to the path towards enlightenment. (Unfortunately that would require that you somehow understand your way of looking at things is flawed though.) Your choice.

Indrajala said:

The problem is that we actually don't know for sure what the Buddha actually taught as the truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course we do, he taught that afflicted people take rebirth in samsara because of their afflictions, and provided remedies for those afflictions in the form of śīla, samadhi, and prajñā so they would stop doing so.

Indrajala said:

Deference to scripture doesn't work because Buddhist scripture does not qualify as a historical witness to circa fifth century BCE Magadha. Consequently examining the chronological development of Buddhist traditions and discerning common features amongst the diverging traditions therein might be the optimal way of identifying what best represents Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

The best representation of Buddhadharma is a qualified teacher.

Indrajala said:

The faith based approach you are advocating doesn't work for everyone. If it works for you, that's fine, but understand that some prefer a more intellectually rigorous approach to their Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is the approach of forensic historians. But they don't generally practice.

Indrajala said:

Even if you say this doesn't produce realization, then what is the alternative? Tell them to just have faith and force themselves to practice something they have no faith in?

Malcolm wrote:

You can see very clearly that it doesn't produce realization. So there is no alternative.

If you don't have faith in the Buddha's teaching, your time is better spent elsewhere. That's just common sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 8:09 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

smcj has a very excellent point, that is why it is important to distinguish the difference between the cadaver called "Buddhism", which forensic historians like Schopen, et al perform an autopsy on for a living, and Buddhadharma, the practice of transforming oneself from an afflicted person into an awakened person.

Matt J said:

This statement sounds a lot like fundamentalism to me.

smcj said:

Basically, I'm calling for an evidence based approach

An evidence based approach to what? You can amass all the evidence you want, but then all you will have is a mass of evidence. If you're going to court, that's fine. But in terms of Dharma practice, the best that you could hope for would be to have all your objections overcome and all your preconditions met. At that point, in theory, you would

finally be ready to Take Refuge. Dharma is about people evolving towards realization.

Or you could skip all that, open your mind, and posit the possibility that The Buddha actually saw the Truth as it pertains to the path towards enlightenment. (Unfortunately that would require that you somehow understand your way of looking at things is flawed though.) Your choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 6:29 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm you haven't given a precise location you have given a general location. So now you understand the analogy? You haven't been able to say exactly where because the heartbeat 'happens' in different places within the same organ. But you can still give the heartbeat a general location. You know it is not happening in your big toe or just in your left ventricle.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it happens exactly when the ventricles eject their contents and that is also where.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is actually my point -- the cosmologies in the Kośa and other texts which describe levels of devas and so on do not correspond with Indian math and astronomy.

Indrajala said:

What do we know about Indian math and astronomy from the era of Vasubandhu?

Malcolm wrote:

Varahamihira lived squarely in the six century. Vasubandhu, the fourth. It is not unreasonable to understand that prior to Varahamihira there was sophisticated knowledge of math and astronomy amongst Buddhists. Calendar making is an important thing.

Indrajala said:

The best place where we see this is in the Kalacakra. There really very little evidence to show that Indians really took such cosmologies like those presented in the Kośa completely literally.

Your conclusions are problematic. The Kālacakra and Kośa are separated by six or seven centuries. Some Indians when the Kālacakra was composed in the first years of the



eleventh century did not take the earlier Kośa model literally. How does this amount to "show that Indians really took such cosmologies like those presented in the Kośa completely literally"? This is an essentialist conclusion.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? What I am saying here is that Kalacakra shows that Indian Buddhists did not take the Kośa cosmology literally. Calculation, which really means astronomy and calendar making, among other things, was mentioned in the Mahāyāna sūtrāṃkara as a necessary art for a bodhisattva to learn.

Indrajala said:

If you are an Indian Buddhist astronomer, you will quickly understand that the cosmology of the Kośa is clearly untenable.

Right, but how many Indian Buddhist astronomers were around when the bulk of major Abhidharma texts were composed, such as the Kośa? Even if there were Buddhist astronomers, why would they have had any say in the writings on Mt. Meru cosmology?

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that Meru Cosmology is a moral cosmology, not a literal one. Vasubandhu even rejects the conventional existence of the hells realms in his Yogacara treatises.

Indrajala said:

Basically, I'm calling for an evidence based approach, though you've already denigrated such an approach, so perhaps this discussion will not prove fruitful.

Malcolm wrote:

It's great if you want a job as an intellectual ghoul or a ghoulish intellectual.

The only evidence based approach to Dharma that counts for a practitioner however is practice.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

But if I ask you where exactly in the heart is the heartbeat? Yo will struggle to give me a precise location.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all:

Each beat of the heart involves five major stages. The first two stages, often considered together as the "ventricular filling" stage, involve the movement of blood from the atria

into the ventricles. The next three stages involve the movement of blood from the ventricles to the pulmonary artery (in the case of the right ventricle) and the aorta (in the case of the left ventricle)...The fourth stage, "ventricular ejection," is when the ventricles are contracting and emptying, and the semilunar valves are open. During the fifth stage, "isovolumic relaxation time", pressure decreases, no blood enters the ventricles, the ventricles stop contracting and begin to relax, and the semilunar valves close due to the pressure of blood in the aorta.

The fourth and fifth stage is where that actual "beat" that you feel exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Which part of the mind does pride reside in?

Malcolm wrote:

Pride is a mental factor (caitta) that arises with the mind (citta), it is not located "in" the mind. Actually it is "in" the dharmadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

People have a right to challenge whatever they want. But sooner or later, when they challenge too much, they stop being buddhists and become ex-buddhists.

Indrajala said:

Some people go through phases where they don't feel like being Buddhists any longer, and maybe even announce this to everyone, but they bounce back. No big deal.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends, some people have decided that "Buddhism" is a stinking cadaver dissected in the academy by intellectual ghouls (or ghoulish intellectuals take your pick), and decide what they really are following is Buddhadharma. But of course in common dialogue, they may also use conventions like "Buddhist".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Indrajala said:

In the case of Buddhist Abhidharma, why provide such detailed numbers for measurements if they were largely structured metaphorically?

Or in the case of the Sūrya Siddhanta or other Indian astronomical texts, why provide empirically verifiable measurements for planetary diameters and distances (many of these check out as largely accurate by modern standards too)?

Malcolm wrote:

That is actually my point -- the cosmologies in the Kośa and other texts which describe levels of devas and so on do not correspond with Indian math and astronomy.

The best place where we see this is in the Kalacakra. There really very little evidence to show that Indians really took such cosmologies like those presented in the Kośa completely literally.

The cosmologies provided a moral universe, locations for rebirth. Astronomy provided a way of creating somewhat accurate calendars. If you were an Indian Buddhist astronomer, you would have quickly understand that the cosmology of the Kośa is clearly untenable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I on other hand really don't have any problem at all with the Buddha teaching about the Indra's palace on Meru, hell realms and so on. I don't see any real need to modernize Buddhism or make it "evidence" based.

Indrajala said:

I don't have any problems with traditional cosmologies and mythology either, though I accept this won't be acceptable to everyone in this era when empirical rationalism is the ideology of choice amongst leading intellectuals.

When the age of rationalism passes we'll still have our cosmologies and mythology.

Malcolm wrote:

One either has the karma to practice authentic Dharma or not. We have no need to make anything acceptable to anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and that is his prerogative. But he is not the boss of Tibetan Buddhism, he is just one lama.

Indrajala said:

He is also arguably the foremost representative of Tibetan Buddhism. So, his opinion does count for a lot in practice since many Buddhists and non-Buddhists alike respect his views.

Malcolm wrote:

The foremost representative of Tibetan Buddhism is one's own Guru.

He is the foremost representative of Tibetans, not necessarily of Tibetan Buddhism. That being said, I am a big fan of HHDL. But I am not so interested in his science dialogues.

Indrajala said:

Really the point is that the dialogue between scientists and Buddhists by request of the Dalai Lama is proceeding and is an interesting chapter in Buddhist history

Malcolm wrote:

It is mostly a dry hump, politics.

Indrajala said:

Really the point is that if someone wants to be more empirical in their approach to Buddhism, then it should be accepted and they have the right to challenge beliefs, especially those based on deference to texts or authorities.

Malcolm wrote:

People have a right to challenge whatever they want. But sooner or later, when they challenge too much, they stop being buddhists and become ex-buddhists.

Indrajala said:

The truth is that śabda-pramana is highly problematic now because of the new scholarship which has revealed the multifaceted development behind Buddhist scriptures. It isn't enough to just declare them buddha-vacana and leave it at that.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a problem at all. There are many kinds of Buddhavacana, direct, permitted, blessed, etc. Then of course there is the notion that whatever is well spoken and corresponds with the Dharma in general can be considered Buddhavacana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:  
Norwegian said:  
Indrajala,

The same person, His Holiness the Dalai Lama, rejects the cosmology chapter of the Abhidharmakosha. He doesn't reject karma, dependent origination, rebirth, and so on however.

Malcolm wrote:  
Jeff is just busting my balls for telling Andrew that he is being very selective about those things he thinks to Buddha said are true and those that are false.

I on other hand really don't have any problem at all with the Buddha teaching about the Indra's palace on Meru, hell realms and so on. I don't see any real need to modernize Buddhism or make it "evidence" based.

All of these things exist within the human body, so of course they have external correlates.

I also still stand by my general contention that Indians were not that obsessed about their cosmologies, and that they were largely structured metaphorically.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 5:34 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
There is a Mt. Meru and four continents. I don't reject the cosmology of ancients Buddhists in the manner in which you imagine. Their picture of the world was grounded on the world. Uttarakuru is exactly where Ptolemy and so on described the people called the Kurus as living and so on.

What I reject is the Kośa cosmology, the way things are described in the Kośa.

M

Indrajala said:  
And do you believe Indra's palace was/is atop Mt. Meru?

Malcolm wrote:  
Sure, why not. He has to live somewhere. Might as well be there. He certainly does not have a pad in Manhattan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares if a bunch of worldly intellectuals takes us seriously?

Indrajala said:

Clearly figures like the Dalai Lama, who dialogues with representatives of neuroscience and seems to care about their opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and that is his prerogative. But he is not the boss of Tibetan Buddhism, he is just one lama.

Quite frankly, the mind-science thing is really a dead end. Has been for years.

It is one thing to be interested in this or that, it is quite another to imagine that "evidence-based" reality is real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, you can choose to consider that version the definitive one. But I don't. I don't think the Buddha presented a definitive cosmology.

Indrajala said:

Now you're just justifying your own selective thinking about what to accept and reject with respect to what the Buddha taught.

It is pretty clear the Buddha's cosmology included Mt. Meru and the four continents. If you reject this based on modern evidence to the contrary, then admit this and concede you are selective about some aspects of the Buddha's teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a Mt. Meru and four continents. I don't reject the cosmology of ancients Buddhists in the manner in which you imagine. Their picture of the world was grounded on the world. Uttarakuru is exactly where Ptolemy and so on described the people called the Kurus as living and so on.

What I reject is the Kośa cosmology, the way things are described in the Kośa.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Indrajala said:

Nowadays in both science and the humanities we have to rely almost exclusively on evidence based approaches otherwise few intellectuals will take us seriously. The revealed testimonies of mystics just doesn't cut it for modern thinkers.

Malcolm wrote:

I already addressed this: this is just a throwback to the Carvaka rejection of inference etc., as pramāṇas.

Who cares if a bunch of worldly intellectuals takes us seriously?

Buddhadharma is only practiced by those with the karma to meet it and practice it. That is what it means to have a "precious human birth". We have no need to convince anyone of anything. We are not on a campaign to ensure that the academy "Takes us seriously". They never have anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha is presented as teaching several different cosmologies. Which one are we to consider definitive?

Indrajala said:

The general model where the world is flat with four continents and a big mountain in the middle atop which Indra lives.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, you can choose to consider that version the definitive one. But I don't. I don't think the Buddha presented a definitive cosmology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't reject the fact that Indians conceived that Meru lay somewhere to the north of India.

Indrajala said:

But you selectively reject Mt. Meru cosmology as taught by the Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha is presented as teaching several different cosmologies. Which one are we to consider definitive?

Now, if it turns out that there really is a ring of iron mountains surrounding our world system to keep the stench of the rotting corpse hell from instantly annihilating all of us, well, then I will be very grateful for all the combined merit of sentient beings that keeps those mountains standing.

My point, is that I don't think the Indians, Buddha included, with their penchant for exaggeration necessarily took their own speculations about such things as Meru as representing some absolutely objective presentation.

On the other hand, there is considerable evidence that Buddha took other things very seriously, such as rebirth.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you see the thing is that you are very selective about what you think the Buddha that is accurate, and what the Buddha said that was not.

Indrajala said:

Don't you reject Mt. Meru cosmology, which in fact the Buddha taught?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't reject the fact that Indians conceived that Meru lay somewhere to the north of India.

We also need to keep in mind that ancient Indians certainly regarded Meru as a mytho-poetic place, as is born out by the multiple cosmologies we find among Indian texts, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist.

I do not think that Indians feverishly adhered to their various cosmologies literally as Tibetans, and so on did. For one thing, Indians were awfully good at astronomy, and Meru cosmology as presented in the Kośa for example, certainly conflicts with Indian astronomical treatises written near the same time. No Buddhist mathematician working on calendars could have squared their calculations with the motion of the sun and



moon around Meru as described. This is quite evident when the calculations in the Kalacakra are analyzed and then compared with the modified Meru Cosmology presented in the Kalacakra. See Henning, Kalacakra and the Tibetan Calendar.

I consider the Kośa cosmology anachronistic, and see no need to take it literally. There are also several cosmologies in Buddhist texts, not only one.

But when I do Mandala offerings, I definitely visualize the universe in that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

smcj said:

Habits are actions, SM CJ, that is the point. There is nothing within the materialist paradigm to suggest that a wealthy person will become impoverished through his stinginess, and so on as a direct and infallible moral consequence of that act. No, the materialist paradigm does not allow for such.

However Dharma paradigm allows for the action to effect the actor. Repeated action even more powerfully so. This same facet of karma explains both how repeated actions can create a drug addict or a virtuoso violinist. If someone can relate to those teachings they should be allowed to use them as a basis for further consideration.

Malcolm wrote:

I never preclude someone from considering the Dharma more deeply, in fact I encourage it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The experience of karma for me is very specific, direct and obvious.

Malcolm wrote:

Since you don't believe in rebirth, being a physicalist, you hold an essentialist view of the mind, i.e. that it is in the brain somehow. For you, karma is irrelevant, as is Buddhadharma.

Andrew108 said:

Well you are painting quite a picture. I have said that I don't see how the usual logic that is advanced for rebirth is a definitive answer. I simply don't know about rebirth except that I won't be around to experience it - although there may be some depersonalised 'I'

that continues and experiences but it won't be 'me'. I don't see mind or consciousness as somehow floating free of the body or being beyond the ALL. For what the ALL means then see my signature.

Malcolm wrote:

In the first part of the bardo you will have a subtle body that looks exactly like the one you have now, you will at first wonder why no one hears you or sees you, and so on, and this continues for the first couple of weeks. Eventually, you figure out that you died. Then, you take on the form of the kind of body you will have in your next rebirth, etc. This is all very clearly described by our teacher, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, in Birth, Life and Death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you. I just want to point out that I in no way conflate "science", which is a practice, with "scientific materialism", which is a belief system.

Prasutagus said:

As someone trained as a scientist, this type of conversation gets heavily leveraged by assumptions as to what science is and is not.

There aren't physical laws scribbled onto the side of the box the universe came in, and if we look hard enough, we'll find the box, and thus the laws, and \*poof\* know how things work. It doesn't work that way. What we call "physical laws" are really conceptual schema for describing subjective experiences of the world. Those laws become more refined as our subjective experience of the world becomes more refined through the use of technologies.

The scientist is able to fall into the fault of physicalism every bit as much as the Buddhist. Scientists will often talk about these conceptual schema as if they actually exist. Nobody has seen an electron but we talk about them as they exist, not to mention quarks, photons and other inventions to describe phenomena. We talk about matter as if it's real, even though, from a physical sense it is made of point quanta and that everything that we really experience is the interactions between the quanta and not the point quanta. Turn everything off and it collapses onto a single point.

If physicalism is a dead end for the scientist, it certainly is for the Buddhist. Trying to reconcile Buddhism with the physicalist dead end of the intellectually naive scientist is no virtue.

Regarding quantum mechanics-- we can roll two ways with that, and I think that's pertinent to this discussion.

The basis of QM is that observations are non-commutative. That means it depends upon whether we measure something's position in one direction before the momentum in another, and so on. This is the Heisenberg uncertainty principle. We can look at that in two ways. One, this is how the quantum world behaves upon observation. As such, we can say this is a property of the geometry or space that things exist in. The flip side of that is that we can say this is how consciousness operates when observing things small enough and discrete enough to notice. QM is then really describing mind, and mind is more fundamental than all these little quanta.

No, Virginia, there is no physical reality separate from mind, and many scientists are coming to see that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

What we need to accept are the methods he gives us for getting this direct experience of mind/cognition. But that is another issue entirely.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as you think that cognition is in the brain, for that long you will not be able to have a direct experience of your own cognition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

smcj said:

Karma has to do with the moral repercussions of actions motivated by affliction on the person themselves in terms of how it affects the circumstances of their own life. The essentialist, physicalist model of reality precludes karma automatically.

Do you say that habit & such are not included in the teachings of karma? I believe it is under the heading of "consequences that reflects the germ of the act". If so, then what A108 is taking as his (current) interpretation could be seen as a correct, albeit partial, understanding of the whole theory. These days Newtonian physics is still seen as legitimate, but just not the whole story.

Malcolm wrote:

Habits are actions, SMCJ, that is the point. There is nothing within the materialist paradigm to suggest that a wealthy person will become impoverished through his stinginess, and so on as a direct and infallible moral consequence of that act.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 2:52 AM  
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism  
Content:

Andrew108 said:  
My understanding is informed by direct experience. .

Malcolm wrote:  
Classically in India, materialists (but not Buddhists and so forth) only accepted direct perception as authoritative. However, the Buddha held that there were three authorities: direct perception, inference, and testimony of reliable witnesses.

I merely point this out to suggest to you that your thinking does not really fit within the fold of Buddhist teaching.

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 2:17 AM  
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind  
Content:

Andrew108 said:  
Oh o.k. Now I understand. Yes you can find cognition - in the sense that you can understand and recognise it's characteristics. You can't find it as a thing by itself. Understanding it's characteristics is just the beginning. It's not like recognizing it means that you reach an end point.

Malcolm wrote:  
No, that's the end point, i.e. "Mind is in the brain", boom!

In reality, your solution, the physicalist one, runs "There mind cannot be found in terms of color, shape or form because there is no mind. What we call "mind" is an epiphenomena of information processes that reside in the brain", end of story.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 2:13 AM  
Title: Re: karma bully  
Content:

Andrew108 said:  
The experience of karma for me is very specific, direct and obvious.

Malcolm wrote:  
Since you don't believe in rebirth, being a physicalist, you hold an essentialist view of

the mind, i.e. that it is in the brain somehow. For you, karma is irrelevant, as is Buddhadharma.

smcj said:

I don't think that is fair to say. The teachings on karma do include habits and such, which is readily experiential. If someone does not feel comfortable extrapolating out beyond that, it's ok. Perhaps in another lifetime they will. But for now their view isn't mistaken, just limited.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma has to do with the moral repercussions of actions motivated by affliction on the person themselves in terms of how it affects the circumstances of their own life. The essentialist, physicalist model of reality precludes karma automatically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The ability to see other realms isn't possible.

Malcolm wrote:

For you it isn't. For a Buddha, it is.

Andrew108 said:

You are right about me. As for the Buddha then I don't know. I guess it is a matter of faith. And you are entitled to have faith. That is your right.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you see the thing is that you are very selective about what you think the Buddha that is accurate, and what the Buddha said that was not. For example, you believe the Buddha about the value of mindfulness, but you don't believe the Buddha when he gives accounts of his memory of his own past lives, his abilities to see into other realms or talk with "supernatural" beings like devas and so on.

I would say that your understanding of Dharma is molded to fit with your present world view, which is founded on a basis of scientific materialism. Now as far as it goes, this is perfectly fine and I have no objection. However, when you speak as if you are an authority on Buddhadharma and enunciate some of the interpretations of his teachings that you do, well...that is a completely different story.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: What is "mind" in mahamudra

Content:

catlady2112 said:

I have been doing Thrangu Rinpoche's mahamudra meditations on locating and observing "the mind," and examining what appears in the mind. I have 2 questions about the meaning of the word "mind" in this context:

1) Does mind mean "all" of these things below (and possibly more I am not considering).

- The thing/experience I have that is aware of the coming and going of thoughts?
- The thing/experience I have that is still present when there are no thoughts?
- The experience I have of being unaffected by thoughts?

2) Based on the 3 elements I've listed above, are these also considered the "nature" of mind ?

Thanks for your help! (I'm rephrasing an earlier question I didn't ask clearly enough to address my root question)

Malcolm wrote:

You should ask your teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Holding a deterministic view of Kamma isn't helpful in my view. In fact, as I mentioned before, I see it as akin to a crime against humanity. If you follow this deterministic interpretation then you can't help but be in a position of indifference and then worse, a moral certitude that blames the victim.

asunthatneversets said:

I don't see that anyone has suggested determinism in this thread. Determinism would require inherent causes giving rise to inherent effects, however if you understand karma it is understood that this isn't the case. Ironically, you are the one who is advocating for inherent natural laws, which is just about as close to determinism as you're going to get.

Malcolm wrote:

I honestly do not know why we have to again and again remove people's misconceptions about this. I wish people would take the time to study these things properly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The experience of karma for me is very specific, direct and obvious.

Malcolm wrote:

Since you don't believe in rebirth, being a physicalist, you hold an essentialist view of the mind, i.e. that it is in the brain somehow. For you, karma is irrelevant, as is Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Holding a deterministic view of Kamma isn't helpful in my view.

Malcolm wrote:

For as long as one has not overcome one's afflictions, for that long one will be subject to the rounds of rebirth. When one overcomes one's afflictions, one will no longer be subject to the rounds of rebirth and the ripening of karma, both positive and negative.

The Buddhist teaching of karma is not deterministic in any ultimate sense; but as long as one has not freed oneself from the three poisonous afflictions, one will still be subject to the effects of the fruit of actions committed while under their influence. For example, a bad king may not have an inherent position, but he and his evil ministers still dominate the subjects. But when the bad king is overthrown, his evil ministers lose their power too, and the subjects are free from their rule. Likewise, we are not inherently afflicted, but we are still dominated by afflictions. When we throw off our afflictions, the king, also we are free from his evil ministers, the result of afflicted actions.

But this is not deterministic. In order for the Buddha's teaching to be deterministic, one would have imagine that afflictions were inherent, but there is nothing in Dharma that states this is so, and quite a lot that rejects it.

What is stated is that karma is unerring, and will always ripen as long as conditions for its ripening are present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha clearly explained that one's karma follows one through lifetime after lifetime like a shadow that follows a bird.

saraswati said:

But... what is the "one" that is followed? What is the bird? Or is the shadow itself the bird?

Malcolm wrote:

The one that is followed is the kleshas which are responsible for assembling the skandhas over and over again in every lifetime, what follows are the actions motivated by those kleshas, which ripens as afflicted body, speech and mind.

Buddha taught it is permissible to refer to the five aggregates as "a self" or "a person", with the understanding that the five aggregates do not constitute a real self which endures over lifetimes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The ability to see other realms isn't possible.

Malcolm wrote:

For you it isn't. For a Buddha, it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Natural law means that nature or reality has characteristics that are observable or applicable in every case.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is the sort of irreducibility that is meant by "ultimate". Such laws are inviolable even by a Buddha. For example, there is no way the Buddha could have any of the psychic powers he claimed for himself, such as the ability read minds, see into other realms and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Berry said:

genetic illnesses ?



Malcolm wrote:

Genetic illnesses, deformities, etc., are by definition karmic diseases.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Andrew108 said:

You may have noticed that I haven't denied that individual beings have their own continuum of causality that is specific to them. But it is at the level of mental reasoning and habitual tendencies that kamma gets played out.

Malcolm wrote:

No, sensations which are a result of negative action are exclusively physical; whereas sensations that are result of positive actions are exclusively mental.

You really ought to study the fourth chapter of the Abhidharmakośa, among other texts, rather than substituting your own concepts about what karma means in a Buddhist context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Andrew108 said:

What I read here is that karma is causality. I don't see any detailed explanation as to the specifics. So can you say what it was in your own karma that caused you to be born into your family? Can you give the specifics?

saraswati said:

When I first got interested in Buddhist thought I got into a bit of a muddle because of this whole identification with past karma. But I got a clarification from Ajahn Sumedho, who pointed out that this identification of myself with "my" karma is a symptom of wrong view. By thinking that "I" must have done something very bad in the past I would be holding to Ahankara, and believing that there was a "me" which could take responsibility for particular acts. At least in my naive view, I feel now that it's all a big pot of karma and we are what we are by picking up some part of it. And if we can help everyone by consuming and eliminating some of this collective karma, all the better. Not sure how this fits in with the Vajrayana view though.

Malcolm wrote:

No pot of karma at all.

Buddha clearly explained that one's karma follows one through lifetime after lifetime like a shadow that follows a bird.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes I am a naturalist. I posit that there are natural laws that exist independently. Natural laws are applicable everywhere. They are pervasive rather than ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

"independent existence" is just another name for "ultimate", i.e., these laws are irreducible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Science doesn't posit an ultimate truth. Most scientists aren't looking for ultimate truth.

Malcolm wrote:

You however do, you posit that there are real natural laws that exist independently.

Andrew108 said:

But for the purposes of furthering discussion, scientists do have proof that there is a world 'out there' and we should take such proof seriously.

Malcolm wrote:

Which proof would that be?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So in that respect I think the authors of that article have made a mistake.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course you do, because your ultimate view is physicalism, not Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

The irony, of course, is that the Buddhism to which these Westerners were drawn was one already transformed by its contact with the West.

He doesn't really say anything about Tibetan Buddhism. Do you think something like this happened with TB as well?

Malcolm wrote:

It has already, look at Rigpa, Shambhala, Dzogchen Community, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: In the shadow of the Buddha

Content:

Sherab said:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u0ssQFNpAJ0> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Anyone read the book?

Malcolm wrote:

For nearly a decade, Matteo Pistono smuggled out of Tibet evidence of atrocities by the Chinese government, showing it to the U.S. government, human rights organizations, and anyone who would listen. Yet Pistono did not originally intend to fight for social justice in Tibet—he had gone there as a Buddhist pilgrim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 9:02 PM

Title: Contra Buddhist Modernism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting article.

<http://www.tricycle.com/interview/losing-our-religion> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;";

What sort of critique of the scientific view might Buddhism otherwise offer? The naturalistic stance—the idea that there is an independent insentient world out there

governed by scientific laws and impersonal processes—is ultimately a human construct, a powerful and effective human construct, but a construct nonetheless. This is not to deny the power of science, but it does call into question the way we approach scientific knowledge. Of course, there are many philosophers, scientists, and historians of science who have made a similar point. But Buddhism has its own insights and perspectives to offer. In other words, when we engage seriously with the Buddhist tradition we learn other ways of construing the world, other stories we can tell about the way things are, and these can be cogent, coherent, and compelling in their own way. This is not to argue for a naive acceptance of Buddhist epistemology and cosmology. But we won't see what Buddhism has to offer if, at the outset, we twist it out of shape to make it conform to contemporary norms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Root guru? Mother sentient beings?

Content:

saraswati said:

Dear friends: could someone give me the Tibetan (or even Sanskrit) terms for the above concepts?

I still don't understand the difference between guru/root guru/lama, but that is a topic for another subforum, maybe. But knowing the terms when they appear in chants would help.

Thank you in advance. And, happy Wesak to all!

Malcolm wrote:

rtsa ba'i bla ma

ma gyur sems can

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

seeker242 said:

Seems appropriate for this topic! Would telling someone that their cancer or disease is just their karma from their bad actions, would that be beneficial for that person? If not, then even if it's true, it would still be an inappropriate thing to say, according to the above. If it's not beneficial, it does not matter if it's true or not. It would still be a cruel thing to say to someone.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out, a Buddhist should understand this already, and non-Buddhist has not need to.

Of course not all diseases are karmic diseases directly. But having a human body is a karmic ripening, and therefore too all the pleasure and pain that accompanies it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 7:09 PM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Zhen Li said:

To say that everything that happens is due to one's own actions is an extreme position.

Malcolm wrote:

No one said that. What I said was that all sensations are a result of action, either directly or indirectly. For example, being reborn in hell.

Buddha himself states in the Karmaśataka:

The happiness and misery of mortal beings  
depends on actions.

And again we see in the Bodhisatvāvadānakalpalatā:

All of these happinesses and sufferings of mortal beings manifests through past karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Adi said:

Not so much anymore since all our cookware is now made in China and when the pots and kettles get to talking it's all in Mandarin or Cantonese and we can't understand a word of it.

Adi

Sherab Dorje said:

Okay people, can we drop the aggression level a few notches please?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Now that is definitely the pot calling the kettle black...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

.

You're new around here. You might want come down off that high horse you rode in on.  
The fall can be crippling.

Berry said:

Good grief! That sounds quite threatening & rather like the school bully .

.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say I was going to push him off. Anyway, his saddle, like the saddle of Gesar's mythic horse, is too high for me to reach. I am just an ordinary sentient being with impure vision, after all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

If you want to debate, it would be a good idea to use argument, not to be offensive.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a debate. I was sharing my opinion of your statement.

You're new around here. You might want come down off that high horse you rode in on.  
The fall can be crippling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

Thus, in the pure vision of enlightened beings, all beings are seen as Buddha and Bodhisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, but not in ours. As Virupa said:

Appearances are impure for sentient beings in defilement;

Appearances are experiential for yogins in samadhi;

Appearances are pure for tathāgatas in the ornamental wheel of the inexhaustible body, speech and mind.

It is really sound to know where one is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

It is a good idea to make sure they are sincere monastics, and not people who use the title of "monk" to attract students, fame, and so on.

I actually think in the Western countries, especially with Western monks and nuns, rather than helping one attract students, fame etc. being a monk or nun actually makes things harder. Many Westerners I know have a strong bias towards lay teachers and often frankly don't like Western ordained Sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that I have met a number of western monks who imagine that by becoming monks they are going to become Dharma teachers. Anyone who wants to become a teacher is insane. If you teach because people repeatedly ask you to, this is a different story.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

AlexanderS said:

As far as I understand it from that text those full benefits are only achieved if one practices the mantra with pure bodhichitta motivation and pure samaya.

Malcolm wrote:

That's a given.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

muni said:

Sherab Dorje,

I understand you when you say phenomena are the cause of suffering, since this is what we experience in samsara/suffering.

Only when the phenomena are really the cause of our suffering, how to get rid of them all? I think many wars (karma) have been started by the idea that the phenomena (other) are the cause of our suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

The weakest practitioners, understanding that phenomena are the cause of suffering break the link at contact, so they will not experience sensation, and so on. This is the function of śīla, discipline. Stronger practitioners can sever the link at sensation, since they can control their craving with samadhi. The best practitioners however, can sever the link at ignorance, since they are owners of prajñā.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

ignorance is klesha, formations is karma, consciousness through sensation are dukkha ; craving and addiction are klesha

muni said:

This makes sense to me.

Addiction = ("the fact or condition of being addicted to a particular substance, thing, or activity..." google) = conditioned by own craving/clinging.

Malcolm wrote:

With is in turn conditioned by sensation [suffering], which is turn conditioned by contact [suffering] and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 7:51 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

catlady2112 said:



I think it's always a good rule of thumb to study with monastics, no matter what generation they are of. People who have taken vows as monks and nuns have committed their whole life to the dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a good idea to make sure they are sincere monastics, and not people who use the title of "monk" to attract students, fame, and so on. Not every one in robes who has taken vows observes them, or even thinks it is incumbent upon them to do so.

Therefore, it is better to take as a teacher someone whose discipline is pure, whether they are a lay person or a monastic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The cause of suffering is karma. The cause of karma is affliction. It is really quite straightforward and not esoteric.

muni said:

And the cause of affliction? (disorder, Disease.. I read on google)

Malcolm wrote:

--> klesha --> karma --dukkha --> klesha -->

For example, according to Nāgārjuna, ignorance is klesha, formations is karma, consciousness through sensation are dukkha ; craving and addiction are klesha, becoming is karma, birth, and aging and death are suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

muni said:

Ah! Then they are not afflicted by themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

"...all phenomena apart from path phenomena are afflicted or conducive to affliction "

muni said:

Thanks. I understand conducive to (actually not, but i went to google). Only, they are not the cause of suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

The cause of suffering is karma. The cause of karma is affliction. It is really quite straightforward and not esoteric. In this respect, as it is said in the four seals "All tainted phenomena are suffering".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

muni said:

Ah! Then they are not afflicted by themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

"...all phenomena apart from path phenomena are afflicted or conducive to affliction "

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 7:03 PM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Phenomena may be empty of essence (and this includes karma) but that does not mean that they are not a source of suffering (since they are empty of essence).

muni said:

Phenomena are the source of suffering or clinging is?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, all phenomena apart from path phenomena are afflicted or conducive to affliction, so they induce craving...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: What Constitutes Misconduct?

Content:

shaunc said:

As far as I know, for a lay follower of Buddhism, the only rule so to speak is adultery. Other things like rape, pedophilia & incest besides being prohibited in Buddhism are

also illegal in most if not all western countries.

Karma Jinpa said:

shaunc, if I wasn't clear before, I apologize. I figured since most of us are, like you, lay-practitioners, that we would discuss sexual misconduct as it pertains to upasakas & upasikas, rather than monastics. While I'm sure it's more nuanced in the Vinaya, the practical rule of thumb for monastics (whether monk or nun) is celibacy, so any sexual conduct would be considered misconduct.

That's one of the reasons Khen Rinpoche's statement is so striking to me, If I'm honest with myself. Transformation of Suffering is a very accessible, down-to-earth explanation of the the Mahayana/Vajrayana Dharma, from the Four Thoughts to Refuge & Bodhicitta and the Six Paramitas. He's most certainly talking to us lay-followers/householders throughout the whole book.

shaunc, which tradition (school/lineage) was the lama who gave you that explanation of misconduct, if I may ask? No need to mention your individual teachers.

That leads me to my next question... Are the vows interpreted differently between the different schools and lineages? Or do Rinpoche's words in ToS match directly with what is said in the Mulasarvastivada Vinaya where we get our Pratimoksha vows?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, all this is explained in Abhidharmakosha. Sexual misconduct for lay people is wrong partner, wrong orifice, wrong time, wrong place.

Wrong partner means someone who is 1) not your spouse 2) underage 3) under the authority of another 4) ordained.

Wrong orifice means 1) anal 2) oral

Wrong time means daytime

Wrong place means in public, in a temple, in general in places where there is no privacy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Yes, quite. But that's not the meaning of backwards I was using.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you were saying that which is actually moving us deeper into strife and barbarism is "forward", based on competitiveness and martial prowess, as opposed to a civilization, which despite its many faults, was one of the few remaining dedicated to the principles

of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I'm open to arguing about backwards, but I defined my terms - which is comparative and competitive. I don't think there's much debate on this one - history is the witness.

Malcolm wrote:

All that history attests to is that we are deeper in the Kali yuga. It is we who are moving backwards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Scientific knowledge that doesn't allow one to out compete other world powers doesn't prevent one from being backwards.

Malcolm wrote:

As Todd pointed out, this is very biased definition of "backwards". Your thinking on this needs some work. As far as I am concerned, the Europeans, et al were the backwards ones, issuing unheralded barbarisms the world has never before seen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 10:02 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Zhen Li said:

less scientific knowledge....

Malcolm wrote:

You're normally a smart guy, but this is simply ignorance.

Tibetan Medicine for example has a germ theory, understood circulation correctly, how nerves functioned in relation to the brain and other sense organs, etc., hundreds of years before anyone in Europe had similar ideas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

At that time, Maha-Moggallana lived alone in a forest hut at Kalasila. After his encounter with Mara he knew that the end of his days was near. Having enjoyed the bliss of liberation, he now felt the body to be just an obstruction and burden. Hence he had no desire to make use of his faculties and keep the body alive for the rest of the aeon. Yet, when he saw the brigands approaching, he just absented himself by using his supernormal powers. The gangsters arrived at an empty hut, and though they searched everywhere, could not find him. They left disappointed, but returned on the following day. On six consecutive days Moggallana escaped from them in the same way. His motivation was not the protection of his own body, but saving the brigands from the fearsome karmic consequences of such a murderous deed, necessarily leading to rebirth in the hells. He wanted to spare them such a fate by giving them time to reconsider and abstain from their crime. But their greed for the promised money was so great that they persisted and returned even on the seventh day. Then their persistence was "rewarded," for on that seventh day Moggallana suddenly lost the magic control over his body. A heinous deed committed in days long past (by causing the death of his own parents) had not yet been expiated, and the ripening of that old Kamma confronted him now, just as others are suddenly confronted by a grave illness. Moggallana realized that he was now unable to escape. The brigands entered, knocked him down, smashed all his limbs and left him lying in his blood. Being keen on quickly getting their reward and also somewhat ill at ease about their dastardly deed, the brigands left at once, without a further look.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/lib/authors/hecker/wheel263.html#ch9> "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Omniscience isn't possible. It would be crazy to assert that it is true. .

Malcolm wrote:

"Not seeing the characteristics of phenomena is the aspect (kara). Knowing all of this is called omniscience , hence "omniscience" is knowing all things."

— Āryāṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāpañjikāsārottamā

TRC said:

Now I know why the Vajrayana can make the claim that Buddhahood can be attained through their path. Just lower the standard of what Buddhahood actually is.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a Mahāyāna sūtra commentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

Emakirikiri said:

I would believe it if there was a textual Dzogchen basis in which it is said so or if it came from ChNNR's mouth. As far as you're aware do you know if it has a grounding in either source?

Malcolm wrote:

It has a grounding in many terma cycles.

KDL said many things like this as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, you keep on reducing things to the impossible -- tell me how well that works out the next time you burn your mouth on pizza.

Vajrasvapna said:

I'll just see the pain as something empty. created by the mind, not as something solid and real.

Malcolm wrote:

That, my friend is just a bunch of intellectual bullshit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 7:14 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

A Buddha teaches according to the tolerance of his students...

Malcolm wrote:

A Buddha has the clairvoyance to look right into a person's mind and know exactly what teaching they need.

We on the other hand, do not.

Vajrasvapna said:

My understanding is that negative actions are all actions motivated by the five poisons and clinging to a self and positive actions are all actions motivated by compassion and selflessness. People create their suffering unknowingly cling to what brings them pleasure and having aversion to what brings them suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, so filling people's ear with a load of stuff about non-dualism probably isn't going to help them, just as telling them they are a poor sinner isn't either.

Actually, most people who are sick just want a doctor, which is why I studied medicine, because in order to help people with Dharma, they have to have already drunk the koolaid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 7:02 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

Emakirikiri said:

Do you believe this to be the case from a Vajrayana view and a Dzogchen view?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't matter if I believe it. The question is, do you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

daverupa said:

can indeed be a great cruelty to be avoided, depending on many contextual variables:

Malcolm wrote:

If they don't follow Dharma, for sure. If they are Buddhists then as Buddha said to Angulimāla, "Bear it brahmin, bear it, this is your past karma ripening...."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 6:32 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

rory said:

[ Basically it must be the norm.

Malcolm wrote:

Judge, jury and executioner, huh?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

The logic of stating that there is a separation between the relative and the absolute is the idea of Svatantrika school, even if this logic is positive to avoid the nihilistic tendencies of some people; I prefer the logic of "reduction to the impossible", as in Prasangika school.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, you keep on reducing things to the impossible -- tell me how well that works out the next time you burn your mouth on pizza.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

To me, karma is an illusion. And what I want is that people help each other and not make use of religion to abuse those already in pain.

Malcolm wrote:

Then keep telling them that their suffering is just an illusion, that will get you really far.

At least the Buddha's teaching on karma, contained in such texts as the String of Pearls Tantra and others, actually explains to them why they are suffering.

"I am suffering"

"This negative sensation you are experiencing is a ripening of your karma."



"I feel pleasure"

"This positive sensation you are experiencing is a ripening of your karma."

"I feel neither suffering or pleasure."

"This neutral sensation you are experiencing is a ripening of your karma."

Etc.

At that time, the signs of awareness are as follows:

the mind of someone who has  
purified karma is clear.

In the same way, if [karma] is not purified, [the mind] is not clear.

All of that arises from positive and negative karma.

Tantra of the Union of the Sun and Moon

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You mean ultimately there is no good or bad action. But even in Dzogchen, relatively speaking there is good and bad action.

Vajrasvapna said:

Actually, I did not mean it, the text that you shared expresses what I wanted to say at the end:

Malcolm wrote:

You should have meant it, since the text clearly says: "the ultimate [your stance] endowed with the form of the relative [where people experience the ripening of action]."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We suffer because of our own past actions, and not for any other reason, as uncomfortable as this notion is to daverūpa and many other folks who nominally describe themselves as Buddhist.

There is a difference between the Theravada and Sarvastivadin point of view on this. The Theravadins maintain that not everything bad that can happen to someone is

necessarily karmic. It is derived from their theory of 24 conditions.

For the Sarvastivadins however, all suffering, even suffering caused by natural disasters, requires some kind of karmic cause.

daverupa said:

So the Theravadans have it wrong, and the Sarvastivadins have it right. The Theravadans are nominally Buddhist; the Sarvastivadins are actually Buddhist.

Do I understand you correctly, Malcolm?

You also either think I'm a Theravadin, or nominally a Buddhist for other reasons, such as citing the Anguttara... I'm so very perplexed.

Malcolm wrote:

Dave,

You took rebirth in samsara. Samsara has three kinds of suffering, according to Shariputra in the Majjhima Nikāya, suffering of suffering, the suffering of change and the suffering of compounded things. Therefore, everything in samsara is suffering. We only take rebirth because of our karma and for no other reason. Since we are reborn in samsara, and there is nothing but suffering, there is no other reason for any of our suffering than karma, either directly, as the Sarvastivadins maintain, or indirectly, as the Theravadins must in the end admit. But there are some people who call themselves Buddhists who actually imagine that there is some kind of happiness in Samsara. These people are a little mistaken.

Your citation of the Anguttara Nikaya does not in any way refute my contention all our suffering comes from past causes of our own creation. That's why I cited the Anguttara Nikaya back at you. I never said anywhere that everything we do now was caused by something we did in the past. Essentially, what I am saying is that all positive, negative and neutral sensations we experience in the three realms are a result of the ripening of positive, negative and neutral actions. You have carried a misunderstanding of my position from our last conversation about this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna, in the only place where he expresses a preference in the MMK, expresses a preference for the debt theory of the Ārya-Sammitiya school. This latter theory has ancient resonances in the immorality of debt which can be found in the Vedas.

Vajrasvapna said:

What is the debt theory of the Ārya-Sammitiya school or where I can read more about it?

Malcolm wrote:

The Ārya-sammitiya proposed that every act created a dharma called an "avipranasha", which was like a debt. It exists until it paid up. The Buddha himself likened action to a debt. You can think of karma as being like an inheritance tax.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

People think that karma works in a dualistic way, all suffering originates from a evil action, but this is not true, because, in essence, there is no good or evil action.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean ultimately there is no good or bad action. But even in Dzogchen, relatively speaking there is good and bad action. As the String of Pearls Tantra states:

One is placed in the dungeon of name and matter  
in the castle of the three realms,  
tortured with the barbs of ignorance and so on,  
oppressed by the thick darkness of samsara,  
attached to the salty taste of desire,  
bound by the neck with the noose of confusion,  
burned with the hot fire of hatred,  
head covered with pride,  
setting a rendezvous with the mistress of jealousy,  
surrounded by the army of enmity...  
tied by the neck with the noose of subject and object, [29b]  
stuck in the mud of successive traces  
and handcuffed with the ripening of karma.  
Having been joined with the ripening of karma,  
one takes bodies good and bad,  
one after another like a water wheel,  
born into each individual class.  
Having crossed at the ford of self-grasping,  
one sinks into the ocean of suffering  
and one is caught by the heart on the hook of the three lower realms.  
One is bound by oneself; the afflictions are the enemy.  
The body of a hell being appears as fire or water.  
Pretas are frightened and intimidated.  
There is a fog-like appearance for animals.  
The aggregates, sense gates and sense elements  
of humans appear as the five elements,  
and also happiness, suffering and indifference.  
They appear as armor and weapons to asuras

and desirable qualities for devas.  
Such dualistic appearances,  
for example, are like a quickly moving wheel  
spinning continuously for a long while.  
As such, diverse appearances  
are like seeing a snake from a rope;  
that [rope] is not [a snake] but is apprehended as a [snake];  
forming as both the outer universe and inhabitants.  
If that is investigated, it is a rope.  
The universe and inhabitants have always been empty,  
the ultimate endowed with the form of the relative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

The Yogacara school says that every action generates a karmic seed, so the seed would be harvested in the future. This idea is in common with the way people think in general, but it is strange from the standpoint of the Mahayana philosophy.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, the Yogacara theory is grounded in the Sautrantika notion that karma is a result of the transformation of vasana [bag chags] in the mind stream [citta samtanaparinama].

Vajrasvapna said:

On the other hand, Nagarjuna, founded of the Madhyamaka school,

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna, in the only place where he expresses a preference in the MMK, expresses a preference for the debt theory of the Ārya-Sammitya school. This latter theory has ancient resonances in the immorality of debt which can be found in the Vedas.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Ven. Khedrup...I'm not bullying you. I just found it hard to believe that after 10 years or so of being involved with Tibetan monastic institutions you haven't also come across

some forms of abuse ( mental and physical).

Malcolm wrote:

He has.

Andrew108 said:

I have come across it in the U.K and also in Boudha, Kathmandu. I was given the impression that what happened to me was common. I'm glad that you have had a different experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Different monastic traditions have different standards. For example, what I am familiar with from Bodhanatha in a monastery I was at, was that many of the adolescent monks had girlfriends. In the group of students I was with, there was also a guy, not a monk, who hit on a couple of the teenage monks.

There is also the issue that indeed pornography is quite widespread in Tibetan exile community in general, and has been for quite a long time, for at least twenty years. It would be extremely naive to believe that adolescent promiscuity in Tibetan monasteries does not happen. Of course it does. But as I already pointed out, most of these kids are not expected to become monks in adult hood. Many of them are being sent their by their parents because they want then to have a religious education.

The problem with this whole conversation, apart from its origins in an clumsy attempt to discredit certain Tibetan cultural beliefs that have nothing to with the Dharma, is that it exists in a vacuum absent a whole range of sociological considerations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

smcj said:

Dude should have given back his robes

Malcolm wrote:

He did.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

smcj said:

If karma was fixed then liberation wouldn't be possible

Unripened karma is not fixed. Fully ripened karma is pretty fixed. If your karma has fully

ripened in such a way that you are going to have a leg amputated, your leg is going to be amputated. But if you purify that same karma while it is in an unripened state you may just have a blister on your foot.

...and karma doesn't operate the forces of nature.

If people who've lived somewhere all their lives are killed in a tsunami its nothing to do with their past.

Don't be so sure. That would mean that airplane crashes, war dead, epidemics and such were not karmic either.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a difference between the Theravada and Sarvastivadin point of view on this. The Theravadins maintain that not everything bad that can happen to someone is necessarily karmic. It is derived from their theory of 24 conditions.

For the Sarvastivadins however, all suffering, even suffering caused by natural disasters, requires some kind of karmic cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

rory said:

I had a prior discussion about 'whether the Buddha can experience evil thoughts' the interesting outcome is that I found there is a big difference between Tibetan Buddhists and East Asian adherents: the former do not have the concept of merit transference that East Asian adherents have...

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the case rory, you are once again mistaken in your understanding of Tibetan Buddhism, and not for the first time. I suggest you study it a bit. Especially a book like Lamrim Chenmo where the principle of dedication of merit is covered in detail.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

theanarchist said:

it's fair to say it's nothing more than a vile smear campaign.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, started by someone who ought to have the common sense to know better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

DCDDM228 said:

No one should ever use karma as a bullying tactic. Just as everyone's concept of reality is different for them as it is for someone else, so are their acts that have affected karma. You never know the details of someone's past that could be dramatically different than yours that affects karma. I have always been under the impression that karma was slightly more entailed than just "do this and get that effect. "

Malcolm wrote:

What you can know about everyone is that we were born in this life because we were afflicted in the past life. All negative karma is caused by affliction, all suffering is caused negative karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes we know about karma. We are just not sure how smart it is to pass a judgement on the suffering of others in a way that suggests the victim/'sufferee' (?) is to blame.

Malcolm wrote:

I just said blame is not even an issue. We suffer because of our own past actions, and not for any other reason, as uncomfortable as this notion is to daverūpa and many other folks who nominally describe themselves as Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Where did I say I didn't? I objected to widespread, endemic, rife and all the other silly adjectives.

Both cases I know of occurred in Thai monasteries though, not Tibetan ones.

Andrew108 said:

You know more than you are saying.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, now you can read minds?

Andrew108 said:

You are worried about Tibet bashing. Anti-Tibetan sentiments. I'm more interested in the truth.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not true. We are concerned that this kind of thing quickly becomes an unfounded witch hunt.

Andrew108 said:

Or at least an open discussion. If we have an open discussion then we can understand more of the subtleties of the situation and this can bring about useful understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this is kind of open discussion you want to have:

"When is the last time you beat your wife?"

"But I don't even have a wife!"

"Ah, that is because you beat her, correct? Then she left you."

"But I've never even been married!"

"Yes, that is because you beat your girlfriend!"

"But I am gay!"

"Aha, so you are a little pervert after all!"

Etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

AN 3.61 said:

"Having approached the brahmans & contemplatives who hold that... 'Whatever a person experiences... is all caused by what was done in the past,' I said to them: 'Is it true that you hold that... "Whatever a person experiences... is all caused by what was done in the past?"' Thus asked by me, they admitted, 'Yes.' Then I said to them, 'Then in that case, a person is a killer of living beings because of what was done in the past. A person is a thief... unchaste... a liar... a divisive speaker... a harsh speaker... an idle chatterer... greedy... malicious... a holder of wrong views because of what was done in the past.' When one falls back on what was done in the past as being essential, monks, there is no desire, no effort [at the thought], 'This should be done. This shouldn't be done.' When one can't pin down as a truth or reality what should & shouldn't be done,



one dwells bewildered & unprotected. One cannot righteously refer to oneself as a contemplative. This was my first righteous refutation of those brahmans & contemplatives who hold to such teachings, such views.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an03/an03.033.than.html>:

"Just as when seeds are not broken, not rotten, not damaged by wind & heat, capable of sprouting, well-buried, planted in well-prepared soil, and the rain-god would offer good streams of rain. Those seeds would thus come to growth, increase, & abundance. In the same way, any action performed with greed ... performed with aversion ... performed with delusion — born of delusion, caused by delusion, originating from delusion: wherever one's selfhood turns up, there that action will ripen. Where that action ripens, there one will experience its fruit, either in this very life that has arisen or further along in the sequence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is a spurious objection. So far as we know, there are no Buddhas running any monasteries in the world today.

Regarding one's guru as being an actual buddha is a practice, not an objective fact.

Andrew108 said:

I didn't say they were Buddhas. I said if they had a fraction of the realization then they would know. Sometimes we get lost in the Maitreya/Asanga elaboration of a Buddha's omniscience rather than looking at the facts on the ground or in the Sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

The Maitreya/Asanga elaboration of a Buddha's omniscience is based on the sūtras, Mahāyāna sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes it is cruel and completely wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

No it is merely a fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: karma bully

Content:

Vajrasvapna said:

I have noticed that it is very common for people to use the concept of karma to abuse people who often are already experiencing some pain, for example, saying "this is your karma" for people who are sick, which gives the impression that the person deserves his or her suffering. I wonder what people opinion about this topic, for it seems to me a great cruelty.

Malcolm wrote:

No one "deserves" suffering, but all suffering is the ripening of past karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

If an enlightened master who heads up a monastic institution had even a fraction of this capacity then they would know about the abuse that goes on under their roof. They would also know how to organise things so that this abuse didn't take place.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a spurious objection. So far as we know, there are no Buddhas running any monasteries in the world today.

Regarding one's guru as being an actual buddha is a practice, not an objective fact.

Andrew108 said:

Knowing something that is 'beyond range' isn't possible.

Malcolm wrote:

The range of a Buddha's mind, what they can see, hear, and so on infinitely exceeds ours.

For example, for us, without binoculars, ALL, in reference to sight, means all that can be seen with our ordinary naked eye. But a Buddha's eye (there are five eyes actually) is not so restricted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I have to admit that I feel a little worn out from much of the recent anti-Tibet sentiment on the board here, as well as from witnessing the same sentiment outside HH DL's teachings in Holland yesterday.

Luke said:

People in Holland have anti-Tibet feelings? May I ask why?

Are they just racist? Or were they just upset about some specific religious/political issue?

Malcolm wrote:

It's the Dogyal crew shouting their same stupid slogans at HHDL.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Does this 'knowing completely' of a Buddha also include that which does not appear to the senses, such as the thoughts and intentions of others as well as past and future events?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. Buddhas can know all phenomena, including the minds of others, where they are reborn, where they are now, what kind of karma they have, where they will be, and so on, throughout the three times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

According to this Sutta the Buddha is confirming 'All knowing' is not possible.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not what is happening in this sutra. What the Buddha is saying here is that he does not assert of himself what Mahathera asserted of himself, i.e. that the Buddha constantly in a state of total knowledge of all things at all times. Buddha rejected this kind of omniscience. The kind of omniscience the Buddha has is the ability to know completely anything to which his mind is directed without effort. Not even in Mahāyāna is asserted that a Buddha in a state of total knowledge of all phenomena at all times.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 1:51 AM  
Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence  
Content:  
mañjughoṣamaṇi said:  
It does border on a racialized discourse though.

Malcolm wrote:  
Indrajala is not a racist, but he is a chauvinist.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 1:33 AM  
Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence  
Content:  
Andrew108 said:  
And by the way the Buddha never made any claims to be omniscient.

Malcolm wrote:  
Believe what you like. But you might want to study a bit of sutra and tantra before you make such bold claims.

In fact, since all phenomena are actually the display of a buddha's wisdom, there is in fact nothing that a buddha cannot know. Buddhas are omniscient, they are not, however, omnipotent.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 1:03 AM  
Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
You do not understand the context of what omniscience means.

It means "not seeing the characteristics of phenomena". Since that is perceived with respect to all phenomena, a Buddha is omniscient. It does mean, as Dharmakīrti famously quipped, that a Buddha knows the number of maggots in the ground.

It means that they know the nature of all phenomena and all the details of all paths to become buddhas.

Andrew108 said:  
You are changing the meaning of the word. So it might be better to use a different term. Knowing the nature of all phenomenon is not the same as omniscience.

Malcolm wrote:  
Latin | Sanskrit | Tibetan | English

omni | sarva | thams cad | all

Latin | Sanskrit | Tibetan | English  
scientia | jñāna | mkhyen pa | knowing

In this case, knowing the nature of all phenomena bears the consequence that one's mind is unimpeded and thus one can also know all the details, should one wish to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Omniscience isn't possible. It would be crazy to assert that it is true. .

Malcolm wrote:

"Not seeing the characteristics of phenomena is the aspect (kara). Knowing all of this is called omniscience , hence "omniscience" is knowing all things."

— Āryāṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāpañjikāsāroṭṭamā

Andrew108 said:

I know that omniscience means knowing all things and I am saying that this 'knowing all things' is not possible.

Malcolm wrote:

You do not understand the context of what omniscience means.

It means "not seeing the characteristics of phenomena". Since that is perceived with respect to all phenomena, a Buddha is omniscient. It does not mean, as Dharmakīrti famously quipped, that a Buddha knows the number of maggots in the ground.

It means that they know the nature of all phenomena and all the details of all paths to become buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 13th, 2014 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Omniscience isn't possible. It would be crazy to assert that it is true. .

Malcolm wrote:

"Not seeing the characteristics of phenomena is the aspect (kara). Knowing all of this is called omniscience , hence "omniscience" is knowing all things."

— Āryāṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāpañjikāsāroṭṭamā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

I'm not saying it is right. Nations generally behave in a way that is in their interests. It isn't about what is right and wrong, but what is in your interests.

Malcolm wrote:

As a Buddhist, you know quite well that knowing the difference between right and wrong and then acting on that information in all areas of one's life is the only thing that is one's own as well as everyone else's interest.

Excusing the harmful actions of great nations on the grounds they are merely acting in their own interest is excusing the sociopathy behind all of the world's conflicts today.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

There's actually a lot of logic behind the decisions undertaken by the PRC. It isn't necessarily moral by Buddhist standards, but they're not a bunch of psychotic monsters.

Malcolm wrote:

Psychopathy has many shades.

<http://tibettruth.com/case-files-on-forced-sterilization/> "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I

realization will be seen to consist of the special reduction or elimination of kleshas and worldly concerns.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the path of freedom, i.e. Arhatship and Pratyekabuddhahood. It is the principle

goal of the Hīnayāna path.

Then there is the path of achieving both freedom and omniscience, i.e. Buddhahood.  
This is the principle goal of the Mahāyāna path.

Then there is the path of achieving freedom and omniscience in one lifetime in this body.  
This is the principle goal of the Vajrayāna path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Some people apparently think that Buddhism in China is more important than the Buddhism in its homeland. This really is a reflection of the belief amongst many Chinese Buddhists that late Indian Buddhism was completely corrupt. A false belief, of course, but one that is widely diffused amongst them.

Indrajala said:

That's true. Some Chinese Buddhists also believe they civilized Buddhism, too.

Incidentally, some Shingon proponents believe late period Vajrayāna is corrupted and degenerate, and that theirs represent pure esoteric Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they believe this. It comes out of believing that some human cultures are better than others, a belief to which you strongly adhere.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

jiashengrox said:

Exactly. One of them is the debate tradition which was inherited from the ancient Nalanda University. I thought it was really wonderful to preserve this pedagogy of learning and study.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people apparently think that Buddhism in China is more important than the Buddhism in its homeland. This really is a reflection of the belief amongst many Chinese Buddhists that late Indian Buddhism was completely corrupt. A false belief, of course, but one that is widely diffused amongst them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am actually really glad they did pull out.

Not because I don't like East Asian Buddhism- I really think if I had met different teachers I could see myself practicing in a traditional Chinese Buddhist order like Master Hua's.

The reason I'm glad they pulled out is that it enabled them to preserve the essence of many Indian Buddhist traditions that died out in the land of their birth, and if they had adopted East Asian Buddhism this would not have been the case.

Malcolm wrote:

As I explained to Rory, after 845 there was no mainstream East Asian Buddhism to join. She should study history a little more closely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

I spoke to the Health Minister of the Exile Government a few months ago and he said TB is the biggest health problem among Tibetans in India (or maybe it was?).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, many of the refugees bring it with them from China when they escape. When I interned in the hospital in Xining, we had a whole wing devoted to TB patients. Many had come back several times.

Indrajala said:

Many would choose poverty over kowtowing to totalitarianism and systematic cultural annihilation.

China is not a totalitarian state.

Malcolm wrote:

\

It really depends on who you are. The Tibetans are under a totalitarian regime; their culture, language and heritage under extreme attack.

Indrajala said:



I'm not so convinced Tibetan culture is subject to 'systematic cultural annihilation'. Monasteries are being rebuilt. Akong Rinpoche was working on that. You can still be a monk in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

When you deny people the right to be educated in their own language, their culture dies.

Indrajala said:

New Tibetan books are regularly published in Tibet, or so I hear.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is true -- but an every dwindling population of Tibetans can read them.

Indrajala said:

but the standard of living is still far better than what you get in India.

Malcolm wrote:

That really depends on where you live and how high up in the party you are.

Having seen many Chinese people as patients while I was an intern, most of their diseases were a result of their very low standard of living, just like in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

rory said:

I really don't have much of an opinion of Tibet, I'm neither a lover nor a basher. I do have a low opinion of their pulling out after 1 debate and not being part of mainstream East Asian Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetans chose to follow mainstream Indian Buddhism because, from the Tibetan point of view, the Chinese Buddhists were bested in a three year debate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Also, medical care in China is prohibitively expensive. Despite being a socialist country, it makes people pay for healthcare just like in America. Good quality hospitals are probably financially out of reach for most Tibetans.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a fact. In order to even be seen in a Chinese emergency room, you must bring 2000 RMB cash.

Add to this the fact that as for most rural Indians, rural Chinese people have thoroughly noisome outhouses (and the bathrooms in the cities are just as foul as any I have encountered in India) and let their little ones pee and poo in public everywhere...his notion that China is cleaner than India is a fantasy. The water in mainland China is polluted beyond belief. The air in many places in China, unbreathable, just like Kathmandu and Delhi. 25 percent of the arable land in China is too polluted to farm, and the list of China's environmental woes goes on and on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 7:12 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Two cases is not "numerous".

Indrajala said:

And suspicion of it occurring elsewhere.

A year later, at least a dozen monks, including some who were underage, were diagnosed with STIs, and at least five monks were known to be HIV positive.

And the link to sexual abuse is?

HIV is unlikely to be introduced to a group of minors from another minor.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you completely naive? Teen transmitted HIV is very common.

For example:

Despite stable rates of HIV diagnosis in older populations, the rate of HIV diagnoses from 2006 to 2009 increased in teens 15-19 and youth 20-24 years of age, and was highest in the 20-24 year-old age group. Undiagnosed HIV cases are thought to be highest among young people. Of the approximately 1.2 million people living with HIV, approximately one in five, or 220,000, doesn't know they're infected. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates more than half of all undiagnosed HIV infections are youth ages 13 – 24.<sup>3</sup>

<https://www.hhs.gov/ash/oah/news/e-updates/june-2012.html> "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

When you add this to the fact that Bhutan has a cultural reputation for promiscuity, well what do you expect in a country where people do not where condoms and the most important culture hero is Drugpa Kunley?

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 7:00 AM  
Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence  
Content:

Indrajala said:  
Also, in 2013 there were also numerous cases of sexual abuse reported in Bhutan:

Malcolm wrote:  
Numerous, as it turns out, is two.

Indrajala said:  
Four victims that have been reported, plus suspicion of it being an issue in the larger community:

Malcolm wrote:  
Two cases is not "numerous".

Indrajala said:  
A year later, at least a dozen monks, including some who were underage, were diagnosed with STIs, and at least five monks were known to be HIV positive.

Malcolm wrote:  
And the link to sexual abuse is?

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 2:52 AM  
Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence  
Content:

Indrajala said:  
Also, in 2013 there were also numerous cases of sexual abuse reported in Bhutan:

Malcolm wrote:  
Numerous, as it turns out, is two.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Teeth and Claws of the Buddha: Monastic Warriors and Sōhei in Japanese History."  
Adolphson, 2007, Hawai'i.

Indrajala said:

It remains unclear how many sōhei were actually monks.

Secondly, there were a minority in Japan, if they were even largely clergy.

Thirdly, they are part of medieval Japanese history, and not Chinese history. In China the Shaolin monks were not necessarily accepted by more mainstream Buddhist monks.

Malcolm wrote:

You made a blanket statement about East Asian Mahāyāna. You did not qualify in anyway.

Indrajala said:

As well as the case of HIV being spread in Bhutanese monasteries:

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/29/bhutas-makes-condoms-available-to-monks-to-stop-spread-of-stds\\_n\\_2976401.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/29/bhutas-makes-condoms-available-to-monks-to-stop-spread-of-stds_n_2976401.html) "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

This not about sexual abuse.

Indrajala said:

Chhoekey Penjor, deputy chief information officer at the Children's Division of the commission, confirmed the allegations were found to be true and "necessary action was taken."

Malcolm wrote:

So yes, there are pedophiles everywhere. Here, they were discovered and punished.

Indrajala said:

If this sort of thing is happening in Bhutan which at least has rule of law and journalists willing to address such matters, what about India and Nepal where Tibetans have little voice being refugees? India and Nepal barely have rule of law, so complaints to the police might not mean much.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not demonstrated this is a pervasive problem in Tibetan Monasteries.

Also, Kalu Rinpoche has said that the cycle of abuse went onto other young monks after he left his monastery:

It wasn't until Kalu returned to the monastery after his three-year retreat that he realized how wrong this practice was. By then the cycle had begun again on a younger generation of victims, he says.

Note the use of the plural there: victim s.

Yes, apparently the gang of monks that abused him continued to abuse others. In his monastery, not all other monasteries in India.

Indrajala said:

Apparently even Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche has voiced concern about sexual abuse in monasteries:

Malcolm wrote:

Stating that it is a "concern" is not a statement that it is endemic or pervasive.

Indrajala said:

Incidentally, in 2000 there were claims of sexual abuse at Samye Ling Center (that's the west, of course, but still Tibetan Buddhist):

Malcolm wrote:

Not of children.

Indrajala said:

Therefore taken altogether I would conclude that sexual abuse in Tibetan monasteries is a serious problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Of which you actually have no proof or evidence of. Merely a suspicion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Vajrayāna claims rapid results.

Tulkus practice Vajrayāna.

Tulkus can't seem to protect children under their care from sexual predation.

Therefore, Vajrayāna claims to produce rapid results are questionable."

This sort of logic is really very poor.

M

Andrew108 said:

The logic is quite well-founded. It shows that rapid results are not axiomatic, even for those who are privileged.

Malcolm wrote:

It's extremely poor, since I have shown that the tulku system does not come from the system of Vajrayāna. It is merely a Tibetan cultural practice. It is not Dharma.

Andrew108 said:

As to the idea that abuse isn't widespread or claims aren't substantiated well you know that there is a lot that is hidden due to feelings of shame.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so there is a conspiracy of silence. What nonsense.

Andrew108 said:

This self-censorship is one large part of the problem - the denial of abuse is only now being seen as not helpful (hence the issuing of condoms to monks in Bhutan).

Malcolm wrote:

Issuing condoms to rape victims? That's a novel approach. In general, teenagers in monasteries tend to have girlfriends. One of the most common reasons for leaving the monastery is knocking up your girlfriend.

Andrew108 said:

Adele Wilde-Blavatsky discusses this in an article she wrote for the Elephant Journal.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I agree that monasteries are not suitable places to educate children. But for reasons different than the one's she raises. Kids educated in monasteries do not receive the benefit of a modern education.

Andrew108 said:

She writes:

"In October 2011, a famous and highly-respected reincarnate Tibetan Buddhist master, Kalu Rinpoche, posted a Youtube video in which he reveals the abuse he suffered as a young monk at the hands of adult monks in his monastery. Rinpoche's allegations caused shockwaves within the Tibetan Buddhist community (particularly his western students). Since that time, I have not heard any Tibetan Buddhist teacher (especially those connected with Kalu Rinpoche) publicly respond to his allegations, let alone suggest there be a formal investigation and those responsible brought to account. One can only hope Kalu Rinpoche's video exposure of this serious issue has not gone to waste and been brushed under the carpet in the hope that people might forget about it.

You wonder why there has been no follow up or public statement.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be irresponsible for anyone to respond without launching an investigation.

Andrew108 said:

If you were a father and your young child was recognized as a tulku would you let your child be taken by monastics? I doubt it.

Malcolm wrote:

I would not let my child be recognized as a tulku to begin with.

Andrew108 said:

Whilst sexual abuse may be hidden and not discussed openly, what is known to be commonplace and is openly discussed is the violent corporal punishment meted out to monks who commit only minor infractions that displease their superiors.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh please. They get a stick across the back of their calves. One of the reasons one of my teachers did so well in school is that those kids who did not memorize their lines would be stood up and would be punished in front of the class.

Andrew108 said:

I myself have seen how sexual relations within Tibetan monastic institutions are commonplace.

Malcolm wrote:

Which kind of sexual relations? Between whom?

Andrew108 said:

You might also consider the testimony of Ruben Derksen (a western tulku) who talks about systematic abuse in the monastery where he was receiving his training.

Malcolm wrote:

What kind of abuse? Beatings, rape, etc?

Andrew108 said:

Now the point is that the leaders of these monasteries are not being proactive in preventing cases of abuse and rarely promote organisational changes that would mitigate against such abuse.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't actually know this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There are well documented cases of abuse.

Malcolm wrote:

Define "well documented". Do you mean that people were arrested, sent to court? Imprisoned?

Or do you mean by well documented "So and so said so".

The point is not to deny that such things can, and indeed, do occur, if we are to believe Kalu Rinpoche's allegations.

The point is to approach the issue with responsibility and not paint all Tibetan institutions as places infested with pedophiles and child rapists.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

theanarchist said:

So, go home with your tired old rambling.

Indrajala said:

Would you be content if we all ignored documented cases of child abuse in monasteries and pretended such things never occurred?

Malcolm wrote:

We would be content if you actually had some facts upon which to base your wide ranging accusations. So far we have Kalu Rinpoche's story as well as ???

Not much at this point. The point is to act responsibly and not fling out accusations which smear shit even on people you have taken teachings from and claim to respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 12th, 2014 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Dan74 said:

Well, this is more than a discussion. When you make statements like "East Asian Mahāyāna actually has a better track record historically than Tibetan Buddhism" it crosses into sectarian bashing, rather than a discussion about learning. Learning can take place in a respectful environment, can it not? That's the key notion I am trying to raise here - respect.



Indrajala said:

It can't qualify as sectarian bashing because EA Mahāyāna is a general geographical designation for forms of Buddhism based on the Classical Chinese canon in the Sinosphere. For the simple fact East Asian clergy seldom had major political-military authority, they were seldom if ever guilty of transgressions that putting down a rebellion would entail. Consequently my statement is reasonable albeit provocative.

Malcolm wrote:

"Teeth and Claws of the Buddha: Monastic Warriors and Sōhei in Japanese History."  
Adolphson, 2007, Hawai'i.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Whether there are Tulkus or not the guru is seen as infallible.

Malcolm wrote:

One is to perceive only one's own guru as free from faults. That does not mean that one not free to see faults wherever and in whomever they exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

WuMing said:

To come back to the original question: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

What about you, Malcolm, being a Dharma teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

There is very little need for me to be a Dharma teacher.

There are many people, both in the East and the West, who are far more qualified than me, and much nicer people to boot.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Vajrayāna claim is that if you take two beginners of equal diligence and capacity and put them on the path, the Mahāyāni will take three incalculable eons to attain full buddhahood, .

theanarchist said:

Can we be sure that it's not possible to do it faster than the being later known as Shakyamuni did? Just because he took this amount of time doesn't automatically mean that as a rule this is the fastest possible.

Malcolm wrote:

Three "incalculable" eons is the minimum time it takes the person of highest capacity to travel the common Mahāyāna path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

smcj said:

Sutra Mahayana does make the claim that full awakening is possible in this body, but only if this body is the product of previous bodies' Dharma practice. So who knows if this body is in striking distance or not? The only way to tell is practice Dharma and see what happens. Sure would be a waste if all you're previous incarnations spent all that time and energy to get you this close and you just didn't feel like it this time.

The tantric claim is that full awakening is possible in the body that first makes contact with Dharma practice, not later incarnations. Sure would be a waste if you're this close and don't feel like making the effort.

Malcolm wrote:

The Vajrayāna claim is that if you take two beginners of equal diligence and capacity and put them on the path, the Mahāyāni will take three incalculable eons to attain full buddhahood, the Vajrayāni will be able to attain full buddhahood in one body and one lifetime.

Why? Quite simply speaking, Mahāyāna has no methods that work with the body and it does not take the result as the path.

However, no one is forcing anyone to believe Vajrayāna claims about anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

smcj said:

Sutra Mahayana does make the claim that full awakening is possible in this body, but only if this body is the product of previous bodies' Dharma practice.:

theanarchist said:

Indeed. Like Shakaymuni was said to have practiced for several immeasurable kalpas to get there.

Malcolm wrote:

Three, in fact. Two eons to get the eighth bhumi, one more to attain full buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

TRC said:

It appears the Vajrayana can be critical of others, but cry foul when some overdue criticism is directed at them.

Malcolm wrote:

People can criticize Vajrayāna all they like, but they should use arguments which make sense, which are actually grounded in Vajrayāna claims, rather than cultural issues which are not actually part of Vajrayāna at all.

Since you are a former Vajrayāna practitioner, whatever that means, you should know perfectly well that one's capacity to experience the results Vajrayāna claims to confer is entirely predicated on how well one maintains one's three vows, pratimokṣa vows, bodhisattva vows as well as samaya vows.

Whoever is disappointed by the Vajrayāna path either has not practiced enough, or has not maintained their vows well enough.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

As you're aware the fundamental premise of Vajrayāna is that one may attain buddhahood in this very life or failing that within a dozen or so lifetimes, as opposed to many countless lifetimes in other models of Mahāyāna.

Malcolm wrote:

If, and only if, you maintain your samaya.

Indrajala said:

In TB it is generally said that this is indeed possible and that it works like this in real life.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people are capable of maintaining their samaya.

Indrajala said:

There are also tulkus who are believed to have the ability to voluntarily come back to the world (as a human) for our benefit.

Malcolm wrote:

You have linked three things in a rather clumsy attempt at being "critical": Vajrayāna claims of rapidity, one instance where a tulku alleges he was repeatedly gang raped as a young boy, and the general competence of tulkus as enlightened administrators in order to cast doubt on Vajrayāna claims (addressed above).

However, items two and three have no relation to item one.

Aside from the fact that the Mañjuśrīmūlakapa Tantra makes predictions about reincarnations which appear in various countries including Tibet; the tulku system as it presently exists is not part of Vajrayāna theory in anyway. It is not mentioned in the tantras, nor the treatises and is a religious custom which first evolved in Tibet during the 13th century among the Kagyus. It continues solely because Tibetan society demands that it does.

Since there is no precedent for the tulku system in Vajrayāna, the effectiveness of tulkus as administrators, even the question of whether tulkus are actually awakened beings or not, is completely irrelevant to Vajrayāna claims about rapidity of its path.

Since there is no precedent for the tulku system in Vajrayāna, there is no reason to expect that tulkus are awakened beings, and no reason to expect that they would be able affectively manage any sexual abuse of minors in their care in any manner other than conventional ones. I.e., the actions need to be discovered, the perpetrators brought to justice, and so on.

This means that your complaints, apart from the fact that they are malicious gossip, amount to nothing more than a hill of beans.

The net effect of your unsubstantiated rumors and gossip is that some chicken-minded people will hear such things, and they too will then start spreading this gossip to others.

The fact is that there is no evidence at all of wide-spread systematic abuse of children, sexual or otherwise, in Tibetan monasteries in India. To claim otherwise without

evidence is simply malicious. Of course, everyone is responsible for their own actions and their own karma. And since as Buddhists we all accept that karma is unerring, those who spread gossip, lies and half-truths can easily understand what kind of suffering they will experience from their own actions, not the least of which is that those who would formally have been inclined to lend them an ear, will not be well disposed to in future.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 11:01 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

yet boys in monasteries of that same tradition are regularly raped...

Malcolm wrote:

You haven't established this, this is mere hearsay.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

And then there are also those who wish to achieve awakening in this life and this body and don't follow Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

If wishes were fishes...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Well, funnily enough, I think it was Schopen who did point out that in fact things like dedication of merit were some of the earliest lay Buddhist practices, based upon inscriptions at stupas. So, I'm pretty sure we're unlikely to lose those types of elements due to archaeology.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, as you may have heard, Jayarava is all fired up to prove that Buddha never existed at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Zhen Li said:

...

He did stop him, that's why we practice Buddhism today and not Devadattism.

Adi said:

So many would say but we're still waiting for Ven. Indrajala's answer and explanation of how he regards what he is now calling sacred myths.

Malcolm wrote:

While Schopen et al were quite right to point to a lack in Buddhist studies, i.e. that there was not sufficient attention being paid to archaeology, now the pendulum has swung to far. The idea that the canon record is of no value for understanding the nature of Buddhadharma or even the Buddha is patent nonsense.

Undoubtedly, one day we be reading Jeff going on and on about how rebirth and karma too cannot really be considered Buddha's teachings, blah, blah, blah...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Why wasn't Lord Buddha able to stop Devadatta?

Indrajala said:

That's mythology, not real life today.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a rebuttal to Khedrup's point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 10th, 2014 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

JKhedrup said:

There is something very disturbing to me about the current climate of Tibet bashing.

Malcolm wrote:

Especially since we never observe China bashing, Japan bashing, etc., on these boards. It's pretty sad, actually. We have the PRC, literally raping Tibet and sterilizing Tibetan women after forcing them to have late term abortions, resettling Tibetan nomads in concrete villages and restricting the number of cattle they can own, fencing off their traditional grazing lands, but no, we don't really hear about this.

What we hear about instead are unfocused accusations against real bodhisattvas like HHDL to the effect that they, like the Catholics, are knowingly complicit in covering up sexual abuse of children in monasteries -- and this goes unremarked and uncorrected by the staff.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 10th, 2014 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

I said there are samaya commitments in TB that if broken result in hell realms.

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily the one in which you physically harm your guru's body. One is born as Vajra Hell, which is just the Vajrayāna name for Avīci hell.

As Khedrup just pointed out, as for the others, there are many ways of maintaining one's samaya vows, which in any case are meant to assist one's practice. Since taking rebirth in the three lower realms is an eventual surety for all sentient beings who are not on a path, samaya vows are the skillful means we use in Vajrayāna to make sure that we do not become complacent about our paths and practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 10th, 2014 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

rory said:

...the sad fact that AIDS is rampant in Bhutan.

Malcolm wrote:

AIDS is "rampant in Bhutan"? Reality check:

In 2011, there were 246 reported cases of HIV in Bhutan, representing just over 0.3% of the population.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HIV/AIDS\\_in\\_Bhutan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HIV/AIDS_in_Bhutan) "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Bhutan and Ireland have the same percentage of people infected with AIDS. About three in every 1000 people. So I guess AIDS is "rampant" in Ireland too. The percentage of people infested with AIDS in Bhutan is the same as in all South Asia, 0.3%.

rory said:

So meanwhile all the enlightened lamas the present Dalai Lama, the various enlightened lamas and Rinpoches past and present knew all about it and did nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you quite sure? Or do you just enjoy engaging in the baseless slander of bodhisattvas?

rory said:

...if you don't believe in the entire mythos of 'enlightened' masters you as a TB practitioner go to Avici hell.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 10th, 2014 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: "The Secret Lamp of Wisdom"

Content:

Bhusuku said:

In the "Supreme Source" it is mentioned that one of the early sources for the 4 yogas of Semde is a tantra called "The Secret Lamp of Wisdom" ( ye shes gsang ba sgron ma rin po che man ngag gi rgyud ).

Malcolm wrote:

Which ironically is one of the root tantras of "klong sde".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 10th, 2014 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

Nobody wants to take Vajrayana away. But not everybody wants to accept Vajrayana's "truths".

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna is a specific path, with a specific method. If you want to follow that path, you are free to. If you don't want to follow that path, you are free not to. But it is useful to know what a path entails prior to embarking upon it, no?



Those who wish to achieve awakening in this life and this body follow Vajrayāna, the rest may do as they please.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 10th, 2014 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

conebeckham said:

Could you explain number 8?

I've got to think number 9 would be hard to prove.....everyone? Really?

Malcolm wrote:

# 8 means the harmer shows up in person, i.e. you can't go chasing after such beings or person, they have to be coming at you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 10th, 2014 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed. In order to engage in abhicarya rites there must be two things: the limitless compassion of the practitioner, and the object of the rite must satisfy ten criteria which render them so evil that the only way they can experience liberation without going straight to hell for harming the Dharma is to be subject to a rite of liberation.

Sherab Dorje said:

Is there a source (in English) that outlines the ten criteria? Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

zhing bcu - ten defects or the ten objects are:

- 1) The enemy of the Three Jewels
- 2) the enemy of the master
- 3) The samaya violator
- 4) the perverted one
- 6) the hostile one
- 7) The samaya enemy with a wicked character
- 8) The one arriving to the congregation
- 9) the harmer of everyone
- 10) the three lower realms

In order to be considered a candidate Vajrayāna extreme rendition, the person or being must satisfy all ten criteria, otherwise the act is nothing more than common act of killing that will send the doer to lower realms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 10th, 2014 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Andrew108 said:

One of my teachers has been very keen on building a democratic community. His teacher before him built an unusual community in Tibet in that it was open and democratic.

Malcolm wrote:

Chang Chub Dorje did not build a community, one sprang up around him.

Andrew108 said:

One wonders why there were not more of these types of communities in Tibet? What was stopping the enlightened masters from implementing this kind of change / social justice?

Malcolm wrote:

There were plenty of such communities in Tibet, gathered around realized masters.

We should not, however, fall into the trap of assuming that institutions are by their very nature corrupt. There were of course many excellent monasteries in Tibet prior to 1959 and while I am sure humans in them have all the human faults and problems, there was also a great deal of good that came out of the Tibetan monastic system, just in case anyone has forgotten this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 10th, 2014 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

theanarchist said:

Devotion and pure perception should come from a deep respect for the qualities of that teacher and gratitude for what he or she gives you.

Malcolm wrote:

That is really not how it is taught in the tantras if by pure perception this allows you to view your guru acts as anything other than buddha activities.

Of course, this is a practice. It is not perfected in a day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: I thought Buddhism wasn't about threatening people with

Content:

The Way said:

Regarding the video in the OP, I believe it was created by Wat Dhammakaya, a group that should not in any way be considered mainline "Theravada". Many Theravadin practitioners over on Dhamma Wheel have compared it to Scientology or even outright labelled it as a cult. Having the conviction that your actions have consequences is far, far different than threatening people with a version of Hell that looks like a Sims expansion pack.

Also shoot, I apologize for resurrecting such an old topic. That's google search for ya.

Mort432 said:

Also gonna gravedig here a little bit, and possibly be a little off topic, but I spoke with my Shingon teacher (who is an ordained lama) and he said that the concept of hell/the narakas in Buddhism is completely false, at least within Shingon.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha definitely taught the hell realms. You can read about them in the Sutta Nipatta, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

rory said:

But try and say that about Tibet! Denial denial and denial....it's very sad.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, since there were no soldier monks in Tibet, denying their existence is similar to denying hair on a tortoise, i.e. it's true there were never soldier monks in Tibet.

rory said:

Tibet was a feudal state...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it wasn't. It was something else entirely different.

rory said:

and after 1 dharma debate withdrew from Chinese intellectual currents unlike the Koreans, Vietnamese Japanese, etc who participated in cross-cultural exchange and development.

Malcolm wrote:

To begin with the debate was not between Tibetan and Chinese protagonists; it was between Indians and Chinese protagonists, sponsored by the Tibetan king, in imitation of similar debates in India. The debate actually occurred over three years, via letters, though people often imagine that it was a one-off smack down with Kamalashila emerging the proclaimed victor. In reality, the account of the debate which later Tibetans inherited was penned by a scion of the Ba clan, who were part of the anti-Chinese faction within the Tibetan aristocracy.

However the debate turned out, and there is no real clear answer to this question, the Tibetans decided that Chinese Buddhism did not represent the latest developments and currents of Indian Buddhism, and so after about 50 years of experience with Chinese Buddhism decided to devote their attentions to the Buddhism being taught at the great universities in India, Nalanda, Somanatha, Vikramashila and so on instead. In other words, they did a perfectly understandable thing: they decided that the Buddhism they found in India was more authentic than the Buddhism they were being introduced to by the Chinese monastics stationed in Lhasa. It is unlikely that the best and the brightest were sent to Lhasa, since the Chinese considered Tibet a barbarian backwater.

Moreover, the Tibetans were attracted to the ritualism of Yoga tantra (there was no anuttarayoga appellation at this time), and they had a shrine built at Samye where the Vajradhātu maṇḍala practice could be regularly performed with a special image of Mahāvairocana crafted for that purpose. It still exists at Samye. The influence of the practice Sarvatathāgatatattva samgraha tantra pervades all of Tibetan Buddhism right down to this day.

Part of the lack of interest of Tibetans with currents in Chinese Buddhism also can be attributed to the fact that Chinese Buddhism was largely destroyed during the reign of the Taoist emperor, Wuzong in 845. As a result of the economic decline of Asia from 845 onward, and due to the chaos of the Five Dynasties period, there really was no Buddhism in China for that could interest Tibetans for the simple reason that Chinese Buddhism was institutionally destroyed by its own people.

Therefore, as Tibet society recovered its own economic stability in the mid 10th century, Yeshe Ö (947–1024 or 959 - 1040), the great, great grandson of Langdarma, the last of the Yarlung Kings, initiated a revival of Buddhist transmissions from India by sending a number of young men in Kashmir to learn Sanskrit and translate texts.

So in fact your castigation of Tibetans for not engaging in cultural exchange misses the mark completely. The Tibetans controlled Central Asia during most of the 8th and 9th centuries, and they maintained constant ties with India and Nepal from the late 9th century onwards. The Tibetans above all were great traders. They simply were more interested in what they saw in India than what they saw in China, as with China they had a neighbor with whom they had had constant struggles. The Tibetans never had any wars with any Indian kingdoms at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Complete Tegal Instruction in Unrestricted New Book

Content:

pensum said:

The Olds aren't the only ones to write a book on togal and make it available, there is also this bizarre shoddy contribution: <https://www.amazon.ca/Vajrasattva-Secret-Wisdoms-Trekcho-Tegal/dp/1491863684/>. Rife with typos and grammatically bizarre phrasing, and not to be trusted in the least. Here's a sample copied exactly as it appears in the Amazon preview:

Rgyun-gyi ting-nge-'dzin, the same state in Tibetan definition is such. Rgyun-gyi has in depth meaning. Self existing pristine Rigpa. Self arising, self ignited, self originated openness of ecstatic Rigpa. Self, here is not the composite of impermanent elements. It is one's own, without grasping, if anything, own power, own guidance.

Anybody know anything about the apparently illiterate author, Richard Chambers Prescott?

Malcolm wrote:

He definitely has a bone to pick with the Nyingmapas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

Seldom were Buddhist clerics either in China or Japan in positions of significant political authority, which is unlike in Tibet where Lamas in charge had to utilize violence in order to advance the interests of the state.

Malcolm wrote:

If you carefully examine Tibetan history, you will discover rather swiftly that Lamas were rarely in positions of significant political authority either, the 5th and the 13th being notable exceptions.

For example, after the death of the 5th, the affairs of state were conducted by the regent, Desrid Sangyas Gyatso, a lay person his whole life. During most of the 18th century, and most of the 19th, the Dalai Lamas played no significant role in governing Tibet. Even the 7th's government lasted only 6 years, from 1751 to his death in 1757. From 1707 to this period of time, Central Tibet has a variety of regimes and it was a time of intense political instability.

There were five Dalai Lamas between the 7th and the 13th in a space of 120 years.

Furthermore, "Tibet" is a big place. Lhasa never controlled Kham (always ruled by independent kings) and Amdo (ruled by a mixture of Muslim, Mongol and Chinese warlords at various times), lost Ladakh to Kashmir in the 18th century, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

I just take what I want from it and leave the rest (like the swan who separates the cream from the water).

Malcolm wrote:

Or perhaps like a musk hunter who takes the gland and leaves behind the corpse.

theanarchist said:

Swans can't separate cream from water.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a traditional metaphor...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is also a srog gtad, an entrustment rite for worldly protectors.

Konchog1 said:

I can't find anything in English on srog gtad. Can you explain it briefly please? What's the difference between worshipping a protector with and without a srog gtad? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Wisdom protectors, for example, Mahakala, generally speaking have everything from full empowerments down to permissions.

A srog gtad on the other hand represents making a contract with a worldly protector to perform services for you in exchange for offerings. It is a deal, basically. It is a practice that does not come from Indian tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is what is called a gtor dbang in Nyingma, where the torma is blessed as the basis of the empowerment, not a mandala.

dakini\_boi said:

Could you say more about the Tor Wang, Malcolm? What is the significance of using a torma instead of a mandala?

Malcolm wrote:

The way it is presented in the Sakya tradition of Vajrakilaya, the torwang comes from the empowerment of the lower activities. Usually, the torma empowerment includes the body, speech, mind, qualities and activities of a the deity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

I just take what I want from it and leave the rest (like the swan who separates the cream from the water).

Malcolm wrote:

Or perhaps like a musk hunter who takes the gland and leaves behind the corpse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is well known. Magical battles between Buddhists and Bonpos continued until at least the 12th century.

Indrajala said:

So, the four immeasurables are to be taught while simultaneously engaging in magical battles to kill opponents? Is there no contradiction here? Where are the enlightened qualities?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed. In order to engage in abhicarya rites there must be two things: the limitless compassion of the practitioner, and the object of the rite must satisfy ten criteria which

render them so evil that the only way they can experience liberation without going straight to hell for harming the Dharma is to be subject to a rite of liberation.

Indrajala said:

Yes, some Tibetans indeed practiced animal sacrifice, how widespread this practice was is subject to much debate because quite frankly, we really know very little about Tibetan religion prior to the seventh century.

According to the cited Chinese source, they did it every year and three years as a way of renewing their oaths.

That sounds rather widespread and common.

Malcolm wrote:

It sounds vague and almost completely uninformative. What is the context? what is the rite? Under what circumstances? In any case, this is pre-Buddhist religion we are talking about. That was largely stamped out and driven into the border lands by the later Yarlung Kings.

Indrajala said:

The Tang histories also display almost no Buddhist sympathies.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, they weren't really written by people who were on the scene, were they?

Indrajala said:

So, what kind of Buddhism existed in the Yarlung period?

Malcolm wrote:

State Buddhism centered around Samye and Lhasa.

Indrajala said:

Magical battles resulting in people being killed and court officials taking oaths with animal sacrifices?

Malcolm wrote:

As explained above, any abhicarya rites Padmasambhava engaged in were engaged in with the criteria listed above. The practice of animal sacrifice was ended during the reign of Trisrong Detsen.

Indrajala said:

Without the strong sponsorship of the Yarlung kings, this would have never happened. A lot of Yarlung kings were opportunistic warlords (the same can be said about early Chinese Tang emperors like Taizong especially too, but nobody calls him a Dharma King as far as I know).



Malcolm wrote:

Not all of the Yarlung Kings are counted as Dharmarājas, only Srongtsan Gampo, who built the original Potala; Trisong Detsan, who definitely invited Shantarakshita and Padmasambhava, and who may have patronized Chan (<http://earlytibet.com/2007/11/13/tibetan-cha-i-the-emperors-cha/> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"), and Ralapacan, who oversaw one of the world's great translations projects.

Indrajala said:

The opinion of some major scholars is that Buddhism offered an attractive model for social cohesion and in turn state consolidation...

So, while there were some devout Buddhists, Buddhism was utilized by the state for less benevolent purposes.

Malcolm wrote:

What can be more benevolent than social cohesion and undermining the old Bon families with allegiance to Zhang Zhung?

Indrajala said:

In light of that, why speak of Dharma Kings in the Yarlung period, or have images of them to be venerated?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the three Dharmarājas of Tibet were responsible for the importation of Dharma to Tibet, whatever their personal reasons may have been, honest or sinister, however they may be. Moreover, the later narratives about the three Dharmarājas provided generations of Tibetans a national identity based on the importation of Buddhism into their culture and grounded the Tibetan people in a Buddhist identity in a way that few other peoples in history have been so affected by Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Lotus\_Bitch said:

Instead of focusing exclusively on "institutional religious violence": why not divulge on [inter-sectarian] political intrigue?

Malcolm wrote:

Well first, we haven't really established that there was institutional religious violence in Tibet. The thread of the title is very misleading, created by one of the mods.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As already pointed out: the citation you provided was sensationalized by use of the term "death squad". It was provided from a work by an academic with no expertise in Tibetan history apart from an ability to read English. It was provided with barely any context at all in Sperling's paper which I provided, from where it was derived by your former source.

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Sperling's specialty is the history of Tibetan-Chinese relations and he relies on Chinese and Tibetan documents. He offers courses in Tibetan and the use of Chinese as a research tool for Tibetan studies at Indiana University. He can read more than English, even if the piece in question was was sensationalist. This is of course a point aside from Jeff engaging in the denigration of Tibetans again, downplaying the grotesque violence of Chinese regimes, and the destabilizing effects of Qing intrigues in Mongol and Tibetan lands.

Malcolm wrote:

Todd, I wasn't talking about Sperling, I was talking about Johan Elverskog, whose expertise is Mongolian, not Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Indrajala said:

Let's look at early Tibetan history then.

According to Tāranātha (1575-1634) in his biography of Padmasambhava, Padmasambhava himself used his magic to kill an opponent of Buddhism. Whether it really happened like this or not is unclear, but it would suggest violent hostility between proponents of and opponents to Buddhism in this period.

Malcolm wrote:

This is well known. Magical battles between Buddhists and Bonpos continued until at least the 12th century.

Indrajala said:

The Tun-Huang Chronicles state the following:

...the paternal subjects rebelled; the maternal subjects revolved. ... The father gNam ri was given poison and died. The son Srong btsan firstly wiped out the families of the rebels and the prisoners.

Meanwhile Butön Rinchen Drup (Wyl. bu ston rin chen grub) (1290-1364) relates the

following:

...Thirteen years of age he ascended the throne and brought under his power all the petty chiefs of the borderland who offered him presents and sent their messages (of submission).

Malcolm wrote:

These two accounts are not necessarily in conflict.

Indrajala said:

This suggests to me an intentional reworking of past history to suit contemporary Buddhist interests.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, this definitely happened, but not for the reasons you seem to imagine.

Indrajala said:

Whereas Songstän Gampo was a violent despot

Malcolm wrote:

This is a bit of an exaggeration.

Indrajala said:

Actually, according to contemporary Tang dynasty reports, the Tibetans practiced animal sacrifice. The Old Book of Tang 舊唐書 has the following:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, some Tibetans indeed practiced animal sacrifice, how widespread this practice was is subject to much debate because quite frankly, we really know very little about Tibetan religion prior to the seventh century. There is no reason to assume that Srongtsan Gampo was a deeply religious man, when the historical record is examined. However, he is credited with bring the practice of Avalokiteshvara to Tibet and Nyingma sources paint him as an emanation of that Bodhisattva.

Indrajala said:

All this leads to questions about the extent or concern for Buddhism in the Yarlung period.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no doubt about how active Tibetans were in bringing Dharma to Tibet in this period. The vast majority of sūtras were translated in the late imperial period, ending with the death of Ralpachan in 838.

Tibetan accounts paint Trisong Detsen as a king too busy to practice, but nevertheless an interested patron of Dharma.

Ralpacan on the other hand was quite zealous and religious, and like most religious zealots, proved to be a rather incompetent ruler, his downfall hastened by economic

discontent due to the very generous relationship he had with monastic establishment. This provoked the backlash amongst the aristocracy that resulted in the assassination of Ralpacan, and the ascension of Langdarma, who tried to tax the monasteries (which resulted in his own assassination).

However, the fact that Tibetans were enthusiastically adopting Buddhism is born out by the fact that by 1000, almost all traces of any organized pre-Buddhist religion in Tibet had completely vanished. Without the strong sponsorship of the Yarlung kings, this would have never happened.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan institutional religious violence

Content:

Adi said:

So far no one has provided any evidence that this is true.

Indrajala said:

I did cite an academic work detailing orders purportedly given by the Fifth Dalai Lama to violently wipe out his opponents.

Malcolm wrote:

As already pointed out: the citation you provided was sensationalized by use of the term "death squad". It was provided from a work by an academic with no expertise in Tibetan history apart from an ability to read English. It was provided with barely any context at all in Sperling's paper which I provided, from where it was derived by your former source.

All we can really glean from the citation, knowing what we know about the war that the King of Tsang thrust upon the 5th when he was a very young man, not that much younger than you, is that during the 1660's there continued to be pockets of unrest by dissenters whom 5th felt that had abandoned their obligation to follow the rule of law, which now squarely rested with his government.

No context at all was given in your original citation. What can we expect to learn from this apart from your desire to downplay religious violence in China and Japan in comparison to secular violence ordered out by a sovereign ruler under the pretext that it contradicted the "the values of Tibetan Institutions". As we know, the values of any Government are to prioritize political stability.

No mention was made by Sperling of the numerous qualms the 5th expressed throughout his career in his autobiography at the unpleasant necessities of his position (one he in fact never sought out and could not in any case relinquish) save one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in Japan they had entire armies of monastics armed to the teeth, who wielded enormous power.

Indrajala said:

Actually it is unclear exactly how many of them were ordained as monks in either the Tendai bodhisattva-renunciate model or otherwise. So while they were nominally called monks, it is unclear how many through the centuries were ordained as such.

Malcolm wrote:

Considering your views on ordination, this hardly seems like a major objection to my point.

Indrajala said:

Also given the proportion of sōhei to the greater monastic population, they would have been a small minority all things considered. Aside from a few major battles, most sōhei it seems got involved in petty skirmishes and burned down monasteries or shrines. Not morally justifiable perhaps, but they never ran the country.

Malcolm wrote:

My point of course is that these were violent religious militants of a kind completely unknown in Tibet.

While wars in Tibet often broke down along sect lines, they were never carried out by religious people, though religious people were frequently victims of violence that generally occurred along sectarian lines. Generally speaking, in Tibet when some aristocratic family decided to go to war with another one, the monasteries they patronized would suffer if they lost, for example, the Karma Kagyu, Jonangpas and Sakyapas suffered when Karma Tenkyong lost to the Ganden Phodrang. Since Karma Tenkyong was actually the aggressor in the war for the control of Tsang (following in his father's footsteps) in the mid 17th century, the actions of the Ganden Phodrang must be considered in that light. Plus, the 5th Dalai Lama was quite young, a man of a mere 25 years when Gushri Khan executed Karma Tenkyong (1642).

In fact the 5th was the first real religious ruler of Tibet. While Chogyal Phagpa was nominally the ruler of Tibet, he spent little time in Tibet, mostly being in Beijing with Kublai Khan.

So it is simply wrong to characterize the wars in Tibet as being wars brought by one religious establishment against another. In general, wars in Tibet were fought by aristocratic clans by soldiers and never monks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 9th, 2014 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

jiashengrox said:

There is no explicit instruction or mention in both treatises that the master has to be enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

No, merely in the latter that one must regard one's guru as a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: H.E. Beru Khyentse Rinpoche

Content:

Gyaltzen Tashi said:

Dear all,

I am thinking of attending this Dharma event with tsog and two empowerments over two days:

<http://www.khyenkong-tharjay.org/EventMay2014> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Upcoming Programme for 2014

Friday 9th May 2014

to

Sunday 11th May 2014

Guru Rinpoche Tsog Bum (with Guru Rinpoche empowerment) & Kurukulle Grand Puja  
(with Kurukulle empowerment)

Venue:

Ngee Ann Auditorium

Teochew Building

97 Tank Road

Singapore 238066

Bus Service(s): 123

Nearest MRT: Dhoby Ghaut

However, I am not familiar with H.E. Beru Khyentse Rinpoche. I only know he is recognised as the 16th Karmapa, which I take as the minimum standard when considering to take empowerments.

Here is his wikipedia page:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second\\_Beru\\_Khyentse](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Beru_Khyentse) "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return  
false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Please advise me today as the event starts tomorrow.

Regards,  
Gyaltzen Tashi

Malcolm wrote:

The Guru Rinpoche empowerment will be from Konchog Chidu, I am almost certain.  
Kurukulla probably from Chogyur Lingpa's collection of termas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Compared to Tibetan Buddhism, in my estimation at least, you see less religious violence in other forms of Mahāyāna, such as in China and Japan. ... Admittedly, there were warrior monks in Japan (most notably in Tendai perhaps) who would torch the monasteries of rival sects, though these were small scale skirmishes.

kirtu said:

Tendai was nearly wiped out as a result of this. And Soto Zen struck out for the hills and mountains. Literally.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in Japan they had entire armies of monastics armed to the teeth, who wielded enormous power.

The phenomena of militarized clergy never existed in Tibet, even with the existence of monastic police (Dob dobs, restricted to Lhasa and mainly active during the Monlam Chenmo).

When there were conflicts between Sakya and Drikung, in general, in the case of Drikungpas, they had patrons among Mongols, and so they used Mongol troops to sack the main monastery at Sakya. The Sakyas, if I understand correctly, used local soldiers when they retaliated.

The Ganden Phodrang under the 5th had a standing army. However, by the nineteenth century and 200 hundred years of being finlandized by the Qing, Lhasa had no real army to speak of. For this reason the 13th tried to create a modern army to repel the invasion that he knew was coming from China.

The fact is all the hostilities in Central Tibet were provoked by the King of Tibet, Karma Tenkyong. Karma Tenkyong allied himself with the Bonpo King of Beri, Donyo Dorje. A letter was intercepted by the Gelugpas indicating a conspiracy between Karma Tenkyong and Donyo Dorje, etc. This Wiki page is based on reliable books:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karma\\_Tenkyong](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karma_Tenkyong) " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

This page is a little less well written but also has useful information which outlines the war for control of Tibet between the Tsang Dynasty and the Ganden Phodrang.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/5th\\_Dalai\\_Lama](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/5th_Dalai_Lama) " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

theanarchist said:

That's based on the fact that unless you develop pure perception you will not obtain anything. That does not mean that you become an undiscerning, idolizing groupie of a guru rock star and are then rewarded with siddhis for this self brainwashing.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so it is only so long as the Guru conforms to your expectations that you are to have a pure perception of that teacher. Right?

If Naropa or Mila had that attitude they would have never developed siddhis.

jiashengrox said:

And that is why it has been explicitly qualified in, say Maitreya's Ornament of Mahayana Sutras, or Fifty Verses (for tantric master).

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? Qualified how? What do you mean? When Naropa meant Tilopa, Tilopa was cooking fish alive.



Of course the Gurupañcāśikā states:  
The intelligent disciple does not take as a guru  
one who has these faults:  
resentment,  
arrogance, desire and lack of restraint.

So how are we to understand Naropa's decision to rely on Tilopa despite this advice from the Gurupañcāśikā?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

2. There is a slight logical loophole. Not criticizing one's guru doesn't imply viewing the guru as the buddha.

Nevertheless:

The Vajramāla Tantra states:

Whoever thinks there is difference between  
the guru and Vajrasattva,  
he or she will not obtain the signs  
of gathering siddhis.

theanarchist said:

That's based on the fact that unless you develop pure perception you will not obtain anything. That does not mean that you become an undiscerning, idolizing groupie of a guru rock star and are then rewarded with siddhis for this self brainwashing.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so it is only so long as the Guru conforms to your expectations that you are to have a pure perception of that teacher. Right?

If Naropa or Mila had that attitude they would have never developed siddhis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

If you snuck this page into the Old Testament probably nobody would notice.

Malcolm wrote:

It is standard Indian hyperbole which basically means "it is really, really, really, really,

really, really important to your path not to criticize your Guru."

jiashengrox said:

Two things:

1. The context of the verses from the Fifty Verses of Guru Devotion is based on the assumption of a qualified spiritual teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed.

jiashengrox said:

2. There is a slight logical loophole. Not criticizing one's guru doesn't imply viewing the guru as the buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless:

The Vajramāla Tantra states:

Whoever thinks there is difference between  
the guru and Vajrasattva,  
he or she will not obtain the signs  
of gathering siddhis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

If you snuck this page into the Old Testament probably nobody would notice.

Malcolm wrote:

It is standard Indian hyperbole which basically means "it is really, really, really, really, really, really important to your path not to criticize your Guru."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

smcj said:

The guru-yoga teachings do not allow for criticism..

theanarchist said:

That's complete nonsense and a misunderstanding of vajrayana pure

perception/devotion

Malcolm wrote:

The Gurupañcāśik ā states:

If one criticizes the master,  
that great confusion will cause death  
because of epidemics, harms,  
spirits, contagious disease, poison.  
Having been slain by  
a king, fire, poison snakes,  
water, dākinis, thieves,  
spirits and misguiders,  
sentient beings will go to hell.

And:

The master's mind  
must never be disturbed.  
If one becomes confused,  
one will surely roast in hell.  
Whatever fearful hells  
are shown such as Avīci and so on,  
those who criticize the master  
are correct explained as being located there.

The Kṛṣṇayamāripaṅjikā states:

Hearing even a single verse  
if one does not hold that person as a guru,  
after being born one hundred times as a dog,  
one will be born as a butcher.

So, it is pretty clear that Indian ideal of guru yoga is to hold the guru as being above all reproach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Compared to Tibetan Buddhism, in my estimation at least, you see less religious violence in other forms of Mahāyāna, such as in China and Japan.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously? What about Sōhei? This sort of thing never existed in Tibet.

Indrajala said:

East Asian Mahāyāna actually has a better track record historically than Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

jiashengrox said:

How would you look at the rise and fall of, say the Sakya empire, from the start of Sapan and Chogyal Phagpa being the preceptor for the Mongol emperors, till the decline of Sakya empire and the rise of the Phagmodrukpa Dynasty?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Sapan died in a foreign country and Phagpa was murdered at 44. The Sakya hegemony was not run by nice people, from what I understand. It was not governed by men of the caliber of Sapan and Phagpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which atrocities, by whom?

kirtu said:

The Sakya Drikung War

Malcolm wrote:

And what "atrocities" were committed by either side during this conflict? Names and events please, not vague accusations of blame.

kirtu said:

the destruction of some monasteries mostly during the time of the 5th Dalai Lama, the war between the Karma Kagyu and the Gelug.

Malcolm wrote:

Which monasteries, you mean like Taranatha's monastery which had a full compliment of Jonang monks practicing Jonang lineages?

kirtu said:

These events are well documented.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so well as you seem to believe.

kirtu said:

If the 5th Dalai Lama wrote an edict ordering violence against people (as Indrajala posted) then that is a serious problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Or, if the Fifth is your guru, it is bodhisattva activity.

In any case, if you read the Sperling paper, you can see that the 5th attempted peaceful means before sending in his soldiers to quell a rebellion in Tsang.

What is left out of the Sperling piece is that the 5th was very conflicted about the secular actions demanded of him as a secular ruler. His qualms are spread through his 4 volume autobiography. As a ruler, he had to make recourse to the stick. It's what rulers must do. He however did not seek power, he was installed as a young boy and was at the mercy of his ministers and inherited a political world that was not of his making, though he left an indelible mark.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Complete Tegal Instruction in Unrestricted New Book

Content:

smcj said:

Plus their famous natural spring hot tubs on the cliff above the sea. They are beautiful at night.

Malcolm wrote:

Clothing optional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 7:08 AM

Title: Re: H.H. Sakya Trizin in Canada May 2014

Content:

conebeckham said:

TBRC.....

this is from the Sakya KaBum...

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O8LS4784%7CO8LS47848LS5280\\$W00EGS1017151](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O8LS4784%7CO8LS47848LS5280$W00EGS1017151) "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return  
false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And this is from Khyentse Wangpo

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00AG016%7CO00AG0161GS37000\\$W21807](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00AG016%7CO00AG0161GS37000$W21807) "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return  
false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Not sure which one is more in use.....Malcolm can likely answer that.

Malcolm wrote:

The first is the long sadhana.

The latter is an instruction, not a sadhana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

kirtu said:

Come on - the atrocities that the Tibetan institutions committed are well documented.

Malcolm wrote:

Which atrocities, by whom?

pensum said:

Here are a few:

"Judicial mutilation - principally the gouging out of eyes, and the cutting off of hands or feet - was formalized under the Sakya school as part of the 13th century Tibetan legal code, "

Heinrich Harrer: "in the days of the fifth Dalai Lama (in the eighteenth century), and even under the thirteenth (1900- 33), Tibetans still had their hands and feet chopped off."

"Whipping was legal and common as punishment in Tibet including in the 20th century, also for minor infractions and outside judicial process. Whipping could also have fatal consequences, as in the case of the trader Gyebo Sherpa subjected to the severe corca whipping for selling cigarettes. He died from his wounds 2 days later in the Potala prison. Tashi Tsering, a self-described critic of traditional Tibetan society, records being whipped as a 13 year old for missing a performance as a dancer in the Dalai Lama's dance troop in 1942, until the skin split and the pain became excruciating."

from

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serfdom\\_in\\_Tibet\\_controversy#Human\\_rights\\_in\\_Tibet](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serfdom_in_Tibet_controversy#Human_rights_in_Tibet)

Malcolm wrote:

"Whipping was common....", really, says who? A Wiki page?

"Judicial mutilation - principally the gouging out of eyes, and the cutting off of hands or feet - was formalized under the Sakya school as part of the 13th century Tibetan legal code, "

This an unattributed claim.

There were a total of five executions carried out by the Tibetan government in the 19th century.

Capital punishment was really quite rare in old Tibet, and not the frequent occurrence it is today under Communist rule.

Most of this page is bullshit Chinese propaganda. Everything composed by Grunfeld for example, is sheer crap fed to him by his Chinese handlers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Complete Tegal Instruction in Unrestricted New Book

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

BTW, it looks like Lama Drimed is teaching at Esalen in September:

<http://www.esalen.org/workshop/week-september-14-21/lotus-borne-perception-awareness-teachings-tibetan-buddhism-and>

theanarchist said:

At a minimum of 900 dollars for one week

Malcolm wrote:

\$900.00 – \$4,975.00 (based on accommodation type)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

kirtu said:

Come on - the atrocities that the Tibetan institutions committed are well documented.

Malcolm wrote:

Which atrocities, by whom?

kirtu said:

Indrajala has made a devastating point.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he hasn't. He quoted a sensationalized citation from a paper written by Eliot Sperling.

[http://info-](http://info-buddhism.com/Orientalism_Violence_Tibetan_Buddhism_Elliot_Sperling.html)

[buddhism.com/Orientalism\\_Violence\\_Tibetan\\_Buddhism\\_Elliot\\_Sperling.html](http://info-buddhism.com/Orientalism_Violence_Tibetan_Buddhism_Elliot_Sperling.html) "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

kirtu said:

The term "death squad" is a little extreme.

Malcolm wrote:

Unfortunately it's not.

Yes, it is. It's ridiculous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: H.H. Sakya Trizin in Canada May 2014

Content:

DechenNamdrol said:

FYI, I was told today that they didn't manage to have the Chakrasamvara sadhana translated in time for this weekend, so they will not be supplying a sadhana to practice with.

Malcolm wrote:

The Luipa tradition is the most complex.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Indrajala said:

If we go back to India, violence was employed in an unapologetic fashion in the late period against Brahman aggression. You've read Verardi's book, right?



Malcolm wrote:  
I did not finish it.

Indrajala said:  
If there were realized bodhisattvas at the helm in Tibet before the invasion, why didn't they foresee and prevent the invasion?

Malcolm wrote:  
Many Lamas did for see the invasion and tried hard to prevent it — some, like the 16th Karmapa left well in advance of it on purpose. In fact, your lack of familiarity with the Tibetan anxiety over being invaded, first by Kuomintang forces, and then by the Communists is a little surprising because it is well documented.

Indrajala said:  
Moreover, why were so many serfs mistreated by their Lama overlords?

Malcolm wrote:  
According to whom? Were there serfs in Tibet? I don't think so. Not by the definition normally imagined when people use the term. You need to read Authenticating Tibet: Answers to China's 100 Questions

Indrajala said:  
The conditions of many common indentured servants in Tibet before the invasion is well documented. This is why so many of them joined the Communists to destroy monasteries.

Malcolm wrote:  
By whom? How many is "so many"?

Indrajala said:  
Whose claims are you referring to?  
Well you've claimed lineage founders were realized. In Tibetan Buddhism it is hoped that at least some of the contemporary leadership is realized.

Malcolm wrote:  
I didn't claim that. I pointed out that all of these masters that I listed were considered to be highly realized in their respective schools.

Indrajala said:  
Papal infallibility didn't work out so well for the Catholics in the end.

Malcolm wrote:

It's completely different. There is no pope. And this is not a rule, it is a practice. One is expected to feel that way, but in widely recognized reality is that it is an aspiration.

It is not the case that everyone is required to recognize HHDL as a buddha since he is not everyone's root guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, as far as Vajrayāna is concerned, one must believe that one's root guru is an actual Buddha, and that includes all the lineage masters, if one is to gain realization oneself.

dzogchungpa said:

I have no doubt most or all of the texts and teachers say that, and I have a lot of faith in Vajrayana, but honestly I can't see how such a statement could be established.

Malcolm wrote:

As in proven? It cannot be proven. But it is indeed how it is taught in every Vajrayāna tradition in Tibet.

Lower tantra does not contain the practice of Guruyoga, so this is why, Jeff, such teachings are absent in Shingon, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Indrajala said:

]If you look at the history of late Indian Buddhism and Tibetan Buddhism, it is difficult to believe there were many "realized" people in charge for the simple fact that these institutions often clearly turned their backs against their own stated values and aims by engaging in all manner of harmful activities against beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Who, what, when, where?

Indrajala said:

The violence and religious conflict would suggest realized bodhisattvas were not at the helm. The serfs and other violently repressed commoners of Tibet before the PRC invasion also lived under brutal tyrants who often derived their authority from religion.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, who, what, when and where?

Indrajala said:

In the case of Tibetan Buddhism, one can look at the life of the fifth Dalai Lama and compare claims with historical facts

Malcolm wrote:

Whose claims are you referring to?

Nevertheless, if the Fifth Dalai Lama is one of your lineage gurus, you should regard him as a Buddha, and his questionable acts as skillful means to tame beings. That is the Vajrayāna way. This is a difficult point for many people. It is better perhaps not to adopt a king as one's guru.

The term "death squad" is a little extreme.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm-

Are you familiar with nyur dze Yeshe Gonpo nyingshuk? I suppose that's not a true srog gtad, though it's called srog gi rgya can?

It, and many of the Shangpa jenangs, include tor-wangs. Are you saying this is Kongtrul being influenced by Nyingma?

Malcolm wrote:

I would say that Shangpa empowerments in general are heavily colored by Khyungpo Naljor's Nyingma past.

conebeckham said:

Not Kongtrul's, eh?

Malcolm wrote:

No, since Shangpa transmissions exist in other schools than Kagyu. Then there is the fact that they all, for the most part, pass through another Nyingmapa, Thangthon Gyalpo.

Don't get me wrong, I am not dissing Shangpa, it is just that gtor ma empowerments do not exist in the New Tantras at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, indeed this seems to be the case. Of course, one assumes that some of these teachers actually did attain realization.

Indrajala said:

It feels reassuring to believe in it, doesn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of reassurance. In fact, as far as Vajrayāna is concerned, one must believe that one's root guru is an actual Buddha, and that includes all the lineage masters, if one is to gain realization oneself.

It is fine to be a skeptic. But that attitude is best left for academics who [for whatever perverse reasons] study "Buddhism" rather than Buddhadharma, people who lack faith in such things as rebirth, karma and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm-

Are you familiar with nyur dze Yeshe Gonpo nyingshuk? I suppose that's not a true srog gtad, though it's called srog gi rgya can?

It, and many of the Shangpa jenangs, include tor-wangs. Are you saying this is Kongtrul being influenced by Nyingma?

Malcolm wrote:

I would say that Shangpa empowerments in general are heavily colored by Khyungpo Naljor's Nyingma past.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So, when we have some realized westerners, then maybe we will have some western lineages — but until then, I expect not.

Indrajala said:

Plenty of eminent Buddhist teachers become "realized" after they die thanks to their hagiographies.

So we'll just wait for that to happen with some western teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, indeed this seems to be the case. Of course, one assumes that some of these teachers actually did attain realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

conebeckham said:

Srog gtad are not only for "worldly protectors," I think....perhaps mainly so.

Malcolm wrote:

They are strictly for worldly protectors. There is no need for such entrustments when it comes to wisdom protectors.

conebeckham said:

And Sarma traditions have gtor dbangs as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, gtor dbangs are strictly a Nyingma thing, their presence in Kagyu and Sakya is derived from Nyingma.

No, they are synonyms for the most part. Sometimes you see the term applied to rites for wisdom protectors, but it not perfectly correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they have many retreats to do, many mandalas and rites to learn and so on.

Indrajala said:

The Tibetans created their own lineages and programs to go with them. The west could just as well take much from TB and create their own lineages with different programs, thus having "lineage heads" with different requirements.

Kukai and Shingon likewise did the same thing. They developed their own programs.

Malcolm wrote:

Lineages are not "created", they evolve. In order to have a lineage, one has to have a realized person at the head of that lineage. For example, in Sakya there is Sachen, Sonam Tsemo, Dragpa Gyaltsen, Sapan, and Phagpa as well as Kunga Zangpo and Losal Gyatso for the two main subsects of Sakya, Ngor and Tshar; Marpa, Mila and Gampopa for Kagyu, with various realized masters sitting at the eight of the subsects of Kagyu; for Nyingma there are tertons or tulku lines who sit at the head of each lineage; For Gelugpa, there is Tsongkhapa, etc.

So, when we have some realized westerners, then maybe we will have some western lineages — but until then, I expect not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

conebeckham said:

Srog gtor are not only for "worldly protectors," I think....perhaps mainly so.

Malcolm wrote:

They are strictly for worldly protectors. There is no need for such entrustments when it comes to wisdom protectors.

conebeckham said:

And Sarma traditions have gtor dbangs as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, gtor dbangs are strictly a Nyingma thing, their presence in Kagyu and Sakya is derived from Nyingma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Let us abandon Tibetan for the moment.

There are basically four kinds of initiations:

abhiṣekas [dbang skur, empowerment] = this is your full empowerment, generally takes two days.

adhiṣṭhānas [byin brlabs, blessing] = this a way of conferring the four empowerments in a short hand, called "don dbang" in Nyingma.

anujñāta [rjes gnam, permission] = this is a type of ritual derived from end of an abhiṣeka where various kinds of permissions are granted, such as permission to recite a mantra, visualize oneself as the deity, and understand the deity's wisdom and one's mind are the same. In general, the more strict schools like Sakya consider that properly speaking, one must have received an abhiṣeka before receiving an adhiṣṭhānas or an anujñāta

Then there is a final rite known as a "rig gtad", a kind of rite for entrusting someone with a vidyāmantra from Kriya tantra, i.e. it permits you to recite the mantra.

There is also a srog gtad, an entrustment rite for worldly protectors.

There is what is called a gtor dbang in Nyingma, where the tormas are blessed as the basis of the empowerment, not a mandala.

Also in Dzogchen there is the so called "rig pa'i rtsal dbang", the empowerment of the power of the vidyā, more or less an expansion of the word empowerment. There are a number of other empowerments in Dzogchen as well such as the rgyal ba spyi blugs, and so on, more or less variations on the theme of the rig pa'u rtsal dbang.

There is finally, the empowerment of the descent of the wisdom vajra described in Indrabhūti's Jñānasiddhi, an influential text on Mahāmudrā.

And that's about it, and in all of this there is no pre-recorded video abhiṣeka, etc., at least, not until this century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Jikan said:

We thought it appropriate that Khenpo's email should basically have the last word.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it was an evasion, and I can understand why, since the correct answer is actually no, one cannot receive an empowerment from a recording.

Privileging someone's answer because of their title, in absence of any clear scriptural precedent or reasoning is pretty lame.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Adamantine said:

Well the idea was mainly that most of the conceivable opinions about recorded wangs have been expressed in the prior thread, and it gets repetitive and almost like proselytizing for the same people to keep expressing the same opinions over and over. If we can try to avoid that here, it would be ideal. The topic is certainly not banned though. Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

What we are discussing now is the fact that "answer" (which was a non answer) basically confirms our opinion that there is no validity to the idea that one can receive an empowerment from a recording (but we already knew that...).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2014 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So he said that no one can say for sure at anytime that another person has received the empowerment.

This amounts to a non-answer. This means that anyone, at any time can declare they have received x empowerment from x guru.

dzogchungpa said:

It might be a non-answer, but it seems to directly contradict what you said here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=16286&p=230684#p230647>

Malcolm wrote:

Were you awake during the activities of the disciple? Did you recite the prayers understanding what they meant and why? Did you try to follow the visualizations sincerely as best you could? If so, then you entered the mandala.

It does not. It is a kind of dissimulation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: A closer look into empowerments

Content:

Unknown said:

So he said that no one can say for sure at anytime that another person has received the empowerment.

Malcolm wrote:

This amounts to a non-answer. This means that anyone, at any time can declare they have received x empowerment from x guru.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Three Steps Insight Meditation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

this way of meditating the view is actually derived from the section on the meditating the inseparability of samsara and nirvana, termed "the three points of practice", i.e. mind, illusion and insubstantiality.

Since the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana as well as the three points of practice should only be discussed with those who have received the Hevajra cause empowerment etc., and the instruction of the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana, I will leave it here.

In other words, if you really want to understand this you should meditate it properly.

kunle said:

totally agree with your last statement - it is a practice instruction.

however, could you elaborate on your previous point?

since the entire nangsum is taught and supposedly practised before one receives Hevajra, i don't see why one has to rely on the explanation on the inseparability of samsara and nirvana. not that it would harm, i'm just trying to understand why you mean one needs to understand this first. cheers.

Malcolm wrote:

The real meditation of these three points in 'khor 'das dbyer med is done on the basis of examples, whereas in snang gsum it is presented on the basis of intellectual analysis. But the format of mind, illusion and insubstantiality is ultimately derived from the Vajra Verses where it says "All phenomena are the appearance of mind itself" and so on.

snang gsum itself is presented on the basis of the outline written for the snang gsum and rgyud gsum which may be found in pod gser ma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Three Steps Insight Meditation

Content:

kunle said:

unfortunately there seems to be no extant Sakya commentary on this text. Rongton is said to have authored one, but it was lost.

apart from Dzongsar, no Sakya shedra teaches this text i believe, so i'm not sure how standard sakya this really is.

Malcolm wrote:

@ Kunle: nevertheless, when the view presented in snang gsum and so on — it is clearly stated that first section of meditation on vipaśyāna is in accordance with how ultimate truth is meditated in Yogacara. It is only in the second and third sections on vipaśyāna in snang gsum and so on that freedom from extremes and inexpressibility is meditated.

@ Astus, this way of meditating the view is actually derived from the section on the meditating the inseparability of samsara and nirvana, termed "the three points of practice", i.e. mind, illusion and insubstantiality.

Since the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana as well as the three points of practice should only be discussed with those who have received the Hevajra cause empowerment etc., and the instruction of the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana, I will leave it here.

In other words, if you really want to understand this you should meditate it properly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Three Steps Insight Meditation

Content:

kirtu said:

Cittamatra is in fact taught as a prelude to Madhyamaka in Sakya.

Astus said:

Do you mean Cittamatra in its limited sense of "all phenomena are only mind"?

Malcolm wrote:

As in Shantaraskita's Yogacara Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The ability to give an empowerment is a technical skill more or less acquired in a decade. The ability to be a lineage head however requires a lifetime of training from a young age. It is important to keep this distinction in mind.

dzogchungpa said:

Is that just because a lineage head has to be able to give many different kinds of empowerments or is there something more to it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they have many retreats to do, many mandalas and rites to learn and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

theanarchist said:

My guess is that in the Tibetan tradition the gap between the holy, venerated tulku teachers and the disciples is deliberately kept so big. It's kind of aristocracy by either recognition or family line.

Therefor i's implied that what they have archieved is pretty much unarchievable for any "ordinary folk" followers anyway. People are not exactly encouraged to aspire the same. (that one day you can teach vajrayana it not exactly something you should aspire like becoming a mechanic, but still it's to such an extent unthinkable that people psychologically limit themselves I think)

Malcolm wrote:

The ability to give an empowerment is a technical skill more or less acquired in a decade. The ability to be a lineage head however requires a lifetime of training from a young age. It is important to keep this distinction in mind.

It is very likely that within the next thirty years there will be a plethora of western teachers who can give a limited set of empowerments. It will be a hundred years before there is a genuine western lineage head.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche is in his early to mid 50's, I believe, as is Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche. So....no offense, but these are the current generation. HH Karmapa, Mingyur Rinpoche, are a generation closer.....or younger, IMO.

dzogchungpa said:

Sure, but with respect to the people mentioned in the OP, DJKR and TWR are 1 or even 2 generations behind them. The point is they could easily be teaching for another 20 years.

Sherab Dorje said:

Or they could die tomorrow.

Malcolm wrote:  
As could any of us...

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 3:51 AM  
Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.  
Content:  
dzogchungpa said:  
First, a nonreturner is not necessarily an arhat...

Malcolm wrote:  
Is never an arhat...

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 2:37 AM  
Title: Re: the so-called "open minds" of the young and old  
Content:  
dzogchungpa said:  
That's interesting. Are you saying that for someone like you, Malcolm, who needs meat to be healthy, but is a non-Vajrayana Mahayana practitioner, it is impermissible?

Malcolm wrote:  
Yes, according to Mahāyāna vows.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 1:50 AM  
Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?  
Content:  
Indrajala said:  
I used to have the same ideas as Malcolm in these respects, but I changed my mind when exposed to new models.

Malcolm wrote:  
The luxury of youth is the ability to change your mind before anyone actually takes you seriously.

Indrajala said:  
lol. You change your mind a lot. On E-sangha you defended meat eating, then one day said it was sinful to eat meat, then not so long ago started defending meat eating yet again.

Malcolm wrote:  
I have always said exactly the same thing about meat eating:

From the point of view pratimokṣa vows it is permissible.  
From the point of view of Mahāyāna vows it is not permissible.  
From the point of view of Vajrayāna samaya, it is permissible.

When I was debating against the general consumption of meat, I was doing so out of personal conviction. Even then I clarified that I exempted the practice of consuming meat in the context of Vajrayāna samaya. I continue to maintain that industrially produced meat (and plantfood) is a bane for the environment to this day, and that it should be avoided. I still do not cook meat in my home.

If there are people who can be vegetarian and be healthy, I applaud them. I cannot. In general, I consume some meat because it is good for me to do so, physically. The two times in my life when I went for extended periods of time without eating meat, my health suffered a great deal, and not because I was not eating correctly. In general as a physician, I see a lot of people who really do need to eat meat and who feel better when they do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I used to have the same ideas as Malcolm in these respects, but I changed my mind when exposed to new models.

Malcolm wrote:

The luxury of youth is the ability to change your mind before anyone actually takes you seriously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

For Bon, there is Tenzin Wangyal.

Malcolm wrote:

I meant when he is gone...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

kalzang said:

I sometimes wonder how Dharma in the West will be affected by the passing of today's famous/popular teachers. What will happen to (the perception of) certain sanghas when their iconic teachers pass away? How will popular support and (serious) attendance be affected? Imagine Plum Village without Thich Nhat Hanh, Sravasti Abbey without Thubten Chodron, Gampo Abbey without Pema Chodron, Rigpa/Lerab Ling without Sogyal Rinpoche etc. Where are the future iconic/charismatic Dharma teachers?

Any thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

For Nyingma there is Dzongsar Khyentse; Zigar Kongtgrul, Khandro Rinpoche, Anam Thubten, etc. lots of people.

The Sakyapas never produce anyone charismatic...

There is the HH Karmapa, Migyur Rinpoche, etc.

I don't know the Gelug or Bon schools well enough to comment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I know a shitload more about everything than I did when I was 28, especially about myself.

Indrajala said:

I think you're a smart guy who has continually been in learning mode, but that's often exceptional in people. Not all people past fifty know so much or even tried to spend part of their lives studying and trying to figure themselves out.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a quality of my generation notably lacking in those younger than us, from the Reagan youth onward. There is a fifteen year slice from roughly of people born from 1950 to 1965 who were remarkably open-minded, introspective, culturally open, etc. People prior to that and subsequent to that tended to be either more conservative or more nihilistic...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Indrajala said:

My generation is a lot more open minded.

Malcolm wrote:

Than who? People my age (51)? I don't think so. And you yourself are not a bastion of open-mindedness, quite the opposite from my perspective.

dzogchungpa said:

Does being a "bastion of open-mindedness" even make sense?

In all fairness to VIJ, it seems to me that he actually is quite open-minded, although perhaps not quite bastion material.

Malcolm wrote:

Have you examined his views on gay marriage lately? How about his view that "inferior" social classes requiring a firm controlling hand...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 5th, 2014 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jeff wrote on his blog that accompanies this:

My generation is still too young to command much respect or authority.

I can remember bitching about this very fact when I was your age. My opinion was that the only difference between me and some 45 year old guy was that he was 45 and I was 28. Of course, in the intervening years I have come to realize that there is a lot of difference between being 28 and 51, and I am sure that when I am 75, if I make it that long, I will have an even longer lens to view things from. I know a shitload more about everything than I did when I was 28, especially about myself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 5th, 2014 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Indrajala said:

My generation is a lot more open minded.

Malcolm wrote:

Than who? People my age (51)? I don't think so. And you yourself are not a bastion of open-mindedness, quite the opposite from my perspective.

Give yourself another 20 years and you will be laughing at your youthful opinions of today, especially when some 28 or 30 year old tells you that his or her generation is more open-minded than yours.

I have live for five decades; what I have learned is that for every decade there are opinions about life that are shared among those people who live in that decade, and that people who have not reached a certain decade generally cannot imagine that the people who have reached that decade have anything worthwhile to say just based on lived experience. But the fact is that the older you get, the more things just stay the same, young people like yourself have been bitching about older people since the dawn of humanity and will continue to do so, and older people will continue to shake their heads in amusement as they watch the younger generations continue to make the same damn mistakes they did.

If you were really a Confucian, you should be seeking to follow the example of some sagacious mentor, you would be attending to your dear parents, and so on. But I see the usual business of young intellectuals like yourself, lots of sturm and drung, tons of opinions, but not much yet in the way of follow through...and how could there be? You have not been an adult for even a decade yet.

It does not mean that you are not bright, or your opinions are not worthwhile, but put them in context...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 5th, 2014 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Next generation of Dharma teachers in the West?

Content:

Indrajala said:

For example, some people condemn me as being delusional or having some cultural fetish for openly adopting certain East Asian cultural bits while mockingly saying they would never accept me as one of their own. This is a curious generation gap I've noticed. Previous generations disdain the idea of someone white adopting Asian ways, whereas in my generation, at least amongst people I know, it is acceptable..

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, dude, you have been in an ex-pat bubble for so long, you have no idea how people in Canada will relate to you as a "monk". Further, you discount the fact that the West is becoming more xenophobic, not less so, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 5th, 2014 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Adamantine said:

But in this case --of a live video or recorded video-- there is a physical support, a support of visual and audible phenomenon. So it is different.

Malcolm wrote:



As I have explained, in the case of the former, the mandala is active, the guru is present, the disciples are present. In the case of the latter, the mandala has been dissolved and the rite is already finished, the guru is not present. Case closed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 5th, 2014 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Source? getting on the horse just to fall off the other

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Hello,

Throughout the years, in reference to Madhyamika and eternalism/nihilism, I've seen variants of phrase that goes something like the following:

"getting on the horse just to fall off the other side"

indicating one's attempts to avoid either of the extremes has left one squarely in the opposite extreme. Does anyone know if there is a canonical source for this expression?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it begins with Gorampa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 5th, 2014 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jigme Lingpa is hardly an ordinary shmoe, a beginner, trying to gain a proper introduction to Vajrayāna. He was a highly experienced practitioner who had been in retreat for years. He also had a real guru, a human being.

Adamantine said:

I pointed out he was of the highest capacity-- I understand his background, however it is still an example of receiving transmission outside of a concrete physical presence.

Malcolm wrote:

That was an example of a siddha receiving transmission from a Sambhogakāya manifestation. Even the Buddha cannot manifest his sambhogakāya to any ordinary sentient being to give them a single word of teaching, much less an empowerment. In order to even see a Sambhogakāya one must be an eighth stage bodhisattva.

Adamantine said:

I don't think it is irresponsible to give the benefit of the doubt to Garchen Rinpoche-- that this was his intent and what he communicated, and that he may indeed have the capacity to benefit beings in this way.

Malcolm wrote:

Not even Buddha Vajradhara can benefit beings in that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 5th, 2014 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Adamantine said:

Speaking of highest capacity though, of course we know that Jigme Lingpa received the body speech and mind blessings of Longchenpa in visionary form. So this may be an example of a yogi truly with the highest capacity. He came to see Longchenpa as his true root Guru, even though he never met him in the flesh.

Malcolm wrote:

Jigme Lingpa is hardly an ordinary shmoe, a beginner, trying to gain a proper introduction to Vajrayāna. He was a highly experienced practitioner who had been in retreat for years. He also had a real guru, a human being.

It is really irresponsible to encourage people to think it is even a remote possibility that one could receive an qualified empowerment from a recording.

Of course, in matters of religion people are free to believe whatever fantasies they want...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 4th, 2014 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Alan Wallace on Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

Half an hour into it he mentions that Dudjom Lingpa never had a human teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

This is of course completely false.

Just look on TBRC, you can see that Dudjom Lingpa was a disciple of a very prominent 19th century Gelugpa master , 'jam dbyangs thub bstan nyi ma.

<http://www.tbrc.org/#!rid=P382> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 4th, 2014 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Tröma Nagmo in Sanskrit?

Content:

plwk said:

<http://www.himalayanart.org/image.cfm/490.html>

No, it is Khrodhakāli, a form of Vajrayogini originally revealed by the Mahāsiddha Virupa and brought to Tibet by Padampa Sangye.

Thanks Malcolm but what you mentioned is also mentioned in the link I gave. So Himalayan Art got the Krishna Krodhini part wrong huh?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I have never seen that equivalent anywhere. There are a lot of mistakes on Himalayan Art actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 4th, 2014 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Tröma Nagmo in Sanskrit?

Content:

yegyal said:

Wouldn't it be Khrodhikali, as both parts of the name are feminized?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 4th, 2014 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Tröma Nagmo in Sanskrit?

Content:

plwk said:

<http://www.himalayanart.org/image.cfm/490.html>

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is Khrodhakāli, a form of Vajrayogini originally revealed by the Mahāsiddha Virupa and brought to Tibet by Padampa Sangye.

zenman said:

Is Krodhakali a direct translation?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 4th, 2014 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Tröma Nagmo in Sanskrit?

Content:  
plwk said:  
<http://www.himalayanart.org/image.cfm/490.html>

Malcolm wrote:  
No, it is Khrodhakāli, a form of Vajrayogini originally revealed by the Mahāsiddha Virupa and brought to Tibet by Padampa Sangye.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 11:59 PM  
Title: Re: Receiving Empowerment: Crash Course  
Content:

Motova said:  
Thanks for the help everyone. So I guess I don't have to memorize this book yet, but I'll still read it and get a good grasp of it. I really prefer it as opposed to the Lam Rim or Words of My Perfect Teacher...

Thanks for the book recommendation Malcolm, I'll definitely order it!

Will this Green Tara initiation allow me to practice the 21 Praises to Tara?

Malcolm wrote:  
Yes, absolutely.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 9:40 PM  
Title: Re: What practices can you do publicly?  
Content:

Sherlock said:  
Sometimes on a nice day, I like to go to a park and sit down and do some practice that doesn't involve much chanting. Is this alright?

What about chod?

Malcolm wrote:  
Doing an outer chod is a little strange. But you can of course do chod in a very simple way. However, if you are chanting strange things in a loud voice, even SOV, this is not a good thing as you know.

But going to do semzins like white a and so on, no problem.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Alfredo said:

Must the tantras be accepted as literally true, in order for tantric Buddhism to make sense?

Malcolm wrote:

In order for the practice presented in Buddhist tantras to make sense, you must accept that one can achieve the result they promise by following the methods they prescribe. If you accept that, then in order to achieve those results, you must follow the methods they prescribe with faith in those methods.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Alfredo said:

Are there no legitimate disagreements, either among the various tantras, or in the case of the same tantra, from one commentary to another?

Malcolm wrote:

Since the procedures for empowerment into HYT mandalas actually depend on yoga tantras such as the Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha, there is an unusual degree of conformity in methodology amongst the HYT tantras for how to give an empowerment into an HYT mandala.

We find very little controversy over the procedure for granting empowerments within the Indian texts themselves. Naturally, different empowerments all have their special features, but in general they all follow a fairly standard model.

There is a fair amount of controversy among Tibetans over what constituted a proper maturational rite; the Nyingmapas and Kagyus being on the loose side of things, the Sakyapas being on the strict side of things, Gelugpas somewhere in the middle. If you are interested in these debates, then you need to read Sapan's Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes and the responses to it by various Kagyu and Nyingma authors. You can also read Tsele Natshog Rangdrol book on empowerments, as well as what Kongtrul has to say on the subject.

But even where there is some debate amongst Tibetans over whether "blessings" (sbyin rlabs) as opposed to full empowerments (dbang skur) have the necessary features to properly introduce one into Vajrayāna, there was never any debate at all that one must properly receive some kind of empowerment in person from the guru in order to be considered someone who has received samaya.

And as you know, this would clearly exclude recorded empowerments from consideration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Alfredo said:

And in those tantras, does the relevant Buddha or tutelary deity typically REVEAL rules which already exist, inherent in the structure of the universe, or ESTABLISH rules according to what would work best for sentient beings, or TRANSMIT rules which he/she received from some other source?

Malcolm wrote:

The source of empowerments are the Buddha Vajradhara's wisdom, set down in words in the tantras. If someone is a person who has faith in Vajrayāna, it is hard to maintain that one has faith in Vajrayāna and yet disbelieves the verity of the basic texts of Vajrayāna.

For example, the Kalacakra tantra contains a chapter which explains empowerments in great detail.

Empowerments themselves are a method, working with causes and results, bases of purification, purifiers and results of purification which are taught in the tantras. Empowerment is a method, and it has certain procedures to ensure it is successful.

Secondly, there are the instructions of Mahāsiddhas like Naropa who have realized the result of the path, and who have written commentaries on empowerments, such as the Sekkhodesha, etc.

Then there are of course commentaries written by learned scholars on these things who nevertheless may not have realization and so on.

At base, the fundamental principle of an empowerment is to reverse samsaric dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 7:09 PM

Title: Re: Receiving Empowerment: Crash Course

Content:

Motova said:

So I just finished school a week ago and started full time landscaping for this summer.

So I haven't had much time to prepare for: <http://www.sakyatoronto.com/> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Hopefully the tickets aren't sold out when I go to buy them this weekend...

I haven't taken refuge yet, though I am going to try and do it myself before I go. And I emailed the rep for the event, and they said refuge isn't necessary, also someone mentioned something along the same lines on a thread here.

Basically, I have two weeks to prepare myself so I can receive proper empowerment and/or not get kicked out.

I have Three Visions - Fundamental Teachings of the Sakya Lineage of Tibetan Buddhism by Ngorchen Konchog Lhundrug with a Foreword by H.H. Sakya Trizin... My plan is to memorize the outline on page 221 for those who have it and try to read the book twice, as well as become familiar with H.H. Sakya Trizin's biography.

Please post anything that you think might help me with my goal. I'm specifically looking for some resources on how to receive empowerment's properly, as well as any stories about Sakya Trizin that might inspire faith in him and/or the Sakya Lineage. Also, if you have any criticism go crazy. Finally, does anyone know the specific sadhana's H.H. Sakya Trizin will be giving transmission for and if they will be handed out or sold on site?

Malcolm wrote:

The Green Tara practice is quite common. But if you cannot find it there let me know after you have received the initiation. My translation is the one used in the Sakya centers under Lama Migmar.

You should consider purchasing Treasures of the Sakya Lineage, available from Shambhala. My trainings is primarily in Sakya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 7:06 PM

Title: Re: Receiving Empowerment: Crash Course

Content:

Motova said:

I haven't taken refuge yet, though I am going to try and do it myself before I go. And I emailed the rep for the event, and they said refuge isn't necessary, also someone mentioned something along the same lines on a thread here.

Karma Jinpa said:

I've never heard of being able to take an empowerment without having first gone for refuge.

Malcolm wrote:

Refuge is given at the beginning of every empowerment, so there is no reason to attend a refuge ceremony as a preliminary. Bodhicitta vows are given in every empowerment, so there is no reasons to attend a bodhicitta vow ceremony separately.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 7:03 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

heart said:

So, in my opinion I don't think anyone that posted in this thread mean disrespect or insult to Garchen Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 6:53 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Alfredo said:

If there are rules governing the validity of Buddhist empowerments, from where do these rules arise?

Malcolm wrote:

The tantras, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 6:47 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

My answer was clarifying that ChNN said he could not confer a full empowerment through the net and why he felt this was so.

JohnJ said:

I apologize for any redundant questions, and questions that are off topic from this thread, but since the teachings of ChNN were brought up again I'd like to make sure my understanding is clear.

By full empowerment, am I correct in understanding that you mean one that includes all 4 empowerments and has the necessary physical supports? Your answer earlier seemed to indicate that for students of the right capacity, direct introduction could suffice for their ripening, and so a full empowerment would not be necessary, while for students of lesser capacity a full empowerment is definitely necessary. Have I understood this correctly, according to the Dzogchen perspective and teachings of



ChNN?

Is the central difference between a meaning empowerment and a full physical empowerment, according to ChNN, found in whether or not there are physical supports? If there is greater underlying difference, could you say a few words as to what that difference is? For instance, sometimes ChNN states that for many people a meaning empowerment can be much more important than a traditional empowerment, does this also have to do with one's capacity?

My questions centrally revolve around the meaning of the word 'full' in this explanation of empowerment, since I have never thought the teachings and path presented by ChNN was lacking, or "not full".

Thank you in advance for helping to clarify any misunderstandings that I might have on this issue.

Malcolm wrote:

A full empowerment generally takes two days (though it can all be done in one) and has an elaborate version of the vase empowerment, etc. Empowerments that do not have that are called "blessings" according to the new tantras and "meaning empowerments" according to the system of anuyoga because they do not have the preparation phase and the four empowerments are given symbolically.

The Garland of Pearls Tantra, one of the 17 Dzogchen tantras, maintains that for students of lesser capacity all four empowerments are necessary, while students of higher capacity or experience may require only direct introduction. The sgra thal gyur definitely states that empowerments are a necessary requirement and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no siddhis without empowerment,  
just as there is no oil even if sand is pressed.  
Whoever proudly explains the tantras and citations  
to those without empowerment,  
both master and disciple go to hell  
as soon as they die even if there are siddhis.  
-- Mahāmudratilaka-tantra

Virgo said:

Very scary.

Kevin

Lhasa said:

Yup, and the Catholic church used to teach that if you swallowed your toothpaste on purpose during the three hour fast before receiving communion, and died on the way home, you went straight to hell.

Malcolm wrote:

The point, of course, is that one should not expect to have any positive results from the practice of Vajrayāna if one does not enter Vajrayāna in a proper way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

face palm buddha 2.jpg

Malcolm wrote:

classic

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

I can't imagine that you don't see this as an opportunity to learn something.i

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot receive an empowerment from a recording of an empowerment. It simply isn't possible. Such a thing resembles the son of a barren women. You can talk about such a boy all you want, you can describe his hair, his abilities, his intelligence, his wit, grace and charm — but in the end, you have to admit you are talking about a fantasy.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dalai Lama on the other hand, opined that people watching Kalacakra and participating actively via a webcast could receive the empowerment in that way. But here, this is all taking place within the context of an active mandala.

Karma Jinpa said:

This is interesting to hear. Did His Holiness say this at the most recent Kalachakra in D.C. a few years ago, or was it at some other place/time?

The reason I ask is because I attended a Guhyasamaja wang he gave back in 2010 or 2011 via webcast and he specifically said that those viewing it online had not received the empowerment. Don't remember if his reasoning was the lack of contact with the substances/supports or not, or if he even gave one. Sounds like either the Dalai Lama is changing his mind on webcast wangs, or that Kalachakra is a special case/exception to the rule.

Also worth noting that His Holiness has said on numerous occasions that he gives the Kalachakra empowerment as skillful means to give introductory and fundamental teachings since tons of people will come from far and wide for such a high empowerment but the vast majority of them won't receive it in actuality.

Malcolm wrote:

It might be the number of people attending but I don't know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Mistranslating Gampopa?

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Thank you to everyone who's provided alternate translations! These have really helped dispel my confusion on the matter.

Malcolm wrote:

It literally ought to be:

Grant blessings [that] Dharma moves to the path;

Karma Jinpa said:

Malcolm, can you kindly give your gloss/understanding of what "Dharma moves to the path" would mean? Thanks.

This is one of the many reasons why I'm so overjoyed to learn the language: one day I'll be able to read the texts directly and even compare my own understanding to the translations of others.

Malcolm wrote:

One is requesting that the Dharma one has learned becomes a path. Then you are asking for the path to destroy delusion, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The issue is not whether someone can receive an empowerment through the internet.

Sherab Dorje said:

Actually, this was raised as an issue too. And your answer was basically that people cannot receive full empowerment via the internet, neither through live broadcast nor through a recording.

Malcolm wrote:

My answer was clarifying that ChNN said he could not confer a full empowerment through the net and why he felt this was so. The Dalai Lama on the other hand, opined that people watching Kalacakra and participating actively via a webcast could receive the empowerment in that way. But here, this is all taking place within the context of an active mandala.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So how can one verify if the siddhi that arose, even in the case of a proper empowerment, are not just based on the exhaustion of merit?

Malcolm wrote:

One can infer on the basis of the kindness of the person whether they are a bodhisattva. Otherwise there is no way you or I can tell.

Sherab Dorje said:

There are Siddhas in non-Buddhist tantric traditions too, do they receive correct empowerment or are their siddhi based exclusively on the exhaustion of merit?

Malcolm wrote:

The latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no siddhis without empowerment,  
just as there is no oil even if sand is pressed.  
Whoever proudly explains the tantras and citations

to those without empowerment,  
both master and disciple go to hell  
as soon as they die even if there are siddhis.  
-- Mahāmudratilaka-tantra

Sherab Dorje said:

I'm not denying the validity of this statement, but if siddhis arose then it would verify the validity of the empowerment, right? Or maybe not? Can empowerments theoretically ripen over lifetimes?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, it is mentioned that even if one shows signs of accomplishment, one is merely exhausting one's merit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 3rd, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Imagine someone claiming they have attained siddhi from only attending a recorded empowerment and doing the retreat, and then seeking to initiate students into that said empowerment.

Sherab Dorje said:

And if the siddhi were verified?

Malcolm wrote:

There are no siddhis without empowerment,  
just as there is no oil even if sand is pressed.  
Whoever proudly explains the tantras and citations  
to those without empowerment,  
both master and disciple go to hell  
as soon as they die even if there are siddhis.  
-- Mahāmudratilaka-tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

untxi said:

I find this whole thread a little disturbing.

There are many very highly qualified masters, with genuine realization, who offer a variety of teachings across a wide range of topics (lam rim, dialectics, empowerments, tantric grounds & paths, kyerim and dzogrim instructions, pointing-out and pith

instructions) in a wide range of contexts (one-one, informally through skillful means, in groups, in teaching retreats, in practice retreats)-- which happen to include modern technologies such as recording and webcasts.

Malcolm wrote:

You are overshooting the mark here with your objections.

The only thing I question, and quite rightly so as far as I am concerned, is the practice of some students encouraging other students to believe that watching a video of an empowerment constitutes receiving that empowerment. I have never once called into question the practice of attending live webcasts, following a course through the mail, and so on.

My concern is quite real, since I think that this belief that one can receive an empowerment or even the transmission of a mantra from a recording will do serious damage to Vajrayāna teachings.

Imagine someone claiming they have attained siddhi from only attending a recorded empowerment and doing the retreat, and then seeking to initiate students into that said empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Dharma Quotes Thread

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

མེས་ལས་གཞན་མང་པར་ནི་སྒྲོས་རིག་ནས།  
དེ་ནས་མེས་ཀྱང་མང་པ་ཉིད་དུ་རྟོགས།  
སྒྲོ་དང་ལྡན་པས་གཉིས་པོ་མང་རིག་ནས།  
དེ་མི་ལྡན་པའི་ཆོས་ཀྱི་དབྱིངས་ལ་གནས།

- Mahayansutralamkara

Malcolm wrote:

Having come know that nothing exists apart from the mind,  
then understanding the mind too does not exist,  
the intelligent, knowing both do not exist,  
dwell in the dharmadhātu that is without them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Lhasa said:

Thank you!

T. Chokyi said:

You're welcome Lhasa, I've been in empowerments with you by Garchen Rinpoche over the internet I do believe, I think I've seen you in the live chat Rinpoche allows at those empowerments, where we can request substances from Rinpoche, and also the deity images, sadhana, and mantras...I believe I've "seen" you there. Tashi Deleg to you!

Malcolm wrote:

This was never an issue. The issue is not whether someone can receive an empowerment through the internet.

The issue is whether one can receive an empowerment from watching a video of an empowerment that took place at an earlier time. This is impossible and I have given many reasons for why this is impossible.

I think many people are largely ignorant of what an empowerment actually is, and so believe all kinds of strange things are possible when in fact they are not. Such thinking truly involves abandoning the Buddha's teaching "where this exists, that exists, where this does not exist, that does not exist." Believing that one can receive an empowerment from watching a video is similar to believing that one can be sustained by looking at a picture of a fine meal. In reality, one will only be fed by sitting down at a real table and eating a real meal.

The point is not to deprive people of an avenue for making a Dharma connection. The point is to make sure that people actually make a Dharma connection.

The person who takes secret mantra on his own  
is like a child who swallows burning iron.  
— Ārya-vajrakrodharājakaḷpa-laghutantra-nāma

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Mistranslating Gampopa?

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

So I always see this translation of the Four Dharmas of Gampopa:

། རྒྱ་ཆོས་སུ་འགྲོ་བར་བྱིན་གྱིས་སྒྲོབས། །  
ཆོས་ལམ་དུ་འགྲོ་བར་བྱིན་གྱིས་སྒྲོབས། །  
ལམ་འཁྲལ་བ་ཞིག་པར་བྱིན་གྱིས་སྒྲོབས། །  
འཁྲལ་བ་ཡི་ཤེས་སུ་འཆར་བར་བྱིན་གྱིས་སྒྲོབས། །

Grant your blessing so that my mind may turn towards the Dharma.

Grant your blessing so that Dharma may progress along the path.

Grant your blessing so that the path may clarify confusion.

Grant your blessing so that confusion may dawn as wisdom.

I've bolded and italicized the part that's always confused me, or struct me as clunky. Is the grammar for the Tibetan such that this is the only way to read it? If that's not the case, I would think that "Grant your blessing so that I may progress along the path of

Dharma" would be a much more sensible translation.

Can anyone with more Tibetan skills weigh in on this?

Malcolm wrote:

It literally ought to be:

Grant blessings [that] mind moves to the Dharma;  
Grant blessings [that] Dharma moves to the path;  
Grant blessings [that] the path destroys delusion;  
Grant blessings [that] delusion rises as wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Doesn't motivation/intention play a role in dependent origination?

Malcolm wrote:

If you take as a master someone who only intends to make money off of empowerment rites, as long as they are done correctly, you still are taking samaya with that person and so on, as well as agreeing to the commitments of Vajrayāna in general. Of course, if you find out later that person is merely a carpetbagger, a Dharma salesman, well, you can leave that guru's company, but you can't look back and say "oh, those empowerments I took were not valid".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 6:53 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, as long as they have done the retreats, and so on.

This is why it is critical to examine the qualities of the guru.

If you take someone as a guru, and request empowerment and so on from them, then you have a connection with that person even if their motivation is wrong. Why? Because you made the connection; you requested empowerment, and so on. From that point on you are supposed to view them as being an actual Buddha. You are the one who, at the beginning of the empowerment, are saying "Guru, please heed me; accept me as your disciple".

Sherab Dorje said:

So an empowerment executed "correctly" with the "wrong" motivation has the desired



result, whereas an empowerment done "incorrectly" but with the "right" motivation does not have the desired result. So can you please explain to me how this contradicts my opinion about the preeminence of ritual?

Malcolm wrote:

It is similar with an ordination of a monk. If the rite is not properly executed, the ordination does not happen. Someone can intend to be a monk with all the right motivation in the world; but if they do not receive the ordination from a properly constituted quorum, they cannot be considered a bhikṣu. On the other hand, someone who wishes to become a monk for power and fame becomes a monk if they ordain in front of a properly constituted quorum.

As for an empowerment, it is the case that an unawakened person can bestow an empowerment which produces the cause and condition for another to achieve awakening in this very life, for example, in the case of Kotalipa who achieved the state of mahāmudra, and whose own guru begged him to become a disciple. Why? Because the rites of maturation during an empowerment are effective. They work because of dependent origination.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 6:40 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

dakini\_boi said:

Well, my understanding is that the orthodox response would be yes (according to scriptural sources which I am unable to cite, but I'm sure you could).

Malcolm wrote:

The answer in fact is no, according to scriptural sources. When the guru asks you to do something that violates Buddhist principles, you are to explain to him that you cannot do that.

dakini\_boi said:

I have learned a lot from this topic, particularly your posts about empowerment, Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

My sole intention is edify, so I am glad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Thus far, no one has been able to offer any sort of reasonable response to my objections about this.

dakini\_boi said:

Vajrayana is based on the instructions of an authentic Guru first and foremost, before any scriptural source...

Malcolm wrote:

I am sorry, but this is just a pathway to delusion. By this reasoning, if the Guru tells you to rape and murder people, you should follow this teaching though it totally violates every Buddhist principle!?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

While I can understand and sympathise with what you are saying here, it seems to me that we are falling into a trap. The trap here is that of the preeminence of ritual.

Malcolm wrote:

You are mistaken. If people think that properly upholding methods taught by the Buddha fall under the heading of adherence to rites and rules, then the Dharma is already hopelessly corrupt and there is no point in my discussing this further. There is no point in even criticizing those who give empowerments without having received them and so on.

M

Sherab Dorje said:

No, because most of those giving empowerments without having received them (and some of those giving them, after having received them) are doing so with wrong/unwholesome motivation.

What do you think: if the vajra master does not have the right motivation, even if the ritual is carried out according to the book, using all the correct physical/material supports etc..., will/can it be successful based only on the adherence to prescribed outer forms?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, as long as they have done the retreats, and so on.

This is why it is critical to examine the qualities of the guru.

If you take someone as a guru, and request empowerment and so on from them, then you have a connection with that person even if their motivation is wrong. Why? Because you made the connection; you requested empowerment, and so on. From that point on you are supposed to view them as being an actual Buddha. You are the one who, at the beginning of the empowerment, are saying "Guru, please heed me; accept me as your disciple".

And if they have not done themselves received empowerment they are granting, then both that guru and you will go to lower realms. All this is clearly stated tantras such as the Mahāmudratilaka and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, you have given a good description of what is supposed to be going on in the guru's mind during an empowerment. What is less clear is what effect this is supposed to have on the students. Perhaps this is the point that needs to be clarified. For example you said: "the master summons the jñānasattva, the wisdom being, into each disciple who is present" but what does that mean exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that through the proper causes and conditions the student is prepared to receive the main part of the empowerment. If the student is free of obstacles, they may experience certain signs that I will not discuss.

There are any number of very good books on the subject of empowerments and what happens during them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

michaelb said:

Do Gelugpas take this true existence as something separate from an object? I know they say it doesn't exist, but is it something separate from the object that they are negating, so "pot is not empty of pot but empty of inherent existence?" would they take a statement that the pot is empty of pot to be nihilism?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they regard statements like "The pot is empty of the pot" to be an over-negation. They only accept "the pot is emptiness of potness".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

While I can understand and sympathise with what you are saying here, it seems to me that we are falling into a trap. The trap here is that of the preeminence of ritual.

Malcolm wrote:

You are mistaken. If people think that properly upholding methods taught by the Buddha fall under the heading of adherence to rites and rules, then the Dharma is already hopelessly corrupt and there is no point in my discussing this further. There is no point in even criticizing those who give empowerments without having received them and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 2nd, 2014 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

haha said:

Dog's tooth can do the Buddha's work. Why the rinpoche's empowerment video cannot do that??? How many people are going to watch that? and then how many people do get benefit from it? However, those ppl whoever want to connect with him definitely get benefit from it if the rinpoche said so.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Faith in the Buddha qualities what caused the results produced in this story. The women did not have faith in a dog's tooth, she had faith in the Buddha's qualities. The women may have been mistaken about the tooth, but she was not mistaken about the Buddha.

But we are not talking about the veneration of relics. No one in history has ever suggested that one can receive, for example, a Vajrakilaya empowerment from even a valid, authentic relic of the Buddha.

We are discussing whether someone who watches recording of an empowerment actually receives it. Thus far, no one has been able to offer any sort of reasonable response to my objections about this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Alfredo said:

An analogy might be with a wedding ceremony.

Malcolm wrote:

It was just pointed out to me that the analogy might be apt if one could be married by watching a recording of someone's else's wedding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Alfredo said:

An analogy might be with a wedding ceremony. What counts as a valid ceremony? Can it be performed by proxy (i.e., with a third person standing in for one of the couple)?

Some religions, notably Catholicism, conceive of marriage (or technically, sacramental marriage--the following would not apply to natural marriage) as indeed involving some kind of spiritual bond, which comes into existence only under certain precise conditions. Others, notably Buddhism, defer to whatever standards each society may have.

Malcolm wrote:

The analogy is not apt. We are not comparing what an empowerment is in Buddhism and Catholicism.

Further, the definitions and procedures of empowerments (a practice unique in Vajrayāna Buddhism with unique requirements) are defined in the basic literature of the Vajrayāna (the tantras); unlike marriage ceremonies which are extra-canonical rites; despite the fact that there are considered one of the seven sacraments of the church.

There are hundreds of texts written by Indian masters on the subject of empowerments, how to conduct them, for all four classes of tantras.

There have been some disagreements among Tibetans in the past as to what constitutes a proper "maturational empowerment" -- those interested can read Sakya Pandita's Clear Differentiation of the Three Vows and the various responses to it by Kagyu masters such as Pawo Tsuglag Trengwa and so on (Here the issue is whether a sbyin rlabs can be considered to "mature" or "ripen" a student).

Nevertheless, everyone agrees that without an empowerment one is not matured as a student of Vajrayāna. The question here is whether one can be ripened by or receive an empowerment from an inanimate object such as a "blessed" picture, book or a movie. The answer is, "Of course not."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

conebeckham said:

Ironically, by inserting the qualifier "inherent" critics say he leaves a subtle sort of "existence" as regards conventional truth. His supporters say those who completely negate existence stray into nihilism.

michaelb said:

Are the 'freedom from extremes' types negating existence, though? Not existent, not nonexistent, etc. But are they just really saying not existent and the other three are added just to copy a traditional Indian pattern?

I'm still a little stuck on the inherent existence thing. Translations I've read from Nagarjuna to Mipham also talk about the absence of this being what emptiness means.

Malcolm wrote:

All four extremes represent positions found in Indian philosophy; for example, the Jain position of indeterminacy is really just the position that something can exist and not exist at the same time.

So yes, all four extremes must be negated, both relatively and ultimately, and that, and that alone is the middle way.

Tsongkhapa is faulted for a lot of things in his Madhyamaka writings which really have very little to do with Madhyamaka per se. Of course, what many people do not understand is that often Gorampa's polemics are not so much aimed at Tsongkhapa as they are Khedrupje.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Alfredo said:

Transmissions are not magic spells--

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, and imagining that digital files can be "blessed" to grant empowerments is precisely the kind of thinking that informs "magical spells".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 7:28 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

JohnJ said:

but merely speculating based on instructions I have received.

Malcolm wrote:

That's a bad idea.

JohnJ said:

I am very grateful for your clarification, however, as it has helped me understand the quote by Garchen Rinpoche that I referenced above. I think, in this case, that you are saying the same thing he has said but in much greater detail.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have any idea what Garchen has said, I merely note that a lot of people are claiming Garchen Rinpoche's endorsement for their own concepts. I have yet to see any formal written statement about this matter from him. For example, you can bet that were ChNN to do something as controversial he would publish a formal written statement and explain his reasons why he was doing this or that very precisely.

JohnJ said:

...to abandon this kind of divisive thinking...

Malcolm wrote:

The divisive thinking here that is being promulgated is being promulgated by those who claim against all reason and common sense that digital files can be "blessed" to "grant" empowerments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Simhamukha and Guru Dragpur

Content:

Reibeam said:

does the lung for the medium Tun give enough authorization to practice Simhamukha and Guru Dragpo separately from the Tun?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Quotes Thread

Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
The Samādhirāja Sūtra states:

Though I have taught the very excellent dharma,  
if you do not correctly practice after hearing it,  
it is like a patient holding a bag of medicine,  
it will not cure one's illness.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 1:55 AM  
Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments  
Content:  
dzogchungpa said:  
OK thanks, but I was also wondering if there are supposed to be "signs" indicating that you have really "received the empowerment"?

Malcolm wrote:  
You mean like stigmata?

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 12:27 AM  
Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
During an empowerment, there are two sections...  
...  
As you can now understand, in order to be a Vajramaster one must have extraordinary powers of samadhi.

dzogchungpa said:  
OK, thanks. If that is (part of) what is necessary to enter a HYT mandala correctly, I kind of wonder how often that happens.  
Is there any way to "verify" that one has indeed done so?

Malcolm wrote:  
Were you awake during the activities of the disciple? Did you recite the prayers understanding what they meant and why? Did you try to follow the visualizations sincerely as best you could? If so, then you entered the mandala.

Even though your master is not the most realized person, as long as he satisfied his responsibilities in doing the basic approach retreats and fire offerings, etc., and performed the empowerment rites correctly, still you took the pledges of samaya, still you received the empowerment. Still you need to regard that person as a real Buddha. If you do so, then you will achieve buddhahood. Even if the Buddha were to give you an empowerment, if you think he is an ordinary shmoe, then like Sunakṣatra, you might be



swallowed up by the ground before you even die.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this is the fault of the master. There are two things that must happen; the master must examine the student, the student must examine the master. If the master does not examine the student and the student walks away thinking the Vajrayāna is bullshit, whose fault could it possibly be other than the master's for not checking the student?

Sherab Dorje said:

Seriously now: when was the last time you ever heard of this happening, either in the "East" or the "West"?

Malcolm wrote:

I know of quite a bit of difficulty encountered by both masters and students because this does not happen. Masters driven by blind kindness or even by selfishness (to gather large retinues to pay for things "for the dharma") and students driven by greed and egotism because they are going to "become buddhas" etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 1st, 2014 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

qwerty13 said:

Do mean by "unsuitable" a person who has no faith in Vajrayana, or even disrespects it?

Malcolm wrote:

As for two, yes.

Sherab Dorje said:

I don't really see how physical presence is any guarantee of this though, I've been to empowerments where many present did not know what they were getting themselves involved in and left with a negative attitude regarding the Vajrayana methods.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this is the fault of the master. There are two things that must happen; the master must examine the student, the student must examine the master. If the master does not examine the student and the student walks away thinking the Vajrayāna is bullshit, whose fault could it possibly be other than the master's for not checking the student?

Unfortunately in this day and age we have a "try it before you buy it" culture. This really

does not work well in a Vajrayāna context, since it ruins both masters and students.

This is why ChNN repeatedly says there is no such thing as taking an empowerment as a blessing, and forgoing the commitments. It is actually impossible, and when you are told "You can take this as a blessing", and you think this means you do not have samaya, or a vajra relationship with that teacher, or the practice and so on, you don't understand anything. If you are not serious about a practice or a teacher, then it is better you don't go.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, there is the very real likelihood that unsuitable people will choose to watch such performances on places like youtube resulting in many samaya problems.

qwerty13 said:

Are you now strictly talking about empowerments in to highest yoga tantra ( like Vajrayogini, Yamantaka, guhyasamaja etc. etc)?

Are these samaya problems (coming from watching recored empowerment) present only in the case of Highest yoga tantra initiation?

Malcolm wrote:

Further, there is the very real likelihood that unsuitable people will choose to watch such performances on places like youtube resulting in many samaya problems.

qwerty13 said:

Do mean by "unsuitable" a person who has no faith in Vajrayana, or even disrespects it?

Malcolm wrote:

As for question one; in general, yes. However, even among kriya yoga deities, those of the Vajra family have samayas to observe which involve secrecy and so on.

As for two, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One: in any empowerment, there are three mandalas: the front created mandala, the vase mandala and the mandala of the teacher. The teacher arranges the descent of the

wisdom being from the front created mandala onto the disciple after he creates each disciple as the form of the deity to be given.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, this is interesting. Is there anything that can be said about how the teacher arranges the descent of the wisdom being from the front created mandala onto the disciple, and what it means to create each disciple as the form of the deity to be given?

Malcolm wrote:

During an empowerment, there are two sections: the self-empowerment conducted by a qualified master which includes such things as preparing the the space, and so on, which culminates in the master conferring the empowerment upon himself into the mandala and the creation of the front mandala as well as the vase mandala.

Second, when all this is done, then the master again repeats the sadhana, creating each disciple as the mandala they into which they are to be initiated: this stage is called creating the samayasattva, the commitment being. Then, when this has been done, the master summons the jñānasattva, the wisdom being, into each disciple who is present. In a very serious empowerment this is done one by one, i.e. the master visualizes each disciple separately as the deity, and is the reason why the most serious and proper way to give empowerments is to give them to one, three, seven or no more than twenty-five disciples at a time. In other words, if he or she is giving the initiation to 3 people, he or she must visualize three separate mandalas. If he or she is giving the empowerment to twenty five people, they must visualize 25 separate and complete mandalas. For example, the Kalacakra Mandala in the full form has 648 deities, if I recall correctly. Each deity must be separately visualized for each person during that empowerment.

Even in a Jenang, where there is only a body, speech and mind "blessing" (i.e. the form of the deity, the mantra and introduction to the deity's wisdom continuum) the master must visualize everyone present as the form of the deity individually.

As you can now understand, in order to be a Vajramaster one must have extraordinary powers of samadhi.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 6:55 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

JohnJ said:

It might be good to mention that in my personal encounters with Garchen Rinpoche and the lamas that teach through his Institute, empowerment is understood as something that is rarely actually recieved. In other words, the belief seems to be that

empowerment only occurs when one has understood the nature of their mind through that empowerment.

Malcolm wrote:

This represents a misunderstanding of the nature of empowerments on your part.

An empowerment is something that arranges a profound dependent origination between someone's body, speech and mind and the three kāyas of the result. Therefore, it is not so that one does not receive the empowerment if one does not realize the nature of the mind.

An empowerment is first of all a method for inducing realization, for example, when Indrabhuti I attained Buddhahood by receiving the Guhyasamaja empowerment. Failing that, we have sadhanas, which is the method connected to the empowerment to produce realization. When we receive an empowerment, we agree to follow various samayas until we attain buddhahood. People who do not receive empowerments do not have those samayas.

JohnJ said:

The real empowerment is much more than a permission to practice various Sadhanas, it is an introduction to the natural state, and only if you do not understand that and remain in confusion should you seek out various Sadhana and yoga practices.

Malcolm wrote:

If you did not truly receive an empowerment because you failed to realize nature of your mind, you could not realize the three kāyas through the practice of sadhanas. Therefore, this idea is really not very correct at all.

JohnJ said:

In that way, most everyone who receives the empowerment is only receiving blessings, not the actual empowerment.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense. This represents a total misunderstanding of what an empowerment actually is.

JohnJ said:

My own understanding is that the recorded empowerments are a permission to practice and a receiving of some lineage blessings, since the vast majority who come or stay at home won't receive the empowerment in the way that Garchen Rinpoche (and many others) understand it.

Malcolm wrote:

There are a number of problems with this:

One: in any empowerment, there are three mandalas: the front created mandala, the vase mandala and the mandala of the teacher. The teacher arranges the descent of the

wisdom being from the front created mandala onto the disciple after he creates each disciple as the form of the deity to be given. If you are not at the empowerment in some fashion during the time it is being given, there is no descent of the wisdom being.

Two: at the end of any empowerment, byin rlabs, or rje gnang there is the dissolution of the mandalas, i.e., the front created mandala, the vase mandala and the mandala of the teacher. One cannot receive initiation into a mandala that has been dissolved by the master. Once the vajramaster has concluded his or her activities, the empowerment is over.

Therefore, watching an empowerment later on is like watching a performance on PBS. It may be interesting, fascinating, and so on. But it is not live, you are not there, you are not participating, you are watching a show. You may be edified, but there is no stream of blessing because the mandala has already been switched off, as it were.

Further, there is the very real likelihood that unsuitable people will choose to watch such performances on places like youtube resulting in many samaya problems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 5:56 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Take the empowerment yourself (or a similar one, for example, the Shi khro nges don snying po ). Then you will see.

ratna said:

Do other Shitros also confer these vows? Isn't Namchö Shitro also Anuyoga? Does this mean we're all bhikṣus in the DC and just don't know it?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: Indian roots of tibetan buddhism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Not every great Buddhist tradition is Indian in origin.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by "tradition" and "origin".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

untxi said:

a webcast

-U

Malcolm wrote:

No one has rejected attending a live webcast...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

JohnJ said:

Furthermore, regarding a "secret mantra guru", the Dzogchen Community has many secondary practices, mantras, protectors, etc. Does this mean that the Direct Introduction, though it has no physical supports, constitutes the entirety of a "proper" empowerment for those who receive it, since there are many practices in the DC that are of the Vajrayana vehicle?

Malcolm wrote:

In the system of Dzogchen, the *rig pa'i rtsal dbang* aka direct introduction is considered to be the source of all empowerments. Therefore, from the perspective of the Dzogchen teachings, a direct introduction by a qualified master alone is sufficient to ripen one as a student of Mantrayāna since the minds of all wisdom deities are the same; differing only in terms of mantra and appearances (for which *thge khrid lung* is then required).

On the other hand, it is not likely that many Sakyapa or Gelugpa lamas agree with this approach. Nevertheless, the system of Dzogchgen, following its own tantras, can support this approach with citations as well as reasonings.

Further, the system of Dzogchen considers the direct introduction to be an expanded, more experiential form of the fourth empowerment.

This however does not mean that other empowerments are not necessary. The Mutig Phrengwa tantra states that those with understanding require only introduction; the rest should receive the four empowerments in order. So it really depends on the capacity of the student.

JohnJ said:

In other words, ChNN rarely seems to give full Vajrayana empowerments, so would it still be correct to say that his teachings contain the essence of the 4 empowerments given in traditional HYT and that the many students and members of DC who follow his teachings have received Samaya, are expected to keep it perfectly, and have entered the Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, from the perspective of Dzogchen teachings, this is correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So how does this all square with the fact that your teacher ChNN gives empowerments over the internet where students will not have access to the sacred substances and material supports of the empowerments (ie not in a proper way ) regardless of the fact that it is "live"?

Malcolm wrote:

Greg,

I just clarified that ChNN does not do this, read more carefully.

CHNN explicitly has stated that he cannot grant full fledged empowerments over the internet at all because there is no way to introduce the student into the mandala directly and so on. However he does give so called "meaning" empowerments and direct introductions because they require no physical supports.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

qwerty13 said:

I dont know anymore how to believe.

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni's mantras is also from sutra (The Ārya-svalpākṣara-prajñāpāramitā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra to be exact), and kriya tantra, and so it too does not require any sort of empowerment at all to recite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

smcj said:

The proof will be in the taste of pudding, as they say. If someone can take an empowerment via whatever means, do a retreat, and gain realization, then the empowerment is valid. Until such time as that experiment has been done we must rely on expert opinions.

I for one, however, am not willing to invest that much time and effort on such an experiment.

Pero said:

But, if you're not going to do it yourself you're just going to take someone else's word for it?

Johnny Dangerous said:

I think I've read a book (chime in if anyone remembers this) by (I think) Karma Chagme where he says something along the lines of "I hereby declare that reading of these words constitutes permissions to practice Avalokiteshvara". I'm sure it was worded differently, but the gist seemed to me that he was giving permission to practice a deity via text, and that reading it was enough. I don't remember the other qualifiers involved though. There certainly seems to be a precedent for reading of texts (for example) being transmission of something in Buddhism here and there.

I wanna say the book was A Spacious Path To Freedom..but I'm not positive.

Pero said:

Now that you say that I think Malcolm in some discussion long ago mentioned that somewhere Jigme Lingpa says that whoever is reading his text (I don't remember which one, too far back) has the lung for it. But since it was so long ago, it could've been whoever "understands" his text... Any memory of what I'm talking about, Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a Dzogchen tantra which states "It is not necessary to hear it, obtaining the text is enough."

But this presumes that one has already been ripened by the four empowerments:

If this kind of intimate instructions is given to improper recipients, both will be burned.  
May it be acquired by those trained suitable recipients with good karma!  
Through that may secret mantra remain for a long while!  
May the darkness of the ignorance of migrating beings be dispelled!

M



Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

If someone could explain what it means to be "ripened" in this context we might be able to have a more constructive discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

"Ripened" means someone has entered a HYT mandala correctly, possesses all the samayas, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I think i've read a book (chime in if anyone remembers this) by (I think) Karma Chagme where he says something along the lines of "I hereby declare that reading of these words constitutes permissions to practice Avalokitsehvara". I'm sure it was worded differently, but the gist seemed to me that he was giving permission to practice a deity via text, and that reading it was enough. I don't remember the other qualifiers involved though. There certainly seems to be a precedent for reading of texts (for example) being transmission of something in Buddhism here and there.

I wanna say the book was A Spacious Path To Freedom..but i'm not positive.

Malcolm wrote:

Om mani padme hum is a sūtra mantra. Anyone can practice it without transmission anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

smcj said:

The authority is the tantras, not the opinions of experts.  
And where in the tantras does it say that live webcasts are valid?

Malcolm wrote:

They don't mention the issue at all.

smcj said:

How is it that the digital reproduction then is more valid than at a later date? Here at Dharma Wheel the validity is accepted because ChNN and Garchen R. say so.

Malcolm wrote:

CHNN explicitly has stated that he cannot grant full fledged empowerments over the internet at all because there is no way to introduce the student into the mandala directly and so on. However he does give so called "meaning" empowerments and direct introductions because they require no physical supports.

smcj said:

The rationale is based on the non-locality of the guru's blessing, on ChNN and G.R.'s expert opinion that such is the active operating principal in a live webcast.

Malcolm wrote:

See above, that is not ChNN's rational. ChNN's rational is that the student and the master are collaborating at the same time, therefore, distance is not an issue but time is.

smcj said:

There are teachings to that effect, that the guru-yoga

Malcolm wrote:

In order to have a secret mantra guru one must have received empowerment in a proper way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

smcj said:

But in any case it still belongs on the editorial page, at least until such time as a consensus is formed one way or the other among the other experts.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really an issue that can be resolved by consensus.

The authority is the tantras, not the opinions of experts.

We may debate about these things, but we must do so based on proper citations reinforced by logical reasoning. It is not sufficient to say "This is my guru's blessing, so therefore it is valid because I have faith in him or her."

Anyway, I have had my say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: When are you considered a 'Buddhist'?

Content:

Pringle said:

When would a person be classed as a 'Buddhist' rather than someone who follows buddhist teachings (if there even is a difference)

Malcolm wrote:

When you sincerely go for refuge to the Three Jewels.

Pringle said:

How would one sincerely go for refuge? Do you mean if one sincerely practices in accordance with the the path with body, speach and mind, or do you mean sincerely go to refuge by taking a formal declartion in the presence of a sangha?

Malcolm wrote:

Or simply by going for refuge in the Three Jewels in your heart.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

smcj said:

However you have a habit of stating your opinions with the same voice of authority that you give your expertise.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not an opinion.

There is no teaching of the Buddha in any authentic Buddhist tantra anywhere that someone who wishes to be ripened to practice Vajrayāna can be ripened merely by interacting with an inanimate object, which is what a recording or a book is in fact.

If someone wants a blessing, they should go visit a lama and get a pat on the head and a cord. If someone wishes to practice Vajrayāna, they should make the effort and sacrifice to go to where a teacher is present, receive an empowerment in a proper way, and if they cannot manage that much, then they should participate in a live online transmission of some kind.

It is not sufficient to watch some video of an empowerment and say " I will do this now and later get the real empowerment" and so on. This kind of thinking also has many faults mentioned in the tantras. We are after all discussing Vajrayāna, right?

Complaining it is impossible to travel, or that there are no teachers where one lives is

the worst sort of lameass excuse one can give considering the enormous troubles the ancient Tibetans went through to bring the teachings to Tibet from India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

jiashengrox said:

Ok thank you! Just to check this is the terma by Rigdzin Jatson Nyingpo, and is different from our usual Karling Shitro?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Shi khro nges don snying po is a full anuyoga system empowerment in brief form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Anders said:

Cool dharma stuff can happen in the saha world too, much as we like to think that's reserved for holy people and holy worlds, etc. Imo, that's why the sutras tell us about these things. To open our minds to the possibilities of transmitting the dharma we can be exposed to.

Malcolm wrote:

This is to miss the point completely.

These kinds of teachings must be in accordance with the capacity of the recipient. Ordinary beings do not smell the sound of Dharma floating out of septic tanks. They smell rotten shit.

I am very sorry that I have to say this, but I have a responsibility to the Dharma. If people feel I am being critical of this or that teacher, that is not my intent.

Empowerments are not mystical transmissions, they are a very specific method with a precise dependent origination that requires the guru and the disciples' active, simultaneous, cooperative participation. The Buddha has no more power to bless a digital file with the potency to confer an empowerment (dbang skur), a blessing (sbyin rlabs), a permission (rjes gnam), a reading transmission or an ordination than the power to bless a book for the same purpose, so what need to mention any teacher living today? To believe otherwise is to fall under the influence of total proliferation.

Therefore, if someone asks me, I will always honestly tell them that it is impossible to receive any kind of Vajrayāna transmission from a recording of a prior event. People are

of course free to disagree and that is between them and lower realms.

There are no siddhis without empowerment,  
just as there is no oil even if sand is pressed.  
Whoever proudly explains the tantras and citations  
to those without empowerment,  
both master and disciple go to hell  
as soon as they die even if there are siddhis.  
-- Mahāmudratilaka-tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The intention here comes from symbolic initiation into bhikṣu pratimokṣa in the Anuyoga grand empowerment.

jiashengrox said:

Would it be possible to support this with evidence? Somehow or another i couldn't find the reason in the same text.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason is not explicitly given.

Take the empowerment yourself (or a similar one, for example, the Shi khro nges don snying po ). Then you will see.

No such empowerment exists in the new tantras, and therefore, Sapan does not accept this perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

jiashengrox said:

I could quote from Ngari Panchen's Ascertaining the Three Vows on this issue:

"An upholder of lay ordination who is also a pure-awareness holder must, except for signs and rituals of complete ordination, practice all that remains" (page 26)

It summarises the need for us to adhere to fundamental pratimoksha precepts (in fact

in a stricter sense, coz in that context, he mentioned the need to follow the bhikkhu's conduct, with exception of ceremonies performed by bhikkhus or ordained ones, the "outer signs of ordination", as commented on by Dudjom Rinpoche).

Malcolm wrote:

Rlght, that I disagree with completely -- this was already rejected by Sakya Pandita in sdom gsum. One only needs to follow the vows which one receives in a given rite.

The intention here comes from symbolic initiation into bhikṣu pratimokṣa in the Anuyoga grand empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: When are you considered a 'Buddhist'?

Content:

Pringle said:

When would a person be classed as a 'Buddhist' rather than someone who follows buddhist teachings (if there even is a difference)

Malcolm wrote:

When you sincerely go for refuge to the Three Jewels.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Too much Vajrayogini?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

In Sakya the Hevajra cycle would be most important for understanding their take on tantra, I am guessing?

Is this point about the mandala the reason it is said VY herself bestows portions of the initiation, whereas for other systems this is not the case?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Lamdre in general, as well as rgyud sde spyi rnam, rin po che ljong shing, etc.

As for the second point -- this is about how Yogini is the essence of the mandala, but it is not exactly like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
And that is not Rongzom's POV at all.

ConradTree said:  
Well he clearly holds tantra as more definitive than sutra.

Malcolm wrote:  
Yes, but that does not mean we throw out the five lay vows because they are predicated on a dualistic view, for example, or toss out samaya for the same reason.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 8:14 AM  
Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa  
Content:  
ConradTree said:  
The moral of all of this is to throw out sutra entirely, and stick to tantra like Rongzom says.

<https://www.amazon.com/Establishing-Appearances-Divine-Reasoning-Madhyamaka/dp/1559392886> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:  
Don't be ridiculous. And that is not Rongzom's POV at all.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 8:13 AM  
Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments  
Content:  
anjali said:  
There came a time when the Buddha's teachings had to be written down.

pueraeternus said:  
That would be passe. In the future, tertons would hide termas in the World of Warcraft, or maybe some obscure corner of Ultima Online.

Malcolm wrote:  
dude, Halo...come on...

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 5:10 AM  
Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa  
Content:

jiashengrox said:

Anyways, i think in Mipham's book, it was said that Sera Jetsunpa (Jetsun Chokyi Gyaltzen), Jamyang Shepa, jamyang Gawai Lodroe and Panchen Delek Nyima did reply to Gorampa with regards to his criticism. I am not sure if that is right (refer to page 246, note 79).

Malcolm wrote:

I don't believe that these replies are considered by Sakyapas to address any of Gorampa's observations in any substantial way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa, Rendawa, and Rongton

Content:

jiashengrox said:

This discussion i hope to have actually stems from the following thread:

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=52&t=16306&p=230132#p230132> "  
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return  
false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

First of all, I would like to ask if any scholar around could give a precise differentiation on Gorampa and Rendawa's views on Madhyamika? As i do know that Gorampa's text is pretty much the standardised texts used in the seminaries, it would be good to actually have some basic information for everyone here before anyone else might make a decision to delve into Gorampa's text on Madhyamika.

Also, as I am currently reading Rongton's Commentary on Mulamadhyamikakarika (translated by Khenpo Ngawang Jorden, if i m not wrong), i would also appreciate if anyone could give an idea of how their differences in view are like? It's just for preliminary understanding.

Finally, if it is possible, would anyone be able to give a heuristic view of the Sakya's approach towards Maitreya's treatises (such as say, Uttarat Tantra)? It would be good to hear a different pov from the gelug, kagyu and nyingma traditions, since there are many translations that have been published.

Thanks a lot!

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, Gorampa and Rongton more or less have the same view. Many of Gorampa's refutations were penned defenses of Rongton against Khedrup.

Gorampa found Rendawa a bit extreme in terms of Rendawa's polemics against Jonang,



but again, there is no real difference view.

As for Maitreya treatises Gorampa considers Abhisamayalamkara and Uttaratantra definitive, depending on interpretation, and the other three provisional.

Gorampa's works are considered the gold standard for view in Sakya, apart from the five founders.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

plwk said:

Thanks Malcolm & jiashengrox. It's rather baffling (to me at least) that the Gelugpas, being known for being a scholastic tradition, would not have produce any commentarial or treatise to compare / contrast / refute Gorampa directly but resort to what is seemingly political moves as a 'valid' response instead? Hmmm...

Malcolm wrote:

Well the founder of Sera did pen one reply, but it more or less amounts to a tome of sputtering indignation, "How dare you, you #%\$@\$\*&^...."

I think the Gelugpas in general would prefer to imagine that Gorampa was just a bad dream someone had. Pabhongkha was pretty indignant that Gorampa's collected works were collected and revived in Eastern Tibet and it seems to be one of his motives for encouraging sectarianism there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

All these questions arise due to our failure to recognize the nature and function of the videokaya.

Malcolm wrote:

More importantly, they arise due to our failure to understand the essence of the interdhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa's nose

Content:

thigle said:

Continuation from <https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=16295%22>

Simon E. said:

The point Malcolm is making thigle, is that 'lobster' has declared himself to be an arhat.

thigle said:

But another much more important point is Simon, that some people declared himself to realised an authentic introduction.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm, no.

Someone merely declared that they understood something.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Now I "get it"

Content:

thigle said:

Stop to project selfish reasons. The delusion is obvious.

Malcolm wrote:

You make a lot of pronouncements so it seems like you consider yourself very expert in the teachings. As to whether some people here are working with various levels of understanding, that of course is true. But unless you are a realized person, it is a little strange to be castigating other people for being deluded when oneself has not even gouged out a small portion of one own delusion. On the other hand, if someone makes a statement that is clearly a factual error and is in contradiction with the teachings, then of course one is helping them by setting them straight, even if they find it painful.

thigle said:

Just as I said before, stop to project selfish reasons. The delusion is obvious.

Consequence: It's better to close this subforum. Make your circle secret. So no one can be harmed anymore. User unity was just a mirror.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, it is generally better to wear shoes than to cover the world with shoe leather. My advice to you is to stop participating in on-line forums such as this one if you disapprove so strongly. They are not going to shut this forum just because you recommend it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: How to make voice last longer?

Content:

Belincia said:

My throat begins to hurt when I try to do a lot of mantras, so like during retreats I'm unable to do them as much as I'd like to. I do drink water a lot while doing it, because that helps somewhat. No matter if I do them loudly/quietly, I still can't keep going as long as I'd like to. I always do them with my normal pitch, which should be the healthiest way.

Are you aware of effective ways to train the voice to last longer?

I am a young person, and I don't have any tendency for illnesses on my "speaking organs". I very rarely get this pain from just talking. I think doing mantras is a bit more intense, as it is continuous.

Thanks in advance.

Malcolm wrote:

Mantras should normally be done quietly, quiet enough so a little guy on your shoulder cannot hear them. It is called "secret mantra" for a reason. Bellowing mantras like Vajrakilaya and so on causes obstacles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Now I "get it"

Content:

thigle said:

So, it's better to close this public forum or this self-destructive obligation of secrecy falls, which has much worse effects for the teachings, than doing the teachings publicly.

Sherab Dorje said:

I disagree. I actually believe that it is very important that this sub-forum exists so that people with wrong views can have them corrected by people with some serious knowledge/experience in Dzogchen. Imagine if they just got their info from various suspect online sources. It is also valuable as it can give people with a serious interest in Dzogchen the opportunity to know what should and should not be discussed. Of course the adage: "Go ask your teacher" can be applied to 90% of the questions asked here, you must take into account that not everybody has a teacher that they can regularly and personally access, so...

Welcome to Kali Yuga "thigle", we can't pretend sh\*t is not out there (anymore), because

it is, and we have to deal with it.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, at least the OP knows better than sharing anything here anymore...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Now I "get it"

Content:

thigle said:

Stop to project selfish reasons. The delusion is obvious.

Malcolm wrote:

You make a lot of pronouncements so it seems like you consider yourself very expert in the teachings. As to whether some people here are working with various levels of understanding, that of course is true. But unless you are a realized person, it is a little strange to be castigating other people for being deluded when oneself has not even gouged out a small portion of one own delusion. On the other hand, if someone makes a statement that is clearly a factual error and is in contradiction with the teachings, then of course one is helping them by setting them straight, even if they find it painful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Now I "get it"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You realize you are talking to an "arhat", right?

thigle said:

I'm talking about Dzogchen in an deluded Dzogchen 'like forum, because nobody talks about Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you really know Dzogchen much better than anyone else here, is that what you think?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 6:36 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

anjali said:

When Rinpoche is no longer in the body, will future generations of practitioners also be

able to receive empowerments from the authorized recordings?

Malcolm wrote:

It would certainly be cheaper than having to train living teachers...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 6:31 PM

Title: Re: Now I "get it"

Content:

thigle said:

Because primordial natural looseness is completely unfabricated. So stability can't be practiced. Therefore one has to make a strong decision and the fruit is relative stability. This can take years and decades. If knowledge is relatively stable, potentiality begins to unfold.

lobster said:

Quite right, it is the conditions for stability that one must enable.

thigle said:

So, if one can't understand the necessity of decisions instead of practicing stability, one never has realized immediate knowledge before. This step isn't a personal fabrication, it is just the consequence what follows after temporarily recognizing immediate knowledge. This decision is absolutely consistent with the ZZNG-tantras I know.

Malcolm wrote:

You realize you are talking to an "arhat", right?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 6:02 PM

Title: Re: Too much Vajrayogini?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

However, in terms of the study of tantra, VY is not really enough to understand Lama Tzongkhapa's teachings on the subject.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not sufficient for understanding the Sakya take on Vajrayāna either.

JKhedrup said:

As for Tsem Tulku's statement about the supremacy of VY, thus has to be taken with a grain of salt.

At every empowerment you attend the lama says why that particular deity is special.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but the reason given for Cakrasamvara and Yogini being especially relevant these days is that the mandala of Cakrasamvara is still extant, open. It was also by far the most popular cycle in India, I suspect, because it had such a compelling narrative based on this idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Unity's theory on the nature of mind

Content:

Unity said:

There's no more that I can say about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Mazard seems to think that ancient Buddhists would have taken such passages literally, but is that clear?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. Just read the Yoga Sutras, full of very similar phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

jiashengrox said:

Are there like differences between their (Rongton and Gorampa) views on madhyamika?

Malcolm wrote:

Not much.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

theanarchist said:

I see. That makes sense. Thanks for the clarification.

Malcolm wrote:

In those days (late 11th, early 12th), in general, the new instructions that were pouring into Tibet were regarded as being more potent, while the Nyingma teachings in general were regarded as having been somewhat corrupted, with very diminished blessings.

theanarchist said:

Was there some actual truth behind this assumption or were the lineages that were freshly imported just more fashionable because they were new and came more freshly from the land of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, the founder of Sakya, Khon Konchog Gyalpo was advised by his older brother to stop practicing Nyingma practices and focus in the new tantras because they saw secret dances being performed at a harvest festival in the market.

theanarchist said:

Is it correct to assume that Padmasambhava had foreseen this and therefor hid the treasures to revive the tradition in later centuries?

Malcolm wrote:

The story goes.

theanarchist said:

I have never heard of what went on in in the earlier centuries of Tibetan buddhism after Padmasambhava beyond the stories of Milarepa and later Je Dzongkhapa. Are there documents from that time or is it pretty much mythological?

Malcolm wrote:

You should read the Blue Annals. Tsongkhapa is very late, i.e. 14th/15th century.

We have a very good knowledge of Tibetan History beginning about 970. The period between 840 and 970 is a little hazy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

jjashengrox said:

would Rongton's interpretation of madhyamika be considered as mainstream? Are there like differences between their (Rongton and Gorampa) views on madhyamika?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as well as Rendawa, and Tsongkhapa in his early commentary on the perfection of

wisdom, now largely neglected in Gelug.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

jiashengrox said:

Hmmm.

Malcolm-la, not sure if this is correct, but could you refer to this article:

[http://himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk/collections/journals/ret/pdf/ret\\_22\\_05.pdf](http://himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk/collections/journals/ret/pdf/ret_22_05.pdf)

Page 11, under footnotes 31. I was wondering if you (or anyone else who knows tibetan language) would have read about khedrup's reply to gorampa, and if so, what are his replies?

I (my personal opinion!) don't think that the gelug scholars would leave such criticisms unanswered for centuries, especially pertaining to issues on madhyamika. But it is my opinion only though, might not be right!

Malcolm wrote:

The article contains an anachronism. Khedrub never replied to Gorampa, or if he did, it was from the grave.

Gorampa lived from 1429 to 1489. Khedrub from 1385 to 1438.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Thanks for sharing your thoughts. What do you currently think about the proposal that Milarepa's iconic hand-to-ear pose represents klong sde practice?

Malcolm wrote:

It's possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:



Malcolm wrote:

The kind of Dzogchen teaching available to Milarepa would likely have only been so called "sems sde". This being the case, he probably would not have regarded it as being any more special or profound than the Mahāmudra teachings he received from Marpa.

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Are you putting the scare quotes around sems sde because it had not yet been classified as such during Milarepa's lifetime? Given your recent studies where do you see the teachings eventually classified as klong sde appearing on the scene?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, it had not been classified as such during that time. Dzeng Dharmabodhi associated with a lot of first generation Kagyus in the Lhodrag region, but I see no reason to think that Vajra Bridge instruction does not go right back to Vairocana. Prior to the revelation of the Vima Nyinthig, Dzogchen was basically just Dzogchen, without the super elaborate schemes we observe today which are all post 1115.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

theanarchist said:

I see. That makes sense. Thanks for the clarification.

Malcolm wrote:

In those days (late 11th, early 12th), in general, the new instructions that were pouring into Tibet were regarded as being more potent, while the Nyingma teachings in general were regarded as having been somewhat corrupted, with very diminished blessings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa

Content:

plwk said:

<http://vajrasana.org/jeff01.htm>

Now to the matter of Gorampa. To this day, the refutations against Tsongkhapa's Madhyamika view by Gorampa Sonam Senge have not even been replied to by the great Gelugpa scholars of the past few hundred years. Instead, the defenders of Tsongkhapa

have attacked the intellectual juniors of Gorampa such as Taktsang Lotsawa, Shakya Chogden and others (see Jeffrey Hopkins, Meditation on Emptiness). Also, Ngorchen Kunga Zangpo (the founder of Ngor), a contemporary, criticized Tsongkhapa's understanding of Tantra.

Please understand that these are not ramblings or sectarian expletives but are commonly known to all who have studied Madhyamika within the greater family of the Tibetan Buddhist Tradition. For the Sakya School Sakya Pandita is the definitive scholar and teacher. Gorampa Sonam Senge is the definitive scholar in explaining the difficult meanings of Sakya Pandita's works.

Many Gelugpa monasteries banned outright Gorampa's works from entering their premises. The works of some other Sakya lamas which criticized Tsongkhapa or seemed at odds with those views were banned from publication entirely within Tibet and were only preserved secretly and re-published openly from Bhutan after 1959. Can anyone elaborate on whether the above are true/factual?

Malcolm wrote:

While I certainly would not refer to Taktsang or Shakya Chogden as Gorampa's "juniors", the above is all true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not so fast Kimosabe, Mila famously sang "Stabbed through in heart by Mahāmudra, stabbed in the back by Dzogchen..." and so on.

theanarchist said:

But apparently he did not pass a dzogchen lineage to his disciples, did he? (at least I have never heard of a dzogchen lineage that has Milarepa as one of the lineage gurus) If he held a dzogchen lineage, why didn't he?

Malcolm wrote:

The kind of Dzogchen teaching available to Milarepa would likely have only been so called "sems sde". This being the case, he probably would not have regarded it as being any more special or profound than the Mahāmudra teachings he received from Marpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

Unity said:

Rigpa is...

Malcolm wrote:

not the universal mind which contains everything...

There is no such thing in Dzogchen. Really. You have deeply confused Dzogchen teaching with Advaita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 7:04 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

ConradTree said:

Marpa got lineage transmissions from other siddhas in India. Not Naropa though.

Sherab Dorje said:

Source?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a contention found in the collected works of the Sakya master, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen. There he states that according to his own Kagyu teacher, Milarepa never mentioned that Marpa directly encountered Naropa.

This is further confirmed by the fact that when Marpa met Atisha, Atisha informed Marpa that Naropa had already passed.

If Marpa did meet Naropa, it is likely he did so in a visionary encounter, similar to the encounter of Sachen Kunga Nyingpo with the Mahāsiddha Virupa in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

smcj said:

There was an interesting line from the link posted just above:

Also, maybe not many of you here knows this - Malcolm (Loppon Namdrol) was asked to teach Dzogchen by KDL but he refused.

Uh, Malcolm, is that true?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. I don't have any realization to speak of and there are many great masters still alive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

theanarchist said:

But according to you Milarepa must have been a complete spiritual noob, because, you know, he can't have attained liberation, because he didn't practice dzogchen and was inferior to, say, guys like Longchenpa, because of this.

ConradTree said:

Milarepa did practice Dzogchen. He had like 10 gurus before Marpa. That must blow your mind.

theanarchist said:

Nope, young, repentent Mila went to see a dzogchen master, the master gave him instructions, Mila totally got them wrong so the dzogchen master told him to go find Marpa, he isn't able to help him.

So Milarepa did obviously not practice dzogchen but the teachings Marpa the translator got in India from Naropa to attain liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not so fast Kimosabe, Mila famously sang "Stabbed through in heart by Mahāmudra, stabbed in the back by Dzogchen..." and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think you can make this case at all. If what you say is true, then someone like Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo, who by the account of Kongtrul, achieved the 13th bhumi, could not have had such realization since JKW's realization came from Lamdre.

ConradTree said:

But both of those guys clearly held Dzogchen as the highest teaching, did they not?

Malcolm wrote:

The highest teaching is the one through which one attains complete Buddhahood. How can there be a teaching higher than that?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If later Nyingma authors refer to the so called anuttarayoga tantras translated in the gsar ma period as being equivalent with the so called "Mahāyoga" presented in the nine yāna scheme, they are being extremely anachronistic.

ConradTree said:

The point is that they evaluated HYT using their reasoning, and found it lacking.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think you can make this case at all. If what you say is true, then someone like Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo, who by the account of Kongtrul, achieved the 13th bhumi, could not have had such realization since JKW's realization came from Lamdre.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

ConradTree said:

There is a thing called the 9 Nyingma yanas for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Which clearly developed in Tibet during the later ninth and early tenth century and is irrelevant to any Vajrayāna developments in India. Even the term "rainbow body" does not make a clear appearance in any Tibetan literature that can be dated prior the 11th century.

It is a grievous error to assume that by "Mahāyoga", any of the tantras which were unknown to Tibetans prior to the 11th century are being referred to.

If later Nyingma authors refer to the so called anuttarayoga tantras translated in the gsar ma period as being equivalent with the so called "Mahāyoga" presented in the nine yāna scheme, they are being extremely anachronistic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Recently I attended HHST's Kalachakra empowerment in NYC. I would like to further my study and practice, but could not find any books on Kalachakra specific to the lineage transmitted by HHST (majority are on the Gelugpa transmissions). Is there any book anyone familiar with the tradition can recommend? Or there is no great differences between the various Kalachakra lineages and I can just refer to any available in the market?

Punya said:

My Sakya teacher is about to start teaching from this book: The Ornament of Stainless Light. An Exposition of the Kalachakra Tantra, Khedrup Norsang Gyatso, The Library of Tibetan Classics. He received the transmissions for Kalachakra from HE Chogye Trichen Rinpoche and HHST.

Malcolm wrote:

Where are you located?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Andrew is discussing his materialist objective condition theory, not anything which resembles the gzhan stong view.

Andrew108 said:

Well that's a mouthful. And not really my position at all. For example I still hold to dependent origination.

The Dalai Lama says: "Philosophically, and for that matter conceptually, it seems more coherent to maintain a position that accepts the reality not only of the subjective world of the mind, but also of the external objects of the physical world."

Malcolm wrote:

But of course there are no appearances that exist apart from mind...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

ConradTree said:

We all know he was a sakya like dilgo khyentse.

but he and his partner jagmon kongtrul still ranked dzogchen higher.

They basically agreed with the nyingma yanas system.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, the nine yāna system ranking is irrelevant to HYT. Both systems lead to rainbow body. But not when we endlessly gossip about these things online.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

achieved his own realization through the practice of Lamdre, according to himself.

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Does he mention which yidam he practiced in the context of the Lamdre teachings? I'm curious since you've mentioned many times that Sakyapas tend to consider that he achieved Buddhahood via Yoginī. Does he give specifics in that regard?

Malcolm wrote:

Hevajra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

theanarchist said:

Plus, where do the sarma vajrayana transmissions fit in there? Have you forgotten them? And do you consider them inferior to the terma lineages?

ConradTree said:

In general Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo...

Malcolm wrote:

achieved his own realization through the practice of Lamdre, according to himself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

Unity said:

This great pure mind which pervades everything was called Parabrahman, Rigpa, God, Allah, and many other things.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not exist in Dzogchen teachings and is explicitly rejected in all Buddhist schools, including Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

theanarchist said:

Talk, about general technicalities of empowerments with other practitioners doesn't break any samayas.

Malcolm wrote:

Discussing these things on a public forum which anyone can read, in a place where many people have no faith in Vajrayāna whatsoever (or worse, think it is bullshit) is a problem.

We do so, in general, because we feel that we have a license to do so because of the abundance of books on the subject of Vajrayāna which exist. However, in reality, it is a mistaken practice to discuss much about Vajrayāna in public forums such as this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

Unity said:

Hm, I understood "rigpa" to mean the "nature of mind".

If you are correct in the way how you define it, then I must apologize for my misuse of the word.

Malcolm wrote:

Vidyā (rig pa) is the opposite of avidyā (ma rig pa). In a Dzogchen context, it means knowledge of your real state which is the nature of the mind. If you do not have this knowledge, you cannot say you possess "rig pa".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 7:08 PM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:



JohnJ said:

Why express an opinion that is in direct contradiction to the words of an established, well respected and loved teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

It is pointless to reply.

JohnJ said:

But not pointless enough to refrain from being condescending. I am human being on the other end of this computer. What if we were face to face and I sincerely asked you why you held the opinion you stated, would you just look at me and say, "It's pointless"? If so, than I would say that one should work on their manners before focusing on Samaya.

Malcolm wrote:

First, this discussion was created by Greg, and not me. I was replying to question about Dharmapālas, and tangentially added my opinion about recorded empowerments, because of course, to practice Dharmapālas one must be someone who possesses samaya and that only comes from a properly granted empowerment.

I am sorry you felt I was being condescending, but I can assure that I was not. I was being factual.

Replying is pointless because:

1. It is not my job to condition you or your beliefs, despite the fact that I have every right to express my opinion.
2. This is not the correct venue to discuss the details of empowerments, how they work and why transmission through a recorded medium is invalid because it involves the discussion of many details of empowerments, how samaya vows are imparted and received, etc., which are not suitable for discussion in a public forum.
3. In the end, you will not accept whatever citations and reasonings I produce to demonstrate that such a system is poorly conceived because you have already declared it is valid.

Therefore, apart from expressing my reservations about the matter I have really nothing further to say on the subject.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

JohnJ said:

Why express an opinion that is in direct contradiction to the words of an established,

well respected and loved teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

It is pointless to reply.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

JohnJ said:

Telling Garchen Rinpoche's students that they did not receive blessings and contravening what he has said about the equality of those who receive empowerments in person versus via livestream introduces scandal, schism, and divisiveness into the community.

Malcolm wrote:

This what I said:

I am really not certain at all that recorded empowerments have the necessary qualities to confer the stream of blessings. In fact, I am sure that they don't.

That is my opinion. I did not tell anyone what to do or not do. There are some who agree with me, and some who do not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

have to get into it. otherwise why practice vajrayana if you are not aware of what samaya really is, of the different samayas etc.. unlucky for me that i have not found my root guru yet. maybe i have found my future root guru but he lives in nepal and doesn't travel to europe anymore. weak connection...

anyway, thanks for the info.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, one is not informed of what samaya is until after one has taken empowerment. Discussions of samaya border on breaking it, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Protectors are for those who have entered secret mantra in the proper way. If you do not have samaya, you do not need any sort of protector apart from the Three Jewels. I am really not certain at all that recorded empowerments have the necessary qualities to confer the stream of blessings. In fact, I am sure that they don't.

M

Adi said:

That's the way I heard it, too.

Adi

KonchokZoepa said:

Malcolm could you inform or explain that what is the connection between having samaya and then needing a dharma protector. what is the function of the Dharmapalas in relation to samaya? hmm, i have more questions or a better question because i can't form it because i don't have enough knowledge aboutt what i am asking about.

Malcolm wrote:

If you do not have samaya, then there is no need for a Dharma protector since Dharma protectors, in principle, are restricted to highest yoga tantra.

That said, in general we can consider the four directional guardians and so on as "protectors" in the Sūtra system since they will automatically protect those who uphold the Dharma of any of the three vehicles.

Otherwise, Mahakāla, etc., only protect those who have samaya from empowerments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Protectors How do I choose one?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...but I don't think a recording is a valid way for someone to receive an empowerment for all kinds of reasons, not merely one.

Sherab Dorje said:

So give a couple of them then.

Malcolm wrote:

There is little point. Suffice it say that a properly granted empowerment concerns the arrangement of profound dependent origination. That cannot occur if the student is not physically present with the teacher in the same room at the same time in some way.

Next, we will have people becoming Buddhist monks on the basis of recorded ordinations.

Hopefully, people who attend such recorded empowerments will make effort to see Garchen Rinpoche in person at a later time. Otherwise, I think there is absolutely no blessing, and in fact, I think there are real problems created in terms of samaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Protectors How do I choose one?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

If a teacher the caliber of Garchen Rinpoche believes that empowerments can be received via recording then, really, who are we to doubt him?

Malcolm wrote:

Since when did we leave our minds at the temple door? I am not criticizing Garchen Rinpoche's motivations, for he is a bodhisattva, but I don't think a recording is a valid way for someone to receive an empowerment for all kinds of reasons, not merely one.

Not only am I entitled to my opinion, I am allowed to express it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 25th, 2014 at 11:23 PM

Title: Validity of recorded empowerments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Discussion split from <http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=52&t=16281>.

Protectors are for those who have entered secret mantra in the proper way. If you do not have samaya, you do not need any sort of protector apart from the Three Jewels. I am really not certain at all that recorded empowerments have the necessary qualities to confer the stream of blessings. In fact, I am sure that they don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 25th, 2014 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

Emakirikiri said:

So would the Parabrahman idea be equivalent to the Shentong idea?

Malcolm wrote:

No, gzhan stong does not accept there there is a unitary ultimate reality in the same sense as Hinduism. gZhan stong instead is asserting that the qualities of buddhahood are ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 25th, 2014 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Alfredo said:

Some Mazard highlights (other than "Canon and Reason" and the farting article, both discussed above)

Malcolm wrote:

Mazard is brewing tempests in teapots, as far as I can see.

Nothing is he says is unknown to people who have been studying Buddhism seriously for some time. He presents these issues however as if they are newly discovered finds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 25th, 2014 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The meaning is entirely different. Parabrahman is a state, it exists, it is sat, etc., objectively exists, and everything else beside it is non-existent.

Vidyā (rig pa) is a very specific kind of knowledge about one's own state, the union of clarity and emptiness of one's mind, and not a universal substrate.

So no, I would not agree at all.

Unity said:

Interesting. What is the difference besides being different words? I understand them like two different fingers pointing to the same moon.

You might object, these two fingers are not the same, but I say, it is the same moon.

Would you agree?...Parabrahman? That means the same as Rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:  
No, it does not.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, April 25th, 2014 at 7:31 AM  
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?  
Content:  
Unity said:  
...Parabrahman? That means the same as Rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:  
No, it does not.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, April 25th, 2014 at 3:54 AM  
Title: Re: Being a yidam outside sitting session  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
In yoga tantra you resume your ordinary form. In highest yoga tantra you are always in the form of the deity 24/7/365

dzogchungpa said:  
This is not an issue for me personally, but don't some masters actually practice several HYT yidams? How would that work out then?

Malcolm wrote:  
You pick one as your main practice.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 9:42 PM  
Title: Re: Being a yidam outside sitting session  
Content:  
smcj said:  
For beginners like me, at the end of a meditation session you dissolve the visualization into emptiness. The idea here is that since you have become the deity that you yourself are dissolved into emptiness. Then post-meditation you resume your normal form. Or at least that's my understanding at the present time.

Malcolm wrote:  
In yoga tantra you resume your ordinary form. In highest yoga tantra you are always in the form of the deity 24/7/365

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you are practicing the sadhana, whether you have done any retreat or not, you should be practicing the yoga of passion if you have a partner. Therefore, that partner better be a fellow practitioner, no?

theanarchist said:

If you are following a vajrayana path you have to be realistic about how far you will be able to get in this lifetime. And for most of those karmamudra is not going to be on the menu this time around. So no reason to look for a partner that would theoretically be suitable.

Malcolm wrote:

The yoga of passion, connected with creation stage, is not karma mudra practice, it is of the same nature as eating yoga, washing yoga and so on. If you practice this yoga with someone who had not been ripened it is a branch downfall.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Guru Pema Tho-threng-tsal

Content:

pemachophel said:

Is Guru Pema Tho-threng-tsal a special form of Guru Rinpoche or simply Guru Rinpoche's secret name? Someone asked me this yesterday and I wasn't sure of the answer. If there is a special form of Guru Pema Tho-threng-tsal with His own posture, gestures, costume, hand symbols, etc., I'd appreciate being steered to a picture or description.

Malcolm wrote:

It is simply Guru P's special name.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

theanarchist said:

It's the choice of the teachers. They could still do it as it has been done in the past, giving empowerment and teaching vajrayana meditation strictly to people who are actually going into retreat. There are lamas who still handle it that way.

conebeckham said:

Sure. In Sakya's Lam Dre, where these instructions are found, as I understand it, there's no "3 year retreat" requirement, but mainly a daily practice commitment. I think there may sometimes be strict retreat requirement, too, though.

Malcolm wrote:

For Lamdre, no retreat commitment, generally as I understand things, these days people are allowed to attend the Tshogs bshad teachings without making a practice commitment apart from a short Hevajra sadhana. For Vajrayogini, yes there is a retreat if you take the some of the oral transmissions associated with the cycle, since it is easier to do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

conebeckham said:

even to THINK about the Path of Passion as a "Layman's off-time activity," much less the Advanced Completion Stage Karmamudra practice, with a Non-Buddhist spouse or significant other?

Malcolm wrote:

This does not require retreat. It is a requirement from the moment one completes abhisheka.

Of course, this does not mean that it is practical. If anyone wonders why it seems that so few people get realization despite the promises made in the tantras, it is because people do not observe samaya carefully.

M

conebeckham said:

Sure. The vast majority of those who have received abhisheka don't even do the NyenDruk, much less the post-session activities, though. Not saying that's good....it's just the way it is.

Not even doing the Nyendrup, how can people talk about the path of passion, much less Karmamudra?

Malcolm wrote:



If you are practicing the sadhana, whether you have done any retreat or not, you should be practicing the yoga of passion if you have a partner. Therefore, that partner better be a fellow practitioner, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Samye Monastery

Content:

kirtu said:

Puja in Samye (this sounds very familiar to me but I can't quite place it yet) ....

Malcolm wrote:

Believe it or not, but Samye has been a Sakya monastery since the 12th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

conebeckham said:

even to THINK about the Path of Passion as a "Layman's off-time activity," much less the Advanced Completion Stage Karmamudra practice, with a Non-Buddhist spouse or significant other?

Malcolm wrote:

This does not require retreat. It is a requirement from the moment one completes abhisheka.

Of course, this does not mean that it is practical. If anyone wonders why it seems that so few people get realization despite the promises made in the tantras, it is because people do not observe samaya carefully.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Do you have to have a highest yoga before taking VY?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm, I've not read much about the three forms of VY given in Sakya--I know Naro Khacho is by far the main practice, but there's also Indra Dakini and Maitri Dakini. Do these forms also stem from the Chakrasamvara practices?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

conebeckham said:

Somewhat tangentially, Kamtsang Chakrasamvara is also derived from the 3 main traditions --Luipa's tradition is primary, but there are elements of Ghantapada and Nagpopa's traditions, as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, since they derive from Naropa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

theanarchist said:

And that's not the case because it's somehow an inheritantly "bad" thing and there needs to be a rule to prevent it, but simply because it's not practical.

Malcolm wrote:

As I gave shown above, there are actually rules against it, in principle.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Do you have to have a highest yoga before taking VY?

Content:

supermaxv said:

The Vajrayogini that HH Sakya Trizin just gave in New York actually had no prerequisites at al.

Malcolm wrote:

This was a two day major empowerment. Therefore, it requires no previous empowerment, it is self contained.

In general, there were three traditions that came through Naropa to Sakya: Luipa, Krishnapa and Ghantapada's Cakrasamvara traditions. Therefore, it is considered that one should have received one, two or all three of these empowerments as a prerequisite for Naro Khachod, because the completion stage practice of Naro Khacho combines all three traditions into the their essentials, in addition its own special features.

However, the Vajrayogini Empowerment comes from Mahasiddha Virupa, and what is not widely known is that his main deity for 24 years was actually Vajrayogini.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

conebeckham said:

"I'm sorry honey, but we have to divorce, since I've just taken refuge and a Buddhist empowerment" said no good Vajrayana Buddhist, ever.

Malcolm wrote:

Even so, for example, ChNN made it very clear on several occasions that it is much better for practitioners to be with other practitioners.

M

Konchog1 said:

I would be interested to see some citations from the Tantras

Malcolm wrote:

The Hevajra tantra and its commentaries describe in detail who can be used as a mudra, and how one goes about finding such a person and training her. One is not allowed to use this person as a mudra until one has granted her abhisheka and given her substantial training in the creation stage.

This stuff is not a joke, and actually, we ought not be discussing it in a public forum.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even so, for example, ChNN made it very clear on several occasions that it is much better for practitioners to be with other practitioners. I am not going to get in the samaya particulars of this issue, but there are several, in fact.

smcj said:

"Better" is vastly different than "downfall".

Malcolm wrote:  
He said it causes obstacles to one's practice.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 4:55 AM  
Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?  
Content:  
ngodrup said:  
So, let me get this...

A person takes an empowerment, is 'anointed' and enthroned as a Deity, receives all four empowerments connected with body, speech and mind and has samaya to maintain pure vision is somehow allowed to refer to any external phenomenon as 'ordinary'? Where is the mandala?  
Where are the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th, 12th, 13th, and 14th root samayas?

There is nothing ordinary under the sun, for one who is actually practicing authentically and sincerely (without duplicity).

Malcolm wrote:  
If a practitioner uses an unripened mudra, blessing her "space" as it were, this is a root downfall because it breaches the 7th root samaya. If one imagines this person mentally as the vidyā (rig ma) it is the first branch downfall. The latter refers to the yoga of passion which is the one of the off-time yogas of a lay person.

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 4:40 AM  
Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?  
Content:  
conebeckham said:  
"I'm sorry honey, but we have to divorce, since I've just taken refuge and a Buddhist empowerment" said no good Vajrayana Buddhist, ever.

Malcolm wrote:  
Even so, for example, ChNN made it very clear on several occasions that it is much better for practitioners to be with other practitioners.

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, April 21st, 2014 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Jikan said:

The Maoists are one faction among many with an interest in taking leadership in Nepal. Participatory democracy is like that--people try to take control of the country. And with an establishment of such delightful leaders as these, it's hard not to blame the Reds for thinking they just might do a better (fairer) job of it than this crowd.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dipendra\\_of\\_Nepal](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dipendra_of_Nepal)

Malcolm's right that the political situation in central Asia is very complicated.

Malcolm wrote:

I mean Bhutan...The Maoists already control Nepal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 21st, 2014 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And they should be between the ages of 16 and 26, since the channels, cakras and elements begin to deteriorate after this point.

ConradTree said:

Assuming both people are nonmonks and have the correct empowerments, does one need oral instruction on the practice?

Or can one proceed from reading texts?

bump for a response

Malcolm wrote:

You need an explanation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 21st, 2014 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And they should be between the ages of 16 and 26, since the channels, cakras and elements begin to deteriorate after this point.

Clarence said:

What about all those old Lama's taking on young consorts? Often after never having done consort practice before. Does that mean the purpose is different for them or are

their prana and channels young like a 16 year olds?

Malcolm wrote:

They do so for life extension.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 21st, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Jigme Lingpa's mystical pranayama experience

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

OK, I assume those are the standard colors. Is the white one actually white?

Malcolm wrote:

The best thing you can do is practice prāṇāyama yourself and discover this experientially. I can tell you what the texts say, but I have no personal experience with this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 21st, 2014 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Jigme Lingpa's mystical pranayama experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

After one is able to see the color of the vāyu through doing various kinds of practice...

dzogchungpa said:

Is it green?

Malcolm wrote:

There are in general five elemental vāyus, so they have different colors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: HUM or HUNG?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Pensum..I have heard that except I have heard different teachers pronounce it distinctly both ways

pensum said:

Certainly, people with different accents pronounce things differently, just like Canadians and Americans pronounce "out and about" differently. And the various

regions of Tibet have various accents and pronunciations as well, for example Khyentse is pronounced either with a hard "k" or a soft "ch". I don't doubt that in ancient India Sanskrit itself was pronounced differently according to various accents as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in Bengal, Vajra was probably pronounced "bazra", as in Kashmir, and also Nepal. In Central India, i.e. Varanasi, "Wajra". Benzar on the other hand...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Chöd as Sutra & Tantra combined

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Chöd is said to be a combination of Sutra and Tantra. At its root it's based on the view of Prajnaparamita, yet its practice is done through tantric methods (visualizing oneself as the deity and offering the body as ganachakra, etc).

I meant to ask this question of Lamchen Gyalpo Rinpoche when I had the chance, but the opportunity came and went, so I'll ask it here. Are any of the various Chöd practices associated with a certain class of tantra (i.e. kriya, charya, yoga, annuttarayoga) or a specific tantric cycle/system (i.e. Guhyasamaja, Chakrasamvara, Vajrabhairava, Hevajra, etc.)? Does the practice of Chöd in general have certain tantric associations?

Malcolm wrote:

It is more associate with mother tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Jigme Lingpa's mystical pranayama experience

Content:

ConradTree said:

You must be referring to this:

<https://www.amazon.com/Taking-Result-Path-Teachings-Tradition/dp/0861714431>

But there is no mention of gourd in it. You can search for words through Amazon.

Malcolm wrote:

After one is able to see the color of the vāyu through doing various kinds of practice, when one unifies the prāṇā and apāṇa vayus, it forms the shape of a ball or a gourd. Yogis can see this with their eyes. You and I cannot.

First however you have to get the level of being able to see your prāṇa. Lamdre explains this process very well, but also the treatise on vāyu in the Vima Nyinthig and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Jigme Lingpa's mystical pranayama experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

ConradTree said:

Anything in English that explains the gourd?

Malcolm wrote:

You can examine Lamdre.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Jigme Lingpa's mystical pranayama experience

Content:

ConradTree said:

Yes, but what does that mean?

Is this gourd thing a well known visible sign in pranayama?

And how is it the basis for all his attainments?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Control of prāṇa is the basis of all attainments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: HUM or HUNG?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I have noticed that some Dzogchen teachers use HUM while others use HUNG..is there really a difference energetically?

asunthatneversets said:

I'd say it's best to go with whichever was used in the transmission you received, but ultimately it doesn't make much difference. Chögyal Namkhai Norbu just recently told the story of Sakya Pandita and the yogi who mispronounced "vajrakilaya" as "chili chilaya", read that story sometime if you get a chance, puts things in perspective with discrepancies like this.



Malcolm wrote:

ChNN always tells this story. The background is that Sapan wrote a text called "How to Pronounce Mantras", in which he makes a strong argument that it is better to pronounce mantras according to rules of Sanskrit pronunciation. He notes that reciting mantras incorrectly may contain blessings, but they are more effective if one tries to pronounce them as well as possible. Naturally, there was a reaction against this idea by many Tibetans even in Sakya.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

Mañjughoṣamaṇi, you think you can explain away that with millions of Buddhist converts in the English speaking world and expats, yet we have no good, complete translation of the Pali cannon, because of the character of Eisel Mazard? We have much better complete translations of so many things millions of English speakers don't claim to follow..

mikenz66 said:

I've seen you and Mazard express your opinion about poor translation a number of times.

Malcolm wrote:

It remains to be seen whether Thrasymachus has any skill at all in Pali, let alone Sanskrit. As such, he is merely repeating hearsay of which he has no ability to verify since he clearly lacks any expertise in any of the four primary Buddhist languages (Sanskrit, Pali, Classical Tibetan and Classical Chinese).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 7:33 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It means that consciousness descends into the womb, in the case of human being, joining with the spermatozoon and oocyte at the moment of conception.

Gwenn Dana said:

When reading some replies, it seems that it is perhaps a common misunderstanding that father's or mother's consciousness would descend into that womb, via some magic sperm or ovum binding.

I only read that consciousness "descends" into that womb, from wherever.

Best wishes  
Gwenn

Malcolm wrote:

It means that three things are required for conception to take place — the father's sperm, the mother's egg and a consciousness seeking rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 7:08 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Those who adopt materialist views of the pre-eminence of the brain...

Malcolm wrote:

A108 has been waffling on about the brain since he got here, if you recall....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 6:48 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Alfredo said:

Speaking of enlightened speech, I've been looking over the past few pages, and noticing the gradual introduction of invectives. I have been enjoying the content of this thread, and selfishly hope that it will not degenerate.

Malcolm wrote:

It degenerated the moment Thrasy machus entered the conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 6:28 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Thrasy machus said:

Well using the same criteria, Malcolm, tomorrow if Transcendental Meditation said it was buddhism, it could be also according to their own sources.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with your view, here is two-fold.

The first problem is the assumption that there is a "true" textual source from which something can be validly described as Buddhadharma. Instead, the criteria of for determining Buddhadharma is not based on some historical literary epoch, it is rather a set of interlinked doctrines which can find their expression in a number of ways providing they adhere to a certain basic set of criteria in terms of view:

Dependent origination  
emptiness  
karma  
rebirth  
liberation as a state of freedom from kleśas, etc.

Since both Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna enthusiastically uphold all of the above criteria, no one can look at these traditions and claim they are not Buddhism, including you.

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 2:24 AM  
Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.  
Content:

Thrasymachus said:

I don't see how you can claim a teacher is so enlightened that they and almost no one in their lineage needs to be familiar with any knowledge of the closest thing available to the primary sources of the doctrine they claim to follow, "because this is Mahayana/Vajrayana, they are enlightened masters beyond needed to obtain actual knowledge, etc.".

Malcolm wrote:

Your remarks are inappropriate because they arise from wholesale ignorance of Tibetan Buddhism.

Our teachers are completely familiar with the primary sources of our tradition, i.e. Vinaya, Mahāyāna sūtra and Buddhist tantras.

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 1:36 AM  
Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
The following post is inappropriate.

smcj said:

...

Meet an enlightened teacher and your worldview will immediately change.

Thrasymachus said:

In operational terms what are you talking about here, exactly? It seems you are talking about someone who claims amazing extra-human mental and other powers, yet they need lowly followers like me and others to give them our money... A lot of people are enlightened using that lazy definition, of claiming they are better than others in some way, so we should give them our money in form of tribute. Lol. Somehow that doesn't impress me.

Here is the infamous confession of Kalu Rinpoche:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z5Ka3bEN1rs>

At 2:17 he says some monks raped him when he was between ages 12-13. If Western converts say they meet those same monks and that they are enlightened, does it mean a tree didn't fall in the woods? I am pretty sure many buddhists easily say everyone is an enlightened master. It seems to me rather than change themselves, they are more interested in the easier path of claiming how close they are to mythically enlightened teacher beings walking around in human guise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

ConradTree said:

My understanding is that both people should be nonmonks, and both people should have the correct empowerments.

I believe these are the only formal prerequisites.

What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

And they should be between the ages of 16 and 26, since the channels, cakras and elements begin to deteriorate after this point.

ConradTree said:

Is this age thing a requirement or a recommendation?

Malcolm wrote:

You can try, but the main reason most people do not do consort practice is that they are too old.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is, this kind of conversation would never be permitted on Dhamma Wheel. It demonstrates bias against Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: extibetanbuddhist dot com

Content:

smcj said:

By 1996 he had met a whole lot of people. HHDL hasn't said anything like that about anybody since, to the best of my knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

But he is not extolling Merton here for his understanding of Buddhism, rather, for his example as a human being. Two entirely different issues.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

smcj said:

As I've said earlier in this thread, the mindset behind this thread is better suited for Dhamma Wheel than here.

daverupa said:

But this, precisely, is the neglect of academic findings that's being discussed.

Mahayana can't relate itself to the historical Buddha while ignoring him in every other respect, can it?

Malcolm wrote:

Are we to mediate our sense of "Buddhism" by confining ourselves to what academics opine? There are many historical Buddhas. One for Theravada, another for Mahāyāna, one for Vajrayāna and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

you are pretending that there are great clairvoyants around in Tibetan buddhism, who don't need to be bothered with pesky things like learning now dead languages, studying ancient texts, scholarship or archeology.

Malcolm wrote:

You are such an ignorant fool. Do you think there have never been or are not now great scholars in Tibetan Buddhism? People expert in Sanskrit, studying ancient texts, etc? There have been such people for centuries. And of all people, the Tibetans had more continuous close sustained contact with Indian Buddhists than anyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

I will not buy a translation of a translation.

Malcolm wrote:

Then there are no Buddhist books you can buy, since even the texts in Pali are translations from an earlier dialect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: extibetanbuddhist dot com

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Merton was interested in Dzogchen, since he had heard about it from Bede Griffiths. He asked HHDL, HHDL sent him to Chatral.

smcj said:

A quote from Simon E., quoting HHDL, from a different thread:...so how do you explain Thomas Merton a Christian monk who was described by HHDL as having at that time a deeper knowledge of Dharma than any westerner he had met ?

Malcolm wrote:

There were not many westerners who had any understanding of Dharma in 1968, least of all who would have met HHDL at that time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Minimum prerequisites for physical karmamudra practice?

Content:

ConradTree said:

My understanding is that both people should be nonmonks, and both people should have the correct empowerments.

I believe these are the only formal prerequisites.

What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

And they should be between the ages of 16 and 26, since the channels, cakras and elements begin to deteriorate after this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: extibetanbuddhist dot com

Content:

smcj said:

HHDL was very fond and approving of Thomas Merton. So was Chatrul R. I doubt their assessment was dependent on Merton's passing a Madhyamaka quiz.

Malcolm wrote:

Approving what sense? You think they approved of his Catholic views? What they approved of was his interest in Buddhism.

smcj said:

My understanding was that they were approving of his spiritual development, compassion, humility, devotion etc. When Chatrul R. gave him his Refuge name I remember it translating as something like, "dharma person that has no lineage", lol.

Malcolm wrote:

Merton was interested in Dzogchen, since he had heard about it from Bede Griffiths. He asked HHDL, HHDL sent him to Chatral.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: extibetanbuddhist dot com

Content:

smcj said:

HHDL was very fond and approving of Thomas Merton. So was Chatrul R. I doubt their assessment was dependent on Merton's passing a Madhyamaka quiz.

Malcolm wrote:

Approving what sense? You think they approved of his Catholic views? What they approved of was his interest in Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

Still I thought it was interesting they were forthright in describing what Tibetans have been doing for a long time: translating and venerating their root gurus and straying further and further from the best evidence of what the alleged Buddha taught.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't need some puffed up amateur like you telling us what is and isn't taught in Tibetan Buddhism.

Tibetan Buddhism is in no sense straying from the Buddha's teachings. Your assertion is totally offensive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

With time any original message drifts if it is not written down early, and if people don't seek out the oldest extant copy which is the most authentic...

Malcolm wrote:

This is so 19th century...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: extibetanbuddhist dot com

Content:

pensum said:

how could they possibly know the actual state a dedicated Christian might attain...?

Malcolm wrote:

From the view they espouse. Realization proceeds from view; and if your view is not dependent origination, it is axiomatic that you will [NOT] be able to attain liberation from



samsara.

M

smcj said:

That's a little myopic.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Real Narakas

Content:

Lotus Sutra, Ch. 3, Watson said:

For countless kalpas · numerous as Ganges sands · he will at birth become deaf and dumb, · his faculties impaired, · will constantly dwell in hell, · strolling in it as though it were a garden, · and the other evil paths of existence · he will look on as his own home. · Camel, donkey, pig, dog- · these will be the forms he will take on. · Because he slandered this sutra, · this is the punishment he will incur. · If he should become a human being, · he will be deaf, blind, dumb.

Masaru said:

What abominable sins did I commit to be reborn in Texas?

Malcolm wrote:

You can read about this is the Texas durgati pariśodana sūtra, aka Purifying the Terrifying Realm of Texas Sūtra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

tobes said:

The issue of controversy here seems to be something like: is it possible to establish a materialist view (in this case, about the nature of mind or consciousness) without making any discursive/conceptual imputations?

Andrew108 said:

I don't think that is the controversy. To establish any view requires concepts. The issue is should we use Buddhists ones or the ones we are familiar with? If we use Buddhist ones we can get a bit stuck. Especially through the adoption of Buddhist cosmology. If we use materialist ones we can relax. We understand evolution and don't have to substitute a Buddhist concept. We understand that causality is not always personal.

Malcolm wrote:

On a conventional level, causation is not always personal, only karmic causation is personal.

Andrew108 said:

We understand that objects obey laws that weren't made by beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Beings don't make up laws; if you think this, you have not understood anything.

Andrew108 said:

We understand that there is a past and a future.

Malcolm wrote:

The past no longer exists, the future hasn't yet occurred.

Andrew108 said:

There is space/time. Light from the sun takes millions of years to get to the surface of the sun and when it does it takes a mere 8 minutes to get to us on Earth. All of these things are readily accepted.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all merely conventional.

Andrew108 said:

We can let go of our concepts much sooner than those who take the mind to be the source of everything. Or who have the idea that the essence of mind is emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not appear that way from where I sit.

Andrew108 said:

What Thigle has been saying is that non-fixation is a fact. Or needs to be a fact. It needs to be absolutely obvious. The sooner concepts are dropped regarding mind, then the sooner the factual status of non-fixation can come about. Milarepa sang that appearances were his texts. This is an extraordinarily important point. But if we hold to a Buddhist view regarding the primacy of mind, it is very hard to see appearances as texts. We are always adding to the appearances rather than just letting them be in their own nature whilst we are also in that nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Milarepa also understood that are appearances existed as mind.

Andrew108 said:

The Mahamudra instruction regarding locating the mind (in this case mental consciousness) is not really weakened by saying that mental consciousness is in the

brain.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is -- you've just given the mind a location.

Andrew108 said:

Those who adopt Buddhist views of the pre-eminence of mind (and I have done this), are not able to let go of subtle concepts regarding mind. Since they cannot let go of these subtle concepts regarding mind, they are not able to progress. That is the long and short of it. If you understand consciousness is located in the brain then go with that. The sooner you are able to have a direct experience of reality not mediated through concepts then the better you'll be.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness is not located in the brain. It is located, conventionally, in the center of the body.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: paramhansa yogananda

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Eminent figures have been spoken to. Incidentally if Malcolm (as he prefers now) were to teach this I don't think he'd be incredulous because he has been around long enough to have heard it before.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the Sakyapa POV is that monks use a jñānamudra.

On the other hand, practitioners who have accomplished the path of strong heat are not capable of breaking samaya, so if they use a karmamudra??? This is a difficult point.

Beyond this however, Vajrayogini, for Sakyapas, obviates the need for kamramudra.

Finally, in Dzogchen, Karmamudra is criticized as being a lower path. Even Saraha criticizes it...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 9:57 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

dude said:

I reject that wholesale.

Malcolm wrote:  
What are you rejecting wholesale?

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 9:41 AM  
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind  
Content:

Sönam said:  
Do you real think that Buddha state could be explained by mind ? ... what can be explained has to be within the scope of the explainer. Buddha state is not in the scope of mind ... otherwise is right.  
That should end this interminable discussion ... but it will not. Mind trip.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:  
It pretty much depends on what you mean by the term "mind". There are plenty of Dzogchen texts that assert buddhahood cannot be found outside of the mind.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 9:39 AM  
Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
We do what we can, and we wish happiness on all. But the best use of our time, until we really have the capacity to truly practice engaged bodhicitta, is to practice Dharma to increase our wisdom. Until that time we should not be giving away our limbs, nor risking our lives trying to "help" others thinking that this is somehow "bodhisattva" activity. As long as we have limited compassion, we should be judicious about how we decide we are going to "help".

Nighthawk said:  
You may be right but this is a very weak attitude.

Malcolm wrote:  
No, it is a realistic attitude.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, April 18th, 2014 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Alfredo said:

There are thousands more stories like this. You must have great confidence in the Bhutan government, military, and police. Or a remarkable hatred of communism, that you would show such disregard for the human rights, and civil legal rights, of noncombatants.

Malcolm wrote:

The Bhutanese were fair, as far as I am concerned. The Nepali Communists wanted to take over Nepal, and used the presence of the Lhotsampas as a pretext for agitation. The whole situation is far more complicated than you paint it. And in the end, the Bhutanese Gvt. has the right to secure their borders and expel those they deem illegal. Not all Lhotsampas were expelled, incidentally. The real crime is the way the Nepalese Communists have abandoned their own countrymen in camps in Eastern Nepal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 18th, 2014 at 7:23 PM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Jayarava said:

But at least we can say that the one thing that does not provide that continuity is vijñāna..."

Malcolm wrote:

This is not true; an Bhavaviveka (if not Candrakirti) specifically allows that conventionally speaking, it is vijñāna that takes rebirth. Moreover, when we look at the chain of dependent origination analyzed by such texts as the Vibhanga, they clearly are discussing a stream of mental events when rebirth is cast over three lifetimes.

Then of course there is the old "when vijñāna descends into the womb..." in the Mahāniddana sutra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 18th, 2014 at 9:41 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Alfredo said:

Are you not ashamed?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 18th, 2014 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Alfredo said:

The reality is that a bunch of people who had been born in Bhutan were forced into exile, apparently in order to prevent that Nepali-speaking Hindu population from gaining a demographic majority...

Malcolm wrote:

That is the communist version of events. In reality, there was a terrorist campaign waged by Nepalis in order to gain control of the Bhutanese Government -- but they failed.

Also, the United States is one of the very few countries where citizenship is granted through birth. Most countries in the world do not do this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 18th, 2014 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Freedom from extremes means not mediating reality through concepts.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it means that when things are examined their existence and their non-existence is no where to be found.

Andrew108 said:

I guess this thread has gone way off topic. The reason I have posted so much is because I think a realist/materialist view is more conducive to this practice of 'direct experience not mediated through concepts'.

Malcolm wrote:

You may think so, but it merely shows that you are fixated.

Andrew108 said:

In the end you have this cognition - just that - and that cognition is not separate from reality. It belongs in reality. If you see this reality as belonging to mind, as being in the mind, then reality is resting on a concept that stands between you and direct experience.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the problem with your view: you see reality as a container in which are contained

cognitions and things. This is an inherently dualistic view; it is also essentialist.

In fact, there is no reality at all, apart from the reality that is constructed by minds acting together. The great Dzogchen master Shabkar reports in canto 11 of his famed Flight of the Garuda:

When a devaputra asked the Buddha:

“Who made Meru, the sun and the moon, and so on?”

The Buddha said:

“There is no other creator here.

The attachment of the traces of one’s conceptuality  
imputes them, grasps them and then they appear in that way.

Everything is created by one’s mind.”

When the devaputra asked the Buddha again:

“How can the attachment of my concepts

make the hardness and stability of

Meru, the sun and moon, and so on?”

The Buddha said:

“In Varanasi, an old woman

meditated her own body as a tiger.

Since the villagers saw her

as a tiger, they evacuated the village.

If one is able to appear like that for a little while,

if one cultivates mental traces for beginningless lifetimes,

one will be able to appear like this for a year.”

Therefore, everything is created by the mind...

therefore, whatever is imputed by the concepts of the mind  
can be perceived by others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 18th, 2014 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: extibetanbuddhist dot com

Content:

pensum said:

how could they possibly know the actual state a dedicated Christian might attain...?

Malcolm wrote:

From the view they espouse. Realization proceeds from view; and if your view is not dependent origination, it is axiomatic that you will be able to attain liberation from samsara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 17th, 2014 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Astrology in East Asian Buddhism

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

Astrology appears to be a set of interpretations. Thoughts. Starlight Feng Shui.

I rather take refuge in Buddha than in astrology's explanations.

Best wishes

Gwenn

Indrajala said:

Funny thing is according to some Mahāyāna scriptures the Buddha in fact taught astrology.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Tibetan tradition, astrology (calculation) was first introduced from China where it has been taught by Manjuśrī to Kong tse 'phrul rgyal, often identified as Confucius. Later Kalacakra was introduced (1027) and this is when Tibetans first began to officially use the 120 (five elements \* 12 animals) year cycle. This is also why dating anything prior to 1027 in Tibetan annals is a problem without external references.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 17th, 2014 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

pueraeternus said:

[

I see. Is this Vajramala the same as the Vajravali?

[https://www.amazon.com/Tibetan-Mandalas-Vajravali-Tantra-Samuccaya-Raghuvira/dp/8186471014/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1397705467&sr=8-1&keywords=vajravali](https://www.amazon.com/Tibetan-Mandalas-Vajravali-Tantra-Samuccaya-Raghuvira/dp/8186471014/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1397705467&sr=8-1&keywords=vajravali)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, vali and mala are alternate both translated as phreng ba into Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 17th, 2014 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Alfredo said:

but Bhutan's government (officially Drukpa Kargyud, with some Nyingma representation) perpetrated ethnic cleansing of Nepali-speaking Hindus in the 1990's. \



Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. Bhutan expelled illegal immigrants in response to a communist threat against their government.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 17th, 2014 at 7:39 PM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhist definition of mind is that the mind is an impermanent serially caused entity that is clear and knowing.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, what are the Buddhist definitions of 'clear' and 'knowing'?

Malcolm wrote:

Clear means that mind is unimpeded and open; knowing means that a mind has the capacity to know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 17th, 2014 at 7:28 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Outside of sentience, proofs are not possible.

Andrew108 said:

You don't need proof. You just need to measure something. Of course theories are part of sentience. I am not denying sentience. I have also said that reality has no theory within it. But there are characteristics that can be measured and that are measured by non-sentient apparatus.

Malcolm wrote:

That which is non-sentient cannot measure anything.

There is no such thing as a non-sentient measurement. Manas, the word for mind in Sanskrit, means "to measure" as well .

I would disagree. I don't think fMRI scanners are sentient. In what way does the 'mind' make a measurement? As I understand it the 'mind' interprets measurements.

Measuring the measurements.

All measurements are based on judgments, long, short, thick, thin, etc. It is a fundamental characteristic of the conceptual mind to judge and measure. Instruments of measurement merely extend the capability of the mind's capacity to judge, but are not themselves capable of measuring anything.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 17th, 2014 at 8:10 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

and it doesn't make any sense to say that something is a product of consciousness but that there is no awareness of it.

...

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it does; such phenomena are called traces; and when a trace is activated, a given consciousness becomes aware of the phenomena produced by that trace. Further, traces are created by actions of consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 17th, 2014 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

All we need to prove is that the mountain has an existence outside of sentience.

Malcolm wrote:

Outside of sentience, proofs are not possible.

Andrew108 said:

So the fact that it can be measured by a non-sentient device and has a series of values (height, mass, dimension and so on) mean that it has an existence outside of sentience.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a non-sentient measurement. Manas, the word for mind in Sanskrit, means "to measure" as well

Andrew108 said:

Another example would be using a non-sentient device to measure phenomena that don't appear to the senses.

Malcolm wrote:

As above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

LastLegend said:

Can you point to text or source that says it?

jeeprs said:

Not really, but see if you can find an agreed definition of the meaning of the term 'mind' according to the discipline of psychology.

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares?

The Buddhist definition of mind is that the mind is an impermanent serially caused entity that is clear and knowing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that you do not understand Dharma language because you have never studied it.

Andrew108 said:

I've studied it.

Malcolm wrote:

What texts, under what teacher, for how long, where?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

He is saying that the universe is brought into being through the collective karma of all beings. Karma, like consciousness, doesn't exist outside of the skandhas. There is no collective karma. There is only 'individual' karma. So to say that there is collective karma (even as a convention of speech) is still an assertion of collective consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so. For example, Vasubandhu goes the example of a soldier in an army. All who

share in the goals of that army (killing enemies) share in the karma of every action undertaken by the members of that army times the number of people who belong to that that army, whether or not they directly engage in killing enemies.

Andrew108 said:

This 'objective condition' wasn't made bit by bit due to the karma of individual beings and neither was it made in one go due to a singular consciousness and neither was it made by a multitude of consciousness. So the model that Malcolm has posted as to how the universe forms is illogical.

Malcolm wrote:

"The variety of the world is due to action"  
-- Vasubandhu.

If you are a realist dualist Buddhist, i.e. you belong to one of the two lower tenet systems (and your views are very much in line with those apart from the fact that you reject rebirth, and thus in reality you are a Carvaka in your view), the differentiation in the world that you observe comes about because of the actions of intelligent creatures acting in the world.

The universe was formed by the multitude of consciousnessess in the following manner — to put it in more modern terms, it is the affliction in the consciousness of sentient beings that caused the instability in the proposed singularity at the observable beginning of this universe.

Until physics can model the general role of consciousness in the formation of the universe mathematically, its explanation of cosmology will always be incomplete and there will always be unanswered questions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 7:32 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It already exists, but was brought into existence through the collective karma of all beings. Really, this is non-controversial and is explained in Abhidharma as well as Yogacara and Vajrayāna.

Andrew108 said:

A term like collective karma is fundamentally useless. If you assert collective karma then you are asserting collective consciousness. It is a highly controversial idea.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a convention used to describe the aggregate of similar karmas belonging to individual beings. It is only in this sense that the term "collective" is used. It does not mean there is a collective consciousness, because of course, there is not.

Of course, when people do not take the time to study the fundamentals of Buddhadharma as presented in Abhidharma and so on, it is very likely they will misunderstand terms like "collective karma" to refer to karma generated by a collective consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 11:00 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We all inhabit the same universe, the universe comes about because of our collective actions. It is as if we all build one house, but then we live on separate floors, using separate entrances.

PadmaVonSamba said:

If all beings inhabit the same universe,  
Yet experience different 'realities' of different realms,  
some pleasant, some torturous, and so on,  
then what they experience cannot be the result of any sort of combined consciousness

Malcolm wrote:

I never said it was.

PadmaVonSamba said:

but rather, due to their own karma,

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

PadmaVonSamba said:

each being experiences the same basic properties of an already existing physical universe in their own way

Malcolm wrote:

It already exists, but was brought into existence through the collective karma of all beings. Really, this is non-controversial and is explained in Abhidharma as well as Yogacara and Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners truly become Buddhists?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am surprised people don't think Westerners are responsible for supporting monasteries.

Whenever I come to India with the geshe I translate for I also use some of my meager resources to make donations to monks who study well, for pujas, and to my teachers.

I am not a maverick who keeps it all for myself, and believe me it is a struggle to make those donations.

Indrajala said:

The reality it seems is that in the context of Tibetan Buddhism there is a widespread sense that western monks/nuns are unnecessary and even undesirable. Your own experiences as a translator who people have to begrudgingly tolerate is suggestive of this.

Malcolm wrote:

The majority of western Mulasarvastivada monks and nuns have very little value to add. Very few are qualified to be Dharma teachers, even less to act as Vajrayāna preceptors (a handful at best). You might argue they are objects of merit accumulations, and there is some truth to this, but mainly they are an economic drain since they have little to return in value (at this point) to the lay practitioners. If they can join a Dharma center where they can do useful work, great, but there are very few of these indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Malcolm, are you saying that all realms share the same universe, or that each realm creates its own universe?

If you say that all realms share the same universe, then the universe cannot be said to be created by the consciousness of beings in a particular realm.

If you say the realms exist in separate universes, then humans and animals could not share the same sense of reality.

Which is it?

...

Malcolm wrote:

It is like a house with separate floors. Not all inhabitants can know whether the others are home.

We all inhabit the same universe, the universe comes about because of our collective actions. It is as if we all build one house, but then we live on separate floors, using separate entrances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Sherab said:

But aren't you implying by your post that the six elements were equally basic while in yogacara and vajrayana systems, consciousness would be more basic than the physical elements even in the conventional sense?

Malcolm wrote:

No, even in Yogacara and Vajrayāna conventionally understand the six dhātus in the same way they are understood in the lower yānas. However, at the level of analysis, in the Yogacara systems and Vajrayāna, consciousness is understood to be more fundamental, and luminosity more fundamental still.

M

Sherab said:

Your reply seems to contradict what you said earlier. I guess that you have forgotten the discussion that led to this.

Malcolm wrote:

If you think so, you will have to remind me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

jeeprs said:

I have noticed that you frequently encounter passages which explicitly state the difference between 'insentient matter' - the aggregates - and 'formless mind'.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a conventional distinction (and a hard distinction drawn in Abhidharma and so on) that is gradually abandoned in later Indian Mahāyānā and especially Vajrayāna.

jeeprs said:

You can say that if you wish. Once you start to be able to draw in the polemical sleights-of-hand offered by the distinction between relative and ultimate, there is practically nothing that you can't say.

In this case, I opt for a literalist interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you are opting for an essentialist interpretation, which is of course the reason this hard distinction was eventually abandoned as being incoherent beyond a certain convenience for conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

jeeprs said:

I have noticed that you frequently encounter passages which explicitly state the difference between 'insentient matter' - the aggregates - and 'formless mind'.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a conventional distinction (and a hard distinction drawn in Abhidharma and so on) that is gradually abandoned in later Indian Mahāyānā and especially Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Since at this early point, there are no objects of attachment, with only consciousness functioning, what possible action of the mind can take place which would generate karma?

Malcolm wrote:

When the previous universe is destroyed, it is destroyed only up to the level of the third form realm. All remaining sentient beings exist in the upper highest form realm (those who are not in the formless realm, that is). Eventually, as their merit is exhausted, the winds created by their traces of karma generate an air mandala which begins the formation of a new container universe. As sentient beings have karma to be reborn in this and that place, this or that place appears to receive them.

M

Andrew108 said:

This has to be proven. Otherwise it is a fairy tale.

Malcolm wrote:

You can prove it for yourself by developing the devacakṣu, the divine eye. You will never be able to prove it to anyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 4:45 AM



Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

There's nowhere along the line any sensible person can hang their coat. However, if one is looking for credible pricing, only the market can provide credible pricing - if the cost doesn't come up in the market place, it doesn't really exist.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because the market externalizes the costs of cleaning up after itself onto the consumer. As the cost of cleaning up after the market becomes higher and more costly, eventually the consumer have no choice but to enact legislations which limit the markets power to sell highly polluting commodities, and to impose fees on those who use them.

It is similar to drugs — the human cost of cleaning up after drugs such as cocaine, meth and heroin are too high -- therefore, these commodities are strictly controlled markets in which a class of professionals is licensed to dispense them. Governments exist because markets exist. Markets exist because governments exist. Markets must be controlled and regulated (rather than planned), and carbon taxation is one way for governments to control the market in petrochemicals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out before, consciousness, in the Buddhist system, is considered an element [dhātu], one of six that make up everything in the universe. As such, it is also defined as a dravya, usually translated as a substance or an ingredient, along with the other five.

Most of these discussions with people like A108 breakdown because they fundamentally never take the time to understand Buddhist principles.

M

Andrew108 said:

You think that the Buddhist system explains subjectivity? It does not. You are assuming that Buddhism explains subjectivity. Saying that matter is based on consciousness (serial/clarity) is not telling me anything about subjectivity at all. In fact, for all those that are criticizing Science because it can't explain subjectivity, remember that when Buddhism tries to explain subjectivity it invariably sees it as illusory.

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that you do not understand Dharma language because you have never studied it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Sherab said:

But aren't you implying by your post that the six elements were equally basic while in yogacara and vajrayana systems, consciousness would be more basic than the physical elements even in the conventional sense?

Malcolm wrote:

No, even in Yogacara and Vajrayāna conventionally understand the six dhātus in the same way they are understood in the lower yānas. However, at the level of analysis, in the Yogacara systems and Vajrayāna, consciousness is understood to be more fundamental, and luminosity more fundamental still.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 15th, 2014 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm rereading the OP and trying to understand how this new theory overcomes the obvious objections to Daniel Dennett's Consciousness Explained from twenty years ago. I remember that I was not the only one who thought Dennett's argument was preposterously reductive, and that the best-warranted evidence in support of his claims is not yet available, leading him essentially to write a series of bounced checks with each claim he makes. Am I reading this new work reductively, or does it seem that it represents the same old wine in newly-labelled bottles?

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out before, consciousness, in the Buddhist system, is considered an element [dhātu], one of six that make up everything in the universe. As such, it is also defined as a dravya, usually translated as a substance or an ingredient, along with the other five.

Most of these discussions with people like A108 breakdown because they fundamentally never take the time to understand Buddhist principles.

M

Sherab said:

If Buddhist system holds that consciousness is one of the six substances that make up everything in the universe, then you are saying that everything in the universe is

reducible only to these six and therefore these six are not reducible to each other and are therefore fundamental substances. Assuming that I understand you correctly, then where do the Mind Only System and Tantric and Dzogchen system fit in the Buddhist system as described by you?

Malcolm wrote:

This is still conventionally true in both [Yogacara and Vajrayāna] systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 15th, 2014 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm rereading the OP and trying to understand how this new theory overcomes the obvious objections to Daniel Dennett's Consciousness Explained from twenty years ago. I remember that I was not the only one who thought Dennett's argument was preposterously reductive, and that the best-warranted evidence in support of his claims is not yet available, leading him essentially to write a series of bounced checks with each claim he makes. Am I reading this new work reductively, or does it seem that it represents the same old wine in newly-labelled bottles?

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out before, consciousness, in the Buddhist system, is considered an element [dhātu], one of six that make up everything in the universe. As such, it is also defined as a dravya, usually translated as a substance or an ingredient, along with the other five.

Most of these discussions with people like A108 breakdown because they fundamentally never take the time to understand Buddhist principles.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 15th, 2014 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, space arises from consciousness, and the four elements arise from space. This is a universal explanation of the arising of matter in Dharm texts.

dzogchungpa said:

Did the historical Buddha teach this?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

dzogchungpa said:  
Well, do you have a reference?

pensum said:  
Bump.

Malcolm wrote:  
You will have to wait until I get home.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, April 15th, 2014 at 3:47 AM  
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind  
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:  
Since at this early point, there are no objects of attachment, with only consciousness functioning, what possible action of the mind can take place which would generate karma?

Malcolm wrote:  
When the previous universe is destroyed, it is destroyed only up to the level of the third form realm. All remaining sentient beings exist in the upper highest form realm (those who are not in the formless realm, that is). Eventually, as their merit is exhausted, the winds created by their traces of karma generate an air mandala which begins the formation of a new container universe. As sentient beings have karma to be reborn in this and that place, this or that place appears to receive them.

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, April 15th, 2014 at 2:39 AM  
Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
I did an entire lecture on this subject recently in Mexico City.

AlexanderS said:  
On the fact that we are imputations or on ghosts?

I wouldn't mind seeing a recording of this lecture if it is possible.

Malcolm wrote:  
On the fact that spirits are imputations which arise from afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 15th, 2014 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

If those atoms are here because of our collective karma, then your karma is part of the reason my body is here...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and the problem is? That is covered under the principle of causation called katana-hetu, i.e., all things are the causes of all other things except for themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I did an entire lecture on this subject recently in Mexico City.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 7:51 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I do expect that people who call themselves Buddhist not substitute their own fantasies, whether derived from neo-plantonism, science, etc., for what the Buddha taught in issues such as cosmology and so on.

PadmaVonSamba said:

But you cannot prove that what is taught as Buddha's own words actually are. You cannot prove that the words he spoke have not been misinterpreted or distorted over the past 2500 years, or even during the century or so after he spoke them, before they were even written down. So, the difference is that some Buddhists rely on faith alone to validate the teachings, and other constantly weigh what is supposed to be the words of The Buddha against what is observable today that wasn't observable then.

I don't think you can say that one type is a true Buddhist and the other type is not.

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

We have a very good idea of what Buddha actually said. Reams and reams of texts which are repetitive and formulaic to the point where one cannot doubt they are

recordings of the words of a single author.

Such things as the operations of karma, rebirth and so on are really beyond any doubt whatsoever. It is sheer sophistry to pretend otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever the case may be; however, the teaching of the Buddha is that a given world system physically arises because of the collective action of the all the sentient beings who have the karma to be in it.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Are you quite positively, absolutely sure that...

...the teaching of the Buddha is that a given world system physically arises because of the collective action of the all the sentient beings who have the karma to be in it.  
or, is it that ...

...the teaching of the Buddha is that what we experience as a given world system physically arising is because of the collective action of the all the sentient beings who have the karma to be in it.

Because, to me anyhow, the first premise makes absolutely no sense  
and the second premise makes perfect sense,  
and there is a difference between the two.

The first premise is not directly observable.

The second premise is at least somewhat observable.

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am quite sure about the first.

For example, when beings no longer have karma to be reborn in the hell realms, the hell realms vanish.

This is all very clearly explained in such texts as Abhidharmakosha. Even if you take a Mahāyāna perspective, which does not accept that phenomena actually exist apart from the mind, nevertheless, it is very clearly explained in such texts as the Mahāyānasamgraha that the container universe exists because of the seeds which exist in the ālayavijñānas of sentient beings, thus all hell beings are experiencing the ripening of seeds for the hell realms in their ālayavijñānas together.

The variety of the world is created by karma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that the universe arises from karma and karma is created by the (afflicted) mind. If all sentient beings were to attain buddhahood, it is certain the (defiled) universe would vanish, never to reappear.

Andrew108 said:

So we have luminosity, then consciousness (serial/clarity), then space (unobstructed), then karmic formations of matter. With the universe appearing due to the karma of the collection of beings within it. And if we don't accept this, we are not Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what I said was if you do not accept rebirth, you really have no understanding of Buddhism.

Andrew108 said:

I also don't believe that Buddhist scholars should use 'orthodoxy' to condition others.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither do I. I do expect that people who call themselves Buddhist not substitute their own fantasies, whether derived from neo-platonism, science, etc., for what the Buddha taught in issues such as cosmology and so on. I.e., they can believe whatever they want, but they should be clear that they are abandoning Buddhist principles in favor of physics, idealism, etc.

Andrew108 said:

So I would ask you to engage in open debate about these issues without challenging posters' right to consider themselves Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I think you should reconsider what "open debate" means; since it includes to right to challenge whether a given person's position X or not.

Andrew108 said:

If they don't accept what you (or apparently the Buddha) are saying there is no need for you to consider their views heretical.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no heresy in Buddhism, there is merely wrong view and right view. For example, your rejection of karma and rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 8:14 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

ConradTree said:

By the way, why did you change your th\*g\*l code word from lhun grub to clarity?

Most people won't get it.

Malcolm wrote:

because the nature, natural perfection, is clarity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Vajramala is collection of template empowerments, so it is a full empowerment, but less elaborate than the two main traditions of Kalachakra (Rwa and Dro).

pueraeternus said:

So would this upcoming book be something that would help?

[https://www.amazon.com/The-Vajra-Rosary-Tantra-](https://www.amazon.com/The-Vajra-Rosary-Tantra-Vajramalatantra/dp/1935011189/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1397430839&sr=8-1&keywords=rosary+tantra)

[Vajramalatantra/dp/1935011189/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1397430839&sr=8-1&keywords=rosary+tantra](https://www.amazon.com/The-Vajra-Rosary-Tantra-Vajramalatantra/dp/1935011189/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1397430839&sr=8-1&keywords=rosary+tantra)

The synopsis indicates the text is mostly about the Guhyasamaja. Isn't this rather different from the Kalachakra (at least on the completion stage)? I am basing this on what I read from Daniel Cozort's book on Highest Yoga Tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajramala is a tantra, it is also a collection of initiations by the Mahāsiddha Abhayakaragupta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure the text has been translated. But it is in the collection of main daily sadhanas used in Sakya.



pueraeternus said:

From these 2 websites, it seems HHST was transmitted the Kalachakra from both HHDL and Chogye Trichen Rinpoche (6 different lineages). Do you happen to know for the recent NYC transmissions, which lineage he transmitted?

<http://sakyausa.org/h-h-sakya-trizin/>

[http://www.gemsofyogadubai.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=21&Itemid=117](http://www.gemsofyogadubai.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=21&Itemid=117)

Malcolm wrote:

The Vajramala is collection of template empowerments, so it is a full empowerment, but less elaborate than the two main traditions of Kalacakra (Rwa and Dro).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

jeeprs said:

It is not anywhere within the Universe itself but is pre-existent. That is more neo-platonist than Buddhist, I acknowledge that.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not Buddhist at all. Which is fine, but there is nothing in Buddhism, even in Dzogchen, which remotely resembles this idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

jeeprs said:

The consequence of your view is that you are every bit as much a realist as A108. No that is not the case but from experience it is most likely pointless to argue about it.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever the case may be; however, the teaching of the Buddha is that a given world system physically arises because of the collective action of the all the sentient beings who have the karma to be in it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It might have to do with the fact that he did a seven year retreat on thogal.

ConradTree said:

That's exactly why I believe bardo of dharmata does not occur for everyone.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you are wrong.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

smcj said:

I take note of the traditional reticence of the Buddha to discuss whether the Universe has a beginning or not. I might be completely mistaken in that regard, and if so, I will have to live with it.

Tibetan cosmology isn't shy like that. It has the universe ending and then reappearing anew endlessly. The causal factor for the reappearance is the leftover karma of sentient being from the previous universe. I think what Malcolm is saying is that if at the end of one universe everybody attained buddhahood, then the next universe would never appear.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, that is what I am saying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that the universe arises from karma and karma is created by the (afflicted) mind. If all sentient beings were to attain buddhahood, it is certain the (defiled) universe would vanish, never to reappear.

jeeprs said:

Well, I can't understand that. I interpret 'the world' to be 'the umwelt', the 'life-world' or 'meaning-world'. I take note of the traditional reticence of the Buddha to discuss whether the Universe has a beginning or not. I might be completely mistaken in that regard, and if so, I will have to live with it.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he was not afraid to discuss whether a given universe cycle had a beginning or not. He was averse to discussing whether the whole process of arising and destruction of universes had a beginning, i.e. he refused to discuss first causes, considering such discussions as fruitless.

The consequence of your view is that you are every bit as much a realist as A108.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because the visions are part of clear light.

ConradTree said:

Yes, but I'm curious why our sleep yoga's experience would be different than KDL's sleep yoga experience?

It must have something to do with channels and stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

It might have to do with the fact that he did a seven year retreat on thogal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the experience of clear light during sleep manifests differently depending on whether you have developed the visions.

ConradTree said:

Yes I brought this up in the other thread. Why does this occur?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the visions are part of clear light.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on whether you are emphasizing the emptiness aspect or the clarity aspect.

ConradTree said:

I emphasize relaxing in the state of knowledge, having definitively recognized ma bcos shes pa skad cig ma.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the experience of clear light during sleep manifests differently depending on whether you have developed the visions. But you should really hear this from a qualified teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, lucid dreaming and so on, are all techniques of being aware while falling asleep; but they will not necessarily lead to resting in the state of luminosity.

ConradTree said:

I don't follow that New Age stuff, so I wouldn't know.

But you do agree that clear light is about falling asleep with trekcho?

Because that's what I was trying to convey.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on whether you are emphasizing the emptiness aspect or the clarity aspect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is "awareness" of a very specific kind.

ConradTree said:

Would you even be able to be aware while falling asleep, if you did not have that specific kind of awareness?

Malcolm wrote:

For example, lucid dreaming and so on, are all techniques of being aware while falling asleep; but they will not necessarily lead to resting in the state of luminosity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: More faith in Amitabha than bardo of dharmata

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In any event, exhaustion of dharmatā happens more easily in the bardo. Only the very best of the best practitioners show any signs of rainbow body at all. Most practitioners get realization in the bardo of dharmatā. Please consult birth, life and death where this process is explained very well.

ConradTree said:

I get it. It all about recognizing the bardo of dharmata.

My concern was whether bardo of dharmata really appears for everyone.

Malcolm wrote:

It really appears to everyone, down to the tiniest creature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: More faith in Amitabha than bardo of dharmata

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is no contradiction. At this point is impossible to revive the person. We can consider therefore the link between body and mind has been severed.

ConradTree said:

If the link has been severed, you wouldn't get rainbow body phenomena like shrinking.

Malcolm wrote:

If the link had not been severed, you could revive the person.

"Shrinking" is not rainbow body.

In any event, exhaustion of dharmatā happens more easily in the bardo. Only the very best of the best practitioners show any signs of rainbow body at all. Most practitioners get realization in the bardo of dharmatā. Please consult birth, life and death where this process is explained very well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Its about falling asleep in a state of recognition of the nature of the mind while the winds withdraw into the heart cakra.  
while falling asleep without distraction.

ConradTree said:

So you do agree its about falling asleep with some kind of awareness?

Because that's what I was trying to convey.

Malcolm wrote:

It is "awareness" of a very specific kind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: More faith in Amitabha than bardo of dharmata

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It occurs after.

ConradTree said:

See:

Malcolm wrote:

rainbow body you realize the exhaustion of phenomena while in the bardo of dharmatā  
i.e. during THUGDAM.

Yes, there is no contradiction. At this point is impossible to revive the person. We can consider therefore the link between body and mind has been severed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: More faith in Amitabha than bardo of dharmata

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sleep is like death, by analogy; but it is not death since one is still connected with this life's body.

ConradTree said:

If exhaustion of phenomena for regular rainbow body occurs at bardo of dharmata, then bardo of dharmata must occur before separation with body,

Malcolm wrote:

It occurs after.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

ConradTree said:

So you do agree its about consciously entering the sleep state?

Malcolm wrote:

Its about falling asleep in a state of recognition of the nature of the mind while the winds withdraw into the heart cakra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Clear light is a state of wisdom; deep sleep is a state of ignorance. When you are sleeping in clear light, that is because you were able to recognize it while falling asleep. Only great practitioners can do this. We can just try.

ConradTree said:

So you do agree its consciously entering the deep sleep state from say the lions posture?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not depend on posture. It is most easily accomplished by going either guru yoga or meditating one's yidam at the heart while falling asleep without distraction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: The clear light of pure reality experience

Content:

ConradTree said:

I'm going by the teachings, nothing else.

Denying that clear light has to do with deep sleep contradicts every book on the subject and Malcolm.

I can consciously enter deep sleep via the lion's posture after about 6 months of trying. The mind is like a serene lake.

Malcolm wrote:

Clear light is a state of wisdom; deep sleep is a state of ignorance. When you are sleeping in clear light, that is because you were able to recognize it while falling asleep.

Only great practitioners can do this. We can just try.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: More faith in Amitabha than bardo of dharmata

Content:

ConradTree said:

Then how come only at a certain point do the visions occur during sleep?

This is where my recent doubt stems from.

Malcolm wrote:

Sleep is like death, by analogy; but it is not death since one is still connected with this life's body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

conebeckham said:

Taranatha wrote about Lam Dre, liRC, and certainly about Kilaya and Vishuddha, right?

Also, Shangpa practices were and are obviously included in Jonang.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, Jonang inherited a lot of Sakya practices, but it also went the other way. There are a lot of practice in Sakya from Jonang originally. HHST made the comment the other day that the Jonang schools was the original Rimed tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but you have to understand what "space" means in Buddhist terms; in this case it refers to absence of obstruction. So space arises from consciousness, just as consciousness itself arises from luminosity [od gsal].

For example, I demonstrated to you before that the five "empty" atoms (meaning very subtle, i.e., the tanmatras actually) in Kalacakra arise from the karmic winds which are produced by consciousness; these then form the basis for the coarse particles and so on. The universe and the elements within it arise from the collective actions of all sentient beings. This is a principle that is very well established from Abhidharma up to Dzogchen.



It is never that case in Dharma that any one thing is produced from a single cause; all conditioned things are produced from causes and conditions conventionally speaking. When it is asserted in a Buddhist context that matter arises from mind it does not mean that one mind produces all matter; it means that all matter is produced by all minds.

M

Andrew108 said:

Just a quick comment. It seems that you are saying consciousness and space are both inside and outside the individual. There is the sense here that space and consciousness are pervasive.

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that the universe arises from karma and karma is created by the (afflicted) mind. If all sentient beings were to attain buddhahood, it is certain the (defiled) universe would vanish, never to reappear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

conebeckham said:

I suppose I should point out that the Jonang lineage, Kalacakra specialists certainly, grew out of the Sakya lineage...

Malcolm wrote:

The Kalacakra of Jonang is not a Sakya lineage, it did not pass through the five founder masters, nor through Tshar or Ngor.

conebeckham said:

Sure. Never meant to imply otherwise. But masters of the Jonang were originally Sakyapas, before they became Kalachakrapadas, right? And later Jonang masters wrote authoritatively about Sakya practice, as well..including the Kama traditions of Kilaya and Vishuddha....

Malcolm wrote:

Only Dolbupa. The Sakyas and the Karma Kagyus both try and take credit for Jonang. The truth is that Jonang has influence from both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: When did "mindfulness" become "mindfulness"?

Content:

Jikan said:

This is a historical or geneological question: at what point was point #7 of the Eightfold Path first translated as "mindfulness" and not some other term (I mean first documented instance)? At what point did "mindfulness" become the most common English word to use in such translations? It seems to me that other words had been used as recently as the mid-20th century, but by the early 1970s, mindfulness was the industry standard.

Any guidance from those who are knowledgeable in the history of such translations will be warmly welcomed. Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

mindful (adj.) Look up mindful at Dictionary.com  
mid-14c., from mind (n.) + -ful. Related: Mindfully; mindfulness. Old English myndful meant "of good memory." Old English also had myndig (adj.) "mindful, recollecting; thoughtful," which if it had lived might have yielded a modern \*mindy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

And what exactly experiences these aggregates, these moments of clarity, this consciousness?

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Clarity/consciousness/mind, etc; that is the "what".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: More faith in Amitabha than bardo of dharmata

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because the bardo of Dharmatā is connected with thögal.

ConradTree said:

Yes that's my entire point.

Bardo of dharmata only appears for long dedicated thogal practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it appears to everyone. The explanation of the bardo of dharmatā however is connected with thogal. Thogal can be seen as a method to recognize this bardo if you do not achieve rainbow body in this life (most won't).

Further, you don't have to be some long dedicated practitioner. If you have confidence in the experience of the first vision, this is sufficient for recognizing the bardo of dharmatā.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What continues is the stream of aggregates, consciousness being the chief of them. Consciousness is defined as a (partless) moment of clarity. These moments are serial and independent from the serial moments of the consciousness of others.

Andrew108 said:

You have said that space arises from consciousness. Then you have defined consciousness as a partless moment of clarity that is serial and independent. So exactly, in what way does space arise from consciousness? Does it arise serially in the same way as consciousness and is it then independent of the consciousness of others?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but you have to understand what "space" means in Buddhist terms; in this case it refers to absence of obstruction. So space arises from consciousness, just as consciousness itself arises from luminosity [od gsal].

For example, I demonstrated to you before that the five "empty" atoms (meaning very subtle, i.e., the tanmatras actually) in Kalacakra arise from the karmic winds which are produced by consciousness; these then form the basis for the coarse particles and so on. The universe and the elements within it arise from the collective actions of all sentient beings. This is a principle that is very well established from Abhidharma up to Dzogchen.

It is never that case in Dharma that any one thing is produced from a single cause; all conditioned things are produced from causes and conditions conventionally speaking. When it is asserted in a Buddhist context that matter arises from mind it does not mean that one mind produces all matter; it means that all matter is produced by all minds.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

What you propose is exactly what you refute elsewhere,  
something permanent that constitutes an individual self (atman).

Malcolm wrote:

I did not suggest this.

PadmaVonSamba said:

The aggregates are not a self.

Malcolm wrote:

No kidding.

PadmaVonSamba said:

They are more like the leaves that are on a tree in spring and summer, arranged for a lifetime,  
then blow apart in the autumn, when a person dies  
only to regather again in a raked up pile, which is the next rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is a serial continuity, albeit momentary in nature. Otherwise, there would be no causal continuity of traces.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Essentially, it is what the Buddha taught:

What we are today comes from our thoughts of yesterday,  
and our present thoughts build our life of tomorrow: our life is the creation of our mind.  
-The Dhammapada

Malcolm wrote:

Please see:

<http://www.fakebuddhaquotes.com/our-life-is-the-creation-of-our-mind/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, the Buddha taught that one's five aggregates continue into the next world. It is foolish to deny that this is what the Buddha taught.

dzogchungpa said:

Even the rupa skandha?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. When your consciousness leaves this body at the moment of death in the very next moment you appropriate a subtle material body in the bardo. In other words, bardo beings also have all five aggregates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: More faith in Amitabha than bardo of dharmata

Content:

ConradTree said:

Of course I believe in bardo of dharmata. As Namdrol says, the realization of rainbow body occurs IN the bardo of dharmata:

Malcolm wrote:

rainbow body you realize the exhaustion of phenomena while in the bardo of dharmatā i.e. during thugdam.

ConradTree said:

Obviously rainbow body occurs, so obviously bardo of dharmata occurs.

However I have come to believe that bardo of dharmata only appears for long dedicated Dzogchen practitioners who have made significant progress.

Malcolm wrote:

Bardo of dharmatā occurs for everyone, but only experienced practitioners can recognize it.

ConradTree said:

Why is there no mention of bardo of dharmata before Dzogchen Menngagde for example?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the bardo of Dharmatā is connected with thögal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In Sakya, the main Kalacakra practice is the preliminary practice for the six yogas; it is a simplified form in one face and two arms. Chogye Trichen remarked this was all one needed.

M

pueraeternus said:

Noted, thanks. That should be easily found.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure the text has been translated. But it is in the collection of main daily sadhanas used in Sakya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, space arises from consciousness, and the four elements arise from space. This is a universal explanation of the arising of matter in Dharm texts.

dzogchungpa said:

Did the historical Buddha teach this?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

[

...because if the idea is that there is some little invisible bubble of thoughts and

personality that escapes the body of a dead person, and floats around, perhaps circling like a vulture, looking for people who are copulating so it can plant itself there, as though there is a sort of condensed version of a particular person, that's off base. But I think it is what a lot of people think rebirth means.

Malcolm wrote:

What continues is the stream of aggregates, consciousness being the chief of them. Consciousness is defined as a (partless) moment of clarity. These moments are serial and independent from the serial moments of the consciousness of others.

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, if one asks, "well, what exactly is it that gets reborn?" , it is exactly what is reborn moment to moment in one's daily life, that is not dependent on a never-changing body. If you start a fire in the woods, and then ext moment, you die, the fire does not die. It keeps burning. Yet, a fire is not the same thing from one second to the next either. each part of the wood causes another part of the wood to ignite. This is a poor analogy to how karma works, meaning how a set of habitual actions established at one time can continue to have a reverberating effect and remanifest themselves accordingly at a later time, even after the person's body is dead.

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

This sort of treatment is the post-modern version of "rebirth". It is not what the Buddha taught, however. In reality, the Buddha taught that one's five aggregates continue into the next world. It is foolish to deny that this is what the Buddha taught. You may not accept it, you may think it is nonsense, but if so, you are not really a student of the Buddha. It bears repeating that Buddha taught four kinds of liberated persons in terms of how many rebirths and in what realm (desire realm or form realm) it would take them to achieve final nirvana. Dzogchen tantras especially spend a great deal of time discussing rebirth and the bardo, and they do not mean this symbolically. To discard rebirth then is to discard the whole of the Buddha's Dharma and to replace it with some post-modern intellectualism as you have done here.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 7:06 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

jeeprs said:

So, the sense in which mind 'creates' space is also the sense in which it 'creates' matter..

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no. Matter arises from consciousness directly, i.e. consciousness is the efficient cause of matter, not merely a formal cause in the sense you provide. I already

demonstrated this to Andrew that this was the Buddhist view (sutra as well as tantra).

When you understand that consciousness, like matter, is a "dravya", then it all makes sense.

M

jeeprs said:

Would you mind pointing out where you demonstrated that?

Malcolm wrote:

Some other thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 9:36 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

jeeprs said:

So, the sense in which mind 'creates' space is also the sense in which it 'creates' matter..

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no. Matter arises from consciousness directly, i.e. consciousness is the efficient cause of matter, not merely a formal cause in the sense you provide. I already demonstrated this to Andrew that this was the Buddhist view (sutra as well as tantra).

When you understand that consciousness, like matter, is a "dravya", then it all makes sense.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 6:29 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you emphasize the emptiness aspect, you will err into annihilation.

odysseus said:

Do elaborate, are you pulling my leg?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness alone is insufficient to attain buddhahood.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 6:28 AM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Thanks Cone and Kirtu.

Malcolm wrote:

HHST wrote a short sadhana for the Kalacakra in NYC.

pueraeternus said:

Yes. It is a really short sadhana. It definitely something to start with, but I am also looking for more substantial texts.

There is this book on Geshe Ngawang Ghargyey's teachings on Kalachakra that he gave at the Sakya Tegchen Choling in Seattle in 1982. Would this be suitable for someone who had initiation from Sakya?

Malcolm wrote:

In Sakya, the main Kalacakra practice is the preliminary practice for the six yogas; it is a simplified form in one face and two arms. Chogye Trichen remarked this was all one needed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So the teachings are heuristic? If so then fair enough. But there should be some transparency, because there are many practitioners who are invested in the belief that matter arises out of consciousness.

asunthatneversets said:

No one has suggested that matter arises out of consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, space arises from consciousness, and the four elements arise from space. This is a universal explanation of the arising of matter in Dharm texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

kirtu said:

<http://vajrasana.org/buddhism.htm> is a teaching that HE Chogye Trichen gave on the Kalchakra.

In general Kalachakra practitioners can fairly openly use sadhana texts (from Berzin). Most of the sadhana texts published are from the Gelug tradition and can be found at the <http://kalachakranet.org/>. Most of the Kalachakra sadhanas are also pretty complex. If you are a student of Khenpo Pema or Lama Kunga then ask them.

There is also a brief sadhana written by Jamgon Kongtrul. This was given out at the Palyul Kalachakra empowerment and teaching that HH Penor Rinpoche gave in 2007.

You could also ask HHST for a Sakya Kalachakra sadhana. HHST said in Kevelaer, Germany that it would be good to practice the Kalachakra but went on to basically note that the empowerment was mostly given as a blessing. Nonetheless, practicing it in the Sakya tradition is in fact possible.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

When Chogye Trichen gave Kalacakra, he gave it from the Jonang tradition primarily.

HHST wrote a short sadhana for the Kalacakra in NYC.

I never said it was impossible to practice Kalacakra in Sakya, just that it is not a main practice in Sakya. However, since Chogye Trichen taught it fairly often, perhaps one of his successors will continue his teaching tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

conebeckham said:

I suppose I should point out that the Jonang lineage, Kalacakra specialists certainly, grew out of the Sakya lineage...

Malcolm wrote:

The Kalacakra of Jonang is not a Sakya lineage, it did not pass through the five founder masters, nor through Tshar or Ngor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I would prefer to say that Science posits truth rather than certainty. Certainty implies the end of the game. The realization itself. I don't trust science sufficiently to believe that it can provide me with realization just by itself. The type of truth science posits concerns the truth of how the world works. In that world objects obey rules. That by itself proves to me that there is an 'objective condition'. The truth of there being an objective condition has implications for my practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Science does no such thing. Scientific inquiry is a process of testing hypothesis, and that is all. There are no scientific truths, there are only the latest in scientific understandings, which are always subject to change and refinement.

Science is very subtle and detailed in its words, but its meaning is as coarse and rough as a pile of sand. By comparison, the words of Buddhadharma are very simple and easy to understand, but its meaning is very deep and profound.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Ordaining as a monk or nun in the west

Content:

Indrajala said:

You could easily train them to do sand mandalas or elaborate pumas.

It would be easier logistically for example to have American monks accompanying some eminent teacher to America.

Malcolm wrote:

It would seem so. However, it takes many years of training to be a ritual attendant, as well as fluency in both spoken and literary Tibetan. Creating sand mandalas is not easy. It is a craft that takes a long time to perfect.

Indrajala said:

Again it just suggests to me that Tibetan Buddhism in general neither wants nor needs monastics from outside their fold, and such sentiments are only reproduced amongst western Tibetan Buddhists who wouldn't spit on you if you were burning on the side of the road.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans monasteries are quite happy to take in Westerners in general. What you don't understand is that Tibetan Monasteries in general do not really provide everything for their monks, who depend on families and benefactors for much of their needs. This is one of the sociological reasons for having monks do prayers on one's behalf, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In some higher Dzogchen texts, it is suggested that even a division of sentient vs. non-sentient is merely conventional and not actual, not to be believed.

odysseus said:

Sure, but this doesn't mean that plants etc. are sentient. It means that there is no duality between sentience and non-sentience as one realizes emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

It means that everything is the state of wisdom (jñāna) right from the beginning.

odysseus said:

Looks like both meanings are valid, no discrepancy.

Malcolm wrote:

If you emphasize the emptiness aspect, you will err into annihilation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't accept this point, then no matter what you think you understand of the Buddha's teaching you cannot be considered someone who truly grasps its import and meaning. There are many refutations of your point of view even in Dzogchen.

Andrew108 said:

Stay on topic. This thread isn't about me.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that you have made many statements about what Dzogchen is, about what reality is, which are in deep conflict with Buddhadharma, Dzogchen included.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

For some people it is difficult to accept that consciousness has a physical basis. For others it is axiomatic.

Malcolm wrote:

For some people it is difficult to accept that matter has a basis in consciousness. For others it is axiomatic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

At it's most fundamental level, science is saying that objects obey rules. This isn't an assumption. It's not just a construct either. These rules are not conventions or formed by consensus. They are universal. It means that these rules are always applicable even without a consensus.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence for you they are an ultimate truth.

Andrew108 said:

What I have said about consciousness is that it can't be something which is beyond the rules of the physical universe.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, its not physical, so therefore, your contention goes out the window.

Andrew108 said:

This idea that objects obey rules is proof that reality is not just a subjective experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Tell that to a Mahāsiddha.

Andrew108 said:

But the 6 realms model is largely a model where an individual suffers because they are

not able to adapt to that environment.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the six realms model is a model which explains six different kinds of perception.

Andrew108 said:

There is no proof of the Buddhist reduction that consciousness exists as a separate entity - as a stream.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there is: karma and liberation.

Andrew108 said:

The one thing they trust, that they must trust, is reality.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as they are relying ultimate truth (the sole reality), this is fine. But you are suggesting that the conventional truth of physics is ultimate truth, and this will never result in realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A sentient being is a stream of consciousness that transmigrates through samsara. If you don't understand this point, you don't understand Buddhadharma, much less Dzogchen, Mahāmudra and so on.

M

Andrew108 said:

You mean that if I don't believe this point. I certainly understand the point, but at the moment I choose not to believe it.

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't accept this point, than no matter what you think you understand of the Buddha's teaching you cannot be considered someone who truly grasps its import and meaning. There are many refutations of your point of view even in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Simon E. said:

Indeed. The gnostic/duality view of the 'ghost in the machine' is found nowhere in Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

There are six dhātus, Simon, not just five. Consciousness is the sixth. The view you enunciate would indicate that there are only five dhātus, earth, water, fire, air and space.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The brain is not a being inhabiting a body. The body and the brain together make the being.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a physicalist, yes. However, such a view is incompatible with Buddhadharma. There are five aggregates, not merely one. A sentient being is a stream of consciousness that transmigrates through samsara. If you don't understand this point, you don't understand Buddhadharma, much less Dzogchen, Mahāmudra and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: Kalachakra practice in Sakya

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Recently I attended HHST's Kalachakra empowerment in NYC. I would like to further my study and practice, but could not find any books on Kalachakra specific to the lineage transmitted by HHST (majority are on the Gelugpa transmissions). Is there any book anyone familiar with the tradition can recommend? Or there is no great differences between the various Kalachakra lineages and I can just refer to any available in the market?

Malcolm wrote:

There is very little material by Sakya authors on Kalachakra. For the most part, only Lama Dampa, Takstang Lotsawa and Amyezhabs wrote anything of significance on Kalachakra, unless of course you count Buton as a Sakyapa -- the Gelug lineage comes from him.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Secondly, Indians had concepts of debt and contracts, found in the Vedas on up.

Buddha, for example, clearly refers to karma has a kind of a debt. Where there are debts, there must be means of keeping records of such debts, etc.

Indrajala said:

You can keep track of debts with colored stones in jars or ropes tied together.

You don't need writing to keep records. Some Mesoamerican civilizations managed fine with just ropes.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, but the fact that Indians were surrounded with people who had writing, and were in contact with people who had writing (Phoenicians, Greeks, Persians, Chinese) makes it unlikely that Indians were unaware of writing.

Basically, I find it unlikely that Indians all of a sudden adopted writing merely because of tenuous contacts with the Greeks. What I am suggesting as a more likely scenario is that Indians used writing for commercial documents, not religious texts, during this period. We have no paper documents at all from the Subcontinent that date earlier than Gandharan finds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

tingdzin said:

I suggest that the experts out there put their opinions in writing in a refereed journal and have them evaluated by other knowledgeable people. Until then , don't be too dogmatic about your opinions. An internet forum is a pretty small pond.

Malcolm wrote:

Personally, I am not that invested in the issue. I simply find it a little far-fetched to believe that Indians widely adopted a writing system based on a Phoenician script within the 150 year time frame.

Secondly, Indians had concepts of debt and contracts, found in the Vedas on up.

Buddha, for example, clearly refers to karma has a kind of a debt. Where there are debts,



there must be means of keeping records of such debts, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 6:46 AM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Is there evidence that such bursaries were established during the Buddha's time? The Buddhist community wandered around as travelling mendicants most of the time (except during retreats), were supposed to only have the 4 requisites, cannot handle money, etc. So all these point the bursars towards a later phase in monastic Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a difference between a monastic officer handling money and a monk handling money personally. You must recall, the Buddha was gifted with property during his lifetime. There is evidence that within 100 years of the Buddha's PN there were permanent Viharas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Indrajala said:

I'm quite solid in my position stating that later developments in Vinaya literature where the Buddha is talking about drawing up loan contracts with people is in fact a much later development and moreover an indication of ignorance on the part of the author(s), who were unaware that writing didn't exist in the Buddha's day.

pueraeternus said:

Even if there were writing at the time of the Buddha, the loan contracts thingy would not make sense, since the Buddha expressively prohibited monastics from handling money (if we believe that part of the Vinaya to be Buddhavacana, which is very likely).

Malcolm wrote:

There were always bursars in monasteries, who were charged with managing money.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Indrajala said:

Megasthenes had very limited contact with Indian culture and civilization.  
He did live there for some time. Your argument is silly.

Malcolm wrote:

He did not see very much of India. His fragments certainly do not constitute an accurate picture of Indian life in the 4th century BCE.

Indrajala said:

You're saying "it is quite likely that some form of writing existed in India during the time of Buddha." Well, you have no evidence for this.

Malcolm wrote:

There is also no evidence to the contrary apart from a single passage in a fragment by a Greek Ambassador in a book for which there is no original.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 10th, 2014 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Most scholars at one time agreed that Troy was a myth...further, Megasthenes is not a reliable witness.

Indrajala said:

And why wouldn't he have been a reliable witness? If writing existed you'd have had mention of it in the earliest stratum of Jain and Buddhist literature, but as far as I know there are no such references. You cannot dismiss him as a period witness.

In any case the Vinaya literature reveals multiple layers of historical development. Read Schopen and educate yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that Vinaya was composed in layers was known a long time before Schopen. Anyone who has studied the three vows literature is already well acquainted with this fact. Read Gorampa (for one) and educate yourself.

According to Schopen, there are no "earliest" records. As you know, he basically does not think anything is reliably datable based on text criticism alone.

Megasthenes had very limited contact with Indian culture and civilization.

We can say with certainty that Ashoka used writing. We cannot say with certainty when writing first was used in India and by whom. All we can really say with certainty is that it, like most other scripts in the ancient world, was based on Western Semitic, where aleph = an Ox.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 10th, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is quite likely that some form of writing existed in India during the time of Buddha.

Indrajala said:

Show us the evidence. There is no evidence of this as far as I know, and most scholars agree.

Malcolm wrote:

Most scholars at one time agreed that Troy was a myth...further, Megasthenes is not a reliable witness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 10th, 2014 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Indrajala said:

[ It was just a formality that orthodox Buddhist traditions demand.

Malcolm wrote:

Hardly.

Indrajala said:

(for example, like how to properly draw up loan contracts with laypeople which is actually attributed to the Buddha who lived in a time with no writing!).

Malcolm wrote:

It is quite likely that some form of writing existed in India during the time of Buddha. It may not have been used to record religious texts, but considering your recent speculations about a Mesopotamian/India connection, it would be absurd to suppose that Indians kept all their financial undertakings in their heads. And given that bark records don't survive long in India...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 7th, 2014 at 7:15 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

After the collapse of the previous universe, there are no buddhas and sentient beings -- and this is called the bardo of samsara and nirvana. Present in the latent basis however is a neutral awareness which does not know itself.

Because of traces of action and affliction remain from previous universe, the basis is stirred, lights shine out, and they are either recognized or not, resulting in samasara and nirvana.

This neutral awareness is what happens when someone achieves an incomplete full awakening, for example an arhat or some other form of lesser liberation that can "return to the cause". This is why Dzogchen makes such a big deal about Dzogchen Buddhahood being one that "does not return to the cause".

Emakirikiri said:

Do the atomic body, rainbow body and great transference body all constitute the "does not return to the cause" version of awakening?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 7th, 2014 at 7:12 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

The idea that gender is determined by past karma is linked to the (cultural) notion that birth as a female is an unfortunate event somehow due to negative actions in the past.

Vajraprajnakhadga said:

That is not a universal perspective. Nyingma in particular have yogini traditions where female birth is seen as auspicious. The view that male rebirth is superior is rooted in patriarchal monasticism, nothing more.

PadmaVonSamba said:

True. It is not universal. But is that attitude the exception? Must a female be exceptional in some way, in order for it to be considered that her birth as a female was not the result of negative karma?

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

In general, in Indian Buddhism, female birth is considered a disadvantage. A term often seen in sutras is "skye dman", inferior birth, used frequently for women. It is based on a Sanskrit original, but I forget what it is, something like hinajati.

It does not mean that women cannot achieve awakening, it means however they have some obstacles men do not have.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 7th, 2014 at 7:10 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The classical division in Buddhadharma is that there is sentient life and non-sentient life. In some higher Dzogchen texts, it is suggested that even a division of sentient vs. non-sentient is merely conventional and not actual, not to be believed.

Gwenn Dana said:

Thank you. Models apparently are not always as unanimous as one might think, even in a similar context.

odysseus said:

Sure, but this doesn't mean that plants etc. are sentient. It means that there is no duality between sentience and non-sentience as one realizes emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

It means that everything is the state of wisdom (jñāna) right from the beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 7th, 2014 at 7:08 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

The idea that gender is determined by past karma is linked to the (cultural) notion that birth as a female is an unfortunate event somehow due to negative actions in the past.

Vajraprajnakhadga said:

That is not a universal perspective. Nyingma in particular have yogini traditions where female birth is seen as auspicious. The view that male rebirth is superior is rooted in patriarchal monasticism, nothing more.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a practical observation. Women have more illnesses, they endure the hardship

of childbirth, menstruation, etc. It is for this reason that there are many sutras where women are encouraged to desire rebirth as men in their next life.

On the other hand, as you note, in all highest yoga tantra traditions, the negative view of female birth is reversed because all women have the nature of prajñā. This is not an especially "Nyingma" perspective.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 7th, 2014 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

However, according to Tibetan Medicine and Ayurveda, gender is not fixed until the third week after conception, and can be changed using various medicines and rites.

dzogchungpa said:

That's not actually true though, is it?

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I am concerned it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 6th, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

alpha said:

Can a mother by manipulating the internal winds in the first three weeks of conception knowingly attract a particular type of consciousness ?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so. The moment of conception requires a viable sperm, egg and a consciousness seeking rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 6th, 2014 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Sorry Alpha, I misread your earlier post.

There can be the karma that ripens a being for rebirth is one that does not involve copulating couple, such as birth in the hell realm and birth in the gods realm. Other births that do not involve copulating couples are also mentioned in Buddhist text such as birth from heat and moisture but I do not know how such a birth maps to birth as understood in modern biology. But as I understand it, the karma for such a birth must ripen in a being for that being to take such a birth.

alpha said:

I meant the IVF process where in the absence of copulating couple, there is no basis on which the consciousness that takes rebirth to generate feelings of revulsion or attraction. Since the basis (the couple copulating) on which the consciousness usually generates attraction and revulsion is missing, how does the consciousness choose if it will be a male or a female?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. Gender is determined mostly by past karma.

Bardo beings are clairvoyant. One presumes that they are aware of the intention of parents to conceive during the IVF process and take that chance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 6th, 2014 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Yes, it does. Totally. It shows that consciousness can just as easily plop itself down into (or as you say, "appropriate" ) a petri dish or a test tube just as easily as a woman's abdomen.

You have suggested all sorts of reasons why consciousness is specifically this or that, or can only go here or there or arise with one kind of thing or another.

It seems that consciousness thinks otherwise.

. . .

alpha said:

The way i see it copulation is not a precondition for rebirth.

But there is a question i don't know the answer for .In the absence of copulation on what basis does the consciousness choose to become a male or a female since the male and female(as a couple copulating) are absent as a basis on which to feel attraction or repulsion ?

Malcolm wrote:

As mentioned above, there are four birth types.

Karma is the primary determinant of gender. However, according to Tibetan Medicine and Ayurveda, gender is not fixed until the third week after conception, and can be

changed using various medicines and rites.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 6th, 2014 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Nature of awareness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When I discuss awareness as a mental factor, I am referring to the mental operation of taking note of an object.

jeeprs said:

I believe that is usually given in English as 'apperception':

The mental process by which a person makes sense of an idea by assimilating it to the body of ideas he or she already possesses.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am referring to the act of taking note of an object, whether inner or outer; so it is a more basic cognitive function.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 6th, 2014 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: Nature of awareness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which Tibetan word do you mean by the term "awareness"?

Vajraprajñākhaḍga said:

In this particular context it would be rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

"Rigpa", vidyā means "to know". It is not a mental factor.

When I discuss awareness as a mental factor, I am referring to the mental operation of taking note of an object.

aware (adj.)

late Old English gewær, from Proto-Germanic \*ga-waraz (cognates: Old Saxon giwar, Middle Dutch gheware, Old High German giwar, German gewahr), from \*ga-, intensive prefix, + waraz "wary, cautious" (see wary).

<http://www.etymonline.com/index.php>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 6th, 2014 at 8:05 PM



Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

Hmmmm. I just read this:

Outside of neuroscience biologists, Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela contributed their Santiago theory of cognition in which they wrote:

Living systems are cognitive systems, and living as a process is a process of cognition. This statement is valid for all organisms, with or without a nervous system.[5]

This theory contributes a perspective that cognition is a process present at organic levels that we don't usually consider to be aware. Given the possible relationship between awareness and cognition, and consciousness, this theory contributes an interesting perspective in the philosophical and scientific dialogue of awareness and living systems theory.

It would be interesting to hear Malcolm's thoughts on this.

Best wishes

Gwenn

Malcolm wrote:

The classical division in Buddhhadharma is that there is sentient life and non-sentient life. In some higher Dzogchen texts, it is suggested that even a division of sentient vs. non-sentient is merely conventional and not actual, not to be believed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 6th, 2014 at 9:52 AM

Title: Re: Nature of awareness

Content:

Jesse said:

So what is it? Does it arise from our physical form (Brain, nervous system etc), Is it a natural phenomena of the universe (Gravity, Space, Time, etc).

What is the difference between my awareness, and everyone else's? Does it even exist separately for each individual?, if not why is my experience so seemingly separate from everyone else, then.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the Buddhist perspective:

Awareness is a mental factor. It belongs to consciousness and arises with it. A consciousness is not always aware, for example, when it is in a state of cessation.

Your awareness is a mental factor of your consciousness, it belongs only to you.

Vajraprajnakhadga said:

That seems to almost be the opposite of what I've been taught. Dzogchen teachings essentially posit that mirror-like awareness is the very essence of what we are, and that it is not a thing ultimately.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Tibetan word do you mean by the term "awareness"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 6th, 2014 at 9:34 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not change anything at all about what Buddhism has to say about conception since there are generally four modes of conception according to the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 5th, 2014 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

But YOU said:

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, they have to be having sex. ...parents engaging in sex (in the case of a human birth)

PadmaVonSamba said:

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

In general, when we are talking about the normal mode of conception for human beings. Test tube babies, cloning, etc., do not really alter what Buddhism has to say about conception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 5th, 2014 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

You need the consciousness of the mother and father to create the conditions for the entry of a third consciousness. Which is more important for life, the consciousness of the mother and father or the consciousness of the third party?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, they have to be having sex. That requires that they are conscious beings, of course. One has to have all three things. In other words, parents engaging in sex (in the case of a human birth), and a gandharva that seeks rebirth.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Science has long proved that actual sexual union is not needed (in other words, a "test-tube baby").

Furthermore, cloning can also produce another being.

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, we would call these moisture and heat births...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 5th, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

.. There is no conceivable way to avoid this as long as we are using words and concepts.

Sherab said:

So you agree that your holding of the two truths as merely cognitions is within a framework of subject-object duality. If so, then there can be no objectivity of such a model of the two truths because such truths will disappear for beings in the two instances I mentioned earlier. I don't think your quoting of Chandrakirti's take on the two truth support your view that the two truths are merely cognitions because it is equally applicable in the model that I have described. In the model that I described, the two truths do not disappear for beings that are unconscious because unlike your model, the model is not tied to the perspective of individual beings.

Malcolm wrote:

First, I don't recall the model you described. This thread is complicated and our discussion has long since departed from the main body of the thread.

In the Madhyamaka model, the two truths are merely cognitions (veridical or false) of

one and the same object.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 5th, 2014 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Nature of awareness

Content:

Jesse said:

So what is it? Does it arise from our physical form (Brain, nervous system etc), Is it a natural phenomena of the universe (Gravity, Space, Time, etc).

What is the difference between my awareness, and everyone else's? Does it even exist separately for each individual?, if not why is my experience so seemingly separate from everyone else, then.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the Buddhist perspective:

Awareness is a mental factor. It belongs to consciousness and arises with it. A consciousness is not always aware, for example, when it is in a state of cessation.

Your awareness is a mental factor of your consciousness, it belongs only to you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 5th, 2014 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

So does an unconscious being has a mind if there is no cognition whatsoever?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it continues as the ālayavijñāna, for example, in nirodha-samapatti.

Sherab said:

Isn't it the case that for an untrained being, he is unconscious at the time of black near attainment? If yes, can an unconscious being at the time of black near attainment has luminosity as the object of his mind?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not that an untrained being is unconscious. He or she is simply not able to recognize the moment of luminosity when it occurs because it is very brief.

Sherab said:

Since you held earlier that the two truths are only cognitions, then in the above two instances, there can be no two truths since there are no cognitions.

This implies that the two truths as cognitions is subjective. Therefore your positing of two truths as cognitions is implicitly in a framework that is not free from subject-object duality.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the way Candrakirti defines the two truths is a little more precise: he states that the two truths are the object of either true or false cognitions respectively. In this case then, luminosity would be an ultimate truth. However, when luminosity is not correctly perceived, it becomes a relative truth; when it is correctly perceived, it is an ultimate truth.

The point however is that the truths are defined on the basis of veridical or false cognitions, so as a shorthand, I place the emphasis on the cognitions since they are the defining factor.

So yes, the two truths are conventionally subjective, they are not objective. The object of a veridical cognition, dharmatā śūnyatā, is the ultimate truth. Nevertheless, the realization of ultimately truth comes when one's mind is truly synchronized with how things are (yatha bhutaṃ) and the apparent duality of subject and object vanishes since it is not there to begin with.

While one is confined to relative truth cognitions (including relative formulations of ultimate truths) one is necessarily confined to subject/object duality. There is no conceivable way to avoid this as long as we are using words and concepts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 5th, 2014 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you properly study Dharma, you will understand the how.

Andrew108 said:

I thought you were against Ad Hominem remarks?

Malcolm wrote:

It was not an hominem remark; it was a simple observation.

Andrew108 said:

Your position is based on belief. It's similar to a Christian saying that you need to study the Bible some more in order to understand the resurrection.

Malcolm wrote:

My position is based on understanding what the Buddha said. I have not made any truth claims for it.

Andrew108 said:

If a consciousness was able to 'descend into a womb' then there are some logical inconstancies with that.

1. You have to get the timing right. Can't descend too soon and can't be too late. So how does a disembodied consciousness get so good at timing?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the timing, etc., have to be right. There are many things that must come together, it must be the right parents, etc.

Andrew108 said:

2. You need the consciousness of the mother and father to create the conditions for the entry of a third consciousness. Which is more important for life, the consciousness of the mother and father or the consciousness of the third party?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, they have to be having sex. That requires that they are conscious beings, of course. One has to have all three things. In other words, parents engaging in sex (in the case of a human birth), and a gandharva that seeks rebirth.

Andrew108 said:

3. The disembodied consciousness must exist somewhere before descending into the womb. What is the nature of the place where the consciousness exists prior to the descent?

Malcolm wrote:

The bardo.

Andrew108 said:

Is it a bounded place?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Its more like a phase. You should read Birth, Life and Death by ChNN. He has a beautiful description of the bardo, and so on.

Andrew108 said:

Is it locatable? Is it another dimension? What is the relationship between that place and the dimension of our physical reality? In what way can they interact? The non-physical penetrating the physical?

Malcolm wrote:

Physical reality is merely an (strong) illusion. There is no physical reality in fact. In the

end, the only thing that is "real" is consciousness.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 5th, 2014 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

So does an unconscious being has a mind if there is no cognition whatsoever?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it continues as the ālayavijñāna, for example, in nirodha-samapatti.

Sherab said:

Isn't it the case that for an untrained being, he is unconscious at the time of black near attainment? If yes, can an unconscious being at the time of black near attainment has luminosity as the object of his mind?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not that an untrained being is unconscious. He or she is simply not able to recognize the moment of luminosity when it occurs because it is very brief.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 4th, 2014 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

I have two questions for you.

If the two truths are cognitions, what cognition is there for a being who is unconscious? More specifically, what cognition is there for a being in the state of black near attainment in the death process?

If the two truths are cognitions, and there is no subject-object duality, then cognition is present in rocks, plants, etc., things that we normally think as not having cognitions of any sort. Is this a valid conclusion? If not, why not?

Malcolm wrote:

By definition an unconscious being has no cognitions.

Second, luminosity is the object of the mind of the black near attainment.

When there is no subject object duality, then according to the Yogacara school there are no further cognitions of things like rocks and trees, which are understood to be mind

only. That absence of subject/object duality aka mind only, is understood by them to be ultimate truth. The appearances of rocks and trees are understood to be relative.

For Madhyamaka the cognition of subject and object is considered relative, when it is understood and realized that all phenomena are empty, that correct cognition is termed ultimate truth and subject and object cognition ceases.

So, your conclusion is not valid, and misses the barn by a wide mark.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 4th, 2014 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It means that consciousness descends into the womb, in the case of human being, joining with the spermatozoon and oocyte at the moment of conception.

PadmaVonSamba said:

You are describing what and I am interested in how.

In other word, what "appropriate" entails.

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

If you properly study Dharma, you will understand the how.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 4th, 2014 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In any event, what you are fundamentally suggesting is that a spermatozoon has a consciousness, separate from the consciousness that descends into the womb at the moment of conception.

PadmaVonSamba said:

You know, that theory, which I think is from Padmasambhava, has a lot of holes in it.

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

That teaching is from the Buddha; specifically the Mahāniddana sutta:

"From consciousness as a requisite condition comes name-and-form.' Thus it has been



said. And this is the way to understand how from consciousness as a requisite condition comes name-and-form. If consciousness were not to descend into the mother's womb, would name-and-form take shape in the womb?"

"No, lord."

"If, after descending into the womb, consciousness were to depart, would name-and-form be produced for this world?"

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.15.0.than.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 4th, 2014 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: intoxication and tibetan buddhism

Content:

ovi said:

Meditation has been the only and single essential factor. Cannabis was a completely unessential one, yet very helpful, for reasons I have already talked about, that is, its powerful anxiolytic effect that it had upon me, which actually allowed me to meditate. I am well aware that it doesn't work the same way with everybody, it can even be anxiogenic to others, but telling me how I am completely deluded about this aspect isn't meant to be helpful, nor is it true.

Malcolm wrote:

Meditation has been the only and single essential factor.

Then why bother defending herb as useful for Buddhist practice?

I am well aware that it doesn't work the same way with everybody

It pretty much does, despite what you presently believe.

telling me how I am completely deluded about this aspect isn't meant to be helpful, nor is it true

It is both helpful and true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 4th, 2014 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Let's define this concept of appropriation...what that actually means in terms of awareness or consciousness arising with, or somehow interacting with organic (or, inorganic matter, from which organic matter is composed) matter.

Malcolm wrote:

It means that consciousness descends into the womb, in the case of human being, joining with the spermatozoon and oocyte at the moment of conception.

PadmaVonSamba said:

You see, I am asking this because I want to understand why, if awareness appropriates a collection of cells (my body) at some point, or even something formless, why not consider that it appropriates a single cell as well?

Malcolm wrote:

The material aggregate consists of sense organs and sense objects. A cell does not have sense organs. Plants do not have sense organs. Spermatozoa and oocytes do not have sense organs.

In any event, what you are fundamentally suggesting is that a spermatozoon has a consciousness, separate from the consciousness that descends into the womb at the moment of conception.

If you say "Sentient beings exist in seven locations" then are you not essentially saying that awareness/consciousness appropriates seven different sets of conditions?  
. . .[/quote]

I am saying that there are six realms and the bardo; that is where sentient beings live.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: intoxication and tibetan buddhism

Content:

ovi said:

I have smoked in the past, but it never got me out of depression until I combined it with meditation. I was never stoned during the meditation process, I consumed less than 1g/week. You know, your entire argument is flawed simply by claiming your own experience is that of everybody else.

Malcolm wrote:

I am glad you no longer feel depressed, but that fact that meditation is the key that helped you feel less depressed should tell you something about the effects of herb on your persona.

It's simple anatomy and pharmacology.

In any event, you do as you please. The reason why I spoke up is that I have more experience in this department than you. I am older, have been practicing far longer, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: intoxication and tibetan buddhism

Content:

ovi said:

I don't want to turn this thread into a place to post endless studies on psychedelics, but you realize that not all studies agree with your conclusions. Furthermore, I don't see how one can reject psychoactive substances in general. Don't you think people should receive treatment for depression, bipolar disorder, anxiety and other disorders if such treatment is useful? None of them are a panacea, but that doesn't reject their usefulness.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything can be medicine and everything can be poison; but that depends on the skill of the physician.

On the other hand, serious meditation practitioners generally avoid all drugs, as well as being intoxicated on alcohol.

In order to discover exactly how deleterious the effects of herb are on meditation, you would have had to have stopped smoking herb completely for at least a year and then resume it to observe its effects on your meditation practice.

Have you done this experiment?

I have. I can report that the effects of smoking herb on one's meditation practice is definitely not good. It leaves one with a cloudy fog which lasts anywhere from a day to a week depending on how much herb one has smoked and its quality. So now I do not smoke herb, nor do I take other kinds of drugs, all of which in my younger days I have done in large quantities. So, you are not speaking with someone who has no personal experience.

Of course, regular people who do not imagine themselves great meditators may do as they please, but not practitioners.

Of course, you may persist in your folly, that is your choice. But at least I have satisfied my obligation to inform you it is a folly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: intoxication and tibetan buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are kidding yourself, however, it is really none of my business if you decide to follow

a mistaken method.

ovi said:

This mistaken method allowed me end a 14-year old depression in one month of meditation and turn my mind towards Buddhism. It's good enough for me! Plus, I already said that in my case it's quite useful for reaching one-pointed concentration and maintaining it for hours. I don't see how anyone could fool themselves about what I said. Aren't we supposed to master all jhanas long before enlightenment? That is enter it at will, maintain it for as long as we want, leave at will and experience all the factors involved. Cannabis made my entry into the first jhana easier and that's about it; no mastery of even the first jhana; maintaining perfect one-pointed concentration for a few hours every day for a month is likely to get you some partial insight into the truth; reading about the kind of serenity and insight I have to develop shows me that all of my progress is quite meager in strength and I never said otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

I can see how a stoned person can be in a state of distraction for hours and fool themselves into believing it was one pointed concentration.

ovi said:

What exactly is so wrong about what I said?

Malcolm wrote:

It contradicts every teaching of the Buddha on the nature of intoxicants.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are four kinds of bases that a given consciousness is can appropriate: moisture and heat birth, egg birth, womb birth and apparitional birth.

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, are you now saying that prior to "appropriating" some organic substance, something separate from organic substance, that can be called 'consciousness,' exists?

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. Sentient beings exist in seven locations, the six realms + the bardo. In each one they appropriate a body (one of four kinds) and have done so since beginningless time. Not all bodies are "material" on the coarse material sense of the term.

This is all Elementary Buddhism 101, what I am saying is not even slightly controversaial.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 10:04 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Truths are merely cognitions (of an object); one false, the other veridical. This is why they are inseparable, for they are cognitions of the nature of one and the same entity, one false; the other, correct.

Sherab said:

You are arguing within a framework where there is subject-object duality. I am arguing within a framework free of subject-object duality.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are not, since truths are nothing other than cognitions. After all, you introduced the notion of "relative" into the conversation, not me.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: intoxication and tibetan buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually it does not. Marijuana impairs short term memory, and that is necessary for mindfulness by definition.

ovi said:

I can't deny facts. Cannabis is used world-wide for spiritual purposes and it has enhanced every part of my meditation session. It does a great job in calming my mind, I've spent hours in just being mindful of breathing without a single interruption, a thing much more difficult for me to do otherwise, it allows me to enter jhana in a matter of minutes, it allowed me to identify the direct connection between emptiness and dependent origination and I've had some pretty neat direct partial experiences of sunyata with ease. It's not essential for practice, but it was quite helpful in understanding the Dharma and turning me towards Buddhism. How it does that, I don't know. I've once read that although it impairs short-term memory, it vastly improves visual memory, among other things.

Malcolm wrote:

You are kidding yourself, however, it is really none of my business if you decide to follow a mistaken method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Underweight worse then being overweight?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In general, in Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine consider that is best to be "slim". But slim does not mean underweight. It just means not carrying around too much extra weight.

Adi said:

And in general, if I'm not mistaken, both medicines don't take a universal approach to there being only one kind of person and One True Diet or One Best Food for everyone. Like coconut oil, it might be suggested for some in generous quantity, just a little for others, and strongly suggested not at all for some others. Or sunflower oil for one person, coconut oil for another, and for a third only small amounts of ghee depending on that person's constitution and their present situation.

Adi

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of life: sentient and non-sentient.

PadmaVonSamba said:

I see....so, a single cell is not sentient, but if it merges with another single cell (which, by the way, is also not sentient) and then splits into a few more cells, and they divide into even more cells, and so on and so on...

then at some point the cells themselves "become" sentient?

...or no?

but if the cells are not sentient, then where is the sentience?

So, are you now saying that sentience is a property of organic matter itself?

...

Malcolm wrote:

Cells never become sentient, since sentience is not an emergent property of matter (which is why plants, which have cells, are nevertheless not included within sentient life). When a specific consciousness appropriates a basis, a material form, we call that

"sentient life". There are four kinds of bases that a given consciousness is can appropriate: moisture and heat birth, egg birth, womb birth and apparitional birth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Sure, but only if you don't hold the view that the relative is all there is.

Malcolm wrote:

All there is is the union of the two truths. If there is a basis, that is the basis.

Sherab said:

In the two truths model of reality, the relative truth is ultimately false, there is just one truth at the end.

If there is just one truth in the end, the so-called union of the two truth is true only provisionally and false ultimately.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, who ever suggested otherwise?

"Since the Jinas have proposed that nirvana alone is true, what wise person would imagine that the rest was not false?"

-- Nāgarjuna

Sherab said:

The basis in the end, can only be the ultimate truth and the relative truth can only be a "truth" that emerges from the ultimate truth. In other words, from a true basis, a false basis can arise. Since the false basis arises from the true basis, it is possible to have the concept of a union of the relative and the ultimate where the relative is a "pure" relative rather than an "impure" relative.

Malcolm wrote:

Truths are merely cognitions (of an object); one false, the other veridical. This is why they are inseparable, for they are cognitions of the nature of one and the same entity, one false; the other, correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Underweight worse then being overweight?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you simply rely on the wisdom of the ṛṣīs, you will be fine.

dzogchungpa said:  
May I ask what the ṛṣīs say?

Malcolm wrote:  
Read either the four tantras or ayurvedic texts such as the Carakasamhita, etc.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 4:19 AM  
Title: Re: Underweight worse then being overweight?  
Content:

KeithBC said:  
On the other hand, numerous studies have shown an increase in longevity on a restricted-calorie diet.

It might come down to reading the fine print in the specific studies, something that you can't do in the popular media.

Om mani padme hum  
Keith

Indrajala said:  
There are so many conflicting opinions. I think too many researchers make a living from coming up with new facts about diet and health. It is a way to advance your career and probably secure funding as anything to do with diet and health will prove popular.

Malcolm wrote:  
If you simply rely on the wisdom of the ṛṣīs, you will be fine.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 4:18 AM  
Title: Re: Underweight worse then being overweight?  
Content:

Indrajala said:  
There was an interesting new study done suggesting being underweight is more dangerous to one's health than being overweight...

Malcolm wrote:  
In general, in Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine consider that is best to be "slim". But slim does not mean underweight. It just means not carrying around too much extra weight.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 3:10 AM



Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The cause/effect regression isn't an infinite regression.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. Why? a first cause would be an unconditioned cause. An unconditioned thing can have no effect on a conditioned thing.

Andrew108 said:

Entropy

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness, being without mass, does not generate heat and is not subject to the law of entropy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Chemical attractions do not indicate the presence of awareness.

PadmaVonSamba said:

The fact that the sperm does not randomly land on the egg but specifically goes toward it demonstrates something more than random chemical interactions. The fact of specific attraction (as opposed to, say, gravitational pull or magnetism, or some sort of stickiness) may not define "awareness" in your book. Whether it is attraction to chemicals, or heat or light is beside the point I am making, which is that something that is alive (A) responds specifically to stimuli from something else which is alive (B). I think that counts for something.

. . .

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of life: sentient and non-sentient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The cause/effect regression isn't an infinite regression.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. Why? a first cause would be an unconditioned cause. An unconditioned

thing can have no effect on a conditioned thing.

PadmaVonSamba said:

So..what's the cause of the whole "cause & effect" thing?

...

Malcolm wrote:

An effect of something else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Chemical attractions do not indicate the presence of awareness.

PadmaVonSamba said:

There is nothing going on in the brain but chemical interactions and electricity.

I am not saying that the chemicals or their interactions "have" awareness.

In fact, completely the opposite.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are saying that sperm has a mind since it evinces what you term "awareness".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Sure, but only if you don't hold the view that the relative is all there is.

Malcolm wrote:

All there is is the union of the two truths. If there is a basis, that is the basis.

All the path is is the union of the method and compassion. If there is a path, that is the path

All the result is is the union of the two kāyas. If there is a result, that is the result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

In that case, a single-cell organism would be sufficient for the arising of awareness. You are saying it's not, because of certain factors that a single cell organism lacks, and then you say those same factors are not dependent on the very thing a single-cell organism lacks.

garudha said:

The way you (PadmaVonSamba) address intelligent life is that sentience is a property of organic matter. Then, elsewhere, I read that form is inherently empty. Personally I took "form" to mean all organic matter, and therefore, that all organic matter is a property of sentience (eg Mind). If, however, form is inherently empty; then how could sentience appropriate form? --that would be a massive contradiction.

PadmaVonSamba said:

No, I have not said that sentience is a property of organic matter. In fact, just the opposite, constantly.

What I have said is that organic matter merely provides the conditions by which basic awareness manifests as the subject-object experience ("mind"). What distinguishes a living thing from a non-living thing is exactly this. Hence, a sperm cell, lacking any sensory apparatus whatsoever, no skandhas, no 12-links, is still attracted to progesterone excreted by the egg.

And my point was that, just as a tiny drop of dew can reflect the Sun, even a tiny think such as a sperm cell is sufficient for the reflection of awareness.

And regardless of whether one calls it "awareness" or not, the fact that the sperm does not randomly land on the egg but specifically goes toward it demonstrates a basic level of specific ("intentional") interaction. And I would even go so far as to suggest that this is at the root of our whole subject-object / self-other experience that is the dominating feature of mind.

...

Malcolm wrote:

Chemical attractions do not indicate the presence of awareness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The cause/effect regression isn't an infinite regression.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. Why? a first cause would be an unconditioned cause. An unconditioned

thing can have no effect on a conditioned thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 3rd, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Impermanent are all component things,

...

Release from them is bliss supreme.

— Mahaa-Parinibbana Sutta (DN 16)

"There is, monks, an unborn .... If there were not that unborn ..., there would not be the case that emancipation from the born.... But precisely because there is an unborn ..., emancipation from the born ... is discerned."

— Ud 8.3

Malcolm wrote:

This is reconciled by the Mahāyāna doctrine that all conditioned things are in a state of nirvana from the beginning.

M

Sherab said:

How do all conditioned things relate to being in a state of nirvana from the beginning? I am not saying that they are not. What I am saying is that the words "release" and "emancipation" means that taking the relative as all there is, can never reconcile the meaning of the two quotations.

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation, in Mahāyāna, is merely the realization that "all conditioned things are in a state of nirvana from the beginning".

It means realizing that the nature of the arising, etc., is precisely, non-arising.

As a tantra states:

"Everything arose from non-arising,  
even arising never arose."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 2nd, 2014 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Impermanent are all component things,

...

Release from them is bliss supreme.

— Mahaa-Parinibbana Sutta (DN 16)

"There is, monks, an unborn .... If there were not that unborn ..., there would not be the case that emancipation from the born.... But precisely because there is an unborn ..., emancipation from the born ... is discerned."

— Ud 8.3

Malcolm wrote:

This is reconciled by the Mahāyāna doctrine that all conditioned things are in a state of nirvana from the beginning.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 2nd, 2014 at 7:59 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Every effect arises from a cause; every cause is an effect. That is a complete explanation and also an infinite regression.

Sherab said:

I disagree. It merely means that causality is the explanation for specific events within an infinite regression while the infinite regression is an axiom or postulate.

Malcolm wrote:

The infinite regression is neither an axiom nor a postulate, it is an inference.

To answer your other question, the stream of cittas has no basis, being empty.

This is no answer from my point of view.

If by empty you mean that the stream of cittas is an infinite causal chain, then the infinite regression is not explained but has to be assumed. In my understanding of the Buddha's teaching, this becomes a fault in that the stream of cittas is always subject to change and because of that, there can be no permanent liberation.

By empty we mean it is not ultimately established.

Liberation (as opposed to Buddhahood) is defined by the eradication of afflictions or fetters in relation to the mind (stream). Through aryan insight those afflictions are "burned", and thus they no longer produce results (birth in various aspects of the three

realms), that is all liberation means and no new afflictive traces are created.

The stream of cittas is subject to causation, but that does not bear the consequence that liberation is a) impossible or b) reversible.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 2nd, 2014 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: intoxication and tibetan buddhism

Content:

ovi said:

On the other hand, cannabis enhances my mindfulness and the strength of the meditation session and even more so when taken together with piracetam and lecithin

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually it does not. Marijuana impairs short term memory, and that is necessary for mindfulness by definition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 2nd, 2014 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

As Malcolm said, the fault of the argument is infinite regression rather than circularity. Circularity anyway is a special form of infinite regression. For me, explanation that results in infinite regression is faulty because it indicates incompleteness of the explanation. In other words, an explanation with infinite regression must also explain that infinite regression if the explanation is to be complete.

Explanations that involves causality and dependent origination can never be complete since they lead to infinite regression. That is why I feel that they can never be satisfactory explanation when they are employed in an ontological argument without being complemented by something else.

Here I should add that where science is concerned, it usually does not have problem with explanations that involve beginninglessness or endlessness, or both. This is because by nature, explanations of science, are inherently provisional.

Malcolm wrote:

Every effect arises from a cause; every cause is an effect. That is a complete explanation and also an infinite regression.

To answer your other question, the stream of cittas has no basis, being empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 31st, 2014 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Even if you take appearing as synonymous with existing conventionally and leave out the part of labelling, the form of my argument as presented still holds.

In other words, things appearing is due to karmic traces appearing; karmic traces appearing is due to mind appearing; and mind appearing is due to mind appearing. Circularity of argument still exists in the end.

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Things [mental appearances] appear because of karmic traces; karmic traces occur because of afflicted minds, afflicted minds also arise because of karma traces. Minds are both cause and results; traces are both causes and results.

Since Buddhadharma rejects origins, the fault you should be seeking is infinite regress, not circularity, but in this case, there is no problem since mind has not discernible origin. There is not absolute beginning to the process of mind, affliction, traces, ripening of traces (appearances) and so on.

The doctrine you should be examining is called citta saṃtana parināma, i.e., transformations of the stream of cittas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 31st, 2014 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Dungse Rigzin Dorje Rinpoche

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

Hi, does anyone know this Lama.

What is the name of his home monastery and is it in Assam?

does he uphold the complete Vima Nyingtik cycle?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Zangdog Palri

Yes.

he is the son of Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, and is an excellent teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 31st, 2014 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

An answer to a question is not an assertion, providing the answer does not exceed the scope of the question.

M

Sherab said:

Not expecting this answer from you though. I thought you could see the internal contradiction in your reply.

Here is how I see the problem of your argument:

Things, exists only conventionally, i.e., appearance appears and the mind labelled the appearances thereby giving things a conventional existence.

Malcolm wrote:

The label does not given something conventional existence; the mere appearances of a thing is its conventional existence.

Sherab said:

Karmic traces causes the appearances of things, but karmic traces are also conventionally existent, i.e., appearances of karmic traces appear to the mind and are then given the label karmic traces.

Malcolm wrote:

See above.

Sherab said:

In our discussion, karmic traces is none other than mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Traces are actually impressions made on the mind by actions. The result of those actions arise when special conditions for the ripening of those traces are met.

Sherab said:

So there is an appearance of mind that the mind then give the label mind and thereby



gives mind a conventional existence. This is inherently a circular argument.

Malcolm wrote:

But it is not my argument, it is an argument you have constructed for me.

Sherab said:

Because of the inherent circularity in your argument, as far as I am concerned, your answer is a non-answer.

Malcolm wrote:

You have non-answered yourself since you have not presented my argument.

Sherab said:

It is also inherently contradictory as the conventional existence of the mind must exist before it can give itself a conventional existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you think that conventional existence depends on labels, that would be a problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 31st, 2014 at 12:47 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

If so, then how do appearances arise?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally.

Sherab said:

Another assertion?

Malcolm wrote:

An answer to a question is not an assertion, providing the answer does not exceed the scope of the question.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 31st, 2014 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherab said:

If so, then how do appearances arise?

Malcolm wrote:  
Conventionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 31st, 2014 at 8:14 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

For example, how do idealists account for cosmic inflation? Or mass? Or light? Or space/time?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is not idealism in the sense you understand.

Buddhism accounts for all of these things, cosmic inflation, mass, light, space, etc. via conventional truth.

Sherab said:

Buddhism does not account for these things. Buddhism merely asserts that these things are conventional in the sense that ultimately, these things don't exist when you analyse them to hunt for their source or sources. But this would contract another assertion that mind(s) (where mind now has to take the specific definition of karmic traces and not other definitions of mind) is(are) the source of these things.

Malcolm wrote:

No. There is no contradiction. When you hunt for mind you do not find it either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 31st, 2014 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

For example, how do idealists account for cosmic inflation? Or mass? Or light? Or space/time?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is not idealism in the sense you understand.

Buddhism accounts for all of these things, cosmic inflation, mass, light, space, etc. via conventional truth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 31st, 2014 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

there is no awareness which can be defined as something separate from a consciousness or a mind.

PadmaVonSamba said:

There is if you are talking about intentional, rather than merely random response to stimuli, whereby A is attracted specifically to B and commences actions which draw it closer to making contact with B. We have discussed this before. It may not be any sort of cognitive awareness, but as opposed to just lying there with no intentional response at all (two rocks lying next to each other) or making contact purely at random (seeds blowing in the wind until they land), you have to have some term for something in which which one thing somehow senses the existence of something else, and for lack of a better term, I use the term basic awareness. So, I am defining it that way.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, and I don't accept your theory. There is only awareness is strictly cognitive.

According Dzogchen, Mahāmudra and so on, no phenomena outside of mind can be established at all, that is, all physical appearances are projections of traces on mind streams, following the Yogacara school.

That is easily disproved, by examples which I have already given, such as not knowing one has cancer.

You don't understand; appearances are generated by activated traces which exist in the ālayavijñāna. We do not need to be "aware" of these traces for them to be activated.

You may think Yogacara is easy to refute, but it isn't.

PadmaVonSamba said:

A common misunderstanding is that nothing occurs anywhere outside of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, it depends on your point of view.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Unless you know everything that is happening in the universe, and nothing can ever be discovered that you didn't already know about, this might be the case. Otherwise, a sane point of view is that there is stuff happening that nobody knows about.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study Yogacara, only then will you understand the context of this. It is more profound than your realism.

After all, the Buddha stated "The three realms are only mind."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 30th, 2014 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

However, a background, or 'ground of awareness' can be said to function, which is usually experienced as a separate perceiver when in contact with phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, there is no awareness which can be defined as something separate from a consciousness or a mind.

PadmaVonSamba said:

But physical phenomena, for example, can exist with no awareness of it.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends. According Dzogchen, Mahāmudra and so on, no phenomena outside of mind can be established at all, that is, all physical appearances are projections of traces on mind streams, following the Yogacara school.

PadmaVonSamba said:

A common misunderstanding is that nothing occurs anywhere outside of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, it depends on your point of view.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Another common misunderstanding is that "illumination" means that the mind is like a beam from a flashlight, that actually comes from someplace and shines on objects thus causing them to occur.

Malcolm wrote:

I have never run across such an assertion in any Buddhist text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 30th, 2014 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... we are speaking about something which exhibits sentience, i.e. a mind.

Gwenn Dana said:

How do you call the thinking facility then?

Malcolm wrote:

A mind. What else? A mind is that which can know, we can use the term consciousness, awareness, mind, knowing etc., but it all boils down to one thing, a mind, i.e. something that has the capacity for knowing. A buddha's consciousness is unrestricted, therefore we say that a buddha is omniscient.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 30th, 2014 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

garudha said:

Malcolm, your statement seems to state that awareness is a property of consciousness.

PadmaVonSamba, your question somewhat assumes that consciousness is a property of awareness.

If you remove all your clothes and go skinny-dipping in what respect do you regard yourself as naked ?

Malcolm wrote:

Awareness is conscious = consciousness is aware.

$1 + 1 = 1 + 1$

M

bob said:

Awareness is mind without objects.

Consciousness is mind with objects.

Malcolm wrote:

In the end it all boils down to pure consciousness or awareness, whether with objects or without — we are speaking about something which exhibits sentience, i.e. a mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Śākyamuni's non-Indo-European heritage.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Witzel's book is not racist, he explicitly states that all human beings come from Africa, and that we have a common ancestor. He is merely saying that there are two streams of myth development, a northern and a southern one and that the southern one seems to lack certain themes found in the northern one. But he never says on the basis of this

that the Laurasian stream is "superior" to the Gondwana stream. That is a fallacious imputation on the part of the reviewers.

Indrajala said:

Incidentally for some great information on what constitutes proto-Indo-European religion, at least under reconstruction, see the following:

<http://pierreligion.org/pierintro.html>

Malcolm wrote:

The answers to all of these questions and many more are to be found in Witzel's new book:

The Origins of the World's Mythologies. Oxford University Press

He has questioned the linguistic nature of the so-called Indus Script (Farmer, Sproat, Witzel 2004).[70] Earlier, he had suggested that a substrate related to, but not identical with the Austroasiatic Munda languages, which he therefore calls para-Munda, might have been the language of (part of) the Indus population.[71][72]

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael\\_Witzel#Research](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Witzel#Research)

Sherlock said:

There seems to be a lot of dissent among the Amazon reviews. Is it mostly coming from Hindu nationalists upset at Witzel for suggesting that Indo-Aryans are not native to India?

I know genetics don't necessarily tell the story of cultures and languages, but in many ways, it is more "rigorous" than linguistic reconstruction.

<http://dienekes.blogspot.co.uk/> collates a lot of relevant genetic studies in anthropology.

I haven't looked in too much detail in the studies on South Asian DNA, but the Indo-European spread in Europe seems to be quite clear.

Europe was populated by dark-skinned hunter-gatherers who might have had light-hair and eyes throughout the Mesolithic, WHG (Western Hunter Gatherers) in short. In the Neolithic, around 7,500 years ago, groups of agriculturalists from the Middle East started moving into Europe. They shared some ancestry with the WHGs but 44% of their DNA came from a lineage which diverged from the main lineage of Eurasians (who later split into West and East Eurasians) early on. These Early European Farmers (EEF) did not mix with the existing WHG population, the population spread was demic, not clinal; i.e. they killed the hunter-gatherers and took their lands. Areas which were previously inhabited by WHGs were taken over by EEF descendants who did not incorporate WHG DNA. EEF spread throughout Europe, West to Iberia and north to Scandinavia. The genes for white skin seem to come from this period. Later on, around 4,000 years ago, a new group of <http://dienekes.blogspot.co.uk/2012/07/bronze-age-indo-european-invasion-of.html> came in. They spread throughout Europe though the West Asian

component is lowest in Iberia, Sardinia and Finland. The surviving WHG DNA also mixed into the resulting population.

I think the picture is quite clear that the West Asians are Indo-Europeans. The areas where West Asian DNA is lowest were the main non-Indo-European-speaking regions in Europe historically. The Iberians probably spoke languages related to Basque, and the Finns also speak a non-Indo-European language.

The situation in India seems to be more complex, with East Eurasian-related groups already living in East India, <http://dienekes.blogspot.co.uk/2012/06/smbe-2012-abstracts-part-ii.html>. There seems to be some presence of <http://dienekes.blogspot.co.uk/2010/12/solution-to-problem-of-indo-aryan.html> DNA in Ancestral North Indian populations. <http://dienekes.blogspot.co.uk/2013/08/major-admixture-in-india-took-place-42.html>.

This is very interesting IMO, I'm not sure exactly what it means but to wager a guess, I think proto-Indo-Europeans weren't genetically distant from ANIs enough for a different population structure to be detected; their spread through India was more of a cultural phenomenon than in Europe and they influenced the pre-existing populations to mix. Dravidian speakers today also carry ANI DNA.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

garudha said:

Malcolm, your statement seems to state that awareness is a property of consciousness.

PadmaVonSamba, your question somewhat assumes that consciousness is a property of awareness.

If you remove all your clothes and go skinny-dipping in what respect do you regard yourself as naked ?

Malcolm wrote:

Awareness is conscious = consciousness is aware.

$1 + 1 = 1 + 1$

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is still no "awareness" in absence of a consciousness-which-is-aware, whether that consciousness has an object or not.

PadmaVonSamba said:

You are saying, without an object (of awareness or of consciousness) to be aware of there is no faculty of awareness or consciousness whatsoever.  
correct?

Malcolm wrote:

Incorrect. I am saying:

There is no "awareness" in absence of a consciousness-which-is-aware, whether or not that consciousness has an object.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Your gender and sexuality

Content:

zsc said:

When the same kind of self-reflection is suggested when it comes to privilege, you'd think I was asking people to lasso the moon.

Malcolm wrote:

I am certainly glad that I was born into a privileged family.

I think it is unfortunate that others are not.

But short of some massive anti-democratic program of social and economic planning, I see no clear means to ensure everyone has the same privilege, the best we can do is try to make sure everyone has the same baseline of opportunity in terms of education, social services, health care, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

garudha said:

Reading between the lines; That explanation would be the yes that I presumed you'd somehow allude to. Although I recognise that we're referring to an Indian "materialist" philosophy. Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Samkhya is not materialist, it is realist, not the same thing at all.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Who are the best teachers of non-duality?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Which is to say that Hindu Advaita is a form of monism? It seems so.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

garudha said:

Malcolm;

Would you agree that Prakriti is actually empty ?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not how it is parsed in the Samkhya system; Samkhya is realist, both prakriti and purusha are real, i.e. they exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, the distinction being made is awareness or consciousness, both with, and without an object.

(the terms "awareness" and "consciousness" may be interchangeable but what is being referred to is not.)

Malcolm wrote:

There is still no "awareness" in absence of a consciousness-which-is-aware, whether that consciousness has an object or not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

garudha said:

Malcolm & Gwenn, you seem to be agreement over a "final step" ...of which could be construed as the cessation of causation eg leading to a "absolute".

Therefore, please could you detail how your agreement might relate the the OP. Specifically, how Puruṣa & Prakṛiti relate to the "consciousnesses" and "mind".

Why? Because on this forum we generally talk about "mind" as being primordial than "consciousnesses". However; from what I'm reading about Samkhya, "consciousnesses" is regarded as more primordial than "mind".

The question:

Can anyone explain something about this or point me to an article?

There exists consciousnesses corresponding to the senses, but it's not the mind in itself, right. While consciousness is dependent on and part of the psycho-physical makeup (as part of the aggregates), the mind is independent of physical matter, or?

Malcolm wrote:

In Samkhya Puruṣa is pure consciousness. Prakṛiti lacks consciousness and is material. It is "energized" by Puruṣa and seems to be aware, but it is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They are describing Dzogchen Śamatha which is more like repeated placement in the Bhavanakrama scheme. I am taking about your classic ninth stage śamatha where you can place your mind on any object for as long as you want without distraction and without effort.

Sherlock said:

Is what you call repeated placement the third stage in the 9 stage scheme? i.e. what Alan Wallace calls "resurgent attention". What is achieved is swift recovery of distracted attention, mostly on the object

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Emakirikiri said:

Malcolm does Lama Migmar's The Tibetan Book of Awakening and Kamalasila's Bhavanakrama contain enough instruction to help a beginner fully reach the one-pointedness of a mental object and the first dhyana (assuming he were in retreat)?

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

Of course the system is different. But I guess the method in the final step is not.

Best wishes

Gwenn

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the method in the final step is quite different because the view is different and the result is different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Indrajala said:

For instance, if so many liberated individuals in the past disdained women and suggested they needed to become men to achieve Buddhahood, what does that say about "liberation" and the purported qualities of compassion and kindness it is supposed to bring about?

Malcolm wrote:

It is well established even in Abhidharmakosha that arhats have non-afflictive ignorance.

Indrajala said:

That's not relevant to what I'm saying.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is, accounts for why some men who had freed themselves from afflictive rebirth

nevertheless had unfortunate opinions about women.

Indrajala said:

I'm simply saying that "enlightened beings" and Buddhist values usually don't work out as they're supposed to on paper in real life history. Just look at the violent history of Buddhist Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not that violent compared to say Japan or China.

Indrajala said:

Just look at the serfs in Tibet who readily joined up with the Reds and proceeded to burn down monasteries.

Malcolm wrote:

They regret it now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Indrajala said:

For instance, if so many liberated individuals in the past disdained women and suggested they needed to become men to achieve Buddhahood, what does that say about "liberation" and the purported qualities of compassion and kindness it is supposed to bring about?

Malcolm wrote:

It is well established even in Abhidharmakosha that arhats have non-afflictive ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

You can also call it bound and unbound consciousness, if that fits your canon better. But some may mistake this as awareness being trapped in the mind.

This differentiation is along the lines of samkhya, where awareness is first bound to form an ego (in realization of the seer/seeing), and afterward binds to the mind, creating all sorts of illusions. I know, this forum is about Buddhism. But I suppose the basic awareness processes between buddhists and other people work the same, indendent from the (21st century English!) words we use ...

You probably do not need to differ between these. I found them very helpful.

Best wishes  
Gwenn

Malcolm wrote:

In Samkhya, the 24 tattvas, beginning with mulaprakṛiti, are insentient. Only purusha is sentient. Buddhi, ahamkara and manas are actually inert, not sentient. They seem to be aware but they are not aware — in actuality, they merely reflect the light of consciousness (jñā, purusha). This is why in Samkhya/yoga one tries to balance three gunas, so that sattva becomes predominate, and then from there one realizes the even buddhi is not the self and then purusha finally rests in itself.

But this is a very different system than Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Who are the best teachers of non-duality?

Content:

greentara said:

We all know non duality means one without a second. So the world and the sense of I are not separate. To wake up is to see that 'we' exist only because the mind thinks us into creation.

Sherab Dorje said:

That's not non-dualism, that's monism. Monism is still dualistic since it posits one in contrast to many.

Malcolm wrote:

It's Hindu Advaita, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

There is if you are examining or talking about dependent arising.

Malcolm wrote:

Why do you think so?

PadmaVonSamba said:

It is self evident, and I think you can easily figure this out.

If not, I am not sure when I will have time to.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think dependent origination is wrong, of course not. I just don't think it justifies the distinctions you try to draw between awareness and consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

rory said:

Someone hasn't read the Lotus Sutra: Chapter 12 - Devadatta

At that moment, the entire assembly saw the Dragon Girl suddenly transform into a man

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently you have not read it either.

M

rory said:

Keep reading Malcolm!

Malcolm wrote:

What it actually says:

atha tasyāṃ velāyāṃ sāgaranāgarājaduhitā sarvalokapratyakṣaṃ sthavirasya ca śāriputrasya pratyakṣaṃ tat strindriyamantarhitāṃ puruṣendriyaṃ ca prādurbhūtaṃ bodhisattvabhūtaṃ cātmānaṃ saṃdarśayati| tasyāṃ velāyāṃ dakṣiṇāṃ diśaṃ prakrāntaḥ| atha dakṣiṇasyāṃ diśi vimalā nāma lokadhātuḥ| tatra saptaratnamaye bodhivṛkṣamūle niṣaṇṇamabhisambuddhamātmānaṃ saṃdarśayati sma, dvātrimśallakṣaṇadharaṃ sarvānuvyajanarūpaṃ prabhayā ca daśadiśaṃ sphuritvā dharmadeśanāṃ kurvāṇam|

འཐ་ནས་དེའི་ཆོ་འཛིན་རྟེན་ཐམས་ཅད་དང་།

གནས་བརྟན་གྱི་རིམ་བུའི་མངོན་སུམ་དུ་གླེང་བྱེད་ཀྱི་དབང་པོ་མི་སྣ་བར་གྱུར་ཏེ་སྐྱེས་པའི་དབང་པོ་བྱང་ནས།  
བདག་ཉིད་བྱང་ཆུབ་སེམས་དཔར་འགྱུར་བར་ཡང་དག་པར་བརྟན་ཏེ་དེའི་ཆོ་རྩ་ཕྱགས་སུ་སོང་ངོ་། འཐ་ནས་ཕྱོད་ཕྱགས་སུ་འཛིན་རྟེན་གྱི་ཁམས་ཁྲི་མ་མེད་ཅེས་བྱ་བ་དང་།  
རིན་པོ་ཆེ་སྣ་བདུན་གྱི་ཤིང་བྱང་དུ་འདུག་ནས་བདག་ཉིད་མངོན་པར་རྟོགས་པར་སངས་རྒྱས་པར་ཀླན་ཏེ་བརྟན་ཏེ་སྐྱེས་པའི་མཚན་སུམ་ཅུ་ཅ་གཉིས་དང་།  
དཔེ་བྱང་བཟང་པོ་ཐམས་ཅད་དང་ཕྲན་པའི་གཟུགས་ཀྱི་ལུས་ཀྱི་འོད་ཀྱི་ཕྱགས་བརྩམས་ཁྱབ་པར་བྱས་ཏེ་ཆོས་རྟེན་པར་བྱང་ངོ་།

rory said:

After that, at that time, in the presence of the whole world, the sthaviras and Śāriputra, the female sexual organs of the daughter of the Nāgarāja Sagara disappeared, and after producing the sexual organs of a man, he [ātmānaṃ] perfectly demonstrated

[saṁdarśayati] transformation into a bodhisattva, and at that time left for the south. After that, residing in front of a tree of seven precious substances in the southern world system called "Vimala", he [ātmānaṁ] perfectly demonstrated perfect Buddhahood, the ten directions were filled with the light of [his] physical body that possessed the thirty two signs of a mahāpuruṣa and all the excellent signs, and [he] taught the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, it is very clear, based on the original Sanskrit and its Tibetan translation, that the transformation is a one way transformation, and the reflexive pronoun ātmānaṁ is correctly rendered as "he" in this passage.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

see me appear before them

Malcolm wrote:

This is all it promises, and nothing more.

Son of Buddha said:

thats incorrect the Nirvana Sutra citation does in fact describe the career of a female Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not

Son of Buddha said:

the same goes for the Nirvana Sutra citation it shows the Buddha manifested itself in the world as a human female and then proceeded to show humans how a human person would go about the path to attaining enlightenment. So both the career paths of either man or female are both manifestations of the Buddha, and are both represented.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in sutra. Despite the fact that there is shift in late Mahāyāna towards the idea that gender is not really so important or defining, still there is no explicitly mention of female buddhas like Tara or Vajrayogini and so on until we move into Vajrayāna texts.

Son of Buddha said:

The idea that there is no gender in the Sukhavati pure land is a post-modern interpretation.

nope the idea of the 32 features of the Buddha which we receive in the pure land, having no gender is not a post modern interpretation unless you consider the Nirvana Sutra post modern. the idea of the Buddha not even being a man can be found in the Donna Sutta so this is hardly a new view.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

I am afraid you are reading things into the texts that are simply not there. In Amitabha's pure land, like Bhaisajyaguru's there is gender and that gender is male. In Akṣobhya's pureland on the other hand, there are both men and women.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 1:48 PM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Malcolm wrote:

There is also the recognition of the advantages of position in vow 43:

If after I have obtained the Buddhahood, that any Bodhisattva of other countries having heard my name, will be incarnated as a member of a noble family (if he so desires) when he dies, otherwise may I not attain enlightenment.

There is in fact no guarantee of immediate birth in Sukhavati in the 48 vows of Amitabha. Vow 19 is the guarantee for immediate rebirth in Sukhavati also it corresponds with the chapter on the 3 different types of aspirants which also teaches guaranteed immediate rebirth in Sukhavati.

Malcolm wrote:

NO, that vow is not a guarantee of rebirth in Sukhavati. It merely guarantees a vision.

Secondly, your Nirvana sutra citation does not describe the career of a female buddha. It merely describes the ability of a buddha to manifest a buddha in female form.

The fact remains that the only place where embodied female buddhahood, i.e. that one can attain buddhahood without changing from a female gender, is expressed only in Vajrayāna. It is just a fact of text, it is not even controversial.

The idea that there is no gender in the Sukhavati pure land is a post-modern interpretation.

But we are far afield from the original topic...



Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 1:29 PM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

rory said:

Someone hasn't read the Lotus Sutra: Chapter 12 - Devadatta

At that moment, the entire assembly saw the Dragon Girl suddenly transform into a man

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently you have not read it either.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 11:27 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

zsc said:

We have no genderless pronoun in English...

Malcolm wrote:

Nor are there any in Sanskrit, Pali, etc.

Amitabha has the thirty two major marks of a Buddha...one is a retractable penis.

In all Sanskrit literature referring to Avalokiteśvara, Avalokiteśvara is strictly referred to as male. It is only in China that Avalokiteśvara's gender is bent.

As to gender ambiguity in bodhisattvas, there are some examples of this, Śariputra's encounter with the goddess of the Ganges, for example. But Amitabha is indeed male as are all who are born in his pure land.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 11:15 AM

Title: Re: Your gender and sexuality

Content:

untxi said:

We can pull some passages from the sutras and just morph "God hates queers" to

"Buddha hates queers".

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, we can't. The most we can do is pull some passages out of Vinaya that bar certain types of persons from ordination as monks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

zsc said:

No, this has been the position of many unethical authorities who wanted to maintain the status quo by using "Buddhist" rationale. I agree that it's not what Buddhism teaches.

Malcolm wrote:

Which unethical authorities,

If it were possible for dedication of merit to change the karma of sentient beings, you would have thought that the Buddhas in their compassion would have dedicated all their merit to us, so that we would no longer suffer.

Besides rory's point, most Pureland thought assumes Amida already has, and Pureland practice serves to karmically link ourselves to him. Suffering is a samsaric condition that we are still bound by, for now.

Then something isn't working, either your theory or his vow.

In Jodo Shinshu, the progress phase is "instantaneously" realized because of the practitioners openness to the gift of shinjin by Amida.

Its a theory, but it has no support in sutra. In fact Shinran had to take huge liberties. And yes, I have read a lot of Shinran.

It is generally understood that the vows are all-encompassing due to Amida's boundless compassion, so they don't contradict each other, they are open to cover as many sentient beings as possible, including people in their deathbed who do not have the time to accumulate merit.

I don't agree.

In the early ages, the lives of women were full of hardships.

They still are.

They were expected to care of the house, go through the the pain of carrying a child to term then giving birth, take care of the kids from then on, and since a lot of women didn't have enough time to become literate (or weren't allowed to), women generally weren't allowed to become influential religious practitioners and teachers.

This is generally still true, though changing.

They were the backbone of the civilization, but this resulted in a lot of them being treated like work horses. Even in other sutras, a male rebirth was assumed to be better

than a male one for practice, and Shakyamuni even hesitated to allow women to practice in the same way as his male disciples did. I've read commentaries that propose what I have said above--so much of society depended on women not dedicating a lot of time to practice when the same wasn't true for men, and even Shakyamuni's hesitance was due to this consideration. This is true in some countries even today. So like I said above, Amida's vows are meant to be all-encompassing. Of course, it is only in Vajrayāna where women's full spiritual potential is actuality recognized, and the only tradition in which there full fledged female Buddhas like Vajrayogini and so on.

Again, the vows are meant to be all-encompassing, they don't negate each other. As it stands today, Pureland practitioners are encouraged to direct their faith primarily to the 18th Vow, which is the Primal Vow.

You mean Jodo Shinshu practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

kirtu said:

Do you have evidence that he significantly turned away Tea Party voters?

Malcolm wrote:

He lost.

kirtu said:

Republicans are a minority nation-wide. Republican presidential victories are only possible if a large enough proportion of Democrats do not turn out or vote for the Democrat candidate and independents vote with a > 50% for the Republican candidate.

So the fact that Romney lost tells us nothing about Tea Party voter turnout or their vote.

BTW - Republicans have held the Massachusetts governorship \*four\* times since 1984: Weld, Weld, Cellucci and Romney.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Weld is a RINO, he does not really count.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no pure being, since there no being or non-being to find. So what is useful about the term "awareness"?

Why create two actors with "awareness expresses itself through consciousness?"

In fact there is no necessity to differentiate awareness, consciousness and mind any more than it is necessary to differentiate limpidity, wetness and water.

PadmaVonSamba said:

There is if you are examining or talking about dependent arising.

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

Why do you think so?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Clarence said:

Thanks. Would you mind exploring a little more how it ties in with Dzogchen practice? Is it absolutely imperative to properly practice Dzogchen? Or, can one get by with (much) less concentration and is the need for concentration mostly related to the practice of the postures?

Malcolm wrote:

If you can't control your mind, you can't sit still for long periods; if you can't sit still for long periods, of what use are postures?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

kirtu said:

Do you have evidence that he significantly turned away Tea Party voters?

Malcolm wrote:

He lost.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

Awareness is that of pure being (unbound presence).

Ego is awareness expressing itself through consciousness (\*I\* am). All senses working, all actions working.

Mind is what constructs concepts (I am some-thing). All senses disturbed by constant evaluation and categorization.

Malcolm wrote:

These are all just different different names and aspects of consciousness. No need to complicate things.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Well, you could also say that they are all aspects of brain activity, but so what?

No, I think this breakdown is useful.

.  
.   
.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no pure being, since there no being or non-being to find. So what is useful about the term "awareness"?

Why create two actors with "awareness expresses itself through consciousness?

In fact there is no necessity to differentiate awareness, consciousness and mind any more than it is necessary to differentiate limpidity, wetness and water.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Sherlock said:

So thoughts don't arise at all while you are concentrating on the object?

Malcolm wrote:

Just one thought, the object of mediation.

Sherlock said:

so it actually sounds more like the Visuddhimagga first jhana then or the Paki Sutta 2nd jhana.

Vitarka and vicara seem to involve thought both in early Pali commentaries and in northern Abhidharma and Yogacara works.

Do the Bhavanakrama-based presentations use the Tibetan equivalents of these 2 terms or is it just Rongzom?

Malcolm wrote:

Vitarka and vicara are mental factors which direct attention and maintain attention. The first dhyana you can change the object because both vitarka and vicara are still present.

I am not sure whether the Bhavanakrama mentions, I forget.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Sherlock said:

So thoughts don't arise at all while you are concentrating on the object?

Malcolm wrote:

Just one thought, the object of mediation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Sherlock said:

Four hours sounds like a good goal to aim towards and seems achievable even in lay life. However is the goal a samadhi in which no thoughts except for the meditation object arise at all or is it that thoughts still arise but they are skilful thoughts and do not distract you?

Malcolm wrote:

The goal is one-pointedness on a single mental object.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Sherlock said:

I Based on what Tom said, it seems like Gelugpas on the other hand recommend developing shamatha through kyerim....

Tom said:

Yes, for Tantric practitioners. Of course, the nine stages, six powers, and four attentions are taught widely in the sutra context by Gelug Lamas.

Malcolm wrote:

In Sakya Lamdre, there is a detailed instruction based on Saroruhavajra's creation stage of Hevajra that includes a detailed breakdown of how the nine stages map to one's practice of the sadhana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

tobes said:

Even on the level of governmental politics, we have to account for the very influential rise of religious influenced conservatism - think about American politics for a moment! We cannot say that American governmental politics is becoming increasingly secular. If anything, it seems to be becoming increasingly less secular.

Malcolm wrote:

That really depends on where you live. Where I live (Western Massachusetts), born again conservative Christian Republicans are about as common as Sasquatch, and their secular counterparts, also infrequently sighted in the wild.

kirtu said:

Malcolm! Your state elected Sasquatch as Governor thus ensuring him national standing long after his semi-mythic salvation of the Salt Lake City Olympics had faded from memory. Just 1 1/2 years ago he was one of two conservative candidates for the Presidency from two supposedly diametrically opposed political parties (which are really just two wings of the same single National Conservative Party). Sasquatch's capitalist health care plan is now the law of the land even though he lost the election!

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics\\_of\\_Massachusetts#Party\\_registration](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics_of_Massachusetts#Party_registration)

So just over 11% of registered voters in Massachusetts \*could\* be a Sasquatch. Maybe it was just your former governor. And maybe all of these Sasquatch live on Cape Cod or outside of Boston.

Ironic that one of the most politically "liberal" states in the US propelled a Tea Party candidate nearly to the Oval Office.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Kirt, I was very specific -- Mormons are not necessarily republican, though they tend to

be conservative, and Romney is hardly a conservative Republican, which is one of the reasons he lost. He is fairly liberal by Republican standards, actually. I was talking about conservative born again evangelical Christians (who do not accept Mormons as being Christians (a big obstacle for Romney to overcome)).

And as I stated, specifically, in my neck of the woods, his kind are extremely rare. Most of the Republicans in MA live in and around Central MA and in Berkshire County. Eastern MA and Western MA (meaning Franklin, Hampshire and Hamden Counties) are about as liberal as you get anywhere in the country.

When Republicans get voted into office in MA (its happened twice in the past thirty years), it is generally because Democrats have botched something huge.

Romney is hardly a tea party candidate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 9:43 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that a Buddha can have afflicted thoughts is patently absurd and should be rejected at face value without any further thought.

M

Indrajala said:

The idea is that the dharmakāya "encompasses" every aspect of saṃsāra.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that a Buddha can have afflicted thoughts is still patently absurd and should be rejected at face value without any further thought. The dharmakāya is a Buddha's omniscience so of course it can encompass every aspect of samsara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 9:30 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Sherlock said:

OK sure, I can only do 3 months of retreat at best though.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you try your best.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Sherlock said:

Using breath concentration?

So how do you explain Dudjom Lingpa and Longchenpa's much shorter time period? Does the control of prana or bindus in the methods they give help to make it arise faster? Or is the samadhi that arises as a result of what they teach not as deep as the full-blown dhyana by whatever criteria you go by?

Many Theravadins also don't require months of retreat to accomplish at least the first jhana in their systems. Retreat, sure, but not that long.

Malcolm wrote:

They are describing Dzogchen Śamatha which is more like repeated placement in the Bhavanakrama scheme. I am talking about your classic ninth stage śamatha where you can place your mind on any object for as long as you want without distraction and without effort.

But anyway, you try yourself, then you will see. One thing for śamatha is that you need to be very relaxed, not concerned with outside world. That takes some time all by itself. You need to be well rested, free of distractions, etc.

But again, you see for yourself. Every practitioner is different. I am using a general time frame based on my personal experience of doing a three year+ retreat. That is what I consider the minimum time to gain a really stable śamatha practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 8:39 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Clarence said:

Malcolm,

How long do you estimate it would take the average person to master the first Dhyana? I have seen you mention it on and off over the years (requiring the first Dhyana for Dzogchen practice) but I have never seen you use a time frame. In Pa Auk it takes several months to years of intensive retreat. I was wondering how you view the process. And if you have any practical tips and pointers I am sure they will be much appreciated.

Many thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends. Almost impossible if you do not do retreat. Six months if you do a real retreat.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 8:38 AM

Title: Re: Your gender and sexuality

Content:

untxi said:

Malcolm...

Let's hope that's the case. A nice aspiration to have. That's the hope of any activist or ally-- that they might not be needed.

Right now, where I live, women and LBGTQIA people are brutalized on a regular basis. That's my fundamental reality.

-U

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the best thing one can do is continue to support civil rights for all people. The recognition of civil rights is not an overnight process, and it is a process. The way it has worked in the US is that first propertied white men secured their full civil rights, then men in general, then in a limited way, blacks; then women, then there was the civil rights movement, based on that the feminist movement, based on that the gay rights movement, now gay marriage.

In reality, the history of the expansion of civil rights is not bleak, it is in fact encouraging. But one lesson we can learn, is that when one group secures recognition for its civil rights, there is often another group that has been ignored or not seen in the back ground.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Gwenn Dana said:

Hello,

I'll try this one real short:

Awareness is that of pure being (unbound presence).

Ego is awareness expressing itself through consciousness (\*I\* am). All senses working, all actions working.

Mind is what constructs concepts (I am some-thing). All senses disturbed by constant evaluation and categorization.

Regards  
Gwenn

Malcolm wrote:

These are all just different different names and aspects of consciousness. No need to complicate things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 8:22 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In the deep South up through the classic "West", there is a movement towards increasingly less secularism.

daverupa said:

Oregon and Colorado seem to be moving in very secular ways. Utah accidentally legalized gay marriage. The West seems to be a wild card.

Malcolm wrote:

The "Northwest" is Oregon and Washington. Colorado is moving towards a more secular demographic because of people from California and other places moving there.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 8:20 AM

Title: Re: Your gender and sexuality

Content:

untxi said:

Again, there are different nuances to normativity and it's connection to oppression. It's not just what the "norm" is, it is asserting that norm to diminish and minimize others.

In all forms of structural violence there is some form of "this is the norm, aspire to this or fail". People endure any number of forms of body modification from skin lightening to eye-lid surgery to other body modifications to comply with socially imposed images of

"normal". People also go through various contortions to hide and deny their identities for the same reason.

If we limit "normativity" to a limited notion of what is normal re common and conventional, then I agree with you.

Malcolm wrote:

As civil rights will and are being recognized for those people who are now considered outside the heterosexual norm, these philosophical concerns will become irrelevant. Since 10 percent of the population will always be gay, gay people are already a normative percentage of society.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 8:14 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

rory said:

Malcolm:

I don't know the practice in TB but in Asian Buddhism it's extremely common to call on Kwan Yin/Kannon/Gwan-eum for help. This bodhisattva uses her abundant karma to help those overcome trials. I've called on Kannon-sama and been helped. This is common.

Malcolm wrote:

Such things merely create a positive dependent origination so that your positive karma can ripen. But quite frankly, it is well understood that unless your dedication of merit is objectless, help by such bodhisattvas in the present exhausts your merit. For example, one can practice Jambhala for wealth, but if you do not have the merit to be wealthy in this life, Jambhala practice merely creates causes for future wealth. And if you do not properly dedicate merit of such practice such that it is objectless, then it is exhaustible merit.

rory said:

Now as for Yogacara and Madhyamaka, these seem to be the only 2 philosophical schools accepted by TB. Whereas in East Asia there is the Avatamsaka School, Tiantai/Lotus Sutra, Pure Land and Ch'an/Zen which is based usually on Yogacara.

Malcolm wrote:

Hua Yen, Tian Tai, Pure Land and Chan are Chinese innovations. Indians did not develop schools of philosophy based on specific sutras. Tibetans follow Indians in this respect.

rory said:

Anyway "Hua-yen [Avatamsaka] sees all phenomena as expression of an originally pure and undifferentiated one mind.....Hua-yen thinkers developed new theories of dependent origination (pratitya samutpada, yuan-ch'i, such as "dharma realm

origination" (fa-chieh yuan-ch'i, tathagata-garbha origination...or "nature origination" to clarify how the one mind manifests in the phenomenal world"

Malcolm wrote:

If this is the case, then Hua-Yen is just Hindu Advaita Vedanta in Buddhist drag.

rory said:

The point of posting that is to show new philosophical developments that originated from Chinese thinkers such as Fazang and Zhi-yi that spread through East Asia as Koreans and Japanese travelled to China and studied these ideas. This obviously didn't happen with Tibet, so it's out of the East Asian mainstream. And this applies to ideas about karma.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Sino Japanese Mahayana Buddhism developed along lines that were outside of the Indian Mahayana mainstream. Tibetans traveled to India and studied Indian Buddhism and developed their schools along the lines set by the great Indian Buddhist monasteries such as Nalanda and Vikramashila.

rory said:

This is why Malcolm in another thread denied that a Buddha could think evil thoughts while those familiar with Zhi-yi's thought know this is true. Ven. Indrajala kindly translated a pertinent piece.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that a Buddha can have afflicted thoughts is patently absurd and should be rejected at face value without any further thought.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Personally, I find Hayek far more appealing than Trotsky, and much more reasonable and sensible. He fully exposes the failures of both right and left wing socialist collectivism.

tobes said:

It pained me to discover this, but I think Hayek is right about the relationship between price and knowledge - and it follows that centrally planned economies have a genuinely huge epistemic problem of making decisions that are not as well informed as those 'on the ground' making and buying stuff.

However, to say that he 'fully exposes' the failures of right and left wing socialist

collectivism is beyond generous. One would have to already be a paid up libertarian to read him in such a kind light. The more orthodox reading is that like most liberals, he either doesn't read Hegel or Marx, or simply doesn't understand their dialectical logic.

One can't fully expose something one doesn't grasp.

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty sure Hayek had a very good grasp of both, since he was Austrian, and fled Europe in 1933.

His principle observation is that both right and left wing collectivism share a common belief, i.e., that economies should be centrally planned. This is the main thrust of his thinking. In general, he was not nearly as libertarian as librarians read him. He fully supported the idea that laws can and should be passed to limit markets and so on. Further, another of his main observations is that Democracies only functioned well when people confined themselves to broad issues upon which consensus could be reached through discussion, and tended to break down when they tried to adjudicate specific economic problems which required the creation of a centralized bureaucracies to implement (as all implementations of economic planning require). His third main point about planned economies is that they were a priori goalless, that they required special knowledge of which no one could possibly have.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist neglect of academic findings.

Content:

tobes said:

Even on the level of governmental politics, we have to account for the very influential rise of religious influenced conservatism - think about American politics for a moment! We cannot say that American governmental politics is becoming increasingly secular. If anything, it seems to be becoming increasingly less secular.

Malcolm wrote:

That really depends on where you live. Where I live (Western Massachusetts), born again conservative Christian Republicans are about as common as Sasquatch, and their secular counterparts, also infrequently sighted in the wild.

In the Northeast and Northwest, as well as most of the left coast (and Canada) politics is increasingly more secular in general.

In the middle swath of the country there is a bit of a ambivalence i.e. Pennsylvania and the Midwest.

In the deep South up through the classic "West", there is a movement towards increasingly less secularism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in India post 8CE

Content:

Sherlock said:

What do you count as early "longde"? Dzeng Dharmabodhi is already in the Sarma period.

Malcolm wrote:

There are a few tantras and a collection of instructions on the nine dhātus (klong) which are pre-11th century. And of course, the vajra verses themselves.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Who are the best teachers of non-duality?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The best teacher of non-duality is the Buddha. The rest are pale imitations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Your gender and sexuality

Content:

untxi said:

We have to differ on this. Heteronormativity does have connotations beyond the mere descriptive element that you describe. In the work of many feminists and queer theorists it is used to describe the social expectations and norms that oppress non-heterosexuals. If heterosexuality is the norm, it is normal, all else is outside the norm and thus abnormal. One can extend this idea to other forms of oppression such as racism: white-normativity.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, these social expectations and so on are a result of more than a thousand years of western history; lately informed by religious doctrines about what is morally normative. We have largely dropped the notion that who you want to f^%k has any moral implications, unless it is children and animals.

As far as racism goes, the problem is not that white is normative, the problem is when privileged people impose norms on those who are not privileged, thus denying them

opportunities. Racism means "You are X, this is the norm you are expected to conform to", It does not mean, "I am Y, this is the norm you should aspire too but can never attain because you are X." If you are X in a racist society, you are never supposed to aspire to Yness.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in India post 8CE

Content:

Sherlock said:

Malcolm why do you think Vajra Bridge can be dated pre 1000CE?

Is it because although Kunzang Dorje's commentary is full of references to prana and bindus the actual Vajra Bridge and the Four Das don't mention them?

Malcolm wrote:

It is because the early literature of so-called klong sde makes no reference in general to such topics which were really only introduced to Tibet during the new translation period. So with the Vajra Bridge histories, we begin to see the evolution of what would swiftly turn into "man ngag sde". Also, I see no reason to doubt the account presented in the Vajra bridge histories and the so called early sems sde histories since they agree on virtually every point about the career of Vairocana and the introduction of Dzogchen to Tibet. The first place we see any real departure from the historical accounts presented in these earlier accounts is with Zhantong's text, which completely reframes the career of Śrī Simha and places the arrival of Vimalamitra during the reign Trisong Detsen, whereas the earlier histories place Vimala's arrival during the reign of Ralpacan.

I personally think that Zhantong's account was intended to compete with the marvelous tales of Indian siddhas like Naropa and so on. There was no such need for such narrative largess in the pre "gsar ma" period. One key clue is the appropriation of the iconography of Virupa for Śrī Simha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

Konchok Zoepa said:

Malcolm can you confirm that to be the right book, the one that Norwegian linked to Amazon. I looked inside the book and it seems that it's not about shamatha.

Malcolm wrote:

That is the book, and the chapter on meditation is on śamatha and the chapter on wisdom is on vipaśyāna. Lama Migmar is the Buddhist chaplain of Harvard, and his



credentials are impeccable. He is one of the best scholars in Sakya. He has also been my teacher and friend for 25 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Your gender and sexuality

Content:

untxi said:

So if gender and sexual orientation aren't that important, then what is the point of Buddhists asserting heteronormativity re social expectations and constraints-- e.g. straight good and normal, otherwise bad and abnormal?

Malcolm wrote:

"Normative" does not imply a value judgement, viz good/bad, etc. It just means, "what is most common". Basically ten percent of the population has a same sex gender orientation, this runs across social class, different societies, etc. This is just how things are. You can make the observation that there is normative ten percent variation in gender preference if you like.

You can parse these things in all kinds of ways. The fact remains that most people's gender orientation is towards the opposite gender. We are embodied mammals and while of course gender orientation has karmic causes, when we are embodied, we tend to express our gender orientations based on the facts of our embodiment.

With the rise of western relationship patterns that do not follow western traditional norms, a variety of civil right issues have arisen that otherwise would not have.

Even so, From a Buddhist pov, everyone is born with a single gender, which cannot be changed despite their sexuality, no matter how fabulous they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Your gender and sexuality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course one's gender is irrelevant [to a point]. If one's gender were a barring factor, women could not practice Heruka deities, and men could not practice Dakinis.

But on a strictly conventional level, one will always be the gender one has been born with (including being intersexed), regardless.

Apart from monastic ordination (barred to intersexed persons), gender is not so important, even if Buddhism is hetero-normative, and will remain so, since the majority of the population is heterosexual. This is just how things are.

untxi said:

This is certainly the textual tradition and the practice tradition in the traditional context. At the same time I have heard extremely high lamas say one's gender and sexual orientation is irrelevant, even in the context of Buddhist tantra. So there's a fork in the road. We have choices to make about how we frame gender and sexual orientation in our individual lives and in our practice communities. It's an important discussion.

-Untxi

That's essentially what we're doing by asserting that Buddhism is hetero-normative..

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist tantra is hetero-normative, as is Buddhism in general. Further, gender in Buddhism is considered congenital, i.e., it is something you are born with, it is an indriya, and cannot be surgically altered, whether you cut off your penis or sew one on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Your gender and sexuality

Content:

untxi said:

That's essentially what we're doing by asserting that Buddhism is hetero-normative..

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist tantra is hetero-normative, as is Buddhism in general. Further, gender in Buddhism is considered congenital, i.e., it is something you are born with, it is an indriya, and cannot be surgically altered, whether you cut off your penis or sew one on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Shamatha and Dhyana in different traditions

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

you could ask your lama if you have one to explain this picture. it depicts the path to shamatha and he can actually explain you through this picture that what the actual accomplishment of shamatha is.

Malcolm wrote:

Lama Migmar's The Tibetan Book of Awakening has a detailed description of the

process of Shamatha depicted here. We based it directly on the Bhavanakrama.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

zsc said:

My main concern here is that the position of one "owning" karma in a completely isolated way, due to solely one's past life, has traditionally had the social consequences of justifying congenital birth defects, generational poverty, inequality and discrimination against social "deviancy" etc. When I say "justifying", I don't mean just "explaining", I mean that this understanding of karma has been used as a way to encourage complacency and passivity about suffering and mistreatment brought on due to social and political systems.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that you and you alone are the owner of your karma (The Buddha likens karma to a debt that one has to pay off) merely explains these things, it does not condone nor justify them. What you say about encouraging complacency is not true of how karma is understood within Buddhism, it is true of how karma is understood in Hinduism.

zsc said:

I have already expounded on a "philosophy of karma that teaches something else", so I just would be repeating myself at this point. Also, I would say that a huge portion of the Buddhist world practicing merit-transference/dedication is more significant than what you imply when say "someone".

Malcolm wrote:

If it were possible for dedication of merit to change the karma of sentient beings, you would have thought that the Buddhas in their compassion would have dedicated all their merit to us, so that we would no longer suffer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: What happened historically to the Vinaya in Japan?

Content:

Seishin said:

I agree. The question is though, should the priests be on equal standing as the monks?

Indrajala said:

In Tibetan traditions sometimes the non-celibate clergy are held as superior to the

sangha. Just look at the Sakya lineage, like HH Sakya Trizin.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an understandable misconception.

In the Sakya tradition there are, in general, no non-celibate clergy apart from the Khon family members. In fact, HHST wanted to become a monk, but because of his birth heritage that option was not available to him. In general, most Khon family males who were not in line to be the throne holder of Sakya usually become monks. In this case, the younger son of His Holiness, Jñānavajra, was a monk for many years. He chose to give up his vows for his own reasons, but it was not without some controversy.

While the Khon family has been the locus for secular power from the beginning of the founding of the tradition, it has only been the spiritual locus of the tradition occasionally, with the real spiritual authority of Sakya resting primarily with the Ngor Khenpos, and the heads of the Tshar school. Occasionally (and apart from the five founding masters) remarkable figures like Lama Dampa, Kunga Tashi, Amyezhabs, Kunga Lodo, Dagchen Trinly Rinchen and so on have emerged from the Khon family to become major lineage figures, but in general, the Khon family has primarily had a political role in the Sakya school as the secular rulers of the Sakya principality.

It is really only in the Nyingma school that there is a notion that mantrikas are on a par with bhikṣus. But even in Nyingma, mantrikas are still seated behind the bhikṣus.

I should also add that even where a lay person is a guru giving initiations, it is permissible, for the purpose of decorum, for monks to prostrate to the shrine rather than the person of the guru if he or she is a lay person. This is fully laid out in 50 verses of Guru Devotion attributed to Ashvaghosha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Śākyamuni's non-Indo-European heritage.

Content:

Indrajala said:

Incidentally for some great information on what constitutes proto-Indo-European religion, at least under reconstruction, see the following:

<http://piereligion.org/pierintro.html>

Malcolm wrote:

The answers to all of these questions and many more are to be found in Witzel's new book:

The Origins of the World's Mythologies. Oxford University Press

He has questioned the linguistic nature of the so-called Indus Script (Farmer, Sproat, Witzel 2004).[70] Earlier, he had suggested that a substrate related to, but not identical with the Austroasiatic Munda languages, which he therefore calls para-Munda, might have been the language of (part of) the Indus population.[71][72]

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael\\_Witzel#Research](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Witzel#Research)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In genera the sutrayāna approach is that it takes a minimum of three incalculable eons to achieve the required accumulations of merit and wisdom to become a Samyak sambuddha. After spending two incalculable eons to reach the eighth bhumi, it take another eon to reach buddhahood.

Thus, the idea that having a human birth means you have all the accumulations behind you is plain wrong when you actually study the Mahāyāna path. Why? When you reach the eighth bhumi, you gain power over birth.

Further, each Bhumi allows one to manifest a number of emanations in different buddhafiels: thus, when one attains the first bhumi, one can manifest 100 emanations in one hundred buddhafiels and so on. When one attains the second bhumi, one can manifest 1000 emanations, etc. At each bhumi, one manifests emanations in successive powers of ten.

We who cannot manifest even two bodies in this lifetimes should not think that we are anywhere near the end of our path. In fact, we are merely on the first path, the path of accumulation, trying to develop authentic bodhicitta. We have indeed attained a precious human birth, but this can be lost easily and who knows when we will have this opportunity again. Buddha himself describes the rarity of the precious human birth through the analogy of a blind tortoise in the ocean who rises to the surface every one hundred years and manages to rise through a golden circle that is randomly floating around on the surface of that ocean.

The pure land path is not a quick path, per se. There are many grades of birth described in the pure land sutras, and some people who are born there are born in lotuses that never open, so they never see the face of Amitabha. Of course, in Shinran's pure land school this is all understood rather differently than in the Chinese and Tibetan pure land traditions. So the point is that even we consider that it is possible to take birth in the pure land, this is not necessarily a swift path. In the Tibetan tradition taking birth in the pure land tends to be considered a resting point, where one can make progress on the bodhisattva path, eventually returning to various impure realms to aid sentient beings. further, while Amitabha's vow clearly says "Whoever hears my name will be reborn in Sukhavati", it does not state "Immediately upon having died in this lifetime". In fact, one

of vows clearly states that in order to take rebirth in Sukhavati, one must accumulate the necessary merits after one has heard his name and so on. So, in reality, birth in the Pure Land is not the shortcut it sometimes appears to be in East Asian Buddhism. And of course vow 35 can be understood to be completely sexist:

When I obtain the Buddhahood, women of boundless and inconceivable Buddha-worlds of the ten quarters after having heard my name thereby awakened in faith and joyful aspiration, and turning their minds towards Bodhi, therefore dislike their own female lives, when they be born again, in their next life should not be incarnated into a masculine body, then may I not attain the enlightenment.

In other words, this vow states that women who have faith in Amitabha, who are unhappy being women because they wish for awakening, will be born as men in their next life.

There is also the recognition of the advantages of position in vow 43:

If after I have obtained the Buddhahood, that any Bodhisattva of other countries having heard my name, will be incarnated as a member of a noble family (if he so desires) when he dies, otherwise may I not attain enlightenment.

There is in fact no guarantee of immediate birth in Sukhavati in the 48 vows of Amitabha.

When it comes to Vajrayāna, Vajrayāna proposes that one can achieve buddhahood in this lifetime in this body. If one does not succeed in this life, one can easily attain buddhahood in the bardo, or failing that, one will definitely achieve awakening with 7 lifetimes if one practices or 16 even if one does not practice.

zsc said:

I think rory's point is valid in explaining the different perspectives here where we are finding our disagreement. Even though I go to a Theravadin sangha because of convenience and I like the people there, my personal orientation is Pureland practice and thought, in which is not a controversial claim to say that this lifetime will be my last lifetime conditioned within samsara. Even with a lot Theravadin lay people who just would like a better rebirth though, meritorious actions are done in the hopes of that being their last lifetime in the human realm, or at the very least their last lifetime as a non-monastic.

Correct me if I'm wrong Tibetan Buddhists, but from a Tibetan Buddhist perspective this may seem sort of myopic to you because eons and eons of progression is taken as a given, while other East Asian traditions like Pureland-based traditions almost imply that our human birth and access to the dharma is "proof" that those eons of meritorious work are "behind" us, so it's realistic to believe we can go "up" from here in just one more lifetime.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Ok, i'm correcting you. It's not remotely controversial in Tibetan Buddhism to talk about enlightenment in one lifetime, nor rebirth in the Pure Land.

A Fuzzy explanation to the best of my knowledge:

Hinayana sutra = many many lifetimes, "incomplete" version, Mahayana sutra = fewer lifetimes but still lots, Tantra = different levels, but there is the definite possibility of this being the last lifetime. IIRC the lowest level is listed as 60 lifetimes until or something like that, all mapped out lol!

I don't know a lot about Pureland, but the biggest difference from what I do know is the "other power" thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 25th, 2014 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

zsc said:

I think rory's point is valid in explaining the different perspectives here where we are finding our disagreement. Even though I go to a Theravadin sangha because of convenience and I like the people there, my personal orientation is Pureland practice and thought, in which is not a controversial claim to say that this lifetime will be my last lifetime conditioned within samsara. Even with a lot Theravadin lay people who just would like a better rebirth though, meritorious actions are done in the hopes of that being their last lifetime in the human realm, or at the very least their last lifetime as a non-monastic.

Correct me if I'm wrong Tibetan Buddhists, but from a Tibetan Buddhist perspective this may seem sort of myopic to you because eons and eons of progression is taken as a given, while other East Asian traditions like Pureland-based traditions almost imply that our human birth and access to the dharma is "proof" that those eons of meritorious work are "behind" us, so it's realistic to believe we can go "up" from here in just one more lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

It rather depends on which Tibetan Buddhist perspective you are discussion, sutra or tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 25th, 2014 at 10:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in India post 8CE

Content:

tingdzin said:

"Relevant materials" is not limited to religious scripture.

Malcolm wrote:

Since there are no records of Shri Simha outside of the religious records that exist, then relevant materials are only religious records.

All of the other things you mentioned about the identity of Li, etc., they have very little to do with the person known as Shri Simha.

For example, there is no archaeological record of a Shri Simha, and what we know of the fellow is restricted to colophons in texts of uncertain date.

When confronted with two separate Dzogchen lineage accounts which sites Shri Simha in India, and a third, later tradition, that sites him in an uncertain "rgya nag", well, chances are the two earlier traditions (pan grub thugs bcud and the rod rje zam pa lineage accounts) are the more correct.

The best we can do is try and understand why Zhangton Tashi Dorje wanted to shift the location of Shri Simha from India to regions outside of India, because it is a certainty that he is the first author to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 25th, 2014 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

The fact is society is just going to have to grow up and make democratic planning of the economy work.

Malcolm wrote:

"Democracy" and "planned economy" are mutually exclusive terms.

tellyontellyon said:

Market forces are not going to save the planet

Malcolm wrote:

I never said they could. Markets require regulation. That what governments are for.

tellyontellyon said:

we need a new economic and political system.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we simply need to decide that some types of resources are better preserved than consumed and pass laws to ensure that.

Personally, I find Hayek far more appealing than Trotsky, and much more reasonable and sensible. He fully exposes the failures of both right and left wing socialist



collectivism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 25th, 2014 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

conebeckham said:

Shifting gears a little bit for me...

About the price. Look, it costs a lot of money to publish any book. Shambhala is not making huge profits. Snow Lion certainly wasn't. The translators are not getting rich, of that you can be assured. The readership of such specialized books is very small. I've not looked at the prices for all the books in the restricted section, but I can tell you that I've seen prices in the \$40-60's. This is frankly not outrageous, in my opinion. Textbooks cost far more. Even this "\$108" dollars that was quoted, well.....that's still far cheaper than a college hardback textbook.

And if a given book is truly precious, a source of refuge or inspiration, a benefit to one's practice, what, really, can be said about the price of such a thing?

About the "Gatekeeper" function....as I understand it, Shambhala is merely "enforcing" or complying with the regulations for purchase bestowed upon the text by a given translator, or a given Lama. Some people here are quick to blame Shambhala for some sort of "scheme" of control, when in fact I don't believe they are instituting the scheme--though certainly they are supporting and participating in it. This point apparently needs to be made clear, based upon some previous posts.

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that such restrictions are totally arbitrary and are not based on genuine and sound reasoning.

conebeckham said:

Well, if it's true that the restrictions are placed upon the texts by the "supervising Lamas"-for example, Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso, His Holiness Sakya Trizin--your argument is addressed to them, and not to Shambhala. Correct?

To be clear, I'm not saying the restrictions are NOT arbitrary or well-Reasoned. Frankly, I don't know. In fact, to know, one would have to have some sort of telepathic ability, or at the very least to have had personal discussions with the parties.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that if you decide to translate something, and then have it published by Snow Lion etc., then the idea of restricting it becomes absurd. If on the other hand, you privately publish a book and control the dissemination of the text, that is a different story.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 25th, 2014 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

conebeckham said:

Shifting gears a little bit for me...

About the price. Look, it costs a lot of money to publish any book. Shambhala is not making huge profits. Snow Lion certainly wasn't. The translators are not getting rich, of that you can be assured. The readership of such specialized books is very small. I've not looked at the prices for all the books in the restricted section, but I can tell you that I've seen prices in the \$40-60's. This is frankly not outrageous, in my opinion. Textbooks cost far more. Even this "\$108" dollars that was quoted, well.....that's still far cheaper than a college hardback textbook.

And if a given book is truly precious, a source of refuge or inspiration, a benefit to one's practice, what, really, can be said about the price of such a thing?

About the "Gatekeeper" function....as I understand it, Shambhala is merely "enforcing" or complying with the regulations for purchase bestowed upon the text by a given translator, or a given Lama. Some people here are quick to blame Shambhala for some sort of "scheme" of control, when in fact I don't believe they are instituting the scheme--though certainly they are supporting and participating in it. This point apparently needs to be made clear, based upon some previous posts.

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that such restrictions are totally arbitrary and are not based on genuine and sound reasoning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 24th, 2014 at 12:42 PM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I say wealth distribution must be part of the aims of a compassionate society and Buddhists should support that.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with wealth redistribution is that it is not feasible. There is no way to ensure fair and equitable distribution because central planning and democracy cannot coexist:

It is the price of democracy that the possibilities of conscious control are restricted to the fields where true agreement exists and that in some fields things must be left to chance. But in a society which for its functioning depends on central planning this

control cannot be made dependent on a majority's being able to agree; it will often be necessary that the will of a small minority be imposed upon the people, because this minority will be the largest group able to agree among themselves on the question at issue. Democratic government has worked successfully where, and so long as, the functions of government were, by a widely accepted creed, restricted to fields where agreement among a majority could be achieved by free discussion; and it is the great merit of the liberal creed that it reduced the range of subjects on which agreement was necessary to one on which it was likely to exist in a society of free men. It is now often said that democracy will not tolerate "capitalism." If "capitalism" means here a competitive system based on free disposal over private property, it is far more important to realize that only within this system is democracy possible. When it becomes dominated by a collectivist creed, democracy will inevitably destroy itself.

Hayek, F. A. (2010-10-22). The Road to Serfdom: Text and Documents--The Definitive Edition (The Collected Works of F. A. Hayek, Volume 2) (pp. 109-110). University of Chicago Press - A. Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 24th, 2014 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in India post 8CE

Content:

alpha said:

Among the 5 sems sde original texts we find the khyung chen lding ba.

Isn't this text attributed to Sri Simha ?

If I am not mistaken CNNr gave teachings on it last year sometime before christmas...

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Alpha:

You are confusing the sems sde text with a tregchö text in the Vima Nyinthig (which indeed ChNN taught last year).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 24th, 2014 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in India post 8CE

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have either read and translated all the earliest datable historical sources for Sṛī Simha (pan grub thugs bcud, lo rgyus chen mo, the Vajra bridge histories, etc,) so your assertion that I have "no background" in relevant materials is plain nonsense.

alpha said:

Are these texts publicly available or will you publish them sometime in the future?

I would be particularly interested in anything related to Vajra Bridge.

Malcolm wrote:

I hope to publish yet another version of the five early bodhicitta texts at some point since I regard them as being the origin of the Dzogchen tradition. I am less certain of the actual provenance of the 13 later bodhicitta texts, and it is pretty clear (to me at any rate) that the kun byed rgyal po, the mdo bcu and the rmad du byung ba tantras are Tibetan compilations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 24th, 2014 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

conebeckham said:

Right. I'm referring to Shambhala's edition of the Treasury of Esoteric Instructions.

<http://www.shambhala.com/books/buddhism/treasury-of-esoteric-instructions.html>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this was published before the LTC's text was published, and the slob bshad is considered more profound. The LTC's book also has a complete commentary on the Vajra verses, written by Sachen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 24th, 2014 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

conebeckham said:

I'm not disagreeing, Malcolm--but, for instance, His Holiness Sakya Trizin is said to be the source of restrictions for the Lam Dre volume. It is the lamas who are the source of the restrictions. I'm just pointing this out for all readers.

Malcolm wrote:

Lamdre is an unrestricted download, and all the most essential Lamdre instructions (slob bshad) have been freely published with HHST's blessings as part of the Library of Tibetan Classics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 24th, 2014 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

zsc said:

This is basically the basis for the motivation to engage the mechanisms of suffering in many different ways, including suffering brought on due to sociopolitical systems. This is just making a meditation practice of what I have been expressing this whole time.

Malcolm wrote:

Tonglen is simply a practice for developing the courage to be a bodhisattva, nothing more.

zsc said:

Edited to add As I continue to read about it, the less I see how this practice refutes my point about karma, which affirms the teachings of interdependence (from dependent co-origination) and nonduality, and therefore does not agree that karma is something that we "own" in any kind of independent way.

Malcolm wrote:

It is impossible to take on the Karma of another, just as it is impossible to take on the sufferings of others. The practice of Tonglen exists to strengthen one's resolve to assist others. For example, when we imagine we are taking the sufferings of all sentient beings, this does not cause us to experience all the sufferings of all sentient beings in fact. When we imagine we are taking on the sufferings of starving children, our bodies do not become emaciated and so on. When we imagine that we are sending all of our happiness and positive roots of virtue to sentient beings, such as starving children, they are not immediately rained upon with food and drink. Since the Buddha was not able to remove the sufferings of all sentient beings, how much less able to do so are we? Nevertheless, like the Buddha, we aspire to do so, because in that aspiration lies the seed to accomplishing the ultimate result, Buddhahood.

zsc said:

Honestly, it seems at this point it seems like there can be no pleasing you.

Malcolm wrote:

It would please me if you were able to elaborate a theory of social justice based on truly grasping Buddhist principles.

zsc said:

No matter what language I use, no usage adheres well enough to the teachings of the superior Malcolmyana vehicle, so the actual issues I am trying to discuss cannot be discussed coherently, because even terms like "conventional reality" don't actually mean "conventional reality". This is not meant to be a personal attack, but just an admission that I cannot get around your rhetorical tricks.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not using rhetorical tricks. I am merely pointing out that the view you present is based on a one-lifetime model. I would also like to point out again that you are misusing the notion of interdependence. You are mistaking *karana-hetu* (the fact that all things are causes of all other things apart from themselves) with *pratītyasamutpāda* (dependent origination, which fundamentally describes how sentient beings are caught in *samsara* and how they can interrupt that process) and the principles of *karmavipaka* (which describe the effects of morally determined actions).

When one confuses these three principles— cause and condition, dependent origination and *karmavipaka* — then one will be very confused about rebirth, karma, status in the world, etc.

When it comes to conventional reality, there is a statement by Shantideva, "the ultimate of the lower system is the conventional of the higher". Conventional truths are not written in stone. They change, they change depending on what one's understanding is. For example, the conventional truth of a ruler is that he is the most powerful person, but from the conventional truth viewpoint of a persona following *Madhyamaka* teaching, rulers are the greatest fools of all with the least power.

From the worldly point of view of the equal rights amendment and so on, we need to enable parity and opportunity for all US citizens, and beyond. I not only accept this, but I support it -- which is why you will have noted on other threads I consider gay marriage to be a civil rights issue and I think that people who don't agree with me have a fundamental lack of understanding of what civil rights means (which is why I think poc who do not support gay marriage have a huge blind spot). I am a deep ecologist, and feel that we have a fundamental obligation to respect all life. While my Buddhist practice informs these perspectives, I do not confuse them with my Buddhist practice. I know quite well that people who are suffering oppression in this life (for example Tibetans in Tibet) are experiencing the ripening of their own karma. Do I support measures to lessen it where possible? Of course. In other words, while it is true that I regard things like having a hot poker shoved in my eye as a result of karma, I also support the idea that the poker ought to be removed as soon as possible, and the inserting of pokers in eyes should be prevented at all costs. But when it does happen, I am not blind to the fact that all sensations in *samsara*, be they pleasant or painful, are fundamentally a result of karma.

A Buddhist social consciousness must be able to accommodate both perspective simultaneously: on the one hand observing that things like attack dogs and water canons being used on non-violent protestors is fundamentally wrong, and understanding also that the people who are being attacked are also experiencing the ripening of their own karma, while the attackers are creating negative karma for themselves too, which will ripen as suffering later. The Buddhist approach to social justice issues therefore should be equanimous concern and effective engagement, rather than passionate involvement and karmically questionable actions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 24th, 2014 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

conebeckham said:

It's not Shambhala who determines restrictions, but the translators or their teachers. In this case, it was the wish of Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso that certain requirements be met.

I think in all cases, it's not the publisher laying down the rules. Take a look at the Yeshe Lama, and the Guhyagarbha...etc.

Malcolm wrote:

The entire (reliable) translation of Longchenpa's commentary on Guhyagarbha is available for free on the internet. It is ludicrous therefore for anyone to restrict commentaries on it.

Everything in Yeshe Lama can be found in various books which anyone can buy. This ludicrous fetish for restriction really ought to be abandoned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 23rd, 2014 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

conebeckham said:

As for "elitism," well.....if the only people with free access to the texts are Tibetan readers, isn't that a form of elitism, as well?

Malcolm wrote:

That is the point. If you do not read Tibetan well, you are discriminated against in a form that those of who do read Tibetan well are not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 23rd, 2014 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in India post 8CE

Content:

tingdzin said:

Once again, Malcolm dismisses as fantasy what does not accord with his preconceptions. As you rightly noted, I supplied a motive for later Tibetan scholars to attribute Indian origins to Sri Singha, while he offers none for the converse situation. I offer a concrete historical location and context, while he just says "near Bodh Gaya". Pensum, I will get back to you with historical sources by PM, but I'm not going to waste time arguing with someone who is Always Right, even when he has no background in the

relevant material.

Malcolm wrote:

Tingzin:

I have either read and translated all the earliest datable historical sources for Śrī Śiṃha (pan grub thugs bcud, lo rgyus chen mo, the Vajra bridge histories, etc,) so your assertion that I have "no background" in relevant materials is plain nonsense.

The lo rgyus chen mo is quite late, comparatively, and is quite out of step with what the earlier sources say (which locate Shri Simha in India). Later Tibetan scholars in general do not locate Shri Simha in India, they locate him in all sorts of places outside of India such as Khotan, China, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 23rd, 2014 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

Osho said:

Pathetic.

Truly pathetic.

practitioner said:

I'd disagree, a translator using their time and expertise to give those who can't read Tibetan access to this text is hardly pathetic. Any restrictions are on the advice of their teacher, hardly a sound marketing strategy...

Malcolm wrote:

The point is these these books are freely available to people like me, translators, without any restrictions at all. So making the English translations restricted is just a kind of elitism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

kirtu said:

The Avatamsaka is highly influential in Tibetan Buddhism although it can be argued that this is restricted to the Gaṇḍavyūha Sutra. For example the Prayer of Samantabhadra is taken directly from the Gaṇḍavyūha Sutra.



I've seen references to the Lotus Sutra pop up but it's influence is weak within Tibetan Buddhism.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:  
Hi Kirt,

Quite the contrary, the Lotus Sutra's ekayāna teachings are very influential in Tibetan Buddhism, forming the basis for example of Sonam Tsemo's observation that there is in reality only one vehicle.

The way we treat sutras is to get at the essential message of a given sutra, and not get caught up in irrelevant details.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 11:12 PM  
Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polity said:  
Content:  
I know you don't read or comment on the Lotus Sutra either....

Malcolm wrote:  
There are commentaries on the Saddharmapundarika Sutra in Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 11:11 PM  
Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polity  
Content:

zsc said:  
Your theory that we cannot remove the karmic obstructions of others goes against the understanding that is the basis of the practice of the transference of merit.

Malcolm wrote:  
The dedication of merit is not a "transfer" of merit.

zsc said:  
Malcolm - I have said over and over here and in the other thread that my concepts of "white/non-white" are referring to conventional reality

Malcolm wrote:  
Your concepts vis a vis this issue appear to be based in a one-lifetime perception of

social relations. From a Buddhist perspective, taking a one life-time view is not conventional reality at all.

zsc said:

Also, it is an accepted understanding that one can practice the dharma with less obstructions when your basic needs are taken care of. It's the practical reason behind why we don't let our monks starve.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be best if no one starved, and yet despite everything, there is still suffering in the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Zabmo Nangdon to be published by Shambhala

Content:

conebeckham said:

Just an FYI, saw that Elizabeth Callahan has translated this, along with Kongtrul's commentary, and it will be available as a restricted text in September from Shambhala. Website says you must have completed ngondro, have had pointing out instructions, and be practicing HYT yidam under the guidance of a qualified lama.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, I just don't support this restricted text nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

rory said:

Malcolm: 8. deaf, dumb, blind or mentally deficient

This is a very good example of re-iterating something that is outdated. Times have changed a current priest in Honmon Butsuryu Shu is deaf and signs the Odaimoku, he enthusiastically wants to bring Buddhism to deaf people with sign language, as opposed to the times he was told in SGI to sit and be silent. Blind people can read braille and study just like anyone else. Even those who are developmentally disabled have levels of ability, it is up to them how much and how far they can learn. Let's not perpetrate these backward attitudes.

Malcolm wrote:

It is true that we have braille and sign language these assist people are deaf and blind learn Dharma. Developmental disabled people can learn Dharma too. But to pretend than these factors do not present significant problems is to just ignore how things are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

zsc said:

I would say that since practice leads to the goal for liberation, more people would be able to practice if they weren't overburdened with concerns like not having enough to eat, not having adequate shelter, not having access to clean water, not having access to education, not having access to educational and employment opportunities, etc. These factors often depend on present social and political structures.

Malcolm wrote:

And all of these are covered in the teaching of the eight freedoms and ten endowments that define a precious human birth:

Freedom from being born in:

1. in the Hell realms
2. as a hungry ghost
3. as an animal
4. in a place where teachings are unavailable
5. as a long-life god (always content and therefore has no motivation for progress)
6. with wrong view (no understanding of karma, and no understanding of past and future lives)
7. where no Buddha has appeared
8. deaf, dumb, blind or mentally deficient

If one is born in any of the above realms, there is no chance of studying and practicing the teachings. What is therefore necessary are the Ten Endowments which consists of Five Inherent Endowments and Five Karma Provisions. The Five Inherent Endowments are one is born

1. as a human being
2. where there are teachings
3. possessing five senses
4. not having committed heavy negative karmas
5. having confidence in and devotion to the Triple Gem

The Five Karma Provisions are one is born

1. where a Buddha has appeared
2. where a Buddha has taught
3. where the Dharma teachings flourish

4. where there are followers who enter the pure path of Dharma
5. where there is support from the kindness of others, including the spiritual master.

zsc said:

Ultimately, I do not see social activism as an attempt to change the samsaric reality, but to remove as many samsaric obstructions as possible so that the Buddhist path can be open to more people. This is why I disagree with points like that reiterated by Johnny Dangerous, et all. I don't perceive any social resolution as an "end", but the means to liberation in a fuller sense.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhist path is open to anyone who takes refuge in the Three Jewels.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

Nemo said:

Will you be returning your land to the indigenous people your ancestors displaced?

Malcolm wrote:

The land I live on was never owned or settled by any tribe, and lay in a sort of no man's land between the Hudson river valley and the Connecticut river valley. Settling in this part of Mass never displaced anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

Nemo said:

I would rather stop wasting resources on Tibet. The battle is lost. Flee the country and regroup elsewhere. We can still preserve something in Nepal and Bhutan.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have to "waste" any resources on Tibet. However, Tibet is important. Tibetans are not going to flee; where would they go? Canada?

Nepal, not likely, they are in the pocket of the PRC. Bhutan is a park.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?

Content:

garudha said:

You realise that not only are these words you are reading right now samsara, but every part of your body, including every single idea, thought & slightest movement of your brain IS samsara itself ?

You think that only the watch-face of the swiss-watch of samsara. I'm telling you that every single piece of the swiss-watch, even the tick noise, IS samsara.

Wisdom & Compassion are the Jewels of the watch. These Jewels are pure and nothing else.

Lotus\_Bitch said:

Fundamentally, this is dualistic, from the Mahayana viewpoint.

garudha said:

Is Yab-Yum dualistic ?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is symbol of the non duality method and wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Can't Really Work with Mahayana by the Looks of it

Content:

rob h said:

Thanks again for the help.

I haven't actually read much about Bodhisattvas in Theravada, but this paper I just found speaks quite a bit about them and some of the misconceptions that have apparently been made. Have only read halfway through so far, but it's trying to say for at least part of it, that the Bodhisattva ideal is actually very alive in Theravada. Also something that I've seen before : that the whole "Hinayana" thing was actually meant to mean some sects of Mahayana, but things then got confused over time. Will hopefully read the rest later on.

<http://journals.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/index.php/jiabs/article/viewFile/8663/2570>

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that in Theravada, if you choose bodhisattva aspiration, it is considered that you cannot become a stream entrant. Needless to say, in Mahāyāna, we do not agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 8:05 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists even care about "engaging" social polit

Content:

zsc said:

From the last discussion that I participated in

( <https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=42&t=11898> ), something came up that I think deserves its own thread, which is the question of how involved Buddhists should be in politics, or if they even should be involved at all. My position is that I don't think it would be detrimental to our practice if we were politically involved.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends very much on how. If your politics cultivates the three poisons, then it is probably better you are not involved in politics.

zsc said:

Related to this, I find it pretty troubling when other Buddhists take positions that basically say that our current social position is the result of our karma from a previous life only. It implies that our social advantages are "rightfully ours" because they have been "earned" in some way, so there is little need to address inequality, making social politics irrelevant to practice. Remove the teaching of rebirth,

Malcolm wrote:

But we don't remove rebirth.

zsc said:

and this is basically the assumption that props up elitism, as well as the myth of the true meritocracy and the "self-made man".

Malcolm wrote:

But of course Buddhist social theory maintains that one's rebirth is based on one's virtuous deeds. So if you are born into an "elite" and behave non-virtuously, you will lose that position in your next life.

zsc said:

These are the mechanisms that have made imperialism, colonialism, racism, and other forms of bigotry possible, and have kept these forms of bigotry institutionalized and powerful.

Malcolm wrote:

None of this applies to Buddhist social theory.

zsc said:

Moreover, white mainstream Buddhism's major players have been taking similar philosophical positions...

Malcolm wrote:

We are just following the lead of our non-white teachers.

zsc said:

Where is the room for conventional reality to be addressed? "No independent identity" should not be taken to mean "irrelevant", especially from Mahayanists, who affirm the non-dualistic nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to be taken seriously on this score you will have to abandon your rhetoric of white/non-white, etc.

zsc said:

Often, people who disagree with me bring up scriptures in which Shakyamuni asserts that political concerns are not appropriate for Buddhists to concern themselves with

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha never said that we should not engage in political life.

zsc said:

The Hindu caste system had spiritual leaders at the top, implying a hierarchy of spiritual maturity...

Malcolm wrote:

When the Buddha was alive, as he very clearly says in many texts, the warrior class was more respected than the priestly class.

zsc said:

I think how we were taught to understand karma matters here. I was never taught that karma was only in relation to accumulation from a past life, but also the causes and conditions that each of us bring about through our thoughts and actions, and doesn't just affect you, because there is not a separate "you" to begin with. This is why the practice of accumulating merit makes sense, for instance. You accumulate good merit from wholesome deeds, and others also accumulate merit through, among other ways, rejoicing in the wholesomeness of your meritorious act when you tell them that you did it. Pretty much the opposite of the Christian understanding that you are supposed to do good deeds in secret.

Malcolm wrote:

You are conflating action (karma) with the ripening of action (karma vipaka). Action, as defined by the Buddha, is intention and what proceeds from intention. "You" are indeed a separate continuum, but that continuum simply isn't a self.

zsc said:

So as it relates to social politics, there is nothing inherently disadvantageous about being born black, for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, not intrinsically; nothing intrinsically disadvantageous about being a woman either. But in this present epoch they seem to be both.

zsc said:

But since it is what it is, where black people and other marginalized groups are suffering due to today's circumstances, this should be engaged.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, Buddhists who feel that they should do something should do something.

zsc said:

So to bring it all back, this is why I don't think that political activism is inappropriate behavior for a Buddhist, since I do not think that it is unwholesome for a Buddhist to engage conventional reality as long as he or she remembers it is ultimately empty.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said at the beginning, what matters is "the how." But there are a number of people you can learn from such as Bernie Glassman, a prominent example of an engaged Buddhist political activist and there are many others

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

he established that the 5 aggregates were Not Self and it was because they WERE not self that they lead to suffering

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha established that the five aggregates were not a self, that none of the five aggregates individually are a self, and important, than there is no self apart from the five aggregates.

Thus, all phenomena, including nirvana, are not self.

Son of Buddha said:

SN 22.46 Impermanent (2) pg 885

At Savatthi. "Bhikkhus, form is impermanent.... Feeling is impermanent.... Perception is impermanent.... Volitional formations are impermanent.... Consciousness is



impermanent. What is Impermanent is suffering. What is suffering is nonself. What is nonself should be seen as it really is with correct wisdom thus: This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self."

so Nirvana is Suffering since it is not self correct?

talk about throwing out the baby with the bath water.

Malcolm wrote:

Where does the Buddha ever say in any śravaka text that nirvana is a self? No where, that's where.

While indeed the five aggregates are not self, this does not mean that space and the two cessations are a self.

Ārya-tathāgatācintyaguhyānirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

Guhyapati, in the same way, the tathāgatas have summarized all Dharmas. The summaries of Dharmas are defined as four. If it is asked what four: in order to conquer the śramanas and brahmins who advocate permanence, the long-lived gods who think of permanence, it is said "All conditioned things are impermanent. In order to conquer humans and gods who think of happiness, it is said "all conditioned things are suffering". In order to conquer the tīrthikas who propose a permanent self, it is said that all phenomena (dharmas) are without self. In order to subdue that proud who engage in conceptuality, it is said that "nirvana is peace".

Guhyapati, impermanent denotes very impermanent. Suffering denotes freedom from aspiration. Selfless denotes the characteristic of emptiness. "Nirvana is peace" denotes actualizing the absence of characteristics.

Here, we can see what the four seals are really intended for. Further, the Ārya-ratnacūḍaparipṛcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

"All conditioned things are impermanent", "all conditioned things are suffering", "all phenomena are not self" and "nirvana is peace" are equivalent statements.

Rājādeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Nirvana is the supreme bliss of peace,  
without concepts grasping it as self and without affliction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

he established that the 5 aggregates were Not Self and it was because they WERE not self that they lead to suffering

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha established that the five aggregates were not a self, that none of the five aggregates individually are a self, and important, than there is no self apart from the five aggregates.

Thus, all phenomena, including nirvana, are not self.

garudha said:

So all phenomena manifests through/as/is the five aggregates ?

Malcolm wrote:

There are two classes of phenomena; conditioned and unconditioned. All conditioned phenomena are included in the five aggregates; the unconditioned phenomena are space, the two cessations (one of them being nirvana) and emptiness.

All of these phenomena are not a self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

he established that the 5 aggregates were Not Self and it was because they WERE not self that they lead to suffering

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha established that the five aggregates were not a self, that none of the five aggregates individually are a self, and important, than there is no self apart from the five aggregates.

Thus, all phenomena, including nirvana, are not self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, I don't think the historical Buddha taught one word of Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna for that matter. They are teachings put in his mouth.

Nighthawk said:

Nagarjuna was a historical Buddha who taught the Mahayana amongst many others.

Malcolm wrote:

I was referring to the Buddha cast in Mahāyāna sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in India post 8CE

Content:

Konch said:

Longchenpa's claim that Srisimha, one of the earliest figures of the Dzogchen lineage, was Ho-shang Mahayana

Malcolm wrote:

Longchenpa's view of the history of the arrival of Dzogchen to Tibet was a bit skewed by Nyang ral's term bio. In some places it seems he follows Nyang, in others, he seems to follow Zhangton. In general, he seems to more or less ignore the sem sde account which formed the basis for the "Great Image" bio of Vairocana (which is a composite bio based on several sources).

Konch said:

But this aside, going back a little to the main topic from the OP, so it seems noone is having a go at the point of what happened to dzogchen in India.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because there is nothing definitive we can say about it beyond the fact that two students of Śrī Siṃha brought it to Tibet.

Given the interchangeability between the terms mahāmudra and rdzogchen in the early texts, we can consider that Dzogchen was a pre-mother tantra approach to the completion stage.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

Nemo said:

It was a protectorate historically and has a predominantly Han population now. Jokhang Temple is now a shopping mall. Previously it was too isolated to bother administering directly. Now it is too resource rich and strategically important to be independent. It will revert back around the same time the Iroquois take back America. Resources should be spent on conserving Nepal and Bhutan.

Malcolm wrote:

It was not a protectorate, historically. Tibetan sovereignty has been well established in the historical record.

The Han who live there now were settled there illegally.

It may be the case that China will never voluntarily relinquish control of Tibet, but that does not mean we need to forget history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Three Turnings.

Content:

kirtu said:

However the Theravadin School is also not just a Sravakayana school.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Three Turnings.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a Mahāyāna POV, which are only Yogacara or Madhyamaka.

kirtu said:

It's not a Mahayana philosophical view of reality but that has nothing to do with one's bodhicitta. One can have a realist view and still be a bodhisattva not on the bhumis and thus nonetheless following the Mahayana path.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I was talking about view, not motivation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Yea your just agreeing with me, you accept that the Buddha taught True Self ,you just think its provisional.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, I don't think the historical Buddha taught one word of Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna for that matter. They are teachings put in his mouth.

I evaluate the these texts based on their content, not who supposedly spoke them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

Vajraprajñākhaḍga said:

I wonder why both of you removed that one sentence from its context.

Malcolm wrote:

Because the rest of your statement, while obvious, does to address the salient feature of the problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 9:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in India post 8CE

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The earliest source that mentions that Shri Siṃha comes from somewhere outside of India is the 12th century lo rgyus chen mo. This is totally unlikely, considering that the pan grub thugs bcud (Bima rgyud 'bum. vol. 1) locates Shri Simha in India, near Bodhgaya. Thus, we can regard any idea that Sṛī Siṃha is anything other than an Indian a late Tibetan fantasy.

dzogchungpa said:

That's interesting. Do you have any idea why they would want to fantasize in that way?

Malcolm wrote:

I cannot speak about their motivations, apart from the fact that perhaps it was important to Zhangton to make Dzogchen seem more exotic than Indian tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 8:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in India post 8CE

Content:

tingdzin said:

I'm sorry, Pensum, but this article you link to is useless from the standpoint of scholarly history. For example: note 3 says that So khyam is Su gnam; this is not only a phonetic stretch, it is directly contradicted by other Tibetan sources (e.g. Deb ther Sngon po, the Blue Annals), that have nothing to do with Sri Singha, but which put So khyam in the NW part of China proper, i.e. the upper reaches of the Yellow River. Phonologically So khyam is correctly related to the Chinese Suo fang and the Khotanese Sva hvam, both historically referring to the same area. This So khyam is moreover quite close to the Chinese Wu tai shan, which would make it a logical choice for Sri Singha's studies. The Five-peaked Mountain in Khotan was attested earlier than the one in China, but I don't think the one in Nepal was; in fact, as I recall, putting a five-peaked mountain in Nepal was simply a result of the later massive transfer of all the lore associated with Khotan to Nepal, under the mistaken later belief that Nepal was the Li yul often talked about in the oldest Tibetan material. This massive transfer might itself have been inspired by the pathological refusal of the later Tibetan schools to accept anything from outside the Indian subcontinent as authentic Buddhism. When the (conveniently anonymous) author of this article says things like "it is known that" to preface remarks which are at least highly controversial and probably complete fabrication, without citing sources, he shows that his "scholarship" is not worthy of consideration, regardless of its acceptance by an official Buddhist organization. If you are very interested in these things, I can refer you to real scholarly materials.

Malcolm wrote:

The earliest source that mentions that Shri Simha comes from somewhere outside of India is the 12th century lo rgyus chen mo. This is totally unlikely, considering that the pan grub thugs bcud (Bima rgyud 'bum. vol. 1) locates Shri Simha in India, near Bodhgaya. Thus, we can regard any idea that Sri Simha is anything other than an Indian a late Tibetan fantasy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 8:34 AM

Title: Re: Can't Really Work with Mahayana by the Looks of it

Content:

Alfredo said:

Mahayana rhetoric to the effect that "Hinayana" practitioners are selfish, less advanced, etc. should be treated as just that--rhetoric. Real-life Theravadins are just as compassionate, etc. as real-life Mahayanists. (.

Malcolm wrote:

Compassion is not the complete measure of Mahāyāna, there is no objectless compassion in Theravada; and the Theravadin bodhisattva doctrine is set up so that aspirants to Buddhahood are denied stream entry.

There are in fact there in fact three kinds of bodhicitta according to Mahāyāna: that of an arhat, a pratyekabuddha and a buddha. Of the three, the last is the most superior.

Just saying....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 8:27 AM

Title: Re: who is the Greatest master you have ever seen?

Content:

xabir said:

That is another occassion, not the teaching on the deer park. He gave countless teachings over his career. The ones in the deer park were his previous companions, and they recognised some change in the Buddha so got attracted to him.

On other occasions, such as the incident I provided, the follower of Buddha has not met Buddha before, and he did not recognise Buddha when meeting with him, and certainly did not suspect that he was Buddha merely by "his shining presence".

Only towards the end of the discourse, in recognising the profundity of Buddha's wisdom, he said, surely this must be the Buddha himself, and repented for the transgression of addressing Buddha as a "friend". He attained the awakening of an anagami after that discourse.

Basically: you can only tell someone is enlightened from his wisdom, not his/her appearance.

Malcolm wrote:

Sunakṣatra was Buddha's first attendant, for many years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Chinese psyche is still scarred and terrified of provinces declaring independence. Tibet is not now, never has been and never will be a "province" of China.

Vajraprajnakhadga said:  
The maps say otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:  
Screw the maps -- they don't represent the facts.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 8:23 AM  
Title: Re: Three Turnings.  
Content:

jeeprs said:  
So the phenomenal world exists, but everything in it is transient, unsatisfying and empty (sunya).

Malcolm wrote:  
This is not a Mahāyāna point of view.

kirtu said:  
It's not a Cittamatrīn or Madhyamānīkian view. It could however be a Mahayana POV...  
Kirt

Malcolm wrote:  
It is not a Mahāyāna POV, which are only Yogācāra or Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 8:20 AM  
Title: Re: who is the Greatest master you have ever seen?  
Content:

tyler2 said:  
you dont understand that noone would believe buddha about enlightenment unless he was "shining" or had presence, anyone can talk and say "i am enlightened".  
the ascetics he originally practiced with who had rejected him originally , were going to reject him again but as he drew closer they were attracted by his aura.

Malcolm wrote:  
Of course, then there is the guy, Sunakṣatra, who claimed the only difference between himself and the Buddha was that the Buddha had a glow.



Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 4:48 AM  
Title: Re: Three Turnings.  
Content:

jeeprs said:  
So the phenomenal world exists, but everything in it is transient, unsatisfying and empty (sunya).

Malcolm wrote:  
This is not a Mahāyāna point of view.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 4:46 AM  
Title: Re: Three Turnings.  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
If one claims the "third turning" is definitive, defines it as a number of sutras like the Saṃdhinirmocana and so on, and then you cite a "first" turning sūtra, you have contradicted yourself.

jeeprs said:  
Not necessarily.

Malcolm wrote:  
Necessarily, since your criteria would then be based on the teachings career of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 4:44 AM  
Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?  
Content:  
Son of Buddha said:  
if you accept the Mahayana and the Vajrayana as being authentic schools of Buddhism then yes the True Self is really the Buddhas teaching.

Malcolm wrote:  
Ah, no you don't. You can understand that so called "self" teachings or tathāgatagabha teachings in some Mahāyāna Buddhist sutras are provisional and still accept the validity of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: who is the Greatest master you have ever seen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"I am sorry I couldn't give you any vibration..."

-- Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's remark to a student who thought other Lamas had more "vibration".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

Unknown said:

The Chinese psyche is still scarred and terrified of provinces declaring independence.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibet is not now, never has been and never will be a "province" of China.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 4:29 AM

Title: Good vibrations...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

(Slightly adapted from the beach boys....)

I, I love the colorful clothes he wears  
And the way the butterlamps play upon his hair  
I hear the sound of a gentle word  
On the wind that lifts his incense through the air

Im pickin up good vibrations  
hes giving me excitations  
Im pickin up good vibrations  
(oom bop bop good vibrations)  
hes giving me excitations  
(oom bop bop excitations)  
Good good good good vibrations  
(oom bop bop)  
hes giving me excitations  
(oom bop bop excitations)  
Good good good good vibrations  
(oom bop bop)  
hes giving me excitations  
(oom bop bop excitations)

Close my eyes  
hes somehow closer now  
Softly smile, I know he must be kind  
When I look in his eyes  
he goes with me to a pure land world

Im pickin up good vibrations  
hes giving me excitations  
Im pickin up good vibrations  
(oom bop bop good vibrations)  
hes giving me excitations  
(oom bop bop excitations)  
Good good good good vibrations  
(oom bop bop)  
hes giving me excitations  
(oom bop bop excitations)  
Good good good good vibrations  
(oom bop bop)  
hes giving me excitations  
(oom bop bop excitations)

(ahhhhhhhh)  
(ah my my what elation)  
I don't know where but he sends me there  
(ah my my what a sensation)  
(ah my my what elations)  
(ah my my what)

Gotta keep those lovin good vibrations  
A happenin with him  
Gotta keep those lovin good vibrations  
A happenin with him  
Gotta keep those lovin good vibrations  
A happenin

Ahhhhhhhhh  
Good good good good vibrations  
(oom bop bop)  
(Im pickin up good vibrations)  
hes giving me excitations  
(oom bop bop)  
(excitations)  
Good good good good vibrations  
(oom bop bop)  
hes na na...

Na na na na na  
Na na na  
Na na na na na  
Na na na  
Do do do do do  
Do do do  
Do do do do do  
Do do do

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, March 19th, 2014 at 10:43 PM  
Title: Re: who is the Greatest master you have ever seen?  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
Who can say one buddha is greater than another?

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, March 19th, 2014 at 10:35 PM  
Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK  
Content:

jeeprs said:

Well, I'm afraid I do not concur. I admit, I might be quite mistaken, and I agree that others may hold completely different views to my own. But the issue is, as regards the recognition of 'gay marriage', that I am being compelled to agree. It means that the society of which I am part, no longer recognizes my right to dissent. It is not enough for me to live and let live anymore; I am required to live and applaud. And I'm not going to do that.

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Really? The Australian government rounds you all up and marches you down to the pride parade to cheer?

Malcolm wrote:

They do that in Canada too, that's why Jeff left. Rob Ford is the only bastion of conservative values left in Canada, I hope they elect him prime minister soon.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, March 19th, 2014 at 10:31 PM  
Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK  
Content:

greentara said:

Some time ago I remember reading about twenty-six year old (female) lawyer who says, 'I choose to use the name Dean and masculine pronouns. In part this feels right

because most people who look at me take me to be woman, so using these words helps to disrupt that process a little and opens a space for me to be something more complicated than that, which I feel better fits who I really am.'

It seems that the idea of identity flux, of being able to be whoever you want, is an essential part of the times we are living in.

The key word here is 'who I really am?'

So really who am I?

Lets dive deep within and look at it from a Buddhist and spiritual perspective, limited identities fail to address the fact that our true identity is limitless.

Malcolm wrote:

We cannot expect them to subscribe to Buddhist ideals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 19th, 2014 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: U.S Heruka Chakrasamvra Initiation

Content:

Matticus said:

I just picked up Lama Yeshe's book in which he discusses then 6 Yogas of Naropa.

Before the book starts discussing the various practices the author strongly suggests the reader obtain a proper Heruka Chakrasamvra initiation. Does anyone know of any facilities or teachers that are able to do this in the U.S?

Thanks for your time and have a good evening!

Matt.

Malcolm wrote:

HH Sakya Trizen will give the root empowerment for all Chakrasamvara empowerments (The Luipa tradition) in Vancouver in May. He will give a major Vajrayogini empowerment from the tradition of Laskminkara on April 4th in the US, as well as several other Vajrayogini blessings (Indra, Maitripa, Naropa, Severed Headed) over those days, as well as a Kalacakra empowerment in NYC April 7-8.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 19th, 2014 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

So the undermining of unions, ofshoring of manufacturing and globalized competition for wages has had no effect on middleclass incomes or the necessity for both partners in a marriage to go out to work then?

Malcolm wrote:

These are all factors in a competitive liberalized global economy. The alternative is much worse.

The decline of the middle class in the US has resulted in a rise in the middle class in other places such as China, India and Mexico. Such are the tides of the global economy.

You can't plan the economy, you can't "save" the middle class; the most you can do is decide what kinds of activities you are going to restrict, for example, pharmaceuticals as opposed to heroin; legal mining as opposed to unregulated illegal mining (a big problem in India), etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 19th, 2014 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

Nonsense. Free market economic policies that favor the superrich at the expense of everyone else have destroyed the middle class and the nuclear family.

Economic policies that rightwing dolts cheerlead for against their own best interests.

Malcolm wrote:

Free market policies created the middle class. Illegal financial speculation in exotic investment instruments have destroyed the middle class. The nuclear family is a socioeconomic myth invented in the fifties; in reality, the "nuclear" family destroyed itself, since two parents are not really capable of adequately raising children on their own.

The raising of children requires many people, the increased social alienation and misery that we see since the fifties is a result of the nuclear family and the decline of the extended family system.

Free markets do not mean unregulated markets. Free markets can and should operate within constraints. But they are the most efficient way of getting goods from place a to b. Planned economies are all nightmares.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 19th, 2014 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

More straw men. In which liberalized societies can parents provide consent for minors to marry?

Indrajala said:

It will come. Canada or Britain might be the first countries to allow it for religious purposes.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact parental marriage consent for minors already exists in states like Kentucky and so on has for a very long time, hearkening back to the day when it was not unusual for girls to be married off at 15.

Child betrothal is an Indian custom, and there is nothing anyone can do to prevent two sets of parents from agreeing that their children will become married in any country apart from the children themselves when they come of age. But as India and so on liberalize, these kinds of things will become rarer and rarer. They will not spread to the West.

As for Sharia law, well, it can't ever spread to the US on any level, so this paranoia is just an Alex Jones/Prison Planet non-starter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 19th, 2014 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

Maybe some people should mind their own freakin' business.

Indrajala said:

By that logic we shouldn't halt all manner of private albeit questionable activities, like narcotics consumption for example, because it is none of our business what adults do in the privacy of their own homes.

Some argue that narcotics damage society, hence must be proscribed. Well, some argue gay marriage will damage society, too.

Malcolm wrote:

And some people argue that evolution destroys the moral fabric of society, still argue that equal rights for blacks damages society and so on. Some people will argue anything. This does not mean their arguments are valid or even deserve to be entertained.

In the case of narcotics, the medical evidence is very clear. In the case of gay marriage there is no evidence at all that it will "damage" society, just like the appallingly stupid claim that feminism has destroyed the American family has no evidence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 19th, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

I have pointed to the fact gay marriage sets a legal precedent that other groups will use for their own claims, which have to be addressed sooner or later.

Malcolm wrote:

And this absurd contention has been dismantled several times.

Indrajala said:

If denying gay marriage = human rights infringement,

Malcolm wrote:

Not human rights, civil rights.

Indrajala said:

...then denying some groups the right to child marriages can also be claimed as a human rights infringement. You can argue this doesn't apply because children can't give consent, but their parents can in fact do so on their behalf, and in any case the trends of increasingly liberalized societies in the west suggest eventually multiculturalism will have to accommodate such alien practices.

Malcolm wrote:

This is no more problematical than denying some groups the right to mutilate the genitals of their female children. Why do we deny such rights? Because the basic right to property is the right to one's body. In a liberalized society, parents do not have rights to their children's bodies. Parents have an obligation to protect the basic rights of their children, by they have no right to violate the right of a child to the integrity of their own bodies except in cases of illnesses where a child may wish to refuse treatments and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

Like I said, I'm just being orthodox. I am one of the good guys on this side of the pond.



Malcolm wrote:

No you are not. There is no "orthodoxy" in Buddhism when it comes to marriage.

What you are doing is reinforcing patriarchal values, specifically, a very Christian version of them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure they do. But in your cynicism, you just don't want to see it.

Indrajala said:

Or perhaps you don't want to admit the failure of your cherished ideology.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see that there are any failures in the principles of democracy and equal rights; I certainly will allow that the United States has not in every instance lived up to its own rhetoric. Nevertheless, people are more free now in history than they ever have been before, and this I attribute to liberal democracy and free market economics which go hand in hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

Not at all. If I was born a century or two ago I could have been a globe trotting swashbuckler. Quite easily actually, especially before passport controls were implemented.

Malcolm wrote:

In reality you probably would have never left your county.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

In practice your cherished notions of human rights and so on simply don't amount to much.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure they do. But in your cynicism, you just don't want to see it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

Dislike me all you want, but I'm actually quite orthodox.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, Jeff. A political reactionary? Yes. Are your views "orthodox Buddhism" on this score? No.

Buddhism does not and never has concerned itself with marriage as an institution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Clarence said:

Add to that the fact that he is representing Buddhism

Malcolm wrote:

He isn't representing Buddhism, he is representing himself. It is important to keep that in mind. The opinions of one junior monk hardly mean anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Jeff does not believe in rights for anyone, he stated so a few posts back. He does not even believe that he has "equal rights" or "human rights", even though of course his ability to spew the nonsense he has been spewing lately is possible because he has both.

Indrajala said:

You are misrepresenting me again.

I said I don't believe in human rights and equal rights.

This is quite different from saying I "do not believe in rights for anyone".

Malcolm wrote:

The concept of "rights" was predicated on class rights. That proved ineffective, so now we have human and equal rights. There are no other kinds, except for rights granted by licensure, and those are more akin to privileges rather than rights. You remind me of a Virginia cavalier who famously stated "I love liberty, but I hate equality!".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Marriage is a govt. sanctioned institution. It confers certain rights onto people who marry (that's why you need a license to do it) to that unmarried people do not enjoy. Since gay people who are in long term committed relationships are denied those same rights as heterosexuals because they are denied the right of marriage, this amounts to civil rights discrimination.

Indrajala said:

Civil rights discrimination as a problem is entirely a subjective opinion. Your point here doesn't make your argument any more rational.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not "subjective opinion" — it is judicial opinion at this point in many advanced nations.

Indrajala said:

Secondly, there is no evidence that heterosexual parents are any better at raising children than gay parents.

It hasn't been widespread long enough to make that judgment call yet.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it has. Gay people have been raising children together forever.

Indrajala said:

No. I've constantly pointed to the fact a legal precedent is set by virtue of sanctioning gay marriage. This can and will be used by fringe groups which many find presently detestable to further their own goals.

Malcolm wrote:

Your qualms are irrational: amounting to "If we allow miscegenation, bestiality must be next!" — you have basically placed gay people on a continuum with pedophiles, and that is really offensive.

Indrajala said:

As I keep noting, there are plenty of civil and well-developed industrial societies like Japan which have neither gay marriage nor overly liberal social policies, and arguably never will in the foreseeable future.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you will be surprised at how quickly this will change in industrialized nations around the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Clarence said:

Actually, it is hateful. And the fact that you say you want what is best for western societies, while arguing against equal rights for gay couples, is truly offensive.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Jeff does not believe in rights for anyone, he stated so a few posts back. He does not even believe that he has "equal rights" or "human rights", even though of course his ability to spew the nonsense he has been spewing lately is possible because he has both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On this score, you are being an idiot.

Indrajala said:

This is just an insult and hardly contributes to the discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

You may feel insulted, I think you have left your senses on this one. Where you normally are clear headed and rational, I think you are being an idiot on this issue. So be insulted. I not only am allowed to think you are being an idiot, I am even allowed to say so. When

you stop being an idiot, I will stop thinking you are being one, and addressing you as such, i.e., when you have returned to your senses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

It deviates from historical norms to the point of being extreme and unprecedented.

Malcolm wrote:

This is total nonsense. As has been pointed out there are no historical norms when it comes to "marriage" and "families" across the broad swath of humanity.

But gay marriage is a natural out growth of the type of democracy we have in the west, it is a civil rights issue, and it naturally flows from the civil rights movement (which of course you don't believe in, since you don't believe in rights).

In this case you are just pissing against the wind, and like all people who piss against the wind, you only soil your own clothes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Like all bigots, you have no rational basis for your claims. You might as well be saying that christians should not marry jews.

Indrajala said:

If this were so, what rational basis is there for claiming same sex couples should be able to marry?

If we are all just basing our arguments on our feelings and opinions, then nobody can claim a rational basis.

Malcolm wrote:

I have explained this already -- so, I will explain it again.

Marriage is a govt. sanctioned institution. It confers certain rights onto people who marry (that's why you need a license to do it) to that unmarried people do not enjoy. Since gay people who are in long term committed relationships are denied those same rights as heterosexuals because they are denied the right of marriage, this amounts to civil rights discrimination.

Since you have famously declared you don't believe in "rights" (though why a Canadian monk imagines he will be invited into the elite to help rule the world is beyond anyone's imagination), I imagine that this point will, as it has in the past, fall on deaf ears.

Secondly, there is no evidence that heterosexual parents are any better at raising children than gay parents. So there is no reason to deny gay men and women the right to raise children (in fact same sex oriented people have been raising children for as long as there has been humans, apparently to no ill effect).

So in the end, your arguments against gay marriage are biased and irrational, which is why they make you a bigot in this respect. Certainly, you can find a sanctuary safe from gay marriage in Uganda or Kenya where they routinely slaughter people for their gender preference, but I don't think you really want to live in such countries where they will probably mistake you for being gay as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 7:47 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

Nevertheless, I still believe sanctioning homosexual marriages is ultimately unwise for a number of reasons which I've outlined at length already.

Seishin said:

I'm still vague as to why it's against the cosmos?

Indrajala said:

There are principles in time and the cosmos that must be considered, observed and followed lest you suffer for it. In the absence of historical norms for a given policy reform, you are basically deviating from all previous norms. Disregarding such a fact is critically unwise.

Malcolm wrote:

Didn't you know? "Marriage is between one man and one woman" was actually etched into the fabric of the universe. We erase this at our peril. Gay marriage is apparently going to cause the entire fabric of the universe to unwind, it makes peak oil look like a stroll in the park.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

I think that many of those who oppose marriage equality live in a bubble where they do

not know any gay families. I too know a lesbian couple with kids. Their family is no different in its joys and challenges to that of any straight couple I know.

Indrajala said:

I have friends who are gay or lesbian. One is happily (and legally) married.

Nevertheless, I still believe sanctioning homosexual marriages is ultimately unwise for a number of reasons which I've outlined at length already.

I have nothing against homosexuality. I just feel it unwise to provide marriage rights to same sex couples.

For the record, I will note, I don't believe in human rights or equal rights. I understand these are sacred cows to many people here, but I don't see them as such.

Human rights are often used by some countries to bully their opponents before committing the same sins they accuse others of. Just look at the USA. It cries out about human rights violations, yet American leadership has slain immeasurable civilians in recent decades, often on false intelligence.

I also don't believe in equal rights for the simple fact that, as in nature, there is hierarchy in human society and clearly not everyone is equal in terms of intellect, power and so on. I think trying to superimpose "equality" on any society is an artificial albeit hopeful attempt at crafting an ultimately infeasible utopia. In actual practice there never are equal rights. Better to recognize this rather than pretend otherwise. Also, empowering the majority of a given population is unwise as it leads to dispersion of political authority, thereby leading to political deadlock. Polybius discusses this at length.

Malcolm wrote:

You clearly have no idea what equal rights are. As soon as you lose yours, you will want them back.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 7:13 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Simon E. said:

I think your thinking on this issue is poorly formed and curiously immature, as well as lacking empathy and compassion Indrajala.

But I think you have the right to express it.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, has a total right to make himself look like an idiot. Maybe he can get a gig as fox news pet buddhist monk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 7:08 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Clarence said:

Yes, Knotty, I find Indrajala's comments rather hateful and ignorant. And, truth be told, I don't know whether I agree with providing him a platform for his hate-speech.

Indrajala said:

It is not hate speech nor is it hateful. I want what is best for western societies, and I feel the state sanctioning same sex marriages will lead to many unnecessary problems down the road.

If you disagree with me, fine, but no need to advocate censorship of opinions you find disagreeable.

Malcolm wrote:

You are advocating repression, that is why people find your speech hateful.

Like all bigots, you have no rational basis for your claims. You might as well be saying that Christians should not marry Jews.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What they think has no bearing on western secular morals. This is not a religious question, it is a social and civil rights question.

Indrajala said:

Buddhists are still nevertheless a voice in the development of social policies, and most Buddhists are still Asian.

Malcolm wrote:

And that is completely irrelevant in the West.

Indrajala said:

A religious voice still has the right to be heard even in secular society, assuming of course that society is democratic.

Malcolm wrote:

A right to speak is not a right to be heard.



Buddhists in the West play virtually no role in the development of social policies.

To the extent that they do so, we are well represented by enlightened leaders like His Holiness.

Enjoy your bastions of reactionary conservatism, but they too will undergo transformation as the forces of market liberalization inevitably change their cultures from social authoritarianism and conformism to democracy, individualism and personal choice. It is funny, your ability to choose to become a monk is based on your being raised in a liberal free market society, but you instead choose anti-democratic, authoritarian elitism.

The funny thing about US conservatism is that the very thing that they proclaim to love the most (free markets) is the very thing that is bringing on the social changes they most detest (gay marriage, etc.).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is the same with abortion. Since arguments against abortion are all grounded on religious issues, and we have no right to legislate those types of religious beliefs, while I personally do not believe abortion is ethical, I understand that my belief is religious and is not a sound reason to deny others who have different beliefs than myself.

Indrajala said:

Your view here is highly problematic. You could just as well argue against abortion in the same way you could argue against corporal punishment for children: it is intentionally harming a living human being.

Malcolm wrote:

My view is not problematical at all. Courts in the US have defined that human life begins at 19 weeks. I don't agree with them, but we live in a secular society, and there are many people who for their own reasons also adopt this view. Since my view is religious, and it cannot be shown that a fetus prior to 19 weeks is "human" under current law, my hands are tied, as are yours. The standard in a secular society is secular, not religious. I prefer to live in a secular society, even though it may disadvantage some of my personal religious views, in general it assures the freedom that I can practice my religion as I see fit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your concerns are not about Asian Buddhist communities, you declared they were about western societies. As such, they are outlandish and out of touch.

Indrajala said:

So, what Asian Buddhist communities might think is not relevant to Buddhists in western society?

Malcolm wrote:

What they think has no bearing on western secular morays. This is not a religious question, it is a social and civil rights question. It is the same with abortion. Since arguments against abortion are all grounded on religious issues, and we have no right to legislate those types of religious beliefs, while I personally do not believe abortion is ethical, I understand that my belief is religious and is not a sound reason to deny others who have different beliefs than myself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your "concerns" about gay marriage could be construed in a number of ways, because they are so outlandish and out of touch.

Indrajala said:

What I would say on the subject would be considered quite reasonable and common sense in Asian Buddhist communities.

Malcolm wrote:

Your concerns are not about Asian Buddhist communities, you declared they were about western societies. As such, they are outlandish and out of touch.

In short, there is no morally defensible reason that a state should bar gay people from being married. As long as states are in the business of licensing marriages, I am quite sure that western countries will continue to legalize marriage for gay men and women, as they should.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

However, marriage was still understood as between men and women with the goal of

producing children.

Malcolm wrote:

As pointed out, then infertile woman and sterile men should be barred from entering the social contract of marriage.

In reality, marriage is not purely about raising children. It is a social contract between two adults who wish to foster and protect each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

homophobia, like anti-semitism, is a pretty reliable marker for incipient or full-blown mental illness, or at least untreatable mental retardation.

Indrajala said:

So, instead of addressing people's genuine concerns you just write them off as signs of mental illness?

Malcolm wrote:

Your "concerns" about gay marriage could be construed in a number of ways, because they are so outlandish and out of touch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just more proof that celibate clergy have nothing useful to say about how the rest of us live, in general.

Indrajala said:

By this logic, the Buddha had nothing useful to say about how to live. He indeed told people in detail how to live their lives for the best.

Malcolm wrote:

I qualified it, with an "in general". And you are not the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Connection of Guru Rinpoche and Marpa the Translator

Content:

dzoki said:

Gampopa was also originally a nyingma practitioner

Berry said:

Gampopa was a doctor and then a Kadampa monk before meeting Milarepa.

<https://www.kagyu.org/kagyulineage/lineage/kag06.php>

.

Malcolm wrote:

As a young man, Gampopa was a Nyingma practitioner; he became a monk because of the death of his wife.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Doesn't change the fact that white-supremacist-influenced western governments & Zionist-influenced governments have had a penchant for bombing Semites and other melanated people. Plus we couldn't say that there isn't a significant Semitic or mixed-Semitic population within Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Malcolm wrote:

Zionists (Israelis) are Semites.

The US government is hardly "white supremacist". We have a black president, for lord's sake.

And no, the Afghanis and Pashtuns, etc., are not significantly mixed with people of Arabic heritage.

I am afraid you have some very racist ideas.

Anyway, this is off topic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I don't dispute that it CAN be a "Buddhist act." I'm just not sure each individual immolation is a Buddhist Act. Would be hard to know that, in any case....

As for it "working," I myself am not so sure. For the sake of Tibetans, I hope so. Out here in California, though, two towns or cities were considering flying the PRC flag --and were shocked by the volume of "hate mail" they got by Pro-Tibetan/Anti-PRC people. If the "Powers that Be" in the Bay Area don't seem to be "in the loop," not sure.....

Malcolm wrote:

Well, they were probably smoking too much herb and forgot...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

...anti-semitism, is a pretty reliable marker for incipient or full-blown mental illness, or at least untreatable mental retardation.

Lhug-Pa said:

Yes there are very many mentally ill anti-Semites in the west, seeing how the west likes to repeatedly bomb Semites e.g. Iraqis, Pakistanis, Afghanis, Palestinians, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Pakistanis and Afghanis are not semitic peoples.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...where Assad started using them against his own folks

Lhug-Pa said:

How so/in what way?

Malcolm wrote:

By gassing them...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Malcolm,

While I'm interested in learning more about the apparent oppression of Kurdish Yezidis, I'm not so quick to buy everything about Saddam Hussein supposedly "gassing the Kurds". If he did gas them and/or in the way they say he did, then I'm certainly against it. It's just that we would have to look at it more before jumping to conclusions. It looks like "Assad gassing his own people" and "Yanukovich sniping his own people" turned out to be BS; and they never found Iraq's "weapons of mass destruction" so that makes most of the rest of the west's allegations very questionable.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because Hussein moved them to Syria, where Assad started using them against his own folks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think that the self-immolations are happening, in general, because of aversion. They are happening because of the Mahāyāna ethics these young men and woman are trained under.

It is not like the suicide bombings, which are, where they occur, part of a calculated plan of terror. These are not terrorist acts in any sense.

conebeckham said:

I agree they're not terrorist acts. But I question whether Mahayana ethics, or emotional frustration, are the cause.

How can we say what the motivation is?

As I mentioned earlier in this thread, I've spent a fair amount of time with younger Tibetans...I sense frustration, anger, and a host of emotions. I can't say these are the drivers for the monks who have self-immolated, but....I've spent time with young Tibetan monks as well, and I see the same emotions in them, when Tibetan political issues are raised.

Malcolm wrote:

But not all the immolations are by young Tibetans. Many were in their thirties, even forties. There are 24 who were under 18.

I am not saying the motivations of all are the same. But I am saying that we cannot condemn them as terrorists, nor should we understand their acts as violating Mahāyāna buddhist ethics since ample sources for "offering the body" can be found in those sources. Remember, Karma Chagme offered his thumb as a lamp. The act of self-immolation, as near as I can tell, is meant to dramatically shine a lamp on the plight of Tibetans in the TAR and outside it. I think it is working.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Jeff,

You seem to be alternating between the notions of "history" and "nature" as your explanatory mechanisms for why gay marriage is supposed to be so dangerous. These two are not equivalent. History is rooted in any number of contingencies, and not all societies evolved an institution of marriage that is anything like that of the West in terms of a nuclear family. In many societies the role of biological father is negligible. In many societies divorce was acceptable and recognition of which could amount to as little as throwing a man's belongings out of the dwelling or a public statement to that effect. This brings us to the next point, which is that any notion of what is natural is quite contentious. Is the nuclear family the natural way of raising children? Is the traditional Mayan way of children being the primary caregivers of children natural? Is the Trobriander way of mother's brother being the most important educator of children instead of the biological father unnatural? Your readings have provided you with a focus on state level societies. Are states natural or historically contingent?

You really ought to brush up on the kinship literature from the past 40 years.

Malcolm wrote:

Just more proof that celibate clergy have nothing useful to say about how the rest of us live, in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That just simply isn't true. You clearly have not studied this issue with any care.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Two-Spirit>

Allan Tulchin, "Same-Sex Couples Creating Households in Old Regime France: The Uses of the Affrèment." Journal of Modern History: September 2007

You really are just broadcasting Christian values.

Indrajala said:

Not exactly gay marriage as it is understood now.

I am not broadcasting Christian values. Good luck finding sufficient numbers of Buddhists and Buddhist clergy in Asia who will actively support gay marriage in their countries.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are broadcasting Christian values.

Marriage is exactly about creating households, sharing property and raising children. Gay people do so just as effectively/or not as heterosexual people. Making gay marriage legal means recognizing that all people have the right to make households regardless of their gender orientation. There is nothing magical about dicks and pussies in combination that makes heterosexual people better parents than dicks and dicks or pussies and pussies. To suggest that parenting ability boils down to some magical social recipe about "MArriage is between one man and one women" is backwards redneck thinking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Gay marriage is hardly a "cosmic" issue. It is simply a civil rights issue.

Indrajala said:

It is a deviation from all historical norms.

.

Malcolm wrote:

That just simply isn't true. You clearly have not studied this issue with any care.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Two-Spirit>

Allan Tulchin, "Same-Sex Couples Creating Households in Old Regime France: The



Uses of the Affrèment." Journal of Modern History: September 2007

The political ideologies, philosophies, and religions of ancient China regarded homosexual relationships as a normal facet of life, and in some cases, promoted homosexual relationships as exemplary. Ming Dynasty literature, such as Bian Er Chai (弁而釵/弁而钗), portray homosexual relationships between men as more enjoyable and more "harmonious" than heterosexual relationships.[10] As in Ancient Rome, homosexual relationships were prevalent in ancient China and were not regarded as morally deviant prior to the influence of foreign cultures. Writings from the Liu Song Dynasty claimed that homosexuality was as common as heterosexuality in the late 3rd century:

All the gentlemen and officials esteemed it. All men in the realm followed this fashion to the extent that husbands and wives were estranged. Resentful unmarried women became jealous.[1]

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality\\_in\\_China#cite\\_ref-Cut\\_Sleeve\\_1992\\_p.\\_170\\_2-0](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality_in_China#cite_ref-Cut_Sleeve_1992_p._170_2-0)

You really are just broadcasting Christian values.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are not Asian and you never will be: you are hairy, uncouth, and you smell bad.

Indrajala said:

I was unaware you've been sneaking into my bedroom at night and thus know the state of my body odour and body hair!

Malcolm wrote:

No, I look at your face book page. Anyway, my point is that while you may fantasize about being "Asian" (as if there is a generic "Asian"), you will never be accepted as anything other than Westerner with pretensions. Being a monk might make it a little easier for you. But for all that in Japan you will still be Gaijin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

There are principles in time and the cosmos that must be considered, observed and followed lest you suffer for it.

Malcolm wrote:

Gay marriage hardly something that so contravenes the cosmic order as to cause a breach in the space/time continuum.

Gay marriage is hardly a "cosmic" issue. It is simply a civil rights issue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Seishin said:

And most of those "non-western" societies are ruled by dictators

Lhug-Pa said:

As if the western leaders are shining examples of justice and morality? Yea right.

Indrajala said:

That's actually a good point. Plenty of people lament a lack of gay marriage rights, yet still pay taxes to their government which routinely murders civilians in foreign countries.

Malcolm wrote:

We have too. Just because we don't condone the acts of this of that branche of our government does not mean that we are free not to pay taxes. It is a legal requirement than we must.

Indrajala said:

Meanwhile countries that mind their own business usually while also dismissing any idea of gay marriage are damned as dictatorships or simply dismissed as not worthy of consideration.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, like Russia, for example?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are not Asian, you are a Canadian.

Indrajala said:

That's just what my passport says.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not Asian and you never will be: you are hairy, uncouth, and you smell bad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

\\

As Indrajala said Iraq was a functioning country

Malcolm wrote:

If gassing Kurds and terrorism is your idea of "functioning".

Lhug-Pa said:

Libya was a functioning country

Malcolm wrote:

Sure...

Lhug-Pa said:

At least Putin apparently stopped the west from murdering the "evil dictator" Assad.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh yes, another very stable person, not a psychopath at all....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your penchant for authoritarianism has been noted already.

That hardly makes you a conservative.

Indrajala said:

Maybe not in America.

I'm in Asia.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not Asian, you are a Canadian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Seishin said:

And most of those "non-western" societies are ruled by dictators - no coincidence.

Indrajala said:

I would rather live in a safe autocratic state than an unsafe democracy.

Malcolm wrote:

Your penchant for authoritarianism has been noted already.

That hardly makes you a conservative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can make an argument against the propagation of Buddhism too. Buddhism will cause the degradation of social cohesion in say, "florida". Therefore, it should not be allowed there.

Indrajala said:

The introduction of a foreign religion on a small scale is hardly comparable to unprecedented legal reforms that most people will feel strongly about one way or another.

Malcolm wrote:

Plain and simple -- denying adult gay people to right to marry each other is violation of their civil rights because it causes all kinds of inequalities and because it unfairly advantages heterosexual couples.

Marriage is a social contract between two people to share property, inheritance, taxes, etc.

There are no sound secular reasons not to oppose marriage among, none at all. You have not come up with even one convincing argument.

There are no reasons at all to oppose gay marriage from a Buddhist perspective.

The only reasons to oppose it is because one subscribes to Judeo-Christian/Islamic values.

By even bring up opposition to the subject, you just make yourself look like an

anachronistic idiot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

In the coming decades as the west declines...

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

It is different in the case of bodhisattva-oriented approaches which require one to actively engage in society for the welfare of it.

Seishin said:

And in what way will homosexual marriage degrade the welfare of society? Help me out here because I really can't see anything wrong with it.

Indrajala said:

One example is how it will draw lines between those who support and oppose it, thus degrading asabiya (social cohesion needed for unity and cooperation).

Malcolm wrote:

So if most everyone supports it, there is no degradation of social cohesion, correct?

You can make an argument against the propagation of Buddhism too. Buddhism will cause the degradation of social cohesion in say, "florida". Therefore, it should not be allowed there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

and pedophilia...

Indrajala said:

The solution to that is simple: only admit adults of their own free will into monasteries.

Malcolm wrote:

But "celibate" priests who are pedophiles prey on children in their congregations, not on children in monasteries...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Religious professionals generally make it their job to do so. Becoming a religious professional has about the lowest entry requirements of any job there is. Even flipping burgers takes more skill.

Indrajala said:

If that's a personal attack against me, well, I'll send anyone my CV who wants to see it.

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that having a religious opinion takes no brains or particular set of skills, and it is religious professionals who typically have the most to say on such issues, who are actually often the least qualified to do so. My point is that by adopting such platforms, you are just painting yourself in with a lot of very stupid people.

I don't think Buddhist monks have any business being in the "who can marry who" business. There are no Buddhist wedding rituals, etc. There is no sustained support of heterosexual marriage in Buddhist texts, no condemnation of homosexuality (just orifices), and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

Historically having celibate monastic orders has worked well on varying levels, particularly with respect to inheritance and the transfer of land assets especially...

Malcolm wrote:

and pedophilia...

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:37 AM  
Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK  
Content:

Knotty Veneer said:  
Stop trying to tell other people how to live.

Malcolm wrote:  
Religious professionals generally make it their job to do so. Becoming a religious professional has about the lowest entry requirements of any job there is. Even flipping burgers takes more skill.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:36 AM  
Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK  
Content:

Indrajala said:  
Homosexual marriage is seen as undesirable by many people, yet they keep silent for fear of being condemned for their opinions.

Malcolm wrote:  
Yes, many religious people fear the idea out of superstition.

It is of course a stupid thing to fear.

Indrajala said:  
Japan and China are very secular societies nowadays, but don't have any inclination towards gay marriage.

There plenty of non-religious people in the west as well who are not keen on the idea.

Malcolm wrote:  
They have nothing to lose but their bias.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:30 AM  
Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?  
Content:

Simon E. said:  
Again I disagree.  
Attempting to force a change of behaviour from a political entity or an individual by threatening to kill oneself in a particularly horrible way is I believe an act of terrorism, even when we agree with the aims of the actor.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think they are making threats, Simon. It is not like these people write a letter and say "This is my list of demands", etc.

I don't think it is terrorism at all. I think it is the opposite, it is a response to terrorism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

Homosexual marriage is seen as undesirable by many people, yet they keep silent for fear of being condemned for their opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, many religious people fear the idea out of superstition.

It is of course a stupid thing to fear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

" Everything is unreal "

-- Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

You have 'everything' - reality. Then you have the nature of that everything - unreal.

This is the simple point that is being made.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not the point that is being made.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Indrajala said:

One other fact about gay marriage that is overlooked is that it will divide a lot of countries and reduce asabiya (i.e., social cohesion) at a time when the west is faltering



and facing enormous problems.

Malcolm wrote:

Total nonsense. Anyway, you are a monk. What do you really care?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That's because there is no such a thing as a "traditional family". This is a Western Christian suburban white myth.

Indrajala said:

Nonsense.

In my grandfather's generation most families were made up of a married man and wife plus their children. His father's generation was more or less the same.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, white Christians in the west.

Indrajala said:

Well there's a generalization bordering on being bigoted.

Malcolm wrote:

Seen it in person, Japan, China etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So that reality that appears, when it's nature is known, is the accomplishment. Wisdom and reality in the end are not different.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed, so why are neither of us Buddhas?

Because we may have an intellectual grasp of the subject, but we are not realized. So we both have some work to do, at least I do.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I would speculate that whilst you might know alot about the mind, you don't really know that much about life.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that you constantly resort to ad hominem remarks?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

There is a growing acceptance in the population at large of homosexual relationships and non-traditional families.

Indrajala said:

In many places there is growing intolerance of advocates for traditional families and conservative values.

Malcolm wrote:

That's because there is no such a thing as a "traditional family". This is a Western Christian suburban white myth.

Indrajala said:

As jeeprs noted, homophobic is basically equated to being bigoted nowadays. If you voice opposition to gay marriage, you're sometimes associated with racism and even slavery because you are denying "equal rights" to all persons, just as racist social arrangements and slavery does/did. Fortunately in most Asian countries such ideas have not gained much mainstream attention or consideration.

Malcolm wrote:

Asian countries are often quite racist.

Indrajala said:

If you legalize gay marriage because its advocates claim there is a human rights

infringement occurring, then it sets a legal precedent for many other fringe groups to do the same whether you want to admit this immediately or not.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it doesn't. But on other hand, I see no problem with polyandry, polygamy and so on.

Indrajala said:

I do not equate homosexuality to pedophilia (I have nothing against homosexuality itself), but what is to stop pedophiles from claiming a human rights infringement based on the fact their lifestyle is presently criminal?

Malcolm wrote:

They can claim whatever they like, but in general, it is considered criminal to have sex with children and minors. I don't see this changing any time soon.

[/quote]

So, on that point, sticking with good old fashioned heterosexual values ain't so bad. They might be unfair to some people, but longstanding social values have the advantage of having been demonstratively effective, past and present.[/quote]

Right, good old fashioned western Christian heterosexual values.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

Simon E. said:

I disagree completely Malcolm. I think its an expression of a pathology which forms part of the complex web that is the legacy of the Subcontinent. I think fear of sex is part of that legacy, as more distantly are suicide bombings.

Burning yourself to death because of aversion to what is, is a greater act of aggression than becoming a Muslim martyr, because more subtle and more capable of provoking moral ambivalence.

Or so it seems to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans are hardly afraid of sex. In fact, they are rather more practical about it then we are.

I don't think that the self-immolations are happening, in general, because of aversion. They are happening because of the Mahāyāna ethics these young men and woman are trained under.

It is not like the suicide bombings, which are, where they occur, part of a calculated plan of terror. These are not terrorist acts in any sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

alpha said:

But still , the basis is individual for each condition ,whether we speak of humans, hungry ghosts, formless or such...And each respective condition represents in its totality the basis of that particular condition.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis represents the potentiality of each sentient being. That potentiality can be parsed a number of ways — for example, in Dzogchen texts it says "At the time of the basis, the three kāyas are dharmakāya; at the time of the path, the three kāyas are the sambhogakāya, and the time of the result, the three kāyas are the nirmanakāya". The essential point here is that the the continuum of the basis is the nature of the mind free from extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Self-Immolation: an anti-Buddhist practice?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Cabazon wrote a good and thoughtful article on the subject:

[http://www.religiondispatches.org/archive/politics/7126/on\\_the\\_ethics\\_of\\_the\\_tibetan\\_self\\_immolations\\_/](http://www.religiondispatches.org/archive/politics/7126/on_the_ethics_of_the_tibetan_self_immolations_/)

Personally, when it first began happening I thought it fruitless and sad. Now, over the years, I have come to see that this form of protest is much superior to violent protest around the world. It is still sad, but I think that such acts being done out of love and caring for Dharma, and not just because Tibetans are being oppressed. Indeed, the whole phenomena is grounded in the notions of offering one's body for the sake of the enlightenment of others. In the article Cabazon recalls several examples, not least among them, the Buddha's own sacrifice of his body at Namo Buddha during his last human lifetime as the bodhisattva. He quotes a one writer, Jigmey who was sentenced to five years for publishing the following:

The Beijing government claims that the act of self-cremation, or the burning of one's body, contradicts the Buddhist texts, but this is a confused position. According to Buddhism, giving up one's life for the welfare of others is an act of a bodhisattva. One can know this from the biography of the compassionate Buddha himself. Before he was enlightened, the future Buddha came across a tigress and her cubs. They were on the

verge of starving to death. Unable to bear their suffering, he sacrificed his own body as food for the tigress. That act of protecting the life of the tigress and her two cubs by giving up his own life is the central theme of many contemporary religious writings; it is widely known. When one reaches the highest level of Mahāyāna practice—that of “the being of great scope”—one is able to give up everything one possesses for the welfare of sentient beings. For example, if it is necessary, one is able to spend many hundreds of millions of years in hell just for the sake of a single sentient being... For all of these reasons giving up one’s own life for the sake of sentient beings or for the sake of one’s own people does not contradict the Buddhist teachings. Not only does it not contradict them, it is actually a tenet of the Mahāyāna; it is a most excellent doctrine. Hence, no one who is informed about these matters would claim that it contradicts Buddhism—no one, that is, except confused government officials and their lackeys.

Of course some will debate the effectiveness of such actions from a cynical real politick perspective, but in my view, the actions of bodhisattvas grounded in Mahāyāna motivation will always outshine such cynicism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So formless realm beings have a body, speech and mind?

alpha said:

Obviously not but I thought we are talking about the basis of the human condition ?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the continuum of the basis is talking about the basis of all sentient beings, not just human beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

I am saying every one of us has a base. All the bases are identical to one another.

Although each base has a knowing aspect, I prefer not to use the word 'mind' to refer to the base.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed, all of this language concerning "the basis" comes from a passage in the Guhyasamaja uttaratantra. The continuum of the basis, since this is the reference, refers to the nature of the mind, which when recognized leads to buddhahood and when not, leads to samsara.

People get so hung up on the use of the word mind, consciousness and so on. Well, just look at these words: shes pa (jñā), rnam shes (vijñāna), shes rab (prajñā) and ye shes (jñāna). What do they all have in common? "shes". "Shes" just means "to know". If you say the basis is ye shes, that wisdom is a knower.

In any case, the commentary of the sgra thal 'gyur clearly maintains that ye shes is encompassed by a shes pa, and that shes pa exists individually in all buddhas and sentient beings as a mere knower (shes tsam).

We can conclude from this then that the basis (which really is strictly a man ngag sde term) is just a name for the continuum of the nature of the mind.

The extent to which it is unconditioned is the extent to which no one made the mind "clear and empty", the mind has been clear and empty from the very start. Thus the resting in the unfabricated mind, the unconditioned mind, is resting in that nature of the mind (inseparable clarity and emptiness) which cannot be altered or modified in anyway at all no matter what appears in it/to it(hence the mirror metaphor). You can't make it better, you can't make it worse.

We say that the nature of the mind in this sense is unconditioned because no one made it, it does not have a beginning, it cannot be altered or changed. You cannot take the clarity of the mind and make it unclear. You cannot take the emptiness of the mind and make the mind substantial.

The mind can have various experiences, suffering, happiness, affliction, purification, thus we can also say that the mind is conditioned. It is also momentary, its continuity is not substantial, it is a continuum of moments, thus it is conditioned.

Once again, we have a conditioned entity, dharmin, the mind, that has an unconditioned nature, dharmatā, the inseparability of clarity and emptiness.

The mind is not merely clear, for then it would be only conditioned. It is not merely empty, since then it would be non-existent. The unconditioned nature of the mind is the inseparability of clarity and emptiness. There is no teaching in Buddhism about the mind and the nature of the mind that goes beyond this.

When we understand the principles above, we understand the union of the two truths, we understand the continuum of the basis, Dzogchen, etc.

When it comes to Dzogchen teachings, it is crucial to understand that the differences between wisdom, shes pa and rnam shes, for example, are all based on the anatomy of the human body, and the modalities of our consciousness as embodied beings.

If we say that wisdom, for example, is beyond mind, does that mean that wisdom is inert, like a rock or a statue? No, it just means that wisdom transcends the operations of the restricted consciousness of ordinary beings, wisdom is a consciousness that has less

restrictions. What is the basis for the freedom of wisdom? The pure clarity and emptiness of the mind, of course.

We do not have a refined vocabulary in English for discussing consciousness and its different modalities. But indeed, that is what Dzogchen as well Buddhist texts in general are talking about, i.e., consciousness and its various modalities, unawakened and awakened.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

I prefer not to use the word 'mind' to refer to the base.

jeeprs said:

Can you suggest another word?

alpha said:

Three words actually: body, voice and mind.

Which is to say all phenomena pure and impure are inseparable in the nature of the basis. And in this way nothing is left out. But while in the knowledge of the basis there are no such distinctions.

Malcolm wrote:

So formless realm beings have a body, speech and mind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

What I was saying if you read my post carefully is that production from conditions or dependent existence is only possible if bhava (something permanent) is not involved. That is why it makes sense for the Buddha to talk about dependent origination. Nagarjuna's dependent existence is defined on something permanent.

Nagarjuna did not exclude dependent existence based on something impermanent.

It is because that dependent existence is based on something impermanent that talking about reification makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that Nāgārjuna explicitly refutes dependent existence. I don't know why it is so hard for you to accept this. If there is no bhāva, there is no existence.

Therefore, there cannot be dependent existence since existence is rejected out of hand by Nāgārjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever has a view of inherent existence, dependent existence, existence or non-existence has not comprehended the intent of the Buddha", which is of course production from conditions, relatively speaking.

jeeprs said:

I really do understand that, but the title of the thread is 'unfabricated mind'. So the implication in that is 'mind' is not among those things which are fabricated, conditioned, and so forth. That is the meaning of the word Mind, capital-M, as in the One Mind, is it not? Isn't that why you frequently read about the importance of 'knowing Mind' in books from Tibetan sources?

Malcolm wrote:

No. There is no "one mind" in Tibetan Buddhism. "Unfabricated" simply means a mind that resides in its own nature (empty clarity) without being contaminated with conceptuality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

But production from conditions to me is another way of saying dependent existence where the dependent existence is not based off a permanent essence (bhava).

Nagarjuna's definition of dependent existence is production that is based off something permanent. This is a crucial difference in our take.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that your take is realist because it involves "existence" (bhāva, sat, asti, etc.).

Nagarjuna's take is based on the idea that something supports something else, not that something is permanent. The śrāvaka schools conceived of things that existed and were also impermanent. They too had an idea of dependent existence. That idea is precisely the idea that Nāgārjuna is criticizing both in the first chapter as well as the chapter 15 of the MMK. There is a vast difference between saying "productions from conditions",



which is merely a convention, and "dependent existence" which requires inherency.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 8:58 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have no problem with dependent origination, this is the Buddha's teaching. I have a problem with dependent existence. If something exists, it does not need to depend on anything.

Sherab said:

So existence to you is restricted to independent existence. Therefore any other form of existence cannot carry the meaning of existence.

I am more liberal in my definition of existence. This is because without that more liberal space, scientific investigations make no sense. However, I do think that the more liberal meaning of existence will come to a head at some point.

Malcolm wrote:

All forms of existence carry the meaning of independent existence, that is Nāgārjuna's whole point. That is why he asks the question "where is there bhāva not included in svabhāva or parabhāva?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If something exists, it does not need to depend on anything.

jeeprs said:

For instance? What exists that does not depend on anything?

Malcolm wrote:

That's the point, one cannot find such a thing, therefore, as Nāgārjuna points out, Whoever has a view of inherent existence, dependent existence, existence or non-existence has not comprehended the intent of the Buddha", which is of course production from conditions, relatively speaking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Therefore, it still make sense to talk about ...dependent existence

Malcolm wrote:

Not to me.

Sherab said:

This was what I said:

Therefore, it still make sense to talk about dependent origination, or dependent existence ... up to a point.

I noticed you left out "dependent origination" and "up to a point". Why?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no problem with dependent origination, this is the Buddha's teaching. I have a problem with dependent existence. If something exist, it does not need to depend on anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: Discussion of Political Topics is Wrong Speech

Content:

tobes said:

i.e. an argument of the kind: that all speech is ignorance.

Malcolm wrote:

But that is clearly not the case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

From Keown's "Buddhism and Bioethics": The sources are describing, using the concepts available to them, the origin of new human life. This was understood conceptually as the point from which all subsequent development proceeds, and before which no material basis for individual life exists. Translating these requirement into modern terms we would have every reason to locate the descent of the intermediate being at fertilisation. Before this time there is no genetic individual, and after it one has come into being. All subsequent developments in the history of the

individual in the present life, including implantation, can be traced back to this point but not beyond it. It is difficult to wish for a clearer point of origin, and fertilisation seems by far the most likely candidate for the point at which new life begins.

Malcolm wrote:

This is when a new body is appropriated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

What about the old story of how plants as tall as humans have devas in them?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is like a human moving into a house. You would not say that house had a mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Appropriate means that while in the bardo a being [gandharva] has the karmic causes and conditions to take certain kinds of birth, so they cluster at these birth places "like flies on rotten meat" as one Dzogchen tantra puts it.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, do these gandharvas have material bodies? I guess I don't really understand how they go to the fertilized ovum, in the case of human birth, say, and what they actually do to "appropriate" it. Don't Buddhists hold that life begins at conception?

Malcolm wrote:

They have mental bodies, mind made bodies. In the case of womb birth, when the sperm, egg and bardo being come together, there is conception. This all clearly explained in Abhidharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

...even though all phenomena appear as mind, appearance itself is the nature of the enlightenment of the Buddhas."/i]

Malcolm wrote:

This is also the point of view of anuttarayoga tantras. But it is not a method. It's a view.

Sherlock said:

So isn't Atiyoga the only path that actually turns that view into a method?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not. This is why, for example, before even embarking on the creation stage, one meditates the on the view in Lamdre.

The purpose of the creation stage to recognize that all phenomena are nothing other than the wisdom of buddhahood.

If you respond this is the view of tregchö, the reason thögal criticizes tregchö is that with tregchö one remains in a state of impure vision. With tregchö and other kinds of Dzogchen practice this view, "all phenomena are nothing other than the wisdom of buddhahood", remains a conceptual view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of a physical body, it must be large enough to accommodate at least the most rudimentary sense organs. Not sure we can include sponges, etc. I think we would have to set the limit at Eumetazoa.

"Sentient" means able to feel.

Sherlock said:

Didn't you post some links about how plants can feel and respond to stimuli too?

Malcolm wrote:

The question is whether this merely biomechanics or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

...even though all phenomena appear as mind, appearance itself is the nature of the enlightenment of the Buddhas."[/i]

Malcolm wrote:

This is also the point of view of anuttarayoga tantras. But it is not a method. It's a view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Sentient" means able to feel.

odysseus said:

So I guess I´m wrong about cognizing. But what about cessation of feeling? One is still sentient?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by "feeling", even Buddhas have feeling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sperm is not sentient.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Then how can it be attracted to the egg?

.  
.   
.

Malcolm wrote:

It isn't. There is no sentience in a sperm to be attracted to it. Impregnation is strictly biomechanics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

odysseus said:

But ultimately, these organisms have no autonomy. It´s attraction/reaction by inherent physical properties to be blunt.

Then you have to determine at what point the multiplication of cells acquire autonomy. Otherwise, even a complex human is merely driven by chemical interactions

(and of course, much of what we experience is. The question then becomes, 'who is experiencing the chemical interactions, such as a particular molecule, as an emotion of fear or joy.)

Also, I am not suggesting that this is a voluntary action.

A sperm doesn't think, "Well, I could swim to that egg, or I could just stay home and watch TV"

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

Sperm is not sentient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is possible for a mind to appropriate the body of a very simple creature. But I do not think that a mind will appropriate the body of a single cell organism.

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, about how many cells do you reckon make a being big enough for a mind to appropriate?

Also, since it is a common beginner's exercise to "try to find where in the body the mind is"

(the answer being that the mind cannot be found anywhere in the body)

--the notion that a mind requires so many cells is absurd.

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of a physical body, it must be large enough to accommodate at least the most rudimentary sense organs. Not sure we can include sponges, etc. I think we would have to set the limit at Eumetazoa.

"Sentient" means able to feel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't, its not part of the Tibetan canon. To give a classic reply, "we don't read that sutra".

Indrajala said:

There are plenty of Indian texts that are not present in the Tibetan canon yet extant in Chinese translation. Why base your beliefs about canonical texts on whether or not they are included in the Tibetan canon rather than, by your own suggestion, judging them on their own merits rather than, say, their ethnic origins?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't base my beliefs about canonicity by what is included in the Tibetan canon. I just pay don't much attention to books I cannot read in Tibetan or English. Plus I practice within a very specific tradition, and that is where my interests lie. I am not much interested what lies outside it. So, there may be fantastic sutras and sashtras in Chinese, but for the most part they don't present anything that is not present in what we have in Tibetan already. As far as the Brahma Net sutra goes, I don't need it, so I don't use it. And I don't pay it any mind. If someone tells me I need to practice the bodhisattva path according to it, I reply, it is not part of my tradition. In general, I don't even pay that much attention to the Yogacara system of bodhisattva vows. The system I follow is the Madhyamaka system.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Therefore, it still make sense to talk about ...dependent existence

Malcolm wrote:

Not to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't reject it, I just don't regard it as an improvement over Indian Mahāyāna vow literature so I don't feel the need to extend it some special status. I understand its importance in Chinese Buddhism, it is irrelevant to me however.

Indrajala said:

Supposing you consider it canonical (i.e., you don't reject it), how can it be irrelevant to you?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't, its not part of the Tibetan canon. To give a classic reply, "we don't read that sutra".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is possible for a mind to appropriate the body of a very simple creature. But I do not think that a mind will appropriate the body of a single cell organism.

dzogchungpa said:

The questions of what kind of thing can be "appropriated" by a mind, and what "appropriate" means in this context are kind of interesting to me. Does the tradition have anything to say about this?

Malcolm wrote:

There are four kinds birth:

moisture/heat birth — this means insects and invertebrates primarily

egg birth — this means reptiles, birds, amphibians and fish

womb birth — humans and other mammals

apparitional birth — devas, pretas and hell beings.

Appropriate means that while in the bardo a being [gandharva] has the karmic causes and conditions to take certain kinds of birth, so they cluster at these birth places "like flies on rotten meat" as one Dzogchen tantra puts it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I keep on stressing that what is most important about all Buddhist texts is not where they are from, but rather, what they say.

Indrajala said:

Didn't you some time ago state you reject the Brahma Net Sūtra because it has its origins in China?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't reject it, I just don't regard it as an improvement over Indian Mahāyāna vow literature so I don't feel the need to extend it some special status. I understand its importance in Chinese Buddhism, it is irrelevant to me however.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can remove all the limbs of a body, but you will never cut the mind. You can cut the brain stem, but brains are not sentient. When you cut the brain stem, the heart stops, the body dies and the stream of consciousness appropriates a new body.

PadmaVonSamba said:

In that case, a single-cell organism would be sufficient for the arising of awareness.

You are saying it's not, because of certain factors that a single cell organism lacks, and then you say those same factors are not dependent on the very thing a single-cell organism lacks.

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

It is possible for a mind to appropriate the body of a very simple creature. But I do not think that a mind will appropriate the body of a single cell organism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

What I am getting at is that ultimately the experiencer,  
illusory as it may be,  
is merely a complex development of this "basic awareness"

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "basic" awareness apart from the awareness of a mind. Awareness is a quality of a mind, not the other way around.

A mind and a body may have the same relationship as a flower and its scent, it may be conceived to circulate around the body on the horse of vāyu and so on; but in the end the body is just a container for the mind.

You can remove all the limbs of a body, but you will never cut the mind. You can cut the brain stem, but brains are not sentient. When you cut the brain stem, the heart stops,

the body dies and the stream of consciousness appropriates a new body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

My point is that if the teachings work, their origin can not be sociopolitical pressure. This is simple cause and effect. And if sociopolitical pressure was involved when describing the lineage, you most certainly could have created a better and more solid lineage. Of course a 1000 years later it is difficult to say what actually happened and what was a vision, a dream or whatever.

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that Buddhist ritualism. such as mandala drawing, fire pujas, etc., is clearly a response to socio-political pressure.

Buddhist practice whether sutra or tantra, still has the same progression through the five paths, six perfections, ten stages, 37 adjuncts of awakening, whether they are described one by one in the Abhidharmakosha or are presented symbolically in the form of the thirty seven goddesses of the Vajrayogini mandala and so on.

heart said:

I believe the 17 tantras reappeared in the 11th century. Maybe some parts were edited and added to but I have no doubt they are genuine teachings originally taught in the samboghkaya dimension for those mahasiddhas capable to take teachings there. Thanks to ChNNR is got a pretty clear picture of how this could happen. That is all.

Malcolm wrote:

I have spoken about this with ChNN personally. One day we were discussing the text of the Kalacakra tantra. He stopped us abruptly to emphasize the point that the text of the tantra was not the tantra itself. The tantra itself was the Kalacakra mandala experienced by a Mahāsiddha. The text was something relative, composed by a person, subject to editing, emendation and so on, a text written about the method of realizing that mandala.

I never said there were no Tibetan mahāsiddhas. There were and are. This is why I continue believe in the effectiveness of man ngag sde teachings even if I don't really accept their traditional origin story anymore.

The problem really arises because Tibetans who produced these texts in the 11th century had to cater to the socio-political pressure of sourcing their teaching outside of Tibet with a foreign teacher— this is true of Nyingma and this is true of Bon. The

Nyingma and Bonpo strategy was the treasure tradition and tales of lost Sanskrit and Zhang Zhung originals (which were true in some instances, like Guhyagarbha). The reason this socio-political pressure existed was that new texts were being brought from India, and in the 11th century and beyond, if you could not prove your text was Indian, it was regarded as spurious. Now, there are all sorts of linguistic reasons (which I do not have space to detail here) that we cannot accept that the seventeen tantras are translations from even one language into Tibetan (let alone three in the case of the Rig pa rang shar, which claims it was translated from Oddiyani, Sanskrit and Chinese!!!).

Nevertheless, while we can understand the historical provenance of the 17 tantras as texts to be a fabrication, we do not have to doubt their spiritual provenance since they are a record of the spiritual experience of a number of yogically advanced scholar practitioners in the 11th century who were riffing off older material from the 8th, 9th and 10th century as well as newer innovations by Indian yogis that was being imported in the eleventh century. Thus their lineage is intact in the live experimentation of yogis, just not in the fairy tale style it is communicated to children and naive people.

For example, Mahasiddha Virupa, a magical terrorist of great power, supposedly stops the sun in India. I love Virupa, he is definitely my favorite mahasiddha, but if he really stops the sun, you would think that such a cosmologically significant event would be noticed by the Chinese, the Arabs, etc. In fact, we have to understand this story as a yogic metaphor (which is the way it is actually explained in the Caryagiti). It is a fun story. It ends with Avalokiteshvara telling Virupa to stop being a magical terrorist. Then Virupa merges with a statue of Avalokiteshvara in S. India, meaning that all along we are to understand Virupa has reached the same level of realization.

For example, the essentials of man ngag sde practice, its anatomy and so on, can be communicated in a few words. We do not need three volumes of primary text, four volumes of secondary texts and four more volumes of commentaries to explain the main points of rushan, semzins, tregchod and thogal. But people like to write books, and they like to elaborate things. Most of what is discussed in the 17 tantras is distilled into a few pages in the Vima Nyingthig, in the three testaments of the Buddhas. This latter text then sets the structure for all the later Nyinthig termas.

As you know, I personally take the view that just as Mahāyāna Buddhism went through stages of development, so did tantra. I happen to think that the authors who wrote Mahāyāna down wrote down a brilliant and sublime teaching. I happen to think the same of the authors of the tantras. But I also think they were human beings and as human beings, they responded to social and political pressures, just as the Buddha clearly did in the Pali canon teachings.

So this is how I reconcile my critical approach to the text I read, and my practice. I understand that the tantric texts of all classes of tantra are just a reflection of a process of yogic experimentation and practice, as well as guides to reproduce those experiments. For me it is interesting to understand the gradual evolution of the Buddhist tantric yogic tradition, and I take the view that it did evolve gradually in the custody of people who were practicing its precepts, just like Mahāyāna, just like Abhidharma. I

understand the claims of lineage origin to be a response to critics outside this or that lineage to validate the lineage to prospective new students. I understand that there are various strategies in Tibetan Buddhism to attract new students. Among these and not restricted to these are the Nyingma strategy, "highest teachings, newest revelation, the most blessings"; the Kagyu strategy is "Most faith, most blessings"; Gelug strategy is "Most systematic, most blessing", the Sakya strategy is "Clearest Indian lineages, most blessings", etc. These are the claims these schools make, they do not cover all the claims these schools make. Other claims all based around the lineage founders, the texts, etc. And of course we already see that within a few short years of Buddhism coming to the west, we have all kinds of tertons popping out of the wood works.

So in the end, Tibetan Buddhism is moving here, and we should expect that it will undergo rigorous critical examination, just like it did in the early days in Tibet. I suggest that if we revise our expectations of what makes a text "legitimate" then the process will be less painful. But if we insist on literal adherence to narratives such as the Great History of Zhangton as a criteria for being a player, then I think that Vajrayāna is doomed in the west.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Can't Really Work with Mahayana by the Looks of it

Content:

rob h said:

It seems like I've decided to pretty much stop working with anything Mahayana...

Malcolm wrote:

Ok.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

alpha said:

I am not sure.

In the way you say it, it looks like body and speech are conditioned or are results of ignorance, or you are trying to create a kind of hierarchy where one is higher than the other, whereas the view of dzogchen is that the entire diversity of pure and impure phenomena are inseparable in the nature of the state of body, speech and mind. Since body speech and mind have the same unique nature and this nature is also the nature of phenomena, whether of samsara or nirvana i see no need of making differentiations.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen texts are quite explicit on this point, everything comes from the mind,

everything that appears is an appearance of the mind. As Buddha said mind is the forerunner, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Unicellular organisms, fungi, plants, and so on, do not have minds and thus to not have awareness at all in any measure. They are non-sentient life.

PadmaVonSamba said:

if a single cell is non-sentient life,

then any multiplication of that single cell,

such as you or I

must therefore also be non-sentient

unless perhaps you can suggest a point at which sentience begins?

.  
.   
.

Malcolm wrote:

Our minds do not come from the cells of our bodies. The cells of our body are not sentient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is the basis, it doesn't have "the basis".

alpha said:

I thought that the basis is from the very beginning the state of body, voice and mind as the self perfected-fruit and not just the mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Body and speech come from mind, just as the rūpakāya arises from the dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Previously, you said that the mind is not real because it cannot be established. You said that cannot be established means cannot be proven to exist dependently or inherently.

Now you said that the mind is not real because it arises from conditions. Is this not equivalent to saying that the mind is not real because it is established to exist dependently (i.e. from conditions) and not inherently?

So can or cannot the mind be established?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind cannot be established because it arises from conditions, therefore it is illusory and free from extremes.

Dependent existence is just a crib for inherent existence, as Nāgārjuna quite clearly shows in the chapter 15 of the MMK.

Sherab said:

Nagarjuna was talking of svabhava and parabhava where bhava is something permanent.

I was not talking about dependent existence as something permanent and therefore cannot be proven, BUT a dependent existence that does not have the characteristic of permanence and therefore can be proven, i.e. established. For example, a water molecule is a dependent existence arising from or emerging from the combination (governed by certain laws of nature) of an oxygen atom and two hydrogen atoms.

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna shows that bhāva is incoherent, therefore, dependent existence is incoherent. Production from conditions is not incoherent because it does not involve use the term "bhava", existence. You will never find Nāgārjuna defending any species of existence at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

In what way is this not ontological?

The tantra of the basis is the reality [gnas lugs] that is present [gnas pa] to be known. It is not cultivated by buddhas nor do sentient beings contrive it through cleverness. It is not established by any words or letters. It is the intrinsic reality of the great perfection free from extremes that is in no way incomplete.

Malcolm wrote:

It is saying that one cannot apply ontological predicates such as being, non-being and so on to the unfabricated mind, the continuum of the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Since the stains of the afflictions have never existed, there are no obstacles to clear away and no qualities to develop. All phenomena are perfect from the beginning in the state of essential identity, with no need for acceptance or rejection, prohibitions or remedies: this view of primordial enlightenment is known as the great perfection.

Malcolm wrote:

Even the perfection of wisdom states this, Hevajra states this, Kalacakra states this. This not a unique feature of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need to talk about ontology since there the four extremes are all invalid.

gad rgyangs said:

saying that is already talking about ontology.

so, since you are already talking about ontology, you need to explain these separate, self-contained monad-bases that you claim are found in each sentient being. Its unclear mereologically what is their relation to each other and what is their collective relationship to a context that would include them all. If the context is "kadag, lundrup and thugje" then that is pointing to a basis that is their collective context.

Malcolm wrote:

I would say that kadag, lundrup and thugje are a generic context, just like "red" is a generic context for all cows that are red.

The Dzogchen tantras are not inventing a brand new theory of Buddhism, they are just riffing on Tantric Buddhism as it already exists. That being the case, Dzogchen tantras, just like all other Buddhist tantras, do not deny conventional doctrines such as mind streams (citta saṃtana) and so on, that are necessary for receiving impressions or traces (vasana, bag chags) etc.

In other words, Dzogchen tantras exist in a continuum with other texts upon which later

Dzogchen tantras like the sgra thal 'gyur (which are clearly influenced by the gsar ma tantras) are based. You want to define the basis as ye shes. The sgra thal 'gyur defines wisdom as encompassed by shes pa, and its commentary indicates that the shes pa that encompass wisdom, whether in Buddhas or sentient beings, is individual and unique to each buddha and sentient being. So what this basically boils down to is a discussion of how individual sentient beings are liberated.

I don't really care about what meta discussion we can have about "what it means". I am interested in what the texts themselves say so that we can understand their intention.

Therefore, since the discussion of the basis is premised on the concept of the three continuums, and since that continuum is just the continuum of an individual sentient beings consciousness, it is pretty meaningless to me to try and insist that the Dzogchen tantras should be saying something other than what they clearly all say, i.e., sentient beings become deluded, and sentient beings become Buddhas.

You might not be satisfied with this, but so what?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

haha said:

Such passage/myth does not support the textual conversion but provide the hypothesis for textual conversion. So do the bio of Yogeswora Virupa.

Malcolm wrote:

All it proves is that Buddhists and Hindus were in competition.

haha said:

The Aṣṭaṅgahridayam that gives these organs in this order: Heart, lung, liver, gall bladder, spleen, kidney. But quoted passage did not used yang organ (gall bladder). Then, there are five yin organs. Thus, it is related with Wu Xing theory.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. These five don snod, may ultimately have come from the arrangement the functional organs in Chinese medicine, but their place is so firmly established in Tibetan medicine by the 13th century when this text was written that any Chinese connection would have been long been obscured.

haha said:

lalana, rasana and avadhuti

These three are purely buddhist in origin (name as well as meaning). Ida, Pingala and Susumna are purely non-buddhist (name as well as meaning).



Malcolm wrote:

Kalacakra uses Ida, Pingala and Susumna.

haha said:

In buddhist context without Vipasyana one cannot work with avadhuti; especially in vajrayana it is directly related with sampannakrama(completion stage meditation). How can such thing derive from non-buddhist tradition?

Malcolm wrote:

Easily, as Sapan points out the two stages exist in Hinduism, the difference is in view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, basically you are denying that a sperm responds specifically to something other than itself.

Malcolm wrote:

I am denying that there is any awareness involved in such interactions.

PadmaVonSamba said:

maybe you wouldn't call it "awareness" in the common Buddhist use of the term, because there is no cognitive grasping.

But then what would you call it?

Responsiveness?

Malcolm wrote:

I wouldn't call it awareness in any usage of the term. Unicellular organisms, fungi, plants, and so on, do not have minds and thus do not have awareness at all in any measure. They are non-sentient life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not an ontological doctrine, it is epistemic.

gad rgyangs said:

ok so if you want to co-opt the basis for your epistemology, then you simply need to use new terms to talk about ontology. So what are they? (and no cop-out saying "since there are no "beings" there is no need for "ontology").

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need to talk about ontology since the the four extremes are all invalid.

In case you missed it:

When we talk about the basis, we are talking about what is termed by the sgra thal 'gyur commentary as the tantra of primal nature [rang bzhin gyi rgyud]:

The tantra of the basis is the reality [gnas lugs] that is present [gnas pa] to be known. It is not cultivated by buddhas nor do sentient being contrived it through cleverness. It is not established by any words or letters. It is the intrinsic reality of the great perfection free from extremes that is in no way incomplete.

The tantra of the path is two-fold: the path is made into a direct perception and into a post-meditation phase on the basis of the capacity of different people.

The tantra of the result is the naturally perfected tantra of the three kāyas and the originally pure tantra of the exhaustion of dharmatā.

This passage in the sgra thal 'gyur commentary is an elaboration upon a discussion found in an early 11th century text, The Mahāyānapathakrama by Subhagavajra:

Now then, the tantra of the basis is the nature of the two truths; the method is the two stages; and the result is the two kāyas, the dharmakāya and rūpakāya. Therefore, since the result is obtained when the method is cultivated in dependence on the basis, a tantra is so called because it connects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Based on your meaning of 'to establish', I read the first quote to mean that the mind is not real because it does not exist dependently nor inherently. This implies that the mind existence is only imagined.

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is not real because it arises from conditions, whatever arises from conditions does not arise in truth and cannot be found on examination. The mind is not unreal because there is clarity, and so on.

Sherab said:

Previously, you said that the mind is not real because it cannot be established. You said that cannot be established means cannot be proven to exist dependently or inherently.

Now you said that the mind is not real because it arises from conditions. Is this not

equivalent to saying that the mind is not real because it is established to exist dependently (i.e. from conditions) and not inherently?

So can or cannot the mind be established?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind cannot be established because it arises from conditions, therefore it is illusory and free from extremes.

Dependent existence is just a crib for inherent existence, as Nāgārjuna quite clearly shows in the chapter 15 of the MMK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

pensum said:

"Presence Itself"?

Malcolm wrote:

sems nyid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is the basis, it doesn't have "the basis".

Sherab said:

That being the case, scientists should be able to find the mind in a rock, a river or the wind. Scientists should not be finding molecules, atoms, sub atomic particles, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

The origin of this language of "the basis" is in the trio of the basis, path and result (sthana, marga, phala), i.e. the three tantras.

It is not an ontological doctrine, it is epistemic.

When we talk about the basis, we are talking about what is termed by the sgra thal 'gyur commentary as the tantra of primal nature [rang bzhin gyi rgyud]:

The tantra of the basis is the reality [gnas lugs] that is present [gnas pa] to be known. It is not cultivated by buddhas nor do sentient beings contrive it through cleverness. It is

not established by any words or letters. It is the intrinsic reality of the great perfection free from extremes that is in no way incomplete.

The tantra of the path is two-fold: the path is made into a direct perception and into a post-meditation phase on the basis of the capacity of different people.

The tantra of the result is the naturally perfected tantra of the three kāyas and the originally pure tantra of the exhaustion of dharmatā.

This passage in the sgra thal 'gyur commentary is an elaboration upon a discussion found in an early 11th century text, The Mahāyānapathakrama by Subhagavajra:

Now then, the tantra of the basis is the nature of the two truths; the method is the two stages; and the result is the two kaṃyas, the dharmakāya and rūpakāya. Therefore, since the result is obtained when the method is cultivated in dependence on the basis, a tantra is so called because it connects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

]

And for 'Presence Itself' you may as well use the term 'life itself'. There is no need to establish the identity of mind in order to overcome delusion. Neither is there a need to posit a final destination in Buddhahood as the epitome of wisdom. When you have confidence that knowledge of 'life itself' is never separate from an experience of 'Presence Itself' then what else do you need?

Malcolm wrote:

Presence is not a good translation for "sems nyid". It just means mind-essence and is a reference to bodhicitta, the mind-essence.

The passage that prefaces this discussion runs:

Since cause and effect are differentiated  
into mind, phenomena and knowing,  
phenomena are established.

But it is never said to establish a  
differentiation into cause and effect  
in the self-originated knowing mind.  
[What] is to said that should be established  
is that everything is established  
by clearly including all phenomena  
in the mind-essence, the great perfection.

This is really very much the same as what the perfection of wisdom sutras say:  
Śāriputra, that which is absence of change and the absence of concepts in all

phenomena is called "the mind essence of the mind".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, basically you are denying that a sperm responds specifically to something other than itself.

Malcolm wrote:

I am denying that there is any awareness involved in such interactions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, there is ample evidence that Dzogchen tantras are merely discussing the nature of individual consciousness and nothing more.

gad rgyangs said:

and what is the basis of those posited multiple, individual consciousnesses?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no posited basis for those multiple, individual consciousness since they are all empty, free from extremes.

As explained before, the term རྩུ་གཞི, generic basis, is just a generic set of attributes that all shes pas possess. That is why the sgra thal 'gyur clearly explains that shes pa, consciousness, exists in all buddhas and sentient beings, and that it has two basis states, pure and impure and so on.

We can continue around and around on this if you want, but there really is no further satisfactory answer. Instant presence, rig pa, is just a quality of one's mind.

As soon as one accepts that all of this is just a way of trying to describe how minds become deluded, and then free from that delusion, then at that point one has understood the purpose of the discussion. If you think Dzogchen texts are positing some permeating basis which supports instantiations of buddhas and sentient beings, then you have understood nothing.

As you know, in the end I have concluded that the Dzogchen theory of a basis is not

really different from the Sakya theory of the all-basis cause continuum, or the Kagyu theory of "mahamudra of the basis". All three are clearly based on the Uttaratantra of the Guhyasamaja's statement:

A tantra is a continua.  
That become three,  
divided by basis, likewise, nature,  
and nothing to abandon,  
the basis and the nature are the cause,  
likewise the result has nothing to abandon.  
The basis is called "the method."  
The topics of tantra are included in three.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A mental event is distinct from a mind exactly how?

gad rgyangs said:

"mind" is a conceptual overlay, a non existent (in the son of a barren women sense) posited substratum or possessor that "has" mental events, or, even worse, "has" the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is the basis, it doesn't have "the basis".

Sure, mind is just a convention, so is "basis", so is "mental event", etc. When subject to analysis, each term is just as incoherent as the other two.

Therefore, all of this discussion of the basis, the arising of the basis, mind, mental events, etc., is all strictly conventional.

Further, there is ample evidence that Dzogchen tantras are merely discussing the nature of individual consciousness and nothing more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So which type of Buddhahood do you want? The type that comes from the realization of

mind or the type that doesn't exist, can't be seen, can't be designated?

Malcolm wrote:  
They are the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

or the the increasingly detailed bios of Padmasambhava resulting in a 12 volume one "revealed" by a Bon master in the 19th century.

mutsuk said:  
What is that ?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know, Tulku Orgyan mentions he read one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

I don't agree. Zhangton wrote an an important Dzogchen history, the Great History of the Dzogchen Nyingtik (rdzogs pa chen po snying thig gi lo rgyus chen mo). I think he is simply retelling the story of the nyingthik as his masters told him (no matter how strange its seemed) but If you like Malcolm is suggesting that he wrote the 17 tantras himself that whole text is not true, which would make it a lie

Malcolm wrote:

I think the story of their origin was largely created by Chegom Nagpo, who communicated this to Zhangton. Zhangton clearly received the 17 Tantras from Chegom Nagpo with whom he studied for one year when he was 10, in 1107.

I think that Dangma Lhungyal (and perhaps some others) and Chetsun Senge Wangchuk wrote the seventeen tantras over a period of 30-40 years or so during 11th century, with six of them being written after the Hevajra tantra was translated, i.e. the the rig pa rang shar, the rig pa rang grol, the bkra shis mdzes ldan, the sgron ma 'bar ba and the mu tig phreng ba, with the sgra thal 'gyur being the last of the whole collection to be written down.

Further, Zhangton claims that he alone receives the unsurpassed secret cycle of teachings which are the Vima Nyinthig. Zhangton wrote large parts of the Vima Nyinthig,

i.e. the gold, copper, agate, conch and turquoise lettered between 1115-1118. I think some of the other texts in the collection are texts he received from Chegom.

Nyang ral reports the existence of the 17 tantras in a lineage that stems from Chegom in his Dharma history, but makes no mention of the Vima Nyinthig, indicating it was not well known yet. The fact that Nyang ral's story of Vimalmitra's life (based on his treasure revelation that Eric translated as "The Lotus Born") contradicts many details of Vimalamitra's life in Zhangton's slightly earlier story [but both composed in the 12th century] shows that Zhangton's Vima Nyinthig was not widely known in the late 11th century and only circulated in a small circle of his immediate disciples surrounding his son, Nyibum.

heart said:

But perhaps you would like suggest that "the Great History of the Dzogchen Nyingtik " is an early work of fiction?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A sperm has no mental organ or any other kind of organ, it cannot be aware.

PadmaVonSamba said:

I agreed that it has no mental organ.

But it is attracted to a chemical excreted by the egg  
and it swims to that egg.

it responds to the actions of the egg.

That function of response,

that attraction,

is what i am talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not constitute evidence of awareness.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Nearly all "alive" things exhibit some sort of response to some stimuli that they themselves do not create.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not constitute evidence of awareness.



PadmaVonSamba said:

Hence, the propensity for the experience of self/other is already there.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so.

PadmaVonSamba said:

This is the basic awareness I am talking about,

Malcolm wrote:

I think you have confused panpsychism with Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

this was how he actually thought it happened. If I was Zhangton I would have made a more believable story.

Malcolm wrote:

Two things about Zhangton. Zhangton demonstrates a very shaky grasp on events in the 11th century, placing atisha one hundred years too early and so on. Second, fabulous tales were very believable to Tibetans (and many of their students) right up to the present day.

When I have discussions with Tibetans about all of this, they demonstrate a lot of indifference to these issues, mainly being concerned with focusing on one practice or lineage. Plus they are basically hostile to text critical analysis of their tradition unless it is within the context of traditional lineage concerns. So for example, if Gorampa criticizes the kun byed rgyal po it is one thing, but if a Western scholar does the same thing it is quite another. They distrust the motives of Western scholars, and dislike the impression that Western scholars like Gyatso, Davidson, Germano etc., are just doing this because they need a job. Whereas a critic like Sapan or Gorampa is regarded as being a realized person (with Sakya), so their opinions carry great weight.

Many western students have the same attitude. I have heard students of ChNN proclaim that if ChNN says something is so, we must believe it is so.

Finally, the purpose of lo rgyus, narrative accounts, are to generate faith in the lineage. Therefore exaggeration and so on are the norm in such accounts because they generate a dramatic tone which fosters receptivity. In the Indo-Tibetan tradition it seems, the more fantastic the better it is received. Of course there are skeptics, like Taranatha, who found the whole literature of the Padma Khathangs to be worth less than the paper they were written on, so he provided the account of Padmasambhava he heard from his Indian master, Buddhaguptanatha as a corrective to the exaggerations of tertons like

Nyang ral.

So what I observe in Tibetan literature of this kind is a kind of one upsmanship, like that one sees when comparing the simpler and less elaborate "sems sde" origin stories with the elaborate story of the man ngag sde lineage, or comparing the increasingly detailed accounts of the early masters of Lamdre as time moves on, or the increasing detailed bios of Milarepa, etc., or the the increasingly detailed bios of Padmasambhava resulting in a 12 volume one "revealed" by a Bon master in the 19th century.

These are, in my view, facts of text that we have to accept.

In terms of Dharma there is basically no difference in meaning between the words in the "emptiness" mantra, om svabhāva śuddha sarvadharmā svabhāva śuddho' ham (The nature of all phenomena is pure, also my nature is pure) and the term "original purity".

In the end, these issues of text origin should be kept separate from practice. I think that the traditional accounts should always be presented, whether we really believe them or not, when we are being presented with teachings for practice. When we are studying these texts for their history however, we should subject the texts to all the best methods of text criticism, archaeology, history and so on that we can muster. In some people's mind this will cause them to lose faith in this or that lineage or tradition, and that is a pity, but that is also the price of scholarship. Many Christians lost faith in Jesus because of text criticism that began to be used by German scholars in the 19th century, but we, as Buddhists, don't really care if Christians lose their faith.

My contention is that if we lose our faith in Buddhadharma (due to text criticism and a better understanding of history) because the origin of some text turns out to have been originally written Tibetan and not some Indic language, then our faith is pretty shaky to begin with and is not based on the principles of Dharma but rather on some strange beliefs that we have decided to cultivate. If we lost faith in the man ngag sde tantras because it turns out they were written in Tibetan in the 11th century, and not taught by some ancient teacher in a heaven during the first eon, then it means we have not really understood the theory and practice contained in those texts on any level at all. If we lose our faith in Kalacakra because the notion that it was taught by the Buddha in a stupa in South India and then was later set down in writing by the seventh king of Shambhala, Mañjuśrīyasa, and only brought to India some 1000 years later during the 10th century turns out to be just a didactic legend, then it means we have understood nothing of the teachings contained in that tantra. If we decide that we have no faith in the Prajñāpāramita sūtras because it turns out that it is impossible they were recovered from under the ocean by Nāgārjuna then we have not understood one word of the Prajñāpāramita.

I keep on stressing that what is most important about all Buddhist texts is not where they are from, but rather, what they say. We are left to our own devices to engage in the experiment and test for ourselves the truth of practices in Buddhist texts. When we have some evidence that the practices in these texts lead to the promised results, our faith moves from aspiring faith to unshakable faith -- but that unshakable faith doesn't mean

that we then necessarily have to believe all the origin legends that accompany these texts. It means we have moved from hypothesis to confirmation for ourselves.

In the meantime, there are interesting things to learn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Well, if the sperm is attracted by the chemical from the egg.  
so, if you don't want to call it "mind" what would you call it?  
I called it "bare awareness".

Malcolm wrote:

A sperm has no mental organ or any other kind of organ, it cannot be aware.

PadmaVonSamba said:

You can't deny that there is a responsive, intentional (meaning not random) contact between two separate entities.  
Somehow the sperm 'knows' to swim to the egg.

Malcolm wrote:

A sperm has no mental organ or any other kind of organ, it cannot be aware.

PadmaVonSamba said:

an awareness of another object occurs even to a single-cell organism,  
which has no brain, no sense organs, no nerve endings.

Malcolm wrote:

Single cell organisms have no sense organs, etc., so they cannot be aware.

Attributing awareness to them is a category error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Based on your meaning of 'to establish', I read the first quote to mean that the mind is not real because it does not exist dependently nor inherently. This implies that the mind existence is only imagined.

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is not real because it arises from conditions, whatever arises from conditions

does not arise in truth and cannot be found on examination. The mind is not unreal because there is clarity, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

...Taken as a whole, the first quote seems to say that the mind is unreal because it is only imagined. But because of imagination (of feeling, thinking and so on), it is not unreal. The whole argument in the first quote therefore seems rather incoherent to me.

Andrew108 said:

Well the other thing is that Malcolm is saying the realization of mind's nature leads to Buddhahood. There must be something realized? if he says that mind cannot be found, then I wonder how can Buddhahood be realized?

Malcolm wrote:

Kun byed rgyal po:

Since one's mind free of proliferation is the dharmadhātu  
all buddhas enter into that freedom from proliferation.

And:

A buddhahood that is an object of sight cannot be seen;  
since buddhahood does not exist, also there is no name "buddhahood";  
The teacher has said that since buddhahood designated by a name it is an error;  
the mistaken path is obtaining buddhahood somewhere else.

And:

Also the teaching of the all-creating kind  
is that one's mind has always been the liberated dharmatā.

There you go, Andrew, how it is explained in the bodhicitta texts of which you are so fond.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

personally I don't think there is such a thing as "mind" even conventionally. "mental events" yes, but "mind" no. it stinks of reification.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think there is such a thing as "mind" even conventionally.

???

gad rgyangs said:

mental event, no substratum or possessor

Malcolm wrote:

A mental event is distinct from a mind exactly how?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

We are still waiting for your translation of the 17 Tantras in order to evaluate its actual content. But in my opinion if you wanted to make a believable story about the origin of a text you wrote you would have traveled to India and made sanskrit copies of them. The lineage that Zhangton Tashi Dorje provide is laughable in comparison the Sarma lineages. No wonder so relatively few people believed in them at the time. This is what don't make sense.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The Sanskrit originals for the 17 tantras are accounted for Zhangton's legend. They are asserted to be the sole copies brought from India with no other copies in India, hidden by Vimalamitra in Tibet just before he departed for China. The origin legends of all the other tantras are no more believable than Zhangton's. The difference of course is that there is no elaborate account of concealment and retrieval in Tibet to contend with for the gsar ma tantras.

In gsar ma, the general mode of the introduction new teachings is through visionary encounter. Marpa meeting Naropa, Sachen meeting Virupa, or through dreams.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 11:15 AM

Title: Re: Three Turnings.

Content:

jeeprs said:

all things have no-essence, no arising, and no passing away, are originally quiescent, and are essentially in cessation

Even though this is something that is said a lot, I don't really understand what it means.

(I \*think\* there is a similarity to the early Greek philosophers, specifically Parmenides [and Zeno's paradoxes which were intended as proofs of Parmenides], which originated from around the same historical time. Parmenides also was concerned with 'what truly is', in comparison to which the 'phenomenal' did not truly exist.

How could what is perish? How could it have come to be? For if it came into being, it is not; nor is it if ever it is going to be. Thus coming into being is extinguished, and destruction unknown.

B 8.20-22. )

So I would be very interested to hear an explanation of what this phrase actually means in terms of modern or analytical philosophy. When it is declared that things are 'not arisen', this doesn't seem to account for the fact that things - creatures, trees, mountains, planets, and so on - actually do 'arise' or come into and then go out of existence. So what does it mean that they don't really arise?

Any supplementary readings on that, preferably from a 'Buddhist studies', rather than traditional, perspective?

Malcolm wrote:

They seem to, but not really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 11:12 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

personally I don't think there is such a thing as "mind" even conventionally. "mental events" yes, but "mind" no. it stinks of reification.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think there is such a thing as "mind" even conventionally.

???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 8:37 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

When this basic ground of awareness arises, or interacts with an object, the result is that is experienced is mind.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no awareness outside the mind.

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, when a plant's roots grow specifically in the direction of a source of water,  
or a sperm cell swims to an egg,  
or white blood cells attack an infection,  
that is mind?

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

None of these things have minds, so they do not have awareness either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 8:35 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

What is the meaning of established as you have used here?

Malcolm wrote:

Proven to exist.

Sherab said:

What does exist mean here? For example, to exist can mean to exist inherently, to exist dependently, to exist as an imagination.

Malcolm wrote:

Proven to exist. There is no difference between existence and inherent existence. There is no difference between dependent existence and inherent existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 8:27 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

So by "mind" you are really referring to the ordinary deluded mind?

Malcolm wrote:

By mind I mean that entity which can become deluded or nondeluded.

gad rgyangs said:

you sure you want to call mind an "entity"?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, sure. I don't mean it has a essence, an ens. I mean it is a subject for discussion. A mind is what experiences samsara or nirvana. It can be pure or impure, to put it the way the sgra thal 'gyur puts it, wisdom is encompassed by the mind.

"Vimalamitra", having clarified that sems, blo and yid are all synonyms for shes pa, states:

The wisdom that is encompassed by the mind is inseparable in all buddhas and sentient beings as mere mind, but since it ultimately pervades them without any nature at all, that [wisdom] is encompassed by the mind [shes pa] of each one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: Three Turnings.

Content:

Astus said:

Therefore, the unconditioned does not exist."/i]

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, and there goes gzhan stong up in smoke hoisted on its own petard.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

So by "mind" you are really referring to the ordinary deluded mind?

Malcolm wrote:

By mind I mean that entity which can become deluded or nondeluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

What is the meaning of established as you have used here?



Malcolm wrote:  
Proven to exist.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 7:18 AM  
Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind  
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:  
When this basic ground of awareness arises, or interacts with an object,  
the result is that is experienced is mind.

Malcolm wrote:  
There is no awareness outside the mind.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 7:16 AM  
Title: Re: Three Turnings.  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
If one claims the "third turning" is definitive, defines it as a number of sutras like the Samdhinirmocana and so on, and then you cite a "first" turning sūtra, you have contradicted yourself.

jeeprs said:  
Not necessarily. It might be the case that the so-called 'later' teachings unpack or explicate deeper meanings that were inherent in the earliest texts. That is why Nagarjuna could say that he was affirming the true meaning of the Buddha's teaching, even though to many of his contemporaries he seemed to be radical (well that is a point made in many of the scholarly studies of early Mahayana anyway.) But that is because the Buddha's teaching, right from the outset, was vast, profound, difficult to fathom, deep and perceptible only to the wise. It accomodates many different kinds of perspectives. So in some ways you can see as the tradition developed, there was the attempt to harmonize some of these perspectives, whilst not claiming that the later ones conflicted with or undermined the earlier. (//edit//although of course from the viewpoint of the traditionalists, the so-called 'later turnings' were simply ways to rationalize heterodoxy.)

('Unborn, unconditioned' comes from  
<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/kn/ud/ud.8.03.than.html>.)

Malcolm wrote:

You are missing my point again, the gzhan stong pas like SOB, generally assert that Buddha's career had three distinct phases.

Maitreyanatha rejects this interpretation and asserts that all three turnings were turned at the same time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 7:14 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, I should use "mind", since it is the realization of that which results in buddhahood and nothing else.

Sherab said:

What is your reason for putting the word mind within quotation marks?

Malcolm wrote:

Because A108 did.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Three Turnings.

Content:

jeeprs said:

"There is, monks, an unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned. If, monks there were not that unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned, you could not know an escape here from the born, become, made, and conditioned. But because there is an unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned, therefore you do know an escape from the born, become, made, and conditioned."

How could such a statement be 'provisional'? Wouldn't that then be a 'conditioned unconditioned'?

Malcolm wrote:

...Not sure you got my point. If one claims the "third turning" is definitive, defines it as a number of sutras like the Saṃdhinirmocana and so on, and then you cite a "first" turning sūtra, you have contradicted yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

I have shown where the Buddhas says the 5 aggregates are suffering.  
You claim that the suttas that say such are provisional...

Malcolm wrote:

I respond here: <https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=39&t=15837#wrap>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 4:56 AM

Title: Three Turnings.

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

I have shown where the Buddhas says the 5 aggregates are suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they are, but there are also pure aggregates.

Son of Buddha said:

You mentioned the Diamond Sutra.....well the Diamond sutra is provisional the third turning deems all 1st and second turning to be provisional, only glimmers of the absolute truth can be found in the provisional teachings and even then they rely on interpretation from the third turning, now if you ask me to prove that with Buddhist scriptural reference I can.....im only you to do the same with your assertions.

Malcolm wrote:

There is really only one reference to the three turnings of the wheel in a single sutra. The Samdhinirmocana. The way I read the Samdhinirmocana is that it confirms the teaching found in the second turning and renders it indisputable.

The Bhagavan, well disclosing the correct entry into all vehicles, beginning from the nonexistence of the inherent existence of all phenomena, beginning from their absence of arising, absence of ceasing, being peaceful from the beginning, being parinirvana by nature, turned a third very amazing wheel of Dharma. This wheel of Dharma is unsurpassable, not circumstantial, of definitive meaning and indisputable.

This is hardly a smoking gun that confirms that you are basing your opinions on the so called third turning. Frankly, there is virtually no attention this teaching in the Indian canon, though a big deal about it is made in Tibetan and Chinese Buddhism. The idea that the three turnings are based on three distinct historical epochs is rejected out of hand by such India scholars as Dharmamitra in his Abhisamayālaṃkārikāprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstraṭīkā prasphuṭapadā.

Son of Buddha said:

<http://ancient-buddhist-texts.net/English-Texts/Exalted-Utterances/8-Pataligamiyavaggo-03.htm>

“There is, monks, an unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned. If, monks there were not that unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned, you could not know an escape here from the born, become, made, and conditioned. But because there is an unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned, therefore you do know an escape from the born, become, made, and conditioned.”

Malcolm wrote:

By your own criteria this is provisional since it comes from the first turning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I recently heard about large amounts of Indian Sanskrit texts having been kept in Tibetan libraries and actually seen by foreign visitors prior to the Chinese invasion. From the sounds of it they were basically stored away and seldom ever touched, but nevertheless they were there. A similar situation existed in China where original Indian manuscripts were stored in various places and left alone for centuries only to be burnt in the Cultural Revolution.

It would be interesting to know the fate of those Indian manuscripts in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

The Library at Sakya still has many original Sanskrit manuscripts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Pronunciation (yes one of these)

Content:

vinodh said:

Additonally to Malcolm's way, I've also been taught that it's pronounced "gya" (I think this may be the most common way now, but not necessarily the most historically accurate)

Usually, this is the North Indian pronunciation of the syllable.

South Indians (including me) still pronounce it as - <dʒṇa> (dʒ is same as English /j/ & ṇ is same as spanish ñ) You'll find South Indian pronunciation of Sanskrit more conservative compared to North India. For Instance, <ai> <au> are mostly realized as monophthongs in most of North India. But they are properly realized as diphthongs only in South India (and Maharashtra).

also "dnya" which just seems weird to me, but is also supposedly correct

It is the Marathi/Oriya way of pronouncing the letter.

----

Well... Ofcourse... You can pick any of the above pronunciations and still sound "native". But I would suggest to go with <dzṇa> - the closest English rendering of which is <jnya>.

V

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Pandita renders jñā and "gnya". Also in Varanasi, that is how it is taught there. In general, Tibetans who spoke Sanskrit followed the N. Indian mode of pronunciation and consider this the most correct. It may not match up with linguistic history, but indeed it is how they see it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

Calling the 17 Tantras a scam is really close to turning people against the Dharma. Because scams are not Dharma, pretty simple.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I call the 17 tantras a scam? No. I simple asserted that they were composed in the 11th century. Just like Kalacakra was composed in the 10th century, Hevajra and the Laghusamvara in the 9th, Guhyasamaja in the 8th and so on.

heart said:

Inventing a lineage is a classic scam, no?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

If you choose to see it that way. I don't. I see it very much along the same lines as placing the words of Mahāyāna sūtras in the mouth of the Buddha, when it is impossible that the historical Buddha even spoke one word of them, let alone all 108 volumes of them and more. I evaluate the texts on what they say, not on the basis of their supposed origins. I think it is a superior approach when a text is evaluated on its actual content rather than who supposedly spoke it.

Let me put it another way, when Amoghavajra [i.e. Shingon tradition] claims that Nāgārjuna took the tantras out of an iron tower in South India, I also do not believe that story. That does not mean I think that the practice of the Vajradhātu mandala is spurious or worthless.

Given the environment of the 11th century, if the authors of the 17 tantras came out and said "We wrote these books, and because we have realized the meaning contained therein, you should practice this" no one would have believed them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

zsc said:

T

The Buddha's teaching is that our current circumstances are not only due to the karma from past lives.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Buddha's teaching is that our current circumstances are due only to our actions from past lives.

The in the Karmavibhanga, the Buddha states:

SN 36.21 said:

"Now when these ascetics and brahmins have such a doctrine and view that 'whatever a person experiences, be it pleasure, pain or neither-pain-nor-pleasure, all that is caused by previous action,' then they go beyond what they know by themselves and what is accepted as true by the world. Therefore, I say that this is wrong on the part of these ascetics and brahmins."

2. "Master Gotama, what is the reason, what is the condition, why inferiority and superiority are met with among human beings, among mankind? For one meets with short-lived and long-lived people, sick and healthy people, ugly and beautiful people, insignificant and influential people, poor and rich people, low-born and high-born people, stupid and wise people. What is the reason, what is the condition, why superiority and inferiority are met with among human beings, among mankind?"

3. "Student, beings are owners of karmas, heirs of karmas, they have karmas as their progenitor, karmas as their kin, karmas as their homing-place. It is karmas that differentiate beings according to inferiority and superiority."

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/nanamoli/wheel248.html#top>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

Unknown said:

On the other hand, having complete strangers who don't care about you ask "What are

you?" is annoying, as plenty of Asian-Americans say. Black women get this in the form of invasive questions about our hair ("Can I touch it?" "Do you wash it?" "Is that your real hair?" etc.). This ascribes an "alien" quality to someone that is dehumanizing. It's creepy, like we are regarded as zoo animals who need to be carefully studied.

Malcolm wrote:

Try having long blond hair in Tibet, if you want to feel like a zoo exhibit. You think these experiences are unique to black people in the US? They are not. They are experienced by anyone who travels somewhere where they are not the majority. Most of us here are widely travelled people, not ignorant rednecks in the N. Georgia mountains.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="zsc"

@Malcolm - To continue on what I touched on, your position of the suffering of people being only the result of their past lives ignores that documented fact that Gotama opposed the caste system, which is the logical conclusion of your stance. Gotama even opposed the caste system \*even while he directly benefited from it\*. There is a metaphor in there about how we should respond to all other forms of social inequality.[/quote]

The in the Karmavibhanga, the Buddha states:

Brahmaputra, therefore, listen well and bear this in mind: from knowing the various actions [karma], the various afflictions, the various views and the various behaviors of sentient beings one can describe the ripened results of positive and negative actions. Brahmaputra, there is birth among hell beings, animals and pretas because of negative actions, birth among humans, asuras and devas because of positive actions.

Brahmaputra, a short life is a vicissitude of karma, a long life is a vicissitude of karma. Frequent illness is a vicissitude of karma, infrequent illness is a vicissitude of karma. A poor complexion is a vicissitude of karma. Beauty is a vicissitude of karma. Inferior social standing is a vicissitude of karma. Superior social standing is a vicissitude of karma. Noble birth is a vicissitude of karma. Ignoble birth is a vicissitude of karma. Great wealth is a vicissitude of karma. Little wealth is a vicissitude of karma. Low intelligence is a vicissitude of karma. High intelligence is a vicissitude of karma. Birth as a hell being is a vicissitude of karma. Birth as animal is a vicissitude of karma. Birth as a preta is a vicissitude of karma. Birth in the human realm is a vicissitude of karma. Birth as a deva enjoying bliss is a vicissitude of karma. Birth as a form realm deva is a vicissitude of karma. Birth as a formless realm deva is a vicissitude of karma. Certainty of birth is a vicissitude of karma. Uncertainty of birth is a vicissitude of karma. Ripening in another land is a vicissitude of karma.

You ignored my observation that the fact that social inequality is in fact a result of karma from the Buddha's point of view does not mean we deal with it passively.

Unknown said:

But I will say, it is ironic that you chose to affirm the reality of karma from our past lives while denying other karmic circumstances in which we are born into, such as where we are born...

Malcolm wrote:

All of this comes from our past karma, I have not ignored any of it.

Unknown said:

And yet, my basic recommendation to examine personal complicity (which is woven into your own karmic situation) to see your role in today's social conditions is met with resistance.

Malcolm wrote:

All of us together mutually created the karmic ripening we observe today, and the ways in which we treat other sentient beings determines what kind of karmic reality we will experience in the future. You very well may have been a privileged white slave owner in a past life. I may have been a slave whose children were ripped away from me and sold at auction. Jews killed in the holocaust may have been reborn as Israelis, while Nazis may have been reborn as Palestinians. We have all been mothers, fathers, sons and daughters, enemies, friends, murders, rapists, thieves, kings, wealthy merchants, libertines, etc., not to mention pretas, gods, hell beings, fish, whales, bugs so many times, that to insist that others must adopt our social view based in the very temporary karmic circumstances we find in this life is just absurd.

The law of karma is unerring. If someone, like Tibetans for example, are experiencing torture, murder and so on at the hands of the PLA, for example, there is a karmic reason for it. That does not mean that Tibetans, for example, need to be passive and not insist on their rights to dignity as human beings, the same thing with Palestinians, Mayans, Rohingyas, etc. But as Buddhists we also must understand that famine, diseases, wars, etc., as well as the beauty and good fortune we have to live in the US (as imperfect as it may be) all comes from karma. How we manage this is what will determine where we take rebirth in the next life and what kind of circumstances we will meet there.

Unknown said:

Meanwhile, my insistence that how we relate to the dharma (which includes to how we relate to each other) is conditioned by our karmic situations (which includes our experiences due to our race) is met with denial. Neither statement is a concept that is alien to Buddhist thought.

Malcolm wrote:

You really must not be paying attention to what I said.



Unknown said:

In light of that, race is a fake social construct, to you "there are no black people" but to people who do everything from deny us opportunities to gun us down there certainly are black people. The same "Sunday-only" dharma referenced above that ignores the lived reality of racism that black Buddhists face, and other poc, is unsurprisingly not one that many poc will adopt. Above I have outlined why I believe this isn't Buddhist at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Race is a social construct that is quite real to many people, but it is still just an illusion. "Black people" and "White people" are just dividing labels. The extent we wish to reinforce them is the extent to which they will continue to bind us.

Unknown said:

Just like with Johnny Dangerous, I would also ask why the solutions of people of color-- in your words, a "black power sangha"--must be palatable to you?

Malcolm wrote:

I can see you really do not read what I said carefully. I said the very idea of such racially divided sanghas violated the intent of the Buddha, who did not differentiate people by caste when they became followers of Buddhadharma.

Unknown said:

Also, it should be clear from history why "white power", an assertion of power by the powerful, is a hate movement, while "black power", a reclamation of agency by systematically oppressed people, is a civil rights movement. Therefore, the two concepts are apples and oranges.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Buddhist point of view, it is just worldly bullshit caught up in the eight worldly Dharmas.

Unknown said:

In reality, black people in America have to face racism and frame it in one way or another as a necessity, to make sense of the world, whether publicly or privately.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course they do. There are a lot of racists out there. Many of them have "black" skin too. They are all to be pitied for their narrowness and lack of compassion.

Unknown said:

A lot of black parents dread the eventual "racism talk" they have to have with their young children for their protection. At the same time, I have read white people resenting having to have the same discussion when they were younger if they happened to have committed some social faux pas that could have been misconstrued as racism. Some white people resent having the racism talk as adults. Both ignore the fact that this talk is thought of as "optional" for them because of white privilege, while it is "required" in one

way or another, for black people.

Malcolm wrote:

My mother, a caucasian women, and founder of the feminist movement in New England, marched in many Civil Rights rallies in the sixties. I was with her at these as I was a small child. I was raised in a household where it was normal to discuss racism and its negative impacts on African Americans.

I am a Buddhist, and while I sympathize with the suffering of any sentient being, I also recognize that the suffering of any sentient being comes strictly from their own karma and no one else makes it for them. You are making a common error in assuming that karmic causes and conditions are "interdependent" in a broader sense. They are not.

The discussion of general cause and condition comes first. Then the subject of dependent origination. Finally, the discussion of karmic cause and condition, i.e. how afflicted minds act, and what kinds of results they can expect to ripen as a result of those acts, both positive and negative. My karma does not ripen on you, and you have no hand in making it. Your karma does not ripen on me, and I had no hand in making it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

Calling the 17 Tantras a scam is really close to turning people against the Dharma. Because scams are not Dharma, pretty simple.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I call the 17 tantras a scam? No. I simple asserted that they were composed in the 11th century. Just like Kalacakra was composed in the 10th century, Hevajra and the Laghusamvara in the 9th, Guhyasamaja in the 8th and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

zsc said:

T

The Buddha's teaching is that our current circumstances are not only due to the karma from past lives.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Buddha's teaching is that our current circumstances are due only to our actions from past lives. You really don't want me to trot out the numerous citations illustrate this.

There are some revisionists who would like to deny this, but they are wrong.

This does not mean we cannot improve our current circumstances. Of course we can. But that too depends on our past karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Crowned Buddha images around Bodhgaya.

Content:

Indrajala said:

Does anyone know why many of the late period images of the Buddha (9th century onwards) around Bodhgaya and Nalanda have crowns and necklaces? At first I thought they might be Vairocana, but many are clearly Śākyamuni "touching the earth" at his enlightenment. Not all the late period images have such adornments, though many do.

Malcolm wrote:

The central imagery in the yoga tantras is bound up with courtly notions of the Cakravartin. That is why Sambhogakāya Buddhas wear crowns and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

It seems like the unintended consequences here are that you will be left with a project that has ceased to be Dharma, and is simply political. Ironically enough, there is all kinds of what some posters would call "white Buddhism" that is basically this, Dharma that has morphed into liberal activism with some Buddha images. Personally I think the things Malcolm and others have said are much too dismissive of the legitimate experiences of those who might be shut out..however, it IS worth considering that part of what is he is getting at is that this is Dharma practice, eventually, somehow, you have to do something that is removed from the values and goals of conventional political activism, and that includes the all-important issue of identity. It is not fair, and it seems to make Buddhism a tough row to hoe for particularly oppressed peoples - but doctrinally, it is true. It is not fair, it IS much easier to do that as white person, but it is still true...Buddhism does not leave much room for identity of the type typically cultivated in this sort of activism..IMO Malcolm has a legitimate point there, no matter how uncomfortable it may be.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not dismissive of their experience. One cannot contextualize one's experience (be social, political or economic) in Buddhism in absence of the teaching of karma, which states quite plainly that all sensations, pleasant, unpleasant and neutral, the social

status into which one is born, one's opportunities in life, and so on result from one's own past actions in previous lives. Buddhists, of whatever "race" are well advised to use this precious human birth (that they may use to attain liberation) to good use.

Meanwhile, as part of their practice, they can devote themselves to whatever social causes strike their fancy depending on their social, political and economic concerns. Thus, if you are a person of color and you wish to devote yourself to causes involving people of color, fine. But don't buy into the non-Buddhist narratives of oppressors and victims, the non-Buddhist narrative of privileging one form of sentient life (human) over the lives of billions of other kinds of sentient life. The teaching of karma is not fuzzy, warm, and it does not feel good. The teaching of karma indicates that what we experience in this life is a result of how we have acted in past lives. If we are oppressed in this life, we can be sure that in a past life we were oppressive, and so on.

This is not a recommendation for inaction or indifference to the plight of people are not so fortunate as to have a precious human birth where they can meet the Perfect Dharma and practice it. We have to be aware of the plight of others and help where we can, and when we are asked to, it's "the bodhisattva" thing to do, and not because we wish to turn others into coreligionists. But in the end, don't ask me to respect you because you are a person of color. I respect you already because you are a human being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The "natural condition" as you call it, isn't something real; it is baseless. It isn't out there, like "atoms", "stars" and "galaxies"; it isn't inside like "blood cells", "mitochondria", etc. This "natural" condition is just the nature of your own mind. It is not an objective condition.....

Andrew108 said:

It's based on the fact that no phenomenon exists that isn't the natural condition.....No one said that the natural condition is 'real' in the limited sense that you use the term 'real'. The way you use the term 'mind' is also limited. The term you should use instead is 'life'.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I should use "mind", since it is the realization of that which results in buddhahood and nothing else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK

Content:

Simon E. said:

Care to name this country which embodies all the virtues of non -prejudice ?

Malcolm wrote:

I think Dzoki is from the Czech Republic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

dzoki said:

Hey, he bought a book, in a free society he can do whatever he wants with it.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a fundamentalist act, that is the point. Sure, he can do what he likes, just like I can fart in a car full of people, but that does not mean that everyone will like it.

We have huge problems with fundamentalism in the world today, Christian fundamentalism, Muslim Fundamentalism, etc. Let's not add to it with Buddhist fundamentalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

.....This is so vague as to be utterly meaningless.

Andrew108 said:

It's based on the fact that no phenomenon exists that isn't the natural condition. So ordinariness is far from ordinary. A practitioner integrates into this natural condition that is right here. There is no projection through views, or filtering through logic, or wishing through goals.

Malcolm wrote:

The "natural condition" as you call it, isn't something real; it is baseless. It isn't out there, like "atoms", "stars" and "galaxies"; it isn't inside like "blood cells", "mitochondria", etc. This "natural" condition is just the nature of your own mind. It is not an objective condition— there is no "objective condition" because there is no "subjective condition". There is no "natural" condition because there is no "unnatural condition".

There is no wisdom apart from the mind and there is no consciousness apart from the mind, there is no buddhahood apart from the mind, there is no delusion apart from the

mind, there is no samsara apart from the mind, no nirvana apart from the mind. Apart from the mind, nothing else needs to be recognized.

The mind is not real because it cannot be established, it is not unreal because one cannot deny that one is feeling, thinking and so on, therefore we say it has "no reality" i.e. there is no state of being that pertains to the mind, since the mind is beyond any extreme, it's nature is sheer clarity and emptiness inseparable. You won't find the mind by resting your attention on a rock, you won't find it by resting your attention on a thought, you won't find even if you rest your attention on the mind's own sheer clarity. You won't find it even if you ascertain sheer clarity is empty. You won't find in nāḍīs, vāyus and bindus, deities, mandalas, etc.

However, that being said, if you do not have a proper method, your afflictions will not cease, you will not gather the twin stores of merit and wisdom, you will not expand your mind to the point of omniscience and you will not realize buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 6:52 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Why? It is an interesting book. Sounds like Nazis burning books because they were written by Jews.

heart said:

Should I have thrown it in the garbage instead, is that more respectful? Anyway you just lost the argument.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No magnus, you should have given it to a library. Burning books is like censoring views, we don't encourage that in a free society.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Sherlock said:

You can read his book, large portions are available on Google books. But basically he didn't accept the idea of termas at all.

Sarah Harding compiles some of the

[https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=rlxdncBwpgC&pg=PA151&lpg=PA151&dq=aris+pema+lingpa&source=bl&ots=5unP\\_g0u1-&sig=\\_dsZ1jOoWaBJ4sKpgLJV-RGhYVQ&hl=en&sa=X&ei=CAQiU72WO9S2hAf\\_n4GQAQ&ved=0CD4Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=aris%20pema%20lingpa&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=rlxdncBwpgC&pg=PA151&lpg=PA151&dq=aris+pema+lingpa&source=bl&ots=5unP_g0u1-&sig=_dsZ1jOoWaBJ4sKpgLJV-RGhYVQ&hl=en&sa=X&ei=CAQiU72WO9S2hAf_n4GQAQ&ved=0CD4Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=aris%20pema%20lingpa&f=false) of Aris' approach even from a scholarly perspective.

heart said:

I read that book years ago, then burnt it. He seems to have beef with Pema Lingpa that goes far beyond any rationale explanation.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Why? It is an interesting book. Sounds like Nazis burning books because they were written by Jews.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

A burnt seed can never be the cause of any fruit, so whatever we think about this subject if we don't believe these teachings comes from "someones" realization then we have broken samaya and left the sphere of vajrayana altogether. That said I do like you a lot pensum and even if I never met Malcolm I do enjoy his brilliant intellect and his flair for drama.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no samaya that says we must believe this or that text is a product of someone's realization, even a tantra or a sutra.

Why do you think there was and is controversy around things like Shugden, Termas etc.? Certainly the Shugden folks believe their protector comes from someone's realization. The people who disbelieve in Shugden think the person who tells them Shugden is a mistaken practice is realized.

In general the recommended approach is that if you are not sure of a teaching, don't criticize it because you might unwittingly criticize and authentic teaching of the Buddhas.

However, origin stories are not Dharma. Disbelieving the claim that some text was written by Padmasambhava or Vimalamitra, then hidden and then dug up 800 years later in some backwater in Kham where it is unlikely Padmasambhava ever set foot hardly constitutes breaking "samaya". Disbelieving that Buddha taught Guhyasamaja to Indrabhuti I hardly constitutes breaking samaya. Disbelieving that the eighteen tantras

fell on the roof of King Za's house and then he had to recruit Kukuraja to understand them is hardly breaking samaya.

"Breaking samaya" means trying to turn people against the Dharma. No one is doing that here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I intended to mention his papers, but I do not have his PhD thesis, it is not on the web yet.

mutsuk said:

It has been published in 1999 by Brepols Publisher.

Not really.

Well your opinion. I worked on both and the 17 tantras from JLA and it went pretty fast...

Malcolm wrote:

I was pointing out that the two texts, Longchenpa's short texts, and Nyibum's are dissimilar.

Of course if you are cutting and pasting citations it would go much faster.

mutsuk said:

JLA informed me on the phone today that he has also done a version of it in the meantime and that he has a Nyingma student preparing another one in French, not to mention a very well-known tibetologist who has prepared a paper on that text with sources based on a second mss of the text. This last one will appear in the RET I think but I don't know when.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I will look forward to seeing it. In the meantime, our book is due sometime this spring. I am writing the introduction as we speak.

The main point in my mentioning this, of course, was to point out that there are examples of termas where entire texts are lifted from earlier Tibetan scholars with no hint of attribution, concealed by including a setting at Samye [despite the fact that Vimalamitra only came to Tibet at least a decade if not more after Trising Detsen passed away, during the reign of Ralpacan].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?



Content:

Tsultim Namdak said:

Where does that 10% estimate come from?

Malcolm wrote:

Dezhung Tulku.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Aris straight out accused Pema Lingpa of fabricating terms for personal gain.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, so did Drukpa Kunley. But he is a national hero in Bhutan.

Sherlock said:

We can't really know if the 17 tantras were revealed in this way or composed and edited intellectually

Malcolm wrote:

Yes we can.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Guess I should just lay down and die right now then.

mutsum said:

There is no shame at referring to other people's work, especially if they have done a nearly similar job before.

Malcolm wrote:

I intended to mention his papers, but I do not have his PhD thesis, it is not on the web yet.

mutsum said:

After all, what is the point of doing any scholarship or translating anything into English?

Well in this field, if you read only english, then you're pretty limited. You have no idea the amount of works that have been done in Germa, French and Italian on Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

I have some.

mutsuk said:

THis is how close they are actually.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

a text definitely authored by Zhangton Tashi Dorje's son, Nyibum (1158-1213), that is included word for word as a terma in the Gongpa Zangthal (revealed in 1366),with its authorship attributed to Vimalamitra. Honestly, it is incredible that no one has noticed this yet, but it is true.

mutsuk said:

It is because you don't read french. .

Malcolm wrote:

Guess I should just lay down and die right now then. After all, what is the point of doing any scholarship or translating anything into English?

More to the point, since Nyibum's text has only recently become available, how could anyone have noted that dgongs pa zang thal text was a [sloppily] reattributed version of it?

Finally, Nyibum's text and Longchenpa's text are pretty different. For one, Longchenpa's text has few citations. Nor does it contain a discussion of the Nidānas and so on. It is much shorter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

pensum said:

Well, as Malcolm just pointed out, within the Tibetan tradition itself there are countless cases of highly regarded lamas denouncing the terma tradition as just that—a scam. Unfortunately, due to personal and political allegiances the authors of the few modern books on the terma tradition available (for example Tulku Thondrup and Andreas Doctor) do not give adequate voice to such criticism and opposition, but rather perpetuate the claims of the tertons themselves..

Malcolm wrote:

There is the late Michael Aris's book which got him exiled from Bhutan for life and earned him the permanent ire of Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche. And we have to remember that until Chogyur Lingpa secured the endorsement of Khyentse Wangpo, even Kongtrul was doubtful, not to mention all those who thought he was a total fraud up to that point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Sikkim was a hidden land of Guru Rinpoche, actually.

Malcolm wrote:

It was only opened in the late 17th century.

conebeckham said:

Maybe, but it was there before then..and according to the Sikkimese, Guru Pema was there.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not mean there is a library there filled with old texts dating from before 1959, which is kind of the point of the discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 14th, 2014 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

The point I am making is that the 17 Tantras are not supposed to be compositions.

Malcolm wrote:

The kun byed rgyal po is not supposed to be a composition, but it clearly is and no one seriously doubts this anymore. It is very clear that the larger Mahāyāna sūtras are layered text productions. The only people who doubt this are Mahāyāna fundamentalist. They are the same people who insist that Mt. Meru is real and that the sun revolves around it. Honestly, such people sound just like Christian and Muslim fundamentalists who insist that the Bible and the Koran were written by God and Allah respectively.

We all want our books to be "special" and the non-fabrication of a book is generally the key criteria that makes one book more sacred and one less. For example, the Vedas are sacred because they are "self-originated". Dzogchen tantras too claim the same status - they are self-originated texts.

When we look at this sort of thing, we have to understand that these are just strategies for acceptance. Another interesting strategy is one by Padmasambhava in the main commentarial text in the *dkon mchog spyi 'dus*, the Sumeru Commentary, where he remarks his own tantra (which is the root of that cycle) is superior to Indian tantras in Sanskrit because it is the speech of the Sambhogakāyā.

So the question will be asked? Can the practice of *dkon mchog spyi 'dus* lead to Buddhahood? Of course it can because all the Dharma in it is sound. The story of its account is just candy for children, like all these mythological accounts.

heart said:

That is the whole point of the terma tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

The point of the terma traditions is that termas are supposed, for the most part, to be the compositions of Padmasambhava, Vimalamitra and so on.

The book I am working on publishing is a translation of a text definitely authored by Zhangton Tashi Dorje's son, Nyibum (1158-1213), that is included word for word as a terma in the Gongpa Zangthal (revealed in 1366), with its authorship attributed to Vimalamitra. Honestly, it is incredible that no one has noticed this yet, but it is true.

heart said:

If Malcolm theory is correct, that the 17 Tantras were composed then the whole lineage would be a lie.

Malcolm wrote:

Not a lie, rather it is a didactic myth. But the seventeen tantras definitely did not exist as texts earlier than dates to which I have assigned them.

Pretty much we have to accept the origin stories of all Mahāyāna texts are either lies or didactic myths. I prefer the latter term.

heart said:

And it would be a very elaborate lie, very close to what we call a scam these days.

Malcolm wrote:

Certainly there were Tibetans who regarded such text production as scams, writing vociferous renunciations of such practices. We have Nyingma authors denouncing the nefarious intent of gold-seeking Indian Panditas who forged tantras on demand in the

13th century, and Sarma authors denouncing gold-seeking tertons who made shows of digging up texts in the very same century.

heart said:

Also we have a living example in ChNNR how texts like these can be discovered, I don't really see the point of doubting him.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I have no doubt that Norbu Rinpoche teachings appear to him in his dreams exactly as he describes them. This does not endorse the authenticity of the origin myths cooked up Zhangton, Nyangral Nyiozer, nor for that matter the myths cooked up to explain the origin of Kalacakra, the Prajñāpāramita, and so on. We, as well as Tibetans before us, tend to take things historically literal that were always regarded as "myth" in the Indian mind. Thus, Indians can manage many competing and contradictory origin myths about the same set of phenomena, but we can't, because we, and also Tibetans, tend to be historical literalists, a literalism you have just admirably demonstrated, i.e. "If the story isn't true, it must be a lie". The Indian mythic imagination thinks "This story is but one story of many". This is why, for example, the authors of the Kalacakra could elaborate a cosmology that they knew for a fact contradicted their mathematical calculations for the position of the sun and so on. Indian tantric authors simply borrowed myths and repurposed them, so the story of Rama's defeat of Ravana becomes the defeat of the Rudra King of Lanka by Hayagriva in Buddhist tales.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Is samapatti a Vajrayāna form of meditation?

Malcolm wrote:

It can be, just as śamatha can be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Tregchö is just a name for samapatti.

dzogchungpa said:

Does that mean you can correctly practice Tregchö without transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

Like any Vajrayāna form of meditation, it cannot be practiced without transmission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

so their value is completely based on the intellectual capacity of the composer?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. Not all Mahāyāna sūtras present the Buddha in the best light, for example. We have clear evidence of Buddhist/Hindu intertextuality, etc. Some termas are much clearer than others. Some terma cycles borrow entire texts authored by early Tibetan scholars and attribute them to people like Vimalamitra. Some tantras are more interesting than other tantras. Some authors of these texts were more realized than others.

I think we are long past the time where we can accept the traditional accounts of Buddhist textual origins. We have far too much evidence of the gradual development of Buddhist texts over centuries to doubt that the evolution of Buddhist ideas from the Nikayas to Vajrayāna is anything other than human beings working out their religious impulses in a Buddhist context.

It does not mean that I disagree with or disregard the ideas expressed in these texts, quite the contrary, I agree with them very much and regard them highly overall. I am after all a practitioner. I simply do not need to subscribe to the origin myths of Mahāyāna and Vajrāyāna texts to find religious meaning in them for myself, just like I do not need to believe in Mt. Meru to do mandala offerings.

In all of this, I am not saying any thing that I have not maintained for years. The difference is that now I have more confidence in my perspective because I have read more texts more closely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You say "revealed", I say "composed".

heart said:

So, do you also think the Hevajra, Chakrasamavra the Guhyasamaya and all other Tantra's and the many Mahayana sutras were composed based on various socio-political pressure?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. As well as the Pali Canon. All of these things were written by human beings. Some of them were buddhas. Text production comes from people; people live in societies; societies exert pressures, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

zsc said:

the lived experiences of black people mean nothing (specifically, this is what Malcolm is saying, over and over), then I will do my best to address it.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that.

What I do maintain is that for a Buddhist things like race, class, gender, etc., really should not be very important as identity markers for oneself as well as for others. To some extent is unavoidable, because we are human beings. But they are not a desiderata, they are barriers. Sanghas that consciously define themselves on the basis of race, class or ethnicity go against the Buddha's message that dismantled caste. Then it winds up being:

The White Power Sangha

The Black Power Sangha

etc.

This is wrong. If there is a Buddhist teacher you want to study with, then go and study. Do not pay attention his or her race, do not pay attention to the race of the people attending that teacher.

Actually, there is no such thing as race. Race is a stupid word. There are different cultures, languages and histories, but is only one human race. There are no black people, no white people, only human people.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Sorry, but when I use the term Presence, I don't have a Tibetan word in mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Then I have no idea what you are taking about. It is useful to have Tibetan words in mind when you are making claims about Dzogchen doctrine.

Andrew108 said:

The objective condition is right in front of you. Here it is now. Calling it 'Presence' is indeed a reification, but then thinking we need to give it a Tibetan name is going way too far away from the intentions of Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

This is so vague as to be utterly meaningless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Orgyenpa described the land he visited as Oddiyana and Buddhaguptanatha still called the place Oddiyana centuries later, so Oddiyana was probably real.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, while Oddiyana was certainly to the north and west of Bodhgaya, Pakistan and Afghanistan are big places. We do not have any definitive proof of exactly where Shambhala or Oddiyana might have been.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Stewart said:

1. Do you believe Mennagde Dzogchen as we know it: Rushan, Trekcho, Tegal etc was ever practiced at all, in any form, in India?

Malcolm wrote:

It is my opinion that many of the rushan practices we find in man ngag sde have



antecedents in Buddhist yogic circles in India. Tregchö is just a name for samapatti. Thogal has antecedents in Buddhist pratyahara practices, in my opinion.

Stewart said:

2. Or, do you hold that Semde and Longde have roots in India and came to Tibet via Sri Singha/Vairocana, and that Mennagde is a later development from these, solely developed in Tibet?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is pretty much what I think. Actually, what I think is that the terms sems sde and klong sde are totally anachronistic and have no meaning or value since they originate in the Vima Nyinthig. Actually, what I think is that the man ngag sde systems was developed because of the importation of the new tantras during the eleventh century from India. The evidence suggests that the man ngag sde system did not develop wide acceptance even in the Nyingma school until the mid 13th century. 13th century Nyingma authors like Rog ban make absolutely no mention of it, even though he discusses in quite some detail the history of Dzogchen, Vairocana and Śrī Simha in his book on Dharma history. Davidson discusses this briefly in his book. He also fails to mention the terma tradition.

Stewart said:

3.What about pre Sri Singha?

Malcolm wrote:

Its all pretty hazy before 1000 CE. But I see no reason doubt the historical existence of Śrī Simha or Vimalamitra, or for that matter Mañjuśrimitra or Garab Dorje.

Stewart said:

4.What about Dzogchen in Oddiyana? Was Oddiyana even real?

Malcolm wrote:

Good question. We are not even really sure where Oddiyana was.

Stewart said:

5.Was there Dzogchen in Zhang Zhung?

Malcolm wrote:

Pre- Buddhist? Very doubtful in my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you like the traditional narrative, it is like comfort food. As far as I can tell, the sgra thal 'gyur was among the last of the seventeen tantras to be composed (along with the

rig pa rang shar, the rig pa rang grol, the mut rig phreng ba and the bkra shis mdzes rgyan), somewhere between 1060 and 1100, most likely by Chetsun Senge Wangchuck himself. The other twelve are earlier, dating between roughly 1020-1050, very likely composed by Dangma Lungyal.

heart said:

Love comfort food. Anyway, I think I have never heard about composing Tantra's, you don't mean revealed?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You say "revealed", I say "composed".

The tradition has it that Dangma Lungyal takes the "seventeen" tantras out of their place of concealment around 906. But the fact that Dangma knows about the Kadampas and mentioned Atisha by name, and the fact that Dangma and Chetsun were contemporaries of Drogmi Lotsawa, and the fact that four of the 17 tantras use terms introduced to Tibet by the Hevajra tantra places the composition of all seventeen tantras in the 11th century, and the composition of a large number of them in the late 11th century. There is virtually no evidence of the type of completion stage practices using nāḍīs, vāyus and bindus that we find in the yogini tantras in Tibetan texts prior to the 11th century, especially not in Dzogchen texts. It is only with the seventeen tantras that we begin to find a body centered praxis in Dzogchen. It is my opinion, not very popular amongst "the faithful", that man ngag sde was elaborated as a response to the arrival of new tantras from India. We even have Nyingma masters [Rog Ban] from the early 12th century complaining about these new fangled heretical practices involving nāḍīs, vāyus and bindus borrowed from Hindus [probably a complaint about Kalacakra's use of Hindu terms for the rasanā, lalanā and avadhūti].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 7:20 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

haha said:

Gerge, thanks for the link.

Discussion was interesting but that did not continue further.

There is nothing to say but the biography of Virupa also supports Sanderson's theory.

Malcolm wrote:

Virupa's bio does not support text conversion. His bio indicates that he went around India converting non-Buddhists through acts of magical terror.

haha said:

Analyzing

-There are five Yin organs (heart, lungs, kidney, liver, and spleen), which are probably Wu Xing/ Five Elements theory from Chinese origin.

Malcolm wrote:

No, for example, there is a passage in the Aṣṭaṅgahridayam that gives these organs in this order:

Heart, lung, liver, gall bladder, spleen, kidney.

haha said:

-Then, they are associated with three major nadis (lalana, rasana and avadhuti), clarity and energy/bliss; it is the buddhist origin, especially from masters of Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

The names are from Buddhist tantra, but it is not certain whether the concepts of the three main nāḍīs are Hindu (ida, pingala or śuśumna) or Buddhist in origin.

So, I don't really agree with you about "adaptation" in this instance. There is some evidence that the nāḍī system was borrowed by the Hindus from Buddhist tantra. But in fact at this point we simply don't know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 6:51 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

I really don't think that socio-political pressure is the main formative force in Buddhism or in Dzogchen. I fully believe ChNNR when he says he isn't the composer of the Longsal teachings and that the Dra Thalgyur is a very ancient Tantra.

/magnus

ratna said:

I, too, fully believe ChNN's description of the mode of discovery of visionary teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really want to get into a discussion of this, but no one doubts that klong gsal comes from his capacity in dream yoga and that they are not fabrications.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 6:48 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

In fact I was thinking about vinaya, the first rule seem to have been "no rule" and then there seem to have been added a lot of rules because "no rule" made some monks misbehave in the strangest ways. Wouldn't it then be reasonable to assume that the first empowerment was "no empowerment" and that elaborations were added on that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, because the ritualism in Buddhism was a response to external pressure to perform in the socio-political sphere in a way that was previously not imperative.

heart said:

I really don't think that socio-political pressure is the main formative force in Buddhism or in Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of Buddhist ritualism found in the tantras, it most certainly is. When it comes to tantra, the reasons for their concealment and revelation are always linked to social and political conditions. The same is true of the anuttarayoga tantras (i.e. they are the most effective practice for the degenerate times we live in).

heart said:

the Dra Thalgyur is a very ancient Tantra.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you like the traditional narrative, it is like comfort food. As far as I can tell, the sgra thal 'gyur was among the last of the seventeen tantras to be composed (along with the rig pa rang shar, the rig pa rang grol, the mut rig phreng ba and the bkra shis mdzes rgyan), somewhere between 1060 and 1100, most likely by Chetsun Senge Wangchuck himself. The other twelve are earlier, dating between roughly 1020-1050, very likely composed by Dangma Lungyal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 11:01 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

just one more reason to leave rigpa untranslated

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed, though I prefer vidyā.

anjali said:

Why do translators seem to have such a hard with translating just the word "rigpa" into English? If we just focus on the word, the English translation is fairly simple. rigpa<-- vidya-->wisdom. Wisdom is the combination of wis + dom where, Wis is Old English and can be traced back to Proto-Indo-European wid- "to see," hence "to know" (vid). Dom is also Old English and in this case means "state or condition". So, the root meaning of wisdom is the state of knowing.

If the word has additional technical meanings, no problem. Just provide a good glossary entry explaining the nuances. Philosophers do that sort of thing all the time--taking a commonly used word and giving special, more nuanced meanings.

Obviously, I'm missing something.

Malcolm wrote:

I tried it once, it didnt work since vidya does not have the same sense as wisdom in English. It is a case where the kn/gn phoneme has shifted meanings with vid phoneme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nepal is well accounted for already, as is Ladakh. Sikkim is a backwater, Bhutan does not have that many libraries. Assam has virtually nothing.

kirtu said:

And Tawang? They seem to have a large library.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Still a backwater.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Sikkim was a hidden land of Guru Rinpoche, actually.

Malcolm wrote:

It was only opened in the late 17th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Question: "Antinomianism" in the Higher Yoga Tantras

Content:

Heterodox Garden said:  
the Cakrasaṃvara Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:  
just one more reason to leave rigpa untranslated

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed, though I prefer vidyā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:  
what Tibetan term does Rinpoche have in mind when he uses the term "instant presence"?

Malcolm wrote:

Rig pa.

Presence = dran pa, i.e. mindfulness.

Some translators like to translate byang chub sems, bodhicitta, as "pure perfect presence".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:  
Sorry, but when I use the term Presence, I don't have a Tibetan word in mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Then I have no idea what you are taking about. It is useful to have Tibetan words in mind when you are making claims about Dzogchen doctrine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Content:

kirtu said:

Tibetan borderland sources?

The borderlands I had in mind were Lhadak, Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan, Tawang and anything that might have been saved in Assam.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Nepal is well accounted for already, as is Ladakh. Sikkim is a backwater, Bhutan does not have that many libraries. Assam has virtually nothing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Isn't dialectic a better way to put it rather than puffery? Otherwise you can conclude in the end that tantra really is no superior to sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, kriya tantra isn't, really. It is only when we come to "carya" and "yog" a tantras that we begin to find statements that indicate there is something more rapid than sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 13th, 2014 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

In the case of Kalachakra it is said that the 'space particle' exists as the objective condition prior to minds that arise dependent on that.

Malcolm wrote:

Kalachakra merely states that physical matter is composed of atoms. But when it describes the source of the universe, the Vimalaprabha states:

When the universe withdraws, this karmavāyu (by which the the perishable universe and buddhaverses were created in the past) has two natures. One is like the stars fixed in space, never moves, and never goes to any region of the perishable universe and buddhaverse. The second has the nature of revolving just like the wheel of houses in the sky. In the same way, the inanimate things included in the the perishable universe have the nature of not moving. The creatures have the nature of moving. The karmavāyu [that creates them] is a quality of consciousness [of sentient beings [that is not nondual]]"...as such, infinite karmavāyus create the the perishable universe and the buddhaverses.

We can clearly see here that what creates the universe is a quality of consciousness. That quality is called karmavāyu. The empty atoms arise from the collective consciousness of all sentient beings. The same is true in Dzogchen teachings.

Andrew108 said:

In Dzogchen, Presence is the objective condition.

Malcolm wrote:

What tibetan term do you mean by presence?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

In fact I was thinking about vinaya, the first rule seem to have been "no rule" and then there seem to have been added a lot of rules because "no rule" made some monks misbehave in the strangest ways. Wouldn't it then be reasonable to assume that the first empowerment was "no empowerment" and that elaborations where added on that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, because the ritualism in Buddhism was a response to external pressure to perform in the socio-political sphere in a way that was previously not imperative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:



Makes the whole thing seem completely constructed.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is just how the texts appear over time that makes it seem that way. Yogacara and its sutras were a reaction to Prajñāpāramitā and Tathagagarbha sūtras. So too with the tantras, each successive generation of texts claims its superiority over the previous generation, both in the primary texts themselves as well as the commentaries written by their exponents.

Thus you have gsar ma claiming its superiority over snying ma; mother tantras over father; ati yoga over mahā; unsurpassed secret cycle declaring its superiority over sems sde and klong sde, as well as the outer, inner and secret cycles; yangti over everything else; terma over karma; Gelugs declaring Tsongkhapa's views superior to the previous Sakya school they grew out of and so on. One aspect of the history of Buddhism is but the history of a contest of puffery and exaggeration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Do you think that maybe around the 8th century, the distinction between Mahayogatantra and yogatantra wasn't as clear-cut as it seemed later?

Malcolm wrote:

There was not distinction, the Indians only knew of three classes of tantra then, kriya, carya and yoga, with Guhyasamaja and the Buddhasamyoga included among yoga tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

I am sure I miss a lot of points Malcolm. But don't you think that the direct introduction is the original empowerment that with time was elaborated with various variations of methods as well as an outline of the path?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, I think the original empowerments were the elaborate abhisheka mandala rituals found in what is now known as "kriya tantra" which never included a "nature of the mind" or "formless" abhisheka until we come to what are now known as "yoga tantra". It is characteristic of kriya tantra empowerments that they only have a body and speech blessing, but no mind blessing.

Then I think "yoga" tantra morphed in anuttarayoga tantra into India. In Tibet yoga tantra, and especially the Guhyagarbha, morphed into mahā and ati, with anu added later because Tibetans did not go to receive any new teachings in India due to the economic chaos that caused the fall of the Tibetan empire in the 840's.

In India, anuttarayoga tantra morphed into the father, mother and Kalacakra tantras, with Kalacakra representing the final development of Indian tantras; just as the 17 tantras represent the final development of Tibetan tantra. In other words. the evolution of tantras was complete in the 11th century, as process that started in the 7th century.

One thing you should understand that is that the tantras written in Tibet are far more homogenous than post 8th century Indian tantras. I chalk this up the isolation of Tibetans from India during this period between 850 and roughly 1000.

Also I should add, the realization of the Anuttarat Tantra in general lead to the Mahāmudra dohas and the Dzogchen lungs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Sherlock said:

What do you mean by you have no doubt about Vairocana's teachings? You mean the Vajra Bridge? Isn't it also 11th century?

Malcolm wrote:

What I mean is that I think Vairocana went to India, met an Indian teacher named Śrī Siṃha (who is happens was also the master of Vimalamitra and perhaps Padmasambhava), and returned with this teacher's oral instructions. I think that Śrī Siṃha is the original source of Dzogchen teachings. I think it is perfectly reasonable to accept the Vajra Bridge instructions as well.

We have not done enough analysis on the other texts to see which ones might be accepted as Indian in origin, and which one's are Tibetan in origin. Any so called treasure texts we can automatically exclude as Tibetan compositions. Other criteria which indicates native Tibetan composition would be etymologies of terms like "byang chub sems" or "ye shes" which bear no relationship to their original Indian etymologies (bodhicitta, jñāna), but are based wholly on their Tibetan phonemes. The point is this is not to impugn the spiritual worth of Tibetan compositions, but to know what is what so we can have a better understanding of the early history of Dzogchen and Nyingma

Tantra in general. Unfortunately, the compilers of the rnying ma rgyud 'bu, rather uncritically combined kama and terma tantras together. So for example, in the klong sde section of the atiyoga section, we find Dorje Lingpa's lta kpong yangs tantra, which is definitely a man snag sde class text.

Sherlock said:

What are the historical works we know for sure (accepted by Sarma too) that were written by Vairocana? I think there was a shamatha text but what else?

Malcolm wrote:

de kho na nyid sgron ma zhes bya ba phyag na rdo rje'i sgrub thabs thams cad rdzogs pa'i rgyan / (tattvapradīpa-nāma-vajrapāṇīsarvasādhana-purāṇa-lamkāra.)

[A] klu sgrub / (nāgārjuna.), [Tr] padma 'byung gnas / (padmakara.), [Tr] glang dpal gyi seng ge (zrīsiMha.), [Rev] rgya gar phyag /

[P. No.] 3048, rgyud 'grel, bi 183a8-209a5 (vol.68, p.173)

[D. No.] 2204, , dzi 147b4-168b1. [N] bi 160a1-183b2. [Kinsha] 1052, bi 223b1 (p.113-2-1)

thugs kyi sgo lcags / ([cittatāḷaka.])

[A] zrīsiGhi (zrīsiMha).

[P. No.] 4758, rgyud 'grel, mu 159a8-164a7 (vol.83, p.241243)

[D. No.] -. [N] mu 164b4-168b7. [Kinsha] 2757, mu 182b4 (p.93-1-4)

u SHN'i SHa sngags kyi man ngag gi bsgrub thabs zhes bya ba / (uSNISamantropadezasādhana-nāma.)

[A] zrīsiMha., [Tr] vairocana., [Tr] zrīsiMha.

[P. No.] 4851, rgyud 'grel, zu 149a1-153a5 (vol.86, p.111113)

[D. No.] -. [N] zu 145b1-150a2. [Kinsha] 2850, zu 194b1 (p.99-1-1)

'khor ba rtsad nas gcod pa gtan tshigs 'khor lo'i man ngag (saMsAramUlacchedakahetucakropadeza.)

[A] zrīsiGGa (zrīsiMha).

[P. No.] 5031, rgyud 'grel, ru 1a1-3a2 (vol.87, p.109-111)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 1a1-3b3. [Kinsha] 3030, ru 1b1 (p.1-2-1)

'khor ba rtsad nas gcod pa bdud rtsi dri med kyi man ngag (saMsAramUlacchedakavimalāmr̥topadeza.)

[A] zrīsiGGa (zrīsiMha).

[P. No.] 5032, rgyud 'grel, ru 3a2-4a6 (vol.87, p.111)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 3b3-5a2. [Kinsha] 3031, ru 3b3 (p.3-2-3)

'khor ba rtsad nas gcod pa rdo rje sems dpa'i man ngag (saMsAramUlacchedkavajrasattvopadeza.)

[A] zrīsiGGa (zrīsiMha).

[P. No.] 5033, rgyud 'grel, ru 4a7-5b2 (vol.87, p.111-112)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 5a2-6a6. [Kinsha] 3032, ru 5b1 (p.3-4-1)

'khor ba rtsad nas gcod pa gser gyi thigs pa'i gdams ngag

(saMsAramUlacchedakakaJcanabindUpadeza.)

[A] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha)., [Tr] vairocana.

[P. No.] 5034, rgyud 'grel, ru 5b2-6b3 (vol.87, p.112)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 6a6-7a6. [Kinsha] 3033, ru 8b1 (p.5-3-1)

'khor ba rtsad nas gcod pa snyan rgyud yi ge med pa'i gdams ngag

(saMsAramUlacchedakakarNatantrAnakSaropadeza.)

[A] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha).

[P. No.] 5035, rgyud 'grel, ru 6b3-7a1 (vol.87, p.112-113)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 7a6-7b3. [Kinsha] 3034, ru 9b5 (p.5-4-5)

lta ba nam mkha' dang mnyam pa'i rgyud kyi dka' 'grel /

(AkAzasamadarzanatantrapajjikA.)

[A] dga' rab rdo rje / (surativajra.), [Tr] vairocana., [Tr] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha).

[P. No.] 5036, rgyud 'grel, ru 7a1-10a8 (vol.87, p.113-114)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 7b3-10b4. [Kinsha] 3035, ru 11b1 (p.7-2-1)

bsgom pa rgya mtsho dang mnyam pa'i rgyud kyi dka' 'grel /

(samudrasamabhAvanAtantrapajjikA.)

[A] dga' rab rdo rje / (surativajra.), [Tr] vairocana., [Tr] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha).

[P. No.] 5037, rgyud 'grel, ru 10a8-12b2 (vol.87, p.114-115)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 10b4-12b4. [Kinsha] 3036, ru 16b1 (p.9-3-1)

spyod pa nyi zla dang mnyam pa'i rgyud kyi dka' 'grel /

(sUryacandrasamacaryAtantrapajjikA.)

[A] dga' rab rdo rje / (surativajra.), [Tr] vairocana., [Tr] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha).

[P. No.] 5038, rgyud 'grel, ru 12b2-15b2 (vol.87, p.115-116)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 12b4-15a7. [Kinsha] 3037, yu 19a2 (p.10-2-2)

'bras bu rin po che dang mnyam pa'i rgyud kyi dka' 'grel /

(mahAratnasamaphalatantrapajjikA.)

[A] dga' rab rdo rje / (surativajra.), [Tr] vairocana., [Tr] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha).

[P. No.] 5039, rgyud 'grel, ru 15b2-18a8 (vol.87, p.116-117)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 15a7-17b7. [Kinsha] 3038, ru 23b1 (p.13-2-1)

lta ba ye shes mdzod chen chos kyi dbyings / (dRSTijJAnamahAkozadharmadhAtu.)

[A] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha).

[P. No.] 5040, rgyud 'grel, ru 18a8-19b8 (vol.87, p.117-118)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 18a1-19b3. [Kinsha] 3039, ru 28b1 (p.15-3-1)

bsgom pa ye shes gsal ba chos kyi dbyings / (bhAvanAjJAnaprakAzadharmadhAtu.)

[A] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha).

[P. No.] 5041, rgyud 'grel, ru 19b8-20b8 (vol.87, p.118)

[D. No.] -. [N] ru 19b4-20b5. [Kinsha] 3040, ru 30a6 (p.16-1-6)

spyod pa ye shes 'bar ba chos kyi dbyings / (caryAjJAnajvaladharmadhAtu.)

[A] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha).

[P. No.] 5042, rgyud 'grel, ru 20b8-21b3 (vol.87, p.118)  
[D. No.] -. [N] ru 20b5-21b3. [Kinsha] 3041, ru 31b4 (p.17-2-4)

'bras bu ye shes sa gcig chos kyi dbyings / (phalajJAnaikabhUmidharmadhAtu.)  
[A] zrisiGGa (zrlsiMha)., [Tr] virocana (vairocana).  
[P. No.] 5047, rgyud 'grel, ru 28b3-30a6 (vol.87, p.121-122)  
[D. No.] -. [N] ru 27b7-29b2. [Kinsha] 3046, ru 43b1 (p.23-2-1)

rigs pa grub pa'i sgron ma / (nyAyasiddhAloka.)  
[A] candragomin., [Tr] virocana., [Tr] zrlsiMhaprabha.  
[P. No.] 5740, tshad ma, ze 197b7-198b6 (vol.138, p.51-52)  
[D. No.] 4242, tshad ma, zhe 187b5-188b2. [N] ze 200b6-201b5. [Kinsha] 3740, ze 261b5  
(p.131-4-5)

You will note that the Sakyapas who edited the Dege Kagyur excluded most of these texts, but they are present in earlier versions of the Tenjur. Note the presence of a short text on logic last translated by Śrī Siṃha and Vairocana.

It is likely that some texts in the Bairo Gyudbum may have actually been authored by Śrī Siṃha or Vairocana.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 8:17 PM  
Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?  
Content:

heart said:  
I am not so sure about that. My feeling is that the duality of development and completion stages is something that wasn't so developed in the early Nyingma Tantra's.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:  
It was quite well developed which is why 9th century texts like the kun byed rgyal po went to such pains to reject it. For example the mdo bcu, thought to have been authored Vairocana states:

Since the place of Samantbhadra arises, there is not need for the creation and completion samadhis.

Or the Vajrasattvamāyājālaguhyasarvādarśa-nāma-tantra, included in the rNying ma rgyud 'bum as well as the bKa' 'gyur, states:

bskyed rdzogs thabs rim gang bstan pa/ /sgyu 'phrul dra bar 'dus pa ste

Any teaching of the stages of the method of creation and completion are included in the Māyājāla

Of course, unifying the two stages is the whole point of the process to begin with in both earlier as well as later tantra.

heart said:

I am sure your quotes are correct, but ultimately if you look deep enough in to the well of Dharma you will find the root of Dharma is actual realization. Methods were taught to facilitate that realization and without the actual realization being introduced to the student how could these methods ever work? So, from the beginning the methods taught might have been quite simple and closely related to the natural state, later (in my opinion) these become the fully fledged two phases.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is certainly true that realization is the goal of any vehicle within Buddhadharma.

The point is that with the elaboration of Unsurpassed Yoga Tantra (not yet known as such in India in the 8th century), the completion stage became a fully elaborated set of practices unto itself. These eventually divorced from the creation stage in the seventeen tantras and their instructions. The fact that there is ambivalence about divorcing Dzogchen from the two stages about this is indicated by such texts as the Khandro Nyingthig, which reimport Mahāyoga and Anuyoga practices, as well as borrow the sexual yoga practices of Ghantapada's Five Stages. Not only this, but the fact that the seventeen tantras elaborate a whole brand new set of empowerments, and that there are recommendations in The Heart Mirror of Vajrasattva and the Self-Arisen Vidyā to practice the three inner tantras as a unity indicates that Tibetans had considerable ambivalence about discarding the classic gradual path system of the inner tantras.

In other words, like Mahāmudra Dohas, the original Dzogchen lungs literally describe the state of realization itself, and they do not describe a path at all. They describe a result. The three traditions of "sems sde" each take different approaches to the material found in the 21 bodhicitta texts; with the upshot that they were combined into a single system at Kahthog called "rgyud mdo rdzogs", i.e. the practice of The Tantra, the Compendium, and Dzogchen.

The key point you are missing, Magnus, is that for something to be secret mantra—and Dzogchen is part of secret mantra—it must be predicated on an empowerment of some kind and a guru. Even the five original lungs of Vairocana make this abundantly clear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 9:57 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I like the idea of infinitely many minds and their traces generating appearances for each other. It's kind of like a mmorpg. Just to be clear, when you say appearances, those are mental events, right?

Malcolm wrote:

It's complicated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

zsc said:

I am a black person.

.

Malcolm wrote:

In this birth. In another you were not human, in another you were a world emperor. In another, an untouchable. In another, Warren Buffet would look like a pauper next to you.

Buddhadharma comes first: race, gender, class, position, these things are not really terribly important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We have only 10% of what existed in Tibet prior to 1959.

kirtu said:

WHAT?? What about the translated German, French and Russian texts in the 19th century and beginning 20th centuries?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

A drop in the bucket.

kirtu said:

More to the point, can the texts be recovered from the Mongolian texts coming to light (the ones saved from the Red Terror after 1924) and from Kalmyk, Siberian and

Malcolm wrote:

Virtually all Gelug, and most post- 17th century.

kirtu said:  
Tibetan borderland sources?

Malcolm wrote:  
Most of the texts in Tibet that were lost were lost due to the wholesale destruction of libraries during the cultural revolution.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 6:38 AM  
Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism  
Content:  
haha said:  
What do you say about this?

Malcolm wrote:  
What is there to say?

Yamala tanta has referred Rishi Vashistha went to Mahacina. Does this Rishi have any relationship with the lineage of Dzogchen-teachers from Oddiyana and India?  
No, not at all.

Is it the synthesis of Taoist and Buddhist ideas about nadi and prana/chi?  
No.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 6:35 AM  
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind  
Content:  
dzogchungpa said:  
I don't see why someone who doesn't accept "out there" accepts "other minds", if only conventionally or whatever.

Malcolm wrote:  
It is quite simple. If there were not other minds "out there", when you are liberated, all other beings would be liberated.

smcj said:  
Well, from your perspective, at that point they are!

Malcolm wrote:  
But you recognize from their perspective, they are still trapped in the fog of ignorance. This is very clearly stated in multiple texts.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I don't see why someone who doesn't accept "out there" accepts "other minds", if only conventionally or whatever.

Malcolm wrote:

It is quite simple. If there were not other minds "out there", when you are liberated, all other beings would be liberated. Vasubandhu defends the existence other minds in a mind-only world in 20 verses.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, but that seems to be begging the question since you are apparently assuming that there are other beings to begin with.

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, no Buddhist school rejects that there are a diversity of sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

alpha said:

I read in the big red book that Vairochana has met Garad Dorje in Dhumastira where he received the entire dzogchen cycle from him. So that would theoretically mean that he received Vajra Bridge as well ?

Also in Golden letters there is a mention of a lineage of Anuyoga where Dharmabodhi looks to be contemporary to Vairochana or just a couple of generations away. If Vajra Bridge has started with Vairochana there are lots of chances that this teaching would reach Dharmabodhi without too many problems.

In this regard of some importance would also be the exegetical treatises composed on the Vajra bridge by some of Dharmabodhi's disciples but i have no idea if these works are known or available...

Malcolm wrote:

We have Dharmabodhi's disciple, Kunzang Dorje's elaborate commentaries on the Vajra Bridge.

There were seven lineage masters between Pang Mipham and Dzeng Dharmabodhi, providing I counted correctly.

Btw, I do not have any doubt about Vairocana's teachings, though it is impossible, in my

opinion, that every text attributed to him or Shri Simha was actually penned by them. What I do not accept the historicity of is the account of man ngag sde tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I don't see why someone who doesn't accept "out there" accepts "other minds", if only conventionally or whatever.

Malcolm wrote:

It is quite simple. If there were not other minds "out there", when you are liberated, all other beings would be liberated. Vasubandhu defends the existence other minds in a mind-only world in 20 verses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Some of us are realists.

Malcolm wrote:

Some of you have no understanding of Dzogchen, or indeed Vajrayāna, at all.

Andrew108 said:

Take a look at Kalachakra. There are systems of Buddhist thought/practice that assert an objective condition.

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think Kalacakra asserts that outer world is real? Mipham comments on 1.6 of the Kalacakra tantra:

The essence of the secret elements come from this aspect of the subtle mind, then the stuff of the inner elements etc., and by that, the external 5 elements. From those the planets, stars etc. arise. This is an important pith of all the upāya path of the secret mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Content:

ConradTree said:

Isn't all this stuff in Bhutan?

Bhutan was the shelter to Gelug suppression.

Malcolm wrote:

Not even remotely. Well, there are still a lot of texts in the library of Sakya no one has ever seen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Content:

ConradTree said:

Yes, but what \*major\* texts are missing like the commentaries on the 17 tantras?

As you know, most Tibetan Buddhist texts are redundant.

Malcolm wrote:

Three volumes of commentary on Kalacakra by Lama Dampa Sonam Gyaltzen, there are so many...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Content:

ConradTree said:

What major Tibetan Buddhist texts are still missing?

Besides some of the commentaries on the 17 tantras of dzogchen menngagde.

Malcolm wrote:

We have only 10% of what existed in Tibet prior to 1959.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

heart said:

I am not so sure about that. My feeling is that the duality of development and

completion stages is something that wasn't so developed in the early Nyingma Tantra's.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It was quite well developed which is why 9th century texts like the kun byed rgyal po went to such pains to reject it. For example the mdo bcu, thought to have been authored Vairocana states:

Since the place of Samantbhadra arises, there is not need for the creation and completion samadhis.

Or the Vajrasattvamāyājālaguhyasarvādarśa-nāma-tantra, included in the rNying ma rgyud 'bum as well as the bKa' 'gyur, states:

bskyed rdzogs thabs rim gang bstan pa/ /sgyu 'phrul dra bar 'dus pa ste

Any teaching of the stages of the method of creation and completion are included in the Māyājāla

Of course, unifying the two stages is the whole point of the process to begin with in both earlier as well as later tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

OK thanks. Actually given the recent scientific study about tummo in some nuns and how the main mechanism behind the raise in temperature is due to the forceful breathing while visualization mainly helps the practitioners maintain the forceful breathing for longer periods, this makes a lot of sense rather than a concept of some nonphysocal force. The idea of a nonphysical force is the one you had been railing against for some time?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is not supported by our tradition. The so called "energy winds" are just vāyu, which is just the element of air. Of course, there are grosser and subtler kind of vāyu, but they all belong to the air element and are not different than the air element.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Some of us are realists.

Malcolm wrote:

Some of you have no understanding of Dzogchen, or indeed Vajrayāna, at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 12th, 2014 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

He is referring to the fact that 'mere' appearances also have functionality. They have energy. We are not remaking the world just by observing it and judging it. It has it's own condition that is independent of the mind that observes it. Some of us are realists.

Malcolm wrote:

No one asserted that world was made by judging and observing. The Dzogchen view of the world is that it's appearances generated by traces in the minds of sentient beings, and that the traces in the minds of sentient beings have the capacity to generate appearances for other minds. So all of our minds together, because of our strong traces to which we are habituated from beginning less time, generate the appearances of the Universe together. Of course this does not mean that the traces of the mind have some state other than bodhicitta. They arise because bodhicitta, the nature of the mind, has not been recognized.

Appearances range from function to non-functional, but in the end they merely appearances of our own minds. The point of view of Dzogchen, and indeed, Vajrayāna in general, is that there is nothing "out there" which objectively exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

So the way in which they physically exist is just our blood and lymph channels, the nuscular system etc?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for example, in the system of the Vajra Bridge, Kunzang Dorje, a disciple of Dharmabodhi who lived in the later 12th century, describes the nāḍīs very clearly as follows:

"Since it is necessary to understand the critical point of nāḍīs and vāyu, though there are 80,000 nāḍīs in a single body, they are gathered into five in the organ of the heart [don snying]. Blood and vāyu exist in the heart nāḍī, the lalanā, which exists on the right. Lymph [chu ser] and vāyu exist in the lung nāḍī, the rasanā, which exists on the left.

Vāyu and bindu exist in the kidney nāḍī, the avādhuti (kun 'dar ma), which exists in the middle. The liver nāḍī generates the pure essence of the sense organs, exists above, and illuminates [sense] consciousness. Since the spleen nāḍī is the lower end of the avadhuti, it produces bliss."

They are necessarily physical structures which contain physical things such as vāyu and bindu, blood and lymph, feces and urine etc. This is merely one example I can provide out of many.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Sherab said:

In addition to the aggregates, there has to be certain relationships in the aggregates and between the aggregates in order for there to be a proper basis for the taking of a designation.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no end. You cannot arbitrarily decide where to end the dependency. In this case, you can only designate the universe as "a self" since everything in it is a dependent relationship. Remember, the material aggregate includes all sense organs and sense objects!

For the reason a so called "dependent" self should be rejected out of hand as incoherent. "Identity" merely exists as a designation upon a collection of parts. For example, you have "a car" because this collection of parts functions according to your expectations; you have a "broken car" when it does not; and when it is a scrap yard, it is called "a dismantled car", for example, "that is a door from a BMW". But there is no dependent identity. "Identity" is merely a convention, and purely a product of designation upon an appearance, nothing more. The identity we impute is a designation based on an appearance, but the fact that identity is not dependent on the appearance can be understood from all the different identities that can be imputed upon an appearance, "Human", "Malcolm", "Löppon", "Asshole", "Heretic", "Buddhist" and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Magnus..I remember that as well..just trying to get a little history of practice in Longde prior to that is all

heart said:

To tell you the truth I think there have always been Tantric elements in Dzogchen.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It's pretty clear that Dzogchen started out life as the realization of the completion stage, identical with Mahāmudra in the gsar ma system [The Kagyupas turned Mahāmudra into an independent system in the 12th century, which as we know elicited a strong reaction from Sakya Pandita]. It was only in the 10th century that Dzogchen became a separate vehicle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: Longde before Dzin Dharmabodhi?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

ChNNR has said that it was Dzin Dharmabodhi that added in the practice of Ngondzog Gyalpo into the Longde teachings. Does anyone know what they were like prior to this?

Malcolm wrote:

We have absolutely no evidence of the Vajra Bridge aka klong sde prior to Dzeng Dharmabodhi. This basically means that like everything else in Tibetan Buddhism, very little can be positively dated before the 11th century. Dates about texts and authors only begin to become clear in the 11 century. For Tibetans, even the 11th century is hazy to those in the 12th, not to mention anything prior to the 11th.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 7:39 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

But I thought you said before that Tibetans realized they were not physical when they dissected bodies and dddn't find any of those channels.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I have never maintained that.

What I said was that the way the nāḍīs exist in the body does not correspond to how they are visualized, not that they do not physically exist. They do physically exist because their process of development during gestation is very precisely described in tantras such as Kālacakra, sGra thaḥ 'gyur and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Elaboration of dependent self:

A dependent self exists because of certain relationships between its parts. These relationships in turn are dependent on the laws of nature. Without a certain stability in the laws of nature for a certain duration, a dependent self cannot exist.

Those who wish to posit that the relative is ultimately illusory, must therefore show that the laws of nature are ultimately illusory. As I see it, modern science is heading in that direction, but is still far from reaching a definitive answer.

Malcolm wrote:

A self is merely a designation, and does not exist apart from designation. It has no parts. A self cannot be found in a part, nor in all of the parts combined. This is why there is no "dependent self". If there were a "dependent" self, it would have to be shown which part is the key part upon which it depended. Since a self cannot be found in one of the aggregates, all of the aggregates or separate from the aggregates, for this reason one cannot accept the existence of a so-called "dependent" self. In fact the two terms are mutually exclusive, like "dependent inherent existence".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 6:08 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

According to that Germano article, the Upanishad channel involved a connection from the heart to the head, it wasn't the fully elaborated system that appears in the yoginitantras. There was no fully system of channels and cakras during the initial transmission of tantra to Tibet in the 8th-9th century so it was fully elaborated only in between then and around 1000CE.

.

Malcolm wrote:

I just wanted to add, I have looked at all the Dzogchen literature extant that could conceivably be pre- 1000, and none of it has any trace of concern or interest in anything remotely resembling the nāḍī, vāyu and bindu systems present in Hevajra, Kalacakra, and so on.



This only changes when we come to the man ngag sde tantras. For this as well as other reasons, I place the composition of the bulk of the seventeen tantras no earlier than 1020-1030 with the sgra thal 'gyur, the mu tig phreng ba, the rig pa rang shar and rang grol as well as the bkra shis mdzes ldan being the last. The sgra thal 'gyur was almost certainly composed by Chetsun Senge Wangchuck, in my opinion.

Sherlock said:

What about Bon Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

It is all 11th century and later, like all bon texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 6:06 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Getting back to the topic, here's another "misleading" quotation, from "The Crystal and the Way of Light": The Base, or Zhi in Tibetan, is the term used to denote the fundamental ground of existence, both at the universal level and at the level of the individual, the two being essentially the same; to realize the one is to realize the other. If you realize yourself, you realize the nature of the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

This is no different than saying that if one realizes the emptiness of one thing, one realizes the emptiness of all things. The principle is the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 6:02 PM

Title: Re: Pronunciation (yes one of these)

Content:

Konchog1 said:

This is sort of embarrassing, one would think that over the whole internet there would be easy to find answers that agree with each other for something so simple.

Nope.

I've been reciting the excellent Sutra of Golden Light and I am unsure of the pronunciation of part of this Dharani:

NAMO BUDDHĀYA/ NAMO DHARMĀYA/ NAMAH SANGHĀYA/ NAMO BRAHMĀYA/ NAMA  
INDRĀYA/ NAMA CHATURNĀM/ MAHĀRĀJĀNĀM/ TADYATHĀ/ HILI HILI/ MILI MILI/  
GAURI/ MAHĀGAURI/ GANDHARI/ MAHĀGANDHARI/ DRIMIDI/ MAHĀDRIMIDI/

DANDAKHUKHUNATI/HA HA HA HA/ HI HI HI HI/ HU HU HU HU/ HALODHAME/  
GUDHAME/ CHA CHA CHA CHA/ CHI CHI CHI CHI/ CHU CHU CHU CHU/  
CHANDESHVARA/ SHIKHARA/ SHIKHARA/ UTISHTHAHE BHAGAVĀN/ SAMVIDJÑĀYE  
SVĀHĀ

<http://www.sutraofgoldenlight.com/2011/06/chapter-19-completed-samjnaya-lord-of.html>

CHANDESHVARA/ SHIKHARA/ SHIKHARA/ UTISHTHAHE BHAGAVĀN/ SAMVIDJÑĀYE  
SVĀHĀ should be pronounced as CHANDE SW ARA/ SHIKHARA/ SHIKHARA/  
UTISHTHAHE BHAGA W ĀN/ SAMVID NYA YE S W ĀHĀ right?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:  
Gnya

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 9:16 AM  
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind  
Content:  
Sherab said:  
Elaboration of dependent self:

A dependent self exists because of certain relationships between its parts. These relationships in turn are dependent on the laws of nature. Without a certain stability in the laws of nature for a certain duration, a dependent self cannot exist.

Those who wish to posit that the relative is ultimately illusory, must therefore show that the laws of nature are ultimately illusory. As I see it, modern science is heading in that direction, but is still far from reaching a definitive answer.

Malcolm wrote:  
So you are realist, not different at all from Sarvastivadins.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 7:54 AM  
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind  
Content:  
Sherab said:

I don't agree with you argument about not naming as it seems to deny that a dependent self exists in the sphere of the relative. As for a self in the sphere of the ultimate, my take is that the experience of nirvana or enlightenment is an experience where the concept of a self or no-self as understood in the sphere of the relative becomes incoherent, but the individuality of the experience cannot be denied.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "dependent" self, there is only a designated self. Apart its designation, the self, such as it is, is the son of a barren woman. If there were a dependent self, it would exist designated upon its parts, like a car or a cup. So what are the parts of the self upon which it is designated?

Sherab said:

There is no things, inanimate or otherwise, that exist designated on its parts. If it did, then by taking apart say a chariot and pile them into a heap, it will not be a pile of other things, but will still be designated as a chariot. A thing exists and functions only when the parts are in a particular relationship with each other. When that particular relationship exists between the parts, a dependent self exists. Upon that dependent self, a label or name is designated.

Malcolm wrote:

You just refuted a dependent self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

According to that Germano article, the Upanishad channel involved a connection from the heart to the head, it wasn't the fully elaborated system that appears in the yoginitantras. There was no fully system of channels and cakras during the initial transmission of tantra to Tibet in the 8th-9th century so it was fully elaborated only in between then and around 1000CE.

.

Malcolm wrote:

I just wanted to add, I have looked at all the Dzogchen literature extant that could conceivably be pre- 1000, and none of it has any trace of concern or interest in anything remotely resembling the nāḍī, vāyu and bindu systems present in Hevajra, Kalacakra, and so on.

This only changes when we come to the man ngag sde tantras. For this as well as other reasons, I place the composition of the bulk of the seventeen tantras no earlier than 1020-1030 with the sgra thal 'gyur, the mu tig phreng ba, the rig pa rang shar and rang grol as well as the bkra shis mdzes ldan being the last. The sgra thal 'gyur was almost certainly composed by Chetsun Senge Wangchuck, in my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Madhyamaka vs Dzogchen - Is this right?

Content:

ConradTree said:

Madhyamaka..... Dzogchen

freedom from extremes..... freedom from extremes

dependent origination.....kadag, lhun grub and thugs rje

two truths.....discards two truths

no tantric features.....direct introduction, dream yoga, dark retreat,

description of death process, description of empty clarity etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Something like that. Dzogchen is a part of secret mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

ConradTree said:

The debate is how much of Dzogchen is Indian Buddhist vs Tibetan Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

My guess, about 5% Indian, 95% Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

That's a good point -- maybe the overall concept that there are subtle, not exactly physical channels and so on in the body is not uniquely Buddhist...

Malcolm wrote:

All the channels are described in the Buddhist tantras as physical structures. They are called "subtle" (sukṣma, phra) because they are very fine, not because they are immaterial or made of some quasi-material. For example, according to Kālacakra, the lower tips of the three main channels produce urine, feces and reproductive fluids. That is hard to do if they are not physical.

All the channels form during gestation in the womb. This is the same in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

According to that Germano article, the Upanishad channel involved a connection from the heart to the head, it wasn't the fully elaborated system that appears in the yoginitantras.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Sherlock said:

There was no fully system of channels and cakras during the initial transmission of tantra to Tibet in the 8th-9th century so it was fully elaborated only in between then and around 1000CE.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Sherlock said:

Some Hindu tantras have references to tantras originating from Mahacina, which might be a reference to either China or an area to the Northeast.

Malcolm wrote:

Principally the Nilasarasvati tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In addition, a so called "pandita" is described as "A scholar in the foundation of outer and inner objects of knowledge." A so called "kusali" is described as "One who has the most dedication inwardly after severing all outer distractions."

In terms of actual perfect Buddhahood: the first, having become knowledgeable about all objects of knowledge, has severed doubt through hearing, reflection and meditation. Then, because of severing doubt through meditating which makes samadhi essential, the pandita gradually attains Buddhahood after actualizing the Dharma of realization. A kusali necessarily has the same basis, but when considered alone, a pandita is closer to Buddhahood.

-- Sakya Pandita

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 7:13 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

I don't agree with your argument about not naming as it seems to deny that a dependent self exists in the sphere of the relative. As for a self in the sphere of the ultimate, my take is that the experience of nirvana or enlightenment is an experience where the concept of a self or no-self as understood in the sphere of the relative becomes incoherent, but the individuality of the experience cannot be denied.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "dependent" self, there is only a designated self. Apart its designation, the self, such as it is, is the son of a barren woman. If there were a dependent self, it would exist designated upon its parts, like a car or a cup. So what are the parts of the self upon which it is designated?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 9:45 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

You seem to be saying that what is pointed out or introduced is nothing, i.e. what ChNNR calls our real condition or natural state is nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that what is pointed out is the nature of the mind, the mind essence, which you will never find when you look for it, apart from the looking itself, which when sought, is not findable either because it is free from extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 7:35 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

From a Dzogchen point of view, and Vajrayāna in general, there is something to point out, i.e. the nature of mind, an empty clarity.

gad rgyangs said:

oh, so there is something after all! thats a relief!

Malcolm wrote:

Clarity is also not established, that is why it is called "empty". In fact, there is nothing to point out, knowing that is clarity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

jeeprs said:

sectarian polemics

Malcolm wrote:

To be perfectly honest, as I have said before, from a textual POV, Dzogchen is filled to the brim with sectarian polemics. It is the most sectarian teaching in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The view of freedom from extremes as explained in Madhyamaka is not the slightest bit different than the view of freedom from extremes as explained in Dzogchen. That is why ChNN cites Sakya Pandita's Analysis of the Three Vows...

dzogchungpa said:

OK, but why then does ChNNR, in "The Base In Dzogchen", say this:

ChNNR said:

...Madhyamika, which is a philosophical system, negates the existence of the Base completely.

dzogchungpa said:

?

Malcolm wrote:

Because Madhyamaka negates everything completely. But that does not mean that the Dzogchen view of freedom from extremes is any different at all from the Madhyamaka view of freedom from extremes, for in fact they are formulated in precisely the same way. Further, Madhyamaka is not focused on the person, but rather in eliminating any sorts of reifications about existence, etc., whereas Dzogchen is concerned with explicating the nature of the mind. In other words, from a Madhyamaka POV there is nothing to point out, since nothing is established. From a Dzogchen point of view, and Vajrayāna in general, there is something to point out, i.e. the nature of mind, an empty clarity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A large problem for people who are approaching Dzogchen is that they fall back into

classical western philosophical categories.

jeeprs said:

Why is this a problem?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist texts need to have their own own distinctive terminologies in English, just as they do in Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan in order to clearly demarcate our teachings and philosophy from those of other traditions. For this reason then using terminology like "ground of being" for gzhi is wholly inadequate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A nice metaphor that illustrates my point again, from the chapter on demonstrating the basis of the buddhas and sentient beings as one from the rdzogs pa chen po nges don 'dus pa:

For example, though one offers a thousand lamps,  
there is no more than one nature of light.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Hey, hey, apparent yet nonexistent retinue: listen well! There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, prajñā does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway."

-- Unwritten Tantra

gad rgyangs said:

Methinks he doth protest too much. if he really doesn't exist, shouldn't he just shut up?

Malcolm wrote:

You know that they say, the empty bucket makes the loudest noise.



Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 2:56 AM  
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind  
Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if you insist there is no ultimate, no relative, no condition, no anything, then you are not really saying anything at all, at least not anything interesting.

Malcolm wrote:

Who said tathatā was supposed to be interesting? Not the Buddha:

“Hey, hey, apparent yet nonexistent retinue: listen well! There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, prajñā does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway.”

-- Unwritten Tantra

“Venerable Śāriputra, if one sees it like so, all phenomena are empty, without characteristics, non-arising, unceasing, without stains, and not free from stains; not decreasing, not increasing.

“Śāriputra, in emptiness there is no matter, no sensation, no ideation, no formations, no consciousness, no eye, no ear, no nose, no tongue, no body, no mind, no form, no sound, no smell, no taste, no contact. There is no eye element up to no mental element, and also nothing up to the element of mental consciousness.

There is no ignorance; there is no end of ignorance; up to there is no aging and death and no end of aging and death.

Likewise, there is no suffering, cause, cessation and path.

There is no wisdom, nothing to obtain, and also nothing not to obtain.

-- The "Heart" Sutra

M

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 2:54 AM  
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind  
Content:

gad rgyangs said:

The metaphor does however demonstrate the source of the seemingly contradictory

statements in the Tantras, some of which clearly point to a universal basis and others which point to a personal basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Its more easily reconciled on the basis of the intellectual categories to which the authors of the man ngag sde tantras in the 11th century were clearly familiar, that of the two kinds of lakṣanas, or characteristics we find in pramāṇa, samanya lakṣanas and svalakṣanas, in other words, universal and particulars. There is so much language of pramāṇa scattered through out the man ngag sde tantras, and use of it in a classical nominalist fashion in these tantras, that it is impossible these guys meant that the universal we call the thog ma spyi gzhi, the original "general or universal" basis, was meant to be anything other than a generic description of qualities and attributes possessed by specific or individual minds.

Use of hologram metaphors does not lead us anywhere near what these gentleman themselves thought of their own textual compositions, not to mention that problem that people get into when they indiscriminately cite the bodhicitta texts as the representing the sum total of Dzogchen thought. Obviously, there is a lot of problem with anachronistic readings of these texts by classical scholars such as Longchenpa. But unless you are a true believer (tm) and accept the original account of the origin of the man ngag sde literature presented in the Vima Nyingthig as historical fact, it is irresponsible to read these texts in that way. In fact the term gzhi is barely used in the bodhicitta texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

smcj said:

As Dudjom R. said (ibid):

What unimpededly appears on it (the mirror) are all the things of relative reality, your mind included.  
(formatting mine)

Sounds undifferentiated to me. Of course you can always say D.R. didn't know what he was talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

All the things in relative reality come about, in Dzogchen parlance, from a mind that does not recognize its own display. But it takes a mind that does not recognize its essence to produce that relative. There is no mind-essence other than in the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

all subtle & sophisticated systems east & west (including Dzogchen) agree the ultimate is beyond description, conceptualization, categorization. So that's not really open to discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, the ultimate is not established, that is also not open to discussion. The reason why the ultimate in Madhyamala, Dzogchen, etc. is beyond description has everything to do with the basis premise of *niṣprapañca* and what that means.

gad rgyangs said:

what I see as an interesting difference of perspective is between systems that think something in our condition is wrong, missing, or fallen,

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing missing in our condition, since we don't have one. If we had a condition, that would be a self, and then we would really have a problem.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

smcj said:

The same applies to Yogacara, "Great Madhyamaka" (is there a singular definition of this in the first place or is it something all teachers call their own interpretation of Madhyamaka) and other themes

Whatever the specifics of Dudjom R.'s interpretation of "Great Madhyamaka" (Empty-of-Other) were should be accepted as a legitimate view of Dzogchen. His shorthand of using the idea of a mirror as the undifferentiated Basis and the images on it as apparent phenomena should be non-controversial as one way of looking at it.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an entirely dualistic metaphor, from where to the images in this mirror arise? In any case, your interpretation that the basis is an undifferentiated unity is not supported in Dzogchen tantras. It is probably not actually supported in gzhan stong either, at this point I am too busy to look.

The Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra states:

The self-originated ultimate garbha,  
in the manner of being perfect without being generated,  
is a brilliant mirror existing in all.

The marginalia notes that the mirror is the wisdom of vidyā, which as we know is what the instantiated basis is termed. So we can clearly see that this self-originated, ultimate garbha is just a term for the mind-essence.

The Self Arisen Vidyā Tantra:

The light rays of all worlds issue forth  
from the mirror of perfect mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

Historical Dzogchen masters familiar with the Indian schools classified the views of those schools as wrong views and described why. If you say Dzogchen teaches a view similar to the views of those schools you are either misunderstanding something or you are implying those historical masters gave misleading statements.

The views of those schools cannot be the same as Dzogchen. If you say they are similar OK but you need to work out on which points they differ.

Malcolm wrote:

The view of freedom from extremes as explained in Madhyamaka is not the slightest bit different than the view of freedom from extremes as explained in Dzogchen. That is why ChNN cites Sakya Pandita's Analysis of the Three Vows when he describes the view of Dzogchen, the full quote as follows:

Tough indeed there are levels of view  
in Śrāvaka and Mahāyāna,  
it is never explained there is a division of views  
in Pāramitā and Secret Mantra.  
If there were a view superior to  
the freedom from proliferation of the Pāramitā,  
that view would contain proliferation.  
If [the view of secret mantra] is free from proliferation, there is no difference.  
Therefore, the view that is comprehended  
with explanation is the same,  
nevertheless, secret mantra is superior  
in the methods for realizing freedom from proliferation.

Longchenpa also admits that freedom from extremes in Prasanga and the Dzogchen view are the same.

Honestly, I don't see where the controversy is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

smcj said:

if aspects of them end up sounding like some other system of thought that's fine.

Malcolm wrote:

If aspects of them sound like some other system, it means that translator has been lazy and has not done his job well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

are Dzogchen and western theology/metaphysics saying the same thing? no.

Malcolm wrote:

If the language of western theology is invited into Dzogchen, how will people be able to distinguish the two? They will not, other than the fact that there is no term in Dzogchen that matches the term "ground of being".

gad rgyangs said:

are they talking about the same thing, i.e. the nature of reality? yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is talking about a state in which there is no creator [i.e. lhun grub]; Tillich is talking about a state on which there is a creator [i.e. dbang phyug]. Dzogchen rejects reality in favor of freedom from extremes, in which neither an ultimate nor relative can be established in anyway. There is no ground of being in Dzogchen, there are no beings in Dzogchen. If the basis was a "ground of being" it would be expressible. Since it is free from being, non-being, etc., it is inexpressible. In the process, Dzogchen does not go beyond Madhyamaka view in anyway at all.

gad rgyangs said:

do both traditions agree that the nature of reality is ineffable and beyond thought and categories? yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen does not agree that there is a reality per se, a state of being that pertains to things. Freedom from all extremes is not a state of being [ity] pertaining [al] to things [res].

gad rgyangs said:

so what does their talking around the nature of reality amount to? poetic metaphors.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, when people reach their level of philosophical incompetence they, at the last resort, pull out the poetry card.

gad rgyangs said:

so is there actually a nature of reality? yes: here we are.

Malcolm wrote:

If there were an actual nature of reality, we couldn't be here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Discussion of Political Topics is Wrong Speech

Content:

tobes said:

there is far more expressively political advice on other matters. I'm not sure how one plausibly could only deny that the Ratnāvalī is filled with such content.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not that filled, it constitutes somewhat less than 10% of the total.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

rory said:

Malcolm: Oh it's a big issue here. In most Dharma centers you never find the rituals that are normal back in Asia.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, clearly you have never been to a Tibetan Buddhist center in the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Again, if you are using the term of "ground of being", which is Christian theological term out of place in Dzogchen, you will run into many contradictions.

jeeprs said:

Interestingly, there is a Wikipedia article called

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ground\\_of\\_Being\\_%28Dzogchen%29](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ground_of_Being_%28Dzogchen%29) (albeit with

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ground\\_of\\_Being\\_%28Dzogchen%29#Nomenclature\\_of\\_article:\\_meta-annotation.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ground_of_Being_%28Dzogchen%29#Nomenclature_of_article:_meta-annotation.))

Malcolm wrote:

The article you mentioned is a mess. First of all, the term that gzhi translates is sthana, not āśraya. It just turns into a muddle from there.

In terms of the origins of the term, it was indeed coined by Tillich to show that "God must be called the infinite power of being which resists the threat of nonbeing."

[Systematic Theology, Vol. pg. 64] You can see why such borrowing is tempting, "The ground of being has the character of self-manifestation; it has logos character"

[Systematic Theology, Vol.1 pg. 158]

A large problem for people who are approaching Dzogchen is that they fall back into classical western philosophical categories. Indeed, Günther wrote once that Dzogchen essentially is not different than Parmenides's theory that whatever was contingent as non-being and whatever is permanent is being. Tillich writes:

"The Orphics, the Pythagoreans, Anaximander, Heraclitus, and Parmenides were driven to their philosophy by the awareness that the world they encountered lack ultimate reality. But only in Plato does the contrast between existential and the essential being become an ontological and ethical problem. Existence for Plato is the realm of mere opinion, error, and evil. It lacks true reality. True being is essential being and is present in the realm of eternal ideas, i.e., in essences. In order to reach essential being, man must rise above existence. He must return to the essential realm from which he fell into existence, In this way man's existence, is standing out of potentiality, is judged as a fall from what he essentially is. The potential is the essential, and to exist, i.e., to stand out of potentiality, is the lost of true essentiality...In God there is no difference between essential and existential being. This implies the split is not ultimately valid and that is has no relevance for the ground of being itself. God is eternally what he is. [Systematic Theology, Vol.2 ppg. 21-22]

Examining this kind of presentation that the term "ground of being" arose out of, it is easy to see why those who are not trained in Indo-Tibetan scholastics as well as Western Philosophy will be very attracted to terms like "ground of being" relationship to the term "basis" or gzhi.

The gzhi is strictly defined as lacking any essence, any svabhāva, in Dzogchen texts. Indeed its potentiality is made possible because of its empty nature. Without that coreless core, the processes of the basis by which the five lights shine out and so on are simply not possible. Emptiness, naturelessness, the absence of being, the absence of reality, the absence of extremes is precisely what makes the basis originally pure. As the

sgra thal gyur tantra states:

Since there is no basis or foundation, dwell in emptiness.

The commentary merely notes that this line confirms the quality of the non-existence of one's mind.

And further it states:

Due to being free from extremes, the middle does not exist.

The commentary describes this as the Great Perfection view that is totally complete freedom from extremes:

The so-called intimate instruction of the view of the totally complete space of the great freedom from activities is the view of the totally complete freedom from extremes. Since that is free from the extreme of existence, it does not fall into the position of substantiality. Since it is free from the extreme of nonexistence, it exhausts grasping to emptiness. Since it is free from both existence and non-existence, it is free from apprehending the intrinsic nature of the apprehender, since it is free from the extreme of neither existence nor nonexistence, there is also no concept of mere non-existence.

Moreover, since it is free from the extreme of emptiness, it possesses the meaning of an intrinsically clear core. Since it is free from the extreme of being non-empty, the extreme of grasping to substantiality is avoided. Since it is free from a basis [gzhi], it is not conceived as being either "clear" or "empty", since it is free from both, there is nothing to prove nor negate. In the same way, combine [the above reasoning] for all such as the extreme of appearance and so on.

Further because it is free from extremes it is not established many. Because it is totally complete, it is not established as one. Since that is free from one and many, it is the inexpressible dharmatā that is free from falling into extremes.

Now then, if it is said "That is not Dzogchen because it begins to abandon extremes", since it is totally complete as existence, it means there is nothing to seek. Since it is totally complete as non-existence, it means there is nothing to abandon. Since it is complete as both, it means it is beyond accepting and rejecting. Since it is complete as neither, everything becomes dharmatā.

Likewise, since empty, not empty and so on are totally complete, therefore, "Great Perfection" means not falling into hope and fear or extremes.

Moreover, because it is one, proliferation is severed, because it is many, there is not need to abandon anything. Further, because there are extremes, the middle is eliminated, because there is a middle, likewise, the extremes are eliminated. As such, if it is wondered why, it is because since it is free from extremes the middle does not exist. Because the extremes are negated, it is empty of a middle; since the middle is negated,



likewise, there is no perception of extremes. Therefore:

"Because it is totally complete, there is nothing to dedicate."

And:

Since there is nothing more, there are no parts.

In case someone still doubts whether the basis is just referring to one's own mind, Vajrasattvamāyājālaguhyasarvādarśa-nāma-tantra states:

The rootless mind itself  
is the root of all phenomena.

A passage from Bhavya's Madhyamakaratnapradīpa reinforces our understanding of this passage:

Just as from the root of the lotus  
leaves and so on are continually produced,  
likewise, though the mind is insubstantial  
it exists as the essence of all phenomena.

This is the meaning of that: just as the root of the lotus is not connected with anything else, exists in water, and though that root does not penetrate anything, it is able to fill a great pond with leaves, flowers, and so on. Likewise, though the mind itself is insubstantial, it exists as the nature of all external and internal phenomena in the relative.

Just as shoots of rice in a terrace  
spread everywhere without roots,  
also the rootless mind itself  
pervades the furthest reaches of space.

Here, the meaning of this is: in ponds and terraces, the plants called "rice" are interlinked, they grow on the surface of a terrace with a yellow flower, their roots do not penetrate. In the same way, while the mind is rootless, it spreads throughout all space, existing as the nature of all phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

zsc said:

Trying to extract culture from the dharma to make it "pure" is actually a western cultural decision, based on Protestant-driven anxiousness to find the "pure" way, the "original" way, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

That is really not an issue here. That will be more of an issue on Dhammawheel. That is mostly a Theravadin discomfort.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

I don't think anyone, at any point on this thread said the relative is all there is. If the ultimate lacks inherency the relative does as well.

Sherab said:

"Lacks inherency" means lacking there is nothing innate and implies that there is only dependency. In other words, everything is relative. Therefore "lacking inherency" is another way of saying that the relative is all there is.

Malcolm wrote:

The ultimate truth is nothing more and nothing less than cognition of what remains after the relative has been examined, or the non-conceptual cognition of true nature of the relative.

To answer your earlier: causes and effects can neither be the same nor can they be different. If they are same, all causes are non-causes and all effects are non-effects. If they are different, causes remain non-causes and effects remain non-effects. When causes and effects are seen as they are, i.e., neither the same nor different, than causality, conventionally speaking, is preserved, without various identity problems. Nāgārjuna states:

It is not valid that arising and perishing are the same,  
nor it is valid that arising and perishing are different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

These days many people express the language of Dzogchen in terms which are little more than a revenant of 19th Century British Idealism...

dzogchungpa said:

Revenant? Wow.

Well, as I've said, I like your POV better, it's much easier for me to understand. It does seem kind of strange that Guarisco is so off though.

Malcolm wrote:

I have no idea what he thinks, I can only know what he writes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, I am just a beginner, so I can't say whether Malcolm is correct. I can see why people might think otherwise, though. Here is a passage from Elio Guarisco's introduction to "Myriad Worlds":

In the Dzog-chen system, the primal creative cause of the universe is neither the evolutionary actions of beings nor the interrelationships of the compassion of the buddhas and sen-tient beings, but rigpa, a state of pure and total awareness. This state of awareness is nothing other than the primordially pure ground of being itself (gzhi).

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen texts, the gzhi is never described as a ground of being for the simple reason that being, non-being, and so on are not established either in the so-called "basis" or in appearances of the basis that has arisen. It is no wonder you are confused when you see use of terms from Paul Tillich out of context in this way. Tillich, the originator of the term, uses the ground of being to describe God.

dzogchungpa said:

and a little later on he says:

Kongtrul states that an understanding of the Dzog-chen view of cyclic life is essential if one is to understand the path and the result of this system. The Dzog-chen perspective holds that everything emerges spontaneously from the primordially pure nature of being, that everything always remains primordially pure, and that when this truth is recognized within one's own natural awareness (rang byung ye shes), one instantly recovers one's original enlightened nature, which has been there all along.

I really can't see how this is compatible with Malcolm's position.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, if you are using the term of "ground of being", which is Christian theological term out of place in Dzogchen, you will run into many contradictions.

These days many people express the language of Dzogchen in terms which are little more than a renege of 19th Century British Idealism:

Our conclusion, so far, will be this, that the Absolute is one system, and that its

contents are nothing but sentient experience. It will hence be a single and all-inclusive experience, which embraces every partial diversity in concord. For it cannot be less than appearances and hence no feeling or thought, of any kind, can fall outside its limits. And if it is more than any feeling or thought which we know, it must still remain more of the same nature. It cannot pass into another region beyond what falls under the general head of sentience.

Bradley, F. H. (Francis Herbert), 1846-1924. Appearance and reality : a metaphysical essay (Kindle Locations 2251-2256). London : G. Allen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

If one holds the mind as a series of discrete mental moments, then by definition, there is a gap between one discrete moment and the next. In the gap, there cannot be any consciousness and therefore knowledge. Consequently, there is no guarantee that the transition from one discrete moment to another will be perfect since it is possible to postulate some disturbance during the transition of a mental moment from one to another that result in an imperfect transition.

Malcolm wrote:

But the mind is not a series of "discrete" mental moments in the way in which you are positing it. If you follow Nāgārjuna's reasoning, the mind is series of moments that are neither the same as nor different from each other. In the case of a person with āryan insight, there is no possibility of any disturbance between one moment of mind and the next because the mind stream has now been purified of causes for the arising of afflictions.

Āryan insight does not transform a relative mind into ultimate mind; it is relative mind that has the capacity to take the ultimate as an "object". The Gelugpa use the useful example of subjective clear light and objective clear light, subjective clear light is the mind that apprehends objective clear light.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There is no first proof that mind and consciousness originated from matter.

Malcolm wrote:

Case closed.

Andrew108 said:

Not at all. Recent studies have shown that physical activity in the brain precedes mental events.

Malcolm wrote:

Still haven't discarded your brain-based physicalism, I see.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

rory said:

You've had two African-American posters tell you why they feel alienated and then you don't agree with their conclusions, say there are no differences, talk over them etc...

Ugh.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and we have gay people tell is why they feel alienated, white people who tell is they feel alienated, and so on. But the fact remains, ultimately Buddhадharma is not about changing the world to suit us since that is impossible. Ultimately, Buddhадharma is about overcoming suffering and the causes of suffering that lay within us, not outside us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 10:56 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

[

Those who argue that ultimately, there is no ultimate, and only the relative is all there is, is basically saying that the traces are their own ground. The consequence of this is that there can be no permanent liberation and any liberation is no different from annihilation.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, one merely moves from an afflicted relative to a nonafflicted relative. Once one's mind is free of afflictions, it cannot revert because the cause of being free of afflictions is āryan insight, which cannot be lost.

From an ultimate point of view, the language of affliction or nonaffliction is incoherent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 10:53 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There is no first proof that mind and consciousness originated from matter.

Malcolm wrote:

Case closed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The variety of the world is created by the collective karma of sentient beings, not by some demiurge/s.

bob said:

I never said anything about demiurges. I simply indicated that a different class of beings than the human class is responsible for creating the illusion that is this 3-D environment, in contrast to Shabkar's assertion. However, since my view is apparently not within the Buddhist box, I will withdraw from further comment on this topic.

Malcolm wrote:

The Mahāyāna Buddhist point is that a given class of beings share a similar experience of a container universe because they have similar karma ripening at the same time. You can understand this through the classic example of humans, devas, asuras, animals, pretas and hell beings all experiencing liquids differently, as water, nectar, a home, pus and blood or molten iron. Specifically the yogacara school regards the entire container universe to consist only of projections caused by the ripening of traces.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Rakshasa said:

The 'fire puja' in Vedas

Malcolm wrote:

Upon which Buddhist fire pujas are clearly based.

Rakshasa said:

The defining feature of Shramanic indigenous religion was the belief in Karma and reincarnation - which is absent in ancient Vedicism. It is a conspiracy by Brahmins and some European scholars nowadays to give credit of Shramanistic religions to the Indo-Aryan, a Caucasian tribe related to many European peoples.

Malcolm wrote:

PIE peoples believed in reincarnation.

Rakshasa said:

Nadis and cakras, from the early Upanishads and Ayurveda

Blanket statement from a very parochialistic and biased point of view. In fact, Ayurveda came from Buddhist sages.

Malcolm wrote:

The earliest Ayurvedic text we have is the Cakrasaṃhita. It is also the earliest source we have for Saṃkhya.

Rakshasa said:

Prāṇāyāma, corollaries to gñāna and so on can be found in the Yoga sutras of Patañjali, and it is a daily part of Vedic practice and has been for three millennia.

The great Indian historian, Kashi Nath Upadhyaya, himself a Brahmin, has amply proven that the Patanjali Yoga sutra was in fact influenced heavily from Early Buddhism - not even later Mahayana Buddhism, but Early Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

However, prāṇāyāma, and so on, things found in the Yoga sutras, clearly have no precedent in Buddhist texts. Just examine the Vibhūti-pādaḥ. While there are certainly very common ideas found in "early" Buddhist texts and the Yogasūtras, these commonality can be explained as coming from a common religious milieu, with different emphasis. For example, Patañjali has the four brahma viharas, but the mode of explanation is quite different than the Buddhas.

Rakshasa said:

It is very unlikely that Buddhism has sprouted out of Hinduism,

Malcolm wrote:

I agree, but there is ample proof right in the early suttas that the Buddha's own world view was essentially informed by Vedic cosmological concepts. Later borrowings from Shaiva and other non-buddhist traditions have precedents in the Buddha's own lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There isn't really any proof that the physical is created by the mental. This philosophical notion is just a heuristic device to promote mindfulness. And like most buddhist philosophy, it shouldn't be taken too seriously.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no proof the mental is created by the physical either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Would a madhyamika also hold the same explanation on how the physical is produce by the mental?

Malcolm wrote:

Even Abhidharma holds that matter is produced by mind, for example, when a being takes rebirth from the formless realm into the form realm, their physical body is created by their minds since here is no other cause for the matter their body is made up of.

Sherab said:

I started out with the Gelug tradition and was taught that beings in the formless realm, have a mind-made body. I did not get any sense that the mind-made body was physical. I was also taught that a result can come only from a similar cause, and because of that, as far as I understood, it was not held that something physical can come from something mental and vice versa. At any rate, I never felt at home with the Gelug's take on a number of issues.

Anyway, I have yet to come across a Madhyamika's explanation that say that the physical is produced by the mental. I posed the question in the hope that you may have come across something to the contrary to what I know and what I've learned while I was with the Gelugpas.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because the Gelugpas adhere to a sautrantika version of relative truth in their sutra explanation.

The Sakyas, Kagyus and Nyingmas tend to favor a Yogacara Madhyamaka explanation of relative truth.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

So the process by which the physical is produced by the mental is the same in yogacara madhyamaka is the same at that in cittamatra?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since the former takes the latter as relative truth. Kalaśīla's Madhyamakālaṃkārapañjikā states:

Since the five characteristics of external cause and condition and the dominant characteristic are false, existing as mind-only [cittamatra] is only non-arising in the manner of representation-only [vijñāpati-matra]. Therefore, whatever the non-arising of the madhyamaka school might be, that demonstrates it.

Sherab said:

Would a madhyamika also hold the same explanation on how the physical is produced by the mental?

Malcolm wrote:

Even Abhidharma holds that matter is produced by mind, for example, when a being takes rebirth from the formless realm into the form realm, their physical body is created by their minds since there is no other cause for the matter their body is made up of.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Seems very cittamitra to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara Madhyamaka, actually, ala Shantaraksita.

Sherab said:

So the process by which the physical is produced by the mental is the same in yogacara madhyamaka is the same at that in cittamatra?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since the former takes the latter as relative truth. Kalaśīla's Madhyamakālaṃkārapañjikā states:

Since the five characteristics of external cause and condition and the dominant characteristic are false, existing as mind-only [cittamatra] is only non-arising in the manner of representation-only [vijñāpati-matra]. Therefore, whatever the non-arising of the madhyamaka school might be, that demonstrates it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

The whole idea that there are other beings who create samsara but are not part of it is counter to Buddhadharma.

bob said:

FWIW, it might help to think of it as an adult class of beings creating a kindergarten environment for a child class of beings in need of behavior training. What I am suggesting is that there is a non-human class of beings who have created this stage for the human class of beings. It does not necessarily mean that the creator beings are beyond samsara (although at a certain level some might be considered "enlightened" beings by our limited descriptors).

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this view is outside of Buddhadharma and has no place within it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

bob said:

Yes, I understand that line of thinking, and at one time would have agreed. In a certain limited sense, there is even some truth to that, especially in regard to karma. We are all creators and creatures of each other, causing and bearing each other's burden within the sphere of our relations and so forth.

However, what I am referring to is the actual mechanics of this current manifestation which we are enjoying, known generally as "this world", which we as human beings have little hand in creating or maintaining (but are doing a pretty good job nevertheless of spoiling). We did not make the mountains, the rivers, or the tigers and elephants, or even our own bodies (which we think of as our own, at least).

In that sense, it is the work of another class of beings, just as is the sun, the moon, and the planets. Nor am I referring to some God-creator (although to most of us, these beings would appear god-like). In other words, there is a hierarchy, or ascending and descending classes of beings.

Now, I realize this comment might not align with the popular understanding of Buddhism, but nevertheless, it is the case. I am not trying to convince anyone of this, btw, but felt moved to insert it as a consideration. There is more to this world than meets the eye, or necessarily tallies with human philosophies or current scientific understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

The variety of the world is created by the collective karma of sentient beings, not by some demiurge/s.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So now you are claiming Buddhist tantra comes from China?

Zen Dude said:

I'd claim, that given the evidence I've seen, that some of the elements that are generally associated with Tantra, may have had origins in Pure Land/Proto-Tantric/Daoist practice in China, which of course, was conditioned, by Pure Land practice in India. For instance, obviously the Chinese wouldn't have written an apocryphal sutra named the "Abhiseka-sutra", if they didn't have knowledge of what an Abhiseka was, from India.

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhist tantra, abhisheka and fire puja are derived from the Vedas, the mantras are similar etc.

Zen Dude said:

Likewise, the earliest records of techniques related to manipulating the subtle winds, are from the Mawangdui( <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mawangdui> ) manuscripts, which, to my knowledge, predate anything similar from India by quite a bit.

Malcolm wrote:

Nadis and cakras, from the early Upanishads and Ayurveda

Prāṇāyāma, corollaries to gtum mo and so on can be found in the Yoga sutras of Patañjali, and it is a daily part of Vedic practice and has been for three millennia.

Zen Dude said:

Back to my original point, I think that there's sufficient evidence that Buddhist Tantra's( at least pre-yogini ), were not simply a copy and paste job from Saivites, as Sanderson seems to be suggesting.

Malcolm wrote:

He is not suggesting it is cut and paste job. He goes to great length to point out that it isn't that simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 11:22 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherab said:

Seems very cittamitra to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara Madhyamaka, actually, ala Shantaraksita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 10:45 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

bob said:

As much as I respect your acumen, I would offer as a rough analogy that the beings who build the zoo are not of the same class as the beings who occupy the cages.

So too with the physical 3-D realm we take to be "the world", which is a stage with props provided for the training and edifying adventures of beings in a less advanced class by beings in a far more advanced class.

Of course, if we were to consider the matter from the absolute point of view, there are no beings, but that is skipping ahead a bit.

Malcolm wrote:

We build our own cage together, no one does it for us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 10:34 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Shabkar is basically claiming that the deluded perceptions of living beings are sufficient to cause similar appearances to other living beings of the same class.

bob said:

The beings who have created the illusion of the mountains are not of the same class as the beings who are perceiving the illusion as mountains.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

More like an innovation in India from whoever created the inner yogatantras.

Malcolm wrote:

Outer tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Zen Dude said:

=the first evidence of an abiseka...

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm...how about the rig veda?

Zen Dude said:

My understanding is that in that context, it would be only performed for gods/god-kings. Introducing it's usage to commoners looks like an innovation on the Chinese side.

Malcolm wrote:

So now you are claiming Buddhist tantra comes from China?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 9:59 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The external mountain is an entity that is capable of appearing because of the force of traces of the minds of all sentient beings. Shabkar uses the example of the woman who meditated upon herself as a tiger for a year, and frightened a village into slaying her because they perceived her as a tiger and not a human woman.

Sherab said:

Could you explain the process with which the "force of traces of the minds of all sentient beings" cause the external mountain? In other words, how does something mental produce something physical.

The example used by Shabkar does not explain this process as far as I can see. It explained how the meditating woman appeared as a tiger but does not explain how other tigers appear as tigers to the people of the village. The woman could have meditated upon herself as a mountain and would appear as a mountain to the village people but that would not explain how other mountains appear as mountains to the village people.

Malcolm wrote:

Shabkar is basically claiming that the deluded perceptions of living beings are sufficient to cause similar appearances to other living beings of the same class.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 7:14 AM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

zsc said:

No one is an a-cultural person, but white mainstream Buddhism seems to frame their "stripped-down" practice as culture-free, when that itself is a cultural decision. Only western culture (WASP) is seen as just "normal" while poc have "cultural trappings".

Malcolm wrote:

I never maintained my practice was culture free. I still imagine Sambhogakāyas as 4th century Indian princes.

zsc said:

All I'm saying is that it's more complicated than ignoring it, or "not letting it get in your way". It doesn't "get in my way", in fact, but that doesn't mean it is a non-issue.

Malcolm wrote:

It is as much an issue as you allow it to be.

zsc said:

People do not become Buddhist unless they have the karmic connections to do so. Not saying you are doing this, but you have to understand, poc Buddhists are told what you are saying nearly every time we dare to address racism, classism, and sexism, and it reads like "ignore how poorly you are treated and regarded" as if it doesn't matter in our every day lives. It does matter, and it also forms the experiences of many different poc in many ways.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism appears racist, classist and sexist to many people.

You are not really talking about how "Buddhists" treat you, you are talking about how you feel treated by caucasians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Zen Dude said:

=the first evidence of an abiseka...

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm...how about the rig veda?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

zsc said:

but I understand that a lot of black people want a black Buddhist culture of their own

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma may have cultural trappings, but if you have the karma to be a follower of Buddhadharma, these things will not get in your way.

zsc said:

See the part in my post about "colorblindness", which is actually racism. Opinions like this one invalidate the experiences of people of color and attempt to shut down conversations about real world issues within the sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not invalidate anything. A caucasian, I have personally experienced very intense racism at the hands of Tibetans. It did not get in my way. People do not become

Buddhist unless they have the karmic connections to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

For that reason and others, I feel somewhat iffy about different groups trying to consciously create their own Buddhist sub-cultures, it seems a bit forced.

Malcolm wrote:

Seconded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I don't know if he is a nihilist and I couldn't care either way. I think he has more serious things to worry about.

Malcolm wrote:

You worry about your business, and I will worry about mine. In the meantime, since you obviously cannot address my citations and reasoning, be silent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I never claimed reality existed, therefore I am free of the fault of claiming it does not exist.

Andrew108 said:

What on earth are you talking about? Just by sharing information and by posting here, you are making a claim that indeed at some level reality exists.

Malcolm wrote:

That's one of the silliest things you have ever said. It is like one illusory guy telling another illusory that because the second guy can respond to the first guy, the second is claiming the illusion is real.

M



Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I never claimed reality existed, therefore I am free of the fault of claiming it does not exist.

Andrew108 said:

What on earth are you talking about? Just by sharing information and by posting here, you are making a claim that indeed at some level reality exists. And then because you are smart you say that there is no reality.

You should stop this nonsense. Let life tell you what it is. This is much better than you and your intellect telling life what it should be.

smcj said:

Malcolm, now you're being accused of being a nihilist. This must not be your day.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not my limitation, it's mustang cave's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W

Content:

zsc said:

but I understand that a lot of black people want a black Buddhist culture of their own

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma may have cultural trappings, but if you have the karma to be a follower of Buddhadharma, these things will not get in your way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

smcj said:

You really know how to thread the needle on this issue.

Malcolm wrote:

That's why they pay me the big bucks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: eleventh fundamental downfall

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so if its not "just emptiness", is that because its also clarity and compassion, or because emptiness is an extreme?

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it is because mere emptiness is an extreme. Clarity has to be a relative characteristic, since it is the foundation of the rūpakāyas.

gad rgyangs said:

i don't think the three characteristics of the basis are hierarchical : if emptiness is considered an extreme then so would be clarity and compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

Mere clarity is an extreme. That is why Dzogchen texts say thing like "Because it is empty, it is free from the extreme of existence; because it is clear, it is free from the extreme of nonexistence" and so on, when describing the mind-essence.

Lamdre texts say basically the same thing, as do Kagyu texts.

This is why we have the description of the mind essence as "the inseparability [thugs rje] of clarity [rang bzhin] and emptiness [ngo bo]". In reality, since the two truths are inseparable, so is clarity and emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

'Malcolm said:

While it is clear that Dzogchen definitely posits the basis as a set of generic characteristics that belong to individual minds, it does not posit that appearances are mental factors.

smcj said:

So this is how you're distancing yourself from the Cittamatra?

Malcolm wrote:

One can experience only one's mind. For this reason Shabkar states in Flight of the Garuda:

Ignorance appearing as the five poisons is also the mind.  
Self-originated primordial wisdom appearing as vidyā is also the mind...  
There are no appearances at all apart from the mind.

smcj said:  
(formatting mine)

Malcolm, I think you're in denial about having succumbed to the Cittamatra view. An intervention may be in order.

Malcolm wrote:  
Subjectively speaking, all internal appearances are just mental images, whether those appearances are derived from your eyes up to your skin.

When you "see" a mountain, you are not aware of the direct perception of that mountain, since it is non-conceptual. What you are aware of is a secondary or derived perception which is an image of the mountain that your eye has captured. Gzhan stong has no theory of perception different than this.

The external mountain is an entity that is capable of appearing because of the force of traces of the minds of all sentient beings. Shabkar uses the example of the woman who meditated upon herself as a tiger for a year, and frightened a village into slaying her because they perceived her as a tiger and not a human woman.

This is not cittamatra view, this is Shantarakṣita's yogacara synthesis, where the view of relative truth is held to be cittamatra, and the view of ultimate truth is madhyamaka. Earlier Madhyamakas generally adopt the Sautrantika view for the most part for relative truth. But even here, no one confuses one's perception of the mountain, the mental image, with the mountain itself.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 2:50 AM  
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
What is however true is that we can only experience the contents of our own minds

gad rgyangs said:  
what is this "we" that would be something distinct from mind?

Malcolm wrote:  
Of course not. One can experience only one's mind. For this reason Shabkar states in Flight of the Garuda:

Ignorance appearing as the five poisons is also the mind.  
Self-originated primordial wisdom appearing as vidyā is also the mind...

There are no appearances at all apart from the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: eleventh fundamental downfall

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so if its not "just emptiness", is that because its also clarity and compassion, or because emptiness is an extreme?

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it is because mere emptiness is an extreme. Clarity has to be a relative characteristic, since it is the foundation of the rūpakāyas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

smcj said:

Therefore the distinction of calling "The Basis" either your own mind or calling it an undifferentiated universal is actually the argument between the Mind Only and Empty-of-Other schools.

Malcolm wrote:

Two problems here. While it is clear that Dzogchen definitely posits the basis as a set of generic characteristics that belong to individual minds, it does not posit that appearances are mental factors. Shabkar clarifies that the delusions of sentient beings are sufficiently strong so as to generate what seem to be concrete appearances for one another. This is why, for example, mountains do not disappear when we cease looking or thinking of them. So it is not accurate to parse this discussion in terms of a Cittamatra/gzhan stong split.

What is however true is that we can only experience the contents of our own minds, whether those minds are liberated or not. The basis mythos runs as follows: when the five lights are perceived, those five lights come from potency [rtsal] of our own minds and no where else. If we reify them as external to our own minds, then we fall into samsara. This is happening all the time. To reverse this, one must practice thogal working with entoptic visions that are understood to be produced internally, not externally. If you do not work with these visions, practicing merely tregchö, one will not be able to purify those traces in our minds that give rise to impure vision, though we may be able to realize the mind-essence and dissolve our bodies at death, we will never be able to realize the body of light.

Dzogchen practitioner are fond of saying that Dzogchen practice works with "wisdom"

[ye shes] and not mind [rnam shes, sems], and this is true, but only because of a very specialized vocabulary which sharply defines the originally pure mode of consciousness [ye shes] from its derivative impure mode [rnam shes], for want of better terms in English.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The intent of Madyamaka is not to establish this 'no reality' thesis. It's praxis is the assertion that genuine reality (which everyone has access to) is beyond extremes.

Malcolm wrote:

No, since this would just be a statement of existence.

Andrew108 said:

If you say that there is no reality then of course you are stating that reality does not exist.

Malcolm wrote:

I never claimed reality existed, therefore I am free of the fault of claiming it does not exist. When someone points out your bank account is empty, is it their fault that you have no money? Have they destroyed money you thought you had? Of course not. It is the same when stating "there is no reality". This is merely pointing out the conclusion of freedom from all extremes.

Āryānantamukhapariśodhananirdeśapārivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

The Sugata said "existence" and "nonexistence" are extremes; whatever does not exist in the extremes, that also does not exist in the middle.

Ārya-varmavyūhanirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Since this vehicle is without extremes,  
also the extreme of the middle does not exist.

Ārya-kāśyapapārivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Kāśyapa, "permanence" is one extreme; impermanence is the second extreme.  
Whatever is the middle of those two extremes, that also cannot be examined.

Sampuṭanāma mahātantra:

There is nothing empty, not empty,  
and nothing to perceive in the middle.

The Meditation on Bodhicitta:

The nonexistence dependent on existence does not exist, also that nonexistence does not exist. Because the extremes do not exist, the middle does not exist, also do not rest in the middle.

The sgra thal gyur:

Because of being free from extremes, do not abide in the middle.

So we can clearly see that sutra and tantra agree on one point, i.e. there is no reality in the extremes, and there is no reality beyond the extremes. Ergo, there is no reality, since reality would have to be either existence or non-existence and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: eleventh fundamental downfall

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

in that case, conceptualizing the basis as "one's unfabricated mind" is an eleventh root downfall.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't.

If you maintain that your mind-essence is just emptiness, that would be the downfall indicated. An unfabricated mind means a mind which is free from all proliferation, when the mind's own freedom from proliferation is not recognized, that mind becomes the basis for samsara; when it is recognized, that mind becomes the basis for nirvana.

However, as Jetsun Rinpoche points out, for beginners it is sufficient to recognize that phenomena are like dreams and illusions despite the fact that in reality they are free from names, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Yeah, it does seem kind of silly to make such a big deal out of a generic characteristic. I don't know what Kangyur Rinpoche was smoking.

Malcolm wrote:

I answer you here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=15767>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: eleventh fundamental downfall

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

From "The Treasury of Precious Qualities, Book Two":

The eleventh root downfall is to subject the ineffable, ultimate nature to logical assessment. That to which the word "dharmadhatu" refers is beyond name, example, and indication; it is beyond all conventional labeling. And even though the discursive intellect can, in its ratiocinations, understand ultimate reality as being "emptiness" and "lack of self," in fact this "no-self" of phenomena is exclusively the field of self-cognizing primordial wisdom. It stands in clean contradiction to the conventional, dualistic mind. The sharp, investigating intellect may indeed point to what is a lesser kind of emptiness of phenomena, such as the aggregates, and say that it is ultimate reality, thereby claiming a superior view. But to evaluate the unborn nature, namely, inconceivable ultimate reality, according to the criteria of ordinary thought, constitutes the eleventh downfall.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason why this definition is not very desirable is that it means only a realized person can avoid this downfall, and since samaya is the root of the path, it means that one can never achieve awakening unless you are already a realized person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Of course it's not wrong to assert non-existence, but only when non-existence is used as an adjective that is one part of the description/experience of genuine reality. Saying that reality does not exist, that there is no reality, is far from the meaning and intent of all the Mahdyamaka texts I have studied.

Malcolm wrote:

It may not be not what you have understood, it is in fact the intent of Madhyamaka to point out that there is no reality, per se. Saying there is "no reality" [gnas lugs med pa] is quite different than saying reality does not exist. In fact it is basic "Heart Sutra" and is non-controversial.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 11:15 PM

Title: eleventh fundamental downfall

Content:

Sherlock said:

Like this?

From Berzin's site (11) Not meditating on voidness continually

As with the ninth tantric root downfall, voidness can be understood according to either the Chittamatra or Madhyamaka systems. Once we gain an understanding of such a view, it is a root downfall to let more than a day and night pass without meditating on it.

With the caveat that maybe experiencing the "view" through practice is more important than understanding according to whatever tenet system?

Malcolm wrote:

What I mean by simple is what Sapan wrote:

"The eleventh is conceptualizing those phenomena which are free from name and so on."

[This means] conceptualizing phenomena free from name and so on as being phenomena free from name and so on. In brief, if one maintains that all phenomena which lack inherent existence [ngo bo nyid med, svabhāva] and are free from proliferation as being emptiness, it is a fundamental downfall.

As Berzin points out, this is related to the ninth, expressed by Sapan here:

"The ninth is doubt about the naturally pure dharmatā"

The primal nature [rang bzhin, prakṛti] of all phenomena is free from proliferation. Since that is not understood, the doubt "Is [the nature of all phenomena] free from proliferation or not?" is a fundamental downfall.

When we consider the eleventh downfall, this effectively means that labeling phenomena as emptiness, when in fact they are free from proliferation, is a downfall.

The ninth basically means that a Vajrayāna practitioner should maintain the view at all times.

The qualm might come, how is a beginner to avoid the 11th downfall? Jetsun Dragpa



Gyaltzen provides an answer:

"A beginner should think though indeed all phenomena are free from names, relatively, all phenomena appear like dreams and illusions", constantly training their minds in the example of illusion."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

Like this?

Malcolm wrote:

Continuing this on a new thread...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

From "The Treasury of Precious Qualities, Book Two": The eleventh root downfall is to subject the ineffable, ultimate nature to logical assessment. That to which the word "dharmadhatu" refers is beyond name, example, and indication; it is beyond all conventional labeling. And even though the discursive intellect can, in its ratiocinations, understand ultimate reality as being "emptiness" and "lack of self," in fact this "no-self" of phenomena is exclusively the field of self-cognizing primordial wisdom. It stands in clean contradiction to the conventional, dualistic mind. The sharp, investigating intellect may indeed point to what is a lesser kind of emptiness of phenomena, such as the aggregates, and say that it is ultimate reality, thereby claiming a superior view. But to evaluate the unborn nature, namely, inconceivable ultimate reality, according to the criteria of ordinary thought, constitutes the eleventh downfall.

Malcolm wrote:

I really dont accept this definition of the 11th downfall. It is much simpler than that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We don't have an ultimate condition, apart from emptiness.

gad rgyangs said:

as you yourself said, emptiness is not "merely" absence of svabhava. so yes, we don't have an ultimate condition apart from the emptiness, clarity and compassion of the basis: that is the ultimate condition.

Malcolm wrote:

And that basis is just one's own mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Tendai is a Ch'an school.

Content:

Indrajala said:

There is a lot hype and paranoia about China in the media, which is rather unfortunate, though understandable given the anti-Chinese propaganda constantly present in western (and Indian) media, to say nothing of how western Tibetan Buddhists usually uncritically accept everything their Tibetan colleagues tell them about China.

Malcolm wrote:

Having been to Chinese controlled Tibet personally, I know exactly how things there are, and things are every bit as bad as Tibetans say it is, if not much worse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Tendai is a Ch'an school.

Content:

Indrajala said:

Buddhism can operate albeit it needs to stay out of politics.

Malcolm wrote:

Right....try putting that one past Tibetans.

Indrajala said:

I really don't care what the average Tibetan thinks.

Malcolm wrote:

I know, you support Chinese imperialism in Tibet. You think it is "good for them".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

@Malcolm. The purpose of going beyond the four extremes is that you are left positionless. This doesn't mean that you are left without reality. Certainly you can't use PrMa to assert that ultimately there is no reality. We both know that this is not possible.

Malcolm wrote:

If you claim there is some reality left over after having gone beyond the four extremes, that is an extreme.

One can certainly use PrMa to assert there is no reality. Even emptiness, suchness and so forth are empty. So in the end, all we are left with is our relative condition. We don't have an ultimate condition, apart from emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Instead of saying that reality has no fixed identity Malcolm has made the mistake of saying that ultimately there is no reality. But everyone makes mistakes. So what.

Malcolm wrote:

Its not a mistake. There is no reality. In order for there to be "reality" (a state of being pertaining to things res+al+ity) it would necessarily be something that either existed, did not exist and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you have to start with something undeniable, something that no one, buddhist, hindu, western philosopher, whatever, could reject.

the only thing that fits the bill is presence: the fact that there is something rather than nothing.

not only is this the starting point, its also the endpoint: the fact that there is something rather than nothing is ultimate reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen tantras don't support your position. Neither does ChNN. This is why he cites Sapan in his "Questions and Answers on the Cycle of Dzogchen":

If there is a view better than madhyamaka,  
that view would posses proliferation.

gad rgyangs said:

you seem reluctant to accept both freedom from extremes and instsnt presence. they  
are not in conflict.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa is relative, so of course they are not in conflict.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It seems clear that the universe is in an 'on state' rather than an 'off state'. It may be that ultimately there is no ultimate reality (noone knows yet), but to assert that ultimately there is no reality is very strange. Especially since Dzogchen deals with reality as it is rather than ultimate/relative varients.

Malcolm wrote:

The only thing that is clear is that we are thinking beings subject to birth, duration and destruction. Everything beyond that is pure speculation by inconstant and impermanent mental states.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Does this mean that we cannot consider Goraksha awakened?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Positing that ultimately there is no reality is a bit strange.

asunthatneversets said:

When you encounter the reflection of the moon in water, ultimately there is no moon.

Andrew108 said:

There is reality. That is what we are trying to understand. "Ultimately there is no reality" is the same as saying that ultimately there is no information, no energy, no display. Dzogchen doesn't refute reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately there is no information, no energy, no display. These things are all relative, not ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you have to start with something undeniable, something that no one, buddhist, hindu, western philosopher, whatever, could reject.

the only thing that fits the bill is presence: the fact that there is something rather than nothing.

not only is this the starting point, its also the endpoint: the fact that there is something rather than nothing is ultimate reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen tantras don't support your position. Neither does ChNN. This is why he cites Sapan in his "Questions and Answers on the Cycle of Dzogchen":

If there is a view better than madhyamaka, that view would posses proliferation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

same question: so what is there, ultimately? if you say "nothing" you are a nihilist, and have done nothing to explain our presence.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, there is no reality. If there were an ultimate reality, it would by necessity fall into one of the four extremes.

gad rgyangs said:

there is ultimate reality (there is something rather than nothing), but it is beyond the four extremes.

Malcolm wrote:

That is just an extreme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot define emptiness as being one thing or many things, since it is not a thing. It is the absence of inherent existence in things, and that is all.

ConradTree said:

But you always say emptiness is not absence of inherent existence.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

I am not saying that emptiness is the mere absence of inherent existence. The "absence of inherent existence" can be understood as short hand for emptiness free from extremes. When you qualify that inherent existence which mere, it is too restrictive. It is like saying that emptiness is only the absence of inherent existence and nothing more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Regarding thugs rje, here's some more from the book. In the section "A general explanation of the fundamental nature of the ground" from Kangyur Rinpoche's commentary, he says of the ground: Consequently, the ground for what appears as samsara and nirvana (nonexistent as these are)<sup>445</sup> is the nature of awareness ( rig pai

chos nyid ), and this is primordially and perfectly endowed with the three kayas. Its pure nature ( ngo bo dag pa ) is dharmakaya; its luminous character ( r ang bzhin gsal ba ) is sambhogakaya; and its cognitive potency endowed with the essence of awareness ( thugs rje rig pa'i snying po can ) is nirmanakaya.<sup>446</sup>

Footnote 446 reads as follows: It is important to note that in this account of the trikaya, the sambhogakaya and the nirmanakaya are aspects of inner luminosity, as will be explained. They are distinct from the sambhogakaya and nirmanakaya of outwardly radiating luminosity (the rupakaya in the usually accepted sense).

Maybe this distinction between the 2 types of rupakayas is relevant?

Malcolm wrote:

The only entity that can know is a mind. Positing some kind of noetic entity that is not a mind is incoherent.

Oh, and no, it is not relevant. The correct translation for "thugs rje" in a Dzogchen context is "compassion" and that's all. For example, Mipham provides "karuna" as the Sanskrit equivalent for thugs rje in a Dzogchen context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

same question: so what is there, ultimately? if you say "nothing" you are a nihilist, and have done nothing to explain our presence.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, there is no reality. If there were an ultimate reality, it would by necessity fall into one of the four extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

garudha said:

So if you think that ALL is truly Empty (including the basis) then who are you

Malcolm wrote:

Nominally speaking, malcolm, otherwise, no one.

garudha said:  
and how do you arise?

Malcolm wrote:  
Conventionally, due to causes and conditions; ultimately not at all.

gad rgyangs said:  
this is why it makes no sense to say the basis is one's unfabricated mind: ultimately there is no "you" or "your mind", you & your mind are appearances of the basis. otherwise you are making your mind the basis of the basis!

Malcolm wrote:  
Note that you use the qualifying term "ultimately", ultimately, there is also no basis; ergo, the basis is also something relative. That relative thing is just your own unfabricated mind, i.e. the mind essence, as Nyibum, Shabkar and many others state. It may not seem fun for modern "dzogchenpas", but the basis is just the mind essence. No mind, no essence. No dharmin, no dharmatā.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 12:50 AM  
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind  
Content:

garudha said:  
go amazon buy good sutra learn wisdom of Buddha.  
Yes, this is good advice for you. I don't need to buy sutras in English since I read them in Tibetan.  
I'm sorry. That last edit was not aimed at you. I didn't realise there might be such frisson before you put it like that.

Malcolm wrote:  
No worries.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 12:50 AM  
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind  
Content:  
dzogchungpa said:  
OK, why is it not invalid, if you don't mind my asking?

Malcolm wrote:  
Because in Dzogchen, thugs rje is what generates mental appearances, thugs rje has/is what we call "rtsal".

dzogchungpa said:  
Right, so the Padmakara translation "cognitive potency" actually seems more accurate



than "compassion", in this context, doesn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, since it is a translation that is not based on the early commentarial imperatives. In others words, the definitions provided by "Vimalamitra" in his commentary on the sgra thal 'gyur should be regarded as the most authoritative and there can be no doubt that the term must be translated as compassion, and not whatever other glosses there are out there these days.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

OK, why is it not invalid, if you don't mind my asking?

Malcolm wrote:

Because in Dzogchen, thugs rje is what generates mental appearances, thugs rje has/is what we call "rtsal".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

garudha said:

So if you think that ALL is truly Empty (including the basis) then who are you

Malcolm wrote:

Nominally speaking, malcolm, otherwise, no one.

garudha said:

and how do you arise?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, due to causes and conditions; ultimately not at all.

garudha said:

Or am I completely misinterpreting Eastern mysticism ?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, to begin with, there is no such thing as "Eastern mysticism", there are a bunch of

religions loosely grouped as Hinduism, there are a bunch of religions loosely grouped as Buddhism. I happen to be a follower of Buddhadharma in its Tibetan expression.

garudha said:

go amazon buy good sutra learn wisdom of Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is good advice for you. I don't need to buy sutras in English since I read them in Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Tendai is a Ch'an school.

Content:

Indrajala said:

Buddhism can operate albeit it needs to stay out of politics.

Malcolm wrote:

Right....try putting that one past Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such as "oneness", at least not in Buddhadharma.

All experiences are subjective.

Anyway, you have not defined what your oneness is. Are all phenomena "one" in that they are all empty? Of course. Is there some existent underlying fabric that unifies all phenomena? Not in Buddhadharma. In Hinduism of various stripes, definitely, but not Buddhadharma.

garudha said:

Look, there's no truth to be found in a play of words.

I say simply as follows:

If all dharmas are empty,

Then the true dharma is like a diamond.

Are there other diamonds? -Yes, perhaps there are, perhaps the goddess wears the diamond in a ring on her finger (but this would be pure conceptualisation and fantasy).

AFAIK; the diamond is one.

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot define emptiness as being one thing or many things, since it is not a thing. It is the absence of inherent existence in things, and that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The meaning of the wisdom of thugs rje from the sgra thal 'gyur commentary:

Thugs is the affection for sentient beings in the heart. rJe is the arising of a special empathy for them.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I'm a little confused. From "Treasury of Precious Qualities, Book Two", translator's introduction: In the context of the Great Perfection, thugs rje means, in the words of Yonten Gyamtso, "pure and unadulterated awareness that has not yet stirred from its own true condition or state," but which has the potential to do so.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is a much later philosophized definition, and while it is not invalid, it really does not address the point that the mind's naturally present compassion is the basis for the arising of the nirmanakāya at the time of the result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Possible confusion regarding language - Dharmadhatu

Content:

garudha said:

Because the "Dharmadhatu" is itself aware.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't. The dharmadhātu is one thing, wisdom is another. You cannot say they are the same, all you can say is that they are inseparable.

garudha said:

If you have basis in something, and you are aware, then the something is aware too.

Malcolm wrote:

Apart from one's own mind, one has no other basis, and no other basis is needed. "The basis", in Dzogchen is just a way of describing an imagined state of how one's mind

might have been prior to an equally imaginary bifurcation of samsara and nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

garudha said:

Furthermore, You seem to have completely misread my intention. My intention was to describe dharmadhātu as a shared fabric.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I understood exactly what your intention was, and I completely disagree with it. Dharmadhātu is not a fabric, it isn't a thing. It is just a categorization of emptiness.

garudha said:

do you really reject Oneness?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such as "oneness", at least not in Buddhadharma.

garudha said:

And what about so many peoples reports of Oneness... Do you suggest that the experience "Oneness" is only to experience our own individual personal basis --and the "Oneness" is not the basis of all phenomena ?

Malcolm wrote:

All experiences are subjective.

Anyway, you have not defined what your oneness is. Are all phenomena "one" in that they are all empty? Of course. Is there some existent underlying fabric that unifies all phenomena? Not in Buddhadharma. In Hinduism of various stripes, definitely, but not Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Possible confusion regarding language - Dharmadhatu

Content:

garudha said:

Because the "Dharmadhatu" is itself aware.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't. The dharmadhātu is one thing, wisdom is another. You cannot say they are the same, all you can say is that they are inseparable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not for me. Mahayoga and Anuyoga are not my path. They can be someone elses path, but they are not mine.

Yudron said:

I'm curious: In 2008 you posted you were practicing bum chen and advised everyone to do the same. Did that not pan out for you was you had hoped?

rai said:

now i am curious, what is bum chen? is it some breathing exercise?

Malcolm wrote:

Khumbhaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

responsiveness!!

Malcolm wrote:

Except for the \_fact\_ that the commentaries on the Dzogchen tantras clearly define thugs rje of the basis as "compassion" in the standard conventional sense of the term.

gad rgyangs said:

is compassion just a feeling or does it not also include responding to the needs of those who require compassion?

Malcolm wrote:

The meaning of the wisdom of thugs rje from the sgra thal 'gyur commentary:

Thugs is the affection for sentient beings in the heart. rJe is the arising of a special empathy for them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

garudha said:

Furthermore, You seem to have completely misread my intention. My intention was to describe dharmadhātu as a shared fabric.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I understood exactly what your intention was, and I completely disagree with it. Dharmadhātu is not a fabric, it isn't a thing. It is just a categorization of emptiness.

garudha said:

do you really reject Oneness?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such as "oneness", at least not in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

responsiveness!!

Malcolm wrote:

Except for the \_fact\_ that the commentaries on the Dzogchen tantras clearly define thugs rje of the basis as "compassion" in the standard conventional sense of the term.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

garudha said:

Three things in favour of a Shared-Dharmadhatu:

1. All those who have thus-gone report it to be infinite (so it includes everything else).

Malcolm wrote:

Suchness, emptiness, luminosity (all synonyms) lack finitude so this hardly novel.

garudha said:

2. Quantum physics can only be explained by a Shared-Dharmadhatu.

Malcolm wrote:

The dharmadhātu has nothing to do with quantum physics.

garudha said:

3. The Buddha gave sermons in higher realms. How could there even be communication if a shared fabric didn't exist ?

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahāyāna, dharmadhātu is just a generic characteristic (samanyalakṣaṇa).

Vasubandhu notes in his commentary on the Madhyantavibhaga:

Apart from the absence of self in phenomena, there are no phenomena. Therefore, dharmadhātu is a so called "generic characteristic of phenomena", and whoever understands it like that, he or she will be unmistaken about the generic characteristic.

The dharmadhātu is not a "fabric", it is an abstraction. And abstraction of what? It is a abstraction of the emptiness of phenomena. By definition, samanyalakṣaṇas are considered unreal in Buddhadharma.

Sthiramati adds:

The dharmadhātu is emptiness. Since it is a generic characteristic, however it is in one thing, it also like that in all things.

There is really no difference between how dharmadhātu is defined in Dzogchen as opposed to sūtra.

As one of the Nāgārjunas stated:

The dharmadhātu does not arise,  
nor does it ever cease;  
totally without affliction at all times,  
untainted in the beginning, middle and end.

There is no significant different between this statement and how the basis is defined in Dzogchen save for one minor point. Indeed, the basis is just the dharmadhātu. And the dharmadhātu is just a generic characteristic which describes the emptiness of phenomena in toto. The minor difference between the basis in Dzogchen and the dharmadhātu however, is that the basis is not "inert", the basis describes the generic characteristics of minds. However the basis is in one mind, it is like that in all minds. This is related to the principle of gcig shes kun grol, "knowing one liberates all".

garudha said:

Without a Shared-Dharmadhatu rebirth could not occur.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it could.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Dhyana (samten) in Vajrayana, especially Dzogchen

Content:

Sherlock said:

According to the Dan Martin article, Milarepa had 2 dzogchen teachers. Sgyerston dbangnge and the other one who was called either Dre lhadga or rongston. Sgyerston was his first teacher after the magic and hailmaking teachers.

The story about Zhangston Chosbar shows that he taught Dzogchen more openly than lamdre.

Malcolm wrote:

My point was that Milarepa had ten teachers before he met Marpa. Milarepa received a major Vajrapani teaching cycle before he met Marpa. He understood creation and completion stage quite well.

Zhangston Chosbar only had one student for Lamdre, i.e., Sachen, as far as we know. My point was that while he may have taught Dzogchen, his own practice was Lamdre.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Tendai is a Ch'an school.

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Are there then 5 types, one for each skandha?

Malcolm wrote:

No, just two, because the sensation and perception skandhas, while being mental factors in fact, are isolated because of their power in keeping one attached to samsaric phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherlock said:

Is there actually Phowa in the sense of transference of consciousness to a pure land in Shaivism or other Hindu tantras? I know there is transference to corpses.

Malcolm wrote:

Read Sanderson's paper.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Is the Mahasiddha view necessarily a Buddhist view?

Malcolm wrote:

It is necessarily a view consistent with dependent origination, emptiness and so on, otherwise, we couldn't consider a siddha "mahā" i.e. awakened.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So, in regards to the various Nath and Kapalika Mahasiddhas, it was the Mahamudra view and not the practices that lead to their realisations?

Malcolm wrote:

Which siddhas do you have in mind?

Sherab Dorje said:

Carbaripa (Carpati), Kapalapa, Minapa...

Malcolm wrote:

We have to examine whether they are "siddhas" or mahāsiddhas. There is a difference. In general, it would be their practice of tantric practices combined with Buddhist view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Dhyana (samten) in Vajrayana, especially Dzogchen

Content:

Sherlock said:

Thanks Malcolm.

Historically though Milarepa didn't seem to be expert in the two stages when he met his Dzogchen teacher. But then I don't know what his hailmaking would have involved. Zhangston Chosbar also seemed to teach Dzogchen openly.

Malcolm wrote:

Milrepa was already quite expert in the two stages before he met Marpa. He studied with ten teachers prior to meeting Marpa.

According to the Lamdre histories, Zhang ston Chos 'bar taught the Brahmin cycle of Dzogchen "by day", but he secretly practiced Lamdre, "by night".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Tendai is a Ch'an school.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Kirt, they have no universal health care at all. If you go to hospital, you must bring cash with you or they will not even admit you. The barefoot doctor thing does not exist anymore, not for decades.

kirtu said:

If you go to most hospitals in the US you must also bring some kind of payment with you.  
Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

That is not true, Kirt, at least not in my experience. It is illegal for emergency rooms to turn you away for want of cash. I have never had to pay up front for any services, and in some places, like Cambridge, they have community hospitals that are chartered to provide free service. When I lived in Cambridge, I used Cambridge City Hospital often.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Tendai is a Ch'an school.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

and then other countries that are in absolute absolute shambles despite having self-governance like India compared to authoritarian states like China which actually ensure a basic standard of living for most people despite their shortcomings.  
China does not provide a basic living for most people. They do not even provide universal health care.

kirtu said:

Aside from the treatment of Tibetans, Mongolians and Uighurs (and those are huge "asides"), China is not as bad as it could be. And the US also does not provide universal health care in any form (not even the recently introduced so-called "Obamacare" does although it is a step in the right direction as far as coverage goes). One of the moderate successes of the PRC is that they did attempt to create universal health care through the Barefoot Doctors and then expanded from that point.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Kirt, they have no universal health care at all. If you go to hospital, you must bring cash with you or they will not even admit you. The barefoot doctor thing does not exist anymore, not for decades.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Tendai is a Ch'an school.

Content:

Indrajala said:

I used to think otherwise, but after traveling around Asia and living in several countries I've decided otherwise. For instance, I've seen countries that work well and are only semi-democratic if not having been authoritarian in the past (Japan, Taiwan, Singapore),

Malcolm wrote:

Did it occur to you this is more cultural than "human"?

Indrajala said:

and then other countries that are in absolute absolute shambles despite having self-governance like India compared to authoritarian states like China which actually ensure a basic standard of living for most people despite their shortcomings.

Malcolm wrote:

China does not provide a basic living for most people. They do not even provide universal health care.

Indrajala said:

So over time I've taken on a rather Confucian approach to political values, as offensive as it might be to a lot of westerners.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not offensive, but it is amusingly anachronistic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Karma

Content:

kresh said:

thanks for the replies!!

I have a follow up question:

is there an amount of good or bad karma? what I mean by that is: is there a difference in bad karma between say stealing a candy bar or killing someone? good karma? picking up somebodies garbage verses helping a homeless man/woman in need?

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are differences, but it mostly has to do with the force of your intention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So, in regards to the various Nath and Kapalika Mahasiddhas, it was the Mahamudra view and not the practices that lead to their realisations?

Malcolm wrote:

Which siddhas do you have in mind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Dhyana (samten) in Vajrayana, especially Dzogchen

Content:

Sherlock said:

E. Successful shamatha through kyerim also makes your mantras work

theanarchist said:

Mmh, as far as I understand it to make vajrayana really meaningful you have to have an experience of emptiness nature (otherwise everything involving a deity is still contrived) and shamatha does not provide an insight into emptiness nature (that would happen with vipasshana).

Malcolm wrote:

That is what happens during empowerment/direct introduction.

theanarchist said:

I see it rather the other way, mantra is a good focus of your shamatha practice. For example very occasionally I wake up during the night with a nightmare. In that non-meditative emotionally upset state to recite mantra is a powerful antidote to the disturbed feeling. After a short while the negative state completely dissolves and makes room for comfortable peace. So obviously mantra can work very well in a disturbed state of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

The meaning of mantra is Manas + tra, i.e. protector of the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Dhyana (samten) in Vajrayana, especially Dzogchen

Content:

Allan Wallace said:

I have also heard of many people who say they have achieved shamatha and dhyana, many claiming to have done so within a matter of days, weeks, or just a few months. But despite such reports, few appear to be able to effortlessly maintain flawless samadhi for at least four hours, with their senses fully withdrawn, while abiding in a luminous state of blissful samadhi.

Pero said:

Malcolm, is your first dhyana the same as Wallace's first dhyana? I haven't read everything available about Dzogchen or Vajrayana but in what I have I haven't seen such a requirement for practice. Seems a bit odd really.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, when you have attained the first dhyāna, you have the capacity to remain in that for as long as you want with no discomfort. It doesn't matter if it is 20 minutes or twenty hours.

The downside of the 1st dhyana is that it is easy to become addicted to it. Then you are just creating traces for rebirth in the form realms. So I think Wallace is being a little bit sutrayāna in his approach here. However, being able to sit comfortable in one posture for a long while is definitely beneficial for longde and thogal practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Dhyana (samten) in Vajrayana, especially Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rongzom is neutral on this point. He maintains that whether one is doing standard śamatha or mantra practice, one must develop these five mental factors. He does not claim one is superior to the other.

Sherlock said:

OK, but you are not really neutral, are you?

Malcolm wrote:

In fact I am neutral.

Sherlock said:

The point you had been developing is that two-stages are important for wannabe Dzogchenpas too right? Nothing wrong with sutra-style shamatha but kyerim offers more carry-over to Dzogchen practice?

Malcolm wrote:

You can either go with the classic Nyingma three inner yana approach, or follow someone like ChNN. I don't really think one can claim one approach is superior to the other. For some, sutra mahāmudra style practice might be all they need.

Sherlock said:

According to that Germano article, Longchenpa also regarded the two stages as important preliminaries. However, he also talked about the completion stage with little elaboration for those with difficulties with the developing stage. Do the other schools have practices like what we find in the 7th lojong in order to stabilize dhyana or do they typically depend on kyerim (whether with mantra or without)?

Malcolm wrote:

The point of completion stage is to allow one to rapidly access the nonconceptual state associated with a deep samadhi. Creation stage is the container for that. Dzogchen classically would be practiced by people quite expert in the creation and completion stages. This is no longer the case.

Sherlock said:

My knowledge of two-stages is quite lacking. So far I'm just trying to follow the Precious Vase. If I have the opportunity maybe I should receive teachings on more elaborate sadhana practices and try to find a teacher to clarify my doubts on how it is exactly done.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are content with ChNN's teachings, Mandarava is quite elaborate enough in terms of creation and completion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Most of the time when I hear claims like these I think to myself: "So what if they are?"

Buddhists do not have a monopoly on Dharma after all.

If a practice works why not use it?

Malcolm wrote:

Sapan clarifies that what distinguishes Hindu and Buddhist tantra is view, not practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Tendai is a Ch'an school.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...your strongest attachment is through the saṃjñā skandha, rather than the vedana skandha...

dzogchungpa said:

This is interesting. Is it a traditional Buddhist idea that people typically have a strongest attachment through a particular skandha?

Malcolm wrote:

It comes from the Kosha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: gaden nyen gyü?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

You'll be glad to know that the Ganden Oral Lineage is alive and well and living in this world. They are mainly special practices of Guru Yoga and Mahamudra views and methods.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is indeed a good thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Dr. Sanderson: Phowa etc. are directly from Saivism

Content:

Zen Dude said:

I find his scholarship to be extremely lacking. An example -

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we all have opinions. Personally, much of what he says is backed up in Tibetan accounts which give the purpose for promulgating Buddhist tantra, i.e., to attract Shaivas and others to Buddhism by providing them with a religious form they could relate to. Sakya Pandita is very clear virtually all the practices in Buddhist tantra have Shaiva, etc., counterparts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

mutsuk said:

You should read JLA's study of the issue in his PhD. He has covered the whole thing in much more details.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure, but it is a fact that the accounts about Shri Simha in the lo rgyus chen mo do not tally with earlier accounts of Shri Simha on any level. I have examined all the early accounts related to this, and there are serious discrepancies in the lo rgyus chen mo, beyond the fact that it is based on an account in Vima Nyinthig itself (which was thus penned by Zhang ston). Of course, Zhang ston's account of events of Vimalamitra's life, etc., was then eclipsed by Nyang ral's treasure bio of Guru P. So what we wind up with is three separate accounts, which are at serious variance with each other on key details, with the later ones (Zhang, Nyang ral) superseding the earlier ones (mainly the account found in the pan grub thugs bcud, which itself is most certainly the basis for Vairocana 'dra bags literature).

By the time we get to Longchenpa, it is all hopelessly garbled, with Longchenpa asserting that Zhangton and Chetsun met. Thus now you see it repeated everywhere that Zhangton was Chetsun's student, when in fact the two men never physically met, and in fact Zhangton was a disciple of Chegom Nagpo. Then of course there is the slanderous asserting preserved in Khetsun Zangpo's brief bio that the reason Zhang ston did not achieve rainbow body is that he allowed his semen to be released, resulting in the birth of his son, Nyibum.

mutsuk said:

I'm not talking about that, I'm talking about the detailed account of the revelation of the 17 Tantras and related material. In JLA published version of his PhD, it is pp. 81-82.

Malcolm wrote:

If we take Zhang ston on his word, then counting backwards, we get 210 years from the time lDang ma discovers the 17 tantras, 180 years from the time when they met, this gives us an approximate date of 916 when the tantras were revealed, and a date of 946 when Chetsun meets lDang ma. But this seems impossible to me because Chetsun was a contemporary of Drogmi Lotsawa. Chetsun has a student called Myang bka' dam pa, thus this places him after 1042, the year Atishas arrives in Purang. So Chetsun's datable era of activity must be between 1042 and around 1064 (the most probably date for the passing of Drogmi according to Davidson). This means that if Zhang ston is correct about when Chegom visited Chetsun's place of attaining rainbow body, this had to have happened roughly in around 1048, though this is maybe a little too soon.

The whole thing hinges on the identity of "Myang bka' dam pa". Since he knew lDang ma,



this places lDang ma squarely in the eleven century. I really can't believe that that 17 tantras, in general, are earlier than lDang ma. lDang ma's death cannot be earlier than mid 11th century, which places his meeting with Chetsun in the late 1040's. Of course it is possible they were written in the first half of the 11th century, but for various reasons it is my present opinion that it is unlikely that any of them predate 1000. They demonstrate far too much influence from gsar ma tantras to be very early.

As far as I can tell, Zhang ston's own dates are a little unrealistic, apart from his date for the Buddha's Parinirvana, but he clearly reporting what Chegom told him about Chetsun and lDangma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Karma

Content:

kresh said:

I understand what the concept of karma is; actions have consequences. What my question is: what renders those actions good or bad?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhas defined ten natural non-virtues: taking life, taking what has not been given and sexual misconduct, lying, harsh speech, calumny and gossip, malice, greed and ignorance (of cause and effects).

That is what makes a given action non-virtuous. The opposite are virtuous karmas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: gaden nyen gyu?

Content:

lama tsewang said:

i have heard of something called an ear whispered gaden tradition . is this something within the gelugpa tradition , thats a little bit separate?

ie. maybe like some of the methods that rechungpa learned.

i have heard here and there that part of it is the lama chopra and the text on gelug-kagyu mahamudra.

and maybe chod?

These thoughts come up because just a few days ago , i was notified that dechen ling press has a new commentary out on lama chopra , and appended to the commentary in the back of the book, they added the famous text on gelug -kagyu mahamudra.

tsewang

Malcolm wrote:

It's based on a mystical book called the dge ldan sgyu phrul legs bam, the miraculous book of Ganden. According to legend, it is a book passed down to dben sa pa aka rgyal ba blo bzang don grub. There is but a single copy, and it is claimed that whenever the owner of this book needs to know something related to sutra and tantra, the answer miraculously appears in it. Indeed, Ganden Chod, Mahāmudra and the bLa ma mchod pa are supposed to be sourced in this book. Interestingly, Samten Karmey discovered a manuscript in Bhutan which is definitely from the dben sa pa lineage that bore the name blo bzang bka' 'bum. Thus the legend was grounded in fact. These days, the main promulgators of the myth of the dge ldan sgyu phrul legs bam are the Shugden folks, since they believe that this miraculous book was passed to Pabhonkga, and he to Trijang Rinpoche. Of course, HHDL quipped once that the real dye ldan sgyu phrul legs bam was the 18 volumes of Lama Tsongkhapa's collected works. According to Karmay, the dge ldan bka' rgyud both represents the views of Lama Tsongkhapa when he was younger and also "leans" Nyingma. It has always been a little controversial in Gelugpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

Leaving aside the issue of guru devotion, one of the main roles for the guru is to present all his accumulated knowledge to his students in a way that fits their capacities isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, but it is the job of the student to increase their capacity, and sectarianism generally arises from feeling that one's teachers presentation is sufficient, or the best, without having properly examined the presentations of others. This is why a lot of hostility on the part of some Nyingmas, Kagyus and Sakya against the views of Lama Tsongkhapa are frankly ridiculous, likewise the hostility of some Gelugpas against the views of Gorampa and Dolbuwa, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

No, but his presentation would be a bit more relevant for one's practice than others'. But it's good to read other works of course.

Malcolm wrote:

I would think the Buddha's presentation would be the most relevant, don't you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

mutsuk said:

You should read JLA's study of the issue in his PhD. He has covered the whole thing in much more details.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure, but it is a fact that the accounts about Shri Simha in the lo rgyus chen mo do not tally with earlier accounts of Shri Simha on any level. I have examined all the early accounts related to this, and there are serious discrepancies in the lo rgyus chen mo, beyond the fact that it is based on an account in Vima Nyinthig itself (which was thus penned by Zhang ston). Of course, Zhang ston's account of events of Vimalamitra's life, etc., was then eclipsed by Nyang ral's treasure bio of Guru P. So what we wind up with is three separate accounts, which are at serious variance with each other on key details, with the later ones (Zhang, Nyang ral) superseding the earlier ones (mainly the account found in the pan grub thugs bcud, which itself is most certainly the basis for Vairocana 'dra bags literature).

By the time we get to Longchenpa, it is all hopelessly garbled, with Longchenpa asserting that Zhangton and Chetsun met. Thus now you see it repeated everywhere that Zhangton was Chetsun's student, when in fact the two men never physically met, and in fact Zhangton was a disciple of Chegom Nagpo. Then of course there is the slanderous asserting preserved in Khetsun Zangpo's brief bio that the reason Zhang ston did not achieve rainbow body is that he allowed his semen to be released, resulting in the birth of his son, Nyibum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

If you are a student of ChNN, read The Precious Vase's section on how to practice the dhyana-paramita.

Malcolm wrote:

If one is a student of ChNN, is one required to limit oneself to his presentations?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

mutsum said:

JLA was the first to note these things in 1992. He since that time has used the commentary of the Klong drug (he obtained in Chengdu in 1994) to show that the bi ma la'i klong 'grel must be another text (still unfound).

Malcolm wrote:

IN looking at the style of the citations, they do not resemble the klong drug commentary we have at all.

mutsum said:

Well there is a detailed chronology in the Lo-rgyus chen-mo which says otherwise. We have no reason to doubt that chronology, do we, since it sound pretty much non-apologetic...

Malcolm wrote:

We have every reason to doubt the lo rgyus chen mo. It is a piece of religious fiction. Anyway, this is the chronology given by Zhangton himself:

0 Parinirvana of the Buddha

360 AP Birth of Vajraprahe

544 AP Mañjuśrimitra meet Vajraprahe

830 AP Shri Siṃha meets Mañjuśrimitra

984 AP Shri Siṃha's parinirvana

994 AP Jñānasūtra's parinirvana

1080 AP Vimāla arrives in Tibet

1093 AP Vimāla leaves for China

1148 AP Nyang erects Zhwa Gon and conceals the texts

1358 AP lDang ma discovers the termas

1388 AP lDang ma gives them to lCe bTsun

1568 AP Zhang ston bKra Shis rDo rJe removes the unsurpassed secret cycle.

If we consider that Vimāla arrives in Tibet after the death of Trisong Detsen (which really is a certainty), but before 20, this means according to Nyinthig chronology, Buddha's parinirvana was between 390-370. By Zhangton's own dates them, he revealed the Vima Nyinthig between 1178-1198, which is obviously too late because he had passed away already. If we move the dates fifty years earlier, it gives an approximate date of 1128 for the revelation of the Nyinthig. Though it is often held that Zhangton met Chetsun directly, in fact this was only a visionary encounter on a bridge in Tsang between 1122-1128 after Zhangton had already revealed the Vima Nyinthig. He says at the end of the Lo rgyus chen mo:

As such, thirty years later, having gone to the place where lCe bTsun disappeared lCe sGom Nag po of mNar mDa' in Rong took out the outer, inner and secret oral lineage and the instruction was not promulgated to others apart from himself. These then spread widely in dBus and gTsang. Fifty years after the revelation by lCe sGom, I removed these unsurpassed secret cycles and the instruction was not promulgated to others apart from myself. At this time, one thousand five hundred sixty eight years have

elapsed since the Buddha's parinirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Hardships and Downfall of Buddhism in India

Content:

theanarchist said:

I don't know, history shows that as soon as one ruling class is removed (for example by revolution) another ruling class comes into power and the whole game starts over.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because of the karma of some people to be in power, others to be in service, some poor, some wealthy and so on.

theanarchist said:

So, yes, it definitely depends on your karma if you become victim of these structures or not but it's not "karma" that Homo sapiens as a species developed this trait through evolution and it is genetically fixed in their brain structure.

Malcolm wrote:

When considering karma, there are no "victims". And yes, it is a result of karma that human beings developed all traits they bear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: Hardships and Downfall of Buddhism in India

Content:

Indrajala said:

Those who might have veered away from Vedic orthodoxy were still accepted no matter how eccentric they became .

theanarchist said:

That sounds so familiar.... Seems to be a worldwide phenomenon that ruling classes strive to eradicate everyone who threatens the status quo. Frankly, humanity is disgusting.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

Interesting, thanks.

Do you know what kind of practices are in the Bram ze'i skor? I think that is the earliest Dzogchen cycle mentioned by a non-Dzogchen practice lineage (Sakya). Also, if Zhang ston Chos 'bar openly mentioned the word 'Dzogchen' in opposition to the new translations to Sachen, it seems that there was an awareness about the Dzogchen and its 'old' origins among the public.

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty sure the Brahmin cycle is a terma system, but I forget which Tibetan master was responsible for its promulgation in the 11th century. It is generally classified as yang ti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 3rd, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

mutsuk said:

Concerning the age of these Tantras, JLA has shown that the Klong-drug is mentioned by title in the bSam-gtan mig-sgron (although without quote, but anyway, the Kun tu bzang po klong drug pa'i rgyud is the only Tantra I know of whose abridged title is Klong-drug, the standard abridged title for this tantra).

Malcolm wrote:

The Mu tig phreng ba commentary treats the 17 tantras as a single collection, but whether it was composed before or after the Vima Nyinthig is very hard to say.

It is true that there is a mention of a text called the klong drug on folio 17a, and there is also a text mentioned called the vi ma la klong 'grel which is mentioned three times, as mentioned by Dylan Esler in his article. However, this is extremely uncertain evidence. Until someone actually goes through the whole of the extant klong drug commentary, we cannot be sure that this commentary attributed to Vimalamitra is in fact the same as the one mentioned by Nubchen, don't you agree?

There is a second issue, which is we don't really know exactly when the bSam gtan mig sgron was composed, but it certainly could not be earlier than circa 1000 CE.

So, as far as I am concerned this still leaves the seventeen tantras as roughly early 11th century compositions, since the first external mention of them is in the Vima Nyinthig, which was definitely composed around 1122 by Zhangston.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 2nd, 2014 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Dhyana (samten) in Vajrayana, especially Dzogchen

Content:

Sherlock said:

So Malcolm, am I right in saying that your point here is that:

A. Dzogchen practitioners must have stable shamatha to the level of the first dhyana

Malcolm wrote:

Check

Sherlock said:

B. Creation stage is a shamatha practice that can help develop that

Malcolm wrote:

Check

Sherlock said:

C. Visualizations are used in both creation stage and in Dzogchen practices

Malcolm wrote:

Check

Sherlock said:

D. General sutra-style shamatha doesn't usually involve visualizations

Malcolm wrote:

Check (kaśīna meditation aside, and then there are the impure dhyana topics, such as visualizing yourself as a skeleton and so on)

Sherlock said:

E. Successful shamatha through kyerim also makes your mantras work

Malcolm wrote:

Check

Sherlock said:

Conclusion: A major reason for Dzogchen practitioners to develop the dhyanic factors by training shamatha through kyerim is that the visualization skills developed will be useful in other practices, and also for the mantra benefit. Therefore it is more useful for Dzogchen practitioners than sutrayana style shamatha.?

Malcolm wrote:

Rongzom is neutral on this point. He maintains that whether one is doing standard

śamatha or mantra practice, one must develop these five mental factors. He does not claim one is superior to the other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 2nd, 2014 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

The texts are always experientially addressed to the reader, to discover his or her state, which of course is the basis, they never say "theres my basis and theres your basis, we really exist as separate subjects so we have separate bases."

to discover his or her state

Malcolm wrote:

You don't need to theorize all kinds of different heats, to understand that all fires have the characteristic of heat. The basis is the same, all sentient beings and buddhas have the same set of characteristics, essence, nature and compassion. The general basis (spyi gzhi, not gzhi gzhi) is just a set of characteristics shared by all sentients, whether buddhas or samsarins, just as all fires share the quality of heat, and that is all it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 2nd, 2014 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

constructors of this narrative attempted to sketch out why no one from India in the sarma period had heard of it and at the same time make it sound more powerful than anything the New Translators were returning with.

Malcolm wrote:

The hilarious about this is very late narrative is that guys like Nyibum, Rongzom etc., were very active in the gsar ma scene. Nyibum was a student of Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen, Nyibum's son, Guru Jober, was a student of Sapan, and so on. Chetsun Senge Wangchuk supposedly assisted Drogmi by giving him gold with which to donate to Gayadhara and so on.

The reason why no one in India had ever heard of the man ngag sde teachings is that they never existed in India at all, and were constructed by Tibetans in the 11th century. Not all Nyingma tantras were composed/revealed by Tibetans, but the Dzogchen tantras, in my opinion (as I have mentioned frequently) most certainly were composed/revealed strictly by Tibetans and never existed in India, ever, nor even "Oddiyāna".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 11:42 PM



Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

End of the day, my Dzogchen teachers say Dzogchen is better than Mahamudra and I believe them.

Malcolm wrote:

In the end, this is mere puffery and triumphalism. It's like saying you can't get rainbow body from practicing Vajrayogini.

You may be more interested in practicing Dzogchen rather than practicing Lamdre, or Mahamudra, etc., but in the end one does not lead to a result higher than the other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Myanmar considers law restricting interfaith marriage

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Appearances are irrelevant, one's internal condition is what is important.

Sufism is also oppressed and suppressed by Shiite and Sunni governments, does that mean there is nobody practicing Sufism in Shiite and Sunni countries?

Burma is apparently a Buddhist country, if their Buddhism is being overrun by Islam then they need to ask themselves "Why?" because banning interfaith marriages is not going to be a long-term solution.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not banning interfaith marriages, they are guaranteeing the right of Buddhist women to keep their Buddhist faith if they enter into marriage with Muslims, undoubtedly to discourage Muslim men from marrying Buddhist women (who then must convert to Islam). You clearly did not read the article carefully:

The proposals include a law "to give protection and rights for ethnic Buddhists when marrying with other religions", as well as a ban on polygamy and legislation to "balance the increasing population".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

Kongtrul says completion is secondary in Creation and Completion.

Malcolm wrote:

Secondary in what sense? Secondary in the sense that yantra is a secondary practice?

The practice of completion stage is what causes one to achieve buddhahood. It is not merely for "reducing attachment" to the creation stage. On the other hand, what he may mean is the "completion" stage practice of dissolving the deity. This still cannot be construed as "secondary" since in a Nyingma sadhana practice, this is where one rests in tregchö.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

I was wondering about the dhyanas in relation to Dzogchen recently. Thanks for the info.

However what about just practicing the semdzins?

Malcolm wrote:

If they induce those mental factors, great. If they don't...

Developing a stable śamatha is crucial in Dzogchen. Just look at the seventh lojong. If someone wants to pursue SMS they will get nowhere without doing many months of long 2 hour sessions. And it gets more meditation heavy the higher you go.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Contrary to popular belief, Dzogchen practitioners also need to maintain their samayas (plural), not just the groovy ones like non-existence, ubiquity, singleness and natural perfection (which can't be broken anyway).

dzogchungpa said:

What are the non-groovy ones, say, for members of the DC?

Malcolm wrote:

The standard 27.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

It seems to me like you are in Sakya mood again, trying to see Dzogchen as just the completion stage of Nyingma. That might have been the view of Sakya Pandita

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it's Mipham's point of view.

Sherlock said:

Dzogchen like Jamgon Kongtrul, Karma Chagmed, Namkhai Norbu all agree that Dzogchen is different from Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course the path of Dzogchen thögal is different than the path of the two stages, (but it doesn't really seem to be that different when you examine the sbyor drug, despite mutsuk's protests to the contrary).

None of them would say that Dzogchen produces a Buddhahood superior to the path of the two stages. That is a Bonpo point of view.

Sherlock said:

In the two stages, the completion stage is secondary to the generation stage, to reduce attachment to the generation stage.

Malcolm wrote:

Creation and completion are to be practice in union from the beginning. Completion stage is no way secondary to creation stage. Whatever made you think it was?

Sherlock said:

Trekchod and thogal, longde four das, semde four contemplations are not secondary to Mahayoga, at least as they survive today.

Malcolm wrote:

I know a lot of people who have received all of these instructions, and just about as many who do nothing with them at all. I know many people, for example, who have received Mandarava creation and completion practices, and many who apply them regularly. I would venture a guess and say that in general, advanced Dzogchen practices remain at a level of fantasy for most people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

You don't need to spend years to get your visualization of a specific body part of a deity perfectly right in Dzogchen, also you just visualize the relevant syllables or channels depending on the practice, not the whole deity. Are you saying that in actual practice, visualization of all the fine details in the two stages is not necessary?

Malcolm wrote:

In actual practice, when you are reciting the sadhana, you just recite it clearly, i.e. without distraction; intensely, i.e. you know what you are saying, and quickly, without lingering on any part of the sadhana until you come to the end.

Let us say you are meditating the Hevajra mandala, there there are thirty-two topics. You pick one topic per session. For example, in the beginning, for the most part, one focuses on cultivating divine pride "I am yidam X". The one focuses on getting the central eye correct. Why? Because this causes the vāyu to begin to settle in the central channel. Then you move from one to the other. Eventually, by switching topics from one to another, you can immediately recall a generic image of the whole deity without any effort. Then you can dispense with this. You don't spend hours and hours trying to get each detail perfect.

In one session you apply both some equipoise on one aspect of the mandala or another, and then one does some completion stage practice, right from the very beginning. When you are doing completion stage practice, you only focus on what you need for that completion stage practice.

Mantra recitation is considered a post-equipoise practice in Sakya because it involves activity. In Nyingma, focusing on the mantra rosary is generally considered the main practice of the creation stage, and resting in the nature of the mind at the end is considered to be the main completion stage.

Even if you are a fantastic "Dzogchen" practitioner, if you recite mantras in a state of distraction, they won't work. So in fact, whether you are doing some elaborate practice like Hevajra, or an Anuyoga practice like Dragphur, you need to have good, stable concentration, otherwise your mantras won't work. The whole point of creation stage is to develop your concentration to the point that your mantras work easily and swiftly. If you think that mantras like the 25 spaces are some exception, they are not. In this case they function only if you are in a state of natural repose, unfettered equipoise i.e. cog bzhag.

Rongzom makes the point very clearly that Dzogchen practitioners must develop the mental factors that characterize the first dhyana, vitarka, vicara, priti, sukha and ekagraha, i.e. applied attention, sustained attention, physical ease, mental ease and one-pointedness. If you do not have a stable śamatha practice, you can't really call yourself a Dzogchen practitioner at all. At best, you can call yourself someone who would like to be a Dzogchen practitioner a ma rdzogs chen pa. People who think that Dzogchen frees one from the need to meditate seriously are seriously deluded. The sgra thal 'gyur clearly says:

The faults of not meditating are:  
the characteristics of samsara appear to one,  
there is self and other, object and consciousness,  
the view is verbal,  
the field is perceptual,  
one is bound by afflictions,  
also one throws away the path of the buddhahood,  
one does not understand the nature of the result,  
a basis for the sameness of all phenomena does not exist,  
one's vidyā is bound by the three realms,  
and one will fall into conceptuality

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Tendai is a Ch'an school.

Content:

Indrajala said:

The way I judge Buddhists is basically based on how much broad knowledge they possess and how well they interpret Dharma in a reasonable and realistic manner. Emotions and warm feelings are not wise guides for judging people.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because, like most religious intellectuals, your strongest attachment is through the saṃjñā skandha, rather than the vedana skandha. This is also why you promiscuously promulgate your point of view that common people should not be allowed to govern themselves, that they need guidance from their "betters" and so on. In other words your elitism is merely a factor of your afflictive make up, there is nothing objective about it at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Myanmar considers law restricting interfaith marriage

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The only thing Buddhists need as protection, is to act like Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the fact is that in some countries, like Lhadak, Buddhist women are "press-ganged" into marriages with Muslims. This also happens in Bangladesh. A lot of what is happening in Myanmar is a direct reaction to the oppression of Buddhists in the Chittagong hills. It does not make it right, but that is actually what is happening. The Buddhist communities in the Chittagong have had close ties with the Burmese for many

centuries.

<http://www.angelfire.com/ab/jumma/bground.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

In semdzins and rushan, the only real "mantra" is the three syllables. There are other syllables but those are not mantras.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously, where do you get the strange idea that the six syllables of Samantbhadara are not mantras? Certainly not from Dzogchen tantras:

Realizing the meaning of the six syllables unravels the great tantra of secret mantra. Abiding in the meaning of the six syllables is a person's nirvana. The kings that creates realization is the six sounds of syllables. All secret mantra is complete in the six syllables.

-- Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva

Sherlock said:

Your other examples are also not essential practices of Dzogchen upadesha (trekchod and thogal).

It's not important to get the fine details of the visualization compared to the two stages.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact creation and completion practices like caṇḍalī yoga are brought up in the seventeen tantras themselves and their commentarial literature proves that they are important.

The main principle of the creation stage of developing divine pride. I really don't know how much experience you have of doing elaborate creation stage practices, but your comments betray a lack of familiarity about how such creation stage is actually done in practice. Many Dzogchen/Nyingma practitioners, unfamiliar with the fine details of "gsar ma" tantras, have the idea that "sudden" or instant creation is only a principle of Anuyoga. However, the Laghusamvara Tantra explicitly teaches instant creation as well as gradual creation. The general consideration is one of experience. In the gsar ma schools, the more elaborate creation stage practices are for beginners, while advanced practitioners rely on instant creation stages. You can read about this in the Lamdre book.

In addition, there are very few people who practice thögal seriously. As Khenpo Ngachung mentions, principally thögal is used these days to stabilize tregchö. Most Dzogchen practitioners are not going to realize the body of light. Most practitioners are going attain realization in the bardo, if at all. If you maintain your samayas, no matter what system of Vajrayāna you practice, you will achieve Buddhahood within seven lifetimes, i.e. if you maintain your samayas, you are functionally equivalent to a stream entrant. Contrary to popular belief, Dzogchen practitioners also need to maintain their samayas (plural), not just the groovy ones like non-existence, ubiquity, singleness and natural perfection (which can't be broken anyway).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"

Content:

Sherlock said:

It is best to follow one's guru. I think for ChNN, the outline of sutrayana he gives in the Precious Vase is what he expects his students to know if they want to learn in a more organized way.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN only sets a minimum bar on what he expects people to know, but he expects \_everyone\_ to learn the base. Sadly, most people ignore him on this point, but it is partially because the translation is difficult to read.

Sherlock said:

I think it's because it starts from a fairly hard to understand and somewhat arcane position: contrasting the different schools in India. The first time I read it, I had problems getting past the first chapter and stopped. Later, I just read the later chapters, which were much clearer.

Malcolm wrote:

It's is principally a commentary on the man ngag lta phreng ba attributed to Padmasambhava.

The reason why we need to acquaint ourselves with these tenet systems is so that we avoid falling into the same errors, thinking our view accords with Buddhadharma, when it really doesn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

The supreme empowerment doesn't refer to the ritualized actions of putting a vase on your head etc

heart said:

In the Vima Nyingtik the first empowerment, the elaborate, is given with a vase.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

As is the second, the unelaborate empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

The only mantra recitation is the three syllables.

Malcolm wrote:

This is seriously a very silly thing to say. Where did you get this idea? What about the six syllables of Samantabhadra, song of the vajra and so on? What about the countless mantras for recitation in the rDzogs pa Rang 'byung? What about the Ekajati practices in the khro ma nag mo rgyud?

Sherlock said:

Visualization is not very important compared to tantric mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Where do you get this idea? What about semzin and rushan? What about all the praṇāyama practices that involve visualization?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

How is the way of the practice the same?

The only mantra recitation is the three syllables. Visualization is not very important compared to tantric mahamudra. The supreme empowerment doesn't refer to the ritualized actions of putting a vase on your head etc, but to conveying the meaning of Dzogchen through whatever means, often just through oral explanations.



If anything, Dzogchen way of practice is more similar to sutrayana meditation than to tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense. For example, the Vima Nyinthig has a detailed text on praṇāyama called the rlung gyi phra khrid, which gives sets of practices that are very important for Dzogchen practitioners. Praṇāyama, not important at all in sutrayāna meditation, is extremely important in Dzogchen. Likewise, the notion that view to be meditated is conferred through experiences gained during the empowerment. Not only this, but the whole contextualization of practice is completely based on the systems of nāḍīs and cakras in the human body and so on.

The supreme empowerment means, according to The Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva:

There are three kinds of empowerments, outer, inner and secret. The outer empowerment is the mandala of colored powder... The empowerments are conferred sequentially. The location of conferring them is the brahmarandhra. Having completed the outer and inner empowerments as such, one should enter into the secret empowerment. There are three syllables... As such, having completed the three empowerments, one should bestow the instructions to be bestowed. The yoga who has the complete empowerments will definitely become accomplished. The illustration of the meaning of secret mantra is granted through empowerment.

In general, the ancient texts and commentaries assume that a person who wants to practice Dzogchen will receive all four empowerments, elaborate, unelaborate and so on. Of course, the system of the direct introduction does exist in the seventeen tantras, but it is generally considered to be given only on the basis of the elaborate and so on empowerments, just as so-called "sems sde" was generally only conferred to people who had received at minimum the Guhyagarbha empowerment. "Longde" as we know, can only be practiced on the basis of an anuyoga empowerment.

And in point of fact, the Dzogs pa rang 'byung tantra mainly concerns mahayoga and anuyoga methods, various kinds of maha and anu style empowerments, as well as elaborate rites for leading practitioners through the bardo. The commentary on the sgra thaḥ 'gyur has a very elaborate Vajravārahī practice as well as other creation stage practices. These are discussed in the commentary to this passage:

Amazing, though there are countless stages  
of ultimate secret practice,  
by dividing the principle ones,  
[the one of] method and [the one of] supremely profound prajñā  
are summarized from them.

In actuality, Dzogchen is always contextualized as a part of secret mantra in the seventeen tantras themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 7:06 PM

Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"

Content:

Sherlock said:

It is best to follow one's guru. I think for ChNN, the outline of sutrayana he gives in the Precious Vase is what he expects his students to know if they want to learn in a more organized way.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN only sets a minimum bar on what he expects people to know, but he expects everyone to learn the base. Sadly, most people ignore him on this point, but it is partially because the translation is difficult to read.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 7:00 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

alpha said:

Also , if you say " Dharmadhtu is a condition common to all beings " that would imply to mean the individual basis not dharmadatu since dharmadathu per Rinpoche's explanation it means "all of existence".

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmadhātu, literally meaning "source of phenomena", in Mahāyāna means the general emptiness of all things. Dharmatā means the specific emptiness of a given thing; however, dharmatā, in Dzogchen texts, also refers to how the basis is instantiated within a given sentient being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 6:54 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

If the other paths in Buddhadharma really had the same view of the base, path, and fruit as Dzogchen, their way of practice would likewise be the same.

Malcolm wrote:

It is more or less the same.

The authors of Dzogchen texts wouldn't feel the need to contrast their path so much with that of the tantras either.

The Supreme Source said:

1. There is no view on which one has to meditate.
2. There is no commitment, or samaya, one has to keep.
3. There is no capacity for spiritual action one has to seek.
4. There is no mandala one has to create.
5. There is no initiation one has to receive.
6. There is no path one has to tread.
7. There are no levels of realization (bhumis) one has to achieve through purification.
8. There is no conduct one has to adopt, or abandon.
9. From the beginning, self-arising wisdom has been free of obstacles.
10. Self-perfection is beyond hope and fear.

Malcolm wrote:

Hevajra Tantra:

No meditator, no meditation,  
no deity, and also no mantra.

And:

Here there is no method and wisdom,  
the appearance of true reality,  
can't be described by another, the innate  
cannot be found anywhere.

And:

All migrating beings arise from me,  
also the three realms also arise from me,  
I pervade all of this,  
the nature of migrating beings is not seen elsewhere.

And:

Therefore, no smell, no sound, no form,  
no purity of taste and thought,  
nothing to touch, no phenomena, everything is pure,  
having understood migrating beings pure by nature as migrating beings.

And:

[C]onsciousness is the form of all.

And:

No recitation of mantra, no austerity, no fire pujas,  
also no one in the maṇḍala, and also no maṇḍala,  
that is the mantra recitation, that is the austerity, that is the fire pujas,  
that is the one in the maṇḍala and the maṇḍala,  
in brief, the mind is the encompassing form.

The pure mind's  
nature is nirvana.

You see, the message of the bodhicitta texts is not really so unique in this respect.

The Supreme Source said:

Is it all just rhetoric? I don't think so. Maybe in actual terms, it still takes many years of retreat for both a Mahamudra practitioner and a Dzogchen practitioner to reach realization, but the way the view of the base, path and fruit differs in both paths strongly influences the actual practice.

Malcolm wrote:

The actual practice of Dzogchen is unifying the three inner tantras. When we talk about essence nature and compassion, this is really just a riff on the three samadhis of mahāyoga, etc. I.e.:

The samadhi of suchness = essence

The samadhi of universal appearance = nature

The samadhi of the cause = compassion

One of the seventeen tantras, The Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva explains:

Again he replied "Oh Vajraholder, listen! After my Nirvana, teach this to sentient beings of the future. Generation stage Mahāyoga is like the basis of all Dharma. Completion state Anuyoga is the like the path of all Dharma. Great Perfection Atiyoga is the like the result of Dharma. Therefore, the meaning of the inseparability of the trio of creation and completion is understood as the three syllables. [9/a] If it is asked what those are, they can be understood with Oṃ Aḥ Hūṃ. Therefore, hold in mind what I have clearly

demonstrated. Without arising or ceasing, Om exists in oneself. Without birth and death, Āḥ exists oneself. Inseparable, Hūṃ exists in oneself. The single unwritten tantra exists in oneself. The single undemonstrated agama exists in oneself. The intimate instruction that discloses one's vidyā exists in oneself. The lamp of the essence of wisdom is very bright. The meaning of the six yānas are to be understood in three. The meaning of the six syllables are to be understood in three syllables. The tantra must be unraveled with the meaning of the trio of creation and completion to sentient beings of the future. The three syllables exist in all sentient beings. Therefore, in terms of accomplishment, explained Accomplishment Mahāyoga using the ground; explain Agama Anuyoga using space; and explained Upadesha Dzogchen using the sun and moon. The confirmation of the ultimate garbha is to be understood with this tantra.”

And:

From that basis existing in the form of a halo of light, the so called “causal condition” is the actual ignorance. Since that becomes an intellectual analysis, it is called the “dominant condition”. Since is apprehended subjectively, it is called “the object condition”. For example, like face of a person shown to a mirror. Since those three happen at the same time, it is called “the immediately simultaneous and antecedent condition”.

That is one's own basis but it was not recognized by oneself. The samsaric three realms are formed through delusion.

This tantra also demonstrates the fault of not receiving empowerment:

The demonstration of the fault of not obtaining the supreme empowerment is that the yogin, for example, will be like a boatman with out an oar, unable to deliver to the other side. If the supreme empowerment is obtained, the secret mantra that is not accomplished will be accomplished.

When it comes to the unique feature of Dzogchen, it lies in the the anatomy of thögal, and that's about it. But even in this respect, that fact that path depends on human physical anatomy classifies it along with other highest yoga tantra systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 6:25 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is the basis of all phenomena of samsara and nirvana, including sentient beings and their minds. A mirror is the basis for all reflections, but it is not contained in the reflections. You said "The basis is a generic set of qualities, essence, nature and compassion, that all minds possess.". This is like saying "The mirror is a generic set of qualities that all reflections possess." This makes no sense.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is like saying that all mirrors possess a general set of characteristics, such as reflectivity, and so on.

Again, you are just reifying the basis as if it were something like "brahman".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The ultimate is emptiness free from proliferation. When there is proliferation, there are sentient beings, buddhas, worlds, universes, etc. In order for there to be a presence or absence of proliferation, there has to be a basis for the the presence or absence of proliferation, and that basis is just the mind of a sentient [i.e. buddhas or beings].

gad rgyangs said:

this is totally circular: first you say that sentient beings are the result of proliferation, and the ultimate is free from proliferation. so far so good. then you say that the ultimate is "just the mind of a sentient being". totally circular, and also total reification of both sentient beings and the ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

The ultimate described in words is merely a reification of a mind.

gad rgyangs said:

relatively there is a concept of a basis in the mind of a sentient being. If, however, that sentient being recognizes instant presence, then all such distinctions of "ultimate" and "relative" fall away.

Malcolm wrote:

Which proves my point that the basis is just the mind of a sentient being, for simplicities sake, when there is no proliferation in that mind, when it is unfabricated, that is buddhahood. When there is proliferation, sentient being hood.

It is inane to discuss things like a basis without discussing what a basis is a basis of (samsara and nirvana). That discussion of the basis of samsara and nirvana is only meaningful with regards to sentient beings. And yes, we are referring to an ālaya of sentient beings, not in the specialized man ngag sde usage of the term, where it refers only to ignorance, but in the more general way, in the way it is used in non-man ngag sde, in some terma cycles like the dgongs pa zang thal, and in the gsar ma schools. In short, what we are talking about is the ālaya cause continuum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: IS THE DALAI LAMA SAFE?

Content:

odysseus said:

There ´s nothing to worry about. The Dalai Lama can handle himself. These "enemies" are not dangerous, they ´re just angry.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be so sure...

<https://tinyurl.com/l337nwj>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is not the "cause" of samsara and nirvana, and you may choose to create an actual duality of delusion/non-delusion, but as you know that is a mistake of the lower vehicles.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is, that is how it is defined by Dzogchen tantras. As Nyibum notes:

The trio of the essence, nature and compassion of the original basis becomes the three ignorances.

gad rgyangs said:

this clearly says that mind "arises from intrinsic luminescence of dharmatā manifesting as the five lights". Isn't that simple enough?

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmatā here is wisdom. If the basis is not wisdom, it is inert, non-sentient. How can there be sentience apart from instantiations of sentience, i.e. minds?

gad rgyangs said:

It is important to understand that "light" in this context refers only to the luminescence [gdangs] or clarity [gsal ba] of one's own consciousness, it is not an "outside" light, it is not physical light which can bleach color out of pigments, etc.

this is what keeps tripping you up. You insist on taking the fiction of "one's own

consciousness" as an absolute, imagining that "inside/outside" is an objective distinction.

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't trip me up at all. Your problem is you think all this is all a description of some ultimate. It isn't. It is all purely conventional.

gad rgyangs said:

I have been all over these texts, and there is never any satisfactory explanation for how a mind arises out of the basis acausally. Since the basis is described as a wisdom, a wisdom must in fact be something which bears noetic capacity, and it must in fact arise as a diversity, i.e., as individual instantiations, so why do you keep saying "the basis" instead of "bases?" why do you keep referring to the basis as an "it" rather than a "them"?

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out, the basis is merely a generic term, just like vijñāna in vijñānadhatu is a generic term which covers all instances of consciousness.

gad rgyangs said:

Thus, there is no contradiction at all in considering the basis a general description for the nature of the mind which can either realize buddhahood or fall into samsara. same problem: all you have done is passed the buck and now you must explain what is the basis for all those individual minds.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is a generic set of qualities, essence, nature and compassion, that all minds possess.

gad rgyangs said:

It is incoherent to talk about the basis if the basis is not in fact one's own mind. Then one has to imagine some noetic uber-field out of which instantiations of omniscient or deluded consciousnesses somehow bootstrap themselves into existence. you have set up this straw man and are having a ball tilting at the windmills, but no one says this: the basis is not a field, it is not a describable thing, period.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a describable principle, that is why Dzogchen tantras spend so much time describing it.

gad rgyangs said:

Notice that you never pull up any of the thousands of quotes in the corpus that say it is beyond conceptual constructs and free of all extremes, so of course for you it must either be X or Y, black or white, etc.



Malcolm wrote:

Those citations are not useful for the purpose at hand, which is explaining how delusion arises from something supposedly undeluded.

gad rgyangs said:

see, there you go: if you can't fit it into a category then its unacceptable to you.

Malcolm wrote:

Your inability to see that it is merely a catalogue of qualities forces you to basically assert one of the five faulty positions of the basis, i.e., that it is indeterminable.

gad rgyangs said:

yes, claiming that sentient beings with multiple bases exist is the product of a mind which reifies.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, which is your claim.

gad rgyangs said:

Your problem is that you want to avoid any discussion of the relative. But Dzogchen tantras are not so shy, and they acknowledge the two truths also, as the String of Pearls states:

The universe and inhabitants have always been empty,  
the ultimate endowed with the form of the relative.

haha and how is this "ultimate" different from God or Brahman exactly? What is the "form of the relative" except illusory universes and beings?

Malcolm wrote:

The ultimate is emptiness free from proliferation. When there is proliferation, there are sentient beings, buddhas, worlds, universes, etc. In order for there to be a presence or absence of proliferation, there has to be a basis for the the presence or absence of proliferation, and that basis is just the mind of a sentient [i.e. buddhas or beings].

In the end, Dzogchen does not actually go beyond the yogacara madhyamaka synthesis.

gad rgyangs said:

And finally, the sgra thal 'gyur states:

Because mind pervades all the embodied,  
there are no buddhas without sentient beings.  
and the PP sutras say there are no buddhas or sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately there are no sentient beings, no basis, etc.

Relatively there is a basis, i.e. the minds of sentient beings, and so on.

So, what we demonstrated here is that Dzogchen in the end, despite a lot of hyperbole and rhetoric is just another conventional scheme for describing the four noble truths: suffering, the cause, the cessation and the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

There seems to be a slight disparity between what you, Malcolm and pensum, are saying, but I will think about it. Maybe we can discuss the first paragraph of the note: What we call the "ground" is the union of emptiness and luminosity. It is the dharmatā: motionless, ultimate reality, the tathāgatagarbha. At the slightest arising of the creative power of awareness (and there is no question of its not arising), there occurs what is called the appearance of the ground (gzhi snang). The appearance of the ground and the creative power of awareness are the same thing. This creative power moves, whereas awareness itself is always motionless. It is as when the sun rises. The sun's rays cover the earth, but the sun does not move out from itself. Its rays are like the creative power of awareness. The appearance of the ground is said to "move," in the sense that it is the ground's radiance, not because it is drawn out by something extraneous.

("creative power" = "rtsal")

I find the phrase "there is no question of its not arising" kind of intriguing. It doesn't seem to explain much.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just a description of the nature of the mind. No mind, no nature of the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As such, one's mind present as the nature of all the phenomena of buddhahood is realized as buddha.

-- Nyima Bum

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 3:55 AM

Title: IS THE DALAI LAMA SAFE?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.jamyangnorbu.com/blog/2014/02/28/is-the-dalai-lama-safe/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is lacking for lay people is a decent education in the basics of Buddhadharma. As I get older I can see that there is limited benefit to Varjayāna practice without some grounding, either prior too or simultaneously, in Sutrayāna teachings. There is any number of very good Sakya Khenpos. Basically in Sakya, you are either a scholar or a ritualist.

Clarence said:

Apologies for taking this off-topic, but how do you see that in regards of Dzogchen practice? Is it easier to practice Dzogchen vs Vajrayana without those basics in Buddhadharma?

Malcolm wrote:

I have wavered on this over the years, as I have in so many other things, but my present thinking is that all Vajrayāna practitioners of whatever stripe need a solid grounding in Hinayāna and Mahāyāna paths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, I like what you're saying, I'm just trying to understand. Could you please respond to my question here:

[https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=15425&p=216335#p216335?](https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=15425&p=216335#p216335)

I find the use of "actualization" in the quotation kind of confusing. Would you, or anybody, happen to know what it might correspond to in Tibetan?

Malcolm wrote:

They mean that vidyā is the "instantiation" (mngon 'gyur) of the basis in a sentient being.

dzogchungpa said:

Those aren't scare quotes, are they?

OK, so how are we to understand "Therefore, while awareness is necessarily the ground, the ground is not necessarily awareness."?

To me, it seems incompatible with your position.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is a set of qualities that all minds have. Vidyā is the specific instantiation of those qualities in a sentient being. The basis here has been defined for you as tathāgatagarbha, i.e. dharmakāya in a obscured form. Dharmakāya demonstrates in this instance nothing more than the potential for a sentient being to become omniscient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Discussion of Political Topics is Wrong Speech

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Political stability in Japan can be accounted for simply through its geographical isolation.

Indrajala said:

What are you talking about? The Yamato court was constantly at war with rivals and non-Japanese tribes (Hayato, Ebisu, etc.) until basically the 8th century. It later suffered decentralization which led to the Kamakura period and subsequent centuries of civil wars. Even in early centuries the Yamato court was at odds with Silla in Korea and invasion was a constant fear. There was a war between Japan against a Silla-Tang alliance in the 660s.

Malcolm wrote:

The Silla-Tang alliance was totally unstable, and never represented a serious threat to the Yamamoto court.

Internal stability does not mean one does not fight others. In fact, the ability to master others in war comes from internal stability. And the Yamamoto were mercenaries in the Korean Peninsula for the Baekje.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Discussion of Political Topics is Wrong Speech

Content:

Indrajala said:

Actually the development of a centralized court model with a heavy hierarchy in Japan based on Chinese models actually was prompted by fears of foreign invasion. By the late Asuka and early Nara period the system was largely in place and it worked wonders for the economy and military. It also produced a respectable nation state that could hold its own weight in international dealings. The Cambridge History of Japan Volume 1 provides all these details.

Malcolm wrote:

Political stability in Japan can be accounted for simply through its geographical isolation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"

Content:

jiashengrox said:

Yes, i don't deny that Sakya predates Gelug by a number of centuries, but the monastic tradition somehow was not as rigorous until the recent years (again i hope i m not wrong).

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you are wrong. Ngorpas are just as strict as Gelugpas.

jiashengrox said:

in fact, i acknowledge that je tsongkhapa somehow inherited this system from the sakya (i would presume through his sakya teacher rendawa), which can pre date to the era of sakya pandita. But this monastic training in sakya is not as prevalent as the past, hence coining the phrase "in some sense following the footsteps of the gelugpas". it is the tradition of the gelugpas that has continually maintained this rigorous monastic training.

Malcolm wrote:

You really need to revise this perspective. Ngorchon (1382-1456) established a very strict monastic order. Also Nalendra was strict. And Sangphu. Perhaps in Sakya itself monks were not as strict.

What is lacking for lay people is a decent education in the basics of Buddhadharma. As I get older I can see that there is limited benefit to Varjayāna practice without some grounding, either prior too or simultaneously, in Sutrayāna teachings. There is any number of very good Sakya Khenpos. Basically in Sakya, you are either a scholar or a ritualist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Discussion of Political Topics is Wrong Speech

Content:

Indrajala said:

A monarch is only as good as his circle of power.

Malcolm wrote:

Āryadeva defines monarchs, in this day and age as fools. There are none more foolish, in fact.

Indrajala said:

Democracies don't always produce decent leaders either.

Malcolm wrote:

No, but it guarantees that an ineffective leader has a limited term. Further, governance, in a Democracy does not really depend on a figure head such as a president.

Indrajala said:

In fact, in a capitalist democracy inevitably the business elites convert their wealth into political power and then serve business interests above all else.

Malcolm wrote:

Its a process of give and take, right now we are in the give part of the cycle, just like a the end of the 19th century. It will shift back.

Indrajala said:

One advantage to a hereditary monarchy is that children are raised from birth with the skills and connections they need to run a nation.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no evidence at all in history that hereditary monarchies provide long term political stability.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, I like what you're saying, I'm just trying to understand. Could you please respond to my question here:

[https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=15425&p=216335#p216335?](https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=15425&p=216335#p216335)

I find the use of "actualization" in the quotation kind of confusing. Would you, or anybody, happen to know what it might correspond to in Tibetan?

Malcolm wrote:

They mean that vidyā is the "instantiation" (mngon 'gyur) of the basis in a sentient being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

heart said:

gad rgyangs is, I think, referring to a method of giving direct introduction that ChNNR use, called Yeshe Sangtal.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is referring to a klong gsal text called Ye shes zang thal, the red volume, volume three, I believe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is not an abstraction, neither is it a thing (res).

Malcolm wrote:

It is a mere abstraction, as such, it is not a thing.

gad rgyangs said:

nope. you are reifying sentient beings again, as those in a dream-state are wont to do.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with the sgra thal 'gyur:

As such, in samsara at the start and nirvana at the end,  
since the buddhas did not become deluded,  
the self-appearances were recognized as natureless [rang bzhin med]  
with sense organs that rose up out of the basis.  
There was no lapse into mental analysis of external objects  
and [the self-appearances] were ascertained to be their own movements.

It is incoherent to define the basis as timeless, and then suggest that a sense organ [here the manas-indriya] rise out of it. But clearly here, a mental organ is defined.

Nyibum states:

[D]elusion came from the basis and a special awareness of the basis. Apart from generally pervading, the so-called “basis” is totally undifferentiated, without any consideration of delusion or nondelusion. That so-called “ knower” or “mind” (the assertion of a specific awareness demonstrated in our own texts) is deluded.

So somehow, a mind, or mental faculty arises (without any cause) from a basis that likewise has no cause and isn't a thing or a non-thing, according to you, but nevertheless is described as the cause of samsara and nirvana, and further, this mind [sems] or knower [shes pa po] is "deluded" but it arises from a state of non-delusion.

There is a coherent explanation of this, but it depends on that fact that the basis as such is merely describing the nature of the mind.

Further, when describing how delusion arises, the commentary of the sgar thal 'gyur states very clearly:

The mind [blo] of the conceptual analysis of the individual members of dependent origination arises from intrinsic luminescence of dharmatā manifesting as the five lights, i.e., the conceptuality about the very clear luminescence of five colors comes from thinking “I come from that” and “That comes from me”, and it is said that the mental faculty [yid] is captivated by the appearance of the light because of the buildup of external grasping. Since it is seen as only suffering, this non-delusion becomes delusion because of conceptual analysis.

It is important to understand that "light" in this context refers only to the luminescence [gdangs] or clarity [gsal ba] of one's own consciousness, it is not an "outside" light, it is not physical light which can bleach color out of pigments, etc.

All of this experience is happening with the context of an individual consciousness. The description is entirely subjective. Its subjectivity and the production of a so called "external universe" is quite easily understood in Yogacara terms, which in fact that Dzogchen tantras borrow from liberally, as we see in the sgra thal 'gyur:

The lamp of self-originated prajñā  
subsumes all phenomena into one taste,  
cutting the continuum of traces connected  
with this grasping to one's appearance.

I have been all over these texts, and there is never any satisfactory explanation for how a mind arises out of the basis acausally. Since the basis is described as a wisdom, a wisdom must in fact be something which bears noetic capacity, and it must in fact arise as a diversity, i.e., as individual instantiations, as the sgra thal 'gyur states:

Other than compassion arising as diversity,  
it is not defined as one thing like this.

Thus, there is no contradiction at all in considering the basis a general description for



the nature of the mind which can either realize buddhahood or fall into samsara. Any other explanation is simply incoherent and runs into the inevitable problem of being indistinguishable from tirthika ideas such as brahman, etc., a flaw, incidentally, that Dzogchen tantras and commentaries express a great deal of interest in avoiding and spend an inordinate amount of time addressing so as to avoid the charge of being outside Buddhadharma.

It is incoherent to talk about the basis if the basis is not in fact one's own mind. Then one has to imagine some noetic uber-field out of which instantiations of omniscient or deluded consciousnesses somehow bootstrap themselves into existence. We can see from this passage in the String of Pearls that the basis is the basis of delusion and can become contaminated:

The general basis is called “the basis of delusion” [28b] because of ignorance and contamination.  
Further, the object of knowledge itself appears tainted because memory and thought arise in the mind.  
The essence itself is contaminated by concepts because the grasping aspect of the six minds is unceasing.  
Further, dharmakāya is bound by apprehension due to being associated with subtle atoms.  
Further, luminosity forms traces due to the impure perception of the four conditions.  
Further, appearances arise as multiplicity because those appearances are apparent objects.

gad rgyangs said:

Conventionally speaking, samanya-lakṣanas (universals) are considered completely unreal, as opposed to svalakṣanas (particulars), which are allowed a certain species of conventional reality.

the basis is not a universal. neither is it a particular.

Malcolm wrote:

Thus, you agree, it is an abstraction. Therefore, there is no basis, unless it is a set of characteristics of one's own mind.

gad rgyangs said:

radical or not, the basis is definitely not the mind of a reified sentient being.

Malcolm wrote:

In order for there to be a reified sentient beings, there has to be a mind which reifies, it is an inescapable reduction. Reification cannot occur without a reifying mind. When a mind ceases to reify, it simple dissolves into its own nature, which is described in Dzogchen texts as the basis. The basis is just one's own unfabricated mind. Any other explanation is complete gibberish.

Your problem is that you want to avoid any discussion of the relative. But Dzogchen tantras are not so shy, and they acknowledge the two truths also, as the String of Pearls states:

The universe and inhabitants have always been empty,  
the ultimate endowed with the form of the relative.

And finally, the sgra thal 'gyur states:

Because mind pervades all the embodied,  
there are no buddhas without sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

pensum said:

Another way to demonstrate this is that the basis of all trees is wood, but there is no wood apart from trees. Without trees there would be no wood. Similarly the basis of all sentient beings is lucid emptiness (gsal stong), yet this empty lucidity does not exist apart from sentient beings.

It's quite simple really.

gad rgyangs said:

sentient beings definitely do not exist apart from the lucid emptiness. In the yeshe sangthal, instant presence is discovered within the vast dimension of emptiness, not the other way around.

Malcolm wrote:

And lucid emptiness does not exist apart from sentient beings and all things:

"Matter is empty, emptiness is matter, there is no matter apart from emptiness, there is not emptiness apart from matter, so too for sensation, perception, formation and consciousness."

"There is no mind in the mind, but the primal nature of the mind is luminous"

The basis in Dzogchen is merely that luminosity described in the PP Sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is an abstraction, thus it is not real apart from its instantiations.

gad rgyangs said:  
so what, its real in its instantiations?

Malcolm wrote:  
Heat is an abstraction derived from instantiations of fire.

The basis is an abstraction derived from instantiations of sapients, both buddhas and sentient beings. Conventionally speaking, samanya-lakṣanas (universals) are considered completely unreal, as opposed to svalakṣanas (particulars), which are allowed a certain species of conventional reality.

The basis is the description of the dharmatā of dharmins. Without a dharmin, a dharmatā is unintelligible, so in the end, the Dzogchen presentation of the basis is not nearly as radical as it is made out to be.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 12:20 AM  
Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"  
Content:

jiashengrox said:  
Then, one might wonder, "Wouldn't it be a little too old for most of the monks to uphold the lineage only after they have completed the studies?" And there is what is an advantage of this system: it ensures quality. If you are unable to even grasp sutric concepts at the very fundamental level, then u are probably not suited to do tantra. I know Sakya has a unique POV of combining sutra and tantra and practicing them concurrently, we realise that even so, sakya is also setting up monastic colleges, which in some sense (i might be wrong again!) following the style of the gelugpas.

Malcolm wrote:  
You are totally wrong considering that Sakya predates Gelug by a number of centuries and that the latter school arose out of the former.

jiashengrox said:  
However, a concerning question in mind should not just be ensuring the survival of the lineage alone (I used the word alone to further emphasise that i concur that it is important to ensure the continuity of the teachings), but the quality of the teachings that are preserved. I m sure that for us who have read the history of Lam Dre lineage from "Taking Result As the Path" by Cyrus Stearns, we note that some did not continue (as in the case of Segom Jangye, the disciple of Se Kharchungwa, page 212-213 of the book) because of not being able to "sustain the practice, develop wisdom, and so forth".

Malcolm wrote:  
The structure to implement the continuation of the Sakya lineage is in the hands of the

'Khon family, the Ngorpas and the Tsharpas (and the Dzongpas too).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Discussion of Political Topics is Wrong Speech

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rome, China, India, Britain, US etc.

Indrajala said:

Rome, China and Britain had empires that arose along meta-ethnic frontiers. In the case of Rome, it was continual conflict with the Gauls that facilitated the development of high asabiya, i.e., social cohesion that lent itself to strong political stability until overpopulation meant inter-elite competition became problematic. In the case of Chinese dynasties the constant eternal enemies were from the northern steppes, such as the Xiongnu, Turks and so on, all of whom were basically permanent aliens and a dangerous "other". But that being said it was less about geography and more about a clash of civilizations. Chinese were settled on plains while the Xiongnu and their kin were largely nomadic horsemen. The Chinese could have just as well, and did, settle the pasture land of nomadic peoples. Likewise the Romans settled Gaul territory.

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose of my example was to show positive (India, US, Britain) and negative examples (China, Rome) of how geography is a key factor in political stability.

Indrajala said:

Resource distribution, unless done at gun point, tends to follow its own internal logic.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, usually becoming a pyramid scheme in which wealth concentrates more and more in the so called upper classes who prove to be too venal to do anything more than engage in more hoarding.

Indrajala said:

This is why wise leaders of the past often suggested a return to simple living, like Marcus Aurelius for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Romantics. It never happens. Usually such guidance is long overdue.

Indrajala said:

It was autocratic forms of government that elevated them from rags to riches.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it was US money that elevated them from rags to riches because they embraced US led anti-communism. Example, Cuba, Venezuela, etc., are autocratic countries excluded from US markets tend to be impoverished because they embrace communism and we won't do business with them as much as possible. Mexico however is doing quite well.

Indrajala said:

India, a democracy in name, is still in rags while their competitor China is fairly well off by regional standards.

Malcolm wrote:

India does not sell as much to the US as China.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

claiming that the basis is "contained" within the minds of illusory sentient beings is like claiming that the mirror is contained in the reflections!

Malcolm wrote:

It is the minds of illusory buddhas and sentient beings. Why is this not a problem? The basis is an abstraction, thus it is not real apart from its instantiations. The basis merely describes the potentiality of the mind's innate nature as the three kāyas and how the mind can deviate from that nature. In other words, one's unfabricated mind is the mirror.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

I don't really think it is just a metaphor. There are other ideas in Buddhadharma such as the six realms of existence, or like the Mahayanasutralamkara (? , not sure if I remember it correctly, but I'm thinking of the text ChNN likes to mention as thinking he managed to understand the first time he read it through, but the second and third times were much more difficult for him until he remembered his teacher's advice to try to understand in terms of his personal life) that both apply on a "cosmic" level as well as within the level of one's one lifetime; I think the cyclical universe idea works similarly.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, these cycles do work on cosmic as well as personal levels. The process of the development as well as the disappearance of our bodies mimics the process of the development and disappearance of the elements in the universe, and the same cycle is repeated through waking and sleeping, etc. But this mimesis does not bear the consequence that the general basis, a set of properties inherent to all sentients, be they buddhas or beings, is a universal mind-stratum. Consciousness permeates all sentient beings, without all sentient beings having the same consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

Sherlock said:

If the basis is one's unfabricated mind, it is easy to see how this model applies to a personal, individual life level. However, is there a way to say that the universe as a whole has its unfabricated mind too?

Malcolm wrote:

How could there be? This would just render the universe one more sentient being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

To be a lineage holder in the Sakya lineage requires training from early childhood. .

theanarchist said:

Sure. But in the Tibetan monastic tradition a lot of young monks join a monastery at under 10 years of age.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and other Kagyu and Nyingma lineages, generally only tulkus are cultivated for lineage holder training, unless, in the case of Nyingma family lineages, you are trained in the terma ritual cycle specific to your family.

In Gelug, however, you have to study for years and years, then you have to study some more in tantric college, then you have to study some more. By the time you are a qualified lineage holder you have spent 30+ years as a scholar/practitioner and are at least in your early forties if not fifties, having only started serious Vajrayāna training in your early thirties or forties.

Even in Sakya however, even if you belong to the Khon or one of the Ngor palaces, you are not automatically selected for such training, you have to show aptitude and interest from a very young age. For this reason, none of HH Dagchen Rinpoche sons were selected for/chose to undergo such training, but his grandson is being trained to succeed HE Ratnavajra at some point. In Ngor, the abbotship traditionally shifted every few years between Khenpos from that family. However, circumstances have lead to the Abbacy of Ngor being defacto in the hands of the Luding family at this point, the senior Luding Khenpo being the uncle of the junior Luding (who is the son of HE Jetsun Kusho). The Tshar lineage however has, as far as I know, been more of a meritocracy since it is based out of Nalendra Phenpo, which was the toughest academic school in Pre-modern Tibet. It still has family connections, but also some important Tullkus, like the Zimog Tulkus. In Derge, the Sakya school depends mostly on tulkus for succession, as that is the eastern Tibetan preference or so it seems. But they send them to Ngor for their education, for the most part.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Discussion of Political Topics is Wrong Speech

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You've been living the Sinosphere too long. Geography, not politics, has been the defining feature of political stability.

Indrajala said:

On what basis do you suggest this?

Malcolm wrote:

Rome, China, India, Britain, US etc.

Indrajala said:

Historically, most political systems fail because ineptness on the part of kings and elites.

No, it is more related to resource issues and overpopulation usually. Regardless of the political system, the elites are only part of the secular cycle.

Malcolm wrote:

Resources generally mismanaged by "elites".

Indrajala said:

The very stability and internal peace that strong empires impose contain within them the seeds of future chaos. Stability and internal peace bring prosperity, and prosperity causes population increase. Demographic growth leads to overpopulation, overpopulation causes lower wages, higher land rents, and falling per capita incomes

for the commoners. At first, low wages and high rents bring unparalleled wealth to the upper classes, but as their numbers and appetites grow, they also begin to suffer from falling incomes. Declining standards of life breed discontent and strife. The elites turn to the state for employment and additional income, and drive up its expenditures at the same time that the tax revenues decline because of the growing misery of the population. When the state's finances collapse, it loses the control of the army and police. Freed from all restraints, strife among the elites escalates into civil war, while the discontent among the poor explodes into popular rebellions.

Peter Turchin, *War and Peace and War The Rise and Fall of Empires*, 13.

Malcolm wrote:

Completely reinforces this point and the point below.

Indrajala said:

Elites usually become fragmented because they become decadent.

That's only part of the puzzle. In most empires the elites early on are modest and the wealth gap between them and the commoners low. It is resource abundance over time that leads to overpopulation and elite enrichment. That alone does not fragment them however.

Malcolm wrote:

Exactly my point, elites become more and more decadent as their power and wealth increases.

Indrajala said:

This is basically a recipe for a totalitarian government in this day and age.

In some places it worked out okay for a few decades. Look at how South Korea and Taiwan went from rags to riches.

Malcolm wrote:

Their economies are part of US economic resource infrastructure, as China too is now.

Indrajala said:

The problem is with the definition of "capable". Who defines it?

There is no universal authority to dictate those terms, but situation by situation it is often evident who is really suitable for leadership.

Malcolm wrote:

Only in hindsight, never in foresight.

Indrajala said:



What you actually suggesting is replacing the rule of law with the rule of persons. That's ok with me, but don't kid yourself that you are advocating anything other than a return to monarchy.

They're not mutually exclusive. A constitutional monarchy is such that you get rule of law which is derived from the authority of the crown, yet the crown is still bound by rule of law.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Such a monarch is a toothless monarch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:

wisdom said:

Question for anyone who might know, if the basis is ones own fabricated mind, how is my unfabricated mind connected to Dharmadhatu? What is the supreme, primordial reality and how does my personal basis abide in it, what is the relationship between these two things (my personal basis, and the universal whatever within which it finds itself)?

Malcolm wrote:

For each one if us, it is the dharmadhatu. Everything that appears to us appears to us only as the light of our own consciousness. When we reify that light, it appears to us as afflictive objects. When we do not reify it, appears to us as the pure luminescence of our own minds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Fortunately the Khon, Ludings, Thartses and so on are not subject to your "political correct" and "egalitarian" notions of fairness.

I personally think that the Sakya masters have done a fantastic job of maintaining the lineage just as it is for the past 1000+ years. If it works, don't fix it.

theanarchist said:

Dharma as a private elite club. Great, now THAT surely is what the buddha had in mind

2500 years ago.... As I can see it, the buddhas son didn't get a VIP treatment back then.

Malcolm wrote:

To be a lineage holder in the Sakya lineage requires training from early childhood.

The families involved in these lineages preserve not because they are private clubs but because it is what these families do and have done for many centuries. It is one thing to be a practitioner, it is quite another to be lineage holder.

Attitudes like yours come from not understanding the requirements needed to be a lineage holder.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"

Content:

theanarchist said:

I find it pretty unfair to put all the effort into the education of someone just based on family descendant and not based on actual talent of an individual, whereas others don't get this level of education.

That's just as with music. There have probably been 50 more Mozarts out there, that simply never got the education so they could never develop to their great potential.

If those members of this family are so above average "talented" for dharma practice then they should clearly show that in a normal monastic education. So, put all reasonable candidates into a proper education and then choose the best ones as lineage holders.

Malcolm wrote:

Fortunately the Khon, Ludings, Thartses and so on are not subject to your "political correct" and "egalitarian" notions of fairness.

I personally think that the Sakya masters have done a fantastic job of maintaining the lineage just as it is for the past 1000+ years. If it works, don't fix it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Discussion of Political Topics is Wrong Speech

Content:

Indrajala said:

Historically it has been strong leadership and a unified elite that produced the most stable and prosperous nations able to defend themselves against barbarians.

Malcolm wrote:

You've been living the Sinosphere too long. Geography, not politics, has been the defining feature of political stability.

Indrajala said:

When you politically empower inept peoples and give them a voice,

Malcolm wrote:

Historically, most political systems fail because ineptness on the part of kings and elites.

Indrajala said:

It is only when elites are fractured that rebellions can end up in revolution and subsequent chaos and anarchy.

Malcolm wrote:

Elites usually become fragmented because they become decadent.

Indrajala said:

The common people need to be looked after by their superiors, not empowered.

Malcolm wrote:

This is basically a recipe for a totalitarian government in this day and age.

Indrajala said:

In my mind the capable should be called to positions of authority while their inferiors are governed with benevolence and tough love if need be.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is with the definition of "capable". Who defines it?

Indrajala said:

This does not mean a totalitarian state.

Malcolm wrote:

In practice, it does.

Indrajala said:

There just needs to be strong leadership with active long-term planning. There has to be unforgiving rule of law, otherwise you end up with chaos.

Malcolm wrote:

What you actually suggesting is replacing the rule of law with the rule of persons. That's ok with me, but don't kid yourself that you are advocating anything other than a return to monarchy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 27th, 2014 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"

Content:

jiashengrox said:

Furthermore, it was mentioned in Dezhung Rinpoche's biography, "A Saint in Seattle":

He also said there were three ways to be recognised as a great lama. The first was by familial descent, which was worst. The second was as an "incarnate lama" ( or tulku ) which also was very imperfect. The third way was through recognized merit and saintly achievement, which was best. In this connection, Dezhung Rinpoche also repeated the view: "How much better it would be to test prospective tulkus for their knowledge after they grew up than to test them as infants for their ability to identify various objects!" ( pg 259 )

kirtu said:

I don't remember that from "Saint in Seattle". I'll have to go back and reread parts for sure.

However the Sakya tradition is relatively skeptical (or at least quite conservative) concerning tulku recognition. Secondly this may be as close as Dezhung Rinpoche would come to open criticism.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, most Sakya tulkus come from East Tibet. But in reality, all the central Tibetan Sakya lineages are controlled by hereditary families.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 27th, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Family lineages vs tulku system vs "meritocracy"

Content:

Sherlock said:

From the thread about Ole Nydahl.

But frankly, all this makes me understand that the family lineage holder model has certain strengths that the other two models, i.e. Tulku succession, or nominated abbotships, as in the throne of Ganden, somewhat lack. While all are subject to manipulation, the family lineage thing has more resistance to external manipulation, at minimum. On the other hand, the Gelug model is appealing too because the head of the Gelug school is nominated on the basis of their scholarship and practice rather than money and power. So, of the three, I think the Tulku system is the weakest. However, it has the most appeal because it allows cults of personality to extend through time in an

unprecedented way.

M

What exactly made the Khon family the only family lineage that lasted past a century while the other Nyingma family lineages from the same period (Gnubs, Zur etc) basically spread out while the original families were lost? (One might say from kula to kaula traditions).

Malcolm wrote:

One, the Sakya branch of the Khon settled largely in the eastern limit of the former Shang Shung kingdom. Two, they were a family that had enjoyed close connections with the Yarlung dynasty. Three, they maintained the ancestral teachings of their clan, in fact Khon Konchog Gyalpo did pass Kilaya and Yangdag to Sachen directly. Four, they were wealthy traders and benefactors. Fifth, they were the chief promulgators of Lamdre, and so on. Sixth, the Sakya branch of the Khon family ruled Tibet for roughly a hundred years. Seventh, the first five Sakya founder Masters were all amazing scholars and practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 27th, 2014 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Jhana and non-dualism - parallels?

Content:

Thomas\_Pynchon said:

Are there parallels between how the Buddha describes his experience of Jhana, as the very vehicle of his enlightenment, and how that is understood within non-dual traditions such as Dzogchen or Advaita?

Malcolm wrote:

Dhyanas are defined by the presence or absence of specific mental factors.

The Dhyanas were not the vehicle of Buddha's awakening, rather he coursed through them in order to remove traces of rebirth associated with the form and formless realms associated with the dhyanas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 26th, 2014 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Can I ask about the responsibility for others.

E.g. If I know that somebody is hurting somebody else e.g. going after somebody with an axe, then I have a choice... Do I intervene or not intervene? Could something I do or fail to do change the outcome of the situation and the ensuing Karmic outcome for both the victim and the attacker.

I am not saying that I am karmically responsible for what the attacker does... but I am karmically responsible for what I do. I.e. intervening or not.

If, for example, I could phone the police but decide not to, or wash my hands on the matter, then a decision that I have made has the likely outcome of greater harm or even the death of the victim, even though I didn't swing the axe myself.

Surely there would be serious karmic consequences for myself if I failed to intervene in a situation that: I know about, and know that it is in my power to help?

Malcolm wrote:

We do what we can, and we wish happiness on all. But the best use of our time, until we really have the capacity to truly practice engaged bodhicitta, is to practice Dharma to increase our wisdom. Until that time we should not be giving away our limbs, nor risking our lives trying to "help" others thinking that this is somehow "bodhisattva" activity. As long as we have limited compassion, we should be judicious about how we decide we are going to "help".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 26th, 2014 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

Astus said:

As for the ultimate accomplishment, Yogacara has non-abiding nirvana, so it doesn't look like something that accepts any substantially existent things or minds.

Malcolm wrote:

We will agree to disagree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 25th, 2014 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Question

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

The expert faker becomes an actual expert, but he just actualizes the Buddha Nature right...I mean, the Sambhogakaya is not a thing substantially separate from oneself right?

Malcolm wrote:

It is both a part of oneself and not.

Each sentient beings has dharmakāya as their buddhanature from the start. When that is realized, then one can manifest the sambhogakāya and the nirmanakāya.

Johnny Dangerous said:

What is one's relationship to the sambhogakaya prior to enlightenment then...i.e. for the purpose of the conversation, I guess what I'm asking is are Yidam etc. "the real thing" prior to this, or just our imagination on our side?

Malcolm wrote:

Prior to attaining the 8th bhumi, the only way you can relate to the Sambhogakāya is through a practice lineage.

The yidams are sambhogakāya manifestations to mahāsiddhis, who then develop the method connected with that manifestation and set that method down in a tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 25th, 2014 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Ole Nydahi and Trungpa rinpoche

Content:

Stewart said:

I know for a fact that Chogye Trichen was instrumental in KTT's recognition.

Fine, can't argue with that...but from my pov, I have trust in Situ Rinpoche, I have received teachings, empowerments and advice from him over the years...I believe him to be an awakened master...but I can accept others have different opinions, that's okay. I have also received the same from Karmapa OTD, again he impressed me, but that's just my personal experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, this all goes without saying.

Stewart said:

We don't have a stake in the game. This basically a power struggle between the Gelugs and conservative Karma Kagyus that has been going on since the war between the King of Tsang and the Ganden Phodrang in the 17th century. All of this politicking comes from that time.

Again, I accept this, and truth be told, the whole Karmapa situation doesn't concern me, it does hurt though when some of my teachers are slandered, especially in light of Akong Rinpoche's death. It's a personal thing really, my problem.

Malcolm wrote:

It is fine to want to defend your guru's reputation. You should never feel sorry about that. The situation with the Karmapas is difficult, and it is very similar to the situation with Gyalpo Shugden in Gelug. In the end, only oneself can be the judge of which perspective is right and which is wrong.

I personally generally go along with HHDL's point of view on both these matters, as does HHST, but I know there are others who disagree with him and feel that their own reasons

are equally valid.

If there is a lesson to be learned, we who follow these lineages in Western dharma centers need to be cautious about getting mixed up in lineage politics we do not really understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 25th, 2014 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Ethics of animal slaughter (vis. Marius the Giraffe)

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

realistically speaking viruses, bacteria, etc... are way "higher" than humans when you look at the system as a whole (in a unidirectional manner).

Malcolm wrote:

It all depends on how you are looking at an ecosystem. Then different definitions are valid, depending on context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Ole Nydahi and Trungpa rinpoche

Content:

Stewart said:

Yes, I agree, it's a mess....but I believe that Shamar first endorsed OTD, before changing his mind... also for a long time, Shamar would not name Chogye Trichen Rinpoche as his source of support, he heavily hinted at it, but when Chogye Trichen Rinpoche was asked directly, he seemingly denied he had advised Shamar.

Malcolm wrote:

I know for a fact that Chogye Trichen was instrumental in KTT's recognition.

Stewart said:

Sakya Trizin has also gave Karmapa OTD several important transmissions, so I think the Sakyapas, perhaps wisely, have remained neutral.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't have a stake in the game. This basically a power struggle between the Gelugs and conservative Karma Kagyus that has been going on since the war between the King of Tsang and the Ganden Phodrang in the 17th century. All of this politicking comes from that time.

[quote]

If I am completely honest, this resurfaced for me recently upon Akong Rinpoche's death,



I knew him very well, for many years, and was shocked...so i reacted badly to the negative comments by various Shamar students. My bad.[/quote]

It is not your bad at all. This a part of your life and history. It is just good to recognize that it is very worldly, on both sides. If you are a Karma Kagyu however, you have to make a decision who is going to be your leader.

But frankly, all this makes me understand that the family lineage holder model has certain strengths that the other two models, i.e. Tulku succession, or nominated abbotships, as in the throne of Ganden, somewhat lack. While all are subject to manipulation, the family lineage thing has more resistance to external manipulation, at minimum. On the other hand, the Gelug model is appealing too because the head of the Gelug school is nominated on the basis of their scholarship and practice rather than money and power. So, of the three, I think the Tulku system is the weakest. However, it has the most appeal because it allows cults of personality to extend through time in an unprecedented way.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Ethics of animal slaughter (vis. Marius the Giraffe)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We tend to focus on the predation part because a) it has been discerned in biology that natural top predators such as wolves, cats, bears and so on are vital for ecosystems, which often create the conditions for many species to flourish (for example, certain kinds of beetles can only flourish if there are elk kills, which leads to other things and so on

Sherab Dorje said:

The very fact that you refer to them as "top" is indicative of the hierarchical and unidirectional model which is being utilised, a model that emphasizes the role of the predator. A truly ecological model has a spherical approach to ecosystems: no elk kills, no beetles, no beetles, no elks (and thus no elk kills), etc...

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, greg. There are certain kinds of environmental dependencies that do break down into hierarchies, for example, without top or alternately "keystone" predators, populations of deer and so on exceed carrying the capacity of their environments. Of course there are ways of analyzing these things into mutual feedback loops and so on, but some kinds of animals play key roles in a given ecosystem, which when removed, cause the ecosystem to degrade. Other animals, when introduced into a previously stable ecosystem (rabbits in OX, mongooses in Hawaii), etc., wreak havoc on an ecosystem.

Sherab Dorje said:

We are not "top" predators. Realistically speaking we are fodder for viruses, bacteria, internal micro (and macro) organisms, worms, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

Realistically speaking, we are both: the two are not mutually exclusive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Ole Nydahi and Trungpa rinpoche

Content:

Stewart said:

The fact of the matter is that the whole thing backfired on Shamar big time, hardly any Kagyu, or other lineages for that matter, have backed Trinlay Thaye, at best they pay him basic respect, but in reality it's always Karmapa OTD they meet publically. So, sadly, you have begun to rely on slander and conspiracy theory to give them a foot hold.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Stewart:

This not a fair assessment of the situation.

The "Shamar" candidate was first recognize by Chogye Trichen Rinpoche, who many assert was the most realized Tibetan teacher in a century. Trinley Thaye was granted the entire sgyud sde kun 'dus by the senior Luding Khenpo in California in a private teaching that lasted for some months.

This is not the first time in history there has been more than one recognized Karmapa. In the end, it just becomes a money and power game. That, sadly, is what the tulku system has largely degenerated into, in my opinion.

The fact that Orgyen Thaye Dorje is accorded "more" respect has more to do with HHDL's patronage than anything else, as far as I can discern. He has also been something of a hostage to the Ganden Podrang, however, and given the history between the Karmapas and the Ganden Phodrang, I can see why this makes many Karma Kagyus very uncomfortable.

The fact remains that the Karma Kagyu school suffered a blow to their reputation because of the controversy. You cannot blame one side more than the other, unless you are a partisan.

As someone with virtually no connection to Karma Kagyu, who has no stake in the game on any side, I think the whole affair is a sad mess and has weakened the Karma Kagyu school considerably.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Ethics of animal slaughter (vis. Marius the Giraffe)

Content:

LastLegend said:

If there are no Buddhas, then there are no sentient beings?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not work that way. Sentient beings are the cause for Buddhas to appear. If there are no sentient beings, Buddha get to take a break.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Ethics of animal slaughter (vis. Marius the Giraffe)

Content:

LastLegend said:

If there are no sentient beings, will there be Buddhas?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Ethics of animal slaughter (vis. Marius the Giraffe)

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Actually there are infinitely more examples of mutual aid in nature than there are of predation. Just that we focus on the predation aspect. It appeals to our sense of hierarchy and domination through violence.

Malcolm wrote:

We tend to focus on the predation part because a) it has been discerned in biology that natural top predators such as wolves, cats, bears and so on are vital for ecosystems, which often create the conditions for many species to flourish (for example, certain kinds of beetles can only flourish if there are elk kills, which leads to other things and so on, and b) as top predators ourselves, we humans have outcompeted all other top predators. However, we are not so healthy for the primeval environment. We are also the only animals that self-consciously create our own environment and impose it on the "natural" one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Ethics of animal slaughter (vis. Marius the Giraffe)

Content:

Simon E. said:

Quite. So does your Bodhisattva vow include 'emptying samsara' of roses, cabbages, and pineapples ?

kirtu said:

Plant life is not held to be sentient in Tibetan Buddhism. Otherwise, yes. The entire three realms are to be liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

Simon has a very good point: taken literally, "emptying samsara" can be construed to have some very negative consequences.

But he needn't fear since "emptying samsara" is a mere Indian literary sentiment exhorting the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas to continue to act benevolently on our behalf. Given that there infinite sentient beings, samsara will never be emptied, therefore, buddhas will always turn the wheel of dharma and bodhisattvas in the form of bees and wasps, etc will always be there to pollinate our flowers and trees (Unless we poison them all). It is a sentiment along the lines of the Zen bodhisattva vow "Sentient beings are numberless, I vow to save them all." It is an aspirational bodhicitta, not a practical one.

So Simon, as attractive as that big glowing pudding may sound, it can never happen practically speaking.

On the other hand, samsara will be emptied during the twenty dark eons when all sentient beings take rebirth in the upper two form realms, in addition to the formless realms, at the destruction of the container universe. That is, from a Buddhist cosmological perspective, a certainty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 7:21 PM

Title: Re: Ole Nydahi and Trungpa rinpoche

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Natha does not mean nephew in either Tibetan or Sanskrit. I imagine a expert translator like Malcolm could clear this up.

In the Trinley Thaye Dorje camp the wrathful emanation mentioned is generally thought to be Shamapa. He lives west from the place mentioned in the prophecy and the Shamarpa is traditionally considered an emanation of Buddha Amitabha (The Buddha of the western direction). As to being an emanation of Padmasambhava

"Karmapa and Konchog Bang(the 5th Shamarpa) and Padma Jung-ney me are all just separate in appearance; In reality there is no separation, (all) in one essence." - Padmasambhava, (from chokgyur lingpas biography).

Malcolm wrote:

Natha (savior, guide, protector) = mgon po = reference to a personal name, in this case some take this "Natha" to be the present Shamar, who is the nephew of the 16th Karmapa.

However, there are different ways of counting the Karmapa incarnations which would indicate that the troubles existed during an earlier incarnation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Question

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

The expert faker becomes an actual expert, but he just actualizes the Buddha Nature right...I mean, the Sambhogakaya is not a thing substantially separate from oneself right?

Malcolm wrote:

It is both a part of oneself and not.

Each sentient beings has dharmakāya as their buddhanature from the start. When that is realized, then one can manifest the sambhogakāya and the nirmanakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 24th, 2014 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

theanarchist said:

The spiritual practice of Guru Yoga itself is not about some a text.

I think the question should rather be, were there any vastly complex visualisation exercises around Guru Yoga in ancient India or is that a Tibetan innovation.

Malcolm wrote:

The answer to the first question is no, not in any recorded text we have, and the answer to the second is yes, as far as we know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 23rd, 2014 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Yes. I mentioned two traditions, Hevajra and Vajrayogini. For example, there are three gurusadhanas translated by a Vibhutipandita into Tibetan. Another text entitled gurumandalasamadana vidhi translated by one of three Dro Lotsawas ('bro lo ts'a ba) which describes a method of practicing the guru, he is invited in front, one makes offerings to him, praises, etc., exactly the way that guru yogas are done in the Tibetan tradition.

Matylda said:

Yeah this sounds interesting.. I Wonder why GY did not make its way to Japan... I do not know shingon or tendai, though I know many monks and nuns of both tradition, just never asked about it. After all the guru position in both Japanese traditions seems to be very important.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Yoga comes from Anuttarayoga tantra, which never made its way to Japan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 23rd, 2014 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Question

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

Sorry, but I believe the standard definitions are sufficient.

Malcolm wrote:

theism:

noun

Belief in the existence of a god or gods, esp. belief in one god as creator of the universe, intervening in it and sustaining a personal relation to his creatures.

I am a theist. Buddhadharma contains a whole pantheon of mundane and transcendent "gods". By the dictionary definition given above, Buddhadharma is theistic.

dogma | 'dôgmə|

noun

a principle or set of principles laid down by an authority as incontrovertibly true:

I am a dogmatic. I accept that the Buddha set forth a set of principles that are incontrovertibly true. By the dictionary definition given above, Buddhadharma is dogmatic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 23rd, 2014 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

To define compassion in the real and relative world so broadly that there can be no distinction between its application to a guard at Dachau and a starving child renders the word devoid of meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it renders compassion impartial, which is the step before "objectless".

The buddhas and ārya-bodhisattvas do not make a distinction between a torturer and a victim, so why should we? It does not mean we do not intercede where we can to protect the victims, or convince the victimizers to restrain their violence, but we certainly do not judge the victimizer to be any other than a suffering sentient being. Extending compassion impartially does not condone those deeds acted out of the three poisons, nor does it condone the karmic ripening of those whose negative karma is ripening upon them. Your extension of compassion to the victims of a flood will have no impact on the ripening of their karma, will prevent no deaths, will not stem the loss of property and suffering. Your extension of compassion to the victims of war will not indict war criminals, nor save them from the fruit of their own actions.

Compassion needs to be wed with equanimity in order for compassion to become impartial. Otherwise, compassion swiftly turns into recrimination and judgement and bias.

When we bring to mind our bodhicitta vows we are not saying, "I vow to do this practice just to save only the sentient beings I like", we are saying "I am practicing the six perfections in order to become a Buddha so that I might rescue all beings from samsara."

In the end, we Mahāyāna Buddhist practitioners seek to develop objectless, unconditional compassion.

So what do we do? We try to stem what suffering we see, and we wish that the suffering we cannot address in others as well as ourselves be pacified. That is all we can do, and nothing more. Compassion is nothing more and nothing less than the wish that sentient beings be free from suffering. All sentient beings are suffering at all times. Some suffering is more obvious than others, which is the suffering we tend to focus on. We need to understand that the nature of samsara is suffering through and through. When we understand this, we can then understand that we should experience compassion for those sentient beings who are involved in heavy actions of warring against unarmed people, as well as the people being warred against and so on. No sentient being is less deserving of our compassion as bodhisattvas than any other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 23rd, 2014 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Question

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

Actually neither. I'm sure we could agree that Buddhism has different approaches. I have opened this discussion to oppose theism and dogmatism in Buddhist practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Define "theism".

Define "dogmatism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 23rd, 2014 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Benten said:

16th bhumi is Tathagatha

Malcolm wrote:

11th through 16th bhumi are tathāgata stages.

1-10, bodhisattva stages.

A 13th stage Vajradhara is perfect, it and the stages beyond are called "The stages of abiding in wisdom", while the 11th and 12th stages, while omniscient, do not regard phenomena as the display of wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 23rd, 2014 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Benten said:

actually they are both

why do you guys have to be so dualistic,

jk

Malcolm wrote:

You might ask yourself the same question, son.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 23rd, 2014 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Ole Nydahi and Trungpa rinpoche

Content:

smcj said:



I remember him saying, "You don't want to put your bodhicitta in a box." So I don't think he even has that specific bodhicitta vow that you are talking about.

But that's just my guess, and a very legalistic take on the issue.

theanarchist said:

As I see it, never ever wanting to see someone again also means not wanting to engage in helping this person to attain enlightenment. Because helping someone attain enlightenment would very likely mean seeing him or her again.

Bodhisattva vow always means not picking and choosing to help one's favourite beings to attain enlightenment and abandoning the "unpleasant" ones.

Malcolm wrote:

It simply means never abandoning the wish to help them achieve awakening. Bodhisattva conduct also means avoiding the familiar company of the childish, the harmful and so on, people you can never help.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

I'm not really seeking "agreement". I'm trying to raise some compassion for the victims. I'm trying to get those who consider themselves as Buddhist to realize that if they feel real compassion for those in error, that the really kind thing for all concerned is to point their error out to them. To claim that as a Buddhist one has no involvement in the activities of others, especially Buddhists, is to deny interdependence. In teaching interdependence it is pointed out when someone claims that they did something by themselves that they must consider all the others involved in making the materials that went into whatever. So, turning this around are we not all involved in the actions of others? Even leaving out the special responsibility created by the Teachings, are we not responsible as fellow human beings?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha said "Karma is volition and its products".

We are not involved in the actions of others apart from the extent to which we agree to the intentions pursued by others. For example, someone who opposed the Vietnam war is responsible for none of the negative karma generated by that war, while all who supported it earn the negative karma \* as many people who supported that war. This is very clearly explained in Abhidharma.

Our mind streams are not interdependent in the same way the roots of trees and mycelium in a forest are. Our mind streams are unique, and the gathering and ripening

of karma upon it is individual, not collective. When beings engage in similar acts, they have similar ripenings, but that is as far as it goes.

Being responsible human beings does not bear the consequence that we must be ashamed of human beings when they engage in negative actions because of the three poisons. We do not feel shame when a person with a disease does something wrong. We understand that they are ill and in need of treatment. Likewise, when sentient beings engage in the ten non-virtues, they do so only because of the three poisons in their own minds.

Can we feel sad that sentient beings engage in negative karma? Yes. Is that sadness connected to the fact that we understand all of our unpleasant experiences in samsara are connected with our own negative actions? Yes. Should we feel shame that other sentient beings engage in non-virtuous actions because of the three poisons? No. No, unless at some point, for example, we whole heartedly backed the killing of a bunch of Rohingyas for the "sin" of being Muslims because of our own afflictions. If we realize that this was wrong on our part, then we should voice that regret, confess it, and move on. But there is very little point in feeling shame at the actions of others in which we played no part.

In order to point out the error of someone, first you must gain their trust and respect. Only then will your admonishments be heeded, respected and effective. Otherwise, admonishing those who do not respect you is like pissing into the wind, it just turns back on you.

As to your point about interdependence. If I am a miner, and I unearth iron to make steel, after it goes to market I have no idea if it will make a car or a gun. So whether it is made into a car or gun has nothing to do with me. I am just mining the ore, and that is all.

One must understand that the way this is taught is that first we have the presentation of the six causes and four conditions; then there is the presentation of dependent origination, and then, only after that is there the presentation of karma, the first is part of the teaching of the noble's truth of suffering, the latter two belong to the noble's truth of the origination of suffering. Cause and condition is not moral cause and condition, so the *karana-hetu*, which means that everything is a cause for everything else apart from itself does not apply to moral questions of karma-vipaka. If you overextend the limit of mutual causation, even the Buddha becomes responsible for the crimes of Angulimala.

Therefore, it needs to be understood that the only thing one needs to feel shame about is one's own action that arise out of the three poisons. Feeling shame for actions of others is a misplaced sense of identity which arises from a false grasping to self.

As for our responsibility towards other humans, well, again it is question of limitations. We are very limited, our capacity to help others is miniscule. We do what we can, we act as witnesses when there are those who are committing crimes, but we don't judge, and we don't abandon the fact that everyone involved in such events also has their own karma, positive and negative which led to that karmavipaka they are experiencing,

including being murdered. The Buddhist view about the karmavipaka is dispassionate. If you engaged in a lot of killing in this life, your life will be shortened in the next. If you engage in a lot of violence in this life, you can bet that in the next you will be subjected to a lot of violence. Karma, like death, is pitiless.

Further, if we engage in judgement, we will lose compassion for the those who truly deserve it, the perpetrators of those crimes. For example, who is deserving of more compassion in this example: the SS soldiers who murdered millions of Jews, or the murdered Jews? Who is going to experience more suffering as a result? Most people feel no compassion for the SS soldiers and wish them into hell, saving their compassion for those who suffered terribly in the death camps. Who is more deserving of compassion, Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge, or the millions they left in the killing fields? Who is more deserving of compassion, Kissinger and Nixon, who murdered hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese or the murdered Vietnamese.

The reality is that they are all equally deserving of compassion. This is the Mahāyāna approach. We do not judge and say this sentient beings deserves more compassion, this one less. All sentient beings are deserving of equal levels of compassions, whether they are Hitler, Mao, Stalin or a Rohingya Muslim or Nāgaland Buddhist, or a Sinhalese Tamil.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Sherab said:

Molten salt nuclear reactors are considered to be "safe and proliferation-resistant".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the operative word here is "considered"; Three Mile Island was "considered" safe, Fukushima was "considered" safe, Chernobyl was "considered" safe until it turned out that they weren't safe at all.

kirtu said:

TMI was in fact safe. The radiation release was heavily overblown in the press

Malcolm wrote:

Your facts are wrong here:

Gundersen, a leading technical expert on nuclear engineering, says: "When I correctly interpreted the containment pressure spike and the doses measured in the environment after the TMI accident, I proved that TMI's releases were about one hundred times higher than the industry and the NRC claim, in part because the containment leaked. This new data supports the epidemiology of Dr. Steve Wing and proves that there really were injuries from the accident. New reactor designs are also effected, as the NRC is using its low assumed release rates to justify decreases in

emergency planning and containment design."

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/harvey-wasserman/people-died-at-three-mile\\_b\\_179588.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/harvey-wasserman/people-died-at-three-mile_b_179588.html)

kirtu said:

Fukushima was stupid design and that could easily be seen.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, which is why there is a reactor of exactly the same design sitting on Long Island Sound, and another just a few miles south of Boston, sitting on the Massachusetts Bay.

kirtu said:

However safe means, if there is a total disaster, the reactor will shut itself down with no or minimal radiation release (obviously we need to engineer this for no release).

Malcolm wrote:

You are a smart guy, and I respect your intelligence, but on this score I think you are being blinded by your enthusiasm for technological fixes. The entire nuclear industry from soup to nuts is lethally toxic and bad for the environment. There is no such thing as a "safe" nuclear power plant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Rickpa said:

As a member of a group, you should be mindful that humans tend to judge any group of which they are outside, by the worst examples.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, this however does not mean that one need feel "shame" for being a Buddhist merely because there are afflicted "Buddhists" out there who do murderous things to innocents.

Likewise, I feel no shame about being an American despite that fact my government has done terrible things. But those things were done without my consent and I oppose them.

Jigme Tsultrim said:

Sorry, but you should in both cases.

Malcolm wrote:

As you can tell, I don't agree. I never feel shame for negative karma that I had no hand in creating. Compassion for the people who engage in such deeds, yes; shame, never.

In any event, it is very presumptuous for you to mandate how anyone ought to feel about

anything. The reason I replied was to let others know that it was not necessary to pander to "politically correct" guilt-mongering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Punya said:

This is interesting news, since you seem to be quite fond of bagging his successor. Not that I'm saying DJKR is a scholar. He is an activity emanation, is he not? And he seems to be doing quite well on that front.

Malcolm wrote:

We are talking about Dilgo Khyentse, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Punya said:

Are you suggesting he made some decisions based on political considerations? Despite his father's position in Tibetan society, this seems unlikely to me.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am suggesting that he was devoted to the greatest scholar (in my opinion) that Tibet ever saw.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The most important factor determining your next birth place is the mental factors you are experiencing when you die.

daverupa said:

Hmm... not quite.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite. For example, Nāgārjuna writes that there is a dharma called an avipranasha which is created by every karma in which one engages. The one created at the time of

one's death is the factor above all others which is instrumental in determining one's next birth location.

The example that you give does not necessarily contradict this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I don't know much about Sakya, or anything, for that matter, but what about this:

[http://www.adarshaphotography.com/Other/Dam-Ngak-](http://www.adarshaphotography.com/Other/Dam-Ngak-Dzod/26568547_m6QQ5D#!i=2242016424&k=fgBJHnS&lb=1&s=L?)

[Dzod/26568547\\_m6QQ5D#!i=2242016424&k=fgBJHnS&lb=1&s=L?](http://www.adarshaphotography.com/Other/Dam-Ngak-Dzod/26568547_m6QQ5D#!i=2242016424&k=fgBJHnS&lb=1&s=L?)

Malcolm wrote:

That's true, he did give the Dam Ngag Dzod recently, I forgot, that contains Lamdre in its minimal form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When push comes to shove, all who die engaged in battle go to hell. Perhaps one's motivation will shorten the duration, but when they say "war is hell", they were not kidding.

Indrajala said:

It isn't so clear cut as that. Past merit and a number of other factors come into play at death.

Malcolm wrote:

It's pretty clear cut when the Buddha explains this to Pasenadi. The most important factor determining your next birth place is the mental factors you are experiencing when you die. Plus all people who voluntarily participate in a battle earn the karma of all the people they are engaged in that activity with.

There really is no positive outcome of war, karmically speaking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

Indrajala said:

If push comes to shove though someone has to do the fighting. Monks of course are obligated to remain out of the conflict, but someone has to man the walls.

The fear of karma is warranted, though I don't think it is so simple. It certainly isn't wholesome karma to inflict violence against even the enemies of Buddhism, but on the other hand it isn't entirely unwholesome either as the motivation is self-defense and preservation of the Buddhadharma in the world.

Indra after all is a stream-enterer yet continues leading armies into war against the asuras...

Malcolm wrote:

When push comes to shove, all who die engaged in battle go to hell. Perhaps one's motivation will shorten the duration, but when they say "war is hell", they were not kidding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

How very protestant.

According to the Lotus Sūtra a single offering to an image of the Buddha can initiate the process towards ultimate buddhahood in the distant future.

So, preserving images is actually essential to at least Mahāyāna Buddhism.  
Do you preserve them with the blood of your enemies?

Malcolm wrote:

It certainly is not the job of Buddhist monks or lay people to get involved in armed struggles.

But Jeff is correct, any country should maintain a strong army to defend itself, and in particular we have seen the repeated and tragic costs to Buddhist countries that do not maintain strong armies to defend themselves. Bhutan of course does not have the power to stave off China or India, but they don't have to. Any threat to Bhutan is a threat against India itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M:

I value everything handed down by the teachers, it is important that the teachings are handed on.... but that is not the same as clinging to it out of fear.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think Bhutan is clinging out of fear to anything.

tellyontellyon said:

That is not the same as manipulating populations to maintain a religious and cultural dominance.

Malcolm wrote:

That is the Maoist game, not the Bhutanese game.

tellyontellyon said:

If the British or whoever it was did that to Bhutan, well that is the past. Two wrongs do not make a right. The Bhutanese people of Nepali descent who were expelled were treated badly. They were just ordinary, poor people who had their lives shattered by the actions of the Bhutanese government.

Malcolm wrote:

They were mostly illegal immigrants.

tellyontellyon said:

As the world changes in technology, communication etc. then of course the cultural forms of Buddhist communities change too. This is unavoidable.

Malcolm wrote:

Many times people think they are preserving "the essence" when they change things, but really they wind up destroying the core.

tellyontellyon said:

By failing to act with compassion the label 'Vajrayana' has been made meaningless. Bhutan doesn't deserve that epithet.

Is that what you think Vajrayana comes down to... deporting ethnic minorities?

Malcolm wrote:

One, by that time, the Bhutanese (Ngalobs) were the minority in their own country, though the with the easterners, most of whom are of Assamese, monpa and so on descent, they formed a Buddhist majority.

I think that the Bhutanese acted as they did to stop illegal immigration into their country as well as rising terrorism. But you will recall they only began the mass deportations as a response to Maoist terrorism.

The situation in Bhutan is nothing like Shri Lanka or Burma.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is also interesting to note that at the end of Dilgo Khyentse's life, when he was repairing Samye, he kept on having recurrent visions of Sakya Pandita which led to a Guru Yoga terma featuring Sakya Pandita that has an outer, inner and secret aspect to it.

pensum said:

Interesting, for Jamyang Khyentse Chokyi Lodro had given DKR a statue of Sakya Pandita which he had used as his own personal practice support.

Malcolm wrote:

DKR was a smart man, he knew which side of the bread his butter was on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Buddhism has made contact with Europe and the US and the rest of the world. That interaction is leading to a new Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

No it isn't.

tellyontellyon said:

The language, scriptures, costumes, temples... all that is wonderful and we can learn so much from that, but that is not the essence of what Buddhism is about.

Malcolm wrote:

Human cultures are worth preserving. Nepal already has one. Let Bhutan have theirs.

tellyontellyon said:

It is important that in trying to preserve cultural forms we do not lose the essence, what Buddhism is really about.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhutan is the last place in the world where the entire country (apart from the Nepalis legally living in the South) is devoted to Vajrayāna. Even if you don't think this is worth preserving, many of us do.

tellyontellyon said:

If we want Buddhism to survive then it must come from a place of compassion and love.

Malcolm wrote:

Sometimes the benefit of all takes on fearsome forms. I think Bhutan did what it needed to do to eliminate a huge population of people who emigrated to Bhutan without papers. They needed to tighten their borders. As I said, I personally have no problem with this.

tellyontellyon said:

If it comes from fear and an attempt to cling to something from the past then we have lost it already.

Malcolm wrote:

But Buddhism does look to the past, that is why we recite lineage prayers, compose religious histories and so on, so that we know where we come from and we do not forget. The past informs the present. There is no place for a Buddhist "cultural revolution". Buddhadharma has a trajectory, an arch. It will last for so long in this world system and then disappear completely. But in the meantime the traditional forms have substance and meaning. I personally believe they should be preserved.

If you want a "new Buddhism", then go follow Bachelor or some of the other advocates of Buddhist reform. As for me, I am about as conservative as one gets when it comes to preserving what we have left from the ancient Buddhist world. There is so little of it left, it needs to remain intact for the edification of the future. We unfortunately live in a world where even the Buddha's seat of awakening, on a relative level, is not immune to Muslim and Hindu attacks. Indeed, in 635 it was destroyed by Sashanka. Last year Bodhgaya was bombed by the Indian Muhajadeen. Everyone recalls the insane shelling of the Buddhas at Bamiyan by the Taliban.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is worse. I have friends who have lived there six months out of every year for the past 20 years. According to them, it is in worse shape than ever.

theanarchist said:

But is that because of the Maoists?

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

theanarchist said:

Erm, yeah. If it was so great, then why were there so many dissatisfied people who turned to the maoists?

Malcolm wrote:

They didn't really — the Maoists basically forced young Nepalis to fight with them or die.

theanarchist said:

I recently read an interview with a Nepali artist who stated that everything is pretty much the same, just instead of one bureaucrat you have to bribe 5.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is worse. I have friends who have lived there six months out of every year for the past 20 years. According to them, it is in worse shape than ever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

theanarchist said:

Whereas Hindus never had any inclination for proselytizing and here in Europe they are among the immigrants that cause the least problems.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read the History of Nepal and India. Or for the matter the Hardship and Decline of Buddhism in India.

theanarchist said:

That's still an intra-Indian affair and a fairly ordinary power struggle of different groups. Those Nepali peasants certainly don't want to take over the government and convert all the buddhists there.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the communists tried to use an imagined Nepali majority to foment an armed rebellion and take over of the Bhutanese government to install a Marxist regime, just like the present day one in Kathmandu. I, for one, am glad they failed. Nepal was great under the old King, these days it is a total mess, largely through the customary ineptness of Marxist governments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M:

You really have to get away from equating genuine Marxism with the distorted nutjobs that are better described as Stalinists/Maoists. I don't call myself a communist for exactly the same reason. I'm not a supporter of the actions or the so called 'communist' organisations that happened in the USSR, North Korea, China, Nepal, Tibet etc. It is really dishonest of you to keep on suggesting that I do.

Malcolm wrote:

TOTO, I think that your beliefs lead to exactly what happened in the USSR, China, North Korea, Nepal, etc.

tellyontellyon said:

Do you have a problem with the fact that if you are a Mohawk Indian of Christian, etc. beliefs, you have no right to be in the government of the Mohawk Nation? I don't.

A Mohawk is a Mohawk, if the govt. of the Mohawk nation is the voice of the entire Mohawk nation it should encompass the whole community. But we are not even talking about a particular 'people' here. We are talking about a country.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually we are talking about a particular people with a specific history, language and cultural tradition.

tellyontellyon said:

People are people, why should Buddhists worry about things like the ethnic background of people.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't. Anyone can become a Buddhist.

tellyontellyon said:

I thought Buddhists embraced impermanence, rather than trying to preserve some sort of model society.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists, when push comes to shove, are much more conservative than you imagine. We tend to like to preserve things like, lineage, culture and so on, and if Bhutan had adopted the policies of Sikkim, there would be no Bhutan today.

tellyontellyon said:

Bhutan is not a museum.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a tiny nation trying to preserve its unique culture and way of life. For example, the Navaho nation, at 27,425 sq mi, is twice the size of Bhutan, though it only has about 180,000 members. Bhutan is more densely populated, at 742,737 (2012), but is little more half the size, at 14,824 sq mi. But in 1991, it had a population of 1,375,400. As you can see, there was a mass migration out of Bhutan, and it was not all forced. Many Nepalis left of their own accord. Only 108,000 were forcibly expelled.

Even today there are more speakers of Nepali in Bhutan than those who speak the national language, Dzongkha. The Nepalis are 35% of the total population. Prior to the mass exodus, they were nearly 50% of the total population, and only 15% of those were actually citizens of Bhutan.

tellyontellyon said:

The expelled people are just human beings. Why reduce them to something less than that with some silly racist label of 'illegal immigrant', and use that as a justification of the suffering imposed on them by the racist govt. of Bhutan.

Malcolm wrote:

The conditions of the camps are appalling, I have friends have been to them. But I blame the government of Nepal for that, and not Bhutan. Calling the Lhotsampas "Bhutanese" is like calling illegal immigrants to the US "US citizens". This page for example states [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethnic\\_groups\\_in\\_Bhutan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethnic_groups_in_Bhutan) "The number of legal permanent Nepalese residents in the late 1980s may have been as few as 15 percent of the total Lhotshampa population, however."

In any event, in the past six years many of these unfortunate people have been resettled in Canada and the US, among other places, and will certainly have a better life here than was possible for them in Nepal or Bhutan.

As I said, Bhutan, for all its faults, is the last independent Vajrayāna kingdom in the world today. It may mean nothing to you, but it means something to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

theanarchist said:

Whereas Hindus never had any inclination for proselytizing and here in Europe they are among the immigrants that cause the least problems.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read the History of Nepal and India. Or for the matter the Hardship and

## Decline of Buddhism in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

pensum said:

the Ngor branch no longer practise the so-called 'ancestral teachings' (yab chö) of the Sakya school, such as the practices of Yangdak Heruka and Vajrakilaya."

Malcolm wrote:

This is not strictly true, actually. However, it is true that the Ngorgpas were very conservative, while the Tsharpas were more eclectic in their approach. The Khon family have always maintained strong connections with the Nyingma school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

, I have no problems with their desire to maintain the Buddhist culture of Bhutan intact without having to accommodate those of other cultures in their midst.

theanarchist said:

Wow, that sounds like Saudi Arabian religious totalitarianism of the lowest kind.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have a problem with the fact that if you are a Mohawk Indian of Christian, etc. beliefs, you have no right to be in the government of the Mohawk Nation? I don't. That's how they set up their constitution, in order to preserve what they can of their culture and original spiritual tradition. Bhutan should be considered in the same light. You can think of it as a Buddhist "reservation".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

Dan74 said:

I was not aware of the risk to women (somebody mentioned the word 'predatory'). Can someone shed more light on this? We also have a 5-year-old daughter.

Malcolm wrote:

Deserved or undeserved, Bhutanese men have a reputation for being womanizers. I

think it has a bit to do with the Drugpa Kunley mythos.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: China Tells Obama not to meet Dalai Lama

Content:

Indrajala said:

The president actually gains their begrudging respect by defying their request not to meet the Dalai Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

No bunch of commies is going to tell the leader of the free world what to do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: China Tells Obama not to meet Dalai Lama

Content:

Adamantine said:

"We urge the United States to take China's concerns seriously and not to facilitate or offer occasion for the Dalai Lama to conduct anti-China secessionist moves," foreign ministry spokesperson Hua Chunying said in a press release.

"By arranging a meeting between the President and the Dalai Lama, the US side will grossly interfere in the internal affairs of China, seriously violate norms governing international relations and severely impair China-US relations. China expresses firm opposition. We urge the US to take China's concerns seriously, immediately cancel the meeting, and not to provide facilitation and platform for the Dalai Lama to carry out anti-China separatist activities in the US," Hua said.

- See more at: <http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/china-urges-obama-to-cancel-meeting-with-dalai-lama/article1-1186409.aspx#sthash.3BbxCY0h.dpuf>

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you have to commend them on their persistence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Sherab said:

Molten salt nuclear reactors are considered to be "safe and proliferation-resistant".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the operative word here is "considered"; Three Mile Island was "considered" safe, Fukushima was "considered" safe, Chernobyl was "considered" safe until it turned out that they weren't safe at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 7:51 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL:

He went on to declare the command economy of the former Soviet Union, “failed,” and then critiqued American capitalism: “At the same time, United States, capitalist country, most richest, but gap rich and poor.”

At this point, Russia has the largest wealth gap. And it has turned into a Fox News paradise, at least if you followed John Stewart's analysis on Wed. night.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are other high lamas in the Sakya school, like Dzongsar Khyentse, but they do not normally give Lamdre and Yogini in large settings.

dzogchungpa said:

DJKR is neither a monk nor from the Khon family, is he?

Malcolm wrote:

He also has never given any major Sakyapa transmissions to my knowledge, and there is no need for him to, considering that the Khon masters are alive and well and kicking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are other high lamas in the Sakya school, like Dzongsar Khyentse, but they do not normally give Lamdre and Yogini in large settings.

dzogchungpa said:

DJKR is neither a monk nor from the Khon family, is he?

heart said:

Maybe that is why he seems so Nyingma then.



/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of tantra, he generally teaches from Nyingma; in terms of sutra, he generally teaches from the Sakya POV; and considering his education, this is not at all surprising.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: I am no longer a Buddhist.

Content:

Anders said:

but rather the tendency for investment in such labels in the first place.

Malcolm wrote:

...which often results in the spouting of idiocies...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 8:05 AM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

He only disapproves of non-marxist colonialism, he is fine with marxist colonialism. You're just talking crap now.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you are, you just call it "Liberation". Just as the communists "liberated" Tibet, so too the communists wanted to "liberate" Bhutan. Why? Because Bhutan lies along the border with Chinese-occupied Tibet. If they could have succeeded in installing a communist Government in Bhutan as well as Nepal, this would have been very powerful for them and China. Unfortunately, the Nepali immigrants got caught up in this "liberation" movement, which is just marxist colonialism, and now we have the present situation. In any event, the US alone between 2008 and 2012 have taken in 65,000+ of these immigrants, so in the end, I think they will all do fine.

You do realize that the Maoist government of Nepal has been gunning down Tibetan refugees as well as handing them back to the Chinese authorities? The Lhotsampas were just pawns being used by the communists, plain and simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Prophecies in Buddhism?

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Could someone please tell me the source of the famous Padmasambhava quote that several books feature that goes along the line of "When the Iron bird flies and steel ox runs of Wheels and the tibetan people are scattered like ants across the earth, my teachings will come to the land of the red men".?

Malcolm wrote:

Please see this post by Sam Van Schaik.

<http://earlytibet.com/2007/09/18/red-faced-men/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Just because they don't do it under a national flag (and some do) doesn't mean it's not colonialism, and I thought as a socialist you oppose colonialism TOTO.

Malcolm wrote:

He only disapproves of non-marxist colonialism, he is fine with marxist colonialism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Living in Bhutan?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

It may not seem pretty or nice, but as Bhutan is the last independent Vajrayāna Kingdom in the world, I have no problems with their desire to maintain the Buddhist culture of Bhutan intact without having to accommodate those of other cultures in their midst. 'Vajrayana Kingdom'?

I reject the desire for religious states.

Malcolm wrote:

You can reject it all you like, but you can't do anything about it.

tellyontellyon said:

I think they are wrong in this day and age. All countries contain people who don't fit the national mould, or more accurately, the myth of a national mould.

Malcolm wrote:

There are plenty of Nepalis still living in southern Bhutan, but they are legally there.

tellyontellyon said:

These arguments are basically the same nationalist/racist arguments that we hear from all over the world.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely an argument in defense of Bhutanese national sovereignty, not racist at all. In any case, I think it is great the Bhutanese are intent on preserving their traditional way of life. I think it is fine for them to run their country however they like.

In any case, you are apparently unaware of the centuries of Hindu encroachment on Buddhist Kingdoms in the Himalayas. Now we see the same thing with Communists using terrorism in Bhutan to try to achieve their goals, like the bombing in Thimphu in 2008.

tellyontellyon said:

Should Buddhists be so defensive about Buddhism that ethnic cleansing becomes acceptable? I think much more is lost by that way of thinking than is imagined might be saved.

Malcolm wrote:

You are entitled to an opinion.

tellyontellyon said:

Just think about what happens to the people that are castigated, uprooted, pushed out of their jobs and homes, children thrown out of their schools, forced to follow dress codes etc. just to satisfy some silly frightened fascist who thinks his 'culture' is disappearing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is all unfortunate. It is a pity that communists pushed the Bhutanese into taking actions they had tried to avoid for many years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 5:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Posts on Bhutan have been moved to the "Living in Bhutan" thread

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=15626>

AlexanderS said:

I don't see why posts discussing a dharma monarchy don't belong in this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

They do, but the issue was not about dharma monarchies so much as the deficiencies of Bhutanese policies, so I asked the mods to move it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Prophecies in Buddhism?

Content:

Rakshasa said:

Although i'm aware that indulging in astrology and such professions is forbidden in Pali canon, yet many mahayana buddhists are known to have made prophecies, like padmasambhava. So what is the Mahayana stand? I've heard of buddhist monks even in Thailand and burma acting as oracles. Are there any prophecies by current buddhist masters?

Malcolm wrote:

Most terms have predictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sönam said:

Socialism has many itemizations ... a modern form is not against the market, but offers a better redistribution of profit. But the point in this case is that the (world) market is against socialism (i.e. a better redistribution). Capital want to continue to rule the world with his own rules. Therefore, for it works, socialism should be implemented in many countries at the same time (enough for it could'nt be isolated/segregated by actors of capital) ... all that very complicated, also because otherwise capitalism will remain the same, greedy, only guided by individual profit and competition.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually the problem is that companies like Walmart exploit Government social benefits in order to keep wages down. Walmart is the largest employer in the US and each of its employees receives an average of \$1000 a year in federal assistance. American fast food workers take in a staggering \$7 billion a year in federal assistance.

Frankly, John Maynard Keynes ideas about the role of government in the economy provided the US and England with the most stable economies they ever had.

Unfortunately, people still keep arguing as if 19th century theories of political economy actually anticipated the global economy. They didnt' and don't, and that is why all of this talk of socialism vs. capitalism is frankly so silly, IMO.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: I am no longer a Buddhist.

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm: Nevertheless, refuge, bodhicitta and dedication are indispensable in Dzogchen.

How do these three differ in Dzogchen, if they do, from any of the Buddhist versions?

Malcolm wrote:

They don't. I am quite certain that Simon has not abandoned Dharma. He is merely saying that so much idiocy is spouted by Buddhists of various stripes he does not want to own any of that by identifying himself to himself as a "Buddhist".

BTW, Simon is quite capable of speaking for himself, but I think that I have captured a main part of his sentiment and he will correct me if I have erred.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Good grief Malcolm:

To consider the expelled Lhotsampa people as mainly 'illegal immigrants' is a new low. Why does an 'enlightened' system even care about ethnic origin anyway?

Can there be not a word of criticism against these enlightened leaders? No faults to be found?

Actually, most of the Lhotsampa had been born in Bhutan, and many went back generations. What happened was the Lhotsampa dared to step out of line by wanting to be treated fairly, and asking for the same rights that other citizens enjoyed. Bhutan is no Shangri-La.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lhotsampa>

Anarchists and Marxists are accused of seeking 'impossible' utopias. The supporters of Buddhist Monarchy seem to think they exist already!

Malcolm wrote:

The Lhotsampas (southern border people) however are a recent immigrant population, their history is long and complicated. Many Lhotsampas do not want to adhere to Buddhadharma, nor do they wish to adhere to essentially non-Nepalese cultural norms. The people who in camps are those who could not prove a pre 1958 citizenship. They are all culturally Nepalese, speaking Nepalese dialects, but Nepal won't have them which is all the more ironic because the present current Maoist government fomented

and exacerbated the unrest. The best solution would be for Nepal to absorb them, since they are Nepalese people. The situation was not aided by the fact that Lotshampas responded with armed violence to the 1988 census which showed large numbers of them were illegal aliens in Bhutan. In fact, much of the unrest was agitated by the Communist Party of Nepal:

Some villagers willingly joined the protests; others did so under duress. The government branded the party, reportedly established by anti-monarchists and backed by the Nepali Congress Party and the Communist Party of Nepal (Unified Marxist-Leninist), as a terrorist organization. The party allegedly led its members – said to be armed with rifles, muzzle-loading guns, knives, and homemade grenades – in raids on villages in southern Bhutan, disrobing people wearing traditional Bhutanese garb; extorting money; and robbing, kidnapping, and killing people.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lhotshampa>

All of the above is very characteristic of how the Maoists in Nepal behaved while they were fighting the government. They hate Buddhism, and will stop at nothing to try and destroy Buddhism in the Himalayas in the interest of their Chinese masters.

The Bhutanese are trying their best to maintain a Buddhist kingdom surrounded on all sides by tīrthikas and enemies, and so from that point of view I think what they are doing is admirable. They observed what happened to Sikkim and determined that the same fate was not going to happen to them.

It may not seem pretty or nice, but as Bhutan is the last independent Vajrayāna Kingdom in the world, I have no problems with their desire to maintain the Buddhist culture of Bhutan intact without having to accommodate those of other cultures in their midst.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: I am no longer a Buddhist.

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm has also mentioned something about Dzogchen being so universal that it is beyond Buddhism (and maybe the buddhadharma?)

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen teachings does not require one to be a "Buddhist". Nevertheless, refuge, bodhicitta and dedication are indispensable in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Yes and I have attended some public teachings by HHST too but it seemed to me that there were higher teachings that were not taught. I.e. HHST made references to the ear-whispered teachings only given to selected disciples and the Kilaya completion stage was not taught.

Malcolm wrote:

The Kilaya completion stage practices, as far as I know, have not survived beyond a tummo practice.

As for these other rumors, well, there are always some intimate instruction or another that is not generally taught. Yogini has some sections that are taught to only three people, or one person at a time. Lamdre also has some transmissions that are one to one. Then there are other teachings like outer, inner and secret Mahakala practices that are not widely promulgated.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Sherlock said:

So you can't access the higher Sakya teachings as a layperson unless you had already learned them while ordained?

Malcolm wrote:

No, traditionally, you cannot be lay Sakya teacher. The teachings of Lamdre and Yogini however are given widely and to anyone who wants to practice them. These days the Khon family more or less has a monopoly on those teachings outside of Tibet. Traditionally, those who could give Lamdre and so on were more or less restricted to members of the Khon family, the abbots of Ngor and the Abbots of Tshar. Other teachings in the Sakaya lineage, like the sadhanas in the sgrub thabs kun 'dus could be given by others. These days, if you are a Sakyapa, necessarily your guru will be HHST or HHSDR, Jetsun Kusho, Lunding Khens senior and junior, or Chogye Trichen. I count HHST and HHSDR as my main Sakya masters, but I have received teachings from everyone but Chogye Trichen. There are other high lamas in the Sakya school, like Dzongsar Khyentse, but they do not normally give Lamdre and Yogini in large settings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

The infant mortality rate is three times higher than even Tibet, and has a life expectancy of only 54.4 years.

Malcolm wrote:

Infant mortality rate dropped 50% in one year in Bhutan, between 2007 and 2008 and is steadily declining.

Life expectancy in Bhutan also increased the same year, between 2007 and 2008. What this means is that the high infant mortality rate (110.9) in 2000 was being factored in. When that dropped by half in 2008, the life expectancy jumped from 52 in 2000 to its present 67.88 years. If they lower their infant mortality rate again by half, you will see another jump in life expectancy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: I am no longer a Buddhist.

Content:

Adamantine said:

I guess this is an example of what HHDL is considering when he generally advocates for people to stick with their native religions rather than convert to Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you really understand what Simon is saying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

kirtu said:

we can now build massive dams.

Malcolm wrote:

Yuck, not acceptable. These things mess with the local environment, and disturb everything in their vicinity for years.

We need to be removing dams in order to restore fisheries in the atlantic and the pacific, not building more of them

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:



Kunga said:

so if a monk gave up ordination the only way to continue would be to become Nyingma...

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, that is the deal. You don't really see any lay people leading centers in Europe or the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I'm not quite sure why Bhutan is being held up as an example to be followed, it is little more than a vassal state of India.

The infant mortality rate is three times higher than even Tibet, and has a life expectancy of only 54.4 years. Bhutan has more refugees outside its borders than Tibet. The racist policies of the Bhutanese government drove a fifth (134,000) of the population into exile in the early 1990's.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, most of the refugees are guest workers who stayed on, not Bhutanese people. They are ethnically Nepalese. The number of refugees living in camps in Eastern Nepal was estimate at 107,000 according to UNHCRat one time.

As for Tibetans, "Based on a CTA survey from 2009, 127,935 Tibetans were registered in the diaspora", according to this wiki page

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tibetan\\_diaspora](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tibetan_diaspora).

The situation is complex and not straight forward. Most of the people in these camps are illegal immigrants.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhutanese\\_refugees](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhutanese_refugees).

Even the very term "Bhutanese refugee" seems to be a misnomer, kind of like calling those deported from the US for illegal immigration "American Refugees".

Alenxander Casella, a one time Director in UNHCR writes (cited from the above page):

"Normally, the UNHCR, before intervening, would have undertaken a survey of the caseload to determine exactly their nationality and reasons for departure. Had this been undertaken, the inescapable conclusion would have been that the overwhelming majority were actually Nepalese and hence, by the fact that they were in their own country, did not qualifying for refugee status"

And presently, the camps have only at most 77,000 people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: I am no longer a Buddhist.

Content:

Simon E. said:

I first took Refuge nearly 40 years ago.

I have now to acknowledge what has been bubbling under for some time...I am no longer a Buddhist, and if I am honest with myself have not been for a while.

But it has been a slow process of letting go. Apart from other considerations I have invested a lot of my life in that direction. It is painful.

I have spent a long period vascillating and rushing back to 'safety '.

My Dzogchen practice will now have to continue without that particular set of references.

Thanks you to all.

If I have offended during this period of uncertainty I am sorry.

I truly wish for you all that you find peace.

Malcolm wrote:

Better to be a true practitioner of Buddhadharma than a follower of "Buddhism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Many Marxists would disagree. There is much evidence against Stalinism and Maoism, but to say a genuine workers democracy would inevitably degenerate into a bureaucracy, that is a quite different question.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they will disagree. No one wants to be associated with Stalin and Mao.

But I definitely think the US is safe from being turned into a "workers democracy". In any event, the whole piece you cited keeps waffling on and on about "elimination of the state" and that, my friend, will never happen unless all civilization falls into utter barbarism and anarchy.

This is why I think you Marxists and Anarchists are just dreamers. Your stateless society will never happen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

conebeckham said:

This thread is like a circle.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean it is meaningless, like samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:22 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Sherlock said:

What about the Zur and gNubs families?

Malcolm wrote:

Do you know where you can find some Zurs and some gNubs? Are they still practicing their ancestral teachings? I rather doubt it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

The Chinese Maoists were a twisted, distorted caricature of Marxism that I'm sure you know by now that I don't support.

Malcolm wrote:

And I think that Stalin and Mao are the very picture of how Marxism is bound to turn out in the end, as you surely know by now. And frankly, we have more evidence on our side than you do on yours, which is why most people in the US think the modern day Marxist socialists are nutjobs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:10 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Sherlock said:

The Guhyagarbha transmission lineages should be at least as old.

Malcolm wrote:

You misunderstand, or I was not clear. The Khon Family (who are the heart and soul of Sakya) have practiced Vajrakilaya without any interruption since the time of Padmasambhava. They are the only religious family in Tibet who can make that claim. It makes them the most Nyingma family in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

BTW, not only was Mao against Dharma, he was against Marxism too.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, right. I don't think so son. I have been to the very birthplace of the Chinese revolution in Shanghai.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

You think I'm wrong to say it should be discussed and understood and tested against experience?

I don't think so...

I think that is exactly what Buddha wanted us to do, not simply act like a 'faith' religion. That which is true will eventually shine through.

Malcolm wrote:

What the Buddha said actually was, until you know for yourself, you need to take it on faith from someone who does.

The Kalamas sutta for example is much misunderstood in that it was taught to non-Buddhists.

But the Eastern Gatehouse Sutta explains very clearly that until you have that taste of nirvana, which is of course based on understand dependent origination, the four noble truths and so on, you must accept the Dharma as it is taught from someone who does know. Hence the crucial importance of having a master of genuine realization.

Further, faith, in Dharma, is defined as a mental factor that brings clarity to the mind. Of course we don't want blind faith, but aspiring faith is also weak, since if your role model

disappoints you, you might abandon Dharma after all. What we are looking for in Buddhadharma is unshakable faith such that if 1000 buddhas showed up and said "Sorry, it was all a mistake" you would not believe them.

Faith is one of the five faculties and one of the five powers. It is the very foundation of the path to nirvana, which is why it is considered one of the 8 transcendent faculties.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Try telling that to some Sakyapas. Actually, Tulku Rabsal Dawa was also considered a Sakyapa Tulku and he maintained a life long practice commitment to all the main Sakya practices.

michaelb said:

Of course, the head lama and founder of Shechen Tennyi Dargyeling in exile, one of the six main Nyingma gompas, and the head lama of the entire Nyingma Tradition is a Sakyapa.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, that's what some Sakyapas say - especially those who are connected to Derge. There is a kind of saying "If a Sakyapa gives up his monks vows, he will become Nyingma".

It is also correct to point here that Sakya is in fact the oldest Nyingma lineage in Tibet through their continuous practice of Kllaya, among other things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

The point isn't whether HHDL is a Marxist or not, although he was certainly still calling himself a Marxist in 2011.

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/belief/2011/jun/20/dalai-lama-marxist-buddhism>

Malcolm wrote:

His putative "Marxism" seems confined to the idea that he wants the best for everyone.

tellyontellyon said:

The point is that it is possible to be a Marxist and be a Buddhist. Whether HHDL still is or not is not the point, the point is that he was for most of his life and therefore being able

to hold both Buddhist and Marxist ideas is not ruled out. HHDL seems able to make his own mind about these things without resorting to telling people they are 'un-dharmic' or 'worldly' for thinking this way or that.

Malcolm wrote:

He thinks that Mao was against Dharma.

tellyontellyon said:

I say it is possible to be a Buddhist and a capitalist also...However, I do object to the idea that being a capitalist is somehow the default position for Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, no one said that. What was said was that one will never be rid of markets, capital accumulation, and so on. And as we see, HHDL is not against markets nor capital accumulation.

tellyontellyon said:

To be honest I don't see Buddhism as a 'recieved' religion and it is all-always up for discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there you are wrong. Thinks like dependent origination, rebirth, emptiness and so are non-negotiable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: HHDL on capitalism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And who says that I, for example, care what HHDL's political view may be? His Dharma teachings? Yes! His politics? Well...

Malcolm wrote:

You don't, but TOTO does, since he was using some of HHDL's political views stated in other places prior to 2009, when this book was published.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

michaelb said:

But Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche was undoubtedly Nyingma.

Malcolm wrote:

Try telling that to some Sakyapas. Actually, Tulku Rabsal Dawa was also considered a Sakyapa Tulku and he maintained a life long practice commitment to all the main Sakya practices.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Kunga said:

Thanks again, Malcolm. Much appreciated!

Malcolm wrote:

Incidentally you might note that the retinue is two Madhyamakas, Two Yogacarins, Two Vinayadharas and Two Logicians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Kunga said:

Fascinating, thanks! I had no idea about that. Can the sadhana/s be found in Khentse Rinpoche's published collected works? If so, I will ask for the transmission for this at Sechen gumpa.

Malcolm wrote:

bkra shis dpal 'byor. "chos rje sa skya paN+Di ta'i bla ma'i rnal 'byor ye shes bdud rtsi'i nyin byed/." In gsung 'bum/\_rab gsal zla ba. TBRC W21809. 17: 585 - 596. delhi: shechen publications, 1994.

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O2DB57601%7CO2DB576012DB61746\\$W21809](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O2DB57601%7CO2DB576012DB61746$W21809)

Kunga said:

Thanks so much

Malcolm wrote:

The outer practice is basically a version of the normal Sapan guruyoga. The inner practice is Sapan as Manjushri surrounded by eight Indian Panditas: Aryadeva, Gunaprabha, Vasubandhu, Asanga, Candrakirti, Dharmakirti, Dignaga and Śakyaprabha with Nāgārjuna as the master of the family. The secret practice is Sapan as Vajrabhairava.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Thank you for the clarification. Where is it possible to find more information on the Khon royal family? Especially them being descendant of a god of the clear light realm?

Can you also go a bit in detail concerning this?

I have always been fascinated by the stories how the very first Tibetan king did not die, but ascended back to heaven on a heavenly rope (dmu-theg).

Malcolm wrote:

This is an extract from a history of Sakya that I wrote for Lama Migmar Tseten which appears in Treasures of the Sakya Lineage published by Shambhala.

The Khon trace their origin to a class of gods called Wosel Lha, gods of luminous clarity.

The Annals of the Khon Lineage (gdung rabs), cites the fifteenth century author,

Ngorchen Kunchog Lhundrup: The line of emanations of Mañjuśrī,

The Glorious Sakyapa, begins in the country of the Gods of Luminous Clarity.

There were three brothers, Chiring, Yuring, and Yuse.

Yuse, having been made a king of humans, bore four sons.

His elder brother, Yuring, came to his aid.

The sons of Yuring and Muza Dembu

were the group of the seven Maza. The six oldest brothers

with their father returned to the land of the gods.

The youngest son, Masang Chije

and Thogcham Wurmo bore a son, Pawo Tag.

Both he and his Naga wife, Trama, bore a son

called Lutsa Tagpo Woechan.

Lutsa and the Mon lady Tsomo Gyal

while living together bore a son

at the divide between slate and grass,

and so he was named Yapang Kyes,

a hero that could not be defeated by others.

In a definitive sense Mañjuśrī is held to have emanated as three gods of luminous clarity,

the gods named Chiring, Yuring and Yuse or Use in order to benefit others. It is of great

importance too that these gods are considered emanations of Mañjuśrī, since all males

of the Khon line are considered to be descendents as well as emanations of the

Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī.

These three brothers descended to the human realm where they were asked to become



the ruler of human beings.

The youngest brother of the gods, Yuse, was elevated to the position of the ruler. He himself bore four sons, known as the four Se Chi Li brothers. Together they fought with the eighteen major tribes of the Dong, one of the four original clans of Tibet. The middle brother, Yuring, came to aid them, and after the Dong clan was subjugated, the Dong were made vassals.

Yuring himself married a daughter of the Mu, Muza Dembu, and they bore the seven Masang brothers. Of those seven, the eldest six returned to the country of the Gods with their father.

The youngest of the Masang brothers, Masang Chije, remained among human beings. He married Thogcham Wurmo, the daughter of the Thoglha Woedchan, they bore a son known as Thogtsad Bangpo Tag.

Thogtsad married Lucham Drama, the daughter of a Nāgā, to whom a son named Lutsa Tagpo Woechan was born.

Lutsa and a Mon lady, Tsomo Gyal were married and their single son was born on the treeline, thus he was given that name Yahpang Kyes i.e. “Born at the divide between slate and grass” i.e. on the tree line of a mountain. The significance of this is that according to the Tibetan conception of cosmology, the gods live in the heights of the mountains above the tree line, while human beings live below the treeline.

The Khon in the Tibetan Imperial Period:

Konchog Lhundrup continues his account: Then having slain the Srinpo named Kyareng Khragmey and

having stolen the wife, Yahdrum Silima he married her.

They had a son named Khonpar Kye.

The son of he [Khonpar Kye] and a Lady of the Tsan, Chambu Dron was handsome and smart, rare in the human lands, named Khonpa Jegung Tag,

he was known as Khonton Palpoche, who went to Nyantse.

Yahpang was engaged in a fight with a Srinpo named Kyareng Khragmed, and having slain this Srinpo, married his wife. Because their boy was born as the outcome of a feud between the gods [lha] and demons [srin po], the boy was named “Born in a Feud”, “Khon par kyes”, and this is given as the origin of the clan name of the Khon.

Khonpar Kye, the offspring of gods, humans and demons, married a lady of a type of a lesser Tibetan god, the Tsan, called Chambu Dron, and their son was known as Khonton Palpoche, i.e. the Khon Teacher who Increases Wealth. He gained his name because after being appointed one of the inner ministers of King Trisrong Detsan’s court, he increased the King’s wealth.

Khonton Palpoche married Lang Zang Nechung, the sister of a translator named Lang Khampa, and while there are slightly varying accounts as to whether there were two or four sons, most later scholars follow the tradition that there were two sons, the elder being the great scholar, the Khon Lotsawa, Lu’i Wangpo, and the younger son, Khon Dorje Rinchen. Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen notes in his Annals of the Khon Lineage [‘khon gyi gdung rabs]:

“Khon Lu’i Wangpo Srungs was the foremost of the seven tested men. His younger brother Khon Dorje Rinchen became a disciple of Master Padmasambhava and became a tantrika.”

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Personally, I have been a religious monarchist since ...

ground said:

We would fight against each other in a revolutionary civil war ...

Malcolm wrote:

What I mean is that my first guru HHST, is a dharmarāja. As is Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, for that matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Kunga said:

Fascinating, thanks! I had no idea about that. Can the sadhana/s be found in Khentse Rinpoche's published collected works? If so, I will ask for the transmission for this at Sechen gompa.

Malcolm wrote:

bkra shis dpal 'byor. "chos rje sa skya paN+Di ta'i bla ma'i rnal 'byor ye shes bdud rtsi'i nyin byed/." In gsung 'bum/\_rab gsal zla ba. TBRC W21809. 17: 585 - 596. delhi: shechen publications, 1994.

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O2DB57601%7CO2DB576012DB61746\\$W21809](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O2DB57601%7CO2DB576012DB61746$W21809)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

I don't want to sidetrack the thread, but may I ask what makes the Khon royal family the oldest surviving in the world?

Why Khon and not for instance the Japanese imperial family or some other royal lineage?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, second oldest then. Though arguably, since the Khon family were the direct descendants of a god of the clear light realm who was elevated to kingship by the clans of Tibet, but this is not historical.

The ascension of the Khon to rulership of Tibet occurred in the thirteenth century. Apart from the Japanese royal family, I personally know of no other family with such a long continuous rule in one place.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Why theravada reject mahayana sutra

Content:

Kunga said:

Tibetans teach all 3 yanas, and ideally should practice all 3 - i.e., keep the outer conduct of the hinayana, possess the motivation of Mahayana to achieve buddahood to free sentient beings, and hold the view / practice the methods as contained in Vajrayana.

Ajahn Brahm is not a 'disgraced' teacher by any stretch of the imagination. He decided to ordain Bhikkhunis, which caused a stir with the patriarchs of the Thai sangha. I admire him for having had the balls to do it. However, the Sri Lankans have been doing this for years; the Thais don't accept this either - so what? To try and cast aspersions on a very senior monk whom many regard as accomplished in jhana meditation is very negative.

Malcolm wrote:

Gorampa Sonam Senge wouldn't buy it. This is why he argued against giving Gelongma ordinations in Tibet, i.e. the lineage was never brought to Tibet.

Just sayin...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Sadhu! Sadhu!

HHDL and I went through the same line of reasoning in life.

I also agree with him that Socialists fundamentally are just well intentioned, they just want to make things better for everyone by bringing equality. It just doesn't work, and

leads to more suffering. That's unfortunate and makes me feel an immense welling up of compassion in my heart whenever I meet someone who is a socialist - they really think they're doing something good and right for the world, which is admirable, even if they are naive.

May all socialists and communists be well, happy and peaceful.

Malcolm wrote:

Personally, I have been a religious monarchist since I received teachings from HH Sakya Trizin (from the Khon, the oldest surviving royal family in the world), but more or less a supporter of representative democracy my whole life. I had a good friend who was a Trot, and listening to TOTO is just like playing a conversation with him from thirty years ago, identical in both word and fervor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

His activities as a tertön were compassionate, but not the basis of his own personal awakening, ironically, despite his importance in Dzogchen lineages.

theanarchist said:

Erm, according to the Nyingma records his predecessor achieved realisation before there even was even a Sakya school in Tibet....

Malcolm wrote:

It is important to remember that Khyentse Wangpo was a Sakya lama whose primary ritual and literary activity was dedicated to that tradition and while he worked closely with the Kagyu Jamgon Kongtrul and the Nyingma Chogyur Lingpa, neither he nor his colleagues made any effort to merge traditions or initiate a new teaching institution.  
<http://www.himalayanart.org/search/set.cfm?setid=2250>

Likewise, despite the fact that I have devoted as many years to the study of Dzogchen as I have Lamdre and so on, people still tend to think of me as a Sakyapa and my training grounds me in that school. And when push comes to shove, I still think Sakya Pandita was Tibet's greatest scholar.

It is also interesting to note that at the end of Dilgo Khyentse's life, when he was repairing Samye, he kept on having recurrent visions of Sakya Pandita which led to a Guru Yoga terma featuring Sakya Pandita that has an outer, inner and secret aspect to it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 2:34 AM

Title: HHDL on capitalism

Content:

Unknown said:

I am, in principle, in favor of “globalization” and the concept of “global” companies. In the past, communities and countries could live in isolation if they wanted to; that is no longer the case. Today, a stock-market crash on one side of the globe has a direct and immediate effect on the other side. Terrorism born in one country can destabilize a dozen others. And the effects of poverty, disease, and social unrest in a handful of nations impact the rest of the world. It is my opinion that global companies can be agents for positive change in our interconnected world.

Another positive result of globalization is increasing competition. Competition generates a very powerful force to produce what people want at reasonable prices. But it is a means; it is not an end. The end is to generate benefits for all. So why is it so difficult to arrive at fair competition and an equitable distribution of those benefits?

Competition generates wealth. But if leaders of businesses are interested only in enriching themselves as fast as possible, with little or no regard for any harmful consequences to others, then competition is being used in the wrong way.

For much of my life, I was attracted to the socialist or communist system because I understood its objective as to provide a decent standard of living and justice for all. I was drawn to it for its equality; in such a system, extreme differences in standards of living between people are not to be tolerated. The stated objectives of socialist systems include abolishing poverty and furthering the brotherhood among people and among countries, which I, of course, found very appealing. But over time, I found out that the countries that practiced the communist system did not reach this objective; they did not even try to. On the contrary, I found that by suppressing free markets and individual freedoms like freedom of speech and freedom to own property, these systems were actually stagnating development and furthering poverty and hardship. Although I still believe that the initial objective was right, I have come to see the flaws in such a system. It was not initially obvious to me that the abolition of private ownership would lead to ownership by the state, with a party elite in charge who would then institute their own restrictive command-and-control system and rule as an elite, like the aristocracies in the past. Of course, we now know this led to many human rights abuses.

It is through this process of listening and observing that I have come to put my faith in the free-market system. Although it has great potential for abuses as well, the fact that it allows for freedom and diversity of thought and religion has convinced me that it is the one we should be working from. Of course, I still believe we should strive for an adequate standard of living for all rather than the “survival of the fittest” position that the free market often follows. The recent developments in China demonstrate how even small movements toward a free-market system can boost economic development and help lift people out of poverty. But of course, in the case of China there is still much work to be done.

Adam Smith refers to the development of moral sense as imagining oneself in the position of others. That is what we refer to as “exchanging self for others.” Unfortunately, Adam Smith did not stress sufficiently the need of people to train in imagining themselves in the position of others. Even though he had a keen interest in and insight

into moral issues, Smith believed that competition and regulation could lead to prosperity for all. But I believe that Right View and Right Conduct are also necessary. Without considering the impact of one's decisions on others, it is not possible for regulation and competition alone to result in a decent standard of living for all. Adam Smith and other economists have concerned themselves with the generation of wealth, but they do not provide any guidance on the distribution of wealth. Karl Marx, on the other hand, looked at this the other way around. He was only interested in the distribution of wealth, not in how to generate it. In my view, both the proper creation of wealth and the proper distribution of it are very important. In order to reach such goals, one requires the right policies and the application of Right View and Right Conduct. All human beings, whatever their cultural or historical background, suffer when they are intimidated, imprisoned, or tortured. It is not enough to define human rights as the United Nations has done; they must also be implemented. Rights depend on responsible action. This is why I put so much emphasis on the word "responsible" when I advocate responsible free-market economy.

Even though Adam Smith was concerned with the moral dimensions of the economic system, many of his successors ignored that aspect. I consider an economic system without a moral dimension to be dangerous. That is why I want to add the dimension of "responsibility" to "free market." I agree with the concept of freedom advocated by Smith and Hayek but feel it does not take us far enough.

Globalization is a positive development as long as leaders of global corporations act responsibly and develop a holistic view of their role in society. And since organizations are also dependent on governments to act in a responsible manner, businesses should work constructively with governments to achieve a responsible free-market economy and reject an economic system without moral values.

Capital is a means, not an end. The end is freedom and prosperity for all. This can best be reached by a free-market system in which all participants act responsibly. In my way of thinking, integrating capitalism and Buddhism happens when Right View and Right Conduct become an integral part of the economic system. I see the word "responsible" in this context as standing for Right View and Right Conduct and therefore hope that the words "responsible free-market economy" will come to replace the words "capitalist system."

Malcolm wrote:

The Leader's Way: The Art of Making the Right Decisions in Our Careers, Our Companies, and the World at Large. Crown Publishing Group. Kindle Edition.

HHDL say many more things, and his position is more nuanced than the citations I have posted might lead one to believe. But it quite clear he has abandoned his "Marxism" in favor of a free market style political economy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Z.L.

I'm not sure about this 'Dharma is eternal law' statement....

Is anything eternal?

And by Dharma, do we mean precepts? The Vinaya?

In what sense are you using the term Dharma? How are you defining it? Can it be defined?

What exactly is it that you say is eternal?

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma is definitely "eternal" in that the principles of karma, dependent origination, emptiness and buddhanature always apply to all sentient beings in every possible universe.

When a Buddha awakens, he always awakens to these four principles.

It does not mean that Shakyamuni's dispensation is eternal; on the contrary, it is impermanent and will disappear some three thousand years hence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

His activities as a tertön were compassionate, but not the basis of his own personal awakening, ironically, despite his importance in Dzogchen lineages.

theanarchist said:

Erm, according to the Nyingma records his predecessor achieved realisation before there even was even a Sakya school in Tibet....

Malcolm wrote:

I recounted a list of his incarnations above, as recorded by Kongtrul. I recounted the account of his personal awakening, as recounted by Ju Mipham. You cannot get much more authoritative than that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And let's not forget Leo Tolstoy. L.N.Tolstoy.jpg

"His literal interpretation of the ethical teachings of Jesus, centering on the Sermon on the Mount, caused him in later life to become a fervent Christian anarchist and anarcho-pacifist. His ideas on nonviolent resistance, expressed in such works as *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*, were to have a profound impact on such pivotal twentieth-century figures as Mohandas Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr."

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leo\\_Tolstoy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leo_Tolstoy)

Malcolm wrote:

This kind of anarchist may not recognize any political authority, but they nevertheless live in a political world. From my point of view, they are basically utopians. They may be admirable, indeed, but they are not important for their political voice, they are important for their philosophical voice, much in the same way that deep ecology/ecosophy is important as an environmental philosophy but not important as a political or social movement (much to the dissatisfaction of other environmental philosophers who come mainly from the left, like Bookchin and so on,)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 20th, 2014 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If this does not define Kyentse Wangpo as Sakyapa, I don't know what else would.

mutsuk said:

Oh, he is indeed a Sakyapa. His non-sectarian approach was such that he also received numerous Bonpo transmissions and wrote a biography of Guru Rinpoche in the mode of the Bon-gsar tradition (together with his Bonpo tertön name, etc.). He was also a great fan of Dechen Lingpa's Collected Works and urged him to reveal several important termas. He also financed (at a time when it would mean cutting a whole forest to print xylographic works) Dechen Lingpa's collected Termas in 13 volumes which are all Bon-gsar. Khyentse was indeed an amazing individual.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and if anyone doubts the profundity and blessings of the teachings of the Sakya school, they should take a lesson from this, since Kongtrul considered Khyentse Wangpo to be a person who had achieved total Buddhahood.

His activities as a tertön were compassionate, but not the basis of his own personal awakening, ironically, despite his importance in Dzogchen lineages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:



To further illustrate my point about Khyentse Wangpo being a Sakyapa. In his short verse biography of Khyenste Wangpo, Mipham writes:

His own awakening was  
in all the intimate instructions  
and textual systems  
of the sublime discourses of the five founders,  
and the father and sons of Ngor,  
Gongkar and Tshar.

If this does not define Kyentse Wangpo as Sakyapa, I don't know what else would.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

michaelb said:

Jamyang Khyentse was also the mind incarnation of Jigme Lingpa Khyentse Ozer.  
Dzongsar is, of course, a Sakya gumpa.

Malcolm wrote:

And the incarnation of several past Sakya masters, such as Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen, Lodro Gyaltsan, Khyenrab Je of Shwalu, Khyentse Wangchuk, the main disciple of Tsarchen, as well as Jampa Namkhai Chime, the 44th throne holder of Ngor and a younger contemporary of Jigme Lingpa.

Not to mention, Manushrimitra, Trisrong Detsen, Longchenpa, Gendun Drup, the "second Dalai Lama", Thangthong Gyalpo as well as Jigme Lingpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

fabrc said:

I would like to know what tibetan buddhist traditions Alan Wallace and Matthieu Ricard belong?

Thanks!

theanarchist said:

Mathieu Ricard is a disciple of Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche. So Nyingma.

pensum said:

His main teacher however was Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche who as an incarnation of Jamyang Khyenste Chokyi Lodro is formally Sakya...

Malcolm wrote:

You mean incarnation of Khyentse Wangpo, who, while being nonsectarian, was definitely Sakyapa, a member of the Ngor school, traditionally patronized by the King of Derge. The Derge region of Kham may have been a hotbed of Nyingma activity, but it's spine is Sakya through and through.

theanarchist said:

Haha, Khyentse Wangpo was a terton and all terton are incarnations of the disciples of Guru Rinpoche and the terma are the teachings of Guru Rinpoche. You can't become more Nyingma than that, even if you also additionally hold a sarma tradition..

Malcolm wrote:

Khyentse Wangpo is most definitely a Sakyapa, there is really no doubt about it. His main practice was Hevajra from the Lamdre. The vast majority of his work involved collating all the Sakyapa teachings in to two collections, the rgyud sde kun 'dus and the sgrub thabs kun 'dus. He was a member of the Ngor subschool of Sakya.

If you examine his education, training and practice, you will discover that he grew out of the Sakya school. All his main tutors were Sakyapas such as the Thartse Khenchen, and so on. His monastery is and remains a Sakya monastery. For example he received his name and later his monastic vows from the latter master.

While it is true that he was an very important terton, the emanations of Guru Rinpoche's disciples is not confined to one school, be it Nyingma (which is really just a gsar ma school too), Sakya, Gelug or the many branches of Kagyu. Emanations of Guru Rinpoche and his disciples are considered to have appeared in all of these schools.

In the end, we must conclude that Khyentse Wangpo was a Sakya pa, as any measure of his literary output will definitely show.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: What tibetan buddhist traditions these people belong?

Content:

pensum said:

His main teacher however was Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche who as an incarnation of Jamyang Khyenste Chokyi Lodro is formally Sakya...

Malcolm wrote:

You mean incarnation of Khyentse Wangpo, who, while being nonsectarian, was

definitely Sakyapa, a member of the Ngor school, traditionally patronized by the King of Derge. The Derge region of Kham may have been a hotbed of Nyingma activity, but it's spine is Sakya through and through.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Water bowls...?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In any case, the point is that any offerings apart from a ganapuja should be discarded in a clean place, and not reserved for personal consumption.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Śākyamuni's non-Indo-European heritage.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Upanishad as well as the Vedas clearly uphold kingship as the ideal.

Zhen Li said:

The ideal for kings is dandaniti. That doesn't mean they view kingship as superior in authority to that of brahmins. Actually in practice most kings didn't really use brahmins in the ideal manner, they'd have them at court for legitimation, not for instruction in Dharma. Buddhism holds that the Brahmin can only exist in society once the king has ordered it, whereas the Brahmanical texts hold that the Brahmin was established as supreme being born from the head of Brahma, a view the Buddhists refute.

Malcolm wrote:

It is clearly states in the early Upanishads that only the ksatriyas knew the meaning of the Vedas, of which Brahmins were ignorant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I think I've figured it out! Arguing about Dzogchen IS the meaning of life.

Malcolm wrote:

NOW it all makes sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Water bowls...?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Cretan.

Sherab Dorje said:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lesbos>, actually!

Malcolm wrote:

Howard Sterns would love it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Water bowls...?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

]After they had finished? Can't see why I shouldn't/wouldn't!

Malcolm wrote:

Barbarian.

Sherab Dorje said:

"Barbarian" is a Greek term:

"The term originates from the Greek word βάρβαρος (barbaros). Hence the Greek idiom "πᾶς μὴ Ἑλλήν βάρβαρος" (pas mē Hellēn barbaros) which literally means "whoever is not Greek is a barbarian"." So it seems that the shoe fits the other foot!

Malcolm wrote:

Cretan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Water bowls...?

Content:

Terma said:

does it really matter what we we do with it when it is time to get rid of it?

Terma

Malcolm wrote:

Would you eat the food off the plate or drink out of the cup of an honored guest? If no, then you have your answer.

Sherab Dorje said:

After they had finished? Can't see why I shouldn't/wouldn't!

Malcolm wrote:  
Barbarian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

conebeckham said:

This, and the extensive Dzogchen discussion, really are tangential to the thread, though, I think.....

Malcolm wrote:

People always want to argue with me about Dzogchen no matter what thread I am in and no matter what I say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ok, so then he's presenting the exact same view as all the Tantras and commentaries?

Malcolm wrote:

As the son of the Zhang ston Tashi Dorje, the tertön who revealed the Vima Nyinthig, I doubt his authority can be questioned.

His book, the eleven topics of Dzogchen, is the basis of Longchenpa's larger work, from which Longchenpa pinches entire passages without attribution. I know this because while I translating the GZ recension of this work, I read it carefully side by side the Tshig Don mDzod.

So, I think it is safe to say that if Nyibum is the main lineage holder of Nyinthig (he is) after his father, his views ought to have considerable weight.

smcj said:

Dudjom R. subscribed to the "Great Madhyamaka"/empty-of-other view. As the nominal "head of the Nyingma Lineage" in the 2nd half of the 20th century his views ought to have considerable weight also.

Malcolm wrote:

As I explained to you before, all schools consider their Madhyamaka "great", so that is just a sectarian jibe. Having said that, yes Dudjom R was indeed a proponent of gzhan stong following Kongtrul. On the other hand, Khenpo Zhanga, one of most influential commentators on these topics and the author of the 13 texts system of education at Dzogchen Monastery and so on, was definitely not a gzhan stong pa, nor for that matter was Mipham.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ok, so then he's presenting the exact same view as all the Tantras and commentaries?

Malcolm wrote:

As the son of the Zhang ston Tashi Dorje, the tertön who revealed the Vima Nyinthig, I doubt his authority can be questioned.

His book, the eleven topics of Dzogchen, is the basis of Longchenpa's larger work, from which Longchenpa pinches entire passages without attribution. I know this because while I translating the GZ recension of this work, I read it carefully side by side the Tshig Don mDzod.

So, I think it is safe to say that if Nyibum is the main lineage holder of Nyinthig (he is) after his father, his views ought to have considerable weight.

gad rgyangs said:

so I assume he's upholding the views of all the main Dzogchen Tantras?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Longchenpa's book TDD, uses virtually all of the same citations Nyibum presents, but also many more, as well since the former's is three times as long (mostly citations, not so much longer in terms of actual explanations).

So here, you see in one place, Nyibum states the basis is unfabricated mind, in another place, he states the definitive view about that basis is ka dag.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It sure took a lot of money for this dude to appear on Ted talk.

Sherab Dorje said:  
Funny that, given we live in a capitalist system.

Malcolm wrote:  
You will never escape the markets greg, not in your lifetime.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 1:17 AM  
Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless  
Content:

gad rgyangs said:  
ok, so then he's presenting the exact same view as all the Tantras and commentaries?

Malcolm wrote:  
As the son of the Zhang ston Tashi Dorje, the tertön who revealed the Vima Nyinthig, I doubt his authority can be questioned.

His book, the eleven topics of Dzogchen, is the basis of Longchenpa's larger work, from which Longchenpa pinches entire passages without attribution. I know this because while I translating the GZ recension of this work, I read it carefully side by side the Tshig Don mDzod.

So, I think it is safe to say that if Nyibum is the main lineage holder of Nyinthig (he is) after his father, his views ought to have considerable weight.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 1:13 AM  
Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless  
Content:

smcj said:  
Isn't the definitive view of Karma Kagyu the view of Mahamudra?  
Mahamudra is a practice. Shentong is a view.

BTW I know of western Mahamudra practitioners that have never studied Madhyamaka or Shentong. Mahamudra is something you do, not just think or talk about.

Malcolm wrote:  
Mahāmudra has a view (ground mahāmudra), it has a path (path mahāmudra) and it has a result (result mahāmudra).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nyibum who is an authority on this subject, could not be clearer. The basis is just one's unfabricated mind.

gad rgyangs said:

Either Nyibum is saying the same thing as all the thousands of Dzogchen Tantras and commentaries, or he is contradicting them. If he's saying the same thing, then what's the controversy? If he's contradicting them, then trying to uphold the eccentric view of one dude against the entire tradition is a little crazy.

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt you can consider Nyibums view eccentric in the least, as he is one of the most important Nyinthig lineage masters, his book, from which this quote was drawn, was repurposed word for word into a treasure revelation that forms a major text in the Gongpa Zangthal cycle. In the Gongpa Zangthal, this work is presented as the work of Vimalamitra, not Nyibum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

3) the appearances of the basis consist of all phenomena of samsara and nirvana, including "sentient beings" and their "minds":

Malcolm wrote:

"All phenomena" simply means one skandha, one āyatana and one dhātu e.g. rūpaskandha, mano-āyatana and the dharmadhātu.

And as I pointed, even the container universe arises from consciousnesses according to Buddhism through their collective activity. Dzogchen is just another way of describing this insight which is found even in Abhidharma (of which Dzogchen is a self-described part).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:



gad rgyangs said:

3) the appearances of the basis consist of all phenomena of samsara and nirvana, including "sentient beings" and their "minds":

Malcolm wrote:

The tantra is describing the basis in abstract general terms, not as an instantiated entity which has a function. Therefore, the basis is not transpersonal in manner in which you have previously suggested.

gad rgyangs said:

The "Illuminating Lamp" says:

"From within this indeterminate spontaneous presence  
There is a manifestation-process of varied plurality,  
And its unceasing play accomplishes everything and anything,  
As it shines forth everywhere in any way;  
In its indeterminacy, there is a plurality of appearances"

so yes, the basis of the mind of a sentient being is the same basis as the basis of all phenomena of samsara and nirvana: the basis beyond all words and categories.

Malcolm wrote:

Nyibum who is an authority on this subject, could not be clearer. The basis is just one's unfabricated mind. That is the basis for all samsara and nirvana. In Sakya it is called the all-basis cause continuum, in Kagyu, ground mahāmudra, in Gelug, the mind of clear light and in Jonang, tathāgatagarbha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

smcj said:

the basis" is not simply your own mind (which would be what is usually called a Yogacaran interpretation)

Malcolm wrote:

=

It is called Wisdom (Skt.: jnana) and also the dharmata. It is the essential reality of all things. It is said to be truly existent and not self-empty. As such it offends the sensibilities of people that get hysterical when the specter of brahman shows itself. As I already pointed out, wisdom is a noetic quality. It cannot be a noetic quality separate from our mind. It cannot be a singular noetic quality pervading all minds.

When the "mind" is completely purified of all taints, it is called "wisdom" (jñāna) When it is with taints it is called consciousness (vijñāna).

If we follow what you are saying, there is no hope at all of finding Buddhahood within our own minds, since buddhahood and wisdom would be extraneous to our continuums. If we are to find buddhahood within our own minds, as hundreds of texts recommend, then we have to discover that buddhahood in the essence of our own minds. That is not transpersonal.

Even gzhan stong does not presuppose a brahman like entity. They are merely stating that the three kāyas are the inherent in the nature of the mind. For example, Dolbupa, arguable the founder of gshan stong terms the tathāgatagarbhe the ālaya, the all-basis. He says too, [Hopkins, 2006, pg. 65] "Similarly the Glorious Hevajra Tantra also says that the natural clear light mind that resides in all sentient beings is buddha..." And on page 106 he says "

...Bhavya's "Lamp for (Nāgārjuna's) Wisdom" if the middle way:  
It consciousness,  
clear light, nirvana,  
All-emptiness, and body of attributes.

[The term] "consciousness" on this occasion is in consideration of the consciousness of the noumenon and pure consciousness because it is used as a synonym for the clearly body of attributes."

On 120 he says:

If the matrix-of-the-one-gone-bliss did not exist in fact, it would incur the irreversible fallacy of contradicting the statement in the Descent to Lankā Sūtra that the mind beyond logic, the essence of the ultimate 12 grounds, natural clear light, buddha-matrix, natural virtue, basis free from all positions, final source of refuge, and exalted buddha wisdom is the matrix-of-one-gone-bliss.

So you can see, the term below "one's unfabricated mind" has exactly the same meaning and for this reason I maintain that the view of the basis proposed in Sakya, Kagyu, Gelug, Nyingma and Jonang are the same, even though they describe it differently, from different angles and with different terminology. The meaning and the subject of discussion however is the same.

As such, because the basis, one's unfabricated mind, arose as the essence of the sole reality, there is no need to search elsewhere for the place etc., i.e. it is called self-originated wisdom.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Water bowls...?

Content:

Terma said:

does it really matter what we we do with it when it is time to get rid of it?

Terma

Malcolm wrote:

Would you eat the food off the plate or drink out of the cup of an honored guest? If no, then you have your answer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

smcj said:

the basis" is not simply your own mind (which would be what is usually called a Yogacaran interpretation)

Malcolm wrote:

The ālaya cause continuum (Sakya), the fundamental mind of luminosity (Gelug), "ground mahāmudra" (Kagyu) or the "basis" (Nyingma) all refer to the same thing, i.e., one's unfabricated mind. There is no contradiction between these positions and a position that holds that the basis is tathāgatagarbha. All of these are merely different ways of discussing tathāgatagarbha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: short term monastic ordination in india ?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The best place to do retreat is in Western Europe or North America.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Malcolm wrote:

It sure took a lot of money for this dude to appear on Ted talk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Śākyamuni's non-Indo-European heritage.

Content:

Zhen Li said:

than the Vedic/Upanisadic model, which is actually pretty deviant from the norm of human societies. Buddhist rajas are just regular rajas.

Malcolm wrote:

The Upanishad as well as the Vedas clearly uphold kingship as the ideal.

See Dumezil.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Water bowls...?

Content:

DiamondSutra said:

What do you think of drinking the water from water bowls?

Way better to put it outside in plants?

We eat the fruit after it's been offered, so why not the water too?

Ok to drink or not?

Malcolm wrote:

It is generally considered that you should discard it in a clean, unpolluted place. Also, you can water your plants with it.

In general, the fruit/food offerings should also be discarded in a the same kind of place.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if, instead of a basis as abgrund for all phenomena, you want to locate it in individual sentient beings' minds, then you a starting with a multiplicity. You are kind of saying that there is nothing that unifies all the sentient beings, each one is an island, self-contained

with its own basis forever independent from the bases of all other sentient beings. At best this is substance svabhava, at worst it is simply crypto-materialism with minds as atoms.

Malcolm wrote:

If you say something unifies sentient beings, you're right back at a field theory.

gad rgyangs said:

as I said before you are positing sentient beings, but upon what?

Malcolm wrote:

Convention, what else?

gad rgyangs said:

you said "ka dag or emptiness" but either A) emptiness is a non-affirming negative, in which case you cannot posit consciousnesses on it or B) it is not a non-affirming negative, but it is a quality/nature, along with lhun sgrub and thugs je, describing the basis of all phenomena including, but not limited to, the minds of sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Kadag is the emptiness of consciousness. It may be the emptiness of everything else as well, but given that all the elements which make up the universe and sentient beings arise from collective consciousnesses of sentient beings, there is not much point in talking about their emptiness. It is axiomatic that they are empty because they are established as mind.

The Introduction Tantra states Since all appearances are introduced as mind, gain mastery over the mind.

Since the mind essence was introduced as emptiness, emptiness is sealed by bliss. Since emptiness was introduced as vidyā, vidyā itself is the non-duality of the dhātu and wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The reason people see the five lights everywhere they look

ConradTree said:

Stop right there. No need to go further.

This indicates the basis is the 5 lights.

checkmate.

Old Malcolm wins over new Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is not the five lights. The five lights are expressions of wisdom.

Those all just exist in one's mind, as Shabkar point out.

The basis is not something separate from you the person, and it is not some uniform transpersonal field. It is just your own mind and it's essence.

By the way I never thought the basis was a transpersonal field. But have become aware that many people interpret it as such, and therefore, I'm writing to correct this misapprehension.

In other words, Dzogchen teachings about the basis are actually "disappointingly" Buddhist and not so radical after all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

OK, thanks for the clarification. This is something I've been wondering about for a while. The specific reason I'm asking is because I'm reading "Treasury of Precious Qualities, Book Two", and in the translator's introduction they kind of make a big deal out of how to translate 'thugs rje' in this context. If you use Amazon's look inside feature here : <https://www.amazon.com/Treasury-Precious-Qualities-Book-Two/dp/1611800455> and look for the 'the third term' you can see what I'm referring to, on page xxviii. In that book they translate it as 'cognitive potency'.

pensum said:

I noticed their insistence on this point as well. However thugs rje is clearly the Tibetan translation of karuna as clearly stated by Mipham and many others. However in the context of Dzogchen, "compassion" takes on a subtle meaning, in that it refers to expressibility or the ability to manifest or appear. Tulku Ugyen explained it thus "Rigpa has a certain thugs rje. Thugs rje refers to the venue or the unobstructed medium for experience." Based on such explanations, one can readily see why Erik Pema Kunsang has opted to translate it as "capacity" rather than "compassion."

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, the word primarily refers to how the nirmanakāya functions, hence "compassion".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

ConradTree said:

Someone who finishes the dzogchen menngagde practices, sees the 5 lights everywhere they look.

Not pristine unfabricated mind.

Malcolm wrote:

They are the same thing.

And no, I was slightly mistaken before.

The reason people see the five lights everywhere they look is that they no longer have traces to reify the five elements as the five elements because their consciousness has become free of all traces of the two obscurations, i.e. with those removed, what remains is wisdom.

Of course, there is nothing substantial that is ever removed, from such a mind.

Then we gave this from the Rig pa rang shar:

Son of a good family, one must recognize the awareness [shes pa] free from grasping as one's own state.

Or the Rang grol:

A vidyā that performs actions does not exist  
in the essence of pure awareness.

Or the Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra has an interlinear note:

The nature of one's vidyā is light. Since kāyas are the gathered in the sphere of wisdom, the meaning of the view of Samantabhadra is realized. Further, there is vidyā and the wisdom that arises from vidyā. Further, vidyā that is free from extremes and beyond multiplicity does not transcend awareness (shes pa) and knowing (rig), endowed with a core of empty wisdom free from the extremes of things.

The Sun and Moon Tantra states:

At that time, that fortunate one

when the appearances are self-evident,  
the non-abiding awareness is called “natural”.

Anyway, there are too many references in various Dzogchen texts which state quite clearly that the basis is just one's mind. This is consistent with Buddhadharma. Other explanations are not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

It sounds sometimes as if I am being accused of putting socialism in place of Buddhism, or accused of saying they are the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you ever said any such thing. But I think you know Marxism better than you know Buddhism. And that is sad.

tellyontellyon said:

it is a question of whether Marxism is better than capitalism.

Malcolm wrote:

I see no evidence that it is.

tellyontellyon said:

Capitalism is a rampantly exploitative and violent system. Capitalists are most certainly not pacifists; it is a system that demands expansion and competition and leads inexorably to violence.

Malcolm wrote:

Every marxist revolution has ended in slaughter and terror. The fact is that market economies function best when there is an absence of political and military conflict. The market therefore, has a vested interest in peace and social stability.

tellyontellyon said:

I think Marx's analysis of capitalism is correct, and the chance of a peaceful transition is far more possible in the modern day. Even in the 19th century Marx saw some possibility of a peaceful transformation in the advanced countries. That possibility is much greater now.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't believe it, I think it is a utopian pipe dream.



tellyontellyon said:

But if you accept Marx's view that capitalism by its very nature deprives people of their humanity and essentially robs them by forcing them to give up their labour below its true value, then you will accept there are consequences for allowing this system to continue.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with any of these claims.

tellyontellyon said:

I say what we need is a little less sanctimonious preaching to the poor that they need to be more 'moral'; and a little more genuine moral behaviour: actually stepping outside of our golden palaces and actually doing something of benefit.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is non-evangelical. But if someone asks me, despite their best efforts to get ahead, what they need to do, and they want a Buddhist answer, I will give it to them: generate more merit. It may not ripen in this lifetime, but it will certainly ripen in future lives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

It sounds sometimes as if I am being accused of putting socialism in place of Buddhism, or accused of saying they are the same thing.

I am not.

Marxists don't claim to be pacifists, though I believe it is possible for a socialist transformation of society to come about peacefully and support such a peaceful transition.

The question isn't whether Marxism is better than Buddhism.... it is a question of whether Marxism is better than capitalism.

Malcolm wrote:

I see no evidence that it is.

tellyontellyon said:

Capitalism is a rampantly exploitative and violent system. Capitalists are most certainly not pacifists; it is a system that demands expansion and competition and leads inexorably to violence.

Malcolm wrote:

Every marxist revolution has ended in slaughter and terror.

tellyontellyon said:

I think Marx's analysis of capitalism is correct, and the chance of a peaceful transition is far more possible in the modern day. Even in the 19th century Marx saw some possibility of a peaceful transformation in the advanced countries. That possibility is much greater now.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't believe it, I think it is a utopian pipe dream.

tellyontellyon said:

But if you accept Marx's view that capitalism by it's very nature deprives people of their humanity and essentially robs them by forcing them to give up their labour below its true value, then you will accept there are consequences for allowing this system to continue.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with any of these claims.

tellyontellyon said:

I say what we need is a little less sanctimonious preaching to the poor that they need to be more 'moral'; and a little more genuine moral behaviour: actually stepping outside of our golden palaces and actually doing something of benefit.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is non-evangelical. But if someone asks me why, despite their best efforts to get ahead, what they need to do, and they want a Buddhist answer, I will give it to them: generate more merit. It may not ripen in this lifetime, but it will certainly ripen in future lives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

ka dag = śuddha

lhun grub =anābhoga/nirābhoga

thugs rje = karuna.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, then why do 'karuna' and 'abheda' have the same meaning here, if that is what you

are saying?

Malcolm wrote:

No, thugs rjes is often defined as the inseparability of ka dag and lhun grub.

Ngo bo/svabhāva, i.e. emptiness is the characteristic of ka dag/śuddha

Rang bzhin/prakṛti, i.e. clarity, is the characteristic of lhun grub/ anābhoga

Thugs rjes/karuna, i.e. compassion, is the characteristic inseparability/abheda of the former pair.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

May I ask what Indic term corresponds to compassion in this case?

Malcolm wrote:

Abheda.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, but why would that correspond to 'thugs rje'?

Malcolm wrote:

ka dag = śuddha

lhun grub = anābhoga/nirābhoga

thugs rje = karuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[Instead, I think B2 is the more proper understanding, based for example on Nyibum's remark that the basis is one's unfabricated mind. This is an authoritative citation that must be addressed and heeded. For example, the Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva states:

M

ConradTree said:

You have previously argued the basis of Dzogchen is not even the unfabricated mind:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=100&t=6459&hilit=basis+Mahamudra#p76393>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and I was also wrong.

But as pointed out in these same texts, the basis is not merely emptiness. It also has "wisdom" (ye shes), which is a kind of shes pa or sems, a primordial or pristine consciousness, as opposed to a rnam shes, an aspected consciousness that possesses concepts.

Yes this is called Advaita Vedanta.

No, since this ye shes is personal, never transpersonal, and at the time of the basis, is merely describing the mind (shes pa, sems) in a pre-afflictive state.

In Dzogchen texts we see an analogous sequence: wisdom --> blue light --> green light --> red light --> white light -- yellow light; which when reified becomes the standard Buddhist sequence above. The only difference between the two sequences is that the former sequence occurs when the latter sequence is not recognized for being what it is, the display of a given being's own noetic capacity.

If you are defining wisdom as pristine consciousness, then this a slight twist on Advaita Vedanta.

Tibetans translate jñāna as ye shes. That term "ye shes" is frequently translated as "pristine awareness" or "primordial wisdom", etc. I am saying that Dzogchen authors take this term very literally (a literalism criticized by people like Sakya Pandita) because they are taking this mode of shes pa (jñatā, jñānatā, parijñāna, etc.), which they describe as ye shes to mean that the original state (ye nas) of the mind (shes pa) is pre-afflictive, and Dzogchen is the path to recover that primordial state.

I am not saying that this consciousness is a universal plenum, like brahman, from which all beings arise; that is exactly the mistake I think most people fall into when studying Dzogchen, i.e. they wind up falling into an unintentional brahman trap.

Thus what I am saying is the basis is personal, not universal. Each's being has their own basis since they each have their own mind, the characteristics of the basis (essence, nature and compassion) are general, and apply to all minds, just as all candles on a table are separate and unique, but all flames on those candles bear the same qualities, heat and light.

The fault that I suffered from was not seeing the fact that "rnam shes" (vijñāna), "shes rab" (prajñā), "ye shes" (jñāna), "shes pa" (jñatā) are all talking about one thing, different modalities of a single continuum from sentient being hood to Buddhahood, based on language in man ngag sde texts, reinforced very strongly by Longchenpa, which make a very hard distinction between sems (citta) and yeshe (jñāna) without recognizing the distinction is not in substance, but merely in mode i.e. afflicted/non-afflicted.

Let me add, that the way I see it now is that "rnam shes", consciousness, refers to the afflicted mind, "ye shes" refers to the unafflicted mind; and "shes pa" refers to a mind which is neutral, that can go either way depending on whether it is under the influence of vidyā or avidyā.

Really, I am not saying anything that is terribly controversial. I am recognizing that I was misled by a distinction made by Longchenpa and others who, for didactic reasons,

make a hard distinction between mind/consciousness and wisdom when what they are really doing is making a hard distinction between utterly afflicted minds and utterly pure minds, and providing a literary mythology (the universe arises out of the basis) to explain the separation of sentient beings and buddhas.

I have similarly come to the conclusion that the account of the basis arising out of the basis and the separation of samsara and nirvana at some imagined start point unimaginable eons ago is just a literary myth, and it does not need to be taken literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 17th, 2014 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I can see, Capitalism, a term invented by Marx, is here to stay.

Sherab Dorje said:

Nothing is here to stay. As I said earlier: the longest running political/social entity (the Byzantine Empire) only lasted a thousand years.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and in Marxists terms it also had primitive accumulations of capital, and its primitive accumulations of capital were in turn taken over from Rome, etc., etc.

People and states have always accumulated capital and they always will, markets being markets. Governments have primarily existed for two reasons, to protect citizens and to stabilize markets, and they always will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 17th, 2014 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

B1, the basis as a transpersonal field out of which everything in samsara and nirvana is instantiated through its non-recognition.

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is not a field. its not an any-thing.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a faulty presentation of the basis, one of the six faulty positions about the basis described in the Six Dimensions of Samantabhadra Tantra, as well as others.

gad rgyangs said:

thats why it cannot contain traces, it would have to be some kind of existent locus for that.

Malcolm wrote:

Wisdom is suitable as a basis for traces, or so the Dzogchen texts tell us.

gad rgyangs said:

Even discussing wisdom as a the basis, even a nonsubstantiated basis as in Dzogchen does not make sense if that wisdom is not describing a noetic entity.

then what is that wisdom?

Malcolm wrote:

A mind lacking fabrications.

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is just the way a sentient being's consciousness [ shes pa rather than rnam par shes pa ] or mind [ sems, citta ] is talked about in Dzogchen texts prior to being afflicted for all the reasons I mentioned earlier.

ok, then whats the basis of that consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

Ka dag or emptiness, the correct description of the basis according the the man ngag sde texts. But as pointed out in these same texts, the basis is not merely emptiness. It also has "wisdom" (ye shes), which is a kind of shes pa or sems, a primordial or pristine consciousness, as opposed to a rnam shes, an aspected consciousness that possesses concepts.

Basically, even though Dzogchen texts describe such a "beginning time", I personally don't believe that there is a start point ever. The description of such a start point is merely a literary device, much as Samantabhadra is a literary device.

The five elements are also included in wisdom, etc., so there is no contradiction between saying that the basis is wisdom, and the basis is empty. The problem comes only if one imagines that basis is somehow a unitary entity, a fabric, which provides the basis for the arising of sentient beings and buddhas on an objective level. But if, as I have come to understand, it is not referring to an objective entity or context, then the basis is easily described as a a set of general features which every noetic entity that we call "buddhas" or "sentient being" shares in common as an idealized "initial" set of conditions. The only difference between buddhas and sentient beings then is the extent to which they recognize this set of general features within their own continuums. Hence in this respect the so called original general basis merely describes an abstract set of qualities, but is not itself an instantiation of those qualities in any way. Those qualities are only instantiated in a sattva, a being. In this way the basis is not one, because it is instantiated individually; it is not many because it is a uniform set of qualities that are being instantiated across all beings.

This way, the general Buddhist dictum which extends all the way down to Vasubandhu's Kośabhaṣ (and clearly the authors of the Dzogchen tantras were familiar with it because they use the Kośa cosmology in such tantras as the Rigpa Rangshar), matter arises from mind/s. I.e. the order of the arising of matter presented in virtually all buddhist texts is:

Consciousness --> space --> air --> fire --> water --> earth.

In Dzogchen texts we see an analogous sequence: wisdom --> blue light --> green light --> red light --> white light -- yellow light; which when reified becomes the standard Buddhist sequence above. The only difference between the two sequences is that the former sequence occurs when the latter sequence is not recognized for being what it is, the display of a given being's own noetic capacity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 17th, 2014 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Defining the basis as a sort of fabric out of which appearances arise does not solve the problem of individuated consciousnesses.

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, does anything?

Malcolm wrote:

What is the basis in fact? The Dzogchen tantras describe this as "wisdom". This wisdom is said to have three aspects [rnam pa], original purity, its svabhāva; natural perfection, its prakṛiti; and compassion, the inseparability of the first two.

dzogchungpa said:

May I ask what Indic term corresponds to compassion in this case?

Malcolm wrote:

Abheda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 17th, 2014 at 11:18 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you are forgetting that at the level of the basis there is no distinction between personal and universal. If you want to call the basis a quality shared by everything that arises you have merely coopted the term ususally used for the origin/ground of everything that

arises and now you need a new term for that. unless of course you want to reify individuals as independent monads of some sort, which is basically svabhava.

Malcolm wrote:

Defining the basis as a sort of fabric out of which appearances arise does not solve the problem of individuated consciousnesses.

What is the basis in fact? The Dzogchen tantras describe this as "wisdom". This wisdom is said to have three aspects [rnam pa], original purity, its svabhāva; natural perfection, its prakṛiti; and compassion, the inseparability of the first two.

Even discussing wisdom as a the basis, even a nonsubstantiated basis as in Dzogchen does not make sense if that wisdom is not describing a noetic entity. Simplistic solutions like refusing to define it as one or many simply raise more questions than they answer.

There are two propositions:

B1, the basis as a transpersonal field out of which everything in samsara and nirvana is instantiated through its non-recognition.

B2 the basis is meant only to apply to any given sentient beings. Since this applies to all sentient being, here the basis is like fire, fire as light and heat as a quality, every instantiation of fire has light and heat. Likewise, every sentient beings shares common characteristics because they are sentient, they have consciousness.

Dante, your position is B1, and while I can understand how people are lead to accept B1 as the message of Dzogchen teachings, it is an exaggeration in my estimation.

Instead, I think B2 is the more proper understanding, based for example on Nyibum's remark that the basis is one's unfabricated mind. This is an authoritative citation that must be addressed and heeded. For example, the Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva states:

That is one's own basis but it was not recognized by oneself. The samsaric three realms are formed through delusion. <sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub> Then, after the afflictions become more coarse, different forms of sentient beings emerge, deluded from the basis in that way."

This just means that each and every sentient being is deluded from their own basis; even though the basis is described in generic terms, it is not the case that all sentient beings ultimate share one basis. The basis is uniform in its nature, if you will, among all instantiations of sentient beings but each and every sentient being's basis is unique to that being. Since the Dzogchen tantras do describe wisdom as being a repository for traces, again we can try to explain this through B1 or B2.

In the B1 scenario, the basis would have to like a bank, where different people placed their traces, kind of like samsara accounts.



A B2 scenario is much simpler, since it is only means that since sentient beings did not recognize their own unfabricated minds, then they begin to develop the traces of action that produce our common karmic visions of the six realms. This is certainly the intent of Shabkar when he writes:

Therefore, since appearances are not fixed,  
whatever appears [appears] because of the power of traces.

And:

Therefore, everything is an appearance of the mind.  
Since everything is created by the concepts of the mind,  
in reality, all of the appearances of the mind are empty.

More importantly Shabkar states:

Self-originated primordial wisdom appearing as vidyā is also the mind...  
There are no appearances at all apart from the mind.

And:

This is the introduction that confirms the basis,  
the natural reality of the mind essence.

Compare these last two with Nyibum:

As such, because the basis, one's unfabricated mind, arose as the essence of the sole reality, there is no need to search elsewhere for the place etc., i.e. it is called self-originated wisdom.

(Apologies for the last version, which was from an earlier unedited version by mistake)

My present position therefore, is B2, the basis is just the way a sentient being's consciousness [ shes pa rather than rnam par shes pa ] or mind [ sems, citta ] is talked about in Dzogchen texts prior to being afflicted for all the reasons I mentioned earlier.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 17th, 2014 at 10:35 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

smcj said:

In defense of Malcolm I'd like to point out that he is evidently presenting Dzogchen from ChNN's perspective. ChNN carries a lot of weight around here, and a lot of people who

post here consider him their teacher. So it is entirely appropriate for Malcolm to clarify the teachings according to ChNN's perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not clarifying anything from ChNN's perspective. I am clarifying it from my own, which is all we have anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Bhūtas, in reality, are a product of affliction that manifest as external spirits. They are formless, and according to Tibetan Medicine as well as the chöd tradition, are a product of imputation. So they exist, but they exist primarily as imputations.

dzogchungpa said:

So they are not sentient beings?

Malcolm wrote:

They can be sentient beings, but they can only harm you if you have a negative karmic relation with them.

And, even we are just products of imputation, so our status as "sentient beings" is also somewhat questionable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I said the basis is just your own mind.

The gzhi, in Dzogchen, has nothing to do with the mind.

cloudburst said:

Hi Malcolm

Could you give a brief account of how your view has changed on this matter? It's somewhat striking.

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

It is simple: the basis has nothing to do with afflicted mind, the one we ordinarily experience. The two statements may be reconciled in the following way.

The basis is simply a way of talking about the components of the universe — earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness — from the point of view their luminous intrinsic purity. A way of saying this in Tibetan in Dzogchen terms would be

ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་རང་བཞིན་གྱིས་ཀྱང་དག་དང་ལྷན་གྱུ་ཞེས་ (all phenomena are pure and naturally perfect by nature); a gsar ma equivalent presentation might run ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་རང་བཞིན་གྱིས་དག་པ་དང་འོད་གསལ་བ་ (all phenomena are pure and luminous by nature).

The Kalacakra tantra makes a very important point about this, as Tagtshang Lotsawa points out in his survey of the Vimalaprabha:

Great bliss and empty forms [śūnyatābimba, stong gzugs] are shown to exist in the basis with this wisdom element of the basis [gzhi] because Bhagavan Vajrasattva Mahāsukha explains that all three realms exist in oneself in the commentary of the third verse of this [adhyātma] chapter, and it is established through the citation of the root text and commentary of “wisdom merged into emptiness”.

What is this wisdom? He again clarifies:

Bearing the name “wisdom”, this consciousness that exists pervading the bodies of all sentient beings is merged into that emptiness which pervades all sentient beings, including the sentient beings of the bardo and the formless realm. This is taught in the commentary as existing through a relative mode.

In Kalacakra, for example, the wisdom element is considered to be the five elements counted as one. Tagtshang again:

As such, from among the ten elements, the first five are enumerated individually, i.e., the elements of space, air, fire, water and earth. Counting the latter five as one, since they are made into one so called “wisdom element”, these six elements form this womb-born body.

The fact that points towards the same meaning as the basis in Dzogchen is provided by him here:

This statement of the root text “Wisdom is merged into emptiness, uniform taste, unchanging, and permanent” is intended for the mind of the apprehending subject that apprehends the object of the empty form established through the power of meditating on the main [devatā]. Here, the meaning of uniform taste, unchanging and permanent are though to be “complete in perfection.” Further, the meaning of permanent is said to be freedom from obscurations. That also intends intrinsically lacking obscuration or without the obscurations of movements. Though there is nothing to identify here in inseparable uniform taste, while produced conditionally, the intention is that the apprehended object and the apprehending subject have a single essence, and that a transforming continuum is not possible.

This is an extremely important point and demonstrates why the body of light is possible through either Dzogchen thögal or the path of the two stages.

Now, someone might object that it is inappropriate to cite the Kalacakra to clarify points in Dzogchen tantras, but then if this is so, then all great masters from Nubchen on down to Dudjom Rinpoche are at fault for using such tantras as the Mañjuśrīnamasamgiti to clarify Dzogchen.

Now, I am just a scholar, sharing with those who are interested my research. For many people it is annoying that I change my opinions, but I only have opinions based on what I know. Since I am not an enlightened person I can only understand what is said in the texts along with my own experience. Therefore, when my learning contradicts my earlier opinions, I change the latter immediately as soon as I have confirmed them mistaken. Such is the only honest path of real scholarship. Since I am not a person who can just accept what is told to me, my path is a bit more brutal and hard than most. But I consider that I am like a goldsmith, and it would be remiss of me not to rigorously test these texts that appear to shine like gold to see if they really are gold, merely gold-plated or fool's gold.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Sherlock said:

You seem to be suggesting that the whole cyclical universe thing is entirely a metaphor for one's mind -- sure it can be that but why not at the same time also a valid description of how the universe actually arises? It sounds to me similar to how some people consider the 6 lokas to be states of being within one's own life -- it is definitely that to some degree, but at the same time in mainstream Buddhism reincarnation into the different lokas is still a given.

Malcolm wrote:

In the highest Yogacara school, the non-aspectarian school, there is in fact no container universe to reincarnate into since the containers universe is merely a projection of seeds in the ālayavijñāna.

Dzogchen does not reject the outer universe in the same. Instead it interprets the pre/non-afflictive states of the five elements as "the five lights". But we can understand that the most subtle form of the five elements exist within consciousness. Wisdom is also just a name for a pre/un-observed consciousness.

The basis is not a universal phenomena. though it is discussed in a manner resembling that for convenience. Each person has their own basis. This is why each person experiences delusion and liberation separately and at different times.

Because the basis seems to be discussed as if it were some universal "pleroma", to borrow a phrase from the Gnostics, this causes some people to go off the deep end and conclude it is some universal phenomena out of which everything arises rather than be a quality shared by everything that arises.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Though, I am not blind to the possibility that the old regime may threaten the new society. I think they would have as much right to defend themselves as anybody else.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, you think that the "Capitalist" regime has a right to defend itself? That's novel. I thought you were of the mind that all these people were basically felons with no right to their "means of production".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Malcolm:

'Markets' or 'Trade', and 'Capitalism' are not the same thing. Explaining that is extremely complicated, capitalism are particular patterns of trade that have come to the fore in the modern world. For a proper explanation of this you will have to work through 'Capital' by Marx yourself. Though of course you could short circuit all that by declaring that you simply don't accept Marx's theory... up to you.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I can see, Capitalism, a term invented by Marx, is here to stay. Socialism, apart from the various degrees of "socialism" in the some Western European democracies failed. It is useless to shout at me that true socialism has never been tried. I wouldn't want to try "true Socialism" in a million years, so you can keep it.

tellyontellyon said:

Also, "There have always been..." is not a logical argument....

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't need to be an argument, its just a matter of fact.

tellyontellyon said:

I haven't said we don't have to look at our minds... but as I said about fixing my car ... we ALSO need a spanner.

We need to work on our anger, jealousy, greed, ignorance and pride... of course that. That goes without saying. That is bleeding obvious....!

Malcolm wrote:

If it were so obvious, then why is no one apart from a few Buddhists doing it?

tellyontellyon said:

But what is ALSO needed is a changed system.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we merely need to change our minds and help others where we can.

People love "systems" because they tell a story. So you have your exploitation story you call Capitalism, and you have your liberation story that you call True Socialism(tm), but they are just abstractions. In truth, no system is perfect because they are only as perfect as the people running them. And quite frankly I see no reason to believe that people will be "better people" under a True Socialist(tm) system, and I suspect that in fact people will be a lot shittier to one another than they are now given the removal of all financial incentives, the only thing left will be social status and hierarchical position.

You can quote the Marxist Dalai Lama all you want, and I can quote the free market loving Dalai Lama right back at you, but what good does that serve?

If we have learned anything, we should have learned that satisfaction of material needs does not lead to greater happiness — this fact is equally true under all political systems. Happiness both mundane and transcendent only comes from inside.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The basis, as I have already shown, is just your own clear and empty mind. There is no vidyā apart from your own mind's vidyā.

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is not vidya.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know, the neutral awareness that can become vidyā or avidyā comes from the basis. As I said the basis is just your own mind. It is not some unitary ontological basis for everything. If it were, it would be no different than brahman. Say that it isn't sat is no help, since brahman too is considered beyond existence and non-existence. If there is a difference, it is that the basis, one's own mind, is also not established.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

sentient beings complaining about appearances, forgetting that both they and the appearances are appearances of the basis, is also an appearance of the basis, so its all good.

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds like brahman to me.

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is not sat.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis, as I have already shown, is just your own clear and empty mind. There is no vidyā apart from your own mind's vidyā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Even if you don't think socialism isn't the answer, we stil need to dump capitalism. It is past it's 'sell by' date and is starting to stink.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not going to dump capitalism ever, because there have always been markets and opportunities for investment and there always will be markets. What needs to happen is that human beings need to grow up and learn how to restrain their appetites, and manage their markets in such a way that they are not destructive to the planet and other creatures in general.

When this happens, we can have our cake and eat it too, we can have both a healthy planet, social justice and peace. Socialism, Neo-liberalism, Anarchism, all these political theories are not going to bring us to the point where we have a healthy planet, social justice and peace, because all of options from the left and the right up till now are predicated on violence. Whether it is violent seizure of new markets (Neo -liberalism), violent seizure of capital (Marxian Socialism) or violent disruption of society (Kropotkin style Anarchism), for as long as humans use violence to have their way in the world for

that long there will never be peace, never be social justice and there will never be a healthy planet.

Those who participate and endorse violence, only get violence in future lives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Not Ideals.... but changing what is worse for something better. There is nothing wrong with being pro-active about something if it seems positive. If you want to be inactive, ok.... but the capitalists are not going to be inactive. They are busy destroying the planet with their insatiable demand for the 2% - 3% compound annual growth that capitalism needs to function.

Zero growth economics is not possible under capitalism...

Malcolm wrote:

No, capitalism is doing no such thing. Human beings are doing it because they do not understand how to control their desire, hatred and ignorance. They do it just as much on Socialist countries like USSR and Communist China.

From a my point of view as a Buddhist, your insistence on focusing on external "solutions" (which in my sincere opinion will make things worse) is misguided. In any event, the market is waking up the fact that destroying its own resource base is bad for the market itself. You will see a shift in global capitalism in the next 50 years away from extractive investment towards renewable and reuse investment. This will happen.

The problem is not markets, nor capital, nor capitalists, communists, socialist, anarchists, fascists, racists, and so on. The problem that we humans are immature, and we need, as a species to grow up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

From what I've seen of Deep Ecology, it seems to involve not actually doing very much... just let nature take its course.

Malcolm wrote:

You haven't understood deep ecology.



tellyontellyon said:

Well, yes, if we just let things drift we can certainly trust that nature will solve all our problems.... mass depopulation resulting from starvation and various other environmental disasters .... did I say disaster...?!

Nay, this is homeostatic Gaia rebalancing the biosphere, cleansing it of those pesky humans.... well, apart from Namdrol and his cabbage patch.... lucky him.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a deep ecological view.

tellyontellyon said:

Population down to ... what was it? 100 million down from 7.1 billion. That's what Naess suggested.

Malcolm wrote:

He suggested this was an ideal number for maintaining human cultural diversity.

tellyontellyon said:

But it sounds just a little brutal to me. I would also question whether this strategy would be 'realistic', 'cause untold suffering' and 'not be stable'.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an idealistic desiderata. It would involve people voluntarily choosing not to have children, over some number of centuries. No one is going to adopt such policies since we as a species do not have the collective maturity to enact such policies, and we understand that in deep ecology.

tellyontellyon said:

7 Billion dead. ... Is that really a more Buddhist solution than nationalising the big corporations, utilities and banks?

Malcolm wrote:

No one in deep ecology ever suggested a mass killing of humans was desirable. That would be the Deep Green Resistance people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

It is they who have the most brutal record of violence imaginable, stopping at nothing to overturn democratic elections if they threaten the rule of capital.

Malcolm wrote:

If you can't beat 'em, join 'em.

tellyontellyon said:  
a workers' democracy.

Malcolm wrote:  
Which as we have seen is just a total concentration camp.

wiki  
tellyontellyon said:  
Hayek's views on Pinochet's Chile.

Malcolm wrote:  
You cited this already.

tellyontellyon said:  
A genuine socialist govt. would not be dictatorial, it would extend and deepen democracy enormously.

Malcolm wrote:  
I don't believe this for a second, "meet the new boss, same as the old boss."

tellyontellyon said:  
This would be more far reaching than the parliamentary democracies of capitalism where we simply get to vote every few years for MPs who do whatever they please once elected. Instead, everybody would take part in deciding how society and the economy would run. Nationally, regionally and locally at every level, elected representatives would be accountable and subject to instant recall. So if the people who elected them didn't like what their representative did, they could make them stand for election again and, if wished, replace them. Elected representatives would receive only the average wage, keeping them in touch with ordinary people.

Malcolm wrote:  
A recipe for political and economic chaos. Direct democracy does not scale.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 6:08 AM  
Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
All that proves is that none of the three are suited to lead a society since they're all just armed thugs, devoted more to violence than peace.

Sherab Dorje said:  
Yes, well, that's easy to say from the comfort of your New England home. You might have a slightly different opinion if you were living in inner city Athens, especially if you

were a Pakistani immigrant (for example).

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, Greg, I just can't condone this kind of random street violence. It is a symptom of a government that is weak.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I can see how lower yanas can have this discussion, but for the Dzoghchen POV, the only thing that is meaningless (or at least a waste of time) is complaining about the appearances of the basis.

kirtu said:

"Complaining" about appearances is quite common because people aren't stable in the view.

Even in the view people react to appearances.

But of course most people, even most Dharma people, accept the appearances as actually real.

Kirt

gad rgyangs said:

sentient beings complaining about appearances, forgetting that both they and the appearances are appearances of the basis, is also an appearance of the basis, so its all good.

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds like brahman to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

kirtu said:

But imho the complete meaninglessness of samsara is very difficult for even Dharma people to accept.

Malcolm wrote:

They are like the liberal Marxists Mao was talking about in Zhen Li's citation. They give

lip service to Buddhadharma, but they still imagine there is worldly happiness and meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I'm less interested in minor spirits and so on, and more interested in higher gods and the stories around them. Aside from invoking the names of those gods friendly to the Buddhadharma (like Indra), I don't really do much else.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhūtas, in reality, are a product of affliction that manifest as external spirits. They are formless, and according to Tibetan Medicine as well as the chöd tradition, are a product of imputation. So they exist, but they exist primarily as imputations.

Lhasa said:

Malcolm, would you explain the 'product of imputation' a bit more? Also, bhutas would be a great thread all its own, especially how to deal with them.

I have heard that when someone suffers trauma/abuse, that they leak life-force and this attracts lower spirits who feed off it. Is this somewhat the same thing as bhutas?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. The primary cause of bhūtagraha is karma, engaging in non-virtuous deeds in this life or past lives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

tobes said:

1. Never; the activity of consciousness cannot be separated from its content.
2. Both are rupa; they are part of embodiment, but I don't see the relevance of asserting them to be either internal or external.

:

Malcolm wrote:

No, consciousness is nāma; but I agree with you that nāma is embodied (rūpaka).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Here in Greece Anarchists and Communists (especially the Stalinists of the Communist Party of Greece) spend as much time beating each other up as they do beating up the neo-Nazis of Golden Dawn.

Malcolm wrote:

All that proves is that none of the three are suited to lead a society since they're all just armed thugs, devoted more to violence than peace.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I'm less interested in minor spirits and so on, and more interested in higher gods and the stories around them. Aside from invoking the names of those gods friendly to the Buddhadharma (like Indra), I don't really do much else.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhūtas, in reality, are a product of affliction that manifest as external spirits. They are formless, and according to Tibetan Medicine as well as the chöd tradition, are a product of imputation. So they exist, but they exist primarily as imputations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

rigpa is ontological not epistemic: its not about some state of consciousness before dualism vision, it is about the basis/abgrund of all possible appearances, including our consciousness in whatever state its in or could ever be in.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I just don't agree with you and think you are just falling in the Hindu brahman trap.

gad rgyangs said:

I'm talking about the perception of the relationship between nothing and something. The question of what jargon to use when talking around it is secondary, although not

without historical interest.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa is just knowing, the noetic quality of a mind. That is all it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

in the yeshe sangthal you dissolve all appearances into the "vast dimension of emptiness", out of which "instant presence" arises. This is cosmological as well as personal, since the two scales are nondual.

Malcolm wrote:

The way that great transference body arises:  
when all appearances have gradually been exhausted,  
when one focuses one's awareness on the appearances strewn about  
on the luminous maṇḍala of the five fingers of one's hand,  
the environment and inhabitants of the universe  
returning from that appearance are perceived as like moon in the water.  
One's body is just a reflection,  
self-apparent as the illusory body of wisdom;  
one obtains a vajra-like body.  
One sees one's body as transparent inside and out.  
The impure eyes of others cannot see one's body as transparent,  
but only the body as it was before...

Shabkar, Key to One Hundred Doors of Samadhi

Outer appearances do not disappear even when great transference body is attained.  
What disappears are the inner visions, that is what is exhausted, not the outer universe  
with its planets, stars, galaxies, mountains, oceans, cliffs, houses, people and sentient  
beings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Sherlock said:

Isn't the difference between transpersonal and personal also a form of dualism?

Malcolm wrote:

The distinction is crucial. If this distinction is not made, Dzogchen sounds like Vedanta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 6:36 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

rigpa is ontological not epistemic: its not about some state of consciousness before dualism vision, it is about the basis/abgrund of all possible appearances, including our consciousness in whatever state its in or could ever be in.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I just don't agree with you and think you are just falling in the Hindu brahman trap.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It's your own rigpa, not a transpersonal rigpa, being a function of your own mind. That mind is empty.

gad rgyangs said:

when all appearances cease, what are you left with?

Malcolm wrote:

they never cease....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because these things are regarded as afflictive, whereas Dzogchen is trying to describe the person in his or her originally nonafflictive condition. It really is just that simple. The so called general basis is a universal derived from the particulars of persons. That is why it is often mistaken for a transpersonal entity. But Dzogchen, especially man ngag sde is very grounded in Buddhist Logic, and one should know that by definition universals are considered to be abstractions and non-existents in Buddhism, and Dzogchen is no exception.

gad rgyangs said:

there is no question of the basis being an entity, thats not the point. Rigpa is precisely what it says in the yeshe sangthal: instant presence experienced against/within the "backdrop" (metaphor) of a "vast dimension of emptiness" (metaphor).

Malcolm wrote:

It's your own rigpa, not a transpersonal rigpa, being a function of your own mind. That mind is empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer to put my faith in the guy whose father started the whole Nyingthig thing. And what is says is verified in many Dzogchen tantras, both from the bodhicitta texts as well as others.

The basis is not a backdrop. Everything is not separate from the basis. But that everything just means your own skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas. There is no basis outside your mind, just as there is no Buddhahood outside of your mind.

gad rgyangs said:

then why speak of a basis at all? just speak of skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas, and be done with it.

Malcolm wrote:

Because these things are regarded as afflictive, whereas Dzogchen is trying to describe the person in his or her originally nonafflictive condition. It really is just that simple. The so called general basis is a universal derived from the particulars of persons. That is why it is often mistaken for a transpersonal entity. But Dzogchen, especially man ngag sde is very grounded in Buddhist Logic, and one should know that by definition universals are considered to be abstractions and non-existents in Buddhism, and Dzogchen is no exception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Consciousness is always a phenomenon.



Malcolm wrote:

So is the basis. They are both dharmas.

Or as the Great Garuda has it when refuting Madhyamaka:

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

An 12th century commentary on this text states (but not this passage):

Amazing bodhicitta (the identity of everything that becomes the basis of pursuing the meaning that cannot be seen nor realized elsewhere than one's vidyā) is wholly the wisdom of the mind distinct as the nine consciousnesses that lack a nature.

In the end, Dzogchen is really just another Buddhist meditative phenomenology of the mind and person and that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

whats an "unfabricated mind" anyway? awareness without the prapanca?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I believe so. So basically, all that fancy Dzogchen lingo about the basis and so on is really just talking about a mind stream that is proposed to have a primordial start point which is completely free of proliferation.

We can trust Nyibum about this because his father invented/revealed the Nyinthig tradition and he himself was a great scholar who studied widely.

gad rgyangs said:

I dunno Malcolm, the basis is more like the backdrop against which any appearances appear, including any consciousness. Also, what sense would it make to say "rigpa is one's knowledge of the basis" if that basis was one's own continuum? the basis is pure no-thing as abgrund of all phenomena. Consciousness is always a phenomenon.

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer to put my faith in the guy whose father started the whole Nyinthig thing. And what he says is verified in many Dzogchen tantras, both from the bodhicitta texts as well as others.

The basis is not a backdrop. Everything is not separate from the basis. But that everything just means your own skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas. There is no basis

outside your mind, just as there is no Buddhahood outside of your mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I accept the existence of bhūtas. Most seriously mentally ill people are afflicted with them. It is very easy to see.

dzogchungpa said:

May I ask how you see that someone is afflicted with bhutas? I don't doubt that you can, I would just like to know.

Malcolm wrote:

Through their behavior. If you see some dude at a yoga conference or a bhajan who seems "off", wearing white, obsessed with purity, fond of spouting off words in Sanskrit, etc., you can be sure he is suffering from devabhūtagraha i.e. demonic possession by a deva. There are also ṛṣibhūtagrahas, gurubhūtagraha, siddhabhutāgraha, pretabhūtagraha, and so on, each with their own unique behavior.

I am doing a one day workshop on bhūtas in Mexico City in March.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

This I don't.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you do. We have shown that the standard accounts of cause and effect, that they are temporally distinct, or that they are identical or different, are incoherent, from a Madhyamaka point of view. But since effects do appear to arise from causes, given that all of the above is true, this leaves only one option, that causes and their effects are neither the same nor are they different, for example, butter and milk, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So basically, all that fancy Dzogchen lingo about the basis and so on is really just talking about a mind stream that is proposed to have a primordial start point which is

completely free of proliferation.

dzogchungpa said:

Can you say a little more about what you mean by a primordial start point?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't really mean anything. The continuum of a mind has no beginning. What is being proposed in (some) Dzogchen texts is that at some idealized point in the most distant past beyond our imagination there was a time when our mind was in a state of non-fabrication. At that time this non-fabricated mind, aka the basis, was not aware of itself or anything else but contains within it all the qualities of buddhahood. Then somehow, and it is never really explained how, our own mind's cognitive potentiality [rtsal] stirs and rises up [phags] out of itself giving rise to neutral awareness that either becomes prajñā or ignorance depending on whether it recognizes its own potentiality or not. This kicks off the division between samsara and nirvana. It is completely personal and is not transpersonal at all. But unfortunately, because Dzogchen texts are not very clear about this, the account of the basis tends to be interpreted transpersonally, most likely due to the proliferation of Advaita.

It is my deeply held conviction that this transpersonal account which is favored by many people is a total misunderstanding based on reading these texts in Tibetan for the past 20 years and receiving detailed teachings on them from a variety of very qualified masters .

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Each moment in the continuum of a knowing clarity is neither the same as nor different than the previous moment.

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, this doesn't make any sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty straight forward Madhyamaka. If a cause exists at the same time as the effect, the effect is a non-effect, like a seed and its sprout existing at the same time. On the other hand if causes and effects are temporally separate, i.e. of the cause exists at a different time than the effect, the cause will amount to a non-cause and the effect, a non-effect. If the cause is the same as the effect, the cause will be a non-cause and the effect will be a non-effect. If they are different, then also cause will be a non-cause and the effect will be a non-effect.

Therefore, what Candrakirti proposes, following Nāgārjuna, is that causes and effects are neither the same nor are they different, and that they are not simultaneous nor are they temporally distinct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry but the term ālaya in Dzogchen and term as it is used, for example in Sakya, are completely different.

The term basis in Dzogchen (sthāna) and the term ālaya in Lamdre for example, have precisely the same meaning, i.e. one's unfabricated mind (rang sems ma bcos pa).

gad rgyangs said:

whats an "unfabricated mind" anyway? awareness without the prapanca?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I believe so. So basically, all that fancy Dzogchen lingo about the basis and so on is really just talking about a mind stream that is proposed to have a primordial start point which is completely free of proliferation.

We can trust Nyibum about this because his father invented/revealed the Nyinthig tradition and he himself was a great scholar who studied widely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nyibum\* states:

As such, because the basis, one's unfabricated mind, arose as the essence of reality as a single nature, there is no need to search elsewhere for the place etc., i.e. it is called self-originated wisdom.

The basis is nothing more nor nothing less this.

\*the son of Zhan stong Chobar, the tertön of the Vima Nyinthig

gad rgyangs said:

I'm glad you took out the part where you said the basis is nothing but alaya!

as to the quote, the basis does not "arise", it is the basis of arising. I'm also not sure I like equating one's mind, unfabricated or not, with the basis: one's mind is clearly an appearance, not the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry but the term ālaya in Dzogchen and term as it is used, for example in Sakya, are completely different.

The term basis in Dzogchen (sthāna) and the term ālaya in Lamdre for example, have precisely the same meaning, i.e. one's unfabricated mind (rang sems ma bcos pa).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Or maybe the question would be better phrased as do you believe in the existence of intelligent non-corporeal beings?

This is a question that maybe divides a lot of Buddhists nowadays. Say you think pretas exist in the wrong company and you'll possibly be mocked for it. On the other hand, there's always been such beings within Buddhist cosmology, and they were not seen as symbolic or metaphorical. They were subjectively real in their own right.

There's actually an interesting book on the subject of monsters by John Michael Greer entitled *Monsters: An Investigator's Guide to Magical Beings*. He points out that statistically over a quarter or so of people report having had contact with some kind of disembodied intelligence at some point, which constitutes evidence suggestive of the phenomenon. You can read the introduction in the preview on Google Books.

Malcolm wrote:

As a Doctor of Tibetan Medicine I would have to say yes, I accept the existence of bhūtas. Most seriously mentally ill people are afflicted with them. It is very easy to see.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Space is a repository for all things, one does not have to reify space to understand that.

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is not space.

Malcolm wrote:

Nyibum\* states:

As such, because the basis, one's unfabricated mind, arose as the essence of reality of a single nature, there is no need to search elsewhere for the place etc., i.e. it is called self-originated wisdom.

The basis is nothing more nor nothing less this.

\*the son of Zhang stong Chobar, the tertön of the Vima Nyinthig

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The basis does not have a cause, just like space does not have a cause. But it is a repository for the build up of traces nevertheless.

gad rgyangs said:

it could only be a repository if it was reified.

The whole process is clearly personal and individual, not transpersonal.

the basis is said to have/be "rang byung ye shes", and is equated with rigpa in many texts. are these not cognitive terms?

Malcolm wrote:

Space is a repository for all things, one does not have to reify space to understand that.

"Rang byung ye shes" means "wisdom that arises from oneself". This point is very clearly explained in many places.

In any event, we can consider that the Vima Nyinthig commentary attributed to Garab Dorje authoritative:

"From now on, the stirred pit of samsara will no appear as the six kinds of living beings. for twenty thousand eons, sentient beings, having severed the stream of samsara, will not appear with a bodily form. After that, from the arising of the subtle latent defilements of different actions, it will be equivalent with the production of the previous samsara and nirvana"

Thus we find out that all this business about the basis and so on is really just a way to talk about what happens in the so called dark eons, when everything below the third and fourth rūpadhātu are held to disappear, even though the origin of the basis is often

couched in terms to place in an unimaginable primeval beginning.

It's a Buddhist way to try to talk about origins without talking about origins. "I can't find where it started so I am going to call it 'self-originated'." But if someone thinks it is pointing to some transcendental uber consciousness, well, if that is what someone thinks, I think someone doesn't really understand Dzogchen at all. If someone thinks the basis is consciousness, or some cognitive or noetic principle, they have understood nothing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

gaden rgyangs said:

how could the basis be subject to karma and afflictions?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis does not have a cause, just like space does not have a cause. But it is a repository for the build up of traces nevertheless.

The way samsara arose at first is, when the trio of *vāyu*, *vidyā* and space arose from the undifferentiated basis, since *vidyā* was unstable because of isolation, and engaged in self-delusion, panicked at sound, frightened of the light, and fainted at the light and was covered by ignorance. After it engages in self-delusion, the duality of outer objects and inner mind arises. The mere thought of self arising from other, and other arising from self, disturbed the *karmavāyus*. Mind is built up by the *vāyu*, the analytical mind analyzes objects. The self-deluded awareness demarcated sensation and since it did not recognize its own appearances, apparent objects were apprehended as a duality. Since that accumulated traces of karma, a physical body was appropriated and the suffering of delusion is uninterrupted. For example, sentient beings formed out of ignorance are like being stuck pitch dark.

The Clear Lamp from the Ka dag rang shar

The whole process is clearly personal and individual, not transpersonal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 15th, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a universal undifferentiated ultimate awareness in Buddhadharma.

mutsuk said:

In other words, following Khenpo Jikphun (transcript from JLA) :

« — You have the Base (gzhi) of the natural state. That state has a knowledge (rig pa) which, owing to the dynamism of the state (which is not static), flashes out of the Base.

Malcolm wrote:

This occurs because of latent traces of karma and affliction left over from the previous eon, according to a commentary attributed to Garab Dorje on the Single Son of All the Buddhas Tantras.

So this neutral awareness that rises out of the basis upon the stirring of vāyu in the basis actually has a cause.

Amazing!

Mere clear vidyā, this mere intermediate realization,

it is not a buddha, is not a sentient beings,

neutral, dependent on both conditions.

For example, it is like a stainless crystal ball,

which can produce fire or water through the condition of the sun or the moon.

Likewise, vidyā, the essence of the mind,

arises as the suffering of samsara or the bliss of nirvana through conditions.

The Three Kāyas Tantra from the Ka dag rang shar

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Astus said:

An awareness without anything to be aware of is like seeing without anything to see.

PadmaVonSamba said:

I am not referring to cognition, rather, the causes of that cognition.

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

Cognitions arise based on previous cognitions. That's all.



If you suggest anything other than this, you wind up in Hindu La la land.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

The name Communist has come to be equated with the Bonapartist degenerated workers state of the USSR et. al.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Degenerated\\_workers%27\\_state](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Degenerated_workers%27_state)

Also

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1939/05/bonapartism.htm>

So I prefer Socialist or Marxist.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, you're a communist. As far as those of us who are not communists are concerned, it is all of a stripe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even the omniscience of a Buddha arises from a cause.

PadmaVonSamba said:

isn't this cause, too, an object of awareness?

Isn't there awareness of this cause?

If awareness of this cause is awareness itself,

then isn't this awareness of awareness?

What causes awareness of awareness, if not awareness?

If awareness is the cause of awareness, isn't it its own cause?

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

Omniscience is the content of a mind freed of afflictions. Even the continuum of a Buddha has a relative ground, i.e. a the rosary or string of moments of clarity is beginningless.

Origination from self is axiomatically negated in Buddhadharma,

Each moment in the continuum of a knowing clarity is neither the same as nor different than the previous moment. Hence the cause of a given instant of a knowing clarity cannot be construed to be itself nor can it be construed to be other than itself. This is the only version of causation which, in the final analysis, Buddhadharma can admit to on a relative level. It is the logical consequence of the Buddha's insight, "When this exists, that exists, with the arising of that, this arose."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Malcolm, I just don't feel convinced by your point of view. So I will stick with my own precarious holding together of both Marxism and Buddhism.

I said a long time back that I know it was not possible to completely reconcile both philosophies. However, I just can't reconcile being a decent human being with the complete renunciation of either. So there we have it: Paradox.

I'll just do the best I can.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, the Green Party is the only party which is reconcilable with Buddhist ethics. That or a Buddhist monarchy. Take your pick.

Anyway, I have no interest in convincing you of anything. You will convince yourself over time as the cognitive dissonance between being a Buddhist and a communist (not to mention the dissonance between social justice and communism) eventually becomes too much to bear.

Anyway, as Naess says, of the three great movements, the peace movement, the social justice movement and the deep ecology movement, one can pick only one to be active in, and I have chosen mine: deep ecology.

It seems you have picked social justice. More power to you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

if you are saying that Dharmakaya is a composite,

produced by other causes.

Malcolm wrote:

No, but as I just said, even uncompounded phenomena — of which Mahāyāna Buddhism recognizes only four: space, the two cessations and emptiness — are not truly existent.

PadmaVonSamba said:

I am talking about even the awareness of these four things.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand. All awarenesses are conditioned. There is no such thing as a universal undifferentiated ultimate awareness in Buddhadharma. Even the omniscience of a Buddha arises from a cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Simon

I'm interested in Buddhism certainly. But not in a Buddhism that becomes so abstract and schizoid that it doesn't open it's eyes to the suffering of ordinary people in the world. When my car is broken, I get out a spanner; meditation and mindfulness is certainly in order... but also the spanner.

Viewing human problems as ultimately non-existent is fair enough if you live in a monastery, but there are two truths. We have to consider conventional reality too. We can't just lop it off and pretend to ourselves that we have achieved a non-dual state of awareness simply by closing our eyes. If I was a fully realised Buddha I could perhaps transcend all these worldly mumblings... But... BUT... I am not, and I don't think a person becomes fully realised simply by blocking out the problems of the world. We need compassion as well as wisdom. Action as well as mindfulness.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't need to block out the problems of the world. You simply need to realize, as a Buddhist, that they can only be solved through the practice of Dharma.

And as I have taken great pains to show, If you are a Buddhist, your political affiliation should be consistent with Buddhist values. As far as I can see, the only political party that even comes close to meeting that criteria is the Green Party movement. I have some reservations about the "new left" rhetoric of the US Green Party for example, but nevertheless I cannot associate myself with the Republicans or the Democrats.

In your neck of the woods:  
<http://greenparty.org.uk/policies.html>

All sorts of room in the green party for petty bourgeoisie people like myself, to stalwart communist heros like yourself, and anarchist windups like Greg.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 8:57 PM  
Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism  
Content:  
tellyontellyon said:  
So National Socialism is really "Ethnic" Socialism or "Racial" Socialism  
It's not socialism at all!

Here is the article, "What is Natonal Socialism", written in 1933:  
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/germany/1933/330610.htm>

Malcolm wrote:  
It is just another form of socialism. Not all socialism is Marxist socialism.

The point the archdruid is making was that the social democracies in Western Europe have more or less adopted all the economic policies that were installed during the Weimar Republic and during the Third Reich. Why? As he said, to attempt to stave off worker rebellions.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 6:48 PM  
Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless  
Content:  
smcj said:  
There is not 100% agreement on that.

Malcolm wrote:  
People who think dharmakāya is truly existent are simply wrong, and suffer from an eternalist bias.

In reality the three kāyas are also conventions.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 6:45 PM  
Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism  
Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So it seems to me that our friend the "archdruid" apart from being misinformed (and misinforming) may actually either be a crypto-sympathiser of Nazism or just plain anti-leftist.

Malcolm wrote:

He is merely saying that policies of Nazi Germany were adopted by the called western European Social Democracies in order to forestall the arising of another Nazi Party along racial lines.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: Ordination debate - vinaya/bodhisattva/upasaka

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quite frankly, the merit of giving dana to a so called ordained person who does not maintain his or her vows as perfectly as possible is no more than the merit of giving dana to an ordinary person dressed in maroon or yellow.

daverupa said:

The Blessed One has actually specified that there is a distinction with respect to whether the offering is pure or not on the side of the giver & the receiver, rendering four scenarios.

In either case - an ordinary person dressed in maroon or yellow, or a monastic with ill-maintained vows -

MN 142 said:

Here the donor is virtuous with good thoughts, the receiver is not virtuous with evil thoughts. Thus the offering is pure, on the side of the donor and not the receiver.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless the offering is not tendered to a pure object, and therefore, there is not as much merit. From the same sutta:

of an offering made to an animal the results expected are by hundreds. Of an offering made to an ordinary not virtuous person the results expected are by thousands. Of an offering made to an ordinary virtuous person the results expected are by hundred - thousands Of an offering made to a not greedy one, turned away from sensuality the results expected are by hundred thousand millions. Of an offering made to a person fallen to the method of realizing the state of entry into the stream of the Teaching, the results expected are innumerable and unlimited. What would be the results for offering a gift to a stream entrant of the Teaching? Or one fallen to the method of realizing the state of not returning? Or one who would not return? Or one fallen to the method of

realizing worthiness? Or a worthy disciple of the Thus Gone One? Or the silent enlightened One? Or the worthy, rightfully enlightened Thus Gone One?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

An excerpt of an interesting post:

The working classes had their choice of several political movements. There were syndicalist parties, which sought to give workers direct ownership of the firms for which they worked; depending on local taste, that might involve anything from stock ownership programs for employees to cooperatives and other worker-owned enterprises. Syndicalism was also called corporatism; “corporation” and its cognates in most European languages could refer to any organization with a government charter, including craft guilds and cooperatives. It was in that sense that Mussolini’s regime, which borrowed some syndicalist elements for its eclectic ideology, liked to refer to itself as a corporatist system. (Those radicals who insist that this meant fascism was a tool of big corporations in the modern sense are thus hopelessly misinformed—a point I’ll cover in much more detail next week.)

There were also socialist parties, which generally sought to place firms under government control; this might amount to anything from government regulation, through stock purchases giving the state a controlling interest in big firms, to outright expropriation and bureaucratic management. Standing apart from the socialist parties were communist parties, which (after 1919) spouted whatever Moscow’s party line happened to be that week; and there were a variety of other, smaller movements—distributism, social credit, and many more—all of which had their own followings and their own proposed answers to the political and economic problems of the day.

The tendency of most of these parties to further the interests of a single class became a matter of concern by the end of the 19th century, and one result was the emergence of parties that pursued, or claimed to pursue, policies of benefit to the entire nation. Many of them tacked the adjective “national” onto their moniker to indicate this shift in orientation. Thus national conservative parties argued that trade barriers and economic policies focused on the agricultural sector would benefit everyone; national liberal parties argued that free trade and colonial expansion was the best option for everyone; national syndicalist parties argued that giving workers a stake in the firms for which they worked would benefit everyone, and so on. There were no national communist parties, because Moscow’s party line didn’t allow it, but there were national bolshevist parties—in Europe between the wars, a bolshevist was someone who supported the Russian Revolution but insisted that Lenin and Stalin had betrayed it in order to impose a personal dictatorship—which argued that violent revolution against the existing order really was in everyone’s best interests.

National socialism was another position along the same lines. National socialist parties argued that business firms should be made subject to government regulation and coordination in order to keep them from acting against the interests of society as a whole, and that the working classes ought to receive a range of government benefits paid for by taxes on corporate income and the well-to-do. Those points were central to the program of the National Socialist German Workers Party from the time it got that name—it was founded as the German Workers Party, and got the rest of the moniker at the urging of a little man with a Charlie Chaplin mustache who became the party's leader not long after its founding—and those were the policies that the same party enacted when it took power in Germany in 1933.

If those policies sound familiar, dear reader, they should. That's the other reason why next to nobody outside of specialist historical works mentions national socialism by name: the Western nations that defeated national socialism in Germany promptly adopted its core economic policies, the main source of its mass appeal, to forestall any attempt to revive it in the postwar world. Strictly speaking, in terms of the meaning that the phrase had before the beginning of the Second World War, national socialism is one of the two standard political flavors of political economy nowadays. The other is liberalism, and it's another irony of history that in the United States, the party that hates the word "liberal" is a picture-perfect example of a liberal party, as that term was understood back in the day.

Now of course when people think of the National Socialist German Workers Party nowadays, they don't think of government regulation of industry and free vacations for factory workers, even though those were significant factors in German public life after 1933. They think of such other habits of Hitler's regime as declaring war on most of the world, slaughtering political opponents en masse, and exterminating whole ethnic groups. Those are realities, and they need to be recalled. It's crucial, though, to remember that when Germany's National Socialists were out there canvassing for votes in the years before 1933, they weren't marching proudly behind banners saying VOTE FOR HITLER SO FIFTY MILLION WILL DIE! When those same National Socialists trotted out their antisemitic rhetoric, for that matter, they weren't saying anything the average German found offensive or even unusual; to borrow a highly useful German word, antisemitism in those days was *salonfähig*, "the kind of thing you can bring into the living room." (To be fair, it was just as socially acceptable in England, the United States, and the rest of the western world at that same time.)

<https://thearchdruidreport.blogspot.com/2014/02/fascism-and-future-part-one-up-from.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 8:54 AM

Title: Re: The 969 Movement in Myanmar (Burma)

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The three vehicles will thrive and survive if Buddhists act like Buddhists regardless of

whether if Islam is annihilated or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

if you are saying that Dharmakaya is a composite,  
produced by other causes.

Malcolm wrote:

No, but as a I just said, even uncompounded phenomena — of which Mahāyāna Buddhism recognizes only four: space, the two cessations and emptiness — are not truly existent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

I suggest it is "truly existent" meaning I used that phrase) for the reasons I have stated,  
the way that space is truly existent.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Space is also not "truly existent". Nirvana is not truly existent.

Read the Heart Sutra again, in case you forgot.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 8:28 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Since this basic awareness cannot be found to have a cause other than itself, and since it has no defining characteristics of its own, and since it cannot be denied, or separated into any kind of 'non-awareness' parts, I would suggest that it is truly existent, non-specific, non-self, synonymous with the meaning of Dharmakaya and the essence of realization.



Malcolm wrote:

As I said before, you have a monistic hindu nondual view. Not even dharmakāya is "truly existent".

PadmaVonSamba said:

Refute awareness.

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

You already did by claiming it truly existed. There is no such thing as "truly existent". I am not refuting awareness, I am refuting your claim that awareness truly exists. Individual awarenesses exist, just not "truly", they have no original cause because they are all conditioned entities. No conditioned series has an origin. Such is the logic of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"The Base, or Zhi in Tibetan, is the term used to denote the fundamental ground of existence, both at the universal level and at the level of the individual"

-ChNNR, "The Crystal and the Way of Light" pg 89

and besides, one of the meaning of sthāna is simply "place"

Malcolm wrote:

But it does not mean "ground".

You do realize that whole book was based on an edited transcript of a translation from Italian into English influenced by John Reynolds who was very active in the community then, correct? As you know quite well, these days, when referring the gzhi, ChNN uses the term "base" or "primordial state".

Personally, I don't care. But as far as I am concerned translating gzhi as ground is less accurate. That is my professional opinion.

gad rgyangs said:

fair enough, point taken.

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, are you going to HHST Kalacakra in April? If so, maybe I will see you there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Ordination debate - vinaya/bodhisattva/upasaka

Content:

rory said:

Why on earth do you feel the need to patrol the behavior of monks and nuns?

Malcolm wrote:

Much of the Vinaya was written because of lay people complaining about the behavior of monks and nuns.

Quite frankly, the merit of giving dana to a so called ordained person who does not maintain his or her vows as perfectly as possible is no more than the merit of giving dana to an ordinary person dressed in maroon or yellow.

Ordained people are supposed to function as pure fields of merit for lay people. They do so by maintaining their vows, all of them, as many as they have, whether they be pratimokṣa, bodhisattva samvara, or Vajrayāna samaya. That is their job. When they don't do their job, they are thieves of merit.

Of course, people are free to do as they wish, to maintain their vows or break them at their leisure. But there are consequences, and one such consequence is that I won't support ordained people unless I am quite sure they are doing their job. Not because I need the merit personally, but based on principle.

rory said:

the Jain monastics (sadhus and sadhvis) manage just fine with these few rules.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not Jains, we're Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Since this basic awareness cannot be found to have a cause other than itself, and since it has no defining characteristics of its own, and since it cannot be denied, or separated into any kind of 'non-awareness' parts, I would suggest that it is truly existent, non-specific, non-self, synonymous with the meaning of Dharmakaya and the essence of realization.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said before, you have a monistic hindu nondual view. Not even dharmakāya is "truly existent".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"The Base, or Zhi in Tibetan, is the term used to denote the fundamental ground of existence, both at the universal level and at the level of the individual"

-ChNNR, "The Crystal and the Way of Light" pg 89

and besides, one of the meaning of sthāna is simply "place"

Malcolm wrote:

But it does not mean "ground".

You do realize that whole book was based on an edited transcript of a translation from Italian into English influenced by John Reynolds who was very active in the community then, correct? As you know quite well, these days, when referring the gzhi, ChNN uses the term "base" or "primordial state".

Personally, I don't care. But as far as I am concerned translating gzhi as ground is less accurate. That is my professional opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The term gzhi translates "sthana", which bears no meaning of "ground" at all.

gad rgyangs said:

first of all, its not a translation from Sanskrit, its written in Tibetan.

second of all, the tshig mdzod chen mo gives, as the definition of "gzhi," first:

ས་ཆ་དང་གནས་ལུས། (ground)

and second:

རྩ་བ (root or basis)

which is why it is translated as either in various Dzogchen translations.

Malcolm wrote:

I'll take your Alak Kankar and raise you a Khyentse. Khyentse Wangpo clearly defines gzhi as sthana.

gzhi does not mean མ་ཆ་དང་གནས་ཡུལ in a Dzogchen context.

All Tibetan Vajrayāna traditions, apart from Bon, assume an Indian source for their terminology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I know that, but "ye" can also by extension mean "perfectly", since that which has always been liberated is perfectly liberated, and I felt it makes more sense to leave time out of it, since at that level there is no time.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact the verse is showing a contrast, that is why "bliss, having always been liberated," etc.

gad rgyangs said:

Anyway, its poetry theres always more than one way to translate it.

Malcolm wrote:

It's didactic verse, it is not poetry in any sense whatsoever.

gad rgyangs said:

I also like "vault" for "phyam" since it plays on the image of roof supports. I see no difference between my "expansive evenness of the Ground" and your "vast uniform basis".

Malcolm wrote:

The term gzhi translates "sthana", which bears no meaning of "ground" at all. Phyam here just mean ubiquitous, in my opinion.

gad rgyangs said:

that is clearly not the case. the whole passage lists many phenomena that are "ye grol" and there is clearly no cause and effect implied between them.

Malcolm wrote:

When bliss and suffering are contrasted, there is a link. Anyway, you are free to disagree, but when I read those lines I have a very different take on them that do you.

I guess my point is "So what?" My rejoinder to that is "What is the use of primordial Buddhahood if even your coarse obscurations have not been reduced." Some people seem to think that obscurations are not a problem once you become a Dzogchen practitioner. The more realistic Dzogchen perspective is found in The String of Pearls

As such, the three realms are  
the five aggregates, the five sense organs,  
the five limbs, the five functional organs,  
the five objects, the five afflictions,  
the five thoughts, the five minds, the five concepts,  
the apprehended objects and apprehending subjects established as samsara [... ]  
Caught in the aggregates, sense gates and the sense elements,  
the apprehended object and apprehending subject,  
samsara itself persists for a long while.  
One is placed in the dungeon of name and matter  
in the castle of the three realms,  
tortured with the barbs of ignorance and so on,  
oppressed by the thick darkness of samsara,  
attached to the salty taste of desire,  
bound by the neck with the noose of confusion,  
burned with the hot fire of hatred,  
head covered with pride,  
setting a rendezvous with the mistress of jealousy,  
surrounded by the army of enmity...  
tied by the neck with the noose of subject and object, [29b]  
stuck in the mud of successive traces  
and handcuffed with the ripening of karma.  
Having been joined with the ripening of karma,  
one takes bodies good and bad,  
one after another like a water wheel,  
born into each individual class.  
Having crossed at the ford of self-grasping,  
one sinks into the ocean of suffering  
and one is caught by the heart on the hook of the three lower realms.  
One is bound by oneself; the afflictions are the enemy.  
The body of a hell being appears as fire or water.  
Pretas are frightened and intimidated.  
There is a fog-like appearance for animals.  
The aggregates, sense gates and sense elements  
of humans appear as the five elements,  
and also happiness, suffering and indifference.  
They appear as armor and weapons to asuras  
and desirable qualities for devas.  
Such dualistic appearances,

for example, are like a quickly moving wheel  
spinning continuously for a long while.  
As such, diverse appearances  
are like seeing a snake from a rope;  
that [rope] is not [a snake] but is apprehended as a [snake];  
forming as both the outer universe and inhabitants.  
If that is investigated, it is a rope.  
The universe and inhabitants have always been empty,  
the ultimate endowed with the form of the relative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

བདེ་བ་ཡི་གྲོལ་ཚེས་ཉིད་ལྷན་དུ་གྲོལ།  
སྤྱུག་བསྐྱེད་ཡི་གྲོལ་གཞི་མཉམ་ཡངས་པར་གྲོལ།

happiness perfectly liberated, in the vault of dharmata liberated.  
suffering perfectly liberated, expansive evenness of the Ground liberated.

Longchenpa - chos dbyings mdzod chapter 12

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is as follows:

Bliss, having always been liberated,\* is liberated as ubiquitous dharmatā.  
Suffering, having always been liberated, is liberated as the vast uniform basis.  
\*"Ye grol" is a contraction of "ye nas grol" and shows a past tense construction, i.e.  
"having always been"

These are nice sentiments, but in truth they don't express anything different than  
standard Mahāyāna. The first line shows the result, the second, the cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Cheers. M. Will look up those people and see what they are up to.

Malcolm wrote:

Vandana Shiva

<http://www.navdanya.org>

Wendell Barry

<http://www.wendellberrybooks.com/author.html>

Bill Mckibben

<http://www.billmckibben.com>

These are probably three of the most well known active advocates of some form or another of deep ecology.

Three decades of writings on deep ecology:

<http://trumpeter.athabascau.ca/index.php/trumpet/search/search>

I imagine in the end you will be more comfortable with social ecology, since it comes out of the left and is based on class analysis and so on:

<http://www.thegreenfuse.org/socialecology.htm>

Murray Bookchin hated deep ecology, he writes:

What Is Deep Ecology?

Deep ecology is so much of a black hole of half-digested, ill-formed, and half-baked ideas that one can easily express utterly vicious notions like Foreman's and still sound like a fiery radical who challenges everything that is anti-ecological in the present realm of ideas. The very words deep ecology, in fact, clue is into the fact that we are not dealing with a body of clear ideas but with a bottomless pit in which vague notions and moods of all kinds can be such into the depths of an ideological toxic dump.

He spews more of the same here:

[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/soccovdeepeco.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/soccovdeepeco.html)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I just had a flashback to the Bergman movie "Fanny and Alexander", which portrays two households: one which embraces life and love in all its joy and sorrow, and the other, the Bishop's household, that exemplifies self- and other-loathing, coldness, "seriousness", and violence, all under the banner of "piety" and religion.

Adamantine said:

I'm sure that the film makes valid points when aimed at a Christian Bishop. Conflating traditions is the mistake of your proposed image in the OP.

gad rgyangs said:

and having a rosy picture of asian religious institutions is an orientalist fantasy.

Malcolm wrote:

And all of this is irrelevant to the Buddha's contention "sarva dukham". You don't have to agree, but it is one of the foundation teachings of the Buddhist view. You can fight it, struggle with it, but in the end "sarva dukkham", there is nothing left out of this, apart from the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, he is a Gemini after all.

heart said:

and I am libra,hmmm...

dzogchungpa said:

Yeah, you air types are always a bit wacky.

Malcolm wrote:

I have virgo rising, keeps my feet on the ground.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

... great efforts at conservation are argued not only as something good and profitable for human beings, but also as something valuable for what is intended to be conserved... Without wanting to repeat myself, can you give us some kind of idea of what these 'great efforts' actually comprise of - other than the great effort you put into your particular form of healing?

I'm really not being facetious, I just don't feel I've had a satisfactory answer to my question yet. Can you give me some practical examples of the conservation activities that Deep Ecologists are actively involved in at the moment?

Malcolm wrote:

Deep ecologists can be found in all aspects of the conservation movement. But I frankly doubt that most of the people who call themselves "deep ecologists" really understand what deep ecology really means.

Basically, Arne Naess identified three great movements of the 20th century: the peace



movement, the social justice movement and the deep ecology movement. All three of these can be included under the rubric of "green" politics. But he clarified, you can't do all three. You have to pick one.

For example, while green politics have been largely coopted by the new left in the form of Social Ecology, there are "greens" like myself who are deep ecologists. There is no badge that distinguishes a deep ecologist from any other type of environmentalist. There is no organization to join. However, Vandana Shiva is a deep ecologist, Joanna Macy, Julia Butterfly Hill, Gary Snyder, John Seed, Pierre-Félix Guattari, Fritzjof Capra, Wendell Barry (recently arrested demonstrating against coal mining in Appalachia) are all people who have some connection with the movement. But as it is not a left wing or right wing trip, it is not organized into cadres with political action committees and so on. Deep ecology is an organic movement. It is slow growing, but then, so are trees. It tends to propagate rhizomatically, like fungus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy

Content:

heart said:

He isn't really making the point that vidya needs a gradual improvement as some seems to think.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I never implied that was the point he was making.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy

Content:

Sherlock said:

So your conclusion now is that basically besides its methods Dzogchen isn't very different from other Vajrayana paths?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is quite different from other Vajrayāna paths (which are really just summed up by the two stages).

But it is a path and its context must be understood in connection with how paths are expressed in Mahāyāna and General Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

The Japanese have the most sophisticated understanding of this, called

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wabi-sabi>.

Malcolm wrote:

Wabi-sabi (侘寂?) represents a comprehensive Japanese world view or aesthetic centered on the acceptance of transience and imperfection. The aesthetic is sometimes described as one of beauty that is "imperfect, impermanent, and incomplete".[1] It is a concept derived from the Buddhist teaching of the three marks of existence (三法印 sanbōin?), specifically impermanence (無常 mujō?), the other two being suffering (苦 ku?) and emptiness or absence of self-nature (空 kū?).

gad rgyangs said:

no one is claiming there is no such thing as suffering, the point is do you reject life altogether because of dualities like happiness/suffering (again: that other thread "make life meaningless") or practice upekṣā and non-attachment to all experience?

Sometimes it seems that Buddhism is neurotically obsessed with suffering, attached to suffering. Ironic, no?

I do object though to the attempts to negate happiness by claiming that it is actually suffering. This is a dangerous form of cultivating negativity that can lead to the very kinds of hell realms in the here-and-now that Adamantine was referring to.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I simply understand that no matter how things may appear, no matter whatever samsaric happiness I experience, everything other than path dharmas are suffering. But it doesn't mean I reach for the hair shirt.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I think you are reading way too much into deep ecology in order to then justify to yourself that it is Buddhist and thus not worldly dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think that deep ecology is Buddhadharma. However I think it is ethically consistent with Buddhadharma for a number of reasons.

Sherab Dorje said:

The deep, in deep ecology, means ecocentric instead of anthropocentric.

I am not going to deny that ecocentrism is undoubtedly less dualistic than anthropocentrism. But on the basis of this rhetoric capitalism, being ego and anthropo-centric, cannot fall within the milieu of non-dualism (or more correctly, ecocentrism) and thus cannot be justified as somehow fitting into a deep ecology model. When was the last time you ran into an ecologically minded CEO of Enron (for example), the World Bank, or the IMF?

Do not confound the two (non-dual and ecocentric).

Malcolm wrote:

You are quite simple mistaken. Frederick Bender clarifies this point in his *The Culture of Extinction*:

In Buddhism, the technical term for the ontological quality of particulars, incorporating both their phenomenality and their interdependence, is "suchness" (Skt. *tathatha*). To frame objects in their suchness is, in Mahayana Buddhist terminology, to express the nondualist "two-truth" doctrine. Particulars, if framed dualistically through the prevalent subject/object (egocentric) and subject/predicate (linguistic) dualities, are real only conventionally. Something similar to the Buddhist two-truth doctrine defines ecological thinking. Living beings are phenomenal manifestations of Earth's ecosphere. They are also particulars-in-relation, though not "bare," self-standing particulars. Deep ecology's so-called depth, considered ontologically, functions as a metaphor for nondualism.

Frederic L. Bender. *The Culture of Extinction: Toward a Philosophy of Deep Ecology* (Kindle Locations 4373-4376). Kindle Edition.

Arne Naess also states:

The belief and acceptance that all whole beings can attain Buddhahood depend upon the rejection of subject-object dualism. That is, one must abandon the sentiment that there is always and always must be an ego involved in experience. An appeal to spontaneity, perhaps especially spontaneous experience in nature, is preferable to a detached view of subject-object relations.

The nondualism in Buddhism is sometimes expressed verbally by saying that all beings are one, or that each being is one with all other beings. Such a formula must not be taken in the counterintuitive sense that, for example, I cannot be cold and hungry and somebody else warm and satisfied. The formula does not imply rejection of personal pronouns or any psychology of the ego and self.

It is an interesting problem to formulate clearly the views that have rejection of subject-object dualism as a common characteristic. Whatever way we formulate the nondualism, adherents of deep ecology tend to feel sympathy with views such as the following, expressed by Yasuaki Nara:

"n Dōgen, through the negation of the egocentric self, whole being, including man, animal, mountains, rivers, grasses, trees etc., is one with him, making both nature and himself encompassed within the world of the Buddha."

Naess, Arne (2009-05-01). The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess (pp. 198-199). Counterpoint. Kindle Edition.

Sherab Dorje said:

Foremans approach does not deny humans a role in an ecosystem, it just does not make them the centre of the system. Thus it is an ecocentric platform: an approach that puts the benefit of the whole (ecosystem) above that of one of the parts (humans).

Malcolm wrote:

Naess' position is a little different. First he questions the usefulness of the term "biocentric", "ecocentric" and so on:

Supporters of the deep ecology movement like to say that they support ecocentrism, not anthropocentrism, and Spinoza certainly offers high-level premises for what has sometimes been labeled biocentric or ecocentric egalitarianism. I think these Latin or Greek terms are useless in serious discussions, but they may be helpful in offering some vague idea of a kind of basic attitude. Spinoza tried something immensely difficult, namely, to articulate with some preciseness certain basic attitudes.

He continues a bit later by saying:

It is characteristic of the deep ecology movement that great efforts at conservation are argued not only as something good and profitable for human beings, but also as something valuable for what is intended to be conserved. It is worthy of conservation, independently of any narrow human interests. This is often called the nonanthropocentric or biocentric or ecocentric view. Nevertheless, in the current social and political milieu, success in conservation efforts depends heavily on arguments that do stress narrowly human interests, especially the requirements of human health. The supporters of the deep ecology movement combine such arguments with those that are independent of narrow human interests.<sup>11</sup> It is essential that "experts" and others who influence policies agree about this combination and that the public be made aware that basically there is agreement. Otherwise, the public is deceived.

Naess, Arne (2009-05-01). The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess (p. 303). Counterpoint. Kindle Edition.

This why why "hard" ecocentrism cannot be construed even remotely as deep ecology. Anyway, Bookchin claimed that Earth First! had converted to social ecology as it turned leftwing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

The Japanese have the most sophisticated understanding of this, called

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wabi-sabi>.

Malcolm wrote:

Wabi-sabi (侘寂?) represents a comprehensive Japanese world view or aesthetic centered on the acceptance of transience and imperfection. The aesthetic is sometimes described as one of beauty that is "imperfect, impermanent, and incomplete".[1] It is a concept derived from the Buddhist teaching of the three marks of existence (三法印 sanbōin?), specifically impermanence (無常 mujō?), the other two being suffering (苦 ku?) and emptiness or absence of self-nature (空 kū?).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy

Content:

heart said:

Like I said, rigpa doesn't last. That is the meaning of "not ripened" and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not the meaning of "unripened", the meaning of unripened, as clearly explained in the Vima Nyingthig, is that vidyā is defined as an awareness that defiled by many cognitions. In this case there is really no difference between what is termed the clarity aspect of the mind and vidyā.

heart said:

Well, when I use the word rigpa it is only a synonym for recognizing the natural state. With the deepest respect I must say that it seems to me that you might misunderstand the meaning of these various vidya's from Vima Nyingtik.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

With all due respect, I do not misunderstand the Vima Nyinthig. The Vima Nyinthig passage in question is extremely clear and is repeated in more than one place. So no, it is not possible that I misunderstand the meaning of the passage in question.

For example, in the Zangs Yig Can, Vimala writes:

What is that "vidyā?"

Vidyā with knowledge obscurations is knowing and lucid.

Here it is clearly stated that Vidyā can possess obscurations of knowledge.

And:

1) Characteristic is called “the vidyā which designates general phenomena and just its own names.” Its action is just-that-itself being a clear non-conceptual awareness, which is polluted by many cognitions.

2) Appropriating the basis\*: when all cognitions are created when abiding in one’s body, and existing within its own clarity; this is called “the unripe vidyā.”

\*basis here refers to the body.

There are three more:

the vidyā present in the basis

the vidyā of insight

the vidyā of tögal

He concludes:

Are those vidyā’ the same, or are they different?

There is nothing other than a single essence.

Therefore, vidyā has different modes depending on whether or not you have received instruction or not. The essence of the vidyā does not change. But the context of how it is understood changes depending on whether you are on the path or not. This is why it is termed "contaminated by many cognitions", and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Ordination debate - vinaya/bodhisattva/upasaka

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Much harder to monitor the conduct of itinerant monks such as yourself. But this is also why posadha is so important for monastics.

Indrajala said:

You can't harm the clouds and water.

Malcolm wrote:

They can be easily polluted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not the meaning of "unripened", the meaning of unripened, as clearly explained in the Vlma Nyingthig, is that vidyā is defined as an awareness that defiled by many cognitions. In this case there is really no difference between what is termed the clarity aspect of the mind and vidyā.

asunthatneversets said:

So these first two of Vimalamitra's five definitions are essentially synonymous?

The vidyā that apprehends characteristics: "the vidyā that imputes phenomena as universals and as mere personal names", is one's mere non-conceptual self-knowing awareness defiled by many cognitions.

The [vidyā that] appropriates the basis [i.e. the human body] creates all cognitions when present in one's body, and is present as the mere intrinsic clarity [of those cognitions] is called "unripened vidyā".

Malcolm wrote:

The former is talking about vidyā in its contaminated state, the second is talking about vidyā as the essence of those contaminating cognitions.

In the end, if you really pay close attention and put aside all the rhetoric, Dzogchen doctrines about the nature of the mind are not terribly different than those of Lamdre, Kalacakra and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

kirtu said:

It is unfortunately what we will have to do.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not in agreement. There is no place for nuclear fission power in any ecologically sustainable future.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Ordination debate - vinaya/bodhisattva/upasaka

Content:

Indrajala said:

So, which takes precedence: the norms of your community or the archaic rulebook which promises you hell for non-compliance?

Malcolm wrote:

The archaic rulebook. This why Ashokan era type reforms are occasionally needed in the Sangha to expel "Bhikṣus" who are not maintaining their vows.

Indrajala said:

This isn't really practical unless the state is involved, otherwise the sangha lacks the teeth to really do much other than ask people to go away and maybe blacklist them.

Malcolm wrote:

Monasteries can handle this. In Tibet, in the stricter monasteries like Ngor if you committed a defeat, or were a general reprobate, you would be shown the door.

Much harder to monitor the conduct of itinerant monks such as yourself. But this is also why posadha is so important for monastics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

kirtu said:

safe nuclear design (which does exist).

Malcolm wrote:

No, it doesn't. And the energy needed to extract uranium is hugely expensive, leaves radioactive waste behind, etc.

NO NUKES!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Ordination debate - vinaya/bodhisattva/upasaka

Content:

Indrajala said:

So, which takes precedence: the norms of your community or the archaic rulebook which promises you hell for non-compliance?

Malcolm wrote:



The archaic rulebook. This why Ashokan era type reforms are occasionally needed in the Sangha to expel "Bhikṣus" who are not maintaining their vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

committed just 3 months ago in Thailand by failing to give protection to 1500 refugees of Buddhist violence in Myanmar.

theanarchist said:

I don't see where this qualifies as BUDDHIST violence. As buddhism doesn't permit or justify violence those are clearly deeds that have absolutely nothing to do with buddhism but are motivated by racism, xenophobia and completely worldly aggression.

Why should people living in a buddhist country act differently than the inhabitants of christian or muslim countries? They all have the same negative emotions and delusions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you're joking right? you've never heard the "licking honey off a razor" metaphor? Are you seriously claiming that most Buddhism doesn't portray "samsara" as nothing but suffering?

Malcolm wrote:

It is nothing but suffering, even Dzogchen tantras clearly state this.

gad rgyangs said:

There's even attempts to poison people's happiness by claiming that even when you think you're happy, you're actually suffering but you just don't know it!!!!

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need to attempt to poison such happiness, it is poisoned already. This happiness is termed "the suffering of change."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

I'm not sure what you mean by that ... you may have to use a few more words.

Malcolm wrote:

Houses and buildings should be designed, and retrofitted where possible, to generate their own power and provide it to the grid.

Kim O'Hara said:

I agree that's a good way to go. It is also a strategy which PV power is ideally suited to, so I'm more and more puzzled by your negativity about PV.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not so much negative about PV power generation as I am about its manner of implementation. Solar panels on a roof is one thing. Acres and acres of solar panels creates hot spots and dead zones, which add to local ambient temperatures and in many cases, at least in northern climes, require the extinction of grasslands which are just as crucial the Co2/O2 balance as trees and rain forests are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Rickpa said:

As a member of a group, you should be mindful that humans tend to judge any group of which they are outside, by the worst examples.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, this however does not mean that one need feel "shame" for being a Buddhist merely because there are afflicted "Buddhists" out there who do murderous things to innocents.

Likewise, I feel no shame about being an American despite that fact my government has done terrible things. But those things were done without my consent and I oppose them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Thank you for your recent posts here, Malcolm (and to Greg and others for prompting them). Deep Ecology is something that has been on the fringe of my thinking for years and I now realise that there is more value in it for me if only I look into it more deeply and I will try to do so. Do you have any getting-up-to-speed recommendations for me?

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is Sessions and Devall's "Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered."

But a better resource is:

<http://trumpeter.athabasca.ca/index.php/trumpet/search/search>

Here are the archives that go back to 1983, thirty-one years of journal issues on deep ecology. It is very eclectic, and there are extensive articles on the role of Buddhism in deep ecology, as well as Jainism, Hinduism, Taoism and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

Take comfort in your clean hands, if you can.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't believe in guilt by association, and neither should you. Why should all Christians be held liable for the acts of a few, or all Muslims? Therefore, all Buddhists should not be held liable for the murderous acts of a few misguided nationalists who have mistaken Buddhadharma for an ethnic identity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy

Content:

heart said:

Like I said, rigpa doesn't last. That is the meaning of "not ripened" and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not the meaning of "unripened", the meaning of unripened, as clearly explained in the Vlma Nyingthig, is that vidyā is defined as an awareness that defiled by many cognitions. In this case there is really no difference between what is termed the clarity aspect of the mind and vidyā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sönam said:

Just found that about anarchism, it's about what it is ... not what it is said it is.

S.

Malcolm wrote:

Sonam, that is not anarchism, that is called "Being a decent person".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Hate Crimes

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

I know I am sickened and deeply ashamed. Are YOU??

Malcolm wrote:

Am I sad that there are sentient beings out there who have afflictions, who act in ways contradictory to Buddhadharma, of course. Am I ashamed? Why should I be? I did not engage in those actions, I did not and do not condone them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Some people disagree with Naess. But fundamental to deep ecology is that one develops one's own ecosophy. Each person's ecosophy is personal. To understand this, you have to understand the apron diagram he and Sessions came up. He notes:

One main point in deep ecology is the deep argumentation, that is, argumentation from ultimate (philosophical, religious) premises, but there is room for very different sets of such premises.

Sherab Dorje said:

In which case one cannot judge Earth First! and say that it was not a deep ecology movement. I believe that the whole issue between people like Naess and Earth First! was the theory vs practice divide. Talking the talk vs walking the walk. The members of Earth First! sacrificed their lives putting Deep Ecology into practice (direct action to protect an ecosystem) whereas Naess produced journals and received university tenures and state sponsored awards. BOTH had a role to play in the development of Deep Ecology both as a theory and as a practice.

Malcolm wrote:

As pointed out, the architects and theorists of deep ecology do not consider Earth First! to be an expression of deep ecology. As for direct action, Naess was a direct action kind

of person. He blocked access to a dam site for twenty years.

There are certain criteria that render one's view as "deep ecological", and lacking those, one cannot describe oneself as a deep ecologist no matter how ecocentric one's views may be. That is, the basis of one's philosophy must lead inevitably to the platform of deep ecology. It can be generated by different value systems such as Buddhist, Christian or Philosophical values. The "deep" in deep ecology is a gloss for "nondual". When other systems are described as shallow, it means that they stem from a dualistic perspective of the world that does not take into consideration the intrinsic non-duality which underlies dependent origination. While not formally a Mahāyāna Buddhist himself, he was a nondualist, and Naess draws upon the two truth theory as well as the tathāgatagarbha theory as he understood them, but he is educated enough to understand that there are Christians nondualisms, Islamic nondualisms and so on. He pretty much clearly states that if your ultimate philosophy is not nondualist, then you will have a hard time arriving at a deep ecology platform.

Ideally it works like this:

One's ultimate premise forms the basis. This is termed level one. Upon that one builds one's platform principles, one's view, i.e. level two. Upon that, one establishes one's policies, one's meditation, if you will, level three; and finally, one engages in practical actions, one's conduct, i.e. level four.

The way he frames this for himself is as follows, his ecosophy:

(N = norm; H=hypothesis, exclamation points represent a value norm)

N1: Self-realization!

H1: The higher the Self-realization attained by anyone, the broader and deeper the identification with others.

H2: The higher the level of Self-realization attained by anyone, the more its further increase depends upon the Self-realization of others.

H3: Complete Self-realization of anyone depends on that of all.

N2: Self-realization for all living beings!

He then offers the following for the environment:

H4: Diversity of life increases Self-realization potentials.

N3: Diversity of Life!

H5: Complexity of life increases Self-realization potentials.

N4: Complexity!

H6: Life resources of the Earth are limited.

H7: Symbiosis maximizes Self-realization potentials under conditions of limited resources.

N5: Symbiosis!

My ecosophy would, and does, run something like the following:

N1 Tathagātagarbha!

H1 All sentient beings are innately buddhas.

H2 The highest goal in life to help all sentient beings achieve that buddhahood.

N2 Bodhicitta!

H3 The way help all sentient beings achieve buddhahood is the bodhisattva path

N3 Bodhisattva!

And so on.

The problem with Foreman's platform is that it excludes humans and is overly biocentric, it is therefore shallow as it is not grounded in nondualist philosophy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

I'm not sure what you mean by that ... you may have to use a few more words.

Malcolm wrote:

Houses and buildings should be designed, and retrofitted where possible, to generate their own power and provide it to the grid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: karmic law vs. causal nexus

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Thought this would make for interesting discussion, just got done reading Lojong:

Cultivating Compassion Through Training The Mind, by Traleg Kyabgon Rinpoche - great book.

Anyway there is this interesting bit on Karma that kind of stuck with me, so i'll just throw the quote out there and see what people think:

Traleg Kyabgon said:

Luckily for us, the karmic causal nexus is not a mechanical, predetermined operation but is instead quite malleable. We are not condemned to suffer its consequences.

Buddhism doesn't entertain the notion of any kind of moral law. The reference to "karmic law" is a Western concept that has been introduced into Buddhist thinking. The relationship between cause and effect far too complex and indeterminate to be a "law". There is some kind of karmic causal nexus, but there is no such thing as a cosmic law, because cause and effect is all about human action.

Johnny Dangerous said:

We get into a lot of talks on here about Karma, quite often people put forth a model of Karma that is somewhat absolute, this seems to indicate something in the opposite direction, what do you guys think about this quote?

Malcolm wrote:

I think he trying to make people (who do not understand the role of afflictions in generating karma and its results) that karma is not an external operator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M,

Could you give us some idea of any practical steps that deep ecologists would engage in. It appears to be a perspective... but what do deep ecologists either do or not do? What practical steps do you engage in?

Malcolm wrote:

I told you already, I learned an ancient medical tradition, which does not rely on industrial medicine and will survive industrial civilization should it fail, and spent more than five years of my life doing so.

I studied this form of medicine as a direct outgrowth of my longstanding commitment to the principles of deep ecology as articulated by its founder, Arne Naess.

My commitment to deep ecology does not suggest that my approach is the only approach, as Naess said "The front is long", meaning that there is room for much diversity of thought in the ecological community. But while social ecology, ecofeminism and so on have useful things to say about social justice issues, etc., their approach is "shallow", meaning ultimately anthropocentric, and not deep. I also think the deep green resistance approach is shallow, and not deep because of their trenchant misanthropy. We can say that any ecological movement based on misanthropy is shallow.

Another point of Naess is that the blue/red political axis is irrelevant to deep ecology itself:

Now a short note on three great contemporary world-wide movements which call for grassroot activism.

The three movements are: the peace movement, the oldest and at present remarkably dormant. But if military expenditures are not rapidly decreasing from about 900 billion dollars a year, I expect it will revive. Then there are many movements I put together under the name 'the social justice movement'. It includes the feminist movement and part of the social ecology movement. As the third movement, one might perhaps also

use the more vague term, radical environmentalism because to use the specific terminology of deep ecology will sooner or later elicit boredom and aggression. But the name 'radical environmentalism' smacks of the old metaphor suggesting humanity surrounded by something outside, the so-called environment of humans; it does not start with ecological concepts. And in the US it will take a long time before radicalism loses its connection with the political red-blue axis which now is irrelevant.

<http://trumpeter.athabasca.ca/index.php/trumpet/article/view/432/708>

Some people disagree with Naess. But fundamental to deep ecology is that one develops one's own ecosophy. Each person's ecosophy is personal. To understand this, you have to understand the apron diagram he and Sessions came up. He notes:

One main point in deep ecology is the deep argumentation, that is, argumentation from ultimate (philosophical, religious) premises, but there is room for very different sets of such premises.

Naess, Arne (2009-05-01). *The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess* (p. 108). Counterpoint. Kindle Edition.

And:

The platform principles of the deep ecology movement can be grounded for individual supporters in a religion or an ultimate philosophy. There is a great diversity of religions and philosophies from which people can support these principles. In a loose sense, the deep ecology movement can be said to be derived from these kinds of fundamentals. The situation reminds us that a set of very similar or even identical conclusions may be drawn from divergent premises. The platform can be the same, even though the fundamental premises differ. One must avoid looking for one definite philosophy or religion among all the supporters of the deep ecology movement. Fortunately, there is a rich manifold of fundamental views compatible with the platform of the deep ecology movement. Supporters live in different cultures and have different religions. Furthermore, there is a plethora of consequences derived from the platform because of these and other differences.

Naess, Arne (2009-05-01). *The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess* (pp. 114-115). Counterpoint. Kindle Edition.

And:

Personally, I favor the kind of powerful premises represented in Chinese, Indian, Islamic, and Hebrew philosophy, as well as in Western philosophy—namely, those having as a slogan the so-called ultimate unity of all life. They do not hide the fact that big fish eat small ones, but stress the profound interdependence, the functional unity, of such a biospheric magnitude that nonviolence, mutual respect, and feelings of identification are always potentially there, even between the predator and its so-called victim. In many cultures, identification is not limited merely to other living things but also to the mineral world, which helps us conceive of ourselves as genuine surface fragments of our planet, fragments capable of somehow experiencing the existence of all other



fragments: a microcosm of the macrocosm.

Naess, Arne (2009-05-01). The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess (pp. 131-132). Counterpoint. Kindle Edition.

So, I am a Buddhist practitioner with a long standing (27 years) commitment to a deep ecological outlook, and this is what informs my political outlook.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Ordination debate - vinaya/bodhisattva/upasaka

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Well, if you are arguing that Mahayana does away with the Vinaya, that's clearly not true.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is not true.

The Ārya Akṣayamatīnirdeśatīka states:

As such, having heard the śīla regulations [saṃvara], just as the Bhagavan said, the training is to be done according the 250 śīlas such as the four defeats, the thirteen saṃghāvaśeṣāḥ and so on without the slightest infraction is how the training should be followed.

So we see that some Mahāyāna attitudes towards monastic vows and vinaya were positive for Mahāyāna monks in India, at least in the textual tradition.

There is another passage in this same texts that one's conduct, immediate activities and inclination towards virtue must be in accord with the world, one ought not be reproached by the world, that that one must follow Vinaya and not contradict the Vinaya.

I suspect that this is the reason why in Tibet, uneducated lay people were generally not permitted to know the regulations of monastic śīla since it might cause them to lose faith in monks if those monks were perceived to not be following Vinaya correctly. This is also important medically, since a number traditional medicinal formulas called for the urine of an eight year old male child or a bhikṣu of pure vows, which generally means someone who has never had sexual relations in their entire life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Ordination debate - vinaya/bodhisattva/upasaka

Content:

Indrajala said:

There's actually a class of bhikṣu called a svāgata-bhikṣu, which refers to those bhikṣus in the Buddha's sangha who never received any precepts. They just had only to show up and join the sangha to be welcomed into it, like Mahākāśyapa. This means there actually is (or was) a class of bhikṣu without any formal precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

No, by being welcomed by the Buddha, they had precepts automatically.

Indrajala said:

In China and Japan the monks came up with an idea that liquor could be "medicine liquor" and consumed as such without any violation of the precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhikṣus can indeed use alcohol medicinally, there is a class of medicines, medicinal wines, called Arishtams in Ayurveda or རྩིས་ཆང་ in Tibetan, medicinal beers, and if a monk, nun or novice is ill, they can use these medicines when prescribed by a doctor. This is well known.

Indrajala said:

There's actually medical evidence suggesting a glass of wine or two a day can be good for your health. This means arguably a monk or nun could enjoy a glass of wine or two with their medicine meal and be at no fault.

Malcolm wrote:

If it was prescribed by their doctor for a specific condition, of course there is no fault.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Guru Rinpoche practices within the Sakya tradition

Content:

Kunga said:

Sure, agreed, in Western Dharma centres it is as you say, particularly, I think, because the VY transmission is more frequently given and taught. The GR tsog is complicated and not easy to fit into western schedules, and actually Nyingmapa in origin.

narraboth said:

well, depends on how elaborate you want to do Guru rinpoche tsog... Nyingma tsog ritual is a little bit different from Sarma ritual, but you can always find some brief text to do (I believe Rigpa centre uses brief tsog texts). In sense of 'western schedules', they are all on the same date of Tibetan calendar.

conebeckham said:

Sure, Nyingma tsoks and Sarma Tsoks do have different ritual outlines, details, etc., no doubt. But in my experience, Nyingma tsoks, especially in the various terma traditions,

are quite a bit shorter than Sarma procedures. The main thing I think is the amount of liturgy.....

Lots of Kagyupas do Konchok Chidu, Peaceful Guru, for instance, and there's a pretty condensed (but profound) tsok in that tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

I forgot to mention that in some cases on the first tenth day a Sapan Guru Yoga might be done, or perhaps a Lamdre Guru offering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

...belonging to a place

This sounds like a deep conservatism...

Malcolm wrote:

Deep ecology is deeply conservative. But not in the modern sense of the term.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Except, my dear Malcolm, there is more to Deep Ecology than just Naess. Earth First was a deep ecologist movement/organisation too you know. I have to admit that I was always more partial to social ecology, deep ecology tips towards the right (cf Ecofascism) too easily.

Malcolm wrote:

One can espouse an ecocentric view without it being consistent with ecosophy, aka deep ecology.

On David Foreman's supposed "deep ecology", George Sessions write:

Lee is adamant that Deep Ecology has been the philosophy of Earth First! although she admits that most EF!ers read very little Deep Ecology philosophy, and that specific mention of Deep Ecology did not appear in the E.F! Journal until mid-1984 (pp.18, 37, 57). It is rather painful to read about some of the positions taken by the Foreman faction in the E.F! Journal: for example, Foreman arguing that even a nuclear war would not be that damaging to the Earth and would hasten the end of industrial society, his remark that "wilderness is the real world" (it's all real! - it's just that the rest has to be restored

and reinhabited) and his remarks elsewhere that we should "allow Ethiopians to starve"; Christopher Manes suggesting that one solution to overpopulation would be to dismantle the medical technology designed to save lives, and of AIDS as Nature's solution to overpopulation; and Reed Noss writing of genetic "deep ecology elite" as a "chosen people" out to save the Earth (pp. 64, 68, 83-84, 92-3, 101-3). [Paul Shepard and E.O. Wilson have claimed that all humans have the "wilderness gene" but that it is suppressed, especially in modern urban people.] Since many, but not all, of these articles appeared under various pseudonyms, this leads to speculation as to whether Foreman, Manes, and the others were merely exercising their rights as individuals to the free expression of radical and shocking (and perhaps misanthropic) ideas; whether these ideas were meant to express the philosophy of Earth First!; and/or whether they thought they were expounding ideas which were the natural outcome of Deep Ecology philosophy. If the latter, they were radically mistaken in their understanding of Deep Ecology philosophy as espoused by Naess and other Deep Ecology movement theorists.

Lee accurately points out that Edward Abbey's ideas, expressed mainly through his novels (and his association with Earth First!) "had inspired the founding of the movement" (p. 126). Given that "since Earth First!'s inception, Dave Foreman had served as its prophet and leader" (p. 105) together with Foreman's idolizing of Abbey, the predominant philosophy and ideology of Earth First! throughout the 1980's is probably best described, not as Deep Ecology, but rather as an idiosyncratic, somewhat misanthropic Abbey/Foreman version of ecocentrism, coupled with a monkey wrenching/"rednecks for wilderness" image that some people found offensive.

<http://trumpeter.athabascau.ca/index.php/trumpet/article/view/232/333>

Again, if it is not consistent with Naess or Sessions and Duvall, it is not deep ecology.

Indeed, deep ecology has been critiqued as a conservative and even a right wing movement:

Devall and Sessions do not question the distribution or ownership of land. Their first principle of land management is to "encourage agencies, legislators, property owners and managers" to flow with natural processes. 'Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered' p.145

Deep ecology is not concerned with who should own land or whether land ownership is legitimate, but only with how it is treated.

At best deep ecology is apolitical, and though it claims to be beyond such distinctions, many feel deep ecology tends towards a right-wing perspective. Social ecologists and ecofeminists agree that not enough analysis is done by deep ecology of the social forces at work in the destruction of the biosphere.

<http://www.thegreenfuse.org/deepcrit.htm#oppressive>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy

Content:

Adamantine said:

Or did you mean it as in: samsaric sentient beings can only perceive the nirmanakaya and possibly the sambhogakaya qualities of a Buddha, but are unable to perceive their dharmakaya quality?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that ordinary people can only see nirmanakāyas. Practitioners of specific realization on the path can see the sambhogakāya. The level at which they can see the sambhogakāya varies depending on the path. The Sambhogakāya images one sees on the four visions are not the actual sambhogakāya since those images are inert. However, at a certain point in the path of the four visions one can see the actual sambhogakāya. The sight of the dharmakāya only occurs at the end of the four visions, i.e. the exhaustion of dharmatā.

In this respect then, Dzogchen is no more non-gradual than any other Buddhist path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Virgo said:

So basically can anyone perceive the Dharmakaya?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Only Buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No. I am saying that the man in question lost the right to use that property. It is an entirely different kind of thing.

Sherab Dorje said:

So you give the gun back after the situation has been "defused"???

Malcolm wrote:

In the US, such a person is then deemed a felon, and as such as barred from owning any sort of firearms for life.

Sherab Dorje said:

This is just not true. A true statement would be: "As you can see some of us Deep Ecologists..."

Malcolm wrote:

If you are not following the thought of Arne Naess, you are not a Deep Ecologist.

Sherab Dorje said:

Many Deep Ecologists would go so far as to promote the sterilisation of non-indigenous humans too.

Malcolm wrote:

Those people are not Deep Ecologists, whatever else they may be. I think you are confusing the thought of the so called "Deep Greens" with Deep Ecology. Their thought is not consistent with either deep ecological ethics nor with Buddhist ethics:

But violence is a broad category of action; it can be wielded destructively or wisely. We can decide when property destruction is acceptable, against which physical targets, and with what risks to civilians. We can decide whether direct violence against people is appropriate.

Jensen, Derrick; MCBay, Aric; Keith, Lierre (2011-01-04). Deep Green Resistance: Strategy to Save the Planet (Kindle Locations 1252-1253). Seven Stories Press. Kindle Edition.

As you can clearly see, the founder of Deep Ecology, Naess, is utterly opposed to this sort of thinking.

Sherab Dorje said:

But really, it is all a juggling game, no matter which side of the non-violent fence you happen to be situated. I have a deep respect for non-violent political struggle but one must realise that in all situations where non-violent struggle was applied, there were parallel liberation movements which involved armed struggle too.

Malcolm wrote:

Those people who are engaged in violence merely condemn themselves to lower births. On this the Buddha was absolutely clear. The Deep Ecology movement has no room for violence. There are those who try to derive arguments for ecotage from Naess's thinking, things like tree spiking, destroying animal traps and so on. But Naess's criteria for such acts is generally grounded in one's belonging to place, not urban youths who decide to go save a forest with which they have no kinship.

Sherab Dorje said:

PS Good luck trying to reconcile Deep Ecology with notions of private property. You're going to need it!

Malcolm wrote:

It's not a problem at all. If one remains grounded in the thought of Naess, deep ecology and a market economy are not incompatible. He writes:

The deep ecology movement has in common with blue [right wing] politics its aversion to bureaucracy, its emphasis on personal enterprise and initiative, and a reluctance to take certain green utopias too seriously. With the old politics of the Western European kind the common ground is more obvious, the fight on the side of the underdog, solidarity with the underprivileged or the powerless, extension of care.

And:

Rich people who work in the world of business, but are supporters of the deep ecology movement, ask in all seriousness whether the green utopian societies must look so dreary. Why portray a society which seemingly needs no big entrepreneurs, only organic farmers, modest artists, and mild naturalists. A capitalist society is in a certain sense a rather wild society. We need some degree of wildness, but not exactly the capitalist sort. The usual utopian green societies seem so sober and tame. We shall need enthusiasts of the extravagant, the luxuriant, the big. But they must not dominate.

<http://trumpeter.athabasca.ca/index.php/trumpet/article/view/432/708>

So you see, Naess's thinking was not exactly pro-capitalist and not exactly anti-capitalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

They don't work very well compared to ones managed by a CEO.

But they do work, some have been around for many years, even in a very competitive capitalist environment. This style of 'management' clearly has legs.

Here is an example of one of the many workers cooperatives operating in the US:

<http://www.alvaradostreetbakery.com/index.php>

Other useful website:

<http://www.usworker.coop/>

Malcolm wrote:

I think Zhen Li's point is that such entities don't scale up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 8:04 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

No. I am saying that the man in question lost the right to use that property.

But this is decided by secular law.

Malcolm wrote:

And in general Buddhist ethics holds that one must obey the laws of the country one is in.

tellyontellyon said:

Secular law can be changed if that is what the majority want.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but it is not as easy as you think. And Buddhist ethics generally comes down on the conservative side when it comes to issues of political change. As the Buddha mentions in the Mahāparinibbana sutta:

"What have you heard, Ananda: do the Vajjis assemble and disperse peacefully and attend to their affairs in concord?"

"I have heard, Lord, that they do."

"So long, Ananda, as this is the case, the growth of the Vajjis is to be expected, not their decline.

"What have you heard, Ananda: do the Vajjis neither enact new decrees nor abolish existing ones, but proceed in accordance with their ancient constitutions?"

"I have heard, Lord, that they do."

"So long, Ananda, as this is the case, the growth of the Vajjis is to be expected, not their decline.

There is never a case where the Buddha predicts the success of a society where violent and radical change is imposed.

tellyontellyon said:

What if the capitalists use their ownership of the means of production in such a way as people decide that they should lose the right to use that property?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if some country wishes to try nationalization of industries and banks through entirely peaceful means, Buddhists living in that country can of course be on either side of that decision, but if the decision is made to nationalize, they have nothing more really to say about it.



But if some citizens of a country decide to enact a violent revolution and seize banks and industries through force, Buddhist ethics would describe that as theft and no Buddhist should participate in that revolution. Not only this, it will not be successful, because those citizens would not be observing not only the seven conditions upon which a successful country is based upon, but not even one.

I never once said that Buddhists could not resist injustice. We can, but we need to do so with the principle of non-violence foremost in our minds and the understanding that as limited common people without the benefit of realization we really do not have the capacity to predict the outcomes of violent upheavals. In other words, when Buddhists enter into a social struggle they may be ready to die for their cause, but they have a higher ethical obligation to strive to preserve the lives of their "enemies" at all costs, even at the cost of their own lives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

What makes a system that is based on (rewards and encourages) greed and self-centredness Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing.

Sherab Dorje said:

Why is a system that encourages, and is based on, sharing and mutual generosity non-Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing.

Neither systems are Buddhist.

Sherab Dorje said:

I guess it all depends on how narrowly one defines Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

I define Buddha Dharma as the practice of the three trainings and the six perfections. I do not define it through political ideologies. People try to use political ideologies in the service of the Dharma, but in such cases usually the Dharma loses and the eight worldly dharmas win.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You have to know for a \_fact\_ that he wants to kill people. When people act in [legally defined] criminal ways, it is well established that they lose certain rights, for example, the right to own and use a gun. If a man walks into a crowd with a gun and threatens to shoot, of course you are well within your rights to confront the assailant and relieve him of his weapon (if you are foolish enough to try). You do not have that right unless you know for a fact that he is doing to act in that way.

Sherab Dorje said:

So now you are saying that it is okay to destroy private property.

Malcolm wrote:

No. I am saying that the man in question lost the right to use that property. It is an entirely different kind of thing.

Sherab Dorje said:

Okay, so tell of one instance of mining (for example) that has not been an ecological catastrophe. And then please explain to me why one should not defend the eco-system from destruction.

Malcolm wrote:

One can defend the ecosystem from catastrophe, but one must do so lawfully and non-violently. I have no problem with corporations such as BP being stripped of their property, legally, when they prove to be negligent in the conduct of their business. But I do not think it is right, or even ecologically sane, to blow up oil pipelines, transmission lines, and so on.

For example, look at all the harm people do like releasing animals from labs. This is just plain stupid as well as dangerous. This does not demonstrate any ecological awareness at all.

To Illustrate how support of monkey wrenching is inconsistent with Deep Ecology, we see that Naess writes:

In many Western countries, environmental struggle involves direct actions and violent confrontation. The norms of nonviolent group conflict as worked out by Gandhi and others exclude violence not only against the opponents, but also against their machinery and other equipment that, from a direct, causal point of view, destroy life and life conditions on a vast scale. The norms against so-called sabotage involving such equipment are based on deep attitudes that express themselves in cultural phenomena such as inochi and kuyo.

Naess, Arne (2009-05-01). *The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess* (p. 204). Counterpoint. Kindle Edition.

As you can see, we Deep Ecologists do not support in any way violence against either people or property. We Buddhists should not either, unless the special conditions of clairvoyance that I mentioned manifest in ourselves, as in the case of the Bodhisattva when he was a sea captain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

What makes a system that is based on (rewards and encourages) greed and self-centredness Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing.

Sherab Dorje said:

Why is a system that encourages, and is based on, sharing and mutual generosity non-Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing.

Neither systems are Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

It means everybody gets what they need, and contribute what they are able to.

Malcolm wrote:

Decided by who?

tellyontellyon said:

Look at the gap between those people at the very top and the people at the very bottom, it is impossible to grasp. That gap needs to narrow by a considerable amount. Also, it doesn't mean no 'trade' or no businesses... It means taking the largest businesses, utilities and banks into public ownership.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, we covered this before. I don't agree this is wise.

tellyontellyon said:

You can bet that far more small businesses have been forced to close by the big companies! The very biggest businesses could be run democratically by their own workers and representatives of the wider society.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't believe this will work. Companies are not democracies, and cannot function as such.

tellyontellyon said:

Deep ecology for example, would you impose that?

Malcolm wrote:

No, of course not, it is against the principles Arne Naess outlined.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Vajrakilaya and date of the 'phur gel 'bum nag

Content:

Sherlock said:

I think the main area of contention arises from the life of Padma Las 'brel rtsal, which Boord notes as "Dates uncertain".

Malcolm wrote:

Not uncertain at all, Padma Las 'brel rtsal, according to the treasury of lives website has these dates: b.1291 - d.1315.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So if you have a guy with a gun who wants to kill people and you destroy the gun it is totally against Buddhist ethics?

Malcolm wrote:

You have to know for a \_fact\_ that he wants to kill people. When people act in [legally defined] criminal ways, it is well established that they lose certain rights, for example, the right to own and use a gun. If a man walks into a crowd with a gun and threatens to shoot, of course you are well within your rights to confront the assailant and relieve him of his weapon (if you are foolish enough to try). You do not have that right unless you know for a fact that he is doing to act in that way.

Sherab Dorje said:

Just because monkey wrenching doesn't fit into your personal world view doesn't mean

it cannot be accommodated within the framework of Buddhist ethics.

Malcolm wrote:

Monkey wrenching cannot be accommodated within Buddhist ethics, since Buddhist ethics also requires that people obey the laws of the country they live in. Monkey wrenching is just vigilantism, plain and simple, and itself is a criminal act.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Wagner and Buddhism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

But are you never moved emotionally listening to his music?

Malcolm wrote:

Wagner is godawful crap.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Bismarck!

An unfortunate icon...

Wiki Bismarck distrusted democracy and ruled through a strong, well-trained bureaucracy with power in the hands of a Junker elite representing the landed aristocracy in the east.

Bismarck, an aristocratic Junker himself, had an extremely aggressive and domineering personality. He possessed not only a long-term national and international vision, but also the short-term ability to juggle many complex developments simultaneously. As the leader of what historians call "revolutionary conservatism"[2] Bismarck became a hero to German nationalists; they built hundreds of monuments glorifying the iconic symbol of powerful conservative leadership.

Malcolm wrote:

I know very well who Bismark is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Simon E. said:

Without wanting to sound like a British Rush Limbaugh, I am afraid Malcolm that there is a whole generation of young Brits who feel that life owes them a living.

When they talk about 'sharing' its all one way traffic. From others to them. If they spent the time that they are on line earning a living they might have something to share.

Malcolm wrote:

Otto Bismark famously said:

He who is not a socialist at 19, has no heart. He who is still a socialist at 30, has no brain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

What about the people who can't afford a house?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, give them a job so they can afford housing and eventually build one of their own.

tellyontellyon said:

Is it a 'nanny state' to suggest that people look out for each other, where we can share what we have?

Malcolm wrote:

We cannot share what we don't have. Frankly, I regards things like healthcare and education to be like utilities, a basic standard should be provided for everyone because the social cost of not doing so is higher. But it still comes out of someone's taxes. I pay taxes for a school system in which I have no children nor ever will have children because I am too old to have children. So I am sharing. I don't complain. I think people are obliged to pay fair taxes for things like roads, etc. I think it is fair for power companies, regulated monopolies, to charge for electricity.

But I do not think it is the job of the government to enforce some artificial standard across the board to make sure everyone has exactly as much as everyone else. That kind of thinking is ludicrous as far as I am concerned.

tellyontellyon said:

What's so un-Buddhist about sharing?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing, I am suggesting that you start. If you really want to help people, go to Haiti. They need help. Get a job as a volunteer with the BRC. You said that you already do

some kind of social work, great.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I'm just talking about a secure job for everybody, one that pays a living wage...

Malcolm wrote:

Then start a business.

tellyontellyon said:

...a home for everybody that is warm and secure.

Malcolm wrote:

Then start a house building business.

tellyontellyon said:

Education, healthcare, free time to relax, meditate, take part in community life.

Malcolm wrote:

You make every too complicated with your insistence that we need this huge Nanny state to take care of everything for us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I'm just talking about a secure job for everybody, one that pays a living wage, a home for everybody that is warm and secure. Education, healthcare, free time to relax, meditate, take part in community life.

Malcolm wrote:

I just figured it out -- you want to live in Norway!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Ha Ha. You sounded a little bit worldly yourself when I suggested the possibility of returning your land to the communal ownership that existed under the native Americans.

Malcolm wrote:

Which ones? You mean the tribes that no longer exist? You really don't seem to understand tribal territories, expansions, conquest and so on as it occurred among Native Americans in the Northeast. Your concept that Native Americans owned land communally is complete nonsense:

In the past, most if not all North American indigenous peoples had a strong belief in individual property rights and ownership. Frederick Hodge (1910) noted that individual private ownership was “the norm” for North American tribes.

Likewise, Julian Steward (1938, 253) asserted that among Native Americans communal property was limited, and Frances Densmore (1939) concluded that the Makah tribe in the Pacific Northwest had property rights similar to Europeans.<sup>7</sup> These early twentieth-century historians and anthropologists had the advantage of actually interviewing tribal members who had lived in pre-reservation Indian society.

By the late 1940s, however, these original and firsthand sources of information had died, and false myths and historical distortions began to take dominant shape. By the mid-1960s, the tone in many college history books, history-inspired films and novels, and even speeches had completely changed (Mika 1995). A typical historical distortion, for example, is found in Baldwin and Kelley's best-selling 1965 college textbook, *The Stream of American History*, where they write, “Indians had little comprehension of the value of money, the ownership of land . . . and so land sharks and grog sellers found it easy to mulct them of their property” (208). These myths were further fueled by popular books such as Jacobs' (1972) *Dispossessing the American Indian*, which suggested that Native Americans felt that land (and other property) was “a gift from the gods” and as such not subject to private ownership. Gradually more and more people started to honestly believe that the indigenous people of North America had been historically communal, non-property oriented, and romantic followers of an economic system more harmonious with nature.

Today, tribal leaders, politicians, and various interest groups in both the United States and Canada often repeat these myths as fact when discussing business, economics, and entrepreneurship during tribal conferences and congressional hearings (Selden 2001).

Terry Anderson (1995) attributes the beginning of the myth to settlers seeking farm land in the Great Plains, who interacted only with nomadic tribes that did not view land as an important asset. These settlers mistakenly generalized the lack of interest in land to infer a lack of property rights among all tribes. We argue that this fiction was further propagated in the nineteenth century by a virtual army of East Coast newspaper journalists, dime novelists, and Washington politicians who, in spite of writing about Native Americans, often had little contact with tribal groups. Reported, retold, and unchallenged, these incorrect perceptions ended up as the basis for later laws and institutional codification.



- See more at: <http://perc.org/articles/american-indian-collectivism#sthash.QzsVsD6T.dpuf>

tellyontellyon said:

All land was originally communal: some bully built a fence that's all.

Malcolm wrote:

The fences were not built by bullies, but rather, by people who wanted to protect their crops from thieves.

The rice plants, as mentioned earlier, began to grow in separate plots and people began to divide lands and tend each other's cluster of rice fief. They became preoccupied in tending their own field. Then, as the evil and greed were aroused, there were people who begin stealing others' crops. At first, the others only warned the culprit and the culprit promised that he would never repeat it again. But when it was repeated several times, the people began punishing him with fist, stones, and then sticks. That is the origin of punishment forms. Then, people began to think that they were too busy to heed every crime and abuse that happened in their society. They grieved on the rising of evil amongst their people. But most of their time had already been invested in tending their fief. So, they appointed someone to rectify what is right and what is wrong, give warnings to those who need it, give punishment to those who deserve it, and in return, they will give him a share of their rice. So, they went to the fairest, ablest, most likeable, and most intelligent person and appointed him to do the judging and passing out sentences on the reward of a share of rice. The appointed person thus agreed and the people bestowed upon him the title : 'Maha Sammata' meaning: The People's Choice. Then, they bestowed also the second title: 'Khattiya' meaning the 'Lord of the Rice Field', and finally the third title: 'Raja' which means 'Who gladdens people with Dhamma (or Truth)'. This order was created by the people's wish and need, based on the Dhamma and not from others. The Buddha stated again that Dhamma is indeed the best of all things.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agga%C3%B1%C3%B1a\\_Sutta](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agga%C3%B1%C3%B1a_Sutta)

tellyontellyon said:

I thought Engaged Buddhism was about addressing the problems of worldly life?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote][/quote]

That is what it may mean to some people. What it means to me is working with our present circumstances according to the best Buddhist ethics one can muster.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:  
Whereas those supporting capitalism are not?

Malcolm wrote:  
I never said I wasn't worldly person. I also never stated that I support capitalist ideology.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 12:30 AM  
Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism  
Content:

tellyontellyon said:  
The purpose of the precepts is to help us overcome suffering, not to lock us into it.

Malcolm wrote:  
Indeed.

tellyontellyon said:  
They are not god given dogma.

Malcolm wrote:  
They are based on the avoidance of the natural ten non-virtues.

Malice  
Greed  
Wrong view  
Harsh speech  
Lying  
Calumny  
Idle speech  
Taking life  
Taking what is not given  
Sexual misconduct

Since the vows do not suppose one's mind can be directly controlled, and since of the four verbal non-virtues, lying is the worst, and because Buddha compassionately understood that people were going to yell, spread calumny and gossip he did not turn those into precepts. He forbade the three non-virtues of the body. These ten non-virtues are what drive rebirth into lower realms; their avoidance results in birth in higher realms.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2014 at 12:26 AM  
Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism  
Content:

tellyontellyon said:

It's not that my view is totally worldly. Perhaps it is that your view is totally unworldly?

You draw such a big distinction between worldly and unworldly. I don't think that the Buddha would draw those lines in quite the same way.

Malcolm wrote:

He drew them even harder.

tellyontellyon said:

I don't think he achieved liberation by divorcing himself from the 'world', it was more that he came to see the nature of that world.

Malcolm wrote:

He came to see the nature of the world was entirely suffering. Even happiness is suffering if that happiness does not come from Dharma practice.

tellyontellyon said:

Understanding the difference or relationship between a 'worldly' and a 'realised' point of view... well that can only come with realisation.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that comes from studying the Dharma.

tellyontellyon said:

In the meantime I think I would like to continue worrying about the 'worldly' lives of the people and all the other beings on this planet.

Malcolm wrote:

The best thing you can do for others is attain realization yourself. That will never happen while you are standing in an angry crowd denouncing some transient worldly condition.

tellyontellyon said:

I can only do what I can within my present capacities.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

tellyontellyon said:

If you don't want to consider me a Buddhist that is fine, (but I'm not quite sure why you feel you have the authority to say such things). Perhaps you are playing politics?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say you weren't a Buddhist. Clearly you consider yourself one. But you don't sound like a Buddhist, you sound like a worldly person, entirely caught in hope and fear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Everyone gains. No rational actor engages in an exchange that is disadvantageous. That's just dogma. If you need a job and the means of production (job's, land, machines, bank's) etc. are in the hands of a tiny minority, and that system inevitably produces endemic unemployment... then the power is all in the hands of that same minority. The super-rich hold all the cards. Therefore, the average wage earner is compelled to sell their labour for a poor deal.

They're compelled to sell their based on their skills based on what is of value to others. If I am a master iron worker in a defunct industry, I am not likely to be paid much for my now useless craft, am I? And those who put up the capital for such a defunct industry will generally fold as well.

If one person is gaining... someone else (or many others) are losing.  
This is very simplistic thinking.  
I honestly wonder if we are living in the same world?

Malcolm wrote:

We live in the world we choose to see. I live in a world where outcomes are largely determined by karma and merit. You live in a world where outcomes are produced by material relations. You may have aspirations to be a Buddhist, but your view of the world is wholly worldly, bound up as it is in these eight worldly dharmas:

hope for happiness and fear of suffering  
hope for fame and fear of insignificance  
hope for praise and fear of blame  
hope for gain and fear of loss

You may protest that it is not yourself for which you are concerned, but the eight worldly dharmas apply to all instances of these hopes and fears.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Evidence:

...or choose your own favourite after oogling "solar power generation" and clicking the "Images" tag on the results page, which is all I did.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

That is not scaling. That is ugly as shit. Also, it is an extremely inefficient use of land area.

The main problem with renewables at this point is lack of storage options (battery technology is still not very advanced), variability in power generation, and the fact that natural gas and coal plants must continue to be used to make up for deficiencies. So called smart grids might be a solution, but the problem with all these technological computer-based fixes is that they introduce increasing complexity thus creating more opportunity for calamitous failure, terrorist attack, and so on.

If any thing, centralization of power generation not a desiderata.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 7:47 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And I never said that I support all instances of property destruction.

Malcolm wrote:

You advocate violence in so far as you think some types of property destruction are permissible based on some arbitrary standard you impose.

But frankly, I cannot see any place in Buddhist ethics where it is permissible.

Sherab Dorje said:

Really? I don't think you have to look all that hard actually. I don't think it would be so difficult, from a Buddhist perspective, to ethically justify destroying a machine in order to save countless lives. Not difficult at all actually.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you are going to get out there and destroy shovels, hoes, rakes, lawn mowers, plows, cars etc? No, there really is no justification for such acts. Such acts are merely symbolic and do nothing to change systems, as the failed efforts of the Luddites clearly demonstrates. Violence, whether against people or property, is not justifiable from a Buddhist ethical standpoint unless you are a realized person in possession of such powers of prescience and clairvoyance that you can be assured of a positive outcome of your acts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

And in those terms, it is much less bad for us to dig up what we need for solar panels than to dig up the coal we would need to generate the same amount of electricity.

Malcolm wrote:

If it scales, sure. So far I see no evidence that it does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

then the sambhogakāya level, and finally, at the end one can see the dharmakāya personally, then one is a Buddha.

Virgo said:

But isn't a state of rigpa more than the nirmanakaya level?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

The state of rigpa is all three kāyas combined, but while you still have obscurations, the nirmanakāya level is all you can experience. If you can experience the sambhogakāya aspect, you are a person of high realization, meaning you are beyond the third vision.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Virgo said:

But it is not gradual in terms of needing to create merit and purify karma, transform perceptions, in order to realize the "state", is it?

The secret is, that was already done in the past, therefore, one has the perception to understand the truth about the three kayas -- which do not arise, are not based on conditions etcetera.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Here is the critical point that everyone over looks.

All Mahāyāna paths whether sūtra or tantra, have one thing in common: realization of the three kāyas. Each path works first at the nirmanakāya level, i.e. at first that's all you can see; then the sambhogakāya level, and finally, at the end one can see the dharmakāya personally, then one is a Buddha.

This is the same whether you are practicing the six perfections, the two stages, or trekchöd and thögal. The only difference is the amount of time it takes, and the methodology used.

Even in sūtra the obscurations are not regarded as something real which need to be abandoned. The Abhisamayālaṃkāra states: The wisdom of the exhaustion and non-arising of taints is called “the awakened state”.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The path is gradual, not the state, but then that is true of every path in Vajrayana.

dzogchungpa said:

So what's up with all the cig car rhetoric?

Malcolm wrote:

It's rhetorical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Guru Rinpoche practices within the Sakya tradition

Content:

Kunga said:

Doing the self-blessing of Kachoma is often private and extra curricular.

Malcolm wrote:

You would know better than I what is done in Sakya monasteries in India.

I was just talking about the tsog, not the self blessing which is little elaborate and can only be done by those people who have done a full retreat.

Also, I was mentioning from the perspective of what is normally done in western Sakya centers, I wasn't really including monasteries in India.

The idea that the first tenth day is for Heruka practices and the second tenth day is for Dakini practices is based on the flow of the white bodhicittas. But in general the first tenth day ganapuja is for increasing merit and the second is for purifying samaya, strictly speaking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For all its cig car rhetoric, in the end, Dzogchen is just a gradual path like everything else in Buddhadharma.

heart said:

Either you recognize the natural state directly and never leave it again or you have to do some habituation to it. I wouldn't call it gradual. It don't get more it just gets longer, easier and more natural and you have less problems letting go of mind.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The path is gradual, not the state, but then that is true of every path in Vajrayana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And I never said that I support all instances of property destruction.

Malcolm wrote:

You advocate violence in so far as you think some types of property destruction are permissible based on some arbitrary standard you impose.

But frankly, I cannot see any place in Buddhist ethics where it is permissible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

...given you consider compulsory sterilisation a public health issue.



Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that it is a public health issue and it is out of my hands, it's not my decision to make. I never made any statement whatsoever about whether I approve or disapprove of the practice.

It is a complicated -- for example, termites, ants, killer bees, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... For example, our friend Greg (Sherab Dorje) considers it just dandy to destroy private property.

Sherab Dorje said:

And our friend Malcolm has no problem with a multinational mining company wreaking havoc just because they own a title deed for the land they are destroying?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that I have no problem with it. I do, I just don't believe that the solution is fire bombing their facilities and equipment.

In any event, most mining companies in the US lease the land they are mining. Not sure how it works in other places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I do not support acts of violence against people or property. So no, I am not a fan of monkey wrenching. I consider that such acts stem from a shallow view.

Sherab Dorje said:

As an ecologist, do you support the compulsory sterilisation of domesticated animals (I am talking here about pets and especially strays)?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not really the question you are asking. What you are implying is, if sentient beings should be viewed as equal (in general, they should), someone who does not support violence against persons or property should not support compulsory sterilization of pets and strays.

I have no pets, so I never think about the issue. That issue is outside of my control, being a public health issue primarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Rickpa said:

This thread strikes me as about being more about systems of governance rather than politics.

Malcolm wrote:

That is where people went with the thread. What I had in mind was more how, given that there are many non-Buddhist political realities out there, Buddhists will conduct themselves in the political sphere. For example, our friend Greg (Sherab Dorje) considers it just dandy to destroy private property.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is, it is completely ignorant. A physical structure is not a "bank". All such actions do is create more negativity, more hostility, more negative karma all around. It is an utterly ignorant and foolish—not to mention criminal— thing to do.

Sherab Dorje said:

I guess you don't support eco-terrorism either?

Malcolm wrote:

I do not support acts of violence against people or property. So no, I am not a fan of monkey wrenching. I consider that such acts stem from a shallow view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 7:32 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I cannot speak on behalf of all Anarchists, but I certainly would not consider burning

banks an unprovoked action.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is, it is completely ignorant. A physical structure is not a "bank". All such actions do is create more negativity, more hostility, more negative karma all around. It is an utterly ignorant and foolish —not to mention criminal— thing to do.

Sherab Dorje said:

Right, capital and property are two different things, though their meaning is commonly conflated in discussions.

Not necessarily, the first definition says: "Financial assets OR ..."

Malcolm wrote:

A financial asset is an intangible asset that derives value because of a contractual claim. Examples include bank deposits, bonds, and stocks. Financial assets are usually more liquid than tangible assets, such as land or real estate, and are traded on financial markets. ...

You mean "asset", an asset can include property such as land, buildings, bulldozers, etc.. A financial asset is a bond, stock, etc.

You are not a stupid person, so I find it a little unbelievable that you waste your time on such adolescent political theories.

Ok, I am really done with this ridiculous thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 7:08 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Capital and property are two entirely different things. One can own thousands of acres of property and yet lack the capital to develop it.

Sherab Dorje said:

According to investopedia.com (a capitalist site): Definition of 'Capital'

1. Financial assets or the financial value of assets, such as cash.
2. The factories, machinery and equipment owned by a business and used in production.

“Capital” can mean many things. Its specific definition depends on the context in which it is used. In general, it refers to financial resources available for use. Companies and societies with more capital are better off than those with less capital.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, capital and property are two different things, though their meaning is commonly conflated in discussions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 6:59 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I don't think a figure of 40 years is anything to be up in arms about. After all, just about any power plant would be lucky to get past regulators running that long without major updates and replacements of key parts.

Malcolm wrote:

That's an ideal estimate. Lifespans in reality are overall much shorter.

Then of course we must mention that extraction process for the rare earth materials in solar panels, wind generators, batteries, etc., are pretty devastating to their local environments because China/Inner Mongolia is about the only place where rare earths are recoverable without significant quantities of radioactive materials, and even then they are strip mined.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 6:55 PM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Your Santideva quote is saying that mental pacification is the result of going beyond concepts: that is not inherently Buddhist, that is something you find in all religions, and is therefore truly "perennial".

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually you do not find this in "all religions".

Addendum, so my initial observation that your sentiment is perennialist' was correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 6:53 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Though I must admit that burning banks (a common pass-time for Greek anarchists) is hardly violence "without provocation".

Malcolm wrote:  
Of course it is.

Sherab Dorje said:  
That's your opinion. I imagine if you ask all the homeless families, whose houses were stolen from them by banks, they may care to disagree.

Malcolm wrote:  
I see, so anarchists, who don't believe in property, are burnings banks on behalf of those whose property was taken from them by foreclosures? What a stupid thing to do, so very Weather Underground.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 6:51 PM  
Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:  
Sherab Dorje said:  
There are no private property/ownership rights in an Anarchist system, so the term is an oxymoron at best.  
Sorry for quoting myself but I should clarify this statement:

Under the political-economic model of capitalism property (capital) is the basis for authority, as it is the means by which a capitalist exploits (asserts authority/dominance over) somebody that does not own capital. Now of course, in the real world, capitalists quite clearly exploit the power of the state (and state owned capital) as well, in order to assert their dominance. But in a utopian capitalist reality the security forces (both executive and administrative) would be privately owned so one would just directly pay for enforcement (instead of having to bribe the state administrators).

Last year, for example, they introduced a series of laws here in Greece where one can now rent actual police officers (not private security personnel) and police equipment (helicopters, boats, etc...) for security purposes. Okay, it is a semi-measure since the money goes to the state (there is the state owned capital again) and not to the individuals, but still one can see in which direction they are pushing. Private military organisations like Haliburton and Blackwater also come to mind, as examples, when discussing issues like this.

That is why there is no such thing as anarchist capitalism, because capital (property) IS authority.

Malcolm wrote:  
Capital and property are two entirely different things. One can own thousands of acres of property and yet lack the capital to develop it.

Your anarchist system might scale up as far as a hippie commune, but will fail beyond that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 6:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Though I must admit that burning banks (a common pass-time for Greek anarchists) is hardly violence "without provocation".

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 9:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Don't worry about suffering dudes... it's all in the mind.

Malcolm wrote:

These kinds of things are very sad, but I don't see you posting pictures of all sentient beings who are suffering:

There is nothing you or I can do to prevent the ripening of someone else's karma.

Of course we try to help as much as we can, but we have to understand that we have limited capacity to help others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: Bronkhorst's Skepticism about early Buddhism

Content:

daverupa said:

(The equation "scholarship = fundamentalism" should probably get it's own thread; I'm amazed by this suggestion.)

Malcolm wrote:

He was not saying that. He was saying that scholarship and religion have different aims. The former is merely about who lived when, what they did, where they went, and maybe what they said. The latter is about one's personal spiritual path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Suffering is caused by greed, anger and ignorance, in the MIND, not by material conditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you. I am glad there is another Buddhist voice in this conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Your Santideva quote is saying that mental pacification is the result of going beyond concepts: that is not inherently Buddhist, that is something you find in all religions, and is therefore truly "perennial".

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually you do not find this in "all religions".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Solar power is a great idea. I knew a man whose hydro bill (i.e. electricity here is called hydro) was something like \$15.00/month because he installed high efficiency insulation, windows, and doors, and solar panels.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is a great idea. But it does not scale. Battery technology has not advanced in years. That said, it is perfectly reasonable for people to install their own panels and so. The only problem is that the panels themselves have a definite lifespan, 40 years at most. There are other problems too. For example, if you have trees in your yard, or live in places where there is possibility of hail and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I would liken it to asking the opinion of Nazi apologists about the benefits of Communism.

Malcolm wrote:

D and G are "nazi apolgists? Hardly

Sherab Dorje said:

Capitalists don't like Anarchists. Mainly because Capitalists like to throw around the term "free" thick and fast: free trade, free markets, etc... whereas their freedom is just slavery to currency.

And then, of course, there is the fact that capitalists love to pay lip service to reducing state intervention to zero, whereas in reality they take every opportunity they can to utilise the state and state structures in order to increase profit and power.

Malcolm wrote:

These people are called "anarcho-capitalists".

Sherab Dorje said:

Capitalists hate Anarchists because Anarchists show up the fact that Capitalism is quite clearly not freedom, and that Authoritarian Socialism is not the only other solution.

Malcolm wrote:

No, people are frightened of anarchists because they do stupid shit like inciting violence without provocation at demonstrations:

<http://www.kvi.com/home/featured/Seattle-anarchist-brags-about-violence-he-plans-for-May-Day-205625871.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 4:52 AM



Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

You are saying.

'nothing arises which is empty,  
because if it arises, how can it be empty'

???

Malcolm wrote:

Precisely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

emptiness too is a mere convention.

PadmaVonSamba said:

objects which arise conditionally were empty of inherent existence  
long before the concept of emptiness was even conceived.

So, while 'emptiness' (sunyata) is, on the one hand, merely our correct understanding of  
phenomena

the fact that phenomena are in fact empty  
is the same whether we 'convene' it or not.

If it were not already so,  
asserting emptiness would be false.

.  
.   
.

Malcolm wrote:

Asserting emptiness is false.

"If there were something subtle not empty, there would be something subtle to be  
empty; as there is nothing not empty, where is there something to be empty?

-- Nāgārjuna

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Does 35 Statues Mean anything?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are 35 Buddhas of confession. This is a famous practice anyone can do, as it is

based in sutra, called the Sutra of the Three Heaps

<http://www.thubtenchodron.org/PrayersAndPractices/35Buddhas.pdf>

gaelic said:

Thank you very much! So these are all statues of Buddha? I didn't know there was confession lol. Do people build shrines to these Buddhas? Thank you very much for the link, I will read that through.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Guru Rinpoche practices within the Sakya tradition

Content:

conebeckham said:

I have a somewhat related question.....sorry I can't help with yours.

But In Kagyu we practice Chakrasamvara on Guru Rinpoche days...wondering if Sakyapas do Hevajra puja and tsok, etc.??

Malcolm wrote:

No, Vajrayogini is done on both tenth days.

Usually HHST gives the Padmasambhava from Apong Tertons treasures.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

Yes?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that meaning is projection. IN other words, there is no meaning to meaning. It is just a convention, therefore it is the object of a false cognition.

shel said:

How is that inconsistent with meaning is emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all, emptiness too is a mere convention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Does 35 Statues Mean anything?

Content:

gaelic said:

Hello and greetings! I have been planning to make a home shrine (I am learning as I go along), just setting up offering bowls and a butter lamp. In this regard, I have had a dream a few times now about building a shrine in a small cabin/hut in the forest here and that there are 35 statues. The number just stands out to me, does it mean anything? I don't count them in the dream or even know who the statues are, but in the dream I just know there are 35. Basically the dream is I am walking through the forest where I live and I come to the small cabin, open the door, and there is a shrine of 35 statues, and I pour water in offering bowls. In other variations, I am taking people with me to the hut that I have never seen before. Just was an odd dream, wondered if it had any meaning and who the statues are. I search "35 buddhist statues" but nothing particular comes up. Probably because I have been putting a lot of thought into making a home shrine lol. Thanks again!

Oh and one more thing, can I use in my home shrine a small Thanka rather than a statue?

Malcolm wrote:

There are 35 Buddhas of confession. This is a famous practice anyone can do, as it is based in sutra, called the Sutra of the Three Heaps

<http://www.thubtenchodron.org/PrayersAndPractices/35Buddhas.pdf>

<https://www.amazon.com/Confession-Downfalls-Sutra-Vajrasattva-Practice/dp/8185102856>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Well, just taking diamonds as an example... high quality gem quality diamonds are much rarer than ordinary industrial diamonds, so it takes more time and effort (labour) to find them and more skill (labour) to cut and polish them.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

tellyontellyon said:

That capitalists make use of monopolies and restriction of production to push prices above natural value is of course understood. Supply and demand also affects price, but in general, production will be raised to meet demand. When demand and supply are

equal then price tends towards natural value.

Malcolm wrote:

So you agree with marginal utility then.

tellyontellyon said:

You are not distinguishing between use value and exchange value.

Malcolm wrote:

Both are accounted for in marginal utility. If I have no use for something, for example, crack, for me it is worthless. I will never spend my money on it. If I want to buy something with whatever crack is at my disposal, however it comes into my hands, it becomes as valuable as whatever the other guy will pay me for it. A bag of smack these days is \$6 in NYC. In New England on the other hand, it is \$30.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

Yes?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that meaning is projection. IN other words, there is no meaning to meaning. It is just a convention, therefore it is the object of a false cognition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This still refers to the imagined nature viz: reification persons and things is the imagined nature, the absence of subject and object which produces the imagined is the dependent nature, the absence of existence and non-existence of the imagined nature in the dependent nature is the perfected nature. All of these three terms hinge on the imagined nature.

rob h said:

Can see what you mean, but still think it highlights the fact that Asanga tried to take the middle path. Will carry on researching/meditating anyway, and hopefully understand better as time passes.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Yogacarins think they are the real Mādhyamikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

conebeckham said:

the root of ignorance is the feeling that samsaric phenomena have, among other things, meaning.

shel said:

Form is emptiness, doctrine tells us, therefore meaning is emptiness. How bout them apples?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it actually says that "Matter is empty". Then it says, "Emptiness is material." Then it says "Matter is not other than emptiness," and then, "Emptiness is not other than the material;" and concludes with "And so too for the other four aggregates."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is anarchy, which is violent by nature, despite what anarchist romantic theorists would like to believe.

Sherab Dorje said:

Yes, well, if Deleuze and Guattari (post modernists and post structuralists) say it's like that then it must be. Sigh...

You do realise that the whole "post-" thing was all just capitalist apologetics, hardly an objective vantage point to judge Anarchism from.

Malcolm wrote:

This is akin to saying that Buddhist dialectics is not a fair place to judge the doctrine of self from. In other words, your objection is bollocks, to which I will pay no mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

You could say the same about gravity. Unfortunately, I am unable to walk on water, walk through walls or fly unaided like superman... so I will just have to reject this superficial 'theory' of economics.

Wiki: Karl Marx died before marginalism became the interpretation of economic value accepted by mainstream economics. His theory was based on the labor theory of value, which distinguishes between exchange value and use value. In his *Capital* he rejected the explanation of long-term market values by supply and demand:

Nothing is easier than to realize the inconsistencies of demand and supply, and the resulting deviation of market-prices from market-values. The real difficulty consists in determining what is meant by the equation of supply and demand.[...]If supply equals demand, they cease to act, and for this very reason commodities are sold at their market-values. Whenever two forces operate equally in opposite directions, they balance one another, exert no outside influence, and any phenomena taking place in these circumstances must be explained by causes other than the effect of these two forces. If supply and demand balance one another, they cease to explain anything, do not affect market-values, and therefore leave us so much more in the dark about the reasons why the market-value is expressed in just this sum of money and no other.[58]

In his early response to marginalism, Nikolai Bukharin argued that "the subjective evaluation from which price is to be derived really starts from this price",[59] concluding: Whenever the Böhm-Bawerk theory, it appears, resorts to individual motives as a basis for the derivation of social phenomena, he is actually smuggling in the social content in a more or less disguised form in advance, so that the entire construction becomes a vicious circle, a continuous logical fallacy, a fallacy that can serve only specious ends, and demonstrating in reality nothing more than the complete barrenness of modern bourgeois theory.[60]

Similarly a later Marxist critic, Ernest Mandel, argued that marginalism was "divorced from reality", ignored the role of production, and that:

It is, moreover, unable to explain how, from the clash of millions of different individual "needs" there emerge not only uniform prices, but prices which remain stable over long periods, even under perfect conditions of free competition. Rather than an explanation of constants, and of the basic evolution of economic life, the "marginal" technique provides at best an explanation of ephemeral, short-term variations.[61]

Maurice Dobb argued that prices derived through marginalism depend on the distribution of income. The ability of consumers to express their preferences is dependent on their spending power. As the theory asserts that prices arise in the act of exchange, Dobb argues that it cannot explain how the distribution of income affects prices and consequently cannot explain prices.[62]

Dobb also criticized the motives behind marginal utility theory. Jevons wrote, for example, "so far as is consistent with the inequality of wealth in every community, all commodities are distributed by exchange so as to produce the maximum social benefit." (See Fundamental theorems of welfare economics.) Dobb contended that this statement indicated that marginalism is intended to insulate market economics from

criticism by making prices the natural result of the given income distribution.[62

Malcolm wrote:

I do not believe however that you can be rid of markets, and I think the labor theory of value is inadequate for explaining many things in the economy. Labor does not give things value. What gives a thing a value is whether it is desired or not, i.e. demand. For example, diamonds -- their value bears no relationship to the capital or the labor used to extract them. Their value is determined by demand and artificial restrictions on their sales which serve to increase that demand. The value of a diamond jewel, nothing more than a piece of hardened carbon, and no more nor less expensive in terms of capital and labor to extract than an industrial diamond, is not determined by those capital and labor investments at all. Neither is the price of oil. Neither is the price of food. Prices in general are not set because labor bears an intrinsic value, because labor, like any thing else in the market, has no intrinsic value of its own. What is the value of a piece of art? If people like your paintings more, you will get more. If they like it less, you will get less. And if you are a terrible artist, your paintings will be worthless and therefore, your labor in creating them is worthless.

Price instability is a function of supply and demand. It really is that simple. Regulations are enforced in order modulate rapid fluctuations in price which are primarily caused by speculators.

BTW, remind yourself that you have decided that someone's labor is worthless the next time you do not buy something because you decide "it isn't worth it."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sönam said:

Malcom,

What you try to figure out regarding Anarchism (I don't speak about communism) could also be said regarding capitalism. Capitalism, as you state it, is an utopia ... and will remains as such because in "real life" capitalism automatically leads to his "disadvantages" <http://listverse.com/2012/01/16/top-10-disadvantages-to-capitalism/> and certainly: waste, starvation, anti-social, danger and so on.

S.

Malcolm wrote:

Sonam:

I am not defending capitalism as an ideology. I am not a Capitalist with a capital C. But I

do not have much patience for utopian fantasies that come from the left, or for that matter utopian fantasies that come from the right (for example, the fantasy that free markets will fix everything, etc.). The capitalist economy we have now is far from a utopia, and because of the free market policies of neoliberals, is heading into a dystopia.

I do embrace our teacher's teachings that we should be pursuing personal evolution, not external revolution. That means we need to follow a middle way. Anarchism, Communism and Libertarianism, etc., just are not it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It should not be concluded that war is a state of nature, but rather that it is the mode of a social state that wards off and prevents the State.

-- Nomadology

This is anarchy, which is violent by nature, despite what anarchist romantic theorists would like to believe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

marginal utility.

It amounts to saying that something is simply worth what someone is willing to pay. It isn't an economic theory at all, rather it amounts to the belief that there are no economic theories, and that value is entirely subjective.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is entirely consistent with Buddhist philosophy. That is to say all value is subjective, and merely conventional. There is no such thing as essences, whether in economics or anything else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The concentration camps were a distraction that contributed in large measure to Hitler's losing the war.



Sherab Dorje said:

A distraction??? The concentration camps were designed to quell all internal resistance to Nazi policy and anybody that stood in the way of the implementation of Nazi policies (Trade Unionists, Communists, Democrats, Humanist Christians, etc...) and to realise Hitler's dream of the eradication of anybody he didn't consider German enough (Jews, Gypsies, etc...) The Nazi regime would not have lasted as long as it did if it wasn't for the concentration camps .

Malcolm wrote:

The Nazi Regime would have lasted much longer, and possibly have won the war on the continent if they had been content to merely expell people rather than spend enormous resources herding people about in cattle cars (on rail lines that Bismark designed to carry troops) in order to kill them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

From somebody that has not figured out the difference between Anarchism and chaos. This is what anarchism will lead to, predation by nomadic bands. You should read Nomadology: [http://zinelibrary.info/files/nomadology\\_read.pdf](http://zinelibrary.info/files/nomadology_read.pdf)

The State is not an agent of war. Wars are bad for states. States generally seek to avoid war, unless they are taken over by their own nomads (as was the case of Iraq).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Which is pretty sad when one stops to think about the history of Anarchism:  
The democratic struggle in Spain during the 1930's (where the CNT was part of the governing democratic alliance),

Malcolm wrote:

A war where they were crushed.

Sherab Dorje said:

the International Workers of the World,

Malcolm wrote:

Lots of street battles.

Sherab Dorje said:

the liberation of the Ukraine from Imperial Russian and German forces AND the Bolsheviks in the 1920's,

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, never happened. Ukraine was dominated by the Communist Party during the 20's, on orders from Moscow.

Sherab Dorje said:

the ongoing self-governance and resistance of the Zapatistas, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

The Zapatistas are ethnic nationalists, not anarchists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sönam said:

and I have many the like ...

S.

Malcolm wrote:

But labor is a commodity, on this Marx agrees with Adam Smith. Labor is the "Wealth of Nations", but even the labor theory of value is obsolete.

These days many economists use quantified marginal utility.

In economics, the marginal utility of a good or service is the gain from an increase or loss from a decrease in the consumption of that good or service. Economists sometimes speak of a law of diminishing marginal utility, meaning that the first unit of consumption of a good or service yields more utility than the second and subsequent units, with a continuing reduction for greater amounts[clarification needed]. The marginal decision rule states that a good or service should be consumed at a quantity at which the marginal utility is equal to the marginal cost.[1]

The concept of marginal utility played a crucial role in the marginal revolution of the late 19th century, and led to the replacement of the labor theory of value by neoclassical value theory in which the relative prices of goods and services are simultaneously determined by marginal rates of substitution in consumption and marginal rates of transformation in production, which are equal in economic equilibrium.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marginal\\_utility](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marginal_utility)

This applies equally to labor as much as anything else. So for example, a cotton picker's

labor has a marginal utility higher when there are no cotton machines to pick cotton. When cotton machines to pick cotton are introduced, that person's labor as a cotton picker becomes 0 value and they are forced to find other work. However, if a government decides, for whatever reason, that value of cotton pickers is innate, they can elect to bar cotton pickers, and thus the marginal utility of a cotton picker remains high for as long as cotton is wanted.

The labor theory of value however would declare that a person's labor is equal to what they can produce, and in Marxist terms, they ought to be rewarded one hundred percent for that. Of course that is not how it works in practice, because skilled workers can produce much more value than unskilled workers, for example, in the translation of Tibetan texts. The only way it could work in Marxist terms is to abolish markets and declare all labor is equal in value as well as all commodities produced by that labor, which is of course total nonsense. A chair made in half an hour is in no way comparable to a chair made by a fine craftsmen in 80 hours.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Rickpa said:

The idea behind free markets is totally voluntary. People exchange something desired for something desired to their mutual benefit. The failure that keeps visiting US markets is the failure to have free markets.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, Rick, the role of government is to regulate markets so they remain stable. What you are advocating is market anarchism. This is demonstrably bad for both the markets themselves as well as the economy.

Rickpa said:

Indeed, we are in peril.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, I don't see Obama stormtroopers crossing my threshold anytime soon, unless you count the meek lady who came by my house yesterday to let us know about healthcare options.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

kirtu said:

Nazi Germany did not try to exterminate communism or the Jewish people due to resource shortages (although Nazi propaganda hyped the necessity for living space).

Malcolm wrote:

Hitler went to war primarily to fuel the German war machine. The concentration camps were a distraction that contributed in large measure to Hitler's losing the war. But in the end, the most important objective in Hitler's campaigns were oil fields in Russia. Since he never seized them, he lost the war.

kirtu said:

WW1 was also not fought primarily due to resource competition.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it was, it was not even possible without Bismark's train system.

kirtu said:

Neither was the Korean War.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it was, that is why North Korea invaded South Korea.

kirtu said:

Neither were the Vietnam Wars.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure they were, the Vietnam wars were fought to oust the French, and then the Americans. The French were there for resources, the Americans (us) blundered into it because of fears that Communist control of South Vietnam would strangle shipping lanes in Indochina.

kirtu said:

Neither was the Nicaraguan wars.

Malcolm wrote:

We did not fight a war in Nicaragua.

kirtu said:

Neither were the Angolan wars.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it was, it was sparked in response to forced cotton cultivation.

kirtu said:

The American Revolutionary War was also not fought over resource competition, even buying the taxes thing.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote][/quote]

Of course it was. It was fought mainly because New England resented British interference in the domestic economy.

Even where wars seem to be fought for power, ultimately power brings only one thing: control over resources.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

...future widespread Anarchist society.

Malcolm wrote:

It will never happen.

Sherab Dorje said:

Never say never.

Malcolm wrote:

Anarchist society:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I think that our current political/economic model is based on theft. I think it is a form of exploitation or extortion that we have got so used to that most of us don't even stop to think about it. I believe capitalism is inherently violent: it not only pushes us into war after war, but its whole value system and praxis is dehumanising and alienating.

Malcolm wrote:

No, resource shortages push us into wars. This will happen under any political or economic system, apart from one run by awakened people (my preferred utopian vision). Therefore, the only obvious solution is to support as many people as possible in becoming awakened. Short of that, it is imperative to encourage worldly people to refrain from the ten non-virtues and to cultivate the four brahma-viharas (love, compassion, joy and equanimity).

tellyontellyon said:

How easy is it to care for all sentient beings when we have to compete with each other for our survival?

Malcolm wrote:

No one said the bodhisattva path was easy, but the first priority of a bodhisattva is preserve themselves so they can be service to others.

tellyontellyon said:

It is important for us to recognise that we all play our part in this political and economic system, none of us are innocent. We are guilty of allowing this system to continue. Some of us might have even found a comfortable little niche within it... but we have to understand that somebody else is paying for that niche.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I am not guilty and I do not feel guilty. I have not stolen anything from anyone. I \_want\_ this present system to continue, 1. because markets are a fact of human existence regardless of the currency which is being used 2. because no proposed alternatives are workable or scale internationally.

And TOTO, evolution is all about niches, and we humans are no different, we inhabit the niches we find ourselves whether through karma or struggle to overcome our karma. You keep forgetting that a person who has no karma to be wealthy will never be wealthy even if you given them all the money in the world, they will have obstacles, or it will be robbed from them, or they will behave in such a way with it that they are sure to go to lower realms.

I am all for small scale experiments. If some want to have a anarchist commune, I am in favor of it. If some want to try and run their country or state according to Marxist principles, well, I think they are crazy but let them try. In the case of the former, they will have to deal with the fact that some people naturally are leaders and that a hierarchy will of necessity evolve, and former will have to face the fact that they will inevitably face supply and demand in the market.

While your desire for universal economic parity is admirable, it is romantic and impractical.

tellyontellyon said:

If someone want's to be a monk and live in a cave, I respect that. But for lay people who work and live in wider society we must recognise that we are playing a role in that society whether we think we are or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but we don't have the right to force our vision of that society down anyone's throat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

rob h said:

Just going back to this from earlier as I missed it :

Malcolm wrote:

Something cannot exist as both conditioned and unconditioned, it must be one or the other. Moreover, the former can never become the latter, nor can the latter become the former.

rob h said:

I think it can be, in the way that it's the basis for both. So while many people go through this world in delusion, others can use this exact same world to realize awakening. Or in the way that one side of the world can be in darkness, but the other side has sunlight. The world (and in turn the dependent.) can be both things at the same time, according to what situation it's looked at from.

Malcolm wrote:

All of this refers to the imagined nature. The imagined neither exists nor does not exist in truth since it never existed, being the projection of traces from the ālayavijñāna.

rob h said:

The version by Khenpo Shenga and Ju Mipham says that it's all three (bold is to point out the verse, just like the book does.) :

What is the reality of the characteristics? Once they are understood, the exaggerated and depreciative views regarding phenomena and persons do not occur. This is what characterizes the reality of the imaginary nature. Nor do the exaggerated and depreciative views of apprehended and apprehender occur, which is what characterizes the reality of the dependent nature. And in the same way, once it is understood, the exaggerated and depreciative views related to existence and non-existence do not occur. This is what characterizes the reality of the thoroughly established nature. Being unmistaken about this fundamental reality is referred to as the “reality of the characteristics.”

Malcolm wrote:

This still refers to the imagined nature viz: reification persons and things is the imagined nature, the absence of subject and object which produces the imagined is the dependent nature, the absence of existence and non-existence of the imagined nature in the dependent nature is the perfected nature. All of these three terms hinge on the imagined nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

...future widespread Anarchist society.

Malcolm wrote:  
It will never happen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But the view of Dzogchen, Mahāmudra and Mahāmadhyamaka are not partial at all since they are based on direct perception of reality.

gad rgyangs said:

Doesn't direct perception of reality, by definition, transcend all concepts and views? Therefore, all conceptual and verbal constructs will be, at best, partial metaphors pointing to that direct perception. At worst, they are entangling briars from which the gullible never escape.

Malcolm wrote:

But the Buddhist view is not actually a verbal construct, and for that matter neither is Buddhist awakening.

For example, one needs only to understand the dependent nature of afflictions to become a stream entrant and so on, becoming free of the fetters. This does not require elaborate philosophy. It merely requires confidence in the teaching of dependent origination and the four truths of nobles.

Likewise, for the realization of emptiness on the path of seeing, one simple has to reflect on the absence of extremes (for a very long time, albeit), as Shantideva states, "when neither an entity or a non-entity remain before the mind, at the time, the mind is pacified", and this too is an experiential view.

In the case of Vajrayāna, the view, such as it is, is based on the experience of the example wisdom at the time of direct introduction or the third and fourth empowerments. Unfettered equipoise in the mind essence, or "ordinary awareness" is the view of Vajrayāna.

So this is why your illustration is irrelevant to Buddhadharma, and why Buddhadharma does not merit inclusion amongst "the blind men".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:



Malcolm wrote:

A partial view is a partial view.

gad rgyangs said:

exactly, and that's all any view is going to be.

Malcolm wrote:

But the view of Dzogchen, Mahāmudra and Mahāmadhyamaka are not partial at all since they are based on direct perception of reality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

rob h said:

Have found this from the Madhyantavibhanga, I know he says elsewhere in the text that something exists, but would guess that this is more of his actual view :

Once they are understood,

The exaggerated and depreciative views

Regarding phenomena and persons,

Apprehended and apprehender,

And existence and non-existence do not occur -

This is what characterizes reality.

Malcolm wrote:

All of this refers to the imagined nature. The imagined neither exists nor does not exist in truth since it never existed, being the projection of traces from the ālayavijñāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, in this case what Asanga is saying is emptiness means empty of the imagined, and that is about it. The dependent is not empty of the perfected, since it is the perfected when the imagined is recognized to be non-existent.

rob h said:

Yeah I think I remember quoting him saying something similar in another thread further down in this forum. Will carry on reading some of his works though and see if he states otherwise elsewhere.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, one must read these things for oneself. Only then can one truly decide.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Malcolm, really.

I think society has changed a great deal. Yes there are many of the same old problems, but many many things have been improved through social action.

I caught a bus the other day in Swansea: two men got on and were snuggling and kissing. No problem. Even forty years ago they would have risked getting beaten up and jailed. I believe in the USA black and white people can now sit in the same section of the bus and eat in the same restaurants. This sort of thing used to be the exception rather than the rule.

Malcolm wrote:

And before slavery was widespread in the US it was the rule to. And your gay friends still risk getting beaten up. Bias against gay people is not finished by a long shot. And of course racism and xenophobia is rampant in Europe right now. And let's not even mention Russia.

Some things have changed, other things have gotten worse, other things have gotten better. Things are better in our neck of the woods because we are the richest nations on the globe. Handing everyone \$56,000 a year is not only impossible, but it won't solve anything.

tellyontellyon said:

People with mental health problems are not chained to the cell wall and sprayed with high pressure hoses in order to help them to become more morally sane.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are dosed with toxic compounds which are much more effective.

tellyontellyon said:

It is no longer acceptable to hit or rape your wife.

Malcolm wrote:

For now, but when things get bad, and it will, all these things will again resurface.

tellyontellyon said:

Social action and protest is what won many of these improvements.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. But they are not permanent.

tellyontellyon said:

If it wasn't for organised social action we would still have 10 year old children working down the mines and nobody would know what a 'weekend' was.

Malcolm wrote:

We still do, just not in England or the US.

Incidentally, I am not saying that one should do nothing, or remain passive. One must help sentient beings. But as has been pointed out a gazillion times it must be done within the confines of Buddhist ethics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your diagram shows them as all equivalent. That is why I said it was perennialist.

gad rgyangs said:

mais non, equivalent in partiality, not in content.

Malcolm wrote:

A partial view is a partial view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think he means in a nondual sense though, not as in individuality or anything conventional.

If exists nondually, it exists, which is why the Madhyamakas claim that Yogacarins are nondual realists.

rob h said:

In a nondual sense though no polarity can be attributed, can it? I still think the problem comes down to taking what he's saying too literally. I can see how some Madhyamikas look at it in that way though. Also how maybe Asanga himself could've worded things better? Or maybe he was simply referring to what's left ultimately when everything false is discarded, and it actually does exist in some way, but with an equal nature of emptiness, so it had a balance. Would like to think that's the case anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in this case what Asanga is saying is emptiness means empty of the imagined, and that is about it. The dependent is not empty of the perfected, since it is the perfected when the imagined is recognized to be non-existent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No Dante, it really isn't like that. And Dzogchen is just an alternate scheme for explaining how one sees, progressively, the three kāyas, in reality no different than the five paths and ten stages. For all its cig car rhetoric, in the end, Dzogchen is just a gradual path like everything else in Buddhadharma.

gad rgyangs said:

Who said anything about Dzogchen? Perspectivism doesn't claim that all dṛṣṭi are equal, just that they are all partial perspectives, even the best ones, like Dzogchen. It's not that there isn't reality, its just that as soon as you conceptualize about it and open your mouth about it, you've got a limited perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

Your diagram shows them as all equivalent. That is why I said it was perennialist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is good to be honest about one's views, even if it amounts to eel wriggling.

That said, I go by the dictum utter by Āryadeva, realization proceeds from view. And of course the basis of the Buddhist path is samyagdṛṣṭi as you know.

gad rgyangs said:

dṛṣṭi is a dirty word since Nagarjuna, and everybody thinks their dṛṣṭi is samyak, based on which part of the elephant they felt up.

Malcolm wrote:

No Dante, it really isn't like that. And Dzogchen is just an alternate scheme for explaining how one sees, progressively, the three kāyas, in reality no different than the five paths and ten stages. For all its cig car rhetoric, in the end, Dzogchen is just a gradual path like everything else in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 5:36 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

rob h said:

Are you going from the "exist in every aspect" part? Because the translation I have words it differently :

If the dependent and the absolute did not exist at all, defilement and purification would not take place.

Malcolm wrote:

It amounts to the same thing, I was translating it direct from Tibetan.

rob h said:

He does seem to contradict himself in parts, but it's maybe because he's explaining from conventional and non-conventional aspects. There's plenty of places in just the Mahayanasamgraha where he could also be said to be stating the opposite. For instance, when speaking of the fourfold pure dharma, this is the first of the four listed :  
(a) The essential purity (prakṛtivyavadāna), i.e., the true nature (tathatā), emptiness (śūnyatā), the utmost point of reality (bhūtakoti), the signless (animitta), the absolute (paramārtha), the fundamental element (dharmadhātu).

Malcolm wrote:

Asanga clarifies elsewhere that he considers emptiness to be an affirming negation, like the emptiness of the Cullasuññata sutta, which cites in its Sanskrit version.

rob h said:

I think he means in a nondual sense though, not as in individuality or anything conventional.

Malcolm wrote:

If exists nondually, it exists, which is why the Madhyamakas claim that Yogacarins are nondual realists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Eel wriggling, in other words, like Sanjaya Bellaputtha.

gad rgyangs said:

one person's eel wriggling is another person's intellectual honesty.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is good to be honest about one's views, even if it amounts to eel wriggling.

That said, I go by the dictum uttered by Āryadeva, realization proceeds from view. And of course the basis of the Buddhist path is samyaktṛṣṭi as you know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

If we wait until we have eliminated all afflictions before we do anything then the planet will have gone up in flames.

Malcolm wrote:

Its going to get there anyway. This is one of the reasons why Buddhists tend to be pessimistic about social revolutions in general. When you have worldly people leading society, no matter who they are, things just get screwed up.

As the song goes:

Meet the new boss

Same as the old boss

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

rob h said:

It seems contradictory but maybe that's because the alayavijnana and the dependent are neither pure nor impure, conditioned nor unconditioned, nondual.

Malcolm wrote:

It's contradictory because he says it exists. That makes Yogacara realist. Something cannot exist as both conditioned and unconditioned, it must be one or the other.

Moreover, the former can never become the latter, nor can the latter become the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

smcj said:

Oh c'mon. Of course it is a matter of partiality. Unless you are saying that there is a broad consensus on the matter, which as we all know is never the case in Tibetan Dharma, then you are presenting your personal preference with an argument attached. What the possible rebuttals to your argument are I have no idea, but suffice it here to say that there are plenty of qualified khenpos that subscribe to the idea of the 3 natures that are familiar with your objection. The Tibetan system of treating the perfected nature as empty of the dependent and the imagined indeed is based on some very late Indian scholars, but it is not justified in the works of Maitreyanatha, Asanga or Vasubandhu. As you say it is a later development. There does seem to be a slippery slope effect here regarding the Buddha Nature teachings that is playing out over time. One of the things I admire about the Gelugpas is their insistence on trying to hold the line. I have a mental image of them as being like the little Dutch boy with his finger in the dike, only the entire dike has already collapsed except for the section a couple feet to the right and left of him.

Where this slippery slope ends up is in the Shentong and Chinese non-dual camps. Making too much of an issue out of it at this point is just crying over spilt milk, imo. I think an ecumenical "we will just have to agree to disagree" approach is in order.

Malcolm wrote:

Even Karl Brunholz admits that the three natures as presented by the Tibetan gzhan stong pas does not reflect their use by the original Yogacara masters. The former use what he describes as the type two schema of the three natures, while he fully admits that the latter use a type one schema. The problem arises because the Tibetan gzhan stong pas clearly claim that they are representing the thought of the original Yogacara masters, Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu when in fact they clearly are not, and thus Tsongkhapa, Gorampa, and so on, a whole host of Kagyu, Sakya, Nyingma and Gelug scholars can take them to task for misapplication of this doctrine.

The three natures doctrine is entirely irrelevant to the tathāgatagarbha teachings. It is wholly absent in the ten so called "tathāgatagarbha" sutras as well as the Uttaratantra. The three natures doctrine was grafted onto the tathāgatagarbha doctrine in Tibet because the tathāgatagarbha sūtras are considered "third turning" and the subject of the three natures is covered extensively in the Saṃdhinirmocana sutra, a sūtra of the Yogacara class, which provides us with the locus classicus of the three turnings, but it is so vague as to what is meant by this as to be rather useless, though much stock is placed in it by the gzhan stong pas.

Longchenpa is a perfectly good example of an author who considers the

tathāgatagarbha sūtras to be definitive without mixing in the Yogacara three own natures. He also considers Prasangika to be the definitive sutra view.

My problem with the gzhan stong pas is that they do not heed the valid objections of their opponents, and as far as I can tell adhere to their tenet system out of sheer stubbornness rather than reason.

My objection to gzhan stong therefore is primarily an objection to their sloppiness of scholarship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Is Buddhist cosmology essentially Vedic?

Content:

theanarchist said:

If I remember Myriad Worlds by Jamgon Kongtrul right, in Buddhism has several different cosmological doctrins.

Malcolm wrote:

Three in fact: the Kośa, the Avatamska and the Kalacakra cosmologies. The much vaunted Dzogchen cosmology is actually nothing of the sort, and is just a restated version of the Kośa cosmology complete with a world tree.

It also seems that the authors of the Kalacakra Tantra knew full well that the Meru cosmology was merely symbolic because their calculations for the movements of the sun, moon, stars and planets ignore it, even though it is used to set up a hierarchy of the three lokas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Then you still wind up with a contradiction because you are claiming that something defined as conditioned is not conditioned.

rob h said:

Isn't that problem there with anything classed as nondual, primordial, one-taste, etc, though? It could be that it's conditioned when the imaginary nature is present, or when it's still attached to, (and also mainly to point out and teach others.) but when it's let go of, it's neither conditioned nor unconditioned, because we're then leaving the realm of logic, and it's then beyond defining. So the whole concept is then let go of once it's served its purpose.

Malcolm wrote:



No, the dependent nature is defined as conditioned. The Mahāyānasamgraha states: Why? If it is asked what is the dependent, since it arises from the seeds of one's traces, given that is the case, it is the conditioned dependent.

Here, one can clearly see the other dependent is the ālayavijñāna.

Then he goes on:

If it is held that whatever appears does not exist in that way, for what reason will the dependent nature not become the total non-existence of everything? If it is asked, if that [dependent nature] does not exist, how will the non-existent perfected nature not become the non-existence of everything? Affliction and purification are perceptible.

Therefore, everything is not non-existent. A verse for that:

If the dependent and the perfected  
do not exist in every aspect,  
affliction and purification  
can never exist at all.

So you see, there is an assertion here by Asanga that the ālayavijñāna which is the basis of purification must be an existent in order that the perfected nature can exist; but since one is conditioned and the other is unconditioned, this Yogacara view suffers from a crucial internal contradiction.

The gzhan stong pas seek to escape this contradiction by mapping the three natures over the two truths. But this mapping is not justified in the Indian texts and in reality harms both systems. So you wind up with a system that is kind of like a tole, a sterile hybrid between a yak and cow, being neither.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with the three natures is that they contain an internal contradiction: viz since the perfected nature is merely the absence of the imagined in the dependent, one must explain how the dependent, which is conditioned, becomes the perfected, which is unconditioned.

rob h said:

Yeah can see how that can be a problem, but maybe it's also an act of pointing to the idea that they're always both present? As in nirvana is also samsara. But by removing the imagined you remove the contradiction, and they're of what you could say, one taste, or nondual. So instead of trying to go from one to the other, instead you can just work on letting the attachment to the imagined go and then the nondual aspect can then arise, appear, return, and so on, in a natural way.

So you could maybe sum it up by saying that the dependent only appears to be conditioned when the imagined is present. Once that's gone, then it's nondual.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you still wind up with a contradiction because you are claiming that something defined as conditioned is not conditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

smcj said:

I didn't realize it was the three natures that was so much of an issue, and will remember to keep that in mind when researching.

It's an issue for Malcolm personally. It's his bugaboo.

rob h said:

Am just wondering Malcolm : why don't you like the concept of the three natures?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a matter of partiality. The problem with the three natures is that they contain an internal contradiction: viz since the perfected nature is merely the absence of the imagined in the dependent, one must explain how the dependent, which is conditioned, becomes the perfected, which is unconditioned.

The Tibetan system of treating the perfected nature as empty of the dependent and the imagined indeed is based on some very late Indian scholars, but it is not justified in the works of Maitreyanatha, Asanga or Vasubandhu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, perennialism states that all religions are partial revelations of a universal truth, or reality.

gad rgyangs said:

there is a fundamental difference between saying that all religions are expressing the same truth, and saying that all human conceptual systems (religious as well as secular science and philosophy) are inherently limited, metaphorical attempts to describe something that is beyond categories and definitions.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perennial\\_philosophy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perennial_philosophy) is always couched in language like "all religions are one" and emphasizes similarities among religions and so-called mystical experiences. What I am suggesting with my doodle is more like

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perspectivism> or

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anekantavada>

Malcolm wrote:

Eel wriggling, in other words, like Sanjaya Bellaputtha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

In a sense that's true. Anarchism is not unlike Libertarianism in that their goal is a state from which everything will gradually build up again.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, supposedly better, but without eradication of the the afflictions, well, it will be the same old shit all over again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 9th, 2014 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria

Content:

Zhen Li said:

(I always find it hard to wrap my head around red = right wing, blue = left wing, in the US)

Malcolm wrote:

It's a media convention collectively arrived at by the US media in the 2000 Gore/Bush contest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria

Content:

Simon E. said:

Those who most typify the current anti-American sentiment which is widespread in the UK would agree with you..

I suspect that in part they see all that was worst about colonialism being replicated by current American foreign policy.

Malcolm wrote:

All the while oblivious to the fact their standard of living depends upon it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria

Content:

Simon E. said:

But that's rather the point Malcolm. When an educated crowd of younger Brits break into spontaneous applause at any negative view of the USA at just about any stand-up venue, from a local Pub to the Edinburgh Festival, they are not inhibited by considerations of heinous behaviour by other nations.

As I said, its visceral. Its not a mindset that results from logic.

And the fact that Brits DO react like that can readily be attested to by anyone who has attended such venues.

If the comic wants a quick laugh then the royal family or the U.S. will get one every time.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is not like the British Empire was this super benevolent entity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sönam said:

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, let's ensure world chaos...screw it...tear it all down and lets go back the pre-agricultural period and 3,000,000 million humans....oh wait...that is called "anarcho-primitivism....and then the cycle will start all over again.

If there is a utopian fantasy out there to subscribe to, I prefer the Shambhala mythos ala a Buddhist world regency.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria

Content:

Simon E. said:

As a reasonably educated Brit I would say that Moldbug has little or no understanding of the phenomenon in question at all.

His rationalisation adds upto little more than a slightly whiney and puzzled ' you guys don't really hate us .'

The reality is both more complex and more visceral.

Malcolm wrote:

He does have a good point, however. In general, the crimes of other nations, Britain, Italy, Germany, France, Japan, Australia, Canada, Mexico, Iraq, Iran, Egypt, you name it, etc. certainly place people from these countries on very shaky ground when it comes to venting spleen against the Great Satan...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Certainly not as smart as you and all the perennialists out there. But being a Buddha, he does not have to be smart, merely totally awakened.

gad rgyangs said:

oops. you walked right into that one! Perennialism says that all religions are expressing the same universal truth. My graphix clearly shows that the various religions (as well as science) are all different, partial perspectives on the nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

No, perennialism states that all religions are partial revelations if a universal truth, or reality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I rather doubt he intended to included his own Dharma in the above description.

gad rgyangs said:

oh, then he not as smart as I thought....

Malcolm wrote:

Certainly not as smart as you and all the perennialists out there. But being a Buddha, he does not have to be smart, merely totally awakened.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize this analogy was first introduced by the Buddha?

dzogchungpa said:

Is that actually known for a fact?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

elephant perspectives 6.jpg

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize this analogy was first introduced by the Buddha?

gad rgyangs said:

he so smart! How come nobody listen to him?

Malcolm wrote:

I rather doubt he intended to included his own Dharma in the above description.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Perspective

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

elephant perspectives 6.jpg

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize this analogy was first introduced by the Buddha?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Longevity Mon Lam

Content:

pemachophel said:

It's not Rinpoche's style to promote His shabten because He is a good Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN uses a generic one because it covers all one's gurus.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Thanks for the "clarification", "Malcolm".

Malcolm wrote:

I thought you understood that Kyle was my emanation...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

There is a direct reference to the Tathagatagarbha which is the Dharmakaya, and in Tathagatagarbha literature the Dharmakaya is Not-Empty.

Malcolm wrote:

What the dharmakāya is not empty of is omniscience.

Son of Buddha said:

spoken like a true Shentongpa All of its qualities are simply qualities of omniscience, and that is all.

aye it is not empty of its qualities.....spoken like a true Shentongpa. The dharmakāya is unconditioned, it has neither form or shape, so those are the only qualities it could be said to possess. It has two aspects, the emptiness aspect and the luminous aspect. Understood in this way, one understands the real meaning of purity, bliss, self, and permanence.

are you trying to quote Ven Dolpopa?

It is pure because it is empty, it is bliss because it is free from suffering, it is "self"

because omniscience transcends both self and non-self and it is permanent because it

not subject to decay.

M

It is pure because it is empty(of all adventitious defilements and conditions)

it is bliss because it is free from suffering

it is "self" because omniscience transcends both self and non-self(of the  
forders).....(just as Dolpopa's True Self is defined)

it is permanent because it not subject to decay.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not gzhan stong. Gzhan stong requires the convoluted misapplication of the three  
natures to the two truths. In other words, gzhan stong is at worst, a deformed  
Madhyamaka; at best it is a transitional view between false aspectarian Yogacara and  
Madhyamaka.

Nothing stated above is inconsistent with the definitive sutras of the second turning of  
the wheel. The Āryāṣṭasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā:

Kauśika, given that is so, the Tathāgata is not named tathāgata because he attained his  
own physical body [ātmabhāvaśarīra], but it is because he attained omniscient wisdom  
that the Tathāgata is called the tathāgata.

Kauśika, whatever the omniscience of the tathāgata arhat samyakbuddha is, this  
comes from prajñāpāramitā.

The attainment of the Tathāgatas own physical body arises from prajñāpāramitā and  
skill in means, and is the support for omniscient wisdom. Relying on such a support [as  
the prajñāpāramitā] will generate omniscient wisdom, and will also generate the body of  
a buddha, and will also generate the dharmakāya, and will also generate the sangha.  
Thus if one wants to realize the dharmakāya and omniscience, one must rely on  
prajñāpāramitā.

Also here is a clear usage of "atman" which does not refer to the self, but rather is being  
used as a reflexive noun.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

The is a direct reference to the Tathagatagarbha which is the Dharmakaya, and in  
Tathagatagarbha lititure the Dharmakaya is Not-Empty.

Malcolm wrote:

What the dharmakāya is not empty of is omniscience. All of its qualities are simply



qualities of omniscience, and that is all. The dharmakāya is unconditioned, it has neither form or shape, so those are the only qualities it could be said to possess. It has two aspects, the emptiness aspect and the luminous aspect. Understood in this way, one understands the real meaning of purity, bliss, self, and permanence.

It is pure because it is empty, it is bliss because it is free from suffering, it is "self" because omniscience transcends both self and non-self and it is permanent because it is not subject to decay.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The freedom to starve is hardly utopian, it is merely pragmatic, and it happens to many people all over the world in our present global capitalist economy. Frankly, the systematic eradication of subsistence farming has been one of the great challenges developing nations face, and one of the great mistakes they have made. It is also a mistake made in the US. The centralization of agriculture is very dangerous.

Sherlock said:

The eradication of nomadic pastoralism is an even greater mistake, one which is causing global desertification. If you seen Savory's presentation on using animal husbandry to fight desertification, his map of desertifying areas basically corresponds to where nomads have been forced in great numbers to leave their traditional way of life. Rather than a complicated top-down approach to organizing herds and so on, it's better to just let them carry on their traditional lifestyle.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I totally agree. properly managed cattle herds can actually restore soil and grassland much faster than "nature" can. There was a reason the sod in the Midwest was 8 feet deep — bison.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Personally I am holding out for this:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sönam said:

If anarchy is understood as a non-system in harmony with "what is" (Libertarianism in a non political sense), it does not refer to any already experimented utopia (including capitalism). It is right that his efficiency would be much improved if human beings were aware of the three afflictions, nevertheless it's a "natural way of interfering", the nearest to the dharma. The main adage of libertarianism being: "My freedom stop where other's freedom start" ... would we really need something else to, all together, interfere?

As for capitalism, I may observe that you approach it with a pinch of utopia when you consider that: "... at least it is not authoritarian or totalitarian. Yes, you may be free to starve under this economic system, but at least you are free."

But we are not going to engage ourselves in a controversial discussion ... so I notice your present point of view.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

The freedom to starve is hardly utopian, it is merely pragmatic, and it happens to many people all over the world in our present global capitalist economy. Frankly, the systematic eradication of subsistence farming has been one of the great challenges developing nations face, and one of the great mistakes they have made. It is also a mistake made in the US. The centralization of agriculture is very dangerous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

"Lord, the Tathagatagarbha is void(empty) of all the defilement-stores, which are discrete and knowing as not liberated.

"Lord, the Tathagatagarbha is not void(empty) of the Buddha dharmas which are nondiscrete, inconceivable, more numerous than the sands of the Ganges, and knowing as liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

This is merely a reference to dharmakāya. Of course, since dharmakāya is emptiness, as Nāgārjuna says, "for those whom emptiness possible, everything is possible..." When one directly knows emptiness, having become a Buddha, one knows everything, those are the buddha qualities being referred to.

The reason why only buddhas can see tathāgatagarbha is the same reason only buddhas can see the dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

The sutra even quotes old anatman(not self) teachings and explains them in the context of True Self.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, indeed, which is why is treated as a provisional text.

The Āryākṣayamatinirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra sets out the criteria for a sūtra of definitive meaning:

Any sūtrānta which explains in a variety of different terms a self, a sentient being, a living being, a personality, a person, an individual, one born from a human, a human, an agent, an experiencer — teaching an owner in what is ownerless — those sutras are called "of provisional meaning". Any sūtrānta which teaches emptiness, the signless, the wishless, the unconditioned, the non-arisen, the unproduced, the insubstantial, the non-existence of self, the non-existence of sentient beings, the non-existence of living beings, the non-existence of individuals, the non-existence of an owner up to the doors of liberation, those are called "definitive meaning". This is taught in the sūtrāntas of definitive meaning but is not taught in the sūtrāntas of the provisional meaning. This is why the tathāgatagarbha doctrine can be either provisional or definitive depending on one's understanding and method of explication.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Rickpa said:

If people are kind and ethical, anarchy would naturally work as well. In fact, nothing would be better. Are we kind and ethical at this time?

Sönam said:

Good point Rick-pa. Anarchy is certainly a non-organization in harmony with "what is" ... that we are not ready yet, as a civilization, does not mean we should not prepare for it now.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:  
Dear Sonam:

From a Buddhist point of view, all of these utopian visions require one thing in common, i.e., that all people are free from the three afflictions, or at least able to keep them in check. We presently live in the era of the five degenerations where afflictions are rampant. What are the five?

The degeneration of lifespan  
The degeneration of the seasons (climate)  
The degeneration of afflictions  
The degeneration of view (i.e. increased reliance on materialism, like Marxism, anarcho-capitalism, etc.)  
The degeneration of decline (declining health, intelligence, and so on)

For this reason I place no hope in any utopian schemes. The present economic system remains the one most accessible of improvement and tuning. Socialism, as envisioned by the 19th and early 20th century firebrands, has proven to be an utter failure. While capitalism is spiritually bereft as well, at least it is not authoritarian or totalitarian. Yes, you may be free to starve under this economic system, but at least you are free.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 10:03 AM  
Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marriage  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
Indian culture is very hygienic and civilized, actually. They suffer from overpopulation in the north. The squalid nature of India has many causes, mostly colonial.

Indrajala said:  
Didn't you say...  
And Indian cities, by and large, are dirty, dangerous and squalid, and always have been. It is their culture. Not ours. We can visit and enjoy it or hate it, but it is not our business to tell them what to do or how to run their country.  
This is contradictory.

Malcolm wrote:  
Not really. Until quite recently Indian culture was largely rural, not urbanized. The problems with overcrowding in the cities in India is a result of people leaving the land. And this has largely happened in the past 40 years. Nevertheless, Indian cities have been squalid, dense and overpopulated for centuries leading to the kinds of urban problems you perceive now.

On the other hand, Indian culture has a well established customs of hygiene, that many

follow very rigorously. But I have to confess, most of my experience in India is in the south. I have spent very little time in the North.

Of course, Chinese cities are just as filthy and just as dangerous. I have been to many of them, and find them to be no improvement over Indian cities. In Chinese cities you see many people dead drunk in the middle of the day, staggering around like idiots, the drinking there is appalling, not to mention the fact that everyone smokes like fiends. The country side is absolutely polluted with industrial waste, and it goes on and on.

Japanese cities, it is true, are generally quite clean, but for example, when I visited Kyoto in 1986, I was appalled at the amount of garbage there was in the woods, despite the fact that the areas where people live are neat and tidy. Also, universally, the toilets were often noisome pits rivaling some toilets I have seen in both China and India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Longevity Mon Lam

Content:

ngodrup said:

I assume there is more than lone Longevity prayer in existence for Rinpoche.  
Does anyone have one?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally it is just the one at the end of the medium thun.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

JKhedrup said:

If laypeople lose even more confidence it does not bode well for the future of the Sangha here.

Malcolm wrote:

Arguing that the bhikṣu ordination is dispensable hardly inspires confidence.

JKhedrup said:

I have no problem with a lay priest lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

We have that in Tibet, and I am one of those.

JKhedrup said:

But a bhikṣu is a bhikṣu and the murkier the distinction becomes, the more danger

there is of losing both the confidence of the lay community and the disappearance of the precious monastic form and discipline. I do not want to see the rules and community life disappear and the robes and outward appearance remain. That would be deeply troubling to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. If it is to be done, it ought to be done right and according to the traditional form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Jikan said:

As an aside: Ven. Indrajala may find the practice model at California Tendai Monastery of interest, in that there's an effort being made to practice along pre-Meiji lines in terms of renunciation.

<http://caltendai.org/TempleLife.html>

note that the use of the word "monk" on the temple's website doesn't correspond to the usage preferred here; ordination in this sense follows the Brahma Net Sutra precepts, not the Vinaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence they are, to coin a phrase "Lay monks".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Atisha thought it was a problem. That is why he never recited posadha with other monks in Tibet. Also, he was prevented from spreading the Mahāsaṃghika lineage because all other ordination lineages were barred by royal decree.

But I am also sure you are aware of the story from Tibetan history about the ordination after the Langdarma period. Chinese Bhikshus of the Dharmagupta tradition helped make up a quorum for a Mulasarvastivada ordination

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, the Vinaya was reintroduced to Tibet twice more, making for a total of three ordination lineages as I know you are aware.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't reject "renunciate bodhisattvas", I simply do not accept that they are bhikṣus. As far as I am concerned, they are celibate upāsakās because they have no more than five pratimokṣa vows to observe.

Indrajala said:

You said, "I don't regard it as valid."

And the Tendai model of renunciate bodhisattvas includes ten major and forty-eight minor precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Those are bodhisattva samvara, not prātimokṣa vows.

What I do not accept as valid is that those samvaras make one equivalent to a bhikṣu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is generally a preliminary step in becoming a dge tshul, a sort of pre-novitiate probation, similar to the śikṣamāṇā and probably adapted from it in spirit.

Indrajala said:

So you accept an ordination that has no literal basis in scripture yet reject the idea of a renunciate bodhisattva of the Tendai model which is likewise adapted from scripture in spirit?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't reject "renunciate bodhisattvas", I simply do not accept that they are bhikṣus. As far as I am concerned, they are celibate upāsakās because they have no more than five pratimokṣa vows to observe. Those are the only vows that can be conferred in a refuge rite, whether it be Śrāvakayāna or Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The gomin is an upāsakā, his or her vows demand celibacy. And the bhramacarya

ordination does as well. When you take the brahmacarya ordination, sexual misconduct for you is sex, period.

Indrajala said:

The five precepts in no scripture I've read actually define the third precept as being brahmacarya. You can have that intent, but that's not the letter of the law.

You speak of a brahmacarya ordination for laypeople. What basis is there for this in scripture? I know of the practice, but where is the third precept (of the five) defined for a layperson as brahmacarya?

Malcolm wrote:

It is generally a preliminary step in becoming a dge tshul, a sort of pre-novitiate probation, similar to the śikṣamāṇā and probably adapted from it in spirit. Basically, the idea goes, if you can maintain celibacy for a year, then they will consider letting you ordain as a dge tshul. I myself received this type of full upāsakā ordination many years ago, but I decided that I was not going to be a bhikṣu, that I was not suited for it by temperament. Since I am a Vajrayāna practitioner, I thought it was pointless. So I am a full Mūlasarvastivādin upāsakā (rather rare actually), but I let go of the intent to be celibate. Most people who take refuge in Tibetan Buddhism do so by a Mahāyāna refuge rite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not just that, but one can take the upāsakā vows with the intent to be celibate.

Indrajala said:

Intent perhaps, but the actual wording and understanding of the five precepts in the lay context refers to sexual misconduct, never celibacy. The upāsakā cannot be defined as a renunciate based on their five precepts, because none of the precepts demand celibacy and abandonment of the home life.

Malcolm wrote:

The gomin is an upāsakā, his or her vows demand celibacy. And the bhramacarya ordination does as well. When you take the brahmacarya ordination, sexual misconduct for you is sex, period. Vows after all are mere intentions.

Anyway, the concept now of "going forth" is a little silly. Buddhist bhikṣus have not truly done so in 2000 years or more for the most part. And as you know, Chinese monks are scandalized to find so called "Mahāyāna" monks living with their wives, engaged in farming in certain hinterlands.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One's status is defined by one's vows, not by one's renunciation. Upāsakās can indeed be renunciates, which is why there are celibate upāsāka ordinations.

Indrajala said:

If you mean the eight precepts and fasting, this is only temporary.

Malcolm wrote:

Not just that, but one can take the upāsakā vows with the intent to be celibate. Or for example, having received them once, one can daily take the fast day vows, or one can take them for a specified period not to exceed one's lifetime.

Anyway, full upāsakās are renunciates by definition as well, for they renounce taking life, taking what has not been given, lying, intoxication and sexual misconduct. Then of course there is the gomin ordination, but these days it exists only in Theravada.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Non-Buddhist vows do not convert to Buddhist vows even with a bodhisattva ordination. Why? Because the basis of that discipline is based on ignorance.

Indrajala said:

Irrelevant. The hypothetical sadhu might not have any vows at all initially. He would be a renunciate, however the upāsāka is not a renunciate. A sadhu cannot be defined as an upāsāka.

Malcolm wrote:

One's status is defined by one's vows, not by one's renunciation. Upāsakās can indeed be renunciates, which is why there are celibate upāsāka ordinations.

A renunciate who takes bodhisattva vows and no other vows immediately becomes a Bauddha upāsakā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If mundane śramaṇas took bodhisattva vows without undergoing ordination they would be mere upāsakās.

Indrajala said:

No, because the upāsāka is not a home leaver.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-Buddhist vows do not convert to Buddhist vows even with a bodhisattva ordination. Why? Because the basis of that discipline is based on ignorance. Such a person would not be allowed to even sit with novices, let alone bhikṣus.

Holding only the five precepts at most, they would be upāsakās. Upāsakās can be renunciants. The word just means "drawing closer to the positive [dharma]".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A śramaṇa in a Buddhist context is just a bhikṣu, bhikṣuṇī, śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera or śrāmaṇerī.

Indrajala said:

Not necessarily. A renunciate or śramaṇa need not be even Buddhist. If a sadhu aspires to bodhisattvahood and he takes on the precepts, he would be a renunciate bodhisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

If mundane śramaṇas took bodhisattva vows without undergoing ordination they would be mere upāsakās.

Indrajala said:

he would be a renunciate bodhisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

And a mere upāsāka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't. Why? Because even lay people can receive all those vows without abandoning their status as upāsakās, etc.

Indrajala said:

A śramaṇa (and a śramaṇa is a renunciate albeit not strictly speaking a Buddhist Vinaya-based bhikṣu, bhikṣuṇī, śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera or śrāmaṇerī) who receives the bodhisattva precepts is effectively a śramaṇa bodhisattva or renunciate bodhisattva, i.e., equivalent to a Śrāvakayāna bhikṣu. In other words, as a renunciate who takes on the stated set of bodhisattva precepts, you are different from the upāsakā who does, given the earlier śramaṇa lifestyle and aspirations.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh nonsense Jeff, what a load of baloney.

A śramaṇa in a Buddhist context is just a bhikṣu, bhikṣuṇī, śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera or śrāmaṇerī.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

JKhedrup said:

As for Malcolm's comment here about monks of a different Vinaya lineage reciting Posada together : As my sramanera ordination is Mulasarvastivada, and Bhikshu ordination Theravada, I asked both Lama Zopa Rinpoche and the current Jangtse Choje Rinpoche about participating in Tibetan Posada recitation. They both encouraged me to do so. Apparently HHDL has indicated this may not be a problem, but I will have to look for a source to quote on this (there were recent meetings with Burmese monks) However, it would not be good for me to act as part of a quorum in an ordination ceremony, as the lineage of the vows is different. But I am sure other more conservative masters would have different opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

Atisha thought it was a problem. That is why he never recited posadha with other monks in Tibet. Also, he was prevented from spreading the Mahāsaṃghika lineage because all other ordination lineages were barred by royal decree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Indrajala said:

It was the tonsure that made the monk really, rather than the precepts. I know that sounds insufficient to people now, but even in China up until recently it was like that. Most monks from the sounds of it didn't have even novice precepts because it was the tonsure and community recognition that made you a monk. This deviates from legal definitions, yes, but nevertheless in practice it worked like that.

Malcolm wrote:  
Well, that is a farce.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 1:52 AM  
Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:  
A bhikṣu ordination absolutely does not exist in Mahāyāna sutra.

Indrajala said:  
Not explicitly, but the meaning can be drawn out.

Malcolm wrote:  
No, it can't.

Indrajala said:  
The term "renunciate bodhisattva" 出家菩薩 is equivalent to a Mahāyāna bhikṣu.

Malcolm wrote:  
No, it isn't. Why? Because even lay people can receive all those vows without abandoning their status as upāsakās, etc.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 1:39 AM  
Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists  
Content:  
Indrajala said:  
[

This is problematic from a contemporary scholarship perspective. The Vinaya is late period literature. See the above quoting of Schopen in Bronkhorst's work.

Malcolm wrote:  
I don't consider Schopen an authority on anything that has to with Dharma.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 1:23 AM  
Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists  
Content:  
Malcolm wrote:

There are not, there never has been, and there never will be two kinds of bhikṣus in the present dispensation of Buddhadharma.

Indrajala said:

Arguably there are more than two. A Mahāsāṃghika bhikṣu took 218 precepts, which is quite a lot less from other ordination lineages in India. They were another type of bhikṣu arguably.

Malcolm wrote:

You understand my point. In other words, apart from ordination in any of the "18" śrāvaka ordination lineages, there cannot be another kind of bhikṣu. There is no Mahāyāna bhikṣu ordination taught in Mahāyāna. One takes one's Mahāyāna training on the basis of whatever prātimokṣa vows one already possesses, and if one does not have those, they are received during the preliminary of going refuge, which is the first step in any Mahāyāna bodhisattva vow rite.

A bhikṣu ordination absolutely does not exist in Mahāyāna sutra.

If it did exist, the Tibetans would have preferred it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Indrajala said:

My source in Chinese states otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

They are wrong.

Indrajala said:

They are prātimokṣa, Vinaya exists to explicate the prātimokṣa in detail.

No, the Vinaya prātimokṣa only exists because of incidents. Many of the precepts in the Vinaya do not actually relate to the five precepts (like those related to preserving the image of the sangha in the face of judgmental laypeople).

Malcolm wrote:

The Vinaya exists to explain why those precepts were enacted. The precepts came first, accreted over the lifetime of the Buddha.

Indrajala said:

While different ordination lineages have different Vinayas, nevertheless, when you take bhikṣu ordination, you are pledging to hold all the prātimokṣa vows you received, not merely the one's that suit you.

The Buddha thought otherwise apparently. If he indeed stated the minor precepts could

be abandoned, and that precepts which were inappropriate in different lands could likewise be ignored, then he certainly no hard liner as you seem to be in this discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

He made allowances for such things as fur and leather for those who lived in cold places. Of course we have to work with circumstances. But this does not mean we can just "adapt" what we want. It is no big deal that Tibetan monks wear the vest originally designed for nuns. Deciding however to do away with large portions of the prātimokṣa merely because it is inconvenient is not satisfactory.

Indrajala said:

No one has the authority to modify the pratimokṣa rules. That's why it was never done, even when the Buddha stated the minor prātimokṣa rules could be ignored.

The sangha has the right to modify the Vinaya as they see fit. In practice this actually happened in India, though perhaps unannounced. The proof for this is found in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya which contains some Mahāyāna allusions and elements, which means there was significant revising of the content long after the development of the other Vinaya texts.

Malcolm wrote:

The basic prātimokṣa rules remained unaltered.

Indrajala said:

So, contrary to your assertion, the sangha in India and elsewhere clearly did modify things. We need only consider how the content and number of precepts differ among the Vinaya texts of various Indian schools.

Malcolm wrote:

They did not modify the prātimokṣa rules.

Indrajala said:

Those precepts were not as sacrosanct as you assert. This is merely your opinion, whereas in actual practice in India it was not like this at all. See Schopen: There appears to be, however, no actual evidence that the textual ideal was ever fully or even partially implemented in actual practice; at least none is ever cited.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an argument from an absence of evidence, which amounts to no argument at all.

Indrajala said:

No, you automatically receive the five precepts, but you can elect to follow only those

you are able to follow, unlike the higher ordinations.  
In practice this is not always so.

Malcolm wrote:  
In practice, it is always so.

Indrajala said:  
This interpretation results in Sanghabheda.  
No, not in the context of East Asia for the simple reason that karma proceedings were not carried out in the Sinosphere.

There are two types of schism: karma-bheda and cakra-bheda. The former was not possible in the Sinosphere. The alternative model proposed does not constitute the latter.

Malcolm wrote:  
A Sanghabheda requires merely that some fully ordained monk declares he has a better idea than the Buddha, and sets up a new rule.

Indrajala said:  
No one has the authority to do that. This is why bhikṣus of one ordination lineage are barred from reciting posadha with bhikṣus from another ordination lineage. Changing the pratimokṣa rules is a Sanghabheda offense.  
At some point somebody changed the original rules otherwise there would not be multiple ordination lineages.

Malcolm wrote:  
No, different people received their ordinations at different points in Buddha's lifetime, and began ordaining other monks in regions removed from the Buddha's immediate presence. This is sufficient to account for disparities in the number of rules as well as their language, and accounts of their elaboration.

Indrajala said:  
The Chan "Pure Rules" and Tendai model worked fairly well however.

Malcolm wrote:  
As institutional disciplines I am sure they worked quite well, but people who do not receive a proper Śrāvakayāna bhikṣu ordination are not bhikṣus in any sense of the word.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 12:50 AM  
Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists  
Content:

Indrajala said:

Nevertheless, the early Heian bhikṣu sangha, with state support, officially recognized Saichō's reformed model as legitimate and ultimately equal Dharmagupta ordinations.

This is why I argue that Saichō's monastic model is effectively an revised bhikṣu Vinaya based on bodhisattva precepts.

Jikan said:

This recognition is interesting; it suggests that the two forms of ordination can be functionally equivalent. This doesn't mean that one is a revision of the other, however. A pen and a pencil can do the same work, but a pencil is not a revised pen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are not, there never has been, and there never will be two kinds of bhikṣus in the present dispensation of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria

Content:

Indrajala said:

Infanticide, sati and child marriages might not be seen as a problem, but they should be halted and made criminal.

Malcolm wrote:

Infanticide, child marriage and so on existed in your Fantasy Sino-Japanese realm too.

Indrajala said:

I see, so you believe in the Strict Parent State after all. Good luck with that. It led to Mao. No, poverty, desperation and decades of civil war led to Mao. The civil religion of communism led more to Mao than Confucian values.

Malcolm wrote:

Russia would up with Stalin because of the cultural precedent set by the Czarist absolutest state, likewise, China, another historically absolutest state, wound with Mao.

Indrajala said:

Such political arrangements worked very well in China, Korea and Japan, producing in pre-modern times societies which were rather stable over the long-term.



Seriously? What nonsense.

\

You don't think the relatively good standard of living and social stability of the Tang dynasty was remarkable given the age?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think it was that stable.

Indrajala said:

And Indian cities, by and large, are dirty, dangerous and squalid, and always have been. It is their culture. Not ours. We can visit and enjoy it or hate it, but it is not our business to tell them what to do or how to run their country.

It is virtuous to introduce civilized values and principles of hygiene as it will alleviate suffering and save lives. To argue otherwise is immoral.

Malcolm wrote:

Indian culture is very hygienic and civilized, actually. They suffer from overpopulation in the north. The squalid nature of India has many causes, mostly colonial.

Indrajala said:

The British did more good than harm in India. It is a shame they had to leave.

Malcolm wrote:

Your paternalist attitudes towards those whom you regard as your inferiors is duly noted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Indrajala said:

This is why I argue that Saichō's monastic model is effectively an revised bhikṣu Vinaya based on bodhisattva precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Except that it isn't and they are not bhikṣus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Indrajala said:

You are mistaken. The first three of the seven past buddhas (Vipaśyin, Śikhin and Viśvabhū) never established any precepts as there was no need.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am not mistaken. A pratimokṣa was taught by all three Buddhas you mention. Please see Prebish, Buddhist Monastic Discipline. pgs. 110-113.

Indrajala said:

You cannot take bodhisattva vows without first going for refuge; since going for refuge automatically entails receiving pratimokṣa vows, your refutation is dismantled without the need to resort to scripture.

Prātimokṣa precepts like the five precepts which come with the refuge vows are not the Vinaya. You cannot equate refuge precepts and the five precepts with the Vinaya. The Vinaya prātimokṣa was only provisionally established given the circumstances of the time. The Vinaya is not universal.

Malcolm wrote:

They are prātimokṣa, Vinaya exists to explicate the prātimokṣa in detail. While different ordination lineages have different Vinayas, nevertheless, when you take bhikṣu ordination, you are pledging to hold all the prātimokṣa vows you received, not merely the one's that suit you.

Indrajala said:

Not so. The sangha officially condoned the reform, which is in line with the Vinaya regulations which permit modifications where necessary.

Malcolm wrote:

No one has the authority to modify the pratimokṣa rules. That's why it was never done, even when the Buddha stated the minor prātimokṣa rules could be ignored. When you take bhikṣu ordination, you agree to follow all of the rules, not merely some of the rules, based on your own judgment. For this reason there is posada, to repair any breach of the rules and confess those you have broken. People who are not ready to follow all of the prātimokṣa rules, i.e. Vinaya, should not become bhikṣus.

Indrajala said:

Of course the bodhisattva samvara is "superior" to pratimokṣa vows; nevertheless they cannot be received without first going for refuge, and the receipt of the upāsakā vows is an automatic consequence of going for refuge whether it is first done in a Mahāyāna based rite of conferring the Bodhisattva trainings or not.

This is not necessarily so. You can have refuge precepts without taking the five precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you automatically receive the five precepts, but you can elect to follow only those you are able to follow, unlike the higher ordinations.

Indrajala said:

Moreover, the upāsaka precepts are not the Vinaya strictly speaking.

Malcolm wrote:

They are prātimokṣa. The method of conferring upāsakā vows is discussed in Vinaya. Therefore, it is part of Vinaya.

Indrajala said:

The "Bodhisattva Vinaya" in the Tendai system is a heavily revised Vinaya system that effectively replaces the Śrāvakayāna model.

Malcolm wrote:

This interpretation results in Sanghabheda.

Indrajala said:

What if the vows are revised and then followed perfectly?

Malcolm wrote:

No one has the authority to do that. This is why bhikṣus of one ordination lineage are barred from reciting posadha with bhikṣus from another ordination lineage. Changing the pratimokṣa rules is a Sanghabheda offense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Prātimokṣa vows are the basis of bodhisattva vows.

Indrajala said:

No, it is the other way around in Mahāyāna. The prātimokṣa vows were provisionally established due to problematic circumstances during the Buddha's lifetime. The bodhisattva precepts are taught by all buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

So was pratimokṣa.

Indrajala said:

Consequently your statement "prātimokṣa vows are the basis of bodhisattva vows" is refuted.

Malcolm wrote:

Every Buddha recites pratimokṣa as well. Not every Buddha institutes a bhikṣu Sangha however.

You cannot take bodhisattva vows without first going for refuge; since going for refuge automatically entails receiving pratimokṣa vows, your refutation is dismantled without

the need to resort to scripture.

Indrajala said:

Without one, you cannot have the other.

Prātimokṣa precepts are encompassed within the bodhisattva precepts, which comprise the three sets of pure precepts:

Malcolm wrote:

See above.

Indrajala said:

A person who follows upāsakā prātimokṣa and bodhisattva vows is still just an upāsakā.

A person who follows śramaṇera prātimokṣa is still just a śramaṇera.

This is strictly speaking an orthodox Vinaya view, which is valid within the context of Śrāvakayāna. That being said it does not apply to the Japanese sangha because the sangha council in the early Heian period approved Saichō's reforms whereby a renunciate bodhisattva received alternative precepts based on bodhisattva precepts which granted him the status of a bhikṣu.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, such "monks" are merely celibate lay persons.

Indrajala said:

There is vast literature in China and Japan as well. I tend to agree with many authors of ancient times who argued for the superiority of bodhisattva precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course the bodhisattva samvara is "superior" to pratimokṣa vows; nevertheless they cannot be received without first going for refuge, and the receipt of the upāsakā vows is an automatic consequence of going for refuge whether it is first done in a Mahāyāna based rite of conferring the Bodhisattva trainings or not.

Indrajala said:

You don't seem to know about or appreciate the fact that a celibate and orderly monastic model based on bodhisattva precepts was devised by Saichō and approved by the Vinaya-based sangha authorities in ancient Japan, thereby making it a valid and quite legitimate reform.

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite aware of it, for a great deal longer than you, actually [1988]. I don't regard it as valid. As I said such "monks" are celibate upāsakās in robes, no matter how realized, venerable or sublime they may be.

If you will recall, this position is what caused the Zen people to freak out on me. I still have not changed my position.

And as far as I am concerned, someone who actually goes to the trouble of receiving the

vows of a śramaṇera or a bhikṣu is obliged to follow them as perfectly as they can without making excuses for not following them as strictly as possible. Otherwise, in my view, they are frauds taking advantage of the robes. Since the ordained Sangha can't seem to keep themselves honest, it is up the lay Sangha to do so by not supporting those ordained people who do not seem to be observing their vows properly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Begging, Panhandling & 8th Major Precept (Brahma Net Sut

Content:

Zhen Li said:

If we have confidence that the panhandler won't abuse a donation, there's no excuse for holding back. Just like if you're confident that you need to eat with your own mouth, you eat.

Malcolm wrote:

Āryadeva passed a blind woman on the road. Hearing him coming she begged him for one of his eyes. He obliged, and she promptly popped the eye in her mouth, and swallowed it with satisfaction. In that moment, Āryadeva suffered a pang of regret, because of course he had intended the women use it for her own sight. Because of his pang of regret, he lost the chance to have his eye miraculously restored. This is why one of his nicknames is Ekacakṣu, "One eye".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria

Content:

Indrajala said:

Countries which perpetually let people make the wrong decisions end up like India or worse.

Malcolm wrote:

Seems like you are more than halfway to fascism. People have an innate right to screw up their lives.

Indrajala said:

In India people constantly make all the wrong decisions, like building a new house with no toilet inside or out because they think it will pollute them, and the fact nobody feels humble enough to clean it (not even their own). So, they defecate outside in public, and preventable diseases spread. They screw their own lives over and those of many other people. This is one example where hard handed political measures are necessary to overcome damaging behavior on the part of unintelligent commoners. India lacks the

capacity and political will to do this, which is why half a billion people or more defecate in public around the subcontinent.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, the toilets in Asia everywhere are abysmal. Some of the foulest toilets I have ever encountered were in Japan. The Japanese think nothing of littering their forests with cigarette cartons, beer cans, etc.

Indrajala said:

So, no people do not have an innate right to screw up their lives when their community suffers as a result.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they do, if their culture does not perceive it as a problem.

Indrajala said:

I'm actually heavily inclined to Confucian political values after reading Chinese history and philosophy somewhat extensively (minus of course the obligatory animal sacrifice if you strictly follow the Li-ji 禮記). This means a strong and well-educated leadership and hierarchy is in place to solve pressing problems and enforce proper behavior on the lower classes whether they like it or not. The leadership takes into account good advice ideally and exercises the five constant virtues (humaneness, due-giving, propriety, wisdom, and trust). State officials might need to act as parental figures to untamed people if they fail to behave like civilized human beings, but it is for their own good ultimately.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you believe in the Strict Parent State after all. Good luck with that. It led to Mao.

Indrajala said:

Such political arrangements worked very well in China, Korea and Japan, producing in pre-modern times societies which were rather stable over the long-term.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously? What nonsense.

Indrajala said:

Likewise, modern Japan and Korea are safe, clean, efficient and well-ordered societies founded on Confucian and Buddhist values. Taiwan is not far behind.

Malcolm wrote:

And Indian cities, by and large, are dirty, dangerous and squalid, and always have been. It is their culture. Not ours. We can visit and enjoy it or hate it, but it is not our business to tell them what to do or how to run their country.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Indrajala said:

In a predominately Mahāyāna society, the bodhisattva precepts take precedence over anything Hīnayāna, including the Vinaya. Consequently, implementing new precepts and procedures was warranted and acceptable even based on Vinaya law.

Malcolm wrote:

Prātimokṣa vows are the basis of bodhisattva vows. Without one, you cannot have the other. A person who follows upāsakā prātimokṣa and bodhisattva vows is still just an upāsakā. A person who follows śramaṇera prātimokṣa is still just a śramaṇera.

While it is true that receiving bodhisattva vows changes the nature of one's prātimokṣa, i.e., one is now adhering to these vows as a form of bodhisattva activity, it does not mean that one can be sloppy with them and just ignore them when convenient.

There is a great deal of Indian writing, as well as Tibetan writing on the subject of the three vows.

In general, however, it is only when a prātimokṣa vows contradict bodhisattva vows that one is to favor the latter over the former. But what is the criteria for that contradiction? In general it only covers activity that one is truly engaged in for the welfare of others.

Since a great many of the pratimokṣa rules were set down because of the complaints of laypeople about the conduct of monks, the main point is that śramaṇeras and bhikṣus and their female counterparts need to consider how they appear to lay people. When śramaṇeras or bhikṣus opines in public that their vows are not important, this leaves a very bad impression on lay people, and causes lay people to suspect (correctly) that the Sangha is degenerate and no longer worthy of respect (and so it seem to me). If one claims that only Mahāyāna vows important, than wearing robes truly is a farce, since Mahāyāna vows are the same whether one is a lay person or an ordained person.

By the way, there is nothing more new age that suggesting that prātimokṣa can be discarded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Had you seen my discussions with our friend Jeff at other occasions, you will have noted that I don't really approve of the idea that Vinaya is something that can be conveniently ignored. .

Indrajala said:  
Yet it is conveniently ignored.

Like in a monastery where lunch starts at 12:00pm sharp. It is institutionally arranged so as to be actually against the rulebook.

As I keep saying, there's more to the Vinaya than the vows. There's the whole matter of karma proceedings and democratic decision making which clearly nobody feels is important.

Malcolm wrote:  
To be more precise, pratimokṣa vows.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 9:10 PM  
Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria  
Content:

Indrajala said:  
Countries which perpetually let people make the wrong decisions end up like India or worse.

Malcolm wrote:  
Seems like you are more than halfway to fascism. People have an innate right to screw up their lives.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 9:08 PM  
Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria  
Content:

WASW said:  
Yes- but I am questioning the idea that there are "unintelligent masses" who require the (quite cynical and manipulative, in this view) existence of institutions that are sanctioned by religions to keep them stable?

Indrajala said:  
The masses are generally unintelligent and unable to properly look after themselves.

Malcolm wrote:  
There is no such thing as "the masses".

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 9:35 AM



Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Yeah of course.

Malcolm wrote:

Had you seen my discussions with our friend Jeff at other occasions, you will have noted that I don't really approve of the idea that Vinaya is something that can be conveniently ignored. My opinion is that if you are going to be a bhikṣu, then be a bhikṣu and follow all the vinaya rules as best as one can, do posadha twice a month with a Sangha, etc. If you cannot do that much, then remain a dge tshul. There is no shame in not taking vows you have no intention of keeping.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Okay, I read the Bhasya and it's more or less saying the same thing as you were. Again, the issue is that the Sarvastivādins did not deny that there are also cetanās related to taking the vow, so the theory being posited by Vasubandhu isn't denied. Also, that it cannot be destroyed since it is a dharma that always exists is just to take unfair advantage of the Sarvastivādan position, of course they posit that conventionally speaking it is destroyed. Imaginary? Maybe, how can we know? It's talking about a state that is non-falsifiable, I wouldn't disagree if you were to say it's meaningless - which isn't Vasubandhu's argument. But like I said before, the fact that indictative dharmas are not being denied as at play is more useful, and the notion of avijñāpti might simply be one's impression of how things are, hence a vitarka/vikalpa.

The point is, the state of being a monk, be it either a continuous stream of karmas from intention, or an actual non-informative form, is more than irrational fears of Marmite.

Malcolm wrote:

There are also arguments against avijñāpti when Vasubandhu covers the eleven forms of matter in chapter one.

Vasubandhu basically says there is no such thing and that such a dharma was never mentioned by the Buddha. It is merely a speculative theory of the Sarvastivādins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 8:56 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

But that doesn't have to mean automatic war.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it does. Any attack launched against US soil will immediately cause the US to go on a war footing, because attacking the US directly is an act of war. Our government will respond in kind without hesitation.

tellyontellyon said:

The terrorists on the planes came from all over the place. They could have used the same reasons to have attacked Pakistan or the Yemen or Saudi Arabia etc.

Malcolm wrote:

They operated and trained out of Afghanistan. In case you have not noticed, the US has been systematically hunting down Al Qaeda terrorists and their training camps everywhere they can find them.

tellyontellyon said:

Defending the country doesn't have to mean automatic war. There is more than one way to defend yourself, full scale invasion wasn't the only option, and given Afghanistans history of resisting invasions, was unlikely to work in the long run.

Malcolm wrote:

We had no interest in holding Afghanistan, and still don't, besides what some conspiracy theory wack jobs think. We were solely interested in Al Qaeda and other allied groups. Getting involved in the Karzi thing was an error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria

Content:

greentara said:

Malcom, 'ok, Chicken Little' Well I think Indrajala has made a few good points. You may not agree with them but I think they are worthy of consideration.

Nighthawk said:

I agree with him as well. Mainly on the point that feminism is to blame for the high divorce rate in western countries. Truth can be hard to swallow sometimes.

Malcolm wrote:

Utter nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 8:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Perhaps inevitable with that particular administration, but a more far-sighted administration might have avoided playing into the hands of the terrorists.

Malcolm wrote:

Any US administration would have been compelled to respond exactly the same way. The job of the president is to defend the country against enemies, both foreign and domestic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria

Content:

WASW said:

Yes- but I am questioning the idea that there are "unintelligent masses" who require the (quite cynical and manipulative, in this view) existence of institutions that are sanctioned by religions to keep them stable? I think that idea is quite patronising and doesn't really reflect the historic realities for the rise of marriage-contracts, that being the control of property and inheritance (not that I think this is the rationale of how marriages need to be conceived of now and in the future, though obviously equal marriage laws do provide homosexual couples with not inconsiderable benefits in terms of protecting bereaved spouses\_.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but you must consider all those "child marriage" advocates out there who will insist that their right to wed six year olds is being infringed upon, you know, because it is all the fault of the feminazis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I'm no fan of Saddam. I hope things are better in the long term, but the price the Iraqis as well as other forces paid was extreme.

Are the regimes in Saudi Arabia, Pakistan etc. any better?

Malcolm wrote:

So far none of them has gassed their own citizens, as far as I know.

tellyontellyon said:

In the end, these peoples will have to find their own solutions. It was always obvious that both the Iraqis and Afghans wouldn't want our troops on their soil.... anymore than you would want a foreign army to take over your government in the way it happened over there.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, America is a global power. Can't have your former puppets openly defying you on the world stage, and you can't let some pissant terrorists take out the brains of your global financial network either. In terms of real politick, what the US did is absolutely consistent with what a world power does when attacked.

tellyontellyon said:

I think we both agree a better way should have been found.

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of Iraq, perhaps. In terms of the Al Qaeda, and Afghanistan, it was never gonna happen, the minute we were attacked, Afghanistan was going to suffer punishment for harboring Al Qaeda. It was an inevitable consequence of their attack on the US.

When the Muslims attack Shambhala, The 25th Kalkin king, Rudracakravartin, will lead Shambhala in a retaliatory attack on Mecca, defeating the Muslims and making the world safe for Dharma for another 1500 years, that is, if you believe the prophecies found in the Kālacakra Tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Zhen Li said:

It is pure vikalpa, from a Sautrantika point of view.

Well, a vitarka can be vikalpa can't it? Vikalpa isn't even a dharma in Sarvastivāda.

Vikalpa = imaginary.

Whatever Sarvastivādin reasonings may be, it is thoroughly rejected by Vasubandhu in the Bhaṣyaṃ.

I don't know his argument, but I think it might just be non-falsifiable.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read the Abhidharmakośabhaṣyaṃ then. It is the preliminary argument in chapter four, Karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

War for regime change is against the Geneva convention anyway. It is by definition a war crime. The whole Iraq war was one big crime.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't support the war in Iraq, and still don't; but toppling the Hussein regime was a good thing for Iraq in the long run.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marria

Content:

greentara said:

Malcom, 'ok, Chicken Little' Well I think Indrajala has made a few good points. You may not agree with them but I think they are worthy of consideration.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I don't agree. I think they are utterly worthless for consideration and should be dismissed out of hand as pure bigotry, something you might hear on a fundamentalist Christian television station.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Zhen Li said:

cittaviprayukta-saṃskāra, it's rūpa, albeit non-informative.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever Sarvastivādin reasonings may be, it is thoroughly rejected by Vasubandhu in the Bhaṣyaṃ.

Zhen Li said:

That being said, I'm not opposed to the idea that it's not a useful classification and may more or less amount to pure vitarka.

Malcolm wrote:

It is pure vikalpa, from a Sautrantika point of view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Well, that certainly makes sense.

I'm not sure that it actually refutes the notion of Avijñapti Rūpa, since for its existence one would need vāsanā anyway. But, unfortunately, I am afraid I just realised might be non-falsifiable. I think that it might be that Avijñapti Rūpa is what 'appears' to be the case, e.g. that object X 'is' in the state of monkhood, regardless of consciousness. Even if that statehood is not informative.

But, the notion of monkhood that does away with Avijñapti Rūpa, as you related, is sufficient and more relevant to questions of value judgements about the wholesomeness and fruitfulness of the state. And the question is really, is it actually the case that the state of monkhood 'exists,' and is actually informative, i.e. vijñapti rūpa?

I am afraid this is leading a bit off topic.

Malcolm wrote:

Sautrantikas refute avijñapti, substituting intention (cetana) as being sufficient for vows.

Zhen Li said:

is it actually the case that the state of monkhood 'exists,' and is actually informative, i.e. vijñapti rūpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not, as the case of our friend Jeff (Indrajala) demonstrates, since we can't really figure out what he means by "bhikṣu".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Before Longchen Nyingthig, what was the most popular cyc

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, having translated the whole thing

ConradTree said:

What do you think of Erik Pema Kunsang's translations?

Nowadays, he translates rigpa as "knowing" and marigpa as "unknowing".

He translated a tiny bit of Gonpa Zangthal in Wellsprings of the Great Perfection.

Malcolm wrote:

eric's translations are fine, but our styles are very different. His translation of rig pa and ma rig pa are perfectly correct, though I would prefer ma rig pa as ignorance i.e. avidyā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Before Longchen Nyingthig, what was the most popular cyc

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Khyentse Wangpo opines that the Gongpa Zangthal is the most profound of the Nyinthig cycles.

ConradTree said:

Yes that's also my opinion.

Now, what is your opinion on the most profound Nyinthig cycle?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, having translated the whole thing, I think that there places where the GZ is definitely clearer than the VN, and its Vārāhī instructions are infinitely more detailed than what you find in the KN or the KYN.

But I don't have really any personal opinion about it. Its all good Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

AlexanderS said:

There is also the problem with wind energy that it is highly unreliable. When the wind doesn't blow there is no energy is produced!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and when it blows too strongly, the turbine must be locked.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Then someone would cease being a monk when the notion is no longer at hand in their mind. Which is not to say that the intention isn't a factor.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Vasubandhu says that as long as the series is not interrupted by a contrary intention, the vow is maintained. For example, if you have taken the vow not to take life, that vow is intact in the mind stream until you decide you want to kill something. Then you lose the vow because your intention is contrary to the intention that formed the vow. But you do not need to be mindful of that vow in some persistent sense constantly reminding yourself that you have the vow. It is sufficient that you took it, and when a situation comes up that demands you either follow the vow or break it, in a person of predominately positive mental factors, the vow will be followed automatically. The Sautrantika theory is very much grounded on the notion of vasanas. The longer you do not violate the initial intent of a vow, the stronger the trace to maintain that vow is. Of course, in the beginning, that trace will be quite weak, and therefore, more active mindfulness may be required. Eventually however, mindfulness and attentiveness (saṃprajāna) become ingrained, and one is called "well trained".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Being caught doesn't make it any less a crime,

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not.

Anyway, we are Buddhists, we do not believe in war at all, much less wars of aggression.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Im sorry Virgo, I'm trying to stay out of these conversations, but what you are saying here is bullshit. There are several documented instances of US soldiers comitting war crimes in Iraq and Afghanistan. A famous example was the video leaked by Bradley Manning. US marines are people trained to kill, and while US marines might be more disciplined than some of their enemies, there is no innocence in war.

Edit - Don't forget Abu Ghraib either.

Malcolm wrote:

Soldiers have rules of engagement. When those are violated, the soldiers are generally



punished. Sometimes soldiers violate rules of engagement out of frustration, when caught, they are punished.

In the Manning video, the gun crew asked their CC for permission to fire. It was granted. It was not, from the US Military or US's point of view, an illegal killing. That is was a total mistake is a fact, that noncombatants were brutally killed by the US Army is a fact. Is there any legal remedy, maybe in a court of international law, but the soldiers followed proper procedures. Are the procedures themselves flawed, certainly. But then we had no business in Iraq anyway.

Abhu Ghraib has resulted in some court martials and convictions, but none were severe enough in my opinion. War is hell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marriage

Content:

Indrajala said:

I fear these trends will result in very undesirable developments in future decades.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, Chicken Little.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marriage

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no justifiable argument that can be produced which can show that gay marriage is disadvantageous to society as a whole.

Indrajala said:

At least nothing we can discern at the moment. The future will tell.

As I said, recognizing gay marriage sets a legal precedent for any other unrecognized group seeking legal sanction for their presently unrecognized activities. This means advocates for child marriage amongst some minorities in the west will have another precedent to refer to as far as legal matters go.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense.

Indrajala said:

Have you checked the divorce rate lately?

Actually popular feminist values likely prompted the increase in divorce over the last few decades. This was perhaps another unforeseen consequence of rapid reforms. This is why a cautious albeit generally tolerant, conservative approach has many advantages rather than rushing through changes and attempting to stamp out disagreement.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, nonsense. The divorce rate rose in the seventies because most people married in the 60's in their early 20's. This set a precedent that continues unabated. Divorce, once scandalous, became increasingly acceptable as celebrities were marrying and divorcing at dizzying rates in the fifties and sixties.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 5th, 2014 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marriage

Content:

Indrajala said:

No, the author is suggesting that a stable institution like heterosexual marriage (which is condoned and supported by religion) lends support to the unintelligent masses.

Malcolm wrote:

Have you checked the divorce rate lately? It is still pretty high, and it is only declining because people are declining to be married at very young ages. In 2011 in the US there were:

Number of marriages: 2,118,000

Marriage rate: 6.8 per 1,000 total population

Divorce rate: 3.6 per 1,000 population

This is hardly what we can define as "stable marriage", for every four people that get married, two people get divorced.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 5th, 2014 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Scotland becomes 17th country to approve same-sex marriage

Content:

Indrajala said:

There is no historical precedent for this sort of thing. Gay marriage allows same-sex parents to raise children. Again, there is no historical precedent for such arrangements and it remains to be seen what this will eventually bring in western societies.

Malcolm wrote:

Having known many children of same-sex couples, all that I have met are heterosexual in orientation, though I am sure there are children of same sex couples who themselves are also gay, I just haven't met any. Since gay couples actually want children and often have to jump through high hoops to have them, they are generally much more loving and supportive as a whole population than heterosexual parents are. So, my experience with the children of same sex couples is that they do extremely well in school, are highly motivated to succeed, and are well loved and turn out to be fantastic people with few problems. So what down side can there be? Added to this, same sex couples who want kids are themselves usually in good relationships and are professionally successful.

Marriage is just a business contract. Gender orientation and marriage are not coterminous. There are many gay men and women for example in history who have married for the social protections such arrangements offered. Now gay persons can marry people of their own orientation. There is no justifiable argument that can be produced which can show that gay marriage is disadvantageous to society as a whole. People who make such arguments are like those who argued against "miscegenation". In other words, they are bigots seeking intellectual justification for their bigotry.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 5th, 2014 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Meeting Taiwan's new-age Buddhists

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I should also note an important abhidharmic element which is being denied by those who don't see the value of the Vinaya. It is that when one engages in ordination, as with many other types of status changes, one then engages in a certain Avijñapti Karma, which results in the possession of a certain Avijñapti Rūpa, or uninformative matter.

Malcolm wrote:

This theory is rejected by Vasubandhu actually. The Sautrantika position is that vows are intentions and do not create an avijñapti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 5th, 2014 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

conebeckham said:

That is samsara. The Rabbit Hole. The Blue Pill.

shel said:

This touches on a point I made earlier but there was no response.

In both the fictional stories of Alice in Wonderland and the Matrix there is an illusory world, but behind that illusory world is a 'real' world, so in these cases there is a correct or meaningful use of the term illusory. So where is the real world in Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:  
It's illusion all the way down...

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, February 5th, 2014 at 8:35 AM  
Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed  
Content:

tellyontellyon said:  
Wind, wave, solar.... these are more difficult to 'own' as such. I suspect that stockmarket investors would expect less of a return on these sorts of technologies. It's not impossible that that could change over time, but renewables need to be developed now, before more damage is done to the environment.

Malcolm wrote:  
You are being naive, these things are quite easy to own, they simply are expensive technologies (dependent on petroleum based manufacturing), with short lifespans (the average wind generator has a life span of about 20 years) that no one will invest in without heavy government subsidies.

Actually, in the US, renewables are a very fast growing part of the energy economy, but there are all kinds of problems with wind depending on where it is going to be sited.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 10:26 PM  
Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless  
Content:

Malcolm wrote:  
when searched for, apart from a mere appearance, keys and other such phenomena cannot be found no matter how hard one may try.

PadmaVonSamba said:  
When you say, " cannot be found ",  
exactly what do mean by "keys"?  
Can you be a little more descriptive?

.  
.   
.

Malcolm wrote:  
Just what I said. Please review the seven fold reasoning of the chariot found in Chandrakirit's Madhyamaka avatara for more detail.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

That's certainly what we have been told to think ... but hold on a moment: who told us to think that?

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

It's obvious.

Kim O'Hara said:

Hi, Malcolm,

Do you mean it's, "Obvious that going after fossil fuels would destroy the world economy" or, "Obvious who told us to think that"?

I disagree with the first and can provide evidence as to its falsity, but agree with the second ... at least, I have some likely candidates in mind. You may have others and may be right about them too.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Kim,

At present our manufacturing capacity as well as our agricultural capacity is completely dependent on fossil fuels, not to mention the grids in various countries. Until someone discovers another relatively inexpensive source of consumable energy that does not itself depend on fossil fuels, at present world population levels it is irresponsible to start eliminating the use of fossil fuels by fiat. Is eliminating their use a desiderata? Certainly. Does our world ecology demand it, certainly. Can we do so immediately and globally? No, our addiction to fossil fuels is so deep, that it is impossible for us to withdraw from fossil fuels at this time. Every part of global trade, manufacture and agriculture extensively uses fossil fuels.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 8:29 AM

Title: Re: Before Longchen Nyingthig, what was the most popular cyc

Content:

Drikung\_Dzogchen said:

You are right, there is the Vima Nyingthig connection but Tulku Thondup says Longchen Nyingthig is also essence of Khandro Nyingthig.

Malcolm wrote:

Sort of, the Rigdzin Dupa is definitely modeled on a very similar sadhana found in the Khandro Nyinthig. But the Dzogchen teachings in the LN depend primarily on the Vima Nyinthig.

The Khandro Nyinthig is more or less a combination of Nyinthig with Anuyoga practices of various kinds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

That's certainly what we have been told to think ... but hold on a moment: who told us to think that?

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

It's obvious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

You're not making sense, all sorts of things can be found about objects besides their 'mere appearance'.

Malcolm wrote:

When you investigate one appearance, for example, "keys", you will not find "keys" in the parts, separate from the parts or in all the parts no matter how hard you try. It is the same with a person, you will not find a person in all the aggregates, one aggregate or separate from the aggregates. A person, while apparent, is just an illusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

We've already discussed that workers are not free to simply go and work somewhere else.

Capitalists own the means of production, i.e. the places of employment. And capitalism, produces endemic levels of unemployment, ensures a never ending stream of unemployed people who would be willing to work for less. An engineered race to the

bottom.

Just because somebody consents that does not mean they aren't being exploited. It really depends on what their other options are. In an extremely unequal society, 'consent' doesn't add up to much.

E.g. Here is an article about girls being trafficked into the sex industry and questions the concept of consent. (Malcolm will love it, it's from Harvard .)

<http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlg/vol27/balos.pdf>

Malcolm wrote:

It is simple. People go where there is work, and they sell their labor. The more skilled they are, the more they earn. So, the moral of the story is to make sure your kids do well in school if you want them to be more successful.

As for the sex trade, this is not a fair comparison.

Anyway, I am about done here. We will never see eye to eye about this so it is pointless to continue going around and around. As far as I can tell, there is no benefit to the types of politics you follow for anyone. At least, in the present economic system, people can and do with regularity and a bit of personal initiative pull themselves up out of poverty. There is a reason everyone wants to come to the States, and it is not because it sucks here.

More importantly, however, I think that Marxism, not to mention Anarchism, and Buddhism are utterly irreconcilable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Vietnam (and now Afghanistan) were/are wars aimed at controlling heroin production and distribution.

Malcolm wrote:

Never though you went in for conspiracy theories, guess I was wrong.

Sherab Dorje said:

I am not into conspiracy theories. I worked with Afghan refugees and knew people working in Afghanistan for Medecins Sans Frontiers. Unfortunately it is not a conspiracy theory. You forget the guns for drugs antics of the Iran-Contra affair? Short memory you have there Malcolm. Was that a conspiracy theory too?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am well aware of the facts of the Iran/Contra case, but we are not in Afghanistan to control the heroin trade.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

oil-subsidies.jpg

Could this have something to do with why we haven't already taken strong action against fossil fuels?

Klm

Malcolm wrote:

We have not gone after fossil fuels because it would destroy the world economy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Vietnam (and now Afghanistan) were/was aimed at controlling heroin production and distribution.

Malcolm wrote:

Never though you went in for conspiracy theories, guess I was wrong.

Sherab Dorje said:

If Vietnam was a proxy war with the Communists then why didn't the US invade Cambodia or Laos?

Malcolm wrote:

We did, illegally. We had a secret war there.

Sherab Dorje said:

The US needed Korea to be able to maintain a foothold (military bases) on continental East Asia.

Malcolm wrote:

That was not in our planning at the time. That is a net effect, not an intention.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I, on the other hand, by employing people and giving them a fair wage based on their skills, am only accruing positive karma.

And who decides if you are paying a fair wage based on their skills?...

Malcolm wrote:

The value of their labor is what they agree to sell it for. If they think they can do better, they are free to try and sell their labor elsewhere. It is the same as if I have a fish. I can try and sell for as much as I like, but the price will always be in accord with demand. That is simply the way economies work.

tellyontellyon said:

Perhaps you'll be the one with the bad Karma?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no bad karma when two people enter into an agreement of exchange and each honors their part of the bargain.

Connolly again: The capital of the master class is not their property; it is the unpaid labor of the working class - 'the hire of the laborer kept back by fraud'.

I simply do not agree that this is so. Of course employers have the option, if they choose, of profit sharing. But it is not a right that employees have, it is a privilege granted by the employer.

You cannot have a market economy under your version of Socialism where people are free to buy and sell as they wish, whatever they wish, so I do not support it. People are not free under your version of Socialism, they must do the bidding of committees and party functionaries.

I also do not agree with anarcho-capitalists, this is another extreme vision.

Markets requires sound regulations in order to keep them stable and functioning. Among those regulations may indeed be wage guarantees so that people without skills may at least make a living wage, but no more than that. We have seen in this country what happens to industries when the unions get a stranglehold on them: they become moribund, eventually sicken and then die. On the other hand, in the beginning unions were important in setting many workplace precedents, and I think that unions have positive roles to play as well. It is a delicate balance.

The fact of the matter is that my thinking comes from analyzing how I feel in these various situations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

A lot of people forget the revolutions of 1848 were fundamentally bourgeois revolutions, because while they have more economic power than aristocracies, they were barred from the tables of power. "Liberalism" in the 19th century Europe meant empowering the bourgeois politically. At least that is what I was taught at Harvard.

Yes, and the great reform movement in the UK was led by the dissenters, who were great entrepreneurs. Liberalism in Europe was protestantism stripped of god, but affirming the same "god given rights" as the Puritans, i.e. equality and democracy.

Unlike Marxists, I don't believe in any materialist force behind the past 400 years, just good intentions gone too far.

I read this today, found it a fun read, and I more or less agree with all of the positions:

<http://cathedralwhatever.wordpress.com/2014/01/02/premises-of-reactionary-thought-taking-stock/>

Malcolm wrote:

I whole heartedly agree with this:

Libertarianism is retarded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Once again, this underlines the futility of many of the post-colonial critiques that really have little to no grounding in economic reality - at the same time, it obviously underlines the futility of imperialist arguments.

Malcolm, what do you think of Westphalian Peace?

Malcolm wrote:

It looks like a historical model fresh on the minds the American Colonials when they forged the Republic. The constitutional congress was very much like this. Most people do not realize for example that Puritans invaded Maryland and ruled it for ten years in the 1650's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

just understand that the bourgeoisie fundamentally always leans towards the progressive, puritan, democratic, and protestant side of things in the world, and you're set.

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of people forget the revolutions of 1848 were fundamentally bourgeois revolutions, because while they have more economic power than aristocracies, they were barred from the tables of power. "Liberalism" in the 19th century Europe meant empowering the bourgeois politically. At least that is what I was taught at Harvard.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We didn't steal anything from Iraq. Their oil reserves were certainly not worth an invasion. We did not steal anything from Afghanistan. They have no developed industries. Maybe some US soldiers bought some heroin. Panama has been in the US sphere of influence for a Century. We did them a favor by getting rid of Noriega, even if he was originally a CIA puppet.

We didn't steal anything from Vietnam, though we did bomb the hell out of them. If you wan to accuse someone of stealing from their, look to the French. We invested hundreds of millions, but never got anything back except 50,000 dead bodies for our troubles. We did not steal anything from S. Korea, nor Japan.

Sherab Dorje said:

So the invasions and occupations were done out of the goodness of their heart? Just for the hell of it? C'mon Malcolm... Give me a break!

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it did have the net effect of injecting our manufacturing economy with increased production of weapons. After the war, in the 1970's, the bottom fell out of the arms industry in the US.

But basically everyone agrees that Iraq, Vietnam, etc. were expensive mistakes, and nothing substantial was won in these engagements.

Korea and Vietnam were just proxy wars with the Communists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Point 2) No, I don't think we are stealing anything from anyone.

Sherab Dorje said:

Iraq? Afghanistan? Panama? Actually, almost any Central and Southern American country you can imagine (especially during the Reagan years), Before that it was Vietnam and Laos. South Korea. Japan. Etc... Hell, they even tried to steal from Somalia, but they got their ass whipped. Imagine trying to steal from Somalia. Like stealing from a beggar, really.

Malcolm wrote:

We didn't steal anything from Iraq. Their oil reserves were certainly not worth an invasion. We did not steal anything from Afghanistan. They have no developed industries. Maybe some US soldiers bought some heroin. Panama has been in the US sphere of influence for a Century. We did them a favor by getting rid of Noriega, even if he was originally a CIA puppet.

We didn't steal anything from Vietnam, though we did bomb the hell out of them. If you want to accuse someone of stealing from there, look to the French. We invested hundreds of millions, but never got anything back except 50,000 dead bodies for our troubles. We did not steal anything from S. Korea, nor Japan.

Sherab Dorje said:

China and Japan are heavily dependent on us to buy their imports.

Why?

Malcolm wrote:

In the case of China, it is because they manufacture things cheaper than can be done in the US due to labor costs. Japan has cornered a market on cars and electronics.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

You have yet to offer a reason. With no reason it appears that you merely lack the ability

to find.

Malcolm wrote:

I gave you a reason, which I will repeat a final time, in case you have not clearly understood.

The reason is precisely because, like an illusion, nothing can be ascertained of phenomena apart from their mere appearance. Just as an illusory elephant cannot be found when searched for, likewise, when searched for, apart from a mere appearance, keys and other such phenomena cannot be found no matter how hard one may try.

Now of course, if you wish, adhere to a belief in some species of "objective existence", but that's your problem and not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Anyway.... What bothers you more: the karmic fate of your exploited workers?... Or your attachment to your 'capital investment'?

Malcolm wrote:

If I allow my employees to steal my business, they will certainly incur a great deal of negative karma. I, on the other hand, by employing people and giving them a fair wage based on their skills, am only accruing positive karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M:

If it's all the ripening of Karma, why worry.... just accept it.

Malcolm wrote:

One has no choice but to accept one's ripened karma. There is nothing one can do about it, apart from becoming a realized person. One can however change the karma one has in future lives, by avoiding the ten non-virtues and adopting their opposite.

Of course, taking what has not been given is the best way to ensure that you will be a pauper or worse in your next life. One simply cannot reconcile the seizure property advocated under Marxism with Buddhist ethics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Edit.... or perhaps you would be out on your ear...?

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe so, but it would be their future bad karma, but merely the ripening of my past bad karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Zhen Li:

Just to point out that Marx was talking about abolishing bourgeois property, I.e. ownership of the means of production.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, thank the founding fathers that ownership of "bourgeois property" is a right protected in the US Constitution.

I can guarantee you, if I had a small factory that manufactured, say, herbal products, and people I employed decided they owned my factory and not me, after I had made all the capital investments to build that business, they would be out on their ear and looking for another job. And if they disturbed my right to conduct my business in peace, of course I would call the police, as would any sane person.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: is there a teacher in the house? or at least some advice

Content:

rubix said:

Was only asking about books doesn't matter anymore I found out what I needed to know I'm in the 5th stage I found it in one of my BOOKS

Malcolm wrote:

You can delude yourself if you like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: is there a teacher in the house? or at least some advice

Content:

rubix said:

I posted in personal experiences about dzogchen and got no where except backwards. I'm doing the best I can without a teacher reading lots and learning a lot too, seeing how I probably won't find a teacher just like that can anyone recommend a book that outlines the completion stage of dzogchen or can someone explain it

Malcolm wrote:

No one will help you, publicly at least, because you do not have a teacher and the necessary transmissions. It is a question of samaya, the code of conduct that governs the secrecy around these teachings. And I gave you advice in the other thread. Now it is up to you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We are discussing illusions and not keys...

shel said:

So keys are not illusory, interesting!

Malcolm wrote:

Prior to analysis, even an illusion of an elephant is taken to be an elephant at face value. One can understand keys and other phenomena in the same way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

That is not a reason. You're only saying that it cannot bear your analysis. If you lost your keys, for example, and did not possess the ability to find them, it would be premature, to say the least, to declare you keys illusory.

Malcolm wrote:

We are discussing illusions and not keys: the analogy is thus, just as illusions cannot bear analysis, likewise, neither can phenomena. They are both the same in being

phenomena that arise from conditions, but when subject to analysis, nothing can be found about them to indicate they are anything other than mere appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is a mere insubstantial appearance that cannot bear analysis.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Why? does it break down and start crying?

appearances can bear analysis. they just always fail the "inherently existent" test.

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

No, appearances cannot bear ultimate analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Drikung Dzogchen Lineage

Content:

Drikung\_Dzogchen said:

Just wanted to clarify that Ganor Rinpoche is Nyingma and not part of the Drikung Kagyu Lineage. He is a Terton that has revealed a number of practices including a Vajrakilaya cycle. I do not know if he revealed an Achi Terma but he did have a vision of Achi Chokyi Drolma that revealed to him that Lho Ontul Rinpoches son Ratna Rinpoche was the Quality emanation of the Drikung Terton Lho Nuden Dorje. Historically Lho Ontul Rinpoche entered the Drikung Kagyu lineage in the 19th century as the older brother of Lho Nuden Dorje. But Achi Chkyi Drolma is also practiced in other lineages such as in Dujom Rinpoche's tradition. At the Khenpo brothers center in New York State her image can be seen. One of her emanations is said to be Yeshe Tsogyal. The late Khenpo Jigme Phuntsok when visiting Terdrom where the Yangzab Terma was revealed had a vision of a wrathful form of Achi Chokyi Drolma and composed a praise to her. Once H.E. Garchen Rinpoche gave me the transmission for the 108 Tara's and stopped at Achi Chokyi Drolma to let me know she was also an emanation of Tara before he finished the transmission. I would be interested to know if Ganor Rinpoche has revealed any Achi termas. Other Achi Termas were revealed by the Drikung Terton Osel Dorje as well as a very special Pure Vision practice of Achi Chokyi Drolma that was received by the previous H.E. Tritasab Rinpoche. This is an amazing practice that was brought out of Tibet by Lho Ontul Rinpoche in the 80's who then gave the transmission to H.H. Drikung Kyabgon Chetsang Rinpoche. In 2004 at the Monkey Year teachings the most current



incarnation of H.E. Tritsab Rinpoche gave the transmission for this practice. In this practice Achi Chokyi Drolma can be practiced as the Lama, Yidam, Dakini, or protector. It is supplemented by many different useful concise practices. The previous H.E. Tritab Rinpoche revealed this while he was in a Chinese Labor Camp in the late sixties. It is very much a practice for these times.

Malcolm wrote:

You might try taking a breath. Paragraphs and punctuation which make for readability are nice too.

Just wanted to clarify that Ganor Rinpoche is Nyingma and not part of the Drikung Kagyu Lineage. He is a Terton that has revealed a number of practices including a Vajrakilaya cycle. I do not know if he revealed an Achi Terma, but he did have a vision of Achi Chokyi Drolma that revealed to him that Lho Ontul Rinpoche's son, Ratna Rinpoche, was the Quality emanation of the Drikung Terton Lho Nuden Dorje. Historically Lho Ontul Rinpoche entered the Drikung Kagyu lineage in the 19th century as the older brother of Lho Nuden Dorje.

Achi Chkyi Drolma is also practiced in other lineages such as in Dujom Rinpoche's tradition. At the Khenpo brothers center in New York State her image can be seen. One of her emanations is said to be Yeshe Tsogyal. The late Khenpo Jigme Phuntsok, when visiting Terdrom where the Yangzab Terma was revealed, had a vision of a wrathful form of Achi Chokyi Drolma and composed a praise to her.

Once H.E. Garchen Rinpoche gave me the transmission for the 108 Tara's and stopped at Achi Chokyi Drolma to let me know she was also an emanation of Tara before he finished the transmission. I would be interested to know if Ganor Rinpoche has revealed any Achi termas.

Other Achi Termas were revealed by the Drikung Terton Osel Dorje. Also there is a very special Pure Vision practice of Achi Chokyi Drolma that was received by the previous H.E. Tritasab Rinpoche. This is an amazing practice that was brought out of Tibet by Lho Ontul Rinpoche in the 80's, who then gave the transmission to H.H. Drikung Kyabgon Chetsang Rinpoche. In 2004, at the Monkey Year teachings, the most current incarnation of H.E. Tritsab Rinpoche gave the transmission for this practice. In this practice, Achi Chokyi Drolma can be practiced as the Lama, Yidam, Dakini, or protector. It is supplemented by many different useful concise practices. The previous H.E. Tritab Rinpoche revealed this while he was in a Chinese Labor Camp in the late sixties. It is very much a practice for these times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 3:19 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The only thing that is true is the cognition of dharmatā. That most certainly requires

some kind of direct introduction ...

dzogchungpa said:

I'm not saying you're wrong, but is it supposed to be obvious that this requires some kind of direct introduction?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not obvious at all, hence the reason one is considered fortunate to meet secret mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

Illusion in the Buddhist sense meaning merely impermanence has meaning, on the other hand.

Malcolm wrote:

Illusion in the (Mahāyāna) Buddhist sense means that when you see an illusion and you investigate it, the illusion you saw cannot be found.

shel said:

Because?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a mere insubstantial appearance that cannot bear analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Before Longchen Nyingthig, what was the most popular cyc

Content:

Drikung\_Dzogchen said:

If I am correct the Longchen Nyingtig is also very related to the Khandro Nyingtig.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is related to the Vlma Nyinthig.

Drikung\_Dzogchen said:

And one of Jigme Lingpa's main practices was a different terma revealed by both Gyalwang Rinchen Phuntsog as well as his root student Sherab Ozer. I imagine that Jigme Lingpa could have very well received the Yangzab.

Malcolm wrote:  
He did.

Drikung\_Dzogchen said:

Jigme Lingpa was devoted enough to Gyalwang Rinchen Phuntsog that he composed a short Namthar (life story) of his Rinchen Phuntsogs life. So I could be wrong but the Yangzab could be the first concise Nyingtig cycle based on the Nyingtig Yabshi, in particular the Khandro Nyingtig.

Malcolm wrote:

That distinction goes to Ratna Lingpa.

Drikung\_Dzogchen said:

The Yangzab contains everything necessary to traverse all the stages of Dzogchen practice. And yes it does have quite a few Wrathful practices but they are not the heart of the terma. We have to remember just how chaotic the 16th century was in Tibet. Gyalwang Rinchen Phuntsog who was equally a fully accomplished practitioner of Mahamudra and the traditional Drikung Kagyu teachings marks a turning point in the Drikung Kagyu lineage. He chose (in his Namthar was called by the Dakinis) to step down as the head of the Drikung Kagyu lineage and go to the mountains above Terdrom where he engaged in extensive retreat and revealed the Yangzab Terma. During this time period the Karma Kagyu and the Drikung Kagyu allied themselves against Ganden and went to war which proved to be a disaster for both lineages, Ganden prevailed. Though Gyalwang Rinchen Phuntsog was not involved in this war he undoubtedly had many enemies who wished him dead. Some of these enemies probably were from within the Drikung Kagyu lineage who help prejudices against the Nyingma teachings. So these wrathful practices were probably very necessary for the times he lived in. But though the Yangzab Terma cannot said to be the most popular cycle, that really matters very little. It has been maintained up to the present time. Gyalwang Rinchen Phuntsog transcended any type of sectarian lineage labels. He really is an early example of the Rime tradition. His root student Sherab Ozer who before meeting Rinchen Phuntsog was trained in the Sakya tradition, and possibly the Gelugpa to some degree. But more importantly he composed what may be the first Rime text outlining how all the lineages fit together as a whole and embody the Buddha's teachings without conflict. The great jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche of the 19th century who brought the Rime movement to full bloom references this text by Sherab Ozer. There is still much research to be done but there are many interesting questions here regarding these various connections. I would be interested in anyone's input as my knowledge is more limited. But I will finish with the following. Gyalwang Rinchen Phuntsog played a major (and not always acknowledged role) in shaping the Drikung Lineage down to the present time. Dudjom Rinpoche said that Rinchen Phuntsog helped save the Nyingma lineage when it was persecuted by the Gelugpa and certain transmissions were in danger of being broken. Rinchen Phuntsog transmitted the Nyingtig Yabshi as well as many other Nyingma transmissions to Lamas who would go on to be very important in upholding the Nyingma lineage. Also Rinchen Phuntsogs's son who was a throne holder of the Drikung lineage was the father to five Tulkus, two of which were the first HH Drikung Kyabgon Chetsang and the first HH

Drikung Kyabgon Chutsang. From this time on the Drikung lineage would be led reincarnations of these two HH Drikung Kyabgon tulkus. The first HH Drikung Kyabgon Chutsang who is also known as Rigzen Chokyi Dragpa was said to be the reincarnation of Rinchen Phuntsog. His collected works comprise of about 15 volumes. He composed numerous Yangzab sadhanas based on the root Terma texts revealed by Rinchen Phuntsog making the practices clearer. The Shinje or Yamantaka practice which is very special to the Drikung Kagyu lineage entered the lineage through Rinchen Phuntsog. Rigzen Chokyi Dragpa or the first HH Drikung Kyabgon Chutsang had numerous Shinje pure visions which then became the Shinje Drubchen that is practiced down to the current day. So I know I have gone on into many different topics than what I started with but I welcome input or corrections and hope my ramblings are of some benefit.

Malcolm wrote:

You can stop advertising now...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Yangzab and Chokling tersar

Content:

Drikung\_Dzogchen said:

Where does he describe the Yangzab in those terms Malcom.

Malcolm wrote:

I forget exactly where, but it is definitely in there. You can ask David Arndt also, since when I was working on these texts for him, we discussed it.

You have to understand that the outer three roots is basically just a elaborated version of the Hayagriva/Yogini sadhana in the KN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

Illusion in the Buddhist sense meaning merely impermanence has meaning, on the other hand.

Malcolm wrote:

Illusion in the (Mahāyāna) Buddhist sense means that when you see an illusion and you investigate it, the illusion you saw cannot be found.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 2:38 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...the ultimate of Madhyamaka can only be established relatively ...

dzogchungpa said:

Can you explain that a little more?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that according to Madhyamaka there are two so called ultimates, one is nominal, the other is the direct perception of emptiness.

But from a Dzogchen point of view, since all relative truths are objects of false cognitions, even the cognition of the nominal ultimate is faulty. The only thing that is true is the cognition of dharmatā. That most certainly requires some kind of direct introduction which is lacking in Sutra teachings. The main advantage to Vajrayāna teachings is that dharmatā or the example wisdom, is introduced during the time of empowerment. In the case of gsar ma, it is the introduction of bliss and emptiness at the time of the third and fourth empowerments; in the case of the Dzogchen it is the introduction of the potentiality of vidyā during anyone of the four styles of empowerment, elaborate, unelaborate and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is no contradiction.

shel said:

I never claimed a contradiction. I merely pointed out that if everything is false then nothing is false. That is also false of course, because I thought it.

Malcolm wrote:

So there you go. On the other, everything being false does not make everything true, that is a non sequitur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Yangzab and Chokling tersar

Content:

Drikung\_Dzogchen said:

Maybe it is fair to say the Yangzab is an appendix to the Khandro Nyingtig...

Malcolm wrote:

Rinchen Puntsog himself describes the Yangzab as an appendix to the Khadro Nyinthig.  
Hard to get more authoritative than that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

How many brands are there?

Malcolm wrote:

Count how many things there are, and that will give you the number.

shel said:

Everything is an illusion, remember, including the concept of emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is no contradiction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

conebeckham said:

Interesting....Malcolm, do you know if the actual Indian sources are translated into English? Haribadra's and Vimuktisena's works, I mean....?

Malcolm wrote:

You should Makransky's book, Buddhahood Embodied I believe, where he details all this. Sparham has translated Ārya Vimuktisena's commentary on AA in full. Dense reading, but worth it.

To My knowledge, Haribhadra's Aloka and Sphutartha remain untranslated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

How many brands are there?

Malcolm wrote:

Count how many things there are, and that will give you the number.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

...if everything is an illusion then nothing is an illusion.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a problem with that? You need something real in contrast to an illusion?  
Something non-empty so there can be emptiness?

shel said:

Emptiness is a human concept, my good man, and thus an illusion.

Malcolm wrote:

That's one kind of emptiness. But just one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless

Content:

shel said:

...if everything is an illusion then nothing is an illusion.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a problem with that? You need something real in contrast to an illusion?  
Something non-empty so there can be emptiness?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Before Longchen Nyingthig, what was the most popular cyc

Content:

conebeckham said:

Lama Gongdu has mengagde level stuff, doesn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

All of these do. Typically it is often stated there are three main Nyingthigs: the Nyingthig Yabshi is the most extensive, the Gongpa Zangthal is the middle length, and Ati Zabdon is the concise one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 11:48 PM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

M

Tsongkhapa said:

This sounds like nihilism, can you please explain what is affirmed by Dzogchen? Anything?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

Self-originated wisdom, rang byung ye shes, svayambhujñāna, the three kāyas, everything thing else is false, thus there is no basis for establishing an ultimate since the relative is merely a delusion (and the ultimate of Madhyamaka can only be established relatively). Dzogchen texts frequently state there is only one stage, buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

As for political instability... you never know what is lurking around the corner for the US. Anyway, wouldn't you say that its stability is based largely on gorging its population on resources stolen from other countries? Not exactly an ecological consciousness. And even with the amount of resources at its disposal it still has a HUGE foreign debt and the US still allows its citizens to go without universal health care, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

As to point 1) I don't think so.

Point 2) No, I don't think we are stealing anything from anyone.

Point 3) If I owe you a hundred dollars, I have to be nice to you. If I owe you a 100,000,000 million, you have to be nice to me.

US foreign debt is 5.6 trillion as of 1/1/13.

If you look, you will see most of debt is held by Other (29.3%) China (22.5%) and Japan



(19.0%), in descending order.

China and Japan are heavily dependent on us to buy their imports. So, I don't really see this as a problem for us. The total external debt however is preposterous: 17,344,649,888,998 i.e. 17.3 trillion dollars. Followed by the UK and 10 trillion, followed by France and Germany, and so on. However, of the US debt, 12 trillion is held by Americans. So we are in no danger.

Point 4) The Affordable Care Act is meant to address that through the market. I think it is a bad idea, personally, and support Universal Health Care, but it seems the majority of Americans still cling to the illusion of market choices where their health care is concerned rather than understanding that health care, even if private, should be a regulated monopoly like any other utility.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I've been to a lot of places in the world, Africa, Asia, India, Europe, etc., and while they all have their points, and I have enjoyed being in them all, the US offers a basic political stability and natural wealth that is hard to beat in most other places in the world. I live in one of the largest contiguous forests in the world, i.e., 25 million acres of trees from Pennsylvania to Maine. Where I live it is largely eco-conscience, we have a strong tradition of social welfare, at a local level we practice direct democracy (Town meetings, invented in the Massachusetts Bay Colony), it is water wealthy because of the forests, etc. Also the Northwest, Oregon and Washington, have a culture that mirrors ours because they were initially settled by New Englanders. There are physical advantages to living here in the Northeast that you can't really find elsewhere because of the wealth of our economy (even when it is in arrears), natural resources and so on.

India, Africa and China are eco-disasters waiting to happen for many reasons. Russia, while filled with a lot of trees, is too damn cold. Europe is nice, but restrictive. Latin America is fun, but politically unstable.

Canada, on the other hand, has many of the advantages of the United States as well.

So, I pick the US, especially the Northeast and Northwest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 9:22 PM

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

Content:

ConradTree said:

But Rongzom says Dzogchen rejects any relative truth.

Dzogchen only subscribes to 1 truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we were talking about sutra.

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

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

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

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

And as it says in Soaring Great Garuda:

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

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

M

ConradTree said:

Is there a published source on these quotes?

It would really help me out.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not these exact translations, for they are mine, but you can find them in the Supreme Source, or Dowman's Original Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Which country in the world do you think is closest in fulfilling those ideals?

Malcolm wrote:

For all the crap people give the US, I'd pick the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dalai Lama:

"I am a supporter of globalization"

<http://www.dalailama.com/news/post/362-exclusive-interview---i-am-a-supporter-of-globalization>

So what it is that we need?

Dalai Lama:

I call it a "responsible free market economy

Sherab Dorje said:

And in the another article he says he is a Marxist and had great respect for Mao... go figure.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it appears during the last decade HHDL's thinking about these things has somewhat evolved. Personally, I think what he actually means by "Marxist" is that a state should provide guaranteed minimal welfare for its citizens. This is very consistent, for example, with the recommendations found in the Ratnavali and so on. I think he also recognizes that a free market economy provides opportunities that are not possible in a planned economy. Free markets spur more than mere exchange of goods. They also spur creativity, for better or for worse.

My perspective is that in an ideal society there is a balance struck between a market economy, providing minimum support needed for citizens (health care, emergency relief, infrastructure) and the ecosystem, with the ecosystem being a dominant consideration. In other words, if a particular market has a particularly negative impact on the ecosystem, it should be be tightly regulated, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Before Longchen Nyingthig, what was the most popular cyc

Content:

ConradTree said:

Okay, forget about popular.

What was considered the best Menngagde cycle before Longchen Nyingthig?

Gonpa Zangthal right?

Malcolm wrote:

Khyentse Wangpo opines that the Gongpa Zangthal is the most profound of the Nyinthig cycles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Buddhist "political theory".

kirtu said:

There is: Nagarjuna's Precious Garland.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I wouldn't go so far as to say that is a systematic political theory, Kirt. It is a Niti śāstra, advice on governance, not a well constructed political theory like Kautilya's Arthaśāstra, i.e. Treatise on Ends.

I would say that it is what it is, advice to a King, with come policy recommendations. However, I do agree that it contains the essentials for forming the basis of someone's political conscience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dalai Lama:

"I am a supporter of globalization"

<http://www.dalailama.com/news/post/362-exclusive-interview---i-am-a-supporter-of-globalization>

So what it is that we need?

Dalai Lama:

I call it a "responsible free market economy

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Before Longchen Nyingthig, what was the most popular cyc

Content:

ConradTree said:

Before Longchen Nyingthig, what was the most popular cycle?

Gongpa Zangthal right?

Malcolm wrote:

Probably Konchog Chidu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

We want to make the Buddha a capitalist, or a socialist, or an anarchist, or an authoritarian in order to justify our preferences.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and this is a problem. Buddha could not have been a capitalist, but he clearly approved of markets and trade; he could not have been a socialist, but he clearly set up temporary propertyless communes that eventually became permanent. He was not by any means an anarchist, since hierarchy clearly established in his sangha with monks, novices and lay people. And he was not an authoritarian since he recommended humanitarian values to rulers.

Like I said in the (currently locked)

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=15439> thread, it might well be that a truly Dharmic social/political reality may not satisfy liberal values at all. Who knows?[/quote]

We can only find out by trying to live with others according to our Buddhist values and see how they play out politically. These online forums are in fact an example of just that. And if history shows anything, it shows we still have some maturity to develop in our interactions with one another, myself included.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Origins of Dzogchen

Content:

mystic author said:

The fact he received numerous empowerments and did sadhana contradicts what he wrote.

Malcolm wrote:

This merely proves that you do not understand Dzogchen.

The root tantra of Dzogchen, the sGra thal gyur states quite unequivocally:

In order to utterly purify

the body, voice and mind of migrating beings,

fortunate one's are to ripened.

The continuums of the devoted is ripened

in four different ways;

elaborately, unelaborately,

very unelaborately

and extremely unelaborately.

Also, for the purpose of perfuming,

the approach, accomplishment and near approach

are performed by a qualified Guru.

In addition, construct the mandala coming from the tantras,

with the earth rite,

the preparations, the layout and the powders.

After that, the rite of conferring empowerment

begins from the the śrāvaka vehicle.

Having completed the eight stages [of vehicles],

confer the Great Perfection empowerment of the potentiality of vidyā,

and explain the purpose of each of those [steps],

the the entry, and special power.

There are a great number of other such citations. For example, The Mirror of the Heart Tantra states:

Where will accomplishment be without relying on the empowerments of secret mantra?

For example, it is like a boatman without a paddle. How will one be able to cross to the

other side? If the empowerments are fully obtained, all secret mantras not

accomplished will be accomplished.

mystic author said:

Did he ever describe Togal the way, say, Jigme Lingpa or Karma Chagme does?

Malcolm wrote:

In a great more detail in fact in such collections as the bLama yang tig, the mKha' 'gro

yang tig, the Zab mo yang tig, as well as the Tshig don rin po che mdzod and the Theg

mchog mdzod. Without Longchenpa, the brief presentations of Jigme Lingpa and Karma

Chagme would not be possible.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Here is what I am talking about:

You are a Buddhist: you have political choice a, b and c. What is your criteria for making a choice? How do your choices square with your practice as a Buddhist? How will your choices inform those around you? Etc.

There is no Buddhist "political theory". In absence of such a theory, how do we conduct ourselves in our political lives (we all have them, even the "apolitical") in accordance with Buddha's teachings?

Sherab Dorje said:

If we are limited in what political choice we can make then I guess the best we can do is choose the one we believe/feel will cause the least harm and the most benefit for the greatest number of sentient beings. I would say that anything that accords with the Noble Eightfold path would be the safest bet under most circumstances.

Malcolm wrote:

We are always limited in what political choices we can make, to a certain extent.

Secondly, we all have various political convictions, how do these square with the Buddha's teachings. More importantly, is it important that they do?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Again, I am talking about personal conduct, not political parties.

Sherab Dorje said:

Dude, your opening question was: What would a middle way politics look like, one informed by the Buddha's teachings rather than those of secular authors?  
A meritocracy is not (necessarily) about political parties.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that I was talking about a meritocracy either.

Here is what I am talking about:

You are a Buddhist: you have political choice a, b and c. What is your criteria for making a choice? How do your choices square with your practice as a Buddhist? How will your choices inform those around you? Etc.

There is no Buddhist "political theory". In absence of such a theory, how do we conduct ourselves in our political lives (we all have them, even the "apolitical") in accordance with Buddha's teachings?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You missed Republican Democracy, which is what we have in the US. Capitalism, as has been pointed out elsewhere, it is not a political system.

Sherab Dorje said:

cf <http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=42&t=12046&start=460> for the full twenty-something page discussion.

Republican Democracy? You do know that the word Republic is just the Latin term for the Greek word Democracy, right?

As for capitalism not being a political system, I seems that only capitalists would like to believe that one! They would like to have us believe that capitalism is just the natural method/law by which exchange functions.

Malcolm wrote:

Capitalism was a term coined by Marx. Prior to Marx, no one ever called themselves a "Capitalist". After Marx, people used the term to describe the economic system we still have at present. But it is not and never was a coherent political system. People started calling Smith's thought "Capitalism" because it was his economic thought and policy suggestions in Wealth of Nations that Marx was largely critiquing.

An argument may be made that political and economic systems are mutually dependent, and it is certainly true that as the US is a product of the Scottish Enlightenment, its political values upon which our style of democracy was founded include such items as ownership of private property, "free" markets, etc. These are enshrined in the Bill of Rights, the fifth amendment of which reads:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall



any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

This is of course why Americans by and large are hostile to socialism and communism, because both systems suggest that people do not have a right to private property. But this we are having this discussion in another thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 8:38 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

kirtu said:

Vermont is one of the few places where direct democracy still exists (on US soil ironically but hopefully) and in many small communities around the world.

Malcolm wrote:

Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Main actually. The town meeting system is deeply ingrained in New England. For example, in my town, we all vote directly on the budget, etc. Then there is a board of selectman charged with carrying out the agendas the town votes on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

conebeckham said:

I've not heard the Dharmakaya broken down this way before. Buddha's omniscient mind, what you call the Wisdom Truth Body, is a conventional truth but is an aspect of the Dharmakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

TKF is citing Haribhadra's presentation, followed by the Gelugpa's. . The presentation followed in Sakya, Kagyu and Nyingma for the most part is based on Ārya-Vimuktisena's earlier presentation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

smcj said:

What I get is that in the Sakya the intellectual view is introduced/utilized at some point in tantric practice.

Malcolm wrote:

In Sakya, the intellectual view is introduced prior to tantric practice, in the three visions section. In Vajrayāna, the experiential view is introduced in the empowerment, and confirmed through a precise system of meditating on various examples.

smcj said:

The first part of the sentence seems to agree with my prior post about sutra Mahamudra. The second part of the sentence starting with what I underlined I think indicates that intellectual view is incorporated into deity practice--at least in the Sakya.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not. What is incorporated into deity practice is the experiential view which comes from empowerment and is stabilized by the unique approach found in Sakya called "meditating the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana".

smcj said:

Frankly, despite polemics between Sakya and Kagyu over the issue of sutra mahāmudra, meditating the view here is not so different than sutra mahāmudra save only the name. I think I get that you are disagreeing with my post about tantric Mahamudra not needing a view--at least in Sakya.

Malcolm wrote:

Tantric Mahāmudra has a "view", but it is experiential, not intellectual, and is based on an example wisdom at the time of empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

About a month ago there was a thread on Buddhism and politics at our sister site. This is how I responded:

Some of my thoughts on different political systems / economies:

Communism - A great, noble effort; promotes egalitarianism, least amount of poverty, hunger, disparities in wealth and income -- in theory. In practice, it doesn't work well. People find ways around not being allowed private property and wealth. Where there's a will, there's a way and there was always a vast underground market in every communist nation. It is also totalitarian and a poor economic system which did not alleviate poverty for the masses as it was implemented.

Capitalism - worked okay in some instances as long as it remained at the Adam Smith free market level. As it progresses to a larger more complex society, it evolves to corporatism where the government favors certain industries and businesses over others, essentially abandoning its roots. Corruption becomes rampant and politicians are bought off. You get the military-industrial-complex, the prison-industrial-complex, among others.

Monarchies, autocracies, timocracies, and other oligarchies - totalitarian, usually hereditary, not surprising that most nations have gone away from these.

Democracy - "two wolves and a lamb voting on what's for lunch" (rule by the tyranny of the majority)

Plato's Republic I always thought sounded pretty reasonable since it is based on meritocracy. Why not have political leaders who actually know a little something? But how to implement it and choose the philosopher kings [leaders]?

In the end, I guess we're stuck with democracy and to make it the most useful and effective, have some balance between socialism and capitalism. The most successful nations in terms of least poverty and warfare appear to be those with a good mix, including the Scandinavian nations and those in Western Europe.

I see there is other interest here too in meritocracy. I think Plato's Republic would meet this principle, but how to implement it? We seem stuck in democracy but as we know this is tyranny too; a tyranny of the majority and we have seen what that can do. I don't think the Buddha would like principles being thrown out the window in the name of [democratic] compromise either. So Plato's Republic / wheel-turning monarch would be ideal but the implementation would be difficult, if not impossible.

Malcolm wrote:

You missed Republican Democracy, which is what we have in the US. Capitalism, as has been pointed out elsewhere, it is not a political system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

A high caste Brahmin could be working in a steel works. His caste would be high, but he would be part of the proletariat.

In another factory. the factory boss and employer, a (capitalist), might go bust and end up working in Burger King cleaning the toilets (a proletarian).

But you can't just change caste like that. They are clearly different frameworks.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you define it in this way, there are almost no capitalists anymore. There are very few people who work for persons who own a factory. For the most part, corporate ownership is collective. What you are saying is that apart from the board and major stockholders, everyone else, from the CEO on down are proletariats because they do not own the means of production, and sell their labor for what they can get.

By contrast, in the nineteenth century, for the most part factories, railroads and so on were own by private persons and families, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 2nd, 2014 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

According to Je Tsongkhapa's teaching, you have to begin with a generic image of emptiness which depends upon holding a correct conceptual understanding of emptiness. If you hold an incorrect conceptual understanding of emptiness, it cannot be realised.

Anders said:

So tsongkhapa is the origin of the Tibetan notion that awakening is dependent on correctly assembling an intellectual jigsaw puzzle?

Tsongkhapafan said:

I don't think so, I doubt it.

Regarding views, if there is no correct view, there is no object of meditation and if there is no correct object of meditation, we cannot gain inner experience that pacifies delusions. All problems are caused by wrong view, so I can't agree with your dismissal of correct views which are the only antidote.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct view in Vajrayāna arises from the empowerment. This is the reason why in Lamdre, for example, one meditates the view only after having received the cause empowerment where it is introduced in the section of the ālaya cause continuum (tantra) among the three tantras (cause, path and result).

Despite this, of course one also meditates a sutrayāna view using śamatha and vipaśyāna (supplemented by citations from the Mahāsiddhas) at the time of the vision of experience teachings from among the three visions (impure, experiential and pure). Frankly, despite polemics between Sakya and Kagyu over the issue of sutra mahāmudra, meditating the view here is not so different than sutra mahāmudra save only the name.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 1st, 2014 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Nemo said:

Like any other unethical system you choose or have to participate in. You make the most sophisticated ethical compromises between the available bad options. If you were forced to order off the McDonald's menu what would you get?

Malcolm wrote:

I'd rather starve.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 1st, 2014 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

This could be any of the twice born castes.

No, it couldn't.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dvija>

...is not the same thing as a capitalist.

This argument that you have that capitalism doesn't really exist is just a way of equating the classes under capitalism with rich and poor or with status, spiritual or otherwise. Although these things can co-occur to an extent they mean different things.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, but you are using a very narrow definition of "class". It is like claiming that out of the ten definitions of Dharma there is only one valid one.

tellyontellyon said:

Both 'types' of class system can co-occur and overlap as one type of society transforms into another. This is a dialectical process. No doubt the lower caste Indians will also find themselves in a lower class in the capitalist structure, but they are two different frameworks.

Malcolm wrote:

The class into which you are born, and your opportunity for advance, lifespan, etc., whether under Marxist analysis or not, is still, and will always remain, a function of your individual karma.

tellyontellyon said:

Equating class as, Marxists use the term, with caste as the Indians used it in the Buddha's day, is an illegitimate use of the term. It is a way of stretching two different words/frameworks to mean the same thing in order to create an invalid scriptural justification for your argument.

Malcolm wrote:

Class is class.

tellyontellyon said:

Class is about a persons economic role in a capitalist society.

Malcolm wrote:

Varna or jati (caste) is about a person's economic role in Ancient Indian society. What Buddha rejected about the Caste system in ancient India is that people born in upper castes were necessarily more virtuous than those born in lower castes. What he did not reject was that idea that one's position in society, one's appearance, health, lifespan, opportunities and so on, were largely dominated by a person's actions in past lives.

tellyontellyon said:

Capitalist society operates differently than feudalism.

Malcolm wrote:

Feudalism, like capitalism, never existed. It is, like capitalism, an artificial construct of historians, and in the case of feudalism, historians who misread and misunderstood medieval documents.

tellyontellyon said:

That's what the posts about m-c-m and c-m-c were about. The economic roles under a feudal society are different, and so class means something different.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not correct to refer to ancient Indian society as "feudal", it is an anachronism.

tellyontellyon said:

If Marx coined a term for a particular phenomenon, that doesn't mean that he invented the phenomenon.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is about the twice born is that any one in those upper three castes could own land, factories, shops, and so on where they employed people who sold their labor at a market value off of which the buyer could turn a profit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 1st, 2014 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

i. Capitalists, or bourgeoisie, own the means of production and purchase the labor power of others

Malcolm wrote:

This could be any of the twice born castes.

tellyontellyon said:

ii. Workers, or proletariat, do not own any means of production or the ability to purchase the labor power of others. Rather, they sell their own labor power.

Malcolm wrote:

These would be shudras.

tellyontellyon said:

iii. A small, transitional class known as the petite bourgeoisie own sufficient means of production but do not purchase labor power.

Malcolm wrote:

This could be any of the twice born castes.

tellyontellyon said:

Class is thus determined by property relations not by income or status. These factors are determined by distribution and consumption, which mirror the production and power relations of classes.

Malcolm wrote:

It's pretty clear that Indian shudras fit the Marxist notion of proletariat; everyone else in India were either "capitalists" or petite bourgeoisie.

tellyontellyon said:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capitalism>

Malcolm wrote:

The word was invented by Karl Marx and it did not exist in English until 1854.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 1st, 2014 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Adamantine said:

I see, so likewise Nemo's response re: meritocracy(similar to my initial thought)is off topic, at least from your intended topic.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it does not address my interest, but any suggestions are open.

Adamantine said:

...but expressing our politics with Middle Way principles, that's another story...you are contemplating or proposing we ponder what a Middle Way political ideology might look like?

Malcolm wrote:

More or less.

Adamantine said:

Regarding personally making political choices based on our understanding of Middle Way principles, I would imagine any of us Mahayanists are trying to do this to some degree, as it is.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, but in political discussions here, what I notice is these political discussions tend to become polarized on a left/right axis. "Property of theft"! cries one, the other replies, "Taking what has not been given is stealing"!

What would our politics truly look like if we strictly confined our political choices to the ethics laid out by the Buddha?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 1st, 2014 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Are you going to run for office?

Virgo said:

I highly doubt it as Malcolm is not really concerned with the eight worldly concerns, as most politicians are. If he were to, however, I am sure that he would do it with a pure motivation.

Also, he comes from a political family, so I assume he really knows what he is talking about.

Kevin



Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Keven, my dad is a philosophy professor and a lawyer (retired from both).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 1st, 2014 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Nemo said:

Ideally it would be a meritocracy. The most spiritually advanced in the group is given near absolute authority. People stay in the collective as long as they wish. The mission obviously transcends members personal desires. The leader need not be an expert in everything. They delegate. Their main job is to purify motivation and justify the use of resources.

The game of modern politics is about selfish elites retaining undeserved wealth and power. There is no middle way of exploitation and coercion. The Buddha's life choices seem to support this thesis. You might as well be talking about Buddhist methods of warfare.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, I am talking about personal conduct, not political parties.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 1st, 2014 at 8:41 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

anjali said:

For those interested, the Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy has a good article on <http://www.iep.utm.edu/polphil/>. It might be a good way to provide some basis for getting everyone on the same page. To quote one paragraph: Political philosophy has its beginnings in ethics: in questions such as what kind of life is the good life for human beings. Since people are by nature sociable – there being few proper anchorites who turn from society to live alone – the question follows as to what kind of life is proper for a person amongst people. The philosophical discourses concerning politics thus develop, broaden and flow from their ethical underpinnings.

Is there a middle-way ethics?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, for Buddhists such as our selves it would be either the eight-fold path or the perfections.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 1st, 2014 at 8:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

'Capitalism doesn't exist', 'class doesn't exist, .... even if it does exist it's all part of some 'grand plan', the 'natural order of things' etc. ....

Malcolm wrote:

There are markets and there are classes. Buddha explains how classes arise. He does not say much about markets at all, except to encourage lay people to turn a good profit to support their families.

mbulance... We don't just say it's 'karma', and leave them there in the road!

Denial is simply ignorance.

tellyontellyon said:

I think that social class is a product of the economic system

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha didn't.

tellyontellyon said:

and the economic system is a form of behavior and can therefore be changed.

Malcolm wrote:

Good luck, no one has ever succeeded in eradicating markets.

tellyontellyon said:

Nagarjuna's advice to his friend, a king, 100's of years ago was good advice in a general sense, but we don't have to take it as a justification for having 'kings' or 'free markets' today. Buddhism enshrines the possibility of change, it is not a formula for a particular political and economic system.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a "free market". All markets are regulated.

tellyontellyon said:

Socialism isn't a panacea, but if implemented properly it could be a real step forward to a better life for everybody. Socialism is more than just regulation, it is the democratic ownership and planning of the economy. It can be done.

Malcolm wrote:

There really isn't such a thing as "democratic" ownership, the closest thing that comes to it is being a stockholder in a company.

tellyontellyon said:

Capitalism is different to simple trading, as has been explored in previous posts.

Malcolm wrote:

"Capitalism" is a Marxist construct that does not exist outside Marxist analysis.

tellyontellyon said:

We have to take responsibility for ourselves and the other life forms on this planet.

Malcolm wrote:

We do not have to take responsibility for other lifeforms, we are not "the stewards of nature" -- this is a Christian and a Social Ecological standpoint. It is shallow, not deep. What we have to do is set aside resources of land and sea and let other lifeforms do their thing. They need no help from us when left alone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 1st, 2014 at 8:27 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Likewise, even in Sanskrit, the term atman has several meanings, all dependent on context.

dzogchungpa said:

Just looking at the Srimala sutra, it seems that the context for its use of atman in connection with dharmakaya is the four viparyayas. So, what would you say the meaning of atman/anatman is in that context?

Malcolm wrote:

Essence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

A specific word has a specific meaning you wouldnt call an airplane a turtle would you, why would you change the word Self to something else?

Malcolm wrote:

Words often have many meanings. For example, the word prajñā in Hinduism means something different than prajñā in Buddhism.

The word "rigs" in Tibetan translates these Sanskrit words: gotra, kula, yukti, etc., all

words with different meanings.

Likewise, even in Sanskrit, the term atman has several meanings, all dependent on context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And who said that socialist economic measure cannot be used for financial gain?

Malcolm wrote:

Socialists...after all, they want to eliminate markets, right?

Sherab Dorje said:

Nope, they want to control markets.

Malcolm wrote:

Then socialists are capitalists because all markets require regulation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Anyway. I am done here. If you cannot accept the basic fact that Capitalism is political as well as economic, then we are wasting our time talking.

Malcolm wrote:

"Capitalism" is not a political doctrine, nor is it even an economic doctrine, though indeed theories have been invented to justify it. Indeed "Capitalism" was invented by Karl Marx.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I was not really talking so much about the role of leaders in politics, but of course this is an understandable inference. What I am really trying to get at is a means of discovering a Buddhist political sensibility which is informed by Buddha's teachings, but can be

applied in how we conduct ourselves in political matters.

For example, the Buddha's original middle way was a path between indulgence and asceticism. So the real question is, "How do we Buddhists walk this path in whatever political situation we find ourselves in". That is what I mean by "Middle Way Politics". TKfan has the right idea, this is not so much about applying political remedies as a party, but what kind of political choices we make in light of our understanding of the Buddha's teaching, based on our own personal transformation dependent on our being people who live in a "polis", who are part of a "polity". So in that case, Adamantine's question about use of force is not an issue. Obviously a key point of a middle way politic would have to include ahimsa as a guiding principle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

I know there are people who believe that a direct transmission of experience of emptiness or enlightenment can be given...

Malcolm wrote:

Not to sidetrack the discussion, but this is not exactly what direct introduction means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Sherab said:

why the variation in intellectual output?

Malcolm wrote:

It is very simple really: people, when in post-equipoise, resume intellectual analysis of emptiness. One could say that the only persons in whom the equipoise view and the post-equipoise view are "identical" are fully awakened buddhas since in fact they are never not in a state of equipoise.

Sherab said:

Post-equipoise, there is a resumption of intellectual analysis of emptiness. However, wouldn't post-equipoise intellectual analysis of emptiness be informed by the experience of equipoise? If yes, then variation in intellectual output would imply variation in the equipoise experienced. That would mean differences in the experiences of the third and fourth empowerment.

If not, is there then no memory of the experience of equipoise?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, the way I understand is that one's post equipoise view will be characterized by one's remaining knowledge obscuration. Supposing that Nāgārjuna, Āsanga and Candra for example were all bodhisattvas on the stages, their differences in views could be accounted for merely by this fact alone.

When we apply this to Tibetans, the same rule would apply. Of course, there is no way the realization of anyone can be validated by ordinary persons such as ourselves...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Sherab said:

why the variation in intellectual output?

Malcolm wrote:

It is very simple really: people, when in post-equipoise, resume intellectual analysis of emptiness. One could say that the only persons in whom the equipoise view and the post-equipoise view are "identical" are fully awakened buddhas since in fact they are never not in a state of equipoise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The key teaching of the Buddha is the Madhyama Pratipad, the middle way.

What would a middle way politics look like, one informed by the Buddha's teachings rather than those of secular authors?

Johnny Dangerous said:

I think it's relative depending on time, place, and circumstance..but basically one would try to help all beings achieve a state of less suffering (the suffering of suffering to be specific, since political change and the material change it brings can't do anything at all to salve the other two), with a minimum of coercion, while encouraging both participation (and a "right" and obligation to participation in that sense), and some sense of responsibility. In addition, instead of politics based on "inherent rights" of really existing beings..I wonder if the model would not be drawn from the acknowledgment of interdependence.

I think you could make a valid argument for a number of different directions, but I think that Anarchism/Libertarian leaning ideas (on the left and right, though personally I am solidly left of center) will be a more natural fit than either statist, or statist/corporatist combinations.

If I had to pick a current party from my personal point of view, I would say to me The Green Party and similar groups are at least vaguely pointed in the right direction, simply due to advocacy of things like smaller scale, cooperative tackling of problems.. even if the parties themselves are pretty lackluster right now. In Europe, it seems that democratic socialist ideals (at least on paper) fit the bill, though I gather there are plenty of complaints in practice.

However, a big part of "Dharma politics" would hopefully be honesty about what is, and is not possible, which puts it out of the running...lol. Politics runs on an unreal picture about "the future", and perpetuates itself with providing people with either fear or longing towards it..the usual endless preparation of samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Lets not say "Dharma politics", because they should not mix. Middle Way Politics is informed by Dharma, but does not pretend to be Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The key teaching of the Buddha is the Madhyama Pratipad, the middle way.

What would a middle way politics look like, one informed by the Buddha's teachings rather than those of secular authors?

Son of Buddha said:

I would say Democratic Socialism.

what would the Buddha say? hmmm not sure ..... possibly a theocratic monarchy ran by the wheel turning King.

then again the Buddha did crush the the caste System in the Pali-Canon...but I don't remember him setting up a new view on a "future" government system.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha refuted the brahmanical theory of the caste system, but he certainly did not "crush" it.

Democratic socialism is a secular theory.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: Was Nāgārjuna a misogynist?

Content:

Astus said:

Enlightened beings are not infallible or omniscient.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what level of awakening you are considering.

Certainly stream entrants and once returners might have some faults, as well as bodhisattvas up the seventh bhumi, but above that, bodhisattvas are faultless since they have no afflictions, and tenth stage bodhisattvas have omniscience that nearly that of a Buddhas. Buddhas of course are omniscient in two ways.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 6:37 AM

Title: Middle Way Politics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The key teaching of the Buddha is the Madhyama Pratipad, the middle way.

What would a middle way politics look like, one informed by the Buddha's teachings rather than those of secular authors?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And who said that socialist economic measure cannot be used for financial gain?

Malcolm wrote:

Socialists...after all, they want to eliminate markets, right?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Sherab Dorje]"if it wasn't for the US's socialist intervention via the Marshall plan[/quote]



The Marshall Plan aid was mostly used for the purchase of goods from the United States...

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marshall\\_Plan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marshall_Plan)

Hardly socialist at all. Its purpose was to make Europe dependent on US exports.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Was Nāgārjuna a misogynist?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Nagarjuna was a Mahasiddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Nāgārjuna are you talking about?

There were at least two, and most probably three. We do not know which Nāgārjuna wrote this text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Engaged Buddhism... what is it?

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Of course, the Buddhas teach through skillfull means. The former example used before was advice given to a monarch and not to a modern day democracy. What I mean about realized beings words carrying more weight is that their teachings come from their wisdom minds and not from delusion.

tellyontellyon said:

Yes, I see.

Though at the same time , there really is a lot of wisdom in ancient teachings that have been proven over many generations to still be beneficial. I was watching a video earlier by a monk who was talking about all the rules a monk has to follow. Apparently they are not allowed to wear a robe that is perfectly clean, there must be some sort of mark on it. It reminds me of the Islamic carpet makers that always put a deliberate mistake in their carpet designs.

The humility of such an act is a valuable way of remembering our 'pride' when we start to think we are perfect, or have nice clothes etc. So these instructions can go very deep and work on all sorts of different levels, not just a literal practical level. I suppose this comes about through practice and may not be self-evident from simply studying the 'rules' from an abstract, uninvolved perspective.

I really admire what these monks have to cope with in order to keep all their vows.

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to live in a true socialist community where there is no property, become a monk. That is the only way to become free from markets and market capitalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Engaged Buddhism... what is it?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Like in the Kalama sutra? yes?

Malcolm wrote:

The Kalamas sutra is the most misunderstood sutra in the Pali canon. It was a teaching to a tribe of nonbuddhists confused about the various gurus who visited them and tried to convert them. It does not mean that once you have taken Buddhism as your path you are free to just interpret everything anyway you want. Of course, you must test everything, like one would test gold, to make sure it is authentic, but that is because you understand the value of real gold.

tellyontellyon said:

I mean, if Nagarjuna says put taxes up, or put taxes down or whatever, that is not some sort of creed or confession of faith that we must accept or otherwise not be 'proper' Buddhists, just because 'Nagarjuna says so'... you're not implying that are you?

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that one does not need to inform one's politics by anything outside the Buddha's teachings, and that most political doctrines are not consistent with Buddha's teachings, increasingly the further right and left that you go.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Exist = appearing to a valid mind.

Malcolm wrote:

How is a mind established as valid?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 31st, 2014 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

smcj said:

Being one of the people that post those type of offenses, I'd like to thank you allowing much of my Shentong postings to go unopposed.

Malcolm wrote:

If someone is a Vajrayāna practitioner, I don't really think it matters much which post-equipose view of emptiness they hold all that much, whether it is the "Prasanga" of the Gelugs, the view of freedom from extremes, or "gzhan stong". The view meditated in Vajrayāna depends on the experience of the third and fourth empowerments and not intellectual analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Engaged Buddhism... what is it?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Nāgārjuna advocated a lowering of excessive tax rates of previous Satavahanas, he advocated market regulation, and so on. Everything you need to conduct yourself and construct a political conscience that accords with Buddhist principles may be found in this book.

I think there is a lot of wisdom in his words. But we have to have some caution too.

There is a lot of general good advice here that is generally applicable, but some of the advice was particular to the person he was talking to and the time and situation he was talking about. He was a great philosopher and practitioner, but as Buddhists we don't accept anything as 'god given' absolute truth for all time.

Buddhism isn't a 'revealed' religion and Nagarjuna wasn't a prophet. So we can learn from Nagarjuna and all the great teachers, but we have to think and find out for ourselves too. Every day is a new day, and we can't be bound by a formulaic approach to anything.

My own teacher, Lama Rabsang (Palpung), says the Buddha gave 84'000 teachings, meaning that there are lots of ways of approaching practice, and life. For me, it is important to always keep this in mind when approaching any teachings, scripture, or teachers. It's just good sense.

I think the same must apply to engaged Buddhism.

p.s. thanks for the links.

Malcolm wrote:

The meaning is that there are 21,000 Dharmas to eliminate ignorance, 21,000 Dharmas to eliminate desire, 21,000 Dharmas to eliminate hatred, and 21,000 Dharmas to eliminate the three afflictions in combination, and that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Engaged Buddhism... what is it?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Buddhism isn't a 'revealed' religion...

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna Buddhism most certainly is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

smcj said:

I didn't realize it was the three natures that was so much of an issue, and will remember to keep that in mind when researching.

It's an issue for Malcolm personally. It's his bugaboo.

I believe that Malcolm has the kind of expertise that could argue either side of the issue effectively if he wanted to. For personal reasons he chooses to subscribe to non-Gelug Madhyamaka. That's perfectly ok, but just know that he has a strong bias and doesn't always identify it as such.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are wrong, the three natures is a major polemical issue between the Madhyamakas and Yogacaras in India, one upon which there are hundreds of pages written. Because of this, it has become a major polemical issue in Tibet too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I understand the above phrase is translated quite literally from Tibetan, but it really does not make sense in English. In English that literally reads:

The nature of the mind is phenomena,  
the nature of emptiness is mind.

What is really should say:

"The nature of all phenomena is the mind,  
The nature of the mind is emptiness."

rob h said:

That seems to merge both schools really well, thanks, and thanks again Tsongkhapafan. But yeah it's interesting that others have tried to make them work together in various ways, and nice quote in relation to that Tsongkhapafan. It seems like if you synthesize these two schools, or take out the extremes from both of them, then maybe there's something that can work very well.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in fact the Yogacara Madhyamaka that Tsongkhapa is referring to is Śāntarakṣita's. Śāntarakṣita's sole concession to Yogacara was that it was allowable to say that all phenomena are established as mind as a conventional truth. But he never goes into some lengthy analysis via the three natures, which he must therefore regards as being rather clumsy and leading one astray from Madhyamaka. Indeed the three natures theory is the main thing that comes under attack from Madhyamakās.

When it comes to the three natures theory in Tibet, this is the main thing about the Jonang presentation that Tsongkhapa attacks in his Legs bshad. He asserts their presentation deviates from how it is presented by Asanga and Vasubandhu and that they misuse it.

rob h said:

Thanks for this too, that's a great help. I didn't realize it was the three natures that was so much of an issue, and will remember to keep that in mind when researching. To be honest I don't really think about those that much either, but I do think the eight consciousness model works well, even if it isn't perfect and is just a concept that eventually has to be dropped with the others eventually. Will try to remember to read up on Santarakṣita and the Madhyamakālaṃkāra as well, it'll probably help clear a lot of things up.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the eight consciousness model is also critiqued by Madhyamakās, and indeed Śāntarakṣita does not address it much, as far as I recall.

There are basically three trends in scholastic thinking about the five treatises in Tibet: one, that they are all definitive [gzhans stong]; two, that of the five, only the Abhisamyālaṃkāra can be considered definitive dge lugs]; three, that Abhisamyālaṃkāra is definitive, and that properly understood, the Uttaratantra is definitive; the rest are not.

Then there is my unique point of view, which I have often stated. Asanga's teacher, Ācārya Maitreya's own point of view is Yogacara (cittamātra) and his identity as Bodhisattva Maitreya is a Tibetan misattribution that has gained such wide currency as to have become a "fact". He wrote five texts in order to clarify the three main streams of Mahāyāna sūtras. For Prajñāpāramitā he composed the Abhisamyālaṃkāra in order to detail its path structure. For the Tathāgatagarbha sūtras he composed the Uttaratantra. And for Yogacara he composed Madhyantavibhanga, being an attempt to correct a

perceived Madhyamaka extremism, and the Dharmadharmatāvibhanga, being a detailed treatment of the topic found in the Samdhinirmocana. He composed a treatise synthesizing these three sūtra streams from a Yogacara prespective, the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

rob h said:

But yeah it's interesting that others have tried to make them work together in various ways, and nice quote in relation to that Tsongkhapafan. It seems like if you synthesize these two schools, or take out the extremes from both of them, then maybe there's something that can work very well.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in fact the Yogacara Madhyamaka that Tsongkhapa is referring to is Śāntarakṣita's. Śāntarakṣita's sole concession to Yogacara was that it was allowable to say that all phenomena are established as mind as a conventional truth. But he never goes into some lengthy analysis via the three natures, which he must therefore regards as being rather clumsy and leading one astray from Madhyamaka. Indeed the three natures theory is the main thing that comes under attack from Madhyamakas.

When it comes to the three natures theory in Tibet, this is the main thing about the Jonang presentation that Tsongkhapa attacks in his Legs bshad. He asserts their presentation deviates from how it is presented by Asanga and Vasubandhu and that they misuse it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

This all seems very intellectual!

The union of the Prasangika and Chittamatrin views was praised by Tsongkhapa as pre-eminent and is very important for Tantric meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone in Tibetan practices Vajrayāna according to this view.

Tsongkhapafan said:

It is expressed simply by Milarepa:

You should know that all phenomena are the nature of mind

And that mind is the nature of emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

I understand the above phrase is translated quite literally from Tibetan, but it really does not make sense in English. In English that literally reads:

The nature of the mind is phenomena,  
the nature of emptiness is mind.

What is really should say:

"The nature of all phenomena is the mind,  
The nature of the mind is emptiness."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

rob h said:

This is difficult, because although I'm trying to point out that there is something there, because there can't possibly be nothing

Malcolm wrote:

There can't be nothing since there never was something which could become nothing.

dzogchungpa said:

Why, for there to be nothing, must there have been something to become nothing?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing always indicates the absence of something, in common language.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

rob h said:

This is difficult, because although I'm trying to point out that there is something there, because there can't possibly be nothing

Malcolm wrote:

There can't be nothing since there never was something which could become nothing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 8:04 AM

Title: Re: Was Nāgārjuna a misogynist?

Content:

Indrajala said:

It begs the question how do modern liberal Buddhists reconcile such sentiments with their own values?

I don't think you can write these statements off as mere engrained cultural habits. Assuming Nāgārjuna actually wrote these (and let's assume he did), these are the words of a realized bodhisattva with only benevolent intentions..

theanarchist said:

I guess since this was mainly aimed at male monastics he wanted to paint women in the worst possible light to make renunciation easier for the poor, desire-plagued sods.

I bet dharma texts aimed at nuns would do the same with men

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really a Dharma text, it is an ancestor to Sakya Pandita's Legs bshad (subhāśita), indeed Sapan cribs a verse here and there from this text. These verses would have been read by educated persons whether monks or not. As I said it is a kind of literary sport in being clever, often at the expense of others, indulged in by Sanskritist literati back in the day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Was Nāgārjuna a misogynist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But then again, I have found many male monastics to have a fair bit of misogyny, so he could have learned this in his Vihara.

Indrajala said:

So a realized master is capable of misogyny? If that's the case, a lot of moral issues are entirely separate from realization of, say, emptiness, though that's problematic. A bodhisattva who has realized emptiness probably should not feel ill will towards anyone, including women. We would at least hope Nāgārjuna had the best of benevolent intentions in writing these verses.

Malcolm wrote:

If he wrote it, perhaps he penned it when he was a younger man, not in possession of realization. After all, we commonly find texts composed by teenagers and in their twenties in the various collected works of Tibetan masters. Often texts such as this serve as demonstrations of skill in composition, as you know, this being a genre called "subhāśita". In subhāśita wit at the expense of others is a desiderata, it is part of the



form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

rob h said:

It isn't an attempt to be substantialist, it's meant to try to convey the idea that there is "something" there...

Malcolm wrote:

And that is the problem, nothing there is found.

rob h said:

If it's all going to be taken literally though, doesn't this ring true also?

Since all finite concepts are negational, the concept of "middle" (madhya) is equally negated, and so one should not even try and abide in a Middle View (madhyamaka).

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Was Nāgārjuna a misogynist?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Basically, what I'm getting at is that modern liberal values are often quite incompatible with older Buddhist ones, yet this is usually conveniently ignored or just dismissed as unimportant or simply backwards thought that we've moved beyond.

Malcolm wrote:

One must distinguish Dharma from culture, yes, even in sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Was Nāgārjuna a misogynist?

Content:

Indrajala said:

In the Tree of Wisdom (Tib. She-rab Dong-Bu ) attributed to Nāgārjuna there are the following verses:

63. A conqueror, a water channel, a creeping plant,  
Women and the blind, these five,  
How they are led by the crafty!  
And this leading places them in the power of others.

182. A woman's appetite is twice (that of a man),  
Her deceitfulness four times (as much),  
Her shame six times,  
And her passions eight times--so it is said.

194. When milk is got from a horn,  
When the reed-flower drops honey,  
Then, when a woman is true,  
The lotus will grow in dry ground.

246. An evil man, gold, a drum,  
A wild horse, women and cloth  
Are controlled by beating.  
These are not vessels for elegant doings.  
<http://www.sacred-texts.com/bud/srdb/srdb.htm>

It begs the question how do modern liberal Buddhists reconcile such sentiments with their own values?

I don't think you can write these statements off as mere engrained cultural habits.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they certainly are -- they are quite commonly found across the board in Indian literature and the same metaphors are found across the board in Sanskrit texts, Buddhist and Hindu.

As he states in one place here "so it is said."

But then again, I have found many male monastics to have a fair bit of misogyny, so he could have learned this in his Vihara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 30th, 2014 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: The Idea of Madhyamaka and Yogacara as Equally Correct

Content:

rob h said:

Yogacara...says that when looking at the whole and not individual parts, there's something there that can "be said" to have some type of existence, reality, substance, and so on, because there's actually something there ultimately when all things are seen without division.

Malcolm wrote:

This is substantialist perspective and will inevitably collapse because of its internal contradictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Engaged Buddhism... what is it?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M.

Are there similar instructions for Theravadin monks?

Could you elaborate please, what part of Nagarjuna's text are you thinking of; what are the actual instructions?

Malcolm wrote:

You will have to read the book yourself, I am afraid, but in brief he encourages kings to eliminate capital punishment, provide healthcare, charity, etc.

tellyontellyon said:

We have a Queen here in the UK; however, she is a Christian and head of the Church of England. Also, there are many countries, e.g. the USA that are Republics and so don't have a king. What if you have a king that is very hostile to Buddhism? Perhaps his social policy could be damaging? So I could imagine some difficulties arising there.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism declined in India largely due to the hostilities of Hindu kings. The life stories of the Mahāsiddhas are full of such events.

tellyontellyon said:

What is the actual word that Nagarjuna used for 'king'?

Malcolm wrote:

Rājā.

He probably authored the text for this king:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Satavahana\\_dynasty#Gautamiputra\\_Satakarni\\_.2878.E2.80.93102\\_CE.29](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Satavahana_dynasty#Gautamiputra_Satakarni_.2878.E2.80.93102_CE.29)

This person was the 23rd ruler of the Satavahana dynasty that ruled major portions of India from 230 BCE to 220 CE. You can see how large this kingdom was on the map.

tellyontellyon said:

So these are instructions that both monarchs and ordinary Buddhists should follow. Everybody.

Malcolm wrote:  
Indeed they are.

Nāgārjuna advocated a lowering of excessive tax rates of previous Satavahanas, he advocated market regulation, and so on. Everything you need to conduct yourself and construct a political conscience that accords with Buddhist principles may be found in this book. Not only that, but of course by following the instructions in this book, you will become a perfect bodhisattva.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 8:23 PM  
Title: Re: Peak oil  
Content:

kirtu said:  
The graphic is in millions. 15000 million =  $15 \times 10^9$ . They then avoid the difference between US and British definitions of billions (anyway Brits favor discussing things in thousands of millions).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:  
I am reporting (sans typos) what an article cited from the UN report that accompanied this graph.

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 8:21 PM  
Title: Re: Engaged Buddhism... what is it?  
Content:

Kim O'Hara said:  
As for lay Buddhists, I guess we can follow the guidelines for monastics if we can work out what they are ...  
Kim

Malcolm wrote:  
Or more simply, we can look at texts like the Ratnavali by Nāgārjuna which set out in some detail how kings are to set out social policies. .

Author: Malcolm  
Date: Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 8:17 AM  
Title: Re: Engaged Buddhism... what is it?  
Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

I was going to point tellyontellyon towards <http://www.ecobuddhism.org> but it seems to have been taken down. Does anyone know why, or whether it has just moved?

TIA,

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

It loads for me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Peak oil

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Also, you mean 'billion' not 'trillion'.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Engaged Buddhism... what is it?

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

What is Engaged Buddhism? What are it's aims, and how should Buddhists engage, generally speaking?

Malcolm wrote:

The term was coined by Thich Nhat Hahn. You can read his precepts of Engaged Buddhism here. You will particularly like precept 5:

Do not accumulate wealth while millions are hungry. Do not take as the aim of your life fame, profit, wealth, or sensual pleasure. Live simply and share time, energy, and material resources with those who are in need.

[http://viewonbuddhism.org/resources/14\\_precepts.html](http://viewonbuddhism.org/resources/14_precepts.html)

Joanna Macy is another person who has written about this quite a bit:

<http://www.joannamacy.net/engaged-buddhism.html>

Engaged Buddhism is basically Deep Ecology with a Buddhist perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

I can quote Madhyamakavatara too to support dependent production:

If you say that causes do not produce effects, then so--called effects do not exist;

And without an effect there is no reason for a cause, and they do not exist.

Since both of these are just like illusions, we are not at fault;

And worldly people's things exist.

VI. 170

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, of course. Then you have to understand that conventions will not bear analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Peak oil

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... indeed, world population appears to be declining on the whole.

dzogchungpa said:

svg

Malcolm wrote:

Right, it means that according to UN estimates, world population in 2150 could be as high as 25 trillion, the red line, or as low as 3.5 trillion, the green line. According to the report, the mathematical model favors the low number.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which is to merely say that they are objects of false cognitions, which when examined cannot be found to exist or be produced in anyway at all.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Since your argument is thus, too, an object of false cognitions,  
can it be found to exist or be produced in anyway at all?

If they are not produced in any way at all,  
even as hallucinations, then there is no samsara,  
not even relatively.

If that's the case, why practice Dharma  
since it too cannot be

"... found to exist or be produced in anyway at all. "

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

I can but cite Candrakirti on this point:

Reflections are not real, but using them we smarten our appearances.

In just the same way we should understand that arguments

That have the power to to cleanse the face of wisdom,

Unlike your limping sophistries, engender the realization of the goal.

But if the reasoning that proves our point were something were truly real,  
and real also the point itself that should be understood,  
then arguments of contact and the rest indeed would have some truth.  
But this is not the case, Your own fatigue is all you have achieved.

But we can demonstrate with easy cogency  
That all phenomena lack a real intrinsic being.

The contrary indeed you cannot prove,

So why ensnare the world in webs of false logic?

(MV, verses 175-177, Introduction to the Middle Way, Shambhala, 2002.)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I support genuine Socialism..... like many US citizens have in the past...

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily first generation Germans, German Jews, and Italians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Nemo said:

Banks should be nationalized. Period. They were traditionally 1-2% of GDP. Now financial services are around 11% and a drain on the real economy. As are speculators. Didn't Adam Smith think speculators should be hung or at the very least taxed out of existence?.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, the repeal of the Glass-Steagall act was a huge mistake. But investment banks have a legitimate role in the economy, just as "venture" capitalists do (they are really the same thing).

That is the beauty of having different countries, each nation is free to try out its own policies and see how it works out for them. Other nations can see the outcomes and decide to follow suit or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Unknown said:

As you well know I am talking about Private Property not Personal Property. Private property is the means of production. The Equipment and resources that we all depend on as a community to live. E.g. the sewer system, the electricity stations and grid, factories, roads, rail systems, banks. Society should not be held to ransom by a tiny percentage of individuals. These things should be both communally owned and communally managed democratically.

Malcolm wrote:

Toto:

One of the things that is nice about the US is that things are not centralized to the degree you imagine by "capitalists".

All the roads in the US are maintained in this order by the states and by the towns or counties.

In many places in the US utilities are in fact owned by the municipality, in other places they are not, where in fact they operate as tightly regulated monopolies.

In every city in the US, water treatment is something run by the local communities.



The rail system in the US, while originally built with private capital in the 19th century, is a now mostly a joint venture between the Feds and what remains of the rail companies that went bankrupt in the 1960's. There do remain a couple of rail systems that continue to operate independently of Amtrak.

In my view, the single biggest financial experiment that went wrong in the US was the dissolution of the long established barriers between savings and loans banks and investment banking in 1999, as well as the increase in credit offerings by the credit card companies and banks in the 1980's. Encouraging people to go into debt is short sighted economic policy. The same thing is now happening in China.

When it comes to financial markets, the main issue is how to insulate the whole of the economy against speculative risk while permitting those who wish to use their money in risk laden ventures. We ought to have learned our lesson in the 1929, but we didn't.

I strongly disagree with you that factories and so on should be "communalized" by force. Anyway, in the US it will never happen. If other countries want to experiment with such socialist remedies, more power to them, but I think that history has shown that such experiments are doomed to failure.

I do believe however that the 1819 Supreme Court Decision on Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward should be reversed, or legislated out of existence. Obviously, corporations are not persons and should not be treated as such. This ruling is actually the seed of neoliberalism (which I am opposed to, of course). Naturally, I think the EU, a neoliberal experiment, should be dissolved. Britain was absolutely correct to keep its distance and currency, and in fact it should never have joined at all.

I think at base, Toto, what we have here is just a cultural difference, in addition, I do not think you have understood Buddhism really very clearly. Nor have you understood the POV of HHDL very clearly. Much is made of his preference for socialism. However, he recently wrote, in his 2009 book, The Leader's Way:

I have come to put my faith in the free-market system.... The fact that it allows for freedom and diversity of thought and religion has convinced me that it is the one we should be working from," he wrote.

He argues in this book that capitalists can learn from Buddhism. But I am sure it surprises you to learn that he supports open markets.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M:

Malcolm wrote:

You are responding to Zhen li, not me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

The fact that half of those countries now calls themselves "Peoples Republic of \_\_\_\_" or "Democratic Socialist Republic of \_\_\_\_," and are now suffering in immense poverty, is quite germane.

Malcolm wrote:

It is germane to other issues, but not to my immediate point with SD, i.e., that the British empire was not "overcome" per se by anyone. It "fell apart", because Britain had no stomach nor money to keep armies fielded to control its colonies.

SD, Canada remains a part of the British Commonwealth and the Queen is the head of state.

The British relinquished Egypt after WWI because they revolted, etc., but even so, most of the former British Empire remain commonwealth territories, sharing the Queen as their head of state, and what's more, the cultural influences of the Empire are enduring.

When I say "bequeathed", the areas formerly dominated by the empire came to be dominated by American economic policy and military power, rather than direct colonization. A former colony, we Americans are traditionally allergic to expanding our powers through direct colonization. Our attempts at foreign intervention sadly have wrought far more harm than long term good, as far as I can tell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Feudalism (a wholly inaccurate historical construct) never existed. The English empire was not overcome, it was bequeathed to the United States after two dreadful wars that managed to ruin its economy.

Zhen Li said:

Rule by colonies is replaced by rule by development grants and loans. Which really develops the countries more?

Malcolm wrote:

Good question, but it is not germane to my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

That's the problem with the Capitalist view, its adherents always express of sense of entitlement to that which is not theirs, whether it be wealth, factories. etc.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not advocating a capitalist view. I am pointing out, as I have over and over again, that the only way you can secure your goals is with lethal violence. I do not condone that, I am utterly opposed to it. I do not share your conviction that "workers own the factories in which they work", unless in fact they do, done so properly, legally and with the full protection of the law. I do not support your view again that the wealth of the ultra rich should be seized, because such a seizure itself would involve catastrophic international conflicts, and because such people have the means to simply remove themselves from your reach. In other words, more harm than good would arise from their temporary (seriously, what's forty years?) control of such wealth. So lets say you do give everyone in the world \$49,000 [233 trillion / by world population]. How are you planning to do this? Actually you aren't. You are going to completely disrupt the economy and destroy everyone's wealth, just like the Bolsheviks did in Russia. Honestly, on this score, I think you are completely naive. But lets say we did, the same thing would happen all over again; some people, most people will squander their wealth, some people will be better at managing it, and eventually the same disparities that have arisen will just arise again.

The socialist democracies that Kirt is so fond of are a kind of rapprochement between a moderate (non-marxist) socialist view and the market economy we live in. However, they are only feasible because they are floating in a sea of money.

I guess the point is, I am not opposed to strict market regulation, it is necessary actually for a whole host of environmental reasons and social reasons. But what I am totally opposed to is the idea that we try to abolish the market economy we have now, because another one, a black one, will just take its place.

Anyway, I really don't think your revolution is ever going to happen anyway. The way global wealth is distributed, you would have to have a revolution in the US first, and that will never happen until we have a poverty crisis. Americans are completely allergic to communism.

You don't seem to have any idea what the eighteen qualities of a precious human birth are, even though you are British and a Buddhist. You should maximize your precious human birth and practice Dharma, not waste all your time on obsolete political religions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M:

That so much wealth is concentrated into the hands of so few at this juncture in history represents a fundamental failure of market regulation brought about by the "liberalization" of the world economy which represents a failure on the part of the various governments in the world to understand the proper role regulation in the market place, so that open markets can function healthily.

You seem to have abandoned your Karmic view that the wealthy got rich via meritorious former lives? Now your argument sounds more like Glenn Beck.

Malcolm wrote:

Those people who managed to receive that wealth had merit to do so, it is not like there is a dollar figure placed on merit. For example, the same person born in the Soviet Communist world would be rich in status, part of the elite, extremely powerful, one of the 40 most powerful people in the country, a Putin.

tellyontellyon said:

It is not up to you or anyone else however to change that apart through fair taxation policies.

Nobody is asking your permission.

Malcolm wrote:

That's the problem with the Marxist view, its adherents always express of a misplaced sense of entitlement to that which is not theirs, whether it be wealth, factories. etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

they have a relative degree of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is to merely say that they are objects of false cognitions, which when examined cannot be found to exist or be produced in anyway at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 8:41 AM

Title: Re: Peak oil

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

We can be much smarter about energy efficiency, for instance - and it's already happening.

Malcolm wrote:

Jevons observed that England's consumption of coal soared after James Watt introduced his coal-fired steam engine, which greatly improved the efficiency of Thomas Newcomen's earlier design.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jevons\\_paradox](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jevons_paradox)

So no, I don't share your technological enthusiasm. I am rather skeptical of it, actually.

Kim O'Hara said:

We can slow our population growth - and that has already happened in the West and I see no reason the developing world won't naturally follow the same path as it follows us through the same developmental sequence.

Malcolm wrote:

This is certainly a desiderata. And indeed, world population appears to be declining on the whole.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M:

Because some people have the karma to become super wealthy and others do not. Rather than bitching about the super wealthy, attend to your own causes of merit. I'm not bitching about the rich. I don't hate the rich or envy their wealth. I am just pointing out a disparity. I am also pointing out that the rich are rich because the poor are poor.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, the rich are rich and the poor are poor because of their karma.

For example, there was a yogi who supplicated the Dorje Legpa, one of three main protectors of the Dzogchen teachings. He was a very good practitioner, so when he summoned Dorje Legpa, Dorje Legpa appeared to him in person. One day the yogi said to Dorje Legpa, "I am tired of being poor, bring me as much wealth as you can." The next day Dorje Legpa returned, but he only had a small brass coin. "What's this", the yogi, said, "Why did not you not bring me more?" Being a wisdom protector, Dorje Legpa

replied, "I am sorry but you do not have the karma to be wealthy so I could only bring you this much".

tellyontellyon said:

Under capitalism, the rich get rich at the expense of the poor.

Malcolm wrote:

It seems that way, but it is not really that way.

tellyontellyon said:

But even that isn't the most important thing:

If society could progress under capitalism, if the system was stable and allowed us to tackle the worlds povert and address the environmental problems effectively then it wouldn't matter all that much if the rich were rich. Thats not what bothers me really.

In it's early period capitalism was progressive, it moved the world forward, and its benefits made its faults tolerable.

But now, in late capitalism, capitalism's problems outweigh its diminishing benefits. It is a chaotic system that is leading us to barbarism.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said before, this state of affairs represents a fundamental failure of world governments to properly regulate the markets because of neoliberal policies which began to be put into place in the 1970's.

tellyontellyon said:

I feel sorry for the super-rich actually. Many of them are decent people and are just as trapped in this corrupting system as the rest of us. However, I do think a very privileged lifestyle can cut people off from what is happening to others, or they start making up rationalizations to justify the enormous differences in society.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not up to you or anyone else however to change that apart through fair taxation policies. Actually, in the US, in the 1950's all income above \$100,000 a year was taxed at something like 90 percent. It provided incentive for reinvestment rather than profit taking.

tellyontellyon said:

I will have to take exception to what seemed to be a suggestion that the poor are somehow more desirous than the rich.

Malcolm wrote:

They have more desire because their need is greater. It does not mean they want to screw everything to moves.

tellyontellyon said:

It seems to me that wealth can act like a drug to some people. It is strange how the

people I know with the most money hang on to it more tightly than people with less money. Perhaps they rely on it so much for their sense of value or self-esteem?

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, the wealthy, like asuras, are primarily dominated by anger and pride.

tellyontellyon said:

That's one of the things about a system that measures value in dollars and cents rather than in smiles and a meaningful existence. Marxists don't want to make everybody rich, they want to make a world where wealth doesn't matter.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Buddhist, wealth matters only in so far as it assists your practice. But there will always be wealthy people and poor people. Some trees will always get more nutrients and sunlight, and others less, that is just life. So get used to it.

tellyontellyon said:

Maybe Karma can create a situation where some people are born rich and others poor. I'm not sure that that means that people who are born rich therefore have earned more merit in a previous life.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it absolutely does.

tellyontellyon said:

Many Tulku's are born into incredibly poor families. Perhaps 'wealth' can mean something different to filthy lucre?

Malcolm wrote:

Having a high Tulku in a poor family is a sure fire way for that family to gain wealth and prestige. Such families are treated like the nouveau riche are treated in the West however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Geez Malcolm, that is the most Hindu sounding view of karma I have heard for a long time. Next you'll be arguing in support of the caste system.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all, karma is unerring. This is the Buddha's teaching.

Sherab Dorje said:

I agree that karma is unerring and that the situations that individuals find themselves in are due to their karma. But that does not mean they have to remain trapped there. That does not mean they cannot work to change their situations either individually or through collective effort. But that does not mean they have to remain trapped there. That does not mean they cannot work to change their situations either individually or through collective effort.

Malcolm wrote:

And I never maintained that they should not try and improve their situation. Of course they should, and will. That is what all sentient beings do constantly, i.e. try and improve their situation. They are merely held back by three mental non-virtues, malice, greed, and wrong view and so their attempts, in the end, always, always fail.

Sherab Dorje said:

Feudalism was overthrown. English imperialism was overcome. Capitalist exploitation will become a thing of the past. Etc... There is present karma too.

Malcolm wrote:

Feudalism (a wholly inaccurate historical construct) never existed. The English empire was not overcome, it was bequeathed to the United States after two dreadful wars that managed to ruin its economy.

It is always a desiderata when any exploitation becomes a thing of the past, whether it is exploitation by capitalists, communists, fascists, racists and other kind of "ist" you can imagine. This does not mean that markets can be abolished (they can't), and that people should not be free to sell their goods or their labor to the person or company that will pay them the most for it. When you "abolish" open (rather than free, since there is also no such a thing as a "free" market) markets, you create the conditions for black markets, where indeed the likelihood of criminal participation is elevated, for example, the Prohibition in the United States. It is also true that some kinds of goods are deemed criminal, such as heroin, etc., and some kinds of labor are deemed criminal, such as protection rackets.

Therefore, markets require regulation, and that is the principle economic role of a government. That so much wealth is concentrated into the hands of so few at this juncture in history represents a fundamental failure of market regulation brought about by the "liberalization" of the world economy which represents a failure on the part of the various governments in the world to understand the proper role of regulation in the market place, so that open markets can function healthily. Markets cannot regulate themselves. They need a stern hand to guide them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:



Matter cannot be found in dreams either, but it exists and functions. Our perceiving it and its functioning is not a wrong awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the matter which appears in a dream is recognized to be unreal. Do you call that which is recognized to be unreal something that exists. I don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Geez Malcolm, that is the most Hindu sounding view of karma I have heard for a long time. Next you'll be arguing in support of the caste system.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all, karma is unerring. This is the Buddha's teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, I am not Buddhist so I cannot predict anything,

Should be:

Of course, I am not Buddha so I cannot predict anything,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Was the struggle to end apartheid "forcing people to be virtuous".

Malcolm wrote:

No, because, having been to South Africa myself, I can tell you that people are just as non-virtuous as they were before, and apart from a rising black middle class, the apartheid system still exists more or less as before, with the main difference being that most of the cops are black, as is the government.

Johnny Dangerous said:

and if not, and you consider it positive, how do you categorically differentiate something like that from any attempt to change the economic system, revolutionary or otherwise? is it just the violence, and idea of taking by force that makes something a wrong headed attempt to make people be virtuous?

Malcolm wrote:

People are free do what they like and most people are ignorant of karma in any case, they don't believe in it. We don't accept fate in Buddhadharma any more than we do God as an explanation for the state of things. But we do accept karma as an explanation for the state of things, both individually as well as collectively (aggregated individual action). The Buddha makes it exceedingly clear that all who engage in any sort of lethal violence will experience negative results in both this life and in future lives.

All political discussion by so called Buddhists must have the view of karma in mind.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I am detecting a hint here that a belief in karma negates the possibility of trying to create a world of with more just conditions at all, albeit impermanent ones;)

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you can try, but then more unjust situations will replace the one you have solved. I am not saying "don't try", I am saying that we need to understand the limitations of being sentient beings in samsara.

Not all persons are Buddhists, and not even Buddhists act carefully with respect to karma, as we can see in Burma, Shri Lanka and elsewhere.

We can also be confident that all unjust actions will be met with karmic ripening for the perpetrators of those actions. As long as people engage in the activities motivated by the three or five afflictions there will be injustice and inequality in the world. However, you cannot remove the root of negative karma, malice, covetousness and ignorance, from people minds with a scalpel.

But what you can do is act more justly with people around you. You can act kindly, you can exemplify the virtues of our practice. But you cannot change others to your liking, and more importantly, it is very difficult to change samsara. And in particular I am saying that trying to bring the edifice of the capitalist economy crashing down artificially will merely result in more negative karma for the people who engineer it because if you think there is suffering now, you haven't seen anything.

Johnny Dangerous said:

if you aren't saying this in any way, sorry for misinterpreting you..this is why i'm asking for specifics regarding the difference between forcing people to be virtuous, and creating the conditions for people to be virtuous - from a Buddhist standpoint. I think one can see that today, in terms of our society, we are in a place that does not promote

people being virtuous with their wealth..so i'm asking, again from a Buddhist standpoint, should that be entirely left alone - is that your position, or are you saying something else?

Malcolm wrote:

We do not have a Buddhist king who can advise people wisely. And I personally do not want a Socialist dictatorship directing my life. Perhaps it is because I am an American, and we Americans in general are pretty much historically opposed to Communism. Indeed, even when Socialism was popular in the US, it was popular mainly among first generations immigrants at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, not amongst those who had been born and bred here, and for the most part, second generation immigrants, horrified by the excesses of Stalin, eschewed it.

The anti-facist Socialist idealism of the thirties in in the US pretty much died when we understood that there is structurally no difference between Marxist-Leninist Socialism and Fascism in terms of outcomes, both have planned economies, both use secret police to terrorize dissent, etc.

85 people may own 1/2 the worlds wealth, but so what? They will die, inheritance taxes will be applied, this state of affairs is very impermanent. All we need to worried about is that our own wealth is gotten virtuously, without stealing it from another.

And we need to understand that in general we cannot change the disparities between people since people have their own karma. This is the reason for example that Buddha did not give his golden alms bowl to a poor family living by a river because he saw that due to their latent afflictions they would all take rebirth in lower realms as a result of such a sudden influx of wealth. Of course, I am not Buddhist so I cannot predict anything, so I have no idea what would happen of 1/2 the world's wealth was suddenly "redistributed". But who would adjudicate it to make it fair?

You see, this is all just a bunch of proliferation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Correction, these Gelugpa teachings do not do. Since the reality of matter, etc., cannot be established other than conventionally, what is the use of defending their reality at all? The Gelugpas tie themselves into knots and wind up becoming quasi realists.

Tsongkhapafan said:

No, there's no problem from a Gelugpa point of view. Form is empty of inherent existence, not empty of itself, otherwise it wouldn't exist at all - where's the problem with that?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is because also the existence of matter cannot be found.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He would explain it as karma.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Sure, but this does not mean he would condone a system that encourages people who have accrued such merit to work mainly in their own self-interest, and thereby exhaust their positive merit while amassing stores of demerit.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot force people to be virtuous.

HHDL has in fact spoken often about the bad repercussions of a world full of the super-rich, and the super poor - as i'm sure you know.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'm staying out of the greater conversation re: Marxism etc., but I feel like you are being a bit cloudy by implying (far as I can tell) that something being acknowledged as a result of Karma means that no one should do anything.

Malcolm wrote:

I am trying to point out that these various political theories of the left are not panaceas for the excesses of right.

First of, while people pair off communism and capitalism, Zhen Li was quite right in pointing out that there is no "Capitalism" per se, it is not a political ideology, unlike Communism.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I was just listening to an audiobook with Dzigar Kongtrul Rinpoche and Pema Chodron where this very subject is brought up, and the Civil Rights movement was used as a specific example of people changing their Karmic circumstances in a positive way, that was beneficial to many.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, this can happen, but you must bear in mind that all positive, negative and neutral sensations in samsara are a result of karma.

Johnny Dangerous said:

just pointing out that something being a result of Karma in no way limits acting to change it in a positive manner

Malcolm wrote:

And I never made such a claim to the contrary, had you read the thread more closely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

You see, Buddha wanted people to become wealthy.

I don't think he was saying that in the sense of the sort of wealth I'm talking about, i.e. 85 individuals having as much wealth between them as the poorest 50 percent of the worlds population.

Malcolm wrote:

He would explain it as karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

If you read my post carefully, you will notice that I am not saying that emptiness or suchness is conditioned. I am merely pointing out the consequence of saying that emptiness is also empty.

PadmaVonSamba said:

To quote HHDL from that same book:

"...We should not, however, understand this self-emptiness or emptiness of self-nature to mean that form is empty of itself; this would be tantamount to denying the reality of form, which, as I have been repeatedly emphasizing, these teachings do not do."

.

.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Correction, these Gelugpa teachings do not do. Since the reality of matter, etc., cannot be established other than conventionally, what is the use of defending their reality at all? The Gelugpas tie themselves into knots and wind up becoming quasi realists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

Actually, my quarrel is with the application of mutually exclusive terms of conditioned and unconditioned to describe one and the same thing because it creates confusion.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

When I was with the Gelugpas, I hear the phrase emptiness of emptiness quite a lot. To me, if one says that emptiness is also empty, one is actually saying that emptiness is conditioned and not unconditioned. I am not sure if the Gelugpas realize that though.

Malcolm wrote:

To say that emptiness is empty is to merely say that emptiness does not arise, not that emptiness is conditioned. If emptiness is conditioned, so is suchness. This kind of reasoning will cause all the Buddhas and bodhisattvas to turn their backs to one.

Sherab said:

If you read my post carefully, you will notice that I am not saying that emptiness or suchness is conditioned. I am merely pointing out the consequence of saying that emptiness is also empty.

As an aside, to say that Buddhas and bodhisattvas turning their backs to one just because of a logical argument is to belittle their compassion and patience isn't it? I for one would not have respect nor have confidence in such buddhas and bodhisattvas.

Malcolm wrote:

Its figurative, it means if you explain the Dharma poorly, without recourse to citation and reasoning, without understanding how to apply this argument this tenet system and that one to that one, one is committing an error of leading others astray. Buddhas and bodhisattvas won't condone such actions. It does not mean that will abandon you in

samsara.

As I pointed out, your arguments are fundamentally an argument from substantialist reasoning whereby the conditioned must be one thing, and the unconditioned another. I have already removed those qualms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

A thing and its nature are not separate. Saying a thing arises is not different from saying the nature of the thing arises. It has to be if inseparability is to make any sense. Therefore when a thing arises, its emptiness arises with it. When a thing ceases, the emptiness of that thing ceases because there is no emptiness of that thing to point to. So there is actually no two arisings as you have asserted. There is only one arising of the phenomenon and its nature and there is only one ceasing of the phenomenon and its nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, from the perspective of Madhyamaka a thing and its nature are identical. This is not so for those in lower schools.

To elaborate, conditions are merely an appearance. The notion of conditioned and unconditioned arises out of the substantialist roots of the substantialist tenet systems. By showing that the essence of phenomena is unconditioned, you are essentially showing that phenomena are in truth unconditioned. This is why the Prajñāpāramitā makes statements like:

Any teaching by the Bhagavan that matter lacks inherent existence, does not arise, does not cease, is peace from the beginning and is parinirvana by nature, all such teaching are not the indirect meaning, nor the intentional meaning, but must be understood literally. (Ārya-pañcaśatikā-prajñāpāramitā)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

It's pretty clear that Marx's opposition to capitalism didn't come from pure reason, it came from his emotional hatred of money and Jews.

Malcolm wrote:

People often hate what they don't have. But I thought Marx was himself Jewish.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

But, if you then defined emptiness as being unconditioned and say that phenomenon A, which dependently arisen, is therefore conditioned, and is also unconditioned because it is empty, an inherent contradiction in terms between conditioned and unconditioned is introduced.

I hope it is now clearer where I am coming from.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it was understood from the beginning where your qualm was coming from. It's only a contradiction in terms for substantialists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The mind essence is like space, it does not arise.

theanarchist said:

Not so sure if modern astrophysics agrees with that claim about space.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of space detailed in Buddhist texts, unconditioned space, which is what is meant by the above, the absence of obstruction, and conditioned space, i.e., cavities and dimensionality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

What you are arguing is that the world the Buddha was talking about, and the way profit was made in the Buddha's time is fundamentally the same. I am saying it is not. That is why I posted those quotes about the capitalist means of production a few posts back.

.



Malcolm wrote:

Sure it was, there were factories, there were owners, there were workers, and there was profit.

The wise and virtuous shine like a blazing fire.  
He who acquires his wealth in harmless ways  
like to a bee that honey gathers,[6]  
riches mount up for him  
like ant hill's rapid growth.

With wealth acquired this way,  
a layman fit for household life,  
in portions four divides his wealth:  
thus will he friendship win.

One portion for his wants he uses,[7]  
two portions on his business spends,  
the fourth for times of need he keeps.

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.31.0.nara.html>

You see, Buddha wanted people to become wealthy. There are many places in the sutras where he gives recommendations for how laypeople may virtuously maximize their wealth. We have already established too that one's social position depends on one's karma, and therefore, one access to initial wealth and opportunity. Of course, we must try our best to extend opportunity to everyone. The construction of schools, hospitals, roads, etc., these things are costs society must bear for everyone's benefit. But it is impossible to provide everyone with the exact same economic parity. Some people are lazier than others. Some people are more talented than others. Some people are more industrious than others because of their karmic dispositions. In reality, social classes tend to be driven by the five afflictions: the lower classes tend to be dominated by ignorance and desire, the middle classes tend to be dominated by desire and jealousy and the upper classes tend to be dominated by anger and pride (which is one reason why those from the upper classes tend to more easily fall into lower realms).

You cannot regulate how people accumulate karma, and cannot fix people's karma by regulating society.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

In the modern world, the 85 richest people on the planet have accumulated as much

wealth between them as half of the world's total population. I'm sure things were different in the Buddha's day.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. Why? Because some people have the karma to become super wealthy and others do not. Rather than bitching about the super wealthy, attend to your own causes of merit.

When contrasted with the endowments of the beings of the deva realms, for example, all the wealth of the earth is just a pauper's bauble, the richest person is less than a beggar.

But since you do not seem to have a view that takes into consideration the six realms of samsara, you are myopically focused on this human life and its endowments, focused on material relations rather than Dharma practice. The ability to practice Dharma is the true wealth of Jambudvipa. If you want to help beings in a concrete way, it is better to spread Dharma than things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

If Mind's original nature is also composite,  
as your statement, "Nothing exists that does not arise from conditions" implies,  
then it also cannot be the source of the perfect cessation of suffering.  
How does that work for you?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind essence is like space, it does not arise, so it cannot be counted as an existent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

When I was with the Gelugpas, I hear the phrase emptiness of emptiness quite a lot. To me, if one says that emptiness is also empty, one is actually saying that emptiness is conditioned and not unconditioned. I am not sure if the Gelugpas realize that though.

Malcolm wrote:

To say that emptiness is empty is to merely say that emptiness does not arise, not that emptiness is conditioned. If emptiness is conditioned, so is suchness. This kind of reasoning will cause all the Buddhas and bodhisattvas to turn their backs to one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

So what is the meaning then of "whatever arises in dependence, that in truth does not arise"?

Malcolm wrote:

It means simply that when you examine dependently originated phenomena you cannot ascertain that they ever arose. A phenomena that never arose is defined as "unconditioned", for example, space, which is the primary metaphor used to describe the actual nature of things. Thus, when we examine phenomena for essences we cannot find one, because phenomena do not arise by virtue of an essence, they in fact, or in truth, never arise. This is what it means to say that conditioned phenomena possess an unconditioned nature, no more and no less.

If conditioned phenomena possessed a conditioned nature, that nature would also have to arise, leading to dual arising for same phenomena, which is absurd. However, since conditioned phenomena possess an unconditioned nature their arising is only apparent, not actual, merely conventional, similar with an illusion, etc. This covers all qualms you may have.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Under REAL socialism, production is for need, and doesn't need to be profitable.

Malcolm wrote:

Under Marxist socialism, all factors of life would be centralized and planned.

I simply don't agree with that model of politics and I never will.

I don't want to wear the same uniform you are wearing, the same clothes, shoes, etc. That is the consequence of "production out of the need" in a large industrial society.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is, since it comes with a sense "me and mine", i.e. "I have the right to use this place, you do not".

Sherab Dorje said:

Nope, it is not the same as ownership. Simple example: when you rent a car you have rights over its use, do you own it? No. Now a rented car belongs to somebody, but the land, it did not belong to somebody. It did not belong to everybody either.

Malcolm wrote:

False, like an apartment you have signed a contract to own the car for a period, with all responsibilities that ownership entails.

Sherab Dorje said:

Necessarily, otherwise it would require "oppressive social/political and economic models". BTW, I am not suggesting that we can reduce the population by any moral means, merely that population reduction is a desiderata. This is a key point of the Deep Ecology platform.

Deep Ecologist were being accused of Malthusian misanthropy since the inception of the particular ideology.

Malcolm wrote:

Malthus is unfairly accused of Misanthropy. He was not a misanthrope, he was a pessimist.

Sherab Dorje said:

A subsistence economy, or steady state economy, can contain all forms of technological production, doing so with respect to environmental impacts, but only if human populations never exceed 100,000,000.

Who comes up with this magical number?

Malcolm wrote:

Arne Naess.

Sherab Dorje said:

Again, total nonsense. All economies function by producing surplus value...

While it is true that, historically, they try to, it is not a necessary function of an economy.

Malcolm wrote:

It is simply true that they do, and always have, and always will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Tom said:

Are you suggesting Jay asserts dependent origination from an ultimate stand point? I'm just not sure how you are using ultimate analysis here?

Malcolm wrote:

I do not think that is what Jay is saying. Jay and I have a disagreement over what constitutes a "satya". I maintain that as a satya is an object of cognition, what is important is whether the cognition is veridical or non-veridical. But Jay asserts that the object (veridical or non-veridical) is what is important, and thus, he concludes, wrongly in my estimation, that there is no ultimate truth, or as you have stated, that the ultimate is that there is no ultimate truth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Yes, that is very nice.

but what is your opinion?

Do you think anything arises which is not a composite?

and do you regard space as a phenomenon

or as something that phenomena arise in,

or both?

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

My opinion is stated in the quote.

Space is a phenomena. It is an unconditioned phenomena therefore it does not arise. It is actually merely nonobstruction.

Nothing arises which does not arise from conditions. Nothing exists that does not arise from conditions. Space is in fact a non-existent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Unknown said:

The (collectively arrived at) right to use is not the same thing as ownership.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is, since it comes with a sense "me and mine", i.e. "I have the right to use this place, you do not".

Unknown said:

Not necessarily. I am sure you are aware of countless societies with sustainable human population levels that were based on oppressive social/political and economic models. With current population levels it would require a drastic reduction in the "quality of life" for "first worlders" and a radical shift in ideology praxis. Misanthropism is not a solution.

Malcolm wrote:

Necessarily, otherwise it would require "oppressive social/political and economic models". BTW, I am not suggesting that we can reduce the population by any moral means, merely that population reduction is a desiderata. This is a key point of the Deep Ecology platform. A subsistence economy, or steady state economy, can contain all forms of technological production, doing so with respect to environmental impacts, but only if human populations never exceed 100,000,000. Since world population is slowly crashing anyway, and will crash much more quickly once petroleum resources are no longer practical to extract, we can anticipate this with planning that encompasses centuries, rather than decades, or years.

Unknown said:

Who said that the Buddha was a Marxist/Anarchist? "Surplus value" is theft and cannot be generated without a supporting system of coercion. That is why/how economies are political.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, total nonsense. All economies function by producing surplus value, the difference is that Communism and Capitalism both regard the non-productive destruction of surplus value as immoral. They both destroy surplus value productively using different ideologies. But all economies produce surplus value, even natural communities generate surplus value until their resources are exhausted, then they die back. This is very different from your admired primitive societies, and festival societies (like old Tibet) where the non-productive destruction of surplus value was regarded as desiderata (the potlach, gilding stupas, etc.).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for example, true existents.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Do you regard space as a true existent?

Hmmmm....come to think of it, do you regard anything at all as a true existent?

Do you assert that "true existent" is an impossibility?

Malcolm wrote:

Sentient beings are not bound by anything.

If one recognizes that true existence is inherently nonexistent,

taints are purified intrinsically,

like muddy water self-purifying.

All phenomena are the same in lacking inherent existence.

-- The String of Pearls Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

theanarchist said:

Cough cough... Rabbit horns..

Malcolm wrote:

Āryāṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāpañjikāsāroṭṭamā:

All phenomena do not arise,

that is the non-existence of the inherent existence of all phenomena,

therefore, that absence of arising is like the horns of a rabbit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"For those whom emptiness is possible, everything is possible, for those whom emptiness is not possible, nothing is possible"

PadmaVonSamba said:

Everything can't be possible, because if everything were possible, then it would also be possible for some things not to be possible.

.  
.   
.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for example, true existents.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

BTW one of the twenty or so capitalist powers that was viciously and ruthlessly intervening in Russia at that time was your country, the USA. The USA can be ruthless, but the Bolshevik supporters are condemned for being ruthless in response?

Malcolm wrote:

While it is true that the US covertly funded opposition to the Bolsheviks, whom the Americans regarded as being under the control of and rightly so, our military presence in Russia was confined to fighting Cossacks along the trans-Siberian railway.

Anyway, you need to read this, it provides a clear account of our military presence in Russia:

<https://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2002/winter/us-army-in-russia-1.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

[

Merely saying that emptiness is defined as unconditioned does not address my question, which was how is it possible to have a thing that is both conditioned and unconditioned at the same time. Perhaps, you are saying it is possible as long as it is defined as possible.

Malcolm wrote:

"For those whom emptiness is possible, everything is possible, for those whom emptiness is not possible, nothing is possible"



If emptiness is a synonym for dependent arising, that would imply that dependent arising is unconditioned. Or to put it more starkly, it would mean that dependent arising does not arise dependently.

There is no entity "dependent arising", there are only phenomena that arise in dependence. Space, the two cessations and emptiness do not arise at all, so they are by definition phenomena that do not arise in dependence. Of course, this does not mean that they are not relative, for both conditioned and unconditioned phenomena are relative. Since both conditioned and unconditioned phenomena are relative, their relationship is strictly a matter of definition.

As for dependently originated phenomena being unconditioned, the Prajñāpāramitā states "Whatever arises in dependence, that in truth does not arise". The argument can be made that even so called dependently originated phenomena are unconditioned in reality, since their production cannot be ascertained at all when subjected to ultimate analysis. Again in this respect there is no contradiction between a conventionally conditioned entity having a conventionally unconditioned nature since in reality both are merely conventions. While the former bears the latter as its nature, in reality neither the former nor the latter can stand up to ultimate analysis. In other words there are no phenomena at all that can stand up to ultimate analysis.

Yes, unconditioned things can be truly existents or false existents that are not dependently arisen. But unconditioned things cannot include false existents that are dependently arisen, don't you agree?

Of course I do not agree: for example, space, an unconditioned phenomena, permeates all conditioned phenomena, and neither obstructs conditioned phenomena nor is obstructed by them. Emptiness, another unconditioned phenomena, likewise permeates all conditioned phenomena, neither obstructing them nor being obstructed by them.

It is precisely because of such contradictions that Garfield and Priest were forced to conclude from their study of Nagarjuna that ultimately there is no ultimate and that dependent arising is all there is.

Jay Garfield is a lovely guy, and an excellent analytical philosopher (he is a professor in the Philosophy Department at Smith college, along with my father (now retired)), however, he is wrong in so far that there isn't even dependent origination in the ultimate analysis.

Again, I don't think that giving a definition as an answer will resolve the logical contradiction that my question raises.

Your question presumes an entity/entity relationship, therefore your very question is flawed. Emptiness is not an entity, neither are phenomena, other than conventionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M:

I am telling you, all this Anarchist and Marxist thinking just does not fly when you view the world through a Buddhist lens.

...

Capitalism can't fly and we must... MUST find a better way of living on this planet, and of overcoming the coercive stranglehold that capitalists have over our planet.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as human beings are under the sway of the three poisons, for that long there will always be "I and mine".

But to be frank, TOTO, I would never want any state telling me how I can best live my life, how my labor is best disposed of. I prefer all the uncertainty under this capitalist system to a certain dreary gray totalitarian future under Communism. You may want to be a zek, but I sure don't.

tellyontellyon said:

You would need a powerful state to maintain any dictatorship.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, which is why the dictatorship of the proletariat is envisioned as being so ruthless.

tellyontellyon said:

Whatever you think the solution might look like, the capitalist mode of production is standing in the way of it.

Malcolm wrote:

The capitalist mode of production is not the problem, according to you Marxists. The problem, according to you, is who owns that means of production.

The only political theories out there that actually call into question the validity of the capitalist mode of production itself, as opposed to the question of ownership of that means of production are certain strains of anarchist thinking, Bookchin's Communalism and Deep Ecology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 10:31 AM

Title: Re: Western geshe and khenpos

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

because his views came under such harsh criticism from Sakya scholars such as Gorampa.

Konchog1 said:

Such as?

Malcolm wrote:

Gorampa, in his commentary on the Madhyamakāvatara lists over a hundred points where he thinks Tsongkhapa erred.

The standard summary of Gorampa's critiques of Tsongkhapa are to found in his famous "Differentiation of Views".

Thus far, Gorampa's views have not been effectively countered by any Gelug scholar I know as they generally refuse to read Gorampa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I did address the claim in other posts, since it comes up a lot. I'll be to the point here:

Nozick is an outlier in libertarianism, the mainstream is probably better defined by Rothbard's Ethics of Liberty (and some Rand), in that he rejects the natural inalienable rights accepted by the American Revolutionaries. This sits better with me, since I think that the main weakness of libertarianism is that people overlook the obvious theological roots of Lockean rights. It's all protestant drivel to me. However, I do not understand why you still place me in the same camp as Nozick, since fundamentally he agrees with mainstream libertarians in believing that the solution is "limited government." After what I have written, I think it is clear that I think this notion is absurd. Government can't be limited by itself, and if it's limited by something higher, then it's not a government in my use of the word.

Malcolm wrote:

I take it back.

As for Nozick, as far as I can tell, in his ASU he is making a moral argument, not a practical one. For him the state is only valid in so far as it has a monopoly on violence. When it exceeds its responsibilities in this respect, it begins to engage in immoral redistribution which people's rights.

He merely takes the Lockean state of nature as preferable to the Hobbsian one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 10:08 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

greentara said:

Right meditation...

Malcolm wrote:

...follows right view, that is why right view is listed first in the eightfold path of nobles.

theanarchist said:

I doubt that anyone can have a truly right view without a direct experience of emptiness nature.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of right view: mundane and supra mundane. One uses the former to realize the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 10:06 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

So it is possible for an conditioned thing to be unconditioned? If so, then are you not essentially implying that the thing is one thing and the nature of the thing is another thing?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness by definition is unconditioned. In Mahāyāna, space, the two cessations and emptiness are all defined as unconditioned.

This is a contradiction, something truly existent can have no relative modes at all because a true existent, be unconditioned and uncaused, cannot express itself as a causal process.

A true existent is unconditioned as you have stated above and cannot express itself as a causal process. Yet if you say that dharmin and dharmata are inseparable, then you are saying that the nature of an unconditioned thing can be in a thing that is a casual process or the result of a causal process.

The four unconditioned phenomena defined by Mahāyāna are all empty. This is why one of the 18 emptinesses illustrated by Candrakīrti is called the emptiness of the unconditioned.

All proposed true existents are unconditioned, but not all unconditioned phenomena are true existents (such as space, the two cessations and emptiness). Therefore, in this respect, since dharmatā refers to the nature of things, which is their emptiness, dharmatā and dharmin are inseparable, yet one is unconditioned and the other, conditioned. I.e. the emptiness of things is not created, and is not subject to decay. It does not arise because things arise, and does not disappear because things disappear. Everything is empty, and that is not something subject to conditions. Therefore, emptiness is not subject to conditions.

Further, if emptiness, which is by definition unconditioned, were to be different than that conditioned thing it is the emptiness of, the thing would not be empty and the emptiness itself would not be an emptiness.

Further, emptiness is not a true existent for it itself is also empty.

If emptiness is not a true existent, then it cannot be unconditioned. Yet you have said earlier that clarity is conditioned and emptiness is unconditioned and are inseparable. Obviously it can, since emptiness in Mahāyana is not only defined as empty (cf the emptiness of emptiness), but also as unconditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

By proposing basic responsibility that the Buddha advocates, in this thread I have already been called a libertarian and conservative many times. I have even been called a jingoistic American exceptionalist. It's really laughable how quickly the blind see devils.

Malcolm wrote:

You are a libertarian and a conservative. I would be surprised if you had any serious disagreements with Nozick, for example.

These days, however, most people gloss neo-conservative as "conservative", which is of course a mistake.

We can't call you a "jingoistic American exceptionalist" because you're Canadian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I really can't see why people don't see the basic principle of the fact that communism (and anarcho-communism), imply immorality from the Buddhist perspective. People need to stop being blinded in the first place by ideology, and question every belief they have from first principles.

Malcolm wrote:

Probably because most people in the West come to their political views fairly early in

life, and Buddhism only later. Especially leftists have a bit of retrofitting to force Buddhism into a leftist model.

This is why I am an advocate of deep ecology. Deep ecology does not require any retooling to fit with Dharma. It just requires an extension of rights to the biosphere as a whole, with the corresponding consequences of that, i.e. maintaining world population at levels that do not exceed the "income of the household" (impractical, I know, just saying).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: Western geshe and khenpos

Content:

smcj said:

[

Very common.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, as time grew on later Gelugpas needed to cover up the fact that Tsongkhapa started out as a Sakyapa because his views came under such harsh criticism from Sakya scholars such as Gorampa. But you must remember, Tsongkhapa's main Guru was Rendawa Zhonnu Lodo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

smcj said:

The unenumerated ultimate is simply the direct perception of emptiness

Hmmm. You're sounding very Yogacaric there (using the Mind Only definition).

Malcolm wrote:

This is straight out of "Prasanga" Madhyamaka texts. No Yogacara here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: Western geshe and khenpos

Content:

Tom said:

I think the Kadampa masters first used the title Geshe. It seems that Bon teachers also use the title Geshe. Does anyone know if that has a long tradition? And are there any Western Bon pa Geshe?

smcj said:

Gelupas are the descendants of the Kadampas. Same DNA with a bit of Kagyu and Sakya thrown in.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a common myth. The historical facts are however that Tsongkhapa was Sakyapa originally, studied at Sakya, and refers to himself as a Sakyapa in some early commentaries. Further, his two main students were Sakyapas. It is indeed true that since his first master was a Kadampa Geshe, he always maintain an obvious affection for Lam rim, but in his training he was a Sakyapa. Most of the transmissions in Gelug come through Sakya because it is a little know fact that the Sakyapas were and still are the richest school in terms of total number of gsar ma tantric lineages from India. Probably because they were among the wealthiest religious families in Tsang. The Kagyu sngags mdzod is quite small when compared to the rgyud sde kun bdus.

Initially, Gelug was called Sakya gsar ma, i.e. new Sakyapas, until it was renamed Ganden pa after Tsongkhapa's monastery in Lhasa. "dge lugs" is a corruption of i.e. dga' lugs, short for dga' ldan pa'i lugs, i.e. "the school of the dga' ldan pas." The proper name for the Gelug school is actually "Ri bo dga' ldan pas", those of Tushita Mountain.

It is also true that Tsongkhapa received important transmissions from Drikung as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 7:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

This is central to one's ontological experience of the world. Every sensation gives rise to a feeling.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, either pleasurable (profitable), painful (unprofitable) or neutral (tending toward unprofitable).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

greentara said:

Right meditation...

Malcolm wrote:

...follows right view, that is why right view is listed first in the eightfold path of nobles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, all human beings have notions of ownership, they simply are alien or do not correspond to the current Roman property law concepts of ownership that are actually at the root of the property law system which generally dominates capitalist countries. These societies generally instead have/had the concept of "right of use" (usufruct) for example, East Coast Native Americans in the Continental US, i.e. they would negotiate with each other about who would own the right to use this or that fishing ground, hunting territory and so on. It is true that ownership of these rights were very plastic, and could easily change since they were not tied to "property" as we understand the term, but also wars were waged when one tribe felt another tribe was violating their rights of use.

Sherab Dorje said:

You go from saying that all human beings have the notion of ownership to giving an example where human beings functioned without the notion of ownership.

Malcolm wrote:

No so, ownership of a usufruct right is ownership, plain and simple. I assume here you are excluding clothes, weapons, horses and so on from your definition of "no ownership".

Sherab Dorje said:

...but only if there is a grand catastrophe involving a shocking reduction of population to levels that were current at the beginning of the agricultural epoch.

Not at all necessary. It would, though, require a radical shift in ideology/praxis.

Malcolm wrote:

Necessarily.

Sherab Dorje said:

Merit arises from positive acts not because one wants to benefit from (capitalise on) the action but because wholesome actions bring wholesome outcomes.

Malcolm wrote:

Merit arises from positive intentions, which can include positive benefits for oneself.

Sherab Dorje said:

It has NOTHING to do with exchange (though it is true that some people think it does). The benefits arising from an act of (seeming) generosity (for example) can be reduced to zero if one's motivation behind an apparently generous act is just to gain merit.



Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not true, but what is true that in Mahāyāna parlance, that merit can be exhausted, as opposed to the merit created by an objectless dedication, which is inexhaustible. There is no comparable notion in Nikāya Buddhism.

Sherab Dorje said:

In marketplace transactions, on the other hand, deception can (and normally does) bring profit since selling an item for more than its production value is essentially theft via deception.

Malcolm wrote:

Total nonsense. Even Buddha encouraged his lay disciples to invest and make profits on their labor, so you just accused Buddha of encouraging theft.

I am telling you, all this Anarchist and Marxist thinking just does not fly when you view the world through a Buddhist lens.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

As much as you Buddhist modernists hate to admit it, in Buddhism there is an even greater manifestation of non-tangible exchange in Karma and Merit.

Malcolm wrote:

I wouldn't say that SD is a Buddhist modernist, but his political POV is more in line with the libertarian municipalism of Bookchin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

a true existent, be unconditioned and uncaused, cannot express itself as a causal process.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Are you saying that relative truth does not arise within the context of ultimate truth?

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimate truth and relative truth are respectively the objects of correct and incorrect cognitions of the same thing. For example, take a pot: relative truth is the perception of its color, shape, size, etc. Ultimate truth is the perception of its emptiness, that's all. The ultimate truth of a pot cannot be found apart from the pot. The enumerated ultimate

is also a conventional, relative truth. The unenumerated ultimate is simply the direct perception of emptiness. Since the emptiness of one thing is like the emptiness of all things, realizing the emptiness of one thing is realizing the emptiness of all things.

Further, emptiness is not a true existent for it itself is also empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

And, I would suggest that (what I am calling) "awareness" truly exists which precludes any differentiation, simply because it cannot be denied since it manifests as consciousness, and later, as personal experience.

.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a contradiction, something truly existent can have no relative modes at all because a true existent, be unconditioned and uncaused, cannot express itself as a causal process.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

smcj said:

If the conversation is about what the broader Karma Kagyu view is, I suggest asking somebody authoritative.

Sherab Dorje said:

And white guys/gals cannot be authoritative? Like, authority comes with skin colour???

smcj said:

Ok, ask a white khenpo. To the best of my knowledge one does not exist.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because to be a Khenpo, you must be a monk. A loppon on the other hand has the same education but is not necessarily a monk.

However, I seem to recall that Karl Brunholz was given the title Khenpo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

What I am suggesting (and perhaps this is merely a suggestion, extrapolated from my vague understanding of dharma, but perhaps, I'll admit, not supported by sutras or tantras) is different from the Hindu or vedic concept, because that "pure, uncaused knower" also arises in it.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Your view here is completely incompatible with any form of Buddhism I have encountered. Buddha rejects this type of ground completely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Many societies (both historically and currently) do not have the notion of ownership within their social/political/economic paradigms.

Malcolm wrote:

No, all human beings have notions of ownership, they simply are alien or do not correspond to the current Roman property law concepts of ownership that are actually at the root of the property law system which generally dominates capitalist countries. These societies generally instead have/had the concept of "right of use" (usufruct) for example, East Coast Native Americans in the Continental US, I.e. they would negotiate with each other about who would own the right to use this or that fishing ground, hunting territory and so on. It is true that ownership of these rights were very plastic, and could easily change since they were not tied to "property" as we understand the term, but also wars were waged when one tribe felt another tribe was violating their rights of use.

At base, ownership is a concept that arises from the three afflictions, and more specifically the delusion "I" and "mine", and this is why as long as human beings are driven by afflictions, we always will move from simpler ownership paradigms, such as those of nomadic and semi-nomadic bands (usufruct rights) to the more complicated property-based economics of the grand civilizations of Europe, African, The Americas and Asia. We could conceivably move back to such a notion of usufruct, but only if there is a grand catastrophe involving a shocking reduction of population to levels that were current at the beginning of the agricultural epoch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I should confess I have not studied Shakya Chogden in detail, and it is generally said that while Shakya Chogden's views are somewhat problematical, he was perhaps the most brilliant philosopher the Sakya school ever produced, apart from Sapan. While I am no Shakya Chogden, one of the things that annoyed people about him is that he changed his views over the years. I do that too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

smcj said:

The fact that Khenpo Tsultrim and other modern Karma Kagyu writers use Yogacara=Shentong is painfully confusing the issue though.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is because the Sakyapa writer Shakya Chogden, upon whom KTG relies heavily, basically argues that Yogacara is a kind of Madhyamaka, and goes to some lengths to reinterpret Dolbuba's gzhan stong approach so it is less eternalistic.

Shakya Chogden's view would have become the main view of the Sakya school but for a divination that was done in front of Four Faced Mahākala, the protector of the view in Sakya. The mo came out in favor of the treatises of Gorampa, and the latter's Mahdyamaka perspective has been considered orthodox ever since. Indeed, I myself for the most part follow Gorampa's reading of Madhyamaka even still.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

smcj said:

So, is your awareness undifferentiated or is it individuated, i.e. a personal continuum? If the former, your view is no different than Advaita. If the latter, that is acceptable within Buddhism.

As I read it, the Yogacara/Cittamatra is the latter, and Shentong is the former.

However I must say that this understanding of mine is only a week or so old, so it is subject to change without notice.

The fact that Khenpo Tsultrim and other modern Karma Kagyu writers use Yogacara=Shentong is painfully confusing the issue though.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Yogacara/cittamatra insists forcefully that awareness/consciousness, whatever you want to call it is individuated. There really is no Buddhist school that argues for an uniform uber-consciousness out of which individual consciousness are instantiated.

Basically, folks like Tony Page really are faced two alternatives, either their "true self" is like Purusha of the Sāṃkhya school, a totally unconditioned individuated knower, as opposed to the nonsentient evolutes of prakriti (buddhi, ahaṃkāra, manas, five sense organs, five organs of action, the five subtle elements (sound, etc.) and the five coarse elements; or it is like brahmin of the Vedantins and so on. They really have only these two choices if they insist on a literal interpretation of the term "atman", bdag nyid in texts like the Nirvana Sutra and so on.

In Sāṃkhya there are an infinite number of purushas, while in Advaita, using the basic model of Sāṃkhya, proposes that purusha and brahmin are synonymous and further, that there is only one purusha, and that further, prakriti and its evolutes are also included in purusha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

While the topic is still fresh, I found this nice quote from the same book about the Trotskyist conception of the state:

To sum up [Trotsky wrote], "the road to Socialism lies through a period of the highest possible intensification of the principle of the State ... The State, before disappearing, assumes the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. the most ruthless form of State, which embraces the life of the citizens authoritatively in every direction" ([The Defence of Terrorism] p. 157). It would be difficult indeed to put the matter more plainly. The state of the proletarian dictatorship is depicted by Trotsky as a huge permanent concentration camp in which the government exercises absolute power over every aspect of the citizens' lives and in particular decides how much work they shall do, of what kind and in what places. Individuals are nothing but labour units. Compulsion is universal, and any organization that is not part of the state must be its enemy, thus the enemy of the proletariat. All this, of course, is in the name of an ideal realm of freedom, the advent of which is expected after an indefinite lapse of historical time. (Vol. II pg. 512)

Socialism in general must descend to this ultimately:

Bukharin, like Lenin, regarded the system of basing economic life on mass terror not as a transient necessity but as a permanent principle of socialist organization. He did not shrink from justifying all means of coercion and held, like Trotsky at the same period,

that the new system called essentially for the militarization of labour – i.e. the use of police and military force to compel the whole population to work in such places and conditions as the state might arbitrarily decree. Indeed, once the market is abolished there is no longer any free sale of labour or competition between workers, and police coercion is therefore the only means of allocating “human resources”. If hired labour is eliminated, only compulsory labour remains. In other words, socialism – as conceived by both Trotsky and Bukharin at this time – is a permanent, nation-wide labour camp. (Vol III. pg. 28-9)

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this was the state of Tibet until the early 1980's under communist rule, and is the state of North Korea even today.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Socialism in general must descend to this ultimately:

Bukharin, like Lenin, regarded the system of basing economic life on mass terror not as a transient necessity but as a permanent principle of socialist organization. He did not shrink from justifying all means of coercion and held, like Trotsky at the same period, that the new system called essentially for the militarization of labour – i.e. the use of police and military force to compel the whole population to work in such places and conditions as the state might arbitrarily decree. Indeed, once the market is abolished there is no longer any free sale of labour or competition between workers, and police coercion is therefore the only means of allocating “human resources”. If hired labour is eliminated, only compulsory labour remains. In other words, socialism – as conceived by both Trotsky and Bukharin at this time – is a permanent, nation-wide labour camp. (Vol III. pg. 28-9)

Sherab Dorje said:

Not necessarily, people do have the capacity to share, you know.

Malcolm wrote:

I imagine that under this totalitarian scenario your labor does not belong to you any more, since it has been socialized. Therefore, sharing your now "valueless" labor could be construed as a crime against the state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The latter black gzhan stong is pretty much heterodox from a Buddhist point of view. SOB adheres to the latter.

Sherab Dorje said:

His confessed adherence to a belief in an Atman puts him well outside the ballpark of any kind of Buddhism I have ever encountered.

Malcolm wrote:

His confessed un-nuanced position does. But it is important to recall that terms like bdag nyid chen po [mahātma] etc regularly show up in Tantric texts all the time.

As I read gzhan stong, the emphasis is not on promulgating a belief in an ultimate self, but rather the focus is on proving that ultimate [as opposed to relative] buddha-qualities are innate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that would be consciousness, no matter what words you want to use, like awareness, etc., it is still consciousness.

So, is your awareness undifferentiated or is it individuated, i.e. a personal continuum? If the former, your view is no different than Advaita. If the latter, that is acceptable within Buddhism.

PadmaVonSamba said:

I regard 'consciousness' as arising from causes...

Also, I am not clear about what you mean by 'undifferentiated'.

Malcolm wrote:

Does "awareness" arise from causes? If it does, how is it different than consciousness? If it does not, how is this different from a number of Hindu positions that maintain the existence of pure, uncaused knower?

Undifferentiated means for example, like an ocean, or SOB's bowl of milk; individuated means like streams or rivers, individual continuums.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 10:11 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Sherab said:

No amount of analysis using mutually exclusive terms on one and the same entity can ever hope to come to a sensible conclusion. That is why the Samdhinirmocana sutra practically sneers at the argument and debates among certain people.

Malcolm wrote:

The salient point is that dharmin and dharmatā are inseparable. The nature of conditioned things is unconditioned, that is the entire point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I'm not sure that just quoting that one line gives the gist of what is being said so here it is in full

Malcolm wrote:

It explains the basic point that I was making, social class, what kind of family you are born into, is result your past karma.

tellyontellyon said:

We can help people in the here and now, we can actually change our present situation..., and in turn our actions can come back to us as positive karma in the future.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, provided we act with wisdom and in accordance with the Dharma. If we abandon the Dharma by adhering to some non-Buddhist principles, we will come to nothing but grief.

For example, if someone accumulates a great deal of money or property, this is a result of their karma. We can encourage them to use it in a socially responsible way, but if we "liberate" it for the "people", believing that a factory for example "belongs" to its workers, then we will be in for some very heavy negative karma of poverty in our future life. On the other hand, if we believe a factory is engaged in unfair practices, and we picket, and protest, appealing to the government to step in, there is no problem with this. Buddhist Vinaya has long established that in terms of matters of law, the civil law of the country you are in handles civil matters and must be obeyed.

So, I am all for people trying to make the world a better place as long as they do so civilly, non-violently and without engaging in force to achieve their ends. I can understand when people react with extreme violence to heavy oppression, understand it, but this also is really just samsaric behavior. At a certain point in your life, you have to give up



attachment to samsara and your own selfish liberation and instead cultivate bodhicitta and a view which is free from grasping.

If you read and follow what is taught in Mahāyāna you will have perfect prescription for how to benefit sentient beings in this life and the next with no need to resort the theories of doctrines of materialists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... because the mind and the mind essence are inseparable, the former conditioned and the latter unconditioned.

Sherab said:

Since mind and mind essence are inseparable, mind and mind essence cannot be separate entities but merely aspects of the same entity, whatever that is. But if mind and mind essence are aspects of the same entity, whatever that is, then that entity is both conditioned and unconditioned. In other words, that entity is both a dependent-arising phenomenon and a non-dependent-arising phenomenon. That clearly makes no sense without twisting the meaning of dependent-arising so much as to make it completely unrecognizable.

Malcolm wrote:

Ah, well, to understand how this works, you must read the Analysis of how phenomena and their nature are neither the same nor different in the Samdhinirmocana sutra. Then you will understand. Otherwise, you are left with the conclusion that the dharmtā of a given thing is conditioned, i.e. that emptiness is conditioned. But emptiness is clearly unconditioned, nevertheless all conditioned things are empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 8:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I think some ideas around Karma might be worth thinking about. What do people think of these idea:

(sorry, more Wiki.... I did say I'm no scholar.

Loy argues that the idea of accumulating merit too easily becomes "spiritual materialism," a view echoed by other Buddhist modernists,[105] and further that

"Karma has been used to rationalize racism, caste, economic oppression, birth handicaps and everything else. Taken literally, karma justifies the authority of political

elites, who therefore must deserve their wealth and power, and the subordination of those who have neither. It provides the perfect theodicy: if there is an infallible cause-and-effect relationship between one's actions and one's fate, there is no need to work toward social justice, because it's already built into the moral fabric of the universe. In fact, if there is no undeserved suffering, there is really no evil that we need to struggle against. It will all balance out in the end."[104]

While some strands of later Buddhist thought did attribute all experience to past karma, the early texts explicitly did not, and in particular state that caste is not determined by karma.[106]

Does anybody know about these early texts that explicitly state that caste is not determined by Karma? Apparently the source for this statement on Wiki came from this reference:

Matthews, Bruce (1986), "Chapter Seven: Post-Classical Developments in the Concepts of Karma and Rebirth in Theravada Buddhism", in Neufeldt, Ronald W., Karma and Rebirth: Post Classical Developments, State University of New York Press,

I will also throw in this article by Thanissaro Bhikkhu:

[http://buddhism.about.com/gi/o.htm?zi=1/XJ&zTi=1&sdn=buddhism&cdn=religion&tm=60&f=00&su=p284.13.342.ip\\_&tt=2&bt=3&bts=80&zu=http%3A//www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/thanissaro/karma.html](http://buddhism.about.com/gi/o.htm?zi=1/XJ&zTi=1&sdn=buddhism&cdn=religion&tm=60&f=00&su=p284.13.342.ip_&tt=2&bt=3&bts=80&zu=http%3A//www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/thanissaro/karma.html)

Malcolm wrote:

The earlier sutta citation I provided for you comes from the Majjhima Nikāya. Clearly, Buddha there states that one's social position, whether high or low is a result of karma.

From the article you shared:

From the standpoint of karma, though, where we come from is old karma, over which we have no control.

We only have control over where we are going, not what family we were born into and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

smcj said:

So, is your awareness undifferentiated or is it individuated, i.e. a personal continuum? If the former, your view is no different than Advaita. If the former, that is acceptable within Buddhism.

Beautifully put!

So the question then becomes; do you believe that the Shentong, of say either Kongtrul

or Dolpoba, is the same or different than Advaita?

Malcolm wrote:

Like the Dalai Lama put it, there is a "white" gzhan stong" and a "black" gzhan stong. Following Rongton Shejya Kunrig, the former would be a transitional view between Yogacara and Madhyamaka, for in reality there is little difference between the false aspectarian Yogacara school in India (Ratnakarashanti) and gzhan stong. The latter black gzhan stong is pretty much heterodox from a Buddhist point of view. SOB adheres to the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

On class, I think the Buddha's idea of class or caste is different to the Marxian definition. It isn't really the same as how wealthy you are or based on culture/attitudes etc.

Malcolm wrote:

"“Under the patriarchal system, under the caste system, under the feudal and corporative system, there was division of labor in the whole of society according to fixed rules. Were these rules established by a legislator? No. Originally born of the conditions of material production, they were born of the conditions of material production; they were raised to the status of laws only much later. In this way these different forms of the division of labour became so many bases of social organization.” ‘Poverty of Philosophy’, 118.

Marx's idea is precisely this. The Buddha would say no, people are born into social stations based on their karma. The two views are therefore incompatible.

tellyontellyon said:

When Marxists talk about class they are referring to particular economic roles that only really exist under capitalism.

Malcolm wrote:

In Capital he writes:

“Manufacture, in fact, produces the skill of the detail labourer, by reproducing, and systematically driving to an extreme within the workshop, the naturally developed differentiation of trades which it found ready to had in society at large. On the other hand, the conversion of fractional work into the life-calling of one man, corresponds to the tendency shown by earlier societies, to make trades hereditary; either to petrify them into castes, or whenever definite historical conditions beget in the individual a tendency to vary in a manner incompatible with the nature of castes, to ossify them into guilds. Castes and guilds arise from the action of the same natural law that regulates the differentiation of plants and animals into species and varieties, except that when a

certain degree of development has been reached, the heredity of castes and exclusiveness of guilds are ordained as a law of society.” (p. 321. Moscow edition 1974).

I see no real distinction that can be made apart from that fact that, put in Marxist terms, these castes arose as a result of primitive accumulations which were then capitalized.

tellyontellyon said:

So Capitalism as defined by Marx is a new phenomenon.

Malcolm wrote:

Specifically, modern Capitalism is a post colonial evolution based on the discovery of gold and silver in the Americas and so on.

If you take the broader view, there have been many waves of capitalism since ancient history, like a trees in a forest, beings compete for resources, some are more effective at gathering resources, other's less. Eventually, the whole forest becomes moribund and is either replaced with new species of trees, or it dies altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, your positing consciousness as an undifferentiated field, which amounts the same thing as positing a self.

PadmaVonSamba said:

When did I ever suggest "consciousness as an undifferentiated field"?

I said "awareness", but that may not be the right term. is that what you are referring to? As a matter of fact, I am not sure of the specific term for what I am talking about, but it is not consciousness (which is a composite). I am talking about a "context" which precedes cognition, from which cognitive experiences such as thoughts, notions of self, etc. arise when interacting with objects of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that would be consciousness, no matter what words you want to use, like awareness, etc., it is still consciousness.

So, is your awareness undifferentiated or is it individuated, i.e. a personal continuum? If the former, your view is no different than Advaita. If the latter, that is acceptable within Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

tobes said:

Nonetheless, I see how certain traditions - Dzogchen, Zen - can read Nagarjuna as denying all forms of causation.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen does not reject causes and conditions conventionally, in fact it elaborates a whole elaborate scheme to explain the cause of samsara as well as consciousness, memory, etc.

tobes said:

Let me re-phrase: I see how certain interpreters of Dzogchen, Zen, can read Nagarjuna as denying all forms of causation....

Malcolm wrote:

The main point being made is that causality itself cannot withstand ultimate analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

causation can be said to operate conventionally in the same way that a person with defective vision sees hairs: in each case the appearance is accepted at face value, as in a dream.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, yet it appears.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I'm confused here. Are people conflating Anarchism with Marxism?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all.

Sherab Dorje said:

Weird, coz just a couple of posts earlier tellyontellyoff was saying that Marxists are

somehow in opposition to states.

Malcolm wrote:

well, in terms of their utopia, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Awareness does not cease.

No 'self' arises unless awareness arises with objects of awareness again, and produces another experience of 'self'.

Malcolm wrote:

You're a Vedantin too.

PadmaVonSamba said:

I am not asserting any valid, intrinsically arising self

merely the experience of a self

such as the one reading this post,

which arises from the interaction of (ground of) awareness and objects of awareness.

Vedantins assert an intrinsically existent self (atman).

I don't.

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

No, your positing consciousness as an undifferentiated field, which amounts the same thing as positing a self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Are you saying that the body is the matrix?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. Where else can consciousness be located?

dzogchungpa said:

OK, then I'm a little confused. If I'm not mistaken 'matrix' = 'garbha', which, according to your Gorampa quote is unconditioned. Is the body then considered to be unconditioned?

Malcolm wrote:

Garbha means something that holds, what is being held, tathatā. Who holds tathatā? Sentient beings.

Sugatagarbha is a short hand way of saying "the dharmakāya encased in afflictions".

What becomes afflicted, clarity. What is the nature of clarity? Emptiness. Tathatāgarbha is just a way of saying that sentient beings have the potential for awakening because the mind and the mind essence are inseparable, the former conditioned and the latter unconditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Awareness does not cease.

No 'self' arises unless awareness arises with objects of awareness again, and produces another experience of 'self'.

Malcolm wrote:

You're a Vedantin too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Using a horrible analogy you are ceral in a bowl of milk(Enlightenment)

The milk is all around the ceral and has soaked into the ceral....the ceral starts to disentagrate(defilements are being removed)

When all the defilents have been removed the ceral disentigrates entirely and and all that is left is the milk.

(sorry horrible analogy)

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, you are definitely a Vedantin in intent if not by name.

Your view is not really very relevant, as long as you practice the sadhana methods properly, you will achieve realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

OK, so there's one matrix etc. for each being?

Malcolm wrote:

Each being is a matrix. This is illustrated by such statements like the Hevajra Tantra:

Great wisdom is present in the body,  
perfectly free from all concepts,  
pervading all things,  
present in, but not arising from the body.

dzogchungpa said:

Are you saying that the body is the matrix?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. Where else can consciousness be located?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I'm confused here. Are people conflating Anarchism with Marxism?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Will said:

Here is Buddha (MN 2) saying that Page's 'the Self is real' is one among several wrong views:

Malcolm wrote:

They will merely reply that the Nikayas were a provisional teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 12:11 AM



Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your second question is misphrased, sentient beings are tathāgatagarbha, without them there is no possibility of Buddhahood, they are the matrix, nexus, locus etc. of tathatā.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, so there's one matrix etc. for each being?

Malcolm wrote:

Each being is a matrix. This is illustrated by such statements like the Hevajra Tantra:

Great wisdom is present in the body,  
perfectly free from all concepts,  
pervading all things,  
present in, but not arising from the body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhist point of view is that states and classes arise inevitably because sentient beings are afflicted and driven by the three humors. In Buddhist legend, anarchy prevailed in the golden age when afflictions were very latent in humans. The golden age degenerated after humans began hoarding grains and their afflictions became activated, and thus protection societies emerged, kings were elected, classes were formed and it degenerated until the present epoch.  
Should have written "poisons".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I don't completely understand Buddhism either, do you?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I pretty well think I do. Others of course may disagree. Of course, there are many details I can learn, some I have forgot, have gone through periods of doubt and intense questioning, but yes, I really do understand the Buddha's teachings. But, then I have done little else for the past 25 years but study and practice it. Am I a realized person, of

course not. Understanding and realization are two entirely different things.

You should reflect very carefully on what I wrote above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The definitive interpretation he renders as follows:

Therefor, the Sugatagarbha is defined as the union of clarity and emptiness but not simply emptiness without clarity, because that [kind of emptiness] is not suitable to be a basis for bondage and liberation. Also it is not simple clarity without emptiness, that is the conditioned part, because the Sugatagarbha is taught as unconditioned.

dzogchungpa said:

If I understand what you've written above, the clarity referred to is conditioned? If so, how can the Sugatagarbha, which is unconditioned, be the union of a conditioned part and something else?

Also, does each being have it's own Sugatagarbha?

Malcolm wrote:

Is emptiness conditioned or unconditioned? It is unconditioned. Are all conditioned things empty? Yes. Therefore, the conditioned and the unconditioned are actually non-dual.

Your second question is misphrased, sentient beings are tathāgatagarbha, without them there is no possibility of Buddhahood, they are the matrix, nexus, locus etc. of tathatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M.

To Marxists the state IS violence. It is a tool for one class to control another. There is an ever present threat of violence that becomes overt if you step outside the limits that are acceptable to the ruling class. Sometimes the cage is bigger, sometimes smaller, but there is always an armed guard.

Malcolm wrote:

States form out of protection societies, in general. We can see this in the case of the Buddha, who in a past life as the Bodhisattva, was appointed the first human king, or so the legend runs, and was appointed a sixth share of the harvest for his troubles.

But as long as human beings are subject to desire, hatred and ignorance, then for that long there will be classes of people, discrimination and so on. There is a reason Buddhists refer to themselves as "insiders". This means that we seek the solution to social ills and problems through personal transformation. There is no way you can remove the three afflictions merely through altering a given set of material relations. The proof of this is the psychological misery of the wealthy. Wealth does not make anyone happy. Of course this does not mean you cannot use material things to entice people into entering the teachings. The four means of converting beings to the Dharma are generosity (which itself has four aspects: giving material gifts, conferring fearlessness, loving kindness and teaching Dharma), pleasant speech, conduct and setting an example.

However, Marxist psychological theory, in contrast with Buddhist teachings, holds that all psychological states are fundamentally a result of social conditions fostered by material relationships, i.e. it is entirely materialist in its perspective. We can see that this perspective is deeply flawed because in fact as long as sentient beings like ourselves are driven by the three afflictions, there can be no happiness anywhere. Even if your Marxist utopia were possible, it would swiftly degenerate because humans are driven by afflictions.

The Buddhist point of view is that states and classes arise inevitably because sentient beings are afflicted and driven by the three humors. In Buddhist legend, anarchy prevailed in the golden age when afflictions were very latent in humans. The golden age degenerated after humans began hoarding grains and their afflictions became activated, and thus protection societies emerged, kings were elected, classes were formed and it degenerated until the present epoch.

So in fact it really seems that a doctrine of Anarchy cannot square with Buddhist teachings, in other words, from a Buddhist perspective a stateless society is completely impossible apart from the upper golden age.

It also appears that the utopia Marx imagines is also impossible as

tellyontellyon said:

But if lethal force is being used against a movement... would they have the right to self defence? That is another question?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha explained very clearly in the Mahaparinibbana sutta that if a country is abiding by its laws, maintaining its own boundaries, and so on, then one it would be hard to attack, and second, if attacked would be difficult to defeat.

He of course understood that countries needed defense forces. But he also clearly demonstrated that no matter what side of a conflict one were on, engaging in lethal violence of any kind would condemn one to hell. Vasubandhu clearly explains that if one belongs to a group of one hundred persons, and that group kills someone, all in that group earn the negative karma of the entire group, i.e, all the Buddhists who recently killed all those Rohingyas all will experience the ripening of murdering those people times the number of people who approve of that action. Karma is unrelenting.

tellyontellyon said:

Before Chinese rule, the Dalai Lama's and the High Lama's would resort to the use of violent force to defend their society. They armed and sent off to war young men just like every other state, and even got into arguments about arms spending.:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tibetan\\_Army](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tibetan_Army)

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out, the principle of karma is unrelenting. For as many Tibetans who violently resisted the Chinese occupation, many thousands more resisted it non-violently in accordance with Buddhist principles. And many were simply cut down in battle by machine guns since the Tibetans had not comparable arms. I cannot say that I know for a fact that they had lower rebirths, and there certainly are one or two scarce passages in Mahāyāna literature that appear to justify violent force to protect the Dharma, but in general, the tenor of Buddhist texts is that lethal violence is unacceptable.

The Dalai Lama freely admits that Tibet fell because the policies of the Tibetan government had fallen into corruption and abuse, therefore, Tibet could be attacked and defeated successfully because of the lack of merit of his own government.

tellyontellyon said:

Even on a mundane level, if you caused trouble or broke the rules in a monastery you could expect to be treated quite roughly by some muscular dob-dobs, who were not at all gentle or sanctimonious.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dob-dob>

Malcolm wrote:

Dobdobs habitually indulged in what we would term child sexual abuse, i.e. rape.

tellyontellyon said:

I never said the Marxists were pacifists... (though it appears neither were the Tibetan lamas!)

Malcolm wrote:

Some Lamas aren't, but in general Buddhism is pacifist in orientation.

tellyontellyon said:

If that is too offensive for you, then please, shake the dust from your sandals and turn your back on the world....

But the fact is the world is a violent place, we can't demand perfection of those we associate with if we are going to get involved with trying to change the world.... but as Buddhists we may use our input to at least mitigate the worst of it and encourage less violent forms of coercion.

Malcolm wrote:

The message of the Buddha is that you cannot change the world in any substantial way through external force. You can only change the world by changing yourself.

tellyontellyon said:

No, I can't answer them very well myself, I don't have the skill, brains or time to do justice to a complex and difficult subject.

Malcolm wrote:

Why would you possibly buy into a doctrine you do not completely understand?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

If there is a true self, what experiences this true self? Does this true self experience itself? If so, by what means? If the true self exists outside of phenomena and thus any points of reference, what ultimately does the true self experience? If the true self does not actually experience anything, then is it a rock? What self experiences samsaric existence? If the samsaric self can be shown to have no true existence, then is it the true self that experiences samsara? Does a being with no mental capacity have a true self? If that being with no mental capacity is essentially made of phenomena (physical matter) such as carbon, and yet has a true self, then does all carbon have a true self? The 'true self' theory raises all sorts of conundrums.

It is essentially no different than believing in god, except that in this case, instead of saying "god" one says "true self".

.  
.  
.

Malcolm wrote:

The term *bdag nyid*, *atman*, just means, in this case, "nature", i.e. referring to the nature of reality free from extremes as being permanent, blissful, pure and self. The luminosity of the mind is understood to be this.

There are various ways to interpret the Uttaratantra and tathāgatagarbha doctrine, one way is definitive in meaning, the other is provisional, according to Gorampa Sonam Senge, thus the tathāgatagarbha sutras become definitive or provisional depending on how they are understood. He states:

In the context of showing the faults of a literal [interpretation] – it's equivalence with the Non-Buddhist Self is that the assertion of unique eternal all pervading cognizing awareness of the Saṃkhya, the unique eternal pristine clarity of the Pashupattis, the unique all pervading intellect of the Vaiśnavas, the impermanent condition, the measure of one's body, in the permanent self-nature of the Jains, and the white, brilliant, shining pellet the size of an atom, existing in each individual's heart of the Vedantins are the same.

The definitive interpretation he renders as follows:

Therefor, the Sugatagarbha is defined as the union of clarity and emptiness but not simply emptiness without clarity, because that [kind of emptiness] is not suitable to be a basis for bondage and liberation. Also it is not simple clarity without emptiness, that is the conditioned part, because the Sugatagarbha is taught as unconditioned.

Khyentse Wangpo, often cited as a gzhan stong pa, basically says that the treatises of Maitreya elucidate the luminosity of the mind, i.e. its purity, whereas Nāgarjuna's treatises illustrate the empty nature of the mind, and that these two together, luminosity and emptiness free from extremes are to be understood as noncontradictory, which we can understand from the famous Prajñāpāramita citation "There is no mind in the mind, the nature of the mind is luminosity".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Friend or Foe.

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And, just for the record, sometimes I don't even agree with myself.

Malcolm wrote:

Typical liberal...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

tobes said:

Nonetheless, I see how certain traditions - Dzogchen, Zen - can read Nagarjuna as denying all forms of causation.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen does not reject causes and conditions conventionally, in fact it elaborates a whole elaborate scheme to explain the cause of samsara as well as consciousness, memory, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

Nagarjuna rejected causes.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, yes; conventionally, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

All markets, for all time, have worked according to value and mediation with commodities of exchange (i.e. money, the earliest forms of which were things like cattle).

Malcolm wrote:

That and credit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 8:24 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

To Marxists...the bourgeois state won't simply wither away, therefore it must be removed by force (the ruling class are unlikely to give it up without a struggle).

Malcolm wrote:

So you finally admit it, Marxists advocate violence, because you certainly cannot exercise force without recourse to violence.

tellyontellyon said:

Therefore, the state must be smashed, overthrown, dismantled.

Malcolm wrote:

How can this possibly be non-violent? Even the language you use is the language of violence and coercion.

tellyontellyon said:

A workers state, a sort of temporary semi-state is established to replace it, and the task of changing society so that eventually there will no longer be two classes is begun. Therefore no longer any need for a state.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean, there will no longer be any need for protection? It will be impossible that human beings will act out of desire, hatred and ignorance?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Hiya Malcolm,

This is a key question. Marx and Engels addressed this and Lenin really focussed on this in the first chapter of his book: The State and Revolution.

He goes into what the 'State' is from a Marxist perspective, what maintains it, and why, undercapitalism, it will not 'whither away'; he explains the need for revolution and how the state would 'wither away' only after that. I guess it will not be your 'cup of tea', but if you can grit your teeth and get through the whole of the first chapter then you will have your answer.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/staterev/>

Malcolm wrote:

But I wanted you to summarize it for us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

By the way, to return the thread to its original topic, Robert Nozick maintains that it is inevitable that out of anarchy, a form of minimal state will arise from the creation of protection organizations.

TOTO, Is the utopia you imagine managed or unmanaged? If it is managed, how is this a stateless society? If it is managed, how is this management different than the minimal state imagined by Nozik?



Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you accept this as an accurate description of an entire race?

Not of an entire group of people, but I would not be surprised if beneath the stereotype there was not some truth to it. In other words, I would not be surprised if indeed there were gangs of criminal Roma wandering around conning people and stealing.

For example, there is the American TV show, The Richs, starring the English comedian Eddie Izzard, and the equally English actress Minnie Driver, who portray a family of Gypsies in the Deep South who engage in one scam after another until it all catches up with them. Certainly the stereotype is international, just as there is the stereotype of the corrupt capitalist. After all, you are very quick to condemn "counter revolutionaries", "capitalists", etc., whole groups of people. But I am sure you will say "It's different".

Sönarn said:

This concerns a minority. We have that discussion in France, because a lot of Roms are migrating to it. It does exist few gangs of organized robbery in main towns (Paris, Lyon, Marseille, ...). It's generally organized from Romania (gangsters) and committed by very young peoples (which are immediately relaxed because of their young age ...). But that represents only a couple of groups. Majority of Roms just try to survive and improve their living condition ... in Romania they are considered as untermensch. So we have to be careful not to propagate this kind of much exaggerated information which only serve the right and extrem-right propaganda.

Sönarn

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

The point is that this is a problem. And it's related to failed immigration and integration politics, one of many symptoms of just this.

No, this is not a 'symptom' of failed immigration.

Malcolm wrote:

He said immigration politics, meaning that immigration policies of Norway are finding disfavor among Norwegians these days. You really do need to watch Lilyhammer. It will put how Norwegians feel about these things and shows the deep ambiguity Norwegians feel about "doing the right thing" in contrast to their very real and deep cultural

conservatism. Until very recently, Norway was a very homogenous country, and these things we are seeing are problems Norwegians have only recently had to deal with. Of course the former British empire, we have more experience with diversity so some of the growing pains we went through over a hundred years ago seems obvious as well as their solutions.

tellyontellyon said:

This represents a very small proportion of the migrants living in Norway,

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to be sufficient to cause anxiety. Of course this is an old story around the world, immigrant population moves in, or are even invited, the local people become uncomfortable after a while, tensions brews, violence breaks out between the two groups, and eventually, if they can avoid genocide of one another, they all settle down peaceably enough.

tellyontellyon said:

It says more about a lack of tolerance to people who "..refuse to live how you are supposed to live". Like say if a muslim woman want's to wear a headscarf etc. etc.. It's just intolerance of difference that the 'right' are trying to build into hatred and fear with scare tactics'.

Malcolm wrote:

I suppose you extend this liberalism to female circumcision then?

tellyontellyon said:

'Gypsies' are a traditional target for the 'right' in Europe. Sometimes this has overflowed into pogroms and even organised genocide.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is completely true. Nomads are often viewed with suspicion since they are considered at the margins. Even in Tibet, nomads have a terrible reputation, while at the same time they are idealized, just as Gypsies have been here in the west.

tellyontellyon said:

It is wrong to downplay these crimes.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not downplaying these other crimes. I was clarifying for you precisely what Norwegian was talking about, i.e. assault rapes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

But there were only 6 assault rapes out of something like 152 rapes.

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't matter. What is defined as rape in Norway is a little different:

In Norway, rape is defined under the Norwegian Penal Code[40] § 192 as either:

1. engaging in sexual activity by means of violence or threatening behaviour,
2. engaging in sexual activity with somebody who is unconscious or for any other reason incapable of resisting the act, or
3. by means of violence or threatening behaviour compelling any person to engage in sexual activity with another person, or to carry out similar actions with him- or herself.

Further, the same section defines aggravated rape as a rape committed

- a. by multiple persons in cooperation (gang rape)
- b. in a particularly painful or offensive manner
- c. by a person previously convicted of rape under § 192 or of sexual activity with a child under the age of 14 (as per § 195 of the penal code)
- d. in such a way that the victim either dies or receives grievous bodily harm.

The section recognizes sexually transmitted diseases (defined in the Infection Protection Act) as grievous bodily harm.

So, if person A has herpes and does not inform person B of this fact, and person B contracts herpes, person A can be accused of rape in Norway.

Or if person A manages to cause pain, or is offensive to person B, this can also be defined as rape.

Basically, the bar for "rape" in Norway is much lower than it is in other countries. In the US, giving someone herpes is offensive, but the onus is on person B to protect his/her own health.

tellyontellyon said:

What about what he said about the Roma? Did you read it?

They are criticized a lot by people, because they have zero interest in behaving in accordance with Norwegian norms and laws. They don't want to work (although that's their excuse used in order to be here and beg for money). They steal, and they treat wherever it is they're staying as if it is an open toilet, defecating and urinating everywhere, be it in a kindergarten property, people's backyards, the forests, open parks, or what not (and when at one point they were given toilets to use, they shat down the toilets as well). People get fed up with the police not doing anything about them shitting everywhere, or stealing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course I read it. The question is, did Norwegian personally witness such behavior or is he merely repeating hearsay. What we can understand from this, however is that Norway's push for integration is a laughable failure in many respects, and has provoked a backlash of resentment.

tellyontellyon said:

Do you accept this as an accurate description of an entire race?

Malcolm wrote:

Not of an entire group of people, but I would not be surprised if beneath the stereotype there was not some truth to it. In other words, I would not be surprised if indeed there were gangs of criminal Roma wandering around conning people and stealing.

For example, there is the American TV show, *The Richs*, starring the English comedian Eddie Izzard, and the equally English actress Minnie Driver, who portray a family of Gypsies in the Deep South who engage in one scam after another until it all catches up with them. Certainly the stereotype is international, just as there is the stereotype of the corrupt capitalist. After all, you are very quick to condemn "counter revolutionaries", "capitalists", etc., whole groups of people. But I am sure you will say "It's different".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Anyway people can read for themselves the police report and make up their own minds about what you are up to.

Just taking this claim about rape:

The actual police report is here:

[https://www.politi.no/vedlegg/lokale\\_vedlegg/oslo/Vedlegg\\_1309.pdf](https://www.politi.no/vedlegg/lokale_vedlegg/oslo/Vedlegg_1309.pdf)

The English translation of pages 51-56:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/76695373/Excerpt-From-Oslo-Police-District-Report-on-Rape>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the report states that assault rapes in Norway are overwhelmingly committed by people with non-Norwegian backgrounds. In the US, for example, apart from statutory rape, i.e. sleeping with a minor, there are no other kinds. I am quite sure that is what Norwegian is talking about, not the all the other kinds of rape defined under Norwegian law that would not even be recognized as rape, in for example, England.

What Norwegian is talking about is the fact that the immigration and integration policies are such failures in Norway that these Norwegian policies are hugely lampooned by Norwegians in such shows as *Lilyhammer*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 8:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

kirtu said:

[Therefore, markets are unreliable: they produce unpredictable and unanticipated phenomena (which is why I started in with Goedel in that post). Therefore regulations cannot anticipate all undesired phenomena and some regulations that guard against undesired phenomena may constrain markets unnecessarily over the lifetime of a business cycle.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand all of this. But there is no alternative.

kirtu said:

There is indeed a ready made alternative: social democracy. There is a secondary alternative: small scale communes where resources are shared and equally divided according to need (this has the actual advantage of being historically an American solution, but I am addressing the general alternative to capitalism). There is a third alternative: an economic system derived from computer simulation where alternatives are tried based on maximizing various values and selecting for long term stability and prosperity. These systems can then be integrated into the actual world economy.

Kirt

Social democracy is a political ideology that officially has as its goal the establishment of democratic socialism through reformist and gradualist methods.[1] Alternatively, social democracy is defined as a policy regime involving a universal welfare state and collective bargaining schemes within the framework of a capitalist economy.

Malcolm wrote:

What is outlined in red is what "social democracy" is today.

Your second scheme won't scale.

Your third scheme requires political coercion, being yet another form of planned economy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

kirtu said:

The main problem in the US is that the economy has become non-functional primary due to cultural reasons and the refusal of a dead-locked government to take further action, even to acknowledge the problems. The reason that "leaders" go not acknowledge these issues is because they are counter to the received ideology and

solutions tend to lay outside the scope of market forces and Keynes has been sidelined. If you have market fundamentalists at nearly every level of every institution, there isn't much to be done when market fundamentalists face a reality that shouldn't exist. You also have the hype-pragmatic stance of Americans: most trends show a slow, slow recovery (U-3 unemployment ~ 6%) by the end of 2014 so the boat seems to be righting itself without further action. The problem is that the replacement jobs are low wage and not secure.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

The economy functions, kirt, it may not function according to what you would like, and I understand your frustration, but your comments are a bit out of line with my personal experience of living in the US and traveling abroad extensively.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

kirtu said:

[Therefore, markets are unreliable: they produce unpredictable and unanticipated phenomena (which is why I started in with Goedel in that post). Therefore regulations cannot anticipate all undesired phenomena and some regulations that guard against undesired phenomena may constrain markets unnecessarily over the lifetime of a business cycle.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand all of this. But there is no alternative.

kirtu said:

Capitalism historically fails after some period of expansion.

Malcolm wrote:

This is true of \_any\_ economy. I did not say that a capitalist economy was a desiderata. I said that at this point, it is better this than some socialist revolution for the time being.

kirtu said:

Americans are often blind to the diversity of political views, for good and ill, that exist outside of their country (or even next door to them). Many have noted this.

Malcolm wrote:

Some Americans, not all. There are know nothings in every country. You fantasize so much about how awesome it is in Europe, well, go live there. I have met many stupid people, and as far as I know, there are just as many stupid Germans, Norwegians, Swedes, Brits, etc., as there are stupid Americans.

kirtu said:

Black people had complete freedom in Massachusetts well before 1964-1968.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually they did.

Even in Norway and Sweden, there is racism and discrimination against blacks, Laplanders and so on. Not to mention discrimination against "guest workers" in Germany and so on. In fact, racism is on the rise in Europe.

kirtu said:

No, aside from the final line what I have written is factual.

Malcolm wrote:

No it isn't.

kirtu said:

As I said, America is Rome. Rome was not noted for its innovations, but for the fact that it wielded the most power. Of course Rome fell, and so too will America, but it will be a long time coming.

Rome was noted for its innovations but its military and political power overshadowed their achievements making the recognition difficult. For example a couple of decades ago it was shown that a Roman structure in Spain, that people thought was a kind of elaborate fountain, was the water power plant for a factory. Secondly I have heard that it took the world to the mid-20th century to reinvent all of Roman engineering knowledge, particularly with respect to concrete.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, America has its innovations too, but I am too polite to list them all.

kirtu said:

However you have just made Azimov's observation on anti-intellectualism in the US. Do you really want the US to follow the slanted model of Roman brutishness?

Malcolm wrote:

America is not anti-intellectual. But we have had this boring conversation before. You just have a huge chip on your shoulder, I wish you would get over it, and your prejudices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Norwegian said:

We have failed immigration politics, and we have failed integration politics..

Malcolm wrote:

One word: Lilyhammer...if you haven't seen it you ought to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Sherlock said:

America is Rome for now, and it will be for some centuries yet. So you better get used to it.

M

Is your thinking on this influenced by Spengler by any chance?

I thought his <https://archive.org/details/PrussianismAndSocialism> of Anglo-American capitalism vs Prussian/German-style socialism was pretty spot-on. He also identifies Marxism as a failed attempt to formulate a Prussian-style system based on Anglo-Saxon assumptions. This prediction, written in 1920, seems quite accurate:

"Instead of authoritarian socialism, the English or American billionaire adheres to an impressive form of private socialism, a welfare program on a grand scale which turns his own personal power into pleasure and morally vanquishes the recipient of welfare funds. The flashy techniques for distributing these millions are an effective cover-up for the methods used to obtain them in the first place. It is the same attitude as that of the old corsairs who, while banqueting in the castle just conquered, threw their table scraps to the prisoners: the voluntary surrender of property increases the value of what remains. The question whether or not such voluntary acts should become a legal duty is the chief point of contention among the economic parties of the future in England and America."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not specifically, but I have read Spengler, but years ago.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

kirtu said:

It's safe to say that without trade their economies could not function. All economies must act on the global stage to grow beyond a certain level. Trade does not necessarily imply capitalism however. There was active trade with Soviet Russia from 60's-90.

Malcolm wrote:



Yes, capitalist trade.

kirtu said:

I am not making personal comments at all. However there are very deep flaws in American culture that people born and raised here do not tend to acknowledge. I do want the US to in fact live up to it's ideals and become the greatest country on Earth. Sadly, I'm still waiting. It was only in my lifetime that African-American people were accorded liberty for example. If American's believed their ideals this wouldn't have been an issue for long.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you are making personal comments. It is becoming rather disgusting.

You have to understand one important point about "American" ideals. They are really the ideals of two groups: New Englanders and small group of educated Virginians. There was a compromise reached with the Deep South, which was not one that was easily made.

However, I can state with confidence that states like Massachusetts, and NE in general along with New York, as well as the left coast states really do live up to "American" ideals. But America is not just one country, it is in fact a nation historically comprised of 11 distinct cultural groups. Unfortunately, people in the culture sphere of the Deep South, Appalachia and the "Western States" have rather different ideas about things. The people in the Mid-West tend to be more conservative than New Englanders, but more liberal than the latter groups.

For example, Massachusetts abolished slavery in 1781.

So don't paint the whole country with a broad brush.

kirtu said:

BTW, it's not just me who thinks that American culture is severely flawed - most citizens like myself who I have met who were born with US citizenship but were raised significantly in northern or western Europe also see this. This was confirmed a few years ago when a report came out about differences in perception among many so-called "military brats", "corporate brats" and "diplomatic brats": oftentimes they felt like de facto aliens in the US and were initially mystified at the many self-contradictions in US culture once they came to live in the US. You can read about this in the literature concerning trans-culture/third culture children.

Malcolm wrote:

This simple means that you do not understand Americans, nor the subtleties of American history.

kirtu said:

There are no shortages of toilet paper in Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Denmark, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Iceland or Finland for starters.

Malcolm wrote:

These countries are all signatories to the WTO. They have neoliberalized economies.

kirtu said:

It's not a tautology.

Malcolm wrote:

To say that markets are chaotic and capitalism is unreliable is a  $1=1$  kind of statement.

kirtu said:

That is the exact situation. There is a narrow, non-diverse spectrum of political thought in the US focusing on conservatism. Almost all people born and raised in the US are some kind of narrow political conservative. People here are simply blind to this fact.

Malcolm wrote:

This is total nonsense. As I said before, this is a symptom of the fact that you live in a culturally conservative part of the US. If you lived in Massachusetts, VT, etc., you would have a very different perspective.

kirtu said:

Actually a report for the Dept. of Defense was published recently noting American decline on the international stage as a result of the perception of inadequate dealing with economics. I'll see if I can find that report.

America has throw a great deal away as a result of the complete failure of it's educational system over at least two generations and, as part of it's cultural flaw, it's slavish adherence to forms of ideology over reasoning and analysis. It has stagnated scientifically and technologically although this is not apparent (nor is the stagnation universal - this is not a controversial statement within some tech corporations but a counter statement is that the US has the strategic people and projects it needs and can continue to acquire [buy] what it does not currently have and that some scientific and tech stagnation is not broadly relevant). It will retain it's militarial dominance but may not retain economic dominance. With an incompetent response to a contrived economic depression it has become Belgium.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all rhetorical irrelevance. As I said, America is Rome. Rome was not noted for its innovations, but for the fact that it wielded the most power. Of course Rome fell, and so too will America, but it will be a long time coming.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

smcj said:

China is swiftly exhausting its environment, in a mad push to become equal to the west in industrial capacity.

They are buying up all the natural resources they can in Africa. My neighbor goes there a lot and says there are Chinese all over the place.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

M:

American dominance on the world stage will last for centuries

What about the development of the BRICS?

Malcolm wrote:

India lacks natural resources. Their main resource is labor.

China is swiftly exhausting its environment, in a mad push to become equal to the west in industrial capacity.

Brazil has mainly oil.

Russia is insane and effectively landlocked.

South Africa is definitely the economic engine of Africa, but it is socially incredibly unstable.

Of these, only Russia and China has anything like the ability to challenge American dominance. But I don't think they really can.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

kirtu said:

Not just (Norway is certainly of course). Germany isn't dependent upon guest workers for manufacturing, etc. But the chief point is that these social democracies are not propped up by capitalism but have safely put it in a terrarium where it can be tightly controlled to actually benefit people rather than being left to run amok and become a cancer like it is in the UK and the US.

Malcolm wrote:

Without the global capitalism, their economies could not function.

kirtu said:

I'm sorry you see it that way. I do not sling invective at the US or it's culture at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you kidding? You do it every chance you get.

kirtu said:

I just want it to live up to it's stated ideals, esp. those egalitarian ones (of course Americans have confused those ideals with others like a fantasied right to bear arms in extreme circumstances [like all the time for some people]). American ideals are fantastic. Hopefully one day Americans will become Americans.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we all have different ideas about what those stated ideals are. The Supreme Court has ruled that second amendment does indeed mean the right to carry a weapon. The court has also decided that the exact way this is carried out can be adjudicated locally. If you don't like guns, live in Massachusetts.

And again you make personal comments "Hopefully one day Americans will become Americans" as if there is some character flaw in Americans, it is really too much.

kirtu said:

Okay so you fall short of the throttling of the market in European social democracies. Please examine Goedel's Incompleteness Theorem: any sufficiently complex system has true statements which can nonetheless not be proven true within that system. Sufficiently complex means as complex as arithmetic. Certainly placing checks and balances on a capitalist economic system is far more complex than arithmetic as both can be modeled as rule based systems and the rules in capitalism far exceed the rules in arithmetic. Therefore unanticipated capitalist events will continue to occur. We don't know for sure what they are, but historically they are periods of increase followed by busts. This is a regular albeit unpredictable cycle. Another aspect is that economic markets are chaotic (in terms of chaos theory). Mathematics indicates that capitalism in the long is unreliable.

Is this problem mitigated by the social democracies tight control of it? No, but they can keep it from becoming a cancer and destroying society.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I think experience has proven that throttling markets winds up with shortages of things that people want, like toilet paper.

"Another aspect is that economic markets are chaotic (in terms of chaos theory). Mathematics indicates that capitalism in the long is unreliable." This is a tautology.

kirtu said:

The main problem as I see it, in the USA, is that corporations have too much access to power, and regulations are unfairly applied to small businesses making it impossible for them to compete against large corporations in almost every area.

That's a problem but by far not the main problem. The complete denial of people's access to labor is one of the main problems within the system. A means of mitigating that is in fact supporting small business and permitting (helping) people who have been locked out of the labor market to start small businesses.

Malcolm wrote:

These things can all be changed and should be changed. I was thinking of farming in particular. One place I think we can all agree is that the financial services industry needs to "throttled".

kirtu said:

The main flaw that I see in the US is the unwillingness of Republicans and Democrats alike to see that their policies together are moving the US to a corporatist state ala Gentile.

In fact there is only the one National Conservative Party, whose two wings have arbitrarily labeled their positions "Republican" and "Democrat".

Malcolm wrote:

This is nice rhetoric at a cocktail party, but in reality it is not like that.

kirtu said:

Who is Gentile?

Malcolm wrote:

Giovanni Gentile, Mussolini's intellectual.

kirtu said:

Rome fell in 2008 with the contrived and ongoing Second Great Depression. Americans don't know it yet.

Malcolm wrote:

Hardly, American dominance on the world stage will last for centuries. This country is far more resilient than you imagine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

In fact Malcolm, from just this little piece.... I'm not sure he really was that smart... Hey, but if you support him, that's your business.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not agree with Hayek, actually. You totally miss my point. My point is that capitalists must read Marx, and Marxists must read libertarians, etc.

You should read Nozick, Rawls (main philosopher articulating social justice, and a large government to bring that about), Bookchin, Naess, etc.

No one person's ideas are complete. It is folly to pick one person's book and say "This is my bible". One must read opposing views.

As I told you, my political beliefs are Deep Ecology/Left Biocentric and as a Buddhist I am committed to nonviolence, I cannot support any ideology which even permits the idea of violent revolutionary struggle. Naess has six principles for public debate which I generally adhere to naturally, but also fail at from time to time. They are:

Avoid tendentious irrelevance

Examples: Personal attacks, claims of opponents' motivation, explaining reasons for an argument.

Avoid tendentious quoting

Quotes should not be edited regarding the subject of the debate.

Avoid tendentious ambiguity

Ambiguity can be exploited to support criticism.

Avoid tendentious use of straw men

Assigning views to the opponent that he or she does not hold.

Avoid tendentious statements of fact

Information put forward should never be untrue or incomplete, and one should not withhold relevant information.

Avoid tendentious tone of presentation

Examples: irony, sarcasm, pejoratives, exaggeration, subtle (or open) threats.

These would be very good to adopt as personal commitments for online Buddhist discussions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Nemo said:

I don't know what planet you live on Malcolm but your claim that capitalism as practiced has moral constraints is ludicrous. Oligopoly, monopoly, monopsony and plutocracy are inevitable. Capitalism is a revolutionary force that naturally frees itself from constraints. It will devour the entire ecosystem and then devour itself.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am making a similar claim to the Marxists, i.e., that the capitalism founded by Smith had a moral theory. Likewise, Marxist style Socialism has a moral theory.

In both cases the the beast unleashed has shaken off the collar of its moral theory every time. We all accept that the Soviet Union and Communist China represent the failure of Marx's theories of economics. No one can possibly claim that any capitalist government has murdered as many people as the communists did in the 20th century. Not even the Nazis murdered as many people as Stalin did alone.

What we have is capitalism, we do not, at present, have another economic system.

What I argue is that trying to change this economic system through revolution will be more harmful than the harm it is presently causing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

On the subject of workers being 'free' to make contracts with employers:  
(today's cut'n'paste from Wiki contribution - because I'm a bit lazy.... )

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criticism\\_of\\_capitalism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criticism_of_capitalism)

Malcolm wrote:

The problems with all of these criticisms of capitalism is that they assume that all value comes solely from labor. This is fine for Smith, Ricardo and Marx, but in fact economists have found the LTV inadequate for explaining all kinds of things in economics.

I guess one of the things I find annoying about the Marxist rank and file is their amateur economics, they all act as if they really understand economics, but what they really do is just recite chapter and verse. And what I also find is that they rarely read contrary points of view. For example, have you read Nozick's Anarchy, State and Utopia? Or Hayek? Even you will never agree with what these fellows say, they are just as smart, if

not smarter than Marx and co. Time to expand your horizons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But rejecting capitalism is foolish and extreme. We merely need to place limits on resources that can be exploited. Capitalism and a steady state economy can co-exist. But it requires checks and balances.

kirtu said:

The only places where capitalism works are the social democracies, all of which are in Scandinavia and central/western Europe and it took them 50 or so years after WW2 to iron out problems (youth unemployment for example).

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the northern European social democracies (Denmark, Sweden, Norway) are propped up by North Sea oil. Germany, manufacturing on an imported labor force. These social democracies are propped up by capitalism.

kirtu said:

Personally I am skeptical of capitalism working in any native English speaking country because of the inherent culture of aggression, domination and exploitation that accompanies English. I would like to be proven wrong but so far history bears this out.

Malcolm wrote:

You have some deep prejudices, my friend. You never avoid a chance to sling invectives at the country you live in and of which you are a citizen.

kirtu said:

However I doubt that you mean social democracy as an instrument placing checks and balances on capitalism. The very notion of checks and balances is the quaint 18th century language dealing with reigning in the powers of King and Parliament, etc. Capitalism left to itself is harmful and will always, \*always\*, eventually lead to economic failure, just as it has in these United States and the UK repeatedly.

Malcolm wrote:

When we say checks and balances we mean exactly that, the use of the government to check corporations so the market can function in a balanced way. Until we manage to arrive at an internationally agreed upon system of population reduction and a steady state economy, the Keynesian approach seems to be most sensible, at least here in the USA.

The main problem as I see it, in the USA, is that corporations have too much access to power, and regulations are unfairly applied to small businesses making it impossible for



them to compete against large corporations in almost every area.

The main flaw that I see in the US is the unwillingness of Republicans and Democrats alike to see that their policies together are moving the US to a corporatist state ala Gentile.

kirtu said:

Anglo-American/French capitalism is historically a clear failure and a danger to civilization.

Malcolm wrote:

America is Rome for now, and it will be for some centuries yet. So you better get used to it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 7:22 AM

Title: Re: HHST 2014 North America & Europe Schedule

Content:

kirtu said:

[http://hhthesakyatrizin.org/schedule\\_2014\\_all.html](http://hhthesakyatrizin.org/schedule_2014_all.html)

supermaxv said:

I am so excited, anyone else headed out to the New York teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

I will be attending the empowerments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Unknown said:

If this is what Buddhists must believe then I am a very bad Buddhist. I believe all life is precious, even non-Buddhist beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Stop being so petulant and you might learn something.

All life is precious, but a precious human birth has eighteen unique characteristics which make it "precious", the so called eight freedoms:

[http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/eight\\_freedoms](http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/eight_freedoms)

And ten endowments:

[http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/ten\\_endowments](http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/ten_endowments)

Unknown said:

But rejecting capitalism is foolish and extreme. We merely need to place limits on resources that can be exploited. Capitalism and a steady state economy can co-exist. The proof is in the pudding.....

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Of course, and I would not expect otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

HHDL wrote: Of all the modern economic theories, the economic system of Marxism is founded on moral principles, while capitalism is concerned only with gain and profitability.

Malcolm wrote:

Capitalism, as portrayed in Smith's Wealth of Nations, is also founded on moral principles. Indeed, the latter book must be read alongside Smith's Moral Sentiments.

Please examine this:

<http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2008/08/adam-smith-on-csr/8665/>

However, the moral principles upon which Smith founds his vision of capitalism and a labor theory of value is not utopian.

The point is while Smith's systems isn't perfect, indeed it is very 18th century, but to loudly proclaim capitalism hasn't any moral theory is grossly wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Malcolm says:

Further, making offerings to the Buddha (a pure object) is far more metitorious than relieving all the poverty of the world.

Perhaps we could do both?

Malcolm wrote:

How are we going to do both without violently relieving someone of their possessions?

tellyontellyon said:

We are not going to agree about Marxism, which in the modern day includes much more than just what Marx happened to say and write. We can learn from what is right and reject what is wrong and doesn't work. I don't want to be ruled by a committee, I want 'power from below', the whole of society being able to contribute to economic planning. Democracy wider and more effective than we have now.

Malcolm wrote:

How is the "whole of society" going to be able to contribute to economic planning? Running a society takes skills. Skills require education.

You want to contribute to economic planning? Then grow food, like I do. Learn a pre-industrial era skill, like I did.

tellyontellyon said:

Marxists consider marxism to be a science, not a faith. Science learns from experience and improves.

Malcolm wrote:

I am aware that Marxists consider Marxism to be scientific, a proposition I take no more seriously than I take the idea that Buddhism is science, and rather less, actually.

tellyontellyon said:

Yes in the name of Marxism terrible things have been done, also capitalist authorities have done terrible things. Stalinism was a nightmare we all know. But there can be a new Marxism... or call it what you will. You know I am not talking about violent revolution, or a repeat of previous mistakes.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not interested in Marxism at all. The proof is in the pudding, it is a failed theory.

tellyontellyon said:

Perhaps your Deep Ecology will be the future? But I don't think it will be attained under a system that requires 2% to 3% compound economic growth annually forever. That is what capitalism must have to work. Capitalism has been very progressive, but that just

can't keep going on forever, the planet just can't take it. Capitalism has to go.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree, the notion of infinite growth of the economy is based on the notion of infinite resources, which of course we do not have.

But rejecting capitalism is foolish and extreme. We merely need to place limits on resources that can be exploited. Capitalism and a steady state economy can co-exist. But it requires checks and balances.

tellyontellyon said:

Global warming is happening now.. in all sorts of ways capitalism is just as bad for the very wealthy... people who could be using their precious lives to attain Buddhahood are starving and dying of AIDS in numbers far greater than needs to be:

Malcolm wrote:

Human birth only becomes precious if you have met Buddhadharma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

muni said:

How can the Buddha be pure and the sentient beings impure? How can those be two?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas have no afflictions, sentient beings are defined by afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Chinese Buddhism and the Anti-Japan War

Content:

Indrajala said:

The holy people who torched themselves in Viet Nam didn't seem to make much of a difference. Plenty of people still died and the communist regime won the war.

.

Malcolm wrote:

They made a huge difference. That image from Vietnam is one of the most enduring images in history. It will live on when most of the details of what caused it have faded from memory.

Indrajala said:

The war still continued, the communists won and America lost, only to engage in wars again and again in the following decades.

Malcolm wrote:

That image was one of the main things that caused the anti-war movement in the US. The US lost because of the US anti-war movement, not because the communists "won".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Wrong Malcolm it is not just "more Marxist whinging", I'm actually talking about the misery of peoples lives. I don't claim any kind of realization, and the injustice of the current system can annoy me from time to time, but you are also wrong if you think that is my mindset and motivation is based on anger.

Malcolm wrote:

It is evident from the words that you write, your complaints on unfairness. Jealousy is still jealousy, even if on behalf of another. You really need to study Bodhicaryāvatara. Instead of rejoicing in people's wealth, and thereby sharing in their merit, you actually create negative karma for yourself by wanting to deprive them of that wealth.

Perhaps you should go to a Buddhist college and properly study Buddhism rather than rotting your mind with Marxist crack.

tellyontellyon said:

No Malcolm, I think we have to help people in a conventional way, that is a part of building merit. It is not enough to visualise yourself and all other beings as compassionate Buddhas... but then not actually do anything compassionate. We can do something about our Karma right now. Karma needs action as well as intention if it is to ripen.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not accumulate danapāramita by giving everyone all that they wanted, it was sufficient for him to sincerely wish that they had all their wants and needs fulfilled.

In fact, Buddha had a golden begging bowl, given to him by the gods. But he thought it ostentatious and so he threw it away in a river. Before throwing it away however, he noticed an impoverished family nearby. He thought to give it to them, but then, through his clairvoyance, he saw that this sudden wealth would merely cause this poor family all to be reborn in hell. So he threw it away. For centuries Hindus have criticized the Buddha for this act.

Further, making offerings to the Buddha (a pure object) is far more meritorious than relieving all the poverty of the world. The sentient beings of the six realms are the impure merit field. We make offerings to them out of compassion.

And, it is actually quite enough to imagine oneself and all sentient beings as buddhas. That is the Vajrayāna way of rapid Buddhahood. So yes, you even have to visualize all those capitalists, all those 300 or whatever number of wealthy people, as Buddhas. And in their guise as sentient beings, you should want them to have all the wealth that they have and rejoice in it. If they use it improperly, then that is a pity, but they had the merit to gain that wealth in this life and no one should take it away from them. If they are dodging their taxes, well, that is a different issue.

tellyontellyon said:

The socio-economic system is not something that just 'happens' to us, we are the ones doing it. Our socio-economic system is a form of activity, of action, of behaviour. But the socio-economic behaviour that we engage in under capitalism is damaging; and it pits one individual against another for survival destroying equanimity and encouraging a 'me', 'me', 'me' mentality.

Malcolm wrote:

The socio-economic behaviour under Marxism is just as damaging, as I have explained to you already, because it merely transfers ownership of production. Marxism also pits people against each other, you just don't see it yet because you are blinded by ideology.

tellyontellyon said:

I want a far more equal society, a world where one person's gain is not another person's loss.

Malcolm wrote:

There will always be loss and gain. This is natural. Increase here, a decrease there. This is just how conditioned things are.

The Marxists say they want an equal society, equal for who, and who decides what is equal? A committee? A bunch of bureaucrats? Who votes them in? Unions, the "proletariat"? Like all Marxists, you speak out of both sides of your mouth at once. Someone has to run things -- I prefer the randomness of American Democracy any day, even if it is propped up by capitalism, to the rule of a committee.

Your rhetoric is just like that of free marketeers who want unrestricted free trade, well, free for who? You are just one side of the same coin. Neither Marxism or Capitalism are adequate solutions. But of the two, I will favor capitalism, because it is the present system and it should not be brought down by a violent revolution. It cannot be brought down by a peaceful one. You must understand that this is reality. Bringing down capitalism will cause untold suffering for billions, worse suffering than there is even now.

In order for things to change, people must personally evolve, and that is the only solution to our present situation. And you cannot force people to evolve.

So, unfortunately my friend, while you are standing behind barricades fighting with the police, I will be doing what I do anyway, practicing, translating, teaching and seeing patients, fixing the bodies you break in your so called "revolution".

tellyontellyon said:

HH Dalai Lama favours the socio-economic system of socialism/Marxism as this is a better way of behaving on this planet. So I must reject your point of view. I base this not only on my own ideas and experience, but also on the fact that I give more weight and authority to HHDL's point of view than yours.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am well aware of HHDL's views on the matter, and I don't think you really understand his point. He does not want a revolution.

We all agree in principle that everyone deserves a fair shake and that capitalism as it stands now has problems. However, what he does not agree with is violence and revolution, and you have yet to show one single Marxist revolution that has not degenerated into total bloodshed.

Socialism and Marxism are not the same thing. There are many socialisms. Why a Buddhist picks the most evil materialist form of it is totally beyond understanding.

But beyond that, if you think a Marxist party should be in power, than vote one in. Good luck with that, because as far as I can tell, very few countries want that kind of Government.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

more Marxist whinging

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to be wealthy, accumulate merit.

Basically, your view of the world is completely unBuddhist in every respect.

You are completely attached to material things. You completely lack any equanimity, your mind is a festering lagoon of resentment and anger, or so it appears.

You really need to give up this Marxist nonsense and turn your mind to Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I haven't got a problem with capitalism simply because a very small minority are super rich. The richest 300 persons on Earth have more money than poorest 3 billion combined... though it is pretty awful when we consider a statistic like that.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, wealthy has no relationship to happiness. In any case, you have the example of Bill Gates, who has taken his money and is trying to good works with it.

tellyontellyon said:

The real problem is how that wealth is wielded. In capitalism, the wealth, and control of the major levers of society, is wielded in a way that is very destructive and is leading us to social and environmental disaster. Is taking that power out of the hands of that tiny minority really so bad?

Malcolm wrote:

There are indeed problems with neoliberalism, but they will not be solved by Marxist Socialism. Its a dead end.

tellyontellyon said:

Buddhist ethics...

Malcolm wrote:

Never include taking the properties to which others lay claim without it being given to oneself freely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

Having said that, I think if you had Shankara around for tea one afternoon, he'd happily acknowledge that, and probably celebrate it.

Malcolm wrote:



I don't think so, after all, he shrilly denounced those who claimed Gaudapada was cribbing Buddhist arguments.

tobes said:

As well, he proposes that Buddhism at his time had degenerated into nihilism. But nonetheless, he is very careful to avoid denouncing particular views or methods, whereas Buddhists tend to proceed via a rather intense philosophical methodology of denouncing. It is an interesting difference.

Malcolm wrote:

Saying that Buddhism degenerated into nihilism is a pretty damning statement, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

bob said:

At least on the internet, we can't literally kill each other...

Malcolm wrote:

We're working on that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Socialism will confiscate the property of the capitalist and in return will secure the individual against poverty and oppression; it, in return for so confiscating, will assure to all men and women a free, happy and unanxious human life.

Malcolm wrote:

Promises, promises.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

You still have the problem of how an inert object, or an object not somehow connected with consciousness, could exist without an essence. If something exists without depending upon mind, it will be inherent. You need to deal with this problem in a way other than just asserting your point.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a problem in the slightest. Anything that arises from causes and conditions has no essence. Being nondependent on mind does not render something inherently existent.

cloudburst said:

In that case you can give an example of an object that is not and has never appeared to mind. If it is an object, it is an object of mind, or an appearance. What else?

Malcolm wrote:

No, because that would be an object that appeared to a mind. This does not however rule out the existence of things that have never appeared to any mind, which nevertheless are product so their own inert and nonsentient causes and conditions, and therefore, not inherently existent and nevertheless, not products of karma. Mental objects are one class of objects, material objects are another class of objects. You are conflating the two. A mental object (part of the dharmadhātu) is an object for the mano dhātu. A material object is an object for the other five dhātus, form for eye, etc. sure, all objects, mental and material, are objects of consciousnesses, sense or otherwise. You get nowhere differentiating mental consciousness from sense consciousness as they are all consciousness, or mind. I appreciate your presentation of the 18 elements, please explain how an object exists independently of mind without implying an essence. Before a mind is generated, if an object exists, it must exist independent of mind. Vasubandhu's presentation is finally a realist one. I am assuming you want to do better than that.

Vasubandhu's presentation is the one that Madhyamakas subscribe to conventionally. The point is that even Candrakīrti accepts that for an eye consciousness to be generated, the eye consciousness depends on an external form. According to your presentation, forms depend solely on consciousness and could never be asserted to exist externally, and as you stated, would not need eyes to be perceived. This would then render all sense organs nonfunctional and unnecessary. But there are so many negative consequences to this I could not possibly list them all.

It is not the intention of Madhyamaka to undermine this or that conventional presentation of the skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas, but merely to show that they are not paramārtha dharmas.

good.

I am interested to see if you can give an explanation of how a thunderstorm could exist that did not arise from karma, without employing a realist ontology.

[/quote]

You need to explain the karmic cause of such a storm.

Simply put however, thunderstorms arises from atmospheric causes and conditions.

There is no necessary precondition for a mind to generate those causes and conditions, and you equally cannot demonstrate how karma causes a thunderstorm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Two examples spring to mind: the total banning of references to Phabonhka Rinpoche at one point..

Malcolm wrote:

We never did that.

kirtu said:

The other thing is the banning of Zen people who said controversial things that are nonetheless in the mainstream of Zen - mainstream may be too strong, views that are acceptable in Zen but are not really mainstream Mahayana Buddhism (I remember this more as a discussion over the historical Buddha or what constitutes Buddhahood although the monk issue was there was well).

Malcolm wrote:

No one was ever banned for saying controversial things. People were suspended for their behavior, and banned for double-nicking, when they tried to go around suspensions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra and Yogacara

Content:

smcj said:

Maybe if I'd learned Tibetan it would be less confusing.

Malcolm wrote:

Here is a fact -- among Indian authors there is very little disagreement about these things. Among Tibetans, there is great disagreement. That should clue you into something.

That some Tibetans consider Yogacara = vijñāptimātra/cittamātra is based in Indian sources. Fellows like Shtiramati were definitely classic "mind-only" proponents. He was a direct disciple of Vasubandhu. Further, another immediate, if not direct disciple, of Vasubandhu, Aryavimuktisena, criticizes Vasubandhu for his substantialism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

Having said that, I think if you had Shankara around for tea one afternoon, he'd happily acknowledge that, and probably celebrate it.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so, after all, he shrilly denounced those who claimed Gaudapada was cribbing Buddhist arguments.

tobes said:

But if you ever assert that a Buddhist master has been influenced by an orthodox Indian school, that is a charge of heresy.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not influenced by, we appropriate from, or reframe. There is a difference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

smcj said:

What are your feelings about maggot or insect mind?

I've often seen flys buzzing against a pane of glass in frustration. They can't see and can't understand what the obstruction is. I cannot think of a better analogy for a stifled Dharma practitioner.

Funny you should ask.

Malcolm wrote:

The three planes of existence blaze with suffering of aging and illness,  
here there is no protection from the intensely blazing fire of death,  
migrating beings born in the world are always confused,  
revolving like bees stuck in a pot.

--Lalitavistara Sūtra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

dharmagoat said:

The point that I have been making is that suffering/liberation is a solely human preoccupation. A maggot most likely has no concept of its suffering and therefore can't be considered to be suffering as a human would. As humans we can only guess how a maggot suffers, and so all we do is project our own experience. We falsely assume that a maggot has a bad life. But for a maggot, how can life be bad if there is no good life to compare it to?

Virgo said:

Surely maggots are not free of the three types of suffering?

dharmagoat said:

Actually, it would seem that maggots only suffer the first kind of suffering, that associated with birth, growing old, illness and dying. I would doubt that they have the capacity to experience the conceptually-based forms of suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Dukha is not a feeling at base, that is the point of the third suffering, which refers to the fact that conditioned things decay.

Maggots definitely suffer. They feel pain, they feel hunger, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

4. Who is really disenchanted with capitalism? People vote with their feet, and they prefer coming to a country ruled by law, where they can keep property without it being stolen by the government. There isn't mass migration to Venezuela or Cuba, quite the opposite, and anyone with half a brain and cerebellum has already left those countries for one where they can live and work in safety

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but you know, all those people are counterrevolutionaries.

Zhen Li said:

If Socialists just want that transformation in the market, then they need to answer for the simple fact that if you spend more than you're making in returns, then that is unsustainable. If you haven't noticed, the US debt means it won't make it into the 22nd century as it is today.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an interesting question, as of right now, today, each US Taxpayer is 150,000 "in arrears" because of the (as of this moment) \$17,336.595,xxx,xxx.xx debt the feds have wracked up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Malcolm wrote

And you are not the rightful owner of my house

Marx would have called that personal property. When he talks about private property he is talking about the means of production. E.g. Power stations, oil companies, the pharmaceutical industry, roads, railroads, factories, banks and so forth.

Malcolm wrote:

So no free enterprise of any kind. Well, planned economies really don't work well at all, at least not at the population levels we have world wide.

tellyontellyon said:

Zhen Li wrote

Also adharmic is the notion of an "inherently right" view of a conditioned set of thoughts, known as Marxism or Socialism. They have no svabhāva, self-existence -- we can only define them according to convention, and conventionally the picture is pretty bleak for Marxism, Socialism and Communism.

Conditioned thoughts: True, but you couldn't you say the same about any written down theory, e.g. Quantum mechanics, existential philosophy, Deep Ecology, Buddhist scripture, or any conditioned set of thoughts about anything I suppose?

Malcolm wrote:

The salient point here is effectiveness. Marxist socialism has not proven to be effective, I simply think their system is unstable, results in huge inequality and condemns us to follow the course of greatest profit rather than what is best for the whole planet and the beings that live on it.

And Marx defines capitalism as progressive and a necessary phase of historical evolution. What Marx predicted was that socialism could only succeed in an advanced capitalist economy. Well, we are not there yet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

That doesn't make it ok. Land that was there for everybody, for communal use, was acquired by force by individuals.

Malcolm wrote:

This process is described by the Buddha.

Until humans beings eliminate the three afflictions from their minds (becoming Buddhas) there is no hope of your utopia.

tellyontellyon said:

To say that the Dharmic consequences have been suffered does not alter the fact that the stolen property has still not been given back to communal use. To its rightful owners .... all of us.

Malcolm wrote:

You did not define the commons. There is a commons to be sure.

But I am sure you have heard of the tragedy of the commons as well.

And you are not the rightful owner of my house. No one is but me, unless I cannot pay the taxes on its, and then the Government will seize it. So you see, there is already common ownership of everything. Governments basically grant a license of ownership. There is no such thing as absolutely ownership in our system of property law.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

I can understand why you'd be a touch defensive about this - but note that I have not in any way singled out the mods for this; I have said nothing at all about policies or techniques of moderation.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, my apologies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Well, as I said before, there is a difference between personal property and private property.

Malcolm wrote:

And how is this distinction drawn? My clothes are my personal property, but my land is private property?

tellyontellyon said:

I think you are conflating violence with the aims of socialism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am merely pointing out the fact that communist revolutions tend to be long drawn out bloody affairs.

tellyontellyon said:

Ultimately it supports a society with no state, no money where we all contribute to each others welfare.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not headed into a utopia, my friend, we are heading into the age of strife. This imaginary stateless society you imagine will never exist. It is a pipe dream, it is a fantasy.

tellyontellyon said:

Theft: When Europeans turned up in the America's and started 'claiming' ownership of the land.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, for the most part first English settlers at any rate, bought and paid for lands they used. Granted however they did allow themselves to take land they perceived as being unused and justified it under Lockean principles.

Then the King of England decided he owned the whole lot and started giving land grants.

tellyontellyon said:

Committing genocide against the native people who, so I've heard' had no concept of owning the land, or the sea or the sky for that matter...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, indeed there was a cultural clash, with Indians having very different concepts of property than we did and do. The Indians lost. A human tragedy to be sure, but that happened in Britain as well. It happened to my Scottish ancestors who were pushed off their lands when the Highlands were fenced off. British soldiers murdered entire Scottish villages for resisting the fencing of the Highlands.



It has happened everywhere in the world. No one living anywhere in the world today, save a few peoples in the Amazon [and even then it is questionable] are the first people there who did not push someone else off their land.

tellyontellyon said:

When Europeans turned up and took that land... now that was theft. They have been dealing in stolen property ever since.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. If no one owns it, it is free for the taking. That's what Europeans thought and that is now they behaved. I am sure that whatever nonvirtues the Pilgrims for example did, they experienced the ripening of their karma. I don't condone what they did, but I also don't feel responsible for it either.

I doubt very much you folks over in England of Norman blood are going to be paying reparations to the Saxons anytime soon, nor the Saxons to the Celts and so on. Or me for that matter, since you bloody Brits stole my land.

In reality, we need to remember the words of the Buddha:

"He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me,"--in those who harbour such thoughts hatred will never cease.

"He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me,"--in those who do not harbour such thoughts hatred will cease.

The basic problem with Marxist socialism is summed up nicely in the first line.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

poor and rich people

Perhaps being born rich or poor is a matter of Karma? But that doesn't mean that they can't do something about it.

It is not the same as say being born with one leg... that is a fate you have to accept.

Malcolm wrote:

I nowhere said that one needed to accept the class into which one was born. You can work hard, get an education and improve your circumstances honestly.

What I said was that classes in society were a result of karma, not capitalism.

Also when your socialist brigades begin stealing people's houses "for the people", and closing their bank accounts "for the people", etc., this is just stealing, and it is a non

virtuous act. Nationalizing the banks is theft. Theft results in poverty, not prosperity.

When you compare the Buddha's teachings with that of Marx, you will discover that nearly everything a revolution seeks to accomplish by Marxist methods are considered non-virtuous methods in Buddhadharma.

Incidentally, this does not mean that Buddhism regards modern capitalism as wise or virtuous, for it doesn't. It is just the other side of Marxist materialism. That was my point originally, you guys don't reject the capitalist means of production, you just want to own it. But it is that very means of production itself which is pernicious.

Frankly, my friend, I get the impression your education in Buddhadharma is rather limited.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Malcome

Malcolm wrote:

That would be "Malcolm"

tellyontellyon said:

As stated several times already. Real socialists do not consider Mao to be a socialist. He was really a Stalinist.

As with Stalin, it suited his regime to portray themselves as Marxists, in the same way that it suits the cheerleaders of capitalism to portray them as Marxists. But they are not. Mao thought that power came from the barrel of a gun, rather than from the solidarity of the 99%

Malcolm wrote:

You sound like Christians "Real Christians do not worship Pope", etc.

Mao was most certainly an ardent student of Marxist-Leninism. But you Trotskyists think you are the only "true" communists because it serves your purposes to place distance between you and the acts of your coreligionists. But Trotsky was also a murderer so as long as you support his acts, you will inherit the result of them, which is saddening for you.

tellyontellyon said:

Edit: You have a fatalistic view of Karma.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I have the Buddha's view of karma:

Master Gotama, what is the reason, what is the condition, why inferiority and superiority are met with among human beings, among mankind? For one meets with short-lived and long-lived people, sick and healthy people, ugly and beautiful people, insignificant and influential people, poor and rich people, low-born and high-born people, stupid and wise people. What is the reason, what is the condition, why superiority and inferiority are met with among human beings, among mankind?"

3. "Student, beings are owners of kammās, heirs of kammās, they have kammās as their progenitor, kammās as their kin, kammās as their homing-place. It is kammās that differentiate beings according to inferiority and superiority."

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/nanamoli/wheel248.html#shorter>

Buddhism and Marxism are incompatible not least because their view of the creation of social classes is radically different. For Buddhists, social class is a result of karma. For Marxists, it is result of material relations. The two views cannot be reconciled.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am afraid this is the more familiar picture of a revolutionary:

"The sign of a true revolutionary was his desire to kill."

Mao

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

It is capitalism that produces the class divisions and antagonisms.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is karma that create class division. Any Buddhist should be able to understand this with ease. I think you really need to study the Buddha's teachings on karma more in

depth.

Class divisions existed long before capitalism, and will exist long after. The classes of the six realms were not created by capitalism. The various classes of animals were not created by capitalism. The classes of devas were not created by capitalism. etc.

Antagonism results when people whose karma landed them in inferior positions become jealous and wish to take from others who are more fortunate [for example, just as the asuras became jealous of the devas]. Likewise, when those who are more fortunate act selfishly and do not properly care for the less fortunate, this too causes class antagonism [for example, when the devas refused to share ambrosia with the asuras].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Zhen Li"] it's just that they tend to be successful in the sense of not requiring gross injustice to maintain order.[/quotes]

In this degenerate age, that is a good start.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You have a film on a movie projector. As you focus the image on the screen, the image appears to become brighter and more clear. But you have not changed or altered the film inside of the projector in anyway.

Likewise, though the visions appear to increase and decrease, they are not actually increasing and decreasing.

You can consider them to be the visible expression of the mind essence, this is why these appearances are termed wisdom appearances since they do not arise from mind.

Astus said:

Are you saying that one always experiences the same visions, except that there are times when one properly focuses and times when not?

Malcolm wrote:

No, Astus.

It is really useless to try and explain this to you over the internet. If you want to understand this, you must seek out a teacher and learn. Someone who can put the sugar in your hand and then have you taste it. Until you do that, you will not understand why Dzogchen makes the claims that it does.

Astus said:

That is, every experience is the same vision, but without the right eyes, they look like the ordinary five elements, but with the right eyes, they are the buddha families? Personally, I always thought of such a connection between elements and buddhas as rather symbolic, and not in a literal way that instead of a green recycle bin I see green Tara.

Malcolm wrote:

The connection between Buddha families and elements is not symbolic. It is actual. The element of air is Samayatara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

I think I have pointed out that even Marx thought that a socialist transformation of society could come about peacefully:

Malcolm wrote:

It has not succeeded yet, since it pitches classes of humans against each other.

tellyontellyon said:

I believe that the capitalist system is not capable of making the changes that society needs and that unless we make these changes we are heading towards barbarism.

Malcolm wrote:

The most barbaric period of human civilization was precisely when the communists were most active in trying to foment revolution all over the world, i.e. most of the 20th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

The nature of mind is without beginning or end, the visionary expressions are not. As they have beginning and end, they are dependently arisen, and as such, they are fabrications.

Malcolm wrote:

Astus: this is not correct.

You may think of this way. You have a film on a movie projector. As you focus the image on the screen, the image appears to become brighter and more clear. But you have not changed or altered the film inside of the projector in anyway.

Likewise, though the visions appear to increase and decrease, they are not actually increasing and decreasing.

You can consider them to the visible expression of the mind essence, this is why these appearances are termed wisdom appearances since they do not arise from mind.

But this is just explaining sweet to someone who has obviously never tasted sugar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

mutusuk said:

No, but the visions are not objects of the senses. If you close your eyes, they arise anyway. They arise in the dark where your senses cannot perceive anything. They are not objects of the senses.

Malcolm wrote:

Just to elaborate a point here: they are an entopic phenomena which arise based on a very precise kind of subtle anatomy which is unique to Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They do, but very few people understand what they are.

Astus said:

Shouldn't it be widespread at least within Tibetan Buddhism then? Many mahamudra teachers were and are familiar with dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are a lot of people who teach one thing but practice another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

Then it should occur to everyone...

Malcolm wrote:

They do, but very few people understand what they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Malcolm says: "Hands up! We are looking for volunteers! .....Only a few billion."

The rest of the world says: "You first Malcolm".

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have children, and I don't intend on having children. One reduces population by not reproducing, not by executing sentient beings.

tellyontellyon said:

Well, as I said, I don't want socialists to seize political power by any means, period. Since there will be many people like me, if you try to seize power, you will be meet with resistance, and you lot will start murdering everyone who does not go along with your revolution, and it will be another red terror.

Why would they murder anybody? A revolution in a real Marxist sense is not carried out by a small band of 'reds', it is a movement involving and supported by the vast majority of the population. It is inherently democratic.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, that is why it has been so successful in the past.

tellyontellyon said:

E.g. The insurrection phase of the Russian revolution happened with barely a shot fired.

The ministers of the constituent assembly were called taxi's and sent home!  
The bloodshed came about when the counter-revolutionaries, provoked and supplied with money, equipment and troops by the US,UK, France,Japan etc. etc. attacked.

Malcolm wrote:

It was not a democratic revolution. No one had a vote. The Bolsheviks nationalized all the banks, confiscated all private accounts, etc. Additionally the Cheka defined as counterrevolutionaries a very broad swath of persons, people who were wealthy were defined as counter revolutionary merely for being wealthy. This is the kind of logic that under the cultural revolution had the communists murdering high rinpoches in Tibet. My teacher, HH Sakya Trizin, still cannot return there. He was defined as a counter revolutionary when he was a young teenager.

tellyontellyon said:

That was when Russia degenerated into the brutal totalitarian democracy.

Malcolm wrote:

??? "totalitarian democracy"? This a contradiction in terms.

tellyontellyon said:

What about the democratically elected socialist govt. in Chile? Supported and cheered on by Reagan and Thatcher, a brutal dictatorship came to power and killed tens of thousands of trade unionists and socialists. Disgusting.

Malcolm wrote:

No argument there. But I have to be honest with you, compared to the millions murdered by Stalin and Mao, this pales.

tellyontellyon said:

In a genuine democracy people should be able to vote on what the laws are. Under capitalist systems (at least the ones that attempt to maintain some semblance of democracy) we still don't have real democracy. If a govt. doesn't do what international monopoly capitalism tells them to.... the generals suddenly appear.

Malcolm wrote:

It really depends on what you are defining as a democracy. For example you term the early Soviet state as a "totalitarian democracy", only the bizarre logic of Marxists could coin such a phrase.

The main point about all of this is that you, as a Buddhist, will not absolutely repudiate violence as a means to a political end. I think you have some reflection to do on the lack of suitability trying to mix Marxism with Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 9:50 PM



Title: Re: Mahamudra and Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

and the assertion, if I recall, was that the dependent, purged of the imaginary, was the perfect nature...which would lead to the conclusion that the dependent "exists." I may be remembering this incorrectly....but for those of you interested in concepts and polemics, have at it....!!!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is how Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu uniformly present the three natures. The idea that perfect is empty of both the dependent and the imagined is very late in Indian exegesis (10th century).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Chinese Buddhism and the Anti-Japan War

Content:

Indrajala said:

The holy people who torched themselves in Viet Nam didn't seem to make much of a difference. Plenty of people still died and the communist regime won the war.

.

Malcolm wrote:

They made a huge difference. That image from Vietnam is one of the most enduring images in history. It will live on when most of the details of what caused it have faded from memory.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

I'll be honest: the internet gave me a massive wake up call about the state of Buddhism in non-traditional places.

The e-sangha days were remarkable in the history of Buddhism - when ever before have practitioners from every kind of existing tradition been able to communicate so effortlessly with each other?

And yet, it must be concluded that the balance between pluralism, openness, mutual learning and spiritual conceit, dogmatism, sectarian superiority, was decided in favour of the latter.

Malcolm wrote:

That is total bullshit, tobes. You really have no idea why E-Sangha evolved as it did. Most

of the so called perception of sectarianism arose out of the need to ascertain who was a qualified ordained person. It was over this point that the rain of charges that we were sectarian fell.

The Theravadins split largely because they had already siloed themselves off on E-Sangha itself, and resented any perception of incursion on their turf by the moderating staff in general.

The confrontation between the ZFI folks and the board was over the question of "what is a monk".

In the end, everyone blames the moderating staff. But in the end, the failure of E-Sangha was a failure of its users, not our policies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Well yea, the internet is not real communication because there's no energy exchange. No one will successfully receive the pointing out instructions over the internet.

Malcolm wrote:

So you means ChNN's webcasts are useless?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 7:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

reddust said:

I looked up studies through Universities on "Deep Ecology." Deep Ecology and UN's Agenda 21 are usually studied together with a bunch of other economic stuff, both want drastic reduction of human population.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the easiest way to manage a general global population reduction would be subject parenting to licensure, which seems to me to be a good idea anyway.

Drastic (peaceful) reductions in human population will ensure there are resources for many future generations of humans, plants and animals to come. It will ensure cultural diversity amongst humans, etc. There are no downsides, only upsides.

reddust said:

I think there would be downsides because people aren't perfect and those who hold the power to license won't be perfect. I've found a lot of books on Deep Ecology, 6 of them

so far and I am going to read up. I looked the theory up on the net and will do some deep study before I form an opinion. Thanks for the data Malcolm, I really appreciate new (for me) ideas and views.

Malcolm wrote:

“ Dans ses écrits, un sage Italien  
Dit que le mieux est l'ennemi du bien.

(In his writings, a wise Italian  
says that the best is the enemy of the good) ”

-- Voltaire

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Population might collapse without any push from governments.

Malcolm wrote:

It might. But it would be good the manage the process no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

reddust said:

I looked up studies through Universities on "Deep Ecology." Deep Ecology and UN's Agenda 21 are usually studied together with a bunch of other economic stuff, both want drastic reduction of human population.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the easiest way to manage a general global population reduction would be subject parenting to licensure, which seems to me to be a good idea anyway.

Drastic (peaceful) reductions in human population will ensure there are resources for many future generations of humans, plants and animals to come. It will ensure cultural diversity amongst humans, etc. There are no downsides, only upsides.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantially smaller human population. The flourishing of non-human life requires a smaller human population.

How much smaller and how are you planning to reduce it.

Malcolm wrote:

Ideally human world population should never exceed the world population of the late eighteenth century, so around 100,000,000.

Of course, this population reduction must be voluntary, because everyone understands the importance of a steady state economy and world.

tellyontellyon said:

Buddha was not a revolutionary in any sense that you would recognize.

That is self evidently not true as my post indicated that I do indeed consider the Buddha a revolutionary.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not intend to change society, he did not seize political power, in fact, Buddha impressed upon his disciples the need to maintain the status quo.

tellyontellyon said:

Perhaps you should reconsider your narrow view that revolution=violence.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, as I said, I don't want socialists to seize political power by any means, period.

Since there will be many people like me, if you try to seize power, you will be meet with resistance, and you lot will start murdering everyone who does not go along with your revolution, and it will be another red terror.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Basically, I prefer the present world order with all its warts and inconstancies to a world order that would be run by totalitarians such as yourself.

This tells me two things:

1) You are happy with the status quo. 2) You think I am a totalitarian.

For point 1... then why are you posting in engaged Buddhism.

On point 2.... you are simply wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

Please describe to me your "workers democracy" and how it would be different than the present democratic order. How will you bring it about? By force if necessary?

As for being happy with the status quo, that term does not apply. I am neither happy nor unhappy about it. As Arne Naess puts it:

Should the world's misery and the approaching ecocatastrophe make one sad? My point is that there is no good reason to feel sad about all this. According to the philosophies I am defending, such regret is a sign of immaturity, the immaturity of unconquered passiveness and lack of integration.

Naess, Arne (2009-05-01). *The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess* (p. 125). Counterpoint. Kindle Edition.

What I said was that I prefer the status quo to a totalitarian regime. But I am under no illusion about the fact that things must change deeply.

tellyontellyon said:

As I said earlier, the corrupt, violent and destructive capitalist system is going to lead to even greater problems in the future including more wars, starvation, environmental disaster. Also it was economic problems and the capitalistic quest for power, markets, land and resources that led to the wars, not the other way around. Billions will die if we don't respond.

Malcolm wrote:

If you respond with force, you will just hasten the bloodshed.

The first thing we need to do is revoke the Treaty of Rome, Naess again:

Economic globalization is somewhat misleading. A better term might be globalization of the four freedoms, referring to the so-called four freedoms of the Treaty of Rome, which was the basis for the European Common Market and is still at the core of the present-day European Union (EU). The document's style of globalization implies successive expansion of its "four freedoms" until it also covers trade among the three giants, the European Union, the United States (and Canada), and Japan, and reluctantly over the rest of the globe. The term four freedoms refers to the free (duty-free) crossing of goods and materials through borders, the free flow of services, the freedom to compete for jobs anywhere (people), and the freedom of capital to flow across any borders. The four freedoms imply four prohibitions, the violation of which will be punished by the authorities. Namely, the freedoms involve strong, adequate protection—for social, medical, ecological, or other reasons of cultural relevance—against the import of certain goods or services, or against certain kinds of flow of foreign capital into a local, regional, or any other limited area, for example, the Arctic coast of Norway.

Naess, Arne (2009-05-01). *The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess* (p. 287). Counterpoint. Kindle Edition.

In other words, we need to start undoing, legally, neo-liberal policies. But while doing that, we need to understand, as Vandana Shiva eloquently writes:

Today, we need to overcome a much wider and deeper apartheid, an eco-apartheid

based on the illusion of separateness, of humans from nature, in our minds and lives. This is an illusion because we are part of nature and earth, not apart from it...Today, we need to overcome a much wider and deeper apartheid, an eco-apartheid based on the illusion of separateness, of humans from nature, in our minds and lives. This is an illusion because we are part of nature and earth, not apart from it. Redefining the economy by embedding it in society and nature is the first step in a paradigm shift. Shifting from GDP and GNP to measures of real wealth, welfare, well-being and happiness is another. Wealth is derived from “weal” (well-being), its original meaning is “condition of well-being”.

She also writes:

Commodification and privatisation are based and promoted on the flawed belief that price equals value. However, all those working for justice in land and water rights and preventing the ecological abuse of land and water, are asking for the opposite – the inalienable right to resources, and in the case of common property resources like water, the inalienability of common rights. The second paradigm of the green economy is earth-centred and people-centred. The resources of the earth vital to life – biodiversity, water, air – are a commons for the common good for all, and a green economy is based on a recovery of the commons and the intrinsic value of the earth and all her species. It would put nature’s ecological cycles as the drivers and shapers of the economy, it would put people first, not investors, and build on women’s core contributions to create economies of sustenance and care that enhance the well-being of all. The industrial/corporate system of food production uses ten times more units of energy as inputs than it produces as food. It wastes 50 per cent of the food produced; it uses and pollutes 70 per cent of the water on the planet; it has destroyed 75 per cent of the biodiversity in agriculture; and it contributes 40 per cent of the greenhouse gases that are destabilising the climate and further threatening food security. By contrast, earth-centred agriculture produces twice as much food as the inputs it uses; it conserves biodiversity; it mitigates and adapts to climate change; it protects the earth; farmers and public health.

Shiva, Vandana, Pluto Press. Kindle Edition.

My basic point here is that classical Marxism, with its narrow minded materialism and so on is just not up to the job of an ecological transformation of humanity. That transformation must spring from the world spiritual traditions.

tellyontellyon said:

Me, Karl Marx and HH Dalai Lama all believe that a non-violent transformation of society to a socialist/marxist may be possible. You are entitled to your opinion and me to mine.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you ought to leave HHDL out of it. I am quite sure he is not a socialist revolutionary. We need an ecological evolution, not a workers revolution. We need to reject the very industrial economy that lies at the heart of all our environmental, social and political troubles, and we need to do so globally and non-violently.

tellyontellyon said:

You said my view is anthropocentric? If by that you mean that I am saying the problems

on this planet are caused by the humans then I would agree and don't really see why you object to that?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I mean that your view is not biocentric.

tellyontellyon said:

What then is the bio-centric or Deep Ecology way of looking at things? I must confess to not knowing about this.

Malcolm wrote:

The well-being and flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: intrinsic value, inherent worth). These values are independent of the usefulness of the non-human world for human purposes.

Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves.

Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.

The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantially smaller human population. The flourishing of non-human life requires a smaller human population.

Present human interference with the non-human world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.

Policies must therefore be changed. These policies affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from the present.

The ideological change will be mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent value) rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between bigness and greatness.

Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to try to implement the necessary changes.

<http://www.haven.net/deep/council/eight.htm>

tellyontellyon said:

Wasn't the American constitution born out of a revolution? Wasn't the Buddha also revolutionary in his own way, he challenged the status quo, he wasn't happy to leave things as they were.

Malcolm wrote:

The Constitution was born out of centuries of Jurisprudence. It was not born of a war.

The Constitution was written because the Articles of Confederation, which was the constitution of the wartime government, was inadequate.

Buddha was not a revolutionary in any sense that you would recognize.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

In a genuinely socialist/marxist society you would not be ruled by the working class.

Marx never idealised the working class. He just thought that because of their key role in production that they were in the position to overthrow capitalism.

His view was that it is capitalism that produces the different classes. His desire was for us all to be treated equally, a society without class.

If we want to get rid of the class and caste systems then I think we have to get rid of the system that produces and perpetuates them.

Malcolm wrote:

We never going to be rid of different classes in this world because the karma of sentient beings is what creates disparities, not economics. I just explained this to you.

tellyontellyon said:

Your view of Karma sounds a bit fatalistic, surely we can through our actions make a better world, and of course improve our karma for future lives.

Malcolm wrote:

My view of karma is directly based on Buddha's teachings.

tellyontellyon said:

The truth of Karma doesn't just mean we can hang our boots up and not try to do anything.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, no one is suggesting that.

tellyontellyon said:

If Buddhist monks are getting caught up using scripture to justify nationalistic violence... well, it's still violence?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, but it is not Buddhist violence, it is nationalist violence. There are no Buddhist scriptures at all that advocate nationalist violence on any level. There are also no



Buddhist scriptures which advocate revolution either.

tellyontellyon said:

I'm not in any way suggesting that that is the fault of Buddhism, I simply make the point that Karma is produced by action rather than ideology as such. I also wanted to make the point that mischievous people can take even a peaceful ideology and use it to their own ends.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma, my friend, is volition and what comes from volition. The fruit of karma arises from that.

tellyontellyon said:

As far as Deep Ecology is concerned. Democracy is fatally skewed by the power of the super-rich and big corporations, hedge-funds etc. "He who calls the piper calls the tune". If we want control over our environment then we need collective ownership. You can't control what you don't possess. The track record so far shows big business is guided by the profit motive, not by the needs of the many or by environmental considerations.

Malcolm wrote:

Ownership is an anthropocentric concept. It is not a biocentric concept. So your statement right there is flawed from a DE perspective.

You will not achieve collective ownership ever. In order to bring that about you will have to fight a long, bloody war with billions dead. The notions of property rights are too deeply embedded in our legal systems.

In order to change those you will have to overthrow entire governments and social orders.

Basically, I prefer the present world order with all its warts and inconstancies to a world order that would be run by totalitarians such as yourself. You will kill billions in your ideological zeal to create a "classless" society [but of course there are always classes and always elites]. It would be better for you just to pray for rebirth in a pure land, there are no classes there.

Western Democracies at this point are too stable for your kind of revolutionary politics to ever be successful (Thank Buddha). The only reason why the Russian Revolution had a prayer of success is that the war footing of the western powers created serious economic instability worldwide. The same was true of China forty years later.

The only solution to the world's problems is the abandonment of violence at all costs, and slowly educating people one person at a time. Inner evolution is the only key to the world's problems, not outer revolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Trots are and have always been religious fanatics. They are the Shia of the Communist world.

Malcolm, again why are you picking on muslims, in this case Shia muslims. All the muslims I have met are decent people, peaceful and not fanatics.

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't picking on Muslims, I was making a comparison. Trots are a minority, have a charismatic leader who was killed, etc.

tellyontellyon said:

I'm sure that it is not possible to reconcile Trotskyist (orthodox marxist) ideology with Buddhist ideology. But in practice, the modern party I am involved in is involved in arguing for peace, ending wars, standing against nuclear arms.

Malcolm wrote:

There are a lot of political parties that argue for peace, ending war, and are anti-nuclear, you know, like the Green Party of the UK.

tellyontellyon said:

Despite Buddhist pacifist ideology, that same ideology has at times also been used as a justification for violence. We see that in Sri Lanka, Burma, Thailand. Most countries with Buddhist majority populations have the death penalty, all have armies. Look how Zen Buddhists priests relied on scripture to justify genocide during WWII.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you know they didn't really. Zen Priests in Japan got mixed up in nationalism. The same problem exists in Sri Lanka, Burma and Thailand. This is the fault of nationalism, not Buddhism.

tellyontellyon said:

Like this from the Upaya-kaushalya Sutra, a Mahayana text that's name literally means 'skillful means.'

While on board a ship, Shakyamuni [Buddha] discovers that there is a robber intent on killing all five hundred of his fellow passengers. Shakyamuni ultimately decides to kill the robber, not only for the sake of his fellow passengers but also to save the robber himself from the karmic consequences of his horrendous act. In doing so, the negative karma from killing the robber should have accrued to Shakyamuni but it did not...

Malcolm wrote:

You do understand that the bodhisattva in this story possessed clairvoyance and was able to read the thief's mind? Correct? Do you possess such clairvoyance?

Without taking this fact into account, the story becomes skewed. The story in the Ārya-upāyakaśālya-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra is not intended to demonstrate that Buddhists should engage in violent interventions. It is intended to demonstrate the amazing capacities of a bodhisattva on the stages. There is another story in the Jatakas where the bodhisattva, when he was reborn as Viśvaṃtara, gave his wife and children away to a brahmin in order to practice the perfection of giving.

tellyontellyon said:

You posted some of the most inflammatory things that Marx wrote. But Marx's ideas developed over his lifetime and must be taken in the context of the historical situation and in the context of what violence others were doing at the time. Marx also said that he thought in advanced countries, with well developed democracy that a genuinely socialist society could come about without revolution.

The fact is when we are talking about Marx we have to ask: which Marx?

You also have to use marxist language with care, for example 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' simply means workers democracy. They used words differently in the 1840's.

Malcolm wrote:

Marx was:

a materialist (Charvaka)

argued that violence was acceptable, and even necessary

was a proponent of forced wealth redistribution (theft), which is and always has been bad economic policy. Taxation is always a better solution.

You have to understand I have read Marx. Marx can be amusing, for example his critique of colonialism at the end of Capital.

tellyontellyon said:

For example, revolution sounds pretty nasty but:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revolutionary\\_socialism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revolutionary_socialism)

The term revolutionary socialism refers to socialist tendencies that subscribe to the doctrine that social revolution is necessary in order to effect structural changes to society. More specifically, it is the view that revolution is a necessary precondition for a transition from capitalism to socialism. Revolution is not necessarily defined as a violent insurrection; it is defined as seizure of political power by mass movements of the working class so that the state is directly controlled by the working class as opposed to the capitalist class and its interests.[1] Revolutionary socialists believe such a state of affairs is a precondition for establishing socialism.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't want the state to be controlled by the working class, per se.

I have no confidence whatsoever that a workers state will have a Deep Ecological outlook. Marxism and Deep Ecology are at odds because the former is anthropocentric and the latter is biocentric.

In the end, I think that, as far as it goes, American Democracy and its analogues in other countries is the best system of government we humans have yet come up, and I do not see Marxist socialism as any improvement at all.

I am a Buddhist. Just as the Buddha did not believe in caste, I do not believe that one "class" has an inherent moral superiority to another class: this is materialist thinking.

Buddhist thinking maintains that people are born into poverty or wealth because of their karma. There are social classes because people's actions in past lives define where they are born in this one, just as their past actions define whether sentient are born as animals or devas.

tellyontellyon said:

In any case, wouldn't it be far far better to talk about what actually needs to be done rather than focus on abstract ideology and throwing quotes back and forth?

Malcolm wrote:

Marxists have very Marxian ideas about what needs to be done, and as part of the Judeo-Christian tradition, they tend to have the view that the planet is here to serve humans, its resources rightly belonging to humans. This is not only contra Buddhist principles, it is contra deep ecological principles.

tellyontellyon said:

It is our actions that really matter.

Malcolm wrote:

It is meritorious to want to help people, of course, but one must not lose sight of what actually creates diversity in this world: it is not economics, it is karma. You can be sure that those super wealthy people who do nothing to benefit others are exhausting their karma. There is nothing to be angry about. They are to be pitied because in their next life, they will be worse than paupers. Nāgārjuna says:

If one becomes a king through long veneration,  
one does not pursue wealth, family, and friends;  
also no matter where people go or live,  
action follows just like a shadow.

If you accumulate positive actions in this life, in the next life you not need to struggle for your wants and needs. If you find you are in place of leisure and wealth in this life, use it for Dharma practice and to help those you can.

tellyontellyon said:

As for saying that Buddhists would be better off not getting involved in politics... well, that's not really possible. Unless you live alone in a cave (and I'm not knocking that btw), then you have a responsibility to contribute to the communal activities of living in a community. That includes working out how you are going to live together, treat each other etc. etc. Restricting contact to members of the Sangha or only to non-materialists is not always possible if you are not a monk. It certainly isn't possible where I live in

Wales.

Malcolm wrote:

The commitments of refuge to the Sangha does not mean that one does not mean that one does not do business and cultivate friendships with non-buddhists, etc., it means that one avoids those who would seek to harm Buddhism or who are engaged in very non-virtuous lifestyles.

tellyontellyon said:

Even if you are a monk, then I still think that monks need to have a think about the food and donations they receive in their alms bowl: I think it is not enough simply to have gratitude... What did the worker have to go through to be able to make that donation?

Malcolm wrote:

As long as your focus is one class, you will have a biased view. Your focus needs to be on all sentient beings.

tellyontellyon said:

Think how many young women, even underage girls in places like Thailand feel pushed into prostitution in order to put meals on the family table.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is a pity, so of course the education of women is a desiderata around the world.

tellyontellyon said:

When monks are meditating on loving kindness, they should spend some time meditating on what some of the poorest and hardest working people in the world have to go through in order to keep them well fed.

Malcolm wrote:

Making donations to the Three Jewels is the best way to ensure one's rebirth will be higher in the next life, with more opportunity. Encouraging others to do so is also meritorious. It is also meritorious to help others as much as one can. It is not meritorious to foment social revolutions when the result is so often death, destruction and war.

tellyontellyon said:

Anyway, whether you agree with me or not. Please, Please stop having sideways stabs at the Muslims, it undermines your own argument and makes you look intolerant.

Malcolm wrote:

I have nothing personal against Muslims. It is their karma to be born Muslims, with animal sacrifice as a major and important part of their religion. In my opinion, part of the reason that Islamic countries have such a high level of violence is that their religion condones animal sacrifice. There is an observable level of poverty and violence that afflicts every nation in which there is a major religion that sanctions animal sacrifice. This is one of the reasons why Southern Hemisphere countries have such problems.

You might object, what about the 60 billion animals a year that are slaughtered for meat to feed the North? The karmic cause is different, therefore the effect is different.

I have a lot of issues with both Islam and Christianity in general. They both are authors of great destruction and havoc in the world. I don't trust Islamic states, or indeed any religious state (including "Buddhist" ones) on any level in general. Thanks goodness one of the effects of the American Constitution was the elimination of state religions in Western Democracies for the most part.

In fact, Marxism and Islam have many structural similarities, similarities noted by George Bataille in his work, *The Accursed Share*. You should read it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

shel said:

So before humans evolved all sentient beings were stuck in a 'narrow' existence, and no existence at for billions of years before life evolved in the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

You are following a "just so story". You have no idea when life first appeared in the universe, if indeed it "first appeared".

shel said:

Yeah, and the universe revolves around the earth...

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that someone told you that there was no life in the universe a x time and you believed them. You have no evidence of such a fact. As you know, the Buddha taught that universe expands and contracts cyclically. This accounts for the appearance increasing complexity, etc. if we are being completely honest, we just admit that we don't know beyond what we can observe and trust the accounts that make the most sense to us for those things we cannot observe. So for example, I don't think that Meru cosmology is particularly true as a "fact"; it is a hierarchical metaphor with roots in ancient mythology.

Evolution is something I accept because it is can predicted. Karma and rebirth is something that I accept because I do not find the materialist presentations of consciousness especially compelling. If I did, I would not bother to be a Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

shel said:

So before humans evolved all sentient beings were stuck in a 'narrow' existence, and no existence at for billions of years before life evolved in the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

You are following a "just so story". You have no idea when life first appeared in the universe, if indeed it "first appeared".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Sanskrit for Nang-wa Tha-yay?

Content:

pemachophel said:

Thanks for the responses. Just to be clear: so are Nang-wa Tha-yay and Od-pag-med synonyms? Are they simply two different Tibetan translations of Amitabha? IOW, when translating these into English, should both terms simply be translated as Amitabha?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are alternate translations of the same Sanskrit word.

Amitābha.

Amita = dpag med, immeasurable, etc.

abha = 'od, light, splendour, etc.

You can clearly see this in titles translated in the tengyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

mutsuk said:

[

For the record, this was what Astus wrote, not me.

Malcolm wrote:

My bad, I did not notice your name in there, I wrote the first post on my Ipad...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I trust the translation, but to interpolate that this means the "consent of the people" in the modern sense of that phrase, I would not. This was the extent of your claim, and I don't accept it.

As regards the idea that the monarch is supposed to be "enlightened," no I don't believe in this either, not in the sense of buddha. However, speaking in terms of practical management of a kingdom, the rule of one who is unenlightened but selected for perceived management capacity, is wiser than the rule of all indiscriminately, who all at the same time are unenlightened. There really is such a thing as too many chefs in the kitchen, i.e. more than one. So, be careful with how far you think my claims are extending -- they may not encompass the breadth you imagine them to. However, I do appreciate your comments, they are by far the most constructive so far.

Malcolm wrote:

as you will recall, Mahā-sammata (an earlier incarnation of the Buddha, and also the Buddhist Manu) was appointed king by farmers who wanted to protect grain they had begun to store. Walsh clearly translates the Buddha explaining that the title Mahasammata means "The People's Choice" and he would only do so based on a commentarial gloss. Also you can find this explained in this alternate translation:

‘He is appointed [agreed to] by the people (mahā, janena sammato),’<sup>114</sup> Vāsetṭha and Bhāradvāja; therefore, he is called “the great elect” (mahā sammata.

<http://dharmafarer.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/2.19-Agganna-S-d27-piya.pdf>

Zhen Li said:

No it doesn't. There are many nuances about democracy as it exists today that don't exist in monarchy. For one, the king is elected by those who have a real stake in the value of the kingdom, not everyone you can find (definitely no baby suffrage here).

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a valid argument, when we say "people", we obviously do not mean babies, we mean adults in full possession their faculties, not those under the authority of others such as children.

Zhen Li said:

Okay, I don't quite see your point. I thought this was about whether monarchy is actually democracy.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that Kings derive their authority from the people, not from heaven.



Zhen Li said:

To reconsider the possibility that I might reply to tellyontellyon's post from earlier, I now think that the main problem is that tellyontellyon might be viewing Marxism in too religious a manner, interpolating all of his own desires of what he thinks the ideal Marx is, that he's unable to see that the reality of Marxism and Trotskyism is not just as he so pleases. With such faith, in place of potential reason, I don't believe it currently possible to engage in any constructive or deconstructive dialogue with regards to Marxism and Trotskyism with tellyontellyon.

Malcolm wrote:

Trots are and have always been religious fanatics. They are the Shia of the Communist world.

Zhen Li said:

However, to address the small matter of an accusation of misrepresentation on my part with regards to the title of one of Trotsky's books, the 1921 Labour Publishing Co. and Allen & Unwin, London edition is indeed named The Defence of Terrorism. Indeed, the idea that Marxist terrorism consists purely of general strikes and paper cuts from leaflets is to ignore and turn a blind eye to the millions of people who died in the name of Communist Terror as most vocally advocated and organised by Leon Davidovich Trotsky.

Malcolm wrote:

Terrorism was not invented by Marx, but he certainly considered it a valid tool to use in a revolution. And you are right, Trotsky was a mass murderer who from a Buddhist point of view is certainly suffering in a lower realm because of his own actions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

The process is a removal of afflictions, and the visions are a sign of that, so they don't appear simply because of the natural state, and thus their disappearance is the final accomplishment. I didn't think dissolution here means total nothing, otherwise it wouldn't be the achievement of buddhahood for the benefit of all beings. Just as in mahamudra non-meditation is not about absolute non-activity. However, it seems to me that thogal and its visions is only one possible method of purification, and not the culmination of everything else, therefore other paths don't need it.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really a process of removing afflictions, it is more of a process of afflictions becoming undone on their own.

Some people assert that the increase of the visions occurs separately from the karmic winds, using this as an example of why for example thogal is superior to other completion stage practices, but too is also not precisely correct. The movement of karmic vāyus in the body is a result of affliction, and it is precisely these that hinder the development of the thogal visions. The postures are meant to still these vāyus which is why you have to remain in them for long periods.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

mutsuk said:

...but that doesn't mean that they don't follow the same process of the build up of a vision and then the vision's dissolution. That's why I said it is like creation and completion.

Malcolm wrote:

The visions in dzogchen are not conceptual constructs like visualizations of the creation and completion stage.

The vanishing of the visions is likened to bands of light returning into a prism, i.e, the colors are inherent in the crystal, but there are no more conditions which cause the potentiality (rtsal) of the crystal to manifest externally.

Thus the buddhaforms and so on that one sees always exist in oneself as the potentiality of the threefold wisdom of the basis, original purity, natural perfection, and compassion. Of these three what actually appears to be an external vision is the compassion aspect.

The Sakyapa explanation of the cause of the appearance of the visions of the first stage of the six branch yoga resembles the explanation of the genesis of the thogal vision of dharmatā. The similarities seem to end there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 10:35 AM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

shel said:

Yes that's the point, there's no hierarchy in evolution, whereas there's a fixed hierarchy Buddhism. That constitutes an irreconcilable difference.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "hierarchy" in terms of karma. You land where you have the karma to land

and that's it.

shel said:

You're saying it's no better to land a maggot than to land a saint?

Malcolm wrote:

Quantitatively yes, qualitatively no in so far as both are sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

smcj said:

The seminal text for the Yogacara and subsequent views is the Uttara Tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, it is the seminal commentary on the Tathāgatagarbha school (viz total absence of reference to concepts like ālaya-vijñāna).

Madhyantavibhanga, Dharmadharmatāvibhanga and Mahāyānasūtra alambkāra are the Yogacara commentaries.

In India there were three major trends in Mahāyāna:

Prajñāpāramitā --> Tathāgatagarbha --> Yogacara

The later two incorporating and modifying ideas found in the earlier.

smcj said:

S.K. Hookam's book traces Yogacara/Shentong to the Uttaratantra. That's what I'm going by.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara is an Indian school; gzhan stong is a Tibetan school based on Kalacakra. They are really completely different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 9:58 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... This is the reason why vase breath is used extensively even in so called sems sde.

dzogchungpa said:

Why "so-called" ?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the term *sems sde* only begins to be used in the *Vima sNying thig*, and the later criticisms of *sems sde* from the point of *sNying thig* are more political than anything else. After all, Longchenpa's *Chos dbying mdzod* is pretty much a commentary on the view of the bodhicitta texts, but it is praised as being the dharmakāya in book form.

In some respects, I am sympathetic to Astus's statement that *man ngag sde* is a return to "tantrism", but he has it slightly wrong. *man ngag sde* represents a desire to ground Dzogchen in its own completely independent system of empowerments, and one can see that it takes a page out of the Kalacakra system of the common four empowerments and then a system of the "higher four empowerments". Please do recall that famed Three Words of Garab Dorje did not even exist until the 1120's when the *Vima Nyingthig* was revealed by Zhangton Tashi Dorje. Prior to this was the seventeen tantra system of the four empowerments [elaborated, unelaborated, etc.]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 9:48 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Its not only those two systems, it is merely articulated most clearly in those two systems.

Astus said:

You mean you know some teachings from other schools too that give similar methods?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the *ṣaḍaṅgayoga* system is actually rather widespread and not confined to Kalacakra, though it is mostly clearly articulated in that system.

Astus said:

Yes, the criticism of the White Self-Sufficient Remedy.

Malcolm wrote:

No, *dkar po gcig thub* is not the same as the system of the four yogas of mahāmudra, they are actually critiqued by Sapan separately and for entirely different reasons. The former is a sudden awakening scheme (which Sapan calls "Chinese Dzogchen"), and Sapan criticizes the latter as a misapplication of Ratnakaraśanti's presentation of of four "yogas" in his *Madhyamakālaṃkara*.

Astus said:

I'd rather like to understand the reason behind considering the appearance of drops and

buddhas - that result in their return to the natural state anyway - is the necessary next step.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know the Kalacakra system well enough to opine about this; but in thogal the four visions appear not because the "natural" state is somehow lacking; they appear in their sequence because persons possess affliction and afflictions attenuate the visions as as they naturally unravel the visions first increase and then vanish. However, the idea that at the end of the four visions there are no appearances is a complete misconception. I will merely quote the beginning of Shabkar's discussion of the fourth vision on this point:

It so happens that in the past some Dzogchenpas have asserted that the kāyas [visible forms] and wisdoms [expressed as the five lights] do not exist within the state of original purity, but this is a great error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 8:05 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The problem I have always had articulating the unique feature of Vajrayāna view to you sutra guys is precisely summed above: wisdom merged into emptiness is the basis [sthana, gzhi], and this is what accounts for the visions in both Dzogchen [klong sde and man ngag sde] as well as Kalacakra.

Astus said:

But that's only those two systems. And even in thogal the fourth vision is the total dissolution, like going through creation and completion stages again. Mahamudra is complete with non-meditation, and there is no point in repeating the whole process of mandalas, mantras and buddhas based on the final realisation. So, I don't think I base my understanding on sutra, since that's how it looks like to me in Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Its not only those two systems, it is merely articulated most clearly in those two systems.

Also Astus, the four yogas are sūtra mahāmudra. If you do not practice the completion stage, mahāmudra according to the upadeśas is a slow path, or so it is asserted by the Sakyapas. This is the reason why vase breath is used extensively even in so called sems sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Sanskrit for Nang-wa Tha-yay?

Content:

pemachophel said:

What's the Sanskrit for Amitabha's epithet, Nang-wa Tha-yay?

Malcolm wrote:

Amitābha.

Amita = mtha' yas, limitless

abha = snang wa, light, splendour, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: giant pressure in between my eyebrows

Content:

threeyears said:

For the last three years I have felt a pressure in between my eyebrows. It doesn't go away when I get off the cushion, it is always there. When I watch it, it moves around. It goes to the back of my head, the sides, into my eyesockets making them twitch, into my nose, up to the top of my head, but it always comes back to the center in between my eyebrows. And it grows incredibly big whenever I watch my thoughts. I stopped meditating for a while because it was becoming so big that I thought my head was going to explode. Its not painful, its just confusing. So for the sake of avoiding brain damage, I put my faith in the people of dharmawheel. Can you please help me?

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds like a disorder of wind -- go see an ayurvedic or tibetan doctor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

smcj said:

The seminal text for the Yogacara and subsequent views is the Uttara Tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, it is the seminal commentary on the Tathāgatagarbha school (viz total absence of reference to concepts like ālaya-vijñāna).

Madhyantavibhanga, Dharmadharmatāvibhanga and Mahāyānasūtra alampara are the Yogacara commentaries.

In India there were three major trends in Mahāyāna:

Prajñāpāramita --> Tathāgatagarbha --> Yogacara

The later two incorporating and modifying ideas found in the earlier.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

So, thögal in tantric mahamudra?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so it seems.

Astus said:

Interesting. I have always had this impression that thögal with its channels and visions is a "step back" to tantra from the direct simplicity of trekchö and mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem I have always had articulating the unique feature of Vajrayāna view to you sutra guys is precisely summed above: wisdom merged into emptiness is the basis [sthana, gzhi], and this is what accounts for the visions in both Dzogchen [klong sde and man ngag sde] as well as Kalacakra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, familiar terms jump out like "gaze at a garland of thighs in cloudless space" and so on.

heart said:

So, thögal in tantric mahamudra?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so it seems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

shel said:

Yes that's the point, there's no hierarchy in evolution, whereas there's a fixed hierarchy Buddhism. That constitutes an irreconcilable difference.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "hierarchy" in terms of karma. You land where you have the karma to land and that's it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Jesse said:

Psychology works with intangibles, experiences, emotions, thoughts, and habits, and that is exactly why it is considered a soft science.

Malcolm wrote:

That really depends on which program you are in, what school, etc.

For example, UVM's psychology program is pretty much hard science all the way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

Seishin said:

I don't disagree Malcolm, which is why I said "preferred" not "correct".

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, I just think that the preference itself is based on a misconception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 18th, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

Seishin said:



The reason "reincarnation" is not preferred in Buddhism is because it is understood throughout the English speaking world, to mean the transmigration of the soul or spirit.

Malcolm wrote:

All terms in Sanskrit or Pali which refer to this phenomena can also be construed in this way [i.e. as transmigration of the soul], which is why there is debate about it between Buddhists and Hindus. Therefore, I reject that there is a valid distinction between "rebirth" as opposed to "reincarnation". They are in fact synonyms.

The distinction was first introduced in the early 70's by Trungpa, incidentally.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Evolution and reincarnation

Content:

Seishin said:

I wasn't saying that Buddha did not teach literal rebirth, I am saying he did not teach "reincarnation" because he did not use the word according to the suttas, essentially refuting your earlier point that Shakyamuni taught "reincarnation". Please re-read what I wrote.

Malcolm wrote:

He did not teach rebirth either, since he did not use that word, according to the suttas.

Actually the term rebirth and reincarnation are just alternate translations of the same term, punarbhāva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Just like deep ecologists, I'm afraid. (And I'm saying that as a huge fan of DE).

Malcolm wrote:

Oh definitely, DE is an intellectual movement in many respects. There is nothing to be gained by Deep Ecologists joining party politics. In the US Green Party, the DE voice has been completely suppressed by the Bookchin faction.

As David Orton points out:

Green parties have become shallow ecology defenders of industrial capitalist society, even if Arne Naess was supportive of them. The German Green Party theoretician Rudolf Bahro resigned from the party in the early 1980s, and pointed out that green party shallow ecology is content to “brush the teeth” of industrial society.

And:

There is arrogance among socialists who think that they should be leading the ecological movement, because they have a “class analysis” and are anti-capitalist. What comes across is that the Left believes it is entitled to intellectual hegemony in the green and environmental movements, by virtue of prior knowledge. The Left does not seem to be able to absorb the pluralism of green and environmental politics – as Naess informed us, “the front is long” – let alone accept the earned leadership of others by virtue of their practical or theoretical work. Ed Abbey noted, through the character Doc Sarvis in *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, the importance of practical involvement in actual environmental struggles: “Let our practice form our doctrine, thus assuring precise theoretical coherence.” (p. 68) The idea that deeper environmentalists and greens can come to an anti-capitalist critique based on their own experiences, without studying Marxism or social ecology, but based on field experience, seems, apparently, difficult to grasp for the Left.

<https://deepgreenweb.blogspot.com/2011/01/deep-ecology-and-left-contradictions.html>

If you are curious as to what my "practical involvement in actual environmental struggles" are, it is precisely my study of traditional medicine, in part inspired by the anarchist writer Laurel Luddites piece, *Anarcho-herbalism*:

Medicine is just one part of the machine that we have to take back and re-create into a form that works for the society we will become. Every herb, pill, and procedure should be judged on its sustainability and accessibility to small groups of people.

<http://www.swsbm.com/HOMEPAGE/Anarcho-herbalism.html>

As for my definition of Marxism, Marxism, as we know, is a failure. Of course the Socialist revolutions of the early 20th century were important in their contributions to shorter work days, etc., all kinds of things we take for granted today in modern post-industrial countries.

But the issue here is defining those features that make Marxism an unsuitable political philosophy for Buddhists. Its advocacy of violence is one reason, the trenchant materialism of the majority of Marxist philosophers is another.

We really do need to get beyond these eighteenth and nineteenth century political models. That is what Deep Ecology is for.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there are differences in the two systems, but it is my present opinion (which could change tomorrow based on some reliably datable text) that it is unlikely that thogal developed until after the Kalacakra was introduced to Tibet (1027). My speculation is that these entopic visions were given a context by the elaborate internal anatomy presented in Kalacakra, and this was further developed by yogis in Dzogchen circles.

mutsuk said:

Both Geluk and Jonang authors concur in saying that the source of the night-time and day-time yogas is in the Prajnaparamita. It's the same in Bon.

Malcolm wrote:

We will see what the Sakyapas have to say about it when I get that far.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

If you wish to be a follower of the Buddha, you will practice avihimsa.

What if you come across something that is violent, harmful and destructive, but your intervention could also be hurtful.

You intervene > harm.

You don't intervene > harm.

You sit on the fence > harm.

What is the solution?

Malcolm wrote:

If you participate in a violent revolution, advocating its aims, causing people, etc., to die, you will assuredly take rebirth in a lower realm. As Marx states:

The purposeless massacres perpetrated since the June and October events, the tedious offering of sacrifices since February and March, the very cannibalism of the counterrevolution will convince the nations that there is only one way in which the murderous death agonies of the old society and the bloody birth throes of the new society can be shortened, simplified and concentrated, and that way is revolutionary terror.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/11/06.htm>

There can never be any harm to anyone through following ahimsa. Non-violent struggles based on ahimsa will never bring harm to anyone. People engaged in non-violent protest may be harmed, but such protest will never bring harm to others.

Then there is the knotty issue of associating with people who have a negative view of Buddhadharma. It is not consistent with one's commitment of refuge to the Sangha to associate with those who are hostile or negative towards Buddhadharma. Therefore, since Marxism is avowedly an enemy of Dharma, as it is the enemy of all religion, it is not appropriate for Buddhists to belong to Marxist political parties (indeed, it is probably better we don't belong to any political parties at all).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

I thought you're a fan of the Frankfurter.s

Malcolm wrote:

I like Adorno, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Jikan said:

Sorry to go temporarily off-topic, but if anyone can direct me to a copy of the translation of Mipham's commentary on the Kalacakra that Malcolm just referenced, I'd greatly appreciate it. Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

If you participated in the recent Longsal Kalacakra, you can apply for membership in the international kalacakra website and you can find it there among the restricted texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

mutsum said:

In the Kalacakra daytime and nighttime yogas, the so-called "visions" are not described as "visions" but as signs (rtags).

Malcolm wrote:

Tagtsang Lotsawa makes the argument, and a very interesting one at that -- he asserts that if wisdom is not the basis, the visions of pratyāhāra will not arise. He then states it is because wisdom is merged with emptiness that the visions can arise:

"Great bliss and empty forms [śūnyatābimba, stong gzugs] are shown to exist in the basis with this wisdom element of the basis [gzhi]...and it is established through the citation of the root text and commentary of "wisdom merged into emptiness." The reasoning is that it is because the visions of the empty forms when mediating on withdrawal [pratyāhāra, so sor sdud pa] and so on will therefore be without a cause." I find this to be a credible account for explaining the genesis of thogal visions as well.

Mipham states in his commentary on the Wisdom Chapter of Kalacakra (as translated by Ives Waldo):

Depending on the great perfection, the path of thod rgal is still a procedure of the completion stage that involves effort. In general establishing the kāya of illusion etc. teaches the display [rtsal] of the illusory body, a teaching which also arises in the father tantras and in the mother tantras. Depending on bliss and bindu, it is taught relying on luminous display. In the Dzogchen tantras there is insight from emptiness the natural state, the wisdom of reality. From mere direct resting in luminous appearance, the conventions of the illusory body etc. are taught.

In all these [teachings], by practicing the intrinsic radiance of the luminous nature of mind as the special pith of the quick path of mantra, both dharmakāya and rūpakāya, in their respective ways are made into real objects, and one seems to enter into them. However, by the distinction of [this experience] having or not having subtle contaminations of karmic prāṇa, whichever it may be, there is the ultimate of all completion stages, the effortless great perfection, the secret path of the Oral Instruction Class, up to the four appearances of thod rgal, with paths ever higher and higher, the vast way of attaining truth that cannot be taken away. There is that explanation, but it is not presented by many writings.

I agree that the daytime yoga in Kalacakra is not thogal, but they even describe buddhaforms showing up in the center of thighs, use of postures and gazes, etc.

Of course there are differences in the two systems, but it is my present opinion (which could change tomorrow based on some reliably datable text) that it is unlikely that thogal developed until after the Kalacakra was introduced to Tibet (1027). My speculation is that these entopic visions were given a context by the elaborate internal anatomy presented in Kalacakra, and this was further developed by yogis in Dzogchen circles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

I do have three seconds though to point out that the vast majority of contemporary Marxism...

Malcolm wrote:

is a bunch of old ladies sitting around wondering why their theories don't work and why no one listens to them, so they endlessly squabble amongst themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Hiya, Treehuggingoctopus, I like the avatar and the name! I've also got Terry Eagleton's book "Why Marx Was Right". It's a great book. I think he is a Christian if I'm right, and quite influenced by the SWP in the UK?

I'll repost this as well:

<http://isme.tamu.edu/ISME07/Meadors07.html>

It's a paper about Buddhist Perspectives on the use of Force, and touches on the Upaya-kaushalya Sutra. Though what this sutra says and how it has been interpreted is certainly open to question. I'm not saying the article 'proves' anything, but it raises interesting points and is well worth a read.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to be a follower of the Buddha, you will practice avihimsa. If you do not wish to be a follower of the Buddha, you can follow the violent creeds of any number of other religions, including the materialist religion of Communism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Malcolm. You are seriously having a fantasy. Look at the countless millions who died under Stalin and Mao, a direct result of Marxist/Leninist principles.

They were a disgusting distortion of Marxism as explained here (for the second time)

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1936/revbet/>

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite familiar with Trotskyist apologetics. They are screed of the losers. I have no doubt that a Trotskyist regime would have been as brutal and murderous as Stalin's, even more so, in fact, since Trotsky was bent on permanent revolution, spread to every

corner of the planet, regardless of whether his attentions were wanted or not. That is a great problem with you Marxists -- the complete lack of ability to respect others when their lack of compliance to your "forces of history" compels you to rob them of their homes, goods, and even their labor all in the name of your completely heartless proletariat revolution. Well thanks but no thanks. I do not want to live in a workers paradise. I do not want to have a dictatorship of the proletariat, it is not inevitable. I do not want to live in the ruined world that will be left after your lot burns down what is left after the failure of "advanced capitalism".

tellyontellyon said:

Oh, and yes. Marxism is materialist, true. So is the theory and practice of most scientists and engineers. Maybe it's all an illusion, but an illusion that us unenlightened folk have to try and live in on a daily basis.

Malcolm wrote:

My point, simply put, is that the thinking of Karl Marx is incompatible with Buddhism. There are all kinds of socialisms that are not, but Marxism most definitely is.

tellyontellyon said:

Sorry, I'm not going to sit by and watch people starve or die of thirst, or get murdered...

Malcolm wrote:

You are doing it right now; right now you are sitting by idly, gossiping on the internet, while people are starving, dying of thirst and being murdered. So spare me the self-righteous rhetoric.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 9:09 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Hell, there have been crossovers between deep ecology and Marxism, too - as any recently published ecocriticism reader should prove.

Malcolm wrote:

To the detriment of Deep Ecology...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

The real weapon of the working class is the General Strike!

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you are actually a Sorelian.

tellyontellyon said:

Are Marxists totally committed to pacifism, no. They are willing to defend themselves against attack. I mentioned that in an earlier post too.

Malcolm wrote:

Trotsky clearly defines red terror as justifiable. You have to be blind not to see it.

tellyontellyon said:

Name the Buddhist country that has no army? Most have the death penalty, something I totally disagree with.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no Buddhist Governments. The reason for that has already been provided. Seeking to be leaders is the business of fools.

tellyontellyon said:

I would hope nobody or the smallest possible number would die in the transition to democratic socialism. If people are killed it will be in self-defence.

Malcolm wrote:

You are seriously having a fantasy. Look at the countless millions who died under Stalin and Mao, a direct result of Marxist/Leninist principles.

tellyontellyon said:

But what is the alternative under a degenerating capitalism? Imperialist war for profit; for land, power, water and food as the worlds becomes unlivable.

Malcolm wrote:

Marxism proposes no alternative because it will do nothing whatsoever to change what it regards as progressive, i.e. industrial civilization (which is entirely consistent with its materialist philosophical position).

tellyontellyon said:

But as Buddhists you say we should not lift a finger. We should sit on our thumbs while billions die of war and starvation and thirst and just watch while the world burns because we are oh so compassionate.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the Buddha did passively watch the Shakya tribe, his kin, being slaughtered and enslaved by the Kosalians when his verbal discouragement failed to move the Kosalian leaders.



Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

theanarchist said:

I met a Tibetan lama who grew up with nomads, and he told us that before he met westerners he didn't even know that something like depression exists. He hadn't heard of anyone there who had that sort of emotional problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, nomads just have problems managing not to kill each other at the slightest pretext.

theanarchist said:

I have also been told that Tibetans usually didn't have so much trouble doing long term solitary retreats.

Malcolm wrote:

Not that many Tibetans actually do solitary retreats.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

thigle said:

Another point is "thögal", which you can not find in mahamudra...

Malcolm wrote:

Not so fast, Kimosabe. My recent studies of Kalacakra and sadāṅgayoga have caused me to revise my opinion about this.

Please examine Ornament of Stainless Light by Norsang Kalsang Gyatso, the section on the daytime withdrawal yoga.

heart said:

Could you elaborate a little Malcolm?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Well, familiar terms jump out like "gaze at a garland of thighs in cloudless space" and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

thigle said:

Another point is "thögal", which you can not find in mahamudra...

Malcolm wrote:

Not so fast, Kimosabe. My recent studies of Kalacakra and sadāṅgayoga have caused me to revise my opinion about this.

Please examine Ornament of Stainless Light by Norsang Kalsang Gyatso, the section on the daytime withdrawal yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Marxism does not advocate terrorism. I have already answered that.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it does. Trotsky quite explicitly states that is perfectly acceptable for communists to engage in terrorism, based on a just war theory.

Marx advocates violent revolution in his manifesto. He certainly is not an advocate of non-violence.

Not only this, but of course Marx is a complete materialist on every sense of the term. So how can Marxism in truth be a fit doctrine for a Buddhist to hold?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Hiya Malcolm.

Well, it does seem that capitalism is inherently unstable and leads to crises. Those crises' also seem to be affecting the whole world. Globalisation, the power of corporations seems to be expanding, and overrides democracy and morality and common sense. As one stock market trader said, "Goldman Sachs Rules The World".

Another way of saying that is "He who pays the piper calls the tune."

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aC19fEqR5bA>

I think if we want to change how we produce things and use the planets resources, then we can not leave our economic system in the hands of such people. You can't control what you don't own... so ownership needs to be collective.. (at least when it comes to the important/big things). That does not mean owning everything or every small/medium business.

~~

Marx didn't only talk about industrial capitalism, he understood financial capitalism. Here's a leaflet:

It's pretty short... for marx.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1865/value-price-profit/>

~~~

Again, people confuse what happened in the Bonapartist Soviet Union with what genuine Marxists today stand for.

This document gives Trotsky's view from 1937.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1937/08/stalinism.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

Marx says nothing about banks and stock markets not already enunciated by Smith, et al.

Trotsky advocated terrorism. How can you admire such people?

Marx and Communism advocate violence and terrorism as valid means to end. This is repugnant.

No Buddhist should advocate Marxism in a real sense. Supporting the goals of Marxism without condemning its explicit advocacy of violent revolution is supporting that violence itself and bears all the karmic consequences of belonging to an army.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Not quite sure why you are having a pop at Islam? All the muslims I have ever met were decent peaceful people. Don't believe everything (or anything) you hear on Fox News.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't pay attention to Fox, CNN, MSNBC, etc. I watch the Daily Show for my infotainment, and not very regularly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 17th, 2014 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Hiya Malcolm.

Well, it does seem that capitalism is inherently unstable and leads to crises.

Malcolm wrote:

Marxist economies are not stable either. Since Marxist economies are predicated upon industrial capitalist means of production, they will be inherently unstable as well.

The problem again is how things scale. low level local capitalism is fine and healthy. What you are talking about is over centralized concentration of wealth. Well, that can happen just as easily in a Marxist workers paradise as a capitalist dystopia.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Longchenpa at TBRC

Content:

Alex Hubbard said:

Thanks, I did that and found two versions, the one from 1973 opened in the reader but not the one from 2000.

Do you know if there are any substantial differences? I'm guessing these are different editions.

Alex.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I doubt it. The 200 edition is the same block prints, AFAIK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Longchenpa at TBRC

Content:

Alex Hubbard said:

Malcolm, yes that's it, thanks so much.

Unfortunately there something wrong as I can't access the reader. It says the RID is invalid. I'll email them. In any case, if you get round to finding your translation I'd really enjoy a read.

Alex.

Malcolm wrote:

just search on this title.

bdud rtsi zil mngar ma

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Longchenpa at TBRC

Content:

Alex Hubbard said:

You're a gent, I appreciate it muchly.

According to 'Sources of the Tibetan Tradition' (which has a pretty idiosyncratic translation) it's in vol.2 pages 328.3– 331.6, but that section on TBRC has the title 'byang chub kyi sems kun byed rgyal po'i don khrin rin chen gru bo' which gave me the impression that the TBRC collection might be a different edition.

Alex.

Malcolm wrote:

dri med 'od zer. " bdud rtsi zil mngar ma/." In gsung thor bu/_dri med 'od zer/(sde dge par ma/). TBRC W23504. 2: 332 - 335. paro, bhutan: lama ngodrup and sherab drimey, 1982. [http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00EGS1013837%7CO2CN67002CN87712CN91062CN91092CN91112CN91122CN91162CN91191PD121506\\$W23504](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00EGS1013837%7CO2CN67002CN87712CN91062CN91092CN91112CN91122CN91162CN91191PD121506$W23504)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Ok, thank very much for clarifying that for me

Malcolm wrote:

Another example might be transient depression due to depleted vata as opposed to a longterm depression caused by the depletion of tarpaka kapha (located in the brain; tshim byed bad kan for the Tibetophiles out there), etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Longchenpa at TBRC

Content:

Alex Hubbard said:

That's great, thanks.

I saw that name but mistook him for one of Dudjom Lingpa's sons.

I'm looking for the original tibetan of his homage to chang. It's in his 'Miscellaneous Collected Works' apparently, I'll go take a look and see if it's there.

Alex.

Malcolm wrote:

I translated it. I'll dig it up later today, it is on another computer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Aagin this is very true, but it still provides no evidence regarding the "accusation" of hyper-realism in regards to the model of the functioning of mind. And, anyway, again, all that is happening is that you are displaying a preference for one conceptual framework over another. Unless, of course, you are saying that Theravada is not Buddhadharma, then we are getting into a whole different conversation.

Malcolm wrote:

What Kevin is saying is that for Theravadins Dharmas are real but persons are not. Perhaps "hyper" is a bit of an exaggeration, but their view is still realist, so far as it goes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

It is not capitalism per se that is the problem. The problem lies in how corporations are

structured, as well as neo-liberal globalization.

But, the nature of capitalist competition itself leads to monopolies, globalisation, hierarchy, a growing disparity between rich and poor. All of this Marx predicted.

Malcolm wrote:

Marx considered capitalism progressive. One of the glaring failures of Marx's theories was his failure to perceive that the industrial capitalist mode of production itself was and is the core of the problem. But not all capitalist enterprise suffers from that because not all capitalist enterprise is necessarily industrial.

Competition, even in capitalism, is not necessarily a negative thing, either. For example, my point of view is "anti-capitalist", but not universally so. A certain amount of capitalism in an economy is necessary, it keeps people invigorated. Even the Buddha supported the notion of profitable investing.

tellyontellyon said:

Whether you agree with anything else he says it appears he was right about that. Even if you don't think marxism is the solution, I don't think capitalism can be either. Just look.

Malcolm wrote:

Marxism has been an utter failure as a solution. Its primary successes all occurred prior to WWI.

tellyontellyon said:

If you think capitalism can be fixed... ok how? What do you think could be done that could solve this? Keynes is a step in the right direction. It was tried in Europe ... and is being torn to pieces before our eyes. Global capitalism continues to become more powerful everywhere.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of fixing capitalism. We already have the means to control it, we simply need to be diligent about making sure that capitalism is properly regulated in ensure the healthy competition upon which it is based. For example, Obama administration's claim that this or that bank is too big to fail is utter nonsense. On the other hand, we need to guarantee small banks.

The fact of the matter is that we already have the means and understanding the balance the social good against the excesses of capitalism. The pity is that you Marxists spend all your time reading Marx, but he is really just tearing a page out of Smith and trying to merge that with Hegel. Marx is a remarkably unoriginal thinker, with a journalists mentality. You should read Smith, thoroughly. His concept of capitalism is really well thought out and socially as well as environmentally sound in many respects. He in fact would be horrified at the modern corporatocracies we are spawning today. He writes very scathingly of those who speculate in the stock market.

However, Smith's views are also unduly enthusiastic about the newly forming industrial economy, and he too, like Marx later, fails to see that the very means of production

themselves drive economic forms of life and therefore, drives politics.

The Luddites understood this quite well, and revolted because of the destruction of cottage industries (which in part arose because of the shuttering of the commons on the 16th and 17th centuries, forced a lot of subsistence level farmers in the British Isles into the trades) that occurred as a result of the burgeoning textile mills.

One of the main points of Deep Ecological thinking is that how we make things is as important as what we make. Centralized production leads to centralized economies. Industrial production is summum bonum of centralized production.

If we want to change our politics, we must change our economy. If we want to change our economy, we must change how we manufacture what we need. If we want to change how we manufacture goods, we must in the end change ourselves.

The Marxist solution is bankrupt precisely because it proposes that all we need to change is our politics and policies, and then everything else will fall into place. This sadly, is the great shortcoming of the Green Parties, who have become little more than a retread of the old left, ala Social Ecology (Murray Bookchin), attempting to foster change at the policy level, rather than at the root, how we manufacture and produce what we use and eat.

tellyontellyon said:

I'm all for reforms of capitalism, but eventually all that gets torn down. At least that is Marx's prediction... what do we see?

Malcolm wrote:

If I were you, I would be more worried about the rise of Islam as a global political force.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Longchenpa at TBRC

Content:

Alex Hubbard said:

Hey folks,

sorry to be a complete dunce but I've tried searching for Longchenpa material over at the TBRC and come up with nada. Could anyone more savvy than me point me in the right direction?

Thanks!

Alex.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to search on his name, i.e. Dri med 'od zer

<http://www.tbrc.org/#!rid=P1583>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

AlexanderS said:

When you say that psychosis and bipolar disorder are physical diseases is that exclusive to these 2 or does it also apply to most "psychiatric illnesses"? Arent most illnesses in TBM a mixture of mental and physical imbalances?

Malcolm wrote:

From a Tibetan medical perspective, emotional disorders must be distinguished from actual psychiatric disorders. The former are fundamentally caused by imbalances in the three humors which arise from the three afflictive emotions. The latter are caused by very serious derangement of either "vata" or "pitta", along with demons. For the most part, the mental illness chapters cover various kinds of demonic causes.

M

AlexanderS said:

Could you give me a brief example of a emotional disorder contra a psychiatric disorder? I simply ask out of curiosity.

Best Alex

Malcolm wrote:

For example, a person who expresses anger compulsively due to an excess of pitta (fire element humor) as opposed to someone who is hallucinating, for example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

3. authorized, selected, agreed upon d iii.93 (mahājana °) vin i.111; iii.150.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the sense of the term.

Zhen Li said:

I don't think we need to do a philological study here, it's pretty clear to anyone that "majority" isn't in the word.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahā...

Certainly you are not going to argue with Āryadeva that the power of the king depends on the consent of the people.

I'd like a quote or reference.

You can find this in his Catuḥśataka, v. 77

Societies servant, paid with a sixth part,

Why are you so arrogant?

Your becoming the agent of actions
depends on being placed in control.

And:

Those who act at others insistence,

Are called fools on this earth.

There is no one else at all

So dependent on others as you.

He also says, v. 88:

The sensible do not acquire kingship.

Since fools have no compassion,

These merciless rulers of men,

though protectors, are irreligious.

As far as enlightened rulership goes, he opines that while once it may have been possible, it is no longer possible, v. 90 states:

Virtuous rulers of the past

Protected the people like children.

Through the practices of this time of strife,

It is now like a waste without wildlife.

(Yogic Deeds of Bodhisattvas, Snow Lion, 1994).

I certainly think that history has certainly demonstrated that rulers, especially sovereign monarchs, are in general completely incompetent. The ideal of the wise, awakened kings is a myth, like the unicorn.

That just lands you smack dab in the lap of democracy again.

No it doesn't. There are many nuances about democracy as it exists today that don't exist in monarchy. For one, the king is elected by those who have a real stake in the value of the kingdom, not everyone you can find (definitely no baby suffrage here).

Athenian Democracy for example, was the province of an elite, a practice initially followed by the framers of the constitution who were unwilling or unable to fully implement the Seven Nations model of direct democracy they had encountered and admired. This also likely had to do with a conflict created by culturally embedded European notions of property rights inherited from the Romans as opposed to First Nation ideas about usufruct rights.

For another, the king has absolute authority. I can elaborate when I have some more time.

Not from a Buddhist point of view. See the above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Even the Dalai Lama doesn't lay this at the door of Marx. I believe the Dalai Lama has great wisdom and compassion and should not be brushed aside so easily.

The world is facing an environmental crisis that threatens the life of everybody on this planet. There will be food shortages. Mineral shortages. Fuel shortages. Communities will be displaced by changing weather patterns and rising seas.

I have no faith whatsoever in capitalism to solve this, I only see the powerful grabbing all they can. I see war and famine. We must find a new way to live together on this planet and it will not be capitalism... even the Taoists may feel the need to act.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not capitalism per se that is the problem. The problem lies in how corporations are structured, as well as neo-liberal globalization.

Of course the state capitalism of the Stalinists and the CCP just turns the State into a corporation.

In fact, there is very little difference in the structure of totalitarian states whether right or left.

Totalitarianism is a scourge, whether it is in the form of a Marxist regime or a Fascist corporatist regime.

All you guys squabbling about the relative merits of worldly political systems need to step back and understand that as followers of Buddhadharma, it is not our job to solve samsara for anyone but ourselves. We cannot solve samsara for anyone else.

We can add our voice, and we can witness, but we are not going to change the behavior of worldlings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Stage nine: abandoned political theories as useless and took up learning Buddhist

primary languages and used all that intellectual talent for study and practice...

Zhen Li said:

Well, I started learning primary languages in stage 7 because it doesn't take much time to figure this stuff out - it takes a lot of time to write about it... and many espressos...

More or less, being a reactionary is abandoning politics. It is saying that all politics is useless, and the natural orders and functions of the world should take over because they're more efficient and yield better results. That includes having a monarch

Malcolm wrote:

Mahasammata means, i.e., "Elected by the majority".

Certainly you are not going to argue with Āryadeva that the power of the king depends on the consent of the people.

That just lands you smack dab in the lap of democracy again.

As Churchill quipped "It has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all the others that have been tried."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Nemo said:

I honestly think the story behind Zhen Li's beliefs would be infinitely more interesting than debunked Austrian praxeology.

Zhen Li said:

Stage 1: Became interested in Marxism based upon the appeal of the goal appearing to be justified.

Stage 2: Decided to base my views on a logical analysis and proceeded to read the Collected Works of Marx and Engels.

Stage 3: Found that transition to Socially Direct Labour isn't explained properly by Marx, found that the Maoist model of experimentation made some sense.

Stage 4: Moral disenchantment with communism through a deeper understanding of the bloody history, and my inability to find anyone who was a pacifist or wasn't bloodthirsty in communist parties. Reduced to intellectual Marxianism.

Stage 5: Found the price-value equation to be nonsense, thus discredited the labour theory of value. Found that Marx stopped advocating historical materialism due to it's lack of empirical concordance. Found that experimentation makes no sense if historical materialism makes no sense.

Stage 6: Conditionally accepted notion of social democracy - improve conditions

through government action. Was liberal/social democrat.

Stage 7: Found economically social democracy doesn't work. Was libertarian - also liked the morality in libertarianism.

Stage 8: Found that libertarianism can't work due to inherent problems with democracy. Discovered Carlyle and neo-cameralist formalism and became a reactionary dinosaur.

Malcolm wrote:

Stage nine: abandoned political theories as useless and took up learning Buddhist primary languages and used all that intellectual talent for study and practice...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: What if Buddhism had become the dominant faith of Europe

Content:

jeeprs said:

The key background factor in all of it was the influence of the nominalists and the overthrow of medieval scholasticism...

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist pramāṇa is nominalist. But it did not help much at all in overthrowing Buddhist medieval scholasticism -- for example, rational people who insist that Meru cosmology is valid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And no, mental illnesses are not automatically attributed to demons. A hefty distortion of the wind energy will be sufficient.

I did not say they were I said "...as well as demons." Demons are the last place we go when we diagnose any kind of illness, when we have exhausted other options of diagnosis and treatment.

However, there are eighteen kinds of bhūtas ('byung po) described in chapter 77 of the man ngag rgyud and chapter 4 of the Uttarasthāna of the Aṣṭāṅga hṛīdāya saṃhita.

See my post here for why Tibetan Medicine practitioners ought to use vata, pitta and kapha:

<http://www.bhaisajya.net/2010/10/bad-humors.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The latter are caused by very serious derangement of either "vata" or "pitta", along with demons.

theanarchist said:

Vata and pitta are concepts from Ayurveda, not Tibetan medicine.

Malcolm wrote:

Would it surprise you to learn that རྩུ་ is how vata is translated into Tibetan? Or that མཁྱིའི་པ་ is how "pitta" is translated into Tibetan? Or that བད་ཀན་ is how kapha is translated into Tibetan? Or that four tantras (rgyud bzhi a.k.a Amritāṅgaṣṭāghuya-upadeśatantra) is heavily based on the Indian Ayurvedic treatise, Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdayasaṃhita? Or that the terms vata, pitta, and kapha (which are in fact rlung, mkhris pa and bad kan) are used in sutras and tantras such as Suvarnaprabhāsa, Kālacakra, etc?

The principle difference between classical Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine is their view: Ayurveda is based on the Sāṃkhya school, Tibetan medicine is based on Buddhist sutras, tantras as well as Ayurveda treatises composed by Buddhists such as Vagbhata (author of the Aṣṭāṅga ḥṛidāya saṃhita), Nāgārjuna and so on. But they both use share the schemes of the tridośa (nyes pa gsum), saptadhātus (lus bzung bdun pa), etc.

As such, they are theoretically nearly identical. In fact, the chapters on mental illness the four tantras are cribbed nearly word for word from the Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdayasaṃhita.

Further, I have crossed trained in both, though my degree is in Tibetan Medicine (Shang Shung/Qinghai University).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

AlexanderS said:

When you say that psychosis and bipolar disorder are physical diseases is that exclusive to these 2 or does it also apply to most "psychiatric illnesses"? Arent most illnesses in TBM a mixture of mental and physical imbalances?

Malcolm wrote:

From a Tibetan medical perspective, emotional disorders must be distinguished from actual psychiatric disorders. The former are fundamentally caused by imbalances in the three humors which arise from the three afflictive emotions. The latter are caused by very serious derangement of either "vata" or "pitta", along with demons. For the most part, the mental illness chapters cover various kinds of demonic causes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Virgo said:

They are an outgrowth of the view of certain logicians that ascribed to a certain view. The purpose of their being described and reasoning for their being taught must be understood within the greater framework of the view of the work from which they come. Specifically, it is a work, dealing with the emptiness of persons, which drives home the same (never touching on the emptiness of all phenomena) by painstakingly describing in great detail, every phenomena which actually does arise and their causation, to show that things arise but people do not. In order to do this effectively and convincingly, it has to go into the utmost detail of the process of a mindstream, to show how none of it is a person, and yet there are mental and physical phenomena which arise.

It is realist in it's nature, not taking mental and physical phenomena as dreamlike, but as quite solid, and real.

Kevin

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 16th, 2014 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: The Three Bodies of the Buddha Sutra

Content:

sherabzangpo said:

I translated this sutra in November 2012. I believe my translation is a better in some ways (I think there may be some mistakes in the 84000 version), but I have yet to do a thorough comparison. Here is the link:

<http://sugatagarbhatranslations.com/2012/11/28/the-three-kayas-sutra/>

Malcolm wrote:

The fact you take ālaya as the ālayavijñāna is an (understandable) error in your translation (not to mention rendering ālaya as "storehouse"). There is no evidence from

the Tibetan text that such a literal reading is warranted.

Finally, in both translations, neither of you have rendered "gnas su dag" perfectly. Hence it would be better to render it as "the purified ālaya is...", "the purified afflicted mind is...".

My point is that there is no such a thing as a finished translation, and all translations are subject to scrutiny and correction, as well as differences of opinion. I have found it to be unprofitable to make bold statements about other translators work unless they are completely incompetent, and neither of you are incompetent.

Will said:

It is a short one Malcolm - give us your version please.

Malcolm wrote:

There is little point, both are fine as far as they go.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

Marxist analysis is...

Malcolm wrote:

...antiquated and irrelevant, fit now only as a subject of literary criticism.

tellyontellyon said:

...but there has to be some way of living on this planet together.

Malcolm wrote:

Go Deep:

The well-being and flourishing of human and nonhuman life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: intrinsic value, inherent value). These values are independent of the usefulness of the nonhuman world for human purposes.

Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves.

Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital human needs.

The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of the human population. The flourishing of nonhuman life requires such a decrease.

Present human interference with the nonhuman world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.

Policies must therefore be changed. These policies affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from the present.

The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent value) rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between big and great.

Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to try to implement the necessary changes.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep_ecology#Principles

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

The US is socialist as per the idea that the government can fix stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the US is a republican democracy based on Locke's notion of the social contract. It is in fact a product of the Scottish Enlightenment.

Zhen Li said:

Capitalism as per Mises is grounded in morality and the nonaggression principle. Only a capitalist economy a la Mises can minimise violence and coercion.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said you are a libertarian. Only libertarians waffle on, insisting that governments are merely about violence and coercion. And you have your head in a bag if you believe capitalism minimizes violence and coercion. Capitalist countries exports violence and coercion to provide comfort at home, generally supporting totalitarian regimes to maintain economic advantage in the market.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

Zhen Li said:

The US has been socialist for decades.

Malcolm wrote:

This is pretty silly.

US has been Keynesian for decades.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Anarchism

Content:

tellyontellyon said:

You have decided that you support something called "Enlightened Despotism", but don't tell us what it is... and then you complain people won't debate you!

Malcolm wrote:

The term is self-evident. The only part I question is whether despots can ever be awake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Because all the five sensory consciousness have to pass through the mano vijnana, which is why I said that this is probably where the mix-up occurs.

Malcolm wrote:

All six sense consciousness are actually one [momentary*] consciousness operating through the five sense gates when those gates meet their objects. This consciousness moment is so brief as to lend the illusion that we are seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking at the same time. We don't, when consciousness functions as an eye consciousness it cannot function as a nose consciousness and so on.

M

The most fundamental unit of time in Abhidharma is the duration of a concept, approximately 7 nanoseconds.

xabir said:

Nice.

Are there any moments where consciousness is not seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking?

Malcolm wrote:

In Madhyamaka, no. Shantideva states:

"When there neither an object or a non-object before the mind, at that time, since there

is no other possibility, the mind is pacified"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: The Three Bodies of the Buddha Sutra

Content:

sherabzangpo said:

I translated this sutra in November 2012. I believe my translation is a better in some ways (I think there may be some mistakes in the 84000 version), but I have yet to do a thorough comparison. Here is the link:

<http://sugatagarbhatranslations.com/2012/11/28/the-three-kayas-sutra/>

Malcolm wrote:

The fact you take ālaya as the ālayavijñāna is an (understandable) error in your translation (not to mention rendering ālaya as "storehouse"). There is no evidence from the Tibetan text that such a literal reading is warranted.

Finally, in both translations, neither of you have rendered "gnas su dag" perfectly. Hence it would be better to render it as "the purified ālaya is...", "the purified afflicted mind is...".

My point is that there is no such a thing as a finished translation, and all translations are subject to scrutiny and correction, as well as differences of opinion. I have found it to be unprofitable to make bold statements about other translators work unless they are completely incompetent, and neither of you are incompetent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Medicine Buddha Sutra translated from Tibetan?

Content:

sherabzangpo said:

Here is the link to my translation of the Concise Medicine Buddha Sutra:

<http://sugatagarbhatranslations.com/2013/04/23/the-exalted-lapis-light-dharani-that-generates-the-power-of-the-tathagatas-meditative-absorption-the-short-medicine-buddha-sutra/>

Malcolm wrote:

One observation:

In Tibetan Materia Medica Vaidurya is not lapis lazuli , it is sapphire, and more specifically star sapphire (which accounts for the checkerboard pattern of the ground in refuge visualizations.

There are blue, white and yellow Vaiduryas. There can never be a white or a yellow Lapis.

Lapis on the other hand is very clearly the stone called mu men (མུ་མེན་). Please consult འཁུངས་དཔེ་དྲི་མེད་ཤེལ་གྱི་མེ་ལོན་ -- this is the standard text reference for materia medica used in Tibetan Medical colleges.

Your reference about beryl is possible, but not definitive.

I should also add, that the word is a generic name for gems that are very shiny and catch light in very specific ways, for example, cat's eye (chrysoberyl) is also called Vaidurya.

Here however it is འུ་ཐུ་ཐོན་ལྷོ་, which is in fact star sapphire, as opposed to the more common indranila, regular blue sapphire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Simon E. said:

Can we clarify our terms here ?

Psychiatry is the branch of medicine that deals with so called 'mental illness'. A psychiatrist is an M.D. Who has undergone further training in psychiatry..

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, this is what I am discussing.

Simon E. said:

You are Loppon. But others are conflating promiscuously .

Malcolm wrote:

Totally sounds like The Dowager:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Simon E. said:

However many see C.B.T. As being very compatible with the development of Mindfulness.

Malcolm wrote:

CBT was developed by a Zen practitioner, so it is not suprizing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Simon E. said:

Can we clarify our terms here ?

Psychiatry is the branch of medicine that deals with so called 'mental illness'. A psychiatrist is an M.D. Who has undergone further training in psychiatry..

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, this is what I am discussing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Because all the five sensory consciousness have to pass through the mano vijnana, which is why I said that this is probably where the mix-up occurs.

Malcolm wrote:

All six sense consciousness are actually one [momentary*] consciousness operating through the five sense gates when those gates meet their objects. This consciousness moment is so brief as to lend the illusion that we are seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking at the same time. We don't, when consciousness functions as an eye consciousness it cannot function as a nose consciousness and so on.

M

The most fundamental unit of time in Abhidharma is the duration of a concept, approximately 7 nanoseconds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 14th, 2014 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

theanarchist said:

Then you had a bad experience and therefor you have a bone to pick with the whole profession and are running a smear campaign...

Malcolm wrote:

Psychiatric medicine, for the most part, cure nothing. They are palliatives only, useful in helping modulate destructive behaviors, of course, useful in suppressing psychotic ideation, of course, but in the end they are also highly destructive substances as well

that often merely replace one kind of suffering with another, such as Tardive Dyskenesia, and so on. Often such drug therapies are little more than chemical straight jackets.

I have watched many people go through the diagnostic mill, one psychiatrist's diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia is another's diagnosis of rapid cycling bi-polar disorder, etc.

There is very little evidence-based science in the diagnosis of psychiatric disorders, since they are generally diagnosis from transient behavior rather than empirically justifiable data. Further, the effects of many drugs used in the treatment of psychiatric disorders are poorly understood. Recent studies show that SSRI's are largely ineffective: They conclude that, "compared with placebo, the new-generation antidepressants do not produce clinically significant improvements in depression in patients who initially have moderate or even very severe depression".
<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn13375-prozac-does-not-work-in-majority-of-depressed-patients.html#.UtVYp3nHFFw>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 14th, 2014 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...

funny, last time I checked, I was a doctor.

Motova said:

Doctor of Medicine, MD?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Medicine

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...for example, cognition of smell could arise from the eye dhātu meeting the form dhātu, etc.

anjali said:

Oddly, something like that does happen with sensory cross-over (synesthesia). For example people seeing sound or hearing light, or seeing touch, etc. How to explain this in traditional teachings? Which makes me wonder if this phenomenon might be a general property of sense consciousness, but one unrecognized and unexplored in traditional teachings.

Sherab Dorje said:

I would hazard a guess and say the mix up occurs when one of the five sense consciousness passes on the info to the mind sense consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

It happens when one of the neural pathways in the brain floods and overloads, it is a physical issue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 4:24 AM

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

Content:

pueraeternus said:

But the end result is still the same. From another angle, the sutra could be seen as easier, since it does not require empowerment nor direct introduction. Of course, teachings and guidance on the path by enlightened teachers and Buddhas are still needed to learn the path.

Malcolm wrote:

If you consider three incalculable eons "easier

pueraeternus said:

But even in the Sravakayana, the path is never taken as "producing" the result - the path leads to the city of Nirvana; it doesn't build it.

Malcolm wrote:

The key distinction here is qualities. Buddhahood is not merely pacification of affliction as in Sravakayāna.

pueraeternus said:

The result does not arise from a cause.

Intimate instructions do not depend on texts.

Buddhahood is not found in the mind.

I am aware of this. It is so like Chan.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

There are some superficial similarities, but Chan does not have direct introduction, since it is sutra path.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We taxpayers pay dearly for waste all the time-- that is what you claim is immoral. You claim that endless research is wasteful and immoral. So is externalizing the cost of the pollution of a massively polluting industry, for example, tar sands, onto governments.

Zhen Li said:

If you're buying the waste it's not an externality...

Malcolm wrote:

That is the point, no one is buying tons of garbage being sunk into the ocean, no one is buying arsenic and heavy metals that flow into the environment, but nevertheless, we taxpayers pick up the costs of disposing of this waste.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Books on the kalachakra teachings

Content:

AlexanderS said:

I was wondering whether any of you can recommend me some good books that includes or provides commentary's on the kalachakra teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many:

Vesna Wallaces three books.

Norsang Kasalng Gyatso's books.

Glenn Wallace has a book of translations

etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Greg: you presented nothing about formless realm beings.

Sherab Dorje said:

By formless realm you mean arupavacara?

Malcolm wrote:

The arūpadhātu with the four āyatana.

Sherab Dorje said:

Also, nothing you presented contradicts the basic Buddhist principle that an eye for example cannot produce the cognition of smell.

Either you seriously misread what I have been saying thus far, or you are waving around red herrings. Neither bodes well.

Malcolm wrote:

The point of the discussion was to demonstrate to cloudburst that one needs more than a manovijñāna indriya to account for various different kinds of sense cognitions.

Sherab Dorje said:

Also, you seem to be under the impression that bhavanga is as fully articulated as the Yogacara ālayavijñāna, but it is not.

It may not be as fully articulated at a theoretical/philosophical level, I agree, yet I have read accounts that conflate the bhavanga with the ālayavijñāna. (ie they basically stated that both terms describe the same phenomenon)

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

The most the Yogacarins say about it is that it is a Nikaya doctrine which proves that ālayavijñāna is valid. Cloudburst, being some sort of strange hybrid of Sautrantika following reasoning and Yogacara rejects the ālayavijñāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, these diseases are still mislabeled.

theanarchist said:

They are not.

How many people with severe mental illnesses have you ever met and talked to about their symptoms and problems? Not many I assume.

Malcolm wrote:

You would assume incorrectly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you are not going to take the discussion seriously then I will ignore your further contributions since they only steal my time.

Sherab Dorje said:

I am taking the discussion seriously, just not deadly seriously (ie I don't really have a horse in the race). On the other hand, if you are willing to examine what you should examine, then it is worth my time to pay attention to your contribution here.

I do examine what I need to examine. Anyway, no need to get bent out of shape just because it doesn't accord to what you believe. We must always respect other people's time, since their time is their life.

It took me plenty of time to dig up the info. that I presented here. Having said that, if you want to be useful, dig up what Theravadins say about formless realm beings.

Well, gee, since you asked so nicely...

Malcolm wrote:

Greg: you presented nothing about formless realm beings. Also, nothing you presented contradicts the basic Buddhist principle that an eye for example cannot produce the cognition of smell. Also, you seem to be under the impression that bhavanga is as fully articulated as the Yogacara ālayavijñāna, but it is not.

Also I have a mild head cold, so I am a little grumpy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

These are mislabeled -- they are not "psychiatric illnesses", they are physical diseases

theanarchist said:

Again wrong. The field of psychiatry covers neurologically caused mental illnesses as

well as environmentally or intrapsychologically caused mental illnesses.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand what psychiatry is. Nevertheless, these diseases are still mislabeled.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Diagnosis, especially of mental illnesses, reflect cultural norms, not scientifically established pathologies.

theanarchist said:

No, they don't. Criteria for the existence of a mental illness is mainly the suffering. And suffering from a state of psychosis, depression, bipolar disorder etc is the same in every culture, even if the interpretations of the unusual behaviour might be different.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read "The Normal and the Pathological".

theanarchist said:

Those symptoms DON`T reflect cultural norms.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually they do.

theanarchist said:

So again, if you have no knowledge about these things, I suggest you stop writing nonsense about them claiming that nonsense to be the truth.

Malcolm wrote:

funny, last time I checked, I was a doctor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Sure you can. People take that kind of money and sink it into luxury commodities all the

time.

Malcolm wrote:

This isn't equivalent. Most luxury commodities, except in the homes of millionaire bureaucrats, are not bought by tax dollars. [/quopte]

That's what you think.

No one pays for waste. That's why it's an externality. You are suggesting making it the product you buy.

We taxpayers pay dearly for waste all the time-- that is what you claim is immoral. You claim that endless research is wasteful and immoral. So is externalizing the cost of the pollution of a massively polluting industry, for example, tar sands, onto governments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 13th, 2014 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We were discussing Madhyamaka, etc. Throwing Abhidhamma into the mix just makes things more complicated to discuss since its concepts are largely irrelevant to the mainstream of Indian Buddhism.

Sherab Dorje said:

What's wrong with complicated? Though I fail to see how Abhidhamma is irrelevant to...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have time for it.

Sherab Dorje said:

I'm not saying that is how Theravadins view formless beings, nor am I interested in proving or disproving their view, I am just proliferating my speculations on the basis of my limited knowledge (ie adding another view to the discussion).

Malcolm wrote:

If you are not going to take the discussion seriously then I will ignore your further contributions since they only steal my time. On the other hand, if you are willing to examine what you should examine, then it is worth my time to pay attention to your contribution here.

We must always respect other people's time, since their time is their life.

Having said that, if you want to be useful, dig up what Theravadins say about formless realm beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So you admit that you are also proliferating a view?

Malcolm wrote:

We were discussing Madhyamaka, etc. Throwing Abhidhamma into the mix just makes things more complicated to discuss since its concepts are largely irrelevant to the mainstream of Indian Buddhism.

Sherab Dorje said:

Here is how Theravadins see a mind sense door process:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to find the specific description in this literature for a formless realm beings cognitions, sense organs, lifespan, propelling karma, etc. That's up to you, since you brought it up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

theanarchist said:

That's really nonsense. Back then there was not even a standard for diagnosing psychiatric illnesses and there was no evaluation of the outcome of the treatments. That guy probably had a zero cure rate with those means with anyone truly suffering from a psychiatric illness. It might have helped with some psychosomatic problems that respond well to placebo effects.

Malcolm wrote:

Diagnosis, especially of mental illnesses, reflect cultural norms, not scientifically established pathologies.

theanarchist said:

Then there are those psychiatric diseases that don't respond to psychotherapy that well, that depend on medications in their treatment, like psychosis and the bipolar disorder.

Malcolm wrote:

These are mislabeled -- they are not "psychiatric illnesses", they are physical diseases

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Is Psychotherapy Better Than Astrology?

Content:

Virgo said:

I don;t think Astrology was ever really used for therapeutic purposes historically. It was more functional, ie. this is a good day to do this, this isn't; this is a good time to plant crops, this isn't; this is a good time to have a child, this isn't, etc.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Astrology has been used as a diagnostic tool in medicine for centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The caveat is that it doesn't necessarily produce results which can be capitalized.

Zhen Li said:

Well they do, otherwise no one would do it.

Malcolm wrote:

The operative word is "necessarily".

Zhen Li said:

I'm not sure we can really say that there's any significant private sector research outside of engineering and technology.

Malcolm wrote:

What kind of research are we talking about?

On the other hand, publicly funded research does not need to demonstrates short term results to continue. There may a lot of waste, but so what?

So you are suggesting a model which drones on forever with low output.

Research needs to demonstrate results, that's the point. If your model is inaccurate to the level of Hansen, you would be fired in the private sector because it could mean the survival of the firm.

Not necessarily -- look at Microsoft -- worst operating system every invented.

In the public sector, you have people like that who simply say "more research is needed" whenever they come up without being able to confirm their own theory. This is the fundamental flaw in their understanding of the scientific method. You don't say more research is needed if your expected dataset isn't found to fit your theory - you change the theory. Science is pretty simple in this regard - you take what data exists, and you explain how it fits together, that is your theory. Then you have positive results no matter what data you find! Problem solved - but the public sector doesn't allow this to happen. If you are saying to the public, "we need 30 more years of observation and funding," you're saying that your current theory is unfalsifiable, and therefore unscientific. Collecting data and making measurements is fundamentally not science, that's data collection. Science is the explanation of the data, and your opinion of that explanation. That doesn't take a 30 year project, if it does, you haven't learned anything in university.

Science ought to be an open ended inquiry.

And fundamentally these kinds of attitudes are just immoral. You can't justify taking the money of productive labour to fund standstill results.

Sure you can. People take that kind of money and sink it into luxury commodities all the time.

Paying for waste can't be justified, that's just the kind of lazy and immoral mentality that one would expect from a Marxist, not a deep ecologist.

We, Joe Public, pay for waste constantly. Waste is one of the principal externalities of modern capitalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Theravada Abhidhamma is completely irrelevant to discussions regarding Madhyamaka, Yogacara, Vajrayāna, Mahāyāna and so on.

In any case, none of what you describe demonstrates that formless realm beings are capable of more than a single cognition during their lifespans.

In fact, your citation merely supports this view, "While a mind-door process can also take any of the five sense data as object, mental object is listed to show its distinctive datum", this means that a sense organ related to the sense datum is required for the requisite cognition of that object to take place. The mind operates through any of the six indriyas, taking the name of that sense gate when it is operating through that sense gate. But the mind cannot smell a form when it is operating through the eye gateway. Since formless realm beings only have a mental indriya, they do not perceive any material objects and since they have no input, they only cognize the concept that propels their rebirth.

If you want to prove this view of the Sautrantikas incorrect, you have some work to do.

It is better to study Abhidharma if you want to understand the context of Indian Buddhism.

Abhidharmakoshaśāstram, AFAIK, there is no different explanation given in Yogācāra or for that matter in the Abhidharmasammucaya. You can understand it in the following way: without physical organs, the mental organ can only have a single object present before it, the thought that propels its rebirth into that āyatana.

You see, this is why people should study Vasubandhu in detail -- then they will have less proliferation and speculation about many things.

M

Sherab Dorje said:

Vasubandhu is merely one take on the matter. Acariya Sangaha states in the Abhidhammattha Sangaha (2000), p152 that for a mind process to occur the one needs the following conditions to be present:

- 1)The heart base (hadayavatthu)*
- 2)A mental object (dhammarammana)
- 3)The bhavanga
- 4)Attention

*"For the mind-door process, the heart-base is only required in those realms where matter is found. While a mind-door process can also take any of the five sense data as object, mental object is listed to show its distinctive datum."

He goes on to say that: "The six types of cognitive processes are conveniently divided into two groups —

(1) the five-door process (pañcadvāravīthi), which includes the five processes occurring at each of the physical sense doors; and (2) the mind-door process (manodvāravīthi), which comprises all processes that occur solely at the mind door. Since the bhavanga is

also the channel from which the five-door processes emerge, the latter is sometimes called "mixed door processes" (missaka-dvāravīthi), inasmuch as they involve both the mind door and a physical sense door. The processes that occur solely at the mind door are then called "bare mind door processes" (suddha-manodvāravīthi), since they emerge

from the bhavanga alone without the instrumentality of a physical sense door. As will be seen, the first five processes all follow a uniform pattern despite the difference in the sense faculty through which they occur, while the sixth comprises a variety of processes

that are alike only in that they occur independently of the external sense doors. "

I see your proliferation and speculation and raise you a pedantry.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 10:09 PM

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

Content:

pueraeternus said:

prajna is probably a better candidate if we were to favour any of them.

Malcolm wrote:

They are actually progressive in the beginning, one builds on the last.

Direct introduction is what it claims to be: a direct introduction to your own state of liberation. You have always had that state, otherwise, you could not be introduced to it. This is why the state of liberation itself is not produced from causes -- it is innate. If it were not innate, if it were something created from causes and conditions, it would be perishable, and therefore, Buddhahood would be something temporary, part of the six lokas

I do not dispute this. Such an idea is found in the earliest strata teachings on nirvana and (later on) tathagatagarbha (the un compounded, unconditioned, uncreated, etc), so I don't think its really that groundbreaking.

The difference between sutra and tantra is empowerment. There is no direct introduction in Sutra. There are also important differences in terms of how the result is contextualized in sutra and tantra in general, and dzogchen specifically.

The path of Dzogchen is exactly what it claims to be: a path upon which there is no progress since the state of liberation is introduced to oneself from the start; the sole stage since all living beings are on it; the result that does not arise from a cause, etc.

The result that does not arise from a cause, except that you do need the eight indriyas?

If the result really does not arise from a cause, then even sraddha won't be needed?

The eight indriyas do not produce the result. For example, gold is present in ore. But you still may need to process the gold with mercury and other substances in order to extract it. You would never say the gold was the result of the process, merely that the process is used to extract it. Likewise, in Dzogchen the path is used merely to extract the result, but you never say that the path produces the result. Indeed, not is the path taken as the result, as in the path of transformation, the result is the path.

I did (study) and I still do (erm, more or less) .

Then it is important to be clear about the six special features of Dzogchen teachings:

The result does not arise from a cause.

Intimate instructions do not depend on texts.

Buddhahood is not found in the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Formless realm beings have only a mental organ, they therefore have only one thought, which is the concept which propels their birth in the four formless āyatanas.

Sherab Dorje said:

Not wanting to be a stick in the mud, but what is your source for this?

Malcolm wrote:

Abhidharmakoshaḥ, AFAIK, there is no different explanation given in Yogacara or for that matter in the Abhidharmasammucaya. You can understand it in the following way: without physical organs, the mental organ can only have a single object present before it, the thought that propels its rebirth into that āyatana.

You see, this is why people should study Vasubandhu in detail -- then they will have less proliferation and speculation about many things.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Mental objects are one class of objects, material objects are another class of objects. You are conflating the two. A mental object (part of the dharmadhātu) is an object for the mano dhātu. A material object is an object for the other five dhātus, form for eye, etc.

Sherab Dorje said:

That is one view/theory. From my understanding Theravadins put the mind as a sense organ at the same level as the other five, yet a component in the functioning of the "material" sensory process too. So it has two roles: the sensing of mental objects and the sensing of mental objects produced by the other five sense consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

The function of vijñāna is really best comprehended by understand the complete presentation of skandhas, āyatanas and dhātus. There is no significant difference between how these are presented in the Vibhanga, for example, and the Koshaḥ.

In both systems, manovijñānadhātu arises from the contact of the mano-indriya dhātu and the dharmadhātu.

12 āyatanas, the manoāyatana covers all sense perceptions because the emphasis is different.

In brief, the emphasis of the presentation of 5 skandhas is on the sense organs, the presentation of the 12 āyatanas emphasizes the sense objects, and the presentation of the 18 dhātus emphasizes the sense consciousnesses.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

so you are saying madhaymikas do not accept the existence of formless-realm beings?

Malcolm wrote:

I addressed this above, so I am not sure why you are asking this question.

cloudburst said:

I am interested to see if you can give a coherent explanation of external object without positing or implying an essence. So far, I don't think you've done so.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I have, external objects are composed of the inert five elements, arising from causes and conditions, lacking any intrinsic nature.

cloudburst said:

In that case you can give an example of an object that is not and has never appeared to mind. If it is an object, it is an object of mind, or an appearance. What else?

Malcolm wrote:

Mental objects are one class of objects, material objects are another class of objects. You are conflating the two. A mental object (part of the dharmadhātu) is an object for the mano dhātu. A material object is an object for the other five dhātus, form for eye, etc.

When for example the manodhātu meets an object that is part of dharmadhātu, a manovijñāna is generated. Before a vijñāna can be generated, the object must appear to the appropriate sense organ (indriya).

When the cakṣudhātu meets the rūpadhātu a cakṣuvijñāna is generated. If it were the case that there are only mental objects any sense consciousness could arise from any sense objects, for example, cognition of smell could arise from the eye dhātu meeting the form dhātu, etc.

It is not the intention of Madhyamaka to undermine this or that conventional presentation of the skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas, but merely to show that they are not paramārtha dharmas.

Of course, as I said, if you prefer to follow the Yogacara presentation of conventional truth that's ok with me, but it was rejected by Candrakīrti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 12th, 2014 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

This is why government is a hopeless manage...

Malcolm wrote:

Your libertarianism is showing. In reality, publicly funded research is far more productive than private funded research. The caveat is that it doesn't necessarily produce results which can be capitalized. Private sector research is at the mercy of the same sorts of people that public sector research is: the only difference is their name -- in the private sector they are called "managers"; in the public sector they are called "bureaucrats". On the other hand, publicly funded research does not need to demonstrate short term results to continue. There may be a lot of waste, but so what? Compared to how much money is spent on means to kill people, it is nothing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Unknown said:

The climate change counter-movement is lavishly funded by dark money to prevent policies limiting carbon pollution that drives man-made climate change

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.ecobuddhism.org/science/cover_up/1bycdm

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Rebirth is different from reincarnation.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, many people over the years try to make this distinction, but I think it is a reach.

As far as I am concerned reincarnation and rebirth mean the same thing.

In reality, the term in Sanskrit is punarbhāva, which literally means "repeated existence".

For eternalists, this "repeated existence" happens because of an essence, as you rightly observe. For us, it happens because of continuing nexus of action and affliction. In both case, a body is appropriated repeatedly, hence they are both theories of reincarnation. In both cases, one is born repeatedly, hence they are both theories of rebirth.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 10:49 PM

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

Content:

Ivo said:

In textual terms, the earliest dzogchen material would be the Dunghuang manuscripts. I am not aware of any tantric references in these texts, are there? On the other hand:

Malcolm wrote:

Part of the confusions arises from the fact that Dzogchen is consistently framed as part of secret mantra (which it is). It is not however a path of renunciation or transformation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

duckfiasco said:

Malcolm, if we need sense organs and contact to have cognition, how does that relate to the appearance of sensory phenomena in dreams or hallucinations? I'm thinking also of things like phantom limb syndrome or the lights that appear in sensory deprivation tanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Dreams are a product of waking impressions on the mind.

Hallucinations are a product of defective or deranged sense organs (through drugs, etc.).

conebeckham said:

In the case of Hallucinogens, is it the case that it is the sense organs, or the sense consciousness(es), or the mental consciousness itself, that is "altered" (defective or deranged, to use your words)??

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because what is affected by hallucinogens are various different paths in the brain connected with the sense organs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 9:45 PM

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

Content:

pueraeternus said:

The 15th-19th indriyas (sraddha, virya, smṛti, samādhi, prajña) are requisites for purification (vyavahāra) and faculties for praxis. They all need to be present and balanced for praxis to be possible in a proper manner. I don't see how this leads to "Direct introduction always works in someone who possesses devotion" - you have to explain better. If you mentioned the 3 pure indriyas - anāyatamānāśyamindriya, ajñendriya and ajñatadvindriya, then you might have a point somewhere there, but sraddha? This sounds so much like, at best, the most strident strain of Pureland faith, or at worse, evangelical Christianity.

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty straightforward: you need to have interest, diligence, etc., for direct introduction to be of any real use. If you have interest, diligence, etc., it undoubtedly works. These eight indriyas beginning with sraddha are path dharmas yes? Since this is so, they are necessary for being on a path, even a Dzogchen path. Also this was never disputed.

Direct introduction is what it claims to be: a direct introduction to your own state of liberation. You have always had that state, otherwise, you could not be introduced to it. This is why the state of liberation itself is not produced from causes -- it is innate. If it were not innate, if it were something created from causes and conditions, it would be perishable, and therefore, Buddhahood would be something temporary, part of the six lokas

The path of Dzogchen is exactly what it claims to be: a path upon which there is no progress since the state of liberation is introduced to oneself from the start; the sole stage since all living beings are on it; the result that does not arise from a cause, etc.

If you want to understand Dzogchen concretely, you need to study and practice Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

duckfiasco said:

So is the difference here then that Yogacara asserts that every sense consciousness is a form of mind consciousness, whereas Madhyamaka holds the mind to be a facet of cognition along with other elements?

Sorry to ask such a basic question but I only recently came across the idea that experience is literally a manifestation of the mind in this thread:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=39&t=11280>

Trying to pick up the pieces of my blown mind here and there. Not sure how they fit back together!

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamakas such as Candrakīrti consistently maintain that a mind will not be produced in absence of a sense organ or an object.

Sherab Dorje said:

Surely though, a being born without sense organs would still possess the mind sense organ and have experiences based on past sensations. I am thinking here of beings without a physical body.

Malcolm wrote:

Formless realm beings have only a mental organ, they therefore have only one thought, which is the concept which propels their birth in the four formless āyatanas.

Bardo beings have a subtle body with a complete complement of sense organs. It is said however in Abhidharma they do not see the sun and moon because of not being born of male and female elements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

duckfiasco said:

So is the difference here then that Yogacara asserts that every sense consciousness is a form of mind consciousness, whereas Madhyamaka holds the mind to be a facet of cognition along with other elements?

Sorry to ask such a basic question but I only recently came across the idea that experience is literally a manifestation of the mind in this thread:
<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=39&t=11280>

Trying to pick up the pieces of my blown mind here and there. Not sure how they fit back together!

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamakas such as Candrakīrti consistently maintain that a mind will not be produced in absence of a sense organ or an object.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

duckfiasco said:

Malcolm, if we need sense organs and contact to have cognition, how does that relate to the appearance of sensory phenomena in dreams or hallucinations? I'm thinking also of things like phantom limb syndrome or the lights that appear in sensory deprivation tanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Dreams are a product of waking impressions on the mind.

Hallucinations are a product of defective or deranged sense organs (through drugs, etc.).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

don't need organs for appearances, but do need object. Appearances (objects) and minds are non dual, that's why appearances are not independent, so a thunderstorm other than mere karmic appearance cannot reasonably be posited.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Yogācāra, you only need a mental organ (and traces, etc.). If you are a Madhyamaka, however, you need a sense organ in order to have a cognition of an object. For example, Candrakīrti's definition of the two kinds of relative truth explicitly depends on possessing a healthy or defective sense organ.

Its ok with me if you want to abandon Madhyamaka, but it is a little surprising to see a Gelugpa do so.

The assertion that appearances and objects are identical is mistaken. If this were the case, there could be no common basis for the imputation of liquids by beings of the six realms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

if objects were more than mere appearances, they could be found upon investigation, don't you think?

Malcolm wrote:

They can be found conventionally upon investigation, don't you think? That is, they can be rationally inferred by ordinary persons.

cloudburst said:

sure, but whatever we have found in a conventional search is always mere appearance, so you have made no progress

Malcolm wrote:

There can be no subjective pole without the establishment of an objective pole. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that in addition to mind, external objects are required for appearances. You are placing all the primacy of this arrangement on mind. But equal weight must be given to the object and sense organ. For example, a blind man can not see color. He cannot even have the appearance of color. We can see color, he cannot. We can see color because all three things required for a cognition of color are present, an undeluded mind, a healthy sense organ and an external object. Madhyamakas in this respect never make mind the primary factor in cognition because that mind cannot even arise in absence of the object and the organ. So in this respect, you have to admit that the appearance is also dependent on the organ and the object, not just the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

if objects were more than mere appearances, they could be found upon investigation, don't you think?

Malcolm wrote:

They can be found conventionally upon investigation, don't you think? That is, they can be rationally inferred by ordinary persons.

Of course, then we enter the knotty complexity of the Gelug assertion that objects are only to be investigated for their ultimate nature, without negating their conventional status.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

dude said:

So the physical world does not exist.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Cittamatra school, this would be their assertion. All that exists are minds.

I must say, you do sound pissed off most of the time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

The cognition of the object arises, and because this object is not itself mind, we can correctly say it is external,

Malcolm wrote:

Since you admit the existence of objects that are external to the mind, you are also admitting that thunderstorms, mountains and so on are not necessarily products of karma, regardless of whatever other products they might be.

If objects are products of karma, they are necessarily mental in nature since their cause is intention (cetana), which is another name for karma.

cloudburst said:

they are external in the sense of not being clarity that is aware, they are appearances and so and arise in dependence upon the mind. Therefore they precisely are the products of karma. If they did not arise from imprints, or mind, they would have to arise from something independent of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to me you are conflating the appearance of an object with an object itself.

I have no problem with the idea that how objects appear to us is based on our own karmic traces. I have a problem with the assertion that Madhyamakas like Candrakirti are asserting that objects are nothing other than appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

The cognition of the object arises, and because this object is not itself mind, we can correctly say it is external,

Malcolm wrote:

Since you admit the existence of objects that are external to the mind, you are also admitting that thunderstorms, mountains and so on are not necessarily products of karma, regardless of whatever other products they might be.

If objects are products of karma, they are necessarily mental in nature since their cause is intention (cetana), which is another name for karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

how do you square that with the fact that when you search for something with wisdom, it vanishes? If something is not merely an appearance, it would be found upon investigation.

Malcolm wrote:

According to your school (Gelug), the only thing that vanishes in that instance is the mistaken perception of inherent existence, but not the conventional appearance of a given phenomena which is posited as necessary in order in order for its emptiness to be established.

According to Madhyamaka in general, there may indeed be no appearances during equipoise, but in post-equipoise, of course there are appearances (which are illusory and unreal).

M

cloudburst said:

so in both cases, nothing is found to exist independent of mind. How does that square with the fact that you have posited that Chandrakirti accepts thunderstorms that are not mere appearances?

Malcolm wrote:

A mind will not find any appearances independent of itself, since it is axiomatic that all appearances to a mind belong to that mind, whether veridical or deluded.

On the other hand it is clear Candrakirti accepts external things from the following statement in the commentary to Intro to the Middle Way: "The intrinsic nature of all external things is of two types, relative and ultimate."

Since a cognition of an object (which is what an appearance is) cannot arise in absence of an object external to the mind (according to Candrakirti, recall any sense cognition requires the meeting of three things, a mind, an organ and object), it is suitable to infer that there are phenomena external to the mind, such as thunderstorms and so on. Even in the case of the appearance of the six realms there must be an object (for example, a liquid) which can form the basis of the six kinds of imputations of water, ambrosia, etc.

As far as I am personally concerned, it matters little to me whether you wish to take the Yogacara view of relative truth, which you are advocating here, or the Sautrantika view of relative truth which is the POV advocated by most Indian Madhyamikas including Candrakirti (for whom objects are held to be external to the mind arising through their own causes and conditions, albeit not necessarily karmic causes and conditions).

I already clarified that for Yogacara in general all appearances are generated by the activation of traces from past karma. It is a nice theory, but not one that finds much favor in Madhyamaka until Shantarakshita's Yogacara Madhyamaka synthesis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

There is no thunderstorm that is not a mere appearance to mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, as I said it depends on what tenet system you want to follow. If you want to follow Yogacara for your relative truth claim, I have no objection.

cloudburst said:

You are not positing a container that exists separately from our perceptions?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not positing anything, but definitely, Sautrantikas (and indeed some Yogacarins) posit a container that is independent of our perceptions. Therefore, if you are following Sautrantika presentations of relative truth (as indeed both Bhavaviveka and Candrakirti do), there are indeed thunderstorms that are not merely appearances to minds.

M

cloudburst said:

how do you square that with the fact that when you search for something with wisdom, it vanishes? If something is not merely an appearance, it would be found upon investigation.

Malcolm wrote:

According to your school (Gelug), the only thing that vanishes in that instance is the mistaken perception of inherent existence, but not the conventional appearance of a given phenomena which is posited as necessary in order in order for its emptiness to be established.

According to Madhyamaka in general, there may indeed be no appearances during equipoise, but in post-equipoise, of course there are appearances (which are illusory and unreal).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Really, the guidelines about pure meat is only relevant if you are begging for it (like mendicants as it meant to be applied to), not shopping at the supermarket.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhavaviveka reviews all the arguments against meat-eating in Mahayāna. His conclusion is that as long as the meat that you eat is pure in three ways, it is karma free.

pueraeternus said:

Sadly, many seems to have forgotten that the pursue of Buddhahood is for the sake of all sentient beings, not a self-centered goal of attaining Buddhahood, whatever that means by the time it gets to this sad state of affairs.

Malcolm wrote:

Others seem to have forgotten that followers of Buddhadharma are not Jains, nor followers of Devadatta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 3:36 AM

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

Content:

pueraeternus said:

[

So more cause and effect then.

Malcolm wrote:

As noted, meeting the teachings depends on meritorious causes. Liberation however does not.

Oh you mean those indriyas. But how did you get from that to "Direct introduction always works in someone who possesses devotion"? I suppose you are assuming this based on, erm, faith?

The first of eight indriyas of nirvana is śraddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

There is no thunderstorm that is not a mere appearance to mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, as I said it depends on what tenet system you want to follow. If you want to follow Yogacara for your relative truth claim, I have no objection.

cloudburst said:

You are not positing a container that exists separately from our perceptions?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not positing anything, but definitely, Sautrantikas (and indeed some Yogacarins) posit a container that is independent of our perceptions. Therefore, if you are following Sautrantika presentations of relative truth (as indeed both Bhavaviveka and Candrakirti do), there are indeed thunderstorms that are not merely appearances to minds.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

jianblade said:

Does one need to accept the concepts of reincarnation karma and the wheel of samsara to follow the teaching of the Buddha? I don't feel comfortable believing in said things...

ajohn4717 said:

A gross misunderstanding of about Buddhism exists today, especially in the notion of reincarnation. The common misunderstanding is that a person has led countless previous lives, usually as an animal, but somehow in this life he is born as a human being and in the next life he will be reborn as an animal, depending on the kind of life he has lived.

This misunderstanding arises because people usually do not know-how to read the sutras or sacred writings. It is said that the Buddha left 84,000 teachings; the symbolic figure represents the diverse backgrounds characteristics, tastes, etc. of the people. The Buddha taught according to the mental and spiritual capacity of each individual. For the simple village folks living during the time of the Buddha, the doctrine of reincarnation was a powerful moral lesson. Fear of birth into the animal world must have frightened many people from acting like animals in this life. If we take this teaching literally today we are confused because we cannot understand it rationally.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course reincarnation or rebirth can be understood rationally. As a matter of fact, the four kinds of realized persons (stream enterers, etc.) are defined precisely by how many lives they must undergo until they attain nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 11:49 PM

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

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Could you share a few examples of such ways to introduce beings to Dzogchen when they have never come into contact with it before?

Malcolm wrote:

This is covered in the teaching call the six liberations, liberation through seeing, hearing, taste, touch, smell and recollection. These are six means to create conducive conditions for beings to meet the teachings.

pueraeternus said:

Noted. Mind refreshing my memory?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes sraddha is one of the five indriyas, which becomes the five balas, powers and so on along with recollection, prajñā, samadhi, etc.

Look into the 22 indriyas as discussed in the second chapter of the Koshabhāsyam. The first fourteen are indriyas of samsara, the final eight are the indriyas of nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 11:29 PM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, there are causes and conditions related to achieving a precious human birth, who ever said otherwise.

pueraeternus said:

So ultimately the practice of the path still depends on cause and effect. Successfully introduction to the natural state is akin to the path of seeing, and even after that there is need to engage practices (even if it is just simple guru yoga) to stabilize. Not that much different from vanilla Bodhisattvayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Meeting the path depends on cause and effect, but this was never denied.

Direct introduction always works in someone who possesses devotion. That devotion will be based on past contact of the with the teachings. If someone has not had contact with Dzogchen teachings in the past, there is no chance they will even hear the word Dzogchen in this life.

If someone has no contact in the past, and hence can't even hear the word Dzogchen in this life, that would mean they will never ever be able to hear it in future lives. I didn't know there are teachings on icchantikas in Dzogchen. Just kidding - but I am sure you have thought of this illogical loop before?

There are all kinds of ways devised to ensure the beings contact with Dzogchen teachings. And the Dzogchen tantras themselves assert that all sentient beings will be liberated in the end, so no, Dzogchen does not support the concept of icchantikas.

I am afraid this is just pious fiction. Sraddha and jnana are not cognate, or relates that way. The success rate is just not very high.

I am afraid you must revisit the first of the nirvanic indriyas and revise your point of view.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Ivo said:

It is traditionally said that there are in existence more than 6 400 000 Dzogchen tantras and only a fraction of those have been taught on Earth.

Malcolm wrote:

According to tradition, there were 6,400,000 shlokas of Dzogchen, not tantras.

Those shlokas were all taught by Garab Dorje.

However, the tradition holds that not all the 6,400,000 shlokas were translated into Tibetan, for example, the bkod pa chen po in 500,000 shlokas was never translated into Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 11:06 PM

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

Content:

pueraeternus said:

So how do one attain this non-dual view?

Malcolm wrote:

You receive direct introduction to your own state.

pueraeternus said:

So there is cause and condition to attaining this view?

What if the direct introduction didn't work?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, there are causes and conditions related to achieving a precious human birth, who ever said otherwise.

Direct introduction always works in someone who possesses devotion. That devotion will be based on past contact of with the teachings. If someone has not had contact with Dzogchen teachings in the past, there is no chance they will even hear the word Dzogchen in this life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 11:03 PM

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

Content:

heart said:

[Accumulation of merit is not done to gain realization it is done to assure the continued auspicious circumstances of such a practice that "abides in liberation, even if those moments of liberation are incredibly brief" until it is continuous.

Malcolm wrote:

I addressed this above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 10:58 PM

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

Content:

pueraeternus said:

So what is that dependent on?

Malcolm wrote:

Whether you have the non-dual view or not.

As samsara was abandoned for something else,

nirvana will not be realized

-- Hevajra Tantra

pueraeternus said:

So how do one attain this non-dual view?

Malcolm wrote:

You receive direct introduction to your own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 7:42 AM

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

Content:

smcj said:

The point is that where you think you are does not matter [snang lugs], its where you actually are that counts [gnas lugs].

Well I think I don't like to suffer. If someone tells me that my suffering is ok they'd better not be within punching distance, otherwise they will quickly find out if their suffering is ok.

Malcolm wrote:

Your suffering is the ripening of your karma. There is nothing you can do about suffering you are presently experiencing or have experienced. There is something you can do about the suffering you have yet to experience, but it does not involve complicated schemes involving purification of infinite past causes of suffering. Even if you could purify the causes of suffering for 10 to the 100th power of past lives, the amount of

causes for suffering left over dwarf this number.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 7:31 AM

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

Content:

theanarchist said:

They are like the train to Paris. If you are already in Paris, then it wouldn't make sense to take the train to Paris. But if you are not there, you will need that train to get there.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen perspective is that we are all in Paris and always have been.

theanarchist said:

Yeah, but we have a VERY hefty, substantial hallucination of being in Rome. Or New York. Or Vladivostok. And the hallucination is so persistent that the buddhas in their wisdom had to give us illusory transports that we could take to get to Paris.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that where you think you are does not matter [snang lugs], its where you actually are that counts [gnas lugs].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 7:14 AM

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

Content:

theanarchist said:

Rituals etc are skillful means. If you can rest in the nature of mind, then you don't need them.

heart said:

Rituals also gives opportunity to rest in the natural state, if you are capable.

/magnus

theanarchist said:

Yeah.

A vajrayana ritual on the relative level is something you can still actually do, even if you are not in a nature of mind state and it doesn't bring you into a full nature of mind state

either, they have an effect.

They are like the train to Paris. If you are already in Paris, then it wouldn't make sense to take the train to Paris. But if you are not there, you will need that train to get there.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen perspective is that we are all in Paris and always have been.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: What is the Largest Buddhist Sect on Earth Today?

Content:

Astus said:

What defines Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Empowerment (abhiṣeka) as the entryway into the teachings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 6:19 AM

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

Content:

pueraeternus said:

So what is that dependent on?

Malcolm wrote:

Whether you have the non-dual view or not.

As samsara was abandoned for something else,

nirvana will not be realized

-- Hevajra Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 5:10 AM

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

Content:

anjali said:

Are you of the opinion that people can do things to help thin the clouds and eventually get a glimpse of the ever-present Sun?

Malcolm wrote:

The sun is perfect, clouds are perfect, where can there be anything which is not already perfect?

anjali said:

Indeed. There is either knowing or not knowing, but it's sure easy to get distracted by those clouds.

So, are you of the opinion that people come by knowing through grace (not in the Christian sense, but more in the sense of spontaneously and unmerited)?

Malcolm wrote:

Its possible, but I think they are not able to articulate it very clearly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 5:09 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The sun is perfect, clouds are perfect, where can there be anything which is not already perfect?

pueraeternus said:

Is suffering perfect?

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on who you are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 4:55 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Listen, if you want to believe that Buddhahood arises from causes and conditions, there is not much I can say except to point you in the direction of Dzogchen texts that deny this. Then it is up to you.

But if one should assert to people that Dzogchen is a gradual path for developing realization then one would be both misleading people and misrepresenting Dzogchen teachings.

There is no progress in the core, the essence itself.

-- Rigpa Rangdrol Tantra

heart said:

It is quite easy, without a master and the auspicious coincidence of actually recognizing the natural state there is no Dzogchen. This come about through causes and conditions. The natural state itself has no causes or conditions but when you are in mind everything has causes and conditions.

Of course there is no progress in "the essence itself". When have I ever said that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The essence itself is Dzogchen. Dzogchen does not depend on direct introduction. If it did, it would be produced from causes and conditions.

I already addressed this issue above, where I clarified that attaining a precious human birth certainly comes from gathering merit, etc.

In Dzogchen, buddhahood does not come from mind. The Dzogchen perspective is that a liberation based on causes and effects is incoherent.

Dzogchen is a path where one abides in liberation, even if those moments of liberation are incredibly brief:

The suffering of samsara, cannot be removed by using this stake of grasping but will be removed if [the stake is] let go.

If fabricated phenomena are abandoned, one will achieve relaxation.

Abandoning all thoughts, the ocean of wisdom does not stir.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 4:36 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since there is no cause for buddhahood in the beginning,

in the end it cannot be created through a condition.

Emptiness possesses a core of wisdom.

-- Rigpa Rangshar Tantra

Wisdom is merged into emptiness: uniform in taste, unchanging and permanent.

-- Kalacakra Root Tantra

If you do not understand the view, you cannot practice Dzogchen. So first you must understand the view. The above is the view of Dzogchen.

anjali said:

Are you of the opinion that people can do things to help thin the clouds and eventually get a glimpse of the ever-present Sun?

Malcolm wrote:

The sun is perfect, clouds are perfect, where can there be anything which is not already perfect?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 3:35 AM

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

Content:

Adamantine said:

However I am keen to know your take on this (without going into detail about total of course!)

Malcolm wrote:

You either have confidence in Dzogchen view or not. If not, it is better for one to practice according to the vehicles of cause and result until you have developed such confidence.
M

heart said:

And confidence is not related to causes?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Listen, if you want to believe that Buddhahood arises from causes and conditions, there is not much I can say except to point you in the direction of Dzogchen texts that deny this. Then it is up to you.

But if one should assert to people that Dzogchen is a gradual path for developing realization then one would be both misleading people and misrepresenting Dzogchen teachings.

There is no progress in the core, the essence itself.

-- Rigpa Rangdrol Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 2:57 AM

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

Content:

Adamantine said:

but from an outer or relative POV it certainly still has the appearance of A—> B—> C in

that these are Dzogchen methods applied to body speech and mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Since there is no cause for buddhahood in the beginning,
in the end it cannot be created through a condition.

Emptiness possesses a core of wisdom.

-- Rigpa Rangshar Tantra

Wisdom is merged into emptiness: uniform in taste, unchanging and permanent.

-- Kalacakra Root Tantra

If you do not understand the view, you cannot practice Dzogchen. So first you must understand the view. The above is the view of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 2:22 AM

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

Content:

Adamantine said:

However I am keen to know your take on this (without going into detail about togal of course!)

Malcolm wrote:

You either have confidence in Dzogchen view or not. If not, it is better for one to practice according to the vehicles of cause and result until you have developed such confidence.

M

Adamantine said:

I'm not sure I understand: are you implying togal practice is a vehicle of cause and result?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it definitely is not. But I am not going to talk about thogal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 10th, 2014 at 2:08 AM

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

Content:

Adamantine said:

However I am keen to know your take on this (without going into detail about togal of course!)

Malcolm wrote:

You either have confidence in Dzogchen view or not. If not, it is better for one to practice according to the vehicles of cause and result until you have developed such confidence.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 9th, 2014 at 10:20 PM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since Dzogchen is the result that does not come from a cause, how can we say that realization of one's natural state can come about from causes and conditions?

Adamantine said:

What's always amazing though, is how much can be said about it. . . Not to split hairs, but there's an awful lot of texts and talk and verbal pointing out and internet forum discussion on the natural state. .

Malcolm wrote:

All of which is just discussions about the taste of sugar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 9th, 2014 at 7:19 AM

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

Content:

Manju said:

Malcolm: Dzogchen realization does not depend on accumulating causes of any kind. Am new here and this was probably discussed a hundred times but still....:

How does the ability to realize the primordial/natural state, let`s say during a pointing out instruction, NOT depend on the accumulation of causes ?

About my background:

Am a Vajrayana practitioner since 3 years and under the impression that the development/completion stage practices (Maha Ati) I am doing will be helpful once the opportunity for a face to face direct introduction with my master comes.

Am I wrong ?

Manju

Malcolm wrote:

One, if by ability you mean "human birth with leisure and endowment", this absolutely depends on accumulating causes to be reborn as a human being, etc.

If you are doing completion stage practice, you have already received direct introduction through the fourth empowerment. So you should contemplate that and what it means to give rise to self-originated wisdom (rang byung ye shes).

You must recall that Dzogchen is:

The result that does not arise from a cause

The intimate instruction that does not come from a text

The buddhahood that does not come from mind.

Since Dzogchen is the result that does not come from a cause, how can we say that realization of one's natural state can come about from causes and conditions?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 8th, 2014 at 11:16 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

John Huntsman, — Twitter, Aug. 18, 2011 said:

I believe in evolution and trust scientists on global warming. Call me crazy.

Malcolm wrote:

Huntsman said this during his run in the primaries, knowing full well that these two issues go against the general grain of current Republican sentiment in the bat shit crazy bible belt states.

Romney, Oct 27th, 2011:

"My view is that we don't know what's causing climate change on this planet. And the idea of spending trillions and trillions of dollars to try to reduce CO2 emissions is not the right course for us."

Seems like he changed his mind between June and October of the same year...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 8th, 2014 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

RE: Malcolm

Women and Gender Studies is a different topic altogether (and I didn't even mention children so I don't know why you brought that up).

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot mention women without mentioning children.

Zhen Li said:

Libertarians in the US want to wind back the government to adherence to the constitution of 1789.

Malcolm wrote:

And what a fricking nightmare that would be. It shows their total ignorance of the Constitution and its function.

Zhen Li said:

This is actually quite incorrect. The US spends \$1.042 Billion under the EPA for the promotion of climate change, and the government issued billions more in loans for renewable energy corporations with the justification of anthropogenic global warming, the most famous of which was the \$535 million U.S. Energy Department loan guarantee to Solyndra.

Malcolm wrote:

Conservative estimates place subsidies of the oil interest around 10 billion dollars a year. So, the US Government spends one dollar to prevent global warming for every nine it spends promoting the very industries that are propelling climate change.

Zhen Li said:

I really don't think you can call opposition to AGW a cult, because there's no end goal like there is in AGW, and it comes almost entirely from individual scientists, rather than activist groups.

Malcolm wrote:

This is total nonsense.

Zhen Li said:

Right now, you can't deny AGW and get elected,

Malcolm wrote:

Are you dreaming? People run on this platform in conservative parts of the US all the time and reelected again and again. If you look at the polls, if you are a Republican, you don't accept AGW. If you are a Democrat, you do. In the US this issue is completely split down party lines, unlike in other nations where conservatives tend to be more sane.

Zhen Li said:

Even Tony Abbott believes in AGW.

Malcolm wrote:

If he were an American Conservative, he could not get elected if he stated he accepted AGW.

Zhen Li said:

You see, the trend over history is that progressive causes always win.

Malcolm wrote:

You only think this because you do not live in the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 8th, 2014 at 10:12 AM

Title: Re: Peak oil

Content:

Zhen Li said:

But really, before peak oil is reached, the nature of the market is such that the transition will be made by the logic of the system - this is why the peak is actually shifted further and further back year by year

Kim O'Hara said:

This is a good point. What I've said about renewables can be taken into account in this way, too, with the advent of cheap renewables slowing down the exploitation of remaining oil reserves and pushing "the end of oil" ever further into the future.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

The peak shifts year by year since the oil industry is subsidized heavily by the government, making it possible for them to extract increasingly more expensive (and tragic for the environment) "oil" reserves.

Renewables are also a farce, I am sad to say, dependent as they are on rare earths which also come at an environmental premium, and entirely dependent on an industrial infrastructure which depends on oil.

The only realistic solution to the world energy crisis is to stop using so much energy. However, the free market fundamentalists, convinced that growth is a desiderata and that the market is "intelligent", are nothing more than pied pipers leading us all down a path of destruction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 8th, 2014 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Within the rite of empowerment itself, yes.

Otherwise how can we understand something that transcends the mind?

Malcolm wrote:

If you do not attain awakening during empowerment, then you have sadhana practice, cause that's what it is for, i.e., sadhopaya, "method of accomplishment".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 8th, 2014 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The path of Varjayāna is taught so that a common, ordinary person can traverse all the paths and stages in a single life, and ideally, within the rite of empowerment itself, or at least so I have been taught (I am someone who has done a three year retreat).

smcj said:

If this is not too personal a question, may I ask in which tradition you practiced in your retreat? For some reason I have the impression it was Sakya. But if it is too personal, never mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it was in Sakya. Most of my training in Sutra and Tantra is in the Sakya school. The rest in Nyingma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 8th, 2014 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Well that's true but the tantras are teachings for those on the path (after realization).

There is outer tantra (Ngondro), but it should be taught by a lama when we are closer to the path.

And the meaning (or view) of prajna is different after realization. The true meaning of prajna won't be realized until after realization.

You might have read Chogyam Trungpa talk about prajna.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of prajñā, contaminated, and pure. The former exists in common practitioners, the latter in realized practitioners.

As for this distinction:

Well that's true but the tantras are teachings for those on the path (after realization).

There is outer tantra (Ngondro), but it should be taught by a lama when we are closer to the path.

The path of Varjayāna is taught so that a common, ordinary person can traverse all the paths and stages in a single life, and ideally, within the rite of empowerment itself, or at least so I have been taught (I am someone who has done a three year retreat).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 8th, 2014 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Read Kongtrul's encyclopedia on practice lineages, he describes it perfectly.

fckw said:

Malcolm, what exactly do you mean with "Kongtrul's encyclopedia"? Are you talking about this:

<http://www.chinabuddhismencyclopedia.com/en/index.php?title=Mahamudra>? Or is there also some book with that title?

Malcolm wrote:

Specifically, Treasury of Knowledge, Esoteric Instructions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.

Content:

smcj said:

\$53. I'm not doing it. I've got enough Dharma books unread on my shelf.

Malcolm wrote:

It's actually about 25 bucks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Have you ever tried applying for research grants?

I had a look at the process with my provincial government a few months ago, and there are boxes of key terms which you can check. If your research deals with key terms in these areas, you're more likely to get funding. One of the boxes was for women and

gender studies, and there was a box for climate change research too. These are two of the topics which get some of the highest funding, no surprise then that now climate change is also a feminist topic.

People don't set out to do a project which makes or breaks massive theories like AGW, they research specific topics and collect data in specific areas. But convincing the government to keep funding such research means convincing them that this is a matter which the government both needs to take seriously because it may be responsible, and needs to take action which can work. The grant process is, in fact, highly political, and each project provides parliament with brief lay-terms summaries.

If studying climate were just business as usual from day to day, like, say, recording migratory patterns, then it'll probably still get funding, but those numbers are not likely to make you a millionaire like this fellow:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/5036333/Multi-millionaire-climate-change-scientist-jailed-for-child-abuse.html> and this fellow

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/11/18/dr-james-hansens-growing-financial-scandal-now-over-a-million-dollars-of-outside-income/>

Not to mention the book deals and movie sales from the hype. Then there's of course the fact that before the hype the stocks of renewable energy sources and electric car companies was relatively equal to its value, compared to the height of the hype a few years ago, when they would have made any investor a small fortune. Of course, I do support renewable energy, but that's beyond the point. If you are just investing in oil stocks, you know you won't be making much more than they're currently worth.

There are many incentives to promoting the idea of AGW. Even accepting all the AGW premises, you still have uncertainty due to the unpredictability of the system -- let's face it, there has been, and probably never will be, reliable ways of predicting climate change. Some people won't be convinced that the premises of AGW don't hold up to scrutiny until we really do have too little carbon based energy sources to utilise and they still see CO2 levels rising and falling with no help from us.

In the end, remember that this is almost all government led. The millions made by Hansen are mostly from government funded institutions, prizes and grants. People in government benefit with jobs and money, that's the bottom line. So long as government as it currently works exists, bureaucracy will keep increasing, and they'll keep paying themselves more and more because they have the monopoly on violence through taxation. Is there a solution to this problem? Not immediately, no. But vox populi vox dei. It doesn't matter what the real state of science is, it doesn't matter that there isn't a real consensus in institutions of higher learning, what works, works according to the simple equation of: public opinion + potential bureaucratic profit = public policy.

Malcolm wrote:

"One of the boxes was for women and gender studies, and there was a box for climate change research too. These are two of the topics which get some of the highest funding, no surprise then that now climate change is also a feminist topic."

Yes, because women and children will be the mostly heavily impacted by the negative effects of climate change, since they are still largely invisible.

"So long as government as it currently works exists, bureaucracy will keep increasing, and they'll keep paying themselves more and more because they have the monopoly on violence through taxation."

That is a common libertarian point of view.

But this is not a proof, this is fallacious reasoning at best, paranoia at worst.

Sorry, but I don't buy into conspiracy theories, right or left.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

In the bone yard said:

I couldn't agree more with respect to intellectual learning but it must be applied intelligently (to sutra not tantra).

Malcolm wrote:

It must be applied to both, that is why I cited a Dzogchen tantra as well as a Dzogchen master.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Does one of the Lotus Sūtra based schools really teach t

Content:

rory said:

there are Buddhas in hell realms for goodness' sake.

Malcolm wrote:

Not because they experience afflicted thoughts. They emanate there out of compassion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

There really is no difference here, it's the same dishonesty.

Malcolm wrote:

What could their motive possibly be?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Nemo said:

America is very sick. Everyone else in the world understands climate change. How is climate change a plot? It's simply the consensus. It was a theory in the 80's and has turned out to be confirmed. Being an unknowing sock puppet of global energy conglomerates is creepy.

Malcolm wrote:

It was even a theory in the nineteenth century, and now it is confirmed. However, some people, for whatever perverse reasons they may have, insist against all reason that we are being duped by a grand conspiracy, the purpose of which they can never clearly articulate.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

In the bone yard said:

There is only one path, and it must be "pointed out" to us.

Then we will understand what we cannot understand intellectually and was not meant to be understood intellectually.

Malcolm wrote:

All Buddhists teachings have three prajñās: the prajñā of hearing, when one listens to the teachings and understands them intellectually; the prajñā of reflection, when one integrates what one has understood; and the prajñā of meditation, where the meaning one has gathered through hearing and reflection is brought to realization.

To claim that we are not meant to intellectually understand the path does not correspond with my education and training. The Tantra of the Union of the Sun and Moon states:

Prajñā is three-fold: the prajñā of hearing severs external reification; the prajñā of reflection severs internal reification; and the prajñā of meditation severs secret reification.

Vimalamitra states:

The characteristics of prajñā:

The characteristic of the prajñā of hearing is a great quantity listening and understanding words without interpolation.

The characteristic of reflection is investigating the words and meanings of the mind, and giving explanations.

The characteristic of meditation is distancing oneself from afflictions through meditation.

We should pay respect to intellectual learning, not dismiss it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 10:25 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/borowitzreport/2014/01/polar-vortex-causes-hundreds-of-injuries-as-people-making-snide-remarks-about-climate-change-are-pun.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: Does one of the Lotus Sūtra based schools really teach t

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course such a teaching is total rubbish.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Unknown said:

As the Arctic rapidly heats up, however, there's less of a temperature difference between the equator and the poles, and the downhill slope in the atmosphere is accordingly less steep. This creates a weaker jet stream, a jet stream that meanders more or, if you prefer the new analogy, staggers around drunkenly. "As the Arctic continues to warm, we expect the jet stream to take these wild swings northward and southward more often," says Francis. "And when it does, that's when we get these particularly wild temperature and precipitation patterns, and they tend to stay in place a long time."

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2014/01/did-global-warming-get-arctic->

drunk

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/capital-weather-gang/wp/2013/08/21/researcher-defends-work-linking-arctic-warming-and-extreme-weather/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.

Content:

conebeckham said:

As far as my reading and study are concerned, on the relative level it is specific to every individual...but again, it's not truly existent in the first place, but is within the realm of conditioned phenomema. Just as a "specific individual" is. However, the underlying, essential, "pure" element is presented by many as the Tathagatagarbha, or, when fully purified, the Dharmakaya. This is, of course, hotly disputed by those who feel the Tathatgatarbha doctrine is expedient, even by those who posit a conventional alayavijnana.

Malcolm wrote:

Asanga argues somewhere that the bhavanga doctrine in the Nikaya schools and the ālayavijñāna have the same meaning. This makes ālayavijñāna personal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

it's the way science always works, you'll always find issues with data analysis.

.

Malcolm wrote:

You can disagree where a hurricane is going to land, but the hurricane is definitely going to land in this case.

Then of course there is the Pascal's wager approach to all of this: there is no downside to being wrong about climate change (saving rainforests, changing from fossil fuels to renewables, etc.), in fact there are positive upsides. But there are severe consequences to being right about climate change and then doing nothing (or too little too late, the present scenario).

As for you my friend, well, "Contrarians gonna contradict..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 11:48 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Well, Malcolm, I think you made up your mind before you considered the argument.

It's undeniable that billions of dollars are invested in the validity of Anthropogenic Climate Change.

And most critiques I've seen are really blatant simplifications of the opponent's arguments. The majority of scientists who have dissented from the consensus definitely do not deny climate change (as I don't), but do deny that humans have the deciding role in it.

Of those who dissent, there are two kinds, those who believe that it is too soon, not enough data, or not possible to draw conclusions about precisely what causes climate change, and those who believe that there are clear causal links elsewhere.

There's absolutely NO reason to treat people who believe there is a reasonable doubt in a scientific theory like Crypto-Nazis.

The politically and financially motivated trolls behind Anthropogenic Climate Change wouldn't make so much energy to refute doubts if money wasn't involved.

Do you realise that there are huge doubts as to what theory of plate tectonics is correct? Where are the critique and bashing sites in the realm of geophysics?

Why doesn't the mainstream media spend millions of dollars on documentaries about these controversies?

Why doesn't NASA have a bashing site critiquing MOND in favour of General Relativity?

It doesn't take a scientist to understand how the system works.

(By the way, glad you liked my analysis of Marxism, I always had the impression that you were a Marxist)

Malcolm wrote:

Ben Franklin has an awesome analysis of anthropogenic climate change. He observed that whenever you cut down a lot of trees, the area would get warmer. Well, multiply this, add burning petroleum to the mix and you get what have today: acidification of oceans, increasingly intense storms, constantly rising global average temperatures, etc.

You appear to think that because there are uncertainties in one area of science, there must uncertainty in all.

As for marx, no -- as i said, I am a deep ecologist. Social ecologists (basically Marxists) consider us bourgeoisie and reactionary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 11:31 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

smcj said:

Stepping out of the theme of this thread, but in keeping with the theme of this website, I'd like to point out that climate change is an example of what Dharma calls "the suffering of change". This means that the answer to any problem, such as the industrial revolution, will in time create its own problems. This is why I say that Dharma does not allow for Utopias, either civic or personal.

Malcolm wrote:

Tell that to Amitabha!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 11:22 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Unfortunately Anthropogenic Climate Change is all politics and no facts.

Malcolm wrote:

The preponderance of research simply does not support your opinions in this matter. I read with interest your analysis of Marx and largely agree with them. But here, you are just on the wrong side of both scientific consensus and history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 11:20 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

smcj said:

Granted, it will change in a thousand years or so after we either stop burning oil for energy or we run out...

How so? The carbon will still be there. It took millions of years for the carbon to be scrubbed out of the atmosphere by plants to get it to the point it is at.

Malcolm wrote:

Grasses sequester more carbon than trees, actually...you can easily find estimates about how long it will take carbon outputs to be "put back in". Anyway, we will be long dead before there is even anything like a rational social response to the climate crisis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 11:17 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Do you need any more evidence to prove that opinions on this are almost always politically motivated than this?: Perhaps we are not as stupid as you presume. We simply have not bought into right wing climate denial.

I am not a conservative, and political opinions have nothing to do with evaluating arguments. Science can't be based on politics, it's based on empirical observation!

Don't all you biased politically motivated liberals understand that ALL of your stock high school-level arguments from websites have answers. Even that stupid graph you posted. And every answer has an answer in reply equally as smarmy and unctuous.

You can only argue science based on facts! It's so simple...

Malcolm wrote:

Unfortunately climate denial is all politics and no facts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 11:09 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

reddust said:

I don't buy into the left-right agenda and I am a skeptic of man made climate change argument. I don't want spend my time arguing about this. Time will be the decider on this debate. Let's stop trying to fix samsara (sarcasm) I've been told...don't leave. Let's have some good Dharma debates

Malcolm wrote:

Closed biosystem + increasing carbon inputs from burning petrochemicals = warming.

Granted, it will change in a thousand years or so after we either stop burning oil for energy or we run out...

Of course it will come as no surprise to any one that I am a deep ecologist/left biocentric ala The late David Orton.

<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/lbprimer.htm>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 10:53 AM

Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.

Content:

conebeckham said:

So perhaps it's appropriate to say the Alayavijnana is neither separate from, nor entirely defined by, the Karmic seeds.

anjali said:

That's my take on it. At the eighth level, consciousness (vijnana) and habit energies (karmic bijas) are not the same, nor are they different.

I've read that the function of the alaya-consciousness is one of projection (fabrication)--bringing forth appearances (apprehended objects and apprehending subject). The apprehending subject and the apprehended objects are just two aspects of a single appearance that haven't been dualistically "solidified" yet (the function of the seventh consciousness).

The eighth consciousness is just the ignorant outward-looking consciousness encountering it's own energy patterns, with no sense of self and other.

Malcolm wrote:

Read Mahayanasamgraha by Asanga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 10:51 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Zhen Li said:

Zhen Li, you are getting perilously close to being insulting.

Yes, I noticed that too.

For my own good, and for everyone else's, I'm going to stop using this site.

I can't get anywhere with anybody. It's not benefiting me, and it's not benefiting others. It's a prime example of a waste of time.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps we are not as stupid as you presume. We simply have not bought into right wing climate denial.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 10:47 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Unknown said:

This story can be summed up very simply: a group of retired NASA scientists with no climate science research experience listened to a few climate scientists and a few fossil fuel-funded contrarian scientists, read a few climate blogs, asked a few relatively simple questions, decided that those questions cannot be answered (though we will answer them in this post), put together a very rudimentary report, and now expect people to listen to them because they used to work at NASA. It's purely an appeal to authority, except that the participants have no authority or expertise in climate science.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.skepticalscience.com/NASA-retirees-letter2.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 10:36 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Extreme weather events, including extreme cold snaps are consistent with a warming climate. In other words climate and weather are not the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 9:58 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The scientific consensus is that human caused climate instability is a fact.

Zhen Li said:

Nice evidence.

Malcolm wrote:
Get real, my friend, you want evidence:

<http://climate.nasa.gov>

You've got your head in the sand.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 9:48 AM
Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed
Content:
Zhen Li said:
The main issue is that the topic is extremely politicized...

Malcolm wrote:
The scientific consensus is that human caused climate instability is a fact. Politicians are the only reason we, as a global civilization, are not effectively responding to this state of affairs.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 6:53 AM
Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
http://www.salon.com/2013/12/18/7_ways_to_shut_down_a_climate_change_denier_partner/

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 5:49 AM
Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod
Content:
tatpurusa said:
by the way, does anyone know how he does this?

dharmagoat said:
He doesn't, his disciples do.

Everyone loves a Lama.

Malcolm wrote:
What a bunch of idiots.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 5:48 AM
Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.
Content:
dude said:
If there are not nine consciousnesses, what is there?

Malcolm wrote:
The so called ninth consciousness, amalavijñāna, is rather late innovation that never gained currency in India, though it had some popularity in Chinese Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 5:36 AM
Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.
Content:
conebeckham said:
In effect, the karmic "seeds" which are said to "reside" in the Alayavijnana, are NOT the Alayavijnana itself.....

Malcolm wrote:
In reality, there are two Yogacara interpretations it seems.

One: ālayavijñāna is a consciousness which retains seeds. This is the later interpretation.

Two: ālayavijñāna and the seeds are coterminous: exhausting the latter eliminates the former. This seems to be the position of Asanga in Mahāyāna Samgraha.

The Nyingma approach to this is that there really are not nine consciousness at all. Consciousness derives its name based on its function in a given operation.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 4:07 AM
Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod
Content:
Guty said:
...the scriptural accounts are nothing but exaggerations and mistranslations.

Malcolm wrote:

They might be exaggerations, but they are not mistranslations.

Refer to the Vibhuti chapter of the Yoga sutras. Flying, for example, is the result of attaining power of the uḍaṇā vayu, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu has said that if anyone of his students can place his hand in fire without beings harmed, ChNN would like to have that person as his teacher. Otherwise, he said, don't call yourself realized if you do not have power over the elements.

dmr82 said:

Glad you confirmed ChNNR believes the abilities manifest as sign of having power over the elements.

That's all the confirmation I needed.

Malcolm wrote:

Just bring a fire extinguisher in case your samadhi is not up to par.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...they prevent people from claiming total buddhahood in absence of such demonstrable abilities.

Even if such abilities are real, they are mundane, having nothing to do with actually gaining realization.

dmr82 said:

You are contradicting yourself. First you say realized beings can demonstrate them, then you say having them has nothing to do with having realization. Also there is nothing mundane about them as sentient beings can't display them except through fakery and deception.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, actually, you have to accept that they are mundane because Buddhists and Hindus like are supposed to be able to manifest them with sufficient practice of

Samadhi.

None of these powers are transcendent in the least.

What I am suggesting is that placing such impossible expectations on what can be expected of a realized individual makes it easy to spot fakes. For example, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu has said that if anyone of his students can place his hand in fire without beings harmed, ChNN would like to have that person as his teacher. Otherwise, he said, don't call yourself realized if you do not have power over the elements.

Of course, the problem with this is that Hindus sages, etc., also claim to have power over the elements and so on.

Thus, these things, power over the elements, the ability to swim through the earth, fly in the sky and so on, are a common stock set of magical abilities common in India literature. We need not take them literally any more than we take Meru literally. The pursuit of such abilities will not lead us to liberation, Buddha was exceptionally clear about this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 6th, 2014 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

dmr82 said:

Nope there is footage of the master from The Magus of Java.

Malcolm wrote:

Sleight of hand.

dmr82 said:

Just because modern dzogchen practitioners don't demonstrate these abilities doesn't mean they are not real. And their absence in modern dzogchen practitioners doesn't devalue dzogchen as the highest vehicle for achieving enlightenment. I think the oral transmission and highest ati yoga instruction manuals didn't set out to deceive people when they mention the abilities that manifest upon completion of the visions.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think there is any intended deception either. Quite the opposite, actually, they prevent people from claiming total buddhahood in absence of such demonstrable abilities.

Even if such abilities are real, they are mundane, having nothing to do with actually gaining realization. People who think otherwise are going down a rabbit hole.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: parinirvana on DW

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

Sherab Dorje said:

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

When in doubt, blame everybody else!

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: parinirvana on DW

Content:

tatpursa said:

What happened to padma norbu?

Malcolm wrote:

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

Alternately, it is the Buddhist rapture.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Sherab said:

So you rationalization does not work.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

M

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.

Content:

smcj said:

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Chandrakirti accepts the ālayavijñāna. Tsongkhapa did not.

cloudburst said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

oushi said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

dmr82 said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

dmr82 said:

If you're interested in the Chinese versions of masters displaying such abilities you can find them in "Opening the Dragon Gate: The Making of a Modern Taoist Wizard" and "The

Magus of Java". Both masters are still alive and can display everything Padmasambhava did. Over the years small groups from Europe have visited these masters in private and confirmed it's not mere fantasy or trickery but real abilities and manifestations of power.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

dmr82 said:

Actually revealing terma is a siddhi.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

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

In the case of the treasure tradition, perhaps it is wise to take Guru Chowang's dictum

to heart, i.e., the entire universe is a greater matter. This perspective solves a lot of teleological problems.

M

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Pero said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

M

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

dmr82 said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

oushi said:

Only if we assume that punishment requires a judge.

Malcolm wrote:

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

oushi said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

oushi said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

oushi said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I am being a little more literal in my definition.

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

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

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

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

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

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

M

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Guty said:

"Once karmic winds get exhausted through completing the visions the body self-liberates into the basic space of phenomena. The self-aware enlightened mandala

perfect from beginningless time becomes evident and one reaches perfect buddhahood. Your physical body is no more real than the thoughts that appear in your mind. Both are result of karmic winds/delusion and both self-liberate when abiding in rigpa. Rigpa is how karmic winds get exhausted. The visions arise as potentiality of rigpa. If the visions are completed before death the body self-liberates completely into the great transfer without having to go through the bardo."

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So you agree that experience is based on karma?

oushi said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

No, I would not say that.

I would say that they remain unproven.

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Guty are you dmr82 on vajracakra?

dmr82 said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.

Content:

Punya said:

If the storehouse consciousness is not accepted, presumably by the prasingikas, what is

their explanation? I seem to remember something about consciousness carrying forward moment to moment but I've never understood it properly. Also, what are the manas? I've tried to research this without success.

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakirti accepts the ālayavijñāna. Tsongkhapa did not.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Guty said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Guty said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Except that karma and rebirth are not "beliefs".

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Guty said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Shamar on Monastic Buddhism in Tibet

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Is there something about the article that you find unclear?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Shamar on Monastic Buddhism in Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<https://tinyurl.com/mlgeaxy>

Discuss...

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

smcj said:

So are you sure about that "Dzogchen" association?

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

brendan said:

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

.

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

tobes said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, but when pushed to it...

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

Anders said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

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

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

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

M

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

ConradTree said:

Malcolm,

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

Anders said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Anders said:

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

dharmagoat said:

An infinite number of durationless moments does.

Anders said:

Not if these moments are partless and therefore discrete.

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Anders said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

This is a mere assertion.

Anders said:

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

What you propose is absurd.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I assert any discrete objects without duration? No.

You need to review Nagarjuna's refutation of time.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Tsondru said:

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

conebeckham said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

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

The Dharmakaya does not teach because it can only be perceived by other Buddhas. The Dharmakaya manifests subtle and gross form bodies for the purpose of teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Master Sonam Tsemo contends:

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

tobes said:

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

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

conebeckham said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Loppon Sonam Tsemo states:

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

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Norwegian said:

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

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

From the page you yourself just linked.

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

Tsongkhapafan said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

I don't really want to get into this as it is obviously pointless and divisive. Dzogchen is not the entire basis of the Nyingma school, they follow Buddha's Sutra and Tantra teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

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

Tsongkhapafan said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Tsongkhapafan said:

when you start denigrating Nagarjuna...

Malcolm wrote:

No one denigrated Nāgārjuna.

Tsongkhapafan said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

tobes said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Well that has been proven in the affirmative. TKfan merely trotted out a dogma without bothering to defend it. According to him, the Buddha must have been a disciple of Candrakirti, otherwise, Buddha's enlightenment was impossible.

tobes said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Buddha did not teach Dzogchen at all.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Dzogchen, Mahamudra, Madhyamaka,

Lamdre, Chod, Zhiched, etc.,

Are various designations.

But if examined by an experienced yogi,

They lead to the same realization.

M

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

tobes said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Well that has been proven in the affirmative. TKfan merely trotted out a dogma without bothering to defend it. According to him, the Buddha must have been a disciple of Candrakirti, otherwise, Buddha's enlightenment was impossible.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

daverupa said:

cromulent

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

daverupa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

tobes said:

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

.

Tsongkhapafan said:

You can't go beyond Madhyamaka as it is the definitive view, as Chandrakirti points out.

As far as tantra goes, the only other refinement is to explain that phenomena are the nature of mind as well as the nature of emptiness. We might call this the Tantric Prasangika view and as such is not going beyond the Madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you can dogmatically assert this, but for example, if you wish to understand how the profound view of Vajrayāna is extraordinarily different from common Madhyamaka, then you must study the work of the Sakya master, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen, one of the founder masters of Sakya, who wrote an extensive refutation of those who apprehend emptiness as the intrinsic nature of all phenomena in his presentation of the abhisamaya of the Hevajra Tantra called The Precious Wish Fulfilling Tree, which also treats Prasanga Madhyamaka in its section on the four tenets.

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

ཚུལ་མེད་

Malcolm wrote:

Is that basically emptiness?[/quote]

More or less.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As it is said:

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

dzogchungpa said:

What is 'nonphenomena' in the Tibetan?

Malcolm wrote:

ཚུལ་མེད་

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

ConradTree said:

But Rongzom says Dzogchen rejects any relative truth.

Dzogchen only subscribes to 1 truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we were talking about sutra.

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

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

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

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

And as it says in Soaring Great Garuda:

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

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

M

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Pictures of cows do not produce milk ever.

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

cloudburst said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Hindus also claim that their ultimate is beyond predicates.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

M

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 8:32 PM

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

Content:

Anders said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

This is a mere assertion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 6:49 AM

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

Content:

Anders said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Eckart Tolle - master of the park bench

Content:

tatpurusa said:

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

mutusuk said:

I personally discussed issues such as westerners wasting their time in other tradition than buddhism/bon, etc. He was adamant. He said "If you want to progress, you'd better put all your eggs in the same basket. Progress takes time, nobody has enough time to waste in "mu-steps-pa business"." ("mu-steps-pa business" was in anglo-tibetan).

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

dzogchungpa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

oushi said:

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

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =

```
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

[/quote]

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

No. But one can imagine conditions which while being conventional, are not

immediately accessible to ordinary cognitions.

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

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

You are really not paying attention. I said:

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

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

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Musings on Kali Yuga

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

theanarchist said:

The muslims ???

There is something in the Kalachakra texts about Muslims?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Anders said:

And irreducible phenomena is necessarily uncaused.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

dzogchungpa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

dzogchungpa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Most people do not understand that abhisheka is primarily a method of attaining

buddhahood, and only secondarily, an introduction to a path.

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Kalachakra in Dzogchen Community

Content:

heart said:

Interesting that Rinpoche is calling the Longsal Kalachakra Ati and Changchub Dorje's Kalachakra Anu. Or did I misunderstand?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, you did not misunderstand.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

theanarchist said:

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

theanarchist said:

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Musings on Kali Yuga

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

From the book The Indus Script and the Rg-Veda

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Musings on Kali Yuga

Content:

smcj said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is -- in Buddhist mythological texts there is clearly described a progressive

degeneration to the present day. In the treta yuga for example, humans are supposed to have had limitless lifespans. Then in the second age, lifespans of 80,000 years and so on, down to the pathetic one hundred years (if you're lucky) lifespan of the present day.

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

M

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Anders said:

And irreducible phenomena is necessarily uncaused.

Malcolm wrote:

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

PadmaVonSamba said:

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

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

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Kalachakra in Dzogchen Community

Content:

Virgo said:

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

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

He gave it again today.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Anders said:

And irreducible phenomena is necessarily uncaused.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

theanarchist said:

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

Other vajrayana samaya connections are just as unbreakable.

Malcolm wrote:

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

theanarchist said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

theanarchist said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they are.

theanarchist said:

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

way.

Malcolm wrote:

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

theanarchist said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

theanarchist said:

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

Other vajrayana samaya connections are just as unbreakable.

Malcolm wrote:

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

theanarchist said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

theanarchist said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they are.

theanarchist said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

theanarchist said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Musings on Kali Yuga

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

The four ages is a nearly universal theme worldwide.

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Kalachakra in Dzogchen Community

Content:

Tenpa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Total realization. Might improve your astrological skills too.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They are simples.

PadmaVonSamba said:

can you explain a little more?

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Am I missing something?

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

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Irreducible does not mean unconditioned.

PadmaVonSamba said:

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

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

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

are perception and feeling established as pre-existing qualities
that occur even with or without the objects of perception and feeling?

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

They are simples.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Am I missing something?

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

.
.

Malcolm wrote:
Irreducible does not mean unconditioned.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 8:59 AM
Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it
Content:

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

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 8:59 AM
Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it
Content:

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

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

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

something very precise.

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

theanarchist said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting opinion. No textual support, however.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

theanarchist said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting opinion. No textual support, however.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The vedana skandha and the saṃjñā skandha are irreducible.

PadmaVonSamba said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

tobes said:

Everyone is always sure that the opponent has been nailed.

Few ever make the effort to actually understand the opponent.

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

smcj said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

PadmaVonSamba said:

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

- .
- .
- .

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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

smcj said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

PadmaVonSamba said:

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

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

.
. .
.

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

People can detect consciousness.

Consciousness can be an object of awareness.

what I mean by that is

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

and you can infer that someone else wrote them.

When we meditate, we are aware of thoughts arising.

We can detect consciousness (the arising of awareness with objects of awareness) in others even though we do not directly experience their exact experience. We can ask, "what do you hear?" and observe that other beings experience cognitive function.

- .
- .
- .

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

People can detect consciousness.

Consciousness can be an object of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Ivo said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

This is definitely not the view of Dzogchen. Dzogchen realization does not depend on

accumulating causes of any kind.

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

It's all good.

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

What we can see from all of this is that since "Mādhyamikas" cannot agree amongst

themselves, not to mention the other three tenets, indeed the "science" of Buddhism has undergone much change and transformation, like any body of human knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Khenpo Tsultrim said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

smcj said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Please compare this with what I stated above:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

gad rgyangs said:

There is conventional production.

Malcolm wrote:

Case closed. We agree.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

smcj said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

(glossed by Chandra as "completely deluded")

Malcolm wrote:

Candra says:

ཡང་དག་མཐོང་ཡུལ་གང་དེ་ཉིད་དེ།
མཐོང་བ་བརྟན་པ་ཀུན་རྒྱུ་བདེན་པར་གསུངས།
མཐོང་བ་བརྟན་པའང་རྣམ་པ་གཉིས་འདོད་དེ།
དབང་པོ་གསལ་དང་དབང་པོ་སྐྱོན་ཟུན་ནོ།

That object which is correctly seen is true,
that falsely seen is said to be relative truth.
Also false seeing is held to be of two kinds:
a non-defective sense organ and a defective sense organ.

He also says:

ཁྱེན་ལས་བྱུང་ཕྱིར་ཁམས་གསུམ་པོ།
འདུས་བྱས་ཡིན་པར་ངེས་པར་བརྟན།
དེ་ནི་དེ་ཡིས་སྤང་ཉིད་གང་།
དེ་ནི་འདུས་བྱས་སྤང་ཉིད་གསུངས།

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

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Causation is deconstructed in chapter 1 of MMK.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, yes; conventionally no, as passages by Buddhapaṇita and Candra demonstrated quite clearly.

You can deconstruct the two truths if you like, and certainly the two truths are rejected in Dzogchen; but not in Madhyamaka. And conventional truth in Madhyamaka clearly

demonstrates the need for causation in order to have a sensible world where everything does not arise from everything at random.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Ditto on the attitude.

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Anyway

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

tingdzin said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

tingdzin said:

His birthplace is specified as So khyam, which through comparative historical linguistics and the accounts of later Tibetan histories, which do not mention Sri Singha at all, can be identified with the Chinese district of Suo fang. This does not mean Khotan -- I've seen that silliness several times and don't know how it got started. Nor does it mean Sri Singha was ethnic Chinese -- Suo fang, though part of the T'ang Empire, fell squarely into what was called the Sogdian (hu) prefectures, because they were populated by Sogdians, an Iranic-speaking people from present-day Uzbekistan (who had a lot of influence on early Chinese Buddhism, by the way). Sri Singha was supposed to have studied in his early life at Wu T'ai Shan, very close to Suo fang.

Malcolm wrote:

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

tingdzin said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

tingdzin said:

3) When you sat that Buddhist Dzogchen was entirely Indic-Buddhist inspired, that is

still quite hotly debated, as you, being pretty au courant with modern scholarship, must know.

Malcolm wrote:

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

M

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

"Yes, plants have both short- and long-term electrical signalling, and they use some neurotransmitter-like chemicals as chemical signals," Lincoln Taiz, an emeritus professor of plant physiology at U.C. Santa Cruz and one of the signers of the Alpi letter, told me. "But the mechanisms are quite different from those of true nervous systems." Taiz says that the writings of the plant neurobiologists suffer from "over-interpretation of data, teleology, anthropomorphizing, philosophizing, and wild speculations."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, thanks, I read the article quite closely.

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

You might also work on the attitude.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

dzogchungpa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

smcj said:

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

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

- Longchenpa

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Empty dharmas are entirely produced
from dharmas strictly empty;
dharmas without a self and [not] of a self.

Words, butter lamps, mirrors, seals,
fire crystals, seeds, sourness and echoes.
Although the aggregates are serially connected,
the wise are to comprehend nothing has transferred.
Someone, having conceived of annihilation,
even in extremely subtle existents,
he is not wise,
and will never see the meaning of 'arisen from conditions'.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

And:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Understanding the Abhidharmakosa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

daverupa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

daverupa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

daverupa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Not in my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

padma norbu said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Confirmation bias...

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Understanding the Abhidharmakosa

Content:

daverupa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Understanding the Abhidharmakosa

Content:

dimeo said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

It presents the general anatomy and physiology of Buddhādharma.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

The pattern of nutrient traffic showed how “mother trees” were using the network to nourish shaded seedlings, including their offspring—which the trees can apparently recognize as kin—until they’re tall enough to reach the light. And, in a striking example of interspecies coöperation, Simard found that fir trees were using the fungal web to

trade nutrients with paper-bark birch trees over the course of the season. The evergreen species will tide over the deciduous one when it has sugars to spare, and then call in the debt later in the season. For the forest community, the value of this coöperative underground economy appears to be better over-all health, more total photosynthesis, and greater resilience in the face of disturbance.

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma is correct.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

As Candra points out in the Prasannapāda:

Therefore, that being the case, here when the Bhagavan clarified the production of things depending on cause and condition, he refuted the production of things causelessly, from a single cause, a dissimilar cause, or generated by self and other.

Since those were refuted, the intrinsic nature of relative things was taught according to how they exist relatively.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

No, they do not agree. Hume, a materialist, is rejecting causal necessity conventionally. Nāgārjuna, a Buddhist, is only rejecting arising ultimately/intrinsically.

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

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

Reply: All living beings are causes and results.

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

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

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

conventional truth".

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

They can indeed be explained.

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that. Not even once.

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

They are not refuted conventionally in MMK 1.1.

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

As Buddhapalita explains:

Also they do not arise without a cause, because the consequence would be that everything arising from everything permanently, and because there would be the fallacy of the purposelessness of all undertakings. Why is that so? Because the arising of existents is not accepted in all aspects, therefor, because there is no arising, the expression 'arising' is just a convention.

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Thats ok with me, but it is not Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Hanuman in Vajrayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

heart said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

heart said:

Yeah, right. you keep telling me that.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna states:

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

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

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 10:46 PM

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

As Rongzom points out, only Madhyamaka "harms" itself.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ever witnessed the arising of something that did not depend on a cause.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Hanuman in Vajrayana

Content:

Destiny said:

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

It is very, very different from Vajrayana.

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

heart said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained this: the basis of imputation is an appearance. Some trends on Madhyamaka then assert that appearances are mind. Since appearances/mind are not

findable on analysis, they/it are equated with illusion. Illusions lack any inherent nature because they are dependent originations. Dependent originations are free from extremes and, in the final analysis, inexpressible. None of this is circular in anyway.

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

If you want to be more specific you can say what appearance? A rope or a car, for example. Upon what is a rope designated? It's parts. Upon what are the parts designated? Their parts, if they have any. If they do not have further parts, then they are designated upon moments, etc., until one runs out of bases of imputation. At that point, you have [intellectually] discovered emptiness, i.e., the absence of a ultimate or final basis of designation. At each stage of the analysis the previous basis of imputation no longer appears since it has been deconstructed. As Shantideva points out:

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

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

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

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

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 1:03 PM

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

This is why N gives the example of illusions, etc., over and over again. That is point of the

example from V. Emanational people can hinder other emanational people, since they can generate them. Since all statements are in fact empty, empty statements can rebut empty statements that assert substantiality.

gad rgyangs said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

You are asking an irrelevant question.

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It's very simple:

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

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

gad rgyangs said:

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

However, in MMK 17.31-32 N says,

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

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

imputations require ropes and magical beings require magicians.

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Sherab Rigdrol said:

Is there a relationship between Shiva and Chenrezig?

Malcolm wrote:

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

me: "and appearances are what?"

thee: "Dependent arisings."

me : "dependent arisings of what?"

thee: "Of appearances..."

dude...

Malcolm wrote:

It's very simple:

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

smcj said:

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

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "inter" in pratīyasamutpada

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

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

There is however nothing "paradoxical" about dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

smcj said:

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

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

If it is asked what is the bodhisattva's skill in the elements [khams, dhātu], it is that which is the wisdom that engages the dharmadhātu. The dharmadhātu is the element of earth, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of solidity. The dharmadhātu is the element of water, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of wetness. The dharmadhātu is the element of fire, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of maturation. The dharmadhātu is the element of air, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of motility. The dharmadhātu is the element of the eye, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of sight...The dharmadhātu is the element of the body, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of touch. The dharmadhātu is the element of mind, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of perception [vijñāpti]. The dharmadhātu is the element of eye consciousness, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of the specific perception of form...The dharmadhātu is the element of form, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of the element of perception of an eye consciousness. The dharmadhātu is the element of phenomena [chos kyī khams, dharma dhātu, one of the eighteen dhātus], but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of the perception of phenomena...the dharmadhātu and the element of the self are the same. The dharmadhātu, the desire realm, form realm and formless realm are the same. The dharmadhātu and the element of samsara and the element of nirvana are the same. The dharmadhātu, the element of sentient beings the element of space and the element of all phenomena, those are the same. If it is asked why they are the same, because they are the same as emptiness, they are the same. This is the basis any Gelugpa can accept.

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

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

Author: Malcolm

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

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:
and appearances are what?

Malcolm wrote:
Dependent arisings.

gad rgyangs said:
dependent arisings of what?

Malcolm wrote:
Of appearances...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 8:59 AM
Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:

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

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

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 7:33 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
and appearances are what?

Malcolm wrote:
Dependent arisings.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 7:26 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

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

Malcolm wrote:
Neither is Dudjom Rinpoche's.

Author: Malcolm

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

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Destiny said:

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

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

Tshogs bdag is Tibetan for Ganapati.

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

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

Malcolm wrote:

As for your first question, as far as I know, no.

Tshogs = gana

bdag = pati.

In general, in the White Mahākala sadhana of Shangpa there is only one Ganapati.

Lords of Demons is an alternate name for Ganesh/Ganapati i.e. Vinayaka.

No need to offer torma to Ganapati in White Mahakāla sadhana.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 6:49 AM

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

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Either way, Dzogpa Chenpo never advocates for a substantial existence.

smcj said:

Neither does Great Madhyamaka advocate for a "substantial" existence. As I quoted Samba as saying on p. 19 of this thread, "the ineffable ground that is also empty (but not empti-ness-a-thing)" is a restating of the Great Madhyamak view.

Malcolm wrote:

It is sort of ridiculous to term gzhan stong "great madhyamaka" since it is a term used to describe several different positions amongst Tibetan Madhyamakas i.e. gzhan stong; the early Sakya/Nyingma view of free from extremes that goes right back to Kawa Paltseg, and of course Tsongkhapa's formulation.

The Indian texts also show no consistency in how the term is used, the anonymous *pramāṇavidhvaṃsanaṭṭipīṭakavṛtti* refers to its adherents as "great madhyamaka" and rejects the so called *cittamatra madhyamaka* [that Bhava advocates in the passage you reference] as inferior.

In reality, in the Indian context, "great madhyamaka" is a term mostly used in tantric treatises; even here however it is used in various different ways. The Śrī-kālacakropadeśayogaśaḍaṅgatantrapañjikā by Avadhutipāda states:

"The nature of the completion [stage] is said to be mahāmadhyamaka".

On other hand, the Śrī-dākārṇavamahāyoginītantrarājasyaṭikāvohitaṭikā by Padmavajra states:

So called "madhyamaka" is the dharma of the essence, the freedom from four extremes of the mahāmadhyamaka of the Mahāyāna and the awakening of the fortunate.

Dombi Heruka's Śrīhevajrasādhana states:

One should meditate on the great madhyamaka free from all signs.

And the Tantric Candrakīrti's Samājābhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti states

Having manifested the mahāmadhyamaka that is like space,
the sunlight of compassion benefits all sentient beings

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 6:00 AM

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

Content:

smcj said:

Dudjom Rinpoche stated that it's acceptable to hold a gzhan stong view in certain circumstances regarding practice. I believe he then also stated that in post-meditation and in instances where discussion/debate was occurring, the rang stong view is appropriate.

I believe what D.R. said was that Prasāṅgika view is best if the subject of emptiness is approached intellectually, and Great Madhyamaka view is best if the subject of emptiness is approached from an experiential/meditational perspective. He calls the Prasāṅgika the "coarse outer Madhyamaka" as opposed to the "subtle inner Madhyamaka". He subscribes to the 3rd turning as definitive. I've got the quote(s) somewhere in the Big Red Book. I will look them up if you so desire.

Malcolm wrote:

I have already shown that this distinction made by many gzhan stong scholars is based on a misconception, and I even trotted out the passage in question.

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=102&t=13306&p=174083&hilit=outer+madhyamaka#p174083>

So called subtle inner Madhyamaka is just taking appearances to be mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Destiny said:

'Oh Ananda, when any son of noble family, daughter of noble family, monk, nun, lay man or lay woman goes to a place of worship other than where the Three Jewels (are worshipped) or enters the palace retinue of a king and practices the mantras (recited in that place) and begins with this Essence of Ganapati-Ganesvara all one's tasks will be accomplished. Have no doubts about it.

Can someone clarify this statement ? Does that mean that by using that mantra, any other non-buddhist mantras become buddhist and brings realization?

I have another question: there is a clear connection between White Mahakala (Gonkar) and Ganesh - or at least that's what I've understood.

If one practice white mahakala sadhana, do you think that if one recite the usual ganesha mantra (om gam ganapataye namaha) his practice will be enhanced?

And what is the connection between the Tso Dak that are under Gonkar's feet and Ganapati? To be more precise, what are the tso dak and their role in Vajrayana buddhism?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

The answer to your first question is no.

Tshogs bdag is Tibetan for Ganapati.

Ganapati is a mundane protector in Tibetan Buddhism. For example, in the Red Ganapati practice transmitted in Sakya, oneself in the form of Vajrapani commands Ganapati to perform one's wishes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 1:55 AM

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

how can aggregates, or anything else, be posited on emptiness? "Emptiness" is not a res.

Malcolm wrote:

"For those whom emptiness is possible, for them everything is possible; for those whom emptiness is not possible, for them nothing is possible."

gad rgyangs said:

sure, but that does not address the fact that the traditional presentation of imputation requires a rope first. Im sure thats why paratantra was made up. you can break it down to atoms, but what is the "rope" that atoms are imputed on?

Malcolm wrote:

The atoms are not imputed upon a rope. When the atoms are perceived, the rope no longer appears, just as when the rope is perceived, the snake no longer appears. As I mentioned above, all of these things are imputed upon appearances. When you run out of appearances, i.e. when you cannot find anything more, you run out of imputations -- hence emptiness. This is all very straightforward.

Yogacara assumes that mind is a basis for everything, hence their paratantra concept.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 1:36 AM

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ok so if we mistake the aggregates for a "self", then what is it we are mistaking as "aggregates"?

Malcolm wrote:

snake = self

rope = aggregates

atoms/moments= constituents of aggregates

Keep breaking it down, you arrive at emptiness.

gad rgyangs said:

how can aggregates, or anything else, be posited on emptiness? "Emptiness" is not a res.

Malcolm wrote:

"For those whom emptiness is possible, for them everything is possible; for those whom emptiness is not possible, for them nothing is possible."

In any event, the main point is that these things are appearances. So the real answer to

your question is that all of these thing such as aggregates, etc., are posited upon appearances. These appearances are dependently arisen. Since they are dependently arisen, they are empty. That is the best you are going to get out of Madhyamaka, hence the two truths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 12:53 AM

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if the self is posited on the aggregates, then what are the aggregates posited on? And no infinite regress please.

Anders said:

The point here is that it is not actually posited on the aggregates. But conventionally designated as the aggregates. That is to say, when people [falsely] impute a self, they do so in relation to the aggregates.

This is, structurally, no different from positing four legs and a plate as 'a table'. Table is a mere designation of apparently connected aggregates. Where the designation of 'self' differs from 'table' is that sentient beings have real hard time recognising, in realtime, that this self we posit all the time is actually a mere convention overlayed on the aggregates. But this is a practical issue, not a logical one.

gad rgyangs said:

ok so if we mistake the aggregates for a "self", then what is it we are mistaking as "aggregates"?

Malcolm wrote:

snake = self

rope = aggregates

atoms/moments= constituents of aggregates

Keep breaking it down, you arrive at emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 11:09 PM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

At this point the whole system becomes realist. The corrective for that is the two truths as presented in Mahāyāna.

gad rgyangs said:

ok this much is history. but can you posit one illusion upon another? and who does all

this positing? another illusory "mental factor"? then we have an illusion positing an illusion on other illusions. Isn't anything said by this illusory configuration about the nature of reality itself an illusion? (I'm not saying "empty" but rather "illusion" so no replys from Vighrahavyavartani. N claims that an empty statement about emptiness is OK. I am asking about the illusory maker of that empty statement.)

Malcolm wrote:

Illusions are empty so there is really no difference between saying "an illusory agent" and "an empty agent". It amounts to the same thing. This is why the example of the illusionist is so frequently used. In the Vighrahavyavartani commentary the example of an illusionist is brought up and addressed:

ཁྱིམ་མུལ་པའི་སྒྲིམ་བྱས་སྒྲིམ་པའི་སྒྲིམ་བྱ་ཞིག་དོན་འགའ་ཞིག་གི་ཕྱིར་འོང་བར་བྱེད་པ་ལ་འགོག་པར་བྱེད་པ་དང་།
སྒྲིམ་མ་མཁན་གྱིས་ཕྱིར་བཞུགས་པའི་སྒྲིམ་བྱས་སྒྲིམ་པའི་སྒྲིམ་བྱ་གཞན་ཞིག་དོན་འགའ་ཞིག་གི་ཕྱིར་འོང་བར་བྱེད་པ་ལ་འགོག་པར་བྱེད་པ་བཞིན་ཏེ་དེ་ལ་སྒྲིམ་པའི་སྒྲིམ་བྱ་དགག་པར་བྱ་
བ་གང་ཡིན་པ་ དེ་ཡང་སྒྲིམ་པ་ཡིན།

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 10:41 PM

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

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if the self is posited on the aggregates, then what are the aggregates posited on? And no infinte regressess please.

Malcolm wrote:

Matter, mind and mental factors: dharmas the Abhidharmikas took to be pāramārtha dharmas.

They posit the material aggregate upon the four elements which make up one's sense organs and their objects. Sensation, perception and formations are posited upon mental factors. The aggregate of consciousness is posited on past (manas), present (vijñāna) and future (citta) minds.

Matter is then posited on particles (described in various ways). Mind and mental factors are posited upon moments.

At this point the whole system becomes realist. The corrective for that is the two truths as presented in Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 10:12 PM

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

Content:

dude said:

what's important is instruction.

Malcolm wrote:
Sure, of course.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 10:57 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

dude said:
I'm talking about the Buddha's teachings themselves, not academic speculation on events.

Malcolm wrote:
Which Buddha's teaching?

dude said:
THE Buddha's teaching.
In the Nirvana Sutra, the Buddha said that supernatural powers aren't really important, what's important is instruction.

Malcolm wrote:
There are lots of Buddhas.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 10:11 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

Sherab Rigdrol said:
I don't need a person obsessed with building a grandiose reputation as a scholar and researcher to explain it to me in terms that are less than several hundred years old.

Malcolm wrote:
Which person would that be?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
Sherab Rigdrol said:
Modern practitioner here who prefers so-called Tibetan myth and supernaturalism's

explanation of reality to modern science's narcissistic and limited temporal conclusions.

Malcolm wrote:
Why narcissistic?

And yes, people need certainty in their lives-- some seek it in science, others in religion; but certainty is found in neither.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 9:11 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

dude said:
I'm talking about the Buddha's teachings themselves, not academic speculation on events.

Malcolm wrote:
Which Buddha's teaching?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 5:48 AM
Title: Re: Sexism in Buddhism
Content:

kirtu said:
The Tara's are of course. However I have a tale for you: one day Naropa was sitting outside the gate at his monastic university reading a parjnaparamita text. An aged hag come up and asked, do you understand what you are reading? Naropa answered, yes, I understand the words. The hag danced for joy. Then Naropa said "I also understand the meaning." Whereupon the hag wept bitterly.....

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
Use of the word "hag" indicates again patriarchal expectations around female beauty, availability and desirability, in this case, Western ones since the word "hag" does not exist in Tibetan.

hag 1 |hag|
noun
1 a witch, esp. one in the form of an ugly old woman (often used as a term of disparagement for a woman): a fat old hag in a dirty apron.

In the original text by Tsang Nyon Heruka, she is simply described as an old women (rgan mo) with thirty seven signs of ugliness.

kirtu said:

Thank-you. Of course most people recounting the tale do not say "There is no word for 'hag' in Tibetan and Tsang Nyon Heruka, simply described her as an old women (rgan mo) with thirty seven signs of ugliness." This is almost always translated as "hag" and then perhaps it's mentioned that she was ugly as well as old.

Malcolm wrote:

"rgan mo" is virtually never translated as hag, and the native Tibetan dictionaries simple describes a "rgan mo" as "a women who is "high" in years" [lo na mtho ba'i bud med]. In this case the translator [Guenther] took license with the Tibetan text in an unfortunate way, looking to make the text more "dramatic".

kirtu said:

The whole use of the term is to counter patriarchal conditioning as the old woman in the story is Vajrayogini appearing to Naropa (for those playing at home). The fully enlightened being appeared in a form counter to Naropa's patriarchial expectations. And this is the lesson to us as well.

Malcolm wrote:

I clarified, had you been reading carefully, that use of the the term "hag" was a result of Western patriarchal expectations, thus undermining the intent of the original Tibetan text.

BTW, if there is a word for "hag" in Tibetan it would be 'bag mo' [འབག་མོ་, literary "mask woman"], as in Sa skya 'bag mo i.e. the witches of Sakya, three very powerful demonesses that are mundane protectors. The term 'bag mo is also used for evil women.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 5:41 AM

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

Content:

dude said:

I think this will be harder for Tibetan Buddhists because supernaturalism is a governing principle in Tibetan Buddhism and is used as a criteria for its ultimate validity. This in itself goes against the Buddha's teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I can tell, the rise in the phenomena of recorded magical battles between Buddhists and Hindus reflected the reality that Buddhists in India were in a losing war in which Hindus, for many complicated reasons, were eventually able to drive Institutional

Buddhism to its knees.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 5:09 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think this will be harder for Tibetan Buddhists because supernaturalism is a governing principle in Tibetan Buddhism and is used as a criteria for its ultimate validity. Demonstrations of siddhis were the rule in ancient contests between Buddhists and Hindus, not the exception if we are to understand how Tibetans perceived the viability of the siddha tradition in ancient India.

Nighthawk said:

Is the "rainbow body" also a supernatural element of TB that Tibetan Buddhists need to get rid of?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that Tibetan Buddhists needed to get rid of anything. I am pointing out that many Tibetan Buddhist beliefs need to be understood as nonfalsifiable. I have actually been saying the same thing for over 15 years now. Inferentially, because many potential "converts" are attracted to Buddhism because of its supposed rationalism, forms like Vipassana are more likely to fit it with the dominant worldview in the West and therefore gain much wider currency. Just look at how the term "mindfulness" has been expropriated from Buddhism. Of course there will always be folks who are attracted to Tibetan Buddhism precisely because of its supernatural elements. But those beliefs are not likely to sustain the transmission of Dharma in the Industrialized West. We do not, for example, see magical duels between Buddhist siddhas and Catholic priests.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 4:30 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Is this insurmountable? No, of course not. However, traditional Tibetan Buddhists will need to accommodate science into their world view.

Anders said:

I don't think Buddhism needs to dump it's myths. It just needs to hold them with a light touch so that modern practitioners may adequately compartmentalise this and science. Given the hoops scientific Christians manage to jump through to accomplish such a feat, I think that's fairly manageable for your average modern Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

I think this will be harder for Tibetan Buddhists because supernaturalism is a governing principle in Tibetan Buddhism and is used as a criteria for its ultimate validity.

Demonstrations of siddhis were the rule in ancient contests between Buddhists and Hindus, not the exception if we are to understand how Tibetans perceived the viability of the siddha tradition in ancient India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Sexism in Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Here are a few images of female Buddhas/10th Bhumi Bodhisattvas in Tibetan Buddhism. Some are found also in other forms of Buddhism:

Malcolm wrote:

Please note however that all these images correspond to patriarchal (Brahmanical in this case) social expectations around female beauty.

kirtu said:

The Tara's are of course. However I have a tale for you: one day Naropa was sitting outside the gate at his monastic university reading a parjnaparamita text. An aged hag come up and asked, do you understand what you are reading? Naropa answered, yes, I understand the words. The hag danced for joy. Then Naropa said "I also understand the meaning." Whereupon the hag wept bitterly....

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Use of the word "hag" indicates again patriarchal expectations around female beauty, availability and desirability, in this case, Western ones since the word "hag" does not exist in Tibetan.

hag 1 |hag|

noun

1 a witch, esp. one in the form of an ugly old woman (often used as a term of disparagement for a woman): a fat old hag in a dirty apron.

In the original text by Tsang Nyon Heruka, she is simply described as an old women (rgan mo) with thirty seven signs of ugliness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Sexism in Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Here are a few images of female Buddhas/10th Bhumi Bodhisattvas in Tibetan Buddhism. Some are found also in other forms of Buddhism:

Malcolm wrote:

Please note however that all these images correspond to patriarchal (Brahmanical in this case) social expectations around female beauty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 3:21 AM

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

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I don't think it is (neither is Islam or Christianity) I think that YOU are facing a crisis of modernity (and projecting it onto Buddhism).

Malcolm wrote:

What I observe is that fundamentalism is how the world's religions are dealing with such things as evolution, science, etc.

Sherab Dorje said:

Sure, I agree. But you know what? Fundamentalism (unfortunately, as far as I am concerned) works really well at overcoming crises. REALLY well.

Malcolm wrote:

Reacting to a crisis is not the same thing as overcoming a crisis. Thus, I must disagree with your assessment.

Buddhism as a whole has a somewhat better chance of dealing with the crisis of modernity because it was reconstructed as a "science" in the late 19th century, with Theravada largely jumping on this bandwagon early on.

Tibetan Buddhism on the other hand is, at present, the least well equipped to deal with modernity because it has layers and layers of metaphysical developments due to it being the end product of 1300 years of the development and evolution of Buddhist thought in India (and of course, this includes the period between 650-1500 in Tibet itself and its unique permutations of basically Indic materials).

Is this insurmountable? No, of course not. However, traditional Tibetan Buddhists will need to accommodate science into their world view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 1:43 AM

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

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I don't think it is (neither is Islam or Christianity) I think that YOU are facing a crisis of modernity (and projecting it onto Buddhism).

Malcolm wrote:

What I observe is that fundamentalism is how the world's religions are dealing with such things as evolution, science, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 12:41 AM

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

Content:

heart said:

Since I don't agree that when using "I" and "mine" I am accepting the idea of a conventional self I find it difficult to discuss this further. I just don't think the Buddha ever made a distinction between a conventional self that is existing and an unconventional non changing ultimate self that don't exist.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact he did:

"Ananda, if I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is a self — were to answer that there is a self, that would be conforming with those brahmans & contemplatives who are exponents of eternalism [the view that there is an eternal, unchanging soul]. If I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is no self — were to answer that there is no self, that would be conforming with those brahmans & contemplatives who are exponents of annihilationism [the view that death is the annihilation of consciousness]. If I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is a self — were to answer that there is a self, would that be in keeping with the arising of knowledge that all phenomena are not-self?"

"No, lord."

"And if I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is no self — were to answer that there is no self, the bewildered Vacchagotta would become even more bewildered: 'Does the self I used to have now not exist?'"

And this is a nice one:

"It's just as when a dog is tied by a leash to a post or stake: If it walks, it walks right around that post or stake. If it stands, it stands right next to that post or stake. If it sits, it sits right next to that post or stake. If it lies down, it lies down right next to that post or stake.

"In the same way, an uninstructed run-of-the-mill person regards form as: 'This is mine, this is my self, this is what I am.' He regards feeling... perception... fabrications... consciousness as: 'This is mine, this is my self, this is what I am.' If he walks, he walks right around these five clinging-aggregates. If he stands, he stands right next to these five clinging-aggregates. If he sits, he sits right next to these five clinging-aggregates. If he lies down, he lies down right next to these five clinging-aggregates. Thus one should reflect on one's mind with every moment: 'For a long time has this mind been defiled by passion, aversion, & delusion.' From the defilement of the mind are beings defiled. From the purification of the mind are beings purified.

Gaddula Sutta: The Leash (2)

Here you can clearly see how the Buddha teaches the conventional self. You have to remember, the corollary of "conventional" is "prior to analysis".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 12:31 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Science does not reject metaphysical claims, it simply is not equipped to deal with them.

Practice said:

I think this is a half truth. It is true that science is not equipped to deal with them, and false that it does not reject metaphysical claims. I think the inherent paradigm of science has to reject it.

Malcolm wrote:

Now that you have given your position, in my opinion, I can see that you are in reaction against modernity.

You are confusing science with logical positivism, in my opinion. Science is unconcerned with metaphysics.

Practice said:

We are rapidly losing any personal contact with any inner understanding and orientation. I think this is where Buddhism shines. It addresses the inner questions of "how we be", a "quality of being".

Malcolm wrote:

Only in so far as, at its best, Buddhism deconstructs the whole ontological project and shows that it is fundamentally pointless since categories of being are proven to be mere conventions, at best.

One does not even need to commit to the bare minimum of Buddhist metaphysical tenets (rebirth, karma and so on) in order to benefit greatly from the Buddhist meditation, ethics, and so on. Of course, anyone who argues that these basic metaphysics are not essential to Buddhadharma itself is deeply mistaken.

Practice said:

All our behavior and actions are up for self review. Out of this inner inquiry and self cultivation, self understanding can grow. This is simply not the concerns of western science.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not true. Neuroscience, for example, is very concerned how social behavior, language, cognition, emotion and so on are grounded in our embodiment as human beings and what that implies for our contentment and happiness. I think you will find that many people involved in the sciences see science as a means of inner inquiry and self-understanding.

Practice said:

I personally hope Buddhism does not drift over to the paradigm of science and lose what it uniquely has to contribute to our self understanding. If it does may be we should call it Neo-Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Plainly put: Buddhists will have to cope with science. They will do so in a variety of fashions. Some will retreat into fundamentalism, rejecting science (while nevertheless enjoying its fruits, such as the internet and so on); some will manage a happy coexistence, and some will want to revise Buddhism to make it "scientific".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Hanmi Buddhism

Content:

Snovid said:

Buddhist these guys are not.

In fact

I also do not consider myself to be a Buddhist

I adore Dzogchen and Bon because of shamanism

Malcolm wrote:

Shamanism and Dzogchen have nothing to do with each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 10:41 PM

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

Content:

heart said:

I do understand what conventional means. But I don't agree that using the "label "I" and "me", you are accepting the "existence" of a conventional self". The Buddha's teaching on the 5 skandhas is clearly pointing to the non-existence of a conventional self. I agree that label "I" and "me", you might be accepting the "existence" of a conventional person. A person is simply not a self. A self is an abstract construct based on a giant misunderstanding and person on the other hand is something quite different.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

If you do not accept a conventional "self" you are in fact rejecting the designations "I" and "mine". I don't really have any stake in convincing you otherwise, but you will find if you pursue this line of reasoning you will be locked into some funny contradictions.

Incidentally, person [pudgala] and self [atman] are generally considered to be synonyms in Buddhist literature. I have never, in all my years of studying these texts ever seen any Indian or Tibetan author make a case that persons and selves ought to be treated as distinct and different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 9:14 PM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You mean people do not use the convention "I" and "me" to refer to themselves?

heart said:

Sure they do, still no proof of an actual conventional self.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Conventional means "dependent on designation", not actual, truly existent, etc.

If you use the label "I" and "me", you are accepting the "existence" of a conventional self

but not necessarily a real, true, actual self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 11:46 AM

Title: Re: Awakening the Sacred Body

Content:

Snowid said:

So if I'm working with the lowest chakra as described by TWR

this means that I'm working on the base chakra in the description of the Hindu?

Crown chakra in Bon

is equivalent of hindu crown chakra and the third eye ?

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 11:43 AM

Title: Re: Dra Thalgyur Tantra

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the abidharmakosa translation is from the french. it shouldnt be hard or take too long to translate the tantra from french to english.

Malcolm wrote:

Much if the tantra makes very little sense on its own without the commentary.

The commentary is roughly 1400 folios long.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 11:38 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, there is a self, there is birth, there is death, and rebirth. Conventionally, there is also karma. Ultimately there is no self, no birth, no death, no rebirth, and also no karma.

heart said:

I am not sure I agree with that. Even conventionally there is no self. If there was someone would be able to find it, but no such luck.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You mean people do not use the convention "I" and "me" to refer to themselves?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

How does that affect me here and now?

Malcolm wrote:

If you really followed that line of thinking yourself, you would never post.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Awakening the Sacred Body

Content:

Snowid said:

Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche described in his book exercises with five chakras

Why does not have all the seven?

Where can I find a description of exercise with the other two chakras?

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, five cakras is the Buddhist/Bon system. Seven is the Hindu system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 1:23 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Scientific methodology cannot verify non-falsifiable phenomena (such as karma, rebirth, God, etc.) because they cannot be tested and reproduced. Nonfalsifiability does not render something false, merely untestable at present.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Yes, that is quite correct.

But a big factor is also what the terms mean.

For example, if karma is used to express some sense of cause and effect, then that can be tested.

Malcolm wrote:

But that is not strictly what karma means. Karma refers to morally driven actions performed by a person whose continuum, either in this life or in some future life, will experience the ripening [phala] of that action.

Cause and condition [hetu and pratyaya] is a separate topic; necessary for understanding karma, but more general.

For this reason, Vasubandhu first writes about causes and conditions; then he writes about dependent origination; then he writes about karma: moving from the very general to the very specific.

PadmaVonSamba said:

if it refers only to some notion of
some continuity of behavior patterns or conditions from one lifetime to another
then, not so easy to test.

Malcolm wrote:

That is what karma means.

PadmaVonSamba said:

And, it depends on what you define as a 'lifetime'.
if there is no 'self', how long is a lifetime?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, there is a self, there is birth, there is death, and rebirth. Conventionally, there is also karma. Ultimately there is no self, no birth, no death, no rebirth, and also no karma.

The lifespan of human beings is considered to be about 80 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Dra Thalgyur Tantra

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Thanks Malcolm..thats what I was afraid of..and let me guess..there is no English translation/commentary, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Not yet...Jean Luc Achard has apparently rendered the whole in French however. I am slowly working on it, and have let the SSI translators know this. So who knows, perhaps my draft will someday become the basis for a publication. But I have completed less than 10 percent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Ivo said:

A careful reading of the Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sūtra will also appeal to some Star Wars fans, and it seems to be one of the early texts, although not of Tibetan origin.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, the concept that this or that form of Buddhādharma is being practiced in some other world system than our own is not an innovation of Dzogchen texts, but appears in Mahāyāna texts from an early time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 12:44 AM

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

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Science does not reject metaphysical claims, it simply is not equipped to deal with them.

Scientific methodology cannot verify non-falsifiable phenomena (such as karma, rebirth, God, etc.) because they cannot be tested and reproduced. Nonfalsifiability does not render something false, merely untestable at present.

smcj said:

Along the same lines, studies of complex systems, like macro economics, cannot be tested and reproduced either, which is why there are so many different economic theories.

Malcolm wrote:

Economics is often called "the dismal science", when in fact it is actually dismal science.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Dra Thalgyur Tantra

Content:

Fa Dao said:

This Tantra seems to be one that is referenced a great deal by many different Dzogchen Teachers. So of course I am thinking it is of obvious importance. I have a few questions#1 Can anyone who can actually read Tibetan give a brief synopsis of the main thrust of this Tantra in comparison to say other Dzogchen Tantras? and #2 how difficult is this Tantra to read if one were to try and learn Tibetan? I just remember somewhere where ChNN had said how difficult some passages were in the Marvelous Primordial State to render into English. It seems that some things in Tibetan are more direct and pithy and others...well...not so much. Any help/insight would be greatly

appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

This tantra is a sprawling text that cannot be correctly read without the aid of a commentary.

It presents the entire path of Dzogchen, embryology, cosmology, etc.

Even if one were to learn Tibetan, a classical education in the five classical sciences is a requirement to actually understand any of these texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 11:38 PM

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

Content:

ddorje said:

Isn't this quite deconstructionist?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhists could take some lessons from Derrida, etc. It might stave off a lot of naive beliefs about our textual traditions.

In any event, there is a long standing critical tradition with Tibetan Buddhism, the problem with it is that it is usually only applied to the other guy's books and not our own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 11:38 PM

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

Content:

ddorje said:

Isn't this quite deconstructionist?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhists could take some lessons from Derrida, etc. It might stave off a lot of naive beliefs about our textual traditions.

In any event, there is a long standing critical tradition with Tibetan Buddhism, the problem with it is that it is usually only applied to the other guy's books and not our own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Ivo said:

As this topic of discussion is quite serious and has a lot of implications it will be meaningful only if some "universally" accepted teacher comes forward with some clear statements.

dzogchungpa said:

What kind of implications are you referring to?

Ivo said:

Well... think for yourself what it would mean if a certain Buddha field from which a certain doctrine is said to have originated can be correlated to a physically observable place in our universe. The implications are more than what most Dharma practitioners will be able to handle comfortably.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the present day origin of Dzogchen teaching can be correlated to a physically identifiable place in the Universe and we are located on it. Otherwise, since most Mahāyāna practitioners who are familiar with the accounts of the universe, for example, as presented in the opening chapters of the Avatamska sutras will have no problem with the idea of the existence of planets in other solar systems and civilizations which exist in them. Nor for that matter will Star Wars fans be that surprised:

In any case, the first chapter of the sgra thal gyur identifies 13 buddhafiels where Dzogchen is practiced. The introduction to the The Supreme Source discusses these in much detail.

It should be noted however that in terms of textual history, there is no mention anywhere of this concept in Tibetan literature which can be reliably dated earlier than the sgra thal rgyur itself, which most likely was compiled between the 10th and 11th centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 10:57 PM

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

Content:

Practice said:

It would be helpful for understanding your over all thesis. I truly would like to understand.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

"Science" is an open-ended iterative method of inquiry into physical reality. Scientism is a belief system, which includes metaphysical beliefs, constructed out of the findings of the former.

Practice said:

To make sure that I am not misunderstanding you-

Two questions:

Does "true science" (science void of scientism) then reject any metaphysical claims?

Also, a major branch of metaphysics is ontology, would science embrace ontological inquires or consider them a form of scientism also?

Malcolm wrote:

Science does not reject metaphysical claims, it simply is not equipped to deal with them.

Scientific methodology cannot verify non-falsifiable phenomena (such as karma, rebirth, God, etc.) because they cannot be tested and reproduced. Nonfalsifiability does not render something false, merely untestable at present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 5:05 AM

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

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Can someone give an example which demonstrates how:

"Scientism is a belief system, which includes metaphysical beliefs, constructed out of the findings of the former."

Malcolm wrote:

For example, deciding that neuro-cognitive functions prove that mind is at best a epiphenomena of the brain. That is a species of metaphysical belief.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 12:03 AM

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

Content:

Practice said:

It would be helpful for understanding your over all thesis. I truly would like to understand.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

"Science" is an open-ended iterative method of inquiry into physical reality. Scientism is a belief system, which includes metaphysical beliefs, constructed out of the findings of

the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 19th, 2013 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Science (as opposed to Scientism) is always "...there is still a lot yet that we don't know".

Practice said:

Could you please be clearer on your distinction between "Science" and "Scientism"?

Please be specific, I think this is very important for communication and an understanding of your position.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientism>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 19th, 2013 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

luckily, Dzogchen is not a religion! rigpa is not an illusion..

Malcolm wrote:

Vidyā is knowing illusions as illusions. But vidyā itself is not something "real".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 18th, 2013 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

Then it turns out the universe is a hologram of a reality that is two dimensional

<http://www.nature.com/news/simulations-back-up-theory-that-universe-is-a-hologram-1.14328>

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Maybe, maybe not.

heart said:
This is where DJKR goes wrong it is only religion that knows because science is always "maybe, maybe not".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Religions give an illusion of certainty. And of course they contradict each other on every detail.

Science (as opposed to Scientism) is always "...there is still a lot yet that we don't know".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, December 18th, 2013 at 7:28 AM
Title: Re: Common Anatta Question
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
How is this different than Advaita Vedanta?

Tsongkhapafan said:
Because the self is not asserted as permanent.

Malcolm wrote:
You mean Buddhahood is conditioned? Whatever is impermanent is conditioned.

Tsongkhapafan said:
A Buddha's self is imputed on the Truth Body

Malcolm wrote:
A Buddha imputes a conditioned self onto the permanent dharmakāya? That seems very strange to me.

Tsongkhapafan said:
Buddhas can impute non-conceptually.

Malcolm wrote:
This is incoherent. Imputations cannot exist in absence of conceptuality, for example, in a direct perception.

Tsongkhapafan said:
It is a valid basis for imputing an I just as the parts of a car are a valid basis for imputing 'car' even though no car can be found in any of the parts of the car. The car, as a

conceptual imputation, functions. So it is with the I or self - it functions in dependence upon being imputed upon the body and mind, otherwise it would be non-existent.

Malcolm wrote:

The parts of a car are not a valid basis for imputing a "car". If they were a valid basis for imputing a car, a car would work when all its parts were piled in a disorganized heap. So your assertion fails.

Tsongkhapafan said:

This verse is often misinterpreted.

Malcolm wrote:

Your alternate translation is incorrect. Mine is based directly on Candrakirti's own commentary.

Tsongkhapafan said:

It is absurd to suggest that Buddhas do not have minds.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas do not possess vijñāna; they possess only jñāna. This is a point poorly understood by most.

In any case, you admit that Candrakirti's verse states that all objects of knowledge are burnt by the fire of wisdom. Even you must admit a mind cannot arise in absence of an object. If there are no objects for a Buddha (as indicated by the verse above), how can a mind (citta) arise, conceptual or otherwise? Therefore, to call the wisdom of a Buddha a "mind" is at best a convention. A Buddha's mind is an omniscient nonconceptual wisdom.

Nāgarjuna states for example in the Sixty Verses of Reasonings:

When reflection-like things
are seen fully with the eye of wisdom,
those great beings
will not be stuck in the swamp of objects.

When there is no attachment, since there is no attachment to or engagement to those things as a self, there is no attachment to the swamp of objects. āryas are conventionally "like [those ones who have] trained their minds on reflections".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Buddhas impute 'I' upon the Truth Body, which is their valid basis of imputation and is

therefore not wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

How is this different than Advaita Vedanta?

Further, how can Buddhas impute anything? The dharmakāya is the "mind" of a Buddha, and is completely free of all concepts. How can there be imputation when there is no conceptuality?

Further, how are the body and mind "valid" bases for imputing an I? No self can be found in either.

I am afraid you have long since abandoned any form of Madhyamaka, let alone "Prasanga".

Since all of the dried fire wood of knowledge objects have been burned, that peace is the dharmakāya of the victors; at that time there is no arising, no cessation; that cessation of the mind is the direct perception of the kāya.

Candrakirti comments upon this that cessation of mind and mental factors is conventionally termed "direct perception" of the kāya.

jeeprs said:

I am struggling to understand how this is not nihilism. If it is the complete cessation of all concepts and the end of 'the person' how is this state different from non-existence?

Malcolm wrote:

"Persons" never started, so how could they end?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Practice said:

@ Malcolm

Your original post is well put and is a thesis that needs to be reckoned with, by all religions.

Let me ask you though, in your view what is the value, if any, to being a Buddhist? Why bother if science has a more modern and better approach to the structure of reality?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see Buddhadharma and scientific inquiry as being inherently in conflict.

Buddhism and Scientism on the other hand, are bound to be in conflict.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Buddhas impute 'I' upon the Truth Body, which is their valid basis of imputation and is therefore not wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

How is this different than Advaita Vedanta?

Further, how can Buddhas impute anything? The dharmakāya is the "mind" of a Buddha, and is completely free of all concepts. How can there be imputation when there is no conceptuality?

Further, how are the body and mind "valid" bases for imputing an I? No self can be found in either.

I am afraid you have long since abandoned any form of Madhyamaka, let alone "Prasanga".

Since all of the dried fire wood of knowledge objects have been burned, that peace is the dharmakāya of the victors; at that time there is no arising, no cessation; that cessation of the mind is the direct perception of the kāya.

Candrakirti comments upon this that cessation of mind and mental factors is conventionally termed "direct perception" of the kāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Khechara

Content:

Konchog1 said:

I know it is a Tantric Pure Land (whatever that means) and that Tantric practice is the cause to be reborn there (especially the practice of Vajrayogini).

Besides from that, what are the properties of Khechara? What is life there like? How does Khechara differ from Sukhavati?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

For one there are women there...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Care to name the (English) source?

Malcolm wrote:

The English source ultimately is myself. I translated the Doha, revised it with Lama Migmar. He allowed Sakya Center to print it, but left my name out inadvertently.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Catherine of Siena said:

The Absolute Innocence of all within my Creation takes a while to understand.

dzogchungpa said:

Did he say how long?

Malcolm wrote:

I have seen Catherine's head in Sienna, where it is preserved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Whether he actually said the things he is purported to have said or not, there are teachings you can actually practice and get the same results,

Malcolm wrote:

Have you met someone who has returned from Sukhavati and reported on it to you?

pueraeternus said:

What are your views on practices such as Phowa?

(Not a loaded question, just curious based on your take on buddhaksetras).

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have much of a view about them. I have done a few phowa retreats, got signs and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

Then it turns out the universe is a hologram of a reality that is two dimensional
<http://www.nature.com/news/simulations-back-up-theory-that-universe-is-a-hologram-1.14328>

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, maybe not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

dude said:

Heaven in monotheism is eternal.

In Buddhism, it isn't even outside the realm of birth and death!

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, I know this. But this is a mere sectarian definition. And this does not make the Buddhist definition true and the eternalist definition false.

In short, all of these beliefs are just mediated by some book someone chooses to believe as opposed to some other books they choose not to believe.

When I say that I "don't believe" in Sukhavati, what I mean is that I am agnostic about it. I will admit though that there is certainly a poetic quality to the mandalas through which the Sukhavati and so on are described. However, remove the Buddhist context and these paradises very are very similar.

And of course there are some unappealingly sexist aspects to the Sukhavati teachings as well as such as:

"[A]fter any woman hears my name, rouses full faith and generates the mind to awaken, she will condemn the female body, and after exchanging those at that time, should she take a female body twice, I shall not attain anuttarasamyaksambodhi."

Of course, we can understand such attitudes to be symptomatic of the age. But if we take that approach, what else should we not just regard as cultural relics?

The doctrine of buddhakṣetras is of course deeply embedded in Mahāyāna Buddhist teachings from a very early period and pervades every Mahāyāna teaching including Dzogchen.

I personally think the motivation for developing such teachings comes as an early response to the doctrine that full buddhahood requires three incalculable eons to attain, i.e. imagining a place in which an ordinary person can find bliss and ease to practice dharma without having to be an 8th stage bodhisattva (required for rebirth in Akaniṣṭha Gaṇḍavyuha)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Whether he actually said the things he is purported to have said or not, there are teachings you can actually practice and get the same results,

Malcolm wrote:

Have you met someone who has returned from Sukhavati and reported on it to you?

While there are certainly some results we can confirm in this triple realm, rebirth in realms outside the three realms is not something we can ascertain personally. So we either take them on faith, actively disbelieve, or remain agnostic regarding them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Upon what is this mere person imputed in absence of aggregates? If there is no basis of imputation, what is the difference between this mere person and horns on a rabbit?

Tsongkhapafan said:

The mere person is imputed on their mind and body which is mere appearance, one nature with emptiness. That explains why there are no aggregates in nirvana, there is just the appearance of them and the appearance of a person imputed on them.

Emptiness is appearing as these phenomena, although that's not someone's constant experience until they attain enlightenment - there is an appearance of inherently

existent aggregates until the imprints of the delusions are removed and omniscience is achieved.

Malcolm wrote:

If there are no aggregates in nirvana, how can there be an appearance of aggregates? It seems you are suggesting that in fact that the appearance of aggregates in nirvana are like the appearance of horns on a rabbit. In other words, these aggregates, which you now agree do not exist in nirvana, appear there due to a false imputation. Is this correct? But if this is so, you also agree that Buddhas make this false imputation, and as Candrakirti observes, they would not then transcend samsara because whoever makes false imputations cannot be considered a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, Sukhavati is just a heaven -- no different than the heaven of Christians, Muslims, or Hindus.

PadmaVonSamba said:

In what way, exactly, is it "no different"?

.
. .
.

Malcolm wrote:

They are places where the faithful imagine they will go when they die.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

dude said:

Do you believe in nirvana?

Malcolm wrote:

That rather depends on who is defining it, why and how.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 9:16 PM
Title: Re: Common Anatta Question
Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
Is there a person in Nirvana? What kind of person?

Malcolm wrote:
A mere person, otherwise nirvana is the extinction of existence and the extreme of nothingness.[/quote]

Upon what is this mere person imputed in absence of aggregates? If there is no basis of imputation, what is the difference between this mere person and horns on a rabbit?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 9:59 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
In reality, Sukhavati is just a heaven -- no different than the heaven of Christians, Muslims, or Hindus.

Nighthawk said:
How is that so? Can you practice the Dharma and manifest Buddhahood in those heavens?

Malcolm wrote:
Ummmmm.....I think the point is that I don't really believe in heavens, Buddhist or otherwise.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 7:25 AM
Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?
Content:

Alfredo said:
Perhaps I am not really sold on the Buddhist teaching that samsaric activities are a waste of time...

Malcolm wrote:
In Mahāyāna skills in the sciences of all kinds are encouraged because they benefit beings. So I think a lot of Buddhists were not sold on this (early Buddhist) idea as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, you are at the end of your argument. You can object to the aesthetics of meat eating, but you really do not have a moral basis to protest against it. At least animals slaughtered in a butcher house are not automatically left to rot where they are killed.

In the end, everything we eat comes from the abattoir of industrial food production. That is just how things are right now. Does it have to stay that way? No. Is it likely to stay that way? Yes.

M

gad rgyangs said:

your argument is the Johnny-not-so-Dangerously school of thought: "since one can't do everything, there's no point in doing anything", closely akin to the "kill 'em all and let Buddha sort 'em out" argument.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is recognizing that you cannot fix samsara.

But I understand that city dwellers who do not actually participate in the act of food production other than as consumers have a very abstract view of the situation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no aggregates in nirvana. How can it be a state of mind?

Tsongkhapafan said:

If there are no aggregates, there is no person...

Malcolm wrote:

Is there a person in Nirvana? What kind of person?

Aryadeva clearly states in 400 Verses:

[Since] there are no aggregates in nirvana,
a person cannot possibly be [in nirvana].

Candrakirti comments on this:

If there are aggregates in nirvana, there is also a person. At that time, because they exist [i.e. aggregates and persons], in contradiction with sūtra there will be a support that turns into nirvana, and samsara cannot be transcended.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

this is actually a nice contribution to the debate: not only does eating meat contribute to the suffering and killing of animals, but it contributes to the accumulation of bad karma by other sentient beings by creating jobs in slaughterhouses, butchers etc.

Malcolm wrote:

So does eating plants by creating jobs for exterminators, hunters (used for pest control) and so on, who kill billions of insects and animals every year in order to make sure you get your tofu.

gad rgyangs said:

meat eaters not only create those jobs too, but the slaughterhouse and butcher jobs as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, you are at the end of your argument. You can object to the aesthetics of meat eating, but you really do not have a moral basis to protest against it. At least animals slaughtered in a butcher house are not automatically left to rot where they are killed.

In the end, everything we eat comes from the abattoir of industrial food production. That is just how things are right now. Does it have to stay that way? No. Is it likely to stay that way? Yes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Of course eating meat is bad, because it always involves killing... which is bad.

porpoise said:

Yes, and for most people eating meat is dependent on others doing the killing and

working in slaughterhouses, which must be a soul-destroying job - which is also considered to be Wrong Livelihood.

gad rgyangs said:

this is actually a nice contribution to the debate: not only does eating meat contribute to the suffering and killing of animals, but it contributes to the accumulation of bad karma by other sentient beings by creating jobs in slaughterhouses, butchers etc.

Malcolm wrote:

So does eating plants by creating jobs for exterminators, hunters (used for pest control) and so on, who kill billions of insects and animals every year in order to make sure you get your tofu.

gad rgyangs said:

New research has found that the use of common pesticides in Europe and Australia has killed up to 42 percent of invertebrates, which make up about 95 percent of all animal species.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.earthweek.com/2013/ew130621/ew130621b.html>

Pest control in organic agriculture:

Here we use one kind of sentient being to kill another kind of sentient beings:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/agriculture/crops/insects/fad64s00.html#Direct%20Treatment>

gad rgyangs said:

Pesticides are found as common contaminants in soil, air, water and on non-target organisms in our urban landscapes. Once there, they can harm plants and animals ranging from beneficial soil microorganisms and insects, non-target plants, fish, birds, and other wildlife. Chlorpyrifos, a common contaminant of urban streams (U.S. Geological Survey, 1999), is highly toxic to fish, and has caused fish kills in waterways near treated fields or buildings (US EPA, 2000). Herbicides can also be toxic to fish. According to the EPA, studies show that trifluralin, an active ingredient in the weed-killer Snapshot, "is highly to very highly toxic to both cold and warm water fish" (U.S. EPA, 1996). In a series of different tests it was also shown to cause vertebral deformities in fish (Koyama, 1996). The weed-killers Ronstar and Roundup are also acutely toxic to fish (Folmar et al., 1979; Shafiei and Costa, 1990). The toxicity of Roundup is likely due to the high toxicity of one of the inert ingredients of the product (Folmar et al., 1979). In addition to direct acute toxicity, some herbicides may produce sublethal effects on fish that lessen their chances for survival and threaten the population as a whole. Glyphosate or glyphosate-containing products can cause sublethal effects such as erratic swimming and labored breathing, which increase the fish's chance of being eaten (Liong et al., 1988). 2,4-D herbicides caused physiological stress responses in sockeye salmon (McBride et al., 1981) and reduced the food-gathering abilities of rainbow trout (Little, 1990).

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2984095/>

In short, there is no kind of mass food production which does not involve the wholesale annihilation of billions of creatures, both invertebrate and vertebrate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

but strictly speaking nirvana is the peace of mind that is experienced when all delusions have been removed. Only living beings can experience nirvana, inanimate objects cannot, because it is a state of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no aggregates in nirvana. How can it be a state of mind?

dude said:

Good question, but it can't be oblivion either, or it wouldn't be peaceful abiding, eh?

Malcolm wrote:

Who stated nirvana was peaceful abiding? Nirvana is peace, meaning a state free from arising or ceasing.

The Mahāyāna analysis holds that as all phenomena never arose from the start, all phenomena have been in a state of nirvana from the start.

Nirvana cannot be oblivion, because "oblivion" means a state of annihilation [where it does not mean a state of unconsciousness].

Nirvana is cessation. Cessation is not annihilation, cessation is the absence of causes for further arising.

For this reason, in Mahāyana, reality is described as non-arisen and unceasing. What has not arisen cannot cease, hence nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

duckfiasco said:

Malcolm, what do you make then of the proliferation of Zen books that don't mention the Four Seals, sila, Refuge, or indeed anything other than "being in the present" and

already being enlightened so there's nothing to do?
I wonder what enlightenment even means with such little context.
I add too that these books are often written for beginners or a lay audience for whom this may be the primary exposure to Buddhism.

If these are not indicative of Western or American Zen, then I'll be very relieved to be corrected.

Malcolm wrote:
You would have to give me some examples.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 5:28 AM
Title: Re: Common Anatta Question
Content:
Tsongkhapa said:
but strictly speaking nirvana is the peace of mind that is experienced when all delusions have been removed. Only living beings can experience nirvana, inanimate objects cannot, because it is a state of mind.

Malcolm wrote:
There are no aggregates in nirvana. How can it be a state of mind?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 12:07 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
not only are all arguments about the nature of reality flawed, but so are all descriptions.
what the lady said.

Malcolm wrote:
It is not a description, it is intended as a proof that there can be a Real that is beyond all predicates.

Simply put, if one can think of a real beyond all predicates, there is a real beyond all predicates.

gad rgyangs said:
its not taken seriously anymore. and it certainly ain't no rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:
Its taken very seriously among philosophers, and like all arguments, is interesting if only

as a literary phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

not only are all arguments about the nature of reality flawed, but so are all descriptions.
what the lady said.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a description, it is intended as a proof that there can be a Real that is beyond all predicates.

Simply put, if one can think of a real beyond all predicates, there is a real beyond all predicates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

Astus said:

Buddhism is about meditation. It is not a religion, it only looks like one, but that is a mistake. That's why Buddhists in the West are called 'practitioners' because unless you meditate it is not even Buddhism.

ReasonAndRhyme said:

Hi Astus,

I'm not sure which part of your post is a quote and which part is you speaking, but concerning the above statement: this is not necessarily so. In Tibetan Buddhism it is a widespread view that you're a Buddhist when you accept the Four Seals. This is for instance how Dzongzar Jamyang Khyentse defines being a Buddhist in <http://www.shambhala.com/what-makes-you-not-a-buddhist.html>:

Anyone who accepts these four seals, even independently of Buddha's teachings, even never having heard the name Shakyamuni Buddha, can be considered to be on the same path as he

What sets Buddhism apart from the religions of the world? I believe it boils down to the four seals (...)

(I'm afraid I can't give any page numbers cause I'm reading the eBook.)

This is also how it was defined in a Gelug study course I participated in a while ago.

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Pandita is more precise. To be considered a follower of Buddhadharma you must:

1. Accept the four seals*
2. Have gone for Refuge
3. Either be training in Buddhadharma through śīla, samadhi and prajñā or have realized the fruit of the three trainings.

According to his thinking, if one satisfies all three criteria listed above, only then can one be considered a follower of Buddhadharma. Personally, I agree with him.

M

*He makes an exception for pudgalavadins because while they do not accept the four seals, they nevertheless go for refuge and engage in the three trainings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

from Jetsunma Tenzin Palmo's FB page:

One time I saw this Russian Orthodox priest who was being interviewed, and he said the first thing they learn in the novitiate is that anything they say or think about God – it's not that. And we could say that exactly for the nature of our true existence. Whatever we think we are, we're not that. It's all just words, but the experience is beyond words.

Malcolm wrote:

The old ontological argument of St. Anselm:

Our understanding of God is a being than which no greater can be conceived.

The idea of God exists in the mind.

A being which exists both in the mind and in reality is greater than a being that exists only in the mind.

If God only exists in the mind, then we can conceive of a greater being—that which exists in reality.

We cannot be imagining something that is greater than God.

Therefore, God exists.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ontological_argument#Anselm

Recast:

Our understanding of the Real is a being than which no greater can be conceived.

The idea of the Real exists in the mind.

A being which exists both in the mind and in reality is greater than a being that exists only in the mind.

If the Real only exists in the mind, then we can conceive of a greater being—that which exists in reality.

We cannot be imagining something that is greater than the Real.

Therefore, the Real exists.

A flawed argument, from my POV, but there you go.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All Mahayana asserts that all phenomena have been in the state of nirvana from the start.

Sherab said:

I remembered something about Garab Dorje (I think) debating with scholars...

Malcolm wrote:

Manjushrimitra, in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

when delusions are removed, what remains is unobstructed awareness (nirvana).

Nirvana not something extra that is obtained, that one didn't have before.

It is what occurs when the defilements are permanently removed.

Malcolm wrote:

"Here there is nothing to remove,

there is nothing to add.

Look correctly at the real

if the real is seen, liberation."

Abhisamayālaṃkāra-nāma-prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstrakārikā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

All phenomena are not in the state of nirvana from the beginning.

Malcolm wrote:

From a sūtra you hold to be definitive:

Subhuti, further, the Tathāgata has shown that sensations, perceptions, formations and consciousness (which do not inherently exist)— non-arisen, unceasing, peaceful from the beginning — to be in parinirvana inherently; all of that which has been demonstrated is not the indirect meaning, is not the intentional meaning, but should be understood literally.

-- Ārya-pañcaśatikā-prajñāpāramitā

I can provide many other similar citations from the prajñāpāramitā sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

What then, is the defining characteristic, from a buddhist understanding, or, since you mention other beings in other realms of samasara, of a human, of of beings in the human realm?

My understanding is that it is the suffering of change
a constant sense of dissatisfaction,
wanting things to change when they do not change,
wanting things to stay the same when they start to change.

But it is also this very thing that gives humans
the greatest opportunity for dharma understanding and practice.

.

Malcolm wrote:

All these features are lacking in Sukhavati: there is no dissatisfaction at all in Sukhavati, hence the name Sukhavativyuha, the field of bliss/happiness, etc.

Thus by your own analysis we cannot consider birth in Sukhavati a human birth place, not just because there is no womb birth in Sukhavati, according to its mythos, but because none of the feature you are defining as integral to human experience are present in that place. Hence the reason why birth in Sukhavati is a desiderata, according the Sukhavativyuha sūtras. One wishes to be born there precisely because all the obstacles we experience as human beings are lacking there. In reality, Sukhavati is just a heaven -- no different than the heaven of Christians, Muslims, or Hindus.

As I have mentioned elsewhere, there is good reason to suppose in fact that the blueprint for the concept of a Buddhist paradise arose in Central Asia (and not India) because of the Persian custom of building wall gardens, such as Cyrus the Great's

walled garden at Pasargadae. The word "paradise" ultimately comes from the Avestan word "pairidaēza", which simply means walled garden where one can engage in peaceful pursuits.

And therefore, the reason I stated that human birth depends on being born from a human womb, which seemed obvious to me at the time, and still seems obvious. There are also no women in Sukhavati, and certainly our gendered experience is crucial to being human as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

Astus said:

Zen is therefore a style.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, largely, though not entirely, based on Sung dynasty Neo-confucian aesthetics as interpreted by the Japanese.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Alfredo said:

but religions ought...not siphon off the resources...

Malcolm wrote:

But this is exactly what religions do. It is like asking a leopard to change its spots to expect otherwise.

Anyway, Buddhist institutions are bipolar in terms of whether Buddhism is a religion or not. One minute Buddhist authors like Thinley Norbu Rinpoche is siding with theistic religions because Buddhism ought properly be grounded in "faith"; the next minute HHDL is telling us that Buddhism is scientific, and empirical verification is the standard Buddhism ought to be striving for.

In the end, it seems to me (and for many years, incidentally) that Buddhism is reeling from the knocks it is taking from its encounter with modernity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Is your point that as soon as one refers to Buddhism, that the 'ism' makes it a reference to one specific tradition or another, and that it is an inaccurate term because not all traditions agree on all the same doctrines, hence, there is no common ("generic") Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

I am making the point it is an inaccurate term for me for the reasons you state. That is why I prefer to call my "self" (a sensitive term around here, apparently) a follower of Buddhadharma, rather than a Buddhist of this or that type.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

My point is that what describes human birth in Sukhavati is not a meat & bones body, but the still-conditioned arising, the projection of mind, of the experience of being human, hearing, seeing, and so forth, the same way as it is experienced here and now, because the causes for that result to occur have not been severed

.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Devas and asuras are also held to be anthropomorphic, but we do not term them human births.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

The baby you were born as is dead

Malcolm wrote:

This is annihilationism. The opposite of the view you accused pensum of holding.

PadmaVonSamba said:

No, Annihilationism requires some sort of 'self' that is annihilated. The total destruction of a soul.

.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not that restrictive. It also means the belief that some entity (like a seed) which existed before, does not exist now. See Nagarjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

you are still clinging to a notion of an intrinsic 'self', as I suggested before.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing me with Pensum.

PadmaVonSamba said:

I was responding to the statement "Where ever there are humans, there is womb birth." Didn't you say that?

.

.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but it does not bear the consequence you impute.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is one strand. There is also a strand of Mahayana that maintains that all perfections are perfected within prajnaparamita. This strand of Mahayana is more characteristic of the Lanka avatara sutra and other nongradual sutras.

smcj said:

Oh I understood that what you said was correct. I just thought that given your stature here you could have been a little more diligent and complete, that's all.

Malcolm wrote:

All Mahayana asserts that all phenomena have been in the state of nirvana from the start.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

smcj said:

From my perspective, the difference between Mahāyāna view and the view of the Nikayas is that Nikāyas view nirvana as a result to be obtained. Mahāyāna understands that all phenomena have always been in the state of nirvana from the start.

As you know the Mahayana-Paramitayana thinks of realization as something to be attained by accumulating merit and awareness. I know it's not your favorite view, and you did start your post with "From my perspective...", but still that's not a totally fair or complete take on the Mahayana.

Sorry to nit-pick.

Malcolm wrote:

That is one strand. There is also a strand of Mahayana that maintains that all perfections are perfected within prajnaparamita. This strand of Mahayana is more characteristic of the Lanka avatara sutra and other nongradual sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

smcj said:

From my perspective, the difference between Mahāyāna view and the view of the Nikayas is that Nikāyas view nirvana as a result to be obtained. Mahāyāna understands that all phenomena have always been in the state of nirvana from the start.

As you know the Mahayana-Paramitayana thinks of realization as something to be attained by accumulating merit and awareness. I know it's not your favorite view, and you did start your post with "From my perspective...", but still that's not a totally fair or complete take on the Mahayana.

Sorry to nit-pick.

Malcolm wrote:

That is one strand. There is also a strand of Mahayana that maintains that all perfections are perfected within prajnaparamita. This strand of Mahayana is more characteristic of the Lanka avatara sutra and other nongradual sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:40 AM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

duckfiasco said:

This is a major point where I think Western Zen has failed.

Malcolm wrote:

Do western Zen practitioners cultivate bodhicitta? Indeed, they do.

Do they need to believe in rebirth? No, they don't.

M

duckfiasco said:

I must've just had bad luck in the centers I went to and the books I read and the forums I visited being almost entirely devoid of talk of compassion, the paramitas, or other such things. DW has been a much appreciated exception.

Instead, it's all Buddha-nature and Dogen, and only a very small slice of his writings about zazen, as Astus noted.

I'll avoid turning this into yet another thread on rebirth. We'll just have to disagree about the importance of rebirth.

I will say that I think it's symptomatic of a larger tendency to reject the parts of Buddhism and Zen that are unpalatable to Western culture or views.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say that rebirth was not important.

I just said they do not need to believe it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Are you your body?

.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha suggests in the Majjhima Nikaya that if, between the body and the mind, we were to choose one to regard as our self, he suggested it was better to choose the body since it at least lasted some 80 odd years, while the mind only lasts but an instant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

you are still clinging to a notion of an intrinsic 'self' , as I suggested before.

.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing me with Pensum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

[

The baby you were born as is dead.

.

Malcolm wrote:

This is annihilationism. The opposite of the view you accused pensum of holding.

Although the aggregates are serially connected,
the wise are to comprehend that nothing transfers

As I said on the other thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

dude said:

There is no self or person that undergoes rebirth in Mahāyāna. In this respect Mahāyāna view is no different than the view expressed in the Pali Canon.

Agreed, but the PC sutras do not go beyond phenomenology, while the final Mahayana teachings explain True Cause and the true aspect in full.

Malcolm wrote:

From my perspective, the difference between Mahāyāna view and the view of the Nikayas is that Nikāyas view nirvana as a result to be obtained. Mahāyāna understands that all phenomena have always been in the state of nirvana from the start.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

duckfiasco said:

This is a major point where I think Western Zen has failed.

Malcolm wrote:

Do western Zen practitioners cultivate bodhicitta? Indeed, they do.

Do they need to believe in rebirth? No, they don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

smcj said:

Do you then accept the Pali Canon as the last word and reject the Mahayana sutras as heresy?

A lot of people do. That's 100% ok.

dude said:

People are free to believe what they will, but the reason I asked is that duckfiasco's reply is based on the Pali Canon sutras, while the Mahayana view is drastically different.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh?

There is no self or person that undergoes rebirth in Mahāyāna. In this respect Mahāyāna view is no different than the view expressed in the Pali Canon.

Although the aggregates are serially connected,
the wise are to comprehend that nothing transfers

Nāgārjuna

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Alfredo said:

the Maitreya Project (now thankfully cancelled) could have happened.

Malcolm wrote:
Not cancelled.

"The laying of the foundation stone for a very large Maitreya Buddha statue in Kushinagar, Uttar Pradesh, India, will take place during a ceremony on Friday, December 13, 2013..."

<http://mandala.fpmt.org/2013/maitreya-project-kushinagar-takes-important-step-forward/>

See also:

<http://www.maitreyaproject.org/en/index.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Chimed Sogthig Instructions

Content:

vangelis said:

Can you recommend me a teacher in these places,for this practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Shenphen Dawa Rinpoche in NYC, Khenpo Sonam in LA, etc., Vajrayana Foundation etc.

Just search Yeshe Nyingpo/ Dudjom Tersar,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: Chimed Sogthig Instructions

Content:

vangelis said:

Can anyone tell me where i can meet a Lama or Rinpoche who can give instructions about Dudjom Rinpoche`s Chimed Sogthig long sadhana ?

Malcolm wrote:

NYC, LA, San Fran, Oregon, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:08 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

...Is it because being human only happens in the human realm?

Malcolm wrote:

It is axiomatic that human birth can only happen to humans. Where ever there are humans, there is womb birth. That is not the case in our idealized paradises like Sukhavat (but unlike Abhirati) where there are no wombs at all, not even women in fact. I never met human being that did not derive in some way from a human womb (even test tube babies), have you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

duckfiasco said:

The kind of meditation that results from this, in my opinion, becomes a way to sit in a seemingly equanimous fog as defilements play out unabated, remaining just as fierce off the cushion.

And since defilements are no issue and all we need is to "just sit" or "just eat" we can meditate for 5 minutes a day and feel real good is being done.

Malcolm wrote:

What the Chan/Zen schools have understood, like the Dzogchen and Mahāmudra traditions which followed them, is that buddhahood is not a result accomplished through effort, that afflictions are not something concrete that can be cleansed the same way we wash our clothes (in fact there is nothing to remove), and the cultivation of conditioned states of samadhi/dhyāna lead nowhere than to more conceptuality.

Since Western Zen practitioners are not harming you, why be so up in arms about it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

pensum said:

And yet they then turn around and claim that those who don't succeed in this life can take rebirth in a buddha realm where the circumstances are ideal and realization assured. I've never questioned it before, but i would be hard-pressed to see how such a rebirth could be considered "human". So even on that fundamental point there would seem to be some discrepancy and contradiction.

PadmaVonSamba said:

The problem is that you are still clinging to a notion of an intrinsic 'self' that takes rebirth.

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Pensum? No, I don't think so at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...it's a question of testability.

bob said:

Yes, and that implies having the right instruments for measurement. However, the limitations of the human vehicle preclude access to some of the higher levels of the spectrum...

Malcolm wrote:

Then such things are cognitively closed to us and not worthy of further speculation, don't you agree?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think this battle ended with all the lives of Ajasatru's soldiers being spared? They fought a battle. People surely died on both sides.

I can't speak for others, but there are plenty of Buddhist sutras where acts of killing are defended as virtuous, for example, the sea captain story and so on.

I am merely pointing out that the issue is not so simple as "killing is bad".

seeker242 said:

"Killing is never skillful. Stealing, lying, and everything else in the first list are never skillful. When asked if there was anything whose killing he approved of, the Buddha answered that there was only one thing: anger. In no recorded instance did he approve

of killing any living being at all. When one of his monks went to an executioner and told the man to kill his victims compassionately, with one blow, rather than torturing them, the Buddha expelled the monk from the Sangha, on the grounds that even the recommendation to kill compassionately is still a recommendation to kill — something he would never condone. If a monk was physically attacked, the Buddha allowed him to strike back in self-defense, but never with the intention to kill."

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/lib/authors/thanissaro/gettingmessage.html>

Thanissaro Bhikkhu must just be wrong then? Although, I find that hard to believe. More like impossible to believe!

Malcolm wrote:

Context is everything. Soldiers are not monks. Laypeople are not monks. Monks, it is true, are not allowed to encourage killing.

Killing is less than ideal. But there are always circumstances when it cannot be avoided.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

bob said:

rambling on about which religion or "scientific" point of view is best.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not question of "best", it's a question of testability. There are tons of things that may be true, which are nevertheless untestable.

Pramaṇa, a term which is generally glossed as "authority", is derived from two Sanskrit roots "pra" and māṇa, and really means "best measurement".

That is all Science can tell us i.e., their best measurements. There is nothing definitive about science, per se. But everyone wants reliable scales.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

smcj said:

Power, all power, is always laced with the threat of violence, the ability to transgress boundaries, whether physical, social, or moral.

Power="the ability to do". A surgeon has the ability, or power, to heal, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but a surgeon can also kill. When you study poisons in order to cure poison, you learn how to poison as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One thing that people seem to be unaware of, because perhaps they are not very clear about the history of Buddhist ideas, is that the so called "siddha" movement largely rose in response to increasing hostility towards Buddhists...

dzogchungpa said:

I understand what you say, and I agree with it. However I think you are using a more restrictive sense of "siddha/siddhi" here than what I, and probably others posting on this thread, have in mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Power, all power, is always laced with the threat of violence, the ability to transgress boundaries, whether physical, social, or moral.

We see these themes again and again the stories of Buddhist siddhas:

Physical boundaries: master over the four elements, etc.

Social boundaries: Kings reduced to beggars like Luipa, brahmins using low caste consorts like Saraha, etc.

Moral boundaries: the five meats, the five nectars, ritual acts of violence like the famous lower activities rites of Vajrakīlaya, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

JKhedrup said:

The legendary battles between buddhist and non-buddhist siddhas always come down to "The fastest siddha in the East". And of course, we only record our victories, not our defeats. For a record of our defeats, we must examine Hindu sources.

Agreed, can you suggest some?

Malcolm wrote:

Take a look at the "The Hardship and Downfall of Buddhism in India" showing that Indian

Buddhism was destroyed by Hindus. This book convincingly puts to rest the idea that Buddhism was not destroyed by Hindus but rather by Muslims. It shows, convincingly in my mind, that the long standing and deeply entrenched Brahmanical hostility to Buddhism was in large part responsible for the downfall of Buddhism in India, as recorded in myths and accounts in Hindu texts and archaeology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

What did he say of the individual soldiers who went onto the battlefield and engaged in killing the enemy?

Malcolm wrote:

If they belong to such a virtuous country, they are not at fault, because the violence is forced upon them. Run a search on Pasenadi at access to insight.

seeker242 said:

"Staying at Savatthi. Then King Ajatasattu of Magadha, the son of Queen Videha, raising a fourfold army, marched toward Kasi against King Pasenadi Kosala. King Pasenadi heard, "King Ajatasattu of Magadha, the son of Queen Videha, they say, has raised a fourfold army and is marching toward Kasi against me." So King Pasenadi, raising a fourfold army, launched a counter-attack toward Kasi against King Ajatasattu. Then King Ajatasattu & King Pasenadi fought a battle, and in that battle King Pasenadi defeated King Ajatasattu and captured him alive.

The thought then occurred to King Pasenadi: "Even though King Ajatasattu has wronged me when I have done him no wrong, still he is my nephew. What if I, having confiscated all his elephant troops, all his cavalry, all his chariots, & all his infantry, were to let him go with just his life?" So King Pasenadi — having confiscated all his elephant troops, cavalry, chariots, & infantry — let King Ajatasattu go with just his life."

And if he had taken his life and not let him go? What then? And what does all this have to do with what goes on at a slaughterhouse?

Honestly, I just can't believe you have people on a Buddhist forum actually defending the act of killing...No wonder it's called the dharma ending age...

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think this battle ended with all the lives of Ajasatru's soldiers being spared? They fought a battle. People surely died on both sides.

I can't speak for others, but there are plenty of Buddhist sutras where acts of killing are defended as virtuous, for example, the sea captain story and so on.

I am merely pointing out that the issue is not so simple as "killing is bad".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Meru is not presented as a visionary model in any Buddhist text It is presented by Vasubandhu as empirical fact. Since that cosmology does not conform to what is universally accessible empirical knowledge, it is relic of another time and another culture that no longer can be entertained as true.

dzogchungpa said:

You seem to accept rebirth. Is that based on universally accessible empirical knowledge?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

No. It's an inferential conclusion about a phenomena of which I have no direct knowledge (I have no recollection of past lives, and couldn't prove it to you even if I did). But I do have a mind, the last I checked (some may disagree of course), and as a matter of inference, is seemed unlikely to me (when I examined the question) that ultimately my stream of consciousness could have emerged from my brain alone (which is a necessary condition for sense cognitions, but in my opinion cannot account for knowing).

M

Should be..."my stream of consciousness could not have emerged..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

What did he say of the individual soldiers who went onto the battlefield and engaged in killing the enemy?

Malcolm wrote:

If they belong to such a virtuous country, they are not at fault, because the violence is

forced upon them. Run a search on Pasenadi at access to insight.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

No Seeker, you're in error. "Killing is bad" is not a pan-Buddhist doctrine.

seeker242 said:

Sorry friend, but it is. What deluded Japanese soldiers did or did not do, is irrelevant to what the Buddha himself taught.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha himself taught that a virtuous country had the right to defend itself with violent force if need be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

"Monks, a lay follower should not engage in five types of business. Which five? Business in weapons, business in human beings, business in meat, business in intoxicants, and business in poison."

Why does he not mention vegetable farming? Hmm, I wonder!...

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist monks are forbidden to dig in the ground because of the harm they will cause to small animals, thus they cannot farm, for a monk this is wrong livelihood. Likewise, monks are forbidden to travel in the rains season primarily because of all the small creatures they will kill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One thing that people seem to be unaware of, because perhaps they are not very clear about the history of Buddhist ideas, is that the so called "siddha" movement largely rose in response to increasing hostility towards Buddhists. In fact, it seems it seems that the tales of magical violence match pretty well with the increasing unviability of Buddhism in India. Think on this.

The legends of siddhas in India virtually all have the context of trying to amaze or defeat non-Buddhist opponents. The legendary battles between buddhist and non-buddhist siddhas always come down to "The fastest siddha in the East". And of course, we only record our victories, not our defeats. For a record of our defeats, we must examine Hindu sources.

If we take the example of Virupa -- in the legends of siddhis he displayed for Buddhists, they are generally kind, like crossing a reflecting pond by walking on the lotus leaves. However, when confronting Hindus they are always wrathful, like causing a linga to split in two by prostrating to it, and so on. Eventually, because Virupa was such a badass, Avalokiteśvara intervened, according to the main account of his career, and asked him to stop displaying siddhis because he was freaking people out too much.

Tibetans were fascinated by such stories. When we look to the accounts of Vajrayāna in Sino-japanese Buddhism, we do not see anything like the narrative of conflict and subjugation that we see when Vajrayāna was imported to Tibet.

While the Buddha himself is said to have criticized displays of ṛddhipati as a means to engender faith, as Buddhism lost ground against hostile Shaivaites and Bhagavatis (followers of Vishnu), there is marked increase in such tales. Unfortunately for Indian Buddhists, there simply were not enough Buddhist siddhas to stave off the eventual destruction of Buddhism in India by hostile Hindus and Muslims -- not to mention Central Asia. In reality, if we examine the Buddhist siddha movement as a defensive strategy in order to preserve the faith, it failed. By the the 12th century, even Bodhgaya had been overrun by nonbuddhists. So it seems that the Buddhist siddha movement in the end completely failed at preserving the Dharma in India.

So what does this have to do with Buddhist "inner science"? Of what possible use are siddhis in taming the mind? Of what possible use are siddhis other than as a frightening display of power imbued with the threat of violence?

If you read the accounts of Buddhist siddhas, they are filled with magical violence of the most extreme kind (Tilopa killing small creatures by the side of a river; Gesar slaying hundreds of thousands of Horpas). What is admirable about stopping the sun so that crops in the field burn and animals begin to die of dehydration (Virupa)? What is admirable about the ability to incinerate your opponent with a wrathful glare (Dharmakirti)? Why do we admire this?

Honestly, I think that people should really evaluate what it is that they find so admirable about the ritual violence (that we term "siddhis") that so many Vajrayāna legends are imbued with. People really should evaluate the fact that many of the primary legends of siddhas concern their skill at destructive magical violence as evidence of their qualities of realization.

This reflection should also cause people to reconsider what is meant by Buddhist "inner science". Perhaps we should form a hypothesis (like any good scientist) and subject that

hypothesis to testing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Meru is not presented as a visionary model in any Buddhist text It is presented by Vasubandhu as empirical fact. Since that cosmology does not conform to what is universally accessible empirical knowledge, it is relic of another time and another culture that no longer can be entertained as true.

dzogchungpa said:

You seem to accept rebirth. Is that based on universally accessible empirical knowledge?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

No. It's an inferential conclusion about a phenomena of which I have no direct knowledge (I have no recollection of past lives, and couldn't prove it to you even if I did). But I do have a mind, the last I checked (some may disagree of course), and as a matter of inference, is seemed unlikely to me (when I examined the question) that ultimately my stream of consciousness could have emerged from my brain alone (which is a necessary condition for sense cognitions, but in my opinion cannot account for knowing).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Things like Meru, which might even have been reasonable inferences once upon a time have stopped being so once Tibetan buddhism joined the world community in 1959.

Karma Dorje said:

Visionary experience != universally accessible empirical knowledge. Collapsing the two is nonsensical.

Malcolm wrote:

Meru is not presented as a visionary model in any Buddhist text It is presented by Vasubandhu as empirical fact. Since that cosmology does not conform to what is universally accessible empirical knowledge, it is relic of another time and another culture that no longer can be entertained as true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Otherwise all this crap about meru, siddhis, magic powers and so on is just useless prapanca people are entertaining themselves with Because they have nothing better to put their minds to.

dzogchungpa said:

Tell us what you really think, Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Truthfully, even discussing it is useless prapanca.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 8:54 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quite frankly, if Buddhists continue to entertain such naive beliefs, no one will take Buddhism seriously. Basically folks, this is Buddhism's Galileo moment.

Karma Dorje said:

Nobody of your ilk perhaps, but plenty of us mere humans. Yet again you are coming off as if you believe your viewpoint is the only sensible, mature one and everyone else is simply wrong. Frankly, I find you a lot more dogmatic about your opinions than these so-called fundamentalists you are railing against. I'll stick with what I have been taught by a realized master over the opinions of a scholar, no matter how eloquently stated or forcefully argued.

Malcolm wrote:

Its not dogma. When you can show me a cosmic mountain in the middle of space somewhere, or even a human being who can fly unaided through the mere power of their will, then there is something discuss. Otherwise all this crap about meru, siddhis, magic powers and so on is just useless prapanca people are entertaining themselves with Because they have nothing better to put their minds to.

Things like Meru, which might even have been reasonable inferences once upon a time have stopped being so once Tibetan buddhism joined the world community in 1959.

Secondly, a person may be realized about the nature of their minds, utterly free of affliction, and may still be completely mistaken about all kinds of things. Realization does not equal omniscience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 8:35 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, they are fun stories, but in the end the real siddhis are the human qualities of compassion, love and awakening: in other words, the things that make us more human, not superhuman. Apart from the supreme siddhi, the other siddhis are just parlor tricks, even if they are true.

M

Karma Dorje said:

A couple or three millennia ago, the flat earth was regarded as a fact. A few hundred years ago, the heavens were thought to be geocentric rather than heliocentric. Those things that we view as self-evident today may be considered quaint 400 years from now and unrecognizable 2000 years from now.

So why be emphatic about what is possible and close off what is not based on one's own current world view? I would rather keep a sense of wonder and possibility than try to be some sort of hard-boiled denizen of modernity puffed up with the conceit of purported progress. I would rather regard life as a riot of paradoxes and fables than as a scorched earth of foolish consistency.

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite sure in 2000 years humans, if we still exist, will still discover the earth revolves around the sun, and not other way around.

For instance, a common fact that no one in any culture has ever rejected is that there is a sun and a moon. One sun, one moon. Not two, not three. Why do you think that is? Everyone understands that there are two human, biologically determined genders, not three, not four.

There are certain basic facts of our existence which are constant. Those facts are explained better today than they were 2000 years ago. Why fight it with fantasies about continents that only siddhas can fly to and so on? To insist there is a shred of truth in abhidharma meru cosmology, for example, is extremely immature. It is exactly at the same level of thinking as biblical creationism.

Quite frankly, if Buddhists continue to entertain such naive beliefs, no one will take Buddhism seriously. Basically folks, this is Buddhism's Galileo moment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

The fact that a school referred to as Pudgalavadins existed and asserted some type of existent 'self', even though that is inconsistent with the doctrine of anatta, regardless of what brought on their demise, it has absolutely nothing to do with this discussion.

.

Malcolm wrote:

It has everything to do with this discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I am quite happy with the traditional accounts of siddhis, siddhas, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

O, I am happy with them too, they are fun to read.

Do I think they ever happened...miracles of loaves and fishes anyone? Raising Lazarus from the dead? Flying to Jerusalem on an ass? Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon...?

Quite frankly, I have never seen any human being swim through the earth, fly through mountains, fly in the air (except in a plane, etc.), stand in the middle of bonfire unharmed, walk through a wall, stick a kila in a rock, leave a footprint in a stone (and I have seen highly respected Tibetan Lamas laugh at the supposed photographed "miracles" of other lamas who claim to have done so (no not saying who)) and so on.

As I said, they are fun stories, but in the end the real siddhis are the human qualities of compassion, love and awakening: in other words, the things that make us more human,

not superhuman. Apart from the supreme siddhi, the other siddhis are just parlor tricks, even if they are true.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

smcj said:

Incidentally, prostrations as a "practice" are Tibetan innovation. This is not a bad thing, but it does need to be recognized as such.

Nylon strings on a classical guitar are an American invention. Nobody wants to go back to cat-gut strings. Sometimes innovation is improvement. But if you tried to put metal strings on a classical guitar you'd collapse the instrument. You've got to know what you're doing. Best to trust the experts.

Malcolm wrote:

My basic point of course, is that I have seen numerous people injure themselves severely with prostrations (knees, backs, necks, wrists). As a Doctor, my motivation is to prevent further injuries so people can practice well and long. The Nalanda style of prostrations (so called half prostrations) is better than that Vikramashila style (so called full prostrations). It is easier on the back, knees and neck.

Sun salutations is better than either in my opinion, because it works all the major joints and channels with little risk of injury done slowly and with care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

So you feel siddhas exist but not the siddhis, since they are all defying the laws of science and common sense?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I think we can all agree that the only important siddhi is the supreme siddhi, i.e., awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

...watering Buddhism down with science and New Age philosophies.

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, I do neither. Buddhism is Buddhism, science is science. One is a religion, the other is an iterative method for advancing our knowledge of the physical universe. Sometimes their paths intersect, but mostly they do not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

So trying to practise what the Buddha taught is now fundamentalism?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all.

Insisting that one must accept as literally true any traditional narratives about the origin of various Buddhist texts (for example, the idea that Nāgārjuna recovers the Prajñāpāramita from the Nāgā realm "under the ocean") is fundamentalism. Insisting that one must accept that Buddha taught Mahāyāna surrounded by millions of bodhisattvas on Rajagriha or that he taught Vajrayāna literally and personally, either inside a stupa in south India, or in some imaginary devaloka is fundamentalism.

My point is that the teachings in these texts must be able to stand on their own and be able to withstand scrutiny on the basis of the ideas presented in those texts on their own without any reference to or dependence upon some imagined authority. In the end, authority is only as strong as the weakest link in the chain. Thus Ganden Chopel said in regards to the question of authority:

"It is a tiger who testifies on behalf of the lion. It is a yak who testifies on behalf of the tiger. It is a dog who testifies on behalf of the yak. It is a mouse who testifies on behalf of the dog. It is a flea who testifies on behalf of the mouse. Therefore, a flea is the ultimate witness on behalf of all."

Not only that, but the various claims put forth by various factions about what the Buddha taught and where wildly contradict one another, especially when we come to Vajrayāna texts, where, according to late 10th century Indian accounts we have the Buddha flying with his monks to Oḍḍiyāna and granting the Guhyasamaja

empowerment to King Indrabhuti, who then, with his kingdom all vanish after achieving enlightenment, only to be replaced by a lake full of nāgās out of which one transforms into a human woman many centuries later, who then travels to South India and imparts the teachings to a South Indian King. (The Nyingma version of the origin of Vajrayāna is completely at odds with this account, involving magical texts that fall from the sky, and so on). I mean these are marvelous stories, but are no more believable than the story of Mahāsiddha Virupa arresting the progress of the sun in the sky while on a drinking binge with his disciple in order to delay the arrival of his bartab.

Therefore, with regard to Buddhist texts, it is my opinion that the best way to approach them, the approach that makes the most sense to me as someone who lives in these texts everyday is to see these texts as products of gradual development and emendation over time. We have many instances of this in the long history of sutra translation into Chinese. I prefer this approach, rather than believing that these texts are a divine revelation imparted completely within the eighty year lifespan of the undoubtedly remarkable human being, Gautama Siddhārtha.

As I see it, Buddhist sutras and tantras are a remarkable record of human beings, some awakened, others not, working out what awakening means. I see it as documentary evidence of a very human process of self-discovery and self-fulfillment.

But I do not think we need to take the legendary and mythological accounts of Buddha's life, or teachings attributed to him as literal, historical fact. We do not even need to take the cosmological myths presented in the Pali canon as fact. Nor do we need to accept the legends Buddha is portrayed as telling about his past lives as fact. In the same I do not believe for an instant that Padmasambhava was, as it is claimed in numerous biographies, born in the center of a lotus blossom somewhere in modern day Pakistan, or that he was three thousand years old and so on. Nevertheless, I happily recite the seven line prayer, understanding that is meaningful symbolically, as myth, etc. But I certainly do not take it to be a literal portrayal of the facts of the life of a person we call Padmasambhava.

We can, if we so choose, accept these myths and legends as literally true, but to insist to others that they must accept these as literal facts is fundamentalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles to Bodhicitta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You must merely observe reality, see that there is suffering and decide that you want to be as awakened as possible so you are finally useful to someone other than yourself. The rest will take care of itself.

Konchog1 said:

Exactly there. Some days I feel some compassion and some days I do not. But if I follow

the Lam Rim procedure of recognizing beings as mothers, remembering kindnesses etc. and generate love, then generate compassion on the basis of that love, I feel stronger compassion than I usually feel. But only for a couple seconds and it isn't progressing stronger.

Malcolm wrote:

We all have good days and bad days.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The name George thus means Guru of Orgyen. The myth or history of Saint George subduing, or slaughtering, the Dragon derives from the legend of Padmasambhava, who is the Guru of Orgyen, i.e. Saint George.

The name George has many variants in european languages, like italian Giorgio, german Jörg & Jürgen, hungarian György, swedish Jörgen, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

This is incredibly silly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:48 PM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no rules, my friend., apart from those we choose to follow.

smcj said:

In my work I sometimes have to go to 3 or 4 different places a week, places I've never been to. They give me directions and a map on how to get there. Nobody forces me to follow their directions, but if I choose not to follow them I can't blame the guy that made the map if I get lost or if I am late. If I take a shortcut I do so at my own peril.

Malcolm wrote:

Maps do not specify if you are to arrive by walking, train, car, bike, bus, helicopter or motorbike.

Incidentally, prostrations as a "practice" are Tibetan innovation. This is not a bad thing, but it does need to be recognized as such.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:16 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Apparently the Pudgalavadins' argument didn't hold up either.

.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that Pudgalavadins asserted a self is sufficient to demolish your claim that all buddhist schools adhered to the three or four seals, and thus renders your claim that theses are universal tenets in buddhism invalid.

Sorry, this is just a fact. You would do well to study a bit more Buddhist history . The fact that this school was long lived is born out by the fact that they were subject to polemical refutations from the time of Asoka until buddhism perished in India. That their schools did not survive owes everything to the destruction buddhism in India and nothing to successful refutation of their positions by opposing buddhist schools. This is simply a fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 11:51 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, things like this are decided by oneself. If one chooses to follow someone else's idea, still it is one's own choice. Nothing trumps personal authority.

smcj said:

Since this is actual practice we are talking about, where do you draw the line? Can you make up your own mantra? Create a new deity or sadhana?

Malcolm wrote:

There are no rules, my friend., apart from those we choose to follow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Things like this are decided by the practitioner's guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, things like this are decided by oneself. If one chooses to follow someone else's idea, still it is one's own choice. Nothing trumps personal authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Witness the *growth* of Islam and fundamentalist Christianity in recent years.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is exactly a result of the crisis of Modernity. Buddhists are just a little late on the scene, hence the phenomena of fledgling Buddhist fundamentalism that we see growing in groups like NKT and so on, and the attitudes of certain fundamentalist Nyingmapas etc.

Karma Dorje said:

What it makes clear is that our own personal understanding is not necessarily tied to, and might actually be counter to, what is good for the institutional survival of Buddhism. The fundamentalism may serve an important purpose in propagating the institutional forms, even though I don't intend to have them over for a beer and a BBQ any time soon.

Malcolm wrote:

If this is the case, the institutional form isn't worth saving. Fundamentalism is basically religious cancer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Witness the *growth* of Islam and fundamentalist Christianity in recent years.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is exactly a result of the crisis of Modernity. Buddhists are just a little late on the scene, hence the phenomena of fledgling Buddhist fundamentalism that we see growing in groups like NKT and so on, and the attitudes of certain fundamentalist Nyingmapas etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Personally, when asked I just say I am a Hindu which is true....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:55 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In order to demonstrate that these three or four are not universal amongst so called "Buddhists".

PadmaVonSamba said:

But you just established that they are:

anicca=impermanence

dukkha=suffering

anatta=no self

Malcolm wrote:

You are apparently not listening very well. I never stated once that these were shared amongst all Buddhist schools.

In fact, Pudgalavadins, a Buddhist school, assert that there is indeed a real self that experiences rebirth. They were once the most populous school in all India. They do not accept the third "seal" above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:48 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles to Bodhicitta

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

My understanding is that bodhicitta is selfless compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhicitta is specifically the arousal [utpada] of the intent or mind [citta] to attain awakening [bodhi]. That has three forms: the intent to awaken as an arhat, as a pratyekabuddha, or as a Samyaksambuddha.

The wish to awaken as a Samyak Sambuddha is special bodhicitta, the kind cultivated by bodhisattvas.

Compassion is its condition. However, as Dharmakirti notes, love and compassion do not have the ability to cause one to achieve full awakening, i.e. the awakening of a Samyaksambuddha. One needs something more, and that something is Mahāyāna bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:43 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In short, Buddhism's "grace" period or probationary period in the West is over and done with. In order for Buddhism to hold its own in the free market of ideas, it must be able to do so without any recourse to traditional authority. If it fails at this, it will fail the test of modernity and as human civilization continues to advance and develop, Buddhism will become yet another footnote to history.

Karma Dorje said:

Has fundamentalist Islam or Christianity met this test?

They don't seem to have a problem growing, regardless of "philosophical moribundity".

Malcolm wrote:

Death throes of a dying beast.

Karma Dorje said:

I am not so convinced of it's relevancy for the bulk of the 7 billion.

Malcolm wrote:

Only time will tell.

Karma Dorje said:

The problem Buddhism faces here is not that it relies too much on traditional Indian and Tibetan epistemological premises.

Malcolm wrote:

So you don't agree that Buddhism is facing a crisis of modernity? Sure seems like it to me.

Karma Dorje said:

It is that people here are conditioned at an emotional and instinctual level to identify with the Abrahamic narratives.

Malcolm wrote:

The Abrahamic narrative thing is overstated, IMO. It is, to use a term borrowed from

Witzel, just another form of the Laurasian Ur-myth that all European, Asian and American cosmological narratives share.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:35 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Unknown said:

...in order to do what?

Malcolm wrote:

In order to demonstrate that these three or four are not universal amongst so called "Buddhists".

Unknown said:

Then tell me, by what cognitive means is the arhat aware that he is an arhat?

Malcolm wrote:

His mind, what else? Surely you are not going to now suggest that arhats lack the five aggregates?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

and yet you have listed three of the four I mentioned.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't claim they were universal in Buddhism. You did.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Yes, and they are.

Malcolm wrote:

So all I have to do is provide one countervailing example?

PadmaVonSamba said:

And again,

do you suppose an arhat is aware he is an arhat?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. For example, the Buddha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:17 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

and yet you have listed three of the four I mentioned.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't claim they were universal in Buddhism. You did.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Unknown said:

"the conviction that rituals can cause moral purity....

Malcolm wrote:

That pretty much does in a lot of Vajrayāna ritual purity rituals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

How about this:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Basic_Points_Unifying_the_Theravada_and_Mahayana?

Malcolm wrote:

That works if you are a Theravadin or Mahāyāni, it does not work so well if you are a Dzogchenpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:33 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is much easier to define what is not Buddhist than what is "Buddhist" in fact.

dzogchungpa said:

What do you think about this attempt:

[https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=39&t=14040&p=184779#p184779?](https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=39&t=14040&p=184779#p184779)

Malcolm wrote:

It is definitely more comprehensive than merely relying on the four seals. But it's not perfect, though it is a start.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:26 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles to Bodhicitta

Content:

Konchog1 said:

How can you generate without force?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, it is very easy. Just look around you.

In other words, you cannot generate bodhicitta from formulas found in books.

You must merely observe reality, see that there is suffering and decide that you want to be as awakened as possible so you are finally useful to someone other than yourself. The rest will take care of itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I don't think the four seals are a sufficient criteria: for example, the Sāṃkhya school regards conditioned phenomena as being nonself, suffering, and impermanent (the manner in which they do so is a bit different than the Buddha's formulation, nevertheless...), and the experience of puruṣa can easily be equated with the unsupported consciousness of the Pali suttas...so...

dzogchungpa said:

I recently read this in DJKR's Buddha Nature book: Buddhists talk about "not truly existent", and I think that in this present day, this is like the ace up our sleeves, our trump card. It is what distinguishes the Buddhist view. However, only the Sāṃkhyas, the high Sāṃkhyas, have a view that is so close to the Buddhist view as to be nearly indistinguishable.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he is referring to the early non-theistic Sāṃkhya of the Rishi Kapila, rather than the later theistic Sāṃkhya.

But this merely goes to show that it is difficult to define a universal core set of Buddhist doctrines that are uniquely and distinctly Buddhist.

It is much easier to define what is not Buddhist than what is "Buddhist" in fact.

Universe created by God? Ok not Buddhist. And that's about it.

Actually, if there is a teaching in Buddhism that is uniquely the Buddha's, it is dependent origination i.e. where this exists, that exists, where that arose, this arose; where that does not exist, this does not exist, with the ceasing of that, this ceased, etc.

But not all "Buddhist" schools accept this as the sine qua non of Dharma. For example, in Dzogchen, the twelve limbs are considered merely a gateway for deluded people, but not the sine qua non of Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

futerko said:

He did write a book about it - "What makes you not a Buddhist", where he discusses the four seals - a definition I seem to remember you using to defend Stephen Batchelor's position a while back.

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, I was doing so because of what other people accepted, not what I accept.

futerko said:

Yes, but I think it's safe to say that DKR has outlined his position concerning your earlier question.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I don't think the four seals are a sufficient criteria: for example, the Sāṃkhya school regards conditioned phenomena as being nonself, suffering, and impermanent (the manner in which they do so is a bit different than the Buddha's formulation, nevertheless...), and the experience of puruṣa can easily be equated with the unsupported consciousness of the Pali suttas...so...

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

futerko said:

He did write a book about it - "What makes you not a Buddhist", where he discusses the four seals - a definition I seem to remember you using to defend Stephen Batchelor's position a while back.

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, I was doing so because of what other people accepted, not what I accept.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is in fact no true standard set of Buddhist doctrines that universally apply to all instances of what we call Buddhism.

PadmaVonSamba said:

How did you determine this?

There are, in fact, four basic tenets common to all schools of Buddhism.

They are commonly referred to as the Four Seals:

All conditioned phenomena are impermanent.

The nature of conditioned (*should be afflicted) phenomena is suffering (duhkha)

All phenomena lack inherent existence (*should be not-self)

The true nature of the mind is free from suffering (nirvana) (*should be nirvana is peaceful)

Malcolm wrote:

No, sorry to contradict you but...

The Theravadins do not have a formulation using the the fourth seal. That only exists in Mahāyāna.

Theravadas use the three seals: anicca, dukkha and anatta.

What is interesting here is of course when seeking to find a common ground among Buddhist schools we depend on doctrines also found in Hindu schools such as Sāṃkhya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

But just out of curiosity, what do you mean by "generic Buddhism"?

If you mean that there isn't a particular school or lineage or sect called "Generic" then you are correct.

Malcolm wrote:

There is in fact no true standard set of Buddhist doctrines that universally apply to all instances of what we call Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So you believe that there is no core of beliefs and practices that can be defined as Buddhist? That there is nothing that all Buddhists can agree on? Dependent origination, for example?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that -- I said there was no generic Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no generic "Buddhism".

Sherab Dorje said:

Of course there is.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Five precepts: an inquiry

Content:

Mouse Soldier said:

What does Buddhism have to say about when life begins?

Malcolm wrote:

It begins at conception. Therefore, Buddhist women need to think long and hard before committing to an abortion. That said, since I do not believe in legislating religious belief into law, I am pro-choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

I think you are wrong, I think the Upadesa is the oldest form of Dzogchen. Semde with it aim to separate itself from Tantric teachings is in my eyes a later development.

Malcolm wrote:

You can think what you like dear Magnus, but the man ngag de texts, all of them being termas, are all demonstrably later than the bodhicitta texts, with the rig pa rang shar and the sgra thal gyur being among the latest of all (no earlier than the 11th century).

Secondly, you are incorrect about "sems sde" trying to separate itself from Anuyoga and so on. Atiyoga, as Rongzom says, is "a commentary" of the lower yānas, as well as their definitive meaning.

But this is all besides the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's inner science and the results of the path can be proven to oneself by practising the methods.

Malcolm wrote:

This is what Scientology says as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Does that sound like "reactionary rhetoric" from someone suffering from "religious and cultural insecurity"? I am very sympathetic with what you have said in this thread, but honestly I feel that you are misrepresenting DJKR.

Malcolm wrote:

I was merely using Dzongsar Khyentse's interview as example of what I find to be a reactionary rhetoric which stems from an overall religious and cultural insecurity I have found amongst Tibetan religious professionals.

He also does not specify this "main philosophy of Buddhism" that must remain "intact".

Perhaps he can drop in and tell us what he feels that might be.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

well, if you like simpler Dzogchen, stick with the bodhicitta texts, since they are most likely the ones which actually have a root in a historical person named "Vajraprahe".

heart said:

I am fine with what I do, thanks. I don't share your or Germano's ideas of the origin of Dzogchen.

/magnus

pensum said:

I'm assuming, Magnus, that you don't realize that Vajraprahe is no other than Garab Dorje. In Tibetan texts his name is rendered in Sanskrit as either Prahevajra or in some of the early texts that Malcolm has been researching as Vajraprahe. Or do you disagree that Garab Dorje most likely was an actual person and that the main, if not all (Buddhist anyway, Bon may be an exception), Dzogchen lineages can be traced back to him (which i believe is Malcolm's view)?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is my view that these persons: Garab Dorje, Manjushrimitra and Shri Simha are historical persons. It is also my view that Dzogchen as an intimate instruction must come from that source. I do not imagine however that all the texts attributed to Garab Dorje are actually by him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

Of course know that dear pensum. Germano and Malcolm share the view that Dzogchen, or at least the Upadesa tradition, is an Tibetan invention. I don't share that view. Not because Tibetan invention would in itself be a bad thing, I am pretty sure that there are many elaborations of Tibetan origin in Dzogchen, but because the insistence on lineage in the Tibetan cultural sphere. I also don't think Dzogchen developed from semde to longde to upadesa or that hinayana developed to mahayana and further to vajrayana, it is just a comfortable darwinistic view that our society is full of. But I am not a scholar and what I think is of little consequence.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

What you call the view that Germano and I share is in fact the Western academic consensus, current even among Western academics who nevertheless are practitioners.

So called sems sde and klong sde are contemporary, they are but two branches of the same teaching of the same Tibetan teacher, Vairocana -- there is nothing philosophically remarkable about klong sde that separates it from so called sems sde. In short, sems sde and klong sde are different streams of the same basic teaching.

Man ngag sde however is a different matter. It is not a Tibetan "invention". That is too crude. It is a reworking of Dzogchen based on the second contact of Tibetan civilization with late Indian Vajrayāna. It is essentially gsar ma rDzogs chen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
The Mahayana is not an evolution of the Dharma in the Nikayas.

Malcolm wrote:
It is not an evolution of the Dharma in the Nikayas, it is an evolution of the Dharma outside of the Nikāyas.

Tsongkhapafan said:
Both were taught by Buddha Shakyamuni...

Malcolm wrote:
Impossible, I say.

Tsongkhapafan said:
The Dharma does not evolve because the nature of samsara and nirvana does not change.

Malcolm wrote:
The Dharma has demonstrably evolved over the centuries in order to cope with changes in human cultures, economics, and civilizations. It is changing now as we speak. To refuse to see this is voluntary blindness.

The meaning of nirvana has changed over time (once a desiderata, then an extreme to be avoided). Even the meaning of samsara has changed (once something to eschew, then something not be abandoned).

Tsongkhapafan said:
The meaning of Dharma does not change, but the presentation may do to suit the capacity and lifestyle of those who are listening.

Malcolm wrote:
There is no such thing as "inherent meaning".

Tsongkhapafan said:
For example the lamrim teachings of Venerable Atisha and Je Tsongkhapa present a complete path to liberation and enlightenment that will not change in meaning, but may be presented differently as times degenerate and the wisdom of living beings wanes.

Malcolm wrote:
The very meaning of "Buddhahood" has changed over time.

++++++

Basically, Buddhism and Buddhists are facing the crisis of modernity.

Like Christianity, Buddhism has no hope of relying upon the pre-modern myths and fables which provided its narratives. The vast majority of modern people simply will not

accept the narratives traditional Buddhisms have proffered for explaining our world. Buddhism[s], which once provided a complete explanation of the universe, is/are no longer capable of doing so.

Buddhism, like Christianity before it, will be forced to discover new meaning for itself, and will need to forge new narratives for itself, if it hopes to survive in the modern world. Of course Buddhism has the materials at hand to do so, like Christianity.

In other words, the validity or absence of validity of Mahāyāna does not depend on its origin legend. If Mahāyāna depends on its origin legends for its validity, then it is intellectually moribund and philosophically meagre. If on the other hand Mahāyāna does not depend upon its origin legend for its validity, then it is intellectually vital and philosophically robust. The same observation can be made about those who require the origin legend of Mahāyāna to be literally true, they are neither intellectually vital nor philosophically robust because they are incapable of defending Mahāyāna ideas purely on their own terms without recourse to some imagined authority.

The corollary however does not hold; the successful defense of Mahāyāna ideas on their own terms does not validate the legends of Mahāyāna origins.

Again, this begs the question: just how many Mahāyānas are there? How many Vajrayānas are there?

In short, Buddhism's "grace" period or probationary period in the West is over and done with. In order for Buddhism to hold its own in the free market of ideas, it must be able to do so without any recourse to traditional authority. If it fails at this, it will fail the test of modernity and as human civilization continues to advance and develop, Buddhism will become yet another footnote to history.

In order to prevent that from happening, Buddhists must in fact be the harshest critics of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

I rather sit at the feet of Garab Dorje and receive Dzogchen personally.

Malcolm wrote:

Me too, but it didn't happen and is not going to happen, so why fantasize?

heart said:

Oh, I don't fantasize, just stating what end of evolution has the most value to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

well, if you like simpler Dzogchen, stick with the bodhicitta texts, since they are most likely the ones which actually have a root in a historical person named "Vajraprahe".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

So if something "develops" or "evolve" it gets more complicated or diversified or just different but not better except randomly so?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Better/worse are human judgements. Simplicity/complexity are observable phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sang Chod

Content:

Kunzang said:

Regarding the question about a requirement for empowerment for practicing Riwo Sang Chod: the version I practice, and I think it's the most common version, has self-visualization as Padmasambhava (i.e., as Padma Thodtrengtsal). So somebody more knowledgeable should correct me if I'm wrong, but even though the RSC itself doesn't require its own empowerment (just the lung), don't you need prior empowerment before you can do any self-visualization practice?

Malcolm wrote:

The original version does not contain a self-visualization at all. The edition penned by Dudjom R., does, and in order to use it as such, one must at least have the lung, if not any suitable Guru P empowerment such as the Rigzin Sogdrup etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Simon E. said:

And the most well known ' recognition ' that Lama Zopa made didn't work out too well, did it ?

Indrajala said:

Does that reflect more on the recognized tulku or the Lama who recognized him?

Simon E. said:

In my view it reflects on the whole process really...

Lets face it we largely know about Hita because he is a westerner...the attrition rate of 'reluctant ' tulkus might be a big proportion actually.

Malcolm wrote:

"Nature habitually overproduces..."

-- Ezra Pound.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

I rather sit at the feet of Garab Dorje and receive Dzogchen personally.

Malcolm wrote:

Me too, but it didn't happen and is not going to happen, so why fantasize?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Simon E. said:

And the most well known ' recognition ' that Lama Zopa made didn't work out too well, did it ?

Indrajala said:

Does that reflect more on the recognized tulku or the Lama who recognized him?

Malcolm wrote:

Equally upon both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

The idea of evolution is that everything becomes better for most beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all.

There are two major definitions here:

1. the process by which different kinds of living organisms are thought to have developed and diversified from earlier forms during the history of the earth.
2. the gradual development of something, esp. from a simple to a more complex form.

The idea of biological evolution is covered by definition one.

Systems of belief and thought, such as Dzogchen, Christianity, Santeria, modern science, communism, free markets, etc. are covered by the definition two.

For example, so called "sems sde" is comparatively simple when contrasted with man ngag sde. Mahāyāna is comparatively more complex than the Buddhism expressed in the Nikāyas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles to Bodhicitta

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Any advice?

Malcolm wrote:

Don't force. Anyway, bodhicitta is not something you can contrive. You either want to become an awakened person to benefit others or you don't, and some days are better than others when you are an ordinary person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

tatpurlusa said:

Dzogchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Ditto.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Rather than: "I am a buddhist"

how about: "I follow (or agree with) the teachings of buddhism"

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddhism?

PadmaVonSamba said:

whichever buddhism you follow.

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no generic "Buddhism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:11 PM

Title: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

JKhedrup said:

The level of scholarship and debate necessary in the great [Tibetan] institutions requires a high degree of doubt and critical thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but it has strictly defined parameters. Despite all the deep learning, critical acumen, and doubt your Geshe may bring to the table, in the end, they are merely expected to master what is already accepted as true according to a consensus. Like musicians, they are merely expected to become expert at playing the scales. They are neither expected nor encouraged to open up whole new fields of learning. They are expected merely to be vessels conveying the wisdom of one generation to another, unaltered like an impression from a seal. Now, do not think that in my view this has no value. It definitely has value. It is a part of human culture and learning.

However, most of the classically educated Tibetans I know have a very hard time with the idea of evolution. They have difficulty accepting that modern humans come from Africa, and that all languages also originally come from Africa and that the pattern of human migration from Africa can be mathematically tracked. Indeed, they have difficulty with Science in general (all the while happily using the fruits of scientific endeavor in the form of electricity, cell phones, antibiotics, and so on).

This is largely because up until recently most educated Tibetans are educated into a pre-modern view of the world that includes Mt. Meru, the Buddhist myth of the origin of humans in devas whose bodies gel and thicken due to their craving for the sweet "cream of the earth" (sa zhag) on the surface of the planet and so on.

There is no fault in all this, of course, but it is important to remember that there are

bound to be vast differences in the way persons like ourselves, raised and educated in a post-modern civilization will view the world when compared to those who have pre-modern educations.

For example, a common theme among Tibetan teachers is the oft repeated trope:

"...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

-- Dzongsar Khyentse

http://www.lifepositive.com/Spirit/Buddhism/Through_the_Lens_of_Reality112005.asp

"Why will Buddhism never change?", we ask; and answer as always is "Because Buddhism is based on wisdom."

Of course, anyone who has studied history will instantly recognize this to be a statement that is at best, very naive. Buddhism has undergone constant change and evolution from the beginning.

Even more questionable is the arrogation of Buddhism as a "science". It is not science, it never was and never will be. Buddhism, is, in its best aspect, a yogic tradition; at worst, a religious dogma. Buddhism may indeed have some ideas which are compatible with the worldview informed by modern science, but it equally entertains many beliefs which are not falsifiable in any respect, and hence must be considered non-scientific (which does not mean false, rather merely empirically untestable).

Now, of course, Dzongsar Khyentse can be forgiven for referring to Buddhism as a "science" because of the use of the term *adhyātmavidyā* (*nang rig*) translated as so-called "inner science" where the term "science" is used to translate the term "*vidyā*".

We must however see statements like Dzongsar Khyentse's for what they are: reactionary rhetoric which misses the target.

Modern science, as we know, is a method of coming up with predicative models. If one's predictions fail, one's model is defective, and one's hypothesis is either abandoned or revised by incorporating the results of one's failure. It is an iterative process, as we all know.

However, there is, in my estimation a religious and cultural insecurity which is responsible for sentiments like Dzongar Khyentse's, a sentiment right at home with similar sentiments about the Bible expressed by Christian Fundamentalists. It is an eternalization of tradition. Stating that Buddhism will never or has never changed is like asserting that words of the Bible or the Koran are infallible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Rather than: "I am a buddhist"

how about: "I follow (or agree with) the teachings of buddhism"

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddhism?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 12:15 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

padma norbu said:

I have occasionally in the past few years started just saying "I'm not really a Buddhist, though" to friends and extended family whenever they ask me about all my books and thangkas and statues...

seeker242 said:

Do they believe you? I probably wouldn't if you had Buddha statues and Buddha pictures all over the place. Does it really matter that friends and family understand the technical differences of Dzogchen vs Buddhism? That sound like a long, complicated conversation, one they probably would not understand.

padma norbu said:

They probably think I'm weird and full of crap like a new age hippy or something. I think this is better than them thinking I'm really a buddhist because I think the professional buddhists who wear robes and stuff do a much better job setting an example than I do. Yes, I could try to set a better example, but it's just not natural for me to be a teacher. If I ever found myself in that position, I'd probably abuse the power more and more with each passing year.

Malcolm wrote:

To nonbuddhists I say freely I am Buddhist. But I am not really a "buddhist". I am a practitioner of Dharma, not a follower of a school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for postration.

Content:

supermaxv said:

Well, in my Ngondro materials from my refuge lama, there are specific guidelines and teachings in regards to the proper forms of prostrations for Ngondro accumulation.

Malcolm wrote:

These things are customs, not Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

So, can you just answer the question? Would it matter to you if Zoroastrianism influenced Buddhism? If so, why?

Malcolm wrote:

It would not matter; but it didn't — not in any meaningful way that I can see.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

I mean, what are you even arguing about?

Malcolm wrote:

Vedanta originally referred the Upanishads [End of the Vedas], only two of which are pre-Buddhist (Brihadaranyaka and the Candogya).

However as a _school_, it is post- buddhist by many centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 7:14 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

So, the Vajra appeared in Vedanta prior to the existence of Vajrayana...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and the Vajra appeared in Buddhism before Vedanta existed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Besides invisiblediamond, would anybody care either way? It doesn't seem like anyone really cares in this thread, they are just stating why it the idea is demonstrably factually incorrect. If it influenced Dzogchen the way Vedanta influenced Vajrayana, it wouldn't actually matter to anyone, right?

Just want to clear this up.

Malcolm wrote:

Who says Vedanta influenced Vajrayāna?

padma norbu said:

The Vajra (thunderbolt) is from Hindu origin, is it not? Then, we have the various deities that were assimilated into Vajrayana like Saraswati, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

The vajra is not "Hindu" it is Vedic, and is a shared mytheme in all Indian religions, just like Saraswati, Tārā and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Is it actually acceptable to do them that way?

Bump

heart said:

No, of course not. Different traditions.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course it is acceptable. A prostration is a prostration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Besides invisiblediamond, would anybody care either way? It doesn't seem like anyone really cares in this thread, they are just stating why it the idea is demonstrably factually incorrect. If it influenced Dzogchen the way Vedanta influenced Vajrayana, it wouldn't actually matter to anyone, right?

Just want to clear this up.

Malcolm wrote:

Who says Vedanta influenced Vajrayāna?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

Look at the west. We still flock to Thor.Where did that come from?

Malcolm wrote:

Marvel Comics.

invisiblediamond said:

We still believe in a work ethic. Where did that come from?

Malcolm wrote:

John Calvin.

invisiblediamond said:

Bonpo say, Shang Shung people were culturally more Persian. This is where dharma met persia and had a baby.

Malcolm wrote:

That is silly. Zhang zhung was literally next door to Kashmir.

Occam's razor, baby.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

To clarify, DC and Z share unique ideas. This is from some where. If not from Z itself, then from what came before and it was so old it was just like the basic world view, or there was some cross pollination with Persian ascetics who must have crossed paths with Shang Shung meditators.

Malcolm wrote:

No. they really do not. Dzogchen is non-theistic. Dzogchen is not eternalist. Dzogchen uses the Indian scheme of the five elements, not the Zoroastrian scheme of seven elements which I posted to you.

I think you are tripping on this one.

Ok, over and out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

So where from in Africa do colors and elements meet? My research makes this a North Central Asian Aryan motif.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://archive.constantcontact.com/fs012/1101454195791/archive/1104070256872.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

From what? That what is the root cultural bias that DC seems to unwind. Bc once it got to the borderlands with Persia, Z ideas were woven in.

Malcolm wrote:

They split as in "went their separate ways".

Dzogchen is based on Indian Antecedents which then were further developed in Tibet in complete absence of any influence from Zoroastrianism, which by the time period you are talking about. We do not have any record in Tibetan, Chinese or any other language of a major contact between Tibetans and Zoroastrians. Zoroastrians strictly do not

proselytize. We do have some evidence of contact between Tibetans and Manichaeans in Khotan however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

I don't believe you. Could be much older, by 10,000 years.

Malcolm wrote:

Then, inexplicably, you are being a knucklehead. And the above is total new age bullshit fueled by some very strong weed, I am sure.

Ok, I am done with this thread because it has degenerated into total nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

OddiyanaIndia said:

I see the core error of InvisibleDiamond.

He doesn't understand geography or borders of pre-1947 India.

invisiblediamond said:

These comments are retarded bc I'm talking about PreVedic time.

Malcolm wrote:

Look, all mythologies come from a common source in Africa 130,000 years ago.

You need to read Witzel's book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

Z influence bc it's that old and pinioned between both regions.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote][/quote][/quote]

Dude, the ancient Indo-aryan and the Ancient Iranians were enemies. Not friends. They split.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It's fascinating.

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of fascinating things. But mixing up Zoroastrianism with Dzogchen? Really, there is no solid basis for this.

invisiblediamond said:

Do the Maya equate color and elements? I know of know other two groups who have this idea. They live in the same region. These are clearly coming from a common cultural root. Failing to see this is fantasizing about one's tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh for christ's sake -- the Chinese also equate their elements and color, and so to the Greeks (black, red, yellow and white).

Mayan elements:

East – Red : Father Sun, the Way of the Visionary: Reed, Knowledge, Crocodile, Serpent, Offering

West – Blue/Black: Grandmother Moon/Ocean, the Way of the Teacher: Monkey, Bird, Rainstorm, Dawn, Deer

South – Yellow: Mother Earth, the Way of the Healer: Road, Wisdom, Sun, Net, Seed

North – White: Father Sky, the Way of the Sacred Warrior: Jaguar, Flint, Wind, Death, Dog

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

They are missing the anthropological evidence so their text based analysis, since texts are dubious, sheds rather little light on what may or may not have really happened.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so what is your archaeological evidence to prove an Iranian source for certain aspects of Dzogchen, namely body of light (Since everything else in Dzogchen is squarely Buddhist like emptiness, three kāyas, buddhas, bodhisattvas, etc.)?

Unless you want to try and convince us that all Mahāyāna is really just Zoroastrianism in drag.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It's fascinating.

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of fascinating things. But mixing up Zoroastrianism with Dzogchen? Really, there is no solid basis for this.

Anyway, this thread has been sunk by useless speculation.

BTW Mahāmudra guys. If you really take seriously what your citations say -- then why bother with gradualism and defending it.

However, I must point out to you that it is really not possible to find the notion of primordial buddhhood in Mahamudra texts explained in the unique style of Dzogchen.

Its ok. Its not a competition. Fundamentally, we can all agree that Dzogchen and Mahamudra are describing the same state. But the paths are different.

Greg, your citations are ok, but you really should have cited Virupa:

All sentient beings are emanations of mahāmudrā,
the essence of those emanations is the forever non-arising dharmadhātu,
also all characteristics of dualistic appearances, happiness, suffering and so on,
are the play of mahāmudrā, the original dharmatā.

and:

Since realism is destroyed in its own state, one is liberated from samsara and nirvana.
Since vidyā is pure in the basis, it is called "Perfect Buddhahood."
Since phenomena and mind are exhausted in the state of exhaustion, therefore it is explained as "nirvana",
uncontrived, unchanging, totally liberated from everything to be given up or to attain.

--Lion Doha

You guys who claim to be practitioners of Mahāmudra really need to be poked every now and again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

I need to see the evidence. .

Malcolm wrote:

Paul, with all due respect, this is a preposterous thing for you to say. You engage in wild speculation and then claim to need to see evidence?

invisiblediamond said:

I'm inferring from what the evidence shows. The similarities to Persian mysticism is unmistakable.

Malcolm wrote:

First, there is no Persian Mysticism. Parsis have not lived in Iran for centuries. They mostly live in Western India. Sure, under the Shah some were invited back, but then it stopped. There are only 30 thousand Parsis in Iran, who all were invited back by the Shah.

Second, the notion of five elements of the physical body reverting to light clearly is found in oral instructions connected to the Cakrasamvara completion stage practices that are contemporary with the Dzogchen tantras that treat the same idea.

Secondly, the notion that the five element vāyus of the body have color is widespread in India Buddhist tantra and intimate instructions. So there are plenty of places where these ideas about rainbow body/body of light can be sourced in India Buddhist texts.

Third, even your presentation of the elements of Zoroastrianism is dramatically wrong.

Sure, I can accept that ideas like Sukhavati and so on were influenced by Persian culture, no problem.

But Zoroastrianism and Dzogchen are incompatible. It is simply irresponsible speculation on your part to continue this way. You have no evidence, you have no proof.

invisiblediamond said:

I won't follow the self-deceived and self-professed.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't need to follow the self-deceived, you are doing an excellent job of deceiving

yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It's a good thing I'm not reputable then. I don't believe these tall tales. I don't trust historical accounts. Many of these folks say they come from Greeks. But they don't as born out by genetic testing. They are indigenous. So accounts can't be trusted.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? Are you high? First you reject that Dzogchen is indigenous to "India". Then you claim, with no evidence at all, that it is Zoroastrian influenced on the basis of some fairly unintelligible account written in the sixties about Zoroastrian mysticism on the basis of the five elements reverting to light, which is interesting but not conclusive in any sense.

Then you reject early Tibetan accounts of the importation of Dzogchen to Tibet based on what? Your "feeling"? Your years of dedicated research on comparative religion and mastery of world history?

invisiblediamond said:

I believe the Proto-Aryan elements are part of maghada. The PreVedics revere the elements and nature.

Malcolm wrote:

You are mixing up so many periods of history, so many cultures, here it is really insane. You must be smoking some really strong weed.

There is no reason to believe that there was a teaching called "atiyoga" prior to the late 6th or 7th century. But there is every reason to accept that it was brought to Tibet by Vairocana in the late 8th.

Doctrines like "the body of light" occur rather late in the textual history of Dzogchen. If they do have Persian Influence at all, it could only be from Central Asian Manichaeans. The other possible influence is the mother tantras, specifically the śrī-vajraḍāka-nāma-mahātantrarāja.

invisiblediamond said:

Dzogchen may very well be the same thing for this Persian influenced group. Based on this I'm pretty doubtful about these yantras.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you smoking some Bonpo crack. Did you hang out with Geshe Chagphur recently or something?

I respect Bon, but their Dzogchen is entirely Buddhist in origin.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

I need to see the evidence. .

Malcolm wrote:

Paul, with all due respect, this is a preposterous thing to for you to say. You engage in wild speculation and then claim to need to see evidence?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Just out of curiosity, does 'Oddiyana', the place name, have anything to do with the 'Uddiyana' of yoga's Uddiyana Bandha?

Malcolm wrote:

Possibly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It would be difficult to pigeon-hole Swat as "culturally Indian." Then, as now, it had its distinct idiosyncrasies that made it seem a little far North of Indian.

Malcolm wrote:

Woo-Chang, or Udyana. Monasteries, and Their Ways. Traces of Buddha.

After crossing the river, (the travellers) immediately came to the kingdom of Woo-chang, which is indeed (a part) of North India. The people all use the language of Central India, "Central India" being what we should call the "Middle Kingdom." The food and clothes of the common people are the same as in that Central Kingdom. The Law of Buddha is very (flourishing in Woo-chang). They call the places where the monks stay (for a time)

or reside permanently Sangharamas; and of these there are in all 500, the monks being all students of the hinayana. When stranger bhikshus arrive at one of them, their wants are supplied for three days, after which they are told to find a resting-place for themselves.

<http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/f/fa-hien/f15l/contents.html>

invisiblediamond said:

If there is a strong influence of Z in DC...

Malcolm wrote:

No respectable, competent scholar thinks Zoroastrianism has a "strong" influence on Dzogchen. Dzogchen is Buddhadharma. Its origins are strictly from the Indo-Buddhist cultural sphere.

In the medium history of the Vajra Bridge (klong sde), it describes nine regions (glings) in "rGya gar" (pre-partition subcontinental India including Indo-China) eight of which are sited from the center, which is of course Vajrasana: Bangla in the east, Bhaitala in the south; Orgyen in the west; Kashmir in the north; Khams bu gLing (Kampuchea) in the south east; Zangs gling (the copper country, Visnagar in Gujarat?) in the south west. Zahor in the northwest; Kamarupa in the northeast — with Vajrasana in the center of all of these.

This text further asserts that rGya gar is the source of Dzogchen; in particular, Northwestern Orgyen.

The earliest accounts we have of Garab Dorje, in the Wheel that Ascertains the Yānas (found in the Bairo rgyud 'bum, vol. nga) records that he was born to a princess from Northwestern region of Orgyen who was a Buddhist nun.

The earliest accounts state that Mañjuśrimitra was from Shri Lanka, but studied at Nalanda (founded in the 5th century AD, and all accounts describe Mañjuśrimitra as being a scholar here). Manjushrimitra meets Garab Dorje in a place within Orgyen called Danakosha, which is held to be on the shores of the great outer ocean, which can only be the Arabian Sea, somewhere on the coast of modern Pakistan.

Shri Simha was an Indian. Despite later Nyinthig accounts that he came from "rgya nag" and the attempt of some modern authors to site him as being from Khotan, the earliest accounts we have about this master indicate that he was an Indian.

We have no real reason to doubt the historicity of these three masters, especially Shri Simha, whom Vairocana met.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It would be difficult to pigeon-hole Swat as "culturally Indian." Then, as now, it had its distinct idiosyncrasies that made it seem a little far North of Indian.

Malcolm wrote:

Woo-Chang, or Udyana. Monasteries, and Their Ways. Traces of Buddha.

After crossing the river, (the travellers) immediately came to the kingdom of Woo-chang, which is indeed (a part) of North India. The people all use the language of Central India, "Central India" being what we should call the "Middle Kingdom." The food and clothes of the common people are the same as in that Central Kingdom. The Law of Buddha is very (flourishing in Woo-chang). They call the places where the monks stay (for a time) or reside permanently Sangharamas; and of these there are in all 500, the monks being all students of the hinayana. When stranger bhikshus arrive at one of them, their wants are supplied for three days, after which they are told to find a resting-place for themselves.

<http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/f/fa-hien/f15l/contents.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

In the link I posted, the College is telling the meat industry to stop lying to people. You are implying that the meat industry is sponsoring people who tell that same meat industry to stop being liars? That is unheard of! The meat industry would never admit to being liars. But of course, this exchange is going nowhere. So you can dismiss my statements, and I can just as easily dismiss your statements and we can just be friends? That would be nice!

Malcolm wrote:

The meat industry as a whole is opposed to the grassfed meat producers.

It is a fact that cows should not eat corn. The article you posted asserts the opposite, i.e. that cows should be fed corn in order to increase marbling of meat. This is a standard meat industry position.

The health issue for humans is antibiotics used by the standard meat industry and so on. There are many other issues as well.

As yes, we never were not friends.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

pemachophel said:

Breach of copyright is most definitely "taking what is not given freely."

dzogchungpa said:

The oracle has spoken!

However, not everyone agrees with you: In this paper, I examine the modern concepts of intellectual property and account for their significance in monastic law and culture of early Buddhism. As a result, I have come to the following conclusions: (1) the infringement of copyrights, patents, and trademarks does not amount to theft as far as Theravādin Vinaya is concerned ...

See: <http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/2012/10/04/intellectual-property-in-early-buddhism/>

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently the author does not believe his own paper:

Copyright Notice: Digital copies of this work may be made and distributed provided no change is made and no alteration is made to the content. Re-production in any other format, with the exception of a single copy for private study, requires the written permission of the author.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Christ! I didn't tell you anything.... All I said was In order for your statement to have weight, you need to prove that it's true. Simply linking to the college website does not provide that proof...

Malcolm wrote:

Smoke --> fire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Oh Christ — Michael Pollan's point of view is that one's diet should be primarily plant based.

On the other hand, he also supports locally sourced, grass-fed operations of the kind run by Joel Salatin.

seeker242 said:

I'm aware of both of those things, but that still does not change the fact that just dismissing it as "industry sponsored science"

Malcolm wrote:

Just look here:

<http://animalscience.psu.edu/extension/meat>

This is the department and program where Dr. John Comerford works. Still want to tell me this not industry sponsored science?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 8:26 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"The reality is there is no evidence whatsoever that grass-fed beef has any advantage for safety, human health, or impact on the environment than grain-fed beef."

This is just industry sponsored "science". You should read Michael Pollen and so on.

seeker242 said:

"Michael Pollen is just grass fed industry marketing manifesting itself."

Now you see, that statement doesn't carry much weight without any actual evidence to back it up. The problem is, with that statement, I have provided just as much evidence as you have. That is really not good enough for an actual debate. You should read Richard Oppenlander, and others, where they debunk the myths perpetuated by Michael Pollan. Just dismissing it as "industry sponsored science" and leaving it at that, is very convenient way to not even address the arguments being made.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh Christ — Michael Pollan's point of view is that one's diet should be primarily plant based.

On the other hand, he also supports locally sourced, grass-fed operations of the kind run by Joel Salatin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

If I'm right then we might have to rework that theory. Even Kashmiri, some speak dialects which are more similar to Persian. Like Burushaski.

Malcolm wrote:

It is well established that Odḍiyāna was well within the Indo-cultural sphere. We have many reports of Chinese pilgrims going through it and so on.

As far as Burushaki goes:

Although Burushaski has been compared to almost any language on earth, no fully convincing relationships have yet been established.

<http://dickgrune.com/NatLang/Summaries/Burushaski.pdf>

While this document claims that no written Burushaki language exists, it is claimed that Nubchen translated the Anuyoga tantras from this language, and in fact Burushaki words do exist in the Anuyoga tantras.

But there is no relationship here with Persian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Do you think that the current demand of meat can be met strictly by using only pasture raised, strictly grass fed beef and dairy? Apparently 6% of beef is grass fed right now. In order to meet the current demand, you would have to increase grass fed production by more than 15 times the current level. What would be the effects of that?

Malcolm wrote:

Massive grassland restoration, for one thing, properly done.

You should look into the farming methods of Joel Salatin.

seeker242 said:

"The reality is there is no evidence whatsoever that grass-fed beef has any advantage for safety, human health, or impact on the environment than grain-fed beef."

Malcolm wrote:

This is just industry sponsored "science". You should read Michael Pollen and so on.

seeker242 said:

Personally, I don't think it's all that simple. Especially when you take into account the grass fed information above, the health effects of high meat consumption on one's body and the ethical ramifications of an industry whose sole intention it is to kill sentient beings. The whole entire meat industry, grass fed or not, has one sole intention, to kill sentient beings and sell their body parts. The whole entire industry is ethically tainted by a slaughterhouse.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not everyone shares the notion that killing animals, birds, and fish for food is morally wrong. Since they don't and are not likely too (ever), it is probably better for everyone to move people away from truly destructive practices presently found in the food production system.

seeker242 said:

That is how it's currently done but it doesn't need to be done that way IMO. The waste treatment plants in the USA that are currently and successfully using treated human waste for good fertilizer, I think is evidence that it can be done another way.

Malcolm wrote:

Because of all the crap we humans put in our bodies, I would be very skeptical of this at the present time. If human waste can be properly filtered and purified, then no problem.

Bottom line -- as long as animals are going to be killed for food (and they will, forever), it is better to move the industry to healthier standards for ourselves and the environments. You may not believe that organically raised beef, chicken and pork is better for people and the environment, but it is. It is a very simple reality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

michaelb said:

Garab Dorje, on the other hand, was Persian.

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje was from Oḍḍiyāna.

invisiblediamond said:

That far North, the people were all Aryan sharing culture up to the Pamirs.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, Oḍḍiyāna was fully within the Indian cultural sphere, not the Persian cultural sphere.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It's not synchronic its aim is to describe Kshnoom, the esotericism of Z. I don't think the Greek and Manichean elements are in there.

Malcolm wrote:

Synchronic means that its ideas are not parsed out in terms of when they arose.

That text has a lot of strange writing which may very well be a modern Parsee mysticism, but I do not think it is very old.

invisiblediamond said:

Yes. But I have to assume the Parsees did what their site says they did, which is go to India to do one thing, preserve the true Z-ism. Including, not mix racially. I'll agree this isn't a smoking gun. But just the fact that stuff is in there is amazing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is interesting.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It's not synchronic it's aim is to describe Kshnoom, the esotericism of Z. I don't think the Greek and Manichean elements are in there.

Malcolm wrote:

Synchronic means that its ideas are not parsed out in terms of when they arose.

That text has a lot of strange writing which may very well be a modern Parsee mysticism, but I do not think it is very old.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

michaelb said:

Garab Dorje, on the other hand, was Persian.

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje was from Oḍḍiyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Simon E. said:

Dzogchen was not originally Bon OR Buddhist...it represents the essence of both and precedes both.

Either are adequate to provide a portal to it.

invisiblediamond said:

That's because it was Zoroastrian.

Malcolm wrote:

No. I am certainly open the idea that Dzogchen teachings as well as Tantric teachings in India may have been influenced by Zoroastrian and Manichean concepts, but the link you provide seems to be a Parsee document which is synchronic, i.e., it does not parse ancient Zoroastrianism from later Greek and Manichaeian ideas. This is a more clear presentation:

<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/elements>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Mouse Soldier said:

The copyright law doesn't have to go anywhere for it to become archaic. They'll simply artificially create other industries in order for us to circumvent them.

Malcolm wrote:

Usually what happens is that when young people like you begin to develop a life, your attitudes change drastically depending on what you have at stake.

When your livelihood seems threatened by people who don't respect your rights, I am quite sure you will be the first one in court.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Qing Tian said:

Futerko wrote: Let's say that corporations claim ownership of the air. Are you still going to insist on legality, or will you challenge the validity of the law?

Really? I was talking about a product that has been created for the purpose of sale and you are talking about claiming ownership of something that is freely available to start with.

futerko said:

Tell that to the native populations of colonized lands.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, while I do not happen to agree with it, the notion of natural right of ownership is, in European law since Locke, superseded by the principle that the right to a resource belongs to that person who can best utilize it. John Winthrop writes in 1629, an attitude in whole derived from Locke:

That which lies common, and has never been replenished or subdued, is free to any that possess and improve it; for God hath given to the sons of men a double right to the earth — there is a natural right and a civil right. The first right was natural when men held the earth in common, every man sowing and feeding where he pleased. Then as men and their cattle increased, they appropriated certain parcels of ground by enclosing and peculiar cultivation, and this in time got them a civil right — such is the right which Ephron the Hittite had in the field of Mackpelah, wherein Abraham could not bury a dead corpse without leave, though for the out parts of the country he dwelt upon them and took the fruit of them at his pleasure. The like did Jacob, who fed his cattle as boldly in Hamor's land (for he is said to be Lord of the country) and in other places where he came, as the native inhabitants themselves. And in those times and places, that men accounted nothing their own but that which they had appropriated by their own industry, appears plainly by this — that Abimileck's servants in their own country, when they oft

contended with Isaac's servants about wells which they had dug, yet never strove for the land wherein they were. So like between Jacob and Laban, he would not take a goat of Laban's without special contract, but he makes no bargain with them for the land where they fed, and it is very probable that, had the land not been as free for Jacob as for Laban, that covetous wretch would have made his advantage of it, and would have upbraided Jacob with it as he did with his cattle. As for the natives in New England, they enclose no land, neither have they any settled habitation, nor any tame cattle to improve the land by, and so have no other but a natural right to those countries. So if we leave them sufficient for their own use, we may lawfully take the rest, there being more than enough for them and for us.

But we all know how this ended...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: "Do not befriend the foolish"

Content:

Lindama said:

what is the context of this... could it also be talking about our own foolish parts? are we above it... and, what about family. Perhaps it is saying do not subscribe to foolishness in others.

old zen master talking to himself:

master, master... are you awake?

yes! yes!

don't be fooled by others

Malcolm wrote:

It is from the Bodhicarya-avatara. It means do not be familiar with immature people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Western world and buddhist life

Content:

pensum said:

Q: To many laypeople in the dharma today, the purity and uncompromising nature of your views will seem like a luxury, even an indulgence.

A: Many people seem to be all but overwhelmed by their jobs and their lives. To support themselves and their families there seems to be no choice but to get up each day and go to work. There is a certain kind of circularity here. People want to engage with teachings that point out that craving and clinging are root causes of stress. Yet people don't want to let go of patterns of being and consuming that fuel craving and clinging. We have to ask honestly whether the people you describe really want to be transformed or whether they are simply looking for ways to reduce their stress. What do they want?

From an interview with Mu Soeng <http://www.tricycle.com/interview/dharma-sale>

Malcolm wrote:
Reduce stress first.

Starve craving and clinging second.

You cannot let go of patterns of craving and clinging if you are stressed out.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs apply here.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:15 AM
Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
The can't claim ownership, they license bandwidth.

futerko said:
Of course, all you need to do is find a way to put a fence around it in order to claim distribution rights.

Malcolm wrote:
If you broadcast on someone else's bandwidth, you will be shutdown pretty fast.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:14 AM
Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?
Content:
Qing Tian said:
I realise that my position is unpopular, but I have yet to hear a convincing argument to support piracy.

Mouse Soldier said:
I felt that my post, and the comparison to the invention of the printing press was somewhat apt. File sharing is a simple fact of life these days because it's so easy and the copyright laws concerning intellectual property are quickly becoming archaic. The printing press put many scribes out of work, but it brought with it wonderful new industries and opportunity for human development. In this analogy the printing press is the internet, and the scribes are corporations wanting to hold onto the old methods of doing things because the modern applications of the internet put their business model in jeopardy.

The biggest difference is that unlike the scribes, these corporations have a lot of money and power that they use to hold back the world from change, in the forms of copyright law and DRM technologies. Progress is inevitable, but they're certainly capable of gumming up the process some and continuing to profit from their arguably artificial means of remaining relevant. For now.

Malcolm wrote:

You are missing one tiny little fact in your analysis. Copyright laws are not going anywhere, since they are based on extremely ancient and deeply embedded principles of property rights that can be traced directly back to Roman Law:

...Roman law regulated the legal protection of property and the equality of legal subjects and their wills, and because it prescribed the possibility that the legal subjects could dispose their property through testament.

In US law, specifically copyright law is intended to ensure:

"...the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."
Article I, Section 8, Clause 8, US Constitution.

Anything I write, be it code, music, etc., is protected by this law. This is why in the US, at any rate, it is quite illegal to download software that has been broken, DRM encryptions and so on. It is theft under US Law. Of course, if an author/artist wishes to relinquish this right, they may do so, hence Copyleft, and other alternate intellectual property schemes have been introduced.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We are talking about whether or not it is theft/receiving stolen goods to download a pirated copy of say Logic Pro.

dzogchungpa said:

I am not saying it is right to download a pirated copy of Logic Pro. However, in all seriousness, I'm not sure it is either theft or receiving stolen goods. It might be illegal, but I don't think it is an example of either of those, legally speaking, and I don't think it's an example of either of those in the ordinary sense of those words either. Buddhists can condemn that kind of thing, but I don't think there's any point in misusing language in our eagerness to do so.

Johnny Dangerous said:

The right thing to do is download Audacity instead heh, and circumvent the whole ethical issue, as well as supporting people who want to make recording software for free, instead of people who ask \$200 for a big box of cute bells and whistles;)

Malcolm wrote:

Audacity does not have all the bells and whistles. Its great for what it does. But Logic Pro infinitely more useful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Qing Tian said:

Futerko, I felt that the claim was implicit.

As for... I personally find your relationship to rule-governed behaviour quite rigid. That's a fair point, although it is also an assumption. If people diligently followed the 8FP then I guess the 'rules' would not be required... but they don't and so they are. Discarding rules in a cavalier fashion without recourse to an acceptable ethical framework is likely to result in further suffering.

I realise that my position is unpopular, but I have yet to hear a convincing argument to support piracy.

You going to provide one?

futerko said:

Let's say that corporations claim ownership of the air. Are you still going to insist on legality, or will you challenge the validity of the law?

Malcolm wrote:

They can't claim ownership, they license bandwidth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Sure, and also, important to the Kagyu Stew, he was a Kadampa Monk as well.....and then he met Milarepa.

smcj said:

And that Milarepa tried the Nyingma Dzogchen/sudden path too. It didn't work for him, so that's when he went to go find Marpa.

Malcolm wrote:

It would have, he just didn't understand the instructions and did not meditate. So Rongton sent him to Marpa.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: "Do not befriend the foolish"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

གསུངས་ is both the imperative as well as the past. Tibetan does not have a "perfect past" It has only three conjugations of verbs, past/future; present/infinitive and imperative. Often the imperative is morphologically the same as the past tense.

So this line could be read both ways i.e. as a command or as past tense.

Generally, for bshes pa to be a verb, it usually requires the auxiliary "byed pa". Here the auxiliary [bya/byed] is elided, but implied.

It could also be translated completely nominally: "Do not be a friend to immature [person] at all", etc.

Depending on dialect, བྱིས་པ་ is pronounced something like "ji/chi pa"; but in Amdo, it would be "Yay pa"

kirtu said:

From Hacket, "A Tibetan Verb Lexicon": བྱིས་པ་འགའ་ཡང་བཤེས་མེན་ཞེས། །དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པ་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་གསུངས།: All the Tathagatas have said "Do not befriend the foolish".

Why does Hacket insert "have" to change གསུངས། to the perfect past? Is there actually a perfect past in Tibetan as opposed to just a past tense (perfect past being things that are actually completed and often a while ago)?

How does this get parsed out: བྱིས་པ་འགའ་ཡང་བཤེས་མེན་ཞེས།:

བྱིས་པ་: foolish beings

འགའ་ཡང་: at all, whatsoever

བཤེས་: friend

མེན་: not

ཞེས།: particle indicating quote

"Do not become friends at all with foolish beings" - ? Is བཞེས actually a verb? Otherwise what is the logic behind this construction?

Also how is བྱེས་པ་ pronounced? be pa (bay pa) ?

Thanks!

Kirt

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

futerko said:

Well, going back a few years, the Sex Pistols weren't too impressed with EMI...

Malcolm wrote:

The Great Rock and Roll Swindle anyone?

<http://sabotagetimes.com/reportage/the-untold-story-behind-the-great-rock-n-roll-swindle/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

futerko said:

Debating the technicalities of whether this is theft, or receiving stolen property, or not, strikes me as rather misplaced.

On the one side - of course corporate property laws designed for maximum profit and establishing a monopoly are suspect and bordering on the exploitative.

On the other - the demand for a steady stream of high production entertainment is also unhealthy for the individual and plays right into the hands of those corporations.

Clearly it is preferable for those individuals to break the cycle of addiction, however it is also desirable to break the corporate stranglehold on artistic content.

Malcolm wrote:

Ahem....it is generally the artists themselves that want these protections....

In any case we are not really taking about Metallica.

We are talking about whether or not it is theft/receiving stolen goods to download a pirated copy of say Logic Pro.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

If you say it's a question of degree, OK,

Malcolm wrote:

It is a question of law.

dzogchungpa said:

If you mean that it is stealing or pirating because the law forbids it, maybe that makes sense in a certain way, but I am addressing the "depriving of profits" = "stealing/pirating" argument, i.e the idea that if someone is "deprived" of profits than an act of stealing or piracy, according to the ordinary understanding of those terms, has taken place. If one accepts that idea, then honestly I believe one would have to admit that libraries are engaged in pirating books as well. For example, I have access through my local library to the link+ system: <http://csul.iii.com/screens/members.html>. I used to buy many books, both used and new, but when I started to use that system, I basically didn't need to anymore, and so I more or less stopped buying books. I doubt authors, publishers and bookstores benefited as a result. Does that mean someone stole or pirated something? It seems that some here would say yes, but I don't think so.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out to you -- libraries pay a higher price for books in general than you do personally.

Also, one can loan and borrow books on Amazon [for a yearly surcharge which is part of Amazon Prime -- clearly some portion of this is being paid to the publishers].

Authors benefit because they their books are being read (they are paid a higher royalty for library sales), Libraries benefit because they can purchase more books. Bookstores do not benefit from libraries of course, but that is the market for you. Libraries and bookstores are in competition which is why B&N etc., permit you to browse and read books in their place, a deferred sales strategy, if you will.

All of this is off-topic however.

In any case: it is clear that downloading software that has been broken into by defeating its cryptographic protections is theft. Those protections are placed on software sold to companies and individuals. You or the company is issued a license to use that software. If you break the encryption or give away the key to your unique copy of that software to

others, you are guilty of theft. If you download pirated software, you are not guilty of stealing exactly, you are guilty of receiving stolen goods, technically. But receipt of stolen goods is still "taking what has not been given".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

If you say it's a question of degree, OK,

Malcolm wrote:

It is a question of law.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Are libraries pirating books?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is no. Publishers price books for libraries at a much higher price than for individuals exactly for this purpose. In fact, some publishers, like Brill, price their speciality books primarily for libraries, which is why they are so expensive.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, but let's say I give the library a book, having paid the regular price for it. Then the library would be pirating it by lending it out and thereby depriving the publisher of profits?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. The publisher would only be deprived of profits if you took the book out of the library copied it, and gave it to your friends. This is why most large copy shops in the US will not copy books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

michaelb said:

Malcolm, I thought maize had been a staple in S.American diet for a very long time, but the widespread use of modified maize syrup was linked to global rise in obesity.

Malcolm wrote:

Domestic cattle, pigs and chicken were only introduced to the Americans in the 16th century by the Spanish. The primary domesticated meat animals of the Americas were dogs and turkeys until this time.

Maize is a crop developed by humans in Central Mexico some believe around 4600 years ago, though others assert it is as old as 10,000 -- it is not clear.

Maize is the only crop we grow that is entirely dependent on human intervention for its propagation. Maize never existed in the wild, unlike wheat, rye, oats, barely and so on. Plant geneticists are still not entirely certain exactly which plants were hybridized to create Maize. The main plant that people think maize comes from is a wild grass called Teosinte.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Jainarayan said:

There are technological safeguards against photocopying and digital copying. If they are not employed by the publisher or distributor, that says to me they are well aware that the materials will be copied. One can go into a Barnes & Noble, get a Starbucks coffee, sit and read a book cover to cover, put it back on the shelf and leave. This is actually encouraged by B&N. B&N has paid for the book, and you are reading it using their facilities without paying for anything other than coffee and maybe a brownie. Is that stealing? B&N doesn't think so. The author and publisher got their share. Now, to make money by selling the copied materials is preceptually wrong as well as illegal, imo.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, Amazon has forced B&N into near bankruptcy. And libraries around the US are shuttering their doors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Are libraries pirating books?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is no. Publishers price books for libraries at a much higher price than for individuals exactly for this purpose. In fact, some publishers, like Brill, price their speciality books primarily for libraries, which is why they are so expensive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I am not making it out to be innocent. It is clearly breaking the law. What it is not doing is breaking the 2nd precept.

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu established the judicial character of the second precept as follows:

To take a thing that does not have an owner is to take what is not given by the ruler of a country.

So, for Canadians, downloading music and tv shows is not a violation of the second precept since it is permitted by their government, whereas for Americans it is, since this kind of activity is prohibited by my government.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

michaelb said:

Does anyone just feed livestock grass and hay? Do pigs and chickens eat grass? I thought, due to lack of space and the weather, even 'organic' cattle are kept inside for at least a few months a year and fed soya, bonemeal and stuff made from chicken feathers. Non-organic livestock are fed GM soya, of course as well as a bunch of other odd stuff (chickens are already cannibals, for example.)

Malcolm wrote:

Chicken meat and pork was traditionally more expensive than beef because these animals require grain in general as part of their diet. Now they are less expensive than beef pound for pound in the US because corn is subsidized by the US Government.

Not only that, but in general, meat of all kinds was traditionally also a seasonal food. In northern climes, animals would not be slaughtered until the autumn. People did not eat steaks year round. It is only with the advent of refrigeration that the modern industrial economy of meat is even possible.

For most of the year, what meat was in people's diets was usually sausage and dried meats in general, added in some portions to meals. Arguably, people were healthier as a result.

From a dietary point of view meat and dairy combined is a very building diet. It is no mistake that individuals in meat/dairy eating societies are larger, heavier and stronger (as well as more aggressive) than those in societies who eat little or no meat.

In the organic "local" beef industry, there are two kinds of programs, grass finished and grain finished. Grain finished beef has more fat. However, maize is a relatively recent crop in human history, and cattle never evolved to properly digest it. It is very harmful for them. The reason so much antibiotic is used in grain-fed feedlot beef, as well as grain-fed dairy cattle, is that corn causes acidosis in cattle which in turn leaves them open to infection, and so on.

Also, there is however another problem (similar to the biofuel craze) -- the craze for grass fed beef has led to clearing rainforest in South America and elsewhere, which is why it is important for an environmentally conscientious omnivore to only eat locally sourced meat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can't even own physical things. The idea of owning physical things is also a metaphor. In fact, the criteria for stealing is based on another's sense of property, not our own.

Karma Dorje said:

If I observe your car parked in your driveway and create a replica of it, you are saying that I stole your car? There is very obviously a difference between copying something and stealing it. If I steal your car, I deprive you of its use. If I copy your car, there are now more cars.

Malcolm wrote:

If I invent a car and patent it, then you copy it and then sell it, then you are stealing.

I understand that in Canada, downloading pirated material is not illegal. But it is in the US. Hence, in the US, downloading music and software online is illegal, whereas if I make a cd of music I own and give it to someone, it is not illegal. Such is the nature of the contradictory laws.

However, in general, since a piece of code is regarded as property, under US law, downloading pirated versions of Acrobat (where the software key has been compromised) is illegal. Giving away that key to others is also illegal, as you know.

DMR also is used for the same reason. You have to break the DMR to pirate iTunes music. Of course, if you buy the CD, copy it and give those copies to your friends, this is not

illegal. If you upload that copy to the internet, however, you will definitely be busted eventually if you do it a lot, and are a US citizen.

But in general the second precept refers to taking what is not given. This also applies to a \$50 bill lying on the ground. If you wish to be very diligent, it is better you do not pick it up. The same applies to digital media. As I said, there are certain Academic books that I will download from Scribd (some of which I have bought in the past for \$\$\$) to further my research. But in general, I have a policy of not using that which I have not paid for, whether it is software, music, tv, movies, etc.

In the end it is a question of individual conscience as well as local laws. If I were Canadian, I would probably not be so reticent about downloading music and so on, since it is not illegal in Canada to do so. I would not download pirated software however, because that has been digitally broken into in order to be distributed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But even so, this text does not really offer a clear affirmation of primordial buddhahood.

Sherab Dorje said:

The Gampopa quote clearly does. Pretty funny when you consider that Gampopa was (for the Karma Kagyu) the "founder" of the whole gradualist approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Gampopa taught what he thought was appropriate for his audience.

You must remember however that Gampopa was a Dzogchen practitioner from a young age, as he originally was a Nyingmapa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Copying and pasting data is not taking. It is copying. Sharing.

Mouse Soldier said:

It's not the data we may be "stealing", it's the money that would have been paid out had we purchased the data.

Karma Dorje said:

This makes no sense. Who is in possession of "the money that would have been paid out"? You can't steal something that someone might have in the future, only something they actually possess. All of these problem ensue from regarding a metaphor as a actuality. You can't own ideas, only physical things. If someone steals a physical book, it's theft. If someone photocopies the book, it's a copyright infringement and this has certain legal significance. Trying to intrude buddhist morality into what is simply a matter of contractual law is perverse and strange.

Malcolm wrote:

You can't even own physical things. The idea of owning physical things is also a metaphor. In fact, the criteria for stealing is based on another's sense of property, not our own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

"By eating meat we share the responsibility of climate change, the destruction of our forests, and the poisoning of our air and water. The simple act of becoming a vegetarian will make a difference in the health of our planet."

Yes, we do have a choice.

Malcolm wrote:

I think that Thich Nhat Hahn is making a massive oversimplification.

seeker242 said:

I think the statement is massively simple but at the same time does accurately reflect and summarize the complex situation. Modern day animal agriculture is extremely destructive to the environment.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes that is true. However, it is not true that eating meat necessarily adds to that. That really depends upon the source of the meat that one eats. Eating meat from commercial feed lots is very destructive, as opposed to pasture raised, strictly grass fed beef and dairy which does not depend on grain which is not environmentally destructive at all. If we wish to stem environmentally destructive meat, it is simple enough to change from industrially produced meat to locally produced meat. However, that also requires changing our plant consumption from industrial agriculture too. As i have pointed out many times, industrial level organic farming absolutely requires animal concentrates at levels possible only because of industrial levels of animal husbandry and slaughter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 11:59 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist ethics also recognize that one must obey the laws of whatever society one belongs to.

Indrajala said:

That's just a general idea really.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a very specific fact of buddhist ethics which as you know has commentarial support.

The sangha is capable of adjudicating only breaches of vows, but not crimes, or even civil disputes.

Taking what is not given applies to anything someone else regards as their property, including intellectual property.

For this reason, while i certainly dont pretend to be a perfect upasaka,, i never diownload pirated music or software. I admit to downloading brilll publications however, and other academic buddhist works that are priced for libraries in order to further my research. But i recognize that it is not a perfect thing to do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Copyright laws are not covered in any pre-modern discussion of Buddhist ethics because they didn't exist.

The general understanding of theft requires that you successfully physically move something you recognize as belonging to another person without their consent.

To copy and paste data does not qualify as theft in that respect. In Buddhist ethics you cannot steal a song, because a song is not something you can deprive from another.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it does.

Buddhist ethics also recognize that one must obey the laws of whatever society one

belongs to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Caz said:

Is this Rigpa the same as Clear light ? or is it a seperate entity ?

Malcolm wrote:

That “Mind of” [kyi sems] is the unmixed totally complete essence, the primal nature of the eight consciousnesses endowed with a luminous [‘od gsal] identity which inherently never wavers into any extreme at all, free from all extremes, naturally pure and unwavering in the three times.

Now then, if it is asked “Is it not impossible for such a pure primal nature to appear to the mind of a person?”, it is possible, called “vidyā” [rig pa, the knowing aspect of the mind]. The vidyā of migrating beings itself appears as the mental consciousness in terms of apprehending subjects and apprehended objects. When vidyā manifests its own primal nature, the mental consciousness manifests as self-originated wisdom, and then the pure basis of the mental consciousness (free from the root of an apprehending subject and apprehended objects) bring samsara to an end. The wisdom of one’s vidyā (without root or leaf) — naturally perfected as it all-encompassingly subsumes everything — is the true state [de kho na nyid].

-- The Sun That Illuminates the Meaning

You really ought to read that text by Tsongkhapa that I mentioned to TK fan. It is useless to quote texts to you from the Dzogchen tradition directly in some respects, but you cannot reject the writing of the founder of your own lineage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Caz said:

Malcolm

Well yes it is to the muddled minds of sentient beings it (samsara) is a very real object.

Malcolm wrote:

So you grant samsara is not real, is not established etc.?

Is that "muddle" in the minds of sentient beings real or not?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Caz said:

How can Buddhahood be Inherently accomplished when it is not manifest ? If it was Inherent as suggested then by nature it would be unchanging and hence never unmanifest yet sentient beings still experience Samsaric suffering and have to work hard to accomplish Enlightenment.

The potentiality is always present but how could Buddhahood be present in the mind of an ordinary being ?

asunthatneversets said:

Primordial wisdom [ye shes] is originally pure [ka dag] and naturally perfected [lhun grub], all that is required is recognition. From the standpoint of wisdom the whole charade of samsāra and nirvāna is illusory and unreal.

Caz said:

If its naturally perfected why is it unmanifest ? If it is Primordial and naturally perfected why is there Samsara in the first place ?

Malcolm wrote:

Is samsara there in the first place?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I would say that Mr. Esler has a slightly anachronistic read of Nubchen. None of the text available to Nubs, AFAIK, use terms like gzhi snang and so on. In this footnote, at any rate, he is reading the man ngag sde text doctrine into the bodhicitta texts. I would say this is erroneous.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, that's interesting. Is his statement about grol-gzhi and 'khrul-gzhi accurate then? If so, would it be possible to explain how the bodhicitta texts view of gzhi differ from what he says in his footnote?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the bodhicitta texts, no distinction is made between the kun gzhi and the gzhi i.e. the all-basis and the basis.

It is true, however that in the bodicitta texts, the all-basis is both the basis of liberation and delusion depending upon whether one has received instructions or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Footnote 10 reads in part as: As such, the ground is always alpha-pure (ka-dag); it is according to an individual's recognition or non-recognition of the ground's illumination (gzhi-sngang) that it becomes, in the experience of a Buddha, the ground of liberation (grol-gzhi) and, in the experience of ordinary sentient beings, the ground of confusion. Of course I don't know if the above is in line with Malcolm's thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

I would say that Mr. Esler has a slightly anachronistic read of Nubchen. None of the text available to Nubs, AFAIK, use terms like gzhi sngang and so on. In this footnote, at any rate, he is reading the man ngag sde text doctrine into the bodhicitta texts. I would say this is erroneous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

"By eating meat we share the responsibility of climate change, the destruction of our forests, and the poisoning of our air and water. The simple act of becoming a vegetarian will make a difference in the health of our planet."

Yes, we do have a choice.

Malcolm wrote:

I think that Thich Nhat Hahn is making a massive oversimplification.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Whatever turns you on dude!

How about this one?

"Meditation:
why look for freedom in a lie?

The net of illusion:
why hold it so tight?

Trust in the truth
of the precious guru's word;

Saraha says:
I've made my declaration."

or this one:

"No tantra, no mantra,
no reflection or recollection -

Hey fool! All this
is the cause of error.

Mind is unstained -
don't taint it with meditation;

you're living in bliss:
don't torment yourself."
Saraha

Malcolm wrote:
As I said, Saraha is not deluded.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Mhamudra is primordial too.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, parse it out for us then, Greg.

Maitripa states in the Mahāmudrākanakamālā:

In the same way, when not realized, samsara and nirvana are analyzed separately; when realized, samsara has always been the kāya of the great buddha.

But this is a little different.

Sherab Dorje said:

"1) To have a decisive understanding about the True Nature

Mahamudra has no causes.

Mahamudra has no conditions.

Mahamudra has no methods.

Mahamudra has no path.

Mahamudra has no result."

Gampopa The Very Essence of Mind, Mahamudra, the One sufficient Path

"6. For thousands of aeons, the sun that shines every day
has never been clouded by darkness.

Likewise, the real nature of the mind's clear light of awareness
Has never been clouded by the cycle of samsara.

12. Never leave Thatness, but don't stay in it either and don't try to represent it.
Simply vow never to leave it, and nothing will obscure the flames [of awakening].
Beyond the reactivity of the [ordinary] mind moving toward and moving away,
not trying to stay, not even trying to see it, then you will see everything there is to see!"
Tilopa Ganges Mahamudra

Malcolm wrote:

You should have cited this verse:

Practitioners of mantra, of the perfections,
of discipline, and of the sutras and so on
do not see the luminosity of mahāmudrā,
with their own texts and theories,
luminosity is not seen, obscured with such wishful thinking.

And this:

Beyond all objects of perception, the nature of the mind is clarity,
without a path to traverse, the path of Buddhahood is entered,
if one cultivates without an object of meditation, one will attain unsurpassed awakening.

But even so, this text does not really offer a clear affirmation of primordial buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

I do have a bias towards not abusing and not mass killing of billions of living beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you need to understand that all agriculture will result in the same thing (i.e. the mass killing of billions of living beings).

Factually speaking, we have a choice -- we can, as we have for the past ten millenia, continue to rely on animal inputs for fertilizing agriculture (which has a corollary, we cannot support or sustain a large population of animals that are not producing inputs into that system, hence the need for slaughter); or we can continue to poison the planet by reliance on petrochemicals (which are increasingly more difficult and dangerous for our environment to extract).

The choice is yours. We either have a living biosystem where living beings (plants and animals) feed on other living beings (plants and animals), or we have a poisoned planet where everything dies apart from humans and those plants and animals we choose to preserve.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Evolution of Pure Land

Content:

zamotcr said:

Right now, undersating and seeying this evolution of concepts and ideas, give me a broader view of Mahayana buddhism, very different from Theravada, and that is, Mahayana is a living religion, evolving with new views and interpretations

kirtu said:

So is Theravada. There used to be 16 or 17 or so Sravaka lineages and now there is only one. And few people know the history of Theravada going back several centuries, for example. But there are still many different Mahayana lineages. We are seeing changes in Mahayana over centuries up to 2.5 millenia. The changes that we are seeing in Theravada are not so obvious and are much more incremental because we are seeing them over a period of decades to 150 years (so the lifespans of 4-5 masters max).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

There are three in fact: Theravada, Mulasarvastivada and Dharmaguptaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Evolution of Pure Land

Content:

zamotcr said:

I have been studying the Lotus Sutra this days and I found the concept of Pure Land to be different from the general accepted view. It's like the Pure Land concept and theory (or comology, perhaps) has evolved from it's inception.

Malcolm wrote:

Chances are, the archeological foundation for the concept of the "western paradise" was <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pasargadae> as well as https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persian_Gardens

See this interesting paper as well:

http://www.sino-platonic.org/complete/spp076_buddhism_paradise.pdf

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

I've got this really strong feeling that Dzogchen is a restatement of Zoroastrianism, transmuting the impure matter into light.?

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are confusing Zoroastrianism with Manichaeism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

What are you talking about Malcolm? Your teacher is arecognised tulku from a family (lineage) of tulkus and nobility to boot. His son (and likely heir) is a tulku that was enthroned and "given" a monastery (seat) too. He even wore a funny hat and rode a pony to prove it. Sure, neither of them hold monks vows but they are 100% part of the tulku deal.

Malcolm wrote:

It is true that both Norbu Rinpoche and his son are tulkus. But Dzogchen Community itself has no affiliation with any monastic seat. It does not invite teachers from any specified monastic lineage. It does not feed students to any monastic establishment.

While it may be the case that both ChNN and Yeshe Namkhai are nominally abbots (via

reincarnation) of two Tibetan monasteries (In the case of the former a Drukpa Kagyu Monastery in Central Tibet; in the case of the latter, a Sakya monastery near Dege), very little fund raising is ever done to support them in the DC. They are supported by Tibetans, not westerners.

As I said, the DC is independent, and is not grounded in the Tibetan monastic establishment. While ChNN has thousands of "students" in Tibet, he has focused most of his attention teaching in the West. He has spent all of his adult life in the West (Happy Bday Rinpoche!!!!), moving to Rome when he was 23 or so (in 1961).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Some people just don't seem to understand that it's about the animals...

Abuse like this is commonplace...It has been found... every...single...time...they have done undercover investigations. It's the rule, not the exception. Is this ethical? How can anyone willingly be involved with this?

Malcolm wrote:

Right. It is about the animals.

But why do you assume that everyone who consumes meat lacks awareness of the horrors of industrial animal husbandry?

Why do you assume it is impossible to make other economic choices about what kind of meat is to be consumed?

And why do you assume you have to only solution to their suffering, even so?

Actually, if one consumes meat it does not add to suffering; refraining from eating meat contributes nothing to the reduction of suffering,

You may think you are reducing suffering of animals by not consuming their flesh, but it isn't so. Thinking that it is so means you understood nothing about the nature of suffering.

If you don't want to eat meat, for whatever reason, that is fine. But you should understand that your choices are not objective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We have three kinds of proposed buddhahood in various schools:

gradual -- ala sutra and most Vajrayāna

sudden/non-gradual -- Mahāmudra/Chan

primordial -- Dzogchen.

Punya said:

Sorry to backtrack but why use the word primordial which in everyday english seems to have a time connotation? What is the tibetan word and is there an alternative translation?

dzogchungpa said:

I'm sure Malcolm will respond, but I think it is most likely 'gdod ma', or possibly 'thog ma'.

Malcolm wrote:

"ye nas"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

i dont know if the story of milarepa is true or not, but if you know its not, where does your sources come from in this matter?

Malcolm wrote:

One of the difficult things in studying pre-modern cultures is sorting out myth, legend and outright fabrication from history.

As it stands, the biography of Milarepa penned by Tsang Nyon Heruka is mostly religious fiction. If you want to know the details of the evolution of Milarepa's biography and its shifting set of details between the 12th century and the 16th, consult Peter Alan Robert's book, The Biographies of Rechungpa: The Evolution of a Tibetan Hagiography

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Pero said:

...this would be nothing other than new-age nonsense.

Indrajala said:

Not really. In most forms of Buddhism you can practice anything you read in scripture without permission or initiation of any sort. Vajrayāna is the exception.

Malcolm wrote:

And of course, the common misunderstanding of empowerments/initiations is that they are merely there to allow you to practice something. In fact empowerment is the primary method of liberation in Vajrayāna. It is only if you do not wake up from the empowerment itself that you are given a sadhana to practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Okay...while we're on this subject, I want to ask why Buddhists rely on Dzogchen when it was not taught by Buddha Shakyamuni or Buddha Vajradhara. I'm prepared to be corrected, but to my knowledge Buddha never taught about Rigpa or Dzogchen, or about primordial Buddhahood. There are the Buddhanature teachings in the Third turning of the Wheel of Dharma but these are not definitive, just interpretative. Can anyone explain the definitive source of the Dzogchen teachings and show that they are Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

For Gelugpas, Dzogchen was validated by Tsongkhapa in a text that appears in the first volume of the Zhol edition of Tsongkhapa's collected works called the zhu lan sman mchog bdud rtsi'i phreng ba (blo bzang grags pa'i dpal. "zhu lan sman mchog bdud rtsi'i phreng ba." In gsung 'bum/_tsong kha pa (zhol). TBRC W635. 1: 295 - 320. new delhi, india: mongolian lama guru deva, 1978-1979.

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O2CZ7209%7CO2CZ72092CZ7221\\$W635](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O2CZ7209%7CO2CZ72092CZ7221$W635))

The English translation can be found in the LTWA publication, Life and Teachings of Tsongkhapa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Pero said:

IMO, the tulku system is not an actual part of my "religion". It is more like some kind of religious political system. I don't doubt there are some true tulkus but I personally couldn't care less who recognized who, it means absolutely nothing.

Indrajala said:

Yet much of your lineage leadership is presumably decided by men who were given the tulku title at birth, as decided by a group of people you have few connections with. Many exclusive resources are put into tulkus which, perhaps, part of your contributions go to.

But then I guess if you don't pay into the system, it isn't an issue. Also, it won't matter if your tradition in your home country is politically and financially autonomous.

Malcolm wrote:

Pero and i do not belong to a school grounded in the traditional tibetan monastic system. So it is not really an issue for us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Indrajala said:

As non-Tibetan Tibetan Buddhists, do you ever feel the tulku system ethnically excludes you? I know there are western tulkus, but not really so many (several of them don't have good track records to date too).

At best you can really just watch from the sidelines as the top Tibetan clerics make their judgements and write letters announcing a new tulku has been found. The whole administrative process and top brass are dominated by a small echelon of Tibetan men. As patrons and practitioners, doesn't it ever feel like you're being excluded from your own religion which you are supposed to be part and parcel of?

I don't ask that to be provocative. I'm actually interested in knowing what people think. You pay for and practice religious traditions which don't really embrace you or your kind into the administrative fold (at least not yet, but it doesn't seem like it will happen anytime soon).

Malcolm wrote:

No more exclusive than the catholic church...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 9:02 AM

Title: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Pero said:

IMO, the tulku system is not an actual part of my "religion". It is more like some kind of religious political system. I don't doubt there are some true tulkus but I personally couldn't care less who recognized who, it means absolutely nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

Seconded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 8:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

but if one rejects meditation in atiyoga, how will it not become endowed with accepting and rejecting?

Does this mean that if a dzogchen practitioner decides on the basis of the preceding part of the quotation that there is no meditation to be done, he or she will stray into accepting and rejecting?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

When a student meets a sudden buddhahood teacher, and is introduced, it is different than when a student meets a primordial buddhahood teacher and is introduced, because...

Malcolm wrote:

Because the former still thinks there is something missing.

Sherab said:

There is something missing. That something is realization. Other than that, nothing else is missing.

Malcolm wrote:

What is missing is the following confidence:

The realization of the truth is that since there is nothing to realize, there is no meditation — one should have confidence that there is nothing to mediate upon. If there is something to realize, for what reason do an object to realize and a realizer not occur? All the teachings of meditation taught in the intimate instructions merely demonstrate meditating on one's vidyā without one moving because there is no inside and outside, but if one rejects meditation in atiyoga, how will it not become endowed with accepting and rejecting?

-- The Sun of the Heart

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Simon E. said:

Or in extreme cases posting material that suggests that meat eaters are hell bound. I think seeker242's "yes !" in the context of that thread shows clearly that he thinks that the text in question indicates that HHDL is going to hell because he is a meat eater. T

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when your path requires three incalculable eons, you have to be a bit more careful, Simon.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist ethics at a national level

Content:

kirtu said:

Legal redress in the US is severely limited.

Malcolm wrote:

That is an over-generalization.

In Yankeedom and the Left Coast, things are easier.

You live on the border of the Deep South. Your perspective about the US is heavily colored by the fact that you on the edge the cultural sphere of one of the most brutal, aggressive and repressive societies every known, founded at Charleston by slavers from Barbados.

You should read American Nations (Woodard, 2011) -- it provides the answer for why I generally disagree with your characterizations of the "US". You live in a "US" I never have. I live in a "US" that you don't.

(Ironically, on another note, Obamacare was indirectly hatched by the Heritage Foundation...which is why it is such a cluster...)

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist ethics at a national level

Content:

Indrajala said:

Pornography, prostitution and so on...

Malcolm wrote:

Sex work is only a vice under patriarchy.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

When a student meets a sudden buddhahood teacher, and is introduced, it is different than when a student meets a primordial buddhahood teacher and is introduced, because...

Malcolm wrote:

Because the former still thinks there is something missing.

Luke said:

Then what is the difference between a Dzogchen master and an ordinary person who is completely content with ordinary life, who could care less about religion, and who doesn't feel that "there is something missing" either?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing. Buddhas and sentient beings are nondual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

That's quite a smoke screen but it seems to me to be a long winded way of just saying "No!".

Malcolm wrote:

Nondual great bliss is the conduct of all sentient beings, demonstrated as a mistaken path by the deluded.

-- Innermost Great Potentiality

Enjoy your buddhahood while you still can, Greg.

M

Sherab Dorje said:
Fat chance, I'm too busy enjoying my ignorance!
"Existence is Nirvana -
indeed, they can't be
considered apart;

they lack a single nature -
to me they are
completely stainless."
Saraha

Malcolm wrote:
Saraha was not deluded, indeed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:47 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Mhamudra is primordial too.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, parse it out for us then, Greg.

Maitripa states in the Mahāmudrākanakamālā:

In the same way, when not realized, samsara and nirvana are analyzed separately; when realized, samsara has always been the kāya of the great buddha.

But this is a little different.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:35 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
invisiblediamond said:
So are we primordial samyaksambuddhas then? The Four Visions are not traversed in time?

Malcolm wrote:
All qualities of buddhahood are complete in all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

When a student meets a sudden buddhahood teacher, and is introduced, it is different than when a student meets a primordial buddhahood teacher and is introduced, because...

Malcolm wrote:

Because the former still thinks there is something missing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, it is not correct to term Dzogchen "nongradual".

dzogchungpa said:

It is beyond cause and effect though, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is why the term "nongradual" is not very accurate when used to describe Dzogchen. We have three kinds of proposed buddhahood in various schools:

gradual -- ala sutra and most Vajrayāna
sudden/non-gradual -- Mahāmudra/Chan
primordial -- Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

smcj said:

Start doing them before the retreat. On a physical level it is like getting into shape for any physical exercise. You do NOT want to just start doing hundreds a day! You will be so sore you'll have to stop, and your other meditations will suffer as well. Get into shape before the retreat!

The important thing about prostration boards (if your teacher will allow them) is that your feet are 3"-4" below where your knees hit. That makes pushing up MUCH easier, which saves your stomach muscles. Also get a soft pad and tape it down where your

knees hit. A couple pieces of spare carpet will do for hand sliders. I use a swimmers lap counter instead of a hand male to count. It fits on your finger and isn't sliding around, which can be annoying.

Good luck!

Malcolm wrote:

There are the three main injuries that turn prostrations into a harmful and injurious activity as opposed to what they are supposed to be: a yoga for loosening the main channels of the body. These are: Injuries to the cervical spine, the lumbar spine, and the knees.

To prevent injuries to the neck, lower your head as you bend down.

To prevent injuries to the small of your back as well as your knees, you should never allow your knees to "hit", nor should you slide out from a kneeling position. You should slide out to the up position of a pushup, and then lower your body in such a way that you do not "hit" your knees (which causes many practitioners to have lifelong knee injuries) nor strain the small of your back.

When you rise, keep your head down while you slide back onto your knees, and then when you stand, keep your head down until you are full standing, rolling up from the base of the spine.

Despite the masochism with which many people approach prostrations, prostrations, and indeed no spiritual activity, should be a cause for harming the body, especially if you are a Vajrayāna practitioner, since knowingly harming the body is violation of root samayas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

oushi said:

Both gradual and nongradual implies a doer.

Since doer is an illusion, he never existed as something fixed.

Realization still implies a person. Liberation is always free from fixation.

Thus, one can realize gradually or nongradually that liberation was always present.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, it is not correct to term Dzogchen "nongradual".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Anyway, as it has been said countless times this concept of non-gradual seems to completely disregard the previous infinite lives one has lived to arrive at liberation "here and now".

Malcolm wrote:

It is irrelevant:

There is no place for birth and transmigration
in the experiential field of Samantabhadra.
Since the twelve limbs of cause and condition
are an explanation for the critical and the analytical,
in this way, the wise should understand this
as a mere doorway for the deluded.

-- Soaring Great Garuda

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

That's quite a smoke screen but it seems to me to be a long winded way of just saying "No!".

Malcolm wrote:

Nondual great bliss is the conduct of all sentient beings,
demonstrated as a mistaken path by the deluded.

-- Innermost Great Potentiality

Enjoy your buddhahood while you still can, Greg.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab said:

If the quotation is to true, then it is wrong to say that there is a buddhahood that is already present and always has been.

Malcolm wrote:

"[T]o identify a prong of gold, having immersed gold in a pan of water and then boiled it, if it becomes black it is not gold. If it is gold, then it will remain gold. In the same way, the mind of sentient beings has always been dharmatā. That being so, since it is demonstrated as the view, buddhahood is inherently accomplished since it has always been accomplished."

-- The Wheel of Ascertaining the View

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

Tsultrim T. said:

Along the same line as the other posters, I think starting slowly is better than stretching. Take it easy and gradually build up how many you are doing per session and per day over time. A platform can be helpful but a wooden or other smooth floor will work just fine. Also having something for the hands to make it easier to slide is helpful. You can make it as easy or hard on yourself as you want, just remember it is supposed to be challenging and break down mental conceptions about body, pain, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Sun salutations is the healthiest way to do your prostrations [but that's "Hindu"...]

However, doing 108 in a row is probably a bad idea. It is better to focus on quality, not on quantity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

yegyal said:

So a couple interesting side notes to this:

1. This is the first time ever that Chatral Rinpoche has been involved with the recognition of a tulku.

Glyn said:

That is debatable. Some would say that he has informally been involved before, although he has also been critical of the tradition.

For the record, he has also recently written a letter regarding one of a set of twins. I thought this was related to the Penor Yangsi, but it's obviously not the case.

Tsultrim T. said:

He was also quite involved in the Dudjom Yangsi recognition process, making it clear

that the Tibetan yangsi, Dudjom Tulku Sangye Pema Zhepa, was the true tulku. Although over time it seems everyone's stance has softened on that.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence the flaw of partisan politics and biases in the Tulku system (Dudjom Yangsi, Karmapa, I am sure we can think of other instances).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I didn't ask what the commentary says, I can see what it says, I asked: are YOU currently enlightened?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no buddhahood apart from rigpa. So when I am I am, and when I am not, I am not. In other words, everyone can have that experience of awakening, even if they are an "ordinary person", like me, and presumably you.

In any event, that is not really the point. The point is that awakening is fundamental feature of sentient beings. Whether or not they can access that state depends solely on whether they have access to a proper guru, introduction and confidence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The quote does not answer sherab's question. I personally would "dumb down" the question and simply ask: are you currently enlightened?

Malcolm wrote:

It precisely answers his question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

LastLegend said:

Nongradual. What does that mean?

Malcolm wrote:

The title is not really quite right, it should be "Dzogchen: Primordial Buddhahood?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Teachers are there to point out a buddhahood that is already present and always has been,

Sherab said:

Is buddhahood = enlighten state? If yes, does this mean that an enlightenment state can be obscured? If so, when one becomes a buddha, what is there to prevent one's enlighten state from being obscured again? If it cannot be obscured, why is it that our original enlighten state can be obscured?

Malcolm wrote:

The erroneous path of the mind that places hope for a result from any virtue, perfections, samaya, practice of accomplishment and so on are said to be deviations from the great vehicle without effort. Now then, if one proposes a cause of realization, because the absence of any activity and the absence of thought are a conducive cause, vidyā is held to arise from within. Since there are many thoughts due to activities, this is not a cause [of realization], again there is obscuration because of many perceptions.

-- The Commentary of the Inner Great Potentiality of The Great Perfection

While we can respect the notion of buddhahood from gathering two accumulations, Dzogchen practitioners do not believe it. Nevertheless, we also do dedications and so on, but from a different POV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Definition of Yangsi vs. Tulku

Content:

smcj said:

I thought the word 'tulku' was the Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit word 'nirmanakaya'. No?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed it is, but it really cannot be taken literally when applied to your average Tibetan reincarnated lama (not that HH Penor Rinpoche was "average" in any way")

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Nelson Mandela has died.

Content:

padma norbu said:

What good all-purpose prayers are there for the recently deceased? I know a Red Tara prayer, not sure if that's the best or maybe it doesn't matter.

Glyn said:

The Aspiration of Sukhavati, or Dewachen Monlam (de mon), from the Tertön Mingyur Dorje is very common. There is a long one which takes about half an hour to chant and a much shorter one.

OM AMI DEWA HRIH

Malcolm wrote:

The long one is actually by Karma Chagmed, the short one is Namcho Migyur Dorje's personal vision of Sukhavati.

However in this case, since it is not clear that Nelson Mandela has any relationship with Dharma at all, it is better to do Shitro for him, and even better, a chang chog rite would be best.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

So when student meets master, there will be no further passage of time between that and buddhahood?

Malcolm wrote:

You should start another thread.

Teachers are there to point out a buddhahood that is already present and always has been, as it states in the Inner Great Potentiality of Bodhicitta [byang chub kyi sems rtsal chen sprugs pa]:

Buddhas and sentient beings are nondual,
how could there be fabrication with a path?

However, a proper guru is indispensable, from the same text:

Without an authentic master, like the scripture of a monkey,
the basis and path will be erroneous, indeed one will be seized by conceptuality.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

So when student meets master, there will be no further passage of time between that and buddhahood?

Malcolm wrote:

You should start another thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 6:54 PM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Malcolm I am not sure how many people take the Hvasang stories literally these days. Even several Geshes I have spoken to are inclined to believe much of the stuff is polemical.

That being said, I still think the gradual approach has many benefits for those suited to it. The great majority of Buddhist paths advocate such an approach, and it is outlined clearly in the Buddhist canon. I don't think Lord Buddha would have spent so much teaching the superfluous- so I think such an approach must be appropriate for a great number of beings.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, my point for bringing up dzogchen is that it is an example of something being "secret", while in reality there is nothing truly offensive to be found in dzogchen tantras, unlike say, the laghusamvara. The main reason they are considered "secret" is, as I said, they reject the idea that buddhahood is something gradual, attained by gradually developing merit and wisdom. Ironically, dzogchen is kept secret precisely because of the responses garnered here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

Alfredo said:

Dzogchen is not so radical that it casts any doubt upon the institution of the lama.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is after all a Vajrayāna system. If someone wants to practice Dzogchen, they must of course have teacher of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

smcj said:

I was addressing the notion of what is "secret", why it is "secret", and the disparity in notions of secrecy.

There is an odd perspective in Dharma called the "One Yana" perspective. Is is peculiar to Vajrayana practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

The notion of "Ekayāna" in fact derives from a number of sūtras, most notable, the Saddharmapundarika.

It is not a particularly Vajrayāna sentiment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

why all the (off topic) trumpet blowing?

I was addressing the notion of what is "secret", why it is "secret", and the disparity in notions of secrecy.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

I have the same notion: that the idea behind the "sudden enlightenment" traditions are a form of skillful means to get people to practice and step into the stream, whereupon it will be revealed to them that they still have a very long way to go, but it is okay since they have already glimpsed Nirvana and gained the patiences. So it is a reverse technique ala the Lotus Sutra, but applied to Mahayanists instead of Sravakayanists.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a sudden enlightenment school.

It is a "everything is already in a state of buddhahood and always has been so" school.

pueraeternus said:

Yes - that is the usual premise such schools rest on.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it's a little different than what you think. But it is off topic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The main "scary" thing about Dzogchen is that it teaches a path beyond cause and result. This is scary for all those people who are easily frightened by the Hashang boogyman, especially those who remain trenchantly committed to Kadampa gradualism.

Sherab Dorje said:

One could quite as easily argue that Dzogchen was devised in order to placate cowardly beings that are scared stiff by the thought that they may actually have to devote a few hundred thousand lifetimes (like the Buddha, for example) to slowly chipping away at the petrified crud that has encrusted their true nature. That it is a ploy to get scaredy-cats to not break a cold sweat over the daunting nature of the task and at least get them started on the path to liberation. I mean, since becoming a one eyed fan, has it not occurred to you that Dzogchen is just another skilful means? Anyway, if the whole deal is so "shit-hot" why all the (off topic) trumpet blowing?

pueraeternus said:

I have the same notion: that the idea behind the "sudden enlightenment" traditions are a form of skillful means to get people to practice and step into the stream, whereupon it will be revealed to them that they still have a very long way to go, but it is okay since they have already glimpsed Nirvana and gained the patiences. So it is a reverse technique ala the Lotus Sutra, but applied to Mahayanists instead of Sravakayanists.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a sudden enlightenment school.

It is a "everything is already in a state of buddhahood and always has been so" school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

Glyn said:

How do you feel about the interactions of the internet and Dharma?

On one level it seems a great way to give access to teachings which would otherwise not be available to great numbers of people, but on the other hand it's also an enabler of a plethora of fakes, and semi-fakes, to promote themselves and for material which should be secret, becoming publically accessible.

Malcolm wrote:

The lack of internet in old Tibet did nothing to prevent the spawn of fakes and semi-fakes.

Not only that, but in old Tibet, nothing was really secret provided you had \$\$\$.

There may be some things in the so called anuttara tantras which probably were meant to titillate the brahmin-born scholars in whose milieu such texts were generally revealed (things entirely unremarkable to a beggar living in the streets). But the Dzogchen tantras, for example are largely free of such elements, and yet are considered super secret, even though in general the doctrines promulgated in such texts are tame in comparison to the sorcery and "antinomian" elements of the Laghusamvara, for example.

The main "scary" thing about Dzogchen is that it teaches a path beyond cause and result. This is scary for all those people who are easily frightened by the Hashang boogyman, especially those who remain trenchantly committed to Kadampa gradualism.

The only valid reason for gradually apportioning practices to students in a gradual manner that I have found is to keep people from getting very conceptual about practices of which they have no experience. Frankly, there is very little that should be kept "secret", and some practices in Vajrayāna have to be acknowledged as socially inappropriate, harmful and sexist, products of a patriarchal era in which the role of women was subordinate to the religious fantasies of wealthy scholars.

Returning to my main point: the truth is that Vajrayāna has never really been that "secret" from the beginning. Indeed, its "secrecy" was its prime marketing device and remains so even to this day.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: recent Jogye controversy

Content:

zed said:

would those anti-gambling Buddhist groups refuse to accept a donation from me?

Serious question.

Malcolm wrote:

Serious answer. I won't refuse it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Punya said:

So would it be correct to say that an emanation is indicative of a higher state than that of a reincarnation? And is a tulku an emanation and a yangsi a reincarnation?

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. But as Sakya Pandita put it:

Even a common geshe is praised as an actual Buddha,
what is pleasing to poets is displeasing to scholars.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

An emanation is fully conscious before conception, during gestation and through his or her birth.

Punya said:

I know this is off topic but how does this definition distinguish the difference between emanation and reincarnation.

Malcolm wrote:

A reincarnation is not fully conscious through the entire process of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He would be an emanation of Vimalamitra. As the legend has it, Vimalamitra returns to Tibet every one hundred years.

M

Punya said:

Malcolm, can you explain what emanation means please.

Malcolm wrote:

An emanation is fully conscious before conception, during gestation and through his or her birth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

what's the difference between a yangsi and a tulku?

Malcolm wrote:

A yang srid [punarbhāva] is literally a reincarnation. A sprul sku is a nirmanakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 5th, 2013 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

reincarnation of Vimalamitra

Malcolm wrote:

He can't be a reincarnation of Vimalamitra since Vimalamitra, according to legend, attained 'pho ba chen po, and still lives at Wutai Shan.

He would be an emanation of Vimalamitra. As the legend has it, Vimalamitra returns to Tibet every one hundred years.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 4th, 2013 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Advice for the young layperson

Content:

flowerbuddh said:

I have set my heart completely on liberating myself and all others from suffering... can any of you link me articles on how others have done this or provide your own insight... so, essentially, being a layperson (esp. young) and how to handle it. Thanks guys! <3

Malcolm wrote:

No one has ever managed to do this [i.e. liberate all others from suffering], not even the Buddha. But you can try.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 4th, 2013 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Tucker's research on reincarnation.

Content:

Indrajala said:

Now, the "variety of the world arises from the actions of living beings" is similar to saying "certain features of the universe and of living things are best explained by an intelligent cause rather than an undirected process such as natural selection". Beings in Buddhist philosophy generate karma as a result of willed action in varying degrees and types, which is saying that their variety is a result of intelligent causes, not strictly natural selection and mutations.

Malcolm wrote:

Its not similar at all.

Intelligence is accounted for in natural selection.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 1st, 2013 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Selling the dharma

Content:

dude said:

That's why we should present offerings without being asked or required to.

Malcolm wrote:

That works fine for sutrayāna teachings, but it is a nonstarter in Vajrayāna where empowerment fees and so on are stipulated in the tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 30th, 2013 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Nighthawk said:

As a PL Buddhist following a Japanese tradition, you're saying I should be chanting it Namō Amitabha Buddha instead of Namu Amida Butsu in order to achieve the full effect?

Malcolm wrote:

That's not a mantra. It's an homage, so saying "Homage to Buddha Amitabha" would also be as effective as either the Sanskrit or the Japanese, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 30th, 2013 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

smcj said:

The āryapañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstrābhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti states, for example:

"The bodhisattva mahāsattva who wishes to overwhelm the cittopāda of the pratyekabuddha (who rejoices in patience) trains in the perfection of wisdom".

The term "generation of bodhicitta" is a gloss for the term cittopāda, "generation of the intent". Intent for what? Intent for one of the three kinds of awakening, i.e., arhat, pratyekabuddha, or samyaksambuddha.

There are many examples like this in the literature of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra which extensively discusses the differences in the creation of the various "intents" to awaken. Well yes, obviously arhats and pratyekabuddhas have 'intents to awaken'. The question at hand is if that is properly called 'bodhicitta'. Your supporting citation is hardly a slam-dunk, but that's ok. This isn't really an important subject so let's drop it.

You're a busy man and I have no wish to make you do additional work. I'd rather not irritate you on this. I will save that privilege for something else that I see as more important.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the term "generation of [bodhi]citta" is what is usually translated by western translators as "generation of bodhicitta". For example, the Rangjung Yeshe dictionary gives:

sems bskyed - forming the resolve; motivation/ aspiration/ to resolve oneself;
1. Bodhicitta, producing the Bodhicitta, [bodhicittotpada]; 2) producing a thought; cultivation of an enlightened attitude. arousing / generating bodhicitta, mental disposition [when not particularly referring to the development of awakening mind]; aspiration; arousing / generating bodhicitta, cultivation of an enlightened attitude [ry]

All three, arhats, pratyekabuddhas and buddhas arises from an intent to awaken [bodhicitta]. Much of Mahāyāna polemical discourse around this is to make sure that Bodhisattvas do not fall into the bodhicitta of an arhat or pratyekabuddha. All three attain bodhi, therefore, it is a misconception to say that those who aspire to arhatship and pratyekabuddhahood have no bodhicitta, but it must be recognized that these bodhicittas are considered inferior bodhicittas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

dude said:

You're quite right about the two being so far apart, and I think this is a positive outcome. I imagine it produced some meaningful dialogue as well with increased understanding for both parties.

mindyourmind said:

For me it was more a reminder of the positions that the two worldviews take, and the gulf of differences that remain, has to remain, in discussions like these.

dude said:

You're right, but it really bothers me because I believe in Buddhism. They're wrong, and cause suffering to self and others. Maybe I can't convince them in some cases, but it's really too bad.

What bothers me even more is Buddhists who refuse to believe in karma and rebirth. That's downright scary.

Malcolm wrote:

It is better not to be so attached to views that it causes you to have an emotional reaction when you find out that there are those who hold different views.

Theism, a belief in god, has brought peace to millions of people's minds.

Second, you don't know that they are wrong, any more than atheists are not right in asserting there is no karma and rebirth. These are all abstractions, concepts. While I personally accept rebirth and karma, I am not going to insist it is true, other than to insist it is part of the Buddhas teachings and needs to be respected as such. But there is no orthodoxy to defend in Dharma, because Dharma is based on personal experience and not on adherence to a set of views. There are many Buddhists who like the bulk of Buddha's ethical and meditative teachings, who nevertheless don't accept rebirth because they have no memories from their past lives and so on. People are better left in freedom to figure things out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

xabir said:

Because Mahāyāna sutras and tantras are filled with Indian myths and legends.

mt meru cosmology originated from pali suttas yes?

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.32.0.piya.html>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, also the Pali canon is filled with Indian myths and legends.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

smcj said:

I think Malcolm is incorrect about calling the aspiration to become an arhat as a 'grade of bodhicitta'.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, in Mahāyāna texts, bodhicitta is presented in exactly this way -- do you really want me to drag out the citations?

smcj said:

Yes please.

Malcolm wrote:

The āryapañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstrābhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti states, for example:

"The bodhisattva mahāsattva who wishes to overwhelm the cittopāda of the pratyekabuddha (who rejoices in patience) trains in the perfection of wisdom".

The term "generation of bodhicitta" is a gloss for the term cittopāda, "generation of the intent". Intent for what? Intent for one of the three kinds of awakening, i.e., arhat, pratyekabuddha, or samyaksambuddha.

There are many examples like this in the literature of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra which extensively discusses the differences in the creation of the various "intents" to awaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

smcj said:

I think Malcolm is incorrect about calling the aspiration to become an arhat as a 'grade

of bodhicitta'.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, in Mahāyāna texts, bodhicitta is presented in exactly this way -- do you really want me to drag out the citations?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Of course we need to decide whether these stories are true or not, but I would contend that Buddhism gives us tools for believing the fantastical. If everything is the mere creation of our mind, like in a dream, and nothing exists from its own side, then anything can appear in accordance with karma. The only thing that is impossible is inherent existence. A true scientific understanding of the mind according to Buddha's teachings make many hidden objects logically provable such as past and future lives, karma, the existence of god realms and hell realms and Pure Lands.

Malcolm wrote:

You realize this is merely medieval style casuistry?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Indrajala said:

...but not so much with Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans, being among the last Asians to encounter the colonial west, still resist modernity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

jeeprs said:

So, as I said, what is a better translation for 'Bodhicitta' than 'Compassion'?

Malcolm wrote:

In the Mahāyāna context, "the intent to awaken".

Tenzin Dorje said:

"for the sake of all sentient beings" (on the basis of having realized perfect and complete enlightenment, the ripening of all positive qualities and the elimination of all non-virtues, as the way to actually help countless sentient beings ; this is why thinking - of it - is important)

Malcolm wrote:

NO, you cannot make that statement -- because while the term bodhicitta is only defined in Mahāyāna, there are different grades of bodhicitta, the intent to awaken as an arhat, and so on. It is only the intent to awaken as a buddha for the benefit of all sentient beings that we describe as the true Mahāyāna bodhicitta, but there are in fact different intents to awaken, not all of which spring from compassion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Indrajala said:

...then people can compose their own prayers and commentaries, or do their practices exclusively in English with it being completely valid and orthodox, rather than reciting in Tibetan and then in a dead tone saying the English.

In due time the English traditions would be settled and have less need to defer to Tibetan sources or even Tibetan teachers.

Jainarayan said:

Would this include translating mantras into the vernacular? Everything I've read says that mantras lose their effectiveness unless recited or chanted in the original language, or close to it. So, I don't mean sound shifts like om mani padme hum to om mani peme hung. That's a case of approximating the sounds between languages, not any kind of literal or word for word translation. The Mahakaruna Dharani and Ushisa Vijaya Dharani do translate into English, but do they have the same effect (I don't know if there is a fully translated into Tibetan version).

I'm not challenging, just curious.

Malcolm wrote:

Mantras are a special case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Indrajala said:

What if Tibetan Buddhism in the west transitions to a primarily English medium?

Malcolm wrote:

It's not a what if. Parroting syllables in a language one does not speak is unsustainable.

Indrajala said:

In due time the English traditions would be settled and have less need to defer to Tibetan sources or even Tibetan teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

English is the new international Dharma language.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

jeeprs said:

I think it is perfectly sound to translate bodhicitta as 'compassion'. It is often translated that way.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a) unsound and b) no one translates bodhicitta as compassion (karuna).

Why is it unsound? Every person who has bodhicitta has compassion, but not every person who has compassion also has bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

jeeprs said:

So, as I said, what is a better translation for 'Bodhicitta' than 'Compassion'?

Malcolm wrote:

In the Mahāyāna context, "the intent to awaken".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That's a novel approach. Where, in any work of these two masters, do they claim to have personally visited Meru?

Tsongkhapa said:

Asanga travelled to Tushita Pure Land with Maitreya (not merely had meditational experiences of Tushita) so he would have seen it as it would be below this realm. In Nagajuna's biography it says that during the period of his second Turning of the Wheel he went to the Northern Continent of the four that surround Mount Meru and taught there for two hundred and fifty years, so he would have seen it too.

To use another example, are we to say that Tushita and Akanishta Pure Lands do not exist because they have never been the objects of human valid cognitions? (actually, while being generally true that humans cannot see Tushita Pure Land, Asanga saw it with his human conventionally valid eye consciousness).

No, this is false. Asanga had meditational experience of Tushita. He did not observe Tushita with his physical eyes

What's your source for this belief? In the widely accepted biographies of Asanga he physically travelled to Tushita and spent fifty human years there, so of course he saw it.

Malcolm wrote:

If you like reading religious novels and accepting them as truth, go for it. As for the Asanga story, I am basing myself on Chinese sources that are much earlier than Tibetan sources.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

the five skandhas are also impermanent, as with the skillful means they ripen into the 5 primordial wisdoms.

philji said:

At a certain level this just seems yada yada yada.....why do Buddhists love to quote stuff like this when asked to help someone.....who does it help?

Malcolm wrote:

yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

Son of Buddha said:
The real nature is Buddha Wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:
Which is just a name, like suchness, emptiness, luminosity, the limit of reality, nirvana, etc., which are all synonyms.

Son of Buddha said:
Emptiness is a negation, meaning the lack thereof if Enlightenment was sheer emptiness it would be nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddha taught only three gateways to liberation:

śūnyatā
alakṣaṇa
apranidāna.

Emptiness, absence of characteristics and absence of aspiration.

He did not teach a fourth gate of liberation.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 4:50 AM
Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness
Content:
SittingSilent said:
What then is this "real nature" you speak of? And mind? I read a lot about mind in Pema Chodron's books.

Malcolm wrote:
Emptiness.

dude said:
no it isn't

Malcolm wrote:
Sure it is. You can all it "luminosity" if you want, but that is also empty.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 1:03 AM
Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language
Content:

Jainarayan said:

...it's Tibetan custom to end practices with Om Ah Hung 3 times.

Malcolm wrote:

No it isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Admittedly, one could logically extend that line of thought and argue that Sanskrit syllables should be used rather than Tibetan ones, but I feel the Tibetan syllables to have no more or less ritual efficacy, and to be no more or less authentic than the Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no one standard Sanskrit shape. For example, the syllables e vaṃ; most of the explanations of these two phonemes in the tantras involve their shape, shapes which they have in some Sanskrit syllabaries, but not all, and not in Tibetan.

For example, the scripts used for the Nyingma tantras in Sanskrit in the 8th century could not be read by Indian Panditas in the 11th century.

In the end the shape of the letter merely represents a sound...it is the sound that is important, not the shape of the phoneme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

SittingSilent said:

What then is this "real nature" you speak of? And mind? I read a lot about mind in Pema Chodron's books.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I guess it depends on how far you want to take it.

According to traditional Indian (Vedic) cosmology the moon landing could have never happened because the scriptures indicate it is the abode of Chandra and the distance calculations are incorrect. Zealously holding to this view did not win the Hare Krishnas many supporters. Below are the founder, Swami Prabhupada's, comments on the issue:

Malcolm wrote:

Incorrect according to a religious text, much in the same vein as the Buddhist texts which make similar cosmological claims.

Ancient Indian Astronomy texts at least are based on mathematical calculations and centuries of specialized observation and records.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I submit that no human being ever perceived Mt. Meru with a conventionally valid cognition. Mt. Meru is and always been a cosmological Indian myth about which there are various and conflicting traditions.

Tsongkhapa said:

Asanga and Nagarjuna have both seen it.

Malcolm wrote:

That's a novel approach. Where, in any work of these two masters, do they claim to have personally visited Meru?

Tsongkhapa said:

They were great realised beings, so I submit that they had conventionally valid cognitions.

Malcolm wrote:

But there is no evidence that they held forth the idea that they had personally visited Meru. So you are merely engaging in proliferation, rank conceptual fabrication.

Tsongkhapa said:

To use another example, are we to say that Tushita and Akanishta Pure Lands do not exist because they have never been the objects of human valid cognitions? (actually, while being generally true that humans cannot see Tushita Pure Land, Asanga saw it with his human conventionally valid eye consciousness).

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is false. Asanga had meditational experience of Tushita. He did not observe

Tushita with his physical eyes.

Tsongkhapafan said:

We cannot say that something doesn't exist just because we cannot perceive it.

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't it strike you as odd that certain facts about the world never change (sun, moon and stars), while other facts (flat earth --> round earth) do? Basically, all this indicates to me is that we have become better at analyzing and investigating the world, not worse, and that such obsolete cosmologies as the one we are discussing come from a time prior to that ability -- i.e. these suppositions could not be tested.

Tsongkhapafan said:

If Mount Sumeru is mythological, why is it referred to in the Sutras and Tantras (for example, Heruka's palace is on top of Mount Meru)?

Malcolm wrote:

Because Mahāyāna sutras and tantras are filled with Indian myths and legends.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

if my mind can perceive the thoughts, past lives and so forth of others, how can I say that others' minds exist outside my own? .

Malcolm wrote:

But your mind cannot. You do not have the five kinds of clairvoyance. So this argument is not valid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: Oldest Buddhist Shrine Uncovered In Nepal

Content:

sukhamanveti said:

Now it looks as though one of the older chronologies may have been vindicated.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so fast. It is well established that the Buddha was born to his mother on a trip to a remote location. It is well known that ancient Indians maintained sacred groves [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sacred_groves_of_India] from time immemorial.

Without datable evidence of specifically Buddhist artifacts, it is too soon to use this as supporting the more traditional dates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

SittingSilent said:

then what gives rise to the sense of me-ness?

Malcolm wrote:

Ignorance of your real nature.

The body is not your self.

Mind and mental factors are not your self.

You have no self external to the mind and body.

Your self is not the body and mind taken together.

However, one designates the body and mind as a self based on convention, and that is fine. There is no other "self" than the conventional one designated on the complex of aggregates.

It is true that some later Mahāyāna trends attempt to define suchness, or the real nature of phenomena as a "self" -- but these trends did not gain much currency in Indian Buddhism because the tortured rhetoric of "self" vs. "nonself" utilized by these trends merely serves to reinforce the concept that a self cannot be ascertained in one's five aggregates, separate from one's five aggregates or is all one's five aggregates together.

Conventionally, there is no problem using the term self. The problem arises when one imputes permanent identity, i.e. an ultimate self, onto the continuum we are now referring to as "SittingSilent", etc.

You might read Hume's refutation of the self. It's sometimes helpful for those trying to grasp what the Buddha meant by absence of self:

According to the standard interpretation of Hume on personal identity, he was a bundle theorist, who held that the self is nothing but a bundle of experiences ("perceptions") linked by the relations of causation and resemblance; or, more accurately, that the empirically warranted idea of the self is just the idea of such a bundle. This view is forwarded by, for example, positivist interpreters, who saw Hume as suggesting that terms such as "self", "person", or "mind" referred to collections of "sense-contents".[58] A modern-day version of the bundle theory of the mind has been advanced by Derek Parfit in his *Reasons and Persons* (1986).

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Hume#The_self

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

The non-existence of Mount Meru FOR US is easily proved by it not being either a hidden or manifest object, but our view is not inherently the only one. The world is subjectively existent. We don't see pus and blood or nectar when we observe liquid...

Malcolm wrote:

This presumes there is a common basis of karmically determined perceptions, i.e. for a single vessel of a liquid, there are six different perceptions.

Now then, the perception of a Mt. Meru and the non-perception of Mt. Meru must have a common basis of perception if we are to accept your analogy.

We are not talking about the conventionally valid cognitions of beings of the six realms, we are only talking about the conventionally valid cognitions of human beings.

I submit that no human being ever perceived Mt. Meru with a conventionally valid cognition. Mt. Meru is and always been a cosmological Indian myth about which there are various and conflicting traditions.

Ancient Indian astronomical works as the Suryasiddhanta clearly describe our world as being round and suspended in space like an iron ball between two magnets. Further:

"The Surya Siddhanta also estimates the diameters of the planets. The estimate for the diameter of Mercury is 3,008 miles, an error of less than 1% from the currently accepted diameter of 3,032 miles. It also estimates the diameter of Saturn as 73,882 miles, which again has an error of less than 1% from the currently accepted diameter of 74,580. Its estimate for the diameter of Mars is 3,772 miles, which has an error within 11% of the currently accepted diameter of 4,218 miles. It also estimated the diameter of Venus as 4,011 miles and Jupiter as 41,624 miles, which are roughly half the currently accepted values, 7,523 miles and 88,748 miles, respectively."

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Surya_Siddhanta

Indian astronomers, while generally subscribing to a geocentric cosmology, were more advanced in their thinking than the mythic superstitions of Buddhist abhidharmikas, for whom Mt. Meru is only viewable by siddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

Arjan Dirkse said:

Emptiness is a bit of misnomer when used to refer to sunyata.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is actually a very precise translation.

Arjan Dirkse said:

OK, the word "misnomer" is a misnomer then...

Still, emptiness in the Buddhist sense is something else to me than what is normally conveyed by the meaning of the English word emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

The term simply means when something lacks something, that lack is termed "emptiness".

For example, the cullasunnata sutta, the lack of a city in a village is designated as the emptiness of the village.

In yogacara "emptiness" means the perfected nature, i.e., the absence of subject and object (the imagined nature) in the dependent nature.

In madhyamaka, the absence of the four extremes in relative phenomena is ultimate, i.e. the emptiness of the things.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

futerko said:

Let me come back to this...

The logical consequence of dependent origination is that nothing originates

PadmaVonSamba said:

No, it means that no thing originates.

In other words, in dependent origination, there is no intrinsically, self-arising thing.

futerko said:

You seem to be suggesting that something originates which is somehow not a thing.

As Oushi wrote, "To talk about time, you need change." So where do you locate any event or any arising outside of any reference to the present?

Without needing to be enlightened, we still know that time appears as a succession of moments in which change appears to occur in those subsequent moments, so if we locate temporal infinity anywhere other than right here and now then we find ourselves in a dead end - positing an uncaused cause.

Malcolm wrote:

Time depends on objects, when objects cannot be ascertained, neither can time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

Arjan Dirkse said:

Emptiness is a bit of misnomer when used to refer to sunyata.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is actually a very precise translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 26th, 2013 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

(having already defined parabhāva as a species of svabhāva) "Where is there a bhāva which is not included in svabhāva or parabhāva?"

cloudburst said:

This is all irrelevant, as you know. This is Nagarjuna arguing against the existence of essences. No one is claiming that. Sophistry will not win the day here, although you may impress the credulous.

Malcolm wrote:

Here, Nāgārjuna is pointing out in no uncertain terms that all assertions of existence and non-existence are fraught with notion of essences automatically. It is one thing to accept that tables and chairs "exist" prior to analysis. It is quite another to assert their existence is valid predicated on deluded cognitions, i.e. a cognition of a non-veridical object, which is in essence what a conventional truth is.

The clause "therefore, since that is so...", only intends to affirm that sense organs and so on are products of the ripening of action, as previously stated, in conformity with worldly convention -- but it is not a statement of commitment on Candrakīrti's part that worldly convention is truthful, which is why he remarks that one should not get involved with how it actually is.

Affirming that eyes are products is all I need. Since they are produced according to

worldly convention, they must exist according to worldly convention.

Worldly convention is predicated on cognitions of non-veridical objects, i.e. it is dependent on false cognitions. What does it matter if eyes and so on are products if the very substrate upon which the acceptance of their status as products is in itself delusion?

Madhyamakas do not make propositions concerning existence. They accept whatever is in common discourse merely for the purpose of demonstrating (to those that care) that the terms of common discourse they are using are deluded and false. What is the root delusion? Assertions of existence which always involve notions of inherency. As much as Tsongkhapa wanted to sever the discussion of called "mere existence" or conventional existence from inherent or ultimate existence, in reality, one cannot hew the two apart.

Nagarjuna's point, very simple put, is that when there are essences, only then can there be existences. When there are no essences, then there can be no existences. Such existences that are spoken about are understood to be merely conventional (meaning imputed, meaning not real), predicated on the deluded cognition of ordinary persons. These are accepted provisionally by Madhyamaka, but not asserted by Madhyamaka.

The Gelug commitment to arguing essenceless existence is fruitless because there are is no such thing as an essenceless existence. This is why it is necessary to negate merely inherent existence, but rather one must negate all four extremes in both the relative and the ultimate -- only this is the profound emptiness taught in Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 26th, 2013 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

smcj said:

Whereas the Buddhists simply say that there is an infinite regression

futerko said:

No, they don't. The whole point of Buddhism is to avoid such an issue of infinite regress.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, Buddhists accept certain kinds of infinite regression as a logical consequence of dependent origination, for example, the infinite regression of dependent causality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 26th, 2013 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

mindyourmind said:

[

What he wants to know (and here my theism may be letting me down) is "Who made it?" In the theistic worldview all of these questions of course have a wonderfully pat answer.

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is that we (every sentient beings in the universe) all did by the force of our past actions which have no beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 25th, 2013 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

mindyourmind said:

To put it in its simplest form, where does karma / rebirth "come from"? Who created such an exquisitely complex system, if there is no god?

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is volition and what proceeds from volition, state Buddha, Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu. Karma/rebirth, therefore come from the mind.

One important Buddhist tenet is beginninglessness. There is no absolute beginning.

All the diversity that we see in the universe is a result of all the individual actions of all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 25th, 2013 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

It's a good question that I've been giving some thought. I think it's because Buddha did - he said there is no creator other than mind, so although mind doesn't exist from its own side it's still the creator of all our experiences. In the Mahamudra teachings Buddha said "if you realise your own mind, you will become a Buddha. You should not seek Buddhahood elsewhere." I think it's possible to assert the primacy of mind without being a Chittamatrin, especially because karma arises from intention, which is part of mind, and the world arises from conceptual imputation which is the major function of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that line of reasoning suffers from infinite regress?

Tsongkhapa said:
I'm curious why - please explain Malcolm

Malcolm wrote:
Well, there are two problems: one your mind is not the only mind. This automatically means that unless you are a solipsist, you automatically must accept the existence of external entities that are not products of your mind, i.e. other minds.

Second, when you claim that everything is a product of one's own mind, including the causes and conditions that give rise to the mind itself, you are locked in an infinite regress, essentially asserting that the mind causes itself.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 25th, 2013 at 12:23 AM
Title: Re: switching from vajrayana to theravada for some time
Content:
dude said:

The Buddha wouldn't agree with the Theravadin monks. They embrace the provisional and reject the essential.

Malcolm wrote:
Which Buddha? The Mahāyāna one?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 24th, 2013 at 3:53 AM
Title: Re: Goenka Retreat
Content:
duckfiasco said:
* it's run entirely by donations, which I found impressive

Malcolm wrote:
They will hit you up for a donation when you leave.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 22nd, 2013 at 6:24 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:
smcj said:
This is why Nāgārjuna also wrote: "An existent [bhāva] does not arise from an existent, an existent does not arise from a nonexistent; a nonexistent does not arise from an existent; a nonexistent does not arise from a nonexistent. How can there be arising?" Nagarjuna would have hated quantum mechanics, where things pop into and out of existence for no good reason.

Hey, doesn't that negate all his philosophy?

Malcolm wrote:

It simply means we don't have the math to understand the causality of a given phenomena, it doesn't entail the consequence that Nāgārjuna's opening statement in the MMK is incorrect:

"At no time and in no place does anything arise from itself, from other than itself, from both, or in absence of a cause."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 21st, 2013 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Actually, they DO assert it. Many many examples of this can be provided. For the purposes of this discussion we will accept your own translation above "Mādhyamikas are proponents of dependent origination."

Malcolm wrote:

That is not an assertion of existence.

cloudburst said:

Of course it is.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't. It is for this reason that Nāgārjuna asks the question (having already defined parabhāva as a species of svabhāva) "Where is there a bhāva which is not included in svabhāva or parabhāva?" Since there is no such thing, to call "dependent origination" a proposition of bhāva is incredibly wrong-headed. This is why Nāgārjuna also wrote: "An existent [bhāva] does not arise from an existent, an existent does not arise from a nonexistent; a nonexistent does not arise from an existent; a nonexistent does not arise from a nonexistent. How can there be arising?"

cloudburst said:

The translators are using inferences to translate the meaning, not just the words. So when they say "therefore they do exist" (which you render as "this is so"), they do so in order to demonstrate that eyes are dependently arisen results of karma. This means that they exist conventionally, so there is no problem in saying so in order to convey the meaning of the citation.

Malcolm wrote:

The clause "therefore, since that is so...", only intends to affirm that sense organs and so on are products of the ripening of action, as previously stated, in conformity with worldly convention -- but it is not a statement of commitment on Candrakīrti's part that worldly convention is truthful, which is why he remarks that one should not get involved

with how it actually is.

The translation (in this instance) is not successful and does not convey the meaning Candrakirti intends. Therefore, when you use it as a citation in support of a reason, the reason also fails. No, I did not have it lying around. Since the translation seemed a bit too pat to me, I examined the source of the citation and found it was slightly off when compared to the Tibetan. The term yod pa can be a translation of several different terms, ranging from asti to sat:

yod pa - saṃ√vid:samvidyamāna
yod pa - saṃniveśa
yod pa - sat
yod pa - sadbhāva
yod pa - sāṃnidhya
yod pa - a-vaikalya
yod pa - /as:asti
yod pa - astitā
yod pa - /vid:vidyate
yod pa - vidyamānatā
yod pa - vidyamāna
yod pa - upa√labh:upalabhyante
yod pa - /bhū:bhavati

Since we do not have the sanskrit original of this commentary, it is a little hard to say what the proper rendering of yod pa is here in "de phyir, de yod pas", it could just as easily be "since that exists" as "since that is so". However, given that context, and given the fact that "de yod pas" bears the instrumental "s" on the yod pa, it is unlikely that to mean : "Therefore, they do exist", especially when there is no plural corresponding to "they" such as "de dag" (eṣām).

An endemic problem in online discussions is the use of citations people haven't the skill to investigate themselves in either a Sanskrit original or in a secondary language such as Tibetan. In order to have a meaningful discussion, we must have first translations we actually agree upon. If we cannot achieve that much, it is difficult to have a meaningful exchange. This is also compounded with the fact that most of these discussions are not predicated on detailed discussions of the source texts, but rather post 12th century Tibetans involved in polemics with agendas often quite removed from the context in which these texts were composed. It is for this reason I generally abstain from discussions about Tibetan Madhyamaka any more, other than to observe that Tibetans after the 12th century, such as Dolbuba, Tsongkhapa, Gorampa (who in fact does not faithfully portray the early Sakya view) and so on began to introduce novelties to Madhyamaka discussion. Khenpo Zhenga tried to remedy this by restoring study of original commentaries and texts, but thus far western disciples of Tibetans still remain committed to whatever sectarian division they were initially trained in.

On the other hand I am certainly happy to talk about Indian Madhyamaka as long as it is understood that citations from Tibetans are excluded from the discussion, since I

decided long ago that Tibetan Madhyamaka was a waste of time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 21st, 2013 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's a good question that I've been giving some thought. I think it's because Buddha did - he said there is no creator other than mind, so although mind doesn't exist from its own side it's still the creator of all our experiences. In the Mahamudra teachings Buddha said "if you realise your own mind, you will become a Buddha. You should not seek Buddhahood elsewhere." I think it's possible to assert the primacy of mind without being a Chittamatrin, especially because karma arises from intention, which is part of mind, and the world arises from conceptual imputation which is the major function of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that line of reasoning suffers from infinite regress?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 21st, 2013 at 8:10 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

cloudburst said:

Actually, they DO assert it. Many many examples of this can be provided. For the purposes of this discussion we will accept your own translation above "Mādhyamikas are proponents of dependent origination."

Malcolm wrote:

That is not an assertion of existence.

Chandrakirti said:

We refute here that things exist essentially; we do not refute that eyes and such are products. and are dependently arisen results of karma. Therefore they exist. Hence, when eyes and so forth are explained only as results of karma, they do exist.

Malcolm wrote:

This passage's translation is not correct.

ཁོ་ལོ་ཅག་ནི་འདིར་དངོས་པོ་རྣམས་རང་གི་ངོ་བོས་གྲུབ་པ་འགོག་གི་མེད་ལ་སོགས་པ་བྱས་ཤིང་རྟེན་ཅིང་འབྲེལ་པར་འབྱུང་བའི་ལས་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པར་སྒྲིན་པ་ཉིད་ནི་མི་འགོག་པའོ། །དེ་འབྱུང་དེ་ཡོད་པས་གང་ཞིག་རྣམ་པར་སྒྲིན་པ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་བསྐྱེད་པས་མེད་ལ་སོགས་པ་ཡོད་པ་ཉིད་དོ།

"We are here refuting that things are proven [grub] through their own entity [svarūpa], but products such as eyes and so on are not refuted, being a ripening of dependently originated actions. Therefore, that is so because that which has been explained as being a ripening are eyes and so on.

So I can't accept your reason here because the citation is not correctly translated as far as I am concerned. Further, the point of the citation is not to prove existence of eyes and so forth, but rather in the original text, the point of the citation is demonstrate that:

དེའི་ཕྱིར་མཁས་པས་འཇིག་རྟེན་པའི་དོན་ལ་ཇི་སྐད་བཤད་པའི་རྣམ་པར་དབྱེད་པ་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ནི་དམ་པོར་བ་དང་རྗེས་སུ་མཐུན་པ་མ་བཅུག་པར་ལས་རྣམས་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པར་སྤྲིན་པ་བས་མ་གྱིས་མེ་བྱུང་པ་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་སྒྲངས་

"Therefore, the wise who investigate according to how it is explained in the mundane meaning accept the inconceivable ripening of actions without getting correspondingly involved with seeing reality [de ko na nydi, tattvam]."

Thus, the citation does not say what you want it to say, nor does it match the point you wish to make.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 21st, 2013 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

As far as claiming 3rd turning as provisional goes the chapter 7 of the Samdhinirmocana Sutra states the first and second turning are provisional and the third turning is definite. As does the Nirvana sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

There are different ways to read the hermeneutic of the three turnings.

One has to present a logical reason why the so called third turning is superior to the second turning. Then one has to carefully identify which texts are actually referred to as such and so on. Personally, I don't think the three turnings are important. Why? Because this was just a scheme by one anonymous author to elevate his own text above other texts.

Further, the elaboration of a third wheel merely shows that texts like the Samdhi-nirmocana and the Nirvana sūtra are not part of the wave of original Mahāyāna texts, and belong to the second wave of Mahāyāna revelation.

In reality, the concept of the three turnings, which becomes so important in Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism receives almost no commentarial attention from Indians themselves in the Indian treatises.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But your mind too does not exist from its own side...so what does it depend on?

Tsongkhapa said:

Mind depends upon many factors such as its parts, energy winds, previous moments and objects.

Malcolm wrote:

Uh huh -- so why privilege mind as the arbiter of external appearances?

Why don't you just simple say "If you have the dependent origination to perceive x, then you will"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

LOL

I'm on your side Malcolm.

tobes said:

Why are you so eager to choose a side and denounce anyone that you think is on the "Other" side?

dzogchungpa said:

Which side is Malcolm on anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

I wish someone would tell me, it would make life so much easier.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What article are you referencing, the funerary buddhism one?

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

yeah.

<http://www.thlib.org/collections/texts/jiats/#!jiats=/01/germano/b8/>

Malcolm wrote:

This simply means that contemporary tertons were working with the same system of praxis in the late 11th and 12th century; it does not render snying thig superior to yang ti.

I imagine the real success of the snying thig literature is actually the compelling and fabulously rich narrative provided to it by the lo rgyus chen mo. Simply put, Zhang ston simply wrote a more interesting legend of the transmission of Dzogchen than other contemporary accounts at that point in time (mid 12th century). Of course, his account was swiftly eclipsed by the Padmasambhava legend revealed/composed/reworked by his younger contemporary, Nyang ral.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

Even if Dzogchen is Tibetan, it still developed within a 100% Buddhist environment according to scholars.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But I don't think anyone disputed this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

If yangti is a copy, then the original is better.

Of course I could be misunderstanding Germano.

Malcolm wrote:

What article are you referencing, the funerary buddhism one?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

So we can say the unsurpassed secret cycle of nyingthig is superior to yangti.

Malcolm wrote:

What is your reasoning concerning this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Now that I have thought about it I am not sure this is a phenomenon completely outside our Western religious traditions. Does the Pope not call Catholics "Children of the Flock." All the priests in my father's Irish Catholic side of the family are called "Father", and nuns are called "Sister" or "Mother" depending on their rank.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and look where infantilizing Catholics brought the Catholic Church.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Emptiness means that things do not exist from their own side in the least which means that 'reality' depends on your mind.

Malcolm wrote:

But your mind too does not exist from its own side...so what does it depend on?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

even going so far as to call them "children" to their faces.

muni said:

Lol. I should see that as an invitation to come home.

"The "coming home" is like the son recognizing his mother. Like a young child leaping up & embracing her".

<http://www.sofiatopia.org/bodhi/dzogchen.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

It was not intended as affection...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Presumably Mipham's description of dharmakaya/nature of mind/whatever in Gateway is Nyingma sutra level view?

Malcolm wrote:

Strictly so.

dzogchungpa said:

I believe you have said that in dzogchen, the thigle of elements in the heart is considered tathāgatagarbha. Is there a distinct Nyingma tantra level view of these things, i.e. something between sutra and dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

Thus we can consider him as the normative Indian position, especially since he was from Vikramshila.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't really believe there was a normative Indian position. There were normative Tibetan biases about what more modern Madhyamaka teachings they were going to seek because of Atisha, but this does not mean that Atisha position was even a majority position in India. Recall too, Atisha, while proclaiming Candrakirti's virtue, never had anything of his translated. Instead Atisha sponsored the translation of Pseudo-

Bhavaviveka's Tarkajvala, etc.

Also keep in mind that "Candrakirti's" popularity most likely had more to do with the tantric Candrakirti's commentaries on the Pañcakrama than Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I think that Malcolm has a point that cultivating multiple relationships with teachers can give one context to prevent abuse and narrow sectarianism.

heart said:

I agree, I feel I sounded a bit too dogmatic in my response to Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

I tend to provoke that response in people of late.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

narraboth said:

Sounds like some masters don't expect their students to act like adults.

Malcolm wrote:

I have met a few lamas who do not respect their (western) students as the adults that they are, and treat them like children, even going so far as to call them "children" to their faces. Of course, this is not a searing indictment of all Tibetan lamas. For the most part, most I have met treat their students with dignity and care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Teachers really cannot discern your capacity unless they have known you for years.

M

AlexanderS said:

I thought an authentic teacher would be able to discern a student's capacity immediately through their supramundane knowledge or is that just fantasy?

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of authentic teachers; some of them might have clairvoyance. Most however are just ordinary people like ourselves, trying to give us a hand up out of samsara while helping themselves as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

So to summarize the errors of those who promote Tathāgatagarbha Sutras.

1. They don't understand all the normative ancient Indian professors like Atisha said Madhyamaka was the definitive sutra teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Just to be fair: Longchenpa states very clearly in the *sgrub mtha' mdzod* that Prasanga is the definitive view, Tathāgatagarbha sutras are the definitive sutras.

Second, there was in India a broad group of masters who dissented from the position you ascribe. Recall, Atisha is very, very late on the scene and had virtually no influence on Indian Buddhism that is presently discernible, apart from being a younger contemporary of Naropa, Ratnakarashanti, Vageshvarakirti, and so on.

Also, Candrakirti seems to have left very little lasting impression on Indian Madhyamaka until Atisha's time, when his works began to be upheld with enthusiasm. This is evident by the controversy they eventually sparked, leading to the composition of such texts as Ratnakarashanti's (Yogacara) Madhyamaka-alamkāra.

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

2. They don't understand there is a difference between tantric Buddha Nature of Mahamudra and sutric Buddha Nature of Tathāgatagarbha Sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this point is confusing for many people. It is made more confusing when scholars like Longchenpa regularly invoke the Uttaratantra in order to introduce concepts in Dzogchen causing people to conflate sugatagarbha teachings as they appear in Dzogchen and sūtra.

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

3. They don't understand tantra is higher than sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, they can't be blamed for this since Sapan strongly argued against this position (indeed arguing against the position of his own guru, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltzen). Since then, virtually all schools but Nyingma have maintained that the view of sutra and tantra is the same, differing only in means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

[

If that is what it boils down to, doesn't that sort of put a downer on a lot of dzogchen material?

Malcolm wrote:

For some people it does, which is why they stick with causal and resultant paths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, I happen to be reading "Gateway to Knowledge" volume 4, and maybe we could discuss the passage beginning on p.33 in the "Nirvana Is Peace" section as follows: Even more than that, by having discarded all the passing stains from the cognizant nature of mind, it becomes the identity of great natural purity, the ultimate transformation of fully perfected abandonment and realization, the dharmakaya, [the body of buddha qualities] This has countless qualities, but to summarize, these are transcendent purity, bliss, permanence and identity.

I'm assuming you have access to it, and the Tibetan is facing it. The "transcendent identity" mentioned above is "bdag gi pha rol tu phyin pa" in the Tibetan for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, perfection of identity, described in the Uttaratantra as being beyond self and non-self:

Having purified the proliferation of self and non-self

Since [the proliferation] is completely pacified, it is the highest self.

But, you have to realize that reality has been described already in the Uttaratantra as free from all extremes of proliferation. The dharmakāya is defined as the wisdom of Jinas, which is course is why it cannot be seen even by tenth stage bodhisattvas since they still possess a thin veil of the knowledge obscuration.

Here, that which is being described as the nature of the mind, the mind essence, is what Mipham is describing.

As far as Buddha qualities go -- it is appalling funny to see grown men arguing over whether the Buddha's penis withdrawn into a pouch ultimately exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 8:26 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmakāya (emptiness) can be a potential. The problem with you is that you can only see things one way.

Son of Buddha said:

so Dharmakaya is only the potential to become Enlightened (which was you exact position on Buddha nature)

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say only, I said "can", it really depends on what you are defining as Dharmakāya - and there are many ways to look at the issue.

Madhyamakas have one approach; Yogacara's a different approach and so on.

Why don't you provide us with a definition for Dharmakāya and we can start from there?

How about the ārya-dharmasaṃgīti-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

"dharmakāya is the nirvana of the tathagatā".

Or ārya-trikāya-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

"dharmakāya means the absence of inherent existence like space"

Or the parinirvāṇasūtra:

"Without having exhausted afflictions, dharmakāya always exists"

These three statements for example can be seen as non-contradictory in the following way:

The Buddha realized nirvana; nirvana is the dharmakāya; dharmakāya is the absence of inherent existence, the absence of inherent existence, i.e. dharmakāya is a permanent fact of reality.

Here, we have an example of asserting the dharmakāya as permanent without asserting that it is something which exists, like the Hindu notion of self.

The problem as I see is that you take literally that which should be understood to be intentional or provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

the poor research comment was in reference to reading like chapter 5 and saying the Lanka only teaches that Buddha nature is skillfull means even when the passage he is quoting doesnt actually say that..... while not knowing that chapter 6 says Buddha nature IS Buddhahood and the highest teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Really? Give me a citation and I will compare it with the Tibetan text -- then we will see.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

nether the less they were posted....and they were your work.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, which I stand by and which despite your persistent effort, you did not refute.

You merely demonstrated that you have a specific way of interpreting these texts. You did not succeed in showing that your approach is the "right one" (tm).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

you actually refuted yourself seeing as you started off with how the Buddha Nature is

only a potential....then you started providing passages that stated Buddha Nature was the Dharmakaya,totally undermining your own position to begin with.

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmakāya (emptiness) can be a potential. The problem with you is that you can only see things one way.

Son of Buddha said:

Since the ultimate nonmenon that is beyond dependent arising is never non existent, when one realises this, one does not fall to an extreme of non existence and is released from the extreme of deprecation.

Malcolm wrote:

And thus, since you advocate a "never nonexistent ultimate", you fall into the extreme of eternalism, and since you advocate a never existent relative, you fall into the extreme of annihilationism.

In other words, you, like the Gelugpas, get on one side of the the horse only to fall off the other side -- the funny thing is that when you are falling off one side, the Gelugpas are falling off the other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

...you do realise that Malcolm's comments are a jumbled mess, half of his quotes are not even relevant to the actual topic,and many of his passages he claims to support his position don't even have anything to do with his claims,also the vast majority of the work is poorly researched...

smcj said:

I don't think that's a fair assessment of Malcolm. He knows what he is talking about. He has worked hard and has some level of expertise. He has his take on things, which I often disagree with, but his ideas are always well thought out, and within the parameters of a well-established buddhist perspective. He doesn't easily allow for other well-established perspectives, but if he did this entire site would be much more boring.

I disagree with him a lot of the time. Then again sometimes I agree with him. And sometimes (OMG!) I even learn from him. But I never dismiss him.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhaputra also forgets that I did not post those citations, LB did, from a post that I

wrote on E-Sangha nearly ten years ago. So of course they are out of context. No one asked me if I thought they were relevant to the present discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Buddha Nature isn't a potential for Enlightenment,

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is exactly that; just as the potential for butter exists in milk, so too the potential for awakening exist in sentient beings. That potential is called "tathāgatagarbha". When that potential is "churned:" by practice, the result emerges just as butter emerges from milk. But if you examine milk before it has been churned you certainly will not find butter there. Likewise, if you examine sentient beings for buddha qualities you also will not find them, even though since they will arise through practice we can consider them naturally complete at the time of the cause.

Anyway, I am not sure why you are upset at being termed "eternalist" since that is exactly what your beliefs are, i.e., eternalist. You believe in the existence of something that is permanent as well as primeval.

Son of Buddha said:

The Buddha Nature/3rd turning Teachings are considered the definite teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not by everyone, for example, me.

Secondly, you use outdated, inaccurate translations [Suzuki, etc.], and while Hodges translation of the Nirvana sutra is fine, even Hodge admits that that long Nirvana sutra flatly contradicts itself, a fact which he attributes to textual interpolation by the translator of the longest version.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

A person of superior faculties could understand dzogchen fully with only a very few pith phrases, and thus a minimal of hermeneutical interpolation. I don't see how the absence of presence of historical errors of dzogchen hermeneutics might impact his understanding of dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen, (apart from being a realization) essentially became hermeneutic criticism after the Tibetans invented the scheme of the nine Yānas in order to explain Dzogchen's relationship to the other strands of Buddhist theory.

Frankly, I think very few people understand Dzogchen based on a few pithy phrases, lord knows I certainly didn't and don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, there was no Tibetan dark age. Langdarma was murdered in 841 in reaction to his taxation of the monasteries. This caused the Tibetan empire to fragment. Because of the ensuing dispute over succession.

But a dark age like Europe? Not at all. Buddhism was wide spread among aristocratic families like the Khon, the lCe, and so on. They preserved these teachings. Masters like Nubs Sang rgyas Ye shes were active and continued to translate and travel to India.

Then there was the western Tibetan Buddhist "revival", usually dated to the time of Rinchen Zangpo's return from Kashmir, in the late 10th century.

Sherlock said:

This sounds like how some people say there was no real dark age in Europe after the fall of the Western Roman Empire. Christianity survived and prospered during the Dark Age there as well, but in "mundane" standards, there was quite a big difference. There was a huge decline in artistic works, in the economy and international trade, in overall order; temples, including Samye, fell into disrepair, I think that qualifies as a dark age.

Malcolm wrote:

You make it sound like Tibetan culture and civilization came to a grinding halt. I suppose, from the point of view that grants Tibet a culture and civilization only in relationship to a recently imported foreign religion, that might be true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?

Content:

Indrajala said:

But then maybe decentralized models of mostly lay practitioners and a minority sangha is a plausible course of action as well.

Sherlock said:

That's how Buddhism survived in Tibet during the Dark Ages.

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, there was no Tibetan dark age. Langdarma was murdered in 841 in reaction to his taxation of the monasteries. This caused the Tibetan empire to fragment. Because of the ensuing dispute over succession.

But a dark age like Europe? Not at all. Buddhism was wide spread among aristocratic families like the Khon, the lCe, and so on. They preserved these teachings. Masters like Nubs Sang rgyas Ye shes were active and continued to translate and travel to India.

Then there was the western Tibetan Buddhist "revival", usually dated to the time of Rinchen Zangpo's return from Kashmir, in the late 10th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

So essentially Malcolm just accused the Buddha of being a realist, eternalist, and having some type of wrong view.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. I merely stated that there are those who understand such statements to affirm some kind of transcendent existent absolute, and that those who have such an interpretation have not understood the Buddha's teachings correctly.

The passage you cite merely states there is a state of bondage and a state of liberation. It does not state that liberation exists without the context of bondage. In fact, it predicates liberation on the fact of bondage.

It really does not say anything more than nirvana means freedom from rebirth.

The only reason you are using a Pali canon citation is that you know that Mahāyāna sūtras are not defensible as historical records of the Buddha.

Instead of giving citations, you should exercise your intellect, which is much better than becoming an expert in this or that species of dogmatics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?

Content:
Indrajala said:
Imperial China...

Malcolm wrote:
Warlords and petty kings, as I said.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 11:33 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?
Content:
Indrajala said:
But then maybe decentralized models of mostly lay practitioners and a minority sangha is a plausible course of action as well.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, you can always hope for serious social fragmentation that will inevitably result in warlords and petty kings again, and then you can once again have your state-supported and sanctioned "Buddhism" (and you can expel some "bonpos" for good measure).

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 11:30 PM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:

Son of Buddha said:
In fact what in my statement do you even disagree with?
"I assert that the True Self/Buddha Nature(which is Enlightenment) is not-born, not-brought-to-being, not-made, and is unconditioned."

Malcolm wrote:
If you think this ultimately exists, then your assertion is realist and eternalist.

smcj said:
Ok, then so what? If you're not doing practices where that becomes an issue, then what's the harm? One can always change their mind later. Personally I'd rather say "ultimately valid" or "ultimately authentic", but that's just me playing with words.

Malcolm wrote:
That becomes an issue in all Buddhist practice, because it is an extreme view.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Chenresig Jenang initiation by HHDL Italy 2014

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

For that matter, is the Dalai Lama considered Chenrezig because that's the so-called "patron deity of Tibet"?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is because in a political move, the regent of the great fifth, one of the all time great scholar scoundrels in Tibetan History, Desri Sangye Gyatso, decided to promote the great fifth as such, and the appellation has stuck every since.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

In fact what in my statement do you even disagree with?

"I assert that the True Self/Buddha Nature(which is Enlightenment) is not-born, not-brought-to-being, not-made, and is unconditioned."

Malcolm wrote:

If you think this ultimately exists, then your assertion is realist and eternalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

Anders said:

Shouldn't that more properly be something like 'Dzogchen hermeneutical development' than just plain 'Dzogchen'?

Malcolm wrote:

How can the two be differentiated?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Fa Dao said:

is there not another possibility besides those two..Dzogchen of Indian origin or Dzogchen as a Tibetan invention? Didnt Dzogchen come from Garab Dorje originally and wasnt he said to be from Oddiyana? And didnt Oddiyana have its own separate language, culture etc apart from India?

Malcolm wrote:

Oḍḍiyāna is not part of modern India, but was considered by Tibetans to be part of rgya gar. It's language was related to Sanskrit but was not Sanskrit, like Hindi, Gujarati, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Lindama said:

Malcolm: it is Dzogchen, because it really does express the religious genius of Tibetans in both its Bonpo and Buddhism forms. There is nothing like it at all in Indian Buddhism, or any other form of Buddhism.

Are you including zen in "any other form of Buddhism" (that is nothing like dzogchen). I have nothing to defend, just wondering.

Malcolm wrote:

\

Absolutely. While comparisons made be made, Zen and Dzogchen are dissimilar despite repeated attempts by some to liken them to on another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing like it at all in Indian Buddhism, or any other form of Buddhism.

Sherab Dorje said:

Uuuuummm... Mahamudra?

Malcolm wrote:

No, mahāmudra is its own thing. I have read a lot of Indian mahāmudra literature, and while certainly comparisons may be made, Atiyoga is just different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

... just because Malcolm says so doesn't make it so either I am afraid.

Malcolm wrote:

Why is it important to you that these texts are translations?

I mean, do you really care about the source of these texts?

If these texts are for the most part native Tibetan compositions, does that make them less profound and interesting?

The funny thing about both Tibetan Buddhism and Bon is the evident fetish for foreign teachings.

If anything has a right to call itself Tibetan Buddhism, it is Dzogchen, because it really does express the religious genius of a group of Tibetans in both its Bonpo and Buddhism forms. There is nothing like it at all in Indian Buddhism, or any other form of Buddhism. I also happen to think that Dzogchen is the most profound expression of Buddhist praxis so far. That is why I have spent most of my adult life focused on its teachings.

On the other hand I personally find that treating most (but not necessarily all) of these texts as native compositions solves many problems and answers many questions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Wang, Lung & Tri: the Trifecta

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

This dawned on me when I read the interviews in the first few pages of Judith Hanson's translation of The Torch of Certainty:

What role does the guru play in guiding an individual through practice of the Four Foundations before, during, and after completion of the practices? What is the nature of the guru-disciple relationship?

TRUNGPA RINPOCHE: (...) Commitment to your guru and his teachings is very necessary; it gives you some guidelines for your life. Without that commitment you might begin to make up your own version of the Dharma, your own edition of the teachings, and sooner or later what you will get back is just your own ego version of the teachings. So the idea of commitment here is total surrendering, complete surrendering. You don't edit your own version of the Dharma anymore.

Thankfully I have found a guru whose instructions my egoic mind is willing to totally submit to, and the path has been made clear. That said, perhaps this thread may provide some help or guidance, bringing benefit to others. This was the intent.

supermaxv said:

Good points. I do find that far too many people on the internet are trying to "edit their own version of the Dharma" when it comes to vajrayana, but I deeply sympathize with those who wish to follow the path but don't have access to a guru and teachings.

I let my egoic mind get out of control earlier this year after receiving a deity initiation from a high Sakya lama (just the wang) that didn't have an associated practice text to go along with it (besides the short daily prayer sheet that was handed out), and I was intensely googling and bugging the lamas and monastery about if there was a more complete sadhana available for study / practice to no avail. It didn't make sense to me, why would there be an empowerment (and it wasn't an obscure one) without a practice sadhana?!? A few weeks ago I randomly found a copy at the monastery store and eagerly snatched it up before I realized that it was (a) really long, (b) really complex, (c) not a daily practice, and (d) a returned copy with some confused notes scribbled in the margins from someone who was probably in my exact state of mind a few weeks earlier.

I took a deep breath and realized I still have a lot of ego to cut through. Since then my motivation and daily practice has intensified almost exponentially.

Malcolm wrote:

IN Sakya, the lung for the practice is generally considered to be included with the empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?

Content:

Sherlock said:

The survival of Buddhist practices during the Tibetan Dark Ages and more recently during the Communist revolutions throughout Asia might offer lessons as to how Buddhism can survive without state support.

Malcolm wrote:

But it didn't survive without state the support. The support system for Tibetan Buddhism, the aristocracy, fled to India.

it's revival in China held Tibet was also supported by state apparatus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since Tibetans like Jigme Lingpa consider the whole of Dzogchen literature as a monolithic textual edifice imported from India rather than a gradual discourse among the developed in Tibet beginning in the early ninth century, they tend to assert dogmatically formulations which derive from man ngag sde and apply them rather indiscriminately. We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

heart said:

First I think you have to be able to prove your thesis about the Tibetan origin of the 17 tantras Malcolm, no? Just because you say so is no proof.

/magnus

Pero said:

Question I have is, where is the proof they are of Indian or other origin? Seems to me either way you go it will be hard to definitely prove anything, unless they find the original texts.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no proof that they are, which is the reason why they were excluded from the bKa' 'gyur. Even though the kun byed rgyal po is included, most scholars, even Tibetans, today accept it is a later compilation.

Anyway, why does it matter? I personally reject the view that they are translations from an Indic language because there are clear reasons to reject that view.

By and large, no one anymore believes Mahāyāna sutras were taught by the Buddha and there are many good reasons to reject that belief. Frankly, my point of view is that imagining Indic origins for the Dzogchen tantras inhibits our ability to understand them.

The problem is that people conflate the issue of origin with the issue of value. For me, the origin of these texts is not what grants them value; but the schemes people have elaborated to understand on the basis of their origin are no more effective than believing that scheme of the three turnings of the wheel grants us definitive insight in the meaning of Buddhist teachings.

What grants these texts value for me is the various ways they describe the process of delusion and how to wake up from that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since Tibetans like Jlgme Lingpa consider the whole of Dzogchen literature as a monolithic textual edifice imported from India rather than a gradual discourse among the developed in Tibet beginning in the early ninth century, they tend to assert dogmatically formulations which derive from man ngag sde and apply them rather indiscriminately. We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

heart said:

First I think you have to be able to prove your thesis about the Tibetan origin of the 17 tantras Malcolm, no? Just because you say so is no proof.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You are entitled to believe whatever you like. I will continue to analyze Dzogchen tantras as a product of gradual textual evolution since that is what makes the most sense to me based on my reading of the texts.

BTW, just because you say the Bible isn't the true word of GOD, doesn't make it so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since Tibetans like Jlgme Lingpa consider the whole of Dzogchen literature as a monolithic textual edifice imported from India rather than a gradual discourse among the developed in Tibet beginning in the early ninth century, they tend to assert dogmatically formulations which derive from man ngag sde and apply them rather indiscriminately. We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

Pero said:

Uhm why? Wouldn't that mean that Tibetans didn't understand Dzogchen fully?

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on what one means by "understand fully". What I mean is understanding the currents that are clearly obvious in Dzogchen tantras that have specific opponents in mind and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

"Those who, not understanding this, mistake the ālaya for the dharmakāya, are like blind men wandering in the desert without a guide. Because of their confusion about the vital points of the basis and result, they have come to a standstill on the path that accomplishes buddhahood in one lifetime."

- Jigme Lingpa

Malcolm wrote:

The only reason I brought up the distinction was because Dante made reference to the gzhi snang concept. Had he advanced the bodhicitta gambit, the discussion would have taken a different turn.

It is my opinion that the gzhi vs. kun gzhi distinction was elaborated by the early man ngag sde school as a sort of a pull back from the earlier, and more radical use of bodhicitta as kun gzhi in the bodhicitta texts.

Since Tibetans like Jigme Lingpa consider the whole of Dzogchen literature as a monolithic textual edifice imported from India rather than a gradual discourse among the developed in Tibet beginning in the early ninth century, they tend to assert dogmatically formulations which derive from man ngag sde and apply them rather indiscriminately. We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

hmmm somebody introduced a

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red_herring

how did we drive off a cliff and end up in the Great Vegetarian Debate thread???

Malcolm wrote:

All threads lead to the Great Vegetarian Debate. This the most gripping controversy in Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

haha now you're conflating threads. anyway, I said that various cognitions lead to different experiences: cognizing yourself killing a cow (or having someone do it for you) and eating it will lead to a cognition in a future life of you being killed and eaten by someone else. cognizing yourself eating a potato leads to rebirth in most excellent Buddha fields where young girls will tend to your every need.

Malcolm wrote:

The cognition of eating a potato actually leads to endless births as potato bugs being killed again and again by organic pesticides...

gad rgyangs said:

no because karmic intent to commit & satisfaction over killing only happens eating steak, not potatoes.

Malcolm wrote:

nonsense. you clearly ignore the consequences to life and the environment of your dietary choices. By doing so, since you approve of all the lethal choices farmers make in producing your food, ergo, you are also culpable, karmically as well as morally.

In samsara, there is no free lunch, whoever much you wish to rationalize one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

a nice story, until the concept of delusion intruded again as a value judgment.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a problem with your deluded preference for potatoes over steak being deluded? After all, they are both just the basis. Case closed, from a Dzogchen point of view, if we follow your reasoning, Veganism is bullshit.

gad rgyangs said:

haha now you're conflating threads. anyway, I said that various cognitions lead to different experiences: cognizing yourself killing a cow (or having someone do it for you) and eating it will lead to a cognition in a future life of you being killed and eaten by someone else. cognizing yourself eating a potato leads to rebirth in most excellent Buddha fields where young girls will tend to your every need.

Malcolm wrote:

The cognition of eating a potato actually leads to endless births as potato bugs being killed again and again by organic pesticides...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

In order to see the basis as it is, rather than the deluded superimposition (samaropa) we normally perceive, we have to uproot the all-basis, the so called ālaya. this is causal as frak.

Malcolm wrote:

It is also Dzogchen theory. You don't have to accept it, but that is how it is explained in the Dzogchen tantras, sNying thig and so on.

gad rgyangs said:

a nice story, until the concept of delusion intruded again as a value judgment.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a problem with your deluded preference for potatoes over steak being deluded? After all, they are both just the basis. Case closed, from a Dzogchen point of view, if we follow your reasoning, Veganism is bullshit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Apology to women

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the things some guys will do to try and get laid

Nighthawk said:

Is it wrong to be male feminist?

Malcolm wrote:

Quite a number of feminists seem to think so. "Male feminism" can be seen as a patriarchal appropriation of a subaltern narrative.

It's probably better to consider yourself "anti-patriarchal", or a "pro-feminist" man than a "male feminist".

Actually, the apology to women (AKA Manifesto of Conscious Men) is one the most

sexist things I have seen in a long time, which is why it was rightfully spoofed by Will Farrell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

But this picture is fundamentally dualistic to begin with, because it starts with a separation of the consciousness that is or is not recognizing from that which is or is not recognized. If this separation is removed, then dualism vanishes of itself, and its called Dzogchen. This state is not created by recognition, is not lost by non-recognition: it is always already the case.

Malcolm wrote:

The interesting feature of Dzogchen is not the basis. The interesting feature of Dzogchen is its explanation of delusion.

You can keep claiming potatoes are the basis I(no need to even call them "appearances of the basis) until the cows come home. This does not help one to understand the process of delusion at all. Fundamentally, Dzogchen teachings serve to explain the process of delusion and how to unravel it.

I agree with you that the basis not improved by recognition or rendered defective by non-recognition. I also agree with you that delusion never stirs from the state of the basis itself. However, this does not mean that cognition of a potato is a cognition of the basis. It is a cognition of the all-basis.

The cognition of conventional things is produced by consciousnesses impregnated with traces of delusion without beginning. The intellectual apprehension that delusion never stirs from the basis is still just an intellectual apprehension that does nothing in terms of unraveling the fundamental delusion the produces deluded experience in the first place.

This is why for example, it is clearly stated in various places that gazing at rocks and trees for example will not lead one to experience the body of light because unlike the wisdom appearances of the four visions, the vision of rocks and trees are karmic visions supported on traces of affliction and action, i.e. the dualism of deluded vision itself.

In order to see the basis as it is, rather than the deluded superimposition (samaropa) we normally perceive, we have to uproot the all-basis, the so called ālaya.

Incidentally, in the account of the appearance of the basis it is pretty clearly stated that the appearance of the basis is perceived with sense organs that arise from the basis along with the neutral awareness that stirs from the potentiality [rtsal] of the basis.

That primordial dualism [the connate ignorance, lhan cig skye ma rig pa] collapses when that neutral awareness recognizes the appearance of the basis as its own state; but when it does not, the imputing ignorance takes the name of the all-basis, producing all of our conventional, and therefore, innately deluded experience.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"false" is an arbitrary label. I'll save us some time:

"superimposed by who?"

"by you, me or anyone"

"and where did we come from? are we not also appearances of the basis, call them false or true?"

"or course, otherwise we and so-called "false" appearances would have a different basis than the basis of true appearances. And there are not multiple bases."

"so really, both so-called "false" or "marigpaed" appearances and so-called "true" or "rigpaed" appearances have one and the same basis, and are therefore both appearances of that basis?"

"or course, there is no other possibility."

Malcolm wrote:

Snake [false appearance of the all-basis], rope [appearance of the basis].

On the other hand without the appearance of the basis there is also no basis for deluded appearances, so I can see why you are confused. This is the principle reason why the man ngag sde school elaborated a gzhi and a kun gzhi to account for how it is that deluded appearances are not the appearance of the basis (which cannot itself give rise to deluded appearances), while demonstrating that deluded, i.e., conventional, (i.e. the false) appearances of everyday things are rooted in the nonrecognition of the basis.

In the bodhicitta texts no differentiation is made between gzhi and kun gzhi, since the concept of the appearance of the basis was not yet formulated.

If potatoes are the appearance of the basis, there is no need for the elaboration of the

all-basis to account for deluded appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Veridical means seeing the actual nature of a given phenomena. Surely you are not eating an ultimate potato.

It is taken for granted in the Madhyamaka view that conventional cognitions are also deluded cognitions. Nevertheless, some deluded cognitions are efficient, hence Nāgārjuna's admonition to rely in the conventional in order to realize the ultimate.

gad rgyangs said:

since this thread is in Dzogchen, I will say that the potato, as an expression of the gzhi snang (rigpa-ed or marigpa-ed) is as ultimate as anything. As you know, the emptiness of the potato cannot be separated from the potato (reified) so where else will one find an ultimate except the potato itself? The other choice, which I am equally at peace with, is there is no ultimate anything, since ultimate requires a contrasting non-ultimate, and what would that be, given gcig pu?

Malcolm wrote:

The potato is not an appearance of the basis, it a false appearance [snang lugs] superimposed on the appearance of the basis. And indeed, there is no ultimate to find apart from the real nature [gnas lugs] of the potato.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas

Content:

Aemilius said:

Madam Blavatsky, who has been mentioned here, concretely experienced how the social order Religion and the social order of Science behave when they encountered her paranormal powers and capacities.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, she did not take kindly to being found out as a fraudulent con artist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas

Content:
tatpurusa said:
Back on topic:

According to Bon tradition, the founder of Bon, Buddha Tonpa Shenrab Miwoche, was born about 18000 years ago, and had a lifespan of thousands of years.

Living Bonpo masters, like Yongdzin Tenzin Namdak, do interpret these numbers literally.

Malcolm wrote:
There is not simply one tradition about this. It is like the Nyingmapa traditions around Padmasambhava. Not every account (i.e. the earlier accounts) has him appearing in a lotus blossom. Some accounts even portray him as having a human father and mother.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 9:05 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
ok so you are defining "absolute truth" as a cognition or mental state of an ordinary being?

Malcolm wrote:
If your cognition is absolutely veridical, it is not longer ordinary, no?

gad rgyangs said:
depends on how you define "veridical": if I recognize the baked potato I am eating right now as a baked potato, that is veridical in a conventional sense. If I shift to rigpa for an instant, then that is veridical as long as it lasts, but then I am back with my potato. last night when I dreamt that my grandmother was a bus, that was veridical at the time too, and all of these plus \$2.50 will get you on the subway.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, but as you know that is not what veridical means. Veridical means seeing the actual nature of a given phenomena. Surely you are not eating an ultimate potato.

It is taken for granted in the Madhyamaka view that conventional cognitions are also deluded cognitions. Nevertheless, some deluded cognitions are efficient, hence Nāgārjuna's admonition to rely in the conventional in order to realize the ultimate.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 8:19 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
who's cognition?

Malcolm wrote:
Oh god, we are not going to play this silly little Zen game are we?

Your cognition of course, any given subjects cognition.

gad rgyangs said:
ok so you are defining "absolute truth" as a cognition or mental state of an ordinary being?

Malcolm wrote:
If your cognition is absolutely veridical, it is not longer ordinary, no?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:58 AM
Title: Re: Apology to women
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Totally creepy.

<http://www.funnyordie.com/videos/55c51f0c23/dear-woman>

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:52 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
By 'the mind which seeks to reject views' I meant a mind which deprecates the idea of views altogether and therefore would attempt to abstain from expressing views.

Malcolm wrote:
All that is required for this is the famed non-affirming negation.

A negation does not necessarily the negator holds a view of his or her own.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:51 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
who's cognition?

Malcolm wrote:
Oh god, we are not going to play this silly little Zen game are we?

Your cognition of course, any given subjects cognition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:11 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Everything that is NOT Nirvana falls into the catagory of Anatta.
<http://www.tbcm.org.my/mn-64-mahamalunkya-sutta-the-greater-discourse-to-malunkyaputta/>

Malcolm wrote:
You do realize this statement is pure dualism through and through?

Son of Buddha said:
Well Malcolm I am quoting from the Pali Canon which is generally considered by both True Self and Not Self Thervadans to be Dualistic in material.

http://www.accesstoinight.org/lib/authors/bodhi/bps-essay_27.html

Here is an essay by a (Not Self Thervadan) well known Ven Bodhi on what the Pali canon teaches about non duality.

I could look up a True Self Thervadans perspective on non duality if you like?
(Shouldnt be to hard to find the largest Buddhist sect in thailand is a True Self Thervadan sect)

But you would also consider their material "dualist" also

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, your view, the view of Theravada in general, etc. are all pretty much mired in trenchant dualisms of various kinds.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:09 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Ultimate truth is a cognition

gad rgyangs said:
a cognition is a mental state. how could that ever be ultimate truth?

Malcolm wrote:
An ultimate truth is an absolutely veridical cognition. That is its definition. If you want to fight the definition, but then you are basically in humpty dumpty land.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 6:40 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Everything that is NOT Nirvana falls into the catagory of Anatta.
<http://www.tbcm.org.my/mn-64-mahamalunkya-sutta-the-greater-discourse-to-malunkyaputta/>

Malcolm wrote:
You do realize this statement is pure dualism through and through?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 6:38 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
24.10 simply acknowledges that common speech (vyavahāra) must be used to talk about the ultimate truth that there is no ultimate truth

Malcolm wrote:
Ultimate truth is a cognition, not an external fact.

The purpose of 24.10 is to shown that the conventional must be relied upon in order to realize the ultimate. It is incorrect to say there is no ultimate truth. If you say there is no ultimate truth you are effectively saying that all minds are always deluded at all times, even the mind that apprehends the non-existence of ultimate truth which you suppose is the ultimate truth.

In other words, by disallowing veridical cognition, you are automatically consigning yourself to a state of permanent unalleviable delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Garchen giving Refuge Vows webcast

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

does refuge vow mean the 5 lay vow's?

heart said:

No, that is a separate ceremony.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Refuge indeed confers the five lay vows, but magnus is also correct in that there is a separate pratimoksha ordination which is classified as Hinayāna, usually given to those who plan on becoming monks or nuns. In general, when Tibetan lamas give refuge, they are doing so from a Mahāyāna system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

Go tell an Advaitan that cit is conditioned by certain factors of mentality (nama) and materiality (rupa), dependent on contact to give rise to the 6 sense media and to practice by being mindful of the arising and passing of each. You will either get a confused look, be laughed at or both.

dzogchungpa said:

I believe they would accept all of that with regards to citta.

Malcolm wrote:

But not cit. That was the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana views on dying and intermediate state

Content:

Luke said:

Just about everyone has heard about the Tibetan Book of the Dead by now, but what do standard Mahayana schools think happens during death and the intermediate state?

Are there any sutras which explain these things from the Mahayana point of view?

I would like to understand how the Tibetan beliefs differ from standard Mahayana ones.

Malcolm wrote:

One, there isn't a single Tibetan system regarding the antarabhāva, or intermediate state, there are several, most derived from Indian sources.

Second, there is not much difference, other than Mahāyāna provides no methods regarding how to practice in such a state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Prayers for the victims of false flags

Content:

prayerwheel said:

Also there's a warning about South Flower and West Fifth Avenue in Los Angeles being the target of a false flag op, so avoid it for a while maybe?

Jikan said:

Got a source on this?

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3y-0dHFvkV4>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Garchen giving Ratna Lingpa's Vajrakilaya

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

oh, thanks, but its not that short. its just as long as the ratna lingpa's version.

i was hoping more like max 20 pages with starting and finishing prayers. anyway, thanks for pointing the sadhana out.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you include and exclude.

The main practice is 11-33, which is more or less exactly the length you said you wanted.

For daily practice you can skip lots of elaboration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Garchen giving Ratna Lingpa's Vajrakilaya

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

it would seem from the header of that scribd text that it is not the same sadhana as the one on theyre webstore...

Malcolm wrote:

This is the one.

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/149130531/Puja-Vajrakilaya-Sadhana-Ratna-Lingpa>

It is actually Sangye Lingpa's sadhana, employed as a short practice for the Ratling tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The tetralemma is used in all kinds of ways by Nāgārjuna. But each use has a context.

gad rgyangs said:

didn't answer the question: name a context where the tetralemma would not apply.

Malcolm wrote:

Which tetralemma? N uses several.

gad rgyangs said:

let me restate why i am bringing this up in this thread: if, as N says in 27.30, Buddha "taught the true Dharma for the abandonment of all views", then, two questions:

1 why is it necessary to carefully distinguish the views of Buddhism and Vedanta, if they both must be abandoned anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

24.10

gad rgyangs said:

2 if the "true Dharma" is not a view, then what is it?

Malcolm wrote:

The intent of teaching dependent origination and emptiness is the elimination of views. Which views? Views of existence and non-existence, and that's all.

FYI, your query has nothing to do with the subject of the thread. The thread has actually gone off topic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

lelopa said:

afak the next one will be adzom drugpa

Malcolm wrote:

The Padmasambhava and Adzom transmissions are identical in every respect apart from the date.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

Shankhara's assesment of Nagarjuna for example is that he was basically correct in his analysis, except that he does not allow for an existent unconditioned element.

Malcolm wrote:

Cough, cough....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if you cant say "is", "is not", "both", or "neither", then what exactly can you say?

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose of that passage actually is to eliminate things you can say about the tathāgata — context is everything.

gad rgyangs said:

are you claiming there are other topics not subject to the tetralemma?

Malcolm wrote:

The tetralemma is used in all kinds of ways by Nāgārjuna. But each use has a context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

all the Buddha's teachings are like the toys on the lawn to get the kids out of the burning house.

Jikan said:

This is, itself, a teaching of the Buddha. Is it also provisional?

Not in the context in which it is put forward. In the Lotus Sutra, where this analogy is developed, it describes the means by which the Buddha deploys provisional teachings as a means to get to the absolute teachings (the Buddha-vehicle). Are the teachings that are characterized as "absolute" themselves merely provisional, merely upaya? Is the concept of upaya itself provisional?

Malcolm wrote:

It's upaya all the way down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if you cant say "is", "is not", "both", or "neither", then what exactly can you say?

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose of that passage actually is to eliminate things you can say about the tathāgata — context is everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ummm, 22.11:

"we do not assert 'empty'

nor do we assert 'nonempty'

we neither assert both nor neither.

they are asserted only for the purpose of designation"

Malcolm wrote:
see 24.17-19

Dependent origination is not the "provisional" teaching of the Buddha. Otherwise, Nāgārjuna would not have introduced MMK with the mangalam praising dependent origination, free from ceasing, arising and so on as the pacification of proliferation.

Is there something more definitive in the Buddha's teaching than the pacification of proliferation? According to you it is all about relinquishing views. When there is no proliferation, how can there be a view?

gad rgyangs said:
all the Buddha's teachings are like the toys on the lawn to get the kids out of the burning house.

Malcolm wrote:
So you basically think all the Buddhas teachings then are "provisional". Ok. I don't agree.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 5:32 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
ummm, 22.11:

"we do not assert 'empty'
nor do we assert 'nonempty'
we neither assert both nor neither.
they are asserted only for the purpose of designation"

Malcolm wrote:
see 24.17-19

Dependent origination is not the "provisional" teaching of the Buddha. Otherwise, Nāgārjuna would not have introduced MMK with the mangalam praising dependent origination, free from ceasing, arising and so on as the pacification of proliferation.

Is there something more definitive in the Buddha's teaching than the pacification of proliferation? According to you it is all about relinquishing views. When there is no proliferation, how can there be a view?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 4:12 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Jikan said:

Is dependent origination a view, or is it adequate knowledge, first hand, of how samsara works?

gad rgyangs said:

how does "first hand" knowledge of dependent origination look different from causation, which is negated in MMK 1?

both "empty" and "dependent origination" (which are really the same thing) are provisional/arbitrary teachings of the Buddha (according to MMK)

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

doesn't it say somewhere something about "relinquishing all views"?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is the intellectual "giving up of views" and then there is realizing the nature of dependent origination which is free from views.

gad rgyangs said:

"dependent origination" is also a view.

Malcolm wrote:

You can make anything into an intellectual trip.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Garchen giving Ratna Lingpa's Vajrakilaya

Content:

heart said:

Ok thanks, you know of any translation?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, there is a translation used the Palyul folks. This is the main Kilaya tradition of Palyul.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

doesn't it say somewhere something about "relinquishing all views"?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is the intellectual "giving up of views" and then there is realizing the nature of dependent origination which is free from views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really buy into the integral models of world spirituality.

Anders said:

Practically or fundamentally? Practically speaking, I could be inclined to agree. But doesn't karma more or less dictate that spirituality is fundamentally integral?

Jikan said:

the word "integral" means many different things. Would you mind explaining what you mean by the term for the purpose of this discussion?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I had in mind the the attempt by various modern perennialists to come up with models that allows absolute equivalencies to be made and hierarchies to be established among various spiritual traditions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The question here is whether or not the cessation of rebirth is effected by seeing dependent origination or by seeing an ontological totality. Take your pick and run with it. But you cannot pick both because they are mutually exclusive views.

Anders said:

I get that, but this still revolves around a 'view of the ultimate' model of liberation. If we take a 'shred of affliction' model as early Buddhism does (I think the former is really mostly useful for determining how practically useful a model is) for our measurement, it comes out to 'no-thing at all to hang a shred of clinging to' vs 'a few ontological shreds of clinging of a mostly purified mind'. I.e, cessation of rebirth is not so much effected by 'seeing dependent origination' as it is by 'ending clinging to views of self' and so forth (from which the perception of dependent origination is produced).

I am understating it here for dramatic effect and all and I do appreciate that the expected view of liberation seems to have a strong effect on the eventual outcome for its successful practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

Any shred of clinging is sufficient to sink your battleship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

Maybe a few (very) crude diagrams will illustrate the difference I am talking about:

Where 'catholicism' would fall under the umbrella of those who do good creating good karma to increase the odds of meeting with the dharma of liberation, etc.

More or less the difference I suppose between the Ekayana view of Arhats, who will continue towards buddhahood so long as they do not fall into the view of personal nirvana and the 'seed of bodhi' model, where the fruit of the Arhat is fundamentally and irreversibly distinct from the fruit of Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really buy into the integral models of world spirituality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

"two distinct schools with two entirely distinct results."

Malcolm wrote:

They are two distinct schools with entirely distinct results because they have entirely different bases.

Anders said:

Do elaborate.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is predicated on dependent origination and emptiness, Advaita refutes both dependent origination and emptiness. The difference, as always, is view.

If you confine your notion of liberation to controlling afflictions, there there is no difference at all between all the various ethical systems which recommend self-control in conjunction with contemplative quietude.

The question here is whether or not the cessation of rebirth is effected by seeing dependent origination or by seeing an ontological totality. Take your pick and run with it. But you cannot pick both because they are mutually exclusive views.

One of the key points of the Dzogchen tradition is understanding all these different tirthika [samsaric] and bauddha [nirvanic] tenet systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

"two distinct schools with two entirely distinct results."

Malcolm wrote:

They are two distinct schools with entirely distinct results because they have entirely different bases.

Dzogchen is predicated on dependent origination and emptiness, Advaita refutes both dependent origination and emptiness.

I am not making any truth claim here for either one. I am merely pointing out that the truth they claim is different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Garchen giving Ratna Lingpa's Vajrakilaya

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Do you know if what he gives now was perhaps in danger of going extinct, and thus Rinpoche began to propagate it? Or do you think perhaps this is the safest Kilaya sadhana for the Western students of his to practice?

heart said:

I don't think this particular terma is in any danger of going extinct. I don't know what you mean with "safest", Vajrakilaya is not dangerous in any way, my guess is that there is a comfortable short sadhana that fit the mentality of westerners in this cycle as well as a translation. I am sure there exist several sadhanas of various length in this cycle, there normally is.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Usually people use the short Kilaya sadhana of Sangye Lingpa in conjunction with this tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

Come now. It's a lot like Brahman, which is why they are so often compared.

Malcolm wrote:

No, brahman is sat, real, where as dharmakāya is the total realization of emptiness free from all extremes and its attendant twin omniscience.

In other words dharmakāya needs a realization to bring it about. Brahman does not.

Anders said:

Unless we talk of Samantabhadra who never fell into ignorance and so forth.

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are making a huge mistake. Samantabhadra does experience ignorance, i.e., the ignorance identical with the cause, and the connate ignorance. What "he" never experiences is the imputing ignorance, thus Samantabhadra never experiences samsara.

Samantabhadra also experiences liberation; doing so without gathering virtue; just as sentient beings experience bondage without gathering nonvirtue.

Please study Dzogchen more carefully. Even rdzogs chen tantras themselves differentiate Dzogchen from Advaita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

Come now. It's a lot like Brahman, which is why they are so often compared.

Malcolm wrote:

No, brahman is sat, real, where as dharmakāya is the total realization of emptiness free from all extremes and its attendant twin omniscience.

In other words dharmakāya needs a realization to bring it about. Brahman does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Unknown said:

1) According to Malcolm, KTGR had to concede in a debate with him in the end that Shentong is no different from Advaita except its emphasis on Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

I simply pointed out to him that the structure of the gzhan stong presentation of the two truths could not be distinguished from the way Advaita formulates the two truths. He admitted this, but replied that Advaita did not have buddhahood and that was the difference between the two. In other words for him, the structural similarities in the formulations were of less consequence than differences in the notions of total liberation between the two systems.

But lets not extend the consequences of answer to far. He was not admitting for example, that there is only one universal cit, and so on, as in Advaita.

There is also the fact that idea of bodhicitta and so on is utterly lacking in tīrthika systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

im reading a book called Dzogchen Primer. and it takes the stance that even Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche taught the traditional path and method of dzogchen. that is to progress through the nine yanas.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not how TUR taught Dzogchen, at least not according to people I know who were personal long term disciples of his. TUR, as I understand it, taught Dzogchen based on the individual person. Some people were taught more gradually, other people less.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Acharya Mahayogi Sridhar Rana Rinpoche

Content:

elpz said:

Hi. Came across this quite by accident, and created an account just to reply to this.

As a student of his I can assure you that Rana Rinpoche is definitely not a Sakyapa. His first Vajrayana teacher was Tulku Ugyen Rinpoche and while he has strong links to the Sakya tradition -- given that Chobgye Trichen, Sakya Trichen, and Karma Thinley Rinpoches have been his primary teachers since his entering retreat in 96 -- he is quite firm in stating that he is non-sectarian.

Here's our sanga's website for more info on him:

<http://www.byomakusuma.org>

Cheers.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is not his attitude towards schools, the point is who his main teachers are and what he mainly practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 12th, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: 13 books of khenpo shenga

Content:

lama tsewang said:

I want to find translations of all the Thirteen Treatises of Khenpo Shenga together with his commentary, and the ones by Mipham Rinpoche , can any one help me please

Malcolm wrote:

They do not exist yet. The only one out there I know of is the translation of the Dharmadharmatā-vibhanga by the Dharmacakra Translation Committee.

There are only a few commentaries by Mipham out there as well. But all the main texts of the thirteen treatises, the indic originals, do exist in translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 11th, 2013 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

tobes said:

The former wants to preserve some universal truth that everything is one, the latter wants to preserve some particular truth that difference is meaningful and decisive.

Malcolm wrote:

They are both sectarian.

Adamantine said:

How so?

Malcolm wrote:

They both present partial views about reality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Mo Lha, and the 5 foremost dieties

Content:

Adamantine said:

Can anyone elaborate on this and how it relates to Tibetan Medicine, and if there are specific pujas related to these 5? And perhaps the significance of paintings like this one

Malcolm wrote:

These five deities are the deities that live on a person's body and are with him or her from birth. If they leave the body, then there can be illnesses since they have protective role.

They are mentioned among the snang srid de brgyad in the sde brgyad ser skhyem.

Adamantine said:

Thanks Malcolm. Do you know if there is a physiological relationship with their placement in the body? For instance, the Mo Lha being at the left armpit?

How do you view these, as actual entities, or metaphors for something related to our individuality?

Are they generally communicated with during sang puja? There is a concise sang by Dudjom Rinpoche the second line of which reads 'GO WA'I LHA NGA DRA LHA NYEN PO NAM

(You five superior gods and the fiercely protective dralha)
Are these five deities in particular what he is referencing?

Thanks for your insight!

Malcolm wrote:

There is a section of the eight classes that are placed on the body. You can look at the serkhyem of the eight classes and see it quite easily.

And yes, DR is referring to those five gods.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

tobes said:

The former wants to preserve some universal truth that everything is one, the latter wants to preserve some particular truth that difference is meaningful and decisive.

Malcolm wrote:

They are both sectarian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Dechan Jueren and Hanmi Buddhism

Content:

BuddhasNoDieCancer said:

The problem is the discontinuity on the teachings from Dechan Jueren to the other disciples.

Malcolm wrote:

Another problem is that he is dead, passed away in 2011.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 8:14 AM

Title: Re: Mo Lha, and the 5 foremost dieties

Content:

Adamantine said:

Can anyone elaborate on this and how it relates to Tibetan Medicine, and if there are specific pujas related to these 5? And perhaps the significance of paintings like this one

Malcolm wrote:

These five deities are the deities that live on a person's body and are with him or her from birth. If they leave the body, then there can be illnesses since they have protective role.

They are mentioned among the snang srid de brgyad in the sde brgyad ser skhyem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Longchenpa & Dolpopa: Contemporaries

Content:

udawa said:

One connection between the two is Rangjung Dorje, the 3rd Karmapa.

I think I'm right in saying that Rangjung Dorje studied alongside Longchenpa and he met Dolpopa at some point.

D

Malcolm wrote:

Kumararaja 1266 - 1343

Rangjung Dorje 1284 -1339.

Longchenpa 1308 - 1364.

If they had met, I am sure it would have been with Longchenpa being a common monk going to meet a very high Lama. I seriously doubt whether they ever studied together, but they both studied with Kumararaja.

I believe Longchenpa only meets Kumararaja when he is 29, two years prior to the death of the third Karmapa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 9th, 2013 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

rory said:

Okay due to a recent question I do have something to add. I was interested in Amoghapasa Avalokitesvara's mantra and dharani and was answered but another thoughtful person mentioned that a tulku gave this sadhana. Now I'm rather interested but if the thing is in Tibetan then it's a confusing turn-off.

Malcolm wrote:

Amoghapasha's mantra and dharani is given in Sanskrit.

Tibetan texts give the Sanskrit in a much more accurate way than anything in Sino-Japanese Buddhism. This is simply a fact.

If a sadhana is listing things like faces, hands, etc., this should be translated in English and recited in English, irrespective of which tradition it comes from. The only exception would Shomyo chanting, etc., things like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Daesung Sunim

Content:

greentara said:

Astus, It is unusual but not improbable. I gather the book is about self enquiry. Obviously the Zen monk Daesung Sunim, was taken by the clarity and perhaps the technique was easy to follow....hence the distribution to fellow monks.

Malcolm wrote:

I actually ran into this guy last summer in Santa Monica, while having a drink at the bar in Shutters by Beach. He really did not speak any English at all, but he was enthusiastic that we were Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 11:00 AM

Title: Re: new subforum to lounge

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rime just means Sakyas, Kagyus And Gelugpas who practice Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Well, here's the thing.

The thing about marijuana is , um...

uh....okay, okay. You know , like, okay. like, you aren't high, and then you, like, you are high,

and there's like this thing, you know?

and, um...when you ummmmm....

....what were we talking about?

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:
Dude! Where's my mala?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 8:56 AM
Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?
Content:

padma norbu said:
All I can tell you is that my main teacher now is Namkhai Norbu and he may not tell all the secret teachings to everybody, but he is teaching pure dzogchen from what I understand, from ZhangZhung ...

Malcolm wrote:
Well, no it is from Oddiyāna, for starters. Garab Dorje was from Oddiyāna.

Secondly, while ChNN definitely has criticized smoking herb because it is bad for one's meditation practice, he has also stated that anyone can try anything.

He has also said, as you remark, that you can drink, but you cannot become drunk. If you become drunk, this is a problem.

Your general pov is ok, but you should not spend so much energy conditioning other people.

padma norbu said:
That's true, especially since I really don't care. Initial post was a bit of a joke, subsequent discussion was evolved naturally by responding to accusations and questions. Thanks for your input. Do you have any knowledge about the psychotropics of ancient Vajrayana or whatever?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, if you are a really stubborn person, then hallucinogens can be administered in order to demonstrate to you that your mind is not a fixed thing.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 8:53 AM
Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us
Content:
Konchog1 said:
How do we create a meritorious connection?

Malcolm wrote:
Through the four means of conversion, of course:

Generosity
Pleasant speech
Purposeful behavior
Consistency

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 8:46 AM
Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?
Content:

padma norbu said:

All I can tell you is that my main teacher now is Namkhai Norbu and he may not tell all the secret teachings to everybody, but he is teaching pure dzogchen from what I understand, from ZhangZhung ...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no it is from Oddiyāna, for starters. Garab Dorje was from Oddiyāna.

Secondly, while ChNN definitely has criticized smoking herb because it is bad for one's meditation practice, he has also stated that anyone can try anything.

He has also said, as you remark, that you can drink, but you cannot become drunk. If you become drunk, this is a problem.

Your general pov is ok, but you should not spend so much energy conditioning other people.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 8:12 AM
Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us
Content:

Clarence said:

[

Also, giving to someone creates a karmic debt on the receiver end, so if someone truly has realization, they will fulfill that debt through their realization. Further, giving creates a connection.

Malcolm wrote:

When one is giving, providing one is a Mahāyānī, as I assume most of us here are, one is supposed to offer dana free from the three wheels, i.e., the idea of the gift, the giver, and the recipient. In this case there can be no question of creating a karmic debt, since none is created.

Konchog1 said:

Don't we want to create karmic connections with beings so they become our disciples when we manifest Enlightenment?

Malcolm wrote:

We want to create meritorious connections with beings, of course, but not debts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

why do you offer an entire universe filled with pure lands and buddhas only to your guru but not also to all sentient beings ?

Malcolm wrote:

The guru is the apex of the pure merit field who unites the Buddha, Dharma and Sangha in one.

Sentient beings are the impure merit field. What you offer sentient beings is the wish that they abide in the four immeasurables, i.e. "May all sentient beings always experience happiness, freedom from suffering, joy and equanimity".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

Clarence said:

[

Also, giving to someone creates a karmic debt on the receiver end, so if someone truly has realization, they will fulfill that debt through their realization. Further, giving creates a connection.

Malcolm wrote:

When one is giving, providing one is a Mahāyānī, as I assume most of us here are, one is supposed to offer dana free from the three wheels, i.e., the idea of the gift, the giver, and the recipient. In this case there can be no question of creating a karmic debt, since none is created.

Karmic debts are incurred only if the dana is not provided or received in such a manner. For example, Aryadeva gave his eye to a blind woman, but when she ate his proffered eye rather than using it to restore her sight, Aryadeva winced with regret at the gift. For this reason, it is said, his eye was not restored to him, as it would have been were he free from the three wheels.

Let us hope that however we exercise our generosity, we do so like wish fulfilling gems,

effortlessly and without thought.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

well if your only giving something to your guru in one scenario and in other you are giving to all sentient beings, you think about which is more beneficial.

Malcolm wrote:

Mandala offerings are given to one's guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

Clarence said:

You think Mandala offerings are better than giving directly to Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche?

Malcolm wrote:

To whom do you think one is offering a mandala to other than one's root guru? How can a few dollars match the merit of offering infinite world systems and all their enjoyments?

The point I was making is that we upāsakās and upāsikās have other options to generate merit than just giving money to śramaṇeras. I was not saying that one should not do so--merely that one ought not think that this is the best or only way to generate merit.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

For the pot people usually smoke these days, the fifth precept definitely applies lol. I remember when I was young you could smoke a joint and still be able to walk around and function, seems less and less common these days for anyone but real potheads with a tolerance.

There is no real pot equivalent of a glass of red wine anymore lol, it's all pretty ridiculous now. Basically what i'm saying is, unless you purposely go out of your way for it, there is

no longer any way to smoke without getting exceptionally intoxicated, unless you have a heavy tolerance..which obviously is a related issue heh.

padma norbu said:

It also breaks samaya of the body as well as the fifth precept.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Meh I dunno, if just inhaling smoke constitutes that...I imagine there's a difference of opinion there, else lots of remedies would also break it.

Malcolm wrote:

Anything taken as medicine will not break the fifth vow. Even monks are allowed alcohol for medicinal reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

lama tsewang said:

how can the beings make merit??

.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many much better ways to gather merit than making cash offerings to monks. For example, mandala offerings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Business enterprises are another option but of course when one mixes dharma with business it can often have disastrous results (I have heard many first-hand accounts), so I'm not sure that is the way to go, though of course it should be looked at.

Malcolm wrote:

But Buddhist monasteries have functioned as business virtually from the beginning...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

lama tsewang said:

are you saying that there are persons who would request that certain rituals etcetera , be done on their behalf , and would not think it appropriate to give an offering?

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying they would never even think about hiring a monk to do such a thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

bryandavis said:

The Dorje Kasung are obviously not an army.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not how they see themselves. Oh yes, sure it is a practice. But I have know many Kasung over the years, including one of the guys who founded them [an ex Green Beret who did several tours in Vietnam], and they definitely conceive themselves as an army, and more importantly, they conceive of themselves as a private security force, which why they were formed in the beginning.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

Alfredo said:

Eventually, some Tibetan center is going to install pews, a pulpit, and an organ. (You know, like the BCA did.)

Or to take another route, maybe they'll hold hands during meditation, while a keyboardist plays soothing mood music, and the lama says things like, "With your feet flat on the floor, relax all the muscles in your body, and surround yourself with love and light..."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in a lot places they already do the Quaker thing, they just sit silently in a room together...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

conebeckham said:
Not the rancid butter...

Malcolm wrote:
It's not rancid, it's aged in airtight leather bags for one year...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 10:54 PM
Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us
Content:

KonchokZoepa said:
and i dont know what is this cultural aspect of tibetan buddhism? personally i havent labeled anything that i have encountered within the tibetan buddhist tradition as "cultural".

Malcolm wrote:
All kinds of things. Another thing I observed is that we in this culture, whether we were buddhists in pasts lives or not, have no tradition of punya-sambhara, merit accumulation, which is the rational which underlies 90 precedent of Buddhist ritual, irrespective of tradition. Because of this, we do not naturally reach for our wallets when we see monks and nuns. Instead, our model is a fee-for-service.

As I have noted elsewhere, I don't see anytime soon that there is going to be much sustainability in Buddhist organizations in the West.

For example, every school and every tradition and every sub-tradition wants it own space, etc. There is no sharing of space (because of course that requires also that people cooperate). One person shared with me their puzzlement at why one tulku wanted to place a center in a region where there was already a center that belonging to the same exact school and lineage. Or in Drikung, in Lincoln Vt., there are two Drikung Kagyu centers, and there used to be three (in a town of 1200 people). In Boston there were two. There is a huge impetus to build empires.

You have to understand that the model of governance in Buddhism culture is grounded on the model of the cakravartin, the wheel turning emperor whose golden wheel [there are four grades of wheels actually] conquers any land it rolls through peacefully. Well, every Tibetan school turns its leaders into just such emperors, at least on a symbolic level, and this leads to lots of unnecessary competition and a lot of unsustainable development. It also, in the past, has lead to internecine warfare in Tibet.

All of this is totally built into Tibetan culture at this point and as proof, we have the so-called "Kingdom of Shambhala" in Halifax, Nova Scotia, complete with a king and royal family, a court, an army and a grand narrative borrowed from the Kalacakra cycle. All of this, is deeply cultural. Of course we can make the observation that Karma Dorje does

and assert that it is based on one's traces, and for us this is true. But it is not a sufficient explanation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.realnews24.com/gray-whale-dies-bringing-us-a-message-with-stomach-full-of-plastic-trash/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am curious as to what you all think. Do you think that the rituals incorporated into so much of the regular expression of Tibetan Buddhism are an inspiration or an obstacle?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends. Recently I was chatting with a lama who was complaining that westerners never make offerings for prayers and so on, while the Chinese and so on do.

He generally feels that it is because of a lack of faith on the part of Westerners. I responded that no, it is not due to a lack of faith, I pointed out that here especially in US where we have a strong tradition of separation of Church and State as well as strong Protestant traditions, that people tended to regard organized religion with suspicion, not because they have no faith, but because they regard organized religion as being corrupted by power and money. Also we have no cultural tradition of hiring priests to come and recite rituals, unless you are Catholic. Basically, what I was pointing out to him that most of this discomfort is grounded in sociological and historical reasons. I suspect that in Tibet, much of the competition revolved around getting people to recite your prayers, not the other guy's.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

SuryaMitra said:

By saying they never took Refuge , I meant they did n` t took the Refuge ceremony.

Thank you very much guys

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, right -- this is not necessary at all.

SuryaMitra said:

And this is something I don't understand...Why it is not necessary ? I know that for Dzogchen teachings one doesn't need formal refuge, but what about the tantric teachings and transmissions? Chod, Guru Dragpur, Simhamukha and many others secondary practices ?

I'm just trying to understand , I'm not criticizing here, but my teachers from Karma Kagyu, Sakya and Ningma traditions always taught me, that for any tantric practice, taking formal Refuge ceremony is indispensable. So, for instance, when they give initiation, they will always make sure that new people can take Refuge before initiation...So could you please explain that to me ?

Malcolm wrote:

Every initiation has a refuge ceremony, as well as a bodhisattva vow ceremony built right into it. So it is completely unnecessary to insist that people take refuge and bodhisattva vows according to their respective systems of conferring vows. It simply isn't necessary.

Their attitude come from the traditional Buddhist custom of "cutting the hair". For them, it marks one's serious commitment to the path -- this is why these kinds of traditional teachers are likely to insist that one has to have had a formal and separate refuge ceremony. Even so, it is not necessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Icelanders and their elves.

Content:

Indrajala said:

It is interesting to see the remnants of polytheism playing a role in environmentalism, small as it may be.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you kidding? Virtually all of the indigenous and traditional people around the world who are involved in environmental movements are doing so also out of concern for non-human beings which we would call spirits, etc. It definitely should be a key point in any Buddhist environmentalist platform.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Is spiritual progress worth it?

Content:

logank9 said:

I just want to know beyond a shadow of a doubt it is. Because it just doesn't make sense to me why everyone wouldn't follow it. If it is the end all be all to highest happiness why isn't everyone spiritually improving themselves all the time?

Malcolm wrote:

Some people are not spiritual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 5th, 2013 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

dharmagoat said:

And our junk will continue to make great homes for all those little critters.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously?

dharmagoat said:

On reflection, no. Not the plastic junk.

Malcolm wrote:

Phew...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

dharmagoat said:

And our junk will continue to make great homes for all those little critters.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously?

"Besides the particles' danger to wildlife, on the microscopic level the floating debris can absorb organic pollutants from seawater, including PCBs, DDT, and PAHs.[32] Aside from toxic effects,[33] when ingested, some of these are mistaken by the endocrine system as estradiol, causing hormone disruption in the affected animal.[30] These

toxin-containing plastic pieces are also eaten by jellyfish, which are then eaten by larger fish."

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Pacific_garbage_patch#Effect_on_wildlife

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

montana said:

All the tantric lineages begin with the transmission from the deity to a guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they all begin with a transmission from the Sambhogakāya to a mahāsiddha, or in certain cases, like Virupa, from a Nirmanakāya to a mahāsiddha.

montana said:

How does a Buddha deity differ from Nirmanakaya and Sambhogakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are our gurus. Not the methods they provide us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

montana said:

All the tantric lineages begin with the transmission from the deity to a guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they all begin with a transmission from the Sambhogakāya to a mahāsiddha, or in certain cases, like Virupa, from a Nirmanakāya to a mahāsiddha.

montana said:

How does a Buddha deity differ from Nirmanakaya and Sambhogakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are our gurus. Not the methods they provide us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Namthar are certainly a source of generating devotion, if not the doctrine itself. Many of the most eminent masters have said that reading namthar is critical to remaining inspired while traversing the path.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with this is when we discover that the Namthars we are supposed to rely on are merely pious fictions that deeply contradict the earliest accounts of this or that master -- Milarepa comes to mind here.

Karma Jinpa said:

Are they 100% historically accurate? Likely not. But they do represent how the lineage has come to see their forebears, and the lessons that can be learned from how they lived, having appeared (whether as ordinary or extraordinary beings).

Malcolm wrote:

Or they represent an author with an agenda which may not be so obvious on the surface.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Namthar are certainly a source of generating devotion, if not the doctrine itself. Many of the most eminent masters have said that reading namthar is critical to remaining inspired while traversing the path.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with this is when we discover that the Namthars we are supposed to rely on are merely pious fictions that deeply contradict the earliest accounts of this or that master -- Milarepa comes to mind here.

Karma Jinpa said:

Are they 100% historically accurate? Likely not. But they do represent how the lineage has come to see their forebears, and the lessons that can be learned from how they lived, having appeared (whether as ordinary or extraordinary beings).

Malcolm wrote:

Or they represent an author with an agenda which may not be so obvious on the surface.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

montana said:

All the tantric lineages begin with the transmission from the deity to a guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they all begin with a transmission from the Sambhogakāya to a mahāsiddha, or in certain cases, like Virupa, from a Nirmanakāya to a mahāsiddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

montana said:

All the tantric lineages begin with the transmission from the deity to a guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they all begin with a transmission from the Sambhogakāya to a mahāsiddha, or in certain cases, like Virupa, from a Nirmanakāya to a mahāsiddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

SuryaMitra said:

By saying they never took Refuge , I meant they did n` t took the Refuge ceremony.

Thank you very much guys

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, right -- this is not necessary at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 3rd, 2013 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that's it. They are garlic, chives, leeks, onions, and asafoetida. Whatever the heck

"asafoetida" is I have no idea! [/quote]

Asafoetida is a spice also called Hing, used in Indian cooking and in Ayurveda and Tibetan medicine for controlling wind diseases. It is generally used by Brahmins as a substitute for Garlic. It is very pungent smelling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 3rd, 2013 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.theherald.com.au/story/1848433/the-ocean-is-broken/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 3rd, 2013 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

SuryaMitra said:

Hi, I received teachings from ChNN, but I know very little about DC, so thank for this post.

During the retreat I spoke with some people, and they told me they never take Refuge.

Malcolm wrote:

That means they do not understand ChNN's teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 2nd, 2013 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Ganapuja and the animal

Content:

max123 said:

how does practicing Ganapuja helps the dead animal that the meat belonged to if the animal has taken rebirth already?i do not know how long it takes for an animal to take rebirth but i'm wondering if it has already before a lot of the meat is eaten(maybe i am wrong i haven't practiced Ganapuja yet and i truly don't know much about it(and how old the meat is etc)but if the animal has taken rebirth would it still benefit?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer lies in the term "rtsal" or "energy, power"; we are connected through this energy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 1st, 2013 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Acharya Mahayogi Sridhar Rana Rinpoche

Content:

philji said:

Does anyone know anything about this teacher?

He is a nepali who was formally practicing Hinduism and then took to Buddhism. I believe his teachers include Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche. He speaks very strongly and clearly about the differences between hindu and buddhist dharma. I would just like to know if he is considered a legitimate teacher within the Nyingma tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

He is a Sakyapa actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 31st, 2013 at 4:13 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Simon E. said:

Of course. But the corporal form of those animals is all around you in the supermarket. It is too late to create a link by being involved in its living.

Sherab Dorje said:

So I say prayers for the liberation of the dead animals. I don't have to eat them to form a connection with them. Saying prayers for the liberation of their consciousness is making a connection with them in their next life (via their death in this life).

seeker242 said:

Yes, what is the reason for having to eat the flesh of a being in order to help it? Prayer isn't good enough? We don't eat the flesh of human beings in order to help those who have passed on, so why does it need to be done for animals?

Malcolm wrote:

You are misunderstanding a key point -- you have to consecrate all of your food because of all the sentient beings who died in its production, not merely meat, but every grain of rice you eat caused the death of something from field to table.

It is a global principle.

You can imagine you are "pure" because you are not eating meat, but you are not. You can imagine you are "compassionate" because you are not eating meat, but if you have no method to help all the beings who are connected to you through debt incurred through eating food, again, your compassion is "miserable", meaning lacking in depth.

Also "praying" for animals is fine, but a little useless since animals pass through the

bardo very rapidly, you need another way to connect with them, another way of creating dependency.

Humans can understand humans when they are in the bardo, therefore, reciting prayers and texts like Bardo Thödröl can be very effective. Even here however, this is really only useful a) for practitioners b) must be recited in language the deceased will understand. There are other prayers that are useful for non-practitioners.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: The shapes of the sense faculties

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the actual sense organs exist as patches of atoms on the back of the respective physical structure which have various shapes.

dzogchungpa said:

So, are you saying that there is, e.g., a crescent moon shaped patch on the back of the tongue that serves as the actual organ of taste, at least according to abhidharma?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, precisely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I am not rationalizing their behaviour. I am saying that when the examples you cite are on the level of HHDL or Tsongkhapa, the burden is on you to show that this applies to the average practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

It applies to anyone who is literate and still has a pulse.

At least they are acquiring teachings, as opposed to building collections of stamps and so on. There is no downside.

Receiving teachings you are not able to practice out of acquisitiveness merely leaves an imprint of acquisitiveness and craving associated with Dharma teachings.

Better to have a craving for Dharma teachings than crack or tobacco.

Receiving teachings you are not ready for, can lead one to develop all sorts of wrong conceptuality about the teachings that could be avoided by relying on the care of a realized master and following his or her prescription.

Average practitioners cannot tell if their teachers are realized. The average teacher generally is only interested in promoting their own teaching lineage.

And what kinds of wrong conceptuality are we worried about here? Why the conservatism? Especially coming from someone who hardly fits a conventional definition of a Tibetan Buddhist since by your own admission you continue to practice Hinduism?

In any event, I think it is important for people to study and receive a lot of things, rather than get stuck in these Tibetan lineage politics. Even if they spend some time in a state of confusion, life is short, teachings are rare, and deciding not to go to a teaching because "it might be bad for me" is really false thinking. If you are interested in tummo, go find a tummo teacher. If you are interested in Dzogchen, go find a Dzogchen teacher.

Teachers really cannot discern your capacity unless they have known you for years.

Of course, once you have perceived the essence of all teachings, then going to teachers is a waste of time unless you have a very specific reason for wanting this or that teaching.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So do I.

Malcolm wrote:

Your story misses the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Both are cases of well-established advanced practitioners making an informed decision on how to best benefit others.

Malcolm wrote:

You can rationalize their behavior however you want. There are countless other examples of the same phenomena in Tibetan biographies. My point is that there is no genuine "standard" or "tradition" upon which your sentiments are based.

Karma Dorje said:

For the average practitioner the same approach can easily end up in students acquiring teachings as if they were a stamp collection, rather than taking it as a medicine to cure sickness.

Malcolm wrote:

At least they are acquiring teachings, as opposed to building collections of stamps and so on. There is no downside.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I tend to think the "creating a link" argument is rather weak, especially when you can consider that you can create a link by saving an animal too.

Malcolm wrote:

I try to do both i.e. create a link for the living and the dead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 29th, 2013 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

You suggested that if one approaches one's guru and he declines to give you a particular transmission that you should just ignore him and go get it from someone else. This only really applies if you do not have a close relationship with your teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not really the case.

And in fact we can see from history that for example, Tsongkhapa wanted to receive Kalackra, and his guru, Rendawa, discouraged him from receiving those teachings.

We also see this today with the present Dalai Lama, who was heavily discouraged by his gurus from making a connection with Nyingmapa teachings he was interested in the sixties.

What we observe is that people's manner of receiving teachings in Tibet does not fit a settled pattern.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 29th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

This is your particular perspective and not at all normative for the tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

It was and is totally normative for those people in Tibet who were able to read and had wide access to books. It is a story often repeated, for example, Longchenpa sees and reads books from the Vima Nyinthig before he finds Kumaraja and asks him for the transmission. There are many other examples from Tibetan history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 29th, 2013 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: The shapes of the sense faculties

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I am reading "Gateway to Knowledge" by Mipham, volume 1, and on p.17 I came across the following: The [shape of the] eye faculty is similar to [the round and blue shape of] the umaka [sesame/cumin] flower; the ear faculty is similar to [the shape of] a twisted roll of birch bark; the nose faculty is similar to [the shape of] parallel copper needles; the tongue faculty is similar to [the shape of] a crescent moon disc; and the body faculty is [all-covering] similar to the skin of the smooth-to-the-touch bird.

I have to admit, this doesn't make much sense to me. Can anyone explain this to me?

Here's the Tibetan:

mig gi dbang po zar ma'i me tog lta bu/ rna ba'i dbang po gro ga'i 'jor bu gcus pa lta bu/
sna'i dbang po zangs kyi mo khab gshibs pa lta bu/ lce'i dbang po zla ba bkas pa lta bu/
lus kyi dbang po bya reg na 'jam gyi pags pa lta bu'o

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the actual sense organs exist as patches of atoms on the back of the respective physical structure which have various shapes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 28th, 2013 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, you should read anything that interests you. If you want to practice, go get the

transmission from a Lama you like. If he does not want to give it, then go ask someone else you like.

There is never any samaya damage from wanting to practice Dharma!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 27th, 2013 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

porpoise said:

Not even if there is a full range of non-meat alternatives available at the supermarket, and the person is making a clear choice to choose the meat product?

Malcolm wrote:

Not even if there is a full range of non-meat products in the market and the person is making a choice to buy meat. Since there is no sentience in a piece of meat, there is no ethical harm in eating meat that one has not killed or has had killed for oneself. In order for one to have the karma of killing on one's hands, one has to do the deed or order someone else to do it, etc. That is, unless one has Mahāyāna obligation to not eat meat, and that is a different issue altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not responsible for the act of killing someone else performs unless I directly pay or ask them to do it.

porpoise said:

So what if somebody orders a Christmas / Thanksgiving turkey from their local turkey farm?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. In this case the action will bear a _karmic_ consequence.

porpoise said:

And what if another person buys their turkey from a selection at the local supermarket? Would you argue that doesn't involve direct responsibility?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. I would argue that there is no _karmic_ consequence for the latter as opposed to the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Good points indeed! What a lot of people don't realize though is how inefficient modern day animal agriculture really is. For example, it takes 4,000-18,000 gallons of water to make ONE hamburger! Meanwhile a pound of corn takes 110 gallons.

Malcolm wrote:

This is true only of feedlot beef. Cows should not be fed corn, since they can't digest it.

seeker242 said:

I wonder what % of the worlds beef is grain fed and what % is true pasture only, grass eating animals?

Malcolm wrote:

Worldwide, 9 percent is grass fed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

porpoise said:

Yes, I do believe we culpable for these indirect actions. If we decide to buy meat then there are consequences. I can't see the relevance of the rest of your post.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if we decide to buy meat there are indeed consequences. If we decide not to buy meat there are also consequences.

However, these consequences are not karmic consequences. I am not responsible for the act of killing someone else performs unless I directly pay or ask them to do it.

"Karma is volition, and what proceeds from volition."

-- Buddha

I am however in a position to take some responsibility for the sources from which I obtain my food. The consequences of eating industrially produced agricultural products

is something I don't like, so I avoid unsustainably produced food as much as I can. I personally try to grow food every year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

That still does not deal with the objection: why does the animal have to die?

Malcolm wrote:

It was their karma to die in such a horrible way.

Thrasymachus said:

Further:

If these Vajrayana people are so powerful...

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the people, it is the method.

Thrasymachus said:

If there is a source, why can't you quote it?

Malcolm wrote:

"Those with compassion eat meat."

-- Hevajra tantra.

This is once again another case of using the worse behavior of others to excuse exercising personal agency over what you can control. It is not impressive that you use the excuse of vegetarians not doing everything, so you can personally be more comfortable about doing nothing.

I am not using any excuse at all. I am simply observing facts. The fact is that people will never stop using animals for food. As long as they do so, there will always be a plentiful supply of meat to be consumed. It is really just that simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Good points indeed! What a lot of people don't realize though is how inefficient modern day animal agriculture really is. For example, it takes 4,000-18,000 gallons of water to make ONE hamburger! Meanwhile a pound of corn takes 110 gallons.

Malcolm wrote:

This is true only of feedlot beef. Cows should not be fed corn, since they can't digest it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Our nation throws away an astonishing amount of food everyday, to the tune of 40%-50% of all the food we produce.

IN 2011, 1.3 billion tons of food was discarded. This represents a third of global food production. The amount of food wasted per US citizen is 240 lbs per year.

Rather than worrying about who is eating what, we ought to turn our attention to who is wasting what.

And lets not get started on FOG (fats, oils and greases) that pollute our waterways.

M

Jikan said:

And here there are consequences that anyone with compassion would do well to reflect on: wasting food means wasting water, with consequences for wildlife and habitats; wasting food means accelerated erosion, fertilizer pollution, soil depletion, air pollution from harvest processing and transport, with consequences for wildlife; food production means the production of greenhouse gases, hence every wasted food item means a hotter planet to no purpose, with consequences for wildlife...

Adi said:

These seem to me excellent points, something everyone can participate in -- the "who is wasting what" and the consequences of all that waste. Instead of proscribing that everyone must eat one way or another, pay attention to what is wasted and to increased efficiencies by not wasting so much food. A middle way of sorts that leaves no one out.

On a personal note, I knew there was a lot of wasting of food in the US as I've worked in the past as a waiter and in catering. But 1.3 billion tons of food wasted in 2011? I had to

go look that up. For those interested in the full report Global Food Losses and Food Waste (apologies if it was already posted in the preceding 130+ pages) by the UN group, it is here:

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/mb060e/mb060e00.pdf>

Adi

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, most of the food produced in the world is grains and vegetables, which also represents vast majority of food wasted per annum. The amount of meat wasted is quite low by comparison (see chart on page four, chapter two).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

ClearblueSky said:

Factory farming is still much, much crueller to animals. By a lot. And if you want to bring up the environment, there is no comparison. Factory farming of cows is the number one cause of global warming. 15% of global warming is due to it, that's more than all the cars on earth.

And I still don't get that logic. Just because it's happening anyway, doesn't mean we have to participate. Sorry to keep referencing my previous post, but I only see how that works if people apply the same to other industries:

There was a point in time where slavery was thought to be inevitable and worldwide. Do you think the people had no karmic consequences if they bought slaves that were already captured, not by their request?

What about with the recent revealing of Seaworld's cruelty. If someone knows what they do to those whales, but still pays seaworld money to go watch them, is that okay because they have the assumption it won't ever change?

If someone explains that those are the same as eating meat, then I would understand. It's really only the separation, people saying one is okay karmically and not the other that I still don't really understand.

Malcolm wrote:

Owning a person is different than eating a the flesh of a dead animal.

One can eat meat without participating in industrial agriculture.

There are two issues in your post:

1. Ethics of eating meat
2. The karmic consequences of eating meat.

The Buddhist ethical positions have been laid out already. The majority of people who are opposing the issue of eating meat are not doing so on the basis of a strictly Buddhist position.

As for karma, karma requires intention, an object, the deed, and satisfaction that the deed was done.

No Buddhist who eats meat will satisfy the criteria for creating a perfect karma of killing. No Buddhist is happy that animals are killed for food. We all regret it.

Even if we refuse to buy meat, still animals will be killed for food. The production of organic food on a national and global scale requires the animal husbandry industry, especially for poultry litter, feather meal, bone meal, blood meal and other such organic fertilizers.

But this issue goes way beyond what Buddhists may or may not do,

A friend of mine whose father runs the largest organic produce farm in Bakersville, CA., was heard to remark that there is not enough chicken shit to produce organic food on a national scale.

Frankly, the real problem is the majority of people who live in cities who do not participate in the production of their own food, people who have no idea how their food is grown, where, and so on.

Our nation throws away an astonishing amount of food everyday, to the tune of 40%-50% of all the food we produce.

IN 2011, 1.3 billion tons of food was discarded. This represents a third of global food production. The amount of food wasted per US citizen is 240 lbs per year.

Rather than worrying about who is eating what, we ought to turn our attention to who is wasting what.

And lets not get started on FOG (fats, oils and greases) that pollute our waterways.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:
gad rgyangs said:
...cannibals...

dzogchungpa said:
So you, gad rgyangs, see no difference between humans and animals?

gad rgyangs said:
in terms of suffering, no

Malcolm wrote:
There is a huge difference -- animals suffer much more.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 10:14 PM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
But when you buy meat in a market, you are not engaging in that karma. There is no intention to kill, as you very well know.

porpoise said:
The intention is to eat meat. The consequences are that you expect somebody else to kill on your behalf, and you expect somebody else to do a job that a Buddhist wouldn't do.

Malcolm wrote:
Absolutely wrong. For example, I know of no Buddhist who eats meat who would eat a lobster in a lobster house because they are killed on the spot for the client.

Granted, because of our economy, meat is cheaper and more available than it was a hundred years ago, when people tended to eat meat seasonally. Chicken and pork were more expensive because they depend on grain for feed (cows should not be fed corn for any reason because they cannot digest it properly).

But this has nothing to do with the basic point that in Vajrayāna there is very clearly a tradition, like it or not, of consuming meat, mostly bovine, and combining that with a method to assist the sentient being that was connected with that flesh at one point.

I am not stating you or anyone else has to follow that tradition. But it exists.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

yes, after you kill them (or, by paying money into the supply chain, having someone else kill them for you)

Malcolm wrote:

You can't really kill a sentient being. All you can do is sever the connection between its mind and body.

But when you buy meat in a market, you are not engaging in that karma. There is no intention to kill, as you very well know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Simon E. said:

In the context of a debate about meat eating which has developed to include the eating of meat in the context of a Vajrayana puja his being or not being a Buddhist is vital in assessing his lack of knowledge of same.

And incidentally your fatuous and nonsensical use of the term 'cannibals' renders your willingness or ability to debate in an objective way doubtful.

gad rgyangs said:

if sentient beings are your brothers and sisters, and yet you happily kill and eat them.....

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot eat a sentient being, you can only its parts of its body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

as if whether he is a Buddhist or not has any bearing on the veracity of his arguments. He has presented links to clear evidence that disproves a major plank in the cannibals' flimsy web of justification: the argument that, since you can't avoid killing entirely, you might as well not worry about it, and that being a vegetarian causes the death of more sentient beings through rice growing than does killing one cow to feed many.

Malcolm wrote:

He has not provided any evidence whatsoever that the majority of the world's nonbuddhists are going to adopt a vegetarian diet anytime soon. Also, his statistics do not show that the rice industry, for example, depends on chicken litter and feather meal.

His statistics ignore the fact that animal inputs are required in any sort of sustainable agriculture, at minimum manure. They ignore the fact of the millions of creatures destroyed by standard organic agriculture, not to mention industrial agriculture.

gad rgyangs said:

I have stated before the simple solution to the ganapuja problem: get the meat for the ganapuja from dumpsters, not supermarkets. And don't discriminate between dumpsters behind restaurants and those behind morgues. Only then can you consider yourself a real tantrika.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is not to be a "real tantrika". The point is aiding sentient beings.

If you are a common Mahāyānist, you should not eat meat at all. If you are a Theravadin you can eat meat. If you are a Vajrayānist, you can eat meat.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

This is just crazy and also speciesist.

Malcolm wrote:

Humans can practice. Animals cannot. We have other methods for creating a positive cause for the eventual liberation of humans who do not practice.

Thrasymachus said:

Is there an actual canonical Buddhist source text that supports this, because you only gave one that supports vegetarianism?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Thrasymachus said:

So who is really being benefited by killing animals due to an addiction to the taste of unhealthy animal products, an addiction and attachment to food, so strong that you are literally killing yourself via diet?

Malcolm wrote:

The production of meat and dairy is deeply embedded into our economy. It will never stop. If you think so you are kidding yourself. Therefore, in Vajrayāna, we have methods

to help creatures that are killed as a result of food production.

You may deride them, of course, as you have here. But that just exposes your own narrow-mindedness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Also the Buddha taught in Mahāyāna sūtra that we mustn't eat meat.

padma norbu said:

But, did he really? It seems like people believe it was added later by Mahayana buddhists who did not appreciate the meat-eating of Theravadins. Seems pretty odd that by Theravadin texts, the Buddha specifically did not make a rule against it, then with Mahayana he did and then with Vajrayana meat is back again. No sir, I don't buy it.

Malcolm wrote:

Note: I said the Buddha in Mahāyāna sūtras.

Not asking anyone to buy anything. But it is beyond doubt that the Buddha did harshly criticize meat eating in Mahāyāna sūtras.

Whether you accept that Buddha actually taught these sūtras or not is an entirely different question.

Since I consider myself a Mahāyānist, I accept the general message of Mahāyāna.

Since I am a Vajrayānist, I practice according to my understanding of the texts, without being overly concerned about their supposed historical provenance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, sorry if you've talked about this before, but what is the take of Tibetan medicine on meat?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan medicine as well as Ayurveda include meat for those with certain conditions that benefit from meat.

One's diet should be based on one's constitution. One should eat in healthy balanced manner, consistent with the one's health and the customs of the land you live in.

BTW, when Norbu Rinpoche says that being a vegetarian is "miserable" compassion, he is primarily referring to Vajrayāna Buddhists who advocate vegetarianism. Why? Because there are methods in Vajrayāna which assist the animals in question achieve liberation who are connected with the production of our food, whether they are destroyed through pesticides and cultivation or through slaughter. Thus, even if one is a vegetarian one may not justify one's choice not to eat meat through resort of arguments of compassion since one is leaving behind animals who are slaughtered for meat.

He also makes it very clear that the writings on vegetarianism by Shabkar and so on are direct towards common people who are not real Vajrayāna practitioners. Since they have no method and no understanding it is much better that they not eat meat. Also the Buddha taught in Mahāyāna sutra that we mustn't eat meat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Jikan said:

Hence, taking his own advice, ChNN had become obese (with exercise he's looking better in recent years) in his efforts to empty samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Norbu Rinpoche became obese primarily because he suffered from a serious illness in the late eighties, then leukemia [now in remission for many years] in 1994. He had both his knees replaced in the late nineties, and was unable to properly exercise. In addition, he was poisoned in Dege, Tibet, which led to metabolic irregularities for his entire life since then. He was very skinny until his early fifties when he started having cascading healthy issues.

He lost 45 kilos in 2011 [through practicing Chulen and eating a restrictive diet that excluded meat] and has for the most part kept the weight off. He does not really eat that much meat, AFAIK.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

can largely be prevented or even reversed by avoiding the meat he advocates. .

Malcolm wrote:

Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche does not recommend eating meat to everyone. Quite the opposite in fact. What he clearly states is that it is better for everyone who is not a practitioner [of Vajrayāna] to be vegetarian.

This means that he thinks it is better for almost all people in the world to be vegetarians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 24th, 2013 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Just Deserts.

Content:

Simon E. said:

During a current discussion on Dhamma Wheel a Bhikkhu member states that the sentiment ' if a person is murdered they are getting their just deserts ' in terms of vipaka, is " ubiquitous among Theosophically influenced Buddhists and common in the Vajrayana '.

Now I have little interest in what may or may not be ubiquitous among Theosophists , but what of his statement that it is a view commonly held in the Vajrayana..what do YOU think ?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, in Tibetan Buddhism justice is an idea associated with karma, dating back to the idea of Yamarāja weighing people's negative karma while sorting out the dead.

If a person is murdered, it is assumed the causes and conditions for their being murdered were laid down in the past by their own actions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

smcj said:

One does not need to reject rebirth to reject the corrupt system of the recognition of reincarnations.

Do you object to the corruption, or to the recognition?

Malcolm wrote:

Both, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

smcj said:

The politics of the tulku system revolves around power first, and money second. The 8 worldly dharmas are corrupting influences on dharma organizations and personalities, to be sure. However if one believes in reincarnation, and believes that advanced practitioners actually do return, then it seems like throwing the baby out with the bath water to dismiss the phenomena as simply corrupt or even invalid. Better perhaps to find a way to minimize the economic, political, and social benefits so that the level of b.s. is reduced as much as is possible.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not need to reject rebirth to reject the corrupt system of the recognition of reincarnations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

smcj said:

It means that people, westerners, who invest their time and energy into study and practice will be recognized as incarnations after they demonstrated results of practice. There is currently in place a system for upgrading a lama's status to "rinpoche" that is, at least in theory, based on merit, without the designation of tulku being attached. The fact that there has been extreme inflationary pressure for various titles (how many "His Holinesses" are there now?), which cheapens the credibility of the entire system of titles, is a sad and seemingly unavoidable comment on our times.

In terms of tulkus there is the functional consideration of choosing which person to put on the fast-track of practice, including possible material support and access to teachers, so some choice should be made early on. Actual public recognition should wait until if and when the results of the practices are stabilized, probably no earlier than the candidate's mid-30s. That should cut down on the percentage of embarrassing train wrecks.

But that's not going to happen. Nobody is in charge to make those types of decisions. The situation will evolve however it will.

Malcolm wrote:

That system of titles comes from UN protocol for the Vatican. It should be abandoned.

The politics of the tulku system revolves around power first, and money second.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

smcj said:

But I would argue against the usefulness of an acting school that currently has actors in training deemed "future academy award winners", no matter how good their acting was in their previous life.

Both HHDL and HH Karmapa (Orgyen Thinley brand) were children taken from seemingly random nomad families in eastern Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL was the child of a wealthy land-owning family from Amdo (which had a Kumbum tulku in it already) about a days' horse ride from Kumbum Monastery. I have personally been to his birth home, seen it with my own eyes. His family was not nomadic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 22nd, 2013 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

Simon E. said:

As you say it has little impact on the vast majority of we westerners apart from any emotional investment we might have made. But if post -mortem recognition becomes the norm that carries implications for the education of such tulkus...doesn't it ?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that people, westerners, who invest their time and energy into study and practice will be recognized as incarnations after they demonstrated results of practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 22nd, 2013 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

Simon E. said:

What's your view Malcolm ?

Malcolm wrote:

My view on the subject is that the terma system and the tulku system both will continue to meet the needs of the client population for these phenomena, mainly Tibetans.

The terma system offers Nyingmapas the assurance that the blessings of their system of teachings never declines and the tulku system in general offers the Tibetan population as a whole, as well as some westerners, the assurance that they will always be guided by buddhas. These are powerful motivations propelling the furtherance of

both traditions.

Whether they will be very relevant to us is another question.

We do not have a cultural identity wrapped up in a mythos of a golden imperial era with emanated bodhisattvas benevolently carrying out the duties of an enlightened monarch, working in concert with a foreign wizard and aiding the spread of the dharma, concealing teachings for such times when there are threats to the nation. In general, these are the terms under which termas are concealed and revealed in the Padmasambhava tradition. As a westerner, one has to be educated into these concepts, concepts which are the running background of Tibetan society in general.

As for the tulku system, the tulku system will continue, but I predict that in the West, most tulku recognitions of practitioners will be post-mortem, as it was before the Karmapas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 22nd, 2013 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

Jikan said:

I'd thought all tertons are by definition tulkus in the sense that they are emanations or re-embodiments (the precise term escapes me, apologies) of one of Guru Padmasambhava's 25 main disciples. Am I mistaken?

Simon E. said:

Most Tulkus are not Tertons.

To be blunt, the Tulku system arose from a socio/political need. The world has changed.

Malcolm wrote:

The terton system also arises from socio/political needs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

Say, what sexual impropriety was Buddha accused of? I hadn't heard that before.

Malcolm wrote:

He was accused of impregnating a woman. She showed up with a trough under her skirt, accused him of getting her pregnant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

In Buddhism, good friendships are the meaning of life. Buddhism can be understood as the art of the beautiful relationship.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said there was no meaning to found in the universe. I said the universe was meaningless.

Two entirely different concepts.

For example, a tree can be meaningful for a carpenter, a mouse, a bird, a boring insect or a sculptor, all in different ways. None of the meaning these beings impute on that tree is inherent in that tree. The tree, so far as anyone knows, merely is born, ages, gets sick and dies. By itself, it has no meaning. By ourselves, we have no meaning. We can find meaning, if we want to, but we should not turn that meaning we have found into teleology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. Even Buddha had prejudices and biases. It's very obvious when you read the Pali canon, for example.

Buddha was a human being, he had a human brain, human sense organs and all the limitations of a human body (birth, aging, sickness and death). He was accused of sexual improprieties and all kinds of other faults. He watched his entire clan be murdered and enslaved and did nothing about it (if that does not demonstrate to one that Buddha found life empty of meaning, nothing else will). Rahula was hugely disappointed in him until Rahula decided to follow the Dharma himself.

Poorbitch said:

one more scholars who falls in the darkness of materialism and false assumptions about the buddhas . So predictable

Malcolm wrote:

And your's are TRUE (tm)? Typical fundamentalist remark.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Clarence said:

The question I find interesting is whether or not you believe someone can be realized without having abandoned his prejudices and biases?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. Even Buddha had prejudices and biases. It's very obvious when you read the Pali canon, for example.

Buddha was a human being, he had a human brain, human sense organs and all the limitations of a human body (birth, aging, sickness and death). He was accused of sexual improprieties and all kinds of other faults. He watched his entire clan be murdered and enslaved and did nothing about it (if that does not demonstrate to one that Buddha found life empty of meaning, nothing else will). Rahula was hugely disappointed in him until Rahula decided to follow the Dharma himself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

They were all Christians and they clearly disliked mahayana and despised vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Which century are you talking about? This is certainly not the case with writers like Davidson and so on.

The notion of the evolution of Mahāyāna Buddhism and then Vajrayāna is based on text critical research.

What is more amusing about your assertion is that classical Indian Buddhist historians of the eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh century take great pains explain why there is a sudden appearance Vajrayāna in India concocting all kinds of wild schemes from Vajrasattva in an iron tower in South India (Amoghavajra and Co in China) to the account of King Dza (Nyingma, but based on Indian antecedents) to the Sakya accounts found in 12th century Presentation of the General Divisions of Tantra, not to mention the earlier and well known account of the recovery of Prajñāpāramita from the Nāgā kingdom under the ocean by Nāgārjuna.

You see, Indians themselves acknowledged from an early period in the common era that Mahāyāna also "suddenly appeared".

Text critical scholars like Davidson, etc., are trying to work out the evolution of these texts because they were pointed to in that direction by what the texts and classical commentaries themselves reveal about the origins of these later canons.

It is just too ungenerous to modern scholars like Gregory Schopen and so on to accuse them of some strange Christian biases.

BTW, the first victim of Christian text critical scholarship was the bible itself.

But text critical scholarship, while not the end all and be all of interpretation of what these texts mean, is very useful in understanding where these texts come from. But sadly, people conflate the two, assuming that if some scholar is correct about say, the Chinese origins of the Heart sutra (Nattier's theory), that therefore, somehow the Heart Sutra becomes less meaningful as a protective charm against non-humans.

The problem is that Western people of a fundamentalist bent shy away from taking text critical scholarship seriously precisely because of our cultural tendency to interpret texts teleologically (which is a Christian, indeed a very western trait inherited from Plato, etc.), a tendency we have deeply inherited from the generally Hegelian theory of history (into which Tibetan narratives predicated on the role of the Imperial period personalities like Padmasambhava and so on play nicely) that we follow.

So when we are confronted with early narratives like that in the 'Bum nag, the sBa bzhed, etc., where Padmasambhava has a human father and mother, we reject these in favor of wildly contradictory later accounts of Padmasambhava's life story because our teachers don't like the idea that Padmasambhava had a human father and mother.

In the end, there are certain Buddhist trends and narratives, especially in Vajrayāna, that play very nicely into our very Western habit of fundamentalism in thought and deed.

This is ironic, because Mahāyāna teachings often completely deconstruct so called Hinayāna teachings, just as Vajrayāna deconstructs the Mahāyāna path and Dzogchen deconstructs Vajrayāna.

We have all these Buddhist teachings deconstructing each other, and yet we have all these Buddhists, both Asian and Western, hell-bent on keeping the whole thing bound together with spit, twine and duct tape. Honestly, it is pretty funny to me.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

I am not really saying that, am I?

Malcolm wrote:

It seems so.

heart said:

I just think it makes sense that, no matter when they were written down, they reflect a teaching taught by the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, probably not in any literal, historical sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point I was making was that making the leap from "Western Buddhologists don't believe Buddha taught Mahāyāna (which is effectively what DKR is talking about) to "This is why I doubt the understanding of seasoned Western practitioners". He making a very specious cultural argument, when all is said and done.

heart said:

I am making exactly the same statement and last time I looked I was a westerner. Not because DKR or anyone else says so but because it makes sense to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I see, so you are asserting you can only understand the meaning of the concept of nonduality in Mahāyāna sutras if you adopt the dualistic standpoint that they were uttered by the historical Buddha sometime about 450-400 years BCE. Right?

If I didn't know you better, I would say that this was a very fundamentalist sentiment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

ReasonAndRhyme said:

Afaik he was also born in Bhutan and is he not also a Bhutanese citizen? But anyway, I just wanted to hint that we all generalize and sometimes overgeneralize.

Malcolm wrote:

The Drukpas (Bhutanese) consider themselves ethnically different than Tibetans, despite sharing a very similar language. DKR's mother is Bhutanese, so I guess you could say he is half Tibetan, half Bhutanese.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

This whole thread has convinced me that DKR is right about the understanding of non-duality of even seasoned Western Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, I have doubts that seasoned Tibetan practitioners, including tulkus, necessarily understand nonduality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think we should feel free to make generalized comments about Tibetan lamas too.

ReasonAndRhyme said:

Especially if they're not Tibetan but Bhutanese

Malcolm wrote:

DKR is Tibetan. He may have been raised in Bhutan, but he is from an ancient aristocratic Tibetan family.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

Malcolm,

I respect you, and I respect your practice. The point here I am trying to make is that when a tibetan lama makes a generalized comment about westerners that there may be a basis for it. What I've just written is my articulation of what I think it is they see but cannot understand. So we can be annoyed by it all we want, but that does not make it go away.

Malcolm wrote:

I think we should feel free to make generalized comments about Tibetan lamas too. There might be a basis too. They might be annoyed, but it will not make it go away.

The point I was making was that making the leap from "Western Buddhologists don't believe Buddha taught Mahāyāna (which is effectively what DKR is talking about) to "This is why I doubt the understanding of seasoned Western practitioners". He making a very specious cultural argument, when all is said and done.

Frankly, I like Popper's idea about non-falsifiability. What DKR does not seem to understand is that non-falsifiability is a completely open-ended heuristic. It does not proclaim anything wrong. It merely addresses the limited range of what ordinary humans can see and creates a category of phenomena which are outside of the range of falsifiability.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Look what I found in Kathmandu...

Content:

Indrajala said:

People will drink their booze regardless of what Buddhism says.

Malcolm wrote:

I certainly shall continue to enjoy wine, regardless of what any Buddhists say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

If there is meaning to life, as I said above, it is only because that meaning is imputed upon it.

This is an existential/nihilistic perspective. The emotional complexities that result from it are what the lamas call "loong", and are a great impediment to the efficacy of our practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry my friend, but this is total nonsense. As doctor of Tibetan Medicine I can assure

you that among the many causes of lung disease, this is not one of them. It is also not an impediment to practice, at least, not to my practice.

smcj said:

Believing we live in a cold merciless meaningless universe where the only meaning is what we impute on it is a fundamentally frightened way to live.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a fearless way to live.

smcj said:

Trying to make things right "on our own terms" is asserting our will in such a way as to be an impediment to receiving blessings.

Malcolm wrote:

"Blessings" don't come from outside. They come from dependent origination and realization. That's about it.

smcj said:

In terms of Dharma practice that fundamental fear is not the problem. It is assumed by Dharma to be the initial operating spiritual principal in the individual. That is why the initial teachings traditionally are about the hell realms, etc. If people have fears, then direct those fears productively and bring them to Dharma. But at some point those fears need to connect to Dharma and need to begin to resolve, which is the stage of "Refuge". Our fears need to begin to be resolved into belief and trust, or as is said more traditionally faith and devotion. At the end of the path there are no more fears, and one of the epithets for buddhahood is "The Great Fearlessness". My late teacher was heard to say, "All fully revealed religions start with fear and end with love. Why? Because fear is the initial spiritual condition of all men, and love the ultimate spiritual condition of all men."

Malcolm wrote:

When we understand there is no meaning then we are at the end of fear. Fear comes from expectations about fulfilling meaning.

smcj said:

In the traditional tibetan culture people feel that they live in a universe where there is a divine justice, and there are loving divinities that are accessible on a functional basis. To them there is an "Ultimate Truth" and people achieve it on a regular basis. This allows them the maximum opportunity to trust and believe, and not be afraid. On the other hand, existential nihilism, coupled with a society in flux, families in disarray, creates frightened people that cannot trust and have no faith. This is the disadvantage we have in our practices. This is what no lama can ever conceive of, since their worldview cannot allow for it. It is our blind spot that we insist not be disturbed because when our own religion collapsed we rejected all religion, not just our religion.

Malcolm wrote:

Ascertaining that the universe has no intrinsic meaning is not existential nihilism.

Personally, I have no use for religion. I do have a use for personal experience.

There has never been any time in history nor has there ever been a culture where societies were not in flux, where families were not in disarray.

The worldview of some lamas do not allow for many things. I am not confined by the worldview of anyone else. Whether I am confined by my own is something you cannot know, but you can certainly judge it if you like.

smcj said:

This is not to say that we have more defilements than a Tibetan. Their anger, greed and such are just as great as ours. It is more like we have a computer virus in our system software that does not allow us to connect properly to the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not suffer from any cultural viruses that cut me off from Dharma.

smcj said:

Protecting our hearts and minds from hurt by being closed makes sense in a merciless universe. Being open is terrifying, as it allows for the hurts to go even deeper. But if our spiritual practice is to be fruitful we need to allow our spirit out so it can grow. If you want to learn to swim you're going to have to get wet. And just about everyone here knows the pitfalls and failings of the modern Dharma scene.

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, the modern Dharma scene is no better and no worse than it was during the time of the Buddha, with one exception, the Buddha, or so we imagine.

smcj said:

But clearly the teachings guide us towards unconditional trust, faith and devotion.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, that is not where my path has lead me. It has lead me to unconditional confidence, knowledge and personal experience. I don't really respond well to the trust, faith and devotion thing.

The Buddha taught that we suffer from birth, aging, sickness and death. He taught us how to escape that condition. Later humans elaborated on the Buddha's message and taught the deeper meaning underlying it (i.e. emptiness of inherent existence). Still other humans later on decided that was too extreme and decided that the deeper meaning needed to be augmented by a somewhat more positive message about our condition, and taught tathāgatagarbha. None of this however renders the universe meaningful.

As I have said many times here and elsewhere. "Life has no meaning, but if you are a

Dharma practitioner, then life is meaningful." But this is not a declaration of a teleological (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Teleology>) meaningfulness of the kind you are expressing here. It is also not a declaration of absolute meaningfulness. It is a strictly relative meaningfulness relevant only to humans who can think and judge. It is not a statement about the value of the universe or even the value of a spotted owl. Spotted owls are meaningful to me personally, but they are not ultimately meaningful in anyway.

The universe will perish. Generally speaking we are taught in the Dharma not to impute meaning on the impermanent, the afflicted and identityless. Since even nirvana is identityless, it is a little risky for Dharma practitioners to invest much meaning in it.

The absence of illness is health.
The absence of suffering is bliss.
The absence of meaning is freedom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Indrajala said:

but they are still the words of a buddha, i.e., the sambhogakāya.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not even necessary to say.

They are just words that a human being wrote down on a piece of paper reflecting their vision of the Buddha and that is all they are. Attributing them to the sambhogakāya is also a nice tradition, but it is outside the range of ordinary human perception.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Look what I found in Kathmandu...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing unusual about a shopkeeper in Katmandhu having a picture of HHDL.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Look what I found in Kathmandu...

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

are you serious ? like guns or knives ? who would do that and why ?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Guns, knives, swords, canons, grenades, anything really that is capable of harm.

Who would do? Why all Tibetans. Why would they do it? Because Dharmapālas, like any army, need weapons.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read the Pali suttas.

heart said:

I find them rather boring, to tell you the truth. No wonder that I get excited by the idea of some Mahayana sutras being just as ancient as the Pali suttas.

I practice Dzogchen and so for me the ultimate intention of the nine yanas are simply the realization of the natural state. That is also why they all have great benefit to practice. This point of view is of course ignoring the nine yanas own efforts to posit a ultimate goal and all the polemics that go with that as well as the constantly growing numbers of bodhisattva bumis and so on. In the natural state both samsara and nirvana self-liberate and so Shakyamuni's intention is fulfilled and anyone capable of that are inseparable from him like Garab Dorje, Guru Rinpoche and Vimalamitra. This is also why Shakyamuni is one of the Dzogchen Buddhas.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Pali suttas are rather dry. One of the reasons is that they are NOT literary compositions. They reflect the extemporaneous speech of the Buddha. The themes covered are limited, oft repeated and formulaic.

Let me give an example. You can listen to any DC webcast. I guarantee you that on the first day Norbu Rinpoche will say x, y and z. He often states these things in virtually identical phrases. The Pali canon is like that -- it is an oral record of what the historical Buddha actually said.

Mahāyāna sutras are often quite interesting, because they are literary compositions intended for audiences with specific religious goals in mind. They sometimes emulate repetition, but they are not mnemonically repetitive in same way that Pali suttas are. Thus, they should not be confused with what the historical Buddha said.

The Mahāyāna Buddha is not a historical buddha by any accepted standard of historiography. Chogyal Namkhai Norbu writes on the birth date of sTon pa Shen rab: "...and since history must be studied in congruence with ordinary human perception, I prefer not to base myself on these traditions" (Drung, Deu and Bon, pg. 156). I suggest we should apply no less a rigorous standard to the study of all Buddhist texts and traditions than we do to the study of Bon and other religious traditions, and also judge them in concert with ordinary human perception.

Whatever the Buddha of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna may mean to us personally is not relevant to what we can know about Mahāyāna sūtras through careful text critical study and archaeological finds and it is better to keep the two separate. I understand that in some people this creates a cognitive dissonance, and they feel they have to choose one or the other. I don't have that problem -- who knows, maybe it is a result of practicing years of creation stage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

What does Dzogchen say about the basis? Malcolm agreed with my teacher when he said, "Not an atom in the universe vibrates that isn't powered by love." Dharma practice isn't trying to find comfort in a cold heartless universe. It is walking the path of fulfilling the potential of the human spirit, which in turn is itself the essence of the universe.

The universe is not a cold mechanistic place, and life is full of meaning. And even an illiterate tibetan villager knows it.

Malcolm wrote:

The universe is a cold place. We seek comfort in our religions, politics, and so on, much like ants seek comfort in ant hills, more or less completely unaware of anything external to their world unless it threatens them.

If there is meaning to life, as I said above, it is only because that meaning is imputed upon it. Even attaining buddhahood is in reality meaningless. Even saving sentient beings is meaningless. If you want it to have meaning, that's ok. But in the end, when we are all dead and buried (within the next 20-60 years) most of us will not even be remembered. We will not remember our past life. We will not remember having decided

to follow Buddhadharma. Some of us might no even be human beings anymore.

We are indeed free of teleological meaningfulness. I prefer to leave such concepts to Hegel and his lot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Look what I found in Kathmandu...

Content:

Nemo said:

At least it wasn't a gun store. Black Label you can offer to the Protectors.

Malcolm wrote:

You can offer weapons to protectors too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I must say that I am totally shocked to hear self-described Mahayanists saying that life (including the bodhisattva motivation) has no meaning, and that ceasing to exist entirely (not just within samsara) is the ultimate aim.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not cease to exist (ucchedavada); however with the absence of the cause for arising there is cessation.

Life does not need to have any meaning for a bodhisattva (who understands the meaninglessness of life) to wish to free sentient beings from pointless rounds of samsaric existence. In fact it entirely underpins their whole motivation. They have recognized that there is no meaning to life, and they wish to rescue others from the delusion that life has meaning.

The point of Buddhadharma is to cease having the experience of birth, aging, sickness and death.

As Maitreya Bodhisattva is supposed to have said, there is not even the a needle point of happiness to be found samsara. Birth only occurs because of afflictions. When afflictions are eradicated, birth also ceases.

However, the meaningless of life does not prevent me from enjoying life. I actually rather enjoy it more, since I know that my existence is free from the burden of teleological meaningfulness.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

If you stay in the natural state samsara stops, that is the only cessation the Buddha ever taught.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

That's simple not true, Magnus, it is especially untrue with respect to Dzogchen.

heart said:

We will have to agree to disagree then.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read the Pali suttas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

then you havent studied shantidevas bodhicharyavatara. or other mahayana text's that deal with motivation of life.

Malcolm wrote:

These texts deal with one's motivation for awakening, which is predicated on the fact that life has no intrinsic meaning. Being born, living, dying are all intrinsically meaningless from the perspective of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, completely. The entire teaching of Buddha Dharma is based on meaningless of samsara and ending the process of taking rebirth in it. Life = samsara. If samsara is meaningless, so is life. The ultimate desiderata is to bring the whole cycle to an end. Since sentient beings are endless, that will never happen. Nevertheless, the primary goal of Buddhadharma is to achieve a nirvana in which nothing is left behind.

M

heart said:

If you stay in the natural state samsara stops, that is the only cessation the Buddha ever taught.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

That's simple not true, Magnus, it is especially untrue with respect to Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There's nothing abstract about genuine love. It's immediate and obvious. Biological self-perpetuation on the other hand, that's a huge ideological abstraction.

Malcolm wrote:

Love is not a purpose, and does not lend itself to imbuing meaning on a cosmic scale.

Life is only meaningful to those who find meaning in it. Buddha clearly didn't which is why he recommended cessation.

heart said:

? are you serious?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, completely. The entire teaching of Buddha Dharma is based on the meaningless of samsara and ending the process of taking rebirth in it. Life = samsara. If samsara is meaningless, so is life. The ultimate desiderata is to bring the whole cycle to an end. Since sentient beings are endless, that will never happen. Nevertheless, the primary goal of Buddhadharma is to achieve a nirvana in which nothing is left behind.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There's nothing abstract about genuine love. It's immediate and obvious. Biological self-perpetuation on the other hand, that's a huge ideological abstraction.

Malcolm wrote:

Love is not a purpose, and does not lend itself to imbuing meaning on a cosmic scale.

Life is only meaningful to those who find meaning in it. Buddha clearly didn't which is why he recommended cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no intrinsic meaning or purpose to life. That is the essence of understanding samsara. We have to make it enjoyable on our own terms, that is the essence of practicing and realizing the Dharma.

Karma Dorje said:

The intrinsic meaning and purpose of life is to yield ourselves to the service of others.

Malcolm wrote:

That also serves no purpose at all unless you subscribe to some abstract ideological which imputes such values.

But life has no purpose at all, unless you consider biological self-perpetuation a "purpose".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Sherab said:

I thought liberation is due to wisdom

Malcolm wrote:

No, liberation is due to the eradication of afflictions.

I am not sure what you mean by "wisdom". So you mean omniscience? Or do you mean prajñā?

If the former, omniscience is not required for liberation.

If the latter, the prajñā that eradicates the afflictions is exactly the same in an arhat and a buddha.

Sherab said:

Okay, let me try again and see if I can make my trend of thought a little clearer.

I was thinking along the line that the liberation of an arhat is liberation from the 12 links of dependent origination. This is done when any link is cut. That cutting is due to a certain wisdom realized.

Since the wisdom of a buddha is far greater than the wisdom of an arhat, there must be a difference in the realization of a buddha compared to an arhat.

This implies that the wisdom realized by a buddha goes further than just cutting the 12 links of dependent origination. It is the difference in knowledge/wisdom of a buddha compared to an arhat that allows the buddha to perform greater 'miraculous' feats than an arhat. So I thought that the difference would come from the buddha having knowledge of all dependencies and not just those of the 12 links of DO. Via the buddha's knowledge/wisdom of all dependencies, the liberation of the buddha is liberation from all dependencies, in contrast to the liberation of an arhat which is only a liberation from the 12 links of DO.

Malcolm wrote:

Regarding liberation:

If you cut a rope, does it matter much whether the scissors you are using are six inches long or six feet long?

Regarding realization:

There is certainly a difference between a six inch flame and a six foot flame.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Sherab said:

I thought liberation is due to wisdom

Malcolm wrote:

No, liberation is due to the eradication of afflictions.

I am not sure what you mean by "wisdom". So you mean omniscience? Or do you mean prajñā?

If the former, omniscience is not required for liberation.

If the latter, the prajñā that eradicates the afflictions is exactly the same in an arhat and a buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between a Buddha and an arhat in terms of liberation, that is why all buddhas are also arhats; there is a vast difference between a buddha and arhat in terms of qualities.

Sherab said:

So there is no difference in the wisdom of an arhat and the wisdom of a buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a difference between their qualities (wisdom being one of them), but not their liberation, i.e., freedom from rebirth in samsara, which after all is the definition of liberation by all Buddhist traditions, as well as a number of non-Buddhist ones.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Sherab said:

If liberation means

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation simply means being free from the operation of afflictions.

Sherab said:

I thought liberation defined as being free from the operation of affliction refers to being free from the 12 links of dependent origination, i.e. the liberation of an arhat or a

pratekyabuddha. In contrast to that, I thought that the liberation of a buddha would be freedom from all dependencies. Otherwise, there would be no difference in realization between a buddha and an arhat.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between a Buddha and an arhat in terms of liberation, that is why all buddhas are also arhats; there is a vast difference between a buddha and arhat in terms of qualities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Sherab said:

If liberation means

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation simply means being free from the operation of afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

Feel free to point me to your sources Malcolm. After almost 30 years listening to Buddhist teachings I find it very probable the Buddha taught in different ways to different disciples. The fact that they find it difficult to find proof that Hinayana is older than Mahayana is an interesting indication of that.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing two different factors: Physical texts with age of a given tradition.

The early Canon was largely oral. We know that by the time of Ashoka texts were starting to be written down.

There is no record of an early reaction to Mahāyāna, as you would suppose there would be, since Ashoka purged the monastic sangha at the encouragement of the Vibhajyavadins. You see reactions towards proto Mahayāna ideas such as multiplicity of Buddhas and so on. But the first solid historical evidence we have of Mahāyāna texts is their translation into Chinese, and now a few fragments from Gandhara which support the idea that Mahāyāna was current in the Gandhara region during the first century.

We have Buddhist texts written on Ashoka pillars that can be pinpointed and have been.

We know that the Pali canon was written down in Sri Lanka during at the beginning of the first century BCE. We know that there were multiple canons. We also know that in Mahāyāna sūtras books are mentioned a lot. In the Pali sūtras, books are never mentioned even once. Clearly, the primary difference between the Nikāyas and the Mahāyāna canon is the difference between collection of texts that were recalled orally for centuries prior to being committed to writing to a collection of texts that are a product of a self-conscious literary process of authorship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation as path of Sutra: sources?

Content:

David Chapman said:

Chögyal Namhkai Norbu Rinpoche characterizes Sutra as the vehicle whose path is renunciation. This certainly seems accurate to me. However, I've had difficulty finding any other source that says the same. Renunciation is regarded as an aspect of the sutric paths, but nowhere else does it seem to be regarded as the essence or summary.

Are there other, earlier sources that regard renunciation as the essence of the Sutric path? Or is this characterization ChNNR's specific teaching?

Thanks very much for any leads.

David

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakyapas clearly make a distinction between Sūtrayāna, which is a path of giving up sense objects, and Vajrayāna, which is a path of not abandoning sense objects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

The problem with that reasoning is that there is actually no archeological evidence for it. The idea of the evolution of Buddhist spiritual practices isn't based in anything solid, and in fact the Dzogchen teachings for example completely negate this idea. Anyway, we are far away from DKR and Tsongkhapa, probably my fault.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is archeological evidence for it -- the evidence is in the texts themselves,

all kinds of evidence -- from the naming of plants and trees, to locations, etc.

The idea of the evolution of Buddhist spiritual practice in Indian history is based on very solid evidence, inscriptions, statues, etc. There is lot of plastic evidence that tracks to evolution of Mahāyāna into Vajrayāna for example aside from texts.

Irrespective of its historical origins: Mahāyāna is valid on its own terms or it is not. I accept that it is. Bodhicitta is a unique contribution of Mahāyāna to world spiritual traditions. I fully identify as a practitioner of Mahāyāna Dharma. I understand the desire and wish to trace this sūtra or that sūtra back to Shakyamuni Buddha, but I think it is futile.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Many people with entrenched biases are not stupid.

dzogchungpa said:

Yes, and DJKR is not one of them.

Malcolm wrote:

We will agree to disagree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Simon E. said:

But quite a number of indications that the Theravada is a remnant of one ancient and partisan school.

heart said:

Well that is the often repeated mantra, still don't explain why there are Mahayana texts recovered among the oldest know Buddhist texts.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The oldest known, physically surviving Buddhist texts exist on the Ashokan pillars.

The Gandhari texts do not shown an overwhelming concern with Mahāyāna -- they reveal a few fragments of Mahāyāna texts dating to the 1st century CE, but we already

know that Mahāyāna was in existence at this time due to the presence of 2nd century translations into Chinese. In order for me to be convinced that Mahāyāna was taught by anyone, let alone the Buddha, prior to the first century BCE, I would need to see some hard physical facts. Luckily for me, my soteriology does not depend on archaeology. Also my estimation of the capacity of Tibetans (or anyone else) to understand nonduality as presented in Buddhist texts does not depend on whether Buddha actually taught "nonduality".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Does that article provide some evidence that Mahayana might have been taught by the Buddha? I looked through it and I didn't see anything like that.

heart said:

It says clearly that the oldest Buddhist texts we have are both Hinayana and Mahayana, as to what the Buddha actually taught is anybody's guess since its early history is hearsay.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It says nothing of their authorship. What the Buddha actually spoke is not really anybody's guess, since there is sufficient evidence to prove that what is taught in the Pali canon/Agamas is more or less directly based on what the Buddha may have actually spoken.

While it is certain that parts of these early teachings have certainly been renovated into sections of Mahāyāna sūtras, the real question is "Did Buddha actually, physically, as a historical reality, teach Mahāyāna sūtras." The answer must be, no he didn't, except in someone's pure vision.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

How many people do you know that believe that there is no intrinsic purpose or meaning to life, and that we just have to make it enjoyable on our own terms? Or how about the opposite? How about the christian fundamentalist that sees the modern world as a threat and must be bullied into conforming to their beliefs?

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, it appears to me that many Tibetan exponents of Buddhism view the modern world as a threat, in much the same way they regard science as a threat.

There is no intrinsic meaning or purpose to life. That is the essence of understanding samsara. We have to make it enjoyable on our own terms, that is the essence of practicing and realizing the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There's no yawning gulf between Tibetans and Westerners, as far as I can see. Same afflictions, same institutional bugbears, same overweening conceits of intellectual prowess...

Malcolm wrote:

It would be nice of Tibetan exponents of Buddhism such as Dzongsar would cease advertising how much more afflicted and so on Westerners are supposed to be. So far as I know, no incarnated Lama has ever been murdered by their own Western students.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Have you been to any of his empowerments?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I have not, precisely because of the kinds of things he says.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I have. I think I am at least as western as you, and I did not get the impression that he does not understand us. Are we really that hard to understand? He's not stupid, you know.

Malcolm wrote:

Many people with entrenched biases are not stupid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

But it seems to take some time to land.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry Magnus, this does not rate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I'm not so sure about that. Have you been to any of his empowerments?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I have not, precisely because of the kinds of things he says.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

It's more that our culture creates chaotic and confused people.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I guess I just can't buy into this way of thinking. Most of the people I know are neither chaotic or confused. In fact the most chaotic, the most confused people I have ever met, apart from rock and rollers, were Buddhists in Dharma centers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

Actually, Mahayana might have been taught by the Buddha. The archeological proofs are becoming just as solid as for the Hinayana scriptures.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Really, what proof?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

My teacher said to me once, "Our minds look like a wiggling can of worms to them, so they give us the Dharma and hope we can make something out of it."

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but I have met many Tibetans and even Tibetan lamas and teachers, for the most part their minds are just as infected with worms as ours appear to be.

I personally am rather tired of the cultural chauvinism exhibited by Tibetans. It is one thing to be appreciative of one's culture. It is another thing to rest on the laurels of history (actually socio-geographical happenstance) and use this fact to tout the superiority of one's culture.

I don't like it when American politicians waffle on about American "exceptionalism" and I don't like it when Tibetan teachers waffle on about Tibetan exceptionalism. There is nothing particularly exceptional about human beings in general, apart from our capacity to think and reason -- and even that is very questionable when viewed from a cosmic perspective.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

DKR has a bad attitude about westerners. It's a pity really.

dzogchungpa said:

I kind of agree, but he has had a lot of experience with westerners, and seems to be quite appreciative of western culture. Maybe he has a point?

Malcolm wrote:

A point about what? He does not understand us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Alfredo said:

Mandala, I see Tsongkhapa's presentation of Indian Buddhist philosophy (e.g. the division into four tenet systems) as a factual distortion, however fruitful it may have been for Tibetan scholasticism.

Malcolm wrote:

The four tenet system is Indian in origin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Alfredo said:

Here's the quote I was thinking of:

[...] I've been talking with a lot of--a few, a few scholars in Oxford. They're very good, really good! Very good. There are many so-called Buddhist professors, or Buddhist experts, and they strongly oppose reincarnation. They don't believe that nonduality is taught by the Buddha, and stuff like that. Very good. It's a very educational for me. [smiles, audience laughs] I would just yesterday talked about--someone I had actually only heard the name, but never really learned anything about...him. Um, Karl...Karl Popper. Karl Popper? So... Also, in Oxford I was told that they're studying Buddhism "objectively." That's very interesting. [smiles, audience laughs] So this is all disorienting for me because [stammers] I had to switch my mind back to the Buddhist mind, so to speak, in order to talk about... this.

Anyway this is very important subject. [long pause] If we don't talk about nonduality, then I don't think we can really talk about Buddhism at all. And nonduality's not so easy. Recently I was talking to...Indians, just Indian intellectuals. And I was even kind of... worried...that how much we Tibetans actually manage to conceive the idea of nonduality thoroughly, as much as these Indians seems to have done. It's not that easy, this nonduality, to really conceive this. Especially if are, you think like, I think, like Karl Popper's way. And if you really think that something can be observed and valued objectively, nonduality's difficult. [shifts on seat] About a year ago I met a professor in America--Berkeley University--and he told me something very interesting. He said actually, it's very important that the Tibetan lamas know the history of Buddhism, and especially the history of Buddhism in the West. And he said especially in America because, he said, that the emergence of Buddhism in the West may be, may have...it started, you know, it started with a very Descartes-like Buddhism. So it's a very dualistic Buddhism, so to speak. I can understand him, because even the most seasoned dharma practitioner in the West sometimes I do have doubt, how much they are really understanding. Of course we are not talking about actual realization of nonduality, but we are talking about intellectual understanding of nonduality. Because the concept is just not proveable. Because every logic, language, method of measurement, is dualistic.

So dualistic method cannot measure and value something nondualistic. Always! And anything that cannot be proved, or anything that does not have a "manufacturing date," so to speak, I think in the materialistic world, modern world, it's all not really...it's a [struggle?], it's like a [struggle?], it really doesn't have much value in it.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NqRyAnyFNsA&list=TLh_vF6bhVwVLQjV8bMUeJ-ExvzM9778se (start from 4 minutes in)

Malcolm wrote:

This quote presents a false argument, one that is is very superficial.

DKR goes from the premise that because Buddhologists in general do not accept the idea that Mahāyāna was historically taught by the Buddha (in other words, texts were composed that used the persona of the Buddha as a mouthpiece for various Mahāyāna doctrines) that they, indeed all Westerners, therefore are under suspicion of being incapable of understanding the nondual message taught in those texts.

His argument is at base a species of cultural chauvinism. This cultural chauvinism that DKR frequently expresses in his lectures is distressingly blind.

In sum, he starts with an issue of historiography and ends up leveling a charge of philosophical incompetence. DKR has a bad attitude about westerners. Its a pity really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The Sarvastivada Abhidharma knew that when it is daytime in Jambudvīpa it is night on the Kuru continent. They possessed knowledge that is still valid about the universe and the planet Earth.

Mount Kailash is not mentioned in the Abhidharmakosha, it is a later interpretation, and it is wrong for several reasons, for example: the Sun and the Moon do not revolve around Mount Kailash, but they do revolve around the South pole (or North pole), when you adopt a flat earth presentation of our planet.

Malcolm wrote:

However the Surya Siddhanta's presentation of the universe (which has Meru at the north pole) wildly conflicts with Sarvastivadin cosmology.

Honestly, it is amazing to find people in the 21st century who try to prove that Abhidharmakosha's cosmology corresponds with the known facts of the universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

its simply a matter of intent: does one try to avoid participating in violence and killing as much as possible, or does one justify extra and unnecessary killing for the sake of one's gustatory pleasure?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "extra" suffering in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

heart said:

Well, I am talking about rig pa'i rtsal bang in the mengakde. I think the purpose is quite singular or else you would be introducing something that was still mind.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are different kinds of rig pa'i rtsal dbangs even within man ngag sde.

heart said:

Of course they are different. There are for Trechö and Tögal and every tradition have there own style. But are they introducing the natural state or not?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Its just not that simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thats a non-sequitur as a response to the question of intent and karma.

Malcolm wrote:

I answered your question. The answer is no (I am not claiming that intent is irrelevant when it comes to karma -- no one would unless they knew nothing about Buddhadharma).

gad rgyangs said:

then you admit that there is a karmic difference between "intent to kill & eat" vs. "intent to try and minimize killing while eating"?

Malcolm wrote:

You left out the middle one:

"Eating without intent to kill."

Anyway, killing is not the problem, the taking of life is. The latter requires intent. The former does not.

But eating anything that lives is a problem for something somewhere. All food involves the death of something else living.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

heart said:

Well, I am talking about rig pa'i rtsal bang in the mengakde. I think the purpose is quite singular or else you would be introducing something that was still mind.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are different kinds of rig pa'i rtsal dbangs even within man ngag sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The descent of the wisdom vajra empowerment procedure is detailed in in chapter 17 of the Jñānasiddhi of Indrabhuti.

It is not the same as a rig pa'i rtsal dbang.

M

heart said:

Which rigpai tsal wang are you talking about, there are many? But getting introduced directly to the nature of enlightenment is exactly what the rigpai tsal wang is about.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It's just not that simple, Magnus. There are two systems of rig pa'i rtsal bang -- sems sde and man ngag sde. Even within man ngag sde there are different kinds of rig pa'i rtsal dbangs, not to mention different rig pa'i rtsal dbangs in anuyoga and mahayoga systems like the King's cycle of Avalokiteshvara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well, thanks for the helpful info about Rigpa'i Tsel Wang. Can we confirm Trekcho and Essence Mahamudra are not the same as a result?

Malcolm, I believe you're familiar with Drikung Kagyu transmissions--is this transmission Paul speaks of the

"Vajra Pristine Awareness Empowerment" as discussed by Indrabhuti?

Malcolm wrote:

Vajra pristine awareness = ye shes rdo rje = jñānavajra.

It is very likely the same. The Eighth Situ also discusses this in his commentary on the Mahamudra Aspiration by the Third Karmapa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Pero said:

Yes well, I don't know when was the last time you went to a restaurant, cafeteria or a grocery etc. but these days (and as long as I've been alive) you don't come there and say "hey, I'd like some beef, go and kill some for me and I'll pay you". You come, there's meat, you buy or you don't.

It's just a silly argument.

gad rgyangs said:

the only thing this demonstrates is that you have no idea how an economy works or what "supply and demand" means.

Malcolm wrote:

And vegetarians, and especially vegans, have their head in the sand with respect to the necessity of animals being involved in the cycle of any viable sustainable, organic, local agricultural system.

for example, all that rice you eat is fertilized with feather meal and poultry litter which comes from exactly the same abattoirs you are condemning. We are all eating animal inputs all the time whenever we eat any organically produced vegetables.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so you're claiming that intent is irrelevant when it comes to karma?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am observing that all living beings feed on other living beings. I will add that the distinction between sentient and non-sentient life is artificial and anachronistic.

M

gad rgyangs said:

thats a non-sequitur as a response to the question of intent and karma.

Malcolm wrote:

I answered your question. The answer is no (I am not claiming that intent is irrelevant when it comes to karma -- no one would unless they knew nothing about Buddhadharma).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

What if everyone were Buddhist? Who would man the slaughter-houses?

Malcolm wrote:

We have already performed this experiment in Tibet, Thailand, etc. The answer is that Buddhists would man the abattoirs and come up with rites of karmic expiation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

maybe it will at least keep the cannibals distracted for long enough that they eat a few less brother sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Life feeds on life, intentionally or not.

M

gad rgyangs said:

so you're claiming that intent is irrelevant when it comes to karma?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am observing that all living beings feed on other living beings. I will add that the distinction between sentient and non-sentient life is artificial and anachronistic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

heart said:

You read empowerment and you think that means something grand, it is just THE pointing-out instruction. Since it is definitive it certainly appropriately could be called "the decent of the vajra wisdom". It by-pass all shamatha/vipassana and tsa-lung and is a non-gradual path.

But really, I hope you go and see Rinpoche and discuss this with him. As you know I myself practice Dzogchen even if my Guru teach both.

/magnus

conebeckham said:

You are equating the Vajra Pristine Awareness empowerment with "Ngotro," Pointing Out Instructions, etc.

The question is, is "Ngotro," Pointing Out Instruction, the Fourth Empowerment of

Anuttarayogatantra, or even the Rigpa'i Tsel Wang the same as this empowerment spoken of by Kongtrul? I cannot answer that question. If you get an answer to that question from any qualified guru, I'd be interested to hear it.

Malcolm wrote:

The descent of the wisdom vajra empowerment procedure is detailed in in chapter 17 of the Jñānasiddhi of Indrabhuti.

It is not the same as a rig pa'i rtsal dbang.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

maybe it will at least keep the cannibals distracted for long enough that they eat a few less brother sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Life feeds on life, intentionally or not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: khyung chen mkha' lding of Sri Simha

Content:

mutsum said:

JLA just told me some have been identified outside the Bima Nyingthik, like the khregs-chod bdun-pa (which was identified by Norbu Rinpoche).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am aware of the khregs chod bdun pa.

Thanks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: khyung chen mkha' lding of Sri Simha

Content:

mutsum said:

It is Upadesha no. 44 from the collection of 119 Upadeshas (partially included in the Bima Nyinghtik).

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have a location for the rest?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

Jikan said:

I have to confess: as a somewhat badly informed outsider, I find the distinction between Sutra Mahamudra & Tantric Mahamudra somewhat baffling. Would someone please clarify for me what these categories mean in practical terms? eg, generally speaking, are these different approaches to practice, are they integrated into one trajectory of practice, or...? by that I mean, are there practitioners solely of Sutra Mahamudra, or Tantric Mahamudra, or are these paths different aspects of the same phenomenon?

Many thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Read Kongtrul's encyclopedia on practice lineages, he describes it perfectly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Why study Sanskrit?

Content:

yegyal said:

Actually, I've never met a Tibetan scholar-practitioner that didn't think studying Sanskrit was worthwhile.

Indrajala said:

I've seldom met anyone from the Himalayas who thought the study of Sanskrit was important and pursued it even at an elementary level. I've met a few, sure, but they're exceptions.

Malcolm wrote:

As Khedrup mentions, Lama Migmar reads Sanskrit with fluency; so does Lama Pema, another Sakya graduate of Varanasi. Students at Sakya College, on the other hand, do not study so much Sanskrit.

Those Tibetans seriously interested in Indian Buddhist texts make the effort. But your

average Geshe, Lama, Khenpo, probably not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Why study Sanskrit?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

With the thousands of volumes of Buddhist texts available in Classical Tibetan and Chinese, for example, the monks have plenty to "do nothing but study with". While Sanskrit is wonderful to study, modern Chinese and Tibetan monks still can build a firm foundational of scriptural knowledge without it.

Malcolm wrote:

Without question, knowledge of Sanskrit is very important. It is one factor that has given the Sakyapas the edge in scholarship for centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Why study Sanskrit?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Earlier a Tibetan monk said to me, "Why bother studying Sanskrit? Everything is available in Tibetan."

I have my own reasons, both personal and scholarly, for studying Sanskrit, though his question is pertinent.

Malcolm wrote:

His question is ridiculous -- much of what was translated into Tibetan cannot be properly understood without some Sanskrit grammar.

If you are never going to read a sutra or sastra from the bka' 'gyur or btan 'gyur, his point might have merit, otherwise? Not so smart.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: simple shrines

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it could be worse, you could be into this:

Notice, Elvis' halo is just a little brighter than that of Jesus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Zhen Li said:

This only lends further credence to the fact that our world taken as a whole is Jambudvipa.

.

Malcolm wrote:

The main thing which upsets this theory is that Ptolemy knew and mentions the Uttarakurus in his geography.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uttarakuru>

It is pretty clear Jambudvipa refers to India, before the Sarvastivadins got out of hand. They were competing with Jains and Hindus in the cosmology game.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: khyung chen mkha' lding of Sri Simha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, I do not think so. The Tibetan is quite difficult and obscure in places.

Jikan said:

Thanks, Malcolm. You wouldn't know the text is so from the recent webcast on it, which has been absolutely lucid & accessible.

Malcolm wrote:

Rinpoche did not, and almost never does, literally translate the text. But of course he is lucid and accessible.

The text itself, however is not really not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: khyung chen mkha' lding of Sri Simha

Content:

Jikan said:

Has this text been translated publicly in English?

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

No, I do not think so. The Tibetan is quite difficult and obscure in places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: "Today I was enlightened"

Content:

Simon E. said:

And of course when and if he reads this it will confirm to him to his own satisfaction that he has transcended the outer form of Buddharma.

Malcolm wrote:

My guess is that he is an avid follower of Bud Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: "Today I was enlightened"

Content:

Adamantine said:

I just don't understand why he is compelled to use the term "enlightenment", which at this point when using English in a spiritual context is a term associated with Nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really.

Anyway, followers of Buddhadharma [The Dharma of the fully awakened one] should use the term "awakening" [bodhi, byang chub] and full awakening, which is what "Buddha" [sangs rvas] actually means. I.e. being fully [rgyas] awakened [sangs] from the slumber of ignorance.

The term enlightened is too broad to be meaningful in the context of Buddhadharma. Further, there is actually no term in all of Buddhadharma which corresponds to the English words "enlightened" or "spiritually illuminated".

But there is a term which corresponds to "waking up", "awakening" i.e. Buddha, bodhisattva, bodhi, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Kunrig - uprooting samsara

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

can you use the sadhana in and of itself, is an "independent" practice to purify evil destinies, and do you need the lung and trid for it, or are these necessary?

Malcolm wrote:

You need the empowerment, the lung and the instruction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Kunrig - uprooting samsara

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

Hi, i came across on vajrapublications this sadhana called

Kunrig - uprooting samsara.

does anyone know what its about and that if you need lung for it and is it practiced in other than the drikung lineage and what are the origins of this sadhana.

thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a sadhana for Sarvavidya related to the yoga tantra sarvadurgatiparishodana i.e. total purification of all evil destinies.

Sarvavidya is what some Kagyus, and the Sakyas and Gelugpas use for guiding people through the bardo. In Nyingma, one normally uses a practice connected with the peaceful and wrathful deities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 6:57 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

ClearblueSky said:

For example, smoking marijuana, though it doesn't have the negative chemicals of cigarettes, can still cause negative health consequences long term because you are inhaling burnt matter into your lungs.

Malcolm wrote:

For example? Which clinical studies are you citing? Oh, there aren't any since herb is illegal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

Malcolm. I would have never involved myself with that cult if Sakya Trizen, or anyone I contacted, had responded to my inquiries.

Sakya Trizen knew, Lama Migmar knew, but they didn't want to get their hands dirty.

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously you never asked me. I have always been forthright in my opinion about that situation in Miami.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

Because now I can ask you, as a human, what makes you more qualified than your teachers and what makes you a worthy receptacle of terms as opposed to the other people in this forum.

Malcolm wrote:

You clearly have a lot of anger. It is misplaced and poorly expressed.

Honestly who gives two shits about what Ivo Kalushev is doing in Mexico? Hopefully, he is eating some nice tortillas, beans and rice, drinking mescal occasionally, and enjoying the diving.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

KD, there is a fair amount of online information on the cult I mentioned now. Though

Sakya Trizen still has not done ANYTHING to discredit it.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because Sakya Trizen never endorsed it, nor had anything to do with starting LR's fantasy to begin with.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

What group are you talking about?

Malcolm wrote:

He is talking about a guy in florida named Luis Riesgo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

Meanwhile, Sakya Trizen, like yourself Malcolm, did nothing to warn people about this cult using his name to validate itself, nor did he respond to people trying to verify the cult leader's claims.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is frankly false, as far as I am concerned. I warned many people.

But it is true I never waged a campaign against this person. That is not my job.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, let me lay it out for you: Was anyone raped? Was any money embezzled? Was anyone deprived of their civil rights?

If the answer to those questions is no, then it is none of our business what these people or any one else is doing.

michaelb said:

Allegations of people being raped, having money embezzled and being deprived of their civil rights have been levelled against the most well known controversial 'Buddhist' groups in the west; NKT and Rigpa, for example.

I understand the caution not to turn into a Dharma cop and but if I was about to get involved with one of these groups I'd like to know about it and I'd hope Dharma practitioners on forums like this would have enough compassion to let me know before I stumbled into such a group.

Malcolm wrote:

- 1: formal religious veneration : worship
- 2: a system of religious beliefs and ritual; also : its body of adherents
- 3: a religion regarded as unorthodox or spurious; also : its body of adherents
- 4: a system for the cure of disease based on dogma set forth by its promulgator <health cults>

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cult>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

Malcolm.

Have you ever been the victim of a cult?

Malcolm wrote:

Have I ever been a victim of religion? No. I don't fit the profile. My egotism is much too strong.

Anyway, there are much worse things out there than tepid religious groups to get all concerned about.

Basically, let me lay it out for you: Was anyone raped? Was any money embezzled? Was anyone deprived of their civil rights?

If the answer to those questions is no, then it is none of our business what these people or any one else is doing.

Too many damn people feel like playing cop on the internet. It is a total waste of time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

Simon and Karma Dorje I have lived long enough to see cults form from innocent Buddhist groups I was involved with more than once, and many more times I have seen them turn from a distance and listened to the accounts of what transpired from students after they fall out of favor with the cult personality.

Malcolm wrote:

Wow, judge, jury and executioner.

Listen, we are talking about _religion_. All religions are cults by definition.

Just live and let live. If Ivo is the next Jim Jones, well, it is too early to tell, isn't it?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 12th, 2013 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: "Today I was enlightened"

Content:

disjointed said:

Simon. I presume you assume this Dzogchen teacher was well taught and fluent in the teachings of Dzogchen. He was not.

Malcolm wrote:

This person then was not a Dzogchen teacher, so your definition is flawed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 12th, 2013 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Trees are sentient beings?

Content:

TheSpirit said:

I am not exactly sure what Buddhist consider sentient beings. However I am just curious if it is possible for trees to be consider a sentient beings in Buddhism? Is it possible for them to have a spiritual essence like we do?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, most writing in Buddhadharma includes plants as part of container universe.

Plants are recognized to be alive, but not sentient. The general thinking runs that plants have no [observable] sense organs, so they cannot be sentient.

There are some trends in East Asian Buddhism, however, as well as in Tibetan Buddhism (Dzogchen) that run counter to this commonly accepted notion of the nonsentience of plants.

Personally, I think plants exhibit sentient properties of various kinds. And because they use prāṇa, exhibit digestion, preferences, communicate Whatever sentience they have however is likely to be very different than the sentience we ascribe to creatures in the invertebrate/vertebrate phylums.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Why should we privilege 21st century narratives over any other? Demons and menstrual blood speak to me in ways that ethnobotany never will.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a very sexist myth which perpetuates the theme of the uncleanliness of the menstrual discharge of women. Having studied many myths of plants, I cannot remember a single one where male demonic seed is cast as responsible for the growth of a plant considered pernicious.

Also, tobacco is the religious plant par excellence of Native Americans, occupying a place similar to juniper in Tibetan culture for rites of cleansing [bsangs] and the removal of pollution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

lol

nobody is answering my question here.

does anyone know if the ayurvedic herbal smokes close to crown chakra?, rendering phowa ineffective..

Malcolm wrote:

Should not be an issue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, the idea that tobacco springs from the menstrual blood of an evil demoness is a little silly since tobacco never existed in the old world until it was brought back from the new world by Europeans.

That being said, tobacco is pernicious if only for the fact that it takes up polonium 210 from the soil, rendering its smoke toxically radioactive, which is why for example, tobacco causes cancer but weed does not.

Jikan said:

Is it possible to read the text with the understanding that tobacco sprang from the menstrual blood of an evil demoness... without reference to geography or ethnobotany? That is, did the tertion really need to specify that tobacco is a North American noxious weed for his text to have value?

Malcolm wrote:

In 19th century Tibet, no. In 21st century America, yes. Moreover, tobacco, like any plant, has medicinal as well as other uses. To characterize it as a weed is wrong. A plant is only a weed when it is not wanted or not understood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, the idea that tobacco springs from the menstrual blood of an evil demoness is a little silly since tobacco never existed in the old world until it was brought back from the new world by Europeans.

That being said, tobacco is pernicious if only for the fact that it takes up polonium 210 from the soil, rendering its smoke toxically radioactive, which is why for example, tobacco causes cancer but weed does not.

Karma Dorje said:

Are you saying that evil demonesses do not live in the New World, or simply that they don't menstruate?

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that the author of that terma clearly had no idea where tobacco came from originally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

have you read about the terms that state that you will go to hell or lower realms because of smoking, are you afraid of this or do you think its something conquerable and not so solid fact?

Karma Dorje said:

I felt it definitely was negative for my health, and of course I was aware of Dudjom Rinpoche's statement on the effects of tobacco.

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, the idea that tobacco springs from the menstrual blood of an evil demoness is a little silly since tobacco never existed in the old world until it was brought back from the new world by Europeans.

That being said, tobacco is pernicious if only for the fact that it takes up polonium 210 from the soil, rendering its smoke toxically radioactive, which is why for example, tobacco causes cancer but weed does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Matylda said:

Yeah Zhang Zhung... it was the closest. By still it was not Tibet in the sense of history, though they could pick up so much from previous kingdoms. It is just natural, that close nation, ethnically and in terms of language have some mutual exchange and influence... But I meant Tibet proper, not by whom it was influenced.

Malcolm wrote:

Zhang Zhung people were Tibetan. Zhang Zhung language is a dialect of Tibetan, and it is still spoken today.

Sherlock said:

AFAIK, this isn't what either ChNN or modern scholars say. Both agree that Zhang Zhung was related to Tibet but not quite the same.

Malcolm wrote:

The Zhang Zhung people were one of six tribes of Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Matylda said:

Yeah Zhang Zhung... it was the closest. By still it was not Tibet in the sense of history, though they could pick up so much from previous kingdoms. It is just natural, that close nation, ethnically and in terms of language have some mutual exchange and influence... But I meant Tibet proper, not by whom it was influenced.

Malcolm wrote:

Zhang Zhung people were Tibetan. Zhang Zhung language is a dialect of Tibetan, and it is still spoken today.

Matylda said:

But GY? was it really spread widely and accepted in India? Even in AYT texts? You mentioned only Hevajra, what about other AYT lineages in India?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Yes. I mentioned two traditions, Hevajra and Vajrayogini. For example, there are three gurusadhanas translated by a Vibhutipandita into Tibetan. Another text entitled gurumandalasamadana vidhi translated by one of three Dro Lotsawas ('bro lo ts'a ba) which describes a method of practicing the guru, he is invited in front, one makes offerings to him, praises, etc., exactly the way that guru yogas are done in the Tibetan tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just who says Tibetans were poorly educated? They had writing, etc. prior to the 7th century.

Why? There were Chinese Monasteries in Lhasa. There were Indian monks, central Asian monks. Tibetans traded widely in India as well as China. And they were the bosses of Central Asia until the 840's and the Chinese economic crisis.

Matylda said:

Well, but how far the society was literate? Was it restricted to the court or some privileged groups what could be rather limited representation? And as for the seal, is one seal enough to prove wide spread written language, or was it just fancy property of the court? I have no idea if there is enough evidence of written language used by majority of Tibetans. In case of China written language was predominant in all parts of China already for ages. Yes military Tibet was very strong and occupied western parts of China, and Chinese missionaries were in Lhasa, however not only there, but in many countries outside of China. Including many monks who traveled to India since II century...

Tibet was in the VII and VIII century just entering the Buddhist way. In China it was predominant religion at that time with history of seven hundred years.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans had long term contact with India and Buddhists. They were surrounded by Buddhist countries for a thousand years. Buddhist yogis, as well as Hindu Yogis frequented the region around Kailash.

Zhang Zhung was a kingdom bordering India. Every evidence points to the fact that while Tibetans themselves may not have developed writing, their ethnic cousins, Zhangzhung people, had done so, and that Tibetans, in a sort of cultural fealty to Zhang Zhung, adopted their writing, customs, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

smcj said:

Just who says Tibetans were poorly educated? They had writing, etc. prior to the 7th century.

They did? I thought written language was imported from India around then. You sure?

Any existing texts (presumably Bonpo) from that period?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is what western scholars would like people to believe. But this is based on an improper reading of what early Tibetan texts actually say about the issue. It is true that Thonmi Sambhota adapted Gupta script to the Tibetan language. But there is sufficient evidence that the court of Zhang Zhang was using writing during the reign of Srong btsan sgam po. We have for example Ligmincha's seal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Matylda said:

So when vajryana arrived in China, it had completely different background for development, also there were many more literati people to accommodate, study or practice compare to rather poorly educated Tibetan society at that time.

Malcolm wrote:

Just who says Tibetans were poorly educated? They had writing, etc. prior to the 7th century.

[/quote]

Anyway to compare state of Buddhism in China and Tibet in the mid of the VIII century is rather risky. Background of both was totally different.[/quote]

Why? There were Chinese Monasteries in Lhasa. There were Indian monks, central Asian monks. Tibetans traded widely in India as well as China. And they were the bosses of Central Asia until the 840's and the Chinese economic crisis.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But this is not true, and I already presented two texts which negate this idea -- which somehow you seem to ignore.

Indrajala said:

I think the key point here is the guru yoga that we now know.

Malcolm wrote:

What Guru yogas do you have in mind? As I pointed out, the basic bones of the practice was well-established in India.

The practice of turning historical teachers like Padmasambhava into objects of Guru Yoga I agree is a Tibetan innovation, but in terms of the skeleton of Guru Yoga, it is like I said. And further, in traditions like Sakya, they adhere principally to the Indian style of Guru yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dunhuang records indicate no such thing.

Indrajala said:

They don't indicate a strongly Buddhist culture by any means. Let me cite an immediate example that comes to mind:

Malcolm wrote:

By your post, you must think I am referring to the 7th century Tibet. But I am not. I am referring to 8th century Tibet, namely to the reign of Khri srong lde' bstan. No one disputes that Buddhism was not a presence in Tibet prior to the reign of Srong btsan sgam po.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Indrajala said:

For one thing, the Dunhuang records indicate Tibet was hardly a Buddhist culture at the time, and the Chinese at the time didn't seem to know of that much Buddhism in Tibet throughout the Tang.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dunhuang records indicate no such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Indrajala said:

In any case, guru yoga as it is found in Tibet does not seem to have ever existed in East Asia, even in the last period of Vajrayāna transmission into China, which is noteworthy and supports Mayer's idea:

Clearly then, the guru yoga that we now know developed in Tibet, not in India.

Malcolm wrote:

But this is not true, and I already presented two texts which negate this idea -- which somehow you seem to ignore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna was introduced to China primarily by a single master.

Indrajala said:

You are mistaken. The three eminent early masters include Śubhakarasiṃha 善無畏

(637-735), Vajrabodhi (671-741) 金剛智 and Amoghavajra (705-774) 不空.

Malcolm wrote:

Note, I said primarily. These other two masters did not have the lasting influence Amoghavajra did.

Indrajala said:

The Chinese court, clergy and economy were in a better position than Tibet to provide the necessary institutions, crafts and so forth to facilitate the transmission of Vajrayāna.

It isn't all about dates.

Malcolm wrote:

Samye is a pretty sizable place. The Tibetans were the dominant power in Asia during the 8th century.

The main point however is that the kind of Vajrayāna practiced in Tibet in the late eight century was basically identical that practiced in China during the same time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, Jeff, you consistently say that Vajrayāna in China was "earlier" than that in Tibet. But this is not really true.

Indrajala said:

Tantric Buddhism was more systematically introduced into China before it was into Tibet it seems.

It seems the Chinese tradition preserved earlier developments more than the Tibetans did. This is the opinion of some Japanese scholars which classify Shingon/Zhenyan as 'middle period' esoteric Buddhism, while Tibetan is generally more associated with a 'later period'.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna was introduced to China primarily by a single master.

Vajrayāna was introduced some thirty years (or earlier) later into Tibet by a large number of masters. After all, Samye was completed by 779 at the latest on a Vajrayāna plan. This means that Padmasambhava was present in Tibet not later than 775. This is a mere 34 years after Amoghavajra returned from his travels in 746.

When we examine these claims purely on the basis of historical dates, the claim that

Vajrayāna in China is significantly "earlier" than Tibetan Imperial period Vajrayāna seems to be vastly overstated. Further, the unrestricted translation of so called anuttarayoga texts in Tibet was actually forbidden by royal edict and the main practices of the imperial period at Samye were grounded in Tattvasamgraha and the Vajrasikhara, just as in China and in Japan (from 804 onwards). Practices such as Vajrakilaya, which do date to that period, were very secret and not public at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The practice of making use of historical or quasi historical figures for Guru yoga is a Tibetan innovation. It seems in India, gurus were generally imagined in the form of one's devatā.

Konchog1 said:

So the Indians didn't visualize the lineage Gurus? Just their Guru?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, in many practices, the master of one's family meditated at the crown is one's guru, even in lower tantras.

BTW, Jeff, you consistently say that Vajrayāna in China was "earlier" than that in Tibet. But this is not really true.

Vajrayāna was brought to Tibet during the reign of khri srong lde'u btsan which lasted from 755 to 797 or 804 depending on whose account you follow. Amoghavajra only translated a portion of the Tattvasamgraha into Chinese in 754, though he translated a number of other texts. Considering that it is very likely that the yoga tantra, etc., we see comes from South India by way of Java and so on, both by tradition and by textual evidence, and the so called annutaryoga tantras such as Guhyasamaja are sited in Oḍḍiyāna from the start, this accounts for the very different characters of Tibetan and Chinese Vajrayāna traditions, not "earlier" and "later" since Guhyasamaja and so on were certainly in circulation by early 700's. Be that as it may, the main shrine in Samye was devoted to the Vajradhātu Maṇḍala pointing to the presence of Tattvasamgraha by 790 at the latest in Tibet.

sarvadurgatipariśodhanatejorājāyatathāgatasyārhatasamyaksambuddhasyakalpanāma, guhyasamaja, and so on are present in the ldan dkar catalogue pointing to its early presence in Tibet. Anyway, the Tattvasamgraha was never completely translated in Chinese until the 11th century, or perhaps the late tenth, around the same time it was translated into Tibetan.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jeff, you have to keep in mind that a lot of ritual procedures written by Tibetans were held in the memories of Indians practitioners since they are a deep cultural part of India.

Indrajala said:

Sure, but then we need to ask why tantric traditions in China never seemed to have had comparable practices (but correct me if I'm wrong).

Malcolm wrote:

I explained that -- Guru yoga, as well as mandala offerings, are quite specific to the annutarayoga tantra phase in India. These tantras were not imported to China in any systematic way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Indian Vajrayana

Content:

Khechara said:

Hello there. Well, I don't know him personally but from what I do know about him, he is far from being an 'ordinary syncretic Hindu'. The Vajrayana tradition which he belongs to is an old Nath lineage. I came across one of his short books, "In Search of Tantra: Vajrayana" on Scribd. This was published for an academic session on the subject a few years ago. I'd like to know what you discussed with him.

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/51812667/tantra-book-format-small>

Malcolm wrote:

This is basically a synthesis of Shaiva-agama with Mahāyāna Buddhism with a sprinkling of Vajrayāna thrown for good measure. A lot of talk of "god" and "self" there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

smcj said:

Who's Lawapa?

Malcolm wrote:

Luipa, the first siddha to write down a Cakrasamvara sadhana. Also there is the Vajrayogini sadhana penned by Naropa which has a very clearly indicated guru yoga

section.

Jeff, you have to keep in mind that a lot of ritual procedures written by Tibetans were held in the memories of Indians practitioners since they are a deep cultural part of India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 7th, 2013 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I always thought it unusual how nothing comparable to Tibetan guru yoga seems to have existed in Chinese esoteric Buddhism (though correct me if I'm wrong), and attributed this perhaps to an earlier period of Indian tantra being transmitted into China. But if Mayer is correct, such guru yoga is a Tibetan innovation.

Malcolm wrote:

That entirely depends on what you mean by "innovation". Guru Yoga certainly exists in a few Indian sources. For example, a general outline of Guru Yoga as it is universally practiced today is provided in the Hevajrasya hastavyavagrāhakrama-nāma.

In general, Guru yoga is only an annutarayoga tantra practice.

The practice of making use of historical or quasi historical figures for Guru yoga is a Tibetan innovation. It seems in India, gurus were generally imagined in the form of one's devatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 7th, 2013 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Christian Influences in Modern Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

I think this movement towards socially engaged Buddhism around the world is actually a result of Buddhists not really believing in saṃsāra any longer.

Malcolm wrote:

I would hesitate to agree with this. Instead I think that "Engaged Buddhism" largely is an offshoot of three things, Gandhi's Satyagraha, the civil rights and antiwar movements in the late sixties and early seventies.

Indrajala said:

It used to be seen as worthwhile to provide institutions and so forth for people to work towards liberation from saṃsāra, but nowadays such goals are not really seen as worthwhile in many circles. Buddhism has to justify its existence by providing liberation

from worldly stress and pastoral care..

Malcolm wrote:

You mention Tibet -- but you seem to fail to recognize that the success or failure of Tibetan monasteries was entirely dependent on the perceived efficacy of lamas in a monastery and providing medical services and pastoral, a.k.a, religious services to the laity. Those in retreat were always a minority. Lay people in Tibet for the most part never concerned much with liberation, doing the usual merit dance of lay Buddhists everywhere. In fact, there is an entire literature devoted to excoriating Tibetans lay and ordained alike for their "non-belief" samsara aka engagement in eight worldly dharmas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: blocking realization

Content:

duffster1 said:

I heard Chogyal Namkhai Noru Rinpoche say at the webcast today that everyone has the potential to realize rainbow body and then he said that one can block that potential and then one has no possibility of realizing it in this life?Is it possible to block one's possibility of having realization for their entire life?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. It is called "having huge misconceptions about the teachings".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

Trungpa

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, you are flogging a dead horse. You aren't one of those one issue posters, are you? I hope to see more from you than "sexual misconduct", "Trungpa", "ethics", etc.

Otherwise, I am afraid I will find you quite boring.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

The same could be said of Mme Blavatsky.

Malcolm wrote:

The influence of the Theosophical Society on the early history of Buddhism in the West is indisputable, despite her many misconceptions about Tibetan Buddhism in particular.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

I readily admit that he is famous and influential. But in what way can he be said to have done "so much good"?

Malcolm wrote:

Hmmm, well, CTR's books have introduced literally millions of people to Buddhadharma for one...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

Malcolm wrote: Alfredo seems to think that Ivo needs to be called out as a fraud. No--not yet, anyway. I haven't seen anything to suggest that he's insincere, though it is possible that he is deluded, and many aspects of his teachings (and the group dynamics underlying them) do raise ethical concerns. Again, I would honestly appreciate additional information. For example, the anecdotes of the several people who have interacted with him in the past, and posted above, I find revealing.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have better ways to spend your time?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, most of us who have been around for any length of time have come to the conclusion that trying to out unethical teachers doesn't work. Their students just cling tighter, and circle the wagons. For example, Mary Finnegan has been waging a war on

Sogyal Rinpoche for more than twenty years. Is he any less successful? No. He is more successful than ever.

dzogchungpa said:

Is Sogyal an unethical teacher in your opinion?

Malcolm wrote:

If the reports are true...but I do not know that they are...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Simon E. said:

As I said above others have the knowledge to read the nuances between the lines here than the degree of my knowledge allows..but we seem to have segued from general misgivings to association with well documented sexual predation ..is there evidence for that kind of abuse from 'Ivo ' ?

Have I missed something ?

Malcolm wrote:

Alfredo seems to think that Ivo needs to be called out at as a fraud. My own position is that whether Ivo is a fraud, deluded, or authentic does not matter to me in the slightest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Christian Influences in Modern Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Those deities were there from the start. But you can see Buddhist exclusivity rising in Indian Mahāyāna texts that define refuge, and so on.

Indrajala said:

Nevertheless, there is plenty of heterogenetic development to be discerned.

Malcolm wrote:

I see it as appropriation.

There are three modes of conversion in Buddhism:

Setting a good example (early Buddhism)

Charity (Middle Buddhism)

Subjugation through appropriation (Late Buddhism, esp. Vajrayāna).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Christian Influences in Modern Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

It wasn't that exclusive when you consider how many Vedic deities were embraced. Just look at the art record alone with all the Hindu epics being splashed around temples.

Malcolm wrote:

Those deities were there from the start. But you can see Buddhist exclusivity rising in Indian Mahāyāna texts that define refuge, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Christian Influences in Modern Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

There's a few more aspects I'd like to discuss:

- The view that the Pali canon best represents an original Buddhism via a historical Buddha, and that this is worth adhering to as a pure or authentic Buddhism (getting to the "true teachings" of the Buddha, not unlike getting to the original teachings of Christ).

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly an issue for Theravadins.

-

Indrajala said:

The new exclusive nature of Buddhism, whereby self-identifying Buddhists are actively discouraged from participating in non-Buddhist religious activities.

Malcolm wrote:

False, Tibetan Buddhism has been very exclusionary from the beginning. It has to do with how refuge is defined in late Indian texts.

Indrajala said:

- In some modern Buddhist traditions a distaste for rituals, 'superfluous iconography'

and archaic liturgy (Protestant influences).

Malcolm wrote:

Some truth in this.

-

Indrajala said:

In some traditions, centralized administrations with a key figurehead and his or her elites in charge of all major decisions and policies with underlings expected to show obedience (Catholic influences).

Malcolm wrote:

Represents a total misunderstanding of the nature of Tibetan Buddhism, both here and in Tibet.

Indrajala said:

I think the most pertinent influence from Christianity has quite possibly been the second on the list: the new Buddhist self-identity where exclusivity is now seen as important and worth emphasizing. Of course in the past "Buddhists" existed, but as we know even today were often readily able and willing to participate in all manner of other practices and ideologies, and even incorporate them. Christian-like exclusivity for Buddhists is probably a fairly new development in most cultures.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so. I imagine you can find the roots of Buddhist exclusivity in the post-Gupta environment, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

The notion that it is enough to focus on our own teachers, and ignore the wider ethical problems plaguing Tibetan Buddhism (or Buddhism in general), to me shows a lack of spiritual responsibility.

Malcolm wrote:

So what do you suggest? Frankly, most of us who have been around for any length of time have come to the conclusion that trying to out unethical teachers doesn't work. Their students just cling tighter, and circle the wagons. For example, Mary Finnegan has been waging a war on Sogyal Rinpoche for more than twenty years. Is he any less successful? No. He is more successful than ever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

But some of his practices can be practiced now, without going to Mexico. Besides, where exactly do you think "here" is?

Lama Ivo has already told his side of the story in some detail on his website, so before asking him to comment, it might be better to read that first. I was actually hoping to learn what other people say about him, in the hopes that that would prove revealing.

So far my impression (from reading his website) has been mixed. On one hand, he seems serious, intense, and knowledgeable. I can hardly fault him for being a Westerner, or an iconoclast. On the other, he has obviously groomed his followers to obey him with some intensity, even when he guides them in unexpected directions. This model of guru-dom is one which I wish could be reformed out of Vajrayana, not simply universalized to make it less Tibetan. But then, I am an unenlightened wretch, so what do I know?

Malcolm wrote:

I read it.

Who cares? Unless you are interested in being his student, of what concern is it to you?

After all this nonsense about Ngagpa Chogyam, Roach, etc., if I have learned anything at all, people are going to believe whatever the hell they want no matter what anyone else says.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, who cares? No one here is going to run off to Mexico to become a student of Ivo's or practice these things. Best to let it alone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 3rd, 2013 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

Is anybody familiar with Lama Ivo? He is a Bulgarian with a Nyingma background, who in some sense broke away from this tradition a few years ago when he received/created a cycle of treasure-texts. His center is located in Mexico:

michaelb said:

Ivo used to be on e-sangha under a few user names.

Malcolm wrote:

Who?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 1st, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

anjali said:

Yes, the knowing quality of the mind is fundamentally empty. As far as I know, no one is saying otherwise. However, this doesn't preclude the possibility self-reflexive knowing. This is why, in a reply to daverupa, I noted that we need to be clear on the distinction between self-reflexive knowing and self-grasping. Self-knowing is just that, knowing that knows itself. Nothing more. Relative to the trikaya model, it is only the ignorance of self-grasping that imputes a substantial (instead of empty), isolated (instead of unified with it's radiance) self-knowing.

Astus said:

We know that we are sentient beings simply because we sense things and we are aware of this process. This is self-awareness. Would you call this knowing that knows itself? If so, this is not a problematic idea at all. Only if you suppose some independent knowing that knows itself is there a problem.

Malcolm wrote:

what do you mean by independent knowing?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la

Content:

WuMing said:

There is no afterlife, just one long bardo that begins with delusion and ends with awakening.

taken from

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=36&t=14140&view=unread&sid=85d265cd34a332ed0dc45b71dd878f6b#unread>

gad rgyangs said:

I like that one too. I've never seen it put quite that way before.

Malcolm wrote:

Can't take credit for it, it comes from Nyi ma 'bum, 11th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Jetsun Taranatha

Content:

smcj said:

Well, that's certainly not mentioned in the Kagyu histories!

Malcolm wrote:

Not only that, but they exist in Sakya Lam 'bras as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Jetsun Taranatha

Content:

smcj said:

Taking this thread even farther afield: Marpa's son is an adept so he transfers consciousness to another body.

This practice, which we still have the sadhana for, evidently caused a lot of problems. So it was decided to allow the practice to die out. No empowerment was given to the next generation, so the practice became inert, dead. You can get the text, and do the sadhana, but since there is no lineage empowerment available, you'd just be wasting your time. Nobody today can make it work anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

grong 'jug practices still exist in Nyingma with uninterrupted transmissions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Presumably you mean a buddha's self-knowing is not self-reflexive, in that mind cannot take itself as its own object. Mind would have to take a 'step back' in order to see itself, thereby setting up an infinite regression. It must somehow know itself without taking itself as an object, correct?

Malcolm wrote:

The buddhas self-knowing is precisely self-reflexive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Music time

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Longde Teachings

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Ok then..thanks Malcolm..so its the entire initiation that is required not just the lung.
Got it. Interesting how these things work. Sometimes all you need is just to hear
Rinpoche say a mantra etc and other times you need an entire initiation. Wish there was
a guideline book out there for all of these things or even have it posted on the website
what exactly is required for each thing that Rinpoche teaches...sure would be helpful...

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, a lung does not have direct introduction. And typically, Rinpoche is a stickler
for transmitting things he received in the manner in which he received them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Longde Teachings

Content:

Fa Dao said:

ok then, so if it isnt the AOM/Ngondzog Gyalpo lung then I wonder what does exactly
constitute transmission for Longde?

Malcolm wrote:

The Ngondzog Gyalpo initiation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

This is precisely how it is described in prajnaparamita for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but no.

oushi said:

Your "arguments" are not convincing...

Perfection of wisdom in 8000 lines, chapter XII.

Malcolm wrote:

Abhisamaya alaṃkāra, the whole book, which explains the hidden meaning of the PP sūtras, including the scope and content of the two kinds of omniscience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

By definition, conditioned and unconditioned are mutually exclusive.

Malcolm wrote:

By definition they are mutually unintelligible without the other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 8:34 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

This is precisely how it is described in prajnaparamita for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Omniscience is irreversible, that is why your statement is trivial and untrue.

oushi said:

All-knowing is always available since it is present through unknowability of all dharmas.

Because dharmas are imperceptible, omniscience is free from knowing.

Simply speaking, there is nothing that can be known.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, that is really not how omniscience is described, you are entitled to whatever you like to think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

That which is know, can also be unknown, thus it is not ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

Trivial and untrue.

oushi said:

I thought you can do better than that. It is very simple, thus difficult to refute. Probably that's why you went straight to trivializing it. Knowing cannot be ultimate simply because it can be unknown.

Malcolm wrote:

Omniscience is irreversible, that is why your statement is trivial and untrue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When you have relinquished all traces for rebirth, automatically the twelve āyatanas will cease at the break up of the body. This is classic "hināyāna" nirvana. Peter Harvey's books suggests that after the eradication of affliction there is a tiny shred of evidence in the Nikayas that Buddha suggests that there is a which vinnana/vijñāna survives in a now unconditioned state (i.e. a state unconditioned by affliction) and that this is nirvana intended by the Buddha. He nevertheless insists that this continuum is not to be referred to as a self, and that Buddha would find it inappropriate to do so.

Koji said:

There is also that odd ayantana:

There is, monks, that ayantana wherein there is neither earth, nor water, nor fire, nor air ... and so on. (Udana VIII, i).

And speaking of Peter and the attâ:

"As will be shown below, though, the early sources used by the Theravâda are bereft of any such explicit denial. The idea that Buddhism, 'denies the self', though, has become a commonplace of Religious Studies" (Peter Harvey, The Selfless Mind, p. 7).

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, but you have to read the last chapter, where he gives his conclusion. It all basically boils down to what Nāgārjuna says, sometimes Buddha said self, sometimes he said not self, and one needs to understand the context. When the self is used as prajñāpti, a designation, then this is acceptable. When trying to discern the nature of things, it is not acceptable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

That which is know, can also be unknown, thus it is not ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

Trivial and untrue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

So, when you say that knowing knows itself, emptiness and radiance, that is actually the Huayan model. Although logically to say that knowing includes (knows) knowing is nothing but stating that knowing is knowing.

anjali said:

The question on the table is whether the knowing quality of the mind can turn back on itself (self-reflexive knowing)? To hijack a zen phrase, is it possible to "turn the light and illuminate back?" From the perspective of self-reflexive knowing, this can be interpreted as taking the light of one's awareness and turning it back on itself. There are folks who say this can be done, and describe it as a singular experience.

Malcolm wrote:

The omniscience of the a buddha is self-knowing, as I mentioned before.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

But religion can also be this: "All religion expresses itself in such an awareness of

something outside and beyond nature." ~ Schleiermacher

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, smoke and mirrors. Pabulum to feed the confused and ignorant. As the Buddha pointed out, there is nothing outside of the twelve āyatanas.

Koji said:

Correct, there is nothing outside of the twelve āyatanas like another twelve āyatanas, or like another sabba beyond the first sabba. At SN 35:23 we learn that the sabba is the 12 ayatana. At SN 35:24 the Buddha teaches us the Dhamma for abandoning sabba (sabbappahānāya). At SN 35:28 we learn the sabba is burning. Seeing thus the Ariyasāvaka experiences a revulsion towards the 12 ayatana after which he is liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

When you have relinquished all traces for rebirth, automatically the twelve āyatanas will cease at the break up of the body. This is classic "hināyāna" nirvana. Peter Harvey's books suggests that after the eradication of affliction there is a tiny shred of evidence in the Nikayas that Buddha suggests that there is a which vinnana/vijñāna survives in a now unconditioned state (i.e. a state unconditioned by affliction) and that this is nirvana intended by the Buddha. He nevertheless insists that this continuum is not to be referred to as a self, and that Buddha would find it inappropriate to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Bodhidharma's Courtesan

Content:

Indrajala said:

It seems the real successor to Bodhidharma was someone other than what the official records tell us.

Any thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

He's pretty short in the picture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

But religion can also be this: "All religion expresses itself in such an awareness of something outside and beyond nature." ~ Schleiermacher

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, smoke and mirrors. Pablum to feed the confused and ignorant. As the Buddha pointed out, there is nothing outside of the twelve āyatana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The question is, why would anyone believe your testimony.

Koji said:

You need a NPOV on the matter.

Malcolm wrote:

This is religion, baby, it is all just smoke and mirrors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: I have some proof here that there's no afterlife

Content:

gandy said:

so how does buddhism reconcile with this?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no afterlife, just one long bardo that begins with delusion and ends with awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

In the internalised trikaya model, as you said, the three are explained separately but they are not actually three different things. There are a number of ways to explain that. The simplest is the statement of the third "kaya" that emptiness and clarity are inseparable; here it is understood that clarity includes all appearances, it is dependent origination.

Malcolm wrote:

This is in line with Mahāmudra schools like Kagyu and Sakya's take on things. But rang bzhin gsal ba which is the sambhogakāya in Dzogchen teachings is definitely not all appearances and is not dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

conebeckham said:

This leads to the question: for those who feel they have "had an experience" or "experienced" Wisdom or Buddhamind or whatnot, and have somehow consequently conceptualized that experience as a sort of "Self," is that "experience" really the experience of Wisdom that is talked about in Sutra, Tantra, and Upadesha? Or is it a mistaken experience?

Koji said:

Let's say I had the experience of attaining nirvana whose self-nature (svabhāva) is that of being unconditioned and, moreover, my attainment is incapable of being conceptualized. How can I be refuted? In fact, there is no way I can be refuted.

Malcolm wrote:

The question is, why would anyone believe your testimony.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

When there is no "internal stimulus", it means there is no mental movement, no mental phenomena. And that means unconsciousness, mindlessness.

jeeprs said:

Why then is there significance given to dhyana states such as the 'immaterial dhyanas'? Do you think when yogis are in those states they are simply inert? Might they as well be asleep? The way I would understand it, this is what is implied by 'passing beyond duality', but it is not simply 'unconsciousness'. It is consciousness without the sense of there being an observer. "Contentless consciousness" is one description I have read.

Malcolm wrote:

Those yogis are governed by the concept that propells them into that formless āyatana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

But you did not comment on this:

And since, in a non-dual state, the experiencer is the experienced, the experiencer must also be an illusion. So we could all be merely part of a computer simulation such as The Matrix and the Buddha is part of that as well. Or the Hindu belief that we are all the dream of the God Brahma is correct and Buddha is also part of the dream.

And that would be a problem.

The fact that you did not comment on the above is to me, a reflection of the difficulty of avoiding the extremes of unconditioned and conditioned, and by extension the extreme position of the other mutually exclusive pairs such as permanent and impermanent, existence and non-existence etc. by using those very words, ie. words such as conditioned and unconditioned etc.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what you mean by nondual. There are three kinds of non dualism. One is cognitive non dualism, i.e., everything is consciousness, for, like example Yogacara. The second is ontological nondualism, i.e. everything is brahman, god, etc. The third is epistemic nondualism, i.e., being, non-being and so on cannot be found on analysis and therefore do not ultimately exist.

The indivisibility of the conditioned and the unconditioned is based on the third. We have only experience of conditioned phenomena. Unconditioned phenomena like space are known purely through inference since they have no characteristics of their own to speak of. When we analyze phenomena, what do we discover? We discover suchness, an unconditioned state, the state free from extremes. That unconditioned state cannot be discovered apart from conditioned phenomena, therefore, we can say with confidence that the conditioned and the unconditioned are nondual. The trick is which version of nonduality you are invoking. This nonduality of the conditioned and unconditioned cannot apply to the first two nondualities for various reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: what is a melong?

Content:

Jikan said:

Thanks to all for the helpful responses. quick follow-up on Dzogchen Community specific applications of the melong:

Have there been design changes in the DC-made melongs? The new ones have the

Longsal symbol on the back, while I think I remember seeing some with a different design on the back (with the six syllables around the edge if memory serves). Is there a difference in function for each of these, or does the change in design reflect different considerations? or am I completely mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are three versions. The oldest version that has a triangle with a bliss swirl in the center. The version which has been in service since early ninties that has the syllables of the six lokas as well as a the longsal symbol, and the smaller version that has only the longsal symbol.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The essence of the mind cannot be different than mind, otherwise it would not be the essence of the mind. It would be like suggesting that fire and the nature of fire [heat] were distinct.

dzogchungpa said:

This essence of the mind is the same as what they call the basis of the individual in Dzogchen?
bump

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

I am just wondering, but how does one personally know "there is just experience"? Of course we all know that anyone can imagine such as state but what the imagination concocts doesn't mean it is either real or attainable.

Astus said:

If there is something that is not an experience you don't experience it, consequently you don't know anything about it. What is not an experience is nothing more than a presumption, a hypothesis, a fantasy, an idea.

Koji said:

When you said ealier: There is neither an experienter nor an experienced, there is just

experience, and even that is empty, does this pertain to "a presumption, a hypothesis, a fantasy, an idea"?

Malcolm wrote:

The emptiness of things is even something you assent to, Ardent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

So this is not the views and tenet system you claimed to not have?

Malcolm wrote:

The essence of the mind is not something you need to analyze to discover. When you have discovered you do not need a theory to account for it, no more than you need a theory to account for the heat of a fire once you have been burned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

I guess you think there is a Self too since you also think that Buddhahood is not an aggregate.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhahood is merely the realization of the nature of phenomena, that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Longde Teachings

Content:

oldbob said:

For me, it is enough that people have a pointing out instruction on the nature of mind, and then remember that everything is included in the infinite potentiality of nature of mind.

Sönam said:

This is also what ChNN says ... integration.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but the question is what is required to practice the methods of Long sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

conebeckham said:

Agreed....though we can discuss the differences between Thamal Gyi She Pa, so-called "Ordinary Mind," and discursive thinking, etc....these are terms of art, I think. Ultimately, there is only one thing...but it ain't a Self.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Yangongpa, the term tha mal gyi shes pa is just a yogis term for wisdom (ye shes). He mentions this in his commentary on Sahaja Mahāmudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that Buddhahood was an aggregate, I cited a sūtra that states quite unequivocally that buddhahood is to be sought in one's mind, and not elsewhere.

conebeckham said:

Agreed. Mind is an aggregate, that should be obvious to anyone with a handful of Dharma study. And it should also be obvious to all that Buddhahood should be sought "in one's mind."

But Buddhahood is not "mind." It is related to Nature of Mind, which is different from Mind. Put another way, we must use "mind" to identify Nature of Mind.....that is the first step. But equating Nature of Mind with a "Great Self" is a slippery slope....expedient means, maybe, for some.

Malcolm wrote:

The essence of the mind cannot be different than mind, otherwise it would not be the essence of the mind. It would be like suggesting that fire and the nature of fire [heat] were distinct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Do you consider the Mind to be an Aggregate?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course it is an aggregate: manas, vijñāna and citta are all synonyms.

Son of Buddha said:

then as the sutras and suttas I quoted state Buddhahood is not an Aggregate
so do you take Buddhahood to be an Aggregate even though the suttas/sutras say it is not?

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that Buddhahood was an aggregate, I cited a sūtra that states quite unequivocally that buddhahood is to be sought in one's mind, and not elsewhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

you represent the tenet system called Dzogchen.....hence why it has a label for which to label itself and its followers.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a tenet system.

Son of Buddha said:

sure it is

do you receive a teaching in Dzogchen from a teacher?

what is his teachings to you???

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is one's state which can be discovered. It is not something about which one needs to speculate and analyze.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Do you consider the Mind to be an Aggregate?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course it is an aggregate: manas, vijñāna and citta are all synonyms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

you represent the tenet system called Dzogchen.....hence why it has a label for which to label itself and its followers.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a tenet system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

(P.S. when did I say Buddhahood lies outside the mind?)

Malcolm wrote:

When you said that your truly existent self lies outside of the aggregates, and that that is buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: 13 Precious Drikung Kagyu Empowerments

Content:

heart said:

I really think you have to watch this live if you really want the empowerment. Recordings are no good.

/magnus

Karma Dorje said:

Magnus is right, the dharmakaya only pervades everything during the empowerment. The rest of the time you are SOL.

Malcolm wrote:

If people have faith in this, then fine. I don't personally believe one can receive a valid empowerment though a recording. But that is just me following the advice of my guru. Your mileage might vary.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

I represent one view you represent another view.....hence a living example of your duality.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't represent a view or a tenet system. But when I examine what is stated in Buddhist texts, I do not see your view of them to be a very accurate picture.

For example, The Aryātajñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra claims: The mind is realized; since it is wisdom one should meditate on the idea of not seeking buddhahood elsewhere.

The tenet system of you, Ardent, Vidyārāja, etc., is too seek a buddhahood that lies outside of the mind, the opposite of this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

as did all the Tantras and Sutras err in doing the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

The sūtras and tantras do not make that error at all.

As Kamalaśīla points out in his commentary on the Vajracchedika sūtra, "While the Tathāgata cannot be seen because by perfect marks, nevertheless, he can be seen through ultimate dharmatā."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

No-self is not a thing, it is a statement that something is without self, that is, a permanent identity. Self, on the other hand, is the concept that there is a permanent identity.

Malcolm wrote:

You're completely ensnared into a dualism vis a vie self and no self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

Actually I was trying to make the point that the conclusion is not that simple.

Malcolm wrote:

It's pretty simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

That would simply mean that there is no conditioned, no compounded, no born, no transcended. And that would simply mean that all that is experienced is nothing but an illusion, a hallucination.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The core of the conditioned is unconditioned.

Sherab said:

So the core of the compounded is uncompounded, the core of the born is unborn, the core of the transcended is untranscended?

Malcolm wrote:

I agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

conebeckham said:

It doesn't operate through the mental consciousness, either, if I recall, as that is transformed into a wisdom....??

Malcolm wrote:

Sense organs means all six.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you are a follower of Madhyamaka.

Astus said:

I don't see how an independent awareness could fit into... Yogacara either.

Malcolm wrote:

There exists a detailed defense of reflexive cognition in Ratnakarashanti's Madhyamakālaṃkāra, not to mention the fact that epistemologists like Dharmakīrti extensively advance the idea.

Further in secret mantra it is stated that the wisdom of a tathāgata is a reflexive cognition, not only is it a reflexive cognition but it does not operate through sense organs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

A knowing/awareness cannot be experienced - only assumed - existing in and of itself. There is always something known, there is always a content of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you are a follower of Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

conebeckham said:

Indeed, Anjali, this is my understanding as well. I try to be a good Kagyupa, myself....

Per 3rd Karmapa's Mahamudra prayer, Mind does not "exist." But Mind cannot be said to be "nonexistent." This is Tantra, but let's forget that distinction for the moment. I think you can find plenty of Sutra and Shastra sources regarding Mind, or perhaps Mere Awareness. Consciousness at it's most basic level. A "Knowing."

I think this is the sort of thing that some folks equate with the "Great Self," though my readings thus far have made it clear to me that using "self" is a bit of a misnomer, and leads to a variety of problems, many of which are outlined here on this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because the term bdag nyid chen po has a different connotation than those people who merely blindly translate things literally.

The term is carefully explained by Nubchen Sangye Yeshe to mean that all phenomena are included in the state of Samantabhadra. This then is the meaning of mahātman, bdag nyid chen po, in Dzogchen teachings in general.

In general, the way the term is used in sutras and tantras is as a title, i.e., "great persons", mahātmās.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: when and where ? Chöd wang and lung

Content:

akatararyo said:

It is my understanding that the Chod from the Dudjom Tersar does not require empowerment to practice since there is no self-generation and T'hroma is visualized above your head.

Malcolm wrote:

You are going to find a lot of disagreement about that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I was not saying that shes rig becomes in the sense of arising. Merely that it becomes conditioned when it becomes involved in object imputation. The notion that shes rig is momentary depends on the conventional status of mind moments. Now granted, Sakya Pandita argues that timeless moments are immune to Madhyamaka reasonings, which according to him only apply to moments with temporal phases. This becomes very similar to the idea that shes rig is unconditioned because timeless moments would themselves be unconditioned with no possibility of any intervals between their instantiation. Of course we are then left with the quandary of what do to with timeless times. Sometimes in the Dzogchen texts you see reference to a fourth time, which is a state beyond the three times, past, present and future.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, this brings up a subject I've wanted to ask about for a long time, namely the nature of time in Buddhism generally, and Dzogchen in particular. It seems to me that a lot of what underlies the kind of argument you see in this thread is that we don't really understand what time is. Does Dzogchen have something distinctive to say about time?

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, time is not established of Nāgārjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Indrajala said:

In East Asia there was monasticism, sure, but it was quite different from the prescribed Indian model. Not quite "lay" but not really in line with the Vinaya either.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, a major difference too was that in Tibet there was already a strong ritualist class that took to the imported Indian rituals like ducks to water. These ritualists performed vital economic functions in the Tibetan economy such as warding off rain, hail, ensuring harvests and calves, etc., exorcising spirits connected with contagious illnesses, herbalism and so on. On the other hand, Monastics in Tibet had little to offer the lay population, since their main function was conducting state rites just like the kind of early Vajrayāna we see about the same time in Japan and China. When the monastic establishment failed in Central Tibet in the 840's, during the Asian economic downturn of the late Tang, the Buddhist ritualists in Tibet continued to provide valued services to the local populations. It was only after the monastic establishment began to integrate these local services and allied themselves with the aristocratic families like the Khon during the 11th century and so on that the populace really began to lend wholesale support to monastic establishment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, shes rig is unconditioned and timeless because time and conditions are not established in any way, but the fact of knowing awareness is indisputable, becoming conditioned only when it becomes entangled in dualistic cognitions.

dzogchungpa said:

I find statements like these very confusing. "When" would something timeless "become" at all?

Malcolm wrote:

I was not saying that shes rig becomes in the sense of arising. Merely that it becomes conditioned when it becomes involved in object imputation. The notion that shes rig is momentary depends on the conventional status of mind moments. Now granted, Sakya Pandita argues that timeless moments are immune to Madhyamaka reasonings, which according to him only apply to moments with temporal phases. This becomes very similar to the idea that shes rig is unconditioned because timeless moments would themselves be unconditioned with no possibility of any intervals between their instantiation. Of course we are then left with the quandary of what to do with timeless times. Sometimes in the Dzogchen texts you see reference to a fourth time, which is a state beyond the three times, past, present and future.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

If no, then what is your definition of "unconditioned" and "conditioned"?

Malcolm wrote:

I just stated at the outset that the conditioned and the unconditioned are not mutually exclusive.

The unconditioned and the conditioned, as I have already stated, are neither the same nor different.

The nature of the conditioned is non-arising. Whatever does not arise is unconditioned. Non-arising, unconditioned, suchness, etc., are all synonyms.

This is why Manjushri says "Whatever is dependently originated does not truly arise."

The core of the conditioned is unconditioned.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

“Nonabiding is without any fundamental [basis]. Mañjuśrī, all dharmas are established on the fundamental [basis] of nonabiding.”[/i]
(Vimalakirti Sutra, ch 7, p 126-127; tr. McRae)

Sherab said:

Understanding this is not as easy as it looks.

Malcolm wrote:

It just means that the "unconditioned and the conditioned" are in a nondual state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

If emptiness is equated with dependent origination, then if emptiness is unconditioned, dependent origination must also be unconditioned. If dependent origination is unconditioned, then causality must also be unconditioned. In other words, there is no cause for causality, which is a contradiction in terms.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is the nature of that which is dependently originated, that's all. What is the dependently originated empty of? All extremes. That emptiness is unconditioned. That emptiness is suchness. Suchness, by every definition is unconditioned. This being the case, as I said, the conditioned and the unconditioned are not mutually exclusive since the conditioned has an unconditioned nature.

The Samdhinirmocana has a nice explanation of how dharma and dharmatā are neither the same nor different.

M

conebeckham said:

But what about Bare Awareness? Im not speaking of "mind," as in consciousness, mindstream, but of the very awareness itself....it is taught, is it not, that this is

unconditioned? It is also taught that it is "empty."

Malcolm wrote:

There are two ways this can be sliced: the first way, the Sakya approach, is to assert that knowing awareness (shes rig) is relative and momentary, its emptiness is ultimate, and that the two are inseparable.

The second way to slice this is that time is predicated on objects (cf Vasubandhu) and that as objects are not established, time is not established (cf Nāgārjuna), leaving shes rig in an unconditioned state since it is not conditioned by objects (upon which imputations of time are dependent). In other words, shes rig is unconditioned and timeless because time and conditions are not established in any way, but the fact of knowing awareness is indisputable, becoming conditioned only when it becomes entangled in dualistic cognitions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Soreness in thighs.

Content:

philji said:

Any ideas or tips for dealing with pain and stiffness in thighs, especially after sitting. I have been doing more sitting of late but am noticing a real stiffness in my thigh muscles...hobbling around for a while like an old man...well I am quite old!!!!!!

Malcolm wrote:

light yoga, especially with postures held for several minutes like Paschimottasana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

The problem is that "vertical" dependence demands a starting point. The question then is: Is this starting point conditioned or unconditioned? If it is conditioned, then it cannot be the starting point. If it is unconditioned, how can it be the cause of all the others that is above it?

Malcolm wrote:

You are just falling into the same trap as Ardent and Co.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

If emptiness is equated with dependent origination, then if emptiness is unconditioned, dependent origination must also be unconditioned. If dependent origination is unconditioned, then causality must also be unconditioned. In other words, there is no cause for causality, which is a contradiction in terms.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is the nature of that which is dependently originated, that's all. What is the dependently originated empty of? All extremes. That emptiness is unconditioned. That emptiness is suchness. Suchness, by every definition is unconditioned. This being the case, as I said, the conditioned and the unconditioned are not mutually exclusive since the conditioned has an unconditioned nature.

The Samdhinirmocana has a nice explanation of how dharma and dharmatā are neither the same nor different.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

mutsum said:

But my point was that the monks consider the Bon western sangha as made of apes (dixit for males) and cows (dixit for females) just good enough to pay for "retreats" (which in my opinion are often only a series of "conferences"...).

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is just standard Xenophobia.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

mutsum said:

tibetan monks are very rarely willing to share that ritual training.

Malcolm wrote:

Which, honestly speaking, is not freaking rocket science.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

You should say both Ardent and the Buddha romantically see the skandhas as a Mara. It would be more accurate Avuso.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, that is one view of the matter. Not the final word however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

This means that the real reality is that there is a relation between the ultimate and the relative, the transcendent and the mundane. That is why it is so difficult to get one's head around it.

Malcolm wrote:

The prajñāpāramitā solution is that the unconditioned and the conditioned are not mutually exclusive, in fact, the nature of the conditioned is unconditioned, and that is what emptiness basically means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Indrajala said:

In fact, I'd argue a lay priesthood is far more adaptable to changing circumstances than a monastic community is.

Malcolm wrote:

This is precisely the argument used in Tibetan history for the existence of sngags pas. When monks fled the chaos that ensued after Langdarma was assassinated for proposing to tax the monasteries, Buddhadharma primarily survived due to the interest of aristocratic Clans such as the Khon and so on in preserving Buddhist teachings within their families.

After China's economy stabilized in the late tenth century, and trade between Tibet and

China was no longer so disrupted, then the monastic community who had survived the travails of that epoch returned to Central Tibet and reestablished monasteries, encouraged by royal support.

The other factor too is that in Tibet, sngags pas are not really considered "lay" in the sense understood here in the West. They have undergone a kind of ordination, They have vows that are distinct from monastic vows, they also have garb to wear, etc. They are educated, which sets them apart from the average person and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, the problem as I see it is that line of reasoning employed by Ardent (Koji), VidyArAja, and so on is that unconditioned and conditioned phenomena are mutually exclusive.

For them the unconditioned is Self even if they cannot precisely say what that Self is (and they never seem to be able to).

Vidyārāja sees this self as the one who is aware (since he keeps asking who or what is aware of emptiness) -- this is very similar to the Samkhya based metaphysics of all the Hindu systems.

Ardent romantically sees the skandas as a mara (though how Ardent live with himself with such a negative view of his psychosomatic continuum is anyone's guess).

In other words, their view is very Manichaen, since they are addicted to an absolute dichotomy between the conditioned and unconditioned or Gnostic, in the sense that the material universe is evil and they are seekers of metanoia so they may return to the pleroma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Longde Teachings

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Does this mean that a person could get this and practice it?

Malcolm wrote:

It means they practice Nhondzog Gyalpo, not Longde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: wallowing

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Luke, I am not sure how standalone Vajrasattva practice normally works in Sakya, there is the 100 syllable mantra in some sadhana, but I do not know anyone who does it as a standalone thing...

Malcolm wrote:

You do the refuge, bodhicitta and then Vajraheruka, then dedication. It is pretty straight forward. Dezhung Rinpoche's text has a dedication specifically for people who are only working on that section.

If you have received any major Sakya empowerment such as Hevajra, etc., you already have the empowerment.

I did the entire Sakya ngondro and a three year retreat in the Sakya system, FYI.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Dolpopa was very clear that the Buddhist Idea of True Self was not the same as the Forders....The problem he stated with the forders Idea of "Self" is that they considered impermanent things to be the Self....

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously, Dolbupa was completely ignorant of what non-Buddhists believed about "the self".

Son of Buddha said:

(I highlighted Blue on your very quote)they considered that which was not Noumena to be Noumena, and imputed what was impermanent to be that which is permanentin Dolpopas argument he states the the forders views did not actually contain the self of thusness,the pure self(ect)

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously Dolbupa erred in attributing truly existent characteristics to the signless.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Sat is what is veridical. Look to the meaning of the underlying ideas. From Gaudapada's verses on the Mandukya Upanisad:

Malcolm wrote:

It is also what is existent, for example, Samkhya is characterized as a satkaryavāda i.e. advocates (vāda) of production (karma) from an existent (sat).

There is a correspondence in Indian philosophy between what is veridical and what is existent. To deny this is to deny 3000 years of Indian thinking on the subject.

sat mf(%{satl4})n. (pr. p. of 1. %{as}) being , existing , occurring , happening , being present (%{sato@me} , ` " when I was present " ; often connected with other participles or with an adverb e.g. %{nAmni@kRte@sati} , ` " when the name has been given " ; %{tathA@sati} , ` " if it be so " ; also ibc. , where sometimes = ` " possessed of " cf. %{sat-kalpavRkSa}) RV. &c. &c. ; abiding in (loc.) MBh. ; belonging to (gen.) S3Br. ; living Mun2d2Up. ; lasting , enduring Ka1v. RV. &c. &c. ; real , actual , as any one or anything ought to be , true , good , right (%{tan@na@sat} , ` " that is not right ") , beautiful , wise , venerable , honest (often in comp. see below) RV. &c. &c. ; m. a being , (pl.) beings , creatures RV. &c. ; a good or wise man , a sage MBh. R. ; good or honest or wise or respectable people Mn. MBh. &c. ; (%{l4}) f. see %{sati4} below ; (%{sat}) n. that which really is , entity or existence , essence , the true being or really existent (in the Veda7nta , ` " the self-existent or Universal Spirit , Brahma ") RV. &c. &c. ; that which is good or real or true , good , advantage , reality , truth ib. ; water Naigh. i , 12 ; (in gram.) the terminations of the present participle Pa1n2. 3-2 , 127 &c. ; (%{sat}) ind. (cf. %{sat-kR} &c.) well , right , fitly. [Cf. Gk. \$ for \$; Lat. {sens} in &343162[1134 ,2] {absens} , {pra-sens} ; {sons} , ` " guilty " , orig. ` " the real doer " ; Lith. {sa1s} , {e4sas} ; Slav. {sy} , {sas8ta}.]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

anjali said:

Let's run with this. Unfortunately, I'm not very familiar with Gaudapada and his teachings. How does he characterize sat in his system of thought? A specific quote

would be very helpful, then we can take a look at how sat compares with emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty straightforward. In his Karikas he argues that if the ultimate is unreal, there cannot be any illusion of birth or actual birth using the example of a barren woman.

"The unreal cannot be born either really or through Māya. For the son of a barren woman is born neither in reality nor in illusion."

In other words, Gaudapada's theory of dualistic appearances depends on the reality of nondual brahman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Jikan said:

I don't speak business-ese and I'd like to give the good people at Tara Mandala the benefit of the doubt. Can anyone clarify what is meant by "competitiveness" in this context? Does it mean that the center is interested in ensuring that their rates & fees &c are priced at about the same level as other comparable centers? Or...?

Malcolm wrote:

I think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So, I don't really agree that all these systems are trying to get the same point, or have the same path, etc. As far as I can tell, Advaitans are climbing up one mountain, Buddhists are climbing a different mountain altogether.

dzogchungpa said:

One man's mountain is another man's valley, I always say.

Seriously though, which mountain are Dzogchenpas climbing?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Receive the advaita upadesha yourself and compare. Otherwise it is just so much comparing liquids based on the differences in the vessels which contain them. Of course the paths are different. After many years of practicing both, it's not so clear to me that there is much real difference in fruit.

Malcolm wrote:

Since the reduction of afflictions is the elementary point of both systems, I am perfectly content to grant that both systems provide the means the suppress afflictions.

I find the element of insight lacking in Hindu systems, as well as bodhicitta. There is no bodhicitta in Hindu systems of any sort whatsoever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

An aside, Nakamura in his important ground breaking work, A History of Early Vedanta Philosophy, has a lot to say about Buddhism and Vedanta. Buddhists should be cautious about asserting that some elements of Buddhism have been influenced by Vedanta. In the case of early Buddhism there was no Vedanta school. Also, Nakamura points out that "quite a few of the Vedanta lines have been greatly influenced by Buddhism, with Buddhist thought pervading them through and through"!

Malcolm wrote:

Oh lord, Ardent, you have not said one damn new thing in 18 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

But sat does not mean existent. Gaudapada was well acquainted with the tetralemma.

The reality of the matter is that ALL systems that posit a non-dual reality that is merely covered over by prapancha are just different philosophical franchises serving up the same tasty patties of ground beef and batons of deep-fried potato, whether on the one hand the cipher used is "emptiness" or on the other hand "Brahman". Their various brands, trademarks, hermeneutical approaches and excuses for why they are right and the other guy is wrong speak only to the different habituations of those to be tamed. One doesn't have to be a perennialist to see this.

Malcolm wrote:

What non-dual means in Buddhadharma is really quite different than what it means say to Sankara and even Gaudapada. Gaudapada may have been sympathetic towards Mahāyāna philosophy, and in the Agamasāstra he indiscriminately cribbed yogacara and madhyamaka arguments to refute Samkhya and Vaṣesika and so on.

What nisprapañca means is also different in these systems.

So, I don't really agree that all these systems are trying to get the same point, or have the same path, etc. As far as I can tell, Advaitans are climbing up one mountain, Buddhists are climbing a different mountain altogether.

Apart from a common agreement that kleśas are what is responsible for transmigration, I don't see these systems as having much in common in terms of how they present the basis, the path and the result.

Also I really don't agree that brahman = śūnyatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

anjali said:

What is the status of the Self's existence? Would you characterize the Self as existent, non-existent, both or neither? Would you characterize it as empty?

Lotus_Bitch said:

In non-dualist philosophies such as Kashmiri Shaivism and Advaita Vedanta respectively: Shiva and Brahman are beyond existence, non-existence, both existence and non-existence and neither existence nor non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

I think this is not really correct. Brahman is ajati because it is unconditioned. It is considered beyond existence and non-existence only in the sense of being conditioned. It is sat, meaning real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Nonetheless, I think what I quoted by Dolpopa on the previous page is quite clearly not the popular no-self notion.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you really understand the citation you cited. I think you lack sufficient education in the hermeneutics of the tantras upon which Dolbupa's entire position is predicated.

Basically, what you have admitted to is that you are merely incorporating some Buddhist masters [you poorly understand] into an over all perennialist agenda. You initiated this by attacking someone whose views you regarded as "heretical" barely even considering that the vast majority of Buddhists would consider your perspective equally outside the pale of Buddhadharma, which it is, by your own admission.

You are a perennialist eclectic, which is fine and dandy, but don't confuse your philosophical tastes with Buddhadharma, for they are not the same.

It would also be good if you learned some humility and stopped pretending you were an expert in teachings which you cannot read in a primary language.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Not who I am in the sense that it isn't my name-form-memories-thoughts or not who I am in the ultimate sense? The Atman isn't personal, but supra-personal, so there is no grasping to self in that sense. Nonetheless, it is the nondual ground of all there is and Tat Tvam Asi.

Malcolm wrote:

If there is a nondual ground of all there is in Mahāyāna, it is emptiness. Not some divine pleroma. In the Nikayas, Buddha explicitly denies the existence of any such ground.

As he was sitting there, he said to the Blessed One, "Now, then, Master Gotama, does everything [2] exist?"

"Everything exists' is the senior form of cosmology, brahman."

"Then, Master Gotama, does everything not exist?"

"Everything does not exist' is the second form of cosmology, brahman."

"Then is everything a Oneness?"

"Everything is a Oneness' is the third form of cosmology, brahman."

"Then is everything a Manyess?"

"Everything is a Manyess' is the fourth form of cosmology, brahman. Avoiding these two extremes, the Tathagata teaches the Dhamma via the middle:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn12/sn12.048.than.html>

Vidyaraja said:

Therefore, the ultimate [reality] in all profound sutras and tantras which finely present thusness, and so forth, is empty of other, never empty of self-nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Dolbupa would be horrified to think that you had so misunderstood his writing. He writes:

"Since the matrix-of-the-one gone-thus is empty of the two selves, it is not similar to the self of the formers, and because uncompounded noumena transcends the momentary, it is permanent, stable, and everlasting. It is not that it, like space, is without any of the qualities, powers, and aspects of a buddha, and it is not like the self of persons that the formers impute to be permanent."

Mountain Doctrine, ppg. 118-119.

But you, from the beginning of this discussion have asserted that the other emptiness asserted by Dolbupa is exactly the affirmation of the atman of the Vedantins and so on.

This is why I say you have no idea what Dolbupa's actual perspective is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Is this clarity who I really am? Have you directly realized this clarity and therefore can say for certain that it is empty of Self, or are you going by the philosophy of others?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not who you are, since it is empty of all extremes. It is who you are since it is the

basis of designating a person. We have an experience of clarity all the time. It is when we mistake the reflections in it for itself, that we reify outer objects as real. When we mistaken it for being a self, or a person, we engage atmagraha, grasping a self.

As it is said in many sutras and tantras, there is no buddhahood outside of the mind.

Vidyaraja said:

Seems that a large number of Buddhists (who incidentally buy into the no-self doctrine) are depressed, self-hating, and mentally unstable.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really know any Buddhist like that. But I think that people who hang around religion groups in general usually have a lot of issues.

Vidyaraja said:

I think the vision of ultimate truth as expressed Dolpopa or various Hindu sages is a happy one.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I am very convinced by now that you haven't the slightest inkling of what Dolbupa really thinks or why he wrote what he did.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Burning the seed of existence as applying to the empirical self which allows one to transcend the triple realm isn't the same burning away the ultimate Self.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically you erred in the same way all the great mystics outside Buddhadharma have erred. You have mistaken clarity for a self, without realizing that clarity too is empty.

Vidyaraja said:

You said previously that non-conceptual wisdom apprehends emptiness, but what is this non-conceptual wisdom and is it aware? What is the relation between us and this non-conceptual wisdom?

Malcolm wrote:

Nonconceptual wisdom replaces consciousness when knowledge obscurations are total eradicated. If you want to understand how this works, read the Mahāyāna Saṃgraha by Asanga which clearly explains how the aggregates transform into the four

wisdoms.

Some people assert Buddhas cognize normally [Gelug] others assert that Buddhas are free from all cognitions and that their acts are totally spontaneous.

Vidyaraja said:

According this line of thought, two options are available, the reality of some part of me (like awareness or transcendent Self) and suffering, or my negation and absence to be free from suffering?

Malcolm wrote:

You clearly do not understand the purpose of the two truths.

Vidyaraja said:

Yes, it is only my opinion, but as pointed out also the opinion of most of world's sages including Hindu yogis and Buddhist masters like Dolpopa, so I think I am in good company.

Malcolm wrote:

Misery loves company.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Those that do deny the Self I believe are primarily philosophers working with a system of thought, not realized yogis attempting to communicate their experiential realization of deathlessness.

Malcolm wrote:

In your opinion. Others vigorously disagree with your assertion, as do the vast majority of Mahāyāna sutras. How the tathāgatagarbha sutras (a very minor part of the Mahāyāna canon) are to be read is a bit of a contentious issue -- suffice it to say that the commentary on them reads like a standard Madhyamaka text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Now this is only relevant to me of course due to being intertwined with personal experience, but beyond that I think the universality and descriptive proximity of all the

world's sages is more of an objective confirmation of the Self being Truth than the exclusive and minority position of the no-self Buddhists. To accept the latter also entails maintaining the falsity of the rest (or at least lower level, incomplete enlightenment) which isn't something I believe in either.

Malcolm wrote:

The falsity of the rest is something repeatedly stated in the Pali canon and throughout the history of Buddhist critiques of other systems.

In brief, since they never burn the seed of existence because of their extreme views of self, they never get out of the triple realm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that Buddha was aware, indeed, knowledgeable in Samkhya since it was the system taught by Arāda.

Aśvaghoṣa clearly describes Arāda as being a follower of Kaplila, and gives an account of the basics of the Samkhya system in Canto 12...

dzogchungpa said:

Is that the main evidence that the Buddha was familiar with Samkhya?

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Man, it is a real shame for Buddhist philosophy and soteriology if the no-Self doctrine is the actual doctrinal position as its supporters maintain for, if such is truly the case, then Buddhism is a false doctrine. Though at least it would prove that even false doctrines can produce realized sages under the right conditions (such as Dolpopa or those Thai figures who equate nibbana and atta.)

Malcolm wrote:

The teaching of the Buddha is just dependent origination, not self, not no-self.

Sariputra quotes the Buddha:

Whoever sees dependent co-arising sees the Dhamma; whoever sees the Dhamma sees dependent co-arising.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.028.than.html>

And the Buddha said:

He who sees Dhamma, Vakkali, sees me; he who sees me sees Dhamma. Truly seeing Dhamma, one sees me; seeing me one sees Dhamma.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn22/sn22.087x.wlsh.html>

Emptiness of a self as well as the absence of intrinsic identity in phenomena, is merely a consequence of dependent origination.

It is very clear, for example, that the tathāgatagarbha doctrine was swiftly marginalized in mainstream Mahāyāna circles. We can see this by virtue of the fact that the Lankāvatara sūtra clearly describes the ālayavijñāna as being the tathāgatagarbha. There exists but two commentaries devoted to tathāgatagarbha doctrine in the bstan 'gyur.

In general, tathāgatagarbha doctrine becomes more prominent in Vajrayāna for various reasons beyond the scope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Please share your thoughts on this.

Indrajala said:

Tibetan Buddhism in the west could introduce democratic federations which manage common retreat centers for everyone to use. The democracy means, ideally, egalitarianism and neutrality when it comes to lineages and gurus.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, it is McDonald's vs. Burger King thinking. They are all selling burgers and fries, but they all want you to think their burgers and fries are the best.

Here is the breakdown.

McDonalds =- Gelugpas

Burger King = Kagyus

Wendy's = Sakya

KFC/Taco Bell = Nyingma

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

The Buddha rejected the interpretation that there is a self outside the aggregates, and some assumed this is somehow related to Samkhya (<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.022.than.html#fn-8>). Although I don't think it really matters whether Samkhya was known or not, as their views don't fit the Buddha's teachings anyway.

Koji said:

There is no passage in the nikayas that states, unambiguously, the Buddha "rejected the interpretation that there is a self outside the aggregates." To assert such is also to assert there is nothing outside or beyond the five murderous aggregates (S.iii.114) which also happen to be Mara the killer (S.iii.189). Neither the Buddha nor his disciples identified their self with the aggregates anymore then they might identify their self with a burning pile of grass, twigs, branches and foliage.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Ardent:

Isn't boring to rehash arguments we had on AOL?

Vasubandhu (cf. Poussin/Pruden) quotes several sources from the Agamas having stated his thesis at the outset:

"There is neither direct perception nor inference of a soul (atman) independent of the skandhas. We know then that a real soul does not exist."

He then cites his authorities such as the Bimbisāra sūtra:

"A stupid ignorant Prthagjana becomes attached to words, and he imagines there is a self; but there is no self nor things pertaining to a self, but only past, present and future painful dharmas".

He cites another, also cited in the Sūtrālaṃkāra:

"Five calamities proceed from the belief in a soul(atman): one creates a theory of a soul, of a being, of a vital principle, one is not distinguished from heterodox teachers...: etc. Even the tathāgatarbha sūtras take great pains to differentiate their "atman" from the atman posited by Pudgalavadins and Hindus because the tatāgatarbha is merely a gloss for dharmatā.

For example, Ārya-tathāgatarbha-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

Whether or not that dharmatā of dharmas produces tathāgatas, these sentient beings always contain tathāgatarbha.

Now, depending on what you understand dharmatā to mean, then you will understand this in that light. But since there can be no dharmatā without dharmas, it is ludicrous to

say this if this tathagātagarbha is other than the aggregates it is also the nature of the aggregates.

Personally, my impression of the main message of the tathagatagarbha sutras is that people should not feel awakening is beyond their capacity. For example, is how this passage from the Tathāgatagarbha sūtra reads:

"Sons of a good family, in the same way all sentient beings are without protection, are tormented with the sufferings of samsara, abiding in a house without a protector, the place of birth in the world. Now, the family of tathagatas exists in all sentient beings, but those it exists in them, those sentient being do not comprehend this.

Sons of a good family, because the Tathāgata do not malign sentient being themselves, sons of good family, you yourselves must not be disheartened, and have firm diligence! There will come a time when the Tathāgata enters into you and you will enter into the ranks of the bodhisattvas and will not be called "sentient beings". Further, when you have entered the ranks of the buddhas, you will not be called "bodhisattvas".

And:

It was taught, "Sentient beings who do not understand dharmatā, do not generate the thought of 'I am inferior'!"

You must set out with firm diligence,
your own body will become a victor without long delay.

Once one has obtained the heart of awakening,
one will be able to liberate 10,000,000,000 creatures.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

smcj said:

otherwise you get every Tom, Dick and Harry wearing robes and parroting something they have heard ...

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm and how is this different than the present state of Tibetan Buddhism, apart from that fact that their names are Tashi, Dondrup and Phuntsog?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

smcj said:

The massive resentment many, if not most of us, have towards institutional religion isn't even on their radar, for the most part.

Malcolm wrote:

It is, but they ridicule it, thinking our antipathy towards organized religion is about God, when instead our antipathy towards organized religion is really more about money and power.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Pande concludes by saying,

"It appears that Sāṅkhya influence on Buddhism has been too lightly assumed" (p. 551).

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that Samkhya was a major influence of Buddhism, did I? No.

What I said was that Buddha was aware, indeed, knowledgeable in Samkhya since it was the system taught by Arāda.

Aśvaghoṣa clearly describes Arāda as being a follower of Kapila, and gives an account of the basics of the Samkhya system in Canto 12 (truly required reading for everyone participating in this discussion).

So, frankly, I think Aśvaghoṣa is a more reliable source than Pande, don't you, Ardent?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well.....is it the students, or the teachers, who foster this sort of thing? That is the primary question you should ask yourself.

And when you've reached your conclusions, consider your alternatives.

Malcolm wrote:

In my experience, it is the teachers, mostly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I have been giving a lot of thought lately to how we as Tibetan Buddhists spend our limited resources in the West. It seems that instead of cooperating with each other to share teaching and retreat facilities, we are repeating the same balkanized organizational structures as in Tibet and the Tibetan diaspora and actually approaching other groups as competition. This to my mind is entirely counterproductive. While there are bigger differences with other forms of Buddhism from other countries, one would think that the schools are close enough to cooperate more closely in the West than they have. Instead we see even lineages within the same school competing.

Please share your thoughts on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Turf war.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Tattoos

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Any idea if he got these pre- or post-Chinese invasion, before or after going into exile? Not that it really matters, simply curious.

By the by, I've heard the eternal knot referred to as the Tibetan form of the swastika. Does anyone know if that is accurate, or is it just a bunch of hokum?

Malcolm wrote:

In the fifties, I assume, when he was mainly in Derge studying with Jamyang Khentse Chokyi Lodo.

Hokum.

Swastikas are called gyung drung in Tibetan, as in gyung drung bon. Eternal knots are called dpal be'u. dPal be'u is a translation of śrīvatsa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Westerner who really makes it work at Sera

Content:

JKhedrup said:

LOL Malcolm it wasn't my answer, it was the Rikchung's answer. I thought your point

made sense, and so asked Geshe la out of curiosity, he replied with the original answer posted above, which I bolded again, making clear both were necessary in his opinion from the beginning.

In Geshe la's answer he mentions both these imprints from the beginning, so your statement about any being born in the deva realm having sufficient causes for arousing bodhicitta was a bit of a stretch. You cannot really reasonably draw that conclusion from what G. said, as he mentions both CA and BC in his answer. That's all I'm sayin'.

If the requirement of Shinay for the arising of Bodhicitta is something debatable, that would be something to explore. Perhaps there are different views across the traditions,

Malcolm wrote:

I meant in the form realms, actually. The mind of any being in the form realm is concentrated to a degree extraordinary to a human being.

In any event, I think there is a problem of infinite regress in this argument in general. That is why I brought up the Buddha in hell point. This is traditionally where it is considered that Buddha first aroused bodhicitta. But of course it is a myth, and as such subject to interpretations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

It depends on what one believes he wrote. In the Maha-prajnaparamita-shastra N appears to have affirmed the âtman.

"People who understand the meaning (artha) of the Buddhist doctrine and know the designation (prajñapti [Pali, paññatti]) say that the âtman exists. People who do not understand the meaning of the Buddhist doctrine and do not know the designation say that the âtman does not exist."

Malcolm wrote:

This simply means that "the self" exists simply as a designation, not that there is a real atman. A real atman would exist without a designation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Right now a hot debate rages in Thailand among Theravadins, between those who assert

nirvana is anatta and those who assert nirvana is atta. The atta side appears to be winning.

dzogchungpa said:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/115896892/Cholvijarn-Nibbana-As-Self-or-Not-Self-181>

Malcolm wrote:

Regarding Phae Tissadevo's position:

The anattā doctrine is only founding in Buddhism because the Buddha realised attā that is different from conditioned dhammas.

It is pretty clear this Sangharāja never studied Samkhya since in fact that is exactly what the Samkhya/Yoga schools maintains, that self or purusha is completely other than consciousness, senses, sense objects and the material body i.e. the twenty four tattvas (prakṛti, buddhi, ahaṁkara, manas, the five organs, five organs of action, the five subtle elements [tanmatras] and the five gross elements).

If an atman is what one wants to find, then there is no better system of finding it than Samkhya/Yoga.

Of course, Buddha was quite familiar with Samkhya, but for some reason did not present it in his teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Tattoos

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dagchen Rinpoche used to have a Swastika tattooed on the back of his left hand above his thumb. When he arrived here in the US, people freaked out so he had it covered with a bird.

Karma Jinpa said:

Would this happen to be HH Jigdral Dagchen Rinpoche, the high lama in Sakya who consecrated the Tibet Tech prayer wheels?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. He still has an eternal knot on the same place on his right hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

I don't deny internal policing existed before. I'm saying I feel it is increasing over time.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you would have found 1930's US pretty damn oppressive, especially if you were in a union.

The US has always reacted to perceived external threats with invasions of privacy. Modern technology just makes it easier to accomplish and more cost effective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

That doesn't negate the possibility we're seeing increased policing in the west. I don't mean cops on the ground arresting burglars, but behind the scenes surveillance and suppression of dissenting voices.

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sedition_Act_of_1918

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Tattoos

Content:

ngodrup said:

My precious Root Lama, who was born, raised and completed his training and practice in Old Tibet-- was also very traditional, to say the least. This very old school Nyingma yogi had a very small tattoo, clearly visible to anybody who looked close enough-- a swastika. So we cannot say that it was not done.

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dagchen Rinpoche used to have a Swastika tattooed on the back of his left hand above his thumb. When he arrived here in the US, people freaked out so he had it covered with a bird.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Tattoos

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Wondering what various people have heard or experienced regarding Vajrayana subject matter as body art.

I've had different responses depending on the lama I asked... Most Karma Kagyu I'm in contact with have seemed to be ok with the idea as long as my motivation is pure. One Drikungpa said it was ok, but not necessary. Another Drikungpa said it is never ok to purposely harm one's body, and that I should do 1 million Tara mantras instead.

A translator friend warned that getting such tattoos opens one up for harm by demons, specifically those very hostile to the Dharma. Basically it puts a bullseye on ya.

What have you folks heard?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a practitioner of completion stage practices, one Dzogchen manual advises against receiving moxabustion or bloodletting treatments (including acupuncture needles). Tattoos are a form of bloodletting. So, if you are a serious completion stage practitioner, then I would say it is better not to get tattoos. If you are not a completion stage practitioner, then just make sure the tattoo artist is hygienic. It is better if they also are a Dharma person.

Further, do not get tattoos of Dharma themes below the waist, on one's left hand (since that is the one most people in Asia wipe with) and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

I've never studied Theosophy before

Malcolm wrote:

Which is why you don't recognize it in Rhys Davies, Grimm and Coomaraswamies, etc., writings.

Koji said:

This is the no-selfer theosophical ploy which is a kind of ad hominem fallacy. It doesn't

mean Mrs. Rhys Davids, I.B. Horner, Pande, Frauwallner, and the rest are dead wrong. Right now a hot debate rages in Thailand among Theravadins, between those who assert nirvana is anatta and those who assert nirvana is atta. The atta side appears to be winning.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma is not sports, though some people seem to treat it as such.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A mind or an awareness [shes pa] has a "choice" recognition or non-recognition. The recognizing mind is called vidyā or prajñā. The non-recognizing mind is called avidyā.

conebeckham said:

"A mind" or "an awareness" --are these momentary awarenesses? Is it the case that there is a moment of vidyā, followed by a moment of avidyā? Are preceding and subsequent moments of vidyā and avidyā related?

Malcolm wrote:

Not really momentary in the sense we normally think of term, however, yes, vidyā is by definition a moment of unfabricated awareness. Vidyā and avidyā are related since they can be based on the same continuum.

There are two kinds of Buddhahood in Dzogchen, abhisambodhi, which has a non-abiding nirvana; samyaksambodhi which enters nirvana without remainder.

I assume this to be the difference between temporary "abiding" in Rigpa, and the complete eradication of avidyā?

It is the difference between bringing one's practice of Dzogchen to a complete finish in this life or not.

Omniscience arises because the capacity for omniscience is present in the form of potential in the basis.

In order for "capacity" to be present in something, even as potential, doesn't that "something" have to "exist?" In Mahamudra terms, we would say, I think, that it is precisely due to the empty nature of Dharmakaya that such omniscience is possible. In other words, the empty nature of the basis is equivalent to it's "capacity" for anything whatsoever.

[/quote]

No, if that were the case, Dzogchen would be no different than Samkhya. A useful referent is the Sakya concept that lhun grub and gnas 'gyur, natural formation and transformation, are not mutually exclusive. Potentiality can be just as well explained

through emptiness as it can existence, even more easily actually. In general, there is a discussion of the three kāyas of the basis i.e. emptiness, clarity and their inseparability. Because these are present as the basis, the three kāyas can manifest at the time of the result, since their base exists in the basis. But this does not mean that the three kāyas of the basis are identical with the three kāyas of the result. The basis is called the basis precisely because of nonrealization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Are you sure that you are presenting an assertion of Nāgārjuna's? Or a position that he is going to dismantle? Check carefully, you wouldn't want to make a mistake.

Koji said:

It seems that your are suggesting that Nagarjuna is likely to contradict himself in another verse saying, essentially, "Nirvana is of the created realm" or "Nirvana is abhava."

Malcolm wrote:

No, what I am suggesting is that Nāgārjuna's Mūla presents both an opponent's contention and his own refutation and you have to know which is which to properly read him. The reason why Kalupahana's translation is a disaster is that he chose to ignore this. So I am suggesting that you discover this then you will have answered your own question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

I've never studied Theosophy before

Malcolm wrote:

Which is why you don't recognize it in Rhys Davies, Grimm and Coomaraswamies, etc., writings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism by Peter Harvey. If you do not read this, it is really hard to take anything you say about this seriously. It will simply appear as if you are engaging in confirmation bias.

He systematically goes through all the claims your are fond of claiming are grounded in the Pali canon and dismembers them one by one.

Vidyaraja said:

How do you know you weren't engaged in confirmation bias while reading that book and finding it to be true? One can only be taken seriously if they've read this particular book and accepted the authors conclusions? I'll look into it though, thanks for the recommendation.

Malcolm wrote:

Because I am a pretty objective scholar who spends my time weeding away what is not present in the texts I am reading.

Vidyaraja said:

There is a difference between irrational and supra-rational. One can be logical or an accomplished logician but also maintain that truth can't be captured by logic or concepts and can only be directly intuited with our spiritual eye.

Malcolm wrote:

It is irrational to claim that with a map you cannot find a city. What you do not want to do is merely be content with possessing the map without making the journey, but an accurate map is essential to the success of any journey.

You are just mixing everything up into one big stew so you don't know if one minute you are chewing on Theosophy, the next minute Zen, the minute after that Vedanta, then slurping a bit of Dolbupa, etc.

I've never studied Theosophy before, but I don't see why a totalistic view of all Buddhism or all human spiritual endeavor and comparing and contrasting between various views should not prove a fruitful exercise. Either way, in general I agree with Frithjof Schuon about the variety of views:

You aren't comparing between different views -- you are merely changing the color of the light you want to look at.

Buddhadharma is radically different than other traditions. Our view at base is dependent origination. As the Buddha said "He who sees dependent origination, sees the Dharma". There is no room for an ultimate transcendent nirvana, self, etc., except as a provisional view for those afraid of emptiness, as stated in the Lanka-avatara sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Westerner who really makes it work at Sera

Content:

JKhedrup said:

No I don't think so, because the imprints of both the Shinay and bodhicitta must be present, this is clear from the answer. And the imprints for bodhicitta are more difficult to cultivate, many practitioners of different paths attain different levels of calm abiding, bodhicitta is far rarer.

I have heard mentioned by Geshe la and several other masters that BSM was able to arouse Bodhicitta in the hell realm only because of extensive cultivation of love, compassion and so forth in previous lifetimes. The arousing of bodhicitta in hell is extremely rare, most beings give rise to it in the human realm. I would think the imprints for Shinay are far more common, since many beings have at some point been born in the Devas realms that require its cultivation.

Since BSM arising of BC required both these imprints (compassion etc. as well as Shinay), I don't think you can draw that conclusion from what Geshe la said. Because in these deva realms most beings are not cultivating BC. It is clear that both are required, one isn't enough, as G. indicated in his answer:

Just as the imprints for bodhicitta were there, which allowed it to be arisen from hell from witnessing the suffering there, a level of calm abiding had been attained in a previous life.

Malcolm wrote:

Even Rakshasas love their children, so I find their answer a bit hard to accept. But that is not what I am objecting too. I am objecting to the idea that śamatha is a necessary precondition to the arousal of bodhicitta. Now you are answering that imprints for both must be present. So you are shifting your answer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is both, and the former will lead to the latter, which is why Āryadeva proclaimed "Realization proceeds from view." This is why there is such a huge emphasis on developing a correct view in sūtrayāna. Whereas in Vajrayāna in general, the view is taught only after empowerment, because the view cultivated in Vajrayāna should be cultivated on the basis of the experience produced during one of the empowerments (but the Gelugpas have a different perspective on this).

Vidyaraja said:

It isn't both, because I didn't ask if both were needed or useful. Rather I asked whether logic and concepts could ever capture truth, not whether they could lead to truth along with spiritual practice. What is a right view can only be truly confirmed through awakening and seeing things how they really are, not relying on the logical structures built by others, which are merely an aid or a single wing of a bird (the other being practice) in flight toward truth.

Malcolm wrote:

It is both, because in order to realize a thing, you need to be able to talk about.

This is very clearly explained by _all_ Indo-tibetan scholars including Dolbupa. He does not subscribe to your irrational mysticism at all. He is a very logical scholar, who goes step by step in presenting his logical, rational, carefully argued view because he wants people to use that as the basis of realizing the ultimate.

You are just mixing everything up into one big stew so you don't know if one minute you are chewing on Theosophy, the next minute Zen, the minute after that Vedanta, then slurping a bit of Dolbupa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They are dreaming. Such a doctrine exists nowhere in the Nikayas.

Vidyaraja said:

That's your opinion and your view. The various scholars mentioned previously as well as various figures in Thai Buddhism for example hold a different view. While you certainly know your stuff, you'll have to excuse me if I don't take you as a superior authority to them.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, you really need to read this book -- it will set your ideas about the Pali canon to rest completely.

The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism by Peter Harvey. If you do not read this, it is really hard to take anything you say about this seriously. It will simply appear as if you are engaging in confirmation bias.

He systematically goes through all the claims your are fond of claiming are grounded in the Pali canon and dismembers them one by one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

In any case, is truth able to be captured by logic or concepts, or is it supra-rational and beyond concepts? Is it knowable through reasoning, or must one awakening to it through kensho and satori as the Zen tradition would have it?

Malcolm wrote:

It is both, and the former will lead to the latter, which is why Āryadeva proclaimed "Realization proceeds from view." This is why there is such a huge emphasis on developing a correct view in sūtrayāna. Whereas in Vajrayāna in general, the view is taught only after empowerment, because the view cultivated in Vajrayāna should be cultivated on the basis of the experience produced during one of the empowerments (but the Gelugpas have a different perspective on this).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Malcolm, earlier you spoke about an "eternalist vision of nirvana" (Wed Sep 18, 2013 6:31 am). I am just wondering what an eternalist vision of nirvana is, exactly. Would it be outside of the realm of existence and non-existence?

Malcolm wrote:

The eternalist vision of nirvana that nirvana is as an unconditioned state to be realized, like brahman.

The non-eternalist view of nirvana (erroneously considered annihilationist in some quarters) is that nirvana is the permanent cessation of afflictions which lead to rebirth in samsara, leading to cessation of birth in samsara.

Koji said:

I read you as saying an unconditioned nirvana, like the Hindu brahman, is the eternalist vision of nirvana which, incidentally, is a view that you believe we must reject. But it is hard for me to wrap my mind around this let alone accept it when I have read from other sources like Nagarjuna's MMK, that nirvana is of the uncreated realm (XXV.13) which is different that the created realm of existence and non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you sure that you are presenting an assertion of Nāgārjuna's? Or a position that he is going to dismantle? Check carefully, you wouldn't want to make a mistake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What about it? First of all, we have to understand the basis is empty, not just empty, since it is also clear but that emptiness is profound. This is fundamental in Dzogchen. Rig pa is not some permanent transcendent awareness. There is a point in time in which rig pa has not arisen, prior to the realization producing buddhas and nonrealization producing sentient beings. But this is a little outside the scope. Basically vidyā is just the mind that knows the appearance of the display as its own appearances. Avidyā is the mind that does not know that. Simple as pie.

conebeckham said:

I'd like to know more about the point in time prior to Rigpa's arising..but agree that's outside the scope.

The statement about vidyā and Avidyā, though.....there is the same "mind" that knows or does not know? Or are we speaking of momentary "minds"-and what of the Enlightened Ones, who abide permanently in vidyā? Or do they?

Malcolm wrote:

A mind or an awareness [shes pa] has a "choice" recognition or non-recognition. The recognizing mind is called vidyā or prajñā. The non-recognizing mind is called avidyā.

There are two kinds of Buddhahood in Dzogchen, abhisambodhi, which has a non-abiding nirvana; samyaksambodhi which enters nirvana without remainder.

Omniscience arises because the capacity for omniscience is present in the form of potential in the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

My understanding of Prasangika Mahdyamika (and someone please correct if i'm wrong) is not that it claims Nirvana is non-existence or something similar, it simply claims that inherent existence of anything is not findable, and it stops there, there is no underlying implication of inherent non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is the Sautrantikas following tenets who assert that nirvana is a nonexistent.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I don't get it Malcolm, so it's correct that Prasangika does not make statements about ultimate reality, or it is incorrect?

Malcolm wrote:

They do not use syllogisms to prove emptiness. They use consequences. For example, "Production from self is meaningless and the series will be endless." This the classical example of prasanga argumentation, argument by means of demonstrating consequences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Yes, nirvana is supra-personal, but it is also awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

This is stated in no sūtra.

Vidyaraja said:

There was a thread on this forum called Mind vs. Self in which a few users argued quite successfully in my opinion, using citations from various scriptures including the Nikayas, for the transcendent Self. Many other intelligent scholars as well as Buddhist masters (like Dolpopa mentioned frequently in this thread) have also maintained this view. I don't think their conclusions were reached without long study or careful consideration and thus can't be said to be simply dreaming.

Malcolm wrote:

They are dreaming. Such a doctrine exists nowhere in the Nikayas.

Dolbupa was a Vajrayāna scholar first and foremost, and the majority of his views are derived from the way in which he read the three bodhisattva commentaries on Kalacakra, Hevajra, and Cakrasamvara respectively authored by Mañjuśrī, Vajragarbha, and Avalokiteśvara according to tradition.

Vidyaraja said:

Though I wonder, why are you hardline in your position that any Self is wrong and all the trends in Buddhism which have maintained it are in error, but soft and accepting of Stephen Batchelor's materialistic secular Buddhism as part of the Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

I think Batchelor is as wrong as you are. I accept his presence in Buddhism as I accept yours, both with views in need of correction since both you and he are porting views into Buddhadharma from external sources, in your case Vedanta/Neoplatonism; in his case, secular materialism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Westerner who really makes it work at Sera

Content:

JKhedrup said:

You are on the ball Malcolm... I think it is a very reasonable qualm so I asked Geshe SN what he thought of it while bringing his evening drink.

Geshe la said the Rikchung candidate was correct, in asserting calm abiding/shinay was necessary for the attainment of bodhicitta.

How then, does one explain Lord Shakyamuni's arousing of bodhicitta in the hell realms?

Geshe la certainly a new attainment of Shinay would not be possible in the hell realms, especially when one looks at the texts and the various conditions that are required for Shinay. However, the shinay had been achieved to some degree in a previous life. Just as the imprints for bodhicitta were there, which allowed it to be arisen from hell from witnessing the suffering there, a level of calm abiding had been attained in a previous life. This attainment does not necessarily carry over from rebirth to rebirth, but in this case it did.

So, Shakyamuni was able to bring forth the Shinay necessary to arise bodhicitta despite the difficult conditions of the hell realm.

Would love to explore this further but further input from Geshe la would have to wait until breakfast (European time).

Malcolm wrote:

I think your Geshes answer is speculative at best. It amounts to saying that anyone who had attained rebirth in a deva realm has the sufficient causes for arousing bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

My understanding of Prasangika Mahdyamika (and someone please correct if i'm wrong) is not that it claims Nirvana is non-existence or something similar, it simply claims that inherent existence of anything is not findable, and it stops there, there is no underlying implication of inherent non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is the Sautrantikas following tenets who assert that nirvana is a nonexistent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No such supreme seer is discussed in the sūtras. Buddhas, possessors of non-abiding nirvana, are held to possess two kinds of omniscience. But this omniscience is held to arise from a cause. As Kamalashila points out, omniscience must have a cause, otherwise it would arise randomly at all times and in every place. Even Dolbupa does not deny the need for conventionally gathering the two accumulations.

conebeckham said:

I understand we're trying to talk about "Early Buddhism and Mahayana" here, but you yourself have brought Dzgkchen into the picture (It's perhaps "Mahayana" in some sense....maybe?) ---I understand the sutras don't discuss a "Supreme Seer," but what about Dzogchen and Rigpa? What about the Natural State, and it's relation to omniscience, and it's relation to causation?

Malcolm wrote:

What about it? First of all, we have to understand the basis is empty, not just empty, since it is also clear but that emptiness is profound. This is fundamental in Dzogchen. Rig pa is not some permanent transcendent awareness. There is a point in time in which rig pa has not arisen, prior to the realization producing buddhas and nonrealization producing sentient beings. But this is a little outside the scope. Basically vidyā is just the mind that knows the appearance of the display as it own appearances. Avidyā is the mind that does not know that. Simple as pie.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

If Madhyamika were mere apophatic or via negative approach to reality in order to help us to awaken (which is what I feel it is or should be) that would be one thing, but it seems many people assert that the ultimate or nirvana is emptiness, anatta, and not eternal.

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is permanent (since cessations are by definition unconditioned), but it also lacks identity since there is no person in nirvana. There are no aggregates in nirvana.

Vidyaraja said:

so equally how can these Madhyamikist's statements about the ultimate be accepted merely through intellectual satisfaction or the result of logical analysis?

Malcolm wrote:

How can your irrational assertions about the nature of the ultimate be acceptable? What Madhyamakas produce is an analytical ultimate. There are reasons to criticize this from a Vajrayāna point of view, but not from a sutrayāna perspective. This is no more nor less than the analytical ultimate shown in Yogacara too, i.e., both ultimates are analytical and can be weighed on their merits in terms of argument. But the Buddhist path is not one of making dogmatic assertions about the ultimate. That is for other schools.

Further, Nāgārjuna clearly states:

Dependent on the relative, the ultimate is understood;
realizing the ultimate, nirvana is attained.

So we are to realize the non-categorized ultimate on the basis of our analysis of things -- not by mystical dogmatic assertions about transcendent nondual awarenesses.

Vidyaraja said:

The reason Buddha refrained from making assertions was to avoid metaphysical speculation or getting trapped in concepts about the ultimate rather than waking up and directly knowing it with our Dharma-eye.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha made all kinds of metaphysical assertions apart from the fourteen famous positions he considered incorrect questions.

Vidyaraja said:

Buddha also never made the statement, "There is no self, nothing beyond the skandhas" but he did use anatta consistently as an adjective.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddha? The Buddha in Nikayas, Buddha in Prajñāpāramita, etc? You can't just go and cherry pick citations from this canon, that canon, and then assemble your ideal Buddha that corresponds to your biases. You need to carefully study everything. Buddha clearly states in the following passage there is no inherently existing self, while

clarifying that we can agree to a conventional self:

"Ananda, if I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is a self — were to answer that there is a self, that would be conforming with those brahmins & contemplatives who are exponents of eternalism [the view that there is an eternal, unchanging soul]. If I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is no self — were to answer that there is no self, that would be conforming with those brahmins & contemplatives who are exponents of annihilationism [the view that death is the annihilation of consciousness]. If I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is a self — were to answer that there is a self, would that be in keeping with the arising of knowledge that all phenomena are not-self?"

"No, lord."

"And if I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is no self — were to answer that there is no self, the bewildered Vacchagotta would become even more bewildered: 'Does the self I used to have now not exist?'"

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn44/sn44.010.than.html>

Vidyaraja said:

Why go through all the trouble saying what specifically is anatta rather than just proclaiming anatta as the ultimate to avoid all confusion? Could it be that he took it for granted that those he addressed his sermons to were well aware of the Great Self being part of the Indic spiritual culture from which they all derived?

Malcolm wrote:

No, absolutely not. Even in the tathāgatagarbha literature, the so called "self" that is being described is described in the Uttaratantra (as well as the commentary attributed to Asanga) on the basis of reality that is free from all extremes, that is to say the profound emptiness taught in Mahāyāna.

If you propose that there is some other self outside the all, Buddha would reply:

The Blessed One said, "What is the All? Simply the eye & forms, ear & sounds, nose & aromas, tongue & flavors, body & tactile sensations, intellect & ideas. This, monks, is called the All. [1] Anyone who would say, 'Repudiating this All, I will describe another,' if questioned on what exactly might be the grounds for his statement, would be unable to explain, and furthermore, would be put to grief. Why? Because it lies beyond range."

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn35/sn35.023.than.html>

There is clearly no intention by the Buddha to teach some transcendent ultimate non-dual awareness in the Nikayas/Agamas. People who assert the opposite are simply dreaming.

So that's it, that's all there is.

In case you are worried that all those fabulous buddhaqualities would not be possible if emptiness is the real nature of everything, Nāgārjuna quips:

"For one whom emptiness is possible, for that one everything is possible;

for one whom emptiness is not possible, for that one everything is impossible."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

I used attainment as a figure of speech, obviously one cannot attain what one already is and there is not, as you say, a person to know it, but I'd contend that the Supreme Seer "is" it and knows itself as it really is, which is not the aggregates, but rather transcendent pristine nondual Awareness. In any case, what happens when the impermanent aggregates dissolve or reenter the flux of becoming according to your view? If they cease to be in a state of becoming due to the removal of afflictions which cause rebirth, what is left?

Malcolm wrote:

No such supreme seer is discussed in the sūtras. Buddhas, possessors of non-abiding nirvana, are held to possess two kinds of omniscience. But this omniscience is held to arise from a cause. As Kamalashila points out, omniscience must have a cause, otherwise it would arise randomly at all times and in every place. Even Dolbupa does not deny the need for conventionally gathering the two accumulations.

Vidyaraja said:

I understand emptiness as applying to the phenomenal world of becoming or samsara. Once we see it as empty and anatta, we are released from it and attain awakening, which is a state free from becoming, impermanence, dukkha, and death. It is eternal, transcendent, blissful, indestructible, permanent, changeless, and Self.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't need to capitalize self.

Vidyaraja said:

Personally I don't understand how the views you and others describe, which have been accused of nihilism in the past and present and which, even if actually not nihilism, at least sounds close enough to it to have those charges brought up against it, could possibly be an attractive view of spirituality, the nature of ourselves, and our liberation. But as they say, 84,000 gates and various skillful means to account for the diversity of human needs and inclinations. I suppose the only way to know thing as they really are is to awaken.

Malcolm wrote:

We have no latent traces of attachment to divinity or any kind of supreme principle. We understand that samsara and nirvana are only possible because of the emptiness of

both. We understand that both are nominal designations. As Nāgārjuna stated:
These two, samsara and nirvana do not exist.
Instead, thorough knowledge of samsara is nirvana.
And as Āryadeva stated, those who argue against emptiness, must argue for each and everything they argue is not empty, whereas Madhyamakas only need prove emptiness but once. So if your non-empty Buddhaqualities are infinite, you are left with the infinite task of proving each and everyone separately. I am sure there must be a hell for that...oh right, I forgot, it is called gzhan stong hell.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:
PorkChop said:
I thought it was the 3rd Noble Truth...

Malcolm wrote:
Cessation is the third truth of āryas.

PorkChop said:
Cessation of Dukkha right?
Dukkha is characterized by that which is "born, become, made, and conditioned" right?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, cessations are unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned.

They exist conventionally as nominal designations, not ultimately as ontological absolutes.

But many people today interpret this passage as if the Buddha was affirming an ontological absolute. They can if they like but I don't think the Buddha had the intention they seem to think he did. In the end it all boils down to opinion.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 1:43 AM
Title: Re: Westerner who really makes it work at Sera
Content:
Unknown said:
My partner began by asking whether calm abiding was necessary for the attainment of bodhichitta, to which I responded it was.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not correct, because if it was, Shakyamuni could not have first aroused bodhicitta in the hell realms.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

PorkChop said:

I thought it was the 3rd Noble Truth...

Malcolm wrote:

Cessation is the third truth of āryas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The eternalist vision of nirvana that nirvana is as an unconditioned state to be realized, like brahman.

Vidyaraja said:

So how do we relate this to what the Buddha said here:

Malcolm wrote:

It's a pep talk, not to be taken literally as ontological commitment, IMO.

The non-eternalist view of nirvana (erroneously considered annihilationist in some quarters) is that nirvana is the permanent cessation of afflictions which lead to rebirth in samsara, leading to cessation of birth in samsara.

What is the difference between attaining the unconditioned state of nirvana and cessation of birth in samsara?

Cessations are not praptis, obtainments.

No one attains an unconditioned state of nirvana. There are no aggregates in nirvana and therefore, no person can be designated upon those aggregates. Nirvana is simply the cessation of the series of aggregates. Mind you, not the immediate cessation of aggregates, but rather the cessation of the afflictions that cause action which lead to rebirth. Another way to put it is that prajñā burns the afflictions. Once the afflictions are burnt, have no more effect, there is also no need for that prajñā so it too ceases.

If we deny the former, what is left or what are we led to in the latter? Who or what has

ceased being born in samsara and what is the resultant state from such a cessation? In what way is it not eternal? If annica is impermanence and related to dukkha, how is the conquest of samsara not eternal or permanent? If it is not eternal or permanent, why bother?

Nirvana is a permanent state of cessation of birth in samsara. It is an extreme. That is why Mahāyāna conceived of the idea of so called non-abiding nirvana (in contrast with the Nikāya "abiding" nirvana), i.e., being in samsara but not of samsara. In general, the nirvana aspired to in Mahāyāna is the non-abiding nirvana.

Basically, if the word emptiness raises the hair on your neck, it is sign that in the past you were a Mahāyāna practitioner. As for me, as soon as I heard the word "emptiness" I knew I was home, and have been a adherent of the Prajñāpāramitā ever since.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: The Meaning of Rebirth

Content:

undefineable said:

then there might be a 'Chance of the Gaps' among more reflective scientists

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma excludes chance as a form of causation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Ngondro

Content:

zimpickens said:

Hi,

I noticed above that deepbluehum posted that the number counting (in ngondro, I'm guessing) started in the 13th C. I'm curious about the history of this number counting and I wasn't sure that people were doing ngondro in the 13 C. so if there are any leads about this I would appreciate hearing about it.

So if deepbluehum or anyone else knows about these topics please let me know.

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Zim:

People did Ngondro, but the overall systematization of Ngondro seems to be a rather nineteenth century phenomena that spread from Kagyu to the other two schools i.e. Nyingma and Sakya. For example, the massive 350 folio commentary on the Lam 'bras preliminaries authored by Zimog Tulku in the nineteenth century was explicitly influenced by Kun bzang bla ma'i zhal lung. Before this text, there was no separate Sakya Ngondro commentary. And the first independent Ngondro text in Sakya was written by Dezhung Rinpoche.

However, there was ngondro from an ancient period of time. For example, the klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma rgyud [which probably dates to the 13th century and is the root tantra for the mkha' 'gro snying thig] has a fully elaborated ngondro from chapters 63-75. For example, the refuge chapter, 67, does not give a number. Chapter 73 specifies doing Vajrasattva for 21 days, for example.

In general, I think the idea of doing 100,000 thousand comes from the idea of reciting mantras 100,000 times in the gsar ma tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: what is a melong?

Content:

Jikan said:

this may or may not be a DC-specific question.

what is a melong, and why would someone want one? by that I mean, what is its function?

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Me long literally means "to arouse fire" suggesting its original use.

In general, the mirror is a symbol of rig pa. In the DC, it is worn for the purpose of Guru Yoga, primarily.

The mirrors sold by SS store are made from five metals, and all contain a bit of the original mirror given to ChNN by his guru. For DC people, other mirrors are fine, but in general it is better to use one made by Giorgio since they are made according to Rinpoche's precise specifications.

Other melongs you may see are one's crafted for long life mirrors, which function to summon all the essence of the elements reflected in that mirror. Other mirrors are worn as good luck charms. These mirrors typically are stamped with the srid pa'i ho mandala on the back and worn on one's belt. These are usually made of bell metal.

Prisms are also called "me longs."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: The Meaning of Rebirth

Content:

Seishin said:

Not only that, but it is woven into the fabric of Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, the entire point of practicing Buddhadharma, like practicing Samkhya, Yoga, Vedanta, Jainism, Bon and so on is to put an end to rebirth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: The Meaning of Rebirth

Content:

jeeprs said:

So I think understanding 'freedom from rebirth' is not actually a matter of whether you believe in reincarnation. It has a deeper meaning than that. It is about whether you are of this world, part of the whole cycle of birth-and-death, change-and-decay, rising-and-falling, that everything in nature is subject to. Nowadays we seem to think that 'natural' is good and wholesome, yet it is the case that everything in nature is subject to decay and death, even if it is temporarily beautiful, young and vital. Whatever is young becomes old, whatever is born will one day die. That is an inevitable fact for every born being.

So is there is something that is beyond change and decay, that is not subject to the constant cycle of birth and death, something that is always new, never perishing? I think that is what the Buddha found and points to. Living in the light of that, realizing what that is and making oneself available to it, is the meaning of 'liberation from the cycle of birth and death'. And I think that is the real 'meaning of rebirth' - not the exotic idea of 'I will be reborn for many lifetimes'.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a soft theory of rebirth. But it is not what was intended by the Buddha by the term punarbhāva, rebecoming. It is pretty clear [except to some confused westerners] that Buddha advocated a hard theory of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Self hatred

Content:

Konchog1 said:

It's part of my refuge name, Konchog Namdag (rare and precious Triple Gem)

Malcolm wrote:

mchog means supreme. Look it up in any dictionary. Your name means Totally Pure Supreme Gem, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

We have less freedom now than what our grandparents enjoyed.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are being a bit romantic. I am old enough to be your father, and have a pretty good recollection about how "free" speech was in the sixties and seventies. It was not very free. The thing is, that technology was not very advanced, it was a lot harder to track people and collect data on them. So it was easier to go under the radar. But then as now, there were the same pressures against freedom of expression. And in the generation before I was born there were the Red scares, Joe McCarthy and his gang, and so on in this country. Canada has always had more strict censorship policies than the US, following the lead of England.

Indrajala said:

Real political freedoms and freedom of speech are actively curtailed, meanwhile people are led to believe "progressive hiring policies", open-door immigration, acceptance of gay marriage and gender equality are what really count as indicators of freedom and rights.

Malcolm wrote:

Affirmative action was an important step in the US (and I guess in Canada) for moving minorities into the middle class out of step and fetch jobs. We don't have an open door immigration policy, so we don't have that issue. Gay Marriage and Gender equality are simply civil rights issues, that's all. Once the Civil Rights movement in the 1960's was more or less successful in eliminating Jim Crow laws and so on, all similar laws discriminating against people on the basis of religion, gender or gender preference were bound to fail, as they should fail.

Indrajala said:

Canada, like much of the rest of the west, is suffering a great deal of internal stress given increasing energy costs in the face of decadent levels of energy consumption. The natural reaction is to invest resources in increased policing and legitimization (like "we are the custodians of human rights").

Malcolm wrote:

I have been in a lot of places where laws were weak and persons were powerful. These places, like India, China, Mexico, and so on are more perilous places to live than the US and Canada.

I don't know about other people's experience but in the town where I live (in New England) there is so little crime that we really do not have a police force in any real sense.

I am sure than the experience of black communities in LA is quite different than mine, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Malcolm, earlier you spoke about an "eternalist vision of nirvana" (Wed Sep 18, 2013 6:31 am). I am just wondering what an eternalist vision of nirvana is, exactly. Would it be outside of the realm of existence and non-existence?

Malcolm wrote:

The eternalist vision of nirvana that nirvana is as an unconditioned state to be realized, like brahman.

The non-eternalist view of nirvana (erroneously considered annihilationist in some quarters) is that nirvana is the permanent cessation of afflictions which lead to rebirth in samsara, leading to cessation of birth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Jetsun Taranatha

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Recently read that not only was Taranatha one of the closest disciples of the 9th Karmapa, Wangchuk Dorje, but that he also wrote about the histories of several tantras. I know some of what he penned about the Tara tantras wound up in Martin Willson's In Praise of Tara: Songs to the Saviouress, but does anyone know where his history of the

Yamantaka tantras can be found?

For that matter, does anyone know what lineage(s) of Yamantaka were held by Jetsun Taranatha, and which are in Jonang? He practiced Kamtsang, Shangpa, and Jonang, so I'm all ears.

Malcolm wrote:

As a Jonangpa, he probably practiced Varjabhairava on the Rwa Lotsawa tradition, generally avoided by Kagyus because Rwa Lotsawa claimed he had ritually murdered Marpa's son.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Self hatred

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

it actually means "rare and precious"

Malcolm wrote:

Actually it means "supremely rare"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, 'basis' here means 'basis of an individual'?

Malcolm wrote:

Both.

dzogchungpa said:

What is the other one?

Malcolm wrote:

There are two bases, the original general basis and the basis of the person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, 'basis' here means 'basis of an individual'?

Malcolm wrote:

Both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

"Not an atom in the universe vibrates that isn't powered by love."

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the aspect of the basis called compassion is the energy of the display of the universe and all its beings.

smcj said:

Wow. I thought that one wasn't going to find acceptance. He didn't say it to me, so I can't say this is an exact quote, but he continued, something along the lines of,

"Even hate is love; derailed by fear and ignorance, and then perverted by self-cherishing, but it is still love in its genesis."

I always assumed that was more of a Vajrayana-esque "pure view" perspective rather than a Dzogchen perspective, but he did practice Dzogchen too. Pearls before swine, I have not a clue.

Malcolm wrote:

Real "pure" view means seeing universe and beings arising as the basis. The "pure" view in Vajrayāna is merely a conceptual construction which itself needs to be remedied with the completion stage. Dzogchen skips the two stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

"Not an atom in the universe vibrates that isn't powered by love."

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the aspect of the basis called compassion is the energy of the display of the

universe and all its beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Karma Chagme & Neydo Kagyu

Content:

philji said:

I believe the Dentok Chikma , Machig guru yoga/Chod, originated with Karma Chagme

Malcolm wrote:

No, he just wrote a version based on earlier texts. Dentok Chigma is a term, not a title.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think these have been translated.

Son of Buddha said:

To Malcolm

could you link me to english translations of these Sutras if they even exist(your the only person I know who might be able to find one of these Translations)

Thank you for your time sorry to be now

Arya-dharanish-vararaja Sutra [also known as the Tathagata-maha-karuna-nidesha Sutra]

Anguli-malya Sutra

Jnana-loka-lamkara Sutra

Anuna-trapur-natva-nirdesha-parivarta Sutra

Mahab-geri Sutra

Avi-kalpa-prave-sha-dharani Sutra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

cloudburst said:

In clear words, Chandrakirti speaks of the difference in the views of ucchedavadins and Madhyamikas:

Clear Words said:

Qualm: Even so, their views are similar in one way, because nihilists consider the absence of an essence in things to be non-existence.

Reply: This is not so. They are not similar because Madhyamikas assert that things without essence exist conventionally; these nihilists do not assert them at all.

cloudburst said:

You may reflect on how this quotation also neatly puts paid to your assertions that 1) madhyamikas do not make assertions, and 2) the Gelug view is that ultimate truth is a non-existent, as Je Tsongkhapa follows Chandrakirti precisely on this point and Chandrakirti here rejects that explicit assertion.

Malcolm wrote:

The rendering you are using is a somewhat inaccurate gloss.

The text says:

saṃvṛtyā mādhyamikairastitvenābhyupagamānna tulyatā

དབུ་མ་པ་དག་གིས་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་པར་ཁས་སྐྱངས་པའི་བྱིར་

"Because Mādhyamikas agree to existence in the relative..."

The text does not say they "assert" ['dod pa], or established [sgrub pa], etc. It says ābhyupagamā, which means assent, agree, etc.

The Tibetan recension contains an extra passage: དེ་དག་གིས་ཁས་སྐྱངས་པའི་བྱིར་མི་མཚུངས་པ་ནི་དེ་དོ།

"and because they [atheists] do not agree [to existence in the relative], [mādhyamikas and atheists] are not the same.

However, this passage is a clarification about what exists relatively, not ultimately. The set up for your citation is:

Here, someone contends "Mādhyamikas are no different than atheists [nāstikas, literally "deniers"]. For what reason? They claim virtuous and non-virtuous actions, agents, results and all worlds are empty of inherent existence., and also atheists also claim those things do not exist. Therefore, mādhyamikas are no different than atheists."

That is not so. Mādhyamikas are proponents of dependent origination. Because of production in connection with conditions this world and all other worlds beyond are proposed to be empty of inherent existence because they are produced in connection with conditions. Other worlds and so on are not conceived as non-existent through emptiness of inherent existence because of production in connection with conditions.

Now then, if it is asked why, they [atheists] reject other things similar to the things

perceived in this world based upon the inherent perception of things of this world, having not perceived coming into this world from another world and going into another world from this world. [a complex way of saying atheists only believe what they can see]

If it is said, "In that case, because they conceive the absence of existence in the intrinsic nature of things as non-existence there is a similarity through this view." It is not so. Because Mādhyamikas agree to existence in the relative and because they [atheists] do not agree [to existence in the relative], [mādhyamikas and atheists] are not the same. The context of the language goes back to the idea that those who deny the Vedas are "nastikas", deniers or atheists [better word than nihilist, in my opinion]. Buddhists are considered nastikas by Hindus. Here Candra is rejecting the claim by pointing out cleverly that since Madhyamikas agree to [rather than assert or establish] such thing as karma, agents, results, this world, future worlds, etc., relatively speaking, even though they do not agree to essences, they agree to the moral structure of Indian religious discourse which in general is based on the idea of future lives, karma, etc.

But I don't think we can consider these so called atheists necessarily Carvakas or Lokayatis, etc., people who for example assert existence by virtue of svābhava. The classic example representing the Carvaka view is that things exist through their nature just like the colors in a peacocks feather. No one created it, it just happens that way. Unfortunately, we do not have any actual Carvaka texts, just parodies of their views here and there in Buddhist and Hindu texts and plays. These so called atheists may very well be just those who do not subscribe to a siddhanta, whether buddhist nor non-buddhist.

Finally, this passage does not defend your assertion that Tsongkhapa does not himself assert the ultimate is a non-existence, since we have already seen that you admit he does assert a non-existence as ultimate i.e. the non-existence of inherent existence in the ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

Since that which perceives or misperceives the basis is mind, you do not skip any intermediate step, and you end up as "substance dualistic," or not, as everyone else.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not exactly. But if you are interested in Dzogchen teachings [which I doubt], basically the point being underscored is that matter and intelligence are non-dual. For example, it is a special tenet of Dzogchen that even the formless realms are material, i.e., that basically, wherever there is matter, there is consciousness, wherever there is consciousness, there is matter. You can either say that matter is intrinsically conscious or that consciousness is intrinsically embodied. Either way it amounts to the same thing. "Sentient" and "non-sentient" are merely conventional designations based on appearances generated by ignorance.

cloudburst said:

And this light? What is that, precisely, photons? The truth of it is that you will engage in verbal gymnastics to avoid the use of the term "mind," but you can never stick the landing.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not photons, not physical light in the western scientific sense of the term. Precisely, the basis is *ye shes*. Empty luminous energetic *ye shes* which appears to a neutral awareness (which itself rises out of the basis when a *vāyu* in the basis stirs).

cloudburst said:

Mind and it's objects are the same nature, or substance.
Which substance is that?

Malcolm wrote:

They are the nature of empty appearances to awareness.

This certainly only means dependently originated appearances of material and immaterial objects.

Just wondering, since Sautrantikas like Vasubandhu clearly explain that mind and matter are different substances.

Sautrantikas say alot of things. There is a time and a place for that to be very helpful to some.

[/quote]

Generally, we understand that Gelugpas follow Sautrantika presentations of conventional truth. You know, that course outer madhyamaka that the *gzhan stong* pas keep yammering on about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

cloudburst said:

such as the existence of other worlds.

Malcolm wrote:

This just means a next life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Vāyu means movement, and that is about it.

dzogchungpa said:
So how are the other elements defined in this context?

Malcolm wrote:
Read Germano's Tshig don mdzod

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 5:56 AM
Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"
Content:

cloudburst said:
why do you say that, please?

Malcolm wrote:
Because they are advocates of "cutting off". You are conflating the ucchedavāda view with the Carvaka and Lokayati schools. They are not really the same.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 5:54 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
The point is that in Dzogchen teachings mind and matter are not treated as different substances as they are in other Buddhist systems. They are equally treated as produces of the five elements. The way in which Dzogchen avoids the charge of being "physicalist" is that the five elements themselves arise from misperception of the nature of the basis [more or less emptiness endowed with light], without needing the intermediate step of proposing everything is an appearance of mind and so on. And of course the awareness that misperceives the basis arises out of a vāyu that stirs in the basis, and so on. It gets a little complex.

dzogchungpa said:
Well, this is where I get confused. What do you mean by the five elements then? Isn't vāyu one of them? It seems circular. Also, I don't mind if it gets complex, I would really like to hear the complete explanation.

Malcolm wrote:
Vāyu means movement, and that is about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

Simply dogmatically asserting your point will not convince anyone but your disciples.

Malcolm wrote:

You just admitted it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

but your claim that dzogchen explains that mind is the operation of vayu in the body is a equally a form of physicalism.

Malcolm wrote:

One, it is it not a claim, it is textual fact.

Second, it would be if that were all there was to it.

The point is that in Dzogchen teachings mind and matter are not treated as different substances as they are in other Buddhist systems. They are equally treated as produces of the five elements. The way in which Dzogchen avoids the charge of being "physicalist" is that the five elements themselves arise from misperception of the nature of the basis [more or less emptiness endowed with light], without needing the intermediate step of proposing everything is an appearance of mind and so on. And of course the awareness that misperceives the basis arises out of a vāyu that stirs in the basis, and so on. It gets a little complex.

cloudburst said:

Mind and it's objects are the same nature, or substance.

Malcolm wrote:

Which substance is that? Just wondering, since Sautrantikas like Vasubandhu clearly explain that mind and matter are different substances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists give money to Hare Krishnas?

Content:

Konchog1 said:

If the money promotes Hindu practices, then it breaks your refuge vows.

Malcolm wrote:

This is merely your opinion.

Your opinion is not supportable by scripture, it is not supportable by reason.

Ashoka, according to you, broke his vows of refuge by impartially donating money to Buddhist Sangha as well as non-Buddhist ascetics. Even the Buddha broke his vows of refuge, according to you, because he encouraged the Vajjians, the subjects of King Pasenadi, to continue to make offerings to and support non-Buddhist ascetics when they visited for offerings.

When people worry about Buddhists following the world wide trend of fundamentalism, such anti-liberal attitudes as this one you display is as far as they need to look to have their fears confirmed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

[

Your information on Gelugpa is off, unfortunately. Gelugpa do not assert the ultimate to be a non-existent. Not at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure they do-- Tsongkhapa asserts the non-existence of inherent existence is the ultimate. Now you might argue that non-existence exists, as I am sure you will; but nevertheless, the Gelug view is that ultimate truth is a non-existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

cloudburst said:

This is only one aspect of the Uchedavada view. They also believe many things to be

non-existent, such as past and future lives, that they never conceived of as existent, as per Clear Words.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the primary sense of the term.

[/quote]

Nagarjuna only demolishes being in an ultimate sense, he and his disciples continuously assert being, or existence, on the conventional level, albeit as mere imputation as you eloquently established elsewhere in this thread.[/quote]

Well, they don't assert it, they accept it for the purposes of common discourse about appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: mala care

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

geishhin well where do you keep it if not in a bag when not on use. i dont like holding it on my hand or wrist all the time.

Malcolm wrote:

Usually coiled on my practice texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: mala care

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

how do you wash your mala, and do you wash your mala?

Malcolm wrote:

Some people like to wash a new mala in pure water scented with pure sandalwood oil. This is actually a traditional procedure. I never bothered much with this personally. It might be nice to have a new mala blessed by some Lama, but the best blessing is your own mantra recitation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

What I mean is this: Malcolm said earlier in this thread that incorrect views are not really dispelled through reasoning, but through realization, and I agree with that. I also have a lot of faith in the realization of Dudjom R and Dilgo K. If the orthodox Nyingma position, or at least the position of masters like Rongzom and Longchenpa, is not shentong, then they (DR and DKR) must have had good reason to go against that, I would think. So, there seems to be some issue here. Let me also say that I don't know enough about this stuff to have a position one way or the other, although intuitively based on what little I do know, I doubt that I would be a shentongpa.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have written elsewhere; gzhan stong principally arises from the hermeneutical urge to reconcile the treatises of Maitreya and Nāgārjuna with one another. Because Tibetan scholars typically assume that Maitreyanatha is identical to the future Bodhisattva Maitreya, they often feel they cannot privilege Nāgārjuna's views over those of Maitreya.

My feeling about Maitreyanatha is rather different. I feel he was just a normal human person, who lived at a time when there were three major trends of Mahāyāna sutras, i.e., prajñāpāramita, yogacara, and tathāgagarbha. He wrote five treatises: Sūtrālaṃkāra which presents a systematic account of Mahāyāna synthesizing all three trends primarily from a Yogacara perspective

Abhisamayālaṃkāra which presents the implicit paths and stages concealed within the prajñāpāramita sutras

Uttaratantra which synthesizes the thought of the ten tathāgatarbha sūtras

Madhyantavibhaga and the Dharmadharmatāvibhaga which analyzes specific issues in Yogacara thought.

I do not feel that it is necessary to try and reconcile these various trends. What is important is to understand the ideas presented in these three trends and then observe how they are used by later schools and scholars.

For example, the way tathāgatarbha is used in Secret Mantra and Dzogchen is quite different than the way it is presented in the Uttaratantra. The way Dolbupa uses the three nature theory is very different than the way it is used in the Yogacara of Maitreya and Asanga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Based upon what Malcolm wrote, that emptiness is svabhava, which I assume is saying all entities lack svabhava which means entities are empty, does this create a split between those Buddhist traditions that don't see any svabhava at all, and those that follow tathagatarbha and all beings have the Buddha-nature? Right now I am getting the message that one tradition says that you have no essence, you are nothing, while

the other says you have a Buddha nature. It sounds like one is nihilistic and the other is not.

Malcolm wrote:

What you say does not make any sense. Even those traditions that accept tathāgatagarbha as something like a self still maintain that entities such as matter, etc., and so on are empty of svābhāva. Their argument is that sentient beings have an essence, in other words that minds or consciousness has an essence. They are not arguing, actually, that all things have an essence.

Therefore, if you are going to attach to the label "nihilist" to those traditions that assert the absence of essence in insentient things, you would have to label all Mahāyāna traditions "nihilist", including the tathāgatagarbha schools.

If this is how you feel, you are better off following one of the non-Mahāyāna schools that assert that things exist by virtue of intrinsic characteristics.

Koji said:

I have no feelings in this matter. Nagarjuna is just confusing at times. Would you say that Nagarjuna's position that all entities are empty of svābhāva just a restatement of all entities or things are not the self (sabbe dhammā anattā, Dh 279)?

Malcolm wrote:

I would say his position is that there is no self which is the part of the aggregates or separate from them; and then when Buddha spoke self and not-self, there is a context that needs to be considered for each statement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that just means that the current Karma Kagyu orthodoxy is slightly eternalistic

dzogchungpa said:

It seems like the current Nyingma orthodoxy is too. Why do all these great masters succumb to the eternalist temptation?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know why people keep on insisting this -- it isn't true. The orthodox Nyingma view represented by Rongzom, Longchenpa, and more lately Mipham and Khenpo Zhenga.

While it is true that Dilgo Khyentse and Dudjom Rinpoche followed the gzhan stong school in terms of sutrayāna, there are many masters such as Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, and so on who do not follow the gzhan stong school.

The primary reason why we think that Nyingma = gzhan stong is because the influence of Trungpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

All I know is that in contemporary times Khenpo Tsultrim is the definitive voice on this subject for the Karma Kagyu sect. That means the quote I gave is safely said to be current Karma Kagyu orthodoxy.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that just means that the current Karma Kagyu orthodoxy is slightly eternalistic, just as the current Gelugpa orthodoxy is slightly nihilistic, since the former assert the ultimate be an existent while the latter assert the ultimate to be a non-existent.

As for me, I will just stick with the great madhyamaka enunciated by Kawa Paltseg:
Freedom of two extremes in the ultimate
is asserted as the great madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Based upon what Malcolm wrote, that emptiness is svabhava, which I assume is saying all entities lack svabhava which means entities are empty, does this create a split between those Buddhist traditions that don't see any svabhava at all, and those that follow tathagatagarbha and all beings have the Buddha-nature? Right now I am getting the message that one tradition says that you have no essence, you are nothing, while the other says you have a Buddha nature. It sounds like one is nihilistic and the other is not.

Malcolm wrote:

What you say does not make any sense. Even those traditions that accept tathāgatagarbha as something like a self still maintain that entities such as matter, etc., and so on are empty of svābhāva. Their argument is that sentient beings have an essence, in other words that minds or consciousness has an essence. They are not arguing, actually, that all things have an essence.

Therefore, if you are going to attach to the label "nihilist" to those traditions that assert the absence of essence in insentient things, you would have to label all Mahāyāna traditions "nihilist", including the tathāgatagarbha schools.

If this is how you feel, you are better off following one of the non-Mahāyāna schools that assert that things exist by virtue of intrinsic characteristics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

The odd thing is is that Asanga was not fond of the tathāgatagarbha school.

Huh? That's kinda like saying Thomas Jefferson wasn't for independence from England!

Malcolm wrote:

You would think that if tathāgatagarbha were important to Asanga it would be mentioned in the Yogacarabhūmi, but the word *de bzhin gshegs pa'i snying po*, tathāgatagarbha, does not appear even once in the entire collection, and this is his Magnum Opus.

Now, it is true that there is a commentary on the Uttaratantra attributed to Asanga, and some scholars believe it is authored by him as well; but if so, this merely reinforces my elsewhere mentioned thesis that the Yogacara school and the Tathāgatagarbha were regarded as separate streams in Indian Mahāyāna and not mixed up with each other.

Of course, this statement in the Āryalaṅkāvatāra-nāma-mahāyānasūtravṛttitathāgatahṛdayālaṅkāra is very nice:

"The dharmatā of the mind liberated from the four extremes constitutes the sugatagarbha."

Here is another nice definition by Mūnīcandra in Sūtrālaṅkāravṛttibhāṣya:

"As such, since suchness exists in sentient beings, because of that, all sentient beings are tathāgatagarbhins."

This means that sentient beings enclose or hold (garbhin) the garbha of the tathāgatas, i.e., suchness.

Of course the Tarkajvala by Bhavya maintains:

The statement "The tathāgata pervades" means wisdom pervades all objects of knowledge, but it does not mean abiding in everything like Viśnu. Further,

"Tathāgatagarbhin" means emptiness, signlessness and absence of aspiration exist the continuums of all sentient beings, but is not an inner personal agent pervading everyone".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Finding One's Yidam

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

A weird realization I just had is that there are a handful of peaceful deities in Kriya tantra that call out to me, but as far as [semi-]wrathful deities go, only 2 are of any interest in HYT. And there's nothing in between. Curious...

heart said:

The same deity often exist in various levels of Tantras so I might be a mistake to assign a deity to a certain level of Tantra, this is specially true in the Nyingma.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is especially true universally in all four schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Finding One's Yidam

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

That said, all yidams are ultimately of the same nature and have completely realized the union of wisdom & compassion, so perhaps I'm fixating on something arbitrary due my mind wanting me to fit in a nice little slot that doesn't exist. From my academic work in Religion, including Vajrayana, I know deep down that there aren't really any solid categories and it's all more complex & fluid.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Yidams such as Jambhala and so on, other action deities (acton the sense of karma, not kriya) will not produce supreme siddhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Finding One's Yidam

Content:

Luke said:

Sometimes the deity which is chosen for you at random is one you have a special connection with (according to Tibetan beliefs, at least).

Malcolm wrote:

This is a myth. I have been in Tibetan Buddhism for many, many years. Not once has any teacher ever picked out a yidam for me to practice. Yes, it does happen sometimes, but it is not common.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

So, is there anything which is ultimately real, which does possess 'own-being'?

My favorite thing to quote is from Khenpo Tsultrim's "Progressive Stages of Meditation on Emptiness". In the chapter on Shentong he writes:

"This non-conceptual Wisdom Mind is not the object of the conceptualizing process and so is not negated by Madhyamaka reasoning. Therefore, it can be said to be the only thing that has absolute and true existence."

He goes on to explain that the non-conceptual Wisdom Mind is not self-empty like Nagarjuna's 4 points or the Prajnaparamita Sutras describe. They are "empty-of-other", that is empty of anything other than its own pure essence that is replete with the qualities of Buddhahood.

(btw Malcolm does not subscribe to this idea.)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and this is why gzhan stong does not really go beyond the false aspectarian yogacara of Ratnakaraśanti. The main difference between the two is that the former avoids the error of the latter, who assert that the non-existence of the imagined nature in the dependent nature is the perfected nature, thus setting up an internal contradiction that the dependent nature becomes unconditioned. Charitably, we can say that gzhan stong is an intermediate view between Yogacara and Madhyamaka.

The main error of the gzhan stong pas however, as I have written elsewhere, is the attempt to map the two truths onto the three natures, where they consider the perfected nature the ultimate and the imagined and the dependent natures relative. In doing, so, they basically do violence to the Yogacara school's own formulation of these three natures. The reason they do this is that there has been a compelling exegetical need of Tibetan scholars to rectify the treatises of Maitreya as a whole with the six texts of reasoning by Nāgārjuna. In the end, both systems lose since neither is accurately represented. Basically, gzhan stong represents an attempt to reconcile all the main lines of Indian Mahāyāna thought as I have noted elsewhere.

Further, by mixing the tathātagarbha doctrine into the mix, they also ruin that. The odd thing is is that Asanga was not fond of the tathātagarbha school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, when we say something is dravyasat (Tib. rdzas yod), we mean it "substantially exists".

dzogchungpa said:

What are the other kinds of sat or yod?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventional existence, ultimate existence, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

jeeprs said:

But I don't think that can be then taken to mean that 'nothing is real', which is the error of nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:

The error of ucchedavada is that things which exist then perish, i.e., become non-existent. But Nāgārjuna tradition also demolishes being as well. Since neither being nor nonbeing are tenable, well, you don't have much left over to describe as real, or unreal, for that matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

jeeprs said:

Buddhism denies that there is any real essence or substance in individual things.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends entirely on which school of Buddhism you are talking about. The word we are using in Buddhism to describe something as a substance is dravya. For example, when we say something is dravyasat (Tib. rdzas yod), we mean it "substantially exists".

Many people act as if Madhyamaka and Madhyamaka influenced scholars present the truth (tm) in Buddhism. But it is not true. Madhyamakas continued to be criticized by

both other Mahāyānists as well as by Nikāya schools until Buddhadharma perished in India.

It is primarily because Vajrayāna Buddhism enshrined Madhyamaka as the supreme tenet of sūtra that today we observe Madhyamaka is the something like the King of Buddhist philosophy to which everyone must pay homage, even scholars like Dolbupa.

That being said, I am myself, of course, of the conviction that Nāgārjuna got it right. Frankly, to borrow a phrase from Whithead, "The safest general characterization of the Buddhist philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Nāgārjuna."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Substance dualism as far as I know is usually a Christian platonic term..that asserts that mind is a fundamentally different substance from matter.

I'm interested also to hear about the nuances of it from Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Substance dualism is a description of Descartes viewpoint. It holds that mind is non-physical substance. So does Buddhism in general. For example, Vasubandhu defines mind as a dravya, which in general can be understood as "substance". In general, in Buddhism nama and rūpa are held to be different in kind and substance though mutually conditioning.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Got it, how does Dzogchen differ here? Beyond the obvious I mean... i have an inkling but i'm not sure.

Malcolm wrote:

While there are of course Dzogchen texts that describe mind and body as separate, in general, the innermost secret cycle holds that the perception that there is a difference between the animate and inanimate is a mistaken one. In the state of ultimate liberation, the distinction between animate and inanimate disappears because it is not true. Further, like other Vajrayāna traditions, Dzogchen provides a physical account for the process of rebirth. For example in the Vajramala Tantra it is proposed that the alayavijñāna inseparable with the mahāprāṇavāyu is responsible for transmigration, for the appropriation of a new series of aggregates. But Dzogchen goes a step further and explicitly identifies consciousness as the operation of a vāyu in the body. Vāyus of course are the function of the refined element of air inside the human body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

But what definition of emptiness are you using? I am only aware of the definition found in the nikayas and agamas.

Malcolm wrote:

The definition found in Mahāyāna i.e. emptiness means empty of svābhava.

For example, in the Āryākṣayamatīrdeśatikā:

"The descriptions from the element of self (atmadhātu) up to the element of all phenomena (sarvadharmadhātu) are the nature of one taste in the ultimate dharmadhātu, emptiness. Since individual characteristics do not exist, all phenomena said to be "equivalent" since they are undifferentiated."

Koji said:

Sorry for asking another question. Is nirvana also empty of svābhava?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, since it is a dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Substance dualism as far as I know is usually a Christian platonic term..that asserts that mind is a fundamentally different substance from matter.

I'm interested also to hear about the nuances of it from Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Substance dualism is a description of Descartes viewpoint. It holds that mind is non-physical substance. So does Buddhism in general. For example, Vasubandhu defines mind as a dravya, which in general can be understood as "substance". In general, in Buddhism nama and rūpa are held to be different in kind and substance though mutually conditioning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

And you think our present systems in the west are reflective of people investing their leadership with power? No, positions of major power are acquired by the merchant class through money. If they don't directly hold the seat of office, they are still the power behind the scenes calling the shots.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on which leaders you mean? When it comes to major posts like "president" and the senate, yes, this is clearly a money game. In the US, the House is not so much a money game -- this is why we have such a diversity of wingnuts in the house. People actually do manage to vote people in who they feel represent their interests.

Even when the business class is "calling the shots", they will do so only so long as a) they are tolerated or b) are willing to resort to repressive measures. History shows that b) never works out in the end of for the oppressors. Oppression is a short term game with high costs for the players. So even the so-called "shot callers" are only able to call shots based in whether they are allowed to.

Indrajala said:

This is why Polybius praised the Roman model: it incorporated elements of monarchy, oligarchy and democracy.

Malcolm wrote:

As does the US system -- maybe this is why it is such a strong form of government. We have the Executive branch i.e. monarchy with a smattering of oligarchy; the judicial branch, clearly an oligarchy; and the house and the senate, democratic, with the latter tending towards oligarchic stasis. Sounds like your ideal place.

Indrajala said:

And in our present model the descendents of exploitative capitalists are increasingly corrupt and running "democratic" governments from Wall Street and other financial centers.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not increasingly corrupt, they are just as corrupt as they ever where and are ever going to get. They are just corrupt.

Indrajala said:

That's probably more to do with the wealth accumulation. Middle class people with an education are less likely to resort to petty crime. They got too much to lose (like property, a career and family).

Malcolm wrote:

It has a lot to do with the fact that it is a lot harder to get away with crime than it used to be in the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

really, honestly and sincerely not true.

Malcolm wrote:

The manner in which the other schools resolved this is through recourse to a species of mentalism i.e. the subtle inner madhyamaka, if you will.

cloudburst said:

This is a definitional move, and a weak argument in my book.

Malcolm wrote:

No, seriously -- for example, Khyentse Wangchuk declares that there is no difference between mind and matter because everything is established as mind. This is perfectly acceptable thing to say in a Lamdre context. I have seen the same statement [everything is established as mind] coming from Gelugpas when they explain how one is to practice Vajrayāna, as opposed to how the Gelug sutra view is formed and asserted. This is also how the Kagyus phrase things.

This is not how Dzogchen deals with the issue at all. Please bear in mind that not everything said by Nyingmapas necessarily reflects the view of Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

Giving too many people access to political power is unwise, though such ideas are contrary to contemporary democratic ideals.

Malcolm wrote:

So you have basically become a monarchist, for all intents and purposes. Good luck

with that.

Indrajala said:

I personally would rather have a ruling class that has power by virtue of inherited title

Malcolm wrote:

As if this has ever actually worked at any time in history in any civilization. Āryadeva points out the foolishness of this kind of thinking in 400 Verses. He clearly advises kings that kings (and leaders in general) rule because of the power the people invest in them and not otherwise.

Indrajala said:

It is in the interests of a landed aristocracy to look to the well-being of their populace because their power base depends on them, not business activities. I'd rather have real kings than kingmakers, so to speak.

Malcolm wrote:

Pure romanticism. The landed aristocracy in western England, for example, left their people starving and in rags. In France it was worse. Russia, even worse. There have been very few "enlightened" kings in history capable of ruling with a fair hand and with the benefit of their people as their chief priority. Mostly they are the descendants of plundering mercenaries and invaders, for example, like the Normans. Further, history shows that in general, generations of landed aristocracy become increasingly more corrupt and exploitative. It is just a form of primitive capital accumulation, that's all.

Indrajala said:

In any case, our present models in the west are rapidly unwinding. We have a lot less freedom now than our grandparents did, which should be alarming, but for many it isn't.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but that is a social consequence of technology and economics. We also have a great deal less crime in the West than we did fifty years ago. The reason US prisons are so full is because of our ridiculous and ineffective drug laws.

Indrajala said:

As time goes on democracy will fail, tyranny will solve the problems of the day (probably at the cost of many lives) and then people will probably look back with disgust at the models of society and government we so often cherish today. Such is how political cycles operate in western civilization.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, maybe not. Personally, I don't believe that in our lifetime there will be much change in the world political balance status quo unless it is driven by a major energy crisis, or because of escalating climate instability. Even so, here in the US, I don't foresee much true political instability. Our system is actually fairly distributed and decentralized.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

really, honestly and sincerely not true.

Malcolm wrote:

The manner in which the other schools resolved this is through recourse to a species of mentalism i.e. the subtle inner madhyamaka, if you will.

Anyway, I think you can agree a separate thread is required.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

But what definition of emptiness are you using? I am only aware of the definition found in the nikayas and agamas.

Malcolm wrote:

The definition found in Mahāyāna i.e. emptiness means empty of svābhava.

For example, in the Āryākṣayamatīrdeśatikā:

"The descriptions from the element of self (atmadhātu) up to the element of all phenomena (sarvadharmadhātu) are the nature of one taste in the ultimate dharmadhātu, emptiness. Since individual characteristics do not exist, all phenomena said to be "equivalent" since they are undifferentiated."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Direct rebirth as a bug

Content:

lobster said:

It should be regarded as particular to forms of a buddhism that are perpetuated by those without a comprehensive education.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a pretty snotty and arrogant statement, as well as being factually untrue. There

are all kinds of people far more educated than you, fully conversant in the latest on neuroscience, physics, and so forth, who nevertheless continue to adhere to a belief in transmigration or rebirth or reincarnation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

As Plato and Polybius described long ago, democracy naturally leads to the most brutal of dictatorships.

Malcolm wrote:

Winston Churchill quipped "It has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all the others that have been tried."

Indrajala said:

The expansion of competing political groups leads to political deadlock, which means major problems remain unresolved while the commonly accepted standard of living declines. The masses are quick to allow for tyranny if it is in their interests regardless of the ethical implications.

Malcolm wrote:

So what do you suggest, Monarchy?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: "Sung-due" collection of sutras

Content:

Sherlock said:

Can anyone tell me more about this collection of sutras by Tsongkhapa called the "Sung-due". I found some information that might be relevant here:

<http://www.lamayeshe.com/?sect=article&id=310>

I got advice from Lama Dawa regarding this collection.

Malcolm wrote:

The gzung 'dus is mainly a compendium of dharanis [gzungs]. But I don't think it was

assembled by Tsongkhapa. I could be wrong, but I think it is older than him. Anyway, it contains many extracts of the dharani portions of sutras, small sutras, for healing, repelling obstacles, it has aspiration prayers, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Everyone agrees the absolute is ineffable, therefore all teachings are provisional.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Gelugpas assert it is effable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

Emptiness - the essence of all there is

Regrettably, that is a big no-no in Buddhist philosophy. Emptiness is exactly the absence of essence. In fact the one thing that everything has in common is absence of essence.

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakirti clearly says in the Prasannapāda, essencelessness is the essence of everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

“O Lord, there are two kinds of wisdom of emptiness with reference to the tathāgatagarbha.

The tathāgatagarbha that is empty is separate from, free from, and different from the stores of all defilements.

And the tathāgatagarbha

that is not empty is not separate from, not free from, and not different from the inconceivable Buddha-Dharmas more numerous than the sands of the Ganges River.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the question becomes what buddha-dharmas means in this context.

But all of this is really wide of the mark of the main conversation I was having with Vidyārāja, the essence of which "what constitutes a criteria for calling someone Buddhist or non-Buddhist", spurred by my remark that so called "Early Buddhism" is a pedantic reconstruction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

we can separate the 2 terms but I will just quote further proof to connect them back together.

Malcolm wrote:

it's not necessary. The fact is that the term dharmadhātu has a limited usage in these sutras. The term dharmadhātu is synonymous with emptiness, which is what you asked me to show. I have shown that. Nothing you can cite will show the opposite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

So the modern rejection of the idea of 'eternal round' on the basis that it is not really a part of the original meaning of the teaching, completely changes its context. Without the prospect of being bound to the wheel of samsara for life after life, 'nirvana' then becomes simply a state of being 'stress free' and Buddhism more like a psycho-therapeutic discipline than a sadhana.

Malcolm wrote:

It all really depends on how interested you are in forcing people to follow a "religion".

jeeprs said:

Not in the least. I have no power to coerce anyone nor any interest in doing so. It is simply a matter of respect for the teaching. Secular interpretations may be fine, but they are derivative, not definitive, which is what many people are trying to make them.

Malcolm wrote:

As we have seen throughout this thread, one's persons definitive is another person's provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 7:31 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which emptiness? Which tradition? Whose interpretation?

Vidyaraja said:

How about your interpretation? Who or what is aware of emptiness in your view?

Malcolm wrote:

The non-categorizable emptiness has no characteristics so it cannot be a direct object of a conventional mind. As Shantideva states, "the ultimate is not within the experiential range of the mind".

Obviously, categorizable emptiness can be conceived by a conventional mind since that kind of emptiness is also a convention, designated on the discovery of a non-existence such as this seed is empty of inherent existence because it is a product. Whatever inherently exists cannot be a product.

Conventionally speaking however, a non-conceptual wisdom "apprehends" emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

your search engine is off.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not use a search engine, I performed a manual search of the digital file of the two volume version present in the bka' 'gyur.

Son of Buddha said:

with that said I respectfully disagree.....But at the same time to refute you I would have to literally reread and note every single time the phrase Dharmakaya

Malcolm wrote:

We are not discussing the term dharmakāya, rather we are discussing the term dharmadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

All four traditions of Tibetan Buddhism, when correctly understood, reject substance dualism. The Gelugpas, at least, also present the teachings in such a way as to allow someone prone to substance dualism to benefit from it a provisional stance. I suspect the other traditions do as well. Each tradition is very rich.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is true that because the five schools [we must include Bon] are tantric, they have a better shot at it. But really, honestly, only in Dzogchen teachings is the substance dualism that is a prime feature of Buddhist thought from abhidharma right up the the lower tantras truly overcome in an explicit fashion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

So the modern rejection of the idea of 'eternal round' on the basis that it is not really a part of the original meaning of the teaching, completely changes its context. Without the prospect of being bound to the wheel of samsara for life after life, 'nirvana' then becomes simply a state of being 'stress free' and Buddhism more like a psycho-therapeutic discipline than a sadhana.

Malcolm wrote:

It all really depends on how interested you are in forcing people to follow a "religion".

Frankly, all many people want from meditation and yoga is a lack of stress in this life. Buddha also provided for this kind of person, as it made perfectly clear in the Kalamas sutra. If we classify the kind of teaching that Batchelor and people like him, the so called Secular Buddhists, seem to advocate, they are teaching what is termed by the Buddha as "the vehicles of devas and humans". But that is a Buddhist vehicle, and we have to respect it as such, even if we imagine we want more, something like total liberation.

Again, it boils down to the patches on Buddha's robes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

LastLegend said:

There is a Deathless state. Why wouldn't there? "It" is not going anywhere.

Malcolm wrote:

When you have eradicated all afflictions which cause rebirth, this is all the deathlessness you need. No more birth, BAM! no more death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Why is it too broad? Who or what is aware of emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

Which emptiness? Which tradition? Whose interpretation?

Vidyaraja said:

And what do we make of the following by Padmasambhava:

Malcolm wrote:

He is talking about vidyā. If you understand the context of the Dzogchen tradition from which this is derived, you will understand that non-buddhists are thought to misidentify vidyā and make incorrect imputations upon it.

Otherwise, you will observe that the list is in ascending order, from non-Buddhists to common Dzogchen terms:

vehicles of non-Buddhists = atman

sravakas = anatman

Mahāyāna denominations:

mind

perfection of wisdom

tathāgatagarbha

Vajrayāna

mahamudra

thig le gnyag gcig

dharmadhātu

ālaya
tha mal gyis shes pa

So I guess this means that you are happy to consider tathāgatagarbha equivalent to mind-only, correct?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 5:58 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:

Son of Buddha said:
so this means you don't know first hand how many times Dharma Dhatu is actually mentioned in the Tathagatagarbha Suttas, your information is based upon the search engine you are using and is only as good as the search engine that is being used.....with that said your search results are flawed.

Malcolm wrote:
The Tathāgatagarbha sūtra does not use the word dharmadhātu even once. It simply is not used in that sūtra as it is present in the bka' gyur

Yup, you are correct, in terms of the Nirvana sūtra, the search engine I used was flawed it will not return searches in texts that span two volumes.

So, I checked via other means and In the Tibetan recension of the two volumes of the Nirvana sutra the term "chos kyi dbyings" i.e. dharmadhātu occurs exactly total of sixteen times. It does not suffer this problem for shorter sutras that do not span volumes. Since the other tathāgatagarbha sūtras are quite short, I have no fear that my search was flawed. Here it is, BTW:

<http://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/xml3/xml/>

Here is another interesting quote from the Nirvana sutra:
Son of a good family, all phenomena are false, where they cease, that is called "true", "a true perception", "dharmadhātu", "wisdom of perfection", "ultimate" and "ultimate emptiness".

Son of Buddha said:
this is actually explained in the sutra, you see when the Dharmakaya is obscured by defilements it is referred to as the Tathagatagarbha.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, I know.

Son of Buddha said:

Now Malcolm the Teachings of Emptiness is of the Tathagatagarbha/Dharmakaya is actually taught in the Buddha Nature Sutras in extreme detail.the Emptiness that is taught is "other Emptiness" i.e Shentong

Malcolm wrote:

This is highly debatable.

Son of Buddha said:

it wasn't neglected.....you just couldn't find the info in your search engine.

Malcolm wrote:

It's neglected, since a proper and thorough examination of the term dharmadhātu revealed that it occurs exactly 16 times in the Nirvana sūtra's Tibetan recension. There is no Sanskrit original, so you would have to consult the Chinese in order to cross check this. I listed the other mentions. My point still stands the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha identifies them explicitly. Vipassi, Sikhin, etc.

Vidyaraja said:

So what about the part about the ancient way that leads to Brahma?

Malcolm wrote:

You mean this?

Vidyaraja said:

7 S.IV.117: te brāhmaṇā purāṇaṃ saranti . . . so maggo brahmapattiyā. In Itiv., 28, 29 those who follow this (ancient) Way taught by the Buddhas are called Mahātmās. [Mais, Sn.284–315, maintenant que es Brāhmaṇs ont négligé depuis longtemps leur Loi ancienne, le Bouddha la prêche à nouveau.]

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure you can find someone on Dhammawheel who can explain those passages to you correctly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

genius of Dolpopa's Mountain Doctrine to support my affirmation of the Self in the context of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

If you really want to understand this work, you need to study with Jonangpas, and practice Kalacakra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Also, what is the relationship between emptiness and awareness? Who or what is aware of emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

Your question is too broad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Just because it isn't explicitly expressed doesn't mean it isn't implicit. There is duality between nirvana and samsara, but in my opinion the deathless Nirvana which Buddha speaks of is without differentiation.

Malcolm wrote:

Purusha is also undifferentiated, as well as uncreated, deathless, permanent, etc. Purusha satisfies all your criteria for a self. And if you don't like Samkhya plurality of purushas, you always have the Advaita interpretation of Purusha as one without a second.

Vidyaraja said:

Who were the formerly Awakened Ones he speaks of.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha identifies them explicitly. Vipassi, Sikhin, etc.

Vidyaraja said:

So you are an enlightened Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it just means I am certain about what Buddhadharma means to me, and which parts of it are definitive and which parts are provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, I don't know. In ordinary life I seem to be able to use the word well enough. What do you mean by it?

Malcolm wrote:

Well I have already explained that Dzogchen maintains that everything including buddhahood is completely equivalent with an illusion.

dzogchungpa said:

I know, I'm sorry for being so obtuse. So, the purpose of Dzogchen is to know precisely what? A delusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, I don't know. In ordinary life I seem to be able to use the word well enough. What do you mean by it?

Malcolm wrote:

Well I have already explained that Dzogchen maintains that everything including buddhahood is completely equivalent with an illusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this is why I don't follow this point of view. Dzogchen has exactly the opposite point of view. The purpose of Dzogchen is to know precisely your own state.

dzogchungpa said:
Is that state real?

Malcolm wrote:
What do you mean by real?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:47 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:
cloudburst said:
You're practically a Gelugpa.

Malcolm wrote:
Thanks for the compliment, but I don't think so.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:45 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
M: The body is made of food, as the mind is made of thoughts.
See them as they are. Non-identification, when natural and spontaneous, is liberation. You need not know what you are.
Enough to know what you are not. What you are you will never know, for every discovery reveals new dimensions to conquer.
The unknown has no limits.
Q: Does it imply ignorance for ever?
M: It means that ignorance never was.
Don't get mad.

Malcolm wrote:
Right, this is why I don't follow this point of view. Dzogchen has exactly the opposite point of view. The purpose of Dzogchen is to know precisely your own state.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:43 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Samkhya is dualistic, Buddhism is nondual.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddhism? Certainly not the Buddhism of the Pali Canon. Bhikkhu Bodhi for example has argued for a hard dualism of nirvana and samsara. Samkhya merely proposes a different account of unconditioned and conditioned. Purusha is the unconditioned, Prakṛiti is the conditioned. Purusha is the self, prakṛiti is the not self.

Basically, all you atmanvadins are doing is merely imposing Samkhya onto Buddhism.

Vidyaraja said:

Just because the Buddha had a unique conceptual system for expressing the inexpressible and leading his followers to the one Truth doesn't mean he denied the Self. Aside from that, ask Ananda Coomaraswamy points out in his book "Hinduism and Buddhism", the Buddha didn't think his way was utterly novel:

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, you will be happier as a devotee of Advaita. You will always be miserable in Buddhadharma because you have to work so hard to find places where you think your views are expressed. But in Advaita, or Trika, it is fully present.

Vidyaraja said:

"I have seen," the Buddha says, "the ancient Way, the Old Road that was taken by the formerly All-Awakened, and that is the path I follow"; and since he elsewhere praises the Brāhmaṇs of old who remembered the Ancient Way that leads to Brahma, there can be no doubt that the Buddha is alluding to "the ancient narrow path that stretches far away, whereby the contemplatives, knowers of Brahma, ascend, set free" (vimuktāḥ), mentioned in verses that were already old when Yajñavalkya cites them in the earliest Upaniṣad.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha used a lot of metaphors with an intellectual history. This does not prove he is a Vedantic sage, or was a proponent of Vedanta. There is absolutely no evidence of this.

Their views are important as part of the history of ideas; however, no serious expert in the field of Buddhist studies really holds their theosophically informed opinions in any regard.

These individuals weren't theosophers, some were Theravadin Sangharajas and some just Pali scholars. Coomaraswamy was a genius who was an expert in religious studies, metaphysics, and I believe could speak some 30 languages. I am sure there are also contemporary experts in Buddhist studies who maintain the view of the Great Self, like Susan K. Hookam of Oxford University for example.

The four westerners (Coomaraswamy was western educated) you mentioned are all deeply influenced by Theosophy. Coomaraswamy may have been a genius, but his

understanding of Buddhism is sorely deficient as far as I am concerned.

I doubt Shenphen Hookham as the same idea about this that you do. gzhan stong is complicated, has many schools, and Kongtrul's (about which she wrote) is basically a modified version of Sakya Chogden's gzhan stong, which is markedly different than Dolbupa's version.

You are a perennialist. This is fine, but you do realize that your views are a severely minority opinion in Buddhadharma.

Seems to prop up more frequently the more I read of older Buddhist masters. For example, I've been reading on Korean Buddhism as of late, and both Chinul and later Gihwa wrote on how they believed Taoism and Neo-Confucianism (at least in the case of Gihwa who was writing during the Joseon) were valid paths.

That does not mean these scholars mistook Taoism and Ne-Confucianism as leading to the same result Buddhadharma purports.

Good luck to you in your search for truth.

I am not searching, but thanks. I am pretty clear about what I think is the real meaning of Buddha's teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

but they qualify those statements to make it clear that the self does exist as mere imputation.

Malcolm wrote:

Which I made clear at the outset. The self exists as an imputation, it does not exist where it is imputed, that is the meaning of "non-existent". The habit of grasping is responsible for that imputation, hence we have the term "the habit of grasping a non-existent self". This habit itself functions as an agent of karma and an object upon which karma ripens, without the self it imputes existing where it is imputed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, could you say more about the truth and freedom you do aspire to?

Malcolm wrote:

Perfect dharmatā is nonarising,
alternately, self-liberated without grasping.

Why? The cause of self-liberation
is unceasing nonattachment.

It is free from a mind of grasping attachment.
Recognize this again and again.
If one familiarizes oneself repeatedly,
one is a person who has seen the truth.
The Self-Risen Vidyā Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

And yet I do not think that accepting Batchelor as a Buddhist and yet publically showing the internal contradictions, fallacies, prejudices and so forth inherent in his positions is a waste of time.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we all make choices.

cloudburst said:

I started out as a materialist and was greatly helped by strong refutations of this materialist view found in my early studies, mostly of Nyingma teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is, Dzogchen texts reject the substance dualism prevalent in virtually the entire Buddhist tradition.

cloudburst said:

It is painful to try and hold a view that cannot be defended, so people move.

Malcolm wrote:

Most people just suck up the party line. It is often difficult enough just to understand that, without understanding why it might be defective or problematical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Just curious, are there differing standards of what Buddhadharma is or just one standard? If just one standard in which tradition or texts can we find it? I think beginners would like to know so we could say something like, "That isn't Buddhism."

Malcolm wrote:

In my opinion basic standards which would indicate a person or a school is Buddhist in orientation are:

A dharma theory based on skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas.

A theory of suffering based on of affliction and dependent origination.

A path theory based on śamatha and vipaśyāna.

Acceptance of the four seals.

A concept of refuge.

I think that this basic framework provides a wide latitude for differences of opinion, including for example eternalist interpretations of the tathāgatagarbha sutras or the austere doctrine of emptiness taught in Madhyamaka and Prajñāpāramitā. It even has room for "heretics" like Batchelor and Zenmar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Was Dudjom Rinpoche a gzhan stong pa?

Malcolm wrote:

He was a gzhan stong pa, yes. But not really in the same way that Dolbupa was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

I wouldn't say it is clear cut that this view is an import into Buddhadharma. Many have argued and continue to do so that the Buddha didn't deny the Self but rather used anatta as a via negativa approach to deny reality to the empirical self consisting of the impermanent aggregates. See my post in this thread for some quotes on this:

Malcolm wrote:

What you are suggesting is already found in Samkhya system. I.e. the twenty four tattvas are not the self aka purusha. Since this system was well known to the Buddha, if that's all his insight was, then his insight is pretty trivial. But Buddha's teachings were novel. Why were they novel? They were novel in the fifth century BCE because of his teaching of dependent origination and emptiness. The refutation of an ultimate self is just

collateral damage.

Vidyaraja said:

Now, you are free to disagree, but if this line of thought (which is shared by other scholars like George Grimm, CAF Rhys Davids, Perez-Reimon, Ananda Coomaraswamy, the Thais of the Dhammakaya movement, other Theravadins, etc.) is correct, then the no-self doctrine as applied to Nirvana is an import into Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Their views are important as part of the history of ideas; however, no serious expert in the field of Buddhist studies really holds their theosophically informed opinions in any regard.

Vidyaraja said:

As to saying that this view doesn't bring about realization, I think numerous Hindu sages from the time of the Vedic rishis up to modern figures like Nisargadatta Maharaj, the Christian mystics like Pseudo-Dionysius or Meister Eckhart, the Sufi sheikhs such as Ibn Arabi and Rumi, Neoplatonist mystics like Plotinus and Iamblichus, Taoists like Lao Tzu, Jains like Mahavira, the Sikhs, Kabbalists, various occult figures, and various Amerindians who speak of the Great Spirit, as well as the Buddhist masters like Dolpopa, and various Zen figures like Huang Po would disagree. Now of course, all intellectual views must be transcended to reach the wordless, intuitive, direct realization of Truth, but nonetheless. My point is, while many of these sages aren't Buddhists, the Madhyamika figures who deny the transcendent Absolute and the Great Self are the minority in the spiritual history of mankind.

Malcolm wrote:

But they are clearly defined majority in the annals of Buddhadharma, which is our subject of discussion.

Vidyaraja said:

You are free to believe that they are an elite who have had the highest realization and everyone else has been deluded or of inferior realization, but for one I refuse to believe that is the case, not only because of the unity across time, culture, religion, etc. of those figures who maintained this view, but because of my own experience tells me otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

You are a perennialist. This is fine, but you do realize that your views are a severely minority opinion in Buddhadharma.

It is not a question of higher or lower realization. The fact is that the liberation to which you aspire is not one I share. It does not mean I am going to deny you the right to call yourself a Buddhist because you happen to hold views that I consider to be out of step with the primary trends of the evolution of Buddhist teachings. The fact is that the liberation to which Batchelor aspires is not one I share. The fact is that the liberation to

which the Pure Land people aspire is not one I share. The fact is that the liberation to which the Theravadins aspire is not one I share. The fact is that the liberation to which Zen practitioners aspire is not one I share. But they are all Buddhists and they all aspire to freedom.

Beyond that, the fact is that the liberation to which Samkhya, Vedanta, Yoga, Vaiśeṣika, Nyaya and Mimamsa aspire is not one I share. But they are also seeking freedom, so I consider them Dharma, albeit, not Buddhadharma. The same goes with all other spiritual paths.

We are all alike in that we are seeking truth and freedom that truth brings. But I do not think for an instant that we all seeking the same truth or the same freedom.

The strength of Buddha's patched robe is that it is able to accommodate such disagreement and so many different point of view of about what Buddha himself meant when he discoursed about truth and freedom.

When it comes to tenets, I think Madhyamaka is the most definitive teaching, when it comes to sūtras, think the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras are the most definitive, and I when it comes to vajrayāna, I think Dzogchen is the most definitive teaching. But that is just my perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

This is an english text, so there is no possibility of correcting a translation from a tibetan text.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, you're quoting from the translator's introduction, I understand. Do you take them as authorities though?

smcj said:

If the translators can't get that right, then nothing else in the book is reliable. It is put as something fundamental to be understood before proceeding. Plus this is Dudjom R.'s position repeatedly stated in many contexts. A Google search will demonstrate this.

Malcolm wrote:

The translators did a fine job on that book. The person who didn't get it right was Dudjom Rinpoche. He just repeated a gloss that is found in many earlier books, and he apparently never looked up the original citation to check it. Tibetan scholarship in general is not known for originality, and it is also not known for detailed citation checking. Mostly people just repeat what they hear from their teachers. Great Lamas

are no different in this respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

OK, here's a quote from Dudjom R.'s "The Nyingma School Of Tibetan Buddhism" (a.k.a. "The Red Book") p. 26:

" The Great Madhyamaka (dbu-ma chen-po) is aloof from the reasoning of the Outer Madhyamaka which is based upon dialectics, and instead must be experientially cultivated in meditation. "

Malcolm wrote:

In Bhavya's text, the difference between the so called coarse outer madhyamaka and the inner subtle madhyamaka merely has to do with how relative truth is treated. I reproduce the entire passage below. You will notice an absence of the terms Prasanga, Svatantra. When one, as a Madhyamaka, treats relative truth from the perspective of the śravakas, this is considered coarse outer madhyamaka. When relative truth is treated from the cittamatra point of view, then this becomes the subtle inner madhyamaka:

When phenomenal entities are categorized, in this way there are two kind: material and immaterial. In this way, material entities appearing as portions of subtle atoms do not exist and also subtle atoms appearing as limited by different directions do not exist. They are immaterial mind. Meanwhile, mind and mental factors are engaged for a moment. Since appearing because of the very subtle aspect through the differentiation of past, present and future does not exist, minds and mental factors are not established, becoming the nature of the dharmadhātu, in which one should abide. The Mother states: "That mind is not mind, because the primal nature [prakṛiti] of the mind is luminosity" and "wherever the mind does not exist, that is inconceivable".

Further, all phenomena can be gathered into the mind, mind gathered into the body, after the body is gathered into the dharmadhātu, it dissolves. The meaning of this is also spoken of by the Ācārya Nāgārjuna in the Madhyamaka Bhāvaśaṃkranta:

The world comes from concepts; concepts come from the mind;

the mind is supported on the body, for that reason investigate the body.

One should dwell in such a meaning. Do not dwell on any kind of occasion or consciousness. Do not conceive anything, do not think about anything, do not dwell all extremes. The essence of any consciousness has not arisen, one should meditate on nothing at all. Further, that prajñā of through analysis does not appear. For example, since fire is produced by rubbing sticks together vigorously, if the wood is burnt, also that fire is understood to naturally pacified, because it also has become non-existent. The meaning of this can be understood in the Ārya-kāśyapaparivarta sūtra.

Further, in the Ārya-ghanavyūha sūtra:

Just the fire which is the burning agent does not exist
since the burnt object does not exist,
likewise if one burns the view to be incinerated,
also the fire of emptiness will cease.
At the time of the cessation of views,
the fire of wisdom will not be produced,
all afflictions having been incinerated.
If the afflictions are incinerated, the aspect is beautiful.
Mahāsukha (aka Padmavajra) says:
Having burned the bundle of firewood of views
with the fire of emptiness,
this is abiding in peace,
in which the fire of suchness has also ceased.
As such, having taught the coarse yoga, now the subtle yoga will be taught. This is
subtle i.e. all dharmas there can be arise as the appearances of one's mere illusory
mind itself. In this way, the mere illusory mind is beyond the three times. Without color
or shape, luminous through its primal nature. Since it does not appear, all phenomena
are to be understood as being the illusory mind itself. There are also citations. The Ārya
Lankāvatara states:
In dependance on mind-only,
do not analyze outer objects;
in dependence upon suchness
one must transcend mind-only.
If one transcends mind-only,
one will abide in non-appearances.
The yogi abiding in non-appearances,
he sees the Mahāyāna.
Ārya Nāgārjuna, Ācarya Āryadeva, Ācarya Candrakīrti speak it in these words. In this
way, speaking about the relative truth in the manner of the śravakas is the coarse outer
madhyamaka. That [relative] existing as one's mind only is the so called "inner
madhyamaka" which is subtle.

There are three things to include here: one, this author, Bhavya, is very late -- he is not
the same author as Bhavaviveka. This is proven by two things: one, he mentions
Candrakīrti. Second, he cites Mahasukha aka Padmavajra and directly cites
Padmavajra's text Sakalatantrasambhavaśaṃcodanī-śrīguhyasiddhi-nama. Padmavajra
may be the same person as Padmasambhava.

At any rate, this text itself is no later than the tenth century but no earlier than the eighth.
This places Bhavya subsequent to Padmavajra, that and Atisha brought the text to Tibet
in the 11th.

Third, Bhavya mentions a great madhyamaka three times in this text. But first person we
know of to use the term in any surviving text was the Tibetan Kawa Paltseg. He uses the
term great madhyamaka as a sobriquet for freedom from extremes.

So frankly, when gzhan stong pas use this passage from Bhavya to support their notion

that great madhyamaka is a non-analytical meditation, their reasoning is pretty flimsy when the citation they use to distinguish an outer and an inner madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, unfortunately, this citation does not actually exist in the text it is supposed to exist in. I have mentioned this before and I am pretty sure I presented the original passage out of which this oft cited distortion is from.

dzogchungpa said:

That's disturbing. How did find it's way into that book then?

Malcolm wrote:

It is an interpretive gloss of a passage treated as a citation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

If you want my humble opinion, that is largely what much of Madhyamika, concepts like emptiness as often understood, no ultimate ground of being, anatta understood as applying to the Absolute rather than as a via negativa applied to the aggregates, and so forth are: the intellectual ideas of philosophers...

No, it is the opposite actually, in my opinion, those people within Buddhadharma who assert a transcendent absolute, a mahātman, etc. are the intellectuals since they are the ones who have to spin the most elaborate hermeneutics to justify their opinions, for example Dolbuba.

Here's a cut and paste from something Dudjom R. wrote. He starts by quoting somebody else:

Concerning the subtle, inner Great Madhyamaka of definitive meaning, it is stated in the Jewel Lamp of the Madhyamaka by the master Bhavya (skal-Idan):

The Madhyamaka of the Prasangika and the Svatantrika is the coarse, Outer Madhyamaka. It should indeed be expressed by those who profess well-informed intelligence during debates with [extremist] Outsiders, during the composition of great treatises, and while establishing texts which concern supreme reasoning. However, when the subtle, inner Madhyamaka is experientially cultivated, one should meditate on the nature of Yogacara-Madhyamaka.

Elsewhere I've seen him say that Prasangika Madhyamaka is for intellectual approach to emptiness and Great Madyamaka (Shentong) is for discussing it from a meditational standpoint without quoting anybody else, but this is what I found with a quick search.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, unfortunately, this citation does not actually exist in the text it is supposed to exist in. I have mentioned this before and I am pretty sure I presented the original passage out of which this oft cited distortion is from.

I will shortly present it again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

can you source this in the Sutras for us all??

(I could of swore the texts that teach Buddha Nature say it is Not-Empty)

Malcolm wrote:

It is more complicated than that. I spent a few minutes this morning running a word search on the bka' 'gyur and I found that only five of the ten tathagatagarbhasūtras say anything at all about the dharmadhātu, and only four of them say anything meaningful.

The Angulimāla sūtra says:

The dhātu of all sentient beings (sarvasattvadhātu) is the dharmadhātu, since flesh is consumed of the same dhātu, the buddhas do not consume meat. It is presented in the context of eating meat. Basically, cannibalism is a taboo in general, and by making the observation that the dharmadhātu is the sattvadhātu, in this sūtra the Buddha is making an argument we ought not eat meat since we are all of the same kind.

The Nirvana Sūtra only contains two explicit mentions of the dharmadhātu:

Empty peace is the dharmadhātu...

Son of a good family, if one of average prajñā truly courses in the dharmadhātu, wisdom of perfection, ultimate truth and ultimate emptiness, that one will attain the śravakas awakening; the one of medium prajñā, the pratyekabuddha awakening, and one is best prajñā, unsurpassed awakening.

There is another sūtra, Ārya-maladevīśiṃhanāda sūtra, that states:

"Bhagavan, this tathāgatagarbha is the sublime dharmadhātu. It is the dharmakāyagarbha, it is the garbha of transcendent phenomena [lokkotaradharmas], it is the garbha of the naturally pure dharmakāya. Bhagavan, since temporary secondary afflictions are naturally pure as the tathāgatagarbha, these secondary afflictions are the site of the tathāgatas."

This sutra pretty clearly states that afflicted phenomena cannot be excluded from the tathāgatagarbha, more or less repeating the thinking of the Angulimala sūtra above.

Ok, therefore, we can see that that tathagatagarbha sūtras are of no help in defining dharmadhātu.

The Ārya-gaṇanāgajaparipṛcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra is the likely locus classicus for the explicit notion that the dharmadhātu is a source. Let me preface this by saying that in Tibetan, the term "dhātu" is glossed as a 'byung gnas, a locus of production, not as a basis or a foundation [gzhi/rtsa ba]. The nature of meaning of the term dhātu is translated into is "dbyings", which has a native meaning as a dimension [klong] or a element [khams]. When it is defined by Vasubandhu he defines the term dhātu as being similar to a mine. Now, the sūtra states:

Phenomena do not come and do not go, they dwell in the dharmadhātu;
all that appears as form, it all comes from space;
all that appears as phenomena[dharmas], those come from the dharmadhātu.
Still we are no closer to a conclusive definition of dharmadhātu.

The Lankāvatara helps us: Suchness, emptiness, nirvana and the dharmadhātu, the non-arising phenomena, are nature of the ultimate.
So here in this text we have a clear demonstration that suchness, emptiness, nirvana and the dharmadhātu are all to be treated as synonymous.

The Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā states: Further, because the dharmadhātu does not exist, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the past; because the dharmadhātu is emptiness, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the past; because the dharmadhātu is isolated it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the past; because the dharmadhātu lacks an intrinsic nature, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the past. Further, because the dharmadhātu does not exist, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the future; because the dharmadhātu is emptiness, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the future; because the dharmadhātu is isolated it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the future; because the dharmadhātu lacks an intrinsic nature, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the future. Further, because the dharmadhātu does not exist, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the middle; because the dharmadhātu is emptiness, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the middle; because the dharmadhātu is isolated it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the middle; because the dharmadhātu lacks an intrinsic nature, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the middle.

So in reality, we see that in the Tathagatagarbha sūtra cycle, the notion of dharmadhātu is rather neglected doctrinally; I would suggest, precisely because of its association with emptiness as presented in the PP sūtras, which in no way permits a reading of a positive ground which serves as the basis for the arising of phenomena. And as we have seen above, the Nirvana sūtra explicitly defines dharmadhātu as emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 2:19 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

So for me, transcendence and a timeless, unborn Absolute reality that is the source of everything

Malcolm wrote:

Conditioned phenomena dependently originate; unconditioned phenomena do not arise at all. Other than that, there is no source. This is why dependent origination is called "profound". The logic of dependent origination precludes a "source" for conditioned phenomena, transcendent or otherwise.

Your view is just one among many imports into Buddhadharma, just like Batchelor's views. In my opinion you are both mistaken -- but that does not really matter, because intellectual views like yours and Batchelors, in the end, are not what bring about realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 2:15 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

That would be true only if you give a special meaning to "nature".

Malcolm wrote:

The word here is *svabhāva* i.e. nature, inherent existence, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 2:12 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But people have a hard time with the kind of intellectual discipline the study of the Buddhist history of ideas demands.

Vidyaraja said:

If you want my humble opinion, that is largely what much of Madhyamika, concepts like emptiness as often understood, no ultimate ground of being, anatta understood as applying to the Absolute rather than as a *via negativa* applied to the aggregates, and so forth are: the intellectual ideas of philosophers...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is the opposite actually, in my opinion, those people within Buddhadharma who assert a transcendent absolute, a mahātman, etc. are the intellectuals since they are the ones who have to spin the most elaborate hermeneutics to justify their opinions, for example Dolbuba.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Since everything is empty, it is often said that everything arises from the dharmadhātu and dissolves into the dharmadhātu. It is an ocean/wave metaphor.

Sounds more like "there's an ultimate ground of being" metaphor.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really.

But people have a hard time with the kind of intellectual discipline the study of the Buddhist history of ideas demands.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no fundamental ground of existence which gives rise to everything.

dzogchungpa said:

Isn't dharmadhatu something like this?

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahāyāna, the dharmadhātu is merely synonym for the general state of emptiness that pervades all things. Since everything is empty, it is often said that everything arises from the dharmadhātu and dissolves into the dharmadhātu. It is an ocean/wave metaphor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Where is an 'unconditioned phenomena'? Show me one 'unconditioned phenomena'.

This is something I say you cannot do - there is no such thing anywhere.
If you believe Asanga, you own Buddha Nature is unconditioned phenomena. It is your own nature, yet cannot be taken as an object of consciousness, yours or anybody else's for that matter. It is an example of something unborn having functionality--the functionality being you!

Malcolm wrote:

If you believe the Buddha as he is presented in the Lankāvatara sutra, tathāgatagarbha is merely an intermediate doctrine for those who are frightened of emptiness.

-

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

I suppose to put it in plain English, I believe in the reality of 'spirit'. 'Spirit' is a most unfortunate word, mostly misunderstood and usually maligned, but there is nothing else in English, unfortunately. Tibetans tend to use 'Mind' to denote that reality, the fundamental ground of existence, that which gives rise to everything. There seem to be many here who deny it. It's a shame, but I will put forward the opposing view from time to time, so that those reading will know that there are some don't acquiesce to this notion that the tathagatha is 'only the five aggregates'.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no fundamental ground of existence which gives rise to everything. This idea is a modern import into Buddhism. I mean, it is fine if you subscribe to it, but you won't find it in a Buddhist sutra or tantra.

As Ārya Nāgārjuna put it succinctly;

Whatever is the nature of the Tathāgata, that is the nature of the world;
since the Tathāgata has no nature, the world has no nature.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is a dharma. It is not beyond phenomena, it is a phenomena albeit, an unconditioned phenomena.

jeeprs said:

Where is an 'unconditioned phenomena'? Show me one 'unconditioned phenomena'.
This is something I say you cannot do - there is no such thing anywhere.

Malcolm wrote:

There are three kinds of unconditioned phenomena (asamskritadharma) we find in Buddhist texts: space and the two kinds of cessation. Of these two last, one is mere absence of a cause for arising, and the second is nirvana i.e. a cessation which is due to analysis.

In Mahāyāna a fourth is added i.e. śūnyatā, emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 6:32 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

There is reality beyond existence and non-existence. It can't be spoken of directly because it is not amongst phenomena and so does not exist in the same way phenomena do.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense. All phenomenon [dharmas], both conditioned and unconditioned are included in one skandha, one āyatana, and one dhātu. The skandha is the material aggregate because it includes all material sense objects and sense organs; the āyatana is the mano-ayatana, which includes all minds; and the dharmadhātu which includes all mental factors, as well as the unconditioned dharmas, including nirvana. Nirvana is a dharma. It is not beyond phenomena, it is a phenomena albeit, an unconditioned phenomena.

jeeprs said:

'Not existent' - the source of existence is not among the things that exist. But it is not non-existent - it is not mere absence, mere nothingness, but the 'basis of all samsara and nirvana'. It is not simply nothing, mere cessation, absence, even though it is very easy to interpret that way.

Malcolm wrote:

This, my friend, is very far away from the meaning intended by Rangjung Dorje.

jeeprs said:

That is not 'eternalism' but a re-statement of the perennial idea of 'the eternal' within the human being.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing eternal within a human being. A human beings consists of five aggregates and nothing more. if there something eternal within a human, that would be

a self.

avidyā is not held to be the cause of existence in dependent origination, because that would make ignorance/avidyā unconditioned itself.

In other words, it is a metaphysical concept.

You need to examine a clear explanation of the twelve nidanas. Of course, you like everyone, are free to invent whatever Buddhism you want out of whole cloth.

Just don't be so convinced that your pet theories are really the truth (tm).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

It seems like the word 'habit' is doing all the heavy lifting here.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, indeed it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dude said:

How can something that doesn't exist function?

cloudburst said:

the self does of course exist conventionally, allowing it to function. That's what Malcolm actually means when he says "the habit of grasping a non-existent self" in his post. He refuses to admit that explicitly, however if you press the point it will become clear.

Malcolm wrote:

What exists is an imputation of a self. We have to discover if this conventional self is one of the aggregates, all of them, or merely imputed upon them? And if it is merely imputed upon the aggregates, is this imputation veridical or merely functional? If this imputation is not veridical, then this means that the imputation is false and the self being imputed does not exist except as an imputation.

What does not exist is a self which function as a basis for that imputation. The basis for the imputation of a self is the appearance of a person constituted to our senses primarily as a rūpa skandha. We can infer the existence of the other four skandhas if that rūpa skandha gives evidence of being able to think and act. At first, we imagine that person has an identity, such as cloudburst or malcolm; but there is nothing within the

five aggregates that will correspond in any way to the designations "cloudburst" and "malcolm".

The term "the habit of grasping a non-existent self" is a very precise way of describing how an imputed self (which does not exist in the aggregates, separate from them, or as one of them) may be an agent while also being a nonexistent. This is precisely the Prasangika method of describing how rebirth functions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

noooo, can't be. You are here opposing what you consider to be incorrect veiws, so your own claim is not credible. Nagarjuna did it, Buddha did it, Shantideva, Chandrkiriti, Longchenpa, Rongdzon, Mipham, Mikkyo Dorje, Sapan...

Malcolm wrote:

I am not opposing incorrect views in the manner in which you imagine, the tiered structure of tenets where the ultimate of the lower is the conventional of the higher.

I am here merely pointing out that it is foolish to deny Batchelor status as a Buddhist because we don't like his views about rebirth.

Secondly, many scholars in the past have written many refutations in the past; but in general the only people who have accepted these refutations have been the students of these polemicists, who merely repeat blindly what their masters have told them is "correct view".

One must discover for oneself what a "correct view" might be. One may arrive at some conviction about what correct view is; one might even willing to argue about it a little bit; but in reality, one cannot impose upon others a correct view, even with recourse to citation and reasoning.

In other words, one can only establish correct view for oneself; one cannot establish for others, for example, via a reasoning such as a syllogism (an inference for another).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dude said:

How can something that doesn't exist function?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, now you are screwed. If you cannot accept that functionality of the habit of imputing a non-existence self, which in turn functions as an agent, you need to propose an existing agent to explain rebirth which is not a mere habit of grasping a self, and if you do that, you will end up with a mass of contradictions. For example, you might try and propose consciousness as an agent of rebirth (ala Bhavaviveka), but that presents a lot of problems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

Actually, this is an Indian Madhaymaka "game," intially. See my quote above where Chandrakirti explicitly disagrees with you.

Malcolm wrote:

One citation does not prove that Candrakirti disagrees with me.

Basically, if you assert there is an ultimate unborn entity [the subject of my negation] beyond existence and non-existence [the premise of Vidyārāja's assertion], since such an entity does not arise it does not exist.

Vidyārāja's nirvana is something beyond what he considered the conditioned. Its classic Buddhist eternalism.

cloudburst said:

What is it that you are saying is a waste of time? Refuting incorrect views?

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, pretty much. They are not really refuted through reasoning but are dispelled only through realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not one person, even Batchelor, denies that Buddha talked about rebirth. There is a lot of disagreement over the what he meant when he did talk about it. For example,

Buddhadassa's point of view is that we have to separate what "rebirth" means as a technical term in Dharma, as opposed to what it means in every day speech, asserting that to interpret rebirth as in every day language is violently at odds with the Buddha's real intention. As I mentioned above, Pudgalavadins claimed there is an inexpressible self responsible for transmigration. Jamgon Kongtrul sees clear light or luminosity as the kernel which transmigrates and so on.

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, has this point ever been definitively clarified by the tradition? Malcolm you say you accept rebirth. How do you define and explain it?

Malcolm wrote:

I understand the mechanism of rebirth in a couple of ways. First, the habit of grasping a non-existent self leads to the appropriation of aggregates in which a self cannot be found. This non-existent self can function as an agent and recipient of karma.

The second has to do with tantric anatomy and principles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dude said:

I maintain that the principles of karma and transmigration (the appearance, disappearance and reappearance in different forms) are irreducible tenets of the Buddha's teaching, to be found in the higher, lower, "earlier and later" teachings with total consistency.

I don't think it's debatable, the words of the sutras are what they are.

To deny this is to slander the Buddha, by the Buddha's own definition : "One who claims the Thus Come One did not say what he said slanders the Thus Come One."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not one person, even Batchelor, denies that Buddha talked about rebirth. There is a lot of disagreement over the what he meant when he did talk about it. For example, Buddhadassa's point of view is that we have to separate what "rebirth" means as a technical term in Dharma, as opposed to what it means in every day speech, asserting that to interpret rebirth as in every day language is violently at odds with the Buddha's real intention. As I mentioned above, Pudgalavadins claimed there is an inexpressible self responsible for transmigration. Jamgon Kongtrul sees clear light or luminosity as the kernel which transmigrates and so on.

Batchelor is very much in tune with Buddhadassa's interpretation of emptiness and selflessness.

dude said:

Then they should explain what they mean. What I've seen so far from proponents of this

line of thinking is not only unsatisfactory, it's absurd.

Malcolm wrote:

You should read the link to Buddhadasa's teaching. He explains his point of view very clearly. I don't agree with him, but I am not going exile him from Buddhist intellectual history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

This is an important point.

Malcolm wrote:

You just proved my point, since Vidyārāja was talking about "ultimately" Nirvana is beyond existence and non-existence. He was not playing into your Gelug "Great Madhyamaka" game where emptiness [an absence] exists conventionally.

cloudburst said:

I think you are wrong, Malcolm, in saying that he is teaching a profound skepticism. He actually sneers and scoffs at the notion of rebirth, and I think much of what he says is harmful. All interpretative views are meant to be refuted by higher views, and eventually by definitive views, so I think we can accept Batchelor as a Buddhist while refuting his incorrect views.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said his skepticism was profound, just that he was skeptical. My point exactly is that we can accept someone as a Buddhist, even if we vehemently disagree with their views even on fundamental principles.

cloudburst said:

If anyone really wants to have this debate, I'm up for it, (should be moved to another thread, I think) but I think its evident if you read Batchelor, he does actively deny rebirth. This means he denies any meaningful interpretation of karma, and also the existence of course of other realms. So in the Batchelordharma, there are no thoughts that turn the mind, no future worlds, no renunciation of samsara since it has been incorrectly identified, no bodhicitta etc..., its a travesty.

Malcolm wrote:

His is a very narrow, selective interpretation of early Buddhism. But he is still a Buddhist, and that was my point.

cloudburst said:

Let it benefit those for whom it is beneficial.

Malcolm wrote:

Its a waste of time, actually. All it does is convince one's own disciples.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

To be honest, I am tired of debating you so I won't continue the debate any further. If you wish to take that as triumph, feel free to do so. However, I think that article by B. Alan Wallace sums up quite nicely why Batchelorism isn't Buddhism, so I will let that do the talking for me. That said, I must ask, is your personal Buddhism based entirely on philosophy or have you had any direct experience? I ask because if you had any direct experience, I am not sure how you could possibly defend Batchelor, which isn't to say that I think he is defensible purely from a philosophical or doctrinal understanding of Buddhism either.

Malcolm wrote:

I am defending Batchelor based on the principle that Buddha's Dharma robe was cobbled together from patches of rags -- which represents his disciples, and their inability to agree with each other in the future.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dude said:

I maintain that the principles of karma and transmigration (the appearance, disappearance and reappearance in different forms) are irreducible tenets of the Buddha's teaching, to be found in the higher, lower, "earlier and later" teachings with total consistency.

I don't think it's debatable, the words of the sutras are what they are.

To deny this is to slander the Buddha, by the Buddha's own definition : "One who claims the Thus Come One did not say what he said slanders the Thus Come One."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not one person, even Batchelor, denies that Buddha talked about rebirth. There is a lot of disagreement over the what he meant when he did talk about it. For example, Buddhadasa's point of view is that we have to separate what "rebirth" means as a technical term in Dharma, as opposed to what it means in every day speech, asserting that to interpret rebirth as in every day language is violently at odds with the Buddha's real intention. As I mentioned above, Pudgalavadins claimed there is an inexpressible self responsible for transmigration. Jamgon Kongtrul sees clear light or luminosity as the kernal which transmigrates and so on.

Batchelor is very much in tune with Buddhadasa's interpretation of emptiness and selflessness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Something that has not arisen [unborn] does not exist. If you accept that nirvana is unborn, you also accept that it does not exist. If you propose it exists, your view is no different than Hindus who believe in a permanent, unborn purusha.

Vidyaraja said:

It is not an existent to be found somewhere phenomenally. It is beyond existence and non-existence. Of course on an ultimate level it is beyond words and concepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Something beyond existence and non-existence is a non-existent by definition.

The fourth seal is merely that nirvana is peaceful. As we have seen, there are all kinds of Buddhist understandings of nirvana -- many of which flat out contradict each other. Moreover, the fourth seal does not exist in Theravada, it is a Mahāyāna interpolation. Yes, and if the material world is all that exists, then dukkha is all there is. Nirvana won't be found holding the view that Batchelor has as mentioned in the interview a few posts back, and if somehow it were, I guarantee that the one who awakened will repudiate his former materialist views.

You still have not adequately addressed even a single point I have brought up. Your reasoning is flawed, BTW. Nirvana is merely the cessation of afflictive patterning aka dukkha.

Buddhists for centuries have accused other Buddhists of "corrupting" the Dharma and indulging in superstitions. Still, you would accept Vajrayāna practitioners as Buddhists, no? How about Mahāyāna Buddhists -- they have many things that could be labeled "superstitions" by Theravādins, for example. Buddhists have accused each of false beliefs and incorrect interpretations for centuries.

All those Buddhists you mentioned accepted that the goal of Buddhism is to transcend the wheel of birth and death, which Batchelor denies.

No, Batchelor accepts that the goal of Buddhism as taught by the Buddha is to transcend birth and death. He also thinks that Buddhism has other, more immediate goals, like living a mindful ethical life based on the eight fold path. What he refuses to do is be drawn into metaphysical debates about such questions as rebirth.

However benign their intentions, their writings may be regarded as "near enemies" of

Buddhism.

I think this is just polemics, just as wrongheaded as your fatwas.

You are merely flinging around a reactionary term you have not defined. What kind of materialist is Batchelor: money, cars and sex? Is he a dialectical materialist?

As defined by twentieth century philosophers William James and Alfred North Whitehead, for instance, scientific materialism is the belief that physical reality, as made available to the natural sciences, is all that truly exist.

What Batchelor stated in the interview previously also touches on what is meant by the term.

I don't think you can pin Batchelor down that easily.

Basically, all you have demonstrated in this thread is that you cannot prove that Batchelor views are in contradiction to three of the most basic tenets of Buddhadharma:

all conditioned things are impermanent
all defiled things are suffering
everything lacks a self.

Batchelor accepts the four noble truths:

suffering
cause
cessation
and the path.

He just does not do so in a way that is appealing to Buddhist dogmatists.

Look, I have argued your side of this before and at length and in detail. But it is a losing argument — why? Because there are many things in many Buddhist teachings that have been regarded as heretical by someone.

The fact is, and you are just going to have to accept it — is that there are a large number of people out there who practice Zen and Vipassana who nevertheless do not accept rebirth. There are even many Nicherin Buddhists who deny that rebirth is a fact. When you take this hard position that "this is the really the teaching of the Buddha" you put yourself in a corner. The strength of the Dharma lies in the fact that it is a method of discovering the truth. We don't lay out the truth in the beginning and say "this is what you must confirm in order to be considered a Buddhist." If this were the case, we could not even have the discussion "Early Buddhism and Mahāyāna". Why? Because the Mahāyāna Buddhists themselves introduced heresies into Buddhism, heresies clearly defined in Abhidharma literatures. Then we have the heresies of Vajrayāna. Then Dzogchen. Then Bon. Then Nicherin Buddhism. Then Chan, Zen, etc.

All we can do really is say "That person's Buddhism is not for me". For example, your eternalist disposition is not for me. I am sure that Dzogchen is not to your liking. So what? Some people like Batchelor's "metaphysics free" approach. They would not even explore Buddhadharma otherwise.

We all have ignorance. All of our views are limited. Even the most perfect mental model of how things are is not how things are. This is why it is more useful to focus on the methods of Dharma and discover for ourselves what we can perceive and what we can infer. We really ought not be telling people like Batchelor that they have no right to call themselves Buddhist. It opens up oneself to the same charge. Our conceptual map is not really that relevant to our practice unless it is causing us suffering and preventing us from practicing. I don't think that practicing Dharma has much to do with our conceptual beliefs. Everyone wants to wake up. How is demonizing Batchelor helping you or anyone else given that you are no more an authority than he is, or Wallace, or me?

As far as I can tell, you don't understand Batchelor's point of view very well. I think it comes from his training in Korean Zen. He is putting it out there that there are many questions the answers to which he does not know and does not feel anyone can know without claiming special knowledge. I respect that position. It is really honest. There is a lot of dishonesty in religious discourse. People claiming as truths things they have merely heard or read and not personally experienced is the essence of dishonesty. This is why I find the polemics against Batchelor incredibly dishonest. Not one person who is criticizing Batchelor has any personal experience or realization of these so called "truths" they are enunciating.

For example, in his book Heartwood, Bhikku Buddhadasa completely rejects literal rebirth as a fiction of the Abhidhammists. Are you going to say that Buddhadasa is not a Buddhist? He says elsewhere:

If we use the Kalama Sutta and the Four Criteria, we can strictly apply the Buddha's principle to choose the right things from layers upon layers of garbage. This is not to say that all of the essays and canons are useless, but that the Buddha's principle must be strictly applied to find the right explanations. According to the Four Criteria, anything that is not in accord with the Doctrine [dhamma] and Discipline [vinaya] should be considered as erroneous hearing, memory, speech, and teaching. The doctrine of dependent origination is primarily intended to abolish the concept of a continuing existence and nihilism. Therefore, if the teaching of the doctrine involves man's transmigration in three lifetimes, then it is unacceptable in accordance with the Four Criteria.

[http://www.what-buddha-](http://www.what-buddha-taught.net/Books6/Bhikkhu_Buddhadasa_Paticcasamuppada.htm)

[taught.net/Books6/Bhikkhu_Buddhadasa_Paticcasamuppada.htm](http://www.what-buddha-taught.net/Books6/Bhikkhu_Buddhadasa_Paticcasamuppada.htm)

So you see, there are a lot of people, intelligent people, who feel that we can interpret Buddha's teaching in such a way that even proposing literal rebirth is actually opposed to Buddha's intention! But of course, according to you, they are not Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

That which transcends time is timeless and unborn, not eternal in the sense of endless time.

Malcolm wrote:

Something that has not arisen [unborn] does not exist. If you accept that nirvana is unborn, you also accept that it does not exist. If you propose it exists, your view is no different than Hindus who believe in a permanent, unborn purusha.

BTW, there are many people who think Dolpopa's view i.e. gzhan stong, is a corrupt view of Buddhadharma.

Let's use a different enlightened master then. Here is something from Huang Po, brackets are mine:

One, I am not sure that translation you are using is reliable. Two, there are a lot of people who have a big problem with the "true self" and "one mind" language and so on that exists in Zen -- who see it as again, crypto -Advaita.

The fourth seal is that of nirvana, which isn't to be found in materialism.

The fourth seal is merely that nirvana is peaceful. As we have seen, there are all kinds of Buddhist understandings of nirvana -- many of which flat out contradict each other.

Moreover, the fourth seal does not exist in Theravada, it is a Mahāyāna interpolation.

What we need to understand about Batchelor, for example, and many Westerners like him, is that they are trying.

Yes, trying to corrupt Buddhism and turn it into a form of secular-atheistic materialism, going so far as making claims that teachings Buddha preached and all Buddhists have accepted historically are superstitions.

Buddhists for centuries have accused other Buddhists of "corrupting" the Dharma and indulging in superstitions. Still, you would accept Vajrayāna practitioners as Buddhists, no? How about Mahāyāna Buddhists -- they have many things that could be labeled "superstitions" by Theravadins, for example. Buddhists have accused each of false beliefs and incorrect interpretations for centuries.

At the end of the day however, eventually these new heretical Buddhist trends become accepted and canonized.

While it is true that Buddhism is based on direct experience, most Buddhist masters I've read emphasize the need for faith in the possibility of enlightenment and the efficacy of the Buddhist path in order to be successful.

What you need is *śraddhā* which is defined as mental clarity. You need the mental clarity to understand that exploring the Buddha's teachings will help you end your own

suffering in this life.

Accepting materialism (nihilism) posing as Buddhism as a new understanding of Dharma isn't generous but erroneous and harmful.

You are merely flinging around a reactionary term you have not defined. What kind of materialist is Batchelor: money, cars and sex? Is he a dialectical materialist?

There is nothing in Batchelor's writings to indicate that he has decided that consciousness is solely a result of material interactions. Merely that he has personally abandoned all metaphysical speculations about rebirth and such questions, and feels that in the context of Buddha's teaching of anatman, Buddha's accounts of rebirth are largely mythological, generated with respect to the milieu Buddha was teaching in. I think he even grants that Buddha may have believed these stories. But his point, one to which I now agree, is that the practice of Buddhadharma does not depend on accepting the Jatakas as literally true, or accepting the Buddha's account as having been the first human king in a past life, and so on.

That being said, I imagine that Batchelor probably is a physicalist, but that is different than being a materialist.

Batchelor generally says a perfectly respectable thing: consciousnesses arise based on specific conditions. When you study Abhidharma you will discover that in Abhidharma (as well as Madhyamaka in general) claim that without a sense organ and a sense object, a consciousness cannot arise. It is never said that without a consciousness and a sense organ, the object won't arise, or that without the sense object, the sense organ won't arise. All these texts clearly state that a consciousness arises only when there is a functioning sense organ and a sense object. This is a perfectly reasonable thing to assert in the context of Buddhism.

So this is another area in which your attempt at blackballing Batchelor fails utterly.

So I can either blackball you for having an eternalist view of nirvana and blackball Batchelor for not accepting the doctrine of rebirth literally or I can be expansive and understand that even though you both suffer from some wrong views, you both are still within the Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

his physicalism does not preclude nirvana. He can experience nirvana whether he believes in rebirth or not, providing he relinquishes his afflictions. His position is that belief in rebirth is irrelevant to the cessation of suffering.

Is not "liberation" freedom from cyclic existence (a.k.a. samsara), the cycle of rebirth?

That's pretty fundamental if one buys the original 4 Noble Truths position that dukha pervades all of life.

Malcolm wrote:

You do not have to accept rebirth literally to accept "sarva dukkham". If the solution to suffering in this life is calming the mind with shamatha and developing the insight which burns away afflictions (it is), then what does believing in rebirth have to do with it?

If you have ended your afflictions you won't take rebirth again, according to Buddha's teachings, anyway. So what does it matter? All that matters is that one sees through the matrix of conditions that create your suffering here and now.

This is the minimum requirement.

So, in this thread, we have seen three things:

- 1) The four seals do not require belief in rebirth
- 2) Refuge in the Three Jewels do not require belief in rebirth
- 3) Belief in an eternal unconditioned ultimate is not a requirement to be a Buddhist.

In reality, no beliefs of any kind are required to enter the Buddha's path.

What we need to understand about Batchelor, for example, and many Westerners like him, is that they are trying. They are inspired by the Buddha's example, and they accept what makes sense to them.

Buddhadharma is not about belief and faith. Ultimately, like all Indian yogic paths, it is about personal experience: direct perception and inferences derived from those based on one's practice. It is a personal journey, not one that exists in a catechism. There is no "bible" in Buddhadharma. Rather, Buddhadharma holds a range of teachings from belief in an inexpressible self which is neither the same nor different than aggregates [pudgalavadins] to the crypto Vedantic musings of Dolbupa, to the explicit refutation of the unconditioned by Nāgārjuna and the assertion that nirvana is a non-existent [sautrantikas].

So now, Buddhists, you have to make room for a new understanding of Dharma, one that does not include rebirth as a vital central principle. It won't kill you to be generous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

is 'the basis' physical? Is it something known to science?

I would have thought that 'the Buddha's opinion', whether he is 'around to tell us or not'

is pretty well summed up in the idea of 'dependent origination'. If you take dependent origination out, what remains is not in any way shape or form Buddhism, as far as I can tell.

And 'dependent origination' presumes that 'the cause of existence is ignorance' (avidya). I can't see how 'ignorance' is not a metaphysical idea, and indeed the whole basis of dependent origination is not something that Western science would be able to validate.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see Batchelor discarding dependent origination, he states:

The Buddha awakened to a glittering plurality of endlessly arising and vanishing phenomena. No God created it; no Mind underpins it; no Unconditioned lies somewhere outside it. Ethics, meditation and wisdom are not founded on some absolute truth, but grow out of a careful examination of what causes suffering and what brings it to an end.

I differ with Batchelor in that I accept rebirth. But I do not see how the above violates some sacred Buddhist principles resulting in the fatwa Vidyārāja has pronounced above.

BTW, avidyā is not held to be the cause of existence in dependent origination, because that would make ignorance/avidyā unconditioned itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

The unconditioned, i.e. nirvana, which leads to the cessation of suffering, is transcendent.

Malcolm wrote:

Since the Sautrantikas strictly define nirvana as a cessation, a non-existence, would you deny them the claim they are Buddhist because they do not support your eternalist vision of nirvana?

Batchelor feels that his view is dependent origination. He derives that view from the Buddha. Dependent origination is the essence of the Buddhist view for most people.

BTW, there are many people who think Dolpopa's view i.e. gzhan stong, is a corrupt view of Buddhadharma.

So there are two things which are not mentioned in the four seals: belief in rebirth, and belief in a transcendent existent nirvana. These two beliefs of yours are not required in order to consider someone a follower of the Buddha's teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

The path of dharma is so vast and takes such effort to master.

Malcolm wrote:

Seven years, according to Sakya Pandita. Dharma is not rocket science, though we like to pretend it is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He just has problems with literal rebirth because he is a physicalist, just as you are a substance dualist. From my point of view, you are both wrong.

dzogchungpa said:

What is your take on the issue?

Malcolm wrote:

mind and matter are both products of the same basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

The deathless is not to be found among conditioned phenomena:

...

Batchelor's materialism precludes this. He isn't a Buddhist as he cuts out the very heart of Buddhism. Regarding rebirth, see [here](#):

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are incorrect, his physicalism does not preclude nirvana. He can experience nirvana whether he believes in rebirth or not, providing he relinquishes his afflictions. His position is that belief in rebirth is irrelevant to the cessation of suffering.

Vidyaraja said:
I am not a substance dualist.

Malcolm wrote:
Sure you are -- you accept rebirth don't you? And you accept that nama and rūpa are distinct in kind and substance don't you?

As to what "being in line with the Dharma" means, it is impossible to say what the Buddha's opinion is, isn't it? He is not around to tell us.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 2:27 AM
Title: Re: Prophecy of Buddhism's Downfall in India
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Yes, there are similar predictions, for example in the Manjushri Root Tantra, if memory serves me correct.

Indrajala said:
When approximately was the first version translated into Tibetan?

Malcolm wrote:
late 10th, early eleventh century.

Here is one such passage, from chapter 24:

ཀླ་བི་ཤེ་དང་བག་ཁ་ལ། མོ་རྟེ་ཡ་ནི་ཁོར་ཡུག་ཡུལ། ཁ་ཆེ་དང་ནི་སྤྱི་ཡུལ། ཁ་བ་ཅན་གྱི་མཚམས་ཀྱན་དང་། བྱང་
ཕྱོགས་སུ་ནི་གནས་བརྟེན་ལ། དག་བའི་ལྷགས་ནི་འགྲུབ་པར་འགྱུར། གང་ཡང་སངས་རྒྱས་ཐོན་གསུངས་དང་། ད་ལྟར་ཡང་ནི་གསུངས་པ་དང་། མ་
འོངས་སངས་རྒྱས་ནམས་ཀྱིས་ཀྱང་། ཁྱི་བའི་རྒྱུ་ནི་གསུངས་པ་ལྟེ། ཁ་བ་ཅན་རིའི་ནང་བྱང་བ། དོར་ནི་ཐམས་ཅད་འགྲུབ་པར་འགྱུར།

The border lands

Kā vi she, Bag ga la, O ḍi ya;
Ka che (Kashmir) and Sin dhu Land,
all the borders of the Kha ba can (Himalayas)
and in the north are Sthaviras
accomplishing the mantras of virtue,
which all the buddhas of the past said,
and all the buddhas of the present said,
and all the buddhas of the future said,
to be a cause of peace.
Arising in the mountains of Kha ba can,
there everything will be accomplished.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 2:10 AM
Title: Re: Prophecy of Buddhism's Downfall in India
Content:

Indrajala said:

I found this interesting: On one of his missions to Middle India, the Tang diplomat Wang Xuance is reported to have learned from the abbot of Mahābodhi Monastery about a belief among Indian clergy that when corrupt doctrines eventually eclipse the Indic lands, genuine Buddhist doctrines will continue to flourish in the peripheral east. In other words, after the disappearance of Buddhist doctrines from India, China would emerge as the new Buddhist realm. If this is indeed a true reflection of views of the seventh-century Indian clergy and not a fabrication of the Chinese Buddhists, it would not only explain the attempts by some of the South and Central Asian monks to authenticate the presence of bodhisattva Mañjuśrī at Mount Wutai, but also the increasing number of Indian and foreign monks making pilgrimage to China.

Tansen Sen, Buddhism Diplomacy and Trade The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600-1400 (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003), 84-85.

Does anyone know of anything similar with respect to Buddhism being transmitted into Tibet?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are similar predictions, for example in the Manjushri Root Tantra, if memory serves me correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Materialism is nihilism, nihilism is against what the Buddha taught, and materialism doesn't lead to the cessation of suffering or nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

Ucchedavada, often mistranslated as nihilism, is the view that there is a self which perishes at death. But I am quite sure that is not Batchelor's view at all.

Vidyaraja said:

Neither the Buddha himself, nor all the Buddhist masters of the past, nor any Buddhist worth their salt today would call Batchelor a Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Batchelor practices that portion of Buddhadharma that he can accept. That makes him a follower of Buddhadharma whether you like it or not. He accepts that all conditioned phenomena are impermanent, that all afflicted phenomena are suffering, and that all phenomena lack self. He probably also accepts that nirvana is peaceful. In other words,

I am quite certain he accepts the four seals. Among the four seals there is not one word that mentions rebirth. He takes refuge in the Buddha, Dharma and Sangha.

I am quite certain that Buddha, being kinder than you, would find room for Batchelor among his students.

He just has problems with literal rebirth because he is a physicalist, just as you are a substance dualist. From my point of view, you are both wrong.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Actually, I've discussed this with others, but I think Buddhist monks/nuns in the west will have to learn from past examples and see to their own income. If it means producing cheese or honey on a communal farm arrangement, then so be it.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, so you have a group of people, who decide to wear special colored clothing, and adhere to a moral code and make stuff together. Not the Sangha I imagine Shakyamuni had in mind. But it is ok AFAIC. Chinese travelers reported (with some attitude) of the existence of married Mahāyāna "monks" who farmed for a living in India.

The point I was making above is that temples were positive contributors to the Tibetan economy. That is why the temple system functioned in Tibet (leave aside of course that Lang Darma was assassinated for deciding to tax Tibetan monasteries during the Asian economic crisis of the 840's -- that was a powerful message to Tibetan aristocrats by the newly powerful monastic establishment).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

We are still at a stage where for philosophical topics we are better off relying on Tibetan Geshes (or Western Geshes, but we produce so few).

Malcolm wrote:

This might be true if you are only interested in a very narrow scope of Gelugpa studies.

JKhedrup said:

I don't think my BA, even though it is from a good university, takes me even close to the level of scholarship required of a Geshe lharampa. A PhD might.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference between our system of education and the Tibetan system is that we are trained to self-educate. Tibetans were not. Curiosity is largely discouraged.

Degrees are not a measure of education. Literacy is. The education gap between the average Tibetan and a Geshe, or a Khenpo is huge. The education gap between a Geshe/Khenpo and your average college educated westerner is not so large.

Also, the useful aspect of Buddhism, what is actually needed for liberation is not found in the realms of polemical yig cha that Geshes and Khenpos specialize in. For most people, studying the niceties of the differences in opinion between scholars of dead Indian Buddhist traditions is just not that important. It is a great thing to do, but most people in the West are really not that interested in it.

JKhedrup said:

This term yogi has always confused me. If Yogi indicates some sort of level of attainment, I would say only a few would be worthy of that title. If it just means a lay practitioner, I guess it makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:

A yogi is someone who practices yoga i.e. tries to discover their real state through various means. Most Westerners actively engaged in Buddhism and Buddhist studies are yogis i.e. they practice Zen, Vipassana, Creation Stage yogas, Completion Stage yogas, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I can think of a lot of easier ways to grab at power rather than donning the robes.

Malcolm wrote:

Its the only way a non-aristocrat who is not a tulku can rise up in Tibetan society, apart from being merchant.

Ecclesiastical hierarchies often balanced and off-set the power of aristocratic hierarchies. but this phenomena does not exist in the West anymore.

Really, what I am pointing out here is that people need to intelligently about what the social implications of a monastic Sangha is in the west, Who is it for, how is it being paid for. While it is easy to understand why ethnic Buddhists such as Cambodians and so on have an interest in having a Vihara in their neighborhood, my experience tells me that second and third generation Asians in the USA are not really that interested in the religion of their forbears.

The point I am making is that in Tibet, for example, Monasteries served a valuable social role; they stored grain, they provided medical services, education and so on. The role they played in Tibet for example was a vital one. But what are monasteries going to do for people here? Evangelize so they can sell their services to a client population that does not really believe in the power of prayer(or if they do, they are probably already Christian).

I personally believe that people are in this headspace of thinking "What are we supposed to do for monastics", but I rarely see anyone asking the question "What real value will supporting a monastic population do for Western Buddhists (who are generally yogis)?" Yes, there is the merit argument, but frankly, this is rather weak.

The monastic sangha is facing a crisis of relevance in western countries. We are already, many of us, just as well educated as any Geshe (with different skill sets of course), and often more so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

jeeprs said:

I had always assumed that the monastic vocation...

Malcolm wrote:

Is actually very political. When you are not in it for sex, power becomes a primary pursuit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Lindama said:

The awakened ones are carefree in such matters.

Malcolm wrote:

That is just another story.

The point here is that we need to be aware of the fact that we are following narratives, preferring one narrative to another. There is not much meaning to the term "awakened one" if there is no narrative connected with their awakening. This is why there are compelling narratives around the liberations of Shakyamuni, Padmasambhava, Tonpa Shenrab and so on.

If we prefer so-called "early Buddhism" to Mahāyāna, or vice versa, we are giving preference to one story over another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Indrajala said:

The śramaṇa culture was already well-developed.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and was systematically engaged in breaking all kinds of social taboos.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:41 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So did Shakyamuni -- like abandoning his family, living in charnel grounds, and so on, wearing dyed winding sheets, etc.

Indrajala said:

Not really. The śramaṇa culture was already well-developed. Many of the Buddha's disciples were already mendicant yogis before studying under him.

In any case, the point is that Vajrayāna seems to have responded with violence and taboo sexual practices to ongoing repression on the part of Brahmins. This was rather revolutionary given the long-standing nominal observance of non-violence and brahmacarya on the part of the Buddhist sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

Taboo sexual practices? Like having sex? With real people? Vajrayāna is just more practical, that's all. And in terms of violence, all Buddhists did in those days was appropriate the symbols of ritual violence and procedures that were well known in their culture.

What I think most people ignore is that prior to the rise of Vajrayāna, there was a huge Puranic revolution that popularized and made available many rites and rituals that previously have been the precinct only of ritual specialists i.e. Brahmins. Buddhists used these rites and symbols, even making arguments for why Buddhist homavidhi was more effective than that of traditional Brahmins. The fact is that Buddhist ritual specialists increasingly took business away from Brahmins. In the context of Indian culture, anyone sufficiently expert in the general lines of Vajrayāna ritual, derived from Brahmanic dīnācārya anyway, could replace a Brahmanic priest. This was not true in the day of the Buddha. Buddhist rulers for example continued to rely on Brahmin priests for state functions, etc. It is only after the fall of the Gupta that we see the rise in Vajrayāna texts, and this corresponds to the breaking of traditional patron/priest relationships in Northern India, and the replacement of the old order with new Buddhist ritual experts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:28 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

anjali said:

"Founder" is colloquial usage. Shakyamuni Buddha turned the dharma wheel once again after the buddha-dharma was forgotten in this world. Some people wish to follow his life model as a monastic. And people have done so throughout the centuries. If Shakyamuni Buddha hadn't lived a monastic lifestyle and founded a monastic order, I doubt any of us would be discussing the prospects of Buddhist monasticism in the West.

Malcolm wrote:

It all depends on who you think really turns the wheel of dharma, i.e., nirmanakāya emanations or the sambhoghakāya.

anjali said:

Does it have to be either/or? Surely you would acknowledge the fundamental role of Shakyamuni Buddha in reestablishing the buddha-dharma in this world? I think most Buddhists would acknowledge Shakyamuni Buddha as the historical root teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni is a historical teacher, and for my tradition, one of thirteen quasi-historical nirmanakāya teachers of great importance. But while important, he is not the most important teacher in my tradition.

That distinction belongs to a character known as "Garab Dorje" who hailed from Oḍḍiyāna. He was not a monk, had no Sangha, and a very small number of successors. He may in fact be entirely a Tibetan fiction, but no matter. For me he is more important than Shakyamuni Buddha.

Even so, even more important than he is the primordial Buddha Samantabhadra, of

which he is but an emanation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:20 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your Buddhism is not his Buddhism, that is all you can say.

Vidyaraja said:

If his atheistic-materialism (nihilism) is Buddhism, anything can be Buddhism, thus rendering the appellation "Buddhism" a meaningless term.

Malcolm wrote:

He feels his story is squarely grounded in the Buddha's teachings. You feel yours is. You are both interested in liberation from suffering. All that separates the two of you is that you are substance dualist and he is a physicalist. Oh, and he will readily call you a Buddhist, but you deny him (as I have in the past) the same decency -- that's another difference.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Indrajala said:

Vajrayāna in India seems to have indeed incorporated otherwise taboo practices.

Malcolm wrote:

So did Shakyamuni -- like abandoning his family, living in charnel grounds, and so on, wearing dyed winding sheets, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

[Though I will still maintain my position that Stephen Batchelor's brand of secular-atheistic "Buddhism" isn't Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Your Buddhism is not his Buddhism, that is all you can say.

Vidyaraja said:

That said, what is the difference between the self-liberation of Dzogchen and renunciation or transformation? Are not Nyingma monks renunciants and do their practices not lead to transformation (even if that transformation is just awareness of our naturally, spontaneously present enlightened state which is always there?)

Malcolm wrote:

By definition, anyone who practices either Vajrayāna or Dzogchen has abandoned the path of renunciation as their path.

Vidyaraja said:

Also, what is the difference between the self-liberation of Dzogchen and the anupaya or "method-less method" or "means of no-means" of Trika/Kashmir Shaivism?

Malcolm wrote:

Very different stories.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, it is really pretty simple. All yogic paths in Indian religion and its offshoots, whether Buddhist, Jain or Hindu, whether in India or Tibet, or China, etc., accept one thing in common: in order to cease taking rebirth in samsara, one must deal somehow with the kleśas that drive rebirth.

Vidyaraja said:

That is true, but their views on the means to this can be deeply variant.

Malcolm wrote:

That's the point -- enlightenment, awakening, is just a story. We all subscribe to different stories of awakening. Some people like to imagine that their story is more solid, more real, than the stories of others. Certainly I have been guilty of this.

Basically, the fact that there is a story of awakening at all is the essence of Dharma. What does not matter very much are the details, except to you, the practitioner. If you ask me what story of awakening I like, I will very swiftly tell you that I like the story of

awakening as it is presented in the teachings of self-liberation, Dzogchen. I like it more than the story of awakening presented in the path of renunciation or the path of transformation. I like it more than the story of awakening presented in Samkhya, Trika, Vedanta and so on. The vehicle of self-liberation is my preferred story. I can't convince you to accept my story of liberation anymore than I could have been convinced of it when I was committed to Buddhism as a religion by someone else. Likewise, I cannot convince any one here of any story about liberation they are not disposed to believe.

But the one thing we share is that we all subscribe to narrative about liberation otherwise we would not be here discussing these issues. And that is why there is no closed Canon in Buddhism, why there never can be.

Buddhists, like all other religionists, like to think that they are the only ones who have a true story. Among Buddhists, all assert their preferred story of liberation as the best, or most practical, or the only possible, or the most historically accurate, and so on.

We Dharma practitioners demonstrate our commitment to our preferred stories by the choices we make, and the practices we do. But in the end we are merely making a commitment to a narrative of liberation we have decided to accept. And that is completely subjective, personal and non-verifiable. No one's putative awakening is verifiable by any objective, empirical standard -- and in these conversations about liberation we all behave as if there were some objective criteria by which liberation can be measured. This is absurd. Every standard by which we can measure liberation and awakening is a complete and utterly arbitrary mental line drawn in space. All of our narratives of liberation come from space too, just like clouds billowing in the sky.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

anjali said:

I think when most people think of the Buddhist tradition they are thinking of the Buddhism with Shakyamuni Buddha as the founder.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma has no founder. It has no historical origin. That is what you discover when you read Buddhist sūtras carefully, even the so called "early" ones.

anjali said:

"Founder" is colloquial usage. Shakyamuni Buddha turned the dharma wheel once again after the buddha-dharma was forgotten in this world. Some people wish to follow his life model as a monastic. And people have done so throughout the centuries. If Shakyamuni Buddha hadn't lived a monastic lifestyle and founded a monastic order, I doubt any of us would be discussing the prospects of Buddhist monasticism in the West.

Malcolm wrote:

It all depends on who you think really turns the wheel of dharma, i.e., nirmanakāya emanations or the sambhoghakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Who has the correct view?

Malcolm wrote:

The one who is has woken up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

anjali said:

I think when most people think of the Buddhist tradition they are thinking of the Buddhism with Shakyamuni Buddha as the founder.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma has no founder. It has no historical origin. That is what you discover when you read Buddhist sūtras carefully, even the so called "early" ones.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

anjali said:

Since the Buddha was a monk

Malcolm wrote:

There have been a lot of Buddhas, not all of them were monks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Whose enlightenment are you going to accept?

Still working on that one- slowly, slowly. There are such divergent opinions and paths. If

one accepts in a general way skillful means perhaps one can accept there are different paths for different practitioners. But of course the more zealous practitioners of the various systems often claim that their methods are unique in offering the full attainment of enlightenment, which leads to all our wrangling.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, it is really pretty simple. All yogic paths in Indian religion and its offshoots, whether Buddhist, Jain or Hindu, whether in India or Tibet, or China, etc., accept one thing in common: in order to cease taking rebirth in samsara, one must deal somehow with the kleśas that drive rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Thanks- so it would seem that Secularism could be said to be the dominant force in Scandinavia?

This is interesting.

Malcolm wrote:

Its the dominant force in America too, in the Blue States at any rate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

As it mentions, though, it is the Evangelical branches of Protestantism that are growing, so as I stated above people conditioned by those schools of religion are very unlikely to be interested in Buddhism anyways.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all besides the point.

The real point of your question is "Are monastics necessary for the continued transmission of Dharma in the West". I think not. It does not mean I am against people taking robes, though in the end it often proves to have been a bad decision.

There is no state support for monastics in the west. This has always served as the precondition for the success of the monastic Sangha. And it still is the condition which

supports the the Tibetan monastic establishment. In fact, the only good argument for maintaing the TGIE is that it supports the monasteries in India (otherwise, it will never regain Tibet so is sort of an anachronism). Without it, I think many Tibetan monasteries in India would disappear.

The shifting fortunes of Chinese monasticism has also been tied to the state, even in modern Taiwan.

in the end, the West is a howling wilderness still for Buddhist monasticism. And given that we live in a very degenerate era, I do not think it will be relevant or able to respond to the needs of westerners in the long term.

Still, you can try.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Put your money where your mouth is

Actually KD has extended assistance to Western monastics.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is good. I like a man who carries through on his stated convictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

One may judge incorrectly. The reality is, either Nichiren's claims are true or they aren't, they aren't true for some and false for others. Either enlightenment is real or it isn't.

Either Buddhist praxis is efficacious or it isn't.

Malcolm wrote:

Whose Buddhist praxis? Maybe Enlightenment is a total fantasy. Whose enlightenment are you going to accept? That one represented in the Pali Canon, Prajñāpāramitā? Chan? Zen? Pure Land? Nichirin? Dzogchen?

All of these schools have very different ideas concerning the path and the result. Whose is correct?

Again, it comes down to using one's own judgement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

seeker242 said:

Western monks and nuns are an intrinsic part of the 3rd jewel of the 3 jewels! Sangha is called 3rd Jewel for a reason! A Sangha with no renunciates? What kind of sangha is that?! A one that is lacking IMO! I wish there were many more monks/nuns in the west!

Malcolm wrote:

Sangha means all practitioners/or alternatively only realized practitioners (this is the actual Sangha Jewel ".

It has nothing to do with the color of ones clothes or the length of ones hair.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There are huge Roman Catholic communities in the US, Canada

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have any idea how much real estate the Vatican has for sale in the US? Or how much in decline the Catholic Church is in the US:

Pope Benedict XVI, who announced Monday that he is stepping down from the papacy, has led the Roman Catholic Church during a time of turmoil and change for American Catholics. Nearly one-third of Americans who were raised Catholic no longer describe themselves as Catholics. Overall, American Catholic churches lost 5 percent of their membership during the last decade, and the decline would have been much steeper if not for the offsetting impact of Catholic immigrants from Latin America.

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/pope-benedict-and-the-decline-of-american-catholicism-20130211>

Karma Dorje said:

Why would we want to discourage monasticism when there are practitioners that aspire to such conduct?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, step up and start funding Lama Tsewang out in Vancouver. Put your money where your mouth is. That is my challenge to all you advocates of monasticism in the west. If you want a monastic Sangha in the West, then pay for it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

.

Protestantism of the mainline variety is on the decline in North America. I think its influence is generally overstated. Protestantism of the charismatic/evangelical variety's influence is not so important as those shaped by it have little chance of developing interest in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

You completely missed my point -- as Latinos become americanized, they will also become Protestantized, and if they pick up yoga, Aryanized as well. It is not a religious thing, it is a cultural thing. And you might be surprised to learn this, but in Latin America, Protestantism is the fastest rising form of Christianity:

Home to about eight per cent of the world's 1.2 billion Catholics - more of the faithful than any country outside Brazil - Mexico has seen a slow but steady decline in people who self-identify with the faith. Currently about 82.7 per cent of Mexicans consider themselves Catholic, down from 88 per cent in 2000 and 96 per cent in 1970.

Evangelical protestant denominations are believed responsible for much of the drop.

"The Vatican is extremely concerned about competition with evangelicals," Daniel Levine, a professor at the University of Michigan who studies religious movements in Latin America, told Al Jazeera. "They are worried about losing their position as 'the' spokesperson for religion and morality in the region. It is a big change from a generation ago."

<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2012/03/201232593459332334.html>

In any event, in the US and in Northern Europe, you absorb the cultural morays if you want to get ahead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For those people who follow Nichiren it is true, for those of us who don't it is not.

Vidyaraja said:

So truth is relative and there is no absolute truth? It seems to me that either Nichiren's claims are true or they aren't.

Malcolm wrote:

Slippery slope there. All one is left with is one's own judgment about what to accept and reject.

Vidyaraja said:

If I revealed a new form of Buddhism wherein violence, theft, lying, and hedonistic indulgence is the path for our advanced Dharma-ending age and millions followed me, would it make that correct or worthy of being considered a form of Buddhism? I'd say no since it contradicts what the Buddha and preceding forms of Buddhism have upheld. There has to be some standard.

Malcolm wrote:

It is interesting to note that in the polemics against Bon, all kinds of standards that are raised and then abandoned when Bon meets them. In the end, Buddhists were just saying "Bon is not Buddhism because we say so".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Monastics provide a field of merit for lay people who do not want to immerse themselves in the practice to practice generosity. Their conduct and example can inspire. A diversity of paths benefits the greatest number of beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Most people in the west who do not practice, are also not Buddhists, so they do not care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Well it depends. I mean, if one trains as a translator, of teachings or texts, can contribute to the running of the centre, becomes a qualified teacher, or serves the lay community, there can be very great benefit.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't need monks or nuns for this. I cannot see at all any valid reason why supporting an ordained person is better than supporting a lay person in the same role. I mean, it is not like westerners are running to monasteries to have rites recited to

improve harvests, prevent frosts, etc. The context of supporting monastics to generate merit is lacking. This works in India because Indians in general support sadhus and other kinds of renunciates. It is a part of their culture. America and Northern Europe, the dominate places where there is interest outside of Asia in Buddhism are also Protestant countries. We don't like celibate priests much; we do not trust them culturally, and regard them with suspicion. And especially in Tibetan Buddhism there is a strong tradition of a trained laity who can carry out all the necessary religious roles which may be needed.

Quite frankly, most Buddhist learning is anachronistic -- the study of Abhidharma is great, but is deeply hampered by the medieval India culture that engendered it. The Prajñāparamita tradition is equally obscure and hard to make relevant. Even Madhyamaka is not so useful to most folks. "Why should I support this guy in studying such weird stuff that is not at all relevant to me?" -- this is the question that the monastic establishment must answer in the West.

There are basically four forms of Buddhism spreading in the West:

- 1) Psychological & Secular Buddhism ala Batchelor, etc.
- 2) Technological Buddhism i.e. Vajrayāna, Bon, Dzogchen etc.
- 3) Contemplative Buddhism i.e. Vipassana, Zen, etc.
- 4) Evangelical Buddhism i.e. Nichirin, Pure Land, etc.

While there are various crossovers between these four, none of these requires the basis of a monastic Sangha.

JKhedrup said:

2) People are meeting a lot of Western monks and nuns who are not qualified or behave badly, but if the standards improved they might be interested in assisting sincere practitioners who have an affinity for the path of ordination.

Malcolm wrote:

Western Buddhists who supports monastics in Asia general do so because of the "cute" factor, or because they have a personal connection with a monastery or a monastic. But it possible because it is cheap.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

If that is the case, how are we to discern which form of continual revelation is true?

Nichiren claims that only the Lotus sutra and the chanting of Daimoku can lead to liberation in this degenerate age of the Dharma. If his revelation is true, this invalidates

most other forms of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

For those people who follow Nichiren it is true, for those of us who don't it is not.

Vidyaraja said:

What about Stephen Batchelor's Buddhism devoid of all higher spirituality and regulated to the level of secular Buddhism? Can we say that this is also part of the continual revelation?

Malcolm wrote:

It is part of the history of Buddhism. His books have "entered the canon" so to speak as there are a large number of people who take them very seriously.

Vidyaraja said:

As to Sanderson's theories, I would say they are correct. The imagery in tantra, such as garlands of skulls or deities standing upon lesser deities or third eyes open, are absent from the Buddhism prior to Vajrayana but present within Shaivism. Hatha yoga, kundalini, occult corporeality (like chakras) are also absent from Buddhism prior to Vajrayana but also present within Shaivism. Mahakala for example, a deity absent from prior forms of Buddhism, is Bhairava, the wrathful form of Shiva. I personally respect a good deal of Shaivism, so this isn't a problem for me, but it may be for other Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, the first text to mention cakras is the Hevajra tantra -- even though the idea of nadis is very ancient. The notion of prāṇayāma and pratyahara, etc. are found in the Majjhima Nikaya and so on.

You need to read Davidson's book, he addresses the majority of your concerns quite well.

In this respect, there is a pan-Indian yogic culture, a toolbox of realization if you will, used by all schools who have different understandings of the results of that practice.

Buddha did not reject yoga, for example, he was a yogi. There is very little difference between how practice is described in the Yoga Sutras and what is described in Pali Buddhist scriptures. Though many people imagine that Patañjali was responding to Buddhists, I think this is a naive assumption.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

The most neurotic Buddhists I have ever met were monks and nuns.

For true monasticism, where monks and nuns can practice single pointedly, some

confidence and support from the lay community is required.

Malcolm wrote:

And of what benefit is this to us? Why is having a monastic sangha a desiderata?

JKhedrup said:

We cannot simply pretend that there is not a problem if we ever hope to get this way of life going here.

Malcolm wrote:

Give a good reason why supporting Western monks and nuns benefits lay people in the West?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares? "Early" Buddhism is not the standard of what Buddhadharma is. "Early Buddhism" is a pedantic reconstruction.

Indrajala said:

The Dharma of the Buddha stems from the figure himself, who is best represented in reconstructions of "Early Buddhism", at least if you accept the mainstream ontology of the present day.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so. "Early" or "Original" Buddhism is text-"critically" engendered fantasy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Do you say early Buddhism is not the standard of what Buddhadharma is and that attempting to discern earliest Buddhism is a pedantic reconstruction because you sincerely believe that

Malcolm wrote:

Because I believe that is it merely a pedantic reconstruction.

Vidyaraja said:

I don't have anything against it for this reason, but it seems to me that the tantra of

Vajrayana is derived from Shaivist rather than Buddhist sources as Alexis Sanderson points out in this article:

Malcolm wrote:

Ronald Davidson has pointed out several shortcomings of Sanderson's theories in Indian Esoteric Buddhism.

I like what Dan Martin says, when defending Bon as a form a Buddhism:

"Eventually, and with the help of a very small band of Buddhologists who have been speaking rather too softly over the years, we will find out that Buddhism has always been a religion of continual revelation...the canonizers of Buddhist scriptures, if they were looking for integrity, would have done well to be satisfied with parts of one or two sūtras, much as our contemporary researchers for 'original Buddhism' would have us do. Then we today would be in a much better position, since ninety-nine percent of the Buddhist scriptures could be relegated to that great and greatly ignored category of 'apocrypha', could be safely dispensed with, just as the Bon canon as a whole has itself been pre-dispensed with."

Ppg 211-213 Unearthing Bon Treasures, Brill, 2001.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

I'm no arhat, but I see the wisdom in abandoning the immediate causes for suffering and anxiety. The politics and alternative universes you see in various forms of Buddhism are causes for causes for anxiety.

Malcolm wrote:

The immediate cause for suffering and anxiety is the three afflictions. There are three ways to deal with these: renunciation, transformation or self-liberation.

The latter two require instruction by a qualified guru. The former does not. In my estimation, the latter two are more effective in this day and age, as we have already discussed elsewhere.

The most neurotic Buddhists I have ever met were monks and nuns.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Well the discussion as turned into general Mahayana, but my initial question was wondering which of the present forms would be most recognizable to the earliest

disciples of Buddhism and which would be most alien--be it in doctrine, modes of practice, approach, etc. I suppose what is meant by early Buddhism would be Buddhism during the first few centuries of its existence.

Indrajala said:

I think Pure Land Buddhism would be seen as rather alien to the early Buddhists, especially Shinran's ideas.

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares? "Early" Buddhism is not the standard of what Buddhadharma is. "Early Buddhism" is a pedantic reconstruction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize, that if you continue in this vein, whether intentionally or not, you are lending credence to the perception that you have animosity and bias towards Tibetan Buddhism.

Indrajala said:

I'm equally critical of any other form of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are not, not at all. You may feel you are, but I don't see you spending much time in the Chan/Zen and Pure Land Forums, or the Nicherin Forums criticizing them. Or the Theravada forums, for that matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

Strictly speaking, liberation from suffering is not the same as buddhahood. The point of Vajrayana is rapid progress to buddhahood.

dzogchungpa said:

What do you think the swiftest path to liberation from suffering is?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, its obvious by his choices. He thinks that being a renunciate is the fastest to achieve

liberation from suffering, and all of his comments in this vein are stemming from his conviction in this perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

The point is that if you make grand claims about advanced abilities and rapid spiritual development, then your tradition and members should readily display many good qualities and constant benevolent conduct.

Malcolm wrote:

Then at the very best, I think Vajrayāna fares quite well in that regard. At the very least, they are no worse than any other tradition within Buddhism.

You do realize, that if you continue in this vein, whether intentionally or not, you are lending credence to the perception that you have animosity and bias towards Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

In other words, the burden of proof is on the people making such enormous claims.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so when are you going to start attacking the Buddha? After all, he made the grandest unsubstantiated claim of all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 16th, 2013 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

kirtu said:

Now in fact your guru may not be a perfect guru. Even Jamgon Kongtrul said that "nowadays perfect gurus are rare." So it may behoove people to read his comments in Ethics on the student/teacher relationship. This has apparently also been published under the title "The Teacher-Student Relationship" by Jamgon Kongtrul.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds like we are dealing with a not-even-marginally-adequate-in-terms-of-qualities guru here. And the implication of your post could lead one to believe that you disapprove separating oneself from a guru of questionable merits.

Actually, it is really, really easy to learn how to construct a mandala, read a liturgy, perform some mudras, ring a bell, wave a vajra around in the air and play a damaru, etc. Along with that, dress up in some traditional robes, look Tibetan, and walla, now you are a Guru.

The hard part about being a guru is guiding people along the path of Buddhahood when you yourself are not a Buddha — and that is where the pitfalls and dangers lay. Guiding people without conditioning them, helping them to understand and then open up their innate capacity for awakening is not easy. Frankly most so called "gurus" these days are just marketing religion in the name of awakening.

Anyone can learn a ritual or two. Waking up is a different matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 16th, 2013 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: is empowerment necessary for guru rinpoche guru yoga

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

i noticed that there are some webcasts but i dont know where, can you post the link.

malcolm, is this lung thing a bit dogmatic, since the lung transfers the lamas realization, or the seed of that. but isnt it kind of harsh that you can't do any practice without the lung for it. because not everyone has the possibility to receive lungs from lamas, but i dont think its a rule or a law that they cant because the dont have lung practice the dharma.

i have no idea when it is possible to receive lung for padmasambhava guru yoga. i dont even know if in the drikung lineage there is padmasambhava guru yoga. ive seen few on the internet and want to try them to see if my devotion flows more freely to padmasambhava than to jigten sumgön.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in Drikung there is the three roots practice of Yangzab as well as the terma cycles of Nuden Dorje. You can get the transmission for Padmasambhava Guru yoga quite easily in drikung.

You can in the meantime supplicate Padmasambhava by reciting the seven line prayer, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 16th, 2013 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

This is of course different from the Vajrayana model, but it aims for buddhahood, which is separate discussion. Let's first get to liberation from suffering first before proceeding to more lofty goals.

Malcolm wrote:

Unless of course one is interested in Vajrayana right from the start...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 16th, 2013 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: is empowerment necessary for guru rinpoche guru yoga

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

i belong mainly to the lineage of drikung kagyu and i havent received the lung or the wang for ngondro but maybe next time i see rinpoche he will bless me with them.

anyway concerning padmasambhava guru yoga, id rather do guru yoga to padmasambhava than jigten sumgon. so is it allowed to practice padmasambhava guru yoga without initiation

Malcolm wrote:

Not without the lung.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: is empowerment necessary for guru rinpoche guru yoga

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

thats my question. is empowerment and lung necessary for padmasambhava guru yoga's.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Who holds the highest throne?

Content:

Alfredo said:
Thus spake Wikipedia:

Malcolm wrote:
This applies only in Gelug.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 10:05 PM
Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher
Content:
Indrajala said:
The real refuge is the Dharma, because it liberates and technically infallible.
.

Malcolm wrote:
The real refuge is the Dharmakāya, because unlike the Dharma and the Sangha, it is not impermanent.

That aside; as you know, the guru considered the primary refuge in Vajrayāna because that is the person from whom one receives both the ripening empowerments, and more importantly, the liberating instructions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 9:59 PM
Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher
Content:
Indrajala said:
I'm aware folks from Tibetan Buddhism will tend to disagree with this, but then I see how disappointed Tibetan Buddhists can be with their gurus. Some spend years and years with someone only to be emotionally and spiritually devastated.

Malcolm wrote:
Hence the detailed and pointed instructions in Vajrayāna texts about taking extreme care in choosing one's guru; the kind of guru to avoid, and the pitfalls of picking a bad one.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 9:57 PM
Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher
Content:
Indrajala said:
Place faith in the Dharma, not fallible humans.

Be your own teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

That attitude does not work in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Nicholas Liber said:

Dowman, on the other hand, in his effort to overcome this obstacle, he's been making use of a more free rendering that includes poetic attitude as a means

Malcolm wrote:

Sadly, and this is a huge misunderstanding of Dzogchen texts i.e. that they are poetry. They are not. To the extent that they are in verses is merely an artifact of what we term "didactic verse". It is a good thing Dzogchen texts are not poetry, because were they so, they would be completely impossible to translate in any meaningful way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Andreas said:

You should read them carefully and maybe compare it with other existing translation to form a good opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

I base my opinions on the original Tibetan, not on comparisons with other English translations. Thus far, we are not there yet in terms of universally good translations of Dzogchen texts into English by anyone -- this includes my own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Andreas said:

Look at his many translations which had been published in the last years, works from Longchenpa and Vairocana: Eye of the Storm, Vairotsana's Five Original Transmissions

Malcolm wrote:
Already done by Adriano Clemente.

Andreas said:
Maya Yoga: Longchenpa's Finding Comfort and Ease in Enchantment

Malcolm wrote:
Guenther

Andreas said:
Natural Perfection: Longchenpa's Radical Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:
Barron

Andreas said:
Spaciousness: The Radical Dzogchen of the Vajra Heart, Longchenpa's Precious Treasury of the Dharmadhatu
and also :

Malcolm wrote:
Barron and Waldo

Andreas said:
Great Secret of Mind: Special Instructions on the Nonduality of Dzogchen
By: Tulku Pema Rigtsal, translated by Keith Dowman

Malcolm wrote:
Ok, my bad, this is the first original text, never before appearing in English, that he has translated and presented in many years.

Just to be clear, I am not saying that Dowman's translations are better or worse than these earlier ones I have listed. Merely that his follows theirs.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 9:37 PM
Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:
philji said:

Pema. Hi..sorry once again for any offence..these online forum things do have their drawbacks... I agree with what you say about people viewing Dzogchen as super sexy etc..... I am just a beginner myself but after receiving instructions from different teachers I can

now begin to see that the instructions for recognising nature of mind are contained in many , many teachings..maybe LL of them?.. Once you know where to look you see it everywhere..it's quite amazing.... I think some folks including myself view some teachings as inferior That's a shame..... Even taking refuge is an introduction to our mind essence is it not?

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Phil:

Dzogchen is not, as is commonly assumed, merely a teaching about the nature of the mind. It is, by itself, a separate vehicle and path to liberation, complete and independent from beginning to end.

Can it be approached gradually, via lower vehicles. Sort of. But it is possible, and in my opinion best, to practice Dzogchen by itself as a complete path. It is not a path for superior people, it is a superior path for inferior people.

Does Dzogchen have some common features with lower yanas such as refuge, and so on. Of course. But it is different in how it approaches such things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

dude said:

Let's move forward as "good friends," neither master nor disciple, but fellow practioners in mutual support to seek the correct path.

Malcolm wrote:

This attitude does not really work in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Vajrapine said:

In Vajrayana, there is so much emphasis on the guru, Samaya etc. So on top of that feeling of... betrayal I guess?... you have to wrestle with the fear of having initiated a Tantric process and relationship that might be toxic in some sense.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't care what traditional teachers might say. If you find you are in a relationship with

an unqualified teacher, drop them like a hot potato, don't look back, and if you are still interested in Dharma, then find another teacher. There are many teachers out there, good ones.

If a teacher has broken his own samayas, then you must not stay with that teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

miranda said:

Of course yes there is animal fat in the 3 white, but the fat used in sur is another one, which is not from milked products, and not ok for the riwo sang chö.

There is another point which is not clear for me: The musk is present in regular high grade tibetan incense. And some riwo sang chö texts (at least the Dudjom version of Lhatsun Namkha Jigme's) include nagas among the guests. Meanwhile I never was told not to use those incense sticks in the sang....

heart said:

Yes, I wonder about this also. The riwo sangchö sticks I use smells great and contains musk.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

If you have doubts, just use juniper...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

philji said:

I am sorry if I have offended anyone through my mention of greediness for Dzogchen...I uses I am old Skool and feel the need for purification and accumulation to clear the shit away from my eyes... Having received the introduction to the nature of my mind this accumulation and purification is so much more wonderful....

Malcolm wrote:

If you feel you need purification, etc., great. But you should not extrapolate from your condition to the condition of others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

so am i correct that you register in your local dzogchen community that is lead by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and then you have the acces the the archive of webcasts?

Malcolm wrote:

The way it works is like this. You can listen to any open webcast (most webcasts are open) without being a member at all.

If you want to listen to replays, then there is an archive of those online, but you must be a member of the Dzogchen Community to access them and must have a password., etc.

You cannot receive any sort of transmission from a replay, they are intended to help people remember what rinpoche taught.

IN order to receive any transmission, you must be listening live. In your case, your gar is Merigar West. So you purchase your membership through their website.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

i dont think dzogchen outrules mahayana teachings of loving kindness and compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen reveals the fact that compassion is a natural expression of the primordial state. Discover that, and you will discover true compassion. Otherwise, compassion is very partial and selective -- I see this among so called "Mahāyāna" practitioners all the time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

philji said:

Everyone is so greedy for Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

Is there a problem with wanting to receive Dzogchen teachings right away? Is there a problem with wanting to be introduced to one's primordial state directly? I should think

not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

ive read a little bit from his website.

it is still quite unclear if it is possible for me to attend these webcasts.

Malcolm wrote:

Many webcasts are open. You can attend by clicking the following link.

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/>

He always gives the complete transmission of Dzogchen in every retreat (some people may disagree, but they are wrong).

So you tomorrow morning, receive some lungs etc., and then make sure you attend the next webcast retreat which is open. In the meantime, you join Dzogchen Community so you can buy restricted books, and receive a password to listen to replays of retreats.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

can you be an ordinary semi beginner Dharma practitioner and still receive the direct introduction?

thankyouu

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, just attend the open webcasts by ChNN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Vajrapine said:

For some years I have followed a teacher in the Tibetan tradition, who simply put has failed.

It has been a very painful process to accept this, and in that process I have lost the drive to practice. It just dissipated. I don't mind practice in theory, but I seem to totally have lost the connection in practice.

I would be immensely grateful for any advice, especially from anyone who has been through a similar experience, on how to get back in the saddle.

VP

Malcolm wrote:
Find a teacher you respect.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 8:41 AM
Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen
Content:
KonchokZoepa said:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pointing-out_instruction

if this is what you mean, can you find direct introduction or pointing out introduction in / from books?

i dont have a mulaguru with whom i study regularly, allthough i just found out that there is a nyingma rinpoche living in my country, allthough in different city.

do the Nyingmapas teach dzogchen to the beginners?

and can you even study dzogchen succesfully with books or is there a requirement for the teacher to introduce it ?

Malcolm wrote:
Just attend webcasts by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. That is the place to start.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen
Content:
KonchokZoepa said:
im quite a beginner meditator, what are the requirements concerning meditation that you can integrate the dzogchen teachings in meditation?

Malcolm wrote:

Direct introduction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 11th, 2013 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Jikan said:

Interesting. Is he revising/updating the translations of others, or simply republishing them wholesale?

Malcolm wrote:

I can't say what his method is -- but he definitely seems to be retranslating texts others have forged ahead before him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 11th, 2013 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Jikan said:

I'd like to know what knowledgeable people think of Keith Dowman's translations (of which I have read only a few). It seems to me he has a unique approach to the work of translation, and there's no question he's productive.

Thoughts? Recommendations?

Malcolm wrote:

He has not published any original translations for many years. The majority of his published translations are retranslations of texts others have already translated. Rightly or wrongly, this has tarnished his reputation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 9th, 2013 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Thank you for your patience with this overly long post. Any insights and comments are most welcome and are always very helpful and interesting additions to a great discussion.

b.f.

Malcolm wrote:

Who knows? I know another person who claims they experienced rigpa by merely being

in Tulku Orgyen's presence without him even uttering a single word, before they have even received a single word of Dzogchen, and according to this person, when TU was asked about this experience later on, this person claims that TU confirmed that it indeed was rigpa this person experienced. This person is also not a person who is setting themselves up as a teacher, etc.

The only really important question a person should ask, and then only to themselves "Would I take teaching from this Mr. Bertelsen?" There are three answers, yes, no and "wait and see".

At this point I do not really see what the benefit to this continued discussion is. I certainly think that Mr. Bertelesen would prefer it if we not make him a continued subject of our scrutiny, because as far as I can tell, apart from naively sharing his experience in a book, he is harming no one that I can see. After all, this is just religion and people can believe whatever the hell they want. Some people believe that Trungpa was a horrible person, other people believe he was a saint, for example. The same is true of HHDL. In the end we are merely left with our own judgements and speculations and these judgements and speculations harm us much more than they harm their object.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 7th, 2013 at 8:57 AM
Title: Re: Celibacy
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Relax

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 7th, 2013 at 4:37 AM
Title: Re: Celibacy
Content:
Dronma said:
I don't like the expression "Boss" when we talk about Rinpoche.

dzogchungpa said:
I believe there is a scene in "My Reincarnation" where Yeshe Namkhai refers to Rinpoche as "the boss".

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, many of us refer to ChNN as "the boss" on a regular basis. He is our boss.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 7th, 2013 at 2:36 AM
Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Unknown said:

In Dzogchen, meditation experiences are not the natural state, if I have understood correctly; you are either having meditation experiences, or you are in the natural state.

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, one is to train in the recognition of the "natural state" while having experiences. Bliss, clarity and non-conceptuality are distinct experiences used for this purpose.

Both movement and stillness are the energy of vidyā.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 7th, 2013 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Goddess Marici and Mayajalamahatantra

Content:

Rakshasa said:

Anyone has any info about Mayajalamahatantra which is about Goddess Marici. I've heard that Goddess Marici is the goddess of military arts. Is this tantra found in Tibetan canon?

kirtu said:

I have to check my notes (and this notebook is not with me at eh moment) but I'm pretty sure that in Bari Lotsawa's cycle she appears as a bodhisattva guarding primarily against robbery.

Kirt

Konchog1 said:

Ah, I remember reading (somewhere) that she is a Kriya deity and often prayed to by travelers. The book didn't explain why she was prayed to though.

Malcolm wrote:

For protection against bandits.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Rinpoche is not talking about illusory body in this context. He really means that there are thirteen other planets where Dzogchen is present being taught.

duffster1 said:

Hi,so he IS saying Dzogchen is being practiced on other planets?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he is. Over and over again for years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

Adamantine said:

That said, Dzongsar Khyentse has said (in an online podcast you can check out) that you don't even strictly need any incense for Riwo Sang Cho, the visualization is enough if you can't do the physical offering-- at least that's what my memory says he said!)

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

And you do not even need to recite a lot of words, use a sang stuff, smudge stick, incense, and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

WeiHan said:

So all other substances are really just later addition?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

WeiHan said:

Hi Malcolm,

For a city dweller like me, life is hectic. Juniper or plants are not readily available. The best option is burning an incense stick for the daily sang practice. It is 100 times better than not practicing. I think different people have a different situation.

Malcolm wrote:

Incense is fine as long as it is pure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: ChNN's Yantra yoga: Transmission or no transmission?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Here it is made quite clear that anything within the following book (including the Tsadul Pranayama) can be practiced without Transmission:

Chögyal Namkhai Norbu said:

<http://www.yantrayoga.org/store3/books/tibetan-yoga-of-movement-the-art-and-practice-of-yantra-yoga/> presents what we call the Open Level of Yantra Yoga and covers the basic practice of Yantra that anyone can apply with a little training and good will. This is my intention and my hope in opening Yantra Yoga to the world.

Lhug-Pa said:

This also implies that the Four Profound Applications Breathing from the public DVD's (which doesn't even reach Minor Kumbhaka, but even so there must be some benefit from it otherwise it would have been pointless to include in the DVD's), since the public DVD's are of the Open Level of Yantra Yoga as explained above by Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

This book contains:

"Table of Contents:

What is Yantra Yoga?; The Uniqueness of Yantra Yoga; Advice for Practice; Warm-ups; The Nine Purification Breathings; The Five Exercises for Loosening the Joints; The Eight Movements to Purify the Prana; The Five Exercises to Control the Channels; The Five Main Groups of Yantras: The First Group; The Second Group; The Third Group; The Fourth Group; The Fifth Group; The Vajra Wave to Eliminate Obstacles"

As I said, all the yantras apart from the seven lotuses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Anonymity and Trolling

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

This is a nonsense discourse for analyzing forums: anonymous people and their trolling.

Malcolm wrote:

A perfect example of trolling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

Dan74 said:

At the end of the day there's something a little suss about rubbishing someone else's religion and culture, even if the said rubbishing makes good points.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many cultural practices that are abusive of people -- these should be spoken out against. Customs where rapists have the option to marry their victims to expiate their crime. The binding of women's feet is another such custom. The custom of burning wives you wish to discard. The custom of honor killings. The custom "circumcising" the clitorises of young girls. The custom of denying young women to right to fair education. The custom of abducting young boys and training them as soldiers. I could go on. None of these customs are worthy of defending or ignoring. All of these customs have cultural and religious justifications. All of these customs are brutal indignities that defy basic principles of human decency.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

WeiHan said:

So all other substances are really just later addition?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Sherab Dorje"

Anyway, i was more referring to the precious metals and stones, sandalwood, silk material, etc.[/quote]

You don't need any of this for Sang offerings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

After all this discussion on suitable ingredients etc... I am going to be a party pooper and say that the thing that is of utmost importance is the internal and secret offering. Not that the external offering isn't important, but I find it hard to believe that yogis living in caves in remote areas of Tibet had access to all the necessary physical ingredients all the time, yet they practiced because they did have access to the most important ingredient: their mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Juniper grows everywhere in Tibet. Flour, honey and milk are available to everyone too.

Making sang substance is not a big deal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

uan said:

A theocracy is antithetical to our traditions...

Sherab Dorje said:

Really? What about Tibet before the Chinese invasion?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibet was never a theocracy. Wrong term. Tibet was not internally organized in this way. If any thing, Tibet was a loose confederation of small, independent Oligarchies, some ruled by monastic interests (who generally functioned much as corporations do today), others ruled by aristocratic families.

The Lhasa government was a combination of the two, the Khashag consisting of a board made up of an equal mix of secular aristocrats and monastic bureaucrats (who, like Desri Sangye Gyatso, were not always themselves monks). The Khashag had very little concrete power outside of the immediate precincts of Ü and Tshang.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Celibacy

Content:

Unknown said:

It is true that some of the books and DVDs about Yantra Yoga are in the public section of SSI webstore. However, it is necessary for someone to have received in advance, at least, the Guruyoga Transmission from Rinpoche, in order to practice the Pranayamas and the advanced Yantras. Only the preliminary practices are open to all. This I know from Laura Evangelisti during a Yantra Yoga course I followed personally.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, all the yantras can now be practiced as well as some of the pranayamas by people without having had transmission from the Boss.

What you say used to be the case, but that has now changed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Or perhaps you are not communicating effectively and need to try another approach.

Sherab Dorje said:

I considered that. That's why I explained it slightly differently each time. Now, unfortunately I am limited to expressing myself with written words, so there is only so much I can do (poetry is not my forte)!

I could post photos of dead Muslim children from all over the world, but then I would be accused of being dramatic.

Do you have something else in mind? I'm willing to try it.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is that you are having one conversation, and Khendrup is having another. So in fact you are talking past each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 4th, 2013 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Anonymity and Trolling

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Somebody interested in intelligent and informed discussion will take the views of the other party into account too.

Malcolm wrote:

The commonly accepted definition of a troll is someone who disrupts conversations for sheer enjoyment.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Troll_%28Internet%29

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 4th, 2013 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I'm not repeating it four times because I want you to agree with me, I am doing it because clearly you (and others) are not understanding what I am trying to say.

Malcolm wrote:

Or perhaps you are not communicating effectively and need to try another approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 4th, 2013 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Rinpoche is not talking about illusory body in this context. He really means that there are thirteen other planets where Dzogchen is present being taught.

Nighthawk said:

In this solar system? HmMMM

Malcolm wrote:

No, not in this solar system, obviously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 3rd, 2013 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Definition of liberal: broad-minded; especially : not bound by authoritarianism, orthodoxy, or traditional forms

When this philosophy becomes selective, ignoring authoritarianism and traditional values that trample on the rights of others, I decided to refer to it as neo-liberalism. It is a selective application of liberal principles according to the modern laws of identity politics and political correctness, which leads to a peculiar silence that shrilly denounces human rights abuses by some and strategically ignores them by others.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, you can't use this — neo-liberalism already has a well defined meaning. It refers to the radical free market ideology that drives corporate globalization.

The far right in the states has coined a term that might exploit to advantage for such people that you describe: libtard.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 3rd, 2013 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Rinpoche is not talking about illusory body in this context. He really means that there are thirteen other planets where Dzogchen is present being taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 3rd, 2013 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Master Norbu may be referring to the illusory body.

Malcolm wrote:
No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 11:17 PM
Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit
Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:
Actually, there is major difference between Tibet and the Andes: water. Water was never in shortage in Tibet. A major river runs right through the center of the country fed by smaller rivers on both sides. Tibetan "urban" civilization was entirely clustered around rivers. Indeed, it is supposed that the Zhang Zhung civilization centered around Kailash collapsed because of climate change, pushing the Zhang Zhung tribes into lower part of the what is the modern day TAR where there was more water.

The Andes, by comparison, are really quite dry, so water is much more of an issue for the Incas.
I don't think you could generalize about the Andes like that, the altiplano sure, but even then there's the Apurimac river to the West of Cusco with the Urubamba flanking East also.

Malcolm wrote:
There is nothing in Andes that resembles the Tsangpo river.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 9:52 PM
Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
This is all irrelevant to the Dharma. America is not a Dharma country (Dharmadeśa), Europe is not a Dharma country; though some buddhists might imagine it is a "central" country due to the presence of the few thousand monks.

What we have are squabbles between various worldly people and other various worldly people. Should they avoid violence? Yes.

American foreign policy has been aggressive for decades. Our Government is the Ajatasatru of the modern era.

Dar el Islam has been aggressive for centuries -- and American foreign policy has woken a sleeping behemoth. Of course there are Western educated liberal muslim scholars.

They are marginal in their own communities however. What they have to say is drowned in the rising tide of anger the Muslim world has towards the West.

The Buddha made things very clear. When a country is peaceful, minding its own business, caring for its population, then well, if they are attacked it is correct for them to respond. Do America and Europe fit this picture? No.

Therefore it should come as no surprise to us that some Moslems are attacking symbols of western imperialism since they do not yet have the power to attack us en masse directly.

The only sane response to this is for America and Europe to depart the middle east peacefully. If the whole place goes up in flames in the ensuing chaos, there is sadly nothing we can do except provide medical and humanitarian relief. But our experiments in regime changes have been utter failures so far.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 10:09 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

brendan said:

How can you type that but also claim there were social advancements in pre-PRC Tibetan civilisation equal to that of western civilisation who had no Realized Masters or Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing at all do with the whether there are more realized Tibetan masters in Tibet or India.

There are more realized Buddha masters (of Vajrayāna) with the borders of Tibet than without. I was not making any sort of claim about Indian civilization, Tibetan Civilization, Western Civilization and so on. You were the one who introduced this into the discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

JKhedrup said:

To be frank I am surprised you would quote such a source and give it so much credence.

Lotus_Bitch said:

There is some credence to what Indrajala brought up though. Looking at the Incan civilization, we see that they developed running water, baths, etc. within similar conditions (of the Tibetans) in the Andes mountains....

<http://enperublog.com/2009/07/08/surprising-water-engineering-at-machu-picchu/>

http://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g294314-d553950-Reviews-Inca_Baths_at_Tambomachay-Cusco_Cusco_Region.html

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, there is major difference between Tibet and the Andes: water. Water was never in shortage in Tibet. A major river runs right through the center of the country fed by smaller rivers on both sides. Tibetan "urban" civilization was entirely clustered around rivers. Indeed, it is supposed that the Zhang Zhung civilization centered around Kailash collapsed because of climate change, pushing the Zhang Zhung tribes into lower part of the what is the modern day TAR where there was more water.

The Andes, by comparison, are really quite dry, so water is much more of an issue for the Incas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

brendan said:

I understand western civilizations so called achievements are not a manifestation of "right view" and could be seen as being demonic.

Malcolm wrote:

You are making an idiot of yourself by such declarations.

brendan said:

Why? climate change seems to be a direct result of our progress.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no teaching in the Dharma that declares useful things "demonic" or somehow lacking "right view".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Humour isn't a sin. You should be able to laugh at Hyecho and his silly remark.

Malcolm wrote:

Humor is not a sin; bringing up that citation in the context this discussion shows an appalling lack of proportion.

Indrajala said:

Jeff, you need to study the history of Central Asia a little more carefully: it is certain that this monk's view of Tibetans was jaundiced by the fact that Tibetans (from Lhasa) held sovereignty over large swaths of Central Asia.

Sure, but the Tang history gives detailed observations of the Tibetan culture and habits at the time. Hyecho isn't my only source.

Malcolm wrote:

Consider the source: the Chinese have had nothing good to say about Tibetans since Minister Gar tricked the emperor out of his prized daughter.

Indrajala said:

Naw. I just counter the overzealous hype over Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Jeff -- your participation here was not countering any overzealous hype about Tibet. Anyone reading the thread can see this. What anyone can also see is that someone who claims to be Buddhist monk is casting racist aspersions about Tibetans, which they should not do, just as they should not invent and spread racist myths about Muslims -- which unfortunately happens in Tibet these days a lot. Tibetans happen to be very racist people in general. So when I hear racist things coming out of the mouths of Tibetans about westerners, or Muslims or Chinese people I become equally annoyed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are either finding yourself amusing, or you have vastly overestimated the caloric value of yak dung as fuel. Trust me, it does not burn very hot, and it takes a very, very long time to heat water at 13,000 feet.

Indrajala said:

When I was in Ladakh at 3600 metres above sea level I managed to do a quick cold wash sponge bath before getting my clothes quickly back on. Easy enough with a small amount of cold water.

Some descriptions of pre-modern Tibet just make it sound like they weren't trying, even in terms of basic sanitation in monasteries.

Malcolm wrote:

Descriptions of pre- Modern Canada makes it sound like they weren't trying very hard, even in terms of the basic sanitation of Toronto.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think this is funny?

Indrajala said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Many racists think their quips about the mores (whether true or false) of other people are funny. It's one of the signs by which one can tell one is racist towards a given group of people.

Indrajala said:

It is a little strange that he thinks there were no monasteries nor knowledge of Buddhism in Tibet. He clearly never visited Central Tibet in his travels.

The Tang Chinese didn't seem to think the Tibetans had much Buddhism, either. In the 8th century maybe they had a bit in the aristocratic circles.

Malcolm wrote:

Jeff, you need to study the history of Central Asia a little more carefully: it is certain that this monk's view of Tibetans was jaundiced by the fact that Tibetans (from Lhasa) held sovereignty over large swaths of Central Asia.

Indrajala said:

I think I've hit a sore spot. Some people here are rather emotionally invested in Tibet ... as Tibetan Buddhists?

Malcolm wrote:

No, if you are saying the same thing about blacks, Chinese people, mexicans, etc., I would equally take you to task.

You never spare any occasion to point barbs at Tibetans or their culture on this forum. Its pretty unbecoming conduct for a so called Buddhist monk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Not too long ago a Tibetan monk commented to me that he felt besides Buddhism, he thinks Tibet never really had much of a civilization.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure your monk friend never went to Tibet and has very little understanding of Tibetan culture and history, having spent his entire life in India (no wonder non-diaspora Tibetans find diaspora Tibetans annoying).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Indeed, if the Tibetans in the more remote and barren areas bathed regularly it would have become a threat to the environment- wood was that scarce and the trees would have disappeared.

Indrajala said:

Naw. An extra dung fire a day for washing wouldn't have been a big deal.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are either finding yourself amusing, or you have vastly overestimated the caloric value of yak dung as fuel. Trust me, it does not burn very hot, and it takes a very, very long time to heat water at 13,000 feet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just read the thread. It's ridiculous and you know it.

Indrajala said:

It is kind of comical, sure, but really my point is that the Tibetans invested a lot of resources into their religion (that's fine) while maybe neglecting things like hygiene, sanitation and infrastructure which they had examples from neighbouring cultures.

The Tang Chinese for instance had mile marker stones which facilitated travel and trade. They also had a limited pension system, baths and other such useful things. The Tibetans could have emulated such projects, but for various reasons it seems they didn't take so much of an interest. In the long-term they invested their resources differently, perhaps neglecting what could have been quite beneficial projects.

Malcolm wrote:

And just exactly what do you know about public works projects and Tibetan civilization? Given how sparsely populated the country was, it is amazing what Tibetans accomplished.

Indrajala said:

I'm well aware of the climate and water issues in Tibet. They still could have taken some of their resources and built public baths. They ultimately didn't. It wasn't a big deal ultimately.

Malcolm wrote:

You are being disingenuous.

Indrajala said:

So this conversation just strikes me as quite racist and narrow minded, with an absence of reflection on the real cultural circumstances, environmental and so on that, that we find these people in.

Was there a pressing need to munch on lice as Hyecho pointed out?

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think this is funny?

Do you have a pressing need to repeat the inaccurate observations of an eighth century Korean out of context?

It is a little strange that he thinks there were no monasteries nor knowledge of

Buddhism in Tibet. He clearly never visited Central Tibet in his travels.

It appears from his observation that he only passed through the nomadic region in far Western Tibet upon leaving Kashmir. So his observations must be considered rather suspect if one is to generalize from them as a whole.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

JKhedrup said:

So it seems unfair to target the Tibetans in this regard.

Malcolm wrote:

It is blatantly racist, given the way and the tone in which the subject was raised.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

brendan said:

I understand western civilizations so called achievements are not a manifestation of "right view" and could be seen as being demonic.

Malcolm wrote:

You are making an idiot of yourself by such declarations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Honestly, I never expected to see such racial prejudice on this forum.

I don't think you can convincingly argue that this is about race. More just poor quality sanitation and hygiene in a given civilization.

Malcolm wrote:

Just read the thread. It's ridiculous and you know it. It is not as if most people in Western Countries have had hot and cold running water prior to 1940.

The attitude being expressed here is one of total misunderstanding of a) differences in climate between the Himalayas and India; resources availability such as water -- it is not like they bathed with heated water in India, Jeff, they used water as it was from wells and rivers, heated by the sun. Rivers in Tibet are extremely cold even in the summer.

Tibetans made regular use of hot springs where they existed. But most nomads lived in places far away from such volcanically active sites, herding yaks and sheep in the meadows and plains.

In places like Lhasa, the aristocracy could afford more regular bathing, just like in Europe, whereas poorer people could not afford it. Monks, when they bathed, only bathed twice a month.

Just as in Americas during the 16th, 17th, 18th, and much of the 19th century, regular bathing was regarded as unhealthy by much of the Tibetan population, farmers and nomads. It was only after Pasteur that bathing began to take hold in Europe and the US. And daily bathing was not common in the US until after WWII, and in parts of Europe, it is still not common.

Conditions in India are different -- it is hot, people are much hairier -- Tibetans have virtually no body hair in general.

In terms of sewer systems -- Tibet never had large populations apart from in Lhasa to deal with, so it was not an issue for most Tibetans when they came to India and Nepal. Population pressure by the Chinese have forced a lot of Tibetans away from their previous, lowland winter habitations, further, most of the pollution in Tibet has been brought by the Chinese, who now outnumber Tibetans in their own land by quite a bit.

So this conversation just strikes me as quite racist and narrow minded, with an absence of reflection on the real cultural circumstances, environmental and so on that, that we find these people in.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

brendan said:

Washing is just one example.

What about woman and children?

What about medicine, giving practitioners safe infrastructure (sewage systems etc)..

Malcolm wrote:

You really actually have no clue what you are talking about. Your ignorance of Tibetan culture and history is pretty appalling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

They didn't see the bathing as worth maintaining it seems.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist monks, according to Mula Sarvastivada Vinaya, were only permitted to bath twice a month.

Also the Tibetans understood quite well the germ theory of disease.

Honestly, I never expected to see such racial prejudice on this forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you people have any clue how racist you sound right now?

Have you examined the hygienic habits of 19th century Canadians and Americans in comparison to the hygienic habits of 19th century Tibetans?

Do you seriously think we were actually cleaner than Tibetans prior to the time when most Europeans and Americans had no running water in their homes?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 10:46 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

anjali said:

are realized masters still present in Tibet who can give authentic transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

More than in India, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 10:45 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Sherlock said:

There are many Chinese monastics at Larung and Yachen and many books and commentaries are translated into Chinese that are not available in English. The accuracy of the translations is a different matter, but the content is out there and there is a demand for it.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chinese actually bulldozed major sections of Larung Gar because there were Chinese people there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Thank you malcolm, that is interesting, it does sound what I remember hearing. Don't know about past and future tense in the Tibetan language, if it is always obvious or not.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it is quite clear in the original text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

cool. great details, etc.

i also heard that there may be a listing of 64 Dzogchen Buddhas in their respective aeons and with their respective buddhafiels and world systems.

Malcolm wrote:

Temporally, it is not hard to discern. They are prior to this eon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

mutsum said:

This is clearly not the case. The meaning of thal-ba is given throughout the commentary as (reduced to) powder, etc. HE Khenpo Jigphun has a long explanation about it, directly related to the title.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I think you are over looking the meaning of thal ba as "samatikramatikrānta".

mutsum said:

Possibly though I doubt it. I prefer to stick to Vimalamitra's interpretation in the commentary and the long explanation by HE Khenpo Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

Is Khenpo Jigphun's explanation to be found in his collected works?.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

mutsum said:

This is clearly not the case. The meaning of thal-ba is given throughout the commentary as (reduced to) powder, etc. HE Khenpo Jigphun has a long explanation about it, directly related to the title.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I think you are over looking the meaning of thal ba as "samatikramatikrānta".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is referring to the so called "thal ba'i gnas", of which there are thirteen.

mutsum said:

No, you are mixing these sanctuaries (thal-ba'i gnas) and the pure realms or buddhafiels (zhing khrams). There are eight of these sanctuaries only, and thirteen pure realms. Actually pure realms (zhing khams) are a subdivision of these sanctuaries.

Malcolm wrote:

There are thirteen thal bas explained in the sgra thal gyur -- it is very clearly explained:

1. thal ba dbyangs
2. thal ba 'dzin
3. thal ba skyob
4. thal ba brdal ba
5. thal ba'i be con
6. thal ba'i rgyun
7. rab tu thal bas khyab
8. thal ba'i sgra
9. thal ba'i rlung
10. rin po che'i rlung thal ba
11. 'du ba'i thal ba
12. dung ldan thal ba
13. skar ma'i thal ba

Each one is called a buddhafiield, because each one also has a teacher, retinue, teaching, etc.

While the commentary on the text indeed glosses "thal ba" as brdal ba in this context i.e. "spread out", however, Norbu Rinpoche maintains that "thal ba" means "beyond".

What the text says is that there are eight types of thal ba'i gnas.

1. 'jig rten khams (durgatiloka)
2. shing khams (kṣetraloka, buddhafiields)
3. dam bca' skyobs
4. skyon gnas
5. 'pheb pa'i sa
6. sbyor ba
7. grags
8. song ba'i gnas

We are discussing here class two: buddhafiields where Dzogchen is taught.

Perhaps we are talking past each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche may be referring to the twelve Nirmanakaya Dzogchen Buddhas

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is referring to the so called "thal ba'i gnas", of which there are thirteen. thal ba

may mean "galaxy" or it may mean "universe". It is certainly broader than a solar system.

Within these thirteen *thal ba* are so called "fields" (*kṣetras*, *zhing khams*). The term *zhing khams* is often translated as "pure land", but that is inaccurate -- there are both pure and impure *kṣetras*. A better term is "buddhafield", since a *kṣetra* is defined as the field of activity of a given Buddha or bodhisattva. All of the *zhing khams* mentioned in these thirteen *thal bas* contain buddhas.

In these thirteen *thal bas* and their buddhafields it is maintained that Dzogchen teachings are presently found during this epoch.

Nighthawk said:

What is the criteria to get into these buddhafields?

Malcolm wrote:

One assumes merit, just the same as what got into this buddhafield.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quite the opposite -- Dharma in Tibet, while under siege, has experienced a massive intellectual resurgence, especially in Eastern Tibet, Amdo and Golok -- with thousands of books being published in Tibetan language every year on all subjects.

Indrajala said:

That rather undermines or at least takes away from the arguments of diaspora Tibetans who say Buddhism is being systematically crushed and eradicated from Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

I already mentioned that Tibetans in Tibet do not necessarily like Diaspora Tibetans very much.

For example, in Tibetan communities in this country [US] they tend to stay separate, with the Diaspora Tibetans always suspecting the non-Diaspora Tibetans of being spies.

There are also regional issues.

However, Institutional Buddhism is being suppressed when it represents a political threat to the Chinese, but the Chinese seem to care very little to prevent Tibetan Buddhist literary production as long as it is strictly academic and religious. Of course the non-diaspora Tibetans have developed an entire vocabulary for voicing their complaints to one another, but Beijing seems not to care. if you ever watched modern Tibetan dance music, you will see all kind of coded references to independence, HHDL

and so on.

Also when Chinese people become interested in teachers like Khenpo Jigme Phuntsok, the Chinese will step in to put it down. They don't seem to care if the Tibetans practice Buddhism -- but they are not happy when the Chinese become interested in it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche may be referring to the twelve Nirmanakaya Dzogchen Buddhas

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is referring to the so called "thal ba'i gnas", of which there are thirteen. thal ba may mean "galaxy" or it may mean "universe". It is certainly broader than a solar system.

Within these thirteen thal ba are so called "fields" (kṣetras, zhing khams). The term zhing khams is often translated as "pure land", but that is inaccurate -- there are both pure and impure kṣetras. A better term is "buddhafield", since a kṣetra is defined as the field of activity of a given Buddha or bodhisattva. All of the zhing khams mentioned in these thirteen thal bas contain buddhas.

In these thirteen thal bas and their buddhafields it is maintained that Dzogchen teachings are presently found during this epoch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, Tibetan Buddhism in India is pretty moribund.

The best work in Tibetan Buddhism by Tibetans is being done in Tibet.

Also the best practitioners and Lamas are in Tibet for the most part, not in India.

The Tibetans in Tibet are not really thrilled with the diaspora Tibetans.

anjali said:

Would you, or someone else also in the know, say more about this? As someone with absolutely no insight into the current state of Buddhism within Tibet, I get the impression that the backbone of Buddhism in Tibet has been broken and that cultural genocide by China is steadily proceeding. Is this not the case? Is Buddhism within Tibet

resilient? Or is it fragmented to the point of unsustainability, even though there may be strong pockets of practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Quite the opposite -- Dharma in Tibet, while under siege, has experienced a massive intellectual resurgence, especially in Eastern Tibet, Amdo and Golok -- with thousands of books being published in Tibetan language every year on all subjects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa & Someone with Tantric Initiation: Difference?

Content:

Kunzang8 said:

Hi

1) What is the difference between someone who is a Ngakpa and someone who has taken higher tantric initiations - don't they have the same Tantric vows and commitments. I suppose it would be correct to say all Ngakpas are Tantric practitioners but not all Tantric practitioners are Ngakpas?

2) If one is a Ngakpa is it normal for such a person later to decide to become an ordained monk? Or for an ordained monk who for whatever reason later to become a Ngakpa (I'm not talking about reverting to being an ordinary lay person but a Ngakpa in the traditional sense). Anyone know such examples?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of people like to wear a stripped robe these days, and call themselves a Ngakpa, but if your mantras have no force and power, then just what is the point of calling yourself a Mantrika? Not much.

Even if you have the formal sngags pa empowerment like me, hesitate to call yourself a sngags pa if your mantras have about as much force as wind on a still hot humid summers day.

Adamantine said:

Malcolm, did you encounter many/any ngakpas in your Tibet travels?

Malcolm wrote:

A few.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa & Someone with Tantric Initiation: Difference?

Content:

Kunzang8 said:

Hi

1) What is the difference between someone who is a Ngakpa and someone who has taken higher tantric initiations - don't they have the same Tantric vows and commitments. I suppose it would be correct to say all Ngakpas are Tantric practitioners but not all Tantric practitioners are Ngakpas?

2) If one is a Ngakpa is it normal for such a person later to decide to become an ordained monk? Or for an ordained monk who for whatever reason later to become a Ngakpa (I'm not talking about reverting to being an ordinary lay person but a Ngakpa in the traditional sense). Anyone know such examples?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of people like to wear a stripped robe these days, and call themselves a Ngakpa, but if your mantras have no force and power, then just what is the point of calling yourself a Mantrika? Not much.

Even if you have the formal sngags pa empowerment like me, hesitate to call yourself a sngags pa if your mantras have about as much force as wind on a still hot humid summers day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

anjali said:

So, although "mindness" is not your usual translation of sems-nyid, I think it works fairly well.

Malcolm wrote:

Its ok, it just sounds weird to me, and honestly, it does not really convey the genitive sense of sems kyi chos nyid i.e. the dharmatā of the mind, which is in my opinion what the term sems nyid is generally glossing in Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sems nyid is a translation of cittatā or citta dharmatā. The tā suffix can mean essence; it can also simply mean "is"; or also "itself" -- as you know it clearly depends on context.

In the example you give above, "the mind essence is the primal nature (prakṛti) of the mind", also redundant, but as you know sometimes tibetan texts are like that.

mutsuk said:

sems nyid as essence of mind does not help much if one comes across sems nyid sems kyi ngo bo yin (the essence of the mind is the essence of the mind). Nyid is a simple reflexive tattva case.

Malcolm wrote:

You can render it this way: the mind essence is the entity of the mind.

In Tibetan it is always redundant, "the mind itself is the essence of mind" is also redundant.

That is why it necessary to look for context. It depends on whether nyid is rendering eva i.e. just so, etc. or tā as in chos nyid.

For example "'DI DAG GIS NI SEMS NYID GZUGS SU SNANG BA NYID DU BSTAN TO"
"Both of those are the mind itself (or just the mind, only the mind) shown as appearing as matter/form" This is clearly an "eva" usage.

Here however we have a sems nyid aka sems kyi chos nyid:

SGRON MA GSAL BAR BYED PA ZHES BYA BA'I RGYA CHER BSHAD PA:
RANG GI SEMS KYI CHOS NYID LA GNAS PA NI RANG GI SEMS KYI ROL BA'O "Abiding in the nature [dharmatā] of one's mind is the play of one's mind"

Or

DBU MA RIN PO CHE'I SGRON MA ZHES BYA BA:

GANG GI TSE GZUGS LA SOGS PA'I DMIGS PA RNAMS SEMS LAS PHYI ROL NA MI
SNANG BA DE'I TSE RANG GI SEMS KYI CHOS NYID LA NGES PAR GNAS PA'I SEMS NI

GNYIS SU MED PA'I YE SHES ZHES BYA

When the perceptions of matter and so on do not appear external to the mind, at that time the mind that definitely abides in the nature [dharmatā] of one's mind is called "non-dual wisdom".

So basically, the issue is distinguishing sems nyid as cittaiva and sems nyid as a gloss for citta dharmatā -- and sometimes that can be difficult.

For example, if we take your example and apply the principle that sems nyid here means sems kyi chos nyid, your sentence in both instances makes more sense "The dharmatā (nature) of the mind is the primal nature of the mind" and "The dharmatā (nature) of the mind is the essence/entity of the mind". It becomes a little strange if we say "The mind itself is the primal nature of the mind" or "The mind itself is the essence/entity of the mind" -- so the cittaiva does not work here.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen VS Mahamudra..why?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Maybe I am just an uneducated rube but perhaps someone can explain to me why there is so much dissension. "Theyre the same" VS "theyre not the same". This seems to crop up a lot and I for one just dont get it. On the one hand you have Garab Dorje, Vimalamitra, Vairocana, Manjushrimitra, etc etc up until present day. All great Totally Realized Masters. On the other hand you have Naropa, Tilopa, Marpa, Milarepa, etc etc up until present day..also great Totally Realized Masters. It doesn't take much reading to see that their methods were different...vive la diferance...But ultimately Total Realization is Total Realization, right??? If a person hears/reads about Garab Dorje or Milarepa and one of those strikes a chord in them isn't that the most important thing? Hopefully somebody here can definitively clear this up for me....because I just don't get it

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is, generally speaking, a gradual path, Dzogchen isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

mitsuk said:

However, as far as translation is concerned, I don't know why but in English Mind (sems-nyid) is often (always?) rendered by "nature of the mind". This is actually a definition not a translation. Sems-nyid is "Mind itself" or "Mind" if you want to drop the "itself".

Choosing Mind or Mind itself would help avoiding ridiculous renderings when encountering sentences like "sems-nyid sems kyi rang bzhin yin/" -- "The nature of the mind (sems-nyid) is the nature of the mind (sems kyi rang bzhin)", which I guess all here

would consider as silly, no?

Malcolm wrote:

Sems nyid is a translation of cittatā or citta dharmatā. The tā suffix can mean essence; it can also simply mean "is"; or also "itself" -- as you know it clearly depends on context.

In the example you give above, "the mind essence is the primal nature (prakṛti) of the mind", also redundant, but as you know sometimes tibetan texts are like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Clarence said:

Malcolm,

Would you mind explaining the difference?

THanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa, vidya, is the recognition of the basis of the individual.

dzogchungpa said:

So basically it's atma vidya, no?

Malcolm wrote:

Atmya sthana vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

Jikan said:

In ChNN's diction, "rigpa" is "instant presence": the recognition of the nature of mind. "being in it."

the nature of mind (sems nyid) is something like a latent capacity that is unrecognized, right? so the difference between the two is being in on the secret, getting it, recognizing it? which is to say, it's a kind of knowledge?

I get this confused from time to time; if I'm still upside-down on this, I do hope someone will set me right.

heart said:

The nature of mind and the natural state are the same, so recognizing the nature of mind and rigpa is the same.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, rig pa can be called "recognizing the nature the mind". You always have "the nature of mind".

Of course, there are Dzogchen teachings which criticize this approach however, because it is held that buddhahood cannot be found in the mind.

So calling rig pa "the recognition of the nature of the mind" is quite provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

heart said:

I certainly never heard him do that distinction, nor have I ever heard anyone else do it except for you Malcolm.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You need to listen more carefully then to what ChNN says, or listen to more retreats.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

In the grand scheme of things...

Malcolm wrote:

In the grand scheme of things there is almost nothing one can do to stem the suffering of others in samsara. Not even Buddha can remove the suffering of others. However, one can remove one's own suffering. And for this reason these sorts of conversations, in the grand scheme of things, are critically important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 7:35 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is not an argument for a lesser evil, in my opinion. It is a very different kind of argument, it is an argument for the greatest good.

Indrajala said:

Potatoh, potatoe.

Malcolm wrote:

You are ignoring the explicit argument that this form of killing, far from being evil, is actually meritorious, and benefits everyone involved, especially the person being killed. Lesser evil thought experiments never run along these lines.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 4:02 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Clarence said:

Malcolm,

Would you mind explaining the difference?

THanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa, vidya, is the recognition of the basis of the individual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 3:39 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rig pa is not the nature of the mind.

heart said:

really, how come ChNNR says so every single retreat?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

He makes a clear distinction rig pa and the nature of the mind, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 10:30 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

In our world it is often about choosing the lesser of evils.

Malcolm wrote:

This is hardly a Buddhist ethic, Mahāyāna or otherwise.

Indrajala said:

Are you unaware of the Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra?

“If the bodhisattva sees a thief about to kill many beings out of a craving for wealth, or about to harm a venerable śrāvaka, pratyekabuddha or bodhisattva, or about to create much karma [for which he will be reborn in] Avīci Hell, seeing such things he thinks, 'If I sever that evil being's life I will fall into hell [naraka]. If it not be severed, then the karma [for which he will be reborn in] Avīci Hell will see him undergo much suffering. I should kill him and fall into hell rather than ever allow him to undergo the suffering of Avīci Hell.' Like this the bodhisattva makes an aspiration and thinks, 'I will have a virtuous or neutral mind towards the being.' Knowing in the future what is to come, he thus generates deep shame and with a compassionate mind severs the life [of the thief]. It is due to these causes and conditions that there is no violation of the bodhisattva precepts, and much merit is produced.”

Malcolm wrote:

That is not an argument for a lesser evil, in my opinion. It is a very different kind of argument, it is an argument for the greatest good.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

In our world it is often about choosing the lesser of evils.

Malcolm wrote:

This is hardly a Buddhist ethic, Mahāyāna or otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

...all this seems, well... really, unbelievably, like completely... pointless and lacking any essence. So sorry for the attitude.

Malcolm wrote:

The suffering of samsara is horrible.

Actually understanding what the term "rig pa" means is important for those who wish to end their suffering, since all Dharma paths, both Hindu and Buddhist, define the cause of suffering as ignorance (avidyā, ma rig pa) and the cause of liberation as knowledge (vidyā, rig pa).

Understanding the distinction between Mahāmudra and Dzogchen is important for those who wish to follow one path versus the other, for whatever their personal reasons may be. For others the distinction may not be important.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Let's see how finely we can split this hair now, shall we?

Clarence said:

It is actually an important difference as Malcolm just showed.

gregkavarnos said:

Yes, I am sure it is, coz now that you know that sems nyid is not Rig pa, well, now you just realised the essential state, whereas up to now you only realised the nature of mind. That's how important that was. Right?

Malcolm wrote:

Are you generally going to be this snotty from now on? Or are you just having a day?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Yes, why bother to be precise when dealing with central concepts of practice? It's all just words anyway, man.

Or we can get all anally retentive about it, and split hairs all day about what is (or is not) mind, whether Mahamudra is Dzogchen, whether they differ in terms of practice or not, whether we are talking about ground or sutra mahamudra, etc... and clutter up yet another thread with the same old boring endless repetitive and essentially useless distracting discussion (ie views) since Dzogchen/Mahamudra essentially only requires pointing out for you to get it, and everything else is just (more) verbal flatulence.

Malcolm wrote:

Your reply amounts to repeating what he said:

"It's all just words anyway, man"

In other words, your reply was essentially pointless.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Jikan said:

I'd thought that rigpa was often but not always translated as "nature of mind."

I don't mean to throw the whole thread off track, but... what's the difference between "nature of mind" and "rigpa" in your usage, Malcolm?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

The term "sems nyid" is the term translated as the "nature of the mind".

Rig pa is knowledge of your primordial state.

They are not the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

heart said:

[

You think perhaps in Dzogchen you realize something different?
My Guru teach both Dzogchen and Mahamudra.

/magnus

Karma Dorje said:
The realization is the same. The paths are different.

heart said:
This statement just define the relationship between mind and nature of mind (sem and rigpa), equally valid for both paths.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Rig pa is not the nature of the mind.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 2:10 AM
Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit
Content:
JKhedrup said:
Yes, and as China becomes a net food importer this will pose a whole new set of additional pressures.

Malcolm wrote:
Indeed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 1:25 AM
Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit
Content:
Indrajala said:
Look at what a catastrophic failure Gandhi and his team were.

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is not correct.

Indrajala said:

Partition resulted in millions of avoidable deaths and untold suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Not Gandhi's fault. He actively opposed Partition. In fact the Congress Party was entirely opposed to it.

Partition was brought about by the Mountbatten plan, in response to the Muslim League's demands for a separate state, and almost entirely contrived by the British.

Indrajala said:

The British did a lot of good in India and it'd be nice if people recognized that.

Malcolm wrote:

The harm to India done by the British to India was recognized from the beginning:

Edmund Burke in a speech said:

What would you call it? To call it tyranny sublimed into madness would be too faint an image; yet this very madness is the principle upon which the ministers at your right hand have proceeded in their estimate of the revenues of the Carnatic, when they were providing, not supply for the establishments of its protection, but rewards for the authors of its ruin...Never did oppression light the nuptial torch; never did extortion and usury spread out the genial bed. Do any of you think that England, so wasted, would, under such a nursing attendance, so rapidly and cheaply recover?

<http://www.ourcivilisation.com/smartboard/shop/burkee/extracts/chap11.htm>

Indrajala said:

They weren't perfect and there were plenty of opportunistic characters, sure, but overall they did more good than harm. If you look at the mess India is in today, you might appreciate how British colonial rule made a lot of sense even back in the day.

Malcolm wrote:

The mess India is today is a direct result of British Mismanagement and interference in India civilization.

Indrajala said:

It was the British who rediscovered many of the Buddhist sites around the subcontinent, too. Their contributions to Indology can't be overlooked.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, someday someone will quip -- "The Chinese contribution to Tibetology cannot be over looked." Hardly even a booby prize, and of little concern to Indians for whom Buddhadharma had been dead for more than a thousand years.

Indrajala said:

That's absurd. The state which has a monopoly on violence has overwhelming authority over the populace.

Malcolm wrote:

The British thought that, and they were wrong in the case of the Colonies, in the case of India and a number of other places.

Indrajala said:

That's just reality.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is conservative defeatism. History does not bear your pessimism out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: What is the Definitive Source?

Content:

oushi said:

Maybe it's not a good moment to ask this, but anyway can someone give a commentary on this:

Listen! You state of pure and total presence,

And all sentient beings of the three realms,

Are clearly shown to be the teacher.

Because you have not seen your mind as the teacher,

Even after 100,000 aeons,

When I, the majestic creativity of the universe,

Manifest as the teacher, you own mind,

You should listen to this message: Your own mind is the teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

You can get Valby's books and see how this is commented on there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Tibet is controlled by the PRC. The land now belongs to them in practice and by the agreement of the international community. The Tibetans were conquered by force of arms and continue to be subjugated. This is how the real world works unfortunately: the PRC has a monopoly of violence in Tibet, so they run the show.

Malcolm wrote:

Imagine Gandhi telling the Indians to give into the Brits, because the Brits had the monopoly on violence.

Imagine Martin Luther King Jr. telling his congregation to just give in to the Southern Whites because they had a monopoly of violence.

History shows that a monopoly on violence does not guarantee power. In fact it often shows instability.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

I don't take either side. I do, however, believe the Tibetans and Tibetan Buddhism would be best served in India and Nepal unless China suddenly collapses,

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, Tibetan Buddhism in India is pretty moribund.

The best work in Tibetan Buddhism by Tibetans is being done in Tibet.

Also the best practitioners and Lamas are in Tibet for the most part, not in India.

The Tibetans in Tibet are not really thrilled with the diaspora Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

it is best to rely, as much as possible, on unemotional observation.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

I don't know where people get the idea I have an aversion to Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, go back and read what you write, if you are so puzzled.

You have spent a fair amount of time arguing that Tibetan political incompetence lead to the diaspora; that Tibetan independence is a fruitless cause; that there is no point in trying to preserve Tibetan culture, language and customs; that Tibetans do not really have a right to self-determination because it is inconsistent with Chinese real politik; that Tibetans should basically lie back and enjoy the Chinese rape of Tibetan land, culture and environment since according to you there is nothing they can do about it anyway. When you are met with indignity at your unfeeling proclamations, you then assert that people are "idealistic", unrealistic", and so on. In short you demonstrate cold-heartedness in the name of political pragmatism, and seem to care nothing about the human costs of the political situations you are commenting upon.

You have generally castigated Tibetan Buddhism for being successful in the west, and castigated Tibetan Buddhists for adopting Tibetan Buddhism.

So it is not surprising to me at all that people think you have a negative attitude about Tibetans and Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is a problem with most people. Not Buddhists in particular.

Indrajala said:

Buddhists though, my experience, tend to be even more idealistic than usual.

It is like they dislike war and therefore think it should go away because they find it disagreeable.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to get out more often.

There are many people far more idealistic than Buddhists, such as climate change advocates and so on.

In general, my experience of Buddhists is that they are pretty pessimistic, like you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: What is the Definitive Source?

Content:

Astus said:

Is there a definitive source of Dzogchen teachings? I mean, if I want to check whether a teaching given is authentic, is there a written canon that can confirm or deny the validity of a doctrine or method? Like, can the tantras be used for this, or the writings of certain masters? Or is it only the living lineage holders who can serve as accepted sources?

Malcolm wrote:

The definitive source of Dzogchen teachings is a Buddha by the name of Garab Dorje. He taught the tantras of the three series, sems sde, klong sde and man ngag sde. Secondly, there are the various instructions that attached to these three series, such as the Vima snyin thig and so on. Finally, there are the surviving commentaries on these various texts. Then there are commentaries written by early Tibetan masters such as Vairocana and Nub Sangye Yeshe, etc. Finally there are the commentaries of Longchenpa.

This taken together can be understood as the definitive sources for Dzogchen teachings.

Of course, without a living Guru, one cannot receive transmission into Dzogchen teaching, and without that transmission, all these books are just so much dry tinder.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: What is the Definitive Source?

Content:

Sönam said:

Only confidence can help in this case ... and peoples having recognized there true nature recognize each others, that's the only point.

It is also not a question of being sure of the master, because the one who recognize is You, not the master.

If it is said that this realization is ineffable, it's because it is ... what ever would be the way we try.

Trust me, once, we the energy of the master, you've realized your nature ... doubt is eliminated.

Astus said:

That means there is no way to decide who is or who is not an authentic Dzogchen teacher. Either you recognise someone as such or not, but it's completely arbitrary. Consequently there is no basis for debating anyone's claim to being a realised Dzogchen master.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no basis for debating anyone's claim to being realized at all, including the

Buddha's claims about his own realization. One either believes it or one does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: HHDL leaving Dharamsala?

Content:

Indrajala said:

All things considered, I think McLeodganj is rather cramped. HHDL gives public teachings and Namgyal isn't really able to accommodate the crowds so well. Some people have to sit upstairs or downstairs and watch a TV monitor.

Malcolm wrote:

Simply put, South India is nicer than North India. The food is better, the people nicer. Mysore is a decent city, Bangalore supposed to be even better.

HHDL is basically a Nyingmapa anyway, so it is fitting for him to be installed in a Nyingma monastery.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

This is a problem I find with a lot of Buddhists. They're idealistic and like to talk about what ought to happen rather than what probably will.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a problem with most people. Not Buddhists in particular.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Who holds the highest throne?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Traditionally the "pyramid" of the stature of the various lamas went something like this, according to the political structure: Dalai Lama, Panchen Lama, Sakya Trizin, Karmapa, Ganden Tripa.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, HHDL, Sakya Trizin, Karmapa, etc. There is a text about this by Khyentse Wangpo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 26th, 2013 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Thank you Malcolm, that's very interesting, as usual. Karma and original sin.....hmmmm.....? wondering if the idea of original sin is similar to the idea of "ignorance" in dzogchen.....and if Dzogchen thinks that teachers like Jesus removed all the negative karma from all Christians, or that other teachers removed all the negative karma from followers of their teachings? Don't want to keep bugging you Malcolm, if you are busy, but just always wondered about this, if anyone has any teachings on the subject.

b.f.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the teaching of Dzogchen is actually very simple: the difference between a buddha (awakened without the performance of even the smallest virtuous deeds) and a sentient being (wandering in samsara without initially having performed the least non-virtuous deed) is the simple recognition or non-recognition of one's own state.

There is, according to ChNN, no possible way to remove all the negative karma accumulated for countless lifetimes in samsara. So it is impossible that a teacher likewise can do this for one, from the perspective of Dzogchen teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 26th, 2013 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing particularly Dzogchen about any of this apart from the citation of Tulku Orgyen's statement.

But as I understand the intent behind this book, it is quite early and is deliberately geared toward an audience that has no knowledge at all of what Dzogchen is or might be, and is therefore intentionally ecumenical.

In reality, there is no relationship between the concept of original sin and karma.

Barney Fife said:

Quotes from "Essence of Mind: An Approach to Dzogchen" by Jes Bertelsen:

"There are many types of continuous exercises. They could be divided into two large main categories. One type is a kind of preparation for meditation: channeling exercises, circulation exercises, and the use of symbolic images (channeling and circulation exercises such as the pineal-hara or yin-yang-breathing described in Presence Meditation, symbols such as a flower or a candle or a yantra in a chakra). The second type is the quintessence of prayer, centered in the heart in the form of a mantra (such as Jesus Christ; Kyrie eleison, Kriste eleison; La illah il allah; Namu amida butsu) (Kindle location 1122; p. 87)

"The other main reason that these continuous exercises are necessary is our dim Precambrian lethargy, with regard to achieving greater wakefulness. In the West, this feature has been accurately described as original sin. In the East it is called negative karma. These terms indicate that the sluggishness reaches beyond the personal and deeply into our collective hereditary backgrounds. It is a feature that is embedded in evolution itself, in our genes, in the collective unconscious." (Kindle Location 1026-130; p.80).

"It is self-evidently true that the great enlightened ones on this earth eliminate original sin and negative karma. But it is just as self-evident-- and we all see this, every day in the media-- that this does not help in the least unless each of us as individuals help the process along, with psychotherapy, ethics, prayer, meditation, and continuous exercises.

Even though this earth has seen a long line of radiant, enlightened teachers (Rumi, Krishna, Buddha, Christ, Francis, Rabia, Meera, Yeshe Tsogyel, Teresa, etc.), and even though each of them, according to their individual capacity and caliber, takes on original sin and purifies it for all the rest of us, this does not help one bit unless each individual lends a hand, too. Frankly, the world has not become a better place, and people have not improved, since the Buddha and the Christ. Rather the opposite-- when seen from the ordinary levels of consciousness.

Even though there are one billion Christians on the planet, and Christ has accepted the total load of original sin for all these one billion Christians, it doesn't work. It is only when the individual does his share of the work (psychotherapy, prayer, ethical behavior, meditation, and continuous exercises) that it turns out, again and again, that at the right moment, when the mystery opens, the enlightened consciousness has already purified the negative karma and has taken and forgiven the original sin. But this divine function can only unfold when the individual human being has prepared himself or herself through existential transformation.

The old teachers bear witness to the divine power of enlightened consciousness to eliminate original sin and negative karma for oneself and others.

Master Eckhart speaks in the West:

"Indeed, you might well turn away quickly and in a short time from all sins, so strongly and with such true revulsion, and turn so strongly to God that, though you had committed all the sins that ever were or shall be since Adam's time, they would all be forgiven you, together with the punishment for them...."

Master Tulku Urgyen speaks in the East:

"One moment in the purest rigpa can eliminate the accumulation of negative karma from a whole lifetime, or even from several lifetimes."

(Kindle Locations 1046-1064; p.81-82)

"Up to this point in the book, the description of the spiritual developmental process all the way to the process of enlightenment has been kept within the context of one lifetime, namely the present one. And-- as it is emphasized for instance in both Christian and Tibetan mysticism-- experience does show that it is possible for a person to realize the enlightenment process in one lifetime. However, Indian spiritual traditions (such as Vedanta, Jainism, Mahayana), among others, maintain that the process of spiritual enlightenment usually extends over several lifetimes, and that it is embedded in a more impersonal overarching developmental continuum. This development includes the process of the self through the progressive karma, as well as the collective karmic process at the level of joint consciousness."

(Kindle Location 1368-1374; p.106)

Would anyone be kind enough to offer some incisive Dzogchen commentary on the above passages of Jes Bertelsen's teachings? Possibly Malcolm, or someone with knowledge of the Dzogchen teachings? Thanks!

b.f.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

padma norbu said:

Hmm, I skipped right to 27 minutes in where he says the thangka tradition has it's origins in shamanic culture and psychoactive substance usage, which, if true, is very interesting.

Malcolm wrote:

It's is total nonsense, of course. The orgins of thangkha art are well understood and documented, being a form of canonical painting formalized over more than a millennia.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

In the end they might last longer in the game than the USA.

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt it -- I vote China the country most likely to degenerate into provinces run by warlords -- they are halfway there (again) already, and things are only being very tenuously tied together by an increasingly moribund and irrelevant Communist Party leadership.

They do not have the resources the western hemisphere has, they do not have the technology, their environment is ruined, there is massive social unrest with frequent riots, and their political system is moribund as well, as noted above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

By all means we have to be mindful and cautious about these things, especially if we have seen the detrimental effects they can have on some people, but we must also be open to the possibility that used under proper guidance ,in a ceremonial ritualistic setting, with careful intent,prayer,mantra,meditation, there can be benefit and merit to the path, even if it is only a temporary vehicle for some, a medicine for others, and a guru of boundless wisdom and compassion for others.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever its benefits may be, the "shaman"'s path is a worldly path, and does not lead to liberation in the sense that those who follow Buddhadharma understand the term "liberation", which specifically means freedom from rebirth in samsara at its most basic level.

Actually, Beyer makes this quite clear in the beginning of his book about Ayahauceros, citing an example of a huge magical war that lead to the death of some his friends on one side at the magical hands of other of his friends on the other side.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 10:51 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

China doesn't need to improve its image anyway. It has the world by the balls financially and industrially.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really -- they are facing a credit bubble, a real estate bubble, their industries are

actually operating at losses in general, all to prop up a growing consumer class.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

And Malcom, this is why i'm here. To learn from those of you with valuable advice and to disregard the Forum/Buddhist elitism many other people display.

.

Malcolm wrote:

The bardo of dharmatā itself has nothing to do with other beings -- it is a direct experience of the ultimate reality of your own state. You can also have that experience in this life, but not with drugs -- they just get in the way because they alter how you directly perceive things, they alter your sensory apparatus and nervous system. And that, from the point of view of directly experiencing your own state, is negative.

Of course, if you want to talk to plants on the other hand, well, then ayahuasca seems to have some positive qualities in that respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

The reason i mentioned Ayawaska and a perception of the Bardo/ astral plane is because it is known to dissolve our normal barriers of ordinary perception .Maybe i am using too many syncretic terms interchangeably without elaborating enough but i think there's a lot to be learnt from the knowledge and connection to the world ,other beings and transcendental states that ayawaska can act as a catylyst for.

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to actually understand the Bardo I suggest you place yourself at the feet of a Dzogchen master and learn what he has to teach you. You are just engaged in a lot of intellectual speculation, and some of us have been there years before you, and actually may have some useful advice for you to follow. But it is up to you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

padma norbu said:

Supposedly, she was medically dead, though.

Malcolm wrote:

Medically "dead" to a Tibetan physician might not be quite the same thing as medically dead to a Western one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

smcj said:

So who were they financed by and why?

Sandoz patented LSD in 1945. If they still have the patent they would benefit. If it is in the public domain, then nobody could make a killing. It would be like aspirin. I don't think you can patent a plant.

I heard that the head of Harvard psychiatry (or psychology?) wants to make MDMA a prescription drug for couples therapy. But a German company patented it in 1915, along with a lot of other forms of amphetamine, so the it has run out. Thus no push by big pharmaceuticals means no legislative action.

Hard to see who would benefit financially from a study like that. But that doesn't mean there aren't other agendas in play.

Malcolm wrote:

The patent ran out on LSD in 1968.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

padma norbu said:

Malcolm, the follow-up question for clarity's sake... Chagdud Tulku's mother was a famous delog. As a child, she apparently "died" for several days and came back to write about her experiences traveling through the bardos and hells, etc. with Tara as her guide (the book "Delog" is available on Amazon). Who's to say that was real or DMT other than her? I read it and I can't say I actually believe it anymore than any other OBE experience I've ever read about.

Malcolm wrote:

IN every instant in her book she is talking about the bardo of rebirth, not the chos nyid bar do. Those with clairvoyance can perceive the beings in the bardo of rebirth and that is who she is universally talking about.

There is another famous Delog, Shardza Tashi Gyaltsen, also has many similar descriptions. I have not really studied this kind of literature in detail. I don't think we really need to consider it an OBE since she never actually experienced total death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am merely reporting to you what the Dzogchen tantras which first present the concept of a bardo of dharmatā say about it.

padma norbu said:

I know and thanks for that. I wish you would respond to my assessment of that rather than repeating that you are citing tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

"Nondual" in Dzogchen does not mean everything is the same in the one without a second (Brahman, Advaita Vedanta); it means that ontic pairs such as existence and non-existence cannot be found. What nondual really means in Dzogchen is that everything is in a state of liberation from the beginning, not the absence of diversity with respect to this and that thing.

padma norbu said:

I know, which is why I posed the question I posed.

Malcolm wrote:

A person who is liberated will not experience the bardo of dharmatā at all.

A person who is not completely liberated will experience the bardo of dharmatā after the separation of their mind from their body. The proposed mechanism by which this occurs is the adoption of a mental body which experiences the bardo. But this only occurs after one loses consciousness during the detachment of the consciousness from body i.e. the total disengagement of consciousness from this body, resulting in total physical death. If one does not recognize one's appearances in this bardo, then one continues on the next bardo, the bardo of rebirth i.e. srid pa'i bar do.

It does not matter at all what hallucinations a person has when they are dying, it is not the bardo of dharmatā by definition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I could cite any number of tantras which clearly explain that that the bardo of dharmatā does not occur until the complete separation of the body and mind. Since the body is not longer a factor, any sensory distortion created by any chemistry in the brain is irrelevant. It might make dying easier, but it has not effect on the bardo of dharmatā and its experiences of sound, lights and rays.

padma norbu said:

So, then, it's as I said: you basically have to have faith in what someone else has said. I'm not sure how you could exactly make the distinction of "separation of mind and body" in this instance, anyway, since a DMT experience, especially at the time of death, could very definitely be considered 'separation of mind and body.'

I'm not arguing for DMT in any way, just something that occurs to me as I read your apparently definitive statements. We live in a nondual reality we experience as duality in our everyday world, so what is "separation from the body?"

Malcolm wrote:

I am merely reporting to you what the Dzogchen tantras which first present the concept of a bardo of dharmatā say about it.

"Nondual" in Dzogchen does not mean everything is the same in the one without a second (Brahman, Advaita Vedanta); it means that ontic pairs such as existence and non-existence cannot be found. What nondual really means in Dzogchen is that everything is in a state of liberation from the beginning, not the absence of diversity with respect to this and that thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, these two studies were paid for by all the companies lining up to sell Ayahuasca, LSD, etc.

gregkavarnos said:

So who were they financed by and why?

Malcolm wrote:

The Norwegian study as sponsored by "...the Research Council of Norway. The authors, Dr. Johnson, and Dr. Bolstridge report no relevant financial relationships." You can look that up yourself, nothing dodgy I can see.

I cannot find information about who may have funded the Spanish study. But it looks like a pretty straightforward academic study to me, also published in the same journal as the Norwegian study.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

I propose that correct application of Ayawaska from a dharma perspective can actually provide first-hand, direct experience and understanding of the Dying process while still alive in incarnation.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, actually, I cannot go along with this. Why? Because in fact there is no need for Ayahuasca to have this understanding, and in fact, while there may be many salutary benefits of ingesting psychedelics, insight in the bardo of dharmatā is just not one of them.

There are two systems of bardo explanation: one that comes from the new translation schools -- it is very brief, mainly concerns the moment of death, and so on. The second comes directly from the tantras of Dzogchen and concerns the visionary experience called dharmatā-antarabhāva i.e. the interval existence of dharmatā or chos nyid bar do. Taking psychedelics such as acid, dmt, shrooms, etc., simply will not cause you to understand what this experience is.

It is not, as is commonly imagined, related to the fact that the brain apparently releases large quantities of DMT when one dies. Why? Because the experience of the bard of dharmatā occurs after the separation of the body and mind.

Instead the experience of the dharmatā is indicated with a detailed system of twenty-one introductions; none of which require ingesting anything whatsoever. In fact, they require that you are sober and paying attention.

In the system (Dzogchen) from which the bardo of dharmatā comes from there is only one valid use for psychedelics, as I have mentioned elsewhere -- and that is demonstrating to oneself that the mind is not a fixed unalterable substance. Once you have gained that insight, that is all the insight any Buddhist text in any tradition has ever suggested that you can derive from psychedelics. Now then, I am not saying that there are no other benefits to be gained from tripping -- but they are not benefits described in nor recognized by any form of Buddhism.

M

padma norbu said:

Thanks for this explanation. And, not to be a dick or anything, but where's the proof for this statement: "It is not, as is commonly imagined, related to the fact that the brain apparently releases large quantities of DMT when one dies. Why? Because the experience of the bard of dharmatā occurs after the separation of the body and mind." ? I just recently read that, upon death, the DMT release causes a profound sense of time-distortion which causes a person to seemingly remain alive hours and even days after his body is dead. Since nobody knows precisely where consciousness is located, I'm not sure how anyone could definitively state whether or not the bardo is experienced after separation of body and mind or whether the mind is simply caught up in a DMT-fuelled experience. I suppose at some point you have to have faith in what someone else tells you or in your own perception of "the astral plane" / "bardo" what-have-you.

Malcolm wrote:

I could cite any number of tantras which clearly explain that that the bardo of dharmatā does not occur until the complete separation of the body and mind. Since the body is not longer a factor, any sensory distortion created by any chemistry in the brain is irrelevant. It might make dying easier, but it has not effect on the bardo of dharmatā and its experiences of sound, lights and rays.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

I propose that correct application of Ayawaska from a dharma perspective can actually provide first-hand, direct experience and understanding of the Dying process while still alive in incarnation.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, actually, I cannot go along with this. Why? Because in fact there is no need for Ayahuasca to have this understanding, and in fact, while there may be many salutary benefits of ingesting psychedelics, insight in the bardo of dharmatā is just not one of them.

There are two systems of bardo explanation: one that comes from the new translation schools -- it is very brief, mainly concerns the moment of death, and so on. The second comes directly from the tantras of Dzogchen and concerns the visionary experience called dharmatā-antarabhāva i.e. the interval existence of dharmatā or chos nyid bar do. Taking psychedelics such as acid, dmt, shrooms, etc., simply will not cause you to understand what this experience is.

It is not, as is commonly imagined, related to the fact that the brain apparently releases large quantities of DMT when one dies. Why? Because the experience of the bard of

dharmatā occurs after the separation of the body and mind.

Instead the experience of the dharmatā is indicated with a detailed system of twenty-one introductions; none of which require ingesting anything whatsoever. In fact, they require that you are sober and paying attention.

In the system (Dzogchen) from which the bardo of dharmatā comes from there is only one valid use for psychedelics, as I have mentioned elsewhere -- and that is demonstrating to oneself that the mind is not a fixed unalterable substance. Once you have gained that insight, that is all the insight any Buddhist text in any tradition has ever suggested that you can derive from psychedelics. Now then, I am not saying that there are no other benefits to be gained from tripping -- but they are not benefits described in nor recognized by any form of Buddhism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The outcome of a study depends on who funds the researchers and why.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, these two studies were paid for by all the companies lining up to sell Ayahuasca, LSD, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

smcj said:

We found no relation between lifetime use of psychedelics and any undesirable past year mental health outcomes, including serious psychological distress, mental health treatment (inpatient, outpatient, medication, felt a need but did not receive), or symptoms of panic disorder, major depressive episode, mania, social phobia, generalized anxiety disorder, agoraphobia, posttraumatic stress disorder, or non-affective psychosis.

The outcome of this study would be radically different if my old high school buddies had been included.

Malcolm wrote:

I have friends from high school with whom I did enormous amounts of psychedelic drugs. In every case those who have psychological problems would have had those

problems whether they had done such drugs or not. And those who today are balanced, normal functioning people [the majority of my friends from high school] would have been normal, balanced functional people whether they had done those drugs or not. But they would be a little less open minded and kind, I think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Your naive statement above is illustrative of idealism rather than a firm grasp on the political reality.

Malcolm wrote:

My statement is neither naive nor idealistic.

China can certainly ensure the wellbeing of its billion people whether or not it has political control over Tibet.

Incidentally, I was not suggesting that the Chinese would ever voluntarily leave Tibet -- they are too foolish to make that wise choice.

They are going to plunge Asia, and the rest of the world, into war if they continue their presently unsustainable policies in the region.

My observations have nothing to do with Tibetan Nationalist politics (I am not Tibetan so their nationalism is not my fight). My observations have more to do with limits on human growth, preserving delicate environments and flora and fauna in them, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Also, in terms of mental health:

So what did the study find? Ayahuasca users were found to measure significantly lower than the controls on all nine psychopathology scales, including significantly less somatization, depression, anxiety, hostility, paranoid ideation, and phobias. The ayahuasca users scored significantly lower than controls on measures of worry, shyness, and fatigability and weakness. And ayahuasca users scored significantly higher than controls on measures of self-transcendence and spiritual orientation, including on such items as transpersonal identification, self-forgetfulness, sacredness of life, altruism, subjective well-being, and mission in life. "Taken together," the authors

state, “the data point at better general mental health and bio-psycho-social adaptation in the ayahuasca-using group compared to the control subjects.”

<http://www.singingtotheplants.com/2012/08/new-ayahuasca-study/>

Further, psychedelics are not innately harmful, as many studies have shown and as this one reinforces, just published on monday:

We found no relation between lifetime use of psychedelics and any undesirable past year mental health outcomes, including serious psychological distress, mental health treatment (inpatient, outpatient, medication, felt a need but did not receive), or symptoms of panic disorder, major depressive episode, mania, social phobia, generalized anxiety disorder, agoraphobia, posttraumatic stress disorder, or non-affective psychosis. In addition to not being significantly different from no association, in all cases the calculated adjusted odds ratios (aOR) were small (for all, psychedelic use $aOR \leq 1.2$). Stratifying by age, gender, past year illicit drug use, or lifetime extremely stressful event did not substantially change the results of any of the logistic regression analyses. Likewise, lifetime use of LSD, psilocybin, mescaline, or peyote, or past year use of LSD, was not associated with a higher rate of mental health problems. There were a number of weak associations between use of any psychedelic or use of specific psychedelics and lower rate of mental health problems; these results might reflect beneficial effects of psychedelic use, relatively better initial mental health among people who use psychedelics, or chance “false positive” findings. Our results are consistent with assessments of the harm potential of psychedelics [28], [29] and with information provided by UN, EU, US, and UK official drug education programs [15], [30]–[34], insofar as these sources do not conclude that psychedelics are demonstrated to cause lasting anxiety, depression, or psychosis.

<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0063972#authorcontrib>

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/21/psychedelics-mental-health-problems_n_3785772.html

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

Any thoughts on the other points i raised?

gregkavarnos said:

My opinion is that Ayahuasca is as sentient, sacred, or as special as any other plant. That's what I think.

Malcolm wrote:

Ayahuasca is not one plant. It is two or more: *Banisteriopsis caapi* mixed with *Diplopterys cabrerana*, *Psychotria viridis*, or *Psychotria carthaginensis* — plants that contain DMT.

If you are interested in being more informed about the uses, culture and religious significance of Ayahuasca, I suggest you secure Steven V. Bayer's (author of The Cult of Tara) recently published Singing to the Plants: A Guide to Mestizo Shamanism in the Upper Amazon. You can also examine the author's website:
<http://www.singingtotheplants.com>, more information.

He writes there:

The ayahuasca drink has several primary actions: it is a hallucinogen, emetic, purgative, and vermifuge. In fact, there is reason to think that the ayahuasca vine was first used for its emetic, purgative, and vermifuge activities. Even today, the ayahuasca drink is often called, simply, la purga, and used to induce violent vomiting, with hallucinations considered side-effects; indeed, ayahuasqueros are sometimes called purgueros. But the emetic effect of the ayahuasca drink has spiritual resonance as well; vomiting shows that the drinker is being cleansed. La purga misma te enseña, they say; vomiting itself teaches you.

And:

Rather, for the shaman, ayahuasca is a teaching plant; it is through the hallucinogenic power of the ayahuasca drink that the hundreds of healing plants, including the plants used for magical attack and defense, reveal their appearance and teach their songs; it is through the power of ayahuasca that the shaman can see distant galaxies and planets, the wellbeing of distant relatives, the location of lost objects, the lover of an unfaithful spouse, and the identity of the sorcerer who has caused a patient to become sick. It is the ayahuasca drink that nurtures the shaman's phlegm, the physical manifestation of shamanic power within the body, used both as defense against magical attack and as a container for the magic darts that are the shaman's principal weapon.

<http://www.singingtotheplants.com/what-is-ayahuasca/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

If China was to walk out of Tibet tomorrow the well-being of a billion or more Chinese people would be compromised.

Malcolm wrote:

This windup is a totally indemonstrable assertion, one I suspect that arises from your not-very-subtle aversion towards the oft-touted "popularity" of Transhimalayan Buddhism amongst a very small section of upper middle-class white boomers in the US and Europe.

The wellbeing of the Chinese population would in no way will be compromised if the Chinese Govt. were to vacate its present western holdings.

As it stands, the Chinese Govt. is foolishly pushing Asia towards a resource war. A war in which everyone will lose, and there will be no winners at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

kirtu said:

Of course merit making is unnecessary for realizing Buddhahood.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Sapan is rolling in his grave.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

Are you suggesting these Lamas taught a position that differers from Tsongkhapa's as a type of skilful means, or is this support for your claim that Gelugpas do not hold any views?

Geshe Gyaltzen passed away in 2009. This discussion has lasted long enough that, we're he still alive, I'd drive down to see him and get clarification. If at some point I can access a geshe in my area, I plan on doing just that, but I'm not flying off to India in a panic.

In any case, until then, I do not concede the point. In your quote of Geshe S.R.: In the eleventh verse he mentions emptiness "free from all assertions." In the twelfth verse he refers to an understanding which "destroys through certainty the way the object is perceived." These phrases may be variously interpreted. "The mainstay of misconceptions" is generally viewed as true existence itself." The qualification of emptiness as being "free from all assertions" may be taken to mean that words cannot describe emptiness as it is. It can also refer to emptiness free from any assertions of intrinsic existence.

I take this as a confirmation that my position is one possible interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is, but he clarifies it is pre-Tsongkhapa position.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

i am familiar with the situation and all the parties involved, and have heard all versions of the jes bertelsen story. i can confirm that the version presented by the learned malcolm represents the version of jes bertelsen and his students, and that the version presented by the accomplished Adamantine represents the version of tulku urgyen rinpoche's close disciples.

b.f.

Malcolm wrote:

Well it is a good thing we have versions. It is starting to sound like Rashoman:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is what I was informed of...

dzogchungpa said:

I have to say that's pretty amazing. Maybe this guy is a real cig car ba.

Is that quote from an email or some other document?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't matter -- this is the main reason why Dzogchen was so hard to find in Tibet. All those people whose lively hoods depended on merit making activities were furious that Dzogchen asserts that accumulating merit and so on is unnecessary for realizing buddhahood.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is what I was informed of:

This transcribed account has been removed at Malcolm's request.

The only person who can confirm this with any authority is Eric. I suggest someone ask.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Jikan said:

Finally, even though I said I would hold my tongue on Bertelsen...

Malcolm wrote:

Its a fact that TU authorized him to teach Dzogchen.

heart said:

Really, how do you know that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Because one of our mutual friends who was in Nagi Gonpa at the time confirmed it to me when I asked him about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

90+% of the lectures I listened to as a young man about the Gelug Prasangika were from FPMT lamas: Lama Yeshe, Lama Zopa, Geshe Gyaltzen, Zong R., etc. That was a long time ago, but as I remember it, Tsongkhapa's contribution of how the interplay between the relative and absolute works did not result in producing a "view". In fact, it was only in the modern era that I found out that Tsongkhapa changed anything. They did not allow for alternative interpretations, what we were hearing was "the buddhist perspective". Nagarjuna's four points were stressed, as well as the absence of view. The phrase "non-affirming negation" was used extensively. Perhaps that is how they chose to teach a bunch of hippies at the time, but that has been, and still is, my education on the subject.

Malcolm wrote:

I have heard Lama Zopa teach extensively on emptiness, as well as HHDL -- they do not resemble at all what you report.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Kunzang Dechen Lingpa regularly excoriated his students (meaning us) for asking him to give empowerments all the time, insisting over and over again that knowledge of Dzogchen does not require this; and further, that the activities of giving empowerments and so on were mere child's play.

dzogchungpa said:

I have heard you say that before, and I have often thought about it. Was KDL's point that empowerments are basically a waste of time?

Malcolm wrote:

Not for childish people, apparently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Its a fact that TU authorized him to teach Dzogchen.

dzogchungpa said:

That's pretty remarkable. Did TU authorize any other westerners?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no idea. BTW, this does not mean that this guy is something like a lineage holder of Chokling Tersar or anything like that. But Dzogchen is a specific kind of knowledge that does not require a lot of elaborations to be communicated.

Kunzang Dechen Lingpa regularly excoriated his students (meaning us) for asking him to give empowerments all the time, insisting over and over again that knowledge of Dzogchen does not require this; and further, that the activities of giving empowerments and so on were mere child's play.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Jikan said:

Finally, even though I said I would hold my tongue on Bertelsen...

Malcolm wrote:

Its a fact that TU authorized him to teach Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Jikan said:

I remember reading Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche's insistence on the practice of ngondro in some of his published writings, but I don't have access to those now. These comments might be relevant to the present conversation.

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

heart said:

A question for the students of Jes Bertelsen, did Jes practice (from Ngondro and up) a full Dzogchen cycle, like for example the Kunzang Tuktik, from the Chokling Tersar?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. (Not a student of his, just know that he didn't practice anything like a ngondro).

heart said:

Hmm Malcolm, how do you know that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Because that is was I was told by one of his students, and that was also confirmed to me by another direct student of TU's who has there when Bertelsen was visting TU.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Who SHOULDN'T practice Vajrayana?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure why this topic even evokes any interest. The answer, as retro implied, is simple: "Anyone who is not interested". If someone is interested, than they should practice Vajrayana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

heart said:

A question for the students of Jes Bertelsen, did Jes practice (from Ngondro and up) a full Dzogchen cycle, like for example the Kunzang Tuktik, from the Chokling Tersar?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. (Not a student of his, just know that he didn't practice anything like a ngondro).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I don't put much faith in ordinary people, and the vast majority of Buddhists are ordinary people. Hence the bias.

Malcolm wrote:

So it seems misplaced to me that you would specifically single out Buddhists for bias.

Also, it must mean you are biased against yourself, since one presumes you regard yourself as an ordinary person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: When do you think the US will have a Buddhist president?

Content:
Luke said:
Yeah, but how else can we save Tibet?

Malcolm wrote:
We can't. Only the Chinese can save Tibet. And they don't seem very interested in that.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 8:43 PM
Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?
Content:

Indrajala said:
I have a slight personal bias against Buddhists in general.

Malcolm wrote:
Sad you have a bias against anyone.

Indrajala said:
Sadly I'm a fallible sinner like most men.

Malcolm wrote:
Seems a little strange to be biased against those whom one would consider your coreligionists. So why do you have a slight bias against Buddhists and what is it?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 10:49 AM
Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?
Content:

Indrajala said:
I have a slight personal bias against Buddhists in general.

Malcolm wrote:
Sad you have a bias against anyone.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 6:18 AM
Title: Re: When do you think the US will have a Buddhist president?
Content:
Luke said:

John F. Kennedy was the first Catholic President of the US, but how long do you think it will be before the US has its first Buddhist president?

And what do you think the pros and cons of the US having a Buddhist president would be?

Malcolm wrote:
he would be a lying politician like all the rest of them.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 4:17 AM
Title: Re: Who SHOULDN'T practice Vajrayana?
Content:
Luke said:
does one really need a guru to realize the nature of mind?

Malcolm wrote:
No, but it's faster.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 3:42 AM
Title: Re: Wikileaks for senate implodes!
Content:
conebeckham said:
I recall quickly glancing at a headline last week, purporting to state that Assange is actually espousing a Libertarian platform.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, he likes Rand Paul, apparently -- he and snowden.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 2:58 AM
Title: Re: Who SHOULDN'T practice Vajrayana?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
It makes you wonder if the secrecy advocated in the Buddhist tantras is not so much about being secret as it is "Hey guys, this Hindu yoga stuff is freaking awesome, but if our Buddhist compatriots get wind of how effective this stuff is a) they won't believe us b) they will consider us heretics no matter how much we insist our view is grounded in Buddhadharma".

Astus said:

And that gives another group of who shouldn't practice Vajrayana. Those who don't believe in ("transcendent") energy and related ideas.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, to put it more simply -- people who do not believe in Ayurvedic anatomy and physiology, even that which is discussed in various Mahāyāna sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?

Content:

Adamantine said:

When you contrast that with Aeons of diligent practice to get any substantial result which the other expressions of Buddhism propose, is there any wonder that in a culture of speed and instant coffee that we would gravitate towards the faster paths?

Malcolm wrote:

As a Bonpo Dzogchen logic text puts it -- effortless buddhahood is a desiderata.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

It is about time you started offering some citations in defense of your novel presentation of Tsongkhapa's views.

I've just moved and downsized my library. The Gelug section took a big hit as I'm not a Gelug student. However I did keep "Teachings on Je Tshongkhapa's Three Principal Aspects of the Path." with a commentary by HHDL.

Tsongkhapa's root text on pg. 43:

Appearances are infallible dependent arings:

Emptiness is free of assertions.

A long as these two understating (sic) are seen as separate,

One has not yet realised the intent of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Here is an alternate translation with the comments of Geshe Sonam Rinchen:

"So long as the understanding of appearances As unfailing dependent arising and of emptiness Free from all assertions seem disparate, You still do not comprehend the

Subduer's thought."

The understanding of the dependently arising and unfailing way in which causes and conditions produce their effects is a cognition of conventional reality, while the understanding that everything is empty of true existence is a cognition of the ultimate mode in which things exist. The way in which these two understandings apprehend their objects differs. So long as they seem incompatible and your understanding of a thing's dependently arising nature appears to undermine your understanding of its emptiness of true existence and vice versa, you still have not gained insight into what the Buddha intended to reveal nor have you found the correct view of the Middle Way. This is an indication that you must continue to persevere."

Geshe Sonam Rinchen. *The Three Principal Aspects of the Path* (Kindle Locations 1283-1287). Kindle Edition.

He continues to explain:

In the eleventh verse he mentions emptiness "free from all assertions." In the twelfth verse he refers to an understanding which "destroys through certainty the way the object is perceived." These phrases may be variously interpreted. "The mainstay of misconceptions" is generally viewed as true existence itself." The qualification of emptiness as being "free from all assertions" may be taken to mean that words cannot describe emptiness as it is. It can also refer to emptiness free from any assertions of intrinsic existence. Some early masters in Tibet, who subscribed to the Madhyamika view that everything is empty of inherent existence, found it difficult to posit conventional existence. They contended that since all phenomena are empty, they cannot be specified as this or that, as either existent or non-existent, and that proponents of the Middle Way hold no position, since they propound emptiness free from all assertions.

Geshe Sonam Rinchen. *The Three Principal Aspects of the Path* (Kindle Locations 1295-1300). Kindle Edition.

Here, Geshe Sonam Rinchen clearly differentiates the view you attribute to the Gelugpas from the actual Gelug view with this statement "Some early masters in Tibet, who subscribed to the Madhyamika view that everything is empty of inherent existence, found it difficult to posit conventional existence. They contended that since all phenomena are empty, they cannot be specified as this or that, as either existent or non-existent, and that proponents of the Middle Way hold no position, since they propound emptiness free from all assertions."

But this statement is not the Gelug view. The Gelug view is that emptiness is the mere absence of true existence i.e. "the understanding that everything is empty of true existence is a cognition of the ultimate mode in which things exist." Further, the Gelugpas claim that not only is this a view, it is the Prasangika view. The Gelugpas never claim that Prasangikas do not have a view. Quite the opposite in fact.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

To disagree with that statement you would have to take the position of a non-Gelug criticism that says they actually do have a view. Their position is that they do not, that their non-affirming negation is an absence of views.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so, the Gelugs assert that Candrakirti does have a view, in contradistinction with the earlier Tibetan presentation of Prasangika which holds that Prasangikas have no views of their own.

SMCJ, with all due respect, you are very confused about what the Gelug point of view actually is. You have completely confused it, utterly, with the view of their opponents.

It is about time you started offering some citations in defense of your novel presentation of Tsongkhapa's views.

The only thing I can imagine is that your Geshe is a renegade with the Gelugpa school, someone who has decided to follow Ganden Chopel's perspective. But Ganden Chopel's views and those of Tsongkhapa are at complete odds with each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

ngodrup said:

Lhodrak (aka Drubchen) Namkha Gyaltsen (1326-1401) Mahasiddha and Dzogchen maser.

Malcolm wrote:

This was hardly Tsongkhapa's most important guru. Can you name even a single practice passed down in Gelug from this master? This master is mainly significant for Nyingmapas because on the series of questions Lhodrak validates Dzogchen for Tsongkhapa. But Tsongkhapa was not a Dzogchen practitioner.

Arguably, Tsongkhapa's most important Guru would be been Lama Umapa (Kadampa)(, from whom Tsongkhapa received the short lineage of Vajrabhairava, as well as many instructions from Manjushri. Other important masters would have been Lama Dampa Sonam Gyaltsen (Sakya), from whom Tsongkhapa received Cakrasamvara and Rendawa Shonu Lodo (Sakya) from whom he received Guhyasamaja. He also received the

transmission of Guhyasamaja and Cakrasamvara as well as Naro Chos drug from Drikung.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Who SHOULDN'T practice Vajrayana?

Content:

yegyal said:

People who have no trust in the teachings. People unwilling to, or incapable of, following a qualified teacher. People who can't keep a promise or a secret.

Simon E. said:

This.:

Hickersonia said:

Perhaps then this could be amended to include: "People who believe that the teachings were never intended to be secret at all."

Not trying to start an argument -- just adding another qualifier that might answer the original prompt.

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is, most of the things that in Vajrayāna which are secret (cakras, nadis, vāyus, asanas, bandhas, praṇāyamas, mantras, agnihotra, mandalas, abhisheka etc.) have been practiced and taught openly for millennia by Hindus.

It makes you wonder if the secrecy advocated in the Buddhist tantras is not so much about being secret as it is "Hey guys, this Hindu yoga stuff is freaking awesome, but if our Buddhist compatriots get wind of how effective this stuff is a) they won't believe us b) they will consider us heretics no matter how much we insist our view is grounded in Buddhadharma".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

ngodrup said:

Lama Tsongkhapa's main tantric guru was Nyingma...

smcj said:

I'm not 100% on my history, but that doesn't sound right. Lama Tsongkhapa had his students practice the Mahamudra and later translation practices. He got them from the Kagyus I believe. I know of no Nyingma practices in the Gelug school, although there may be some.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa's main project was to unify the three tantras, Guhyasamaja, Cakrasamvara and Vajrabhairava into a cohesive practice, centered around the exegesis of the Guhyasamaja Tantra as the most important of all these tantras.

Tsongkhapa has not single work in his corpus devoted to Mahāmudra alone.

Gelug Mahāmudra was developed many centuries later by the First Panchen Lama.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

ngodrup said:

Lama Tsongkhapa's main tantric guru was Nyingma

Malcolm wrote:

??? Who was that?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

The Gelug approach is to logically prove that the way things abide cannot be put into a logical proposition.

Malcolm wrote:

Not according to any Gelugpa teaching I have ever read.

smcj said:

The "non-affirming negation" negates, or disproves, what? It negates/disproves that things:

1. Actually exist.
2. Don't exist.
3. Both exist and don't exist.
4. Neither exist or don't exist.

Those are the four logical possibilities. There are no other logical possibilities. All four have been disproven, negated, rejected. Nothing else is offered as an alternative--ever!.

This is Gelug 101. How do you not see that my statement is the fundamental position of

the Gelug school? How can there be any other interpretation? If you think that the Gelug school asserts a logical proposition that explains the way things abide, I'd love to hear it.

Malcolm wrote:

Gelug 101: "does not exist in the ultimate, does not exist in the relative". Tsongkhapa explicitly rejects the analysis of three and four in your list because according to him they are merely double negations.

What you have presented is the non-Gelugpa presentation of freedom from four extremes, which is explicitly rejected by Tsongkhapa in Lamrim Chenmo and elsewhere as being incorrect. Tsongkhapa only rejects inherent existence, the subtle object of negation -- he never advocates rejecting existence, the coarse object of negation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

The Gelug approach is to logically prove that the way things abide cannot be put into a logical proposition.

Malcolm wrote:

Not according to any Gelugpa teaching I have ever read.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

That is what I was told in a private interview with my Gelug mentor.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there are various strains of Gelug thinking. But in general Gelugpas strenuously defend the idea that the intellectual exercise of identifying the object of negation, non-affirming negation, the emptiness of true existence in things, the negation of inherent existence resembles the actual realization of emptiness, is it is appropriate to be maintained conceptually. Granted, the Gelugpas also wish to go beyond mind, but they spend a lot of time defending and insisting that one needs to have a perfect Madhyamaka view before moving on the Vajrayāna, and insist that one needs to continue to cultivate that view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

It is famously "the non-affirming negation", which is an absence of intellectual view.

Malcolm wrote:

The Gelug treatment of a the non-affirming negation is absolutely an intellectual view -- that is what Gorampa, Mipham and others give them so much shit about.

smcj said:

The entire purpose of the geshe program is to bring the intellect fully to Dharma so it it sees, on its own terms, that the intellect cannot conceive of emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a total misread of the Gelug project.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

...since your intellectual views are pretty irrelevant if you are a Dzogchen practitioner, or even a Vajrayana practitioner.

This is an important point that often gets lost.

conebeckham said:

Agree, with the proviso that I'm not sure mainstream Gelukpas would.....

Malcolm wrote:

Mainstream Gelugs would absolutely not agree, since they subordinate Vajrayāna view to sutrayāna view -- which is the over all trend among Tibetan intellectuals since the time of Sakya Pandita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 21st, 2013 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

The Nyingmas call Shentong "Great Mad1yamaka".

Malcolm wrote:

The first person to use this term in Tibet was Kawa Paltseg. He uses the term dbu ma chen po to refer to spros bral, freedom from extremes. His presentation of Madhyamaka

bears no observable commonalities with gzhan stong.

The Sakyapas follow Kawa Paltseg's point of view, and refer to their Madhyamaka as great Madhyamaka also. The Gelugpas also refer to Lama Tsongkhapa's point of view as Great Madhyamaka.

So basically, everyone in Tibet refers to their preferred system of Madhyamaka as "great".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 21st, 2013 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Outside of the Jonang school, what are the views of the other schools in regards to the Shentong position and the works/thought of Dolpopa, particularly the Nyingma and Kagyu? Is it possible to be part of these schools while maintaining a personal Shentong view or is there a dogmatism that members must follow? Can one practice Dzogchen while maintaining Dolpopa's viewpoint on the Absolute and are there any prominent figures who have done so?

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

Strains of gzhan stong exist in Sakya, Kagyu and Nyingma.

gZhan stong is fundamentally a new mantra (sngags gsar ma) school position, having arrived to Tibet with the 11th century translator, Yumo Mikyo Dorje, as a oral instruction related to Kalacakra. So from that point of view, gzhan stong and Dzogchen are historically unrelated.

gZhan stong, along with the Jonang tradition of Kalacakra, was imported into the Kagyu via a 17th century Nyingma Lama named Rigzin Tsewang, who was the root guru of the Karma Kagyu Lama, Situ Panchen. Situ Panchen was originally disinterested in gzhan stong, so the story goes, but because his view was a bit nihilistic, Rigzin Tsewang advised Situ Panchen to adopt the gzhan stong view in order to extend his life. After that, gzhan stong view spread widely among Karma Kagyu in Eastern Tibet. However, the lineage did not widely spread amongst the Nyingma school itself until the time of Khyentse and Kongtrul. Because Kongtrul was such a strong exponent of gzhan stong, many Kagyus and Nyingmapas adopted gzhan stong as their own view. However, as far as Nyingma goes, just as many did not. Presently, Nyingmapas are evenly divided more or less between those who follow the "freedom from extremes" Madhyamaka position set forth by Kawa Paltseg in the early 9th century and neo-gzhan stong as presented by Kongtrul.

In general, since the madhyamaka system of the two truths is incompatible with

Dzogchen, what need to mention the Yogacara system of three natures? However, just as a person can maintain a sutrayāna view of Gelug prasangika (for example, Jigme Lingpa) and still be a Dzogchen practitioner, one can also maintain the view of gzhan stong and be a Dzogchen practitioner -- since your intellectual views are pretty irrelevant if you are a Dzogchen practitioner, or even a Vajrayana practitioner. The standard early Nyingma view (i.e. Rongzom, Rogben, etc.) is that the view of tantra in general and Dzogchen in particular is higher than that of madhyamaka in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 21st, 2013 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: 'Buddhist' forms of alternative medicine?

Content:

dyanaprajna2011 said:

Are there any Buddhist forms of alternative medicine? I know groups such as Chinese medicine and Tibetan medicine have Buddhist influences, but are there any based solely, or at least mostly, on Buddhist philosophy?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Medicine is philosophically based solely on Buddhadharma. In other words, the remote cause of all disease is the ignorance that grasps self. The approximate cause is the three afflictions, desire, hatred and ignorance. The immediate cause is the three doṣas, vatta, pitta, and kapha.

The basis for Tibetan Medicine is Buddhist sutra and tantra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 20th, 2013 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhist Take on What Is and Isn't Knowable

Content:

Matt J said:

I have not seen a similar Buddhist classification. Not to say there isn't one, but I haven't come across it.

Malcolm wrote:

There isn't. Buddhadharma accepts only three authorities, the ones I've listed above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 20th, 2013 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: How to develop devotion to a deity?

Content:

philji said:

In our meditation group we have just started song a mantra and visualization practice of Green Tara. one of the group tells me he feels no devotion and thinks it is all fabricated... I am wondering what advice to give.....how to develop devotion? What to do if you have none? Many thanks...

Malcolm wrote:

In order to have devotion to a practice, you need to have devotion to the master from whom you received it. If you feel no devotion towards that master, then how can you be expected to have devotion towards a given practice?

Perhaps this person would prefer to practice śamatha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 18th, 2013 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

brendan said:

So if the Taliban community or the US military complex community(don't mean to single out the Taliban or the US) at this moment were to receive a transmission of Vajrasattva providing all the cognitions were correct. Why would the process of purification commence?

Malcolm wrote:

Because it is assumed that someone who receives transmission is interested in the path shown by Vajrasattva, Vajradhara and so on.

brendan said:

Why is so much co-emergence required from the other side considering the apparent attributes of Vajrasattva?

The "great vehicle" Buddhahood seems in complete.

Cessation of suffering from a "Great Vehicle" view has only occurred on paper.

Malcolm wrote:

What does the Buddhahood of Mahāyāna lack? And why do you assert it has never been realized?

From what source do you derive your seemingly authoritative pronouncements?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 18th, 2013 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: What school of Buddhism do you follow?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

you forgot to add "no school"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 17th, 2013 at 6:58 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Some relevant quotes:

Malcolm wrote:

According to Garab Dorje, the purpose of using hallucinogens is to see that the mind is malleable, not a fixed or permanent substance. So, in fact hallucinogens do have a use in Dharma, albeit an extremely limited and narrow one.

tomamundsen said:

Any idea which text this comes from? What hallucinogens would they have been using in Oddiyana? Datura?

Malcolm wrote:

It is in the Vlma Nyinthig, and yes, the plant mentioned is datura. Also Datura was used in India for Mahakala initiations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

lama tsewang said:

is the book by sonam tsemo, the book translator as yoginis eye??

tsewang

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. However the title is incorrect. There is no mention of a yogini's eye anywhere in the

text.

I have also translated this text, but it is still in editing mode.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

Konchog1 said:

While we're on the topic...Why did Pabhongkha like Vajrayogini so much? Considering him, I would assume he would have been a strict 'Tsongkhapa's three' purist.

(Everyone, let's please not make this one of those threads)

Malcolm wrote:

Pabhongkha, when he was younger, had a close relationship with one of the Zimog Tulkus of Nalendra Phenpo, from whom he received most of the Sakya traditions he favored (such as four faced Mahākala, and so on).

Apparently (since I have not actually read his bio), he had a vision of Vajrayogini who encouraged him to merge the stream of Naro Khachö teachings with the view of Tsongkhapa.

In one sense, Yogini was an ideal practice for this -- it (unlike Lamdre) does not have any extensive instructions of view on its own, being purely a practice cycle. So in Sakya, Yogini is practiced in the broader context of the Lamdre view. One common approach is that Hevajra is used for working on creation stage, and Yogini for completion stage.

Secondly, Pabhongkha was a specialist in Cakrasamvara, and Yogini is the essence of Cakrasamvara practice. If one practices Yogini, the entire Cakrasamvara mandala is included.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: Je Rinpoche on Guhyasamāja tantra

Content:

Will said:

In 2010 Robert Thurman headed up a translation of the Five Stages commentary by Je Rinpoche. Then in March of 2013 Gavin Kilty came out with another translation.

Any students or practitioners who have compared the two? If yes, what are the differences between the two versions?

No, I am not going to practice or suggest others practice based on a book; just wondering about accuracy & quality of the two translations.

Malcolm wrote:
Kilty's is better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 8:00 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Thanks Malcolm this is interesting information, I will definitely follow up. If HHST gives it in India it might be possible, but in Europe I have to work most weekends so it is more difficult. rgyud sde spyi nams is definitely something I will look into. Can I get the text online or should I ask a friend of mine at Dzongsar Shedra to send it?

Malcolm wrote:

rgyud sde spyi nams (Sonam Tsemo):

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG03981\\$W22271](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG03981$W22271)

rin po che ljong shing (Dragpa Gyaltsen):

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04025\\$W22271](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04025$W22271)

These two texts are like the sun and the moon of Sakya view and practice. If you read these, you will understand very perfectly the point of view of the Sakyapa school on everything from sutra to tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I would happily take a Sakya Vajrayogini initiation if the opportunity arose from HHST or Jetsun Kushok-la. The thing is, though, I am not sure if the Sakya ngondro and things would be required before taking this.

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakyapas would not require you to complete ngondro before receiving this transmission.

JKhedrup said:

I was just surprised that Lama Migmar reacted to the question. I was very curious, and wanted to ask, but was half expecting a "Ah Yes the Gelugs co-opted one of our treasured inner practices bit", so his open response was a pleasant surprise.

Malcolm wrote:

Lama Migmar (Khenpo, actually) is a great proponent of Vajrayogini as well as Tara. He feels that Vajrayogini is the ideal practice for this day and age, and as such, approves of its wide spread amongst Gelug, and anywhere else for that matter.

JKhedrup said:

He actually said there were some interesting commentaries in the Gelug tradition, though of course, that the Sakyas "held the complete lineage with uncommon instructions etc." (paraphrasing as this was awhile ago).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact the most detailed commentary on the practice was composed by a Geshe who happened to be a disciple of Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo.

The fact of the matter however is that the Yogini practice is elaborated based on the Sakyapa understanding of tantra, and so therefore, reading such texts as rgyud sde spyi rnam and so on will assist in how one understands the practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

JKhedrup said:

When I met Lama Migmar in Europe and asked him this question he did say the Gelug Vajrayogini incorporated some longer elements in the offering section and different word choices in other parts of the sadhana, but that he felt there were no major, significant differences. I was a little surprised because I heard several Sakya lamas were not so happy with their VY practice being co-opted and popularized so widely by Gelug Lamas. (Lama Migmar is a scholar and teacher in the Sakya tradition).

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, the pre-Pabhongkha tradition of VY is unchanged from the Sakya presentation. But Pabhongkha made a number of changes to the tradition based on his own intellectual ideas of how the practice should be brought into line with the broader Cakrasamvara tradition.

Since Pabhongkha made fundamental changes to the tradition, Sakya lineage masters will not bestow the uncommon Vajrayogini instructions on someone who has only received the tradition from Pabhongkha lineage. They [meaning HH Sakya Trizin, Jetsun Kusho and others] will require you to receive both a two-day empowerment in Hevajra or Cakrasamvara as well as Vajrayogini blessing from a major Sakya lineage holder as a

prerequisite even if you have received these in Gelug.

Also, HH Dalai Lama is not fond of the fact that Vajrayogini has eclipsed more traditional Gelug practices and has stated this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: Bodong Tradition

Content:

Dorje Shedrub said:

I never heard of this tradition until today when I was reading an intro to a tantra. Elsewhere I read that it is a branch from the Sakya tradition.

Does anyone have more information? Thanks

DS

Malcolm wrote:

The Bodong tradition stems from Bodong Panchen Chogley Namgyal. He was an amazing polymath whose collected works form 108 volumes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism beyond the nation state

Content:

Sherlock said:

ChNN doesn't really find the term lamaism very offensive.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but the manner on which it was used by Waddell and others suggests degeneration and backwardness -- hardly the actual state of Buddhism in Tibet at the time, when there were bhiṣkus holding the strictest vinaya, great meditators everywhere, and panditas in all the monasteries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhist Take on What Is and Isn't Knowable

Content:

plwk said:

Pratyakṣa — direct sense perception

Anumāna — logical inference

Śabda — verbal testimony

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhadharma, all three of these are regarded as pramāṇas, i.e., authorities.
Realization of ultimate truth is considered yogic pratyakṣa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism beyond the nation state

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I can only speak for the gelug tradition with which i am familiar, but at least a majority were exposed to the texts in the first few years, and were able to read them at least. But yes, many did not finish their education or worked.

Indrajala said:

Regardless of how we feel about it now in 2013, at the time it would have understandably seemed warranted to have a different term for the religion in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I suppose so, given that one was likely to be an ignorant western barbarian with no civilization and manners at that time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism beyond the nation state

Content:

Indrajala said:

For example in the case of "Tibetan Buddhism":

David Gray (University of Santa Clara) questions the category Tibetan Buddhism. In his essay "How Tibetan is Tibetan Buddhism? On the Applicability of a National Designation for a Transnational Tradition," he points out that today there is no Tibet to which this label can refer. Additionally, arguably the majority of practitioners of "Tibetan" Buddhism neither are ethnic Tibetans, nor do they speak or read Tibetan. More significantly, while Tibetans considered themselves Buddhists and had a sense of Tibet as a distinct geo-political category, "they simply did not conceive of their tradition in nationalistic terms."

What comes to mind here is how contemporary Tibetan Buddhism in the west is often intricately linked with Tibetan nationalism, going hand in hand with the Tibetan independence movement.

Malcolm wrote:

Presently, Buddhism has become a nationalist banner for young Tibetans inside of Tibet, so Gray is mistaken. In fact, under the Chinese hegemony, Buddhism, especially the Nyingma school, has become widely identified with the struggle for Tibetan independence in large part because Nyingma legends are based on the Tibetan Imperial Period -- and in coordination with that is a very popular cult of Gesar as guru, deva and dharmapāla.

As for westerners who use the sobriquet "Tibetan Buddhism", this is not really nationalistic -- it is connected with the source of the brand i.e. Tibet, as opposed to Japanese Buddhism (Zen, Shingon, Tendai, Nichiren), etc., or Chinese Buddhism (Chan, Pure Land, etc.).

Many westerners adopt the styles, customs and costumes of the nation their Buddhism derives from: for example, in Zen, Chan, Son, Theravada, Sakya, Kagyu, Nyingma, Gelug etc. They even adopt the individual customs of different sects.

But this adoption and adaptation is largely free from political overtones. For example, I am sure no western practitioner of Zen really takes the ultra nationalist positions of their Japanese forbears.

In fact, what I think you are witnessing is merely a phase in adaptation of a regional Buddhist teaching which can be grouped into three rough phases: curiosity; exploration and adoption; maturation and evolution beyond that cultural source of a given teaching.

Some Tibetans, like Trungpa, tried to build cultural separation from the source culture of his teachings right from the beginning. Most of the Shambhala Buddhists I know are only very dimly aware of Tibet and really do not care much about it. They are not encouraged to learn Tibetan and they are actively discouraged from having direct contact with Tibetan teachers.

Other Tibetans, like Chagdud, Lama Dawa, etc., are very interested in having their students preserve the uniquely Tibetan forms of the Nyingma school.

Some other Tibetans, like Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, assert their Dharma teachings is beyond cultural limitations, etc., but maintain separate organizations for the academic study and preservation of aspects of Tibetan cultural knowledge such as medicine, astrology, etc.

So the stereotype you paint here is rather limited and feeble. The forms of Dharma that come from Tibet have been in the West long enough so that now various different organizations are starting to stand on their own without much support from Tibetan institutions.

In general, those organizations most tied into Tibetan culture are the Gelugs and the Kagyus because they funnel large amounts of money from Taiwan, Europe and the US to monasteries in India.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 14th, 2013 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Is Buddhist cosmology essentially Vedic?

Content:

retrofuturist said:

Greetings,

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty hard to square this opinion with the Buddha's recognition that the Gayatri Mantra is the supreme among mantras (tat savitur...etc.) in the Pali Canon.

retrofuturist said:

Do you have a credible source for this? I very much doubt this is "in the Pali Canon"...

Maitri,

Retro.

Malcolm wrote:

It is there, but I cannot recall where. It is not an advocacy of doing the mantra, it is in a list of "greats". Likewise, the Buddha charges Ananda with requesting knowledgeable and faithful kṣatriyas, brahmins and householders to carry out his funeral rites.

What the Buddha rejected was the purva-mimamsa view of liberation through rites and rituals. But he did not reject Vedic culture completely, as witnessed in his advice to Vajjians to maintain their ancestral practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 14th, 2013 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Buddhist cosmology essentially Vedic?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Even in early Buddhism, anything that seems Vedic might actually just be cause of common Indo-European heritage. At the time you had Indo-Europeans, who were not necessarily people of the Vedas, settled all around north India and Central Asia.

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty hard to square this opinion with the Buddha's recognition that the Gayatri Mantra is the supreme among mantras (tat savitur...etc.) in the Pali Canon.

Buddhism is filled with Vedic ideas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 13th, 2013 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Lineage connected to Vairocana ?

Content:

heart said:

Never ending new website this man manage to create

The teachings of Vairocana is contained in the Nyingma Kama teachings.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

And taught completely by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 12th, 2013 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

Kunzang8 said:

Hi

What are the differences between the Sakya and Gelug lineages of VY? I understand that the Gelug VY originally came from Sakya but I heard there are differences in the practice itself. Within the limits of what can be discussed in a public forum could someone please explain to me what the main differences in practice between the two lineages? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

The Gelug form has differences in how the guru yoga is performed (it is more elaborate), how the offerings are made, how the mantra is visualized, and so on. Primarily the Gelug form merely makes the sadhana practice more elaborate.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 10th, 2013 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Mahavairocana empowerment applicability

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In the Tibetan tradition...

Indrajala said:

Fair enough, but the texts I've looked at themselves don't mention these things, which from a scholarly point of view makes me wonder how much was added on top of them after they were translated. The content might remain static, but the expectations and conditions associated with a given text or practice seem often to have been multiplied and amplified. This isn't wrong, but just makes you wonder if the model of 2013 accurately reflects what they were doing in the 9th century.

Malcolm wrote:

Indian tantric texts themselves this give triad of teachings, so it is not some invention of Tibetans. If your goal is adherence to some Indian idea of tantric practice, then your best bet is to become educated in the Sakya school's tradition. Four of the five founding masters of Sakya were conversationally fluent in Sanskrit and studied with the great Indian pandits of their day who came to Tibet. As far as the Sakya school is concerned, its early textual tradition is a direct import of 10th/11th century Indian Buddhist tantrism and its procedures and values. Granted, the Sakya school's practices underwent consolidation and streamlining, but is in general very faithful to how things were being done in India during the 10th and 11th century, especially in lower tantra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 10th, 2013 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Mahavairocana empowerment applicability

Content:

Indrajala said:

If you're referring to oral instructions that are passed down from generation to generation, I'm sceptical these instructions would actually reflect the original practice and oral commentary, supposing such a thing existed apart from the text from the start. Things change in transmission and translation.

Malcolm wrote:

In the Tibetan tradition, there are two levels when it comes to tantra -- the ripening empowerment and the liberating instruction. You are not really qualified to practice sadhana without instruction i.e. the liberating instruction. Beyond this, upadeshas are necessary, which define the key points of practice that arise from the experience of realized masters in the lineage. So generally, to be fully equipped to practice in a given Indo-Tibetan practice lineage such as Lamdre, Naro Khachod, etc., (no matter what school) or even Yogatantra such as Sarvavidyā, you need three things: empowerment, instructions and upadeshas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 9th, 2013 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: Mahavairocana empowerment applicability

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Theoretically, but not necessarily, because the explanation and instruction lineage is completely different. Also the method of conferring the initiation might be quite different.

Indrajala said:

Someone suggested that it is like the Kalacakra empowerment in that if you receive it you can study and practice anything related to Kalacakra. So, theoretically, it should be possible. It just seems rather unorthodox, but not necessarily wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

That is also not necessarily the case. For example, even you have received a general Kalacakra empowerment, you are not necessarily permitted to receive teachings on the Sadāṅgayoga teachings. Why? Because there are many levels of Kalacakra empowerments, outer, inner, secret, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 9th, 2013 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Mahavairocana empowerment applicability

Content:

Indrajala said:

If someone had received the full Mahavairocana empowerment (yoga-tantra) from a Tibetan master, would that entitle them to study and practice the Mahavairocana-associated materials as found in Tang Vajrayana (i.e., Shingon)?

This seems a bit ambiguous because all the traditions are supposed to have the same source, and the empowerment in Tibetan Buddhism ultimately covers all Mahavairocana associated practices, of which the Shingon ones would have to be included, no?

Malcolm wrote:

Theoretically, but not necessarily, because the explanation and instruction lineage is completely different. Also the method of conferring the initiation might be quite different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 8th, 2013 at 9:34 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

smcj said:

One basic idea in Dharma is that nothing exists in the way we normally assume things to

exist-- including ourselves! My teacher used to emphasize that when I listened to teachings on emptiness I should remember that they were a description of how I actually abide.

Is there anyone here that thinks a description of how yidam abide wouldn't include some abstractions?

Malcolm wrote:

The personages whom yidams portray conventionally exist as sambhogakāya manifestations. Otherwise, there could be no method connected with them. Why? Because in the path of transformation the result is practiced as the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 7th, 2013 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Violence in late period Indian Buddhism

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Rechungpa, Padmasambhava, Virupa, and several of the Mahasiddha are described as killing tirthikas. It's unnecessary to sift through metaphors to find such examples.

Malcolm wrote:

sources?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 3rd, 2013 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, archetypes as used by Dahl is a Jungian term, not really to be conflated with Platonic usages of the term at all. Buddhism in all its forms is strictly nominalist, and rejects all universals (samanya-artha) as being unreal abstractions.

Yidams are sambhogakāya emanations, not archetypes.

gregkavarnos said:

Fair enough. Leads me to ask the question as to what is better: to allow a practitioner to consider Yidams as archetypes and to practice according to that interpretation or is it better to remain locked into a formal (correct) interpretation which may cause the practitioner (due to their karmic preponderances) to abandon practices and lose faith in the teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

Considering yidams as "archetypes" will not lead to a correct result. Why? At one level

yidams are paths that represent the mandala of the basis, the mandala of the path, and the mandala of the result. At another level, yidams are sambhogakāya forms i.e. the form in which a sambhogakāya appeared in order to transmit the method of the path of transformation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 2nd, 2013 at 1:49 PM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

yegyal said:

So Cort's explanation is exactly what I'm talking about. The way he is explaining is one way of looking at it, but it's not the only one.

Malcolm wrote:

It's actually total nonsense. The idea of "archetypes" comes from Jung, and is completely foreign to Buddhadharma.

gregkavarnos said:

The idea or concept of archetypes (αρχέτυπα) predates Jung by a few thousand years. Jung was the first modern theorist to use the term systematically. The term actually originates from Plato's Theory of Forms. So the concept wouldn't have been alien to ancient Buddhist philosophers. I don't know if they would have agreed with it too much though.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, archetypes as used by Dahl is a Jungian term, not really to be conflated with with Platonic usages of the term at all. Buddhism in all its forms is strictly nominalist, and rejects all universals (samanya-artha) as being unreal abstractions.

Yidams are sambhogakāya emanations, not archetypes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 2nd, 2013 at 12:41 PM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

yegyal said:

So Cort's explanation is exactly what I'm talking about. The way he is explaining is one way of looking at it, but it's not the only one.

Malcolm wrote:

It's actually total nonsense. The idea of "archetypes" comes from Jung, and is

completely foreign to Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 31st, 2013 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Kunjed Gyalpo: The Supreme Source

Content:

mutsum said:

Jim Valby knows and understands what he translates.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 30th, 2013 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

smcj said:

It's like asking, "who wrote the Uttaratantra"?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. There are texts attributed directly to Garab Dorje, and there are the tantras which are considered to have been revealed by him, which were taught by various past Buddhas such as Shonnu Pawo Tobdan, Vajrasattva and so on.

To answer the question, in the east there is the pure buddhafield of Nirmanakāya Vajrasattva.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 29th, 2013 at 11:26 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

smcj said:

Even though it is not in the purview of the thread, I'd like to say that Vajrasattva is very important and not just a confession practice.

Garab Dorje created Dzogchen from doing Vajrasattva practice. I guess innate purity=perfection.

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje in no sense "created" Dzogchen. Garab Dorje is the Nirmanakāya emanation of Vajrasattva (Sambhogakāya).

Dzogchen, according to its own texts and traditions is the original Dharma teaching from which all other so called "Buddhist" and "non-Buddhist" Dharma teachings arise.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 23rd, 2013 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Translation requested for Tibetan name

Content:

Jinzang said:

Display of Changeless Merit. The last word (rtsal) is difficult to translate and others might argue over it. The first two, merit (bsod nams) and changeless ('gyur med) are standard.

Malcolm wrote:

rtsal = vega = powerful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 20th, 2013 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Greg said:

Is one list mistaken, or are these two different things?

Malcolm wrote:

The list of the four contemplations (ting nge 'dzin) is the more accurate list. But the other list also is correct, though it is from the point of view of the meaning of gnas pa and mi gyo ba.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 20th, 2013 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, Gampopa started out as a Nyingmapa, then became a Kadampa monk, then met Milarepa towards the end of the latter's life.

smcj said:

Where did you hear he started out as a Nyingmapa? I thought his entry into Dharma was

because his dying wife asked him not to marry again, thus his becoming a Kadampa monk.

Malcolm wrote:

He was a doctor before he was a monk. And most people in Tibet at that time were Nyingmapas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 1:41 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I guess your experience and observations differ? I doubt it!

Malcolm wrote:

Quite different, but then I am not a textual fundamentalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 12:32 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mitsuk said:

He says "on occasion", not every day at every meal. Moreover, most of this is explained with medical purposes, not daily behavior. His testament to the Ngakpas remain full of sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you began by saying that alcohol was poison that destroyed the channels -- but in fact as we see, that is false -- alcohol can be quite good for the channels.

Secondly, while I don't have a drink with every meal, far from it, I still maintain that it is no problem to have a glass of wine with dinner, especially if it is good quality, properly and carefully made wine. No one, apart from someone with a medical condition, gets intoxicated from a glass of wine with dinner and the health benefits are well documented.

Of course, in the eighth century, and in places like China today, alcohol was an appalling travesty -- it is all rot gut. There is no good quality alcohol anywhere outside of the important wine growing regions of the world and their markets.

Tibetan chang is an exception, because it is rarely is more than 2 percent alcohol and is

quite weak. Arak is a different story.

In short, there is a lot of alcohol such as whiskey and so on that can be quite harmful to one's health. But wine and beer in moderation is not a problem (which is all I have been saying) for most people, in general.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If not, then there is no problem using any of these things.

mutsuk said:

No, there is a problem with alcohol indeed in itself.

Malcolm wrote:

He also wrote in the dgongs pa zang thal:

There is no fault if on occasion
one administers yogurt, good alcohol and milk.

and:

"After that, in order to enhance one's channels and vāyu, use good meat, good alcohol that is sweet and gentle, milk soups, butter, triphala medicinal ghee and pañcamula medicinal ghee."

But there are other occasions when he strongly recommends avoiding alcohol, for example, when doing rasāyana, etc. And indeed criticizes people for _heedlessly_ consuming meat and alcohol.

So the real point is one must work with circumstances and understand one's situation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But when we consider textual sources, for example, the late Dudjom Rinpoche writes very clearly in the Throma retreat manual that it is important to drink a small amount of

alcohol everyday for integration.

mutsuk said:

This is done in order to test one's integration of various circumstances including using intoxicants. Dudjom Rinpoche has also given a very lively portrait of people "calling themselves Dzogchenpas when their breath fetid with wine, their heavy bottom, their stinking odor, etc." (rDzogs chen ngo sprod skal bzang snying nor, bDud 'joms gsung 'bum, vol. 25, p. 341). This is in context of rDzogs chen instructions, not sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is no different than having a glass of wine with dinner. If you cannot integrate, you should not drink wine for dinner -- who ever said otherwise?

And yes, it is in the context of Dzogchen instructions, just like ChNN's point of view. As I said, I am not a sūtrayāna practitioner. What is appropriate for them is not appropriate necessarily for Vajrayāna practitioners.

If you are a person with a propensity for a problem with anything, be it food, alcohol, sex, etc., then one has to examine that. If not, then there is no problem using any of these things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

It is clear throughout all the pages of this thread that you definitely need to justify your usage.

Malcolm wrote:

Need to justify? No, not in any sense at all.

But when we consider textual sources, for example, the late Dudjom Rinpoche writes very clearly in the Throma retreat manual that it is important to drink a small amount of alcohol everyday for integration.

The Caraksamhita as well as the rgyud bzhi does not describe alcohol solely in terms of faults.

Longchenpa as we have seen praises the benefits of alcohol.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu explicitly teaches us in the DC that we need not consider ourselves constrained by pratimokṣa rules _at all_, and he is a person who benefits many people who regularly partakes of alcohol.

Finally, I am not sūtrayāna practitioner, so what is appropriate for such people is not appropriate for me in every case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, greg. It does not. Everthing in the world can be either poison or amrita -- it depends on the method.

From the ultimate perspective: yes! From the relative perspective: no! /quote]

Method means relative, that is the point of having a method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

the Buddha says : "A person who delights in drinking alcohol/ Cannot bring benefit to himself or happiness to others." (chang 'thung ba la mngon par dga' ba'i mi/ bdag la phan dang gzhan la bde mi nus/).

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what one means by "delights" -- I am pretty sure that a glass of wine with dinner is not included.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

For some people even a gulp of alcohol is harmful.

Malcolm wrote:

For other people, even a single peanut is fatal.

M

gregkavarnos said:

So what? I do not know of anybody that has died from peanut poisoning. I have a friend that suffers from the incapacity to metabolise alcohol. Nor do I know of anybody going on a weekend peanut binge. I personally know of two people that died due to the consequences of long term alcohol (over) consumption. I had another two friends go through detox programs and another one that detoxed on their own. I also personally know a couple of people that died in automobile and motorcycle accidents due to drink driving. I do not know of anybody that has crashed their car under the influence of peanuts. I know that after a couple of handfuls of peanuts I do not lose any awareness, I cannot say the same thing for what happens after a couple of beers. I guess that makes your example completely invalid then. Right?

Malcolm wrote:

No, greg. It does not. Everthing in the world can be either poison or amrita -- it depends on the method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutasuk said:

So yes, once and for all, it is a poison.

Malcolm wrote:

Total and complete nonsense.

mutasuk said:

Yeah sure, whatever Nyagla Pema Dūdül, and Shardza Rinpoche wrote is total nonsense. Can you imagine that your opinion might be of little value compared to their teachings ?

Malcolm wrote:

I can imagine that their views on the subject are not definitive.

"World! Do not doubt beer!"

-- Virupa

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

For some people even a gulp of alcohol is harmful.

Malcolm wrote:

For other people, even a single peanut is fatal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 1:35 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

flavio81 said:

Yes. Frankly, it does not make sense. One should try to understand the underlying fundamentals of the teaching being followed instead of going the easy way of taking any tibetan scripture -disregarding its context- to support one's extreme views.

gregkavarnos said:

Why do you consider that saying "one should refrain from alcohol" is an extreme view and yet consider that saying "one should drink alcohol" is a moderate view? Is it just an attempt to invalidate the point being made by "mutsuk"? An attempt based merely on your personal/cultural preferences?

Alcohol, from a scientific/medical point of view is a poison.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, it is acetaldehyde that is the toxin produced by metabolizing ethanol, which is then further oxidized into harmless acetic acid by acetaldehyde dehydrogenase.

Thus if one drinks alcohol in moderation, there is no problem. It is only when one drinks in excess that alcohol is poisonous. But a glass or two of wine will not be harmful and has many benefits.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 11:11 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

So yes, once and for all, it is a poison.

Malcolm wrote:

Total and complete nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Alcohol is not a poison...

mutsuk said:

It is.

Malcolm wrote:

It isn't.

Read long chen pa's praise of the qualities of alcohol.

dri med 'od zer. " bdud rtsi zil mngar ma/." In gsung thor bu/_dri med 'od zer/(sde dge par ma/). TBRC W23504. 2: 332 - 335. paro, bhutan: lama ngodrup and sherab drimey, 1982.
[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00EGS1013837%7CO2CN67002CN87712CN91062CN91092CN91112CN91122CN91162CN91191PD121506\\$W23504](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00EGS1013837%7CO2CN67002CN87712CN91062CN91092CN91112CN91122CN91162CN91191PD121506$W23504)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

In a body, channels and winds are channels and winds, no matter if one is a monk, a yogi or someone doing nothing. The poison is doing the same ravages...

Malcolm wrote:

Alcohol is not a poison, unless it is misused, just like water.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

kirtu said:

For most people on this path, a glass of wine or beer clearly isn't indulgence.

mutsuk said:

Well Shardza Rinpoche is of the opinion that alcohol affects channels and winds with irreversible results...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there are many opinions out there. And Shardza was after all a monk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

Yes that's exactly it! Thanks for reading with unbiased eyes ! What Sönam is trying to have people swallow is that: 1. there are no vows or samayas in Dzogchen, and 2. people who follow vows are of inferior capacities. This is misleading.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two different things here:

1) The textual system of Dzogchen in which there are samayas which much be maintained (actually some Dzogchen tantras state there are no samayas to maintain -- this point is addressed by Nyi 'bum in his tshig don bcu gcig).

2) The teachings of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu in which it is maintained that the principle of Dzogchen is not based on vows to follow. But of course even ChNN expects his students to follow samaya. But in his case, it is interesting because he has not (to my knowledge) detailed a specific list of vows nor has he bothered to say anything about samaya other than that we ought to strive to get along with each other, and not blabber secret teachings in public.

But this is all besides the point of thread -- the subject of which is why Śakyamuni Buddha felt compelled to prohibit alcohol.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood not being the end of the path

Content:

Sherlock said:

Then why are there general Mahayana aspirations about vowing not to achieve Buddhahood until all sentient beings are liberated etc?

Malcolm wrote:

There are three aspirations for buddhahood: king, captain and shepard. The aspiration you mention above is the shepard type -- it not the one commonly taught, for example, in Tibetan Buddhism.

In Tibetan Buddhism the king-like aspiration is taught, i.e. may I achieve complete buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings.

trevor said:

I can feel that I am the last sentient being in samsara and everyone else is a Buddha trying to make me realize.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, one can feel many things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 12:28 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

The respect of vows and necessity to hold them is affirmed in numerous Dzogchen Tantras, starting with the sGra-thal-'gyur. It is again a case of misunderstanding Dzogchen and the Dzogchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Among the 27 samayas mentioned by Longchenpa in the bla ma yang thig, avoiding alcohol is never mentioned.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood not being the end of the path

Content:

Sherlock said:

Then why are there general Mahayana aspirations about vowing not to achieve Buddhahood until all sentient beings are liberated etc?

Malcolm wrote:

There are three aspirations for buddhahood: king, captain and shepard. The aspiration you mention above is the shepard type -- it not the one commonly taught, for example, in Tibetan Buddhism.

In Tibetan Buddhism the king-like aspiration is taught, i.e. may I achieve complete buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood not being the end of the path

Content:

Sherlock said:

Correct me if I'm wrong, but In general Mahayana, the general idea seems to be that achieving Buddhahood will prevent one from further benefiting sentient beings

Malcolm wrote:

No. This idea is incorrect. The goal of Mahāyāna Buddhism is non-abiding nirvana in which a buddha always acts on behalf of sentient beings, as opposed to the hīnayāna concept of buddhahood in which a buddha ceases his activity at parinirvana.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

5heaps said:

this should count as transformation as well...

Malcolm wrote:

But it does not as a matter of definition.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 13th, 2013 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Dan74"]

I fail to understand why his character needs to be put on trial and feel a bit odd peering into these 4-5 year-old exchanges./quote]

It speaks to his motives.

I don't disagree with what Snowden did, BTW. And I think the reaction by the US Gvt. is a bit over the top, but I also, from the beginning, have found something pretty off about the whole affair.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 13th, 2013 at 1:02 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As it turns out, Snowden is a right wing anti-Obama libertarian.

<http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2013/06/exclusive-in-2009-ed-snowden-said-leakers-should-be-shot-then-he-became-one/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 11th, 2013 at 11:53 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

5heaps said:

yes that is the result according to everyone except Tsongkhapa, but are liberation and the arya truths not considered purity? are the dissolution of a suffering persona and the arising of an identity beyond suffering not considered purities? by definition selflessness and these which accompany it are beyond samsara, thats why you used the word 'liberation'. so we can call them transformations, from the afflicted (samsara), to the non-afflicted (pure). what is wrong with that?

if you then move the scale from selflessness to emptiness, you now have fullblown buddhahood transformations.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no _path_ of transformation in common Mahāyāna. The method of common Mahāyāna is called the six pāramitās.

Phenomena remain afflictive even for ārya bodhisattvas until they reach the pure bhumis (8-10). After this point, Bodhisattvas only take rebirth in the so called pure abodes, but this takes two incalculable eons to acheive, and an additional one incalculable one to move through the rest of the bhumis while the last trace of the jñeya-avarana is removed. The kleśa-avarana is removed at the end of the seventh bhumi.

In other words, there is no rapid method in common Mahāyāna which ensures liberation within one to sixteen lifetimes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 12:59 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

It's said that Gampopa most likely received semde teachings from Milarepa and put his

own spin on them, though I'm sure that is open to debate...

Malcolm wrote:

No, Gampopa started out as a Nyingmapa, then became a Kadampa monk, then met Milarepa towards the end of the latter's life.

asunthatneversets said:

The four naljors are:

- (i) shi-nè (zhi gNas)
- (ii) lhatong (lhag mThong)
- (iii) nyi-mèd (nyis med)
- (iv) lhundrüp (lhun grub)

Malcolm wrote:

It is the the four ting 'dzins (samadhis) and the first two are actually gnas pa (calm state) and mi gyo ba (non-movement); the others are fine. This is the system of Khams lugs sems sde.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 12:47 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

jeeprs said:

But I think it is only possible to use such things when one is not bound by them

Malcolm wrote:

If this were so there would be no point to Vajrayāna at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 12:45 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

this the explanation for someone who has realized the first bhumi in Mahāyāna.

The only vision that is non-karmic is buddhahood.

5heaps said:

your position doesn't seem to follow then. since the particular transformations into purity

Malcolm wrote:

There is no transformation into purity in sūtra, none at all. Just because a sūtrayāna practitioner realizes emptiness it does not mean that they have pure vision. That only happens when one becomes a Buddha.

Vajrayāna is the method of taking the path as the result, therefore, we train in pure vision of ourselves as deity mandalas right from the start of creation stage. There is no such training for anyone, including tenth stage bodhisattvas which is taught in sūtra. You cannot find one sūtra passage that even suggests this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

5heaps said:

what about this argument:

when you realize subtle selflessness (the lack of a substantial self-sufficient self to persons), you subsequently cognize the arya truths and your ordinary self-identity dissolves, at which time, there is an appearance of a divine self-identity. divine meaning free from suffering, since you are briefly free from assenting to a substantial self.

Malcolm wrote:

No self identity at all arises at that time, divine or otherwise, but in the post-equipoise state, it is very clearly explained that one's vision is karmic, albeit, unreal. Therefore, as stated there is no method in common Mahāyāna similar to the path of transformation described in Vajrayāna.

5heaps said:

is the explanation the same for someone who realizes emptiness? namely, that the vision linked with cessation but still considered karmic. if so, what then is the unique feature of tantra that enables it to be non-karmic?

Malcolm wrote:

this the explanation for someone who has realized the first bhumi in Mahāyāna.

The only vision that is non-karmic is buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 9th, 2013 at 1:15 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

jeeprs said:

I am confused by that. What constitutes 'sexual misconduct'? How is one to interpret such traditional sources as the Surangama Sutra?

...

There are many comparable passages in Mahayana sutras, admonishing lust and sensual desire.

Malcolm wrote:

I am surprised you are asking this question. Sexual misconduct is defined by time, place, person and orifice. In terms of persons, it only defines married persons or persons spoken for (i.e. betrothed persons) as well as minors as well as person with whom engaging in sexual activity is inappropriate, such as non-consenting adults, in the case of rape of an adult (given that all sexual contact with minors is considered misconduct).

Secondly, there are many passages in the tantras which claim that passion can only be removed with passion, just as fire is removed with fire and water is removed with water, for example, in the Hevajra tantra, etc. Many such passages exist. The criteria for differentiating common vs. uncommon Mahayāna, i.e., Secret Mantra, is whether one is in the possession of the proper method or not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 9th, 2013 at 12:05 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Benten said:

The problem with tantra seems to be its all coded and as soon as you take it literal and break away from the ten virtues you are nothing less than a hot mess.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no prohibition against having sexual partners outside of marriage even in sūtra if one is also not married nor an exhortation to be married, even in sūtra, much less Vajrayāna.

The non-virtue of sexual misconduct does not mention anything about freely consenting free adults having relations with other freely consenting free adults. Further, alcohol is not mentioned amongst the ten non-virtues at all.

And, if you have a proper method, wine and sexual partners are not a problem (nowhere

did I imply multiple sexual partners -- but even that is fine providing the criteria mentioned above is met).

Finally, Padmasambhava's advice that one's conduct be fine as a grain of sand does not mean following rules; rather, it means being aware of circumstances and acting appropriately at all times.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 9th, 2013 at 11:58 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

5heaps said:

what about this argument:

when you realize subtle selflessness (the lack of a substantial self-sufficient self to persons), you subsequently cognize the arya truths and your ordinary self-identity dissolves, at which time, there is an appearance of a divine self-identity. divine meaning free from suffering, since you are briefly free from assenting to a substantial self.

Malcolm wrote:

No self identity at all arises at that time, divine or otherwise, but in the post-equipoise state, it is very clearly explained that one's vision is karmic, albeit, unreal. Therefore, as stated there is no method in common Mahāyāna similar to the path of transformation described in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 8th, 2013 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Vajrajapa / Guhysamaja Question

Content:

Vajrabhijna said:

As it stands, I have a very casual transmission from a kagyu lama, who asked me to study English sources I could find. Those that I have found, I believe draw from Gelug sources. This is the root of my concern.

I am not trying to mix anything, my question is geared rather at unmixing anything. So we can conclude that there is no difference in the Gelug texts, or Tsonkhapa's exposition of

the guhyasamaja, as from the Kagyu?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, for the most part the Gelug presentations of Guhyasamaja follow the commentarial tradition introduced by translator Go Lotsawa, who is considered part of the Sakya tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 7th, 2013 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Terrorist Bombing at Mahabodhi, Bodhgaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It should not go unnoticed that this attack was timed to coincide with HH Dalai Lama's birthday.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 7th, 2013 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Negative Consequence of Playing Cards

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am not so sure. Look at what it really requires to have a complete and pure refuge, it is not such an easy thing.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a very easy thing, as the Uttaratantra states:

Ultimate refuge

is only the buddha,

because the Muni is endowed with the dharma body.

If one understands that definition of refuge, the others become secondary and not so important at all since the dharmakāya is the source of all other refuges, and exists as an innate attribute in all sentient beings. Therefore, the highest, most perfect refuge is one's own primal nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 6th, 2013 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: people's reactions

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'm curious to hear stories (positive and negative) about how people in your life reacted whenever you consider yourself to have visibly "gotten serious" about Dharma practice.

Malcolm wrote:

MY family, atheists, never showed interest in Dharma, but were always supportive of my choice to be involved in Dharma, even when I thought I was a Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 5th, 2013 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

cdpatton said:

It was the failure of the government to maintain itself in the face of Hitler's illegalities that led to totalitarianism.

Malcolm wrote:

And those illegalities were largely permitted in an atmosphere of political disengagement and apathy.

Conditions are presently ripening in the United States for fascism to happen here. We are not there yet. But we are heading in that direction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 5th, 2013 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[

Actually, Facism in Italy, Germany and Spain came about because of lack of participation. For example, in 1933 in Germany, the Nazis only won because electiral turnout was abysmal.

kirtu said:

In the case of Germany that is untrue.

Malcolm wrote:

It is true:

"The resources of big business and the state were thrown behind the Nazis' campaign to achieve saturation coverage all over Germany. Brownshirts and SS patrolled and marched menacingly through the streets of cities and towns. A "combination of terror, repression and propaganda was mobilized in every... community, large and small, across the land." [6] To further ensure the outcome of the vote would be a Nazi majority, Nazi organizations "monitored" the vote process. In Prussia 50,000 members of the SS, SA and Stahlhelm were ordered to monitor the votes as deputy sheriffs by acting Interior Minister Hermann Göring."

The 1933 elections was one of the greatest vote suppression campaigns in modern electoral history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Simon E. said:

As a sidebar I find myself wondering , and not for the first time , if some citizens of the USA realise how this kind of hysterical over -reaction makes them appear in the eyes of the rest of the world.

Sönarn said:

Long time the rest of the world has no illusion about ... to pretend today that USA is the biggest democracy is a (very bad) joke. Everybody knows that ... except maybe US citizen?

Simon E. said:

I am sure that many Americans would find the reaction of its government just as puzzling as we Europeans do.

Malcolm wrote:

We do. I saw a billboard the other day that quipped " who said government doesn't listen?"

Everyone knows that the NSA has been recording all internet traffic and phone calls for at least decade. Snowden merely produced documentary evidence that is irrefutable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Konchog1 said:

History disagrees. From Caesar to Mao, dictators (which is what I assume you are referring to) have usually come into power through the passion of the people.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends very much on whose history one reads.

Actually, Facism in Italy, Germany and Spain came about because of lack of participation. For example, in 1933 in Germany, the Nazis only won because electiral turnout was abysmal.

Further, Mao and Ceasar did not come into power because of a popular mandate. They came into power through manipulation. In Ceasar's case, it was with the backing of his

army.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 1:42 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sentiments such as these are precursors to Fascism. Similarly, Obama's suggestion that we must weigh security against privacy, etc., are also such precursors.

M

Indrajala said:

Fascism is a natural response to failed alternatives. It can only come to exist through enough people supporting it, i.e., the mandate of the people.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Fascism never comes about because of a popular mandate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 12:43 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Konchog1 said:

If that is freedom, I'd rather be a slave.

Malcolm wrote:

People often prefer their own slavery if it comes at the expense of the liberty of others of whom they disapprove.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 12:37 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

Freedom is overrated.

Malcolm wrote:

Sentiments such as these are precursors to Fascism. Similarly, Obama's suggestion that we must weigh security against privacy, etc., are also such precursors.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 3rd, 2013 at 11:49 AM

Title: Re: Madhyamakaratnapradipa reference from the Derge Tengyur

Content:

Greg said:

In the Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism (Red Book), pg 169:

. . . it is stated in the Jewel Lamp of the Madhyamaka by the master Bhavya (skal-Idan): "The Madhyamaka of the Prasangika and the Svatantrika is the coarse, Outer Madhyamaka. It should indeed be expressed by those who profess well-informed intelligence during debates with [extremist] Outsiders, during the composition of great treatises, and while establishing texts which concern supreme reasoning. However, when the subtle, inner Madhyamaka is experientially cultivated, one should meditate on the nature of Yogacara-Madhyamaka."

The note associated with the quote indicates "The quotation given here does not occur in the extant Tibetan text of Bhavya's Madhyamakaratnapradipa, rather it paraphrases passages found on fols. 280-1 of the Derge canonical edn. of the text: dbu-m a, Vol. Tsha."

As far as I know the terms "Prasangika" and "Svatantrika" are Tibetan innovation when used to describe discrete approaches to Madhyamaka. So I'm guessing this "quote" is a rather loose "paraphrase" indeed. Can anyone shed some light on what it actually says in fols. 280-1 of the Derge canonical edn. of the Madhyamakaratnapradipa: dbu-ma, Vol. Tsha?

Malcolm wrote:

It is basically an explanation of madhyamaka view from a Shantarakshita style perspective.

There is no mention of either prasanga or svatantra in the entire text. It is not a text by Bhavaviveka. Bhavya is a much later master, post Shantarakshita.

This passage basically states that Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva and Candrakīrti present a so-called "coarse outer Madhyamakas" when they speak from the relative truth point of view of śrāvakas; but then Bhavya also presents a couple of citations by Āryadeva and Candrakīrti which shows that in terms of the relative truth these three masters support the concept of mind-only in relative truth, and that this is the inner subtle madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 3rd, 2013 at 9:45 AM

Title: Re: Which Skandha is Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is sugatagarbha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 2nd, 2013 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Most recent terma?

Content:

mutsuk said:

Even before Sechen, he had drang-srong (bonpo) vows which he did not want to give back when he had to convert to the buddhist vinaya. He was forced to anyway... In any case, his appreciation of gter-ma was pristine from the start, mostly because nearly 99 per cent of the Bon literature (in which he was such an expert) is gter-ma.

Malcolm wrote:

If you read his bio, there he recounts that because he developed doubts about terma while at palpung he developed some obstacles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 30th, 2013 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

Ohhh, ok. I'm assuming this isn't invoking the dharmapala, right? Something that's "unique" to zhitro?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a Muni for each of the six realms.

Lotus_Bitch said:

In the mandala of xitro, does Yamaraja have the same appearance as the dharmapala of the same name?

All I need is a yes or no answer...I must know!!!

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

smcj said:

In all the various wonderful descriptions of Amitabja's Pure Land, has anyone heard their political system described?

tobes said:

Vow number 10 of Dharmakara in the longer sutra sounds a lot like Lennon's political utopia;

"Blessed one, may I not awaken to unsurpassable, perfect, full awakening if the living beings who are born in this buddha-field should conceive of any idea of property, even if it is only with regard to their own body."

"Imagine no possessions
I wonder if you can
No need for greed or hunger
A brotherhood of man
Imagine all the people sharing all the world"

Who was arguing for natural property rights again?? Not in the pure lands!

Malcolm wrote:
Correction, not in Amitabha's pureland, populated only by males.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 10:12 PM
Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism
Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:
Ohhh, ok. I'm assuming this isn't invoking the dharmapala, right? Something that's "unique" to zhitro?

Malcolm wrote:
There is a Muni for each of the six realms.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 11:52 AM
Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Dharma never promises another better life. In fact it assures us that if we are passive and refuse to put the teachings into practice we will certainly not experience a better life in the hereafter.

The Buddha of the hell realms is Yamaraja.

M

Lotus_Bitch said:

That's the first time I've heard of Yama being referred to as a buddha.
Yamaraja=Dharmaraja right?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a Xitro thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Religions, nearly universally promising another, better life after this one, have always been manipulated to justify the abuses of the power structure. Even if we do believe in rebirth, it shouldn't justify our complacency toward present injustice.

Also, I don't think both views are necessarily at odds. Bodhisattvas don't just descend into the hell realms with the intent of planting the seeds of dharma in future lives, right? They also try to assuage the suffering of the present.

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma never promises another better life. In fact it assures us that if we are passive and refuse to put the teachings into practice we will certainly not experience a better life in the hereafter.

The Buddha of the hell realms is Yamaraja.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Will said:

Good grief, what are bodhisattvas up to anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

Benefitting others, but I don't think they were putting up Dharma event posters.

Will said:

True - more likely pillars of Dharma wisdom - like Ashoka did.

Malcolm wrote:

Sad thing is no one could read them after a couple hundred years, and worse no one in india knew who ashoka was until his memory was revived by the brits in the 19th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Will said:

Good grief, what are bodhisattvas up to anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

Benefitting others, but I don't think they were putting up Dharma event posters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

It seems like you're saying that working for a political situation that brings people the relative liberties to practice cannot be the ripening of karma...

Malcolm:

There is nothing wrong with working for a political situation that brings people more samsaric liberty in general. Imagining that one is doing so to enable people to practice Dharma is a delusion — also nothing wrong with that either, apart from that fact that it is a useless occupation.

We contemplate the eight freedoms and ten endowments of a precious human birth in order to appreciate how truly rare is the opportunity to meet the Dharma and how truly difficult it is to put it into practice.

And,

when we figure out which of those freedoms and advantages that are missing, we are told to do anything in our power to gain them. Even samsaric activities, right?

Malcolm wrote:

For example, if someone is born in a country where even the name Dharma does not exist, what is there to do? If a sentient being is not born a human being, what is there to do? If one is born without sense organs, etc., what is there to do? There is no exhortation to supply conditions lacking in a human birth to make it "precious". You either have them or you don't. All of them are a result of karma, not one of them is a result of any kind of social activism. If you find you have the eighteen qualifications, then you should practice the Dharma. One either has these eighteen factors or one doesn't. If one has them, don't waste time on non-Dharmic activities.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

It seems like you're saying that working for a political situation that brings people the relative liberties to practice cannot be the ripening of karma...

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with working for a political situation that brings people more samsaric liberty in general. Imagining that one is doing so to enable people to practice Dharma is a delusion — also nothing wrong with that either, apart from that fact that it is a useless occupation.

We contemplate the eight freedoms and ten endowments of a precious human birth in order to appreciate how truly rare is the opportunity to meet the Dharma and how truly difficult it is to put it into practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 28th, 2013 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is simple: if you met with the Dharma in this life, you met with it in a past one. If one does not have that dependent origination, one will never meet the Dharma in this life.

anjali said:

People have to encounter the Dharma for the first time in some lifetime. Why can that not happen for some in this lifetime?

Malcolm wrote:

It is as statistically improbable as it is statistically possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 28th, 2013 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

These "liberties" are a result of our karma based on our own actions in past lives. There is nothing political about them.

Nilasarasvati said:

Kind of circular isn't it?

If you don't have the Karma to practice the Dharma, too bad! Work hard and make aspirations to be reborn wealthier so that you can!

If you have the karma to practise the Dharma, great! No need to help others less privileged do the same because it's just their karma.

Or, to be more than a little irreverent:

Shantarakshita: Please come to Tibet and help King Trisong Deutsen subdue the untameable beings, deities, and black magicians of this barbarous land!

Padmasambhava: I don't get involved in politics. If the Tibetans had the good merit to practice the Dharma, they'd have been born in a central land in the first place.

Malcolm wrote:

It is sad that people who are ostensibly Dharma practitioners seem not to understand the infallibility of karma. Nevertheless. It is simple: if you met with the Dharma in this life, you met with it in a past one. If one does not have that dependent origination, one will never meet the Dharma in this life. This why evangelism is useless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 28th, 2013 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All politics is reducible to parties with different sorts of self-oriented goals, including the politics of deep ecology (which has a self-oriented goal i.e. the preservation of the earth's ecosphere for all beings). But even saving the planet is not a Dharma goal. The goal of Dharma is concerned solely with the liberation of persons from samsara. If we extend this to Mahāyāna, still, all Mahāyāna schools are concerned with the liberation of persons from samsara.

The political process at all levels may be used to beautify samsara or control samsara, but politics is ultimately samsaric, that is the point of differentiating Dharma and politics.

tobes said:

Again, you just introduce a sweeping, immutable definition of politics - without reasons or evidence.

I do not think politics is reducible to this.

Two reasons why the goal of all Mahayana schools is itself - innately - political:

1. Practicing the Dharma requires negative liberty (freedom from coercion, either physical or epistemic).
2. Practicing the Dharma requires positive liberty (freedom to make use of ones potentiality).

This denies your basic claim that politics is necessarily ultimately samsaric: the goal of politics might be to liberate persons from samsara. Nagarjuna certainly thought that was plausible.

Malcolm wrote:

These "liberties" are a result of our karma based on our own actions in past lives. There is nothing political about them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 27th, 2013 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The function of the Dharma is to end samsaric dependent origination i.e. --> affliction --> action --> suffering, etc. This in turn is based upon afflictive obscurations. Afflictive obscurations in turn are based on knowledge obscurations, and the root of those is the habit of "I am".

This habit of "I am" (unreal as its supposed basis of designation may be) is sufficient for considering ordinary persons autonomous, since it is this very habit that gives them the capacity to act as autonomous agents i.e. acting solely with reference to their own interests.

The process of politics is entirely afflictive and afflicted, as far as I can tell, based on various false senses of identity, "I am", "We are", etc.

tobes said:

The process of a particular kind of politics might be predicated on various false senses of identity. But you have not established that politics per se necessarily expresses or manifests as those afflicted processes.

You just assert this as an immutable definition.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I assert this as a practical definition, since there are no other kinds of politics or political processes apart from those which I define above, AFAIK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 26th, 2013 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Just one issue, for me: seperating Dharma from politics seems to be like trying to seperate samsara from Nirvana, the relative from the absolute, etc... ie, as things stand right now, it just ain't happening!

Malcolm wrote:

Both samsara and nirvana are conventional states, as are the notions relative and absolute, etc. But unlike dharmin and dharmatā of water, for example; we can't really say that the intrinsic nature of politics [dharmin] is Dharma [dharmatā].

gregkavarnos said:

So you are saying there is something (a dharma) which is not (included in the) Dharmakaya? Actually maybe Dharmadhatu would probably be the more correct term.

Malcolm wrote:

Am I saying politics is not empty? Of course politics is empty, so is Dharma. Everything is included in the state of dharmakāya. But that has nothing to with the present discussion. At least, not as far as I can observe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 26th, 2013 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Just one issue, for me: seperating Dharma from politics seems to be like trying to seperate samsara from Nirvana, the relative from the absolute, etc... ie, as things stand right now, it just ain't happening!

Malcolm wrote:

Both samsara and nirvana are conventional states, as are the notions relative and absolute, etc. But unlike dharmin and dharmatā of water, for example; we can't really say that the intrinsic nature of politics [dharmin] is Dharma [dharmatā].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 25th, 2013 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: On Dealing with Destructive Emotions

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Does any of this stuff sound familiar?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, fruit of the paths of Mahāmudra and Dzogchen are the same.

The differences lie in how one is introduced to one's primordial state and the method used for discovering and maintaining that state.

Mahāmudra has very few methods: either the two stages, practicing the four yogas or suddenly awakening, like Saraha.

Dzogchen, by contrast, has a plethora which are adapted to every conceivable capacity of interested persons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 25th, 2013 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

The Buddha does reject the autonomous person conventionally. It is not a question of finding a place where he does so explicitly, as it is about realising the disjuncture between the kind of conventional person posited by the Buddha, and the kinds of autonomy westerners tend to mean when they say autonomy. Sure there is still a conventional person of some kind, but the kind of conventional person given (by the Buddha) is - necessarily - a process and relational conventional person. i.e. there is no moral autonomy of the kind favoured by western theologians or philosophers, grounded in a concept of soul or rationality or will or transcendental ego. There is perhaps something akin to what is favoured by the British empiricists - a dispositional theory of agency where there is some kind of autonomy found in choice making....but this is still a very social conception of agency.

Malcolm wrote:

First, when I say autonomous person, I am referring to a person, the most irreducible nominal basis of which is a unique and independent mind stream, with a unique and specific karma, as well as unique and specific causes and conditions. Invoking *karana hetu* [each and everything is a cause for all other things apart from itself] etc. is too broad and is an overapplication of the principle.

Autonomy is essential to the definition of "person" [pudgala]. A convention is understood on the basis its definition. Buddha deconstructed persons via the devices

of skandhas, āyatanas and dhātus, etc. Nevertheless, karma ripens only on an autonomous person. So it is difficult to argue that Buddha denied autonomous persons conventionally.

tobes said:

The question of dependent origination probably lies at the heart of this conversation; this is where the two truths become important. I think that the Dharma leads us into an apprehension of the dependently originated nature of things, not away from dependent origination per se. But I'm fairly sure you think otherwise - and this is probably the reason for our disagreement.

Malcolm wrote:

The function of the Dharma is to end samsaric dependent origination i.e. --> affliction --> action --> suffering, etc. This in turn is based upon afflictive obscurations. Afflictive obscurations in turn are based on knowledge obscurations, and the root of those is the habit of "I am".

This habit of "I am" (unreal as its supposed basis of designation may be) is sufficient for considering ordinary persons autonomous, since it is this very habit that gives them the capacity to act as autonomous agents i.e. acting solely with reference to their own interests.

The process of politics is entirely afflictive and afflicted, as far as I can tell, based on various false senses of identity, "I am", "We are", etc.

tobes said:

Obviously the Buddha does not instruct us to join a political party - but it does not follow from that that the Dharma is distinct from politics. For many reasons - namely that politics is not reducible to party politics and that a contemporary Buddhist cannot read the Buddha's advice in the Nikaya's and apply it as if we are still in ancient India (i.e. obviously there was not party politics taking place there).

Malcolm wrote:

All politics is reducible to parties with different sorts of self-oriented goals, including the politics of deep ecology (which has a self-oriented goal i.e. the preservation of the earth's ecosphere for all beings). But even saving the planet is not a Dharma goal. The goal of Dharma is concerned solely with the liberation of persons from samsara. If we extend this to Mahāyāna, still, all Mahāyāna schools are concerned with the liberation of persons from samsara.

The political process at all levels may be used to beautify samsara or control samsara, but politics is ultimately samsaric, that is the point of differentiating Dharma and politics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 25th, 2013 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

And the biological sciences have debunked the need for "animal protein" with valid scientific method.

dzogchungpa said:

This is interesting to me. Can you provide a reference?

Also, I would point out that proteins are not the only macronutrients.

seeker242 said:

The most recent reference that I know of comes from the "American Dietetic Association", now known as "The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics" and is the world's largest organization of food and nutrition professionals. They published a well referenced position paper on it. It can be found here. The abstract is pretty self explanatory. <http://www.eatright.org/About/Content.aspx?id=8357>

Malcolm wrote:

Bunch of quacks.

A 1995 report noted the AND received funding from companies like McDonald's, PepsiCo, The Coca Cola Company, Sara Lee, Abbott Nutrition, General Mills, Kellogg's, Mars, McNeil Nutritionals, SOYJOY, Truvia, Unilever, and The Sugar Association as corporate sponsorship.[16] The AND also partners with ConAgra Foods, which produces Orville Redenbacher, Slim Jims, Hunt's Ketchup, SnackPacks, and Hebrew National hot dogs, to maintain the American Dietetic Association/ConAgra Foods Home Food Safety...It's in Your Hands program.[48] Additionally, the AND earns revenue from corporations by selling space at its booth during conventions, doing this for soft drinks and candy makers.[16][49]

In April 2013, a dietitian working on a panel charged with setting policy on genetically modified foods for the academy contended she was removed for pointing out that two of its members had ties to Monsanto, one of the biggest makers of genetically modified seeds.[50] The resulting controversy highlighted the fact that Ms. Smith Edge, chairwoman of the committee charged with developing the GMO policy, is a senior vice president at the International Food Information Council, which is largely financed by food, beverage and agriculture businesses, including companies like DuPont, Bayer CropScience and Cargill, companies that were among the biggest financial opponents of a State of California GMO labeling initiative.[51]

The AND maintains that being at the "same table" with food companies is important in order to exert a positive influence over their products and message, although critics describe this as an "unhealthy alliance" between the AND and junk food companies.[49][52] The accusation is that despite what good may come of such programs, it ultimately whitewashes (similar to the greenwashing efforts of

environmentally irresponsible companies) the brand's role in the country's food ecosystem. Watchdogs note that the AND rarely criticizes food companies, believing it to be out of fear of "biting the hand that feeds them." [53][54][55] Nutrition expert Marion Nestle opined that she believed that as long as the AND partners with the makers of food and beverage products, "its opinions about diet and health will never be believed [to be] independent." [49] A 2011 survey found that 80% of Academy members are critical of the Academy's position. They believe that the Academy is endorsing corporate sponsors and their products when it allows their sponsorship. [56]
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Academy_of_Nutrition_and_Dietetics

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I cannot see how one can practice Dharma in this world system without impacting on a social/political level. Seems impossible to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I ever say that Dharma practitioners were incapable of impacting society or politics? No, I never suggested such a thing. In fact I acknowledged several times that Dharma practitioners could have such impacts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The very fact that a Bodhisattva requires an other to act on, undeniably immediately places them in a social and political context.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not bear the consequence that Dharma and politics are mutually inclusive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

He did not say that about growing vegetables!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact for monks, cultivating vegetables is wrong livelihood because digging in the ground etc., causes harm to sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The social character of Dharma is also clearly evident in the "other-oriented" attitude of the Bodhisattvas.

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhisattvas are "other-oriented" because they see how sentient beings are suffering. They engage in deeds to benefit others.

But whether those deeds are transformative or are worldly does not depend on the social relationships in which those deeds take place.

Their function as deeds depends on the depth of realization of the person, and not the social context of the deeds themselves.

For example, the acts of giving away bread to the hungry performed by an ordinary person, a bodhisattva and a buddha do not have the same value. The deed is evaluated on the realization of the agent, not on the plight of the recipient, since all recipients are assumed to be suffering equally by virtue of their all being trapped in the three realms of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

It clearly cannot be contained to the sphere of the personal.

The Dharma opens us up to an ontology of interdependence, which radically undermines the distinctions between the personal and the social.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't attain liberation through Dharma practice in groups.

tobes said:

That in itself is highly political, because it denies the kinds of politics predicated on atomistic, autonomous individuals.

I'm really not sure how this could be denied.....

Malcolm wrote:

Can you point to some teaching by the Buddha where he rejected autonomous persons conventionally? The same arguments that negate the identity of the person can be used to negate the identity of the polis. Certainly the Buddha's intent was not to replace a sense individual personhood with a sense of collective or dependent personhood. His intent was to expose absence of identity, the lack of recognition of which is the primary cause of suffering.

Your "ontology of interdependence" is something that has been abstracted out of Dharma teachings by intellectuals; but it is not point of Dharma itself. The point of Dharma teachings is to overcome that fact of interdependence. The point of Dharma is the personal reversal of samsaric dependent origination.

Where does the Buddha instruct us to use our Dharma conscience to join the political party of our choice, for example the Green Party, The Tea Party, etc.?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Because it seems like Chatral Sangye Dorje does.

Malcolm wrote:

He is entitled to his opinion. I don't follow people because they have famous reputations or are the disciples of famous people. I honestly could care less what Chatral Rinpoche thinks. I know what I think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Do you really think though that there is no difference between eating a bowl of cheerios and eating a big bowl of hamburger helper?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Whereas if I eat a bowl of cheerios, I'm only dealing with the harm that came from raising the grain.

Malcolm wrote:

For example us say you are eating organic cheerios. Organic oats are generally fertilized with bone meal, all from slaughtered animals.

You cannot abstract your Cheerios out of the loop. It just wont work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

smcj said:

From "Writings of Kalu Rinpoche" tr. McLeod:

NON-MERITORIOUS KARMA

The non-virtuous acts emerge from emotional dispositions, and are explained as follows:

Physical Acts

The first is the taking of life. Taking life because of desire means killing for the sake of meat, skin, bones, musk, or other parts of an animal, for money, or to protect yourself or your friends. Taking life out of anger means killing because of enmity or dispute. Taking life for the sake of offerings or gifts, thinking that it is virtuous, is killing because of stupidity.

Greg & I are both Kagyus. Maybe it's a Kagyu thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand the formal definitions of how the three mental non-virtues work and their consequence on the actions of killing and so on. This is all very carefully explained in Abhidharmakosha [chapter four], which I have studied in close detail for many years.

But you cannot kill without aversion for the thing you are killing, even if you are killing it out of greed [brnab sems] or wrong view [log lta] -- underneath that greed or wrong view will still be a deeper affliction of hatred.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

To slay a sentient being requires the desire that they no longer exist [dvesha]. All such slaying then comes from a sense of enmity.

gregkavarnos said:

When I used to hunt rabbits I did it coz they tasted really good as a pot roast with red wine, bay leaves, baby onions and garlic, not coz I hated them. On the contrary, they were cute, furry, fluffy and hippity-hopity, but they tasted damn fine!

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry Greg, but in order to slay, you have to desire the non-existence of another sentient being. It is impossible that state of mind exists without being tinged with aversion, no matter how slight.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

I still think your conception of "individual only" dharma is slanted by Western romanticism, individualism, the enlightenment or something---I mean, I agree with all the consequences you probably have in mind (when Dharma and Politics go wrong--our current situation in Myanmar for example) but I'm afraid you have your head in the ether cloud of ideal shoulds and shouldn'ts rather than talking about people's ordinary lived realities.

Malcolm wrote:

My opinion is a product of my direct observation of people in action with each other "in the name of the Dharma" over the past 25 years; and having studied the socio-political history of Buddhism as it has existed for the past 2500 years in this epoch.

Just as there is no group karma, there is also no group Dharma. Dharma is solely about personal evolution and transformation. If enough people evolve and transform, well then, what a nice place to live that would be.

In fact, it is the observation of people's ordinary lived realities that has lead me to my present conclusion. It is one of the reasons I made a radical distinction between Dharma and Buddhism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, not taking life is about eliminating enmity in your own mind, first, and secondarily about protecting others.

gregkavarnos said:

If it was about eliminating enmity then it would be proscription against enmity and not specifically against taking life. Anyway, people do not take life based strictly on enmity, they may do so based on greed, on pride, etc... A butcher does not hate the livestock he slaughters.

Malcolm wrote:

To slay a sentient being requires the desire that they no longer exist [dvesha]. All such slaying then comes from a sense of enmity.

gregkavarnos said:

This is not a quality of politics per se but a quality of samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Politics is just a samsara of hope and fear. In politics there are always winners and always losers. In Dharma there are only winners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

With the main issue being that some types of food are more harmful and other types are less harmful!

Malcolm wrote:

This is false. All food production is equally harmful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The sphere of the Dharma is not the polis, it is the person.

Then Dharma is not about creating a better society, or a more equitable society -- it never has been. The sphere of the Dharma is personal, it is about personal evolution.

gregkavarnos said:

And the teachings of the Noble Eightfold Path? The proscription on not taking life is about not taking another's life. That makes it social. No taking what is not given (stealing)? Social. etc...

Malcolm wrote:

No, not taking life is about eliminating enmity in your own mind, first, and secondarily about protecting others.

Ahimsa, on the other hand, is a mental factor which functions in concert with the other positive mental factors, also it is not social necessarily. For example, we extend the principle of ahimsa even to so called "non-sentient" life like trees and so on.

But you know, this is just my opinion. I think that Dharma and politics are separate, not that they have to be kept secret. We can clearly see the results of the two things are very different. One results inevitably in peace and contentment; the other, constant struggle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The sphere of the Dharma is not the polis, it is the person.

Nilasarasvati said:

How does this distinction of yours function when it runs into the concept of Sangha?

Malcolm wrote:

Good question. Is the Sangha a polis? No, I don't think so. It is merely a name for a group of people on the path or who have realized the result of that path who may or may not live or associate in a community. For example, pratyakabuddhas are also Sangha, etc.

To the extent that such like-minded people assemble [sangha] and work to achieve a common spiritual goal, it is constant struggle for them to keep their relationships pure and focused on the Dharma. Too often, such community efforts wind up spoiled by politics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 23rd, 2013 at 6:41 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

For mine, I do not see how 'The Dharma' - in any form - is distinct from action, interrelation, causes, conditions and effects. So long as it is related to these things, then it may shape, constitute or inform them. And these are partly political phenomena, unless one chooses to define 'the political' in a very specific and particular way, such as a liberal-democratic sphere of law making and popular representation.

I have yet to see a convincing argument against that.

Malcolm wrote:

The sphere of the Dharma is not the polis, it is the person.

Then Dharma is not about creating a better society, or a more equitable society -- it never has been. The sphere of the Dharma is personal, it is about personal evolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 23rd, 2013 at 6:36 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

So in short: one of the most contradictory elements in this thread is the deeply political claim that the Dharma ought to be separate from politics.

It is contradictory because that position itself situates the Dharma in a very particular, highly political way.

i.e. it frames the Dharma through and in relation to a liberal-secularist ideology.

Malcolm wrote:

If you prefer to see it that way, you will.

I don't see it that way.

- 1) the claim that Dharma and politics belong to separate spheres is not a political claim
- 2) that claim itself does not politicize Dharma

3) that claim has a long tradition stemming back to a pre-liberal secularist era.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 23rd, 2013 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Malcolm, I've always heard "Nirvana is beyond extremes" which seems much more helpful in establishing the view---is it really just Nirvana is peace (ksanti?).

smcj said:

I'm not a translator, but i prefer something that suggests the end of the road, like 'finality' or 'fulfillment' rather than 'peaceful' or 'peace'.

Malcolm wrote:

༥ འདུ་བྱེད་ཐམས་ཅད་མི་རྟག་ཅིང་།
ཟག་བཅས་ཐམས་ཅད་སྦྱག་བསྐྱལ་བ།
ཆོས་རྒྱམས་སྣོང་ཞིང་བདག་མེད་པ།
ཟུང་ངན་འདས་པ་ཞི་བའོ།

Literally:

All conditioned [phenomena] are impermanent.

All contaminated [phenomena] are suffering.

All phenomena are empty and lack self.

Nirvana is peace [ཞི་བའོ].

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 22nd, 2013 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Well Politics isn't a substitute or equivalent to Dharma...that's silly.

As for your translation of the 4 Seals...hmmm...I think it leaves much of the nuance out.

Malcolm wrote:

They is generally given as:

All conditioned phenomena are impermanent.

All afflicted phenomena are suffering.

All phenomena lack self.

Nirvana is peaceful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I cannot see how you can describe it so unidirectionally.

Malcolm wrote:

What can I say? When Dharma and politics mix, politics is never enhanced, and Dharma loses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, of course Dharma practitioners can act politically, even have political biases and opinions, but they should never confuse their political beliefs and opinions with the Dharma they are attempting to put into practice.

gregkavarnos said:

So are you saying that Dharma cannot inform politics (political ideology, political action)?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you are a Dharma practitioner, everything you do should be informed by your observance of Dharma principles such as non-harming, and so on. But, should a Dharma practitioner seek to outlaw abortion through political action and claim it is an act of Dharma "politics"? No, I don't think so. Why? Because we should not try and legislate our conscience on others. That would be forcing other people to adopt our principles. This is antithetical to Dharma, in my opinion.

So while a Dharma person may make this or that political decision based on their conscience as a Dharma practitioner, they should not claim that their political choices are "Dharmic" as opposed to the political choices of a Christian, Moslem or a religious Jew.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: East Bay - White Tara and Vajrayogini with Jetsun Kushok

Content:

namoh said:

I'm curious, and perhaps Malcolm or Kirtu could shed some light on this, but is the

Uncommon White Tara given by Jetsun Kusho la the same as the White Tara initiation that HE Dagmo Kusho Sakya in Seattle gives from time to time?

Will

Malcolm wrote:
Probably.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

All Buddhist political elements that have been unable to defend themselves have gotten swallowed up except for Nepal.

That's supposed to read: except for Bhutan. I would just change it but it's been quoted in response already.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Bhutan is a very repressive kingdom. Hardly the ideal Dharma polity you imagine.

<https://www.greenleft.org.au/node/40554>

<http://www.expontomagazine.com/nl/opinie/244-bhutans-way-of-ethnic-cleansing>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhutanese_refugees

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

People still have to make mundane decisions about grain storage, etc. Scarce resources still need to be allocated (the essence of economics) and people still need guidance in living in society (the essence of politics) if only to promote cooperation. Beyond one's door some degree of picking and choosing becomes necessary.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course -- the role of politics is just such practical considerations.

But when people start saying "My point of view about grain storage is justified in this or that sutra of the Buddha", than at that point one is, to quote a mind training slogan, "reducing a god into a demon".

The difference between politics and Dharma is the difference between glasses and a mirror: one uses the former to focus on things outside oneself; but a mirror is used to investigate oneself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Secondly, your scenario requires a monarchy.

Doesn't require a monarchy. That part of the myth is irrelevant.

Malcolm wrote:

Seems pretty key to me.

kirtu said:

Third, Shambhala was destroyed by other humans, so it didn't really work out so well for the Shambhalians,

All Buddhist political elements that have been unable to defend themselves have gotten swallowed up except for Nepal. This is a serious problem. But it probably just means that Shambhala-like communities need to be created in relatively stable environments.

Malcolm wrote:

Shambhala was a kingdom, a real historical place. It was destroyed by Muslims in the eighth century.

kirtu said:

Anyway Buddhist utopianism is as much a fantasy as any other kind of utopianism.

Really? Like Changchub Dorje's commune? It sounds like that worked out pretty well.

Malcolm wrote:

Chanchub Dorje's place was not a utopia. It was just a small place in Khams where there were a bunch of Dharma practitioners following a teacher. But there was certainly no political ideology governing the place, utopian or otherwise. If one is a perfect Dharma practitioner, what need for politics will one have?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

jeeprs said:

Politics is unavoidable on the level of conventional existence. It might have no ultimate significance but as long as people have to live in communities, follow laws, provide public services, and so on, then some kind of political engagement is unavoidable.

Even the Buddhist teaching itself is only an 'expedient means' to help beings realise the true nature. That is the meaning of the parable of the Raft, is it not?

It follows from that, I would think, that the kind of political system that Buddhism would encourage would be minimalist and self-limiting. Of course the obvious difficulty with that is that the ruthless will immediately see the opportunities for exploiting it. So in an 'ideal existence' there would be no need for politics, or even Buddhism, for that matter, but the world is never like that, it is an intermediate realm, within which politics plays a necessary part. I don't see how you can avoid that without basically ceding the field to self-interest.

Malcolm wrote:

Politics is all about self-interest. That is yet another reason that it is incompatible with Dharma. Politics is not based on wisdom. It is always based on conflicts.

Buddhisms of course are not Dharma, and can encourage all the politics they like -- this is why we can have Green Buddhism, Marxist Buddhism, Conservative Buddhism, etc. Buddhisms are just sects based on the limitations and biases of their followers.

As I said, of course Dharma practitioners can act politically, even have political biases and opinions, but they should never confuse their political beliefs and opinions with the Dharma they are attempting to put into practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: East Bay - White Tara and Vajrayogini with Jetsun Kushok

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Thanks. So, is this practice related to what DJKR will be giving this August:
<http://www.siddharthasintent.org/2013/01/abhisheka-and-teachings.html>,
which I am also planning to attend?

Malcolm wrote:

Different lineages: that relates to Vimalamitra, Padmasambhava and Shri Singha, if I recall correctly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 9:36 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

So individual ownership is natural, but particular individuals per se nor particular entities do not substantially exist.

Malcolm wrote:

So individual ownership is natural [conventionally, just as selves are], but particular individuals per se nor particular entities do not substantially exist [ultimately].

tobes said:

So who naturally owns what and how is that grounded?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventional persons own conventional things.

tobes said:

you need a theory of substance to ground a claim for natural rights.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not follow: you simply need conventional persons.

tobes said:

Most Buddhists profoundly reject such a theory, and it is clearly not found in the sutta addressed to Siggalakka

Malcolm wrote:

What is found in the Siggalaka sutta is the notion that lay people should employ others, save wealth, and so on -- all of which is predicated on the common sense notion that individuals own things.

tobes said:

You can however, get ground for positivist rights, when you acknowledge that concepts (and thus, rights) are nominal and conventional

Malcolm wrote:

Water is a convention, nevertheless, wetness is innate to water. Conventionality and innateness are not mutually exclusive, though some people who badly misunderstand things think so.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

Moreover, whilst I agree that the precept not to take property presupposes a theory of property rights, that theory cannot be a 'natural right to individual ownership' - the predications of such a theory are not at all commensurate with Buddhist metaphysics or ethics.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. Just read the Siggilaka sutta.

tobes said:

That only leaves the possibility of a positivist right

Malcolm wrote:

Stealing is a natural non-virtue, not a "positivist" non-virtue. Therefore, ownership is a natural right, not a positivist right.

In any case, you can have all the fine definitions and subtle nonsense you want. It is just intellectual self-stimulation. Dharma and politics are not compatible.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: East Bay - White Tara and Vajrayogini with Jetsun Kushok

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I'm curious about this Uncommon White Tara Empowerment. She seems to give it quite often.

Does anyone here know anything about it?

kirtu said:

It's an Annutarayoga tantra White Tara that may come from Jamyang Khyentse Wango.

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=White_Tara_Wishfulfilling_Wheel is the RigaWiki entry. Generally Sakayapas don't talk about the details of higher practices and Khenpo Kalsang said next to nothing about it. So it's a kind of secret practice to some extent although HE Jetsun Kusho-la gives it often.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really that secret at all.

The origin of the practice is Bari Lotsawa, passed through the Kagyu lineage (Gampopa apparently extended his life with this practice) until it rejoined Sakya during the period of Tsarchen Losal Gyatso. It was one of Khyentse Wangpo's very important practices and he supposedly possessed a thangka of White Tara that could speak.

It is a very wonderful practice, but it is quite complicated in terms of the visualization. Khyentse Wangpo composed a teaching manual on it, that is spread out over one week or so.

The essential visualization of the protection cakra is combined into Dzogchen Community Tara practice. So receiving this initiation and practice is a good support for the DC practice.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcom said:

No. You do this as a practitioner on the path, not when you have realized mahāmudra. Anyway, you are missing the point -- which is: only in Vajrayāna (anuttarayoga tantra) does one make offerings to oneself as the deity from the beginning. These principles are so basic, I am surprised that practitioners who have been practicing for years do not understand this.

Ben Yuan said:

Thanks for clarifying.

I hope it did not come across as if I was trying to pass my suggestion as an official practice of a lineage, it is just something I made up myself. Apologies.

Malcolm wrote:

Ah, well — it is always best to base oneself on authority. In reality, the proper way to

have a conversation about the dharma is to make a statement, then present a sutra or a tantra which shows that one has not indulged in personal fabrications. Then the worst thing that can happen is that someone will show you why you have not understood the sense of the statement.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 7:16 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

greentara said:

Indeed no political position is in accordance with the dharma. Discord resides anywhere where people are urged to take sides in a way that urges them, as Iago does in Shakespeare's Othello, to "mock the meat" on which hate, jealousy and desire for power feeds.

gregkavarnos said:

Really? And what of King Menander and Ashoka then?

Malcolm wrote:

Ashoka's biased favoring of the Vaibhajiavadins was pure politics and not Dharma. Also, he was a war criminal (which everyone seems to blank out on), excused because he was forgotten in India until the Brits revived his memory from the pillars (which no one could read for two millennia.)

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 7:15 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

Example 1: if from the perspective of the Dharma, there can be no grasping to phenomenal entities, no sense of 'mine', no sense of possession....then it follows that there cannot be a grounding for individual ownership - in the form of natural, innate or even positivist rights.

Malcolm wrote:

False, if this were the case, there could be no precept against taking what is not given. Property is recognized as a natural right in Dharma. I.e. the precept against taking what is not given.

For example, in Dharma, it is illegal to destroy the homes of beings. For example, the bodhisattva vow maintains that it is violation of that vow to destroy cities, towns and so on. One could extend this to ant hills and so on.

tobes said:

Therefore, if a Buddhist practices a politics predicated on the preservation of those rights, they are out of accord with the Dharma.

However, if a Buddhist practices a politics which is explicitly the negation of those individual rights to ownership, than she is in accord with the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

False, as above.

tobes said:

It is not the case that both of those positions are equal with respect to the Dharma, and that therefore, there is no relationship between the political and the Dharma. One is in accord with it, one is not in accord with it.

Malcolm wrote:

Those positions are equal with respect to Dharma since neither position has to do with achieving liberation in Dharmic sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

If you have actualized your perception 100% as the deity.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No. You do this as a practitioner on the path, not when you have realized mahāmudra. Anyway, you are missing the point -- which is: only in Vajrayāna (anuttarayoga tantra) does one make offerings to oneself as the deity from the beginning. These principles are so basic, I am surprised that practitioners who have been practicing for years do not understand this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

Ben Yuan said:

If you sense a tasty piece of food, and then in your mind later you desire that tasty piece of food, thinking of all it's good and pleasurable and gratifying qualities, you can dedicate all the pleasure of that thought to the Buddhas. Similarly, when you sense the tasty piece of food, you can dedicate the pleasure to the Buddhas, and of course, when you are eating, you can visualise yourself as offering it to the Buddhas a food offering.

Malcolm wrote:

Which just generally reinforces the idea that common Mahāyāna is not about enjoying sense pleasures for oneself, unlike Vajrayāna.

Ben Yuan said:

Not if you are the Buddha who is eating the offering (which you are).

Malcolm wrote:

If you are practicing Vajrayāna there is no need to dedicate the enjoyment of the objects of the five senses to "the buddhas", you enjoy them since you are offering them to yourself. There is no method of doing this in common Mahāyāna. It simply does not exist there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

in so far as consciously trying to hide your views about politics could be a political choice.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't try to hide my political views, I merely understand that they are not Dharma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Politics is fundamentally about accepting and rejecting — the basis of the eight so called worldly dharmas i.e. praise/blame and so on.

...

This is why Dharma and politics are incompatible, and why, even though Dharma practitioners may act politically if they choose, they should understand that those

actions are based in human ethics rather than sublime Dharma.

kirtu said:

However we have the mythological example of Shambhala where enlightened Dharma rulers were able to act politically without their actions based on human ethics. We can begin over time to actualize this archetype.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

One word there, Kirt, and it is a big one: "mythological".

Secondly, your scenario requires a monarchy.

Third, Shambhala was destroyed by other humans, so it didn't really work out so well for the Shambhalians, kind of like Stalin's Socialism in One Country. That didn't work out either. Anyway Buddhist utopianism is as much a fantasy as any other kind of utopianism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Also, the Thinley Norbu quote has a lot of really amazing implications that have gone undiscussed. I may have completely misunderstood it, but I posted it with you in mind, Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because you misunderstand what I am getting at. I am not suggesting that Dharma practitioners should refrain from being active in politics. I am merely suggesting that politics and Dharma do not mix.

For example, we have a Dharma practitioner who is a free market neo-liberal advocate of corporate globalization; we have another Dharma practitioner who is a conservative royalist who believes in mercantile economics; we have a Dharma practitioner who is a leftist labor social activist; and we have someone like myself, a proponent of deep ecology/left-biocentrism. We can have many more variations and flavors.

Whose politics are right? Whose politics are in line with Dharma? Whose selective point of view wrapped up in accepting and rejecting, biased opinion and limited thinking is the one that accords best with the principles of Buddha's teachings?

My point of view is that no political position is in accordance with Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Jikan said:

OK. What is the word for conduct that is based on wisdom and not on thinking and judging and choosing? How would you characterize such activity?

Malcolm wrote:

Rare.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The difference, Jikan, is that Dharma is based on wisdom, and politics is based on the limitations of thinking and judging and choosing.

M

tobes said:

This seems to me to be an arbitrary demarcation.

Unless wisdom is trapped eternally in some Platonic realm, then it must be able to interact with phenomena. If it can interact with phenomena, then it can be political.

Malcolm wrote:

It's really not hard — the purpose of Dharma is to transcend worldly entanglements like politics, power, government etc.

Politics is fundamentally about accepting and rejecting — the basis of the eight so called worldly dharmas i.e. praise/blame and so on.

So advice about conduct in Dharma, any Dharma, is ultimately about becoming free from those eight worldly dharmas.

This is why Dharma and politics are incompatible, and why, even though Dharma practitioners may act politically if they choose, they should understand that those actions are based in human ethics rather than sublime Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

Ben Yuan said:

If you sense a tasty piece of food, and then in your mind later you desire that tasty piece of food, thinking of all it's good and pleasurable and gratifying qualities, you can dedicate all the pleasure of that thought to the Buddhas. Similarly, when you sense the tasty piece of food, you can dedicate the pleasure to the Buddhas, and of course, when you are eating, you can visualise yourself as offering it to the Buddhas a food offering.

Malcolm wrote:

Which just generally reinforces the idea that common Mahāyāna is not about enjoying sense pleasures for oneself, unlike Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The difference, Jikan, is that Dharma is based on wisdom, and politics is based on the limitations of thinking and judging and choosing. M

MalaBeads said:

As a statement, I would agree.

However, a query immediately comes to mind. There was plenty of Dharma, based on wisdom, in old Tibet. And yet....look what happened.

In your opinion, Malcolm, what happened there?

Malcolm wrote:

There was more counterfeit Dharma in old Tibet than authentic Dharma towards the end — mostly, but not exclusively, in the monastic establishment (in case anyone was wondering why I think the monastic system is basically defunct and not worth preserving).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

That's true but my "practice" of Dzogchen won't get too far.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

The only one placing that limitation on you is yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nyingma \neq Dzogchen.

M

heart said:

Would be interesting if you could offer some proof of that strange idea, but there seems to be nothing at all.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is snga 'gyur early translation, but then so is yoga tantra, and so on, even Vinaya.

I would say that Nyingma = Guhyagarbha -- that is the main tantra of the Nyingma school.

But the main tantra of Dzogpa Chenpo is not Guhyagarbha, it is the sgra thal gyur.

Since this is the case, really, Nyingma is a Vajrayāna school. Further, Nyingma is a gradual path school. Dzogchen is not a gradual path at all, not even a little.

We have had this discussion in various forms for years, no need to hash it out again.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma is not some objective thing independent of the world; it is a collection of truths, ideas, practices and values all of which are expressive of the way one is and ought to be in the world. In this sense, it is always and already political.

Ok, well, in this case we do not agree. Dharma is two-fold, the Dharma of realization and the Dharma of texts. What is the Dharma of realization? It is pretty straight-forward, summed up in the Lalitavistara, it is blissful, free from proliferation, luminous, permanent, etc. The Dharma of texts allows one to taste and realize that state.

Jikan said:

Hi Malcolm, I'm having a hard time understanding how this rebuts tobes' claim on conduct in the world, which (to my mind) necessarily involves integrating in all moments and in all relationships. Which means that realization must be, in this limited sense, a social phenomenon, even a collaborative one. I think I see more agreement between your position and tobes than disagreement if this exchange is taken in a bigger context.

Am I misunderstanding?

Malcolm wrote:

The difference, Jikan, is that Dharma is based on wisdom, and politics is based on the limitations of thinking and judging and choosing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

Who wrote it? Would you please give the title in Tibetan? Precious Tree (ཐུགས་ལྗོངས་མཆོག་མཆོག་མཆོག་), Precious Wish-Granting Tree?

Malcolm wrote:

"rgyud kyi mngon par rtogs pa rin po che'i ljon shing/." In sa skya bka' 'bum. TBRC W22271. 6: 9 - 286. dehra dun: sakya center, 1992-1993.

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04025\\$W22271](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04025$W22271)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

As for Dzogchen, all I can say is that in general Dzogchen practitioners are not governed by rules at all, there are no vows or samayas to follow in particular, no paths and stages, no particular conduct to adopt or reject. As long as you are mindful and not indifferent you don't need rules, vows and samayas.
You mean other than maintaining the view.

Malcolm wrote:
Not even maintaining the view is a samaya.

kirtu said:
But this is where people (Black Rudra of example) can run into trouble.

Malcolm wrote:
Tharpa Nagpo got into trouble because he had a nihilistic view, not because he had a good view.

kirtu said:
As Andreas Kreschmar has noted, around wisdom masters, everything gets enhanced.

Malcolm wrote:
And he is an authority because...?

kirtu said:
There is at least one Nyingma teaching that combines all three approaches (Sravakayana, Paramitayana and Vajrayana).
Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
Nyingma \neq Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 8:20 PM
Title: Re: Dealing With Desire
Content:

kirtu said:
His disciples had noticed that his behavior had changed slightly and were worried about him...

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, it seems that once he had some real understanding, he wasn't such an exemplary monastic anymore...

kirtu said:
If you assert that then you have misread the story even though the story does allow

multiple readings. It wasn't until the tsok, later, that he may have violated his vows with women (although he didn't - different people spying on him saw different things - the women some saw were dakinis), after which Virupa really played up the part to avoid embarrassing his students and to provide them a lesson.

But you are correct - after some real understanding - after attaining the bhumis - he was not bound by convention.

But before attaining the bhumis, people need to continue to develop their wisdom and accumulate virtue and strictly (not legalistically) follow the training of the individual liberation precepts, their Bodhisattva Vows and very strictly keep their samaya if they practice Vajrayana. Most of the time these are not in conflict. The higher trumps the lower but most of the time the individual liberation precepts support Vajrayana conduct. As Padmasambhava said : "Our view is as high as the sky, And our conduct is as fine as barley flour."

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

There are various accounts of Virupa, and they do not all agree in particulars -- for example, one version of the mālā story holds that he threw his mālā away because he became realized. Also, there is a pun in Sanskrit that few people notice: the waste products of the body are called "mala"; a rosary is called a mālā. So when Shri Dharmapāla threw his mālā in the mala, he was making a statement about his realization i.e. since he had overcome his mala, he no longer needed his mālā.

You really need to read Rin po che ljong shing if you really want to understand the Tantric path of the Sakyapa school. In that book you will discover that in Vajrayāna (according to the Sakya school) there are three grades of heat (weak, medium, strong) on the path of application (rather than four grades as in sūtra i.e. heat, peak, etc.). Here, Vajrayāna practitioners are supposed to engage in "unconventional behavior" -- first in the their rooms, etc.

As for Dzogchen, all I can say is that in general Dzogchen practitioners are not governed by rules at all, there are no vows or samayas to follow in particular, no paths and stages, no particular conduct to adopt or reject. As long as you are not indifferent and mindful, you don't need rules, vows and samayas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 7:30 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

How can you claim that a true dharma practitioner has a conscience independent of the

dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

Meaning, they should not mistake their particular relative and conditioned views as representing THE Dharma, which is an eternal truth.

tobes said:

The Dharma is not some objective thing independent of the world; it is a collection of truths, ideas, practices and values all of which are expressive of the way one is and ought to be in the world. In this sense, it is always and already political.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, well, in this case we do not agree. Dharma is two-fold, the Dharma of realization and the Dharma of texts. What is the Dharma of realization? It is pretty straight-forward, summed up in the Lalitavistara, it is blissful, free from proliferation, luminous, permanent, etc. The Dharma of texts allows one to taste and realize that state.

tobes said:

Buddhist history clearly shows this; as do numerous nikayas and shastras.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists have acted politically, but politics and Dharma are not the same thing, and historically, political śāstras are considered "mi chos", i.e. human ethics. That is different than "lha chose" i.e. Dharma.

tobes said:

Nagarjuna did not see any contradiction between the dharma and giving robust normative political advice. Nor did the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Secular ethics and the teachings of realization are compartmentalized in the Indo-Tibetan tradition. That of course does not mean that the canon does not record Buddha's runins with kings and ministers, but what is remarkable is that in his advice to them the goals of realization always are prioritized over and against any secular value his advice could have had.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

His disciples had noticed that his behavior had changed slightly and were worried about him...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it seems that once he had some real understanding, he wasn't such an exemplary monastic anymore...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

I'm saying more that Buddhists ought to be political as an expression of Dharma

Malcolm wrote:

No, they should be political as expressions of their conscience apart from Dharma. The minute that you claim your conscience is Dharma, then you destroy the Dharma and yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

Hmmm, who else fits this? Why off the top of my head, Virupa, Nagarjuna and Atisha as well as many others including some of the other Mahasiddhas.

Have to exclude the Tibetan masters since after the establishment of Buddhism in Tibet everyone began practicing Vajrayana so this was an open secret. But otherwise many, many Tibetan masters fit this as well: the five Sakya founders, Tsongkhapa, Gampopa, and on and on.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Which Nāgārjuna? You mean the original one (2nd century CE or Rasāyāna Nāgārjuna, siddha Nagarjuna, etc. ? There simply is no possibility that all the texts ascribed to a Nāgārjuna in the bstan 'gyur are by the same person. So we really know nothing about the Nagarjuna, disciple of Saraha, who stands as a seminal Vajrayāna master, apart from the fact that he was not the same person as the Nāgārjuna who wrote the Mūlamadhyamaka-karikas. The Tibetan tradition have conflated at least three separate Nāgārjunas into one personage.

Virupa was expelled from his monastery -- that hardly sounds like "perfect outer conduct while secretly practicing Vajrayāna".

Atisha was a very nice master, but his true personae was masked by Dromton, whom Milrepa referred to as a demon.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

The danger with that logic is that no Buddhist anywhere does anything political at all, out of the humble sense that it may simply create more problems.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists can be and are political, but they ought not be political in the name of Dharma. Otherwise we have aberrations such as Sri Lanka and Burma.

gregkavarnos said:

And Tibet!

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think Tibet qualifies in the same way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

The danger with that logic is that no Buddhist anywhere does anything political at all, out of the humble sense that it may simply create more problems.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists can be and are political, but they ought not be political in the name of Dharma. Otherwise we have aberrations such as Sri Lanka and Burma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Caz said:

Shantideva was a Tantric practitioner as well though, His advise is multifaceted.

Malcolm wrote:

I was discussing the Bodhicarya-avatara and the Śikṣa Sammucaya. Those two texts, as you know, are strictly common Mahāyāna.

Also we do not really know that Śantideva was a Vajrayāna practitioner, though of course there is a tradition that he was. But many such traditions are just stories, not really based in historical reality, so it is difficult to know whether they are true or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 16th, 2013 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan translator of the Samdhinirmocana sutra?

Content:

Huifeng said:

Dear lotsawas!

As title: who was the Tibetan translator of the Samdhinirmocana sutra?

Can't find the answer in any of Power's works, and don't have Lamotte's French at hand.

Thanks in advance.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

That information was not preserved in the colophon, so therefore it is not listed anywhere. This is the reason you cannot find it. Lamotte will not help you either.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 16th, 2013 at 6:32 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

But if you didn't attain the bhumis during empowerment then sutra study and practice is

good for you and is what most Tibetan masters (those whose bios I have read at least) who also didn't attain the bhumis during empowerment did.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Vajrayāna practitioner, then that is your practice — not sūtra. For example, if you read Śāntideva, then you discover the aggregates are impure. Regarding the aggregates as impure is a samaya fault in Vajrayāna, etc.

If by practicing "sutra" you mean trying to maintain the three vows without contradiction — then at least as far as the Sakya school is concerned, the higher commitments trump the lower.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 16th, 2013 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

refers primarily to the Sravaka path and is his standard introduction to Vajrayana usually just before he gives the Hevajra empowerment. It is meant as an explanation of why he is giving the empowerment to begin with.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it primarily refers to the sūtra path. Of course it is the standard preliminary to the Hevajra empowerment because the Sakya school, (at least according to how it is presented by Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen in *The Wish Fulfilling Tree* and Gorampa in *The Sharp Weapon of Reasoning That Cuts Down False Statements Concerning Vajrayāna*) does not require any training at all in sutra prior to taking Vajrayāna empowerments.

I understand that many Tibetans and their Western adherents seem to feel some sort of gradual sūtrayāna approach is required as a preliminary for Vajrayāna, but in reality, it is just not so.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 14th, 2013 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

You cannot have the physical without the mental.

Malcolm wrote:

The reverse is also true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 14th, 2013 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And then of course there is the sad fact that all of us who function as teachers and commentators of the Dharma who are not Ārya practitioners are frauds and charlatans in some sense since we are basically talking about things we have not personally experienced and of which we have only theoretical knowledge.

gregkavarnos said:

Unless we limit ourselves to just teaching about what we have personally experienced. Wouldn't really leave all that much to say, actually!

Malcolm wrote:

It could cause the Buddhist internet to experience cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 14th, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

Judging from the commodification of Buddhism, in particular Tibetan Buddhism, I would say it is readily being endorsed and appropriated by the system into a marketable and ready-made lifestyle. It is fully customizable, too, down to the selection of meditation cushions available for purchase.

Malcolm wrote:

There is Barne's and Nobles Dharma, and then there is practitioner's Dharma. Sometimes the former leads to the latter.

Indrajala said:

Yes, and I recognize that. However, with the potential for profit to be made, there is likewise the high probability that charlatans will seek such profits.

Malcolm wrote:

As you know, charlatans often are responsible for people meeting the Dharma, who then become good practitioners.

And then of course there is the sad fact that all of us who function as teachers and commentators of the Dharma who are not Ārya practitioners are frauds and charlatans in some sense since we are basically talking about things we have not personally experienced and of which we have only theoretical knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

Judging from the commodification of Buddhism, in particular Tibetan Buddhism, I would say it is readily being endorsed and appropriated by the system into a marketable and ready-made lifestyle. It is fully customizable, too, down to the selection of meditation cushions available for purchase.

Malcolm wrote:

There is Barne's and Nobles Dharma, and then there is practitioner's Dharma. Sometimes the former leads to the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

MalaBeads said:

You are maintaining that the core method of Mahayana is the renunciation of sense objects while i am saying that is abandoning attachment to those objects.

Malcolm wrote:

I am maintaining that in the path of renunciation, Mahāyāna included, attachment to those desire objects [of the three realms] is abandoned by abandoning those objects themselves directly. When those objects are abandoned, attachment to them no longer arises i.e. no contact, no sensation; no sensation, no craving.

In the path of transformation it is a little different. While contact with impure material sense organs with impure material sense objects [all considered part of the upadāna rūpaskandha] results in craving, etc., contact by pure sense organs with pure objects [all transformed into a pure mandala] does not result in craving.

In the path of self-liberation, there is no need to relinquish or transform anything since [ideally] there is no grasping at all. If there is any grasping [whether internally or externally], self-liberation is not possible. Of course the path of self-liberation is a path, and therefore, there is specific way to train to reach the level of being totally free of grasping.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Given that Tantra was in its historical origins, transgressive (against a Brahmin/Sattvic/dualistic Vedic society) how does/doesn't contemporary Vajrayana in the West fit into notions and attempts to upset the dominant value system of our materialist/Capitalist/postmodern/dualistic society?

Malcolm wrote:

Tantra was not transgressive. Or to put it another way; Vajrayāna tantras were no more transgressive than, for example, the Arthavaveda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Konchog1 said:

When Sonam Tsemo says "The second general topic is the Pāramitāyāna practitioner making that basis into a path by giving it up", I understand him to be saying 'the Paramitayana practitioner does not cling to the five kinds of desire objects by avoiding them'.

Which is in agreement with what I said before.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, correct. Pāramitāyāna practitioners avoid in the five desire objects in order to eliminate clinging to them.

Of course, generally we can say all Secret Mantra is a "Mahāyāna" belief.

However, you are muddying the issue: the path of general Secret Mantra is based upon "not giving up the basis" which is clearly defined as the five desire objects. Sonam Tsemo is stating that the path of mainstream Mahāyāna is "giving up the basis".

M

Konchog1 said:

I'm sorry, I'm completely lost. I agree with you. Why are we debating?

Malcolm wrote:

Its more fun than agreeing

Seriously though, since you cited the Vajrayāna section of Sonam Tsemo's text, I thought you were making an opposing argument.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Konchog1 said:

When Sonam Tsemo says "The second general topic is the Pāramitāyāna practitioner making that basis into a path by giving it up", I understand him to be saying 'the Paramitayana practitioner does not cling to the five kinds of desire objects by avoiding them'.

Which is in agreement with what I said before.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, correct. Pāramitāyāna practitioners avoid in the five desire objects in order to eliminate clinging to them.

Of course, generally we can say all Secret Mantra is a "Mahāyāna" belief.

However, you are muddying the issue: the path of general Secret Mantra is based upon "not giving up the basis" which is clearly defined as the five desire objects. Sonam Tsemo is stating that the path of mainstream Mahāyāna is "giving up the basis".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Will said:

Putting a bag over one's head to 'renounce' the sensory object of a curvaceous lassie will not work. Nor will going to a cave that is free of such lovelies.

Konchog1 said:

Right, because the problem is that clinging arises from the mind, not from objects. If renouncing sensory objects resulted in enlightenment, then the formless gods are enlightened.

"objects are not inherently fetters; perverse thoughts based on them act as fetters."

-Sonam Tsemo, General Presentation of the Tantra Sets, 14a.4-14b.3

Edit for clarification

Of course the above quote is from the Vajrayana but I believe it expresses a Mahayana belief.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not correctly presenting Loppon Rinpoche's thought:

"The second general topic is the Pāramitāyāna practitioner making that basis into a path by giving it up."

-- The General Presentation of the Divisions of Tantra folio 12/a.

Clearly in this treatise he is claiming two things there is a basis to be given up, and he defines that basis as the five desire objects:

"If it is asked what that cause is, it becomes many things when analyzed extensively — aggregates [skandha], elements [dhātu], gateways [āyatana], etc. In brief it is the five kinds of desire objects. If is wondered how is it summarized into five; the creator of samsara and nirvana is the mind. Its objects are six or twelve, but all are just the five [desire objects] themselves and what follows those, apart from which there isn't anything else. Therefore, these five are the basis."

-- folio 11/a

He later states:

"... as such, if is wondered whether the basis of samsara and nirvana is shared or separate, it is shared.

Now, if one thinks "Doesn't the one who wishes nirvana give up the basis? If that is so, [the basis] cannot be shared."

Indeed, it is true [the basis, i.e. the five desire objects] is given up. Since it is necessary to make [the basis which is] given up itself into an object, since that is so, [the basis] is also proven to be the basis of nirvana."

Thus, your citation (which comes in the section where secret mantra is defined through the fact that is does not give up the basis [the five desire objects]) cannot be understood in the manner in which you are citing it because it directly contradicts the intention of the author, irrespective of what you personally believe to be the intention of Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Some educational posts on Tibetan History:

"Tibetan intransigence persuaded the British to give up their exploratory mission into Tibet. Instead Britain secured China's recognition of its military takeover of Burma, and reciprocated by recognizing China's claim of suzerainty over Tibet.

Tibetans were deliberately excluded from all the conventions and discussions that took place in those years between the British and China concerning Tibet or Sikkim. In 1893 when the Trade Regulation talks were held in Darjeeling, the Tibetan cabinet sent a senior official, Paljor Dorje Shatra to keep an eye on the proceedings. Shatra's presence appears to have been resented by the British. Some English subalterns dragged him off his horse and threw him into a public fountain in the Chowrasta square."

<http://www.jamyangnorbu.com/blog/2013/02/13/a-brief-overview-of-events-that-led-to-the-13th-dalai-lama%E2%80%99s-proclamation-of-tibetan-independence>

"Tibetans can legitimately view the events from 1876 to 1904 as the first chapter in their modern history. Most accounts of this period, largely written by British officials or scholars tend to downplay native resistance and patriotism and ascribe them instead to Tibetan religious fanaticism."

<http://www.jamyangnorbu.com/blog/2013/02/06/backstory-to-the-13th-dalai-lamas-declaration-of-independence>

"Academic scholarship may not generally lend itself to moving or inspirational writing, but there are exceptions. Edward Gibbon's, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, is probably the greatest work of history written in the English language (Hugh Trevor-Roper) and a literary masterpiece praised for its narrative clarity, biting irony and elegant prose. It was a book that woke people up to a whole new way of viewing antiquity, especially in relation to the development of religious institutions – the Christian church in particular. It was also the defining work of history that came out of the European Enlightenment.

Tsepon Wangchuk Deden Shakabpa's *Advanced Political History of Tibet* deals with events, places and personalities that have, of course, less resonance or significance to the rest of the world, especially at the moment when China is being hailed internationally as the next global superpower, and the issue of Tibet has been relegated to a kind of oblivion, more distant and inconsequential (it sometimes appears) than a chariot race at the Hippodrome in ancient Constantinople."

<http://www.jamyangnorbu.com/blog/2011/12/06/shakabpa-and-the-awakening-of-tibetan-history/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When the householder bodhisattva possesses three Dharmas, having stayed at home, until perfect unsurpassed awakening, he never enjoys the five desire objects, and in that way develops the root of virtue.

Trisambaranirdeśaparivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Because of this sūtra in the past, having abandoned the five desire objects, I will always take the [Mahāyāna] vows [samvara] at the six times.

Ārya-prabhāsādhana-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Astus said:

Not enjoying a sunset is not the same as not seeing a sunset. So, what is abandoned is attachment and desire, not the sense data. Even when contemplating the foulness of the body the point is not to see no bodies at all but not to see it as desirable.

Malcolm wrote:

The point of taking a vow of celibacy is not to allow contact of your penis with a vagina., etc.

Anyway, I could spend my time and find many citations that prove that in terms of Mahāyāna view and conduct, the five desire objects themselves are something to be abandoned for many reasons, some having to do with becoming free from attachment, others having to do with the developing samadhi, etc. But I am going to stop here because I have clearly made my point about why Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna differ on the point of eliminating contact with desire objects themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

why is this so hard to understand?

M

MalaBeads said:

Because understanding is not the whole of practice, Malcolm. Because we have body, speech and mind. Because if the three are not integrated, then there is no realization of what is being taught.

Malcolm wrote:

You are totally missing the point. We are discussing why Mahāyāna is a path of renunciation. We are not discussing integration in terms of how that is presented in Dzogchen teachings, not at all. Mahāyāna conduct is completely based on abandoning sense objects, as we can see from many citations. It is critical to understand this point.

When we say that Mahāyāna is a path of renunciation, we are saying we are abandoning the five desire objects, because that is how we are going to abandon attachment to them. The Vajrayāna path of transformation exists for people who are too weak to abandon the five desire objects because their craving is so strong.

It is really simple: the links of dependent origination in this life function in this way -->

contact [sparśa] --> sensation [vedana] -- craving [trṣṇā] --> addiction [upādāna] -->

The easiest way stop craving is to sever contact with a given sense object, for example, an alcoholic and alcohol.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

to give up attachment to the five desire objects, the five desire objects themselves are given up as part of the path.

Honestly, why is this so hard to understand?

Astus said:

Because it means, as I read it from your words, that one gives up what is seen, heard, smelled, tasted and touched. That is, the person becomes completely insensitive and incorporeal. I doubt that either sravakas or bodhisattvas would aim for that.

Malcolm wrote:

When the householder bodhisattva possesses three Dharmas, having stayed at home, until perfect unsurpassed awakening, he never enjoys the five desire objects, and in that way develops the root of virtue.

Trisambaranirdeśaparivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Because of this sūtra in the past, having abandoned the five desire objects, I will always take the [Mahāyāna] vows [samvara] at the six times.

Ārya-prabhāsādhana-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I disagree it is not the path of renouncing sense objects, but the path of renouncing attachment to sense objects. If they renounce sense objects, they would not be eating and drinking.

Exactly, we have to understand what the spang bya (ཤང་བྱ་) is, the object of abandonment. It is not the sense object themselves but the attachment and other delusions that arise connected with those sense objects.

Malcolm wrote:

Śariputra: likewise, bodhisattva mahāsattvas welled trained in the illusions of Mahāyāna attain the experience of illusory phenomena. Though free from all afflictions, they enjoy the five desire objects [pañcakāmaguṇa] from the perspective of great compassion in order to ripen sentient beings to be disciplined, but they do not associate with those [five desire objects], they are not moved by those.

Śariputra: bodhisattva mahāsattvas describe the faults of desire objects with many similes: desire objects are a conflagration. Desire objects are totally inferior. Desire objects are murderers. Desire objects are enemies. Desire objects are invaders. Desire objects are like straw huts. Desire objects are like the kimpakā fruit. Desire objects are like the edge of a razor. Desire objects are like cinders. Desire objects are like poison leaves. Desire objects are like sparrows. Desire objects are like cesspools.

As such, Śariputra, though bodhisattva mahāsattvas comprehend desire objects thoroughly, for the purpose of ripening sentient beings who lack skillful means, [they] are remorseful from the five desire objects, and in order to free those [sentient beings] from the five desire objects, [bodhisattva mahāsattvas] expound upon [the faults] of the five desire objects in detail.

-- Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā

The point, dear friends, is that in Mahāyāna, just as in Śravakayāna, order to give up attachment to the five desire objects, the five desire objects themselves are given up as part of the path. This is why in Vajrayāna tradition, common Mahāyāna [as opposed to uncommon Mahāyāna Vajrayāna] is clearly described as a path of renunciation because it is a path of renunciation.

Honestly, why is this so hard to understand?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 11:45 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

MalaBeads said:

= It is impossible to abandon all sense objects unless you are dead.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not the case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 11:30 AM

Title: Re: How do Tibetans Rationalize the Tibetan Genocide?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I've never heard a Tibetan blame the bad political decisions of the Tibetan government for what happened (maybe they'd see that as insulting to HHDL).

Malcolm wrote:

You haven't been paying attention then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 11:28 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

MalaBeads said:

Quite so. Attachment is the problem not sense objects.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and the essence of paths of renunciation is abandoning sense objects in order to eliminate attachments. That, after all, is the point of paths of renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

mitsuk said:

Greg, I may be wrong but I think you read the phonetic kama as corresponding to pali kamma (skt karma). What Pero (and Malcolm) were talking about is bKa'-ma (phonetized as *kama). bKa' ma is a collection of orally transmitted works which were put into written form (or more precisely compiled and edited) by Lochen Dharma sri and Terdak Lingpa. It is supposed to contain works orally (bka') transmitted since the 8th century in tibetan language. Terma teachings are or should be in harmony with the teachings of Kama (bKa' ma), as a demonstration of their canonicity.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, the Guhyagarbha is kama, shidro is Terma. Both have the mandala of peaceful and wrathful deities; the authority for the latter rests on the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Ramon1920 said:

Three things come to mind with regards to dealing with desire, they all are activities of giving proper attention: Benefits and disadvantages, the false appearance, and the internal feelings (winds if you will).

[...]

Konchog1 said:

While this is all true, its more in line with Theravada. Whereas this is a Mahayana forum.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a classic Mahāyāna formulation:

Objects and poisons are alike, pleasing just when first tasted.

Objects and poisons are alike, their result is unpleasant and unbearable.

Objects and poisons are alike, causing one to be clouded by the darkness of ignorance.

Objects and poisons are alike, their power is hard to reverse, and deceptive, etc...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Astus said:

The topic is about dealing with desires, and you restrict Mahayana to a single approach that desires can only be rejected. My position is that Mahayana is more than that and encompasses several methods.

"For the bodhisattva, afflictions accord with his nature.

He is not one who takes nirvāṇa as his very nature.

It is not the case that the burning up of the afflictions

Allows one to generate the seed of bodhi."

(Nagarjuna: Guide to the Bodhisattva Path, v. 79)

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a refutation of my point. This is merely an sectarian observation that standard presentation of the śrāvaka path is not a path that results in the generation of full buddhahood.

As for your other points -- the path of Mahāyāna really no different than that of śravakayāna -- and is a path based on the renunciation of sense objects and has no other path than that.

You can dance on books all day and you will never alter this fact. I can give you a hundred citations from the very sutras and texts you cite [that the bodhisattva path is path of renouncing sense objects], and still you will never retreat from your point of view.

It is good that you are devoted to prajñāpāramitā, but the pāramitā path just a path of renouncing sense objects.

I will leave it here — The Sāgaramatipariṣcchā-sūtra states:

"Bodhisattvas who possess prajñā are to be reproached about the accumulation of merit; without the method, they do not endeavor in generosity, discipline, patience, diligence and concentration. They indulge in proliferation, thinking 'the perfection of prajñā is extraordinarily supreme, the other perfections are inferior'."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 11th, 2013 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Your teacher is a tertön and terma are (currently) the penultimate expression of the modification and transformation of the Buddhist corpus. Much more so than commentaries since terma are considered the direct manifestation of the wisdom of enlightened beings (like the old "Thus I have heard" of the Mahayana Sutras).

Malcolm wrote:

Greg:

If termas are the manifestation of the wisdom of an awakened person, what can be more conservative than this?

Apart from that, termas must correspond to kama. If they do not, they are not termas. Termas are not meant to be innovative, they are meant restorative.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 11th, 2013 at 7:47 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a statement about means.

Astus said:

Prajnaparamita is the basis of the bodhisattvayana, and there are no methods to apply without it. It is prajnaparamita that liberates all beings and it includes all means. Isn't the inseparability of compassion and wisdom the essential realisation of a bodhisattva?

Malcolm wrote:

No, Astus -- bodhicitta is the basis of the bodhisattvayāna, and that has both relative and ultimate aspects.

Your bodhisattvayāna is a bird that is wounded in one wing.

In any event, this stream of replies and responses is far away from the original point, which is that Mahāyāna is a path of renunciation, just like Śrāvakayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 11th, 2013 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Astus said:

...that the afflictions are not rejected but they are actually required.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not how I understand the passage.

Astus said:

You don't change afflictions, you train in pure vision. By slowly transforming your vision, since ordinary vision is caused by afflictions which generate concepts, counteract that with sadhana practice, completion stage etc.

You use afflictions just as they are, but by changing how you relate to the world, by transforming your world, slowly you realize the state of Mahāmudra without giving anything up at all.

With establishing prajnaparamita as the correct view there is nothing to improve or get rid of.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a statement about means.

Astus said:

As it says in chapter 22 in PP8000, purification means simply the extent one uses prajnaparamita. To this you may say that this is again the ultimate view, and that in order to reach that one has to follow a sravaka-style practice by renouncing the world, etc. As I see it, to hop on the Great Vehicle, one needs prajnaparamita (ch. 1, PP8000).

Malcolm wrote:

Pāramitāyāna is a gradual path, one that requires infinite lifetimes to complete. If you are a very fortunate person close to your last rebirth, you might be able to hop on the Prajñāpāramitā express, but in reality we can see that this is not the case for most sentient beings.

We all have prajñā, but whether than prajñā has been brought to the level of being a pāramitā is completely another question.

Astus said:

This is how prajnaparamita is a universal solution for all defilements, because it removes the root of the problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, prajñā takes many eons to perfect according to Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Wait a second, a few posts ago you were going to town on Ven Indrajala saying that if he didn't stick to the rules exactly as they are laid down then he was contravening them and not a proper monastic and now you say that one has to use ones intelligence in regard to the rules. So which is it to be?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not do the former. Where Jeff and I disagree is that over whether the basic rules of monastics can be altered. I don't think so.

If you don't want to follow all the rules of a Bhikṣu as best as you can -- then don't become a bhikṣu, that is what I am saying. Indrajala is basically saying that he feels that the only ordination that is necessary is the śrāmanera or novice ordination. He is also saying Vinaya should be revised to reflect that.

There is certainly an avenue for people to only receive the dge tshul ordination. Many very high lamas only ordain up to that level, for example. But I don't think the Vinaya rules should be revised, and it is unlikely they will be in Theravada and Mulasarvastivada since that would require a council of Vinayadharas and I just don't think it will happen (as it shouldn't).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is, the cultural revolution in Tibet was largely carried out by Tibetans.

anjali said:

Hmm. Willingly, or under duress (more like the French in Nazi occupied France during WWII)?

Malcolm wrote:

Willingly. It was Tibetan cadres that carried out the most brutal actions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In many places being celibate is considered very strange and weird. So are you saying Buddhist monks should abandon celibacy in such places?

M

Indrajala said:

No, because, as I said above, liberation via renunciation requires celibacy. You cannot transcend the kāma-dhātu via dhyāna without abandoning kāma, which requires abstaining from sense desires, most importantly sexual activities and thoughts. This is to say nothing of reaching the rūpa-dhātu and ārūpya-dhātu, both of which must be reached and transcended via conventional dhyāna. Even just the first dhyāna requires abandonment of sense desires. How much more so the other three?

This is why I said the expectation of celibacy is non-negotiable, so to speak. Celibacy and the traditional śramaṇa path go hand in hand.

Malcolm wrote:

You see, your example does not really work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

At a certain point, the pratimokṣa was settled.

Indrajala said:

That's not entirely true. The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya as translated by Yijing during the Tang displays explicit Mahāyāna elements: mention of the Mahāyāna path in contrast to that of the śrāvaka-s, buddhas in the plural and bodhisattvas. This is significant because it demonstrates, at least around Nalanda where it came from, the Vinaya was fair game for revision, even centuries after the main Vinaya texts were supposed to have been settled.

Malcolm wrote:

The pratimokṣa was settled. Commentaries on it may not have been, and the supporting texts may have been expanded.

Gunaprabha's Vinaya sutra is really the basis for the MS vinaya as it is practiced today.

This Vinaya, as it stands in the bka' 'gyur displays no such references AFAIK.

Of course texts change, since they are not fixed in stone, and are modified to reflect the interest of their readers. It is not surprising there are Mahāyāna elements in some Vinaya recensions somewhere, since there were a lot of monks of Mahāyāna persuasion.

We have not addressed the issue, thus far, of the Bodhisattva pratimokṣa, which in my view is the primary valid basis for modifying one's pratimokṣa vows.

But I really do not share your view that monks ought to just ignore vows they think are unnecessary. Monks depend on lay people. Monastic comportment was designed as much to discipline monks as it was to make lay people comfortable with monks so they would support them.

I expect monks that I support to follow Vinaya. Otherwise, I have no interest in supporting them, either in spirit or financially.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They were rules set down by the Buddha. They should be respected and preserved, not tossed away out of convenience.

Indrajala said:

We should not overlook statements like the following as found in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya which states, "Even if it be something I have prohibited, if it is not considered pure [conduct] in other lands, then it all should not be adopted. Even if it is not something I have prohibited, if something must be carried out in other lands, then it all must be carried out."

Malcolm wrote:

In many places being celibate is considered very strange and weird. So are you saying Buddhist monks should abandon celibacy in such places?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is obvious that renunciate paths (as opposed to the general dissatisfaction with samsara) are less possible then before. Actually, it is easier to be dissatisfied with samsara now, but it is much less easy to do something about it.

gregkavarnos said:

I disagree. Given the current proliferation of Dharma in the West and the willingness for people to engage with spiritual traditions outside of the Judeo-Christian framework (especially after the 1960's) I would say that for westerners it is now actually easier to "do something about it".

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma might be proliferating in Europe and Russia, in the US it has become a little bit moribund, its growth has slowed markedly.

gregkavarnos said:

Another point that I do not understand: you seem totally opposed to the alteration (mainly removal of irrelevant rules) of the Vinaya code, yet you are happy to see the changes (mainly additions) imposed on monastics; changes which were made during the historical course of the development of the Vinaya. Why?

Malcolm wrote:

At a certain point, the pratimokṣa was settled. It was clearly settled after Buddha's famous statement. We don't know exactly when. Nevertheless, we have the pratimokṣa we do. Elsewhere I noted that a monastic Sangha is not vital to the survival of the Dharma since Sikhin, for example, had no monastic Sanagha. Many Buddhas had/have/will have retinues, but no Sangha of monks.

gregkavarnos said:

Given you accept changes in the form of additions why do you not accept subtractions (or modifications)? What makes this even stranger is that your current teacher is actually quite opposed to ossification and very much in support of development, innovation and modification. Is this purposeful reticence on your behalf?

Malcolm wrote:

My current teacher is the most conservative Dzogchen teacher alive, actually. He is even more conservative than Chatral Sangye Dorje. Why? Because he teaches Dzogchen that way Garab Dorje said to teach Dzogchen, not the way Tibetan Lamas say to teach Dzogchen.

gregkavarnos said:

I ask this because (for example) a monastic living in a Western urban environment will be unable to procure cow dung and urine to purify their dwelling after eating garlic, so maybe changing the clause so that the monastic can use air freshener wouldn't be a tragic loss to the Vinaya transmission (or count as a downfall)? Otherwise, it seems to me, that you are purposefully setting up the system for failure.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a question of being intelligent -- one can understand that having eaten garlic, one needs to mask the odor. One infers intention and use one's intelligence. The downfall is not failing to use cowdung, it is consuming garlic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 11:12 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Pero said:

So why become a monk then? Why are there monks if that's all there is to it?

Indrajala said:

Bear in mind for the first five years there were no precepts. The first disciples of the Buddha received neither precepts nor vows. So, at one point there were completely legitimate śramaṇa disciples of the Buddha with no precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

You did not answer the question.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so for you a bodhisattva is solely someone who has realized emptiness. Well, that certainly does leave a lot of people out.

Astus said:

"if a bodhisattva holds the notion of a self, the notion of person, the notion of sentient being, and the notion of life span, then she is not a bodhisattva." (Diamond Sutra, ch. 17, tr. C. Muller)

Malcolm wrote:

Again with the ultimate truth thing -- it is a pity the Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra was only translated into Chinese in 1930.

Astus said:

So while I don't make the difference here between ordinary and noble bodhisattvas, it is with the intention to show that the bodhisattvayana, as presented by the sutras and several teachers, is not just how it tends to be represented in later "sudden teaching" texts (i.e. as something that only incompetent fools choose over their direct path to buddhahood).

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, you are presenting a very one-sided view. We all understand, since "Dharma" kindergarten, that the Vajracchedhika sūtra presents a very definitive view of prajñāpāramitā, beginning with dānapāramitā. Mahāyāna does not just exist as a teaching on ultimate truth.

Astus said:

If "phenomena themselves" are afflictive, then are phenomena should be removed or the afflictions? If ignorance lies in appearances then shouldn't the realm of nothingness or complete annihilation be nirvana? As I understand it, the problem is with believing appearances to be self, and that's why the realisation of emptiness is the solution.

Malcolm wrote:

Phenomena, as you well know, are afflictive because they are conducive to suffering and are suffering. The path of renunciation suggests, in both Nikaya schools as well as Mahāyāna, that phenomena are to removed -- and this is generally accomplished with vows. For example, monks remove the phenomena of others genitals; they remove the phenomena of handling precious things. More importantly, the abandonment of sense objects is seen as a condition for development of samadhi in both Nikāya Buddhism and Mahāyana. Ask anyone around here.

Astus said:

They are like illusions because they are empty, and seeing things as empty only means non-attachment but not annihilation. Why do you say then that they are abandoned?

Malcolm wrote:

They are abandoned because they are no longer a basis for effluents when emptiness is realized.

Astus said:

"you should understand that all the afflictions constitute the seed of the Tathāgata. It is like not being able to attain the priceless jewelpearl without entering the ocean.

Therefore, if one does not enter the great sea of the afflictions, one will not be able to attain the jewel of omniscience." (Vimalakirti Sutra, ch. 8, tr. McRae)

This sutra says...

Malcolm wrote:

...nothing of the sort. The citation you provide is no different than the peacock eating poisoned plants metaphor. The passage in question as read from the Tibetan states:

"For example, in a desert, flowers such as the blue poppy, padma, jasmine, pundarika, and the saugandhikam will not grow, but the blue poppy, padma, jasmine, pundarika, and the saugandhikam will grow in a swamp or an island. Likewise, buddhadharmas will not grow in sentient beings who have attained the certainty of the unconditioned, but buddhadharmas will grow in sentient beings who have become swamps and islands of afflictions.

Seeds will not grow in space, but will grow when placed in the ground. Likewise, buddhadharmas will not grow in sentient beings who have attained the certainty of the unconditioned, but having generated a view of a perishable assembly [satkāyadr̥ṣṭi] equal [in size] with Sumeru, from that buddhadharmas will grow.

Son of a good family, with these similes, all afflictions should be known as the tathāgata gotra [r̥igs]. Just as one can never reach a priceless jewel without entering the ocean, likewise, without entering the ocean of afflictions, omniscience will never grow from that."

When you use citations, you must comment based on the actual sense of the passage, not merely produce it in a sort of "dancing on books" kind of a way. Before you produce a citation, it is best to check if it is accurate. This citation definitely is mistranslated.

Here gotra does not mean seed — it never means "seed". It means "protection or shelter for cows , cow-pen , cow-shed , stable for cattle , stable (in general) , hurdle , enclosure" and secondarily, "family , race , lineage , kin" -- here it is obvious that the former meaning is more intended than the latter.

Here, it is very clear that it is container/contained metaphor. But what this incorrect citation is saying is that the field is the seed. What you are suggesting is an identity proposition. That is the completely wrong way to understand this passage.

Afflictions are the field, the enclosure, in which tathāgatas are grown. In this sutra, afflictions are not themselves omniscience. Afflictions are the ocean, the enclosure,

within which is held the priceless jewel, omniscience,.

Here, the intention of this passage is to compare bodhisattvas conduct (who is not afraid of afflictions) with the conduct of śravakas who attain certainty in nirvana. Bodhisattvas here are not afraid to continue taking rebirth in samsara [enter the ocean] while they accumulate the qualities of omniscience [the priceless jewel]. But this passage is not saying "Afflictions are omniscience", for example.

Even more importantly, the passage is arguing that even having a sense of self is to be preferred to having realized selflessness in terms of being fearless about cultivating omniscience.

The passage as a whole is a Mahāyāna sectarian passage condemning "main stream" buddhists for being cowardly.

Astus said:

You don't use afflictions on the path of transformation just as they are...

Malcolm wrote:

Really?

The Vajrapañjara-tantra states: Created by passion, the worldly shall be liberated by the same passion.

Śrī Guhyasamāja The passionate desiring wisdom always rely on the five desire objects

Śrī Hevajra-tantra states: The savage actions of people bring bondage by such and such;

If one possesses the method, by just those [actions] one shall be liberated from the bondage of becoming

Śrī Guhyasamāja: All the desired pleasures are what one serves with desire;

make offerings to oneself and others with the yoga of oneself as the deity

You don't change afflictions, you train in pure vision. By slowly transforming your vision, since ordinary vision is caused by afflictions which generate concepts, counteract that with sadhana practice, completion stage etc.

As The Hevajra states: Since the poison has been eliminated by purification, these objects to be relied upon are reliable

You use afflictions just as they are, but by changing how you relate to the world, by transforming your world, slowly you realize the state of Mahāmudra without giving anything up at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Liberation Unleashed in the POV of Dzogchen

Content:

Tenpa said:

What intrigues me is whether its method have a correlation with Dzogchen's Pointing Out?. Is now a time where traditional method such as preliminaries and all of its samaya all being by-passed?

Malcolm wrote:

None whatsoever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

This organization isn't marked by "spectacular failure"

Malcolm wrote:

Monastically, yes, it is -- and that is all I was talking about.

They could take some of the millions raised set aside for building a huge statue, for example, and build a monastic college in say Idaho.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Astus said:

Bodhisattvas have no trouble with samsara because they understand how afflictions are enlightenment, it is not some abstract far away goal but the path itself, because a bodhisattva practises prajnaparamita.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so for you a bodhisattva is solely someone who has realized emptiness. Well, that certainly does leave a lot of people out.

Astus said:

As above, the dharmas need not be rejected or removed. Even in Theravada it is taught that the problem is not with the skandhas but with attachment ("I-making and mine-

making").

Malcolm wrote:

No, in terms of relative truth Mahāyāna teaches that phenomena themselves are afflictive. Also in the Nikāya schools, phenomena themselves are regarded as afflictive and a cause of suffering.

Astus said:

It is with the realisation of emptiness that one can walk the bodhisattva path itself. If there were "subtle and not so subtle accepting and rejecting" then how could it be non-abiding?

Malcolm wrote:

As I noted above, you are making the claim that only those who have realized emptiness can "walk the bodhisattva path". Of course this is totally false. It's great if you have realized emptiness. If you can truly speak from that point of view, if you, like "Geshe" Michael Roach, have truly realized emptiness, how wonderful. I rejoice in your realization! I want to be your student! But if not, then you are just spewing hot air which is not practical at all, and not only does not relate to your own state, but it does not relate the state of others.

In reality the intent of such statements that you introduced is that in Mahāyāna, the contemplation of the emptiness is for abandoning sense objects.

The victor stated that desire objects, wealth and the three planes of existence are similar to illusions, mirages, a moon in the water, and apparitions.

Or for example, when we examples of Aryādharma and Sadaprarudita have parties with many women and so on, at this point these bodhisattvas are already past the point of darśana marga. But common Mahāyāna offers no methods for ordinary persons to take sense objects in to the path.

How do ordinary Mahāyāna practitioners practice? For the most part their practice is no different than that of non-Mahāyāna Buddhists. i.e. śīla, samadhi and prajñā.

Only their view is a little different, with a slightly more liberal attitude towards vows. The fault in your argument lies in not making a distinction between aryabodhisattvas and regular bodhisattvas, those who have not realized prajñāpāramitā.

Astus said:

Is there still attachment on the path of transformation and self-liberation? If yes, then how can it be called transformation and self-liberation? If no, it also abandons attachment.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is attachment on the path of transformation. There is attachment on the

path of transformation until there is realization. Then the path changes. At that point, there is no more attachment. Attachment is used on the path transformation to eliminate attachment. Desire is used to eliminate desire, etc.

The path of self-liberation is a little difference since self-liberation is non-attachment (but it is not so simple as that).

Astus said:

Therefore, saying that renunciation is less possible than before is a statement valid only for those who want to practise something else.

Malcolm wrote:

It is obvious that renunciate paths (as opposed to the general dissatisfaction with samsara) are less possible then before. Actually, it is easier to be dissatisfied with samsara now, but it is much less easy to do something about it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

But I am gonna stick to causes and conditions as explanation for everything that happens.

By itself, that doesn't seem flippant.

It's because of the prior statement about the Tibetans not having the merit to "dodge" the cultural revolution...

makes the sentence above seem strange, dismissive perhaps.

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is, the cultural revolution in Tibet was largely carried out by Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Yes, because Buddhist monasticism aka the order of bhikṣus, has seen its day. Now, if Buddhist lay people wish to create retreat centers, and even cloistered community, that is fine and dandy -- but they won't be Buddhist monks [even though these days many such people in such places are laboring under the delusion that they are "monks" all the while being married, etc.]. This is why the appellation "minister" is more useful. One can

be a Buddhist religious professional without calling oneself a "monk". I.e. one can be a Buddhist minister.

But Malcolm surely with the amount of reading you have done you know that many texts say after the bhikshu Sangha has disappeared the dharma is at its end. Do you feel that these are simply provisional teachings, or that this is not the case with secret mantra?

Malcolm wrote:

I feel it is along the lines of statements like "Only this day of Śakyamuni's teaching is secret mantra teachings available..." etc -- a completely provisional statement since I have seen interesting corrections of this in various places. All Buddhas can teach secret mantra.

JKhedrup said:

Secondly, I have no problem with Buddhist ministers but I am little wary of any titles. Why? Because in the West we have people who use titles like shoulderpads (from the 80s) to puff up their credentials and stature when actually they have very little knowledge and capacity as teachers. We see how disastrous this is with Western Buddhist organizations who send people out to serve the guru's mission after less than a year of study and practice.

Malcolm wrote:

We see people becoming bhikṣus mainly to get a leg up in Buddhist hierarchy. And yes, there are problems with anything like this.

JKhedrup said:

It is very frustrating on the ground at times, let me tell you.

Malcolm wrote:

I agree with everything you say. The main point of being a teacher is not running one's mouth -- that is what we have the internet for. The main point of being a teacher is that you are helping people free themselves.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Jnana said:

It seems to me that the capacities and shared vision of the community members and the abilities of the community leaders are among the most important factors that contribute to the success of any given community.

Indrajala said:

When a community is up and coming without widespread support from society, then of

course the leadership and common vision are essential for anything to happen. This is perhaps the most difficult aspect of developing Buddhism in the west. Without the right people, then there's not even general social support to fall back on to keep things above the water line.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because Buddhist monasticism aka the order of bhikṣus, has seen its day. Now, if Buddhist lay people wish to create retreat centers, and even cloistered community, that is fine and dandy -- but they won't be Buddhist monks [even though these days many such people in such places are laboring under the delusion that they are "monks" all the while being married, etc.]. This is why the appellation "minister" is more useful. One can be a Buddhist religious professional without calling oneself a "monk". I.e. one can be a Buddhist minister.

Indrajala said:

We just need to keep things simple. If you're a śramaṇa, remain single and celibate. Behave yourself. Speak the truth, speak well, speak clearly. Try to emulate the Buddha as best you can.

This ideal isn't necessarily incompatible with vinaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Jnana/Indrajala: this does not have the force of the vow.

Indrajala said:

For various reasons though a lot of Buddhists are unwilling to consider modifications to the formal Vinaya systems, even when they admit not everything can or will be followed in the present day. The sacrosanct quality of it is remarkable despite it really being house rules aimed primarily at irresponsible young men and women.

Malcolm wrote:

They were rules set down by the Buddha. They should be respected and preserved, not tossed away out of convenience.

Indrajala said:

Personally, I don't feel I need to hold myself to account for silly things some people apparently did twenty-five centuries ago in rural Magadha.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhikṣus have a responsibility to uphold their vows. Whether they do or not is up to them, of course.

Indrajala said:

What's really striking is the literature which outlines in detail the long years that will be spent in hell for violating even minor precepts. You can go to hell for immeasurable years if you eat yeast and fail to confess it according to the authors. Quite terrifying and

ghoulish punishments await he who eats yeast or brewer's lees and fails to confess the sin.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because that person took a vow not to do something. If he or she willfully ignores it, then yes, of course, if this person does not attain stream entry, who knows where they will wind up. But secondly these kinds of things are part of Indian commentarial hyperbole intended to make the person understand it is really important even to follow minor rules as best one can and confess them if one does not.

Indrajala said:

Again, this leads me more and more to agree with Jizang's conclusion. In both Indian and Chinese literature I see a lot of logical inconsistencies and easily refuted metaphysical speculations.

Malcolm wrote:

Vows are intentions. We don't need the theory of avijñāpti, etc. When you take a vow, you make an intention to follow that vow. Except, apparently in this day and age, people take vows with no intention of following them at all.

To be a Dharma person, the essence of vinaya is non-harming, the essence of Mahāyāna is bodhicitta, and the essence of Vajrayāna is pure vision -- one does not need to take many vows at all follow this -- but if someone takes vows, they should try to follow them. If they can't follow them, they should not take them.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 7:21 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

jeeprs said:

You'd be mad to abandon all that, wouldn't you?

Indrajala said:

Some of us are just eccentric.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I really consider bhikṣus with credit cards to be renunciates... [not].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 7:19 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Taking sense objects "into" the path[/i] (is that separate? Is that what you meant?) is distinct from that/can be a skilful means. What does that look like in a practical sense? (in postmeditation, I mean).

Malcolm wrote:

Yoga of passion, eating, washing, wearing clothes, maintaining post-equipose pure view of all appearances, sound and thoughts deity, mantra and wisdom, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A very short one, in terms of liturgy, and a solitary deity, rather than a complicated mandala, for example, the Phyag rgya gcig ma form of Vajrakīlaya from Choling Tersar, or Solitary Heruka Yamantaka, etc.

Konchog1 said:

But do short Sadhanas have the full benefit? I thought they just existed so busy people could fulfill their practice requirements.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on your view and tradition -- in general, for example, in Sakya, longer sadhanas are considered to be for beginners.

In Nyingma however, a short sadhana is considered all that is necessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

...are you saying essentially that it's unrealistic for laypeople to really abandon sense pleasures and they should just take the desire as the path/trust that sadhana to slowly dissolve obscurations? [/b]

Malcolm wrote:

It is unrealistic for lay people (and even bhikṣus) to abandon sense pleasures in this day and age, therefore, it is best to use a method where sense pleasures are used for one's own purposes as part of the path, hence the reason for the Vajrayāna path of transformation. Of course if you do not have Vajrayāna methods you try and be free from

accepting and rejecting ala Chan and Zen, but that is a slow path since it lacks skill methods, from a Vajrayāna perspective.

I should add, no one takes desire [or the other afflictions] as a path except for people who wish to continue to cycle in samsara. One can take sense objects into the path through using the sadhana method if you did not achieve liberation through receiving empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Malcolm, drinking wine is a violation of a basic Buddhist precept. Can one intentionally also break the other four and still able to gain some type of enlightenment in Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Drinking wine is not a violation of five precepts, getting intoxicated is.

As far as the the other four precepts, they must be observed by everyone. Of course, when one becomes sufficiently mature, one ceases to wish to kill, steal, lie or engage in sexual misconduct, and even, become intoxicated.

Vasubandhu's opinion that madana means even a single drop of alcohol is highly debatable.

Nighthawk said:

What type of daily Vajrayana sadhana would you recommend for someone with a busy schedule?

Malcolm wrote:

A very short one, in terms of liturgy, and a solitary deity, rather than a complicated mandala, for example, the Phyag rgya gcig ma form of Vajrakilaya from Choling Tersar, or Solitary Heruka Yamantaka, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

Ideally. You're just telling me what the manual says, not how real life works.

Malcolm wrote:

In real life, when you have a vow not to kill, and you kill, the demerit is stronger, much stronger, than if you did not have such a vow. The merit of refraining from killing is likewise much stronger

Indrajala said:

If you want to be a śramaṇa and behave like one, then you're a śramaṇa, i.e., a monk. If you're a student of the Buddha's teachings, you're a Buddhist monk. You don't need anyone's consent or acknowledgement to be a śramaṇa.

Malcolm wrote:

To be a Buddhist śramanera, in fact you do. Otherwise, one is merely engaging in personal fabrications.

Indrajala said:

And all their preceptors and their own going back twenty-some centuries were all having intact vows?

Malcolm wrote:

In the case of Tibetan ordination lineages, this is the case. I can't speak about those in other transmissions.

Indrajala said:

You once said samaya is a social construct. How can you argue that while saying ordination is not?

Malcolm wrote:

Ordination has no meaning outside of its social context, just like Samaya. Just like Samaya, it too is a tradition, a transmission, from awakened people. Like samaya, ordination is a species of contract between the one who imparts the vow and the vow holder.

I never said however that Samaya was not important. It is. How it is understood differs in different tantras. You can make the same argument for pratimokṣa vows, but in order to have them modified by bodhisattva vows, first you must have received pratimokṣa vows.

Thus far, we have only been dealing pratimokṣa vows. We have not been considering the way in which bodhisattva vows and even samaya vows affect one's basic pratimokṣa vows.

In principle, I think it is too hard to be a Buddhist monk in this day and age. I never said we should abandon the bodhisattva trainings or Vajrayāna contracts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Malcolm, drinking wine is a violation of a basic Buddhist precept. Can one intentionally also break the other four and still able to gain some type of enlightenment in Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Drinking wine is not a violation of five precepts, getting intoxicated is.

As far as the the other four precepts, they must be observed by everyone. Of course, when one becomes sufficiently mature, one ceases to wish to kill, steal, lie or engage in sexual misconduct, and even, become intoxicated.

Vasubandhu's opinion that madana means even a single drop of alcohol is highly debatable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Precepts don't make a renunciate anymore than elaborate rites do.

No, of course not. The desire to take vows should stem from a renunciate's desire to deepen their renunciation.

kirtu said:

There we go!

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, kirt, if you have a problem with drinking then you should take a vow not to drink.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

Right, but that's not defrocking. The perpetrator has the right to move elsewhere. They still have their status as a monk or nun.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is. If you get kicked out of your monastery, you will disrobe. The perpetrator does not have the right to move elsewhere. In order to join a monastery you need sponsorship and references. No one will touch a monk who has been expelled from their monastery in the Tibetan tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There were and are all kinds of mendicants in yellow robes in India, not just Buddhists.

Indrajala said:

Buddhists were specifically targeted in purges and attacks.

Malcolm wrote:

You deliberately missed my point — Brahmins were generally suspicious of shramanas of all denominations, not just Buddhist ones.

Indrajala said:

My position on this has not changed one iota. The fact that there are so called Buddhist "monks" who do not have vows, and generally behave like ordinary people just illustrates my point even more.

There are monks who have vows and behave like ordinary people, too, so your point isn't very strong.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are such monks. But the force of the ordination rite changes the nature of behavior that one is following.

Indrajala said:

Precepts don't make a renunciate anymore than elaborate rites do.

Malcolm wrote:

No, of course not. The desire to take vows should stem from a renunciate's desire to deepen their renunciation.

Indrajala said:

So, were countless millions of bald men and women throughout 20 centuries in East Asia practising the path just laity pretending to be monks? According to you, yes, but according to their own traditions and values, they were renunciates and legitimate monks.

Malcolm wrote:

They were lay Mahāyāna practitioners.

Indrajala said:

Yes, and there is no precept against smoking tobacco, despite the fact that Buddha would have disapproved of it.

According to the Vinaya he allowed disciples to smoke herbs in a pipe if it was so needed as medicine.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as they would have been allowed to drink. But tobacco is a vice, and unlike alcohol, no medical use has been found for it Asian culture anywhere.

Indrajala said:

But this is not how it is for us today. In order to become any kind of ordained person up to bhikṣu, you must become ordained through a rite.

Why? Why can't someone set on liberation and renunciation put on robes and go forward on their own initiative? Why is it that their status has to be legitimized through a rite? Why are you so attached to forms and procedures?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a transmission involved in being ordained. Vinaya ordination requires a preceptor and quorum of monks who have intact vows who are able to transmit those vows; unlike Mahāyāna bodhisattva precepts, which may be undertaken by oneself in absence of a teacher directly from Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. Without that ordination, one cannot be considered a Buddhist monk of any kind. For example, I am sngags pa. Not your average everyday kind of Vajrayāna practitioner that has general samaya. You cannot just invent yourself as a Ngagpa -- though people do -- you must receive a special type of empowerment to be a Ngakpa. Then you may not cut your hair and so on. There are specific reasons for this which are connected with practice.

Likewise with ordination as a novice or a bhikṣu. In the Tibetan tradition, there are many people who remain lifelong shramaneras, often because they regard holding bhikṣu vows too difficult and because it is far less restrictive. But there are specific reasons connected with the bhikṣu vows, and since they are an intact body of vows in each tradition, they are received and transmitted in blocks necessarily. None of the them may be dispensed with. If someone cannot follow a given rule, then it must be confessed, acknowledged etc. This is your peer pressure. Without the support of posadha

recitation, Buddhist monasticism swiftly degenerates.

Indrajala said:

I went through a rite, but to be honest I feel such things are unnecessary.

Malcolm wrote:

Proof we live in a degenerate era.

Indrajala said:

Ordination in any case is a social construct. Renunciation is something else.

Malcolm wrote:

Ordination is not merely a social construct — it is a tradition that comes from awakened people.

Indrajala said:

Ananda, as we know, forgot to ask what "minor" meant and no one so far as had the arrogance to decide what that meant.

No, the various Vinaya schools of India define what they think "minor" meant.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he forgot to ask, and no one felt they knew which minor vows the Buddha meant.

Indrajala said:

In Japan nobody invented new rules permitting marriage.

Malcolm wrote:

I had "invented" in brackets. I know they just ignored their ordination rules.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

I think one practical consideration overlooked in this discussion is that monasticism is economically efficient. ...

Malcolm wrote:

It can't be economically efficient.

Monastics, in Buddhadharma, by definition are dependent on others for everything....Having homeless mendicants creates a financial burden that most

western communities are not interested in supporting and in reality, cannot support. ...Support of the monastic community in Buddhadharma arises from the belief that one will accumulated merit by supporting monastics. There are simply not enough western Buddhists to effectively do so in the West.

kirtu said:

Sure they can be supported. Westerners are impoverished mostly because they don't work together and help one another. In the West it would be easy to create supportable communities specifically for monastics. 3M Western Buddhists could easily support several hundred monastics, perhaps more. As land and buildings accreted, housing becomes much less of an issue and food and other costs drop to near insignificance. In real countries with a real society (i.e. universal health care) this concern isn't an issue (depending on how the universal health care is implemented). Thus the 10-20k Buddhists in Austria may be able to support several hundred monastics on their own (should they emerge).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Leaving aside your long-standing antipathy towards the nation in which you reside (which apparently isn't a real country), I think you missed the point: "...that most western communities are not interested in supporting and in reality, cannot support..." because: "Support of the monastic community in Buddhadharma arises from the belief that one will accumulated merit by supporting monastics..." and there simply are not enough western Buddhists that believe supporting western monastics is sufficiently important since they are already supporting Lamas and Dharma centers, etc.

While I applaud your idealism, the reality is harsh. There simply is not enough support for Western monastics, and the large scale experiments thus far, FPMT, etc., have been marked by spectacular failure for the most part.

I really think that monasticism of virtually every kind is a fading institution because most people do not see it as relevant -- part of this has to do with the dominant Protestant-based culture of the US and northern Europe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm enjoying this conversation as it pertains to the viability of traditional monastic culture and institutions globally. I'd like to shift the emphasis a bit back to the immediate question of desire. Let's say, hypothetically, that a student of Dharma is experiencing very strong desire or attachment or undiluted sexual desire. How ought that student to be advised in terms of practice? What are some different ways in which

a serious student of Dharma might work with desire in practical terms?

Malcolm wrote:

If they are not a Vajrayāna practitioner, they should follow the advice given in the Bodhicaryāvatara concerning attachment and sexual desire.

If they are a Vajrayāna practitioner, they should work with their sadhana practice and understand that Vajrayāna practice tends to heighten afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

JKhedrup said:

...But I don't see enough reasonably sane Westerners taking it up and keeping their ordination for significant periods of time.

Due to the sad reality of the situation, my first question to would-be Western ordinands has to be "how will you support yourself?". And if the answer is by working a regular job in a non-dharma environment, I advise them it isn't a good idea to ordain.

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you. That is my basic point.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have met four people who I am certain are/were genuinely realized people on the bhumis

5heaps said:

how do you tell that it is not merely something like coarse selflessness ie. that persons are btags-yod rather than substantially knowable as they appear now

Malcolm wrote:

Can you rephrase the question in English?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Sometimes it is more pragmatic for Centres to have monastics in certain roles, we are not always necessarily a burden!

For example, because I am a monk translator, I live in the centre and only have to take a small stipend. I know centres where the translators are laypeople and they have husbands/wives and children to support- so they need a bigger salary. If they live outside they need money for rent, if they live in the centre their partner needs a room too.

Even single translators in most cases need a bit of money to go on a date once in awhile, or buy some decent clothes.

Because I'm a monk I can live on a pittance, I am waaay cheaper than a layperson translator would be.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but supporting a community of bhikṣus becomes quickly problematical, don't you agree?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Astus said:

Do you mean that they teach one thing but practise another?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Astus -- this is the function of the two truths.

In truth, this statement by Nāgārjuna illustrates how to practice according to Mahāyāna:

Hold your mind tightly when it (starts to) rove, as though it were
Like your learning, similar to your child, resembling a treasure,
or comparable to your life.

Recoil from the pleasures of sensory objects, as though they were like
Venom, poison, a weapon, an enemy, or fire.

Sensory objects bring ruination! The Lord of the Triumphant
Has said that they're like the kimpaka fruit -
(sweet on the outside, bitter within).

Abandon them! By their iron chains,
Worldly people are bound in the prison of recurring samsara.
Of those who triumph over the objects
Of the ever-inconstant, roving six senses,
And those over a host of foes in battle,
The wise favor the first to be the best heroes.

<http://www.rigdzindharma.org/uploads/6/9/5/6/6956478/nagarjunalettertoafriend.pdf>

Astus said:

You change the view from attachment to objects to non-attachment to objects. This is no different from what Ajahn Chah said, or what you find in Mahayana...

Malcolm wrote:

But in former, you do so without ever giving up such objects, and in the latter, one must give up objects. This is the essential difference between the path of renunciation and the path of transformation.

Astus said:

It means that affliction (klesa) is empty, therefore there is nothing to reject or transform.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in ultimate truth -- but ultimate truth is not a practice, it is a realization. So when you realize emptiness completely, then for you afflictions are singed and no longer give forth fruit. Teachings like these are very characteristic of Chan, which I recognize and accept as a definitive understanding of the purport of Mahāyāna sutras. But Chan is still a path of renunciation, even if its view is beyond accepting and rejecting objects, there is still subtle and not so subtle accepting and rejecting concerning relative and ultimate truth.

Astus said:

...No, only the attachment to them, otherwise arhats would be blind and deaf. The sensation stays, only grasping goes.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is why it is not part of the path of transformation because "...those evil, unskillful thoughts are abandoned and subside." And it is not teaching a path of self-liberation either because the refrain in each verse is "...those evil, unskillful thoughts are abandoned and subside."

But it is a nice sutta and it does present the path of renunciation most perfectly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, most monastics are religious professional providing ecclesiastical services, which is not what Buddha intended for bhikṣus, etc. There were already brahmins for that.

Indrajala said:

History decided otherwise, especially when the traditional mendicant lifestyle became infeasible in some territories. You have Brahmanical literature which talks about what a bad omen it is when yellow robed monks show up. The long conflict between Buddhists and Brahmins, which the former lost, saw a need for landed monasticism.

Malcolm wrote:

There were and are all kinds of mendicants in yellow robes in India, not just Buddhists.

Indrajala said:

...

Later on full bhikṣu ordinations were restricted by the state. Until fairly recently there were not so many full bhikṣu-s in Chinese Buddhism. Modern authors sometimes lamented how earlier a lot of monks just had the tonsure and that's it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, my point precisely.

Indrajala said:

In the case of Zen, a Zen monk in Kamakura Japan was a monk. He lived in a monastery, shaved his head and was expected to maintain celibacy. That's what we call a monk in English. They weren't legally defined as bhikṣu-s, but then in Japanese "bhikṣu" became a humble first person pronoun. Their own forms of monasticism developed based on environmental and social circumstances.

Malcolm wrote:

As you know from the E-sangha debacle, for me a Buddhist "monk" is a bhikṣu. So called Buddhist "monks" who are not bhikṣus, etc., are just celibate/non-celibate lay people.

My position on this has not changed one iota. The fact that there are so called Buddhist "monks" who do not have vows, and generally behave like ordinary people just illustrates my point even more.

Indrajala said:

The fact that money carries value is sufficient. There is no intrinsic value to gold, its value is also determined by fiat.

There ain't no precepts against having fiat currency through a plastic card connected to a global banking network.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and there is no precept against smoking tobacco, despite the fact that Buddha would have disapproved of it.

Indrajala said:

Christian monks, yes, not Buddhist monks.

You should visit Taiwan. They got full bhikṣu-s growing food.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, then they are breaking their precepts, and that is a pity.

Indrajala said:

The Vinaya[s] is/are the only basis upon which someone can be considered a bhikṣu or not.

Bhikṣu just means beggar. There's a legal definition of the term, but you fail to recognize that the Buddha's first disciples and some other eminent followers were technically bhikṣu-s without having received any precepts at all (this is called a svagata bhikṣu in Vinaya jargon). The first disciples had no precepts because precepts only came to exist, at least as the story goes, because of incidents occurring that caused problems for the community.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is true. But when you ordain you receive all of these accreted vows, and are expected to maintain them. For example, when you receive Bodhisattva vows, you don't decide which ones you are going to follow based on whether it is convenient for you. You try your best to follow all.

The first disciples of the Buddha were generally stream entrants very quickly. Later as more common foolish people ordained, Buddha needed to elaborate rules for their conduct. Buddha also was able to merely declare someone a Bhikṣu, without any other rite. But this is not how it is for us today. In order to become any kind of ordained person up to bhikṣu, you must become ordained through a rite. Or are you suggesting we can just dispense with ordination rites as well, since after all, Buddha did not use them in the beginning?

Indrajala said:

The Vinaya system nevertheless is a later development and the fundamentalist interpretation of it, which you are pushing here to justify your lack of generosity towards monastics, was not the Buddha's intent at all. Even according to the orthodox story, he told Ananda to drop the minor rules. He's also on record stating that things could be adapted to foreign environments.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, when monks live in cold climates, they can have leather sandals and fur cloaks; when they are sick they can drink alcohol, and so forth. Ananda, as we know, forgot to ask what "minor" meant and no one so far as had the arrogance to decide what that meant.

Indrajala said:

There's nothing wrong with ignoring or simply cutting away rules and regulations...

Malcolm wrote:

Statements like this merely prove that this age is not a suitable age for monasticism. Pretty soon we will see Buddhist "monks" "inventing" rules that allow one to be married, non-celibate, and wealthy (Oh wait, we already have that in Japan).

Indrajala said:

...which make no sense anymore (like having to smear your room with cow dung after having eaten garlic).

Malcolm wrote:

Cow dung mixed with cow urine and spread on the wall of a clay house smells quite sweet. But granted, it would be hard to do anywhere in the West. But the intent is obvious-- if you eat garlic you need to deodorize yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

I'm somewhat surprised to hear this as there are several Western people who have ordained in the Sakya lineage. I think that some of these Westerners sell others a bit short and quote HE Dezhung Rinpoche's somewhat pessimistic remarks from ~26 years ago (something that Trungpa for one addressed).

There are a few, but not so many. And we will see how long they last.

I never said that you advocated harming beings. I said that you advocate dropping formally taking precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I never said anything such thing. I said it was pointless to take ordination as a bhikṣu in this day and age. I never said that avoiding the ten non-virtues should be ignored (nor would I), I never suggested that people avoid receiving bodhisattva vows, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Monastics, in Buddhadharma, by definition are dependent on others for everything.

Indrajala said:

That's not how it works in real life though.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, most monastics are religious professionals providing ecclesiastical services, which is not what Buddha intended for bhikṣus, etc. There were already brahmins for that.

Indrajala said:

Monastics are forbidden to dig in the ground, so they cannot feed themselves. They are forbidden to handle money, so they really ought not work. In fact, monasticism, of the Buddhist variety, is pretty unsustainable.

Chan and Zen monasteries are well known for their agriculture. They sustained themselves in times of social upheaval and civil war when economic systems were in chaos.

Malcolm wrote:

Bad example, especially in the case of Zen, where we know that virtually no "monks" fit the criteria of being considered bhikṣus. And in China, this kind of labor was done by novices who have no vow not to dig in the ground, not by senior bhikṣus.

Indrajala said:

Again, the issue with money is largely irrelevant. As we know most monastics nowadays use money, which is fiat currency anyway and has no relation to precious metals or gems.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that money carries value is sufficient. There is no intrinsic value to gold, its value is also determined by fiat.

Indrajala said:

Having homeless mendicants creates a financial burden that most western communities are not interested in supporting and in reality, cannot support. I'm sure I don't have to point out to you that there are monks who grow their own food, cut their own firewood and generate their own income through various crafts.

Malcolm wrote:

Christian monks, yes, not Buddhist monks.

Indrajala said:

Your criticism here is based on prescriptions in the Vinaya, many of which are ignored nowadays.

Malcolm wrote:

The Vinaya[s] is/are the only basis upon which someone can be considered a bhikṣu or not. Their success as a bhikṣu depends largely on how successful they are at a) maintaining all of their vows and b) regularly reciting posadha. I would personally never support a monk who was not 100 percent committed to maintain all of their vows precisely. If they were, then I would support them. But because I have met virtually no monks in my tradition [Mulasarvastivada] who are so committed, I don't support them. And that is largely my point, it is very difficult to follow monastic vows precisely in this day and age. Since they all are Vajrayāna practitioners, it is better for them to be laypeople, in my opinion. It is not whether monks are good or bad, it is about whether Buddhist monasticism can be maintained in a proper way, and I think that conditions for that are vanishing, both because of the qualities of the people seeking ordination and because of the qualities of the epoch -- which are both rather inferior, in my opinion -- though there are rare exceptions like HH Dalai Lama, Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche and so on.

Indrajala said:

And frankly, most dana given by Westerners goes into gold for statues and stupas, not into the support of monastics.

Maybe in Tibetan Buddhism that's the case, but that's not universal.

Malcolm wrote:

I was talking about Buddhadharma in the West. Of course, in Asia, there are large populations of monastics who extract a huge amount of money out of lay people for support.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

I think one practical consideration overlooked in this discussion is that monasticism is

economically efficient. Instead of having several households, you have a community living together with shared resources. The community also will ideally look after its own, so if you become ill, then there's always someone to look after you. On top of that communal living can be emotionally rewarding. Practice is up to the individual, but basic life concerns are readily taken care over through monastic arrangements. Not having children and relationships can free up a lot of time in life to focus on one's interests.

There's practical elements to monasticism that we can't overlook. Now, granted, monasticism is not necessarily renunciation, but it is a step in that direction.

Malcolm wrote:

It can't be economically efficient.

Monastics, in Buddhadharma, by definition are dependent on others for everything. Monastics are forbidden to dig in the ground, so they cannot feed themselves. They are forbidden to handle money, so they really ought not work. In fact, monasticism, of the Buddhist variety, is pretty unsustainable.

In fact, the economic burden imposed by the enormous plethora of monastics in the early period of Śakyamuni's Dharma was one of the reasons Ashoka cracked down and assisted the Vaibhajyavadins in "defrocking" many thousands of monks. Having homeless mendicants creates a financial burden that most western communities are not interested in supporting and in reality, cannot support.

Support of the monastic community in Buddhadharma arises from the belief that one will accumulated merit by supporting monastics. There are simply not enough western Buddhists to effectively do so in the West. And frankly, most dana given by Westerners goes into gold for statues and stupas, not into the support of monastics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine, meat, sexual partners and so on has never been discouraged in my spiritual tradition.

Indrajala said:

Sounds like quite a desirable arrangement.

Malcolm wrote:

It is what it is. Some people don't like sex, meat and wine, other people do. There is a path of liberation for both. I personally think the path of the latter is more rapid than the path of the former, but that is just my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

mandala said:

Saying - oh it's kali yuga.. degenerate times.. becoming ordained is too hard, let's get drunk and pick up some women and call it spiritual practice - is frankly the polluted state of mind the Buddha talked about.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I say that? No.

mandala said:

Ditto for using 'you don't see many arhats around these days' as some kind of curious proof that there aren't highly realised practitioners about... well, of course you don't see them, that's your karma. That would be an indication to me that one needs to grow a pair and get serious about keeping vows and ethical living - not to simply declare it wouldn't work in the society we live in because there are so many desirous objects about.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I say there were no highly realized people around? No, what I said was is that these days one does not encounter many arhats or first stage bodhisattvas practicing classical Mahāyāna. I have met four people who I am certain are/were genuinely realized people on the bhūmis, above and beyond the idea that one should regard one's spiritual friend or guru as a buddha. I have met a few more than I am certain have cultivated at least strong heat on Vajrayāna path of application.

mandala said:

No matter what the path, it all starts with renunciation.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, renunciation is the wish to be free from samsara. Some people assume that begins with giving up sense objects. However, that is a false assumption. There is no need to give up sense objects in order to be free of samsara.

mandala said:

The [ordained] sangha is the measure of dharma in the world...

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it isn't. For example, the Buddha Sikkhī was not ordained and never created a monastic Sangha. It may be the measure of Śākyamuni's monastic dispensation, but it is not the measure of Dharma in the world, though a lot of monastics have a vested interest in keeping people convinced that it is so.

mandala said:

In The Heaps of Jewels Sutra, Buddha said: "If all the beings in the universe were to become bodhisattvas as lay people, and they each offered a butter lamp as vast as a great ocean to a stupa containing the relics of all the [past] Buddhas, this would not equal even a fraction of the merit gained by a single ordained bodhisattva offering one butterlamp to the holy stupa."

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, Mahāyāna is a path of renunciation in which monastic ordination is often valorized. However, I would rather achieve liberation swiftly than accumulate a lot of merit in an external fashion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine, meat, sexual partners and so on has never been discouraged in my spiritual tradition.

gregkavarnos said:

"Your" spiritual tradition or the spiritual tradition that you are currently practicing in? Not meaning to be a pedant or anything, but you just sound a little too Jim Jonesish when you make statements expressed in that manner!

Malcolm wrote:

My spiritual tradition. I started out as a Vajrayāna practitioner in Sakya. The attitude towards these things in Sakya is not different in Dzogchen teachings. For example, one of the key creation stage practices for lay people in Sakya is called "The yoga of passion". Meat and alcohol are considered indispensable for Ganapujas, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Clarence said:

Thank you Malcolm for participating in this thread.

Secondly: you mention in another post that the path of transformation is not about experiencing anger and then transforming it. Would you mind elaborating on what you think it really is then?

Malcolm wrote:

The path of transformation involves transforming our impure vision into a pure vision. The basic theory underlying this is that when everything is perceived as gold, one stops desiring gold. So we are to understand through empowerment and then sadhana, for example, that all of our aggregates are buddhas, all of the elements are female buddhas, our sense organs and sense objects are bodhisattvas and offering goddesses and so on. But it is not a psychological technique of antidotes i.e. I am experiencing anger, but this is really Akṣobhya, for example. The path of transformation means transforming our relationship with the world, sentient beings and our own body (through empowerment and sadhana) from an impure relationship into a pure relationship. The path of transformation involves taking the result as the path -- for Buddhas, sense objects are not toxic, they are not afflictive, they are pure goddesses. When sense objects and consciousnesses are purified through the process of sadhana, the afflictive power of sense objects is lessened, and the links between sensation and craving is weakened and finally severed. For example, we replace our sense of identity with a Buddha identity -- the so called "divine pride" which is the essence of the creation stage, etc. In the course of working with pure vision, it is necessary to engage sense objects in every different way, smells, colors, tastes, sounds, sights, and so on.

Clarence said:

Thirdly: you say a path of renunciation of sense objects is not necessary in these times but does that mean retreat is not necessary either? Wouldn't it be better to do a 3-year Thögal retreat than a 3-year The Big Bang Theory Marathon retreat?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course retreat is important. Yes, it would be better to do a three year retreat on one deity like Hevajra, than a retreat where you do tons of different sadhanas. If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, it would be better to do a three retreat on Dzogchen preliminaries like rushan, etc. on up through tregchö and thögal. But one does not need to do a three year retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

The point apparently alluded to is the explicit inclusion of the Bodhisattva path thus supplying trainees with methods that go beyond simple renunciation. Renunciation is added to somewhat in the progressively higher yanas. Principally the Bodhisattva Path sees the beginning of transformation of the perception of sense objects presaging the flowering of that theme in the Vajrayana ("The Wheel of Sharp Weapons" for example).

Malcolm wrote:

When it comes to the Bodhisattva path, we have six or ten perfections, correct? Not one of the six or ten perfections can be construed as enjoying sense objects and sense pleasures for our own benefit. The basis of the bodhisattva path is not enjoyment of sense objects for our own benefit and never can be.

This [enjoyment of sense objects and sense pleasures] is however the basis of the Vajrayāna path in toto.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

Why is Malcolm wrong wrt renunciation? He doesn't just want people to shy away from the Path of Renunciation, he wants people to abandon entry into the monastic sangha as well. He has claimed in other conversations that people are more or less incapable of holding vows and thus the taking of vows sets people up for the cultivation of demerit instead of merit.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact they more or less are so incapable, which is why the Sakya hierarchs actively discourage people from seeking to ordain. But I don't want people to do anything. If people are all fired up to become monks and nuns (mostly because they are having a fantasy that they will be able to practice more and better) then they are free to do as they please.

kirtu said:

Why is Malcolm wrong? He is wrong because as trainees in the Buddhadharma the very first step is to restrain one's behavior and refrain from performing harmful actions. This protects other beings and yourself as well. It protects yourself by immediately accumulating merit and refraining from committing actions that create negative karma.

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever said I was advocating that people go out and harm sentient beings? Your point is wildly and completely off the mark.

kirtu said:

HH Sakya Trizen has said that once one begins behaving in the right way, they naturally create merit. What is behaving in the right way? Of course this involves abandoning killing, stealing, deception (lying), sexual misconduct and harsh, divisive speech.

Malcolm wrote:

But this has nothing to do with my point, once again.

kirtu said:

Why have these two lamas (and many others) not leapt directly to Malcolm's solution of maintaining transcendent awareness or constantly dwelling in the Bodhi mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are projecting -- I never proposed such a solution. I merely pointed out what

HH Sakya Trizin taught so many years ago when I first took teachings from him: that in this day and age, the path of renunciation was not effective anymore, and practicing Vajrayāna teachings such as Hevajra which did not involve giving up sense objects was more effective in this epoch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine and sexual partners is not a problem if you have a proper method.

Indrajala said:

Therein lay the danger: thinking you're successfully carrying out the method when in reality you're just excusing behaviour you know is discouraged by your religious tradition, or at least a good part of it for many many centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine, meat, sexual partners and so on has never been discouraged in my spiritual tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

While Malcolm is entitled to his opinion, I fear some might assume that enjoyment of wine and women/men is not really problematic and instead think they see it all as bodhi while actively engaging in such sense pleasures in a way that proves detrimental.

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine and sexual partners is not a problem if you have a proper method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 7:12 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

What about the reintroduction of the Gomin path (lifelong lay renunciates). Or even one day vows or serious Nyungne practice? This begins to get a little tricky. Malcolm can't just reject Nyungne practice because it is lower tantra (except that from memory he might also reject lower tantra practice). But for some people these are necessary

practice paths (necessary for the individual).

Malcolm wrote:

I don't reject any practice, not even taking ordination. If someone is dead set on becoming ordained, that is their business. I simply think that conditions are not conducive in this age for paths of renunciation, and that other paths are more effective for people.

kirtu said:

The very nature of renunciation changes somewhat from yana to yana but renunciation is still a component even of higher tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

There is renunciation, the wish to be free from samsara. That is one thing. Then there are paths of renunciation, where for example, you follow many rules about what and who you can touch, and what and who you cannot touch and so on, what you should wear, what you should wear.

The former [renunciation] is necessary in every path, and especially it is necessary in the Kali Yuga. The latter [a path of renunciation of sense objects] is not necessary at all, and is especially difficult to follow in the Kali Yuga — and not, in my opinion, a particularly effective path in modern society.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 6:49 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

wisdom said:

In essence the Mahayana approach goes beyond accepting and rejecting objects of the senses as inherently good or bad...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, it doesn't — Mahāyāna regards sense objects as negative, something to be rejected.

Astus said:

This is from a Theravada teacher (who was also a Vinaya specialist),

"For the really earnest student, the more sensations the better. But many meditators shrink away from sensations, they don't want to deal with them. This is like the naughty schoolboy who won't go to school, won't listen to the teacher. These sensations are teaching us. When we know sensations then we are practicing Dhamma."

(<http://www.accesstoinight.org/lib/thai/chah/living.html>)

Malcolm wrote:

This is quite different.

Astus said:

The doctrine that "affliction is enlightenment" (煩惱即菩提) is well known in East Asian Mahayana schools like Chan and Tiantai.

Malcolm wrote:

You can find such statements in Mahāyāna sutras, but such statements do not constitute the path of Mahāyāna.

Astus said:

In Vajrayana they say that the sutra path is renunciation, the tantra path is transformation and the dzogchen path is self-liberation (e.g. <http://www.dzogchen.org.au/index.php?page=dzogchen>).

And here is what a Chan master said,

"There are many methods in practicing Buddhism. The Lesser Vehicle practices "eradicating afflictions." The Great Vehicle (Mahayana) "transforms afflictions." In the Ultimate Vehicle "afflictions are bodhi." Each method is centered on the mind. In the end, they all enable sentient beings to attain unsurpassed complete enlightenment." (http://ctzen.org/sunnyvale/enUS/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=219&Itemid=59)

Malcolm wrote:

In Vajrayāna one does not transform afflictions. That is not what "path of transformation" means in Vajrayāna. You don't experience anger, for example, and then try to change it into the mirror-like wisdom.

Further, we have to examine what is meant by "affliction" is bodhi.

Trotting out slogans does not produce understanding. In fact, it can show that one has not understood anything of what the other person is getting at, as in this case.

Astus said:

Although there are different traditions they are aware of the various methods that can be used in order to deal with desire, anger and ignorance. In a single teaching the Buddha gave five different methods to deal with unskillful thoughts, and these techniques could be matched with the above three: <http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.020.than.html>.

Malcolm wrote:

Perfect example of the path of renunciation in toto. I do not see at all how, for example, this relates in anyway to the path of transformation. I can see very clearly where all five paragraphs of that sutra are as applicable in Mahāyāna as they are in the Nikāya Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 6:35 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, yes it does, and anyone sufficiently educated in Mahāyāna knows this.

oushi said:

And you think what, if not education, is the cause of so few arhats nowadays?

Malcolm wrote:

Most arhats were highly educated brahmins, but not all.

oushi said:

so you are perfectly aware of Mahayana teachings that go beyond rejection, or acceptance of any dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

From the perspective of ultimate truth; but Mahāyāna practice is not merely confined to the perspective of ultimate truth. The rejection of sense objects is a key component of the Mahāyāna path, and why it is defined, along with the Nikāya schools, as a path of renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

wisdom said:

In essence the Mahayana approach goes beyond accepting and rejecting objects of the senses as inherently good or bad...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, it doesn't — Mahāyāna regards sense objects as negative, something to be rejected.

oushi said:

Well, no, it doesn't. Of course, you can construct such a view out of all the available teachings, but you can also construct totally opposite view out of them...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, yes it does, and anyone sufficiently educated in Mahāyāna knows this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

wisdom said:

In essence the Mahayana approach goes beyond accepting and rejecting objects of the senses as inherently good or bad...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, it doesn't — Mahāyāna regards sense objects as negative, something to be rejected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

spot dawa said:

Nirvana itself arises due to conditions...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it doesn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

spot dawa said:

Certainly true, Malcolm! There is a certain very powerful feeling of joy that comes with surrender. A person who has pledged to be of benefit to all sentient beings is drawn on to holiness by that joy, and the pleasures of compassion and lovingkindness. Those feelings of enjoyment are also capable of becoming fetters; they are to be replaced by equanimity.

Also in the same vein as desire, is aversion, as is indifference. Equanimity is the result of applying the antidote to these poisons.

Karma Dorje said:

Applying antidotes is just housekeeping in a dream.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Please try to avoid the sweeping generalisations.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? You don't.

Look around, it is not like there are thousands of arhats, or first stage bodhisattvas. We are not in India in the Pre-Gupta phase, when realization was relatively easy.

We are at the stale end of the dispensation of Śākyamuni. Hell, most [Mahāyāna] people here don't even believe the texts they follow were actually authored by the historical Buddha.

95% of all the westerners that really try to do the Bhikṣu thing give back their vows. It is a little different with bhikṣunis, because they are more ideologically motivated [which is also not exactly renunciation].

As a great Sakya master put it "What's the use of the cutting the hair on your head if you can't cut the woolly mess of concepts?"

I know a lot of bhikṣus -- and every last one of them is worldly and lacks renunciation. Not one of them lives according to Vinaya. It is different in Theravada, of course. But that is ethnic Buddhism, as far as the bhikku Sangha goes -- and even then, renunciation is in short supply in Theravadin monasteries as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

spot dawa said:

who does not cultivate lustful thought or actions...

Malcolm wrote:

Desire objects are not confined to sex. Bodhisattvas in Mahāyāna training are not supposed to enjoy any sense objects for their own benefit, only if it will benefit others. The general attitude in Mahāyāna towards sense objects is illustrated by Candragomin: Objects and poisons are alike, pleasing just when first tasted. Objects and poisons are alike, their result is unpleasant and unbearable.

Objects and poisons are alike, causing one to be clouded by the darkness of ignorance.
Objects and poisons are alike, their power is hard to reverse, and deceptive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

smcj said:

I hear there is a lot of tension in Dharamsala between the Tibetans who come from Tibet and the ones already living there or born there. Apparently the Tibetan Tibetans are disappointed because their standard of living diminishes when they arrive in India (this applies to Lhasa Tibetans).

They are free to go back. They don't.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, they often do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

This is a fault to consider and good cause for abandoning desire.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you are practicing a path of renunciation. But in the Kali Yoga, this is not realistic.

Indrajala said:

Prove it.

Malcolm wrote:

Prove what, that this is not a good time for paths of renunciation?

With logic and reason or text? Or both.

As for the first, [though you simply won't agree even when presented with a vast amount of evidence] in this day and age, the Sangha of Bhikṣus has basically come to the point where it is basically badge wearing and politics, and is completely irrelevant in the world we live in, outside of offering pastoral service to ethnic Buddhists (in ever declining numbers).

And of course there are numerous tantras that declare the path of renunciation of desire objects is no longer effective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

This is a fault to consider and good cause for abandoning desire.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you are practicing a path of renunciation. But in the Kali Yoga, this is not realistic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetans did not have the industrial infrastructure to build such a military, nor the economic wealth to buy such a military. So your point is invalid.

Indrajala said:

Was there an attempt to do so? That's the key question.

Japan got the ball rolling on it early on.

Malcolm wrote:

Japan had ports and a healthy trade relationship with the Western colonial powers. They were able to afford a modern Navy, and they were not corrupt like the Qing.

Indrajala said:

The policy of Xenophobia was an understandable response to the encroachment of colonial powers in Asia.

That's just an excuse for a poor political policy.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not an excuse, it is a fact.

Indrajala said:

Look at Japan -- they had an isolationist policy for centuries, but they also were not a landlocked nation.

Right, but when they realized that policy wasn't going to work any longer, they opened up trade and diplomatic negotiations with foreign powers and established themselves as a recognized sovereign state.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, they were forced to open their doors by the United States. No one wanted anything from Tibet because no one understood that there was anything there. People were only interested in Tibet because of border issues.

Indrajala said:

Religious prejudice on the part of the Gelug-controlled Government of Tibet ; all these prophecies came from the Nyingma school, specifically the treasure tradition.

Again, not reacting in an intelligent way to a dangerous situation while prophecies all talk about Tibet's imminent downfall.

Malcolm wrote:

All this proves is that Tibetans were keenly aware of their predicament and shows that at least outside of the moribund, Chinese influenced government of Tibet, there was considerable anxiety about what the Chinese would do for over a 100 years. You can understand that Tibet was much like Italy prior to Garibaldi. There was no "Tibet" -- that is why most of your arguments are bogus. The Tibetans even today are not united around questions of ethnicity and tribe. Tibet is a Western political construction for western Colonial purposes.

Indrajala said:

All you are giving evidence of is that your study of Tibetan culture, history and religion lack depth and nuance.

Well, an eyewitness account by Heinrich Harrer states that in the 40s Kham was in fact bandit territory that the Lhasa government had no control over. Nobody had control over it. At the time it seems it was anarchy, at least in the areas he visited and according to the people he spoke to.

Malcolm wrote:

Harrer? Are you serious? The Gelugpas hated Kham because it was a Nyingma stronghold. So of course they would claim it was full of bandits. In fact Khams was most intellectually developed region of Tibet, far more open and interesting than the intellectual moribund monastic cities in Lhasa.

And it was not anarchical in the slightest. For Christ sakes, why dont you read books by people who grew up there and wrote in Tibetan about their experience their. Basing yourself on the reports of Nazis is ridiculous.

Look, the whole story can be traced in this way: in 1705 Lhazang Khan, at the encouragement of Kangxi Emperor, attacked Lhasa and murdered virtually every one in the Govt and took teh 6th Dalai Lama captive. After the sixth was murdered, a seventh Dalai Lama was recognized, and with this one, the Qing Dynasty seized control of Lhasa as well as Kham and Amdo after Tashi Rabten and Zhungar Mongols were defeated (who

themselves had wrested control of Lhasa from Lazang Khan in 1717).

The Kangxi Emperor (1622–1723) declared Tibet a protectorate of the Qing Empire and in 1727 installed two high commissioners, or ambans, and a garrison of Qing troops from China in Lhasa.[10] The walls of Lhasa were torn down and "Kham (with Batang, Litang, Tatsienlu, etc.) annexed to the Chinese province of Sichuan. The Qing protectorate, which was to last till the end of the Qing Dynasty (1912), was established." [11]
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kelzang_Gyatso,_7th_Dalai_Lama

So you see, Tibet was been an occupied nation most of the last two hundred and eighty six years, except from the period of thirty three years i.e., 1913-1950, when conditions made it possible for the Tibetans to throw off Chinese rule and declare independence. But as you can see, even though they did, while the British (to their advantage) accepted that Tibet was an independent nation, the US never did.

[
Indrajala said:
quote]

It is difficult when the Chinese and British are writing treaties about you without your participation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is difficult to participate in diplomatic negotiations when you fail to play the game of formal diplomacy. [/quote]

You might as well blame American Indians for being screwed over by the US Government because they too were either not invited or did not understand the rules. Hell, while we are at it, lets just wash away the Holocaust too, because the Jews were not able to negotiate well with the Nazis. After all, Africans just let themselves be sold into slavery. There is no injustice in the world, just incompetent peoples and nations that allow themselves to be exploited and massacred.

Indrajala said:

You forget that eighty thousand khampas showed up to fight the PLA in 1959. You forget that the invasion of Tibet took nine years to complete, starting in 1950 when the PLA started "liberating" Tibet. You forget that the international community just stood by and watched as the PLA invaded Tibet.

The insurgency of course happened, but how well coordinated was it? The invasion took time, sure, but that's the roof of the world. The failure of the international community to respond is an intriguing question because the western power bloc reacted differently in Korea and elsewhere. It seems to me this was largely because foreign powers just didn't know about Tibet. How many Tibetan representatives at the time could have met with officials in London or Washington?

Malcolm wrote:

No one would supply the Tibetan insurgency with arms until after 1959. Then, the CIA did for a number of years until Nixon abandoned them.

The United States, as a matter of official policy has always considered Tibet a part of China, and therefore, no one would ever hear an embassy from Tibetans advocating for themselves. In 1943 the US State Department wrote:

"The United States considers the Tibet Autonomous Region or TAR (hereinafter referred to as "Tibet") as part of the People's Republic of China. This longstanding policy is consistent with the view of the entire international community, including all China's neighbors: no country recognizes Tibet as a sovereign state. Moreover, U.S. acceptance of China's claim of sovereignty over Tibet predates the establishment of the People's Republic of China. In 1942, we told the Nationalist Chinese government then headquartered in Chongqing (Chungking) that we had "at no time raised (a) question" over Chinese claims to Tibet."^[55]

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_relations_of_Tibet#cite_ref-58

Therefore, at no time would the US even have considered helping the Tibetans against the Chinese in an overt war.

Indrajala said:

In fact, it was the 13th Dalai Lama who threw off the shackles of the Qing (which is why he is considered a hero) and tried to modernize the army and so on without success. He might have tried, but his government appears to have acted unwisely resulting in the downfall of Tibet. Nevertheless, at the same time you had all these prophecies predicting the downfall of the culture. Did it seem inevitable?

Malcolm wrote:

The 13th died in 1936. He tried his best having inherited a moribund government that had been eviscerated for one hundred and eighty six years the corrupt politicians of the Qing protectorate.

But when you understand the history a bit better, blaming the Tibetans for losing Tibet is just like blaming a girl for being raped.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Indrajala:

Elsewhere we've discussed varying religious explanations for the cultural destruction of Tibet. In this regard, I brought up the point that I seldom hear anyone, especially Tibetan Buddhists, point out it was the bad political decisions of the Tibetan government that failed to deter the PRC takeover of Tibet.

No, it was the fact that Tibetan Government had been subject the whims of the Qing Dynasty Ambans for most of the nineteenth century that lead to Tibet's weakened political structure in the nineteenth, plus the fact that Tibetan was used as a football

during the great game between Britain and Russia. Also, if you recall correctly, the Tibetans had to repel a Chinese invasion as well as deal with the Younghusband expedition.

Unknown said:

I imagine this has something to do with the issue that if you criticize the former government, you're indirectly criticizing the 13th Dalai Lama Thubten Gyatso, which may be perceived as criticism against the present 14th Dalai Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't think Tibetans are so naive.

Unknown said:

In any case, while the pro-Tibetan lobby frequently lays full blame on homicidal communist forces from China, there were a few factors that made the takeover of Tibet relatively easy.

- Tibet was very reluctant and slow to modernize both its infrastructure and military, thus posing little challenge to the battle hardened mechanized army of the PRC. There was almost no military deterrent.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetans did not have the industrial infrastructure to build such a military, nor the economic wealth to buy such a military. So your point is invalid.

Unknown said:

- The Tibetan government kept foreigners out and didn't make an active move for international recognition until it was too late. They didn't establish embassies in the capitals of world powers. After WWII when it was clear the British were moving out of India, it would have been apparent that Tibet should have entered onto the world stage.

Malcolm wrote:

The policy of Xenophobia was an understandable response to the encroachment of colonial powers in Asia. Tibet's regions at that time border both China and Burma directly, as well as Nepal, etc. and a great deal of trade contact made the Tibetans aware of what was in store for nations like China (and themselves) as well when colonial powers were let in. Look at Japan -- they had an isolationist policy for centuries, but they also were not a landlocked nation.

Unknown said:

- Despite several famous prophecies about the imminent downfall of Tibet, it seems the government didn't do much in the way of serious defensive works to deter foreign aggression.

Malcolm wrote:

Religious prejudice on the part of the Gelug-controlled Government of Tibet ; all these prophecies came from the Nyingma school, specifically the treasure tradition.

Unknown said:

- Lhasa didn't really have control over places like Kham. It was bandit territory that even the government avoided.

Malcolm wrote:

A large part of Kham was controlled by the King of Derge, and during the 19th Century, Derge was the center of the religious and cultural renaissance called "The Ris med" movement. Western Kham was controlled by the King of Nangchen. Chamdo was controlled by Lhasa. You should get your facts straight. All you are giving evidence of is that your study of Tibetan culture, history and religion lack depth and nuance.

Yes, there were bandits in Tibet. There are still bandits in Tibet [in Golog]. There are also bandits in Tokyo.

Unknown said:

Arguably in such anarchy and ill-managed areas a foreign invading force could have just rolled right in, deep into Tibetan territory, as did happen. The Tibetan government didn't do much to secure their borders or even consolidate themselves as a proper nation state which in turn made it easy for the PRC to claim sovereignty over Tibet without much protest from the international community.

Malcolm wrote:

It is difficult when the Chinese and British are writing treaties about you without your participation.

"Early British efforts to create a boundary for north-east India were triggered by their discovery in the mid-19th century that Tawang, an important trading town, was Tibetan territory.[5] Britain had concluded treaties with Qing China concerning Tibet's boundaries with Burma[6] and Sikkim.[7] However, Tibet refused to recognise the boundaries drawn by these treaties[citation needed]. British forces led by Sir Francis Younghusband entered Tibet in 1904 and made a treaty with the Tibetans.[8] In 1907, Britain and Russia acknowledged Chinese "suzerainty" over Tibet.[9]"

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simla_Accord_%281914%29

Unknown said:

Now, granted, what's past is past, but nevertheless the narrative of Tibet's downfall, which is an intrinsic part of Tibetan Buddhism nowadays, is quite slanted and one-sided.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, it is not slanted and one-sided at all.

And the fact is that the fall of Tibet had far more to do with Colonialism in Asia than it has anything to do with some innate failure on the part of Tibetans to defend their own nation. You forget that eighty thousand khampas showed up to fight the PLA in 1959. You forget that the invasion of Tibet took nine years to complete, starting in 1950 when the PLA started "liberating" Tibet. You forget that the international community just

stood by and watched as the PLA invaded Tibet.

Unknown said:

Good Tibetans versus Evil Communist Chinese. That's perhaps easier to digest than the reality where China could opportunistically seize Tibet owing in part to the bad political decisions of the Lhasa government. Understandably, there's going to be a reluctance to acknowledge that point. Still, the pro-Tibetan propaganda line doesn't really help matters much because it is skewed and heavily biased.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, Tibet was a victim of several factors: western colonial policy, specifically, Britain's presence in India. Tibet was also subject to Qing dynasty in the 18th and 19th century, who poisoned several Dalai Lamas to maintain control over Lhasa (there was a lot of money in the Tibetan salt and tea trades). The Qing deliberately kept the Lhasa government weak and under their control. The primary reason that Kham and Amdo were not under the Lhasa Gvt., is that they were territories of China from the early 18th century onward, not because Khams was filled with bandits.

In fact, it was the 13th Dalai Lama who threw off the shackles of the Qing (which is why he is considered a hero) and tried to modernize the army and so on without success.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

yegyal said:

Yes, I have for many years, but I guess you're still going to tell me that they call old monks 'rinpoche.' Well, Indians refer to five year old monks as 'lama' but it doesn't make them lamas.

Indrajala said:

Titles are used loosely and thrown around quite easily. Addressing an elderly Tibetan monk as rinpoche is harmless and done with deferential respect.

Malcolm wrote:

It is harmless, but they think you are an idiot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

Naturally this isn't just TB. I have similar questions about other forms of Buddhism as well. They have grand claims about rapid buddhahood and so forth, but the organizations pushing these claims don't exactly have clean histories. Anyone asking for a demonstration or proof can be told, as I was above, to take it on faith:

All I can say then is that you have not met any mahāsiddhas. Or if you have, you were like Sunakṣatra and could not perceive their qualities.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not an organization, I don't speak for an organization, and you don't have to take anything on faith.

Sunakṣatra was unable to perceive the Buddha's qualities, even though he was his attendant for 24 years. But his vision was blind to Buddha's qualities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

This helps to explain why a lot of Buddhists are flaming egotists, like me.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm...actually, triumphalism is what feeds egos, which is precisely what you are arguing, that Tibetan Buddhists are on a big ego trip.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It has a Vinaya lineage, it doesn't need more than one. Dharmagupta Vinaya is not different than Mulasarvastivada in its intention. The path of Vinaya in all "eighteen" schools is the same path. There are not different Vinaya paths.

Indrajala said:

No all Vinaya paths are identical. The Mahāsāṃghika school had 218 precepts in contrast to the Dharmagupta's 250. Their goals might have been the same, but nevertheless their procedures still differ.

Malcolm wrote:

The paths are identical.

There are different numbers of rules for each Vinaya because all were compiled separately in different places by different groups. There are minor differences in the

mode of ordination procedure. But the paths are the same, how one is to practice, etc. So really, your point isn't valid.

Indrajala said:

My point really is that functionally speaking East Asia just as well has a complete path to liberation plus some components which the Tibetans simply lacked, and there's no reason to denigrate it.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetans do not lack Vinaya. One does not need more than one Vinaya to be a Bhikṣu.

Indrajala said:

Tibetan Buddhism as two bodhisattva vow lineages...so are you going to now argue that Chinese Buddhism has a less complete Mahāyāna system since it only has one bodhisattva precept lineage?

No, because Chinese Buddhism has two mainstream bodhisattva lineages for precepts. One based on the Brahma Net Sūtra and the other on the Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra / Sūtra of Bodhisattva Stages.

Malcolm wrote:

Brahma net sutra does not come from India. Your argument was predicated on lineages from India.

Indrajala said:

and presumably some of the divination and astrology practices as found in East Asia that originate from India.

These things are not paths. And Pramaṇā as well as other things never found much footing in the Sino-sphere.

Your statement here is problematic.

They are arguably part of some paths. Kukai and Shingon were quite appreciative of the astrology texts as translated by Amoghavajra and others. However, even long before this we find sūtras which offer detailed guidance on astrology. Astrology was a key part of Buddhadharma to some early Buddhists in India.

Malcolm wrote:

The calculation of auspicious days and calendar creation does not constitute a path. Astrology was a key part of agricultural life everywhere in the world at that time -- still is not a path, however.

Indrajala said:

For example, the Mātāṅga Sūtra (摩登伽經), translated into Chinese in 230 CE by Zhiqian 支謙, is the oldest known Indic sūtra translated into Chinese to include jyotiṣa elements such as the 28 nakṣatras, 9 grahas, monthly gnomonic and the Metonic cycle. There was an earlier translation of the text done by An shigao 安世高 between 148-170 CE, though it is much shorter and does not contain astrological references. It is a brief sūtra about a daughter of a witch wanting marry the handsome Ānanda. The mother attempts to use witchcraft to trap and make him consummate a marriage, but fails. The girl becomes a bhikṣuṇī in the end and renounces her evil ways. Zhiqian's work picks up from here and extends the sūtra to include dialogue between characters from some long past time, including many teachings on astrology.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing forbidding the inclusion of astronomical information in sutras and tantras -- that was not my point -- nevertheless astrology and divination do not constitute paths. They simply don't, even if they are useful aids on the path, like medicine, arts and so on.

Indrajala said:

If I'm too thick headed and merit-less to perceive the qualities of a mahāsiddha when I meet them, then there's not much I can do about it at the moment.

Malcolm wrote:

You can be more less intellectual and more open.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

What possible impact on your life, as a Mahayana monk...

Indrajala said:

What exactly does "Mahāyāna monk" mean? Is this in contrast to a Vajrayāna monk? If so, this is again one of those Tibetan Buddhist distinctions that are projected onto others who may not recognize them. That's really unfair, like calling a bhikkhu a Hīnayāna monk. He wouldn't call himself that.

I tend to think of myself more as a śramaṇa. There's really no need to identify with terms so heavily.

Malcolm wrote:

A Mahāyāna monk (or layperson) is someone who, in addition to Pratimokṣa vows, also has Bodhisattva vows. A Vajrayāna monk (or layperson) additionally has samaya vows. Where the lower vows contradict the higher vows, one follows the higher vows.

A bhikku would not recognize Theravada (along with the other "eighteen" schools) as hīnayāna, and he also would not recognize the validity Bodhisattva vows or Vajrayāna vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that virtually all late Indian Vajrayāna tantras and transmissions, as well as late Mahayāna developments such as the Abhisamaya-alaṃkara tradition, etc., are absent everywhere but in Tibet, Nepal and Mongolia means that no other tradition has all paths taught in India. Thus, the statement can be read as a true statement.

Indrajala said:

"All paths" as late Indian Vajrayāna and Mahayāna excludes other core components which make up a "complete system of Buddhism". Tibetan Buddhism doesn't have a Dharmagupta Vinaya lineage. It has the one Vinaya lineage, sure, but not the alternative paths that were available in India.

Malcolm wrote:

It has a Vinaya lineage, it doesn't need more than one. Dharmagupta Vinaya is not different than Mulasarvastivada in its intention. The path of Vinaya in all "eighteen" schools is the same path. There are not different Vinaya paths.

Indrajala said:

This same applies for bodhisattva precept lineages

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhism as two bodhisattva vow lineages...so are you going to now argue that Chinese Buddhism has a less complete Mahāyāna system since it only has one bodhisattva precept lineage? It seems you must since you fault Tibetan Buddhism for only maintaining one Vinaya lineage. In reality, the intention of bodhisattva precepts are the same whether concise (Nagarjuna's lineage) or elaborate (Asanga and Chinese system).

Indrajala said:

and presumably some of the divination and astrology practices as found in East Asia that originate from India.

Malcolm wrote:

These things are not paths. And Pramaṇā as well as other things never found much footing in the Sino-sphere.

Indrajala said:

Is late period Indian Vajrayāna so much better than what Shingon and Taimitsu in East

Asia acquired and developed? The developments in India are not necessarily going to be superior to what unfolded in, say, Shingon or even other native schools like Chan.

Malcolm wrote:

You really do not want me to answer that question. But yes, frankly, Anuttarayoga tantra is intrinsically more profound than Yogatantra, which, by itself, is already profound. I encourage you to receive abhiśeka and practice and study Vajrayāna. All you have to lose is a few more lifetimes on the path.

Indrajala said:

I often find Tibetan Buddhists like to claim the superiority of their practices in contrast to lesser teachings and practices (not you specifically Malcolm), yet very few demonstrate the qualities which they claim their practices rapidly develop.

Malcolm wrote:

All I can say then is that you have not met any mahāsiddhas. Or if you have, you were like Sunakṣatra and could not perceive their qualities.

Indrajala said:

There's something of a superiority complex tied to a lot of Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot of triumphalism in Buddhism in general, as religions go, it is very triumphalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhism contains the complete path for awakening for every single conceivable layer of the development of Buddhism in Buddhist history, Hīnayāna, Mahāyāna and Mantrayāna (including a few developments, such as Dzogchen that do not at all exist outside of Tibetan Buddhism). That is what is meant by "complete".

Indrajala said:

The issue is that some Tibetan Buddhists claim themselves as the only ones with a truly complete path.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that virtually all late Indian Vajrayāna tantras and transmissions, as well as late Mahāyāna developments such as the Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra tradition, etc., are absent everywhere but in Tibet, Nepal and Mongolia means that no other tradition has all paths taught in India. Thus, the statement can be read as a true statement. It does not mean that other Mahayana traditions do not present a complete path to Buddhahood, it just means that in Tibetan Buddhism one has available all paths that have ever been taught

under the rubric of "Buddhism". That cannot be said of any other tradition. It is a simple fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: bit of confusion - 5 colors

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Vairocana is not just the color blue, Vajrasattva is not just the color white in that sequence, but Vairocana arises with all five colors; blue, white, red, yellow, and green."

-- Vajrasattva's Heart Mirror Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

My point is really to demonstrate that some Tibetans, or Tibetan Buddhism in general, defines itself as a caretaker of a complete transmission of Indian Buddhism, despite the fact this is easily contested and moreover refuted. Still, it is part of the Tibetan national identity.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhism contains the complete path for awakening for every single conceivable layer of the development of Buddhism in Buddhist history, Hīnayāna, Mahāyāna and Mantrayāna (including a few developments, such as Dzogchen that do not at all exist outside of Tibetan Buddhism). That is what is meant by "complete".

No one intends by complete that Tibetans translated every Indian text. We know this because the record of eminent translators mention that there were many sutras, tantras, and so on that were not translated in Tibetan, such as the Kalacakra in 500,00 lines; The Hevajra Tantra in 500,00 lines, and so on. So obviously, Tibetans themselves are aware that they did not manage to translate every text. But what they were able to bring to Tibet was a complete path covering all three yānas (as defined from a 8th--10th century Indian Vajrayāna perspective). Yes, of course, we all known including Tibetans, that Tibetan Buddhism was a snapshot of late medieval Indian Buddhist culture during its decline phase.

Further, Merely bringing Abhidharmakosha, Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra and one Tantra say, Kalacakra, would constitute a complete transmission of Indian Buddhism.

Buddhadharma is a path, not a bunch of books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Thanks Malcolm, it is very interesting. It seems at the very least that these 4 categories of Tantra are somewhat fluid in some respects.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for example, Manjushri Namasamghiti can be commented upon as a Yoga tantra text, but also as an Anuttarayoga tantra text, or even as a Dzogchen text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Thanks Malcolm. I have heard Sarvavidya mentioned during teachings on Tantric Grounds and Paths, but have never heard of an initiation being given into it.

It is interesting what you say about the Tara and Medicine Buddha practices- most of the initiations rituals I have translated for Geshe describe the practices as Kriya Tantra. Would this be because they are Jenangs/subsequent permissions rather than dbangs?

I have only translated one 2 day wang/ full initiation into Chenrezig, and it was still described as Kriya Tantra. So now I am totally confused, though I am not dismissing at all what you said, just unsure of what it means on the ground!

Malcolm wrote:

There are many elaborate abhishekas in Kriya tantra.

Medicine Buddha, Tara and so on come from Kriya but they are general practiced according to Yoga Tantra view, that makes them automatically Carya. There are specifically Carya level tantras like the Vairocana-abhisambodhi, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

JKhedrup said:

And the Yoga tantras are missing from Tibet, no? How much practice is there of

Performance Tantra?

AFAIK, Yoga Tantra is available in Japan.

Malcolm wrote:

Sarvavidyā [From the Sarvadurgatiparishodana] practiced widely in Kagyu, Sakya and Gelugpa is Yogatantra.

Practices such as Tara, Medicine Buddha and so forth where the wisdom being is dismissed is Caryā Tantra.

What is not practiced much in Tibetan Buddhism is kriya tantra. But all the initiations for Kriya, Caryā and Yoga Tantra still exist and are transmitted in every generation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 6:49 AM

Title: Departure

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dear Friends:

The time has come for me to bid adieu to this particular forum.

You know how to find me via my blog, <http://www.atikosha.org> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;".

I will not be checking back in so there is no point in replying this post.

Malcolm

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Evolving Beyond Tribalism

Content:

MalaBeads said:

[

I don't know how to have this discussion. I see Dharma as a-cultural, or beyond culture. Not confined to any particular system or any particular era. However, as with learning any art, you have to master the particulars. And particulars are always associated with a "system". The system I learned - and so did you Malcom, was Buddhist. ?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't learn Buddhism, in fact what I learned was Dharma. My mistake for many years

was mistaking the former for the latter.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thank you, but with all respect, It is just illogical for me,

Malcolm wrote:

Suit yourself, I myself prefer to follow what Indian Mādhyamikas, who were capable of debating with actual Yogacara masters, have to say about the matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Got it in regards to the "fringe" thing! Thank you!

Still some nagging doubt about the -ism bit. What is it about the practice of tantra (or tantric practice) in Hindu and Buddhist religion that does not make it an -ism?

Malcolm wrote:

Tantrism is more or less a Western academic fabrication.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Why was it not the way all Indian religious or spiritual movements practiced per se (because it seems to have been a "fringe" thing).

Malcolm wrote:

Subsequent to British Colonialism, forms of religion deemed offensive to the British were largely purged by Western Educated Hindus. Hence what we now think of a "fringe" thing was the dominant religious form among Hindus until the 17th century i.e. the so called Shakti traditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So are you saying that the shared (let's say ritual) similarities between Buddhist Tantra and Hindu Tantra (for example) are not an example of a shared methodology: a "Tantrism", or "Tantric" approach, if you wish? (let me add you kicked off the use of the word in this thread, I made no such mention previously).

PS I am not being argumentative, I am trying to understand.

Malcolm wrote:

They share methodologies and similarities because they both come from Indian culture, but not because there was something special about "tantra" itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

But wait on, is the discussion about religions or practice? Tantra is, after all, merely a form of method/practice COMMON to some forms of Hinduism and Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a kind of misconception. "Tantra", as a movement is a purely Western historical construction. As I have often pointed out, the earliest texts known as "tantras" are medical texts belonging to Ayurveda.

gregkavarnos said:

I said method not movement. Do you prefer the term praxis?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no real such thing as "Tantrism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Zen to Tibetan Dictionary? *grins*

Content:

pemachophel said:

For a discussion of the Tibetan Chan Malcolm is referring to, Google Sam van Schaik + Tibet. This will get you to his blog on early Tibetan history. He has 3-4 articles on this issue based primarily on texts from the Dunhuang cache. IMO, definitely worth the read.

Malcolm wrote:

Also in another a thread, there is a link to some papers published on sems sde, one of which review Jeffery Broughton's contention that Chan was influential on Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Evolving Beyond Tribalism

Content:

MalaBeads said:

Buddhism teaches us about the root of these faulty perceptions.

Malcolm wrote:

Substitute "Dharma" for "Buddhism" and I will readily agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhst Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

But wait on, is the discussion about religions or practice? Tantra is, after all, merely a form of method/practice COMMON to some forms of Hinduism and Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a kind of misconception. "Tantra", as a movement is a purely Western historical construction. As I have often pointed out, the earliest texts known as "tantras" are medical texts belonging to Ayurveda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in English

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by complete?

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I don't really know. It's just that often when reading Dzogchen discussions I feel like I am missing some basic information, and I was wondering if there was some systematic presentation I could consult.

I think you recently mentioned 4 of Longchenpa's treasures in a similar context, but of those, 2 are not yet translated, and I'm not sure if you think the translations available are really accurate.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in terms of overview, Dudjom Rinpoche's book is fine. But if you are looking for details of how to practice Dzogchen, these days the emphasis is on man ngag sde, and as such, the main text most Lamas teach from is Tri Yeshe Lama. But there are a number of other texts as well.

The Theg mchog mdzod is the most comprehensive review of man ngag sde literature, but it is not translated as of yet, so far as I know.

There is ChNN's Santi Mahasangha, and those who have received all nine levels (no one as of yet to my knowledge) will have received the most comprehensive training in the three series of Dzogchen available.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

Raksha said:

Suffice to say that the Hindus never beat the Buddhists in debate...

pueraeternus said:

Can you recommend any books or articles that studied this? I have always wondered this, but most of what I have read came from the Buddhist POV, so that's probably biased. It would be interesting to see if there are academic research that confirms that for the most part, Buddhist pandits trounce Hindu ones.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no real objective accounts, just sectarian annals on both sides.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Zen to Tibetan Dictionary? *grins*

Content:

Huseng said:

Chan specific terms won't exist in Tibetan.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that just isn't true actually. There are a number of Chan texts in Tibetan translation

dating from the eighth century and before.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

Raksha said:

Suffice to say that the Hindus never beat the Buddhists in debate...

Malcolm wrote:

That is a pretty unfounded statement. Did you forget Shankaracarya? Navy Nyaya?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in English

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

This might be a stupid question, but it is a sincere one. Is there anything like a complete, accurate presentation of Dzogchen available in English?

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by complete?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Evolving Beyond Tribalism

Content:

viniketa said:

The reason human society is not utopia already is that no one has figured out a way to replace "what is" with "what should be". If done by force, coercion, or even mere fraud, utopia collapses immediately.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, no one has yet discovered a method of universally replacing samsara with nirvana. Hence Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

username said:

major extremist right wingers

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I see. Now I am "major extremist right winger?"

Do you seriously think that my piddling opinions have the weight to destroy centuries of world culture?

Are you so deluded as to think that you are saving the masses (your words in another post) in some grand scheme derived from Plato's Republic where you, "having renounced your religion" (again, your words), a philosopher king (with advanced western academic degrees, yawn) are preserving religious palliatives for the ignorant masses until such time as they can become Buddhists?

You are on such a tear about my insignificant opinions that you have made yourself look ridiculous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Can I Hang Up A Thangka Received as a Gift?

Content:

Mr. G said:

I received a very nice thangka of White Mahakala from a very good friend. He even had it specially framed, and I believe just the framing itself cost a good deal of money (possibly around \$300). My friend doesn't know much about Tibetan Buddhism, and took the thangka solely to be a piece of art. I know I'm not supposed to hang up thangkas in my apartment like it's just a piece of art, but I also would not like to offend my friend. Thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

Hang it up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Seriously, man.....read it again, and the meaning is clear.

Malcolm wrote:

Careful Cone, you have put on a black list as my "friend". Lord knows what our resident Joe McCarthy will do next. Perhaps setup a Commission on Un-Buddhist Activities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 10:43 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Yudron said:

So, as another example, I would love to see a panel discussion with ChNN,

Malcolm wrote:

You have seen enough Nyingma Khenpos, you can read Van Shaik, etc. easily. I suggest you attend a retreat with ChNN instead, as that would be more useful for you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Yudron said:

I often think how wonderful it would be if the idea of a panel discussion could be introduced in Tibetan Buddhism. Just to listen to a civil discussion on how emptiness is presented in the various schools, for example, would be really informative.

Malcolm wrote:

Its pretty straight forward actually: the Sakyas and some Nyingmapas follow the view of Madhyamaka promulgated during the early period. Most Kagyus and some Nyingmapas adhere to the gzhan stong view, first elaborated by Dolbupa. Gelugpas and some Nyingmapas adhere to the presentation of emptiness first elaborated by Je Tsongkhapa.

For the most, the lines of discussion and debates between these three approaches to emptiness have remained unchanged since the 15th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Yudron said:

Many Nyingma lamas just ignore that ChNN exists, and that is their way of dealing with his unconventional approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Yet, many of them have adopted features of his approach...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

heart said:

That must have been quite an interesting discussion, all things considered.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The way CHNN explains it, it was not so interesting for him.

heart said:

Yes, I also heard it several times, he don't sound to amused. But knowing Khenpo Choga a little, well he is not stupid and quite unusual. Did you ever meet him?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, I never met him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

heart said:

That must have been quite an interesting discussion, all things considered.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The way CHNN explains it, it was not so interesting for him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Now I see what it's all about.

A typical a case where a religious fiction clashes head on with historical facts, with all the ruffle such accidents usually cause.

The big red book (Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism: Its Fundamentals and History by Dudjom Rinpoche) is rather well known. I, on the other hand, would be prone to recommend this particular book for those interested in History instead of the hegemonic religious version of it.

Yudron said:

It's not as simple as that--that one version is fact and one is fiction. Neither version of early Dzogchen history fits our western idea of historical fact in any way, shape, or form. I don't mean this disrespectfully, but they are legends, like Noah's Ark and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN's book is not about the history of Dzogchen. Dzogchen is mentioned tangentially in the book because he argues it was present in Bon prior to the arrival of Indian Buddhism to Tibet. The book is about establishing that Tibet already had its own culture, literature, system of writing and so on prior to the time of King Trisrong Detsen. I suggest you read it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

. The back story is that on hearing that ChNN was coming to Nepal, Khenpo Choga started boasting to everyone that he was going to debate ChNN and defeat him. We all know how that turned out for him.

heart said:

So Khenpo Choga was one the Khenpos that visited ChNNR while he was at Tulku Urgyen?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 3rd, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Yudron said:

In any event, ChNN's old book *Necklace of Zi* upset a lot of lamas at the time, because it does not reflect the traditional Nyingma view of Tibetan History. This led to Dzongsar Khyentse saying that ChNN had done more to harm the Nyingma lineage than the Chinese ever did, and so on. But that is water under the bridge.

My understanding of the story was that ChNN said that he was commissioned to write the book by the Tibetan Women's Association as a political history of Tibet and it was not meant to be a religious history, and that pacified the situation.

Malcolm wrote:

I have heard this story from ChNN myself, personally, more than once.

The back story is that on hearing that ChNN was coming to Nepal, Khenpo Choga started boasting to everyone that he was going to debate ChNN and defeat him. We all know how that turned out for him.

And yes, in the course of his research, ChNN has found many things that contradict certain features of both Nyingma as well as Bon accounts concerning the imperial era. And yes, this has upset some Tibetans -- many who foolishly continue to assert to this very day that ChNN is a Bonpo.

Yudron said:

How I am supposed to relate to the lineage histories -- be they Nyingma or Bon -- of the origins of Dzogchen, as someone with a pretty good Western education, is a mystery to me. I'm pretty excited about this subject actually... and open minded.

Malcolm wrote:

The origins of Dzogchen are given in the *man ngag sde* tantras, mainly the *sgra thal gyur* and its commentary. The account of the origins of Dzogchen is mythological in scope and involve the twelve teachers prior to Garab Dorje. AFAIK, ChNN takes this account literally, as fact. His twist, if you will, is adding the name of Tonpa Shenrab to that list as a Dzogchen nirmanakāya. This is not without precedent in Nyingma, since as you will recall Guru Chowang also asserts that Tonpa Shenrab is a nirmanakāya who taught the liberative vehicles as well in his *gter 'byung che*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 3rd, 2012 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Lama and moving

Content:

freakpower70 said:

From what I have heard it is a violation of the student teacher relationship to take a new teacher before one has finished the former's instructions.

Malcolm wrote:
You heard wrong.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 5:11 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?
Content:

username said:
They claimed to be Dzogchen masters and wanting to purge Dzogchen of Bonpos.

Malcolm wrote:
No.

username said:
They were told to go away once they started debating him by asking him about the view of the basis when he told them to go away.

Malcolm wrote:
No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 5:11 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?
Content:

username said:
We know there are differences of opinion on ngondro, etc. You are wrong on both counts.

underthetree said:
Are there differing opinions on rigpa (or whatever the translation du jour is - maybe I've just answered the question...)?

username said:
We are told rigpa is not a matter of semantic, cognition, concepts etc. but of ineffable experience and realization or knowledge of the ultimate state by the person. There are many opinions by them on how to teach students though.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, as I said, differences on pedagogy -- (but of course since you love to disagree with every fricking thing I say, you even do so when you contradict yourself).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

username said:

There are still TB Dzogchen masters who publicly do not accept Bonpos Dzogchen. I don't accept them. But that is my opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

What is that you do not accept? Bonpo Dzogchen masters?

username said:

We know there are differences of opinion on ngondro, etc. You are wrong on both counts.

Malcolm wrote:

Differences of opinion about pedagogy, not differences in opinion about the meaning of Dzogchen -- but you are such a tear to find fault with what I say, you are completely blind to anything other than whatever fictions you spin in your head.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

catmoon said:

Okay, then they should all be in perfect agreement in their teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen masters are, when it comes to discussing Dzogchen.

catmoon said:

All righty. With that kind of agreeent, it must surely be impossible that there would be sects in Dzogchen, since all the teachers are in perfect agreement. It must be nice to enjoy the sort of universal agreement that no other religion in the history of humanity has attained. This would also explain the complete absence of conflict in the Dzogchen threads here.

Nope, couldn't say it with a straight face.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no sects in Dzogchen per se. There are differences in how this knowledge should be approached, which is what you see being discussed. But there is no room for debate about what Dzogchen is. Of course, most of the people here talking about Dzogchen have little or no facility in Tibetan, and therefore, are quite limited in their scope.

These days, the definitive read on Dzogchen is held to be Longchenpa's four treasures of the dharmadhātu, reality, subjects and supreme vehicle. Dzogchen is a very precise teaching and in this end, even when people disagree about the best method of pedagogy, they do not disagree about meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

username said:

It is wrong to state all Dzogchen masters are united when discussing Dzogchen. ChNN often tells the story of when he was staying with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche in Nepal and three Dozgchen masters, couple of Khenpos and a tulku, suddenly appeared to debate him in the presence of TUR on why ChNN is wrong to accept Bonpos as genuine Dzogchenpas. He disagreed. They asked for elaboration on the view of the base in Dzogchen and a debate on invalidity of Bonpo Dzogchen. ChNN said, you should know about the basis and there will be no explanation. We disagree and there will be no debate from me on Dzogchen or Bonpos with you. They promptly left.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN never said they were Dzogchen masters.

If you are going to tell a story, get the facts straight.

They wanted to question him on the basis of their misunderstanding of a point of history he had explained in one of his books i.e. that Tonpa Shenrab existed before both Shakyamuni and Garab Dorje, and therefore, they concluded he, ChNN was stating that Dzogchen has its origin in Bon. Of course ChNN explained to them to the history of the 12 ancient masters of Dzogchgen beginning with Nangwa Dampa, who are much more ancient than Tonpa Shenrab.

The three, abashed, then requested Dzogchen teachings from ChNN, who replied to the effect he does not teach Dzogchen to people who come to debate with him about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

catmoon said:

Ok, then there should be zero difference between realized masters.

Malcolm wrote:

There is zero difference in the substance of their realization.

catmoon said:

Okay, then they should all be in perfect agreement in their teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen masters are, when it comes to discussing Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

catmoon said:

Ok, then there should be zero difference between realized masters.

Malcolm wrote:

There is zero difference in the substance of their realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 1st, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

(Leaving aside Zen, which is actually more widespread than Vajrayāna Dharma), Vajrayāna is more popular because it promotes liberation in a single body and a single lifetime. Second, it is intrinsically more adaptable to our highly technological civilization because it is very much based on a yogic understanding of liberation i.e. how the body is an instrument of liberation, not just the mind alone.

M

Huseng said:

How many Tibetan Buddhists in the west though study it to that extent (the body as an instrument of liberation and all the technical details)?

Malcolm wrote:

I would say most, since empowerment into that knowledge is the defining feature of Vajrayāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 1st, 2012 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?

Content:

Huseng said:

I'm going to go out on a limb here and ask a question I've been pondering for awhile.

Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular in the western world than, say, Zen, Chan, Tendai, Pure Land, Seon or any other form of contemporary Mahāyāna?

Malcolm wrote:

(Leaving aside Zen, which is actually more widespread than Vajrayāna Dharma), Vajrayāna is more popular because it promotes liberation in a single body and a single lifetime. Second, it is intrinsically more adaptable to our highly technological civilization because it is very much based on a yogic understanding of liberation i.e. how the body is an instrument of liberation, not just the mind alone.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 30th, 2012 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

catmoon said:

There is no Dzogchen, it's just a word. Each person's practice differs radically from the next guy's even if they are chanting from the same book, reciting identical words. That in turn differs radically from the teacher's practice, and his teacher's practice, all the way back.

Malcolm wrote:

You says this because you do not understand Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 29th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

username said:

He said he used the commentaries to clean up the old root's original commentary's photocopy his friend smuggled out of Potala into a definitive mistake-free correct

version since the old copying method gremlins had struck that too. This took him several years. I don't think he had time to clean up 6 commentaries on it or cared to with all his activities and health problems during that time. Though possible he did and said so, but I doubt it and think he just used them as reference to clean up the main commentary. I hope you finish your Rongzom stuff too after all these years. He is undiscovered in the west and just as great if not greater than Longchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

The six commentaries we have are:

a commentary on the sgra thal gyur (edited by ChNN from two different manuscripts, one belonging to the Great Fifth)
a commentary on the mu tig phreng ba
a commentary on the yi ge med pa
a commentary on the sgron ma bar ba
a commentary on the sku gdung 'bar ba
and a commentary on the kun bzang klong drug.

These six commentaries, apart from the Vima Snying thig and the seventeen tantras themselves, are the most important ancient Dzogchen texts we have.

My Rongzom translation needs to editing, along with a whole lot of other stuff I have done. But I am only one person.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Sherlock said:

ChNN remarked that he helped prepare the text for the 6 commentaries in a recent webcast IIRC although he didn't elaborate.

Malcolm wrote:

He edited the sgra thal 'gyur commentary, but I was not aware that he was working on teh others, though it makes sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Yudron said:

Thank you. I do hope that if you start preparing Dzogchen translations for publication, that you will either have a glossary in the back with this kind of explanation

Malcolm wrote:

For key terms my glossaries will contain definitions derived from original and ancient Dzogchen commentaries themselves. My method is to base myself on how these terms are actually defined in Tibetan by the ancient masters as much as possible. While I will not be providing the texts themselves, my translations contain references to the Tibetan page number on every page, so someone with some facility in Tibetan can go and look in the original and see how I have translated something.

M

Yudron said:

That all makes sense for a scholarly minded person, who was reared in the Sakya tradition before coming to Dzogchen.

I'm really happy you will be providing glossaries and page references. Which "ancient masters" do you rely on for definitions? Rangzom?

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever wrote the commentaries on the seventeen tantras, traditionally attributed to Vimalamitra. In particular, the commentary on the sgra thal gyur attributed to him is an excellent source of definitions. There is much in that commentary alone that has been largely abandoned by the later tradition, not to mention the commentaries on the mu tig phreng ba, kun bzang klong drug, and so on, as well as the 119 intimate instruction section of the Vima snying thig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Svasamvedana

Content:

Yudron said:

Malcolm,

The rang syllable is an endless source of confusion for me. The Dzogchen masters themselves seem to gloss it as meaning "of itself" (or "naturally") sometimes, and then sometimes it refers to the one's own person. In general we beginners need to be aware of the genitive particle that is omitted in the contractions used in dzogchen texts (such as rang rig), and that may help us understand the usage?

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, self-aware or self-knowing requires the instrumental particle kyis/gis/gyis/ etc.

For example, "rang gi lus" means simply "one's body" likewise, "rang gi rig pa" means simply "one's knowledge". In the most ancient dzogchen commentaries such as the two volume commentary on the sgra thal gyur, "rang" of rang rig is glossed simply as gnas pa i.e. as a location.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This statement simply ignores and betrays ignorance of the entire history of tenet system literature in India as well as Tibet.

M

Mariusz said:

I've already read english books which I always quoted here. Of course I will be happy if you again present some new quotes in question. Thanx

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you have read books influenced completely by a post-14th century read on Indian Tenet systems.

For example, the eleventh century Nyingam scholar, Rongzom Chozang, writes in his seminal intro to Mahayāna systems:

When the Yogacara assert the characteristic of emptiness of dualistic false conceptualities, emptiness is not asserted to be anything other than the other dependent.

Or:

Also in the system of the Yogacāra, the mind and mental factors of the three realms, the characteristic of the falsely imagined is not an object and also is not a subject, [6/a] but a tenet system of being the characteristic of a mere self-reflexive cognition empty of both [subject and object] is asserted.

And then he includes a paraphrase from Asanga's Mahayānasamgraha to support his assertion.

Or, when summarizing their final view:

When the [Yogacāra] tenets are summarized, all [schools of Yogacāra] claim “Non-conceptual primordial wisdom possessing the suchness of being empty of duality substantially exists as ultimate.

Thus, your claim that Tsongkhapa was the first to marginalize Yogacāra as cittamatra is shown to be unfounded. Also Sakya Pandita demonstrates the same thing as Rongzom.

Or Kawa Paltseg's lta ba'i rim pa bshad pa, written in the later 8th or early 9th century places Vijñaptimatra [i.e. Yogacāra/Cittamatra] below Madhyamaka:

The vehicle of characteristics has three divisions:

Vijñaptimatra; Yogacara
and Sautrantika Madhyamaka.

The Vijñaptimatrins assert that [the appearance of] a man of [a misperceived] cairn
does not exist like bamboo horse,
the deluded appearance of one's own consciousness;
assert that the ultimate is a moment of wisdom;
and are in accord with Yogacāra Mādhyamika [in terms of] the relative.
[But Mādhyamikas] assert the ultimate as non-arisen emptiness,
and the Sautrantika [Mādhyamikas] assert the relative as mere illusion,
seen as appearing from the perspective of the object.
Since it is sublime, freedom from the two extremes
is asserted to be great Madhyamaka.

Now, the difference between Yogacara Madhyamaka, formulated by Shantaraksita and
so called Sautrantika Madhyamaka (meaning Buddhapalita, Bhavaveka, etc.) was well
known at this time. But Yogacara itself was considered inferior to Madhyamaka, and
Yogacara, Vijñaptimatra and Cittamatra were all considered synonyms in Tibet up until
the time Dolbupa.

This text, incidentally, gives the first appearance of the term "dbu ma chen po" that we
know of.

So it is just wrong to claim that Tsongkhapa was the one who "marginalizes" Yogacara
as cittamatra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Yudron said:

Thank you. I do hope that if you start preparing Dzogchen translations for publication,
that you will either have a glossary in the back with this kind of explanation

Malcolm wrote:

For key terms my glossaries will contain definitions derived from original and ancient
Dzogchen commentaries themselves. My method is to base myself on how these terms
are actually defined in Tibetan by the ancient masters as much as possible. While I will
not be providing the texts themselves, my translations contain references to the Tibetan
page number on every page, so someone with some facility in Tibetan can go and look in
the original and see how I have translated something.

Like many practitioners of Dzogchen I study "Kama" and practice terms.

I do not spend much time on later Dzogchen texts because they are all 100 percent

derivative of ancient texts. About as modern as I get is the 14th century in general. Everything in Dzogchen has completely developed by that time. Longchenpa is not really at all original in terms of Dzogchen. He merely represents the culmination of the development of snying thig tradition, some might argue he is the fruit of that tradition.

In terms of actual content, there is nothing original in Dzogchen following the revelation of the Mkha' 'gro snying thig by Tsultrim Dorje in the early 14th century (which is notable mainly for the way it combines anuyoga into Dzogchen, not because it is especially novel in comparison with the Vima snying thig). Everything that follows is just restatement, a defense against polemics or a minor clarification.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Sūtra, Tantra, & Essence Mahāmudrā

Content:

viniketa said:

Having only an elementary familiarity with both Mahāmudrā and Dzogchen, I recently ran across a book on Mahāmudrā and picked it up to learn more about Mahāmudrā: Brown, Daniel, (2006). Pointing Out the Great Way: The Stages of Meditation in the Mahāmudrā Tradition. It seems a good overview of the Mahāmudrā tradition; I like the way in which the author places the tradition in the history of both Indian and Tibetan Buddhism and in the three major methods of practice: sūtra, tantra, & essence.

As I do not read (or speak) Tibetan, as I thought would happen, I am coming across terminology that seems familiar but that, without a Sanskrit or Pali base, I'm uncertain. For example, the gnas lugs, Brown presents as the "Buddha nature" of mind, or "the way the realized mind stays". Now, Buddha-nature I would equate with tathāgatagarbha, while "the way the realized mind stays" I would equate with alāya; however, these are not necessarily the same in some traditions.

So, first I would ask: are these the correct approximations in Sanskrit of those two terms? Second, if so, does Mahāmudrā generally consider these two an equivalent?

Thanks in advance for reading and answering.

Malcolm wrote:

gnas lugs renders two Sanskrit terms: bhutatā and tattva, for example Longchenpa's famed gnas lugs rin po che mdzod is given a Sanskrit title by him: tattvaratnakośa. I do not know why translators from Tibetan persist in translating "gnas lugs" as "way of abiding". Thus it is pretty clear the title of the text ought to be translated "Treasury of Precious Reality".

Gnas lugs in this context simply means "reality".

Ālaya and gnas lugs are equivalent in Mahāmudra teachings in both Kagyu and Sakya.

The third sense of gnas lugs, often overlooked, is "anatomy", for example, when we talk about the rtsa'i gnas lugs i.e. the anatomy of the channels, and so on.

M

Yudron said:

Thank you. I do hope that if you start preparing Dzogchen translations for publication, that you will either have a glossary in the back with this kind of explanation or put the Tibetan in the same volume, so we can know what words you are translating. When you actually give your reasoning, it is really good for stumbling old poor readers like myself, and also for aspiring young translators who can then ask scholars about these specific kind of points.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I made a hasty error -- Longchenpa's text is not the tattvaratnakośa, but the tathatvaratnakosha. Nevertheless, my point is the same.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Mariusz said:

With regard to Madhyamika...well.....not so sure.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsonkhapa because of His the new Prasangika marginalized Yogacara to this Mind Only interpretation. [/quote]

This statement simply ignores and betrays ignorance of the entire history of tenet system literature in India as well as Tibet.

Yogacara was considered "mind only" in Tibet from the eighth century. I suggest you learn Tibetan and read Kawa Paltseg's treatise on tenet systems, not to mention Shantaraksita's Tattvasamgraha which is in English, which negates Yogacara as mind-only and so on.

It was only after the 14th century that a rennovated "Yogacara" was presented by some Tibetan scholars such as Dolbupa, etc. Prior to this, in general, Tibetans in general considered Yogacara "cittamatra". I can provide numerous examples going back to the 8th century.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Contemporary tertons of Eastern Tibet

Content:

Yudron said:

...personally I think it's better to leave Ngakpa Chogyam and his students alone.

Malcolm wrote:

I could really care less anymore, I have no interest in hounding them at all. I was merely confirming what was reported.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Mandala prayers

Content:

markadm said:

By the way, I wanted to ask: many prayers require permission or empowerment in order to 'work'. Can I safely assume that anyone could make a mandala offering, even the elaborate (long) one?

Malcolm wrote:

Technically, no. Mandala offerings are connected with Guru Yoga, and come from the Guhyasamaja tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Gelug View of Dzogchen?

Content:

Tom said:

I just have misgivings of the need to classify Dzokchen as a Gelug practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a Gelug practice -- nevertheless, there have been many great Gelug Dzogchen masters such as the great Fifth, Desri Sangye Gyatso, etc., and more recently, Khenpo Acho.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Sūtra, Tantra, & Essence Mahāmudrā

Content:

viniketa said:

Having only an elementary familiarity with both Mahāmudrā and Dzogchen, I recently ran across a book on Mahāmudrā and picked it up to learn more about Mahāmudrā: Brown, Daniel, (2006). Pointing Out the Great Way: The Stages of Meditation in the Mahāmudrā Tradition. It seems a good overview of the Mahāmudrā tradition; I like the way in which the author places the tradition in the history of both Indian and Tibetan Buddhism and in the three major methods of practice: sūtra, tantra, & essence.

As I do not read (or speak) Tibetan, as I thought would happen, I am coming across terminology that seems familiar but that, without a Sanskrit or Pali base, I'm uncertain. For example, the gnas lugs, Brown presents as the "Buddha nature" of mind, or "the way the realized mind stays". Now, Buddha-nature I would equate with tathāgatagarbha, while "the way the realized mind stays" I would equate with alāya; however, these are not necessarily the same in some traditions.

So, first I would ask: are these the correct approximations in Sanskrit of those two terms? Second, if so, does Mahāmudrā generally consider these two an equivalent?

Thanks in advance for reading and answering.

Malcolm wrote:

gnas lugs renders two Sanskrit terms: bhutatā and tattva, for example Longchenpa's famed gnas lugs rin po che mdzod is given a Sanskrit title by him: tattvaratnakośa. I do not know why translators from Tibetan persist in translating "gnas lugs" as "way of abiding". Thus it is pretty clear the title of the text ought to be translated "Treasury of Precious Reality".

Gnas lugs in this context simply means "reality".

Ālaya and gnas lugs are equivalent in Mahāmudra teachings in both Kagyu and Sakya.

The third sense of gnas lugs, often overlooked, is "anatomy", for example, when we talk about the rtsa'i gnas lugs i.e. the anatomy of the channels, and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Contemporary tertons of Eastern Tibet

Content:

Kunzang said:

If I recall correctly, back on e-sangha, Malcolm said that an acquaintance of his had attended a retreat with Namkha Rinpoche who gave a reading transmission of Dudjom's works (I don't recall which Dudjom) and Namkha Rinpoche came across the passage in question and was shocked.

Malcolm wrote:

This is correct -- this was in 2003 while I was at Merigar and a fellow from the Rigzin Sangha, Konchok, if I myself recall correctly, was attending a retreat at Merigar. He was the one who told me this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Mariusz said:

If one can see my quotes from Vasubandhu and Buddha in this way, of course it is not a big problem. Tsongkhapa and others innovators used to like to see them this way of course.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa, etc., is not an innovator in the slightest -- the innovators are people like Dolbupa etc., who have invented a Yogacara that never existed in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Pracjnaparamita in 25,000 lines

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

There are basically two versions of the 25,000 line sutra: the unarranged version that lacks the headings of the Abhisamaya-alamkara and the collated version that possesses the topic headings of the AA.

Am I to expect that the the unarranged version is the version to see as more original in spirit and text, then?

Malcolm wrote:

They are more or less identical. The headings of the AA merely show how the text was read after Ārya Vimuktisena's seminal AA commentary based on the PP in 25,000 lines was written.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 26th, 2012 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Pracjnaparamita in 25,000 lines

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

My general impression is that the Pancavimsatisahasrika-prajnaparamita-sutra is the "standard edition" of this collection of materials, the one that outlines reference, and the one that lay behind the Nagarjuna shastra.

My further impression is that Conze's long 100,000 version is a constructed hybrid. I have always had a high impression of him but I have heard people actually hiss at this.

Is the Pancavimsatisahasrika-prajnaparamita-sutra available in english somewhere?

And does it include the Wisdom chapter?

(Side note: that new interview with Paul Williams is, ahem, a Revelation....)

Malcolm wrote:

The answer, Leo, is no, not yet.

Conzes "Large Sutra" thus is an abridgement of the 18,000 and 25,000 line version. Conze's book is a construction from the 18,000 and 25,000 line version with some comparisons to the 100,000 line version.

There are basically two versions of the 25,000 line sutra: the unarranged version that lacks the headings of the Abhisamaya-alamkara and the collated version that possesses the topic headings of the AA.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 26th, 2012 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It would be more accurate to say that Dzogchen finds the doctrine of the dependent nature faulty. The fault for which the yogacara school is criticized is the assertion the dependent nature is ultimate.

Jyoti said:

The dependent arising nature (依他起性 paratantra-svabhāva) is not considered the same as the absolute nature (圓成實性 parini-panna-svabhāva). The former is the means of the latter (body), only the body is considered as established and therefore ultimate. The two is not consider separate nor same, this is the basis of the two truths.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

The perfected nature (parinispanna) is the non-existence of the imagined nature

(parikalpita) in the dependent nature, that is all. The dependent nature, nevertheless is considered ultimate in Indian Yogacara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 25th, 2012 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Jyoti said:

Dzogchen does not possess the teaching of the three natures, there is danger that it will confuse the dependent arising nature with the imaginary nature.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be more accurate to say that Dzogchen finds the doctrine of the dependent nature faulty. The fault for which the yogacara school is criticized is the assertion the dependent nature is ultimate.

This is identical to the Madhyamaka criticism of Yogacara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

Anyone managed to write down the mantra for the Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol today?

Please pm me, thanks!

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is in the mantra book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Jyoti said:

Free from extremes refer only to the means

Malcolm wrote:
No, it refers to reality.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 9:34 PM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?
Content:

Tiger said:

And then claiming that the Buddhahood of Dzogchen is "self-emergent" or "spontaneous" and "beyond cause and effect", you contradict the first statement because a Guru's empowerment was logically concluded to be a necessary requirement in your sect. Either the requirement for Guru is indispensable for your goal (and your realization is NON-spontaneous) OR your vehicle leads to the arousal of "Buddhahood" spontaneously. It cannot be both at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhahood in Dzogchen is analgous to picking fruit off of a tree. You need a Guru to show you where the tree is and that the fruit is there to be picked. You need do nothing to grow the fruit, however -- it is just hanging there to be picked.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 12:16 AM
Title: Re: Anyone here practicing Vajrayana without a Guru?
Content:

lobster said:

A path that is no path at all . . .

Sounds ideal . . .

Malcolm wrote:
Krishnamurti, etc., is aisle three, under Eastern Philosophy, along with the Eckhart Tolle, Adhyashanti and pop Zen books.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 12:05 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:

Jyoti said:

These are just play of names which are without the meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

People in glass houses ought not throw stones.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 23rd, 2012 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Anyone here practicing Vajrayana without a Guru?

Content:

lobster said:

Some practices such as Chenrezig, Tara and quite few others are complete paths, dependent on your sincerity.

Malcolm wrote:

Without transmission from a guru, these are not paths at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 23rd, 2012 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Anyone here practicing Vajrayana without a Guru?

Content:

Daniel83 said:

My question would be if there are actually people who practice Vajrayana without a teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is no such a thing. Everyone who practices Vajrayāna does so having received transmission from a Guru.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Pronunciation of "ai" in Tibetan

Content:

Sherlock said:

When is "ai" pronounced /ai/? In ChNN's own name for instance, it is usually pronounced /ai/ but in other instances involving the genitive of namkha it is pronounced /namkhe/.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on where you are from in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Svasamvedana

Content:

Will said:

So Malcolm, this translation (and notes) of the Three Statements is pretty poor?

"faith in Self-Reflexive Awareness" for example?

<http://www.dharmafellowship.org/library/texts/three-statements.htm> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yes... especially considering that they are missing have the text which occurs before the three statements themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Direct Introduction online?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He offers direct introduction with every webcasted retreat, not just three times a year.

23rd Sept. 10am-12pm.

Give a Donwang of Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol.

This contains direct introduction.

There is an open webcast which started today at 4 am eastern time -- I suggest you get up and listen.

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

21st -27th September 2012

Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol

the terma teaching of Ridzin Jyangchub Dorje.
OPEN WEBCAST. Timezone: GMT+2

21st Sept. 10am-12pm.

Introduction about this Teaching and the transmission of Ati Guru Yoga related with the tridlung of Short Thun Practice.

monktastic said:

I just noticed this morning that I missed the first session (2 AM MDT). If the DI takes place on Sep 23., I will attend tomorrow and Sunday's sessions! BTW, how did you discover that the DI takes place on the 23rd? From the description bolded above? (If so, it's not something I would/could have discovered!)

Also, if I register as a member of the Community, it seems I can listen to / watch old webcasts. Does that mean I can listen in on old Direct Introductions? Does this even make sense if it's not real-time?

Thanks,
M

Malcolm wrote:
I have received this transmission.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 1:04 AM
Title: Re: Direct Introduction online?
Content:
monktastic said:
Hi all,

I'm practicing semi-self-taught Mahamudra right now, and I understand that it's not a good idea. So I'll be finding myself a guru.

I have a question about the Direct Introduction / Pointing Out Instruction. I know Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche offers direct transmission three times a year, and I will attempt to sit in on the November one. It sounds like it may be harder to receive online, and even harder if I only get an audio feed. Is this a reasonable concern? Do people actually recognize rigpa in this way, or is it much better to receive it in person? With any luck, I'll be doing that soon anyway, but that will probably happen later.

Thanks,
M

Malcolm wrote:

He offers direct introduction with every webcasted retreat, not just three times a year.

23rd Sept. 10am-12pm.

Give a Donwang of Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol.

This contains direct introduction.

There is an open webcast which started today at 4 am eastern time -- I suggest you get up and listen.

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

21st -27th September 2012

Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol

the terma teaching of Ridzin Jyangchub Dorje.

OPEN WEBCAST. Timezone: GMT+2

21st Sept. 10am-12pm.

Introduction about this Teaching and the transmission of Ati Guru Yoga related with the tridlung of Short Thun Practice.

22nd Sept. 10am-12pm.

Giving more detail explanation about the teaching of Zhitro and its different methods.

23rd Sept. 10am-12pm.

Give a Donwang of Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol.

24th Sept. 10am-12pm.

Giving instruction about the essential practice of the Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol.

25th Sept. 10am-12pm.

Giving instructions how we do the practice of Zhitro for the living and dying people.
12,30pm - 1pm. We do a Short Gana Puja for the day of Guru Rinpoche.

26th Sept. 10am-12pm.

We do the practice of Jyangchog for all dead people who we have good or bad relations.

27th Sept. 10am-12pm.

Giving some advices for the daily life practices and tridlungs of collective practices and so on. We also do an Ati Guru Yoga altogether for finishing our retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Svasamvedana

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm,

Is rang rig or rig pa the translation of this "self-awareness" term?

Malcolm wrote:

rang rig pa/svasamvedana means "reflexive knowing", and it is theory of cognition usually considered to have originated with Dignaga and Dharmakirti.

Will said:

But is it not important in Dzogchen, even Garab Dorje's (or Patrul's comments) Three Words using it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, svasamvedana is different i.e. it is rang gyis rig, self-knowing.

Rang rig in Dzogchen is rang gi rig, one's own, and is derived instead from another Sanskrit construct: atmyavedana, and in turn this is part of a long phrase, very common in Sanskrit, pratyatmyavedanajñāna or in Tibetan so sor rang gi rig pa'i ye shes i.e. personally known wisdom. This is what the rang rig means in Dzogchen i.e. one's own knowledge, wisdom that was not learned from another but arises from one's own experience.

The translation of Dzogchen tantras and texts is still in its infancy, and the 95 percent of them should not be trusted by people who do not know Tibetan, including my own translations.

As is the case with much tantric literature, the root tantras of Dzogchen cannot be understood completely without commentaries. But, within the past ten years or so, six seminal commentaries on the man ngag sde tantras attributed to Vimalamitra have come to light.

Earlier translations made without recourse to these commentaries will be somewhat

inaccurate automatically -- it just cannot be helped and there is no reason to blame anyone for honest efforts carried out with insufficient supporting commentaries. But it must be understood that good translations of Dzogchen texts into English are a desiderata. My own efforts are merely a preliminary. I am sure that after I am gone, they will be picked up, picked over, polished or discarded as the case may be in the quest to make clearer and more accurate translations that conform to the definitions and explanations of key points of Dzogchen teachings found in the tantras and commentaries themselves.

In addition there is a wealth commentarial material in the Vima Nyinthig that needs to be digested well.

Maybe in 10 years we will start to have fully accurate, fully nuanced translations of Dzogchen texts that are widely available. Frankly, most Tibetan lamas do not really deeply understand these tantras and their language even if they understand Dzogchen in general perfectly well (moral of story: you do not have to be an expert on the 17 tantras to achieve rainbow body).

For example, today I am working on a citation from the klong drug about nature, essence, and compassion which is literally 1.75 folios long. It is so dense, it cannot be unpacked or understood, let alone translated, without the commentary (which I have, fortunately). In this translation this long and important passage will have to be extensively foot noted with explanations from the commentary (or an appendix, since it covers some 7 long folios). Longchenpa is no help at all, since his method is to merely make a point, and then unleash a long citation from a root tantra with virtually no explanation of the meaning of the passage. In fact in his commentary which closely follows the commentary I am working on (i.e. the tshig don mdzod), he skips this passage entirely because it is so hard to understand without the commentary, or so I am convinced, because for the most part he merely follows the citations as given in this earlier work in the exact order they are presented in that latter.

Back to work...

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 21st, 2012 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Svasamvedana

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm,

Is rang rig or rig pa the translation of this "self-awareness" term?

Malcolm wrote:

rang rig pa/svasamvedana means "reflexive knowing", and it is theory of cognition usually considered to have originated with Dignaga and Dharmakirti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 21st, 2012 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Six Types Of Mindfulness in Dzogchen?

Content:

Sönam said:

Bhumis in Dzogchen? ... does he "really" talks about Dzogchen?

mutsuk said:

Of course he talks about Dzogchen. There are 16 bhumis in Dzogchen, defined in the Rig-pa rang-shar and elsewhere (Longchenpa, etc.).

Skywalker said:

Sorry, I am just a humble fool regarding philosophy, but I heard otherwise from a student of Mr. Norbu. I was told that in Dzogchen there is only one Bhumi. Either you recognize the mind of clear light and are in Rigpa or you don't. I am not trying to disagree with you here, I am just pointing out a contradiction which comes to me. Being quite ignorant of the intricacies of Buddhist and Dzogchen philosophy, I am eager to learn.

Malcolm wrote:

Both are correct. There is only a single bhumi; and in there are also sixteen bhumis. There is a single stage from the point of view of reality, and sixteen stages from the point of view of experience on the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 21st, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Ok good. So the sense in which Dzogchen and Yogacara are different depends on whether a genuine difference exists in terms of this understanding about the 8th consciousness. If they have the same view about this 8th consciousness then they would be saying the same thing. Is this a fair assessment? We are not trying to establish superiority here, but we are interested in whether Dzogchen does in fact share the same view as Yogacara. Is this okay?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. Yogacara is a species of non-dual realism.

Mariusz said:

Again it. Cittamatra of course, but Yogacara is never a species of realism or nihilism as Madhyamaka is either. It was discussed in the past forums already. Yogacara and

Madhyamaka relies on the analysis until its collapse beyond all extremes in the end.
Dzogchen relies on Direct Introduction into Rigpa since the start.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, we do not agree. I do not accept that there is a so called Indian Yogacara that is not cittamatra, despite whatever confusion some Tibetans and Westerners have about this issue.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 20th, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Ok good. So the sense in which Dzogchen and Yogacara are different depends on whether a genuine difference exists in terms of this understanding about the 8th consciousness. If they have the same view about this 8th consciousness then they would be saying the same thing. Is this a fair assessment? We are not trying to establish superiority here, but we are interested in whether Dzogchen does in fact share the same view as Yogacara. Is this okay?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. Yogacara is a species of non-dual realism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 20th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sutras and Tantras

Content:

Tiger said:

Here, Malcolm, this is the Translator's not of Vajra-Suchi, that I was referring to, which shows that Brahmins usually were prejudiced heavily against Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Brahmins were indeed intellectually biased against Buddhism, but their bias was not colonial. Western bias against Hinduism is colonial, and not intellectual. In other words, Hindu problems with Buddhism are based on Buddhist denials of a creator and so forth. Western problems with Tibetan Buddhism and Hinduism have to do with what Westerners see as grotesquery in Hinduism and Tantra Buddhism, and the bias against both Tibetan Buddhism and Hinduism has everything to do with Protestant reactions to the British and German encounter with Indian culture in the early nineteenth century; reactions and attitudes that to this day still infect unbiased study of both Hinduism and

Tibetan Buddhism, as well as Bon, Taoism, Shinto, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 20th, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sutras and Tantras

Content:

Tiger said:

Malcolm,

Your post shows more similarities between Tantras and Sutras than differences. Why were the Tantras called "Tantras" instead of "Sutras"? Their format is similar to the Sutras and they contain discussions on Dharma, practices, moral discussions etc just as Sutras do.

Malcolm wrote:

"Yes, because they [tantras] also contain yogic methods and teachings which must be transmitted in certain specific ways since tantric practice is based on a very specific view of the human body and its role in liberation."

Additionally, the tantras teach a view of emptiness that is more profound than sūtra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ārya-pratyutpanna-buddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhī-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Jyoti said:

佛說般舟三昧經

Buddha Pronounces the Sūtra of the Pratyutpanna Buddha Sammukhāvasthita Samādhī:

"What should they do in order to achieve self-fulfillment, free from sycophancy and flattery and unattached to the Three Realms of Existence? "

The above passage is indication that this is not a scripture of definitive meaning. The Maharatnakuta

sutra stated "If any scripture, there is a saying that show: revulsion against samsara and inclined

toward nirvana, is non-definitive."

Try to rely on any recognized scripture of definitive meaning if you want to compare the perspective of sutras with dzogchen tantra.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

The sutra in question is part of the Ratnakuta collection. We already discussed this -- we don't agree what "sutras of the definitive meaning" are and there is no agreement on this point between yogacara and madhyamaka either.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

anjali said:

Hmmm. What does "strictly" mean in your comment, "Because the nature of the mind for sutra is strictly emptiness"?

I like your quotes, particularly, "The wise are liberated by knowing the phenomena's empty luminous nature in that way."

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on how you use "nature" -- in this case what I mean is that the ultimate nature of the mind for sutra is absence of any nature, as demonstrated by my citations -- that does not conflict with the capacity of the mind to know or be aware etc., as demonstrated by my citations, not even does it contradict the that mind is ultimately the buddha when it knows its own nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Josef said:

Chinul may state that mind-essence includes both awareness and emptiness but he is still missing the third part, thugje.

Thus no lhundrub, thus the two are clearly different definitions of nature of mind.

anjali said:

Elsewhere he states that the mind-essence has the three properties of a mirror: ground, luminosity, and capacity (to reflect anything). People can come to whatever conclusions they want: the same, different, both same and different, neither same nor different.

Malcolm wrote:

Also the common sutra has ādarśa-jñāna i.e. the mirrorlike wisdom.

Also Hindus use the metaphor of the mirror. Surely you are not going to equate Shankaracarya and Chinul?

Further the example of a mirror is used over and over again in sutra teachings. Surely you are not going to assert Dzogchen exists in sutra?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because the nature of the mind for sutra is strictly emptiness. Lhundrup is never mentioned nor implied in sutra at all in any way. The understanding of mind (sems, citta) in Chan/Sutra is completely different than in Dzogchen for that reason.

But you can believe whatever you like, I don't have time to properly correct your misunderstanding. Read Nubchen.

anjali said:

Chinul clearly states that mind-essence includes both awareness and emptiness. Therefore, his exposition can't be considered strictly sutra. I will take a look at Nubchen, if I can find a good english translation.

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think the nature of the mind being both empty and aware is not a sutrayāna perspective? It in fact is.

In the sangs rgyas kyi gtsug tor dpa' bar 'gro ba'i mdo it states:

"Next, from stabilizing clear and empty mind, it only becomes prajñā".

Ārya-sūthitamatidevaputrapariṣcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

"The wise are liberated by knowing the phenomena's empty luminous nature in that way."

Ārya-pratyutpanna-buddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhi-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Buddhas are made by the mind;

are also seen with the mind.

The mind is my buddhahood;
the mind is the sugata.
The mind is my body;
buddhas are seen with the mind.
The mind is my awakening;
the mind is natureless.
The mind is not known with the mind,
the mind does not see the mind.
The mind is not perceived as the mind,
not known as the mind, it is nirvana.
M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 1:06 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:

anjali said:
Why do assert that Chinul is referring to mind when the distinction is clearly made between mind and mind-essence. And Chinul's mind-essence has the aspects we would expect it to?

Malcolm wrote:
Because the nature of the mind for sutra is strictly emptiness. Lhundrup is never mentioned nor implied in sutra at all in any way. The understanding of mind (sems, citta) in Chan/Sutra is completely different than in Dzogchen for that reason.

But you can believe whatever you like, I don't have time to properly correct your misunderstanding. Read Nubchen.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 12:17 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
anjali said:
Others may differ on that assessment!

Malcolm wrote:
I am unwilling to agree that the intention of Chinul and the intention of Tulku Orgyen, for example, are the same, based on superficial similarities based on English translations divorced from the original language of the texts cited.

Also, while I am not expert in any sense in Korean, Chinese, etc., I am expert in Tibetan language, especially the language of Dzogchen, as well as Indo-Tibetan tenet systems in general. I have digested Nubchen's differentiation of Dzogchen and Chan in his bsam gtan mig sgron (I suggest you try to as well) -- I therefore see no compelling reason to take your assessment seriously.

The best that can be said is that Dzogchen includes the meaning of Chan, Yogacara, etc., but the reverse cannot be said to be true.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 18th, 2012 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That's the problem with mere comparisons of terms, one loses all nuance.

You neglected to cite Tsognyi Rinpoche in full i.e. "Rigpa is empty in essence, cognizant by nature, and unconfined in capacity. Simultaneously seeing these three is named rigpa."

Rigpa is also beyond mind, etc.

anjali said:

Actually, I was quoting his father. I get that Dzogchen makes the distinction between mind and mind-essence. As Urgyen Rinpoche says, "In every sentient being there is mind. The essence of this mind, whether it is known or not, is rigpa." The nature of rigpa is further elaborated as unconfined empty awareness.

Because of the importance of this distinction in Dzogchen, one can reasonably ask if such a distinction is made in other buddhist systems, perhaps under different terminology. For example, is generally acknowledged that Dzogchen and Mahamudra describe the same underlying nature, just with different terminology.

In the work I cited, Tracing Back the Radiance, such a distinction is made. For example, "your pure mind-essence of void and calm numinous awareness." Here is a more elaborate description of this mind-essence in response to an expository question within the text,

These are examples of apophatic discourse; they are not intended to expose the essence of the mind. If I did not point out that the clear, constant awareness which is present now, never interrupted and never obscured, is your own mind, what could I refer to as being uncreated and signless and so forth? For this reason, you must realize that all the various teachings explain only that it is this awareness which is neither arising nor ceasing and so forth.

...

Voidness means that it is devoid of all signs; it is still an aphophatic term. Calm is the immutable, immovable aspect of the real nature; it is not the same as empty nothingness. Awareness refers to the manifestation of this very essence; it is not the same as discrimination. These three components alone comprise the fundamental essence of the true mind. Therefore, from the initial activation of the bodhicitta until the attainment of Buddhahood, there is only calmness and only awareness, unchanging and uninterrupted. p 164

Thus, the essence of the mind clearly appears to be identified as empty and aware. For someone not looking to pick a nit, this sure seems to be describing rigpa. Now, to get back to the original reason for my comment--essence/function. On top of this basic understanding of mind-essence, with the two notions (functions) of luminosity and unconfined ability to reflect anything (per the mirror analogy mentioned earlier), we see that, although the terminology is different, the underlying framework is essentially the same as Dzogchen--unconfined empty awareness. At least that is how it appears to me.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the same -- the workin Buswell you cited is referring to mind, but ngo bo, rang bzhin and thugs rje refer to the three aspects of the wisdom of the basis that are never involved with mind even for a second. Hence, it is different.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 18th, 2012 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Dharma and Magic: is the latter necessary?

Content:

Tarpa said:

I think this part of Buddhist culture, and I do see it as part of Buddhist culture itself, not ethno geographical cultural baggage, may be de-emphasised in transition to the west so as to make Buddhism more palatable to western acceptance, as I feel vajrayana in some aspects in general has been made a bit more palatable and window shopping friendly beginning with the monastic inclusion of vajrayana to the present as it is presented more in a religious way.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, more palatable to the Western Anti-Hindu colonial morays.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 18th, 2012 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sutras and Tantras

Content:

Tiger said:

I am familiar with Sutras (and Suttas), but not much with the Tantras. In what way are both different from each other?

1. Are Tantras exclusively like training manuals of various Yogic and ritual practices unlike Sutras which contain both practices as well as metaphysical, moral and general discussion of Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

No, tantras also present metaphysical, moral and general discussions of Dharma.

Tiger said:

2. Tantras are meant to be secret where as Sutras are meant to be open?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because they also contain yogic methods and teachings which must be transmitted in certain specific ways since tantric practice is based on a very specific view of the human body and its role in liberation.

Tiger said:

How do you Vajrayanists reconcile with this fact?

Malcolm wrote:

I guess if I had decided that the Western historiographical approach to Indo-Tibetan religious history was definitive I would be a bit worried. As I have not, and am not likely to, I can read Indo-Tibetan religious history as framed by western scholars with interest without it impinging my interest in the study and practice of Dzogchen.

Western academic studies of Hinduism and Indo-Tibetan Buddhism are often grotesque examples of colonial bias in action. The whole anxiety of Western and Westernized Buddhists (especially in Western neo-Theravada) about "Hinduism" quite frankly is a result of this colonial bias against Hinduism, just as your post betrays.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 10:55 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Jyoti said:

But even mahayana (including dzogchen) practitioners who strayed to the body will make attempt to weaken the means (intellect), and consequently the fruit will not be higher than those achieved by the arahants and formless meditators.

Malcolm wrote:

This is like talking about water without ever having tasted it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

About how long would it take a Dzogchen practitioner who is between lower and medium scope at best regarding their capacity—yet who also has average or slightly-above-average intellectual-faculties—to learn Tibetan well enough in order to at least 'somewhat grasp' the sense of what is written in the 17 (+2) Dzogchen Upadesha Tantra's?

Malcolm wrote:

20 years. If you ask me in ten years, I will say 30.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 10:30 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have had similar pointless conversations with Astus, who also used this idea of essence/function in order to show how Zen was comparable with Dzogchen or even superior to it.

This idea is strictly Sino-Buddhist, and as you rightly point out, is completely incommensurable with Dzogchen.

anjali said:

The only reading I've done in this area is from the book *Tracing Back the Radiance*, Chinul's Korean Way of Zen, translated by Robert E. Buswell, Jr. Here is perhaps the clearest quote on the nature of essence/function in that work:

The original essence of the true mind contains two types of functions. First, there is the innate function of the self-nature. Second, there is the function which adapts to conditions. These can be compared to a bronze mirror. The bronze itself corresponds to the essence of the self-nature. The brightness of the bronze corresponds to the function of the self-nature. The images reflected because of that brightness are the function which adapts to conditions. Under suitable conditions images can be reflected and manifest in thousands of different ways; but the brightness is ever bright. p.165

From my limited knowledge, this seems to be similar to the notion of ground/luminosity/unconfined capacity.

The revelation teaching also employs the two approaches of revelation through

inference and revelation through perception. Hung-chou notes, "The mind cannot be pointed out; it is through such properties as capacity for speech and so forth that we can prove its existence and become aware of the presence of the Buddha-nature." This is the approach of revelation through inference. Ho-tse says straightaway, "Since the mind-essence is that which is capable of awareness, awareness is precisely the mind." To reveal the mind through its awareness is the approach of revelation through perception.

pp. 166

Elsewhere in the work, it is pointed out that the essence of the mind is void. Adding all this up, it seems to be similar to the notion of "empty in essence, cognizant/aware in nature, and unconfined in capacity."

Malcolm wrote:

That's the problem with mere comparisons of terms, one loses all nuance.

You neglected to cite Tsognyi Rinpoche in full i.e. "Rigpa is empty in essence, cognizant by nature, and unconfined in capacity. Simultaneously seeing these three is named rigpa."

Rigpa is also beyond mind, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Can other religions lead to enlightenment?

Content:

viniketa said:

Not every śrāvaka attains śrotāpatti pratipannaka (stream entry), and not every śrotāpanna attains sakadagami (once returner), not every sakadagamanna attains anagami (non-returner) in their own lifetime. This is clear even from the Pali suttas, for example:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an05/an05.202.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an06/an06.086.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an05/an05.179.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this also is an indirect path to liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Can other religions lead to enlightenment?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All nine yānas lead indirectly or directly to liberation. The first yāna, the yānas of gods and humans, includes Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, Shamanism, Taoism, Confucism, etc.

JinpaRangdrol said:

Hmm...this seems like a big assertion. Sources? It was my understanding that the śrāvakayāna was still centered around Buddhadharma, and simply focused on renunciation and personal liberation as an Arhat. Christianity, Islam, etc generally do not promote renunciation (especially not in the 21st century), and do not recognize liberation as a goal. And the very idea of being a "listener" of the Buddha's teachings would clearly be absent in most other religions.

Don't get me wrong, I'd love to believe that all religions lead indirectly or directly to liberation, but I need scriptural sources to back that up.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two presentations of the nine yānas. The sgra thal gyur presentation of the nine yānas combines the śravaka and pratyekabuddha yāna into the one, making it the second yāna, and places the vehicles of gods and men as the first yāna. This is not only my understanding, but it is frequently mentioned by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

The feature of all these religions which makes them indirect paths is that they all extol some variation of the ten virtues. The practice of the ten virtues leads to higher rebirth. Therefore, they are indirect paths to liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Since the concept isn't known in any source in Sanskrit using it as a kind of key-term, since everything you say revolves around this concept, to defend Yogacara is an error. I would even say that it makes most of your posts off topic.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I have had similar pointless conversations with Astus, who also used this idea of essence/function in order to show how Zen was comparable with Dzogchen or even superior to it.

This idea is strictly Sino-Buddhist, and as you rightly point out, is completely incommensurable with Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Jyoti said:

What errors? What ignorance?

According to what is being analysed through the theory of ti-yung. Various examples are in previous posts.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

Essence/function is irrelevant to Dzogchen teachings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So Jhoti what is it that you want? What do you want to happen? Do you have a goal in mind?

Jyoti said:

The intention is to clarify errors as well as ignorance within teaching of individual and tradition with words that may be useful.

Jyoti

Andrew108 said:

What errors? What ignorance?

Malcolm wrote:

Her own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 7:24 PM

Title: Re: sanskrit translation of "rNam Dag"

Content:

namoh said:

Actually, at the risk of splitting hairs, Vishuddha seems to also mean Yangdak. Does it simply serve double duty?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 7:24 PM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth in the triple realm. What else could possibly matter?

M

tomamundsen said:

Being able to help sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

That happens automatically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Dharma and Magic: is the latter necessary?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, it seems in the Buddha's time śramaṇas in the Buddhist community did not directly appeal to such forces, and instead focused on their meditative practices. The Atanatiya Sutta contradicts this perception.

Huseng said:

Interesting. I didn't know about this before.

<http://www.accesstinsight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.32.0.piya.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Interesting that the Buddha is offered this rather than teaching it:

"Bhante, may the Blessed One learn the Atanata[4] protection so that the displeased Yakkhas may be pleased, so that the monks and nuns, laymen and laywomen, may be at ease, guarded, protected and unharmed."

The Blessed One gave consent by his silence. Then the great King Vessavana, knowing that the Blessed One had consented, recited the Atanatiya protection:

When the night had passed the Blessed One addressed the monks: (The Buddha related to the monks word for word what has been said by the great King Vessavana, see above.)

"Learn by heart, monks, the Atanata protection, constantly make use of it, bear it in mind. This Atanata protection, monks, pertains to your welfare, and by virtue of it, monks and nuns, laymen and laywomen may live at ease, guarded, protected, and unharmed."

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did teach it, that is why it is a sutta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Dharma and Magic: is the latter necessary?

Content:

Unknown said:

On the other hand, it seems in the Buddha's time śramaṇas in the Buddhist community did not directly appeal to such forces, and instead focused on their meditative practices.

Malcolm wrote:

The Atanatiya Sutta contradicts this perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Purelands that decay

Content:

zamotcr said:

I always though that the Pure Lands were some kind of a special land where the Buddhas teach the dharma without restriction, a place where we can attain buddhahood without problems.

But it seems that this is not always the case. I have read that every Buddha has a Pure Land, and the Shakyamuni's Pure Land is this Saha world.

So, not every Pure Land is created by a Buddha, like our world, that wasn't created by Shakyamuni, and other Pure Lands are created by merit of some Buddha (like Amitabha's Pure Land, created by his own merits).

In the Lotus Sutra are a lot of examples of Buddha Lands that decay in the hands of Mara, so not every Buddha Land is perfect.

So, why these different, what make each Pure Land so different?
Why some pure lands are outside samsara, and others are inside samsara?

Sorry for my bad english

Malcolm wrote:

The term "Pure land" is wrong. The Sanskrit term is buddhakṣetra which means "Buddhafield" -- some, like Sukhavati, are considered outside of samsara. Some, like the Sahaloka, are part of samsara. However, both the Lotus Sutra and the Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sutra show that the idea of distinguishing between pure and impure buddhakṣetras is based on an error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so what do you do instead of being born in the triple realm?

Malcolm wrote:

Presumably one dallies with celestial viginis, eating grapes and drinking wine.

M

gad rgyangs said:

virgins not for long! but seriously, I'd rather eat ice cream and smoke weed - is that an option there?

Malcolm wrote:

grapes and wine can be viewed as placeholders for a variable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

no rebirth as in "extinction", or no rebirth as in "an improvement in one's circumstances"?

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth in the triple realm. What else could possibly matter?

M

gad rgyangs said:

so what do you do instead of being born in the triple realm?

Malcolm wrote:

Presumably one dallies with celestial viginis, eating grapes and drinking wine.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Can other religions lead to enlightenment?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All nine yānas lead indirectly or directly to liberation. The first yāna, the yānas of gods and humans, includes Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, Shamanism, Taoism, Confucism, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

and if you get rid of the afflictions, what's left?

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth.

gad rgyangs said:

no rebirth as in "extinction", or no rebirth as in "an improvement in one's circumstances"?

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth in the triple realm. What else could possibly matter?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

new2dharma said:

So do buddhists believe in an individual's soul or self? If not what gets reincarnated?

Thanks and Namaste, Dan

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Afflictions.

gad rgyangs said:

and if you get rid of the afflictions, what's left?

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

new2dharma said:

So do buddhists believe in an individual's soul or self? If not what gets reincarnated?

Thanks and Namaste, Dan

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

Pero said:

No, that was the tantra for Yantra Yoga. The song of the vajra is not in this tantra but in the Upadesha tantra of the same name.

simhanada said:

So, for further clarification, we are talking about the Nyida Khajor as one of the 17 tantras? or different?

Malcolm wrote:

The upadesha for Yantra Yoga is Called Nyi zla kha sbyor.

There is also an upadesha tantra, one of the seventeen, called Nyi zla kha sbyor as part of its title.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 14th, 2012 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Back online and upgraded!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

response time is definitely faster -- the old server was experiencing a bit of a lag at times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 14th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Bj Lhundrup said:

Anyone know the names that are used in the TsamDrak & TingKye editions for this tantra that goings by these names?

nag mo khros ma.

khros ma nag mo.

bka' srung nag mo'i rgyud.

bka' srung nag mo'i snying thun gsang ba.

sngags srung gsang rgyud.

These names are not in both those editions and I need to know what title they go by in these two version of the NGB.

thanks

L

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I can tell it is not in the NGB in either of those collections.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But we do not accept Mahayana as definitive. We only accept Dzogchen as definitive, based on what the Buddha has taught in those teachings.

Jyoti said:

This type of claim is precisely the reason the buddha explicitly stated the guidelines on how to distinguish the scriptures of non-definitive meaning from the scriptures of definitive meaning. Therefore, based on those guidelines, no person can undermine the authenticity of the definitive scriptures, or the mahayana that is established by it.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

This is not even very precise -- for example, one Indian school of common Mahāyāna (i.e. Madhyamaka) follows the Akṣayamati-nirdeśa sūtra for ascertaining what is definitive; another (Yogacara) follows the Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra. Both schools also utilize the four reliances from the Kaśyapa-parivarta sūtra. Your criteria therefore is far less certain than you pretend.

When it comes to Dzogchen, Dzogchen is beyond the considerations of common Mahāyāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, in terms of textual history, the earliest tantra by name that we have is the core of the famed Ayurvedic classic, the Caraka Samhita. This text is called Agniveśa Tantra.

The term "tantra" is just a general word in Sanskrit that means effectively "manual".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

Tiger said:

The Hindus (Shaivites) claim that they founded Tantras and the Buddhist claim that they were the first creators of Tantra. So which one came first?

I found this interesting explanation from

<http://www.kamakotimandali.com/blog/index.php?p=1082&more=1&c=1&tb=1&pb=1>:

The nāgārjuna of vajrayāna is generally identified by the Tibetan Buddhists with the mādhyamika philosopher, but these two were definitely different teachers.

Matsyendranātha, a Tantric teacher of Shaktism, enjoying great reputation as a kaula

yogin appeared in Assam sometime in the early centuries of the Christian era. He is taken as the founder of the Kaula system in kaliyuga. That system is said to have been started by four yuganāṭhas in four yugas and they are respectively khagendranātha, kūrmanātha, meṣanātha and matsyendranātha. arāha alias rāhulabhadra, a Buddhist monk of the vijnānavāda school, learnt Kaula Tantra from some efficient teacher belonging to the line of matsyendranātha. He adapted it to the fundamental principles of vijnānavāda and presented it efficiently as a secret sādhana taught by Buddhism. He eliminated cleverly two very important principles of śākta tantra for such purpose. One of these is the principle of the existence of a constant entity called ātman. The other principle is that of absolute theism. Besides, he changed the names of Tantric deities so as to make them look like Buddhist ones and gave all philosophical terms a Buddhist coloring. Thus he presented the śākta system of matsyendranātha as mystic Buddhism and gave it the name, vajrayāna. One of his very efficient disciples was a monk named nāgārjuna who also is, many a time, wrongly identified with the ancient mādhyamika philosopher of the South by the Lamas of Tibet and Mongolia. He popularized among Buddhist monks such Tantrism which passed on under the name of vajrayāna Buddhism. Padmasambhava, a disciple in his line, carried such Tantric Buddhism to Tibet and from there it spread to many countries of the Buddhist world.

How true is the above account?

Malcolm wrote:

It is very speculative. In any case, Buddhist tantras are primordial.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Sönam said:

Then we do not have the same view on what's definitive ...

Sönam

Jyoti said:

This is not my view, it is the sutra's view about what is definitive, so anything outside this sutra's view that does not come from the Buddha cannot be relied. Note the instructions of the four reliances of mahayana.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

But we do not accept Mahayana as definitive. We only accept Dzogchen as definitive, based on what the Buddha has taught in those teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

In 3 separate places I've found 3 different deities being referenced to as the black wrathful goddess in the "Black Wrathful Goddess Tantra"...

In the OP I copied the run-down of the 17 Tantras from a website which listed the Black Wrathful Goddess Tantra (nag mo khros ma); as referring to a black form of Vajrayogini (khros ma nag mo).

In another more in depth run-down I found done by Khenpo Ngakchung it lists this tantra as the Tantra of The Wrathful Black Guardian Shri Ekajati, which resembles a sharp razor, describes how to protect the practitioner against harms inflicted by others. Obviously referencing Ekajati.

And then on Vajranatha's website he has this as referencing Simhamukha: The secret sadhana (gsang sgrub) is for the exceedingly wrathful black Krodha Kali Simhamukha (khros-ma nga-mo), "the wrathful black goddess", who appears to annihilate the delusion of ego, symbolized by the insatiable demon king Rudra, much like Durga cutting the head off the demon king Mahisha. The secret sadhana is also connected with the practice of Chod (gcod), the severing or cutting off of the ego. For this reason, this form of Simhamukha is also called Vajra Nairatma (rDo-rje bdag-med-ma), "she who destroys the notion of an ego."

Which deity is actually being discussed in this tantra?

Malcolm wrote:

Mamo Ekajati. The confusion comes from the fact that the tantra is called "khros ma nag mo", which is also the name of several other cycles of unrelated devas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Did Shakyamuni Buddha also give empowerments?

Content:

Tiger said:

it is the Vajrayanists first who have claimed to be most supreme...

Malcolm wrote:

No, that would be Gautama Buddha, who proclaimed that only through his Dharma and Vinaya would one attain buddhahood, then came Mahāyāna (Perfection of wisdom sutras, etc.), then came Yogacara, third turning; then came general mantras, then annutarayogatantra, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Did Shakyamuni Buddha also give empowerments?

Content:

Tiger said:

If empowerment from a Guru is required to attain Anuttarasamyaksambodhi, then why is it called Anuttara samyaksam bodhi to begin with? Our Buddha is often described as a fully self enlightened one and this is because he attained enlightenment through his own efforts.

Malcolm wrote:

Anuttarasamyaksambodhi means "unsurpassed perfect full awakening"-- there is nothing about the term, from a Mahayāna perspective that suggests that the Buddha was "self-enlightened".

We can see that gurus are intended to be respected in common Mahāyāna as well:

Ārya-mahākaruṇāpuṇḍarīka-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra shows that in the past when the Buddha was a bodhisattva he relied on a guru

Ananda, As such, in the past when I practiced the conduct of a bodhisattva I bowed fully bowed and prostrated to a Guru.

The buddhas arise in the world as gurus, as Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra clearly states:

Limitless amazing victors

produce loving minds to benefit the world;

since they arise as guiding Guru teachers,

from now on they will attract disciples in the ten directions.

And also recommends that:

The wise generate devotion to a guru

Ārya-sarvadharmasvabhāvasamatāvipaṇcita-samādhirāja-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra recommends:

Serving the guru with noble intention,

doing whatever he asks just as he asks,

one should serve Dharma teachers without interruption,

such is the precept of the victor.

Ārya-sāgaramatipariṣcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

Two Dharmas to esteem:

serving the spiritual friend

and relying on the guru with devotion.

We can see from just this small sampling of important Mahāyāna sūtras how important it is to rely on a guru in common Mahāyāna in order to achieve

Anuttarasamyaksambodhi. There are many other similar statements made in Mahāyāna sūtras. So we must understand that relying on a guru is critical for achieving buddhahood.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Did Shakyamuni Buddha also give empowerments?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

So even in regular Mahayana there is a tantric-like empowerment that is given by the rest of the Buddhas when you are on the appropriate bhumi.

Thats what I'm understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

It takes place through light rays, but yes, effectively the Vajrayāna principle of empowerment is validated by Mahāyāna sutra. The principle difference of course is that the empowerments of the former system can be granted to ordinary persons, while the empowerments of the latter system are reserved for tenth stage bodhisattvas.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 4th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Did Shakyamuni Buddha also give empowerments?

Content:

Tiger said:

1. Vajrayana practitioners consider higher Tantras/Yogas (Mahamudra, Dzogchen etc) as the ONLY method to attain Buddhahood (correct me if I am wrong here). Which is why I asked if Buddha Shakyamuni also delivered empowerments.

Malcolm wrote:

Anuttarasamyaksambodhi is only possible through empowerment -- this is why for example abhiśeka is mentioned as a key feature of buddhahood in the Āvataṃsaka sūtra and so on.

When a bodhisattva attains buddhahood, they do so on the basis of an empowerment (abhiśeka) transmitted through from all the tathagatas of the ten directions. For example, the Buddhāvataṃsaka-nāma-mahāvaiṣṭya-sūtra states:

Whoever attains facility through the supreme samadhi, they completely receive the ornaments of the empowerment conferred from the victors of the ten directions

Ārya-tathāgatācintyaguhyānirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

By attaining empowerment, one is endowed with all qualities.

Ārya-svapnanirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

On the tenth stage one is predicted as a buddha through empowerment

Āryākṣayamatiparipṛcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Since the tenth creation of bodhicitta is the empowerment that grants power over qualities, wisdoms and all phenomena, it is seen to be equal with space through the example of the name "cakravartin".

Ārya-ratnacūḍaparipṛcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

All who are impeded by a single birth obtain empowerment.

Ārya-lalitavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Through possessing love and compassion, the bodhisattva who has been conferred the empowerment of merit and wisdom leaves Tuṣita.

Thus, empowerment in Vajrayāna, the direct route to experiencing anuttarasamyaksambodhi in a single lifetime in a single body, is fully validated by Mahāyāna sutras.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 4th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Marihuana and meditation

Content:

TaTa said:

The mindfulness has drastically reduce the "wanting" part of the addiction but still i cant seem to not smoke when someone lights one up around me.

Malcolm wrote:

Avoid people who smoke herb.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 4th, 2012 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Why is dependent origination so important?

Content:

Music said:

Why is it important to know? What does it mean to know, anyway? We all know that everything is connected with everything else ...

Malcolm wrote:

It is important for understanding how suffering arises, so it can be undone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

Sönam said:

and there is a precise tempo, wether slow

(http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/files/SOV_SLOW.pdf) or fast

(http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/files/SOV_FAST.pdf) ... it is not supposed to be sung otherwise.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are being a little too rigid there, Sonam. Even ChNN does not sing SOV the way Adriano has transcribed it.

Pero said:

Yeah hahaha. As far as I understood Adriano in that webcast that's the way it's supposed to be in done in the dance of the vajra because it's coordinated with movements. When alone I try to sing it as close as I'm able to the way Adriano taught it then, but we don't sing it quite like that with Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

I follow the boss.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Yudron said:

Jim Valby was kind enough to send me a CD of the 17 main Dzogchen tantras input into Wylie. My intention is to eventually use Tibet doc to change them into u-chen. I have not proofed any against the original yet.

I really appreciate his generosity.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking I use the Adzom Chogar recension for convenience, but I have found that many respects the Tsham Brag recension of the 17 to be more accurate, at least when it comes to comparing root text with commentaries.

Yudron said:

Thanks! I'm really in over my head here: I don't know what the tsham brag edition is. Is that on TBRC?

I was assuming they were in the nyingma gyud bum.

Malcolm wrote:

There are three Nyingma rgyud 'bums: Ting skyes, Tsham brag and Derge (Adzom Chogar).

The first two share a common root, and the last is a separate tradition.

IN reality, you need all three. For example, the Rig pa rang shar version found in the Derge lineage was collated out of three manuscript traditions, and all three are represented here in the mchan 'grel i.e interlineal notes. These notes are absent from the first two collections of tantras.

I am presently working on translating all 17 tantras into English. When they are published, if they are published, it is quite likely I shall insist that they can only be made available to those people who have received at minimum either the Vima Nyinthig or Khandro Nyingthig empowerments or equivalents, and the complete lung for the seventeen tantras themselves. They will also cost a lot of money. Please do not ask me for them, I am not presently distributing them to anyone so I will just ignore you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Yudron said:

Jim Valby was kind enough to send me a CD of the 17 main Dzogchen tantras input into Wylie. My intention is to eventually use Tibet doc to change them into u-chen. I have not proofed any against the original yet.

I really appreciate his generosity.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking I use the Adzom Chogar recension for convenience, but I have found that in many respects the Tsham Brag recension of the 17 to be more accurate, at least when it comes to comparing root text with commentaries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

Sönam said:

and there is a precise tempo, wether slow

(http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/files/SOV_SLOW.pdf) or fast

(http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/files/SOV_FAST.pdf) ... it is not supposed to be sung otherwise.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are being a little too rigid there, Sonam. Even ChNN does not sing SOV the way Adriano has transcribed it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

heart said:

]

I don't either think its positive, it is a sign of the degenerate times we live in.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense -- it is perfectly fine. The more people who see the video the better. The words of SOV are liberation through hearing all by themselvs, no matter how good the melody, etc.

M

heart said:

yeah, and the video is also a fine piece of art.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is pretty silly, but harmless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

heart said:

No, the melody ChNNR sing the SoV is actually part of the terma which he received from Ekajati, if I understood correctly.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, the melody for SOV first came to ChNN in a dream when he was eight years old --no connection with his later Ekajati terma, which is connected with Mandarava.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

Sönam said:

It seems you all agree to say it's a positive thing ... sorry, I don't, and it is not insignificant too.

mutsuk said:

I don't think it's positive either. I would have preferred a perfectly sung version of the traditional melody with someone with a nice, extra nice and deep voice. That is something practitioners would love to have and it would easily sustain contemplation...Any good (DC traditional) recording around ? I have a CD from the DC dating back to the 1990s but the sound is ugly and the voice is... too loud (to close to the mikes).

heart said:

I don't either think its positive, it is a sign of the degenerate times we live in.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense -- it is perfectly fine. The more people who see the video the better. The words of SOV are liberation through hearing all by themselves, no matter how good the melody, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

mutsuk said:

... the traditional melody ...

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "traditional" melody of the Song of the Vajra. Prior to ChNN's transmission, this melody did not exist in any human dimension.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Chinese language and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

The translators had to accommodate all these preconditions in order to convey the purport and function of texts.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you have an obligation to read the guy's book before you comment much further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Females who achieved rainbow body

Content:

mutsuk said:

No they are pretty much different, in terms of "waves of blessings" and capacity to liberate others.

Malcolm wrote:

Here rlabs means " nus pa dang, mthu stobs kyi tshad,...nus rlabs dang ldan pa,...phan rlabs chung ba,...'phrin las rlabs chen,...gom pa rlabs can,...las chod rlabs che ba" not "chu sogs 'gul skabs byung ba'i gnyer ma,...chu rlabs,...rba rlabs,...rlabs mthon por 'phyur ba,...rlabs ris med pa.."

Thus bying rlabs has the connocation of "conferring power..." etc., which is characteristic of its Sanskrit corollary: adhiṣṭhānam

mutsuk said:

I know, I 'm not translating byin-rlabs as wave at all, but referring to the degree of the power of the byin-rlabs.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, I just see a lot of translators doing that based on a false etymology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Females who achieved rainbow body

Content:

mutsuk said:

No they are pretty much different, in terms of "waves of blessings" and capacity to liberate others.

Malcolm wrote:

Here rlabs means " nus pa dang, mthu stobs kyi tshad,...nus rlabs dang ldan pa,...phan rlabs chung ba,...'phrin las rlabs chen,...gom pa rlabs can,...las chod rlabs che ba" not "chu sogs 'gul skabs byung ba'i gnyer ma,...chu rlabs,...rba rlabs,...rlabs mthon por 'phyur ba,...rlabs ris med pa.."

Thus byin rlabs has the connotation of "conferring power...." etc., which is characteristic of its Sanskrit corollary: adhiṣṭhānam

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Chinese language and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

For native Chinese readers the Chinese translations generally conveyed the meaning of the original text.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, I think the thrust of the point is that they were not successful in this project, and therefore, Chinese Buddhism evolved along lines dissimilar to contemporary Indian Buddhism during the same period.

It is hard for you to tell, since you have been educated into Buddhism via western Buddhological hermeneutical criteria and you read Chinese Buddhist material through the lense of an understanding heavily modified through a century of comparison of Chinese texts with Sanskrit and Tibetan.

Nevertheless, I also think Mutsuk is overstating the point, since there are a number of commentaries and small number of sutras that passed through Chinese on their way to Tibetan which are regarded as important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Chinese language and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

Tibetan texts are not necessarily superior to Chinese translations.

Malcolm wrote:

They are generally superior, even from a diachronic perspective that includes textual evolution.

viniketa said:

Superior meaning 'more accurate'...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, more accurate. It is an accurate conceit that nevertheless Sino-Japanese scholars find annoying. But anyone who learns Tibetan and can compare with the Chinese will readily allow that there are advantages to Tibetan translations absent in Chinese translations where an original text cannot be recovered for comparison.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Chinese language and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

Tibetan texts are not necessarily superior to Chinese translations.

Malcolm wrote:

They are generally superior, even from a diachronic perspective that includes textual evolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

My suspicion is that Potala is the same as Tirumala mountain, and that the statue of Venkateswara is actually that of Avalokiteśvara.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

username said:

Potala mountain.

Malcolm wrote:

Potala, Avalokiteśvara's buddhfield, is in South India:

<http://buddhisma2z.com/content.php?id=317> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return

false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Females who achieved rainbow body

Content:

arsent said:

It looks like she did!

Malcolm wrote:

Nope:

<http://www.treasuryoflives.org/biographies/view/Ayu-Khandro-Dorje-Peldron/13139> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And:

"Near the twenty-fifth, without any sign of illness, we found that she had left her body at the time she would normally be finishing her meditation session. She remained in meditation posture for two weeks and when she had finished her tugdam, her body had become very small. We put some ornaments on it and many many people came to witness it.

"In the second month on the tenth day, we cremated her. There were many interesting signs at the time of her death. There was a sudden thaw and everything burst into bloom. It was the middle of winter. There were many ringsel and, as she had instructed, all this and her clothes were put into the stupa that she had prepared at the Sakya monastery."

I, Namkhai Norbu, was given the little statue of Jamyang Khentse Wongpo and a volume of the Simhamukha Gongter and her writings and advice and spiritual songs. Among her disciples there were few rich and important people; her disciples were yogis and yoginis and practitioners from all over Tibet. There are many tales told about her, but I have written only what she herself told me. This is just a little biography of A-Yu Khadro written for her disciples and those who are interested.

Since ChNN personally was present at her cremation, I don't think we can consider that she attained rainbow body.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Sang offerings

Content:

philji said:

During a sang offering, should the emphasis be on offering all that is wonderful and precious etc to the 4 guests or of offering our own negative emotions and defilements for purification?

Malcolm wrote:

The former and never the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Opening Lha Kang

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

With the striped shirt?

So which one are you?

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Sangha Yungdrung Rignga Ling Netherlands.jpg

After some time our Lha Kang named Yungdrung Rignga Ling was opened on the 26-08-2012 by our Geshela Khorden Lhundup Gyaltsen.

Everybody was very happy that our Geshela blessed our Lha Kang.

Now we have a Sangha and a good filled program.

A Geshela, is like the head of the body.

Witout the head the body is death.

Mutsog Marro

KY

Tashi delek,

On the photo i am the second from the left side.

Mutsug marro

KY

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Opening Lha Kang

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which one are you in the picture?

So which one are you?

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Sangha Yungdrung Rignga Ling Netherlands.jpg

After some time our Lha Kang named Yungdrung Rignga Ling was opened on the 26-08-2012 by our Geshela Khorden Lhundup Gyaltzen.

Everybody was very happy that our Geshela blessed our Lha Kang.
Now we have a Sangha and a good filled program.

A Geshela, is like the head of the body.
Without the head the body is death.

Mutsog Marro
KY

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

Perhaps Norbu Rinpoche is teaching more from a mengagde POV even when teaching Longde and Semde.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has said that all he teaches in general retreats is trekchö many times -- so don't ask him to teach it.

Pero said:

What is "it"?

Malcolm wrote:

Trekchö

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

Perhaps Norbu Rinpoche is teaching more from a mengagde POV even when teaching Longde and Semde.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has said that all he teaches in general retreats is trekchö many times -- so don't ask him to teach it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Opening Lha Kang

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So which one are you?

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Sangha Yungdrung Rignga Ling Netherlands.jpg

After some time our Lha Kang named Yungdrung Rignga Ling was opened on the 26-08-2012 by our Geshela Khorden Lhundup Gyaltzen.

Everybody was very happy that our Geshela blessed our Lha Kang.

Now we have a Sangha and a good filled program.

A Geshela, is like the head of the body.

Without the head the body is death.

Mutsog Marro

KY

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

mutsum said:

The Zhai lhakhang (Zhwa'i lha khang) where the 17 Tantras were rediscovered...

Malcolm wrote:

Does that still exist?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

by lineage i meant is there a list that goes back to Garab Dorje or the Omniscient One Longchenpa?

oldbob said:

Don't know.

My take (47 years with the Tibetans) is that ChNN Rinpoche is Garab Dorje and the Omniscient One Longchenpa.

Don't need the list.

ob

Malcolm wrote:

According to the dgongs pa zang thal cycle of teachings there are three basic lineages: the long kama lineage; the short treasure lineage, the very short direct lineage i.e. samantabhadra, vajrasattva, one's guru. Of these three, the latter is the most critical.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Ok, what about most sacred Dzogchen site outside India?

Malcolm wrote:

IMO, Samye and Samye Chimphu in Tibet, as username alluded to before, as well as the many caves where Guru Rinpoche etc., did practice in Central Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 31st, 2012 at 10:46 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

Yudron said:

Since most contemporary Dzogchen practitioners base their practice on a terma text of Guru Rinpoche, all the many sacred places of Guru Rinpoche would be appropriate pilgrimage places. In addition to that, Longchenpa and Jigme Lingpa wrote or discovered what are today the most important explanatory texts of the tradition, so the

places they walked and practiced would be very significant.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless the most sacred site for Dzogchen practitioners is Vajrasana at Bodhgaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 31st, 2012 at 10:44 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhgaya.

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Any specific connections to Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 31st, 2012 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Consciousness as just a sticker.

Content:

Nothing said:

Words are just words, it is the meaning behind them that matters most.

However the question is still a valid one.

Malcolm wrote:

A meaning separate from words cannot be meaningfully discussed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 30th, 2012 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Consciousness as just a sticker.

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Jyoti:

Consciousness is not composed of concept, so it cannot be prove or dis-proven by concept. There is no buddhist teaching high or low that is not based on the consciousness as the basis.

(I separate this topic)

So for you, it is clear that consciousness is not just a sticker. For you, if I take out the sticker, I will still be able to see this unnamed consciousness.

Do you know that in 12 links dependent, no. 1 is ignorant, no. 3 is consciousness?

You should see there, because you have ignorant, then you can have consciousness.

If you don't have ignorant, you won't have consciousness.

But our position is different, regardless there is ignorant or know, consciousness is always there.

You remove the sticker, but you hold the unnamed basis as unnamed consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of tallying up rabbit horns, shearing the hair of turtles, and breastfeeding children of barren women.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 30th, 2012 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Bonzhik Khyungnak the first Tibetan Tulku

Content:

Tilopa said:

What I should have said is " maybe, who cares and does it really matter? "

Malcolm wrote:

For Bonpos, a much unfairly maligned and disenfranchised group of Tibetans, yes, it matters quite a lot.

Apparently it mattered enough for you to comment upon it, in the typically dismissive mode so many Tibetan Buddhists have towards Bon.

If you don't care, why even comment at all?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Bonzhik Khyungnak the first Tibetan Tulku

Content:

Sherlock said:

Rongzompa was recognised even earlier as an incarnation of an Indian guru by Atisa IIRC, Bonzhik Khyungnak might be the first recognised Tibetan reincarnation of a Tibetan lama though.

Malcolm wrote:

It is unlikely Atisha actually met Rongzom, but barring that detail, he was held to be an incarnation of Krishnacarya.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 10:41 PM
Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:
Content:

DarwidHalim said:
There is no Madyamaka there, there is no Dzogchen there, there is no Mahayana there, there is no Theravada there. Why should we care about it?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 9:48 PM
Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:
Content:

Andrew108 said:
Then there are those who teach themselves from books and become their own teachers..

Malcolm wrote:
[Serious note] Those sort of people do not achieve rainbow body, or any much, for that matter.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 9:45 PM
Title: Re: Bonzhik Khyungnak the first Tibetan Tulku
Content:

dzoki said:
Well Marpa was recognized as an incarnation of Dombi Heruka

Malcolm wrote:
Posthumous recognitions in Namthars written centuries later hardly count.

What Achard is alluding to is that this is the first textual account we have of a Tibetan being recognized as the reincarnation of a previous [realized] Tibetan Lama.

Just as, for example, Bonpos count their treasure tradition earlier than the Buddhist treasure tradition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 9:42 PM
Title: Re: Bonzhik Khyungnak the first Tibetan Tulku
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

The identification marks him as perhaps the first tulku in any Tibetan religious tradition

Tilopa said:

Yeah right, OK, sure, whatever.....

Malcolm wrote:

While no doubt I am the author of many a rude and uncalled for remark, this was rude, uncalled for and disrespectful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

Huseng said:

We might end up with a situation like in India where most people can't really afford to eat meat (even if they wanted to) and live mostly on lentils and simple carbohydrates like roti or rice.

Malcolm wrote:

That was the situation in North America during the 19th Century. Meat was scarce for many people; chicken and turkey were luxuries because they require grain feed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

username said:

I know, I was agreeing with what you were saying to people. Dzogchen masters try to explain that view in concepts as much as possible though finally it has to be experienced for proper realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, agreed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.elephantjournal.com/2012/08/if-you-eat-meat-you-should-know-what-this-looks-like/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

“This particular steer was bought at auction when it was a calf, after buying the steer, paying for the guy to slaughter and deliver it to the butcher, then paying the butcher, the end cost was about \$2/pound. The cheapest hamburger goes for about \$3.50/lb where I live. He grazed for about 9 months before he was killed.

We now have a few cows and there's a bull that visits when they want a gentleman caller. Last year we kept a calf from one of the cows and just had him slaughtered in June. Cost on that one was just over \$1/lb. I've been told that the quality of the meat is on par with the organic free-range grass fed beef you'd find in high end grocery stores for upwards of \$15-\$20/lb. I've never bought that kind of meat so that's just hearsay...

Grass is cheap, you don't get as much meat and they grow slower, but the meat is lean and delicious. Also the cattle don't seem to get sick when you're not loading them up with grain and regular animal feed, so vet costs are few and far between.

We split the meat with another family since one steer produces a lot. I share some with my family and put the rest into a chest freezer at -10 degrees, it lasts 9 months easy, the ground beef will go a year pretty easy. If it gets too close to being too old we have a big BBQ to use up anything that's at the limit. I also have a lot of it sliced for jerky, probably 20lbs or so out of each steer ends up as jerky...

Once you go grass fed the meat from the store will taste really funny. It's got a much meatier flavor, for lack of a better word. Also leaner, and the fat that it does have has a much better flavor. This steer was split between 2 families, a total of 4 adults and 7 kids. It yielded around 320 pounds of meat which lasted about 6 months.”

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

username said:

I don't think any view can be %100 without concepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen "view" means being in the state of contemplation, that is what i was getting at.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The difference in view in the three series is not conceptual, it is experiential.

heart said:

Experience have a tendency to be expressed conceptually in general, I think that might be true for all the nine yanas actually.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Those expressions are not the experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhgaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:

Content:

oushi said:

Great example. I will try it next time.

How about developing short and fast answer for sunyata addicts, that will easily extinguish their enthusiasm?

Tarpa said:

Sure, tell them to stand in front of a train, since the train, movement, and the person standing in front of it don't exist there should be no problem

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is actually being called "being run over by one's own ignorance"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Or the other one is that there is no killing since there is no soul and anyway, we don't exist. There is no person, animal, being to kill. And the animal, human, being will be reborn, so you can't kill him anyway.

Such rubbish could justify a small killing to even a genocide.

Which of course is poetic nonsense as the Buddha clearly mentioned how all beings suffer and feel pain and how we should not cause them pain or death.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha was merely speaking to those who are ignorant of their own non-existence. Once they understand they do not exist, they will cease to feel any pain. Remember, after all, you only feel pain if you are ignorant. Even that ignorance of course is merely a convention, just like Buddha, in which case we can be free of any struggle at all, now that we have discerned that since neither Buddha nor suffering exist we can all relax... Prasanga Beer!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

it is acceptable to eat meat from an environmental point.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what anyone is saying. It is not acceptable to eat grain fed meat.

David N. Snyder said:

You are advocating pasture raised cattle for slaughter. This is not realistic, especially in a growing population. As Huseng mentions, the population densities are rising. What pasture is available in Bangladesh, for example?

Malcolm wrote:

It is more realistic that McMansions with five acres in subdivisions where even gardening is prohibited, much less raising fowl.

If you want to understand the issues around Indian agriculture, read Vandana Shiva and Annam Bhrama: Organic Food in India. Also read Fatal Harvest if you really want to know how screwed up the industrial agriculture system is. Going vegetarian won't fix it.

In our own country, as I said, massive agricultural reforms to stimulate small farms all over is what is needed to forestall any food supply crises.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

it is acceptable to eat meat from an environmental point.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what anyone is saying. It is not acceptable to eat grain fed meat.

It is also not necessary, or would not be necessary since Government regulations in the US, and so called food safety laws (which are actually unsafe) make it impossible for farmers to butcher steers, fowl and so on on their farms.

The Food Gestapo in the USA make alternatives to large-scale feedlot etc., production prohibitive.

Food production is one area where we need much, much less regulation than what is currently in place, and smarter, scalable regulation so that small producers are not regulated out of entering the market.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Ok we all can agree that

Mengagde nyingthig / yangti >>>>other Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

If you cannot understand it, man ngag sde is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, long sde is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, atiyoga is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, anuyoga is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, mahayoga is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, yoga is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, upa is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, kriya is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, the bodhisattva yāna is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, the śravaka and pratyekabuddha yanas are completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, the vehicle of tirthikas is completely useless
If you cannot understand it, even the vehicle of gods and men is completely useless.

Therefore, the supreme vehicle for you is the one you can understand and practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:

Content:

conebeckham said:

My son's name is Karma....as to how he works, well.....

He's a recent graduate. Need I say more?

Malcolm wrote:

In reality you do not have any son. Why, because if you had a son, then your son must have inherently arisen, but since there is no inherent existence your son cannot have arisen. Since there is no arising, you do not have any son, because it is impossible that there can be any arising. And we all know that this is what prasanga says, and even that does not say anything...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

yang ti is part of man ngag sde.

SSJ3Gogeta said:

oh yes thats right.

yangti thinks its higher than the innermost secret cycle though.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really; everything in yang ti is in snying thig and vice versa, including dark retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Everything I've seen presents upadesha (mengagde) as the best class.....better than longde or semde.

Actually thats not true, because yangti class claims its even higher?

Malcolm wrote:
yang ti is part of man ngag sde.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 12:04 AM
Title: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Example:

Q: How does karma work?

A1: Karma means intention and what results from intention

A2: There is no karma because karma is just a name...

Conversation sputters and dies and or goes off into long irrelevant screeds about "prasanga" madhyamaka, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 11:42 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Pero said:
Because of the fact that several methods for recognizing rigpa in mengagde are the same in semde and longde (or vice versa) I see no reason to think it is different across the three series.

Malcolm wrote:
Ok, whatever you like to beleive.

Pero said:
But why do you think it's different (without bringing thogal in the mix)?

Malcolm wrote:
You just answered your own question. There is also the fact that sems sde does not result in rainbow body.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

Because of the fact that several methods for recognizing rigpa in mengagde are the same in semde and longde (or vice versa) I see no reason to think it is different across the three series.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, whatever you like to beleive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

But if there is a difference in view it should amount to something.

Pero said:

To what do you mean?

Of course I'm not saying there aren't any differences, there certainly are, but rigpa is the same throughout the three series. This is IMO undeniable.

As for the view, I actually don't find the views contradictory but then the explanations of the various views of the three series are not that clear to me. It could be I'm just not smart enough to understand it.

heart said:

In general the way the views are defined in all the nine yanas are quite abstract and to understand them fully I think you have to have a deep knowledge of Buddhist philosophy. Still, the whole idea is that the view gets more and more refined and less conceptual. Even within the Mengakde there are the four cycles that have views that are described in this way as increasingly subtle non-conceptual. Even if it always, even in the lower yanas, it is the same rigpa that we recognize it is obvious that we later might define it conceptually as this or that. I think for example that this is the essential meaning of Karma Lingpas terma translated by John Reynolds as "Self-Liberation Through Seeing with Naked Awareness".

Thank you for the article, it was interesting.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The difference in view in the three series is not conceptual, it is experiential.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 7:06 AM
Title: Re: the drajyor macabre
Content:
conebeckham said:
Hey Malcolm-

Isn't that Manual of Standard Tibetan focused more on colloq.? I've not seen it, but reading the blurbs leads me to believe it's more about spoken Tibetan....??

Malcolm wrote:
It is not exclusively focused on colloquial.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 2:15 AM
Title: Re: World must go vege.
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Grass fed (i.e.natural) beef does not require any grain at all. The solution to food shortages is decentralized intensive small farming.

M

Dave The Seeker said:
I agree with you on this point, but the acres needed to produce beef is pretty significant. One must have enough acres to rotational graze as the previously grazed pasture recovers. As well as for us in the north, where there is winter, a supply of food stuffs to accommodate the months of no growing.
Also the weather plays a significant role as well. This year has shown the proof of that with the drought like conditions all over the US. Without proper water there will be no grass to graze on.

We'll see how the beef prices soar soon. As I know many feed lots that are reducing their animal count due to grain prices going through the roof right now, and still climbing. As well as hay, highest prices in over 10 years, and other sources of fodder not doing well because of weather and the fuel costs to get these products to the feed lot. Beef is becoming too expensive to produce. The cost in the market goes up, but the producers price barely sees an increase.

Malcolm wrote:
Such are the perils of farming. But the gross misuse of industrial agriculture just make it all worse and more perilous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

Nemo said:

40% of corn in the USA is used to make ethanol fuel. That is 1,537,500,000,000 pounds of corn. Enough to feed 1,404,109,589 people a pound of corn three times a day. This percentage will continue to grow by legal mandate. Canada pays over 200 million a year in subsidies in a similar program IIRC. If we stopped using food for fuel we have enough already. These programs have made corn too expensive for Mexicans(ironic as corn comes from and is the main staple of Mexico) who then buy rice. Rice goes up in price and people start starving. I think the powers that be are fine with starving a few hundred million to death by the end of the decade. Going veg is irrelevant if all the extra food is being burned in SUV's.

If you want to make things better you have to grapple with the Great Taboo. Free Market Capitalism. If global capital has no moral constraints the point is moot. Starving people with no money never appear on a corporations bottom line.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The five elements permeate all matter. They are a phenomenological observation about matter, about how we experience matter viz. solids, liquids, gases, heat and dimensionality. This is how they are defined even in Abhidharma, despite the naive atomism that is also found there.

M

Andrew108 said:

Why are they called 'elements'? The term doesn't seem accurate.

Malcolm wrote:

The actual term in Sanskrit is *bhūta*; in Tibetan, *'byung ba*. The meaning is something like "producer". We say "elements" because we don't have a very good English word for translating this concept. We use the term element from Latin "*elementum*" which means either "principle" or "rudiment" or "first principle, element, basic constituent...".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

oushi said:

Interesting thing happens when you approve such a person analysis, and even encourage him to elaborate more.

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamika bloviation is a common problem on this forum. Stick around long enough and you will likely agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

But then again the 5 element hypothesis is extremely limited (childish even). Scientists seem to have much more interesting and accurate explanations concerning what the universe is made of. Plus they just landed a one tonne mobile science experiment on Mars. I think they win.

Malcolm wrote:

The five elements permeate all matter. They are a phenomenological observation about matter, about how we experience matter viz. solids, liquids, gases, heat and dimensionality. This is how they are defined even in Abhidharma, despite the naive atomism that is also found there.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

Huseng said:

Take for example that you need something like 14 kilos of grain to produce 1 kilogram of beef. You could feed a lot more people with the grain than with the beef.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize of course that steers do not naturally eat grain (corn)?

Grass fed (i.e.natural) beef does not require any grain at all. The solution to food shortages is decentralized intensive small farming.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: the drajyor macabre

Content:

Yudron said:

Just memorizing the Tibetan alphabet will go a long way towards helping you pronounce things, although pronunciations are very regional.

Note: Your post seems to be about some text of the Dzogchen Community. The Dzogchen forum is for all Dzogchen people, so please either make DC posts to the DC thread, or be clear in the title of your post what you are talking about, e.g. this one could be "Struggling with English Phonetics for Tibetan Practice Texts" and include us all in.

Thanks.

Blue Garuda said:

Not meaning to be rude, so please take this in the right way - that's a daft idea.

Anyone is permitted to ask a specific question in the Dzogchen forum, including those by DC members about a DC topic.

The rest of DW is the same - staff run it that way.

Single topics do get buried in a huge thread like the DC one, which is very fast moving, and such a topic may be several pages back before even a day has passed.

What if you had a series of questions about your own Guru's teachings and practices - you'd lump the lot into one thread forever?

Unless you place all the topics related to each school in only one special thread as well, across the whole of DW, this is illogical.

Methinks you are being a little over-sensitive. If it isn't of interest to you, don't read it - simple.

Yudron said:

Well, I don't disagree with you that anyone can post on any topic.

I don't know what Tibetan words the "drajyor" refers too, but many Tibetan practices have the same abbreviated name, e.g. lanal for (one of thousands of) lama'i naljyos. Just put a clue in the title, e.g. "help sought with DC community drajyor", and this will be a much more welcoming forum. I'm not the most sensitive person in the world, so if I'm feeling it I'm sure others who are less verbal than I are feeling it as well.

I think everyone wants to be friendly, welcoming and kind, here. We just forget sometimes.

Malcolm wrote:

sgra sbyor meanings "putting sounds together" and is the name of ChNN's transcription system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to stick around a bit longer and observe...

oushi said:

You are probably right, I just wanted to say that the more you pressure madhyamaka proponent, deeper into elaborating he goes. Negation is a starting point of disagreement. Every concept is a sticker, truth is beyond words, so it cannot be tainted by words. Although, words can point to truth, so throwing them away is not wise.

Malcolm wrote:

It is just a practical observation -- I have observed again and again how people misuse madhyamaka analysis to engage in one-upsmanship on internet forums. It is very boring and not the purpose of madhyamaka analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

simhanada said:

FYi yantra is a secondary practice.

How do you understand the differentiation of main and secondary practices Malcolm?

As simple as Guruyoga and everything else?

Or as Magnus suggested Semde, Longde. Mannagde?

Where does Yantra and Dance fall under that schema?

Malcolm wrote:

The only essential practice is ate guru yoga. However, we cannot spend our whole life sounding A, so we have other practices too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Conventional truth is nothing more than just an opinion.

If this universe has substance, this universe cannot work.

Because it doesn't have substance, dependent origination can work.

Because it also doesn't have substance, by convention you cannot say this as such or such.

It is meaningless than to say that this universe is made of 5 elements + consciousness.

Why? Because it is nothing more than just a stricker.

A sticker.

Malcolm wrote:

You need detox from the crack of madhyamaka analysis because it makes a bore to converse with you.

oushi said:

By accepting DarwinHalim view, you would release his karma. By negating it, you create more of it.

This strong madhyamaka approach is not wrong, neither is it right. It is a ladder to no views. We should encourage people to climb it.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to stick around a bit longer and observe...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: the drajyor macabre

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Thanks Malcolm.

And you know what, I'm going to. Could you recommend some decent handbooks, please? I'm afraid I'll have to do it all by myself, at least initially; can't really afford private lessons.

Malcolm wrote:

Manual of standard Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Conventional truth is nothing more than just an opinion.

If this universe has substance, this universe cannot work.

Because it doesn't have substance, dependent origination can work.

Because it also doesn't have substance, by convention you cannot say this as such or such.

It is meaningless than to say that this universe is made of 5 elements + consciousness.

Why? Because it is nothing more than just a stricker.

A sticker.

Malcolm wrote:

You need detox from the crack of madhyamaka analysis because it makes a bore to converse with you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: the drajyor macabre

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Argh.

I've finally decided to teach myself to read drajyor correctly - ChNN stresses time and again that we should learn to pronounce Tibetan words in a way that is at least a bit related to the way they should be pronounced, and he's of course damn right. Enough of this silly pseudo-Tibetan chanting then, let's get down to business properly at last.

So I got meself the Drajyor book and the newly published Mantras and Invocations DVD/book combo, and started to analyse the drajyor transcriptions of the basic things we all know (or thought we knew) and love, such as the seven line prayer or Jigme Lingpa's puja, against the background of Rinpoche's reading them out slowly and clearly.

And it turns out that many of the rules spelled out in the drajyor book just don't make sense. If your apply the rules, you produce an utterance that as often corresponds to what ChNN actually says as it is way off the mark.

Has anyone tried to sort it out? Any guidance, any help? Are there any DOI handouts? A homebrew errata perhaps?

Help me, Dharma-Wheel. You're my only hope.

Btw, I don't speak or read Tibetan, of course, but I'm a philologist. Which is to say, if you want to, by all means get technical.

Malcolm wrote:
Just learn Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 8:27 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
heart said:
Just a small comment, I think when ChNNR says "main practice" he means Semde, Longde and Mengakde. Rushan and Semdzin are actually preliminaries to the Mengakde.
/magnus

simhanada said:
Cool, thankyou for the clarification

Malcolm wrote:
FYi yantra is a secondary practice.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 10:26 PM
Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?
Content:

DarwidHalim said:
Conventionally, we can assume there is substance. But, that is just agreement based on unfound bases.

Conventionally as well, we can assert there is no substance, because by convention you cannot find anything when you separate the things into the smallest size.

Malcolm wrote:
You don't really understand the meaning of "conventional" -- "conventional" means "prior to analysis" for Madhyamaka, whether Candrakirti or anyone else.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 8:46 PM
Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?
Content:

DarwidHalim said:

There is no substance in this universe, not even fire, water, earth, space, wind, and consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally speaking, even in Madhyamaka, the universe is made of five elements plus consciousness, the so called sadadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Music said:

Whatever that substance is.

Jyoti said:

Consciousness (the body) and the seed of consciousness (means). The five elements do not exist apart from consciousness, the manifestation of all phenomena internal and external is due to the perfuming of the various seeds within consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally speaking, even in Yogacara, the universe is made of five elements plus consciousness, the so called sadadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have also been told, in connection with the Tersar lineage that Drollo is considered something like the essence of Kilaya and when I talked with Shenphen Rinpoche, he confirmed that indeed, all the instructions from Namchag Putri concerning Dzogchen etc., were applicable to Drollo since there is no elaborate set of separate teachings on Dzogchen for Drollo.

dakini_boi said:

Is this the case also with tsa lung practices? I.E. the tsa lung from Namchag Putri being applied as completion stage practices for Dorje Drollo?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, precisely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

You can hear Americans from everywhere make statements about some branch of knowledge being useless.

Malcolm wrote:

You might, I never do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Malcolm in the past has said that my observation of these kinds of things is due to a limited experience of the US

Malcolm wrote:

we live in different countries. I don't live in the America you live in.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Having studied all of them except medicine, mathematics and logic are the most useful.

Of course this just means that particular people have particular affinities with different fields of study.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Adhyātma vidya means Buddhism i.e. the inner sciences.

Math does not really mean math as you understand it -- it means calculating calendars, mostly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Dzogchen

Content:

Sherlock said:

The recent Garuda donwang that ChNN gave seems to combine Hayagriva as well as Vajrakilaya too.

Malcolm wrote:

And Vajrapani.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Dzogchen

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=6781&hilit=DROLLO#p80925>

I understand Drollo can be used in the Thuns in place of Guru Tragphur.

Yudron said:

In most Dzogchen lineages, but not all, Drollo and Phurba are practiced separately. In your lama's terma tradition they are together.

Malcolm wrote:

Dragphur that is used in Dzogchen Community is actually a combination of Guru Dragpo, Kilaya, Hayagriva, Yangdag Heruka, Vajrapani and Garuda.

The principle of Dragphur is based on the so called "Son kilayas" of the Kilaya mandala, which is where the lower activities are concerned.

Most major cycles of terma have some form or another of a Tragpur yidam, including Dudjom Lingpa's termas.

Guru Dorje Drollo and Guru Dragpo are generally considered synonymous and often you see the mantra for Dragpo being used for Drollo Sadhanas. When I first receive the Dudjom Tersar tradition of Drollo from Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje, he explained the account of Guru Dragpo subduing Pehar. I have also been told, in connection with the Tersar lineage that Drollo is considered something like the essence of Kilaya and when I talked with Shenphen Rinpoche, he confirmed that indeed, all the instructions from Namchag Putri concerning Dzogchen etc., were applicable to Drollo since there is no elaborate set of separate teachings on Dzogchen for Drollo.

However, it is not the case Guru Dragphur is Drollo combined with Phurba -- ChNN never explains it that way. Dorje Drollo is Dorje Drollo; Guru Dragphur is Guru Dragphur.

They are more less the same in function. But they have different sources. According to ChNN, origin of Drollo is in Bhutan, where Drollo subdued the Bon deity Ati Muwer, and took her as his mount. The origin of Dragpo is Samye, where Guru Rinpoche subdued Pehar.

Further, the place of Paro Taktsang was the site of a tiger god worshipped by the ancient people living there; and Paro Takstang was hit by a flaming meteor which was taken as sign of that god. This ancient memory is referenced in the Padma Srogdrup sadhana of Dudjom Tersar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa Rinpoche and the Green woman?

Content:

illusionsgame said:

People like that need to be told to go sit.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not your business to condition people one way or another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Drollo is means total integration. When you are totally integrated, everything becomes your servant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Having studied them all, they are useful, especially medicine and adhyātma-vidyā

Huseng said:

What prompted you to study medicine? Was it a long-term interest or something that was sparked at some particular point?

Malcolm wrote:

I became interested in herbal medicine, and then the opportunity arose to study tibetan medicine. Glad I did.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

?

I seem to recall he wrote about her in PV but I'm not home right now and can't check.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but there are no practices in the DC that involve her specifically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

mirage said:

So far I fail to understand how such a thing can be explained without falling into indirect realism of some sort or whatever.

futerko said:

I'm not sure I follow you here, if anything, Buddhism appears to be a form of subjective idealism, at least at a "naive" level.

mirage said:

Most contemporary authors, including Lusthaus whose book I am currently reading, seem very much opposed to the definition of Yogacara as any kind of idealism. So far I do not understand how do they classify it themselves.

But yes, on my current (indeed very "naive") level Yogacara looks somewhat similar to subjective idealism. So, the question is: how can subjective idealism avoid sliding into solipsism (or at least "functional solipsism" - other minds exist, but they are entirely separate and do not interact with our mind)?

Malcolm wrote:

This has been accounted for: mutual traces project a common container universe. This is discussed in the Mahāyāna Saṃgraha at length. If you read that book, your question will be answered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

In ancient Mahāyāna there developed an appreciation for the five sciences (pañca-vidyā), a kind of extracurricular set of pursuits that a bodhisattva could pursue for the benefit of beings. They include:

- grammar and composition (śabda-vidyā)
- the arts and mathematics (śilpakarma-sthāna-vidyā)
- medicine (cikitsā-vidyā)
- logic-epistemology (hetu-vidyā)
- philosophy (adhyātma-vidyā)

This perhaps reflects a more intellectual side to Indian Buddhism, but nevertheless the idea is that if someone is able they can and should pursue such studies as it enables a practitioner to further understand and benefit the world while more efficiently operating within it. It may not be directly aimed at liberation, but such knowledges are still useful nevertheless.

So how do you personally feel about studying such subjects? Do you think they would be worthwhile? If you have studied them, do you feel it benefits you as a practitioner? Have you helped others as a result?

Malcolm wrote:

Having studied them all, they are useful, especially medicine and adhyātma-vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Huseng said:

The universe is a result of the collective karma of all beings.

Malcolm wrote:

That is what makes it [collective karma], but that is not what it is made of i.e. like a potter and clay.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

mirage said:

We have a very common example of the situation I am talking about: dreams. In dreams we interact with "people", but they are not sentient beings.

Huseng said:
Sometimes they are.

mirage said:
Maybe. But what matters in this case is that often they are not.

Malcolm wrote:
Only if you decide that the waking state is more real than dreaming, in which case you have sunk your whole position of doubt.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 10:49 PM
Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?
Content:
Music said:
Whatever that substance is.

Malcolm wrote:
The universe and everything it are made of six elements:

Earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 10:44 PM
Title: Re: Rebirth
Content:
Music said:
Wouldn't that mean each person is on a different level?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 10:34 PM
Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
You do not need to make it so complicated. We are communicating right now using words, via a print media i.e. body.

mirage said:
Oh, I do not know about that. I might as well be seeing a kind of a dream, and these words on my screen are just a bit of my karma manifesting, without any other sentient being involved. Probably good karma, but still.

Malcolm wrote:
Don't be silly, it simply a matter of conventional fact.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:43 PM
Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?
Content:
Gyalpo said:
Also many western monks do have photos in robes. Does it make them pretenders?

Malcolm wrote:
The difference, Gyalpo, is that for monks wearing robes is actually part of their vows. The same cannot be said of so called Ngagpas. I have read many fulfillment rituals, I never saw one where a Ngagpa needed to confess not wearing his or her religious gear.

But like Joe said, if you are in a Sangha where the teacher likes his students to wear such things, then it is better to please your teacher.

ChNN thinks such things are pretty ridiculous on westerners, so I don't wear such articles. I prefer the shamanic hippy look.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:36 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
underthetree said:
Slightly off the wall question:

Does ChNN Rinpoche teach a practice of Yeshe Tsogyal?.

Malcolm wrote:
Not that I am aware of.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:33 PM
Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?
Content:

mirage said:

But I find the question of intersubjectivity to be very relevant to the aims of Mahayana. If the ultimate aim is Buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings, then any Mahayana philosophy has to explain how beings can possibly interact with each other.

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained: body, voice and mind.

mirage said:

Sorry, but I do not understand how this answers the question I asked earlier - the example with Eiffel Tower.

Malcolm wrote:

You do not need to make it so complicated. We are communicating right now using words, via a print media i.e. body. If we were talking that would be voice, if we had advanced skills of clairvoyance, we could communicate mind to mind.

We do not need things like intersubjectivity and so on. They are rabbit holes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

futerko said:

The issue of epistemology focuses on the question of knowledge of phenomena which is less of an issue if one's focus of enquiry is the study of the structures of consciousness and the phenomena that appear in acts of consciousness.

Rather than the issue of objective knowledge, Buddhism enquires as the conditions for anything appearing at all - the focus is not about the truth "behind" appearances, but the truth about them.

mirage said:

But I find the question of intersubjectivity to be very relevant to the aims of Mahayana. If the ultimate aim is Buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings, then any Mahayana philosophy has to explain how beings can possibly interact with each other.

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained: body, voice and mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: essential tremor

Content:

Jikan said:

Essential tremor seems to run in my family. I have some symptoms sometimes; these are mitigated by avoiding excesses of coffee and staying present in the moment. I still get the shakes though.

what are the causes of this condition in TM? general advice?

Malcolm wrote:

Without seeing you in person, it is hard to say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is all explained pretty well in the Mahāyāna Saṃhāra, from a Yogacara perspective.

Madhyamakas in general accept the outer universe etc., conventionally speaking.

mirage said:

Thanks. Actually, if I am trying to develop the right view to understand Buddhist practice on a deeper level, is it worth it to investigate Yogacara, or should I go straight for Madhyamaka which is considered a superior school? On the other hand, Yogacara seems far easier to understand.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara is much more difficult to understand than Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Offering The First Portion Of Every Meal

Content:

ToddR said:

Hello, been a lurker here for a while but this is my first posting.

I've been wondering how others perform the offerings of the first portion of every meal to the three jewels. Is there a specific procedure that most follow? Also, when eating out, would you bring back the first portion and place it on the shrine?

Any help or comments would be appreciated.

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

You just offer the food before you yourself eat it -- this is called "offering the first portion".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Only in Yogacara. And even within Yogacara in India there were several different schools, half-eggists, true aspectarians, false aspectarians, etc.

mirage said:

Could you please recommend a book or an article, where Yogacara and Madhyamaka viewpoints are explained in a more-or-less accessible way?

Malcolm wrote:

Shared or like traces produce a common container universe.

mirage said:

I understand that similar traces would produce similar phenomena in different mind-streams. But wouldn't it actually just result in two "synchronized" mind-streams, meaning that being A would see phenomena corresponding to being B and vice versa, and they would seemingly interact, but in fact their mind-streams would remain completely independent? I recall reading something like that.

Another example: person A sees an Eiffel Tower, and person B sees an Eiffel Tower. This actually means that phenomenon a1, labelled "Eiffel Tower", appears in mind-stream A, and phenomenon b1, labelled "Eiffel Tower", appears in mind-stream B. Phenomena a1 and b1 are distinct. How are they connected? There is no thing-in-itself which would produce both a1 and b1, connecting them.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all explained pretty well in the Mahāyāna Saṃhāra, from a Yogacara perspective.

Madhyamakas in general accept the outer universe etc., conventionally speaking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

futerko said:

The idea of an existing thing-in-itself means something unchanging and eternal, and it is this that is disproven, but it does not then follow that phenomena do not appear whatsoever.

mirage said:

True, phenomena do appear, that is obvious. But phenomena appear within mind-streams, right (or mind-streams consist of phenomena, I do not know which is the more correct way to say it)? So we have mind-stream A, in which phenomena a1, a2, a3... appear, and mind-stream B, in which phenomena b1, b2, b3... appear. How are they related and in what manner a material inter-subjective universe can exist?

Malcolm wrote:

Shared or like traces produce a common container universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

mirage said:

But isn't it stated that everything that a being experiences is a result of a ripening karmic seed from that beings alayavijnana?

Malcolm wrote:

Only in Yogacara. And even within Yogacara in India there were several different schools, half-eggists, true aspectarians, false aspectarians, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

What words would you (or anyone else) use to describe the "feeling" of mindfulness from a Dzogchen perspective?

Malcolm wrote:

Mindfulness is just mindfulness -- it simply means that you know what you are doing when you are doing. For example, when typing a post, you know you are typing a post -- it is not different than any other form of mindfulness. The caveat only is that if you are a Dzogchen practitioner, than part of your mindfulness is informed by your discovery of your real nature.

Otherwise, there is no genuinely special form of mindfulness called "Dzogchen mindfulness".

Jeff said:

I agree that mindfulness is just mindfulness (when residing in mindfulness) and everything just feels "normal".

But, when for the first time experiencing (slipping into) mindfulness... Was there no "peaceful" feel of that "easy chair"? My experience has been a "growth" in being able to stay mindful (focused on the moment).

Malcolm wrote:

I suppose you could say there is a kind of a flowing experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

What words would you (or anyone else) use to describe the "feeling" of mindfulness from a Dzogchen perspective?

Malcolm wrote:

Mindfulness is just mindfulness -- it simply means that you know what you are doing when you are doing. For example, when typing a post, you know you are typing a post -- it is not different than any other form of mindfulness. The caveat only is that if you are a Dzogchen practitioner, then part of your mindfulness is informed by your discovery of your real nature.

Otherwise, there is no genuinely special form of mindfulness called "Dzogchen mindfulness".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

mirage said:

Hello everyone,

I am fairly new to Buddhism, so I have some basic questions.

As I understand, in Buddhist thought a sentient being is basically a mind-stream, i.e. a sequence of experienced states (I may be using wrong terminology here). These mind-streams are distinct - they are not all parts of a single universal consciousness, or something. This makes sense - if they were not distinct, we would all have the same experiences.

(I suppose this is a Yogacara position? Madhyamaka seems to be completely beyond me so far.)

My question is: how do sentient beings interact with each other? Because I am getting

the impression that in the described model interaction would be in fact impossible - and how would then Buddhas and Bodhisattvas aid other sentient beings and so on?

Malcolm wrote:

conventionally sentient beings are series of aggregates inhabiting a universe, even for Yogacara. They interact with their bodies and voices on the material level mostly; though some can interact directly through mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

Could you describe how it would be different? Does not a senior student feel light/divine love in the presence of someone who has attained Rigpa? (Divine love "feels" more like a combination of "peace" and "joy" than what we normally describe as romantic love.)

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Divine love?

Dzogchen is nothing like this. Its not like New Age love and light B.S.

Jeff said:

From a post by muni...

Tibetan teacher Tsoknyi Rinpoche describes the layers of self that cover over our "essence love," and the way that mindfulness reconnects us to our true nature.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dmEce-DxTYc> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

But he is not really talking about Dzogchen. What he is describing is from a common Mahāyāna point of view.

The Dzogchen approach to developing compassion is not to cultivate compassion through mindfulness and so on, observing how one feels, etc. The Dzogchen approach is based on discovering one's real nature. Once that is discovered, it is impossible not to have compassion for all sentient beings who are ignorant of their real nature -- that is "essence love".

However, SSJ3 is correct: Dzogchen is not connected with so called New age love and light trips.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

citta santana means "mind stream".

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

/

Right. But I meant - the mindstream is the bindu, correct? I.e. they aren't really different things?

Malcolm wrote:

In father tantra, bindu refers to vāyu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Jikan said:

a practical question on the hair commitment:

It seems to me from casual observation that many Tibetan men who keep this commitment do so with a simple topknot, and it's easy because they have so little hair. Let's say you're gifted in the follicle department: do you keep it in a topknot samurai style? braided and out of the way? or let it dread up for less maintenance? or might it make sense to keep it covered as the Sikhs do?

Blue Garuda said:

And what about the beard?

Malcolm wrote:

It is skra dbang -- there is no need for a beard. Beards are not skra. Skra is the hair on your head, only.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Jikan said:

a practical question on the hair commitment:

It seems to me from casual observation that many Tibetan men who keep this commitment do so with a simple topknot, and it's easy because they have so little hair. Let's say you're gifted in the follicle department: do you keep it in a topknot samurai style? braided and out of the way? or let it dread up for less maintenance? or might it make sense to keep it covered as the Sikhs do?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not matter how you wear your hair. A lot of Ngagpas in Tibet have dreads.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Greg said:

In fairness, it is not entirely clear how grahika and grahya could be nondual and yet cittasantanas are still multiple in some sense. One can also see how East Asian stuff like rocks and mountains having Buddha nature arose - if grahika and grahya are nondual how could they not?

Malcolm wrote:

Cittasantanas are real. Subject and object are not.

Greg said:

I'm still not clear as to how cittasantanas could be real and multiple without being subjects and objects of one another. Multiplicity and nonduality would seem to be mutually exclusive.

Malcolm wrote:

They can be subjects and objects of each other. This is specifically admitted in Yogacara theory. What does not exist is the apparent external world of subjects and objects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Please excuse the newbie question - I presume in Vajrayana 'citta-santana' is pretty much the same as 'bindu'?

Malcolm wrote:

citta santana means "mind stream".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Asceticism in TB and "The Middle Way"

Content:

Jnana said:

It doesn't matter what kind of teacher s/he claims to be. It's still a ridiculous characterization that doesn't at all describe the monks and nuns that I've known.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the whole statement by Rajneesh, and it has nothing to do with Bhikṣus, actually:

The more cultured and civilised the more dead. If you want to see perfectly dead men and yet still alive go to the monks in the monasteries, go to the priests in the churches, the Pope in the Vatican. They are not alive – they are so afraid of life, so afraid of nature that they have suppressed it from everywhere. They are already in their graves. You can paint the grave, you can even make a marble grave, very valuable – but the man inside is dead.

He is talking about Christian monasticism. Now, it still may not be an accurate statement, but nevertheless, the origin of the statement is in the context of a discussion of Chang Tzu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 at 10:36 AM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Greg said:

In fairness, it is not entirely clear how grahika and grahya could be nondual and yet cittasantanas are still multiple in some sense. One can also see how East Asian stuff like rocks and mountains having Buddha nature arose - if grahika and grahya are nondual how could they not?

Malcolm wrote:

Cittasantanas are real. Subject and object are not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

KeithBC said:

The traditional protection against such things is adherence to a traditional lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

Virtually all of the sexual misconduct I have heard about is in traditional lineages with traditional teachers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

Caz said:

With respect to Lama Phabonkhapa it would be fairly foolish to consider him sectarian when he incorporated the the Vajrayogini practice from the Sakya system.

Malcolm wrote:

It is proper to consider him sectarian based on the numerous grossly sectarian comments scattered in his collected works.

M

Caz said:

And yet when he taught he taught to all regardless of sect. But lets not get into the business of dragging Lama's names through the mud. Sectarianism to combat Sectarianism is still Sectarianism.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, it is called "making converts".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

viniketa said:

My point is that the ālayavijñāna seems to speak to 'dual existence' (in saṃsāra), while the vimuktikāyo is said to be dvidhādauṣṭhulyahānitaḥ, sa evānāśravo dhātur acintyaḥ kuśalo dhruvaḥ.

My understanding is that the ālayavijñāna contains bīja, vāsanā (karmic 'impressions') which provide 'initial conditions' for a continuum. But I do not find in the literature that those vāsanā, if bīja are 'nullified', have any effect on the process of āśrayasyaparāvṛtti, 'return to the basis'.

This is what I am finding confusing.

Malcolm wrote:

The transformation of the basis is the conversion of vijñāna to jñāna based on the eradication of the bijas.

The Mahāyāna saṃgraha contains a complete account.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

No offense taken. I think you will find the terms/experiences that I am describing are part of many paths.

Malcolm wrote:

There are experiences in the Dzogchen path that are shared. There are experiences in the Dzogchen path that are unique to that path. Rainbow body comes from the latter experiences, and not the former.

Jeff said:

That may well be true. Those are the differences that I have looking for.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, then, you need to find a Dzogchen master in whom you have faith, receive transmission and do whatever he or she says.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

viniketa said:

Thank you again, Joyti, for your reply.

I'm attempting to follow this discussion, so would like to back-up a bit...

malcolm said:

Correct, the Yogacara schools asserts an essence. This is why the Madhyamakas refer to them as "vastuvadins" i.e. realists. In other words, they are non-dualists because all phenomena of skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas are mind only. They are realists because they propose the existence of individual continuums.

viniketa said:

To which "Madhyamakas" does this refer, specifically?

Malcolm wrote:

All Indian Madhyamaka.

viniketa said:

Also, the "individual continuums", I assume, are ālayavijñāna?

Thanks in advance.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we can know this is so because Asanga, defending on the concept of ālayavijñāna asserts that it is the same thing as what is referred to in the "Nikaya" schools as the bhavaṅga-citta, the so called re-linking consciousness.

viniketa said:

Where, in Yogācāra literature, is the connection between ālayavijñāna and āśrayasya parāvṛttir?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna Saṃgraha, Trimsika, Yogacarabhūmi, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

Actually I'm referring to your statement about dzogchen "The basis described in Dzogchen has no essence, is not established in anyway, being originally pure. In other word, the basis in Dzogchen is kadag, emptiness free from all extremes. " Your argument just point back to your own statement rendering it as of duality.

You also criticize proponents of yogacara as realists and advice me to read which I did, but I don't see any, mind to provide the reason why you think it is falling on the side of existence?

Malcolm wrote:

All statements made are necessarily confined to language, all language is dualistic. If you wish to be in the realm of non-duality, then don't say anything.

You need to read more thoroughly and carefully.

But frankly, I don't see much point in continuing this conversation, since you are not here to learn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

No offense taken. I think you will find the terms/experiences that I am describing are part of many paths.

Malcolm wrote:

There are experiences in the Dzogchen path that are shared. There are experiences in the Dzogchen path that are unique to that path. Rainbow body comes from the latter experiences, and not the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

According to your logic, then the need to mention 'free from all extremes' mean such a doctrine is of 'duality, not free from extremes', then that would apply to your own view of dzogchen as well.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I never said that doctrine of Advaita was dualistic, merely that it fell on the side of existence. Likewise, Yogacara is a non-dual teaching, but it too falls on the side of existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Tsong Khapa, form realm shamatha and emptiness

Content:

Virgo said:

Just so you know, in Theravada, vipassana refers to actual moments of penetrative insight, not to techniques that may or may not bring vipassana about. Concentration is present with every arisen citta, so vipassana, including all stages of it, is possible at any moment. This is why non-meditators and even some who were not exactly upstanding citizens gained insight (became aryas) while listening to an explanation by Buddha, etc. For some people shamatha might be an aid because if done correctly it is kusala, or wholesome, and all kusala is an aid in wisdom.

Kevin

Tom said:

I am only slightly familiar with the Pāli tradition, however, I find the relationship between vipassana and Kuśāla and the semantic differences between Kuśāla and Puñña to be quite a fascinating topic. I think that understanding the difference between Kuśāla and Puñña sheds light on the roles of samatha and vipassana but that is a little controversial and takes us down a different rabbit hole ... anyways gotta run ...

Jnana said:

According to the Pāli Abhidhamma every skillful mind (kusala citta) includes both samatha & vipassanā.

Malcolm wrote:

Kusala is better translated as "positive".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The basis described in Dzogchen has no essence, is not established in anyway, being originally pure. In other word, the basis in Dzogchen is kadag, emptiness free from all extremes.

Jyoti said:

What is this kadag (emptiness) then, if an essence is nondual, there is no need to say 'free from all extremes'.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a need, precisely because Advaitan non-duality is not free from extremes, it is the extreme of existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Yes, many Gelug teachers are trying to make peace with this. No one can deny what is there in black and white in his collected works, and not just one volume. Malcolm can direct you to where to find it. (He sent the stuff to me and as my Tibetan improved I forced myself to read it).

In fact, I thank Malcolm for opening my eyes in this way because it caused me a lot of soul searching and helped me find my own way of coping in the very traditional Tibetan Buddhist settings in which I work and live. (Well, it was one of several factors but much appreciated).

History has so many lessons to teach us. Some of them are painful.

Malcolm, I am sure... And I would think you are probably right that it was Ngulchu Dharmabhadra's commentary. Do you think that most of the Sakya lamas would be willing to give someone like me an initiation, who has had it previously in Gelug? It would be nice to be able to take a broader range of teachings on it.

I would love to know what the things Phabongkhapa instituted are, but I am betting they are too detailed for discussion on a general forum.

Malcolm wrote:

Any Sakya lama would happily give you the dbang lung and khri of the Naro Khacho system.

Major changes Pabhongkha made was tossing out the introduction to Dharmata; and he made the Guru yoga section very complicated in a completely unnecessary way, he added offerings and so on that are not needed, etc. In other words, he tried to bring the sadhana into line with Gelug expectations of a Cakrasamvara sadhana.

Actually, one of the most important commentaries in Sakya on Naro Khacho was written by a Gelug disciple of Khyentse Wangpo.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to start providing citations -- and not just your so called "logic".

I don't care if someone is a Buddhist or a Hindu or whatever, but it pains me to see anyone so thoroughly misrepresent both traditions as you are doing here.

Jyoti said:

The mahayana scriptures don't specially mentioned this topic but the dzogchen scriptures and commentaries does provide some clues, with concept such as 'phenomena is mere appearance without an essence', the concept of 'existence of samantabhadra as unique', etc. I'm sure you don't need me to provide citation for these.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are going to assert that the intention of Dzogchen and Advaita are the same, then you need to provide side by side citations.

There is no point of course, because, for example, the Rig pa rang shar specifically refutes Advaita, naming Shankaracarya by name in the 25th chapter.

So what I am telling you is that even if you try to present citations from both Advaita and Dzogchen to try and illustrate their commonality, it will be easy to show how you are mistaken.

Sadly, many people make the same mistake you are making and come up with a system that is called "ra ma lug" in Tibetan i.e. a system that is neither a goat nor a sheep. How do they do this? By relying on their own intellectual contrivances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Even one Sakya lama praised some of the Gelug commentaries on VY but asked that this not be broadcast too widely!

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakya commentaries written Dharmabhadra and Thugkwan are fine in that they do not depart at all from the earlier Sakya commentaries. Pabhongakha instituted some novelties in his presentation of the system that earned some criticism by the present head of Sakya. It is for this reason that if you want to hear the Vajrayogini teachings from a Sakya Lama you must receive the empowerment from a Sakya lama.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

Caz said:

With respect to Lama Phabonkhapa it would be fairly foolish to consider him sectarian when he incorporated the the Vajrayogini practice from the Sakya system.

Malcolm wrote:

It is proper to consider him sectarian based on the numerous grossly sectarian comments scattered in his collected works.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

there is no contradiction to the advaita vedanta and dzogchen perspective of the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there are differences: deep and important differences. Only someone ignorant of the details of both with make such a ridiculous claim.

Jyoti said:

The basis (body) has no details more than what is describe here, only the means are much difference with the three but we are not talking about the means here.

Malcolm wrote:

Brahman, the basis if you will, of Advaita Vendanta, is described as sat, cit, ananda -- being, conciousness and bliss. It is truly existent, unproduced, unchanged over time, etc.

The basis described in Dzogchen has no essence, is not established in anyway, being originally pure. In other word, the basis in Dzogchen is kadag, emptiness free from all extremes.

You see, you are misrepresenting both traditions by claiming they have the same meaning.

This is not a difference in means, this is a difference in fundamental view.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

The body is similar but the means is different.

viniketa said:

Thank you for the answer, Jyoti. Are you saying that Advaita Vedānta is a further implementation of Yogācāra?

Jyoti said:

No. Yogacara did not specifically say anything about the root consciouness being a singularity or plural, neither did any scriptures of the mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to start providing citations -- and not just your so called "logic".

I don't care if someone is a Buddhist or a Hindu or whatever, but it pains me to see anyone so thoroughly misrepresent both traditions as you are doing here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

there is no contradiction to the advaita vedanta and dzogchen perspective of the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there are differences: deep and important differences. Only someone ignorant of the details of both with make such a ridiculous claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Jyoti said:

The root consciousness itself cannot be shared.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, that is why each individual sentient being possesses their own unique, unshared mulavijñāna.

Each sentient being possess the eight consciousness separately which are merely different names for the operations of vijñāna. It is similar with prāṇa vāyu -- the main vāyu functioning in the body is prāṇa; but it takes different names based on its action.

Likewise, each sentient being possess a vijñāna skandha: when it is described from the point of view of possessing traces, it is called the ālaya or mūlavijñāna; when it function through the six senses, it is called the six sense consciousness; when it incorrectly grasps a self it is called the kliṣṭamano-vijñāna, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Yudron said:

I'm not a scholar or translator, but I do feel that rigpa (vidya Skt) does not mean knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa, in all Dzogchen texts, is contrasted with Ma rigpa. Because of not knowing [ma rig pa] our real state we enter samsara. Through knowing [rig pa] our real state, we attain liberation.

M

Yudron said:

Of course we don't disagree -- it's just the word knowing IMHO is not the best because it implies a thought.

Malcolm wrote:

Thought is not a problem for one who has rigpa. It is only a problem for those who do not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

What happens in a Dzogchen master's transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

Not what you describe.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

If it does, then beings are not mere appearance but possessing real essence.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the Yogacara schools asserts an essence. This is why the Madhyamakas refer to them as "vastuvadins" i.e. realists. In other words, they are non-dualists because all phenomena of skandhas, dhātus and ayatanas are mind only. They are realists because they propose the existence of individual continuums.

Jyoti said:

And we have the problem of shared consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. This is why you need to read what Yogacara authors like Asanga actually say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: The latest academic thought on Dzog Chen and Mahayoga

Content:

conebeckham said:

Anything is possible when you're talking about Tibetan Hagiographies. In particular, writers have agendas--even academics have agendas, much less adherents and promulgators of various lineages.

But in the end, Naropa is a source of great blessings, and he is known widely as the "synthesizer" (or compiler, if you like) of the most famous Tibetan Tantrayana Completion Stage system known to the wide world, and is important not merely for the Kagyupas--as well as being the source of Sakyapas Vajrayogini. He is hardly "over-rated," regardless.

Malcolm wrote:

I think there is also a little competition happening here --because the Naro Khacho teachings in Sakya are always billed as "The teaching so special even Marpa didn't get it".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Male and female

Content:

Virgo said:

Is there Buddhist and/or medical reasons why children are born either male or female? What causes birth as a particular sex? Are people always born as one or the other successively over lifetimes or does it change?

Thanks for any responses.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

There are reasons connected with karma and with biology. Tibetan Medicine emphasizes the biological aspect more. If semen is more profuse, it will be a boy. If the

ovum is more profuse then it will be a girl. If both are in equal portion, then the child will be homosexual or intersexed.

M

JinpaRangdrol said:

I have never heard homosexuality as a result of equal virility of the essences. Only intersexuality. But it makes total sense! Is there a source where I can find more on the correlation? As a gay man, I'd be very interested to read more about TTM's explanation for sexual orientation.

Thanks so much!

JR

Malcolm wrote:

It is briefly explained in the chapter on conception in the explanatory tantra of the four medicine tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: The latest acadmenic thought on Dzog Chen and Mahayoga

Content:

Stewart said:

Elaborate on this please, I have never heard that Marpa never met Naropa.

Malcolm wrote:

In Sakya sources, it is reported that Milarepa himself never reported that Marpa had met Naropa in person. Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen expresses the opinion therefore, that Marpa indeed never met Naropa in person. Jetsun Rinpoche was born mid 12th century. The standard dates for Mila are 1052-1135.

Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen lived 1147-1216. He was teaching the Hevajra tantra by the time he was eleven. He had received Kagyu teachings from minor lineage holder from Marpa.

So the Sakyas have always maintained that Marpa never met Naropa in person, that he was a disciple only of Maitripa in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

Agreed. But, those are really not examples of what I meant by a "guru connection".

Malcolm wrote:
Then be more precise.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 5:50 AM
Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

There are broad commonalities in Dzogchen with common Mahāyāna view; commonalities with Vajrayāna as well; but the perspective of Dzogchen about the basis in terms of what is called sound, lights, and rays is unique to Dzogchen and not shared with other traditions -- though it is tempting to try and find connections.

M

Jeff said:
OK, one last question...

When you read the following statement...

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 179-182). Kindle Edition.

But such a being may manifest a body through which others can have the possibility of being helped. The Body of Light, or the Light Body of a being who has realized the Great Transfer, are both phenomena which can be actively maintained so that those having the visionary clarity necessary for perceiving them can communicate with the fully realized individuals whose bodies find themselves in a dimension of pure light.

... You do not think this communication is the same/similar as what is experienced between a Guru and an advanced student?

Malcolm wrote:
Depends on the tradition, the guru, and the student.

Receiving shaktipat from a Kundalini guru, for example, or satsang with an Advaita, etc., or Dokusan from a Zenmaster has nothing at all to do with a direct introduction from a Dzogchen master. They are not even in the same ballpark. Different principles, different practices, different experiences, different results.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

As stated previously, I was just attempting to point out what I believe to be universal components.

Malcolm wrote:

There are broad commonalities in Dzogchen with common Mahāyāna view; commonalities with Vajrayāna as well; but the perspective of Dzogchen about the basis in terms of what is called sound, lights, and rays is unique to Dzogchen and not shared with other traditions -- though it is tempting to try and find connections.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Yudron said:

I'm not a scholar or translator, but I do feel that rigpa (vidya Skt) does not mean knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa, in all Dzogchen texts, is contrasted with Ma rigpa. Because of not knowing [ma rig pa] our real state we enter samsara. Through knowing [rig pa] our real state, we attain liberation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

My point is that different paths describe similar things with different words. This is often because the various perspectives driven by the time and culture.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case you would be mistaken since you know next to nothing about Dzogchen.

Jeff said:

Making the 5 elements of your body dissolve into light can be "translated to" Ascending into heaven.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it can't. It has nothing to do with going to heaven, or anything like that.

Jeff said:

I will stop. You continue to miss my point. I am not trying to define that there is a "heaven". Only that to an educated person, seeing a body dissolve into light could be described as "ascending into heaven".

Malcolm wrote:

And you continue to miss mine i.e. you actually don't understand what is being discussed here in the Dzogchen forum, whatever else you may properly understand elsewhere.

And as to your point, you won't see anyone actually dissolving into light. At most, you would observe a shrinkage of the physical remains of a person.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

ngodrup said:

Dudjom Rinpoche, Jigdral Yeshe Dorje said this quite clearly in his Dzogchen View of Ngondro.

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, Ngondro *is* the practice of Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Rinpoche, Namkhai Norbu, says this very clearly in every retreat. If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, Guru Yoga is the practice of Dzogchen.

They are saying the same thing -- way of proceeding is a little different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

My "Bet" is that if you were in the presence of someone who had attained Rigpa you would "feel" an overwhelming sense of "peace" (if you were not yet able to connect as Chogyal Namkhai Norbu describes).

Malcolm wrote:

You would lose that bet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

My point is that different paths describe similar things with different words. This is often because the various perspectives driven by the time and culture.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case you would be mistaken since you know next to nothing about Dzogchen.

Jeff said:

Making the 5 elements of your body dissolve into light can be "translated to" Ascending into heaven.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it can't. It has nothing to do with going to heaven, or anything like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

I fail to see the point of the above comment other than to politely say that I don't know what I am talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

When it comes to Dzogchen, yes, you have no idea what you are talking about.

If you are interested in Dzogchen, you should connect with a Dzogchen master.

Saying that there is one truth and different paths is meaningless in this context. Without connecting with the transmission of Dzogchen, and applying it in your life you will never understand what Dzogchen is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

Thank you for your words. I believe the above is exactly what I have said in this thread and in the "Guru Yoga" thread. I have just attempted to describe it in experiential (and simple) terms.

I will also check out your book recommendation.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not something that you arrive to on your own. It depends on transmission from a qualified master.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

Could you describe how it would be different? Does not a senior student feel light/divine love in the presence of someone who has attained Rigpa? (Divine love "feels" more like a combination of "peace" and "joy" than what we normally describe as romantic love.)

Malcolm wrote:

No. Not at all. There is no "vibration" that you will feel emanating from someone who has genuine knowledge of the state of Dzogchen.

I suggest you read Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, and become a little more educated about this subject.

I cannot educate you from the ground up. However, I can supply you with a couple of citations:

When a master teaches Dzogchen, he or she is trying to transmit a state of knowledge. The aim of the master is to awaken the student, opening that individual's consciousness to the primordial state. The master will not say, "Follow my rules and

obey my precepts!" He will say, "Open your inner eye and observe yourself. Stop seeking an external lamp to enlighten you from outside, but light your own inner lamp. Thus the teachings will come to live in you, and you in the teachings."

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 179-182). Kindle Edition.

Ordinary beings are reborn without choice, conditioned by their karma into taking a body according to the causes they have accumulated over countless past lives. A totally realized being, on the other hand, is free from the cycle of conditioned cause and effect. But such a being may manifest a body through which others can have the possibility of being helped. The Body of Light, or the Light Body of a being who has realized the Great Transfer, are both phenomena which can be actively maintained so that those having the visionary clarity necessary for perceiving them can communicate with the fully realized individuals whose bodies find themselves in a dimension of pure light.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. The Crystal and the Way of Light: Sutra, Tantra and Dzogchen (pp. 162-163). Kindle Edition.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

In Dzogchen, is not the rainbow body something noticed/seen by another? One "reaches the point" where the radiating of light can be "seen". In Dzogchen, I had thought this was part of attaining Rigpa. (But, I apologize in advance, my specific knowledge of Dzogchen and terms is very limited.)

Malcolm wrote:

Ordinary people cannot perceive rainbow body.

It is called "rainbow body" because the five elements revert to their original nature as the five wisdom lights. But this light is not photons -- it is called "light" but it is not physical light.

M

Jeff said:

Agreed. That is why I put words like "seen" in quotes.

Seeing is a product (or conversion) of the mind. It would be better to say that it can be "felt" by one with an open heart. In other transitions it is described as "an outpouring of divine love".

Malcolm wrote:

Rainbow body, or the body of light is something very precise in Dzogchen teachings. It is not something felt by people with open hearts, etc.

It is a very specific result of a very specific type of practice called tögal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

In Dzogchen, is not the rainbow body something noticed/seen by another? One "reaches the point" where the radiating of light can be "seen". In Dzogchen, I had thought this was part of attaining Rigpa. (But, I apologize in advance, my specific knowledge of Dzogchen and terms is very limited.)

Malcolm wrote:

Ordinary people cannot perceive rainbow body.

It is called "rainbow body" because the five elements revert to their original nature as the five wisdom lights. But this light is not photons -- it is called "light" but it is not physical light.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Jyoti said:

If one witness from a subjective angle, a being other than the witness is awakened, his awakening is of appearance only in term of the witness. It does not affect the purification of the witness's own alaya. On the other hand, if one witness one's own awakening, it does not affect the karma of other beings, since other beings were of mere appearance without an actual basis that is connected to one's own state.

Malcolm wrote:

You still have not solved the problem. You are speaking about this being and that being as independent continuums. This is only possible if each being's ālayavijñāna is separate,

etc (which is of course the actual position of the yogacara school).

You just keep chewing away at this logically, and you will arrive at the position of Asanga and Vasubandhu -- or you could simply do yourself a favor and actually read what they say. Start with the Mahāyāna Saṃgraha.

Ok, I am finished with this conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

They are both just different terms to describe the high level development of the energy/light body. With an "energy" approach, the feeling refines from periodic heat/vibrations in parts of the body, to the full body, to full 24/7, then to the full body at a cellular level (atomic). With a "meditation" approach, often one does not notice the energy until it starts "radiating" beyond the body and at that point, it is already so "refined" that it "feels" like light.

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing to do with Dzogchen teaching on rainbow body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The fault of this reasoning of course is that when one sentient being purifies the mulavijñāna, then all would be liberated.

M

Jyoti said:

Karma persist for beings with ignorance, but these are not view as impure by oneself who were awakened.

Malcolm wrote:

If this theoretical single mulavijñāna is purified, there is no possibility of ignorance for anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Jyoti said:

by Malcolm » Mon Aug 20, 2012 12:06 pm

Jyoti wrote:

Just as within a dream, appearances of people seems to have their own individual mind streams, but they are not real, only deceptively exist as appearance only. What make a dream environment possible is not due to multiple consciousnesses, but the consciousness of your own which is not share by anyone else. Similary in reality, all phenomena is manifestation of a single consciousness.

Malcolm:

This is Vedanta.

Jyoti:

This is not a problem on the position of definitive meaning.

Malcolm

Yes, it most certainly is. Moreover, since you are a fan of Yogacara, you should be aware that while Vasubandhu, for example, rejects outer objects, he defends the existence of sentient beings possessing distinct and unique mental continuums.

In other words, yogacara does not propose that the appearance of other minds is illusory -- in fact, when you read the Mahāyāna Samgraha, for example, by Asanga, he shows quite clearly that it is because of shared traces that we all perceive the same container world. In other words, for Yogacara, individual minds are real, but not their appearances.

I think you need to correct your understanding of Yogacara.

BTW, this is off topic for this thread, you should continue this in either the academic forum or somewhere else, but not in this thread.

M

I can merely discuss the matter itself based on my own understanding on the topics.

1. "for example, rejects outer objects, he defends the existence of sentient beings possessing distinct and unique mental continuums".

The alaya-vijnana stored the mental traces of others as well as those of our own, in other words, beings are not really exist outside of this single root consciousness.

2. "for example, by Asanga, he shows quite clearly that it is because of shared traces

that we all perceive the same container world. In other words, for Yogacara, individual minds are real, but not their appearances. "

Being the content (traces) of the singular consciousness, of course these traces were shared, otherwise there is no means nor basis for such sharing to occur. The individual minds are real as one's own since both are equal as being contained within a single consciousness.

jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

The fault of this reasoning of course is that when one sentient being purifies the mulavijñāna, then all would be liberated.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 12:06 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Jyoti said:

Just as within a dream, appearances of people seem to have their own individual mind streams, but they are not real, only deceptively exist as appearance only. What makes a dream environment possible is not due to multiple consciousnesses, but the consciousness of your own which is not shared by anyone else. Similarly in reality, all phenomena is manifestation of a single consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

This is Vedānta.

Jyoti said:

This is not a problem on the position of definitive meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it most certainly is. Moreover, since you are a fan of Yogacara, you should be aware that while Vasubandhu, for example, rejects outer objects, he defends the existence of sentient beings possessing distinct and unique mental continuums.

In other words, Yogacara does not propose that the appearance of other minds is illusory -- in fact, when you read the Mahāyāna Saṃgraha, for example, by Asaṅga, he shows quite clearly that it is because of shared traces that we all perceive the same container world. In other words, for Yogacara, individual minds are real, but not their appearances.

I think you need to correct your understanding of Yogacara.

BTW, this is off topic for this thread, you should continue this in either the academic forum or somewhere else, but not in this thread.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

humanpreta said:

Is the nirmanakaya buddhafield in one of samsara's realm? i.e.: formless.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not a formless realm and no it is not part of samsara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

sorry i keep asking these repetitive questions.

just tryna get a good understanding.

thanks for the clarification.

peace

Malcolm wrote:

No worries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Tönpa Shenrab Miwoche is from a 14th century terma?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

By the way, if anyone thinks I am undermining Bon, Sam van Schaik does a similar treatment on Guru Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

The earliest formal accounts of Tonpa Shenrab as a Buddha are from the Mdo 'dus and the Zer mig which both are termas revealed in the 11th century. However, there were 18 Bonpo Tertons before Shenchén Lugah.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Mandala Offering in Ngondro

Content:

Sopa Yutso said:

Thank you, now it is all clear...

Malcolm wrote:

The universe has not yet been put up for sale, so it is still without an owner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

OK. That's the vernacular, but you mentioned 'all samayas'. In DI the samaya encompasses all others, so presumably breaking it also breaks all others?

In terms of the Ngagpa, is it correct to assume they all practice Dzogchen, or do the Gelug Ngagpas not do so? (I was told there was a Gelug Ngagpa ordination, but I've not managed to confirm this.)

Malcolm wrote:

The term sngags pa is pretty general and loose.

The probable early origin of it had to do with the fact that serious Buddhist upasakas in India typically wore white. This custom was transferred to Tibet. Because in Tibet there was no context of a wider Buddhist society, upasaka mantra practitioners came to be respected along with the monks. It was never the case that in India there was a so called "sngags pa" sangha. The sngags pa class of practitioners evolved from the circumstances of Tibetan society. So, your so called sngags pa was originally a Buddhist upasaka who practiced tantra.

Later on when the Chö tradition was evolving, alongside of this there evolved a kind of Buddhist sadhu in Tibet called a chöpa. The present day hair empowerment tradition largely is derived from chö.

These days there are many people who are told by their teachers to where stripped robes, etc., and they call themselves Ngagpas too. Also the garb of different sngag pa colleges vary -- there really isn't a set thing.

There is no sngags pa tradition in Gelug. It exists only in Nyingma. The only Ngagpas in Sakya are the Khon, and their tradition is Nyingma as well. The Kagyus don't really have ngagpas in the same way as the Nyingmapas. They have Togdens and Repas (also another kind of Buddhist sadhu). In general, the term Ngagpa has come to mean "serious tantric practitioner who is not a monk", much like its original usage. The idea that ngagpas have to follow monastic vows is a very debatable point of view --but it comes from the approach to the nine yānas found in root Anuyoga tantra, Dupa'i Do.

ChNN does not emphasize a chatechistic approach to samaya where you are behaving like a hinayāna practitioner, obsessed with the details of one's vows.

Samaya means "being together". So in this case it refers to your relationship with the teachings, teacher, fellow students, and ultimately all beings. If you treat other people like shit, if you are rude to them without cause, etc., then you have made mistake. Also we often do not understand when we have broken a samaya so it is pointless to obsess about the vows. There are hundreds and thousands of samayas. So, we just do Guru yoga.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, you still receive all samayas. There is no "samaya" free transmission.

Blue Garuda said:

Is there a brief definition of 'samaya' which applies here?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that you keep good relations with your teacher and fellow students, and you don't blab about secret practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

need help clarifying with the term infinite potentiality and the symbol of the mirror.

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

The term "infinite potentiality" refers to the primordial state's capacity to allow any form at all to appear within it.

The mirror means your primordial state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

I'm talking about someone who just receives straight up Direct Introduction ala ChNN.

I'm pretty sure such people have sex with non-practitioners.

So would this be allowed?

Malcolm wrote:

Right, you still receive all samayas. There is no "samaya" free transmission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

xabir said:

'Thusness' asked me not to talk openly about his realizations in terms of bhumi (not that he rejects such maps). It is not good to tell people 'I am such and such bhumi' (it often carries lots of baggage) but it is ok to discuss one's experience/realization as it is.

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Its funny that 'Thusness' thinks he is on any bhumi at all.

Atleast Adyashanti has a Zen lineage. 'Thusness' is just a fraud.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think we really need to be discussing this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Jyoti said:

Just as within a dream, appearances of people seems to have their own individual mind streams, but they are not real, only deceptively exist as appearance only. What make a dream environment possible is not due to multiple consciousnesses, but the consciousness of your own which is not share by anyone else. Similary in reality, all phenomena is manifestation of a single consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

This is Vedanta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Also receiving direct introduction is connected with samaya.

SSJ3Gogeta said:

yes but only one, as opposed to 14 root and 8 branch samayas.

Malcolm wrote:

No, also these other samayas applys.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone who recieves an anuttarayogatantra empowerment already has the 14 root and 8 branch samayas.

M

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Then its best not to take such empowerments, and just get Direct Introduction?

I know I'm changing the subject.

Malcolm wrote:

Also receiving direct introduction is connected with samaya. But if you are a ChNN student, you just worry about how he teaches it and don't worry about the rest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

byamspa said:

shrug. I was told to wear mine in practice situations, so I try to do that as practical. If yours was causing problems, I can see that it would be just as practical to put it aside too.

It might slightly dharma-psycho-somatic or something, but I think it helps me focus on what I'm doing when I wear it.

Malcolm wrote:

I merely keep my hair long. You would just think I was some hippy. I don't wear any religion clothing of any kind. It is not necessary for me.

byamspa said:

we all do what we gotta do. I have my instructions that I follow to the best of my ability.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. Sometimes if it is cold, I might use a blanket. Then I kind of look like a fat blond guy wearing a native blanket.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

There are two suttas that describe nibbana as consciousness (vinnana) eternal (anantam) and everywhere (sabbato) aka omnipresent. And another that also calls it eternal (dhuvam). So it's hardly sketchy to refer to Nibbana as eternal. You yourself previously pointed out the dharmakaya is eternal as in the Mahayana Parinirvana Sutra. This has nothing to do with the Pudgala theory. There is simply a distinction being made between the conditioned vs. the unconditioned consciousnesses. Underlying everything is consciousness, meaning, it is the final analytic. And it is already beyond existence and non-, per the analysis of the 12-links. So I think Garchen Rinpoche and Jeff are right; it is due to the nature of consciousness being all-pervasive that Guru Yoga can have its effect.

Malcolm wrote:

Any consciousness by which one describing the Tathagata would describe him: That the Tathagata has abandoned, its root destroyed, made like a palmyra stump, deprived of the conditions of development, not destined for future arising. Freed from the classification of consciousness, Vaccha, the Tathagata is deep, boundless, hard to fathom, like the sea."

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.072.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

For the supported there is instability, for the unsupported there is no instability; when there is no instability there is serenity; when there is serenity there is no inclination: when there is no inclination there is no coming-and-going; when there is no coming-and-going there is no decrease-and-arising; when there is no decrease-and-arising there is neither "here" nor "beyond" nor "in between the two." Just this is the end of suffering.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/kn/ud/ud.8.04.irel.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

There is, bhikkhus, that base where there is no earth, no water, no fire, no air; no base consisting of the infinity of space, no base consisting of the infinity of consciousness, no base consisting of nothingness, no base consisting of neither-perception-nor-non-perception; neither this world nor another world nor both; neither sun nor moon. Here, bhikkhus, I say there is no coming, no going, no staying, no deceasing, no arising. Not fixed, not movable, it has no support. Just this is the end of suffering.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/kn/ud/ud.8.01.irel.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

byamspa said:

shrug. I was told to wear mine in practice situations, so i try to do that as practical. If yours was causing problems, I can see that it would be just as practical to put it aside too.

It might slightly dharma-psycho-somatic or something, but i think it helps me focus on what im doing when i wear it.

Malcolm wrote:

I merely keep my hair long. You would just think I was some hippy. I don't wear any religion clothing of any kind. It is not necessary for me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

heart said:

Yes, sure. You know any such community?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I don't mean like place with a gate and land, I mean a society of practitioners who live near each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A real sngags pa (mantrika) is someone whose mantras actually work.

As such, they are the Tibetan equivalent of brahmins, and often belong to family lineages. Like traditional brahmins they wear white, have long hair, are married and are responsible for the ritual life of their communities.

heart said:

Yes, indeed. My Guru also said several times said that we should be able to show "some result from our practice" if we dress like that. Even though I am a Ngakpa I have doubts about what Ngakpas could or should be here in the west. The picture you paint here Malcolm would certainly only work in a Buddhist society.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Well, within a community of practitioners it would work just fine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

ngodrup said:

Seems there's another category, the ngakpa who is ordained as such. At least this exists in the Nyingma.

I think it's going to be a case by case analysis when talking about ngakpas who also happen to be western-- just the same as it is with those ngakpas from traditionally Buddhist countries. On top of that there are various lineages of ngakpas and their style of practice varies.

Quite a few are practitioners of Dudjom Tersar, or Longchen Nyingtik, or Chang Ter; but then there are dratsangs that practice several lineages and follow distinct traditions.

heart said:

It isn't actually an ordination, like the ordination to become a monk/nun, it is an empowerment. You can call it an elaborate Samaya if you like.

/magnus

Blue Garuda said:

There is often formal ordination based on tantric samayas.

Malcolm wrote:

Sort of -- this is a kind of a Ngagpa by fiat sort of thing. It has nothing to do with a real sngags pa empowerment which is called a skra dbang, a hair empowerment.

If you are a real sngags pa then you receive the hair empowerment; and the most common tradition these days is Dudjom Tersar.

In point of fact that hair empowerment is intimately connected with the uncontrived conduct of a Dzogchen practitioner.

Everyone who receives an anuttarayogatantra empowerment already has the 14 root and 8 branch samayas. Receiving them again in a special ceremony along with a Zentra is just sort of a formality.

Actually, each item of Ngagpa "gear" has very profound meaning and points to a realization possessed or aspired to.

And finally, one's hair is empowered as a mandala of dakinis, so it can never be cut or trimmed -- because to do so would invite a punishment by dakinis for destroying their home.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A real sngags pa (mantrika) is someone whose mantras actually work.

As such, they are the Tibetan equivalent of brahmins, and often belong to family lineages. Like traditional brahmins they wear white, have long hair, are married and are responsible for the ritual life of their communities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

He is citing a parallel with Buddha's discourses, not a distinction.

Malcolm wrote:

A parallel, yes, but with a distinction. You are overlooking the distinctions.

deepbluehum said:

Sure, there's a small distinction being made in context. The Buddha never asserts an unchanging individual atman; that's obvious. That's not what's important. What's important is that he never specifically refutes Upanishadic notions. That's number one. Number two, he does assert nibbana as an being eternal consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Buddha never says that. This is why there is so much discussion about it among various schools. He never comes right out and says, anywhere at all that "Nirvana is an eternal consciousness". This is the reason why, for example, the Sautrantikas can say that nirvana is a non-existence, etc. Why? Because they reject the speculations of the Abhidharmikas, and based themselves strictly on what the sutras say. Since the Śravaka sutras do not say explicitly this, we then have divergent schools of thought arising about what the Buddha meant.

deepbluehum said:

There's no getting around that. Number three, even if you assert an unchanging atman, if you assert a changing atman superimposed on the unchanging one, and the unchanging one merges into Brahman when the changing one ceases, then you have, in sum and in function, an identical theory with Buddhist liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you beleive in your first assertion.

deepbluehum said:

You would have what would amount to a distinction without a difference. This is what I've been pointing at in these recent threads, that all the profusions of Buddhist diatribe amounts to endless distinctions without a functional difference. And that is why you have the functionality of Guru Yoga which functions almost identically to the same procedure in Hindu tantric systems.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if your intitial premise is true. However, your initial premise is an gross overstatement not grounded in fact; rather it is grounded in a sketchy interpretation of one statement in the Tripitika. It is similar to the Pudgalavadins who try to prove, based on one or two statements, that Buddha taught the existence of an inexpressible person [pudgala] who is neither the same as nor different than the aggregates who nevertheless transmigrates.

Like their position, there is not sufficient evidence to support your present claim. It is definitely not sufficient for making argument about principles of Guru Yoga. Guru Yoga is simply a method of recognizing and abiding in the nature of the reality that your Guru introduces and nothing more.

On another note, it certainly would be nice if everyone was in a state of ekacitta -- then all these pointless conversations would cease.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:14 AM

Title: Re: Tönpa Shenrab Miwoche is from a 14th century terma?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/96594534/Bellezza-Shenrab> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

[

He is citing a parallell with Buddha's discourses, not a distinction.

Malcolm wrote:

A parallel, yes, but with a distinction. You are overlooking the distinctions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Sometimes you have to let things stand. The passage means what it says.

Malcolm wrote:

You have misread -- see pg. 94, section 6.9:

"...though it is clearly seen as not having any metaphysical self/ ātman as an underlying support, as does the transmigrating ātman"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I think it's more correct to say that the basis in gzhan stong (Shentong) is "Buddha Nature," which is not EXACTLY equivalent with emptiness, at least according to Dolpopa's presentation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is exactly emptiness precisely in the fashion that I described it, even in Dolbuwa's presentation.

conebeckham said:

I think there's a subtle point here. Shentong does say Buddha Nature is "Emptiness," but also discusses a basis beyond conceptual mind. This is from the POV of post-equipoise dialectics, though--I agree that the meditation is the same. "Prasangikas," that Tibetan invention, do not discuss a "basis" at all.

Yes?

Malcolm wrote:

No, they do discuss a basis. That basis is emptiness.

"Where emptiness is possible...", etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The Upanishads were not in full bloom then. Even in Upanishadic tradition, the atman is not seen as unchanging. Harvey and Werner recognized this when commenting that Buddha was not rejecting Upanishadic notions. There is a definite symbiosis going on here.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chandogya, which defines Atman as permanent and unchanging, predates the Buddha by three or four hundred years, as does the Brihadarayanaka.

deepbluehum said:

As Harvey notes from Werner's analysis, the Buddha is only refuting an unchanging personality structure that could be called atma. An unchanging Unconditioned Atma is okay, Harvey also notes, Buddha describes Arahats as men of developed Atma. So Buddha is not refuting the Upanishadic notions at all.

Malcolm wrote:

The Upanishads are not proclaiming a personality structure as atman.

The Buddha clearly rejects an atman that is one of the five aggregates, all of the five aggregates, or separate from the five aggregates.

I see little ground to support the notion that Buddha supported the notion of a Self.

Harvey's discussion is very nuanced, and very precise, and to understand it, you will agree, one must read the whole text thoroughly and carefully because it is easy to be misled in the middle if you have not got all the way to the end.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

This is yet again another Hindu/ Advaitin view, which is wrong view in all yantras of Buddhism.

Jyoti said:

This view is of definitive meaning that has only one yana, that is the mahayana, regardless of tradition.

Malcolm wrote:
The proper term is Ekayāna.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:04 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?
Content:

deepbluehum said:

The Upanishads were not in full bloom then. Even in Upanishadic tradition, the atman is not seen as unchanging. Harvey and Werner recognized this when commenting that Buddha was not rejecting Upanishadic notions. There is a definite symbiosis going on here.

Malcolm wrote:
The Chandogya, which defines Atman as permanent and unchanging, predates the Buddha by three or four hundred years, as does the Brihadarayanaka.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:02 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?
Content:

deepbluehum said:

You're right except when Buddha said in DN 11, MN 49 and Iti 43, that Nibbana is an eternal consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:
No, these passages do not state that nirvana is an eternal consciousness. If they did, Buddha would just be a Vedantin following the Upanishads.

deepbluehum said:

Two words:

Dhuvam,
Anantam,

These mean eternal.

One word:

Vinnana,

Means consciousness

So perhaps he is an Upanishadic Vedantin. As much as the exclusivism of Buddhism has allured me, it's not supported. It's something I've had to take time to accept. But, read 'em and weep.

Malcolm wrote:

Anantam just means limitless (an+anta); it does not mean eternal.

Dhuvam can mean permanent, but more often is understood as continuous:

Dhuva

Dhuva (adj.) [Sk. dhruva, cp. Lith. drúta firm; Goth. triggws=Ohg. triuwi (Ger. treue, trost); Ags. tréowe= E. true, of Idg. *dheru, enlarged form of *dher, see dharati] stable, constant, permanent; fixed, regular, certain, sure D i.18; S i.142; iv.370; A ii.33; J i.19; v.121 (° sassataṇ maraṇaṇ); iii.325; Bu ii.82; Miln 114 (na tā nadiyo dh -- salilā). 334 (° phala); Vism 77; DA i.112 (maraṇaṇ apassanto dh.), 150 (=thāvara); DhA iii.170 (adhuvaṇ jīvitaṇ dhuvaṇ maraṇaṇ); ThA 241; Sdhp 331. -- nt. permanence, stability M i.326; Dh 147. Also Ep. of Nibbāna (see ° gāmin). -- nt. as adv. dhuvaṇ continuously, constantly, always J ii.24=Miln 172; PvA 207; certainly J i.18, v.103. -- adhuva (addhuva) changing, unstable, impermanent D i.19 (anicca a. appāyuka); M i.326; S iv.302; J i.393; iii.19 (addhuva -- sīla); VvA 77.

-- gāmin leading to permanence, i. e. Nibbāna S iv.370

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Malcolm, The previous two posts skirt the issue. What quality do both possess the one can see it in the other and thereby see it in themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Kadag, lhun grub and thugs rje, the three inseperable wisdoms of the basis.

deepbluehum said:

Dzogchen is almost unabashedly Vedantic in its functional procedures, which is why you were very defensive of Vedism previously, it take it. I could be wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't defending Vedism because it has something to with Dzogchen. I was pointing out that Vedic culture has had much valuable knowledge to contribute to the world, regardless of how brahmins may have behaved. Your focus is on the power and privilege

issue; my focus is on such thing as Ayurveda, Yoga, etc. We are really not talking about the same thing when we talk about "Vedism".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

You're right except when Buddha said in DN 11, MN 49 and Iti 43, that Nibbana is an eternal consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

No, these passages do not state that nirvana is an eternal consciousness. If they did, Buddha would just be a Vedantin following the Upanishads.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Take Dzogchen direct introduction, for example. The guru has to "get into that state," otherwise you can't. How is it possible someone can recognize the guru's state without a pervasive continuity?

Malcolm wrote:

Just as two different dharmas, for example, two instances of fire, possess the same dharma, for example, heat; likewise two different sentient beings also possess the same state without the need for some ontically established pervasive continuity.

deepbluehum said:

Heat is something you can feel and transfer from one thing to the next. How does the student feel the state or what is transferred?

How do the sounds of the Song of the Vajra emanate directly from Samantabhadra, if nothing is there?

Malcolm wrote:

We are not really discussing Dzogchen -- we are discussing your speculations about Śravakayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Take Dzogchen direct introduction, for example. The guru has to "get into that state," otherwise you can't. How is it possible someone can recognize the guru's state without a pervasive continuity?

Malcolm wrote:

Just as two different dharmins, for example, two instances of fire, possess the same dharmatā, for example, heat; likewise two different sentient beings also possess the same state without the need for some ontically established pervasive continuity.

deepbluehum said:

Heat is something you can feel and transfer from one thing to the next.

Malcolm wrote:

Just as two different dharmins, for example, two instances of water, possess the same dharmatā, for example, pellucidity; likewise two different sentient beings also possess the same state without the need for some ontically established pervasive continuity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Jeff said:

I would argue that everyone has equal access to everyone else's mind (body), but their perspective is obstructed.

Malcolm wrote:

Obstructions =lack of access.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Take Dzogchen direct introduction, for example. The guru has to "get into that state," otherwise you can't. How is it possible someone can recognize the guru's state without a pervasive continuity?

Malcolm wrote:

Just as two different dharmins, for example, two instances of fire, possess the same dharmatā, for example, heat; likewise two different sentient beings also possess the same state without the need for some ontically established pervasive continuity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I was being a little coy. We don't all share one conditioned mind. But the unconditioned is shared, just like the space in the pots. So it doesn't mean same features. Otherwise how could he read their minds and be of "one mind." I think you are reading more into it than is there. It's quite plainly stated.

Malcolm wrote:

We simple do not understand this passage the same way. No point in discussing it further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

... the simile of Indra's Net from the Avatamsaka Sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

FYI, the origin of the Indra's net metaphor is found in the Atharva Veda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, this simply means that their individual continuums were freed of boundaries, not that there is only one mental continuum sharing three bodies. In other words, they have equal access to each other's mind, etc.

And it certainly does not mean that we are all just of one mind.

"eka" not only means "one" but can mean "same" in the sense of identical in feature i.e.

this pot is the same as the pot, they are identical pots. See one, see all, etc.

So I think you are reading something in that passage that is not there.

M

Jeff said:

Maybe we have a semantics issue... In non-duality, how would "equal access to each other's mind" (body) be different?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, they do not have the same type of access to other people's minds and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I forgot I read Harvey already. He underscores that the suttas do not really deny a Self. He points to the same clauses I did to support that.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read it again. He does not state what you just said.

deepbluehum said:

Check the quoted passage I just posted. "One citta." We are one.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this simply means that their individual continuums were freed of boundaries, not that there is only one mental continuum sharing three bodies. In other words, they have equal access to each other's mind, etc.

And it certainly does not mean that we are all just of one mind.

"eka" not only means "one" but can mean "same" in the sense of identical in feature i.e. this pot is the same as the pot, they are identical pots. See one, see all, etc.

So I think you are reading something in that passage that is not there.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This "consciousness without feature" is the one-sided samadhi of cessation the Lanka-avatara asserts Arhats fall into, from which they are aroused to begin the Bodhisattva path.

Jnana said:

You remember, of course, that Nāgārjuna uses a version of the passage from DN 11 in his Ratnāvalī. There are also other sources, such as the Kāśyapaparivarta Sūtra, which describe the mind as being "anidarśana," etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is true. He uses the passage in the course of deconstructing the idea of an integral self.

Nāgārjuna commonly uses Agama passages to illustrate points the Nikāya schools and Mahāyāna hold in common. He also asserts in the Ratnāvalī that the teachings in the Sravaka canon are unable to bring one to Buddhahood.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I forgot I read Harvey already. He underscores that the suttas do not really deny a Self. He points to the same clauses I did to support that.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read it again. He does not state what you just said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

Sherlock said:

Changchub Dorje didn't realise rainbow body; besides Uncle Togden, it was Ayu Khandro.

Malcolm wrote:

CCD did realize rainbow body. Ayu Khandro did not realize rainbow body:

"Near the twenty-fifth, without any sign of illness, we found that she had left her body at the time she would normally be finishing her meditation session. She remained in meditation posture for two weeks and when she had finished her tuggedam, her body had become very small. We put some ornaments on it and many many people came to witness it.

"In the second month on the tenth day, we cremated her. There were many interesting signs at the time of her death. There was a sudden thaw and everything burst into bloom. It was the middle of winter. There were many ringsel and, as she had instructed, all this and her clothes were put into the stupa that she had prepared at the Sakya monastery."

I, Namkhai Norbu, was given the little statue of Jamyang Khentse Wongpo and a volume of the Simhamukha Gongter and her writings and advice and spiritual songs. Among her disciples there were few rich and important people; her disciples were yogis and yoginis and practitioners from all over Tibet. There are many tales told about her, but I have written only what she herself told me. This is just a little biography of A-Yu Khadro written for her disciples and those who are interested.

<http://www.khandro.net/book-womenofwisdom.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You just need to connect with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and not look back. He is the only teacher alive today that I know of who had two masters achieve rainbow body in this life.[/quote]

I know one is Changchub Dorje Rinpoche, who is the other?

thx[/quote]

His Uncle, Togden Rinpoche.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

username said:

Actually as I said before we consider all (17 historic) Hinayana schools such as Theravada (plus Mahayana ones) Buddhist but they do not consider Mahayana as buddhists & all of them consider Vajrayana not buddhist. This is much much worse than calling a path within Buddhism lower or higher or slower or faster, that was never answered here. If Hinayana establishment centers announce Mahayana as buddhists or both of them announce we Vajrayana followers are buddhists then they have made a Leap from the dark ages.

Jnana said:

Speak for yourself. This "us" vs. "them" dichotomy is not nearly as black and white as you seem to want it to be in order to justify your trip.

username said:

What a few say is irrelevant as official announcements from various establishment centers of both Hinayana & Mahayana sects, all of them, is required but this will never come. This is the real outrage & elephant in the room people like Reggie never answer & divert from by apparent emotions.

Jnana said:

Yes, it's a messy world.

Malcolm wrote:

He/she does have a point, Geoff.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I will see the text you cite. Generally, I'm familiar with the arguments. The Lanka-avatara sutra's claim about this makes no sense vis a vis the Buddha's assertions that they attain parinibbana. There wouldn't be someone to wake up. It is exactly the samadhi Buddha had when he passed. I don't really believe the Lanka-avatara sutra. As for it not being rigpa, as it is the opposite of avijja, it is vijja, vidya, aka, rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

If your standard for evidence is going to be a Pali sutra, all you will wind up with is a śravakayāna view. The śravaka canon does not present a complete picture. It is oriented towards people who merely want to escape.

"The ultimate of the lower is the relative of the higher"
--Shantideva.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 4:21 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?
Content:

deepbluehum said:
It says in the Kosha that color is form. It is not a materialist position. It is part of nama-rupa.

Andrew108 said:
It's saying that color is a form in dependence on the skandhas and the skandhas are?

deepbluehum said:
Andrew, please don't be pedantic. Just say what you want to say.

Skandhas are dependently arisen...

You will not do away with my point with this line of reasoning. The "consciousness without feature" is not dependently arisen.

Malcolm wrote:
That does not make it "pan" or "universal".

Each and every person who attains cessation experiences that continuum independently. Peter Harvey wrote quite a good book about this where he carefully goes through all the Pali sources.

The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism

I highly recommend it.

This "consciousness without feature" is the one-sided samadhi of cessation the Lanka-avatara asserts Arhats fall into, from which they are aroused to begin the Bodhisattva path.

It is not rig pa.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 4:18 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

It says in the Kosha that color is form. It is not a materialist position. It is part of nama-rupa.

Andrew108 said:

It's saying that color is a form in dependence on the skandhas and the skandhas are?

Malcolm wrote:

It is saying that color is a form [rūpa] that is part of the material [rūpa] aggregates, so color is based on the arrangement of the atoms of the four elements. Color is part of the secondary or derived matter of the rūpa skandha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

It says in the Kosha that color is form. It is not a materialist position. It is part of nama-rupa.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, it says that rūpa, the object of the eye (as opposed to the rūpa skandha) is color.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Actually in Dzogchen you don't have a view. You have an experience. You go beyond the mind. For a Dzogchen practitioner, the practice part has nothing to do with thoughts.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a "view", the experience to which you refer is the "view".

deepbluehum said:

It's not a sentence is the point.

Malcolm wrote:

Gaining mastery of the obvious, are you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Again, unlike you, I don't just acquieece when a monk tells me what to think.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't acquiesce to what anyone tells me to think.

I provided those sources for information.

And unlike you, I refrain from baseless ad hominem remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For context:

Where do earth, water, fire and air no footing find?

Where are long and short, small and great, fair and four –

Where are “name and form” wholly destroyed?

And the answer is:

‘Where consciousness is signless, boundless, all-luminous,

That’s where earth, water, fire and air find no footing,

There both long and short, small and great, fair and foul –

There “name and form” are wholly destroyed.

With the cessation of consciousness this is all destroyed.’”

Thannisaro renders it slightly differently:

Where do water, earth, fire, & wind

have no footing?

Where are long & short,

coarse & fine,

fair & foul,

name & form

brought to an end?

"And the answer to that is:

Consciousness without feature,[1]
without end,
luminous all around:
Here water, earth, fire, & wind
have no footing.
Here long & short
coarse & fine
fair & foul
name & form
are all brought to an end.
With the cessation of [the activity of] consciousness
each is here brought to an end."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Actually in Dzogchen you don't have a view. You have an experience. You go beyond the mind. For a Dzogchen practitioner, the practice part has nothing to do with thoughts.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a "view", the experience to which you refer is the "view".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The universal Buddha consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing.

deepbluehum said:

I think Jeff disagrees with you. So does Garchen Rinpoche, such phrases like, "all pervading," even in Dzogchen texts, betray omnipresence, i.e., pan-psychism, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Thanissaro notes:

Viññanam anidassanam. This term is nowhere explained in the Canon, although MN 49 mentions that it "does not partake in the allness of the All" — the "All" meaning the six internal and six external sense media (see SN 35.23). In this it differs from the consciousness factor in dependent co-arising, which is defined in terms of the six sense media. Lying outside of time and space, it would also not come under the consciousness-aggregate, which covers all consciousness near and far; past, present, and future. However, the fact that it is outside of time and space — in a dimension where there is no here, there, or in between (Ud 1.10), no coming, no going, or staying (Ud 8.1) — means that it cannot be described as permanent or omnipresent, terms that have meaning only within space and time. The standard description of nibbana after death is, "All that is sensed, not being relished, will grow cold right here." (See MN 140 and Iti 44.) Again, as "all" is defined as the sense media, this raises the question as to whether consciousness without feature is not covered by this "all." However, AN 4.174 warns that any speculation as to whether anything does or doesn't remain after the remainderless stopping of the six sense media is to "objectify non-objectification," which gets in the way of attaining the non-objectified. Thus this is a question that is best put aside.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

From a Dzogchen point of view, such a samanyārtha (spyi don) is an intellectual analysis, an conceptual contrivance.

Of course, you can play with words if you like, and argue that concepts are experiences, but that is not the distinction that is being drawn here.

The experience of vidyā Longchenpa is referring to is not a samanyārtha, a generic image, even for a commoner. It is also never a result of conceptual analysis of any kind.

In other words, to tease it out for you further, as you admit, the object for a commoner meditating emptiness according to any system of Madhyamaka is a conceptual object which in truth is conceptual abstraction based on an intellectual analysis.

The "object", for a commoner meditating according to the system of Dzogchen, is always a non-abstract non-conceptual pratyakṣa [mngon gsum] of dharmatā.

The ultimate meaning of both systems is the same, but the means and praxis are quite different -- thus providing the reason why Madhyamaka, being a sutrayāna path, requires three incalculable eons to traverse the paths and stages; whereas the path of

atiyoga possesses only a single stage, traversable immediately.

M

cloudburst said:

Thank you for your informed and helpful answer.

I have many arguments with it, but don't see the benefit of debating it at the moment, especially as the gang here seems to be "of a view." Perhaps I'll be feeling more argumentative in the future, but for now, I hope you enjoy your summer!

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, enjoy your summer as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Seems like one of Jhoti's posts went missing?

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps someone figured out that she is not really adding anything of value to the discussion of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

wow i did not know that, there is alot i need to learn but im glad to be alive at the time of this great master and have the chance to connect with him.

im sure there will be many hardships but im happy to have discovered what ive been looking for,i just need to hold onto this enthusiasim for the ret of my life.

also afer i attend the WWT and join the DC will i be considered a disciple of Rinpoche? i know he has thousands of disciples,how do i go about having a personal relationship with CNNR?obviously to meet him in person is the goal but even then wont it be a huge amount of people trying to meet him at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for one thing he responds to emails. Secondly, people make a big deal out of close personal relationships with their teachers, but it is an over stated thing. ChNN teaches in such a way that you really won't need much personal attention. Plus there are many

older students who can help you with 98 percent of your questions. and you will be able to meet him and say hello. There is more chance for personal contact with him in smaller and newer places. It is impossible really in merigar, tsegylgar, etc.

Anyway, you won't have many questions that are worthwhile until you have applied the practices a bit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Jnana said:

Your qualms about this quote are nonsense for one reason: It doesn't matter where it came from. It's high f*cking time to stop using it as a meaningful term to refer to any contemporary Buddhist or Buddhist tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

The term Mahāyāna then ceases to have much meaning, no?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Jnana said:

I've never quoted it before.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps I have you confused with Tilt -- but I have certainly seen this quote used again and again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He is entitled to his opinion but he is factually incorrect. The term Hināyāna, it's usage and understanding is derived from Indian masters and their commentaries. It is really too much to imagine they were not referring their contemporary non-Mahāyāna colleagues.

Jnana said:

Of course it's derived from Indian sources. That doesn't make it any more palatable. It's

a divisive term with nasty connotations, as you yourself have acknowledged. It demonstrates quite well the all-too-human side of Mahāyāna Buddhism and the inescapable fact that this term is not the speech of the historical Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

In Indian Mahāyāna Sūtra and śāstra, in text after text, the word "hināyāna" is defined as the teachings followed by śravakas and pratyekabuddhas. I am certain that you do not imagine that these Indian texts were not referring to actual contemporary traditions?

It is useless to pretend that the term Hinayāna was not used by Indian Mahāyāna authors to refer to those who did not accept Mahāyāna sutras i.e. Sarvastivadins, Mahāsaṃghikas, Thervadins, etc.

According to Ray's statement "...it is really not appropriate to assume that the Tibetan definition of Hinayana identifies a venerable living tradition as the Theravada or any other historical school" one is left with the idea that term as it is used in Tibetan Buddhism has no precedent in Indian Buddhism.

This statement by Ray is nonsense for two reasons -- the way the term is used by Tibetans was determined by Indians. Those Indians certainly were referring to their contemporaries. Since this citation is not accurate at all, much less precise, you should not keep trotting it out as if it is a meaningful statement. It is not a meaningful statement at all since it is factually incorrect.

A factually correct statement would be "it is appropriate to assume that the Indian definition of Hinayana identifies then living traditions such as the Theravada and other historical schools..."

Another more or less correct statement might be "In absence of the polemical environment where the newly produced Mahāyāna movement was subject to constant criticism by conservatives among the Nikāya schools, Tibetans revisioned the term "hināyāna" in such a fashion that it no longer truly refers to any currently extant non-Mahāyāna tradition in a meaningful way".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

So whats the chance of becoming fully awakened in this lifetime after being introduced o your real nature?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a diligent person, have received introduction and applied the teachings of Dzogchen to your life in a concrete way, you will never need to fear of returning to

samsara's three realms ever again. Even if you do not achieve full awakening in this life you will either achieve full awakening in the bardo, or in a nirmanakāya buddhafield.

RikudouSennin said:

well then i have found exactly what i have been looking for throughout my entire life

now only if i can manage to not die before i am introduced.

Malcolm wrote:

You just need to connect with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and not look back. He is the only teacher alive today that I know of who had two masters achieve rainbow body in this life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Milarepa -- too lazy to practise Dzogchen or no results?

Content:

Sherlock said:

There are two different versions of Milarepa's story about receiving Dzogchen teachings, in one he just slacks off because he hears about how rapid Dzogchen is and in the other he practises diligently without results until his teacher sends him away. Which is the older one?

Malcolm wrote:

The first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Mandala Offering in Ngondro

Content:

Sopa Yutso said:

I've checked WOMPT and Torch of Certainty about this, but am still lost... in the mandala section of the Barchey Kunsel, we make offerings to the "three realms and worlds, the beings and all their splendor..." Can anyone clarify what exactly these three realms and worlds are? They are not the form, formless and desire realms...?

Malcolm wrote:

They are. The worlds means all the worlds in the universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:
The universal Buddha consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:
There is no such thing.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:17 AM
Title: Re: masters of the tradition
Content:
RikudouSennin said:
So whats the chance of becoming fully awakened in this lifetime after being introduced
o your real nature?

Malcolm wrote:
If you are a diligent person, have received introduction and applied the teachings of
Dzogchen to your life in a concrete way, you will never need to fear of returning to
samsara's three realms ever again. Even if you do not acheive full awakening in this life
you will either acheive full awakening in the bardo, or in a nirmanakāya buddhafield.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?
Content:

deepbluehum said:
Is everything permeated by this?

Malcolm wrote:
The three kāyas are the basis. Everything that appears to arise, arises from ignorance
[ma rig pa] of this basis. When one is in possession of knowledge [rig pa] of the basis's
actual state, and has integrated completely with that knowledge, then it is said that the
universe arises as the basis.

It is not complex, nor does it entail pantheism, panpsychism or anything else. It is what
it is.

M

deepbluehum said:

What it is is a Samkya Vedanta question. When It is what you say it is, it is compounded. When you are referring to faculties for the pragmatic approach to soteriology, what it is is irrelevant. You go straight to the finish where is, it or not are unnecessary to fashion.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is asaṃkṛita.

The Dzogchen tantras are aware of Saṃkhya as well as Vedanta, and take specific pains to differentiate Dzogchen view from these systems.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Is everything permeated by this?

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are the basis. Everything that appears to arise, arises from ignorance [ma rig pa] of this basis. When one is in possession of knowledge [rig pa] of the basis's actual state, and has integrated completely with that knowledge, then it is said that the universe arises as the basis.

It is not complex, nor does it entail pantheism, panpsychism or anything else. It is what it is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: rGyal tshab rJe Dar ma rin chen - UTTARATANTRA

Content:

gerdovan said:

Hi everybody,

I am looking for the Tibetan text of rGyal tshab rJe Dar ma rin chen's commentary on the rGyud bla ma ((UTTARATANTRA). Preferably not in Why lie.... can I download it from somewhere?

Can somebody help me with that?

Thank you!

Gerd

Malcolm wrote:

dar ma rin chen. "theg pa chen po rgyud bla ma'i TI k+ka/." In gsung 'bum/_rgyal tshab rje (bkra shis lhun po par rnying). TBRC W29194. 3: 5 - 440. dharamsala: sherig parkhang, 1997. [http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01ACI1%7CO01ACI101ACI23\\$W29194](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01ACI1%7CO01ACI101ACI23$W29194) " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Jnana said:

Reggie Ray thinks otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

He is entitled to his opinion but he is factually incorrect. The term Hināyāna, it's usage and understanding is derived from Indian masters and their commentaries. It is really too much to imagine they were not referring their contemporary non-Mahāyāna colleagues.

Just run a word search on the bstan 'gyur for "theg pa chung" and you will be forced to come to the conclusion that term Hinayāna and its usage is not some Tibetan construction as presented by Ray.

Jnana said:

And the vajrayāna is merely upāya from soup to nuts.

Malcolm wrote:

This is hardly a fair assessment of the situation, though it is a fashionable sentiment post Sakya Pandita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Sure there is. Monism too. How else can the Dharmakaya be all pervasive so that two minds can unite?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what happens in Guru yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I recently asked Garchen Rinpoche how Guru Yoga works. Garchen Rinpoche told me the nature of mind is omnipresent and permeates all beings which is why one can unite with the mind of the guru. I asked him if this was the same as the Hindu notion of Brahman? He said the Buddha only meant to refute a Creator God, but the notion of Brahman is basically fine with buddha-dharma. That was surprising to me.

Malcolm has also pointed out that in the Khandro Nyingthig texts Guru P has stated that everything is rigpa.

So does Guru Yoga betray the Pantheism underlying Mahayana, Vajrayana and Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Pantheism is an inappropriate term. There is no god in any form of Buddhadharma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: Letter of resignation

Content:

tobes said:

I

On what is unacceptable:

Malcolm wrote:

What is unacceptable is to give in to something you regard as evil and disengage.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I think it's more correct to say that the basis in gzhan stong (Shentong) is "Buddha

Nature," which is not EXACTLY equivalent with emptiness, at least according to Dolpopa's presentation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is exactly emptiness precisely in the fashion that I described it, even in Dolbuwa's presentation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

pueraeternus said:

I may follow along if deepbluehum remains unreceptive.

deepbluehum said:

Aside from your factual interpretations, show me in the suttas where Buddha himself teaches how his realization is superior to the Arahats.

Malcolm wrote:

Apprently you beleive the Buddha's teachings are confined to the Nikayas/Agamas. That is ok, but such sentiments are out of place in a Mahāyāna forum.

This is religion, here, not science. If you want science, you are in the wrong place and wrong faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

pueraeternus said:

This has nothing to do with the topic about comparing the fruits of a Buddha and the fruits of an Arhat. You are talking about what may be best for people of various dispositions. Fine if you want to start another thread and talk about it. This thread is off topic enough already.

dharmagoat said:

I'm done.

pueraeternus said:

I may follow along if deepbluehum remains unreceptive.

Malcolm wrote:

DBH is going through a phase, it seems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

All you do is argue online.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not all I do. What I do is translate texts and see patients. I sporadically engage in conversations here which are usually trolled.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually they don't.

If so, then you have to ask why the Arhat Mogallana was forced to ask the Buddha where his mother had taken rebirth, since his "divine" eye was insufficiently strong to see where she had gone.

deepbluehum said:

Then you have to ask how come buddha had to ask where had all his students gone after he came out of his cave retreat, when he didn't know they had killed themselves.

You can ask a lot of questions.

Malcolm wrote:

It is quite simple. According to the Nikaya tradition, the Buddha's omniscience is only operative when he chooses to direct his attention towards a given phenomena -- a Buddha is not omniscient 24/7, according to the Nikayas. Nevertheless, the Buddha's six abhijñās are completely unobstructed and fully developed. The development of the six abhijñās are not necessary for an Arhat, and even then, never can develop to the full extent of a Buddhas. Why? They lack the requisite past-life training as a bodhisattva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, like most one-sided polemicists.

deepbluehum said:

That's what you are, Mr. Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Unlike you, I am not pursuing a polemical agenda. I am happy to let people practice whatever the hell they want without telling them they are wrong, or screwed up, etc. If people want to believe that Arhats are omniscient, that's ok with me. I just don't believe it, and I don't think their citations or reasonings are sound. But I sure am not really that interested in arguing about it, I have better things to do with my time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What you guys are willfully ignoring is that the bodhi for an arahant is the same as a buddha, an arahant is an arahant sammāsambuddha. The Buddha clearly refutes any cognitive obscuration.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I understand that that is how it may seem to be defined in the Nikāyas and the Āgamas depending on how one chooses to read things, but the Śrāvaka canon is not definitive for me [though it may be for you] and then there is the fact that in general the Nikāya schools do not comment on things in this way indicates that Tilt's POV is a modernist revisionism.

In short, all samyaksaṃbuddhas are arhats, but not all arhats are saṃyaksambuddhas.

Śrāvaka-bodhi is not the same thing as the bodhi of an bodhisattva or that of a buddha. Please see the Abhisamaya-ālaṃkāra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The suttas that Tiltbilings cites in his thread refutes these commentarial threads.

pueraeternus said:

Tilt cites only the suttas that suit his cause.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, like most one-sided polemicists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

futerko said:

Hi Malcom, are you including Shentong Madhyamaka in this?

Malcolm wrote:

The actual mode of meditation in rang stong and gzhan stong are not different at all. The difference lay primarily in how they conceptualize the view in post-meditation.

futerko said:

Earlier you said, "the basis in Madhyamaka is emptiness, whereas the basis in Dzogchen is considered to be rigpa."

Presentations that I have seen tend to contrast the rang stong basis of emptiness with the gzhan stong basis of radiance, or the light of the clear light nature of mind which can only be realized non-conceptually and non-dualistically by the clear light nature of mind itself.

Is it only that the mode of meditation is different from Rdzogs chen, or are you also suggesting that this formulation of gzhan stong is still somehow conceptual?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis in gzhan stong is still emptiness, albeit is an emptiness qualified by the presence of ultimate buddha qualities, where samsaric phenomena are considere extraneous. Why? Because these ultimate qualities are only held to appear to exist in post-equipoise, but their appearance of existence disappear when in equipoise.

The equipoise in both rang stong and gzhan stong is characterized as an equipoise free from extremes. In the case of commoners, this freedom from extremes is arrived through analysis that negate the four extremes in turn. This is necessary even in gshan stong because attachment to the luminosity described by the PP sutras will result in an extreme view, just as grasping to emptiness results in an extreme view.

As I said, the most salient difference between R and S is in their post-equipose formulation. In terms of how adherents of the so called R and S views actually meditate, there is no ultimate difference.

The pitfall of both approaches is the same -- failure to eradicate all extremes results in the former grasping to non-existence as emptiness, and the latter grasping to existence as emptiness.

The purpose of Madhyamaka analysis is not to come to some imagined "correct" generic image of the ultimate, but rather to exhaust the mind's capacity to reify phenomena according to any extreme so that one's experience of conventional truth upon reaching the path of seeing in post-equipose is that all phenomena are seen to be illusions, dreams and so on i.e. unreal and yet apparent due to the force of traces.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Jnana said:

FWIW, according to the Theravāda Paṭisambhidāmagga a buddha has the following knowledges and abilities not shared by arhat disciples:

knowledge of the penetration of other beings' faculties

knowledge of other beings' biases and underlying tendencies

knowledge of the twin miracle *

knowledge of the attainment of great compassion

omniscience & unobstructed knowledge

The Theravāda commentaries also differentiate between sammāsambodhi, paccekabodhi, and sāvakabodhi. Accordingly, a mahābodhisatta develops the perfections, etc., to a greater degree in order to realize sammāsambodhi.

* i.e. the ability to produce fire and water from various parts of the body, as well as walk amid an aura of colors while a created image of his body sits or lies down, etc.

deepbluehum said:

The suttas that Tiltbilings cites in his thread refutes these commentarial threads.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually they don't.

If so, then you have to ask why the Arhat Mogallana was forced to ask the Buddha where his mother had taken rebirth, since his "divine" eye was insufficiently strong to see where she had gone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

futerko said:

Hi Malcom, are you including Shentong Madhyamaka in this?

Malcolm wrote:

The actual mode of meditation in rang stong and gzhan stong are not different at all. The difference lay primarily in how they conceptualize the view in post-meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

The process of madhyamaka is based on intellectual analysis. Through this process of investigation, one develops insight. This new view is experiential, and this is the point of view of madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

After an eon of meditating perhaps. But while one is below the path of seeing one's "insight" is conceptual, and not experiential.

cloudburst said:

The point of view is either conceptual or not depending upon the meditator.

How long it takes to become the type of meditator for whom it is non-conceptual depends upon the meditator, the methods, the guru etc. Could be aeons could a few years , or monthsdays.... really it depends.

You have moved from saying that Madhyamaka is "just an intellectual analysis" to saying that conceptual is not experiential. I would say that for a yogi on the path of preparation meditating with ultimate example clear light, the point of view is technically speaking conceptual, but this means something very very different from "just intellectual analysis," doesn't it? This discussion is about the prasangika point of VIEW, and a view is necessarily experiential, as it is a view.

meditating on a generic image of ultimate truth with a mind of clear light is certainly experiential.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Dzogchen point of view, such a samanyārtha (spyi don) is an intellectual analysis, an conceptual contrivance.

Of course, you can play with words if you like, and argue that concepts are experiences, but that is not the distinction that is being drawn here.

The experience of vidyā Longchenpa is referring to is not a samanyārtha, a generic image, even for a commoner. It is also never a result of conceptual analysis of any kind.

In other words, to tease it out for you further, as you admit, the object for a commoner meditating emptiness according to any system of Madhyamaka is a conceptual object which in truth is conceptual abstraction based on an intellectual analysis.

The "object", for a commoner meditating according to the system of Dzogchen, is always a non-abstract non-conceptual pratyakṣa [mngon gsum] of dharmatā.

The ultimate meaning of both systems is the same, but the means and praxis are quite different -- thus providing the reason why Madhyamaka, being a sutrayāna path, requires three incalculable eons to traverse the paths and stages; whereas the path of atiyoga possesses only a single stage, traversable immediately.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

...but I won't say that the other vehicles are incapable of approaching gnosis and attainment of anuttarasamyaksambodhi on their own terms.

Malcolm wrote:

No one has said this.

pueraeternus said:

Glad to hear this. The way some of the dzogchen threads around here went, it gave a lot of people the impression that dzogchenpas think only through dzogchen can one attain complete enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

All nine yānas, including the yāna of gods and humans, lead directly or indirectly to full awakening. (boy this thread has gone off-topic)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Tiger said:

Also my criticism...

Malcolm wrote:

We are not actually interested in your criticisms. Not...even...slightly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: "No Thought" in Pao-T'ang Ch'an and early Atiyoga

Content:

Tiger said:

Nice paper.

<https://www.google.co.in/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=atiyoga&source=web&cd=41&cad=rja&ved=0CEgQFjAAOCg&url=http%3A%2F%2Farchiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de%2Ffojs%2Findex.php%2Fjiabs%2Farticle%2Fdownload%2F8661%2F2568&ei=cd4sUKSgJYuY0QXTmoGwDA&usg=AFQjCNFj1L4O70DaC5veMycwxj9jjCnz0Q> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Andrew108 said:

Why do you think it's a nice paper?

Tiger said:

For the historical analysis.

Malcolm wrote:

This article is quite outdated. This is a much more recent, more informed, and a more nuanced presentation of the interaction of Chan and Atiyoga in Tibet:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/49744856/Lighting-the-Lamp-An-Examination-of-the-Structure-of-the-Bsam-Gtan-Mig-Sgron> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

...but I won't say that the other vehicles are incapable of approaching gnosis and attainment of anuttarasamyaksambodhi on their own terms.

Malcolm wrote:

No one has said this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 7:32 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

cloudburst said:

also, is there an example of ignoreance that is not delusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the non-afflictive ignorance possessed by Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas, etc.

cloudburst said:

and a definition of extremes, if you will?

Malcolm wrote:

A one sided state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Whether or not Madhyamaka fails in exceeding an intellectual approach depends upon whether or not the meditator fails to exceed and intellectual approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamaka is based on intellectual analysis. It has no form of vipashyana which is uniquely distinguished from sūtrayāna in general.

When it comes to meditating vipashyāna, one does not sit there and engage in intellectual analysis ala madhyamaka.

cloudburst said:

The process of madhyamaka is based on intellectual analysis. Through this process of investigation, one develops insight. This new view is experiential, and this is the point of view of madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

After an eon of meditating perhaps. But while one is below the path of seeing one's

"insight" is conceptual, and not experiential.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 10:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

... The Prajnaparamita...

Malcolm wrote:

Lacks the explanation of lhun grub.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study more.

deepbluehum said:

You're being silly again. I know where your position comes from. You think Arahats have the cognitive obscuration. Because I practiced more, I realized it's bullshit.

Malcolm wrote:

Now whose being silly?

Even in the Pali canon Buddha makes it very clear that Arhats do not possess omniscience. Furthermore, Vasubandhu is extremely clear about this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Whether or not Madhyamaka fails in exceeding an intellectual approach depends upon whether or not the meditator fails to exceed and intellectual approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamaka is based on intellectual analysis. It has no form of vipashyana which is uniquely distinguished from sūtrayāna in general.

When it comes to meditating vipashyāna, one does not sit there and engage in intellectual analysis ala madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 10:29 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The attainment of nirvana may entail the end of suffering and delusion but not of ignorance.

deepbluehum said:

That's ridiculous. Nirvana is not possible unless there is the cessation of ignorance.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

While some dzogchenpa busy themselves in reasoning out about the simple matter of mahayana due to their distorted system, the mahayanist already ahead of them in the utilization of means which are definitive.

Malcolm wrote:

You are in the wrong forum. If you wish to criticize Dzogchen teachings, you may. Its your samaya, not mine.

I am done here.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

[

3. The alaya has karmic traces, but when it transformed as wisdom, it is the dharmakaya, same basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen tantras define ālaya as ignorance. It cannot be transformed into wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even rocks have dharmatā. Resting in the dharmatā of a rock is not really going beyond the rock. In fact, it can't.

pueraeternus said:

But we are not rocks. And since the embodiment of the dharmata dawns as the dharmakaya...

Malcolm wrote:

This amounts to saying that mind dawns as dharmakāya since the mind is the embodiment of its own dharmatā. But this does not correspond to how things are. It is a theory. Why? The dharmatā of the mind is not wisdom, and resting in it does not go beyond mind.

However, as Khenpo Ngachung pointed out, even if it is pointed out to those of the eight lower yānas that their vehicles never go beyond mind, they will not believe it -- which again is yet another reason it is pointless to argue or discuss Dzogchen with those who are not really interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Pero said:

Sure it is. You don't have to read even one sutra to practice Dzogchen and even if you do, it will not help your understanding of Dzogchen. You can't understand Dzogchen by trying to look at it from the POV of a lower vehicle.

Jyoti said:

Unless you practicing in cave blocking all outside interference, then you don't need the many tools of mahayana that is meant for busy practitioners whose mind cannot be free from the thinking of the various matters of daily life. The mahayana is not a lower vehicle, the classification of the yana by the nyinama is not universal in buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no basis for this discussion since there is no common ground for a discussion

at all. It is better to leave this here.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Yes, I'm capable, but I want your own interpretation on the matter, yet you can't even use your own terms.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, it is not correct to debate about Dzogchen teachings with people, especially people who have wrong views about Dzogchen. So I am not to about argue with you about your views and try to condition you. You have already sufficiently conditioned yourself into an incorrect view about Dzogchen teachings. It is up to you to condition yourself out of it.

However I will leave you with this much — If you do not differentiate mind and wisdom, you will not understand Dzogchen at all.

In Dzogchen, the all-basis (ālaya) is only a repository of traces. Ālaya is āvidyā, ignorance. From ignorance arises the eight consciousnesses. Ignorance of what? The ignorance that results from not recognizing the gzhi (sthana) i.e. the three wisdoms. All this is very clearly explained in many, many Dzogchen tantras and texts.

I have given you enough information so that you may untie yourself from the knot that you have created for yourself.

Good luck.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

In his Gelug/Kagyu Mahamudra text the Dalai Lama advises Dzogchen practitioners to study Je Tsongkhapa's prasangika presentation of emptiness, saying that it would be "very beneficial."

Malcolm wrote:

While Jigme Lingpa in general gives Tsongkhapa's presentation of Prasanga in his Yontan mdzod; later, in the Dzogchen section he criticizes Madhyamaka in general for failing to be able to exceed intellectual analysis.

Longchenpa, half a century before Tsongkhapa, writes in his autocommentary to the Treasury of the Dharmadhātu in chapter 8:

This system of the natural great perfection is equivalent with the Consequentialist Madhyamaka's usual way of considering freedom from extremes and so on.

However, emptiness in Madhyamaka is an emptiness counted as similar to space, made into the basis; here naked pellucid vidyā pure from the beginning that is not established; that, merely unceasing, is made into the basis.

So in terms of freedom from extremes and so on, Madhyamaka and Dzogchen are identical. Where they differ is what is considered the basis [gzhi, sthana]-- the basis in Madhyamaka is emptiness, whereas the basis in Dzogchen is considered to be rigpa.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

[

Personally, I won't say that it does not really succeed, but that it uses different methods. In general, tantra (including Mahamudra and Dzogchen) has more efficient tools, or rather tools that suit a certain mentality.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very post-Sakya Pandita view of tantric teachings in general.

pueraeternus said:

Why do you think so? *Genuine question - this is not a challenge*

Malcolm wrote:

Even rocks have dharmatā. Resting in the dharmatā of a rock is not really going beyond the rock. In fact, it can't.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 5:30 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:

pueraeternus said:
But that is because you pigeon-hole it into that category and assume it to be so.
Prajnaparamita is also sutrayana, but that doesn't mean it is merely the transformation of vijñāna.

Malcolm wrote:
That depends on one's exegetical tradition i.e. yogacara or madhyamaka.

Basically, the Dzogchen critique of sutrayāna in general is that even when sūtrayāna asserts wisdom beyond mind, it does not really succeed.

Even so, the emphasis of Chan is on dharmatā, not wisdom. Chan does not go beyond mind because it merely declares all things dharmatā.

That is not really going beyond mind.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 4:56 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?
Content:
Caz said:
?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, the difference is however that Prasanga is just an intellectual analysis where as Dzogchen is experiential.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 4:11 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:
cloudburst said:
also, is there an example of ignorance that is not delusion?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, the non-afflictive ignorance possessed by Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you assume the trikāya has something to do with vijñāna, then you would be correct. But that is not how the trikāya is understood in Dzogchen.

You need to read Primordial Experience, and understand how the Dzogchen tradition treats the cittamatra school and its doctrines so that you may correctly differentiate them. Otherwise, you will merely continue down this path of confusing yourself and others.

M

Jyoti said:

Why not just quote the text here or describe the content?

Malcolm wrote:

You are an intelligent person and capable of doing your own reading.

https://www.amazon.com/Primordial-Experience-Introduction-rDzogs-chen-Meditation/dp/157062898X/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1345057594&sr=8-1&keywords=primordial+experience " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Poor Jyoti. Seems like everyone is ganging up on him. But I'm sure some good understanding will come out of this.

Pero said:

True. Though it just sort of happened that way.

Malcolm wrote:

It is likely to happen whenever someone comes to the Dzogchen forum and starts asserting that Dzogchen is subordinate to common Mahāyāna.

Jyoti has obviously not read Manjushrimitra's rdo la gser zhun

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, as I said, Dzogchen has nothing to do with mind, vijñāna.

Jyoti said:

So you equate mind as consciousness (vijñana), to have nothing to do with consciousness, you would have nothing to do with the dhamadhatu and the trikaya, and your version of dzogchen would have no basis.

Malcolm wrote:

If you assume the trikāya has something to do with vijñāna, then you would be correct. But that is not how the trikāya is understood in Dzogchen.

You need to read Primordial Experience, and understand how the Dzogchen tradition treats the cittamatra school and its doctrines so that you may correctly differentiate them. Otherwise, you will merely continue down this path of confusing yourself and others.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Chan does not stop at the vijñana level.

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of Dzogchen, it does.

pueraeternus said:

It really doesn't, but there is nothing new in Buddhism for one tradition criticizing another based on incomplete understanding. Happens both ways.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it really does. Why? Because for Chan, being a sutrayāna tradition, wisdom is the transformation of vijñāna.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 2:08 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:

pueraeternus said:
Chan does not stop at the vijnana level.

Malcolm wrote:
From the point of view of Dzogchen, it does.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 1:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:

Jyoti said:
... as for the definitive meaning of dzogchen, I can find it in ch'an and the consciousness-only school...

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is a mistake. But it is your mistake so I leave you to it.

Neither Chan nor Cittamatra go beyond mind.

M

Jyoti said:
Defined mind, otherwise don't simply go beyond because a tradition said so. Both ch'an and the consciousness-only tradition focused only on consciousnesses and its transformation.

Malcolm wrote:
Right, as I said, Dzogchen has nothing to do with mind, vijñāna.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 1:36 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:

Jyoti said:
... as for the definitive meaning of dzogchen, I can find it in ch'an and the consciousness-only school...

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is a mistake. But it is your mistake so I leave you to it.

Neither Chan nor Cittamatra go beyond mind.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is an extreme because nirvana is a cessation -- as the etymology of the name implies. But this is all besides the point.

deepbluehum said:

It is a cessation of suffering and delusion. Who wants to keep that going? It's funny the transforms that happen due to clinging to dictionary thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

The attainment of nirvana may entail the end of suffering and delusion but not of ignorance. Hence, nirvana is still an extreme because it is a mere cessation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Experience is required, questions and answers are what appears when one analyse the words of the teacher or scriptures. You need a question, in order to find answer within experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Meaning comes from experience.

You don't really need to ask that many questions about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: How can Buddhists be so sure of themselves?

Content:

My Socks Smell said:

Am I to understand that, unlike materialism, Buddhism is a belief system based upon the assertion that there is something after death for us to worry about?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind stream does not die along with the body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Well I studied and practice dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

From whom did you receive Dzogchen transmission?

Teacher and Guru -- not the same thing at all.

Dzogchen is not based on questions and answers. It is based on experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Point me to one dzogchen teacher who is still living who taught the sudden teachings without mixing with any gradual means in all of their teachings, and point me to a consciousness-only scriptures that teach the gradual method, then repeat the same statement above.

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Gandavyuha, etc

Jyoti said:

N.N also taught skillful means such as yantra yoga and development stage yoga, where is purity of the sudden approach? The demand for purity is simple, there should not be mixture of two different approach in any discourse, otherwise confusion is inevitable. Also those who rely exclusively on the definitive meaning, do not required additional aid of skillful means.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement indicates that a) you do not understand the teachings of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu b) that you do not understand Dzogchen.

Jyoti said:

The Gandavyuha is not a scripture of definitive meaning, and so would not be used by the consciousness-only school.

Malcolm wrote:

The Gandavyuha commonly considered a Yogacara sūtra.

There are a number of Yogacara sutras. Also for example the Saṃdhinirmocana is a gradualist sūtra belonging to the so called vijñaptimatra or cittamatra school -- a foundational text, actually.

It is fine if you want to consider Mahāyāna definitive. But that is just not how it is for we who follow the teaching of Dzogchen. We consider Dzogchen definitive, and everything else provisional. That is normal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Point me to one dzogchen teacher who is still living who taught the sudden teachings without mixing with any gradual means in all of their teachings, and point me to a consciousness-only scriptures that teach the gradual method, then repeat the same statement above.

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Gandavyuha, etc

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara is not commensurate with Dzogchen.

Jyoti said:

I didn't find difficulty deciphering dzogchen within the framework of consciousness-only system. They both belong to the sudden vehicle, but the consciousness-only system is purer as it is never a mixture of gradual and sudden teachings. The main collection of dzogchen teaching is from teachers who taught the gradual path of vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Both of your assertions are unsupported.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Not the version of dzogchen that I know.

Malcolm wrote:

Then the version you know has a problem.

There is an extensive literature differentiating the ālaya from the dharmakāya based on the second chapter of the primary root tantra of Dzogchen, the sgra thal 'gyur.

Jyoti said:

Not objecting the need to differentiate alaya and dharmakaya either, but on the context above on transformation of consciousness into wisdom, it is regarding the body (basis), both alaya and dharmakaya are not from a different body.

Referring to the mahayana tripitaka:

頓悟入道要門論云：「問束四智成三身者，幾個智共成一身？幾個智獨成一身？答大圓鏡智獨成法身。平等性智獨成報身。妙觀察智與成所作智共成化身。」以上雖說四智三身，並無別佛，只是一佛所具！三身具足，四智圓滿之佛果，即是究竟位，此即唯識行者之大目的，大歸趣！

My rough translation:

<<The 'Commentary on the main point of sudden realization' said: "On the question regarding the four wisdoms becoming the trikaya, which wisdoms that combined to form the one body? The answer is the mirror-like wisdom alone become the dharmakaya. The equality wisdom become the sambogakaya. The combination of both discriminative wisdom and equality wisdom become the nirmanakaya". Although the above talked about the four wisdoms and trikaya, there are no other buddhas, but being

possessed in a single buddha only! The perfection of the fruit of buddhahood that possessed the trikaya and four wisdoms is the seat of the ultimate, this is the grand objective and the meaning of the grand returning of the practitioner of the consciousness-only!>>

Here's the break down of the four wisdoms and their corresponding body and consciousness:

Mirror-like wisdom = dharmakaya = 8th consciousness (alaya-vijnana)

Equality wisdom = sambogakaya = 7th consciousness

Discriminative wisdom = 6th consciousness

Equality wisdom + discriminative wisdom = nirmanakaya

When one discusses on the stand-point of the body, the different terms are not considered different if they belong to same basis. But when one discussed conditions and method based on such conditions, those terms make a difference and should be differentiated in their respective condition.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara is not commensurate with Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I know. It seems Mahayana's nonabiding nirvana is jivan-mukti repackaged.

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is an extreme because nirvana is a cessation -- as the etymology of the name implies. But this is all besides the point.

It seems you have, for the time being, adopted the view that the Nikāya/Agamic Buddhism is the real stuff. Next you will be telling us that rebirth [punarbhava] is balony too, and that karma is bollocks.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What it boils down to is samsara vs. nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

What is boils down to is going to both, since both are extremes.

deepbluehum said:

That's that double talk. Nirvana is not an extreme. It is the middle between extremes.

Samsara fluctuates between extremes.

Malcolm wrote:

Dear fellow, from a Mahāyāna POV, nirvana is an extreme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What it boils down to is samsara vs. nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

What is boils down to is going beyond both, since both are extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Not the version of dzogchen that I know.

Malcolm wrote:

Then the version you know has a problem.

There is an extensive literature differentiating the ālaya from the dharmakāya based on the second chapter of the primary root tantra of Dzogchen, the sgra thal 'gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Andrew108 said:

What do you mean by body? Means is what exactly?

Jyoti said:

The body is what is permanent, uncreated, such as dharma, dharmakaya, dharmadhatu, nirvana and so on. The means is the functionalities of the body, it is made up of consciousnesses of the individual. There are 8 consciousnesses within the individual, only one is utilized as active means, the others as passive support, the body is actually the 8th consciousness (alaya-vijnana) which corresponds to the dharmakaya, it also acts as passive support. The active consciousness that is utilized as means is the 6th consciousness, this consciousness supports the thinking faculty and also discriminative wisdom, as long as this wisdom is activated, the 7th consciousness becomes support of the wisdom of equality. When these two are activated, the rest of the consciousnesses transformed into wisdom altogether.

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing to do with dzogchen which explicitly rejects the idea that the ālaya = the dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Malcolm,

Apologies. Actually, that part of the post was not a response to you, but to "Deep Blue Hum". I know that you have read enough Sutras and other Buddhist literature to probably not suggest abandoning monasticism entirely, though you are critical of it (which I have been around long enough to be okay with, I am not wearing rose coloured glasses).

The latter part of my post, about the TCVs, was directed to you and that is why your name appeared. Because in fact I think that the problem has more to do with lack of oversight in the Tibetan institutions than monasticism or celibacy.

I have heard several stories of such abuse at both Tibetan and Indian boarding schools from some of the children and local concerned Westerners.

Malcolm wrote:

What I was referring to was the systematic child abuse in traditional pre-modern Tibetan monasteries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Andrew108 said:

What do you mean by body? Means is what exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

he already defined it, he means dharmadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

JKhedrup said:

So then why are we suggesting the abandoning of monasticism entirely?

Malcolm wrote:

Only one person made that suggestion and it was not me. Another person agreed, again not me.

Granted, I personally think that Buddhist monasticism is not very relevant in today's society, at least in the West, but that is a different issue.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

viniketa said:

My understanding is that that any such 'rivalry' came later than the Vedas.

deepbluehum said:

The Vedas came from the Kshatriyas. The rulers basically had these things produced. There are geneological records of Kshatriya families in Hardwar that go back thousands of years. Especially the Kshatriya clans were by varna and jati from the beginning.

Malcolm wrote:

Seems your trenchant antipathy should be directed at the Ksatriyas then.

However, we can, from a the point of view of the sutras, understand that when brahmins were respected, buddhas are born to brahmin families; when kṣatriyas are respected, they are born to kṣatriya families. This is a universal point of view in all Buddhist presentations.

As far as the Vedas coming from kṣatriyas -- we actually do not know the real origin of the Vedas. We have some guesses, some literary theories. The Hindutva people want to make the Vedas super ancient. Western scholars like Witzel suppose they are merely

3500 years old or so. Regardless of their origin, I personally think they are very interesting texts, especially the Atharva Veda, which is arguably quite late, but very important for Ayurveda and the Tantric movement in general.

We know that the early Upanishads were not brahmanical compositions, since texts like the Brihadaranyaka and the Candogya clearly state they contain the meaning of the Vedas that was not understood by brahmins, but only by kṣatriyas. The Buddha was clearly aware of, and rejected, Upanishadic ideas like the atman idealized as a luminous essence in the center of the heart -- ideas that were later recapitulated in Buddhist tantrism in a modified form -- thus, for example necessitating refutations of this idea in the Rig pa rang shar tantra, to give one example, in order to differentiate Dzogchen from Vedanta. Concepts like nadis, the five vāyus, etc., find their earliest literary expression in Candogya Upanishad, etc. Other concepts, like the five experiences of union with brahman which come from these early Upanishads are found regularly in Buddhist tantric texts i.e. smoke, fireflies, butter lamps, etc., as signs that the vāyu is entering into the avadhuti nadi. In short, while the metaphysics of Buddhist tantra may ultimately be grounded in emptiness, many, many concepts found in the Buddhist tantras, from a text critical point of view, find their earliest expression in the ten Mukhya Upanishads, also accepted as śruti by Hindus, but not by Buddhists, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Hsuan Hua on Homosexuality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, neither cannabis or opium is intended here. Smoking a specific blend of medicinal herbs that are good for the lungs is mentioned as part of dinācarya (regular conduct) in the Caraka Saṃhita.

Huseng said:

I stand corrected. However, it doesn't specify specifically what the substance is to be smoked.

《四分律》卷 43: 「爾時有比丘患風。醫教用煙。佛言聽用煙。」 (CBETA, T22, no. 1428, p. 877, a12-13)

“At that time there was a bhikṣu suffering wind. The doctor instructed him to use 'smoking'. The Buddha said using 'smoking' was permissible.”

Malcolm wrote:

Which Vinaya is this from. It is probably clear in the Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 8:08 PM

Title: Vinaya Reference to Smoking

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Topic split from here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=53&t=9638> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Huseng said:

《四分律》卷 43:「爾時有比丘患風。醫教用煙。佛言聽用煙。」(CBETA, T22, no. 1428, p. 877, a12-13)

“At that time there was a bhikṣu suffering wind. The doctor instructed him to use 'smoking'. The Buddha said using 'smoking' was permissible.”

Lotus415 said:

Interesting, since Hsuan Hua said in the comments on smoking provided in the link above that, " during that time when the Buddha was in the world no one knew how to smoke."

Huseng said:

They knew how to smoke and clearly did. It was part of Ayurveda. Again, it wasn't tobacco, but probably opium or cannabis. Also, this was for medical reasons, not to get high.

Malcolm wrote:

No, neither cannabis or opium is intended here. Smoking a specific blend of medicinal herbs that are good for the lungs is mentioned as part of *dinācārya* (regular conduct) in the *Caraka Saṃhita*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Cha Sum

Content:

alexa42 said:

First off, I'd like to say hello This is my first real post, though I've been a regular lurker. My question is, does anyone know what Cha Sum is? I recently requested a puja from Kopan to help clear some obstacles to my practice, and the Geshe la there suggested Tara puja, and Cha Sum... I've never heard of the latter and the little information I can find online suggests that it is used to clear obstacles related to spirits. Is anyone here familiar with this practice?

Malcolm wrote:
it is a common torma ritual from lower tantra.

cha gsum.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 7:42 PM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:
Tiger said:

I will elaborate further on the disharmony and even hostility of Indian religions, especially Buddhists and Brahmanists, which gives another picture from the unified "Dharmic religions" diatribe of Malhotra.

Malcolm wrote:
He does not claim that there never periods of friction between religious groups in India. He does not even claim they were unified. He merely claims that Dharmic religions have a common cultural source and common expectations.

In any event, the majority of instances you cite come from the very unstable post-Gupta period when North India was thrown into disarray after the invasion of the white Huns.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 11:28 AM
Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Read the article again.

David N. Snyder said:
Okay.
Research carried out by the BBC Sinhala service has revealed that over the last decade, nearly 110 Buddhist monks have been charged for sexual and physical assaults on minors in Sri Lanka.

He and another leading monk in the town of Anuradhapura, Namalwewa Rathnasara Thera, are currently released on bail in relation to the accusations - which they vehemently deny.
Innocent until proven guilty.

If they are guilty then the monks in question should be hung from the nearest tree (metaphorically); disrobed and placed in prison until their next life.

These are terrible crimes, if true. I don't know the statistics about which is more likely to

engage in such behavior (clergy or non-clergy), but I do know that when a clergy member or another person of power / famous person commits such an act or is accused of such an act, it is newsworthy. When the average Joe does so, it is not newsworthy. Thus, the media gives the illusion that celibate monks are all sex-crazed pedophiles, which is not the case in 99.9% of the clergy.

Malcolm wrote:

Unlike you, I have no confidence that Buddhist monastics are statistically less like to commit acts of sexual abuse than Catholic Clergy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I think it is a tired argument that monasticism leads to child abuse. There is child abuse anywhere where adults deal with children- boy scouts, boarding school, air cadets, softball, kindergarten have all seen many scandals.

David N. Snyder said:

Exactly. And most of the perpetrators are/were married older men, not celibate monastics of any kind.

Malcolm wrote:

Read the article again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Nirvana does not have this feature.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually the Pali sutras describe nirvana as deathless, permanent, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and therefore, you accept an uncreated and eternal tantra. Otherwise, you would have to assert that dharmakāya is a mere blank insentient voidness.

deepbluehum said:
How about this: What dharmakaya?

Malcolm wrote:
Right, you just became an annihilationist.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 1:11 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:
deepbluehum said:
...Vedic cosmological views leading to an eon of genetic subjugation and enslavement.

Malcolm wrote:
This is pretty outlandish.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:

deepbluehum said:
Pali suttas support the notion that Buddha rejected the notion of hereditary brahmins which was prevalent at the time, which is why he mentioned it.

Malcolm wrote:
The Pali suttas prove that varna was fluid and that people change their varna -- please examine the Ambhaṭṭha sutta in the Dīgha Nikāya.

They do not prove that Buddha rejected varna; merely that he thought personal moral character was of far greater importance than family lineage.

The Pali suttas however also, in keeping with the Upanishads, also support the idea that kṣatriyas were a better caliber of people than brahmins in general, which is why the Buddha was born in a Kṣatriya family -- since at that time they were more respected than brahmins.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:38 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:
deepbluehum said:
Tantras arise do to conditions, period.

Malcolm wrote:

Does the dharmakāya arise due to conditions?

deepbluehum said:

Doesn't arise at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and therefore, you accept an uncreated and eternal tantra. Otherwise, you would have to assert that dharmakāya is a mere blank insentient voidness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Tantras arise do to conditions, period.

Malcolm wrote:

Does the dharmakāya arise due to conditions?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The notion that sutrayana depends on taking a vow is an attitude ChNN reports about some version of Hinayana he had access to.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am not making this assertion based on his point of view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is invalid because it does not correspond to the mode of transmission of the teachings. Sutrayāna texts do not require any transmission because they are essentially paths of renunciation, not tied to any particular experience. Sutrayāna paths are based on taking a vow. This has caused confusion for many famous Vajrayāna scholars in all schools such as Sakya Pandita, etc., who assume that the function of empowerments and so on is to impart yet another series of vows. But this is a terrible

mistake. The function of empowerments is to impart experiences. Subsequent to having that experience, it may be important to guard a commitment regarding that experience, but without that experience the vow is useless.

Your idea that texts are sufficient, and can be treated exactly as formulas to be reproduced like for example, a drug formula, or a formula for synthesizing a plastic precisely demonstrates the pitfalls the western analysis of Dharma traditions.

deepbluehum said:
I don't agree with any of this.

Malcolm wrote:
It's ok, you don't have to.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:05 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:

deepbluehum said:
Let me try to sew up a point here so that this might get back on topic. What's happening on this board with Western dharma is imagining a dharma that isn't real, a Pollyanna dharma. Vedic dharma has always been about heredity. The idea that from the primordial sound AUM emanated all the Vedas, the rishis the brahmans and all the castes is the basis for this millennial aged Eugenics program. Make no mistake, it is about racism. It's not good. It is a mind numbing evil. Shame on India for it. If you want to go get involved with that, you can't, you are barred by birth. You can go be an outcaste; see how you like it.

Malcolm wrote:
An analysis of the role of Varna in pre-5th century AD India shows that jati and varna were not so hard and fast. In fact the ossification of jati in India really is a function first of Mughal interference and secondly, British interference.

Incidentally, there really is no caste system in South India -- the area most free from colonial influence.

deepbluehum said:
Then, you look at Malcolm's new fetish for all things Vedic, I think it arises from the similarity of the Dzogchen tantras to the Vedas with respect to their "primordial origin" in the sound of "A."

Malcolm wrote:
You obviously have not been paying attention to my writing for many years. I have observed that Vedic ideas are important in Buddhism in a positive sense rather than the commonly assumed negative sense for the entire 17 years I have participated online in any fashion. I have always been interested in and felt positive regard for the Vedas.

Dzogchen, Tantra, and the Vedas, as well as some trends in Mahāyāna Sutra, all share common assumptions about śabda based on ancient Indian grammatical science.

deepbluehum said:

Here's a reason why India is so F'd up, it's the caste system. It makes people crazy. It makes the country crazy.

Malcolm wrote:

As noted above, the ossification of the caste system (in North India primarily) is largely a result of eight hundred years of external colonialism by first the Mughals and then the Brits-- imposing caste as a method of social control. It is not intrinsic to the Indian cultural idea of Varna or Jati. Any quick read of the Pali suttas proves this.

Further, the Dalit identity was largely created by Colonial Brits.

deepbluehum said:

The idea that Sanskrit itself encodes the primordial sounds of divinity is stupid bullshit.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not about Sanskrit per se --though for some Indians it may very well be. Nevertheless, no one can argue that Sanskrit is not a brilliant language system, and in fact modern linguistics up to Chomsky is based on it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Also, one of the main cases mentioned in the article was related to the abuse of the children by the lay workers of the temple, not the monks. So clearly celibacy was not the main cause of the abuse in that case.

Malcolm wrote:

Research carried out by the BBC Sinhala service has revealed that over the last decade, nearly 110 Buddhist monks have been charged for sexual and physical assaults on minors in Sri Lanka.

JKhedrup said:

I think it is a tired argument that monasticism leads to child abuse. There is child abuse anywhere where adults deal with children- boy Scouts, boarding school, air cadets, softball, kindergarten have all seen many scandals.

Malcolm wrote:

Mixing children with "celibate" males inevitably results in pedophilia. This is proven in the case of the Catholic Church, and is as it turns out, is broadly true in Tibetan

Buddhism as well. You just have no idea the number of stories I have heard from Tibetans about this issue.

JKhedrup said:

Lord Buddha in both the Mahayana and Theravada canon states the importance of the ordained sangha again and again, so I don't think labeling it as "no longer of use" should be taken lightly.

Malcolm wrote:

He also points out that by this time, it is merely a reflection of what it was back in the day.

JKhedrup said:

For me, my ordination has been the greatest teaching tool in my spiritual life. From the moments of utmost joy, to the moments where I considered re-entering laylife. It is a way of life which is suited to my character, aspirations and way of practice. Should such an option be taken away for those few seekers who can truly cultivate it?

For me celibacy really is a natural way of life and what I struggle with as a monk has mostly to do with the other restrictions (such as not being able to go out late at night dancing, having to work in an authoritarian structure etc.) I don't think the fact that being celibate is natural for me makes me grotesque or a pervert, although in modern society I am often made to feel this way, even with remarks from family and friends.

Malcolm wrote:

The issue is not personal choice, but institutional facts.

JKhedrup said:

Why was one of Buddha's first acts after leaving the palace to shave his hair and don the robe of a shramana?

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni Buddha was not the only Buddha. Not all Buddhas create a monastic sangha -- Sikhin, for example. And the answer is that in that day and age, shramanas were more respected as spiritual teachers than lay persons such as brahmins.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:
Take the Suttanta tradition for example.

Malcolm wrote:
Invalid example.

deepbluehum said:
So sayeth the King!

Malcolm wrote:
It is invalid because it does not correspond to the mode of transmission of the teachings. Sutrayāna texts do not require any transmission because they are essentially paths of renunciation, not tied to any particular experience. Sutrayāna paths are based on taking a vow. This has caused confusion for many famous Vajrayāna scholars in all schools such as Sakya Pandita, etc., who assume that the function of empowerments and so on is to impart yet another series of vows. But this is a terrible mistake. The function of empowerments is to impart experiences. Subsequent to having that experience, it may be important to guard a commitment regarding that experience, but without that experience the vow is useless.

Your idea that texts are sufficient, and can be treated exactly as formulas to be reproduced like for example, a drug formula, or a formula for synthesizing a plastic precisely demonstrates the pitfalls the western analysis of Dharma traditions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 8:46 PM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:
JKhedrup said:
It seems this thread is veering into another subject entirely, not that it isn't interesting...

Malcolm wrote:
As usual...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 10:43 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:

deepbluehum said:
Take the Suttanta tradition for example.

Malcolm wrote:
Invalid example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

PS There is a misconception that the efficacy of mantras depends on hearing it from the guru.

Malcolm wrote:

There are differences in how mantras are regarded in Buddhadharma and in Sanatana Dharma. It is best not to conflate the two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I'm referring to the story that Garab Dorje's mother bore him in a virgin birth. Then he was a spiritually precocious child who won debates with monks. Jesus' mother was a virgin; he was spiritually precocious and won debates with the Saducees. This story is a retelling of Horus/Isis.

Malcolm wrote:

First, the Jesus story is not Gnostic. Second, Buddha's mother was a virgin birth, also the Buddha was a precocious scholar. So you do not need to look to the middle east for the pattern of the Garab Dorje's story, nor that of Padmasambhava. Both of the latter biographies are grounded in the Mahasamghika sources for the Buddha's birth story, etc.

deepbluehum said:

But I agree with the other influences you cite. Those are all at play, better yet interplay.

Malcolm wrote:

I was not citing them as influences, actually — there is absolutely no evidence to support such influences on Dzogchen teachings. There is merely some speculation by scholars working in the 1950's and 60's such as RA Stien and so on, who were working from inadequate understandings of the texts and the traditions.

deepbluehum said:

The way I see it is there's no beginning to dharma. All we have is an old conversation between many old traditions. There is no neat boundary for anyone to live in. Take the Black Throma system. It's Dzogchen right? Well how come the Mahamudra lineage has a practice of Vajrayogini arising without seed syllables or mantras? There's no real line there. Even the mind/nature of mind thing is just efficiency.

Malcolm wrote:

Krodhakali's kama tradition is through Padampa Sangye. This is why it is associated with Cho. Throma in the Dudjom system is a pure vision of Saraha -- it technically is not a treasure teaching.

deepbluehum said:

You have Dzogchen Tantras, but Bon Dzogchen don't need 'em.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many, many Bon Dzogchen tantras. And even so, there is clear intertextuality between so called "Buddhist" and Bon Dzogchen.

deepbluehum said:

What is essential...

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are just dissembling because you shot off your mouth without any evidence to back up your point.

deepbluehum said:

I hold that all methods, if they are factually efficacious, should be reproducible from texts...

Malcolm wrote:

This results in a sterile practice that produces not results. You cannot learn these things from books. The books are there to reinforce the oral tradition, not substitute for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, rather than speculate about what Dzogchen texts say, I read them. So I really am in a position to say whether or not there is so called "gnostic" influence on them or not.

Quite frankly, Vedic culture is much more a pressing influence in Dzogchen texts, if anything.

If you want to claim Gnostic influences on Dzogchen, you have to be very specific, give

examples -- cite a text, show how some intertextuality -- prove a connection. If you can't, you are just spouting hot air.

deepbluehum said:

I gave you one. It's pretty simple. I guess you didn't want that one.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you didn't -- you made a vague and non-specific reference to the biographies of four persons.

Which Gnostics? Which texts? You would be on firmer ground arguing for pre-Muslim Iranian influences such as Zoroastrianism on Dzogchen. A possible Manichaean influence would be the notion that our bodies contain a "spiritual light". But this spiritual effulgence can easily also be seen as an influence from Shaivism where primordial sound flashes forth as light and then rays (see Padoux, Vāc, The Concept of the Word in Selected Hindu Tantras). Or, as I prefer to view it, the Dzogchen tantras do not necessarily owe any debt to any tradition, but instead are the product of the realization of Buddhist yogis.

As I said, those who make arguments for external influence on Dzogchen, apart from its obvious grounding in Buddhadharma, do so very speculatively and with a lack of textual support.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

My point is that the western academic notion that the Buddha rejected Vedic culture is a complete distortion.

Michael_Dorfman said:

Which scholars do you have in mind? The most recent work I can think of on the relationship between the Buddha and Vedic culture is Gombrich, and he's certainly not arguing that it is a simple rejection; rather, he argues that the Buddha intentionally echoed and re-deployed Vedic notions in a new, sometimes parodic manner.

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily 19th century scholars who sought to embed in Buddhism their own protestant values. However, such ideas have become deeply embedded in Buddhism's reception in the west and you often see these ideas repeated:

Buddha rejected the Vedas (he didn't and in fact refers to the Gayatri as the chief of all mantras)

Buddha was a reformer (he wasn't anything of the sort)

Buddha rejected jati and varna (he did not -- but he reframed the idea of a "brahman" as

an ethical quality; but this did mean he neglected the value of brahmins in Indian society as a whole)

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Reading a bit about this book. The thing about "mutual respect" is a bit of a slight of hand on his part. He is basically trying to get other religions to respect Hindu ideals.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think his point is that facile. For example, Buddha actually did respect other paths, even if he did not sign off on them.

viniketa said:

Though I wouldn't exactly call it 'slight of hand', here, deepbluehum has a point. Malhotra defines 'respect' specifically as 'mutual respect', which means, to him, admitting that all paths lead to the divine. He does this knowing full well Abrahamic religions cannot accord mutual respect due to their exclusivism. Buddha would have had to 'sign off on them' to meet Malhotra's criteria.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so -- he addresses this point and includes Carvaka and Lokayati schools as well. You guys have not read this book carefully enough.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Any similarities in the birth stories of Padmasambhava, Garab Dorje, Jesus and Moses are incidental.

There are no gnostic influences on Dzogchen. Any imagined influences are purely speculative and not grounded in any concrete fact, historical or textual.

deepbluehum said:

You mean to say the textual similarity is not a textual similarity? You love Dzogchen too

much. Everything about the origin of tantras is speculative. That's what the Tibetans need to figure out.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, rather than speculate about what Dzogchen texts say, I read them. So I really am in a position to say whether or not there is so called "gnostic" influence on them or not.

Quite frankly, Vedic culture is much more a pressing influence in Dzogchen texts, if anything.

If you want to claim Gnostic influences on Dzogchen, you have to be very specific, give examples -- cite a text, show how some intertextuality -- prove a connection. If you can't, you are just spouting hot air.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What you are ignoring is the fact that Buddha used cultural Aikido on the Hindu world. Which in turn, they did back. This is the "Dharmic world." There was never any real respect for each other. The Buddha's story about the Vedic rite for his funeral is not what you think. There is a nonchalantness about it. If you live in Indian culture you can see this first hand how "respect for others" is given in a nonchalant way. In India, it's path of least resistance. It is way different than adoption. The Thai are playing imitation. The world has a hell of a time with India. India transcends reasons. The Western scholars are correct, Buddha was mocking Vedic cosmology. It's a very Indian kind of humor, very subtle and ironic, but the undertone is a death blow.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha just did what all Indians did -- he had a palate and used it. He was not doing "aikido" of any kind. He was not trying to upset any applecarts. The whole idea that Buddha was trying reject the so called system of varna and jati is complete crap.

The Buddha's recommendations for his funeral was exactly what I said it was. -- shramanas were not expected to conduct in such rites, it was not in their job description.

My point is that the western academic notion that the Buddha rejected Vedic culture is a complete distortion.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:00 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What also comes to mind are texts like "The Sermon on the Mount According to Swami So and So," interpreting Christianity in Hindu terms. Everything this guy blames the West of doing, Hindus did it too. He's doing underhanded Hindu proselytizing. This is exactly the kind of empty debate the Buddha warned of.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is actually being quite above board. He is making a cogent argument about a certain flexibility that Dharmic culture sustains, that Abrahamic cultures cannot.

What he is saying is not new-- for example, Bataille makes a distinction between festival cultures which regularly engage in the destruction of surplus value and hegemonic cultures which suppress such destruction (see *The Accursed Share*). Or exam the interesting essay from Ten Thousand Plateaus called *Nomadology*.

What Malhotra is interested in, among other things, as driving home the fact that western academic myth of the Aryan Invasion Theory, etc. has created many distortions of Indian culture. This is not to say that there are no linguistic continuities between peoples in the so called IE continuum. But languages are not peoples.

Also I find his work appealing, especially as someone who has abandoned Buddhist chauvanism -- and such chauvanism is essentially a Western phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Also let's not forget the similarity of the birth and childhood stories of Jesus and Garab Dorje, Padmasambhava and Moses. Scholars have noticed the gnostic influence on Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean they have imagined such an influence.

deepbluehum said:

It's a bit of a glaring similarity, bordering on plagiarism.

Malcolm wrote:

Any similarities in the birth stories of Padmasambhava, Garab Dorje, Jesus and Moses

are incidental.

There are no gnostic influences on Dzogchen. Any imagined influences are purely speculative and not grounded in any concrete fact, historical or textual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Reading a bit about this book. The thing about "mutual respect" is a bit of a slight of hand on his part. He is basically trying to get other religions to respect Hindu ideals.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think his point is that facile. For example, Buddha actually did respect other paths, even if he did not sign off on them.

What Malhotra was pointing out was that in general, in ancient India there was a cultural flexibility that could accomodate a pluralistic religious and social culture in ways that Abrahamic religions just cannot.

But when we read Indian polemics through western eyes, we tend to reify these debates into evangelisms that are just not present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Reading a bit about this book. The thing about "mutual respect" is a bit of a slight of hand on his part. He is basically trying to get other religions to respect Hindu ideals. Only Hindus think all paths are equally paths to god. Almost all other religions are exclusivist, Buddhism included. Did Buddha respect Hindu ideas? Not really, he satirized them.

Malcolm wrote:

We have a very skewed view of Buddhism on the ground in ancient and how it was actually practiced -- we derive our view of Buddhism in India through the lense of a few polemical scholars, ignoring many inconvenient facts. For example, that fact that the Thai court still maintains brahmin priests, and has done so for hundreds of years, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Also let's not forget the similarity of the birth and childhood stories of Jesus and Garab Dorje, Padmasambhava and Moses. Scholars have noticed the gnostic influence on Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean they have imagined such an influence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

tobes said:

If we are to speak of a western universalism, surely it is a/ the ideology of liberal-democracy and b/ the political economy of neo-liberalism. The vast majority of Indian students head to western institutions to learn about demand, supply, finance and management. This has nothing to do with German idealism, history or monotheism - and everything to do with the logic of utility.

And in India, this logic has become extremely powerful - if there is a national undercurrent at the moment, it is: economic growth, I.T., infrastructure, wealth creation. Little of that is Vedic.

So I just think Malhotra has the wrong end of the stick here.

Malcolm wrote:

All of these things that you mention are a logical extension of the ideological currents that begins with the Enlightenment. Malhotra addresses the Indian capitulation to the exact type of Western Universalism you mention above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Agreed, "how" is a question for another thread.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Western "Buddhists" could start by recognizing the value of Vedic culture and its overwhelming contribution.

Western Tibetan Buddhists could start by dropping their obsession with validating their narratives in contradistinction to Bon narratives.

Theravadins could drop their obsession with finding "original Buddhism". etc.

deepbluehum said:

Hey don't blame White Man for everything. The Red Men of Tibet are pretty damn obsessed with their lineages and historical validity. Somehow White Man and Red Man combine to obscure the Indian persuasion.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are -- this is a symptom of a type of historical consciousness that the Sinosphere possessed that the Indosphere was rather lacking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you read the Pali Canon, you can find that Buddha himself was not ill-disposed towards Brahmins, or tradition Vedic religion per se. He simply disputed certain theories still popular among Hindus. A good source for this is the Mahaparinibbana sutta in the Digha-nikāya.

viniketa said:

Thank you for the reply. Of the above, I am aware. I am interested in the idea of his rejection of śruti, per se. Or, did you mean, earlier, that he rejected "shruti, uncreated and eternal" as a package?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, uncreated and eternal shruti, as a package.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He rejected the idea that the Vedas were shruti

viniketa said:

Thank you, Malcolm. I would like to learn more about this, if you could point to a source. It is confusing, given the nature of the śrāvaka tradition in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

If you read the Pali Canon, you can find that Buddha himself was not ill-disposed towards Brahmins, or tradition Vedic religion per se. He simply disputed certain theories still popular among Hindus. A good source for this is the Mahaparinibbana sutta in the Digha-nikāya.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Throma Nagmo Teachings by Lama Tharchin Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Elaborate ritual does not necessarily equate with mahāyoga. It is the style of creation that determines whether something is Mahayoga or not. Just so you know, I have the complete transmission of this cycle and over the years have practiced it a lot.

Yudron said:

Dudjom Lingpa's Throma sadhanas with tsog combine mahayoga, chö, and the view of Atiyoga in a unique way -- it's really something...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

alpha said:

i dont want to be difficult but why is CNNR asking his disciple things he cant do himself. According to him the one who can integrate ,in this instance, with the fire element will get permission from him to teach dzogchen.

Why is he not saying for example .."if you at least have my knowledge of dzogchen and my level of integration then you can teach dzogchen to others".

Malcolm wrote:

No, what he said was if you can do this, then he wants to take teachings from you!

As for the second statement, he is saying that, all the time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Hsuan Hua on Homosexuality

Content:

Huseng said:

I think it has more to do with the widespread fear among Chinese Buddhist bhikṣus about Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is fundamentally based on racism against Tibetans.

Huseng said:

Where do you get that idea?

Malcolm wrote:

History.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Hsuan Hua on Homosexuality

Content:

Huseng said:

I think it has more to do with the widespread fear among Chinese Buddhist bhikṣus about Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is fundamentally based on racism against Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Hsuan Hua on Homosexuality

Content:

Jnana said:

I also think that there are a couple of points worth mentioning: (1) a bodhisattva practicing on any of the first six or seven bhūmis isn't perfect, they still have cognitive and afflictive obscurations; and (2) there's no reason why an āryabodhisattva would have to automatically adopt liberal Western values upon attaining the first bhūmi.

Huseng said:

I still have to wonder where he got the idea that most Lamas have AIDS.

Malcolm wrote:

He is a racist, obviously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha was a Vedic Indian.

viniketa said:

We often see it written that Guatama Buddha 'rejected the Vedas' or 'rejected the authority of the Vedas', while it is my understanding that he rejected the authority of certain groups of Brahmin priests. See Stephen Knapp: http://www.stephen-knapp.com/buddhism_and_its_vedic_connections.htm " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

He rejected the idea that the Vedas were shruti, uncreated and eternal. Of course, such ideas are key in Dzogchen where we find the Dzogchen tantras are uncreated and eternal in the same sense the Vedas were held to be.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apaurusheyatva> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

JKhedrup said:

My appreciation for Vedic culture arose after my arrival in India. Though I'm a Buddhist monk with firm refuge in the triple gem, I wanted to understand the broader culture from which the dharma arose.

This led me to travel to various Hindu and Jain holy sites on the subcontinent such as Vrindavan, Varanasi and several ashrams. Though the Buddhist teachings are definitely "for me", the thread that runs through these dharmic traditions is one of mutual reciprocity and development. Some developments in Buddhism closely mirror those of Hinduism during a certain time period and vice versa.

As an aside, does anyone know what philosophy of "Hinduism" was held by the family of Siddhartha Gautama, Lord Buddha? What would the practice of his family have been like?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha was a Vedic Indian. For example, when he died he recommended to Ananda that "faithful" brahmins could handle his funeral rites. Just because he rejected the mechanical efficacy of brahmanical rites, he understood their deeper import. Thus, all the parts of the Stupa are named after parts of the Vedic Agnihotra precinct, including the so called "srog shing" or yaṣṭi (central pillar of the stupa), to which the animal was to be tied in preparation for the yajnam (mchod sbyin), the offering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Agreed, "how" is a question for another thread.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Western "Buddhists" could start by recognizing the value of Vedic culture and its overwhelming contribution.

Western Tibetan Buddhists could start by dropping their obsession with validating their narratives in contradistinction to Bon narratives.

Theravadins could drop their obsession with finding "original Buddhism". etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Osho said:

We have neo Sufis here in the UK who seem to do little else but fire walk and place their unblemished hands onto red hot coals. They're not necessarily 'realized beings' but it does make for good theatre.

Malcolm wrote:

Um.... that is not what he means. He means putting one's hand in a fire and leaving it there indefinitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I only wish that Buddhist countries like Singapore had a Buddhist voice similar to Malhotra's in order to challenge the shift in culture that is leading to a youth uninterested in the teachings of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Sooner or later those of us who are proponents of Dharma culture are going to have to put aside our western style "faith commitments" and find a common ground in the Dharma, which is a pluralistic decentralized religious culture.

If we don't, then the culture of Dharma will vanish.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Throma Nagmo Teachings by Lama Tharchin Rinpoche

Content:

Yudron said:

The tertön himself never used that language to describe any aspect of the medium or short deity practice, or the cycle in general, and neither did Dudjom Rinpoche in the supportive texts.

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Throma, in all sadhanas, is explicitly described by Dudjom Rinpoche as a called "Ati syle of creation" i.e. instant recollection without any seed syllable at all. In the retreat manual it is stated:

"Here, the unelaborate ati creation beyond the conventions of the three samadhis is the universe arising as the basis, the self-originated naturally formed mandala, the totally perfect (rdzog chen par) self-visualization in a moment of recollection in the manner of a fish leaping from the water."

Since the goal of Anuyoga is atiyoga, it is fair to say that actually the Throma is ati of anu. Anu because it involves transformation, ati because the principle of creation is a self-originated naturally formed [rang byung lhun grub] mandala.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Osho said:

If one accepts 'linear historicity' as if-this-then-that causal temporality then it surely must be taken as underpinning later western empiricist philosophies, all of them

including Malhotra who has both feet rooted firmly within the western methodological approach albeit the PoMo subaltern. The enlightenment project did not spring fully formed from the void and the subaltern is its child not its live in domestic help. Dawkins is, after all; an evangelist as were those of his predecessors cited above. Malhotra is non different.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are missing a critical point: that of the purva-paksha. Malhotra is equally critical of Dharmic religions present lack of sophistication in constructing purva-pakshas i.e. "prior positions", to show that they readily understand the thought and implications of the intellectual (and in this case, cultural as well) opponent's POV. He devotes an entire chapter to purva-paksha, a discipline really unknown outside of Indian polemics. He introduces the concept in the first chapter:

The corrective to this problem in my view is the ancient and powerful Indian practice of 'purva paksha'. This is the traditional dharmic approach to rival schools. It is a dialectical approach, taking a thesis by an opponent ('purva pakshin') and then providing its rebuttal ('khandana') so as to establish the protagonist's views ('siddhanta'). The purva paksha tradition required any debater first to argue from the perspective of his opponent in order to test the validity of his understanding of the opposing position, and from there to realize his own shortcomings. Only after perfecting his understanding of opposing views would he be qualified to refute them. Such debates encourage individuals to maintain flexibility of perspective and honesty rather than seek victory egotistically. In this way, the dialectical process ensures a genuine and far-reaching shift in the individual.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). *Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism* (Kindle Locations 842-848). . Kindle Edition.

And:

Unfortunately, this tradition was not operative when Islam, Christianity and the European Enlightenment entered India. Rather than engaging in purva paksha with Islam and Christianity, or more recently with Marxism and secularism, the dharmic philosophers tended simply to ignore these foreign entries or else defer to them by adopting the attitude that 'all is one'. This stance, a misreading of the dharmic teachings, became an excuse for abandoning purva paksha, for if there are no differences, there is nothing important at which to gaze. The purva paksha method of engagement can engender sympathy as well as distance, understanding as well as critique. It must, however, retain several qualities not often found today: direct confrontation, clarification of difference, and an assumption of equality. Purva paksha should take place with transparency in as open a forum as possible and in such a way as to benefit each party. Acceptance of the need and potential for change should be a baseline from which to work.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). *Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western*

Universalism (Kindle Locations 856-863). . Kindle Edition.

In other words he is equally critical of the Indian failure to engage the West with a purva-paksha, something it credits the Chinese for having done historically from the beginning of their engagement with the West.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

to be said:

I see linear historicity as grounded far more in Enlightenment philosophies which were really running against the Abrahamic religions. i.e. Darwin, Hegel, Marx et al and conceptions of historical progress.

Malcolm wrote:

'While Christianity claims a divine mandate to superimpose its own history-centrism on the entire world, thinkers of the European Enlightenment have also developed various conceptual absolutes and endowed these with 'universal' status. The profound assumption is that the shape and direction of world history are leading to a single Western goal – be it salvation or scientific secular progress.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism (Kindle Locations 5079-5082). . Kindle Edition.

But it was Hegel, among all German thinkers, who had the deepest and most enduring impact on Western thought and identity. It is often forgotten that his work was a reaction against the Romantics' passion for India's past. He borrowed Indian ideas (such as monism) while debating Indologists to argue against the value of Indian civilization. He posited that the West, and only the West, was the agent of history and teleology. India was the 'frozen other', which he used as a foil to define the West.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism (Kindle Locations 5174-5178). . Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: History of 17 Tantras

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

. . . the sgra thal 'gyur tantra is the root of all Dharma. It is the first Dharma ever taught to sentient beings. Every other Dharma comes from it.

M

dakini_boi said:

Where can I find out more on the history of the 17 Dzogchen Tantras? Where is it said that the sgra thal gyur was the first dharma taught to sentient beings?

Thankyou

Malcolm wrote:

In the sgra thal 'gyur, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

tobes said:

I think it's a huge (and wrong, and bad) reification of 'western' epistemic/ hermeneutical frameworks.

Malcolm wrote:

He adresses this objection in his book early on.

tobes said:

What is his argument?

Malcolm wrote:

In making these arguments, I may be accused of using broad definitions, generalizations and extreme contrasts. When I speak of 'the West' vs 'India', or the 'Judeo-Christian religions' vs the 'dharma traditions', I am well aware that I may be indulging in the kind of essentialism that postmodern thinkers have correctly challenged. I am also aware that such large categories comprise multiple traditions which are separate and often opposed. I view these terms as family resemblances and guides, not as reified or immutable entities. Furthermore, most people do understand them as pointing to actual entities with distinct spiritual and cosmological orientations, even if they can only be defined in opposition to one another. The terms can thus be used as entry points for debate and as foils to contrast both sides, which may help deepen our understanding.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism (Kindle Locations 110-116). . Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is very interesting is that way Western ideas of historicity shape our concerns about the Dharmas we westerners choose to learn. These ideas are very foreign to the spirit of Dharmic religions, at least as expressed through Malhotra's book. I cite all of the endless debates about whether Mahāyāna was taught by the Buddha; whether the Pali Canon is the "real" Buddhism. Whether Vajrayāna is as valid as Mahāyāna, or more recently, the abortive debate over the historicity of Bon accounts of their religion.

Malhotra argues:

Itihasa is also fundamentally pluralistic: there are usually a variety of versions. A remodelled account or a new version of a narrative does not nullify all others. There is no burning of old books to erase past versions. What gets rejected is simply ignored, possibly to be revived or revisited at a later time when it might again become contextually relevant. Hence, in India one finds ancient customs coexisting with those from later periods. An open past serves as a creative resource for future generations who might want to explore the roads not taken. The Western unfolding of history, on the other hand, does not have room for parallel streams, finding them threatening and hence believing it safer to display them in museums (i.e., not as living traditions but as dead ones). But collapsing all variations into a mono-history only produces a mono-culture. Such a lack of understanding and insight causes itihasa to get misconstrued as myth vis-à-vis some putative 'reality'.¹³

The West demands that its myths be historicized so that they may be claimed as true. Indians do not carry the burden of history-centrism and so are under no pressure to present their myths as history.

There are multiple stakeholders who compete for their respective versions of history to prevail. Power is always at work in the construction of history. (History is written by the victors, as the popular adage goes.) More often than not, history is arbitrary in terms of what is included and what is not, what is emphasized, whose point of view is privileged, what values get superimposed, and so forth. In the West, a powerful apparatus and elaborate process have evolved to present history, and the transformation of Western myths into fact remains a major preoccupation of the Western humanities.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). *Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism* (Kindle Locations 1123-1136). . Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I also know that there are western practitioners who have genuine realization, but they are somewhat undervalued.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by realization.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's definition is very stringent. If you can place your hand in fire without it being harmed, then he will consider you realized. Since he himself cannot do this, he does not consider himself realized, just a little more experienced than we, his students.

I personally believe he is an arya, someone who is actually an awakened person -- but that is just me.

M

Nighthawk said:

You think he is a full fledged Buddha or just someone who is realized?

Malcolm wrote:

I think he is someone who has the constant knowledge of his own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

But it's a good point. How many realized beings are there in the world? Who is becoming realized in the West? How many have become enlightened in the last ten years? Twenty years? Fifty? The last century?

Malcolm wrote:

I can think of at least five people within the past 15 years who achieved total realization -- two bonpo in Tibet, a couple of buddhist yogis in repkong, Khenpo Acho is famous. I am sure there are more.

underthetree said:

It gave me pause to read the recent thread on Buddhist saints. Every candidate was from the Middle Ages at the very latest.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah...there are plenty of saints, enough to go around for everyone, even in this century, Buddhist, Bonpo and Hindu -- even Christian.

alpha said:

How about westerners?

How many of those you know who have been educated in the west have achieved ,are very close to achieve or just about to achieve total realization or are very far gone , almost continually integrated,day and night ,free ,totaly free, nearly free,just about to be free?

How many?

Or lets go one step lower.

How many you know ,westereners, who can carry their rigpa around ,on leaving home,getting on the bus,reading on the bus,getting off the bus,taking the tube,reading on the tube getting off the tube,walking to office ,on the way to office saying hello to 50 individuals,spending 10 hours doing shit in a stupid f...d up office..leaving work.. etc....and so on...?

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN very recently said that he knows of students in the DC who have concrete knowledge of Dzogchen, good practitioners, this means they are very integrated.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He adresses this objection in his book early on.

viniketa said:

He also addresses objections based in 'postmodern' arguments early-on.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually I did not know about this author, but I read a substantial portion of his book "Being Different" last night, and I find that I broadly agree with his presentation of Dharmic culture as opposed to Judeo-Christian-Islamic culture. Many of his points are points I have made in the past in various places and to various people over the past 25 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 10th, 2012 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

tobes said:

I think it's a huge (and wrong, and bad) reification of 'western' epistemic/ hermeneutical frameworks.

Malcolm wrote:
He addresses this objection in his book early on.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 10th, 2012 at 10:19 PM
Title: Re: Iron Ornaments
Content:

Yudron said:
I'm having a new iron security fence built, and I have the opportunity to have an iron ornament fabricated and welded on to it--this is pretty common. I'm thinking a lotus motif, like a simple line drawing, might be nice. Has anyone out there done anything like that?

Malcolm wrote:
Vajras would be better.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 10:18 PM
Title: Re: Which Buddhist School is Right For Me?
Content:

My Socks Smell said:
I'm in Southwestern Virginia.

Malcolm wrote:
<https://www.ligmincha.org> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://www.tcbci.org/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And of course, because my master constantly gives webcasted retreats:

<http://www.tsegyalgar.org> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 10:09 PM
Title: Re: Does Zen/Chan Offer an Opinion Regarding Shentong/Rangtong?
Content:

Matylda said:
Rangtong and shentong have nothing to do with Indian Buddhism. Names and ideas are Tibetan... similarly there are no 4 or 6 tantra division in Japan, as there was no such division known in India.

Malcolm wrote:
Your first statement here is correct.

The second is false: there were such divisions in India -- it is found in such tantras as the Vajramala and so on, but they are post-eighth century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

Jax said:

However Bon does not have the cycle of Dungs'o Repa regarding the Seven Levels of Visions that are quite extraordinary. Norbu offers this transmission, and I have found the results from practice to be most profound. It is considered in Nyingma to be the pinnacle of esoteric methods. I recommend everyone to pursue this unique transmission. Norbu recently taught all seven levels at a public retreat.

spanda said:

Does anybody know when exactly has N. Norbu taught this transmission of Dungs'o Repa's Seven Levels of Visions?

Except for Longde teachings, Yangti (taught not in a complete form), and Thogal teachings, I don't know any other teaching similar with this, given by N. Norbu..

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has given the lung for this cycle teachings several times, for example, in 1992 in Conway. But he informed us then that we do the first level, then we communicate with him and based on our experience, he will communicate the next level and so on.

He gave the Longsal Yangti teaching last year in Merigar. It has the same basic structure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I am in the UK and it would be great to have a centre (Gar?) here.

Malcolm wrote:

Kunselling is there.

Blue Garuda said:

Yes, to clarify I meant a centre (as in permanent owned building) in the UK. Is there one?

EDIT: Just found it - wonderful!

Malcolm wrote:

<http://dzogchencommunity.org/kunselling/kunselling.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I am in the UK and it would be great to have a centre (Gar?) here.

Malcolm wrote:

Kunselling is there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

You still fail to understand or acknowledge the point: There are people who are not receptive to dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, as the Dzogchen tantras openly acknowledge.

The job of the teacher is identify such persons and steer them to the appropriate spritual solution. *

M

rai said:

i am wondering how does it happen when teacher has many students and don't know me very well (at all)?

* the quote is from "Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations" thread but my question fits this discussion more i think.

Malcolm wrote:

A person like ChNN can size you up very quickly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

What I said was that even if they receive DI, they do not necessarily experience rigpa (in fact, my opinion is that most people don't). This shows they have limitations and have to work on them. How do they work on them? They apply teachings for other yantras. But they have to know about these yantras first before they can apply, hence the teachings of other yantras are important.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Actually, such people would most likely benefit much more by diligently practicing rushen and semdzins...

pueraeternus said:

Or they could also do the usual hundred thousand Vajrasattvas, mandala offerings, etc, and other myriad methods from the other yantras. Nothing wrong with that.

As mentioned before, my replies were in response to how the thread in the Dharma-free-for-all forum went, and my intention to correct those sentiments that I felt wasn't appropriate for a general dharma audience, or even for aspiring Dzogchen practitioners. Moving these posts here have shifted the context of that discussion. But in any case, this is also the general Dzogchen forum, so teachings from other Dzogchen masters who follow a more traditional method should be honored too.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with a traditional ngondro, but it is not essential. Rushen and semzin on the other hand, are essential.

Aspiring Dzogchen practitioners should find the best possible lineage. I really do not know of any other master alive today who had two direct masters who attained rainbow body. Do you? Of course there are other masters who have concrete knowledge of four visions and so on. So you get who you get based on your karma -- but in general, we do not have much time. Therefore, I always tell people who want to really understand Dzogchen that they should receive teachings from ChNN.

Then there are a class of people like yourself who have received teachings from ChNN but are actually following other teachers in reality. This is fine, this is good-- but there is generally a disconnect between what your teachers consider important for Dzogchen practice and what mine does. It comes out again and again in the endless and fruitless debate over ngondro. It is inevitable that if someone following more traditional teacher claims you have to ngondro, etc., someone who is following ChNN will disagree.

There is really no need to follow other yānas if you are a Dzogchen practitioner. Why? Because the sgra thal 'gyur tantra is the root of all Dharma. It is the first Dharma ever taught to sentient beings. Every other Dharma comes from it. All this talk about the

need to go step by step through all nine yānas is really a misconception forced on Dzogchen teachings by those who follow the system of Kamalashila and later, Atisha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

catmoon said:

Might be good to start with Stephen Batchelor's "Buddhism Without Beliefs". He's not exactly trying to expunge karma and rebirth from Buddhism, and those looking for a classic anti-rebirth stance may be disappointed in his agnostic position, but he is a major figure on the scene. If there are "Pitfalls of Western Analysis of Dharmic Traditions", they should show up in his writings.

Malcolm wrote:

His explicit rejection of karma and rebirth happens in Confessions of a Buddhist Atheist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You should read the Longchen Nyinthing aspiration of basis, path and result.

tomamundsen said:

Is there an English translation of this? If so, can you point us in that direction?

Thanks!

Is it <http://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/nyingma-masters/jigme-lingpa/prayer-ground-path-and-fruition?>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen

Content:

username said:

- Finally it is wrong to say Rigpa is this or that, it is ineffable and has many manifestations, not just one.

<http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/Rigpa> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Vimalamitra defines five kinds of rig pa. These five more or less cover everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Nice quote, but that is hardly everything I think.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

As far as people interested in Dzogchen goes, that passage is cited over and over again by many masters. There is another way to divide up capacities in 21 capacities. Apart from the best, the majority of the other capacities refer to when a person is liberated in the bardo, or if one is very average, in a nirmanakāya pure realm in one's next life.

Vimalamitra states in his commentary on the sgra thal 'rgyur tantra:

"...that person of extraordinary diligence will attain buddhahood in this life with the contaminated body disappearing. Even the average person, after taking spontaneous birth in a natural nirmanakāya buddhafiield, will find solace from that and attain buddhahood. Therefore, merely by entering into this teaching of the definitive great secret one will not enter into the three realms."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

If the introduction failed, they can't go on to the 2nd statement "Do not remain in doubt". Hence at this point they have to work with their situation and limitations so that they may be successful the next time.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you have missed a critical point. If they did not recognize their real nature from the direct introduction they must move to the second statement. This is the purpose of the methods of semzin and rushan. See page 29 of the SOV book.

Otherwise, if they definitely recognized their real nature through the direct introduction, then they can skip that and go to the third statement, continue in that state. But such people are very rare. So, the second statement means you confirm the experience of the direct introduction by using many methods, whatever it takes, whatever works for your condition best.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Real Bodhisattva path really starts with the 1st Bhumi as an arya - the others are just aspiring Bodhisattvas.

Malcolm wrote:

This is also false. The true bodhisattva path starts with the path of accumulation i.e. sambharamarga. This is why it is stated quite clearly that a beginning bodhisattva who has just given rise to supreme bodhicitta on the path of accumulation is much superior to an Arhat.

Basically, every path starts with its mode of entry -- for Hināyāna it is taking a vow. For Mahāyāna it creating bodhicitta. For Vajrayāna it is taking an initiation. For Dzogchen it is receiving direct introduction.

You do not have to receive all these other rites of vows and so on however to enter into Dzogchen teachings. It is completely unnecessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Real Dzogchen, as has been pointed out infinite times, starts with direct introduction, and that is all.

pueraeternus said:

Doesn't Real Dzogchen start with rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it starts with direct introduction. Thus, we have the first of Garab Dorje's three statements.

If Dzogchen started with rigpa, it would be impossible for people who are ignorant to be introduced to their own nature. But because it is possible to introduce people to that nature, Dzogchen starts with direct introduction.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But if you start insisting people must conform to your limitations, I will point out that this is not so.

M

pueraeternus said:

I have not insisted others to conform to anything. I merely pointed out that (a) most of us have a lot of limitations, (b) we should be honest and aware of it as much as we can, (c) please don't diss the lower yanas, since they are precious in helping us overcome limitations.

Malcolm wrote:

On the contrary, you have insisted most assiduously that people cannot practice Dzogchen even if they have received direct introduction. This is a completely misguided idea. In Dzogchen teachings we discover our limitations so we can go beyond them-- we do not decide to remain in our limitations.

I have not even mentioned other yānas apart from correcting your perception of the purpose of the SMS base level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Such sentiments do not accord with the teachings of Dzogchen themselves at all.

pueraeternus said:

It accords with the way other teachers of Dzogchen transmit it.

Malcolm wrote:

What so called "teachers of Dzogchen" teach is not necessarily Dzogchen at all. For this

reason, I will stick what what the Dzogchen teachings actually say rather than what some teachers of "Dzogchen" say. You however are free to disagree and follow whomever you please. But if you start insisting people must conform to your limitations, I will point out that this is not so.

What I am talking about is the path of Dzogchen. We don't need to take one road, and then another road, and then finally we can be on the road of Dzogchen. If this were the case, then Dzogchen would not be a Yāna.

That is not the principle of Dzogchen teachings at all. You should read the Longchen Nyinthig aspiration of basis, path and result. Then you will understand more clearly. Otherwise, this conversation has become useless since you are merely crowing the party line of some Nyingmapas.

If people are interested in following Dzogchen teachings, then they should make an effort to meet Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Of course there are other teachers who give very nice teachings of Dzogchen as well. But in general this Lamrim style approach to Dzogchen really has very little to with actual Dzogchen.

Real Dzogchen, as has been pointed out infinite times, starts with direct introduction, and that is all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

I have understood that the qualities of the Dzogchen practitioners are mentioned quite clearly in the Dzogchen Tantra's themselves. Malcolm, perhaps you could sum up the most important points? Personally I think that before meeting Dzogchen my studies of Dharma made less sense. Everything in sutra and tantra make sense in the light of Dzogchen, but this is perhaps not the experience of everyone in this forum.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Listen well to my demonstration of the sublime method! There is no increase or decrease in true wisdom. There is no clarity or lack of clarity in the appearances of wisdom. There is no near or far on the path of secret mantra. There is no greater or smaller in the self-appearing. There is no sharp or dull in the capacity of sentient beings.

-- Rig pa rang drol

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Pero said:

That's why you go on a retreat.

Malcolm wrote:

This is primarily directed to Pero:

In 2002, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu told me personally and privately that by doing six days of retreat on Khandroling you can realize what would take six months in other places. I then related this to other people. It is true.

ChNN has also said many times his students never need to do more than three months of retreat at a time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

I would say that the majority are of the latter. And for them to have a chance to discover that potentiality, they have to plough the field first, and even then, the seed might not sprout in this life.

Malcolm wrote:

Such sentiments do not accord with the teachings of Dzogchen themselves at all.

pueraeternus said:

I think a lot of Dzogchen practitioners really only have a conceptual knowledge of their potential. The real danger for them is that they mistaken it for true rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

You would better off being concerned with your own rigpa, and not that of others. In particular you should be careful not to discourage those people interested in entering Dzogchen teachings by insisting they should follow sutra or tantra first.

If you have discovered a limitation in yourself, then that is fine. You should try to improve

your own capacity -- but judging the capacities of others to be low and insisting upon it to them is a very damaging mistake that can really have negative impact for yourself and those who listen to you. If you block the path of others, in the future, your own path will be blocked.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Yes, but that assumes that the students have a great deal of self-awareness and reflection. If students were really honest with themselves, then a lot of them would come to a realization there is so much work they have to do that they might as well do a form of assembly line approach.

Malcolm wrote:

We do not share the same perspective.

pueraeternus said:

Already, merely by entering Dzogchen teachings you have proved you are of very high capacity. If not, you never will ever hear even one word of Dzogchen teachings. This point is made again and again in Dzogchen tantras, and also by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and other masters.

Then everyone in DW is of very high capacity?

Malcolm wrote:

Entering means receiving direct introduction. Not merely hearing about the teachings intellectually, such as on a forum such as this. But even to hear the word Dzogchen intellectually proves one has a connection with the teachings.

pueraeternus said:

Therefore, this point of view that many people primulgate "I am interested in Dzogchen but I do not have sufficient capacity to study and practice Dzogchen" or "Dzogchen is so profound, there is no way it can be practiced unless you have studied and practiced sutra and tantra for many years" is completely wrong, I am very sorry to say.

How many really have the experience of rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Many people following Dzogchen teachings have concrete knowledge [rigpa] of their primordial potentiality, including some people who post on this forum. The rest of the people following Dzogchen teachings are actively trying to discover that potentiality so they can be in that knowledge.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

ChNN leaves it to his students to observe themselves and apply methods accordingly...

Malcolm wrote:

This is the key point: the standard assembly line approach advocated by the monastic system insists that everyone must move ahead, step by step, mastering one thing before moving onto the next thing. But this is not the approach of Dzogchen teachings at all. The approach of Dzogchen teachings is that you receive transmission and then discover for yourself what you need, and that is all. You do not need to study anything intellectually at all.

Already, merely by entering Dzogchen teachings you have proved you are of very high capacity. If not, you never will ever hear even one word of Dzogchen teachings. This point is made again and again in Dzogchen tantras, and also by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and other masters.

Therefore, this point of view that many people promulgate "I am interested in Dzogchen but I do not have sufficient capacity to study and practice Dzogchen" or "Dzogchen is so profound, there is no way it can be practiced unless you have studied and practiced sutra and tantra for many years" is completely wrong, I am very sorry to say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Why do you think he created the Santi Maha Sangha?

Malcolm wrote:

To preserve Dzogchen teachings by training people in a more detailed fashion. BTW, Santi Maha Sangha is Odḍiyāna language for "Dzogchen Community" (rdzog chen 'dus sde).

M

pueraeternus said:

Yes, but the Base is also full of sutric and tantric teachings. With that, its easier for the trainee to proceed to Semde, Longde and Mennagde.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis of SMS follows Padmasambhava's Man ngag lta ba phreng ba. As such, its main POV is a little connected with Mahāyoga, in my opinion. However, ChNN never claims that one needs to follow the Base in order to follow Dzogchen teachings. These are provided not as a step by step formula, but in order for the practitioner to make use of whatever teachings he or she needs, and also to gain a little experience in all the different sort of practices one can do. For this reason then, the basis contains practices from Hinayāna, Mahāyāna, Mahāyoga, Anuyoga, Semde and Managde -- but the main point throughout is how we integrate Dzogchen teachings into our whole life. Actually, for a Dzogchen practitioner, conduct, or attitude, as ChNN translates spyod pa, is arguably the most important aspect of one's practice. How do we know our practice is moving ahead? Through our conduct. Our conduct or attitude is where we discover our level of integration. Do we have more tension? More problems? Then our integration is not good, and our attitude needs adjustment. Are we having less tension and less problems? Then our integration is improving, and our attitude is becoming better and better.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

But it's a good point. How many realized beings are there in the world? Who is becoming realized in the West? How many have become enlightened in the last ten years? Twenty years? Fifty? The last century?

Malcolm wrote:

I can think of at least five people within the past 15 years who achieved total realization -- two bonpo in Tibet, a couple of buddhist yogis in repkong, Khenpo Acho is famous. I am sure there are more.

underthetree said:

It gave me pause to read the recent thread on Buddhist saints. Every candidate was from the Middle Ages at the very latest.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah...there are plenty of saints, enough to go around for everyone, even in this century, Buddhist, Bonpo and Hindu -- even Christian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Why do you think he created the Santi Maha Sangha?

Malcolm wrote:

To preserve Dzogchen teachings by training people in a more detailed fashion. BTW, Santi Maha Sangha is Oḍḍiyāna language for "Dzogchen Community" (rdzog chen 'dus sde).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

JKhedrup said:

If Gampopa had not studied with the Kadampa teachers as well as Milarepa, would he have produced his magnum opus "Jewel Ornament of Liberation".

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone forgets that Gampopa was a Nyingmapa to begin with, and that Nyingma remained influential on him all his life.

pueraeternus said:

Do you have a source for this?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, his biography.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

Spiritual practice and study becomes extremely difficult in such circumstances.

Worldly pleasures and pursuits are more appealing than Dharma quite often.

Malcolm wrote:

This is simply because people do not have teachers that teach them how to integrate. Frankly, most of the so-called Buddhists I have met are very non-integrated people. After years of so called Dharma practice they just do not have their shit together, and they cannot manifest what they need.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You have to eat. You have to have clothes. You have to have shelter.

That means you have to make money. This is how it is in our world. We cannot go begging door to door. This is not realistic.

Everyone must have a job.

M

Huseng said:

Of course. Though it is possible to set aside sufficient funds to go practice for extended periods and then come back to the ordinary world. If I'm not mistaken you went on extended three year retreat in the past, right? Clearly you came back alive and well.

Malcolm wrote:

I did a three year retreat. It was valuable. I had a hard time adjusting however, and most people do, when they get out.

Huseng said:

However in the west a guy leaving his wife and kids behind to do a three year retreat is probably going to be called a deadbeat. Maybe we can't avoid that.

Malcolm wrote:

He is a deadbeat, unless his wife and kids are on board with it in a positive sense. The Buddha clearly never intended that people abandon their families.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm, is that the New Age Invasion, or the Dharma Police Lynch Mob?

Malcolm wrote:

Lynch mob.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

Serious practice is usually not done by family men or women. Let's be realistic and honest.

Malcolm wrote:

Serious practice is not usually done by anybody, including people in long retreats. Let's be realistic and honest.

It has nothing to do with whether one is in retreat, or is a farmer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

With the greatest respect, Huseng, may you never have to deal with the consequences when someone you know decides to 'just leave their family.' What 'immeasurable opportunities' could be opened up by an act of such monstrous selfishness?

Huseng said:

When I did it I didn't think it was monstrously selfish.

Malcolm wrote:

I think he meant wife and kids. Did you leave a wife and kid behind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

Renunciation doesn't mean departing from worthwhile friends (kalyāṇa-mitra), though generally speaking mundane affairs and a lot of social engagements take people away from spiritual cultivation and practice. The Buddha himself was keen on the value of likeminded friends, though he cautioned everyone about mundane attachments and strong social ties and duties. This is what I have in mind at the moment.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to eat. You have to have clothes. You have to have shelter.

That means you have to make money. This is how it is in our world. We cannot go begging door to door. This is not realistic.

Everyone must have a job.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

In the future having a life partner might make a lot of sense economically for example...

Malcolm wrote:

Sigh.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

I don't quite understand what your last statement means.

Malcolm wrote:

There are a lot of so called "renunciates", monks and nun, out there whose so called "renunication" is just bitterness, disappointment, grudges.

It is much better to have an open heart.

Human beings are meant to be in communities with one another. This is why the Buddha said that friendship is the whole of the so called "spritual life". The idea that we are somehow better off in isolation is a fundamental error that comes about from not understanding who we are. Of course there are some people who can be like Mahākashyapa, but he was by all accounts a pretty crusty character.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

Such freedom when I think about it is a lot more satisfying and worthwhile than being in a long-term relationship (which I've had)..

Malcolm wrote:

Um....no offense, but you are twenty-six, you have not lived long enough enough to be in a real longterm relationship. Younger men such as yourself often make bold declarations about how they are going to be in the future.

Reality is much different, and you have no idea how your karma will ripen.

An open heart beats all this fabricated talk about renunciation, everyday.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Practiced distinterest is better than shrill denunciations.

M

catmoon said:

"All that is required for evil to prosper is that good men do nothing."

Malcolm wrote:

That might be true of the Third Reich, but it hardly applies to the "new ager question".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

For all the lip-service to the Goddess and the feminine, Buddhism, like the New Age, can be quite startlingly chauvinistic. I find that my distaste for this fact - as a man as well as a practitioner - is one of the main things that keeps me at arms' distance from sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

While the Dharma, in its essence is not patriarchal, Buddhism is a very patriarchal religion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: Tryodashang Guggul

Content:

Virgo said:

I just noticed recently that I have a bunch of this in the house that I ordered a couple of years ago from India, but for some reason never took at that time (it is still within date). Normally, I don't take medicines as I was told to straighten out problems by way of diet and lifestyle first, which I have; however with the recent job change and schedule change it might be good to take for a while. This is good for vata, only thing is I can't take anything that is too warming. any idea if this stuff is too warming for me?

Thanks.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Should be fine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

JKhedrup said:

If Gampopa had not studied with the Kadampa teachers as well as Milarepa, would he have produced his magnum opus "Jewel Ornament of Liberation".

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone forgets that Gampopa was a Nyingmapa to begin with, and that Nyingma remained influential on him all his life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Nemo said:

It's very realistic when you are young and have no ties. Even a crusty bastard like me has taken a few years out of his life for retreat. Admitting that your need for comfort and security is greater than your spiritual aspirations is more honest than saying it is an escapist dream. People love money and worldly life more than Dharma. It sounds like you are trying to comfort yourself by thinking everyone has your low standards.

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone has to discover their limitations and practice withing those. When you know what your limitations are, then liberation is very possible, even if you like money, comfort and security.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

KeithBC said:

Threads that are not worth paying attention to (by Buddhists) will be kept alive by the New Agers who outnumber us.

Malcolm wrote:

so called Newagers do not outnumber Buddhists on this board.

Disinterest always works -- if you don't find something interesting, don't read it, and if you do, don't respond.

I do not respond to 98+ percent of posts made in this forum. I am unlikely to respond to anymore posts in this thread, now that I have made my opinion known, for whatever it is worth.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Hiding "Dharma treasures" for future generations to find

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need for this.

The sublime Dharma arises from the intrinsic sound of Dharmatā. That is always present, just as awakened beings are always present to communicate it. Hence, the treasure tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

catmoon said:

Perhaps we should look at whether or not there is some basic Dharma, like the 4NT and 8FP, that can be realistically defended by mods.

Malcolm wrote:

What you do not want to do is go in the direction of E-Sangha. Our motivation was good, but the bureaucratic heavy-handedness backfired and created more problems than it solved.

People's speculations will wear out if no one expresses interest in them. Threads that are not worth paying attention to will die.

Practiced disinterest is better than shrill denunciations.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Throma Nagmo Teachings by Lama Tharchin Rinpoche

Content:

Pero said:

Cool, thanks! I browsed around their website a bit and it seems this particular teaching

will be about a short sadhana of Troma Nagmo. Do you or anyone else know if there will be recitation commitments or something?

Malcolm wrote:

I think you need the Wang to attend

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:

deepbluehum said:

My apologies:

So Malcolm, what's so special about this text that makes it useful vis a vis the Kosha? .

Malcolm wrote:

It is directly connected with Dzogchen practice.

Even if you take the position it is a pseudographia, it was produced by a realized Dzogchen master, Shenchén Luga, etc. So the teachings of Dzogchen permeate it.

It has interesting and detailed accounts of the dharmadhātu, wisdoms, etc.

deepbluehum said:

This has really nothing to do with the Kosha. The issue becomes how is the Mdzog phug an interesting text vis a vis Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

The Mdzog phug itself really has nothing to do with the Kosha, apart from cribbing a few passages here and there (which Buddhists make a big fuss about, at the expense of the rest of the text).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Caz said:

I appreciate they may reinforce one and other but how is it necessary to study Lamdre in order to improve your understanding of Guhyasamaja or Dzogchen, Surely if one accomplishes the results of one perfect clarity and understanding will come naturally regarding the rest ?

Malcolm wrote:

Such accomplishment is rare. Studying all teachings impartially improves our chances

for realization because it improves our prajñā.

Further, we never know what circumstances we will be born in. If we are familiar with all teachings, and make a connection with all teachings, then we have more opportunity and it will be easier to study and practice in the future. For example, even if we want to be a Kagyu in life after life there is no guarantee.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

JKhedrup said:

HH the Dalai Lama Dharamsala Lam Rim Commentary 1998

Therefore Kagyupas must know the Mahamudra teaching in Sakya. The Sakyapas must know Dzogchen, they must know Kagyu. The Gelugpas must know Dzogchen, they must know Sakya and Kagyu. Such knowledge should not be learned merely for scholarship but for the sake of one's practice.

For the sake of one's practice one should receive important empowerments, get important transmissions and in this way on the one hand you will get some idea and knowledge, and at the same time be able to gain more understanding.

In my own experience, with regards to understanding the meaning of clear light as explained in the Guyyasamaja, I was able to get much inspiration from my study and understanding of Dzogchen. Likewise, certain teachings in the Gelugpa tradition, such as the explanation of the three voidnesses, such kind of understanding will be very helpful in understanding the Dzogchen or Nyingma tradition.

Caz said:

It sounds like he is saying that these lineages are not complete in of their selves unless it is a mistranslation, To be Non sectarian does one have to mix lineages or just respect them as equals ?

Malcolm wrote:

What he is saying is that all teachings reinforce one another, that one's understanding of Dzogchen, for example will be improved by studying Lamdre and Guhyasamaja, One's understanding of Mahamudra will be improved by studying Dzogchen and Lamdre, one's understanding of Lamdre will be improved by studying Dzogchen and Mahamudra, etc.

I think he is mostly talking to lineage heads.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Throma Nagmo Teachings by Lama Tharchin Rinpoche

Content:

Pero said:

Can you say a bit more about this teaching? Throma Nagmo is a wrathful deity and related to Chod practice?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a major cycle from Dudjom Lingpa -- it has chod as an important part of the practice, but it is a cycle of Dzogchen teachings very much connected with Anuyoga, which has complete tregcho and thoga instructions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 4th, 2012 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:

ratna said:

I studied one chapter of it recently, the chapter on the five elements with Dranpa Namkhai's commentary, and found it to be an amazing text of much interest, much more interesting in many respects than Vasubandhu's Kosha for someone who is practicing Dzogchen.

I'd appreciate if you elaborated on this.

BTW, could you give a TBRC reference for the commentary?

R

Malcolm wrote:

The basic verses and the commentary were published by LTN in 1966. I have an original copy of that which is miraculously still in one piece.

The tbrc number for a later commentary is W23426.

Unfortunately LTN's edition Mdzod Phug: Basic Verses is not available through TBRC. I am just lucky to have acquired a copy from Saujanya books in India some years ago.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 4th, 2012 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:
deepbluehum said:
My apologies:

So Malcolm, what's so special about this text that makes it useful vis a vis the Kosha? .

Malcolm wrote:
It is directly connected with Dzogchen practice.

Even if you take the position it is a pseudographia, it was produced by a realized Dzogchen master, Shenchen Luga, etc. So the teachings of Dzogchen permeate it.

It has interesting and detailed accounts of the dharmadhātu, wisdoms, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 4th, 2012 at 9:12 PM
Title: Re: What makes one a Mahayanist?
Content:
Kunga said:
I was thinking earlier, exactly what does one have to accept in order to be a Mahayanist.

Malcolm wrote:
One has to generate supreme bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 10:30 PM
Title: Re: The Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra = Yogācārabhūmi ?
Content:
Jnana said:
Well, the Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript by Wayman leaves quite a bit untranslated (and what is translated could be done better). The Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra covers much of the same ideas as the Bodhisattvabhūmi but the content isn't exactly the same.

Malcolm wrote:
The Yogacarabhumi can be roughly considered to be a systematic grand commentary on the Mahāyāna Sūtra Ālaṃkāra, and the five treatises of Maitrya in general.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 9:48 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
seraphim said:

Hi all, so the Donwang we got today is actually Shitro Khorde Rangdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The text is often incorrectly dismissed as a copy of the Buddhist Abhidharmakosha but it is nothing of the sort.

deepbluehum said:

It lifts entire passages wholesale.

Malcolm wrote:

Dan Martin analyzed the whole text. You need to read this if you are interested:

Comparing Treasuries: Mental states and Mdzod phug lists and passages with parallels in Abhidharma works by Vasubandhu and Asanga, or in Prajñāpāramitā sūtras: A progress report

http://ir.minpaku.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10502/1286/1/SER15_004.pdf "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

There was no Dzogchen at the time of Vasubhandu.

That merely serves to show how interesting the Mdzod phug is.

Incidentally, I made an error, the commentary of the Mdzod phug was produced about a century later.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Vasubandhu Pure Land site

Content:

Jikan said:

Related question that Malcolm is particularly well positioned to address:

in the volume Heart Drops of Dharmakaya, it's claimed that Vasubhandu's cosmology shares a common origin with Bonpo teachings. Is this a plausible claim? If so, does it contradict the claim that it derives from the Sarvastivada school? Or does it follow that the Bonpo tradition may share a common origin with the Sarvastivada school also?

Malcolm wrote:

see <https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=78&t=9553> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Tadyatha

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Thank you both.

So, grammatically, does the tadyatha signify that the praise is made by means of the mantra? i.e., "Praise to so and so - [make the praise] like this: Om. . . "

Malcolm wrote:

Tadyatha is made of two words tad yatha, "as follows here":

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:

Jikan said:

Related question that Malcolm is particularly well positioned to address:

in the volume Heart Drops of Dharmakaya, it's claimed that Vasubhandu's cosmology shares a common origin with Bonpo teachings. Is this a plausible claim? If so, does it contradict the claim that it derives from the Sarvastivada school? Or does it follow that the Bonpo tradition may share a common origin with the Sarvastivada school also?

Malcolm wrote:

This is because the so called Bonpo Abhidharma, the Srid pa'i Mdzod Phug (revealed and written down by Shenchen Luga

<http://www.thlib.org/?wiki=/access/wiki/site/679c2e7e-ca49-462b-0038-a5e0534b709f/biography%20of%20shenchen%20luga.html> (996-1035) in 1017) is held by the Bonpos to have been taught by Tonpa Shenrab. Tonpa Shenrab lived much earlier than Vasubandhu and the Buddha. There are some passages in the mDzod phug that are shared with the Kosha, but not very many, actually. But the Meru Cosmology etc., is basically the same. Therefore, the Bonpos claim the Mdzod phug influenced Buddhist cosmology.

Most modern scholars believe that the Mdzod Phug was partially influenced by the Kosha. However, the Mdzod Phug has a great deal of material in it that indicates it was also highly influenced by Dzogchen and so on. The materials in it are rich and have not been studied very much. The text is often incorrectly dismissed as a copy of the Buddhist Abhidharmakosha but it is nothing of the sort.

I studied one chapter of it recently, the chapter on the five elements with Dranpa Namkhai's commentary, and found it to be an amazing text of much interest, much more interesting in many respects than Vasubandhu's Kosha for someone who is practicing Dzogchen.

Dan Martin has done a lot of interesting analysis of the root text, but not so much on the commentary. Both texts, the root and the commentary were produced/revealed at the same time, in 1017.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Question about rainbow bodies

Content:

Fa Dao said:

heres a thought...

after a person has achieved rainbow body is it possible for them to physically incarnate again? or do they stay that way indefinitely?

heart said:

Chetsun Senghe Wangchuk attained rainbow body and was later born as Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo, who then reveled the Chetsun Nyingthig.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

JKW was an emanation, not a reincarnation, technically speaking.

Likewise, Vimalamitra is supposed to manifest an emanation every one hundred years or so. My teacher, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa was an emantion of Vimalamitra, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Tadyatha

Content:

dakini_boi said:

namo bhagavate bhaiṣajyaguru

vaiḍūryaprabharājāya tathāgatāya

arhate samyaksambuddhāya tadyathā:

oṃ bhaiṣajye bhaiṣajye mahābhaiṣajya-samudgate svāhā

Malcolm wrote:

Right, the first part is a praise, "Homage to the Bhagavan Bhaisajjaraguru Vaiduryaprabharaja, a tathagata, an arhat, a samyaksambuddha", followed by his mantra, thus, om....etc.

but typically we recite all together.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Vasubandhu Pure Land site

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

I have so a question:

- Maybe could you help me to find the kosmological interpretations of Vasubandhu

Malcolm wrote:

Chapter three of the Abhidharmakoshabhasyam.

kalden yungdrung said:

and maybe is it also explainable why his vision differs greatly from the Vajrayana opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't really. Kalacakra cosmology is unique -- but otherwise the model of the Meru cosmology used in Vasubandhu's presentation as the defacto cosmology used in Indian and Tibetan Vajrayāna accounts.

The origin of Vasubandhu's cosmology is the the Sarvastivada school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation

Content:

Will said:

They are the same thing

Malcolm wrote:

They are not the thing. One who is free of grasping and attachment has no need renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jikan said:

“Man-ngag Tag-drol Gyud”

a precious Terma teaching of Rigdzin Jangchub Dorje

would someone please describe this teaching briefly? eg does it go by a particular title in English? thanks

Malcolm wrote:

The Tantra of the Liberation Through Wearing Intimate Instruction.

This is a tantra about these complicated and important tagdrols, how to make them, how to use them, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation

Content:

Will said:

then renunciation or non-attachment will be occurring.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not the same thing.

For example, a renunciate who has given up sexual activity may still be attached to sexual activity. A non-renunciate may be no attachment to sexual activity.

But there are different paths for different people of different dispositions, this is why we talk about the path of renunciation, transformation, and self-liberation. The essence of the last path is freedom from grasping, but not renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Appropriate relationship with Guru

Content:

heart said:

You might have some doubts about his/her knowledge of Danish cheeses or politics in Austria but it isn't proper to doubt his/her knowledge and realization of the natural state.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, because if you do, that person should not be your guru and you should cease taking teachings from them immediately.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Drug relapse leads to broken Samaya?

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

Also, do you know of any practice within Dzogchen or Tibetan medicine that is good for addictions. I am thinking specifically for protection against negative influences. It is said that environment is stronger than will. I am deeply involved with my practice but I am very isolated from my teachers and sangha. I work as a cook in busy restaurants where drug and alcohol use is rampant. In one sense this provides me with opportunities for postmeditation practices, but I have always fallen prey to the influence of those around me. I do pretty good, but man it certainly is not easy! I feel like I am living a double life, most people don't know that I am a practitioner, even though it's been a huge part of my life for nearly ten years. I would really like to say that I will never relapse again, but like I said, it's not easy, especially when drugs are literally in my face. This is where a lot of the doubt comes from, because I have failed so many times in the past. Drugs really screwed me up, I still feel their effects years later and I am sure that I have yet to pay the full price of my mistakes.

So I am thinking protection and purification practices. I have also been doing purification of the five elements. I'll probably order some Agar 35, maybe it will help me to relax and trust myself some.

Thanks,
Troy

Malcolm wrote:

You should write to ChNN and ask him for a Dorje Gotrab amulet.

You should recite a lot of purification of five element mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Drug relapse leads to broken Samaya?

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

So this has been an important year for me. If something is transmitted, or brought forth

during an empowerment, is it possible for me to lose that through negative actions?

Malcolm wrote:

Your primordial state cannot be broken, nor can it be improved.

Keeping samaya means being interested in your path. Breaking samaya means ceasing to care about your path.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For Ipad users try:

Photon Flash Player Browser

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For Ipad users try:

iSwifter Flash Browser.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm: Renunciation is not a cause for liberation.

Baloney. Virtually every other spiritual tradition agrees with Buddha, that non-attachment or renunciation is a critical element on the path to liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-attachment aka freedom from grasping on the one hand, and renunciation on the other are very different.

The former is liberation; the latter is not, and does not necessarily lead to the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation is a low-hanging fruit, you only need to pick it -- but you have to have a guide who can show you where that fruit is.

You don't need to give up anything to attain liberation.

Huseng said:

The Buddha suggested otherwise: renunciation.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on which of the Buddha's teachings you wish to consider definitive.

Renunciation is not a cause for liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

But you're right. There's hardly any way to be calm any more, for any length of time, in our world.

Huseng said:

It will get worse, especially as economic contraction takes it toll on the "developed world". Being kaliyuga there are a lot of events, both physical and occult, that are progressively making ordinary existence in this world harder and harder in both obvious and subtle ways. Demonic forces are becoming stronger as time goes on as well.

I think figures like Ajahn Brahm are worth considering. He's definitely an adept and highly attained yogi.

However, the lot of us sit on our arses worrying about our financial future and careers, so we're not really willing to give it all up for liberation. Perhaps doubt prevents many of us from doing it. The doubt that perhaps liberation isn't really possible, so you might as well play it safe by only going half-way while living the ordinary prescribed lifestyle.

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation is a low-hanging fruit, you only need to pick it -- but you have to have a guide who can show you where that fruit is.

You don't need to give up anything to attain liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I also know that there are western practitioners who have genuine realization, but they are somewhat undervalued.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by realization.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's definition is very stringent. If you can place your hand in fire without it being harmed, then he will consider you realized. Since he himself cannot do this, he does not consider himself realized, just a little more experienced than we, his students.

I personally believe he is an arya, someone who is actually an awakened person -- but that is just me.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

tobes said:

If anyone is interested in a devastating refutation of this strange strawman distinction - that there are coherent and unified things called 'western' and 'Islamic' civilisations - please pm me, and I'll attach the scholarly article.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, there isn't. There is just an economic struggle happening, and different ideological groups seeking to control resources for their own propagation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Advice by Lunations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It goes by the four or six seasons. The end of a lunar month is considered the new moon, not the full moon.

Virgo said:

Thanks for the correction, Malcolm. In Tibetan Astrology is the full moon considered a time when things (projects, ideas, and so forth) come to a certain culmination? (I know it is in Vedic and Western) If so, as a Menpa would you think that is a way to mark time (so to speak), in a way, of when doshas are effected on a more minute level than on a seasonal level (even though of course it is a gradual process, happening moment to moment)? I would just like your thoughts on this, please.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

The full moon represents the end of the monthly cycle of flourishing which begins with the cycle of the waxing moon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Advice by Lunations

Content:

Virgo said:

A calander year contains either three or four seasons, depending on how the seasons are split up or reckoned. Whether it is reckoned as three or four seasons, a calander year still consist of twelve complete lunations or moon cycles. Sometimes (every 2 - 3 years), there is an additional moon cycle in a calander year, because the length of lunations varies depending on how close the moon is to the earth at any given time at which it cycles, as well as other reasons.

I know that advice is given in Tibetan Medicine for diet and lifestyle by season. The reason being that certain elements are dominant during certain seasons and this can disturb humours, effect digestion, etc.-- we accumulate certain things more at certain times. However, I also know that ancient people marked time by lunar phases. Specifically, the full moon (the end of a lunation) is the time where things come to completion. So, I was wondering if there is any extant advice for diet, behavior, cleanses etc., taught by lunations, that is to say for each of the individual 12 moon cycles in a calander year (whether over 3 or 4 seasons).

Thanks,

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

It goes by the four or six seasons. The end of a lunar month is considered the new moon, not the full moon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Bon Phurpa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of interest as well:

<http://blogs.orient.ox.ac.uk/kila/2012/04/27/the-great-khu-tsha-zla-od/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Different Taras

Content:

Konchog1 said:

BUT, then why are there separate empowerments and mantras for White Tara and Kurukulle?

Malcolm wrote:

Different lineages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: psychedelics and visions

Content:

Nighthawk said:

How important and widespread is the use of psychedelics such as datura in order to have visions of Vajrayoginis, Dakinis, Taras etc. amongst Vajrayana masters and practitioners? Are these visions to be seen as genuine spiritual experiences or just mere hallucinations of the mind on drugs? I would love to hear your opinions on this matter.

Malcolm wrote:

In general there is no use of hallucinogens in Varjayāna. Even in the case of certain exceptions, these usages are no longer current i.e. they are not part of the living tradition. Where they were used, hallucinogens served only to demonstrate that the mind was not a fixed substance.

People who have used hallucinogens can understand their experiences with this in this respect. Garab Dorje clearly states in one commentary that hallucinogens merely generate worldly visions. So from a Vajrayāna perspective, hallucinogens do not have much, if any, spiritual value.

That being said, this is not to deny the value of the spiritual traditions of Huichol Indians, or Ayahuasca shamans who commune with plant spirits, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

My understanding is that as both are forms of Dark Blue Garuda from the same terma, the donwang for one of them grants permission for the practice of both, together with the medicinal practices and mantras.

Malcolm wrote:

They are separate empowerments completely, albeit from the same overall cycle of teachings.

Rinpoche has regularly been giving the lung main mantra for Khyung nag since last year.

Retreat on either form of garuda, or even having completed the three roots recitation, is sufficient for reciting the action mantras, etc.

Blue Garuda said:

Thanks for the clarification.

If you have attended the recent retreat on Takhyung Kilaya and have the lung for Khyung nag main mantra then you can use both main mantras ?

Malcolm wrote:

You can use either, as you wish. The sngags 'bum actually contains the root mantra of the Lama Zabdon cycle, which is not connected with either of these deities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 10:22 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Yangtso, how do you explain the Merotic (as opposed to Nilotic) features of many ancient depictions of Buddhas around the world?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha statues in Cambodia show Cambodian features. Some black nationalists have decided this proved Buddha was a negro. It is a very silly idea.

Anyone who has studied the history of Buddhist statuary knows there are two sculptural traditions of Buddha statues, Gandharan and Mathuran. The Mathuran tradition is a little later, and is the ancestor of all Theravadin traditions of Buddhist statuary. The Gandharan tradition is the prototype for all Chinese and Mahayāna traditions.

Cambodians are Australasiatics, and their art reflects their ethnicity.

But Negros do not universally have flat faces, thick lips and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

"The religion of Buddha, of India, is well known to have been very ancient. In the most ancient temples scattered throughout Asia, where his worship is yet continued, he is found black as jet, with the flat face, thick lips, and curly hair of the Negro."

"Stonehenge...temple of the black, curly-headed Buddha." - Master Mason Godfrey Higgins

Malcolm wrote:

This citation is obvious nonsense, and racist to boot.

The Masons don't know shit about Buddhadharma, whatever other "mysteries" they may claim to know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What HH Dalai Lama and Berzin are quoted as saying is factually incorrect. Vasubandhu says nothing about homosexuality per se.

Lhug-Pa said:

Well I actually meant to refer to the behavior itself, and not necessarily the 'orientation' alone.

Although, I'm quite sure that H.H. the Dalai Lama never implied that masturbation is not sexual misconduct for non-monks.

Also, from Berzin-Archives:

Alexander Berzin said:

Since both Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism base their practice of ethical self-discipline on Vasubandhu's texts, their lineages still include homosexuality in their lists of inappropriate sexual behavior.

Lhug-Pa said:

And:

H.H. the Dalai Lama said:

It's part of what we Buddhists call 'bad sexual conduct.' Sexual organs were created for reproduction between the male element and the female element and everything that deviates from that is not acceptable from a Buddhist point of view. Between a man and man, a woman and another woman, in the mouth, the anus, or even using a hand.

Lhug-Pa said:

"Reproduction" here can also refer to the Spiritual Reproduction or Regeneration that results from Karmamudra practice, not only physically making children; otherwise H.H. the Dalai Lama would not teach about Karmamudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Why would H.H. the Dalai Lama, as a Dzogchenpa, say that homosexuality is sexual misconduct if it were not?

Malcolm wrote:

He never said such a thing.

He merely stated that using certain orifices is sexual misconduct. Masturbation, he stated, was sexual misconduct only for monks.

There is no teaching anywhere, in any vinaya pitika, sutra or tantra, that states that

homosexuality i.e. same sex gender orientation, is "sexual misconduct".

You need to learn the distinction between gender orientation and sexual activity.

According to the traditional teachings anal or oral sex (ears, etc., are also included here under the general connotation of wrong orifice) is sexual misconduct whether done with a man or a woman.

Masturbation, for lay people, is not included in sexual misconduct.

By the way, your sig is incredibly racist and factually wrong.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

My understanding is that as both are forms of Dark Blue Garuda from the same terma, the donwang for one of them grants permission for the practice of both, together with the medicinal practices and mantras.

Malcolm wrote:

They are separate empowerments completely, albeit from the same overall cycle of teachings.

Rinpoche has regularly been giving the lung main mantra for Khyung nag since last year.

Retreat on either form of garuda, or even having completed the three roots recitation, is sufficient for reciting the action mantras, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

It is confusing! Isn't it?

[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

He did not give the transmission for the snags 'bum which contains the action mantras

during last year's retreat. This year, he gave the so called snags 'bum lung during the Moscow retreat, but he had already given the whole lung for the medicine tantra which contains many mantras many of which are also in the snags 'bum. This time he gave the lung for the mantras in the snags 'bum of Lama Zabdon as well as the remaning mantras in the medicine tantra. The release of the book was timed to coincide with the conclusion of this retreat.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

Yes, I read the announcement in Norbunet as well.

In this case, SSI must clear up why someone had to be present during the retreat in Merigar West and it is not enough to have received that transmission only through the webcast of last year, while the transmission from Kunsangar North is enough to have been received only through webcast this year.

I never heard such announcement by Rinpoche himself. He always says that transmissions through any webcast are enough for practising any mantra.

It is confusing! Isn't it?

Pero said:

The mantras weren't transmitted over the webcast last year, neither was there a donwang.

Dronma said:

I don't remember now what was or was not transmitted during the retreat of the last year, and it is not that I don't believe you, but it is something that SSI must write clearly.

Don't you think so?

Malcolm wrote:

It was not because I wrote ChNN about it last year and while the teachings about Garuda were webcast, the empowerment and the transmission of the mantras were not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

arsent said:

arsent wrote:

There is a new book and ebook available from European SSI bookstore related to the last dark Garuda practice teachings retreat.

http://www.shanghungstore.org/index.php?l=product_detail&p=491 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Important note by SSI about this book:

The Practice and Action Mantras of Dark Garuda is reserved for those who have received the direct transmission of these mantras from Chögyal Namkhai Norbu and were thus physically present at the Dark Garuda retreat at Merigar West on the days when the mantras were transmitted or at a later retreat on this Dark Garuda practice. from Norbunet today's list: "The Practice and Action Mantras of Dark Garuda is available for all practitioners who received the related transmission from the Master.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu gave the transmission of the practice at Merigar West in August 2011 and during the closed webcast from Kunsangar North on July 25 to 29, 2012.

To be eligible to do this practice and read the book, you must have been present at Merigar West on the day when the mantras were transmitted during the August 2011 retreat or listening to the webcast from Kunsangar North on July 27, 2012.

If you wish to purchase the booklet and CD or ebook and downloadable MP3, please log in to our webshop at <http://www.shanghungstore.org> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;". These products are for personal use only and cannot be reproduced in any form.

Although there are differences in the two practices and Rinpoche transmitted a different root mantra for the two teachings, he has confirmed that the eligibility extends to those who participated in the mantra transmission of either teaching.

"

Dronma said:

Yes, I read the announcement in Norbunet as well.

In this case, SSI must clear up why someone had to be present during the retreat in Merigar West and it is not enough to have received that transmission only through the webcast of last year, while the transmission from Kunsangar North is enough to have been received only through webcast this year.

I never heard such announcement by Rinpoche himself. He always says that transmissions through any webcast are enough for practising any mantra. It is confusing! Isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Last year's transmission of Khyung Nag could not be given as a donwang -- Rinpoche mentioned this during the Moscow retreat a couple of days ago. However, he was able to give Takhyung as a donwang. In any case, the medicine tantra has a homage to Takhyung in the very introduction, so the Takhyung practice is more closely related with the transmission in the Srog sman tantra he gave last year in Moscow than the Khyung nag practice he gave in Merigar last year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

With masturbation or anal sex there's no contact between opposite poles.

Malcolm wrote:

You do understand that jñānamudra practice for monks or single yogis (male or female) involves masturbation?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 29th, 2012 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation

Content:

JKhedrup said:

With words I am always interested in how the Tibetan gives it, because there can sometimes be several different English translations for the same word. In Tibetan nges par 'byung ba is the word that is often translated into English as renunciation. In fact if you break down the word nges par is "definitely" and byung ba is emerge, hence another translation is definite emergence.

To me this carries a connotation of definitely wanting to emerge from, to get out of, that which binds us, and to eventually leave samsara behind.

Malcolm wrote:

nges par 'byung ba = niḥsaraṇaḥ

Cologne Digital Sanskrit Lexicon: Search Results

1 niHsaraNa n. going forth or out MBh. Pan5c. ; issue , egress , gate L. ; means , expedient , remedy to get rid of (comp.) MBh. ; departure , death final beatitude L. ; %{-vat} (%{niH-sa4r-}) mfn. flowing out , liquid S3Br.

2 niHsAraNa n. turning out , expelling Ra1jat. ; egress or road of egress L.

The Pali Text Society's Pali-English dictionary.

Nissaraṇa

Nissaraṇa (nt.) [Sk. niḥsaraṇa, to nis+sarati, cp. BSk. nissaraṇa giving up (?) AvŚ ii.193] going out, departure; issue, outcome, result; giving up, leaving behind, being freed, escape (fr. saṅsāra), salvation Vin i.104; D iii.240, 248 sq.; S i.128, 142; ii.5; iii.170 (catunnaṇ dhātūnaṇ); iv.7 sq. (id.); v.121 sq.; A i.258, 260; ii.10 (kāmaṇaṇ etc.); iii.245 sq.; iv.76 (uttariṇ); v.188; M i.87 (kāmaṇaṇ), 326 (uttariṇ); iii.25; It 37, 61; Ps ii.180, 244; Vbh 247; Vism 116; ThA 233; DhsA 164; Sdhp 579. Cp. nissaṭṭa & nissaraṇīya. -- dassin wise in knowing results, prescient, able to find a way to salvation S iv.205; -- pañña (adj.)= °dassin D i.245 (a °); iii.46; S ii.194; iv.332; A v.178 (a °), 181 sq.; Miln 401.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

As others have also pointed out, ChNN is giving direct introduction ridiculously often... I can only think of one webcast in the last year when he didn't give it, and it was announced beforehand that it was a general public teaching and not a transmission. WWT is only as special as all of Rinpoche's other webcasts and vice versa.

Malcolm wrote:

A bit of history is in order:

Originally, we practiced the Guru Yoga of White A on Garab Dorje's anniversary at the same time, around the world, on the hour of Garab Dorje's birth. We also did the same Padmasambhava guru yoga of medium thun for Padmasambhava and Adzom Drugpa's anniversary. We did this because of the importance of these three holidays for practitioners in the DC.

Then, in the late 90's, Rinpoche instituted the WWT with videos, using a video to synchronize practitioners so he could give DI, stating that introduction is beyond the limits of distance -- i.e. just as long as practitioners were present following the tape, and he was following the tape, direct introduction was occurring. The reason was that he was trying to make it possible for interested newcomers to receive transmission even if they could not immediately attend a retreat.

With the advent of the webcasts, he was able to switch live broadcasts of the WWT on these three important anniversary days.

Ultimately, the import of WWT is to do Guru Yoga at these special times with the whole community around the world, and not just to receive DI.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 3:12 PM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nonetheless, Guru P was a buddha way before any of his consorts were. They obviously were not at the same level.

deepbluehum said:

Liberated does not equal fully awakened.

I would not regard Namthars written by disciples as accurate reports of the level of realization of this or that person.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't need to get hung up on stupid details. It's just an example. It's simple logic.

Guru P was enlightened before he got with Mandarava and Yeshe Tsogyal. So...[/quote]

According to their namthars both M and Yt were emanations also...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 10:19 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

deepbluehum said:

But if you want to use your version, the sisters were liberated and Milarepa was on the path, so again, they weren't on the same level.

Nonetheless, Guru P was a buddha way before any of his consorts were. They obviously were not at the same level.

Malcolm wrote:

Liberated does not equal fully awakened.

I would not regard Namthars written by disciples as accurate reports of the level of realization of this or that person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What it's meant is that both have received HYT empowerments.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what is meant that they are on the same stage i.e. path of application or seeing, etc.

The Tseringma sisters are not worldly deities, they were liberated by Guru P.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: How can Zen be considered it's own thing...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="/johnny\"/>
teacher?[/quote]

Experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: What's up with Phantom59

Content:

Stewart said:

I'm not sure how others check Dharmawheel, but I always start with 'view active topics'... sometimes phantom59 has posted half a dozen or so topics and I have to scroll through all the bump to get to the threads I am interested in..

Can we poll people to see if they want it blocked or not?

9 times out of 10 the link takes you to a page with the exact same quote and little else!
It's pointless, I have rarely seen anything of interest on them.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. P59 is taking up bandwidth in a rather useless way. He should stick to phayul.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 27th, 2012 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: Drug relapse leads to broken Samaya?

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

OK, thanks,

so where is the line drawn? It seems that maybe samaya is not as cut and dry as a Hinayana vow, which is perhaps more confined within the dualism of right/wrong or good/bad. Does the samaya depend more on my state of mind than my actions? At this point I am truly interested because in my experience teachers haven't explained this after they gave empowerments. It seems that I may be dwelling on the situation a little too much, at first I was afraid that I had lost or damaged the transmissions somehow.

Troy

Malcolm wrote:

Breaking samaya means you don't care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 27th, 2012 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Drug relapse leads to broken Samaya?

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

I know nothing about the self-initiation practice, I always thought that's what lamas did before they gave empowerments. If someone could please inform me about samaya. I heard Malcolm say on DW that if we broke our samaya we would know it. What happens to the transmissions when our samaya is damaged? How exactly do we break samaya? Did this little (big) slip up of mine damage my samaya? Any help would be great, I don't have access to my lamas right now, so asking more experienced practitioners on this board is the next best thing, I guess.

Thanks,

Troy

Malcolm wrote:

Making mistakes is not breaking samaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 26th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

In replacing Guru Tragphur with Dorje Drollo in, say, the Short Tun, does he act as a direct substitute in the waxing moon phase, or does he also substitute for Simhamukha in the waning phase.

It seems that Yidam practices begin in a similar way to the Tun and continue into the natural state, so presumably the Yidam practice of Dorje Drollo or Guru Tragphur do so as well. I'm assuming this is quite different from their role in the Tun?

Malcolm wrote:
Direct substitute.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 26th, 2012 at 12:24 AM
Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya
Content:
username said:
ChNNR specifically said people organizing and inviting him for teaching around the world are specially advised to do Dorje Drollo.

Malcolm wrote:
Not that this is a bad idea, but he only gave this transmission once, this year, prior to losar -- so when did he say this -- I do not recall him saying this, but then my memory is not perfect, nor my attention.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 26th, 2012 at 12:18 AM
Title: Re: DC Practice Recommendation for Someone with Liver Failure
Content:
Blue Garuda said:
Thanks.

Has ChNNR ever given donwang for the White Garuda he mentions?

In terms of performing the Garuda practice for a sick person, before using the relevant Action Mantra, how much practice should be done with the main mantra?

If the guy needs help right now, will confidence in the main mantra suffice?

Malcolm wrote:
Main mantra includes all action mantras. However, you do the main mantra for a while in a qualified way -- one to three weeks, then you apply action mantra, if it works, than that is enough

In general, black garuda is connected with the cycle of teachings of which the srog sman medicine tantra is a part. So ChNN will give all action mantras related to that tantra this weekend. Last year he gave the lung for the whole tantra.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: DC Practice Recommendation for Someone with Liver Failure

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Does blue or red make a difference?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, Mandarava for reinforcing life force, garuda for eliminating disease, lots of mantra of five elements also. Either Garuda practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

tamm said:

I already sent a small note over to Blue Garuda about this, but thought it would hurt to ask here too; but do you guys think there is a way to get a membership set up and going soon enough to do the retreat things this week? I know it's super late in the game here and I did already email the webcast team, but the email I got back just didn't make sense to me.

So sorry for all the trauma!

Malcolm wrote:

If you live near a center or a gar, you should be able to attend in person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: DC Practice Recommendation for Someone with Liver Failure

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Of the DC methods that help with health, which one would be best for someone with liver failure? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Shitro.

M

deepbluehum said:

What if the liver is not completely failed, they are back to work and they are testing to see if he will need a transplant?

Malcolm wrote:

Probably garuda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: DC Practice Recommendation for Someone with Liver Failure

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Of the DC methods that help with health, which one would be best for someone with liver failure? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Shitro.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

pemachophel said:

The story I read in Bhutan when getting ready to visit Parao Taktshang was that Guru Rinpoche and Yeshe Tshogyal were in eastern Tibet practicing in retreat there. Yeshe Tshogyal saw that there were demons in western Bhutan that needed subduing. She urged Guru Rinpoche to go and do something about this. He did not. Yeshe Tshogyal got more and more impatient and insistent. She eventually transformed into a tigress to fly to western Bhutan to do something Herself. At that point, Guru Rinpoche mounted the tigress and They flew together to Paro Taktshang, etc., etc., etc. However, I also think I have heard that the tigress was a Bon deity (possibly from Lama Dawa Chodak).

Seems like there are different versions of the explanation of Dorje Drolo's tigress mount.

Malcolm wrote:

I was not insisting it was the only account, merely the account I heard from one source.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

mutsuk said:

Maybe, but then you should understand that it's not the way it is for Bonpos. Ati Muwer is a peaceful dharmakaya form. There is no other Ati Muwer in Bon...and no tiger around him.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I do understand that. Prior to this conversation, I had no idea. I am not an expert in Bon.

But it is a fact that Drollo's mount Ati Muwer was identified for me by ChNN as Ati Muwer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Relationships With Non-Buddhists

Content:

underthetree said:

relationships with non-practitioners tend to be fraught with differing values and life-goals.

As do all relationships, really. A relationship between two practitioners would be just as fraught when it came to worldly concerns, I'd have thought.

But I have no idea. You may very well be right. For me, my marriage - along with my family, my work and the rest of it - is part of my practice. I can't conceive of it any other way.

Malcolm wrote:

We should work with circumstances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Relationships With Non-Buddhists

Content:

underthetree said:

Do you really think not, Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

I really think it is better for practitioners to be partners with other practitioners. Of course, we should work with circumstances -- but in my life I have found that relationships with non-practitioners tend to be fraught with differing values and life-goals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

mutsuk said:

I don't think so...

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with ChNN. The only time I have ever heard the name "Ati Muwer" is in connection with Drollo, as his mount. Sorry, that is just the way it is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Relationships With Non-Buddhists

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Hi,

I just moved in with my (non-Buddhist) girlfriend, and we have been arguing a lot.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, it never really works with non-practitioners. Better for you to find someone in your sangha or a least another practitioner.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One, the tigress is a Bon deity, named Ati muwer -- oral communucation, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

mutasuk said:

However, it's pretty unlikely that it is named Ati Muwer.

Malcolm wrote:

Its name is Ati Muwer. I have heard Norbu Rinpoche discuss this on more than one occasion.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Discussion on Aversion

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I was questioning whether it is healthy to cultivate aversion, considering the emphasis Buddhism places on its being unhealthy. The consensus seems to be that for some cultivating aversion to samsara is more helpful than it is unhealthy, and I will go along with that.

Blue Garuda said:

I think it can easily be overdone, as I posted earlier. I've seen beginners leave after a few sessions when they were unfortunate enough to join the class when death and samsaric rebirth were topics.

One left for another reason, quote: 'That silly bugger is telling me I'm going to be reborn as a dog!'

Sometimes, when we understand the context ourselves, we forget how it appears to newcomers.

Negative teaching is a bit like: 'Do you want the bad news first.....or the bad news first! '

We can't all be inspiring teachers, I guess.

Malcolm wrote:

It is better to start with "your primordial state is perfect...." and then go from there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

kirtu said:

unless Malcolm means the tigresses first heat ever?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, her first heat ever.

dakini_boi said:

This is interesting. What is the term in Tibetan, and why is it usually understood as "pregnant?"

Malcolm wrote:

The term is sbrum which has two meanings 1) A pregnant woman 2) A lustful woman.

The term refers to the second sense. Since tigresses are only lustful when they are in heat, and since in many sadhanas the tigress is termed gzhon nu i.e. young, hence the oral communication indicates that the tigress in question is experiencing her first heat and is in a fit of crazed lust. If you have ever seen a cat go through her first heat, then you

will understand better.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 24th, 2012 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

kirtu said:

unless Malcolm means the tigresses first heat ever?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, her first heat ever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 22nd, 2012 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

muni said:

sparks. To show how truly crazy he is, he dances on the back of a pregnant tigress...

Malcolm wrote:

One, the tigress is a Bon deity, named Ati muwer -- oral communication, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Two, the tigress is not pregnant, she is in her first heat -- oral communication, Khenpo Jigme Phunstok

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 22nd, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Large random shooting in Colorado

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The cause is epidemic blood lust.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I think the cause is gdon, spirit provocations.

M

Huseng said:

In your mind what is the cause of said provocations on the rise?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, many things, increased stress, pollution, non-virtuous activities, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 22nd, 2012 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Large random shooting in Colorado

Content:

deepbluehum said:

We need to counter this with the brightness of spirituality. Many on this forum, myself including, have a dour view of the world. I feel like this is wrong. It's time to be inspiring.

Malcolm wrote:

The greater the depth of darkness, the brighter mere sparks seem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 22nd, 2012 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Large random shooting in Colorado

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The cause is epidemic blood lust.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I think the cause is greed, spirit provocations.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Radical Buddhism and the Paradox of Acceptance

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

To be fair most use consumerism, the entertainment industry, career climbing and many other pursuits to ignore how profoundly unfair and unjust the social order is.

Malcolm wrote:

Samsara is not "fair".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2012 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm not sure that's a workable analogy, Malcolm. Fascism is a political program. Islam is a religious identity.

Malcolm wrote:

When does a religious identity cease being an ideological commitment? What makes it sacred, as opposed other ideological commitments? Certainly, Facism was upheld with religious zeal. Often religion is used for political programs, etc. Where do we want to draw the line, and how do we do so?

M

Jikan said:

I agree that ideology (defined in the sense of false consciousness) and identification are certainly problematic in either case, but I don't think both Islam and Fascism (or rather being-a-Muslim and being-a-Fascist) are reducible to ideology. It's possible to be born Muslim, for instance, and hence to have an Islamic identity projected onto you; the current American president inherited some of this with his middle name (and hence the conviction among the wingnut-o-sphere that Barry Obama from Hawaii is clearly a Muslim and ipso-facto a "Terrorist"). It's not possible to become a Fascist without having made a choice. And unlike a traditional religious identity, which is essentially a social marker, you can choose to stop identifying as a Fascist, to stop doing or promoting Fascism, and you're done. Try no longer being a Muslim or a Jew for that matter; it would mean a change in your life on the magnitude of joining the witness protection program (new name, new family, new hometown, all that).

That's the distinction I'm getting at. I don't disagree with your premise that we really need to stop identifying and taking this stuff at face value as real (that's the "demystification" of ideology as false consciousness, which basically means coming to grips with your situation broadly speaking, not the make-believe world of us as good and them as bad). I disagree there's a significant and important human difference between Islam and Fascism that needs to be recognized, or else one risks minimizing one or the other.

Islam's a religion. Fascism is a political program. Different functions, different conditions, different consequences, some of which may overlap.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you saying that once born a Muslim, you cannot cease being a Muslim? Are you saying one necessarily chooses to be a republican? Because I certainly know Christians who have become Buddhists, etc. I know many people who are excoriated for changing their political beliefs, and know of some who have even been killed for it.

I think it is glib to propose that political identities cannot be projected as easily as religious ones -- communist, fascist, etc.

I don't think you are making very convincing arguments for privileging religious ideologies over political ones -- they are both equally malleable and susceptible to being culturally embedded -- for example, Socialism in Tuscany. Try being a Fascist in Tuscany!

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2012 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm not sure that's a workable analogy, Malcolm. Fascism is a political program. Islam is a religious identity.

Malcolm wrote:

When does a religious identity cease being an ideological commitment? What makes it sacred, as opposed to other ideological commitments? Certainly, Fascism was upheld with religious zeal. Often religion is used for political programs, etc. Where do we want to draw the line, and how do we do so?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2012 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

It's not quite a 'serves them right!' comment yet, at least not explicitly. But it's damn close to being one.

Malcolm wrote:

People with differing ideological commitments often cannot live with each other. Fascists/communists, etc.

I wonder how Tobes would feel however if we replaced "fascist" for "muslim"? I am not recommending intolerance towards muslims, but I am curious if Tobes' "liberalism" can be extended by him/her to fascists as well.

Just when do we decide that someone's ideological commitments are toxic, and then what do we do about it?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 20th, 2012 at 7:25 PM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Some more light on the issue:

<http://www.zcommunications.org/democracy-and-slaughter-in-burma-gold-rush-overrides-human-rights-by-ramzy-baroud> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

tobes said:

Thanks. I am still at a profound loss as to why ****supposed**** Buddhists on this forum have been engaged in justifying this. It really doesn't say much for contemporary Buddhism....

Malcolm wrote:

It is simply evidence that some Buddhists follow the Dharma and others do not -- nothing more, nothing less. "Buddhism" is a sectarian identity, and as such, is susceptible to the flaws of the same.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 19th, 2012 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: transmissions, ngondro, samaya

Content:

pemachophel said:

Just because all ngondro contain the same elements doesn't mean that you can mix and match those elements as you choose.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not addressing a point that anyone has suggested. The OP wanted to know if they could change their ngondro practice, for example, and do a different one instead of the one they started with.

It is the opinion of some people this creates "traces" about not finishing this or that practice. It is the opinion of others that there is no fault at all. If you are interested in some other practice more than the one you are doing, then you can change. For example, if you are doing Sakya ngondro, but then decide you would rather do Longchen Nyingthig, then in my opinion, fine. If you have finished refuge/bodhicitta for example, and want to begin this new ngondro at Vajrasattva, then fine.

Refuge is Refuge. Why? Because if you are doing refuge correctly, not only do you imagine the gurus of the lineage specific that to that lineage, but you are always enjoined to understand the gurus and lineages of all teachings you have are present there as well. This is a universal instruction in every ngondro tradition. Therefore, for example if you are doing refuge in the Dudjom tersar ngondro, but have received Ngondro for something else like Sakya, Kagyu, etc., you are automatically including all those lineages. If you are doing a Nyingma ngondro, and it is dragging along, but become inspired by Karma Kagyu, and then you can approach this practice enthusiastically because you have a good connection with that teacher, for example, then it is better for you to change your ngondro and not be stuck in conceptual limits.

If you go to a teacher, and you want mahāmudra teachings, and they decide to begin with the 18 hells (as happened to ChNN), then since you asked for their teachings, you respect that teacher and listen to their teaching, even if you know the subject perfectly. Why? Because you asked. You don't decide to reject that teacher's teachings because it is not conforming to your perfect wish.

However, if you have received teachings, respectfully, then you make sure in your own practice that you are focusing the essentials of whatever practice you have received, and you do the practice/s that are really working well for you. You should not be passive and always expect this or that lama to know what is best for you. You should take responsibility for yourself because we are not children that need to be taught step by step how to tie our shoes.

If anything, what western practitioners lack is balance -- on the one hand, some practitioners simply will not follow any guidance at all. On the other hand, some practitioners refuse to think for themselves and become completely passive. Neither of these approaches is good. Practitioners need to consult with their teachers on essential points, and also need to take responsibility for their own practice and decide what is working, and what is not.

If you have the fortune of feeling that your teacher is an awakened person, like I do, then as username mentions, you should not be looking for any advice from anyone else but that person. If you do not have that feeling, then it is better not to invent it, and it is also better to take responsibility for your own practice and try to understand the essentials.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 19th, 2012 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: transmissions, ngondro, samaya

Content:

username said:

Not all ngondros are interchangeable, for example Troma Nagmo Ngondro is specific.

Malcolm wrote:

An exception which proves the rule. The Troma ngondro (which I have practiced) is, as you say, very specific and interesting. It does not contain Vajrasattva, for example (Three kāya dakini purification is used instead), though it contains the rest, and so on.

However, the vast majority of Nyingma, Sakya, and Kagyu Ngondros are basically the same with small variations in order, and differ only in the actual words, but do not differ at all in the essence.

And all ngondros all have exactly the same point, as you will readily agree, i.e. Guru Yoga.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 18th, 2012 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Spontaneously Arising Moral Ethics?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I have a question about the context of moral ethics in Dzogchen. I understand in the context of Dzogchen realization one's compassion is non-directional and all-pervasive, and thus not a chosen attitude that one keeps reminding oneself about.

Malcolm wrote:

As it is said in the Nyinthig, the realization of emptiness is accompanied by the knowledge that engaging in non-virtue is pointless.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 17th, 2012 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: transmissions, ngondro, samaya

Content:

roman said:

I have been practicing a particular ngondro, but have also been given transmissions for others. I have been deeply contemplating changing my practice and have run into these questions. One, if one receives transmissions for other practices and don't do them is that breaking a samaya vow, of some sort. And, if I do change my ngondro, would that be breaking a samaya vow?

Malcolm wrote:

All preliminary practices are the same --they have refuge, bodhicitta, etc. It does not matter which one you do. You do the one you are doing, or you can do a different one everyday.

If you do one ngondro, you are doing all, so there is no break in "samaya".

If you change from one ngondro to another also no problem.

But bear in mind the real ngondro in Dzogchen is rushan and semzin, not counting.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 16th, 2012 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Rushan

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

the preliminaries are not seen as per se necessary regarding the Direct Introduction (DI).

Malcolm wrote:

Rushan is an indispensable preliminary practice in Dzogchen, and no one ever said otherwise.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 16th, 2012 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Bimala in the EU

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Bimala: is it available anywhere in the EU?

There's a few American sites that are willing to ship it to the Old World, but I'm a bit afraid of customs officers destroying the parcel as soon as they find out what's inside. And in Europe bimala does seem remarkably hard to find: Shang Shung Institute used to sell it, but they've apparently run out of stock - and that appears to be it, I know no other shop that has it on offer.

All your help will be greatly appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

I have Vimala.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 13th, 2012 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

Jikan said:

invocation implies bringing something into being (invoking it) with words. someone might invoke the power of a god in order to accomplish something.

supplication is what you do when you go to someone who is much more powerful than you (say a king or queen) and ask for help.

Dronma said:

Thank you, Jikan!

The meanings of these 2 words are similar in Greek: επίκληση (invocation) and ικεσία (supplication).

In this case, I prefer "invocation" (επίκληση), because it is more direct.

"Supplication" presupposes a strong dualistic view.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN uses the term "invocation" for two distinctly different kinds of texts i.e. smon lam i.e. aspirations (pranidhāna) and gsol 'debs i.e. petitions (adhyeṣaṇā).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 13th, 2012 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

. . . there are two systems.

The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam)

The Longsal system (which is the classical order of Indian cosmology): space, air, fire, water, earth (e yam ram bam lam).

Also these very same seed syllables in the latter system are also found in precisely the same order in Hindu element purification practice.

dakini_boi said:

What is the reason for the order of the elemental colors in the thun system? -

space - air - water - fire - earth

Malcolm wrote:

I think this is the order it is presented in Yoga/Kriya tantra system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 13th, 2012 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

Sherlock said:

Invocazione still doesn't quite mean the same thing as preghiera. On the other hand, maybe invocazione is much more commonly used in Italian than its English cognate, and ChNN chose this word with the implications behind it instead of prayer.

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer the word "supplication".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

Sherlock said:

Maybe an old student of ChNN can help me answer this: Why is "invocation" used so commonly in DC translations?

Most other translations will use "prayer" or something like that for the Invocation of Samantabhadra, Marmé Monlam, Seven-line Prayer/Invocation of Padmasambhava. I think invocation actually is a much better word, but I don't come across it much outside of literature about magic. Does it have something to do with Tsegylgar originally being a Fourth-Way Community which involved other magical practices?

Thanks for the fast SoV link. That's Adriano Clemente singing I think.

Malcolm wrote:

It has to do with ChNN learning Italian before English.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

Of course. But if they are not connected with already existed lineages of dzogchen - they can not refresh, can they? So if they can not refresh, what is their other purpose? As I know the tertön is always "connected".

Malcolm wrote:

Termas are always connected with Kama -- for example, Shitro is connected with Guhyagarbha, but also with the mandala of peaceful and wrathful deities that are found

directly in Dzogchen tantras such as the Rigpa Rangshar.

In this case, the klong gsal teachings are connected with the Nirmanakāya Dakini Gomadeva, the Sambhogakāya ḍākinī Guhyajñāna, etc. In terma there are many cycles of Guhyajñāna teachings. Guhyajñāna is the source of Simhamukha, Mamo Ekajati, etc., as well.

In general, with Gomadevi, there is nothing to refresh, it is unique. I do not know of any practice cycles previously that are connected with her. However, she however is a fully realized Dzogchen master, and you can read about her in The Great Image -- she is the ninth master in the lineage of Sems sde.

Mandarava practice on the other hand is a more recent practice of Mandarava.

Lama Khandro Thugthig has three series, outer, inner and secret. The outer practice concerns Guru Rinpoche and Jñāṇaḍākinī.

The klong sde cycle of klong gsal is based on the Vajra Bridge instructions of Vairocana, etc. So of course, for all of ChNN's klong gsal series there is a kama basis. If there was no Kama basis, it would not be a valid teaching.

So if someone has an open mind, and is interested, then they can learn the teachings of klong gsal and apply them. Otherwise, if you do not apply them, they are of no benefit at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

It does not matter what your opinion would be

KY

Malcolm wrote:

But it matters very much what my opinion is, since you are discussing why I acted the way I did.

I know perfectly well why I closed the Bon forum, much better than you, since I was the one who decided it needed to be done.

You can either accept my testimony, or you can continue with your speculations.

M

kalden yungdrung said:
Sorry, your testimony is not acceptable for me.

So it sure matters for you only, your opinion, that is very clear but not for the other party.
So i go on with my opinion and am not convinced, when i may say so? If to be not convinced would be equal to speculations, well that is up to you.
In my opinion word games.

KY

Malcolm wrote:
So what were my motivations for closing the Bon forum again? Just so we are clear.

(And is it really necessary to rehash something that happened on E-Sangha years ago, and something which I acknowledge was wrong, regardless of my motivations?)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:50 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

Mariusz said:
As I wrote traditional terma is from a tertön, the person from the time of original masters of Dzogchen who discovers again their teachings, like for example Pema Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:
It appears that Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is not that kind of tertön. He is a different kind of tertön.

Mariusz said:
Can you elaborate please? What is the connection of His pure dreams with already existed systems of Dzogchen, like Khandro and Wima Nyinthing?

Malcolm wrote:
You should ask him. In the end, all of these questions should be directed to Chogyal Namkhai Norbu himself.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:48 PM
Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:
Could we all be wrong?

KY

Malcolm wrote:

When you speculate about my motives for closing the forum, yes you are wrong.

I am not saying that you are wrong about your experience at E-Sangha in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:46 PM

Title: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

It does not the matter what your opinion would be

KY

Malcolm wrote:

But it matters very much what my opinion is, since you are discussing why I acted the way I did.

I know perfectly well why I closed the Bon forum, much better than you, since I was the one who decided it needed to be done.

You can either accept my testimony, or you can continue with your speculations.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

Yes, these are the question I also have: 1) is this "new complete system" possible (for example from pure dreams of people who have never met dzogchen before)? 2)why to create "new complete system" again, as one always can ad something (a supplement) within it to instruct others? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

1) I don't think so.

2) If this question is about ChNN -- it appears that he is merely expressing his experience. If you find Longsal useful, than practice it. If not, then don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

As I wrote traditional terma is from a tertön, the person from the time of original masters of Dzogchen who discovers again their teachings, like for example Pema Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:

It appears that Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is not that kind of tertön. He is a different kind of tertön.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

The other links tell something about the hard wind that blew against all that was not Buddhist in the way you did wanted that. Bon did belong to that black group.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, everything in that thread is speculative, i.e., has nothing to do with my actual motivations for closing the Bon forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Bon forum was closed at E-Sangha, because the Buddha Shakyamuni would be the only source of blessings regarding Dzogchen according to Namdrol's opinion.

No, this is a false statement -- I never made such claim, and would never make such a claim.

The Bon forum was closed for the reason I stated above.

kalden yungdrung said:

Here something to refresh your memory:

<http://esanghalert.wordpress.com/category/bon-banned/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://www.openbuddha.com/2008/03/17/e-sangha-drama-continues/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://yungdrung-rignga-ling.forums-free.com/bon-esangha-namdrol-please-help-t217.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

The first link has nothing to do with the closing of the Bon forum. The second link just validates what I said above. The third link I cannot read because you never approved my application to read posts on your forum.

kalden yungdrung said:

It was a long time ago but your ending words regarding the closed Bon forum were that in our Kali Yuga age or time, the Buddha Shakyamuni would be anyway the source of blessings. That was that what i have in mind and nevertheless that you deny it i keep it like that.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, I was making a bit of a different point/ The reason there was Buddha's teaching in India is that there was a Buddha. Bon owes a huge debt to Buddha's teaching in terms of texts, theory, etc. But because Bonpos will not acknowledge this, at that time I closed that forum. I realize now that our decision to close the Bon forum at that time for that reason was wrong. It was wrong not because I have changed my mind about history, but because I was not paying respect to your beliefs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The klong chen 'od gsal mkha' mgro snying thig aka Longsal teachings, is a complete and independent cycle of teachings which contains various teachings on Dzogchen (sems sde, klong sde and man ngag sde), related anuyoga cycles such as Mandarava, Gomadevi and Jñanadakini, and various kinds of completion stage practices. They form the main core of his own practice.

They are all products of Rinpoche's dreams, and the complete details of each series of dreams as they were written down by ChNN is provided in detail in the books that accompany the root texts. Sometimes, it took several dreams over many years to produce a root text, because for whatever reason, the text was not able to be written down completely.

They are not traditional terma teachings revealed in the traditional manner i.e. he received an index, etc., and then went and took them out of the ground, etc.

My remark about new termas comes from my master, the late Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, who considered ChNN to be an incomparable master of Dzogchen (his words, not mine). KDL said that since there is no samaya breakage with new termas, they have stronger blessings. And to practice the termas of a master while he is still alive carries the greatest blessings of all.

M

rai said:

What would be the most essential practice from Rinpoche's terma cycle?

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Yoga. However, he also stated that Jñānaḍākinī was the essence of Longsal. He himself practices Mandarava everyday.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

the terma of Chanchub Dorje

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily mind termas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

If you take for example Khandro Nyinthig, it was the same complete system every time, from Pema Ledrelstal, Longchenpa, Pema Lingpa. I don't know how are the pure dreams? Perhaps they are useful for already realized master of Dzogchen only as a supplement for his complete system from the source elsewhere?

Malcolm wrote:

The klong chen 'od gsal mkha' mgro snying thig aka Longsal teachings, is a complete and independent cycle of teachings which contains various teachings on Dzogchen (sems sde, klong sde and man ngag sde), related anuyoga cycles such as Mandarava, Gomadevi and Jñānadakini, and various kinds of completion stage practices. They form the main core of his own practice.

They are all products of Rinpoche's dreams, and the complete details of each series of dreams as they were written down by ChNN is provided in detail in the books that accompany the root texts. Sometimes, it took several dreams over many years to produce a root text, because for whatever reason, the text was not able to be written down completely.

They are not traditional terma teachings revealed in the traditional manner i.e. he received an index, etc., and then went and took them out of the ground, etc.

My remark about new termas comes from my master, the late Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, who considered ChNN to be an incomparable master of Dzogchen (his words, not mine). KDL said that since there is no samaya breakage with new termas, they have stronger blessings. And to practice the termas of a master while he is still alive carries the greatest blessings of all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

Unknown said:

The Bon forum was closed at E-Sangha, because the Buddha Shakyamuni would be the only source of blessings regarding Dzogchen according to Namdrol's opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is a false statement -- I never made such claim, and would never make such a claim.

The Bon forum was closed for the reason I stated above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This thread has recently become quite silly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

. But the E-Sangha fire is again burning somewhere else.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, you are setting the fire, and epitomizing that which you disliked on E-sangha. Oh the irony.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

By the way if we get the Rainbow Body in the Bon Zhang Zhung Nyengyud, then we do belong also after that attainment to the Lineage of Taphirista.

But that i never can explain and defend at your home here and now. So where can i do that? Only at the Bon sub forum

So out of conciderations we keep it there and nowhere else.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Taphihritsa is an important lineage master in Dzogchen Community, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Andrew108 said:

In this forum there is so much clinging to the form and words of the teacher. This isn't Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There is indeed much clinging to words and form. But that is not our business.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 11th, 2012 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sönam said:

If you speak dzogchen, ChNN is incontrovertible!

Sönam

kalden yungdrung said:

That is sure your private opinion, no doubt about it.

It sounds like propaganda or advertisement as the best here and there.

Better to discuss general topics, which are agreed by all Dzogchen Traditions.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

This thread is DC specific, so it is better to discuss things connected with the teaching of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 11th, 2012 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The main point is that we have to respect each other. That does not mean we have to agree about everything.

As far as DC topics go, we need to respect that closed webcasts are closed for a reason. People should not be having disagreements about what ChNN says in forums like this. If you have doubt, make an effort to purchase the mp3's.

People in the DC need to respect other people's POV. This does not mean that we have to agree, or admit they are right. We only need to pay attention to our own practice without attempting to condition others.

For example, many people think you need to be a Buddhist in order to be a Dzogchen practitioners. I don't agree, but I respect the opinion of those people who think so. Their approach is not wrong. But neither is mine.

ChNN is an unusual teacher. He is not presenting Dzogchen as part of the Nyingma or Bon traditions. We who are his students do not necessarily consider ourselves Nyingma or Bon. Some may, but most of us do not. This can cause some misunderstanding.

So, non-DC people need to understand that attitude of DC people is not typical of Tibetan Buddhists in other traditions, including Bon. DC people need to respect that Buddhists have a very specific POV around Dzogchen. If this is kept in mind, and we communicate with respect, then this will eliminate most problems.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 9th, 2012 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I agree with lightening the atmosphere as the last thing you want is panic, but think ChNNR, once he knew it was a fire alarm, should have immediately asked everyone to calmly leave. I'm sure he is very familiar with these large group meetings, and already had everyone's attention.

Malcolm wrote:

While ChNN was kidding around with the audience, we had sent someone to the administration office to discover if we needed to leave the building. This the 2 minute hesitation you observed.

When it was determined we needed to leave, we left immediately, as you saw.

This building is a solid brick building, single story with almost no wood, or other flammables apart from classrooms and the auditorium, built in the late 60's. There was never any real possibility of a fire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 9th, 2012 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I was the person who told the boss we had to leave during the fire alarm. But announcements are made by others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 9th, 2012 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Oh, and the schedule for the current retreat that I downloaded, says that the Ganapuja is tomorrow.

But did I hear an announcement today correctly, that there will be a Ganapuja today at 2 PM EDT?

Sally Gross said:

I think you heard correctly: as I recall, Malcolm announced it immediately after the

teaching session.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi,

FYI, I am not announcing anything -- that is another guy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 5th, 2012 at 7:22 PM

Title: Re: How are offerings accepted?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Does the "outer" offering then have any value at all?

Malcolm wrote:

It strengthens your intention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 5th, 2012 at 10:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Garuda Practice And Cancer

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Someone also just suggested Vajra Armor (Dorje Gotrab) which is supposedly more of an all-encompassing healing practice, would that be a better option? Or a good practice to do in addition to the garuda (as a supplement)? I know the garuda is specifically for cancer, being that cancer is generally a naga provocation. Again any information and/or suggestions are much appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

Garuda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

That's silly.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you have a sutrayāna view of things.

Virgo said:

Malcolm these different channels have to do with different winds which relate to the different consciousnesses?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 9:40 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

That's silly.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you have a sutrayāna view of things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I have often felt intuitively that tantra's obsession with numerical correspondences was rather arbitrary.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it is physiological.

deepbluehum said:

So the eight spokes actually correspond to the 8 consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

....

When we eat meat (or anything else) mindfully, we create a connection with all those animals through our shared rtsal energy. That gives them a connection to meet the teachings through us.

M

Inge said:

Hi

Could you explain a little about rtsal energy? What it is and how it works?

Malcolm wrote:

Rtsal is how the primordial state manifests.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I have often felt intuitively that tantra's obsession with numerical correspondences was rather arbitrary.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it is physiological.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

This time we have new needs.

Malcolm wrote:

Makng Milanese stew however is not the solution.

deepbluehum said:

That's what happens when you take really divergent systems and try to combine them,

like Christianity, Hinduism and Buddhism.

What I'm making is more of a reduction.

Malcolm wrote:

It won't work. The terms of these different tenet systems are incommensurate. Of course you can have critical reevaluations of them, such as Candrakirti's revaluation of the term ālayavijñāna as "consciousness apprehending the basis i.e. emptiness, but it does not mean there is a unified field theory that ties all these tenet systems together. Realism includes all tenet systems up to the level of Madhyamaka. Even Madhyamaka subscribes to a qualified realism through its teaching of the two truths. Mahamudra does not really go beyond Madhyamaka in this respect.

The use of the eight consciousnesses in Vajrayāna systems is related to the eight channel spokes of the heart cakra, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

This time we have new needs.

Malcolm wrote:

Making Milanese stew however is not the solution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

Jnana said:

Well, I'd suggest that at some point practice becomes radically simple and these apparent discrepancies lose momentum and fall away.

deepbluehum said:

Yes. That is the practice side. I thought we were talking about the explanatory side.

Malcolm wrote:

The basic point is that different explanations were elaborated at different times, for different purposes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Very cute and poetic. Can't do much with it. The Buddha boiled it down to 12-links.

Malcolm wrote:

The twelve links can be further reduced to three, as Nagarjuna puts it --> affliction --> action --> suffering --> affliction -->.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

The Seeker said:

Malcolm, that is a large scale operation, but there are many that are quite large that don't use manure of any type or any animal byproduct as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Animal manure = sustainable soil fertility. That can be enhanced by carcasses of various kinds propely composted, etc.

However, in this day and age of soil depletion either one uses chemicals, or one uses the results of animal husbandry, manure, etc. The latter is, in my opinion, better for the earth. Of course organic fertilizers are not restricted to feather, blood and bone meal -- but they are used extensively and you will readily agree, they are an important component of present day organic agriculture.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Meru?

Content:

underthetree said:

Historically, how long has Mount Kailash been regarded as Mount Meru, and in how many cultures?

Malcolm wrote:

Only by some Tibetans. Indians never thought Meru was Kailash.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Meru?

Content:

Huseng said:

In many Indo-European religions we find reference to a mountain being at the center of a culture's cosmological vision. For example, Olympus (Greek), Asgard (Norse), Harā Bərəzaitī (Persian) and Mount Meru (Indic).

Clearly the fact these diverse cultures share the same mythological element speaks of a common source.

So what are we to make of it? This is a controversial issue in modern times because it has been discovered that our planet is not made up of four continents with Meru at the center.

However, Mount Meru is said to be the abode of various deities up to a certain point, which would indicate it is not physical, but something beyond our ordinary physical realm.

The Vedic proponent Richard Thompson in his work Vedic Cosmography and Astronomy suggested that Mount Meru is part of a transcendental cosmological map. He demonstrated that the ancient Indians had scientific astronomical knowledge, but given the divine nature of the knowledge it extended beyond the physical realm, hence beyond what we can ordinarily perceive.

Or are we just talking about ancient cosmology that failed to pass the test of modern cosmology and hence can be set aside without further ado?

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Surya Siddhanta, Meru is the north pole.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: Yangzab and Chokling tersar

Content:

roman said:

Malcolm-- would say them the Yang zab would not be complete? To me it sounds like no. Can you tell me more of the Yang zab....you have studied it under Lamkhyen Gyalpo Rinpoche, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yangzab is 98 percent sadhanas.

It really only has one or two actual Dzogchen texts. Yangzab is an appendix to Khandro

Nyinthig and is meant to be practiced in conjunction with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 9:02 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are totally missing the point -- organic agriculture depends on animal by products. In order to eat rice, you need slaughtered chickens.

gregkavarnos said:

Not all organic fertilisers are made from the feathers of slaughtered chickens. There are also manure based organic fertilisers.

The Seeker said:

You two are also missing the point that in an organic set up compost of only plant matter is more effective than any animal byproduct. The animal byproduct isn't necessary in plant production.

Malcolm wrote:

In large scale operations, it is more than essential.

For example, Lundberg farms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 9:00 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are totally missing the point -- organic agriculture depends on animal by products. In order to eat rice, you need slaughtered chickens.

gregkavarnos said:

Not all organic fertilisers are made from the feathers of slaughtered chickens. There are also manure based organic fertilisers.

Malcolm wrote:

Manure is fantastic, but it is not as nutritionally dense as feathers, bone meal or blood meal -- which is why it is used in large scale organic farming.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:54 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The discrepancies between Mahayana, Vajrayana, Mahamudra and Dzogchen. Mahayana you have Yogacara and 8 consciousness. Vajrayana goes along with that somewhat but Kagyu Mahamudra makes this distinction with Alaya as pure. Then, Dzogchen says Alaya is ignorance and posits the Gzhi.

Malcolm wrote:

Different terminology elaborated at different times, for different purposes, for different reasons. There is no need to try and sew it all up in a nice neat package.

"A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines. With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do. He may as well concern himself with his shadow on the wall. Speak what you think now in hard words, and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict every thing you said to-day. ó 'Ah, so you shall be sure to be misunderstood.' ó Is it so bad, then, to be misunderstood? Pythagoras was misunderstood, and Socrates, and Jesus, and Luther, and Copernicus, and Galileo, and Newton, and every pure and wise spirit that ever took flesh. To be great is to be misunderstood."

--- Ralph Waldo Emerson

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Obviously. If you really are going to hold this as a view, then there is no reason even to use something like an 8 Consciousness model. The model is there to represent what happens when you don't know all consciousnesses are empty.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the model is actually there to explain, among other things, why it is that when someone experiences nirodha samapatti, their mind can resume functioning.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

But if you take the alayavijnana to be emptiness...

Malcolm wrote:
But it isn't, except in Candrakirti's scheme of things.

deepbluehum said:
So what you are saying is you don't agree with Candrakirti. You haven't shown "it isn't."

Malcolm wrote:
Candrakirti has no interest in representing the yogacara theory from the point of view of Yogacarins. He is only interested in negating it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 5:13 AM
Title: Re: Yangzab and Chokling tersar
Content:
roman said:
Until Chogyal Namkhai Norbu-- and his klong sde is much more detailed than the klong sde section in the sde gsum.
What about the klong sde section in the yangzab? Isn't being clear subjective, or is it that much clearer?

Malcolm wrote:
There is no sems sde or klong sde in the yang zab.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 5:11 AM
Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana
Content:
deepbluehum said:
But if you take the alayavijnana to be emptiness...

Malcolm wrote:
But it isn't, except in Candrakirti's scheme of things.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 5:09 AM
Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana
Content:
deepbluehum said:
Dzogchen is the 8th.

Malcolm wrote:
So you have just reduced Dzogchen to the level of mind.

deepbluehum said:
Not really. 8th is emptiness, etc.

Malcolm wrote:
All consciousnesses are empty.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 10:24 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:

seeker242 said:
And the amount used to grow grain to feed to cows to raise for food, is in the trillions of tons. And at the end of that, you get to dine on a dead carcass.

Malcolm wrote:
You are totally missing the point -- organic agriculture depends on animal by products. In order to eat rice, you need slaughtered chickens.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 10:05 AM
Title: Re: Yangzab and Chokling Tersar
Content:
roman said:
but only Chokgyur Lingpa transmitted the Space Section.

Malcolm wrote:
Until Chogyal Namkhai Norbu-- and his klong sde is much more detailed than the klong sde section in the sde gsum.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 5:32 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Blue Garuda said:
The quote was something about students (in SOV?) looking at the sky instead of looking at him.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, that is right, when singing SOV it is better to gaze at the boss than over his head. I have heard him say this myself.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Lojongs, Rushens, and Semdzins

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

Also, after one has recieved transmission from ChNN...does that give one permission to start the rushen practice,

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jacob said:

If I had once DC membership but I didn't buy it this year, can I still use my login and password and listen to restricted webcast?

Malcolm wrote:

You ought to just pay your membership.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This webcast contained formal sems khrid/rig pa'i ngo sprod yesterday morning.

Greg said:

Thanks - it seems to have . . .not registered, or something. When was that, exactly? Understandable if you don't want to elaborate on public forum.

Malcolm wrote:

When he gave transmission in the last 45 minutes of the session.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

heart said:

That is not how my Guru explains it, he says that taking the result as the path means to take the natural state as the path since there is no other Buddha.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yidam is a symbol of natural state.

In general, however this language belongs to the vehicles of cause and result. There are specific passages in Dzogchen tantras which reject this language.

Taking the three kāyas into the path is different than taking the result as the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Greg said:

Point of clarification requested. I've read:

alpha said:

But does Rinpoche ever give pointing out instructions or direct introductions to rigpa as part of a webcast?

Malcolm wrote:

Always.

Greg said:

and

alpha said:

Would it be accurate to say that WHATEVER he says is actually pointing out?

Malcolm wrote:

Whenever Rinpoche is talking about Dzogchen, he is giving direct introduction.

N

Greg said:

But for webcasts such as this one that didn't include a more formal sems khrid/rig pa'i ngo sprod, is it considered a direct introduction/ww transmission for the purposes of permission to purchase and study books and so forth?

Malcolm wrote:

This webcast contained formal sems khrid/rig pa'i ngo sprod yesterday morning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No only this but the amount of animal products used to grow vegetables, rice, etc. is in the millions of tons.

gregkavarnos said:

Animal by-products not animal products.

Malcolm wrote:

Blood, bones and feathers are not animal products?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

Today ChNN Rinpoche clarified for one more time with the following words exactly that:

"Zen is Sutra teaching.

Dzogchen is part of Vajrayana".

Cheers!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

CapNCrunch said:

Dzogchen belongs to the teaching taking the result as the path

I just understood this statement to mean that the result (the fruit) is the path in Dzogchen - in the sense that it is often said that the state of guru yoga or "enlightenment" is the base, the path and the fruit of Dzogchen. Ergo, the result (the fruit of the practice) is also the path.

Malcolm wrote:

No, to take the result as the path means, for example, to meditate on oneself as a buddha, for example, Guru Dragphur, which is the method of Upa, Yoga, Mahayoga and Anuyoga.

One is not a buddha, but one takes the result as one's path.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

heart said:

Dzogchen belongs to the teaching taking the result as the path.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely not.

heart said:

It is called Vajrayana. "Dzogchen is a part of Vajrayana" ChNNR

Edit: I understand that this is also a name for the Lamdre teachings (after some google)
I of course don't mean that Dzogchen is a part of Lamdre.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

One does not take the path as the result in Dzogchen. For example, Vajrayāna is nominally part of Mahāyāna, nevertheless, Vajrayāna is not a causal vehicle. Vajrayāna in general is the result vehicle. Likewise, Dzogchen is nominally part of the both Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna but it is the vehicle beyond cause and result.

Hence my negation of your statement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Huseng said:

If you're vegetarian or vegan avoiding animal biproducts is almost impossible given than many ingredients in processed foods are derived from dead livestock in some form or another.

Malcolm wrote:

No only this but the amount of animal products used to grow vegetables, rice, etc. is in the millions of tons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

heart said:

Dzogchen belongs to the teaching taking the result as the path.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Great Depression History and its shadow

Content:

kirtu said:

Of course since 2007 US household wealth has once again dropped 40% - not the same as income but I personally know people whose personal income has dropped 90%.

These pages also raise an issue of people starving to death in the US during the Great Depression although that was in effect covered up.

Kirt

Huseng said:

Does everyone there have access to food stamps?

kirtu said:

I don't know as I don't know as I know almost nothing about food stamps even though I should have applied for food stamps three years ago.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Getting food stamps is a huge pain. They really ride your ass with paperwork, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Dzogchen is the 8th.

Malcolm wrote:

So you have just reduced Dzogchen to the level of mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

It is this erroneous thinking that has created so much confusion over the centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a simple definition found in various sutras.

deepbluehum said:

I question their validity.

Malcolm wrote:

Since the whole concept of the ālaya-vijñāna comes from sutra, it is a little strange to contest the definitions set out by the defining literature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

See I don't agree with you here. I think everything needs to be reconciled.

Malcolm wrote:

Have at it then -- but AFAIC, it is a colossal waste of time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

In Mahāmudra and Lamdre, ālaya refers to the nature of the mind i.e. inseparable clarity and emptiness. In Dzogchen ālaya refers to ignorance. It is very simple. Not even worth a discussion, really.

It's only polemics and one-upsmanship.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is just a different system with a different terminology.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The ālayavijñāna is afflicted since it stores the bijas of affliction.

deepbluehum said:

It is this erroneous thinking that has created so much confusion over the centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a simple definition found in various sutras.

deepbluehum said:

Once all the traces have been eradicated, the ālayavijñāna disappears.

Emptiness can never disappear. The Alaya-vijnana is emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to the definition of Candrakīrti given in the Madhyamaka-
avatarabhāṣyaṃ but not according to the definition of the cittamātra school. So you
have to be clear whose definition you are speaking from. Incidentally, in the tantras,
they use the definition of the cittamātra school since ālayavijñāna is relative
consciousness that is a function of the body.

deepbluehum said:

There is a difference between the ālaya discussed in Mahāmudra teachings and the
ālayavijñāna. However in Dzogchen teachings, the ālaya is also considered afflicted. In
Dzogchen ālaya = avidyā.

I resolved these discrepancies. Take another look at my analysis. What you said might

be the formulaic subscriptions given by certain teachers from certain lineages at certain times, but there is no reason to think these should remain so fixed.

Malcolm wrote:

I go by the definitions provided in the man ngag sde tantras where the definition of the ālaya is well defined. It is of little use to reconcile different terminologies apart from noting that they refer to different things.

In Mahāmudra and Lamdre, ālaya refers to the nature of the mind i.e. inseparable clarity and emptiness. In Dzogchen ālaya refers to ignorance. It is very simple. Not even worth a discussion, really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I tend to differ with Jnana's quoted material for the following reasons. The source is myself and my experience with oral transmission in the Vajrayana lineages.

The first Five Consciousnesses (Vijnana) correspond to each of the Five Sense Media (eye, nose, ear, tongue and body). The Sixth Consciousness (Manovijnana), postulating external "objects", corresponds to the Five Sense Bases or "sense objects." The Seventh Consciousness (Manas) is the afflicted consciousness that postulates a truly existent subject or "I." Alayavijnana is the eighth of the Eight Consciousnesses which is the nature of mind, Emptiness, Prajnaparamita, Mahamudra, etc. The sense-Vijnanas, the Manovijnana and the Manas are mutually conditioned by the Three Poisons (ignorances, attachment and aversion), and, together, these constitute the basis (alaya with a little "a") for samsara. The prime mover is the Manovijnana-Manas dynamic. Thus, the Alaya is not afflicted.

Malcolm wrote:

The ālayavijñāna is afflicted since it stores the bijas of affliction.

deepbluehum said:

Thus, the Alaya is neither perceived by the ignorant, apprehended, nor obscured. All the apprehension and obscuration is occurring from the seventh consciousness and below.

Malcolm wrote:

Once all the traces have been eradicated, the ālayavijñāna disappears.

There is a difference between the ālaya discussed in Mahāmudra teachings and the ālayavijñāna. However in Dzogchen teachings, the ālaya is also considered afflicted. In Dzogchen ālaya = avidyā.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

There are several brands of vegetarian dog foods out there and there are several brands of vegan cat food already out there.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the very definition of animal cruelty -- like feeding corn to cows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Does it apply to all practitioners that they benefit the animal by eating it, or only those who are able to do so when in the natural state, as I am unsure how many DC members are at that level where it would be much help?

Malcolm wrote:

You can use a mantra as a support for blessing, such as om ah hum, or འ་ཏཱ་ཤཱ་མུམ་, or if you have the confidence of instant presence, that is sufficient. In any case, the main point is not to remain passive -- this is the fault of Mahāyāna style vegetarianism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

How about those who will not eat meat unless the animal died naturally or in an accident?

Malcolm wrote:

All death is natural and is a result of karma, including being butchered in an abbatoir.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

The original premise is that it is 'given' that killing animals can't be stopped.

Malcolm wrote:

It cannot be stoppped. Without animals, agriculture is not possible. For example, all commercial organic agriculture uses millions of ton of feather meal, bone meal and blood meal.

All farming results in millions of rodent, bird, and insect deaths.

So even when you eat your rice cake, you still have to do so with mindfulness of all the animals that died to bring that good to your table. So when you understand things in this way, then you understand that the arguments against eating meat are essentially silly and vain.

The only positive argument against eating meat is health. The way we consume meat in Western Industrial Society is not healthy. But the idea that eschewing meat stops the process of death is deluded.

When we eat meat (or anything else) mindfully, we create a connection with all those animals through our shared rtsal energy. That gives them a connection to meet the teachings through us.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

have I misunderstood ChNNR when he advised people to buy supermarket meat?

Malcolm wrote:

Completely. He is saying that the animal is already dead and refusing to purchase meat based on some fantasy that this will prevent the future slaughter of animals is therefore a fantasy-based decision. Worse, it means that from a Dzogchen POV, you are abandoning animals to limitless suffering. He says, and said last night that buying meats like sausage is even better since it is made from many animals and not just one. When you use this meat in a ganapuja, you create possibilities for that animal to be reborn as your student, etc.

Listen to his webcast from last night where he clearly addressed all of this, including criticisms directed at Dzogchen practitioners who advocate meat-eating as a compassionate thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan translation challenge

Content:

conebeckham said:

Barnang= inner blazing?

Malcolm wrote:

བར་སྒྲོན་ i.e. the sky. Means the space in front of one, the "middle appearance".

ས་ i.e. earth, hence sky and earth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 28th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Pero said:

I don't see what it has to do with being a Buddhist or not. Dzogchen Tantras have teachings on the bardo. Actually I'm not entirely sure if they're not actually their source. But in any case that is why it is funny to say it's not a Dzogchen teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Phowa is not a specifically Dzogchen teaching.

The four or six bardo scheme is specifically Dzogchen and is not found in the gsar ma tantras, the main source for the teaching on bardos is nyi zla kha sbyor rgyud.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 27th, 2012 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jacob said:

Hm, could anyone explain me what's the function of serkyem practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Offering a drink to the four guests, focusing on the eight classes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

ChNN's guru yoga transmission is extraordinary form of guru yoga. ChNN is an extraordinary teacher. This is a very unique opportunity.

Malcolm wrote:

Preaching to the choir -- ChNN has been my root Guru since 1992.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

If they were truly pure visions, they would be Sambhogakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever you like to believe.

I am not going to discuss this further on an open forum.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thogal visions are not marigpa at all -- otherwise, they are not thogal visions.

Malcolm wrote:

?[/quote]

Marigpa is "subject-side", visions are "object side". When the display of the basis is recognized as one's own state, no more dualism, no more ignorance.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 8:50 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations
Content:

deepbluehum said:
The visions are not Sambhogakaya IIRC.

Malcolm wrote:
The visions are completely pure, meaning they are not fabricated by the mind.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 8:39 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
deepbluehum said:
The specific wangs for specific practices are required...

Malcolm wrote:
No, this not correct.

If you have DI, then all you need is lung for mantra and brief explanation of practice, in general.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 7:37 AM
Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen
Content:

BuddhaSoup said:
Now if only someone could tell me that, with no-self/anatta/anatman in mind, what survives death to occasion rebirth? A consciousness? A cosmic bit of dust? A semi-soul? A wisp of smoke that follows an extinguished candle?

Malcolm wrote:
Affliction and action.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 7:36 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Mariusz said:

What I wrote in the post above: the 3 visions of thogal are the second Marigpa which can have Samantabhadra and yet return (forth vision). All of them are not third marigpa where is the Mind. Please read Longchen Rabjam, Tulku Thondup: "The Practice of Dzogchen", Snow Lion Publications, 2002, ISBN 1559391790.

deepbluehum said:

I've studied the text. It doesn't seem to be well translated or the concepts don't jibe somehow or perhaps I don't follow your writing well. This presentation is a bit confusing and strange. Longchenpa was a great teacher, but I'm not that jazzed about his writing. The three visions of thogal are still marigpa because you don't recognize them to be your own appearance yet. There is still some dualism vision. The visions themselves are pure, they are neither samsara nor nirvana, but you are not Samantabhadra and neither are they. Longchepe's language often, to my mind, ventures into the realm of idealism.

Malcolm wrote:

Thogal visions are not marigpa at all -- otherwise, they are not thogal visions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 7:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

And yes they are "wisdom appearances" with the caveat that they are not yet completely pure...

Malcolm wrote:

They are completely pure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: Not Accepting, Not Rejecting

Content:

MalaBeads said:

It is easier for me to understanding the instruction "not rejecting". It is more difficult for me to see what is meant by "not accepting".

My own lifelong habit has been more to simply accept whatever was happening in my life and work with it. And then whenever I would reject something, someone, it would be with a vengeance.

So what do there's understand by this instruction "not accepting"?

Any and all help is gratefully accepted.

Malcolm wrote:

The term is more like "not rejecting, not adopting".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

All the manifesting is marigpa. Once you finally resolve the view, there is exhaustion of phenomena.

Mariusz said:

Even the visions of thogal? You know the exhaustion is the forth vision only.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all.

Thogal visions are wisdom appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Mariusz said:

For example visions of thogal have nothing to do with the Mind, but it is possible to have breaks for ordinary life activity.

Malcolm wrote:

"Samantabhadra" is a state of total integration where it is impossible to return to the state of being an ordinary person.

Below this level, we have alternating experiences of rigpa and marigpa.

This does not mean we need to do anything to achieve awakening. We merely need to extend the period of our non-dual integration from nanoseconds to 24/7.

Samantabhadra has five definitions, one of those is "the basis Samantabhadra".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Mariusz said:

]When you recognize Rigpa, there is no Mind. However one moment later it arises somehow. It is called Marigpa. Even Samantabhadra can have Marigpa! Please read my notes: <http://www.lamrimnotes.webs.com/dzogchen.html>. More theory I don't know for sure, I'm a preliminary Dzogchen practitioner only and I'm focusing mainly on practice

heart said:

Samantabhadra don't have any ignorance, and so he have no mind (sem) either.

Sentient beings have mind (sem) and ignorance. I received very elaborate teachings on this over the years.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra had ignorance, but never experienced dualism because he recognized the arising of the basis as his own display.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Pero said:

What is the tibetan for "reenlightenment"? I don't believe this term actually exists.

Mariusz said:

I will look at book "the practice of dzogchen for it. Perhaps I heard it also from some Rinpoche, so I will check my notes. However the theory of dzogchen is not so linear as mahayana, especially in Nyinthig, and you can surprise yourselves

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra both possessed ignorance (innate ignorance and ignorance that resembles the cause) and once he recognized his own state, he never returned to a state of ignorance.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Jnana said:

You still fail to understand or acknowledge the point: There are people who are not receptive to dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, as the Dzogchen tantras openly acknowledge.

The job of the teacher is identify such persons and steer them to the appropriate spritual solution.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I feel like I shouldn't leave this hanging. I'll try to be reserved. For example, tanha doesn't mean desire. It means urge. Avijja doesn't mean ignorance. It means unawares.

Malcolm wrote:

Tanha [tṛṣṇa] means thirst. Avijja [avidyā] means not knowing [i.e.ignorance].

deepbluehum said:

I don't expect to convince you of something. I don't agree Buddha was saying thirst. He was talking about something deeper.

[/quote[]

Yes, he meant thirst, and yes, he was using the term to point to something deeper, the salt water of desire, etc.

He didn't mean to say knowing some information was overcoming avijja. He was talking about becoming aware of what's happening.

Malcolm wrote:

He was using it in both senses, knowledge that overcomes ignorance, knowing what is happening.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 8:15 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations
Content:

deepbluehum said:
I feel like I shouldn't leave this hanging. I'll try to be reserved. For example, tanha doesn't mean desire. It means urge. Avijja doesn't mean ignorance. It means unawares.

Malcolm wrote:
Tanha [tṛṣṇa] means thirst. Avijja [avidyā] means not knowing [i.e.ignorance].

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 3:19 AM
Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen
Content:
BuddhaSoup said:
...the original teachings.

Malcolm wrote:
There is no such thing.

BuddhaSoup said:
There does seem to be a consensus view that the original teachings of Gautama were kept within the oral tradition of his monks, who met after his death to organize the teachings. Over time, these teachings were written down; how accurately in anyone's best estimate, but the scholarship suggests that there is a uniform agreement that the Buddha's teachings on Four Noble Truths, Dependent Origination, among others, survived fairly intact.

Malcolm wrote:
Even the Buddha acknowledges that he is not the first Buddha, hence his teachings are not "the original".

This notion that Gotama Buddha's teachings in the Nikayas/Agamas are the "originals" is purely a scholastic artifice and should not be believed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 1:05 AM
Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona
Content:

pemachophel said:
It would also be interesting to hear from some Tibetan Lamas why they don't speak out

in public on such issues.

Malcolm wrote:

Because they all have dirt on each other, or members of each other's lineages. If accusations start flying, it will never end.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I see. Is there a particular method for introduction by touch or are we assuming like some quick shock from a sharp touch for example?

Malcolm wrote:

Introduction need not necessarily be via a Hadawa. Could be something smooth, then something rough, etc. Anyway, while in principle we can consider that as long as a human being has some sensory capacity, they can receive introduction, practically speaking it is a little difficult if they are too sensorily deprived.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

If someone's deaf and blind, then what are they supposed to do? The master has to communicate somehow. A smile is a far cry from the Direct Introduction of Six A. There are those limitations that someone cannot overcome so it's next life for them.

Malcolm wrote:

Braile and touch.

deepbluehum said:

That's transmission by reading, which I thought was no no.

Malcolm wrote:

braile to communicate concepts, touch for introduction...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 12:04 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations
Content:

deepbluehum said:

If someone's deaf and blind, then what are they supposed to do? The master has to communicate somehow. A smile is a far cry from the Direct Introduction of Six A. There are those limitations that someone cannot overcome so it's next life for them.

Malcolm wrote:
Braile and touch.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 12:02 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

deepbluehum said:

...Westerers need Asian culture along with Dharma instructions. Screw that.

Malcolm wrote:
Indeed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 11:23 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Hi B:

You should not expect much at a short retreat. However, if you can, find Joe Evans.

He is here on Dwheel. He is there in Pasadena.

M

bjf77 said:

With all that I said before, in my previous post....I have a sort of bone to pick.
Before I say anything though let me preface it with this:
ChNN is amazing!! His teaching is amazing (method and introduction).

The community though, in my very weak and humble opinion, could use some work. I came out here to Pasadena, CA, from SLC, UT (there are NO other D.C. members in SLC that I know of), alone for this retreat...and I guess I shouldn't complain, because I did come out to meet ChNN and receive teachings in person. However, the community has been quite oddly 'distant' overall. People have been kind, polite, and genuinely 'nice', but have remained at a distance from me (and I assume from other loners at this event). I have remained a loner the entire time at this retreat. I have attempted several times to try to start conversations to get to know people and start to 'experience' the Dzogchen Community. I have been a member since 2008 and this is the first time I have had the chance to interact and relate with other members of the community in person. I don't feel like I am socially inadequate or awkward. Maybe a bit shy at times, but I tend to be able to make 'friends' fairly easily and am able to carry a conversation. I feel like I somehow, somewhere, missed some 'boat' though. The longest conversation I had was about 2 minutes and everybody seemed interested in ending our little chat as quickly as possible. It just struck me as odd.

Perhaps, the issue is one of expectation that should be dropped....A close friend of mine, I talked to via the internet tonight about this topic told me, "it's a great time to experience working with your own condition"...TRUE! But I can't help but feeling a bit disappointed. This is suppose to be a community, it's very name is such, the Dzogchen Community. In my opinion, it doesn't feel much like a community, but more of a 'fend for yourself' 'feel/mentality'. Perhaps it's just the mixture of people at this particular area/retreat? I don't want this post to come across as harsh....I love ChNN, the teaching, and the Community (at least with my limited digital contact) and was hoping that the experience would be reciprocal from the community. Apparently, this is an issue that exists in my mind as it is a judgement, a part of dualistic vision, and should be dropped.

So, what am I going to do, besides be aware of the judgement, emotion etc... and let it self liberate? Well, if I am ever fortunate enough to be at a D.C. event again, retreat, teachings, practice, etc.... I will make it a point to find that loner or 'newb' and welcome him/her and try to help them get their bearings, answer questions, get to know them, even invite them out for a lunch or dinner (if appropriate for the situation) and be as much like a 'community' member as possible, because I don't want another to have the experience that I have had with something that is so dear to me. I would challenge all D.C. members to do the same.

Much Love, Light, and Bows....

B

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

How can a deaf person hear transmission with their eyes?

Malcolm wrote:

Transmission is not only by sound, but can be communicated through any of the five senses. The main point is that they understand.

And then there is sign language.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Functioning senses is one of the endowments needed for this to be a precious human life, as explained in Mahayana and Vajrayana generally, let alone Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are Dzogchen instructions (thögal) for those who are blind explained in the Gongpa Zangthal teachings.

deepbluehum said:

Well that's encouraging. Dzogchen doesn't seem to leave any stones unturned. Is there anything to be done for deaf people who cannot hear transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

They have eyes, so yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen

Content:

BuddhaSoup said:

...the original teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Functioning senses is one of the endowments needed for this to be a precious human life, as explained in Mahayana and Vajrayana generally, let alone Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are Dzogchen instructions (thögal) for those who are blind explained in the Gongpa Zangthal teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

So Dzogchen would be not limited but a Dzogchenpa does to a certain degree. Karma is somehow still counting.....

Malcolm wrote:

"When we discover our limits we have to try to overcome them, untying ourselves from whatever type of religious, political, or social conviction may condition us."

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 193-195). Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Ogyen said:

Attended my first ChNNR webcast for the Los Angeles Retreat- "Kunzang Monlam" Introduction to Ati Guru Yoga and tridlung of Short Thun.

Wow. Just wow. Like. Wow.

deepbluehum said:

It's hard to follow another teacher after hearing him.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 21st, 2012 at 9:40 AM

Title: Re: Balancing the Three Humors

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You have an imbalance of bad kan, phlegm. More exercise, lighter diet, etc. Go to an

ayurveda practitioner for a kapha balancing diet or consult an ayurvedic cooking manual for the same.

Do yantra, a lot.

Sherlock said:

Is an imbalance of phlegm also expressed through physical phlegm i.e. mucus from the nose and phlegm in the mouth?

Malcolm wrote:

Can be

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2012 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Unknown said:

News flash, if you follow the classic approach, you're expected to actually practice Dzogchen after perfecting kyerim, something most of you will never get to do. The defilements are considered so powerful these days, that some lamas will require not 100.000 of each accumulation, but 400.000.

Malcolm wrote:

This based on the idea that 100,000 is the Treta yoga amount, but since we are in Kali yuga, it is multiplied by four.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2012 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: Dzochenpa Census

Content:

Clarence said:

Andrew, meet Geoff. Our resident genius hermit (I am being serious). He can read Pali, Sankrit and Tibetan and lives like a hermit. He is also a nice fellow from what I can gather of reading his posts for many many years. So, sometimes it is good to listen to what he has to say.

Sönam said:

Thank you ... my hears are whistling since a couple of days, since Malcom stopped answering there is a rush of arrogant and caustic statements.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Partly it is because I am on the road.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 19th, 2012 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am a bit shocked but I guess I have not been following your postings of closely enough of late.

So in fact you see all those many years of learning Tibetan, studying the Sakya systems, translating those texts

and investigating the abhidharmakosha etc. as a waste of time. You think you would have been better off

just resting in your natural state.

OR Did it take that much to get to this point?

It is a bit discouraging to hear, somehow. For me personally, I couldn't imagine jumping into these formless

meditations without a sort of gradual progression. I guess according to the Dzogchen presentation I am a

dull faculty disciple. If I did think all the rest was unnecessary, I wouldn't have busted my butt these last few years learning Tibetan and translation. I really feel what Geshe la teaches me now

is what will allow these formless things to make sense in the future.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, don't get me wrong, I still enjoy reading texts like the Kosha and so on, but I am not longer under the il/delusion that liberation lies in that direction. Studying medieval philosophy, while entertaining, is a hobby.

As I said elsewhere, for Dzogchen all you really need to understand is the five poisons, the five elements, body, voice and mind, as well as the eight examples of illusion. That is about the extent of "abidharma" and madhyamaka you need to understand. You do not even need to understand the five aggregates, etc.

This dawned on me in April when I was teaching a course on Tibetan Medicine (which is all about the five elements and how they create, maintain and destroy the body) and realized that in all the thousands of pages of Tibetan texts I have translated and read of original Dzogchen material, apart from the five poisons, the vast portion of other topics in Abhidharma, the complex pirouettes of Abhisamaya, the scheme of the two truths and so on, is more or less completely absent in Dzogchen tantras apart from when they are criticizing these schemes or presenting the views of the different yānas.

Of course the Dzogchen tantras themselves deal with the doctrines of other yānas,

mostly critically. And of course to be a translator of Dzogchen texts etc., yes, you need to study everything from the three vows all the way up the ladder -- especially if you want to become enmeshed in the texts of Longchenpa. So in answer to your other question, I am not sorry for having studied anything. All study can be taken with you into your next life. I am a "knowledge friendly anti-intellectual" these days.

To practice Dzogchen, you need to study very little. You just need to receive transmission from a qualified master (cannot underestimate the importance of that) and then go practice. If you think you need to study many things to understand Dzogchen then you are wasting your time. Why can I say this? Because many simple, uneducated people have achieved total liberation through Dzogchen teachings. Butchers, hunters, farmers, stone carvers, laborers of all kinds, people who did not spend years in retreat learning complicated practices and doctrines.

Dzogchen boils down to rigpa and marigpa i.e. knowledge or ignorance of the real condition of your body speech and mind which is created out of the five elements [yes mind too is created out of the five elements].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

rai said:

it is great but it would be interesting to know how many are getting it.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as you are not passive and apply yourself, all will "get it".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

xylem said:

"will the true dzogchen please stand up" debate on DW.

-xy

Malcolm wrote:

It's been going on since E-Sangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Yudron said:

Malcolm this actually brings up an interesting point. I tried looking at some dzogchen tantras in the Nyingma Gyudbum, and they were handwritten -- difficult to read and containing a lot of scribal mistakes. Many criticize the bible for being so rife with scribal errors compounded one upon the other that it could hardly reflect the early documents it purports to represent... and perhaps intentionally distorted in places.

Malcolm wrote:

The Adzom Chogar edition of the seventeen tantras is the best; it is based on the Derge edition and provides all the alternate readings. For example, there were at least three manuscript traditions of the Rangshar -- the one in the Tingskye/Tsham brag edition is has differences in certain respects from the Adzom Chogar and is based on only one manuscript tradition.

Yudron said:

Now, I don't know why you look at the Dzogchen tantras from a religious view when you are eschewing religion

Malcolm wrote:

I don't "beleive" in the Dzogchen tantras, I have personal experience of what they are discussing (no this does not mean I am a realized person). So I don't look at them from a religious point of view -- they are experiential manuals.

Yudron said:

but clearly you believe, as I do, that they are not Tibetan inventions.

Malcolm wrote:

There are features of the Man ngag sde tantras that can only exist in native Tibetan compositions.

My view of the Dzogchen tantras is that they are human compositions, relative, and so confined in space and time to this epoch. For example, the Rangshar was taught by the primordial master Zhonnu Pawo Tobdan. But it also mentions Shankaracaraya and Kumarila who are both from the 7th-8th century. So when it was set down or recounted, in the enumeration of views, Vimalamitra or someone else, if it is really a translation, mentioned these Hindu masters who were of recent fame. So I think that the Dzogchen tantras have multiple layers and multiple authors. And this also does not mean that they do not have an oral origin in a guy named Garab Dorje -- we simply do not know.

But faith in the historicity of Garab Dorje, or the veracity of the traditional lineage account is unnecessary for the pratice Dzogchen. Even if Dzogchen were invented yesterday by Eckhart Tolle, it would still be a verifiable personal experience one can have.

For example, the Rangshar's colophon holds that Vimalamitra translated the text using copies in three languages, that of Sanskrit, Oḍḍiyānese, and rgya nag, which at the time, probably meant Central Asia (according to Hansen-Barber), but usually is understood as China by modern Tibetans. This is strange and interesting.

Yudron said:

So, we believe...they are not just 1,000 years old, but 2,000 or more years old.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure of that. All we know for sure is that around this literature emerged in the tenth century. We have no text datable prior to the tenth century apart from the Guhyagarbha tantra -- this is because Samyas burned down. Even so, the 17 tantras were supposedly confined to a single edition discovered by Dangma Lhungyal and given to Chetsun. Chetsun gave them to Zhangton in 1128 along with the Vima Nyinthig. He also gave them to Chegom who revealed some other interesting tantras (which are in NGB) that show up in slightly different recensions Gongpa Zangthal. At that time, Terma revelations were not so codified the way they are now. The colophons of the texts in the zangs yig can for example recommend that the practitioner himself conceal the texts for later times if he cannot find a suitable disciple.

Yudron said:

With each edition there have been scribal errors and edits by well-intentioned lamas trying to figure out what needs correcting--probably dozens of editions. Whomever Garab Dorje was, living in whatever era he did, what we have now as Dzogchen tantras clearly are not what he received from Vajrasattva.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, these texts have been subject to emendation and addition. One thing, Garab Dorje was a nirmanakāya -- his speech is Vajrasattva and his mind is Samanabhadra. The three kāyas are inseparable -- so the Samantabhadra --> Vajrasattva --> Garab Dorje lineage thing is just a literary device, and not meant to be taken literally, IMO.

Yudron said:

Did I read somewhere that Jim Valby inputted a critical edition of the main 17 tantras?

In any event, while very interested in the current redaction of these ancient documents, I place my faith in the personal menngak from current Buddhas who have accomplished the path in the present.

Malcolm wrote:

All the 17 tantras have been put on line in wylie, Valby's edition. They are a not a critical edition. For some tantras, he input parallel copies, which is better than "critical editions".

My present understanding of Dzogchen is entirely due primarily to the kindness of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, which is not to discount the

kindness of othe teachers.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: What is Yeshe?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If one knows [shes] the buddhahood that has always been [ye] naturally formed by nature,

there will be buddhahood of clear realization.

That is the definition of wisdom [ye shes].

Rigpa Rangshar tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Balancing the Three Humors

Content:

Clarence said:

So, after yesterday's talk about the practice of the night and balancing the three humors, I have some questions I hope you can answer.

Personally, I have a hard time remembering my dreams. It seems I sleep pretty deeply and, like Rinpoche said, don't feel like doing a lot of physical stuff during the day. All symptoms of heavy I couldn't make out what he said. Thing is, I don't sleep during the day nor do I fall asleep during meditation.

So, what could I do to lower the level of which makes for the heavy sleep? What diet is best? I am a vegetarian and would prefer to stay one.

Many thanks, Clarence

Malcolm wrote:

You have an imbalance of bad kan, phlegm. More exercise, lighter diet, etc. Go to an ayurveda practitioner for a kapha balancing diet or consult an ayurvedic cooking manual for the same.

Do yantra, a lot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Dependent Origination and Lhundrup

Content:

Sherab said:

Horizontal aspect of DO manifests as causal chain and when examine, points to impermanence of all phenomena.

Vertical aspect of DO when examine, points to sunyata.

In Dzogpa Chenpo, lhundrup is more fundamental than DO. Because of lhundrup, there is DO.

What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

I think that not recognizing lhun grub results in dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Yudron said:

Is Nubchen now the great oppressor?

Malcolm wrote:

My remark concerned Dalton, not Nubchen.

Anyway, the nine yānas are not a problem, since they include the tirthika vehicles as well, following the scheme laid out in the sgra thal gyur (first yāna, yāna of gods and humans).

The nine yānas are not reflective of the hostility Dzogchen received in Tibet, nor the continuing hostility Dzogchen has been subjected to in various Buddhist quarters, Sakya, Kagyu as well as Kadampa/Gelug.

The Bonpos, contrary to the post 10th century mythology of the imperial period, were never hostile to Dzogchen despite the fact that they definitely pushed back against in the three way political contest between Chinese influence, Indian influence, and native traditions.

It is funny you know: in the colophon of the Rigpa Rangshar tantra, when Trisong Detsen is presenting the Rigpa Rangshar to Nyanbang he says "This [tantra] is evil mantra (ngan sngags) that will ruin Tibet. If Tibet comes to ruin, you should move this outside of it."

What is hilarious about this of course is that the Rigpa Rangshar barely contains any mantras, has no methods of liberation or union, etc., and discusses the four empowerments of man ngag sde in only the barest of terms. But the message is

Dzogchen is that anyone can understand it and practice it (providing they have transmission of course). This is threatening to Indian/Kadampa style gradualism that has come to dominate all schools of Tibetan Buddhism including modern Nyingma and Bon.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

Adamantine said:

This is precisely the kind of snarky and cynical overgeneralization that reduces your credibility considerably.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not terribly worried about my credibility. That is other people's problem, not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:33 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Bhusuku said:

From the little I know of Bön scriptures, it really seems to me that most of them are interspersed with Dzogchen teachings...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the commentary on the Bon "abhidharma" attributed to Drenpa Namkhai mentions tregchö, for example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Bhusuku said:

It would be really interesting to know if they do Ngöndro the way Tibetans do. Unfortunately, I didn't come across any information about that yet.

Malcolm wrote:

They don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

Yudron said:

This teaching addresses the reasons that many lamas do not teach Dzogchen proper in public. This is similar, but not exactly the same, as the reasoning about why ordinary people like me—who are not even close to being Dzogchen masters--do not mouth off about Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Dzogchen is very threatening to Tibetan Buddhist hierarchy. When it is discovered that everyone has the same state, it really renders havoc to the feudal relations Tibetan Buddhism depends on for its economic functioning.

M

Yudron said:

I'm not a cynical as you, Malcolm. Our current Dudjom lineage holders--such as Khyentse Rinpoche--for example, are not trying to defend their power base, quite the contrary. Each of them cares only about how blossom enlightenment in us as quickly as possible. An this involves being very meticulous and careful, as Longchenpa recommended... carefully working with each student in an individualized manner and protecting them from derailment. They put all their heart into carefully guiding serious practitioners, and don't give a **** what one's nationality or pedigree is.

Malcolm wrote:

No disrespect, it's a nice sales pitch, but I am not buying it. No interested in religion anymore, Buddhist or otherwise, even packaged as "enlightenment" whatever that is.

But, different strokes for different folks, as the saying goes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Adamantine said:

These are just theories, and not corresponding to the way the Nyingmapas tell their own history.

Bhusuku said:

Well, if you read about tibetan history and not only about the "way the Nyingmapas tell their own history" you'll get another picture... Yudron suggested Dalton's "Uses of the Dgong Pa 'Dus Pa'i Mdo in the Development of the Rnying-Ma School of Tibetan Buddhism" earlier in this thread, and if I remember correctly, that text is a good start in this regard.

Malcolm wrote:

It's kind of funny to cite Dalton in defense of Nyingma orthopraxy since the conclusion of his PhD thesis is that Nubchen basically composed the anuyoga tantras with Chetsun Kye's help.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

Yudron said:

This teaching addresses the reasons that many lamas do not teach Dzogchen proper in public. This is similar, but not exactly the same, as the reasoning about why ordinary people like me—who are not even close to being Dzogchen masters--do not mouth off about Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Dzogchen is very threatening to Tibetan Buddhist hierarchy. When it is discovered that everyone has the same state, it really renders havoc to the feudal relations Tibetan Buddhism depends on for its economic functioning.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 11:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He never stayed in Bristol, but he stayed in Lincoln at Osa's house (mostly) and also David Arndt's house.

Adamantine said:

Malcolm, were you by chance at an elaborate Drollo wang he gave in Lincoln, that John Petit translated? If so, would you have been wearing a striped zen? I have a vague

memory, wondering if that was you. . .

BTW, I got a copy of a translation you did for the short practice of his Drollo terma from Khenpo Sonam in LA, and the lung from his son Rigdzen Dorje Rinpoche. Thank you for your work on that.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Adamantine:

I was there. I don't think I brought a Zen to that wang. But it is a fact that I am the only western person who received the skra dbang (hair empowerment) from KDL who kept it (I was the one who requested for it, so it would have been gauche for me not to be keep it). Everyone else, for whatever reason, has cut there hair one time or another.

You are welcome. BTW. The "short" practice is actually the practice. There is another Drollo cycle in his gter kha, but it is elaborate, and is mainly used fo drubchens.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 11:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I don't find strange at all that during some periods of Tibetan history Dzogchen had to go "underground", being cloaked in Tantric robes.

There were some factions inside the schools of the new translation very hostile to Dzogchen teachings, as you know.

Adamantine said:

These are just theories, and not corresponding to the way the Nyingmapas tell their own history. I think it is just a tad disrespectful to imply that they were so influenced by sectarian anxieties that they forgot their own history and their reasons for making important decisions.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Dechen is merely repeating what ChNN has said many times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as one of his heart sons, I can say this is absolutely true.

Virgo said:

I wasn't fortunate enough to be his student, but I did stay at a house in Bristol where apparently he stayed many times when he visited Vermont.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

He never stayed in Bristol, but he stayed in Lincoln at Osa's house (mostly) and also David Arndt's house.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:19 AM

Title: Re: Question concerning Dzogchen practice of Dream Yoga.

Content:

oldbob said:

That said, I have never, in the 32 years that I have been with ChNNR, have heard him say that anyone should not study with other Teachers, or limit themselves in any way

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Transmission itself is the only blessing you need.

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Is reading The Precious Treasury... By Longchenpa a transmission ? Or only When you listen to ChNN via Webcast/or live ?

Malcolm wrote:

Reading a book is not transmission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- Is ChNN then the only exception who is convinced about the non necessity of the

preliminaries within Dzogchen?

- Are there then maybe more Dzogchen Masters (anno 2012), who share ChNN's point of view?

Mutsog Marro
KY

Virgo said:
The great Kunzang Dechen Lingpa did.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, as one of his heart sons, I can say this is absolutely true.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:10 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro
Content:

Adamantine said:
Well, this goes back to another thing we used to hash out on Esangha. Malcolm and others may say these Nyingma terma revelations are all just creative writings of the tertons.

Malcolm wrote:
I never said they were mere creative writings. This would mean they were products of conceptual mind.

I don't think that.

But I don't think that termas are necessarily reflective of some conventional historical factual event.

Of course the evolution of the terma tradition is poorly understood, even by Tibetans. However, if we look at the first account of the terma tradition, i.e. the one written by Guru Chowang, this can give us some clarity. Also looking at the colophons of the Vima Nyingthig and the 17 tantras, etc, will bring clarity, as well as looking at the Bonpo termas tradition which is arguably earlier than the Buddhist one.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: What is Yeshe?

Content:

Sherab said:

If by Wisdom, you refer to the knowledge of the actual condition, then you are saying that light can be obscured by darkness or enlightened knowledge can be obscured by misknowledge. If your Wisdom refers to something else, then it is merely mundane wisdom and is of no consequence. Calling that Wisdom becomes an obfuscation.

Malcolm wrote:

Wisdom (jñāna, yeshe) is the basis.

Rigpa/sherab is knowledge of one's actual condition i.e. the basis.

Anyway, you can use whatever word you want for ye shes, timeless awakening, pristine cognition blah blah blah.

These are all just signifiers anyway and of no real consequence.

Wisdom (insert favorite jargon here i.e. Jñāna, God, Brahmin, Yeshe, George, Turiyatva etc.) is a state, i.e. the basis (sthana). It is unaffected by either knowledge or ignorance, cannot be improved or damaged, is permanent, self-originated, empty, radiant, etc., has the three kāyas, everyone possesses it, and so on -- you know the drill.

Anyway, I am tired of debating people -- -suit yourself.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 7:31 AM

Title: Re: Cleansing the physical body of bad toxins

Content:

Wesley1982 said:

What's the best way to cleanse the physical body of bad toxins? thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Colorado Cleanse

<http://www.lifespas.com> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Understanding the message of the teachings means discovering one's own true condition,

Kunga Lhadzom said:

So even if you understand, you still need a dzogchen master (living), to bless you with his realization, before your understanding is authentic ?

Malcolm wrote:

Transmission itself is the only blessing you need.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 5:07 AM

Title: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen teachings are neither a philosophy, nor a religious doctrine, nor a cultural tradition. Understanding the message of the teachings means discovering one's own true condition, stripped of all the self-deceptions and falsifications which the mind creates.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 123-124). Kindle Edition.

Dzogchen is not a school or sect, or a religious system. It is simply a state of knowledge which masters have transmitted beyond any limits of sect or monastic tradition.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 171-172). Kindle Edition.

A monk, without giving up his vows, can perfectly well practice Dzogchen, as can a Catholic priest, a clerk, a workman, and so on, without having to abandon their role in society, because Dzogchen does not change people from the outside.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 183-184). Kindle Edition.

Every religion, every spiritual teaching, has its basic philosophical principles, its characteristic way of seeing things. Within the philosophy of Buddhism alone, for example, there have arisen different systems and traditions, often disagreeing with each other only over subtleties of interpretation of the fundamental principles. In Tibet these philosophical controversies have lasted up until the present day, and the resulting polemical writings now form a whole body of literature in itself. But in Dzogchen no importance at all is attached to philosophical opinions and convictions. The way of seeing in Dzogchen is not based on intellectual knowledge, but on an awareness of the individual's own true condition.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 185-189). Kindle Edition.

All our concepts and beliefs, no matter how profound they may seem, are like nets which trap us in dualism. When we discover our limits we have to try to overcome them, untying ourselves from whatever type of religious, political, or social conviction may condition us.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 193-

195). Kindle Edition.

For example, those who already have a certain familiarity with Tibetan culture might think that to practice Dzogchen you have to convert to either Buddhism or Bon, because Dzogchen has been spread through these two religious traditions. This shows how limited our way of thinking is.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 161-163). Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

You are to only one using the word mandatory Dechen. I hear a lot of bitterness in you but I can't see how I have anything to do with that.

/magnus

Dechen Norbu said:

There's no bitterness here. I'm explaining what I'm doing, that's all. Can you stop guessing my mental states and intentions, please? Trying to place a negative emotional charge where there is none won't do much good for the discussion.

Adamantine said:

This is the tragedy of online communication. . . (you've done this to me a bunch lately too Dechen, and I am sure I'm guilty as well!) Maybe we all need to realize internet communication is tone-deaf and do our best to give everyone's intentions and moods the benefit of the doubt. Let's at the very least assume everyone's motivation is altruistic in the sense of trying to benefit others through personal experience and clarifying aspects of teachings according to each person's given understanding. Naturally, this will be different for each person, -for so many reasons!

Malcolm wrote:

Come on man, it is really simple -- we DC people know what ChNN teaches, and we are constantly told we are wrong.

This is an old story and it goes back to E-Sangha days. It is a skipping CD.

Do we know that there is Dzogchen outside of the DC, of course. But the fact remains that the way our teacher teaches really is quite different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Energetics of Thought

Content:

underthetree said:

Something I've found, both in meditation and in everyday life is that, when a thought arises and I look at it and let it dissolve, I always experience a physical sensation, either in the area of my heart, my solar plexus or occasionally roughly in my sinuses. The same applies for emotion. This is a sort of faint physical tremor or thrill accompanied by a sensation which is neither pleasant or unpleasant. From my limited understanding of Tibetan esoteric physiology I'm guessing that this is a function or manifestation of lung, but I'd like to know more.

Malcolm wrote:

Thoughts are rlung. When your lung does not move, thoughts do not arise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Question concerning Dzogchen practice of Dream Yoga.

Content:

Jacob said:

but what can he teach me that e.g. ChNNR can't?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing. He is teaching dream yoga from the perspective of Kagyu. While it is a fine teaching, it has nothing to do with the practice of the night as taught by ChNN.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

In general it is an anti-intellectual, hedonistically oriented, aggressive monoculture.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh bullshit.

kirtu said:

I'm surprised by your flight to ad hominem and illogic. Please calm yourself.

One solution would be for you to spend 3-5 years in Western Europe outside of a strictly American environment. You might not agree with me, but the arguments would make more sense to you.

Malcolm wrote:

I have spent a lot of time in Europe. I like Europe.

kirtu said:

However my argument is with all of western culture as a font of death and misery.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh please.

kirtu said:

I am not advocating religious government.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the only way your Dharmic society will happen.

Unless of course you agree with my perspective of individual evolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Real Marijuana as Herbal Medicine?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't practice, herb is fine. If you do, herb is a fetter.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

In general it is an anti-intellectual, hedonistically oriented, aggressive monoculture.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh bullshit.

kirtu said:

US citizens do not understand that they are basically a monoculture and certainly deny it. One of the reasons is that US people largely have not experienced other societies.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not a monoculture at all. Seriously, kirt, get over your trip.

kirtu said:

I'm stunned that you could assert that US culture is not superficial intellectually. Just look at the level of "discussion" on various topics in the US on most levels.

Malcolm wrote:

You watch too much goddamn TV.

kirtu said:

As far as TV, I don't experience societies through TV.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the only way you can come to your conclusion.

Again, your top down approach is totalitarian. I prefer American Democracy along with all its warts and mistakes.

Once again, it's not a top down approach and I am not advocating totalitarianism. This is at least the second time in two forums that you have accused me of totalitarianism and that is highly offensive.

Right, just as offensive as the bullshit you have been spewing in this thread, if you don't like America, than move.

AFAIC, any religious government will ultimately result in totalitarianism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

IMHO,

The Diamond Sutra is a Dzogchen teaching. Also The Heart Sutra. Any teaching on Emptiness really...no ?

Malcolm wrote:

Indirectly, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

"An oral commentary to Narag Tontrug" page 11: "In fact the Manjushri Tantra, which contains many oral transmissions and teachings, was taught by Shakyamuni through particular manifestations, and through these teachings he transmitted knowledge and understanding of the state of Dzogchen"

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, that is quite different. Mañjuśrī nāmasaṃgiti is not a Dzogchen tantra, and can be understood in many different ways. That being said, there are passages in the Nāmasaṃgiti which show up in Dzogchen tantras, such as "The single eye of wisdom is stainless".

But you will never find Sakyamuni giving a teaching on Dzogchen in an explicit way.

heart said:

This is an exact quote.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know. Nevertheless, ChNN also maintains that Shakyamuni never taught Dzogchen explicitly. I have heard him say it any number time. Man you are stubborn.

It is getting to the fraking point on this board that unless you come armed with a volume of fraking citations you cannot say anything.

Kunsanggar, June 1st, 2001:

"Buddha Shakyamuni did not directly teach Dzogchen. Not only Buddha Sakyamuni, but some of the other twelve teachers did not directly give Dzogchen teachings. They communicated indirectly because the essence of their teaching is Dzogchen."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, point of protocol, it is either Chogyal Namkhai Norbu or Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche. If you use one you do not need the other.

What do you mean: 1) ChNN says that Shakyamuni taught Dzogchen 2) he predicted

Garab Dorje?

heart said:

What is wrong with calling him "the precious Dharma King Namkhai Norbu"?

For the rest, see above.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing, it simply is not necessary. His formal title is Chogyal, that is more proper than "Rinpoche". You could call him Chogyal Rinpoche, which is how he was known in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Who taught Shakyamuni dzogchen?

The 11th Ngöndzok Gyalpo ?

Did Shakyamuni receive pointing out from Ngondzok ?

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Bonpos, Shakyamuni received Dzogchen teachings from Shenrab when the former incarnated as Sangba Dupa.

But in a way that is a wrong question, Shakyamuni did not need anyone to give him transmission since he was a nirmanakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

ChNNR says he did.

/magnus

Dechen Norbu said:

Sources, please.

heart said:

"An oral commentary to Narag Tontrug" page 11: "In fact the Manjushri Tantra, which contains many oral transmissions and teachings, was taught by Shakyamuni through particular manifestations, and through these teachings he transmitted knowledge and

understanding of the state of Dzogchen"

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, that is quite different. Mañjuśrī nāmasaṃgiti is not a Dzogchen tantra, and can be understood in many different ways. That being said, there are passages in the Nāmasaṃgiti which show up in Dzogchen tantras, such as "The single eye of wisdom is stainless".

But you will never find Sakyamuni giving a teaching on Dzogchen in an explicit way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Twelve_teachers Even Buddha Sakyamuni is considered a dzogchen teacher !

Malcolm wrote:

yes, though he did not teach any Dzogchen texts directly, he predicted Garab Dorje.

heart said:

ChNNR says he did.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, point of protocol, it is either Chogyal Namkhai Norbu or Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche. If you use one you do not need the other.

What do you mean: 1) ChNN says that Shakyamuni taught Dzogchen 2) he predicted Garab Dorje?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Twelve_teachers Even Buddha Sakyamuni is considered a dzogchen teacher !

Malcolm wrote:

yes, though he did not teach any Dzogchen texts directly, he predicted Garab Dorje.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

When and where did dzogchen begin?

Wasn't it taught in other parts of the Universe before coming to Earth ?

Who was the first teacher in the Universe ?

Malcolm wrote:

1) Dzogchen teachings are primordial, they have no beginning. They arise out of the very fabric of reality.

2) Dzogchen is mentioned in the sgra thal gyur tantra to have been taught in 13 other places besides this one.

3) The first teacher of Dzogchen in this great eonic cycle is usually considered to be Nangwa Dampa, the first of the 12 primordial masters, who taught all the man ngage sde tantras including the primary root tantra of Dzogchen, the sgra thal gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Bhusuku said:

One quick question: What is actually the earliest source for the Ngöndro practice, and how old is that source?

Malcolm wrote:

Ngondro as a formal set of practices developed in Tibet between the 11th and 13th century. You will find no Ngondro texts in the bstan 'gyur.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Pero said:

Yudron was saying what is needed for accomplishment, and I'd say turning oneself into a qualified student (not just being an interested one) is a good part of that.

Malcolm wrote:

She does not use the word accomplishment once in her post. So I did not read it that way.

Pero said:

She does, you missed it:

Yudron said:

...but I've heard that accomplishment is based on 1) Having a qualified guru (someone who has brought his or her Dzogchen practice to culmination, this has been verified by his/her teacher, and who has been asked to teach Dzogchen based on this). 2) Being a qualified disciple (we skip over this part, don't we?) 3) Having pure view of one's guru. 4) Actually practicing daily.

Malcolm wrote:

I stand corrected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

There's also a point I forgot to comment and I think it deserves a little discussion. The bold part:

Yudron said:

It's really not a big deal, and it is pretty enjoyable. So, there is no need to take 20 years to avoid something that takes three or four years. Especially in the west where we are probably not even Buddhists before ngondro, we need at least that long to reorient to a Buddhist framework.

Dechen Norbu said:

The question is, does this Buddhist framework is really necessary for a Dzogchen practitioner?

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not for Father Francis Tiso.

And here we go again...

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

You are right Malcom, I am sorry.

Now do you understand that all of this isn't helping?

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on who you ask. It may not be helpful for you, which means you should put it aside.

In the bone yard said:

Please just remember that there are members on this board who do take their practice seriously and that your actions effect others.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am quite aware of both things. What I do and say here is quite deliberate and not whimsical. I have to say your stalking of my posts on the board with your unwelcome and anonymous admonishments is becoming quite tiresome. Talk to someone who is interested.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Pero said:

Yudron was saying what is needed for accomplishment, and I'd say turning oneself into a qualified student (not just being an interested one) is a good part of that.

Malcolm wrote:

She does not use the word accomplishment once in her post. So I did not read it that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I am 50 now and I am not as sharp as I was when I was younger but I guess its better late than never.

Malcolm wrote:

Sharp and dull is of no consequence on Dzogchen. The only thing that matters is personal experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: I thought Buddhism wasn't about threatening people with Hell

Content:

Ikkyu said:

From what I understand, Madhyamaka is about finding balance in everything.

Anders said:

That's not really what Madhyamika, or the middle way in general, is about. It's just about steering clear of the extremes. In Madhyamika, that means the extremes of existence and non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, Ikkyu, you are talking about the Madhyamā pratipad i.e. the middle way path:

Monks, these two extremes ought not to be practiced by one who has gone forth from the household life. (What are the two?) There is addiction to indulgence of sense-pleasures, which is low, coarse, the way of ordinary people, unworthy, and unprofitable; and there is addiction to self-mortification, which is painful, unworthy, and unprofitable.

Avoiding both these extremes, the Tathagata (the Perfect One) has realized the Middle Path; it gives vision, gives knowledge, and leads to calm, to insight, to enlightenment and to Nibbana. And what is that Middle Path realized by the Tathagata...? It is the Noble Eightfold path, and nothing else, namely: right understanding, right thought, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness and right concentration

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

I said nothing about imposing a totalitarian system at all. I did say we need to create a Dharmic culture. Right now and basically forever, the US, as an example, is blind to the consequences of it's culture.

Malcolm wrote:

No we aren't.

kirtu said:

US culture permits (and in some view , insists upon) state murder (execution). This is a consequence of the culture. US culture also permits the blunt use of military force because it is a non-reflective culture

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this assessment.

kirtu said:

and as we have seen when a form of mass hysteria arises as a result of some severe trauma (9/11 and the partially justified view that terrorist want to kill everyone) indiscriminate military force is applied.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, and this isn't also happening in Europe? Haven't you noticed burgeoning rise of the far right in European politics -- did it escape your attention that Nato is involved in every war we have been in?

kirtu said:

One of the reasons that both are possible is the lack of compassion as a serious motivation in the society and from an intellectual POV the intense superficiality of the society, resulting in a tendency to not consider consequences or alternatives.

Malcolm wrote:

The American society I live in is not superficial, intellectually or otherwise. You need to read folks like Wendell Berry, etc. I honestly think you have not explored American culture beyond what you see on TV even though you have lived here your whole life.

kirtu said:

Certainly the bedrock values of a Dharmic culture would be compassion and the sanctity of life. These values are certainly no where near the core values of society, not even social democracies at this point.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, your top down approach is totalitarian. I prefer American Democracy along with all its warts and mistakes.

kirtu said:

However, people can follow Dharma as best they can, and they can be "mini-cultures". Evolution, as my teacher says, not revolution -- one person at a time. That is certainly true but people also need to begin to change society to move it in a compassionate direction.

Malcolm wrote:

If and when people evolve, society will evolve, and not before.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

In an attempt to solve this situation, this topic was created.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just a rerun of conversations held at E-Sangha, with exactly the same players.

We are like old men in Miami arguing about a Dodgers game we both saw in the '50's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

We create an enlightenment culture, a Dharmic culture

Malcolm wrote:

We need to become integrated persons, then the rest will happen naturally. There is no way to create a top-down culture of the kind you envision, and I wouldn't want it anyway.

Why? Whose vision of Dharma are we to follow? Buddhists can't even agree on that (one of the reasons I don't consider myself a Buddhist anymore, after all, just what is Buddhism other than a demographic label?). No, the whole idea of a "Dharmic" culture is problematical and ultimately, totalitarian.

However, people can follow Dharma as best they can, and they can be "mini-cultures". Evolution, as my teacher says, not revolution -- one person at a time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

The 4 Aspects of the Attainment of Freedom in Dzogchen is the same as the Basis of Purification in tantric scripture.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis of purification in Vajrayāna depends. In Lamdre for example, in general it is the five aggregates, etc. that is given as the basis of purification.

That is not the basis of purification in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

You are right Malcom, I am sorry.

Now do you understand that all of this isn't helping?

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on who you ask. It may not be helpful for you, which means you should put it aside.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

I agree Yudron, this whole discussion stems from a few people here having a Guru that says it isn't necessary for them to do Ngondro or Yidam and for some reason they translate that personal instruction to a universal truth that defines Dzogchen as a teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

That's because this is what that Guru tells them is universally true about Dzogchen as presented in the original tantras of Dzogchen, which is the perspective from which he teaches.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Yudron said:

2) Being a qualified disciple (we skip over this part, don't we?)

Malcolm wrote:

If you have met Dzogchen teachings, you are a qualified disciple, in so far as you interested in practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: What is Yeshe?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ye shes is Dzogchen.

Sherab said:

Is Dzogchen neutral with regard to Wisdom? i.e. Dzogchen is Dzogchen whether Wisdom is present or not? If yes, then since Ye shes is Dzog chen, then Ye shes is ye shes whether Wisdom is present or not. If so, then using Wisdom in the translation of Ye shes would be inappropriate.

Malcolm wrote:

Wisdom is always present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

That is nice Malcom, but you didn't say it.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I did. I said it to you.

In the bone yard said:

You are a Buddha.

---Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh Lectures

Hey Malcom,

I am a Buddha!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are. Now act like one and stop giving me a hard time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Virgo said:

Kirt, what do you propose we do about this so-called "problem of culture"?

kirtu said:

We create an enlightenment culture, a Dharmic culture, in which communal murder for one (and that's not the only thing, BTW) becomes as impossible as possible. So a Dharmic Swedish culture of sorts. And we change culture worldwide over a several century period to reflect this Dharmic culture. This is not imposed on top of local culture per se but aspects of local culture are diminished that would lead to negative action and aspects of local culture that promote peace and kindness are enhanced. So over time, all cultures become bodhisattvic in their own way.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism does not have good record in this department. There is nothing about any Buddhist culture which suggests a commitment to peace and kindness other verbal lip service.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

The cultures of all societies are harmful.]

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I don't share your cynicism. But you're more interested in being "right" than sharing perspectives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they are related in the terms of goal how could they be independent of each other? My understanding of the word "independent" is something like "unrelated".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

In the same way that three different roads are independent and lead to the same

destination. But, you can only travel one road at a time.

heart said:

Perhaps in terms of view but concerning methods that would mean that you are limiting yourself.

Going to bed now, see you tomorrow!

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

View is what is being considered here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: Invocation of Samantabhadra

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I know that ChNNR is giving a retreat for this in LA next week. What is its purpose? How is it used/practiced?

Malcolm wrote:

It is an essential teaching on the basis, and how ignorance happens and what to do about it in the form of a beautiful aspiration. It comes from a long tantra from the Gongpa Zangthal cycle

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they are related in the terms of goal how could they be independent of each other? My understanding of the word "independent" is something like "unrelated".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

In the same way that three different roads are independent and lead to the same destination. But, you can only travel one road at a time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

That is nice Malcom, but you didn't say it.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I did. I said it to you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they were truly independent why would you need to use renunciation and transformation to explain self-liberation?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

They are contrasted so one can understand the difference between them, why they are different, how they are different, etc.

heart said:

If they lack relation in terms of goal it makes no sense to differentiate them.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

They are related in terms of goal, that is the point of differentiating them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they were truly independent why would you need to use renunciation and transformation to explain self-liberation? Why would Kunjed Gyalpo go on and on about why Dzogchen is superior to the Mahayoga and Anuyoga?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen takes a critical posture towards the eight yanas (even the nine yanas), just as Vajrayāna takes a critical posture towards Mahayāna, and Mahāyāna, a critical posture towards hinayāna.

M

heart said:

Yes, exactly.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and in contrast to the approaches of these eight or nine yāna, Dzogchen presents its own independent approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they were truly independent why would you need to use renunciation and transformation to explain self-liberation?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

They are contrasted so one can understand the difference between them, why they are different, how they are different, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think Dzogchen is not independent of Vajrayāna?

heart said:

Depends on what you mean by independent, Dzogchen is always presented as a part of Vajrayana. "I am Manjusrimitra, who have attained the siddhi of Yamantaka." Anyway, nothing in this world is independent.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

What I mean by independent is that Dzogchen has its unique approach. It does not mean that Dzogchen cannot be approached thorough mahā and anuyoga; it can; but it also has its own approach. Thus my Guru has said, and likewise my reading in early Dzogchen tantras bear this out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

Oh, and I am pretty bored with this discussion because nothing new ever appear in it.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

renunciation

transformation

self-liberation

Three different paths, independent of each other.

M

heart said:

If they were truly independent why would you need to use renunciation and transformation to explain self-liberation? Why would Kunjed Gyalpo go on and on about why Dzogchen is superior to the Mahayoga and Anuyoga?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen takes a critical posture towards the eight yanas (even the nine yanas), just as Vajrayāna takes a critical posture towards Mahayāna, and Mahāyāna, a critical posture towards hinayāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

If we are low intellect we cannot expect to understand and practice Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

If this is practiced, all will be liberated;

there is no distinction between sharpness and dullness in capacities.

--- Flight of the Garuda

There are many other citations to similar effect. If you have the good fortune to meet Dzogchen, you can practice it and achieve liberation, regardless of who you are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

Oh, and I am pretty bored with this discussion because nothing new ever appear in it.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

renunciation

transformation

self-liberation

Three different paths, independent of each other.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

There is no "pure Dzogchen" it is a pipe dream.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are practices which come from the three series which are independent. They can be mixed with practices from the lower yanas or not.

How many more rounds do you want to fight until you get bored with it?

heart said:

Instead of just claiming Dzogchen is completely and fully independent of Vajrayana, how about you try to prove it? I have seen no proofs at all yet.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think Dzogchen is not independent of Vajrayāna?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

mutsuk said:

No, not in the Nyingthiks.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the Vima Nyinthig this is exactly how it is and how it is laid out in the shal chems in the gser yig can.

This changes with the introduction of the klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma rgyud which most likely dates to early-mid thirteenth century.

heart said:

The "klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma rgyud" is not real Dzogchen? Is that what you are saying?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It explains why there is a difference between the kama tradition on this point and the terma tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Well, going straight to Rushen, Trekcho, etc. straight from Direct Introduction is traditional for pure Dzogchen.

And doing Ngondro before Rushen, Trekcho, etc. is traditional for Dzogchen integrated with lower Yanas.

And both ways are perfectly fine, and are also both "traditional" in their own way, yes?

heart said:

There is no "pure Dzogchen" it is a pipe dream.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are practices which come from the three series which are independent. They can be mixed with practices from the lower yanas or not.

How many more rounds do you want to fight until you get bored with it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, he said "direct introduction". Why? Because in Dzogchen Buddhahood exists to be demonstrated. If it is not demonstrated, there is no liberation, even though it is present from the beginning.

heart said:

Exactly, and how do that happen? There are no rules, so stop pretending that there is.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Did I say anything about rules? Mutsuk was making a claim, proposing that there was always a sutra and Vajrayāna style ngondro attached to Dzogchen teachings and that this is evident in Nyinthig. Well, it is evident in Khandro Nyinthig tradition, but is not evident in the early 12th century Vima Nyinthig tradition. Even in the third Karmapa's commentary on the Vima Nyinthig, it is the seven mind trainings that are offered, unlike Kongtrul's large commentary on the Mother and son Nyinthigs, which has a standard ngondro attached.

After all, if you have confidence in the teachings, believe in your guru, and have compassion, what more do you need?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jacob said:

Yeah, i always wonder if this white A is in sphere or it is flat. I asked some elder practitioners and i got two different answers. I think it doesn't matter ;p

Malcolm wrote:

It is in a thigle i.e. a sphere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Well, going straight to Rushen, Trekcho, etc. straight from Direct Introduction is traditional for pure Dzogchen.

mitsuk said:

No, not in the Nyingthiks.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the Vima Nyinthig this is exactly how it is and how it is laid out in the shal chems in the gser yig can.

This changes with the introduction of the klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma rgyud which most likely dates to early-mid thirteenth century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mitsuk said:

Therefore, the main way Dzogchen is being taught is through a traditional approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, everywhere but the DC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mitsuk said:

This is the purpose of the direct introduction. As Vimalamitra says at the beginning of his 1st volume commentary on the Dra Thelgyur, the Path of Dzogchen consists of the gradual steps explained in this Tantra. This involves ordinary preliminaries, etc, together

with Rushen, etc., and of course the four Visions.

Malcolm wrote:
Page numbers?

I am looking at that section, and it starts with rushan following receiving the four empowerments. But I don't see refuge, mandala, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:45 AM
Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen
Content:
mutsuk said:
but its a gradual path anyway.

Malcolm wrote:
As I said, we will agree to disagree.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:08 AM
Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen
Content:
Dechen Norbu said:
heart,

I'll quote Malcom as this reply of his fits your comments about using the traditional ngöndro to get rid of doubt.

More, SMS base level is not particularly related to Garab Dorje's second statement.

heart said:
So it is connected with his first statement? Seem so you didn't get my point, what practice you do don't necessary correspond with any of the the three statements so I think when ChNNR says that Garab Dorje didn't say "first do the Ngondro" that is just a joke because for sure he didn't say "first do Guru Yoga with a white Ah" either nor did he say "first do lodjongs, semdzins and rushan" or "first do Semde" or any other method at all. It is between you and your Guru what you do and when.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
No, he said "direct introduction". Why? Beause in Dzogchen Buddhahood exists to be

demonstrated. If it is not demonstrated, there is no liberation, even though it is present from the beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mutsuk said:

To the extent that there is a path in Dzogchen, that path consists of discovering what you have not discovered.

Malcolm wrote:

Not only, it deals with becoming familiar with what you were not. The DC usually forget about the Tsel of Rigpa and the related practice.

[/quote]

As for your first sentence, this is a quibble.

As for the second part, No, you are wrong.

mutsuk said:

This is the reason for the special preliminaries as I am sure you will agree.

Yes sure, but not only, these preliminaries have purposes too.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, a given practice can have ultimate as well as temporary benefits.

mutsuk said:

So, there is a path to discovering this knowledge, but it is not really gradual in the sense of gathering the two accumulations and so on as in sutra and tantra.

The understanding is not gradual, nobody said so. But it takes an entire life to become so familiar with the dynamic nature of the state to reach its ultimate expression. So it's gradual. Those who went from the 1st to the 4th vision are more than quite rare in the entire history of Dzogchen. For the 99,99 per cent remaining, including gigantically advanced masters, there is a path to follow. This Path is explained in the entire Dzogchen literature and it's its purpose. Any Path is gradual, even terribly abrupt ones. This is why Trekcho is a View and Thogel a Meditation (or a Path depending on authors).

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone can have the first vision. Most people manage the second vision with relative ease. Many, though less, even manage the third.

For example, the Rigpa Rangshar has a detailed presentation of the 21 capacities. Only

the best of the best achieve the body of light in this lifetime. Most of the rest achieve buddhahood in the bardo after varying length of time after death. The rest take rebirth in the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels.

The energy of the wisdom of rigpa neither increases nor does it decrease regardless of the four visions.

The "path" in Dzogchen is not like "path" in other systems, where you start out from point a and wind up at point b. The "path" of Dzogchen is simple removing the jaundice of ignorance so you see what is there all along from the beginning. It is not about acquiring something new you did have before.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

However, it is not a gradual approach. Nothing in Dzogchen is gradual. If it is gradual, it is not Dzogchen, even if it is useful.

mutuk said:

It is indeed a gradual approach compared to the way other lamas teach this Testament. Moreover, everything that has a Path is gradual. You must not conflate Dzogchen and the Dzogchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

It is best if we agree to disagree.

It could only be gradual if you consider sems sde gradual (it isn't). Instead, it is scheme outlining the intention of the three series in very broad strokes.

Dzogchen is a kind of knowledge: you either have it or you don't. To the extent that there is a path in Dzogchen, that path consists of discovering what you have not discovered. This is the reason for the special preliminaries as I am sure you will agree.

So, there is a path to discovering this knowledge, but it is not really gradual in the sense of gathering the two accumulations and so on as in sutra and tantra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

More, SMS base level is not particularly related to Garab Dorje's second statement.

mutasuk said:

Garab Dorje's Testament is strictly an Upadesha, as can be seen in the commentaries by Dza Patrul and others. This is not a text dealing with Semde or Longde. Only ChNN Rinpoche interprets it as a gradual approach to Dzogchen. This is not the case with any other master alive or in the past. I don't mean it's wrong, it's just simply not the case. His gradual approach to the Testament of Garab Dorje is not the traditional one.

Malcolm wrote:

That is correct, ChNN clearly states that his equation of the three statements with sems sde, klong sde, and man ngag sde is based on his dreams and is not an explanation one will find in any other master's teachings.

However, it is not a gradual approach. Nothing in Dzogchen is gradual. If it is gradual, it is not Dzogchen, even if it is useful.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Copyrighted Dharma books

Content:

LastLegend said:

Every translation is someone's intellectual property. However, there are movements to make everything available for free on the web, like the following:

<http://84000.co/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

What is intellectual property?

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intellectual_property " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Copyrighted Dharma books

Content:

LastLegend said:

Right. What about teachings that are not intellectual properties?

Malcolm wrote:

Every translation is someone's intellectual property. However, there are movements to make everything available for free on the web, like the following:

<http://84000.co/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Copyrighted Dharma books

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha also did not need to get paid, he left his family and had no one to support. He lived under trees, did not have a mortgage, wrote nothing down, did not distribute books, etc.

LastLegend said:

True. It is understandable that printing books cost money, and people need to make a living. But why copyrighted?

Malcolm wrote:

Because a lot of things written about buddhism are people's own intellectual property.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

Sönam said:

Rinpoché says different things at different moments. One take what he hears at the moment he hears it ... btw, have you noticed that the secrecy is only sealed by a member ship payment.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Sonam:

While what you say is true, in general Dzogchen is not "secret"; ChNN also regularly reminds people that Dzogchen practices are not to be shared with people who do not have the proper transmission. "Secret" and samaya are different. "Secret" means that no one should know. Samaya means that you can discuss with people who have same transmission. "rgya rgya rgya" means that you should maintain the samaya of body, of speech, and of mind with regard to the teachings. It just means to take care to not share them with people who are not interested, to not think to do so, speak about them, or show them with your body.

But "samaya" does not mean "secret" -- it comes from two words "sam + yama" -- it

really means "keeping perfect discipline".

M

Sönam said:

Thank you for precision ... also I don't think I have really made such a mistake. I don't think that to consider my short answer to someone having followed the concerned teachings could be considered as a failure of my samaya. Anyway I will try to be more attentive next time.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Sonam:

I was not criticizing you -- I was trying to bring some clarity to the issue of "secret" as opposed to what is appropriate to share. I think in general people in Dzogchen confuse the idea with "secret" with samaya. There is very little in Dzogchgen that is "secret" unlike tantric practices. There are many things in Vajrayāna that are secret in a concrete way. But it is not like that in Dzogchen. So we are in broad agreement. I just wanted to clarify that while Dzogchen is not secret, we still have samaya not to share things with people who are not interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Copyrighted Dharma books

Content:

LastLegend said:

I don't mean to upset people with this post at all. But lately it came to me that Buddha had taught Dharma for 49 years of his life, but he never claimed that what he taught came from him. Today, there are Dharma books that have personal copyrights that require permission from the publishers or writers for redistribution. Should Dharma teachings be freely available to all sentient beings? Please shed some lights and share your thoughts.

Keep in mind that I am not saying copyrighted Dharma books are not helpful. I hope I am not upsetting anyone.

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha also did not need to get paid, he left his family and had no one to support. He

lived under trees, did not have a mortgage, wrote nothing down, did not distribute books, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Apologies all. This is the DC thread. Yes you are right Mariusz.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Andrew:

Yes, what you have said is more or less what ChNN has said many times.

With one caveat, there really is a potentiality of the five elements within our body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

Sönam said:

Rinpoché says different things at different moments. One take what he hears at the moment he hears it ... btw, have you noticed that the secrecy is only sealed by a member ship payment.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Sonam:

While what you say is true, in general Dzogchen is not "secret"; ChNN also regularly reminds people that Dzogchen practices are not to be shared with people who do not have the proper transmission. "Secret" and samaya are different. "Secret" means that no one should know. Samaya means that you can discuss with people who have same transmission. "rgya rgya rgya" means that you should maintain the samaya of body, of speech, and of mind with regard to the teachings. It just means to take care to not share them with people who are not interested, to not think to do so, speak about them, or show them with your body.

But "samaya" does not mean "secret" -- it comes from two words "sam + yama" -- it really means "keeping perfect discipline".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: What is Yeshe?

Content:

Sherab said:

Yeshe + Rigpa of Dzogpa Chenpo = Sherab of Dzogpa Chenpo

Therefore the use of Wisdom in translating Yeshe seems inappropriate.

What then is Yeshe?

It is that which has the ability to perceive Dzogpa Chenpo.

A Yeshe that has not perceive Dzogpa Chenpo is the mundane mind.

What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, shes rab and rig pa are basically synonymous.

Ye shes is Dzogchen.

A rig pa that has not recognized ye shes is ma rig pa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mutuk said:

Since nearly all Dzogchen texts state that you have to have accomplished Ngöndro before and have to perform your training in the main teaching (trekcho and thogel) in retreat, I know where I have to establish my trust.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it sure does not say this in any of the three series of Dzogchen tantras (of which I have thus far read). I put my trust in the original Dzogchen tantras.

If people want to follow masters that teach in the established traditional way, they can and ought to if it feels right for them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mutsum said:

[EDIT: mutsum's off topic comments removed] As Malcolm have told you before, JLA's description of the traditional Dzogchen curriculum (in his book on Khenpo Gangshar) is the same as that of SMS. JLA is not forwarding his own program as you claim everywhere but the traditional program. Period. Or you have to concede that Yongdzin Rinpoche and many other masters are not qualified, serious, etc., in your own view. But hey, how long have you been into Dzogchen and still not distinguish the state and the individual ?

Malcolm wrote:

While it is true that in SMS there is a gradual way proceeding in the base and the first level, it is hyper-abbreviated compared to the traditional approach, the emphasis being on gaining experience in each of the topics. The practice amounts recommended are just recommendations, with a minimum of a week for somethings, and a day for other things.

But the important thing to remember is that SMS is not mandatory, and everything that ChNN teaches in SMS he also teaches in other contexts. SMS was originally designed for teacher training -- and is a comprehensive approach to the various systems found in Dzogchen.

Also, his longsal cycle is a completely different -- and is not connected with SMS at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 1:09 PM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When we talk about preserving culture, we are talking about music, art, crafts, literature, sciences, medicine, healing traditions, etc., the things that make human life wonderful and diverse.

We are not talking about preserving deviant or exploitative social and economic phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Ogyen said:

I wonder why this list specifically and not other animals...? And was this purely for the Vinaya (part of their many vows?) or for lay persons as well?

Huseng said:

In the case of elephant flesh, the elephant King Bimbisāra died and the low caste butchers went to go eat it, along with a few monks. Some people asked the Buddha about this and the rule against eating elephant flesh was established. In the case of vultures, as the story goes the monks ate some vulture meat and a bunch of them followed them into the woods, squawking at them, whereupon the Buddha then banned the consumption of vulture flesh.

It was a case by case basis.

Human flesh was apparently used in medicine.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything can be medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

Thanks. Yes, I know that is what Rinpoche said. I am just wondering if that emptiness is the same emptiness as one of the three experiences of body, speech and mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Not the same.

Clarence said:

Thank you Malcolm-la. Guess this whole Rigpa thing isn't so easy as it seems in the beginning.

Malcolm wrote:

The experience of emptiness is a state free from thought.

Ka dag emptiness is a fundamental feature of the basis, it is the emptiness discussed in madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sönam said:

Rinpoché says

"Non dual of Kadhag and Lundhrub is Dzogchen. Kadhag means, emptiness since the beginning pure. Lundhrub means it has infinite potentiality ... and non dual you have to discover "

Sönam

Clarence said:

Thanks. Yes, I know that is what Rinpoche said. I am just wondering if that emptiness is the same emptiness as one of the three experiences of body, speech and mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Not the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: @DalaiLama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

@DalaiLama

I am increasingly convinced that the time has come to find a way of thinking about spirituality and ethics beyond religion altogether.

Huifeng said:

Great.

But, what does he mean by "religion", "spirituality" and "ethics", exactly?

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Religion -- Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, etc.

Spirituality -- compassion, kindness, love, openness

Ethics -- valuing life

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

Witch burning...

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No, witches emerged from pagan European culture, but because the Church wanted to control medicine, they instituted a program against healers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

Well this is just a fact.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is your opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

So the better aspects of culture can eventually trump evolutionary impulses.

Malcolm wrote:

Your arguments are not about culture, they are about crimes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

Like most Americans you want to ignore serious issues and hope they go away. Of course this isn't just an American issue but many western Europeans are prepared to engage on these issues after a beer or two.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a very chauvanistic attitude.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Sönam said:

You're possibly right at the end of the bill. But women have also been preserved from such oppressions as war, responsibilities and a long list of others delikatessen of the kind ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe in the upper classes but not in the lower classes (hint, there are more of them).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

What in these examples is praiseworthy and worth preserving?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot sum up a whole culture in its faults. That is rather racist.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

conebeckham said:

Perhaps the question should better be "in what human culture(s) are females NOT oppressed, as compared to males?"

Precious few, I think.

Sönam said:

It depends how you view oppression. I think thousands years of male education have created some habituation that men have to deal with ... and it's not easy for them. I can

easily compare that man's oppression to the woman's oppression, and I'm not sure which one is the heaviest ... if even there is one heaviest.

Sönarn

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, women's.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 2:13 AM
Title: Re: Nakedness
Content:

oldbob said:
Me thinks ye are hoist by your own petard,

Malcolm wrote:
I never offer instructions here, only opinions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 1:28 AM
Title: Re: Nakedness
Content:

oldbob said:
My offering of a non-verbal experience in a simple practice, is a non-verbal way of possibly answering that question.

Malcolm wrote:
I am pretty certain he told you he was not interested.

oldbob said:
Malcolm,

Respectfully,

"Eat a nectarine it's the best fruit ever made."

Respectfully,

ob

Malcolm wrote:
Bob:

When someone asks you teach, then you teach, in a proper way, in a proper place, at a proper time.

Otherwise, offering unasked for instructions is a mistake.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

oldbob said:

My offering of a non-verbal experience in a simple practice, is a non-verbal way of possibly answering that question.

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty certain he told you he was not interested.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

oldbob said:

Mia Culpa, please forgive me.

Malcolm wrote:

Bob,

Sharing instructions no one asked for is a little strange.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 10:55 PM

Title: @DalaiLama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

@DalaiLama

I am increasingly convinced that the time has come to find a way of thinking about spirituality and ethics beyond religion altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: George W Bush in Game of Thrones

Content:

Clarence said:

At 1:10 his head is on a stake.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the profile, slight resemblance, I guess.

M

Clarence said:

Yeah, that's it. There is some ruckus about it. Apparently the DVD has extras where they explained they used Bush's head because their budget was too strained to make new ones every time.

Malcolm wrote:

Hilarious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: George W Bush in Game of Thrones

Content:

Clarence said:

At 1:10 his head is on a stake.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the profile, slight resemblance, I guess.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: George W Bush in Game of Thrones

Content:

Clarence said:

Who would have thought:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
```

<https://phpbbex.com/> [video]

Not very cool but interesting on how little we notice really.

Malcolm wrote:

Not seeing it...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Uncertain Minds: How the West Misunderstands Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

By the way:

Murthugpa = Barhaspatya

Malcolm wrote:

Where is your source for this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR - pricing and costing issues

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Afterwards is the profit counted.....

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Dzogchen Community.

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

That is what i do believe blindfolded.

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

You do not understand how things work in the DC, nor should you presume too. But the fact is that profit is not a motive on any level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR - pricing and costing issues

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Afterwards is the profit counted.....

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Dzogchen Community.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

Sally Gross said:

I wonder whether Rigdzin Changchub Dorje's gar, in which each would seem to have given according to ability and to have received according to need, is not a model which underpins the constitution of the Dzogchen Community fostered by Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the model for the community.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Zhang Zhung and Garab Dorje

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

For me personal Rigpa is Awareness like preferred in Bon and Nyingma and not Knowledge like translated in ChNN's DC.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, rig pa is just a word. You either understand what it means or you don't.

M

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

The whole Dharma does consist out of only words.
It is the meaning of those words which is important but also the correct use of it.

Malcolm wrote:
what is important is the meaning behind the words.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:56 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Bob:

You have been complaining about this issue for years. The fact is that there are options for people if they seek them out. There are disability/low income memberships.

Media costs money to produce.

I happen to know for a fact that the financial policies in the DC come directly from ChNN. When you complain about the money, you are complaining about the boss.

M

oldbob said:
Respectfully, nope.

The Boss is Perfect, and whatever he does is Perfect (my mother right or wrong) but working with circumstances, allows himself to be conditioned by the people advising him. Some people say this has been less than perfect, for the Dzogchen Community. Sure you can say, "It's not so bad" and "it could be a lot worse," and while true, DOESN'T HELP ANYONE FROM MOLDOVA.

How often do the members of the International Gaykil change? Did you ever try to collaborate on the "Collaboration" website? Maybe as the Community evolves, the advisors, and advice, could evolve too.

Respectfully,

ob

Malcolm wrote:
Bob, you are aware that the pricing structure of memberships and so on for people in

Eastern Europe and Russia is completely different than for Western Europeans?

Tashigar South is cheaper than Tsegylgar?

Anyway, it is best we not be too attached to our opinions, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

heart said:

ever considered writing your biography oldbob? I will read it,

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Bob has had a very interesting life. He lived in India for many years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Bob:

You have been complaining about this issue for years. The fact is that there are options for people if they seek them out. There are disability/low income memberships.

Media costs money to produce.

I happen to know for a fact that the financial policies in the DC come directly from ChNN. When you complain about the money, you are complaining about the boss.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

heart said:

Not comparing him to you Malcolm, anyway we never met IRL.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I am not an oral translator. I was a) discouraged from learning colloquial Tibetan by my original Tibetan teacher b) I have spent insufficient time in Tibetan communities to gain oral fluency c) Colloquial Tibetan is of little use in translating Dharma texts.

And no, we never met in meatspace.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The power issues in the gars is ameliorated by the fact that board of directors must rotate every three years. No one can be a member of the board for more than three years.

M

Sönam said:

In theory ... I had the personal experience in a specific relation that, once one has been engaged in a responsibility, one stay involved as a consulting reference and impact Gar relations over his mandate.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, one weakness of the model is that the Gakyil loses its memory every three years. Another problem is that sometimes people only go onto the Gakyil because they do not like the way things were being run. But the latter is not a good motivation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

conebeckham said:

I dunno the Gars from Timbuktu, of course, so my words may not reflect accurately on the situation. Just some general observations.

Malcolm wrote:

Different gars, different energies. Tsegyalgar is a bit heavy sometimes, but maybe that is because it is in New England.

The power issues in the gars is ameliorated by the fact that board of directors must rotate every three years. No one can be a member of the board for more than three years.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Zhang Zhung and Garab Dorje

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

For me personal Rigpa is Awareness like preferred in Bon and Nyingma and not Knowledge like translated in ChNN's DC.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, rig pa is just a word. You either understand what it means or you don't.

M

Sönam said:

Then you don't translate ... you take it as it already is.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Correct -- or in my case, backtranslate it to vidyā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

username said:

...I remember Frances Garrett's ebook affected your views.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all -- her book is an excellent summary of the available gestational models in various cycles, TTM, Kalacakra and Rgra thal gyur, etc.

username said:

On another point, Ayurveda as a source, has really just been taken up in recent decades properly, just like all Tibetan Studies, and needs much more research.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Like the Four Tantra's (in which respect is paid to Bonpos in terms of which tradition to which one should resort when doing rites to dispell provocations), the Aṣṭāṅgahridaya Samhita is a text, which while authored by a follower of Buddhadharma, pays respect to Brahmins and others in terms of the customs a patient might use as their spiritual support.

username said:

Thirdly the aspects of language theory you are referring to affect not only Tibetan studies but all fields as a century of European theorists have been debating. It is a vast area.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed. My work is just a drop in a vast sea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

username said:

All translators, like all writers, have judgments and views which they can not stop coming across. Also every translation, or any writing, affects each reader uniquely.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is true. I just try to translate the text as accurately as I can, taking the meaning into account first. Thus, when I see a term like sang rgyas I just translate it as Buddha, buddhahood, etc. without making too much judgment unless there is a play on words in the text.

Actually for all the recent sturm and drung about this and that "view" of mine, I really try very hard to be as transparent in my translations as possible. Of course, you are right, I have to make choices, but I hope that my choices based on my 23 years as a Dharma practitioner are informed primarily by my practice of these teachings. To be honest, the greatest single thing that changed the way I linguistically looked at Dzogchen texts in particular was studying Tibetan Medicine. Dzogchen language, like the language of medicine is not static, it is dynamic, process-oriented, where as the language of Madhyamaka, Abhidharma, etc., is very static.

One thing people forget is that there is a close connection with Dzogchen and Tibetan doctors. Even Chetsun Senge Wangchuk was a doctor, and many great tertons, like Rigdzin Godem, Rigzin Jatson Nyingpo, Kongtrul, Khyentse, etc., were skilled physicians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

username said:

You have a talent in pithy precise definitions but every translator's hues of judgments comes true. Maybe that is why you keep changing them.

Malcolm wrote:

Not sure which judgements you mean. But every translation is a learning experience and an opportunity for learning and refinement.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

username said:

Thanks to Erik's translations similar to this over the decades who is the best lotsawa IMO and whose mastery technically in vocabulary and context is even more apt than Valby IMO whose dictionary is fantastic too, nevermind lessers.

Malcolm wrote:

Hey, I thought you said I might be the best English translator:

Your work here is benefiting many and I hope it continues in force as well as looking forward to your translations as I think you might be the best living English translator But it is not really a competition since my spoken Tibetan sucks...Erik is a fine translator. So is Valby, and a host of others.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Zhang Zhung and Garab Dorje

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

For me personal Rigpa is Awareness like preferred in Bon and Nyingma and not Knowledge like translated in ChNN's DC.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, rig pa is just a word. You either understand what it means or you don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Word of the Day

Content:

simhamuka said:

kor-wa -- circumambulate

བསྐྱོད་པ་

Malcolm wrote:

བསྐྱོད་པ་.

You left off the narö.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: New Bon - Bon Sarma

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

P.s.: I hope that this dark blue colour is ok for your eyes.

Malcolm wrote:

You could just choose to use the quote tags. It is much easier for everyone to read.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

But charging \$10,000 for a teaching is ludicrous, that isn't right IMO.

Malcolm wrote:

Bob was referring to a voluntary donation made to a Lama in order to sponsor a teaching.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Life history of Maitripa ?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Hi All,

Do you have the story of life history of Maitripa?

I come accross that he is the mahasidda who didnt follow tantric practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Um, not, this is not correct. This is the main form of Vajrayogini he promulgated from his vision of her:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen

Content:

Anders said:

So basically no difference between sensing each other 'face to face' and sensing each other through the online medium, if I understand you correctly?

Malcolm wrote:

For the purposes of communication, nope. If smell or touch is involved, as in some empowerments, there is an issue -- but for transmitting refuge, bodhisattva vows, teachings, etc., there is no problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Any questions? One can't make an omelette without breaking a few eggs, I suppose.

Gassho, Jundo

...stating that face-to-face encounters are "the basis for evaluating a student's readiness for ordination and eventually membership in the SZBA." By "face-to-face," the SZBA board means "in the same physical room.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement betrays a basic lack of understanding of how the material aggregates is defined.

M

Anders said:

As a point of curiosity - how are we to understand how the material aggregates are defined, for the purpose of evaluating a student's readiness, sub-context of online interaction and all that?

Malcolm wrote:

The material aggregates include all five physical sense organs and sense objects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 12:58 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Should be:

So we professionals don't really get a pass the same way privileged gurus do when they do not serve the best interests of their patients.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

xylem said:

if anything, vajrayana is about personal responsibility.

Malcolm wrote:

So is life.

xylem said:

what makes this difficult for western converts is that we give all of our responsibility away.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this sentiment at all.

xylem said:

we project all sorts of qualities and expectations from our own side that are completely unrelated to the lama's qualities and capabilities.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a two way street -- there is a cultural lack of comprehension on both sides.

xylem said:

we have some unnatural notion that the spiritual work is done from the side of the lama and not our own side.

Malcolm wrote:

No one I know has this idea.

xylem said:

...we come away from teachings high on some sort of contact lama buzz and reach for that again and again.

Malcolm wrote:

When there is such dependencies, it is not as if westerners are not being encouraged to become empowerment junkies.

xylem said:

if we thought about it rationally we'd know this is madness, but there is so much psychological need. it's really hard to look beneath that veneer to even begin to examine the lama in a traditional way, and having built up all of this psychological projection around the lama, it's really difficult, even painful, to address a problem and walk away. given all this, i think it's even more imperative to put the burden on responsibility of examining the lama entirely on the student. why? because there's a little bit of personal introspection and self-work we need to do to get to that point.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is all great, but in Vajrayāna students are disempowered in all kinds of direct and indirect fashions which makes examining teachers for proper qualities damn near impossible. Students are put in the catch-22 of committing to lamas they do not know or missing out entirely because they do not trust the situation. For the most part, the cultural hierarchies that Tibetan Buddhism is embedded within make it virtually impossible for students, especially beginning students to have a clear picture of their teachers. These memes and hierarchies are also exploited by western teachers. And this is not merely a problem in Vajrayāna, this is also a problem in Zen. (In Theravada it is a little more clear since lay teachers are comparatively rare and monastic precepts are highly valued.) The of course there is the taboo against criticizing any lama from whom one has received transmission no matter how egregious their behavior has been. This taboo is actually more enforced by students than lamas. So there is enormous peer pressure within dysfunctional groups to regard the pathological behavior of Dipshit Rinpoche, etc., as "awakened activity".

So frankly, while I can appreciate the caveat emptor approach, we are too quick to divorce gurus from their own personal responsibility to their students when we insist it is all on the student.

xylem said:

one has to come to some sense of personal responsibility for one's health and healing and have oriented their minds somewhat towards changing one's life.

Malcolm wrote:

As a physician of Tibetan Medicine myself I can appreciate your sentiment, but ultimately, if I am not correctly treating the patient, that does not lie at the feet of the patient, that is my fault. So we professionals don't really get a pass the same way privileged gurus do when they do serve the best interests of their patients.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Any questions? One can't make an omelette without breaking a few eggs, I suppose.

Gassho, Jundo

...stating that face-to-face encounters are "the basis for evaluating a student's readiness for ordination and eventually membership in the SZBA." By "face-to-face," the SZBA board means "in the same physical room.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement betrays a basic lack of understanding of how the material aggregates is defined.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Four forbidden fruits

Content:

Huseng said:

比邏婆

(H2) bilvá [p= 732,1] [L=145299] m. (in later language also vilva) Aegle Marmelos , the wood-apple tree (commonly called Bel ; its delicious fruit when unripe is used medicinally ; its leaves , are employed in the ceremonial of the worship of śiva ; cf. RTL. 336) AV. &c

While the transliteration seems to be pointing to this, I'd have to see if anywhere else

this kind of fruit is banned.

Malcolm wrote:

Unlikely, since in Chinese depictions of Bhaisajyaguru, this is the fruit he is depicted as holding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really. And spirit possession is painful and taxing, from what I understand.

Huseng said:

Okay, that clarifies what I was curious about.

In the context of this thread I thought it might shed some light on the possible mechanism by which a plant could be "inhabited" by a deva or spirit as the Jataka literature suggests.

Malcolm wrote:

As I opined before, there is little difference between presuming that our body is inhabited by an atman (popular Indian view) and the idea that a plant is inhabited by a deva. Certainly, there is plenty of evidence based on Jatakas and non-Buddhist sources that these tree devas regard their trees as their bodies.

Thus, I think it is basically a way of archaic method of talking about plant minds/bodies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

So I'm really wondering if I am interpreting ChNNR correctly in assuming that previous practice commitments are met through Guruyoga as he teaches it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Blue Garuda said:

Thanks.

I'm assuming Guruyoga is a daily practice for Dzogchen as taught by ChNNR. It's being

very productive for me and so is a personal commitment. ChNNR doesn't seem to have given it as a formal practice commitment, but I'm assuming I should regard it as such anyway, with the White A for each morning, evening etc. ?

Malcolm wrote:

You should practice Ati Guru Yoga all the time, there are no specific sessions. Anytime you stop and take a break at work, while you are walking, driving, eating, making love, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Spirits do not have gross physical bodies, they lack visible form, according to Tibetan Medicine. In the case of an oracle like Nechung, the monk (and must be a monk) for example, will experience what we would call epilepsy. Then the monk in question will undergo years of training to make their channel system receptive to the various deities associated with Nechung. So effectively what happens is that entity seizes the prāṇa system of the body.

In terms of diseases caused by provocations, these manifest as different diseases depending on the type of provocation.

Huseng said:

So strictly speaking there is no idea that spirits can "inhabit" a body otherwise normally under the control of the original of another sattva?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really. And spirit possession is painful and taxing, from what I understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can for example, rationalize that there are devas that inhabit plants as houses (standard Indo-Tibetan view), but as far as I am concerned this is merely a way of articulating the sentience of plants. It may be the case that plants achieve sentience only in communities, just like our body is not wholly sentient -- to use your example of a branch which can be propagated, also cells from our body may be propagated etc., and we certainly would not necessarily call either sentient in a conventional way.

Huseng said:

In Tibetan medicine how does spirit possession work in this context? Do they externally

provoke symptoms or do they "hijack and infiltrate" a being (like a deva inhabiting a plant as a house)?

Malcolm wrote:

Spirits do not have gross physical bodies, they lack visible form, according to Tibetan Medicine. In the case of an oracle like Nechung, the monk (and must be a monk) for example, will experience what we would call epilepsy. Then the monk in question will undergo years of training to make their channel system receptive to the various deities associated with Nechung. So effectively what happens is that entity seizes the prāṇa system of the body.

In terms of diseases caused by provocations, these manifest as different diseases depending on the type of provocation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

So I'm really wondering if I am interpreting ChNNR correctly in assuming that previous practice commitments are met through Guruyoga as he teaches it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

Ogyen said:

My reply was no joke... I was thinking, perhaps if my work were seen for what it is, I should blush, come to my senses and put some content warning on it.....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Ogyen said:

For example, we could benefit from a female Malcolm-type posting here -

Malcolm wrote:

Step up, the post is vacant.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

xylem said:

but it might be hard. regardless, the burden is on us, not the lama.

Malcolm wrote:

You would never say that about a doctor or any other kind of professional. So why give gurus a pass?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is the best way for a Dzogchen practitioner, in my opinion: my teacher and I have the same state. His/her job is to show me that state and s/he can do that because they are a further along the path than I.

(Of course I think that ChNN is an awakened person, but that is a different story).

Adamantine said:

So do you think someone who has not somewhat realized/accomplished Dzogchen view-meditation-and-action is capable of giving pointing out? How far along the path do they need to be? I believe most people see their teachers this way :further along the path-- maybe much further.. not too many are thinking in a categorical way(with exception of DM people maybe) such as "my teacher is an 8th Bhumi Bodhisattva" or a "fully realized Buddha", etc. Although probably many students of HH Dudjom Rinpoche did feel this way, with good reason, just as you feel that way about ChNN... some great masters there is just too much evidence to dispute that they are awakened, then it becomes "reasonable" faith, not blind faith..

Malcolm wrote:

They have to have the experience of at least the second vision, in addition to other necessary qualifications.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Definition of Mahamudra according to CNR

Content:

Adamantine said:

But correspond means what exactly? I am assuming there are not practices that work with visual phenomenon and light in the same way Thogal practices do...

Malcolm wrote:

It is a literal definition i.e. la bzla ba (which is a Dzogchen term incidentally, it is a very old Tibetan word) means "to transcend, to go beyond", thod rgal means literally, in a sutra sense "skipping bhumis", which how it is used in sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Yes. Two things. One, the teacher was/is totally delusional. IMO not really someone who "understands the material, has done necessary retreats, and has permission to teach". And two, I'm not really sure that viewing one's teacher as a Buddha requires you to drop all reason.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but Pero -- if you decide that someone is a Buddha, then you will see their delusions as skillful means.

And two, when decide, based on a conceptual belief that someone is a Buddha, then well, it is hard to be reasonable or reasoned with about that person.

This is the best way for a Dzogchen practitioner, in my opinion: my teacher and I have the same state. His/her job is to show me that state and s/he can do that because they are a further along the path than I.

There, see? No belief that one's teacher is a Buddha required.

M

(Of course I think that ChNN is an awakened person, but that is a different story).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

uan said:

So then we lose the opportunity forever? There are an infinite number of opportunities, some we see, most we don't. That well doesn't run dry.

Malcolm wrote:

That's being optimistic.

uan said:

I agree with the first part of your premise, which is ChNN presents us with a unique opportunity, but if one doesn't take it, it'd only be a big deal in a conventional sense, and probably not even then, and certainly not in a "time is running out" sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Time is running out. It always is. People live 80-90 years at most, in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Pero:

I think it is a total joke for unrealized teachers to permit their students to perceive them as Buddhas. This is encouraging people to believe in fantasies.

You can think it wrong all you like. That is what I think. So we will agree to disagree.

Pero said:

Ok, though it's not like I don't get where you're coming from. But I still wonder what you think of the saying that "if you view the teacher as a realized being..." then?

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize this is exactly the kind of thinking that lead the Diamond Mountain people down their particular garden path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Pero:

I think it is a total joke for unrealized teachers to permit their students to perceive them as Buddhas. This is encouraging people to believe in fantasies.

You can think it wrong all you like. That is what I think. So we will agree to disagree.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but we don't have a lot of time, and time is passing.

uan said:

really? very linear concept. I guess we only have this one life then the flame goes out forever.

Malcolm wrote:

Flame? No? Opportunity, very likely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I see the first four more as an encouragement not to waste time or energy on useless things. But I don't see them as an encouraging a path of renunciation.

Clarence said:

What is not useless besides practicing?

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoying your life, having a nice glass of wine, a juicy steak, a good woman (or man) at your side, nice music, flowers, herbs, etc.

All these things are important and necessary (depending on your preferences and health, etc.)

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

xylem said:

"encouragement not to waste time or energy on useless things" is the pith essence of renunciation even in the sutra tradition.

i'm starting to think people just want to fight here.

there is really only one dharma.

-xy

Malcolm wrote:

I see the first four (lojongs of vima nyigthig) more as an encouragement not to waste time or energy on useless things. But I don't see them as a encouraging a path of renunciation.

Not really xylem-- the motive is really quite different. In Sutrayāna teachings, desire for example is regarded as poison, etc. Dzogchen is not a path of renunciation, as you know. Suggesting that in order to understand Dzogchen you must engage in path of renunciation practices is, my opinion, just not so.

As to your other observation, yes it is true, people really mostly want to have arguments here. Hence my decreasing participation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

This was said by Padmasambhava and Norbu Rinpoche mentions it often, it's an important practice. So you guys should be careful in what you say...

Malcolm wrote:

The onus is on the teacher's side to be honest. Conceptually deciding that Dipshit Rinpoche and Geshe Unctuous is a Buddha when all his actions indicate the contrary is just plain stupid and deluded. When Dipshit Rinpoche and Geshe Unctuous encourage their students into such beliefs, it just creates cults.

M

Pero said:

Sure, but that's not what you said at first.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is. I was saying that teachers who recognize that they are not realized should

completely discourage their students from perceiving them as Buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

However, I do believe there are quite a few more than the one you are promoting. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but we don't have a lot of time, and time is passing.

Adamantine said:

But if they didn't have the connection with ChNN, then time would be passing until they found their karmic Guru, even if they stayed with ChNN out of fear that time was passing... or isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Such a person would be like a man who did not like the shape the gold nugget he has found, and discards it to look for another, more attractive one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

we have to embrace renunciation

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Dzogchen.

heart said:

eh? how about the lodjongs in the Vima Nyinthig? that is real meaning of renunciation.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I see the first four more as an encouragement not to waste time or energy on useless things. But I don't see them as an encouraging a path of renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:
we have to embrace renunciation

Malcolm wrote:
Not in Dzogchen.

kirtu said:
You are correct that in dzogchen we do not have to embrace renunciation and in fact as a conceptualization it will get in the way of realization but consider the actual lives of people drowning in the poisons. If they were able to see the arising of lust or anger as the adornment of wisdom and really rest in that then there would be no problem. But most people can't do that. They get carried away at some point. So for them dzogchen on the cushion and dzogchen view as much as possible but they will need some renunciation as a safety net. Otherwise some people are on a highwire and will endure some painful encounters with the ground.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
people need to understand their own condition, but they do not need canned religion.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 10:07 PM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
kirtu said:
we have to embrace renunciation

Malcolm wrote:
Not in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 9:04 PM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
Pero said:
This was said by Padmasambhava and Norbu Rinpoche mentions it often, it's an important practice. So you guys should be careful in what you say...

Malcolm wrote:
The onus is on the teacher's side to be honest. Conceptually deciding that Dipshit Rinpoche and Geshe Unctuous is a Buddha when all his actions indicate the contrary is just plain stupid and deluded. When Dipshit Rinpoche and Geshe Unctuous encourage their students into such beliefs, it just creates cults.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: How can Buddhists be so sure of themselves?

Content:

Ikkyu said:

What real, hard evidence is there that bodhisattvas exist, that enlightenment is possibility or that rebirth can happen either?

Malcolm wrote:

None. Zip. Zero. Nada.

This is why Buddhism is a religion.

But wisdom is not scientific.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but such a person should be honest with themselves and their students and even if they give empowerments, should never insist, encourage, or even subtly imply that their students should regard them as "buddhas".

Clarence said:

How much use would empowerments from such a person be? Wouldn't it be cause for rebirth in the lower realms for both teacher and student?

Malcolm wrote:

If the teacher in question understands the material, has done necessary retreats, and has permission to teach, then there is no problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Sherlock said:

Can a non-awakened teacher, nevertheless with good intentions and an understanding of the teachings, still give teachings which will benefit the students?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but such a person should be honest with themselves and their students and even if they give empowerments, should never insist, encourage, or even subtly imply that their students should regard them as "buddhas".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The open ones you can.

Totoro said:

I'm sorry do you mean I can view the next open webcast or some previous webcasts? Because I don't see anything I can view from previous webcasts there at the moment.

If I am a complete newbie, do you think it's advisable for me to take part in the upcoming open webcasts or wait until I take part in the WWT for the first time? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Take first webcast you can, i.e:

Hawaii Retreat

June 13 -17, 2012

Longsal Ati'i Nadzer

Hawaii Time (HST) is GMT-10

OPEN WEBCAST

13th June 4pm-6pm

Introduction about Ati Dzogchen Teaching and its transmission.
Tridlung of Short Gana Puja.

14th June 10am-12pm

Instruction on the important Viewpoint of Ati Dzogchen.
Instruction on the important Point of Gompa for Ati Dzogchen, and
tridlung of Short Thun.

12:30-1:00 pm. Short Gana Puja for the Day of the Dakini.

15th June 10am-12pm.

Instruction on the important Point of Jyodpa for Ati Dzogchen, and tridlung of Medium Gana Puja.

16th June 10am-12pm.

Instruction on the important Point of Drasbu for Ati Dzogchen, and tridlung of Medium Thun.

4-7pm. Medium Gana Puja for end of retreat.

17th June 10am-12pm.

Advice for daily life practices, and tridlungs of collective practices, etc.
Ati Guru Yoga for finish of retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 10:09 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

However, I do believe there are quite a few more than the one you are promoting. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but we don't have a lot of time, and time is passing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It was an observation made about people's trip about having awakened teachers, who then fail to follow through on that aspiration and follow other teachers for various reasons.

Adamantine said:

But you aren't intending to imply that these people's other teachers are not awakened? Because if you do not mean that, then the whole statement starts to lose sense. . .

Malcolm wrote:

There are almost no awakened teachers. I am not commenting on any specific teacher, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: No need for relative bodhicitta

Content:

Adamantine said:

I recently asked Garchen Rinpoche a question about this...

Malcolm wrote:

I am glad you had this teaching from Garchen Rinpoche, I hope you apply it well.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Totoro,

have you read "The Crystal and the Way of Light? If not I would suggest starting there.

Then if you are still interested watch a few webcasts. Here is the link:

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The long term schedule for the webcasts can be found here:

<http://www.melong.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Specific times for each one will be posted a few days ahead of time on the webcast site.

If you do that and you feel it is for you then you can become a Dzogchen Community member. Then from there, well, the skies the limit. (pun intended hehehe)

Totoro said:

Thanks FD, I don't think i can watch those webcasts if I'm not a member with a p/w yet.

Malcolm wrote:

The open ones you can.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: No need for relative bodhicitta

Content:

jnanasutra said:

isn't it amazing that in Dzogchen there is no need to cultivate relative bodhicitta because dynamic compassionate activity is already present in the basis. We do not say that the buddha's activity is like a wish-fulfilling gem which manifests due to disciples prayers and aspirations, but rather compassion manifest of it own accord as a natural expression of the basis. How nice!

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, we say it is exactly like a wishfulfilling gem that spontaneously manifests whatever is wished for -- that is the energy of the basis.

jnanasutra said:

Right, it is the energy of the basis, not dependent on the wishes and aspirations of disciples. It is an inherent natural expression, not dependent upon others.

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that Dzogchen tantras and text explicitly use the metaphor of the wishfulfilling gem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 8:22 AM

Title: Re: No need for relative bodhicitta

Content:

jnanasutra said:

isn't it amazing that in Dzogchen there is no need to cultivate relative bodhicitta because dynamic compassionate activity is already present in the basis. We do not say that the buddha's activity is like a wish-fulfilling gem which manifests due to disciples prayers and aspirations, but rather compassion manifest of it own accord as a natural expression of the basis. How nice!

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, we say it is exactly like a wishfulfilling gem that spontaneously manifests whatever is wished for -- that is the energy of the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

xylem said:

malcolm...

if not a criticism of those individuals' teachers-- then who/what... or are you being completely misconstrued as criticizing anyone/anything?

-xy

Adamantine said:

Now, ChNN is one of my own teachers.. but I have other teachers who I am closer to who I consider to be at least equally realized, as do many people here.. but Malcolm's above post clearly makes it sound like if someone is studying with someone other than ChNN, then they "like limitations, it makes them feel comfortable" This clearly contradicts a great amount of what he said in the other post. dismissing other people's teachers, Dzogchen teachers or otherwise in this way, is to me certainly a type of tribalism.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a criticism of anyone's _teachers_.

It was an observation made about people's trip about having awakened teachers, who then fail to follow through on that aspiration and follow other teachers for various reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Now, ChNN is one of my own teachers.. but I have other teachers who I am closer to who I consider to be at least equally realized, as do many people here.. but Malcolm's above post clearly makes it sound like if someone is studying with someone other than ChNN, then they "like limitations, it makes them feel comfortable" This clearly contradicts a great amount of what he said in the other post. dismissing other people's teachers, Dzogchen teachers or otherwise in this way, is to me certainly a type of tribalism.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a criticism of anyone's _teachers_.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Is that a quote from trungpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, it is a quote from Malcolm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Nakedness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The easiest thing in the world to do is walk naked, and the hardest. We have to take off the clothes we put on in which to admire ourselves. If we don't, then we never see the truth of ourselves. We are naked to others even if we think we are clothed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Buddh-ism without the -ism?

Content:

Jinzang said:

Buddhahood is explained as the completion of the two accumulations, the accumulation of merit and wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

In some systems.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

But since Malcolm stopped posting the rest of group A have some problem getting their arguments together and so discussion is dwindling.

/magnus

Sönam said:

This is provocative and wrong ... arguments of all sorts have been provided, and Malcom has not been the only one to post on the subject. Anyone can consult them in previous threads. It is just that there is no positive reasons in looping again and again in the same circle.

Also, having been understood, I have been asked not to come again and again on the same subject ... so I consider it right and I stop posting.

But now that some of us have decided not to continue this looping discussion, what you call group B is coming strongly and say "you see they don't post anymore ... it's because they have nothing to say, ah, ah, ah"

Be happy.
Sönam

heart said:

I am always wrong Sönam, but it wasn't meant as a provocation. I only noticed that very little happened since Malcolm stopped posting (probably my fault) in these threads. My sincere apologize for the provocative way I formulated that sentence my only excuse is that I really don't believe there is any homogenous group A or B.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I have not added anything new to these threads because I haven't anything new to say.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Buddh-ism without the -ism?

Content:

alpha said:

Trying to acumulate merit after you've discovered your nature would be delusion.

Jinzang said:

The traditional view is that bodhisattvas on the first bhumi and above continue to accumulate merit through one kalpa while they strive to attain enlightenment. I suppose from one standpoint you are correct: merit, enlightenment, and budhahood are all delusions. But that leaves us with nothing to talk about.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the view enunciated by Haribhadra.

Jinzang said:

It seems that some people on this forum are trying to gift wrap Neo-Advaita and sell it as the highest vehicle of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not observed this to be the case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not for me. Mahayoga and Anuyoga are not my path. They can be someone else's path, but they are not mine.

heart said:

In that case your opinions on this subject are, with all respect, irrelevant.

/magnus

Malcolm, perhaps I wrote that when I was a bit pissed with you. I do actually put a lot of value in your opinions, whatever you want to call yourself, because I admire your bright intellect. I also consider that my path is Dzogchen but do apply whatever I want to and have transmission for among the methods of the nine yanas. You might feel the same, or not, sorry if I sounded harsh. Certainly your opinions are not irrelevant.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

No worries.

My path is Dzogchen. When I do yoga practice, it is Dzogchen. When I garden it is Dzogchen. When I relax, it is Dzogchen. Unless of course I am distracted, then it is mind, even if I am sounding A or doing Rushan, or reciting a mantra, or whatever.

But my path is Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Listen, I'm basing my view on Buddhism, and you clearly aren't.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as this question goes, I think the scholastic buddhist perspective is outdated and wrong.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 7:20 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

In what way do you think plants have perception, as described canonically in my post? Blue, yellow, hot, cold, smooth, sharp, rough, etc. Do you think that the perceptions take place being expressed through this theoretical plant-brain network? How does a plant designate, or label what is yellow or green, what is smooth or hard, how does it mark an experience and retain recognition of that experience? I'm not saying I "know" they don't perceive, but, there's no evidence for perception, need for it, and the scientific observations actually oppose perception. What's more, the canonical resources never insinuate a need for perceptual, karmic, plant sentience.

Malcolm wrote:

Mt. Meru is "canonical".

Your science is outdated.

The qualia of plants, like that of bats, is closed to us.

Son said:

Against Perception:

Trees experience strong wind or weak wind, but what in the tree designates, "this is strong and this is weak?" It does not make a mark, "these are the designations of wind that I have experienced." It responds to the wind chemically over and over. The rosemary bush, when having a leaf plucked, does not designate that sense in any way, "the leaf was plucked," and mark it for later recognition, so that when another leaf is cut, it refers to that same mark of designation. One leaf is cut, then another leaf is cut, and another and another and so forth, but the plant just reacts according to the experience and doesn't empirically memorize the suggestion of losing leaves. It doesn't need to, because the leaves are lost in Fall, and leaves regrow in Spring. It just happens, inherently. Therefore there is no volition, which means there is no pretense of volition, no karma, and therefore cannot be previous life nor rebirth, and no stream of karmic consciousness, reproductive consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

So you assert and cannot prove.

Son said:

Against Mental Formation:

Lacking mental formation, in which consciousness has its discrete origin, plants do not have consciousness of their own stratum.

Malcolm wrote:

So you assert but cannot prove.

Son said:

Against Obscuring Consciousness and Storehouse Consciousness:

These living beings are thus "primitive sentient," or, "proto-sentient, sub-sentient." There is substratum consciousness, but it lacks the obscuring consciousness and there is no karmic tainting that displays storehouse consciousnesses. In other words, they have empty storehouse consciousness, and the only reason they're able to be sentient living beings at all, is because the primordial substratum consciousness provides contact between "sense base" and "sense object." So they lack perceiving and mental formation, and there's no presence of continual consciousness, only "projected."

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are contradicting yourself and yogacara theory. The ālavijñāna exists only so as long as the bijas exist. When they are eradicated, the ālavijñāna vanishes.

Son said:

The Buddha did say that consciousness arises in mental formation (thus storehouse consciousness, derived from prim.sub.conscious.),

Malcolm wrote:

Your complicated yogacara arguments are quite irrelevant to the question, AFAIC. You are in essence saying plants are projections. Ok. Yogacara is unconvincing. I don't buy it.

Son said:

but it's perfectly sensible to regard substratum consciousness as functioning without mental formation, without storehouse consciousness. In fact, that's how the Dharmakaya and Sambhogakayas (hence nirmanakayas) function in the Mahayanist views. So you can't exist karmically as a plant, and neither them as other beings--which is why they're not described in the cosmological system. But by all means, the Buddhas can. To me, this also provides some illumination to the nature of wildlife devas...

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you accept that plants are awakened.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Yes, well plants have intelligence. That's not new news--in fact, it is very, very old. And to the concentrated scientific observer, plant intelligence is obvious. Why do you think we call plants "living beings?"

However, they don't have "sanna," or perceptions.

Malcolm wrote:
So you claim.

Son said:
... Are you going to refute that claim, or present arguments against it? Discussion?

In order for a plant to have consciousness "of its own, storehouse consciousness," volitions or mental formation must give rise to that. They don't intend and obsess over objects, they don't "form volition" in the mind, there is no coloring of the mind derived from sensations. They do not apprehend the quality of sense-objects, and color their own mind in that way. They simply react to it naturally, there is no coloring or intention and obsessions over the objects, it's an impersonal experience. So, personal sentient consciousness can't arise here, dependent on mental formations.

Malcolm wrote:
You have not presented any arguments at all, all you have presented is the same bald unsupported assertions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 5:42 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

Karma Dorje said:
So what you are saying is that you can't find a convenient category to put a viewpoint (or more properly group of congruent viewpoints) in, so it vexes you? Isn't this exactly the point of your so-called camp "A"?

xylem said:
nothing vexes me. i can't get my mind around what's being discussed so i'm trying to clarify. from what i can call i'm 50% camp "A", 50% camp "B" which doesn't promise to have a good outcome.

-xy

Malcolm wrote:
That's because this thread was split off from another thread and given this title by a mod. Refer to my op for context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Any chance of you scanning and attaching the abovementioned page?

Malcolm wrote:

As befits their modular structure and the ability to grow from each of their modules, unlike animals, plants have no use for a centralized brain and/or nervous system. Instead of centralized brain tissue, a newly emerging field of plant science, dubbed “plant neurobiology,” is suggesting that plants may actually have thousands of brain-like entities that are involved in the emergence of intelligent behavior. These entities are a type of tissue known as meristems. Current theories suggest that the meristematic tissue, located at the tips of roots and shoots, combined with the vascular strands capable of complex molecular and electrical signalling, may well comprise the plant equivalent of the nervous/neuronal system.⁵⁴ In a groundbreaking text *Communication in Plants*, Baluška et al. echo the pioneering work of Darwin:

Each root apex is proposed to harbour brain-like units of the nervous system of plants. The number of root apices in the plant body is high, and all “brain units” are interconnected via vascular strands (plant neurons) with their polarly-transported auxin (plant neurotransmitter), to form a serial (parallel) neuronal system of plants.⁵⁵

Rather than following Darwin’s judgement that this plant nervous system is inferior to that found in animals, plant neurobiology researchers regard this decentralized assessment and response system to be the most effective for maximizing plant fitness.⁵⁶ Such a system is thought to enable decentralized behavior (i.e., growth), which allows plants to thrive in complex and everchanging rhizospheric environments.

It has been proposed that in the plant the meristematic “brains” may exert influence on the rest of the plant tissue by the transmission of signalling molecules such as the hormone auxin. Auxins are manufactured at the root and shoot apices, and it is thought that their movement is one method for allowing the transfer of information throughout the individual. It has been proposed that the end poles (cross walls of cells) are analogous to the synapse in animals.⁵⁷ At so called “plant synapses,” vesicular transport of auxin moves this signalling molecule from cell to cell. Although the exact processes have yet to be uncovered, it has been proposed that this extracellular transport of auxin “exerts rapid electrical responses” across the plant synapse and “initiates the electrical responses of plant cells.”⁵⁸ Whatever the pathway within the plant, communication can occur over long-distances, with information on the environmental and developmental state of the roots being transferred to the shoots—as in the case of stomatal closure during water stress. As well as auxin and electrical signals, plants produce and use a variety of neurotransmitter molecules to communicate from cell to cell. Dopamine, acetylcholine, glutamate, histamine, and glycine are all touted as potential signalling chemicals between cells.⁵⁹ Other complex communication

molecules include protein kinases, minerals, lipids, sugars, gases, and nucleic acids. Trewavas has drawn attention to this complexity and notes that “from the current rate of progress, it looks as though communication is likely to be as complex as that within a [animal] brain.”⁶⁰

In response to some of the assertions of plant neurobiologists, Alpi et al. have suggested that the existence of plasmodesmata (microscopic channels, which traverse plant cell walls and enable transport and communication between cells) contradicts the idea of plant synapses and of auxin as a neurotransmitter, as their existence facilitates extensive electrical coupling, precluding the need for any cell-cell transmission of a neurotransmitter-like compound.⁶¹ However, this criticism has been refuted by Brenner et al., who assert that although the exact pathways are still to be discovered, auxin is known to be transported from cell-cell and active, communicative plant behavior does take place.⁶² Along with the exact mechanisms of electrical cell-cell coupling, they assert that investigating these transfers represents an exciting field of study for understanding plant signalling and behavior.

With thousands of meristems, a plant has potentially thousands of “brain units.” It is proposed by advocates of plant neurobiology that plants integrate sensory information and make decisions based upon communication between a multitude of plant tissues such as the root meristems, interior meristems, and the vascular tissues. Barlow has pointed toward the involvement of the vascular tissue (xylem and phloem) in conveying APs from zones of special sensitivity to other regions of the plant—an “informational channel” involved in organismal organization.⁶³ Trewavas has proposed that the meristematic tissue, which runs throughout the plant, could be an integrative assessment and computational tissue, acting with sensory input from local meristems.⁶⁴ With active debate on this topic, it is still to be uncovered whether this internal communication systems are centralized, decentralized, or somewhere in between.⁶⁵

The structural complexity of these communication networks within plants is of great interest for an understanding of the intelligent behavior that plants display. The eminent animal physiologist Denis Noble has recently argued that networkstyle interactions (like those found in plants), actually organize and direct the activity of all living beings. In *The Music of Life*, he disputes the view that a unitary, external mind or self controls and directs the activity of living organisms.⁶⁶ Against this Cartesian notion, Noble argues that it is decentralized communicative networks that heterarchically self-organize and direct living activity.

In Noble’s view of systems biology, “there is no single controller.” no single Cartesian mind substance, which is the director of living systems.⁶⁷ Instead, from a systems viewpoint, mental properties such as intelligence, reasoning, and choice are thought to emerge from the interactions of physiological networks of signalling and communication. As Evan Thompson puts it, the “emergent process is one that results from collective self-organisation.”⁶⁸ These principles of heterarchical organization and the emergence of higher level properties are fundamental

principles of systems biology, which are elegantly summed up by Fritjof Capra: According to the systems view, the essential properties of an organism, or living system, are properties of the whole, which none of the parts

have. They arise from the interactions and relationships between the parts. These properties are destroyed when the system is dissected, either physically or theoretically, into isolated elements.⁶⁹

Although the exact pathways are still being investigated, we can state that from a systems perspective, the interconnecting, heterarchical network of plant tissues (including meristems) enables intelligent plant behavior, rather than the Cartesian consciousness or free will alluded to by Struik et al.⁷⁰

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

However, they don't have "sanna," or perceptions.

Malcolm wrote:

So you claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you just tell me where Mt. Meru is on this planet.

gregkavarnos said:

Just south of Kyrgistan (Utarakuru, Northern Kuru).

PS "Stewart", "practitioner" and "Greg", it really doesn't matter what they do in Shambhala, does it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to Ptolemy, the northern nomads on the central Asian steps were called Kuru -- and I can see, how Kyrgistan could have derived ultimately from Kuru.

However, I don't think the Pamirs = Meru is going to make anyone happy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 12:34 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

I disagree with that view and disagree that what I'm saying indicates Aristotelian view. Maybe if you explained HOW I have Aristotelian view, we could actually decide which is which. But I doubt you will.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, read Aristotle, then compare what you have enunciated with Aristotle's POV about plants being insentient automata.

M

Son said:

Plants aren't in-sentient automata.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you admit plants are sentient and not automata?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 12:16 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

I disagree with that view and disagree that what I'm saying indicates Aristotelian view. Maybe if you explained HOW I have Aristotelian view, we could actually decide which is which. But I doubt you will.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, read Aristotle, then compare what you have enunciated with Aristotle's POV about plants being insentient automata.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 10:10 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Uttarakuru, as Mipham surely conceived it, is not this planet.

kirtu said:

So in your view, Mipham is telling Khenpo Kunpel that they will reunite in a celestial or pure realm? Or perhaps an impure realm just not on the planet? I thought that traditionally all four continents were on this planet surrounding Mt. Meru?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you just tell me where Mt. Meru is on this planet.

The fact is, Uttarakuru is not something accessible for us, according Kosha cosmology, unless you are a siddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 10:06 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

The use of me saying that plants aren't "fully" sentient is because I think it is very wrong, and very bad for people to walk around looking at plant life and--beyond understanding that it is LIVING--think and act as though that plantlife feels, perceives, cognizes, or forms volition in any way

Malcolm wrote:

Right, we don't agree on this point. This is a classic Aristotelian view of plantlife, embedded into our cultural thinking about plants.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Typo alert:

But Buddhism no more moves away from a decentralized notion of sentience that does Aristotle.

Should be "But Buddhism no more moves away from a centralized notion of sentience that does Aristotle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

(I know you've said having access to a teacher/community has been an issue for you due to your location).

Wesley1982 said:

Distance and location issue is not much of a problem if your teacher/guru can communicate to you through the manifestation of dharma practice.

Malcolm wrote:

There are several upcoming webcast with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

If you look back over the past 7 pages you will find that I have been involved in a discussion on the sentience of plants and not an ideological war on the righteousness of Buddhism and the Buddhist view. This only occurred after you threw out the "heresy watch" accusation. So can we put it to rest now and get on with the point at hand please? ie "Are plants sentient?"

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing intrinsically non-Buddhist about the idea of plant sentience. However the scholastic tradition made it clear that it was uncomfortable with the idea precisely for the same reason you are: what about the karma of eating and killing plants? Thus, the resulting judgment that plants are insentient is truly just a utilitarian claim meant to ease the consciousness of Buddhist scholastics. Because it is certain that common people in India continued to regard plants as sentient, and do so up to the present.

Since you have a background in biology, Matthew Hall suggests that the problem in addressing plant sentience is a function of entrenched zoocentrism in cognitive modeling which begins with Aristotle. When the question gets brought up, the immediate response is "where is the nervous system, where is the brain, etc." It does not occur to people to ask "If plants are sentient, how might plant neurobiology differ from zoomorphic neurobiology?" In particular, in Hall's book on page 147 he discusses the issues of plant brains.

The conceptual problem, as I see it, is that in Buddhism we have substituted "consciousness" for a soul, or a living being (jiva). But Buddhism no more moves away from a decentralized notion of sentience that does Aristotle. Truthfully, there really is not much difference between the idea of a transmigrating consciousness as the irreducible fact of a sentient being and a soul (despite the chorus of protests this will raise). A transmigrating consciousness transmigrates precisely because of the delusion of selfhood. We take rebirth because we are deluded about I-ness. The only difference

between the early Buddhist anatman and the Hindu atman is what is taken as identity. The Hindus understand all persons and phenomena as lacking identity, but suppose that underneath all these illusory appearances, there is a permanent sat-cit-ananda, whose definition is very much like the Mahāyāna definition of tathagatagarbha i.e. permanent, self, blissful, and pure.

The issue, as I see it, is that the substance dualism implicit in the way scholastic Buddhists treat namarūpa make a systems theory of consciousness impossible. This is not an issue in Dzogchen (and to a lesser extent, in Vajrayāna), because consciousness itself is a product of systems interactions i.e. the interactions of the five elements in the body and so on.

What I propose is that the language of plant devas in Buddhist literature is used as a device to ameliorate karmic responsibility for using plants as food. Certainly, in animist traditions where plant spirits are considered, it is not like that. We consult with the spirit of the plant before using it, just as we consult with the spirits of animals we hunt. When we kill a plant, we do not necessarily kill its spirit, just as when we hunt we do not necessarily kill the spirit of the animal we are hunting. This model is still grounded in a naive substance dualism, but it has the benefit of making us recognize that all our actions of eating involve taking life and the life of one living being is not held to be more important than that of another.

Of course in the East Asian Traditions of Buddhism, plant sentience is also accepted in some quarters. The Shingon views of Kukai are very close to my understanding predicated on Dzogchen teachings:

If plants and trees are devoid of Buddhahood,
Waves would then be without humidity.

As people may or may not know, I am committed to the principles of deep ecology/biocentrism, and the denial of plant sentience not in keeping with those principles. If we deny plant sentience, as we do merely on the basis of zoomorphic orthodoxy, we deny the intrinsic value of the great preponderance of biomass on our world and reduce it, in biblical terms, as something merely for our use, biological automata, without sense, without feeling, without intelligence. For many centuries, we regarded animals as mere automata too. Now we understand better. In time, I am certain, we will understand this kind of thinking is a mistake when we consider anything that lives.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

...BUT Sakyong Jamgon Mipham Rinpoche, Jampal Trinley Dradul (born Osel Rangdrol

Mukpo in 1962, son of Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche), since he was born in Bodhgaya India, can be recognised as the official second incarnation of Ju Mipham.

Malcolm wrote:

No, because Bodhgaya is part of an impure realm.

What Mipham was saying in fact that as a Dzogchen practitioner he was going to take rebirth in the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels, but not here, on this planet or in this world system.

gregkavarnos said:

Aha! So what you are saying is not that the three statements are contradictory but that they are complementary. Yes, I can see that. So you are saying that the statement: "...seek me in the northern lands of distant Uttarakuru, and elsewhere, east, west, north and south." is figurative and not literal?

Malcolm wrote:

Uttarakuru, as Mipham surely conceived it, is not this planet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 10:44 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Isn't Meru Cosmology symbolic, rather than simply wrong, old superstition, etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

It was taken literally until 1959 by most Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

I have supplied this answer a few times.

From the Dzogchen perspective, everything, including consciousness, is a merely a display of the basis' energetic radiance.

I don't find that statement "easier." I'm not even sure what "easier" means. But really it's not that critical. In that frame of speaking, sentience doesn't even come into question, and saying any being is sentient or not sentient is unfounded.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that all life is a function of rtsal. Since everything is a display of rtsal, the

notion of sentient vs. non-sentient is not just an ultimate mistake, but a conventional one as well.

You should examine *Plants as People* by Hall. Much of this conversation is colored by a trenchant post-Aristotelian zoocentrism.

Plants are sentient, we might just have to revise our understanding of what sentience is.

In this respect Buddhist dogmatics is of no use and should be discarded the same way we have discarded Meru Cosmology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 10:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

If not, then do you really think that the animals who are sacrificed are treated worse than your dinner was on a factory farm?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in general (but not always) animals used in such ritual sacrifices are then consumed. It is the same actually in Dakshinkali in Katmandhu. From my point of view, blood sacrifices are based on a mistaken concept. But I think anyone from one of these religions where blood sacrifice is common who comes to practice Dzogchen teachings will understand that and eventually cease. However, please do bear in mind that the Lhasa Govt. hired non-Buddhist priests to sacrifice bulls yearly to satiate the bloodthirsty gods and demons of Tibet prior to 1959.

As for gyalpos, not all gyalpos are "bad". ChNN makes that point frequently.

As I said, any person from any religion, who is interested to study and practice Dzogchen may do so without having to convert to Buddhism.

Anyway, I am not going to lend any further dignity to this thread because it was clearly conceived polemically, with religious hostility, and I am not interested pursuing this thread any further.

I leave you to your own devices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Now how does this work with the claim that any religion can come and study

Dzogchen?[/b]

Malcolm wrote:

I never made that claim. Religions are not people.

What I said was that anyone, regardless of religion, who is interested may come and study Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Adamantine said:

In another thread, Malcolm states:

Malcolm wrote:

I have already spoken to you about your rhetorical flourishes. BTW, when is last time you molested a child?

See? I am not answering this question because it is just a screed.

Your question is like Fox News.

Adamantine said:

No, Malcolm, that reply is so weak it means you must have no adequate response. Saying my "rhetorical flourishes" are like Fox News" is your own rhetorical flourish worthy of Fox News. What I was asking, as I said, is no more than bringing your statements to a logical extreme.. this is a common form of Buddhist dialogue, you should be familiar with that as much as anyone! So don't be so disingenuous!

Malcolm wrote:

I am not going to answer that barrage of questions in the manner in which it was asked. You may try to rephrase the question(s) if you like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Now, also in terms of Dzogchen being beyond cause and result, beyond the two stages.. I understand the theory but how does this actually function practically?

Because you need someone to give pointing out instructions.. that is a cause.. don't we

need merit to enable us to connect to a qualified teacher who has the capacity to do this? Or are you saying it is just mere chance? randomness?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a cause of your primordial state. That is a cause of meeting the teachings.

Adamantine said:

right. but we are talking about practicing Dzogchen now, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Practicing Dzogchen means first of all; recognizing your primordial state -- and for that purpose we can use many methods but all of them will be connected with mind since we have not yet gone beyond mind. When we have that recognition practice consists in integrating that knowledge directly with practices that go beyond mind.

Ati Guru Yoga can be and is for both.

Adamantine said:

Because in other threads you've created a whole lot of rhetoric around the supreme path of pure Dzogchen vs. tantric Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I haven't. But some people, like you, have assumed that I was.

Dzogchen proper has its methods. Mahāyoga and Anuyoga likewise have their methods. The latter are based on transformation, the former is not. Dzogchen practitioners can use all of these methods, and more.

Adamantine said:

I would guess, if you don't need it, you're already enlightened.. or 100% integrated, whatever language you want to use. I don't think we need to hash these things out on behalf of Buddhas, these issues are for us who still have the need to practice something.

Malcolm wrote:

You should practice whatever you feel is important for you. Afterall, you know your own condition best.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

You know that's Malcom's blog, right, rai?
(That Malcom is this Malcom. Just making sure...)

Malcolm wrote:
It's a fair question.

The answer is that I have changed my mind. I don't support that position anymore.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:44 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"
Content:
Adamantine said:
In another thread, Malcolm states:

Malcolm wrote:
I have already spoken to you about your rhetorical flourishes. BTW, when is last time you molested a child?

See? I am not answering this question because it is just a screed.

Your question is like Fox News.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:41 AM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:

Son said:
Actually, the beings dwelling in the Sphere of Infinite Space have consciousness and perception. The beings dwelling in the Sphere of Infinite consciousness also have consciousness--(how did you miss that in your expert study?). In the Sphere of Nothingness, there is also perception. In the Sphere of Neither Perception nor Non-Perception is where dwell the beings without perception, who are thus cut off from other existences.

Malcolm wrote:
As I said, according to the Kosha, beings in the ārupyadhātu do not possess physical sense organs; they possess a mental faculty, a consciousness and single mental object (the concentration which propells their rebirth). They likewise possess only three faculties (indriya)-- the mental faculty, the life faculty, and the faculty of equanimity.

Your argument was about self-awareness. Formless realm beings have none.

Son said:

The distinction between fruition of consciousness (karma) and projection of consciousness is thereby defined.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen perspective is much easier.

Son said:

... Sounds good?

Malcolm wrote:

I have supplied this answer a few times.

From the Dzogchen perspective, everything, including consciousness, is a merely a display of the basis' energetic radiance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Now, also in terms of Dzogchen being beyond cause and result, beyond the two stages.. I understand the theory but how does this actually function practically?

Because you need someone to give pointing out instructions.. that is a cause.. don't we need merit to enable us to connect to a qualified teacher who has the capacity to do this? Or are you saying it is just mere chance? randomness?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a cause of your primordial state. That is a cause of meeting the teachings.

Adamantine said:

Also, in the case of ChNN's instructions, we are given precise instructions, that involve a visualization. You say Guru Yoga of the White Ah is all anyone needs, and they can subscribe to any religion, etc. whatever. But how is making the effort to properly visualize a white Ah in a rainbow ticle not making use of effort, or a cause?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, in the beginning you are working with mind through a simple visualization, but it is not a cause of your primordial state, it is method of connecting with and working with the transmission, a method for directly entering that knowledge.

Adamantine said:

What is so radically different?

Malcolm wrote:

Even Ati Guru Yoga is a method. If you don't need, you don't have to use it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Actually, the beings dwelling in the Sphere of Infinite Space have consciousness and perception. The beings dwelling in the Sphere of Infinite consciousness also have consciousness--(how did you miss that in your expert study?). In the Sphere of Nothingness, there is also perception. In the Sphere of Neither Perception nor Non-Perception is where dwell the beings without perception, who are thus cut off from other existences.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, according to the Kosha, beings in the ārupyadhātu do not possess physical sense organs; they possess a mental faculty, a consciousness and single mental object (the concentration which propells their rebirth). They likewise possess only three faculties (indriya)-- the mental faculty, the life faculty, and the faculty of equanimity.

Your argument was about self-awareness. Formless realm beings have none.

Son said:

The distinction between fruition of consciousness (karma) and projection of consciousness is thereby defined.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen perspective is much easier.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a buddhist.

David N. Snyder said:

Just curious, if you are not Buddhist, which religion / path do you identify with?

If it is just about not wanting to be labeled the R word (religion) which path is closest to your views?

Malcolm wrote:

I am a Dzogchen practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Who are you to say, "the Buddha used devas as a rationalization of plant sentience?"

Malcolm wrote:

Who are you to say he wasn't?

Son said:

Just a guy who has studied the canons.

Malcolm wrote:

So have I.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think that there is a world of difference between pruning an olive tree and cutting the leg off a living cow.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you don't prune cows.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but your point has little bearing on the original meaning of the MPSN sutra as a text in its own right, apart from the various sectarian uses and interpretations of it there may be been. I was discussing the fact that originally the MPNS introduced a eternalism into Buddhism.

M

Will said:

Yes, and I am discussing the last 1500 years or so of influence of the larger standard, popular sutra. Conversely, your scholarly point "has little bearing" on my point.

Ah, if only the pointless Dzogchenpa would reappear.

Malcolm wrote:

Well you and I both know that the very few people actually read these texts, like Astus (and me, etc.), tend to cherry pick them to make their points. My consideration here is simply to point out to Astus that his citations come from a part of the sutra found only in Chinese sources.

Therefore, they have little bearing on the essential subject of this thread, as I understand it i.e. the presence of a Buddhist eternalism in India. So I suspect we are not having the same conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

...support them with Buddhist sources.

Malcolm wrote:

I did that. I also made it clear that I don't agree with the later Buddhist scholastics and why.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

you have to take into account that you are posting in the general Dharma section of a Buddhist forum

Malcolm wrote:

This is the free for all section greg.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

UCalling plants sentient just adds another layer of grief to human behaviour, since now it becomes ethically ambivalent whether it is okay to "kill" plants. It becomes a source of mental grief and doubt. In order to maintain ethical conduct we would have to adopt the behaviour of Jains.

Malcolm wrote:

Harming plants and killing animals (requiring only simple confession) are considered the same class of infractions in monastic vows, so this is an exaggeration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Will said:

The view of "specialist scholars" is not relevant to the influence on the buddhadharma & generations of practitioners of the "standard" sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that part of the sutra under question, which "normalizes" the view of the MPNS does not seem to be present in any other recension. It certainly is not in the Tibetan version. Based in that, we can consider that the original Tathagatagarbha theory was fully eternalist.

Will said:

Sounds like an old Namdrol "point" - my point is different.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but your point has little bearing on the original meaning of the MPNS sutra as a text in its own right, apart from the various sectarian uses and interpretations of it there may be been. I was discussing the fact that originally the MPNS introduced a eternalism into Buddhism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Astus said:

Malcolm,

In fact, at the final part it has explanations on the differentiation between what is void and what is non-void.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, from the section regarded as apocryphal which has no correspondence in any other early version of the sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, from a statement by Padmasambhava in a Dzogchen teaching that the distinction between sentient and non-sentient appears, but should not be believed, and that when enters into full awakening, the distinction between sentient and non-sentient being false, vanishes.

gregkavarnos said:

It doesn't vanish by calling plants sentient, it just takes plants from within the category of non-sentient and puts them into the category of sentient. Making the distinction between sentient and non-sentient vanish is also not achieved by saying that everything is sentient. No more than saying everything is eternal makes the distinction between eternal and impermanent vanish.

Malcolm wrote:

Padmasambhava is saying that ignorance is maintaining that there is a meaningful distinction between the so called sentient and non-sentient. Plants, rocks, trees, and galaxies all have the same primordial state as humans, and other so called beings in the six lokas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...

the two truths and the two stages are not the system of Dzogchen...

heart said:

That part is clear enough, but this relation to Mahayoga/Anuyoga that is so valuable and still irrelevant leaves a lot of questions.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Not for me. Mahayoga and Anuyoga are not my path. They can be someone else's path, but they are not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

so from what are you building this idea? That is something I am interested in and is the reason I'm in this discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, from a statement by Padmasambhava in a Dzogchen teaching that the distinction between sentient and non-sentient appears, but should not be believed, and that when enters into full awakening, the distinction between sentient and non-sentient being false, vanishes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Will said:

The view of "specialist scholars" is not relevant to the influence on the buddhadharma & generations of practitioners of the "standard" sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that part of the sutra under question, which "normalizes" the view of the MPNS does not seem to be present in any other recension. It certainly is not in the Tibetan version. Based in that, we can consider that the original Tathagatagarbha theory was fully eternalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Instead, we hear him say, "they do not have self-awareness."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this simply means they are not aware of the themselves; likewise, unconscious gods and so called formless realm gods have no self-awareness.

Son said:

That is not true. And that is not written.

Malcolm wrote:

It most certainly is true --according the Abhidharmakosha (something I am a little expert in) formless realm beings for example have only one thought and have no awareness outside of that thought, i.e. the thought that propels them into that ayatana. Why? Because they have no physical sense faculties. Hence they have no self-reflexive cognition of any kind. But, like plants, they are a birth, albeit, one without self-knowledge.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Who are you to say, "the Buddha used devas as a rationalization of plant sentience?"

Malcolm wrote:

Who are you to say he wasn't?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Instead, we hear him say, "they do not have self-awareness."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this simply means they are not aware of the themselves; likewise, unconscious gods and so called formless realm gods have no self-awareness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

I don't know what kind of approach that is, but it doesn't seem Buddhistic.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to Hodge there are two distinct sections. It seems you are citing from parts that are not regarded as core portions, but rather later interpolations meant to bring the MPNS in line with a more standard "Buddhist read:

However, Dharmakṣema's translation of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra extends for a further thirty juan beyond the accepted core text of this sutra. The provenance and authenticity of the Sanskrit text, if such existed, underlying this part of his translation has been debated amongst scholars for decades, with many doubting that it is a text of Indian origin. The chief reasons for this skepticism are these: no traces of a extended Sanskrit text has ever been found, while Sanskrit manuscript fragments of twenty four separate pages distributed right across the core portion of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra have been found over the past hundred years in various parts of Asia; no quotations are known from this latter portion in any Indian commentaries or sutra anthologies; and no other translator in China or Tibet ever found Sanskrit copies of this portion.[12]:12-13 The Chinese monk-translator Yijing travelled widely through India and parts South East Asia over a twenty-five year period. In his account of "Eminent Monks who Went West in Search of the Dharma" (大唐西域求法高僧傳 T2066), he mentions that he searched for a copy of the enlarged Mahaparinirvāṇa-sūtra through all that time, but only found manuscripts corresponding to the core portion of this work.[5] For these reasons, textual scholars generally regard the authenticity of the latter portion as dubious: they surmise it may have been a local Central Asian composition at best or else written by Dharmakṣema himself who had both the ability and the motive for doing so.[5]:124-5[14] As a consequence, specialist scholars accept that this latter portion of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra translated by Dharmakṣema has no value for the history of the tathāgata-garbha concept and related doctrines during their development in India.[12][6]:163-4

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahayana_Mahaparinirvana_Sutra "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Son of Buddha said:

emptiness isn't considered dharmadhatu in tathagatagarbha, (the nirvana sutra/Lotus sutra) states it was teachings to help one end tainted individual self(false self) not the actual goal.

Astus said:

Consider these passages from the Nirvana Sutra. Page number is according to the common PDF edition.

"The Truth is the Tathagata. The Tathagata is the True; the True is the Void; the Void is the True; the True is the Buddha-Nature; the Buddha-Nature is the True."
(p. 159)

"O good man! All that is made is not eternal. The Void is not anything made. So, it is eternal. The Buddha-Nature is not what is made. So, it is eternal. "The Void is the Buddha-Nature; the Buddha-Nature is the Tathagata; the Tathagata is not what has been made. What has not been made is Eternal."
(p. 162)

"How does the Bodhisattva meditate on the Void of nature ["prakrti-shunyata" - Emptiness of primordial matter]? This Bodhisattva-mahasattva sees that the original nature of all elements is all void. These are the five skandhas, the 18 realms, the 12 spheres, the Eternal, the non-Eternal, suffering, Bliss, the Pure, the impure, Self, and non-Self. In all such things, he sees no nature of their own. This is how the Bodhisattva-mahasattva meditates on the Void of nature."
(p. 194)

"When the Bodhisattva-mahasattva practises Great Nirvana, he knows and sees the universe and he realises that the real state is all-void and that there is nothing that one possesses, and that there is nothing that has any mode of harmonisation or perception. And what he gains is such a phase [state of realisation] as the unbreakable [i.e. undefiled], non-doing, the phantomic, the burning flame of the hot season, and the all-empty phase of a gandharvan castle."
(p. 257)

"He practises "Paramartha-satya" [Ultimate Reality] and the Ultimate Void. Why? Because all Bodhisattvas always thoroughly practise the natures and characteristics of the Void. By practising the Void, he can now know what he did not know in the past. What does he know? He knows that there is no self and what one possesses. All beings have the Buddha-Nature. He knows that by reason of the Buddha-Nature, even the icchantika, when he abandons the mind that he possesses, can indeed attain unsurpassed Enlightenment. Such is not what sravakas and pratyekabuddhas can know."
(p. 282)

"Now, hearing Dharma relates to the 11 shunyatas. Due to these voids, we see no form in anything. Now, hearing Dharma begins with the first aspiration and proceeds up to the ultimate unsurpassed Bodhi Mind. By gaining the first aspiration, one gains Great Nirvana. Through hearing, one does not gain Great Nirvana; by practising, one attains Great Nirvana."

(p. 293)

"What is the True? One knows well the phases of Nirvana, the Buddha-Nature, the Tathagata, Dharma, the priest, the Real State, and the Void. This is what is True."

(p. 296)

"The Buddha-Nature is none other than the All-Void of "Paramartha-satya" [Ultimate Truth]. The All-Void of "Paramartha-satya" is Wisdom. We say "All-Void".

(p. 318)

"The Middle Path is the Buddha-Nature. For this reason, the Buddha-Nature is Eternal and there is no change. As ignorance overspreads [them], all beings are unable to see. The sravaka and pratyekabuddha see the All-Void of all things. But they do not see the non-Void. Or they see the non-Self of all things, but they do not see the Self. Because of this, they are unable to gain the All-Void of "Paramartha-satya". Since they fail to gain the All-Void of "Paramartha-satya", they fail to enact the Middle Path. Since there is no Middle Path, there is no seeing of the Buddha- Nature."

(p. 319)

"The samadhi resultant from right thinking is right meditation. One abiding in right meditation sees all things as Void. This is right Wisdom. One perfect in right Wisdom segregates his self from all the bonds of defilement. This is Emancipation. "The person who has gained Emancipation praises it to all beings and says that this Emancipation is Eternal and Unchanging. This is the correct praising of Emancipation. This is unsurpassed Mahaparinirvana."

(p. 327)

"The Buddha-Nature of beings is not-one and not-two. The equality spoken of regarding all Buddhas is like the Void. All beings possess it. Anybody who indeed practises the Noble Eightfold Path gains - one should know - a bright view."

(p. 352)

"The Eternal of the Tathagata is the Self. The Dharmakaya "[Dharma-Body]" of the Tathagata is unboundedness, unobstructedness, birthlessness, undyingness, and the eight unmolestednesses. This is the Self. The beings, truth to tell, do not have such a Self and what the Self possesses. Only because of the fact that a person absolutely attains the absolute Void of "Paramartha-satya" do we say the Buddha-Nature."

(p. 389)

"The Buddha-Nature of the being is like the Void. The Void is not past, not future, and not present. it is not in, nor out; it is not within the boundaries of colour, sound, taste, and

touch. It is the same with the Buddha-Nature."
(p. 414)

"If there is nothing, this is the Void. The same is the case with the Buddha-Nature, too. O good man! As the Void is empty, it does not fall into the category of the Three Times. As the Buddha-Nature is Eternal, it is not within the category of the Three Times."
(p. 440)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 10:54 PM
Title: Re: Queen's Diamond Jubilee
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
kilt_fail.jpg (53.1 KiB) Viewed 1761 times
kilt_fail.jpg (53.1 KiB) Viewed 1761 times

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 10:39 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Son said:
...and I sincerely think that they are projections of sentience.

Malcolm wrote:
The minute you admit that plants are admitted onto scale of sentience, all of your other arguments are just rationals.

Son said:
Well if you pretend that I mean something other than what I said, yes.

Malcolm wrote:
What you said was...

Son said:
Plants should be considered borderline sentient

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 10:23 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Instead, I prefer to think that matter is intrinsically imbued with intelligence, and that all forms of matter may naturally manifest their intrinsic intelligence given proper causes and conditions.

gregkavarnos said:

To say that all sentients have form is one thing, to say all forms are sentient is another. Is an asphalt tarmac sentient? Is my desk sentient? The desk lamp? What about the printer? That's a border line case because every time I try to print it seems to have a mind of its own and do whatever it feels like...

Well, it doesn't really work as a theory does it?

Malcolm wrote:

...given proper causes and conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

This seems to be comfortable canonically.

Malcolm wrote:

In scholastic Buddhism this debate came about because Buddha's teachings were more or less silent on the issue, and there are a couple of passages where the Buddha clearly included plant life as a kind of birth.

This raised a question, and because Jains and Hindus already supported the notion of plant sentience, arch-contrarians that they are, Buddhist scholastics rejected this point of view.

You can for example, rationalize that there are devas that inhabit plants as houses (standard Indo-Tibetan view), but as far as I am concerned this is merely a way of articulating the sentience of plants. It may be the case that plants achieve sentience only in communities, just like our body is not wholly sentient -- to use your example of a branch which can be propagated, also cells from our body may be propagated etc., and we certainly would not necessarily call either sentient in a conventional way.

Likewise, we do not have sentience apart from our embodiment, the community of organisms that make up our body. I think the Buddhist basic view -- the sutrayāna view - is that we are embodied because we are sentient. Underlying the whole Buddhist rejection of plant sentience is a hard substance dualism.

Dzogchen rejects this substance dualism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Okay, does that conflict with something you read?

Malcom,

There are many practices and levels of depth the Buddha taught.

However, they do not conflict with each other. We can't compare the teachings.

There are contradiction when we compare teachings and lineages because of depth.

That is why the buddha said to contemplate a teaching and discard teachings one does not understand.

The higher teachings are not meant to be understood intellectually, they must be experienced.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of higher and lower.

But the fact remains is that the two truths and the two stages are not the system of Dzogchen and are irrelevant in Dzogchen.

heart said:

The obvious question is then why ChNNR would teach on the two stages if it is irrelevant in Dzogchen? Not a long time ago you said that it is possible to integrate any religion or belief with the practice of Dzogchen, if I understood you correctly. The two stages and the two truths should then be easy to integrate with Dzogchen, right?

Then you told me yourself that the two stages are mentioned as practices in the 17 Tantras. The Kunjed Gyalpo is full of references to the two stages even if it is as a way to define the difference between Mahayoga/Anuyoga and Dzogchen I don't think that the word "irrelevant" is at all appropriate.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Jesus, do we really have to go round and round on this one again? You know what I mean when I say "The two stages are irrelevant to Dzogchen".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you are interested, you should check out Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, my teacher. He does many free and open webcasts every year. Open does not mean "less profound". Usually, when something is restricted, it is less profound, and more connected with Vajrayāna methods rather than pure Dzogchen.

heart said:

A wise man said recently;

Malcolm wrote:

According to ChNN, the idea of a "pure Dzogchen" is a mistake. He also says we need to understand our practice in terms of the unity of the three inner tantras. Dzogchen is how we practice those three inner tantras.

N

heart said:

But here you are again back to "pure dzogchen".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

By "pure Dzogchen" I simply mean from the three series of Dzogchen proper, rather than the result vehicle approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

I just ordered the Guru Yoga e-book (I think Dechen Norbu mentioned in one of his posts some time ago). I just started reading and came across the oral, symbolic, direct transmissions.

During webcasts, does Rinpoche always give all three? I know he often gives oral and symbolic transmission but what about direct transmission?

Many thanks,

C

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:43 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

Is it knowledge? This is a serious question. Because I describe it more as a sort of wild unfocused stumbling, like a drunken bee in a California poppy.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know Zen at all. I am a Dzogchen practitioner. I know what my state is. For the most part I am connected with that state. It is based on personal experience.

mujushinkyo said:

Yes! I don't know Zen at all either. Don't think I'm asking about Zen or Dzogchen. I was just asking about the direct experience, because it intrigues me.

Not a challenge or a demand -- or anything of the sort

As you know, I expect. Because if we're talking about the same thing, we needn't have our discussion "here" at all -- we can meet anytime in Infinity.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are interested, you should check out Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, my teacher. He does many free and open webcasts every year. Open does not mean "less profound". Usually, when something is restricted, it is less profound, and more connected with Vajrayāna methods rather than pure Dzogchen.

This is the best thing.

Otherwise, the best thing I can say is: that direct experience is based on direct introduction by a qualified teacher (These days most Dzogchen teachers will be very interested in having you sign on as a Buddhist, but not ChNN). Having received direct introduction, then there are many methods to come to be free of doubt about one's primordial state. Once one is free of doubt, one ceases to worry about buddhahood that is a result of practice and effort, since it does not exist.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:25 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

Is it knowledge? This is a serious question. Because I describe it more as a sort of wild unfocused stumbling, like a drunken bee in a California poppy.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know Zen at all. I am a Dzogchen practitioner. I know what my state is. For the most part I am connected with that state. It is based on personal experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:19 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I personally have no idea what satori is. All I know is what my primordial state is.

mujushinkyo said:

That's what it is.

But satori is what happens if "you" are ever unlucky enough to stray in an illusory way from your primordial state and then suddenly rejoin it with an anti- illusory big bang.

Malcolm wrote:

That used to happen. Now it does not happen anymore because I am not separate from that knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:12 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

What are the infallible signs of someone having had kensho?

This is an interesting topic for a Dharma discussion board. Maybe much more interesting than the depredations of a group of cultists.

Malcolm wrote:

Just saying, it is easy for people to say anything.

mujushinkyo said:

That's true!

Listen, the only reason I invest Kensho with any significance is that it does liberate people to be happier. I've seen it happen in others. I'm happy.

It's hard to get across to anyone just what this is, because people want to know instead what it "means." It doesn't mean anything. It's just waking up to the glory of This. If it were a religious issue -- a personal possession, an attainment of "holiness" -- we could argue about who has it and who doesn't.

This is actually basic to the cult stalking I experienced. The cultists were enraged that I said I'd had kensho. Enraged.

There's no way to convince anybody of what they refuse to accept, but if there's someone who claims they know the difference between a person who's had satori and who hasn't, let's hear it!

Malcolm wrote:

I personally have no idea what satori is. All I know is what my primordial state is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:00 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

What are the infallible signs of someone having had kensho?

This is an interesting topic for a Dharma discussion board. Maybe much more interesting than the depredations of a group of cultists.

Malcolm wrote:

Just saying, it is easy for people to say anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 11:44 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

I hate to break it to you, because you seem attached to your idea of kensho,

kirtu said:

nope, not an idea of kensho.

I had wu/satori.

From your speech and topics of concern, you are deeply mistaken. And are behaving in a mistaken way.

Kirt

mujushinkyo said:

Kirt, Let me ask. Have you had Kensho?

Or Satori?

"Nope."

It's all just a religious, idealistic concept to you, isn't it?

Are you not behaving in mistaken way, by telling any other person they are behaving in a mistaken way?

Look into it clearly. You're missing something here, and it could be important for you to find out what it is.

Andrew

Malcolm wrote:

Here, I should say, this is unproductive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 11:41 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

My response: Some of you little Buddhist scamps here are worse than the worst Catholics. You're crazed -- totally sunk in an anti-life religious ascetic delusion.

Malcolm wrote:

Well that is a bit of an exaggeration, but yes -- Buddhism is a pretty alienating religion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 11:15 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

...and I sincerely think that they are projections of sentience.

Malcolm wrote:

The minute you admit that plants are admitted onto scale of sentience, all of your other arguments are just rationals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Nemo said:

Isn't it a bit ironic posting that?

So what you are saying is ignore the problem, blame ourselves and it will go away?

Malcolm wrote:

Hence the Tibetan Institutional Response (TIR). Lojong teachings are often used as Mind Control. Milarepa had good reason to call Dromton a demon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Thanks Malcolm...sometimes its difficult for some of us newbies to strike a balance between being precise/anal and being hippy-dippy/anything goes. So then my new avatar that I worked on with my sons help for many hours should be fine then, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Looks good to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Chiefly, it is crucial to understand that plants are not self-aware, and therefore are not sentient in the way that humans, animals, or devas are considered sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

But, to raise yet another objection, shamanic traditions clearly are at odds with this view.

Son said:

I am very well integrated into shamanism and study with shamans.

In that experience, I can say that no it is not. As a shamanist I can say that it's not at odds with this view. In fact, according to myself and other shamanists I've interacted

with, this completely validates these aspects of shamanism from a Buddhist mentality. Maybe if you explained what's on your mind?

Malcolm wrote:

There are a lot of different kinds of shamanism -- but specifically, plants have their own energetic resonance. Since we moderns have a deeply ingrained substance dualism, when we see terms like "plant spirits" we assume this means somehow just like a mind appropriates a body, spirits appropriate a given set of plants -- but in my view as a Dzogchen practitioner, it is not like that. So how is it? Humans are living beings, and our consciousness is an expression of how energy is instantiated in our forms. Plants are living beings, and the way energy is instantiated in their forms is not the same as ours, so too with animals, devas, etc. But this energy, call it rtsal, permeates and gives rise to all displays of life in a samsaric context, and buddhas in a nirvanic context. You can set them out them on a band if you like, for example, as some hindus do, tamasic to sattvic with plant inhabiting the tamasic end of the consciousness scale, and liberated beings at the ultimate sattvic end.

To think like a tree can take centuries -- Garab Dorje says "The color of rtsal is green". Without rtsal there is no growth, no flourishing of anything. Rtsal is the root of consciousness. Tree thoughts are not like human thoughts. For most of us, we are closed off. We cannot perceive how a tree thinks, or a mountain, a planet, a solar system, galaxy or universe.

All universes are supposed to be included inside of the body of the mahāsambhogakāya Vairocana Himasagara. Our world system is supposed to be in a billion world system that is part of another system which is in the palm of his hand. Are we truly sentient in that respect? Or are we just neurons, synapses in a massive cosmos spanning Buddha?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Chiefly, it is crucial to understand that plants are not self-aware, and therefore are not sentient in the way that humans, animals, or devas are considered sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

But, to raise yet another objection, shamanic traditions clearly are at odds with this view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:
so then this is not correct for visualization for Longsal Longde?

Malcolm wrote:
It is fine. The principle is more important than the details.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 7:43 AM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Son said:
So, what is your answer to that? Are you on my page or not?

Malcolm wrote:
My answer to that if it is alive, it is sentient. So we are not on the same page, since you clearly think plants are not alive, and I think they are.

:=)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 7:31 AM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Son said:
If the plant is the sentient beings form-body, than that means the deva can't move or touch anything that doesn't touch the plant...

Malcolm wrote:
I am not advocating substance dualism at all. That is a Buddhist trip. I am saying that plant sentience is articulated through the language of plant "spirits" in the jatakas. And that there is a very clear relationship between the body of the plant and the life of the plant "spirit" in question. Harm one, harm the other.

Likewise, when your body is harmed, also your mind experiences harm.

My point of view is not informed by the early Buddhist tradition -- it is merely that in this period there was no hard and fast doctrinal position about it and even the Abhidharmika Samghabhadra recognizes that in the earliest sources there is no firm opinion to back up the Buddhist rejection of non-Buddhist assertions about plant sentience.

So therefore, when Buddhists such as yourself claim "Plants are not sentient" -- it is actually far more ambiguous than is comfortable for you.

As for my position, everything is made of five elements, and that is permeated with wisdom. Therefore, plant sentience, etc., is perfectly reasonable from my perspective and I don't agree with the scholastic arguments against it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Okay, does that conflict with something you read?

Malcom,

There are many practices and levels of depth the Buddha taught.

However, they do not conflict with each other. We can't compare the teachings.

There are contradiction when we compare teachings and lineages because of depth.

That is why the buddha said to contemplate a teaching and discard teachings one does not understand.

The higher teachings are not meant to be understood intellectually, they must be experienced.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of higher and lower.

But the fact remains is that the two truths and the two stages are not the system of Dzogchen and are irrelevant in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

it is not the plant that is sentient but the deva.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just like saying that your body is not sentient but your mind is. Of course, those who subscribe to Buddhist substance dualism will be happy with this pov.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

This is where the absolute and relative truths are found.

Malcolm wrote:

Which have nothing to do with Dzogchen.

In the bone yard said:

Oh really?

Malcolm wrote:

Really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Tibetan dharma organizations need to learn a thing or two about accountability if they expect to succeed here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Really?

Malcolm wrote:

Really:

“Since thou art bent to tear my body from me, cut me small,
And cut me piecemeal limb from limb, O King, or not at all.

“Cut first the top, the middle next, then last the root of me:
And if thou cut me so, O King, death will not painful be.”

...

“The reason (and a reason ’tis full noble) why piecemeal
I would be cut, O mighty king! Come listen while I tell.

“My kith and kin all prospering round me well-sheltered grow:

These I should crush by one huge fall,—and great would be their woe.”

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Yes. It is. Plants do not experience. They don't have the storehouse consciousness, they don't have the element of consciousness but are only form. Indeed, the Hindus called them "one-facultied life." In Buddhism, life cannot have one faculty, that of body.

Malcolm wrote:

They are talking about sparśendriya, the faculty of touch.

Also in this Jataka, a tree deva clearly identifies his tree as his body, which when cut down, will end his life:

http://jathakakatha.org/english/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=332:453-bhaddasala-jataka-&catid=51:451-500&Itemid=99 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not saying that. I am saying do UHC/SP right or don't do it. Don't do a half-assed job that in end only serves to enrich HMO's and create needless beauracracy. You have no idea what a burden Romney/Obamacare is on many lower income people in Mass.

kirtu said:

I understand. And when can we expect your candidacy for the MA legislature in order to amend the state heathcare system in order to remove the burden on lower income people?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I am pretty sure the USCUS will force a doover of the whole mess.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

Thanks, but the tiple in dronmas post is space, air, fire, earth, water is that correct or not?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as it should be IN THE THUN SYSTEM.

LONGSAL is different.

M

Finney said:

Malcolm,

Here you seem to be agreeing that the proper Thun order is: space, air, fire, earth, water.

But earlier you wrote:

Malcolm wrote:

The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam)

Finney said:

so, I'm a little confused. Can you help clarify it for me?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh I see... I was not paying careful attention. Also Tbhun cover is out of order. There is no system where water is last. That is just for aesthetics. It has been like that for 30 years. Since Crystal. My bad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But I'll be damned if I am going to be forced to pay some insurance company for health insurance I damn well don't need and won't use.

kirtu said:

Just another version of: why should I help pay for other people's health care? IOW you are selfish and only looking out for yourself given this condition. Or as President Obama said: some people believe that "you are on your own" and that's the way things should be.

Anyway everyone is 100% guaranteed to use health care.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I am not saying that. I am saying do UHC/SP right or don't do it. Don't do a half-assed job that in end only serves to enrich HMO's and create needless beauracracy. You have no idea what a burden Romney/Obamacare is on many lower income people in Mass.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

...the order of the colors of the 5 elements depends on the practice.

[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are correct: there are two systems.

The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam)

The Longsal system (which is the classical order of Indian cosmology): space, air, fire, water, earth (e yam ram bam lam).

Also these very same seed syllables in the latter system are also found in precisely the same order in Hindu element purification practice.

Mr. G said:

If we're doing an Anuyoga practice, we would use the one in the thun?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends: if you are doing an Anuyoga practice like Jnanadakini you use the Longsal system. If you are doing something not connected with Longsal, you use Thun system. The system used in the Thun book comes from lower tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

Thanks, but the tiple in dronmas post is space, air, fire, earth, water is that correct or not?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, as it should be IN THE THUN SYSTEM.

LONGSAL is different.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:02 AM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Son said:
They are still subject to consciousness, they're just in a suspended state.

Malcolm wrote:
Specious-- one could make the same argument for plants.

Just admit it -- the Buddha includes plants as a kind of jati, a kind of birth, right along side all the other births.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 3:59 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

Sönam said:
As a french guy, I also do not understand that point of view ... as for payement, in France, as the rights are established depending on your salary the richs pay more, and the poor do not pay at all ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:
"Most general physicians are in private practice but draw their income from the public insurance funds. These funds, unlike their German counterparts, have never gained self-management responsibility. Instead, the government has taken responsibility for the financial and operational management of health insurance (by setting premium levels related to income and determining the prices of goods and services refunded)"

I have no problem with this --but Obamacare is not this.

Obamacare was set up by HMOs for HMOs

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

This is a kind of thinking that is just incomprehensible to me. And many people born and raised in the US repeat this.

Malcolm wrote:

Either give health care to everyone (UHC/SP), or don't give it to anyone. But I'll be damned if I am going to be forced to pay some insurance company for health insurance I damn well don't need and won't use. Moreover, I am completely opposed to the present HMO system.

I really hope they do toss out Obama care on its ear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

...the order of the colors of the 5 elements depends on the practice.

[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are correct: there are two systems.

The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam)

The Longsal system (which is the classical order of Indian cosmology): space, air, fire, water, earth (e yam ram bam lam).

Also these very same seed syllables in the latter system are also found in precisely the same order in Hindu element purification practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Isn't a lack of self awareness a description of non-sentience? Of course plants are

"born" but, like I said before, let us not confound living with sentience.

Malcolm wrote:

By your definition unconscious gods would then be non-sentient, as would people in comas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Anders said:

Multiply by several orders of magnitude for Big Stuff like culture, religion, etc. I suppose. Someone on Youtube actually took offence at the 'Sickest Buddhist Ever' video.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, or Buddha prints on bakinis. The fact is that a Buddha image on some cute girl's (or boy's) ass might waken a trace in someone and cause them to investigate the teachings.

Tathāgata Booty Beauty Buddha.

Click at your own risk:

<https://hediedformygrins.blogspot.com/2011/12/buddha-bikini.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Do Theravadins have anything similar to Dzogchen?

Content:

Anders said:

I think that may be a reflection of your inclination on topics moreso than theirs.

Jnana said:

Not at all. It's a pluralistic world Anders. I know practicing Theravāda monastics who do Green Tārā Sādhana every evening, etc., etc..

Malcolm wrote:

Thank goodness it is a pluralistic world -- let's keep it that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Do Theravadins have anything similar to Dzogchen?

Content:

Anders said:

You're skipping a number of steps though. Vajrayana doesn't accept this for the same reasons Mahayana doesn't. Simply being awakened doesn't constitute a shortcut to Buddhahood. Buddhahood is predicated on taking much longer than arhatship because of the two accumulations even though their practise of wisdom is basically the same.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen model of abhisamaya is so different from Nikāya, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna abhisamaya it is basically completely meaningless to discuss them on the same basis. Anyone at all can practice Dzogchen irrespective of their religious tradition.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Anders said:

Ergo, an appreciation of culture and the diversity of culture, in the right perspective of it being a play of celebration and expression of life, can be a delightful thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Buddhists are too depressing and gloomy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Spirituality said:

That was way more than necessary, but clear, at least in this translation. You're right: in this translation this sutra does teach Buddha is eternal and is, as such, hard to reconcile with traditional Buddhism.

I'd love to hear what someone with access to the original language who knows something of the Buddhist history of ideas has to say about this text.

Anders said:

IIRC, when https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Stephen_Hodge posted on E-sangha, his position was that the Nirvana sutra was rather unapologetic about its eternalism.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and he is perhaps THE expert on this text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Unfortunately overturning Obamas's healthcare proposal or Romney's implementation of healthcare is not guaranteed to move the US to a single payer system. Culturally US people really do believe that the principle that "you are on your own" is correct. Therefore most Republicans and many Democrats (almost all of whom are merely liberal Republicans anyway) agree with this point of view.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

AFAIC am concerned, that is better than mandated insurance coverage which I regard as a violation of my rights to choose and as something that makes Govt, interference in our lives all the more pervasive since it is tied to our income taxes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Anders said:

At a more fundamental level though, it does seem to imply that spirits can embody a vessel in similar fashion to the way we 'embody' a car and move around in it, the step out when we're done with it. I can imagine a similar principle could be applied to spirits and plants.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and minds and bodies, and so the substance dualism of Abhidharma remains in force.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Which is why I originally asked why the Buddha did not include plants as a seventh realm of samsaric existence if they were considered sentient by him...

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha includes "grass and trees" among "birth" i.e. jati.

Know first the grass and trees:

Though they lack self-awareness,

Their birth is their distinctive mark;

For many are the kinds of birth.

-- Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha, pg. 800

Here, Buddha clearly includes plants among the "born". He continues next with moths up to ants, and so on. But if you read this without bias, he says later, on pg. 806:

Who knows his manifold past lives,

And sees the heavens and states of woe,

Who has reached the destruction of birth,

He is the one I call a bhramin.

Since plants are included among birth here, I see no reason not to understand that they are possible rebirths though lacking self-knowing (na cāpi paṭijānare), also so called formless realm beings lack self-knowing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In response to Xabir, the idea that plants have "spirits" inhabiting them is as silly as the idea we are a mind inhabiting a body.

xabir said:

What happens then when a person gets possessed by evil spirits so that the body gets taken control by another mindstream, or a taoist medium gets possessed by spirit-deities, or a tibetan oracle gets possessed by protectors etc? Can't the same happen for plants?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but invasion implies force, and in the case of all three examples, you have the invasion of a foreign entity into another entity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

The Seeker said:

Andres, I'm not saying that they don't "move" to follow the sun.
But they do it in a solid location being rooted i. That location.

Malcom, yes Mycelium Running is a great book full of information. I also consider the fungi world entirely different from any other realm. Having studied and being certified in professional mushroom cultivation by Stamets, I'd have to say the fungi would have more characteristic tendencies of sentience than plants. Also in response to pulling the weeds being displacing the insects home. One is not making an area bare, there are other plants and root systems for them to reside in. Which most likely, they "visit" anyway.

Kindest wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

well, tell that to the bug the text time, you pull it up with some roots...The other day i was making some rosewater, and some junebugs crawled out of the rose heads, very indignant, i might add.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I was reflecting this morning sentience is not a function of individual members anyway. It is a function of the interaction of communities, just as our body is a member of a sentient community. It is the interactions of the five elements we can our body through all of its sense organs and so forth than gives rise to our consciousness.

This is why such notions as autopoiesis (lhun grub) are critical for going beyond archaic and alienating notions inherent in the mind/matter dichotomy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Trees communicating and benefiting one another is a cute idea, for sure. Unfortunately it all sounds like speculation, not science. What I find interesting is the idea that trees could communicate through their roots with the help of fungi, but no evidence is presented that they actually do.

Come to think of it, I wouldn't be surprised if this video turned out to be a hoax. But well worth watching.

Malcolm wrote:

Read Mycelium Running: How Mushrooms Can Help Save the World by Paul Stamets

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

But Malcolm - this is the kind of indirectness and abandonment of logical thought that is a real problem in discussions. My point on health care is that the US does not have a health care system (not a universal health care system). So while President Obama's system is also not a universal health care system, Single Payer is certainly not a legitimate option, other than for powerful or greedy people who simply want to exploit others. It's this kind of thinking that we should reduce and not encourage. The US has not always taken an extreme "you are on your own" approach but it seems that it has been moving towards that extreme view since at least the 1st Great Depression (because homeless people and poor people were significantly maltreated in that period).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Single Payer = Universal Health Care in my lexicon i.e. healthcare as a basic human right, a base level of which should be guaranteed by the government, just as the government guarantees education as a basic human right.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

This is a delusion that the Buddha himself tried to put an end to.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not say anything about it at all. All arguments against plant sentience are from later, extra canonical, scholastic sources. There is in fact good evidence to suppose that like other contemporary Indians, early Buddhists believed in the sentience of plants. Certainly Jains did and continue to do so.

Lotus_Bitch said:

What do you think of the Surangama Sutra? Regardless of when and who composed this work, it is widely regarded as a meditation manual first. Hence its importance in Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

The arguments about the sentience of plants in Chinese Mahāyāna is well known with many Chinese masters coming down on the side of plant sentience.

Lotus_Bitch said:

The view you are propounding is common among those of eternalistic views, which is why you'll hear of this in tribal communities as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Am I? That is news to me. Are you quite sure all tribal people are eternalists? How did you come to universal knowledge of the beliefs of all tribal peoples?

In response to Xabir, the idea that plants have "spirits" inhabiting them is as silly as the idea we are a mind inhabiting a body. This is merely a perpetuation of the mind/matter dichotomy, the intractable substance dualism that has infected scholastic Buddhist discourse, with which modern Buddhist authors such as Alan Wallace jump through hoops to vainly defend.

Instead, I prefer to think that matter is intrinsically imbued with intelligence, and that all forms of matter may naturally manifest their intrinsic intelligence given proper causes and conditions. In other words, I think the concepts "sentient" vs. "non-sentient" is just an abstraction. The intelligence of matter is a function of self-organization or autopoiesis. It used to be the case that we believed animals to be mere automata. Now we have revised that view, and we consider that while animals demonstrate will, communication, etc., we feel that plants are mere automata -- but this view is also slowly changing.

My present feeling is that we inhabit a living world, and it too has a consciousness that envelops us. In order to make it comprehensible we render it in archetypes like an Earth Goddess, Pritvi, etc. But the world is impermanent, and thus it too is subject to birth, aging, illness and death.

Why would the intelligence of a mountain, a planet, a solar system, a galaxy, a universe resemble that of a human being?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

The Seeker said:

I can not see how by physically pulling a weed/plant you are harming a worm or bug. Unless of course you don't see it and crush it when grabbing the weed.

Kindest wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you can destroy something's home. If someone plucked your house up by the roots I am sure you would feel harmed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:01 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

This is a delusion that the Buddha himself tried to put an end to.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not say anything about it at all. All arguments against plant sentience are from later, extra canonical, scholastic sources. There is in fact good evidence to suppose that like other contemporary Indians, early Buddhists believed in the sentience of plants. Certainly Jains did and continue to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I see little value in preserving elements of a culture that have become redundant, especially if these elements are at odds with other cultures.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, we should just have one color of corn. Who needs diverse corn to make high fructose corn syrup? After all who needs Glass Gem Corn:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-south-asia-15507304> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

...BUT Sakyong Jamgon Mipham Rinpoche, Jampal Trinley Dradul (born Osel Rangdrol Mukpo in 1962, son of Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche), since he was born in Bodhgaya India, can be recognised as the official second incarnation of Ju Mipham.

Malcolm wrote:

No, because Bodhgaya is part of an impure realm.

What Mipham was saying in fact that as a Dzogchen practitioner he was going to take rebirth in the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels, but not here, on this planet or in this world system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to work with plants more.

The Seeker said:

Now I remember why I don't ask questions here.

I grow many plants, year round in NE North America. Under lights and in hydroponic systems. Guess I should work with them more.....

Kindsst wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

Then I am suprised that you don't relate to plants in terms of their ability to sense their environment and respond to it -- that after all is all a feeling is. Things that are painful we avoid; things that are pleasurable we seek out. Plants behave in the same way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 3:04 AM

Title: The Value of Culture

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Kirt asks:

I'm still asking what if anything beyond science, mathematics and engineering needs to be preserved in western culture. Is there a there there? Sally and username are discussing Marx from the starting point of Marx's criticism of capitalism.

Cultures arose historically mostly from little groups with mutual language comprehensibility or religious cohesion interacting. This is all embeded in a samsaric

context and Tibetan culture is no different at least on the secular level.

Why do we need to preserve cultures? The majority of cultures that have ever existed on the planet are gone as distinct, labelable entities. Cultures are identities that people attach to. Do cultures serve any real purpose for humans?

We need to preserve humans cultures in the same way we need to preserve biodiversity in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

This is where the absolute and relative truths are found.

Malcolm wrote:

Which have nothing to do with Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Andrew was arrested in connection with Bill Cassidy and then released when it was ascertained he and Cassidy were not the same person nor acting in concert.

mujushinkyo said:

Please note that I was not arrested. Although I know the cultists are saying loudly that I was.

My house was raided in a pre-dawn tactical operation to seize and search my computers.

Malcolm wrote:

Apologies -- your computers were arrested and held for a year without being charged.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhism and culture

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just an observation, but this thread seems to have seriously veered off course, but since it was a thread created out of another thread, may be this is normal...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

I am a US Army veteran.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have healthcare.

kirtu said:

No - most veterans who served in the late/final Cold War period do not have veteran's benefits (more correctly they don't have war era veteran's benefits) 1975/77 - 1991/2. I served in the middle of that period. I don't have healthcare benefits. I can't even claim the 5 pt federal preference on federal job applications (or couldn't while I was working in the federal government as a civilian - some generals and admirals have spoken out about this issue over the past 18 yrs).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I see, well it seems likely that the Supreme Court will toss out Obama/Romney care, and then they will have a chance to do it right with Single Payer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

The Seeker said:

Hey Malcom, could you please explain this.

other than possibly predatory plants, Venus fly trap for example, I haven't observed anything I'd consider feeling.

Kindest Wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

You need to work with plants more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

kirtu said:

So you are also harassing people.

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, the FBI knocked down the door to his house, locked and loaded, looking for cyber terrorists. I think you would be venting a bit if it happened to you. This is Andrew's party....you would cry to if it happened to you...

kirtu said:

If this actually happened then this needs to be taken to the national press for an investigation of how the FBI can be manipulated and used as a tool against other people. That is very dangerous and imperils the republic.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a matter of public record, it was published in the national media for crying out loud.

kirtu said:

The talk about "Nyingma taliban" ect., death threats without evidence is simply incendiary. If there were death threats, etc. then this needs to be taken to a prosecutor.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say they issued a death warrant, I said they issued a fatwa:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fatw> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;ā

kirtu said:

However as you said Malcolm, the best thing to do on a personal level is simply to ignore the people. However the possible manipulation of the FBI and possible death threats have to be handled legally.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Andrew was arrested in connection with Bill Cassidy and then released when it was ascertained he and Cassidy were not the same person nor acting in concert.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

So you're saying that if I make fun of tulkus I should expect someone to frame me up with the FBI and try to get me killed?

Malcolm wrote:

Around the world, in every religion, people are moving in a more fundamentalist direction. Yes, also in Buddhism. So, since you were perceived to be a threat by a minor league self-appointed Nyingma Taliban, they issued a fatwa against you which is apparently still in force. Rather than admit they made have been mistaken, they have no choice but to continue to harass you. So now you are the subject of a holy jihad. This is characteristic of the religious mentality. It is not a characteristic of the yogic or spiritual mentality. And converts to a religion, you will recall, are usually far more zealous in the prosecution of their new faith (embarrassingly so) than people raised in it. Honestly, the only way to win is to not play (classic game theory). Twitter is a such a stupid service anyway.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Do Theravadins have anything similar to Dzogchen?

Content:

catlady2112 said:

I am curious if the Theravadin tradition has anything equivalent to dzogchen view/practices? Is there even a translation of the word "Dzogchen" into pali (via sanskrit)? Thx!

Malcolm wrote:

No and no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, look closely. Greg: all three accounts specify that Mipham will not be reborn in Tibet. He said to Khenpo Kunphel:

I shall not take rebirth in Tibet. In twenty years, seek me in the northern lands of distant Uttarakuru, and elsewhere, east, west, north and south. Fear not, we shall be re-united again, as father and son. Now go!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

I did write that "obese tulkus make better lovers" tweet. I really do enjoy satire and the absurd, and once it struck me that the people in question weren't going to let me alone no matter what, I indulged this enjoyment fully. I maintain that I have a right to satirize tulkus on my own Twitter page.

I'd like to publish a little book of "tulku tweets" -- not just by me but by a dozen other people at least -- because many of them are really funny, and cumulatively they seem to gain something, even becoming hilarious.

heart said:

If you provoke people you should not be surprised when they get provoked, it is just ordinary cause and effect. Even if you don't consider yourself a Buddhist you should be careful with your actions. I think your expression "tulku tweets" show that your intention isn't the best.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, the FBI knocked down the door to his house, locked and loaded, looking for cyber terrorists. I think you would be venting a bit if it happened to you. This is Andrew's party...you would cry to if it happened to you...

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

The US could still live up to it's promise, become a democracy and help lead humanity to a bright future.

But the way it's going now, the US is on track to create the Ferengi Alliance, although as Quark pointed out in StarTrek DS9 humans are already much worse than Ferengi.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Ferengi Alliance is the WTO, IMF, and the World Bank.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

I am a US Army veteran.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have healthcare.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Mariusz said:

In my humble POV, the best is to do what one's own master of Dzogchen point-out, not necessary Namkhai Norbu...

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, and no one said otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

The Seeker said:

These actions require an actual brain and nervous system to carry out these functions, primarily feeling.

Malcolm wrote:

Plants certainly exhibit the characteristic of feeling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 11:31 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

What's more, some of the things they're saying about me are quite serious. I see nothing wrong with appealing to other Buddhists, sane Buddhists, for help.

Malcolm wrote:

You may have noticed a remarkable importance on the part of the Tibetan ecclesiastical hierarchy to deal with problems of their own creation, whether eastern or western.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The standard Buddhist view is that there are sentient beings who lack form. This is not accepted in Dzogchen teachings.

gregkavarnos said:

Is this because consciousness is based on the element of wind/air in Dzogchen theory?

Malcolm wrote:

As we have seen, for Dzogchen it is because the differentiation between mind and vāyu is merely nominal (different names for the same thing in a body), and thus, all sentient beings must have a physical body, even if it is very subtle, including formless realm beings. Vāyu of course is the name of the air element, and means that. Vāyu, air (Tibetan: rlung) is given the name "prāṇa" (Tibetan: srog) solely because it gives life. Furthermore, each of the five elements contains the potentiality of the other four elements within it.

Plants also use prāṇavāyu...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhism and culture

Content:

username said:

So let's appreciate what we have inherited as civil rights and democracy which is not guaranteed to last forever.

Malcolm wrote:

Amen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Yep, 9 PM EDT.

Although I think it got changed to a closed webcast as of yesterday, as I had to login onto the Shang Shung webcast video page when entered the website.

Virgo said:

Thanks Lhug-Pa. Guess I'll find out at nine. If it's closed I probably won't be able to get in.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

its open, you just have click on audio or video

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The quotes give two accounts: one of Ju Mipham saying he will not reincarnate and one saying that he will reincarnate, but not in Tibet. Both accounts were oral directives given to his attendants.

Malcolm wrote:

Three accounts, Greg: two to students, one publically. So two out of three.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[

You have to realize that Kirt is basically a Monarchist.

M

Virgo said:

Really? I am surprised

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he buys into the idea of enlightened rulers. Of course at the end of the day that is just Plato's Republic redux, the original fascist nightmare.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Eternalism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Again, Madhyamaka revisionism.

gregkavarnos said:

Well, excuse me if I prefer Madhyamaka revisionism to an attempt to introduce the atman into Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

I am merely pointing out that what Madhyamakas say about Tathagatagarbha theory does not necessarily represent the intent of the texts in question themselves. This is why Dolbupa vehemently refuted such Madhyamaka reads of the Tgarbha theory. +

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Eternalism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The True Self alluded to in the Mahaparinirvana Sutra is merely the realisation of the dependently arisen nature of one's existence, the True Self is merely a realisation of the illusory quality of the conventional self. That is the explanation I have heard from a lecture series on the Wheel of Sharp Weapons by Berzin. It's got NOTHING to do with the idea of an atman.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, Madhyamaka revisionism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm: All that is necessary after having received Dzogchen direct introduction (from ChNN) is Guru Yoga.

Must one be in the physical presence, with few people around, for this introduction to be experienced?

Is every transmission from the Guru to disciple X always received loud and clear?

Or is only one transmission, fully experienced, needed?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen language is fairly straight forward and simple, the examples clear, the implications however can take some time to sink in. Many people or few people makes no difference, as long you as are interested, participate as fully as you can and do not expect that direct introduction is a passive experience.

One direct transmission, followed by diligence in application of practice is all you need. Of course some people become transmission junkies searching for something they don't know they are "holding in their hands".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

In the natural state they are complete, but that don't help you much when your not in the natural state.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the principle of Dzogchen that you need to gather something you do not have. It is the principle of Dzogchen to recognize what you already possess.

Relatively speaking, merit ensures rebirth in higher realms, and that is it.

M

heart said:

You think merit has an intention? That sounds like God to me. Merit becomes whatever we dedicate it to, that is why we dedicate it to the full enlightenment of all sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Merit is intention, it does not have intention.

The effect of merit is to ensure rebirth in higher realms. It eventually got conflated with the pre-Buddhist notion of the major and minor marks of a mahāpurusha, which in turn became the major and minor marks of the physical body of a nirmanakāya.

heart said:

Long life, happiness, a great Guru that gives you the direct introduction and the possibility to and capacity as well as the will to practice the instructions until full realization, that is merit. If you have to work all day, have no money, never see your Guru, as many of us live. This is certainly a lack of merit.

You can certainly practice anyway but it is a lot more difficult. Merit can't make us recognize the natural state but it certainly helps a lot.

Malcolm wrote:

Merit, being conditioned and relative, can certainly assist our relative and conditioned state, but that is all. In dzogchen, the rūpakāya is not considered a result of merit, instead it is also an expression of thugs rje.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Both stages are necessary after the pointing out no matter what lineage you practice.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not so. All that is necessary after having received Dzogchen direct introduction (from ChNN) is Guru Yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Hi Malcolm - what has ChNN said about the two accumulations and Dzogchen? I'm wondering particularly about accumulation of merit. As you know there are contrived practices within Tibetan Buddhism for the accumulations. How does this work in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, as I understand it, the two accumulations have always been complete.

M

heart said:

In the natural state they are complete, but that don't help you much when your not in the natural state.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the principle of Dzogchen that you need to gather something you do not have. It is the principle of Dzogchen to recognize what you already possess.

Relatively speaking, merit ensures rebirth in higher realms, and that is it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

The primary impulse of the west is to control other people and restrict their creativity through serfdom. Marx was essentially correct on this point.

Kirt

Anders said:

I have never met or heard of anyone with an impulse to such a thing. Nor do I believe there is a conspiracy to effect this.

It may be an unintentional consequence of western society, but I don't believe it is the driving impulse.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to realize that Kirt is basically a Monarchist.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Are you suggesting our conditions are only formed by our opinions?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I am suggesting that people have a right to assess their own experience without being gainsayed by others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

JKhedrup said:

So I think that while the teachings are presented in this sort of containerless form, ChNN does see tremendous value in traditions as preserved in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, and those of other cultures as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

Excuse me for curiosity. Can I have the answers about the webcast please? When we hear Rinpoche, it is only electronic sound but not his voice and when we see Rinpoche, it is only the pixels but not his body. If we do not have the connection what we are seeing and what we are hearing, how the transmission really works?

Lhug-Pa said:

Because it is that we're in the same moment with Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche when he intends to give the transmission(s); so since we are in the same moment with his intention, distance is not an issue at all.

Mariusz said:

Has Rinpoche in the past webcasts done a Direct Introduction to Rigpa ever?

Lhug-Pa said:

Yes.

The first few pages of this thread, and at least three other threads as well, have some in-depth discussions regarding this.

Mariusz said:

Sorry, I will read them if I have more time. But can I quickly question: Has Rinpoche ever said it is better to have the direct oral transmission (tib. lung) by him than by internet only? What about DI, is better to meet him at least one time in order to take directly DI from Him, or the same will be if one has never met him and only takes DI from internet?

Malcolm wrote:

CHNN has many times made the statement that receiving transmission and direct introduction from him via webcast is no different than being there in person.

The only exception to this rule is that he will not attempt to do elaborate anuyoga style empowerments via webcast -- for those you must be present. He does frequently give don dbangs, or meaning empowerments via webcast however. He considers the latter more essential and more profound.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Was this sufficient transmission to engage in the Guru Dragphur practice per se...?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well....okay. But it is possible that it did, in fact, make a difference, though he has no "conscious experience" of the difference, is it not?

In other words, one often does not know one's Karma, and it is possible that accumulation of merit occurred, creating seeds, etc., etc., without one being "aware" of it. Do you disagree?

"Recognition" is a wonderful thing, I grant you, and sustaining it is also a wonderful thing, but I think we can all agree that there are causes and conditions that lead to recognition, and often those causes and conditions are not "consciously recognized."

Yes?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know why we have to spend so much time second guessing people's experience. If he said it didn't help, it didn't. If Magnus said it helped him, then it did. You feel me?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

Which other texts?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāparinirvana sūtra for one.

kirtu said:

Dang, I fell into your trap. I have to actually sit down and read that sutra through but you are referring to Chapter 12 where the Tathagatagarbha is identified as the self, etc.? Of course sutra's are finger's pointing to the moon, not the moon itself. It is of course true that the Tathagatagarbha is the self as all beings are endowed with the potential to attain Buddhahood. However that Tathagatagarbha is not self-existent and fully developed (unless we want to suggest that a person's occasional good deed and spontaneous compassion is a sign of the Tathagatagarbha lurking beneath the conditioned surface). We could go round and round (and you have in various explanations over the years and forums). And I could hardly raise a real objection to your arguments.

Nonetheless I would suggest that at least two of the three men's views that were raised a few posts ago, and possibly all three, would almost certainly admit a stronger degree of eternalism than that possibly raised in the Mahāparinirvana Sūtra.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Your statement about the Tathagatagabha sutras is the polished and revisionist

Madhyamaka/Yogacara version of Tgarbha theory. I personally beleive they are every bit as eternalistic in intent as their critics thought them to be. Unlike Madhyamaka [PP sutras] and Yogacara [yogacara sutras] there are no surviving independent treatises which do not belong to either of the aforementioned schools on Tgarbha theory. Tgarbha theory too is arguably much earlier than Yogacara. And the gzhan stong of Dolbuba is fully as eternlist as he is accused of being. Just saying...

M

But this is

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Simon E. said:

I did the full Kagyu Ngondro.

It made no difference one way or another to the transmission of Dzogchen ..

heart said:

I did to, how do you know it didn't make no different?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Because he said so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

Which other texts?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāparinirvana sūtra for one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

All in all Malcolm i do respect your better visions and they are great and inside Dzochén understandable, but we must bear in mind that others can have problems with your very fast methods of taking conclusions. I guess if this was done within a year then it was better with understanding your changing etc., but it went so fast from one person we knew Namdrol to Malcolm. And all within here aboard 3 weeks?

Really believe me it is all very overwhelming, not expected etc. and then this 180 degree contra that what you mostly did believe before.

All very fast, so it does need a certain time to let sink all (new informations / corrections etc. , then many can see better through.

Malcolm wrote:

Understandable.

However, in Dzogchen we do have the metaphor of the Garuda, who develops his ability to fly while still in the egg. Of course, this metaphor really refers to the practitioner who seems ordinary in life, when "the shell of the body" is broken, emerges with all qualities complete in the bardo. Not really making that claim -- but what I am saying is that in most people their personal evolution is not something they usually wear on their sleeve.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

So that's what I base my assertion on. While I haven't spoken to them personally I have nonetheless heard and read their words.

Malcolm wrote:

Uh huh. Buddha also taught eternalism for some folks.

kirtu said:

Yes, that's true. But that was also upaya in order to get them to not fall into nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:

That's what some texts say. And there are other texts that say the opposite.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

So that's what I base my assertion on. While I haven't spoken to them personally I have nonetheless heard and read their words.

Malcolm wrote:

Uh huh. Buddha also taught eternalism for some folks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

Of course esp. in our dark world one can learn lovingkindness and compassion and service from these great people. But they are not teaching a realization of anatta (except possibly in the gross sense of the breakdown or dissolution of artificial ego barriers).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

How do you know? Did you ever talk to them about whether they accept a personal self?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

If Namdrol would be in Nyingma or Bon, then he would have obtained there Dzogchen earlier and he would be satisfied with that and his Buddhist knowledge, if i may assume that. But Malcolm did reached that insight about Dzogchen after a tough study from many years. How many years when i may ask? And Malcolm doesn't regret it all at the moment, i hope so. I mean so many years to reach Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Kalsang:

I took refuge in May, 1989 with HH Sakya Trizin.

My first direct encounter with Dzogchen teachings was in 1990 when I attended a lecture on Rushan from Tri Yeshe Lama -- I didn't understand anything.

Then in 1992 I received the Guuhyagarbha empowerment from Bakha Tulku and the explanation of the Rongzom's commentary on that tantra from him. I met Chogyal Namkhai Norbu in that year too and attended a retreat with him that year and in 1993 (klong sde). I also met Khenpo Jigphun in 1993 and received from him his complete Manjushri Dzogchen cycle, the Khandro Nyingthig wang, and the transmission for the Chetsun Nyingthig. I practiced the latter for some time while in my three year retreat.

When I got out of my three retreat I more or less gave up all formal sadhana practice apart from Tregchö for some years apart from receiving the Nyingma Kama transmissions from Penor Rinpoche in 1998 and the explanation of the Buddha in the Palm of Your Hand Ngondro cycle.

In 2001 I met Taklung Tsetrul Rinoche and received his permission to read and translate the five volumes of the Gongpa Zangthal teachings. I also met Kunzang Dechen Lingpa in that year.

In 2002, I met Chogyal Namkhai Norbu again.

At the end of 2002 I received the Nyingthig Yazhi from KDL, and continued to receive many teachings from him in 2004 and 2005 including most of his termas and complete tregchö and thögal from him.

In 2006, 2007, and 2008, I received more instructions on Man ngag sde from Kunzang Dechen's Lingpa's son, Ridzin Dorje.

During this time I was also receiving regular teachings from ChNN, as well as studying to become a doctor of Tibetan Medicine (2005-2009).

It is funny, people often think I am a Sakya, but in fact I have received more Dzogchen teachings than I have received sadhana instruction, or sutrayāna instruction apart from my early days with the Sakaya school and my three year retreat in Sakya. The main Sakya teachings I have received are Tsembupa Chenrezi cycle, Lamdre Tsogshad, and the Vajrayogini Lobshad cycles, and that's it. I have received far more Nyingma teachings than Sakya ones, so it is a little bizzare when people call me a Sakyapa. Of course, I have a title from Sakya, i.e. Acarya based on mostly on my mastery of Tibetan, three year retreat and early course work, Abhidharma and so on and the fact that I have helped Lama Migmar Tseten over the years in many ways. But I am no Geshe, and I am not nearly as well educated as some people assume I am. What I am is an aggressive reader.

So, in fact, when you add it all together, I have received more Dzogchen teachings than any other kind of teaching, and that history goes back for more than 20 years. Not only that, but I had dreams about ChNN in 1987-8, before I ever took refuge.

When I decided I was a Buddhist, it was because I was standing in the rain listening to a group of Japanese woman recite the heart sutra on Hiezan near Kyoto in the summer of

1986. Up to that point I was a musician (fiddle, guitar, bass, early electronica).

So, just so you understand I have been devoting myself to Dzogchen practice for 20 years now self-consciously. Of course, there have been over the years a lot of turmoil in my understanding because my early three years in Sakya and my former drive for orthodox understanding caused inner conflict. However, in the end my love of the Dzogchen teachings and personal value of them for me won out. I happen to be good at tenet systems and have a good memory so it used to fun to debate in a polemical way.

But now I find it heart wrenching and very wrong headed. We live in a world where the five poisons fill not just our minds, but where they are expressed in our very environment, in the way the five elements are in conflict with one another. But of course there is also beauty too, for as I sit writing this, the lovely scent of our Kazanalik roses waft in through my library window.

We cannot do anything about the cycle of living and dying, the fact that we are all food for each other, but we can, through tolerance, natural compassion, and mutual recognition of each other's humanity transcend these divisions that so alienate us from each other, that cause us to split in religion, sect, and tribe and conduct war with other, denying one another our basic humanity through objectifying those who do not understand what we think we understand as "other".

There are no others. All beings are our reflection; through all beings we find ourselves, and see our own faces. And when we meet a master, or two, or three, or more, we have a chance to see our real face. Having seen that real face, how can we deny that to others. Our real face is not white, black, red, yellow. It is not Buddhist, non-Buddhist, or something in between. When we have seen our own real face, then we will see the real face of all others and all of these petty differences just melt.

Please don't think I have had some sudden epiphany -- these thoughts I am expressing have come about through a long process of tempering, heated through hearing, sharpened through meditation and polished through prajñā-- but in the forging of a practitioner is nothing that ever reaches completion until total realization.

In the Samurai tradition, there is a concept of the life-giving sword -- I would like to think of Dharma the same way. When Buddhadhama is wielded polemically, to enforce a view, or a position, or a policy, or a political stance, it too can be just as destructive as a sword wrongly wielded. And in this I am as guilty as any petty sectarian scholar, since I have been petty sectarian scholar for many years. The sword of Dharma should never be drawn lightly. The sword of Dharma should only be drawn to preserve life, to draw people together, who see its highly polished glint and look at it with awe rather than fear. When the sword of Dharma is unsheathed, the scent of attar of rose should fill the air, not blood.

So you see, for me, I have no interest anymore in sectarian buddhism that characterizes so much of "buddhist discourse" over the centuries. The siddha movement in late medieval India was non-sectarian -- it produced two main heirs, the Vajrayāna tradition

of Tibet and the Natha Sampradaya, as well as other offshoots. "Non-Buddhist" bards call the Bauls in Bengal still sing the Dohas contained in the Caryagiti. Some people think Vajrayāna disappeared into India. Nothing could be further from the truth. India and its outlying regions such as Oḍḍiyāna have been the garden for the many spiritual movements. They sprout, they flourish, they fruit, they are harvested, and in the end they are ploughed back into the soil to provide nourishment for future spiritual movements. Occasionally, strains escaped from India, and flourished in Isolation. Dzogchen is just one such movement. Mahāyāna another.

I have spent the last 20 years devoting almost my whole life to Buddhist texts, and in particular Dzogchen texts. Everything I have studied or read was somehow related to my practice, even my working stuff out as a sectarian jerk (which people still accuse me of) was related somehow to my practice. I have come to the point in my understanding where I clearly see that all these sectarian divisions of this religion and that religion are negative. Not in the sense that we should not all pursue a spiritual path that is pleasing to us (right now mine is smelling roses, listening to music and typing this post), but in the sense we should be kind and generous about others spiritual paths. Dont get me wrong, I am not saying put on rose-colored spectacles and ignore for example that in the past there have been grave injustices met out to many peoples in the name of religion, the misdeeds of institutional religion in all its forms. We can recognize these and then move on.

Humanity needs to move into post-religious, post-tribal phase where we meet each other with respect and decency. I am trying my best to meet all of you here on Dwheel from that point of view, and I also fail, will fail, have failed, and for that I am sorry. But my deepest wish is that we can all just get past all divisive nonsense and focus on what is truly important. It's a process, and no one gets it right the first time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

...but this is not the same understanding and realization as Buddhdharma.

Malcolm wrote:

When you have realized Buddhadharma, then you can say something about the "realization of Buddhadharma". As for understanding, there are a hundred different understandings of Buddhadharma, and some are quite "eternalistic". In the meantime, it is better to keep an open mind and not create more unnecessary divisions in an already fractured world.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Why everybody keeps calling it a Buddhist community is well beyond me! I mean the "secular" newspapers who have no idea, I can understand, but now even Tricycle? Mind you, from what I hear about Tricycle... Sigh...

Knotty Veneer said:

I know what you mean. I just got spammed by Tricycle for a "BuddhaFest Online Film Festival" which included a film about Ram Das and video of a performance by Krishna Das. Now I am sure the latter two gentlemen are wonderful people but neither is Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, both Ram Das and Krishna Das are students of Tulku Orgyen. Many of Neem Karoli Baba's students wound up sitting at the feet of Tulku Orgyen and many are still involved with Gomde crowd, Danny Goleman, etc.

But your comments are just more proof of what a confining and narrow box the label "Buddhist" has come to be. The first place I ever encountered Guru Rinpoche and his mantra was in Be Here Now.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhasa said:

If someone had said it involves yoga positions and you need to be physically fit to do them, :

Malcolm wrote:

These postions do not require you to be physically fit. Longde was originally transmitted to an 80 year old guy who had to rest his chin on a stick.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

i am trying to understand the connection between Donwang of Heruka Ngondzog Gyalpo, longde and the Guru Yoga with AUM.

My understanding is that whenever one does a session of longde practice one has to do the Guru Yoga with AUM to connect with the transmission of this particular practice of longde .

Is this correct?

Another question i have is related to The Donwang itself.

For me personally this donwang was particularly powerful.

Is there any point in repeating it as a way of Guru yoga or as a way of re-actualizing the transmission?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

As to question one, yes.

As to two, no.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 11:48 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Quite a few, if not most of the arguments used by vegetarians to illustrate why not eating meat is a wise choice are valid. It may be better for your health, better for the environment, and will separate one slightly from the slaughterhouse industry.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what kind of meat. Industrial agriculture produces inferior food, whether plant or animal, organic or conventional, since it is based on petro-chemicals is not nourishing. Eat local, eat in season, eat a wide variety of things. Then you will be healthy.

The bulk of food ideologies are hoaxes. And yes, it is inevitable that for some beings to live, other beings must die.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 11:04 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Virgo said:

Maybe you ought to realize that it is the nature of man to use force. You seem to wish to deny this fact and ignore it. However, you would have the law makers force all people in the land to not eat meat at all, and have the enforcers of the law armed to the teeth to enforce such. Who's the one that's confused now?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Forget it Kev -- this guy is into the food police all the while complaining about "violence". Vegan fascism, basically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

That is also not an argument.

Earlier in this thread when you tried to produce what you thought were good arguments or facts for meat consumption you mentioned about hypothetical ideal grass feed livestock operations even specifically mentioning the infamous Polyface farm of Joel Salatin. I dealt with that here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=213&p=99443&hilit=polyface+farm#p99443> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

and here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=213&p=99470&hilit=vegetarian+myth#p99470> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Counting the surrounding forest so vital to that operation you can only feed a very meager 2 people per 10 acres. That kind of meat is also very expensive for consumers, and like all other meat it is also costly for the environment and the health-care system.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea it their method of animal husbandry is costly for the enviroment is total nonsense. You obviously have not read a single thing written by Salatan.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 10:04 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

Obviously veganism promotes less violence and not more, if it didn't you could figure out an actual argument instead of innuendo.

Malcolm wrote:

What nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

Now that is for people, for animals, especially livestock, they live with much more restrictions, with almost no choice possible and much more violence used against them to suit taste preferences which demand cheap meat. What people like you don't want to realize is that your way of life is predicated on a huge amount of violence, coercion, techniques of manipulation. For the developed world to live their relatively lavish lifestyle, they victimize most the rest of the globe. It is not a way of life you have a right to live, it is maintained by force, by the American military, its allies, by coercive institutions like the IMF, the World bank, etc.

So people are ok with force, what they are not ok is having to do with less than they are accustomed to, that is the root of the issue. If you are an adult and you don't already realize such things it is because you don't want to know.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh I see, Veganism is the solution to the world woes? Give me a break.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Blue Garuda"]

My point was that on the basis of that assertion it is not logical to claim that all things with form are therefore sentient.

[/quite]

I never made that inference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

when computers communicate with each other over a network, does that mean they are sentient?

Malcolm wrote:

The internet is not a self-organizing system, it's a limited extension of our neurology.

gad rgyangs said:

if computers are connected to a network, to robots who can build computers, and run software that evaluates its own architecture, modifies designs, and uses the robots to build new computers and robots that further evolve and change, is it sentient?

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps machines can evolve into sentience. But at this point I don't think we can consider consider machines self-organizing at the level of complexity we see with biological life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Let's not confuse form with sentience. Apparently not all sentient beings have form and not all forms are sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

All sentient beings have form.

M

Blue Garuda said:

Hmmm: 'Swans are white therefore all white things are swans' kinda logic here?

All things which have form are not necessarily 'beings' or 'sentient' - we just attach those labels.

Malcolm wrote:

The standard Buddhist view is that there are sentient beings who lack form. This is not accepted in Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Fa Dao said:

WOW!! this has been going on now for quite some time. Some people are really getting fired up. Not my place to take a side or say who is right or wrong. But at some point dont we all have to ask ourselves "is all of this bickering really helping anyone?" (and it truly has turned into bickering) Maybe its time to bury the hatchet and just move on to more productive discussions? Just a thought.....

Silent Bob said:

Well, Mr. Smarty-Pants, you are wrong once again! This is not bickering, not at all, though it may appear that way to the unlettered. It will be recognized in years to come as the First Internet Council of the Wise, where the future direction of Buddhadharma was decided and the tulku system abolished.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh hell bob, now you've gone and spoilt everthang. Iffen we cain't bicker, what else is we gonna do in our dilbert cubes???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Let's not confuse form with sentience. Apparently not all sentient beings have form and not all forms are sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

All sentient beings have form.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

misrepresenting what I said.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not misrepresented a single thing you have said. The reverse, sadly, is not true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

You have completely lost your critical reasoning, rationalism and any sense of balance.

Malcolm wrote:

You brought up Mao not me.

username said:

My point was that it is part Buddhist tradition. Just that.

Malcolm wrote:

What you said was that refuge was a Buddhist tradition. I pointed out that not only Buddhism has a tradition of refuge.

username said:

Like when Mariusz asked if a believer of other traditions denying emptiness can receive the whole of Dzogchen transmissions and go through the four visions while holding on to those contradictory beliefs. You said he can receive all of Dzogchen Transmissions.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, he can.

username said:

You have been debating people in the thread when they talked of bodhicitta methods in their traditions. I said they are necessary specially if someone mistakenly thinks he has realized his nature as well as Rushens Semzins etc. There is a restricted booklet on this by ChNNR that I have from Dzogchen POV. They are necessary after that initial stage too. The rest of your post above again is nothing to do with what I said, like Ganesh on youtube etc.. Finally you are engaging in sophistry again as bodicitta is included in the nine yanas of buddhism as I said "Buddhist relative bodhicitta methods" quote you attack. That Buddhist path for most Dzogchenpas includes Ati yoga. So again my definition is valid and the mistake is yours. QED.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said anywhere that bodhicitta was unnecessary. What I did say that gradual cultivation of contrived compassion and so on is unnecessary.

You should really not jump to conclusions.

We all know the three sublime things you have for a perfect practice: refuge, knowledge of our real condition (bodhicitta), and dedication.

Now, I would expect about now you are a little bored with this, cause I sure am. Between your persistent misrepresentations of what I have actually said, and Dronma's persistent accusations that I am leading a Jihad (really????!???, what silliness) it is all a bit much.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Yes but not everyone you learn some facts from as is claimed here in error. You could watch a film clip of Hitler or Mao or George W. Bush and learn a few statistics or facts you might not know but then you can't stick them up there in the tree and take refuge which BTW is Buddhist. So you have to weed out some and not include all as Malcolm claims.

Malcolm wrote:

When I first heard this teaching from ChNN in 1992, he said all your teachers, anyone from whom you have learned anything -- he included grade school teachers and so on.

The concept of going for refuge (sharanam) is not strictly Buddhist. Also Hindus go for refuge:

<https://youtu.be/4jXAMZtnxn0> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

username said:

1- Well tell the Dalai Lama who had to endure lectures and facts and figures on a few occasions from Mao who killed tens of millions of Chinese by war and famine that he needs to take refuge in Mao too as part of his refuge tree. As before you misunderstand ChNNR.

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL considers himself a Marxist, and he learned his Marxism from Mao.

NDTV: Do you still think of yourself as a Marxist ?

The Dalai Lama: Yes . As far as social economic theory is concerned I am a Marxist.

<http://dalailama.com/messages/transcripts/barkha-dutt-interview-ndtv> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

2- Irrelevant, my point was that refuge tree is part of Tibetan Buddhist Vajrayana founded by Padmasambhava whose inner most essence teaching and intent is Dzogchen.

You mean refuge tree visualizations did not exist in India?

username said:

Excluding relative Bodhicitta from Dzogchen path in the name of sectarianism is yet another lack of realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Who excluded relative bodhicitta from the Dzogchen path -- not me? You said:

username said:

The best way to cultivate it is by buddhist relative bodhicitta methods.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a standard sectarian Buddhist view. Oh well.

I did not exclude anything.

I just pointed out once again your limiting language. Relative bodhicitta, for example, is only "buddhist" according to you. I guess a lot of bodhisattvas who have never heard of Buddhism are screwed since they do not know about your relative bodhicitta, having never heard of it. Frankly, I know many non-buddhists who have much better bodhicitta than a lot of the so called mahāyāna buddhists I know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But if you look at my siganture, you will see that it is not that way in Dzogchen.

Virgo said:

I understand.

Kevin

tomamundsen said:

Hi Malcolm. Could you please explain your signature? I don't understand it...

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

It means that plants are part of the display of Samanabhadra, just like everything else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Have you ever caught a fish? They certainly do feel pain.

Virgo said:

I don't really like fishing it was never my thing.

And yeah I was just joking. Fish certainly do feel pain.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

I did not understand the jk.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

when computers communicate with each other over a network, does that mean they are sentient?

Malcolm wrote:

The internet is not a self-organizing system, it's a limited extension of our neurology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

greentreeee said:

wow, Hitler and Jihad?

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Godwin%27s_law "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;:"

It states: "As an online discussion grows longer, the probability of a comparison involving Nazis or Hitler approaches 1." [2] [3] In other words, Godwin observed that, given enough time, in any online discussion—regardless of topic or scope—someone inevitably makes some comparison to Hitler and the Nazis.

And:

There are many corollaries to Godwin's law, some considered more canonical (by being adopted by Godwin himself) [3] than others. [1] For example, there is a tradition in many newsgroups and other Internet discussion forums that once such a comparison is made, the thread is finished and whoever mentioned the Nazis has automatically lost whatever debate was in progress. [8] This principle is itself frequently referred to as Godwin's law. It is considered poor form to raise such a comparison arbitrarily with the motive of ending the thread. There is a widely recognized corollary that any such ulterior-motive invocation of Godwin's law will be unsuccessful. [9]

And:

Some have called for Godwin's law to be renamed Beck's law because of the numerous allusions to Nazi Germany by talk show host Glenn Beck. [16] The Washington Post tallied 202 mentions of Nazis or Nazism, according to transcripts, 147 mentions of Hitler, 193 uses of "fascism" or "fascist," and another 24 mentions of Joseph Goebbels, all within 18 months. Media Matters used these facts to assert Godwin's Law is no longer relegated to chat rooms but now applies to cable news and other media outlets. [17]

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Termas discovered outside of Tibet/Nepal

Content:

Josef said:

Didnt KDL reveal mind ter in New York state as well?

Malcolm wrote:

And at my house when I was living in Shelburne Falls, on my front porch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Nemo said:

To say some DNA based life is sentient and some is not sounds implausible. It makes me think of the turn of the century "scientists" who unequivocally said animals like dogs cannot feel pain.

I will treat all life like it is alive.

Malcolm wrote:

Good point:

In the center of every plant cell – from algae to orchids – and in the center of every animal cell – from jellyfish to you and me – there's a copy of the organism's genetic material. This DNA carries a complete blueprint of the organism. It's what transfers characteristics from one generation to the next.

There are pretty obvious differences between plants and animals, but – at the chemical level – the cells of all plants and all animals contain DNA in the same shape – the famous “double helix” that looks like a twisted ladder. What's more, all DNA molecules – in both plants and animals – are made from the same four chemical building blocks – called nucleotides.

What is different is how these four nucleotides in DNA are arranged. It's their sequence that determines which proteins will be made. The way the nucleotides are arranged, and the information they encode, decides whether the organism will produce scales or leaves – legs or a stalk.

Research shows that plants and animals may produce some proteins in common. One prominent example is known as Cytochrome C. But because the DNA copying process is imperfect, mistakes accumulate over time, making Cytochrome C slightly different in different creatures. The gene regions that specify the amino acid sequence in human Cytochrome C are more similar to those in another mammal like a rabbit, and less similar to a more evolutionarily distant creature, like a sunflower.

The schematic of classifying animals and plants in kingdoms is facing competition. More recently an alternative system has arisen, based on evolutionary and molecular information. Cytochrome c is perhaps the canonical or paradigmatic molecule in this approach.

Every species has a characteristic number of chromosomes, called the chromosome number. Animals have more chromosomes; plants have fewer.

<http://earthsky.org/?p=433> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Nemo said:

To say some DNA based life is sentient and some is not sounds implausible. It makes me think of the turn of the century "scientists" who unequivocally said animals like dogs cannot feel pain.

I will treat all life like it is alive.

Virgo said:

Fish don't feel pain, though.

Jk

Malcolm wrote:

Have you ever caught a fish? They certainly do feel pain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Sherlock said:

No one practising Western magic has to my knowledge achieved results as described in the grimoires even when they've followed them very literally (speaking as someone who has actually tried it, I haven't gotten any significant results either). There are no magicians out there who've managed to get demons to appear before them and instantly teach them everything about physics, languages etc or used demons to conjure up armies. There is a lot of magical thinking and lying going on in this field, not saying there isn't in Tibetan Buddhism, but then again Dzogchen isn't Buddhism. The results which Western magicians actually do achieve, you can too by anuyoga practice, and that will probably do more for helping with your experience of vidya at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

Grimoires for the most part were written for Christian priests expert in Christian liturgy. If you don't beleive in the Tetreagrammaton it is very likely that grimoire magic is not going to work for you. For example:

And I say to thee obey, in the name of him who spake and it was; and in every one of ye, O ye names of God! Moreover in the names Adonai, EL., Elohim., Elohi, Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh, Zabaoth, Elion, Iah, Tetragrammaton, Shaddai, Lord God Most High, I stir thee up; and in our strength I say Obey!

If you don't beleive in god, it just ain't going to fly for you. You will lack conviction.

Ok, returning to topic...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, is the human host body "sentient"? The minute you admit that "spirits" inhabit plants, you are opening the door for plants to be considered sentient. Just as the mind leaves the host body, so to would plant spirits leave the their host plants, and take up a new life in a newly germinated plant, for example. This just means that "plants" would be part of the preta realm.

M

Virgo said:

Explained that way it seems more plausible.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for as long as one is still attached the principle of a dichotomy between mind and matter.

But if you look at my signature, you will see that it is not that way in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

PS It seems that the term inhabits (in reference to the Yakshas) is the key to understanding the statement. Like humans inhabit houses but this does not make houses sentient so Yakshas inhabit trees, rocks, and other natural physical phenomena but this does not make the phenomena sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, is the human host body "sentient"? The minute you admit that "spirits" inhabit plants, you are opening the door for plants to be considered sentient. Just as the mind leaves the host body, so to would plant spirits leave the their host plants, and take up a new life in a newly germinated plant, for example. This just means that "plants" would be part of the preta realm.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

If we are to consider plants as sentient then where do they fit into the 6 realms schema? What is the mental "poison" that causes one to be born as a plant? Why did the Buddha not include plants in the schema of realms? Why is there no reference in the bardo teachings on the light, Buddha, wisdom and poison associated with the plant realm?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is I have no idea.

gregkavarnos said:

Do you believe that the concept of "plants as sentients" can be introduced into the teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is extraneous to the teachings.

gregkavarnos said:

How would that benefit practice or help one achieve liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

If plants are conscious communities, and this is demonstrable, then this opens up the door for increased awareness and understanding of our world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Challenge23 said:

My experience matches up with what you are talking about pretty closely. I was told by Rinpoche that in order to learn Dzogchen I would have to do the Ngondro, learn Phowa, Dream Yoga, Tummo, and Shinay, then Striking the Essence in Three Phrases by Garab Dorje and then I would be able to learn Dzogchen. Needless to say I am pretty sure that I won't be able to really buckle down and really learn all that until I retire(I'm soon to be 36 now), if ever.

Malcolm wrote:

None of which was ever required by Garab Dorje.

Dzogchen starts with direct introduction. Once you have received that, you are on a Dzogchen path and you do not need to do all this other stuff first.

Challenge23 said:

Yeah. The ironic part is that if you would have asked me about 15 years ago if I wanted a group of teachings that would eventually allow me to have a solid foundation in Tibetan magic(which from my understanding I would be very close to by the time I got done with all of those prerequisites) I would have been so interested I would have gone into fits of approval. However, at the time I just wanted to learn Dzogchen and get on with my life. Now I'm not sure that all of the time past 20 minutes of meditation 3x a week would be better spent playing World of Warcraft.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you are into magic, just practice Dzogchen and all those results which take years of practice through elaborate rituals can accomplished merely through Dzogchen practice without uttering a single mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Challenge23 said:

My experience matches up with what you are talking about pretty closely. I was told by Rinpoche that in order to learn Dzogchen I would have to do the Ngondro, learn Phowa, Dream Yoga, Tummo, and Shinay, then Striking the Essence in Three Phrases by Garab Dorje and then I would be able to learn Dzogchen. Needless to say I am pretty sure that I won't be able to really buckle down and really learn all that until I retire(I'm soon to be 36 now), if ever.

Malcolm wrote:

None of which was ever required by Garab Dorje.

Dzogchen starts with direct introduction. Once you have received that, you are on a Dzogchen path and you do not need to do all this other stuff first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Huseng said:

This is interesting (from Bhante's blog above):

The ancient Indians believed that trees would give their bounty on condition that they were treated with a degree of respect and the Buddha told a story to illustrate this very point. Long ago, the mythical King Koravya had an amazing banyan tree in his realm which bore fruit of exceptional sweetness. Everyone in the realm enjoyed the fruit freely and so there was no reason to guard the tree. But one day a man ate his fill of the fruit then broke a branch and went away. So angry was the spirit of the tree by this ingratitude

that it caused the tree to bear no more fruit (A.III,369-70).

It seems the idea that trees could be inhabited by "spirits" (I'd be curious what the Pali or Sanskrit would be ... deva?) was widespread.

Malcolm wrote:
Yakṣās.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:30 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:

I was going to say that there has got to be an Eastern counterpart specifically related to the idea of Plant Elementals, but here we have it from the Jataka Tales, Tree Spirits:

Huseng said:
I also recall a Jataka tale about two "tree spirits"...

<http://www.danielharper.org/story22.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
I don't think this is really canonical, let alone widely accepted. The issue of plant sentience is basically just that the Buddha never said, "Plants are not sentient beings." Within the six paths you don't see plants listed anywhere and even in early Buddhism I've never seen mention of "rebirth as a plant". It might be that even in early times people were uncertain about the "sentient status" of plants.

Malcolm wrote:
Schmidhausen has an interesting monograph on the status of plants in Early Buddhism, his take on it is that early Buddhists did regard plants as sentient in some fashion.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:20 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
It makes me realize the truth of this Upanishadic statement:

"All beings, that exist on earth, are born of food; then they live by food, then again to the food they go at the end . so verily food is the eldest of all creatures. Therefore, it is called the medicament of all. All those who worship food as Brahman obtain all food. Food is indeed the eldest of all creatures. Therefore, it is called the medicine for all. From food all beings are born, having been born they grow by food. Food is eaten by the beings and it also eats them. Therefore, it is called food (Anna)."

https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Taittiriya_Upanishad "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Huseng said:

There is a kind of reassuring comfort knowing that despite having consumed and harmed so many beings in this life, when all is said and done my flesh and blood will nourish many other beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists spend so much time worrying about the "self" that they fail to appreciate the great and profound wisdom to be gleaned from the rishis who composed the Vedas and Upanishads. Consider the Hymn to Herbs:

1. HERBS that sprang up in time of old, three ages earlier than the Gods,—
Of these, whose hue is brown, will I declare the hundred powers and seven.
2 Ye, Mothers, have a hundred homes, yea, and a thousand are your growths.
Do ye who have a thousand powers free this my patient from disease.
3 Be glad and joyful in the Plants, both blossoming and bearing fruit,
Plants that will lead us to success like mares who conquer in the race.
4 Plants, by this name I speak to you, Mothers, to you the Goddesses:
Steed, cow, and garment may I win, win back thy very self, O man.
5 The Holy Fig tree is your home, your mansion is the Parna tree:
Winners of cattle shali ye be if ye regain for me this man.
6 He who hath store of Herbs at hand like Kings amid a crowd of men,—
Physician is that sage's name, fiend-slayer, chaser of disease.
7 Herbs rich in Soma, rich in steeds, in nourishments, in strengthening power,—
All these have I provided here, that this man may be whole again.
8 The healing virtues of the Plants stream forth like cattle from the stall,—
Plants that shall win me store of wealth, and save thy vital breath, O man.
9 Reliever is your mother's name, and hence Restorers are ye called.
Rivers are ye with wings that fly: keep far whatever brings disease.
10 Over all fences have they passed, as steals a thief into the fold.
The Plants have driven from the frame whatever malady was there.
11 When, bringing back the vanished strength, I hold these herbs within my hand,
The spirit of disease departs ere he can seize upon the life.
12 He through whose frame, O Plants, ye creep member by member, joint by joint,—
From him ye drive away disease like some strong arbiter of strife.
13 Fly, Spirit of Disease, begone, with the blue jay and kingfisher.
Fly with the wind's impetuous speed, vanish together with the storm.
14 Help every one the other, lend assistance each of you to each,
All of you be accordant, give furtherance to this speech of mine.
15 Let fruitful Plants, and fruitless, those that blossom, and the blossomless,
Urged onward by Br̥haspati, release us from our pain and grief;
16 Release me from the curse's plague and woe that comes from Varuṇa;
Free me from Yama's fetter, from sin and offence against the Gods.
17 What time, descending from the sky, the Plants flew earthward, thus they spake:
No evil shall befall the man whom while he liveth we pervade,

18 Of all the many Plants whose King is, Soma, Plants of hundred forms,
Thou art the Plant most excellent, prompt to the wish, sweet to the heart.
19 O all ye various Herbs whose King is Soma, that o'erspread the earth,
Urged onward by Brhaspati, combine your virtue in this Plant.
20 Unharm'd be he who digs you up, unharm'd the man for whom I dig:
And let no malady attack biped or quadruped of ours.
21 All Plants that hear this speech, and those that have departed far away,
Come all assembled and confer your healing power upon this Herb.
22 With Soma as their Sovran Lord the Plants hold colloquy and say:
O King, we save from death the man whose cure a Brahman undertakes.
23 Most excellent of all art thou, O Plant thy vassals are the trees.
Let him be subject to our power, the man who seeks to injure us.

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/rigveda/rv10097.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I am absolutely mystified why there has been no public calling to account of this organization by the Palyul organization as a whole.

Malcolm wrote:

Because to acknowledge that there is a problem means that someone is responsible for the problem, and in this case it all leads back to Gyaltrul Rinpoche and Penor Rinpoche.

This is the just the standard Tibetan approach, if you pretend that something isn't a problem, it ceases to be one, theoretically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, he isn't.

Huseng said:

I also recall a Jataka tale about two "tree spirits"...

<http://www.danielharper.org/story22.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

It is an interesting matter to consider.

It makes me consider a Jain diet to be honest.

Malcolm wrote:

It makes me realize the truth of these Upanishadic statements:

"All beings, that exist on earth, are born of food; then they live by food, then again to the food they go at the end. So verily food is the eldest of all creatures. Therefore, it is called the medicament of all. All those who worship food as Brahman obtain all food. Food is indeed the eldest of all creatures. Therefore, it is called the medicine for all. From food all beings are born, having been born they grow by food. Food is eaten by the beings and it also eats them. Therefore, it is called food (Anna)."

And:

He perceived that food is Brahman, for from food these beings are produced; by food, when born, they live; and into food they enter at their death.

And:

Let him never abuse food, that is the rule.

Breath is food, the body eats the food. The body rests on breath, breath rests on the body. This is the food resting on food. He who knows this food resting on food, rests exalted, becomes rich in food, and able to eat food (healthy), becomes great by offspring, cattle, and the splendour of his knowledge (of Brahman), great by fame.

Let him never shun food, that is the rule. Water is food, the light eats the food. The light rests on water, water rests on light. This is the food resting on food. He who knows this food resting on food, rests exalted, becomes rich in food, and able to eat food (healthy), becomes great by offspring, cattle, and the splendour of his knowledge (of Brahman), great by fame.

Let him acquire much food, that is the rule. Earth is food, the ether eats the food. The ether rests on the earth, the earth rests on the ether. This is the food resting on food. He who knows this food resting on food, rests exalted, becomes rich in food, and able to eat food (healthy), becomes great by offspring, cattle, and the splendour of his knowledge (of Brahman), great by fame.

'I am food (object), I am food, I am food! I am the eater of food (subject), I am the eater of food, I am the eater of food! I am the poet (who joins the two together), I am the poet, I am the poet! I am the first-born of the Right (rita). Before the Devas I was in the centre of all that is immortal. He who gives me away, he alone preserves me: him who eats food, I eat as food.

https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Taittiriya_Upanishad "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:58 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Huseng said:
Beautiful research.

I've often wondered if trees could be self-aware on some level.

I'm aware that the Jains insist that all plants have souls, hence their unique ideas on vegetarianism.

As far as I know the Buddha is not on record declaring that plants could not be sattva.

Malcolm wrote:
No, he isn't.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:31 PM
Title: Plant Sentient
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
<http://www.wakingtimes.com/2012/05/02/how-trees-communicate-video/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:14 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
username said:
Yes but not everyone you learn some facts from as is claimed here in error. You could watch a film clip of Hitler or Mao or George W. Bush and learn a few statistics or facts you might not know but then you can't stick them up there in the tree and take refuge which BTW is Buddhist. So you have to weed out some and not include all as Malcolm claims.

Malcolm wrote:
When I first heard this teaching from ChNN in 1992, he said all your teachers, anyone from whom you have learned anything -- he included grade school teachers and so on.

The concept of going for refuge (sharanam) is not strictly Buddhist. Also Hindus go for refuge:

<https://youtu.be/4jXAMZtnxn0> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Termas discovered outside of Tibet/Nepal

Content:

Sherlock said:

Have there been any termas discovered outside of Tibet/Nepal in recorded history?

Much of Southeast Asia and even the Maldives (and of course even Oddiyana, Gandhara etc) used to practise Vajrayana, and lamas travel around this region all the time, have they uncovered any sidhis here yet? ChNN did receive an initial dream of one of his mind-ters in Singapore but it wasn't really connected to the region from what I've read.

Malcolm wrote:

Not earth treasures, so far as I know.

But the treasures of ChNN are very connected with place -- the Vajradance for example was first revealed at Khandroling just 6 miles from the house I grew up in, in Ashfield, MA, and 7.5 miles away from where I presently live. ChNN will come here to have very specific dreams for new indications for details of his teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Not really. You started this whole thing by saying (gist of) going up a hill by a stream or something how you were struck by the beauty of nature and realized being 50 you suddenly felt full of love for all beings and felt the need to apologize to 3 of the biggest damsi mandalas currently going not to mention saying what you said about opposing the nkt and leaving out others you had attacked/argued with but said you mean them all.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually this all started because I said that you don't need much besides the five elements, etc.

I think when we hurt the feelings of others without need, we should make apologies. It does not matter if we think they are samaya breakers or whatever. That concept of "samaya breakers" only functions in the Buddhist world. This kind of thing is all completely relative. And really, in the long run, if someone breaks their samaya that is their business, and not ours.

username said:

However you soon picked up criticizing TNR who according to many including some of your dead and living gurus was a great siddha. So it was a sudden U-turn in your own words which you deny as gradual. This sort of thing happens to many who are actually quite settled and happy. That is the point.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not criticize TNR, I just said I don't agree with his reasoning about Mt. Meru and so on.

username said:

You have had many shifts of position on Dzogchen. First being an orthodox Sakya. Then saying Dzogchen was the highest. Then before e-sangha's parinirvana you suddenly had another U-turn and said you were wrong and "years of study and sitting on your meditation cushion (realizations?) had led you to believe that in fact Dzogchen was not above other systems and equivalent to the fourth Word empowerment". Then on this forum you had a fourth U-turn saying Dzogchen was the greatest above others in the Buddhist system. Now you are turning left saying you are not a buddhist and Garab Dorje was not a Buddhist and he is who matters to you not Padmasambhava as for Nyingmapas. But your lineage masters would say they got it from Padmasambhava's lineage who said he and Garab were Buddhists!

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't really say I was not a Buddhist, I said, actually that nominally I was a Buddhist meaning that other people will still consider me a Buddhist, but that I don't care about that label anymore, that I am not really feeling it. I find it is just a label that causes separation and limitations. So I don't need it anymore. You are welcome to it.

I never said Padmasambhava does not matter to me, but Garab Dorje is more important.

username said:

You tarred me with the same brush

Malcolm wrote:

I did not tar you with any brush -- I simply disagreed with a statement you made about Gaudapada.

username said:

If you look at most of my postings you will see I was supporting many of your positions and saying I have been at this position all along.

Malcolm wrote:

In the past, yes this is true,
Also as I said this is not the time to start a crusade

No one started a crusade.

username said:

As I said Buddhist is a label but so is Dzogchenpa which you have to concede. Also you quote me saying Buddhism is an illusory upaya, but so is nirvana and the bhumis and as I said the Dzogchen path is also an illusory upaya which you have to accept too. So same same, and better have the realization that peoples' various conditions have to be respected.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree with all of this.

username said:

The best way to cultivate it is by buddhist relative bodhicitta methods.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a standard sectarian Buddhist view. Oh well.

username said:

All the best Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks, and you too.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Malcolm,

You know for me being Buddhist has nothing to do with belief or intellectual ideas. It is a path. Since I received direct introduction from my Guru 20 years ago I have slowly come to the conclusion that the practices I been working so hard at before receiving direct introduction were actually perfectly designed to make you relax in the natural state.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, never said otherwise.

heart said:

So you can say that the direct introduction verified Buddhism as a valid path for me and also as a very perfect path.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, never said otherwise.

heart said:

When I applauded your now removed blogpost on the inability to separate Dzogchen and Buddhism, that you wrote in response to Jim Valby teaching "Dzogchen without Buddhism", it was of course a lack of openness on my part.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not write that as a reponse to Jim Valby, actually. I wrote that as a response to a title of a program. I removed the post temporarily, because I want to write a response to myself. I don't disagree with many things I said in that post, but I want to clarify somethings.

heart said:

You see I never had any other spiritual path or religion than Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Me either.

I wasn't baptized: me either

never took the first communion: me either

never felt interested i anything but old magic and anarchism: me too

heart said:

In general I must say that I know very little about spiritual paths compared with the people on this forum for example. I think that is a good thing I learned from this discussion, that one actually is limited in many ways. For this reason it is probably a bad idea to say that you have to be a Buddhist to attain full enlightenment, I certainly don't know that. But I am afraid I can't give up the label "Buddhist" because it is the path I am standing on, it is the methods I use, and its heart of wisdom is the Dzogchen Tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said anyone had to change anything. That is not the principle of Dzogchen. Buddhists do not have to change being Buddhist, Xtians do not have to change being Xtians, Hindus do not have to change being Hindus, etc. If they are interested enough to practice Dzogchen, all they have to do is receive introduction and apply the practice, but they don't have change a thing.

heart said:

Anyway Malcolm, you certainly know how to put the house on fire, it is your dramatic streak. Sorry if I come of as the small minded and limited person I am. So, in to the lions mouth with you Loppon Kunga Namdrol Malcolm Smith and may you only know happiness and go from clarity to clarity.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

My apparent "changes" sometimes take people by surprise, and as person born in a Tiger year, it is impossible for me to march to anyone else's drummer.

I never mean to be dramatic, but I guess some people take things I say as dramatic.

Anyway, I appreciate your reply.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:59 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Virgo said:

What does this discussion have to do with a mid-life crisis at all.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing of course. But because I decided once and for all to depart from the mask I have maintained for years as an orthodox Buddhist polemicist, people are understandably puzzled, critical, or disbelieving.

Once people have fixed you in their minds, if you do not satisfy their criteria of you, they generally become critical. For example, when I originally defended meat-eating on E-Sangha, some people supported that, others did not. When I went through a phase of having personal issues with eating meat, and discussed it, some people supported it, others did not. When I reversed my thinking about it once and for all, some of the people who supported me in my meat-critical phase were understandably puzzled at my reversal of perspective.

Now, some people do not like the fact that as far as I am concerned, "Buddhism" is just another limitation. They do not like the fact that I am not holding some sacred place for Buddhism over against non-Buddhist religions. They think that this is some sudden shift on my part. But had they really been paying attention to my posts over the years they would have noted my gradual evolution away from "Buddhism" per se.

They have not understood my basic point at all:...when you have received direct introduction, and are diligently applying the practice of Dzogchen, it does not matter at all what you believe while you are not practicing, it does not matter what your intellectual view is. Dzogchen view is not an intellectual posture, it is a personal experience of instant presence, and no amount of "correct" Buddhist thinking will lead you to that personal experience of your primordial state, and no amount of "incorrect" non-Buddhist thinking will prevent you from having that personal experience of your primordial state if you diligently apply the teaching in practice having received direct

introduction.

People seem not to realize that this is precisely what is stated in many Dzogchen tantras and upadeshas.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:31 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Buddhism is an illusory upaya...

Malcolm wrote:

Then all your sturm and drung and breast beating is rather unnecessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Some never fully abandon contradictory beliefs to Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

Including Buddhists as we can clearly see on this forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:59 AM

Title: Re: Consciousness & the Brain

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In Abhidharma yes, matter comes from mind. In Dzogchen, no. Matter comes from the non-recognition of the five lights.

The mind ultimately comes from the ignorance of non-recognition. The ignorance of non-recognition itself is predicated on a dispensible or relative latent awareness that exists at the time of the basis in the basis and is a function of the movement of vāyu or rlung in the basis, the movement that is responsible for the arising of the basis from the basis. When the display of the basis is recognized as being ones own display, that latent awareness becomes prajñā, when it does not, it becomes avidyā.

Consciousness is produced by the body, but it is not primarily located in the brain. It is located in the heart. Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

Bhusuku said:

I find the things you're writing about this topic very interesting and very useful, especially your(?) translations from the Khandro Nyinthig. But since I'm a slow learner and not that particularly bright, I'd like to ask if you can point me to any book where these things are discussed in greater detail?

Malcolm wrote:

Not in English. apart from Lipman's translation of the some of the same materials in the KN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:57 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

If you bother to read any of the traditional accounts D&G, you will find out that Dzogchen was met with total hostility from Indian Buddhists by and large. Malcom, I really appreciate your way to judge with open mind and intellectual autonomy the atrocities of tibetan feudal society and the big incongruencies you mentioned in various posts. I am serious.

But with the same open mind and intellectual autonomy you should recognize that traditional accounts are often quite far from reality, leaving a lot of incongruency without solutions, such as the indication that Garab dorje born in the second century BC and he transmitted also teaching to Padmasambhava at the same time, having more about 1000 years gap without solutions.

For this reason I take in consideration the positions of various modern western scholars who doubt the entire story you mention, because as it is impossible having Garab dorje contemporary of Padmasambhava as the traditional accounts report, it make sense doubting the indian or oddiyana origin of Dzogchen because of lack of historical evidence

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen definitely has an Indian/Oḍḍiyāna origin. Guhyagarbha proves it.

If you wish to refrain from judging whether seventeen tantras, etc., are native Tibetan compositions or not, I can understand this. There are certainly a lot of reasons to suspect that they are, or if they are actually translations then they are very free translations. factually speaking, no one has done enough work on the 17 tantra to know for sure. to identify layers of composition etc.

I can tell you from my research they are very homogenous, and seem to be composed by a single author or small group. Some sections read like translations from an Indic language, other sections read like straight up Tibetan. My guess honestly is that they are

mixture of both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Dronma said:

They freely consider themselves as Buddhists! [/b]

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, there are also many people in the DC who consider themselves Buddhists. I know this, obviously, since I used to be one of them.

There are people who consider themselves buddhists and christians, etc. No problem for me at all.

And there are a lot of people in teh DC who do not consider themselves Buddhist at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Sonam,

Tunhuang texts you mentioned are Dzog chen texts - very simple and elementar - who prove, if ever, that dzogchen had a chinese diffusion (Shri Simha origin was chinese as you probably know), but they do not prove that Dzog chen had an Indian diffusion at all.

Furthermore I am not claiming that dzog chen tantra as Kunjed Gyalpo is faulse, as Dzog Chen detractor loved to state. I am discussing here about another subject: that accoridng to Modern western independent scholar there is no evidence of the Dzog chen Indian diffusion

Malcolm wrote:

Shri Singha's nationality is quite debatable -- some people think he was Indo-chinese, other's think he was from central asia. The texts are not very clear. In any event, what is clear is that he met Vimalamitra in India, as well as Vairocana.

As far as your contention above, then you have a hard time explaining Dzogchen in the Guhyagarbha which is a text of proven Indian provenance.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:32 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Dronma said:

They consider themselves as Buddhists also.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no they don't. I can introduce you to many people I know very well in the DC who just do not think of themselves as Buddhist, and if you ask them, they will deny they are Buddhists. If you tell them are taking refuge in Buddha, Dharma and Sangha, they will say, no, I am taking refuge in the Guru, deva and dakini.

Trust me, for years I told all these people they were Buddhists even if they did not care to label themselves such. Then I understood, and now I accept their point of view. Also I don't feel that need anymore to belong to the religion called "buddhism". And I am pretty expert in "Buddhism", ask anyone -- that is why I have an Acarya degree from the Sakya school, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Yes...which is why ChNN encourages his Christian students to continue to go to church if they like. I know one member of the DC who is really into the Dzogchen teachings, was a member of the Tsegyalgar Gakyil a couple of years ago, and who is presently studying in a Baptist seminary in Kentucky. His facebook page combines Dzogchen symbols like A, Aom, and Hūṃ with Jesus and the Apostles.

Despite the fact you seem enthusiastic in presenting this nice melt pot Christian-Dzogchen as a step forward in Dzogchen free diffusion in the global village, it would be interesting to understand how this guy can at the same time follow dzog chen view, where there is no God to pray and the only ultimate refuge is your own nature of mind (as explained in Lonchen Nyntig as for the ultimate Gururyoga), with the teistic Christian approach when you can be saved only because of the grace of Jesus and you have to pray him as a god in order to be saved.

These are 2 tawas very difficult to practice at the same time.....

Malcolm wrote:

As ChNN says, if you regard god a symbol of your primordial potentiality, then there is no problem. In any event, you can just keep assuming that your point of view is right until you decide differently. For example, last night I had a discussion with an SMS teacher, and he felt there was no problem at all in including Jesus in your refuge tree.

I used to be like you, a True Buddhist(tm) member of Dzogchen Community and always

had (minor) arguments with people who did share your (and my former) POV. I gave it up because my former view (your present view) and Rinpoches teachings on these issues do not correspond. There are very few people I know in the community that have your POV. But it is ok, I respect it even if I don't agree with it for many reasons, not least of which is that I read Tibetan fluently and have access to the originals.

But I did not give up my former POV based on ChNN's say so. I gave it up because I personally understood that all this stuff which is so important to you, dronma, magnus, adamantine, greg and kalsang yungdrung was completely extraneous to the teachings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

[

" Buddhist ostility was the cause of Dzog chen desappearing in India" as if it were matter of fact, as you do.

Malcolm wrote:

If you bother to read any of the traditional accounts D&G, you will find out that Dzogchen was met with total hostility from Indian Buddhists by and large.

When Vimalamitra left for Tibet, he brought the sole copy of Nyingthig cycle with him, as well as the remaining texts of sems sde and klong sde.

rdzogs pa chen po, incidentally, in the language of Oḍḍiyāna is santimahā, not mahāsandhi (Sanskrit).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Consciousness & the Brain

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

jeeprs said:

And vice versa?

Malcolm wrote:

You can draw that inference if you like. It is controversial from a Buddhist standpoint, but not from a Dzogchen standpoint.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Paul said:

Hi Malcolm - thanks for posting all that.

Most of that, especially sections like this:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, to begin with, the body is formed by ignorance of the wisdom of basis. The nature of wisdom in that body is the refined part of the five elements, present in the material bindu as the play of the kāyas and wisdoms. Since their luminous radiance arose as light, it is given the name "three wisdoms".

Paul said:

seems to be linked to the theory and practice of togal. Is it of any direct relevance to the practice of trekcho?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it explains how one's impure vision evolved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Male and female

Content:

justsit said:

A woman is born with all the eggs she will ever have, 1-2 million. Only one to maybe 9-10 eggs max are available during each monthly cycle, contrasted with billions of sperm per ejaculation. At fertilization, one egg is fertilized by one sperm. How does "profuse" apply here to determine sex?

Malcolm wrote:

It basically has to do with how the quantity of female sexual fluids during the time of arousal, or amount of ejaculate. This is how I understand it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes I see that now. You are right. I'm sorry I doubted what you said.

Malcolm wrote:

It makes our job as Dzogchen practitioners a lot easier. Of course if it is useful, we can study anything. But after a certain point, spending time on becoming expert in Madhyamaka, or Mahyoga, etc., is kind of a waste of time unless you are going to be a teacher. Even then, maybe not so useful. This is why I abandoned my sutra studies for Medicine. Medicine is useful, Dogchen is useful -- the rest of it is not so useful. Someday the Dzogchen tantras and texts like Khandro Nyingthig will be available and people will be able to focus on Dzogchen teachings alone.

Also, the above is just an indication, it is not enough for practice. You need to find a qualified teacher to practice the above. Fortunately, klong sde is sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Wow thanks Malcolm!

Paul - many thanks too!

Malcolm wrote:

As I said to understand Dzogchen all you need to understand is the five elements, and to cut grasping to solidity, the examples of illusion, how else do you think illiterate cowherds can attain rainbow body -- of course at a certain point their prajñā flowers and they understand everything without need to study.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Adamantine said:

Statements like this prove to me you have really missed my point.

Malcolm wrote:

So maybe express your point more clearly. [/quote]

I expressed it pretty clearly, but people keep on coming with whatifs and maybes.

My point was only this -- anyone at all can practice Dzogchen a) without abandoning their previous faith b) without converting to Buddhism.

Adamantine said:

I don't think he means that, but is that what you are saying?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes...which is why ChNN encourages his Christian students to continue to go to church if they like. I know one member of the DC who is really into the Dzogchen teachings, was a member of the Tsegylgar Gakyil a couple of years ago, and who is presently studying in a Baptist seminary in Kentucky. His facebook page combines Dzogchen symbols like A, Aom, and Hūṃ with Jesus and the Apostles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Malcolm, is this the Kunnu Lama you were talking about?

[http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Khunu_Lama_Tenzin_Gyaltsen "](http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Khunu_Lama_Tenzin_Gyaltsen)
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

AilurusFulgens said:

May I ask, what is the reference for the statement that Kunnu Lama met sadhus in Varanasi in the 1930s, who were Cakrasamvara practitioners. I am very interested in this. In which text was this mentioned?

Malcolm wrote:

Oral communication to me by one of his western students.

AilurusFulgens said:

Do you think that these traditions still exist today? I mean unbroken, native Indian lineages of Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

AilurusFulgens said:

Btw, I read the excellent article about Buddhaguptanatha written by Templeman and would concur with your view that the situation concerning the destruction of Vajrayana in India is much more complex than it appears to be.

It would be interesting to see the true extent of the connections between the Nathas and Vajrayana - apart from the token "Gorakshanatha is one of the 84 Mahasiddhas".

Malcolm wrote:

And the fact that the 80 Siddhas are mentioned as part of the Nath lineage.

AilurusFulgens said:

Is there any indication that the Nathas might have practiced Dzogchen teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no idea. But Nathas used to visit Tibet a lot and it is possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The elements form from the non-recognition of the five lights of connected with the five wisdoms.

Andrew108 said:

This is particularly hard to grasp since the elements described here seem to be co-emergent with individual ignorance. Or is it more that the elements are 'held in place' as a conceptual form rather than how they are originally constructed? Is it possible to elaborate on this? How would the element of water form from the non-recognition of the five lights? Hope you can help.

Malcolm wrote:

The Khandro Nyinthig states:

Since that mind arose as automatic manifestation of six mental apprehenders, the five elements are produced. Since those are not recognized as the five wisdoms, the five elements assemble in dependence upon grasping those [five wisdoms]. Since those assemble, the body forms through the action of one [element] assisting the other. With that forms the apprehended and the apprehender.

And: As such, that basis, the natural reality of things, the great intrinsic energy of wisdom, the dharmakāya, was not recognized, and because of the stains of grasping to it, the elements assemble; the body forms from them, and based on that [body], one wanders in samsara until one ages and dies.

And: Since the five energies of wisdom are unceasing, the body forms from the five elements. Since two kāyas are integrated with the relative elements, that previous understanding of the intrinsic energy of wisdom is totally forgotten. The ultimate four elements is the dharmakāya, the relative four elements is the sambogakāya.

Nirmanakāya is the lack of sameness and difference of the two kāyas.

And: To sum it all up, ignorant attachment to dualistic appearances assembles the energy of wisdom into the elements, and forms the body in actuality.

And: Energy is produced unceasingly from that wisdom. Since that energy was not recognized, that apparent and natureless radiant luminosity of wisdom arose as the empty luminosity of the five lights. [430] Within that, since this thinker of thoughts

grasps the unceasing energy of wisdom, and since that five colored energy is assembled as the elements, therefore, the body, flesh, blood, warmth, breath, channels and so on are formed from that energy of wisdom. For as long as the mind and the body do not separate, the channels, vāyus, bindus, wisdoms and so on are inseparable. Since that is not recognized as such and the one is grasped as many, like the nameless becoming named, since the five wisdoms, the five afflictions, and so on are divisions in one thing, also those wishing for Buddhahood have aggregates, without contacting the meaning of this even slightly. With this everything is recognized as coming from the energy of wisdom. Since inseparability is recognized, therefore the defiled also comes from the energy of wisdom. Also that self-liberated from the mind, and as the defiled does not appear, Buddhahood is attained in the expanse of wisdom. Therefore, it is inseparable. Others hold them as different, and respond with practice.

And:... after the body formed because the energy of initial vidyā was not recognized as wisdom, there is delusion because of the grasping of materiality, and wandering in samsara.

And: The relative material bindu is the intrinsic radiance of those five wisdoms of the originally pure dharmadhātu externally manifesting as five lights, after which, the elements are produced upon the mere traces of grasping of the mind. Further, the natural reality of that mind (that established in anyway) is space. Whether that is like this or not, the energy of that vivid luminosity arising as the diversity, that is called “vāyu”, it is called “mind”. Though luminosity is called mind, because of movement, it is called “vāyu”. When examined, it is not established in anyway. Also luminosity is not established, also movement is not established, also inseparability is not established.

Since that is not recognized, since that energy that grasps so called “vāyu” produces heat, there is fire. For example, just as when sweat and heat is produced when a person does hard work, [fire] is produced from that grasping onto heat. When the heat of fire touches the ground, water is produced in the form of vapor. Since grasping onto that energy of wisdom arose, the outer five elements are produced, caused one by one. The five elements form matter. Since grasping onto that arose, the five elements assemble, and the body forms through the condition of the five refined parts of those [elements], one by one.

If it is asked why, now then to begin with, the energy of wisdom is vāyu, from that is heat; from that, earth; from that, water: since each assists another, the body develops more i.e. the body actually forms out of the refined part of the five elements. That [body] is pervaded by the refined part of the five elements. The refined parts and that energy of wisdom are given the name “channels, vāyus, and bindu”. The energy of wisdom is the five elements. Since wisdom is present in them, there are five wisdoms. That is given the name material bindu. Wisdom is inseparably present within that material bindu.

And: Further, to begin with, the body is formed by ignorance of the wisdom of basis. The nature of wisdom in that body is the refined part of the five elements, present in the material bindu as the play of the kāyas and wisdoms. Since their luminous radiance arose as light, it is given the name “three wisdoms”.

And: Though the body is formed from ignorance of the basis, as soon as that is recognized, it is not beyond wisdom in the beginning, the end and in the middle.

Etc. this text just goes on and on in the same vein.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

muni said:

The old kadampa from Lama Atisha, respected by the Nyingmapa is not the new kadampa from Je Tsongkapa, which came later.

Malcolm wrote:

The main opponents of Dzogchen in the tenth century in Tibet were the Kadampas, hence Rongzom's Theg chen tshul 'jug, Introduction to Mahāyāna Principles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

it is uncorrect under many POVs proposing the reduction that dzogchen disappeared from India because of Buddhist hostility.

Well Malcom but you did not answer to the main point above

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, thought you knew your Dzogchen history better. There was only one copy of the Dzogchen tantras, according to the traditional accounts and it existed at Nalanda. When the Nalanda panditas, hostile to Dzogchen already (they didn't very much like all this talk about a result without a cause, a buddhahood that does not come from mind, and an upadesha that is not based on citations), heard that Vimala had been invited to Tibet, they dispatched with him the last remaining copies of the Dzogchen tantras in India and Dzogchen vanished forever from the Indian Subcontinent thenceforth. So it is absolutely correct to observe that Dzogchen disappeared from India due to Buddhist hostility against Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

The answer is that due to Buddhist hostility against Dzogchen teachings, Dzogchen completely died out in India. It was preserved in Tibet by Tibetans.

Malcom, As matter of fact not only Dzogchen disappeared from India, but all Buddhism in general, Vajrayana included, due to the Muslims' activity.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna survived in India until at least the 16th century, as witnessed by the fact that one of Taranatha's most important gurus was Nath sadhu by the name of Buddhaguptanatha, from whom Taranatha received the Tarayogini tantra and transmissions, which had not been brought to Tibet prior to this time. There are another Nath, by the name of Vajranatha, who in the 15th century taught Drikung Rinchen Phunstok as well as Khyentse Wangchuck an important collection of teachings which continues in both Sakya and Drikung. The demise of Vajrayāna in India is greatly overstated. In fact Kunnu Lama recounts meeting sadhus who were Cakrasamvara practitioners in the 1930s when he was in Varanasi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

That Bonpos "don't feel" them not Buddhist, that is more a word game in so far Bon has a Buddha inside their Lineage.

But we have Chos Pas and Bon Pos and not Buddhists inside Tibet, remarkable.

Also misunderstood for non-Bonpos, that the Buddha Shakyamuni was a student from the Bon Buddha, so he is known in Bon by name.

So Bon can sure be called Buddhist in that sense but is spoken different, for some reasons.

Malcolm wrote:

And up until the HHDL accepted Bon as a "fifth school" of Tibetan Buddhism, most so called chos pa would not accept bonpos as "nang pas" i.e. insiders. You just read Dudjom Rinpoche's highly critical remarks about Bon in his History of the Nyingma School

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Adamantine said:

I just think anyone who wants to practice Dzogchen is inevitably practicing the Buddhadharma. . .

Malcolm wrote:

There are just as many concepts in Dzogchen that absolutely contradict accepted Buddhist ideas.

Adamantine said:

Do you agree with him now?

Malcolm wrote:

Why would I agree with that? Statements like this prove to me you have really missed my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Mariusz said:

To have faith for example in no bardo state after death at all, and practice rushen according to it, is the experiment. I don't like further to write on rushen because I'm not allowed.

Malcolm wrote:

I understand your position now -- you have to accept Buddhist teachings otherwise you are not suitable candidate for Dzogchen -- is that about right? Otherwise you are "experimenting", which is a bad thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

No, I wasn't asking about ethnicity.. I was asking about Buddhist background. .You cry murder when you feel someone else twists your words but like to freely do it yourself.

Josef said:

Why does it matter?

On this planet at least we can probably say that there are none without the Bon or Buddhist background yet.

But again, why does this matter?

Malcolm wrote:

It matters because for them Dzogchen is "Buddhist", with a charitable shout out to the recently validated "Buddhist" Bonpos.

And you have a good point, there are also thirteen other world systems where Dzogchen is taught. I don't think you will find a Buddhist or Bonpo sangha in any of them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Yeah, who are the great Dzogchen masters in the last few centuries that didn't have a Buddhist or Buddhist-colored Bon background?

Malcolm wrote:

First, I thought you were referring to those with monastic educations from the way you framed your question --my error.

The question is who in the past 1000 years has been a great Dzogchen master who was not Tibetan. The answer is that due to Buddhist hostility against Dzogchen teachings, Dzogchen completely died out in India. It was preserved in Tibet by Tibetans. So only Tibetans have been great Dzogchen masters for many centuries.

That will now change.

Adamantine said:

No, I wasn't asking about ethnicity.. I was asking about Buddhist background. .You cry murder when you feel someone else twists your words but like to freely do it yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

The Bonpos don't feel influenced by Buddhism so, unless you are gainsaying them, there have been many great Bonpo Dzogchen masters since the 10th century, beginning with Shenchen Luga. You may wish to insist they are Buddhist, but I remember when we shut down the Bon forum because on E-Sangha because Kalsang Yundrung refused to admit he took refuge in Sakyamuni Buddha as a Bonpo. We decided that E-Sangha was for Buddhists, and Bonpos were not included under that rubric. Bonpos sure don't feel Buddhist. Try telling Loppon Tenzin Namdag he is a Buddhist and see how far you get.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Mariusz said:

I'm not so brave to experiment with other yet incompatible supports like other religions/atheism. So I'd like the quickest

Malcolm wrote:

Yet another misconception -- no one has suggested experimenting with other religions.

To reiterate, people may, if they are interested, learn and practice Dzogchen without

converting to Buddhism or abandoning their previous faiths. What is so difficult to understand about this statement?

I have nowhere said that anyone should feel compelled to rush out and become a Hari Krishna. I have basically said that a Dzogchen practitioner should feel free to go anywhere and study anything they feel will be useful for their personal path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Yeah, who are the great Dzogchen masters in the last few centuries that didn't have a Buddhist or Buddhist-colored Bon background?

Malcolm wrote:

First, I thought you were referring to those with monastic educations from the way you framed your question --my error.

The question is who in the past 1000 years has been a great Dzogchen master who was not Tibetan. The answer is that due to Buddhist hostility against Dzogchen teachings, Dzogchen completely died out in India. It was preserved in Tibet by Tibetans. So only Tibetans have been great Dzogchen masters for many centuries.

That will now change.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Male and female

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If semen is more profuse, it will be a boy. If the ovum is more profuse then it will be a girl. If both are in equal portion, then the child will be homosexual or intersexed.

M

justsit said:

Do you mean profuse as in absolute numbers?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in terms of quantity.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
Isn't it interesting that such a vastly realized Dzogchenpa could emerge from such a corrupt system such as Tibetan Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:
Lotuses grow in mud.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
So where is there an example of a great master of Dzogchen in the last 1000 years who didn't have this background?

Malcolm wrote:
Are you serious?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
So whose personal experience of the bardos and the purelands are we talking about, -- which practitioners exactly?

Malcolm wrote:
Since you don't know the answers to these questions I suggest you ask your teacher.

M

Adamantine said:
I wouldn't ask my teacher about your claims.. I am asking you.

Malcolm wrote:
One can understand the experience of the bardo of dharmatā and the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels experientially in this life, you don't have to wait. If you want to understand this experientially, ask your teacher. I am not your teacher, so don't ask me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Timeless awareness" is a translator's gloss of the term ye shes. You cannot understand Dzogchen without understand the terms and a bit of tibetan grammer. These are the various ways this term has been translated:

ye shes - jnana, (exalted, primordial) wisdom, (primal, transcending, original, unitary, authentic, pure, absolute, a priori, genuine, spiritual, ever-fresh, pristine) awareness, wakefulness, pristine cognition, mystic illumination, gnosis, understanding by peak experience, (intuitive, transcending, comprehensive, true) knowledge, SA mched pa'i ye shes, mnyam nyid ye shes, me long ye shes, chos dbyings ye shes, bya sgrub ye shes, sor rtog ye shes, perfect absolute divine wisdom, pristine wisdom, primordial awareness, timeless awareness

Since the brain is made of five elements, it too is made of the five wisdoms (ye shes) of vidyā. Therefore, there is no problem with awareness, etc., having a basis in the body. Actually, what we say in Dzogchen is that the wisdom of vidyā is located in the heart, the energy of vidyā is located in the brain, where it governs sense organs and cognitions.

M

Andrew108 said:

Thanks Malcolm very useful. I understand the 'ever-fresh' aspect to it in the sense that it's so fresh that it seems unborn, but in what way can ye she be said to come into existence? I mean if ye shes is indeterminate or ever-fresh then in what sense are the elements 'formed'? What accounts for perceived 'duration' of the elements'?

Malcolm wrote:

Ye nas means "has always been...", it contrasts another grammatical phrase rtag tu i.e. "...will always be".

Wisdom has no origin, it formed naturally. Hence the metaphor of the peacock feather.

The elements form from the non-recognition of of the five lights of connected with the five wisdoms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

You keep talking about that, "personal experience" at the same time you keep talking about the realization of Dzogchen practice not being fully accomplished until the bardo, or some time in purelands, for the majority of practitioners.

So whose personal experience are we referring to here?

Malcolm wrote:

The practitioners, of course.

Adamantine said:

So whose personal experience of the bardos and the purelands are we talking about, -- which practitioners exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

Since you don't know the answers to these questions I suggest you ask your teacher.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Anders said:

What does that make Longchenpa? Was he just being a Buddhist apologist when he wrote the Great Chariot?

No small amount of hubris in some of the statements being made here.

Sönam said:

Sorry, I am not able to set a relation between what I've said and what you answer.

Longchenpa, like all we are had his own culture, but why would he be an apologist? You mean Longchenpa was all along on the institution side?

Sorry, develop please

Sönam

Anders said:

I mean Longchenpa wrote extensively on the integration of Dzogchen into a graduated 9-yana scheme, in works such as the Great Chariot. To reduce all this to no more than the political pressure of Buddhist institutions that we can now do away with as an artefact of history reads to my mind like saying that works like the Great Chariot are in fact no more than apologetic propaganda for 'the institution'.

Malcolm wrote:

The Great Chariot was written pretty early Longchenpa's career. As such it presents the standard tantra, agama, upadesha approach to Dzogchen made famous at Kathog monastery combined with the so called kadampa style bstan rim (stages of the teachings). He was educated at the Kadampa University, Sangphu.

Other texts such as the yod bzhin mdzod and the grub mtha' mdzod are mainly polemical defenses of Dzogchen trying to site it within the nine yānas scheme.

Texts such as the tshig don mdzod, chos dbyings mdzod, theg mchog mdzod, and the gnas lugs mdzod however present Dzogchen itself in and of itself, as an independent vehicle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

You keep talking about that, "personal experience" at the same time you keep talking about the realization of Dzogchen practice not being fully accomplished until the bardo, or some time in purelands, for the majority of practitioners.

So whose personal experience are we referring to here?

Malcolm wrote:

The practitioners, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Still don't agree with that Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you need to reread your history of Dzogchen in India and in Tibet. I think you missed some chapters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Dzogchen is no longer presented as the apex of years of practice of other yanas. The practitioner starts with Dzogchen practice and ends with Dzogchen practice.

heart said:

While you are doing the list on corrupt Lama's could you please make a list of Lama's that teach Dzogchen in this way? I never met even one.

/magnus

Sherlock said:

Namkhai Norbu and KDL. Probably a few others too, I think

<http://youngedrodulling.org/2012retreat.shtml> is doing that as well for one.

Malcolm wrote:

FAIK, only ChNN and KDL. Not Khachab.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

The only thing I didn't like was his idea that Dzogchen in reality was foreign to both Buddhism and Bon. This I don't agree on.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, what I said was that the primary hostility aimed at Dzogchen has always come from Buddhists. I said that the Bonpoas were never hostile to Dzogchen. They incorporated it in everything, even their "abidharma".

Funny, you are the first person ever to call me "dramatic".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Malcolm and Dechen and everyone else that feel that Tibetan Buddhism is just a about money, power and sex. Please, in the interest of all can you list all corrupt teachers that you know about and what they have done? I think it is quite important to be open about these things and even the Dalai Lama have said that if one is sure about a Lama being corrupt one should call the newspapers (or something like that). I find it very difficult to respond to these allegations when I have no idea what you are talking about or what

your personal experience is. My personal experience with Dharma been a mixed bag but I don't know any Lama that I could call corrupt, but I might be very gullible or just lucky.

/magnus

Adamantine said:

I would appreciate this list too.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no point in trotting out a laundry list. It does not change anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When one has eliminated the traces of affliction and action in one's own five elements ones body reverts to its original state as five lights, hence "The body of light".

Andrew108 said:

Malcom - could you talk about 'timeless awareness'. I see the term in translations so often. For me the term is key because it seems to point to an awareness that is not temporal or brain-based (if we accept the commonly held view that the brain is key to temporality). Can you comment on this? Isn't time and experience mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

"Timeless awareness" is a translator's gloss of the term ye shes. You cannot understand Dzogchen without understand the terms and a bit of tibetan grammer. These are the various ways this term has been translated:

ye shes - jnana, (exalted, primordial) wisdom, (primal, transcending, original, unitary, authentic, pure, absolute, a priori, genuine, spiritual, ever-fresh, pristine) awareness, wakefulness, pristine cognition, mystic illumination, gnosis, understanding by peak experience, (intuitive, transcending, comprehensive, true) knowledge, SA mched pa'i ye shes, mnyam nyid ye shes, me long ye shes, chos dbyings ye shes, bya sgrub ye shes, sor rtog ye shes, perfect absolute divine wisdom, pristine wisdom, primordial awareness, timeless awareness

Since the brain is made of five elements, it too is made of the five wisdoms (ye shes) of vidyā. Therefore, there is no problem with awareness, etc., having a basis in the body. Actually, what we say in Dzogchen is that the wisdom of vidyā is located in the heart, the energy of vidyā is located in the brain, where it governs sense organs and cognitions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Nyala Rinpoche Rigdzin Changchub Dorje

Content:

Sherlock said:

His disciples probably, like ChNN. Actually I think it's unclear if he was really illiterate or just unschooled in all the classical literature. I hope the Communists only destroyed his discs and the texts are still somewhere.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has a complete collection of all surviving manuscripts that made it through cultural revolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Male and female

Content:

Virgo said:

Is there Buddhist and/or medical reasons why children are born either male or female? What causes birth as a particular sex? Are people always born as one or the other successively over lifetimes or does it change?

Thanks for any responses.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

There are reasons connected with karma and with biology. Tibetan Medicine emphasizes the biological aspect more. If semen is more profuse, it will be a boy. If the ovum is more profuse then it will be a girl. If both are in equal portion, then the child will be homosexual or intersexed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Consciousness & the Brain

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

[

You are believing in a different metaphysical system, that's all. There's nothing factual

about it. Those materialist claims about the brain creating consciousness are nothing but fallacious metaphysical extrapolations. Question that also, for goodness sake, especially because they contradict your own experience! Don't swallow hook, line and sinker.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness is produced by the body, but it is not primarily located in the brain. It is located in the heart. Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

Sherlock said:

So the vayus are technically "matter"?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are composed of the element of air (vāyu).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Clarence said:

So, one uses Thogal to bring the 5 elements back to the 5 lights?

Malcolm wrote:

When one has eliminated the traces of affliction and action in one's own five elements one's body reverts to its original state as five lights, hence "The body of light".

Clarence said:

And one uses Thogal to accomplish that?

Malcolm wrote:

or klong sde, or yang ti, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

No, I was not aware of this. That's very interesting. I take it you mean the first Ju Mipham left the letter? Where can one find a reference for this? Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

I think if you read any detailed bio of Mipham you can discover this fact. I forgot where I

read this, but it was in an academic work.

Perhaps in Kapstein. In any event, as far as I am concerned there are no tulkus of Mipham who are in reality reincarnations of Mipham.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Consciousness & the Brain

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

[

You are believing in a different metaphysical system, that's all. There's nothing factual about it. Those materialist claims about the brain creating consciousness are nothing but fallacious metaphysical extrapolations. Question that also, for goodness sake, especially because they contradict your own experience! Don't swallow hook, line and sinker.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness is produced by the body, but it is not primarily located in the brain. It is located in the heart. Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

...but other are incompatible for complete realization of Dzogchen including the 4 visions.

Malcolm wrote:

Right. I understand how you feel. I just don't happen to agree with you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Clarence said:

So, one uses Thogal to bring the 5 elements back to the 5 lights?

Malcolm wrote:

When one has eliminated the traces of affliction and action in one's own five elements one's body reverts to its original state as five lights, hence "The body of light".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I have no problem with this except that I personally feel incapable to, among the huge amount of worldly Dharma systems that exist, even guess which are of short term or long term benefit. I certainly can't say if any of them will eventually lead to liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

All of them are Samantabhadra's vehicles.

heart said:

Of course, at this point you are debating with ChNNs statement. But I will endeavor to set out what I take away from it. People have generated traditions around Dzogchen. Those traditions are secondary. The rig pa'i rtsal dbang is much misunderstood. It is not a ritual, though it can be packaged in one. The rig pa'i rtsal dbang is direct introduction. Dzogchen transmission depends solely on direct introduction. Direct introduction can be given in myriad ways, there is no set tradition. Which of these interpretation of "tradition" do you think ChNNR intend? Because certainly some of these above does corresponds pretty good with both Dzogchen and Dzogchen Community.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is not Dzogchen, just like the thun book is not Dzogchen practice.

heart said:

No matter how direct introduction is achieved, it certainly can happen in many different ways, ChNNR himself have regularly been given three special transmissions every year according to a preset and that can, at least to a certain degree be called a ritual.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a rite that goes with the WW transmission days. But direct introduction is not restricted to that and does not depend on that.

heart said:

The Dzogchen tantras themselves maintain that no distinction is made in Dzogchen between those of higher capacity and lower capacity, good karmic accumulations or negative.

Well, Jigme Lingpa certainly do that distinction in the Yeshe Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer to follow what Dzogchen tantras say. Tri Yeshe Lama is important, but it is not the end all be all of Dzogchen.

heart said:

Quite literally there are differences between the paths of renunciation (yānas 1-3), transformation (4-8), and self-liberation (ati).

As I have pointed out endlessly, there is a difference between Hināyāna and Mahāyāna, for example. Important differences in vows, conduct, practice, methods, etc. What is permissible in one is not permissible in the other. This also applies to Vajrayāna - what is permissible in Vajrayāna is not permissible in Mahāyāna. In Dzogchen there are no rules.

That things are different don't mean that they are incompatible or in any kind of conflict.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen practitioners can and should eat meat. Mahāyanists should never eat meat. If you want to wish away the various contradictions that exist in the three or nine yānas, which are demonstrated in tantras such as kun byed rgyal po to be mistakes and deviations, feel free.

heart said:

Sakyamuni did not teach Dzogchen so far as anyone knows -- there is no record of it in the original tantras of Dzogchen.

Except that he, for example in the Vima Nyingthik, is counted among the twelve Dzogchen Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as has been pointed out endlessly, the reason for this is not that he taught Dzogchen, but because he predicted Garab Dorje. Also, the source of the twelve teachers is sgra thal gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Because the sympathy for the Teachings of the Buddha one is called a Buddhist and not anymore a Muslim etc.

Mariusz said:

I agree with this approach. Having it no any intolerance and bias is needed. Also no any need for the new theory of "universal Dzogchen for every religion" or something fancy the same.

Malcolm wrote:

Not Dzogchen for every religion -- Dzogchen for every person regardless of religion.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Paul said:

I really recommend reading through all of Malcolm's posts on this issue to clarify things.

asunthatneversets said:

I do too but I'm not sure if a materialist view is being propagated. I don't discount the fact that gross physicality is unbelievably compelling and seems 100% real but investigate this belief. The body in a dream can also seem very real and subject to compelling experiences.

Malcolm wrote:

The five elements form out of the five light of the wisdom of rigpa under the influence of ignorance. Everything is made out of the five elements. The division between sentient and non-sentient appears, but do not believe in it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

You really think Christians, Jews, Muslims, Jains, Rastafarians, Atheists, Agnostics, Scientific Materialists, Nihilists in general.. you think they can all easily accept and participate in Dzogchen teachings and practice when a big part of it is regarding Bardos and Buddhafields? And you believe that these teachings are not Buddhist?

Who is going to spend all of their time practicing something that most likely they will never see the biggest benefit from until after they die, in the "bardo" or "pureland", when they don't believe in bardos or purelands?

Malcolm wrote:

Since Dzogchen is based on personal experience, anyone can practice if they are interested, no matter what they believe. If they are not interested, what can we do? But if they are interested, they do not need to be converted to Buddhism in order to benefit from Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 7:30 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Let's take another example: the 17th Karmapa Thaye Trinley Dorje is a tulku, recognised by tulkus, whose father is a tulku (the third Ju Mipham)

Malcolm wrote:

This is a littel off topic -- but you do realize that Mipham left a letter expressly stating that he was not coming back as a tulku at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Chandrakirti, Prasanapada

[Valid cognitions and valid objects] are established through mutual dependence . When valid cognitions exist, then there are things that are objects of comprehension. When there are things that are objects of comprehension then they are valid cognitions. However neither valid cognitions nor objects of comprehension exist essentially

Malcolm wrote:

The point the Vigravahavyavartani makes is that they cannot be mutually established. If a pramāṇā is a pramāṇa, it does not need a prameya; and vice versa.

M

cloudburst said:

As always, one must examine the discussion in its own context. This point made by the Vigravahavyavartani is directed at Nyayika logicians who are attempting to show that an independent pramana, which had already been shown by Nagarjuna to be in impossibility, is mutually established with it's independent object. Nagarjuna shoots down this move and explains that these two cannot be mutually established since establishing something that is already established would make no sense.

As the quotation from Chandrakirti demonstrates, neither valid cognitions nor objects of comprehension exist independently, but they are established in mutual dependence.

Therefore your point

Malcolm wrote:

Then you must admit that valid objects exist. Then you must explain their existence. This can only be done if you accept independent existence.

cloudburst said:
is refuted and done.

Malcolm wrote:
What you fail to recognize is that there was no system of Buddhist pramāṇa at this time. Bhavaviveka's interest in syllogism is post-Dignaga etc.

Since there can be no ultimately established prameya, there can be no ultimately established pramāṇa, and if you argue they established mutually, they are relative and therefore, not ultimate.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 9:56 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Andrew108 said:

...but Dzogchen in my opinion is impossible to value fully if 1. you haven't built a Buddhist identity and had Dzogchen deconstruct it and 2. you haven't at least understood the implications of absence of self.

Malcolm wrote:
I respect your opinion, but I differ because this is not how it is taught in the original Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 9:50 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

heart said:
So you actually consider Dzogchen Dharma? Does Dharma include any other parts of Buddhism for you?

Malcolm wrote:
Dharma includes all nine yānas. To the extent that so called "Buddhists" and "non-Buddhists" comport with one or another of these yānas, they are Dharma practitioners. To the extent they do not, they are not. "Buddhism" is a label. Dharma is a practice. One is a category, one is a function. You can call yourself a "buddhist" and not practice Dharma -- there are many people like this. You can not call yourself a "buddhist" and be a Dharma practitioner, there are also many people like this. You can call yourself a "buddhist" and be a Dharma practitioner, there are also many people like this.

There are many Dharmas out there for many different people. Some of those Dharmas do not fit in the category of "Buddhism" i.e. the Dharma directly taught by the Buddha, but because they lead people to better rebirths, result in happiness in this life, and so on -- these systems are considered Dharma and if people practice according to them, eventually they will achieve total liberation. Even though these so called tirthika systems are couched on a metaphysical language of unacceptable to Buddhists, and so on, even here it is possible that people can have profound experiences. This is obvious because they report it to be so.

heart said:

Isn't it true that there is a rather large set of teachings of Dzogchen that do have a tradition? This tradition seems to have been rather private, meaning closed doors (even a guard)? There is even one tradition of the "nyengyu" that is only from one person to one other. There is a tradition of transmitting the text i.e. given "lung" of the texts you give teaching on. There is a tradition of giving "rigpai tsal wang" to the student. So what exactly do you mean with no tradition here when talking about Dzogchen as a teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, at this point you are debating with ChNNs statement. But I will endeavor to set out what I take away from it. People have generated traditions around Dzogchen. Those traditions are secondary. The rig pa'i rtsal dbang is much misunderstood. It is not a ritual, though it can be packaged in one. The rig pa'i rtsal dbang is direct introduction. Dzogchen transmission depends solely on direct introduction. Direct introduction can be given in myriad ways, there is no set tradition.

heart said:

I agree on this but I fail to see any serious conflict. Various ways of presenting the teaching dependent on the persons listening exist also in Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen tantras themselves maintain that no distinction is made in Dzogchen between those of higher capacity and lower capacity, good karmic accumulations or negative.

heart said:

Teachings are a coherent way to present the Dharma so that it will benefit the persons listening. This however can happen at many different levels at the same time. This is because of the superior qualities of Dharma. I for example often feel that no matter on what level my Guru teach I hear Dzogchen. In this way I don't, in a very direct way, feel any conflict between Dzogchen and sutra/tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite literally there are differences between the paths of renunciation (yānas 1-3), transformation (4-8), and self-liberation (ati).

As I have pointed out endlessly, there is a difference between Hināyāna and Mahāyāna,

for example. Important differences in vows, conduct, practice, methods, etc. What is permissible in one is not permissible in the other. This also applies to Vajrayāna - what is permissible in Vajrayāna is not permissible in Mahāyāna. In Dzogchen there are no rules.

heart said:

For this reason I also feel that it is quite possible that Shakyamuni was a Dzogchen teacher even if a lineage of these teachings don't remain today.

Malcolm wrote:

Sakyamuni did not teach Dzogchen so far as anyone knows -- there is no record of it in the original tantras of Dzogchen.

heart said:

From a Dzogchen point of view for sure Shakyamuni's realization can't have been that different from for example Garab Dorje because then it would not have been enlightenment, it would have been something completely different.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Not all nirmanakāya buddhas teach Vajrayāna, let alone Dzogchen. Not all buddhas teach a Vinaya and establish a monastic Sangha (such as Sikkhins). Not all buddhas teach Mahāyāna. All nirmanakāya buddhas are the same in terms of realization -- but their teachings, retinue, place, and time are all different. For example, when the buddha of hell manifests for hell beings, I am sure he is not teaching them Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 11:51 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

That is perhaps another issue, but there are many animal rights activists who don't like pet ownership. Pet ownership could be phased out too or alternatively there are vegetarian dog foods that can be made with all the nutrition and protein a dog needs. Cats on the other hand are pretty strict carnivores. As the food science advances I imagine they may come up with a vegetarian alternative for cats too.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense. This is just a fantasy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 11:50 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

The world will not become completely vegetarian overnight. It would be a gradual process (if it even happened, of course this is just hypothetically speaking). Even if 10,000 new people stopped eating meat everyday, the agri-businesses would simply stop breeding the livestock so much. The breeding would slow down, even stop if necessary until everyone became vegetarian or vegan. And then you have less slaughtering going on and eventually close the slaughter houses.

Malcolm wrote:

Such sentiments display a complete lack of understanding of sustainable agriculture. It is not about agro-business. It is about environmental sanity. Environmental sanity requires animal husbandry since it is the primary way soil fertility is ensured.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 9:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Our master ChNN Rinpoche advised them - when they asked him - not to include Jesus Christ in their unification of Gurus.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not talking about the same thing, so we will end this here.

Dronma said:

Of course, Malcolm.

Talking theoretically is very easy. Making things practically grounded in our daily life, is the most difficult part!

Thank you for discussing with me.

Malcolm wrote:

Funny you should say that -- I was not talking theoretically but there is no point in carrying this further, I respect your point of view, I just think you don't understand mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Our master ChNN Rinpoche advised them - when they asked him - not to include Jesus Christ in their unification of Gurus.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not talking about the same thing, so we will end this here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Yes, this is true!

It is clear that Khyentse Yeshe is the successor Master of DC.

There is no doubt about it, and personally I am feeling fine!!!

Malcolm wrote:

Not just him, also his sister, who started teaching years before he was interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

But my question was about the unification of "non-buddhist" masters in the Ati Guru Yoga. Since our teacher has explained that we cannot include Jesus Christ (hence Mohammed, nor Jehovah) in the Refuge Tree, then who are those "non-buddhist" masters? [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, first of all. If you were never a Christian, or a Hindu, or never took teachings from such a master, for example, Hatha Yoga, Ayurveda, etc., then there is no need. But if you have taken teachings from such people, then you can carry this into your Ati Guru Yoga.

When we do refuge in the DC -- we generally do not do an elaborate refuge tree visualization, we do the One Jewel Unifies All system, so the principle is still the same.

It is not about including Jesus, Mohammed and so on in some imaginary refuge tree; it is about honoring the sources of all of our spritual knowledge, so the idea is completely different. It is about honoring all of our teachers, no matter what Dharma tradition they come from in the nine yānas. All Yānas belong to Samantabhadra, including the so called samsaric ones. This is the principle that is in play here. The Rigpa Rangshar states:

Though my yānas are inconceivable, when summarized,
they are included in two, samsara and nirvana

This means that all Dharma systems, "Buddhist" and "Non-Buddhist" are vehicles of Samantabhadra. If you have a connection with any of them, you unify them through the principle of Guru Yoga and go beyond limitations.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Moreover, if we have to take into account the 1st Yana, then we have to accept that the whole spectrum of the 9 Yanas is included in Dzogchen Guru Yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

I am going to present my understanding, and how I was taught by ChNN.

The reason why we can unify all teachings and teachers in Ati Guru Yoga is two-fold:

- 1) We all have the same state
- 2) This is the state we are all trying to discover, whether putatively "buddhist" or "non-buddhist"

Dronma said:

Which gives us the conclusion that no separation can be made between Dzogchen and Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Now, if we follow your logic here, since Hinduism, Christianity, etc., is part of the nine yānas too, and since the next seven are the vehicles that normally characterize "buddhism" it then follows that "Buddhism" and "Non-buddhism" cannot be separated either, and it therefore also follows we cannot separate Dzogchen from these non-buddhist religions as well.

But it is not like this. "Yāna" means vehicle. It carries you somewhere. Where? In this case, to liberation. The nine yānas are not a progressive program where you train in one yāna and then move onto the next one, like changing trains at a station or like a system of grades in a school.

Each yāna is an independent method for liberation, some are direct, like Dzogchen, some are very indirect, like the vehicle of gods and men. The rest are in the middle. So each yāna and also Dzogchen are independent vehicles. It is also the same with the three yāna scheme. One does not need to train in Hinayāna to enter Mahāyāna. One

does not need to train in Mahāyāna to enter Vajrayāna. Each of these three vehicles of a complete conveyance for liberation. The idea common in Tibetan Buddhism that you need to stack up the three yānas, in terms of the three vows, or progress through the three yānas as a gradual training. But this is not an exclusive approach. One can also enter Vajrayāna immediately.

Dzogchen can also be practiced as an intimate instruction for mahāyoga and anuyoga. So, there are two ways to approach Dzogchen -- as a completely independent vehicle, which in general is the approach of ChNN, KDL, etc., or as an intimate instruction for the inner tantras, the usual approach of the Nyingma school.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

For example, before Buddhism I was taken part in an order of western mysticism, in where I had received initiations, too. Do you think that I can include those initiators in my Dzogchen Guru Yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

You can unify everything in Ati Guru Yoga. Even the person who taught you to tie your shoes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So it is just coincidence that the "presidential" position will go to his son (a recognised tulku, whose father is a tulku) rather than ChNN's senior student? Right? Spare me Malcolm, I'm not a fool. There is no such a thing as enforced collaboration. Of course there is, collaboration under duress.

Malcolm wrote:

You really have no idea what you are talking about Greg. Khyentse Yeshe has to go through the same exams as everyone else to teach a given level of SMS. And he does not give transmissions or introduction.

But I am done trying to disabuse you of your ideas.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

After some discussion with a good friend about this thread I have decided to ask Malcolm this;

When you say "Dzogchen and Buddhism" do you mean the teaching of Dzogchen or the natural state?

Malcolm wrote:

Both. But I have clarified that I have come to make a hard distinction between "Buddhism" and Dharma. There can even be a "Dzogchen Buddhism" -- but would just be Dzogchen turned into a religion divorced from personal experience. I could care less about "Buddhism" anymore. Dharma however is important.

heart said:

Statement by ChNNR like "Dzogchen has no method, no tradition" do you think it is the natural state that is intended or the teaching of Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Both. The state of Dzogchen is your primordial state -- Dzogchen teaching is the introduction of that state through a personal experience or a direct perception or transmission of means to recapitulate that personal experience or direct perception on your own. There is no set method of performing this transmission, unlike for example, Sutra and Tantra in which there are very established traditions and methods which create a lot of attachments and limitations (read: the entire history of polemics in Buddhism).

heart said:

Saying things like "Dzogchen is in conflict with the teachings of sutra and tantra" is it the natural state that is intended or the teaching of Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

The latter. Sutra and tantra also aim at the state of Dzogchen whether directly or less directly. However, the teachings of Dzogchen about such things as paths, stages, cause, result and so forth in terms of Dzogchen and the other eight yānas are often incompatible and conflict with one another.

The sutra and tantra followers usual approach to this incompatibility is to chalk it up to absence of realization i.e. we are at a lower level, a causal level (whether in the true vehicle of the cause or the result vehicle approach of taking the result as the path); whereas Dzogchen is the result level, what we are aiming for.

My understanding is different. My understanding is that buddhahood is innate and exists to be demonstrated even to ordinary persons. Incidentally, this is a vastly different proposition than the tathāgatagarbha sutra position, which holds that tathāgatagarbha can only be seen by buddhas. When one's innate buddhahood is demonstrated then liberation is possible; if not, liberation is not possible.

heart said:

My friend pointed out that there seems to be a lot of flipping back and forth between Dzogchen as a teaching and as the natural state in this thread and that this therefore might be making unnecessary confusion for people and perhaps creating difficulties in the discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, that is a good observation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Chandrakirti, Prasanapada

[Valid cognitions and valid objects] are established through mutual dependence . When valid cognitions exist, then there are things that are objects of comprehension. When there are things that are objects of comprehension then they are valid cognitions. However neither valid cognitions nor objects of comprehension exist essentially

Malcolm wrote:

The point the Vigravahavyavartani makes is that they cannot be mutually established. If a pramāṇa is a pramāṇa, it does not need a prameya; and vice versa.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Paul said:

Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche say, interestingly:

Now we are entering the realm of Ati yoga, where we discover that actually the fundamental state of our being is our physical body - our existence as body

Malcolm wrote:

This is perfectly in line with what I have said all along for many years. Let those who have ears, listen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

All organisations rely on collaboration whether voluntary, enforced or rewarded. It's a moot point.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such a thing as enforced collaboration. But in general the point of view is that everyone, including ChNN, etc., in the community is equal. No one is higher than anyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

It is exactly the same for the Guru Yoga which is transmitted by ChNN Rinpoche. Rinpoche has explained clearly a few times that Jesus Christ cannot be included in our Guru Yoga when he was asked by some of his students. The reasons are the same like the ones you are referring here, kalden yungdrung. So, I guess, Mohammed neither....

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I had also mentioned this fact earlier in this very thread. I really do not recall anyone suggesting we can use Jesus or some other teacher who has no connection with the Dzogchen lineage in an Anu or Mahahyoga style guru yoga. There is no basis for it.

Dronma said:

I am glad that we agree.

But Sönam claimed a few posts ago:

Sönam said:

Even non Buddhists masters ...

Sönam

Dronma said:

Like whom for example???

I need some specific names and not abstract personal guesswork.

Then, we can ask Rinpoche himself....

Malcolm wrote:

What Sonam means is that when we do Guru Yoga we can unify all knowledge and masters into Guru Yoga including the knowledge we might have learned from non-Buddhist masters. This is quite different from saying we can use non-Buddhist masters for Dzogchen Guru Yoga. The point is that non-buddhist traditions are included in the first Yāna i.e. the vehicle of gods and humans. That is all Sonam means. The point, as I have understood it since 1992, is that one unifies all knowledge into the state of Guru Yoga.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

It is exactly the same for the Guru Yoga which is transmitted by ChNN Rinpoche. Rinpoche has explained clearly a few times that Jesus Christ cannot be included in our Guru Yoga when he was asked by some of his students. The reasons are the same like the ones you are referring here, kalden yungdrung. So, I guess, Mohammed neither....

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I had also mentioned this fact earlier in this very thread. I really do not recall anyone suggesting we can use Jesus or some other teacher who has no connection with the Dzogchen lineage in an Anu or Mahahyoga style guru yoga. There is no basis for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So let's just cut the bs about DC not being a (Tibetan styled) institution. I mean really.

Malcolm wrote:

You are inferring from the fact that ChNN and Khyentse Yeshe are tulkus that Dzogchen Community is a traditional institution? A Tibetan styled one?

That is a pretty thin inference, Greg, even you can see that, I hope.

Sometime you should buy a copy of this book:

THE DZOGCHEN COMMUNITY: PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES.

It establishes the DC as a society based on the principles of mutual respect and collaboration between practitioners with a common aim. That is the key word "Collaboration". You can read about ChNN's vision of the Dzogchen Community in The Song of the Vajra, ppg. 105-114.

So someone like you, who may appreciate ChNN and his teachings, has your own commitments and your own path. You have no real idea about the internal life of Dzogchen Community and our values.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Sönam said:

Hello Greg ... can you give your sources

gregkavarnos said:

<http://khyentseyeshe.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://tsegyalgar.org/theteachers/namkhainorbu/> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Beleave what you will.

gregkavarnos said:

I believe what I can very clearly see.

Malcolm wrote:

In my opinion, you see what you beleive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So let's just cut the bs about DC not being a (Tibetan styled) institution.

treehuggingoctopus said:

It's NOT a Tibetan-styled institution. Not like it, either - at least I know no Tibetan institutions comparable to the DC. Judging what it is on the basis of info leaflets, adverts or wiki entries will not do, btw. Join it - or talk to those who've done so - and you'll understand.

It really is an autarky, with all the (numerous) pros and (not so numerous, but by no means scant) cons autarkies entail. And no, ChNNR is not its hidden puppet-master. In no way he is.

Malcolm wrote:

You're wasting your breath. Let those who live in institutional Buddhism keep their institutions. It is not our job to condition anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It does not support a feudal elite.

gregkavarnos said:

Well not a political feudal elite but definitely a spiritual one...

Malcolm wrote:

Believe what you will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 1:08 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

here you go...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 1:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I am not putting words in his mouth.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually you are. You just did. And it proves that you are not reading what I am saying dispassionately. You have a grudge. Perhaps it is time you put me on ignore.

M

Adamantine said:

Malcolm, if I didn't directly quote you in one response it's because I was attempting to distill your sentiments from 10 different posts of yours into one line, to save time and space. If you feel misrepresented I apologize but it's really the gist of what I got from some of your statements.. Things you said I think are problematic.

I don't have a grudge against you. I more often agree with you than not, I appreciate your presence here and I like you, having spent time with you. I have no gripe with you. I was just disagreeing with things you have communicated and the way you've communicated them. You also make many claims which I don't think stand up to common sense, or scrutiny. So if my disagreeing or questioning you on this pisses you off, sorry, but then don't be so overly opinionated on a public forum.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't mind disagreement, I do mind when someone distorts what I am saying. The comparisons with Batchelor, the Trimondi's and so on, are very unhelpful exercises in polemical rhetoric. I am a very plain-spoken person, and I never distort what other people say. I just flat out disagree with them and then tell them why.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

Many dharma centers subsist on fledgeling budgets barely making ends meet. I just don't see all the financial corruptions.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever made you think I was talking about the pathetic Dharma center scene in the US? Though one reason it is pretty sad is that when Lama tours come through everyone goes broke trying to host them and money sure does not stay in the Dharma centers.

LunaRoja said:

Actually the point that I was trying to make is that there are other Lamas like ChNN that do not live off of donations and visiting Lamas that do not walk away with large sums of money.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are some.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

Many dharma centers subsist on fledgeling budgets barely making ends meet. I just don't see all the financial corruptions.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever made you think I was talking about the pathetic Dharma center scene in the US? Though one reason it is pretty sad is that when Lama tours come through everyone goes broke trying to host them and money sure does not stay in the Dharma centers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

That's not what you meant? Then clarify, because I was not trying to misrepresent you, that's clearly how I read it based on your choice of words and sentence structure.

Malcolm wrote:

You could have asked me what I meant. Instead you chose to read into it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Listen, I don't disagree with many of your critiques of Tibetan Buddhist institutional politics. I think there are many problems with institutions in general, not only monastic or political ones. I am aware of many problems in Tibetan politics both historically and currently.

However, I separate that from my experience, because my experience, ---and it has been extensive--- has been wholly positive.

Malcolm wrote:

You are lucky you are not an attractive woman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sherlock said:

...if anyone reaches SMS Level 9...

Bhusuku said:

I'm curious about that. I mean, AFAIK, until today no one, not even the oldest students who are practicing since almost 40 years passed beyond level 4 or 5, hence I'm wondering how big the chances are that anybody ever is going to reach level 9...

BTW, is Khyentse Yeshe actually participating in the SMS program? I ask, because he doesn't show up in the lists of SMS instructors...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I am becoming a little tired of seeing you distort what Malcom says, Adamantine.

I don't know if you aren't really understanding him or if you are distorting what he says on purpose by reasons unknown to me, but nevertheless it's becoming annoying already. Can you stop? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

He is just pissed because I am tired of the hierarchical bullshit that is so integral to Tibetan Buddhism and am open about it. He is mad because I have over the years made it absolutely clear that I disdain the tulku system as a mere money game, and so on. He is mad because I don't respect the system -- and I don't. Of course, lotuses grow in swamps, and likewise, there are mavelous persons who have come out of that system, or rather, despite it. I also don't share the sort of lame "anti-science" rhetoric he is into dereived in large part from the late Thrinly Norbu Rinpoche. He brought it up earlier in this thread and it is never far from his lips in these discussions. Now, I understand why he is into it, since TNR is one his gurus, but I don't find it TNR's arguments very compelling at all, and I am far from a "new athiest" of the Dawkins and Harris variety. Indeed, recently, Adamantine compared me with Batchelor, as if I had abandoned the notion of rebirth. So he is clearly approaching me from some ideological bent that I honestly can't relate to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I am not putting words in his mouth.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually you are. You just did. And it proves that you are not reading what I am saying dispassionately. You have a grudge. Perhaps it is time you put me on ignore.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:25 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

This sentence structure I am not saying that there are no good monks, nuns, lamas, khenpos and tulkus, clearly indicates that good monks, nuns, lamas, khenpos and Tulkus would be the rare exception, not the rule.

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you for telling me what I mean. Honestly-- the amazing thing to me is how you and others go out of your way to misrepresent what I say. I never do that you or anyone else.

It is quite dishonest -- you sound like Fox News.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He decided to take responsibility. It is from his side. Actually, both Yeshe and his sister, Yuden, are ChNN's lineage holders.

Adamantine said:

Then it's exactly the same social structure as any Nyingma dynasty where a powerful lama enthrones one or both of his offspring to hold the lineage.

Why not one of his Western students instead?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, ChNN has never publically declared anything, AFAIK. I just happen to know this is fact i.e that Yuden and Yeshe are his lineage holders. ChNN is 100 percent convinced that Yeshe is the reincarnation of his uncle.

As far as his western students go, well, there are SMS teachers. And in fact he has placed Fabio and Laura Evangelisa 100 percent in charge of Yantra Yoga. He has actually placed a number of people in places of great responsibility.

Adamantine said:

Your theories that the DC is so radically different don't hold up to scrutiny.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure they do. You just don't to see it because you have an personal axe to grind with me based in your Nyingmapa conservatism.

Adamantine said:

It seems the more traditional "Buddhist" Chagdud Tulku was much more modern and liberal in this regard: his Dzogchen lineage holder and most of his tantric lineage holders he left to run his scene were mostly if not all Westerners he trained. Not his own Tibetan flesh-and-blood, as with ChNn

Malcolm wrote:

Different teacher, different group of students, different situation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

You imply most followers of the lineages of Buddhas are sexual predators, greedy manipulators or power hungry deadbeats. It seems especially in regards to Tibetan Buddhism you feel everyone is complicit in a hierarchical conspiracy

of control and deceit.

Malcolm wrote:

As for the first statement, that is an unreal misattribution. I never implied anything of the sort. However, since you bring it up, I have heard or met a number of Lamas here in the west that precisely fit the descriptions you have provided. I never said they were the majority. But it only takes a few bad apples...

As for the second, I guess you just have no idea. I guess I have known people involved with Tibetan religious politics a little more closely than you. It is every bit as nasty and corrupt and widespread as I have painted it.

I have seen first hand the incredibly nasty politics that infect every lineage of Tibetan Buddhism. Anyone who denies these things just has their head in the sand.

Adamantine said:

You are starting to sound like the Trimondis.

Malcolm wrote:

They have no idea what they are talking about. They are attacking Vajrayāna teachings out of pure malice and misunderstanding. I have not done that. What I am saying is an honest critique of a system that is badly in need of modernization and reform if it is to adapt to the modern world.

Adamantine said:

You don't need to tear apart something that is much vaster and less homogenous than you disingenuously pretend.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study more history of Tibetan Buddhism.

For example, Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje told me never to go to Dharamsala because it was filled with evil people. He was beaten within an inch of his life for no reason on Losar in the mid 80's.

The good things about Tibetan culture and the Dharma do not cancel out the negative side of Tibetan religious politics. We spend a lot of time being involved in Tibetan internecine conflicts we are completely unaware of. I have heard Nyingma students proclaim "If your view of emptiness is Gelug, you will never be able to practice Dzogchen...." oblivious to the fact that both Shabkar and Jigme Lingpa favored Tsongkhapa's view of Madhyamaka. It just goes on and on. There is a certain bliss in ignorance, but I am too knowledgeable about controversy and issues in Tibetan Buddhism to be blind to the fact that they form a certain patterns.

The strongest critics of Tibetan culture are Tibetans themselves, people like Milarepa, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen, Drukpa Kunly, Patrul and others who were not blind to the

problems of the institutional culture of Tibetan Buddhism. Of course, if they say things, they are heralded as great saints, but if I make the same observations I am accused of being a Trimondi. Honestly, what nonsense.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

I hope you will permit me a contrarian view.

Malcolm wrote:

How dare you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 10:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I think ChNN is great, and I think what he is doing is great. And I think it does him a disservice

to attack Buddhists, including other Dzogchen teachers in his name...

Malcolm wrote:

I did not do that. Your flights of rhetoric merely serve to make things less clear.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Thoughts on Tegal for newcomers

Content:

Sherlock said:

Looks like you're right Malcolm. Unless he schedules it at the end of next year or in 2014. He's not even coming to my country next year.

Malcolm wrote:

He has said many times that klong sde is sufficient for total realization - also with klong sde you work with the four visions. He is giving klong sde twice this year.

Pema Rigdzin said:

When is he giving Longde next (after the current retreat)?

Also, I was able to receive the donwang the other night but have only been able to catch bits and pieces of the actual instructions for Longde. If I wish to implement Longde, would it be considered insufficient to do so on the basis of going back and listening to the replays? In other words, would I need to catch the next retreat and hear the specific Longde instructions live?

Malcolm wrote:

You can listen to replays.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is an autarchy. It is self-governed. All practitioners are equal. We all have the same state. We are working toward the same goal. Some of us are further along, like ChNN, some of us are not, like me. But in the DC all practitioners are equal, we all have the same state.

Adamantine said:

It's great that you can idealize things like this, but I don't see that. If it was truly an autarchy and not an oligarchy then why would ChNN's son Yeshe need to be preened as the one to take over?

Malcolm wrote:

He decided to take responsibility. It is from his side. Actually, both Yeshe and his sister, Yuden, are ChNN's lineage holders.

But no one is in "charge" so to speak --every gar is autonomous.

Adamantine said:

I am having a hard time interpreting your curt remarks.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

M

Mariusz said:

He failed to recognize Rigpa

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Simply it is very difficult to concilate thesw 2 facts: Less realized master on one hand and the Spreading of real dozgchen on the other hand, instead of a fake misleading dzogchen taught by not realized master

I guess I just have more confidence in people than you do.

Positive thought is fine if you speak about master like Antony Robbins, but you have not answered to my previous consideration I quote above

I have not heard about many Rainbow around, after HH Dudjom rinpoche, when according to CNNR stories in Tibet there where many rainbow bodies between Dzogchen masters?

So Malcon, tell me please how you can conciliate Less realized master as the time goes by on one hand and the Spreading of real dzogchen on the other hand?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, D&G, most people who realize Dzogchen teachings fully awaken in the bardo. There are 21 capacities of practitioners. Having the ability to correctly and perfectly communicate the transmission of Dzogchen does not necessarily mean you yourself will attain phowa chenpo, or even rainbow body. But everyone who sincerely dedicates themselves to Dzogchen, having had the fortune to meet the full teachings will awaken in the bardo -- or at minimum they will spend 500 years in the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels before acheiving total realization. This is guaranteed as long as you understand the teachings. The third statement of Garab Dorje, literally translated means "continue in the confidence of liberation" -- this does not mean of course you are totally realized. It means you know the true meaning of liberation and are certain of acheiving it, so you "...continue in that state".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 6:00 AM
Title: Re: Why is a lung for mantra necessary?
Content:

LunaRoja said:
YAY we agree!

Malcolm wrote:
Well, when we exercise patience, we will almost always get to yes if we want to.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:55 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

dorje e gabbana said:
think the implication of my statement is that there will be more people who have real knowledge of Dzogchen and are able to successfully communicate this to others
I wish you will be right but it sounds a little bit like a new age thought, like the celestine prophecy, Aquarian age and a lot of stuff like that.

Malcolm wrote:
I guess I just have more confidence in people than you do.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:34 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

dorje e gabbana said:
And CNNE was very clear about the fact that without real realization Dzog Chen transmission cannot happen

Malcolm wrote:
Of course. What could you have possibly thought I meant?

dorje e gabbana said:
I wasn't referring to what you meant. Simply it is very difficult to conciliate these 2 facts:
Less realized master on one hand and the Spreading of real dzogchen on the other hand,
instead of a fake misleading dzogchen taught by not realized master

Malcolm wrote:
I think the implication of my statement is that there will be more people who have real

knowledge of Dzogchen and are able to successfully communicate this to others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

And CNNE was very clear about the fact that without real realization Dzog Chen transmission cannot happen

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. What could you have possibly thought I meant?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Malcolm, you are kidding! Isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. There are predictions to this effect in the original tantras of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

rai said:

sorry i dont really follow this thread. you are joking Malcolm, right?

i mean, you mentioned in other thread that realisation is very rare and we have seen so many great teachers passed away last years and all the great teachers we have left are getting old. so who is going to carry the transmission? or who will have the ability to spread the transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

About a Dzogchen New World Order? Of course i was kidding.

rai said:

no i mean that the Dzogchen will spread. you mentioned that we have very few realized masters alive and they are getting old so who is going to do the job?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course Dzogchen will spread, it is now spreading. I firmly believe this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Reality is found in the complete version of Buddhadharma namely like Andrew did suggest also in Sutra and Tantra.

So if Dzogchen would be spread without Sutra and Tantra would mean that everybody is fit for Dzogchen, and that is what is greatly doubted by me.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has often spoken of a time in the future on this planet when all teachings apart from Dzogchen have completely disappeared, and all people practice only Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

rai said:

sorry i don't really follow this thread. you are joking Malcolm, right?

Malcolm wrote:

About a Dzogchen New World Order? Of course i was kidding.

rai said:

i mean, you mentioned in other thread that realisation is very rare and we have seen so many great teachers passed away last years and all the great teachers we have left are getting old. so who is going to carry the transmission? or who will have the ability to spread the transmission?

can even DC survive without someone giving the transmissions? do you think Jim Valby will do?

Malcolm wrote:
It will all become clear in time.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:51 AM
Title: Re: Yeshe Tsogyal/Vajrayogini
Content:
sangyey said:
How about relationship with Tara?

Malcolm wrote:
Tsogyal is considered an emanation of Tara as well. This is why for example in the Togyal cycle in Longchen Nyinthig there is a special section for combining mantras of tara with Dechen Gyalmo pratice.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:48 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
To have a hope that the world will wake up to Dzogchen is falling into an extreme.

Malcolm wrote:
ཀླུ་པ་ཀུན་གྱི་གསང་ཆེན་མཛོད།
ཁྱ་མེད་ཚགས་ཆེན་བསྟན་པ་ནི།
རི་ལྷོ་མཁའ་ལ་ཉི་ཤར་བཞིན།
ཀླུ་ཁམས་ཡོངས་ལ་དར་ཀླས་ཤོག།

May the secret treasury of all victors,
the unsurpassed Dzogchen teachings,
spread widely through all nations
just like the sun rising in the sky.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:39 AM
Title: Re: Mipham's Shower of Blessings
Content:
yenima said:

Thanks for your answer, Adamantine, I think you're right on the dot. I'm pretty sure when we did the SoB Tsok at the temple, we did the entire practice from beginning to end, left nothing out, and I don't recall ever receiving a specific empowerment for that. I can't reach my lama right now to clarify this but I think your presentation is correct.

I'm drawn to this beautiful brief sadhana, for its use as a daily Guru Rinpoche Guru Yoga practice, with or without the Tsok, that is a lot simpler and perhaps more effective than other Guru Yogas such as Konchog Chidu, Thigle Gyachen or Pema Sangthig, for all of which I've received the empowerment, lung & commentary, in which the Guru is treated more like a yidam in a maha/atiyoga kyerim practice.

This may be particularly effective in conjunction with a study of Mipham's text "White Lotus."

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on how you practice it. There are many ways to practice Konchog Chidu. It is an anu yoga system in fact. But after it hit the Kagyus it has been treated more of a Mahāyoga system. But it isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I had the opposite experience. Two great video webcasts only with minor glitches.

Sally Gross said:

It looks as if the problems were due to my connections. Reception on my cellphone is bad in my house for some reason, and it may affect the 3G USB stick as well. Will it be possible to review the transmissions off-line? I will need to do so with these teachings, and would also like to review the two Australian retreats I followed. The first of the two Australian retreats was my first, and there was a lot I was not able to understand in that webcast or in the second Australian retreat because of my lack of knowledge. Light seems to be dawning gradually over the whole (with apologies to Wittgenstein, On Certainty, 141). None of the webcasts I have attended thus far (the two Australian retreat webcasts) are available for review in the replays section of the webcast website yet. Is there anywhere else where replays of the webcasts are available for review?

Malcolm wrote:

You can usually buy them later if you attended the webcast as best you could you can also listen to replay.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Is there any room for buddhafiels in a Dzogchen without "traditional trappings" since buddhafiels is a purely Buddhist concept and not a Dzogchen one?

Malcolm wrote:

By traditional, one should understand "Tibetan Cultural Trappings".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Perhaps you are suggesting a new tradition...

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not what I mean. But it is natural that some people might misunderstand what I mean.

What I mean is that Dzogchen in the future may be transmitted in the traditional buddhist and bon containers it has had -- but it will also be spread separately from them depending on circumstances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sally Gross said:

...

It is a lovely image, though it jars me slightly as a South African to see a globe showing on North America. I'm used to images of the globe showing at least a bit of Africa and other continents as well. What is needed is a holographic 3D rainbow sphere. Is a drop or a sphere also a thigle?

Sönam said:

I had the same thought coming from that image ... BUT my self is more use of the European view in front

this view for example

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Well good the thing the globe turns on an axis. I have no skill with 3d images so I am sorry that some of you feel left out.

The image I used was the famous Blue Pearl, the first color image of the globe taken from

space.(Oh Lord, now someone is going to accuse me of subverting Dzogchen with Siddha Yoga's blue pearl meditation)/

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

What is left here that is utopia which resembles Dzogchen new age a la 2012.

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

M

heart said:

You sound like a taliban.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/79376210@N05/7274576886/>

M

Andrew108 said:

This is scary. As Dzogchen isn't really open for criticism I hope that it doesn't become another form of control.

Sally Gross said:

A form of control is something which is imposed. How can Dzogchen be imposed? A state of awareness which cannot be achieved by striving We are talking about letting go and relaxing, about letting things be and not about some kind of global power-structure which seeks to manipulate and to control. It is a lovely image, though it jars me slightly as a South African to see a globe showing on North America. I'm used to images of the globe showing at least a bit of Africa and other continents as well. What is needed is a holographic 3D rainbow sphere. Is a drop or a sphere also a thigle?

Malcolm wrote:

Well you see, Sally, it means the New Dzogchen World Order will start in the Southwest, with the former USA as the central capital of the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Why is a lung for mantra necessary?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For this reason the first of all syllables is A.

N

LunaRoja said:

The manjushri nama samgiti also teaches that all sound comes from the short A. The shortest recitation of the prajnaparamitra is also the short A.

So it is really the basis of all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Also Hindus believe this as well. This is a common idea between Buddhism and many non-dual Hindu traditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/79376210@N05/7274576886/>

M

Andrew108 said:

This is scary. As Dzogchen isn't really open for criticism I hope that it doesn't become another form of control.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, we are going to force everyone to have rainbow body whether they want it or not

Bwahahahahahahahhahahahahahahahahahahahaha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Why is a lung for mantra necessary?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds, lights and rays are the qualities of the three kāyas, not the three kāyas themselves. Kalacakra is a sambhogakāya manifestation. Shakyamuni had that realization, so he was able to communicate that concretely to those who could perceive it.

LunaRoja said:

Actually this is not what he said. He said the source of Kalachakra was from the mantra the sound.

Malcolm wrote:

Sound is a quality of dharmakāya because vibration is related to emptiness and all manifestations ultimately arise from dharmakāya. So we can say that all manifestations come from sound, and sound is possible because of emptiness. The way I understand this is that emptiness permits vibration; that vibration manifests as light, the quality of clarity; light manifests as rays, the quality of energy. For this reason the first of all syllables is A.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Why is a lung for mantra necessary?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Just found this thread:

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=4303>

I've wondered, or maybe even heard, that it could be that some Mantras were empowered by the Deity who originated them or by the Rishi who first received them, in such a way that they will work for anyone; and that other Mantras were empowered by the Deity or Rishi in such a way that they will work only for ones who have received the transmission for them. Or maybe the latter type of Mantras can still work for those who haven't received the transmission, but will be much more limited in their effect.

LunaRoja said:

Actually I think it is the opposite the deity comes from the mantra. One time when ChNN was teaching he mentioned Kalachakra. How could Kalachakra have come from Shakyamuni Buddha since Shakyamuni was a monk? He then said Kalachakra came from the mantra. For me this is why the mantras are sacred. First comes sound then rays and lights. The sacred sound is the origin of the deity as I understand it. Also it is through mantra recitation that you become the deity in deity yoga practice, sending and receiving blessings throughout the universe.

Peace,

LR

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds, lights and rays are the qualities of the three kāyas, not the three kāyas themselves. Kalachakra is a sambhogakāya manifestation. Shakyamuni had that realization, so he was able to communicate that concretely to those who could perceive it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Yeshe Tsogyal/Vajrayogini

Content:

Kelwin said:

I'm familiar with Vajrayogini from the Kagyu perspective, but how common is she in Nyingma lineages? (I am aware of the somewhat artificial dichotomy here). Are there terma practices of Vajrayogini that are used within a Nyingma and Dzogchen context?

Edit: PS I didn't mean to hijack the thread, I hope the original question is sufficiently answered by Malcolm's reply. I would however be interested to know, if there are Nyingma practices of her, in the same dancing posture, and if Yeshe Tsogyal plays a role in the Sadhanas.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayogini in various forms is a critical Anuyoga practice in many, many, cycles of teachings, beginning with the Khandro Nyinthig, which set the pattern for the rest.

Kelwin said:

I've practiced her in other forms, like Throma Nagmo, but haven't encountered her yet in the same 'Kagyu style' red form, dancing on one leg. But she will be there again then, once I dive more deeply into the Nyingthig's? That, somehow, is reassuring

Malcolm wrote:

This form is found in Khandro Nyinthig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Norwegian said:

Malcolm,

That is an awesome image.

Malcolm wrote:

I have no skill as a graphic designer, but I think it gets the message across.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 2:24 AM

Title: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

What is left here that is utopia which resembles Dzogchen new age a la 2012.

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/79376210@N05/7274576886/>

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thank you very much you finally wrote after our long forum: "it is only your belief - masters of Dzogchen will be neither buddhist nor bon"! I will remember it in the future.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said otherwise. But I am glad you feel you have wrung such an important admission out of me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

By the way, earlier in this thread Malcolm claimed that Madhyamakas reject logic. I challenged that assertion and asked for citations. None were provided.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not true -- I provided you with the reference for the Vighavyavartani and suggested you read it. There is a very readable translation by E.H Johnston.

Candra rejects pramāṇa when it comes to emptiness, accepting consequences as sufficient to show emptiness. He does not reject pramāṇa in every case, however, when he accepts that we can infer first stage bodhisattas through their compassionate deeds.

When I said Madyamakas reject "logic", I meant that they reject pramāṇa as being a meaningful path to ultimate truth. That is all I meant. Pramāṇa is a useful worldly science -- but as Rongzom states in his Introduction To The Principles of Mahāyāna (which I have incidentally translated completely, but it is unedited), "If one could reach the ends of objects of knowledge with a single flawless reasoning, for what reason was it not demonstrated in all the transmissions of the victors to begin with?"

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sherlock said:

So night practice was how Rinpoche did most of his practices including togal while he was a professor?

Malcolm wrote:

I think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

But ChNN is completely self sufficient. He does not need to raise money for himself.

This is true, He is a retired Professor who taught many yrs in the Eastern University of Naples, in Italy, and he has always lived in simple but decent conditions without using his student money

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is no class of indigent mendicants who have an excuse not support themselves in the DC. This alone makes it a very different proposition. I know a Lama who won't visit India, at least not where there are any monasteries because if he feels required to bring a minimum of \$10,000 merely to make tea offerings.

I mean, fine, this is Tibetan culture, and I am not judging Tibetan culture on its own merits. But this is completely at odds with Western culture.

But the above is not, as far as I can tell, what the Buddha intended for his Sangha of monks. Heck, one of the reasons Ashoka cracked down on the Bhikṣu Sangha and purged tens of thousands of monks from the ranks of bhikṣus is that within 150 years the Bhikṣu Sangha had become a haven for all kinds of negative people.

Poor Langdarma was murdered because he wanted to tax the monasteries, so the revisionists who rewrote the history of Imperial era cast him as a Dharma destroyer. Actually, a better read is that he saw the monasteries as an economic drain on the people and wanted to rein it in. For that he was murdered even though he was a Buddhist and wrote Buddhist texts, as the Tunhuang documents prove.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Yeshe Tsogyal/Vajrayogini

Content:

Kelwin said:

I'm familiar with Vajrayogini from the Kagyu perspective, but how common is she in Nyingma lineages? (I am aware of the somewhat artificial dichotomy here).

Are there terma practices of Vajrayogini that are used within a Nyingma and Dzogchen context?

Edit: PS I didn't mean to hijack the thread, I hope the original question is sufficiently

answered by Malcolm's reply. I would however be interested to know, if there are Nyingma practices of her, in the same dancing posture, and if Yeshe Tsogyal plays a role in the Sadhanas.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayogini in various forms is a critical Anuyoga practice in many, many, cycles of teachings, beginning with the Khandro Nyinthing, which set the pattern for the rest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It does not support a feudal elite.

Josef said:

I think this is a key point. And it illustrates a huge problem with how Tibetan Buddhist structures function in the west.

We are often treated at best as placeholders for the teachings until the next generation of Tibetans come of age and at worst we are expected to be serfs with American dollars and a good exchange rate.

When Tibetan teachers are busted sexually abusing or ripping off their American students its called crazy wisdom or they just get a free pass. When an American teacher does this kind of thing they are excommunicated and publicly ruined and turned into an example of how "we arent ready" to be real holders of the lineage. Its feudalism and racism, nothing more.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and when Someone Rinpoche and Tulku So and So gets into trouble, the putative hierarchies in Tibetan Buddhism act with complete impotence, because Someone Rinpoche and Tulku So and So are "recognized" to be some enlightened yogin, and it is all such total intolerable bullshit.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All that matters is that one's lineage is valid. If someone takes Dzogchen teachings from ChNN -- he never insists that you must adopt Buddhism as your religion. I am very sure now that Dzogchen has burst out of the Tibetan culture sphere, there will indeed be dzogchen masters who are neither buddhist nor bon.

Andrew108 said:

Hi Malcolm - what has ChNN said about the two accumulations and Dzogchen? I'm wondering particularly about accumulation of merit. As you know there are contrived practices within Tibetan Buddhism for the accumulations. How does this work in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, as I understand it, the two accumulations have always been complete.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

I regard Thurman's call for a rule of Buddhist philosopher kings a farce -- it completely failed in Tibet, from the beginning. Since it failed there, it will not succeed here.

I agree

Malcolm wrote:

Good we can agree on something.

dorje e gabbana said:

But I have seen that Tibetan Buddhist institutions run on cash. It is all about the money. It is the same also for DC. DC asks for membership card you pay cash, if you attend a DC retreat you pay cash. What is the difference between DC and other Tibetan Buddhist Institution regarding this point? please explain

Malcolm wrote:

It does not support a feudal elite.

dorje e gabbana said:

Everytime Lamas come here they are putting out the plate for donations. CNNR do the same. in 20yrs I have never seen not even one Namkhai Norbu retreat ending without Rinpoche lead a lottery where you pay cash, they raise money and people around selling you lottery ticket. Don't tell me please that lottery is a primary Dzog chen practice, neither a secondary practice.....

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, Rinpoche gives %100 of money to the Gar for its various projects. Like a good gardener, he turns the crop right back into the soil, he leaves it right where it is to keep that that garden growing and rich.

One of his strict personal samayas is to never accept money for Dzogchen teachings, to use it as means of fame, etc.

But in general, Tibetan Buddhism uses the West as a wealth pump (so do Hindus, etc., just to make sure that people understand that I am not being selective). Now, I have no problem with this when Lamas are completely up front about it like Kunzang Dechen Lingpa ("I never came here to teach, only to raise money, but then I found out there were some interested people, so I am teaching Dzogchen to those of you who are interested"). People are free to do with their money what they like. But one thing I particularly don't like is Lamas who use the name "Dzogchen" to support themselves.

dorje e gabbana said:

I am not saying it is bad from CNNR, but asking for money in DC it is non dissimilar to other Tibetan buddhist Insitution.

BTW CNNR has been accepting donations troughout the yrs for his projects from his students exatly like other tibetna buddist lamas has done and I do not see the difference.

I

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, sure, if people want to donate money to this or that project, there is no problem.

But ChNN is completely self sufficient. He does not need to raise money for himself. He had a regular job his whole life. He did not spend his life living on the donations given to monasteries. In that he is a completely different.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

I don't know why Dzogchen is from buddhist teachers. But it is merely the fact these days. In that way as flower is called a flower, but you can see and smell it.

Malcolm wrote:

All that matters is that one's lineage is valid. If someone takes Dzogchen teachings from ChNN -- he never insists that you must adopt Buddhism as your religion. I am very sure now that Dzogchen has burst out of the Tibetan culture sphere, there will indeed be dzogchen masters who are neither buddhist nor bon.

M

Mariusz said:

You meant, you are an oracle? Padmasambhava mentioned it but He didn't say it will be not from buddhists, as I know?

Malcolm wrote:

It is what I believe, and what is predicted by ChNN. Eventually, according to him, all will practice Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

I don't know why Dzogchen is from buddhist teachers. But it is merely the fact these days. In that way as flower is called a flower, but you can see and smell it.

Malcolm wrote:

All that matters is that one's lineage is valid. If someone takes Dzogchen teachings from ChNN -- he never insists that you must adopt Buddhism as your religion. I am very sure now that Dzogchen has burst out of the Tibetan culture sphere, there will indeed be dzogchen masters who are neither buddhist nor bon.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

How can they find Dzogchen teachers then if otherwise?

Malcolm wrote:

They simply find someone who is teaching the practice of Dzogchen. Not so hard.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

You can said it even with Dzogchen: "dzogchen is not Dzogchen, People label it a "Dzogchen", but they need that comfort from a "nominally buddhists" who can teach it

completely these days. Is it not true?

Malcolm wrote:

We call potters "potters" because they make pots. We called drivers "drivers" because they drive vehicles. We call practitioners "practitioners" because they practice. We call Dzogchen practitioners "Dzogchen practitioners" because they practice Dzogchen.

It is pretty straight-foward, I don't see where your confusion lies. I don't see what useful benefit your attachment to the label "Buddhism" for Dzogchen is. Of what benefit is it to insist that Dzogchen must be part of the religion called Buddhism? Please explain this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Magnus, maybe it is simply about not limiting oneself with conceptual labels?

Malcolm wrote:

...Chogyal Namkhai Norbu ... is a nominally a Buddhist in name, because he was raised in a Buddhist culture

M

Mariusz said:

Thank you for it. You are already also "a nominally a Buddhist in name, because you was in a Buddhist culture". So the question was not about you, not also about Rinpoche. I will wait if someone who is not "a nominally a Buddhist in name because not in a Buddhist culture" will realize 4 visions completely and if really will establish the new Dzogchen lineage these days. I will agree then with you and I will be very happy of course about the "someone" who can teach Dzogchen completely. Ok?

Malcolm wrote:

Mariusz -- I am not a "Buddhist". I am a Dzogchen practitioner. I have no complaints about Dharma, but I have many complaints about "Buddhism" (and Hinduism, etc. -- just so you don't think I am leaving anyone out).

People label me a "Buddhist" because that is the box that makes people comfortable. I used to lable myself a Buddhist because it made me comfortable. I don't need that comfort anymore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

But any so called "Buddhist" or "Nyingma" would never consider themselves really[/i] a Buddhist or a Nyingma, etc. . . because the whole point is not clinging to anything, especially to self identifications or labels...

Malcolm wrote:

I saw pages and pages and pages in this thread alone where people were furiously insisting that Dzogchen was Buddhism, etc., people strongly proclaiming their identities as Buddhists and so on -- all because a stalwart bastion of Buddhist sectarianism on the internet, a guy name Namdrol, decided to let people know he had dropped it.

Adamantine said:

The teachings just have one structured framework or another... the DC is one kind. You often say you are a member of Dzogchen Community.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, a card-carrying one. Dzogchen Community is a fraternal organization. You pay dues to belong.

Adamantine said:

It can be that certainly, but it can also be a cup that holds the sacred Dharma, just as the DC with all it's global centers and books and sangha is. Just because there are people who call themselves Buddhist who don't really understand Dharma or do any practice or who screw up or act sectarian does not degrade the many noble beings who are actually practicing Dharma and accessing their Buddha nature, at whatever capacity or yana they may be able to relate to. Same as DC. It just seems like a different conceptual framework to me, is all. But maybe we will just have to not see things eye to eye on this point.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is an autarchy. It is self-governed. All practitioners are equal. We all have the same state. We are working toward the same goal. Some of us are further along, like ChNN, some of us are not, like me. But in the DC all practitioners are equal, we all have the same state.

In my opinion, in Buddhism the insitutions have become more important than the people. Actually, it has been this way for centuries -- Buddhist Institutions have functioned to support a privileged elite in a very feudal manner. Buddhism, especially Tibetan Buddhism, is an oligarchy. Tibeian Buddhism functions based on a system of vassalage and fealty. It is actually the same in other Buddhist cultures as well. The reason for this has to do with the way Buddhism has adapted itself for the past 2300 years to various aristocracies.

I used to think that since democracy and Buddhism were not compatible, we needed to subordinate ourselves to hierarchy of monks, lamas, tulkus, etc because it was necessary for the survival of the Dharma, because they supposedly represented the work of the Dharma in the world. I no longer believe that. There is way too much corruption, greed, abuse, and lust for power, title and position in Tibetan Buddhism and in Buddhism in general. There are way too many Lamas who abuse the Dharma to control people, to control scandals, to extort money from their students, etc. This completely wrong. But I have seen that Tibetan Buddhist institutions run on cash. It is all about the money. Everytime Lamas come here they are putting out the plate for donations. Of course, they have to, because they are expected to, it is their job. But frankly, I am fatigued by it. I could go on and on about my gripes about the way Tibetan Buddhism. Perhaps I have just seen one corrupt lama too many.

I am not saying that there are no good monks, nuns, lamas, khenpos and tulkus, genuinely spiritual people who mean nothing but the best for everyone. Of course there are. Not all catholic priests are pedarests either. But I am pretty toasted on the worldly ambitions of Tibetan Buddhism.

I do not beleive that traditional Buddhism is in any way capable of addressing the problems we face in the world today. I am sure that it was never capable of addressing these issues. I regard the Shambhala vision of an enlightened society to be a total fantasy, and I regard Thurman's call for a rule of Buddhist philosopher kings a farce -- it completely failed in Tibet, from the beginning. Since it failed there, it will not succeed here.

The only way we can solve the problems we have in the word today is to put down our socio/religious/culture banners. We must be like Angulimala -- we must stop. If we human beings cannot get along as one human family, there will be no chance for Dharma let alone Buddhism, no anything -- just war, famine, sickness and death.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sherlock said:

Does the belt absolutely have to be made traditionally or would a similar belt (say for weightlifting) be useable as long as it holds in your sides tightly?

Malcolm wrote:

You should get a Gomthag, a meditation belt.

<https://www.ligmincha.org/store/vmchk/root-category-40/category-43/view-all->

products.html " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

http://www.tibetanspirit.com/productview.asp_Q_id_E_1514_A_catid_E_271_A_maincat_E_Meditation_A_subcatid_E_277_A_subcat_E_Shawls+%26+Belts "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts on Tegal for newcomers

Content:

Sherlock said:

Looks like you're right Malcolm. Unless he schedules it at the end of next year or in 2014. He's not even coming to my country next year.

Malcolm wrote:

He has said many times that klong sde is sufficient for total realization - also with klong sde you work with the four visions. He is giving klong sde twice this year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

ok, so then basically you do the postures etc until you get to the point of no doubt and then just work on integrating it into daily life, right? So then where does the rainbow body part fit in?

Malcolm wrote:

It comes at the end of the four visions. You also use the postures in cultivating those.

My advice, you just apply the practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts on Tegal for newcomers

Content:

Sherlock said:

ChNN will give threkchod and tegal in Tenerife right? Will he also give yangti transmission?

Andrew108 said:

That was last year. Is he giving these practices again?

Malcolm wrote:
No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 9:01 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
...no daily practice other than a commitment to discover your real nature through
atiyoga...

gregkavarnos said:
Oh, is that all...

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, indeed, that is all. That includes a lot of things to do, however.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:59 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Fa Dao said:
I could use a little help here...Rinpoche has said that many people have attained
rainbow body by practicing Longde i.e full realization. So I thought a while back that
maybe Longde would be perfect for me as I come from a Chan background and that I
could do it for the rest of my life. Then of course during this retreat he said that you only
practice Longde until your doubts are dispelled. (Rinpoche has this knack for tearing
down ones mental constructs and leaving one floating with nothing to grasp onto, or is it
just me?)
Anyways, if I have misunderstood or whatever I could use a little help/clarification.
Thanks.

Jikan said:
I had thought he said that the postures that are part of longde practice are used only
temporarily, and that the whole of longde practice is related to the second of Garab
Dorje's three statements (no longer remaining in doubt).

I'm interested in longde for more or less the same reason as you.

Malcolm wrote:
What he is said is that you do not need to spend the rest of your life in a posture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Anyways, if I have misunderstood or whatever I could use a little help/clarification.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

You can practice klong sde for your entire life, just like many practitioners have done.

He is saying that the series of klong sde is primarily connected with not remaining in doubt, but because it includes total realization, it is also connected with continuing in that state.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Yeshe Tsogyal/Vajrayogini

Content:

sangyey said:

What is Yeshe Ysogyal's relationship to Vajrayogini?

Malcolm wrote:

Tsogyal is considered to be a nirmanakāya, Vajrayogini is considered to be the Sambhogakāya; Samantabhadri is the Dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Magnus, maybe it is simply about not limiting oneself with conceptual labels?

Malcolm wrote:

Guys -- it is really not hard to understand: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is not a Nyingmapa, though all the Nyingmapas think he is. He is not a Sakyapa, though all the Sakyapas, think he is; he is not a Drugpa Kagyu, though all the Drukpa Kagyus think he is; He is not a Bonpo, though all the Gelugpas think he is.

He is a nominally a Buddhist in name, because he was raised in a Buddhist culture and Buddhist monastery -- and no one ever said otherwise. But he has also said explicitly he is not a Buddhist, nor a Bonpo. "Buddhist", Bonpo, Hindu, Christian, etc. are cultural identification -- but Dzogchen is beyond culture.

So what is he really? A Dzogchen practitioner who has integrated the meaning of Dzogchen into his life as completely as he can.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Good point. . . hmmmnnn.. maybe it's more of a conceptual difference?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it means that Ati Gury Yoga is the center of DC practice. The center of DC practice is not the thun book. You know, every retreat ChNN's holds up the thun book and says "Some people think this is Dzogchen practice -- this is not Dzogchen practice." There used to be a book called Dzogchen Ritual Practices. A nice book, very useful. Because people misunderstood, the book was swiftly discontinued and has now been out of print for twenty years.

Theoretically can be a DC practitioner and never practice a single deity their whole life. Of course, that would be a silly limitation, because sometimes it is useful to use a method of transformation. But transformation is not Atiyoga. In atiyoga, as taught by ChNN there is nothing to transform, no vows to take, no daily practice other than a commitment to discover your real nature through atiyoga -- hence the reason working with the transmission with ati guru yoga is indispensable.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

You just don't get it, the point is that he gives "lung" for it just about every time he teach.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as a secondary practice.

heart said:

This term "secondary" is a bit confusing the way you use it since Ati Guru Yoga and Song of the Vajra is a part of every thun practice.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I used it the way ChNN uses it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Conceptual said:

In the current webcast ChNN mentioned something about breathing (on the right side for males). What is he referring to?

Malcolm wrote:

When you can win a poker game or do good in business.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 10:06 AM

Title: Re: CONFUSED

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Any thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

Part of your primordial state is thugs rje -- what could be more comforting than that?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I believe the player uses flash. Apple (famously) doesn't support Flash on iOS.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Much more, we should never discuss about direct transmission publicly

Malcolm wrote:

Corret, we should never discuss the details of various methods of transmission of direct introduction. The fact of direct introduction however may be discussed because it is widely mentioned in all kinds of publically available books by ChNN and other authors.

Dronma said:

I am sorry, Malcolm. Maybe you should listen again on what Rinpoche advised us today. He said that we should never mention that we received direct transmission even to the other Dharma teachers we might have! Much more, we should never discuss about direct transmission publicly. Nothing more to say.

Malcolm wrote:

I know very well what he was saying I have heard him say it a gazillion times. Sakyapas and Gelugpas do not accept direct introduction as an independent method (The Gelugpas negate it completely, Sakyas accept it only after one has received a major empowerment -- like ChNN I was educated in the Sakya system). Therefore, he was saying that you should not go to a Sakya or Gelug Lama and tell them that you have received direct introduction because they might negate you.

But in fact Sakya and Gelug Lamas know this perfectly well.

So, saying "Dzogchen is based on direct introduction, not tantric intitiation" is a perfectly acceptable thing to say when someone asks you "What is the difference between the method of entering Dzogchen teachings and Vajrayāna."

Just out of curiosity, just how long have you been a student of ChNN? Beyond that, you follow your conscience, I will follow mine, deal?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Much more, we should never discuss about direct transmission publicly

Malcolm wrote:

Corret, we should never discuss the details of various methods of transmission of direct introduction. The fact of direct introduction however may be discussed because it is widely mentioned in all kinds of publically available books by ChNN and other authors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Haha no arguements here, except for one, which is that I'm quite sure that The Precious Vase says that Yantra Yoga is a indispensable secondary practice.

Malcolm wrote:

It says yantra is an indispensable practice related to behavior for integrating the three gates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Secondary also does not necessarily mean not indispensable.

Of course the primary practice, Guru Yoga, is indispensable.

However it seems that there are secondary practices that are indispensable, and secondary practices that are not indispensable.

Indispensable secondary practices, in the Dzogchen Community, I believe would include Ganapuja, the Song of the Vajra, and Yantra Yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, lhug old buddy -- for DC people only Ati Guru Yoga is indispensable.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Is ganapuja also considered a secondary practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. Being "secondary" does not mean "not useful".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I note that the triple refuge is a part of the Thun's ChNNR teach.

Malcolm wrote:

The thun book is not Dzogchen, as ChNN says everytime he gives the lung from that text.

heart said:

You just don't get it, the point is that he gives "lung" for it just about every time he teach.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as a secondary practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Just received 'The Crystal and the Way of Light' today.

Very clear explanations about many things which I'm looking forward to examining more deeply, and very much consistent with advice given on other threads here with regard to : 'how to maintain commitment by applying the essentials of practice'.

I came across the drawing of Dorje Legba and, for reasons obvious to some of you, was a little taken aback until I noticed his right hand held a vajra. LOL

Malcolm wrote:

Yes,Vajrasadhu, the Dzogchen practitioner's friend.

This is the more characteristic way he presented in the DC, as a wild Masang.

Blue Garuda said:

'Masang' ?

I Googled the word and came up with local protector or a physical region of Tibet. Would 'local' or 'worldy' be correct, or another wording?

In the book the description is of a protector to be called upon for worldly and less powerful action than Rahula (not sure about using the names on an open forum).

Having only spent a couple of hours skimming the book (which I always do before I read in depth) it seems a pity that you can't just point to it online and use it to support answers about Ati Guruyoga and Direct Introduction. You see, I'm slow and pernickety and I got it (finally) so there's hope for everyone.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Dorje Legpa's job among other things, it to control the masang, just like Ejajati's job is to control mamos and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

What is your real contribution to this discussion in terms of contents, so far ? ZERO

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, and you have made a real contribution? All you have done since showing up is spread fractious contention, as well as demonstrated rudeness, arrogance and pride.

But you have not made one substantially valuable post since appearing here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

So don't go around claiming to be some great Dzogchen meditator when in fact you are nothing but a farting lout, stinking of alcohol and rank with lust

Malcolm wrote:

It would be nice if you followed this advice, and behaved a little more humbly yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

By the way it sounds strange hearing people claiming that CNNR just teaches Dzogchen as an independent vehicle.

Malcolm wrote:

What was said was that ChNN teaches that Dzogchen is an independent path; no one said he does not also teach there are other ways to approach Dzogchen.

dorje e gabbana said:

In The Santi maha sanga training you must:

complete Ngondro

Malcolm wrote:

Not in the way you imagine. But this is a first level requirement, so I am not going to discuss it.

dorje e gabbana said:

Practising tza sum, that is 3 roots: guru, deva e dakini mantra accumulating at list one bum for each one

Malcolm wrote:

Visualizing clearly the Three Roots of the Anuyoga practice - Guru (Padma Thötrengtsal), Deva (Guru Tragpo or Guru Tragphur) and Dakini (Simhamukha) - and connecting the concentration with recitation of the mantra, for each of the Three Roots:

- According to recitation based on quantity, one must do seven hundred thousand, five hundred thousand or at least three hundred thousand recitations.
- According to recitation (based on quality) with perfect visualization integrated with the reciting of the mantra (singing the melody in the case of Padma Thötrengtsal) one must dedicate at least three weeks of recitation (in retreat).

So you have a choice between time and number.

dorje e gabbana said:

So he asks people seriously committed in getting semde, londe, mennagde teachings, to practice before the standard tantric set of practice required by all Nyma masters.

Malcolm wrote:

Another misconception.

dorje e gabbana said:

And it is very very good, and also normal in a serious way to teach dzogchen, even if for some people used to get only external teaching from CNNR it seems very strange

Malcolm wrote:

SMS is not for everyone. Only for people who are interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Inge said:

Hi!

A few years ago I prematurely attended some teachings and empowerments that were given with lifetime daily practice commitments. Afterwards I struggled immensely with these practices for maybe a half year or so, but they made no sense to me, and I ended up doing them out of guilt, and fear of vajra hell. Then I gave them up altogether. Now I only try to follow the teachings of ChNN, do Guru Yoga when I remember, and other DC practices when I have time and energy, but I still fear negative consequences for abandoning past practice commitments.

LunaRoja said:

In all fairness to Inge's original question she states she does Guru Yoga when she remembers. How often does she remember; once a day, once a week, once a month, every couple of years etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

And what business is it of yours? She is asking those of us who are in the DC what our teacher thinks about such things. So we explained it, very clearly.

All you people will wind up doing -- assuming she is paying the slightest attention to you (which she ought not) -- is enhancing her anxiety. This is not useful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

conebeckham said:

Those of you with full faith and confidence in CNNR, follow his instructions. Those of you with full faith and confidence in another teacher, follow that teacher's instructions.

Malcolm wrote:
Exactly.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:32 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

samdrup said:
Thanks for your condescending reply anyway.

Malcolm wrote:
I know, and I thought I was a condescending prick...I have been bested.

heart said:
You didn't see that one coming, right?

Malcolm wrote:
Nope, right out of the goddamn blue sky.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:08 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

samdrup said:
Thanks for your condescending reply anyway.

Malcolm wrote:
I know, and I thought I was a condescending prick...I have been bested.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:06 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

Adamantine said:
Or do you read this differently Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, I read it to mean that since the goal of all teachings is Atiyoga, doing Ati Guru Yoga

sincerely actually develops all these transmissions.

People keep on bringing up this idea of a half-hearted A etc. Don't you understand that this in itself is a distracting misrepresentation? Or is it more important to you to tease out every possible defect then understand the main goddamn point?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Adamantine said:

Perhaps I did hear, and forgot. Hard to say. Although I have great respect for ChNN, and use many things he has taught me, he is not my main teacher since I feel it is important to have more access to my main teacher for questions and clarification than a moment on stage every couple years in the midst of a long line or a short email. As such, I have had many teachings which may not agree with ChNN's perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

We all have different paths. He is my main Guru. So for me, what he says matters first, then upadeshas, then tantras, etc. -- last on the list and very far down is the opinion of other Lamas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes! For the 100th time! I have said this over and over again for years. I find it hard to beleive that anyone who has been following ChNN's teachings for years could have failed to hear him say this.

M

Adamantine said:

Perhaps I did hear, and forgot. Hard to say. Although I have great respect for ChNN, and use many things he has taught me, he is not my main teacher since I feel it is important to have more access to my main teacher for questions and clarification than a moment on stage every couple years in the midst of a long line or a short email. As such, I have had many teachings which may not agree with ChNN's perspective.

I also was a student of KDL, could you clarify what he said regarding Guru Yoga fulfilling commitments? Which guru yoga was he referring to, any one, or a specific terma of his own?

Malcolm wrote:

He was referring to himself. Mere devotion to him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Dzog chen and white A GY are far beyond intellectual understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh I get it now -- you really deeply understand Dzogchen teachings and Ati Guru Yoga much better than anyone here on Dharmawheel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

I think DC practioners are intelligent people and not 7 years old children like you seem to think.

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not since you insult their intelligence at every turn and tell them that what they have heard that have not heard, what they have seen, they have not seen. It is actually you who are insisting that DC people are children, and not the other way around.

Anyway:

"First of all, when you take a a Tantric Initiation, you're given a water to drink. And this is called the water of one's vows, of one's promises. When you drink that water you've taken a kind of oath. You've sworn to follow that which you are about to commit yourself to. Many people do not know all this and collect hundreds of of different initiations. If one does this and then does nothing about these commitments, far from having done yourself good, what you have done is created obstacles and impediments for yourself.

What do you have to do? You have to maintain the transmission. If you're a practitioner of Dzogchen and understand the principle involved, and you don't remain in some boxed-in limited conditions, you can for all of these commitments made carry them to the level of Guruyoga. Whatever transmissions you have received, you can take them to the level of their unification, and at that level practice the Guruyoga. In such a case it all

becomes positive. That is to say, you're acting to deepen and develop all these transmissions you have received.

You have to remember that this is the way of seeing of a Dzogchen practitioner. If one lives limited and boxed in to some level of teaching, then that's not the case for you. But you have to therefore understand and see through the limits of the traditions and systems.

Talks in OZ, 1982 ppg 171-172

As far as I can tell, you are very interested in keeping people in boxes of your own contrivance.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Pero said:

Perhaps you should learn something from them.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, it is amazing -- answer a simple question and the Buddhist Sanhedrin gets all up in arms. Seven pages of pointless perseveration about poor Inge's personal business.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

I think CNNR's teaching about the way to integrate all samaya through Guruyoga is very precious. But GY according to him is synonymous of rigpa because he is a dzogchen master and not a tantric master.

Well, many people are satisfied with general answers and don't dig in to the problem because they are not aware of all the implications or just to cut the story short not to feel guilty conscience

Try to ask CNNR instead very directly if the samaya are kept even if you are not in the rigpa state and just sound A, using your mind and not abiding in the nature of mind..

Malcolm wrote:

As long as you are not indifferent, and are trying your best, then there is no problem, as I said -- a statement you rejected.

dorje e gabbana said:

The way to integrate all lineage and samaya in the "White A guru yoga" does not mean that everything is OK if you practice GY only following a dzog chen style, rather the real issue is to be really in dzog chen state of natural mind, and if you are or not in that rigpa state while doing A.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as you are trying your best, there is no problem.

dorje e gabbana said:

Unfortunately many people is not very interested in understanding if they really recognize what you supposed to recognize in Dzog chen. T

They are just satisfied sounding A and everything is really wonderful

Malcolm wrote:

Another misrepresentation. The question was "Can Ati Guru Yoga received from ChNN maintain your commitments to previously taken tantric practice commitments, etc." The answer, for those people who do not have wax in their ears and cobwebs in their eyes, YES!

Ati Guru Yoga is not just a method of maintaining commitments, no one said that it was. It is a method of discovering your instant presence, a supreme method, more important than many others. If you need help, more assistance, then you add Song of the Vajra. The point is not to remain complacent -- and if you think that is what I was saying you really are very wrong.

I don't even know who you are or if ChNN is your main teacher or what. But if he is, I am amazed that you do not understand the principle here. If not, then I can understand why you are out of step with our understanding.

Still, you should know better than to sow doubts in people's minds when they ask honest questions. This person, Inge said she could not relate to the practice she had received. She wanted to know a simple answer. She received it according to the principles that ChNN has been enunciating for years. If you are following his teaching, you should integrate all your transmissions and teachings into Guru Yoga of one of three styles, Ati, Anu, or Mahā -- your choice. That's it -- it is really simple. No one was advocating complacency or indifference to samaya or anything else -- so it is egregious that you, gabbana, have created such a misrepresentation.

If people are offended because I said she did not have to go back to her former teacher and "give back" her practice commitment -- tough. Too goddamn bad. It is not necessary.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Just received 'The Crystal and the Way of Light' today.

Very clear explanations about many things which I'm looking forward to examining more deeply, and very much consistent with advice given on other threads here with regard to : 'how to maintain commitment by applying the essentials of practice'.

I came across the drawing of Dorje Legba and, for reasons obvious to some of you, was a little taken aback until I noticed his right hand held a vajra. LOL

Malcolm wrote:

Yes,Vajrasadhu, the Dzogchen practitioner's friend.

This is the more characteristic way he presented in the DC, as a wild Masang.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

If it based on anything, it is based on income, since to purchase 100% organic you have to be fairly economically privileged.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, you just have to be willing to cook.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Your behaviour about this subject is really strange. I do not intend coming back on it

Malcolm wrote:

Fine, you are not Pizza.

From my point of view, your behavior is strange. And it is good that you give this up.

I know very well, from long experience of many people including myself, that if she wrote an email to ChNN and asked him, he would tell her not to worry and to just continue to do Guru Yoga -- I have seen many personal emails from him to people with similar anxieties, because indeed this is a common anxiety. He always says the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Sherlock said:

Actually just yesterday he said that you can integrate teachings from other teachers, Gelugpa, Sakyapa etc with Guru Yoga but advised against telling them that because they would disagree.

Adamantine said:

Are you sure he was not talking about integrating the teachers into Guru Yoga? I don't see how you could integrate other teachings into Guru Yoga, but Rinpoche always encourages us to integrate all of our teachers while doing Guru Yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he was talking about sadhana practice daily commitments! I frankly do not see why this is hard to understand. This was also teaching of Kunzang Dechen Lingpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Adamantine said:

I don't want to split hairs here, but this is a general, and interpretable statement. Does he really intend this to mean: whatever tantric samayas you may have received from other Lamas, however profound, and despite whatever they may tell you themselves: it doesn't matter, just do the Guruyoga I teach you and drop the rest, and you don't need to worry about the rest.??

Malcolm wrote:

Yes! For the 100th time! I have said this over and over again for years. I find it hard to beleive that anyone who has been following ChNN's teachings for years could have

failed to hear him say this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Adamantine said:

I might be missing something, but I don't see ChNN's quote as contradicting Longchenpa's in any way. The way I read ChNN's quote is that in Dzogchen practice, the only samaya is to find oneself in the condition of "what is," as it is. I believe this is the Dzogchen samaya, once one has transmission for it. He does not here say, imply, or intend that if you have already taken a Mahayoga empowerment for instance, with whatever samayas that entails, that taking Dzogchen transmission relieves you of that samaya and all you need to focus on is your Dzogchen samaya. I don't see how you get that at all from this quote. Please find some textual proof, in Dzogchen tantras or ChNN's own writing or transcribed teaching where he says this. I have attended a few retreats with him in person and a bunch of webcasts and read his books and I never ever heard him say this.

Sönam said:

"...according to Dzogchen the way to keep all samayas is to do Guruyoga." ... but of course it implies that one understand what is Dzogchen. Dzogchen is not included in Vajrayana ... Vajrayana can be included in Dzogchen. ChNN call it "to integrate".

Dzogchen is not for all practitioners ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

I would revise that slightly -- ChNN's Dzogchen is not for all practitioners since people find his perspectives unsettling. Anyway, he said even just now, if you have not understood rigpa, then you do Song of the Vajra, as it says in the Nyi zla kha byor tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sönam said:

Some people are making Tune book, they say I make Dzogchen practice, it is not Dzogchen practice. Tune book is Anuyoga. Dzogchen is Guru Yoga ...

ChNN - 5/25/2012

Malcolm wrote:

Yes -- but it is not our job to condition people. Mostly, we have been pushing back because people are strongly trying to condition us. The truth is that we just need to ignore people who disagree with us about what our teacher says. We are committed to his teachings, they are not -- so their opinion is pretty irrelevant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Adamantine said:

I might be missing something, but I don't see ChNN's quote as contradicting Longchenpa's in any way. The way I read ChNN's quote is that in Dzogchen practice, the only samaya is to find oneself in the condition of "what is," as it is. I believe this is the Dzogchen samaya, once one has transmission for it. He does not here say, imply, or intend that if you have already taken a Mahayoga empowerment for instance, with whatever samayas that entails, that taking Dzogchen transmission relieves you of that samaya and all you need to focus on is your Dzogchen samaya. I don't see how you get that at all from this quote. Please find some textual proof, in Dzogchen tantras or ChNN's own writing or transcribed teaching where he says this. I have attended a few retreats with him in person and a bunch of webcasts and read his books and I never ever heard him say this.

Malcolm wrote:

From the Guruyoga book:

"...according to Dzogchen the way to keep all samayas is to do Guruyoga."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Malcom Please provide any proof that CNNR has really stated or written what you have just stated about the fact that trying do to your best even though you are not in rigpa state is enough to keep other tantric samayas.

Malcolm wrote:

Pizza, If I do not reply to your question, you can understand that I think your question is absolutley worthless because it misrepresents what I said. The same goes for Mariusz.

However, this one last time:

From the Guruyoga book:

"...according to Dzogchen the way to keep all samayas is to do Guruyoga."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

rai said:

because i cannot rest in rigpa and dont have really idea about it is but i can sound A with visualization. would that be sufficient then?

Malcolm wrote:

It means you understand that the white A and thigle in your heart unifies all your transmissions. Even if you have not yet come to confidence about what rigpa means, since you are trying your best, this is sufficient. If you want to do something more elaborate, you can do an Anu or Mahāyoga style guru yoga ala the short thun or medium thun. It is always up to you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:08 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I note he is acting like a normal Nyingma master sending his son to Tibet to be enthroned as a Tulku and set him up as his successor. What am I missing?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

well, for one, it was a Sakya monastery, the Sakya monastery ChNN's family has been associated with for centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I note that the triple refuge is a part of the Thun's ChNNR teach.

Malcolm wrote:

The thun book is not Dzogchen, as ChNN says everytime he gives the lung from that text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:02 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is not part of Nyingma. I wish people would just get used to this fact.

heart said:

Because you say so, or do you have a quote?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Because ChNN says he is not a Nyingmapa.

Also I do not belong to any school of Tibetan Buddhism. I am just a member of the DC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:54 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Now, I never met Longchenpa -- but I know ChNN, since he is my root guru. The person who asked the original question is a student of ChNN and interested in following him, I will refer that person to ChNN's POV over Longchenpa.

Sorry if you find that offensive.

LunaRoja said:

No offense. It is good to offer different POV.

Malcolm wrote:

In ChNN's case, you can consider that he has granted all of his students permission to just unify their practice in Ati Guru Yoga. I was talking to a ChNN student.

At the end of the day, one must admit that students of ChNN have a very different attitude towards these issues than Nyingmapas. So really, it is better to leave it alone.

And it is super boring to have people insist to us we have not understood our own teacher's point of view. I have been to countless retreats with ChNN and read countless books by him. But every now and again, someone comes along who is not in the DC who starts telling DC people based on Nyingma, or Kagyu, or whatever, what we are supposed to think. Just stop it.

Dzogchen Community is not part of Nyingma. I wish people would just get used to this fact.

Thanks,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:46 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Is that supposed to be Lama Drimed Norbu?

because I think he's a Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

What I heard is that Wynn Fischel got bounced from Rigdzin Ling because he started incorporating Shamanic work and so on for his students and freaked out the Buddhist conservatives. Or so I have been told by people who lived there and are close to the situation.

M

Adamantine said:

I think his name is Alwyn, and I don't know about all that.. All I know is David (in LA) who I think you must know via Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, speaks quite highly of him.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, everyone I know speaks highly of Wynn. It is also true that he started working with shamanism and energy practices from non-Buddhist sources because he thought it was useful for his students and from what I understand the Buddhist conservatives at Rigzin Ling freaked out and tossed him out on his ear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:41 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

LunaRoja said:

"When one is practicing on such a path, it is necessary to observe all the primary and secondary samayas (which are subsumed within the principles of enlightened form, speech, and mind) just as they are described. If one does not observe them, one will develop many faults, the inevitable consequences of which are weighty, and one will linger for a long time in lower states of rebirth" Longchenpa (How the Lower Approaches are Subsumed into The Higher) p.353 The Precious Treasury of Philosophical Systems

Malcolm wrote:

When one receives an initiation, for example, one promises to carry out the transformation practice daily, reciting the corresponding mantra at least three or seven times. On top of this commitment, there are also many other related samaya which must be observed. But in Dzogchen the only samaya involved is to find oneself in the condition of "what is," as it is. All the rest, that is to say all the judgments and creations of the mind, all our limits, and so on, all these are false and superfluous.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 986-989). Kindle Edition.

Now, I never met Longchenpa -- but I know ChNN, since he is my root guru. The person who asked the original question is a student of ChNN and interested in following him, I will refer that person to ChNN's POV over Longchenpa.

Sorry if you find that offensive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:19 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I also have heard of returning samaya. Thank you Dorje e gabbana!

Malcolm wrote:

No one said you cannot ask some Guru to relieve you of samaya you may have undertaken. But there is no ritual to do so. You simply ask.

It is also true that if you are a Dzogchen practioner, there is no need to return anything -- all samayas are maintained perfectly by pursuing Dzogchen practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:13 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

I have never met a stand along dzog chenpa and probably the only one in all the dzog chen history was Garab Dorje -Prahevajra

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen practitioners can make use of all and any methods they choose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:10 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

This is all nice, but in reality it is just so much conceptual proliferation. Commitments are connected with a path. If you decide you are not going to follow that path, then what is the point of maintaining commitments to a path one is not following? None

Malcolm Your point is very original in both vajrayana and dzogchen.

Try to explain it to dakinis and Daharmapala and Damchens when you will be in the bardo, they will probably consider your little Occam human logic even though they are everything but humans and they are not P.C. and sensitive about human rights

Malcolm wrote:

You worry about you. I will worry about me.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:51 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

These are the first sources I can give you right away. Study both of you guys better Vajrayana and you will find evidence of that

Malcolm wrote:

These are not sources. This is just hearsay. A source would be, for example, a clear statement from some tantra, etc. Since no such rite exists, however, you will not be able to provide such a source.

Adamantine said:

Maybe not in a text, but Kagyu is the "ear whispered" lineage after all Malcolm! Maybe

give the benefit of the doubt to this persons teachers. . . Tantras are coded and interpretable, which is why there is such an emphasis on oral instructions. . .

Malcolm wrote:

All Varjayāna lineages are so called snyan rgyuds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:41 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

but this is anyway the teching I received from the lama I mentioned

Malcolm wrote:

Your lama is not an authority for anyone but you. Further, this has nothing to do with Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:39 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Josef said:

Its completely unnecessary to "remove" the samayas whether or not there is a ritual to do so.

Practicing Dzogchen properly keeps all samayas.

There is no need to give anything up or give anything back.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:38 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

These are the first sources I can give you right away. Study both of you guys better Vajrayana and you will find evidence of that

Malcolm wrote:

These are not sources. This is just hearsay. A source would be, for example, a clear statement from some tantra, etc. Since no such rite exists, however, you will not be able to provide such a source.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:05 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
Is that supposed to be Lama Drimed Norbu?

because I think he's a Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:
What I heard as that Wynn Fischel got bounced from Rigdzin Ling because he started incorporating Shamanic work and so on for his students and freaked out the Buddhist conservatives. Or so I have been told by people who lived there and are close to the situation.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:00 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
When one receives an initiation, for example, one promises to carry out the transformation practice daily, reciting the corresponding mantra at least three or seven times. On top of this commitment, there are also many other related samaya which must be observed. But in Dzogchen the only samaya involved is to find oneself in the condition of "what is," as it is. All the rest, that is to say all the judgments and creations of the mind, all our limits, and so on, all these are false and superfluous.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 986-989). Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:49 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

Yontan said:
There's no benefit to "worrying" about past commitments, but from our confused pov, the importance of maintaining prior commitments is not something to poo-poo and abandon. When we commit to and engage in a higher practice it encompasses the intent of the lower practice. It reminds us of the parable of the friends who made a boat

to carry them to the island of gold and then carried the boat on their heads out of respect.

If we abandon prior commitments, it robs us of the power to commit. When we commit to a higher practice, we can feed all of our resolve into it and make aspirations that all previous dharmic commitments be fulfilled in this practice, and that any failing of commitment will be mitigated by our even stronger current commitment. This keeps us from being lazy and from falling into the fault of abandoning the lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all nice, but in reality it is just so much conceptual proliferation. Commitments are connected with a path. If you decide you are not going to follow that path, then what is the point of maintaining commitments to a path one is not following? None.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:42 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

As matter of fact in Vajrayana there are specific rituals in order to give back tantric samaya to the master who gave you...

Malcolm wrote:

Nonesense -- such a rite does not exist.

dorje e gabbana said:

For the same reasons a monk can give back his vinaya vows and come back to the layman status.

Malcolm wrote:

This only applies in Hīnayāna. There is no rite for returning a vow in Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Perfect. But I wasn't speaking about what he said from the 90's on. What you say , Malcolm, is very well known by everybody who followed CNNR throughout the years.

Instead I was speaking about what he taught in the 70's and I tried to figure out why he changed his definition of rigpa

Malcolm wrote:

I explained, it is the difference between dran shes and shes rig i.e. aware mindfulness and knowing awareness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Pero said:

(and you shouldn't abandon your Vajra teachers in any case).

Malcolm wrote:

Unless they prove to be total dipshits and false guides.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

He calls rigpa instant presence because in tregchö the essence is ma bcos shes pa skad gcig ma i.e. a moment of unfabricated awareness. ma bcos shes pa skad gcig ma is not mind, it is beyond mind, thoughts and concepts.

Yes but as I explained in the 70's he pointed out that whatever kind of presence (instant presence or presence) was not rigpa. Than he changed as he changed many other things

How long have you been known CNNR?

In any case I am just dorje e gabbana and nobody else.

Malcolm wrote:

Since 1992. Now, CHNN is very clear presence = mindfulness; instant presence = rigpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

Unknown said:

CNNR got probably used to indicate rigpa as the state of presence after meeting the Gurdjef followers in Conway Community. They gave him their own centre recognizing him as the master they were looking for many yrs who was the natural link with the gurdjef simple teachings about presence, they were used to adopt in their studies. That is my thought because CNNR did not use the word presence as synonymous with rigpa before meeting the Conway's guys.

CNNR started to use very often the equation rigpa=presence, may be because he thought it was a more understandable definition for western disciples, even though in the 70's it was very clear about the fact that Rigpa is not Presence.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, ChNN does not equate rigpa with presence. That is mindfulness.

He calls rigpa instant presence because in tregchö the essence is ma bcos shes pa skad gcig ma i.e. a moment of unfabricated awareness. ma bcos shes pa skad gcig ma is not mind, it is beyond mind, thoughts and concepts.

BTW, welcome back Dorje Pizza

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

Sönam said:

Not to forget that Namkhai Norbu itself has choose to translate rigpa by "presence".

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Sonam: ChNN translates dran pa i.e. mindfulness as presence. rig pa is translated as instant presence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Are you being deliberately obtuse? The idea of a daily practice commitment comes from lower tantra. This is not a Dzogchen principle.

LunaRoja said:

No I am not being deliberately obtuse. I wanted you to clarify your answer which I did not understand. The daily practice commitments usually come from HYT not the lower tantras. I know some Dzogchen Lamas that also give HYT empowerment's.

No need to be insulting. So far I am not in agreement with what you said. I will maintain my samaya with my Vajrayana gurus. You make your own choice.

Malcolm wrote:

The notion of daily practice commitments comes from lower tantras. In Tibet the practice of the three outer tantas has greatly influenced the way higher yoga tantras are

practiced.

Also such things as the shape of the vajra and the bell, etc. You have a mantra, you must recite this everyday. This is completely not in accordance with any principles of Dzogchen teachings. Of course they have their own principles, but there is no Dzogchen tantra anywhere that says "When you receive this empowerment, you must recite this mantra, etc...".

The question was: is a Dzogchen practitioner required to maintain previous practice commitments they might have received. The answer is you can unify all commitments into Guru Yoga, and no, you do not have to recite every mantra that came with a lifetime practice commitment because that idea is from lower tantra, which includes maha and anu.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I hope in this Dharma Wheel forum for Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhists we can celebrate and rejoice in the great fortune we have to have met the Dharma in this life.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not been debating, just teasing out more possibilities than Buddhists typically wish to allow.

But yes, of course -- Namo Shakyamunaye.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sönam said:

not only they are deaf ... but also they are blind

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they only see what they believe.

Oh well, the funny thing is I am not conditioning anyone. But Mariusz in particular is very interested in conditioning others to his point of view. Well this is his limitation, and not ours.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I fear that these type of dialogues may even produce some new examples.

Malcolm wrote:

"Fear is the mind-killer."

-- Bene Gesserit litany against fear

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen teachings are neither a philosophy, nor a religious doctrine, nor a cultural tradition. Understanding the message of the teachings means discovering one's own true condition, stripped of all the self-deceptions and falsifications which the mind creates. The very meaning of the Tibetan term Dzogchen, "Great Perfection," refers to the true primordial state of every individual and not to any transcendent reality.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 123-125). Kindle Edition.

For example, those who already have a certain familiarity with Tibetan culture might think that to practice Dzogchen you have to convert to either Buddhism or Bon, because Dzogchen has been spread through these two religious traditions. This shows how limited our way of thinking is. If we decide to follow a spiritual teaching, we are convinced that it is necessary for us to change something, such as our way of dressing, of eating, of behaving, and so on. But Dzogchen does not ask one to adhere to any religious doctrine or to enter a monastic order, or to blindly accept the teachings and become a "Dzogchenist." All of these things can, in fact, create serious obstacles to true knowledge.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 161-166). Kindle Edition.

The principle in Dzogchen is to avoid creating anything false, and to really understand the reasons for what one is doing. It is not important to define oneself as belonging to

this or that school, tradition, or point of view, and it makes no difference whether one considers oneself to be Buddhist or not. Basically, feeling oneself to be a follower of something or other is just a limit, and what one really needs is to understand one's own condition and to open oneself, getting rid of all these kinds of barriers.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 1048-1051). Kindle Edition.

For a practitioner of Dzogchen, even to call oneself "nonsectarian" is just another way of taking a position of one's own in relation to the position of someone else, which is irrelevant, because the truth is that any definition of this kind at all is an unnecessary limitation.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 1054-1055). Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Have you found this master in non-Buddhism or non-Bon now in the world? Simply answer please.

Malcolm wrote:

I already answered this question.

Mariusz said:

Please repeat, I didn't read it.

Malcolm wrote:

Read my posts. I am not here merely to answer your obsessive questions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

So are you finally agree Buddhism or Bon is necessary for complete transmission of Dzogchen now, including realization of 4 visions? I,ve questioned you it here.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither Buddhism nor Bon are necessary for a complete transmission of Dzogchen. All that is necessary is a Dzogchen master.

M

kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Is it for that so called Dzogchen Master important to partake or not within the Buddhist Dzogchen Lineages and Masters?

Mutsog Marro
KY

Malcolm wrote:
What do you mean by partake?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:20 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Mariusz said:
So are you finally agree Buddhism or Bon is necessary for complete transmission of Dzogchen now, including realization of 4 visions? I,ve questioned you it here.

Malcolm wrote:
Neither Buddhism nor Bon are necessary for a complete transmission of Dzogchen. All that is necessary is a Dzogchen master.

M

Mariusz said:
Have you found this master in non-Buddhism or non-Bon now in the world? It is necessary or not? Simply answer please.

Malcolm wrote:
I already answered this question.

I will say "My master was educated a Buddhist."

You will say Aha! So Dzogchen must be Buddhist! (or Bon).

I will say, no, Dzogchen is beyond that.

You are merely chasing your tail.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Ok, it is a Buddhist belief with a couple noted exceptions. This doesn't really change the point. Unless you are arguing that some Hindus and followers of a relatively extinct version of Christianity can practice Dzogchen without contradiction, but not everyone else?

Malcolm wrote:

It is also a modern finding consistent with Quantum physics of various strands, and so on -- there are all kinds of people and people who do not think that world is "real" per se.

People who think the world is real generally do not seek out Eastern spiritual traditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who said anything about erase? One's commitment is to discover one's primordial state. As long as that remains your focus, there is no problem at all.

M

LunaRoja said:

To clarify my question a Lama who may or may not be a Dzogchen master gives a student an empowerment and states the samaya is to do the sadhana for the rest of one's life. The student decides to focus on discovering their primordial state instead of doing the sadhana. How does this fulfill their commitment?

Malcolm wrote:

Are you being deliberately obtuse? The idea of a daily practice commitment comes from lower tantra. This is not a Dzogchen principle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Is it OK to post such long excerpts from restricted books (if they're not explaining the practices itself)?

Malcolm wrote:

that is on the web for anyone to read.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

dupe

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

So are you finally agree Buddhism or Bon is necessary for complete transmission of Dzogchen now, including realization of 4 visions? I,ve questioned you it here.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither Buddhism nor Bon are necessary for a complete transmission of Dzogchen. All that is necessary is a Dzogchen master.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

...experiences of realms are just as real as our experience of our human realm.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is to say they are not real at all.

Adamantine said:

That is a Buddhist belief.

Malcolm wrote:

Well no it isn't. It is a commonly shared perspective all across the spectrum of Indian religions. It is also present in Christianity vix platonism, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Again, how is anyone from another tradition (most other traditions have elements of Eternalism), or a scientific-materialist/empiricist going to agree with this? Let alone be able to practice a tradition based on this view? I understand that people from other traditions can be exposed to Dzogchen teachings, and even begin practicing them.. but at a certain point, they are going to have to choose one view or another.

Malcolm wrote:

The only "view" they have to adopt is that the ignorant mind has the capacity to display all possibilities of suffering. They do not have to adopt a cosmology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Here I'm writing there is no any lineage outside Buddhism and Bon now. Someones believe otherwise here...

Malcolm wrote:

It is really amazing how persistant and wrongheaded your mischaracterizations are.

I never stated anywhere that there was at present a lineage of Dzogchen that existed outside the container of the religions known as Buddhism and Bon.

What I said was that in order to practice Dzogchen one does not have to sign up and become a Buddhist or a Bonpo. Two entirely different statements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Lets say we decide to take ChNN's theory of the origin of ZZNG as being the correct theory. There is no evidence in what scholars consider to be "early Bon" that the Bonpos had a theory of rebirth that corresponds to the Pan-Indian cultural idea of the six lokas.

Adamantine said:

There is not much known about "early Bon" at all so there is hardly room for much beyond speculation. . .Not much to go on as a basis for your arguments.

Malcolm wrote:

One thing for sure, Bonpos did not have a Buddhist cosmology.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

...experiences of realms are just as real as our experience of our human realm.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is to say they are not real at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In reality there are no six lokas anyway.

M

Adamantine said:

In "reality" there is no reality. But relative to our shared experience of the human realm, the 6 lokas exist: according to Buddhism and Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not true. For human beings, there is no hell realm, not deva realm, no ghost realm: when is the last time you saw any types of sentient being that was not a human or an animal?

When you have the experience of a hell being, you will not have any awareness of human beings, devas, etc.

The six lokas are merely potentialities in our bodyminds. Right now that potentiality is expressing itself as the human realm. The six lokas are not external realities that exist side by side like six bookshelves which have books on devas, asuras, humans, animals, pretas and hell beings.

To put it another way -- ignorance can experience itself as any of the six lokas. This does not say anything about some "objective" or "relative" existence of the six lokas.

It may be convenient for someone to believe in the relative existence of the six lokas, but it is pretty hard to defend the existence of the six lokas as anything more than the expression of traces. And when we are not expressing those traces those realms do not "externally" exist for us in any way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

The point is, how do Dzogchen teachings function without any belief, in the sense of Batchelor's "Buddhism Without Beliefs"? I don't think based on what and how ChNN teaches, that this is his intent.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen practice does not depend on a literal belief in the six lokas. It depends on the understanding that the ignorant mind can generate all false appearances because of not perceiving our true condition. Six lokas practice merely eliminates the traces for those false appearances. For example, for us, there is no hell. We do not perceive hell, hell is outside our experiential range. For us hell is completely false. For a hell being, the human realm is completely false. The root of both is an ignorant mind that has traces to produce those experiences. We do not need to imagine the six lokas exist anywhere other than in our own bodyminds.

But I did not advance Dzogchen as radical empiricism. The Dzogchen proposition that our experience of sentient beings and the world is a misperception of radiant wisdom light is sufficient to put an end to the idea that it is.

However, the essential point in Dzogchen teachings is direct introduction and an experience of instant presence. That does not depend on any belief at all other than desire to come to recognize one's real state.

Considering that the body of light is a commonly advanced desiderata of Dzogchen practice, it is difficult to be a radical empiricist ala Batchelor, Dawkins and Harris and practice Dzogchen.

Lets say we decide to take ChNN's theory of the origin of ZZNG as being the correct theory. There is no evidence in what scholars consider to be "early Bon" that the Bonpos had a theory of rebirth that corresponds to the Pan-Indian cultural idea of the six lokas. But they had Dzogchen. Later, when the Dzogchen lineage of Garab Dorje entered Tibet, the Bonpos adopted a number of ideas from the adoption of Buddhism including the bardo, six lokas, and so on.

So, there are number of angles we can approach this from without having necessarily adopt scientific atheism as our view.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

BTW, I don't have a horse in this race: however, there are simple points that don't hold up to scrutiny. Perhaps that is why you are not responding to them in any adequate way. For instance, purification of the six lokas: standard Dzogchen preliminary-- how do you relate to this if you simply do not believe in karma, bardo, or rebirth in the six realms?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, anyone can see they have five afflictions. So if they understand the six lokas as being metaphors for the six afflictive states, then they can do the practice without beleiving in rebirth.

In reality there are no six lokas anyway.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Yes great idea, so he can become pissed again.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes I can see it now:

Dear ChNN:

Your student Malcolm says anyone can practice Dzogchen, they do not have to become a Buddhist. He even says Dzogchen is not Buddhist, it goes beyond Buddhism. Is this really true? I really think Malcolm is harming Buddhism and ruining people's paths. I am sure he is going to go to hell for eons, but I just want to make sure that I am right, so I am writing to you to confirm my opinion. He is a really bad person, and is confusing everyone with all this talk of Dzogchen being an independent vehicle, and the fact that you do not have to get a Buddhist name to practice Dzogchen. He even says that Dzogchen is a separate lineage in Bon! But we all know that our compassionate Padmasambhava took pity on the poor ignorant Bonpos and manifested as a teacher to till the soil a bit to make them ready to receive the seed of our wonderful true Buddhist Dzogchen(tm). Please write back soon so that I can tell him and everyone else how wrong he is.

Thanks,

Faithful Buddhist Snitch

PS It does not matter that he has introduced scores of people to your teachings via webcast via private emails for the past 10 years, he still is a very bad man.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Btw, insofar as I understand Malcolm doesn't disagree with the notion that Dzogchen is 'the essence of Buddhist teachings'. On the contrary, he's been arguing that Dzogchen is very much the essence of Buddhist teachings - as well as of any other 'spiritual' teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, my point is that Dzogchen, our true state, is the essence of all Dharmas and that it just not come from the store bearing a tag that says "Made in Buddhism".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Buddhadharma, even if it recognizes a greater value in human life, still sees significant value in the lives of all other beings, including animals. Part of this is recognizing that our own mindstreams can incarnate in such forms, and that any animals or other beings may have been a close relation to us in prior lives. This is a practical way to see an equalizing factor that instills a naturally arising empathy: Kantian theory doesn't even have a trace of this. I don't find any solace in his ethical theory regarding animals.

Malcolm wrote:

The point of this exercise was not to say that Kant's teaching was better than the Buddha's. The point was to remove the objection that a theory of rebirth was necessary to behave as a moral agent, which is essentially what DKR was saying. I did not agree with it when he said it in Walden, I do not agree with it now. And I never would be so foolish as to use it as an example.

However, there is a level of sophistication of discourse in western moral philosophy which is absent in Buddhist philosophy. As you know, moral philosophy did not end with Kant, nor begin with him.

It is a good thing we have such as a Journal of Buddhist Ethics, because slowly Buddhist philosophers will gain sophistication when discussing these issues among themselves and with others.

On the other hand, Buddhists also use animals as things all the time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

If you follow Dzogchen as a system of assertions...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't. Others may.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Christians, and everyone will experience sound, lights and rays in the bardo.

M

Adamantine said:

So says your religion. (Buddhism). A Christian will not agree that this is what everyone will experience.

Personal experience trumps belief, even Buddhist beliefs.

You are claiming personal experience of the bardo after death?

Malcolm wrote:

No, of course not. I would have to die in order in order to have that experience and I don't remember the last round.

But, even if you don't accept rebirth, practicing Dzogchen will help you relax in this life, and if you have experience in this life, then when you find yourself in the bardo, you will know what do to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Origins of Anuyoga in Kyrgyzstan

Content:

Sherlock said:

ChNN has said a few times that anuyoga was mainly transmitted to Tibet from what is currently Kyrgyzstan. Does anyone have more information about this? There does not seem to be an archaeological record of a literate, Buddhist culture there. Could it be instead a reference to the Tocharians?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on whether you identify 'Dru sha as a corruptions of "Turkish" as ChNN seems to, or whether you think 'bru sha is Gilgit, which is the modern academic consensus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Other students of Changchub Dorje?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Are there any other known students of Changchub Dorje besides ChNN? If so, are they teaching? IF not then I suppose most of them are still in Tibet and quite old now; does anyone know where Changchub Dorje's gar was?

Malcolm wrote:

Lama Wangdor is one, and there may be some others in Tibet near Khamdo gar. Changchub Dorje's grandson is alive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All deity practices represent a method of trying to discover your primordial state. Also that is the purpose of Dzogchen. If you are doing the latter you don't need to do the former.

M

LunaRoja said:

I don't understand how Dzogchen practice can erase your previous commitments and maybe this commitment is to another Dzogchen master.

Malcolm wrote:

Who said anything about erase? One's commitment is to discover one's primordial state. As long as that remains your focus, there is no problem at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Let's examine: ChNN and other teacher of Dzogchen point out that for most of us, we will not reach liberation in this life, but in the bardo. Like the Garuda, born fully grown once the egg hatches. How are we to interpret this outside of the teachings on the bardo? As a Christian, or Muslim, or Amazonian Shaman, (or existentialist) you will have your own structured belief about what happens immediately at the time of death, which may contradict bardo teachings. How does this fit with the argument that any denomination of any tradition can also be a full-fledged Dzogchen practitioner? At a certain point, they will have to choose to discard one version, or the other, ---or both will lose all sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Christians, and everyone will experience sound, lights and rays in the bardo. If they practice Dzogchen, they will learn how to recognize this experience.

Personal experience trumps belief, even Buddhist beliefs.

Adamantine said:

It seems all or most of the people arguing for an autonomous Dzogchen are part of the Dzogchen Community, --as Malcolm points out, a very human institution. Are we arguing for a Dzogchen without the Dzogchen Community? Why would we? That's where the teachings are held, cared for, and transmitted. Same with Buddhism. And they are not different. In DC, Rinpoche has us do Tuns and Ganapujas which have very Buddhist, tantric, practices..

Deity Yoga, mantra recitation, seven line prayer, protectors, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Institutions are impermanent. They develop, flourish and then die out. Buddhism developed, flourished, and is now dying.

Dharma, on the other hand, is eternal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I am aware, and I am aware of how completely amoral Kant was in regards to animals. As he determined animals to be not rational, and without wills, he saw them as mechanical and in no need of any ethical treatment. It is traces of Kantian theory which I believe lie at the root for the scientific atrocities that are perpetrated on animals every day in modern society, not to mention industrial animal farming. I find Kant completely ethically bankrupt on this count. I couldn't think of a worse example.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing Kant with Descartes:

Any action whereby we may torment animals, or let them suffer distress, or otherwise treat them without love, is demeaning to ourselves

-- Immanuel Kant.

Adamantine said:

Maybe Kant developed a little more subtlety around his approach to animals than Descartes, but he still retained the view that animals were without will, and basically mechanical. I don't see how you can have it both ways, I don't think he did much to further any ethical approach to animals, when he continued to further Cartesian paradigms. Anyhow, even in the above quote, the act of killing is not included as being problematic.

Malcolm wrote:

,

If a man shoots his dog because the animal is no longer capable of service, he does not fail in his duty to the dog, for the dog cannot judge, but his act is inhuman and damages in himself that humanity which it is his duty to show towards mankind. If he is not to stifle his human feelings, he must practice kindness towards animals, for he who is cruel to animals becomes hard also in his dealings with men.

-- Kant

That the Buddha did not accord animals the same status as humans can be understood from the mere fact that killing animals is an act which requires mere confession with no punishment at all, like drinking alcohol, digging in the earth or plucking the leaves off of trees. For a Buddhist monk, masturbation is considered a more serious offense than killing an animal, requiring not only confession but a form of stringent probation in isolation. Needless to say, killing a human or even a human fetus is a parajika offense which causes one to lose one's vows completely.

In general, the prohibition against killing for lay people primarily means killing humans, but has been extended to all sentient beings though long and ancient custom as an extension of Ahimsa, formally included in Tibetan Buddhism as a commitment of refuge in the Dharma. But the discussions of killing in Abhidharma, etc., never involve discussions of killing animals, only the murder of human beings.

The practice of ahimsa is actually separate from the vow of not taking life, since ahimsa extends not only to animals but plants and other features of what we considered the natural environment. Ahimsa is not a vow. Ahimsa is an ethic, a way of life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

cloudburst said:

Sorry if I upset anyone!

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, no one is upset here.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Back then, when you made those statements, you were (obviously) sure of their validity, as you are sure of the validity of your current statements.

Malcolm wrote:

Hopefully we all are capable of being self-reflexive and seeing where we have erred.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I am aware, and I am aware of how completely amoral Kant was in regards to animals. As he determined animals to be not rational, and without wills, he saw them as mechanical and in no need of any ethical treatment. It is traces of Kantian theory which I believe lie at the root for the scientific atrocities that are perpetrated on animals every day in modern society, not to mention industrial animal farming. I find Kant completely ethically bankrupt on this count. I couldn't think of a worse example.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing Kant with Descartes:

Any action whereby we may torment animals, or let them suffer distress, or otherwise treat them without love, is demeaning to ourselves
-- Immanuel Kant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

Horses are slaughtered everyday in USA and used for petfood. I can't speak to how things may have been done in old Tibet, but clearly the meat-for-food industry was questionable using muslims as butchers, etc. as a way to distance themselves from the killing, even as they were placing the orders. However, I don't think it would have been too unusual to find dead animals in old Tibet either.. harsh climate. . especially at a time when weather-control would have been deemed necessary. I assume Malcolm can clear all this up, having been close with Ngakpa Yeshe Dorje.

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly this phenomena of using muslim butchers is a Lhasa custom. In other regions, where Muslims were not to be found, Tibetans had to kill their own food animals. It is a pratical necessity.

Actually, it is just a fact of samsara -- animal husbandry and salughter provides the raw resources for virtually all organic farming. This is one reason why I think the vegans are nuts. They are not living in the real world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

However Malcolm told us that his ngakpa teacher did indeed perform a blood sacrifice of real animals as part of a weather controlling ritual of some sort.

Adamantine said:

I think you are mistaken here Kirt. Malcolm can clarify, but I recall that NYD may have used some horse heads or something as an offering to placate certain entities with control over the weather, -- but he did not kill these animals or order them to be killed. In this sense, it does not seem much different than ganapuja or protector offerings that include meat.

kirtu said:

I hope that I am mistaken but horse heads can't be that easy to come by. Cow heads unfortunately are another matter. But look, in old Tibet how would this ritual have been performed? Would they have waited around for some animals to die naturally and then to encase the head or other animal part in some kind of resin for reuse, etc.? Probably not.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans, especially nomads and farmers, slaughter animals quite regularly (by suffocation usually, basically waterboarding them), feel bad about it, and try to purify the effect of that karma yearly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

However Malcolm told us that his ngakpa teacher did indeed perform a blood sacrifice

of real animals as part of a weather controlling ritual of some sort.

Malcolm wrote:
I never said that.

They went to an abbatoir and procured the head of a bull that had been slaughtered.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:42 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
In regards to the philosophical approaches to ethics within an existential or scientific-materialist framework, perhaps there can be found an infinite number of reasons to act ethically. But ethics are completely subjective in many ways, as is the idea of non-harm. For many, capital punishment, or abortion as a means of family-planning, or even torture are considered ethical for many. And even if some nominal sense of ethics can be found in materialistic traditions or those of other religions, your above quotations included, I think the six paramitas would be way outside of their comfort-zones, and would appear completely nonsensical.

Malcolm wrote:
It is quite clear from your statement you have not delved into the Western tradition of moral philosophy very deep.

The impact of Kant's metaphysic of morals is very simple, and can be stated as follows:
"A rational being has the obligation to protect other rational beings, even and especially at their own expense because rational beings must never be used as a means for our own end as we would never wish to be used as means."

The entire human rights movement grew out of Kant's moral metaphysics. In terms of moral philosophy, Buddhism is far behind the curve in terms of sophistication, for the most part still in the 14th century somewhere.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:34 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

gregkavarnos said:
I imagine many here will find themselves with egg on their faces and their feet lodged firmly in their mouths.

Malcolm wrote:
What the hell does that mean Greg?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:30 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:

Malcolm, with all due respect you were at the same teaching and brought up this same quote, with a similar point in a thread about Reggie Ray on Esangha a few years ago. He wasn't in your list of things you felt sorry for, should he have been? If you've completely gone 360 on this issue, that is fine, it is sad to see you join the ranks of Stephen Batchelor though.

Malcolm wrote:

With all due respect, I never said that ethical action without believing in karma was impossible. I think it is a foolish thing to say.

As far as Ray goes, I criticized him for saying that rebirth was not a necessary part of the Dharma taught by the Buddha. He was wrong to say that. So, not I am not sorry for making that observation. If someone claims that we can eject rebirth as so much Asian baggage, that person is not teaching the Dharma of the Buddha correctly.

Just because I feel a little sad for some things I have said does not mean that I have necessarily changed my opinions about these issues. It just means that I recognized the folly of creating enemies when it is not necessary.

Adamantine said:

I also strongly disagree that Dzongsar Khyentse's statement is intellectually impoverished. .

Malcolm wrote:

I find the suggestion that moral action only to be possible in the context of rebirth a repugnant claim.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:24 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
mindyourmind said:
Hi Malcolm

I understood all of that the first time you explained it. I just cannot agree with you that

somehow Buddhism is a human construct, a human institution (and it shows), but Dzogchen is not.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhism is not Dharma.

mindyourmind said:
Another big disagreement there.

Your cynicism is really not good to see, Malcolm. I know there is this wordplay going on about the meaning of "Buddhism" and "Dharma", but I just look at that in plain language, and this trip of yours not something I want to be a part of.

Malcolm wrote:
As I said, Buddhism is just a container. Bon is another. Dharma is beyond these things. We categorize these things into convenient categories put them on shelves, and then we begin to think the label is the food.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:02 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
mindyourmind said:
Hi Malcolm

I understood all of that the first time you explained it. I just cannot agree with you that somehow Buddhism is a human construct, a human institution (and it shows), but Dzogchen is not.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhism is not Dharma. Just a container.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:54 PM
Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona
Content:
conebeckham said:
The "touched my genitals" thing vis a vis a Yamantaka empowerment? WTF?

Malcolm wrote:
Come on, admit it -- you're just jealous!!!

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

What many are saying is that they can conceive a Dzogchen that can be practiced by people who don't identify themselves as Buddhists and that there's the possibility of Dzogchen standing outside the limitations of any denomination, Buddhist or otherwise. I keep failing to understand why this is polemic. Do you think Dzogchen must be considered Buddhist to work?

heart said:

Not at all, for me you are free to experiment. Anyway, who could stop you, the pope of Buddhism? The whole way through this long thread my only point is that Dzogchen is, and have been since Garab Dorje, a part of Buddhism. As I said many times, for me Dzogchen is the heart of Buddhism.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and no one told you that you could not or should not feel that way.

I don't agree with your historical read, however.

For me, Dzogchen is the essence of Dharma, be it samsaric or nirvanic, but not all Buddhists accept all Dharma as valid, as we see in this thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Whatever the fancy images, it is still a samsaric institution, with flawed beings creating all kinds of political and financial tensions. I don't see how it is superior to what you are critiquing in so-called Buddhist institutions. There are the same tensions about fundraising, supporting centers, paying rent, and not allowing people who are too broke to pay into the teachings. (Yeah, I know there are free webcasts but that is not unique to the DC).

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, the flaws in the DC comes from people. Good thing no one thinks the DC is Dzogchen, not even in the DC.

As far as the webcast go, no one is teaching profound Dzogchen the way CHNN is via webcast. They just aren't. I don't know why. There are perhaps many reasons, distrust of

technology, concerns about samayas, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

If we don't believe in samsara, and rebirth, as Dzongsar Khyentse pointed out in his teachings on Abandoning the Four Attachments: it would be a lot easier and more fun to just rob a bank and retire to some exotic island, enjoying sensory pleasures indefinitely.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh this is total nonsense. There are many reasons to behave ethically, and most people behave ethically merely because it is in their best interest to do so, no medieval threats of hell realms needed.

You know, when ever Buddhists bring this example up, normal people look at them like they are completely full of shite and just consider them fundamentalist weirdos.

These kinds of statements by eminent Buddhists teachers are intellectually impoverished. They make these statements largely out of cultural ignorance of the centuries of upon centuries of very pointed western philosophical inquiry into the nature of morals and ethics.

My father is a former philosophy professor and he would consider such as proposition above childish and simplistic, which indeed it is.

Apparently Dzogsar as never read Kant's Groundwork For a Metaphysics of Morals nor does he know anything about the categorical imperative. Indeed, the human rights movement grew out of Kantian moral metaphysics.

1) Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law without contradiction.

2) Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end.

3) Therefore, every rational being must so act as if he were through his maxim always a legislating member in the universal kingdom of ends.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Right. And anything else, organized around "Dzogchen", is just theoretical.

Malcolm wrote:

Well Dzogchen Community is not very organized. It has no sangha of monks, no hierarchy of practitioners, no unified corporate structure, etc. This, in a real sense, is Dzogchen community:

In the center there are the Dzogchen Teachings. Surrounding that are the gars, then the gakyils, the groups of practitioners, then individuals, all interconnected. The Gars, Gakyils, and groups have three colors, symbolizing how we collaborate. The individuals in the periphery have the same color as the teachings in the middle symbolizing that we all have the same state. Everyone is the same, no one is higher, no one is lower.

Adamantine said:

I think the point is that there is nothing wrong with the essence of Buddhism...

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with Buddhadharma, there are many things wrong with Buddhism.

Adamantine said:

The point is maturing in one's own practice to be able to discover the essence, and not holding on to the labels, whatever they may be.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but to discover that essence you do not first have to put on the label "Buddhist".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

According to your new Dzogchen without Buddhism or what?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is a human institution developed by ordinary human beings, and it shows.

mindyourmind said:

Right there is an example of a statement that is quite acceptable, here on the Dzogchen

sub-forum, but to comment on it may be again construed as policing, living in a cage, living with limitations etc.

Are there any institutions not made by humans? If so, what are they? Is Dzogchen a human institution, and does it show?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a "human" institution. There are human institutions that have been built up around Dzogchen teachings, and like all such things, they are subject to the flaws of the humans that participate in them. The purpose of Dzogchen Community, for example, is to assist people's development of the knowledge of Dzogchen in themselves, first and foremost through following a qualified master who has that knowledge. This is the purpose of any group of people assembled to develop the knowledge of any teaching. But whenever you have people gather, also there is always a very real probability that some people will not have a perfect understanding. Thus, Dzogchen Community is also not a perfect institution. People in the Community, as in any community, make many mistakes. However, they are gathered to develop Dzogchen teachings among human beings. Dzogchen Community is not a very traditional organization in the Tibetan Buddhist sense of the term. There is no emphasis on reproducing the forms and culture of Tibetan Buddhism in the DC, unlike other organizations. This is because ChNN found there was no point in doing this, because while human culture is wonderful and rich, Dzogchen is beyond cultural limitations. Of course he loves his own culture, but he has no interest in converting people to the culture of Tibetan Buddhism because we are not Tibetans.

When human institutions become old and entrenched, very often the institution becomes more important than the people it was originally designed to serve. This point is very much lost in this discussion. People always say "We should serve the Dharma" but what happens in reality is that we wind up serving "Dharma" institutions, and naively, merely perpetuate the eight worldly dharmas. The same is true of the Catholics, Anglicans, Governments, etc.

A great deal of this thread has been devoted to the question of whether it is important to consider Dzogchen a part of Buddhism. Well, one of the reasons this question has not been answered is because it is obvious Dzogchen exists within Buddhist institutions. Some people think that because it exists in Buddhist institutions, this makes Dzogchen "Buddhist" and that this limits Dzogchen to Buddhism.

I sure don't share that view. Dharma in general does not belong to institutions. The Buddha himself never created a single Buddhist institution. Garab Dorje never created a Dzogchen "Institution" -- he never built a temple, or a shrine, etc. Also Chogyal Namkhai Norbu did not create Dzogchen Community. He merely gave this name to the group of students that spontaneously gathered around him in the mid '70's when he decided there was sufficient interest in Dzogchen. Why did he give a name? Because they were following Dzogchen teachings. They were not following "Buddhism". They were not Buddhists, the vast majority of them. They did not become "Buddhists" just because they became students of Dzogchen teachings. Most of the early students from that

period of time still do not consider themselves "Buddhists". They were never told by their teacher they must consider themselves "Buddhists". The only thing they were told is that they were learning a teaching called Dzogchen. Buddhists who came to receive teachings were never told they must not call themselves Buddhists. The only thing they were told is that they were learning a teaching called Dzogchen.

As I said, I came to Dzogchen through Tibetan Buddhism. I am nominally a Buddhist. But I don't feel particularly Buddhist any more in so far as I feel a strong cultural allegiance to any Buddhist institutions be they Hinayana, Mahayana, or Vajrayana. I feel like a Doctor of Tibetan Medicine, and a Dzogchen practitioner.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Does it not show once more Dzogchen is not without Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

It shows a characteristically Buddhist approach to Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

According to your new Dzogchen without Buddhism or what?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is a human institution developed by ordinary human beings, and it shows.

Adamantine said:

So is Dzogchen Community, isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is not Dzogchen. It too is a human institution, and it shows.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

According to your new Dzogchen without Buddhism or what?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is a human institution developed by ordinary human beings, and it shows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thank you, the old well-know Namdrol, I'm glad you again are here Please read our archives.

Malcolm wrote:

I am happy that you feel you have successfully tilted a windmill.

Mariusz said:

According to your new Dzogchen without Buddhism or what?

Malcolm wrote:

I was referring to your quixotic effort to prove that relative truth was not entirely false. Now lets please return to the topic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Ouch, sound problems

Conceptual said:

Try opening the webcast in two tabs — audio webcast & video webcast. Mute the audio in the video tab. I find that alleviates any issues.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a good idea -- it puts extra strain on server.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

I have already debated successfully it with Namdrol in many forum threads in Dharmawheel, as for example "the seeming is not totally faulty".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you feel you have. Others have a different perception of your "success".

Mariusz said:

Thank you, the old well-know Namdrol, I'm glad you again are here Please read our archives.

Malcolm wrote:

I am happy that you feel you have successfully tilted a windmill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

I have already debated successfully it with Namdrol in many forum threads in Dharmawheel, as for example "the seeming is not totally faulty".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you feel you have. Others have a different perception of your "success".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

To complain about being misunderstood, more than once, could also simply mean that a message was conveyed poorly...

Malcolm wrote:

In my case, no.

mindyourmind said:

...as opposed to the recipients twisting the message.

Malcolm wrote:

In their case, yes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The president of Golden Dawn and current member of national parliament, Mihaloliakos, taking his dogs out for their afternoon walk. images.jpg

kirtu said:

This is truly frightening stuff. Why is radical nationalism making a come back in Russia, the Balkans and Greece?

Kirt

treehuggingoctopus said:

Don't forget about France (Marine le Pen), Finland's True Finns (ponder the name!) and the Netherlands (Wilders). Those guys are fascists as well - suit-wearing types, sure enough, not boneheads - but fascists nonetheless. The whole Third Position talk is ridiculously easy to see through.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is Nationalist Socialism. But the causes of it are neo-liberalism at the core, the gutting of national economies and infrastructure in the interest of so called "free trade".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I have signed up but not received any notification about membership. How long does this process take? Who is the best person to call to attempt to expedite in time for the start of the retreat tomorrow?

Thanks to all for your help!

Malcolm wrote:

Call Harold at tsegyalgar

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The president of Golden Dawn and current member of national parliament, Mihaloliakos, taking his dogs out for their afternoon walk. images.jpg

kirtu said:

This is truly frightening stuff. Why is radical nationalism making a come back in Russia, the Balkans and Greece?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

It is a symptom of the weakening of local economies under the forces of international globalization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Inge said:

Hi!

A few years ago I prematurely attended some teachings and empowerments that were given with lifetime daily practice commitments. Afterwards I struggled immensely with these practices for maybe a half year or so, but they made no sense to me, and I ended up doing them out of guilt, and fear of vajra hell. Then I gave them up altogether. Now I only try to follow the teachings of ChNN, do Guru Yoga when I remember, and other DC practices when I have time and energy, but I still fear negative consequences for abandoning past practice commitments. This is due to the snake in the bamboo image. I find it unreasonable to go to Vajra hell just for attending some teachings. I might understand if it was due to some kind of practices that manipulated the pranas, etc., that if done wrongly might lead to madness, etc., but just for attending empowerments and teachings? It does not make sense. I was thinking at the time that going could only be a good thing, that nothing bad could come from attending. So this was my motivation. I did not know anything about the teacher, lineage, teachings, practices, etc. So in this case, what am I to do?

Malcolm wrote:

Don't worry about it at all. With Ati Guru Yoga you are going into the essence of all teachings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Alternatives for the Dzogchenpa

Content:

Sherlock said:

Malcolm once said that if you received the teachings from ChNN and did the practice daily (I assume guru yoga?) he guarantees that you will face no difficulties upon death. I'd also be curious to know his answer.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Inge said:

Is this also the case for non-recognizers like me?

Malcolm wrote:

If you apply Ati Guru Yoga with diligence, then you will face no difficulties at death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

As for advanced results such as obtaining the rainbow body or four visions while for example dismissing emptiness in favor of worshipping Jesus or Jehovah then Malcolm is undecided.

Malcolm wrote:

I really wish you would stop having my opinions for me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Curious Treasury ...

Content:

Sönam said:

It is certainly very much 9 yanas approach ... for a treasure

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Man ngag mdzod is not about Dzogchen specifically niether is the grub tha' mdzod or

the yid bzhin mdzod. Only the other four.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I'm wondering how someone from another 'faith' background can work within the Dzogchen tradition if they frame their experience and practice in terms of prayer. Is it that prayer is a secondary practice if you are a Christian Dzogchenpa? Or is it that by becoming a dzogchen practitioner you will no longer have need for a belief in Christianity or in the need for prayer?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner who is a Christian, presumably it means you still participate in your denomination, sing hymns, etc., because these things for you are meaningful. Perhaps your family is Christian and it is important for them that you continue to participate in the Church. I honestly do not know how it works for these people. But since ChNN has any number of sincere students who are followers of his who nevertheless continue to participate in other faiths besides Buddhism, all I know is that it must be possible to integrate this with Dzogchen teachings since people seem to manage to do it.

I am not in a position to judge them -- merely note that they do not see a conflict. Perhaps they see God, as ChNN suggested, as meaning their primordial potentiality -- I have no idea.

So I prefer to remain open.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Many of us have been saying you can enter the Dzogchen or other dharma vehicles' paths being of other beliefs but in advanced stages of Dzogchen for example the person can not hold contradictory beliefs and expect results.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not need beleifs for Dzogchen. Just personal experience.

username said:

For example denying emptiness or grasping to a solid god. Or for example can not support the violent behavior of people like Muhammad and take refuge in him while expecting thogal advanced results or rainbow body.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't support Mohammed's violent behavior. Never said that I did. However, no one takes refuge in Mohammed, not even Muslims. They go for refuge to Allah.

username said:

I just mentioned an exception of someone, who can enter the path but not expect advanced results holding on to such old beliefs, which disproves your global rule and shows your misrepresentation of what Rinpoche says as invalid.

Malcolm wrote:

What global rule?

username said:

Thirdly with regards to such messages from you and others proclaiming peace and claiming to be right on yet constantly attacking squares like me, who had been against your extreme ultra orthodox views on the other extreme end till recently, with personal attacks:

Malcolm wrote:

No extreme ultra orthodox views here. But I do know how to play the scales of tenet systems as well as anyone, and when someone in the past said something that was out of line with tenet systems as I understand them, I corrected them. But as anyone who has followed my career online, I have wavered between orthodoxy and liberalism as much as anyone. When I was participating in the administration of E-Sangha, I felt we had to maintain a certain orthodox position viz Buddhism. I recognize now that was an error. Not because it is wrong to be na orthodox Buddhist, but all Buddhists have a very different idea of what that means and we were more or less enforcing an Indo-Tibetan idea of orthodoxy. So yes, I have varied between very liberal expressions and very orthodox ones. Sorry for being so human.

More recently, you decided of your own volition to get into with me because I felt you were mispresenting Gaudapada, etc., and I told you so. In response you went ballistic.

You have completely ignored my basic statement: "I am not saying that every path leads to the same liberation, but where we can all agree is that everyone is seeking the peace and happiness that comes from freedom, and if we maintain presence and awareness of this fact, we can go beyond limitations regarding religion".

Then of couse, some people decided to have a metadiscussion about whether there is indeed liberation in other schools (something I never claimed. I hope so, but I don't follow those schools so I don't know). People trotted out various criteria for what differentiates Buddhist from non-Buddhist, for example, the idea of being an insider as

someone who is concerned with their mind -- and I showed this definition equally applied to the Yoga system and others. Someone else advanced the idea that it was the four seals -- but I showed that this can be found in Advaita as well. Other people asserted that as far as Bon goes, they only achieve liberation because they adopted Buddhism -- that is quite kind in its spirit, but interestingly, you did not critique Bonpos for plagiarism, only poor Guadapada. I merely pointed out that dogmatic assertions that liberation only occurs in Buddhism are just that -- dogmatic assertions with no substance. I have in the past said the criteria for what constitutes liberation in this school or that school differs so dramatically that it is impossible to judge. All one can say is that in many cases, it does not resemble what Buddhists imagine liberation to be. And when it comes to Dzogchen, a lot of Buddhists cannot fathom what liberation is Dzogchen is. So there you go.

I also pointed out that the most trechant and sustained criticism of Dzogchen has come from within Buddhism and that it continues to this day. And I do feel a lot of Nyingmapas mispresent Dzogchen completely, perhaps they mean well, but a lot of Nyingmapas just don't get it because they are so conditioned by the Kadamapa outlook.

I have also said that Dzogchen is a personal experience, as you well know. If someone comes to Dzogchen who is a rabbi, for example, they do not need to shed their rabbi skin just because they are a Dzogchen practitioner. They can continue just as they are. Dzogchen is not a matter of belief. Having a Madhyamaka view makes you no nearer to Dzogchen than having a Christian view. That is my present understanding. If one does not have that unique personal experience called "Dzogchen" than one is very far away from Dzogchen. If one is trying very hard to discover that experience than one can be called a Dzogchen practitioner. If one has that experience and the attendant confidence in that experience, then one has no need of any beliefs at all -- which I also said.

Frankly, this thread has come to the point where I am responding to things I never said merely because someone claimed that I said them. That is a pity since it is waste of time for people to make such remarks and it is a waste of time to respond to them. So I am putting everyone on notice. If you make a claim about something I have said which in fact is not what I said -- I am not going to respond at all. I will not longer respond to distortions and misrepresentations. If you want to quote something I said and give an opinion of it -- fine. For other posts, in order to garner a response from me, that post must contain a direct citation. Otherwise, I will ignore as I choose.

Thanks,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Isn't it amazing how people that are not bound by golden cages, who aspire to be free of most normal constraints and who practice non-duality daily end up, in the Dzogchen forum, with a thread 60 pages and counting.

It's hilarious.

Malcolm wrote:

One, you cannot "practice" non-duality; two, no one said anything about being free from normal constraints. Another misrepresentation.

The level of misrepresentation in this thread of what I have said is most astonishing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

... dismissing the Victor Shakyamuni's Buddhadharma as unnecessary for Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

Actually my point was quite different. But whatever, misrepresentation of what I have been saying has abounded in this thread, so I shan't expect it to cease now.

username said:

So you are still saying that someone taking refuge and prostrating 5 times a day to the God of Muhammad knowing full well he beheaded hundreds of a certain innocent Jewish tribe guilty of only giving water and food to another Jewish tribe who were being starved to death women and babies included and those hundreds beheaded one by one included young teenage boys which they do not deny and sharing in that collective karma by intention, can go through the four visions and necessary thogal practices onto rainbow body? And that is what Rinpoche says?

Malcolm wrote:

Username, when is the last time you beat your wife?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

... dismissing the Victor Shakyamuni's Buddhadharma as unnecessary for Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

Actually my point was quite different. Just to remind you:

This is a very good question. I have been moving slowly toward the pov of view that for most people studying these lower yānas is a complete waste of time. Oh, it can be useful to study a bit of Abhidharma because it helps contextualize mandala practice, and Madhyamaka does help cut through intellectual proliferation, properly studied and absorbed. Studying a bit of Madhyamaka helps one avoid the pitfal of crypto-advaita. ...etc.

The one absolutely indispensable thing is direct introduction. There is no path of Dzogchen without that at its head. If people are unwilling to put into practice the methods of Dzogchen following receiving that, this is their limitation and there can be no help for it.

Dzogchen includes the meaning of all Buddhadharma, so one cannot say that by practicing Dzogchen as an independent path, one is dismissing Buddhadharma as unnecessary. One can dismiss the organized religion that has accreted around Buddhadharma i.e. "Buddhism", the corresponding socio/political/economic institutions, as unnecessary for Dzogchen practitioners.

For example, most of the primordial teachers of Dzogchen did not have a monastic Sangha -- only Ser'wöd Dampa and Shakyamuni did. But Garab Dorje did not. The rest of these teachers had various kinds of retinues, some had retinues of buddhas, thers of bodhisattvas, some of daknis, others of yakshas and rakshashas. For example the retinue of Nangwa Dampa was 1002 Buddhas, as well as devas. We have no insight into the social organization and hierarchies of buddhas, bodhisattvas, devas, dakinis, yakshas and rakshasas. We only have insight into the social organization of human beings.

"Unnecessary" does not mean "should never participate". I have made it clear that if someone, a Dzogchen practitioner, likes to participate in shrines and temples constructed by Buddhists than they should. I like shrines. They can be beautiful. The most moving place for me so far in my life was seeing the Jowo in Lhasa, and being in Samye -- and being in the Yarlung Valley. Shrines can also be gaudy and unnecessary.

If someone likes to think of themselves as Nyingmapas, or Kagyus, or Sakyas, or Gelugs, its ok with me. I am not saying to anyone they need to feel the way I do.

While other people consider Shakyamuni the most important teacher of all, I consider Garab Dorje more important. Garab Dorje is the most important teacher for Dzogchen, even more important than Padmasambhava (for Nyingmapas, perhaps Padmasambhava is more important). Why? Because Garab Dorje, not Padmasambhava, not Shakyamuni, taught the six million four hundred thousands lines of Dzogchen tantras, all the Dzogchen tantras that had been taught by all the previous Teachers of Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

... dismissing the Victor Shakyamuni's Buddhadharma as unnecessary for Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

Actually my point was quite different. But whatever, misrepresentation of what I have been saying has abounded in this thread, so I shan't expect it to cease now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=77770#p77770> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, I did not call CTR a jerk. I said, "Frankly, in this story, Trungpa just comes across as a clueless jerk."

Pretty different statement. I am quite certain the waitress though he was a total jerk.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All I said about Trungpa that he seemed to me like an ordinary person based on the related episode. I guess calling someone an ordinary person is a bad thing. I honestly do not know whether Trungpa was realized or not. And I don't care much. He has been dead for more than twenty years. Perhaps he was completely naive about guns. Really. I reacted when I said that. I am sorry it offended you.

username said:

No recently you said you doubted his realizations and said he was a jerk. Also your attacks on him goes back years. Again dishonest.

Karma Dorje said:

Saying Trungpa was a jerk is a simple statement of fact. He slept with his student's regardless of whether they were in a relationship or not. He promoted a preening and predatory student as his successor that ended up killing those he should be protecting. Was he a siddha? Perhaps, but irrespective of his realization, he was a jerk.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think I said he was a jerk. Someone recounted an episode where he apparently was trying to shoot a gun at a bird. The owner of the gun took it away from him and shot the bird in front of Trungpa. I think what I said was "for me, Trungpa is an ordinary person".

I said it on a thread on Chris Battis's facebook page. Should still be there.

As far having said other negative things about CTR -- I never said a peep about him ever.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

[But you are facing some obstacles in this aspect. .

Malcolm wrote:

Hi username:

No obstacles, quite the opposite. But like any good vintage of wine, you have to let things sit in the bottle for some years.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

conebeckham said:

So much energy and emotion invested in proving points, dicing up the vegetables.....and so many assumptions being made about other people's statements....it's quite exhausting. To coin an essential Dzogchen instruction...."Relax."

IMO, Namdrol's not making stew. Nor is he devaluing any path, unless that path takes an exclusivist stance. He was quite clear about where he felt certain paths "go wrong." Now, Dzogchen can be accused of taking that same stance...but if you really

understand what he's saying, I think all these conceptions and assertions can be sidestepped if one understands that, in Dzokchen, all that is just so much wind. Personal experience, one's own personal experience, is so removed from that stuff.

He's not "endorsing" Hinduism, or "demeaning" Buddhism. He's also not validating any path but the one he practices. He's saying, simply, he can't "know" those paths he doesn't practice, personally, and therefore can't condemn them or call them invalid-- how could he? And how can we? Yes, we can point out logical and conceptual inconsistencies, but when we do so we are so in danger of missing the forest for the tress, you know? Don't forget the forest, even when you're lopping branches off trees, and be careful lopping of branches.....they may, or may not, block the view. I'm happy he's happy, and I am grateful for his words.

Malcolm wrote:
Thanks Cone.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:54 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Mariusz said:
I'm not naive. Limitations/calculations are necessary to survive in this world.

Nangwa said:
This samsaric world that is.
Get rid of those limitations and we just might get rid of samsara.

Mariusz said:
It was about genuine lineages of dzogchen also. You want to get rid them also.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, that is what I want, I want to get rid of the genuine transmission of Dzogchen (not)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:49 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

I have critiqued the Buddhist reception of Dzogchen in ...India...

M

Matylda said:

Dear Malcolm, maybe I missed it somewhere in this long discussion, but it I am curious about India and dzgochen reception there... could you elaborate a little bit or give some source. I am interested in it.

Malcolm wrote:

The basic gist of it is that standard Vajrayāna received institutional support from the beginning primarily because it was heavily grounded in Yogatantra. For example, the Guhyasamaja is also listed among the 18 tantras Amoghavajra brought to China in the early 8th century, if I recall correctly. And the mother tantras such as Cakrasamvara, Hevajra, also received approval as well. The reason for this, as far as I can tell, is that they never sought to supercede the path structure, the abhisamaya process, as desribed in sutra. They were tantras that utilized Abidharma, as it were, differently. So for example, the 37 dākinīs in the Cakrasamvara mandala are described as being representative of the 37 bodhipakṣa dharmas, etc.

But Dzogchen tantras makes little or no use of these schemes at all. While they indeed make reference to the peaceful and wrathful mandalas mentioned also in the Guhyagarbha, they treat these quite differently than the Guhyagarbha treats them. However, since these mandalas are mentioned in the Dzogchen tantras, especially the Rigpa Rangshar, and since the Guhyagarbha mentions Dzogchen explicitly in the body of the text, exegesis of the Guhyagarbha became a mandatory study since the Guhyagarbha has Indian commentaries and is based on verifiable Sanskrit text. Though Indian originals of the 17 tantras, the 18 sems de lungs and five tantras, and the klong sde tantras and so on either never existed or were lost, The Guhyagarbha as well as the Vajrakilaya fragment tantra, among others, provided a key link through which the adherents of the old translation school could proclaim that contrary to the accusations leveled by Go and others could claim that Dzogchen had an authentic ground on Indian soil. Because the monastery of Samyas burnt down several times, many precious Indian manuscripts were lost. Also the manuscripts of Samyas were written in I beleive Gupta script, which was not readable by most Indian panditas by the time fo Atisha, since the script in question used at that time was Pala, I think.

Anyway, according to the annals of the lineage of Dzogchen, Dzogchen received an incredibly hostile reception from Buddhists both in India and Tibet, confined to a very small group of practitioners and never grew in prominence in India as part of the siddha movement, in the same way as the more normative "Buddhist" tantras in which Mahāmudra is grounded. Thus, by the eleventh century, and certainly much earlier, all trace of Dzogchen and even the Guhyagarbha tantra was erased from Indian history as if it had never existed.

One possibility is that since the Bonpos had a teaching of Dzogchen already, when the Garab Dorje lineage of Dzogchen was introduced to Tibet they took it up immediately and with enthusiasm. They never produced any polemical literature against Dzogchen,

instead they incorporated the Garab Dorje lineage of teachings, and even Garab Dorje himself, into ZZNG. But because they preserved Dzogchen clearly, also Dzogchen was framed as Bon teaching. Certainly I have read polemics to this effect. Then there is the Nyingma crib that Tapihritsa, one of the most important masters of ZZNG was really an emanation of Guru Rinpoche, which actually is proof that the Nyingmapas recognize that ZZNG preceded the advent of Buddhism in Tibet.

The Buddhist history of Dzogchen is very much bound up with the fact that Indian Buddhists rejected Dzogchen overwhelmingly -- according to the annals of Dzogchen, the 17 tantras, for example were concealed in Nalanda. When Vimalamitra went to Tibet, Nalanda handed the only copy of the extant Dzogchen tantras surviving and thus Dzogchen disappeared from the subcontinent, or so the story runs. The difficulties facing Vairocana and Vimalamitra in Tibet are well known.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Your work here is benefiting many and I hope it continues in force as well as looking forward to your translations as I think you might be the best living English translator but can not fathom why you procrastinate so much.

Best of Luck to you.

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks, that's a nice compliment.

As to the other thing, I am not procrastinating, but the process of bringing out a proper translation is pains-taking, and since I am very productive, the sheer amount of raw translations I need to edit is rather staggering. And it is not in my nature to allow editors to edit my work without my approval and discussion of every change. I need to live another 50 years.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Finally I would like to point out that I am typing these responses with a smile and consider you overall a good Vajra brother.

Wishing you all the best as ever.

Malcolm wrote:

I consider your objections to be largely incoherent in many respects, others sort of along the lines of "When is the last time you beat your wife", and a large number of obvious distortions as anyone can plainly see.

Be well,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Malcolm. Why are you not just waiting if the hypothetical experiments with non-buddhist or non-bon people will succeed in their full realization of 4 visions of dzogchen thogal according to instructions of Namkhai Norbu or any other buddhist/Bon master, and further if their future non-buddhist/non-bon lineages will survive outside Buddhism or Bon? I agree with username. You are still fighting although only on speculations. Earlier you were fighting sakyapa with protectors based on some facts. So it even got worse. Buddhism was the institution where Dzogchen fully survived! Not Hinduism or other.

Malcolm wrote:

You just keep right on dividing up the world into limitations. But at the end of the day, the only one you are limiting is yourself.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Hi Malcolm,

I hope you are well. I merely said first in this thread that he got a lot of his ideas from buddhist yogachara schools and rebranded them which he did as Hindu. Even back then which was not so long ago when you founded a new school you were supposed to come clean if a lot of your tenets were based on someone else's completely different religion. Today they claim they had it all along.

Malcolm wrote:

Gaudapāda acknowledged the Buddha as the source of his ajativādin arguments. Shankaracarya sought to cover this up in his commentary on the Agamasastra. But we were not talking about the latter. We were talking about the former, and you were the one that used the term "plagiarism" to describe his literary activity. I have studied that Agamasastra in detail.

username said:

Malcolm I don't think you can accuse me of narrowmindedness after I praised nisargadata and even said he was probably a Tulku.

Malcolm wrote:

Proclaiming that Nisgardatta must have been a Buddhist Tulku can be seen as a kind of narrowness. This is a kind of narrowmindedness we see all the time among Buddhists -- everything good and interesting that we like in other religious schools must somehow be the activity of Buddhist tulkus, as if nothing good can come about in the world if it is not tied to some explicitly Buddhist institution or belief.

username said:

Yet you never mentioned Trungpa, a major tertön, who you called something bad recently as well as saying you doubted his realization. Or others.

Malcolm wrote:

I made a blanket apology since I have said so many things and offended so many people, it is all I can do. I am sure people are still offended. But after a certain point it becomes their problem and not mine.

All I said about Trungpa that he seemed to me like an ordinary person based on the related episode. I guess calling someone an ordinary person is a bad thing. I honestly do not know whether Trungpa was realized or not. And I don't care much. He has been dead for more than twenty years. Perhaps he was completely naive about guns. Really. I reacted when I said that. I am sorry it offended you.

username said:

You say you're heart is now filled with love but you don't stop someone here attacking anyone against your views with personal attacks in your defense.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not defended anything, not have I attacked anyone. I have not attacked you either. I said you displayed narrowness in your post.

username said:

You praise all schools and religions and yet attack and have no understanding for buddhist institutions ' mistakes which is still less than the other religions outside Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

My point about this was when we examine who really persecuted Dzogchen teachings,

it was not Non-Buddhists, all the Non-Buddhists I have ever talked with about Dzogchen think it is cool. The Bonpos were totally into Dzogchen. They took to it like ducks to water. There is no history of Bonpos attacking Dzogchen, none at all.

I have found it is Buddhists who raise the largest and most sustained arguments against Dzogchen. And so I recounted that history. These things are merely facts -- facts are not attacks. I can understand however that many people's hackles are raised because I am presenting these things in the open. I understand the polemics against Dzogchen quite well.

username said:

If you said other religions fleece their students and screw their flock then it would have been fair but you just attack buddhist ones. And many have written here they perceive you attack Buddhism too.

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite sure there are false teachers in every religion, just as there are sincere ones. But since I am not privy to the sordid details of the false guides in other schools, I don't really have much to say about them. What I am familiar with is the situation of Tibetan Buddhism and the presence of a great deal of corruption and malfeasance in its institutions.

username said:

I am sorry Malcolm but you just changed one group of people you attacked with another, not your basic attitude.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I have not attacked anyone. I have critiqued the Buddhist reception of Dzogchen in both India and Tibet and traced a little bit of the history of how it became normalized within the institutions of Tibetan Buddhism.

Now, I am sorry that you feel attacked, but I am equally certain that I am not attacking you or anyone else.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Buddhist's point was that Gaudapada copied it, rebranded it and presented as something new of his own. Plus he came much much later than centuries of Buddhist philosophical debates he "ripped off" without quoting the sources. Sort of intellectual theft and plagiarism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is completely unfair. In his Agamasastra, he prostrates to the Buddha openly. He was beyond limits of Hindu and Buddhist sectarian divisions. He used arguments derived from Mahāyāna to tease a middle way between Samkhya (satkaryavādins) and Vaisheika (asatkarvādins) perspectives and establishes ajativāda, the position of non-origination.

I am sorry to say, username, this is exactly the type narrowness that is a problem. Why is it a problem for some intelligent brahmin to make use of Buddhist arguments when he sees that they point out a deficiency in some other tenet systems perspective? Are you implying that to make use of a logical formula derived from Madhyamaka, you must declare yourself a Buddhist? This is like insisting that in order to practice Dzogchen, you must declare allegiance to Buddhism.

Also Karma Vajra has a point, the ethos of ancient scholarship did not include the idea of plagiarism. This is a modern idea based on capitalism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The nirvana of the early Buddhists is an attributeless unconditioned consciousness as Peter Harvey very eloquently shows in his *The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism*.

xabir said:

The point is not pure consciousness. There is nothing wrong with pure consciousness. It is making it into an ultimate reality, ultimate ground, a transcendental essence that is despite being said to be beyond conceptual notions yet clung to as truly existent (despite how they want to phrase it being beyond notions of existence etc which is simply trying to express the non-conceptuality of that reality, it will always be treated as an ontological essence which therefore leads to clinging to the ultimate ground).

I do not believe Theravada talks about consciousness as an ultimate ground, and the Buddha actually rejected the view of making nirvana into a source right in MN 1 and Thanissaro Bhikkhu made a good commentary on it.

Malcolm wrote:

Unconditioned means ultimate, generally speaking.

Brahmin is not a ground in the sense of prakriti. It is a ground only in the sense that since it is not recognized, māya emerges, etc.

My point all along being is that also Advaita, like Dzogchen and other forms of Dharma recognize that ignorance of our true nature is the real problem, and the solution is to discover that real state.

The rest is semantics after a certain point. Nevertheless, I am not committed to a position that is stating absolutely Advaita realization and Buddhist realization are the same. My only point is bringing this up is shake up the tree of dogmatic clinging to views.

As I said, all human beings are searching for the peace and happiness that comes from freedom. We can go beyond sectarian limitations by keeping this point in our minds.

As for myself, I am a Dzogchen practitioner. My religious background, obviously is Buddhist. I am not a Bonpo. But first and foremost I am a practitioner of the path of Dzogchen. Buddhist teachings and practices which assist that practice can be useful. Those that are not, I don't use and leave them aside for others to use as they wish.

But Dzogchen in the end cannot be reduced to "Buddhism" -- Dzogchen goes beyond these sectarian, ideological and culture limitations. Of course these days there are many teachers who teach a system called "dzogchen", an elaborate textual system culled from many texts. But this is not real Dzogchen, this is an intellectual system. This kind of teaching is very far away from the real meaning of Dzogchen. Like anything with an extensive literature it is possible to turn "dzogchen" into a mere intellectual trip. We must keep this in mind.

This is not the Dzogchen I have learned from my principle gurus. The Dzogchen that I have learned from my teachers is based on personal experience. Frankly, talking about Dzogchen in absence of that personal experience is a bit like talking about sweet to a man who cannot taste anything. Nevertheless, in order to encourage people to pursue these teachings who express interest I talk about the teachings.

The point of this is not to engage in intellectual discussions about whether Dzogchen is Buddhist or non-Buddhist. Honestly, I don't care anymore. I don't care whether people think I am a Buddhist or non-Buddhist. I have no interest in defending Dzogchen as a part of Buddhism. If people want to think it is not part of Buddhism, that is ok with me. If people want to think it is part of Buddhism, that is ok with me too. If some people decide they do are not interested in Dzogchen because it is "not buddhist" -- this is your loss. If someone people think they should only study Dzogchen because it is part of Buddhism -- this is your limitation.

Dzogchen is path of personal recognition of one's primordial potentiality, the basis, one's true nature, dharmatā, and integration into that, and that is all — it is not a school, a religion or a philosophy. You can be a Buddhist, Bonpo, or not, and practice Dzogchen. In the end Dzogchen is about the our state of innate freedom and learning to be in that state.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you understand atman to mean your primordial potentiality, for example the way the word bdag nyid chen po (mahātman) is used in Sems sde and so on, then there is no real difference. Just as if one understands "God" in these terms, then there is no problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

xabir said:

Brahman is an ultimate reality that is beyond notions of existence and non-existence, because Brahman is deemed as a transcendental, unchanging and independent ultimate reality that cannot be accessed with concepts. It is attributeless pure consciousness.

[/i]

Malcolm wrote:

The nirvana of the early Buddhists is an attributeless unconditioned consciousness as Peter Harvey very eloquently shows in his *The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sherlock said:

From an old thread

The basis in Dzogchen is completely free of affliction, it therefore is not something which ever participates in afflicted dependent origination. Unafflicted causality in Dzogchen is described as lhun grub, natural formation. However, since there is causality in the basis, it also must be empty since the manner in which the basis arises from the basis is described as "when this occurs, this arises" and so on. The only reasons why this can happen is because the basis is also completely empty and illusory. It is not something real or ultimate, or truly existent in a definitive sense. If it were, Dzogchen would be no different than Advaita, etc. If the basis were truly real, ultimate or existent, there could be no processess in the basis, Samantabhadra would have no opportunity to recognize his own state and wake up and we sentient beings would have

never become deluded. So, even though we do not refer to the basis as dependently originated, natural formation can be understood to underlie dependent origination; in other words, whatever is dependently originated forms naturally. Lhun grub after all simply and only means "sus ma byas", not made by anyone.
Sorry, I'm a bit confused now. So based on your current readings Malcolm, does Advaita actually say that brahman is real/ultimate/truly existent?

Malcolm wrote:

Some would hold the basis as lhun grub, and lhun grub as a self. This is one of the six perspectives about the basis which the Dzogchen tantras reject,

You can find statements by Advaita authors that define brahmin as real, you can also find statements by advaita authors which deny this kind of real existence to brahman in their effort to show that brahmin goes beyond all limitations. Advaita, like everything, is not monolithic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

I don't see how emptiness negates lhun-drub at all, unless you view emptiness as Brahman instead of as freedom from extremes. Emptiness is the condition of all phenomena. I don't understand why you keep talking about it as something other than the nature of phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

lhun grub is not a phenomena, and has nothing to do with phenomena. Phenomena are a result of ignorance that does not recognize the basis. Lhun grub is one of the three wisdoms inherent to the basis, the visible side. Ka dag is the emptiness aspect of the basis, the non-visible side. Energy/compassion is the inseparability of those two.

Now pay careful attention: I never equated Dzogchen with Advaita, nor did I venture an opinion on the nature of realization in Advaita. I said I don't know what Advaitans and other Hindus realize. I never denied that Dzogchen was a Buddhadharma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

I am talking about Ācārya Dharma Vajra in that article. He is talking about Madyamaka not Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

He mentions both.

mzaur said:

Define empty. Is Atman free from extremes or not?

Malcolm wrote:

Empty = lacking inherent existence. Atman is not free from extremes. Atman is Brahman, and Brahman is inherently existing. When I talk about Brahman, I refer to Nirguna Brahman (undifferentiated sat chit ananda)

Inherent existence is an extreme, no?[/quote]

First of all, that definition of emptiness is incomplete unless you are a Gelugpa.

If you investigate carefully, you will discover that Brahmin is considered to go beyond this notion of inherent existence [svabhāva] since it is considered to be beyond predicates and extremes and thus is inexpressible.

Now, I am not saying that Advaita and Madhyamaka are precisely the same -- but in terms of linguistic formulation, it is very difficult to distinguish them.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

It's actually very easy to differentiate the two.

<https://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.com/2009/02/madhyamika-buddhism-vis-vis-hindu.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Sridhar SJB Rana's response first of all is just crypto-realism:

"First of all, to the Buddha and Nagarjuna, Samsara is not an illusion but like an illusion."

And he is wrong -- I have addressed this issue at length elsewhere on this forum. Rongzom clearly states that in Dzogchen at any rate, all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions:

mzaur said:

He isn't talking about Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, he is.

mzaur said:

Second, Bhavaviveka admits that the distinction between the Vedantic Atman and the Buddhist Anatman is extremely difficult to parse.

It's not difficult at all. Atman is not empty.

Malcolm wrote:

Define empty. Is Atman free from extremes or not?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

Yes, Advaita does teach that there is an ultimate space which is the source of all reality, all phenomena. But this is wrong view according to Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chos dbyings mdzod states "Everything arises from the dharmadhātu, everything subsides into the dharmadhātu..."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

I would agree with Namdrol that Dzogchen is not Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Namdrol never said this, nor does Malcolm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

But I am saying that when you study these things, philosophically, at any rate, it is very hard to show the difference between Advaita and Madhyamaka.

mzaur said:

It's actually very easy to differentiate the two.

<https://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.com/2009/02/madhyamika-buddhism-vis-vis-hindu.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Sridhar SJB Rana's reponse first of all is just crypto-realism:

"First of all, to the Buddha and Nagarjuna, Samsara is not an illusion but like an illusion."

And he is wrong -- I have addressed this issue at length elsewhere on this forum.

Rongzom clearly states that in Dzogchen at any rate, all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions:

"Likewise, the system of dzogchen realizes and is the culmination of the comprehension of all phenomena as totally equivalent with illusions. That being the case, the mind is not confused by the power of appearances and there is no ability to develop formations; nothing is adopted, nothing rejected, nothings moves, nothing is sought. As such, this culmination of the comprehension of being like an illusion is also proven to the culmination of comprehending the two truths as inseparable."

And:

"Because the system of dzogchen understands four things for all phenomena— understanding what is to be abandoned; understanding what is to be taken up; understanding what can be left in equanimity; and what understanding what can never be actualized, it establishes all phenomena as non-dual. At that time there is no difference between non-duality, homogeneity, [68/a] non-arising, naturelessness, emptiness and selflessness. Since that is so, because this proof of all phenomena as non-dual is the heart of all intimate instructions, therefore, [dzogchen] is “the heart of

all intimate instructions”

Second, Bhavaviveka admits that the distinction between the Vedantic Atman and the Buddhist Anatman is extremely difficult to parse.

Third, as I already pointed out, Santaraksita complains of the Advaitan, since they accept the non-arising nature of phenomena, which is the Tathāgatas position, for what reason then do they not simply join the Buddhist fold.

Fourth, the similarities between Advaita and Mahāyāna did not go unnoticed by Hindu scholars, with the Dvaita Vedantins and others going so far as to accuse Shankaracarya of being a crypto-buddhist.

So, while I am not claiming that Advaita and Madhyamala are making the same point, I am pointing out that it is much more difficult to differentiate them mere sectarian declarations like Shridhar Rana makes in his article.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Eckhart Tolle says experiential wise Dzogchen is identical with Advaita and Zen.

Malcolm seems to be echoing the same words now.

Not saying that's a bad thing. It's probably true.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not saying that. I don't know what Advaitans experience. I was simply making the observation that if we reduce Buddhism to the three or four seals, well Advaita can fit that description too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Bon

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to understand the situation of pre-Buddhist bon than read Drung Deu and Bon by ChNN.

Lhug-Pa said:

Not if many Böns had become corrupt back then.

From what I've learned there are basically three types of Bön:

"Black" Bön

"White" Bön

Yungdrung Bön

"Black" Bön is apparently Shamanism more or less devoid of the Dzogchen of Yungdrung Bön.

"White" Bön is apparently Bön mixed with Buddhism mainly for the purpose of avoiding persecution.

Yungdrung Bön is Eternal Bön which has the pure Dzogchen Transmission, such as the Zhang Zhung Nyengyud.

It would have been "Black Bön" that would have fallen into some nasty sorts of practices, corruption, etc.

But I believe that all three forms of Bön have Shamanistic practices.

It seems that these days most Bönpo's teachings are a mixture of White Bön and Yungdrung Bön.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

What we often forget is that many of our previous lives was as different lifeforms in other worlds. Apart from the thousand Buddhas there are infinite types of manifestations of nirmanakayas in the universe and each Buddha emphasizes different aspects to suit the time and location. Dzogchen is also having separate histories in the thirteen lucky worlds that receive it in a large sector. The final fruit of the fourth vision is an actual dissolution of all phenomena back into the basic pure aspect of ultimate space. This includes the path and deities which should not be solidified by vajrayana practitioners either out of habit. Even if not dismissed in the higher Anuyoga yana the deity is nevertheless an empty clear manifestation that arises and dissolves from and back into that space. Thinking otherwise out of habitual needs is a great fault even in vajrayana.

mzaur said:

Sounds like Brahman. You sure that's Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It's static in the sense of been seen as a 'oneness'. Now I understand the necessity of the Uttarat Tantra Shastra. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

You could draw the same complaint against Dzogchen.

For example: Shankaracarya writes:

In its identification with the five-sheaths the Immaculate Atman appears to have borrowed their qualities upon itself; as in the case of a crystal which appears to gather unto itself colour of its vicinity (blue cloth, etc.,).

This is exactly how the gdangs of original purity is described when discussing essence.

Again, I am not saying Advaita realization and buddhahood are the same. But I think that in general Tibetan Lamas are terribly ignorant of the subtleties and profundity of non-Buddhist systems such as Advaita, Trika, Samkhya and so on. They generally only read about them to refute them, and badly at that.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Could you explain the root of the Shugden controversy? I have never understood it.

Malcolm wrote:

It's complicated, but it ultimately emerged out of Mongolian Gelug anxiety about the growth of Nyingma practitioners in that region. Shugden is very strong in Mongolia. It is stronger there than in any other country.

M

dakini_boi said:

So Shugden's main original function was to stop the spread of Dzogchen? And that is one of the reasons he is considered by HHDL to be a harmful worldly force?

Malcolm wrote:

Not Dzogchen, Nyingmapas. Of course Pabhongkha accepted the sectarian polemics against Dzogchen and the terma tradition but this is way off the point. We should stop here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I once forced Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso to admit (I have a witness, incidentally) that there was no substantial difference between Advaita Vedanta and Gzhan stong in terms of how they presented their view. His only response was a sectarian polemic "But there is no buddhahood in Vedanta!" Now, mind you, I am not saying that there is such a thing. But when you study these texts, you come to realize, even as Bhavaviveka and Shantaraksita both observed, that language of Advaita and the language of Madhyamaka are more or less identical. Shantaraksita complains in his Tattvasiddhi to the effect "If you accept the nature of things is non-arising, why do you not become Buddhist!?"

M

Andrew108 said:

Hi Malcolm. Lovely post again. Great to read this. One thing though. The assertion of buddhahood in Shentong and it's absence in Vedanta is not merely being sectarian. It's of vital importance. The reason is that buddhahood / buddhanature is dynamic and responsive and is an active non-duality rather than the Advaita assertion of unchanging passive non-duality.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a misreading of Advaita. Advaita is a great deal more subtle than your summary here. Maya is the sport (lila) of Brahman, so it is not static at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Could you explain the root of the Shugden controversy? I have never understood it.

Malcolm wrote:

It's complicated, but it ultimately emerged out of Mongolian Gelug anxiety about the

growth of Nyingma practitioners in that region. Shugden is very strong in Mongolia. It is stronger there than in any other country.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Well he does say things like "unify all teachers of all traditions" but I have found it always in context with Buddhism and Dzogchen. Nowhere (that I know of) does he directly say things like "unify with your Catholic priest", but he did say things like you don't have to (I think it wasn't that you can't, just that it doesn't make much sense) unify with your teacher of carpenting or Jesus etc.

Malcolm wrote:

When I first heard ChNN explain Ati Guru Yoga he said unify all teachers of all knowledge you have received from a positive source, no matter what it is. I beleive at the time he included school teachers as an example.

Since the vehicle of gods and men is included in the nine yānas, then this also includes all teachers one may have had or will have who are not necessarily Buddhists. This does not mean you are mixing traditions. It means that all knowledge you have learned contributes to your integration and practice of your main path, in this instance, Dzogchen.

BY the way, just to be clear, I am not for one second advocating combining this or that random thing with Dzogchen. Absolutely not. We have to respect other traditions, and we have respect Dzogchen. "Combining" is not respecting. That is why I rejected Jikan's propostition about "Hindu Dzogchen, Catholic Dzogchen, etc. There is only one Dzogchen. But it can be practiced by anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State

Content:

Will said:

One of these days I will have to finish Crystal.

Since Dzogchen has been around for a very long time and been part of many Asian cultures, what other names might it be known under besides Ati Yoga? Also, in ancient Dzogchen were ashrams or monasteries or some sort of groupings standard or was it wandering yogis and scattered lay disciples or both or neither?

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has asserted that it may have influenced Chan. I am sure there is a little influence of Taoism. Taoism and ancient Bon have a lot of similarities, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Now (and here I refer back to the original post) it seems that to experience the state of Great Perfection one does not need the theoretical framework (method) of Buddhism (or Bon, or even Dzogchenism), the only thing that is needed is know the state (have it pointed out to you). I believe though that without Buddhadharma (and by this I mean a system of practice that is based on the Four Dharma Seals, something that Dzogchenism is also) one would have no opportunity to abide in the true nature of their mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

What are the four seals?

All conditioned phenomena are impermanent.

All afflicted phenomena are suffering

All phenomena lack identity

Nirvana is bliss.

You can find these four seals in Advaita Vedanta as well. Just substitute brahman for nirvana and you have a perfect match. It is very hard to differentiate brahman from nirvana. Really, go ahead and try.

I once forced Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso to admit (I have a witness, incidentally) that there was no substantial difference between Advaita Vedanta and Gzhansong in terms of how they presented their view. His only response was a sectarian polemic "But there is no buddhahood in Vedanta!" Now, mind you, I am not saying that there is such a thing. But when you study these texts, you come to realize, even as Bhavaviveka and Shantaraksita both observed, that language of Advaita and the language of Madhyamaka are more or less identical. Shantaraksita complains in his Tattvasiddhi to the effect "If you accept the nature of things is non-arising, why do you not become Buddhist!?"

Now, again, I am not saying that if you practice Advaita you will become a buddha -- I honestly do not know. But I am saying that when you study these things, philosophically, at any rate, it is very hard to show the difference between Advaita and Madhyamaka. The main difference between them is that Hindus accept the Vedas as self-originated and

Buddhists do not.

But in Dzogchen we accept that Dzogchen tantras are self-originated, that they arise directly out of the sound of dharmatā. So, this is not really very different than what the Vedic scholars believe. For example, the Song of the Vajra is just the intrinsic sound of dharmatā, the state of realization of Samantabhadra and Samantabhadri in union.

Though Dzogchen tantras do take pains to differentiate themselves from Upanishadic doctrines of the atman, these very same ideas get used in Dzogchen in a very similar way -- which is why there is a rebuttal in Dzogchen tantras of certain ideas we find in the Upanishads so we don't run out and say "The Upanishads teach the same thing as Dzogchen".

So we can find a lot of parallels in Dzogchen and non-Buddhist teachings. The one main difference between Dzogchen and most non-Buddhist traditions is that in Dzogchen there is a definite rejection of creation by a creator. Even in Advaita, on a relative level, they accept Ishvara as a creator. So this is an important difference.

Don't believe it when people say that Kun byed rgyal po is a Buddhist creator myth. It is not true. Kun byed rgyal po refers to the mind. It does not mean Samantabhadra is a primordial creator deity or a kind of Buddhism theism. People who claim this like Alan Wallace and Eva Dargay-Neumier are mistaken.

But as Chogyal Namkhai Norbu says, "God" can be understood as a symbol of one's primordial state. So we do not necessarily have to reject "God" if we are Dzogchen practitioners, if by "God" we mean our own primordial potentiality and the primordial potentiality of everything. This is why we have that famous passage the text on Rigpa from the Tibetan Book of the Dead, cribbed by Shabkar in this way:

Now then, fortunate beloved children, listen!
Concerning this important term widely known as "mind",
in terms of existence, the mind does not exist as a single entity.
In terms of sources, the mind is the source of the diverse happiness and suffering of
samsara and nirvana.

Assertions about the mind exist in many categories of the vehicles.

The mind is designated by inconceivable different names:

ordinary people call the mind "I";
some non-Buddhists give it the name "atman";
the shravakas call it the "selfless person";
the mind-only school gives it the name "mind";
some call it "the perfection of wisdom";
some give it the name "sugatagarbha";
some give it the name "mahāmudra";
some give it the name "madhyamaka";
some give it the name "the single unique sphere";
some give it the name "dharmadhātu";

some give it the name “all-basis”;
some give it the name “ordinary mind”.
Although it is given inconceivable names,
since it is just this mind in reality, one must recognize it.

You must let the mind itself go free just where it is.
Having been let go, naked ordinary awareness,
a clarity that cannot be seen by looking for it,
the clear and vivid personal experience of vidyā,
is not established in any way at all, empty and pellucid.
Brilliant non-dual clarity and emptiness
is not permanent— not established at all;
is not annihilated— clear and vivid;
is not single— manifold, knowing and clear;
is not manifold— indivisible, one taste.
Not existing elsewhere, this is one’s own vidyā,
the true face of the original guide dwelling within one’s heart,
seen here right now in one’s personal experience.
Never be separate from this beloved children!

We could add a passage:

"other non-Buddhists give it the name “god”..."

This passage illustrates the point I have made all along. We do not need to imagine that all faiths lead to the same point, we merely have to accept that all humans beings are trying to find the same thing: the peace and happiness that comes from freedom.

I feel that Dzogchen is one path which can lead all of us beyond all schools so we can all find that peace and happiness that comes from freedom. Why? Because whatever measure of freedom, and the ensuing peace and happiness, I have found comes from practicing Dzogchen teachings.

Someone might object, and say but what about your Sakya practice, etc. Of course all of these things have helped. But I was a very sectarian Sakyapa, even while receiving teachings about Dzogchen, I was very conditioned by Sakya Pandita, and so on. For me, Dzogchen was just another completion stage system. I found it very hard to understand Dzogchen as a separate independent path because I was so conditioned by the Sakya school's point of view, conditioned by Madhyamaka before that, and so on. I can't really say when my present understanding arose. I think it has been some time. To a large extent, in the past few years, I have been slowly shedding my fabricated identity as a "buddhist". If it is important for others such as Buddhist to regard me as a buddhist, that's ok, but that is more about them than it is about me. For me "Dzogchen practitioner" is enough.

I have been thinking about my comments about Dzogchen and how they related to Mahāmudra. I think one can say the same thing about Mahāmudra. I also think that

Mahāmudra in a real sense transcends the boundaries of sect and culture. Why? Because it too is based on direct introduction.

I think it is possible to teach Mahāmudra and Dzogchen without insisting on the label "Buddhist". In India, the siddhas taught Mahāmudra to Buddhists and non-Buddhists alike. Naropa had many non-Buddhist students, actually, just as one example. Gorkshanatha is a mahasiddha who practiced both Vajrayāna Buddhism and Shaivism side by side. If you read his texts he moves from Shunyatā to Shiva in one breath.

Some people think that what I am saying amounts to pissing on Buddhism, but that would be a wrong perception. What I am saying is that there is no happiness in these labels "Buddhist", "Christian", "Muslim", "Hindu", "Jew" and so on-- none at all. We all have the same nature, the same primordial state. It is time we recognised that in each other and put an end to the pretense of otherness. According Dzogchen doctrine, all sentient beings will realize their primordial state. I can't say if this is really true, but I hope it is. A Christian might say "We and everything else were all created for His (i.e. God's) enjoyment." This is very similar to the Shaivaite idea of all phenomena being the lila of Shiva. This is very similar to the idea of all phenomena being the rol pa, display of bodhicitta, in Dzogchen and Virupa's statement in his Doha:

All sentient beings are emanations of mahāmudrā,
the essence of those emanations is the forever non-arising dharmadhātu,
also all characteristics of dualistic appearances, happiness, suffering and so on,
are the play of mahāmudrā, the original dharmatā.

We should be circumspect about criticizing others since that creates enemies in a concrete sense. I guess a large part of my present point of view has a lot to do with the sectarian arguments I have taken part in here on this board and E-sangha. Really, I feel very sad about that. We were all trying to do our best on E-Sangha -- but I myself, and we together, admins and mods, made many mistakes.

I feel a little sad about what happened with Jax. Oh, I don't agree with his approach or much of what he says, and I find it sad that he has positioned himself as a master when there are more qualified masters one can follow; but I feel a little sad that I was so harsh with him. It was unnecessary and disrespectful -- so since you are reading this, "Sorry Jax, my bad". That action of mine turned a person into an enemy. This is my fault. The same is true of the rest of what I have to say.

I also feel sad about my strong criticism of the Aro folks and Kirkpatrick. Of course that came about because I am a student of Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje (whose memory is dear to me-- I was with him at the very end of his life -- he showed me personally how a real yogi faces death). But in the end, given all the evil that is in the world today, what they are doing is not really harmful at all on any level. Actually, Kirkpatrick has a beautiful farm and tries to help people in Pemakod, etc. So this is a good thing. Chogyam has a ranch near Kalispell Montana and likes to dress up like a 1880's cowboy. I am sure they have a lot of fun. To be honest, while we were all groaning, pissing and moaning about the Aro thing, they were largely ignoring us and having a blast, so who really lost in that

exchange?

I am not really sorry for criticizing the NKT. I think the practice of Shugden is a harmful erroneous practice and should be ended. But on the other hand, they are never going to listen to what we say, so what is the point of saying anything at all? They are very successful, people like their scene. We should leave them alone.

We also leave alone animists in Africa, and they make blood sacrifices to some very heavy worldly deities every day, deities that are much worse than Shugden. Millions of chickens, goats, and cows are sacrificed to them every year in Africa. But at least they eat the animals afterwards, and in many instances their motivations are perfectly altruistic (which is not to say they won't turn to black magic in a second if they feel threatened by an enemy) because they are making offerings to benefit the whole world -- this is what they believe. Also the NKT strongly believe that what they are doing is positive. In other words, if someone is practicing something we think is based on an error, we just avoid that practice ourselves. Still of course, if someone asks me about them, I am going to be honest and say "Better you look elsewhere." But if someone is happy in NKT, it is not our job to condition that person. We also need to respect that person, even when they make what we might consider poor choices.

I am also not sorry for [lightly] criticizing the Diamond Mountain scene. I think that there are many things going on in that scene that are pretty unhealthy. But again, apart from observing that it is not for me, what else is there to do? And I feel sad that Christy Macnally's second husband died such an awful death and that she is in pain (Michael Roach was husband number 1).

I do feel sad for having criticized Lama Tsongkhapa's point of view. This is the sectarian side of the Sakya school that I find distasteful. I also find it distasteful that we in the West just pick up and carry Tibetan polemics as if they are our own. This is a mistake.

I feel sad for having allowed Theravada people think that I feel their practice is inferior.

I am sorry about the whole Zen thing, the Jundo Cohen episode. I tried to handle that skillfully, but it was Indo-Tibetan sectarian bullshit on my part, even though my motive was to try and bring clarity about who was a monk and who was not.

I also feel sad about having indulged in Sakya polemics about Kagyu Mahāmudra.

There are probably many other things I should feel sad about in my online relations with others. But I can't remember everything I said. So, my blanket apology is-- If I said something upsetting to you that came from narrow-mindedness on my part, I am sorry". So I have made a lot of mistakes. I am sorry that I hurt anyone.

I do not believe that anyone who is attached to a sectarian outlook, whether towards Buddhists or towards non-Buddhists can really be a fully integrated person. I do not believe that such a person, be they a student of Dzogchen or "master", has integrated the meaning of their primordial state completely.

All the conflicts in the world come about because of religion and ideology, whether political or economic. But Dzogchen is not based on ideology or belief, it is based on personal experience that is introduced by a master, someone who has integrated that knowledge into their life completely.

My personal goal in this life is to be as integrated as I can be. I have still have a lot of work to do on that score, but I am trying. That for me is the main point, in case anyone cares.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Now (and here I refer back to the original post) it seems that to experience the state of Great Perfection one does not need the theoretical framework (method) of Buddhism (or Bon, or even Dzogchenism), the only thing that is needed is know the state (have it pointed out to you). I believe though that without Buddhadharma (and by this I mean a system of practice that is based on the Four Dharma Seals, something that Dzogchenism is also) one would have no opportunity to abide in the true nature of their mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

What are the four seals?

All conditioned phenomena are impermanent.

All afflicted phenomena are suffering

All phenomena lack identity

Nirvana is bliss.

You can find these four seals in Advaita Vedanta as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

No, because both all Buddhist vehicles--Sutra, Tantra, and Dzogchen(as a path)--sprouted from Shakyamuni's ultimate realization, and that ultimate realization is what is the real Dzogchen. So again, all enlightening paths--whether provisional or direct--

come from realization, not religions and their adherents.

gregkavarnos said:

So in effect the title of this thread: "Dzogchen and Buddhism" is actually invalid. Why? Because the discussion in this thread revolves around Dzogchenism and Buddhism, NOT ultimate realisation/true nature/ultimate nature... and Buddhism. Unless, of course, one wishes to make the preposterous claim that realisation of ones true nature only comes through Dzogchenism OR that Buddhism is not a valid path to "uncover" ones ultimate nature.

Malcolm wrote:

I titled the thread Dzogchen and Buddhism principally because many people think, as I once did, that you need to have a lot of instruction in other Buddhist topics before approaching Dzogchen teachings. This is the standard, post-Kadampa approach.

Understanding of other foundational Buddhist topics is necessary for people who are going to be translators and teachers. But not for those who are just wanting to practice.

As a practice, Dzogchen is a completely independent system; it has its own tantras and commentaries, its own set of outer preliminaries called the "seven mind trainings"; its own set of inner preliminaries called rushan and semzin, and its own main practices in the form of the four samadhis of Sems sde, the four symbols of klong sde, or the trekchö and tögal, etc., in man ngag sde. The central practice in Dzogchen is Ati Guru Yoga.

Beyond this, a Dzogchen practitioner may make use of whatever else is helpful for their practice. If that means going to Catholic Mass on Sundays, or going to a Kirtan, etc., or practicing a Tara sadhana, then that is fine.

As for myself, for many years I practiced Dzogchen practice side by side with Sakya practices, this is even true up until late last year. I had also put aside all formal practice between the periods of 1998-2001 and focused only on Guru Yoga and Tregchö. In 2001 I met some excellent Lamas like Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche, like Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, (whose terms I also received and from whom I received the Nyingthg Yabzhi) and so on, and practiced Konchog Chidu, Troma, etc., for a while. Then I reconnected with my root Guru, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu in 2002. (For me, ChNN and KDL are inseparable). Also I received Vajrayogini from HH Jetsun Kusho -- I practiced this for a few years. Now however I practice only Dzogchen according to the instructions of ChNN, KDL and other Dzogchen masters I have received instructions from. So that's it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Caz said:

And how it surpasses everything that was ever taught.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-Buddhist schools, as well as Hinayāna and Mahāyāna, are classified as vehicles of the cause.

The various levels of Vajrayāna are classified as vehicles of the result.

Dzogchen defines itself as the vehicle beyond cause and result. For this reason many Buddhists reject it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Will said:

Is it Buddhism that has 'sectarian limitations' or some Buddhists?

Are all Dzogchenpas free of 'sectarian limitations'?

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first question, it is the first alternative.

As to the second, no -- there are many people who turn Dzogchen into a school.

M

Will said:

I wonder how there can be 'Buddhism' without Buddhists?

Malcolm wrote:

As you well know will, some people will turn that which is free from limits into a limitation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Will said:

Is it Buddhism that has 'sectarian limitations' or some Buddhists?

Are all Dzogchenpas free of 'sectarian limitations'?

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first question, it is the first alternative.

As to the second, no -- there are many people who turn Dzogchen into a school.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 11:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State

Content:

Huifeng said:

Hi,

While I read some general books about Dzogchen years ago, finally got around to reading some more recently.

Just finished off Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche's Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State. Nice entry point, I felt.

That's it. Thanks!

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Number two on intro books to Dzogchen. Crystal however is still required reading.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 8:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

The Dzogchen Tantras may not say all of this explicitly, but what I'm saying also does not contradict them.

Malcolm wrote:

They do, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

In which year(s) were those Termas and where discovered?

Forgot to ask what was the reason for concealment / hiding?

Malcolm wrote:

All we can say for certain is that Chetsun Senge Wangchuk had passed on the lineage and texts for the 17 tantras and the Vima Nyinthig by 1128.

We don't really know how old he was when he met Lhungyal nor how old he was when he achieved rainbow body.

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Do you eventual know the reason why these texts were hidden?

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

I assume it was because it was met with strong opposition by court Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 7:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

In which year(s) were those Termas and where discovered?

Forgot to ask what was the reason for concealment / hiding?

Malcolm wrote:

All we can say for certain is that Chetsun Senge Wangchuk had passed on the lineage and texts for the 17 tantras and the Vima Nyinthig by 1128.

We don't really know how old he was when he met Lhungyal nor how old he was when he achieved rainbow body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Anders Honore said:

Buddhism has its root and centre in the liberation of the mind.

Malcolm wrote:

One can say the same thing about many traditions. This is not a unique feature of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: buddhahood that reverts to the basis

Content:

CapNCRunch said:

Are Dzogchen practitioners guaranteed to eventually attain the buddhahood that doesn't revert to the basis? Does this necessarily include the body of light?

Malcolm wrote:

If they practice

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Out of all who responded to my post, it looks like everyone except for Kalden Yungdrung missed this part:

However since the Buddha Shakyamuni is listed as one of the Twelve Dzogchen teachers, we could then say that the Buddha Dharma has Dzogchen roots.

The Dzogchen Tantras say that the Buddha Shakyamuni was one of the Twelve Dzogchen Teachers. If you don't agree with that, well then that's your choice. But as has been said a number of times in this very thread, if you don't agree with that then you could not on the same grounds say that Vajrayana (or maybe even Mahayana for that matter) has any more validity than Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Matylida said:

The same applies to dzogchen, isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

If you take Dzogchen as some intellectual school. Yes. But that is not Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Rheumatoid Arthritis

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you Malcolm. What are the recommendations for diet?

LunaRoja said:

Does the arthritis hurt more when it is cold or warm?

N

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely cold and humidity is very difficult. I don't eat dairy since that seems to exacerbate it so I was wondering if there is anything else I can either remove or add to my diet.

Thank you kindly for your help. A Tibetan Dr comes to town here every couple of years but she is usually booked up before she arrives. I have also tried accupinture which has been very helpful.[/quote]

I would recommend you do an ayurvedic cleanse and rekindle your digestive fire. You need to stay warm, eat only warm food, such as lamb, buffalo, with spices like pepper, cardamon, ginger, etc.:

diet for rheumatoid arthritis: Ayurvedic recommended food

Posted on January 13, 2011 by Dr J V Hebbar MD(Ayu)

In rheumatoid arthritis Ayurvedic treatment, diet plays an important role in improving the joint health and to keep control on swelling and pain. Since Ayurveda believes that the root cause of rheumatoid arthritis lies in impaired digestion and metabolism, the rheumatoid arthritis diet also targeted to improve the same.

Rheumatoid arthritis Ayurvedic diet:

Ayurveda advises to include following food items to be included in rheumatoid arthritis.

Garlic: Recent study states that the micro nutrients of garlic helps in preventing arthritis changes of bones.

Buttermilk: Curds is a food item to avoid, but buttermilk is good for Rheumatoid Arthritis.

Two garlic pearls with 2 ounces of buttermilk is an excellent daily drink and home remedy for rheumatoid arthritis.

Ginger, long pepper and pepper – These three help to correct digestion and metabolism, hence recommended for daily usage in rheumatoid arthritis patients.

Barley, horse gram: Both these are very easy to adopt in diet.

Bitter gourd (Bitter melon): It improves digestion, very low in calorie and good source of Vitamin B1, 2 & 3. It is a good detoxifying herb and is traditionally indicated in diet for rheumatoid arthritis.

Hot water: Hot water drinking is beneficial to improve digestion. Regular drinking of hot water helps to bring lightness to the joints and improves flexibility in Rheumatoid arthritis.

Food to avoid: While it is important to know what food is good, it is also important to know food to avoid in rheumatoid arthritis. It makes the complete rheumatoid arthritis diet plan.

<http://easyayurveda.com/2011/01/13/diet-for-rheumatoid-arthritis-ayurvedic-recommended-food/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We all have compassion. So the way to increase it is to simply see that we have it, and exercise that muscle a bit more.

M

LunaRoja said:

What is the difference between, exercising that muscle a bit more and cultivating compassion? They are both a conscious attempt to be more compassionate just worded differently.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhist approach always starts out by suggesting that everyone has a compassion deficit. I don't agree. Some people's compassion is not developed however even after years of Lam rim meditation. This is so easy to see.

So, I think a different approach is needed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

Malcolm -this post has really brought forwards something that's I've been ruminating over for a while, mostly unconsciously. One thing I have found to be increasingly odd is that the Dzogchen teachings seem to be frequently put on a high shelf, as if to keep them out of the way of many people.

Malcolm wrote:

I think this condition exists because Buddhists in India, and then later in Tibet, were so hostile to Dzogchen when it was first revealed by Garab Dorje.

Since Vajrayāna emerged out in the context of the Yogatantra systems, and is not fundamentally at odds with the notion of cause and result in the terms of path theory in Buddhism in general, it never met with such a hostile reception.

Paul said:

There are many things that must often be done before a person is given instructions. A common attitude is that person must complete ngondro first, do many years of retreat, be adept at creation and completion etc. otherwise it's going to be too hard for a person to get any benefit at all. In some cases I've found that it's not seen as a good thing to even talk about Dzogchen. This seems frankly a little ridiculous and also counter productive as in my experience it can even damage a person's belief they can ever understand their nature experientially. In my opinion, with diligence and a good teacher it's pretty straight forwards.

Malcolm wrote:

There are lots of different ways to build golden cages.

Paul said:

Do you think that the 'sorry kid, it's too High and Special a teaching for you' stance that can be found in the orthodox Tibetan religious structure is a symptom of Dzogchen's problematic consequences to power structures - restricting it to only a few carefully selected groups? The part I've highlighted in bold above is a comment from you that makes me think I may be on the right lines.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it has more to do with the fact that Dzogchen tantras themselves utterly dismisses the cause/result approach to awakening; whereas Buddhism is heavily invested in the cause/result paradigm and has an entire intellectual and institutional edifice dedicated to preserving it at any cost. So therefore, the standard line you often get is "Dzogchen is

a practice for Buddhas...." and so on. Dzogchen tantras completely toss out the whole conditioned merit making thing on its ear, for example -- and this is not good for the enterprise of gilding statues. If you tell people they will never attain awakening through making donations to monasteries, they might think twice before giving at the office. Dzogchen goes much further than tathāgatagarbha theory. Vimalamitra states:

Hey, Son of a good family, listen up! The one who is "free from virtue and sin" in the conventions of the natural great perfection are yogis who see the meaning of their own vidyā. That vidyā is connected with the intimate instructions of the Guru. If that is not demonstrated, a scholarly paṇḍita trained in tripitika will not know even a fragment of a subtle particle split into one hundred thousand pieces of the meaning. That being so, it is called "depending on the method of secret mantra".

If demonstrated, since even a poor cowherd can see it, that being case it is called "without good and bad action".

If it is not practiced, even Vajrasattva will not be liberated. That being the case, it is called "familiarity with the intimate instruction meets its measure". If practiced, even one who has committed one of the five limitless actions can be liberated from this appearance. That being so, it is called "being unaffected by the benefit or harm of good and bad actions". Since it is impossible that a person who has committed the five limitless actions cannot be liberated if demonstrated in that way, it demonstrated that [vidyā] itself is not affected by sins. Since it is impossible even for Samantabhadra to be liberated if it is not demonstrated, it is demonstrated that there [vidyā] itself is protected by virtue. That being so, it is shown that there is no difference between five hundred butchers who have seen vidyā and Vajrasattva who has also seen vidyā.

The leveling of social, and therefore, spiritual hierarchies which are a mere reflection of the latter, is threatening to the traditional Buddhist political establishment. I cannot tell you the number of times of I have heard educated Lama laugh at the idea that yak herders could have realization. They should just recite the Mani is the general attitude of many educated Tibetan Lamas. This kind of Tantric elitism is much more pronounced in Sakya and Gelug of course.

Thus the tool of secrecy has been used two ways in Dzogchen teachings -- it has been used by the external establishment to keep the wraps on the radical teachings of Mahāmudra on the one hand, and Dzogchen on the other. The way it has been used by Dzogchen is to protect itself.

But this is no longer necessary so much. We live in a somewhat democratic, egalitarian society. Dzogchen teachings can really flourish under such circumstances. This is not to say there is not a proper way to introduce people to the teachings, there is of course. But in the end, they will flourish more widely than all the other traditions of the world. ChNN has predicted many times that Dzogchen teachings will flourish worldwide and that everyone will be affected by them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

I'm not talking about (just)myself. You have a large following here, and I am concerned that anything that looks like a subtle rejection of gradual methods can be misunderstood and do much harm.

Malcolm wrote:

I have stated over and over again, it is everyone's responsibility to discover for themselves what is useful.

mindyourmind said:

We are talking about important issues here, concepts that can be easily misunderstood. This fine line is one of the reasons why Dzogchen has been kept secret in the past, why it should only be approached when the student is ready.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason Dzogchen was kept secret in the past is because of the hostility it garnered from Buddhists since its inception. Now Dzogchen is out in the world, and it not within the clutches of Tibetan Buddhists anymore. This does not mean we can ignore things like transmission, lineage and so on. But it does mean that we can speak more freely to those who are interested in what the real point of view of Dzogchen is itself. And it is not the gradual system the Nyingmapas were forced to adopt to forstall criticisms of the Kadampa influenced hegemony.

mindyourmind said:

Another point I'm making is that Dzogchen itself (if such a monolithic view can ever be found)does not really consistently propose a sudden approach.

Malcolm wrote:

If by Dzogchen, we are referring to the what Dzogchen tantras themselves state quite clearly, then this is not correct.

If we are talking about how Dzogchen has been presented by the Nyingma school under intense pressure from its opponents, then it is true, Nyingma presents Dzogchen as a graduated path. But the point of view of the Nyingma school and the point of view of Dzogchen are not necessarily the same thing.

mindyourmind said:

We are also, in some of the discussions so far, on the verge of confusing whether compassion is inherent, and whether the methods to cultivate it, are sudden or gradual.

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahāyāna, as I stated, compassion is gradually cultivated over many lifetimes.

In Dzogchen, there is little need to "cultivate" compassion since compassion is recognized a) to be innate b) will be expanded up by recognizing your own state.

I know many Mahāyāna practitioners who cultivate compassion for many years, who are like rocks in the bottom of the ocean. They talk about compassion a lot, but never stop to help anyone or anything.

I know many non-buddhists who never "cultivated" compassion even once in their lives. But they are always helpful, without restraint.

I have little confidence in the canned meditations of the gradual system. They sure did not work for me when I was in retreat, so I abandoned them in favor of a more experiential approach. I just recognized that I had compassion, that I often acted compassionately, and then continued to move in the direction. I built on what I had, and expanded it -- rather than just sitting on my ass running through canned meditation topics. This is much better than sitting around with a Lam rim book in hand and practicing scales.

We all have compassion. So the way to increase it is to simply see that we have it, and exercise that muscle a bit more.

Then, when we recognize our true condition, our compassion will burst out like the sun behind a cloud.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

Most of them seem to be pasting a cherry picked version of Buddhism elements onto a default base of materialist ideology and narrative. If you're born and raised in a 1st world country, chances are you believe in materialism as the default worldview by virtue of it being the state sanctioned view. To deviate from it is not so comforting to many.

Malcolm wrote:

The religion of the state is only power. Always has been, always will be. Power reduces everything to mere things to used. That is the real materialism we should worry about.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

Thank you very much, Malcolm. That's sorted a lot of things out for me and I see exactly where you are coming from. I can also see why many religious institutions have reacted badly to the Dzogchen teachings - it seems to be something that could act as an aqua regia to any formal power structure.

Karma Dorje said:

Except aqua regia was used to hide gold in something corrosive. This would be concealing something corrosive in gold.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess the intent of the metaphor was to indicate a solvent that other things are incapable of dissolving.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

Banned said:

Virupa's back lineage is actually Mahamudra isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Virupa realized Mahāmudra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As you probably know, I was a Sakya practitioner for many years.

N

Matylda said:

So did you give up sakya? In favor of ChNNR?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I did not give up Sakya. But ChNN has been my primary root guru since 1992.

I unify, I don't abandon.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

If even the Lonchen Nyingtig contains a graduated method (and gradual realization) then we should accept that instantaneous vs gradual depends on a lot of things, such as the practitioner's abilities and so on. There is no right and wrong way. The development of compassion needs all the help it can get.

Jigme Lingpa himself is said to have favored a gradual approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Mym:

It all depends on how fast you want that compassion express itself fully, rapidly or slowly.

If you are convinced that you need gradual methods, then there is no point trying to tell you otherwise. It is best to impart to you those methods. If you wish to practice Dzogchen, then compassion is inherent in the path without needing copious amounts of cultivation. Compassion is released merely from recognizing your true condition.

Really.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So you are saying that true compassion only arises via pointing out? Is that why everybody here has devoted their lives to voluntarily assisting lepers in Bangladesh?

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that unlimited compassion arises from recognizing your real nature. I also said that compassion was innate and everyone has it.

gregkavarnos said:

The question was directed towards Sonams statement. I am not saying that compassion is not innate, but if one recognises their real nature via pointing out or via a gradual didactic approach is ultimately irrelevant. What is bizarre to me is to consider didactic approaches "contrived" in contrast to instantaneous approaches as uncontrived. True compassion, whether it is arrived at (realised) gradually through Lojong/Lam Rim practices or whether arrived at instantaneously through pointing out can never be contrived. Pretending to be compassionate is contrived. (Yes, I know you said this, I'm just repeating it for others sake).

Back to the walking example: you gotta fall over and bruise yourself a number of times before you can walk.

This is apparent even in the direct introduction approach coz seeing it once is not enough. You lose sight, then you see it again, then... until it is stabilised. Thus it is obviously as contrived (or uncontrived) as having it taught to you.

And back to the leper example, I am sure mother Theresa did not have a Dzogchen master point out her innate compassion to her, not in this lifetime anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg,

I am not talking about true compassion versus contrived.

No one needs to meditate on compassion for hours and days. of course, cultivating the four immeasurables is a good thing, but do you know what its function really is? Accumulating merit. Now this is not bad, of course. But what results from accumulating merit? Just a better body in samsara, that's all.

When we see suffering, we respond with empathy, unless we are a twisted f#ck.

What I was talking about was the difference between bound compassion and boundless compassion.

We all have bound compassion. Boundless compassion only comes from discovering our real nature. In Mahāyāna, this may mean cultivating compassion in a meaningful way through many kinds of practices. Of course, if someone wants to do that, that is fantastic -- who does not want people in the world who are more compassionate?

The problem with Mahāyāna is that this kind of cultivation takes eons.

But if you wish to have boundless compassion without waiting eons, then it is better for you to go to a Dzogchen master or a Mahāmudra master, receive introduction and

discover your real nature as fast as possible.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: buddhahood that reverts to the basis

Content:

trevor said:

So all those beings that have not achieved budhahood through the Dzogche doctrine will have to cycle in samsara again at the end of the dark eon?

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. What happens is, the best I understand is, is that while their consciousnesses are liberated, they have not completely eradicated all traces from the elements, and therefore, this unresolved contamination causes the latent awareness in the basis to arise from the movement of vāyu in the basis. When this neutral awareness recognizes its own state, it becomes prajñā, when it does not, it becomes ignorance. Just to be clear, this latent awareness of the basis is not a unified field, it is relative and differentiated. Thus, even though all sentient beings achieve liberation, sentient beings are not somehow newly created.

Sentient beings are just nexus of affliction, nothing more.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Jikan said:

Finally: thank you, Malcolm, for describing your understanding to us. I for one greatly appreciate it.

Malcolm wrote:

You are welcome, Dan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Jikan said:

If, as Malcolm suggests, a Sufi or Christian or Hindu Dzogchen might be possible... what

might a Tendai Dzogchen look like? I don't know: I'm just proposing it as a thought experiment (or in my case, a life experiment)

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Buddhist Dzogchen or Bonpo Dzogchen. This why there cannot be a Hindu Dzogchen, a Sufu Dzogchen, a Christian Dzogchen, or a Tendai Dzogchen, a Zen Dzogchen.

Dzogchen does not belong to a school. There is no school of Dzogchen. A Dzogchen school would not be Dzogchen. This would be a completely wrong approach.

But anyone from any school or traditon who would like to learn Dzogchen can come and learn Dzogchen from a qualified teacher.

For example, the lineage of Dzogchen at this juncture in time appears in Buddhism and Bon. This does not make Dzogchen Buddhist and Bonpo. Dzogchen is the essence of the teachings, all teachings. When we do Ati Guru Yoga, we unify all the knowledge we learned from any teacher, be they Buddhist, Bon, Hindu, Christian, Sufi, etc.

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, you must go beyond the limitations of schools. In the context of Tibetan culture, the rimey movement was started by Dzogchen practitioners. Why? Because they understood the need to go beyond the limitations of schools and discover the essence of the teachings. Now Dzogchen, the jewel of Tibetan culture, has left the confines of Tibeian culture. We must go beyond the limitations of all schools, all philosophies, all ideologies if we are to practice Dzogchen.

As human beings, we have too much to lose if we continue to remain limited by religion, ideology, class, race and tribe. Yesterday, ChNN strongly stated that every human being should learn Dzogchen and put these teachings into practice. And if every human being did this, we would have much less problems in the world.

I cannot say the same thing about Buddhism. Why? Because the very first opponents of Dzogchen were Buddhists! And Buddhists remained hostile to Dzogchen for centuries.

We human beings like our niches, our cages we build for ourselves, the limitations in which we place ourselves. We justify those limitations, and create many arguments for them. I suggest that people look at that. I have, and I have found these wanting, and unnecessary.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Requirements to give empowerments?

Content:

Caz said:

The story of the dogs tooth is a perfect example of how someones faith transformed the perceived object.

Malcolm wrote:

The dogs tooth story is a perfect example of how unscrupulous sons dupe their mothers naive faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

zerwe said:

...

Realizing that the example of the kind mother is the source of compassion

Sönam said:

I'm not shure it's a good exemple ... it's most often an exemple of egoism, centered on herself, HER kid.

Sönam

zerwe said:

Sönam, I can see your point. However, if we are describing it as innate the only worldly example we have

of love and compassion is in the "mother." It would seem that it is through this example of the mother, developing compassion for oneself through recognizing our own suffering,

and turning this gradually toward others that we can realize our own true nature.

Shaun

Malcolm wrote:

The reason that compassion is said to lead to profound realization in Mahāyāna is that gradual cultivation of compassion in an authentic way can lead to seeing the absence of identity in phenomena. This perfectly fine and wonderful.

Even more wonderful is the recognition of our real condition that unleashes the tap of compassion spontaneously.

Buddhahood does not come about because of engaging in the conditioned benefit of sentient beings. When you fully integrate with your real conditions, since compassion is innate in the basis, the needs of sentient beings are automatically satisfied.

This at least is the Dzogchen view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Rheumatoid Arthritis

Content:

LunaRoja said:

How does Tibetan Medicine treat flares of Rheumatoid arthritis especially in the joints in the fingers and hands?

Malcolm wrote:

Medicinal baths, herbs, bloodletting/moxa (depending on cause), diet.

LunaRoja said:

Thank you Malcolm. What are the recommendations for diet?

Malcolm wrote:

Does the arthritis hurt more when it is cold or warm?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

LunaRoja said:

How does it differ from the Kagyu school?

Malcolm wrote:

Mainly it is just difference in lineage. Result is the same.

N

LunaRoja said:

There are philosophical difference since Sapan did not believe in the pointing out instructions...

Malcolm wrote:

Sure he did, he just felt is needed to be based on having already received the four full empowerments.

Sapan did not accept sutra mahāmudra as such -- but he opined that Mahāmudra could be realized through either the two stages or through Guru Yoga.

LunaRoja said:

but thought the great seal depended on initiation into a full Mandala. Sapan thought Mahamudra was totally free of concepts but criticized Gampopa's Mahamudra as just creating greater clarity and calm. He considered any sutra based non-tantric great seal to be impossible. Mahamudra in Sakya is depended on complete initiation into the Hevajra tantra. Now the Tsarpa Sakya I have been told do believe in pointing out instructions, but in general the Ngor and Khon lineages do not. So those are the major differences that I am aware of.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayogini has had a mahāmudra pointing out instruction from the beginning. It is in Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen's collected works. Therefore, the Ngor and Khon Lineages accept pointing out.

As you probably know, I was a Sakya practitioner for many years.

As for the distinction between the inseparability of clarity of the three visions and emptiness and sutra mahāmudra, this is just fighting over a name. The meaning of the two is the completely identical.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Regarding the next closed webcast for Longsal Longde, if we have an immediate family member who wants to attend with us, yet who is not yet a Dzogchen Community member and would not be able to join in time; would this be permissible? Or is this something that we would have to try to ask Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche?

Malcolm wrote:

It would be permissible if they are truly interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So you are saying that true compassion only arises via pointing out? Is that why

everybody here has devoted their lives to voluntarily assisting lepers in Bangladesh?

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that unlimited compassion arises from recognizing your real nature. I also said that compassion was innate and everyone has it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:24 PM

Title: Re: Rheumatoid Arthritis

Content:

LunaRoja said:

How does Tibetan Medicine treat flares of Rheumatoid arthritis especially in the joints in the fingers and hands?

Malcolm wrote:

Medicinal baths, herbs, bloodletting/moxa (depending on cause), diet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

zerwe said:

It would not seem to be innate, but something that must be developed.

Malcolm wrote:

It is innate, but because of not recognizing the absence of identity, it's scope is limited.

If you want your compassion to be free from limitations, the only way to do that is to recognize your own state.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:19 PM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

LunaRoja said:

It is not the same as Kagyu Mahamudra I thought it was from the unique point of view of the 3 Visions.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is one of the three tantras, the result tantra.

Sutra Mahāmudra = union of clarity and emptiness

Tantric mahāmudra = the result tantra

Essence mahāmudra = the inseparability of samsara and nirvana

LunaRoja said:

How does it differ from the Kagyu school?

Malcolm wrote:

Mainly it is just difference in lineage. Result is the same.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:43 AM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

LunaRoja said:

It is not the same as Kagyu Mahamudra I thought it was from the unique point of view of the 3 Visions.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is one of the three tantras, the result tantra.

Sutra Mahāmudra = union of clarity and emptiness

Tantric mahāmudra = the result tantra

Essence mahāmudra = the inseparability of samsara and nirvana

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

Banned said:

My understanding is that Virupa's lineage descends from Mahamudra.

Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

LunaRoja said:

No it is much deeper than that it is the path and the fruit, the indivisible nature of Samsara and Nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

The result of Lamdre is mahāmudra. It is not deeper than mahāmudra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

Ok if you say so!

Malcolm wrote:

It is simple, when you see suffering, do you have compassion or not? Did that compassion come about because you spent lots of time sitting thinking about your kind mother, etc....? No, probably not. It came about because compassion is a natural part of our state and when we witness suffering, we are empathetic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: shilajit

Content:

Pero said:

So, who normally takes it? Is it addictive?

Malcolm wrote:

Shilajit enhances the potency of other medicines. No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Requirements to give empowerments?

Content:

Luke said:

What traditionally are the requirements that a lama has to fulfill in order for him or her to be able to give empowerments to other people?

Have any living western lamas fulfilled these requirements?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to have permission of your Lama. For example, when I received the

transmission of Troma Nagpo from Kayprok Tulku, a Sherpa Lama was was one of Trulshik Rinpoche's best friends from childhood, when he concluded the empowerment, he told us that he had given it in the most complete way so that if we ever needed to bestow the empowerment, we could. Granted, this means that one has to learn a considerable number of things, but you see how it is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mirage said:

Anyway, I am not really interested in discussing it, just expressing my feelings. Don't mind me.

Malcolm wrote:

I am drawing a distinction between aritificially contrived compassion, the kind of "mouth" compassion and bodhicitta that drips out of the mouths of Buddhist teachers and students alike (while they screw their students, steal money, manipulate each other and so on) and real compassion that stems from recognizing one's actual state and the resulting automatic responsive concern for those sentient beings who do not recognize their own nature.

LunaRoja said:

All compassion is contrived until one reaches a realized state. In the causal vehicles contrived compassion leads to absolute compassion or in terms of the non-causals schools it results in removing the obscurations to realizing one's natural state. I thought this is why we practiced compassion (contrived) until it is actualized.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is the gradualist party line. I think it is really just disempowering. Compassion is part of your state. Just let it go free.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mirage said:

Anyway, I am not really interested in discussing it, just expressing my feelings. Don't mind me.

Malcolm wrote:

I am drawing a distinction between aritificially contrived compassion, the kind of "mouth" compassion and bodhicitta that drips out of the mouths of Buddhist teachers and students alike (while they screw their students, steal money, manipulate each other and so on) and real compassion that stems from recognizing one's actual state and the resulting automatic responsive concern for those sentient beings who do not recognize their own nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm - some people see a rainbow and think that it exists. Look at the illusion of the internet if you are not sure how it is that people fixate illusions. I'm not trying to be argumentative for the sake of it. Emptiness is simple but not that simple.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why there are eight examples of illusion, and not just one.

But it is sufficient, Rongton Sheja Kunrig refers to this as the upadesha lineage of Madhyamaka. Longchen wrote a whole book about them.

The examples of illusion are all that someone interested in Dzogchen needs to know about emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Why is it sufficient to merely reflect on the examples of illusion to understand emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

Because that is all that is necessary for anyone to understand emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Are you a nicer person? I do not mean are you a more "compassionate" person in that syrupy fake Lam rim way.

M

LunaRoja said:

This statement seems a little unfair to our Lam Rim friends. I have met some wonderfully compassionate Lam Rim students and some very grouchy Dzogchenpas. As far as compassion goes one of the most compassionate people I've met in my life is a Roman Catholic. I really think the nonsectarian approach is best. There are great fruits in all the schools and religions.

Sincerely,

LR

Malcolm wrote:

Put emphasis on fake, then you will understand my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

Thank you very much, Malcolm. That's sorted a lot of things out for me and I see exactly where you are coming from. I can also see why many religious institutions have reacted badly to the Dzogchen teachings - it seems to be something that could act as an aqua regia to any formal power structure.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the archtypal bad reaction is when "500" Nalanda panditas travelled to Oḍḍiyāna to bully an 8 year old kid when they heard he was teaching that liberation was beyond cause and result. We know the rest of that story.

Tibetan power structures have been trying to keep the lid on Dzogchen ever since it entered into Tibet. Vairocana was banned to Eastern Tibet by a spurned queen and ministers who did not approve of Dzogchen. For example the 11th century translator Go Khugpa Lhatse accuses Vairocana of forging the five sems sde lungs, accuses Nubchen of forging the smad du byung wa, and exorciates Aro Yeshe Jungney for composed defiled compositions connected to sems sde, etc. The fourteenth century master, Buton accuses Guru Chowang (the treasure revealer of the seven line prayer) of being a fraud, dimisses symbolic dakini script as ridiculous, states outright that Dzogchen teachings are the indepedent fabrications of Nyingmapas. Indeed this was the standard

attitude towards Dzogchen, etc. for centuries in Tibet. This is actually at the root of the whole Shugden controversy.

To make it worse, the Nyingmapas, eventually cowed by this pressure to conform to the Sutrayāna gradualism politically enforced by King Trisong Detsen after the outcome of the three year exchange of letters called "the Samye debate", gradually began to present Dzogchen as the summit of a gradual path, abandoning the earliest presentation of Dzogchen as a independent vehicle. There are some people enamored of scholars like Sam Van Schaik, a Sakyapa, who specializes in Dunhuang material. Now, he is a good scholar, and I like very much his point of view. But in my opinion, he has completely misunderstood the intent of the early Dzogchen tradition in Tibet. He presents Dzogchen based on the man ngag lta ba phreng ba (MTP), attributed to Padmasambhava and widely accepted to be his work even in Gelug. As you know or can find out, the MTP presents Dzogchen as the culmination phase of the creation and completion phase based on the Guhyagarbha tantra. Now there is nothing wrong with this at all. But this is not how Dzogchen is presented either in the Seventeen Tantras, klong sde or sems sde. For example, Nubchen, writing in the late 9th century clearly shows that Dzogchen is not merely a completion stage for Dzogchen in his bsam brtan mig gron [SMG]. he identifies Dzogchen as a cig char system. Not only this, but he defends Chan as being the definitive sutrayāna approach because it too is a cig char system. He says for example:

"Do not seek out a philosophical position [siddhanta], there is also nothing to illustrate, if there is something to illustrate, the non-dual is illustrated to be free from activity, thought, or analysis through an example."

But here on this thread, we have many people voice the opinion, to understand Dzogchen you need madhyamaka either Rang stong or gzhan stong, you need to have the view of dependent origination, etc. All kinds of preconditions but one, the indispensable one.

There is but one thing indispensable for Dzogchen, and that is an introduction from a master. As Nubchen points out this is the critical difference between sutra and tantra. The critical difference between tantra and Dzogchen is whether one's practice is based on the notion of cause and result or not. And that is based on whether or not one has authentically recognized one's own stage so that one is possession of that famous rigpa.

Some people are interested in how we know if our practice is moving ahead. It is easy -- are you more integrated, are you having less problems in life? Is your clarity increasing? Are you a nicer person? I do not mean are you a more "compassionate" person in that syrupy fake Lam rim way. I mean are you a nicer person? A decent, ordinary, normal human being who plays well with others? Or are you still an alienated freak who can't get along with anyone and always demands that everyone around you change in conformity with your own neurosis, especially your religious neurosis?

How can anyone say incidentally these are merely features of a Buddhist path? Look at all the basket cases in Buddhism. Do we really think we have our shit together more

than Hindus, Christians and so on? I don't think so -- incidentally I am not making a claim that people who are interested in Dzogchen necessarily are more together, I have met a lot of flakes in and out of the community and there are a lot of people who think I am a flake. But most people like me even if they think I shoot my mouth off too much (I do).

Back to the main topic: the notion of a vehicle beyond cause and result, one that does not require accumulations, practice with effort, and so on is very threatening to the gradualist establishment in Tibetan culture. The gradualists really hate the message of Atiyoga. It threatens their grip on feudal power. This is why Dzogchen will not be found in Tibetan monasteries and large Dharma centers. It will only be found at the feet of Dzogchen masters. You can take a hundred high Dzogchen empowerments but if you do not understand the main point, then it is of limited benefit. But if you can put yourself at the feet of qualified master who teaches Dzogchen from their own experience then there is no limit of benefit and you will receive transmission whether you are a Buddhist, an Catholic or an Alien. Transmission is beyond mind. Dzogchen is beyond mind, a personal experience beyond reckoning, calculation, something within the reach of everyone who is interested to discover their own nature. So yes, Dzogchen is an aqua regia, a royal water capable of dissolving all limitations whatsoever if one just puts it into sincere practice.

Some people are very attached to the Buddhist clothes in which they find Dzogchen. Those clothes are not so important. Dzogchen texts are relative so they reflect the culture of those they find themselves in. The principle of the three kāyas is beyond language, so it does not matter at all what you call your three kāyas. The three kāyas just express aspects of the wisdom of the basis.

In fact if you closely examine Dzogchen language you see that it uses non-Buddhist examples all the time. For example. the notion of the peacock feather's colors being naturally formed is actually drawn from the Carvaka India materialist school -- they use that example to prove there is no creator, and so do we. A peacocks feather has eyes just because it is the nature of a peacock's feather to have eyes. Wisdom exists in the heart of each and every sentient beings just because it is the nature of a sentient being to have wisdom in each and everyone's heart. We don't have to do anything to create that wisdom. We don't have to do anything at all to develop that wisdom. We cannot improve that wisdom or harm it in anyway. It is as integral to our state as the five elements from which we are made (since they are made from it, anyway).

If we want to understand emptiness in Dzogchen, we do not need to engage in any analysis at all -- we need to merely reflect on the examples of illusion -- that is sufficient for understanding everything is unreal -- no analysis required, no fancy Madyamaka analysis, we don't even have to use the word "emptiness", "Life is but a dream...." In this way we penetrate to the real essence of the teachings.

And then we rest in our own state, or we discover it. These are the only choices we have in Dzogchen, discover, then rest.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

pemachophel said:

In any case, knowing what I know about Kyabje Chatral Rinpoche, I find the previous respondents hypothesis unlikely.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is certainly true that for many Buddhist masters of Dzogchen declaring a religious allegiance to Buddhism is a very important first step with all that entails i.e. eschewing non-Buddhist gods and companions, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

In Dzogchen a persona has to discover rigpa, which is the point where concepts collapse and wisdom arises. A person's beliefs - such as being a Nyingmapa for example - is actually just a bunch of concepts. So from the Dzogchen POV (i.e. the experience of actually resting steadily in rigpa) it's actually false and as equally false as any other belief. There's no such thing as a 'more correct dream' - there's only waking up.

Malcolm wrote:

Check.

Paul said:

In order to fully integrate everything a Dzogchen practitioner cannot pick and choose. As you mention it's the path of not changing anything - i.e. not accepting and not rejecting. So if a person is going to practice, they have to 'eat whatever's on their plate', but the corollary is that as long as they are remaining in the liberated state that their teacher pointed out they can eat whatever they like. And it actually helps deepen their practice to have a varied diet - their capacity grows and limitations dwindle.

Malcolm wrote:

Check.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm - thanks. Would you equate real knowledge of instant presence to something like 'stream-enterer' in Theravada? I mean in the sense of the knowledge of instant presence having with it a quality that liberates and that does not degenerate?

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you could say something like that i.e. a Dzogchen stream entrant is someone who has discovered their real state.

The difference of course is that discovering your real condition does not mean you are liberated from what buddhists call "fetters" and hindus call samskaras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm I hope you are right. How many members of the Dzogchen Community do you think have achieved this liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really know where they keep those sorts of statistics. But I am very certain that many of our sibs have real knowledge of instant presence. So I do not worry so much. Some of whom in which I have personal confidence.

M

Andrew108 said:

Hi Malcolm - do you mean by 'sibs' those that have studied and completed SMS level 1?

Malcolm wrote:

I mean those who have received transmission and applied themselves in a serious fashion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

But didn't you debate for the "Aryan invasion theory" in the other thread about Hindu and Buddhist Deities? A 'theory' that if true, would show the Dravidian culture to be the bedrock of Indian civilization. If this is true, it of course does not necessarily negate Sanskrit as a 'Primordial' or 'Sacred' language.

Malcolm wrote:

Indian Civilization as we know it is based on the Vedas, first and foremost regardless of the AIT or the Hindutva theories of history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm I hope you are right. How many members of the Dzogchen Community do you think have achieved this liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really know where they keep those sorts of statistics. But I am very certain that many of our sibs have real knowledge of instant presence. So I do not worry so much. Some of whom in which I have personal confidence.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

pemachophel said:

It's clear that one can practice Dzogchen as a stand-alone system. It is also clear that one can practice Dzogchen along with whatever practices ones chooses/one's Guru chooses for them from the other eight yanas. Most Nyingma Lamas alive today (such as Kyabje Chatral Rinpoche) and those recently deceased (such as Kyabje Dudjom Rinpoche, Kyabje Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche, Kyabje Trulshik Rinpoche, Urgyen Kusum Lingpa, etc.) make/made pretty heavy use of the other eight yanas both for Themselves and Their students. IMO, since everything depends on the Guru, the right approach or mix depends on one's Guru's instructions and example and the student's faith and devotion to their Teacher(s). The report card comes at the time of death. Since most Baby Boomer practitioners will be dying in the next 20 years, we should have ample evidence of which approaches produce the most consistent or dependable results. Till then, may all of us on this forum practice according to our Guru(s) instructions as diligently as possible and may all of us bring the path to fruition as quickly as possible.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing to disagree with there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Alternatives for the Dzogchenpa

Content:

Sherlock said:

Malcolm once said that if you received the teachings from ChNN and did the practice daily (I assume guru yoga?) he guarantees that you will face no difficulties upon death. I'd also be curious to know his answer.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Yes, but we don't exactly know much about the history of the klong sde lineage before the 11th century? But we know it been a part of the klong sde lineage for almost 1000 years so that seems like something, at least to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Sure we do, we know the name of each master, who attained rainbow body, etc.

When Dzin Dharmabodhi combined klong sde with the practice of Ngondzog Gyalpo, he did so because Ngondzog Gyalpo taught the klong sde tantras. Ngondzog Gyalpo is a guru sadhana from anuyoga. So we do this practice to connect with the lineage, just as we do Guru Yoga of White A to connect with Garab Dorje, but that is also from Anuyoga system, it is not Dzogchen.

N

heart said:

Yes, but they are not exactly historically verified yet, even if I am sure they will be eventually. But the last 1000 years are of a historically verified lineage, that is worth something. But I think I heard ChNNR call the Guru Yoga with a White Ah a Ati Guru Yoga, no?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are three versions of this. What I am talking about is "A dkar bla ma'i rnal sbyor" it is a text with visualization of Garab Dorje, in the collective practices book.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

.....All that is necessary for liberation is direct introduction and subsequent diligence applying that introduction.

M

Andrew108 said:

Are you really sure about this...

Do you really think this happens?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

xabir said:

But I do not see how a person can awaken and then still hold on to their old beliefs and views or their religions, since they would have seen through the views of their old religions. Even a stream enterer has ended three fetters: self-view, sceptical doubt and attachment to precepts and practices.

heart said:

Recognizing your own nature is not the same as realization except for a select few. I assume that is what you mean with awaken.

/magnus

xabir said:

Yes, in my understanding based on what I have read on ChNNR's texts and Namdrol's explanation, recognising Instant Presence is not equivalent to realizing emptiness and so does not have the effect of ending the fetters.

Malcolm wrote:

No, then there is something to do with that instant presence. No one said, "oh now I have recognized my real nature, now I am done."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

xabir said:

It is impossible to continue holding on to a view of self and at the same time be liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

It is impossible to hold onto a view of self or non-self and at the same time be liberated.

xabir said:

But I do not see how a person can awaken and then still hold on to their old beliefs and views or their religions, since they would have seen through the views of their old religions. In other words they can be a non-Buddhist up to the point of their awakening.

Malcolm wrote:

You still have not grasped the principle of "not changing anything". That means you integrate with wherever you find yourself. If you recognize your real condition while belonging to the Christian religion, you do not suddenly have to stop going to church. Maybe you like going to church. Maybe, being a Dzogchen practitioner makes a _better_ Christian.

Maybe being a Dzogchen practitioner can make Buddhists better Buddhists because Buddhists quite frankly are really grumpy and narrow minded, just like anyone else caught in the grip of grasping one-sided views. I can say this because I have more experience of Buddhists. Maybe, being a Dzogchen practitioner can make a Dzogchenpa a better Dzogchenpa.

An example of using old beliefs and views while still awakening is Bon. Bon did not throw anything out. They still teach their egg cosmology along with another more modern, "Buddhist" cosmology. They divide all that "non-Buddhist stuff" and call it all "The causal vehicle", right where the sgar thal gyur places the vehicle of gods and men i.e.:

Causal vehicles:

Gods and men

Hināyāna

Mahāyanā

Result vehicles:

kriya

upa
yoga
mahā
anu

Vehicle beyond cause and result
Ati.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:29 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

heart said:
Yes, but we don't exactly know much about the history of the klong sde lineage before the 11th century? But we know it been a part of the klong sde lineage for almost 1000 years so that seems like something, at least to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Sure we do, we know the name of each master, who attained rainbow body, etc.

When Dzin Dharmabodhi combined klong sde with the practice of Ngondzog Gyalpo, he did so because Ngondzog Gyalpo taught the klong sde tantras. Ngondzog Gyalpo is a guru sadhana from anuyoga. So we do this practice to connect with the lineage, just as we do Guru Yoga of White A to connect with Garab Dorje, but that is also from Anuyoga system, it is not Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:16 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:
you don't have practice with Anuyoga Deities or do Guardian Practices in Dzogchen, although it can help to do so.

heart said:
Depends on what you mean with that but Ekajati is a Dzogchen protector and there is a

Dzogchen Tantra on her practice, can't recall the name. Similarly I have been told some other deities appear in the Dzogchen Tantra's as practices. The empowerment of the Dzogchen Longde is for a deity and the Longde contains also lot of deity practice. Also Garab Dorje received all the Dzogchen teachings from Vajrasattva, who is a deity. So it is not so clean cut as I used to think. Of course the main point of all Dzogchen teachings is the realization of the natural state, but at least I think that could be said about Buddhism or rather the Dharma as a whole.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The addition of the empowerment for the Anuyoga style Guru Yoga of the primordial master Ngondzong Gyalpo was tacked onto the klong sde lineage in the 11th century by Dzin Dharmabodhi. Before that, there was no specific empowerment of klong sde.

Vajrasattva is one of Garab Dorje's names. For example, if you read the Rigpa Rangshar tantra, the master who teaches that Tantra is Zhonnu Pawo Tobden -- during the course the tantra, he is called Mahavajradhara, Samantabhadra, Vajrasattva and many other names and title. Any fully awakened person is the manifestation of all three kāyas.

Garab Dorje's Speech is Vajrasattva. His Mind is Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Tarpa said:

I have one question, do you think liberation is possible in other religions without the teaching of dependent origination ?

Malcolm wrote:

I understand why you ask this because it is strong statement I have made in the past.

But the view of Dzogchen is not dependent origination at all. Dependent origination, in Dzogchen, is how we describe the arising of afflicted phenomena in Dzogchen, the phenomena that manifest out of non-recognition of our real nature.

Tarpa said:

I understand a direct experience surpasses any need for intellectual study of anything, like reading a map after you've already arrived at a destination and since our real nature is inherent than of course it would be accessible to anybody able to recognize it, which is a wonderful thing of course, but do you think study of dependent origination and the wisdom teachings of Buddhism necessary for liberation ?

Malcolm wrote:

As I said in the first post in this thread, all that I think is necessary for studying Dzogchen is understanding the five elements and three gates and having a good motivation. All that is necessary for liberation is direct introduction and subsequent diligence applying that introduction. Of course one can study anything and it can be helpful and useful to broadening one's understanding, so if you read my first post, you will see what I said. If you are going to be a teacher, you have to study a little more broadly in order to relate to more diverse capacities.

Tarpa said:

Are you saying all other religions or whatever people want to call them can be looked at as stepping stones to an ultimate experience of one's real nature (which of course there is no label there saying "welcome to Buddhism you've made it" or anything like that), or looked at like part of the staircase of the gradual teachings, is what "the paths of gods and men mean"? It's okay they don't have understanding of dependent origination for now they are starting off in a good direction? But wouldn't eternalist and solid self / soul / reality views etc. be a problem?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, it does not matter much what your intellectual view is.

For example, no matter whether you are a cittamātrīn or a madhyamaka you can still attain liberation if you follow the the sādhana method. Why? Because the sādhana method in Vajrayāna recapitulates the experiential introduction in the third and fourth empowerments. The "view" in Vajrayāna in general is not a result of intellectual analysis, it is a result of introduction and the experiential cultivation of introduction. If it does not matter whether you are a cittamātrīn or a madhyamaka when it comes to practicing sādhana -- because you will still attain liberation either way. Your post-meditation view will not interfere with your sādhana practice. Since cittamātra is a realist view and it does not interfere with your liberation when practicing a vajrayāna sādhana, why should other realist views interfere with your liberation?

Dzogchen is based completely on direct introduction. As long as you are willing to employ its methods, then what does it matter if you come to Dzogchen practice believing in Jesus, Buddha, Krishna, etc.? What does it matter if you believe in Parātmā? What does it matter if you believe in tathāgatagarbha which is described in so many tathāgatagarbha texts as a self (though, perish the thought, not the SAME self as advocated by the Hindus -- actually, if someone is really, really honest with themselves, they will admit it is impossible to differentiate the sat cit ananda of the Hindus from the atman, sukha, nitya, śuddha of the uttarantra)? The Dzogchen view is not a view, it is the experience of a moment of uncontrived awareness aka instant presence (an Indian moment i.e. roughly about 5 milliseconds) based on direct introduction.

As long as you are practicing Ati guru yoga etc., and doing your best, none of your previous conditioning, whether non-Buddhist or Buddhist will interfere with your liberation. Why? Because "liberation" is solely based on recognizing your real condition. It is not based on belief philosophy, intellectual analysis, conditioned merit, or anything else. It is not based on having a view of emptiness, dependent origination,

buddhanature, etc. These views are just as relative as views of self, a creator, and so on.

Tarpa said:

I think I'd like to finally start getting into dzogchen, I have read a bunch of books about dzogchen but no actual dzogchen books per se, texts, I have been putting it off for years because I found it a bit confusing while studying mahamudra after experienced practitioners such as yourself were saying it is not the same thing while all the intro books about buddhism were saying it was, then I got the sense that maybe trekcho and mahamudra are more or less same but togal is something completely different than anything elsewhere, and terms and definitions seemed to be different in both systems so I didn't want to confuse myself and decided to study one or the other and picked mahamudra. Tegal is mainly what I'm interested in learning about.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, start with klong sde. Listen to ChNN retreat coming up, it is closed, so you have to get your membership and the login right away. starts very soon, like thursday or something.

Tarpa said:

I think I'll join the dzogchen community.

Malcolm wrote:

Good call.

Tarpa said:

I'm a Buddhist and will always cherish it...

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have to change anything to be a Dzogchen practitioner. If you are a Catholic, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Buddhist because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner and you can still partake of the Sacraments of the church as much as you like, just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a Wiccan, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Buddhist because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner. If you want dance naked under the moon during during a sabbat, there is no problem, just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a religious Jew, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Buddhist because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner, you can still observe the sabbath, there is no problem, just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a Taoist, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Buddhist because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner, when you practice Taoist rites and so on, just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a Buddhist, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Dzogchen practitioners because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner, when you practice meditation, sadhana, etc., just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, and all of sudden you don't feel very much like you

need the label "Catholic, Wiccan, Jew, Taoist, Buddhist" there is also no problem. Just continue to practice Dzogchen and be present and aware.

Some people think I have abandoned Dharma. It is not true. My relationship to Dharma and my understanding of it has changed. As I mentioned before all Dharma paths, whether Buddhist or non-Buddhist, have the same motivation, the peace and happiness that comes from freedom.

I just don't feel the need to self-identify as a "buddhist" anymore. I am personally finding the label "buddhist" to be a limitation for me. I am not suggesting to anyone else that they need to change anything.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Tarpa said:

Does receiving Dzogchen related hyt empowerments (protectors) with ati yoga version sadhanas, yangzab lineage / Traga Rinpoche, count as direct introduction or entry on Dzogchen path ?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. Yangzab is an Anuyoga system. Traga Rinpoche is a Dzogchen master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Dzogchen has no tradition. Dzogchen is beyond tradition"

ChNN 5/18/2012

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We find four main kinds of conflict narratives in Tibeian religious culture

1) The narratives of conflict between Buddhists and Bonpos during the imperial period

2) The narratives of conflict between Indian Mahāsiddhas with Hindus during the early new translation period

3) The narratives of conflict expressed in the subjugation of Rudra, the Ogre King of Lanka, in Nyingma Mahāyoga sources (which clearly parallel Rama's defeat of Ravana in the Ramayāna) and those expressed in the subjugation of Bhairava/Shiva, etc. in the Sarma tantras.

4) The narratives of conflict of Indian Buddhists with masters of the Atiyoga lineage.

Please do not forget that Indian Buddhists completely rejected Ati as a heresy, completely. People forget this. One could make the argument that treasures attributed to Padmasambhava such as klong gsal nyi ma bar ma rgyud, mkha' gro snying thig and so on served to validate and normalize the heretofore controversial teachings of Dzogchen that were under severe attack by Kadampas, Sakyas, and so on and earlier, during the tenth century by such people as Lha Bla ma Yeshe 'od, etc i.e. the tenth century Buddhist conservatives who maintained the old imperial era policies against translating mahayoga tantra texts and so on. Creating the narrative that Padmasambhava had validated them served to propel Nyingthig to new heights of popularity. Not only were there treasures, but also in the kama tradition we find texts with colophons stating they were translated by Guru Padmasambhava. The problem here is that the first Nyingma catalogue of Tantras was not compiled until the 13th century, etc., etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

1. The Bonpo Dzogchen Guardians have ordered the Masters to teach it openly
2. Dzogchen Teachings are an open secret i.e. if one has no capacity then one will not be able to understand them and will not be interested in reading
3. For those who have the capacity and connection, it may bring great benefit by providing a link to the text and Master which they can then follow if they wish to enter the way of dzogchen
4. It is clearly stated in the text that if one wishes to put these Teachings into practice then just reading the book is not enough. One must find and follow an authentic Master.

So reading is different than doing the practice. i guess it is always good to have some knowledge before one gets started.

Malcolm wrote:

I was not talking about other people, I was referring to how those who consider themselves students of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu ought to behave.

I, for one:

a) have no problem with all Dzogchen teachings be taught openly.

b) do not consider Dzogchen secret in anyway. "Secret" does not mean "...never show anyone" -- it means, only show it to those who are interested. Do not talk about thogal, etc., on internet forums, bars and coffee shops. For example, Tibetans call one's private parts "gsang gnas", the secret place. So, just like we do not expose our penises and vaginas in public places, and only show them to people who are interested, likewise, these teachings should only be shown to people who are interested. They should not be made available so people can make a kind of book collection.

c) people who want to read Heartdrops can buy the book. I do not support this idea that all books should be downloadable for free.

4) Yes, I know. It says this clearly.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But we should not kid ourselves into to believing that liberation is only possible according to our preconceptions.

Pero said:

What does it matter if we "kid ourselves" like that?

Malcolm wrote:

Then we enter into unnecessary limitations.

By the way, I did not assert to TKfan that there was liberation in other schools.

Merely that his dogmatic scholastics were articles of faith, not proofs of anything concrete.

When you asked me if I think liberation is possible outside of Buddhism, the only answer is yes, because otherwise, we would not have Buddha, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

In the end we have little time and no doubt Buddhadharma leads to Buddhahood. You cannot say the same about other teachings (save Bon).

Malcolm wrote:

I am not suggesting we change anything. I am in the path I am content with. But we should not kid ourselves into believing that liberation is only possible according to our preconceptions.

The best thing is to just confess that one does not know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

But the thing is there is no knowledge of the reality of phenomena outside of Buddhism and Bon (and Dzogchen).

Malcolm wrote:

Are you really, really, really sure about that? And what would it cost you if you were wrong about that?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Malcolm, do you now believe that achieving Buddhahood is possible outside of Buddhism and Bon (including Dzogchen)?

Malcolm wrote:

Achieving Buddhahood has always been possible outside of "Buddhism". There was no Buddhism when appeared. or when Tonpa Shenrab appeared. Or when Ngon Dzog Gyalpo, appeared. Etc. In fact, Ngondzong Gyalpo left no Buddhist sangha behind. Nor when Zhonnu Pawo Tobden appeared, or Nangwa Dampa, etc.

Then there are pratyekabuddhas. They in fact often appear in the garb of so called non-Buddhist ascetics.

Nagarjuna has said that even if there are no Buddhas in the world, it is always possible to for there to be liberation anyway since the reality of phenomena is always present.

So yes I think it is possible. I do not think any longer that liberation is the sole province of Buddhists.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Your story is right except that Gyerpung Nang Zher Lodpo was a student from Taphiritsa.

Malcolm wrote:

Vision/student, same difference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since there is no arising, there is no cessation,
no coming nor going, all pervasive;
the unmoving supreme dharma of great bliss,
immaculate liberation equal with space.

Without a foundation, unsupported,
non-abiding, not appropriated, a great dharma;
a vast naturally uniform primordial liberation
not bound nor unbound.

An all-embracing dwelling place that has always existed,
thoroughly uncorrupted, beyond karma,
a vast area, the expanse of space,
the blazing great dharma is the orb of the sun and the moon.

Naturally formed and personally experienced,
a vajra, a mountain, a great lotus,

the sun, a lion, wisdom, a song,
Great sound, incomparable music.

Enjoyed to the limits of space,
fully awakened equal with all the buddhas,
on the vast stage of Samantabhadra, the pinnacle of dharma,
in the dimension of space, the spacious womb of Samantabhadri,
the naturally-formed luminous dimension has always been totally perfect.

This is my rendering in a more literal way done some years ago, and slightly revised this morning.

There is a very beautiful free rendering of the Song of the Vajra on page 91 of Crystal and the Way of Light. It seems to have been taken from an oral commentary, so not all the words of the Tibetan text of Longchenpa's translation [found in the Tshig don mdzod, vol. 2, page 1295] are represented in this version.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to Tun huang documents, Gyer chen sNang bzhed lhod po was a contemporary of Srongtsan Gampo. He wrote down the rgyud chung bcu gnyis, the root verses of the whole Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud after a vision of Taphihritsa, and wrote a number of commentaries on them.

Jnana said:

Okay. Are there Dunhuang documents containing Bon teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

However, it is clear that Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud predates the arrival of Dzogchen from India.

Jnana said:

Clear from archaeological sources? Or text-critical analysis? Or?...

Malcolm wrote:

As to one, yes. As to two, in terms of archaeology, not yet so far as I know. In terms of text criticism, ChNN has done a lot of work here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Unknown said:

Personally, I have no confidence that an awakened teacher has ever existed or will ever exist without realizing pratīyasamutpāda in both forward and reverse sequence and the four noble truths.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok.

And yet, the Bonpos had Dzogchen in the form of the Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud prior to the introduction of Shakyamuni's teachings into Tibet. This is a most excellent reason to support the notion that Dzogchen can be fruitfully practiced as an independent vehicle. What is your "objective fact to which all will readily agree, like the heat of a flame" that proves this claim that Bonpos had dzogchen prior to Buddhism being introduced into Tibet?

According to Tun huang documents, Gyer chen sNang bzhed lhod po was a contemporary of Srongtsan Gompo. He wrote down the rgyud chung bcu gnyis, the root verses of the whole Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud after a vision of Taphihritsa, and wrote a number of commentaries on them.

But you have not proven that awakened beings are found solely within Buddhism. Nor have you proven Buddhism alone has the methods of producing such beings. You have merely recited some received dogma. The fact that awakened beings are also found in Bon contradicts your assertion.

And what is your "objective fact to which all will readily agree, like the heat of a flame" for this claim that awakened beings are also found in Bon, specifically, prior to Buddhism being introduced into Tibet?[/quote]

That was not the scope of the question I had in mind Shardza, etc. However, it is clear that Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud predates the arrival of Dzogchen from India.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

If you meant I should be a dzogchen practitioner - I am practicing in Nyingmapa the Kün-zang Gongdü Nyinthig cycle of Pema Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, and that's fantastic. You can be a buddhist and a Dzogchen practitioner -- never said you couldn't.

M

Mariusz said:

As you will see I questioned you earlier and waiting for answers? You seems to me not reliable for such an advise now. Take your statement made outside Dharmawheel for example.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not see your question. This thread has 28 pages in three days -- a little hard to keep up.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Except if your "real state" actually holds a view. That then will be dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

But your primordial state does not contain a view.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 7:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

If you meant I should be a dzogchen practitioner - I'am practicing in Nyingmapa the Kün-zang Gongdü Nyinthig cycle of Pema Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, and that's fantastic. You can be a buddhist and a Dzogchen practitioner -- never said you couldn't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 6:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

A deliciously funny thing about this thread is that those who are now opposing Malcolm most vehemently are relying to a great extent on the arguments he himself used years ago - and has abandoned by now and exposed as wanting. 27 pages of Malcolm being attacked by people who do little but raise Malcolm's ghosts - which he's all laid to rest

Andrew108 said:

Perhaps we shouldn't 'oppose' (and 'we' don't actually) but just accept. Sounds like you might have the mindset to be a good Dzogchen practitioner. Just wait until Malcolm speaks, accept what he says. No need to bother trying to work it out for yourself. Nice and easy way to enslave yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a very nice thing to say to THO. That is not respecting him at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 6:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Not to you, Malcolm, but to a lot of us it is.

M

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and that is fine. I have nothing against buddhists. I am nominally a buddhist. And I have nothing but love for Buddha's Dharma.

But many of our Dharma brothers and sisters, some my closest friends in Dzogchen Community, do not feel nor consider themselves buddhists. So I see no reason to condition them into accepting a label that is not important for them; just as I have no wish for you or anyone else to abandon a label that is important for you.

For example, if you came to me and said "I feel anyone can practice Mahāmudra". They do not need to be a Buddhist to do so." I would agree. End of conversation. If you said "I don't feel like a buddhist, but I really like practicing mahāmudra, I would said -- excellent.

For me it is not about accepting and rejecting the appellation "buddhist".

In the end, when it comes to the personal experience of your primordial state, that experience has never come with the lable "buddhist" attached to it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 6:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

tomamundsen said:

So, is the emphasis here on "considers themselves" as a Buddhist? Or do you mean they can actually hold views that are not in accord with Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

What kinds of views you hold does not really matter. Dzogchen is not a question of holding a view. It is a question of discovering your real state through your personal experience. All the intellectualization about what is Dzogchen? what is not Dzogchen? is it Buddhist? is it not Buddhist? will never, ever substitute for that personal experience. When you have that personal experience, all that intellectualization becomes unnecessary.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:01 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha just means someone who is awake. Also Hindu yogis and ascetics strive to become awake, to become Jivanmuktis, "liberated while still alive". What is your objective fact to which all will readily agree, like the heat of a flame, that these persons do not achieve awakening?

M

xabir said:

Have you seen a Hindu have experiential realization of the two emptiness, dependent origination, etc? I haven't. If they had, I can't see how they could still call themselves Hindu.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not answer the question I posts to T-fan.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 10:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Everyone has compassion because they have Buddhanature, but the wisdom methods to develop this Buddhanature and transform it into enlightenment can only be found within Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

What is your objective fact that proves this point? A fact so objective all will agree to it, just as all agree there is a sun in the center of our solar system?

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's also arguable that the methods to transform ordinary, limited compassion into enlightened compassion can also only be found within Buddha's teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

It is also arguable that this is not so. Hence, Hindus and those of other faiths very much disagree with you. What is your objective fact to which all will readily agree, just as all agree that the moon appears in the sky, that proves this to be so?

Tsongkhapafan said:

True compassion is really bodhichitta, and that, being a compassionate wish to become a Buddha, is most definitely and exclusively Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha just means someone who is awake. Also Hindu yogis and ascetics strive to become awake, to become Jivanmuktis, "liberated while still alive". What is your objective fact to which all will readily agree, like the heat of a flame, that these persons do not achieve awakening?

Tsongkhapafan said:

I'm not being sectarian and exclusivist

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you are. And that is perfectly alright. Just admit to yourself that you are being both sectarian and exclusivist. Self-knowledge is a very good thing.

Tsongkhapafan said:

everyone needs enlightenment, but in order to attain enlightenment it's very necessary to go for refuge to enlightened beings, their Teachings and their qualified followers to create the foundation, otherwise it's like trying to grow a seed with no soil.

Malcolm wrote:

But you have not proven that awakened beings are found solely within Buddhism. Nor have you proven Buddhism alone has the methods of producing such beings. You have merely recited some received dogma. The fact that awakened beings are also found in Bon contradicts your assertion. If they can be found in Bon, why can't they be found in

other traditions? Of course we can invent fantasies about why it is impossible for them to be found in other Dharmas. But those fantasies will be just fantasies. They will not be based in facts.

You are a Gelugpa. You pride yourself on hard logic and facts. Where do your facts end and unprovable beliefs begin? This is something for you to discover. When you discover where your facts end and where your beliefs begin, you will be just a little bit closer to the truth. When you discover where your facts end and where your beliefs begin, then you will be more free.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 10:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

...

Malcolm wrote:

You have to turn your email on to receive replies.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 7:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

"Buddhist" is not only lable, but the context and environment until complete realization of Dzogchen. I wish you to solve all your contradictions related with Buddhism. I remember your final statement after our long debate: intention of madhyamaka and dzogchen is the same. We are still in the progress. Thank you for inspirations

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Mariusz:

As I said, if it is important for you to contextualize Dzogchen as a buddhist path, that's ok with me. But I don't feel that need anymore. I don't find it necessary. I once felt very much as you did. But for a long while that feeling has been weakening. You can ask anyone from my e-Sangha days. I would be fiercely extolling the necessity of being a Buddhist to practice Dzogchen.

Buddhism does not own Dzogchen. No one does.

As I have said, I don't think one has to be a "Buddhist" (or a Bonpo) to practice Dzogchen. Dzogchen, from my point of view is an independent path for total realization. It does not depend on any other path. I am glad there are other paths. I am glad there is a Dharma out there for every person on the planet to follow. I am glad there is Bon Dharma, Hindu Dharma, Christian Dharma, Muslim Dharma, Jewish Dharma, Taoist Dharma, etc.

In Tibetan, the term Dharma is translated as Chos. What does chos mean in Tibetan? It is the imperative of the term རྒྱལ་ཆོས་ ('chos) -- it means to set right, to fix, etc. The purpose of Dharma is to set right. So there are all kinds Chos out there for all kinds of people.

Not only are the intention of Madhyamaka and Dzogchen the same, the intention of all spiritual traditions is the same, the peace and ease that comes from freedom. That is what comes from setting things right.

So Dzogchen can be followed by Buddhists, Bonpos, Hindus, Jews, Christians right along side of their own religions. It is up to each person to decide this for themselves.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: mind/matter dichotomy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As we know, Madhyamaka adopts the conventional truth either according to the Sautrantika system, or the Yogacara system. But since its own perspective is grounded in the Prajñāpāramitāsūtras, it regards distinctions such as mind and matter to be merely conventional designations that do not have any real basis apart from imputation.

Jnana said:

Don't you mean to say "merely conventional designations that do not have any real basis apart from imputation"?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It means that when you have reached a decisive understanding in Madhyamaka then you will have a profound understanding of the Dzogchen view. So what could be better than that?

Malcolm wrote:

It means you will have understood the ka dag side. From personal experience I can tell you that the lhun grub side cannot be understood through intellectual analysis at all. It is completely missing in sutra altogether.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: protection from lower realms

Content:

Namdrol said:

The method of Dzogchen to protect practitioners from the three lower realms has not one single thing to do with tantric methods, Buddhist or Bon.

dakini_boi said:

Are you referring to the purification of the six lokas? If so, how can what you said be so, when the practice includes visualization & generation of deity?

Dronma said:

All practices of the Purification of Six Lokas from the Longsal Cycle include: Refuge and Bodhichitta, Guru Yoga with Padmasambhava, 6 Syllables of Samantabhadra, Song of the Vajra, and Dedication of Merits.

Especially the one, which is preliminary of the Path of Ati, includes visualization of Vajrasattva for purification.

Malcolm wrote:

It is sufficient to do Ati Guru Yoga and then engage in purification of six lokas. One can recite SOV or not, depending on how you feel. Then dedicate.

One can also do the Long Longsal Ngondro as you mention above. It is a beautiful practice. There is also another six lokas purification which ChNN will teach this year which is based on physical postures and breathing called "self liberation of the six lokas". It is very interesting.

So there is, like with everything, an essential way, a medium way and a more elaborate way, depending on your time and how you feel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What could you possibly want to know?

M

Clarence said:

Honestly, it is none of my business. That said, your development on the forum is very interesting. I just wonder whether your insights are the result of any special "experiences" or something else.

Maybe you reached third vision and came to your new realization. Or maybe you just started to think differently about things because you got a pet plant. You also changed your avatar name. You are now Malcolm and not Namdrol anymore. I just find it fascinating, that's all. Especially since there is another western Lama who also started saying similar things like you do after he did his 3-year retreat and he reached a certain level.

Malcolm wrote:

I had been thinking of ditching the namdrol nym for sometime. It is not like no one knows who I am.

At this point in my life and practice I just feel differently about things than I did before. I am nearly 50 (in about a month actually). I have spent most of my adult life engaged in the pursuit of spiritual truths. I remember when I first met Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. I was so buzzed someone needed to put chains on my legs to keep me from floating off the ground. It changed my life. But I am a stubborn person, and I was also very conditioned by the Sakya school by the time I met him. So when I did my three year retreat, I combined Lamdre practice with tregchö according to ChNN's instructions. I was in a golden cage of my own making (some will say I still am) to a large extent. I became very expert in debating various tenet systems.

Then, 2003, I started to study the system of Tibetan medicine. This changed my understanding of Dzogchen considerably because now I had access to a different way of seeing the body and I began to see things in Dzogchen teachings that that years of studying static tenet systems had not prepared me for. When I looked at Dzogchen texts after that, they became alive for me in a different way, the very language of the Dzogchen tantras changed. I understood Tibetan language differently.

Also I started to study medicine because it is useful for helping everyone, whereas with Madhyamaka and even Buddhism, people have to sign on to a point of view. With medicine, no one has to sign onto any point of view -- they are sick, they go to a practitioner like me, and I help them get well based on their own experience. It is all driven by their own experience. Dzogchen is also like that, as I see it. The view of Dzogchen and the view of Tibetan Medicine are exactly the same.

They both propose two states, a unchanged state and a changed state. The former is healthy and balanced and the latter is unhealthy and out of balance. The cause of the unhealthy state is ignorance. The role of introduction and practice in Dzogchen and diagnosis and therapies Tibetan Medicine are to remove ignorance through knowledge

(rigpa) and restore balance through methods. The changed state has all the components of the unchanged state, but because the unchanged state is not correctly seen, imbalances enter the system, change occurs, and ill-health results. When the imbalances are addressed the changed state is correct and returned to the unchanged state. The result of both Dzogchen and Tibetan Medicine is the body of light.

Tibetan Medicine is connected with Dzogchen and it is also connected with the ancient Rishis of India, the Drang srong of Tibet, and the immortals of China.

Why is institutional Buddhism different? Institutional Buddhism is a bit like allopathic medicine -- if you have x disease, you get exactly the same treatment as everyone else with x disease. Maybe it will cure a disease, but just as likely, you will contract another illness from your treatment. But if you go to a skilled Tibetan doctor, everyone who has x disease will receive a completely different treatment. So Dzogchen is like that, at least the Dzogchen that I practice, as I understand it.

If you go to Sakya, you get one practice, Nyingma, another practice, etc. Of course this is fine and there is nothing wrong with it. But in my opinion the modern institutional approaches we find in Tibetan Buddhism are not truly healthy, just like the institutional approaches to medicine create as many illnesses as they treat. I think they reflect more about Tibetan feudal culture than they do about Dharma. There are eight great practice lineages in Tibet and a thousand minor ones. That is a more accurate way to define things -- those eight practice lineages are the real Dharma in Tibet. Not, Kagyu, Sakya, Nyingma, Gelug, Jonang, Bon, etc.

I don't care anymore where wisdom comes from-- wisdom about plants, yoga, channels, winds, bindus, nature of mind, elements, people, etc. I just don't care anymore where it comes from. Wisdom is wisdom. If other people want to be involved in counting the horns on rabbits with tenet system studies, that is fine, I also put in my time with it until I realized it was a total waste of energy and never got me one inch closer to recognizing my true nature. That kind of knowledge, as far as I am concerned is only useful for polemics. And polemics are useful for nothing but passing the time, verbal flatulence for the most part.

There are beautiful teachings in the Vedas, the Puranas, Mahāyāna, the Pali Canon, Bon, Taoism, Confucism, Tantras, both Buddhist and Hindu, and of course, for me most of all, in the Dzogchen tantras irrespective of whether they are from Oddiyāna or Zhang Zhung.

We live in a world contaminated with rage, hate, anger, division and so many of us sit around and pick lint out of our navels. And the reason we do this is because we take our pet philosophy, whether it is Buddhism, Dzogchen, etc., and rather than helping one another, we try to convert everyone to our point of view. Lord (take your pick, Allah, Buddha, Jesus, Krishna) knows that in the past I also have behaved in precisely the same way. For example, our friend Magnus told this poor guy "If you are a Zen practitioner you must be a Buddhist!". My reply to this, if he does not feel like a Buddhist, then for Buddha's sake don't insist to him he must feel that way.

To be perfectly frank I don't really feel very much like a Buddhist either. I do feel like a Dzogchen practitioner, because that is what I spend most of my time doing and have been doing so since 1992. But please don't tell me I don't love the Dharma as much as the next guy because I am not feeling very buddhist anymore. There is more to the Dharma than the name "buddhist". Our friend Jñāna pointed out that Buddhism is for whoever is interested. This is perfectly true, well, with one proviso. Dharma is for whoever is interested. Buddhism is only for "Buddhists" by definition.

Just because I am not feeling very buddhist does not mean I won't practice Shitro for my loved ones and friends when they die, that I won't practice Mandarava for longevity, that I won't do Ganapuja to Guru Rinpoche, etc. Guru Rinpoche never said, for example, I will only come to Buddhists on the tenth day of the lunar month when they invoke me. He said I will come before anyone in person on the tenth day of every month who invokes me. This is his samaya, to appear in person to anyone who calls on him with faith (good thing he is beyond limitations because that day is very full of appointments). Don't tell me I don't have confidence in Guru Rinpoche because I am not feeling very buddhist. Don't tell me that my bodhicitta, or my love and compassion is defective because I am not feeling very buddhist these days.

Just because I am not feeling very buddhist does not mean that I have lost the sense of refuge. My path is the path of Dzogchen. It is not other paths. So the path upon which I am going for refuge is the Dzogchen path. If you want to see it as a buddhist or a bon path, that is ok if it makes you feel more comfortable. It is not meaningful for me to see the path of Dzogchen as a buddhist or bonpo. I am going for refuge on the Dzogchen path. I am not conditioning others. I am talking about it means for me. So I am going for refuge on a Dzogchen path and I am not feeling particularly like I need that label "buddhist" anymore. I also don't need the label "Dzogchen practitioner". But my path is Dzogchen, so that is the most accurate label for me at present, though "malcolm" is a little better still.

When I was feeling very Buddhist I used to read the religious books of other schools, but not to enjoy them, only to reject them. What foolishness! The Upanishads are beautiful. There is a beautiful hymn to medicinal herbs in the Atharvaveda. There are beautiful praises the moon, the sun, the stars, the planets and so on in the Rk Veda. The Bhagavad Gita is renowned for its beauty. But buddhists tend to merely read them to reject them. We even have rules about how much time we should spend reading non-buddhist books. What nonsense! When we read a Bonpo mdo (sutra), we read it to compare it with some imagined Buddhist "original" because we buddhists can't get our heads out of our own asses long enough to see how foolish we look. Because of this bias, Bonpos don't even want to share the beauty of their tradition with buddhists, because face it buddhists -- we (to the extent I still feel buddhist) have been total assholes to the Bonpos for 1400 years, ever since Srongtsan Gampo assassinated the last king of Zhang Zhung in the 5th decade of the seventh century. The buddhists scattered them like ants during the time of Trisrong Detsen, fabricated stories about their beliefs that are still repeated to this day, forced them to ape buddhist morays and so on.

I read authors like Wendell Berry, who is a lovely man, a very important writer in the local farming movement in the US who writes lovely things like the following:

It would be foolish, probably, to suggest that God's pleasure in all things can be fully understood or appreciated by mere humans. The passage suggests, however, that our truest and profoundest religious experience may be the simple, unasking pleasure in the existence of other creatures that is possible to humans. It suggests that God's pleasure in all things must be respected by us in our use of things, and even in our displeasure in some things. It suggests too that we have an obligation to preserve God's pleasure in all things, and surely this means not only that we must not misuse or abuse anything, but also that there must be some things and some places that by common agreement we do not use at all, but leave wild.

Berry, Wendell (2010-04-23). What Matters?: Economics for a Renewed Commonwealth (pp. 98-99). Perseus Books Group. Kindle Edition.

The old grumpy buddhist in me would have bristled at such language. Now I just see the beauty that Mr. Berry is trying to convey. For example, before a series of intense thunder storms yesterday in western Ma, I went for a walk up the hill. My senses open, as I walk up the hill, my heart beating faster, the stream by the road full from the previous days runoff, birds singing in the woods by the road, and I know exactly what Wendell Berry is talking about. As Garab Dorje said, "The Color of Rtsal is green".

We may not see directly the wisdom display that underlies all of our karmic experience, but if we know it is there through our personal experience, we can still come to the appreciation of mystery of things as they are, we can come a little bit more into balance when we integrate with our natural surroundings, sitting with the experience of the five elements. The teachings of the Gongpa Zanghtal state that we can also use our aesthetic experiences of beauty to be in a state of instant presence.

The lable "buddhist" was just getting in my way. It's a label I don't need anymore. I guess it does not really apply except in the most superficial of ways i.e. I am a Sakya Acharya. I have received teachings from Nyingma and Kagyu teachers, and even Bon teachers. I hold the lineage of Abhidharma, among other things. I have a small amount of skill explaining Dharma tenets and texts. I still enjoy reading sutras, tantras, sastras, though I read them now quite differently than I once did. These things many people will think define me as a Buddhist. But for myself, I really don't feel very buddhist.

But I definitely feel like a Dzogchen practitioner. And that, my friends, is all I want and need for the moment.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: protection from lower realms

Content:

Namdrol said:

The method of Dzogchen to protect practitioners from the three lower realms has not one single thing to do with tantric methods, Buddhist or Bon.

dakini_boi said:

Are you referring to the purification of the six lokas? If so, how can what you said be so, when the practice includes visualization & generation of deity?

Malcolm wrote:

I was not referring to the rushen practice of purification of the six lokas. Six lokas practice definitely does not necessarily included generation of a deity, though I have seen systems where it does.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot of misunderstanding of things that I have said here. There are some people who think this is a debate. It is not, at least not for me (apart from some correction of facts). Some people are uncomfortable with what it is they imagine I am saying. Other people seem to understand what I am saying but disagree, as is their right. Other people seem to understand and agree with it whole-heartedly. To make clear the main points as I stated them:

- 1) Dzogchen is a teaching for all of humanity, not just Buddhists or Bonpos
- 2) Dzogchen is an independent path, not dependent on sutra or tantra
- 3) All methods from any tradition or yāna can be utilized by a Dzogchen practitioner according to their understanding and condition
- 4) As Dzogchen practitioners, we should be free from all limitations of religion, ideology, nation, race, class and tribe

Andrew108 said:

There is a debate here because not everyone accepts this description of Dzogchen. From my own side I see this description as a reification whether unintended or not. That is what has been discussed. I am aware of what ChNN says about this but the above description has no meaning for me. And so we discuss it. No worries. Except of course when it is said that not accepting the above description implies a lack of faith or understanding even. And so it gets discussed.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for some people:

- 1) Dzogchen is not a teaching for all humanity, it is only for Buddhists and Bonpos
- 2) Dzogchen is not an independent path, it is dependent on sutra and tantra
- 3) Dzogchen practitioners should confine themselves to methods found in Buddhism and/or Bon

I accept that many people feel this way. It is their right to understand Dzogchen however they do. I am not interfering with anyone at all. I am merely expressing my own perspective.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Putting Dzogchen on a special throne and calling it the only pure and true Dharma is actually a way to limit Dzogchen practitioners, not liberating them.

Malcolm wrote:

Please cite the passage where I said this?

Otherwise, please retract your mischaracterization of my writings.

M

heart said:

I am not quoting you Namdrol I am expressing what I think you are saying. If you don't think Dzogchen is the only pure and true Dharma I apologize. I think personally that the Dzogchen methods just don't sum up Dzogchen, it goes way beyond that.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

Dzogchen itself is a personal experience introduced by one's Guru. That is about all I said on the subject.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: mind/matter dichotomy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The contradiction between sutra and tantra on the one hand, and Dzogchen on the other,

concerning the difference/non-difference between mind and matter is not an important contradiction.

dakini_boi said:

This is an intriguing point that Malcolm has made a few times lately. I had never heard it put in quite that way. I'm wondering, Malcolm, if you could give a short explanation of the sutra, tantra and dzogchen view on mind/matter. I would have thought that even in sutra, and definitely in tantra, because the nature of both mind and matter is emptiness, there would be no such dichotomy.

Malcolm wrote:

If you elevate everything to the ultimate level, even "...matter is unconditioned without anything missing", as it says in the Yum Chenmo, the sutra of Perfect Wisdom in 100,000 lines.

But the Buddhist scholastics from Sarvastivada up to Dharmakirti have always maintained a hard division between mind and matter, between *nāma* on the one hand and *rūpa* on the other. For example, in the account of the twelve links in the Vibhanga, the Pali Abhidharma compendium, when discussing the twelve nidanas, it even leaves off the *rūpa* in the nidana of *nāmarūpa*, running ignorance, formations, consciousness, name, etc.

The Yogacara school attempts to supercede this dualism through asserting that everything is fundamentally a projection of the mind -- in fact the 15th century Lamdre Master Khyentse Wangchuk states, there is no dualism of mind and matter because everything is mind.

As we know, Madhyamaka adopts the conventional truth either according to the Sautrantika system, or the Yogacara system. But since its own perspective is grounded in the Prajñāpāramitāsūtras, it regards distinctions such as mind and matter to be merely conventional designations that do have any real basis apart from imputation.

But we can see that this division is well preserved in Buddhist tantric literature (as well as Hindu tantric literature) when we find for example that the mind is described as a rider of a horse, *vāyu*. This is because both forms of tantra, Buddhist as well as Hindu, are concerned with the mechanics of the body for understanding how to gain realization through our embodiment through the practice of various kinds of yoga.

Granted, this is sometimes found in Dzogchen literature as well. But when we examine that actual system of Dzogchen according to the ancient Dzogchen tantras, we find that in fact even consciousness itself is generated physiologically in the body by a *vāyu*. I have yet to find in an original Dzogchen tantra the common Buddhist term *kham drug*, *sadadhātu* i.e. earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness. I may yet find it, but at least the Valby KWIC tool does not in fact list it in the 83 or so important Dzogchen tantras that he converted into searchable text files. It also does not list every instance of *thod rgal* in the Dzogchen tantras as well so its look up routines are not completely infallible. But there are hundreds of references to the five elements ('byung

Inga, pañcabhutani).

I have been also examining the Mdzod phug lately, Bon "Abhidharma" and cosmology, is largely freed from the constraints of Buddhist conservatism, has very interesting things to say about the five elements and so on, and when is a text clearly influenced by Dzogchen. A kind of Dzogchen Abhidharma. One of the reasons why I started looking into this text is that the Rigpa Rangshar tantra contains a very brief mention of a primordial egg cosmology which accounts for the formation of the world, similar to the Vedas and Bon:

Now, to demonstrate the ignorance of the object of delusion: delusion is deluded by the forgoing. The field is prior to the formation of the world; a so called "wish-fulfilling tree" grows, a tree growing from the blessing of the youthful vase body of the buddha, born from warmth and moisture which arose from an egg. The Sahāloka formed from the mind disturbing the so-called self-originated wisdom in that. That is called the ignorance of the field of delusion.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Clarence said:

Very interesting thread. Fascinating to follow Malcolm's development over the years.

Now, Malcolm-la, will you also start telling us about your practice? That would be really nice.

Malcolm wrote:

What could you possibly want to know?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I totally agree, and it wasn't ChNNR that started this thread with a statement that Dzogchen contradict sutra and tantra.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps you should go back and read the post that started this thread.

heart said:

Oh I did several times Namdrol. You don't come straight out and say it but it is there.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so it is true that you are reacting to your own projections.

heart said:

Putting Dzogchen on a special throne and calling it the only pure and true Dharma is actually a way to limit Dzogchen practitioners, not liberating them.

Malcolm wrote:

Please cite the passage where I said this?

Otherwise, please retract your mischaracterization of my writings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I know what a contradiction is and as you can see below Namdrol think there is one, not me.

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of contradictions between various yānas. For example:

In Hināyāna a monk may eat meat but must not touch gold.

In Mahāyāna a monk must not eat meat but may touch gold.

In Vajrayāna a monk may both eat meat and touch gold.

The contradiction between sutra and tantra on the one hand, and Dzogchen on the other, concerning the difference/non-difference between mind and matter is not an important contradiction.

A more important contradiction between sutra, tantra and Dzogchen is that the latter is a vehicle beyond cause and result, whereas both sutra and tantra are vehicles of cause and result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot of misunderstanding of things that I have said here. There are some people who think this is a debate. It is not, at least not for me (apart from some correction of facts). Some people are uncomfortable with what it is they imagine I am saying. Other people seem to understand what I am saying but disagree, as is their right. Other people seem to understand and agree with it whole-heartedly. To make clear the main points as I stated them:

- 1) Dzogchen is a teaching for all of humanity, not just Buddhists or Bonpos
- 2) Dzogchen is an independent path, not dependent on sutra or tantra
- 3) All methods from any tradition or yāna can be utilized by a Dzogchen practitioner according to their understanding and condition
- 4) As Dzogchen practitioners, we should be free from all limitations of religion, ideology, nation, race, class and tribe

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

"Dzogchen is a path. You can start with Dzogchen, you can finish with Dzogchen."

-- ChNN 5/17/12

Jnana said:

Yes, and there's really nothing provocative or controversial in this statement. Norbu Rinpoche is doing excellent work separating the wheat from the chaff.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as there is nothing really provocative or controversial in mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

if your Master is inside a Dzogchen Lineage ?

Namdrol said:

???

kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Does it mean you don't know?

Mutstog Marro
KY

Malcolm wrote:
Who is my Guru, KY?

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 8:00 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
heart said:
To me it seems like a strange intellectual game trying to separate Dzogchen from the Buddha's Dharma.
/magnus

Namdrol said:
Well, it would be strange if that is what I was suggesting. But it appears that most people have not understood what I am talking about.

N

Andrew108 said:
In the end you are saying that..in order to be liberated that you only need study Dzogchen...Dzogchen for you is all inclusive...

Malcolm wrote:
Yes. That is what I am saying. The rest of what you have supposed does not apply.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:58 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
"Dzogchen is a path. You can start with Dzogchen, you can finish with Dzogchen."

-- ChNN 5/17/12

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

if your Master is inside a Dzogchen Lineage ?

Malcolm wrote:

???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:19 PM

Title: Re: neck trauma

Content:

Lobsang P. said:

I have had an MRI. The neck vertebrae are intact but muscularly compromised.

I have a vague memory of reading that chronic inflammation can be aided by diet.

Malcolm wrote:

fresh beef, goat, goat milk, etc. I will get back to you more recommendations

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:10 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I totally agree, and it wasn't ChNNR that started this thread with a statement that Dzogchen contradict sutra and tantra.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps you should go back and read the post that started this thread:

This is a very good question. I have been moving slowly toward the pov of view that for most people studying these lower yānas is a complete waste of time. Oh, it can be useful to study a bit of Abhidharma because it helps contextualize mandala practice, and Madhyamaka does help cut through intellectual proliferation, properly studied and absorbed. Studying a bit of Madhyamaka helps one avoid the pitfall of crypto-advaita.

Also places where Dzogchen differs from sutra and tantra will not be readily understood if one does not have at least some superficial familiarity with them.

You don't really need to study all this sutra stuff to understand Dzogchen, and as far as Tantra goes, anuyoga is sufficient. On the other hand, also a practitioner needs to understand that nothing really limits their practice to so called "Dzogchen practice" -- anything at all whether from Buddhist or non-Buddhist sources like Yoga, etc., can be incorporated into Dzogchen practitioner's life. One can even participate in a non-Buddhist religion, if for some reason that is necessary.

I personally think one will understand Dzogchen much better if one is grounded in sutra and tantra, but no, it is not completely necessary to learn these things. Understanding the five elements, three gates, emptiness, and bodhicitta are about all one needs at bare minimum. That, and a realized Guru -- and those are in rather short supply.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

To me it seems like a strange intellectual game trying to separate Dzogchen from the Buddha's Dharma.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it would be strange if that is what I was suggesting. But it appears that most people have not understood what I am talking about.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 10:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

I agree that the two stages are not necessary in Dzogchen practice, but Anuyoga does not contain the two stages.

Namdrol said:

Both Mahāyoga and Anuyoga contain the two stages my dear. Please see section 2.8.5 in Precious Vase.

Thanks.

N

Dronma said:

I am trying to find what you are saying in the Precious Vase.

I don't see anything in any of the existing 2.8.5 sections.]

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what edition you are using. I am using the 1999/2000 edition, the outline numbers off by one in the revised translation. The section is titled "the fundamental difference between mahāyoga and anuyoga".

In any event, both Mahāyoga and Anuyoga have the two stages. The difference in the creation stage and completion stage i.e. gradual or non-gradual, marks the difference between Mahāyoga and Anuyoga in terms of method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

It is impossible for a Nirmanakaya emanation Shakyamuni to have a Nirmanakaya emanation Garab Dorje.

Malcolm wrote:

ok if you say so

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

The gist of what is being said here, is that Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

...can be practiced by anyone who is interested to do so regardless of their institutional affiliation to any of the world's religions, regardless of their culture, etc.

But since no one listens to this when my guru, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu says this, it is not surprising then that no one listens to me when I say it.

C'est la vie.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

The unpleasant tangle starts when we try to establish through our personal experience a universal rule which is good to be followed by everybody.

[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

The unpleasant tangle starts when people start engaging in unfounded projections that are based ultimately in their own attachments and fears rather than carefully listening and reading and paying attention.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I am still not clear on when Shakyamuni Buddha taught Dzogchen?

Namdrol said:

Never, but he predicted Garab Dorje.

N

LunaRoja said:

When exactly did he predict him and what did he say?

Malcolm wrote:

You are already asked me this and I told that apart from ChNN's say so, I dont have a handy citation. When I have it, I will present it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:37 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Dronma said:
I agree that the two stages are not necessary in Dzogchen practice, but Anuyoga does not contain the two stages.

Malcolm wrote:
Both Mahāyoga and Anuyoga contain the two stages my dear. Please see section 2.8.5 in Precious Vase.

Thanks.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:24 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

LunaRoja said:
I am still not clear on when Shakyamuni Buddha taught Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:
Never, but he predicted Garab Dorje.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 6:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Norwegian said:
If you think that Dzogchen does not have an ethical framework, or think that Dzogchen do not have methods that guards practitioners from the lower realms (and so on), then you really don't know anything at all about Dzogchen.

gregkavarnos said:
Of course it currently has ethical frameworks: Buddhist and Bonpo. Of course it has methods to guard practitioners from the lower realms: Buddhist tantric methods.

Malcolm wrote:

The method of Dzogchen to protect practitioners from the three lower realms has not one single thing to do with tantric methods, Buddhist or Bon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think that the failure of the Dzogchen that is being presented here...

Malcolm wrote:

That is the failure of the Dzogchen you are presenting. Not the failure of Dzogchen as I have come to understand it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

Hey, thanks Andrew and also to all of you. I must say I am only asking for help because it's starting to get worse again, rather than better. I thought that when the FBI returned my laptops I wouldn't hear anything from "Jetsunma" again. But last week she threatened to sue me over my Twitter posts. Also, the crazy "Protecting Nyingma" blog is now claiming that I'm conspiring with William Cassidy to fly helicopters over the KPC compound (!!).

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I saw that. What a bunch of kooks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nothing the Buddha taught was false, first of all. Everyone should understand that at the outset ... But Dzogchen as such as self-sufficient. The Dzogchen tantras themselves describe a complete teaching that is not dependent on any other teaching, but which can be integrated with anything a practitioner needs.

gregkavarnos said:

Wouldn't you say though that Buddh-ism does play an important role by providing the framework within which Buddhadharma can be practiced AND protected? I mean if it wasn't for Buddh-ism then people like Michael Roach, Aro, Jax, neo-Advaita and some new age shamanic Dzogchenpas would have free reign with no structure or framework to compare them to, and thus define them, as adharmic. The Four Dharma Seals are Buddhadharma AND the defining characteristic of Buddh-ism as well. I don't know if one can separate them at this point in history without pulling the finger from the dyke and causing a deluge.

Malcolm wrote:

I think we need to make a distinction between the worldly institutions we called "Buddhism" and the Dharma it is supposed to represent. Words like Buddhist, Buddhism, etc. are not important.

The Dharma is important. In particular, Dzogchen is a complete teaching unto itself. It also encompasses all Dharmas whether nominally Buddhist or not. -- but I have explained this already.

Dronma said:

What makes you believe that Dzogchen (even in the case of being totally disengaged from any Buddhist preconceptions) will not follow the same deterioration?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is is not a school, it is not a sect, it is not a philosophy, it is not a religion -- it is a personal experience. It has a view, a meditation, conduct and a result grounded in that personal experience. Since it is based on a personal experience (introduced by a master who is capable of introducing that knowledge to us) Dzogchen is immune to degeneration of that kind. Of course, we must find a master who has that capacity.

Now then, if it makes you happy to consider me a Buddhist, I am fine with that. I have nominally been a Buddhist since I was too ignorant to understand that that meant 16 or so. I also have those Dharma lineages which I treasure since all Dharma is important as it was taught to benefit people. But I once received Guru Yoga transmission from Tenzin Wangyal many years ago, so some people might consider me a Bonpo too. I very much would like to receive the transmission of Zhang Zhung Nyan rGyud from Loppon Tenzin Namdak -- and if I can do that, some Buddhists will consider me a tainted Bonpo, just as people have complained for years about Chogyal Namkhai Norbu -- accusing him of being a Bonpo. For several years, I have wanted to study Hatha Yoga and the Yoga Sutras with a qualified brahmin master I know about, a disciple of Krishnamacarya -- I have not been able to make time to do that -- but if I do, some of you will feel certain that I have broken my vows of refuge by studying with this brahmin master, learning how to chant the Yoga Sutras in proper Sanskrit cadences and so on.

Dronma, do you have any idea how many people in the Dzogchen Community do not

consider themselves Buddhists at all in any sense? They simply do not self-identify as buddhists. I used to be annoyed by this, but now I deeply understand where they are coming from. Refusing to consider yourself a buddhist is not a denegration of Buddhadharma, and does not disqualify one from studying and practicing Buddhadharma. Refuge, as we know, is merely being interested in following a path and doing so. In this thread I noticed so far that some people are very attached to the name "Buddhist", but this is just a label. Even Chogyal Namkhai Norbu has said that really, he is not a "Buddhist", that he is a Dzogchen practitioner. This used to bother me too and was an obstacle for many years. Not considering yourself a Buddhist is not disrespectful to Buddhadharma.

So what am I? like all of you, I am a human being, I use speech and I am able to make distinctions -- this is the basic definition of a human being according to Tibetan Medicine. Second, I am a man -- I have that gender mark. So this is the first place where we differentiate human beings. Third, I am middle aged. The next way we distinguish people is on the basis of their age. Fourth, I am an Anglophone (obviously). Fifth I am a caucasian. Sixth, I am Dzogchen practitioner. Seventh, I am a doctor of Tibetan Medicine. That's it. That is all I need to be and all I want to be. And I have no choices about the first five items.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: colored light

Content:

dakini_boi said:

So then, the appearance of the five lights are still a manifestation of ignorance?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but in this case it is non-afflictive ignorance, since the imputational ignorance is that which does not recognize this display to be its own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Hi Namdrol - so the purpose of Dzogchen is to have this buddhanature recognized and demonstrated? Isn't it the case that only the qualities can be recognized and demonstrated?

Malcolm wrote:
That is not the case.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:32 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Namdrol said:
One does not need to be grounded in and conditioned by "conventional" Dharma in order for Dzogchen to be introduced to a student who is interested.

justsit said:
Does it matter if the student is not only interested but ready, or "ripened," as it were?

Malcolm wrote:
Interest indicates ripeness for the teachings.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:21 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Dronma said:
Do you dissociate Dharma from Buddhism? [/color]

Namdrol said:
It is obvious that Buddhism is rife with Adharma these days, so yes, yes I do.

gregkavarnos said:
So separate it from Buddh-ism yet maintain it's basis in Buddhadharma? Is that what you are saying?

Malcolm wrote:
Nothing the Buddha taught was false, first of all. Everyone should understand that at the outset.

What the Buddha taught is Dharma, there is no doubt. But the Buddhist schools that have sprung up around the teaching of the Buddha are mired in various limitations, no doubt all with the best of intentions. We can know this because the Dzogchen tantras describe in very clear detail what the limitations of each of the nine yānas, as well the samsaric vehicles, are, as well as the polemical schools in classic Indian Buddhism, the four siddhāntas i.e. vaibhāṣika, sautrāntika, yogācāra and mādhyamika.

For example, our friend Andrew 108 is very enamored of the idea of the three Dharmacakras, and advocates the standard gzhan stong approach to Vajrayāna that sees the three turnings as being a progressive series of teachings intended to prepare

one for Vajrayāna, with gzhan stong being the ultimate view which is carried through sutrayāna. This is certainly one approach to Dzogchen teachings, and perhaps it works for some people. It doesn't work for me because even though these sutras are profound and interesting, in terms of personal experience intellectual views do not matter much.

I personally ceased being very interested in the intellectual study of tenet systems many years ago when I understood from a work by Gorampa Sonam Senge's that they are unnecessary for Vajrayāna practitioners in general. Since that time I have been primarily interested in the Yogic side of Buddhism once I understood finally that correct view is based on the personal experience of the introduction and not on any intellectual analysis and subsequent meditation. Of course, if you are not a Vajrayāna practitioner, then this intellectual analysis and subsequent meditation is the only method of progress. It can be effective in the very long run, but it requires many lifetimes of effort and application. There is no short path sans secret mantra.

There are others such as Magnus, who may agree with the above, but still believe that it is essential to engage in practices of the two stages and so on and so forth as a preparation for Dzogchen practice and realization.

But there are other practices in Dzogchen for supporting and reinforcing the experience of introduction so it is not certain that the two stages are necessary in Dzogchen practice at all, though it can be helpful for some. Also since the teaching of the basis in Anuyoga and Atiyoga is the same, for this reason Anuyoga practice is especially suited for Dzogchen practitioners who need or want to practice the two stages.

But beyond this, methods such as fire puja, sang offerings, lungta, namkha, lü, bla gug, etc., all these practices from the mundane vehicles can also be employed for the health and well being of the practitioner.

But Dzogchen as such is self-sufficient. The Dzogchen tantras themselves describe a complete teaching that is not dependent on any other teaching, but which can be integrated with anything a practitioner needs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Do you dissociate Dharma from Buddhism? [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

It is obvious that Buddhism is rife with Adharma these days, so yes, yes I do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

You can see from this quote how closely a genuine understanding of rigpa is tied to the buddhist vehicles (second and third turnings) and it is presented as a union of these two. So the idea of Dzogchen standing by itself is wrong in my view because this would be like presenting just the 'union' without an understanding of the the things that were unified. In this case the second and third turnings. To proceed in this way distorts the teachings and you get left with just the skin of it and none of the meat so to speak. I don't really see Namdrol disagreeing with this but there has been a habit of experienced Dzogchen practitioners believing that Dzogchen is all you need. The process that gets you to to a point where Dzogchen is all you need has been forgotten about and there is a little bit of celebratory arrogance at work.

Malcolm wrote:

I completely disagree with this. I do not think a genuine understanding of rigpa is necessarily tied to the second and third turnings at all.

I might have agreed with this once, but my understanding has changed considerably.
N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

We are debating whether or not this knowledge can be introduced in an authentic way without the student first being grounded in and conditioned by so-called 'conventional' dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

You're debating this. For me there is no debate. One does not need to be grounded in and conditoned by "conventional" Dharma in order for Dzogchen to be introduced to a student who is interested.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is making the claim that distinction between the sentient and the non-sentient is false. You can work out the rest.

N

Andrew108 said:

Sorry for being pedantic but the statement is not making a distinction as to what is false - otherwise that would be a position held in regard to the relative. And as you know in Dzogchen there are no positions held in terms of conventional and ultimate truth.

Malcolm wrote:

There are statements made with regard to what a product of ignorance and a product of knowledge.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

..I'm asking because one might say if buddhahood is an innate attribute then why also follow Dzogchen teachings or 'become a Dzogchenpa'? Here we just seem to be replacing Buddhism with Dzogchen. Within buddhism there are many sutras that talk explicitly about buddhanature for example.

Malcolm wrote:

As it says in the Tantra of Self-arisen Vidyā, that buddhahood exists to be demonstrated. If it is not demonstrated, it will not be recognised, thus the purpose of following Dzogchen teachings.

Tathagatagarbha as it is discussed in sutra is not discussed as something that can be demonstrated, rather it is quite the opposite. According to the Śrīmāladevisūtra, for example, Tathagatagarbha can only be seen by buddhas. It is not a buddhahood that exists to be demonstrated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Guru Chowang makes no mention of Padmasambhava at all in his Great History of Treasures.

[/i]

Mariusz said:

Heavy statement. Are you completely sure? I just quoted. Have you received the commentaries/oral instructions on it?

Malcolm wrote:

What I meant was, that when he discusses Bon in his "Great History of Treasures", which I cited above directly, he makes no mention of Padmasambhava.

We have not access to the terma, bka' rstis, that Padma Namgyal cites in his text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Namdrol - Dzogchen is your religion. Is this not the case? Could you give it up?

Namdrol said:

No, for me, Dzogchen is not a religion, nor it is a philosophy. I cannot speak about other people's perspective.

Mariusz said:

Can I ask you a personal question if you are not a buddhist now?

Malcolm wrote:

I never said I was not a Buddhist. You apparently did not pay very close attention to my post. But go ahead and ask anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Namdrol - Dzogchen is your religion. Is this not the case? Could you give it up?

Malcolm wrote:

No, for me, Dzogchen is not a religion, nor it is a philosophy. I cannot speak about other people's perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Jnana said:

Well, "Buddhism" is just a designation primarily referring to the theories and practices associated with the Buddha's Dharma, and other related social and cultural accretions.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma is a better descriptive than "Buddhism"; it excludes the related social and cultural accretions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

According to our karmic vision plants are non-sentient. But according to Padmasambhava in the Khandro Nyinthig:

After first being created by the energy (rtsal) of wisdom, in the middle, as it was not recognized that the body of the refined part of the assembled elements actually is the five wisdoms, since this was not realized through intellectual views, the non-sentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it... As such, the sign of non-duality is [the body] disappearing into wisdom without any effluents because the critical point of the non-duality or sameness of the non-sentient and the sentient was understood according to the Guru's intimate instructions.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Thanks a lot.

Andrew108 said:

This is part of the all inclusive view of Dzogchen where there really isn't 'reality' - just wisdom. So it's not saying plants are sentient and it's not saying that they are not. It's not making claims about sentience as such or that there is a reality that can be established as anything other than wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

It is making the claim that distinction between the sentient and the non-sentient is false. You can work out the rest.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

Personally as a vegan I know I am doing a very small favor to livestock animals by being on the vanguard of the animal liberation movement with my dietary choice, not to mention the health and environmental benefits. Every year over 10 billion totally enslaved animals are slaughtered so Americans can be one of the fattest populations around the globe.

tobes said:

How about this argument Thrasymachus: If no one ate meat, those 10 billion animals would not ever be born. If you care for their sentience, isn't it better that they exist rather than they never exist?

Five years in a paddock, as a sentient creature, is surely more valuable than non-existence.

The cause of those 5 years of sentient life? People eating meat!

You want an argument about causality, here it is. Advocating global veganism is not simply advocating the cessation of killing: it is also advocating the cessation of breeding, birth, life and the existence of however many animals are desired by humans for food.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he wants us all to keep them as pets. Oh right, I forgot, keeping pets is chattel slavery too. I guess we just cut all these cows, chickens and pigs loose and let them fend for themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Dzogchen is for anyone who is interested, without any preconditions at all.

Jnana said:

So is Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is not really true.

Dharma is for anyone who interested without preconditions. Buddhism is a religion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is the Shenrab Miwoche from Bon listed among the 12 Dzogchen Buddhas?

Namdrol said:

Not in the sgra thal gyur. But Tonpa Shenrab has been added to the 12 Teachers by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, where he has an equal position with the twelve mentioned in the sgra thal gyur

Mariusz said:

So what is the source or quote He did it?

Malcolm wrote:

I just cited one source, Guru Chowang. But in general, it is because ChNN considers Zhang Zhung Nyan rGyud a valid independent stream of Dzogchen he includes Tonpa Shenrab with the other twelve who existed before Garab Dorje.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Tashi delek. It is great the Bon in Tibet entered Buddhism, including Dzogchen, not only from Gelug. Buddhism is without bias. Just quoting "the Practice of dzogchen" p.109: In terma discovered by Guru Chowang: when Guru Padmasambhava was in absorption..Tibet controlled by Bon, was hard to spread Dharma ...he manifested as Shenhla Odkar. Terton Longsal Nyingpo said: Guru Padmasambhava saw Zhangzhung would be only tamed by Bon. He went there with the retinues of self-lights and spoke "My father is Trenpa Yeshekyi Namkha... opened the door of numerous teachings....

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Chowang makes no mention of of Padmasambhava at all in his Great History of Treasures. He writes:

First: the two the supreme of all beneficial qualities, [5/a] the treasure of the true words of Bon emanations: the way the compassionate body came from the pure dimension of the bon nyid [= dharmatā] and the after the treasure of body, speech and mind arose,

the way the teaching was spread, i.e. the way a treasure descends from a treasure.

First: the pure dimension of the bon nyid, completely free from falling into any parts or divisions was singular and unique, the treasure of the hidden Bon dharmakāya [bon chos sku] which has nothing to give up, appeared from pure activity to tame beings as the sambhogakāya Shenlha Wodkar [gshen lha 'od dkar]. The way his compassion was moved is that in general he thought of all migrating beings. Specifically, he thought of beings in Jambudvīpa.

Second: after the treasure of the body, speech and mind was produced, the teachings were widely spread. The way the treasure descends from a treasure is that in order to tame the the confusion of ignorance, the root of samsara, at Wolmo Lungring in the land of Zhang Zhung the hidden treasure of compassion arrived in the form of Shenrab Miwoche [gshen rab mi bo che, i.e. the supreme one of the Shen clan, the greatest of men]. The hidden treasure was concealed in a single intention by all the Tathāgatas in the mind of Shenrab, and he taught the nine vehicles of Bon.

Afterwards, Shenrab's words were collected by the fortune Bonpos and placed in a catalogue. The cause Bon tamed ordinary beings, and result Bon tamed intelligent beings.

The teachings were spread in Tokharistan, where people wear silk turbans, the land India and the border lands and also spread in dPur rGyal in Tibet and Bon was disseminated first.

The King was given the name as the Elder Brother of Bon because he made sure the teaching did not decline, and also he concealed the Bon treasures of cause and result in Zhang Zhung the temple of Shampo Lhatse. Furthermore, as they were spread in the mountain of white peaks in Oddiyana, the Chinese mountain Dru Dzin and in southern and northern Tibet, having concealed treasures which descended from treasures, the Bon texts were not destroyed, and the Bonpo's became renowned.

Also I, Chowang, say that the profound teaching of Bon is uninterrupted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:18 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Isn't it the case that you want to do the SMS course? Why do the course if it's o.k to have received the transmission and to be an outsider?

Malcolm wrote:

Look at your language of exclusion.

But to answer your question, why do not do the course?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:14 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

If Garab Dorje would be the "first" "human teacher" who did teach Dzogchen here on our planet called world, that is a very one sided vision, imo.

Namdrol said:

Right, I did not say that, so you were not reading carefully: Garab Dorje was the last, before him, Shakymuni, before him Shenrab, before him Kashyapa Buddha, before him, Ngondzong Gyalpo, etc.

Mariusz said:

Is the Shenrab Miwoche from Bon listed among the 12 Dzogchen Buddhas?

Malcolm wrote:

Not in the sgra thal gyur. But Tonpa Shenrab has been added to the 12 Teachers by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, where he has an equal position with the twelve mentioned in the sgra thal gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:57 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Shakyamuni is an emanation of Vajradhara, so is Garab Dorje. ChNN frequently calls Garab Dorje an emanation of Shakyamuni.

LunaRoja said:

My understanding is that ChNN said that Garab Dorje is an independent Nirmanakaya Manifestation. Where has he said that Garab Dorje is a Shakyamuni emanation? I would like to read this.

Thank you again for your help.

Malcolm wrote:

He said so yesterday in his lecture. You can listen in the replay.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

If Garab Dorje would be the "first" "human teacher" who did teach Dzogchen here on our planet called world, that is a very one sided vision, imo.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I did not say that, so you were not reading carefully: Garab Dorje was the last, before him, Shakymuni, before him Shenrab, before him Kashyapa Buddha, before him, Ngondzog Gyalpo, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 11:17 AM

Title: Re: colored light

Content:

dakini_boi said:

It is said that the nature of the five elements are the five colors of light. Is this actual visible light, or something else?

Malcolm wrote:

The colors which the five lights express arise because of the adulteration of the five wisdoms with karmic winds or vāyus, without which the five wisdoms have no manifest expression. At the gross level, these five lights are expressed though delusion as the five elements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 11:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

But this could get into a debate about whether or not non-Dzogchen traditions in themselves could introduce to people that which is introduced (the Nature of Mind) in Dzogchen (a debate which has been done to death).

anjali said:

I have no intention of stirring up any old debates, but, but an outsider looking in, it has been my experience that non-Dzogchen (specifically Advaita) traditions can introduce people to the cognizant nature of the mind. What seems to be missing is an

introduction to the essence of mind, emptiness. At least it was for me. Now back to your regularly scheduled program.

Dronma said:

In fact, Emptiness or Voidness or Sunyata does not exist to anyone of the aforementioned doctrines I am aware!

Which bring us the first and most serious obstacle for the actualization of the otherwise Namdrol's appealing theory.....

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is for anyone who is interested, without any preconditions at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Shakyamuni is an emanation of Vajradhara, so is Garab Dorje. ChNN frequently calls Garab Dorje an emanation of Shakyamuni.

LunaRoja said:

Yes, but when did Shakyamuni predict his emanation? This is definitely not in any sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have a specific citation for you. Perhaps the source is in the commentary to the sgra thal gyur. When I find it, I will post it. Though I may not do so anytime soon.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Also, it does not seem that Tonpa Shenrab taught all the Dzogchen tantras as Garab Dorje did. In fact Shakyamuni is considered to be a Teacher of Dzogchen, but he did not teach even one Dzogchen text. But he is so considered because he predicted his emanation of Garab Dorje.

N

LunaRoja said:

Garab Dorje is an emanation of Shakyamuni! I have never heard this before. When did he predict his emanation of Garab Dorje? Is this in the Dzogchen tantras?

LR

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni is an emanation of Vajradhara, so is Garab Dorje. ChNN frequently calls Garab Dorje an emanation of Shakyamuni.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I am confused about how our inherent state resting within it's primordial nature fulfills the bodhisattva vow.

Namdrol said:

When you realize your primordial state, out of that realization nirmanakāyas will naturally flow because compassion is inherent in your real nature.

tomamundsen said:

Could you elaborate on this, please?

Malcolm wrote:

One of the main functions of the third primordial wisdom of the basis, called thugs rje, and translated in various ways to emphasize different aspects, is to provide the basis for working for the benefit of sentient beings after samsara and nirvana "turn their backs on one another". When we consider this from the point of view of its function, we call it rtsal -- and this rtsal is what is visible to ordinary sentient beings -- everyone can experience rtsal directly through their six senses. In fact, the operation of rtsal through their six senses is what gives rise to sense consciousnesses and so on. Nirmanakāyas are simply the energy of the basis that functions to help sentient beings in samsara in the same way that a wishfulfilling gem grants all wishes, without thought, naturally, spontaneously.

So when we fully integrate with our primordial state and achieve the great transformation body or the body of light, out of that emanates so called nirmanakāyas to benefit sentient beings. Of course when we practice, we are practicing also out of concern for sentient beings. But we don't need to contrive that compassion. Even a hint of an experience of the nature of our mind is sufficient to activate our bodhicitta for others. This is a million times better than all the contrived meditations on bodhicitta one finds in such texts as Lam rim and so on. Of course, if you want to do Lamrim and

systematically cultivate bodhicitta, there is no fault.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Garab Dorje was the first human teacher of Dzogchen in this epoch.

dakini_boi said:

Thank you. Could you clarify what is the definition of "epoch"?

Malcolm wrote:

Good question. We can say during the śāsana of Sakyamuni Buddha. However, the cycles of manifestations of Dzogchen teachers do not really match up with the principles of so called supreme Nirmanakāyas.

Also, it does not seem that Tonpa Shenrab taught all the Dzogchen tantras as Garab Dorje did. In fact Shakyamuni is considered to be a Teacher of Dzogchen, but he did not teach even one Dzogchen text. But he is so considered because he predicted his emanation of Garab Dorje.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Plant a Bee Garden

Content:

Qian Zheng Yi said:

From The Honey Bee Conservancy:

<http://thehoneybeeconservancy.org/act-today-2/plant-a-bee-garden/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Fantastic Idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Zhang Zhung Nyengyud is an authentic line of Dzogchen intimate instruction that do not depend on Garab Dorje.

dakini_boi said:

I thought, according to ChNNR, Garab Dorje was the first teacher of Dzogchen on this planet (or in this time cycle or something, not sure of the terminology). . . am I mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje was the first human teacher of Dzogchen in this epoch. Tonpa Shenrab lived roughly 2000 years before the Buddha. Before him was Buddha Kashyapa, another Teacher in the 12 Traditions. In Dzogchen Community we add Tonpa Shenrab to the 12 teachers mentioned in the sgra thal gyur. And in the sras gicg bu rgyud many more teachers are mentioned beyond these twelve. So we can understand that in reality the Teachers of Dzogchen are limitless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I am confused about how our inherent state resting within it's primordial nature fulfills the bodhisattva vow.

Namdrol said:

When you realize your primordial state, out of that realization nirmanakāyas will naturally flow because compassion is inherent in your real nature.

LunaRoja said:

I thought the idea of the 3 KAYAS came from the Mahayana tradition. If Dzogchen posits Nirmankayas isn't this a Buddhist concept? How could a non-buddhist practice Dzogchen without an understanding of the 3 kayas?

Thank you for your help.

LR

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are just the essence, nature and energy/compassion of your own state. If you recognize that, it does not matter what you call them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Tibetan word for Buddhism denotes "to turn inwards". We must consider Buddhism as
The science of mind.

Namdrol said:

Not exactly. The Tibetan word for "Buddhist" is "nang pa" "insider" as opposed to "phyi pa" i.e. outsider. We must cease to make a distinction between "insiders" and "outsiders".

Mariusz said:

I quoted His Eminence the Third Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche, Karma Lodrö Chökyi Senge;
The Relationship between Buddhism & Christianity from
http://www.dharmadownload.net/pages/english/Natsok/0010_Teaching_English/Teaching_English_0001.htm

Malcolm wrote:

Many forms of Hinduism would qualify as "Buddhism" under this definition of "nang pa" because certainly, Hindu yogins all turn "inwards" to observe their consciousness, just as Kongtrul says: "We look at the source of discontent by turning our attention on our consciousness." Under this definition Hindu religious tradition such as Yoga, Samkhya, Advaita, Trika, etc., as well as Bon, Sufism, Mystical Christianity, Taoism and neo-Confucism, and Modern Psychology in its various forms all qualify under the this definition.

But I will am happy to agree that by the definition you have provided all these different disciplines are devoted to turning "...our attention inwards".

However in reality, the term "nang pa" is a sectarian term which distinguishes insiders (Buddhists) from outsiders (Non-Buddhists, including Bonpos, depending on which Tibetan author one reads and depending on the century).

This we can see clearly in the common definition of nang pa in any Tibetan dictionary, but in particular, the bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo give it as follows:
nang pa: chos phyi nang gnyis su phyed ba'i nang pa ste sangs rgyas pa

Insider, the insiders of the division of both insider and outsider dharma are the Buddhists (sang rgyas pa).

And for outsiders: phyi pa - phyi rol pa ste, sangs rgyas chos lugs pas rang nyid la nang pa zer zhing, rang gi chos lugs ma yin pa rnams la phyi rol pa'am mu stegs pa zer,

Outsider: the one who is outside. Dharma system of the Buddha calls itself "insiders", but those who are not of our dharma system are called outsiders or tīrthikas (mu stegs

pa).

If you gloss the term "nang pa" as Kongtrul has done (and this is a common gloss popular in the West), then as I said, you are left with the conclusion that all these tīrthikas are nang pas too. Which suits me just fine since they too are concerned to know their minds and turn inwards to do so.

So in the end we are left with the fact that this language should be abandoned. Buddhists should not call themselves "insiders" in contradistinction to "outsiders" as if Non-buddhists are not concerned with the same issues as freedom from suffering and liberation from the kleshas through turning their attention within for they very clearly are.

In fact the terms "insider" and "outsider" are just native sectarian Tibetan terms that Buddhists in Tibet used to distinguish themselves from Bonpos, Muslims, Christians, Taoists, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Tibetan word for Buddhism denotes "to turn inwards". We must consider Buddhism as The science of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. The Tibetan word for "Buddhist" is "nang pa" "insider" as opposed to "phyi pa" i.e. outsider. We must cease to make a distinction between "insiders" and "outsiders".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I am confused about how our inherent state resting within it's primordial nature fulfills the bodhisattva vow.

Malcolm wrote:

When you realize your primordial state, out of that realization nirmanakāyas will naturally flow because compassion is inherent in your real nature.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 3:01 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
So Namdrol have you realized your real condition?

Malcolm wrote:
That depends on what you mean by "realize".

if you mean experientially understand, than yes. If you mean am I prepared to go rainbow, not anytime soon, probably not in this lifetime unless I stop writing posts and translating texts, gardening, and everything else I do.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 2:35 AM
Title: Dzogchen and Compassion
Content:
Anders Honore said:
Are you saying bodhicitta is a dispensible part of Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:
Compassion is an innate quality of one's primdordial state i.e. the basis. You can't really give up bodhicitta, and you can't really create it. It can be covered over by obscurations, but those are adventitious. When you recognize your condition as it is, compassion for others naturally arises.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 2:30 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Dzogchen is the heart of all paths, whether of samsara or nirvana, and is the truth that everyone is trying to discover. What is Dzogchen? We all know the answer to that question -- it is our real condition.

Everyone, no matter what religion they belong to, is trying to discover the truth. That truth exists in the heart of every single sentient being. So when you discover that truth, there is no need to remain locked in the limitations of "Buddhist" and "non-Buddhist".

Limitations are what cause all the suffering in the world.

We cannot change the world for others, but we can change the world for ourselves. The only way to do this is to evolve beyond the limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race, and tribe. If we go beyond these limitations through discovering our primordial potentiality, then we are participating in changing the world.

As we have seen, for example, the six liberations are not just for Buddhists -- you don't have to make someone a Buddhist in order to sing Song of the Vajra for them, for example, or recite the Aspiration of Samantabhadra -- any sentient being who hears these sung or recited will have a seed of future liberation planted in their continuum, thos grol (liberation through hearing). You don't have to make someone a Buddhist to give them some myong grol (liberation through taste), or give them a btags grol (liberation through wearing), or show them some image that is a mthong grol (liberation through sight), or give them some incense which is a specially formulated dri grol (liberation through smell), etc.

Of course I am a Buddhist. But where I used to be a Buddhist before I was a Dzogchen practitioner, now it is other way around. This is not because of some intellectual trip. This is based on my practice of Buddhism and Dzogchen for 20+ years now.

I can see really clearly that we need to go beyond Buddhist provincialism. We even complain about sectarianism among Buddhists. We also war with each other about such things whose Karmapa is the real one; which is better, gzhan stong or rang stong; is yogacara as high as madhayamaka or not; is Theravada Hinayāna or not; is Mahāyāna or the tantras the real teaching of the Buddha or not. If we do not go beyond these kinds of petty intellectual differences, we will never survive as a species and we will continue to destroy ourselves.

In the end it honestly does not matter much whether we put our faith in Jesus, Krishna or Buddha. There is no perfect faith that leads to liberation. The only thing that leads to liberation is knowledge of our true condition. When we know that state, we don't have need of faith since now we have certainty.

We do not need to ecumenically pretend that all paths lead to the same place. All we need to understand is that everyone is searching for the same thing, the peace and happiness that springs from freedom. We can overcome all our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe just by maintaining presence and awareness of this fact.

When we have overcome our own limitations regarding religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe, then we can work with any circumstances. If one is attached to some limitation, there is no way one can work well with circumstances. One can only work with circumstances by seeing what one's limitations are.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe then we are more free. We are more free to celebrate life, sorrow at death, wonder at creation, we are more free to enjoy our lives and the lives of others.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe we are more free to celebrate the threatening "other", to celebrate the beauty of human diversity and difference, which is the strength of our species.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe we are more free to act wisely, to cherish this beautiful planet we live on and all the richness of life, the plants, the animals, the rocks, minerals, oceans, mountains, rivers, and lakes it offers us.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe through knowing our own state through personal experience the universe and all the beings in it are revealed as an astonishing panoply of spheres of light and color, sound, lights and rays that has no boundary nor center.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe through knowing our own state just as it is, we have no need to ensure any creed, no need to confirm any ideology, no need to control anyone or anything -- we can let the free be free as they have been all along whether they know it or not.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe through direct and perfect knowledge of our own state, then, if we have the capacity, we can introduce others to their own state without regard to religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe.

If, for example, Dzogchen teachings are only for Buddhists, how can we ever hope to overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe? How can enforcing limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe ever be useful in the project of overcoming our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe?

Dzogchen teachings are for all who are interested. Because the ancient peoples of Zhang Zhung and Tibet were interested in Dzogchen, Dzogchen spread there before the formal advent of Buddhism in that country. Originally Dzogchen was not a formal part of Buddhism. It spread through a very small lineage of practitioners. This group of practitioners, beginning with Mañjuśrīmitra, saw that Dzogchen was the essence of what the Buddha was trying to communicate. So they spread it slowly. Later, because Padmasambhava, Vairocana and Vimalamitra brought it to Tibet and some Tibetans too understood it was the essence of the Buddha's teaching, they kept it in secret and it slowly spread among Tibetans. Then, in the 11-12th century, when the Nyingmapas gained self-awareness as an independent school, they adopted Dzogchen as their official "position" in competition with the new translation trends and incorporated it into their school. But by this time, Dzogchen had completely died out in India. But Dzogchen, as is proven by its presence in Bon, is not strictly the province of Buddhism. Though the Bonpos revised their teachings to bring them into line with Buddhist teachings, Zhang Zhung Nyengyud is an authentic line of Dzogchen intimate instruction that do not depend on Garab Dorje. Therefore, in the same way that early masters of Dzogchen were free from limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe and taught

Dzogchen to whoever came to them, we should also endeavor to overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe.

We must not consider the Dzogchen teachings as belonging to any religion, ideology, nation, class, race or tribe. Instead, as practitioners of Dzogchen, we should endeavor to overcome our personal limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe through knowing our real state just as it is. When we know our own state just as it is, we can engage with people wherever they are without ourselves throwing up any barriers of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe. So I suggest it is very important for Dzogchen practitioners, including myself, to overcome any limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe. We already have the means to do this -- we simply need to will to do it. If we ground ourselves in the deep natural transformation that comes from recognizing and integrating with our primordial potentiality, then we can go beyond the limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe. By going beyond these limitations (as well as the limitations of conceptuality, imputation, paths, stages, realizations, attainments, buddhas and sentient beings) through recognizing our own innate state that is originally pure and naturally formed, we can move freely through the world and meet everyone and everything from the authentic space of recognition of great original purity of all that is.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

I prefer to think that the Dzogchen practitioner can make use of all methods without regard to whether they are Buddhist or non-Buddhist.

Kilaya. said:

I agree, let's just think of NNR who regularly visited a Catholic church for years after arriving in Italy. But then again, Dzogchen seems to be totally intertwined with Tibetan Buddhism. No Dzogchen teacher will tell you it's okay to do guruyoga with Shiva or Jesus.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because Shiva and Jesus are not part of the transmission lineage, so it does not apply.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

[

Dzogchen, or rather the Dzogchenpa, is a part of Buddhism as long as you use the Buddhist methods, even if it is "only" Anuyoga.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Since the first vehicle, according to the sgra thal gyur, is the vehicle of gods and men, are you stating that when a Dzogchenpa uses the methods of vehicles of gods and men they cease to be Buddhist?

I prefer to think that the Dzogchen practitioner can make use of all methods without regard to whether they are Buddhist or non-Buddhist. If you want to go to a kirtan, go. If you want to go to a Catholic service, go. If you want to go to a prayer meeting, go. If you want to dance with dervishes, go. If you want to attend a sweat lodge, go. If you want to hang out with a shaman, go. If you want to experiment once or twice with Ayuhuasca with a Brazilian shaman, go ahead. If you want to take peyote once or twice with a Mexican shaman, go ahead. If you want to spend time among Shaivite Sadhus, go ahead. If you want to hang out with Bonpos, go ahead. If you want to hang out with Brahmins, then like the Buddha himself, go ahead. Likewise, if you want to practice shrakvayāna methods, then go ahead. If you want to take refuge, and get a nice Tibetan name, then go ahead. If you want to practice Mahāyāna, then go ahead. If you want to take bodhisattva vows, then go ahead. If you want to practice the six levels of outer and inner tantra, then go ahead. Do you as Dzogchen practitioner have to do anything of these things? Nope. Should you criticize others for doing these things? Nope. What is indispensable for a Dzogchen practitioner in the tradition of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu? Ati Guru Yoga and that is all. Other teachers of Dzogchen will see things differently.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: neck trauma

Content:

Lobsang P. said:

Three months on from suffering a neck trauma I am still experiencing pain and limited movement. Most exercise seems to make it worse..any thoughts ?

Malcolm wrote:

It sounds like you have a serious inflammation of the tendons in your neck. You should

alternate hot and cold compresses and avoid anything that will cause more inflammation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: Any regular Mahamudra webcasts?

Content:

Astus said:

Mahamudra is not as bound to transmissions as Dzogchen,

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra, like Dzogchen, is dependent on direct introduction.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Inge said:

I've heard ChNN sometimes mention a remedy for rlung disorder consisting of good quality old wine and some other ingredients. Do you remember the other ingredients?

Malcolm wrote:

Butter I beleive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Having a fast track which only a few may be suited whilst the rest will have to make to with lesser 'means' sounds pretty elitist to me.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Is recognizing that different beings have differing needs and proclivities elitist? Do you not recognize that no matter what sphere we look at, either mundane or spiritual, beings have differing needs and proclivities? Whose fault is it that not all beings are xerox copies of each other? And is there even something wrong with the fact that they're not? Are some better or possessive of greater worth than others because of their differences?

There is no hegemony in Buddhism steering otherwise qualified people away from some

Dzogchen fast track only the privileged few can access. People are as free to pursue the direct way of Dzogchen as they feel they are. Wanna practice according to Dzogchen, go meet a Dzogchen guru. Can't find one near you or can't afford to travel to meet one? Can't afford some large, fixed donation for teachings that are available in your area? Can't find a teacher who will teach you Dzogchen straight away without first completing ngondro or some other preliminary? ChNN is a fully qualified master who gives it away for free to literally anyone with an internet connection and the interest and attention span to participate. Not very elitist at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I always have to chuckle when I see this charge of elitism being made. Anyone who is interested in Dzogchen and decides to meet a teacher and do practice is part of "the elite". Those who are not, are not. People self-select though their own karma.

I don't know how many people I have sent to ChNN. Then I see them later, "how is your practice going" . They reply, oh, I am studying with someone else. I am like, that is nice. People always cry about wanting to have realized teachers, and when there is one in the world, who really teaches Dzogchen just as it is, I am constantly amazed at people who just do not see the incredible value of ChNN in this day and age. I have come to the conclusion that people like limitations, it makes them feel comfortable.

Do I personally think Dzogchen is the bees knees, the most profound thing since sliced bread? Of course I do, that is way I spend most of my time studying and practicing it. All teachings have their value, even non-Buddhist teachings. I am especially fond of Kashmir Trika Shaivism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: garlic for lung

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Mashing is not cooking though, is it? I mean you mash it raw. Or do you mean boil and mash?

Malcolm wrote:

Boil and mash.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: garlic for lung

Content:

dakini_boi said:

If garlic is to be therapeutic in treating lung disorders, must it be raw?

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, what you ought to do is mash it.

Yu can get some Agar 35 from Siddhi energetics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 4:44 AM

Title: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

However, the purpose is to shift the mind and become the Yidam in the Yidam's world. The mind enters that reality totally so all phenomena are also real.

If the mind finally enters the mandala and remains there, it becomes that of an enlightened Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the function of a HYT mandala visualization. Without understanding the principle of the basis of purification, the result of purification, and the purifier, one has not understood the purpose of the creation stage on any level at all. And no one has 16 arms and four legs, for example, not one single human being alive, past or present. This is the reason, for example, that when doing completion stage practices, one generally uses the sahaja or natural form of the deity i.e. with one face and two arms and legs.

Secondly, as Nangwa pointed out, the principle of the completion stage, partially, is to break clinging to the mentally generated pure appearances of the creation stage. The generated mandala is only mind, meant to cut attachment to the world of the impure vision. It does not go beyond mind in any sense. In order to go beyond mind one needs the experience of the completion stage. When one is able to unify the two stages within one's practice, this is called the state of mahāmudra, in tantric terms.

Blue Garuda said:

What does Dzogchen offer that is greater?

Malcolm wrote:

It is said that if a butcher is given the explanation of Dzogchen they will achieve buddhahood more rapidly than a learned pandita who has never received any explanations of Dzogchen. So when explaining and teaching Dzogchen to an uneducated butcher, do we resort to complicated Buddhist words and topics? Do we belabor them with skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas? No. We just explain their state to them in terms any one can easily grasp -- the five elements and body, speech and mind. These eight things are readily understood by anyone.

There is no need to spend years learning the forensics of dead medieval tenet systems that no one believes anymore merely to refute these topics with Madhyamaka reasonings

that everyone disagrees on. How pyrrhic this exercise is. Enjoyable, a past time, but ultimately a dead end.

Other people have brought up the issue of Dzogchen as a triumphalist position. But that is missing the point. What I brought up was the fact that much of what is studied in the "lower" vehicles can be passed over when learning Dzogchen.

People seem upset because Dzogchen does position itself both within and outside of the the nine vehicles. I did not invent this. One can read this very same thing in Norbu Rinpoche Crystal and the Way of Light:

"...there is a danger that some readers may make the false assumption that it implies a hierarchy of teachings with Dzogchen at the top. In fact, the whole layout could have been reversed with Dzogchen at the bottom; or the chart could be read from the bottom up which is the sequence in which the gradual paths are presented and practiced, each stage having to be completed before the next can be approached. Dzogchen differs from gradual paths because the master introduces the disciple directly to the Great Perfection, which is the heart of all paths. But the reason so many paths exist is that there is a teaching suited to the capacity of every individual. So, for example, for someone to whom sutra teaching is best suited, that teaching can be said be the "highest", because that teaching will work best for that individual. Any use of the words "high" and "highest" in relation to the Dzogchen teachings, should be read with this important proviso in mind." pg. 53

"Gradual paths insist that a practitioner must work from here upwards. Dzogchen, on the other hand, doesn't adopt a hierarchical approach; it proceeds right away on the basis of the master giving the student a Direct Introduction to the primordial state to enable the student to recognize that state for him or herself, and then remain in it.

Dzogchen is beyond limits, and the practices of any of the other levels can be used as secondary practices by a Dzogchen practitioner. But the principle practice of Dzogchen is to enter directly into a non-dual contemplation, and to remain in it, continuing to deepen it until one reaches total realization." pg. 175

My concern here in this thread is not defending Dzogchen as the highest. My interest in the OP's question has to do with certain features I have observed in reading original Dzogchen texts, and seeing that they consistently confirm and reinforce many things my teacher has said in the 36 years he has been teaching Dzogchen around the world.

I don't have a particular agenda in sharing these thoughts with people. I am a pretty open book and people have seen the evolution (or degeneration) of my thinking on various topics based on my study and practice. We have all been having a long conversation with each other for many years now. Sometimes my thoughts make people happy and sometimes they do not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Dzogchen abandons the dichotomy between mind and matter found in sutra and tantra. Theoretically, this is a most crucial difference. Because it abandons this dichotomy, it also abandons the dichotomy between the sentient and the non-sentient.

N

Blue Garuda said:

If you can find dichotomies in sutra and tantra perhaps it is because you have been conditioned to think that way. Certainly in self-generation in HYT there can be no dichotomy, surely.

Malcolm wrote:

Self-generation is a visualization practice. Nevertheless it still involves creating an inanimate container universe to support the inner mandala. However, the plants and trees and so on that one visualizes are simply that, a mental image, and mental creation and nothing more.

The dichotomy between mind and matter in scholastic Buddhism is well established. How many times has one seen defenses of rebirth predicated on the difference in kind between mind and matter? We find them in Abhidharma, Sutra and even Tantra (i.e. where the mind is held to be a rider on the energy of the body). And this is perfectly fine within the context of those teachings.

In Dzogchen on the other hand, mind is held to be generated by the *vāyus* in the body. In the Khandro Nyinthig Padmasambhava declares that mind and *vāyu* are just different names for the same thing:

"...the energy of that vivid luminosity arising as the diversity, that is called "*vāyu*", and it is called "mind". Though luminosity is called mind, because of movement, it is called "*vāyu*"

Mind, such as it is can be considered the subtle aspect of *vāyu*. But in reality, *vāyu*, the air element functioning in the human body, is what we call mind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Chulen - max 3 months?

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Should Chulen be taken for max 3 months at a time?

Malcolm wrote:

One can take chulen indefinately.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

I no longer believe that plants are insentient because I beleive the distinction between sentient and insentient is a false distinction. At least, it is a false distinction from a Dzogchen perspective. From the Dzogchen point of view, everything is made of five elements, all sentient beings, even consciousness, even the buddhas. Plants are every bit alive as animals. As Garab Dorje says "The color of rtsal is green". But because it is convenient and because they are ignorant of the principles of the basis, ideological vegetarians make a false distinction between sentient and non-sentient. There is, according to Dzogchen teachings, no true distinction to be made between the sentient and the non-sentient.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Wow, that is another little shock for me here - I'd been convinced for quite a few years that according to Dzogchen plants are very much insentient, and loads of old time practitioners would confirm what now turns out to be my misconception. Thanks for bringing up Garab Dorje and correcting it at last

Would you be so kind as to elaborate a bit more, though? What's the position of plants in samsara? Are there any available texts that deal with the matter?

Malcolm wrote:

According to our karmic vision plants are non-sentient. But according to Padmasambhava in the Khandro Nyinthig:

After first being created by the energy (rtsal) of wisdom, in the middle, as it was not recognized that the body of the refined part of the assembled elements actually is the five wisdoms, since this was not realized through intellectual views, the non-sentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it... As such, the sign of non-duality is [the body] disappearing into wisdom without any effluents because the critical point of the non-duality or sameness of the non-sentient and the sentient was understood according to the Guru's intimate instructions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Dzogchen abandons the dichotomy between mind and matter found in sutra and tantra. Theoretically, this is a most crucial difference. Because it abandons this dichotomy, it also abandons the dichotomy between the sentient and the non-sentient.

N

Matylda said:

But then it sounds like zen teaching... I think Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche does not like it. Then what about the view? If it is only the mind body issue doesn't it implicate only the difference in the method? Then some would not agree again.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN likes Chan/Zen just fine.

I am not sure I understand the rest of your question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

pensum said:

i find it fascinating that so many people seem to be omniscient and know what is best for other individuals at their stage in life, understanding and practice. almost everyone, whether Buddhist, Dzogchenpa, Nyingma, Kagyupa, Gelugpa, Sakyapa, Theravada, Mahayana, Zen, Shingon, Jodo Shinshu, Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Hindu, etc. etc. all claim that their path is the best or only true path. being an ignorant old fool i don't doubt that for them whatever path they are on is the best path, as it is the result of their own individual karma. so many of the world's ills and problems seem to arise however from assuming that you are the only person in the world and everyone else is simply your clone and either ignorant, evil or damned for not seeing or admitting that fact and that yours is the one true path. well, count me among the damned for i can't help but feel that those scriptural statements that there are as many paths as there are individuals have a basis in fact.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is correct. This is why it is crucial that Dzogchen be presented as a path

available to all without any restriction other than their interest.

Buddhism has become in many respects an ossified missionary religion primarily concerned with gaining converts and worshipping in nice houses. Now, don't get me wrong, I like nice houses, but it seems to me that by and large nice houses have become more important than the Dharma they are supposed to house. All that is Buddhist is not necessarily Dharma. All that is Dharma is not necessarily Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

I just don't think it's for me, and I say that after a long and rigorous investigation. And that has nothing to do with my mental and intellectual abilities, it's just what I see as an effective vehicle for me, one where I will make the most progress with.

As I see it Dzogchen was an add-on, a stage that you reached after you did the hard yards, once your arse was already calloused from meditation and all those "unnecessary" things.

Malcolm wrote:

A Dzogchen practitioner's fundamental responsibility is to understand their own condition. They may use any and all useful methods from the nine-yānas, or even non-Buddhist traditions like hatha yoga to better integrate with their own state. So for example, if someone is having obstacles, then perhaps they should focus on Tara or Guru Drag Phur. Since Manjushri is the state of the realization described in the 80th chapter of the Self-Arisen Vidyā tantra, someone who wishes to understand Dzogchen in general better might concentrate on a Manjushri cycle such as Manjushrivadasimha, etc. If someone needs to extend their life, they should rely on Amitayus or Mandarava or White Tara.

There is no limitation on what a Dzogchen practitioner can practice. We can study the Yoga Sutras for example, since they are interesting and have valuable advice on meditation practice. There are no limitations apart from those we impose on ourselves and others. The function of Dzogchen, Mahāmudra, Perfection of Wisdom is to transcend limitations, not to stay bound in them.

The idea that Dzogchen is an "add-on" is not the perspective of Dzogchen tantras or Garab Dorje himself. This is a later gradualist view that was largely promulgated as a response to criticisms of the Sarma schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Bhusuku said:

And if Dzogchen contradicts the sutra/tantra teachings even on such basic buddhist doctrines, what is actually the use of studying sutra teachings at all for someone who's mainly interested in Dzogchen? I mean, isn't it actually a waste of time studying Abhidharma, if later on you realize that the Dzogchen teachings have a complete different POV on many Abhidharma subjects? The same applies for studying Madhyamaka: why waste many years to gain an in depth understanding of the two truths if later on you realize that there's only one truth in Dzogchen?

heart said:

In what way does Dzogchen contradict the sutra and tantra teachings?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen abandons the dichotomy between mind and matter found in sutra and tantra. Theoretically, this is a most crucial difference. Because it abandons this dichotomy, it also abandons the dichotomy between the sentient and the non-sentient.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

And just like it happened that all these incredibly important ideals and means have been reduced to a money making scam, you will find that it will also (has already started to) happen to Dzogchen. Then what will you do? Look for something new and untainted until that is worn thin again?

Malcolm wrote:

I will recommend that someone find an authentic teacher of Dzogchen, if that is their interest. Then this is sufficient. I can't help what con artists who sell the name "Dzogchen" to make money do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

This whole Ati-lite thing is getting on my nerves. Read something like "Blazing Splendor" and see how Dzogchen should be studied.

Malcolm wrote:

The state of Dzogchen is Buddhahood. Whoever practices Dzogchen is trying to integrate with that state. A Dzogchen without Buddhism is not possible, since Dzogchen represents the goal of all paths, whether non-Buddhist or Buddhist. That goal is buddahood or full awakening.

"My vehicles are inconceivable,
when summarized, are included in two, samsara and nirvana"
-- The Tantra of Self-Arisen Vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Bhusuku said:

Thanks, Namdrol! This is interesting, since by taking ChNN's words about always going to the essence to heart I came more and more to the same conclusion.

Namdrol said:

as far as Tantra goes, anuyoga is sufficient.

Bhusuku said:

If that's the case, why is it that the Precious Vase explains Atiyoga more from the Mahayoga POV? Doesn't that approach make things unnecessary more complicated?

Malcolm wrote:

The Precious Vase is based on Padmasambhava's Man ngag lta ba phreng ba, that is why.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

...I have been moving slowly toward the pov of view that for most people studying these lower yānas is a complete waste of time...

gregkavarnos said:

This is coming from a man who spent decades studying the lower yana.

My dear N. as it ever occurred to you that it was as a consequence of decades of causal path practices that you accumulated the merit to be able to fully understand and

practice (and even teach) Dzogchen? Or maybe you don't believe in karma now either? Is that why you are suddenly open to non-Buddhist practices and traditions? I mean a month ago you took Jax to pieces for saying something very similar (albeit that Jax also negated the need for a guru) and now you are suddenly sounding all new-age and ecumenical. It's been a while since you have seen your guru tete-a-tete, hasn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

Since Dzogchen tantras reject the body/mind dualism of the lower yānas, it makes it hard for people fed on the lower yānas to appreciate Dzogchen. Since this is so, the need to study in detail the lower yānas is limited. Someone who is planning to be a teacher needs to know these things, but practitioners, not necessarily. I have seen in my own studies how my Buddhist conditioning has made it difficult at times for me to understand certain key points of Dzogchen teachings.

As far as the ecumenical thing goes -- I have come to the conclusion that Dzogchen is for all who are interested. Not a "Dzogchen without Buddhism" if you will. But I see no good reason why interested Hindus, Christians, Moslems, and so on cannot receive Dzogchen teachings and practice them. Dzogchen may have come from Buddhism, but as we see in Bon, Dzogchen is not just for Buddhists.

Dzogchen is for everyone who is interested to learn about it and then practice it. When someone comes to my teacher to learn Dzogchen, he never says "Now you must nominally become a Buddhist in order to study Dzogchen". He says "In order to study and learn about Dzogchen you must receive direct introduction", that is all.

The Buddha never said anywhere in the sutras "In order to study the Dharma, first you must take refuge". The whole refuge thing has been turned into a game of religious politics. When people took refuge in the Buddha they did so merely out of their gratitude for teachings they received. You can read about this in many places in the Pali canon.

These days, refuge has been turned into a badge, a tool for conversion. It has been turned into a ritual. But how many people change their name into something nice like Kunga Namdrol, or Padma Tsering, etc., etc., without changing anything in their hearts? Refuge ceremonies have just become empty baptisms that people think are hugely important but actually change nothing. It is the same with bodhisattva vow ceremonies and also empowerments.

But in Dzogchen there is nothing to convert or change or alter. Buddhahood is an innate attribute of all sentient beings, so what is the point of "becoming a Buddhist?"

People like to say "Did you go for refuge? What is your Dharma name?", "How long have you been a Buddhist?", "Who is your refuge teacher?", "Did you take bodhisattva vows?", "Did you receive initiation?", etc. None of this is the principle of Dzogchen teachings as I

understand it. None of these things taken in and of themselves are bad, BTW, there is nothing wrong with having gone for refuge to the Three Jewels, created bodhicitta, taken initiation and so on. But it is better to penetrate to the essence of these things rather than just leave them as empty forms, which sadly today they mostly have become.

But the principle of entering Dzogchen teachings is none of the above. The principle of entering Dzogchen teachings is solely direct introduction. And my teacher, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, will give that to anyone who is interested in receiving the teachings of Dzogchen regardless of their race, color, creed, gender or gender orientation.

The principle of practicing Dzogchen teachings, according to my teacher, is integrating with your primordial state through Ati Guru Yoga and deepening your knowledge of that state through various kinds of practices. Anyone who is interested can do this without having to consider themselves a "Buddhist".

As far as being open to non-Buddhist practices -- it is the case that people who belong to other religions might become interested in Dzogchen teachings. I see no reason at all why they should give up those practices merely because they are interested in Dzogchen teachings. Granted, it is impossible to reconcile sacrificing animals with Dzogchen teachings, but apart from that, I do not see the problem. If some Christian is practicing Ati Guru Yoga, then they are practicing Dzogchen whether they consider themselves Buddhists or not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 12:42 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

mindyourmind said:

That "skillful means, if such it is, contributes to the demand side of the problem, that "skillful means" creates another cause for an animal to be slaughtered. It remains participation in the process.

Malcolm wrote:

We should work with circumstances. As for myself, I will choose to create positive causes for the liberation of sentient beings by any means possible. You are free to refuse to do so, if that is your choice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 6:46 AM

Title: Re: esoteric meaning for the three jewels

Content:

anjali said:

I was wondering about an esoteric meaning for the triple jewels: Buddham saranam gachammi; Dharmam saranam gachammi; Sangham saranam gachammi.

Is it acceptable to view the three refugees in the following way? "Buddham" represents the nature of mind, the cognizant, awake quality. "Dharmam" represents the essence of mind, the empty quality. "Sangham" represents the embodiment of the Dharma, the unconfined capacity of the mind. Thus, taking refuge would be taking refuge in one's own trikaya nature.

If the three jewels are talked about in this way somewhere, any pointers would be greatly appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

Usually buddha = emptiness

dharma = clarity

sangha = union of clarity and emptiness

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Withdrawing from that process, whether it helps the big picture in an infinitesimal degree or whether it actually makes a difference to that big picture, makes a difference to that practitioner, or at least it should.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I am not communicating well enough -- refusing to eat meat is withdrawing from the process. If you eat meat with the proper method, you can help that creature whose meat you are eating meet the causes for liberation.

If you tie a protection cord on it, or sing the six syllables of Samantabhadra to it while it is alive, there is benefit. We cannot always be there in time to help the living, but we can help the deceased with the method of eating meat with compassion, awareness and presence.

So from my point of view, refusing to eat meat in such a way is withdrawing, because the consequence of not eating meat is that that animal will never make a good connection for their eventual liberation.

So our intention is the same, our method is different, my method includes yours; yours lacks a skillful means for "food" animals that have already been slaughtered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 5:22 AM

Title: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Bhusuku said:

And if Dzogchen contradicts the sutra/tantra teachings even on such basic buddhist doctrines, what is actually the use of studying sutra teachings at all for someone who's mainly interested in Dzogchen? I mean, isn't it actually a waste of time studying Abhidharma, if later on you realize that the Dzogchen teachings have a complete different POV on many Abhidharma subjects? The same applies for studying Madhyamaka: why waste many years to gain an in depth understanding of the two truths if later on you realize that there's only one truth in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very good question. I have been moving slowly toward the pov of view that for most people studying these lower yānas is a complete waste of time. Oh, it can be useful to study a bit of Abhidharma because it helps contextualize mandala practice, and Madhyamaka does help cut through intellectual proliferation, properly studied and absorbed. Studying a bit of Madhyamaka helps one avoid the pitfall of crypto-advaita.

Also places where Dzogchen differs from sutra and tantra will not be readily understood if one does not have at least some superficial familiarity with them.

You don't really need to study all this sutra stuff to understand Dzogchen, and as far as Tantra goes, anuyoga is sufficient. On the other hand, also a practitioner needs to understand that nothing really limits their practice to so called "Dzogchen practice" -- anything at all whether from Buddhist or non-Buddhist sources like Yoga, etc., can be incorporated into Dzogchen practitioner's life. One can even participate in a non-Buddhist religion, if for some reason that is necessary.

I personally think one will understand Dzogchen much better if one is grounded in sutra and tantra, but no, it is not completely necessary to learn these things. Understanding the five elements, three gates, emptiness, and bodhicitta are about all one needs at bare minimum. That, and a realized Guru -- and those are in rather short supply.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Devotion is the most critical aspect

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so. Certainty in your knowledge of the primordial state is the most critical aspect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Lasik Surgery and Thogal

Content:

Clarence said:

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

I should have added, this is only to be done if you have not begun this practice. If you have started, as someone pointed out to me privately in an email, you ought not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Meekly accepting that an animal is dead, that the shelf is full of meat so I may as well eat it is hardly a helpful approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing meek about me. I deliberately eat meat, when I eat meat, in order to create a positive cause for that animal's eventual liberation. When all is said and done that is my motive.

I also sponsor freeing of animals, and so on.

There is no way to lessen the suffering of samsara for others, however, by such means as freeing animals and so on. The best you can do is conquer your own samsara.

However, through using a method coming from one of the six liberations (sight, sound, smell, taste, hearing, touch etc.) you can benefit other sentient beings so that they too one day may receive teachings and achieve liberation. That is where I am coming from.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:
mindyourmind said:
Change the world ...one practitioner at a time, one steer at a time

Malcolm wrote:
And the central question really is -- how do you benefit some steer that has already been slaughtered? Praying?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 4:10 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
...

If you don't realize your own true mind, it doesn't matter what goes into your belly or where it came from. You may save a herd of cattle in this lifetime, and that will be a very good thing, but that will be all you save.

mindyourmind said:
What if you can do both - realize your own true mind and save a herd of cattle? Why the false dichotomy?

Malcolm wrote:
If you can do both, great. But when you prevent the slaughter of 10 steers, you hasten the slaughter of ten more. So what to do? And the central question really is -- how do you benefit some steer that has already been slaughtered? Praying?

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 3:04 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
Namdrol said:

I will state that, based on my understanding of Dzogchen teachings, those Buddhist scholastics who argued that plants were not alive, equivalent with rocks and crystals, were wrong in their understanding.

Bhusuku said:
"Buddhist scholastics"? Didn't the Buddha himself taught this?

Malcolm wrote:
No, he did not teach this. Read the Schmithausen monograph.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

mindyourmind said:

And yes, I believe that there is a great, real and rather obvious difference. For starters we can start with the amount of suffering involved. If someone is going to, with a straight face, try to convince me that the "suffering" undergone by a truckful of cabbage is anything approximating that undergone by say a truckload of pigs, well then I have very little else to say, and it would be best for at least the rules of this forum if we leave the debate just there.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it seems that your criteria of suffering is a little limited and only addresses the suffering of suffering.

mindyourmind said:

Raising, killing and eating an animal is just simply involving more suffering than even the worst case scenario of the amount of bugs we kill in producing a non-meat meal.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think the suffering of a mammal is qualitatively or quantitatively greater than the suffering of an insect -- I know that some Buddhists make this (false) distinction, but the monastic penalty for killing an insect is no less than that of killing a cow -- it merely requires confession. What this says to me is that Buddha valued the life of all creatures equally regardless of phyla. Destroying vegetation, especially seeds, is also included in this class of vows, as is digging in the ground.

mindyourmind said:

Remember also that some of those same bugs are also killed in the process of slaughtering an animal.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

mindyourmind said:

Part of that precise answer would, in addition to suffering, most definitely deal with the presence or absence of a central nervous system, although if you will that could be a duplication of the suffering argument.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a value judgment you are making that does not have an objective base.

It is a certainly the case that in Early Buddhism the issue was not so clear cut among Buddhists. Coming from a common Vedic Heritage where plants are considered fully qualified animate beings, early Buddhists also held this view. Only later, under the influence of scholastic dogmatism, did Buddhist philosophers begin to argue plants were non-sentient. The Buddhist arguments against plant life being sentient are quite late, motivated it seems mainly to defend Buddhist from criticisms from Jains and Hindus. Lambert Schmithausen wrote a long and interesting article about this and concludes (<http://www.scribd.com/doc/78950014/The-Problem-of-the-Sentience-of-Plants-in-Earliest-Buddhism> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;):

But as stated above (§ 5.2 and n. 204) a few sources suggest yet another motivation, viz. that plants should not be injured or destroyed because they are the abode or habitat of animal s (cp. also the analogous motivation not to pollute water in § 11.1). This ecological argument is fully valid today also, indeed more than ever before, and for both monks and lay people.

39.2 However, I for one should find it reasonable to combine this latter argument with a different view of the nature of plants - one that is perhaps not too far from what I hope I have been able to show to have been, with some probability, that of earliest Buddhism: the view that plants themselves, too, are living beings, in the sense of a border-line case. But contrary to the situation in earliest Buddhism where the border-line status of plants served to reduce inhibitions against injuring them, it should now be used to re-establish them. In this sense, we should rather stress the other aspect of the border-line status: Plants are, to be sure, not living beings like animals, and not at all living beings like men, with some secret anthropomorphic features and faculties, and hence perhaps not sentient beings in the usual sense of the word; but not entirely insentient either, not altogether insusceptible of being injured; living beings of a peculiar kind, which we can somehow explore from outside, but which we will probably never be able to "understand" from within; familiar beings, but at the same time utterly strange, and precisely for that reason to be treated with respect: because we simply do not know, and perhaps cannot even imagine, what it means for a plant itself to be injured. To be sure, unless we are ready to starve, we cannot avoid using plants, and this often means: injuring or even killing them. But we should do this as little as possible, carefully and with a sense of regret, not with the unnecessary brutality and relentlessness which has become habitual, and at the root of which is mostly not need but greed.

mindyourmind said:

This whole argument equating animal sentience with plant "sentience" is simply a last-ditch, desperate and rather unbecoming argument, designed to defend our choices as meat-eaters.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not equate the two. I merely pointed out that I no longer believe that anything imbued with prāṇa can possibly be non-sentient. Plants possess prāṇa, therefore, they

are alive, therefore, after some fashion, I must accept that they too are sentient. Not only to plants possess prāṇa, but they also possess ojas, mdangs, they also possess the seven phase digestive process that we humans and all animals do. They take food, they break it down, is it conducted by fluid within plant membranes where it builds their flesh, their soft tissue, hard tissues and finally in the end they produce sap, flowers, seeds, etc.

I will state that, based on my understanding of Dzogchen teachings, those Buddhist scholastics who argued that plants were not alive, equivalent with rocks and crystals, were wrong in their understanding.

mindyourmind said:

I accept without any reservation that a vegetarian meal involves death and suffering, but not more so, or even equal, than the death and suffering involved in eating meat.

Again, I respect everyone's choice in what they eat and do not eat, and what you eat or not will not liberate you, but let's not make stuff up to make us feel better.

Malcolm wrote:

When growing plants in the large quantities made necessary by the increasing population of our planet is made possible only through the use of animal-based fertilizers that come from the death of animals in the billions, such as in organic agriculture, or the petrochemical fertilizers/pesticides/herbicides that contaminate the environment and poison billions of birds and insects, such as in conventional cultivation, there is no solid argument that can be made that a vegetarian diet, even a so called organic veg is less harmful to animals than a non-vegetarian diet. It simple does not add up.

So let us not pretend that being a vegetarian is intrinsically more moral or better than being an omnivore. Vegetarians who argue in that way are simply being false brahmins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Lasik Surgery and Thogal

Content:

Clarence said:

N-la,

Do you know if Lasik surgery on the eyes make Thogal practice impossible or more difficult or are there no consequences on practice after the surgery?

Many thanks,

Clarence

Malcolm wrote:
Should have no effect.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 11:49 PM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
mindyourmind said:
There is a qualitative difference then, even on this argument, between plant sentience and animal sentience.

Malcolm wrote:
Really, what is the difference? Visible sense organs? A so called "nervous system"?

It simply won't do to call something an "obsfucation" merely because you disagree with someone's opinion.

You are a lawyer, be precise.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 11:21 PM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
mindyourmind said:
What I never understood, and have no real hope of ever understanding, is why these enlightened practitioners must actually participate in killing a sentient being to improve its lot. Surely such a practitioner can benefit such a being by simply saying mantras, or another practice - other than participating in killing it.

Malcolm wrote:
Killing, the taking of life, requires the intent to take life, an object, the carrying out of the action and satisfaction in doing so.

mindyourmind said:
In other words, a human that is so advanced that he or she can actually directly choose to benefit another being should be able to do so through other means than participating in the killing of that being.

Malcolm wrote:
Eating meat does not equate with killing unless you killed the meat you are eating, or asked that it be killed for you.

However, whenever we eat anything at all we are participating in the death of something

else. This is a simple fact of life. When we harvest grain, we destroy the homes and lives of many creatures. We participate in their death when we eat oats, wheat, not to mention the death of the plants in question, etc. To live is to participate in the death of other beings, both plant and animal.

Many vegetarians argue the deaths caused by agriculture is unavoidable. And I agree with them. But they never accept responsibility for the deaths of creatures caused by agriculture, and do their best to pretend they have no karmic responsibility for them.

When a piece of meat is available in a restaurant, its death is unavoidable. Why? Because it is dead. It has been slaughtered already. It has been packaged and sold. But I did not kill that animal. I no more killed that animal than our vegetarian friends killed all the insects and birds that die in the large scale production of rice harvested by machines in Lundberg Farms. For example, feathermeal is one of the main products Lundberg Farms uses in organic rice production. Feathermeal, in case you were wondering, is described as follows:

Feather meal is a byproduct of processing poultry; it is made from poultry feathers by partially hydrolyzing them under elevated heat and pressure, and then grinding and drying. Although total nitrogen levels are fairly high (up to 12%), the bioavailability of this nitrogen may be low. Feather meal is used in formulated animal feed and in organic fertilizer.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Feather_meal " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Now, how can vegetarians, who suppose they eat a diet free from animal products, possibly excuse themselves when they eat rice and other kinds of large scale organic produce? Feathermeal is pervasively used in the cultivation of organic crops. Feathermeal is a by-product of the poultry industry. The feathers of those chickens in those truly hellish chicken factories get ground up and used in "organic" fertilizer. Feathermeal is also fed to steers in industrial beef operations.

Another common organic fertilizer is blood meal. Another one is bone meal. What about manure? All of these are used pervasively in growing organic produce. What about Biodynamic farming? This is another form of organic food production that depends heavily on the use of animal products in production of organic foods.

I can refuse to eat that piece of meat or fish, but that organic bread too comes at the cost of life, as does the rice, and the asparagus. All food comes at the cost of life. The cost of life is death. There is no food that does not come at the cost of life.

One need not be "advanced" to benefit some animal whose meat you are consuming. In fact, to benefit those with whom one does not have direct contact in some way is impossible on a merely mental level unless you are an awakened person. For example, this is the reason ordinary people cannot successfully do Phowa for others. They simply do not have the yogic capacity to eject the consciousness of another being from its

body (these days there are many arrogant people who run around and pretend to do phowa for others, deceiving the relatives and accepting money for their deceptions)

When you eat meat with compassion, presence and awareness, and use a mantra like the six spaces of Samantabhadra, you create a positive cause for that animal specifically, and if you are eating a vegetarian meal, a specific positive cause for any animal who was killed during the harvesting of that crop. This works for ordinary people best because one is making a concrete physical connection with those animals through tsal.

I no longer believe that plants are insentient because I believe the distinction between sentient and insentient is a false distinction. At least, it is a false distinction from a Dzogchen perspective. From the Dzogchen point of view, everything is made of five elements, all sentient beings, even consciousness, even the buddhas. Plants are every bit alive as animals. As Garab Dorje says "The color of rtsal is green". But because it is convenient and because they are ignorant of the principles of the basis, ideological vegetarians make a false distinction between sentient and non-sentient. There is, according to Dzogchen teachings, no true distinction to be made between the sentient and the non-sentient. Therefore we must respect all life, not just the life that is convenient for us to respect. Even though we must respect all life, life must be taken for other life to flourish. This is simply how samsara is. Therefore whenever we eat, and no matter what we eat, we must do so with compassion, presence and awareness because all food comes at the cost of something's life.

Everytime we consume the flesh of something we are incorporating that being's vital energy into our own, whether it is plant or an animal. When we die, our vital energy, our rtsal, contributes to the growth and health of other creatures. This is the natural cycle of life.

Thus one simply has to be mindful and attentive, present and aware. If one eats without presence and awareness, even eating a tomato becomes a non-virtue. If one eats with presence and awareness, even eating meat becomes a virtue.

mindyourmind said:

...but let's just be very honest about this popular "defense" of eating meat.

Malcolm wrote:

I am being very honest about this extremely unpopular advocacy of meat-eating -- because in the end it is not about meat, it is about compassion, presence and awareness. I know that many people with more conventional Mahāyāna views about meat-eating, not to mention fanatical vegans and so on, will find this principle, if not just counter-intuitive, completely unacceptable.

So people like to mention Chatral Rinpoche, and so on. But they are not speaking from the point of view of Dzogchen. They are speaking from the point of view of common Mahāyāna. As I have said many times, this is fine. But it is not the point of view of Dzogchen teachings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

...

If you don't realize your own true mind, it doesn't matter what goes into your belly or where it came from. You may save a herd of cattle in this lifetime, and that will be a very good thing, but that will be all you save.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I have also read that the Dalai Lama supports vegetarianism but feels he cannot be vegetarian due to his health.

namdrol - are you saying that he does or does not understand and practice Dzogchen?

Namdrol said:

I am quite certain HHDL understands and practices Dzogchen. I am certain it is his primary practice.

N

Blue Garuda said:

In which case why does he not preach like ChNNR that vegetarianism is a miserable form of compassion?

Malcolm wrote:

You will have to ask him. ChNN's point of view is not for everyone. One either agrees or disagrees. But he thinks it important enough to bring it up at nearly every retreat.

Also, HHDL is under a lot of pressure from a lot of people to conform to their view of him.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Meaning of 'brang rgyas (Tibetan)

Content:

Totoro said:

Hi

Could someone please tell me the meaning of this term 'brang rgyas used in Tantric sadhanas? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Need more context. But it can mean "full breasted".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

-- Not eating meat is more than just an ego trip. It really contributes to prevent suffering...

Malcolm wrote:

No it doesn't, not even one tiny bit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There is a lot of quoting from orthodoxy here. I wonder if it would be possible to talk from experience?

Malcolm wrote:

I was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I have also read that the Dalai Lama supports vegetarianism but feels he cannot be vegetarian due to his health.

namdrol - are you saying that he does or does not understand and practice Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite certain HHDL understands and practices Dzogchen. I am certain it is his primary practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I know it seems heretical to say this but perhaps after a while one needs to disconnect from the idea of guru and also the idea of union.

Whilst connecting through guru yoga is indeed necessary initially, I wonder if it isn't as important to disconnect at some point.

But I'm talking here of a deeper level to the practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is the essence of practice. As you discover your nature, you just integrate more with your gurus state of realization.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

I don't agree with this perspective. When a practitioner eats meat with presence and awareness, there is a connection made with that sentient being that serves to benefit that animal.

Thrasymachus said:

That is typical win(for the practitioner of carnism) and lose(for the dead animal). I don't see it like that at all. Why would a being that died for your food care about how enlightened, present or aware you are or aren't, what religion or doctrine you follow? The only doctrine they would care about is that which benefits them also -- and not just you.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you are not a Dzogchen practitioner presumably, so I guess you perhaps do not understand the function of rtsal. Everything is connected through rtsal, plants, animals, rocks, people and so on. Since there is benefit to practitioners, there is also benefit to the animals. But not of course, if you eat in a state of ignorance and lack of attention.

The same goes for eating a tomato, or a piece of lettuce, one has to be aware of the sentient beings who died bringing that peice of food to your plate-- whether one eats the flesh an animal or the flesh of a tomato one must eat with presence and awareness.

practitioner said:

Clearly HHDL, HH Karmapa, Chatral Rinpoche, etc. are just practicing at a lower level than those who facilitate the killing of sentient beings "out of compassion"...

Malcolm wrote:

Now, as I said, I do not object to people who wish to follow a vegetarian or vegan lifestyle for health, political, environmental, or spiritual reasons. I do not object to people who wish to follow common Mahāyāna. But as I mentioned, one who is going to follow common Mahāyāna must also eschew garlic, onion, alchohol and so on.

And as I mentioned above, His Holiness The Dalai Lama is not a vegetarian -- though in Dharmasala he maintains a vegetarian kitchen. He has also scolded people for bringing him vegetarian dishes while he is on the road, and he eats meat for his health, according to the instructions of his Tibetan doctors.

Niether the Karmapa nor Chatral Rinpoche are gurus of mine. My guru is Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. I follow his teachings on this subject and no one else's. You may not like him, you may not agree with him, but what I have said is basically his point of view on the subject. He considers the compassion argument for vegetarianism a "miserable compassion". He is quite emphatic on this point and brings it up at nearly every retreat.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the Dalai Lama...

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dalai Lama is not a vegetarian.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

But you we are physiologically and ethically capable of extending compassion to

animals by not killing many animals by refusing meat.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this perspective. When a practitioner eats meat with presence and awareness, there is a connection made with that sentient being that serves to benefit that animal.

You do not have to accept this point of view for yourself, but it is my point of view.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

You search for manipulated facts to make meat eating more acceptable. For example earlier you railed on soy, citing this article: <http://civileats.com/2009/01/27/a-vegan-reassesses-soy-a-health-and-environmental-perspective/> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

But that article itself mentioned most soy, 80%, goes to feed livestock.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not eat industrially produced meat for environmental as well as ethical reasons. I made that clear.

Thrasymachus said:

So counting the forest so essential to this "ideal" meat eating enterprise, you can only feed about 2 people per 10 acres.

Malcolm wrote:

Where do you derive this figure from?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

It seems alot of people here are using a fundamentalist Buddhist approach to justify meat eating.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Not at all. As with everything, there are a number of views about meat-eating in Buddhism. In my case, it has nothing to do with the traditional diet of Tibetans.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Which of the two questions are you answering no to? Coz it makes a HUGE difference!

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is the sole path of all the buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

Kelwin said:

Ok, let's invert the question this time. Is Guru Yoga necessary? Can we reach accomplishment without it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: recent Jogye controversy

Content:

mindyourmind said:

People having fun.

How dare they

Malcolm wrote:

I know, what is the world coming too, meat eating, and now this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: recent Jogye controversy

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

The leader of South Korea's biggest Buddhist order has apologised after monks were filmed apparently gambling illegally. Six leaders of the Jogye order offered to resign on Thursday after the secretly-filmed footage emerged. Film apparently showing monks playing poker at a luxury hotel, some smoking and drinking, was aired on television....
More here:

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-18030813> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Ha! Back in the early '90's there was a strip joint (The Naked Eye) where some strippers that were friends of mine used to work in Boston in the Combat Zone. One night a friend and I headed down there for a drink and five Korean monks, in their monastic dress, who were staying at the Cambridge Zen Center walked out of the place as we were walking in. Our friend, who has dancing that evening, told us they had left her the best tip she had had so far that night.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Care to elucidate?

Malcolm wrote:

The five outer course elements are made out of the five lights of the wisdom of rigpa. Everything (all sentient beings including their consciousness as well as everything we consider inanimate) is made out of the five elements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

But when you buy meat at the meat store, whatever "being" once lived in that meat already moved out of that house long ago. There is no karma from buying or eating this meat...

Malcolm wrote:

This is also Bhavaviveka's perspective.

The truth is that Christians, Moslems, Jews, and Secularists will never stop eating meat. They will never stop raising animals for food. If practitioners refuse to eat meat, they are refusing to create a good cause for the animal whose flesh they are eating.

There is no need to suppose we must therefore decide to eat every kind of dead creature and so on. We can work within the convention of what are considered food animals in our culture and society, i.e. poultry, beef, pork, lamb, goat, venison, wild game, fish and shellfish. It is also ok to enjoy the taste and the flavor of these kinds of foods. We have sense organs, we should enjoy what we eat. We should also be aware, we should not be blind to suffering. Also when we eat a salad, or a tomato, we have to be aware of the suffering the production of that tomato or lettuce, or head of broccoli engenders. When we pick a tomato, we are also picking someone else's food, the food of another creature. When we eat a strawberry, we are stealing it from some bird, chipmunk or insect. When we buy mass produced vegetables in a market, how many creatures died to produce that? When we use sesame oil to cook our vegetarian meal, how many millions of small creatures were crushed to death to extract that sesame oil? The idea that being a vegetarian is less harmful to sentient beings than being a meat eater is deluded. You can, for example, in the same cycle of treasure texts find one text that says you must avoid meat, and in another text from the same cycle, instructions that one must eat meat.

If you have a specific reason for being a vegetarian, for example, you are doing chulen (rasāyana) practice -- then you must avoid all foods that give rise to the three humors and focus only on sattvic foods, essence foods, such as ghee, honey, rice, fruits, etc. You cannot eat garlic, onion, radishes, etc., roots in general. This also has to do with how to cleanse the digestive pathways in the formation of the various tissues of the body. Even so, there are tantras that identify meat as rasāyana, chulen. So meat can even be used for chulen practice.

If one is a Dzogchen practitioner, there are no rules about what one may eat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Everything is made out of rigpa.

Isn't this a case of considering butter to be milk?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 8:18 PM
Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

It's quite clear that most humanoids on this planet are currently devolving.

Adamantine said:

Well, yeah.. I haven't invested a great deal of time studying evolutionary theory but I imagine there are allowances for population explosions and bottlenecks of everything from virulent plants, insects, and rodents to humans.. any lifeforms that get way out of proportion and balance with the environment can end up altering it drastically, and eventually be the cause for their own demise potentially. I would just assume this must be an aspect of "evolutionary" theory, and if not than it is quite deficient.

On another note, Guru Rinpoche's prophecies do seem to be right on target, and I don't think he was subjecting his forward gaze to evolutionary models..

There's theory, and then there's omniscience.. I am aiming for the latter.. for now though I may have to dabble in the former.. sigh

Malcolm wrote:

"Evolution is any change across successive generations in the heritable characteristics of biological populations. Evolutionary processes give rise to diversity at every level of biological organisation, including species, individual organisms and molecules such as DNA and proteins."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 8:04 PM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:

practitioner said:

Butcher ---> Purchaser = bad karma

Butcher ---> Market ---> Purchaser = no problem

Malcolm wrote:

The argument is, and it is the Buddha's argument, recall, that meat that was not slaughtered for you specifically, that you have not seen slaughtered, and did not request slaughtered is pure. In case someone feels this is merely a Hinayāna argument, let me also remind you that the Madhyamaka author Bhavaviveka also follows the same argument. Shantideva of course is well known for arguing against meat eating.

While it is true that the lower tantras instruct us that to be vegetarian -- tantras like Hevajra instruct us in the opposite fashion.

So, again, it all depends on what you personally want to practice.

I am a Dzogchen Community practitioner, therefore I practice according to that tradition. I believe that refusing to eat meat is a refusal to extend one's compassion.

In the end, we are all food. Get used to it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I mean the animal is still be raised to be slaughtered in order to fulfil your attachment to the taste of flesh. Environmentally it may be better but ethically???

Malcolm wrote:

When meat is available I eat it. When it isn't I don't. It is pretty simple.

I already pointed out I do not eat meat if it is impure in any of three ways.

When practitioners consume meat with a method, then there is benefit.

Namdrol said:

Dzogchen theoretically rejects the distinction between sentient and non-sentient.

Really? So rocks also have Buddha nature according to Dzogchen and are capable of attaining awareness of their true nature?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is made out of rigpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nemo said:

Look at the price tag of your organic food next time you are at the store. Are you going to tell me land is more productive specifically in calories per acre using organic practices?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it is.

Nemo said:
Then wouldn't everyone do it?

Malcolm wrote:
It's a rigged game, with a long history that goes back to the 18th century. Fundamentally, the land use patterns of Southern planters became dominant in the wheat and corn growing regions of the US, and the Northern practices of restorative husbandry fell by the wayside.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 7:31 PM
Title: Re: Combining Semde and Bimala
Content:

AlexanderS said:
If used on the same day, should Bimala be taken in the evening if Semde is taken in the morning?

Is it also okay to take 1 pill of agar-35 when taken Bimala?

Malcolm wrote:
No need to take Agar 25 with Vimala -- take either one or the other.

You can take Semde in the morning with either of these.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 10:42 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the concept of progress....
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen is unique because...

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhahood is an innate quality:

“Oh Vajradhara you must listen! Since buddhahood is unconditioned, there is no buddhahood through fabricated dharmas. The three kāyas of buddhahood are present as the kāya of prajñā. Since there are no material signs in the the kāya of prajñā, it is unaffected by the consequences of karma. Since this impure deluded appearance arises as buddhahood, there is no need to purify karma and traces.”
-- The Tantra of Buddhahood as an Intrinsic Attribute

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Some may argue that plants aren't sentient beings but there's been discoveries regarding plant behavior which refute that view.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen theoretically rejects the distinction between sentient and non-sentient.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

practitioner said:

So if I have a house infested with termites and I hire an exterminator to spray the whole place, since I didn't do the actual killing myself I have no karmic responsibility? Sure...

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you are, you are contracting it to be done, just as if you contracted a butcher to slaughter a steer for you.

Your objection is moot however since I was not making this argument.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: How to learn from a Teacher of the Dharma <?>

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Second make sure you avoid the many Buddhist cults out there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nemo said:

The health benefits for either camp are simply not there.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonesense, industrial agriculture contributes significantly to global warming or climate instability, whatever you want to call it. It results in large scale enviromental degradation, it is hugely inefficient, costly, and it returns less and less every year in terms of energy inputs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nemo said:

Maybe on planet granola. Pests eat so much you need to plant at least twice as much and the labour involved is often ridiculous.

As well the produce rots much faster and in the "good ol' days" of organic farming it took one in six adults working full time growing food to produce enough to feed everyone.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you don't know very much about organic farming, companion planting etc. But believe whatever you want. People have different definitions of food. Mine excludes anything grown through agrocporate methods, GMOS, etc.

If organic produce really rots faster (it doesn't), I would take that as a good sign.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Are you actually claiming that if you go to one of those Chinese seafood restaurants where they have the live fish in tanks, and you point to the fish you want them to kill and cook, it is karmically and morally different from going to a restaurant and letting them choose which fish to kill and cook to feed you?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't eat seafood in those kind of Chinese resturants; I don't order lobster in places where they boil them to order. I don't eat meat that I have seen being killed. And I never ask anyone to slaughter animals on my behalf. I won't eat meat that has been slaughtered for me.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

But frankly, being a vegetarian is not a superior moral choice. If you are a vegetarian for reasons of health it is one thing. But vegetarianism as moral campaign is deluded. Millions of animals large and small die to bring vegetables and grains to our plates every day. But over and over again vegetarians justify this claiming that the purpose of such agriculture is not to kill animals, so therefore, they morally excuse themselves from culpability in the death of countless millions of creatures.

Acchantika said:

It seems to me that your argument is against the modern agriculture industry not vegetarianism per se. If vegetarianism could operate without the use of organic or inorganic pesticides in a sustainable way perhaps that would be the superior moral choice. This isn't feasible on a large scale currently, but vegetarianism even in its current state would be a progressive step towards that end while non-vegetarianism cannot be. In the same way that world peace is not achievable currently, and many may technically die because one does not join an army to protect oppressed countries by killing oppressors, this is not a valid reason to join the army.

Malcolm wrote:

When people stop killing animals for food, I will stop eating meat. Until then, I won't. It is pretty simple. I personally don't care what diet people have -- but the saccharine fake compassion holier than thou attitude of some vegetarians is pretty pathetic. So if your conscience won't permit you to eat meat, great, don't eat it. My conscience won't permit me not to. But don't lecture me with some lame ass criticisms and poorly cited arguments from Abhidharma (which incidentally is a Hinayāna system in which meat eating is permitted). If people wish to follow common Mahāyāna and avoid meat, fine. The Hevajra tantra states however "Those who eat meat have compassion."

If you really want to follow the common Mahāyāna POV, not only must you avoid meat, but you must avoid onion, garlic, scallions, wine, and so on. So if you are going to do down that road, be consistent. Don't eat onion, garlic, meat, drink wine and so on.

As I pointed out, if people grass fed their cattle in a proper way, for both dairy and meat, we could reverse 200 years of carbon release in ten-twenty years.

So far no one has answered my observation that whether eats meat or not makes absolutely not one whit of difference concerning whether one will become an awakened person or not. But there are apparently some people think that their choice diet makes them superior buddhists -- well, screw that, what bullshit -- load of religious crapola disconnected with reality.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nemo said:

I don't know if that is still true. Organic agriculture would only produce enough food for about 3 billion people right now with current land usage. If that is the "moral" choice,.....

Malcolm wrote:

That is also not true. The only reason we have industrial agriculture is because of oil.

There are much smarter ways to do agriculture. Small organic farms generate a much higher yield per acre than large agrobusiness monocrop "farms".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

according to the Buddhist view of karma, accidentally stepping on a bug is different from deliberately stepping on a bug. What is the difference? In the first case there is no intention to kill, in the second there is. In eating a carrot, there is no intention to kill; in eating a hamburger, by definition, there is.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, that just not fly. Buying a hamburger in a market does not equate intention to kill. I know you desperately want it too, but it does not. Asking someone outright to slaughter a steer so you can have meat on the other hand would involve an intention to kill.

Bhavaviveka dispensed with your argument long ago in his Tarkajyala.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if you purchase meat, either in a store or restaurant, you are, in effect, paying someone to kill the animal for you, so the intent is there just as much as if you killed the animal yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

By the same reasoning, if you eat a tomato, etc. to which pesticides have been applied, you are as culpable in terms of intent as the farmer in the death of the insects. But of course ideological vegetarians always try to excuse the harm to beings caused by agriculture. It is one of their largest blind spots.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Chatral Rinpoche is a dzogchen master and is a big advocate of vegetarianism...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct. He is setting a good example for those who do not have the capacity to employ methods.

As for me, I follow Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's advice.

But frankly, being a vegetarian is not a superior moral choice. If you are a vegetarian for reasons of health it is one thing. But vegetarianism as moral campaign is deluded. Millions of animals large and small die to bring vegetables and grains to our plates every day. But over and over again vegetarians justify this claiming that the purpose of such agriculture is not to kill animals, so therefore, they morally excuse themselves from culpability in the death of countless millions of creatures.

We all live in a world where our decisions negatively impact the lives of other creatures all the time. We drive a car for 20 minutes, how many bugs are smashed on our windshields? I see a serious myopia on the part of vegetarians who excuse themselves from the harm they cause insects and mammals through driving, who excuse themselves from the environmental degradation caused by their use of oil, who excuse themselves from their contributions to the effluent stream much of which is simply dumped into the ocean, and who then excoriate in a high handed fashion people who meat.

Frankly, eating grassfed meat is far better for the environment and ecosystems in the

world than being a consumer of soy products. Soy is a very environmentally damaging crop (<http://civileats.com/2009/01/27/a-vegan-reassesses-soy-a-health-and-environmental-perspective> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"). Grass fed cattle who are moved from fresh pasture to pasture actually sequester carbon and rebuild the local environment because of the interaction between cattle and pasture. Joel Salatin writes in his recent *The Sheer Ecstasy of Being a Lunatic Farmer* (2010, Polyface):

There you have it: mob stocking herbivorous solar conversion lignified carbon sequestration fertilization. If every farmer in America practiced this prehistoric system, in fewer than ten years we would sequester all the carbon that has been emitted since the beginning of the industrial age. It's really that simple. One of the most environmentally-enhancing things you can do is to eat grass finished beef. That sequesters more carbon than soybeans, or corn, or any other annual. And yet how many radical environmentalists have turned to soy milk and veganism in order to be earth friendly. (page 28)

Finally, in the end, being an eater of meat does not make one less capable of realizing the meaning of the teachings, and being a vegetarian does not make one more capable of realizing the teachings.

That is the bottom line.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

practitioner said:

My point being, Milarepa was a Buddha, capable of extraordinary feats due to his complete realization of emptiness. So the fact that Milarepa or Marpa or any other highly realized practitioner ate meat is of no concern to me because they of course realized the true emptiness of that action.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, Milarepa ate meat as a matter of course in his life, both before and after his awakening.

practitioner said:

How many people who eat meat claiming to do it with a Dzogchen/Vajrayana view of eating the meat of sentient beings out of compassion really have the realization to actually do it? How many are just using the terms Dzogchen and Vajrayana to justify their own attachments to eating meat?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not require "realization", it merely requires a method, mindfulness and compassion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Channeled Message from the Buddha

Content:

Aemilius said:

If we accept tertons and teachings based on pure visions, why not the channeled teachings ?

<http://organiccocosmos.ning.com/profiles/blogs/channeled-message-from-buddha-through-elizabeth-trutwin>

According to Buddha (in Kalama sutta and elsewhere) we should not depend on authority, but we should depend on our own reason, our own capability of judgement. In practice buddhism seems to be only about authority, if lama so and so says something then it has to be accepted by everyone, we must be good boys and girls.

Malcolm wrote:

"You cling to the programming from inside the Matrix."

Seriously?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 11:27 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

The Vajrayāna/Dzogchen perspective is that refusing to eat meat is a refusal to extend one's compassion. So one must decide what level one is going to practice at.

N

practitioner said:

Well there is no ONE Vajrayana perspective either. For example, I am from the Kagyu tradition and the Karmapa has given up meat and is now vegetarian. Does he not practice Vajrayana?? Here is a short excerpt from a transcript of a teaching on the subject.

Malcolm wrote:

He is setting a good example for those who prefer a more Mahāyāna approach to this issue. But I don't consider his point of view a Vajrayāna approach. It is a lower tantra/common Mahāyāna perspective.

You will also recall that Milarepa was a meat eater, as was Marpa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

practitioner said:

However, I think the most important point is that eating meat should be unacceptable from a Buddhist perspective and whatever it takes for anyone to reach that conclusion is fine by me.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many Buddhist perspectives, and often they stand in apparent contradiction to one another.

The common Mahāyāna perspective is that eating meat is unacceptable.

The Vajrayāna/Dzogchen perspective is that refusing to eat meat is a refusal to extend one's compassion. So one must decide what level one is going to practice at.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

I don't deny evolution. However I also do not believe that modern humans evolved from hominids that evolved from apes...

Anyway, if you didn't attend the retreat I mentioned where Rinpoche talked about some of this, the replay should be available as you know.

Malcolm wrote:

Apes also evolved from hominids. We are all cousins. This is just a genetic fact.

I heard what Rinpoche said. He does not believe in Meru. Ok. Cool. He does not believe in the evolution of humans from apes. Ok. Cool (anthropologists don't either). He prefers the Treta Yuga etc., model. Ok cool -- but that has nothing to do with the

mathematical precision with which we can track DNA, etc., and nothing to do with the fact that our human form evolved from earlier and less sophisticated forms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

So I agree with Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche that the idea of humans "evolving from apes" is rather silly.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, actually Humans evolved from earlier homonids. Apes evolved along different lines than humans, branching off from the hominidea clade. No one who studies paleo-anthropology would say that humans evolved from apes.

The physical form we call "homo sapiens" at present is 100% a product of evolution.

Evolution is not merely a theory, it is a demonstrable fact that can be empirically reproduced in labs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

At issue is not where the IE languages developed, but the timeframe and the mechanism of its diffusion. The Aryan invasion theory as you are aware posits a light-skinned conquering tribe of nomadic "Aryas" on chariots that conquered a dark-skinned Dravidian city-dwelling culture bringing with them the Vedic culture. This theory is proto-fascist hogwash based on a fanciful reading of itihasa.

There is no evidence that the Vedic culture originated anywhere other than India. This is not to say that Vedic culture is the source of the IE language family. Conquest is much less effective than commerce to spread a language. English is a perfect example of that.

Malcolm wrote:

George Dumezil shows there is clear continuity between, for example Roman ritual practices conducted by flamens and Indian ritualism conducted by brahmins, and as we all know, br becomes fl by phonetic shift.

No one has suggested by the way that the Rg Veda was composed outside of India since

places in NW India can be clearly discerned with it. What has been suggested is that it was composed by peoples who had newly arrived in India, that the language of the text bears evidence of this fact, and that the culture that produced the Rg Veda bear a culture continuity with steppe nomads.

If by Vedic culture you mean the post Harappan civilization that emerged in India, then we can agree. But if you are proposing the Sarasvati culture meme of the Hindutvavadins, well, they have little evidence for this. It is all very speculative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You should read Bryant's book. His basic pov it is that there is little in the way of solid proof for either side of this debate.

Another book you ought to read:

The Horse, The Wheel and Language by David W. Anthony, Princeton, 2007

In particular you should read the section from 402-411. This entire book adequately supports the claim that PIE evolved in the steppes of Asia among nomads.

The basic point is that language carries culture, not DNA.

So there is plenty of evidence for the fact that Proto IE language speakers moved into India from outside of it: dna, linguistics, archaeology, etc. These days these kinds of movements can be plotted mathematically on the basis of both linguistics and dna, just as the spread of human language can be plotted mathematically from South Africa to Polynesia. Both phonemic and genetic diversity is densest in South Africa, and least dense in among Polynesians.

Sure, the first people to move into India probably moved there 75,000 years ago. There have been many successive movements of people into India. Humans beings come from Africa, not India.

Witzel owned Frawley because Witzel's Sanskrit is much better than Frawley's and Witzel is a better scholar.

Karma Dorje said:

Witzel has staked his reputation on defending a theory that there is no objective evidence for.

The same charge may be leveled at Hindutvavada. Read Bryant.

He has politicized the conversation to a large degree...

So have the Hindutvavadins.

The most damning evidence to the theory, aside from the complete lack of an archeological record which substantiates their fanciful interpretation of veda and itihasa is current genetic analysis that demonstrates that the population of India has been indigenous for at least the last 10,000 years.

This does not prevent IE languages coming from some location in central Asia.

Languages, as well as pots, are not people. English proves that well enough.

Whilst at McGill in the 90s, I had constant arguments with Katherine Young and others about this theory which they have all now rejected in light of current scientific evidence. When philology and fact collide, facts usually win.

Malcolm wrote:

It is highly unlikely that the IE languages and cultures evolved in India and spread from there. The Hindutva theory is every bit as racist as the Hindutvavadins claim the Aryan Invasion Theory to be.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

The last thing I want to do is argue about brand marketing with a true believer.

Malcolm wrote:

The only thing I believe in is my own personal experience. Claims of realization are bullshit. Realization is bullshit.

That being said, the idea that the goals of this or that Hindu system and this or that Buddhist system are the same is pretty far fetched, as far as I am concerned.

For example, Jivanmuktis are held to be able to remove the karma of others. This is a preposterous claim from a Buddhist perspective.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I guess you consider yourself a great master. It must be so since you are arguing from experience.

How terribly patronizing. The experience I argue from is my interaction with masters,

particularly my tsawai lama that held lineages from both traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Who says your mulaguru actually knows shit? Everyone has a a root guru. Very few of them are realized. And even if you claim he/she is realized, who can vouch for your claim? Proclamations of the realization of one's master is pretty much a shell game.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

The question I would ask in light of this, is how do the Mahavidya, Nath, and Kaula traditions relate to the Dravidians? Who here thinks (or knows) that the "'Indo-Aryan" invasion of Dravidian India' theory (that the Mahabharata is said to describe) holds any weight?

The so-called Aryan invasion theory has been thoroughly debunked in modern academia.

Malcolm wrote:

No it hasn't. Havn't you read Witzel's debunking of the Hindutva nationalist origins theory? Especially Frawley's tepid presentation?

The best and most balanced book on the subject is The Quest for The Origins of Vedic Culture by Edwin Bryant, Oxford, 2001.

Karma Dorje said:

While there are a number of full length works, this article provides a decent synopsis of the main arguments against it:

http://www.hindunet.org/hindu_history/ancient/aryan/aryan_frawley.html "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

You can read Frawley getting owned by Michael Witzel back in 2002 in a number of exchanges involving the two of them as well as others. In order to access these articles you need to go here:

<http://www.hindu.com/thehindu/op/arcop.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And access them by date.

1/22/02 N.S. Rajaram : Historical divide: archaeology and literature

1/29/02 M. Witzel Indus Civilisation and Vedic society

2/5/02 Clarence Maloney : Vedic-Indus debate: save Indian civilisation today

2/19/02 N.S. Rajaram: Theory and evidence

3/5/02 M. Witzel : Harappan horse myths and the sciences

3/12/02 R. Nagaswamy: Harappan horse

5/21/02 M. Witzel (assisted by Richard Meadow): Horses, logic, and evidence

6/18/02 David Frawley: Vedic literature and the Gulf of Cambay discovery

6/25./02 M. Witzel : A maritime Rigveda? — How not to read ancient texts

7/2/02 R. Nagaswamy : From Harappan horse to camel

7/9/02 Patrizia Norelli-Bachelet : Cosmology in Rigveda — the third premise

7/16/02 D.,Frawley: Witzel's vanishing ocean

8/6/02 M. Witzel Philology vanished: Frawley's Rigveda — I

8/13/02 M. Witzel: Philology vanished: Frawley's Rigveda — II

8/20/02 D.Frawley: Witzel's philology

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I think that there is a larger point that bears greater investigation: regardless of stated viewpoint, is the actual realization of the great masters of these various teachings different? My experience of this is that it is not. .

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you consider yourself a great master. It must be so since you are arguing from experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Nighthawk said:

What is Lakshmi seen as?

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhism, Laxmi is called Vasudevi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Nemo said:

So when a certain mantra is done in the context of Hindu Japa it is mundane, but if I do it Buddhist style it becomes supermundane. Same mantra but different being. Sounds unlikely.

Namdrol said:

Tara mantra is just about the only mantra I know of that is shared between both traditions. But the mahavidyā tradition in Hinduism is quite different in its approach to Tara practice than Tara practice as it exists in Buddhism. Here is a clear example of a popular Buddhist deity being appropriated by Hinduism.

This is the point of the view of the Mahavidyā tradition:

"Tantra is accepted as the authoritative proof then and then only when it contradicts not the Vedas. Whatever goes clearly against the Vedas can in no way be accepted as a proof. In matters concerning Dharma, the Vedas is the Sole Proof."

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/db/bk11ch01.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Buddhists do not accept śruti i.e. Vedic authority.

N

Nemo said:

Tara is a bad example. IMO I think they are different. But there are many more mantras in common.

Malcolm wrote:

well, the mantra of both Taras is the same i.e. om tare tuttare ture svaha.

Nemo said:

Lets take Jambala. A minor Hindu deity and Buddhist Protector. He was a student of the Buddha of the previous age. If memory serves Kashyapa Buddha. He took vows and has been a full time Bodhisattva long before recorded history.

Malcolm wrote:

Jambhala is not a Hindu deity.

Nemo said:

Perhaps parts of Hinduism are remnants of teachings of Buddhas of past ages. To say there was no Dharma prior to the historical Buddha in 500 BC and that only humans have access to Dharma seems doctrinaire.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say any of this.

Nemo said:

Many of the Gods were taught by the historical Buddha and received prophecies on their eventual Buddhahood. Some were also taught by previous Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Receiving a prediction does not make you awakened.

Nemo said:

Will Jambala not bless Hindu devotees?

Malcolm wrote:

They don't practice Jambhala. They practice Kubera. Same type of deity, to be sure. But not identical.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Well I've heard something along the lines of that the Upanishads were originally composed by Dravidian Tantrikas, and then later on the Vedics tacked them onto the Vedas thereby trying to claim the Upanishads as their own.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, the Upanishads themselves refer to the Vedas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Isn't it quite possible, even likely, that the Mahavidya/Tantric Mother-Goddess tradition is originally pre-Vedic Dravidian?

Malcolm wrote:

The Mahāvidyā tradition is Puranic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Nemo said:

So when a certain mantra is done in the context of Hindu Japa it is mundane, but if I do it Buddhist style it becomes supermundane. Same mantra but different being. Sounds unlikely.

Malcolm wrote:

Tara mantra is just about the only mantra I know of that is shared between both traditions. But the mahavidyā tradition in Hinduism is quite different in its approach to Tara practice than Tara practice as it exists in Buddhism. Here is a clear example of a popular Buddhist deity being appropriated by Hinduism.

This is the point of the view of the Mahavidyā tradition:

"Tantra is accepted as the authoritative proof then and then only when it contradicts not the Vedas. Whatever goes clearly against the Vedas can in no way be accepted as a proof. In matters concerning Dharma, the Vedas is the Sole Proof."

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/db/bk11ch01.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Buddhists do not accept śruti i.e. Vedic authority.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Namdrol said:

The verity of the claim "Kali is Yogini" is what is underdispute. However, for my part, if the tradition maintains that Kali is the subordinate of Yogini, that they are different person, one indicated by the name "Kali" and the other indicated by the name "Yogini", then I accept that they are different.

Adamantine said:

I thought it was regarding Troma and Kali, not Vajrayogini and Kali.

Malcolm wrote:

Troma is a form of Yogini.

Adamantine said:

You did belittle the tendency to conflate all female divinities into one "mother" in both the Hindu and Buddhist tradition...

Malcolm wrote:

No I didn't.

Adamantine said:

Similarly, this trinity is also referred to as "the three Mothers". So they are seen as distinct. But if you were to conflate them into one, I believe it would be Samantabhadri, not Vajrayogini.

Malcolm wrote:

Besides the point.

Adamantine said:

Maybe, but was their practice or realization any different? One of the most common teaching stories circulated by modern Tibetan Lamas is the good old "dog's tooth".

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of bullshit gets swept under that rug.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:
threats of banning.

Malcolm wrote:

Not by me. But by all means, continue with your obsession about delusion, picking the right one as it were.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Has a genuine and impartial evaluation of Trika and Dzogchen been made in the last couple hundred years? No, because on both side there is more importance given to the brand than an honest discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Trika is realist. Dzogchen is not.

Namdrol said:

Once again, if you read the Karandavyuha, you will find Shiva is converted by Avalokiteshvara. Two different persons, if you will.

And if you read the Abhidharma there is a square central mountain with the continents arrayed around it. It doesn't take a brilliant polemicist to come up with stories like that and it convinces no one who hasn't already made up their mind.

Malcolm wrote:

The persons who authored the Karandavyuha clearly intended different persons by the name "Shiva" and "Avalokiteshvara".

Namdrol said:

I already accepted intertextuality.

I am not positing intertextuality. I am positing shared genesis and continued cross-fertilization.

Malcolm wrote:
Same difference.

Namdrol said:

I can't see how you can dismiss the cosmology of the central mountain on the one hand and yet still insist on cosmological fables of the creation of the devatas when there is a clearly symbolic agenda to the use of these deities as seats.

I was arguing from the point of view of the tradition itself. I was not making a truth claim. The position of the tradition itself is not in dispute. The verity of its claims is.

Malcolm wrote:

The verity of the claim "Kali is Yogini" is what is underdispute. However, for my part, if the tradition maintains that Kali is the subordinate of Yogini, that they are different person, one indicated by the name "Kali" and the other indicated by the name "Yogini", then I accept that they are different.

For example, Tibetans imagined that Bodhgaya was in Assam for centuries. They went in pilgrimages their, made offerings at Hindu shrines they imagined were Buddhists ones, and so on. But certainly, these gods the Tibetans mistook for Buddhist deities were not.

Namdrol said:

No, the mythos is history. It shows the means of Buddhist appropriations of an older religious culture and a repurposing of it to suit Buddhist purposes. The Buddhist stupa's parts is a reworking of the symbolism of the vedic fire altar. But certainly a Buddhist stupa is not a vedic fire altar.

No one would argue that a stupa is a fire altar, nor a kila a yupa. However, when one looks impartially at tantric ritual in both Hindu and Buddhist context they see that both draw in exactly the same manner upon the Vedic strata.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, this is the ritual syntax of Pan-Indian culture.

Namdrol said:

Tantrism accomplished the same thing in ostensibly different contexts and traditions that likely developed at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with you. It is my opinion that different traditions adopted the body based methods of tantrism that grew out of the Upanishadic/Yoga/Ayurvedic traditions and adapted them to their own view and soteriologies. I do not accept as a necessary consequence that these methods offer the same result irrespective of the views of those who practice them.

I prefer Trika to all other versions of Hinduism, but I do not think that Trika and Dzogchen are even remotely the same. I am pretty certain there is no Togal in Trika -- at least, in what I have read in English (a fair amount) I have never run across it. Of course, I do

recognize that texts like the Vijñānabhairava have many methods that bear resemblance to certain preliminary Dzogchen practices. Emptiness is not the final view in Trika, however. It is the final view in Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Nemo said:

I don't mix practices of course. But I am not so closed minded as to think that the Rahula that the Hindus worship is different from the one Buddhists do.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two, in fact, the mudane one, and the supermundane one used to control the latter.

This is all getting rather far afield.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There are two points here: the first that you seem to be saying that the only way to realization is through practicing Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not believe the ideas about liberation in non-buddhist traditions and Buddhist traditions are commensurate. They are different ideas of liberation which offer different kinds of results.

Karma Dorje said:

The second point is that I am not making an equation between Chakrasamvara and Shiva. I have not looked at the historical record of these traditions. The equation between Pashupati and Avalokiteshvara on the one hand and Chinnamasta and Vajrayogini are well documented as two prominent examples of shared provenance.

Malcolm wrote:

Once again, if you read the Karandavyuha, you will find Shiva is converted by Avalokiteshvara. Two different persons, if you will.

Karma Dorje said:

Not to mention the use of pancamakaras in both Kaula and Vajrayana ritual, the identity of the upacharas used in worship, or shared lineage gurus amongst the 84 mahasiddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

I already accepted intertextuality.

Karma Dorje said:

I can't see how you can dismiss the cosmology of the central mountain on the one hand and yet still insist on cosmological fables of the creation of the devatas when there is a clearly symbolic agenda to the use of these deities as seats.

Malcolm wrote:

I was arguing from the point of view of the tradition itself. I was not making a truth claim.

Karma Dorje said:

Śrī Devi is almost certainly not of Indian origin. In fact what relationship there is between Śrī Devi is a relationship with Nīla-sarasvatī.

As I am sure you are aware, there is close equation in Hindu tantra between Tara/Nīlasarasvatī and Kālī, particularly at Tarapitha. It is in fact likely that Tara's cult came to Bengal from Tibet, as indicated by her name "Mahacinnatara". Tantra cross-pollinated at many points over the last couple millennia.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a tendency on the Hindu side to boil every female manifestation down into a great mother. Likewise, there is tendency on the Buddhist side to boil all female manifestations down into a great mother. But I don't think one is accurate in portraying Prajñāpāramitā as Kālī.

Karma Dorje said:

However, reading the mythos as history rather than polemics is nonsensical.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the mythos is history. It shows the means of Buddhist appropriations of an older religious culture and a repurposing of it to suit Buddhist purposes. The Buddhist stupa's parts is a reworking of the symbolism of the vedic fire altar. But certainly a Buddhist stupa is not a vedic fire altar.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

But to say a mundane God...

Isn't this rather like the Christians that insist that only those that believe in Jesus will be saved?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not.

Karma Dorje said:

Who is to say that all beings who aren't nominally Buddhist are samsaric?

Malcolm wrote:

All beings who are not āryas are samsaric.

Karma Dorje said:

While I will agree that if we are to make correspondences between Hindu and Buddhist forms of the goddess the correlation is between Vajrayogini and Chinnamasta, there certainly is little conceptual OR energetic difference between the Hindu Mahakali and any of a constellation of Mahakalis in the Buddhist pantheon.

Malcolm wrote:

Śrī Devi is almost certainly not of Indian origin. In fact what relationship there is between Śrī Devi is a relationship with Nīla-sarasvatī.

Karma Dorje said:

The use of various devatas as a seat is merely the age-old religious principle of "the god of the old religion becomes the devil of the new" that we see around the world...

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that Yogini is not Kali. Yogini forcefully appropriates the garb of Kali just as Heruka forcefully appropriates the garb of Bhairava and in the process "liberates" them, bestowing a prediction of Bhairava's eventual buddhahood. But this by no means can be taken to mean that Shiva is Cakrasamvara or Kali is Yogini, even given the fact of intertextuality between Indian traditions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Four mantras

Content:

rai said:

dear whoever seen the book and/or have the knowledge,

so finally i got the book and have one question, there are mantras to recite and to write on

the scarf or tshirt but what we are suppose to do with the Chakras? hang it on the wall or wore as an amulets?

thank you!

Malcolm wrote:
Amulet.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 9:25 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
All of this argument about relative truth is merely trying to choose one delusion over another.

Waste of time.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 6:35 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Bhusuku said:
Well, after a while of searching I came across
https://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=ru&ie=UTF8&langpair=ru%7Cen&rurl=www.google.com&twu=1&u=http://rangjungyeshe.ru/page.php%3Fid%3D472&usg=ALkJrhg57Ztx9vWVOwrDxHC-RQwXRcbIjQ. But now's the question: is this the "right" version, i.e. are there different ways to sing the kun bzang smon lam?

Malcolm wrote:
Mostly it is sung according to the whim of the Umdze of a given monastery.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Chanting
Content:

conebeckham said:
I think it's a combination of a lot of things.....melodies and means of chanting sometimes came to great masters in "visions," etc.

There's a funny song, I think it was from Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo, about the differences between lineages--and he talks about the differences in chanting styles--

"Gandenpas chant from deep below, Nyingmas chant through the nose, " or some sort of funny comments like that. He also pokes fun of every lineage, before really making some terse statements about the great benefit of all....

There are quite elaborate systems of music, melody, chanting, etc., for every lineage--even for sub-lineages. I'm sure even the various Nyingma lineages have quite a variety of styles, melodies, etc.

A few years back I was very fortunate to have two Bhutanese (Drukpa Kagyu) Loppons stay with me for a while, and we did a shrine consecration--I joined them, and their methods of chanting, melodies, music, etc. was utterly unlike what I'd been taught. The varieties are truly endless!

Blue Garuda said:
Ah, thanks.

At the moment, when unfamiliar, I just rise and fall with the tide of actions by those who know what they are doing! LOL

Malcolm wrote:
The most profound Dzogchen chant is Song of the Vajra.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 1:57 AM
Title: Re: What are the differences between reincarnation and rebirth?
Content:
Will said:
Incarnation: (esp. of a deity or spirit) embodied in flesh; in human form
says a dictionary.

Something is distinct from the flesh and thus is within the body. Since the 4 higher skandhas qualify as distinct from the rupa-form, the only question is - are they 'within' the body or not. If yes, then reincarnation is more accurate; if no, then rebirth is more accurate.

Malcolm wrote:
OED:

rebirth |rē' bərTH, 'rē, bərTH|

noun

the process of being reincarnated or born again: the endless cycle of birth, death, and rebirth.

- the action of reappearing or starting to flourish or increase after a decline; revival: the rebirth of a defeated nation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: What are the differences between reincarnation and rebirth?

Content:

Nighthawk said:

There is no "soul" that transmigrates from one body to the other so how is it possible to say both versions are identical?

Namdrol said:

There is nothing in the word "reincarnation" that suggests a soul; there is nothing in the word "rebirth" that does not.

N

Clarence said:

I once had a professor who was adamant that Buddhists should use rebirth. His argument was that reincarnation comes from the Latin *re in carne*, meaning again into the flesh. So, he took that to mean there was one entity going into a body again instead of, well, the Buddhist idea. To me, although his argument makes sense, I think it is too pedantic and don't care.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, by his argument reincarnation is better, since what happens rebirth is the reappropriation of a body, hence reincarnation. Also what gets reborn? Why a body, of course.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Chanting

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I know next to nothing about Dzogchen and indeed the Nyingma in general.

My background is Gelugpa where the chanting I have encountered has been fairly flat or the deep throat chanting I can almost accomplish at times.

I have recently posted about receiving an empowerment from Dozgchen Rinpoche, in the course of which I received a mantra and also bought a CD of Dzogchen Monastery Chants.

I find the chants completely engrossing as they enter my mind, almost hypnotic, and chanting the one for which I have transmission is a wonderful experience.

The complexity of the Dzogchen chants seems to involve a lot of singing 'around' each syllable rather than simple enunciation, and some variation such as 'OYM' at the start rather than 'OM' or 'AUMN'.

Is this a characteristic?

Is it was intended to disguise the mantra, or because it is rooted in a more ancient form, etc ?

Here's an example:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7YSlU1_kd-A "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:
It is just style.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 12:45 AM
Title: Re: Protectors in DC question
Content:

heart said:
Among others that is the Dharmapalas.

/magnus

dakini_boi said:
I thought the remains are offered to sentient beings of the 6 realms after the main offerings to the 3 roots and dharmapalas. - and therefore the dharmapalas are not included among the recipients of the remains.

Malcolm wrote:
They are not.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 12:44 AM
Title: Re: Protectors in DC question
Content:
Namdrol said:
They are offered to those outside the mandala.

dakini_boi said:
but why are they called "guardians?"

Malcolm wrote:
Becuase they also have some function of guarding place.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 12:19 AM
Title: Re: Protectors in DC question
Content:

Namdrol said:
Just a remainder offering. Three roots are inside you, as well as protectors

dakini_boi said:
Why is the remainder offered to the "guardians of the remains." These are really offered to the guests of compassion, having nothing to do with dharmapalas - correct?

Malcolm wrote:
They are offered to those outside the mandala.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 9:47 PM
Title: Re: What are the differences between reincarnation and rebirth?
Content:

Nighthawk said:
There is no "soul" that transmigrates from one body to the other so how is it possible to say both versions are identical?

Malcolm wrote:
There is nothing in the word "reincarnation" that suggests a soul; there is nothing in the word "rebirth" that does not.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 11:21 AM
Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona
Content:
Nemo said:

Agreed.

Malcolm wrote:

Then there is nothing more to discuss.

When you invoke Kali, what you get is death. I have a tatoo of a Kali yantra on my left arm from my pre-Buddhist days. Kali is not Vajrayogini. Kali takes her payment in blood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 11:20 AM

Title: Re: What are the differences between reincarnation and rebirth?

Content:

Takoda said:

What is the difference between reincarnation and rebirth?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing at all. But some Buddhists like to pretend there is a difference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

This was answered by a high Lama, fyi.

Malcolm wrote:

So called "High" Lamas also assert Meru Cosmology is true. I don't put much value in the assertions of "high" lamas when they contradict common sense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 9:45 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Nemo said:

I think the only person qualified to answer that would be a high Lama who knows both parties personally. Many of these once mundane Gods have been practitioners and students of the Buddhas for aeons. If I kept my Samayas for a thousand years and used

the powers of a God to accumulate merit progress on the path would be swift. To think of Gods as static and unchanging sounds like eternalism. Even very negative beings become miraculous protectors full of love when they accept guidance of the Aryas.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, this is not the issue. Kali does not become Vajrayogini by mere fiat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 8:33 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

Unless those traditional accounts had more to do with Buddhist-Hindu competing interpretations at the time of their inception. . . My understanding is that the actual energies of these two are identical, however, it is a misunderstanding of certain qualities and symbolism that have led Hindu devotees to do terrible things like commit blood human and animal sacrifices in her name, etc. Perhaps the symbolism of these early accounts has more to do with purifying the context of devotion from this degeneration, and is framed as suppression in a colorful way to communicate this. Again, I am just offering an alternative way to interpret what you are putting forth as an absolute truth. I am sure there are more.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a modern interpretation. Some Lama may have adopted it. I still think it is bunk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Interesting thread, about which I know very little.

Anyone care to comment on the TsurLuk and Pukluk systems, and their differences?

Malcolm wrote:

The main difference lies in when they start the year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Kilaya. said:

I usually add the Naggong to the Short Thun, I hope this little invention is not that bad.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not your invention. DC practices are quite modular.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

I don't see your logic here, what makes it impossible? You are talking about symbolic representations now, not the actual energies at play anymore.

Namdrol said:

It is simple. Yogini emanated to suppress Kāli, just as Heruka emanated to suppress Bhairava. Hence, there is no way Kali can be Yogini, there is no way this worldly goddess can be one and the same as Buddha Vajrayogini.

Adamantine said:

You believe this to be literally true Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

I believe that this is the traditional account of the origin of all forms of Vajrayogini and hence, it is impossible for Yogini to be Kali.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 9:57 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Jinzang said:

And, you should never be afraid to do guardian practice. They are guardians after all. They will never harm you.

I have been told that although the protectors are enlightened beings and would not harm practitioners, that they have oath bound beings in their retinue who are unenlightened and sometimes not very patient with lazy, careless, and conceited practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

More fear mongering.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Ah I see, thanks. So no matter how long or short a Ganapuja we perform (that is at least if Guardians are in any way involved), we should always transform regardless.

.

Malcolm wrote:

When you do with meal, there is no need to transform. In this case mainly you are making an offering to yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

What is the best way to contact the Guardians without transforming...

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot. To contact guardians, one must always be in a transformation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

I don't see your logic here, what makes it impossible? You are talking about symbolic representations now, not the actual energies at play anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

It is simple. Yogini emanated to suppress Kāli, just as Heruka emanated to suppress Bhairava. Hence, there is no way Kali can be Yogini, there is no way this worldly goddess can be one and the same as Buddha Vajrayogini.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

That said, Krodakali, aka Troma, as practiced in the Nyingma lineage, is equivalent to Kali.

Namdrol said:

No it isn't. There is no relationship between the two. Krodhakali is a form of Vajrayogini. Vajrayogini is not Kali.

Adamantine said:

According to you. But not according to lineage masters I have conferred with. I have been told they are the same.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it ain't so.

Krodhakālī originally entered Tibet with Padampa Sangye, hence the long association with Chö. This transmission is from a sadhana Virupa received in Oḍḍiyāna from a dakini there.

Kālarātri aka Kālī along with Bhairāva serve as the seat of Cakrasamvara and Vajrayogini. So it is really quite impossible that Kālī can be Vajrayogini. In reality, Cakrasamvara and Vajrayogini emanated from Akaniṣṭha to counteract Bhairava and Kālī.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you are turning your meal into a Ganapuja there is no need for a separate plate, just make sure you leave some remainder.

dakini_boi said:

Is this remainder to be regarded as the 3-roots offering, or the offering of the remainders, or both?

Thank you, as usual, your input is invaluable in demystifying these things.

Malcolm wrote:

Just a remainder offering. Three roots are inside you, as well as protectors

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Thank you all.

Namdrol, this is what I figured, and you have set my mind at ease. Is this generally how guardian offerings are regarded in other Dzogchen-heavy Nyingma lineages?

Also, is it even necessary to have a separate plate for the 3 roots when doing (informal) tsog by oneself or in a small group?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are doing a Ganapuja then follow the instructions in the book for doing Ganapujas.

If you are turning your meal into a Ganapuja there is no need for a separate plate, just make sure you leave some remainder.

Most Nyingma lineages are into daily offerings and this sort of thing. AFAIK, ChNN is unique in his approach to guardians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:20 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

You may be right. It could be illness or perhaps they were doing a practice like nyung nas which limits food and drink intake. If foul play is ruled out- it still leaves the question why were they in the cave in the first place? And why did those who supported them by providing food, water etc. for the three months they were there not have more sense. Why did they feel they could not inform the community? Something was not right. Did the assistants not recognise the danger the couple were in? It's all very murky and unpleasant.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps they contracted Hanta virus.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hantavirus> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Namdrol said:

But the idea that guardians are jealous gods who might punish you because you don't

feed them everyday is a very primitive concept. Therefore, in the DC we do not worry about it so much.

N

Dronma said:

Yes, exactly!

Nevertheless, it is not good (like Rinpoche says) to correct practitioners from other lineages. Each one has to follow the instructions which he/she got from his/her Guru.

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't correcting anyone, I was answering his question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Worldly Vehicle

Content:

dakini_boi said:

ChNNR made a passing statement about how Dzogchen includes all paths. I'm not sure I'm totally clear on what he said, but from what I understood, he said that in Dzogchen, the 1st 3 vehicles are:

1. all worldly vehicles, including non-buddhist spiritual paths
2. hinayana (I'm assuming this means both shrevakayana & pratyekabuddhayana)
3. mahayana

Could someone confirm or correct this?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to the sgra thal gyur, the first vehicle is called the vehicle of gods and men.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 6:59 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

dakini_boi said:

I'm wondering about protocols involving protectors in various lineages. A while ago, a kagyu friend told me that he is required to give a physical offering to the protectors every day - i.e. it's not a good idea to call on protectors without making an offering. Since then, I have been kind of hesitant to do any practice that calls on protectors, although I know the same rules don't apply in DC. What I'm wondering is - does this difference characterize general difference in how kagyu vs. nyingma deal with protectors? Or is it

an example of ChNNR's always going for the essence of the teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

You do not need to do protector offerings at all in the DC. Why? It is because the job of the protectors is to protect the transmission and the transmission lives in you. Therefore, they protect you. So you don't have to do anything.

Protectors do not eat tea and biscuits. They do not require fancy tormas.

Of course, sometimes it is useful to contact the guardians, for example, if you do something stupid which causes a problem in the transmission. Then you can purify this with guardian practice. Or if there is an obstacle to your practice, then you can make offerings to the guardians.

But the idea that guardians are jealous gods who might punish you because you don't feed them everyday is a very primitive concept. Therefore, in the DC we do not worry about it so much.

And, you should never be afraid to do guardian practice. They are guardians after all. They will never harm you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

In response to Namdrol's point that two explanations are not mutually exclusive, as I am not privy to the decisions of the Dharma Protectors I cannot say. However, I think in this case there are plenty of plain old rational explanations for what led to this sorry situation that any intervention by supernatural forces would be superfluous.

Malcolm wrote:

Gdon attacking retreatants and causing them to behave in bizarre ways is not unheard of. For example, Sachen Kunga Nyingpo was attacked by Gyalpo Pehar, for which he resorted to the meditation of Acala.

Likewise, Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje was assigned by Dudjom Rinpoche to do retreat in a cave where several people had died, presumably because there was a malevolent gdon that inhabited the place. His attendant was so freaked out, he left after only a few days.

Having myself done a solitary three year retreat, I can report that one's imagination can run away with itself. I can remember having a fantasy, among other fantasies, that a

chainsaw that my dad gave me to cut wood for myself suddenly started and chased me around the cabin. I had a similar fantasy about an axe.

These fantasies were very vivid. I of course understood they were merely fantasies, but they were powerful. I can remember brooding about what I would do in case of a nuclear emergency, and wondering which way I would go, west to find my parents, or east to find my best friend, etc.

Further, it is very easy for people in retreat to be subject of provocations of various kinds.

Despite the fact that we all generally are not super impressed with the Diamond Mountain scene (but then I am not super impressed with any of the missionary Buddhist organizations in the US, regardless of lineage or affiliation), the meltdown of Macnally and Thorson's retreat and ensuing tragedy should be met with compassion. Further, it must be very difficult for the other people in the retreat as well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Pero said:

So uhm, is there Kali in the Gelug tradition? Or in any other?

Knotty Veneer said:

You know I get kinda p*ssed off when people start implying supernatural causes in situations like this. Ooh it must be the dharma protectors taking revenge on samaya breakers. Oooh there must be rgyal po interfering with the retreat. Oooh the gnas gdon are hostile to the dharma and causing obstacles. And so on and so forth. The tragedy at Diamond Mountain was due to very human weaknesses. To suggest otherwise, absolves those involved of the blame due them and denies the victim the justice due him.

Malcolm wrote:

Both are possible without being mutually exclusive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

That said, Krodakali, aka Troma, as practiced in the Nyingma lineage, is equivalent to

Kali.

Malcolm wrote:

No it isn't. There is no relationship between the two. Krodhakali is a form of Vajrayogini. Vajrayogini is not Kali.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

heart said:

Funny thing, according to the local newspaper there was water and food in the cave. How do you die of dehydration when there is water?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It sounds like what he actually died of was exposure. Anyway, we will know soon when they release the autopsy report. Poor guy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is a lot of student codependence with dysfunctional gurus in general.

To be a true Guru, one must be more or less fully integrated.

To be a proper Dharma teacher, one must be 80% integrated.

gregkavarnos said:

What do you mean by "integrated"???

Malcolm wrote:

View and meditation integrated into conduct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

.... i mean, who could have foreseen this current tragic/farcical development?

Tilopa said:

Anyone who knows anything about Vajrayana Buddhism.

Something weird like this was bound to happen sooner or later.

Knotty Veneer said:

Well, aspiring yogis dying in caves was probably not unknown in Tibet either. While I think the people in and around Diamond Mountain should have taken heed long ago when the Dalai Lama censured Roach, they are probably not all crazies and dharmatose groupies. I imagine many are going thru a lot. Discovering your guru has feet of clay is not a pleasant experience.

But as gad rgyangs suggests it would probably better for them to cut their losses now and go elsewhere. As somebody else pointed out, Garchen Rinpoche - one of the finest yogis alive - lives in Arizona. Why would you waste your time with Roach (even if he were straight up) when Garchen Rinpoche is nearby?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot of student codependence with dysfunctional gurus in general.

To be a true Guru, one must be more or less fully integrated.

To be a proper Dharma teacher, one must be 80% integrated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Ku-nye

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Thanks for the usefull reply.

Another question:

- For what use are the 5 sticks in Tibetan Massage?
- Which places are hit regarding which indication ?

Mutsog marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

I am not familiar with that terminology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Ku-nye

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Very simply, "ku" means to apply warm oil. Oil has the opposite qualities of lung; lung is sharp, cold, rough, light, motile; while oil is heavy, warm, dull, smooth, and stable.

The symptoms of many mental illnesses include wind symptoms.

The "nye" part means "to rub" -- so by rubbing, one can place the winds back in their proper place in the body.

If the wind becomes out of balance, it automatically disturbs the other humors. Therefore, at all times balancing wind is important.

kalden yungdrung said:

Among them, Massage (Ku-nye) is one of the very practical and effective methods to restore the energy and keep the humors in balance. Especially it is an effective method for rlung/wind disorder or psychological originated disorders.

Tashi delek,

Here a link regarding Ku-nye or Tibetan massage.

<http://www.tibetanmedicine-edu.org/index.php/tibetan-massage>
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

A few questions:

- Especially it is an effective method for rlung/wind disorder or psychological originated disorders.

How can this be explained, the psychological aspect?

- How can which Tibetan system (energy) be effected by massage.?

- Is this done also with the help of pressure?

- How is the upward and downward energy influenced, in what case?

Thanks at before hand,

Mutsog Marro
KY

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 7:46 PM
Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Pretty sad situation.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 7:26 PM
Title: Re: Memorization of Dzogchen Tantras/Upadeshas/Texts
Content:
Fa Dao said:
Namdrol, you wouldnt happen to know of a good translation for that would you?

Malcolm wrote:
Well, it will probably be posted online when Rinpoche does the webcast in a few days times.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 11:43 AM
Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators
Content:

tomamundsen said:
Whoa!

So, will you ever get the chance to teach the Pramanavarttika as planned?

Malcolm wrote:
Not in the near future, no.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 10:01 AM
Title: Re: Modern Buddhist Utopias & Alternative Communities
Content:
Namdrol said:
If you put \$20,000 into a Thaibank, you can get a permanent resident visa if you are over fifty. You can easily live on your Social Security in Thailand.

kirtu said:

That's good to know but SS is a ways in the future and I now have < 20,000 anyway. Had I known that after I had to sell my condo then I might have done that.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I only found this out recently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Modern Buddhist Utopias & Alternative Communities

Content:

Nemo said:

Mansion sized house is about 35k out in the provinces.

kirtu said:

I have < 35k and it appears that I have been permanently locked out of the job market so what I have in the bank now is probably approximately what I have to survive on for many years.

Cambodia would be even cheaper. You could live like a king. Worth it for the occasional bout of Delhi belly.

The Cambodians killed each other off in my personal memory. One of my classmates was killed in the killing fields.

I can't go to Nepal or India as a long term solution because you have to leave the country for the year after 5-6 months because of the new visa restrictions.

The ideal thing in North America, if it is doable, is to create a Buddhist yogic community where people can creatively express themselves and create or collaborate So it's not s on their own projects while maintaining a place that they can do intense retreat if they like. So it's not secular as a focus but people can work as necessary and do retreat when they wish or need to. So not just secular and not just practice but a balance (although if people wanted to do life retreat then that should be possible too).

So in the immediate range, ideally I need to find a place for myself that I can then open up to others. I pitched this back on eSangha and I think here as: let's buy land and start a Dharmic civilization.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

If you put \$20,000 into a Thaibank, you can get a permanent resident visa if you are over

fifty. You can easily live on your Social Security in Thailand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: Memorization of Dzogchen Tantras/Upadeshas/Texts

Content:

Namdrol said:

Memorizing a short text like the aspiration of Samantabhadra is only helpful, never harmful.

kirtu said:

Does it plant a seed for future lives?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Most assuredly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Memorization of Dzogchen Tantras/Upadeshas/Texts

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I can see the benefit in doing this to help develop and clarify ones View/Tawa but I can also see the opposite. Would like to hear others thoughts on this...

Malcolm wrote:

Memorizing a short text like the aspiration of Samantabhadra is only helpful, never harmful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So the recognition is not discriminating? More like knowing the flavor of the base?

Namdrol said:

Recognition is prajñā.

Andrew108 said:

And this prajñā is the prajñā of self-liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

Self-liberation, as is clearly defined by the Dzogchen tantras is freedom from grasping. Whatever one grasps is not self-liberated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So the recognition is not discriminating? More like knowing the flavor of the base?

Malcolm wrote:

Recognition is prajñā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

maybay said:

If I ever manage to integrate Dharma into my ego just do me a favour and shoot me.

Namdrol said:

Consider yourself shot.

maybay said:

I always thought of you as the goal-keeper. What should the fans think when they see him shooting goals with the forwards?

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, sports metaphors are lost on me, among many other things, like for example, what your point is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: value of personal experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

Visting teachers is not Dharma.

Receiving empowerments is not Dharma.

Dharma is understanding your real condition.

Clarence said:

However, when you visit teachers or receive empowerments, it is much easier to get an

understanding of your real condition. Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said don't receive transmission and teachings. I am saying, turn your dharma teachings and transmissions in Dharma. Use them to understand yourself. Don't leave them as an intellectual pursuit. For the most part, every dharma text I ever studied, am studying, and will study, was for the purpose of understanding something about my path, about myself, my own state. I learned Tibetan to enhance my practice, not to become a skilled translator who is expert in dancing on books (though I am pretty good). I did not learn Dharma to come to places like Dharma wheel and have debates. So I am pointing out that Buddhist Philosophy, the intellectual study of Buddhism divorced from a path, is a waste of time. If you want to study Madhyamaka, first understand how it is relevant to solving the Buddha's existential question: what is suffering, it's cause, it's cessation and the path. If you keep this in mind, then this study becomes Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: value of personal experience

Content:

Will said:

So when I wrote "vast numbers of sadhanas, initiations or Dharma talks heard" - they still provide "little or no education in Dharma"? Pretty grim picture - reading books suck, thinking sucks, listening to Dharma sucks, practice & wongs suck etc.

Namdrol said:

Reciting large stacks of sadhana is not Dharma.

Reading large volumes of sutras and shastras is not Dharma.

Visting teachers is not Dharma.

Receiving empowerments is not Dharma.

Taking vows and precepts is not Dharma.

This is all conceptual proliferation.

Dharma is understanding your real condition.

Will said:

My goodness - how simple - no need for conditionality, merit, purification, devotion or the conceptual mind - Dharma is Buddha.

Pithy sayings are the enemy of understanding like the perfect is the enemy of the better.

Malcolm wrote:

I am just echoing the words of Sakya Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen:

Freedom from extremes is beyond knowledge, expressions and objects;

Madhyamaka, Cittamatra, etc.,

expressions in words are proliferations.

Thoughts in the mind are concepts,

the nature is inexpressible and unthinkable.
For as long as views continue to exist,
there is no liberation from all suffering.
Conceptuality is great ignorance,
it is said one sinks into the ocean of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

If the basis could not be recognize, liberation would not be possible.

Or is it that liberation is possible because the base cannot be recognized?

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not how it is taught in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: value of personal experience

Content:

Will said:

So when I wrote "vast numbers of sadhanas, initiations or Dharma talks heard" - they still provide "little or no education in Dharma"? Pretty grim picture - reading books suck, thinking sucks, listening to Dharma sucks, practice & wongs suck etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Reciting large stacks of sadhana is not Dharma.

Reading large volumes of sutras and shastras is not Dharma.

Visting teachers is not Dharma.

Receiving empowerments is not Dharma.

Taking vows and precepts is not Dharma.

This is all conceptual proliferation.

Dharma is understanding your real condition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

Any effort in togal at all will gaurantee that one will attain buddhahood in the bardo.

N

alpha said:

isn't it more like if one dies while at the level of first vision one will be reborn in a pure realm where one will live for 500 years practising dzogchen ?

Malcolm wrote:

That will happen only if, for some reason, you were not able to recognise the appearances of the bardo of dharmatā as being your own state.

You ought to read Birth, Life and Death by ChNN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

In a real sense, however there is neither mind no matter. Mind and matter are equally produced through non-recognition of the basis i.e. essence, nature and energy.

N

Andrew108 said:

Is this saying that our 'reality' is the non-recognition of the basis? And if the basis is recognized then is this a recognition of another alternative 'reality'? When it comes to recognition of the base does it make sense to talk about it as being a 'reality' that can be known?

Malcolm wrote:

What our impure vision is a result of not recognizing the basis. When we fully recognize and then integrate with the basis, then our impure vision vanishes.

If the basis could not be recognize, liberation would not be possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

maybay said:

If I ever manage to integrate Dharma into my ego just do me a favour and shoot me.

Malcolm wrote:

Consider yourself shot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

deepbluehum said:

BTW, as fascinating and l33t as togal is, it's pretty difficult, as in super difficult. The postures are awkward. I think very few people will make to the final phase. Pranayama methods are a lot easier, and can be a lot more comfortable and easier on the eyes.

Namdrol said:

Any effort in togal at all will guarantee that one will attain buddhahood in the bardo.

Can't say that about pranayāma.

N

deepbluehum said:

A good argument to do both.

Malcolm wrote:

Pranayāma is important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

deepbluehum said:

BTW, as fascinating and l33t as togal is, it's pretty difficult, as in super difficult. The postures are awkward. I think very few people will make to the final phase. Pranayama methods are a lot easier, and can be a lot more comfortable and easier on the eyes.

Malcolm wrote:

Any effort in togal at all will guarantee that one will attain buddhahood in the bardo.

Can't say that about pranayāma.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 5:36 AM
Title: Re: value of personal experience
Content:

Will said:
Then why pick on intellectuals or readers...

Malcolm wrote:
Because while it is understandable that those with little or no education in Dharma might not have integrated Dharma into their life, it is inexcusable of those who are well educated.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 5:10 AM
Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...
Content:

deepbluehum said:
The relative truth, if you know it's just relative, and knows it's an illusion, then is not avidya anymore isn't it? [Unity of two truths to the rescue!]

Namdrol said:
This is the flaw of tregchö.

deepbluehum said:
Thregcho and togal are inseparable. I feel this notion of a flaw, no two truths and such comes from thinking thregcho is its own path and togal is something different.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, of course, in a real sense there is no tregchö without thogal and vice verse; but nevertheless, Longchenpa devotes many pages to criticizing tregchö in comparison with thögal.

The "no two truths" thing comes from my master, ChNN. But also in it is stated the same in the Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 4:28 AM
Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...
Content:

deepbluehum said:

The relative truth, if you know it's just relative, and knows it's an illusion, then is not avidya anymore isn't it? [Unity of two truths to the rescue!]

Malcolm wrote:

This is the flaw of tregchö.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Namdrol said:

<http://rsl-ne.com/abhidharma1.shtml>

dakini_boi said:

Hi Namdrol,

Could you provide the new link for this course? I know I asked you this once before, but I can't seem to find the post. Thanks again.

Malcolm wrote:

That website no longer exists and I no longer have any relationship with that organization or its teacher due to personal differences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I feel the middle way dispenses with dichotomies.

Namdrol said:

Yes, this is why the best thing we can say about the two truths is that they are neither truth nor are they false. Dichotomy resolved.

N

deepbluehum said:

To me this is the two truths as unity of the two truths, aka only one truth, and Dzogchen isn't that special.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, the sole truth in Dzogchen is not the unity of the two truths, because relative truth is only delusion, avidyā. There are no two truths in Dzogchen.

The sole truth in Dzogchen is vidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

But the first paragraph is quite interesting. I was under the impression that matter was a particular type, or case if you prefer, of mind and not the other way around.

Namdrol said:

In Abhidharma yes, matter comes from mind. In Dzogchen, no. Matter comes from the non-recognition of the five lights.

N

Dechen Norbu said:

And mind? The same , no?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind ultimately comes from the ignorance of non-recognition. The ignorance of non-recognition itself is predicated on a dispensible or relative latent awareness that exists at the time of the basis in the basis and is a function of the movement of vāyu or rlung in the basis, the movement that is responsible for the arising of the basis from the basis. When the display of the basis is recognized as being ones own display, that latent awareness becomes prajñā, when it does not, it becomes avidyā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I feel the middle way dispenses with dichotomies.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is why the best thing we can say about the two truths is that they are neither truth nor are they false. Dichotomy resolved.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

But the first paragraph is quite interesting. I was under the impression that matter was a particular type, or case if you prefer, of mind and not the other way around.

Malcolm wrote:

In Abhidharma yes, matter comes from mind. In Dzogchen, no. Matter comes from the non-recognition of the five lights.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

In a real sense, however there is neither mind no matter. Mind and matter are equally produced through non-recognition of the basis i.e. essence, nature and energy.

deepbluehum said:

The essence is emptiness (the middle way). Nature (clarity) and energy (continuous) are also emptiness, let's not forget. There's no unified field of consciousness. So I don't fully agree with "matter is conscious." Nothing is conscious. Consciousness is just an illusion. I think the Dzogchen tantras support my take. Without this key bit, Dzogchen becomes Upanishadic.

Malcolm wrote:

I haven't forgotten.

I did not say there was a unified field of consciousness. Nor is there a unified field of matter.

It is incorret to say nothing is conscious. This is to deny the illusion. The best thing you can say is that consciousness is like a moon in the water, it is neither true nor is it false. But the same goes for matter.

Practically speaking however, ancient Dzogchen tantras and instructions completely

dispense with the lower yāna dichotomy between nāma and rūpa. For example, the Rigpa Rangshar names the vāyu or rlung, that generates consciousness in the body.

So little has been published on the important Dzogchen tantras, that most people (apart from those literate in Tibetan who are not wasting their time translating repetitious sadhanas) really have very little idea what the true position of Dzogchen as a system is regarding this or that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

deepbluehum said:

...but where does the experience beyond words come into play?

Malcolm wrote:

One will not know the definition of vidyā until one has that personal experience or direct perception upon which that knoweledge, vidyā, is predicated. But once one has that knowledge, then the definition will be as obvious to one as the taste of sugar.

The purpose of path of Dzogchen is to discover than knowledge, remove doubts concerning it, and continue in confidence about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes it would be good if Namdrol would clarify this.

But the tantras are different from Dzogchen - this needs to be pointed out.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen tantras are not different from Dzogchen. They define, delineate, explicate and explain Dzogchen since they arise out of the state of realization of Samantabhadra directly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes it would be good if Namdrol would clarify this.

But the tantras are different from Dzogchen - this needs to be pointed out.

deepbluehum said:

He did. Consciousness is a physiological process. You guys have your Philosophy 101 blinders on.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, consciousness arises from the admixture of karmavāyus with the rtsal of rigpa located in the heart.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

To Dechen Norbu:

As Namdrol said: Consciousness is clearly defined in the ancient Dzogchen tantras, as well as seminal instructions such as the Khandro Nyinthig, as a physiological phenomena.

Dechen Norbu said:

I guess it depends on what we consider consciousness, if it has levels and so on and so forth.

If you imply that once the body dies we become unconscious, a la annihilationism, such is not implied by the tantras. But Namdrol can confirm and also refine the terms.

Malcolm wrote:

Matter is conscious. Specifically, the function of consciousness is connected with rlung, the air element. They are actually one and the same. When this body dies, in the bardo a "mental" body is formed out of the air element. In this our stream of afflictions and karmas continues. There is no contradiction between rebirth, and the notion that mind and matter are not two different things. Instead, we must come to understand that minds are a function of matter, and specifically, teachings like Dzogchen (and Vajrayāna to a lesser extent) show this because our liberation is entirely dependent on understanding our physical embodiment, why it happens, how it happens and what to do about it.

In a real sense, however there is neither mind nor matter. Mind and matter are equally produced through non-recognition of the basis i.e. essence, nature and energy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Translators

Content:

heart said:

The question was ... is it a must like JLA considers it.

I guess it is, if you are following the SMS training.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

If you ever wish to get to level II it is. But SMS is not a requirement, for example, AFAIK, Longsal and SMS are not related. SMS is for people who want to have more detailed explanation of the fine points.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes - so no mind/body dualism.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. This is an atavism of the nine yantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: value of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Will said:

So you find little or no usefulness in the 3 stage prajñā of Literary, leading to Contemplative leading to Real Mark prajñā?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, your first category is misleading, śrūti means "hearing" and "listening". It does not mean studying books. To whom should we listen? A person qualified to give teachings. The prajñā that results is called "śrūtamayī prajñā". Without this vital step, no amount of reading books will awaken the prajñā of the path.

Then we have the prajñā that comes from reflection, cintā-mayī prajñā. In my estimation, reading may constitute a part of this prajñā.

Then finally, you have bhāvanā-mayī prajñā, the prajñā born of practice.

But the exercise by some to become expert in the tenet systems of this or that ancient Abidharma schools, for example, or to become expert in pramāṇa, and so on, completely misses the mark of Dharma practice and realization.

I don't say these things idly. I say these things because I observe many people over the years, westerners as well as so called Geshes, Lamas, Khenpos and so on, who, while being quite expert in myriad ancient opinions about this and that fine point of Buddhist philosophy, nevertheless never succeed in integrating the meaning of the Dharma into their personal life. And so for these people, Dharma remains a religion and a culture, rather than a personal experience.

N

-

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

People who are blind at birth do not dream with images - they dream with sounds as long as they were not born deaf. Those that have lost their sight later on in life do dream with images but the images are blurred - not well defined at all.

Malcolm wrote:

And you know this how?

Andrew108 said:

As to Dzogchen - well there is the concept 'Dzogchen' and that is brain-based - what we think we know about Dzogchen. But genuine dharma - genuine dzogchen - it's not a causal vehicle and so we can never 'see' it with the brain - we can never figure it out with the brain - genuine Dzogchen can't be 'drawn' by the brain as a result of analysis (unlike other vehicles). In that sense it escapes us - escapes being brain-based and could be said to be beyond the brain.

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, the differentiation between mind and matter is considered a delusion, as is the differentiation between sentient and non-sentient. Consciousness is clearly defined in the ancient Dzogchen tantras, as well as seminal instructions such as the Khandro Nyinthig, as a physiological phenomena.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 11:44 PM
Title: Re: Translators
Content:

Sönam said:

About retreats ...

- 1) Ordinary preliminaries
- 2) Extrordinary preliminaries
- 3) zhi gnas and lhag mthong ... mental quietness and higher vision.
- 4) bskyed rim ... developping phase on Yidam. Minimum 100 days.
- 5) rdzogs rim ... perfection phase with steng sgo and 'og sgo instructions
- 6) external and internal disjunctions of samsara-nirvana. phyi nang 'khor 'das ru shan dbye ba.
- 7) 3 doors. sgo gsum sbyang ba.
- 8) rig pa'i rtsal dbang. khregs chod.
- 9) more than one retreat on thod rgal.

Sönam

Namdrol said:

This is all covered in SMS training.

dakini_boi said:

In SMS, one actually does the traditional ngondro?

Malcolm wrote:

One to three weeks of each (sans prostrations).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 11:35 PM
Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy
Content:
Will said:

Namdrol, Be more precise, yet please elaborate. Which major texts, if any, have value in stimulating growth in prajna by the student.

Malcolm wrote:

All intellectual studies contribute to defiled prajñā, Buddhist and non-buddhist. But they do not necessarily contribute to undefiled prajñā, the realization of which after all is the point of the Dharma.

So the question should be "which texts contribute to the growth of undefiled prajñā",

and the answer to that, sadly, is none of them, should one's study not be balanced with qualified practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

maybay said:

According to a global swarm of post-history trolls.

Malcolm wrote:

Wow, in my 18 years of being on the internet and participating in internet Buddhist forums, no one has ever accused me of being a troll. First time for everything I guess.

I guess, having studied in detail tenet systems directly in Tibetan according to the presentations of many masters, and having taught Abhidharma and so on, I just don't share the starry eyed idealism some still maintain for elaborate conceptual infrastuctures.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Translators

Content:

Sönam said:

that it is a secondary practice that one practice depending on circumstances, JLA says that a lot of practices are necessary ... as an exemple, in the introduction of "Principes de la pureté primordiale" (on Khenpo Gangshar) he says about Dzogchen (my translation) : "The practitioner which engages in that Path must follows the following cursus of instruction", then follows a list of 9 retreats, some of them quite long, and six must be realized before to be introduced. In those retreats some concerne vajrayana practices (bskyed rim and rdzogs rim).

Sönam

Clarence said:

Sönam,

Would you mind listing the 9 retreats JLA mentions? Also, where can I find Principes de la pureté primordiale? My French isn't perfect but I can get by.

Many thanks, C

Sönam said:

It has been published by les éditions Khyung-Lung which is not on the normal market.

You can ask for the catalog at <mailto:khyunglungeditions@yahoo.com>... this is very private/secret. But it is a very interesting publisher, with many titles.

About retreats ...

- 1) Ordinary preliminaries
- 2) Extrordinary preliminaries
- 3) zhi gnas and lhag mthong ... mental quietness and higher vision.
- 4) bskyed rim ... developping phase on Yidam. Minimum 100 days.
- 5) rdzogs rim ... perfection phase with steng sgo and 'og sgo instructions
- 6) external and internal disjunctions of samsara-nirvana. phyi nang 'khor 'das ru shan dbye ba.
- 7) 3 doors. sgo gsum sbyang ba.
- 8) rig pa'i rtsal dbang. khregs chod.
- 9) more than one retreat on thod rgal.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

This is all covered in SMS training.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 9:17 AM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

Namdrol said:

The idea that calling vidyā "self" will get you to where you want to go.

The purpose of that passage (which is largely cribbed from the cycle connected with the bardo thos grol) is to point out that all these different systems are aimed an discovering the real state. It does not mean that they are all equally successful in their endeavor.

N

deepbluehum said:

I agree. I wasn't saying it was. My take on Shabkar's point is that words cannot be mistaken for the view. Garuda is about Dzogchen obviously. Saying vidya is not going to get you vidya either. Neither will knowing the definition. I'm saying there is wiggle room and you could even use the word "Self" as Saraha did. In that case, he was sort of tongue in cheek, but in context, you get the point of mahamudra. Like that.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you know the actual definition of vidyā, than this means you have that

knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

shel said:

Let me see if I've got this straight. In the relative cause & effect sense there is first cause, but in the absolute sense a first cause makes no sense?

Malcolm wrote:

Ignorance also has a cause, hence there is no first cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

deepbluehum said:

So here, you can call it awareness, self-awareness, or as Shabkar Rinpoche says, even "Self."

Namdrol said:

This is a very common misunderstanding of Shabkar.

deepbluehum said:

A mistranslation?

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that calling vidyā "self" will get you to where you want to go.

The purpose of that passage (which is largely cribbed from the cycle connected with the bardo thos grol) is to point out that all these different systems are aimed at discovering the real state. It does not mean that they are all equally successful in their endeavor.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

deepbluehum said:

So here, you can call it awareness, self-awareness, or as Shabkar Rinpoche says, even "Self."

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very common misunderstanding of Shabkar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

heart said:

There really don't need to be any verbal instruction at all for the direct introduction to take place.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

I do not agree with this in terms of ordinary people.

heart said:

The first time I read that was like 25 years ago in "The crystal and the way of the light" I was a bit chocked, but I have come to accept it fully. Also, sometimes I think that there are no "ordinary" people that are interested in Dzogchen.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

A more clear presentation is presented in song of the vajra book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

kirtu said:

Buddhist philosophy is a description of enlightened view from various perspectives.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is the scat of ancient Buddhist intellectuals trying to understand the meaning of the teachings, and in many cases, unsuccessfully.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- Would be the books from the Hara Krishna written in Vedic or Sanskrit or a mix of both?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahābharata, Ramayāna, etc., these great epics are written classical Sanskrit.

kalden yungdrung said:

- What is then the difference between Vedic Sanskrit and Sanskrit ?

Malcolm wrote:

Vedic Sanskrit is the language the Vedas are written in. These texts are quite ancient, and the brahmins claim they have no author, they are self-manifested.

kalden yungdrung said:

- What is formal Sanskrit?

Malcolm wrote:

It dates from the great classic of Sanskrit grammar written by Pāṇini, sometimes in the 6th century BCE.

kalden yungdrung said:

So when it is understood it well then is there a great difference between Sanskrit and Sanskrit so are the related translations.

Very difficult to get insight into the right translations here due to the many Sanskrit languages.

Malcolm wrote:

The somewhat artificial term "Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit" is the language of the sutras and tantras from India. Most of these tantras have legendary origins in Oḍḍiyāna as well.

kalden yungdrung said:

In case of Indian Dzogchen, understandable that you do prefer Sanskrit instead of Tibetan, because of the exact used Sanskrit terms.

Malcolm wrote:

From an academic point of view, even one believes the Dzogchen tantras were largely written in Tibet rather than India, etc., they articulated the teachings in terms of a terminology predicated on Sanskrit and for example, the Rigpa Rangshar has a whole chapter devoted to terms which are presented in an Indic form, such as dhātu for dbying and so on. Therefore, since these texts clearly reference Sanskrit, key terms are better backtranslated.

In terms of bon texts, I believe it is better to use Kuntuzangpo and rigpa. Also bonku, longku, etc. However, since these terms identical to usage in Buddhism, also there is no fault of the Sanskrit equivalents are used.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

heart said:

There really don't need to be any verbal instruction at all for the direct introduction to take place.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I do not agree with this in terms of ordinary people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

You and the zombification again, Mariusz...

You are being haunted by that idea.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he is big into no reference point, but inexpressibility is not his forté, since he keeps talking on and on using many reference points to talk about no reference points. He'll get over it eventually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Translators

Content:

heart said:

I don't think it is important at all to be scholar when translating Dzogchen texts, but it is very important to receive the Gurus permission and blessing as well as help to resolve difficult issues in the texts. If not it will lack the blessing of the lineage.

The same might be true for Tantric texts.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is very important to be a scholar AND have personal experience (real blessings) in

Dzogchen teachings.

Dzogchen tantras are not easy to translate. They require detailed and fairly comprehensive knowledge of all nine yānas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is not necessary to elevate everything immediately to ultimate truth, unless of course you are trying to shut the conversation down.

Mariusz said:

But it is more not necessary to make division between ultimate truth and conventional truth, since another reference point.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it is not even necessary to mention ultimate truth since it is another reference point.

Checkmate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

steveb1 said:

Please forgive if this issue has been beaten to death around here, but I am looking for a short explanation of the seeming absence of a First Cause in Buddhism.

Namdrol said:

There are no causes that are not also effects.

The Buddhist POV is beginninglessness -- we have not problem with infinite regress, we accept it, in this case.

Dharmakāya is not a cause.

N

Mariusz said:

"beginninglessness"- according to madhyamaka there was never such reference point in the first place. "First Cause" also never was in the first place. The freedom from all these reference points is just called sunyata.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not necessary to elevate everything immediately to ultimate truth, unless of course you are trying to shut the conversation down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

steveb1 said:

Please forgive if this issue has been beaten to death around here, but I am looking for a short explanation of the seeming absence of a First Cause in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no causes that are not also effects.

The Buddhist POV is beginninglessness -- we have not problem with infinite regress, we accept it, in this case.

Dharmakāya is not a cause.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 7:24 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

When i understood it well then is seeing with an object and subject not seeing the Natural State.

This because the dualisms are not integrated by the Natural State, whereas the Natural State does encompass everything.

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not "seeing" with a subject and object that is a problem. It is attachment to the same as a discrete or real subject and object that is the problem.

When you eyes sees, it sees an object. This is not a problem for as long you are do not reify this as a discrete subject and object.

People are really confused about this because of a) a poor understanding of Yogacara

(mind only) b) confusing Advaita with Buddhist non-dualism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 7:21 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- Are these Tantras who are written in Apabrahmsa of Vedic origin?
- Mention please some of those Apabrahmsa Tantras and the author.

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Large sections of Buddhist sutras and Tantras, such as Hevajra, are in a kind of mixed Sanskrit and Apabhramsa.

No Vedic text is in anything other than Sanskrit. Vedic = Vedic Sanskrit.

Buddhist mahayāna sutras of the classical period also show plenty of evidence of being adapted from local dialects and being rewritten or worked out of Indic dialects into a more formal Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 6:58 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Yes if we take the advice from Lopon Tenzin Namdak serious and take Tibetan language for Tibetan Dzogchen.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

But of course, in practice, also Bonpos use the terms dharmakāya for bon sku, etc. Bon = Chos, Chos = Dharma, Dharma = Bon.

And there is no "Tibetan Dzogchen" per se. All Dzogchen teachings come from lands other than Tibet. Including Zhang Zhung Nyen Gyud. Taphihritsa is not a Tibetan name.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 6:50 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Sönam said:

In the case of Dzogchen terms, they originated from Oddiyana, not India ... Vimalamitra and other pandits went to see Garab Dorje from Nalanda. So is it not better to use Tibetan words?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, since in the titles of the seventeen man ngag sde tantras we find that rigpa is the translation for vidyā, just as byang chub sems is the translation for bodhicitta in the titles of sems sde tantras.

Further, Oddiyāna language is not a distant cousin to Sanskrit, quite the opposite, in Oddiyāna as well, Sanskrit was the language of scholars. Oddiyāna language is a kind of dialect of the Indic language spoken in the that region.

Large numbers of tantras originating in India are not in Sanskrit, properly speaking, but have sections which are in Apabrahmsa, which is a kind of dialect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Namdrol said:

That is why I just use vidyā in the same way that we use dharmakāya, etc.

Sönam said:

If you use vidyā, why can't we simply use rigpa then, and forget all that discussion? ... anyway rigpa/vidyā has only an interest for those who know about.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

One can, but in my translations, when I must use a dharma term, I prefer the Sanskrit original to the Tibetan if possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Yes the term Rigpa, is a very difficult word to translate, sure when it is related to

awareness.

Also is it clear that Rigpa could also be intelligence, that was also one of my earlier suggestion.

Namdrol said:

In my opinion, translating rigpa as "awareness" is simply wrong. Intelligence is also not good, again IMO.

In this case, knowledge is best. Why? Because rigpa is opposite to ma rig pa. Knowledge is the opposite of ignorance.

N

Adamantine said:

Knowledge has a connotation of the conceptual, or merely factual. This is most likely due to it's common usage, but it still sticks. I think because of this it is a bit tainted for use as a translation for Rigpa.

Also, I would propose that the timeless quality of Rigpa would be better served by the term "knowing" than "knowledge", as knowledge also has a connotation of a static quality of an object or subject known by the mind. Maybe a conditional of "non-conceptual knowing" would be better, -- but then, look at the definition of intuition from Merriam Webster : direct perception of truth, fact, etc., independent of any reasoning process; immediate apprehension. This does seem to fit better, however it has it's own connotations due to common usage that could cause other misunderstandings.

Malcolm wrote:

That is why I just use vidyā in the same way that we use dharmakāya, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 29th, 2012 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

alpha said:

Tsal, rolpa, and gdang refer to what the practitioner is able to experience. Tsal is at the nirnanakāya level, which mean it can be observed by ordinary people.

Malcolm wrote:

i'm sorry but i don't understand how this relates to my question .
what is the relationship between rolpa and sambhogakaya?[/quote]

Rolpa is the energy of the base at the Sambhogakāya level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 29th, 2012 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, not at all. Rolpa is always internal, never external.

alpha said:

Yeah...sorry.I didnt formuate the question in the right way.I didnt mean to say that tsal is becoming rolpa and rolpa remains external .

And would it be accurate to say that at the moment of rolpa the field of sambogakaya is being actualized ?

Malcolm wrote:

Tsal, rolpa, and gdang refer to what the practitioner is able to experience. Tsal is at the nirnanakāya level, which mean it can be observed by ordinary people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 29th, 2012 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Causes and conditions. That's where we are.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But we don't have to remain there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 29th, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

what is "dependent arising" if not causality? "When this arises, that arises. When this subsides, that subsides". Either the one arising causes the other, or they are completely unrelated. If caused, what is the mechanism? If unrelated, then whence karma, rebirth, and other core Buddhist doctrines? If oak trees do not arise from maple seeds, then theres still something governing the illusory manifestations, and they are not arbitrary. Since this is the case, again, what is the mechanism, if not causality?

Malcolm wrote:

Relatively speaking, cause and effect are neither the same nor are they different. If they are the same, this is a problem, if they are different, this is a problem -- the sole solution and the one advanced by Candrakirti, et al in commenting on MMK is the one I just mentioned.

Anyway, cause and condition are thoroughly deconstructed in MMK 1.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

alpha said:

But you have to agree that this is how lots of teachers instruct their students by giving them directions of how the knowledge can turn on itself.

Malcolm wrote:

I have never heard my teachers (ChNN, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa) say anything like this ever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

alpha said:

"Oneself encountering oneself" or "like is likewise liberated by like" can be seen only if one has familiarity with the limitless or boundless aspect of mind and its knowing quality.

The knowing then can turn on itself and the display is recognized as oneself.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the whole point that no one gets e.g. knowing does not need to turn in on itself.

This is a hangover from the idea of *svasaṃvedana* (rang rig) used in Buddhist logic. That step of knowing turning in on itself is not needed, in fact, it is a deviation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

who is closest to appearance-only than mind-only when they deny external objects?

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that we do not posit some substratum like the ālayavijñāna to account for those appearances. Nor are we denying the appearance of external objects. We are merely stating the obvious i.e. that those appearances are not real, and hence are completely equivalent with illusions. The charge of nihilism is not appropriate because we are not denying appearances. The charge of eternalism is not appropriate because those unreal appearances cannot be found on analysis. We are saying that appearances are not false, because they appear, but they are not true, because they cannot be found, just like the appearance of a moon in the water. We are saying that all phenomena are like that. Similarly illusions too are not false, because the elephants, and so on of the illusion appear, but they are not true, because when examined they cannot be found. This approach to the two truths is called the upadesha transmission of Madhyamaka. It is much superior to the Madhyamaka of analysis which is focused on rejecting wrong views of the lower tenet systems.

In fact, according to Rongzom, the purpose of the affirming negation is reject the views of an opponent, while affirming your own, in the form of a proof. The purpose of the non-affirming negation is merely to eliminate the point of view of an opponent.

Madhyamaka only has non-affirming negations, and does not make use of affirming negations at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

alpha said:

This is what is being said in Golden letters in the commentary on the first statement "Whatever may arise ,appearing as external phenomena to the individual,is merely one's own internal state of existence manifesting externally ,that is to say ,it is merely the potentiality or creative energy of awareness becoming visible to the individual".

Is this what you are saying?

Malcolm wrote:

" Oneself encountering oneself (For example, just as one encounters people of the same language in some country of a different language, one is recognized, when anger is recognized, it is liberated) is the self-sufficient power (Therefore, like is likewise liberated by like, there is no other antidote) of whatever appears being oneself (A phenomena that is otherwise cannot be found elsewhere)."

This is my rendering of the same passage, not having examined Reynold's version. It sticks very closely to the Tibetan, and has the added advantage of including the interlinear footnotes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

To be in the Natural State = to experience or be aware of these creations of Lights, sounds and rays.

Noisiness would mean here the inner sounds as well the outer sounds.

The outer things are reflected on the crystal, without disturbing the crystal.

The inner things are emanating from the potential of the crystal to create.

Mutsog Marro

KY[/color]

alpha said:

How can anything be thought of being internal or external while in rigpa?

My understanding is that while in rigpa the appearances cannot be thought of being separate from knowing or clarity.

Malcolm wrote:

Rig pa means knowing appearances as your own state. Ma rig is ignorance of this fact. But rig pa is not a type of solipsism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Again see above i doubt that really. If above mentioned persons were not academics of such a high degree then i would agree.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, I am very underwhelmed by academic scholars, especially European ones. I find European Academia very rigid and prejudiced. It is very hard in European Academia to be taken seriously if you are a practitioner.

kalden yungdrung said:

Bonpos have so their translators and they are many. Most of them have a western title Phd / prof. so it is not only John who does the job.

Malcolm wrote:

"PhD" does not mean very much to me. It is just a title for getting a job. I have meant many PhD's in Buddhist studies from Harvard and so on who are not very learned about Buddhism in general. They are learned in writing papers, much of which is filled with crap.

kalden yungdrung said:

English would be a combination of French and German when i understood that well. In German one can express oneself also very exact.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, German is a very precise language, and in some respects is better for translating Tibetan texts than English because both languages are agglutinative. Also German can reproduce the subject-object-verb structure of Tibetan quite well, whereas English cannot.

Nevertheless, since English is forged out Anglo-Saxon, French, Latin and Greek, and easily absorbs terms from other languages such as nirvana, samsara, etc. In my opinion, since English is now the international language of advanced scholarship, this proves that English is the best language to translation Dharma texts into, all thanks to the British Empire, Britannia Rule the Waves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 7:16 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Jean-Luc Achard is a native french speaking person and his English is praised by prof. Henk Blezer of university Leiden (NL). It is a pity that he is not here present aboard.

Malcolm wrote:

I welcome JLA's presence. I respect him a lot. I don't know Hank Blezer, but I am rather unimpressed by a lot of his writing, specifically on Tibetan medicine (something about which I definitely know more since I am a trained sman pa). Also Henk Blezer is not a native English speaker.

kalden yungdrung said:

Indeed the translations in English out of Tibetan from Jean-Luc Achard do belong to the best Tibetan translations.

Malcolm wrote:

JLA has some funny translation equivalents that I think are odd, but in general he understands the meaning of Dzogchen texts.

kalden yungdrung said:

So it is not true that you as a native English speaking person, together of course linked to your education, would be better in English translations than a Frenchman like Jean Luc Achard from the Sorbonne / Paris. You would probably have a better accent then JLA, i guess.

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone translating into their own native language will do better than someone who is not.

kalden yungdrung said:

But nevertheless, i would point out the necessity for a standard, for Dzogchen terms. This because we deal here with exact the same experiences.....

Malcolm wrote:

That is not going to happen anytime soon. Dzogchen Community uses its jargon following ChNN and Adriano Clemente; Padma Publishing has their jargon; Rangjung Yeshe has its jargon; Tony Duff has his (awkward) jargon; Dharmacakra Translation committee has its; You Bonpos have yours following John Reynolds primarily as far as I can see, etc.

kalden yungdrung said:

One can never add or subtract things related to Dzogchen, that is clear. So i guess it is due to the English language shortcomings, that we explain the same things with different words, or we make a mistake with the right following order of Dzogchen experiences.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no shortcoming in the English language. Actually, English, being the European language with the highest number of synonyms, the most heterogenous language in Europe, is the most ideal for translations, especially translations of a technical nature because it is rigid about word order in way that Romance and Tuetonic languages are not.

Further, even within Dzogchen literature, the same things are explained with different terminology. The personal experience of Dzogchen is vastly more important than the words.

kalden yungdrung said:

It shows that Dzogchen can be approached on different ways explained by different Dzogchen Masters.

Malcolm wrote:

What I observe is that for the most part the language this or that master uses depends on who they get as a translator and when. These days, none of Reynolds' conventions are in vogue in Dzogchen Community.

A lot of ChNN's translations of terms depend in the fact that he started teaching Dzogchen in Italian first, and then merely translated his Italian translations into English, for example, lhun grup in Italian is autoperfezione or self-perfection in English.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 11:06 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

it would be like saying the cake does not truly exist.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you saying the cake truly exists?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

What do you think about the qualities of our Yongdzin Rinpoche?

Malcolm wrote:

I only met him once, and never took teachings from him, but he is a great master.

kalden yungdrung said:

He is assisted by many very well learned people who have a university degree, and some of them can translate Tibetan very well like Jean Luc Achard, Donatelli, Snellgrove, Ermakovi, John Reynolds etc. and they all make the same translations about self awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Achard, Donatelli, and Ermakovi are not native English speakers (as you are not); Snellgrove is ancient, his book on Bon is 50 years old before people had any understanding of the nuances of Dzogchen, and Reynolds too was educated in the 60's and has habits which persist from that era.

N

kalden yungdrung said:

i guess there are persons around Lopon Tenzin Namdak who can translate Tibetan as well as you do or even maybe better.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but I will stand by my opinion. You and I have gone back and forth on this one too many times. It is not useful. So we will agree to disagree.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Did Xuanzang meet Candrakīrti?

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

Nope. Anyway, at this point in my life, I find all this Buddhist philosophy boring and don't take it very seriously anymore. It was a useful tool, but eventually it is a distraction. I am curious. Do you mean academically rationalizing the activity of meditation and the insights of meditation - or programmatic or thematic meditations altogether, (bhavanakrama).

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, what I mean is that Buddhist Philosophy and tenet systems is pretty much a dry hump. It does not lead anywhere. In the end it is merely dry intellectualization divorced from personal experience.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

and so I do. And I can explain their existence. They exist by way of mental imputation, as because of this, there is no need to assert independence.

Namdrol said:

Then there is no difference between fire circles and firebrands since they both depend on mental imputation.

Mate in one move.

cloudburst said:

correct, no difference in terms of the ultimate.

Conventionally, big big difference.

mustn't advise sentient beings that drinking mirage water and actual water are same

Malcolm wrote:

But since conventional imputations are deluded by definition, it is only from the point of view of the deluded that mirage water and "water" are different.

Checkmate.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Did Xuanzang meet Candrakirti?

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

based on Atisha's praise of Candrakirti's works as the sole path to liberation

I stand corrected! :)

... although I hope I can suggest Atisha's praise of Candrakirti doesn't mean I am to be shunned as an icchantika!

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Anyway, at this point in my life, I find all this Buddhist philosophy boring and don't take it very seriously anymore. It was a useful tool, but eventually it is a distraction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

and so I do. And I can explain their existence. They exist by way of mental imputation, as because of this, there is no need to assert independence.

Malcolm wrote:

Then there is no difference between fire circles and firebrands since they both depend on mental imputation.

Mate in one move.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Did Xuanzang meet Candrakīrti?

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

DON'T FORGET: Candrakīrti was made famous because it was a keystone of the State Religion in Tibet much later. And Tibetan literature was translated and printed by the USA because it annoyed the Chines with whom we were in a Cold War.)

Malcolm wrote:

No, Candrakīrti was made famous in Tibet because of the clarity of his presentation of Madhyamaka and the fact that his works superceded those of Bhavaviveka as the dominant voice in Madhyamaka from the 12th century onwards based on Atisha's praise of Candrakīrti's works as the sole path to liberation in the eleventh century.

It is most likely that Candrakīrti lived between 600-650.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Did Xuanzang meet Candrakīrti?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakīrti was a rather late, much later than Xuanzang -- Candrakīrti was a contemporary of Candragomin.

Leo Rivers said:

Xuanzang and Candrakīrti?

Nalanda was actually a University - meaning it consisted of colleges - and within a college students would cluster around a teacher in a department who was department-head or a popular "thesis adviser".

The way teachers became famous was to defeat a rival philosophy in a debate that was famous because it upheld the reputation of the School.

NEXT, a biography must survive relating a teacher's "wins" in debates. Xuanzang's debate at Nalanda survived because he defended the Yogacara which met applause in its contemporary context and was later supported by later rich patron who paid to have books telling us about it printed.

Xuanzang's Biography largely survived because Xuanzang had state support in China. That's why his debates with Kumarajiva are known. (Wriggens, p. 30) And it is important "he defeated all challengers (ibid, page 53) - I think a draw is passed over in silence.

It seems Dharmapala's reputation at Nalanda rested on his effectiveness at calming down Madhyamaka/Yogacara tensions by offering reconciling Views, "(Lausthaus, page 403-405), as per his commentary on Aryadeva's Sataka sastra which is Dharmapala's refutation of Bhavavivika's Maddyamaka critique of Yogacara.

The Yogacarabhumi is the reason Hsuan Tzang went to India. It was this defense of Dharmapala's that actually makes its appearance in his own Ch'eng Wei-shin lun of Dharmapala's works.

Candrakīrti was against this spirit of the times at Nalanda. (my guess). Why?

Dharmapala was the was trained by Silabhadra who taught Yogacara to Hsuan Tzang. (Wriggens, page 131)

It may be Candrakīrti was most active subsequently to Hsuan Tzang, (this seems the implication from Lausthaus, page 412, and his opinion on page 447) He doesn't appear in Wriggin's index.

SO I believe Candrakīrti may have met with some disapproval at Nalanda - Candrakīrti was at odds with the 'spirit of the day' at Nalanda. Candrakīrti was made famous TO US by voicing the State Religion position in Tibet much later.)

Lausthaus, D., 2003. Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogacara Buddhism and the Ch'eng Wei-shih Lun, RoutledgeCurzon.

Wriggens, S., 2003. The Silk Road Journey With Xuanzang, Basic Books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 7:21 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

Anders Honore said:

I see a lot of talk here about the status of phenomena, whether they lack essence, can be accurately cognised, and so forth, which to me looks like a kind of pseudo-ontology.

Malcolm wrote:

This is primarily a result of Tsongkhapa's over-intellectualization of Madhyamaka and his inability to differentiate between Candrakīrti's POV and Bhavaviveka's, and his ideological commitment to the superiority of Candrakīrti's presentation.

The idea that Candra's presentation is superior to Bhava's is not unique, but what is

unique is Tsongkhapa's simultaneous commitment to the language of logic as a tool to explain Madhyamaka, and as a result we see strange formulations such as "Prasangikas" do not refute valid cognizers and so on, when in fact they clearly do. In point of fact, that Prasangikas who do not reject valid cognizers are only the followers of Tsongkhapa. The rest, from Candrakirti, to Jayananda, and so on, do refute them.

Also, Buddhist logic never made significant inroads into Chinese philosophy, so much of this talk about valid cognition and so on would sound foreign to a Chinese Buddhist. But because of the trenchant polemics in India between Buddhists and non-Buddhists, there was much discussion of valid cognition and what entailed, since the whole field of pramana was adopted by the Buddhists defensively.

However, during the time of Nagarjuna there was no well developed school of Buddhist logic, and so we see in texts like Vigrahavyavartani a thorough rejection of the whole notion of valid cognizers since in the end the notion of a valid cognition depends on notions of inherency. So naturally the Chinese were not that interested.

However, in response to non-Buddhists, Vasubandhu began to articulate the first epistemological responses to non-Buddhist criticism, his disciple, Dignaga, formulated the foundations and Buddhist pramana, Dharmakirti elaborated it, and the rest is history. Pramana came to be regarded as one of the Panca Vidya, the five sciences with its understandable impact on Tibetan Buddhism.

Of course in Dzogchen, the principle is not the two truths, but simple vidyā and avidyā. By comparison, there is only one truth in Dzogchen teachings, vidyā. The rest, falling under the heading of avidyā (ignorance) is fundamentally false — for example, in the same way that a jaundiced man sees everything as yellow, those who suffering from the jaundice of ignorance never see things as they truly are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 7:04 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

mmm said:

to cone: In kama dzogchen semde contains 18 rigpai calwang, longde contains vajra bridge and mengngagde empowerment of 17 tantras, which is by nature given in rather tantric style. In Dupa Do there seems to be different ways of giving it. e.g. Trulshik Rinpoche gave a specific empowerment name for each of the 9 yanas wang are contained in it, also it took one day for one yana. For practise they say Narag Tongdrug contains the essence of all. Or just Vajrasattva single form. Something like this is given also to keep the blessing of the whole cycle. good luck, mmm

Pero said:

So the entire initiation lasts 9 days?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is a very long initiation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 6:41 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Maybe in additon, handy to read this link:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=78&t=8052>"
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I frankly disagree with calling rang rig self-awareness for a number of reasons, not least of which I am a native English speaker, and understand the nuances of English better than LTN.

But in the end, if one has understood what rang rig actually is, that is more important than the word that we use for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

is an image of you savaging a straw man. Prasnaṅgikas never refute valid cognition, although they do strongly and continuously refute intrinsic existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Nagārajuna refutes valid cognition in the Vīṅśatikāśāstra. Since he does not accept it, ergo, neither does Madhyamaka in general.

Namdrol said:

You may say, for example, that "the cognition of the firebrand as unreal is a valid cognition".

Malcolm wrote:

This is one type of valid cognition

Namdrol said:

This is sloppy reasoning. In this case we may define one type of valid cognition as the cognition of the unreality of phenomena. There may be other valid cognitions that apprehend conventions whose ultimate nature is unreality.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you must admit that valid objects exist. Then you must explain their existence. This can only be done if you accept independent existence.

Namdrol said:

Hence we can state without error that all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions, as it is proved eloquently by Rongzom Chökyi Pandita.

Rongzom got it wrong. Present his case and we'll pull that apart also. I've read the Koppl book,

Malcolm wrote:

I have not read her book. But I have read Rongzom.

Namdrol said:

This may be frightening to those who cling to notions of relative and ultimate truth.

I do find your reasoning frightening, but not because I cling to any such notions, though I do uphold them, as did all the great Madhyamikas, esp Buddha Shakyamuni. The really frightening bit is where you abandon the Madhyamaka by abandoning the two truths. Or do you? Perhaps you accept the two truths in a way that is free from clinging?

Malcolm wrote:

"Since the jinas have stated nirvana is the sole truth, at that time, what wise person would think 'the rest is not the opposite'."

-- Yuktiṣaṣṭika

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

In your example, the firebrand is appearing but unreal, but it appears to a valid mind, free from causes of error. The circle is simply non-existent, the mind to which it appears is a wrong awareness. You are equivocating sir.

Malcolm wrote:

If you assert that the mind apprehending the firebrand is valid, you must also have a valid object of cognition. This requires the prameya, the object of a valid cognition, which bears intrinsic characteristics from its own side; it must be a valid object prior to its apprehension.

In order to have a valid cognition (pramana) there must be a prameya. But if you claim, as you have, that even the fire brand is unreal, you have eliminated the basis for your claim that a mind that apprehends it can be valid since the definition of a valid cognition depends on the apprehension of a valid object — a firebrand is not such an object, since you admit it is unreal.

If a valid cognition is valid, it must be valid intrinsically, in which case it needs not depend on a valid object of cognition. Likewise, a valid object of cognition must be intrinsically valid in its own right, independently of a valid cognition. In which case, all minds apprehending valid objects are valid, just as all objects apprehended by a valid cognition must be valid. Since this is so, the whole basis of your argument from the point of view of pramana fails, because you cannot establish the verity of valid cognition to begin with, and certainly there cannot be a valid cognition of something unreal free from error.

You may say, for example, that "the cognition of the firebrand as unreal is a valid cognition". This only works if you admit that all phenomena which are apprehensible by a valid cognition are unreal as well. In this case you are forced to define a valid cognition as the cognition of the unreality of phenomena. For that reason then, there is no good reason to make a distinction between phenomena such as fire circles, apparent, yet unreal; and fire brands, equally apparent, yet unreal. Hence we can state without error that all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions, as it is proved eloquently by Rongzom Chökyi Pandita.

This may be frightening to those who cling to notions of relative and ultimate truth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Kilaya. said:

I find the melody of the DC Sang practice too complicated, so I simply recite the verses.
Is that okay?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not that complicated at all, but it is a Tibetan cadence so a bit hard to follow for Westerners. Often what I do it refresh my memory once by hearing a bit fo the cd before I do Rinpoche's sang. Otherwise, I use Riwo Sangchö which I know quite well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 10:54 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

Namdrol gave the example of the stick with fire, spinning and forming an illusion of a circle.

can you hold the circle? no. illusion.

can you hold the stick? yes. not an illusion.

.

Namdrol said:

If you say the fire circle is illusory because it arises from the cause and condition of whirling a fire brand, for what reason is the fire brand not illusory, since it too arises from causes and conditions?

cloudburst said:

It is not said that the circle is an illusion becasue it arises from causes and conditions, it is said becasue there is no circle. The fire brand is not illusory because there is a firebrand.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a circle when it appears, because causes and conditions to produce that circle are present; likewise, when the causes and conditions of a firebrand exist a firebrand appears. In this way we can understand that all phenomena are equally and totally illusory because no phenomenon can appear in absence of causes and conditions for that phenomenon's appearance regardless of whether it is a fire circle or a fire brand.

Illusory means "apparent, yet unreal". So to, all phenomena are apparent, yet unreal.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community webcasts and Buddhist symbols

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Yes, I'm not really serious about any of this, before I get shouted at

I'm more poking fun at my own love of garish Vajrayana displays that show more gold than Fort Knox and the Kardashians together.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, Nouveau Riche Dharma.

A temple outfitted by Carmella Soprano.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community webcasts and Buddhist symbols

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I for one prefer a clean look.

alpha said:

i am kind of the same.

my so called shrine is a board on which i pinned various deity images to help with visualization during tun or any other DC practices. And at the base of this board i have 2 candles and incense.

mindyourmind said:

Nah, I like my teachings with all the gold and brocade you can pile on, incense, flowers and more colour than at a Liberace concert, a true tarted-up show, bells and whistles, statues and thankas in and on every surface, and then some.

Malcolm wrote:

In Merigar, all the surfaces of the Gumpa are painted -- all the deities are on the ends of the beams supporting the roof, and the ceiling is painted with the Song of the Vajra and the mantras of the Twenty Five Thigles. On the moulding between ceiling and wall are beautiful murals of the important masters of Dzogchen in Bon, Nyingma, Sakya, Kagyu and Gelug as well as major tertons, and the above his own throne is a mural of the thirteen primordial masters of Dzogchen from Nangawa Dampa down to Shakyamuni Buddha and Garab Dorje, as well as Samantabhadra and Vajrasattva.

But because most of the walls are floor to ceiling glass, there is no wall space for Thangkas.

In the Tsegylgar Gumpa we have all these huge Thangkas of Ekajati, Guru Rinpoche and three roots, Garab Dorje and Thirteen Primordial, Masters Gomadevi and so on.

So it is all based on circumstances.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community webcasts and Buddhist symbols

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

My point is simply that advanced practitioners simply do not need images, offering bowls and rupas and that the presence of these objects is for the disciples, not for the Guru or any Buddha.

mindyourmind said:

So there are no disciples at these webcasts?

Malcolm wrote:

MYM, if you look at pictures of retreats, there is always a shrine the necessary things, rupa, stupa, dharma text, and offerings. In Merigar, there is a more elaborate shrine, but still by comparison it is sparse by normal Tibetan Buddhist standards. ChNN cannot carry a shrine with him everywhere, and moreover, many times the retreats are in public venues because they can be quite well attended, sometimes 1000 people or more. So it is a little impossible to go over the top with elaborate thrones and so on on the road. ChNN likes to travel light.

But if you like that sort of thing, his throne in Merigar, his main seat is beautiful.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Navayana Buddhism

Content:

nowheat said:

for example in saying that if dukkha includes physical pain, then one can't be totally free of dukkha till after that last death

Malcolm wrote:

When free of clinging, then one is free of dukkha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

Namdrol gave the example of the stick with fire, spinning and forming an illusion of a circle.

can you hold the circle? no. illusion.

can you hold the stick? yes. not an illusion.

.

Malcolm wrote:

If you say the fire circle is illusory because it arises from the cause and condition of whirling a fire brand, for what reason is the fire brand not illusory, since it too arises from causes and conditions?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 7:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community webcasts and Buddhist symbols

Content:

mindyourmind said:

but I for one would like to see these teachings sometimes being presented in a slightly more traditional setting.

Malcolm wrote:

When Vidyadharas presented teachings, they rarely did so in elaborate temples and shrines. Garab Dorje for example taught in a charnel ground, not in an elegant temple. I doubt very much he had a statue of Shakyamuni.

So what could be more traditional than that?

That said, at most teachings there is a streamlined shrine with a statue of Buddha or Guru Rinpoche with water offerings, candles, incense and tormas -- as PR just mentioned it is generally off camera.

But according to ChNN -- the only thing that is really essential in a shrine for a Dzogchen practitioner is a candle or light and incense (as an offering to the protectors, etc.). In my case, also I have a few symbols in our practice room, peacock feather, crystal, melong, small stupa, statue of Guru P, small thankga of Drollo. Very, very simple and sparse.

Often ChNN mentions that in this day and age it is important not to draw attention to oneself. So for example he says it is sufficient to have a white A in a thigle of five colors framed like an art print on one wall (with candle and incense burner nearby). Then this

seems to ordinary people, non-practitioners like art.

So ChNN says it is important not to make oneself a target. We do not need to show anyone we are practitioners. We do not need to have any statues of Buddha, Padmasambhava, etc. at all. Of course if we have the possibility to have a more elaborate shrine, than it is fine. But it is completely unnecessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 6:38 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

conebeckham said:

So, my understanding is that the Guhyagarbha is the crucial Kama transmission for Mahayoga Tantra practice. This Dupa Do is the crucial Kama transmission for Anuyoga Tantra practice. Is there a "Kama" transmission for Ati, as well? Khandro Nyingthik, if I am not mistaken, is Terma, and Menngakde level of Ati, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Most seems sde, virtually all klong sde and the Vima Nyinthig (despite the fact that it contains many terms of Chetsun Senge Wangchuck) along with the seventeen tanzas are Kama.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Blog (formerly Dzogchen World)...

Content:

mzaur said:

Yeah i'm not particularly sure why it's only for current members

Malcolm wrote:

Because it shows your commitment to Dzogchen Community.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Namdrol said:

Rigpa comes from recognition and is based on recognition.

gregkavarnos said:

But surely recognition necessitates a mediation. I mean there has to be something

recognised and a recogniser, right? In which case it all goes down the tubes again. I guess we can put it down to the shortcomings of language.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-dual in Dzogchen does not discount a subject and an object. It is just that subject and object are non-dual. So when you recognize your primordial state, you are recognizing your own face, as it were.

The term "recognize" is used over and over again in Dzogchen texts. It is an experiential unmediated direct recognition. That recognition is the basis for your knowledge/knowing/vidyā. Without that recognition, you are in a state of ignorance/āvidya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Dronma said:

Sometimes, English scholars are using the Greek term Gnosis for indicating Rigpa in a more fancy way, which is wrong as I have posted in many threads before.

Because gnosis means knowledge. As Greek, I would never say that Rigpa is Gnosis (Γνώσις). But I would say that Rigpa is Anagnorisis (Αναγνώρισις), which includes etymologically the root of the term Gnosis in it, but it is more specific and can be translated in English as Recognition.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa comes from recognition and is based on recognition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

mzaur said:

Thank you for clarifying. So this knowledge is not a thought... it's a non-conceptual knowing. Right? I guess what confused me was that I see knowledge as having thoughts about a certain topic.

Malcolm wrote:

It is direct perception and the knowledge that results from that direct perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

mzaur said:

Knowledge sounds so abstract. Like, I have a lot of knowledge about computers. How do I rest in that knowledge? I guess I don't understand what you mean by knowledge. Language is tricky.

To use your example of a job well done. Ok, so I 'know' I did a job well done because I have the thought, 'wow I did a great job' and the feeling of relief, satisfaction, etc.. so there is a thought and a feeling.. and you rest in that?

Malcolm wrote:

It means you rest in the knowledge you discovered through a direct perception of your own state, your primordial state. One you have this knowledge, that's it. And yes there is relief and satisfaction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Thanks for the clarification. That's the way I've always seen it. An elite club for the high capacity.

Mr. G said:

Namdrol clarifies the idea of capacity here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=4002&p=38072#p38072> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Capacity depends on personal interest and diligence -- nothing more.

Malcolm wrote:

Diligence means you concretely apply what you were interested to learn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Namdrol said:

Look, The Yangzab is a supplement of the Khandro Nyinthig, in some sense the Gongpa Zangthal is a supplement to the Khandro Nyinthig, etc., there are many termas that are considered to be supplements or in some way related to the KN because they are all based primarily on the klong gsal tantra and take Hayagriva and Vajrayogini Yab Yum as the main yidam of the practice.

But the Khandro Nyinthig is the first, and other termas are not the Khandro Nyinthig.

Mariusz said:

I'm not sure only about: "Khandro Nyinthig is the first, and other termas are not the Khandro Nyinthig". Since it was from dakini script of Yeshe Tsogyal. But I will ask for it when the time comes to confirm it. Nevertheless it deals with KN as you also wrote here.

Malcolm wrote:

Many termas are held to have been written down by Yeshe Tsogyal, are they all the Khandro Nyinthig? No.

The Khandro Nyinthig is a specific teaching, with a specific history, and a specific time it was supposed to have been revealed by a specific tertön at a specific place. The same is true of the Kunzang Gongdu. I do not think that most people will accept that if you received the empowerment for the Khandro Nyinthig/Yangthig that you have received the empowerment for the Kunzang Gongdu as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Mariusz said:

Since Khandro Yangtig is a supplement, so is Kunzang Gongdu.

Malcolm wrote:

It was not mine. Ask Rinpoche. [/quote]

Look, The Yangzab is a supplement of the Khandro Nyinthig, in some sense the Gongpa Zangthal is a supplement to the Khandro Nyinthig, etc., there are many termas that are considered to be supplements or in some way related to the KN because they are all based primarily on the klong gsal tantra and take Hayagriva and Vajrayogini Yab Yum as the main yidam of the practice.

But the Khandro Nyinthig is the first, and other termas are not the Khandro Nyinthig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 10:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Blog (formerly Dzogchen World)...

Content:

mzaur said:

Is this it? <https://dzogchen.tumblr.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

http://dzogchenworld.ning.com/?xg_source=msg_invite_net "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Yes the term Rigpa, is a very difficult word to translate, sure when it is related to awareness.

Also is it clear that Rigpa could also be intelligence, that was also one of my earlier suggestion.

Namdrol said:

In my opinion, translating rigpa as "awareness" is simply wrong. Intelligence is also not good, again IMO.

In this case, knowledge is best. Why? Because rigpa is opposite to ma rig pa. Knowledge is the opposite of ignorance.

N

mzaur said:

Could you please explain then how "rest in rigpa" makes sense? How do you rest in knowledge?

Malcolm wrote:

"He rested in the knowledge of a job well done..."

"He rested in his knowledge of the basis...."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, the Kunzang Gondu is a completely different cycle. Yes, of course it is related to Khandro Nyinthig, since it, like the Khandro Nyinthig is rooted in the klong gsal nyi ma bar ma rgyud.

But specifically the Khandro Khandro Nyinthig is the terma of Tulku Tsultrim Dorje. The

Khandro Yantig is the supplement to this by Longchenpa. Since Peme Lingpa is considered the tulku of Longchenpa, for this reason the Kunzang Gongdu is considered to be a further supplement to teh Khandro Nyinthig -- but it is not the Khandro Nyinthig which is only two volumes long and between the Khandro Nyinthig and Yanthig, there is only one empowerment composed by Longchenpa based on teh root texts of the Khandro Nyinthig.

Mariusz said:

It is said Longchenpa during his visit in Bhutan discovered the terma but buried it again. Pema Lingpa discovered it later again. So it is not the supplement. Kunzang Gondu "is more on Khandro Nyinthig".

Malcolm wrote:

Since Khandro Yangtig is a supplement, so is Kunzang Gondu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 3:28 AM

Title: Dzogchen Blog (formerly Dzogchen World)...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

..is back up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Mariusz said:

Rinpoche gave the dzogchen cycle of initiations four or three years ago in Darnkow, Poland, but as I talked with some person it was not the full cycle. Another Rinpoche from Bhutan <http://yeshekhlorlo.mahajana.net/wp-content/gallery/materialy/awers.jpg> gave the full cycle of initiations of Khando Nyinthig in 2009 during 2 weeks.

Pero said:

Says Kunzang Gongdu, not Khandro Nyingthig. In any case, I wish there was some mailing list for these events in Europe or something.

Mariusz said:

Kunzang Gongdu Kundu, "The Totality of Samantabhadra Enlightened Intentions" is bhutanese complete terma of Khandro Nyinthig, and it also cantains other teachings like Anuyoga tsalung and tummo. Pema Linga was the one of the 5 main tertons and also the one who was the incarnation of Longchenpa up to Princess Pemasel. If you look in bio of HH Dudjom Rinpoche it was one of His main transmissions He gave, also to Bhutan.

I will inform you next time, sorry

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Kunzang Gondu is a completely different cycle. Yes, of course it is related to Khandro Nyinthig, since it, like the Khandro Nyinthig is rooted in the klong gsal nyi ma bar ma rgyud.

But specifically the Khandro Khandro Nyinthig is the terma of Tulku Tsultrim Dorje. The Khandro Yantig is the supplement to this by Longchenpa. Since Peme Lingpa is considered the tulku of Longchenpa, for this reason the Kunzang Gongdu is considered to be a further supplement to teh Khandro Nyinthig -- but it is not the Khandro Nyinthig which is only two volumes long and between the Khandro Nyinthig and Yanthig, there is only one empowerment composed by Longchenpa based on teh root texts of the Khandro Nyinthig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Pero said:

Why do you consider these three to be critical?

Namdrol said:

Please see section 2.8.6 of Precious Vase.

Pero said:

Yes I'm aware of this (it's 2.8.5 and funnily I opened the PV exactly on this page right now haha). However, I never really understood this. Here it almost sounds as if you can't practice anything unless you receive these but that shouldn't be the case since otherwise all those teachings we've received so far would be pointless. So could you shed some light on this?

I see that the Shitro Khorde Rangdrol from Changchub Dorje is also noted as one of those that one should receive if the others aren't an option. Rinpoche is giving it again this year in Merigar...

Malcolm wrote:

In my edition, (1999, 2001) it is 2.8.6.

I suspect that these initiations are the ones that render one suitable to continue in Santi Mahasangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:
Pero said:
Why do you consider these three to be critical?

Malcolm wrote:
Please see section 2.8.6 of Precious Vase.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 10:45 PM
Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions
Content:
Namdrol said:
This is one of the three critical empowerments one can receive. The other two are the Guhyagarbha empowerment and the Khandro Nyinthig empowerment.

Clarence said:
Thanks N-la, as usual! Hope Rinpoche will be able to make it to Poland then. And me too of course.

BTW, which Khandro Nyingthig empowerment do you mean? I thought there are many in the KN. Still want to receive the Nyingthig Yabzhi.

Malcolm wrote:
There is only one empowerment for Khandro Nyinthig.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 10:20 PM
Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions
Content:
Clarence said:
Can someone elaborate on the Tantra please? What is it about? Why would it be good to receive? Etc. etc.

Namdrol said:
It is the root tantra and empowerment of Anuyoga.

Clarence said:
Thanks N-la, so this would be good to receive? I was hoping he would give the Gongpa Zangthal but this sounds very nice as well. Does it have Rigpa'i Tsal Wang?

Malcolm wrote:
This is one of the three critical empowerments one can receive. The other two are the

Guhyagarbha empowerment and the Khandro Nyinthig empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Clarence said:

Can someone elaborate on the Tantra please? What is it about? Why would it be good to receive? Etc. etc.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the root tantra and empowerment of Anuyoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

When i am right informed would Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche have had some teachings from our Yongdzin Rinpoche, no doubt that Rigpa would be used many times in the sense of awareness.....

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever teachings ChNN received from LTN, it is certain they were in Tibetan and not English.

In the end, it does not matter what word you use. If you want to called Rigpa "George" it is also ok, as long as people understand what the word "George" is a symbol for. But if you examine the the range of meanings the word rig pa has in Dzogchen texts, you quickly come to the conclusion it is inappropriate to crib "rig pa" with a single English word. Hence it is better to leave it in Tibetan or backtranslate it into Sanskrit -- hence vidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

If ChNN says the brain is like an office then I don't have to accept it as a definitive truth. I

can see it as a relative truth. If ChNN says the brain is appearance/emptiness inseparable then I would accept that as a definitive truth and proceed accordingly.

Namdrol said:

That reason why Norbu Rinpoche says this is because Dzogchen is predicated on an understanding of the human body that founded on medical ideas current in Tibet and India at that time.

In Dzogchen, the rtsal or energy of wisdom, ye shes, is specifically stated to be located in the brain. And the brain is specifically stated to be the organ that coordinates input from the five material sense organs. This is symbolized by the presence of the mandala of the 58 herukas in the brain, just as the eight consciousness are symbolized by the presence of the 42 peaceful deities in the heart.

mzaur said:

I am curious...if this is so, then maybe Dzogchen needs a reboot given current medical ideas? There have been several advances since then

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. For example, the visual cortex located in the brain is responsible for sight on a coarse level. If it is destroyed, you cannot see, even if you have perfectly healthy eyes. If your eyes are destroyed, you cannot see, even if your visual cortex is undamaged. But if even if your sight is impaired, or you have brain damage that blinds you, you will still have dreams in which you have sight. This proves that visual consciousness is not located in the brain, necessarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Huseng said:

Śabda-pramana, knowing through the testimony of an authoritative source, is traditionally an accepted source of knowledge by Buddhists. In this context deferring to the Buddha's word is perfectly acceptable provided we can establish the Buddha as a valid authority. Non-Buddhists will not accept it just as I do not accept the word of the Vedas or Bible as authoritative, but this is a Buddhist forum so I may employ the aforementioned pramana to prove a point.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, that also does not work too well, since for example, if I read a sutra you don't, you will not accept it as an authority. For example, you are not likely to accept the Kulayarāja sūtra, the root text of sems sde in Dzogchen, as authoritative.

So this notion of authority only functions among those who accept the exact same set of texts and hermeneutical criteria for deriving authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: How are teachers like Mangos?

Content:

Sönam said:

I like the term Ripe ... because after a while it becomes Rotten

Sönam

heart said:

That might be true for mango's, not Guru's though. The 4th vision is even better.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

We can consider the fourth vision, the exhaustion of dharmatā, rotten. So indeed a rotten guru is even better than a ripe one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, those instructions are provided for Dzogchen practitioners of the most average caliber so that they can achieve full awakening by taking rebirth in each of the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels for a period of one hundred years each, and attain full awakening within five hundred years, never returning to samsara. This result is attained by doing rushan, actually.

N

Nighthawk said:

Why is it not possible to reach full awakening in only one Buddhafiel?

Malcolm wrote:

Each of the five pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels corresponds to and is an external expression of one of the five wisdoms. For example, Sukhavati is an expression of purified desire i.e. the individually-discriminating wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: How are teachers like Mangos?

Content:

Paul said:

Could you please name those you consider ripe (or indeed unripe)?

Namdrol said:

Oh, that is easy -- Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche.

As for the rest, people will have to go and check them out on the fruit stand personally.

kirtu said:

The whole of the Tibetan Buddhist world cannot learn just from two, three, four, five teachers even if we only go on a kind of retreat with them once a year.

Malcolm wrote:

I was not making a global statement. Paul asked me who I thought was "ripe", and the context here is Dzogchen masters. I do not know other Dzogchen masters, apart from ones who have passed away. This is not a dis against other teachers.

Dzogchen should be learned from a ripe master. There are very few of those -- meet them while you still have a chance. I just mentioned two.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: How are teachers like Mangos?

Content:

Paul said:

Could you please name those you consider ripe (or indeed unripe)?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, that is easy -- Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche.

As for the rest, people will have to go and check them out on the fruit stand personally.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 2:25 AM

Title: How are teachers like Mangos?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Qualified masters are extremely rare and hard to discern. They are like mangoes.

There are some teachers who look ripe and are ripe; some teachers who look ripe but are not ripe; some teachers who look unripe but are ripe; and some teachers who look unripe and are unripe.

If you find the first type of teacher or the third, fantastic. If you wind up with two or four, good luck.

Make sure your master has a real lineage.

There are many people out there these days who promote themselves as "Dzogchen masters", "tertons", "tulkus" and so on. There are many gullible people in America, etc., and many unethical people who don't mind taking advantage of them.

So be careful.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Dzogchen requires the pointing out instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct.

But since we are intrinsically endowed with Buddhahood down to the smallest particle of our being, there is no reason to seek rebirth in Sukhavati.

Of course, realizing that and saying are two different things altogether, and the former requires seeking out a qualified master of Dzogchen and following his or her instructions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

Namdrol said:

The point I was making is that there is no need to do aspirations to be born in Sukhavati, Zangdog Palri and so on if one is really practicing Dzogchen. If not, then, well, mileage varies.

N

Clarence said:

What do you consider really practicing Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

sems sde, klong sde and man ngag sde.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

wisdomfire said:

IMHO, pureland practice should be practised in conjunction with Dzogchen, it is a kind of safe-guard. Also, many enlightened masters went to Sukhavati...

Namdrol said:

Pure land practice is completely unnecessary for Dzogchen practitioners. If someone thinks they need to take rebirth in a pure land, they have not understood one word of Dzogchen.

heart said:

I think no one thinks they "need to" do that. It is not exactly pure land practice but it Jigme Lingpa's Yeshe Lama deals in detail with how to attain rebirth in a pure land, those instructions are for Dzogchen practitioners.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, those instructions are provided for Dzogchen practitioners of the most average caliber so that they can achieve full awakening by taking rebirth in each of the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels for a period of one hundred years each, and attain full awakening within five hundred years, never returning to samsara. This result is attained by doing rushan, actually.

The point I was making is that there is no need to do aspirations to be born in Sukhavati, Zangdog Palri and so on if one is really practicing Dzogchen. If not, then, well, mileage varies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

wisdomfire said:

IMHO, pureland practice should be practised in conjunction with Dzogchen, it is a kind of safe-guard. Also, many enlightened masters went to Sukhavati...

Malcolm wrote:

Pure land practice is completely unnecessary for Dzogchen practitioners. If someone thinks they need to take rebirth in a pure land, they have not understood one word of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

TenzinDorje said:

During teachings on Tsog this last fall, Lama Dawa said a Kapala full of alcohol is allowed each day for a Ngakpa.:

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on how strong it is. A Kapala full of chang is quite weak. A Kapala full of Bacardi 151 would knock most people out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2012 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: The permanence of enlightenment

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

...a non-conceptual target is...

Malcolm wrote:

...a contradiction in terms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

Prasangas accept transmigration, but they reject that any of the aggregates transmigrates. Svatantrikas assert that consciousness transmigrates.

Prasangas assert that the mistaken imputation "I am" (which is actually a non-existent) appropriates the series of aggregates, generates action, and experiences its results.

As I said, all that transmigrates is delusion.

N

Ogyen said:

not to sound asinine - but what is the consciousness that does not get destroyed then?

I understand it's free of aggregates, clearly these fall apart with the body that dies - but what is stored in the consciousness to move on - the delusion itself?

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness is an aggregate, and conventionally speaking, is momentary. There is no such a thing as a permanent consciousness. Ergo, there is a stream of moments of mind appropriated by the delusion of self-identity, but there is no consciousness, no entity at all that transmigrates per se. The continuum of rebirth is maintained solely by a delusion that appropriates the five aggregates, matter, sensation, perception, formations, and consciousness as a self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Innovation in North American Zen

Content:

Wesley1982 said:

Why can't buddhism be reflected in wearing plain & casual clothing? . .

Malcolm wrote:

It can, but a lot of people like wearing ridiculous clothes. I guess it makes them feel more spritual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

The so called "Prasanga" branch of Madhyamaka generally rejects the idea that

consciousness transmigrates.

N

cloudburst said:

What sophistry is this?

Can we expect some terse qualification, or are you actually claiming that Prasangikas do not accept transmigration?

Malcolm wrote:

Prasangas accept transmigration, but they reject that any of the aggregates transmigrates. Svatantrikas assert that consciousness transmigrates.

Prasangas assert that the mistaken imputation "I am" (which is actually a non-existent) appropriates the series of aggregates, generates action, and experiences its results.

As I said, all that transmigrates is delusion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: losing yourself in buddhism

Content:

ryu said:

Hi all,

I often find that i am distracted by the different concepts / ideas and processes of the various schools of buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Tenet systems is a dry hump.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

I take your points Namdrol. Definitely in the Pali sutta's dukkah is explicitly cashed out as -literally - the dis-ease of having aggregates etc.

I have been thinking about it more metaphysically, from an Abhidharmic and Madhyamakan point of view. I suppose there are some interesting distinctions to be made in this respect.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha's approach regarding the 4NT was to introduce an irrefutable experiential fact: everywhere you look there is suffering, because everything and everyone ages, then sickens, then dies. The point is that this is an experiential fact no needs guess at it - everyone knows what suffering means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 10:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

I think I mentioned this responding to you in another thread: the state of dukkha gains its formal definition only in relationship to an enduring state of satisfaction (i.e. nirvana). If there was no such enduring satisfaction, then there is no real basis to define intransient bliss as dukkha.

Malcolm wrote:

Bliss in Buddhism is a strictly negative definition i.e. it is the absence of suffering just as health is defined as the absence of illness.

In fact that notion of dukkha and the notion of roga (disease) are intimately related.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

But unless you're presupposing a Buddhist framework, there is no necessity to define these pursuits in the negation. Someone like Bentham would just say: these people are looking for and finding pleasure, and gaining tangible and quantifiable satisfaction from it.

Malcolm wrote:

Pleasure is defined by misery, as satisfaction is defined by dissatisfaction.

tobes said:

The avoidance of suffering would be refraining from visiting your mother-in-law or

walking into a fire.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

tobes said:

So you take the axiomatic Buddhist definition of dukkah - that conditioned pleasure is in reality dukkah because it is conditioned - as a self-evident truth, when really it is a truth claim which stands contrary to many other truth claims.

Malcolm wrote:

The suffering the Buddha was talking about was mental and physical disease and pain i.e. illness, aging and death.

No one can refute that illness is suffering, aging is suffering and death is suffering. That is was the truth of suffering is actually about -- not some rarified middle Indian abhidharma redefinition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: NON-DUALITY

Content:

mindyourmind said:

How does non-duality end suffering? What if the non-dual state is a state of suffering?

Malcolm wrote:

Non-duality does not end suffering. People suffer in the state of non-duality.

What is the state of non-duality [from the Buddhist and Dzogchen POV]? Just the fact that all things arise in dependence and are therefore empty, free from all extremes. There is no non-duality apart from that.

However, by recognizing that we are suffering because we do not perceive the non-dual nature of things, we can reverse that suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, suffering is self-evident.

tobes said:

It's not at all. Suffering is not a good translation for dukkah - because dukkah pertains to why conditioned phenomena are unsatisfactory.

It seems clear to me that most people take it as self-evident that conditioned phenomena are satisfactory. That's why everyone is out driving bmw's, getting pissed, eating chocolate and shagging.

Malcolm wrote:

In the contrary, suffering is a perfectly adequate translation for dukkha. Suffering is self-evident because all actions in which sentient beings engage is aimed at avoiding suffering, for example, driving beamers, getting pissed, eating choclate and shagging.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, suffering is self-evident.

kirtu said:

Only gross personal suffering is evident for everyone.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

That is sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

Mariusz said:

"The reality is illusion". It is from Svatantrikas, not from Prasangikas. Svatantrikas in India were called "the Centrists who establish illusion through reasoning."

Malcolm wrote:

It is from Nāgārjuna. Chapter 7 MMK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 1:45 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

At the level of the 4NT, belief does not ever need to enter into it. This is the beauty of the Hīnayāna approach -- one never needs to believe anything. One can decide to experiment with the 4NT as a hypothesis and see if it is correct.

Mahāyāna and other forms of Buddhism (apart from Dzogchen) require more of a metaphysical commitment from the get go.

tobes said:

I think even on the most basic level, a certain amount of belief is required: to experiment with any degree of efficacy, one also has to assume that there is something true or meaningful in the 4NT's.

Malcolm wrote:

No, suffering is self-evident.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

By the way, who give a transmission to Siddharta Gautama?

heart said:

All the other Buddha's.

/magnus

Konchog1 said:

And where did they get it from?

Malcolm wrote:

Other buddhas.

It's buddhas all the way down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

Behind the illusory appearance is the emptiness, and we cannot speak of reality without

emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not real either.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

lucidaromulus said:

i see...thanks for patiently helping me by answering my queries.

is it counted as a downfall or bad karma created if a non initiated person or one who did not receive oral transmission read text that were meant for the initiated?

two cases:

1. it was done not on purpose.(happened to me cause i was so new to tibetan buddhism and it happened to be an ebook which stated in the preface that "please do not read if not empowered", sadly i was so foolish by skipping the preface and read a some of the material. i felt bad but don't know what to do then and now if it happens again.)[and in the past i did not even know which are initiate-only text and which are not. However, lately i've managed to know that all tantra-deity teachings are off limits for me until i am initiated.]

2. if it was done on purpose.(no idea why would someone do that but curiosity might be at fault here.)

Malcolm wrote:

Don't worry, there is no problem.

These everyone reads everything. Of course this gives rise to many misunderstandings, but if someone really wants to understand the meaning of such things they should make an effort to find a qualified teacher who is in a respected lineage.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

lucidaromulus said:

Thank you so much Namdrol for the knowledge

Take the mani mantra for example, personally how would you describe the difference

between receiving oral transmission and not receiving it? that is of course from your experiences...

Malcolm wrote:

If you do not receive transmission you cannot use the Mani as a means personal realization. You can only recite it like a prayer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

lucidaromulus said:

- 1) does that mean the person who received the transmission can transmit it to other people?
- 2) does this oral transmission need to be a formal ceremony?
- 3) if a qualified teacher speaks/chants any sutra or mantra through a microphone, anyone who hears it receives the oral transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

- 1) Not necessarily.
- 2) Not necessarily, no. But of course you have to sit and listen.
- 3) Only if that teacher is intending to give the transmission of that mantra or text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

lucidaromulus said:

what is the difference between oral transmission and reading from a book?

for example a mantra/sutra, receiving oral transmission from rinpoche/reading from a book.

please enlighten me

Malcolm wrote:

When you receive a lung from a qualified teacher (not just any teacher) you receive a living transmission of energy, the power of the verbal transmission of dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

illusions occur.

- .
- .
- .

Malcolm wrote:

But that does not make them real. Likewise, phenomena occur, but this also does not make them real.

Something real does not need to occur because it has always been real from the beginning.

The problem with most people's understanding of dependent origination is that they actually conceive of dependent origination as "dependence on something else". But you see, Nāgārjuna clearly shows that other dependence (parabhāva) as a merely guise for svabhāva. Things do not derive reality from being dependent anymore than illusions derive reality through being dependent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

It's clearly more than this. It is a state of perfection, a supreme attainment, the basis for transcendental knowledge et al, et al.

One really doesn't have to look too hard in various canons to see that nirvana is doing more work than you want to acknowledge.

Sönam said:

This is because you believe that there is a greater thing than "our real nature" ... but that not the case in buddhism, nirvana is absence of suffering like it is said at the very beginning in the 4NT ...

In fact you do not really trust in Buddha's words.

Sönam

tobes said:

This is precisely my point Sonam: a very critical part of the epistemology of Buddhism is, as you put it, trusting the Buddha's words. To a large extent, the four noble truths and nirvana (whether it is defined in negation or stated more positively) depend upon that.

This does not mean 'blind faith' but nor does it mean 'absolute logical coherence.'

So I'm just saying: it is hypocritical to demand absolute logical coherence for non-Buddhists.

Moreover, where exactly have I stated that I believe in a greater thing than "our real nature?"

Malcolm wrote:

At the level of the 4NT, belief does not ever need to enter into it. This is the beauty of the Hinayāna approach -- one never needs to believe anything. One can decide to experiment with the 4NT as a hypothesis and see if it is correct.

Mahāyāna and other forms of Buddhism (apart from Dzogchen) require more of a metaphysical commitment from the get go.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

It's clearly more than this. It is a state of perfection, a supreme attainment, the basis for transcendental knowledge et al, et al.

One really doesn't have to look too hard in various canons to see that nirvana is doing more work than you want to acknowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, compared to samsara nirvana is perfect since it involves the cessation of suffering and is free from suffering; that cessation of suffering is a supreme attainment, and experiencing the freedom from afflictions is a basis for lokottarajñāna i.e. transcendent wisdom. But in the nirvana is merely state of the absence of further rebirth which given various salutary names; it is merely the state of freedom from afflictions which cause rebirth and that is all. I was not implying that the no effort was involved in removing those affliction mental patterns which sustain rebirth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

to call the dependently arisen 'an illusion' instead of 'like an illusion' would be nihilism, since everything was negated in its entirety

Malcolm wrote:

This is mistaken: illusions also depend on causes and conditions to arise, hence whatever arises dependently is illusory. The same mirages, dreams, fire wheels, etc.

When one removes the causes and conditions for an illusion, it vanishes. When one removes the causes and conditions of something dependently originated, it vanishes.

The eight examples of illusion show that the dependently arisen is merely illusory and not real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 10:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

She demands that Buddhist claims must be evidence based and logical. You give her accounts of causality, selflessness and impermanence.

Great, she says. What about nirvana?

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is the absence of a cause for further suffering, and that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 10:41 AM

Title: Re: Lungta

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Is the Three Whites and Sweets and different woods and so forth required for Sang? Or is just incense okay?

Malcolm wrote:

Just incense is ok. If you have opportunity to do more, than it is better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The simple answer would be: the same thing that moves from one moment to the next during the bardo of life.

Tilopa said:

Correct - the continuum of the subtle clear light consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

That would be a tantric perspective (Gelug), but the Prasanga perspective is the one I outlined above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Breaking the one vow

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Out of curiosity what was the vow? If it's ´true private, then of ´course dont tell me.

Ogyen said:

I will not engage in divisive speech.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh well, say you're sorry and move on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

How is it then that we can equate reality with illusion...?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the real cannot be found on analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Lungta

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Then in that case there might be an explanation of the standard use of water for Lungta practices found in one of the following texts for example:

<http://www.lotsawahouse.org/topics/riwo-sangcho> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

In our system, you use an evergreen branch and with it sprinkle water on the flags to purify them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 8:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Ganapuja

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

If we don't have a larger Puja Drum for parts of practices that it compliments, which is the next best scenario:

Malcolm wrote:

Use a bell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

If he valued righteousness so much he would have kept his kingdom. But have you ever heard of a righteous physician?

Namdrol said:

Your statement is a non-sequitar.

maybay said:

One should not try to do the impossible. Have I failed?

Malcolm wrote:

non-sequitar #2

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

If he valued righteousness so much he would have kept his kingdom. But have you ever heard of a righteous physician?

Malcolm wrote:

You statement is a non-sequitar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

Show me a scripture that says reality is an illusion. You will not find it.

DarwidHalim said:

By the way, what is the difference between saying reality is like an illusion and reality is illusion?

Malcolm wrote:

The first is a form of weak realism; the second is the Buddha's view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: What is Kagyae Initiation?! (HH DL)

Content:

heart said:

No, I haven't received the Yeshe Zangtal from ChNNR but since I am not particularly searching for a pure Ati style, it is enough for me if I actually get what I am receiving. Direct introduction, no matter the package, is always completely pure for me.

Namdrol said:

According to ChNN, the idea of a "pure Dzogchen" is a mistake. He also says we need to understand our practice in terms of the unity of the three inner tantras. Dzogchen is how we practice those three inner tantras.

N

Mariusz said:

What about thogal of Dzogchen. Is it in Dzogchen only or is not? Does it mean for practice of thogal Maha and Anu Tantras are somehow necessary?

Malcolm wrote:

There are thogal intimate instructions connected with both mahāyoga and anuyoga cycles. It does not mean that these cycles are necessary in order to do thogal, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Five Mountain Zen Order & Paul Lynch

Content:

Jikan said:

It's a lot easier for the buyer to beware when he or she is better informed of what's going on.

When does public criticism become pissing in the wind?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for example, when it came to attention of the world that James Foster was improperly claiming to be a Tendai Priest, did he stop? No, he just morphed into a "Zen" Priest, and now he is an Ancient Buddha.

So you see, I while I am cynical about the hucksters, snake-oil salesman and racketeers in Buddhism (both Asian and Western), my observation is that they don't stop even when called to account.

Why? Because people are free to rip other people off when it comes to Religion. Religious careers are the sole occupation one can follow where there are no true standards, where one is free to bilk people for millions if one can get away with it. Religion requires very little capital startup, almost no training at all, and a reasonably articulate and amoral person or otherwise self-deluded person, can get people to go along with one's spiel and charge them good money for it.

So this is why it is just pissing in the wind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

Huseng said:

This is one perspective. Vasubandhu had a different idea (see 18a-d):

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu's perspective is vastly inferior to that of Nāgārjuna in my opinion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nope, these are very clear. "the five aggregates are illusory. They do not exist" could not be clearer. The meaning of the illusion metaphor is very clear and is summed up in the tibetan term med par gsal snang i.e. clearly apparent non-existent.

Malcolm wrote:
Not at all.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 10:06 PM
Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth
Content:

Huseng said:

Collectively it is the mental aggregates, which are a dependently-originated karmic reaction fundamentally driven by ignorance of reality (hence subject to perishing), that are reborn. There is no "self" in a concrete sense, but there is a reaction between causes and conditions which leads to the continued existence of a sentient being.

In explaining such things a general audience it is best just to say the mind is reborn. The mind, however, is not absolute either and is dependently originated just as much as a physical body is.

Malcolm wrote:
Nagāgarjuna opines:

Although the aggregates are serially connected,
the wise are to comprehend nothing has transmigrated
In that respect, the aggregates are the aggregates of matter, sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness. Those are termed 'serially connected'. Not having ceased, they produce another produced from that cause. Nevertheless, not even a subtle particle of an existent has transmigrated from this world to the next. That being the case, the wheel of samsara is created by the traces of erroneous concepts.

The so called "Prasanga" branch of Madhyamaka generally rejects the idea that consciousness transmigrates.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 9:11 PM
Title: Re: What is Kagyae Initiation?! (HH DL)
Content:

heart said:

No, I haven't received the Yeshe Zangtal from ChNNR but since I am not particularly searching for a pure Ati style, it is enough for me if I actually get what I am receiving. Direct introduction, no matter the package, is always completely pure for me.

Malcolm wrote:

According to ChNN, the idea of a "pure Dzogchen" is a mistake. He also says we need to understand our practice in terms of the unity of the three inner tantras. Dzogchen is how we practice those three inner tantras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Five Mountain Zen Order & Paul Lynch

Content:

jisahn108 said:

Astus, clearly you aren't going to meet me on this. You seem to think Dharma is maybe about stringing a logical series of words together in a convincing fashion, and sort of doing what you want as long as you can convince yourself that theoretically in the end it's skillful means? This isn't about a single claim being true or not. This isn't some vague hypothetical. Again - Zen teaching primarily consists of modeled and embodied behavior, not nice words. By this measure, Paul Lynch's teaching largely consists of inflation, distortion, manipulation, disrespect, outright lying, and a total lack of integrity, at a number of levels. In other words, not very Zen at all.

Please don't bother with more theoretical possibilities or historical examples. I can do that for myself, thanks. Our takes are on the table.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that all your complaining amounts to pissing in the wind, right? This issue is not confined to Zen/Chan/Son. Buddhism is rife with frauds, grifters and charlatons. That is just how it is. Caveat emptor. And the sad thing is that I observe that money is the thing which drives it all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

The fact that someone could eventually mistake the Base for God doesn't make them the same.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it remains like the jaundiced view of a conch shell or a white cloth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

Show me a scripture that says reality is an illusion. You will not find it.

Namdrol said:

Because of dwelling in the equivalence of all phenomena with illusions, mirages, dreams, water moons, echoes and double vision, the Dharma free of affliction is perfectly realized.

-- ārya-lalitavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Further, sister, the five aggregates are illusory. They do not exist. There is no arising of erroneous action. It is conventionally designated through an error. Sister, awakening is like an illusion, it does not exist, it is conventionally designated through an error. Sister, though awakening is like an illusion, it does not exist, it is conventionally designated through an error. Therefore, sister, because illusions are the same, the aggregates are the same. Because the aggregates are the same, illusion is the same. Since illusion is the same, awakening is the same. Since awakening is the same, illusion is the same. Sister, therefore, I call you "awakened".

-- ārya-mañjuśrīvikurvāṇaparivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

maybay said:

The search continues...

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, these are very clear. "the five aggregates are illusory. They do not exist" could not be clearer. The meaning of the illusion metaphor is very clear and is summed up in the tibetan term med par gsal snang i.e. clearly apparent non-existent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Prima facie, of course. But if you dig a little deeper, the story is far more complex.

For starters, svabava is not precisely commensurable with what is meant by essence in some western contexts. And what is meant by essence differs markedly in different thinkers and traditions.

Namdrol said:

Notions of essence boil down to the Paramedian distinction between being and non-being, as far as western philosophy goes.

At base, apart from Madhyamaka, all of these different schools are asserting some sort of being contrasted with some sort of non-being.

This is why everyone apart from Madhyamaka is considered realist in some sense or another.

N

tobes said:

That's an incredibly reductive and misleading account of western philosophy.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, given that I was raised by a professor of philosophy, I am entitled to be incredibly reductive about it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 12:48 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Prima facie, of course. But if you dig a little deeper, the story is far more complex.

For starters, svabava is not precisely commensurable with what is meant by essence in some western contexts. And what is meant by essence differs markedly in different thinkers and traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Notions of essence boil down to the Paramedian distinction between being and non-being, as far as western philosophy goes.

At base, apart from Madhyamaka, all of these different schools are asserting some sort of being contrasted with some sort of non-being.

This is why everyone apart from Madhyamaka is considered realist in some sense or another.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 12:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Because I don't think anyone has done this yet. There's barely been a published paper on these kinds of topics.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not necessary. All theistic views, especially in ancient Philosophy boil down to essentialism. Madhyamaka rejects that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 12:27 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

Show me a scripture that says reality is an illusion. You will not find it.

Malcolm wrote:

Because of dwelling in the equivalence of all phenomena with illusions, mirages, dreams, water moons, echoes and double vision, the Dharma free of affliction is perfectly realized.

-- ārya-lalitavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Further, sister, the five aggregates are illusory. They do not exist. There is no arising of erroneous action. It is conventionally designated through an error. Sister, awakening is like an illusion, it does not exist, it is conventionally designated through an error. Sister, though awakening is like an illusion, it does not exist, it is conventionally designated through an error. Therefore, sister, because illusions are the same, the aggregates are the same. Because the aggregates are the same, illusion is the same. Since illusion is the same, awakening is the same. Since awakening is the same, illusion is the same. Sister, therefore, I call you "awakened".

-- ārya-mañjuśrīvikurvāṇaparivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:48 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Mint, Dechen Norbu, did you guys happen to hear Rinpoche's teaching on the last day of the recent retreat?

<http://www.freezecast.com/replay/index.php> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

He addressed the very topic that you two are debating (in context of course).

Malcolm wrote:

Not really -- what he said was is that it was possible to frame "God" as a signifier for one's primordial potentiality (i.e. the basis), but he did not state that this was how theistic traditions would understand it nor that they would accept it in this way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:45 AM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

Ogyen said:

I do NOT want to hash out a whole argument on rebirth. I have often been asked this one question that I honestly don't know how to answer because I'm not qualified, but it has been bugging me now for some time. According to my own studies (Nyingma tradition) there is no solid 'self' thing or anything to call a 'soul.' So when I'm asked about 'reincarnation' by non-buddhists I flat out deny it, "Buddhism does not ascribe to 'reincarnation'" then they say, "What about rebirth" at which point I just say I'm not qualified to speak on the matter-because I'm not. I'm a newb. It's good practice for reducing self-importance to look like an dolt on a regular basis in showing you don't know something. In my studies I've come to understand that there is nothing to 'reincarnate' - however the issue is complex because of the 12 links of DO we have ignorance as the cause and desire and nama and rupa etc etc, so something continues to grasp for form, for being...

I beg our members here to please NOT make this into a thread about rebirth's validity or not (as threads around this questions often degenerate and polarize), I'm not interested in that - in this sense, I have no questions around validity, in practice i just want to understand what is being asked and perhaps gain better insight myself in terms of "what moves on" into new form in rebirth - and how the cycle goes on and on... Is it the deepest part of consciousness (alaya)? What is it in me that will continue to grasp with desire out of ignorance into new form and find new ways to compound new karma?

Malcolm wrote:

Delusion and nothing more, that is what "moves". Which delusion? The delusion "I am".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:44 AM

Title: Re: Breaking the one vow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Vows work like this -- when you break them, the break only lasts for a single day. You confess, and you move on with your life.

N

Ogyen said:

I have hit a brick wall - everywhere I look the filters of gloom cover my sight, a nasty negative energy shrouds my outlook despite keeping at it and doing everything I know (and that list is fairly extensive having years of practice working with the goggles of depression and the afflictions of mental stress). My head knows it's just filters, tricks of perception, nothing to even dive too deep into - I watch the clouds like storms come and go.. I even sense very keenly some days there is no 'me' to get all bent out of shape and I let much of it rise and fall away without 'acting/reacting' to the whole cycle... but the one thing I'm least proud of that I did was break the one vow I made to my teacher when I took refuge. He made me pick one of the 10 that I vowed and said, "This is the one that you vow to never do, the one that you vow to me." And I picked. I don't know why I picked that one. I even felt I didn't know if I could always keep it no matter what. And in the lowest of lowest, I broke it. I feel like the biggest phony ever. I probably am - I mean I don't even pretend to try to be Buddhist... even that is a construct. I feel like either I embody a Buddha or shut up kid - don't pretend or try to be anything. There is no try, either do or don't -and watch yourself doing or not doing. Meanwhile, I FEEL the suffering. Intensely. And no relief is coming.

What are the consequences of breaking one's vow to one's teacher? I imagine pretty dire...?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Then if we choose between combining Sang & Serkyem with a Tun or a Ganapuja, it would be better to choose combining it with a Thun practice?

Thanks again.

Malcolm wrote:

I think so. Ganapuja already has many offerings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Thank you Namdrol.

I wasn't thinking of actually combining Sang & Serkyem with a Tun or Ganapuja (was referring to doing them in sequence rather); but if we can do that, then I'd like to combine the practice with Thun or Ganapuja.

So let's say for example we combine Sang & Serkyem with a long Ganapuja; would we begin it right after the Offerings to the Guardians, right after the Invocations to the Guardians, or right after the Naggon or Ngagkong for the Guardians?

Also, if we are to offer milk-tea and red wine, we would mix them together in the upper Serkyem cup then?

Malcolm wrote:

generally you would not combined with ganapuja. But if you did, after ngaggong.

You offer the three drinks seperately.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 7:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Adamantine said:

Something I have a habit of doing when offering to the dharmapalas is filling a serkyem with offering substances, as the support torma. Is this considered acceptable, or complimentary to do in the context of a DC Tun or Ganapuja? I don't recall ever seeing a physical support offered to the protectors in any DC event I've been to, or Rinpoche ever mentioning it, so it clearly doesn't seem to be a requirement, -but is it acceptable to include if one likes and has the proper materials?

heart said:

In ChNNR book Sang offering and Serkyem for the eight classes he mention clearly how to us the serkyem and what to put in it

http://shangshung.org/store/index.php?main_page=product_info&products_id=280

Lhug-Pa said:

When offering Sang & Serkyem is it generally acceptable—when finished—to go straight into a Long Life practice or Ganapuja and to leave the Serkyem on the Shrine with its contents? If this is not acceptable, can we then just set the Serkyem aside somewhere in the Shrine room until the Ganapuja is finished?

And I take it that milk-tea can go in the lower basin of the Serkyem and red wine in the top offering cup of the same Serkyem?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally Sang and Serkyme are done alone --but if combining with Thun practices then they are done after the protectors.

When doing it by yourself, you only need wine. And no, tea, milk and wine go into the serkyem cup. The basin is to catch excess. Some people also put food in the basin. There are differing customs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

The institution of "Buddhism" has many provided many unprovables. People born out of lotus flowers and so on.

This cannot be denied.

But believing in them is not essential. it is not demanded of the follower.

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on which school or teacher you follow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Five Mountain Zen Order & Paul Lynch

Content:

jisahn108 said:

Personally, he gives me dharmic heartburn.

Malcolm wrote:

It is good stop eating foods that give you heartburn.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Author of Lujin

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

So you're saying the Lujin was initially compiled by Karma Chagme from the works of the III Karmapa and then further edited by the XIV Karmapa and Jamgon Kongtrul. So the original compiler is Karma Chagme but the version we use today in the Karma Kagyu is probably that of Jamgon Kongtrul Lodro Thaye?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. And very likely, Karma Chagme was not the original compiler.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Author of Lujin

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

I have seen the text of the Kagyu daily Chod practice or Lujin variously attributed to the XIV Karmapa Thekchok Dorje (Lama Lodo), Karma Chakme (Sarah Harding) or Lodro Thaye (Tenga Rinpoche). I understand that a lot of it is compiled from the work of the III Karmapa Rangjung Dorje but who was the actual author/compiler? Anyone know?

Malcolm wrote:

All of them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Do you really think most neo-Buddhists are prepared to accept their position as mere ideology?

Malcolm wrote:

They will make faster progress if they do.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:

tobes said:

However, what worries me, is that this epistemological double standard leaves neo-Buddhism open to the charge that it is functioning more or less as an ideology.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. That is the Dzogchen critique of the nine yanas, i.e., that they are ideologies.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 11:19 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:

Nighthawk said:

The Dzogchen view that all sentient beings will become Buddhas at the end of this aeon regardless if they have practiced the Dharma or not doesn't really make much sense at all.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the Dzogchen view.

The Dzogchen view is that all sentient beings will become Buddhas by the end of the eon because they will all meet Dzogchen teachings and practice them.

Nighthawk said:

And then these Buddhas are said to revert back to the "basis" in other words ignorance, but how can a Buddha ever revert back to that? If a Buddha will revert back to ignorance then he is not really a Buddha so why even label them as that?

Malcolm wrote:

Here, the usage "buddha" is not precise. It means those who have gained some measure of realization i.e. bodhi, but not necessarily annutara samyak sambodhi.

Also revert to the basis does not mean reverting to ignorance. There is no ignorance in the basis.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Rinpoche wrote that traditionally we are to consider ourselves already a year old when we were born, so when the calendar and the consulting-the-calendar-book say to calculate specific things according to "when we were born" does this always come with the assumption that we should always consider that our animal and element are the ones that are actually of a year before our actual date of birth?

Malcolm wrote:

Never. If you are born in a Dragon year, you are one when you are born, are a dragon, and turn 2 at the next new year, even if you are born the day before the Tibetan new year of the following year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 7:00 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

steveb1 said:

That's really interesting. Not to tax the point, does this Buddha of the present eon have a name - I presume it was not Shakyamuni because other Buddhas preceded him?

Namdrol said:

Samantabhadra.

Nighthawk said:

Where did this idea originate from the Adi Buddha is the "Primordial" Buddha rather than the first Buddha of this aeon? Is it perhaps a mistranslation from Tibetan texts or the teaching of a different Tibetan school(s)?

Malcolm wrote:

Misunderstanding of early western scholars.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

steveb1 said:

That's really interesting. Not to tax the point, does this Buddha of the present eon have a name - I presume it was not Shakyamuni because other Buddhas preceded him?

Malcolm wrote:
Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 3:39 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:

freefromsamsara said:

How do you know the Lord Creator isn't the same being as Adi Buddha in buddhist cosmology?

Namdrol said:
Because the Adibuddha is not a creator.

steveb1 said:
Could someone please expand on this ... ?

I did not find much on Abi Buddha when I did a Google search, except that Abi Buddha is a primordial Buddha from whom things flow in an "emanationist" manner. Granted that this is accurate, and that emanation is not the same as creation, still: what is the essential difference ... ? If Abi Buddha is not a "sky father"-type creator, but still "He" is an emanator, then is "He" not involved in the origination of universes and the structure of physical processes ... ? But if that is true, how is that a Buddha would emanate a samsaric world full of ignorance and suffering ... ?

Malcolm wrote:
Because "Adi" means first, and really refers to the first Buddha of the present eon, the first Buddha who woke up.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 10:20 PM
Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves
Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Really Magnus? I never noticed that...

I never understood him to see shamatha as the experience of emptiness.

Namdrol said:
ChNN frequently says this actually, but he does not mean realization of emptiness free from extremes, he means an experience where the mind is empty of thought.

heart said:

Like non-thought as in bliss, clarity and non-thought? He actually means something like non-conceptual?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

mzaur said:

Does anyone know what the topic will be for the NY retreat? I could not find any info here

<http://tsegyalgar.org/localcenters/kundrolling/kundrollingevents/retreatwithchoegya3/>
" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Most likely a general retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Namdrol said:

The experience of emptiness here is a Vajrayāna description.

mzaur said:

Ah, I see. So what does Vajrayana call the insight into Pratītyasamutpāda?

Malcolm wrote:

Realization of emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

heart said:

I always found it quite confusing that ChNNR seems to equate shamata and emptiness.

/magnus

mzaur said:

Ah, so that's it. Sonam's quote was indeed confusing...Rinpoche isn't talking about Pratītyasamutpāda (dependent origination) when he says shunyata/emptiness... so what does Rinpoche call dependent origination then?

It does seem that many people, especially non-Buddhists but also Buddhists too, talk about emptiness as a state of mind free from thought, perhaps because the word emptiness does seem to point to that experience [although of course shunyata does not mean that]. It does seem skillful for Rinpoche to accept that definition and use it.

Malcolm wrote:

The experience of emptiness here is a Vajrayāna description.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

That's how I take it. But never really noticed him equating with shamatha.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he does. I have heard him say this many times over the years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Really Magnus? I never noticed that...

I never understood him to see shamatha as the experience of emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN frequently says this actually, but he does not mean realization of emptiness free from extremes, he means an experience where the mind is empty of thought.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

heart said:

I always found it quite confusing that ChNNR seems to equate shamata and emptiness.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

He isn't. I used to find this confusing too until I came across a passage by Sachen Kunga Nyingpo where he described the experience of the gap between two thoughts as being an experience of emptiness i.e. an experience of absence of thoughts.

But ChNN does not mean that this experience of emptiness is emptiness qua emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

freefromsamsara said:

How do you know the Lord Creator isn't the same being as Adi Buddha in buddhist cosmology?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the Adibuddha is not a creator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

mzaur said:

but what's stopping Zen practitioners from realizing that also?

Malcolm wrote:

Lack of intimate instructions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Untill now i know only the sexual abuse related to karma mudra but there must be more like for instance the money shuffle side of town which is based on a certain Sangha power.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two main things: sexual misconduct and misusing the money of students for

personal gain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Are Dharmapalas Necessary ?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Thank you - not the first time you have clarified for me the position vis a vis Yidam and Dharmapala forms.

I was misled by a footnote here, amongst other sources, regarding Hayagriva as a Dharmapala:

<http://www.rinpoche.com/teachings/darmapalas.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Note 6: The eight Dharmapalas are Mahakala, Palden Lhamo, Yamantaka, Kubera, Hayagriva, Changpa, Yama, and Begtse.

Certainly in the recent Nyenpa Lha Sum empowerment with Dzogchen Rinpoche all three deities were Yidams - Hayagriva (Padmanta Trita), Vajrapani and Garuda. Yet all three are Antidote Deities which remove obstructions, and assist in dealing with illnesses and spirit harm.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this is a "lesser" form of Hayagriva. But also Hayagriva/Vajravārāhi is the central deity of many Anuyoga cycles connected with Dzogchen such as the Khandro Nyinthig.

If you have received any transmissions from Ch. Namkhai Norbu, the Guru Dragphur is a combination deity of Guru Dragpo, Yangdag Heruka, Vajrakilaya, Vajrapani, Hayagriva and Garuda.

Guru Dragpo is Padmasambhava. Yangdag Heruka was his main practice. He realized the level of a mahamudra vidyādhara through practicing Vajrakilaya. And then of course, Vajrapani is for controlling celestial negative forces; Hayagriva is for controlling terrestrial negative forces, and Garuda is for controlling subterranean negative forces.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Are Dharmapalas Necessary ?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

In terms of the broad topic, the fact that Mahakala and others appear as both Yidams and Dharmapalas would denote some necessity, so precisely what is it that the Dharmapala Mahakala can do that the Yidam Mahakala cannot? Would it be that the answer is simply in the way we regard the deity rather than a material difference between the two forms, i.e. using the same tool for two different purposes?

.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what kind of empowerment you receive.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Are Dharmapalas Necessary ?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

A second point I would make is that in practice we self-generate as a Yidam, but never as a Protector as far as I know.

Namdrol said:

Mahākala and Mahākali are both Yidams as well as Dharmapālas.

The practice of Mahākala as a Yidam is quite widespread in Sakya, actually. It is also widespread in Kagyu and Nyingma.

N

Blue Garuda said:

Yes, I believe that Hayagriva is similarly regarded as Yidam and Dharmapala within Nyingma.

Malcolm wrote:

Hayagriva is only a Yidam.

Blue Garuda said:

To choose one example, does the practitioner self-generate as the Dharmapala Mahakala or only as the Yidam Mahakala?

Malcolm wrote:

Only as Yidam in the Yidam practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 9th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Are Dharmapalas Necessary ?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

A second point I would make is that in practice we self-generate as a Yidam, but never as a Protector as far as I know.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahākala and Mahākali are both Yidams as well as Dharmapālas.

The practice of Mahākala as a Yidam is quite widespread in Sakya, actually. It is also widespread in Kagyu and Nyingma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 9th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

Yontan said:

Agreed.

Longchenpa has done his best to give us a leg up. I believe his Resting at Ease trilogy has good info. Paltrul's seminal ngondro text has good help as well. At the least a teacher's students should show some bodhicitta, but even that can be hard to discern when first starting out.

I suppose it all comes down to karma. Best to pray to the bodhisattvas for guidance.

Malcolm wrote:

There is not such thing as a teacher whose conduct is immune to reproach. Buddhsit tantras warn again and again about the necessity to pick a qualified Guru.

Unacceptable conduct in teachers is not the kind of thing one can necessarily predict in the beginning of a teacher/student relationship, and erudition, even the appearance of bodhicitta, will not prevent such people from engaging in completely unacceptable conduct.

When you discover unacceptable conduct in some "teacher" like this, you have no choice but to separate yourself from that person, as Kongtrul makes very clear.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 9th, 2012 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- How can a beginner have a knowledge about the truly qualified Dzogchenpa Master?

Malcolm wrote:

Admittedly this is a difficult issue.

kalden yungdrung said:

- This does count also in choosing as a beginner, a Tantric Master.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, difficult.

kalden yungdrung said:

So it seems to be nearly impossible to make a correct choice as a beginner, so good karma and to have built up in previous lives a connection / base, would be important..... Maybe I did forget something

Malcolm wrote:

It is difficult even when one is not a beginner. Sometimes people make errors of judgement, and someone they thought was a qualified to give teachings turns out not to be qualified at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 9th, 2012 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

pemachophel said:

I offer this as a caveat against simply reading the available Dzogchen literature in English, thinking that one has understood the natural state, and then traveling down a wrong path.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen texts are manuals, not literature, and need to be understood in that way.

They need to be studied in conjunction with a teacher, until one's understanding is comprehensive and moving in the right direction. If one is studying with someone who does not have an actual understanding of Dzogchen but merely uses Dzogchen as a way attracting students in order to make a living, this can also interfere with a student's progress. So it is important to make sure that one's teacher of Dzogchen is a truly qualified teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: The Buddha Witinin by Jamgon Kontrul

Content:

Jax said:

Jean Luc, who I know well, would agree with "knowledge" for Rigpa. As they both think rigpa is some kind of knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

So in fact does my Guru, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu -- in fact he said so again just last night. "Rigpa is not the basis, the basis is called bodhicitta; rigpa is one's knowledge of that basis and the ability to remain in that knowledge."

It is also true that ChNN translates rig pa as instant presence. The term rigpa gets used in a variety of ways in Dzogchen texts, which is why Vimalamitra articulated five different forms of rigpa.

As for awareness, that bests translates shes pa as in thamal gyi shes pa i.e. ordinary awareness or ma bcos shes pa skad cig ma, momentary unfabricated awareness, etc. Sometimes shes pa means "to understand" when used as a verb. In other contexts it is better to translate shes pa as cognition, and so on. Tibetan is a language that is very synonym poor, so the same words have to do a lot of work in many different contexts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

Then I learned how much many "masters" were not realized. They knew the spiel but had no profound realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Care to list any masters you think are realized?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

You moron, I explained it in exact detail. Ok, ok... You are a bit slow, I get it.

Mr. G said:

Couldn't even keep it under control after being given a second chance, huh? ::sigh::

Malcolm wrote:

It's ok. I provoked him into on purpose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

Mental constructions cannot be said to exist or not exist as they are beyond both extremes.

Malcolm wrote:

We were not discussing the emptiness of mental constructs, but rather, how they come about. You have not provided an adequate response.

No worries. I did not imagine you could.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

No belief necessary Nam... Doubt is just distraction." Feel the Force Luke... You can't know it with your intellect". Just having fun with you Nam(or is it Malcolm?)

Malcolm wrote:

Either Malcolm or Namdrol.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: The Buddha Witinin by Jamgon Kontrul

Content:

Jax said:

Your translation is being influenced by the conceptualized vidya as used in all sorts of (gelugpa) translations.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm no, it is being influenced by the title of numerous dzogchen tantras where vidyā is translated as rig pa. Two upadesha tantras bear the term vidyā for rigpa in their Sanskrit titles, as well as many other titles of tantras. For example, in the dgongs pa zang thal, there is a text entitled the cittavidyā praveśa tantra or in Tibetan sems dang rig pa dbye ba'i rgyud or in English the The Tantra of Distinguishing Mind (citta) and Vidyā (rigpa).

These days there is a movement to just leave the term rigpa in Tibetan. I prefer vidyā because we commonly use terms like dharmakāya, etc.

But your assertion that there is no term for rig pa in Sanskrit is truly humorous and completely false. Saying such things just makes you look like a fool.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 10:02 AM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

No Namdrol, "sentient beings" are just a mental construction arising within the space of the Dharmakaya, like reflections in a mirror.

Namdrol said:

How do those those mental constructions come about according to you (I am perfectly familiar with what Dzogchen texts say)? Do mental constructions merely arise from themselves without a cause, or do they have a cause?

Jax said:

Mental constructions arise as the radiance of the ground, Zhi. They are an evolution of the Five Lights as tsal and rolpa, as an arising consciousness evolves it is bewildered by the display of the Five Lights, of which it is a part. Seeing the display as "other", subject and object are established. From this a false dichotomy arises in which all aspects of sem arise.

Malcolm wrote:

So you have retreated from your assertion that there are no "sems can" i.e. possessors of sem i.e. sentient beings.

Jax said:

But in fact nothing was "caused" because an "effect" never attained to the status of becoming an independently existing entity.

Malcolm wrote:

Independently existing entities do not require causes or conditions so your statement here is a non-sequiter.

Jax said:

Although a sentient being may be said to exist conventionally...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they may. Good to see you grasp this fact.

Still, there are two things: one you have not explained how an arising consciousness evolves, nor have you given a reason why this happens. So you have not answered the question of whether these mental constructions are independently existent entities since they arise from themselves and lack causes, or are caused entities that lack independent existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

You are exactly right Namdrol, I have no "idea" what Rigpa is. There you have it, I came clean man. And I also know, you have only "ideas" about what Rigpa is. I have never been able to capture Rigpa as an idea.

Malcolm wrote:

We have seen you over and over again proclaim your qualities of realization and understanding. We just don't believe you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: The Buddha Witinin by Jamgon Kontrul

Content:

Jax said:

Wow! Thank you Namdrol! I never considered myself an intellectual, but coming from you that has weight.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not a compliment.

Jax said:

Then you too can teach others from insight not just dry, literal parroting of others teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

That's funny, coming from you.

Jax said:

But you got stuck there because you try to translate Rigpa from the nuance of Sanskrit "vidya".

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, if you were less of an intellectual you would understand that vidyā is the word that Tibetans translate as "rig pa". For example, the Tantra Of The Great Self-liberated Vidyā That Unravels All is translated into Tibetan as the rig pa rang grol chen po thams cad 'grol ba'i rgyud from the Sanskrit Mahā vidyā svamukti sarva ghadita tantra

Jax said:

Sanskrit had no word for Rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Your ignorance is astonishing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:29 AM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

Cap'n, ask around to people who had either large retreat "direct introduction" or webcast. Ask them if they experienced the non-dual Rigpa. In Tibet the populace came to Dzogchen masters for a "blessing", they weren't seriously engaged as practitioners (per Norbu). Real practitioners met in private for the Tsal Wang and other forms of "direct introduction". You need almost daily contact with a teacher until the retreat practice is completed as well as afterward. I know many people, for many years... As Tenzin Wangyal said "only about 1% of disciples will recognize actual rigpa". To me that is unacceptable, it's not that difficult when one on one instruction is available easily, lineage or not. Senior students have the same capacity if they have really "recognized".

Malcolm wrote:

Jax, you have no idea what rigpa is. Just admit it, come clean man.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:21 AM
Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa
Content:
samdrup said:
Jax, I'm beginning to think you're taking the piss.

Malcolm wrote:
It's been obvious for a while, but he also charges money for it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:15 AM
Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote
Content:
Jax said:
Nam, Nubs was wrong. He didn't realize that Chan realization is Mahamudra and trekchod, realizing kadag. Boy, you don't read my posts. I explained that earlier.

Malcolm wrote:
Realization of Chan, Mahāmudra, and Dzogchen are all the same. The length of time it takes to gain that realization is what makes the distinction.

Your concept of ka dag is a bit limited though. Kadag is not simply emptiness, though it has been dumbed down in that way for people like you.

Jax said:
Nubs should have stayed within his own knowledge base.

Malcolm wrote:
Nonsense, Nubchen had personal experience of Chan.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:13 AM
Title: Re: The Buddha Witin in by Jamgon Kontrul
Content:
Jax said:
Try to "recognize" Rinpoche's intent and meaning.. If you do, that's transmission of the best kind.

Malcolm wrote:
Your problem, Jax, and the reason why your teachings are complete shite, is that you are an intellectual. Not a particularly skillful one, nor especially articulate, but an intellectual nevertheless.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

Nam, only my intestines...

Malcolm wrote:

No, completely and utterly, head to toe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

Tom... Yes, at least some balance. It seems there is similarity between some positions here as expressed in "The Great Debate" at Samye in Tibet in the 800's (if it actually occurred!). The debate centered between the "sudden" or "all at once school" of the Chan school and the "gradual approach" of Kamalasila.

Malcolm wrote:

This solely concerned sutrayāna teachings and had nothing to do with Varjayāna. In his seminal Lamp of the Eye of Concentration, Nubchen clarifies that even though Mahāyoga is "gradual" is still superior to Chan because of the presence of introduction in Mahāyoga and its absence in Chan. Of course, Dzogchen is yet again superior to Mahāyoga, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

I most often write from that Space.

Malcolm wrote:

You, Jax, are completely and entirely full of shit, in my not so humble opinion of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

No Namdrol,"sentient beings" are just a mental construction arising within the space of the Dharmakaya, like reflections in a mirror.

Malcolm wrote:

How do those those mental constructions come about according to you (I am perfectly familiar with what Dzogchen texts say)? Do mental constructions merely arise from themselves without a cause, or do they have a cause?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

spanda said:

What do you think? Another attempt to "adapt" Dzogchen teachings to the westerners?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

Dechen please hang in here with me a second. There is no one who attains or maintains the natural state or rigpa. There is no entity to rest in the natural state. The one who would recognize or rest is just the assembly of five skandhas, sem. The skandhas are arisings in that uncaused Dharmakaya, who you are. There is no self to realize Rigpa, that's a contradiction of terms.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no self to realize period in Dharma as a whole. Again, this is simple sutrayāna 101 stuff.

Jax said:

It's not that there is nothing "to do", but rather there is no one to do it.

Malcolm wrote:

So far you have shared nothing with us from Dzogchen teachings themselves. You have

just shared a bunch of sutrayāna perspectives. The idea that there is really nothing to introduce is Sakyapa and Gelug idea, one the ChNN regularly laughs at. In Dzogchen there is something to introduce.

Your problem is that you are still hung up on the relative/ultimate dichotomy like a first year Zen student.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

What happened to "nyamnyid" as same taste wherein all appearances are equal in value?

Malcolm wrote:

All appearances are equal in value.

But when people are not properly taught, they are cut off from the possibility of realization and that is an abomination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

Good answer Namdrol, but perhaps it would be more precise to say the only true refuge is one's own indestructible and changeless Nature as the Dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you want to go the Sutrayāna route, you might say this.

Still, Primordial Buddhahood is useless if it does not lessen your faults.

Nevertheless, if one does not practice, one will not realize anything and one will just remain an ordinary afflicted sentient being.

You do accept that there are such things, no matter how illusory, correct?

And you do accept you are one, correct?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:39 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

We find a slightly different rendering in the Pali Mahāparinibbāna Sutta where it says: "Therefore, Ānanda, be islands unto yourselves, refuges unto yourselves, seeking no external refuge; with the Dhamma as your island, the Dhamma as your refuge, seeking no other refuge. (Tr. vipassana.com)

Tasmātihānanda, attadīpā viharatha attasaranā anaññasaranā, dhammadīpā dhammasaranā anaññasaranā.

How does this injunction from the Buddha square with Vajrayana in general?

Malcolm wrote:

The only true refuge one has is one's own practice of Dharma. Ultimately there is no other refuge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:36 PM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

"Even the thought that freedom comes about through direct introduction is deluded.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the basis is always intrinsically liberated.

Jax said:

One strives to free this essence from whatever binds it, but nothing need be done to free it, for unobstructed Awareness, which has never existed as anything whatsoever, does not entail any duality of something to be realized and someone to realize it.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, since the basis is always intrinsically liberated.

Jax said:

What can be shown at this point is the transcendence of view and meditation, in which nothing need be done regarding realization, nothing need be directly introduced, and no state of meditation need be cultivated. So there is the expression 'it is irrelevant whether or not one has realization'."

Malcolm wrote:

This is where you deviate in your understanding. The Tibetan text does not use the term "need". It says quite simply:

"Here, since it is demonstrated there is nothing to be realized, nothing introduced, beyond view and meditation, it is called "beyond realization and non-realization".

But the context of the sentence above is provided in the previous sentence:
"Because an object to realize is not established since that ultimate dharmatā is beyond mind, a so called "realization" in the relative is described to be solely a deluded concept."

This passage is not saying that introduction is unnecessary. It is saying that from the ultimate point of view, there is nothing to introduce. But from an ultimate point of view not only are there no sentient beings, there are also no buddhas. This point of view is not especially profound. Even the Perfection of Wisdom sutras makes this point. So what?

Longchenpa is not saying that introduction is unnecessary. The context of this statement in general, in terms of the commentary as whole, comes after his description of the two types of transference, those of best capacity and those of medium capacity. Following this, he moves into a description of why Ati is considered unreasonable by those in lower vehicles since Ati is beyond cause and result.

But nevertheless, this does not mean that he considers introduction unnecessary. Quite the opposite in fact, given the sheer number of introduction texts he wrote.

Incidentally, on his deathbed, Longchenpa never said "After I die, rely on chos dbyings mdzod". What he said actually was "After I die, rely on the Yangthig Yidbzhin Norbu" a.k.a. the Lama Yangthig.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Altar in Bedroom

Content:

Fa Dao said:

yeaaaah...ok..I get that. I was just wondering why that is considered bad?

Malcolm wrote:

It is considered part of sexual misconduct to screw in front of a shrine of a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

So I and some others are presenting a generic approach to these teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

In my opinion, you and those others lack the necessary qualifications to present these

teachings, generic or not.

Jax said:

The evolution and flowering of a generic Dzogchen in the West is an exciting and challenging prospect.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is an abomination. Such a thing is completely disconnected from the meaning of the teachings as well as the lineage of the teachings so on and so forth.

Jax said:

The other issue is that the lineage teachings are not presenting a format that allows real one on one access to the Guru in the intimate quality that maximizes the benefits.

Malcolm wrote:

Setting oneself up as a guru is not the way to go about "mono a mono" access to a true Dzogchen master. And the only valid Dzogchen teachings are "lineage teachings". Of course, there will always be "teachers" who manifest like mushrooms in a field after rain.

Jax said:

We have to work on that, just signing up and going to a retreat once in awhile is not functional without close instruction. It's a definite problem...

Malcolm wrote:

It is even more of a problem when con artists pretend to be Dzogchen masters in order to make money (whether Tibetan or not), and give invalid teachings of Dzogchen -- this just leads people to lower realms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

For me, I take Longchenpa at his word.

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously you do not. When Longchenpa citations are produced which directly contradict your mistaken assertions, you blithely ignore them.

Likewise with kun byed rgyal po citations that contradict what you state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Altar in Bedroom

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Namdrol,

I have heard that before from other teachers. Why is that?

Malcolm wrote:

It is because people screw in their bedrooms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: nihilism

Content:

ngodrup said:

Indeed. The denial of intangible wisdom phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

Mt. Meru is not an intangible wisdom phenomenon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Can dharma alone make life worth living?

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

My question is:

1) Is dharma alone enough to make life worth living

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma alone makes life worth living.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: rTsa, rTsaI, and the Fruition of Trekchö

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Are there Tibetan (or even Sanskrit) words that would fill in the following blanks?

Trekchö - Kadag - Dharmakaya - Thigle - Essence - Sounds

Thögal - Lhungrub - Sambhogakaya - Lung - Nature - Lights

Yermed - _____ - Nirmanakaya - rTsa - Energy - Rays

Namdrol said:

samapatti; viśuddhi, dharmakāya, tilaka/bindu, svabhāva, śabda

xxxxx ; nirabhogana/anabhogana, sambhogakāya, vāyu, prakriti, ābhāsvarāḥ, prabhā
asambhedaḥ, karuna, nirmanakāya, nāḍī, kāra, raśmi

Greg said:

Just so I'm reading this correctly, "nyingje" should be in the blank spot after Yermed, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Thugs rje -- the honorific form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Shang Shung Institute Online Tibetan Medicine

Content:

Nangwa said:

Distance learning program starts this year.

<http://www.shangshung.org/home/about/school-of-tibetan-medicine/2012-on-line-tm-program/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Namdrol, any thoughts, comments or suggestions for people who might be interested?

Malcolm wrote:

Learn Tibetan first. it will help.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

Isn't Longchenpa pointing to the fact that Awareness (rigpa) cannot be attained by training, practice or any efforts of any kind? He says that because Awareness is fully present right now. Its not hidden. He even says in the same text that no "direct introduction" or realization is necessary. Your cognitive presence that is experiencing, is the experience, of the five senses, as well as your thoughts and emotions...is this

timelessly present Knowingness, that Norbu call pure "noticing". It's not more present after practice or study or transmission. Its the clear unchanging Awareness that appears as everything. Is it really so hard to notice that the Awareness he is speaking of is your present open and clear awareness just as it is?

Malcolm wrote:

No actually, what Longchenpa is talking about vidyā as dharmakāya.

Because vidyā is essenceless, because a substantial active agent is contradicted in the real state, and because it has always been naturally formed, there are no stages to train on, paths to traverse, mandala to create, empowerment to receive, path to meditate, commitments to protect, activities to accomplish and so on. There is no need create again what has already formed naturally. If it were necessary, conventionally designating natural formation as unconditioned would be invalid. Consequently, the dharmakāya would be perishable because it would be conditioned, and because it would have been made by causes and conditions.

The purpose of this statement is to point out that in reality there are no agent and actions so therefore these following things do not exist in vidyā, the dharmakāya. It does not mean that there is nothing to do. Most people are unaware that lhun grub means "not made by anyone". It means that vidyā cannot be fabricated, only recognized.

But Longchenpa does not say that introduction is unnecessary. On the contrary, chapter nine explicitly teaches introduction:

From the two systems in which naked vidyā is suddenly recognized, this is the introduction which does not depend on critical points. Since that stark, uninterrupted and uniform awareness (which does not move outwardly, grasp inwardly, rest in middle, is not fabricated with the mind and is without conceptual movement) exists at all times, by introducing it's naked arising within the state of the blessing at the time when the master and student are momentarily in the same state, starkness is seen nakedly. That alone can generate confidence in dharmakāya. The critical point is to sustain that state without meditation and without distraction.

Then of course there is the system of introduction that depends on six critical points.

However your contention " He even says in the same text that no "direct introduction" or realization is necessary." is proven to be false.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Altar in Bedroom

Content:

The Seeker said:

Thanks for the replies.

Padma, I thought that the statues and stupas, as well as the Dharma text were to be considered Holy objects that deserve respect. I take it as it is stuff, in a store until you purchase it and it has been placed in a place of respect.

But then again, that's just a new comers understanding I guess.

Adamantine, thank you

Kindest wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

You should put your altar in your living room, not in your bedroom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

I just am interested in interacting with people who are interested in approaching the teachings more from a practice perspective as opposed to pure literary discussions. If the discussions are outside the norms for Dharma Wheel, the conversations can be carried on with PM or private messages.

Malcolm wrote:

Most of us have teachers and a practice and have no interest in your instructions or recommendations for practice. And for those who do wish to communicate with you via pm about such topics, caveat emptor.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 11:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

The transmission that I received from Norbu could have been conveyed to me via an excellent book with the same information.

Malcolm wrote:

The Kun byed rgyal po has an entire chapter (chapter 83) on how a devoted student should relate to their guru:

The heart of the teachings, the Kulayarāja, should be given to one who swears "For as long as I and the master should live, while life and body remain connected, your commands will be accomplished".

It is just not the case that a guru is optional in Dzogchen. No Guru, no Dzogchen. Period.

Further, in chapter 27 the Kun byed rgyal po states very clearly:

The inauthentic master teaches scripture like a monkey, his false path beset with concepts.

And it states:

The master who displays the truth is a precious treasury worth an inestimable price.

So this is what authentic Dzogchen teachings state.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Kelwin said:

Online debate is not going to help anyone anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out many times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Fa Dao said:

In point of fact, Norbu Rinpoche maintains the rga thal gyur is the most important text of Dzogchen.

So Namdrol, has this text been translated into English? And if so where does one find it?

A little info on this text would be greatly appreciated by many here I'm sure.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope it has not been translated into English. One of the reasons there is so very little understanding of Dzogchen is that very little of the basic and seminal literature of Dzogchen has been translated into English. The Kun byed rgyal po for example exists one very bad translation by Eva Neumeyer-Dargye and a partial translation by Adriano Clemente. Jim Valby has been translating a two volume commentary on it that is being published in sections and is available from SSI bookstore.

Most of the other texts that are being published are rather late compendiums like Yeshe Lama which are summaries of the main points of the teaching. But the early material sits neglected, piling dust, and acting as nests for insects.

As far as Longchenpa's works go -- I am not very keen on the translations of those that presently exist. In his native language, Longchenpa is a difficult writer at best, very, very intellectual, and the English renditions of his works do not do justice to his writings, I am afraid. People seem to think it is necessary to pile on foreign intellectual bullshit on top of what is already very difficult writing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

I am fully capable of discussing my positions with textual references in as much detail as required.

Malcolm wrote:

When it comes to dancing on books, Jax, I am quite sure I am better at it than you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Kilaya. said:

Okay, what's the difference? I mean, how is the real rainbow body superior to your body dissolving into subtle particles?

Namdrol said:

Simply put, one's body remains in an impure conditioned state since subtle particles are still conditioned phenomena. It means you have not removed all traces of affliction

and karma in your psycho-physical continuum.

Sönam said:

Is that the difference between normal rainbow body and phowa chenpo, where it is said that they did not even manifest death?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that with so called normal rainbow body you realize the exhaustion of phenomena while in the bardo of dharmatā i.e. during thugdam, whereas in phowa chenpo you realize this during this lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Kilaya. said:

Okay, what's the difference? I mean, how is the real rainbow body superior to your body dissolving into subtle particles?

Namdrol said:

Simply put, one's body remains in an impure conditioned state since subtle particles are still conditioned phenomena. It means you have not removed all traces of affliction and karma in your psycho-physical continuum.

Kilaya. said:

This is an interesting subject, mind if I ask more?

What happens after that? You continue to exist in some subtle form? Or you take birth again in a physical body and practice until you attain the highest level of realization?

Malcolm wrote:

You again take rebirth until you eradicate all traces.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

Namdrol said:

It doesn't matter -- the main point is that it is the correctly one for your year, and that you authenticate it and keep it in your home.

Pema Rigdzin said:

I'm assuming the necessary info to enable one to choose the correct one can be found in ChNN's namkha booklet? Also, you know where properly made namkha can be found for purchase online?

Lastly, without asking you to share anything inappropriate, could you share a little about the benefits you've experienced from your namkha?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a book with complete instructions for calculating ones Namkha-- there is also a computer program for Windows that works too.

<http://tibecal.youhost.com.ar/namkha.php> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

well, it brightens my shrine room considerably.

They are very cheerful and useful. DOing the practice of Namkha balances your energy. You do need to periodically re-authenticate, especially when you are having a problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Kilaya. said:

Okay, what's the difference? I mean, how is the real rainbow body superior to your body dissolving into subtle particles?

Malcolm wrote:

Simply put, one's body remains in an impure conditioned state since subtle particles are still conditioned phenomena. It means you have not removed all traces of affliction and karma in your psycho-physical continuum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

As Buddha and Garab Dorje attained perfect illumination without a Guru, learn to access the Guru within.

Malcolm wrote:

No Jax -- this is not how it is. Buddha and Garab Dorje were emanations, nirmanakāyas. They did not attain anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sems sde will not lead to rainbow body, as ChNN has stated many times.

Kilaya. said:

Is trekchö not part of the semde cycle? I heard from the above mentioned Lama that by perfecting trekchö one attains the rainbow body, while thögal leads to phowa chenpo.

Malcolm wrote:

Trekcho is not sems sde. Trekchö's result is that body dissolves into subtle particles. This is called "rainbow body" but is not true rainbow body, as the above lama, as well as many other masters, have clarified over the centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

So it seems there is no willingness to relinquish fixed opinions that can't be supported on any level.

Malcolm wrote:

Jax, you are not in any position to tell anyone anything -- you have no authority whatsoever to speak of when it comes to Dzogchen with anyone who is not your student.

You are certainly welcome to share, but not to dictate -- clear?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

Ok, I get it Namdrol, I am criticized for scripturally unsupported positions, and then when I support my positions with absolutely appropriate texts, I am "cherry picking". What absurdity! Namdrol, you have no problem with the speciousness of your argument?

I am fully capable of discussing my positions with textual references in as much detail as required.

Malcolm wrote:

Well then do so. Producing a citation without context is meaningless -- that is called "cherry picking".

But in any event, as I said, it is a waste of time to argue about Dzogchen.

Chos dbyings mdzod is a great text, but it also contains a number of criticisms, for example, it criticizes the idea that our ordinary thoughts and concepts are self-originated wisdom; the play of rtsal yes, but wisdom, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Mariusz said:

The situation is not so dramatic There are many other still living masters of Dzogchen now, just for practice with.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know these other teachers personally, so I cannot recommend them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

Like I said Namdrol, I have not violated any samaya that I have pledged to honor, especially not any that I have never been told about by my teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said you violated samaya -- I merely corrected your statement that you do not have any.

Jax said:

What you are quoting is a mish mash of Dzogchen and Tantric precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what I am citing comes directly from the man ngag sde tantras themselves.

Jax said:

Norbu has said numerous times that "if you want to know the real, authentic Dzogchen you must refer to the only Kama text we have, the Kunje Gyalpo."

Malcolm wrote:

This is not Norbu Rinpoche's point of view at all. Moreover, there are many kama texts, the eighteen sems sde lungs of Dzogchen, etc. The reason ChNN started teaching sems sde is that his students were not understanding man ngag sde properly.

Jax said:

None of the contamination by tantric influence is present in KJG.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonesense. You have bought into a rather warped version of Dzogchen history-- the fantasy that at one time there was a pristine Dzogchen removed from all tantric influence -- it is a ludicrous proposition considering the sheer amount of tantric topics that are brought up in the kun byed rgyal po, even if they are brought up to be dismissed.

Jax said:

Norbu said later teachings incorporated Tantric and Vajrayana elements in order to survive in a hostile world of Sarma power players who were doing their best to discredit Dzogchen as a valid Buddhist teaching. These are the words of your teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Norbu Rinpoche is here referring to the treasure tradition where Dzogchen teachings were combined with anuyoga cycles of practice for example, the Khandro Nyinthig, Gongpa Zangthal and so on. However, even here, the Khandro Nyinthig, for example, contains some of the clearest teachings there are on man ngag sde. The Gongpa Zangthal contains many tantras there are pure man ngag sde. It also contains a Shitro cycle, it also contains a cycle on Vajrayogini.

The Vima Nyinthig, however is considered Kama, just like the seventeen tantras.

In point of fact, Norbu Rinpoche maintains the rga thal gyur is the most important text of Dzogchen. The types of doctrines present in man ngag sde are very radical compared to the kun byed rgyal po.

Jax said:

Semde has the same power as the Mahamudra tradition in being able to bring one to full and total realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Sems sde will not lead to rainbow body, as ChNN has stated many times.

[/quote]I teach from the Semde perspective as it is most attuned to the intellectual proclivities of Westerners.[/quote]

I don't agree that Semsde is most attuned to westerners. With respect, I think this is total bullshit. I will agree however that Sems sde has the most detailed presentation of the view. After all, sems sde is mostly about view.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jax:

CYD is a long text with a very long argument -- you cannot just cherry pick quotes from it to suit yourself.

Jax said:

Did you all miss this last post?

Re: No-self and Rigpa

by Jax » Wed Apr 04, 2012 7:23 am

More on "imputations" being the Great Perfection:

Longchenpa writes: "Everything is the perfection of awakened mind. Furthermore there is perfection in oneness, in that everything is perfect within the scope of awareness. There is perfection in duality, in that there is perfection in the creations of ordinary mind (sem)." Choying Dzod.

Jax

Posts: 107

Joined: Wed Mar 07, 2012 9:05 pm

Top

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

I agree Namdrol...

However, well placed "pointing out" can easily bring about an "aha" moment. That is the reason the great masters like Longchenpa and others wrote so extensively. Their writings like Tilopa's, Maitripa's, Saraha's and Niguma's to mention just a few, were meant to trigger a realization of one's Natural State.

Malcolm wrote:

Let us take for example the chos dbyings mdzod. This text is not literature in the commonly understood western idea of the term. This text is meant to be used as a tool for giving introduction by a qualified master. Once someone has received Dzogchen transmission in a proper way, then the text may be used in order to reinforce the meaning of the teachings. But it was never the intent of the authors of texts like Chos dbyings mdzod, the Shabar's Flight of the Garuda and so on that they be read in absence of proper transmission by a qualified Guru.

Jax said:

I actually have never been asked to agree to any samaya by any teacher at any time.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a misunderstanding on your part. While it is true that samaya in Dzogchen is not really a catechistic list such as one finds in Mahayoga and so on, everyone who is an authentic Dzogchen practitioner from having received Dzogchen transmission has samaya. For example, all Dzogchen practitioners have a samaya not to take life. This is the fundamental samaya of the body. Dzogchen practitioners do have a fundamental obligation to observe the principles of basic human decency which is embodied in avoiding the ten non-virtues and adopting the ten virtues. Longchenpa, of whom you are fond, writes in the Ocean of Liberation which is from the Lama Yangthig:

Now then, although there is nothing to damage or transgress, the natural great completion being beyond a boundary to protect, it is necessary for yogins on the path of practice to abide in samaya...

He then goes on to describe in great detail the 27 samayas of a practitioner of Dzogchen (body, speech and mind * outer, inner and secret * outer, inner and secret).

Such tantras as the sgra thal gyur, the rig pa rang shar and so on very clearly explain the meaning of samaya, how it must be kept, the fruit of keeping it, and consequences of not doing so.

Of course, if you choose to ignore samaya, that is your choice, and fundamentally the only person you are harming is yourself.

Jax said:

I guess it's not clear to me why you post here if you feel it can't be of any real value regarding Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are some people who have received transmission from authentic lineage holders of the teachings of Dzogchen, and since I have developed the skill of reading Tibetan, and since I have access to texts normally unavailable to people or only available in translations of questionable merit, people sometimes find my contributions of value. But in general I do not fund my contributions concerning Dzogchen to be of any value whatsoever to people who have not received transmissions in a proper way. For

example, many times people from outside the Dzogchen tradition ask me questions about what sets Dzogchen apart -- and they cannot find any answer that I give satisfactory. The reason of course is that I do not feel it is appropriate to discuss various topics with people who do not have transmission, who do not have the fortune to meet an authentic teacher of Dzogchen like Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche, Loppon Tenzin Namdak and so on, to name three, still living, masters of Dzogchen. Even were I to "tell all" they still will not understand because the nine yānas are all paths based on mind, where as true Dzogchen goes beyond mind and is based on wisdom from the very beginning. Further, this basis in wisdom is based on one's personal experience which arises from one's interaction with a guru, and not on any sort of intellectual analysis.

Jax said:

I differ perhaps in feeling a responsibility to guide and share to the best of my capacity.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many ways to act responsibly. My approach is encourage people to discover the value of Dzogchen teachings by first and foremost receiving transmission from a qualified master. Encouraging them to learn things like Song of the Vajra, and so on as detailed in the Tantras of the Sun and Moon. Encouraging them to keep up ganapujas offered to qualified masters, as is recommended quite clearly in the ultimate root tantra of Dzogchen, the sgra thal gyur, to encourage people to learn about the peaceful and wrathful deities which are crucial part of Dzogchen teachings detailed no less than twice in the Rig pa rang shar, etc. I encourage people to understand the length and breadth of the Dzogchen teachings. Sems sde is fine, but it is primarily confined to view. Those who want to go deeper must engage the Nyingthig teachings. And the details of Nyingthig teachings just are not appropriate for discussion in a public forum, just as it is not proper to run one's mouth about tögal in a bar.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 8:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Dzogchen fundamentally concerns how delusion self-embodies as sentient beings, and what the embodied sentient beings who have good fortune to meet Dzogchen teachings can do to reverse that delusion through which they are embodied. That is all. There is nothing more to Dzogchen than this. The principles involved in reversing that delusion require personal instruction from a master who knows what they are doing.

Dzogchen is based on a personal experience introduced by such a master. That experience cannot be communicated in words to people who do not have that experience. It can only be demonstrated. This is why arguing about Dzogchen on internet forums is hopelessly deluded.

N

Namdrol, that has to be one of the most profound and sad things I have read about Dzogchen in a very long time. Sad because what is one supposed to do if one does not have access to that "personal instruction" you spoke of? (I am guessing that webcasts dont count as personal instruction)

Malcolm wrote:

Webcasts do count as personal instruction. But you have to pay very, very close attention to what is being said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

Namdrol, I disagree. Great benefit can come from discussions that clarify the insight and means to that insight. Much in terms of conceptual deconstruction of deluded self-deceptions can be accomplished. You have been doing that quite well here. Bows... To you!

Malcolm wrote:

That is not Dzogchen, whatever else it might be, Madhyamaka, etc.

While certainly one can dispell uncertainty concerning such things as whether Dzogchen tantras promulgate this or that point of view, in the end, since Dzogchen is based on a personal experience, if one lacks that experience, then most Dzogchen teachings are either pure intellectual verbiage, like sems sde, or hopelessly obscure references that make no sense without having the intimate context of personal experience of the subject matter.

Of course talking about Dzogchen practice among practitioners who understand the teachings can help those of lesser capacity have deeper understanding, but that in general is not what is happening here. What is happening here is mostly lot of negation [dgag] and offering of proofs [sgrub].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

Namdrol, unfortunately those challenging posts are often buried within a litany of critique and assumptions that really are most often too convoluted and rhetorical to respond. It would be great if there was one question, clean and simple quoting one of my comments alone that I can sensibly respond to. I have responded to many specific

questions in great detail. I try to answer several points in one response that should clarify several related questions. I apologize if I missed some questions. I will try to do better...

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen fundamentally concerns how delusion self-embodies as sentient beings, and what the embodied sentient beings who have good fortune to meet Dzogchen teachings can do to reverse that delusion through which they are embodied. That is all. There is nothing more to Dzogchen than this. The principles involved in reversing that delusion require personal instruction from a master who knows what they are doing.

Dzogchen is based on a personal experience introduced by such a master. That experience cannot be communicated in words to people who do not have that experience. It can only be demonstrated. This is why arguing about Dzogchen on internet forums is hopelessly deluded.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

I challenge you to point out one statement that i have made regarding the "view" of Dzogchen that is inaccurate or misleading.

Malcolm wrote:

People have, but you ignore them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I have the lung for this practice from ChNN and the dvd/cd and booklet set but the set does not include a practice. Where can I get the text for the authentication rite/practice?

Malcolm wrote:

It in the back of the thun book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Is it more effective to create a namkha for oneself vs. purchasing an authentic one made by others?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't matter -- the main point is that it is the correctly one for your year, and that you authenticate it and keep it in your home.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

Perhaps the Great Perfection IS the imputations and the populating by the intellect with dualisms... As opposed from being separate from or prior to?

Namdrol said:

So pompous elephants of ati would maintain, unable to distinguish sems from rtsal.

Jax said:

Namdrol... Sem is tsal (or rolpa if you prefer) All of the display is "equally" the play or ornament of the Base.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you need to read chos dbyings mdzod, chapter 5, a little more carefully:

In Ati these days, conceited elephants [claim]
the mass of discursive concepts is awakened mind (bodhicitta);
this confusion is a dimension of complete darkness,
a hindrance to the meaning of the natural great perfection.

And:

Thus, the energy of compassion moves from self-originated wisdom, that cognition arisen towards an object is called "play arising from energy". That [cognition] is not self-originated wisdom because of the difference between the existence and non-existence of the object and because if there is no connection with the method, affliction and action leading to existence are generated, and because the nature of conceptuality and

discursivess never transcends samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Pero said:

Well this sucks haha. I still wanted to get some replays from there. That's what I get for being lazy.

Dronma said:

Exactly the same with me!

Does anyone know how this thing works for being able to listen to the replays?

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to be broken

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Why? according to your definition one needs only to generate the meaning of the experience from the third empowerment as I understand it.

Namdrol said:

Because comprehending this meaning depends on one's merit and the instruction of the Guru.

Mariusz said:

So something has to be received also, unconditioned, not only generated from experience of the master, since the master had also one's own master from He/She received this something unconditioned too. Is it true?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the fourth empowerment, an example wisdom, simply contextualizes the experience of the third empowerment and is used to indicate the meaning of the innate. It is not an actual transference of any sort of experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Why? according to your definition one needs only to generate the meaning of the experience from the third empowerment as i understand it.

Malcolm wrote:

Because comprehending this meaning depends on one's merit and the instruction of the Guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Namdrol said:

As tom mentioned, the fourth empowerment is an introduction [to] the meaning of the experience generated by the third empowerment, and this is the same in all four schools.

Mariusz said:

So is it possible to complete one's own HYT path without receiving the fourth empowerment from one's own HYTmaster?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Anders Honore said:

Is there anything about Dzogchen that should make the question of free will different from Buddhism in general?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Well yes, in Buddhism you have a bunch of old ladies squawking about karma, whereas in Dzogchen you have a bunch of old ladies squawking about self-liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

Perhaps the Great Perfection IS the imputations and the populating by the intellect with dualisms... As opposed from being separate from or prior to?

Malcolm wrote:

So pompous elephants of ati would maintain, unable to distinguish sems from rtsal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Maybe I've misunderstood the meaning of the term 'direct introduction'. If it's simply a transmission of oral instructions based on experience, and the blessings of that instruction, I would agree that the fourth empowerment is a direct introduction.

Malcolm wrote:

As tom mentioned, the fourth empowerment is an introduction the meaning of the experience generated by the third empowerment, and this is the same in all four schools.

A direct introduction has the same meaning as the fourth empowerment but, according to the Nyingma system, does not need to be preceeded by the three lower empowerments.

Sakya Pandita accepts direction introductions given seperately from a formal empowerment, but only if that person has already received a formal empowerment.

The Nyingma and the Kagyu schools maintain that it is not necessary to give formal empowerments as a requirement for receiving direct introduction.

Pahongkha maintained that Tsongkhapa rejected the idea of direct introduction, which is why he altered the transmission of Vajrayogini and excluded the introduction to dharmatā that clearly exists in the Sakya tradition of Naro Khachö from earliest times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

CapN Crunch said:

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/freewill/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; ""Free Will" is a philosophical term of art for a particular sort of capacity of rational agents to choose a course of action from among various alternatives."

Malcolm wrote:

Well this definition itself is flawed since it presumes there are such things as "rational agents" and arguably by this definition anyone who knowingly engages in afflicted conduct is irrational and therefore incapable of free will even though they may be making all kinds of choices.

From a Dzogchen perspective sentient beings are fundamentally irrational since they are entirely products of ignorance and deluded appearances.

In other words, this western philosophical concept is entirely irrelevant to Buddhism, including Dzogchen (which is a form of Buddhism, or rather, an a proposed solution to existential questions found in Buddhism).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

CapN Crunch said:

freewill exists in Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Why? Because you have a will (cetana, volition), and you can direct it wherever you want, including the path of freedom.

No. Why? Because as long as you continue under the power of the five afflictions you will never escape from samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

CapN Crunch said:

...where does sin come into this?

Malcolm wrote:

Free will.

Sin is meaningless unless we have free will to choose to sin or not.

This issue is a complete non-starter in Buddhism.

Determinism is also irrelevant in Buddhism.

We make our own karma, and we can put an end to it too.

Thus, the philosophical context for the question of free will never arises and thus it was never an issue for Buddhists and the issue never comes up as a topic of philosophy in Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

CapN Crunch said:

So having said that - How does free will, or the lack thereof correspond to Dzogchen view?

Malcolm wrote:

Free will is of concern only to those who are trying reconcile sin with creation by a creator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

The fourth empowerment is not a direct introduction, it's a description of the Spiritual Master's experience as a pointing out instruction that gives powerful blessings, but not a mystical transfer of his complete experience.

Malcolm wrote:

A direct introduction is not a mystical transfer of a master's complete experience. It is a pointing out instruction. It does not transfer the master's realization (that is impossible), it communicates the student's own state.

Actually the word translated as "introduction" and "pointing out" is the same word i.e. ngo phrad.

Tsongkhapa said:

Regarding Sakya Pandita, didn't he say that Dzogchen was not Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Pandita criticized certain trends he saw in the Nyingma (much in the same way that Gorampa and Shakya Chogden criticized certain trends in Gelug), but he never stated that Dzogchen was not Buddhism, quite the opposite. He stated in fact that he had received Dzogchen teachings and respected them, as is stated plainly in his Analysis of the Three Vows. In fact, Sapan reserved most of his criticisms for the Kagyu school, spending very little time on the Nyingma school. After all, Sapan is a very important master for Vajrakilaya teachings. Dzogchen is the ancestral teaching of the Khon family.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Finally! Mahamudra Library of Tibetan Classics Volume

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

One of my teachers just informed me that he will be giving instructions on the section of this volume that deals with the mahamudra writings of Gampopa. Does anybody have a list of the texts included in the volume?

I want to read them before the retreat but, unless things go hideously right, I doubt I will have the \$70 needed to buy the book sometime soon.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahamudra and Related Instructions: Core Teachings of the Kagyu Schools (Library of Tibetan Classics) by Peter Roberts and Peter Alan Roberts (Kindle Edition - May 10, 2010) - Kindle eBook

Buy: \$29.99

You can buy it in a kindle edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Question ~ Answer Thread

Content:

Wesley1982 said:

Do you follow a daily routine or daily schedule? . .

Malcolm wrote:

First, find a teacher. Make sure they are qualified by observing their character for a number of years while learning Buddhism at the same time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

... (and Sakya Pandita) don't accept it.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not true. Sakya Pandita accepted direct introduction, but only subsequent to having received empowerments. The fourth empowerment is in fact a direct introduction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Totoro said:

According to the Sakya lineage, there are two kinds of persons, those who require the gradual training you mention (rim gyis pas), and those who are able to enter Vajrayāna teachings immediately without prior training (cig car bas). These two types of persons are clearly demonstrated in Aryadeva's commentary on the Pañcakrama.

Thus, it is best to understand that there are different approaches for different people.

N

འོ་རིམ་གྱིས་པ་ (rim gyis pa)

<noun> "That which proceeds gradually" or "gradual type". One of a pair of terms. The opp. is cig car ba, that which proceeds without any stages, that which goes at once.

In the language of the buddhist tantras, two types of practitioner are identified: the rim gyis pa is the gradual type, the person who goes to liberation by stages; the cig car ba is the sudden type, the one who goes to it immediately. Acc. Tenga Rinpoche, the general distinction is as follows. The gradual type person is someone who has not developed a connection to the practice previously or who has only developed a small connection to it. Because of this, they have to work at the practice again and again before it comes to fruit. A sudden type is someone who has developed a great connection to or realization of the practice previously and therefore, when they meet the teaching again, they are capable of realizing it all at once.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a little different than the standard distinction between these two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Will said:

N. - you mean that the sutric ethical, dialectical & meditative foundation are never used as a preliminary practice? Surely in every lifetime those basic methods & practices must be recapitulated by everyone? For the very advanced that revisiting of such basic practices may take only a few years (or less?), but all must have that foundation.

Namdrol said:

I never engaged in them. I entered Vajrayāna from the beginning without engaging in lam rim teachings.

Tom said:

Still, even if introduced later aren't sutra topics such as Abhidharma foundational for Tantric practice in Sakya? Actually, I have found Sakya lamas to be more concerned about their Vajrayana students understanding of basic Abhidharma topics even more than Gelugpa lamas.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally in Sakya, they backfill. In other words, people are given abhisheka right away, and then instructed to learn whatever they need to contextualize their Vajrayāna practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

according to the lineage of Atisha and Je Tsongkhapa.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Sakya lineage, there are two kinds of persons, those who require the gradual training you mention (rim gyis pas), and those who are able to enter Vajrayāna teachings immediately without prior training (cig car bas). These two types of persons are clearly demonstrated in Aryadeva's commentary on the Pañcakrama.

Thus, it is best to understand that there are different approaches for different people.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is it possible to progress through...
without necessity of sutra methods or not?

Namdrol said:

From the point of view of Nyingma, Sakya and so on, definitely.

Will said:

N. - you mean that the sutric ethical, dialectical & meditative foundation are never used as a preliminary practice? Surely in every lifetime those basic methods & practices must be recapitulated by everyone? For the very advanced that revisiting of such basic practices may take only a few years (or less?), but all must have that foundation.

Malcolm wrote:

I never engaged in them. I entered Vajrayāna from the beginning without engaging in lam rim teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Namdrol said:

You are free to disagree of course, but I don't beleive in the existence of 600 year old human beings.

Mariusz said:

Li_Ching-Yuen https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Li_Ching-Yuen

Malcolm wrote:

And this is proof of what?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is it possible to progress through...
without necessity of sutra methods or not?

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of Nyingma, Sakya and so on, definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Nagarjuna was known as a Alchemist, and one of the Siddhis of Alchemy is the "Elixir of Long Life".

Is living for over 600 years any more far-fetched than other Siddhis described in Buddhist writings?

Or are the descriptions of the phenomena (or Noumena) of Siddhis only allegorical/metaphorical?

Malcolm wrote:

It is clearly a case of mistaken identity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Anders Honore said:

I think it's a vajrayana thing to reduce Madhyamika to a mere dialiectic tool. It certainly isn't so in its east-asian incarnation and I think neither was it so in its Indian incarnation.

gregkavarnos said:

In the Kagyu tradition Nagarjuna is one of the Mahasiddha, thus quite clearly a philosopher AND a great practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think we can seriously consider the Nāgārjuna who lived in the 2nd century CE and authored the Madhyamaka corpus to be the same person who was a disciple of Saraha in the eighth century and authored the Pañcakrama and other Vajrayāna texts. You are free to disagree of course, but I don't beleive in the existence of 600 year old human beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not for beginners. Only for advanced pracitioners.

Mariusz said:

The ones who really enter HYT methods.

Malcolm wrote:

What Tsongkhapa is saying is that until one gains advanced proficiency in completion stage, one must rely on Madhyamaka analysis in tandem with the two stages. He is never saying that one may begin to engage [i.e. enter] in HYT practices without having done extensive analysis based on Madhyamaka texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Namdrol said:

Well, what Tsongkhapa is saying here is that first you generate the view in accordance with Madhyamaka texts. Then, outside of the context of creation and completion one still engages in Madhyamaka analysis.

However, advanced meditators in the completion stage have no further need to engage in such analysis and so they don't.

N

Mariusz said:

Yes. For me it is also. So in this case the HYT methods are sufficient alone without any need for the sutra adding even according to Tsongkhapa . No necessity for mixing the both.

Malcolm wrote:

Not for beginners. Only for advanced practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tom said:

Obviously from his writings it appears Tsongkhapa thought otherwise!

Mariusz said:

It is not so obvious. Here you have a quote on the analysis (sutra methods) which is not performed during HYTantra:

(Tsongkhapa's Final Exposition of Wisdom; page.158) Our own system is as follows:

Even in the context of Highest Yoga [Mantra] the system (Vajrayana) of generating understanding of the view must be done in accordance with what occurs in the Middle Way texts. With respect to how it is sustained, on some occasions during states subsequent to meditative equipoise on the stages of generation and completion, one takes suchness to mind within analyzing it, but when those on the stage of completion who have attained the capacity to put penetrative focus on essential points in the body sustain suchness in meditative equipoise, although they definitely must meditate within setting [the mind] in the context of the view, they do not perform the analytical meditation of special insight as it occurs in other texts. Therefore, with respect to that occasion, do not posit analytical meditation as one-pointed meditation on suchness from within the context of the view ancillary to stabilizing [meditation].

Malcolm wrote:

Well, what Tsongkhapa is saying here is that first you generate the view in accordance with Madhyamaka texts. Then, outside of the context of creation and completion one still engages in Madhyamaka analysis.

However, advanced meditators in the completion stage have no further need to engage in such analysis and so they don't.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

So there's apparently no such thing as Kunzhi (Alaya) by itself, as Kunzhi (Alaya) is either shorthand for Kunzhi-Namshe or longhand for gZhi (someone correct me if I'm mistaken).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a kun gzhi which stands by itself.

In dzogchen we have the gdod ma' spyi gzhi, "the original general basis".

The we have the kung gzhi (ālaya), which arises from ignorance. From the ālaya or all-basis eight eight consciousness, including the ālayavijñāna (all-basis consciousness), dependent origination's twelve links and so on arise.

Not distinguishing the kun gzhi from the gzhi causes a lot of problems for people when trying to understand Dzogchen.

For example, the a text from the dgongs pa zang thal states:

The all-basis is the bardo of all,
unconsciousness, unclear, and inexpressible,
does not form wisdom, being the cause of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Question ~ Answer Thread

Content:

bodhipunk said:

Here's another assessment straight from Buddha himself, "Both formerly and now, it is only dukkha that I describe, and the cessation of dukkha."

Wesley1982 said:

Dukkha is called one of the 4 noble truths. Correct?

Malcolm wrote:

Sarvadukkham -- suffering is everywhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Question ~ Answer Thread

Content:

Wesley1982 said:

Can the complete teachings of the Buddha be assessed in a -{easy/medium/difficult}- fashion? . .

Malcolm wrote:

All conditioned things are impermanent.

All afflicted things are suffering.

All things lack identity.

Nirvana is peace.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and space

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="catmoon"]Space is a fundamental concept in Buddhism. /quote]

There are two kinds of space talked about in Buddhism -- unconditioned space which is

simple absence of obstruction and conditioned space, which means cavities.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

yes, as you say, "among other things" but in the last retreat webcast he seemed to be pretty clearly saying rigpa is not your real nature, it is your knowledge of your real nature (or words to that effect). whereas, as in the vimaningthig you posted:

3) The vidyā present as the basis is the reality of the essence, original purity, that exists possessing the three primordial wisdoms.

rigpa/vidya* is being used as a synonym for the basis, our real nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct. And the word is used both ways in Dzogchen texts. But what ChNN is emphasizing is the one basis, two paths, two results approach of the dgongs pa zang thal. I.e. he is presenting vidyā in its aspect as the experience of path (from among the trio of the vidyā of the basis, mentioned above; the path and the result) which is clearly discussed in those teachings.

gad rgyangs said:

* why use the sanskrit term when there are no sanskrit dzogchen texts, and probably never were? the tibetan term suffices, methinks.

Malcolm wrote:

Because the word vidyā is the term used in titles such as the rig pa rang shar tantra, etc., and because the term vidyā has cognates in English through Latin and is connected with seeing and vision. And finally, mostly, because I prefer to use Sanskrit terms such as vidyā, dharmadhātu, prajñā, dharmakāya, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is basically no difference in methods. Yangti methods such as dark retreat and so on occur in Snying thig as well.

In snying thig there is the unsurpassed secret cycle. This equals yang ti.

Pero said:

Didn't you mention once that yang ti considers itself superior?

Malcolm wrote:

All Dzogchen texts have abundant triumphalist rhetoric.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

Xabir, what you wrote is very interesting but Nagarjuna was not totally comfortable with the view of the Abidharma as it colored the Buddhist view of his day. Consciousness in Abidharma is strictly "sem" or afflicted karmic mind that arises dependently. This consciousness is not Rigpa Awareness or the unchanging cognitive Knowing of the Dharmakaya. The vision you describe is the more nihilistic nirvana of Abidharma theory. Dzogchen, especially thogal and Yangti offers the view of the Thigle Chenpo and Thigle Nyak Chik, Great Hyper Sphere and Unique Singularity. Beyond the skandha of consciousness you have the qualities of omniscience, clairvoyance and telepathy etc. All of which pertain to Buddha Mind, realized after the "collapse" of skandhic "consciousness". It's beyond, beyond at the other shore, the other shore that is always fully present right here in every moment as the only cognitive Presence in and as all experience.

xabir said:

Pardon my very limited understanding on this... may others correct me if I am wrong too.

In post-Yogacara teaching, consciousness is understood as dualistic vision, to be distinguished from Wisdom which is non-dualistic. But in Pali suttas, the original teachings of the Buddha, no such division was being taught - so there is no talk about converting consciousness into wisdom - consciousness is simply these six types of cognizance that arises whether you are awakened... except that for the awakened and liberated, there is cognizance/consciousness without taints or ignorance, while for the unawakened there is the instant of cognizance/consciousness quickly followed by the taints, the craving, attachment, and identification with 'I, me, mine'. In other words it is not the 'cognizance/consciousness' that is the problem, it is the taints, the ignorance, the grasping that is the problem.

For post-Yogacara teachings, consciousness is understood to be dualistic vision, so consciousness must be transformed into wisdom. In Dzogchen, I think it is not too different in this respect, as Namdrol once said: Further, there is no rigpa to speak of that exists separate from the earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness that make up the universe and sentient beings. Rigpa is merely a different way of talking about these

six things. In their pure state (their actual state) we talk about the radiance of the five wisdoms of rig pa. In their impure state we talk about how the five elements arise from consciousness. One coin, two sides. And it is completely empty from beginning to end, and top to bottom, free from all extremes and not established in anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

Longchenpa also discuss the meditation of Dzogchen in the following way:

Just as reflections arise in limpid water, the eyes and clairvoyances will arise from limpid vidyā. Moreover, one should practice by leaving the unobstructed sense faculties in their own limpidity. Since the main organ, the eyes, are limpid, vidyā is limpid, because the eyes are the gate of the personal experience of wisdom. Otherwise, just as the appearances of reflections do not condition the water, [35/b] likewise, even though all outer appearances arise as a brilliant vision, since one's awareness does become lost among such appearances, it is said "they are not established in vidyā". The sense of this is also demonstrated in the Pramanaviniścaya: Having included everything in the mind, since there is no movement from this inner nature, the form [seen by] the eye arises from the power of that intellect of sight.

This passage from the Pramanaviniścaya, while obscure, is in fact a description of what we call pratyakṣa, direct perception or personal experience as mentioned above. So, in fact you are correct, the key point of meditation in Dzogchen is simply to let all sense objects meet their respective sense organs, as Longchenpa says "likewise, even though all outer appearances arise as a brilliant vision, since one's awareness does become lost among such appearances, it is said "they are not established in vidyā"."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

You can either emphasize the ineffability of the base, or talk around it forever (which is a lot of fun actually), but either way the first thing is recognizing it. ChNNR seems to be campaigning for an adjustment of Dzogchen terminology, where "rigpa" is no longer to be used also as a synonym for the base itself (as it often is in the old texts) but is to be reserved for our knowledge of the base.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no campaign, he is right. Rigpa, among other things, is exactly the knowledge of

the display of the basis as one's own display, and ignorance is ignorance of that.

gad rgyangs said:

What does this knowledge "look like"? It can not be conceptual, otherwise just reading sentences like the quote above would be rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

There are five types of vidyā described by Vimalamitra in the Vima Snying thig i.e. 1) the vidyā that apprehends characteristics; 2) the vidyā that apprehends or appropriates the basis; 3) the vidyā that is present as the basis; 4) the vidyā of insight; and 5) the vidyā of thögal.

1) The vidyā that apprehends characteristics: “the vidyā that imputes phenomena as universals and as mere personal names”, is one’s mere non-conceptual self-knowing awareness defiled by many cognitions.

2) The [vidyā that] appropriates the basis creates all cognitions when present in one’s body, present as the mere intrinsic clarity [of those cognitions], is called “unripened vidyā”.

3) The vidyā present as the basis is the reality of the essence, original purity, that exists possessing the three primordial wisdoms. The vidyā which is not covered by partiality is present as the essence of omniscient wisdom. Further, that primordial wisdom is present as a subtle primordial wisdom. If that primordial wisdom did not exist, there would be no liberation from emptiness. Further, there would be no liberation from the inert. However, if vidyā exists as primordial wisdom, it would be no different than the realist’s nirmanakāya.

4) The vidyā of insight is those vivid appearances when the instruction is demonstrated. It is called “the essence of the self-apparent thigle”. As there are many unmixed appearances, the Teacher stated: Everything arose from non-arising, showing the great miraculous display in every way.

5) The vidyā of thögal is the absence of increase or decrease in experience having reached the full measure of appearance through practice. Having completed all the signs and qualities, also they are not established by their own nature. When self-manifesting as omniscient wisdom, it [the vidyā of thögal] is called “abandoning phenomena”, “the exhaustion of phenomena”, “beyond phenomena”, “liberated from phenomena”, and “no arising even in mere arising”.

So the issue really is complex and there are many different ways or angles from which to discuss vidyā or rigpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there is the irreducible presence of the here and now where we find ourselves.

Malcolm wrote:

It's reducible, thank goodness.

In any event, what you are talking about is the famous "clarity" aspect of the mind, the famed Descartes trope, "I can doubt everything but that fact that I am doubting". But this hardly constitutes "the fact of the existent".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the fact of the existent is given. everything else, like defining just what the existent is or isn't, is conceptual.

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting, Dante, I wouldn't have pegged you for being a realist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Dronma said:

That's all. Nothing more to say. [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't exist. There is no better term, otherwise, I would be using it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Dronma said:

Personally I prefer the latter, because the first notion leads to nihilism or zero, which is wrong. [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not nothingness since somethingness was not proposed to begin with.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Dronma said:

Chaos (Greek χάος khaos) refers to the formless or void state preceding the creation of the universe or cosmos in the Greek creation myths.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Dronma said:

How can nothing manifest something?

Namdrol said:

It doesn't. The Dzogchen view is that everything is completely equivalent with an illusion.

""Hey, hey, apparent yet non existent retinue: listen well! There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, discriminating knowledge does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway."
-- The Unwritten Tantra

Dronma said:

Exactly! Please remember that I am always talking here about linguistic expression. I am sure there must be better words to express "this".

Well, according to my language which I have much better knowledge, I think that instead of κενότητα - emptiness, the word χάος - chaos is more closed to the concept of infinitum which has all potentialities but no inherent formation at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Stong (སྟོང་) in tibetan is related to stongs (སྟོངས་), which means to empty out.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:07 AM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:

Dronma said:
How can nothing manifest something?

Malcolm wrote:
It doesn't. The Dzogchen view is that everything is completely equivalent with an illusion.

"“Hey, hey, apparent yet non existent retinue: listen well! There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, discriminating knowledge does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway.”
-- The Unwritten Tantra

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:03 AM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:
Namdrol said:
śūnyatā is a term in Indian mathematics which means 0.

N

Dronma said:
Sure, there is no doubt about that. But zero can manifest only zero, according to mathematics.
So, "this" which is manifesting everything and it is full of potentialities cannot be zero!

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, actually it can.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 7:50 AM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The moment a subject relates to an object, acceptance and rejection, attachment and aversion, are immediately present. There's no harm in implementing the conventional

concept of "no-self" as long as it's understood to be just that. The very self it (concept of no-self) negates arises from (and is sustained by) the very act of accepting/rejecting which is perpetually reborn as long as experience is dominated and swept away by the plague of delusion the initial (no-self) concept attempts to reveal. So you're right to be weary of this notion, however while you're correct in stating that only the "self" would dualistically accept/reject the self/no-self, it must also be taken into account that likewise only the "self" would accept/reject the acceptance/rejection of the self/no-self. It becomes an inescapable downward spiral (hence the endless cycle of samsara, the shoreless ocean of suffering). This is why skillful means and right view are so imperative. The more one struggles to escape, the tighter samsara's noose becomes around one's throat. But at the same time utter non-action is the same death sentence. There's no going beyond acceptance and rejection, it was empty from the start, the unestablished cannot go beyond that which is likewise primordially unestablished. There was never two to begin with.

When the [ultimate] truth is explained as it is, the conventional is not obstructed; Independent of the conventional, no [ultimate] truth can be found. - Nagarjuna

Dronma said:

Well said!

However I was talking about the linguistic expression, and not about the essential meaning which is beyond words anyway.

Even the terms "emptiness" or "voidness" are not really accurate for expressing śūnyatā or stong-pa nyid.

I feel that they are incomplete and maybe misleading.

Although in between "emptiness" and "voidness", I prefer the latter.

I have the same doubt with the Greek versions of those 2 words. They are not accurate either.

Malcolm wrote:

śūnyatā is a term in Indian mathematics which means 0.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 30th, 2012 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Sometimes what appears to a student as something negative is based on the limited understanding of the student.

Malcolm wrote:

It is possible to slide a lot of bullshit under this rug.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 30th, 2012 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

Namdrol said:

Both.

YangtiConfusion said:

So is this "yangti" terminology not found in Bon?

Namdrol said:

dark retreat and so on on occur in Snying thig as well.

YangtiConfusion said:

But only in something like Gongspa Zangthal right? Not in most nyingthig?

Malcolm wrote:

No, in all major snying thig cycles.

The practices of snying thig, yang ti, etc, are also found in Bon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 30th, 2012 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: On the Bardo - Stuck souls?

Content:

bardoq said:

I'm a little puzzled that you say that very few people see anyone in the Bardo, if it's so difficult, how has it then been possible to discover the max limit of 49 days and the "small deaths"? Someone must have been able to verify their existence over an extended period of time, right? And I would like to ask such a lama/tulku some follow-up questions, too.

Malcolm wrote:

49 days is symbolic number, not a fixed number.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 30th, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

YangtiConfusion said:

1. Is yangti a practice or a Nyingma classification of literature? Or both? See following link:

<http://www.thlib.org/collections/texts/jiats/#!jiats=/01/germano/b8/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Both.

YangtiConfusion said:

4. If you practice in Yangti methods for awhile and then switch over to the Seminal Heart, would the progress of the first automatically translate into the second?

Malcolm wrote:

There is basically no difference in methods. Yangti methods such as dark retreat and so on occur in Snying thig as well.

In snying thig there is the unsurpassed secret cycle. This equals yang ti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

heart said:

One even stranger thing was that this Geshe insisted that someone meditating on emptiness would not see or experience the world around him. Like emptiness was separate from phenomena somehow.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

This is a sūtrayāna idea.

Mariusz said:

Can you quote any sutra on "emptiness as separated from phenomena somehow"?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the idea to which I am referring.

The idea to which I am referring is that when one is having a non-conceptual direct experience of emptiness on the path of seeing, etc. one does not have perception of phenomena. This how non-conceptuality is interpreted by those in sūtrayāna i.e. no eyes, not ears, etc.

And this is why Gelugpas frequently make the claim mentioned above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:44 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

heart said:

One even stranger thing was that this Geshe insisted that someone meditating on emptiness would not see or experience the world around him. Like emptiness was separate from phenomena somehow.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

This is a sūtrayāna idea.

heart said:

Yes, but the heart sutra is also from the sutrayana, right?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this idea comes from the PP sutras mainly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:43 PM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Then don't name the women. If you keep the teacher's names quiet, than what about all the new students that arrive, with no idea what they may be in for? History repeats, unless provoked. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Yup quite true. But in naming the teachers, the women will be harmed. There is just no way to avoid it. Until they are willing to go public what to do? But these women feel constrained by many issues.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 12:45 PM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

But...this is a pervasive problem in dharma centers in the West. To think otherwise is to be ignorant. I personally know instances (yes plural) of woman pressured to have abortions after they have been impregnated by their teachers.

Adamantine said:

That's really disturbing. I wonder why you keep the names quiet.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not about the teachers, it is about protecting the women from further harm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 12:07 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

heart said:

One thing he often said was that Buddha nature is like a seed, then you have to make it grow with the nourishment of the accumulation of merit and wisdom.

Sherab said:

I too have problem with the idea of Buddha nature as a seed that needs to be grown. This contradicts the Prajnaparamita sutras where one reads that enlightenment is not obtained or attained. It also contradicts the classification of nirvana as unconditioned.

heart said:

One even stranger thing was that this Geshe insisted that someone meditating on emptiness would not see or experience the world around him. Like emptiness was separate from phenomena somehow.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

This is a sūtrayāna idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 10:54 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Then of course there is also the question how many Yidams one actually need to practice as a Dzogchen practitioner?

/magnus

Namdrol said:

The answer is none. Zero.

heart said:

Of course, but it helps just like all the preliminaries. But will 50 Yidams help more, I don't think so.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 10:46 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

There are many problems you can find in institutionalized Tibetan Buddhism...

Malcolm wrote:

I can't speak to the Sanghas you frequent since I do not know them, apart from Shenphen Rinpoche, and I know he is a good guy. I really do have full confidence in him.

But...this is a pervasive problem in dharma centers in the West. To think otherwise is to be ignorant. I personally know instances (yes plural) of woman pressured to have abortions after they have been impregnated by their teachers.

One of the problems is a corrupted idea of samaya -- women subject to harrasment, etc. in Tibetan Buddhist dharma centers feel silenced by "vows" and so they do not speak up for many reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

I also feel like you are being willfully obtuse for someone who follows terma traditions and who was close with Ngakpa Yeshe Dorje who was able to alter weather patterns on a regular basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Ngagpa Rinpoche could control weather, but it is not a miracle. Doubtless, there are some people who can control the elements.

My point is that there is no reason to accept any of this on faith and nor should one.

Adamantine said:

Another huge impediment is that women are not treated as equals in Tibetan Buddhism. In particular, young attractive women are subject to tremendous sexual attention, most of it unwanted, as well as actual harassment, emotional abuse and scare tactics which prevent them from speaking out.

I am sure this happens sometimes.. but this is not particular to Tibetan Buddhism. This is particular to men-in-general across the globe. Men's libidos cause great harm to women, in various ways, across all traditions and among all those who hold no tradition. This is the sad truth. To blame Tibetan Buddhism for having men who also engage in this harmful stupidity is the same as blaming "Tibetan Buddhism" for having samsaric individuals in it that aren't yet Buddhas. Of course, not everyone practicing Dharma is yet a Buddha, and is subject to craving and aversion... and not everyone's conduct is in line with relative Dharma ethics. But this hardly can be determined to be a downfall of Tibetan Buddhism in particular. If that were true, then you wouldn't find these same downfalls across the board on a global scale. This is a human downfall. I don't think any Buddhas have acted in this way.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Pretending that this not a problem in Tibetan Buddhism is merely to put on your blinders. Until we accept that this is a problem in Tibetan Buddhism, it will not be properly addressed. This is just like saying pedophilia is not a Catholic problem, it is a problem with men across the world. Well, there are ways in which pedophilia was institutionalized in Catholicism, and ways in which sexual harassment and so on are institutionalized in Tibetan Buddhism -- the sooner we recognize that fact and stop wishing it would just go away, the sooner women will feel safer around Tibetan teachers. You see, I know at least a dozen women who have been on the short end of that stick, and for them it is not pretty, and it is not fair.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

You certainly appear to be clinging to this fabrication you call "common-sense".

And I simply don't have as much faith in historical empiricism as you do...

Malcolm wrote:

Look, the simple fact is that Tibetan Buddhism, like every other faith in the world, needs to adapt to the modern age. It is trying to adapt -- I am not suggesting that it needs to abandon its narratives, principles such as rebirth, and so on. But when it comes to how it works its way through the world, the teachings need to adapt themselves to the society in which they find themselves. Mahasiddhas stopping the sun are not essential to Dzogchen or Tibetan Buddhism. Insisting such stories are "true" is actually a huge impediment for many people who might otherwise come to the Dharma.

Another huge impediment is that women are not treated as equals in Tibetan Buddhism. In particular, young attractive women are subject to tremendous sexual attention, most of it unwanted, as well as actual harassment, emotional abuse and scare tactics which prevent them from speaking out. This is not of course a problem isolated to Tibetan Buddhism -- sexual harassment of women is a worldwide issue. But the fact that it exists in Tibetan Buddhism needs to be recognized and not explained away, justified or otherwise ignored.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

The only I have ever seen around Lamas that defies common sense is the willingness of people to lose it.

Adamantine said:

That's sad, if true. Well, you still have more life ahead of you. . .

Your dualistic framework of "either it's this or it's that" is not quite in line with how Buddhas communicate about the nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha's framework is "Where this exists, that exists, with the arising of that, this arose."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Your dualistic framework of "either it's this or it's that" is not quite in line with how Buddhas communicate about the nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha's framework is "Where this exists, that exists, with the arising of that, this arose."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Namdrol said:

Greed may be a failing but it is not a cause for a Vajrayāna student to criticize their teacher.

Sönam said:

That's why it's important to ponderate ... and not to excessively enter in a cycle of opinion, judgement and so on. Most of the discomfort could be resolved by splitting without necessarily providing a commentary. Of course if a guru is outrageously lying or abusing it should be reported ... but except for that, the best is only to quit.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Funny how no one ever sees these "miracles" actually done. Oh right, we don't have enough merit, I forgot.

Adamantine said:

Sure, plenty of people see miracles. I have experienced enough that defies common sense not to entrust my faith to common-sense. Frankly, in all your time practicing Dharma and being around the Lamas you have, I'd be surprised if you've never experienced anything that defies "common sense". If you haven't, than I suppose it explains our different positions.

Malcolm wrote:

The only I have ever seen around Lamas that defies common sense is the willingness of people to lose it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

I think you've maxed out on the number of times you can use that example. But since it's your favorite, I'll give it a go:

If Virupa was indeed a Mahasiddha, and he was working with the display of appearances

to play with the presumptions of those in his immediate environment-- why would he want to scare the

shit out of an entire world? I think you are really clinging to something that you feel should make sense to you, about a display that goes beyond sense altogether. This misses the point.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have in fact admitted this is not a historical event, whatever else it may have been, and he did not stop the world's rotation on its axis (required for "stopping the sun").

So Mahasiddhas distort the perceptions of those whom they are trying to impress? Is that how it works?

Mahasiddhas can no more violate dependent origination than anyone else can.

I am not clinging to anything -- I don't take the stories of mahāsiddha's miracles literally, never have, never felt the need to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

If we don't believe that anything is possible, then we no longer believe in Sunyata. We are either nihilists or eternalists.

Namdrol said:

If you think that apple trees can grow from wheat seeds, you have left the realm of common sense.

N

Adamantine said:

Well, hand prints in rock, or Milarepa fitting inside a yak's horn...these have all left common sense far behind. Vajrayana is meant to invoke uncommon sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Funny how no one ever sees these "miracles" actually done. Oh right, we don't have enough merit, I forgot.

If you assume for example that Virupa really stopped the sun such a cataclysmic event should have been recorded around the world. Can you imagine?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

There have been much greater numbers of authors in general in the West (what exactly are we defining as the West here?), so proportionally this is not a fair accounting. Also, you are clearly grouping many countries and multiple land masses into your accounting of what is the "West", and opposing it to India and Tibet, two countries only. I hardly think your comparisons are useful. Also, you deflect the issue of whether women are considered to have as great or greater potential as men onto an issue of authorship, which is a bit of a red-herring. Many yogis and yoginis who reach high levels of realization don't author texts.

Malcolm wrote:

Can you provide a citation from a primary text which states that women have more potential than men for awakening? I personally do not believe that gender makes one person superior to another person in terms of capacity for awakening. I think it is a very silly thing to say.

If Tibetan tradition truly maintains that women had a greater potential for awakening than men, it would stand to reason that it would report more instances of awakened women than men. But in fact there are very few reports of awakened women as

opposed to endless litneys of men who are supposed to have achieved awakening.

While it is certainly the case that we can find positive messages about woman's potential for awakening in many tantras, in general Tibetan cultural practice, woman have been very disadvantaged.

If we take just one culture, Anglo-American culture, and compare it with Indo-Tibetan culture, the incidence of female authorship is much higher in our culture than in Indo-Tibetan culture. Why? It is quite simple -- in old Tibet educating women was not the norm, it was by far and away the exception. Of course, through the influence of Western values, Tibetan culture has decided to value the education of women, and this is a good thing, a positive direction. But there is still enormous sexism in both cultures, our and their's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

YogaDude11 said:

Have you had any experiences similar to what i have described?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but they are just experiences.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Okay. I have one question about samaya. What if the teacher falls into dualistic grasping in a such a way as to buy into a common run of the mill worldly point of view that the student thinks is petty?

Namdrol said:

The student should mind his own business.

deepbluehum said:

What if the teacher exhibits greed?

Malcolm wrote:

Greed may be a failing but it is not a cause for a Vajrayāna student to criticize their

teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

If we don't believe that anything is possible, then we no longer believe in Sunyata. We are either nihilists or eternalists.

Malcolm wrote:

If you think that apple trees can grow from wheat seeds, you have left the realm of common sense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Samaya is not koolaid, though it seem that many people treat it as such. Insitutionally mandated sexism does not need to be a part of Vajrayāna -- this just leads to the ruthless exploitation of women. Justifying it by invoking Machig Labdron is just sad.

N

Adamantine said:

I interpret this story of Machig in the same light as I would Padmasambhava being swallowed and eaten by his female teacher Kungamo,

Malcolm wrote:

The former (if true) is a story of teacher who gives a student a disease (though in fact the story hinges on ML breaking samaya and contracting a disease). The later is a story of a common feature of many initiations.

Adamantine said:

or Tilopa provoking Naropa to get the living crap beat out of him by a wedding party, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Tilopa, supposedly, had the power to completely restore Naropa to health.

Adamantine said:

If we decide that the stories of the siddhas are just fantasy, bent on political ends, and hold mundane views of social politics and western scientific materialism as supreme--

Malcolm wrote:

I think TNR's defense of Kosha Cosmology is pretty poor, frankly, since it also depends on us accepting the the Bible, the Koran and so on as superior to western empirical science.

Adamantine said:

then it seems to me that this would render our faith in vajrayana and guru yoga sterile, and there wouldn't be much point in following this path at all.

Malcolm wrote:

If we are following Vajrayāna because of some miraculous tale, we are doomed before we have even started.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Jax said:

Namdrol, what do think of Germano's research regarding sPyti being a reaction to the tantric elements being so broadly integrated into Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Highly speculative. The spyi ti texts were largely produced by Nyangral, one of the major promulgators of Nyingma tantric cycles in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

how Gurus may expect free labor for Dharma centers etc. then this is deeply built into the Dharma itself-- not related to Tibetan political structures.. The Vajrayana is founded on the model of mandalas in the form of kingdoms, with the Yidam/Guru on thrones in the center of palaces, etc. And serving the Guru and the Dharma are considered the supreme way to generate merit. . . If you have issue with these things, which is generally why the social-structures of Dharma centers arise the way they do-- then you aren't critiquing Tibetan culture per se you are criticizing the nature of Vajrayana itself.

Malcolm wrote:

The model of Vajrayāna that emerged in India during the 8-12 centuries is very much a reflection of the style of feudalism and vassalage present in Indian culture, a model Tibetans adapted to their own feudal system.

Serving the master and the Dharma is wonderful. But such service can be easily perverted to worldly ends.

I have observed before that in a real sense, anuttarayoga tantra is not suited to institutional practice of the kind we see in Tibetan culture.

Many absolutist notions about gurus we find in traditional sources (where they are not sheer didactic fabrications such as Milarepa's towers) need to be questioned, and can be questioned even after we have entered Vajrayāna.

Samaya is not koolaid, though it seem that many people treat it as such. Insitutionally mandated sexism does not need to be a part of Vajrayāna -- this just leads to the ruthless exploitation of women. Justifying it by invoking Machig Labdron is just sad.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

but from a feminist perspective this just doesn't fly.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not fly from the perspective of basic human decency. The minute that Vajrayāna practice becomes more important than basic human decency, Vajrayāna practice ceases to be Dharma and becomes a mere cult.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

then you aren't critiquing Tibetan culture per se you are criticizing the nature of Vajrayana itself.

Malcolm wrote:

I am ok with that. Vajrayāna can use some criticism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Pero said:

So I really doubt whatever anyone who doesn't respect his teachers says.

Namdrol said:

Of course. But I also would doubt what a teacher who does not respect his students says.

muni said:

Study/listen/reflect.... as much as you can, then find a teacher, I think, this advice once given, shouldn't be underestimated.

Malcolm wrote:

This is no guarantee that the teacher, once found, will be a good one, a qualified one. If that teacher does not measure up to Dharma standards, he or she should be dropped like a hot coal from one's hands.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Pero said:

So I really doubt whatever anyone who doesn't respect his teachers says.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. But I also would doubt what a teacher who does not respect his students says.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Okay. I have one question about samaya. What if the teacher falls into dualistic grasping in a such a way as to buy into a common run of the mill worldly point of view that the student thinks is petty?

Malcolm wrote:

The student should mind his own business.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

YogaDude11 said:

Hey Namdrol, Are you a practitioner of yantra yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

I have practiced it on and off for years, and have been a student of ChNN since 1992.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

heart said:

[

At the best you are interpreting Samaya here, but your interpretation is not in harmony with what I been taught or studied nor with what I have experienced. But I have no energy for this discussion.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

On whether you should stay with a teacher who has acted in a way that is not in accord with Dharma, simply examine page 51 of Buddhist Ethics where it clearly says that one should immediately sever one's relationship with such a person. On whether it is necessarily a breakage of samaya to criticize one's guru, examine the six criteria Kongtrul lists for samaya breakage to exist when criticizing one's guru, page 257. It depends primarily on one's motives.

No one is ever going to feel good about it, but sometimes, for the protection of others, it is necessary.

heart said:

One might wonder what is to be considered in accord with the Dharma when one consider Samaya a social construct?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I consider non-harming to be the basic criteria of Dharma. For example, it is the commitment of taking refuge in the Dharma.

Samaya is a social construct, and has no meaning outside of that construct. For example, samaya represents a contract between two people, a teacher and a student. But the salient point is that it is a two way contract and the teacher is as obliged to observe these commitments as the student.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Jax said:

I use the Kunje Gyalpo as my root reference regarding original Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

The sgra thal gyur is considered the root tantra of Dzogchen, not the kun byed rgyal po. And, if you take a text critical approach, they were both written around the same time.

For myself personally, I consider man ngag sde more profound in general. As it says in the man sngag sde tantras, sems sde is for intellectuals.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

pemachophel said:

"If so, are we not breaking these samaya's constantly when not in rigpa?"

This is exactly what I have been taught by my Teachers. When an Australian Lama friend once asked H.H. Dudjom Rinpoche what He did when He realized His mind had wandered, His Holiness said He immediately said Vajrasattva mantra.

Malcolm wrote:

These four samayas represent the state of the basis. They cannot be broken.

However, the Rangshar says:

As such, the qualified master
remains in equipoise on the real,
the samaya holder does likewise.

Here samaya holder means the student. Allowing oneself to become distracted is a "breakage" of samaya i.e. one's delusion becomes stronger.

In the DC, rather than Vajrasattva, we would do Guru Yoga. Same meaning, different method.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

heart said:

At the best you are interpreting Samaya here, but your interpretation is not in harmony with what I been taught or studied nor with what I have experienced. But I have no energy for this discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything requires interpretation, Magnus. Even your literalist stance is actually an interpretation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

heart said:

[

At the best you are interpreting Samaya here, but your interpretation is not in harmony with what I been taught or studied nor with what I have experienced. But I have no energy for this discussion.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

On whether you should stay with a teacher who has acted in a way that is not in accord with Dharma, simply examine page 51 of Buddhist Ethics where it clearly says that one should immediately sever one's relationship with such a person. On whether it is necessarily a breakage of samaya to criticize one's guru, examine the six criteria Kongtrul lists for samaya breakage to exist when criticizing one's guru, page 257. It depends primarily on one's motives.

No one is ever going to feel good about it, but sometimes, for the protection of others, it is necessary.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:31 PM
Title: Re: Vajra Hell
Content:

Namdrol said:
You can't really break these samayas since they concern your primordial state, and that is something you cannot break.

N

alpha said:
So these would be more like attributes of the primordial state?

Malcolm wrote:
Correct.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:31 PM
Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience
Content:
YogaDude11 said:
No I have not. But I will be doing that very soon. All i have is the book and the dvds.

Malcolm wrote:
You should understand then that vegetarianism is not required, nor is abstinence.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:12 PM
Title: Re: Vajra Hell
Content:

Namdrol said:
It lists general samaya as the famous four samayas of Dzogchen -- non-existence, singleness, ubuiquity, and natural formation.

N

alpha said:
Are these four samayas upheld only when resting in rigpa?
If so, are we not breaking these samaya's constantly when not in rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

You can't really break these samayas since they concern your primordial state, and that is something you cannot break.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Namdrol said:

And if you criticize them with a view to protecting others from their mistaken and harmful actions, there is also no fault.

N

Kilaya. said:

How do we decide whether a story about a specific Lama is correct or not, especially when we read it on the internet? I mean, there is no teacher you can't find any critical remarks about somewhere on the internet (including our own teacher).

Malcolm wrote:

How can one decide whether any gossip is correct? You have to go to the source, right?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

I understand these things can be generalized-- but I just have rarely if ever seen any of these tendencies in a number of Tibetan lamas I've had the good fortune to study with-- a good portion from old Tibet, and some of which you and I share. But then, maybe the Nyingmas are a bit different because the monastic system isn't as overarching, and there's a greater proportion of female saints....

Malcolm wrote:

Nyingmapas are every bit as bad as the all the others -- this is a Tibetan cultural issue, not a lineage issue. Tibetans do not have, in their own culture, an idea of civil rights and universal suffrage. This is because Tibetans have not yet rejected the feudal power structures of their past -- in fact, all they have done is export them to west where they survive in extra-governmental organizations -- very much like the papacy preserving the

structures of the Roman Imperium with the Pope as emperor and the college of cardinals representing the senate.

I do not want to paint all Tibetans in a bad light-- they are human beings just as we are, and we like they suffer many faults too that are a result of acculturation. But let's not be blind, shall we?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Jax said:

Samaya etc. pertain to tantric and other lower yantras. Dzogchen is beyond all mind constructed concepts.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not strictly true, Jax. In terms of samaya, the Rigpa Rangshar's interlinear notes clarifies the samaya of the view to realized i.e. non-conceptual prajñā.

It lists general samaya as the famous four samayas of Dzogchen -- non-existence, singleness, ubiquity, and natural formation.

Beyond that however, it also clarifies items constituting the body, speech and mind samayas of a Dzogchen practitioner:

The samaya of the body is abandoning taking life.

The samaya of speech is abandoning lying, calumny and harsh words.

The samaya of mind is not troubling concentration or disturbing the guru's mind.

However, the Rangshar also makes it very clear that the Guru is obliged to follow these samayas listed here, and others as well.

It makes it very clear that that the worst samaya to break is the samaya of the body i.e. not to take life. In other words, like all other Buddhist systems, Dzogchen establishes ahimsa as the most basic standard of conduct for a Dzogchen practitioner.

But the system of samaya in Dzogchen is not the system of samaya of maha and anu. On the other hand, it does not mean we completely ignore these samayas too.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Off the top of my head, I can think of only five Tibetan woman who authored texts prior to the mid-twentieth century -- Yeshe Tsogyal, Machig Labdron, Jomo Menmo, Migyur Paldron (daughter of Terdag Lingpa) and Sera Khandro. There are only four or so significant Indian woman who authored texts too, Siddhirajni, Niguma, Sukhasiddhi, and Laksminkara.

N

Adamantine said:

This is more or less a global thing though Namdrol- - I mean, there were far fewer female authors in Europe or America in the 19th or early 20th century then there has been in the last 60 or so years... let's put things in perspective...

Malcolm wrote:

There have been hundreds of women authors through the ages in the West, especially since the 17th century. On this score, Western culture has a much better score than Indo-Asian culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Have you received transmission from ChNN?

N

YogaDude11 said:

Thanks for the share. Sounds like I am entering some kind of stage of development. I have been observing a vegetarian diet and i have cut out all intoxicants and everything that is not "good" for the body. I have tried to maintain celibacy as well, but I do have the occasional releases, but it seems to be getting more under control as time goes on. No television either, or as little as possible. It also seems that with consistent practice everyday I require much less oxygen on each breath, it is as if though the body just does not need to breathe as often.

From what I have read in the book by ChNN, it says that the resultant qualities of the practice are that the yogi develops "profound contemplation". From what I understand that means very deep meditation. So I do not know if what I am experiencing is profound contemplation or maybe the beginning stages of it?

I have been practicing yantra yoga for maybe a year now. I also do sitting mindfulness on the breath meditation. Lately I have been getting this extremely pleasurable feeling/vibration in the middle of the forehead. When I close my eyes my eyelids become heavy after a few minutes and I have this feeling like someone switched my mind off but I am still there fully present, no thoughts seem to arise. It is quite intoxicating and very pleasurable, to be honest if I did not have other things to do I can prob sit there the whole day and abide in this state. I have read some material on mediation and it seems what i am experiencing is the action of the third eye/ajna chakra. I am not quite sure what exactly I am experiencing, all I know is it feels pretty good. I was wondering if anyone can give some more info or personal experiences perhaps. Thanks!

Konchog1 said:

A step before the First Jhana? Try to spread the feeling throughout your body.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/ptf/dhamma/sacca/sacca4/samma-samadhi/jhana.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Namdrol said:

But as Jax says, in general samaya as commonly discussed in Tibetan Buddhism circles is just a social construct, a contract between you and a guru.

But what Jax did not say, and what he left out, was that real samaya is the comittment to discovering your own primordial state, and when discovered, maintaining knowledge (rigpa) of that state.

But in Dzogchen there are no specific rules or vows. It is all about being present, aware and working with circumstances.

N

heart said:

Really? I don't agree with that. If you disparage your Guru for example it is impossible to be present and aware at the same time.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on whether someone who has acted as your guru is acting in accordance with the Dharma or not. If they are no, there is not fault in severing one's relationship with them. And if you criticize them with a view to protecting others from their mistaken

and harmful actions, there is also no fault. Look it up, you will find I am correct.

"Guru" is a role, not a person. The role has certain obligations, just as the role "student" has certain obligations. The sooner people sort this out, the better.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Its bullshit. skye dman simple means inferior rebirth, that is all.

Adamantine said:

Ok, but what's your understanding of what that means? Dronma is interpreting it that women don't have capacity for practicing Dzogchen, or Dharma, etc. .

My understanding is that it means there are greater obstacles to practicing Dharma. . . and to aspects of life in general-- freedoms, etc.. which is more or less what they were saying. . from a Vajrayana perspective it never meant that women had less capacity than men, that would automatically break a root vow to even use the term then..

Malcolm wrote:

What it has come to mean in the context of Tibetan society is that women are more suited to menial work. Off the top of my head, I can think of only five Tibetan woman who authored texts prior to the mid-twentieth century -- Yeshe Tsogyal, Machig Labdron, Jomo Menmo, Migyur Paldron (daughter of Terdag Lingpa) and Sera Khandro. There are only four or so significant Indian woman who authored texts too, Siddhirajni, Niguma, Sukhasiddhi, and Laksminkara.

The fact is that Tibetan Buddhism is completely patriarchal and sexist -- in fact it is pretty toxic for women in general and is in much need of reform (some of which is happening).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: Don't Let Dharma Reinforce Groupthink

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Well if the language changed in dependence on the sanskrit/indian then how that word gained contemporary meaning in the Tibetan society, how it was generally interpreted is another thing.. I believe this is what they are getting at and not just a simple revisionism. Certainly, either way is a generalization.. I am sure some used it in the most derogatory of ways at a given time and context, and some held other views..

Malcolm wrote:

Its bullshit. skye dman simple means inferior rebirth, that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

deepbluehum said:

but the fact is that the samsaric body somehow dissolves into the five lights.

Namdrol said:

Also no.

deepbluehum said:

Now you've really got me on the edge of my seat. I would just love to get a complete thought from you. That would be just too exciting. Honestly. Please, do tell.

Please tell me what happens to channels and physical body when practicing Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Dronma said:

Jilkan, it seems that officially Tibetans do not use the term Dzogchenma. Probably, according to their view about females as being of lower rebirth, they do not even believe that a female can have such capacity for practising Dzogchen.

So, I personally doubt that they use Dzogchenpa for females, either.

Adamantine said:

This is not true, at all. Actually, women are generally considered to have superior spiritual potential than men. The term that we translate into English as "lower birth" according to Gross and Aziz via Judith Simmer-Brown is "not a point of doctrine but an insight from Tibetan Folk wisdom that accurately observes the constrictions and difficulties of a woman's life under patriarchy". Simmer-Brown also points out that this hardship is not looked at in traditional Tibetan understanding as something to lament, but rather something that provides greater recognition of the sufferings of samsara and thus even greater motivation for practicing Dharma. Actually, if you are interested in this issue, as you seem to be, -you should read Judith Simmer-Brown's book "The Dakini's Warm Breath: The Feminine Principle in Tibetan Buddhism" and specifically the chapter on gender in traditional Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Wonderful feminist revisionism — the term "skye dman" is a direct translation from Sanskrit i.e. jātiḥina, and far from reflecting Tibetan folk wisdom, merely perpetuates the patriarchal oppression of women.

The pre-Buddhist name for women in Tibet is "sman mo" literally "good woman" where the sman, which also means medicine, has the connotation of "goodness".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

deepbluehum said:

but the fact is that the samsaric body somehow dissolves into the five lights.

Malcolm wrote:

Also no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Dzogchen transforms the channels into light.

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

padma norbu said:

I've broken samaya and had no idea. My life didn't get any worse than usual.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you didn't break samaya. To break samaya you have to know what you are doing. You have to be aware and not care. You have to be indifferent.

But as Jax says, in general samaya as commonly discussed in Tibetan Buddhism circles is just a social construct, a contract between you and a guru.

But what Jax did not say, and what he left out, was that real samaya is the commitment to discovering your own primordial state, and when discovered, maintaining knowledge (rigpa) of that state.

But in Dzogchen there are no specific rules or vows. It is all about being present, aware and working with circumstances.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Books and Study Materials on Tibetan Medicine

Content:

Nangwa said:

Tibetan Buddhist Medicine and Psychiatry by Terry Clifford.

Early in the book is a very interesting discussion of how Vajrayana Buddhism greatly influenced and contributed to the sophistication of ayurveda in India.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the opposite way actually. Ayurveda contributed to the development of annutarayoga tantra completion stage practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

pemachophel said:

Namdrol,

You will know what?

- A) That you broke samaya
- B) The awakened state beyond pain and suffering

Malcolm wrote:
That you broke samaya.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 12:58 AM
Title: Re: Vajra Hell
Content:
pemachophel said:
Jax,

Your theory sounds good. Recognize the suffering as empty and it's all good. However, in my experience, if you break samaya, you will experience suffering and you won't recognize. :

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is not how it is explained in texts. When you break samaya, you will know.

However, when it comes to samaya, common human decency trumps all and any contracts with gurus. In other words, if you have to break "samaya" to act with common decency, pick common decency.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 12:55 AM
Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"
Content:

Jikan said:
I'm still unclear on something after reading this thread through.

Is it acceptable grammatically to refer to a woman who practices the Great Perfection as a Dzogchenpa? is that normal usage?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

What is a jenang again? I forgot.

Nangwa said:

Its just a shorter kind of empowerment that is thought of as being a permission giving ritual.

Usually takes between an hour and half or so to three hours, whereas a full wang (at least in Sakya and Gelug) can take a day or two to complete.

Malcolm wrote:

Permissions do not contain the full four empowerments. They contain only a a body, speech and mind blessing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Dronma said:

Then I was surprised to discover that some men are denying the female gender of Tibetan language, and they like to equate it with English, which has no gender in nouns and adjectives.

Malcolm wrote:

No one did that. However, some people, who lack expertise in Tibetan, like making up "Tibetan" words.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: the matter of life and death

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

]And at the end of the Mahapralaya is when the Basis begins to stir signifying the beginning of a Mahakalpa (?)

.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Then of course there is also the question how many Yidams one actually need to practice as a Dzogchen practitioner?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is none. Zero.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

But I cannot see the reason why I have to bow down to anyone who says something without providing any reliable source.

Malcolm wrote:

You do not. But you do need to learn a language before you start having many opinions about it.

As it so happens, I am one of the first batch of doctors who graduated from Shang Shung Institute, and I really do know Tibetan quite well.

The nature of language is that it changes, sometimes its influences are natural evolution from within; sometimes, like with so called "sngags ma", words are coined by outsiders that then become adopted.

For example, many people are not aware that mkha' 'gro really means ḍāka, the male; while mkha' 'gro ma means ḍākinī, the female. But in personal names the "ma" is general left off.

So, what I am trying to say is that while constructions like "rdzogs chen ma" might be possible, they are non-idiomatic, that is -- Tibetans never use these terms in their daily speech nor in their formal writing.

Also Tibetans are not, at this point, sensitive about political correctness in terms of gender use in speech. They still commonly refer to woman as "skye dman", lower rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

pemachophel said:

In Jamgon Kongtrul's Knowing One Liberates All, He says it usually takes six months of recitation retreat (when going by time) to accomplish a given Deity. However, each sadhana typically spells out how many mantra (when going by number) one should expect to recite before achieving accomplishment. In most of the sadhanas I am familiar with, the recitations are divided into three stages: nyen-pa (approach [familiarization]), drub-pa (accomplishment), and lay-jor (activity), with each stage/mantra being said a certain number of times. A general rule for nyen-pa is to say the root mantra 100,000 times for each syllable with possibly another 100,000 for good measure, i.e., to make up any deficiencies. However, in the Paltrul sung-gyud (Paltrul Rinpoche's lineage of Longchen Nyingthig [as, for instance, carried on by Kyabje Chatral Rinpoche]), one typically does 11% over and beyond what the text stipulates. So, if the text says 100,000, the practitioner does 111,111. I agree with Dechen Norbu that it usually takes serious time and effort doing the root mantra before being able to make the activity mantra really work. I have also heard one Lama say (on several occasions) that reciting more than just a few of the activity mantra before having done the requisite nyen-pa and drub-pa is a breach of samaya that can shorten the Teacher's life. If that is true, then I think it goes without saying that it would also be bad for/dangerous to the sadhaka that did so.

Malcolm wrote:

This is definitely not what ChNN says to his students in general. Quality is far more important than quantity. One week of high quality is much better than months of low quality recitation in terms of quantity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: the matter of life and death

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not necessarily, they revert to the basis.

Lhug-Pa said:

So this is what happens for them at the end of a Kalpa or Mahakalpa.... What about at the end of a Pralaya or Mahapralaya?

Malcolm wrote:

They revert to the basis at the end of the mahakalpa. The dissolution of the universe, pralaya, happens between great eons.

Lhug-Pa said:

Do Buddhas who have not reached full enlightenment fall into ignorance again?

Malcolm wrote:

No, there are no buddhas or sentient beings in the basis, there is no falling into ignorance per se, since there is no ignorance in the basis either. In any event, this type of cosmology is useless for most people's practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 12:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

So, Namdrol was wrong when he said: "For example, all women from Eastern Tibet are Khampas, there is no term "Khamma" for eastern Tibetan women".

Malcolm wrote:

Well no, not really. While one can construct such a term, there is no word "kham mo" in any Tibetan dictionary.

There is a word "kham pa" which is defined as "kham kyi yul mi" i.e. a person of the region of Kham -- this term covers all persons from Kham.

But anyway, I am not going to waste my time arguing with you about a language I read fluently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: the matter of life and death

Content:

Ryoto said:

Arhats, praytyekabuddhas, bodhisattvas are not fully enlightened buddhas. And in Vajrayana, those buddhas on the 11th and 12th bhumis are considered not fully awakened.

Thanks for your reply. Just to clear up the confusion are saying that these Arhats, Praytyekabuddhas, and Bodhisattvas all revert back to ignorance after the destruction of the universe?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily, they revert to the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

So, what happens with Naljorpa and Naljorma? Do they also reflect assignments in Sanskrit? [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Five Mountain Zen Order & Paul Lynch

Content:

jrzen said:

Especially since Foster is gone.

Malcolm wrote:

He is not just gone, he has gone beyond apparently, having become the 81st Ancestor of Zen.

<https://prajnaInstitute.org/faculty/myogak-foster/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2012 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Kagyu one of the best known Third Karmapa Rangjung Dorje elaborates it:

Likewise,

once the adventitious stains—or, more personally speaking, we as sentient beings—have dissolved, it is a moot question whether “our” dharmadhātu (or buddha nature) and “all the rest” of the dharmadhātu (or the buddha natures of all Buddhas) are the same or different, since what is called a sentient being is nothing but the very mistakenness that makes up such a distinction.

p.101:

Malcolm wrote:
Correct.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2012 at 10:07 PM
Title: Re: the matter of life and death
Content:

padma norbu said:

That's what I thought until I read Namdrol's post and when I asked him if the Buddhas are destroyed, too, his response was not quite as definite as yours. He said something like "what does it matter?" which suggested to me that, even if that is the case, there's no point struggling against reality, it's still the best option out there. Sorry, I don't have the thread bookmarked.

dakini_boi said:

That's funny, I think I read in another of Namdrol's posts that fully enlightened buddhas will not revert to samsara even after the destruction of the universe. Think about it, if buddhahood is not permanent, then a buddha's reality would be samsara, by definition. So there would be nothing other than sentient beings of the 6 realms. Therefore there would be no buddha. I tend to take this on faith, that buddhahood is possible and that it is permanent, because otherwise. . . it's just too depressing

Ryoto said:

So you're saying there is such a thing as not fully enlightened Buddhas? One is either a fully enlightened Buddha or not. There is no in between.

Is this some Dzogchen teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats, praytyekabuddhas, bodhisattvas are not fully enlightened buddhas. And in Vajrayana, those buddhas on the 11th and 12th bhumis are considered not fully awakened.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2012 at 9:54 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

Dronma said:

So, for clearing up my query, can we say - for example - that Ayu Khandro was a Dzogchenma?

Is it correct from the point of Tibetan language? ?[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not correct as there is no word in tibetan རྒྱལ་ཆེན་མ་.

As Adamantine says, Tibetans reflect gender assignations in Sanskrit with pa and ma, but these do not necessarily apply to Tibetans terms themselves.

If you want to read about the gender of Tibetan words there is a book by Steven Beyer, The Classical Tibetan Language, that explains this very well i.e. when pa and ma are gender signs, and when they are not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2012 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: the matter of life and death

Content:

padma norbu said:

That's what I thought until I read Namdrol's post and when I asked him if the Buddhas are destroyed, too, his response was not quite as definite as yours. He said something like "what does it matter?" which suggested to me that, even if that is the case, there's no point struggling against reality, it's still the best option out there. Sorry, I don't have the thread bookmarked.

dakini_boi said:

That's funny, I think I read in another of Namdrol's posts that fully enlightened buddhas will not revert to samsara even after the destruction of the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that fully awakened buddhas never revert to the basis, as opposed to all those with lesser or no realization.

The basis however possesses compassion, so whenever there are sentient beings, buddhas appear. But the division between samsara and nirvana is merely the deluded vision of sentient beings. There is no samsara and nirvana in the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: 2 Karmapas: Let's avoid any hostility

Content:

sherabpa said:

It does not follow that there could not ever be two Karmapas at any point in time.

Malcolm wrote:
Politics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2012 at 11:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

I asked about the Tibetan language!

So, like Naljorpa and Naljorma, Nagpa and Nagma, it might be Dzogchenpa and Dzogchenma or Dzogchenmo - as pensum suggested.

If somebody has accurate knowledge of this, I'd appreciate a lot an accurate grammatical response! [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

"sngags ma" is a western neologism that has been adopted by Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2012 at 11:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

I'd like to bring this question to the surface of the board again, since it was buried by many posts.

So, from the replies it seems that "Dzogchenpa" is a qualified, serious practitioner of Dzogchen. Isn't it?

Then, what is the term for the female Dzogchen practitioner?

Dzogchenmo or Dzogchenma?

Pero said:

Perhaps there isn't one. The -pa doesn't necessarily indicate the male gender wherever you see it. In this case I think it simply means someone who is in the state of dzogchen.

Dronma said:

I think that -pa indicates the gender.

I'd like a response from someone who really knows.

Malcolm wrote:

ཁོ་ is a nominalizer. It does not necessarily indicate gender. For example, all women from Eastern Tibet are Khampas, there is no term "Khamma" for eastern Tibetan women.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sentient beings are deluded about the display of the basis. When they cease to be so deluded, they are buddhas.

The basis never displays as anything other than the five lights.

gad rgyangs said:

so you're saying sentient beings and buddhas are the display of a different basis? you're saying that sentient beings and buddhas are not included in "all phenomena of samsara and nirvana"? you seem to be claiming there is the basis and its display, on the one hand, and then there's sentient beings and buddhas, but they have nothing to do with each other. if this were so, in what way would the basis be "our real nature"?

Malcolm wrote:

I like the way you systematically misrepresent what I am saying.

read what I said above, and you will see how much your statement purporting to represent what I said, does not represent it, much in the same way that a man with jaundice persistently sees white as yellow.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Dronma said:

Much Ado About Nothing!

The whole topic has been mutated to a personal controversy between gad rgyangs and Namdrol.

asunthatneversets said:

What seems like personal controversy on this thread is more like a resurfacing battle which originates from an epic and ancient war spanning eons of thread. We may never see the end of it, but know that you'll learn some interesting things and gain valuable insight while it goes on. It never sleeps and it cannot be stopped... Resistance is futile!

Malcolm wrote:

No personal controversy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Therefore, are sentient beings and their delusion part of the display of the basis? check, and mate.

Malcolm wrote:

Sentient beings are deluded about the display of the basis. When they cease to be so deluded, they are buddhas.

The basis never displays as anything other than the five lights.

Further, The Luminous Space states:

That mind is produced out of the dualistic grasping
to the six objects of the manifestation of wisdom.

How can that [mind] be produced? Since [the mind] is produced from that ignorance
that does not recognize the intrinsic manifestation of wisdom [the mind] is produced.

Sentient beings, rocks and trees are assembled by delusion about the basis. But the
basis only displays one way. It does not display as both samsara and nirvana.

Since that critical point of luminous empty vidyā was not recognized, grasping onto that
produced the five elements, and the causal thigle [was produced] from the refined part
of those. The body was produced from that [refined part] and energy [rtsal] of wisdom
produces the five sense gates in that [body]. Within those [sense gates] the five
wisdoms are produced. The five [sense gates] grasping onto those [five wisdoms
produce] the five afflictions. After first being created by the energy of wisdom; in the
middle, it was not recognized that the body of the refined part of the assembled
elements actually is the five wisdoms, since this was not realized through intellectual
views, the non-sentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it. Here, it is actually
five wisdoms to begin with; in the middle, when the body is formed from assembly of
the elements through ignorance grasping onto those [five wisdoms] also, it is actually
the five wisdoms. The five aggregates, sense organs, and afflictions also are actually the
five wisdoms. In the end, since one transcends accepting, rejecting, proofs, and
negations since those are realized to be real. As such, the sign of non-duality is [the
body] disappearing into wisdom without any effluents because the critical point of the
non-duality or sameness of the non-sentient and the sentient was understood
according to the Guru's intimate instruction.

The basis only is the five wisdom and only displays the five wisdoms -- the rest is
delusion. Ignorance [avidyā] is not a display of the basis, it is delusion about the display

of the basis. Knowledge is not a display of the basis, it is the absence of delusion about the display of the basis.

One basis, two paths, two results.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the reason why we disagree about this is because you have already forgotten the last thread where this was decided once and for all. I will copy the crucial citation:

Malcolm wrote:

"In brief, those delusions also are not delusion that exist in the cause and basis, but as one does not understand the actual state of the basis one is stubbornly deluded about one's appearances. For example when grasping to a seeming appearance that does not exist in the material, a rope appears to be a snake. Like a conch shell appearing yellow, the actual state of the basis has not been understood, and there is fixated delusion about one's appearances."

-- Khandro Nyinthig

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Instead of complaining more about things not going well for me, how about I offer something potentially helpful here....

It's funny that I said:

A happy song for sure.

As I'm thinking that the song in question might be from the following CD (?):

http://www.snowlionpub.com/html/product_9636.html

About offerings:

In

[url=http://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=6203&start=60#p73628]Guardians of the Teaching,[/url] Namdrol said:

When you do medium thun for example, it is sufficient to visualize offerings. If you want to set them up, that is ok too. Whatever you have space and time for.

In general, there are only two things that you need for offerings (apart from the Ganapuja), according to my understanding of ChNN's intent: light and incense, and even these are not absolutely required.

If you like setting out water offerings, sense offering, medicine and blood, tormas and so on -- go for it -- but it is not absolutely necessary. After all, the universe is a torma according to the torma tantra.

Lhug-Pa said:

Therefore in regard to working with circumstances, in my case I currently cannot burn incense where I live, so if I were to offer Sang and Serkyem, I would have to take Sang incense and try to distill into an essential oil in order to use in my essential oil diffuser (whenever performing a Puja, I at least try to diffuse essential oil, even if it's just some Sage oil or something that I have on hand).

Malcolm wrote:

You can just use juniper essential oil.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Mariusz said:

Moreover, I pointed-out you the seeming is not totally faulty here again, after I wrote your statement "the relative truth is totally faulty" in Academic Discussion forum when we discussed Madhyamaka. So it is only for you, not for me. As long as for you "the relative truth is always faulty" I recognize your view as nihilistic So I use here the dependent nature of Yogacara as one another antidote for your statement.

Malcolm wrote:

What I actually said that was "relative truth is the object of a mistaken cognition", "ultimate truth is the object of an unmistaken cognition". These are Candrakirti's definitions and not mine.

Further, Candra devotes a number of verses to refuting the dependent nature -- read them.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 10:03 PM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:
If Being in the State of Dzogchen Contemplation is equivalent to proper Recognition of the Basis & Its display; then in that moment of Contemplation, all Vision is a display of the Basis, yes?

Malcolm wrote:
Not exactly.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 8:11 PM
Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka
Content:
Mariusz said:
Where I accept something for me? .

Malcolm wrote:
If you accept the perfected nature, your view is not Madhyamaka. This is why Candrakirti in detail refutes the three natures scheme.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 7:19 PM
Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka
Content:
Namdrol said:
according to tortured late Tibetan exegesis [Mipham or Shakya Chogden]

Mariusz said:
I don't think so it is so. As you see above, I take it by simply using the subject-side perspective instead of object-side perspective. So for me nothing is "out there" existent, non-existent, so on and so fort.

Malcolm wrote:
Right, your view is cittamatra, since you accept the existence of the subjective side ultimately.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: "Location" of mind in Dzogchen

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Its value/use applies mostly to tögal I'm pretty sure

Sönam said:

The crystal canal is not about mind ...

Sönam

asunthatneversets said:

Whatever term you would say the crystal canal concerns is synonymous with what I'm designating as "mind". I don't usually refer to it as mind either, it only warranted that title in the context of this thread to show the wide array and uses of the term "mind". So any deviation in shared view between you and I is going to be merely semantical.

Malcolm wrote:

No -- in this context the mind is physiologically sited in the lungs, and wisdom is sited in the heart. This is one key difference between the common teachings (i.e. mind has no source, no location and no destination when it leaves) and the uncommon teachings (mind has a source, a location and a destination).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the basis manifests as all phenomena of samsara and nirvana. even if you break it down as

basis--->five lights--->recognition&nonrecognition---->samsara&nirvana

its not like what counts as the display stops at some point and then you get something that is ontologically different.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis only displays one way. That display is either properly recognized or not, leading to samsara and nirvana. Neither samsara nor nirvana exist in the basis. But the basis is made up of three wisdoms. Since there is no ignorance in that state to begin with, there can be no ignorance in that state later. This is why we disagree about whether ignorance is a display of the basis or not. The reason why samsaric phenomena are considered originally pure is that they are simply a result of misapprehensions of the originally pure naturally formed display of the basis. We do not need to manipulate these phenomena in anyway. But we do need to recognize their actual state, both as delusions (the way they are appearing to us (snang lugs)) and the way these apparent phenomena are present in and of themselves (gnas lugs).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I was thinking about this too. what conclusion can be drawn from this fact? some possibilities are: the corpus is inconsistent, or the view operates on many levels which have different descriptions. certainly we must distinguish texts written "from the point of view of the basis" from those written from the point of view of sentient beings. they may appear contradictory because of this difference of perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

In Man ngag sde there are texts which are aimed at explicating tregchö and texts aimed at explicating thögal. The texts explicating the former are almost exclusively about the basis and the view. The text explicating the latter are almost exclusively about the path and meditation. Sems sde for example is also almost exclusively about the basis i.e. the view. klong sde and man ngag sde are more concerned with the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

But wait, I thought there were no mistaken views because it's all the manifestations of the basis?

And thus how can Namdrol be mistaken, since his view is a manifestation of the basis?

gad rgyangs said:

Namdrol and his mistaken view are not a mistake in the sense that he and his mistaken view should never have arisen in the first place, for yes, him and his mistaken view are just an appearance of the basis. what else could they be? even if his view was not

mistaken, he and his view would still be just an appearance of the basis. what else could they be?

so one can entertain mistaken views about the nature of the basis, but thats no more or less a manifestation of the basis than correct views. It leads to a different movie though.

Malcolm wrote:

You're mistaken in assuming that there is no error -- the proof of that is contained within your own statement.

There is a difference between the appearance of the basis, and the error and non-error regarding that apperance. It leads to different movies, just as you say. But the erroneous perception of basis leads to a movie that is desirable to avoid, as Longchenpa states, and the non-erronenous perception leads to a movie that is desirable to see.

Basically, your point of view entails that for you liberation is meaningless. Which is fine, but that is not the point of view of Dzogchen, nor Buddhism as a whole. It may be the point of view of various neo-advaita, pseudo-zen, new age gurus, but not Dzogchen.

You might be able to post this or that citation that you feels defends your perspective, but so can I -- so that is rather pointless. Nevertheless the String of Pearls states:

Having been gripped by the apprehender and apprehended
in the aggregates, elements and gateways,
one remains in samsara itself for a long while,
within the belly of the three realms
one is placed in the prison of name and matter, [352]
bound by the chains of ignorance,
covered with dense black darkness of samsara,
attached to the spicy taste of passion,
one is bound by the noose of confusion,
tormented by the hot fire of hatred,
one's head is covered by pride,
the gates of jealousy are locked,
surrounded by the armies of resentment and so on,
tied about the neck with the noose of apprehender and apprehended,
stuck in the swamp of past traces,
one's hands are shackled with ripened karma,
the mother of karma is joined with her child,
one following the other just like a water wheel,
alternating between good and bad bodies,
born in different forms,
and through heightening one's self-grasping
one sinks to the bottom of the ocean of suffering,
one's heart is grabbed by the goad of the evil destinies,
one binds oneself with the enemy, afflictions.
Fire appears as water to hell beings,

as hunger and thirst to hungry ghosts,
as fog to animals.
the aggregates, gateways and elements appears as the five elements to humans,
those are also pleasurable, painful and neutral,
as weapons and armor to asuras,
and as desirable things to gods.
For example, just like a rapidly spinning fire wheel
one abides continuously in samsara for a long while.
Such various appearances are like seeing a snake in a rope
since what isn't there is held to be there,
both the outer and inner container and contents form,
and if that is investigated, it is a rope,
i.e. the container and contents are already empty
the ultimate with the form of the relative."

The mistake then is seeing as there what isn't there, which is why this tantra, among others uses the rope/snake example. What this tantra is stating is that deluded appearances we see that are predicated in the basis do not exist in the basis and are not appearances of the basis, but rather misapprehensions of the appearance of the basis.

You on the other hand seem to be saying that the basis manifests as sentient beings and the six realms. If this is what you are saying, then you are very far away from the point of view of the great perfection.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

"The essence of mind is an obscuration to be given up. The essence of vidyā is a wisdom to be attained."

--Longchenpa from nam mkha' dri med in the bla ma yang thig

Something did go wrong, the basis was not recognized. This is why there is, as stated in the dgongs pa zang thal teachings, one basis, two paths and two results. If something did not go wrong there would be no need at all for Dzogchen texts to spend thousands of words explaining how delusion and sentient beings arose.

N

gad rgyangs said:

just because there is rigpa and marigpa doesn't mean that one is right and one is wrong.

one (presumably) leads to cessation of suffering and efficacy in aiding beings, and the other leads to a movie full of all kinds of emotions and experiences. but both come from the same basis, and therefore are just as ka dag as that basis. that is why it is our real nature even while we are marigpa-pas. if it wasn't, introduction wouldn't be possible. think about it, buddhas and sentient beings have the same nature, so how could one be the result of "something going wrong?"

Malcolm wrote:

If something had not gone wrong, no introduction would be necessary, and we could all bliss out in the fake Dzogchen proposition that started this thread.

The point is not about whether everything is ka dag and lhun grub. The point is whether that is recognized and the consequences that occur when it isn't.

gad rgyangs said:

so how could one be the result of "something going wrong?"

Malcolm wrote:

Sentient beings are clearly the result of something gone wrong since they result from ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

"The essence of mind is an obscuration to be given up. The essence of vidyā is a wisdom to be attained."

--Longchenpa from nam mkha' dri med in the bla ma yang thig

Something did go wrong, the basis was not recognized. This is why there is, as stated in the dgongs pa zang thal teachings, one basis, two paths and two results. If something did not go wrong there would be no need at all for Dzogchen texts to spend thousands of words explaining how delusion and sentient beings arose.

N

gad rgyangs said:

just because there is rigpa and marigpa doesn't mean that one is right and one is wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it means that one is right and the other is wrong. By definition marigpa is always wrong.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

exactly, but both the "mistaken" and "not mistaken" are appearances of the basis. if you claim otherwise, you are in effect positing a dual ground, or at least a dual display, one for mistaken sentient beings and one for non-mistaken buddhas.

Namdrol said:

No. We already had this conversation before. There is one basis, two paths and two results. Because sentient beings are deluded they perceive the basis in terms of subject and object, etc. Since buddhas are not deluded about the basis they do not have this dualistic conceptual delusion. The basis only presents one way, but it is perceived differently by buddhas and sentient beings. As long as sentient beings are mistaken about the appearances of the basis, for that long they will continue to cycle in samsara.

N

gad rgyangs said:

this kind of dualism vision always has implicit within it the assumption that things should be different from what they are, that somewhere along the way, "something went wrong". Its really no different from the concept of the fall in Judaeo-Christianity. The assumption "something went wrong" leads naturally to the assumption "something needs to be done, to be corrected". I'm sure even you will agree this is not at all the Dzoghchen view. So, if we reject the idea that "something went wrong" and "something needs to be done", then the idea that all phenomena of samsara and nirvana are the display of the basis, including marigpa, makes perfect sense. texts have been cited in the other thread that demonstrate this, no need to haul them out again, but perhaps you should re-read that thread.

Malcolm wrote:

"The essence of mind is an obscuration to be given up. The essence of vidyā is a wisdom to be attained."

--Longchenpa from nam mkha' dri med in the bla ma yang thig

Something did go wrong, the basis was not recognized. This is why there is, as stated in the dgongs pa zang thal teachings, one basis, two paths and two results. If something did not go wrong there would be no need at all for Dzogchen texts to spend thousands of words explaining how delusion and sentient beings arose.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 3:33 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
you're right about the "yes" part, but mistaken otherwise.

Namdrol said:
You are entitled to your opinion.
the basis is the real nature of sentient beings. the gzhi snang can (and is in the texts) subdivided into stages, but that doesn't mean you can say that "before this stage its the appearances of the basis, but after that stage, its not anymore." All I can do is refer again to the citations I gave, which are very clear.
Sentient beings are cognitive errors, that's all. What they are mistaken about is their own nature, which is the basis. When they cease to be mistaken about those appearances, they are buddhas.

N

gad rgyangs said:
exactly, but both the "mistaken" and "not mistaken" are appearances of the basis. if you claim otherwise, you are in effect positing a dual ground, or at least a dual display, one for mistaken sentient beings and one for non-mistaken buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:
No. We already had this conversation before. There is one basis, two paths and two results. Because sentient beings are deluded they perceive the basis in terms of subject and object, etc. Since buddhas are not deluded about the basis they do not have this dualistic conceptual delusion. The basis only presents one way, but it is perceived differently by buddhas and sentient beings. As long as sentient beings are mistaken about the appearances of the basis, for that long they will continue to cycle in samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 3:20 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
you're right about the "yes" part, but mistaken otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

You are entitled to your opinion.

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is the real nature of sentient beings. the gzhi snang can (and is in the texts) subdivided into stages, but that doesn't mean you can say that "before this stage its the appearances of the basis, but after that stage, its not anymore." All I can do is refer again to the citations I gave, which are very clear.

Malcolm wrote:

Sentient beings are cognitive errors, that's all. What they are mistaken about is their own nature, which is the basis. When they cease to be mistaken about those appearances, they are buddhas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Now then, you seem to be hard of hearing.

The appearance of the basis does not contain faults. Not recognizing the appearance of the basis is a fault, as the tantra I cited demonstrates.

N

gad rgyangs said:

.....and conveniently ignoring the citations I gave.

Malcolm wrote:

The citations you gave do not contradict what I am saying in the least.

gad rgyangs said:

lets try it this way: "are sentient beings included within appearances of the basis?"

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and no.

No, because there are no sentient beings in the basis and sentient being do not appear when the basis appears. Yes, because the non-recognition of the basis produces sentient beings after the basis appears. Sentient beings, and everything else, is made of the appearance of the five lights of the basis etc. But the five lights of the basis etc are never contaminated by the ignorance that does not recognize the basis for what it is. In this way the proper answer is both yes and no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there isn't a Dzogchen master alive who would say that Longchenpa's writings are anything other than the purest expression of the the Dzogchen view we have. So, I will ignore the snide aspersions being cast upon him here.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually the aspersion was being cast on those who think that it is sufficient to rely on Longchenpa for a well-rounded view of Dzogchen. For example, Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo opines that dgongs pa zang thal teachings are more profound than other nyinthig teachings for this and that reason.

Now then, you seem to be hard of hearing.

The appearance of the basis does not contain faults. Not recognizing the appearance of the basis is a fault, as the tantra I cited demonstrates.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Reigle vs Sparham - Sanskrit

Content:

Will said:

N. - if "dharma-dhātu is the svabhāva of the dharma-dhātu" is correct meaning, then the notion of dharma-dhātu having no svabhāva, ie, being empty of inherent existence, seems impossible. How can dharma-dhātu be both svabhāva & nisvabhāva at once? Is this not a big difference between Mahayana & Hinayana?

Namdrol said:

Since the svabhāva of matter and so on are emptiness, if the svabhāva of matter is emptiness and matter, etc., is also matter and so on are the svabhāva of the dharmadhātu, there is no contradiction

Will said:

Sorry N., but my stupid factor looms larger as the years pass. Please clarify if you are saying that 1) dharma-dhātu has svabhāva or 2) dharma-dhātu has no svabhāva or 3) some other option(s)

Malcolm wrote:

The dharmadhātu has a svabhāva and that svabhāva is dharmas such as matter and so on that lack svabhāva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there is no fault in the basis, therefore, neither is there the possibility of fault in that which proceeds from the basis. in fact, the absence of fault in the basis is what guarantees that there is no possibility of fault in the display.

Malcolm wrote:

No one said there was a fault in the display or in the basis. All that was said was that not recognizing the display for what it is a mistake, a fault, an error.

A tantra called Uprooting Delusion from the dgongs pa zang thal cycle provides the following description:

The way sentient beings arise:
that nameless general ground,
is non-conceptual and not established at all,
invisible and unclear, from which
when the bifurcation occurs,
since vāyu, vidyā, and space separate, [3/b]
the intrinsic sound of the elements produces vibration.
From the inside of the darkness of the clear part of appearances,
as soon as a storm of fire emerges,
scattering everywhere,
Vidyā, like the mind of a lunatic,
is dazed and reeling.
Since vidyā lacks confidence in its own appearances,
it panics at sound, is frightened of rays,
and through awareness not taking its own place,
the ignorance that arises simultaneously with it
is called "the causal ignorance.

Because of a lack of mindful attention,
self and other are grasped as a duality,
and both outer and inner dependent origination occur.
The whole universe arises
through awareness looking externally.
All sentient being arise

through awareness looking internally.
Through looking there, fearful appearances arise,
through looking here, 'self' arises.
Many mistakes arise from the single mistake
about the appearances of here and there.
Because of being mistaken about a self, there is a mistake about other,
attachment to self, aversion to other.
From the seed of attachment and aversion,
the whole outer universe and inhabitants are mistakes.
Because one is held as two, [4/a]
that is called the delusion of dualistic grasping.
Since one imputed and mistook outer and inner,
that is called "the imputing ignorance".
Because of familiarity of subject and object of that,
from the thick buildup of traces,
there was entrance into the state of samsara.
That is how the six migrations occurred."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Mariusz said:

With all respect I did not see it in your quotes. Perhaps prove it with another one please.
All I see is the dependent nature as never existed in the first place although it seems to be, so also not totally faulty.

Namdrol said:

You need to read the Mahayāna Samgraha by Asanga then it will be more clear to you.

N

Mariusz said:

Thanx. Do you know suitable english book on it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is in translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

The appearance of the basis is not a fault; the non-recognition of those appearances is.

gad rgyangs said:

so if you're saying that what should have happened is that "everybody" recognized and abided as samantabhadra, then you're denigrating the basis, saying it can't do anything right, it spits out a display and even that is all messed up with "faults" and mistakes", retarded sems can who don't know any better. what a loser-basis.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no fault in the basis. But not recognizing the basis is a fault.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Bimala

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Thank you guys. One more silly question: how much are you supposed to take? Would one pill per day be enough?

Malcolm wrote:

2

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist ethics and BDSM?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Really, seven pages on bondage? Face it greg, some people like being tied up when they screw, lashed with whips, and otherwise dominated and humiliated, and some people like to do that stuff to others while screwing them, and BDSM is a protocol for doing it relatively safely without it resulting in rape, etc. Is it deluded? Yes. Does it matter? Not much.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Everything can be traced back to non-recognition of the appearance of the basis. That

non-recognition is a mistake. Samsara is a fault because it is the result of an error.

gad rgyangs said:

and what: some part of the appearances of the basis are incompetent?

Malcolm wrote:

The appearance of the basis is not a fault; the non-recognition of those appearances is. That is where samsara comes from. And, as long as you have samsaric vision, karmic vision, you can be sure that you are not seeing the appearances of the basis as they are, but are viewing them through traces of affliction and action. In other words, the gnas lugs, how things are, and snang lugs, how things appear are dissonant because of ignorance., etc.

This is why many fake Dzogchenpas resort to the opposite of Garab Dorje's three words i.e. they introduce as many people as they can to to their own delusion, convince them that delusion is perfectly ok, and they all continue in samsara for ever.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Mariusz said:

With all respect I did not see it in your quotes. Perhaps prove it with another one please. All I see is the dependent nature as never existed in the first place although it seems to be, so also not totally faulty.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read the Mahayāna Samgraha by Asanga then it will be more clear to you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

well said DarwidHalim. The common response to this view is "but if you are still seeing the story, it does no good to say its all dharmakaya/empty/perfect/dzogpachenpo/etc...you have to do the practices...etc". My contention is that it is precisely by understanding why doing practices actually changes nothing at all, that your practices can actually be beneficial. As long as you think they are actually changing anything real, they will not be so effective. that may

seem paradoxical, but there it is. So the people fighting the Dzogchen view tooth and nail (surprisingly many of whom self-identify as students of Dzogchen) are actually doing themselves a disservice, and walking straight away from that which they so vociferously proclaim is necessary, that is, the reduction/elimination of suffering.

heart said:

Practices don't change the natural state, nor make it closer in any way. Practices destroy misunderstanding, intellectualized views and confusion. Our minds are very tricky and deceptive, which is obvious in these threads, and for this reason no matter how many pretty books you read you will never understand the Great Perfection. In all Dzogchen manuals it is written that you should find a qualified teacher and do anything he/she says. I am afraid that is the only way because cleverness will just not make.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Sometimes I think the problem is that people only read Longchenpa, who has a very specific take and they do not read the wider tradition of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 7:15 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Mariusz said:

I also thank you. So it supports my investigation based only on english translation here in my previous posts. Good to see it finally as not the Mind only (Cittamatra), but as Yogacara compatible with Madhyamaka as I wrote earlier

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what Tom is saying. Tom is saying that imagination of the unreal exists. That is precisely the cittamatra POV. If one reads the MV objectively, there is no way to read it as Madhyamaka text. If you read it according to tortured late Tibetan exegesis [Mipham or Shakya Chogden], then you can try, but in doing so you have to basically assert that the perfected nature is never the dependent nature. But in fact in the MV it is made extremely clear that the perfected nature simple is the non-existence of the imagined nature in the dependent nature, and that non-existence exists. In summary, there really is no way to reconcile Maitreyanath's Madhyāntavibhanga and Dharmadharmatāvibhanga with Madhyamaka. They are all Yogacara (cittamatra) treatises meant to explicate the Yogacara tradition sutras such the Samdhinirmocana, the Lanka and so on. This applies also to the the Sutra-alaṃkāra. This also applies to the Uttaratantra. Why? Because the Cittamatras also present a presentation of freedom from reference points i.e. the wisdom exists but it is free from reference points. The Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra is also not free from fault in this respect because it really only discusses the structure of the path. The reason why the Yogacara commentaries of the AA are not widely studied in Tibet is because they are not compatible Madhyamaka view.

Primarily Aryavimuktisena and Haribhadra are studied, both Madhyamaka scholars critical of the Yogacara point of view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 7:04 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

well said DarwidHalim. The common response to this view is "but if you are still seeing the story, it does no good to say its all

dharmakaya/empty/perfect/dzogpachenpo/etc...you have to do the practices...etc".

My contention is that it is precisely by understanding why doing practices actually changes nothing at all, that your practices can actually be beneficial. As long as you think they are actually changing anything real, they will not be so effective. that may seem paradoxical, but there it is. So the people fighting the Dzogchen view tooth and nail (surprisingly many of whom self-identify as students of Dzoghchen) are actually doing themselves a disservice, and walking straight away from that which they so vociferously proclaim is necessary, that is, the reduction/elimination of suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course practices don't change anything real whoever said they did? -- we all know the path is completely illusory from beginning to end, even buddhahood is completely illusory. But this is not a Dzogchen perspective -- this is a perspective from perfection of wisdom sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 6:57 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you can stop cycling in samsara if thats your predilection, its just that samsara is not a "fault" or "mistake". how could anything that arises be a mistake, since everything is ultimately traceable back into the ka dag, lhun grub and thugs rje of the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything can be traced back to non-recognition of the appearance of the basis. That non-recognition is a mistake. Samsara is a fault because it is the result of an error. But there are some people who like this fake Dzogchen approach where they feel that all of the problems they cause themselves and others are "ok" because it is all "original purity and so on. This is little different than the kind of nihilism that some people who misunderstand the perfection of wisdom sutras engage in. So, the next time you are pissed off, or suffering, just try and explain it all away to yourself as the three wisdoms

of the basis and then get back to us on how well that is working out for you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

not sure what "on top of" is meaning here?

Malcolm wrote:

What Khenpo Jigphun is saying is that there is no liberation in the basis, liberation and non-liberation are only valid questions from the point of view of the arising of basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

cycling in samsara is only a fault if your view is dualism.

Malcolm wrote:

Please enjoy yourself then...even though it seems you have utterly missed the point that Dzogchen also just an attempt to solve the Buddhist question of how to stop cycling in samsara.

The answer to that question is not "Cycling in samsara? No problem, please continue...."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there are not really two approaches, because it is by realizing the first that the second is fulfilled.

Longchenpa, in chos dbyings mdzod says "although Buddhahood is timeless, there is

awakening to Buddhahood anew." Basically this means that you can enjoy the ride without sweating it. The awakening anew part is just for fun, the ground/you just playing hide and seek with itself/yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

Khenpo Jigphun points:

"Even though the omniscient guru [Longchenpa] may have stated "Samantabhadra was liberated on the basis", if there is liberation on the basis there be the fault of once again cycling in samsara. Therefore, it is necessary that liberation is on top of the appearance of the basis."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Jinzang said:

The nub of the issue is that although buddha mind is ordinary mind (tha mal gyi shes pa), we don't see ordinary mind because of our obscurations. Hence the many expedient means to remove them. In the sense that seeing ordinary mind is quite rare, what is called ordinary is extraordinary.

Malcolm wrote:

tha mal gyi shes pa is just a yogi's word for ye shes i.e. wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth of whom?

Content:

cyndilydia said:

While the organic host has died, it has left the entity charged with properties priming it for the next "rebirth".

I hope this makes sense.

duckfiasco said:

What is hosted by the entity? What is their relationship? What is leaving, where does it go, and what is left behind?

cyndilydia said:

Good questions. In talking things out, I can identify and address holes in reasoning. Let me take a stab..

The entity is that which lives the multiple lifetimes working to nirvana

The host is the organism whose life force is the entity. The host is born, lives and dies. Upon death, the entity is ready to be reborn to another host.

Leaving is death of the host, I don't know where the entity goes - am working on a couple of theories

What is left behind is a carcass

These answers aren't really satisfying. Hopefully it's like writing code for me - I don't know what I'm doing, but when the errors are all fixed, the program works.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no entity that takes rebirth. But there is rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Reigle vs Sparham - Sanskrit

Content:

Will said:

N. - if "dharma are the svabhāva of the dharma-dhātu" is correct meaning, then the notion of dharma-dhātu having no svabhāva, ie, being empty of inherent existence, seems impossible. How can dharma-dhātu be both svabhāva & nisvabhāva at once? Is this not a big difference between Mahayana & Hinayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Since the svabhāva of matter and so on are emptiness, if the svabhāva of matter is emptiness and matter, etc., is also matter and so on are the svabhāva of the dharmadhātu, there is no contradiction

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 16th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

White Lotus said:

so... we have these two approaches and should be aware that they cannot be reconciled. there have been great masters from many lineages who have emphasised one over the other.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are two approaches:

1) True Dzogchen teachings

2) False Dzogchen teachings (which by definition are not actually Dzogchen, but are various strains of recycled Neo-Zen, Crypto-Advaita, New Age fantasy and so on and so forth).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 16th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Reigle vs Sparham - Sanskrit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This gentleman's understanding is correct.

Will said:

Anyone competent enough in Sanskrit to understand who correctly translates these verses in the Abhisamayālaṃkāra? This is from this blog - <http://prajnaquest.fr/blog/> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

David Reigle

March 13, 2012 at 5:40 am

Regarding the quotations from Haribhadra's Āloka, rather than my own translations I had intended to give these as translated by Gareth Sparham (Abhisamayālaṃkāra with Vṛtti and Ālokā, 4 vols., Jain Publishing Company, 2006-2012). It is thanks to his English translation that I found these quotations. However, he incorrectly translates these as saying that the dharma-dhātu is the svabhāva of the dharmas, rather than that the dharmas are the svabhāva of the dharma-dhātu. Since this idea is of considerable importance to our research, I will provide some detail.

Gareth was the first (and still the only) person to translate the two primary Indian commentaries on Maitreya's Abhisamayālaṃkāra into English. This small and concise text outlines the path to Buddhahood buried in the large and diffuse Prajñāpāramitā sūtras. Because it gives the whole path to Buddhahood, the Abhisamayālaṃkāra (in Tibetan translation) became the most widely studied text in Tibet. Because of the complexity of this path, the Abhisamayālaṃkāra became the most commented on text in Tibet. Gareth has also translated Tsong kha pa's extensive commentary on it, titled Golden Garland of Eloquence. Gareth's long study of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra and the path it teaches, first with Tibetan lamas from Tibetan texts, and then later from the original Sanskrit texts, has allowed him to translate this complex material into English for us. One must know the technicalities of the system before the texts are comprehensible. One cannot just pick up a text and expect to comprehend it. So we are fortunate to have access to this material through his translations. But of course, in dealing with this vast material, small mistakes are easily made and are to be expected.

Haribhadra's statements usually use the compound, dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatayā, or

dharmā-dhātu-svabhāvatvāt. The suffixes -tā and -tva, basically meaning “-ness” or “-hood,” are very often used in Sanskrit as a quick substitute for the finite verb meaning “is” or “are.” When declined in the instrumental or ablative cases, -tayā or -tvāt, as they are here, they mean “because [something] is [such and such],” more literally, “by being . . .,” or “due to being . . .” These compounds are usually straightforward. Here we have simple tatpuruṣa or case relation compounds. In these, the genitive case ending, meaning “of,” must be supplied for dharmā-dhātu. This gives us “the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharmā-dhātu.” The declined suffixes -tayā or -tvāt then give us “because [they, i.e., dharmas] are the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu.” This is, by the way, fully supported by the Tibetan translations, which supply the elided case endings for these tatpuruṣa compounds. They give chos kyi dbyings kyi ngo bo nyid, supplying the genitive case ending “kyi.”

In order to reverse this meaning, and get that the dharmā-dhātu is the inherent nature of the dharmas, one would have to take this compound as a bahuvrīhi, an adjective. This is apparently what Gareth did. However, this cannot be done. First, since the -tā or -tva suffixes already say that something “is” something, one would not expect these compounds to be bahuvrīhis or adjectives. Second, as a bahuvrīhi or adjective, it must agree in gender and number with the word it modifies. If it describes the dharmas, these words must agree; but they do not. What we have is dharmas in the masculine genitive plural, dharmāṇām (or rūpādīnām), while the compound ending in -tayā is feminine singular and the compound ending in -tvāt is neuter singular. If this compound was a bahuvrīhi or adjective (which it is not), it could be translated as “they whose svabhāva is the dharmā-dhātu,” or “having the dharmā-dhātu as svabhāva.” This is apparently how Gareth got his translations. The Tibetan translations also rule this out. To take this compound as a bahuvrīhi or adjective means to take the underlying compound as a karmadhāraya rather than as a tatpuruṣa, while the Tibetan translations show it as a tatpuruṣa.

This phrase, dharmāṇām dharmā-dhātu-svabhāvatayā (or -svabhāvatvāt), means literally, “of the dharmas, because of the being the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu.” This, in English, is a very convoluted way of saying, “because the dharmas are the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu.” This Sanskrit phrasing is very common, especially in prose commentaries on verse works. It was not until years into my Sanskrit studies (mostly reading verses) that I figured out how to translate this prose phrase. No Sanskrit textbook known to me explains it. To get idiomatic English, one must take the word declined in the genitive case as the subject, take the -tā or -tva suffix as the verb “is/are,” place the “because” at the very beginning (given at the very end of the Sanskrit by the instrumental or ablative case ending), and then bring in what the -tā or -tva suffix is attached to. Thus, “because (instrumental “ayā” of “ā”) the dharmas (dharmāṇām) are (-tā) the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu (dharmā-dhātu-svabhāva).” This also works when the word having the -tā or -tva suffix is declined in the nominative rather than the instrumental or ablative cases. One merely leaves out the “because.” Thus, rūpādīnām mahattā: literally, “of form, etc., [there is] greatness”; idiomatically, “form, etc., are (-tā) great.” When the “subject” in the genitive case is not stated, one may supply a pronoun, “it” or “they.” Thus, dharmā-dhātu-svabhāvatvāt: “because it is (or they are) the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu.”

Besides the instrumental -tayā and the ablative -tvāt, we also have the suffix -tva declined in the instrumental case, -tvena. In theory -tvena should have the same meaning as the instrumental -tayā (and the ablative -tvāt), “because (it/they) is/are,” but in practice -tvena more often means “as being” (or simply, “as”). Sometimes a phrase using -tvena is found along with a phrase using -tvāt. Then the -tvena phrase may be subordinated to the -tvāt phrase. Thus, sarva-dharmāṇāṃ dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvena rāgārāga-viviktatvāt: literally, “of all dharmas, as being the inherent nature of the dharma-dhātu, because they are distinct from desire and non-desire.” For idiomatic English, we may place the “because” of the -tvāt phrase first, make the genitive the subject, then insert the subordinate -tvena phrase, and then complete the -tvāt phrase. Thus, “because all dharmas, as being the inherent nature of the dharma-dhātu, are distinct from desire and non-desire.” This explanation of the Sanskrit construction of these phrases is an aside, hopefully useful for Sanskrit students. The translation problem being referred to in this note specifically pertains to the construal of just the compound, not to the construal of the whole phrase.

With the help of Gareth’s translation, I have taken note of nine places in Haribhadra’s text where this statement is made. Here is a listing of these places, along with his translations. My additions are given in double brackets. The single brackets and parentheses are his. His translations are followed by the Sanskrit text, with references to both Unrai Wogihara’s 1932 edition, Abhisamayālaṃkāṛālokā, and to P. L. Vaidya’s 1960 edition, Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā. Then given are translations that are as literal as I could make them in keeping with English idiom, so that the Sanskrit text can be more easily followed and compared.

1. Sparham, vol. 1, p. 304: “And why? Subhūti says, Because a Bodhisattva is as boundless as form, etc., is boundless. Based on the maxim, ‘There is no dharma over and above the dharma element [[dharma-dhātu]],’ just as the dharma element is boundless, so too is the form [skandha], etc., that has that for its essential nature [[svabhāva]] boundless.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 110, lines 3-4, Vaidya p. 323, line 1: . . . dharma-dhātuvat tat-svabhāvi-bhūtānāṃ yasmād rūpādīnāṃ aparyantatayā bodhisattvāparyantatā . . . Reigle: “. . . like the dharma-dhātu, because form, etc., which are its inherent nature (svabhāva), are boundless, bodhisattvas are boundless . . .” (I have not translated yasmād here, because it correlates with tasmād later in the sentence).

2. Sparham, vol. 2, p. 124: “Here [Maitreya] is saying that form and so on [[the dharmas]] are great because the Dharma Element [[dharma-dhātu]] is their final nature (svabhāva).” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 176, line 3, Vaidya p. 349, line 15: etad uktam | rūpādīnāṃ dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatayā mahattā. Reigle: “This is what was said: Form, etc. [the dharmas], are great, because they are the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu.”

3. Sparham, vol. 2, p. 130: “[Maitreya] is saying [the gods say a Bodhisattva] standing in that [Perfection of Wisdom] is certain that the form [skandha] and so on with the Dharma Element [[dharma-dhātu]] as its essential nature [[svabhāva]] is the Tathāgata.”

Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 182, lines 11-12, Vaidya p. 351 lines 15-16: etad uktam | prajñā-pāramitāyāṃ sthitasya vastuno dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatayā rūpādīnāṃ tathāgatatvādvadhāraṇam iti. Reigle: “This is what was said: For something established in the Perfection of Wisdom, tathāgatahood (buddhahood) is ascertained, because form, etc., are the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu.”

4. Sparham, vol. 2, p. 134: “[Maitreya] is saying [the gods are saying] that all dharmas have the Dharma Element [[dharma-dhātu]] as their essential nature [[svabhāva]], . . .” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 185, lines 21-23, Vaidya p. 353, lines 10-11: etad uktam | dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatayā prajñā-pāramitāyāṃ sthitasya bodhisattvasya sarva-dharmāṇāṃ nodgraha-tyāga-bhāvanādikam iti. Reigle: “This is what was said: For a bodhisattva established in the Perfection of Wisdom there is no cultivation, etc., of the taking up or abandoning of all dharmas, because they are the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu.”

5. Sparham, vol. 2, p. 241: “. . . a wholesome root . . . and has the same own-being [[svabhāva]] because its own-being is the Dharma Element [[dharma-dhātu]].” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 350, lines 23-25, Vaidya p. 391, lines 18-19: . . . dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvāt tat-svabhāvam. Reigle: “. . . [has] the inherent nature (svabhāva) of that, because it is the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu.”

6. Sparham, vol. 3, p. 138: “He means that in true reality form, etc., its sign, and its own-being [[svabhāva]] are the Dharma Element, and the practice that therefore does not conceive, etc., of them enables [Bodhisattvas] to gain non-conceptual practice and not construct [or conceive of] powers that are ‘unthinkable,’ i.e., beyond thought.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 479, lines 1-2, Vaidya p. 425, line 8: tattvato dharma-dhātu-rūpatvād rūpādi-tan-nimitta-tat-svabhāvāvikalpanādi-pratipatti-sāmarthyena . . . Reigle: “In reality, because it is the form of the dharma-dhātu, through the capability of the practice of non-conception, etc., of form, etc., which are the sign of that and the inherent nature (svabhāva) of that, . . .”

7. Sparham, vol. 4, p. 196: “All dharmas have the Dharma Element for their own-being [[svabhāva]], [i.e., essential nature], so you cannot get at any other different suchness dharma. Since this is the case, ultimately, no one stands in suchness.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 859, lines 14-16, Vaidya p. 517, lines 14-15: dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvāt sarva-dharmāṇāṃ tathatā-vyatiriktānya-dharmānupalambhe sati naiva kaścit paramārthatas tathatāyāṃ sthāsyati. Reigle: “Because all dharmas are the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu, there being no perception of other dharmas distinct from suchness, no one ultimately will stand in suchness.”

8. Sparham, vol. 4, p. 228: “To remove the conceptualization of a nominal (prajñapti) being, [they should meditate] on the fact that, because all dharmas have, in their original nature, the Dharma Element as own-being [[svabhāva]], they are isolated from a shared or specific place.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 898, lines 4-5, Vaidya p. 527, lines 27-28: sattva-prajñapti-vikalpa-nirāsārtham sarva-dharmāṇāṃ prakṛtyā dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvena sāmānya-viśiṣṭa-deśa-viviktatvāt. Reigle: “This is for the sake of removing the conceptualization of the designation of a being, because all dharmas, as

naturally being the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu, are distinct from a common or specific place.”

9. Sparham, vol. 4, p. 229: “To remove the conceptualization of attachment, [they should meditate] on the fact that all dharmas are isolated from attachment and non-attachment because they have as their own-being [[svabhāva]] the Dharma Element.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 898, lines 20-21, Vaidya p. 528, lines 2-3: sakti-vikalpa-nirāsārtham sarva-dharmāṇāṃ dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvena rāgārāga-viviktatvāt. Reigle: “This is for the sake of removing the conceptualization of attachment, because all dharmas, as being the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu, are distinct from desire and non-desire.”

Note: I sent this to Gareth before posting it, and he very graciously encouraged me to go ahead and post it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 16th, 2012 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Tom said:

Here it says that abhūta parikalpa is the dependent nature, not imagined nature which is said to correspond to the object.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. The "imagination of the unreal" is a single entity. However it contains content i.e. the unreal.

Some people seem to think that that it ought to be translated as "unreal imagination", as if the imagination itself in question is unreal. I do not think this is correct. Unreal is not an adjective of the imagination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 5:27 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Tom said:

It seems to contradict verse 1:5.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see how.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Tom said:

Why do you divide these two components into the real and unreal? I can't see this in the text.

Malcolm wrote:

The imagination of the unreal exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Tom said:

Just to be clear in "1) The imagination is the dependent." you mean imagination of the unreal "abhūta parikalpa," not imagination "parikalpita svābhava", yes?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Tom said:

I only ask because of the context of the next verse (1:5).

Also, given verse 1:9 how do you conclude that the ālayavijñāna is equated with the imagination of the unreal?

Malcolm wrote:

Verse nine describes the imagination (the ālayavijñāna) of the unreal (the other seven consciousness).

You seem to think that all eight are the unreal. This is not the intention of 1:8-9.

Tom said:

Are you translating from the Tibetan? or are you using someone else's translation?

Malcolm wrote:

I generally translate directly from Tibetan, if not I give citation of source.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Veganism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not better, just different. Native Americans heavily altered the environment of North America to suit themselves.

gregkavarnos said:

Better and different. If one compares the environment, and the human life styles impact on it, in Europe to those in North America in the period prior to the full scale invasion and some time into it, you would be hard pressed not to consider them better, superior, more sustainable, less destructive, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

You forget that when Europeans first came to New England, Columbus had already introduced most of the western diseases that had completely depopulated North America by 90 percent, according to some estimates.

And, you forget the Mayans basically destroyed their civilization through not understanding environmental limitations.

You are basically making an argument that stone-age is better than copper or iron age. In reality, Indians loved guns. Couldn't get enough of them. Much better than arrows. More efficient at bagging game. If NA has not been depopulated by smallpox and so on, I think we would have a very different assessment of what kind of an impact Indians had on the land.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Does he say why?

(I think the teacher who said the comment I alluded to earlier was Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche, but as I'm not 100% sure...)

Malcolm wrote:

For integration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2012 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

catmoon said:

I do have to wonder though, if alcohol consumption was a regular thing in the very early

Sangha, how on earth did they manage to meditate? A couple of drinks and I'm out of the meditation game for 24 hours. Four or five and I'm out for 3 or 4 days.

Dechen Norbu said:

There are people who meditate very well after a sip. Not my case either. I can't even convince myself to drink a glass of red wine during meals, even if I know it would be great for my health. I get very lazy only by drinking a little.

Still, there was a teacher who even said that meditation went better after a martini (a small glass of vermouth... but I'm sure it doesn't matter), perhaps because some people tend to be very uptight when they start their formal practice (too much formality perhaps). But that comment was made in a specific context and under particular conditions. So it's better not to generalize it.

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Rinpoche recommends in one retreat manual that one should have a drink every day while in retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Veganism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

But the topic of this discussion was their relationship to the animals they hunted and consumed (and if we stretch it a bit, to their environment in general). It would be very difficult to convince me that it was not (and still is to a degree) infinitely better than European attitudes and relationships.

Malcolm wrote:

Not better, just different. Native Americans heavily altered the environment of North America to suit themselves.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2012 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

PS I do not consider wine with meals covered.

Can we stretch this one to cover beer and crisps or whiskey and peanuts?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. That depends on one's capacity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2012 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think the mods have dealt quite well with a variety of individuals that come here merely to stir trouble.

Namdrol said:

I doubt that Jax has come here for the purpose of causing trouble. I don't agree with how he discusses the teachings and his point of view seems perennialist -- he does not strike me as a "troublemaker" per se.

N

Mr. G said:

Namdrol, are you saying you think he should not have been banned? If so, do you have suggestions on how to best objectively qualify in the future whether a member should, or should not be banned? To me, his claims of accomplishing the result of gtum mo, lack of respect towards his own Dzogchen teachers, repeatedly openly discussing the specifics of inner practices involving channels, gazing, etc., and bizarre statements blending advaita, Dzogchen and Gnostic teachings had me label him as a disruptive troll. Was I too quick to act? Is there better criteria to be used in the future?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not going to second guess the admin's decisions.

However, what he said regarding Gnostic blah blah blah has been said by John Reynolds.

As far as lack of respect of his teachers goes, that is his problem, not ours.

As far as talking about the specifics of thögal openly, this is not the correct way -- but it was corrected.

We have many people who say strange things here. It is to be expected. I think the main thing that bothered people was that he does not care about lineage and that he has some odd ideas about transmission.

So, whether you choose to readmit him or not, I think that most of what you outline above is not really something we ought to ban people for.

Most of us here understand the right way. We also do not want a repeat of E-Sangha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Seishin said:

Are we talking about for monastics only?

Huseng said:

The five lay precepts include a prohibition on alcohol as well, so yes it includes everyone, not just monastics.

Malcolm wrote:

The point in general is intoxication, not alcohol. I do not consider wine with meals covered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think the mods have dealt quite well with a variety of individuals that come here merely to stir trouble.

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt that Jax has come here for the purpose of causing trouble. I don't agree with how he discusses the teachings and his point of view seems perennialist -- he does not strike me as a "troublemaker" per se.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Censorship on This Forum

Content:

Jacks said:

Debate has the function of bringing out unsupported notions that can't survive the light of day. More importantly, great debate can be lots of fun!

Malcolm wrote:

Well for example, your notion that Dzogchen is an affirming negation turns out to be

completely unsupported by the primary texts of the system. But that does not require debate, that merely requires reading the texts themselves.

In general, we find that in many Dzogchen texts the twin terms dgag and sgrub are used -
- dgag means to refute, sgrub means to prove. The essence of debate is refutation and proof, rejecting one point of view and accepting another point of view. But in reality, as Rongzom Chozang points out, the state of Dzogchen is beyond both refutation and proof. This is why I continue to insist that it is waste of time to debate about Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Censorship on This Forum

Content:

Jinzang said:

Debate is just conceptual grasping itself.

Then spending time on forums is a waste, yes?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not necessarily. But I find debate singularly unproductive.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Censorship on This Forum

Content:

Rudra said:

Vigorous Dzogchen debate is encouraged and taught in the Bon tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but in IMO debate about Dzogchen is really a waste of time. Debate is just conceptual grasping itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Censorship on This Forum

Content:

Rudra said:

There seems to be a belief that by refining one's intellectual understanding of Dzogchen terminology that one can build a stairway to Rigpa through conceptual grasping.

Malcolm wrote:

No one has this belief. Everyone here understands that the real knowledge of Dzogchen is based on personal experience.

I don't know why you were banned, but it might be because of saying things like "fundamentalist Taliban intellectuals".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Would you say the translation you just posted above is most accurate? (I assume you would be saying that I'm sure you translated it)

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, yes. My translation of the passage is based on Vimalamitra's commentary of the passage in question, which apart from one error pointed out above, is perfectly fine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

Jnana said:

Yeah. And what's even more hilarious is arguing over poetry!!!

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen texts are not poetry. This is a common misunderstanding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

Adamantine said:

...

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I made a translation error -- this is from an old, unedited translation I have not re-examined. The passage should be read:

"Since neither of those exist [i.e. samsara or nirvana], one understands that the originally pure vidyā [rig pa] which apprehends the basis and the vidyā of insight, the chains, do not exist other than being mere designations...

(My bad I don't usually trot out unedited translations without checking them to see if they are free of errors)

The passage is trying to state that all of these discussions are merely nominal. This is why Longchenpa, Jigme Lingpa and others state over and over the intention of Dzogchen and the intention of Madhyamaka are the same.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

Adamantine said:

I have to admit I am a bit confused too, even considering the context..that is if we are holding it to standards of logic as opposed to a type poetic allusion.

Unless it is trying to say that "existence" only makes sense when contrasted with non-existence.. and since there is nothing apart from pure vidya and vidya of insight therefore there is no "existence" of vidya per se.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

it says "since there is nothing but X1 and X2, X does not exist" how does that make sense semantically?

Malcolm wrote:

You are being myopic:

Here is the passage Vimalamitra is commenting on:

There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not

exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, prajñā does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway.

Context, context, context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Namdrol said:

Vimalamitra's final paragraph on this passage states:

"Since neither of those exist [i.e. samsara or nirvana], since one understands that there nothing apart from the originally pure vidyā [rig pa] which apprehends the basis and the vidyā of insight which apprehends the chains, it [vidyā] also does not exist. Since the essence of vidyā does not exist, the vidyā of the perduring basis (the source of both energy [rtsal] and qualities, and also the apprehender of characteristics) does not exist.

gad rgyangs said:

Hi N - I'm having trouble with this paragraph: the translation appears to be saying " since there (is)* nothing apart from pure vidya and vidya of insight, vidya does not exist." On the face of it, this makes no sense.

*Im assumng this word was left out accidentally?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a a typo.

And the passage makes perfect sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

samdrup said:

Hey M,

You missed the main event Banned maybe? Don't know.

S.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh? What was the main event?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

Jinzang said:

The real difference between Advaita and Madhyamika is that what Advaita takes to be an inexpressible something Madhyamika explains as the absence of anything determinate.

gad rgyangs said:

comparing advaita and madhyamaka is apples and oranges. comparing advaita and dzogchen or shentong is more interesting. I wonder if Shakya chokden, Mipham, Kongtrul, Kalu Rinpoche or Dudjom Rinpoche came here they would be attacked for being "crypto vedantins" and banned.

Malcolm wrote:

First, Mipham was not a gzhan stong pa, though he was very interested in rennovating Yogacara and reintrepreting (unsuccessfully, IMO) it in a madhyamaka manner.

Dudjom Rinpoche was basically a follower of Kongtrul's modernized gzhan stong which owes more to Shakya Chogchen than Dolbuba.

Even here, the vast majority of modern gzhan stong pas claim that it (gzhan stong) is a post-meditative intepretive scheme not used in meditation. They claim that in meditation there their view is the same as what they describe as rang stong.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jax said:

You are Being.

Namdrol said:

This is not Dzogchen. This is Neo-Advaita.

Jax said:

Ok... you are not Being? If Dzogchen is a "confirming negation", which it is, then there is affirmative existence regarding Rigpa. This is the difference between Madhyamaka and Dzogchen. Madhyamaka is a "non-confirming negation", leaving us just with emptiness. Hence Madhyamaka is a different result. Vajrasattva means Diamond Being. It is not

about neo-advaita or Taoism... its about what we are. We are Aware Emptiness in full integration with our equally empty, yet appearing Luminosity.

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think Dzogchen is a affirming negation?

This is not the case. Dzogchen does not have a view to support or promulgate, and that is what affirming negations are for i.e. rejecting one thing in order to prove one's own perspective. By asserting that Dzogchen is asserting an affirming negation you are rendering Dzogchen inferior to Madhyamaka.

If Dzogchen is an affirming negation, than this statement from the Unwritten Tantra makes no sense:

“Apparent yet non-existent retinue, listen well! There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, prajñā does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway.”

Vimalamitra's final paragraph on this passage states:

"Since neither of those exist [i.e. samsara or nirvana], since one understands that there nothing apart from the originally pure vidyā [rig pa] which apprehends the basis and the vidyā of insight which apprehends the chains, it [vidyā] also does not exist. Since the essence of vidyā does not exist, the vidyā of the perduring basis (the source of both energy [rtsal] and qualities, and also the apprehender of characteristics) does not exist.

Since the wisdom appearances of people's own vidyā that are seen in personal experience are not established as entities of any kind, it is the appearance of the exhaustion of dharmatā."

Further, Vimalamitra states in The Lamp Summarizing Emptiness:

Now then, the emptiness of dharmatā: natural dharmatā is the emptiness of the non-existence of a primal substance. Thus, all appearances were never established according to the eight examples of illusion. When appearances spread, that basis of the emptiness of dharmatā does not shift whatsoever, never transcending the emptiness of dharmatā. Furthermore:

Everything arose from non-arising;
even arising itself never arose.

Dharmatā in and of itself is empty without a basis, present at all times as the single nature of the great emptiness of the basis, path, and result. Furthermore, primordial emptiness is empty without beginning. [180]

Empty things are empty by nature.

Since the emptiness of dharmatā is present without being contrived and without being transformed in the basis, yogins are also liberated by remaining naturally without

contrivance and without transformations.

And:

"That dharmatā emptiness dwells in a fortress and is captured in a fortress: the fortress (that is like a circle of spears in the sky) encircles (without a beginning or an end) dharmatā, i.e., existence is dharmatā, non-existence is dharmatā, both are dharmatā and neither are dharmatā. As such, [dharmatā] is surrounded by the names “clear and unclear”, “empty and not-empty”, “existence and non-existence”, “permanence and annihilation”, and so on. That lack of finding evidence itself is dharmatā. Further, in reality nothing exists apart from dharmatā. That being the case, that emptiness (as a mere representation, baseless, and non-referential, being non-existent like a pretense) is understood with scripture, accepted by reasoning, proven by argument, and captured in a fortress. Be confident that dharmatā is the unmistakable true emptiness.

Therefore, to describe Dzogchen as an affirming negation does not make any sense at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jax said:

You are Being.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not Dzogchen. This is Neo-Advaita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 6:28 PM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

Sönam said:

Is there not a notion of knowledge in being present? ... instant presence is a knowledge, isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 2:31 PM

Title: Re: What is the Point of Tögal?

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

This^ contradicts what the Dzogchen tantras say. the tantras and the commentaries on them give at least 7 ways in which tögal and its realization is superior to trekchod.

Wanna know what they are? Gotta go talk to a Dzogchen master who will explain this at the proper time. Suffice it say that tögal is not some enhancement for trekchod. To the contrary, trekchod enables the knowledge and stability necessary for tögal to work.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no tregchö without tögal, and no tögal without tregchö.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 2:16 PM

Title: Re: Origins of Dzogchen

Content:

Jax said:

Ahem... Guys, I didn't hear one word of refutation regarding Sam Van Schaik's and David Germano's attributions of the origins of Dzogchen. Do you know of more scholarly evidence that points to other origins? Or is this topic taboo to the "true believers" in the mythological stories regarding Dzogchen's origins?

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing to refute. They are text critical historians -- their job is to figure out when a certain idea was first documented on a piece of paper. The inferences they draw from that however should not be regarded as gospels themselves. Western scholarship is all fine and dandy, but it does not lead one to understand what is a valid teaching and what is not.

Dzogchen tantras are intrinsically valid irrespective if they were written in the eighth century, the first aeon, or the twenty first century, they do not need the confirmation of this or that western scholar's opinion. They express the awakened state of persons such as Garab Dorje, Manjushrimitra, Vimalamitra, Rigzin Godem, ChNN, KDL, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 2:05 PM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

Sönam said:

Not to forget that Namkhai Norbu itself has choose to translate rigpa by "presence".

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN sometimes translates it as instant presence, sometimes as knowledge. In fact, Vimalamitra defines fives kinds of vidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: What is the Point of Togal?

Content:

Jax said:

If you read Longchenpa's Precious Seven Treasuries texts, the Lamas overseeing the translation, Chagdud Rinpoche, Tulku Thondup, Mingyur Rinpoche, Khenpo Tsewang Gyatso, Khenpo Gyurmed Tinley, and Lama Sonam Tsering... ALL chose the word "awareness" to be used for Rigpa whenever cited.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually it was the editorial staff who chose that term. Since I know the senior editor who works on those books quite well, I am quite sure of this.

Jax said:

That is good enough for me. Also Tulku Urgyen often uses the term "awareness" for Rigpa in his dual volume As It Is texts.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that would have been Eric Pema Kunsang. Eric has since decided that "awareness" is not a good equivalent for rigpa.

Jax said:

That would be just translating "vidya" as knowledge from the sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is clearly the intent of the term "rigpa"; hence ChNN over and over again defines rigpa (vidyā) as a species of knowledge about one's state as opposed to avidyā, i.e. not knowing that state.

It is best to leave the term either in Tibetan or in Sanskrit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 9th, 2012 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

when he says "the awareness through which I can say that "I am aware of this sense of self"" this is basically a knowledge of the basis, and therefore, rigpa. (IMO)

Malcolm wrote:

Pity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 9th, 2012 at 6:52 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

padma norbu said:

I see at least 50 people in the retreat photo on his website. At \$70 per person per day

Malcolm wrote:

\$3500 (\$70 x 50 people) per day is a pretty good racket. A labor of love indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 5th, 2012 at 2:29 PM

Title: Re: According to Yogachara...?

Content:

Jinzang said:

Most Nyingma... practitioners hold the view of other emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely a huge over statement.

Some Nyingmapas like gzhan stong, not most.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 2nd, 2012 at 1:34 PM

Title: Re: Possession

Content:

Konchog1 said:

I read in the paper that a woman with two daughters was suffering from burning pain in her stomach and back, headaches, and anxiety. So Valentines Day, she buys her daughters some presents and the next day she drowns them. Everyone that knew her is

stunned by her odd behavior so I was wondering Namdrol, do you think this is a case of possession? By Gyalpo?

Malcolm wrote:

Provocation for sure, not sure what kind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 1st, 2012 at 3:00 PM

Title: Re: Taking vimala and semde concurrently

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol,

Would it be OK to take semde in the a.m. and vimala at bedtime?

I ask because nearly a month of taking vimala every night has resolved my anxiety pretty much entirely, but while it's really taken the edge off my depression, it still lingers on.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Take semde in the am.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 27th, 2012 at 4:30 PM

Title: Re: Arhat From The Perspective Of Mahayana

Content:

Huseng said:

However, some might have suggested that the real cause for rebirth was ignorance with desire being a secondary by-product of that ignorance, in which case the ignorant Arhat, despite having achieved cessation of desire, could still be subject to eventual rebirth regardless.

Malcolm wrote:

But then we have the POV of Vasubandhu that Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas are subject to a non-afflictive ignorance, hence this will not drive rebirth.

Retrogression of Arhats, BTW, just means they return to the state of a never returner, not that they regress to being ordinary beings.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 11:39 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

heart said:
Exactly, I think that is clear from my quote as well.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
yup

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 11:39 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

heart said:
Exactly, I think that is clear from my quote as well.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
yup

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 10:15 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

heart said:
"Likewise, no ignorance exist in the ground, yet ignorance naturally arise from the aspect of what manifested as compassion."

/magnus

gad rgyangs said:
exactly.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since that aspect was not recognized, but compassion does not arise as ignorance otherwise, ignorance would be intrinsic to the ground, and it is not. For example, the five lights do not arise as the five elements, but since the display of the basis was not recognized, the five elements are effectively arise through the non-recognition of the five lights.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings...

Content:

Dronma said:

Do they sound the same?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Translating the Words of the Buddha

Content:

Karinos said:

I think they do deep revision sutra by sutra (or tantra by tantra) as far as I understood from their page. however you are right about complete revision at the end.

Malcolm wrote:

The thing is for example Conze has become a defacto standard in PP sutra literature. So the translation of Abhisamaalamkara by Spareham largely follows his lead.

So what do we do, retranslate the all these sutras and then make sure that the vast corpus of AA commentary texts use the those sutra passages or what? It is a big question -- that is why my verdict on the thing is only OK.

For example in the tantra they released they translated camphor but did not translate "silha" which is Frankincense and related resins from trees of the Boswellia family. With just a little extra digging they could have sorted that out.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Unknown said:

Namdrol could you please provide some quotes from where you got this? Looking at Tshigdon Mdzod it seems to me that it is saying that ignorance is not part of the appearances of the base. However I can't find anything that says that ignorance is prior to the appearance but more looks like the opposite (or maybe that they arise at the same time?). What is there to be ignorant about before the appearance of the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no avidyā in the basis, but through non-recognition, avidyā depends on vidyā after the appearances of the basis. This is only possible if the awareness and knowing factor which are complete in the basis are not aware of themselves (which they aren't) That lack of knowledge I argue is a species of non-afflictive ignorance.

Samantabhadra upon the arising of the basis possesses the first two kinds of ignorance but never the third (imputing ignorance).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Translating the Words of the Buddha

Content:

Karinos said:

why would you question quality of translation of team of more then 100 people in the first place?

<http://84000.co/about/translators/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://84000.co/about/team/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Huseng said:

I can't judge for myself the quality of the translations because I don't know Tibetan. So, I asked Namdrol's opinion as he is a translator of Tibetan with many years experience.

I hope their translations are quality.

Malcolm wrote:

Once the whole thing is translated, a complete revision will be necessary to take into account intertextuality. It is a good first step, but these translations should be regarded as drafts subject to change, as all translation made in the present day should be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Im also not sure which term from the Dzogchen corpus you are translating as "convention"?

Malcolm wrote:

tha snyad, vyavahara.

This is why, as the rigpa rang shar states, though in Dzogchen there is actually no basis, path and result, nevertheless, we talk about a basis, path and result. Ergo, the basis and the rest are merely conventional, quite in line with Haribhadra's proclamation that the entire path, including buddhahood, is totally illusory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Translating the Words of the Buddha

Content:

Pero said:

Which Dzogchen texts are in the Kangyur?

Namdrol said:

kun byed rgyal po

Huseng said:

Can you comment on the quality of the English texts being produced in the 84000 project?

Malcolm wrote:

they are ok.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

The basis is merely a convention.

gad rgyangs said:
in what sense, surely not in a madhyamaka sense.

Malcolm wrote:
There basis is not real. Ergo it is merely a convention. If someone should think the basis was real, they would be missing the point of ka dag. The basis is baseless, it is not established in anyway at all.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 8:59 PM
Title: Re: Translating the Words of the Buddha
Content:
Pero said:
Which Dzogchen texts are in the Kangyur?

Malcolm wrote:
kun byed rgyal po

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 6:32 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The basis is a convention isn't it?

gad rgyangs said:
the word "basis" is a convention, the basis is not.

Malcolm wrote:
The basis is merely a convention.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 11:36 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
Longchenpa was a historical personality whose realization is not disputed, and whose

actual writings we have intact. Garab Dorje, not so much. Texts attributed to GD are pretty much like texts where Samantabhadra or Vajrasattva is speaking (not that that's a problem or anything).

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is the difference between you and I -- I pretty much think that Garab Dorje is a historical personality. We have his extant writings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Sönam said:

But Dzogchen view is not Dzogchen ... how can a point of view express the Base?
Language is his own limitation, sounds can possibly express the Base not concepts?

Sönam

gad rgyangs said:

tell that to Longchenpa, whose mdzod bdun (7 treasures) is devoted to expressing the Dzogchen view in many ways, from technical philosophy to poetry, and runs to ~4300 pages altogether.

Malcolm wrote:

Longchenpa, in most of these works, was attempting to legitimize Dzogchen in the context of scholasticism.

I prefer Garab Dorje.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=6607&p=78514&hilit=Pralaya#p78514>

Lhug-Pa said:

So then gZhi is translated as Laya, Sthana, or could be translated as both?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Pay attention to what I said-- "ignorance is not an appearance of the basis".

gad rgyangs said:

If "All phenomena of samsara and nirvana are appearances of the basis". (premise from innumerable texts)

and "Ignorance is not an appearance of the basis" (Namdrol).

Therefore: ignorance is not a phenomena of samsara or nirvana. (implication of your claim).

Malcolm wrote:

Your major premise and minor premise don't match. Therefore, the conclusion is faulty.

Further, ignorance is prior to the appearance of samsara and nirvana, correct? Since ignorance is prior to the appearance of the basis, consequently, ignorance is not an appearance of the basis.

Ignorance exists before the basis appears; therefore ignorance is not an appearance of the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if Namdrol refuses to acknowledge that "all phenomena of samsara and nirvana" are appearances of the basis

Malcolm wrote:

I did not refuse to acknowledge that. Pay attention to what I said-- "ignorance is not an appearance of the basis".

gad rgyangs said:

and insists that ignorance is instead separately based on a kun gzhi which is not itself an appearance of the basis,

Malcolm wrote:

Kun gzhi is a synonym of ignorance.

But, as I said before, it is not appropriate to argue and debate about Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 19th, 2012 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Astus said:

The concept of equality is another thing, mostly a legal matter and such.

Namdrol said:

That is not how we Americans view the issue.

kirtu said:

My experience with American's and equality is that while Americans verbally venerate equality

Malcolm wrote:

It's a process. Once the concept of rights caught hold, human beings started to catch up with the idea.

The American concept of rights does not immediately mean that everyone sees the full implications the notion of equal rights or that there is no injustice. But rights are considered inalienable, and the process of our Democracy involves discovering those rights as we go along.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 19th, 2012 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Third, sentient beings are part of the appearance of the basis (since they are comprised of the five elements), their ignorance however is not because ignorance does not and cannot belong to the basis. Their ignorance (avidyā) is precisely their lack of knowledge of the nature of the basis (hence ignorance depends on the basis), just as their knowledge (vidyā) is precisely the knowledge of the nature of the basis.

gad rgyangs said:

sentient beings are part of the appearances of the basis, and a sentient being is a consciousness obscured by non-recognition. "the ground of all that arises", "the ground for all phenomena of samsara and nirvana", how many different ways does it need to be said? If ignorance is not a phenomena of samsara, I don't know what is. "It arises as anything at all" - including ignorance, delusion, and confusion, i.e. us sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis [gzhi] is not the all-basis [kun gzhi], which is that you are describing here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

muni said:

The methods of correcting/comparing/analysing/rejecting/accepting-tradition by intellectual scholars, what is that regarding nature-dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Potentially useless proliferation divorced from practical experience -- but if it helps someone see their way clear to understanding, then fine, if not, well it is waste of time.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

ཐུགས་རྗེ་སྤར་པ་ལས་མ་རིག་བ་བྱུང་

Ignorance was produced from an arising that falsely resembles [i.e. ltar as byed khul, not nang bzhin] compassion.

gad rgyangs said:

what justification is there for reading ltar as byed khul?

In any case, you still have not stated what you consider to be the ground of ignorance. is a sentient being part of the appearances of the basis? if so, so is its ignorance. if not, then what is a sentient being in relation to the appearances of the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

As for your first question, it is based on the context of the sentence as well as its grammar.

As for your second question I have explained this, so I am not going to explain it again.

Third, sentient beings are part of the appearance of the basis (since they are comprised of the five elements), their ignorance however is not because ignorance does not and cannot belong to the basis. Their ignorance (avidyā) is precisely their lack of knowledge of the nature of the basis (hence ignorance depends on the basis), just as their knowledge (vidyā) is precisely the knowledge of the nature of the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:39 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

are you still maintaing this, and if so, how do you explain it within the context of the quote?

Malcolm wrote:

That does not say that non-recognition is an appearance of the basis i.e.

གཞི་ལ་མ་རིག་པ་ཡོད་པ་ཅང་མ་ཡིན་

Ignorance never [cang ma yin] existed in the basis.

It says:

ཐུགས་རྗེ་མ་ངེས་པ་ལས་མ་རིག་པ་རང་བྱུང་

Ignorance self-originated from the non-ascertainment of compassion.

And:

ཐུགས་རྗེ་ལྟར་ཤར་བ་ལས་མ་རིག་པ་བྱུང་

Ignorance was produced from an arising that falsely resembles [i.e. ltar as byed khul, not nang bzhin] compassion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:17 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Longchenpa in the tshig don mdzod quotes the Auspicious Beauty Tantra (bkra shis mdzes ldan):

Malcolm wrote:

So what's the problem? this is perfectly clear. You answered your own question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 10:21 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Caz said:

There is no such thing as equality in Samsara and as far as I know Buddhists are still within Samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is exactly one kind of equality i.e. being in samsara all sentient beings are equal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Astus said:

Equality requires a mind that sees all as equals.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it doesn't.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

kirtu said:

Methinks this is not an auspicious beginning

Malcolm wrote:

A reformation of Buddhism is inevitable in its coming to the west, just as the Protestant Reformation was inevitable in Northern Europe.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism / Nonduality Influenced Metal Bands

Content:

padma norbu said:

David Tibet, too. That's not his real last name and he may be influenced by Tibetan Buddhism, but he's more of a Crowley/Spare kinda guy. He fronts Current 93

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, yes, yes, and yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Astus said:

"Therefore a bhikkhu ... should not present himself as equal to, nor imagine himself to be inferior, nor better than, another."

(<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.4.05.irel.html>)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and I wish more bhikṣus would recall this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Astus said:

The concept of equality is another thing, mostly a legal matter and such.

Malcolm wrote:
That is not how we Americans view the issue.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:17 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
and the basis of that non-recognition is marigpa and the basis of marigpa is...?

Malcolm wrote:
Ignorance has three causes, essence, nature and compassion. However, as Padmasambhava states in the Khandro Nyingthig (volume I, pg 348)

"Therefore, in that case, the three causes of ignorance are the trio of essence, nature and compassion...Further more, though those three wisdoms above cannot cause delusion, there is the delusion of the condition of ignorance about them. For example, though within the sun there is no basis nor cause for darkness, it is like being blocked by fog in the sky."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 11:21 PM
Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?
Content:
Huseng said:
This is one thing that might get dropped if Buddhism is really transmitted into the west.

Namdrol said:
And good riddance too.

N

Huseng said:
I've come to have similar sentiments.

But then here in Asia, from India to Nepal to Taiwan, the whole hierarchy thing is ever present. This kind of thing is part of institutionalized Buddhism everywhere in Asia of course, though trying to extract Buddhadharma from it while maintaining the lifeline of a tradition for more than a generation might prove difficult.

I think some monastics might try to justify it by saying it fosters humility or something, but that to me is just contrived and superficial head bowing. Another form of self-grasping and cause for worry about offending someone.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the problem is that Asians tend to identify their hierarchy _as_ the Dharma. This is one reason I personally find the explicit leveling of hierarchy in Dzogchen so appealing, and why traditionally in Tibet, at any rate, Dzogchen teachings were considered threatening to the hierarchy. If you tell a bunch of folks that ignorant butchers will achieve realization faster than panditas based on instructions that you possess, it is going to shake some things up.

And yes, BTW to your question, the way it stands now is that some Buddhists are more equal than others -- for example, monastics with jobs still get to attend many teachings free of charge, while unemployed lay people are barred entrance. There is a phenomena in Buddhism where monastics correct every threat to their hegemony. This is largely sociological -- in societies where power lay in the hands of the aristocracy, the only way to power for common people is through the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

In societies like ours, where there is no de facto aristocracy, monastic heirarchies become one. In Buddhism in particular there is this notion of a hierarchy of virtue. I do not believe this was the Buddha's intent, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Huseng said:

This is one thing that might get dropped if Buddhism is really transmitted into the west.

Malcolm wrote:

And good riddance too.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Huseng said:

In many modern day societies there is at the least the pretence and belief that everyone is equal no matter their status or background.

I think this belief might get transferred over to contemporary Buddhist communities as well to some extent. It wouldn't please people to just outright say that the male monks are chiefly superior followed by the male novices, then female nuns, female novices and following them the laity, even though this is how it is presented on paper. Seating arrangements have always been quite important. Moreover, there is a prescribed

hierarchy.

So do we run into a situation where everyone is equal, but some are more equal than others? Wouldn't it just be best to do away with such pretences and consent to the existence of a prescribed hierarchy where male monastics are at the top and laity at the bottom? Or should a monastic have to earn their position of respect from the laity by virtue of wisdom and deeds rather than by putting on robes and formally renouncing?

Malcolm wrote:

Of what use is this proliferation about rank and position?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings...

Content:

catmoon said:

Did you mean to say "cause" instead of consequence?

The idea that Dharma is the cause and Dzogchen the result can't possibly be universal, simply because there are billions of Buddhists who are not Dzogchenpas.

Malcolm wrote:

All Buddhas are Dzogchenpas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

I am not claiming that non-recognition is an appearance of the basis. I never said that, or even implied it. That is your imputation.

gad rgyangs said:

what is there besides the basis and appearances of the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

The non-recognition of that appearance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

conebeckham said:

You assume the lack of the false imagination, and specifically the lack of duality, in the

dependent is the only thing that parinispanna signifies? That the perfect nature is merely the lack of false imagination?

This would seem to imply that the seeds, or some sort of "contents" of the alaya, would still be present....or do you find all the seeds, habits, etc., would be purified merely by virtue of the lack of false imagination?

Malcolm wrote:

Recognizing the non-existence of the unreal is parinispanna, that is the classical Yogacara presentation of emptiness free from extremes.

How the paths and stages are meditated is a different story. I don't think we can say it is sufficient to merely recognize this fact and then we are finished. This is how the Yogacara scholars are presenting the view of emptiness, which is why for example, the Madhyāntavibhaga gives a presentation of the sixteen emptinesses. If this recognition were sufficient, there would be no purpose for the rest of the treatises which details the 37 bodhipakṣa dharmas and so on.

Anyway, in 1:3-4, Vasubandhu explains MV as follows:

As such, having described the characteristic of the existence and and characteristics of the non-existence of the imagination of the false, now the intrinsic characteristic will be described:

Consciousness appearing
as objects, sentient beings, self, and cognitions
arise, but its objects do not exist,
since they do not exist, it does not exist.

Now then, appearing as objects means whatever appears as a thing such as form and so on; appearing as sentient beings what appears to the five sense organs appearing in the continuums of self and others; appearing as a self is the afflicted mind because the concomitance of confusion and so about a self; appearing as a cognition is the six consciousnesses. "Its objects do not exist means" the appearances as objects, and sentient beings do exist; self and cognitions means mistaken appearances. Since the objects do not exist, also that apprehending consciousness does not exist.

That imagination of the unreal
is established because of that,
is not as it seems, is not a total non-existent.

As such, however appearances are produced, they are not as they seem; because of the production of mere delusion, are also not totally non-existent.

If it is asked why its total non-existence is not asserted:

Having exhausted that, liberation is asserted.

If it were otherwise, bondage and freedom would not be established, and definitely the afflictive state and complete purification would be repudiated.

There are three points here:

- 1) The imagination is the dependent.
- 2) It is held to exist, but its content does not exist.
- 3) If it is held to be totally non-existent, both samsara and nirvana are impossible because there would be no basis for delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Jikan said:

Seems to me that Wonhyo advocated a ninth consciousness on the basis of the Vajrasamadhi sutra (published as Cultivating Original Enlightenment). I know that Wonhyo himself was likely the compiler of that text. I bring it up because I'd like to know if this concept took hold in Korean Buddhism following Wonhyo, or if it was forgotten.

Malcolm wrote:

This sutra is well established to be a Korean composition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if (as you are claiming) appearances of the basis are the basis, and non-recognition is an appearance of the basis, then non-recognition is the basis. this makes no sense, therefore, appearances of the basis are not the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not claiming that non-recognition is an appearance of the basis. I never said that, or even implied it. That is your imputation.

Anyway, Dzogchen is not something to be debated or argued. Learn Tibetan.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

I see. So this was completely of his own invention then?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thats not the basis appearing, otherwise there would be no reason to distinguish basis (gzhi) from appearances of the basis (gzhi snang) and have two terms.

Namdrol said:

And you think this because?

gad rgyangs said:

since the basis is also the basis for non-recognition, it would mean that marigpa would be a characteristic of the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is the basis for non-recognition. This is why for example, the Rosary of Pearls states:

Though the explanation of the basis of delusion is of many kinds
it is natural formation and compassion.

There are three wisdoms of the basis, essence, nature and compassion. The appearance of the basis is the nature and compassion aspect. The "invisible" part of the basis is original purity; but essence, nature and compassion are inseparable. This is why the sgra thal rgyu states:

Other than wisdom dwelling in itself,
there is no separation into three modes.

When the basis appears, it was not recognized. That non-recognition however is not a characteristic of the basis because the basis cannot be affected by non-recognition; for example, if one does not recognize someone's face in the crowd, it does not follow necessarily that one's own non-recognition is inherent in the face of the person one should recognize. If it were, that person could never be recognized.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

[quote="Namdrol"]It seems to be his original contribution. The idea is rejected by Bhavaviveka.

Malcolm wrote:

Was {aramarthas source ffrom any of the sutras?[/quote]

No, this is the reason it was rejected by Bhavaviveka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

nirmal said:

The ninth consciousness, emphasized in Tantra, contains all the virtues and potentialities of Buddhahood. When one is Fully Enlightened, this consciousness becomes the totality of wisdom WITHOUT ANY SENSE OF CONSCIOUSNESS.
)

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Buddhist tantra which teaches a "ninth" consciousness. It does not exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Random question on Chogyam Trungpa

Content:

Nangwa said:

Great username by the way.

Lotus_Bitch said:

Thank you. I came up with it based off a day dream I had at work, about starting a progressive death metal band with female vocals. The songs subject matter would've been based off of the buddhadharma; hence "Lotus"...With the inclusion of female vocals making it "Bitch." This may or may not be offensive to women.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess it is a rather literal translation of Padmadas, "Servant of Padmasambhava".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

Does anyone know who or what sect has taught or teaches about the amala-vijnana ("stainless" consciousness?)

As far as I know there was only one individual who taught this; an Indian by the name of Paramartha (499-569.) Also apparently the Nichiren sect teaches this, according to this website I found while doing an internet search of the subject:

<https://www.sgi.org/buddhism/buddhist-concepts/the-nine-consciousnesses.html> Is that a legitimate source for what the Nichiren sect teaches? Because I thought it was based off the Lotus sutra and from reading the Lotus sutra: I didn't see any mention of an amala-vijnana?

Namdrol said:

This is a teaching by the Indian scholar Paramartha who introduced this idea to China. It was never a main stream Indian idea.

Lotus_Bitch said:

Where was the source of this theory? As in where did he learn of this? Or was it something he came up with by himself?

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to be his original contribution. The idea is rejected by Bhavaviveka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 6:26 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

Does anyone know who or what sect has taught or teaches about the amala-vijnana ("stainless" consciousness?)

As far as I know there was only one individual who taught this; an Indian by the name of Paramartha (499-569.) Also apparently the Nichiren sect teaches this, according to this website I found while doing an internet search of the subject:

<https://www.sgi.org/buddhism/buddhist-concepts/the-nine-consciousnesses.html> Is that a legitimate source for what the Nichiren sect teaches? Because I thought it was based off the Lotus sutra and from reading the Lotus sutra: I didn't see any mention of an amala-vijnana?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a teaching by the Indian scholar Paramartha who introduced this idea to China. It was never a main stream Indian idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

conebeckham said:

My personal understanding, at this point, subject to change, is that:

1. Yogacara texts do, in fact, assert an "existent."
2. The nature of that "existent" is the Perfect Nature.
3. The existent which is of the perfect nature is the substrate of all consciousnesses, including the ālayavijñāna, as well as all the other consciousnesses.
4. The ālayavijñāna is not the ultimate existent, as it is said to "cease." In the same way, all the other consciousness cease, so none of them can be said to be ultimate, though they are "of" the ultimate, in a sense.

Malcolm wrote:

The ālayavijñāna is the imagination of the unreal.

So we will break it down: the imagination [dependent nature] of the unreal [the imagined nature] exists; however in it duality does not exist [parinispanna].

So when the unreal is removed, what remains is the dependent nature. That is why it is said that the absence of the imagined in the dependent is the perfected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

since the basis does not appear, how can it be illusory?

Namdrol said:

The basis does appear. This is why we use the term "gzhi snang".

gad rgyangs said:

thats not the basis appearing, otherwise there would be no reason to distinguish basis (gzhi) from appearances of the basis (gzhi snang) and have two terms.

Malcolm wrote:
And you think this because?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 4:09 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
since the basis does not appear, how can it be illusory?

Malcolm wrote:
The basis does appear. This is why we use the term "gzhi snang".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 1:25 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
Namdrol said:
The point of view of Dzogchen, according to Rongzompa, is that all phenomena of samsara and nirvana are completely and totally equivalent with illusions.

gad rgyangs said:
sure but the basis is prior to all phenomena of samsara and nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:
Does not make it any less illusory, does it?

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
"emptiness" cannot be a substance-noun, it means "the condition of being empty" (OED), agreed? "empty" is an adjective, as in "the glass is empty". you can nominalize this by speaking of "the emptiness of the glass", but this is referring to the fact that the glass is empty, it is not talking about some thing called "emptiness". now, we know that the basis is not some "thing" but rather pure potentiality, "es gibt Sein". Since only conventionalities can be "empty" (since only conventionalities are dependently arisen), and the basis clearly cannot be considered a conventional existent/dependent arising,

then what sense does it make to call it "empty" , let alone calling it "emptiness(!)" surely you're not saying that the basis is simply the fact of the lack of svabhava in dependent arisings? now, if you want to posit another definition of "emptiness", fine, but then don't say that Dzoghchen follows prasangika madhyamaka. if you want, you can say it follows "great madhyamaka", as presented by Dudjom R in the Big Red Book.

Namdrol said:

The basis is a convention.

gad rgyangs said:

you mean like saṃvṛiti/kun rdzob?

Malcolm wrote:

In the Great Perfection, Atiyoga,
there is no basis, path and result,
nevertheless a basis, path and result is taught.

-- Rig pa rang shar

The point of view of Dzoghchen, according to Rongzompa, is that all phenomena of samsara and nirvana are completely and totally equivalent with illusions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"emptiness" cannot be a substance-noun, it means "the condition of being empty" (OED), agreed? "empty" is an adjective, as in "the glass is empty". you can nominalize this by speaking of "the emptiness of the glass", but this is referring to the fact that the glass is empty, it is not talking about some thing called "emptiness". now, we know that the basis is not some "thing" but rather pure potentiality, "es gibt Sein". Since only conventionalities can be "empty" (since only conventionalities are dependently arisen), and the basis clearly cannot be considered a conventional existent/dependent arising, then what sense does it make to call it "empty" , let alone calling it "emptiness(!)" surely you're not saying that the basis is simply the fact of the lack of svabhava in dependent arisings? now, if you want to posit another definition of "emptiness", fine, but then don't say that Dzoghchen follows prasangika madhyamaka. if you want, you can say it follows "great madhyamaka", as presented by Dudjom R in the Big Red Book.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is a convention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if you say that the basis is emptiness, you are reifying emptiness and Nagarjuna has pronounced you incurable.

Malcolm wrote:

For those whom emptiness is possible, for them, everything is possible.

For those whom emptiness is not possible, for them, nothing is possible.

--Nāgarjuna

The basis is emptiness aka original purity.

But I would rather be an incurable Dzogchenpa crossing space in a single movement than a myopic follower of some imagined "madhyamaka" that consists of drearily hopping along on one leg, wondering where the other leg had got to.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Excuse me, it was not mine:

"

Malcolm wrote:

You are missing the point. The point is that you took fragments of passages from different pages in this book, Middle Beyond Extremes, mixed your own words into them, and did not clearly differentiate any of them. Further, your attempt at citation does not form an argument.

Finally, citing what two nineteenth century Tibetan authors write about a 5th century Indian text gives us no insight at all into what the 5th century Indians might have intended in their own words. This thread is not about what Mipham, Dolbupa, Shenga, Tsongkhapa, Gorampa, Mikyo Dorje, Rangjung Dorje, etc. thought about the issues of the relationship between ālayavijñāna and the dependent nature, it is about what Maitryanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu and their Indian followers thought. Karl's B's essay I pointed you too does an excellent job of clarifying that in fact the early Yogacaras authors all use the type 1 model of the three natures, the very one gshan stong pas aka (neo) "Yogacara Madhyamakas" term the cittamatra presentation, which Karl B readily admits. This is indisputable. Of course, KB's paper intends to find sources

for the gzhan stong view in Early Indian Yogacara, but he fails because it is not there.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Also I'm collecting the arguments that show all Buddhism is cohesive and non contradictory in the principle, whatever if sutra or tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so there is no contradiction between positing partless ultimate atoms and emptiness. Sure.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche Fanboys

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

both balls and ovaries"?

Malcolm wrote:

Balls and tits, please.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

That's just how my mind works. For me, the simplest way to sum up why there are no beginnings to anything is to rid myself of the notion of there even being things in an ultimate sense.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a totally unnecessary step. The simplest approach is to recognize that conditioned causes are results and must always themselves have causes. You don't even have to mention emptiness, being, etc. at all. Right?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Each and every phenomenon one could ever think of is dependently originated--we impute singular "thingness" onto "things" which are really aggregations of multiple parts and causes and conditions, and each of those parts are likewise aggregations of multiple parts and causes and conditions, ad infinitum... No thing can be found anywhere that exists by the power of its own essence, made up only of itself, with no dependence on anything else. That being the case--that is, since all phenomena depend for their conventional "existence" on our imputing "thingness" and existence onto them--where can one find anything at all to have begin to exist, endured for a time, and then disintegrated?

At the same time, despite this emptiness, where can one find any cause at all that fails to bear a result, and who can be found that doesn't experience samsara as the Buddha said we do?

PadmaVonSamba said:

Well said!

Thats why cause ->"thingness" isn't a valid understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know why a simple question like this has to be ramped up to the ultimate right away.

There is no ultimate origin for conditioned phenomena. There are no beginnings for conditioned phenomena in general. Right? So bringing complicated discussions about imputations, and emptiness, and so on and so forth don't really answer the question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, your habit of mishmashing citations from books is also not very skillful. The fact is that here you have randomly strung together passages from different pages. How can anyone take this as "scholarship"? Why should anyone bother with this type of disorganized presentation?

Mariusz said:

When the false imagination... from Maitreya, Khenpo Shenga and Ju Mipham.

Malcolm wrote:

In short, this is neither from Maitreyanatha, not Mipham, nor Shenga, because you have just randomly strung together bits and peices of texts written and translated by others and added here and there your own words without clearly distinguishing what is what.

Really, get it together, otherwise I am just not going to bother responding to anything you have to say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

also an advise no to make the fault of denigrating conventions for Namdrol.

Malcolm wrote:

I really wish you would stop making baseless personal criticisms that have no part in the conversation.

I really cannot see anywhere in this thread where I have even discussed conventions, let alone denigrated them.

This kind of random, off topic remark ruins conversations. Please desist and confine yourself to the topic at hand.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

You are wrong because you: (2. With respect to the dependent nature, it is empty in the sense that this lack of entity is itself a non-entity, but) for you while nothing exists as imagined, it is the case that wakefulness does not exist.

Malcolm wrote:

Your response is a complete and total non-sequitar. In other words, it does not make any sense.

Also this thread is going wildly off topic due in part to the inability of all respondents to

communicate with sufficient discipline.

Therefore, unless it returns to a proper course, I am finished with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

I've been under the impression that Yogacara is basically a term that can refer to either Asanga's Cittamatra or Vasubandhu's Vijnanavada.

In other words, that Chittamatra and Vijnana-vada are distinct, yet are also both considered Yogachara.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, cittamatra is a term used interchangeably with vijñānamatratvada by Mādhyamika authors. The yogacarins referred to themselves as "yogacarins".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

And it works compatible with my dzogchen

Namdrol said:

When it comes to Vajrayāna, one's intellectual contrived view is pretty irrelevant.

One's view is delivered through the third and fourth empowerments, and or direct introduction, and is maintained on the basis of that experience in one's practice. So all of this is really just dancing on books. (yawn).

Mariusz said:

Even writing it you unintentionally agree with me: "it" has to be pointed-out only. So the principle is the same even considering Vajrayāna/Dzogchen, let alone Yogacara or Madhyamaka. The difference is only the method.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so fast, sport: there is no "pointing-out" in Madhyamaka. From a Madhyamaka perspective, there is no "pointing-out" since there is nothing to be pointed out. The view in Madhyamaka is strictly a result of intellectual analysis, which one then applies in meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche Fanboys

Content:

tomamundsen said:

The Crystal and the Way of Light is profound as balls.

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I'm in agreement that this is all dancing on books--this being the Academic Discussion forum, of course that's what's done here. But I feel the need to point out that Yogacara was not merely a conceptual philosophy foisted upon us, but was an attempt to make sense of some real meditative experience, originally--or so I think. Also, all these categorizations into 6, 8, 9 or however-many consciousnesses need to be seen as dynamic attempts at explaining experience in a conceptual way, rather than as "positions" one must defend. Then again, maybe this is all inappropriate for the Academic Discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is true, it was an attempt to explain the stages of the path. It's complexity has resulted in a lot of difficult discussions over the centuries, especially since for the most part the followers of Asanaga and so on were eclipsed by the more practical Mādhyamikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

mint said:

Infinite regression? or beyond infinite regression? (Infinity can seem awfully constraining.)

Malcolm wrote:
Infinite regression.

There are no beginnings.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:44 AM
Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?
Content:
Mariusz said:
And it works compatible with my dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:
When it comes to Vajrayāna, one's intellectual contrived view is pretty irrelevant.

One's view is delivered through the third and fourth empowerments, and or direct introduction, and is maintained on the basis of that experience in one's practice. So all of this is really just dancing on books. (yawn).

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:21 AM
Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?
Content:

Mariusz said:
Of course here I not consider it as the shentong also. Following Nitārtha Institute I consider it as yogacara not as cittamatra's the narrow interpretation.

Namdrol said:
Only gzhan stong pas maintain there is a difference between Yogacara and cittamatra.

N

Mariusz said:
Namdrol, with all respect you are not the only one who want to back into the source, a "archaeologist" for Madhyamaka. Karl Brunnhölzl in "The Center" discovered for example:

Malcolm wrote:
You should read his article at the Tsadra foundation blog where he substantially revises his position about this.

BTW, I remain committed to my statment. Only gzhan stong adherents maintain there is a distinction between a so called "Yogacara" and what Madhyamakas call "cittamatra"; what they like to term "Great Madhyamaka". This is a simple fact of the intellectual history of Tibetan Buddhism.

If you maintain there is such a distinction, you are a gzhan stong adherent.

Otherwise, please explain to us the difference between this so called "Yogacara" and gzhan stong. But please start another thread to do so. Thanks.

By the way, there is no shame in being a gzhan stong pa -- I simply don't agree that the gzhan stong interpretation of Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu's texts is the correct one. I think that Tsongkhapa's refutation of gzhan stong, as well as Rongston and Gorampa's, is apt and accurate. I think Rendawa's is a little too strongly worded.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

So as I understand, it is still the middle way, the poining-out the freedom beyond the reference points.

Malcolm wrote:

Both Madhyakamaka and Cittamatra/Yogacara agree that wisdom is free from proliferation (nisprapañca) and free from reference points (anupalambha).

The difference between them is whether this wisdom is held to be ultimately real or not. This the main reason why Candarkirti goes to such great lengths to refute the Yogacara presentation of paratantra very pointedly at 6:72 in Madhyamakāvatara

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Of course here I not consider it as the shentong also. Following Nitārtha Institute I consider it as yogacara not as cittamatra's the narrow interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Only gzhan stong pas maintain there is a difference between Yogacara and cittamatra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, how can a cause pre-exist everything?

Malcolm wrote:

There was no beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When ever I present some text without attributing the authorship of the translation, you may immediately assume the translation is mine.

Mariusz said:

Now from the translation of Khenpo Shenga:

Malcolm wrote:

I assume by "translation" you mean the presentation of Khenpo Shenga's interlinear commentary as translated in the Middle Beyond Extremes (Snow Lion 2006)? Khenpo Shenga himself never translated anything.

The final line of Khenpo Shenga's commentary (which you seem to find at odds with Vasubandhu's statement I cited above) actually says:

ཐམས་ཅད་གཅིག་ཏུ་སྟོང་པ་ཡང་མ་ཡིན་ལ་གཅིག་ཏུ་མི་སྟོང་པ་ཡང་མ་ཡིན་པ་དེ་ནི་དབུ་མའི་ལམ་ཡིན་ནོ།

Though everything is not empty on the one hand, it is also not not empty on other hand. That is the middle way.

While someone might be tempted to see a difference in meaning between Khenpo Shenga's passage and Vasubandhu's original commentary based on the way the Dharmacakra translation committee has chosen to translate this passage, in reality, based on the way Khenpo Shenga wrote the original Tibetan there is no difference in

meaning.

I think I should add that Khenpo Shenga was in no way a supporter of gzhan stong and was a staunch supporter of Gorampa. Therefore, he, like Gorampa before him, would have and did consider the Madhyāntavibhāga, the Dharmadharmatāvibhāga and the Mahāyānasutrālaṅkāra cittamātrīn texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Seem to me that this thread has lost its focus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

It is an incorrect starting point because in this assumption, "everything" is regarded as some kind of result.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is some kind of result.

All causes are results, all results can be causes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The question ought to be: is the dependent nature ultimate or not in yogacara texts. I think that actually the answer is yes.

N

Mariusz said:

I think that actually the answer is no.

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is yes:

From the Madhyāntavibhagatīka:

As it is said:

"The imagination of the unreal exists,
duality does not exist in that,
emptiness exists in this,
that also exists in that.

Now then, the imagination of the false means the concept of an apprehended object and the apprehending subject. Duality means free from a real apprehended object and an apprehending subject. Emptiness means the imagination of the false being free from a real apprehended object and an apprehending subject. "That also exists in that" means the imagination of the false. As such, that non-existence of something somewhere, that is truly seeing the empty truly just as it is. Whatever remains here, that is understood just as it truly is to exist here. As such, the characteristic of emptiness is demonstrated without mistake.

Not empty and not not empty,
in that way is everything explained,
because of existence, because of non-existence, because of existence,
that is the middle path.

"It is not empty" means emptiness and the imagination of the false. "It is not not-empty" means duality i.e. the apprehended object and an apprehending subject. 'Everything' means 'the imagination of the false' is the conditioned and 'emptiness' is the unconditioned. 'Explained' means demonstrated. 'Exists' means the imagination of the false. 'Non-existence' means duality. 'Existence' means emptiness exists in the imagination of the false, and the imagination of the false exists in that too. "That is the middle path" means everything is not only empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 12:01 PM

Title: Re: Candrakīrti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

I personally find it bizarre that no-one has translated Prasannapada or the Avataraḥśya or the Catuḥśatīkā. I suppose patience is the order of the day.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree and it is my personal bitch with Buddhist studies of Madhyamaka, as you know. There is no base line by which we can judge what all these Tibetans are gossiping about in their treatises unless one reads Tibetan and Sanskrit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 11:57 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Huifeng said:

Any sort of academic discussion on the topic of "ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?" would have to be text, or text statement, specific.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Well then make one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Reposted, after some editing, as off-topic on the Chandakirit/Alaya thread.

The question is, whether ālayavijñāna is posited to be truly existent, or merely conventionally existent, in Yogacara texts...

Malcolm wrote:

The question ought to be: is the dependent nature ultimate or not in yogacara texts. I think that actually the answer is yes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

conebeckham said:

Cloudburst-

Doesn't it make more sense to "birth" a storehouse consciousness, inherent or not, due to things such as "memories," "habits," etc., than to create the notion of ālayavijñāna as that which is merely the "mental consciousness knowing emptiness?"

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Cone:

The ālaya is emptiness, that is all that is needed for karma to function. No

consciousness that stores seeds is required. But consciousness can know that emptiness, this is how Jayananda is glossing things because of the Lanka passage which describes the ālayavijñāna as subtle and deep, and easily mistaken for a self and also the Lanka passage to declares ālayavijñāna is emptiness.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

Is it your point of view that Buddha did teach the alaya, but that he meant the mental consciousness knowing emptiness? This was misunderstood by yogacharins and the idea of an inherent storehouse consciousness was "born."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, technically the Yogacarins don't really treat the ālayavijñāna as "inherent", since if you read the Mahāyānasamgraha, Asanga clearly maintains that when the seeds are exhausted, the ālayavijñāna ceases to exist. So then the question becomes not so much about the this consciousness, the ālayavijñāna, but paratantra, dependent nature.

These interpretative difficulties are addressed somewhat by Candrakirti in the verses that cover the dependent nature, 47-72.

As to your first question -- definitely this is Jayananda's interpretation. Given the way Candrakirti cites the Lanka to this effect, it is probable that this is Candra's point of view as well, though I would not swear to it. Given that the Buddha of the Lanka also treats the Ālaya as an interpretable doctrine, the Buddha (as presented in this sutra) seems to have presented ālayavijñāna to just a consciousness that apprehends emptiness, but it is not so clearly stated. All the Buddha really says there is that "know that only emptiness is indicated by the [the term] ālayavijñāna".

To really get at the guts of what Candra thinks about this one would need to read the lengthy discussions of both commentaries covering the ground between 47-72.

I am sorry but I will have to spend some serious amount of time with these things before I really can respond any further. But I will. Jayananda has an exhaustive presentation of his perspective on Yogacara that fills his commentary.

Candra sticks more to the his own text.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

Namdrol said:

Tibetan madhyamaka/yogacara is more safe than alone translations.

Malcolm wrote:

Both have their hazards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: Guidance on renunciation

Content:

Nemo said:

Afterwards your job prospects will be shite. You won't even know about movies or sports people are talking about. You will be very soft and not well suited for the competitive world that we struggle in. Your guilelessness will get you into all sorts of trouble. After you may shack up with inappropriate women...

Malcolm wrote:

Glad I am not alone in this experience.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

mint said:

If everything has a cause, who/what caused the ground of being (Base)?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis has no cause because it is just emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

conebeckham said:

I don't see how this quote posits an existent Alaya--it posits an existent "luminous mind of dharmata," for sure....but this is not the ālayavijñāna.

Malcolm wrote:

You are totally off-topic. But this is just like saying dirty/clean cloth. The question is where the cloth is real, not whether it is dirty or clean, it's state of being clean or dirty is incidental; the question of its conventional or ultimate existence is not.

BTW. I can only handle so many threads at a time. Looking up answers takes time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

Namdrol said:

What Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu claim is that the dependent nature is real, it exists. However, the dependent nature = the ālayavijñāna. The ālaya is only called the ālaya as long as there are seeds. When these have been eradicated, the ālaya also ceases; but the dependent nature, being an existent, does not.

Mariusz said:

Can I ask two implications please? I cannot find more.

Is it means the dependent nature (gzhan dbang; paratantra) has no seeds at all during its "existence" with or without the ālayavijñāna? Or is it means the dependent nature (gzhan dbang; paratantra) has seeds somehow more subtle than the ālayavijñāna which are still "existent" even after the eradication of the ālayavijñāna?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that while the ālayavijñāna depends on seeds for the name "ālaya", the dependent nature does not depend on seeds for the name "dependent nature". But please, if you want to talk yogacara, start another thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

I am sure you have your reasons as to why you refuse to answer this question post after post. So that we can know that you are not answering just to avoid having to admit that he did teach that, would you kindly answer?

According to you, did Buddha ever teach that there were 8 consciousnesses?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not answer directly because I already mentioned that fact that while

svāsaṃvedana is not mentioned in the sutras, ālayavijñāna was. Since I stated that ālayavijñāna was mentioned as something taught by the Buddha, by implication we can understand the other seven were also taught since ālayavijñāna is never taught in absence of the other seven, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

Is it your claim that Buddha never taught that inherent persons exist?

Malcolm wrote:

There are some who thought the Buddha taught such a thing aka the Pudgalavadins. I myself have never seen a sutra statement, for example, in the Pali canon, where the Buddha unambiguously claims there is an ultimate self of the kind proposed by Pudgalavadins.

Namdrol said:

The Buddha never explained anywhere that the self and the aggregates existed ultimately -- who told you he did?

Mipham (I know, you don't care about Tibetans and their points of view.)

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps you can send me a citation by PM where he says such a thing. To me it seems a little strange and not in accordance with what I have understood about the Buddha's teaching in the Pali canon, etc.

Namdrol said:

Vasubandhu devotes an entire chapter in the Kosha refuting the person, his main Buddhist target being the Pudgalavadins.

This does not indicate that Buddha never taught it, though.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Vasubandhu shows how the key citations Pudgalavadins use to support their view is misunderstood by them. I suggest you read the Kosha, Chapter nine. If you think the Buddha taught such an ultimate self, or the aggregate(!?) as ultimate, please tell me where.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

conebeckham said:

I don't think Vasubhandu claimed the Alaya, per se, "existed" as an absolute

Malcolm wrote:

What Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu claim is that the dependent nature is real, it exists. However, the dependent nature = the ālayavijñāna. The ālaya is only called the ālaya as long as there are seeds. When these have been eradicated, the ālaya also ceases; but the dependent nature, being an existent, does not.

Just to recap -- the classical Yogacara(Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu) model holds that parikalpita is non-existent, but paratantra and parinispāna do exist. The late Indian/gzhan stong interpretation is that parikalpita is non-existent, paratantra is merely conventionally existent, and parinispāna exists, mapping the three natures respectively onto false relative truth, true relative truth and ultimate truth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Huseng said:

Just the finer details of precisely how it was described and taught we are unsure of.

Malcolm wrote:

This is unimportant for the present conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Huseng said:

I'm just specifying that due to the differing accounts we can't be so sure about what the Buddha taught.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I simply do not agree with this perspective. I think we can be very, very, very sure.

Btw, yoru statement above really harms claims you made earlier in this thread citing scriptural authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Huseng said:

Well, the Vinaya does record what the Buddha said and provides his judgement on various matters. Don't you think that is important?

Malcolm wrote:

The Vinayas record what the Buddha said to different groups of monks in different parts of India. But also, they report differing accounts since these Sanghas were widespread.

Huseng said:

I agree that we have the general teachings and there is no doubt of that (especially in the case of rebirth, karma, dependent origination, etc...), but the finer details vary too much for us to say for sure exactly what was taught.

Malcolm wrote:

General principles are the point in this discussion, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Our record of what the historical Buddha taught is therefore much better than what skeptics would have us believe. And as well, the content of the Pali canon is so homogenous, really, there is no doubt what the Buddha taught. And it was not what Batchelor is teaching as what the Buddha taught.

Huseng said:

One problem that comes to mind, though, is the discrepancies between the various Nikaya and Agama canons that we have. In general the main teachings are the same, but there are discrepancies. For example comparing various Vinayas in Chinese translation I noticed that while the rule might be the same, the finer details of how and why the rule came about differ across multiple editions. For example in the prohibition against alcohol they all say Sugata got drunk and passed out after a party celebrating his placation of a naga, but the details of where he passed out and whether he kicked

the Buddha or not are all different when looking at the different editions of the Vinaya.

It doesn't seem like scribal errors to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares about Vinaya (except monks)? The various Vinayas were redacted separately. This is common knowledge even to traditional scholars.

But the sutras, this is a different stories. My point is that there is an internal consistency in early Buddhist teachings of the sutras which is very homogenous and so the intent of the Buddha cannot be doubted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

as does the abhidharama where Buddha explained the self and aggregates to exist ultimately.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha never explained anywhere that the self and the aggregates existed ultimately -- who told you he did? Vasubandhu devotes an entire chapter in the Kosha refuting the person, his main Buddhist target being the Pudgalavadins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I just want to note that I am far more interested in what Candrakirti has to say for himself, and what Jayananda has to say about that; then what Gorampa, or Tsongkhapa or any Tibetan scholar has to say about them from here on out.

Namdrol said:

You means that skandhas and persons are conventionally non-existent?

cloudburst said:

inherent persons and aggregates, as taught in the abhidharma.

Malcolm wrote:

So in other words you accept that aggregates and persons conventionally exist. Well, it seems that the ālaya, according to Candra, also exists in that way i.e. conventionally.

(No abhidharma treatises teaches there are inherent aggregates since this contradicts the name i.e. skandha. Persons are only taught by Pudgalavadins. Atoms and moments are the main problem with Vaibhaṣikas and Sautrantikas).

cloudburst said:

What of the afflicted mind?

Malcolm wrote:

The kliṣṭāmanas is never mentioned by Candrakīrti at all in any text. This leads me to believe he has very little interest in rejecting it.

The term does occur Jayananda's Tika. I need to read what Jayananda is saying carefully. From what I can tell via a quick scan, Jayananda does not seem reject the kliṣṭāmanas outright.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Huifeng said:

The date of when things were first written down is not the key element here. Moreover, while we our present earliest manuscripts are the Gandharin, their dates are not when writing was first used.

The issue is back tracking agama stemmas; and of the traditions, we can fairly confidently do that to the point of the so-called second council, via parallel traditions.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Given the Gombrich-Cousins dates, then the second council would have been between 297 and 320 somewhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

catmoon said:

Fair enough, but what what I was getting at was that since nothing was written down for centuries after the Buddha, the sutras are telling us more about the terminology used by writers two or three centuries after his time, than anything else. That's enough time time for the development of a complete religious vernacular, significant shifts in language use and so on. Of course I could be wrong, I seem to recall it happening once before....

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the best dates for the Buddha's parinirvana place it at 407-400 BCE. The Asokan Pillars were erected sometime around 260BCE. But that time the Buddhist canon was already being committed to writing. Therefore, we can imagine that the earliest the Buddhist canon was being committed to writing was within 50-75 years of the Buddha's parinirvana, and perhaps even earlier. The very latest would be 150 years afterwards.

People also forget that in the Ancient Buddhist Sangha, right from the first council there was a special class of monks trained to memorize word for word entire sections of the canon even after that canon was written down. The Buddhist sutras were not "written" by the Buddha -- but they were written by the Buddha's immediate, and awakened, disciples. Further, not only that, but many of these monks who were professional reciters were also awakened belonging to the four classes of aryas.

Our record of what the historical Buddha taught is therefore much better than what skeptics would have us believe. And as well, the content of the Pali canon is so homogenous, really, there is no doubt what the Buddha taught. And it was not what Batchelor is teaching as what the Buddha taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

All three are non-existent, taught for the benefit of those who lacked the faculties to go deeper at the time.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean that skandhas and persons are conventionally non-existent?

As for your other points, as I said before, Candrakirti is criticizing the way the Yogacarins used the term ālayavijñāna. Jayananda makes it very clear that the reason why Candrakirti cites the Lanka at them is that they have not understood their own sutras, not that we should necessarily discard the sutras. For example, the primary citation refuting svasaṃvedana comes from the Lanka itself, using the example of the edge of a sword which cannot cut itself.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 9:33 AM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

I think since I started trying to eat and live according to ayurveda this past January I let myself get a bit obsessed with trying to do everything I can to remedy my conditions and trying to "maximize the effects" of everything. Of course that kind of thinking and grasping itself is the root of at least part of my problems. I'm just gonna relax and be satisfied with the power of vimala and good ayurveda-guided nutrition-and not least of all, Dharma practice-to allow me to be happy and healthy.

So at night I'll take the bimala straight with warm boiled water instead of worrying about "maximizing" it through anupana and messing with my blood sugar. And in the morning I'll take a vata-pacifying drink of soaked & peeled raw almonds with ginger, saffron, & nutmeg blended into warmed milk which will also serve to restore ojas and I'll look into doing the colorado cleanse soon as I can. How that sound?

Namdrol said:

Sounds good. Ten year old Tawny Port is a great anupana BTW.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Cool. Hey, thanks very much for your help.

P.S.: just take a normal size portion of the port with the bimala ground up and mixed in, right?

Malcolm wrote:

No, take your vimala and enjoy your port. No need to ruin the port with some herbs. Two ounces is a usual pour for port. Goes best in a proper Reidel port glass.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

I think since I started trying to eat and live according to ayurveda this past January I let myself get a bit obsessed with trying to do everything I can to remedy my conditions and trying to "maximize the effects" of everything. Of course that kind of thinking and grasping itself is the root of at least part of my problems. I'm just gonna relax and be satisfied with the power of vimala and good ayurveda-guided nutrition-and not least of all, Dharma practice-to allow me to be happy and healthy.

So at night I'll take the bimala straight with warm boiled water instead of worrying about "maximizing" it through anupana and messing with my blood sugar. And in the morning I'll take a vata-pacifying drink of soaked & peeled raw almonds with ginger, saffron, & nutmeg blended into warmed milk which will also serve to restore ojas and I'll look into doing the colorado cleanse soon as I can. How that sound?

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds good. Ten year old Tawny Port is a great anupana BTW.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

catmoon said:

It would be interesting to see how many centuries passed before the sangha started calling themselves Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

Almost right away -- they termed themselves "sakyaputtiyā", sons of Shakya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Sadhanas

Content:

Paul said:

I've been revisiting the Konchok Chidu sadhana I have (as mentioned in the other thread) and it's a little confusing in that it references trekchod and thogal - so it seems that there is a significant 'bleed through' between yanas in some way. Maybe it's simpler to delineate outer and inner tantras?

heart said:

Terma cycles often contain maha, anu and ati instructions within one cycle, like for example the Konchog Chidu. When I received the Lama Gongdu from Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche he said: "Lama Gongdu contains complete instructions covering the three inner Tantras, it isn't incomplete like many other cycles that contain just this or that".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

That is a really large cycle, did he give the complete lung?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

Unknown said:

This discussion arose over a flap with Gorampa saying that although such are rejected

ultimately, this does not mean that we should not accept entities like the alaya, the manas and self-cognizers conventionally.

Malcolm wrote:

While I don't really want to discuss Gorampa, but this is not what he says, at least not in lta ba shan 'byed. He does not argue, in this text at any rate, that we must believe that Candrakirti accepts rang rig conventionally. He does assert that we must accept that Candrakirti accepts ālayavijñāna conventionally as Candrakirti presents it in the bhasyam. I believe that he does so based on how he reads Jayananda.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

In conclusion it is as clear as ever that Chandrakirti completely rejects an Alaya which is of a different nature from the six consciousnesses, although he accepted the use of Alaya understanding the referent object to be the ultimate, and on some occasions, the mental consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are missing the point. The point is really pretty simple: Buddha used a number of terms in different sutras. If you claim that the Buddha intended the son of a barren women by using the term ālayavijñāna, then you are really doing a disservice to the Buddha's teachings -- the Buddha, as stated by Candrakirti, was referring to something conventionally acceptable.

If on the other hand you merely assert that Yogacara scholars are not correctly understanding the intent of such terms, then there is no problem. But this still gives no cause for a complete negation of the ālayavijñāna.

Again you bring up the term "rang rig" (svasamvedana). There seems to be no mention at all of a "rang rig", a "svasamvedana" in the sutras (there is, in the Lanka and Gandavyuha, frequent mention of "so sor rang rig" or "pratyatmyavedana" -- but this means "personally intuited/known" or "known for oneself", etc. rather than "self-knowing", and is a partial term, not a complete term. It is combined with many other terms such as ye shes, and so on). Careful analysis of the sutras by word search therefore suggests the term is something introduced into Buddhism through pramana. In the tantras, however the term "rang rig" appears in all classes of tantra from kriya on up. But we are discussing Madhyamaka and sutra, not tantra, so we shall leave that aside and remain focused on the actual issue at hand -- ālayavijñāna.

Further, if you look into the commentaries on the Bodhicaryāvatara, it is made abundantly clear that what is being refuted is this "svasaṃvedana" advanced in the treatises of the pramanikas -- it is stated there explicitly. The ālayavijñāna itself is not mentioned even once in the root text nor is it discussed in any of the two volumes of extant commentary we have on the text apart from a single mention in the Pañjika. Shantideva not only does not refute ālayavijñāna, he never mentions it. If you think about it, it is really kind of amazing. Therefore, comparing Santideva's refutation of svasaṃvedana with Candrakīrti's criticism of the Yogacara usage of ālayavijñāna is mistaken. The passage in the Bodhicaryāvatara refuting reflexive cognition is always presented as a refutation of Yogacara, but in reality it is actually just a refutation of Pramāṇa. It bears consequences for Yogacara, of course, but the advocates of consciousness-only [vijñānamātravadins, rnam par shes pa tsam du smra ba] are merely mentioned as an afterthought in the Pañjika.

So, you cannot equate ālayavijñāna with svasaṃvedana -- that former is the teaching of the Buddha, the latter is not. Thus in the passage I initially introduced there is no mention of svasaṃvedana:

"The ālaya exists', 'the person exists',
'only these aggregates exist'...

These three are accepted conventionally, but not necessarily in the fashion in which, for example, the Pudgalavadins might accept the statement "the person exists" when they suggest that that there is an inexpressible person which is neither the same as nor different than the aggregates.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Sadhanas

Content:

Paul said:

I've been revisiting the Konchok Chidu sadhana I have (as mentioned in the other thread) and it's a little confusing in that it references trekchod and thogal - so it seems that there is a significant 'bleed through' between yanas in some way. Maybe it's simpler to delineate outer and inner tantras?

Malcolm wrote:

\

Konchog Chidu is basically an Anuyoga system of practice. So, its view of the basis is the same as Dzogchen, and tregcho and thogal form part of its completion stage practice.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 9:26 PM
Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana
Content:

Namdrol said:
Why are you using it?

Pema Rigdzin said:
Because I understand it's balancing to all three doshas - I'm a kapha-pitta who's about 60 lbs overweight (though have lost about 15 lbs since January through eliminating processed foods and going organic), beginning to exhibit insulin resistance (although that's been entirely remedied since January through proper diet), and has anxiety and depression. Was taking semde & agar which helped a lot with the anxiety & depression, but just switched to bimala the other day after finishing the semde & agar. Also, depletion of ojas through not being so wise while recovering from a cold (and it was probably a slight bit depleted before). Right now, in process of very slowly weening myself off low dose of anxiety meds and all is going well even though I'm in college right now which is kinda stressful, though sleep has been rough. I should add that the depression & anxiety, though difficult, are relatively mild but persisitent.

So, long story short, thought the triphala might supplement the bimala to balance me, along with diet and self-massage, and also restore ojas.

Malcolm wrote:
Vimala already has triphala in it, as does Agar 35. In Tibetan medicines it used as a buffer.

If you are looking to lose weight Ayurvedically, then follow the Colorado cleanse. Depending on your diligence, you could lose 20 pounds in two weeks.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 9:41 AM
Title: Re: Identity and Dharma
Content:

Huseng said:
Here in Taiwan I would reckon that it is beneficial for people to self-identify as Buddhist. It fosters morality and perhaps a sense of dignity connected to one's sangha. If you're a prominent member in a Buddhist organization and all your colleagues know this, you might otherwise avoid questionable (or dangerous) behaviour as it would reflect poorly on your sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

It is fine to self-identify as a Buddhist, better to self-identify as a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Also, do you think it would be fine to take a tea of triphala in the A.M. while taking bimala at bedtime?

Namdrol said:

Triphala is very drying. I am not a big fan of triphala used all the time.

Pema Rigdzin said:

What about for a short period of time, while taking bimala in the PM?

Malcolm wrote:

Why are you using it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Stephie said:

IMO He's not a Buddhist - he's an academic up for a bit of stirring

Greg said:

Except that he's actually not an academic . . .

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=1548&start=400#p84434>

he's just a guy who's been bouncing around a long time and now has students who pay him money. And Tricycle editors who treat him as if he was some kind of authority.

Sometimes he's listed as affiliated with "Sharpham College," which seems to be an unaccredited fake school that he himself founded despite having no academic credentials himself.

Malcolm wrote:

That is defunct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 5:39 AM

Title: Lemmy is God!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 4:44 AM

Title: Great Rock Band Ever! Greatest Song Ever!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is completely Buddhist in sentiment:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Also, do you think it would be fine to take a tea of triphala in the A.M. while taking bimala at bedtime?

Malcolm wrote:

Triphala is very drying. I am not a big fan of triphala used all the time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol la,

I saw your advice on siddhienergetics about combining bimala with warmed milk sweetened by succanat.

Do you know if using sweeteners like xylitol or stevia instead would also work?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know-- they are not traditional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Shared Reality

Content:

yadave said:

I have a simple explanation for shared reality, you do not.

Namdrol said:

Sure I do: functionality.

yadave said:

I would enjoy a better (lay person's) understanding of Buddhist functionality and how it relates to or explains shared reality.

Namdrol said:

You will find it by running a search on arthakriya and its interpretation by Chandrakirti.

yadave said:

Thanks. I see artha and kriya on Wikipedia.

Namdrol said:

The basis of shared experience depends not on real external existence, but merely whether two people might accomplish the same result given similar sets of apparent conditions.

yadave said:

Assume, for the sake of discussion, that neither you nor I are schizophrenic. We are walking and talking and see a tree and both of us point and say "Look, there is a tree."

Now suppose Russell Crowe from the movie "A Beautiful Mind" walks up, points to empty space, and says "Look, there is a tree."

What is the difference? Is it we who are schizophrenic in some weird shared way and Russell has it right?

Regards,
Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that we are enjoying a common appearance and can agree to cut down the tree. We can't agree to cut down a tree we both are not seeing. The fact that we agree there is a tree does not prove by any standard that there is real tree. We agree there is a tree because we agree to call a given appearance a tree because, ostensibly, we have a common use for such an appearance, or, to use another example, a bike.

Appearances that function are shared reality. We do not need to assert anything other than that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 6:28 AM

Title: Re: Shared Reality

Content:

yadave said:

I have a simple explanation for shared reality, you do not.

Namdrol said:

Sure I do: functionality.

yadave said:

Hi all,

Namdrol, I can't find much on "Buddhist functionality" on- or offline. I see a theory of functionalism in philosophy of mind but think you refer to something else here. If you or anyone has a minute to spare, I would enjoy a better (lay person's) understanding of Buddhist functionality and how it relates to or explains shared reality.

Regards,

Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

You will find it by running a search on arthakriya and its interpretation by Chandrakirti.

The basis of shared experience depends not on real external existence, but merely whether two people might accomplish the same result given similar sets of apparent conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Is a Damaru necessary for the condensed Mandarava practice?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Not needed for long one either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

Well, I think there is more at stake in this discussion than that particular issue - primarily, what are the terms which constitute something to be dharma or adharma?

How about you define this for us, and we take it from there.....

Huseng said:

That which is conducive to liberation from samsara is saddharma. That which deters one away from liberation from samsara is adharma.

Rejecting rebirth constitutes a wrong view, which deters one away from liberation, and is an example of adharma.

tobes said:

By this definition, most orthodox Indian schools/traditions would be dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed and rightly so, but not Bauddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: How Germany Became Europe's Richest Country

Content:

Mr. G said:

Hmmm.....so we should demolish ourselves to improve the economy?!

Malcolm wrote:

Well that seems to be the thinking guiding the republican party.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: The Freedoms and Endowments For Dzogchen Practice

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

1) Is receiving Direct Introduction to Dzogchen equivalent to receiving the Fourth Empowerment;

2) does receiving the Direct Introduction/Fourth Empowerment automatically include the other Three Empowerments?

3) Can we be sure that receiving Dzogchen teachings from Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche NOT during a Worldwide Transmission with its Empowerments in itself includes Direct Introduction if it is our intention to receive Direct Introduction?

Malcolm wrote:

1) Yes.

2) Yes, from a Dzogchen perspective.

3) Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: How Germany Became Europe's Richest Country

Content:

Mr. G said:

As European debt crisis negotiations approach the 11th hour on yet another bailout for Greece, Margaret Warner reports on some of the people behind the economic success of Germany -- Europe's richest country.

]

Malcolm wrote:

It used to be the easiest way to become the richest country in your region was to get demolished by America.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Phoba, Phowa literal meaning

Content:
Will said:
Malcolm is a gem

Are the dictionary passages above online? There does not seem to be Devanagari, which is good, but the display is horrid. If I could look at the site directly, maybe things would clear up.

Malcolm wrote:
<http://www.sanskrit-lexicon.uni-koeln.de/scans/MWScan/tamil/index.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

It is Harvard Kyoto romanization which is horrid.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 11:31 PM
Title: Re: Phoba - Sanskrit Equivalent
Content:

Will said:
Now if you generous teachers will take another step and provide which Sanskrit term or terms 'phoba is translating.

Malcolm wrote:
jātiparivartaḥ: jāti means birthplace; parivartah means changing.

The practice of phowa is conscious rebirth in another place, such as Sukhavati. The meaning of phowa is just taking birth in the next world after dying in this one.

Then there is the native Tibetan meaning of phowa which mentioned above. The Tibetans also translated these other Sanskrit words as 'pho ba:

parivarta: %{ -vartaka} &c. see %{parivRt} , p. 601.
2 parivarta m. revolving , revolution (of a planet &c.) Su1ryas. ; a period or lapse or expiration of time (esp. of a Yuga q.v.) MBh. R. &c. ; (with %{lokAnAm}) the end of the world R. ; a year L. ; moving to and fro , stirring Prasannar. ; turning back , flight L. ; change , exchange , barter (also %{parl-v-}) Ya1jn5. MBh. Ka1v. &c. ; requital , return W. ; an abode , spot , place Hariv. ; a chapter , section , book &c. Lalit. ; N. of a son of Doh2-saha (son of Mr2ityu) Ma1rkP. [601,3] ; of the Ku1rma or 2nd incarnation of Vishn2u (also %{parl-v-}) L.
3 parlvartha m. exchange , barter Hit. (v.l.) ; N. of the Ku1rma or 2nd incarnation of Vishn2u L. (cf. %{pari-v-}). %{ -vartam} ind. (%{vRt}) in a circle , recurring , repeatedly Ta1n2d2Br.

saṃkrānti: going from one place to another , course or passage or entry into , transference to (loc. or comp.) Ka1v. Ma1rkP. ; (in astron.) passage of the sun or a planet from one sign or position in the heavens into another (e.g. %uttarA7yaNa-s-), ` " passage of the sun to its northern course " [cf. %kUTa-s-]; a day on which a principal Sam2kra1nti occurs is kept as a festival , see RTL. 428) Su1ryas. ; transference of an art (from a teacher to a pupil) Ma1lav. i , 15 , 18 ; transferring to a picture , image , reflection W. ; = %{-vAdin} Buddh. ; %{-kaumudl} f. N. of an astron. wk. ; %{-cakra} n. an astrological diagram marked with the Nakshatras and used for foretelling good or bad fortune MW. ; %{-nirNaya} m. %{-paTala} m. n. %{-prakaraNa} n. %{-phala} n. %{-lakSaNa} n. N. of wks. ; %{-vAdin} m. pl. a partic. Buddhist school ; %{-viveka} m. %{-vyavasthA-nirNaya} m. %{-zAnti} , f. ; (%{-nty}) %{-udyApana} n. N. of wks.

saṃcāra: mfn. going about , moving (see %divA-s-) ; going or belonging together , simultaneous VS. A1pS3r. ; m. (ifc. f. %A) passage , a way , road , path , place for walking (esp. the space assigned to each person who takes part in a rite) TS. S3Br. S3rS. Ka1lid. Katha1s. ; a difficult passage , defile , bridge over a torrent &c. W. ; (in Sa1m2khya) evolution , development , emanation Tattvas. ; the body L. ; killing W. ; %{-bhAgin} mfn. obtaining a share with difficulty (?) Vas. 2 saMcAra m. (ifc. f. %A) walking about , wandering , roaming , driving or riding , any motion MBh. Ka1v. &c. ; transit , passage ib. ; the passage or entrance of the sun into a new sign MW. ; passing over , transition , transference to (comp.) Ya1jn5. ; transmission (of disease) , contagion W. ; course , path , way (also fig. = ` " mode , manner ") MBh. Hariv. ; track (of wild animals) S3ak. Sch. ; course of life , career Sa1h. ; a partic. class of spies L. ; difficult progress , difficulty , distress W. ; leading , guiding ib. ; inciting , impelling ib. ; a gem supposed to be in the head of a serpent ib. ; = %huM-kAra} ChUp. ; [w.r. for %saM-cara} , %saM-sAra} , and %sac-cAra} ; %{-jlvin} m. (prob.) a tramp , vagabond L. ; %{-patha} m. a walk , walking-place Hariv. ; (in dram.) a female attendant on a king (= %yavanl}) Bhar. ; %{-pUta} mfn. purified by the course or passage (of anything) MW. ; %{-vyAdhi} m. a partic. (prob. infectious) disease L.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Some definitions please

Content:

Namdrol said:

Realization means you know the meaning and have confidence based on that; liberation means you have integrated that.

gad rgyangs said:

the meaning of what?

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever teaching you are practicing, for example: when you have realized the nature of

the mind, by integrating that realization you will be liberated.

But people also use the term by degrees i.e. basic realization, total realization (liberation), etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Phoba, Phowa literal meaning

Content:

Will said:

tantular, thanks again for your help.

Do you agree that the general or basic meaning is motion or movement?

Please give your list of actual, alternate meanings (not translation choices) other than "transference, motion, movement"

Malcolm wrote:

In the dictionary he mentioned, it give the meaning he indicated, to leave or desert ('khyur) and to depart/move ('gro ba). The second definition is states that it is a name for death ('chi ba).

'gro is a word that means move, but has a connation of moving away -- it's counterpart is 'on ba, to come. This is why dictionary glosses 'pho ba with 'gro ba; because it is emphasizing the notion of moving away from somewhere. As stated above.

Thus when we die, the mind departs and leaves for another world, for example.

However, when 'pho is combined with 'rgyur, it is a sort of fancy way of saying "change"; the example give is "there is no change ('pho 'gyur) in space."

Therefore, when it comes the exegisis of a word like 'pho ba chen po, it seems it is mostly glossed as "transformation" as if the term in full would be 'pho 'gyur chen po'i sku i.e. body of complete transformation (of the physical elements into wisdom light).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Some definitions please

Content:

pemachophel said:

Reading the topic under Mahayana about philosophical zombies makes me want to know what the Tibetan is for the following oft-used English terms:

Enlightenment
Buddhahood
Realization
Liberation
Attainment
Accomplishment

Also, if anyone (Namdrol?) would like to differentiate the practical meanings of these terms in terms of Tibetan Buddhism, I'd be much obliged. For instance, recently one of my Teachers made a distinction between realization and liberation, with realization being something less/first and liberation something more/later. Unfortunately, it wasn't appropriate at the time to ask for clarification or expansion on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Realization means you know the meaning and have confidence based on that; liberation means you have integrated that. Buddhahood, sambodhi, means you have completely eradicated all afflictions and all wisdom has expanded. Attainment usually refers to attaining a level, a realization, a liberation, a bhumi or a siddhi. Accomplishment is similar to attainment.

Enlightenment/awakening means you have begun the process of applying realization and have seen the truth. For example Buddha realized dependent origination and then applied it and then he woke up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Anders Honore said:

but I think the wish to have truly profound happiness in the here and now, can be as potent a driving force.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, that is not Buddhism, that is the vehicle of gods and men.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

So returning to Batchelor, emphasizing particular Buddhist methods such as meditation and mindfulness are not without value, simply because rebirth is not playing a role.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that mindfulness and meditation are not especially Buddhist. So there is no need to dress them up in Buddhism. But when you do, there are some conventions to which you ought to adhere.

If you want mindfulness and meditation without rebirth, I can suggest a number of wonderful Neo-confucian masters, such as Wang-yang Ming, and so on. But there is also no real soteriology here, apart from the experience of serenity and inner harmony.

I would suggest that Batchelor would do well to spend more time searching out such non-Buddhist meditative traditions which are more reflective of his intuitions, rather than trying to torture Buddhism into fitting his post-modernist model.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

But as far as I can tell, his project is mainly about emphasising existential and pragmatic elements in the sutta's, which are also clearly there in some respects.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the existential aspect of the suttas are about rebirth, and offer a pragmatic solution to that existential issue. Suffering is intimately bound up with rebirth.

Toss out rebirth, and there is no meaning to Buddha's pragmatic method. It is not pragmatic -- it's a waste of valuable time better spent getting rich, getting drunk and whoring, and running over anyone who gets in your way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

P.S.: all of you who do ChNN's Mandarava practice, do you buy chudlen pills or compile your own ingredients or what? If you buy them, where from?

pensum said:

High quality Chulen pills can also be purchased from Siddhi Energetics

<http://www.siddhienergetics.com/products/chulen>

simhanada said:

They are good, I have got them from there too. The chulen you can get from the dzogchen community (when its available) is made according to Rinpoche's terma and is specific to the Mandarava practice. Usually its also blessed by Rinpoche or at least they used to be. So that would be my first port of call with siddhi energetics second if I'm using them for Mandarava practice. The siddhi energetics one wouldn't have the exact same function I imagine?

Malcolm wrote:

As ChNN explains, these are relative considerations -- one does not need pills to do chulen. They are merely supports. You can use Chavayan prash, or anything, really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

in this very body characteristic of Vajrayana

Kirt

Namdrol said:

This means during this lifetime.

kirtu said:

Well obviously. Again, that's not the issue.

The philosophical zombie assertion is an issue.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, this is not an issue for Dzogchen. But it is an issue for Sakyapas, because they have a very literal interpretation of the Gandavyuha cosmology. Therefore for them, it is hard to accept that the two rūpakāyas are the same continuum because of various contradictions that arise. So because the Sambhogakāya is defined as the definitive rūpakāya, the nirmanakāya is relegated to a secondary status, not possessing any true motives, actions, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

in this very body characteristic of Vajrayana

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

This means during this lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Soooo... you think putting a properly-prepared statue of Dorje Drolo on my altar would cause obstacles just by itself? I know this seems ridiculous, but I have to add something else to my basket and this seems like it would be a wise purchase if it's not going to cause me problems.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be a great purchase.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Actually you are a lot less annoying these days. In particular the last six months. I suspect you took the red pill in Teneriffe and are now heading down the rabbit-hole.
/magnus

padma norbu said:

Maybe Namkhai Norbu told him to stop.

I'd be curious to know what retreat happened in Teneriffe, though. That's the real reason I'm replying.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing, apart from receiving teachings there and eating lots of good food.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

"Well, she's annoying. I won't let her discourage me."

Namdrol said:

So are you, so good choice.

padma norbu said:

I know I'm annoying.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, lighten up, it was just a quip.

All I was really saying, is that we are sentient beings with flaws -- seeing our own helps us to be more forgiving of our own flaws in others.

If you think you are annoyung, I am much more annoying. There are whole websites devoted to how annoying I am:

<http://esanghalert.wordpress.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

If they only knew how much this inflames my ego, they would take it all down right away! But they are not kind, and so they leave it up, and my ego just gets bigger and bigger.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

Is Dzogchen found in the Pali suttas?

Namdrol said:

If you are a Dzogchenpa, of course.

tobes said:

And what do you suppose the Theravadans would say about this?

Which brings me to the only point I'm trying to make here: hermeneutical contestation - good, necessary, interesting, fruitful.

The claim of privileged hermeneutical authenticity - dubious, without basis, ideological, unfruitful.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, claims of privilege might be fraught, but not claims that this or that position represents a violation of obviously stated principles. For example, if someone were to claim that Marx was a royalist, it requires no privilege to point out that such a claim is not born out by the writings of Marx. Likewise, to claim that Buddha did not believe in rebirth, or even if he did, did not think it important, is to ignore the persistent mention of the four types of aryas found all over the Pali canon.

Basically, Buddha's Dharma takes rebirth as the central problem of existence and proposes a solution to it. This is the central axiom of Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: ChNN's pronunciation

Content:

Sherlock said:

I notice that his pronunciation of Sanskrit is a lot closer to the original than most Tibetans (e.g. Vajra instead of "benzar"). Is he atypical in this way or maybe it's just my own limited exposure to lamas?

Namdrol said:

He studied Sanskrit at Derge, and also has taken a keen interest in languages his whole life.

His pronunciation is Derge dialect from East Tibet.

mindyourmind said:

...with a wonderful tinge of Italian thrown in there somewhere

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Kirt:

It is very simple: from a Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna perspective, no one attains full awakening in the Sahaloka. Awakening occurs only on the sambhogakāya level, never the nirmanakāya level. "Nirmana" means "to emanate". Sambhohga means means "to enjoy".

In common Mahāyāna, bodhisattvas take rebirth in Akaniṣṭha then they achieve full awakening having recieved abhisheka from the all the tathagatas. No buddha actually attains awakening here.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: ChNN's pronunciation

Content:

Sherlock said:

I notice that his pronunciation of Sanskrit is a lot closer to the original than most Tibetans (e.g. Vajra instead of "benzar"). Is he atypical in this way or maybe it's just my own limited exposure to lamas?

Malcolm wrote:

He studied Sanskrit at Derge, and also has taken a keen interest in languages his whole life.

His pronunciation is Derge dialect from East Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

"Well, she's annoying. I won't let her discourage me."

Malcolm wrote:

So are you, so good choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Meh... actually, my problems probably were caused by dedicating myself to the path and then committing root downfalls. Someone brought it to my attention recently on this forum that I was "dangerously close" to committing the root downfall of discouraging others. Well, I've probably done plenty of that without meaning to. Upon re-reading the list of root downfalls, I'm sure I've committed this one: (1) Praising ourselves and/or belittling others... and (19) Belittling others with sarcastic verses or words ... and possibly (11) Teaching voidness to those whose minds are untrained. I don't think I've caused a split in a monastic community (that seems a stretch), but it's possible something I said about my experiences in the past may have caused some distress to the sangha. I don't know. Also, (18) Giving up bodhichitta ...I've definitely had several days where I say "screw it" only to come back to it later.

Hopefully, this is stuff many people go through. Some seem to take to it all quite easily, but for me it has been a long, difficult process beginning in my early 20s exploring Theravada and thinking I couldn't really give up all that, then Zen and Vajrayana and thinking roughly the same, that I didn't really have the discipline required to formally commit. When I heard about Dzogchen, I mistakenly understood it to be "easier," but as it turns out, you pretty much have to keep most of the same vows as the rest plus some additional discipline required to sort out what's different and how in your mind. All in all, it's been rough.

Do I just do Vajrasattva to purify past actions and try to be sure not to screw up in the future? Would probably be easier for me to start fresh again now if I knew how to really "clean the slate" and start over, so to speak.

Malcolm wrote:

Best purification is rigpa. After that, Guru Yoga, after that, Ganapuja.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 11:06 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Thanks. So then we could incorporate Dorje Drolo in the Tun practice with the Lung only as well?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 10:35 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Is there any benefit in having the Lung for Dorje Drolo without the Donwang?

If there is any benefit for having the Lung only, how would it be applied?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and you would recite the mantra etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Out of curiosity, Namdrol, given your preference for pronouncing mantras as closely to the Sanskrit as possible, do you personally say "Drowo" or "Krowo"? I ask because I've taken to trying to stay more faithful to the Sanskrit too, but Drollod's name seems to have been so thoroughly Tibetanized that it bears so little resemblance to its properly Sanskrit version.

Malcolm wrote:

gro bo lot is a Apabhramsa corruption of krodhalokottara according to Situ Panchen. In Sanskrit then, it means "transcendentally wrathful".

I pronounce it as Rinpoche does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

See, thats been the problem lately. It has been difficult to follow Rinpoches instructions on relaxing, being Present, and doing Guru Yoga etc. Keep running into weird shit/obstacles/problems/illnesses. Perhaps I should take a few days and do this practice for both quality and quantity.

Malcolm wrote:

That also can help. Remember what he said about mixiing it up though...pick a few practices, like Mandarava and drollo combined. Rushan and drollo, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Thanks..I really do feel a lot better now. Its just that there have been so many posts in this thread about going crazy etc..had me a little freaked out. I dont know a lot but I know not to screw around with this stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

crazy | 'krāzē| informal

adjective (crazier , craziest)

1) To lack integration and awareness

2) To be distracted by tension

3) Wisdom

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Are the sort of obstacles generally like highlighting your major weaknesses? Seems logical that these obstacles would just be like "here's your problem, here's your problem, here's your problem, here's your problem..." so you get the point quicker: HEY! THIS IS MY PROBLEM! And then you can deal with it?

Malcolm wrote:

The sort of obstacles that happen are things sometimes seem not to work out right, things that challenge your integration and your ability to relax.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

It is because this practice has a lot to do with pacifying the wildest of the eight classes.

This is why one should only do the action mantra with a very light touch.

Namdrol, would you mind explaining this? I already have enough problems/obstacles as it is without screwing myself up more. If you cant go into more detail in open forum

could you please PM me. Unfortunately I apparently missed some important pieces. Maybe this practice is just for more advanced practitioners and I am in over my head its just that the little I have been able to do so far (doing it in the short tun) I like the feeling of. Havent even tried the action mantra yet...would be good to know exactly what the action mantra is used for.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, Drolo is very powerful. But obviously now is the time for Drolo practice in the DC.

Drolo is used for overcoming obstacles. Also it is a complete path.

Rinpoche has mentioned that even doing such peaceful practices as Sang can sometimes caused problems if you do them in a distracted way.

Rinpoche really emphasized quality over quantity, as he often does.

But in the end, ChNN would not have taught the practice if he did not feel people could not handle it.

Just treat it with awareness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

But no one else has really bothered to actually take issue with Batchelor's interpretative argument.....by engaging with it sufficiently and offering a refutation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a self-defeating argument as he expects us to believe that Buddha did not believe what Buddha himself was saying, that Buddha was merely catering to the "primitive" and naive views of his day.

He overlooks the fact that during the time of the Buddha there were soteriological alternatives to rebirth and karma. Ajivikas mendicants rejected both.

India has a long tradition of very eloquent materialist philosophers.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:08 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

Is Dzogchen found in the Pali suttas?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Dzogchenpa, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

Drollo practice can cause lots of obstacles.

alpha said:

Is it because this kind of practice leads to an intensification of strong emotions ,anger,hatred..etc..?

And also is it that because they become more apparent and readily available(these emotions) would make resting in rigpa much more easy ???

Malcolm wrote:

It is because this practice has a lot to do with pacifying the wildest of the eight classes. This is why one should only do the action mantra with a very light touch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Buddha denied he was a human being when the question was put to him.

AilurusFulgens said:

This is fascinating! If Buddha is not a human being, then who or what is he?

Malcolm wrote:

His answer was that he was a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

If my mind is transformed into wisdom then I have attained liberation at some level in an impure dimension.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

kirtu said:

You are proposing that at least some high (in terms of attainment) lama's and masters are not actually human.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha denied he was a human being when the question was put to him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

See this is highly problematic. It's one thing to assert that this is the case for Buddha nirmanakayas : actual Buddhahood occurs in Akanistha (fine) and then an emanation play acts (either for real or in effect). However this restricts mere sentient beings from attaining full enlightenment at least in this lifetime. That can be resolved by asserting that sentient beings actually don't attain enlightenment in this lifetime - it really happens after death in Akanistha, etc.

Namdrol said:

In common Mahāyāna, buddhahood only happens after one becomes a Mahāyāna never returner, and can see the Sambhogakāya i.e. eighth bhumi onward.

STMT2: However, in Vajrayāna, we are trained to understand how to realize Sambhogkāya buddhahood through mandala practice. This is another reason why Vajrayāna is fast.

STMT3: So we never really ever achieve buddhahood in the saḥāloka dhātu.

kirtu said:

How can you justify stmt3 as a conclusion on the basis of stmt2? It doesn't seem to necessarily follow.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

There is no attainment of buddhahood in impure dimensions. This is the purpose of path of transformation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Further, you say Batchelor is not trying to recreate the Buddha's experience. I think he would disagree here also.

Malcolm wrote:

If he were, he would be spending time trying to remember his past lives, rather than speculatively rejecting the notion and reinterpreting karma to suit his physicalist views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

I just sounds like he's saying "Torlay" to me. Dorje Torlay. Is that right?

I'm asking because the mantra has "guru grovolod" in it and I know it's not going to be easy to decipher by listening to the replay.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is saying Dorje Drolö.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

I don't understand the pronunciation of these two based on the spelling: Dragphur and Drolo. Namkhai Norbu seems to shift the "r" to a different location, similar to the way

Brett Favre's last name is pronounced "Farv" which is clearly transposing the "v" and "r".

Malcolm wrote:

ལྷོ་ལོ་ཏ་ is pronounced:

drölöt

Elongate the first ō to double the length. So it is not "dro wo" as pronounced in some other traditions. ChNN clearly explained that in this case, the 'wo' (ལོ) is merely elongating the o sound and the 'w' part is elided in pronunciation.

Second o has an umlaut, this is a feature of Tibetan pronunciation of o when there is a final consonant that sounds to us like it has a 'r' sound in it, but it doesn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

See this is highly problematic. It's one thing to assert that this is the case for Buddha nirmanakayas : actual Buddhahood occurs in Akanistha (fine) and then an emanation play acts (either for real or in effect). However this restricts mere sentient beings from attaining full enlightenment at least in this lifetime. That can be resolved by asserting that sentient beings actually don't attain enlightenment in this lifetime - it really happens after death in Akanistha, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

In common Mahāyāna, buddhahood only happens after one becomes a Mahāyāna never returner, and can see the Sambhogakāya i.e. eighth bhumi onward.

However, in Vajrayāna, we are trained to understand how to realize Sambhogakāya buddhahood through mandala practice. This is another reason why Vajrayāna is fast.

So we never really ever achieve buddhahood in the saḥālokadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

alpha said:

Can someone Pm me with a brief summary of the anuyoga style Dorje Drolo given in the second day?

I got lost at the point where Rinpoche started to mention the action mantra and just

before blue Hung or the 3 Hung's. And how do you conclude the practice? He doesn't say.

And in this short version are we visualizing the mantra as he explained before when he said that we can do the practice of Dorje Drollo like in Tun when we replace Guru Thragpur?

Also in the 3rd day I didn't understand a word he said when he started to explain the very essential practice with the Hung in the Ati style. There was lots of Dzogchen jargon in there and I got completely lost. What are you supposed to do in this practice?

I would really appreciate it.
Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:
Just put it in the short or medium thuns, substituting it for Dragphur.

I will pm you separately on the other.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 11:21 AM
Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"
Content:

tobes said:
However, I think he was pretty explicit that this was his particular interpretation;

Malcolm wrote:
No, his works present his POV as Buddha's POV.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 7:10 AM
Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?
Content:

Namdrol said:
He points out that if the nirmankāya and Sambhogakāya were the same continuum, then when the Buddha stepped on an acacia thorn, Vairocana in Akanistha would have been harmed. He therefore, states that the relationship between Sambhogakāyas and Nirmankāyas are like that of illusionists and illusions. However, what he was referring to was puppet shows, since that is actually the kind of illusion being discussed in that example i.e. taking clods of earth, sticks and so on, and causing the illusions of people, elephants and so on to appear on a screen.

kirtu said:

Where does Gorampa discuss this?

Gorampa's argument is not really logical (that must score max points for some kind of combination of irony and arrogance on my part) and is constrained to a particular interpretation or sets of interpretations. Your paragraph explanation can be debated but well, I lack the background to debate this seriously.

If considered seriously a nirmanakaya as a *puppet* is problematic on many levels (for one thing this can be seen as denying liberation at the level of Buddhahood). As an emanation and thus a kind of illusion (but not a puppet) this is not problematic.

Even the case of Shakyamuni is problematic with this puppet interpretation while attaining full enlightenment in the remote past and then enacting (or playacting) the twelve deeds isn't.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

It is based on the idea, stated in the Lanka and elsewhere, that actual Buddhahood occurs in Akaniṣṭha Gandavyuha, and that nirmankāyas only seem to achieve buddhahood here. In other words, they are merely projections of the Sambogakāya, they are sort of philosophical zombies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

Where does Gorampa discuss this?

Malcolm wrote:

His commentary on Sapan's three vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

Batchelor at least, to his credit, does make such a claim, nor speak from such a

position.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be silly -- he certainly makes such claims, like everyone, putting them in the mouth of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Anyone know what pages in Adzom Drugpa works from TBRC where the Drollo tsog is?

/magnus

Namdrol said:

It is part of medium activity manual, and the feast itself starts on page 72.

heart said:

Thank you Namdrol! So from the the longer and shorter sadhanas and activity manuals Rinpoche is giving the essence of the concise daily practice?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

This another sadhana, called the rgyun khyer, page 133-135. This is what he again gave the short lung for today.

Then of course, one can do it in the short thun, etc., in all the ways rinpoche mentioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

The advice he is giving today is fantastic. A lot of detail about many things. I am not sure if these last days of retreat are usually available as replays due to the fact that the last day is mostly reading of lungs, but I hope this one is since there is pronunciation advice and practice advice, etc. which is hard to get all at once without being able to pause and rewind if necessary.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, generally they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Anyone know what pages in Adzom Drugpa works from TBRC where the Drollo tsog is?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is part of medium activity manual, and the feast itself starts on page 72.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Aalaya and Neutral awareness

Content:

Daniel Arraes said:

Can one say that, according to Dzogchen, Aalaya (kun-gzhi) and the neutral awareness (shes-pa-lung-ma-bstan) are the same thing?

Namdrol said:

No, they are different. The ālaya is ignorance.

Daniel Arraes said:

What type of ignorance: innate or imputing?

Malcolm wrote:

Imputing since it is afflicted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 11:54 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

Awareness can not be seen without a reflection.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence paths based on mind are limited and insufficient for liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 11:44 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

However, the nirmanakaya is not a puppet in the world...

Namdrol said:

That is exactly how Gorampa describes it, in point of fact.

kirtu said:

What does he base that upon?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

He points out that if the nirmankāya and Sambhogakāya were the same continuum, then when the Buddha stepped on an acacia thorn, Vairocana in Akanistha would have been harmed. He therefore, states that the relationship between Sambhogakāyas and Nirmankāyas are like that of illusionists and illusions. However, what he was referring to was puppet shows, since that is actually the kind of illusion being discussed in that example i.e. taking clods of earth, sticks and so on, and causing the illusions of people, elephants and so on to appear on a screen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 11:38 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It is kept away not for safety, but for profit.

Malcolm wrote:

Secret just means don't share things with people a) when they are not interested b) one does not have the proper qualifications to share them properly (i.e. experience).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

However, the nirmanakaya is not a puppet in the world...

Malcolm wrote:

That is exactly how Gorampa describes it, in point of fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 8:05 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

Namdrol said:

You responded with a cracked mirror. Apparently, some subtleties are lost even on you.

teknix said:

I am sure there are some that are. It maybe lost on me, or the response could just as well be lost on you.

Malcolm wrote:

When one holds up one finger, the other should hold up one finger. If the other holds up two fingers, it means the other does not understand.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It is often the case when ones beliefs come into question, a self-defense mechanism designed to contain energy within a given structure or form is unleashed to aid in justifying the falseness.

Namdrol said:

But you have not questioned anyone's beleifs. You have merely proffered your own.

teknix said:

I do not hold any beliefs that I am aware of, maybe you could point them out for me.

Malcolm wrote:

You responded with a cracked mirror. Apparently, some subtleties are lost even to you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It takes an ego to point at an ego.

Namdrol said:

And?

teknix said:

The subtlety is that the accuser is the one displaying ego.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so when you said that "Let's see how bloated these ego's are" you admit then that you are merely displaying your own ego, correct?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It is often the case when ones beliefs come into question, a self-defense mechanism designed to contain energy within a given structure or form is unleashed to aid in justifying the falseness.

Malcolm wrote:

But you have not questioned anyone's beliefs. You have merely proffered your own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It takes an ego to point at an ego.

Malcolm wrote:

And?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

Let's see how bloated these ego's are.

Namdrol said:

You might have to deflate your own a little, to make some room.

teknix said:

It takes an ego to point at an ego.

You may interpret my confidence however you choose, that is your right, although it does NOT say anything about me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

Let's see how bloated these ego's are.

Malcolm wrote:

You might have to deflate your own a little, to make some room.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Aalaya and Neutral awareness

Content:

Daniel Arraes said:

Can one say that, according to Dzogchen, Aalaya (kun-gzhi) and the neutral awareness (shes-pa-lung-ma-bstan) are the same thing?

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are different. The ālaya is ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

MrDistracted said:

Yes, awesome. These are the first teachings, other than reading Crystal and the Way of Light that I've received from Rinpoche, it's pretty mindblowing.

Did I hear it right that he said that he would give the donwang again tomorrow because of the bad connection yesterday?

Malcolm wrote:

I think so, in a more essential way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Alaya

Content:

Clarence said:

Having listened to CNN for some time now, I would like to ask a question which has been going around in my mind lately.

In Chokyi Nyima Rinpoche's book Indisputable Truth he describes how there are 3 obstacles to the "experience" of Rigpa, namely:

- Indifference. This is where you confuse being indifferent and not caring with being in Rigpa. (This one I understand)

- Letting thoughts run wild. This is where you think that since there is nothing to do and thoughts are Rigpa you just let your monkey mind run free. (This I also understand)

- Confusing the experience of Alaya all-ground for Rigpa. Apparently they are very similar. (So, this one I don't understand.)

I started reading Thrangu Rinpoche's commentary on Distinguishing Consciousness from Wisdom and hope that will help clarify things a little but for now, how can one be sure and how do the experiences differ?

Many thanks. C

Malcolm wrote:

Ālaya, in Dzogchen generally is considered ignorance. They reason they are similar is that they have the same basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 6th, 2012 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Kalu Rinpoche shocking news!

Content:

Unknown said:

Why don't you go ask the Dalai Lama, the 17th Karmapa, Tai Situ Rinpoche etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

The general Tibetan cultural approach to problems is to close one's eyes so that they disappear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 6th, 2012 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: How would you translate this sentence?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

sentient beings of deluded dualistic vision/appearances

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 5th, 2012 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

To all people freaking out about whether they got this or not, relax, you did.

As long as you participated as best you could you got it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 5th, 2012 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Anyone got the "dokpa" and can share it?

/magnus

Mr. G said:

It's in the short tun.

heart said:

I doubt it was the same, it sounded drollo related to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is in the short thun.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

I noticed that he said he gave transmission today. While he was saying the mantras, both times he said it, my connection paused. It was also delayed by about 3 or 4 minutes anyway from the audio. So... I really don't think I received transmission.

Is the initiation tomorrow all I will really need?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and really, don't get so locked into concepts -- for example, it even takes some time for sound to travel through air in the same room. If you obsess about things like this, you will never overcome doubt.

As long as you heard it, then you received it. He intended you to receive it, you intended to receive it, therefore, the transmission is perfect, ok?

Tomorrow, just listen to the audio feed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

A few days ago when the webcast was closed I downloaded the file. I just now downloaded the newer file and the primary mantra has a one word addition, (dont want to repeat it in open forum) which one do I use?

Mr. G said:

I downloaded the file yesterday. Following along with the webcast, it seemed to match. Perhaps Namdrol or Nangwa can comment on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Use the later one. The earlier one had a typo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 10:52 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I dont mean to be a pest but if one is already doing Guru Tragphur what would the difference/benefit be from doing this practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Drollo is more connected with Dzogchen explicitly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 7:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

michaelb said:

Oh, I see.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a question of shifting lingo from one dharma scene to another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

michaelb said:

Oh, I must have misunderstood that bit. What form the the transmission take? I suppose I was expecting a bit of a shout and that.

Malcolm wrote:

he explained Guru YOga of white A. That is transmission -- transmission and introduction are two different things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Mr. G said:

I decided to take a day off work Sunday for the Donwang. However, I may miss Monday and Tuesday.

I was wondering, Will this still enable me to practice Drolo in the future if I wanted to, and be OK for me to replay the instructions for Monday and Tuesday?

Malcolm wrote:

Better you also take off monday, however, it is as eight am eastern time, so maybe you can just be late

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

michaelb said:

I don't think he gave Guru Yoga transmission.

Malcolm wrote:

He gave transmission for Guru Yoga-- he clearly said so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

TBRC??

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center -- the largest online repository of Tibetan texts in the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is only one way to be a text translator. Just do it.

First read a lot of books for five years and learn Dharma. Then learn source language. Meanwhile practice as much as you can.

Then, having learned the source language's grammar, practice in that language and

translate the shit out of texts for 6-10 years before you even produce something worthwhile. Spend the next ten years polishing your craft. Minimum 60 hours a week working on translations. Read books the rest of the time, when you are not practicing. Do not, under any circumstances, join a Buddhist studies program and so on. Do not expect to make a living. Expect to be poor for many years.

If you want to translate, learn the grammar, start translating and ask qualified people to look at your stuff -- oh and study Abhidharma first.

If you are a poor writer in English, either improve your English skills or abandon hope because your translations will always be hopeless garbage even if you have understood the texts. There is so much hopeless garbage out there it seems we will never dig our way out of it.

Having the blessings of your guru helps.

Many days I generally work from 8 am to around 9 pm, usually without much of a break. I don't do it to get paid, I do it because I love it. For example, this morning I began at 7 am. It is 10 pm. I am still working.

Also remember, if you are happy with your translation, it probably sucks.

N

Mr. G said:
Namdrol,

Have you ever thought of running a course like the Tibetan Language Institute for those that want to learn how to translate texts for their own personal use? A combination of video lectures online, forum discussion, and personal tutoring options? It'd be a great way for beginners to avoid the pitfalls that others have gone through in attempting to learn by themselves.

Malcolm wrote:
I have been asked to teach others in the past, but no one stays with the program.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:31 PM
Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators
Content:
Will said:

It is good that enough rugged individualists have trod the narrow, winding path of Dharma translation into English that we have what we have now. But it is bad for the future if only a few 'hobbyists' decide to do this work.

Malcolm wrote:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:08 PM
Title: Re: What are 84000 teachings?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
You are on your own from here on out.

DarwidHalim said:
I think Ananda must have meaning buy saying 82000 from Buddha.

In Vajrayana context For example, the scholars say tantric teachings are inside this 84000 teachings.

So, if they claimed so, they themselves must have the complete 84000 teachings all must be in Pali.

This is a source of gray area and dispute.

I dont think Ananda will say 84000 as many many teachings. He can use as many Gangga sands or other fancy term.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:53 PM
Title: Re: What are 84000 teachings?
Content:
DarwidHalim said:
Then what is the actual meaning of this 21000?

21000 techniques to handle ignorance?

21000 types of ignorance?

21000 way we get ignorance?

Or what?

Malcolm wrote:

Originally, it was a number enunciated by Ananda. It is a way of saying, for every problem there is a solution. It is just a convention. In reality, afflictions are innumerable, and so are dharma teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: What are 84000 teachings?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

They are calculated from 21,000 afflictions of desire, 21,000 afflictions of hatred, 21,000 afflictions of ignorance and 21,000 combined afflictions = 84,000. Thus, there is a dharma teaching for each affliction.

Ok. What are the title of each those teachings for ignorance for example?

They are 21000. That is a lot. What is the name for each 21000 items?

Malcolm wrote:

Sutra for anger, vinaya for desire, abhidharma for ignorance, and so on.

But there isn't 84,000 names of dharma teachings for 84,000 individually named afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: What are 84000 teachings?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

I have heard about this term 84000 teachings both in Mahayana and Theravada teachings?

What does it mean?

How do they calculate this number?

Is it like 1. Anapasatti Sutta 2. Prajna paramitha Sutta, 3. Xxxx, etc. ?

How many of them in Pali and how many of them in Sankrit? Other language?

Or 84000 teachings are just symbolic meaning? In this case why the number is 84000?

Malcolm wrote:

They are calculated from 21,000 afflictions of desire, 21,000 afflictions of hatred, 21,000 afflictions of ignorance and 21,000 combined afflictions = 84,000. Thus, there is a dharma teaching for each affliction.

Another way of calculating it is the eighty thousand dharma skandhas, mentioned in Abhidharma; 20 thousands dharma skandhas of sutra, abhidharma, vinaya, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

MrDistracted said:

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Just be aware, my course is more of a "How do you read the Kosha", rather than a line by line exposition. I cover the high points mainly, trying to make it practical Vajrayāna and Dzogchen practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, there is indeed a short sadhana, you can find it on TBRC.

Nangwa said:

Do you know where it is in the files?

I have a pretty large Adzom Drukpa Drolo file from TBRC but have no idea where the short sadhana is in there.

Malcolm wrote:

Pg. 133-135

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://rsl-ne.com/abhidharma1.shtml> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Will said:

Why avoid Buddhist studies' programs N. ?

Namdrol said:

Because they mostly fill one with bias, and give one false sense of accomplishment.

Will said:

But is the Dharma language learning part (which I thought was mandatory) so terrible?

Malcolm wrote:

In most Academic Buddhist studies programs, you are being trained to be teacher not a translator.

In the non-Academic ones, you are being trained to propagate a lineage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

zerwe said:

FPMT has the Lotsawa Rinchen Zangpo Translator Programme includes two years of classroom study in Dharamsala and two years serving as translator to a resident Geshe in centers worldwide. I will put this out there for Namdrol that, although FPMT are Gelug, I have encountered nothing but a very open non-sectarian style of presenting the Dharma in my 2+ years as a practitioner within this organization. I am sure others might have a different view, but that is my two cents.

Shaun

Malcolm wrote:

By bias I don't mean sectarian, I mean that one will be conditioned by a given school's way of presenting things. There is a difference between bias and sectarianism. To be a good translator, you have to be familiar with all kinds of things and scholastic bias causes one to have blinders.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

Does anybody know if they'll post a copy of the full Sadhana on the webcast page, or if not, does anybody have a PDF of it?

Namdrol said:

It is already up.

The full sadhana consists of a seed syllable and two mantras. That is just how we roll in the DC.

N

heart said:

Yes, but how did Adzom Drugpa roll? For sure there is a sadhana, right?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is indeed a short sadhana, you can find it on TBRC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:42 AM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Will said:

Why avoid Buddhist studies' programs N. ?

Malcolm wrote:

Because they mostly fill one with bias, and give one false sense of accomplishment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:18 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

Does anybody know if they'll post a copy of the full Sadhana on the webcast page, or if not, does anybody have a PDF of it?

Malcolm wrote:

It is already up.

The full sadhana consists of a seed syllable and two mantras. That is just how we roll in the DC.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is only one way to be a text translator. Just do it.

First read a lot of books for five years and learn Dharma. Then learn source language. Meanwhile practice as much as you can.

Then, having learned the source language's grammar, practice in that language and translate the shit out of texts for 6-10 years before you even produce something worthwhile. Spend the next ten years polishing your craft. Minimum 60 hours a week working on translations. Read books the rest of the time, when you are not practicing. Do not, under any circumstances, join a Buddhist studies program and so on. Do not expect to make a living. Expect to be poor for many years.

If you want to translate, learn the grammar, start translating and ask qualified people to look at your stuff -- oh and study Abhidharma first.

If you are a poor writer in English, either improve your English skills or abandon hope because your translations will always be hopeless garbage even if you have understood the texts. There is so much hopeless garbage out there it seems we will never dig our way out of it.

Having the blessings of your guru helps.

Many days I generally work from 8 am to around 9 pm, usually without much of a break. I don't do it to get paid, I do it because I love it. For example, this morning I began at 7 am. It is 10 pm. I am still working.

Also remember, if you are happy with your translation, it probably sucks.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

I'm not sure the "Three Natures" is completely irrelevant, I think it has some value--even if it's "wrong." After all, it takes a mind, even one that doesn't ultimately exist, to even say that things are empty or come to that (non)conclusion! There's some soteriological value to some of these concepts and ideas.....But I certainly can't disagree with your assessments about "revisionism," or about the confusion regarding what "early" or "True" Yogacara's positions and doctrines were, given the plethora of late Indian versions, and the Tibetan penchant for logorrhoea.

BTW, speaking of "frameworks of Buddhist philosophy," I bet you love Kongtrul's "Secret Mantra Madhyamaka," the apex of that portion of the Sheja Dzod, eh?

Malcolm wrote:

There is some justification for Dolbupa's position in so-called the three bodhisattva commentaries i.e. on Kalacakra, Hevajra, and Cakrasamvara.

What is clear to me is the rigid typological boundaries in the four tenet systems tend to fall apart when it comes to Vajrayāna, since in Vajrayāna, the view is not an intellectual construct, but rather, an experiential introduction. That being the case, whether one's intellectual view is cittamatra or madhyamaka is not very important since one's practice will be based on the view communicated during the empowerment, not a view arrived at analytically.

However, here we are discussing emptiness in yogacara, and whether it really is true that they posit non-dual consciousness that substantially exists. I think in face of the evidence it is a little hard to deny that in fact they did so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

Interesting, also, that even in India there were a variety of interpretations.

Malcolm wrote:

Not until quite late. The salient point is that Maitreyanatha, Asanga, and Vasubandhu all use the type 1 presentation which means they all were cittamatrins by gshan stong pa standards.

conebeckham said:

As an aside, I tend to think of all this ultimately as less about ontology, and more about practice and experience. I always come to the conclusion that conceptual mind cannot directly know reality, much less formulate some sort of framework describing it.

Malcolm wrote:

The issue has been, as always, whether post-Yogacara Madhyamakas like Bhavaviveka were justified in their critiques of Maitreyanatha, Asanga, and Vasubandhu.

It is clear that after the attacks of Bhavaviveka and so on on the Yogacara school, that there was a response which involved a) altering the Perfection of Wisdom in 25 and 18 thousand lines with the addition of the Maitreya chapter in order to b) provide justification of the reworking the three nature model.

Basically, we can identify three phases of Yogacara: the sutra period, original commentatator period, and the post-Madhyamaka response period.

What we observe in period two is trenchant attacks by Asanga in particular on the austerity of the perfection of wisdom vision and a concern that it lead to a form of annihilationism.

What we observe in period three is a revamping of Yogacara, recasting the three natures in terms of the two truths.

This latter phase represents a defeat for the Yogacara system in general, since the three natures are completely unnecessary given the presentation of two truths. However, late Yogacarins managed to communicate their ideas to Tibet, and since the time of Dolbupa, centuries of followers of gshan stong have been seriously confused about what the actual teaching of Maitreyanatha, Asanga, and Vasubandhu might have been, especially as this has been conflated with the tathagatagarbha theory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

Cake? What cake? Who said anything about cake...???

Malcolm wrote:

Read this, especially the conclusion.

<http://wordpress.tsadra.org/?p=1215> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Uncontrived

Content:

Beatzen said:

I think it's ironic that ritualists like Tibetan buddhists criticize anything about zazen as

contrived.

Malcolm wrote:

If you think you can sum Tibetan Buddhism up as ritualist, it means you have not understood anything at all about Tibetan Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Using a mala

Content:

MalaBeads said:

I am interested in buying a mala. I have heard that different malas are used for different mantras. I would like to do Tara and Chenrezig mantras mostly. What kind of mala should I buy

Malcolm wrote:

You should get a bodhiseed mālā since the Buddhist tantras state quite clearly this is preferred general purpose mālā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As an aside, what the Madhyamakas are trying to explain to the Yogacarin is that they cannot have their cake and eat it too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Looks like it's an open webcast after all!

This is from an email I got from Conway, MA:

3rd Feb.

4-6pm. - Introduction of this retreat teaching and the transmission of Ati Guru Yoga.

^ is that the correct US time and is that when the Dorje Drolo wang will be given?

...or more likely this day:

5th Feb.

10-12am. - Donwang of Guru Dorje Drolod and the instruction for doing the practice of Dorje Drolod in daily life.

Donwang appears to have the word "wang" in it.

Again, are these the correct US times? No need to add or subtract 2 or 3 hours? I pretty much always miss these things. Don't want to miss this one.

Malcolm wrote:

Argentina is two hours ahead of NY, so when the retreat starts at 4:00 pm, tune in at 2:00 pm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

well, yes, thats what they say, but I'll be damned if it makes any sense at all.

Malcolm wrote:

It makes sense: for them, paratantra is like a cloth; when it is dirty it is made dirty through the imagination of the false; but the dirt does not inhere to the cloth, when it is removed, it is perfect.

In reality, it is just an attempt to explain the Buddha's statement here:

"Luminous, monks, is the mind. [paratanta] And it is defiled by incoming defilements." [parikalpita]

"Luminous, monks, is the mind. [paratanta] And it is freed from incoming defilements." [parinispanna]

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an01/an01.049.than.html>
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Thanissaro mentions that the commentaries mention that this refers to the bhavanga citta, and we know for a fact that the Asanga equates the bhavanga citta with the ālayavijñāna.

For the yogacara, the emptiness of the mind lies in its innate freedom from affliction, this is why in the passage above that I introduced Vasubandhu terms this emptiness "unconditioned" while the imagination of the false is termed "conditioned".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if the alaya is a designation only, then what kind of reality does it have beyond being parikalpita? if the seeds that are the basis of that designation is what is being called paratantra then, when there are "no more seeds", what is left? you said "a non-dual consciousness... now called wisdom" but what is that basis for that designation?

Malcolm wrote:

The non-dual consciousness is present from the beginning. This is why Yogacaras use the three own natures.

Paratantra is not parikalpita. Please don't confuse yourself and others by misusing these terms.

"The imagination (parikalpita) of the unreal exists (paratantra), duality does not exist (parinispanna) in that (paratantra).

Therefore, the basis of the designation for wisdom is paratantra in which the seeds have been removed [as the result of the transformation in the basis]. When the seeds have not been removed, paratantra is termed ālayavijñāna. The other seven consciousnesses are termed parikalpita, they are themselves the seeds which function dualistically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Uncontrived

Content:

Beatzen said:

But in zazen, we aren't doing such things. Steadying the mind on the breath in the tanden region, we empty our mind of its contents and relax into glimpsing our original face.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a pretty contrived meditation, from this Tibetan Buddhist's POV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

Anders Honore said:

I freely admit, I am more interested in interpreting Yogacara prescriptively than descriptively. So my point of curiosity in this is: Without regard for what yogacara scholars may be saying about their own texts, is yogacara necessarily realist?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as your citation below shows.

Anders Honore said:

le, you say yogacara goofed on the whole transformation thing, but did they have to commit this fallacy to retain the integrity of their system or not? I am thinking of passages like this from the platform sutra:

Although the sixth and seventh are transformed within the cause, the [first] five and the eighth are transformed on the basis of the result. Only the names are transformed; the [consciousnesses] are not transformed in their essences.)

Which strikes me as a simple solution to the controversy. If it is indeed so, it does make me wonder why the yogacarins were allegedly so vested in not opting for this solution.

Malcolm wrote:

This passage means that Yogacarins are cittamatrins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the whole paratantra thing was parikalpita from the start.

Malcolm wrote:

This is one reason I find it unrewarding to have this discussion, as most people are incapable of weeding out how gzhan stong pas present the three natures [as you have above] and the way Yogacara scholars in India actually present them.

If, as you suggest, paratantra is parikalpita, then you are asserting that parinispanna is also completely non-existent. Why? Because the yogacara authors very clearly explain that the absence parikalpita in paratantra is parinispanna. This bears that consequence that paratantra must exist.

In any event, I did not invent the term āśrayaḥ parivarta. You can blame Yogacarins for that. If you carefully examine their literature, they are indeed asserting that there is a transformation of the kind described. This is especially clear in the Mahāyāna samgraha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 5:43 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

Mariusz said:

Are Bhaviveka and Candrakirti, Santarakṣita the Madhyamikas, who did not "never locate reference points"?

Namdrol said:

You should read them for yourself and find out what they think.

Mariusz said:

I can not find suitable english books these days. Can you recommend any books which deals directly with what I asked? As far as I know the quotes from Candrakirti, He never located reference points in the Two Truths, but for the purpose of the debate to help others understand Madhyamka He sometimes used suitable reference points as the "antidote, medicine" for them only. To free them "from all reference points", from clinging to the Two Truths, the freedom "beyond" the seeming=unblurred, unimpaired vision.

Malcolm wrote:

Procure and read Nāgārjuna's Reason Sixty. A somewhat clumsy translation, to be sure, but it has Candrakirti's commentary. Incidentally, Candrakirti's densest treatment of worldly convention seems to be contained in his commentary on the seventy verses on emptiness.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

Regarding your comments about the internal contradiction in the three natures, my understanding of the Three Natures is that the False Nature is purely imaginary, thus obviously nonexistent, the Dependent nature is empty dependent origination, and the Perfect nature is neither existent nor nonexistent.

Malcolm wrote:

And this is a perfectly gzhan stong interpretation.

The way this is parsed in authentic Yogacara texts is that the non-existence of the imagined in the dependent is the perfected nature. Hence the citation above states that the imagination of the false is empty and not empty as well has existence, non-existence, and as well as existence.

The ālayavijñāna is the dependent nature; when the seeds within it are exhausted, there

is a transformation in the basis, it's nature as the ālayavijñāna ceases, becoming wisdom. Why? The Yogacara designate the ālayavijñāna based upon the storage of seeds. When there are no more seeds, then there is no basis for designation of a container or storage place of seeds. What remains is a non-dual consciousness. That is not longer termed "mind", it is now termed "wisdom".

The sole thing that is refuted by the Yogacara school as being non-existent is duality. Duality does not exist in the imagination of the unreal. But the imagination itself exists. It's emptiness is solely emptiness of the unreal.

For this reason then we can understand their school is a non-dual realism i.e. "everything is not only empty".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Doctors, please read

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Would Chulen that is taken for the purpose of needing less sleep and having more energy for a retreat, have to be taken according to the instructions that Padma Norbu posted in the original post?

Or could these said Chudlen be taken the same way as say Bimala or Semde?

Malcolm wrote:

Chulen pills have a method of being blessed as in Mandarava practice, so use that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

Do we agree that the real question, regarding Yogacara, is not whether Buddhahood is the result of transformation or revaluation, but whether Yogacaras posit an absolute existent, such that they are to be considered "realists?"

Malcolm wrote:

The two questions are inextricably related. The Tibetan gzhan stong debates have caused the issue to become skewed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

conebeckham said:

In fact, Eighth Karmapa's commentary on the Abhisamayalamkara indicates that it is a mistake to think that, for instance, the Alayavijnana turns into Mirror-like wisdom, as many Mahamudra practitioners do. He says it is "not possible within the sphere of knowable objects that something impure turns into something pure," or vice versa.

Malcolm wrote:

This nevertheless is the fault of the yogacara school, the inner contradiction of their position that dependent nature must exist since it is what imagines the false. You must read very carefully what Vasubandhu says in the citation above.

The Karmapa's commentary, incidentally, will be based on either Ārya Vimuktisena's commentary Haribhadr's or a combination of both, depending whether he prefers a three kāya scheme following the former, or a four kāya scheme following the latter, so his commentary on that will hardly be relevant here.

We are discussing what Yogacara scholars say about their own texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

Mariusz said:

Are Bhaviveka and Candrakirti, Santarakṣita the Madhyamikas, who did not "never locate reference points"?

Malcolm wrote:

You should read them for yourself and find out what they think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

conebeckham said:

Mahayanasutralamkara, VI. 8:

The mind that is aware that nothing other than mind exists.

Then, it is realized that mind does not exist either.

The intelligent ones are aware that both do not exist

and abide in the Dharmadhatu, in which these are absent.
This would lead to "revealed," rather than transformed, yes?
Though it's true the Yogacara texts are constantly going on about the "fundamental change of state."

Malcolm wrote:

My response to this is the evidence provided in the Madhyāntavibhagatīka:

As it is said:

"The imagination of the unreal exists,
duality does not exist in that,
emptiness exists in this,
that also exists in that.

Now then, the imagination of the false means the concept of an apprehended object and the apprehending subject. Duality means free from a real apprehended object and an apprehending subject. Emptiness means the imagination of the false being free from a real apprehended object and an apprehending subject. "That also exists in that" means the imagination of the false. As such, that non-existence of something somewhere, that is truly seeing the empty truly just as it is. Whatever remains here, that is understood just as it truly is to exist here. As such, the characteristic of emptiness is demonstrated without mistake.

Not empty and not not empty,
in that way is everything explained,
because of existence, because of non-existence, because of existence,
that is the middle path.

"It is not empty" means emptiness and the imagination of the false. "It is not not-empty" means duality i.e. the apprehended object and an apprehending subject. 'Everything' means 'the imagination of the false' is the conditioned and 'emptiness' is the unconditioned. 'Explained' means demonstrated. 'Exists' means the imagination of the false. 'Non-existence' means duality. 'Existence' means emptiness exists in the imagination of the false, and the imagination of the false exists in that too. "That is the middle path" means everything is not only empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

Namdrol said:

What they propose is that a mind freed from subject object transforms into wisdom, and if this wisdom does not really exist, liberation is impossible. In order for this wisdom to exist, then the mind out of which wisdom is transformed necessarily must exist. Yogacara thus becomes a non-dual realist system. This is not simply a prasanga distinction -- this is a universal mahdyamaka charge against the treatises of yogacara.

N

gad rgyangs said:

"transforms into wisdom" or "is revealed as wisdom"?

Malcolm wrote:

Transforms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

conebeckham said:

Some "Yogacaras" don't posit that Mind ultimately exists, I should point out. Or, so say some Tibetan commentators. The standard objection of some Tibetan "Prasangika Madhyamika adherents" often ignores this....

Malcolm wrote:

What they propose is that a mind freed from subject object transforms into wisdom, and if this wisdom does not really exist, liberation is impossible. In order for this wisdom to exist, then the mind out of which wisdom is transformed necessarily must exist. Yogacara thus becomes a non-dual realist system. This is not simply a prasanga distinction -- this is a universal mahdyamaka charge against the treatises of yogacara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

dakini_boi said:

How do you log on to a closed webcast? Go to the normal webcast site? Anything special you have to do?

Malcolm wrote:

Use your webcast team assigned user name and password on the login page which is found on the files page

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Technology is only one part of the equation. Without addressing the other two we will just rip through whatever savings we may find through more efficient technologies.

Malcolm wrote:

Then there is the Jevons Paradox:

In 1865, the English economist William Stanley Jevons observed that technological improvements that increased the efficiency of coal-use led to the increased consumption of coal in a wide range of industries. He argued that, contrary to common intuition, technological improvements could not be relied upon to reduce fuel consumption.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jevons_paradox " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

This led to a reexamination and restatement as the Khazzoom-Brookes postulate:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khazzoom-Brookes_postulate " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

"When individuals change behavior and begin to use methods and devices that are more energy efficient, there are cases where, on a macro-economic level, energy usage actually increases." The effect of higher energy prices, either through taxes or producer-induced shortages, initially reduces demand but in the longer term encourages greater energy efficiency. This efficiency response amounts to a partial accommodation of the price rise and thus the reduction in demand is blunted. The end result is a new balance between supply and demand at a higher level of supply and consumption than if there had been no efficiency response.

<http://www-dse.ec.unipi.it/persona/docenti/luzzati/italiano/didattica/herringefficiency.pdf> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Dependent origination Vs Interdependent

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

If the seed exists in the sprout then it is not a cause it is an effect. Something cannot be a cause and an effect simultaneously.

If the sprout arises from the seed then the sprout exists as the seed. Something cannot be an effect and a cause at the same time.

If the seed exists independently of the sprout or the sprout exists independently of the seed then we fall into eternalism as we have uncaused effects.

If neither the seed nor the sprout exist we fall into nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:

Nagarjuna says about this, and repeated by Candrakirti in the Prasannapāda is that causes and effects are neither the same nor are they different, using the example of milk and butter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

By the way, the concept of particle only valid for Vaibhasika and Sautrantika.

Cittamantra already reject particle. Cittamantra itself is rejected further by Madyamika.

Cittamantra say everything is mind, and the existence of mind is rejected by Madyamika.

Malcolm wrote:

Some Madhyamakas, such as Bhaviveka and Candrakirti, accepted the model of relative truth proposed by the Sautrantikas, but rejected that of Yogacara. Others, such as Santarakṣita, accepted the relative truth proposed by Yogacara but rejected Yogacara presentations of the ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Sherlock said:

The wang will be given through the webcast too?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, a so called don dbang, a meaning empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Aemilius said:

Actually romans did have machines, here is a picture of a roman sawmill, as an example:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:R%C3%B6mische_S%C3%A4gem%C3%BChle.svg

Namdrol said:

Yes, run by slaves. The cotton gin was also a machine, albeit run by slaves.

Aemilius said:

The roman saw mill uses the power of gravity, ie the flowing of water to a lower level, as in a normal waterpowered electricity generator.

Malcolm wrote:

Manned by slaves again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Partless particle is absurd.

Partless means no part.

Malcolm wrote:

Partless particles are a Sautranika tenet, not a tenet of Bhavaviveka.

Partless particle have no sides i.e. no top bottom, east, west, etc. They do not adhere to one another as in the building block idea of atoms of the Vaibhaṣika school that have sides, etc., which form matter by adhering to the sides of each other.

This is all basic Abhidharma, and do not really have much to do with Mahdyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

Namdrol said:

No that, in his lingo, is self-perfected.

Pero said:

Yeah but I think sometimes he says infinite potentiality (not primordial, my mistake).

You know like when he's saying not only emptiness (ka dag) but also infinite potentiality.

Couldn't we say that lhun grub is the potential for manifestation and thugs rje is the way this potential manifests (as either dang, rolpa or tsal)?

Malcolm wrote:

We talk about three wisdoms, but really, these three are aspects of a single state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

Namdrol said:

It's a meaning gloss. On the other hand, "energy" does not fully express theb nirmanakāya activity of benefitting sentient beings, of which it is the base (hence the reason the wisdom of the basis is described as thug rjes or karuna). So I prefer to translate it as compassion, save energy for "rtsal". "Energy", in my opinion is too vague since it does necessarily included the fact that nirmanakāyas manifest to guide sentient beings.

Someone who understands Dzogchen teachings will then understand the unpacked meaning of thugs rje with the seen the three wisdoms described. ChNN these days tends to translate it as "primordial potentiality". No matter what, when ever it is explained, you always have to mention that it literally means "compassion".

Pero said:

Hmmm I thought primordial/infinite potentiality was lhun grub.

Malcolm wrote:

No that, in his lingo, is self-perfected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Wouldn't it be necessary, to actually have formally have asked a teacher to be your root guru before it is so. I mean, that there is a formal and conscious relationship between the teacher and the student. I wouldn't want to break heavy samaya by slandering or having wrong views about my root guru without actually consciously knowing he is my root guru.

Malcolm wrote:

Whenever a guru gives a major empowerment or direct introduction, there is always a possibility that one or more students will have an authentic discovery of their true state. He already accepts that some students their may discover their real nature, and that they might come to regard him or her as their root guru. That is what it means to take responsibility for giving transmission. When someone gives transmission they are doing so in order to help people become realized, to realized their own nature. When that

happens, that guru becomes the root guru for that student, and from then on that student has real knowledge of their own nature. The person who removes that doubt for you is your root guru and no other. It also does not mean you realize that right away. Sometimes it may take you a little while to figure out. So there is never any need to ask formal permission from some Lama "Oh, can I consider you my root teacher"-- if they say yes, than what shall you do? If you do this, it means you do not have real knowledge of your state or that you have some doubts or are in a state of confusion. Especially if the request is based on just some sort of love-sick emotion that poses as faith (which happens a lot, and why unstable western students often leave this or that lama when the infatuation wears off). The identity of your root guru is based on your own knowledge. No one can tell you who your root guru is, not even some Lama who is acting as a guru. If some Lama declares to you "I am your root guru" before you have some real knowledge of the teachings, then be careful, especially if you have never received some sort of empowerment or direct introduction from that person. If you take a major empowerment from some guru, as I have said, according to the system of Sakya, etc., this person already is your root guru. In this system, one can therefore have as many root gurus as one has received major empowerments. Receiving the four empowerments automatically makes them your root guru. If you received sixteen major empowerments from sixteen different gurus you have sixteen root gurus. According to this system, however, there is also the concept of the karmic link root guru which resembles the Kagyu and Nyingma approach i.e. based on this guru's instructions you have an authentic realization of the nature of your mind. So, if you are approaching this from a Kagyu and Dzogchen point of view, and you do not have real confidence in your state, then you don't have to consider anyone your root guru. Of course you still have gurus -- but when you have real conviction and knowledge then those people who have given you that conviction and knowledge are your actual root gurus. Before that time, they are just your gurus."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Wouldn't it be necessary, to actually have formally have asked a teacher to be your root guru before it is so. I mean, that there is a formal and conscious relationship between the teacher and the student. I wouldn't want to break heavy samaya by slandering or having wrong views about my root guru without actually consciously knowing he is my root guru.

Malcolm wrote:

Whenever a guru gives a major empowerment or direct introduction, there is always a possibility that one or more students will have an authentic discovery of their true state. He already accepts that some students their may discover their real nature, and that they might come to regard him or her as their root guru. That is what it means to take

responsibility for giving transmission. When someone gives transmission they are doing so in order to help people become realized, to realized their own nature. When that happens, that guru becomes the root guru for that student, and from then on that student has real knowledge of their own nature. The person who removes that doubt for you is your root guru and no other. It also does not mean you realize that right away. Sometimes it may take you a little while to figure out. So there is never any need to ask formal permission from some Lama "Oh, can I consider you my root teacher"-- if they say yes, than what shall you do? If you do this, it means you do not have real knowledge of your state or that you have some doubts or are in a state of confusion. Especially if the request is based on just some sort of love-sick emotion that poses as faith (which happens a lot, and why unstable western students often leave this or that lama when the infatuation wears off). The identity of your root guru is based on your own knowledge. No one can tell you who your root guru is, not even some Lama who is acting as a guru. If some Lama declares to you "I am your root guru" before you have some real knowledge of the teachings, then be careful, especially if you have never received some sort of empowerment or direct introduction from that person. If you take a major empowerment from some guru, as I have said, according to the system of Sakya, etc., this person already is your root guru. In this system, one can therefore have as many root gurus as one has received major empowerments. Receiving the four empowerments automatically makes them your root guru. If you received sixteen major empowerments from sixteen different gurus you have sixteen root gurus. According to this system, however, there is also the concept of the karmic link root guru which resembles the Kagyu and Nyingma approach i.e. based on this guru's instructions you have an authentic realization of the nature of your mind. So, if you are approaching this from a Kagyu and Dzogchen point of view, and you do not have real confidence in your state, then you don't have to consider anyone your root guru. Of course you still have gurus -- but when you have real conviction and knowledge then those people who have given you that conviction and knowledge are your actual root gurus. Before that time, they are just your gurus."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

Namdrol said:

According to the traditions of Sakya, Gelug and Jonang, a root guru is anyone from whom one has received the four empowerments.

In Kagyu, a root guru is someone who actually caused you to recognize the nature of your mind in a non-intellectual way.

In Dzogchen, a root guru is the person who introduces one to one's primordial state in an unmistakable way.

Clarence said:

N-la,

Is there a difference between what is shown in Kagyu and Dzogchen or do they both show the same thing, only the way to get there is different?

Best, C

Malcolm wrote:

You will probably get different answers, but the former is included in the latter, so there is some similarity of meaning. The terminology is very different however, and there are key differences between the two presentations that depend on their respective paths.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

Namdrol said:

According to the traditions of Sakya, Gelug and Jonang, a root guru is anyone from whom one has received the four empowerments.

In Kagyu, a root guru is someone who actually caused you to recognize the nature of your mind in a non-intellectual way.

In Dzogchen, a root guru is the person who introduces one to one's primordial state in an unmistakable way.

Clarence said:

N-la,

Is there a difference between what is shown in Kagyu and Dzogchen or do they both show the same thing, only the way to get there is different?

Best, C

Malcolm wrote:

You will probably get different answers, but the former is included in the latter, so there is some similarity of meaning. The terminology is very different however, and there are key differences between the two presentations that depend on their respective paths.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

Totoro said:

In another post Gregkarvanos said:

A teacher is one thing, but a root guru is a completely different deal!

When does a teacher become a root guru? Say, if a teacher decides to spend a couple of years or so to check out a disciple and vice versa, before 'accepting' him as a serious student, what will happen to change that status to 'root guru'? Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the traditions of Sakya, Gelug and Jonang, a root guru is anyone from whom one has received the four empowerments.

In Kagyu, a root guru is someone who actually caused you to recognize the nature of your mind in a non-intellectual way.

In Dzogchen, a root guru is the person who introduces one to one's primordial state in an unmistakable way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

Totoro said:

In another post Gregkarvanos said:

A teacher is one thing, but a root guru is a completely different deal!

When does a teacher become a root guru? Say, if a teacher decides to spend a couple of years or so to check out a disciple and vice versa, before 'accepting' him as a serious student, what will happen to change that status to 'root guru'? Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the traditions of Sakya, Gelug and Jonang, a root guru is anyone from whom one has received the four empowerments.

In Kagyu, a root guru is someone who actually caused you to recognize the nature of your mind in a non-intellectual way.

In Dzogchen, a root guru is the person who introduces one to one's primordial state in an unmistakable way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Chod vs Mahamudra Chod

Content:

twonny said:

As far as I know there is no such think as Dzogchen or Mahamudra chod

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there are. Jigme Lingpa's chö is an example of Chö from the Dzogchen tradition.

Troma Nagmo from Dudjom Tersar is another. These chö practices are marked by using termonology from the system of Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Aemilius said:

Actually romans did have machines, here is a picture of a roman sawmill, as an example:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:R%C3%B6mische_S%C3%A4gem%C3%BChle.svg

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, run by slaves. The cotton gin was also a machine, albeit run by slaves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thugs rje rig pa'i ye shes su bzhugs pas mkhyen pa'i cha ma 'gag par so sor gsal kyang
bya ba dang byed pa'i rnam pa yul yul can du snang ba ni med do/

Namdrol said:

Though the knowing part manifests individually without ceasing [mkhyen pa'i cha ma 'gag par so sor gsal kyang] since compassion is present as the wisdom of vidyā [thugs rje rig pa'i ye shes su bzhugs pas], the aspect of action and agent [bya ba dang byed pa'i rnam] appearing as [du snang ba] an object and a subject [yul yul can] does not exist.

gad rgyangs said:

thanks, this is awesome! first, i'm wondering how the published version translated "rig pa'i ye shes" as "intrinsic awareness (rig pa) of pristine wisdom (ye shes)", it seems backwards to me, or doesn't it really matter?

Malcolm wrote:

It matters. It is a genetive constuction. Also intrinsic awareness in an inappropriate gloss. Pristine is a little weird because it is usage that dates from 16th century which is not generally current. These days pristine means "new or fresh", generally not "original, former, primitive and undeveloped", unless we are talking about old growth forests and wilderness as in "pristine wilderness". Ye nas "has always" is a synonym of rtag tu, "will always, permanently", etc., and as a clause in Tibetan functions the same way.

gad rgyangs said:

I've been thinking about "energy" as the translation of thugs rje...

Malcolm wrote:

It's a meaning gloss. On the other hand, "energy" does not fully express theb nirmanakāya activity of benefitting sentient beings, of which it is the base (hence the reason the wisdom of the basis is described as thug rjes or karuna). So I prefer to translate it as compassion, save energy for "rtsal". "Energy", in my opinion is too vague since it does necessarily included the fact that nirmanakāyas manifest to guide sentient beings.

Someone who understands Dzogchen teachings will then understand the unpacked meaning of thugs rje with the seen the three wisdoms described. ChNN these days tends to translate it as "primordial potentiality". No matter what, when ever it is explained, you always have to mention that it literally means "compassion".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

arsent said:

It seems to me it will be an open webcast..

Malcolm wrote:

It isn't

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thugs rje rig pa'i ye shes su bzhugs pas mkhyen pa'i cha ma 'gag par so sor gsal kyang
bya ba dang byed pa'i rnam pa yul yul can du snang ba ni med do/

Malcolm wrote:

Though the knowing part manifests individually without ceasing [mkhyen pa'i cha ma 'gag par so sor gsal kyang] since compassion is present as the wisdom of vidyā [thugs rje rig pa'i ye shes su bzhugs pas], the aspect of action and agent [bya ba dang byed pa'i rnam] appearing as [du snang ba] an object and a subject [yul yul can] does not exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Thanks for the clarification, Namdrol. I'm sure I would practice incorrectly, but maybe it's something I could do on my deathbed.

Malcolm wrote:

It is best to have such a teaching so it can be practiced when needed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if sentient beings and buddhas are the basis' awareness, what the basis' awareness manifests as, then it is not necessary to posit an aware entity that is dangerously close to being a deity. the basis sleeps in its bardo, and its awareness (us) is withdrawn. it wakes, and we manifest.

Namdrol said:

This is basically how it is -- but since there is no individuating consciousnesses driven by affliction, the awareness latent in the basis is not discussed in plural terms, that is until there are individuating consciousnesses when samasara and nirvana "turn their back to each other".

gad rgyangs said:

ok. now: next problem. what the heck is this cyclic thingy of the basis, its "sleeping" phase, with latent awareness, and its manifest phase? first of all, this is temporal, and certainly anything that is beyond concepts of existence or non-existence is going to be way beyond temporality. so, the basis cannot actually have a cycle, its tsal maybe does whatever it wants, including cycles, but not the basis itself.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, this comes about because of traces of action and ignorance. Nothing in the basis

changes, of course, what happens is that there is sort of cosmic pulsation of ignorance and its subsidence which results in the appearance and disappearance of samsara and nirvana; and as we know, traces can accumulate in wisdom.

You have to understand that all of this explanation of cosmic cycles is really intended to be brought down to the level of the individual's life cycle in terms of the four bardos:

The bardo of death == destruction of the universe up to the two higher form realms

The bardo of dharmatā == the arising of the sound, light and rays of the basis

The bardo of becoming == non-recognition of the basis

The natural bardo of this life == the appearance of samsara and nirvana

It is an explanation for practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

heehee, I should do this retreat just so you can all see just how bad the results can be... but, seriously, thanks again for the info. Will steer clear of this one for sure.

asunthatneversets said:

Why steer clear? It's not often opportunities like this come up, even if you receive the wang, lung and tri and don't do the practice at this point in time it's still good to receive the teaching... you may change your mind in the future and then you're already locked and loaded. Not everyone has access to teachings like this, or teachers like ChNN, you have the opportunity, I'd say take advantage of it. Authentic teachers are few and far between and life is delicate and can be lost at any moment, now is the time!

padma norbu said:

Uh... I don't need any more obstacles and I'm crazy enough already. Based on what Namdrol has said here, at least I have enough sense to avoid this teaching. I'm just thankful for the knowledge and wanted to express my thanks. I've received other teachings without knowledge of what it fully entails and didn't appreciate it too much. I would be furious if I learned this practice can create obstacles or madness after the fact, when my life seems to be going even more haywire than it already is.

Malcolm wrote:

Receiving the teaching does not cause problems -- practicing it incorrectly does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if sentient beings and buddhas are the basis' awareness, what the basis' awareness manifests as, then it is not necessary to posit an aware entity that is dangerously close to being a deity. the basis sleeps in its bardo, and its awareness (us) is withdrawn. it wakes, and we manifest.

Malcolm wrote:

This is basically how it is -- but since there is no individuating consciousnesses driven by affliction, the awareness latent in the basis is not discussed in plural terms, that is until there are individuating consciousnesses when samasara and nirvana "turn their back to each other".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Adumbra said:

There is really no strong refutation of theism once you trade in the idea of a good and perfect creator for one who is, at best, amoral and capable of error such as the demiurgos of Plato's conception.

gregkavarnos said:

Of course there is, Dependent Origination, yah know???

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you, Greg.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Aemilius said:

They didn't have machines, that's true, but they had some form of mass production of tiles. It is justified when historians have said that certain emperors owned tile factories.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, millions of slaves.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:18 PM
Title: Re: Understanding The Basis
Content:

Namdrol said:
The basis is the three kāyas. The three kāyas are free from thought, but the basis is not a mere inert void.

gad rgyangs said:
2 questions:

1. is the basis aware in any way, or are we sentient beings and not-quite-perfect-buddhas the only manifestations of sentience?

Malcolm wrote:
Define what you mean by "aware".

gad rgyangs said:
2. can we agree (in the interests of communication) that rang byung ye shes (self arisen wisdom) usually pertains to the base, is in fact a synonym for the base, and rigpa is the manifestation of that ye shes in/as a sentient being?

Malcolm wrote:
Rigpa is one's knowledge of the basis and that is all. Rigpa is not the basis.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:08 PM
Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat
Content:

michaelb said:
I know. I attended some teachings in London a couple of years ago, and have watched quite a few open webcasts, and met up with local members for the transmission. but joining just for one closed webcast when i really want teachings on another terma may not be the best reason to join.

Malcolm wrote:
It could be a perfect reason to join.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Clarence said:

Having everything decentralized just doesn't work efficiently in this case.

Malcolm wrote:

It is mostly an issue of differences in international law.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 8:54 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so its more like the basis is a container for this aggregate of latent awarenesses, rather than it being the awareness of the basis itself?

Namdrol said:

It is part of the rtsal of the basis.

The basis is not one thing, it is not many. It is the dharmadhātu.

N

gad rgyangs said:

so sentient beings and buddhas are part of the tsal of the basis, but the basis itself has no awareness, since during the bardo phase, the latent awarenesses in the basis are really the dormant sentient beings and non-'samyak sambuddha' buddhas? where are the samyak sambuddhas then, if the basis is the dharmakaya, they must be there too? i mean, there's no "larger context" within which the basis is found, no "where" outside the basis where the samyak sambuddhas would be?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is the three kāyas. The three kāyas are free from thought, but the basis is not a mere inert void.

There is no larger context and you know better than to ask one of the fourteen questions Buddha refused to answer (i.e. where do tathagatas go after death).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so its more like the basis is a container for this aggregate of latent awarenesses, rather than it being the awareness of the basis itself?

Malcolm wrote:

It is part of the rtsal of the basis.

The basis is not one thing, it is not many. It is the dharmadhātu.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so what becomes of the latent awareness of the basis? are we it?

Malcolm wrote:

When the latent awareness (shes pa bag la nyal] of the basis recognizes the basis as its own display, it becomes prajñā [shes rab] and realizes buddhahood as Samantabhadra.

When the latent awareness of the basis does not recognize itself, under the power of the imputing ignorance that imputs appearances as other and that awareness as a self, it becomes consciousness [rnam par shes pa].

The 'latent awareness of the basis' is an aggregate name for all those beings who have not achieved total buddhahood in the previous eon, but achieved a so called "buddhahood that reverts to the cause", [as I have explained now several times within the last few weeks] in the same way that we refer to the aggregated consciousnesses of all sentient beings as the vijñānadhātu, along with dhātus of earth, water, air, fire and space, the so called sadadhātu, the six dhātus.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Call me Fruity if you like, but I then start wondering why Nagarjuna is so highly valued in

Mahayana circles, and his work explained on such a broad basis, instead of the narrow one for which it seems it was initially meant.

It does make good sense to me in the narrow way, and it explains why in the broad way it often feels like missing the mark.

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

Most of Nagarjuna's works are critical, but they are based in Mahāyāna sūtra perspectives, specifically, the prajñāpāramitā sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

My smart phone knows my name.

Malcolm wrote:

So it is a "knowing knower?"

Related to your other comment, there are instances where Nagarjuna's refutations are completely irrelevant in the modern context, and instances where they are relevant and very much so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Apparently not in Dzogchen, since during this phase, there are neither buddhas nor sentient beings, no samsara, no nirvana. This the reason why the basis is also called "the bardo of samsara and nirvana", meaning that neither are manifest during this period.

gad rgyangs said:

hang on: the basis isn't only during the bardo. what about the basis right now?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is called the basis because it has not been realized.

At present the basis is not latent, like it is between eons. At present the basis is in a

state of manifestation as Buddhas and sentient beings. When the basis is latent, we term it "the time of the basis" or "the bardo of samsara and nirvana". After the basis manifests we term this phase "samsara and nirvana turn their backs to one another". When we

When we fully realize the path of dzogchen, it is called "the universe manifests as the basis": in other words, our total experience will be the three wisdoms subsumed under the name, great original purity.

The basis itself has not changed in anyway during these three time periods.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i was thinking of the general sense of knowing awareness, more specifically self-awareness. in the sense of rigpa maybe? im just interested in the idea that if the basis is not conscious, so where does consciousness in general, and rigpa specifically, come from?

Namdrol said:

The basis possesses a neutral or latent awareness [shes pa lung ma bstan or shes pa bag la nyal] which is unaware of itself. But this is only a very general way of speaking, just as we speak of the six dhātus: earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness.

gad rgyangs said:

isnt awareness (of any kind) a characteristic of a sentient being, indeed the definition of a sentient being?

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not in Dzogchen, since during this phase, there are neither buddhas nor sentient beings, no samsara, no nirvana. This the reason why the basis is also called "the bardo of samsara and nirvana", meaning that neither are manifest during this period.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i was thinking of the general sense of knowing awareness, more specifically self-awareness. in the sense of rigpa maybe? im just interested in the idea that if the basis is not conscious, so where does consciousness in general, and rigpa specifically, come from?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis possesses a neutral or latent awareness [shes pa lung ma bstan or shes pa bag la nyal] which is unaware of itself. But this is only a very general way of speaking, just as we speak of the six dhātus: earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Thugs rjes (karuna) is the word used to describe the nirmanakāya function of the basis. As long as we understand that is what compassion means, we do not need a better word than compassion to describe this aspect of the basis.

N

gad rgyangs said:

so on what level does cognizance make its appearance: dharmakaya, sambhogakaya, or nirmanakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

What is the Tibetan word for you are using "cognizance"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

then the basis is just a metaphor (fine with me).

Namdrol said:

Well, no -- compassion is the basis for the expression of the nirmanakāya and its activities.

gad rgyangs said:

maybe "compassion" and "responsiveness" are not good translations then, since they

are so clearly agentive. Rinpoche in Crystal +Way of Light seems to be translating thugs rje as "energy"

Malcolm wrote:

Thugs rjes (karuna) is the word used to describe the nirmanakāya function of the basis. As long as we understand that is what compassion means, we do not need a better word than compassion to describe this aspect of the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Ok I understand now, but it raises the question what are we seeking liberation from and how does a Bodhisattva save all sentient beings

Malcolm wrote:

We are seeking liberation from beginningless samsara; and bodhisattvas do not save all sentient beings, they merely wish to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 29th, 2012 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

where did these previous beings from the previous universe come from? it just goes around in circles and would only work if there were a finite amount of beings

Malcolm wrote:

From the universe prior to that ad infinitum. The logic of dependent origination does not permit of any sort of beginnings whatsoever. No first causes, no first moment, no first universe, etc. There are an infinite number of sentient beings who also have no beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 29th, 2012 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Design means to draw or create deliberately according to some plan -- but instead the universe arose because the blind force of the collective actions of ignorant sentient beings [from a previous universe]/quote

where did these previous beings come from?

Malcolm wrote:

The previous universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 29th, 2012 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

You caught my sense Tom, it was about the ball, MMK CH2:1 is about the rolling.

Malcolm wrote:

MMK refutes moving movers, such as rolling balls. The minute you suggest that balls roll, then automatically the subroutine that refutes rolling rollers kicks in.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 29th, 2012 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

Yes, persons and aggregates exist conventionally.

We can reject the alaya as a non-existent by carefully reading Chandrakirti.

Malcolm wrote:

So in other words, you admit that it is not explicitly obvious that Candrakirti rejects ālaya conventionally, and this rejection must be based on a "careful" reading of the MAV.

cloudburst said:

In the MAV verse you cite above, he says that although things are natureless, he taught that they exist. This can only mean that although things are natureless, he taught that they exist by nature, because otherwise he wouldn't have set up natureless and existence as opposites and used the word "though." So Buddha taught that the alaya, persons, aggregates, etc exist inherently or by nature whereas they do not.

Malcolm wrote:

Here is Candra's statment commenting on 6:46:

"Now then, if it is said that ālayavijñāna is something which is said in the Ārya Lankāvatara and so on to be the basis [possessing a special power of limitless phenomena] of all seeds which are the cause of the arising of all things, like waves and an ocean. Does that not exist as arising in any way at all?"

Such is not the case, but that was demonstrated as stated because it is demonstrated as existing to those to be disciplined. In order to introduce the nature [svabhāva] of all things, only emptiness is demonstrated by the word ālayajijñāna."

If you read this passage alone, you will come away with the idea that Candrakīrti is basically saying there is no ālaya. But...

Jayananda's expansion of this passage is interesting, and I think it is likely a source of disagreement among Tibetan scholars on this point because of a) how he qualifies Candrakīrti's discussion b) because his is the only Indian commentary we possess after Candrakīrti's bhasya of MAV. I have parsed out the passage for clarity and have spent some time doing so today since I don't know that anyone has actually looked at this before (maybe, perhaps in some journal somewhere).

That 'suppose' is for demonstrating the argument of the cittamātrins, it is said "Supposing in that way...". When 'presented in connection with the result of actions', though the ālayavijñāna does not exist, since the actions lack a nature, the conclusion of a perished action is presented as the production of the the result of action in the relative [samvṛtti].

The 'basis which has a special power of limitless phenomena' means a consciousness of the appearance of infinite phenomena such as blue, yellow, and so on. The power of those means the traces (vāsanā). For example, like the scent arising from approaching a flower, in that same way, the consciousness of blue and so on perfume the ālayavijñāna; it is the basis or support of the traces. Therefore, this is the significance of saying it is the cause of all the seeds (bījas) i.e. consciousnesses.

Now in order to demonstrate the example, waves and so on are mentioned.

'The cause of the arising all things' means because it is the cause of giving rise to the consciousness of the appearances of blue and so on.

"Ārya Lankāvatara and so on..." says
The ālayavijñāna is deep and subtle,
like a flowing river upon which all the seeds fall,
I do not teach this to the immature
since they will imagine they should impute a self.
'Does that not exist in anyway?' means 'has it never existed'?

Now then, in order to respond to the question, it is said 'Such is not the case...' and so on.

'Such is not the case' means 'it is not non-existent', but on the other hand, 'it was taught as existent for a purpose by the Bhagavan.'

'That was demonstrated as stated because it is demonstrated as existing to those to be disciplined' means 'Since the ālayavijñāna was demonstrated as existent, the ālayavijñāna was demonstrated as existent to those persons who were to be disciplined'.

Ultimately [don dam], because the 'ālayavijñāna' is demonstrated as being an description of only emptiness, it is said '...the nature of all things' and so on.

For what reason is it said 'In order to introduce the nature of all things'? It is for introducing the the emptiness of things with "Not from self, not from other..." i.e. only emptiness is the ālaya, but because of the consciousness of that [emptiness] itself [de nyid] i.e. because of the perfect comprehension of that is free from perception of all phenomena [chos thams cad mi dmigs pa], therefore, emptiness itself is demonstrated by the term ālayavijñāna."

I submit therefore that this passage opens up a very different way of looking the Candrakirtian treatment of the ālayavijñāna. Since we ought to accept that Jayānanda possessed the oral lineage of interpreting this text, I think we can safely say that this passage means we really ought to carefully rethink whether Candrakirti so thoroughly rejects ālayavijñāna as some Tibetan Madhyamaka scholars seem to think he does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

in the Dzogchen view, the characteristics of the basis are purity (kadag, emptiness), inexhaustible and uninterrupted manifestation (lhundrup) and responsiveness/compassion (thugje). now, can there be compassion and responsiveness as an impersonal phenomena? I don't see how, since it is by definition intentional, and intentionality is a characteristic of consciousness, of awareness.

Namdrol said:

Gems are inert, so they have no intention. Whoever possesses that gem can get what they want.

Likewise, compassion has no intentionlity, but since everyone posssess that basis, liberation is possible for all sentient beings.

gad rgyangs said:

then the basis is just a metaphor (fine with me).

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no -- compassion is the basis for the expression of the nirmanakāya and its activities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

Did Gorampa accept that the Alaya as a consciousness was non-existent like the hair on a bald man's head? If not we DO disagree there which as the original point.

Malcolm wrote:

Candra says: in MAV 6:43-44 (my translation):

"The ālaya exists', 'the person exists',
'only these aggregates exist',
these teachings are for those who
cannot understand the profound dharma.
Just as the Buddha taught 'I' and 'mine',
though free from the view of a self [satkāyadṛiṣṭi];
likewise, though indeed things are natureless,
'existence' is demonstrated as the provisional meaning [neyartha].

The first question I have for you is: do persons and aggregates exist conventionally, and if they do, upon what basis are we then to reject the ālaya as being the son of a barren women, if we on the other hand admit that persons and aggregates are the sons of fertile women?

The second question I have for you is: what in your view, is the difference between the provisional meaning and conventional truth?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Rinpoche has given the Medicine Buddha transmission numerous times. Is there a specific DC practice for this or can it be done in Anuyoga style? Also I have heard the mantra done a couple of different ways, how does Rinpoche teach it?

Malcolm wrote:

There are two -- Orgyen Menlha and the Medicine Buddha from Namcho. I am not sure where you can get them, but I think if you send an email to the secretary of DCA, he can help you further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Tom said:

The reason for which is the lack of existence of motion in any of the three times. It just seemed your previous statement could be read as drawing an ontological distinction between moved objects and moving objects.

Namdrol said:

There is no basis for saying that something is moving, apart from something which has not moved or has moved. If you are familiar with the argument rejecting motion in the MMK than all of this is old hat.

Tom said:

I don't disagree, you are basically just quoting MMK CH2:1, my point is just that this verse is about the rolling not the ball.

Although, I do understand that motion and movement exist interdependently. Without motion there is no mover and without a mover there is no motion and that this precludes existing either independently or inherently.

Malcolm wrote:

I was responding to this: "a basketball rolling across the floor."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Tom said:

The reason for which is the lack of existence of motion in any of the three times. It just seemed your previous statement could be read as drawing an ontological distinction between moved objects and moving objects.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no basis for saying that something is moving, apart from something which has not moved or has moved. If you are familiar with the argument rejecting motion in the MMK than all of this is old hat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

If something like this worked, it might be easier to understand Nagarjuna's fivefold reasoning applied to, say, a basketball rolling across the floor.

Namdrol said:

No, Nāgārjuna would say something much simpler:

"Apart from a ball which has rolled and a ball which has not rolled, there no ball rolling."

CF his negation of movement.

Tom said:

Isn't it problematic to posit a rolled ball and a not rolled ball and then refute the rolling ball? They all exist in the same way, by way of conception.

What is refuted is that there is rolling in the past, rolling in the future, or rolling in the present (which is an instant).

Malcolm wrote:

The subject of the analysis in MMK is "I am going to town". "The ball is rolling" is the same sort of statment, treated the same way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

If something like this worked, it might be easier to understand Nagarjuna's fivefold reasoning applied to, say, a basketball rolling across the floor.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Nāgārjuna would say something much simpler:

"Apart from a ball which has rolled and a ball which has not rolled, there no ball rolling."

CF his negation of movement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Fatigue in high humidity climates.

Content:

Huseng said:

Question for Namdrol.

I've noticed that in high humidity climates my strength drains away and I suffer fatigue. I can't sleep enough and feel tired until at least around 10am/11am.

I don't seem to have this problem in low humidity climates like in Ladakh or Canada, or even around Bihar when I was there in February. But in summertime Japan and during the rainy season there, as well as here in Taiwan where the humidity is always high, I suffer fatigue. Getting up at 6am is a hard struggle. Though in low humidity zones this isn't an issue for me.

Any suggestions?

Malcolm wrote:

The best thing I can suggest is to try sleeping on an outside veranda with screening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Namdrol said:

How about "suffering cannot be removed with the hand..."

Sherab said:

No source of the citation was provided.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a citation produced in a thousand Tibetan texts. My example was found in a text on Madhyamaka called Moonrays penned by Rongton Shebya Kunrig.

I have tried text searches on the bka' 'gyur and bstan 'gyur to no avail. If it exists there, it does not exist in the common translation one sees in a thousand tibetan books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

look at me go! I would say we can both spit out a basic presentation of how madhyamaka works. Did Gorampa accept that the Alaya as a consciousness was non-existent like the hair on a bald man's head? If not we DO disagree there which as the original point.

Malcolm wrote:

I think the question you are asking is "Does Gorampa accept that idea that Candrakirti thinks the ālaya as a consciousness is like the hair on a bald man's head."

As I stated before, I think that Gorampa thinks that Candrakirti's view on the conventional existence or non-existence of the ālayavijñāna is more nuanced and subtle than what some other scholars are willing to allow and that he disagrees with how some other scholars present Candrakirti's refutation of the ālayavijñāna, and so on, for reasons that are complex.

I have no idea whether Gorampa is correct or incorrect because Candrakirti is not around to be questioned. My suggestion is that one should examine the Bhasya and Jayānanda's commentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

I am not discussing my own POV.

cloudburst said:

Whose POV are you discussing?

In this particular exchange, I am discussing what gorampa has to say, and because what Gorampa has to say is a little complicated about a very specific point, I was teasing out the threads so it would be easier to understand.

As far as learning Tibetan goes, it is my observation that people get led very far afield because they become attached to certain English phrases which are not very precise renditions of Sanskrit and Tibetan terms, or in the case of Khenpo Karl, rather novel attempts at accuracy which have not gained wide currency. Thus, if they learn Tibetan, they will have more ability to check a given translation in order to better understand it. I must say, that is an excellent point and I accept it and applaud you and second it. I find one of the best ways to question this is to debate it, honestly.

Malcolm wrote:

It might help you, then, to debate with someone who is more highly trained than myself, or the average run of the mill internet user. For example, let us say you defeat in debate someone who is inarticulate at expressing Tsongkhapa's view -- have you defeated

Tsongkhapa's view? No.

I really hesitate to boldly state: "This scholar is wrong, this scholar is right". The reason I continually encourage people to go back to the basic Indian texts is that, quite frankly, Tibetan scholarship on these issues extremely complex.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

Gorampa is saying that conventional things possess internal contradictions — this fact [that they possess internal contradictions] is what allows them to be refuted ultimately. He is not saying that these internal contradictions are what appear prior to analysis.

cloudburst said:

Though I fear to give you further feelings of futility and despair, I cannot agree with Gorampa. If you must think it is for sectarian reasons so be it. I think that whatever internal contradictions they appear to have are resolved at the conventional level. Contradictions may appear, but these contradictions only arise when you fail to be satisfied with valid appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

You just agreed with Gorampa. Gorampa said contradictions exist within conventionalities which do not appear until analysis. All analysis appears at the conventional level. No one is disputing that; but all analysis has one aim, at least in Madhyamaka, to discern the real state of a given event or thing, such as a self-cognizing mind or a self-illuminating lamp, and so on.

cloudburst said:

Does a lamp dispel darkness? Yup. Does an orange seed give rise to an orange tree? Yup. If you begin to analyze these conventions, they will become unstable, but if analyzed, as all the Madhyamaka masters advise, they appear and function in a thoroughly non-contradictory manner.

Malcolm wrote:

You just agreed with Gorampa.

cloudburst said:

in the MMK Nagarjuna's investigation seeks out HOW the darkness is dispelled.... does it meet with the light? But how could it, where the lamp is there is no darkness! etc. This contradiction arises as a result of the beginning of an ultimate search. Conventionally, we can say that the lamp dispels the darkness and there is a conventional reason for that. What about that reason, does it too have a reason? Yes.

and so on until the answer is I don't know why that is, but we know that in fact it is.

Malcolm wrote:

You just agreed with Gorampa. This is the sort of hastiness that has led to centuries of Tibetan trench warfare.

Namdrol said:

I am not saying that Gorampa is better than you, for on this score, indeed he is not.

you are no better than either of us low-down beings who cannot refrain from polemics. Declaim all you like but

Malcolm wrote:

I am trying to show you that such polemics carried out in the way we all have previously carried them out bring no one closer to any real understanding of anything, and in fact merely dig deeper sectarian trenches.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Yantra Yoga - 2 DVDs set

Content:

spanda said:

I addressed this question because I thought that Yantra Yoga can be learned only if I attend retreats with yantra yoga instructors. Now I can learn by myself, using these DVDs, if I have the transmission?

Also: it is possible to replace with this system of yantra, another system of tsa-lung, connected with a tummo practice from another lineage/cycle of teachings?

I can practice this system of yantra yoga with tummo from a different cycle of teachings, with the same efficiency?

Namdrol said:

Sure. why not.

spanda said:

So, we can't say in any way that a specific system of yantra (from kalachakra, or Lamdre, for example), is better than this one, for tummo practice?

Malcolm wrote:

The best system is the one you will practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Because the force of our ignorance is stronger than their power.

spanda said:

Are you serious here? This is not a joke?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am being completely serious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:30 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

spanda said:

Being a bodhisattva on the paths and stages does not mean one has knowledge of methods. It just means one has realized emptiness and is practicing the six perfections.

.

My mistake. Fully enlightened beings. Why they don't coordinate the elements of all the people in sufferings, to make them healthy, if it is possible? There are limitations for them also, here?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the force of our ignorance is stronger than their power.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Yantra Yoga - 2 DVDs set

Content:

spanda said:

I addressed this question because I thought that Yantra Yoga can be learned only if I attend retreats with yantra yoga instructors. Now I can learn by myself, using this DVDs, if I have the transmission?

Also: it is possible to replace with this system of yantra, another system of tsa-lung, connected with a tummo practice from another lineage/cycle of teachings?

I can practice this system of yantra yoga with tummo from a different cycle of teachings, with the same efficiency?

Malcolm wrote:
Sure. why not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

spanda said:

And by the limitation imposed by Namdrol (somehow logical) its' very difficult to explain how this practices work.

Malcolm wrote:

They work because we are all connected through the elements, and the elements are empty.

At the level of Dzogchen they function because of rtsal.

But there are serious limitations on what we can do for someone else.

Being a bodhisattva on the paths and stages does not mean one has knowledge of methods. It just means one has realized emptiness and is practicing the six perfections.

For example, in Tibetan Medicine we discuss the issue of karmic diseases. When someone has a karmic disease there is nothing they can do about it except accumulate merit. They can hire someone do rituals on their behalf, and this is effective because they are causing the action to take place, etc. etc.

When a community of people do a long life practice for teacher for example, as a community they are generating merit, and since the teacher belongs to that community too, also their own merit increases, etc. It is mutually reinforcing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Yantra Yoga - 2 DVDs set

Content:

spanda said:

Detailed instruction on ALL series of Yantra Yoga? If I have learned from an instructor, only the basis of Yantra Yoga (Warm Ups - The Nine Purification Breathings - Tsigjong, Lungsang, Tsadul), I can learn the rest of Yantra yoga (the five series) form this DVDs? It's to nice to be real...

Malcolm wrote:

There are two different sets -- this covers everything up through first series of yantras;

there is another CD which covers the rest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

in the Dzogchen view, the characteristics of the basis are purity (kadag, emptiness), inexhaustible and uninterrupted manifestation (lhundrup) and responsiveness/compassion (thugje). now, can there be compassion and responsiveness as an impersonal phenomena? I don't see how, since it is by definition intentional, and intentionality is a characteristic of consciousness, of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Gems are inert, so they have no intention. Whoever possesses that gem can get what they want.

Likewise, compassion has no intentionality, but since everyone possesses that basis, liberation is possible for all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Will said:

[

So intelligent design, Yes - Supreme Creator, No.

Malcolm wrote:

Design means to draw or create deliberately according to some plan -- but instead the universe arose because the blind force of the collective actions of ignorant sentient beings [from a previous universe]. So, no intelligence, no design and no creator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The universe, therefore, arose from distant cause of ignorance.

gad rgyangs said:

just as long as this is not interpreted as a mistake, or something that needs to be

"corrected"

Malcolm wrote:

It needs to be corrected so that the universe will arise as the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:41 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Sherab said:

I've also stated that vajrayana practices/customs point to the ability of giving and taking something that has been manifested.

Malcolm wrote:

For example? What practices? Customs are not Dharma. They are customs. For example is was the custom in a part of Eastern Bhutan to slaughter animals for ganapujas until Kunzang Dechen Lingpa put an end to it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:39 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Sherab said:

I've asked for quotations to show that manifested results cannot be remove from a being by another...

Malcolm wrote:

How about "suffering cannot be removed with the hand..."

This is about as clear a citation as you can get.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:37 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Namdrol said:

The idea that Buddhas can take on the karma of sentient beings is the worst sort of theistic thinking.

Sherab said:

Assertion like this without providing explanations does not help move a discussion forward to a resolution and is merely an attempt to impose a particular viewpoint. And I think no one here is really referring to the action karma or any latency but to the manifested results.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhas are free from experiencing the ripening of the result of karma [karmavipakaphala], hence it stands to reason they cannot take on the results of karma.

Birth in one of the six lokas is the manifested result of karma. Do you think Buddha can just place one in nirvana?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 7:14 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

As everyone can see

Namdrol said:

Good luck with your studies.

N

Mariusz said:

Sorry, its my english. I did not mean wordly beings but worldly beings, and worldly daily-life consensus.

Malcolm wrote:

worldly daily life consenseus = lokavyavahara = worldly convention, which is what we are discussing. So you just agreed with Gorampa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Tibetanmedicine-edu.org 3 year online course

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

Namdrol,

Is the Shang Shung Institute's online Tibetan Medicine school up and running yet? It seems that they said they'd have info by September of last year, but I still don't see anything. I'm planning on applying for the full 4-year program. Do you have any info or

advice?

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty sure that it is.

You ought to contact Dr. Phuntsog Wangmo and find out from her directly.

Best,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

As everyone can see

Malcolm wrote:

Good luck with your studies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Can someone please post some works of Nagarjuna?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Bocking's Nagarjuna in China is one of the clearest. Full MMK plus commentary closely related to Buddhapālita which clearly identifies positions.

Jnana said:

There's also Akira Saito's doctoral dissertation:

<https://digitalcollections.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/8139>, which includes an English translation of Buddhapālita's commentary and edited Tibetan text.

Malcolm wrote:

Awesome, saves me the task of completing my translation of the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan question

Content:

Jack Dawkins said:

Hi, I'm hoping someone can help on an issue of punctuation. I want to quote the first two lines - but only the first two lines - of the following:

འཁོར་བ་ཐུ་ངན་འདས་པ་ལས།
ཁྱད་པར་ཅུང་ཟད་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན།
ཐུ་ངན་འདས་པ་འཁོར་བ་ལས།
ཁྱད་པར་ཅུང་ཟད་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན།

Can anyone tell me which punctuation marks I should include? If the first two lines are put on a single line (i.e.):

འཁོར་བ་ཐུ་ངན་འདས་པ་ལས།ཁྱད་པར་ཅུང་ཟད་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན།

Do I need to delete one or both of the shads in the middle? Also, do the shads at the beginning and end remain the same?

The text is of course from MMK 25.19

Many thanks,

JD

Malcolm wrote:

It has to look like this:

འཁོར་བ་ཐུ་ངན་འདས་པ་ལས། ཁྱད་པར་ཅུང་ཟད་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན།

You need more space between final shad and the beginning shad.

But if you did it in Sanskrit it would be just one long string i.e. two verses of Tibetan generally = one verse of Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that Buddhas can take on the karma of sentient beings is the worst sort of theistic thinking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Will said:

Buddha defined karma as intentional or purposive (cetana) action; thus action/karma requires a being or beings. So the universe arises from beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the universe arises from the actions of beings in it. Actions are motivated by afflictions. Afflictions arose from knowledge obscuration of ignorance. The universe, therefore, arose from distant cause of ignorance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

You no longer wish to debate but for some reason you do while complaining about it.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not debating. I have no position to lose, or point to score. I am not discussing my own POV.

My purpose was to respond to Mariusz who produced a citation in which it can be easily shown that the ninth Karmapa, following the eighth, is engaging in the kind of straw man polemics Tibetan scholars are so famous for. Gorampa does it, Tsongkhapa does it [though he, like Rongton, is quite moderate in his production of strawmen], they all do it.

By immediately responding that Gorampa was wrong on this or that point, all you immediately do, if indeed you think he was an arya, is accumulate the negative merit of criticizing aryas.

I am attempting to encourage people to take a more constructive approach: instead of saying, as I have many times in the past, "Tsongkhapa was wrong to say that we may leave off the second two alternatives of the four extremes because they are double negatives", it is better to think long and hard why he might give such an opinion. Rather than immediately assume that Gorampa is wrong in asserting that Candrakirti accepts things like svasamvedana conventionally, it is better to ask yourself why he might assert that. These great scholars almost always have very solid reasons for saying what they do about this and that thing, and the thing is, we have to really question ourselves if we think something they said is wrong. That is my point.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

To say that Tibetans invented them is misleading.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not at all misleading. There were no separate schools of Madhyamaka in India [unless you count Yogacaras as Madhyamaka, and they certainly thought of themselves in this way.]

There was a difference in opinion among different Madhyamaka scholars about how best to use reasoning to refute opponents and that is the extent of it. The whole controversy hinged solely on Bhavaviveka's criticism of Buddhapalita for not using a fully formed syllogism to refute self-production; with Candrakirti coming to Buddhapalita's defense. End of story.

The development of a "Prasangika" school occurred at Sangphu because Phyapa and his students were hostile to Chandrakirti's texts when they were introduced by Batsap. Thus, the division between Prasangika and Svatantrika is wholly a Tibetan invention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

Gorampa is making a mistake here.

In the MMK Nagarjuna is refuting inherent production, and it is in this context that he brings in the example of the lamp. All his consequences are designed to show that nothing is inherently produced.

Because lamps do dispel darkness conventionally, there are no contradictions conventionally. The contradictions arise when the analysis probes under the convention, and this is the beginning of analysis for the ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

If there were no contradictions, then these things could not be rejected ultimately. It is because these conventional entities do possess internal contradictions that they cannot bear ultimate analysis.

cloudburst said:

Chandrakirti clearly refutes the existence of the alaya even conventionally in the avatara and it's bhasya.

Malcolm wrote:

That is indeed what some people think. Other people think Candrakirti's view is more nuanced than that. Candrakirti, in citing the Lanka in the Bhasya, clearly states that ālayavijñāna is a synonym for emptiness, thus laying the ground for ālayavijñāna to be accepted conventionally.

cloudburst said:

Shantideva refutes self-cognition even conventionally in Bodhicharyavatara etc so Gorampa's defense of these is not based on good scholarship.

Malcolm wrote:

Santideva is rejecting a truly established mind and the argument of reflexive cognition that cittamatrins introduce to defend it. That is the context of Santideva's argument, and that is all.

cloudburst said:

Gorampa makes an error here as well:

"Someone's position that after one understands the passages which reject a reflexive cognition that is able to bear analysis have been understood from the MMK, the Vighrahavyavartani and the Prasannapāda, one should apply them to a rejection of reflexive cognition conventionally is erroneous. [It is erroneous] because just as in the MMK a lamp illuminating itself is rejected having refuted the given example for reflexive cognition, a lamp, through analysis, since also removal of darkness [by a lamp] also rejected [in the MMK], the consequence would be that even conventionally [a lamp's ability] to remove darkness would not be acceptable.

the example of a lamp illuminating itself and others in MMK is used to show that there is no ultimate production. As for this, there is production conventionally, but not ultimately, just as a lamp does not illuminate itself or others ultimately. Conventionally, it does illuminate other, but is not self-illuminating.

Malcolm wrote:

So some would have it.

cloudburst said:

If we follow the position Gorampa puts forward, then even though things are contradictory conventionally, we should still accept them. This gives disastrous consequences. Without the ability to refute something conventionally as a result of internal contradictions in the position, we have no power to refute anything.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you are not understanding Gorampa's point [which is why I find this whole exercise to be one of utter futility since you seem only interested in rejecting rather than understanding]. Gorampa is saying that conventional things possess internal contradictions — this fact [that they possess internal contradictions] is what allows them to be refuted ultimately. He is not saying that these internal contradictions are

what appear prior to analysis. Thus your statement is the kind of unthinking fault-finding that I find troublesome in these conversations to begin with and why I no longer wish to participate in these kinds of discussions.

You do not read Gorampa openly. You read him polemically. I.e. for every statement advanced, a fault is found, for every fault that is found, a counter fault is found, and it just goes on and on. It seems impossible that people are capable of enjoying the subtlety of Tsongkhapa, Gorampa, and so on because they are so caught up in their political parties.

I am not saying that Gorampa is better than you, for on this score, indeed he is not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

mint said:

Design explains all the most important aspects of existence: truth, goodness, freedom, justice, beauty, love, the order of the universe, the origin of life, the progressive development and existence of rational, autonomous, moral beings who have the capacity for unselfish love and the right to life, freedom and self-determination.

Scientific evidence for design consists of:

1. The laws of nature which are necessary for life and a rational existence.
2. The directiveness of living organisms.
3. The progressive nature of development.
4. The information system contained in the DNA code.
5. The survival of life despite overwhelming odds.
6. The development of the most complex phenomenon in the universe: the human brain.
7. The existence of rational, autonomous, moral and responsible beings with a capacity for unselfish love.

What are your views?

Malcolm wrote:

"The variety of the world arises from karma."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

kirtu said:

The suttas referenced wrt merit transfer for dead relatives are the Sigaloavada Sutta, Tirokudda Kanda Sutta, and the Janussonin Sutta.

Malcolm wrote:

Sigaloavada Sutta has alms offered on behalf of the dead -- which is clearly a pre-Buddhist custom such as that mentioned in the first part of the Mahāparinibbana.

Tirokudda Kanda Sutta: has clean good and drink offered to pretas, but the merit accrued is one's own.

Janussonin Sutta: <http://online-dhamma.net/nanda/AccessToInsight/html/tipitaka/an/an10/an10.177.than.html> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

This sutra says that gifts made to one's ancestors who have been reborn as hell beings, animals, gods or human cannot be enjoyed by them. However, gifts made to hungry ghosts can be enjoyed by them. In all cases the donor enjoys the merit of the gift.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

If we look at the controversies between great masters or schools in this way, they can be helpful as models to gauge and refine our personal insights.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I don't agree with this. Controversies merely breed more controversy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

If there were anything to be observed

Through direct perception and the other instances [of valid cognition],

It would be something to be established or rejected.

However, since no such thing exists, I cannot be criticized. [/i]

Malcolm wrote:

The point that Goramapa is making is that this is rejection of authority ultimately, not conventionally. The purpose of the Vighavyavartani is to reject svabhāva and the notion that there are inherently authoritative cognitions.

Nagarjuna is not rejecting conventional inference [anumāṇa] and direct perception [pratyakṣa] -- he is rejecting the notion that authorities [pramāṇa] and objects of authority [prameya] are inherently authoritative. He is also rejecting the argument in this text that since emptiness is not an object, it cannot lead to valid knowledge, since valid knowledge must come from truly valid direct perceptions and inferences based on objects of knowledge that truly exist.

Nagārjuna, Buddhapalita, Candrakīrti, as well as Śāntideva all use instances of conventional direct perception and inference in their writing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

However, these do not contradict the possibility the analysis for one's own help will lead to the collapse until realization? The analysis is not meaningless. As for Mahamudra or Dzogchen it can be also the support.

Malcolm wrote:

I told you in the very beginning that Karmapa was misrepresenting Gorampa's position.

I guess you have not understood what I was trying to say -- so please try to listen. If you are going to follow what some Tibetan says, fine. Pick one scholar. Follow their point of view. Unless you are prepared or capable of reading the scholars with which they choose to disagree, please do not jump on Team Goramapa, Team Tsongkhapa, Team Karmapa or Team Mipham. I have made that mistake in the past. I now clearly recognize that it is an error to jump on the bandwagon of Post-Indian Madhyamaka developments. It is one thing to try to understand the intellectual history of Tibetan Madhyamaka -- that can be interesting for some people. It is quite another to jump on the bandwagon of this or that school -- then this just becomes scholastic politics.

As far as Mahamudra and Dzogchen go, Madhyamaka is not absolutely required at all. While Madhyamaka can be a support, more often than not it turns into a meaningless intellectual game of proof and rebuttal, accepting and rejecting — leading to outlandish thread titles like the one that heads this thread.

What is meaningless is the endless games of dialectics [in which I have also played]

where each school and scholar triumphantly asserts that only they have the real key to Nagarjauna's intention. It is total nonsense.

What we do not need to transmitted to the West is the scholastic environment of competitive sectarianism. This helps not one's practice at all. When we see clear misrepresentations of one scholar's point of view by another, as we have in this thread, how can we trust any of it?

Without understanding the political background of anxiety of Kagyu and Sakya about the burgeoning success of the Gelug tradition, how can we fairly assess the criticisms of Tsongkhapa by Rongton, Gorampa, Shakya Chogden, and so on? Without understanding the relationship between Shakya Chogden and his Karma Kagyu patrons, how can we understand his seeming championship of the gzhan stong position? Without understanding the relationship between Rendawa Zhonnu Lodo and his very critical assessment of various schools and trends during his day, how can we understand the writing of his main disciple, Tsongkhapa? Without understanding the hostile reception Candrakirti's works met at Sangphu when they were initially translated by Batsab with Jayananda, how can we really understand the Tibetan invention of Prasangika and Svatantrika? All of these things must be understood by any responsible scholar of Tibetan Madhyamaka. And even more basic, the conditions that produced Indian Madhyamaka were quite different than the conditions that produced Tibetan Madhyamaka. Tibetans introduced all kinds of issues in their prosecution of Madhyamaka that would have never occurred to Indians. You have Tibetans arguing over points that to Indians would seem utterly irrelevant. I personally think Candrakirti would have been appalled at all the divisions and sub-divisions of Madhyamaka in which the Tibetans sincerely and earnestly engaged.

So please be more careful in future. And honestly, learn Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Merit is not shared in a real sense, but by sharing your merit you create much more for yourself.

xabir said:

So the story in the sutras about mogallana saving his mother in hell by dedicating merits have no basis in dharma at all?

Also, "according to the Sutra of The Great Vows of Ksitigarbha Bodhisattva, one can "transfer" 1/7 merit of an act they have performed to a deceased loved one"... You think this is not true?

Malcolm wrote:

If the transfer of merit could rescue beings from samsara, then considering that no one has greater merit than a Buddha, and no greater generosity, why have we not all been liberated?

In any event, I think the Ksitigarbha sutra is 100% Chinese apocrypha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Mariusz:

Let's examine what you initially introduced:

There are some, such as Gorampa and Shākya Chokden, who say that this verse [verse 6.75 of the Entrance] proves that Chandrakirti holds, from his own perspective, that self-awareness exists conventionally.

What does Gorampa actually say?

He says, quote "This master [Candrakirti] explains the all-basis, the afflicted mind, reflexive cognition and so on from authoritative citations. Even though no distinction of whether they are true or not is made, the internal contradictions of conventions are accepted conventionally, but the refutation of those upon analysis is maintained from the perspective of the ultimate."

He continues:

"Someone's position that after one understands the passages which reject a reflexive cognition that is able to bear analysis have been understood from the MMK, the Vigrahavyavartani and the Prasannapāda, one should apply them to a rejection of reflexive cognition conventionally is erroneous. [It is erroneous] because just as in the MMK a lamp illuminating itself is rejected having refuted the given example for reflexive cognition, a lamp, through analysis, since also removal of darkness [by a lamp] also rejected [in the MMK], the consequence would be that even conventionally [a lamp's ability] to remove darkness would not be acceptable. [It is erroneous] because when, in the Vigrahavyavartani, the self-evidential validity of that authoritative cognition is rejected, since validity through another is also rejected, the consequence would be that there can never be an authoritatively cognizing subject even conventionally. [Finally, it is erroneous] because when the Prasannapād cites sutras that state that a mind which experiences cognition without reflexive cognition cannot be found, the consequence would be that even the experiencing mind itself would not exist conventionally."

So you see, that passage is not about whether reflexive cognitions exist. The passage is

concerned with how Candrakirti treats citations concerning conventionality.

In this case, what is being affirmed is not reflexive cognition. What is being rejected is the Gelug over-negation of reflexive cognition through showing contradictions implicit in rejecting reflexive awareness, as well as other conventions, conventionally.

If this passage and its reasoning is not clear for you, I can explain it further. But it not a passage stating that reflexive cognition exists conventionally, it is a passage stating that reflexive cognition is to be accepted conventionally [i.e. without analysis], even if that convention contains many internal contradictions, which Gorampa admits that it does right up front. However, conventionally, those internal contradictions are not subject to analysis; just in the same way as when we turn on a light, we say "Turn on the light" in order to remove darkness, even though when analyzed, a light capable of removing darkness can never be found.

In other words, for Gorampa there is no doubt that these things like ālaya-vijñāna, the afflicted mind, and so on cannot bear analysis -- but as conventions we leave them alone with all their myriad internal contradictions just as we leave the convention that lamps remove the darkness of rooms alone.

For this reason, it is little irresponsible merely to just throw out soundbites of positions. I am sure that Gorampa's critique of Tsongkhapa's position [though I have not read it] on this issue also has problems, or that he selectively misreads Tsongkhapa's point of view and so on.

So just compare what Gorampa says here to the Jayananda citation I produced above. And for Buddha's sake man, at least learn Tibetan. I don't have time to do this in general!

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

Since meditation in Vajrayāna systems is based on an example wisdom gained during the introduction of the third and fourth empowerments, Gorampa points out in a treatise refuting some on Tsongkhapa's interpretations of the Guhyasamaja sadhana that it does matter very much what your intellectual view might be; whether cittamatra or madhyamaka, since your meditation is not based on an intellectual analysis, but rather a path wisdom derived from the introduction of third and fourth empowerment.

kirtu said:

Shouldn't this read:

that it does not matter very much what your intellectual view might be

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you for catching that typo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

dakini_boi said:

What about the case of a Buddha liberating demons? While not exactly taking on their karma, if a Buddha can actually liberate them, then their karma is completely dismantled.

Malcolm wrote:

This is entirely symbolic -- demons arise because of your affliction and karma. When you have eliminated your own affliction and karma, then demons become gods.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Is negative karma cannot be taken, how can merit then be giving and shared?

Malcolm wrote:

Merit is not shared in a real sense, but by sharing your merit you create much more for yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

One becomes a rudra much more rapidly than other practices. It is a dangerous practice for one's ego.

The guardians of Drollo are the worldly eight classes, in general.

There is nothing more wrathful in any school.

Jikan said:

would such or similar dangers inhere also in practices that invoke Dorje Drollo, such as Trungpa's _Sadhana of Mahamudra_? (as opposed to a practice in which one takes the

same as a yidam)

Malcolm wrote:

The sadhana of mahamudra is a yidam practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

One becomes a rudra much more rapidly than other practices. It is a dangerous practice for one's ego.

The guardians of Drollo are the worldly eight classes, in general.

There is nothing more wrathful in any school.

AilurusFulgens said:

Thank you for the reply, Namdrol. Just one last question in this respect: are termas the exclusive source for all existant Dorje Drollo sadhanas or are there also other sources - like for instance tantras transmitted directly by Guru Rinpoche and coming down through various unbroken lineages i.e. sources, which are NOT termas?

Malcolm wrote:

Termas are the exclusive source.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

spanda said:

Could someone explain me, what exactly Milarepa did? Was Milarepa capable (if he wanted) to take someones else's suffering? If yes, this mean that he could "take"/reduce someone else karma?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a story in a Tibetan novel. Pure fiction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is a little complicated. But the long and short of it is that it is the most wrathful practice there is. If your view is very stable, then there is no problem, but if not. Drollos name is "krodha lokottara" i.e. "transcendent wrath" -- gro wo lod is a corruption of that.

AilurusFulgens said:

If you can talk about this in an open forum, may I then ask what exactly are the negative side-effects of the Dorje Drollo practice specifically i.e. in case something goes wrong?

What exactly would be the benefits if you do everything correctly? What precisely does the Dorje Drollo practice do - aside from the very general statement that it clears the obstacles?

Is the Dorje Drollo the most wrathful practice in all of Vajrayana or is this just valid for the Nyingma school?

A. Fulgens

Malcolm wrote:

One becomes a rudra much more rapidly than other practices. It is a dangerous practice for one's ego.

The guardians of Drollo are the worldly eight classes, in general.

There is nothing more wrathful in any school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you want to know Candrakirti's own point of view on this passage in the Madhyamaka - avatara from his autocommentary, however, well, here it is:

gang phyir gang gis yul myong 'gyur de las/ /dran pa 'di gzhan nga la yod min pa/ /de phyir nga yis mthong snyam dran 'gyur te/ /'di yang 'jig rten tha snyad tshul lugs yin/ /gang gis yul myong ba de yul nyams su myong ba'i shes pa de las dran pa'i shes pa gzhan nyid du ji ltar med pa de ltar na sngar bshad zin to/ /gang gi phyir dran pa gzhan nyid yod pa ma yin pa de'i phyir/ gang nyams su myong bas myong ba de dran pa'i shes pas myong ba ma yin pa ma yin pas dran pa yul dang ldan par 'byung la/ nyams su myong ba'i shes pas yongs su gcod pa gang yin pa de dran pas yongs su ma bcad pa ma yin pas bdag gis mthong ngo zhes bya bar 'gyur ro/ /'di yang 'jig rten tshul lugs yin gyi shin tu dpyad par

bya ba ni ma yin te/ brdzun pa'i don can nyid kyis 'jig rten gyi tha snyad yin pa'i phyir ro/

Mariusz said:

Ok. Give me a minute. I will translate it in google translator

Malcolm wrote:

Here is Jayanada's sub-commentary on this passage:

brjod par bya ste zhes bya ba la sogs pa gsungs te gang gis yul myong 'gyur zhes bya ba ni sngon po'i shes pa gang gis yul nyams su myong bar 'gyur ba'o/ /'di las dran pa 'di gzhan nga la yod min pa/ /zhes bya ba ni yul shes pa de la dran pa'i shes pa gzhan ma yin pa'o/ /de'i phyir nga yis mthong snyam dran 'gyur te/ /zhes bya ba ni gang gi phyir nyams su myong ba'i dran pa las dran pa'i shes pa gzhan nyid ma yin pa de'i tshe gang nyams su myong ba'i shes pas gang nyams su myong ba de nyid dran pa'i shes pas kyang nyams su myong ba yin pas ngas mthong snyam du dran par 'gyur ba'o/ /gal te shes pa rnams skad cig ma yin pa dang rang rig med pas ngas mthong ngo snyam du ji ltar dran zhe na/ de la lan ni/ 'di yang 'jig rten tha snyad tshul lugs yin/ /zhes bya ba gsungs te/ 'jig rten pa'i tha snyad brtag dpyad kyi go skabs med pas na 'jig rten na ci ltar yod pa de ltar khas blang bar bya dgos pas so; /des na 'jig rten pas rang rig med du zin kyang mthong ngo snyam pa'i tha snyad byed pas/ nyams su myong ba'i shes pa dag gcig tu zhen pa yin pas skyon yod pa ma yin no zhes pa'o/

Here is the salient point of the passage, to make of what you will:

/gal te shes pa rnams skad cig ma yin pa dang rang rig med pas ngas mthong ngo snyam du ji ltar dran zhe na/ de la lan ni/ 'di yang 'jig rten tha snyad tshul lugs yin/ /zhes bya ba gsungs te/ 'jig rten pa'i tha snyad brtag dpyad kyi go skabs med pas na 'jig rten na ci ltar yod pa de ltar khas blang bar bya dgos pas so; /des na 'jig rten pas rang rig med du zin kyang mthong ngo snyam pa'i tha snyad byed pas/ nyams su myong ba'i shes pa dag gcig tu zhen pa yin pas skyon yod pa ma yin no zhes pa'o/

"If it is asked, 'how is can there be a memory such as in the thought "It was seen by me" if cognitions are momentary but there is no reflexive cognition [rang rig, svasamvedana]?"

The reply to that is: 'This also is the standard of worldly convention.'

Since there is no opportunity to analyze the conventions of the worldly, however it seems in the world, it is necessary to accept it as such. Therefore, as the worldly also maintain there is no reflexive cognition [rang rig, svasamvedana], since the convention of the thought "it was seen" was generated, there is clinging to the cognitions of the experience [nyams su myong ba' shes pa dag] as being the same, thus there is no fault." Therefore we can infer from this that since Candrakirti rejects reflexive cognitions based on world convention, in order to be consistent he must accept outer objects since those too are accepted based on worldly convention.

Tibetans may now argue amongst themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

The Madhyamikas debate is always beneficial and healthy.

Malcolm wrote:

It might be if you were really talking about what Candrakirti and Nagarjuna said, but you are not -- you are arguing about what Tibetans say about categories of Madhyamaka invented wholly by Tibetans.

Mariusz said:

Can I ask personal question to Namdrol? Why did you not protest when questions to Tsongkhapa, but protest when questions to Gorampa?

Malcolm wrote:

You have forgotten that I spent several weeks defending Tsongkhapa from what I considered to erroneous criticisms of his view on e-Sangha.

You have also forgotten that when someone opined that one could not realize the meaning of Dzogchen if they held Tsongkhapa's point of view about "Prasangika" [Prasangika being a Tibetan invention, a term coined at Sangphu by Batsab Nyima Drag in the 12th century] I swiftly reminded them that both Jigme Lingpa and Shabkar upheld Tsongkhapa's interpretation of Prasangika.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

Very excuse me. Madhyamaka is not meaningless.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say Madhyamaka was meaningless, I said that worrying about Tibetan scholastic nit picking this or that point was meaningless.

If that is really what you want to spend your life doing, then the only fair way to do it is to select the scholars from all four schools: present what each and everyone of them says about each passage in the Madhyamaka avatara for example with their refutations of each other's POV and leave it like that.

Otherwise, this cherry picking just leads to confusion and a very incomplete understanding and causes people to criticize amazing scholars we could not even withstand for five seconds in debate.

I am quite sure that if you read Tsongkhapa with a open mind, at the end of the day, you will be completely sure he is correct and perfect.

But then, I am quite sure that if you read Gorampa with a open mind, at the end of the day, you will be completely sure he is correct and perfect.

Then, I am quite sure that if you read Dolbupa with a open mind, at the end of the day, you will be completely sure he is correct and perfect.

Next, I am quite sure that if you read Mipham with a open mind, at the end of the day, you will be completely sure he is correct and perfect.

And it just goes on and on.

Why? Because there is no end to intellectual analysis.

If you want to know Candrakirti's own point of view on this passage in the Madhyamaka - avatara from his autocommentary, however, well, here it is:

gang phyir gang gis yul myong 'gyur de las/ /dran pa 'di gzhan nga la yod min pa/ /de phyir nga yis mthong snyam dran 'gyur te/ /'di yang 'jig rten tha snyad tshul lugs yin/ /gang gis yul myong ba de yul nyams su myong ba'i shes pa de las dran pa'i shes pa gzhan nyid du ji ltar med pa de ltar na sngar bshad zin to/ /gang gi phyir dran pa gzhan nyid yod pa ma yin pa de'i phyir/ gang nyams su myong bas myong ba de dran pa'i shes pas myong ba ma yin pa ma yin pas dran pa yul dang ldan par 'byung la/ nyams su myong ba'i shes pas yongs su gcod pa gang yin pa de dran pas yongs su ma bcad pa ma yin pas bdag gis mthong ngo zhes bya bar 'gyur ro/ /'di yang 'jig rten tshul lugs yin gyi shin tu dpyad par bya ba ni ma yin te/ brdzun pa'i don can nyid kyis 'jig rten gyi tha snyad yin pa'i phyir ro/

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Pero said:

I really doubt this. Anyone else heard the same elsewhere?

Namdrol said:

Yup.

Drollo practice can cause lots of obstacles.

Pero said:

Wow... But why is that? I thought Drollo was for clearing obstacles.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a little complicated. But the long and short of it is that it is the most wrathful practice there is. If your view is very stable, then there is no problem, but if not. Drollo's name is "krodha lokottara" i.e. "transcendent wrath" -- gro wo lod is a corruption of that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Birth, Life and Death with Dr. Malcolm Smith

Content:

Mr. G said:

Namdrol,

Will this be offered in MP3 format for purchase at a later date for those that can't make it in person?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no idea -- that is a question for SSI.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Misdeeds cannot be washed away with water,
the suffering of living beings cannot be removed with the hand,
my realization cannot be transferred to another,
but by showing the true nature of things, there will be liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

Spiny Norman said:

Good stuff, but I'm not sure about describing it as the "unity" of awareness and emptiness. Isn't it just awareness of emptiness?

Spiny

pensum said:

As you are not sure Spiny I strongly recommend you visit a lama...

Malcolm wrote:

He did that, decided Vipassana was more suited to his nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

The term "self-liberation" is nothing new. For example is also in Dzogchen where "cutting through until primordial purity", or "the all is the play of Mahamudra" from the tradition IX Karmapa is.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference of course is introduction. There is no introduction in sutra, hence, no introduction for Madhyamaka.

Madhyamaka is not equivalent with Dzogchen and Mahamudra. As both Longchen pa and Jigme Lingpa points out, while the intellectual structure of the view of Prasanga and Dzogchen are identical i.e. free from all extremes, the former is based on an intellectual analysis whereas the latter is based on a personal experience.

In Dzogchen and Mahamudra meditation is based on an example wisdom. This is not the case with Madhyamaka.

Since meditation in Vajrayāna systems is based on an example wisdom gained during the introduction of the third and fourth empowerments, Gorampa points out in a treatise refuting some on Tsongkhapa's interpretations of the Guhyasamaja sadhana that it does matter very much what your intellectual view might be; whether cittamatra or madhyamaka, since your meditation is not based on an intellectual analysis, but rather a path wisdom derived from the introduction of third and fourth empowerment.

Therefore, I feel personally that all of this scholastic nit picking about Tibetan scholar's disagreements about what they think Indian scholars think is pretty much just an empty diversion. Hence the reason I lack patience with it, and am not very interested in defending Gorampa or criticizing Dolbupa, or Tsongkhapa, etc. I simply think that it is a waste of time.

If people want to spend their time reading books about Madhyamaka, I have no problem with that, but silly thread titles like "Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa" for me are meaningless. Honestly, who cares? (well obviously mariusz does). Also Gendun Chopel faults Gorampa for this and that point -- and there is no doubt the eighth Karmapa can be faulted for this and that point. It is all just meaningless dancing on books to me, something scholars do when they have a bit of free time for fun. The

whole history of Tibetan Buddhist scholastics is scholars faulting each other for this and that point.

That is why I recommend going back to the basics: If you want read Madhyamaka, read the originals. If you have to learn Tibetan or Sanskrit to do so, great. But honestly, all this "Tsongkhapa is wrong!" "Gorampa is wrong!" "Karmapa is wrong!" Dolbupa is wrong" is really nonsensical and just perpetuates a sectarian intellectual culture that we should leave behind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Pero said:

I really doubt this. Anyone else heard the same elsewhere?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Drollo practice can cause lots of obstacles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Namdrol said:

...This is simply a fact.

gregkavarnos said:

Yup! And Department of Justice statistics verify this fact. But certainly there are other factors involved. For example, did you know though that "During the offense that brought them to prison, 15% of State inmates and 13% of Federal inmates carried a handgun, and about 2%, a military-style semiautomatic gun." So basically "only" 17% of convicted crimes were carried out using a firearm anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

Which puts to rest the notion that the US is a society filled with gun violence. It isn't.

gregkavarnos said:

Another factor may also be that underprivileged adolescent males (ie those most likely to commit violent crimes) have been shipped off (with fantastic economic incentives) to

kill and die in foreign lands (Iraq and Afghanistan) instead of in their own country since the mid-nineties?

Malcolm wrote:

No, only since 2003. The number of military personnel in the US was cut by a third under Clinton.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 10:27 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sherab:

Mind can never transcend itself. This is why intellectualism is useless.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The strange thing? In my fifteen years on the island there has not been a single reported instance of somebody shooting somebody dead using assault rifles. Not one. Actually, shooting deaths on the island are normally by shotgun and very rare. On the island of Crete, where they have a handgun culture that rivals even the US, people get shot and killed all the time. In Athens, again, mainly handguns and normally during robberies.

Malcolm wrote:

Though I am not a gun owner, and do not support the wide proliferation of firearms, however there is a very interesting fact about America: since the early 1990's, the number of guns of all kinds have proliferated enormously in the US, but the incidence of all crimes, including violent crimes of with guns, has steadily declined.

This is simply a fact.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

The suffering of chasing mirages never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

The suffering of accepting and rejecting never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

Sherab said:

I can agree with these.

Namdrol said:

..likewise, the suffering of intellectual pursuits never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

..likewise, the suffering of proof and rebuttal never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

Sherab said:

I have a problem with these. Why? I cannot leave contradictions and paradoxes unresolved as they eat away at my faith/belief in the Dhamma/Dharma and disturb my mental peace. That's just me I guess.

Malcolm wrote:

intellectual pursuits are like mirages, always promising satiation and just creating more doubt.

Proof and rebuttal is merely intellectual accepting and rejecting.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Sherab said:

However, all these anecdotes do not square with what I was taught about karma .. that it cannot be taken away by someone else. But I think the suttas and sutras are silent about this. So what I've stated in my previous post is my way of resolving the impasse.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not silent about it. The sutras reject this idea explicitly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

spanda said:

...Therefore I wonder, is really impossible to take someone else karma, or it is possible in exceptional cases?

Sherab said:

My speculation:

Enlightened beings can take away the karma that you have already created but they cannot stop you from creating new karma. Without the stopping of creation of new karma, taking away karma already created is ultimately an exercise in futility.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite impossible, from a Buddhist pov.

However, in Hinduism, Jivanmuktis are considered able to accomplish this feat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Art and Initiations Question

Content:

Mr. G said:

I'm thinking of having a thangka commissioned to be done by a trained Tibetan Buddhist artist. This is a gift for a teacher later this year.

My question is, does the artist need to have already received initiation on the Yidam in order to paint it? I think the Yidam may be quite rare, so I'm curious.

Also, if anyone could give recommendations, that would be great. I was thinking of the following:

<http://www.tibetanpaintings.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://www.tashimannox.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Namdrol said:

Segei Noskov is quite excellent and fast, but he works with acrylics.

The tibetan painting people do quite excellent work, but they take three years.

Mr. G said:

Thanks Namdrol, I found his site:

<http://sergey-noskov.artistwebsites.com/index.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Do you think a thangka could be completed in a couple of months? I was hoping before June.

Also, the Yidam I want done is from a terma. Does one need initiation in the Yidam before painting?

Malcolm wrote:
not necessarily

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Art and Initiations Question

Content:

Mr. G said:

I'm thinking of having a thangka commissioned to be done by a trained Tibetan Buddhist artist. This is a gift for a teacher later this year.

My question is, does the artist need to have already received initiation on the Yidam in order to paint it? I think the Yidam may be quite rare, so I'm curious.

Also, if anyone could give recommendations, that would be great. I was thinking of the following:

<http://www.tibetanpaintings.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://www.tashimannox.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Segei Noskov is quite excellent and fast, but he works with acrylics.

The tibetan painting people do quite excellent work, but they take three years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

dakini_boi said:

At the end of the retreat this morning, Rinpoche mentioned there would be a Dorje Drolo retreat soon. He said it wouldn't be open, but would be on webcast - does that mean that DC members will be able to attend through webcast? Anyone have any more info on when it will be? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, that means if you are a member of the DC you can log in to the webcast page using you pre-assigned user name and password.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

conebeckham said:

The imputation of existence, as well as the bifurcation into subject/object dichotomy, are both cognitive errors.

PadmaVonSamba said:

YEAH!

Paul said:

That reminds me of a thread that Namdrol once started in E-Sangha that started off a real atom of posts - the original post being something very terse like "Reality is a cognitive error". People went a bit crazy - it was very amusing.

Malcolm wrote:

"Sentient beings are nothing more than cognitive errors".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

wayland said:

Some pretty profound vids on YouTube by Bentinho Massaro.

I'm unsure what to make of them. Would you say that he is abiding in rigpa?

Is this a direct introduction to mind?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C6-J5BjWb9I> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tij5PtEtHvU&feature=related> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OaWfcrA6ByY&feature=related> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Not profound.

Not rigpa.
No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 11:21 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
Unknown said:
it is when you throw "existence/reality"

Malcolm wrote:
You need to examine your attachment to the imputation you label "reality". That is the rabbit horn to which you are attached.

But part of the problem is that what you think is real is the external whole. You are happy to accept that your mental functioning creates an illusory identity, but you seem to think inert things like lettuce to be more real than your mind. Minds and lettuce however are of a piece, they are both depend phenomena and therefore, amount to no more than passing illusions.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 4:13 AM
Title: Re: China party official warns members over religion
Content:
Beatzen said:
Marx was good at describing the structure of the cage, but in the end he offered no alternative to industrial capitalism. :p

Malcolm wrote:
Right, he thought the cage was progressive.

His nineteenth scientism is quaint and charming, but utterly irrelevant.

I much prefer Naess.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 3:00 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?
Content:

gregkavarnos said:

And what of the gun nut poster? It is not extreme, right? It's a balanced, moderate and objective view, right?

Namdrol said:

Not a shining example of moderation either.

David N. Snyder said:

Huh? Not sure what that is supposed to mean?

Good moderation is to allow all sides to have their say. I haven't moderated or censored anyone's posts here in this thread or others, including the ad hom and emotional ones against me or others.

Malcolm wrote:

Not that moderation. More in the line of "everything in moderation".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

I have a simple explanation for shared reality, you do not.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I do: functionality.

BTW, you seem to think I am trying to convince you Madhyamaka is correct -- I am not -- I am trying to help you understand what Madhyamaka is actually pointing out. Madhyamaka is not necessarily the appropriate POV for all practitioners.

Namdrol said:

So whatever clinging we have to any impermanent collection whether internal or external in terms of identity is certain to lead to suffering. This is the point of Madhyamaka i.e. to demonstrate that the belief that attributions of identity onto impermanent collections are anything more than mere conventions is a delusion. We agree on the internal part, we agree Madhyamaka extends this idea to external stuff, we've (hopefully) seen that I don't accept the latter, the meaning of "clinging to salt" is dubious and bears little relationship to "clinging to self" which, as you point out elsewhere, was Nagarjuna's main target in the first place.

Malcolm wrote:

The point was clinging to identity (atman). Atman, as you know, means self, it also means "essence" in Sanskrit, and it's synonym of svabhāva. This will be addressed below.

Namdrol said:

Of course these conventions work, but they are no more real than the habit of the "I" we attribute to our personal collection of aggregates. The habit of "I" certainly works, but that "I" is not real. The imputation of salt onto a given collection we have chosen to call salt "works" but the "salt" can't be found apart from the imputation we make onto that collection so we can use it effectively.

This flattening of external into internal just doesn't work for me, Namdrol. It looks elegant on the surface but loses too much "reality". And I have a strong suspicion that you and I have just about the same "salt experience."

Malcolm wrote:

Of course we do. Conventional truth is called "conventional" (vyavahāra) because it is based on empirically observed functionality shared by common people's ordinary healthy sense perception. What Madhyamaka rejects is that there is an salt atman or svabhāva, and further observes that claims for the existence of salt, or anything else for that matter, quickly become entangled with identity propositions.

Namdrol said:

Madhyamaka as a whole is an exercise in trying to introduce people to the real meaning of dependent origination i.e. the emptiness of persons and phenomena based in the Buddha's observation that statements about existence and non-existence were at odds with the real meaning of dependent origination.

Since there are no permanent phenomena, claims for the existence and non-existence of phenomena are completely naive on anything other than a conventional level.

"Permanent phenomena" is a straw man imho, a nonexistent used to assert something about existence. Impermanence is measurable, quantifiable, rocks persist longer than thoughts, let's not throw out the baby with the bath.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and for this reason, in the Majjhima Nikāya, the Buddha quips that if one must choose a self between the body and the mind, it is better to choose the body since it at least lasts for up to 80 years, whereas a thought lasts mere milliseconds.

But permanent phenomena is not such a straw man, since we see in physics a trend to try and prove "self-origination" through the big bang theory and so on.

Namdrol said:

So you can keep insisting that salt harms snails as much as you like. Since you are making a conventional statement you are not going to get any complaint from me, but if you assert that there is saltiness in salt, for example, you have only two courses -- mire yourself in the myriad contradictions of asserting that there is an essence of salt or simply accede the point that "salt" is a conventional identity proposition that is at best a functional imputation and nothing more than that.

I think we're going in circles, Sir. There are salt molecules. "Essence" is your word, your quagmire, I was just offering something for it to mean wrt salt.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, I am trying to explain to you that Madhyamaka states the self, the identity, the atman of any given phenomena, not merely personal phenomena, is merely an imputed label which derives from the functionality of that phenomena. The absence of identity in external phenomena does not obliterate them, indeed, from a Madhyamaka POV that absence of identity is all that makes them possible since whatever conditioned phenomena there are must be dependently originated and hence, must lack an intrinsic or unique identity, a "self", an essence, an atman.

We are not asserting, for example that dependent phenomenon are in the class of children of barren women or horns on rabbits or other such total non-existents -- which I suspect is your fear.

Dependent phenomena are free from both existence and non-existence since dependent phenomena are empty of a self or svabhāva, in other words, when a salt molecule ceases, there is no atman of salt that continues, and there is no atman of salt that ceases. When a salt molecule perishes all that has happened is that the causes and conditions for producing salt have ceased. Cessations are absence of causes, and are not caused per se.

If phenomena were to exist, they would not need causes and conditions, and since phenomena appear to be produced from causes and conditions, they are not non-existent either. They are not both existent and non-existent, since this is just a summary of the first extreme, and they are not neither, since this is just a summary of the second.

Therefore, since we cannot say that phenomena fall into one of these four extremes, Nagarjuna states dependent origination is free from eight extremes: in dependent origination there is no ceasing, arising, annihilation, permanence, going, coming, difference or sameness. He praises the Buddha for giving such a teaching because it frees one from ontological doubts i.e. pacifies proliferation.

All I am trying to get you to understand is that emptiness means that when you examine some conventional entity, something that we would say "exists out there in shared reality", there is no underlying reality proping it, apart from being labeled on the basis of functional appearances, such conventional entities cannot be found.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

And what of the gun nut poster? It is not extreme, right? It's a balanced, moderate and objective view, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Not a shining example of moderation either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Mariusz"]Is it means the distress is really produced? In contrast, let's look what

IX Karmapa wrote:

[/quote]

Of course not. There is no real production.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 11:31 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

[\\

At the end of the day, we would know that our saltiness experience required one of these saltiness producers and hope that it wasn't one of the nasty ones that causes zits. Sorry.

Malcolm wrote:

And at the end of the day, we will still be left with the fact that all of these so called "things" are just imputations of identity onto impermanent collections, which themselves are composed of still further impermanent collections.

So whatever clinging we have to any impermanent collection whether internal or external in terms of identity is certain to lead to suffering. This is the point of Madhyamaka i.e. to demonstrate that the belief that attributions of identity onto impermanent collections are anything more than mere conventions is a delusion.

Of course these conventions work, but they are no more real than the habit of the "I" we attribute to our personal collection of aggregates. The habit of "I" certainly works, but that "I" is not real. The imputation of salt onto a given collection we have chosen to call salt "works" but the "salt" can't be found apart from the imputation we make onto that collection so we can use it effectively.

The problem most laypeople have with the MMK is that people rarely are acquainted with the views that MMK is seeking to correct. Without understanding Abhidharma,

most of the arguments in the MMK will seem rather pointless if not obscure in the extreme. Some people mistakenly think that MMK is a panacea -- when in fact it is rather narrow text with a rather narrow project i.e. to correct Abhidharma realism and bring errant Abhidharmikas back to a proper understanding of dependent origination and help them to abandon a kind of naive essentialism that had crept into Buddhism.

Madhyamaka as a whole is an exercise in trying to introduce people to the real meaning of dependent origination i.e. the emptiness of persons and phenomena based in the Buddha's observation that statements about existence and non-existence were at odds with the real meaning of dependent origination.

Since there are no permanent phenomena, claims for the existence and non-existence of phenomena are completely naive on anything other than a conventional level.

So you can keep insisting that salt harms snails as much as you like. Since you are making a conventional statement you are not going to get any complaint from me, but if you assert that there is saltiness in salt, for example, you have only two courses -- mire yourself in the myriad contradictions of asserting that there is an essence of salt or simply accede the point that "salt" is a conventional identity proposition that is at best a functional imputation and nothing more than that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 10:24 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

In this sense, saltiness is an inherent quality of salt molecules, guilty as charged.

Tom said:

Quick question for Dave, and apologies if this interrupts the flow of debate - it is a quick one ...

I'm interested to know if you consider substances, say for example salt, that bear qualities, in this instance saltiness, to be more than conceptual fictions?

yadave said:

Hi Tom.

Yes.

Regards,
Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

I think the real question is, do you accept that these substances are intrinsically real, qualitatively real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Saltiness arises when we combine salt molecules with a tongue. I get that. If we look at all the tastes a tongue provides and ask which ones are salty, what do we find? Salt molecules.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi dave, that's just not true. Monosodium glutamate is not salt. But it produces a salty taste.

There are lots of things that taste salty, that have no salt in them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

So then, the question becomes: "to what may one apply the term "exist?"

...and you are saying that "exist" can apply to conditionally arising phenomena,

...and (I believe) Namdrol is saying that it is erroneous to apply the term "exist" to conditionally arising phenomena.

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

As the Buddha specified:

Dvayaṃnissito kho'yaṃ kaccaana loko yebhuyyena atthita—ceva natthita—ca
Kaaccana, this world abides in duality, normally abiding in 'is' and 'is not'.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

I think if we place one salt molecule on a snail and watch under a microscope we will see tiny bubbles. Not sure what you mean yet.

Malcolm wrote:

Salt molecules do not produce this effect all by themselves. You need a snail for that.

The rest is pointless to respond to.

I was not making a Madhyamaka claim, but the way with pointing out the *karana* *hetu*. *Karana* *hetu* (what you mistook as a Gaia statement) is a *Abhidharma* claim which Madhyamakas assert is merely a convention that cannot withstand analysis, like salt.

The point of that description however, was that conventionally speaking, Madhyamakas are generally considered to accept production from another, even if this does not withstand ultimate analysis, it is the conventional mode Madhyamakas are comfortable with because it accords with dependent origination. Thus salt a dependent collection upon which term salt is applied, the same goes for cars, persons and everything else without the need for some non-dependent entity to exist which can serve as a basis for designation.

Salt molecules are not independent entities, so "salt" therefore, is just a dependent designation on a collection, like "Dave" and "Malcolm".

The absolute truth of salt, Dave and Malcolm is emptiness i.e. that when salt, dave and malcolm are sought as distinct entities in their respective collections, nothing can be found apart from a designation upon a collection.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Right, but this is why we stopped looking for salt beyond a salt molecule earlier because all the smaller stuff isn't salty.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why for you saltiness is an inherent quality and intrinsic characteristic. But if you try to find salty in a salt molecule, you will not find it.

Look at the examination of intrinsic characteristics in the MMK.

but it is hopeless, you already decided you are a "realist" and that things "really exist".

Madhyamaka is not antirealist, Madhyamaka is beyond the extremes of "real" and "unreal".

Madhyamaka can be considered "antirealism" to the extent that realism is a wrong view, but not because Madhyamaka proposes there are "unreal" things.

To change the terms a little, "It is not that we claim that things are unreal, we merely remove claims of real things".

Salt is merely an imputation on a collection, but there is no real salt in salt. Dave is likewise an imputation on a collection, but there is no Dave in Dave. If would look for Dave in the collection called "Dave", where are we going to find it? In your head, brain, heart, liver, hand, etc? Apart from your head, liver, etc.? The same analysis of the person, by which we discover that persons are merely designations on a collection, must be extended to phenomena. That is the intent of Madhyamaka. In other words, just as the term car is merely a designation on a collection of parts, and not car is found in a car, likewise, we can make the same observation for all compounded phenomena. People are not one case and cars and salt another.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

kirtu said:

How would Gorampa critique it?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

As I explained elsewhere, according to Goramap the imputation of mere existence is sufficient to produce this distress.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"inherent existence" is an abstract concept only appearing to an onto-analytical consciousness of a philosopher, and even then not usually when he's drinking tea!

kirtu said:

No - inherent existence is an emotional grasping to objects. If someone broke a favourite cup then this causes emotional distress with most people who liked that cup. Grasping to inherent existence of phenomena takes place before conscious thought and is a product of momentary ignorance of impermanence and dependant origination.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Gorampa would not agree with this assessment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 6:25 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

cloudburst said:

Though you bridle, it is actually a form of obscurantism that you will not admit up front that you are using the term "existent" in a specialized sense. As a result, newbies can't figure out what you are saying.

Malcolm wrote:

I regularly qualify that in Madhyamaka the term "existent" is used in a very specific way. I discovered this through a close reading of Buddhapalita many years ago -- this is one of the reasons why I cite him more frequently than others.

Namdrol said:

There is some disagreement among Tibetans as to what we are not supposed to find. However, when we clearly identify that the object of our investigation is a truly existent phenomena, for example, the body that we normally perceive with our faulty perception, all schools agree that it does not exist in any way. We all fail to find the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that not all Tibetans agree that this is all we are supposed to find, i.e. the non-existence of a "chos bden par sgrub pa", a truly existent phenomena. Many Tibetans assert, and have done so for centuries prior to Tsongkhapa, that not only are we to not find truly existent phenomena, we are indeed to find no phenomena at all which exist according to any of the four extremes. If these Tibetans are incorrect, then how can we accept the realization of any Tibetans prior to Tsongkhapa, or in any school that differs in opinion with his view? How are we for example to accept the realization of Atisha, Milarepa, etc.?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

The emptiness of salt does not prove salt does not exist, it merely removes the claim that there is an existent called "salt" When salt is analyzed, no salt is found in salt. There is no entity among the components of salt that make salt salt.

yadave said:

Salt molecules are entities, conditioned entities, the smallest things we find that have properties we know of that make salt salt, make salty taste salty. What are you looking for?

Malcolm wrote:

If salt molecules are conditioned entities they are unable to act as salt alone. Hence there is no "salt" in the appearance we are labeling salt because the conditions which support the appearance of "salt" do not end at "salt molecules", do they? Salt molecules, we will readily, are conditioned entities upon which we label the aggregate we are calling salt. But a salt molecule itself is an aggregate, and so and so forth. A salt molecule cannot act as salt, it must be in an aggregate to have that function. And a given salt molecule itself cannot function without the aggregate upon which it depends. And that dependence has both depth as well as extension i.e. not only does it depend on its own specific causes and conditions, but its dependence is lateral, since it depends the presence of the element of sodium, chloride, as has been mentioned above. Not only does salt molecule depend on these two elements, it depends on conditions of pressure, heat, and so on. So a great deal more goes into producing the appearance we are labeling salt mere salt molecules. In fact, the presence of salt molecules is dependent on every other phenomena in the universe i.e. karana hetu or "creative cause" or the "dominant condition" the principle that all phenomena are causes for all other phenomena apart from themselves. When all of this is taken into consideration, as any proper analysis must, we find that in a very real sense salt is empty of salt just as persons are empty of persons, and just as all conditioned phenomena are empty of conditioned phenomena.

Whatever arises dependently, that is empty -- that is Nagarjuna's message -- there is no place where we say "Oh, we can stop our analysis here". If you stop your analysis, you are in effect making a claim of independence, at least, that is what Nagarjuna is trying to force you to admit.

yadave said:

Well I apologize, Namdrol, I know we've been through this, but we do find a basis for our labels.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if we arbitrarily limit our analysis of dependent relations. And if we limit that analysis, the Madhyamakas will try to force us to admit that we have made a claim about essences.

yadave said:

The only way I can make sense of your assertion is by imagining some kind of blocks world where we are looking for a smallest indivisible block to label. But we don't do this when looking for the smallest component of salt, we label this "salt molecule." For Padma's composite thunderstorm, we find a basis consisting of wind, rain, lightning, an array of composite entities that we collectively label "thunderstorm." We don't include "airplanes" in our collection because they are not required to have a "thunderstorm."

Malcolm wrote:

Airplains and all other phenomena are required, it is intrinsic to the logic of the six causes and four conditions, which are the six causes and four conditions that Nagarjuna sets out and dismantles completely in the first chapter of the MMK.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

in the west, it was Heidegger who pointed out that in our everyday lives, we don't really notice the cup at all: we just use it. we take it from the cupboard, pour tea in it, drink from it, wash it and put it away without ever thinking about it at all! so not only do we not perceive a cup's "inherent existence", we normally don't even perceive its existence as an object for a subject at all! its only when the handle falls off or it breaks that we even notice the cup as a cup, it puts us in an entirely different state of consciousness in relation to the cup. the point is that the "philosophical" activity of contemplating the cup's existence or lack of it, is a quite artificial one to begin with. So, if conventional reality is defined in Madhyamaka as the way the world unthinkingly goes about its business with "objects" that function, then its really more the way Heidegger says it is, and certainly not the way tsongkhapa says. "inherent existence" is an abstract concept only appearing to an onto-analytical consciousness of a philosopher, and even then not usually when he's drinking tea!

Malcolm wrote:

Nagarjuna was critiquing the notion that a cup is there. He was critiquing how common everyday language is misleading. Hence his famed refutation of movement:

"Apart having moved or not having moved, there is no present movement".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is some disagreement among Tibetans as to what we are not supposed to find.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Tibetans put salt in their tea.

Malcolm wrote:

Is this really a helpful statement? If so how? If people spent less time being smart asses and trying to be clever, this conversation might be more worthwhile.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

My concern is when folks begin claiming that "emptiness of salt proves salt does not exist"

Malcolm wrote:

The emptiness of salt does not prove salt does not exist, it merely removes the claim that there is an existent called "salt" When salt is analyzed, no salt is found in salt. There is no entity among the components of salt that make salt salt.

It is the same for any composite entity. We experience an appearance, we impute a label upon it, this act lets us work with that appearance. When we examine the appearance to find the basis for the label, however, none can be found. That non-finding is the emptiness of the appearance in question.

There is some disagreement among Tibetans as to what we are not supposed to find.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Virgo said:

Just that it exists, but before I studied I thought there was actual "cup" and not just rūpa.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

What is the difference between "actual" and "exists"? Nothing substantive, as far as I can tell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It is not that people perceive things to exist, it's that they perceive things to exist inherently.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the unproven assertion at the heart of Tsongkhapa's system.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

Gorampa points out that Tsongkhapa's first assertion is untrue, since inherent existences does not appear

Virgo said:

But don't sentient beings naturally impute or assume this?

Malcolm wrote:

That is what Tsongkhapa believes and what Gorampa rejects.

You can ask yourself the question very simply-- when you see a cup of coffee, do you think, even for a second, that it exists inherently? Or do you merely accept that it is exists there?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

My understanding is that the Prasangikas who follow Gorampa completely deny the validity of conventional truth. For them, conventional truths are completely false objects appearing to an ignorant mind, so when you become enlightened, you do not perceive conventional truths. Tsongkhapa teaches that conventional and ultimate truths are mutually supportive and equally valid (albeit that conventional truths incorrectly appear as inherently existent to non-Buddhas) and that Buddhas realize the union of conventional and ultimate truth simultaneously.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that for Tsongkhapa, conventional truths are able to withstand ultimate analysis since all that is being analyzed is the subtle object of negation, inherent existence, not the existence, of a conventional truth.

For Gorampa, they can not, since no phenomena can survive examination via the course object of negation, existence. Gorampa accepts that Candrakirti specifically identifies (in the Prasannapāda) a subtle object of negation, but according to Gorampa, it is just a formal identification since inherent existence is automatically eliminated when existence itself is analyzed.

According to Tsongkhapa, what is being misperceived by sentient beings in conventional truths is the inherent existence of conventional truths i.e. he claims that when an ordinary person sees a chair, they are seeing an inherently existent chair. However, Tsongkhapa also claims that ordinary sentient beings are incapable of distinguishing between mere existence and inherent existence.

Gorampa points out that Tsongkhapa's first assertion is untrue, since inherent existence does not appear, and Tsongkhapa's second assertion is self-contradictory, sentient beings only see existences, not inherent existences.

Tsongkhapa replies that conventional truths are linguistic entities, mental imputations, and that therefore, the notion of inherent existence is embedded in all imputations of conventional truth. Gorampa counters that this interpretation of conventional truth is faulty, since in fact relative truths are first and foremost appearances to a deluded mind, and what such a deluded mind grasps is not a truly existent object, but rather a merely existing object, and imputations of inherency are confined to the philosophical speculations of scholars, not the naive imputations of ordinary persons such as Chai wallas, who would never imagine their tea cups had some intrinsic nature that made them teacups.

So, at base, a large part of the disagreement hinges on how these two masters understand conceptual operations in sentient beings and what they understand Nagarjuna, Buddhapaṇita and Candrakīrti to be saying about such conceptual operations. This is why Tsongkhapa places such importance on separating and

identifying the correct object of negation, and why Gorampa thinks that such an effort misses the point and is unnecessary, since the coarse object of negation is sufficient for removing wrong views via the classic tetralemma (in ordinary persons -- awakened persons have no need of the caturskoti).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

Namdrol said:

In the early period of Buddhism, there were two yānas, śamatha yāna and vipaśyāna yāna; beginners went to Śariputra to training in vipaśyāna for stream entry; then they would go train in śamatha with Maudgalyana for further progress.

Lance Cousins wrote a very interesting article about this.

Mr. G said:

Hi Namdrol,

Do you recall the name of the article, or if the article was published in a book? I just searched on JSTOR and didn't find anything.

Malcolm wrote:

Cousins, L.S., 1984, 'Samatha-yāna and vipassanā-yāna' in Dhammapala D., et al., eds, Buddhist

Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhatissa, Nugegoda, Sri Lanka, pp. 56-68.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings...

Content:

catmoon said:

The idea that Dharma is the cause and Dzogchen the result can't possibly be universal, simply because there are billions of Buddhists who are not Dzogchenpas.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, the point being made is that Dzogchen is the cause and basis for all dharma traditions, whether of samsara or nirvana. But I don't expect anyone to accept that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Anders Honore said:

I am not sure how one can possibly avoid existence and non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the purpose of dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

Spiny Norman said:

Actually I think in the early teachings samatha and vipasyana were not seen as separate activities anyway.

Spiny

Malcolm wrote:

In the early period of Buddhism, there were two yānas, śamatha yāna and vipaśyāna yāna; beginners went to Śāriputra to training in vipaśyāna for stream entry; then they would go train in śamatha with Maudgalyana for further progress.

Lance Cousins wrote a very interesting article about this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

cloudburst said:

In the meantime, since we both know you cannot take your own advice, please feel free to continue debating!

Malcolm wrote:

I have very little interest in debate, since debate generally consists of dancing on books.

However, please do not confuse my sincere answers to questions as debate, since that

is not my intent. My days of debating this point and that point are finished.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

There are some, such as Gorampa and Shākya Chokden, who say that this verse [verse 6.75 of the Entrance] proves that Chandrakīrti holds, from his own perspective, that self-awareness exists conventionally. They also say that in Chandrakīrti's tradition the all-base, self-awareness, outer objects, and the person all exist conventionally, but they do not exist as "conventional phenomena that can withstand analysis."

These positions are untenable. The master Chandrakīrti does not, as his own position, accept any phenomenon as existent or nonexistent in either ultimate or conventional truth

Anders Honore said:

Stupid outsider question here that I am sure has been covered a thousand times in the endless Prasangika/Svatantrika debates, but what exactly is wrong with saying that things exist conventionally? How could there even be language if we did not play along with the convention that things exist?

Malcolm wrote:

This is all nauseating hair-splitting by Tibetan scholars with nothing better to do with their time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

As you see the topic is linked to our discussion in Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika forum, so I think it is beneficial.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. Don't care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

catmoon said:

Um, if mercury sulfate

Malcolm wrote:

My error, mercury sulfide.

In any case, detoxified mercury is not a commonly used medicine, because it is difficult to make, and if prepared improperly, can harm the patient. That being said, it is used, it is prepared, and when used properly, is quite beneficial for many diseases.

Quite frankly, people get all het up about mercury, but think nothing of doing chemo.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

dumbbambu said:

really?

Malcolm wrote:

Really.

Though my vehicles are inconceivable,
they are included in two categories:
samsara and nirvana.

--Rig pa rang shar tantra, the main explanatory tantra of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

cloudburst said:

In context, as explained above, we can see that since what Nagarjuna is talking about here is essential existence, it must either be svabhava or parabhava, and as you correctly point out, parabhava is actually just a form of svabhava.

thanks!

Namdrol said:

For Nag. that is the only kind of existence there could be i.e. bhāva = svābhava.

cloudburst said:

It would seem then that his principal disciples failed to understand him as they repeatedly refer to things existing conventionally, as did Buddha, upon whose explanations Nagarjuna's work is based.

I know precisely what you are trying to say. You are just having a awful, self-contradictory time doing it.

If svabhava, exhaustively refuted by Nagarjuna, were the only way in which things could exist, nothing would exist in any way.

Malcolm wrote:

As Buddhapalita states:

"It is not that we assert non-existence, we merely remove claims for existing existents".

Your concern is to maintain people's conventional sense of reality.

The Madhyamaka concern is to remove people's false conceptions.

See my post over in the Gorampa thread. All of this discussion is just chasing illusions and being wrapped in accepting and rejecting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

You go first. Tell me where Gorampa actually says this. It is not sufficient to produce a charge without providing evidence.

Mariusz said:

My quote of the Karmapa is already in the first post where "The Feast for the Fortunate. A Commentary on the Entrance to the Middle Way That Easily Pulls Along the Chariot of the Takpo Kagyü Siddhas " of the Karmapa;

2.2.2.1.1.6.2.3.1.1.1.2.1.1.2.2.2.2.1.2.2.2.2.2. (Refuting claims that the above refutation applies equally to our own explanation of memory).

Malcolm wrote:

Not playing. This kind of thing for me is no longer of any importance. But I do suggest that those who are interested may read Gorampa for themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

ccording to the Karmapa for Gorampa "outer objects exist conventionally" somewhere "out there" although can not withstand analysis.

Namdrol said:

This is a misrepresentation of Gorampa' view, thus it is worthy of no further consideration.

Mariusz said:

Why do you think it is a misrepresentation? Can you quote please?

Malcolm wrote:

The suffering of chasing mirages never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop. likewise, the suffering of intellectual pursuits never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

The suffering of accepting and rejecting never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

likewise, the suffering of proof and rebuttal never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jikan said:

good morning webcasters

Malcolm wrote:

good morning!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

cloudburst said:

In context, as explained above, we can see that since what Nagarjuna is talking about here is essential existence, it must either be svabhava or parabhava, and as you

correctly point out, parabhava is actually just a form of svabhava.

thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

For Nag. that is the only kind of existence there could be i.e. bhāva = svābhava.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

catmoon said:

OMG are you guys serious? You are eating things laced with mercury and arsenic? That's crazy dangerous.

Malcolm wrote:

Arsenic is not present in all Shilajit.

"Mercury" used in Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine is a form of processed mercury, processed into mercury sulfate, which is inert in the human body, but very useful for treating many kinds of serious diseases. Mercury preparations are not commonly dispensed, however.

Both Ayurvedic and Tibetan medical texts are filled with warnings about using and handling raw mercury.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Anyone Know Anything About This?

Content:

alpha said:

So, for those who run the international dzogchen community is social networking something unacceptable?

Malcolm wrote:

No, but putting up websites that represent the community without checking is unacceptable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

According to the Karmapa for Gorampa "outer objects exist conventionally" somewhere "out there" although can not withstand analysis.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a misrepresentation of Gorampa's view, thus it is worthy of no further consideration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 10:09 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Nemo said:

I think there may be more than one type of shilajit and they have different properties.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Traditionally there are several kinds, depending on what minerals are present in it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 10:08 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Nemo said:

It's not the same as it was years ago. It used to come from the Himalayas and was black.

Malcolm wrote:

Try Siddhi Energetics stuff. It is from Ladakh and it is as black as obsidian. Tell em I sent you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: Anyone Know Anything About This?

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

So does anyone have any idea what the actual problems with Dzogchen World were? The reasons for shutting it down were not at all clear to me in that email.

Malcolm wrote:

They did not get the sign off of the international Gakyil among other issues. There are

fairly rigid guidelines about what an official DC website can be.

I don't think that they anticipated social networking, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jikan said:

Kundalini is mentioned in _The Crystal and the Way of Light_ (p. 124) in a way that is a bit confusing. is it thigle, is it prana... ?

wisdom said:

Ah! It seems to indicate that thigle/kundalini is the essential nature of prana. It reads: There are many types of prana, and they support the many types of dualistic mind; as long as the prana circulates in the many various channels, these dualistic minds persist. But when prana is brought into the central channel, its essential nature -thigle, or kundalini- is activated and enters the channels. Dualistic mind is then overcome, and realization achieved.

So its not saying prana is kundalini (which accords also with what Hindu tantra believes) but that when prana is brought into the central channel, its essential nature manifests as thigle or kundalini. In the same way, the mind has its thoughts, imputations, and so forth, and its essential nature which can be revealed.

Malcolm wrote:

In the Guhyasamaja system, bindu refers to a bindu of prana vāyu. Bindu therefore can refer to prana vāyu.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

Kundalini energy? I thought Buddhists don't recognize Kundalini? Namdrol-la, how are we to understand that?

Malcolm wrote:

The term kundalini never occurs in any buddhist texts. But the notion of unblocking the nadis of the cakras from the bottom cakra on up does exist in Buddhist tantras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

In reading

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=96&t=4893&p=50672&hilit=Shilajit#p50672>, it looks like Shilajit is more-or-less neutral temperature-wise, yet leaning a little towards warming.

Malcolm wrote:

You are right, I was in error. In Tibetan medicine is used to reduce fevers.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Beatzen said:

I knew that the mahayana extended that absense to external phenomenon. But when it's analysis of the inner self, is it "emptiness of self" instead of where the pali would dictate "no self"?

Malcolm wrote:

These two terms are identical in meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Beatzen said:

Namdrol, is there a variance between teachings of anatman and shunyata?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna traditionally maintains that the Pali canon and its kin and the traditions that derive from them focuses on teaching the emptiness of persons only and do not in general extend the analysis of absence of identity to phenomena themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

Paul said:

Thanks for posting that. It's reminded me of something that Erik Pema Kunsang said recently - that Dzogchen is beyond both a gradual path and an instantaneous path. It's far more complex than those two categories.

Malcolm wrote:

From my point of view, it is far less complicated; Dzogchen in a real sense is not a path, it is one's state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Kilaya said:

Video connection is working, too. Tenerife guys must have read our complaints and did something about bandwidth.

Namdrol said:

If you are in tenerife, then you are not listening the actual retreat....

There is a glitch where a recorded retreat is at the shang shung address.

Use this

<http://www.freezecast.com:8000/audio> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Kilaya said:

Rinpoche is presently speaking about sacred places. Am I listening to the actual retreat?

Malcolm wrote:

yes

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Is taking medication a sin?

Content:

waqqashokhar said:

I am an academic researching this topic from the point of view of patients asked to take medication which may have religiously forbidden ingredients e.g. Gelatine or stearic

acid.

Would like to know that in the context of vegetarianism being accepted practice in many Buddhist traditions, is there any dietary law that prohibits any specific animals or use of animal products in medication?

Would appreciate comments, suggestions for further reading or expert opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, the traditional Buddhist medicine is Ayurveda and there are kinds of meat, as well as urines, feces, etc., recommended as remedies for diseases in Ayurvedic texts as well as texts on Tibetan Medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Kilaya said:

Video connection is working, too. Tenerife guys must have read our complaints and did something about bandwidth.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are in tenerife, then you are not listening the actual retreat....

There is a glitch where a recorded retreat is at the shang shung address.

Use this

<http://www.freezecast.com:8000/audio> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

But is said also in the suttas that the Buddha once levitated to an elevation of 14 palm trees.

PadmaVonSamba said:

maybe they were teensy weensy trees.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but even levitating half an inch off the ground is pretty damn amazing, don't you think?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Big Mind, Big Money, Big Scam

Content:

BuddhaSoup said:

I'm just amazed that Genpo stills markets himself as Roshi, and a Zen Master.

Malcolm wrote:

He's got bills, like everyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Unseen Beings in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

Is there such a thing as a poltergeist in Tibetan buddhism? I seem to remember mention of a type of being with "power over the movement of objects" in a sangcho text and it sounded very similar.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

... He just uses different terms like "staying in the I AM" ...

Sönam said:

It does not sound very dzogchen ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. Not very dzogchen at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Thug4lyfe said:

Isn't that the same thing what most other Mahayana schools are teaching? If all Dharma gates are equal, why does it sound like your trying to say Dzogchen is da best au? Know wat im sayin?

Astus said:

Sectarian thinking never becomes outdated.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people might think that is what is behind my statement, but they would be mistaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 10:47 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

People, hummingbirds, and snails must all "go around the tree" to get to the other side. Words and perceptions may differ, but the "tree" is real in this sense and no personal hubris of mine causes this to be so.

Namdrol said:

But some people don't.

yadave said:

Namdrol, are you saying some people go through the tree, as in walking through a wall?

Regards,

Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

One day Candrakirti was walking through a passageway in Nalanda, his head in a book, and he bumped his head on a pillar -- a student saw this and said "Aha! That pillar is not so empty, is it!". Candra looked at him, and passed his hand right through the pillar much to the student's embarrassed astonishment. Or so this traditional story runs.

Of course there is kashina meditation -- ostensibly, if you meditate on the kashina of earth, you gain control over the earth element and can travel through mountains, etc.

It is my opinion that the apparent solidity of phenomena such as trees and rocks, etc., is directly related to the solidity of one's delusion. The more solid one's delusion, the more solid apparent phenomena seem.

On the other hand, people with very solid delusions regularly kill themselves too, through not recognizing that solid things will kill them, like the ground when they attempt to fly off buildings.

But is said also in the suttas that the Buddha once levitated to an elevation of 14 palm trees. Such yogic feats are described too often in Buddhist texts generation after generation for me to simply reject them out of hand.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 10:11 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

People, hummingbirds, and snails must all "go around the tree" to get to the other side. Words and perceptions may differ, but the "tree" is real in this sense and no personal hubris of mine causes this to be so.

Malcolm wrote:

But some people don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: How "Old School" of an Internet user are you?

Content:

kirtu said:

Way back when I do played around with the Altair 8800, PET, etc. My first personal machine was in Germany and was an Atari 800. I've been online permanently since 1984 both on the Internet and BBS's and was probably on BBS's a bit while in Germany (so maybe from '83). Of course we had email even before that in college but no Arpanet access then (maybe Arpanet was just for college professors and researchers at that time).

I played around with Minitel in Strassbourg in early fall 1983 when visiting a friend there.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Had a mac in 85, never bothered with BBoards though I knew what they were. Got first modem in 1994 along with second mac. Found AOL., etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Namdrol has me pulling out my Jay Garfield MMK and I remember an important term missing from this list. Jay says (page 220) "Essence by definition is eternal and independent" so

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but the point is that Nag. equates existence (bhāva) with svabhāva (essence in this translation). In other words, Nag. is asserting that bhāva is svabhāva by necessity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Nemo said:

Where does Shilajit come from now? It is a completely different colour than it was years ago.

Did Nagarjuna leave any of his recipes for mercury medicines? I just read about his alchemical practices last night. Perhaps we should dig up his old recipes for turning iron into gold to support the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Shilajatu is a kind of bitumous exudate that oozes from cliffs in the heat of summer.

Nagarjuna's method of processing mercury into mercury sulfate still exists and is used in Tibetan medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Nagarjuna view is clarified by his last student Chandrakirti that there is no such thing called arise, persist and perish even at conventional level.

Malcolm wrote:

You are simply mistaken about Candrakirti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

dumbbombu said:

gotcha, thanks. so would it be fair to say Dzogchen views all schools favourably then although it perhaps views itself as the pinnacle or ultimate?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen regards all vehicles favorably and perceives itself as the final meaning of all Buddhist, as well as non-Buddhist, teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Namdrol said:

All teachings spring from dzogchen, it is the source of all teachings, and the place to which all teachings return.

N

dumbbombu said:

hi Namdrol, this is an interesting statement. when you say it, are you meaning all Vajrayana teachings, all tantric teachings or all Buddhadharma teachings, period? if the latter, care to elaborate a little in layman's terms? cheers.

Malcolm wrote:

All dharma teachings. All dharma teachings arise from the need to educate people about their real state. That real state is called "Dzogchen". Some teachings are more direct, some are less so, but in the end, that is the state they are all pointing at, whether directly or indirectly.

Of course, dzogchen teachings themselves point to this state in the most direct way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Although in reading the thread here about Shilajit, it seems that it might be cooling, which wouldnt be good for Tummo practice; although it was also said that Shilajit could have a warming after-digestion effect.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite the opposite, Shilajatu is very warming.

Pregnant women in general should take no herbs at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: A 1st look: Red Pine's Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra as Jasmine Tea

Content:

Will said:

Could this "book of Indian letters" be some sort of dictionary and he was just back translating from Chinese into Sanskrit, then Tibetan? Why say he then "established it"; why not simply write "he translated it."?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it cannot mean that.

It means that he had an Indian manuscript of the text in front of him. Established here means something like "edited it". Means he translated it and checked it for accuracy.

It is quite likely he had a Chinese version with him as well. Many early sutras translated into Tibetan were translations which triangulated between Sanskrit originals and Chinese translations.

For example, here is another colophon for the 'phags pa legs nyes kyi rgyu dang 'bras bu bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo

zhus chen gyi lo tstsha ba bande chos grub kyis rgya gar dang rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa/

The Zhuchen Lotsawa, the monk Chosdrup, translated it from an Indian and an Chinese text, edited it and established it.

Or here from one of the Ratnakuta sutras, the āryāyusmannandagarbhāvākṛāntinirdeśa

lo tstsha ba 'gos chos grub kyis rgya nag gi dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa

Lotsawa Gos Chosdrup translated from a Chinese book, edited it, and established it.

I will grant you however, it seems that our Lotsawa Gos here is more comfortable with Chinese than Sanskrit. However, given that the Sanskrit was available to Gos at the time, and that he knew it, it seems unlikely he translated the Lanka directly from Chinese.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 10:49 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred Space

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 9:43 AM

Title: Re: A 1st look: Red Pine's Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra as Jasmine Tea

Content:

Will said:

In Porter's defense, he avoided translating the Lanka for many years because he could not understand Gunabhadra's Chinese. It followed the Sanskrit syntax, which makes a profound text many times harder to understand, much less translate into English. The fact that only one other translation has appeared since 1932, suggests it was & is a very hard nut to crack.

Namdrol said:

If you don't know Tibetan or Sanskrit, then yes it could be.

The Tibetan version reads very straightforwardly though.

Will said:

Good for Chos-grub, but he was translating from the Chinese of Gunabhadra, not the Sanskrit - why? - beats me. Also I wrote "Sanskrit syntax", but Porter wrote "Sanskrit word sequence" - if that makes any difference. A later Tibetan version by Anonymous is from the Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

'gos chos grub kyis rgya dpe las bsgyur te gtan la phab pa'o

"Gos Chodrup translated from the Indian text and established it."

rgya dpe - rgya gar gyi yi ge dpe cha,

rgya dpe -- a book of Indian letters

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 8:38 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Hey guys and gals,

Let me know if you don't want to discuss this anymore. In the meantime, are the following statements equivalent in the language of Madhyamaka?

1. X ultimately exists.
2. X inherently exists.
3. X is unconditioned.
4. X is independent.
5. X is not dependently originated.
6. X is not empty.

Regards,

Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

Add to that:

7. X exists

And I would say you have a full deck.

You see, in chapter 15 of MMK Nagarjuna asks, where is there an existent not included in svabhāva (inherent existence) or parabhāva (dependent existence defined as a stealth version of svabhāva in the previous verse)? He then goes on to say that if existents are not established, then non-existents are not established, since a non-existent is normally defined by people as something which existed before, does not exist now. Having set this out, he then says, whoever has a view involving existents, non-existents, inherent existents or dependent existents does not understand Buddha's view. He then cites the Reply to Katyayana, the only sutra cited in the whole of the MML i.e. "The world is bound by a duality, "It is" and "It is not".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: A 1st look: Red Pine's Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra as Jasmine Tea

Content:

Will said:

In Porter's defense, he avoided translating the Lanka for many years because he could not understand Gunabhadra's Chinese. It followed the Sanskrit syntax, which makes a profound text many times harder to understand, much less translate into English. The fact that only one other translation has appeared since 1932, suggests it was & is a very hard nut to crack.

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't know Tibetan or Sanskrit, then yes it could be.

The Tibetan version reads very straightforwardly though.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: Stranded on a desert island...which 3 books would you want?

Content:

Mr. G said:

Scenario: You're stranded on a desert island and can only have 3 Dzogchen books with you. Which ones would you pick?

Malcolm wrote:

The unwritten tantra

the sgra thal gyur

the rigpa rangshar

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Why do Tulku/reincarnate realized masters

Content:

reg said:

why are these demons or demonic forces or whatever so bent on harming or interfering with others' spiritual practice?

kirtu said:

They are dedicated to evil and want to turn at least our world into a hell realm.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are manifestations of karmic debts that we owe to sentient beings we have knowingly or unknowingly injured.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

Virgo said:

Yes, but no one can protect you from your karma. And when the five poisons increase... you do bad things.

Isn't it true Loppon?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

True.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

wisdom said:

Oh I fully agree in the objective existence of the protectors, and I believe that Virgo had the experience he says he had. I have enough experience with the objective spirit world to know of its power. I guess my question is why does tobacco have this quality, and not any other number of vices? I can smoke pot constantly by this theory, and still be protected, but one cigarette will exempt me from protection. Or if I am a perfect practitioner with perfect conduct, but walk into a bar where people are smoking, all the protectors will abandon me, and I will be left unprotected and unable to be helped? What about walking down the street, am I unprotected every time I walk past a smoker? Or at a bus stop? I guess my question is why do the protectors hate smoke this much, why are they unable to stand its presence?

Malcolm wrote:

Worldly protectors, the once that react to tobacco smoke, don't really live in cities anyway. Too many humans, too much pollution.

Wisdom protectors don't care.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

ngodrup said:

Who can check Chogyur Linpga's recipe for magnetizing incense for musk?

Malcolm wrote:

Where is it located, send me the page number and I can tell you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Ngondro

Content:

Clarence said:

One day I will have learned enough acronyms to belong to the group of deep knowledge.

Anyway, I think I will order ToC.

gregkavarnos said:

Asking your lama would probably be a good idea too. I was lucky enough to get a transmission of Gendun Rinpoche's advice for Ngondro to three year retreatants . Unbelievable quantity of detail (and quality too), stuff that was neither in the sadhana, nor the ToC. Stuff that you can only get from a lama! Plus when you get it from a lama you also have the opportunity to ask questions regarding details and about stuff that was not said or read.

Malcolm wrote:

TOC is an incomplete translation. All the Sahaja Mahāmudra stuff was left out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

wayland said:

Thanks Namdrol. I found the following on p194 of The Supreme Source by CNN, in the context of not following a gradual path: Training to progress along the levels of realization, one practices the methods for stabilizing the state of calm, however, meditation tending towards perfection is far from the equanimity of the state free of concepts.

Seeking to understand the ultimate nature of existence, one practices the methods of meditation for clarity, however, meditation directed to clarifying something is far from the equanimity of the state free of concepts.

Is this contrasting śamatha and vipaśyāna (as practiced by other schools) with that of the dzogchen path you quoted above?

They seem to be portrayed as a gradualist method in this context.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 11:00 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
DarwidHalim said:
Nagarjuna said there is no arising, there is no duration, there is no cessation.

Malcolm wrote:
He said there is no arising, duration or perishing which can be found on analysis.

But the consequence of this is that there is nothing unconditioned or ultimate which can be found either.

If you can't find a thing, you can't find its nature.

But in terms of conventional truth, Nagarajuna certainly accepted that things arose, persisted, and perished. Just not ultimately so.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 10:26 PM
Title: Re: Smoking tobacco
Content:
Adamantine said:
Do you really think it would have been hard for him to procure cigarettes?

Malcolm wrote:
Snuff and pipe smoking was common enough. But rolled cigarettes? Possible but not too likely in regular supply in Golog.

But perhaps they came in with the brick tea trade.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 10:19 PM
Title: Re: Smoking tobacco
Content:
Lingpupa said:
I could be wrong, of course, but I would be surprised if cigarette smoking was widespread in 19th century Tibet. Snuff, perhaps, again, I don't know, but cigarettes? Do

you think that one is true or just someone re-telling the story of Dudjom Lingpa and grafting it on to Gendun Chopel?

If anything it strikes me as more likely (I must stress again that this is not much more than an educated hunch) that the story might have been first attached to a figure of Gendun Chopel's time and then grafted back to Dudjom Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:

People did not smoke cigarettes in Tibet during the 19th century. But they did smoke these tiny little pipes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: robaire on Buddhism & Christianity

Content:

robaire said:

I know enough.

Malcolm wrote:

Not, apparently, about Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: China party official warns members over religion

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Karl Marx talked about the inherent contradictions of capital that give rise to an impoverished proletariat and that the social/historical consequences of this dialectic will be the collapse of capitalism and the institution of a proletarian centred political/economic/social structure.

You are talking about Karl Marx right? Not Groucho, Harpo or Chico Marx? Right???

Or maybe you read the Smith and Keynes translation of his works?

Malcolm wrote:

I think Beatzen is referring to the fact that Marx called capitalism "progressive", and a necessary phase in the historical developments which presage Industrial Socialism.

What Marx was, in fact, was an ideologue of urbanism and industrial civilization.

In terms of Smith, there is in fact very little in Marx that goes beyond Smith's labor theory of wealth. Marx's Capital is essentially a commentary on Wealth of Nations, properly understood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

wayland said:

To what extent are śamatha and vipaśyanā considered important in dzogchen and does dzogchen have its own definitions of them?

Namdrol said:

They are important and yes.

wayland said:

Hi Namdrol,

I'd be interested if you could point me in the direction of any information regarding how dzogchen interprets them. I would assume (perhaps incorrectly) that they are a natural condition within dzogchen, as opposed to a gradualist presentation?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

When one loosely rests vidyā in its own state, after coarse and subtle concepts come to calmly rest on their own, vidyā vividly abides in its own state. That śamatha is called “dwelling in the essence of vidyā”. In that state there is no lethargy or agitation in vidyā. Clarity, pristine lucidity, vividness, nakedness, and limpidity respectively cannot be seen with the eye, cannot be described with words, and cannot be established as a thing. The clarity that is like seeing, the pristine lucidity that is like an experience, the vividness that is like description, the nakedness that is like apprehending a thing, and the limpidity that is like a thought occurs in vidyā in and of itself. That alone is the wisdom of vipaśyāna. Though śamatha and vipaśyāna are given two separate names, in essence there is no difference.

-- Explanatory Tantra of Distinguishing Mind and Vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Also, about "obsession with fluids and gender", try telling that to H.H. the Dalai Lama, who is, first and foremost, a Dzogchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

I would be happy to discuss this with HHDL anytime. I have ample proof in the form of texts and so on that his presentation is not properly understood by others.

Anyway Lhugpa, you are not even remotely an expert on this subject. You have received what, a couple of direct introductions, at best from ChNN? Have you ever received a full on major empowerment such as Hevajra, Kalacakra, Guhyagarbha, etc? If you have not, then I would suggest that you are not qualified to have an opinion on this topic, let alone be discussing it.

You are not speaking from the perspective of a practitioner. You have not engaged in creation stage practice, so how can you pretend to have any insight at all into completion stage practices? At least, at the very least, I spent three years in solitary retreat doing these practices.

You are not speaking from the perspective of a translator, nor a scholar. You are speaking from the perspective of an enthusiastic layperson with very inadequate knowledge of the subject.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Anyone Know Anything About This?

Content:

Mr. G said:

Can someone verify they know the owner of this site, or at least confirm this site is fine? There's a lot of personal questions that are asked upon registration.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it was set up by Song Park. He is the first registered user.

I know him pretty well, He is a good guy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

I think it's interesting that a Dzogchenpa is this adamant about condemning homosexuality on an internet forum. I'd be interested to hear ChNNR's opinion on the matter...

Malcolm wrote:

Lhugpa is a noob (sorry, but its true). I would not call him a Dzogchenpa just yet.

He is working it out. He has a lot of conceptual baggage from non-Buddhsits he stills find authoratative.

He will realize eventually that all this obsession with fluids and gender is a complete waste of time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

In regard to all three above-mentioned Lamas now:

"Any reliable sources for your assertion?"

Malcolm wrote:

In the case of the latter, a personal student of Dudjom R-- personal communication verified by a second party.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

H.E. Garchen Rinpoche and Thrangu Rinpoche are two prominent gurus who support homosexual pairings in traditional Yab Yum practice, as well.

Malcolm wrote:

So did Dujdom R.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

All of the spiritual side effects aside (blocked channels, breaking of Samaya with protectors, addiction, distress in the Bardo, etc.), I think the bottom line lies in the Four Thoughts. The precious human birth is EXTREMELY hard to attain. Why would you EVER participate in a practice that is proven to destroy it, without any kind of tangible benefit whatsoever?

Namdrol said:

Catmoon is not a Nyingmapa, and so I don't think these dire warnings, which are from a Nyingma perspective, have much influence.

gregkavarnos said:

The four thoughts are a Nyingmapa thing??? We go through them before every single practice in the Karma Kagyu lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I meant all the terma warnings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

wayland said:

To what extent are śamatha and vipaśyanā considered important in dzogchen and does dzogchen have its own definitions of them?

Malcolm wrote:

They are important and yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

How many is in a lapse of memory?

Malcolm wrote:

Forever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Which Buddhist text that explain the duration of thought is 13 milliseconds?

Malcolm wrote:

The Abhidharmakosha among others.

A kṣanas is the most fundamental unit of time in Buddhism. The duration of a kṣanas is the duration of a thought. So if you do the math:

120 kṣanas equals on tatkṣana; 60 tatkṣanas equal a lava; 30 lava equal a muhurta; 30 muhurtas equal an ahorata, which is a single 24 hour period of time. So, according to Buddhist principles then, a moment of thought has a duration of 0.0013 seconds.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Beatzen said:

Give it a couple hundred years. Some western yogis will develop novel approaches to dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

No need. We have what we need.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 9:34 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Masturbation is not listed as lay sexual misconduct in Abhidharma or the Vinaya Sutra.

It is a sexual misconduct that requires confession and penance in the case of bhikṣūs.

N

Adamantine said:

So you don't disagree that for a Vajrayana practitioner it is breaking the fourth root vow?

Malcolm wrote:

I disagree that it breaks the fourth root samaya. That vow is referring to Mahāyāna bodhicitta, not semen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 9:32 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Beatzen said:

I'm sure you can say that dzogchen constitutes the essence of the path, sort of the way Trungpa said that the three yanas compliment each other. I'm sure you get what I mean by "preserving the essence though

Malcolm wrote:

The essence is dzogchen.

If you ask someone else, they will give you a different answer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 9:30 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Beatzen said:

I wouldn't know that, but it seems like preserving atiyoga is peripheral when it concerns the survival of the whole enchilada. Not unimportant, just that why focus on dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

All teachings spring from dzogchen, it is the source of all teachings, and the place to which all teachings return. Therefore, preserving dzogchen is of the greatest importance.

Monastic sangas are secondary, and not every Buddha's dispensation has one.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

All of the spiritual side effects aside (blocked channels, breaking of Samaya with protectors, addiction, distress in the Bardo, etc.), I think the bottom line lies in the Four Thoughts. The precious human birth is EXTREMELY hard to attain. Why would you EVER participate in a practice that is proven to destroy it, without any kind of tangible benefit whatsoever?

Malcolm wrote:

Catmoon is not a Nyingmapa, and so I don't think these dire warnings, which are from a Nyingma perspective, have much influence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: Unable to visualize

Content:

Inge said:

I have been trying to learn to visualize for a couple of year now, but it is as if I lack the ability to do so. Could this be a result of my rlung imbalance? Is it something specific that can be done in order to overcome this problem.

I feel that much of the practice I try to do is ineffective because I can't do the visualisations. Especially the guru yoga of white A.

kirtu said:

Do you think in images? Can you imagine an image of a circle in your mind?

Kirt

Inge said:

No I don't and no I can't.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Inge,

Then just sound A and relax into that state -- don;t worry about the visualization. It is not important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Beatzen said:

The only way to preserve the pure dharma of established traditions is to establish a strong monastic community here.

Malcolm wrote:

I used to believe that, but I don't anymore. Dzogchen does not survive well in the monastic system.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Beatzen said:

My european history professor argues that modern people are distinguished by their capacity for doubt.

Malcolm wrote:

He never met a 12th century Tibetan scholar then. Let alone a 6th century Indian Buddhist acharya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

Buddhists may assent to the fact that there is no person identity which is any other than a designation for the five aggregates, but I don't think you will find any Buddhists who assert that the aggregate of consciousness is a non-existent, conventionally speaking.

yadave said:

Exactly. Buddhists have skandhas, Kant had his categories, scientists speak of a language center, an analytical left side, an intuitive right side, and so on. Conventional descriptions of dravya (flow of consciousness).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, my point was is that there are two kinds of dravya in Buddhism, rūpa and nāma, material dravya, and mental dravya. What you said was that Science and Buddhism where in agreement that the former existed and the latter does not. I think this a false statement.

Some scientists, like Dennet, et al, are certainly of the opinion that there is no such a thing as a mind at all.

One of more impressive western scholars on the question of the hard problem of consciousness is Colin McGinn, whom I once had the pleasure of hearing speak. He argues, pretty well in my opinion, that the nature of consciousness is cognitively closed

to human minds i.e. that in some sense we are frogs in a well and that our view is limited to what we can see out of the top of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

In the US, there is trend for yoga practicing Buddhists to eschew eating meat. Also amongst some younger Tibetan Buddhists there is a trend to stop eating meat -- which is ironic, because virtually all instructions of yantra and tummo recommend that one eat some meat, especially lamb and yak, which are quite warming.

Virgo said:

Hey Loppon, what about elk and venison?

Thanks,

Kev

Malcolm wrote:

Both prettty warming, as is bison.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

The five abhijñās, i.e. the ability to recall past lives, see into other realms, know the minds of others and so on are simply a result of concentrated śāmatha practice and are in themselves nothign special.

N

Clarence said:

One more time

Thanks N-la. Nothing special because they are easy to attain or because they don't lead to liberation?

- C

Malcolm wrote:

They do not lead to liberation. not so easy to attain. They come naturally though, for most practitioners who practice enough.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Clarence said:

Going

N-la,

Namdrol said:

Such a demonstration is cognitively closed to anyone who has not developed the yogic capacity to know other minds directly. If one had that ability, then there are all kinds of phenomena in the universe one could experience but never prove to someone else who had not developed the same skills.

Clarence said:

How does one develop those skills? Is it described in the Abhidharma? Are those the same perceptions developed through for example Tsa Lung practices?

Many thanks, as usual,

Clarence

Malcolm wrote:

The five abhijñās, i.e. the ability to recall past lives, see into other realms, know the minds of others and so on are simply a result of concentrated śāmatha practice and are in themselves nothing special.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

... there is no duration of thought which cannot be divided infinitely

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, according to Buddhist texts, the duration of a thought is about 13 milliseconds, almost three times the amount of time it takes for a neuron to fire in the brain.

The basic unit of time in Buddhism is the duration of a thought.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

So Tsongkhapa had a revelation that doesn't count but yogi's have other revelations that do count.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogis don't have revelations, they have direct personal knowledge.

Now, Tsongkhapas followers believe of course that Tsongkhapa was a realized person with such direct knowledge. Tsongkhapa's detractors on the other hand are not convinced.

yadave said:

Now you label me physicalist after erasing my actual view. Scientists and Buddhists agree that a "mind" or "self" really does not exist.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists may assent to the fact that there is no person identity which is any other than a designation for the five aggregates, but I don't think you will find any Buddhists who assert that the aggregate of consciousness is a non-existent, conventionally speaking.

yadave said:

My curiosity is to keep all doors open rather than repeat a dogma I cannot personally confirm in direct experience per Mr. Buddha's recommendation.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Buddha, in the Eastern Gatehouse Sutta, asserted the opposite -- those who do not have direct knowledge need to accept it on faith from people who do. The Sutta spoken to the Kalamas was spoken to non-buddhists who were confused by all the competing claims made by itinerant religious teachers who visited them. In the end, in that Sutta, Buddha does not teach anything especially Buddhist, but gave them the brahma viharas, asserting that those who practiced these would take rebirth in a better place, and even if they did not believe in rebirth, this practice would improve their lives as they were. But the four brahma viharas are not a specifically Buddhist practice and therefore are never held to lead to liberation. They are the practice of the "vehicles of gods and humans".

Namdrol said:

The fact that there is no identity, or self, is the natural conclusion of the logic of dependent origination.

I think the Buddha was blown away practicing self-enquiry under a tree before he started writing books.

Malcolm wrote:

What Buddha arrived at was the logic of dependent origination through having reviewed thousands of his previous lives. When he discerned the principle of dependent origination, he applied to his continuum and then he woke up. In other words, his view preceded his realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: banned from zenforuminternational...

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Mostly they don't mind so much as far as I remember.

But I know that as soon as I (for example) would start talking about rebirth being metaphorical instead of literal, or what have you, some people would immediately get on my case, and wouldn't stop hounding me until I cried uncle...

It's not a very pleasant situation to be in to be honest, so I can imagine someone with these viewpoints not getting into a habit of posting here frequently.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason why people would get on your case about it is that it is quite obvious that the Buddha never intended for rebirth to be taken as a metaphor. There is simply no justification for such a view. If you wish to understand rebirth metaphorically, that is one thing -- but asserting that rebirth must be understood as a metaphor is completely wrong.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Energy from Buddhist perspective

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Same with karma. Although we experience good karma, actually that karma cannot be exhausted or vanish. It just changes.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a completely baseless statement. You really do need to study abhidharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: banned from zenforuminternational...

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Again, I never said or meant subversive, just cultural. Buddhist "modernists" would fit badly in this culture for example, so the chance of one sticking around here for a time are pretty slim.

So, I think I can actually correlate that.

Malcolm wrote:

They would fit badly if they expected people to simply roll over and not challenge any of their views.

I love it when "Buddhist" modernists feel they have an absolute right to challenge any Buddhist idea they like, but get so offended when their own modernist biases and irrationalities are called into question.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

Virgo said:

For example, work places should let smokers smoke outside the front or back doors, etc., one should not have to leave the parking lot and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I don't agree. I hate walking through clouds of smoke into a building. Smoking is a nasty habit and it would be better for all concerned if cigarettes were taxed and banned until it just becomes impossible to smoke. For years I would not go listen to music, or go to clubs, because of all the smoke.

There is no two ways about it -- smoking is an awful habit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Unable to visualize

Content:

Inge said:

I saw this in the "smoking tobacco" thread

Fa Dao said:

Is it possible from a Tibetan medical or spiritual standpoint or any other for that matter that smoking could effect my ability to do visualization?...

Namdrol said:

Yes, by disturbing your wind/vatta/rlung.

...

N

Inge said:

I have been trying to learn to visualize for a couple of year now, but it is as if I lack the ability to do so. Could this be a result of my rlung imbalance? Is it something specific that can be done in order to overcome this problem.

I feel that much of the practice I try to do is ineffective because I can't do the visualisations. Especially the guru yoga of white A.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, visualize a western Letter A in a thigle. That is fine.

IN terms of deity practice, in Dzogchen, it is sufficient to think you are the deity. There is no need to focus on all details.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Is there also such thing as a vajra guru? Who takes it upon themselves to have sole responsibility of their student's realization? I heard this somewhere.

Malcolm wrote:

The only person who can be responsible for your realization is you, despite whatever else you may have heard.

A vajra guru just means a teacher of secret mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: banned from zenforuminternational...

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Well, you're pretty pivotal here also it looks like.

Mr. G said:

The overall policies of this forum were, and are setup by the Owner, Founders, Administrators, and Moderators. Namdrol assisted in setting up the initial policies for the Tibetan Medicine sub-forum as he is the Tibetan Medicine Lead.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I have no role at all otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: banned from zenforuminternational...

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Funny that there's a Theravada, a Mahayana(actually mostly Vajrayana) and a Zen forum by the way. Three pretty different interpretations/temperaments it seems.

Malcolm wrote:

That is pretty much exactly how it was at E-Sangha. What made people unhappy was that most of the mods were Tibetan Buddhists, even though we tried hard to have team balanced between Zen, TB and Theravada.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: banned from zenforuminternational...

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

I always figured you and Nonin had more in common than you both wanted to admit.....

Namdrol said:

One thing people really don't understand is that I virtually had no hand in making the policies of E-Sangha.

I was just a convenient person to blame.

N

Fruitzilla said:

I have no insight into the internal affairs of the moderating team.

You did seem pretty pivotal in the prevailing culture over there though.

Malcolm wrote:

No more so than here.

The fact is that E-sangha was too big, and trying to wear too many hats, being everything to everyone. The fact that it fell apart and reconstituted itself into three separate forums completely makes sense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

But if having a brain were all that was needed to be perfectly free from suffering, then why wouldn't beings be perfectly free from suffering? Why seek food and warmth?

.

padma norbu said:

Also, something I just remembered regarding Namdrol's point of neurons firing (sentient beings) vs. hormones (plants) is that all forms of Buddhism I am aware of consider various spirit beings as sentient beings. Pretas (ghosts) and demons, etc. have less of a body than plants (from the human perspective of being able to examine and compare, anyway). I suppose in deciding about the sentience of beings, we must defer to whatever the Buddhas have said.

Malcolm wrote:

I was talking about sentient beings with gross physical bodies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: banned from zenforuminternational...

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

I always figured you and Nonin had more in common than you both wanted to admit.....

Malcolm wrote:

One thing people really don't understand is that I virtually had no hand in making the policies of E-Sangha.

I was just a convenient person to blame.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.grist.org/list/2012-01-12-american-beef-consumption-is-at-a-50-year-low> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: banned from zenforuminternational...

Content:

klqv said:

has anyone else experienced this kind of bullshit on a supposedly buddhist website?

gad rgyangs said:

you're joking right? have you ever heard of e-sangha?

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is they all quit e-sangha because we were too "draconian" -- but from what I hear, they have instituted very draconian policies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is the point of view of physicalism ala Dennet, etc. And I do not think it is accurate at all. MRI, PET scans, etc., don't measure the mind. They measure the brain's bloodflow, etc., but they do not measure minds.

yadave said:

You seem to hold a substantialist view. There is no mind to measure. There is bloodflow and electrical patterns and nerve impulses that "seem" like a mind. The illusion is strong but there is really no independent mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness is classified as a dravya [lit 'flow'], in classical Buddhist texts. So, conventionally, it is a substance, like water, or fire, it is not a material substance; it is a substance of a different order than material substances.

Namdrol said:

But the cause and condition of a mind is not a brain, from a Buddhist perspective. Judging from your disagreements with Gelugs and so on, I'm not sure a single Buddhist perspective exists. For example, HHDL seems pretty open to all this, MIT invites Buddhists to help with this work, there is even a new branch of "contemplative science." I find it fascinating rather than threatening and believe it will help us better understand ourselves and so be better able to relieve suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

The perspective on this in Tibetan Buddhism comes from the second chapter of Dharmakirti's *Pramanasiddhi*, where he systematically excludes physicalism. This text is shared by all schools of Tibetan Buddhism, and no one disagrees with its points. The reason why people disagree with Tsongkhapa is that his explanations of things are not discernable in Indian Madhyamaka literature, which he himself admits, combined with his and his disciples assertion that Tsongkhapa's Madhyamaka view came about largely as a result of a series of spiritual encounters he had with the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, and not out of his personal intellectual investigations.

I don't feel threatened by research into cognition and the brain. You might think that knowledge about the relationship between the brain and sense organs is modern, not known to Tibetan Buddhists before the 20th century -- but in point of fact Tibetan Medicine was aware of the connection between the brain, sense organs and internal organs from at least the 11th century and understood the function of the brain was to act as a central processor for sense data, as well as the organ that governs motor impulses, internal organ function, so on and so forth. All of this information is pretty clearly described in Tibetan Medical literature on nerve damage and head injuries.

Namdrol said:

...the onus is on you to show us a "mind" without an associated brain or person.

Malcolm wrote:

Such a demonstration is cognitively closed to anyone who has not developed the yogic capacity to know other minds directly. If one had that ability, then there are all kinds of phenomena in the universe one could experience but never prove to someone else who had not developed the same skills.

Namdrol said:

These recent scientific studies confirm ancient Buddhist truths. Anatta. Emptiness in spades. I would think this fascinating to anyone studying Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Hume rejected a self too. Not too interesting, from my point of view. He also rejected necessary connection -- Nagarjuna beat him to the punch by 1500 years.

The fact that there is no identity, or self, is the natural conclusion of the logic of dependent origination. Scientific studies only confirm what some Buddhists have already known for millenia -- entities in causal relationships have no intrinsic nature or essence. If entities did, they would not need to be in causal relationships.

The primary difference between Buddhist schools was in how far down they were willing to extend that analysis. The non-Mahāyāna schools stopped at paramanus i.e. "atoms"; the Mahāyāna Yogacara school stopped at consciousness. Madhyamaka extended its analysis all the way and came up with emptiness as the basis of reality i.e. that in the end, reality has no objective basis whatsoever.

Namdrol said:

My teachers encouraged an attitude of curiosity. Hope I don't lose this.

Malcolm wrote:

The unwillingness to entertain the idea that yogis may possess knowledge that cannot be tested for in a lab is a form of lacking of curiosity. Thinking that PET scans, etc., prove that the mind is merely an epiphenomenal illusion is simply fundamentalist physicalism. The only thing these experiments prove is what Buddhists have been saying all along, mind and matter can interact, conventionally speaking. Pet scans don't work on formless realm beings. You would assert it is because they don't exist. Buddhists would assert that it is because they do not have physical bodies. As I said, you can only verify their existence yogically. You cannot share that perception directly in an empirical or testable fashion, because not everyone has the same capacity to develop the necessary skills to perceive devas in the form and formless realms.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Is it possible from a Tibetan medical or spiritual standpoint or any other for that matter that smoking could effect my ability to do visualization? And yes, if I ever am able to go to a live retreat with ChNNR and he was to tell me that I had to stop I would do it without any hesitation.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, by disturbing your wind/vatta/rlung.

He would never tell you that you have to stop. But he always tells people it is better if they do not smoke.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

padma norbu said:

:: kills self ::

Seriously, though, great last few pages. I particularly like the breakdown of the brain constituents and molecular comparison to a rock. I've had a sense of vague unease at times when others talk about sentient beings and vegetarianism and the idea is always raised that plants are not sentient beings. I always think of the famous experiments which show some sort of reaction from plants in response to negative or positive actions in their presence (not even necessarily to the plant itself). The plants don't have a brain, but the mind isn't found in the brain. In relation to what I've learned and pondered these past couple days about energy, there is something interesting yet unknowable here...

Malcolm wrote:

All living things have tsal. But while plants have a hormonal system, they lack a neural system, and while the mind is not reducible to the brain and neural system, in any thing we define as sentient there is always at least a rudimentary neural network. Also, information transfer in plants depends on hormones, while information transfer in animals depends on neurons i.e. when a plant is attacked, it communicates that by releasing hormones, when an animal is attacked, it fire neurons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Increase in 5 Poisons

Content:

Virgo said:

What is going on?

Malcolm wrote:

The world is not getting worse, your vision is getting clearer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

padma norbu said:

Thanks for taking the time to explain these things.

Malcolm wrote:

I am glad you have found some benefit in my posts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I have been following this thread with interest for a while now. Can anyone explain exactly how and why smoking effects ones practice without resorting to "its bad...its evil..it blocks the channels..etc etc" Please explain how it blocks channels and effects practice. And if possible how it effects Dzogchen practice. Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for one the tar from tobacco blocks the channels in the lungs, reducing our ability to breath.

Secondly, it contaminates the air we breath directly.

Third, it creates a vata imbalance, this will directly affect whatever practice you are doing.

Fourth, it physically addictive, which means your body will start to crave it, and this craving is distracting.

In short, there is nothing positive about smoking at all -- it is a stupid, addictive, life-destroying habit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: 'How Yoga Wrecks the Body' via The New York Times

Content:

Namdrol said:

The fact is that most of the people I know who have done a lot of yoga (of any kind) have seriously injured themselves, and this includes more than one high lama.

N

Anders Honore said:

Since we Buddhists tend to prefer the Lotus position for that sweet blend of relaxation and upright firmness, what would you propose?

Simply going into it without proper being properly limber for it is a sure way to ruin your knees and is not very relaxing either. If not yoga, how would you propose to work towards that? Or is it only some kinds of yoga that should be cautioned against?

Malcolm wrote:

Deep squats using a chair helps.

The reason it is easy for Asians to sit in lotus is that they mostly hunker when they have to go to the toilet. The infamous Asian toilets which are little more than ceramic troughs on the floor are the reason that Asians can more easily sit in lotus.

Sitting in lotus is a not a question of knee flexibility, it is a question of hip openness. This a reason why women usually find it easier to get into lotus then men, and children easier than adults.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

I hope you like barbeque. I am destined for many hell realms first.
but I never read any sutra that specifically prohibited cannibalism,
so grab a fork.

Malcolm wrote:

It is prohibited in Vinaya, along with the meat of predators and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

catmoon said:

Chogyam Trungpa. His mere existence disproves the whole idea that smoking is a barrier to enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

This presumes that Trungpa was an awakened person. I have had increasing doubts

about this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

padma norbu said:

Also, my other problem with the whole concept of "there is no more power an offering than offering to the Guru" is very simple: just what that means exactly is just a jumbled up mess in my brain.

Malcolm wrote:

There are four gurus: the guru who gives you introduction is the outer guru; the path practiced is the inner guru; the result realized is the secret guru; rigpa is the ultimate guru;

But without the first, the rest will not happen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

A brain is the smallest common denominator we know of that appears in any "mind experience."

Malcolm wrote:

This is the point of view of physicalism ala Dennet, etc. And I do not think it is accurate at all. MRI, PET scans, etc., don't measure the mind. They measure the brain's bloodflow, etc., but they do not measure minds.

Mind and soul differentiated in Buddhism; the former exists, the latter do not. The former is an impermanent dependent phenomena; the latter is permanent, non-dependent phenomena.

But the cause and condition of a mind is not a brain, from a Buddhist perspective. But this discussion of differences in POV between Buddhism and physicalism is a bit off topic.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

Mr. G said:

Thanks Namdrol. I will give this some thought.

Malcolm wrote:

The definition of lhun grub is "not made by anyone". Lhun drub is dependent origination free of afflictive patterning, thus it is pure process and transformation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 8:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

Mr. G said:

Hi Namdrol,

Am I inferring correctly that dependent origination from a Dzogchen POV is illusory?

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent origination from the Buddha's point of view is illusory.

Mr. G said:

How would a Dzogchenpa address the concern that the Basis does not accord with dependent origination?

Malcolm wrote:

Lhun grub.

Mr. G said:

How would a Dzogchenpa address the concern that the Basis has been reified?

Malcolm wrote:

Ka dag

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

I tried to say that you appear to be looking for an "I" while the actual process involves no "I" in transforming sensory input into "a thought". In other jargon, there is no homunculus, no "little person" directing things in the brain. It is one massive complicated network of systems that eventually deliver something that arises as "my thought" in the forebrain, the final place where most of us start to play.

Malcolm wrote:

A view pretty much completely incompatible with Buddhism. From a Buddhist POV, the mind is not located in the brain, nor does it depend on the brain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 7:20 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

In the meantime, I'm gonna just say salt molecules exist and they are the smallest common denominator we know of that appears in any "salt experience." This is a nonmetaphysical "essence" if you like.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this a substantialist position, which is incompatible with all Mahāyāna tenet systems, but is entirely compatible with non-Mahāyāna tenet systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: A 1st look: Red Pine's Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra as Jasmine Tea

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

t or if you are pontificating yourself

No, I was stumbling trying to explain that Red Pine's use of the word "memory" limits the depth of the 4th skanda referred to. My bad. I am unfamiliar with it all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, limits it in a way that is entirely inappropriate. "Formations" is better, since the saṃskāra skandha consists of regular formations of mental factors associated with various positive, negative, and afflicted mental states.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 4:43 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
but there are no sentient beings during the basis-bardo, so does that mean that there are no buddhas either?

Malcolm wrote:
Correct.

gad rgyangs said:
Do both Buddhas with traces and Buddhas without traces get absorbed into the basis during the basis-bardo?

Malcolm wrote:
Again, all sentient beings achieve some species of awakening by the end of a given eon. Samyak Sambuddhas achieve buddhahood without remainder.

gad rgyangs said:
So are there Dzogchen Buddhas who wave bye bye to the Samyak Sambuddhas who enter into parinirvana without remainder? is it simply a choice which one you want to be, or is one considered a "higher" level of realization (I assume since we are talking Dzogchen view, the abiding-nirvana-Buddhas are higher)?

Malcolm wrote:
According to Dzogchen texts, Samyak sambuddhas Buddhas enter into parinirvana without remainder. Buddhahood without remainder is considered superior to or higher than Buddhahood with remainder. It is the highest form of Buddhahood, according to Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 4:08 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
im confused about where the samyak sambuddhas are during the basis-bardo.

Malcolm wrote:
Parinirvana without any remainder.

This is another place where Dzogchen doctrine differs from common Mahāyāna -- the goal in common Mahāyāna is a non-abiding nirvana.

The ultimate result of Dzogchen is an abiding nirvana.

Why? Because compassion is innate in the basis, and whenever sentient beings appear, so do Buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

If Nagarjuna had an electron microscope, he would have thought it was an alien death ray machine and freaked out. Namdrol told me the molecules-are-atoms theory and I replied that atoms weren't salty. "Self-inherent existence" is a metaphysical Buddhist notion, a stellar concept with regards to our intuitive notion of self, a misplaced idea when projected onto shared perceptions. In my humble opinion of course.

Malcolm wrote:

Your view is similar with Sautrantika position. You accept the absence of identity of persons, but you uphold that things bear intrinsic characteristics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

Namdrol said:

Those who have completed the fourth vision experience the universe arising as the basis [snang srid gzhi bzhengs].

gad rgyangs said:

what is the "basis" of that experience? it can't be the same basis, as that would be circular.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the same basis since self-originated wisdom is unchanging.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

Namdrol said:

Everything from stream enterers up to the 12th bhumi.

gad rgyangs said:

are you saying up to and including 12th bhumi has traces and gets re-absorbed? 13th-16th counts as samyak sambuddha and doesn't get re-absorbed? so where do they hang out during that bardo period? and if the basis is rang byung ye shes, are they then not "grounded" in it (so to speak), not needing to "return" to it?

Malcolm wrote:

Those who have completed the fourth vision experience the universe arising as the basis [snang srid gzhir bzhengs].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: A 1st look: Red Pine's Lañkāvatāra Sūtra as Jasmine Tea

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

On the very same page as the self characterization of the text by the translator is this statement:

"These include the 5 Skandhas (form, sensation, perception, memory, and consciousness)", (page 15).

That rendering into English of "samskāra" as "memory"

Malcolm wrote:

This is simply misleading and wrong. The samakāra skandha is composed of all kinds of caittas, mental factors, of which smṛti, memory, is merely one. I hope that the rest of his translation is not dominated by such coarse glosses.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

So are you then asserting that saltiness is caused by something other than salt?

N

Beatzen said:

Salty is a discrimination of mind consciousness. The sense object alone is not the cause of the salty experience, because that is a byproduct of the object's interaction with the sense organs. Each link in the chain leading up to mind categorization as "salty" is not the cause in itself. Therefore, emptiness via effective causality.

Malcolm wrote:
So you are saying that salt is not salty?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 12:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
so even fully enlightened Buddhas never really eliminate all afflictions

Namdrol said:
Samyak Sambuddhas fully eliminate traces. Hence the "samyak". Dzogchen texts speak of them achieving parinirvana.

N

gad rgyangs said:
so when you said earlier:
there are no sentient beings at the time of the latent basis, because all sentient beings, theoretically, achieved some kind of buddhahood in the last eon.
"some kind of buddhahood" includes types that leave traces ("returning to the cause" kind?) and the samyak kind, that does not entail getting re-absorbed into the basis during the bardo period?

Malcolm wrote:
Everything from stream enterers up to the 12th bhumi.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 11:07 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
so even fully enlightened Buddhas never really eliminate all afflictions

Malcolm wrote:
Samyak Sambuddhas fully eliminate traces. Hence the "samyak". Dzogchen texts speak of them achieving parinirvana.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 11:05 PM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Can Insects Feel Pain?

.

Adamantine said:

Just to shake things up even more, it's a must to read this book as an overview of contemporary scientific research into intelligence in life forms other-than-human, -- including plants (that make decisions, interact with their environments, and appear to feel pain) and slime molds which solve mazes. Warning-- the contents of this book certainly do challenge some long-held Buddhist beliefs about the limits of "sentience" .

Acchantika said:

I just wanted to clarify that whether an insect can or can't feel pain is not a reflection of whether or not it is sentient. As before, some human's can't feel pain, but that doesn't mean they are not sentient. Just as humans lack the sensory capabilities to detect gamma rays, but are sentient, insects lack a centralized nervous system which would make it impossible for them to experience pain as we currently understand it. But, we may understand it wrong. Either way, this doesn't mean they are not aware or conscious at all.

Sönam said:

when you have no other choice, you better kill the animal form the most distant from buddhahood ... an insect is more distant to buddhahood than a cow, for exemple.

Sönam

Namdrol said:

I violently disagree with this point of view, actually.

Acchantika said:

Forced to kill one or the other, what would inform your decision?

Malcolm wrote:

I would insist the person forcing me be the one to choose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: You know your a Tibetan Buddhist when,...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You know you're a Tibetan Buddhist when you reflexively jam your left ring finger into all food and drink and flick it in the air.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

Nemo said:

You know your a Tibetan Buddhist when you don't mind if your neighbors smoke pot, but when a whiff of tobacco smoke comes across your deck you close all the windows and go inside.

Malcolm wrote:

Very true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

But atoms are not salty. The homework assignment was to find saltiness.

Namdrol said:

If atoms don't produce saltiness, then from where does it come? From where does the saltiness of salt molecules come? Your analysis is not finished.

N

Beatzen said:

The sixth consciousness labels the experience "salty", but the taste is dependent both on the molecules of salt and the molecules of taste buds. To paraphrase Padma, there is nothing existing which could be called salty, or cause of it's own saltiness.

Malcolm wrote:

So are you then asserting that saltiness is caused by something other than salt?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: May wrathful practice be performed?

Content:

Kilaya said:

Does Throma Nagmo have any separate sadhana of her own apart from the Chöd ritual?

Namdrol said:

Yes. Many.

N

Kilaya said:

Is her specific activity similar to that of Sengdongma?

Malcolm wrote:

The kama origin of Krodhakali is the mahāsiddha Virupa who received the sadhana for Krodhakali in Oddiyāna. This sadhana was introduced to Tibet by Padampha Sangye.

The remaining Krodhakali practices are all terma, beginning with the Krodhakali practice of Nyang Ral Nyima Ozer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: May wrathful practice be performed?

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

Nyingma Sengdongma or the Sarma Sengdongma from the Chakrasamvara Tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

They are the same. They both use the 14 syllable mantra. The sole difference is whether it is kama or terma. Nyingma Simhamukha is all terma. Kama Simhamukha comes from Bari Lotsawa through Sakya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

padma norbu said:

What I would like to know is... how do I bring them back to life? You know, like Tilopa. just kidding.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I think rebirth pretty much covers it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sönam said:

when you have no other choice, you better kill the animal form the most distant from buddhahood ... an insect is more distant to buddhahood than a cow, for example.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I never explained such a principle. I violently disagree with this point of view, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sönam said:

Yes but, and that is why have difficulty with that recommendation of Rinpoché, at the same time you are more upstream of the chain, because you are also one of the multiple causes of the violent death of the concerned animal.

Namdrol said:

This is just as much a problem with animals killed during the production of wheat.

Sönam said:

yes but, as you explained to me years ago, there is a hierarchy by animals regarding buddhahood ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

I did not explain it, but other people maintain that higher animals lives are more precious because they are higher life forms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

but then I spent a few years eating meat, constantly justifying it to myself with the same ol' Vajrayana rhetoric of "imbibing poison to transform it."

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing to purify, it's all rtsal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sönam said:

Yes but, and that is why have difficulty with that recommendation of Rinpoché, at the same time you are more upstream of the chain, because you are also one of the multiple causes of the violent death of the concerned animal.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just as much a problem with animals killed during the production of wheat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

padma norbu said:

Uh, because I don't believe that is possible. Namdrol once said he's a vegetarian now EXCEPT for not refusing such offerings because he didn't quite think he had that ability himself, but he would never refuse ritual substances.

Malcolm wrote:

Our bodies, essentially, are composed of rtsal which is expressed in our ignorance as the five outer and inner elements.

When practitioners eat the flesh of those who have been killed (necessarily by someone else, not at our specific encouragement, nor have we seen the animal killed) a positive cause is created for this being. Why? Because a connection is made through the field of rtsal which also includes minds.

Since we don't eat anything but cattle, pigs, goats, sheep, fowl, fish and seafood, these animals are in some sense luckier than others, they are more closely associated with human beings, and more likely to wind up in the diet of practitioners.

It is not a question of ability, it is question of knowledge. When you know how everything is connected through rtsal, then such questions about the mechanisms by which a practitioner consuming the flesh of some unfortunate animal benefits that animal becomes very obvious.

The reason why Ganapujas have a powerful effect is that there is no more power an offering than offering to the Guru. If your ganapuja is just a dry ritual, then of course it will have little benefit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

But atoms are not salty. The homework assignment was to find saltiness.

Malcolm wrote:

If atoms don't produce saltiness, then from where does it come? From where does the saltiness of salt molecules come? Your analysis is not finished.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Namdrol, and what would those methods be ,if i may ask?

Namdrol said:

Rushan.

N

padma norbu said:

As found in that little pamphlet The Practice of Purification of the Six Lokas?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that among other rushans.

'khor 'das ru shan practices are called "seperation of samsara and nirvana" is that successful completion of them guarantees one will not longer be reborn in samsara, equivalent with attaining patience on the path of application.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Does it mean that whoever has not achieved the Rainbow Body of Great Transference i.e. the complete and final result of Dzogchen can fall back into a state of ignorance after the pralaya happens and then a new universe (or should I rather say multiverse) emerges?

A. Fulgens

Namdrol said:

No, one can achieve complete realization either in this life, at the time of death, or in the bardo of dharmatā.

If one is a Dzogchen practitioner, even if one is at best an average practitioner i.e. the lowest capacity, there are methods to ensure rebirth in the five pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels, where one will attain samyaksambuddhahood within five hundred human years, according to the texts.

alpha said:

Namdrol, and what would those methods be ,if i may ask?

Is not that i am an average practitioner but i hope that one day i will come to engender the hope of becoming a beginner and thus i could be called a proper "average practitioner"

I find the knowledge in this tread extremely fascinating.

Malcolm wrote:

Rushan.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

Also, I think it should be mentioned that a very prominent (relatively) western practitioner that I was very close to was a cigarette smoker. He died of a heart attack a couple of years ago (probably related to smoking), but his enlightenment in the Bardo of Dharmata was attested by multiple Rinpoches. There were also incredible signs surrounding his death. He was an accomplished Tögal practitioner, but had smoked long before he started practicing Buddhism...

Malcolm wrote:

Tögal does not work with relative channels. What is being discussed is relative channels.

Your friend is fortunate to have received tögal instruction, and unfortunate to have had an addiction that prevented his complete realization in this life.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Red Tara Sadhana

Content:

sangyey said:

For instance I had been trying to visualize when listening to music the sound as the mantra conjoined with emptiness as a way to develop compassion/wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

Sound is already mantra. Just enjoy it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Does it mean that whoever has not achieved the Rainbow Body of Great Transference i.e. the complete and final result of Dzogchen can fall back into a state of ignorance after the pralaya happens and then a new universe (or should I rather say multiverse) emerges?

A. Fulgens

Malcolm wrote:

No, one can achieve complete realization either in this life, at the time of death, or in the bardo of dharmatā.

If one is a Dzogchen practitioner, even if one is at best an average practitioner i.e. the lowest capacity, there are methods to ensure rebirth in the five pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels, where one will attain samyaksambuddhahood within five hundred human years, according to the texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, the basis is self-originated wisdom; sentient beings arise from the condition of ignorance. The cause of their arising is the non-recognition of wisdom. Hence the term "buddhahood that returns the cause".

N

wisdom said:

What is the meaning of "returning to the cause".

Malcolm wrote:

Means returning to the state of the basis -- the basis is called the basis because it has not been realized. When it is realized, the basis is called the result. If it is realized imperfectly, then that is called a result that returns to the cause; when it is realized perfectly, then it is called "the result that does not return to the cause".

Please bear in mind that these things are theoretical, and they have very little if nothing at all to do with daily practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Malcolm, this is super-fascinating. thanks for taking the time to explain this stuff.

I have a question here:

Because of traces of action and affliction remain from previous universe, the basis is stirred, lights shine out, and they are either recognized or not, resulting in samasara and nirvana.

where are these traces during the basis-bardo, in the basis itself? that doesn't sound plausible. we would then have a basis with latent awareness(es) and latent afflicted traces???

Malcolm wrote:

In the basis itself, which is why I cited the passage "Wisdom is the accumulator of traces". And yes, that is exactly what Dzogchen "cosmology" is saying i.e. that there are latent awareness [shes pa bag la nyal] in the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 9:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the dzogchen presentation of the basis, what exactly it is or isn't, and how things arise from it, is intimately related to questions of just what a sentient being is, just what we are, what our awareness is, where it comes from, etc. none of this stuff is trivial.

Namdrol said:

Things don't rise from the basis. They arise from non-recognition of the basis, i.e. the parikalpita- avidyā.

N

gad rgyangs said:

what is it that fails to recognize the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

I have explained this now several ways. So, I'll try again: there are no sentient beings at the time of the latent basis, because all sentient beings, theoretically, achieved some kind of buddhahood in the last eon. The notion of the basis in Dzogchen *man ngag sde* is very similar to the Hindu idea of *Pralaya*. [In fact, in the term *kun gzhi*, *ālaya*, *kun* = *ā*, *gzhi* = *laya*. The term *kun gzhi* is distinguished from the term *gzhi* in Dzogchen, as you can easily find out, but the fact that *gzhi* is described as the *bardo* of *samara* and *nirvana* is nothing if not telling. If someone is taking a text critical approach, they will note that there is a movement in Buddhist tantric texts in India in the late 9th through the 10th century in such texts as the *Samputa tantra* and the *Kalacakra* to borrow and repurpose some *Samkhya* concepts. Hence Dzogchen use of the term *prakriti*, etc.]

After the collapse of the previous universe, there are no buddhas and sentient beings -- and this is called the *bardo* of *samsara* and *nirvana*. Present in the latent basis however is a neutral awareness which does not know itself.

Because of traces of action and affliction remain from previous universe, the basis is stirred, lights shine out, and they are either recognized or not, resulting in *samasara* and *nirvana*.

This neutral awareness is what happens when someone achieves an incomplete full awakening, for example an *arhat* or some other form of lesser liberation that can "return to the cause". This is why Dzogchen makes such a big deal about Dzogchen Buddhahood being one that "does not return to the cause".

gad rgyangs said:

have sentient beings existed since beginningless time alongside the basis, but not arising from it?

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen answer is no. Sentient beings newly arise at the end of each *bardo* of

samsara and nirvana.

How do they arise? They arise when neutral awareness in the basis makes the error of not recognizing the display of the basis as its own display. The imputing ignorance results in self and other, the ālaya forms, the twelve links start up, samsara and nirvana divide. Etc.

As I mentioned above, Dzogchen texts do not distinguish whether this neutral awareness in the basis is multiple or singular.

So this question is left for us to solve on our own: either the neutral awareness of basis is multiple, not entirely satisfying for a number of reasons, but this explains how there are individual mind streams from the start; or it is singular (not entirely satisfying for a number of reasons), but gets warped by the presence of trace afflictions into individuated sentient beings; or is it neither singular or multiple (not entirely satisfying for a number of reasons) and gets warped by the presence of trace afflictions into individuated sentient beings. In the last two scenarios, the inability of awakened people to completely eradicate all traces of afflictions leaves traces of affliction left over, where they act as seeds for new sentient beings. There is a passage in the Gongpa Zangthal that describes wisdom as "the accumulator of traces".

gad rgyangs said:

do the basis and sentient beings have a common origin?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the basis is self-originated wisdom; sentient beings arise from the condition of ignorance. The cause of their arising is the non-recognition of wisdom. Hence the term "buddhahood that returns the cause".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Buddhism

Content:

Beatzen said:

Atisha explicitly stated not to concern oneself with others. You really shouldn't even judge yourself. You are encouraged to cultivate without hope of benefit or reward.

gregkavarnos said:

Hogwash, not only do we have the right to judge the capacity and motivation of those that are teaching us, we have to! It's a tantric thang! How else will we find a teacher to totally commit to?

Malcolm wrote:

The unexamined master is a māra for the disciple,
the unexamined disciple is the enemy of the master.
-- Tantra of Self-arisen Vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the dzogchen presentation of the basis, what exactly it is or isnt, and how things arise from it, is intimately related to questions of just what a sentient being is, just what we are, what our awareness is, where it comes from, etc. none of this stuff is trivial.

Malcolm wrote:

Things dont rise from the basis. They arise from non-recognition of the basis, i.e. the parikalpita- avidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

Kai said:

Therefore KaDag ChenPo = basis = yeshe?

Malcolm wrote:

indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i don't see how anyone could not experience some perplexity with this story.

Virgo said:

It's actually the clearest explanation of things I've come across.

Kevin

gad rgyangs said:

i didnt say it wasnt clear, i said it was bizarre.

Malcolm wrote:
No more bizarre than Kalacakra space atoms.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 4:05 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
a "basis" that is "self originated" and possesses some kind of rudimentary
"awarenesses". it sounds like some kind of primordial blob or something.

Namdrol said:
I guess you are not very interested in understanding Dzogchne. It is probably better for
you to study Lamdre or Mahamudra.

N

gad rgyangs said:
that's not fair. i am asking honest questions and expressing my perplexity with some
aspects of this creation story. i don't see how anyone could not experience some
perplexity with this story. your explanations are very clear and appreciated, but that
doesn't mean it's something to be just swallowed hook line and sinker without question.

Malcolm wrote:
You should examine the tone of your questions. BTW, it is not a creation story. The basis
refers to a time between universes. Also, as I have mentioned before, if you are not
practicing thögal, this explanation is not relevant to your practice. This explanation is
directly tied to tögal teachings and provides the basis for understanding the Nyingthig
model of liberation. It is actually not really good that there is so much out there about
this "cosmology" since people misunderstand its intent badly.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 3:59 AM
Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Masturbation is not listed as lay sexual misconduct in Abhidharma or the Vinaya Sutra.

It is a sexual misconduct that requires confession and penance in the case of bhikṣūs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

a "basis" that is "self originated" and possesses some kind of rudimentary "awarenesses". it sounds like some kind of primordial blob or something.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you are not very interested in understanding Dzogchne. It is probably better for you to study Lamdre or Mahamudra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

Namdrol said:

The basis is original purity. The Unwritten Tantra states:

“There is no object to investigate within the view of self-originated wisdom: nothing went before, nothing happens later, nothing is present now at all. Action does not exist. Traces do not exist. Ignorance does not exist. Mind does not exist. Prajñā does not exist. Samsara does not exist. Nirvana does not exist. Even vidyā itself does not exist i.e. nothing at all appears in wisdom. That arose from not grasping anything.”

However, Prasaga is an intellectual view. Dzogchen is not and that is the main difference between the two.

gad rgyangs said:

so wisdom (ye shes) is prior to vidya (rig pa), and is actually a synonym for the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

gad rgyangs said:

when ye shes takes an object it becomes rig pa (or rather ye shes stirs and becomes a duality of rigpa and object)? what then is "resting in rig pa", what is the object then?

Malcolm wrote:

Awarenesses [shes pa rnam] in the basis are neutral, meaning they are not afflicted,

but they possess innate ignorance since they not know themselves. When there is a stirring in the basis and the light of wisdom shines out, then these awarenesses either recognize it, in which case their shes pa becomes a shes rab and they know [vidyā] the basis as their own state; or they reify appearance of the five lights as an object through the imputing ignorance and this sets into motion I-making, dependent origination and all the rest of it, and their shes pa becomes rnam shes.

BTW, the texts themselves do not speak of the shes pas in the plural. They just use the the term shes pa lung ma bstan.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

is the basis a dependent arising or not? if it is, its not a basis. if it is not, it is not empty, which is impossible.

Namdrol said:

The basis is not dependently originated. It is self-originated.

The Blazing Lamp Tantra:

Within initial original purity

the nature is like so:

not made by anyone, intrinsically clear

the nature is already just so.

gad rgyangs said:

how is this reconcilable with the standard Dzogchen trope that Dzogchen follows the view of Prasangika Madhayamaka and the MMK?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is original purity. The Unwritten Tantra states:

“There is no object to investigate within the view of self-originated wisdom: nothing went before, nothing happens later, nothing is present now at all. Action does not exist. Traces do not exist. Ignorance does not exist. Mind does not exist. Prajñā does not exist. Samsara does not exist. Nirvana does not exist. Even vidyā itself does not exist i.e. nothing at all appears in wisdom. That arose from not grasping anything.”

However, Prasaga is an intellectual view. Dzogchen is not and that is the main difference

between the two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: May wrathful practice be performed?

Content:

Kilaya said:

Does Throma Nagmo have any separate sadhana of her own apart from the Chöd ritual?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Many.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: How to Generate Merit?

Content:

Clarence said:

So, after some thinking and contemplating, I decided to get cracking at increasing my merit. Now, my life is good and easy so I am looking to increase the merit so I get to do retreats and meet realized Lamas. I don't need merit to attract women or money, so you can skip that.

What would you suggest are the best practices for this?

Many thanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

DO Ganapujas. Sing SOV. More merit in a single moment of contemplation than all the stupas in the universe.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

is the basis a dependent arising or not? if it is, its not a basis. if it is not, it is not empty, which is impossible.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is not dependently originated. It is self-originated.

The Blazing Lamp Tantra:

Within initial original purity

the nature is like so:

not made by anyone, intrinsically clear

the nature is already just so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Orthodoxy in Vajrayana

Content:

Astus said:

Thanks Namdrol for the initial input. You listed the major differences between sutra and tantra, but what are the fundamental doctrines that tantras have to accord with in order to be considered authentic? I think of something similar to the four seals and such.

Malcolm wrote:

Those are the ten criteria I listed above. Then I mentioned that Dzogchen tosses them out.

Astus said:

You say the transmission is valid if the teacher is realised or if s/he has an unbroken lineage. I assume there are no verifiable proofs for either of that, are there?

Malcolm wrote:

Zero.

Astus said:

Is a lineage authentic as long as it originates from a realised master -

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But this is true of both sutra and tantric teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: The Lack of Cause and Result in Dzogchen

Content:

Mr. G said:

Hi Namdrol,

Perhaps I was being a bit more granular than I wanted to be. This is the context in which I was using the word "causation":

The accumulation of merit leads to the meeting of Dzogchen teachings, which leads to receiving Direct Introduction, which leads to the eventual recognition of rigpa. So:

merit ---> Direct Introduction ---> recognition of rigpa.

Does this sound about right?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at the time of the basis; after the basis has arisen and samsara and nirvana have split, then this is correct. I.e. it is correct for sentient beings. At the time of the basis however there are neither buddhas nor sentient beings, hence it is called the bardo of samsara and nirvana.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, since it is naturally formed [lhun grub] i.e. it is not made by anyone [sus ma byas, (the actual definition of lhun grub)]

gaden rgyangs said:

this is the actual definition of svabhava.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no diversity in a svābhāva. There is diversity in lhun grub. This is the reason why ka dag is termed ngo bo, or svabhāva; while lhun grub is termed prakriti or rang bzhin.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Kai said:
Thats a strictly Sakya view.

Malcolm wrote:
Nope, it is view of the Samputa tantra.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
sounds good, but im not sure how this is really different from Vishnu dreaming the universe or other creation myths. this "basis" seems like a possesor of substance svabhava.

Malcolm wrote:
No, since it is originally pure.

gad rgyangs said:
if you say no, its empty, then that means its dependently originated, in which case, the question becomes, what kind of "basis" is it that would be dependent on causes and conditions, and what would these causes and conditions be in this case?

Malcolm wrote:
No, since it is naturally formed [lhun grub] i.e. it is not made by anyone [sus ma byas, (the actual definition of lhun grub)] but it is also not conditioned by afflictions.

However, since it is naturally formed, it can appear as dependently originated phenomena, for example, the five lights being reified as the five elements, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 1:54 AM
Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing
Content:

Nemo said:
I think that reading a book about dzog chen without a Masters supervision is about as useful as reading a book on brain surgery.

Malcolm wrote:
Agreed, fortunately I have all necessary transmissions and instructions. Thanks.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

then this implies that the sentient being exists first, and then fails to recognize its state, which results in it being a sentient being, which is a circular regress.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

As I have stated elsewhere, Dzogchen cosmology is just a minor variation on the standard abhidharma cosmology. In Abhidharmakośa, at the end of the eon, all sentient beings are reborn in the two upper form realms, where their minds are in a state of dharmatā. After twenty anatarakalpas, intermediate eons, because of traces of latent afflictions, the air mandala forms and so on, resulting in a container universe which is repopulated by sentient beings who take birth in it from top to bottom.

In Dzogchen, at the end of the previous mahākalpa, all sentient beings attain "buddhahood" after taking birth in the Kalavinkaloka. Then after twenty thousand eons while samsara and nirvana does not appear (this is called the bardo (antara) of samsara and nirvana in dzogchen texts), because of the lingering traces of affliction and action left over from the last eon, the basis becomes stirred, the five lights shine out and there is a chance for recognition or non-recognition by the neutral awareness(es) that is/are obscured by the innate ignorance of mere non-recognition while the basis is in a latent state. Depending on the fact of recognition or non-recognition, there is Samantabhadra and sentient beings.

Thus, we understand that the basis has two phases, active and latent. During the bardo of samsara and nirvana, it is in a latent phase.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

padma norbu said:

One last question, then: when everything is destroyed at the end a world age, do the Buddhas survive that or not?

Malcolm wrote:

This is one of those fourteen questions....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: The Lack of Cause and Result in Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

....are called the basis (aka bodhicitta in sems sde) when they are not recognized. When they are recognized, they are called the path.

N

Mr. G said:

Hi Namdrol,

What "causes" the act of recognition?

Malcolm wrote:

It is more like, what is the condition for recognition. The condition for recognition is the stirring of the basis

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: The Lack of Cause and Result in Dzogchen

Content:

Mr. G said:

The basis was not recognized as being originally pure and free of afflictions which initiated samsara and nirvana. However, we can't call the act of "recognition" a real act or cause due to the the basis which possesses a nature, essence and compassion. So it is not the individual that is "recognizing", but it is the intelligence of the basis that is at work.

Malcolm wrote:

The three wisdoms, essence, nature and compassion, are called the basis (aka bodhicitta in sems sde) when they are not recognized. When they are recognized, they are called the path. When they are realized, they are called the result.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Then I look at my example of a modern person searching for saltiness and stopping at

the salt molecule and it seems so dumb to continue decomposing things, everything is made of the smaller stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

Molecules are made of atoms which are made of electrons and protons, etc.

By stopping at the salt molecule, you are making precisely the mistake Madhyamakas criticized Sarvastivadins for making i.e. arbitrarily stopping your analysis at a false level of irreducibility.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

And if you can argue for and against a view, it makes one wonder why you casually brush one off.

Malcolm wrote:

Because I think that Tsongkhapa's presentation does not reflect Chandrakirti's intention, or that of Nagarjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Jnana said:

There are also other conservative interpretations on the role and importance of karmamudrā. For example, Chomdan Rigpey Raltri's Dohālamkārāpuṣpa (Do ha rgyan gyi me tog):

People who do not know [that] the nature of everything [is] co-emergence claim that unadulterated great bliss is attained while engaging in sexual union with a karmamudrā. They are mistaken, like the thirsty wild deer who sees a mirage as water, goes running after it and gets injured. They die from thirst; can they get water from the sky? Similarly, [such people] mistake the bliss of the four joys to be primordial awareness, and do not realize co-emergence. For this reason, since that bliss which is born from sexual union has no capacity to give rise to and sustain co-emergence, where can it complete the realization [which is] free of the three worlds, [i.e.] the three doors? Well, it cannot complete this.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. The bliss of karmaudra practice is just a tool. In the lamdre system, it is called the practice of small bliss and emptiness and is connected with the third consecration. It does not produce a final result since it works by purifying the the white and red bodhicitta. For that, you need the practices of the jñānavāyu, the wisdom winds (albiet

still practiced with either sort of mudra), termed in Lamdre, great bliss and emptiness -- the practice that transforms the karmavāyus into jñānāvāyus -- thus resulting in rainbow body, as in Dzogchen.

The main advantage of Dzogchen togal over these practices is that a) it does not require a consort b) it does not require the step by step purification of the four mandalas through the two stages (i.e. the outer body channel mandala, the inner channel syllable mandala, the bodhicitta mandala, and the vāyu mandala). This is why togal is sometimes equated with the completion stage practices of the gsar ma system.

The practice of tregchö, the inseparability of samsara and nirvana of Sakya, mahāmudra of Kagyu, and clear light nature of the mind of the Gelugpas have essentially the same point i.e. cultivating a momentary unfabricated awareness.

Dzogchenpas maintain however that this cultivation of a momentary unfabricated awareness by itself will not result in rainbow body, but rather, will result only in the the body dissolving at death into subtle particles. In Nyingma, Sakya and Gelug, it seems this cultivation of a momentary unfabricated awareness forms the basis for the practice the two stages, whereas Kagyu dissents, and asserts that this meditation alone can be sufficient for a person of supreme caliber.

In any event, the main point of the view in all four (or five if we included Jonang) schools is the experiential cultivation of a momentary unfabricated awareness. Other than that, the main differences are terminologies related to the specifics of each schools presentation of their respective paths and methodologies.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: The Lack of Cause and Result in Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sentient beings occur through non-recognition of the basis.

The result does not arise from a cause.

Mr. G said:

Would you be able to elaborate on this? I'm stuck on the notion that recognition or non-recognition is a "cause" of sorts that enables the result.

Malcolm wrote:

The result does not depend on the two accumulations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

Namdrol said:

The basis is free from one and many, therefore it is neither individual nor shared.

gad rgyangs said:

are you an individual? yes

does that mean you and the basis are therefore distinct?

Malcolm wrote:

Imputing ignorance [kun brtags ma rig pa] reifies the basis as a self and an other. This ignorance does not exist in the basis, has never existed in the basis and will never exist in the basis. Nevertheless, the basis, nature, essence and compassion, serve as its cause in the sense that it is the basis which is reified. However, the basis itself is free from reification and therefore any sort of enumeration. Even the notion of three wisdoms of essence, nature and compassion is merely a way of talking about the basis which in fact has one essence.

Individuals occur because the basis was not recognized at the beginning of the eon, when the neutral awareness [shes pa lung ma bstan, jñāvyakṛta] in the basis became consciousness [rnam shes, vijñāna] through not recognizing the basis as its own state due to the imputing ignorance mentioned above. When that neutral awareness recognizes the basis as its own display, it becomes prajñā [shes rab] through knowing [rig pa, vidyā] the basis as its own display, there is effortless buddhahood in the state of realization called "Samantabhadra".

Sentient beings in others words are merely a continuation of ignorance about our own true state.

The answer of course is that individuals are neither the same nor different than the basis. If they were the same, the basis would be afflicted, if they were utterly different, sentient beings could not become buddhas through recognizing the basis as their own state.

Also bear in mind that the term "basis" is applied to the three wisdoms because they have not been realized. When the three wisdoms are realized, then they are termed the fruit and one rests on the stage of great original purity, uttarajñāna, highest wisdom.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 2:22 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Namdrol, could you explain how you can say wanking is only sexual misconduct for monks without contradicting Dudjom Rinpoche? I am not trying to debate, I am just genuinely interested.

Malcolm wrote:

Because that item is not covered as part of sexual misconduct for laypeople.

Losing the "white" bodhicitta is interpreted differently by different masters. So I regard the whole thing as a matter of opinion, with no masters opinion being definitive.

I don't consider either Ngari Panchen or Dudjom R. to be final authorities about anything. The same goes for Sakya Pandita, Kongtrul, etc.

In other words, I am happy to contradict any scholar living or dead if I think they are mistaken.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 2:10 PM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

Acid_Trancer said:

I am very much interested in dzogchen but I dont understand the relation between the dharmakaya and the individual natural state.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is free from one and many, therefore it is niether individual nor shared.

The three kayas have one essence.

The three kayas do not exist apart from the basis.

Sentient beings occur through non-recognition of the basis.

The result does not arise from a cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 1:56 PM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

attempting to get back to the OPs mereological question, the holographic paradigm may point to an understanding: in a hologram, each fragment contains/reflects the whole. Aurobindo also said (IIIRC) something to the effect that each thing is the whole universe presenting a different frontal aspect. clues like these may be fertile for rumination.

Sherab said:

So if one part of the universe becomes enlightened, every part of the universe become enlightened?

gad rgyangs said:

since this is the Dzogchen forum, of course theres nothing to "become enlightened", in the sense of a process or attainment actually happening. Illusory holographic fragments may kaleidoscopically change colors, that is all. the point is, there is both the illusory individual fragment holographically containing/contained in the illusory whole, and the illusory whole containing/contained in the illusory fragment. its not an either/or situation.

Malcolm wrote:

Read Guenther much? Word salad. At best some distorted Hua Yen. It is just not that complicated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 1:47 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

It is odd that there was such interest in Conventional Reality on its original thread but now there is none.

It is odd that the only response was "More Gelug naval gazing" and no Gelug's jump forward (if this has anything to do with it).

Almost makes me uncomfortable to ask.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason is, is that that I can argue for the Gelug position and against it. BTW, I know Jay Garfield reasonably well, and we have also had this conversation. He is a smart guy, but I don't completely agree with his assessment of Madhyamaka -- but we respect each other.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 1:43 PM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

brendan said:

The less Theism in the place the better.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no theism in my thinking or statements, so it is just your imagination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 1:42 PM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

brendan said:

Your facebook profile says "Originally Pure Natural Formation", you seem to be contradicting your self once again with "wishing people to experience nirvana".

Malcolm wrote:

The reason the basis is called "the basis" is because it has not been realized.

Once the basis has been fully realized, then there is parinirvana.

There is no contradiction.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 11:57 AM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

Sherab said:

Wow, the exchanges are UNREAL.

asunthatneversets said:

FOREAL.

Malcolm wrote:

brenden is forever seeing theism under every bed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 11:54 AM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

brendan said:

RIP=Theism

Malcolm wrote:

Only you if have severe aversions to wishing people to experience nirvana.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

brendan said:

Why then did you write "RIP Steve Jobs" on your facebook page when Steve Jobs died?

Namdrol said:

Why do you care?

brendan said:

Dont cheat.

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is: I wrote that out of sentimentality because I am fond of his products.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

brendan said:

Why then did you write "RIP Steve Jobs" on your facebook page when Steve Jobs died?

Malcolm wrote:

Why do you care?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Tsering927 said:

I think this is the crucial point of Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

The crucial point of Vajrayāna is using the body as the method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

dharmakaya is a turtle living in a gingerbread house under the sea, but it isn't real, so my statement is buddhist and not a fairytale.

Malcolm wrote:

Being unreal does not mean being arbitrary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya

Content:

wisdom said:

It is also all pervading and infinite, present in all things.

gad rgyangs said:

how is this different from vedanta or theism?

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmakāya isn't real.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

padma norbu said:

It seems there is a quality of awareness which contains all knowledge and which is shared by everything in various quantities like an energy of some sort, basically, and then you basically contact and capture bits of this awareness like lightning bugs in a jar.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is called thugs rjes which expresses itself as rtsal or energy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

padma norbu said:

So... why is it necessary to receive knowledge from something "other" at all? Why can't he just know these teachings if they come from his real nature without the necessity of a manifestation of wisdom display to communicate it back to himself?

Malcolm wrote:

Because he has a body, and therefore a mind, and in the state of dreams, everyone has seven times more clarity than when they are awake.

Also while he is a realized person, he says he is not a completely realized person at the end of the path.

You also have this same state, so, you might as well ask yourself why you are not spontaneously receiving these teachings, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

deff said:

masturbation is very dangerous?

Namdrol said:

Some people apparently think so -- they might go blind or grow hair on their palms.

Dechen Norbu said:

If it was, most male teens would never reach adulthood...

Malcolm wrote:

Some women would argue that most male teens never do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

padma norbu said:

We are told that if we have visions of deities not to hold too much importance to that

Malcolm wrote:

Because those visions are mental projections, based on mind.

padma norbu said:

and yet here we have world-famous teachers writing entire series of books based on visions from deities.

Malcolm wrote:

Because this teacher has knowledge of his real state, and because he is expert in dream yoga, the display of his wisdom manifests as teachers and deities that communicate knowledge which he then commits to writing.

And he also has provided the method by which we may know the difference between karmic dreams (based on on mind) and dreams of clarity (based on wisdom).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Bhairava in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:
Hindu Bhairava = Mahākala

Karinos said:
Mahakala and Bhairava are not the same.

Malcolm wrote:
I know that Bhairava and Mahākala are not the same.

However, Bhairava shrines in Nepal are considered Mahākala shrines by Tibetans.

It is the same principle with Vajrayogini statues being considered to be emanations of Kali.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 8:17 PM
Title: Re: Bhairava in Buddhism?
Content:

Adamantine said:
Hi, wondering if anyone is familiar with the cross-pollinating deities of Nepal, and specifically with the various statues and shrines devoted to Bhairava and how / if they fit into the context of tantric Buddhism. I wonder because I find some of the statues beautiful and powerful, but I am not familiar with the link.. some appear almost identical to the protector Mahakala... but unlike Siva I have not heard that Bhairava specifically corresponds to a Nyingma protector ---->although Bhairava is supposedly another manifestation of Siva -- so would I then consider Bhairava as Mahadeva?

I know that this deity was particularly important to Newars, but I also understand Newars are primarily Buddhist. . . if anyone has any in-depth insight I'd love to hear it.

Malcolm wrote:
Hindu Bhairava = Mahākala

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 10:23 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:
is physical phenomena an illusion
or is it the reality of physical phenomena that is the illusion?

Malcolm wrote:

If the reality of physical phenomena is an illusion, physical phenomena are illusory because the nature of a thing cannot be different than the thing that bears that nature -- for example, wetness and water, heat and fire, etc.

PadmaVonSamba said:

But why is divisibility the criteria for establishing the "reality" of something?

Malcolm wrote:

Irreducibility is held to be the criteria for establishing identity. Identity is the basis for establishing the reality of a given thing. If the identity of a given thing cannot be established for that thing because a given thing can still be reduced and analyzed, that thing's reality depends on non-analytical acceptance (hence a convention). Assuming that no phenomena can bear ultimate analysis, a given thing's reality is an imputation based upon an appearance that has not been subject to ultimate analysis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

Anyway, this is a boring game of semantics.

PadmaVonSamba said:

....Or does it only APPEAR to be???

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it appears so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: My father

Content:

KeithBC said:

My father left this life at 2:05 this afternoon, three weeks short of his 89th birthday. If you feel so inclined, please join me in wishing him a safe journey to his next life, and fortunate rebirth. He did his best in this life.

Om mani padme hum.

Keith

Malcolm wrote:

Om aḥ hūṃ bodhicitta mahāsukha jñānadhātu a

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

Namdrol said:

yes.

Lhug-Pa said:

Thanks. I've got enough 'practices' lined up as it is, but if upon reading about the Longsal preliminaries we decide that it's more effective, then it can only help to adjust our practice for the better. Of course it's important too to work with what we have and stick to it, instead of going something like "Oh, I now have a Lung for this other better practice, I'd better learn it first before I start practicing." (note to self)

Pero

No worries lol

Ah I see, thanks again.

Malcolm wrote:

Who is "we".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: 'How Yoga Wrecks the Body' via The New York Times

Content:

Namdrol said:

The fact is that most of the people I know who have done a lot of yoga (of any kind) have seriously injured themselves, and this includes more than one high lama.

N

zangskar said:

Do you mind saying a bit about what kind of (permanent?) injuries? (Not who.)

Best wishes

Lars

Malcolm wrote:

Neck, back, knees.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 6:32 AM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

With having the Lung for Longsal preliminaries, can I practice the preliminaries until I receive the Longsal Empowerment as well?

Malcolm wrote:

yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: 'How Yoga Wrecks the Body' via The New York Times

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

If there is any danger in "Yoga", it's that most mainstream "Yoga" studios don't teach Hatha Yoga for its original purpose: To prepare the body for deep meditation.

It seems that most "Yoga" studios nowadays only, whether intentionally or unintentionally, teach people how to increase their vanity and lust; and charge an arm & a leg to boot (whether for overpriced classes, supplies, clothing, mats, etc.)

Better to learn Yantra Yoga instead, and from a qualified source.

Hatha Yoga can be very beneficial too though, that is with proper guidance (even if only from an authentic book) and Right Intention.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that most of the people I know who have done a lot of yoga (of any kind) have seriously injured themselves, and this includes more than one high lama.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

deff said:

masturbation is very dangerous?

Malcolm wrote:

Some people apparently think so -- they might go blind or grow hair on their palms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

If you are having a dream, and somebody in the dream comes up to you and tells you that you are dreaming, since they are not "real", why should you believe them?

Malcolm wrote:

Who else would you believe if there are no real persons.

Anyway, this is a boring game of semantics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

If what you are experiencing is illusion, then how do you know it is illusion?

Malcolm wrote:

The same way you know you are dreaming when you are in a dream.

Not easy, not impossible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

There are other methods to reveal knowledge

Malcolm wrote:

There is all kinds of knowledge and all kinds of methods to reveal it -- Madhyamaka is

intent on discovering the knowledge that completely pacifies suffering.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Tsering927 said:

My point is that they are not in union in bed

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they are -- this idea is a total fantasy, I am sorry to say.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

really true meaning, "is (the alledged fact of) ignorance being just as illusory as buddhahood merely a subjective projection of the mind, or can we say that objectively ignorance is just as illusory as buddhahood?

Malcolm wrote:

The entire path, from the beginning until final Buddhahood is completely illusory, insubstantial, according to Haribhadra.

For example, afflictions are not substantial entities in the mind that must be removed. They have no more reality than the mind they are felt to afflict. Wisdom is not something substantial which is gained by the mind.

The whole network of dependent origination is insubstantial. There are no substantial members which belong to anything dependently originated. Substantiality is a deluded mental appearance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

Clarence said:
Namdrol-la,

You are allowed to teach Dzogchen. What if someone like Padma came to you with his story, what would you say? Why would he have to learn Tibetan (colloquial or Tibetan)? How would that get rid of his doubts? I know you don't want to teach but I am genuinely curious as Padma isn't the only one with doubt.

The advice to practice more seems not to work perfectly well either as the problem is doubt. Not just doubt about the whole tradition but also doubt about whether the practice is done right. At the same time we hear stories that if the practice is done wrongly, the results will be disastrous. So, the practice more exhortation does not work in this case. At least, that is what I think.

Just curious about your opinion.

Thanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

If someone comes to me with doubts, I generally send that person back to their teacher. In Padma's case, he should try and get his hands on ChNN's Upadesha on All-Penetrating Wisdom (ye shes zang thal), Longsal Series Volume three. If he attended the recent webcast, ChNN gave the Longsal transmission of Yeshe Zangthel in the last open retreat, not the lung, but the transmission. This book also contains the Longsal Ngondro for which ChNN gave the lung in the last retreat. So he should have no trouble procuring this text. I personally found this one short text to be something like a key that deepened my understanding of Dzogchen beyond tregchö and unlocked the meaning of many tantras.

BTW, in tregchö, that is it. All you are doing just totally relaxing in a state of instant presence. It does not make anything better but if you are relaxed, you don't mind, also if things are better, you don't mind. If you are not being relaxed, then you are not understanding the main point of tregchö. So you must learn and apply the four chozhags. Cog (མོག) is an ancient Tibetan word that means all. It also means to have leisure. Shag (གཤག) means to let go. So this is why ChNN translates this as total relaxation. There are four points of cogzhag which should be applied together at the same time. It is not hard to learn what this means, as I recall ChNN talked about this in the last retreat.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 11:29 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

Namdrol said:

No, ignorance is just as illusory as buddhahood.

N

PadmaVonSamba said:
Is that really true?

Malcolm wrote:
Word games. Not interested.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Orthodoxy in Vajrayana

Content:

Astus said:

What constitutes orthodoxy (including orthopraxy) in Vajrayana? What is its definition? Or is it that there are several definitions? What are they?

I find that faith is emphasised as an essential key to Vajrayana practice. However, is it based on pure faith in the tantras, the lineage and the guru, or there are objective criteria for what makes a teaching Vajrayana? What are the requirements of a lineage, transmission, treasure text? Is it possible at all to separate transmission from the teaching, or they implicitly require each other? What is the guarantee for a transmission to be true?

What would be good to have here are actual references in answer for the above questions, and then some extra discussion of them.

Malcolm wrote:

There are ten criteria that define a valid tantra, for example. But the Dzogchen tradition throws them away.

The real difference between sutra and tantra is the following: yoga tantra and highest yoga tantra has a method based on transmission of an example wisdom communicated by a guru, a physiologically based understanding of meditation and the path, a concept of wisdom being physically embodied in the center of the body, the theory of mind and vāyu interactivity; teachings on ṇāḍī, vāyu and bindu which is crucial to tantric praxis, the so called body method. All of these features are almost completely lacking in lower and non-Vajrayāna teachings.

As far as transmission goes, the Nyingmapas argue that all Mahāyāna teachings are treasure texts. The gsar ma schools were predicated on bringing back new Indian texts. So Sakya, Gelug and Jonang tend to emphasize the new tantras as being more authentic since they have a clearer Indian pedigree. Kagyus go both ways, historically -- that is to say. Nyingmapas have developed various polemics to defend continued text production.

Basically, the Nyingma collection of tantras is not closed, the Kengyur and Tengyur are closed. I am a student of three different tertons who have produced "new" tantras.

One cannot separate transmission from the teaching. The transmission is true if a) the teacher teaching it has personal realization of the teaching, or his lineage is unbroken. The first is the best of course, but most people get the latter. Of course there are no guarantees at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

padma norbu said:

lol, thanks for point that out, Namdrol.

I think I should change my name to "the grappler"... I wrestle too much. seems to be how my brain is wired.

Malcolm wrote:

What you should do is learn Tibetan.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

padma norbu said:

btw, I was joking about throwing the mala in the toilet. Just venting and grappling with some shi-yot, per usual. I don't know why I bother, though, really. I already know everything, apparently, because I never hear anything new. :: pats self on back :: is know-it-all ::

Malcolm wrote:

There is a bit of a pun on the word māla and mala in this story. In prakrit, Indians tend to not pay attention to long and short vowels -- so māla means a garland of flowers, but mala means excrement. So he threw his māla in the mala.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

padma norbu said:
Well, I'm throwing my mala in the toilet.

Malcolm wrote:
Who needs a mala?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 11:00 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
Namdrol said:
Those who still cling to existents as real necessarily have shallower understanding of dependent origination than those who understand that the final implication of dependent origination is that existents, though apparent, are not real in any meaningful and ultimate sense.

PadmaVonSamba said:
Are those people really clinging? I mean, Really?
Is the fact of ignorance real?

Malcolm wrote:
No, ignorance is just as illusory as buddhahood.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 12:57 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
Namdrol said:
Those who still cling to existents as real necessarily have shallower understanding of dependent origination than those who understand that the final implication of dependent origination is that existents, though apparent, are not real in any meaningful and ultimate sense.

N

Virgo said:
And thus we have Madhyamaka.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:
Well, the main point is to help people overcome limitations, not erect a school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 12:27 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

I'm too tired to redesign religions. The feeling of fatigue. Sleep well.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to understand Madhyamaka, then I, among others can help you here. Some of us, like myself, have formal training in the field.

But there is nothing in Buddhism to redesign. Buddhism is all about understanding dependent origination. Some people's understanding of dependent origination is deeper than that of others. Those who still cling to existents as real necessarily have shallower understanding of dependent origination than those who understand that the final implication of dependent origination is that existents, though apparent, are not real in any meaningful and ultimate sense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 12:21 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Unknown said:

If "Buddhism" means many schools of equal status

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. Madhyamaka is definitive, the rest are not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 11:03 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

In other words, the Candrikirti interpretation you provide requires Buddhists to be antirealists --

Namdrol said:

Not all Buddhists, just Madhyamakas.

yadave said:

Guess I value a bigger Dharma, larger audience, higher number of liberated beings than

you.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a term Madhyamikas, including Gelugpas, use for other Buddhist schools below Madhyamaka "dngos po smra ba" (vastuvadins) which roughly means "those who advocate things as real". This assumes of course that Madhyamaka is the ultimate Buddhist perspective.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 10:50 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

catmoon said:

Yup, us nasty, navel-gazing cowherders got better things to do. Fer Instance, I need to take a leak. Please notice how carefully I aim so it does not land on someone else's path.

Malcolm wrote:

My point was that this book is typical of Madhyamaka books these days that cannot escape the event horizon of Gelug -- but there is a whole neglected world of Madhyamaka out there that has nothing to do with Tsongkhapa and his opinions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 10:24 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Candrikirti would reject his own formulation today. QED.

Malcolm wrote:

You're reaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

In other words, the Candrikirti interpretation you provide requires Buddhists to be antirealists --

Malcolm wrote:
Not all Buddhists, just Madhyamakas.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 5:01 AM
Title: Re: Illusory body /rainbow body after death and rebirth
Content:
heart said:
I have no idea. But if you have a rainbow body rebirth just doesn't make any sense.

/magnus

Namdrol said:
Khyentse Wangpo managed it. Guess this begs the question -- when is rebirth not rebirth?

heart said:
Since he was Chetsun Senge Wangchuk in an earlier life?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
indeed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 4:59 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

yadave said:
So you agree with MS and, for Candrakirti, a truth [satya] means an object, and each "object" is really two objects...

Malcolm wrote:
Not exactly, a truth is "an object of a cognition" -- you cannot leave the cognition part off since it is integral to the definition. A truth is not merely an object, it is an object defined as relative or ultimate depending upon whether the cognition is deceived or undeceived. One object, two natures, hence two cognitions, correct and false.

This is an development over the Abhidharmic concept of a truth, in which a truth [satya]

is a cognition, for example, a cognition of water is a relative truth, whereas a cognition of the characteristics of water, limpidity, wetness and coolness, are ultimate truths.

In other words, here, in Abhidharma, an ultimate truth is defined as the irreducible cognition that remains after something (such as a cup or water) has been subjected to complete analysis.

There really isn't that much difference between this and the Madhyamaka definition. The Madhyamaka definition might run something like "...an ultimate truth is defined as the object of an unmistaken cognition that remains after something (such as a cup or water) has been subjected to complete analysis."

The emphasis in both cases, both in Abhidharma and Madhyamaka is on the cognition. So no, I do not agree with the MS discussion in all respects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Illusory body /rainbow body after death and rebirth

Content:

heart said:

I have no idea. But if you have a rainbow body rebirth just doesn't make any sense.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Khyentse Wangpo managed it. Guess this begs the question -- when is rebirth not rebirth?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

Clarence said:

It worries me when a relative Dzogchen newbie (who claimed earlier to be a Sotapanna) starts giving Dzogchen advice to other newbies. I don't know whether this should be the place for such things. Especially with the certainty that accompanies said advice.

Virgo said:

People are generally always worried about something. But I am not concerned.

Kevin

heart said:

At your level of realization you should try to do something special to test your realization,

here is a good example http://chronicleproject.com/stories_19.html "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, in this story, Trungpa just comes across as a clueless jerk.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Huseng said:

How is it that China, let alone the rest of the world, is going to transition from an economy and infrastructure that is based in its majority on fossil fuels to something that isn't?

Malcolm wrote:

Yak shit!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the whole point of madhyamaka is to deconstruct the abhidharma phenomenology as anything other than arbitrary and illusory convention. once abhidharma loses its really existent simple dharmas, it collapses as anything other than a language game.

Malcolm wrote:

You've confused Madhyamaka with Wittgenstein.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the whole point of madhyamaka is to deconstruct the abhidharma phenomenology as

anything other than arbitrary and illusory convention. once abhidharma loses its really existent simple dharmas, it collapses as anything other than a language game.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the whole point of Madhyamaka is to bring abhidharma back into line with dependent origination by refuting abhidharma essentialism. Madhyamaka does not reject such things as the 5 skandhas, twelve āyatanas, and eighteen dhātus, the twelve nidanas and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

where in madhyamaka texts does it talk like that?

Namdrol said:

Gorampa uses this term all the time in his Madhyamaka texts.

gad rgyangs said:

i mean indian madhyamaka texts, not post-dzogchen tibetan ones

Malcolm wrote:

Gorampa was not a Dzogchen practitioner at all. He was a Sakyapa. He rejected the authenticity of kun byed rgyal po, and so on.

But anyway, it does not matter. Pre-Yogacara Madhyamakas [i.e. pre Shantarakṣita] accepted the standard cognitive model of Abhidharma, so for them it was proper to speak of objects, organs and sense consciousnesses. So in fact your whole line of inquiry is in vain. For them, there were, conventionally speaking, given objects in precisely the terms to which you object. For them, from Nagarjuna onwards, without the meeting of a cup, for example, and a healthy eye organ [i.e a functional patch of atoms in the shape of a flax flower in the back of the eye], and an eye consciousness operating through that sense organ, there could be no eye-consciousness of a cup at all. Three things are required for an instance of vision, in the Madhyamaka model.

Face it, my statement was just not a problem from a classical Madhyamaka point of view so I am not going to spend anymore time on this. Why? Because this is non-controversial.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

always means something like "object + a cognition". If yours is the latter, I'll have to work on managing unusual expressions like "true relative truth." (Seem simpler to just say "true cognition" is a truth, "false cognition" is a falsehood...)

Malcolm wrote:

For Candrakirti, a truth [satya] is always the object of a cognition (of which there are two kinds).

The reason why we say that there is a true and false relative truth, is as I explained it above. The former is mistaken concerning the nature of an apparent object; the latter is mistaken about the apparent object itself.

An ultimate truth is an object of an wholly unmistaken cognition.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

kirtu said:

I am talking about inherently safe designs that cannot result in another Fukushima or Chernobyl. As for spent nuclear fuel, we can either store it or send it into the Sun. It's a matter of commitment. We can really move to a completely electrical driven economy for this with the vast majority of electricity generated from renewable energy and the rest generated from nuclear sources. Over time electricity costs actually drop to 0.

Kirt

Namdrol said:

Nuclear is one of the least efficient ... energy sources.

N

kirtu said:

Nuclear fission exceeds all other power sources in terms of potential energy by at least 1M times. So how is it the least efficient energy source? Your statement is wholly unsupportable.

Malcolm wrote:

Because of the total amount of energy that goes into mining and refining fissionable material, in addition to the costs of disposing the waste (the sun, really? you have any idea how expensive that would be in terms of energy cost?), constructing the plants, etc.

Nuclear is totally untenable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

... if it does need the sentient being, then it is really just a mental appearance. if it doesn't need the sentient being, then it's either being reified, or it's some kind of alaya/paratantra.

Malcolm wrote:

According to classical Madhyamaka texts, a perception cannot occur if there is no object and no subject. I.e. the standard abhidharma triad, sense organ, object, sense consciousness. Candrakīrti rejects reflexive cognition, you may recall.

Remind me: with whom did you study madhyamaka?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

where in madhyamaka texts does it talk like that?

Malcolm wrote:

Gorampa uses this term all the time in his Madhyamaka texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

conceptual construction occurs after perception of an appearance.

gad rgyangs said:
what exactly is it that is "appearing"?

Malcolm wrote:
A clearly apparent non-existent or non-existent clear appearance (med par gsal snang),
take your pick.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 1:14 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
yes but an apparent what? you can't say a table is apparent in any way beyond an
arbitrary conceptual construction.

Malcolm wrote:
That is not true -- conceptual construction occurs after perception of an appearance.
Otherwise, we would left with many ensuing faults. Please see Gorampa on this point.

gad rgyangs said:
"the given"

Malcolm wrote:
"Given" means when this specific chair is offered up for examination, this chair is the
given chair. This is the kind of petty quibbling that really stalls meaningful conversation.

gad rgyangs said:
the statement about understanding the ultimate through the relative is didactic like
saying to understand that mirages are illusions, you first have to be fooled by one.

Malcolm wrote:
No, first you merely have to see one, whether you are fooled by a mirage or not, still one
perceives one, no?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 12:51 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
Namdrol said:
What Candrakirti is saying is that Nagarjuna is saying that any given entity someone

perceives can be perceived either correctly or incorrectly.

N

gad rgyangs said:

entities are not "given" and if you are perceiving one, it is an incorrect cognition. this goes back to the prajnaparamita sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps we do not mean the same thing by entity. Here I am using "entity" simply to mean an apparent.

If you mean by an "entity" something which possesses being, then we are in agreement — any perception predicated on perceiving an entity as existent is an incorrect cognition.

Apparents are a given, that is what it means when Nagarjuna states that one understands ultimate truth through relative truth. If they are not a given that the classical statement "Matter is empty, emptiness is matter..." etc., is unintelligible.

We have to have "given" objects because we do not reject appearances in classical Madhyamaka. We understand that appearances arise in dependence. What we reject about appearances is not the appearance itself, rather, that it has any underlying reality. For example, a moon in the water.

This is quite different than yogacara where appearances themselves in their totality are rejected.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 9th, 2012 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Mandarava said:

Namdrol where do you get the info that Saraswat is Shiva's wife? Can you quote it please as traditionally she is viewed as the wife of Brahma.

http://www.sanatansociety.org/hindu_gods_and_goddesses/saraswati.htm " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

From the initiation text of the white Sarsvati cycle. She can also be Brahma's wife, just as she is Manjuśrī's consort. These goddesss have a busy schedule!

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

In terms of language or rhetoric, Nagarjuna's method works so well, and frustrates so many, because it is based on two truths, and two truths is effectively two contexts from which to interpret anything, be it the true/false value of truthbearers (like statements, perceptions, cognitions), or the real/unreal value of objects (like whether something exists).

So one cannot say "p is true" because it is not true in all contexts. Similarly, one cannot say "p is false" because Nagarjuna again shifts to the other context. Same method works for statements about existence.

Malcolm wrote:

What Candrakirti is saying is that Nagarjuna is saying that any given entity someone perceives can be perceived either correctly or incorrectly.

Among incorrect perceptions of objects there is a further subdivision; true relative truth and false relative truth. A true relative truth is something that is efficient and producing a result, for example, a wheat seed that produces a wheat sprout. Such observed efficiency provides the basis for consensus reality. False relative truths are conventional delusions, for example, a drunk who has doubled vision or a jaundice patient who perceives everything as yellowed.

Ultimate truths are always true no matter the context. Relative truths are contextual. For example, the relative truth of the speed of light breaks down when gravitational conditions are altered the event horizon of a black hole, for example. However, we can connect these relative truths on a continuum by understanding their context so they remain generally true even when they are not specifically true.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

gad rgyang said:

as soon as you posit "something" that is either given an imaginary nature by erroneous cognition, or understood as empty of that imaginary nature by correct cognition, it is

trīsvabhava.

you said "the given apparent phenomena being perceived as an object", which is saying "something" ("phenomena") is being perceived as an object, i.e. paratantra is being perceived as parikalpita.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what you said is that the imputed identity was parikalpita. Look back at what you said.

The three own natures have to do with how objects themselves are deluded cognitions (parikalpita) i.e. mental states (caittas) which arise from the activation of seeds (bijas) stored in the ālayavijñāna (paratantra). When those appearances are recognized as being mere mental states, and non-existent in the ālayavijñāna itself, then the ālayavijñāna transforms into wisdom (pariniṣpanna). Paratantra only refers to the ālayavijñāna.

Basically, if you want to talk about Yogacara this is not the thread to do it.

As I said, what I stated it basically pulled directly from MAV -- and as you know, Candra, later in this text, demolishes the three own nature theory altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

padma norbu said:

Imagine being able to subdue monstrously powerful demonic manifestations to the point that you never stray from the realization that they are merely mental phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

The most powerful demonic manifestation is the misconception of "I" that started the whole process of samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

Mr. G said:

Namdrol who translates for both Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Malcolm wrote:

I have done translations at the encouragement of ChNN, but I don't translate for the community.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing

Content:

padma norbu said:

...

Malcolm wrote:

One's rigpa is embodied, it exists in a body. How it exists in a body is the root of understanding all Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

this is yogacara:

Namdrol said:

No, since Yogacara rejects the appearance itself as being a mere cognition.

Here, the appearance is not being rejected, only the correct or false cognition of the object.

gad rgyangs said:

paratantra is not a mere cognition.

Malcolm wrote:

Parikalpita, however, is. That is what appears in the three nature scheme. Madhyamaka on the other hand accepts external phenomena according to common consensus i.e. if it appears for everyone, it is not questioned further until analysis.

Basically, what I stated above is straight out of Madhyamaka-avatara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 1:37 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

this is yogacara:

Malcolm wrote:

No, since Yogacara rejects the appearance itself as being a mere cognition.

Here, the appearance is not being rejected, only the correct or false cognition of the object.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 1:02 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Anyway, here is a potential problem with Nagarjuna's reliance on Ratnakuta Sutra: If we just blindly "accept what the world accepts" then, on the conventional at least, "a Madhyamika's principal epistemic task [is] just to passively acquiesce and duplicate." (MS152.)

It is a trivialization of the idea of truth. If truth means nothing, then qualifying it with "conventional" or "ultimate" adds little.

Regards,

Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

First things first -- truths (satyas) are objects of cognitions -- which can be either correct (ultimate) or false (relative). Since you are studying Gelug influenced discourse, this may not be immediately evident to you.

This means that if you see something that you identify as salt, and it functions as salt, this cognition is true in so far as it is efficient.

When you analyze that appearance for some fundamental saltiness in that appearance of salt, that cognition of salt fails because no fundamental saltiness will or can be found. In other words, relative truths are true so long as they are not investigated, that is, so long as the appearance which produces the cognition which labels that appearance is not analyzed to discover whether or not there is an essence which produces the identification of the given appearance in question.

A relative truth is the subject of a cognition that is not in possession of the fact that the given apparent phenomena being perceived as an object of said cognition lacks the

identity imputed to it. An ultimate truth is an object of a cognition which is in possession of the fact that the given apparent phenomena being perceived as an object of said cognition lacks the identity imputed to it and does not perceive the identity which is non-existent in that object of cognition.

The function of the two truths is to lead to the cessation of proliferation about identity. The lack of identity within phenomena and persons alone is emptiness and nothing else.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 12:00 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

I read online that "In the Ratnakuta Sutra, the thought of the Middle Way is developed, which later became the basis for the Madhyamaka teaching of Nagarjuna." So Nagarjuna agreed with the Dalai Lama and we can relax.

Namdrol said:

But [Ratnakuta Sutra] doesn't [undermine Madhyamaka] at all.

yadave said:

I think some scholars disagree. Probably just nasty Gelugpa nonsense but let me look up the problem again.

Malcolm wrote:

Reading Nagarajuna through the lense of 15th century Tibetans is inherently problematical.

The problem is not Tsongkhapa per se, but the extent to which modern Madhyamaka studies centers around Tsongkhapa's interpretation of Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 11:39 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Page 151 of MoonShadows restates the Ratnakuta passage that Sunshine and I have been playing with here,

Candrakirti said:

The world (loka) argues with me. I don't argue with the world. What is agreed upon

(saṃmata) in the world to exist, I too agree that it exists. What is agreed upon in the world to be nonexistent, I too agree that it does not exist.

yadave said:

and explains how this undermines the Madhyamika project.

Regards,

Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

But it doesn't at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 11:28 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

kirtu said:

I am talking about inherently safe designs that cannot result in another Fukushima or Chernobyl. As for spent nuclear fuel, we can either store it or send it into the Sun. It's a matter of commitment. We can really move to a completely electrical driven economy for this with the vast majority of electricity generated from renewable energy and the rest generated from nuclear sources. Over time electricity costs actually drop to 0.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Nuclear is one of the least efficient and most polluting energy sources.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Well, after skimming several chapters of MoonShadows,

Malcolm wrote:

Boring, just more warmed over Gelugpa navel gazing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Tsering927 said:

Does the human consort have to be there in physical form?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are practicing karmamudra, yes. If not, then you are practicing jñānamudra with an imaginary consort and your hand. You need to get an erection (or if you are female, aroused) somehow and develop physical pleasure. Otherwise the solo practice does not work and is just intellectual exercise not grounded in the bliss of the body.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: First cases of totally drug resistant TB in India, one dead

Content:

Huseng said:

I was in a hospital in India a few weeks ago where TB patients are also kept.

The quality of healthcare in India, especially public hospitals, leads to these problems no doubt.

Malcolm wrote:

TB is not easy to get. You have to be malnourished, live in damp, cold conditions, and be continually exposed to it for a very long period of time. It is one of the hardest bacteria to culture.

TB is mostly a public health issue i.e. if people's living conditions are improved, their risk of contracting the disease lessens considerably. This is that reason that in the US most cases of TB are in the homeless population.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2012 at 2:14 AM

Title: Visionary Experience in Buddhism

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

So what are Buddhist experiencing when they get visions as a result of particular practices?

Malcolm wrote:

That really depends on how deluded they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

catmoon said:

It's an odd thing but I keep bumping into Ganesh in TB. There must be a reason for that.

kirtu said:

Ganesh seems to get around. There was an article sometime several years ago in Tricycle written by a student of the Khenpo Brothers who kept seeing Ganesh. They also told the author that Ganesh was considered a worldly deity under command of the Buddhas and gave some advice.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for example, there is a Ganapati sadhana that is part of the thirteen golden dharma. Ganapati is a common worldly dharma protector in Nyingma, as is Shiva.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

kirtu said:

But that conduct wasn't even real. It was just a vision seen by some people. Others saw other things (lamps, etc.).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

You can believe whatever you like, Kirt.

He was also hanging out with prostitutes in bars before he got bounced from the monastery.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

I'm clueless there ^^^. It couldn't be referring to Jnanamudra or Vajroli Mudra, so maybe Namdrol took for a bunch of wankers and was only takin' the mickey.

Namdrol said:

Vajrayāna in India was an urban phenomena.

Lhug-Pa said:

Sure. But in reading Sky Dancer for example, I remember the said 'esoteric conduct' (Karmamudra) having taken place in more rugged settings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in Tibet. Tibetans were very prudish about sexuality.

But not in India. For example, when Virupa was practicing conduct, he did so in his room in the monastery. This is why he got kicked out actually.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Caz said:

Tantric wanking ?

Isn't this why it's not meant to be discussed openly to prevent fits of giggles ?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a skillful means meant to make Buddhism appealing to teen football hooligans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Namdrol said:

In fact, to do consort practice, you have to inflame you and your partner's desire as much as possible, use very erotic language, candles, nice food, wine, clothes, scents, being as free from physical inhibition as possible, etc., and you have to do so for an

extended period of time, weeks and months.

People who claim that it is some dry yogic experience free of desire obviously have never actually received actual detailed instruction on it, or done the practice.

Lhug-Pa said:

Karmamudra practice is at times combined with a Pancatattva-style Ganachakra or Ganapuja. Although didn't many of the Mahasiddhas do consort practice in places like caves and such, and therefore did not always have many of these kinds of ornaments for the practice? Yet considering that they were Siddhas and Mahasiddhas, they probably could have just manifested them out of thin air.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna in India was an urban phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 12:57 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Astus said:

What do you make of the similar magic techniques described in HYT like the Cakrasamvara Tantra? It becomes symbolic suddenly?

Namdrol said:

Oh, who really knows. The way these tantras are interpreted however is that they are all symbols.

kirtu said:

All symbolic? Methinks this is a bit of an exaggeration.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

In the case of Cakrasamvara, Hevajra and so on, not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 11:04 AM

Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Jangchup Donden said:

That's interesting. So each hell being's delusional experience is unique to that hell

being?

Malcolm wrote:
So it seems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Konchog1 said:

There are prayers to him (as Ganapati) I don't know if he is considered Enlightened or not. Same with Saraswati.

Namdrol said:

The former no, the latter, yes. She is Mañjuśrī's consort as well as Shiva's wife.

Konchog1 said:

She isn't Brahma's wife?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

For example, when the premission blessing is given, there is always a tormā given to Parvati, who is Shiva's other wife, who because of her jealousy will otherwise afflict practitioners of White Sarasvati with poverty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Konchog1 said:

There are prayers to him (as Ganapati) I don't know if he is considered Enlightened or not. Same with Saraswati.

Malcolm wrote:

The former no, the latter, yes. She is Mañjuśrī's consort as well as Shiva's wife.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

According to Berzin, Vasubandhu presents the Buddhist Cosmology in the Abhidarmakosha, "Treasure House of Special Topics of Knowledge", and it's intended to

be understood to be as real as our current existence.

Namdrol said:

Yes, Berzin is correct, as far as the Kosha goes. However, in Vasubandhu's text, 20 verses as well as its commentary, the realms of ghosts and hell beings do not have the same level of conventional existence as animals on up.

Jangchup Donden said:

How can something be conventionally more or less real than something else? It would seem like something is either conventionally real or not. I find it hard to fathom something being 25% conventionally real.

Malcolm wrote:

It means that while animals, humans, gods, and asuras all share the same conventional universe; hell beings and ghosts do not. It means that experience of hell beings and ghosts is an unshared deluded vision.

Our deluded vision however is shared with animals, gods, and asuras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Jangchup Donden said:

How is Ganesh viewed in Tibetan Buddhism?

I was recently given a (rather nice) jeweled painting of him and was wondering what to do with it.

Malcolm wrote:

Put it on your shrine. Ganesh is a worldly deity, under the command of Vajrapani.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be a Buddhist and believe in God?

Content:

Nemo said:

How would you explain the Primordial Buddha Samantabhadra to a person lacking a strong background in philosophy?

Namdrol said:

The same way I would explain it to you -- Samantabhadra was the first person in this eon to wake up, did so without ever falling into samsara, hence he is the first (adi) buddha.

N

Caz said:

How can you wake up if your not asleep ? Like a Day dream ?

Malcolm wrote:

Samatabhadra possessed a non-afflictive ignorance. Simply put, he, like all of us, was in a state where he was not aware at the time of the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

wayland said:

Is it merely a case of imagination and visualization?

Malcolm wrote:

Jñānamudra is a visualized consort.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

According to Berzin, Vasubandhu presents the Buddhist Cosmology in the Abhidarmakosha, "Treasure House of Special Topics of Knowledge", and it's intended to be understood to be as real as our current existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Berzin is correct, as far as the Kosha goes. However, in Vasubandhu's text, 20 verses as well as its commentary, the realms of ghosts and hell beings do not have the same level of conventional existence as animals on up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Anyway, it is a Yogacara idea.

Mr. G said:

Is there higher view which you prefer?

Malcolm wrote:

No, i think the yogcara idea is a good one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Mr. G said:

I don't think it is practical for the majority. There's probably a handful of people who know how to properly practice karmamudra. It can easily turn into some ego-trip where people think they are progressing on the path when in fact they are increasing afflictions.

Tilopa said:

Correct. Unless you can cause the winds to flow in the central channel consort practice will only increase bondage to samsara. It's a practice for yogis with a considerable degree of accomplishment.

Malcolm wrote:

Certainly that is how it is explained but certain people in Tibetan Buddhism.

Others explain it differntly i.e. it is method for inducing rapid accomplishment. For example, in Lamdre, there is union yoga both below and above the path of seeing.

This relates somewhat to what David Chapman was talking about in the Aro thread i.e. that "tantra" or the erotic elements in Vajrayāna have been somewhat suppressed. Probably a necessary consequence of Vajrayāna in monasteries. But in reality, tantric practice in India was more liberal. There is also cultural issues -- Indians have a more eroticized culture than Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

thetrouserman said:

"Basically,Vasubandhu, in the Vimasatika, refutes the idea that Hells are real places because the hell beings (karma yamas) that one is tortured by would be gathering karma, but in fact they are not. They are just projections of the mind." --Namdrol

My own Buddhist teacher said that even this world is a projection of the mind, and yet it

feels very real, and pain in it feels very real, so how is it not real in Tibetan Buddhism? Even here we have torturers who are collecting up bad karma.

Also could you tell me where I can find this information that you have given?

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that hells do not have a conventional or externally perceivable location, unlike ghosts, animal realm, human realm, god realm, and so on.

Anyway, it is a Yogacara idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Namdrol said:

One of the funny things that people say is that lower tantra is more suitable for general public. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Actually, in lower tantra there are many rites for attracting and seducing human and non-human woman, killing enemies, and so on.

The model for the four activities, pacifying, enrichment, power, and destructive rites, etc., come directly from kriya tantra. Kriya tantra is practiced for these siddhis specifically.

Astus said:

What do you make of the similar magic techniques described in HYT like the Cakrasamvara Tantra? It becomes symbolic suddenly?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, who really knows. The way these tantras are interpreted however is that they are all symbols.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Namdrol said:

in lower tantra there are many rites for attracting and seducing human and non-human woman,

wayland said:

Hi Namdrol,

In the absence of a flesh & blood consort, is a Jñāna Mudrā - a maiden created through

the power of one's visualization - a viable alternative? I wondered if the non-human woman you mention above is similar?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, viable.

No, in kriya tantra such rites are just for having control over woman. Non-human in this case means yakshinis and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

'Tantric wanking' ?

Are you referring to Vajroli Mudra?

Vajroli Mudra, though it might appear to be like "wanking", is actually quite the opposite of wanking.

Edit: Of course there is also Jnanamudra; and there are also many variations of Vajrolimudra out there.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. That is different. Vajroli is training in drawing fluids into the urethra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

justsit said:

I was referring to wanking.

Malcolm wrote:

Unless of course it is tantric wanking since you lack a real consort, for example, monks. You still have to inflame your passion and so on. It is not just simple visualization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:
Sexual-misconduct like masturbation

Namdrol said:
Wanking is only sexual misconduct for monks.

justsit said:
It's still craving and attachment for everyone, yes?

Malcolm wrote:
In fact, to do consort practice, you have to inflame you and your partner's desire as much as possible, use very erotic language, candles, nice food, wine, clothes, scents, being as free from physical inhibition as possible, etc., and you have to do so for an extended period of time, weeks and months.

People who claim that it is some dry yogic experience free of desire obviously have never actually received actual detailed instruction on it, or done the practice.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 2:57 AM
Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:
If people want to waste their energy through masturbation, that's their choice then. But I do not recommend it at all.

Anyway, in The Crystal and the Way of Light, Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche implied that Karmamudra is not necessary for Dzogchen, but that it can be a great Semdzin practice.

Malcolm wrote:
Karmamudra practice is completely unnecessary in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 2:34 AM
Title: Re: The Aro gTér: some answers and questions
Content:
cloudburst said:
But we are having fun.

Malcolm wrote:

Strange idea of fun -- recycling endless boring conversations on the internet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

No, because it causes damage to the nervous system whether we are a monk or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Bollocks.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Sexual-misconduct like masturbation

Malcolm wrote:

Wanking is only sexual misconduct for monks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Also, if you have received the Direct Introduction of Dzogchen, you can perform Karmamudra as a Semdzin, without having to do any complicated visualizations.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not karmamudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: The Aro gTér: some answers and questions

Content:

Jikan said:

Apropos of whether an invented history & lineage are problematic for Dzogchenpas: I also saw lay tantrikas who had acted irresponsibly, old sorcerers, and ordinary people who had pretended to be lamas, inconceivable numbers of them vomiting blood and experiencing unbearable bodily pain. I saw many carnivorous creatures devouring them and many denizens of hell hurling accusations of misdeeds at them.

This is from Delog Dawa Drolma's account of her experiences in the various realms, recorded in English in Delog (p. 82). I assume this text has some authority in this forum and in this thread.

I would like to know if there is any plausible rebuttal to the position that our friends involved in a "vajra romance" with the Aro scene are, in fact, students of ordinary people who are pretending to be lamas, as Dawa Drolma puts it. This is the primary critique against Aro, that it's phony. It's clear to me from this and other sources that if it's phony, then it's a problem. But the problem goes away if David or anyone else can show it's not phony. Well?

Malcolm wrote:

This whole thread is ridiculous-- why? Because this was first discussed on the Trike boards. Then E-sangha. Now here. And it is largely the same people, and the same words.

It is very clear -- some people like Chogyam and his trip; other people think it is bullshit. So, nothing has changed. Some people like Dzogchen, other people think it is bullshit. Some people like Mahamudra, other people think it is bullshit. Some people like Gelug, other people think it is bullshit. Some people like Lamdre, other people think it is bullshit. Some people like gzhan stong, other people think it is bullshit. Some people like Tibetan Buddhism, other people think it is bullshit. Some people like Zen, other people think it is bullshit. Some people like Buddhism, other people think it is bullshit.

So, we have gone nowhere further than discovering some people like Chogyam and his trip, and other people think it is bullshit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Kriya tantra, such as avalokiteshvara tantra is more suitable for general public. This tantra is without consort and te conduct has to be extremely pure. No garlic and vegetarian.

Malcolm wrote:

One of the funny things that people say is that lower tantra is more suitable for general public. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Actually, in lower tantra there are many rites for attracting and seducing human and non-human woman, killing enemies, and so on.

The model for the four activities, pacifying, enrichment, power, and destructive rites, etc., come directly from kriya tantra. Kriya tantra is practiced for these siddhis specifically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 7th, 2012 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

conebeckham said:

Mahamudra is at all times inseperable from the path of Tantra, in fact. It's inseperable from all experience.

Malcolm wrote:

All sentient beings are emanations of mahāmudrā, the essence of those emanations is the forever non-arising dharmadhātu, also all characteristics of dualistic appearances, happiness, suffering and so on, are the play of mahāmudrā, the original dharmatā.

-- Virupa

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: devotion in refuge practice

Content:

tomamundsen said:

That leads to the immediate follow-up question: should I even be doing the inner preliminaries if I don't have tremendous devotion for him yet? I mean, yea he has been guiding through the visualization and mechanics of the practice, but is there some sort of implicit agreement in Tibetan sanghas that you shouldn't actually begin ngondro until you can see him as a buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

No.

While you are to understand the object being visualized as inseperable with your root

guru, if you don't have a root guru, just focus on the object of refuge.

Do not contrive devotion you do not have. But by practicing you will develop devotion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: devotion in refuge practice

Content:

tomamundsen said:

there actually a difference between the two? Even if there is no difference, I still feel like it will be two separate processes.

Malcolm wrote:

You always, no matter what, take refuge in your root Guru inseperable with the object of refuge you are visualizing, for instance, Guru Rinpoche or Vajradhara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: The Aro gTér: some answers and questions

Content:

David Chapman said:

Uh, no. Are you referring to "No cosmic justice"? That doesn't reject rebirth or karma at all. (I understand that it could easily be misread that way if you start from the assumption that anyone who isn't altogether traditional will hold all modernist prejudices. Maybe it needs some clarification and expansion.)

The page explicitly endorses a particular notion of karma, and says nothing about rebirth one way or the other. The point is that there isn't an external, eternal mechanism of reward and punishment.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you might one to rework that one, than -- because there is nothing partiucclarly novel about the Dzogchen presentation of karma. There are novelties in Dzogchen, but that is not one of them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: The Aro gTér: some answers and questions

Content:

David Chapman said:

Adamantine, yes, the distinction between terma and other re-presentation is worth being clear about. (Although, according to Guru Chöwang, ultimately, all Dharma is terma.)

Malcolm wrote:

No, Guru Chowang's point is that the whole universe is a treasure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Vimala or Agar

Content:

MalaBeads said:

What is the best way of obtaining some vimala or agar? There are no Tibetan doctors in my area.

Being conditioned by the western medical system, I have an assumption that a doctor would want to see me before prescribing but that may not be the case. I know some Tibetan herbs may be obtained via mail. If so, how and where would I send for them? What's the best way of going about this?

Malcolm wrote:

Vimala can be used by more or less anyone.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Namdrol said:

Mahāmudra is a result by whatever path you practice to get there. Sure, you can say "This is the road to New York". But being on the road to New York is not being in New York. Likewise, you can say "this is the path of Mahāmudra", meaning that if you practice this path, you will realize the result, mahāmudra.

Jinzang said:

Mahamudra is taught as ground, path, and fruition. This sort of logic chopping is not helpful to the practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure: Tilopa describes the ground, path and result mahāmudra quite concisely in this passage:

Beyond all objects of perception, the nature of the mind is luminous, [basis]
without a path to traverse, the path of Buddhahood is entered, [path]
if one cultivates without an object of meditation, one will attain unsurpassed awakening.
[result]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

conebeckham said:

I understand this position, Namdrol, and I have had almost exactly the same conversation with Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso myself, and have also heard him comment on it publically in a larger group, as well. Nevertheless, if one takes the position, as you have in another thread, that Mahamudra REALLY means the "result," then can it not be said that all practices and techniques are really Mahamudra teachings, in a sense? Granted, the contents of the teachings contained in the Sutra presentation focus on Mind's Emptiness and Nature, Qualities, Awareness, etc. But even Serlingpa's Lojong tradition, which is surely a Sutra-based tradition with no Tantric content can be said to be part of the presentation.....

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really, because sutrayāna practice will not result in the realization of the 13th bhumi. The state of mahāmudra and the thirteenth bhumi are synonymous. The name of thirteenth bhumi, much less, mahāmudra, does not exist in sutra and is not really even hinted at.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

tomamundsen said:

The truth is that if you just dig a little deeper and read some of the less popular fascicles in Shobogenzo, you'll see he talks about literal reincarnation, accumulation of merit, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes I know that. I have.

But in fact I disagree with you about the first point. I do not agree that Dogen is a gradual school adherent.

That is why I use the term "non-gradual" rather than sudden.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Universities/Buddhist Studies

Content:

lotwell said:

My fantasy is unearthing ancient texts in remote monasteries and translating them. In reality I would more likely be looking at sitting in front of a computer all day translating works no one will ever read.

Malcolm wrote:

The reality, if you can actually get a teaching position, is that you will spend your days teaching world religion classes to freshman who don't care and survey courses on Buddhism, and in the evening writing papers because of the publish or die phenomena that is pervasive in academia. You will get little translation done.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: The Aro gTér: some answers and questions

Content:

heart said:

Protestant Buddhism expressing its true face as the degeneration of Dharma in our times. There can't be much of Dudjom Rinpoche left in Ngakpa Chögyam teachings if his students say this.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

In David's case, he explicitly rejects karma and rebirth and claims that the rejection of karma and rebirth is intention of Dzogchen, its "little secret".

Of course this is completely false since the concept of multiple bardos and so on come directly from the Dzogchen tantras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Astus said:

Dogen... taught no enlightenment to be achieved but zazen itself became buddhahood for him.

tomamundsen said:

A common misunderstanding of Dogen.

Malcolm wrote:

Well then, there are tons of Soto Zen practitioners out there who misunderstand Dogen and there own tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 2:25 PM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Soto is a gradual enlightenment school of zen

Namdrol said:

No, this is not so.

tomamundsen said:

Right, but it's not sudden either.

Malcolm wrote:

The best term is non-gradual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 1:00 PM

Title: Re: Are Karma and Rebirth Real?

Content:

Beatzen said:

I don't believe that we are the same "person" who is reborn. The mind is the same, but the contents are more or less [dis]similar, though influenced by past karma.

Malcolm wrote:

Causes and effects are not the same, nor are they different.

The mind that takes rebirth is not as same as the previous mind nor is it different.

This is the reason why it is possible for sentient beings to experience serial rebirth through the appropriation of an infinite series of new physical bodies over time, relatively speaking.

By saying that there is no actual rebirth, one is committing oneself to a metaphysical position called *ucchedavada* i.e. annihilationism. Committing oneself to the position that there is an actual self, person, or entity that is reborn is called *śāśvatavāda*, eternalism.

But when one understands that one instant of mind is neither the same nor different than the next instant of mind; since they are not the same, one avoids *śāśvatavāda*; and since they are not different, one avoids *ucchedavada* — thus one can understand the truth of rebirth, karma and its result, and dependent origination in the manner in which the Buddha intended and leave off the metaphysical speculations that plague non-Buddhists about such issues. One can then also understand that since the mind has no beginning, it never arose; and since it never arose, it never ceases.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 12:07 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

All of the sectarian criticisms from all quarters have already been voiced and addressed centuries ago.

Malcolm wrote:

You seem to have mistaken me for someone who is sectarian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 11:51 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Find for yourself whether it is true or not.

.

Malcolm wrote:
I already have.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 11:40 AM
Title: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi
Content:

DarwidHalim said:
Soto is a gradual enlightenment school of zen

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is not so.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 11:28 AM
Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi
Content:
DarwidHalim said:
You are mixing up with what is called
Pure Mahamudra, and
Tantric Mahamudra.

There is no such thing called consort practice or deity yoga in Mahamudra, like what had been said by Virupa and Saraha.

Pure Mahamudra is free from all these tantric stuff, energy stuff, and free from ceremony etc. In this way, Shikantaza fits properly with pure Mahamudra practice.

Malcolm wrote:
What you are referring to as "pure" mahāmudra is based on a direct introduction as the Dohakosha of Saraha clearly states "The non-dual is demonstrated by the venerable supreme Guru".

In this respect it is nothing like Shikantaza in Soto Zen, since in Soto Zen there is no direct introduction.

The practice of Shikantaza is non-gradual. Sutra mahāmudra is gradual. So they are different in this respect as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 10:49 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is no path of mahāmudra. Mahāmudra is not a path and not meditation. For example, the mahāsiddha Kotalipa states:

Do not cultivate a mental meditation,
also non-meditation is not a meditation.
Beyond meditation and non-meditation,
not existing in the mind, is mahāmudrā.

tomamundsen said:

This sounds a lot like shikantaza.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that this is based on direct introduction and consort practice. Kotalipa also said:

Bhadrapa said excellently:

“There is no instruction, meditation, or contemplation;
Buddhahood itself is attained
because of the beautiful consort possessing supreme joy.”

And:

When the sun and moon are seized by the eclipse
Buddhahood itself arises here
through the non-dual wisdom which
melts from the union of the prajñā and the vajra.

And:

Possessing the power of the ten wisdoms.
The space of the sublime Prajñā Queen’s lotus
is the path upon which to travel,
to return to Bhadra’s stage.

But then of course we have Dombhi Heruka's Four Syllables:

The Upadeśa of the Great Bliss of Dharma

There are three essences, four commitments, three deviations and four methods of equipoise.

The three essences:

Effortlessness;

Without contrivance;

Everything that occurs is understood as one's own mind.

The four commitments:

Afflictions are not abandoned because they are one's mind.

Antidotes are not relied upon because the mind is non-dual.

The true nature is not meditated upon because mind is without grasping.

A result is not hoped for, realizing the mind itself is Buddhahood.

The three deviations:

If there is hope for Buddhahood, it is a deviation.

If there is fear towards Samsara, it is a deviation.

If there is attachment to appearances, it is a deviation.

The four methods of equipoise:

Just like the limpid quality of water when it is undisturbed, remain relaxed in uncontrived mind.

Just as a bird in the sky leaves no tracks, consciousness remains without support.

Just like the sun not concealed by clouds, remain in one's own unobstructed state relaxing into the objects of the six sense organs.

Just like water always falling, remain undistracted at all times and in all activities.

The heart upadesha of the great master Dombhi Heruka called 'Four Syllables' is complete.

Translated by Lama Migmar Tseten and Loppon Kunga Namdrol.

© Drogmi translation Project 2006

Dobhi Heruka himself, however, achieved complete awakening through the empowerment.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: The Neurotic Zen of Mint

Content:

mint said:

I just wish I had some sort of plan laid out for me like a syllabus explaining what I can and can't, should and shouldn't do.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no limitations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 10:25 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sahaja Mahāmudra, according to the great Drugpa Kagyu master Gyalba Yanggonpa, is Gampopa's own system. So you really cannot claim that Kagyu Mahāmudra is any more Indian than the Dzogchen you are criticizing.

conebeckham said:

Well...although Saraha certainly practiced the Two Stages, he is often credited as the primary Mahasiddha source of Sahaja Mahamudra.....which is presented as separate from the two stages.

Or so I've been taught.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two systems of realizing mahāmudra: the two stages or guru yoga.

Mahāmudra is based on direct introduction in both cases. Apart from that, there is no other Mahāmudra.

Some people like to talk about a sutra mahāmudra, but it is very clear that was elaborated by Gampopa for people he felt were not ready for real Mahāmudra teachings. Not only have I read this, but this was also kindly explained to me by Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso personally.

BTW, since this is just the "Mahāmudra" forum -- it is not the sole province of Kagyupas. Sakyas, Gelugs, Nyingmapas also have teachings on Mahāmudra. So in no way can the Kagyu perspective on Mahāmudra be considered definitive or all-embracing -- all schools of Tibetan Buddhism have lineages and teachings on Saraha's original Sahaja Mahāmudra. But only Kagyu and later, Gelug, have teachings on a system termed sutra mahāmudra. Sutra mahāmudra is not bad -- in fact, it is quite a good system -- but in reality it is just a name for perfection of wisdom teachings with some effort made to correlate the view of the tantras and the dohas with the view of sutra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 10:19 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Z

Mahāmudra is not combined with tantric practice, it is the result of tantric practice of the two stages.

Jinzang said:

Mahamudra is the result, but also a set of practices that lead to the result, and not just the development and completion stage practices. So says every Kagyu lama I have ever met, and their view ought to be definitive, and not the view of some critics of mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is a result by whatever path you practice to get there. Sure, you can say "This is the road to New York". But being on the road to New York is not being in New York. Likewise, you can say "this is the path of Mahāmudra", meaning that if you practice this path, you will realize the result, mahāmudra.

The two stages are not the only way to realize mahāmudra. There is also Guru Yoga.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Z

Tantric yoga is combined between Mahamudra practice + deity yoga + guru yoga , and so on.

That is the point I want to make it clear by putting all this Saraha, Virupa song.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is not combined with tantric practice, it is the result of tantric practice of the two stages.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

This is even scarier.

What is the use all master explaining the PATH of mahamudra?

Again, we need to know the place when we are talking realization and when we are

talking the practice part to realize that.

Please don't mix them.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no path of mahāmudra. Mahāmudra is not a path and not meditation. For example, the mahāsiddha Kotalipa states:

Do not cultivate a mental meditation,
also non-meditation is not a meditation.
Beyond meditation and non-meditation,
not existing in the mind, is mahāmudrā.

And Virupa states:

That great profound term “mahāmudrā”,
whatever it's basis of designation is, also has the label “empty”;
as moments are empty by nature who realizes selflessness?
There is no realizer, just a name, a term, a label,
Also that is not perfect, a projection of disciples,
also in disciples there is no self, similar with illusions and emanations,
“Mahāmudrā” is a mental imputation of the childish.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: The Neurotic Zen of Mint

Content:

wisdom said:

My financial situation sucks too. I make 10\$ an hour, live with a room mate who has pretty heavy delusions, I take public transit to work. I haven't even been able to afford to join the DC yet, let alone buy a pile of books and DVDs. My family is poor, my father is basically homeless. On top of this I have about 10 grand in debt from various stupid things. Most of that is from a single electric bill and the IRS, despite being minimum wage they think I owe them thousands of dollars and I can't afford to fight it. I have no schooling to show for it, and can't afford to attend the Buddhist college I want to go to because they don't accept FAFSA. I can't ordain to become a monk because you have to be debt free, and I would actually do that for a few years if I could and learn Tibetan, then go off to a 9 year college in Tibet. If I had only 20k, I could begin to make all my dreams a reality. As it stands most likely none of them will ever happen, and such a small barrier in reality exists between them being a fantasy and reality. Such is life.

Malcolm wrote:

Acually, what you have to do is file for bankruptcy. Chapter 7. Really. They will just clear

your debts. Including your tax debt, as long as you filed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

In this case you are saying there is no meditation in Kagyu lineage.

Please note we are now talking not in the ultimate sense, but in relative sense. If we just mix them without knowing the place, it simply brings confusion.

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot meditate on mahāmudra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: Is Zen Buddhism...

Content:

Beatzen said:

that's what makes it fun. And also fun is playing ball with the teacher where teacher constantly knocks down all your bullshit opinions about the meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

The meaning of the heart sutra is very simple -- it is about the inseparability of samsara and nirvana. That is simple, but it is also profound.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

tomamundsen said:

I thought all beings in Kamadhatu had form bodies?

Namdrol said:

Basically,Vasubandhu, in the Vimasatika, refutes the idea that Hells are real places because the hell beings (karma yamas) that one is tortured by would be gathering karma, but in fact they are not. They are just projections of the mind.

tomamundsen said:

Ah, thank you for the clarification Loppon-la. But in the Kosa, he presents it as a physical place, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Caz said:

Basically,Vasubandhu, in the Vimasatika, refutes the idea that Hells are real places because the hell beings (karma yamas) that one is tortured by would be gathering karma, but in fact they are not. They are just projections of the mind.

This wouldnt not make it any less real would it ? Just like the dream that you never awake from. I wouldnt assume that hells where physically existing places but rather like the bardos no ?

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, they have no physical location, they are not x number of yojanas below the ground.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

thetrouserman said:

I learned from two of my Theravada teachers that hell is a real place of torture that you go to when you die if your karma is bad enough to merit going there. What is the Tibetan Buddhist view of hell? Is it the same?

Namdrol said:

In Tibetan Buddhism, in Mahāyāna in general, it is considered a mental state, but not a real external place.

tomamundsen said:
I thought all beings in Kamadhatu had form bodies?

Malcolm wrote:
Basically,Vasubandhu, in the Vimasatika, refutes the idea that Hells are real places because the hell beings (karma yamas) that one is tortured by would be gathering karma, but in fact they are not. They are just projections of the mind.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 5:43 AM
Title: Re: The Neurotic Zen of Mint
Content:
Pero said:
Otherwise most of us here could go ballistic half the time Namdrol posts something.

Malcolm wrote:
....

Half the time people do...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 3:21 AM
Title: Re: The Neurotic Zen of Mint
Content:

mint said:
I'm scared to practice Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:
This is like being scared of recognizing your own face in a mirror.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 2:58 AM
Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
thetrouserman said:
I learned from two of my Theravada teachers that hell is a real place of torture that you go to when you die if your karma is bad enough to merit going there. What is the Tibetan Buddhist view of hell? Is it the same?

Malcolm wrote:

In Tibetan Buddhism, in Mahāyāna in general, it is considered a mental state, but not a real external place.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: The Aro gTér: some answers and questions

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: The Neurotic Zen of Mint

Content:

mint said:

I hope, after reading this thread, people will exercise more discretion when pushing people into things which they themselves acknowledge that they're not ready for!

Malcolm wrote:

No one pushed you to do anything.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Expanding Samadhi

Content:

Beatzen said:

Can you also give me a rundown of the other mental factors, for my learning?

Malcolm wrote:

Here is a good list.

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Fifty-one_mental_states "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

As for discovering mind's root, that doesn't sound like Zazen, and I'd like not to be tempted to shop around after these couple years of study with the Zen people. I have a hard time with a meditation where you "look" for things. Not my personal style.

Discovering the root of the mind eliminates the need for Zazen or any other form of contrived meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

All are complete path. If not complete, Saraha and Virupa will not criticize these practices in this Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

What you seem to fail to understand is that for Saraha and Virupa, there is no meditation of Mahāmudra at all. Mahāmudra is a name for the result, buddhahood.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: I Believe in Literal Rebirth - Poll

Content:

Beatzen said:

Well I'm certainly not going to apologize for that, Ad. I've always regarded pali sources as more authentic when it comes to the words of the buddha. I value the prajnaparamita sutras, but when it comes to teachings on dependant origination, and other technical concepts - I usually look for the pali reference. Just an ideosyncrasy I have.

Malcolm wrote:

The Pali Canon (as well the Agamas) does not tease out the nuances of dependent origination and emptiness

That is where Mahāyāna sutras and tantras are important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

I see, so for you, the most profound practice and the high point of India Mahāyāna is the two stages with their result, Mahāmudra as taught by Virupa, Tilopa, Naropa, etc. from the Hevajra, Cakrasamvara, Kalacakra and other annutarayoga tantras.

Jnana said:

Yes, of course. And also the teachings of Maitrīpa and Atiśa, and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok -- well, I find the 17 tantras and Nyinthig more interesting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Why I said Shikantaza and Mahamudra is similar is because of the direct path meditation.

Not all Mahamudra needs ceremony. They can be as plain and as simple as Shikantaza.

Malcolm wrote:

Sutra Mahāmudra also has rather elaborate system of introduction.

All Mahāmudra is based on introduction, because ultimately Mahāmudra is a Vajrayāna system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: How is Mahamudra different from Shikantaza

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Virupa mentioned:

"Some are completely tortured with empowerment rites, some always count their rosary saying hūm phat, some consume shit, piss, blood, semen and meat, some meditate the yoga of nadi and vāyu, but all are deluded."

Funny, this is my translation from which you are quoting.

You are missing a crucial point. This Doha for example, of Virupa is not an expression of mahāmudra as a path. It is an expression of Virupa's realization of the result from following the path of the two stages of creation and completion based on his practice of Nairatmayogini (the consort of Hevajra).

At the end, I just want to say that Mahamudra meditation is a meditation free from visualization, it is a direct path to realize this clear light. Can you see the conflict with Tantra - generation Path, where actually we PURPOSELY do visualization? They are conflicting each other.

Malcolm wrote:

These three mahāmudras are regularly practice by Karma Kagyus without conflict (This elaboration of three mahāmudras is mostly Karma Kagyu approach, BTW, in Drugpa and Drigung, they practice a different system that comes from Phagmo Dru called five-fold mahāmudra). In fact they are considered to be mutually supportive.

But in all of this you are missing one crucial point -- sutra mahāmudra that you cite, according to Kongtrul, is elaborated for those who do not have the capacity to practice the two stages. This meditation is does not rely on mantra and visualization because it is sutra path of the perfection of wisdom.

The middle one, is classical Indian tantric practice of the two stages of creation and completion.

The last, essence mahāmudra, is the mahāmudra which is solely based on a direct introduction and finds its justification in the mahāmudra chapter of the Jñānasiddhi by Indrabodhi. Through this, the disciple realizes the essence of the nature of the mind and remains in that state.

But Darwid, this far, while I have received teaching on Zen, Mahāmudra, and Dzogchen, I am not sure what teachings, if any you are have received from anyone. If you have not received any real teachings on these things, you are like a blind man talking about colors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

So you really cannot claim that Kagyu Mahāmudra is any more Indian that the Dzogchen you are criticizing.

Jnana said:

Again, the teachings of the Indian mahāsiddhas (Tilo, Naro, etc.) is the high point of Mahāyāna Buddhism, and hasn't been surpassed by anything that came later, including Kagyu mahāmudrā.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so for you, the most profound practice and the high point of India Mahāyāna is the two stages with their result, Mahāmudra as taught by Virupa, Tilopa, Naropa, etc. from the Hevajra, Cakrasamvara, Kalacakra and other annutarayoga tantras.

If I did not know better, I would say you were a Sakyapa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Astus said:

Zen doesn't require anything special, there are no transmissions,

Malcolm wrote:

This is the main different between Zen on the one hand, and (Kagyu) Mahāmudra and Dzogchen on the other. It is also the main difference between sutra and tantra i.e. the presence or absence of direct introduction. Mahāmudra and Dzogchen are based on direct introduction. This does not exist in any school of Zen, much less sutra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

However, IMO the teachings of the Indian mahāsiddhas (Tilo, Naro, etc.) represent the high point of Mahāyāna Buddhism, and nothing else has surpassed them in any way (contrary to the claims of certain Tibetan doxographies, and so on).

Malcolm wrote:

The path of such Indian mahāsiddhas was the two stages. Mahāmudra was the result experienced by these Indian mahāsiddhas from practicing the two stages which is why Saraha, Tilopa and Naropa passed on so many tantric practices (especially, Cakrasamvara, which begins with Saraha).

Sahaja Mahāmudra, according to the great Drugpa Kagyu master Gyalba Yanggonpa, is Gampopa's own system. So you really cannot claim that Kagyu Mahāmudra is any more Indian than the Dzogchen you are criticizing.

In fact, if anything, the Dzogchen you are criticizing is, from a western textual perspective, a bit earlier than Kagyu Mahāmudra. Chetsun Senge Wangchuk achieved rainbow body in 1128, having passed on his teachings to lCegom Nagpo and Shangton, just to put things in perspective. By this time the 17 tantras and the Dzogchen Nyingthig system were fully articulated. Milarepa passed in 1135. Milarepa's teachings became famous, in part, because his student Gampopa spread the fame of his teacher among Kadampas and secured the reputation of the Kagyu school. Nyingthig continued in obscurity in western Tsang largely, I imagine, because it became a family lineage of the

lCe clan (Lcegom Nagpo, etc) and the Zhang clan (Zhangton, his son Zhangkhas Nyibum, etc.).

While I am not going to knock the practice the two stages, for me, Dzogchen is more interesting.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Well, except that modern authors, like Dudjom R., ridiculed the Tibetan tendency to dismiss "Tibetan" tantras just because they were "Tibetan", pointing out there was no good reason to assume that Indians were more realized by nature than Tibetans.

gregkavarnos said:

But then doesn't the concept of lineage just fall apart at the seams? I mean, so much time and energy is spent by all trying to trace the lineage of their teaching back to its (normally) Indian source and suddenly...

Doesn't a statement like this leave the whole deal open to tantras that do not have an Indian origin (or at least a lineage to back them up), like the English language tantra of the Aro mob?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not at all. If a full realized Tibetan produces a tantra, then it should be accepted as a valid teaching -- same goes for a fully realized American, African, European, etc.

The fact is however, is that there is very little to "reveal" -- so there is not much point in producing new texts that say the same stuff over and over again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

And how is this different than Mahāyāna in general?

Jnana said:

It isn't. As I've already said, it's the same boring recurring theme in the long history of Buddhist polemics: Move the goal posts, invent new rules, create a lineage history going back to some authoritative source (preferably Indian), then claim that yours is a

superior game. It's like arguing over the quickest way to arrive at the Garden of the Hesperides.

[/quote/

I wasn't making a polemical argument -- I was making a taxonomical statement, which for some reason you insist was polemical -- even though it is not.

Namdrol said:

Generally speaking it works like this -- if you read books by Kagyus, Mahāmudra and Dzogchen are the same.

And this is the crux of the issue, given that this thread is in the Mahāmudrā sub-forum. I've offered explicit statements by a number of teachers who have trained in both systems, as has Astus. I think that their analysis is cogent, and that yours is not.

Malcolm wrote:

And I can offer citations by masters who have trained in both systems who assert the presentation of the basis in Dzogchen and Mahāmudra are not the same, and that it is an error to conflate them based in superficial similarities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be a Buddhist and believe in God?

Content:

Nemo said:

How would you explain the Primordial Buddha Samantabhadra to a person lacking a strong background in philosophy?

Malcolm wrote:

The same way I would explain it to you -- Samantabhadra was the first person in this eon to wake up, did so without ever falling into samsara, hence he is the first (adi) buddha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 11:45 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

You reckon if we keep thrashing it we will finally break it down to its essential particles?

wisdom said:

I for one want this horse to look like its been through CERN!

Seriously though, because I'm not well read enough to know about these subtle distinctions, and since I have both Dzogchen and Mahamudra books, its nice to see how people think they are the same and different

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking it works like this -- if you read books by Kagyus, Mahāmudra and Dzogchen are the same. If you read books by Nyingmapas, they are different, and Kagyu Mahāmudra is just Dzogchen sems sde in drag. Sakyapas happily admit Dzogchen and Mahāmudra are different (where they are not shunning it as a Hashang deviation) and charitable Geluggpas like HHDL try to convince everyone that the fundamental mind of clear light and Dzogchen are the same.

Me, I stick with what ChNN says about the issue (i.e. Dzogchen and Mahāmudra are completely different, with different paths and so on).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 11:41 AM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be a Buddhist and believe in God?

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

This idea that 'Buddhism' is strictly atheist is a western invention used to please secularists

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all -- there are detailed refutations of God in all sorts of classical Buddhist texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 11:35 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

In this case, we are simply back to the square.

Ok then, let it be.

Malcolm wrote:

Ball is in your court, since the initial assertion was yours.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

To them, to call a teaching "Tibetan" rather than "Indian" was the ultimate put down.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, except that modern authors, like Dudjom R., ridiculed the Tibetan tendency to dismiss "Tibetan" tantras just because they were "Tibetan", pointing out there was no good reason to assume that Indians were more realized by nature than Tibetans.

Now then, there is certainly good reason to dismiss a "Tibetan" teaching if you find that it does not meet your criteria for a useful teaching.

ince I have no vested interest in harmonizing this or that teaching with some other teaching, I am free to examine each teaching based on its merits and from its terminological perspective.

The fact is that I think that Dzogchen is more interesting than other teachings and more relevant and more profound for a ton of reasons space will not allow me to expand upon.

Jñāna seems to think that just because people use similar terms they must mean the same thing or have the same path. But we know this is a very faulty and problematical perspective. This kind of thinking has lead to reams of improper refutation -- for example, Gelugpas refuting Lamdre and Dzogchen on an equal footing as mind-only school proponents, (not to mention Kagyu Mahāmudra) because both Dzogchen and Lamdre use the term "ālaya" (albeit in different ways)

My sole point which set this off is that the basis discussed in dzogchen and the basis discussed in mahāmudra are not the same since the path is not the same. Is it the case that tregchö and mahāmudra are very similar? Yes -- but tregchö is not summum bonum of Dzogchen.

But according to Jñāna, we should ignore tögal because, according to him, it and man ngag sde has no "Indian" antecedent (as if that is even important).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 11:05 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

There is no dispute in the view of mahamudra. So, we are not discussing mahamudra here. My view about Mahamudra has no conflict with all proponents of Mahamudra here.

Malcolm wrote:

Your view of mahāmudra is in conflict with mine.

DarwidHalim said:

Since you can say Zazen is less direct than Mahamudra, you have must a solid base to say it out. We want to know your this solid base about Zazen.

Malcolm wrote:

Since you obviously think Zazen is the same as Mahāmudra, "you have must a solid base to say it out. We want to know your this solid base about" mahāmudra.

N

PS, everyone can see by now this conversation is fruitless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 10:41 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

It's rather hilarious that something which was never a significant part of Indian Buddhism is now proclaimed as the apex of all things Buddhist!

Malcolm wrote:

And how is this different than Mahāyāna in general? Just what exactly is it about Indians that make their insight intrinsically more valuable than those from Oddiyāna, or Khotan, or Gilgit or even Tibet -- not to mention China or Japan?

At least when I dismiss something, I don't do so on the basis of its national origin. I try to do so based on what is actually being said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

What Tibetan and Sanskrit term are you using for natural state?

Jnana said:

Buddhist soteriology doesn't require a specialized language. But take your pick: gnas lugs, gshis kyi gnas lugs, gshis kyi babs, etc., etc..

Malcolm wrote:

Well, yes it does. Dharmatā for example, does not have the same meaning in every system, correct?

Mahāmudra has its terminology based on its path; Dzogchen, its terminology based on its path; they are different paths and their terminology is not commensurate because of that.

Jnana said:

The Dzogchen Tantras fall into the same category of scriptural apocrypha as the Vajrasamadhi Sutra and other non-Indian sources.

Malcolm wrote:

When did you become an Indiophile, or have you always been and I just never noticed?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 10:20 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

It is fair isn't it? If we want to say something we must know what we are talking in great detail. Please then elaborate.

Malcolm wrote:

As our Norwegian friend said, apply the same standard to yourself, then we can talk. For starters, please tell us who gave you instruction in Dzogchen and Mahāmudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Namdrol said:

My initial point, which prompted this flood of comments, was to disabuse someone of the notion that the meditation of mahāmudra, dzogchen and Soto Zen are more or less the same. This assertion could not be more mistaken.

gregkavarnos said:

So, to clarify the situation for me, what you are saying is that the methods differ but not the outcomes? Am I understanding you correctly?

Malcolm wrote:

All Buddhist paths lead to buddhahood, some sooner, some later.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Honestly, I think this analysis by this master is a bit misleading -- he is trying to assert that gzhi described by Dzogchen has an equivalent counterpart in the kun gzhi of the Mahāmudra system.

Jnana said:

The natural state is the natural state.

Malcolm wrote:

What Tibetan and Sanskrit term are you using for natural state?

Namdrol said:

The system of differentiating mind and wisdom (sems and ye shes) in Mahāmudra is not the same as differentiating between mind and vidyā in Dzogchen and does not have the same intention.

I suspect that the Indian mahasiddhas would have had no problem satirizing these Tibetan maneuvers. As would the Chinese Chan masters.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Ok, I will repeat one more time for the benefit our readers, since you are clearly not interested in having any kind of reasonable discussion -- these differences in presentation depend on respective differences in paths.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Unknown said:

Tsele Natsok Rangdröl indicates otherwise. The Circle of the Sun:...

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, I think this analysis by this master is a bit misleading -- he is trying to assert that gzhi described by Dzogchen has an equivalent counterpart in the kun gzhi of the Mahāmudra system. However, if you read any straight mahāmudra manual, for example, Dagpo Tashi Namgyal's texts or Sakyapa presentations and so on, for them the basis [gzhi] is the all-basis [kun gzhi], the clear and empty nature of the mind. It is called the all-basis because when it is not recognized, it is the basis for samsara, and when it is recognized, it is the basis for nirvana.

On the other hand, you have Dzogchen texts that systematically differentiate between gzhi and kun gzhi. The reason for this is not arbitrary and have everything to do with the path of Dzogchen. These topics are not mentioned at all in any system of Mahāmudra since they form no part of Mahāmudra practice. The system of differentiating mind and wisdom (sems and ye shes) in Mahāmudra is not the same as differentiating between mind and vidyā in Dzogchen and does not have the same intention.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: rTsa, rTsal, and the Fruition of Trekchö

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Are there Tibetan (or even Sanskrit) words that would fill in the following blanks?

Trekchö - Kadag - Dharmakaya - Thigle - Essence - Sounds

Thögal - Lhungrub - Sambhogakaya - Lung - Nature - Lights

Yermed - _____ - Nirmanakaya - rTsa - Energy - Rays

Malcolm wrote:

samapatti; viśuddhi, dharmakāya, tilaka/bindu, svabhāva, śabda

xxxxx ; nirabhogana/anabhogana, sambhogakāya, vāyu, prakriti, ābhāsvarāḥ, prabhā
asambhedaḥ, karuna, nirmanakāya, nāḍī, kāra, raśmi

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:
there are different views possible, or something else?

Malcolm wrote:
There are different views.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 11:33 PM
Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen
Content:
Astus said:
kalden yungdrung,

The topic of lights, energy and bardo are covered under the six yogas of Naropa. In that sense, it is the path of transformation and not the path of liberation.

Malcolm wrote:
You should read Dudjom R. You are suffering from more misconceptions than I have time to remove.

Astus said:
Also note what Jnana has referred to here before, that the whole tögal teaching with the lamps, etc. is a later development in Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:
You know what? We really do not know this to be a fact. All we know for sure is that the earliest texts we see for these practices (klong sde and man ngag sde) that we have access to seem to date from around the mid 10th century onward. But it is very hard to date this material. There is also a kama transmission for thögal which is held to date to the 8th century that consists of just a page or two where it forms part of the completion stage of Kilya/Yangdag.

Anyway, even if man ngag sde did prove to be a later elaboration, it does not matter. Jñāna seems to evince a preference for Indian authored material. That's ok, but I do not see Indian authorship as proof of superior content, or Tibetan authorship of inferior content.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 11:06 PM
Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi
Content:
Namdrol said:
My initial point, which prompted this flood of comments, was to disabuse someone of the notion that the meditation of mahāmudra, dzogchen and Soto Zen are more or less the same. This assertion could not be more mistaken.

gregkavarnos said:

So, to clarify the situation for me, what you are saying is that the methods differ but not the outcomes? Am I understanding you correctly?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a question of directness. Mahāmudra and Dzogchen are more direct, Soto less, but in the end, all Buddhist paths lead to complete liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nevertheless the distinction is crucial.

Astus said:

Crucial to what?

Malcolm wrote:

To the path of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

then claim that yours is a superior game.

Malcolm wrote:

You know what? I didn't say anything of the kind in this discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

What is the Sanskrit term for gzhi?

Malcolm wrote:

According to Khyenste Wangpo, sthāna.

Jnana said:

The basis in mahāmudrā is not limited to compounded, momentary minds. Karmapa Wangchuk Dorje, Mahamudra: The Ocean of Definitive Meaning:

[Ground mahamudra] is what is realized and actualized by the nondual mind of the buddhas and noble individuals. It is the basic state (gshis kyi babs) of the three realms of samsara and the true nature of all phenomena from the beginning. It is connate wisdom (lhan gcig skyes pa'i ye shes), which pervades the entire ground.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this is not the same thing as the gzhi. Tilopa describes this as the nature of mind:

As such, the nature of the mind resembles space from the beginning,
there are no phenomena not included in it...

This is still the ālaya. As the third Karmapa writes in The Profound Inner Topics:

The cause is the beginningless nature of the mind,
which does not fall into any partialities,
yet from its unceasing play --
the essence emptiness, and the nature, clarity--
all kinds of aspects arose.

Not recognizing itself,
the movements of mind's formations
are like waves moving on water,
from which object and apprehender both appear,
itself focusing on and apprehending itself;
that mind moves outward; from the apparent aspect
the consciousness that apprehends objects in external objects appears.

This is the ālaya but it is not the gzhi as described by Dzogchen.

The terminology of dzogchen and mahāmudra are not commensurate with each other
because the paths are different.

Jnana said:

Neither mahāmudrā nor dzogchen require tögal (cf. all of the dzogchen teachings
composed prior to the development of the man ngag sde class).

Malcolm wrote:

However things may have been prior to the 11th century, since then tögal is the main
thrust of Dzogchen practice. And since this is so, the way the basis is described is
different, necessarily so. And so I still do not agree that similarity in terminology
indicates similarity in intention.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

It is amazing how this can be brought to quite a different discussion by picking out a single word and then setting up a whole view on it.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless the distinction is crucial.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Could it be that if the latter is referring to Kun gzhi, this is in relation to the Chittamatra view ?

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

the all-basis (kun gzhi, ālaya) is not the all-basis consciousness (kun gzhi rnam par shes pa, ālayavijñāna). The former is the mere clarity and emptiness of the mind; the latter is an afflicted, impure consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

Here are a few quotations regarding view and meditation from teachers who have trained in both systems. Tsele Natsok Rangdröl, The Circle of the Sun:

In short, what dzogchen calls 'endowed with the threefold wisdom,' the wisdom of the primordially pure essence, the wisdom of the spontaneously present nature and the wisdom of the all-pervasive compassion, is described by the followers of mahāmudrā as the nonarising essence, the unobstructed nature, and the variously manifesting expression. '

Namdrol said:

I don't agree with this point. The former is referring the basis (gzhi), the latter is referring

to the all-basis (kun gzhi). The gzhi and kun gzhi are completely different.

N

heart said:

Tsele Natsok Rangdrol don't mistake the gzhi and the kun gzhi, in fact he makes a big point of the distinction between these in the two first chapters of Circle of the Sun. So maybe he don't think that essence, nature and expression in Mahamudra is referring to the kun gzhi.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have this book, so I cannot really comment further about his perspective. But I can say that in Mahamudra, there is no distinction made between gzhi and kun gzhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

If the natural state is the same thing, how can you meaningfully assert that the basis recognized is different?

Malcolm wrote:

The alaya is the inseparable clarity and emptiness of the mind.

The gzhi, in Dzogchen, has nothing to do with the mind.

Another point I want to make is the reason for basis [gzhi] being described the way they are in these two systems as everything to do with their respective paths.

Tregchö is not the path in Dzogchen. It is the ground for practicing the path. The path in Dzogchen is thögal. Hence, the way the basis is explained in Dzogchen reflects the actual path in Dzogchen, thus the explanation of the basis in Dzogchen is completely different than that of Mahāmudra.

A Different basis is elaborated because the paths are very different.

The point of tregchö and mahāmudra is basically the same i.e. the instant of unfabricated awareness [ma bcos shes pa skad cig ma]. But in Dzogchen, this only the starting point -- it is not the path, which is why in general, no-one is considered to achieve rainbow body (yes, I know there are some theoretical formulations which might contradict this assertion) only through tregchö.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

The western academic consensus is that there are none.

Jnana said:

Yes. And I would suggest that the Kagyu mahāmudrā system is generally using older Indian terminology as used by Saraha, Tilopa, Naropa, and Maitripa. This difference in terminology doesn't entail a different basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Look, if you decide that Mahāmudra is an older terminology, then you have to accept that the authors of man ngag sde class (which defines essence, nature and compassion) were familiar with this older terminology of the ālaya/kun gzhi, found it lacking and had a different aim in their writing. In other words, you have to accept that Dzogchen terminology is different and has a different intent on the basis of the claim that it is different. You have to accept the fact that the Indian-derived Sarma notions of the all-basis was inadequate for the purposes of Dangma Lhungyal and Chetsun Senge Wangchug, for example (should we take these persons to be the original authors and collators of the 17 Tantras and Vima Nyinthig), and that therefore, these authors chose to elaborate a terminology to express their differences.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

I don't agree with this point. The former is referring the basis (gzhi), the latter is referring to the all-basis (kun gzhi).

Jnana said:

Tibetan polemics....

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all.

Jnana said:

But more to the point: Where is the Indian pedigree for dzogchen as we now have it with the inclusion of tögal instruction? That is, Indian texts written in India by Indians (i.e. not

tantras or termas composed by Tibetans).

Malcolm wrote:

The western academic consensus is that there are none. As you know already, according to the annals of the upadesha class, the Indian Panditas kicked Dzogchen out of India and sent it to Tibet with Vimalamitra because they could not deal with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

Here are a few quotations regarding view and meditation from teachers who have trained in both systems. Tsele Natsok Rangdröl, The Circle of the Sun:

In short, what dzogchen calls 'endowed with the threefold wisdom,' the wisdom of the primordially pure essence, the wisdom of the spontaneously present nature and the wisdom of the all-pervasive compassion, is described by the followers of mahāmudrā as the nonarising essence, the unobstructed nature, and the variously manifesting expression. '

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this point. The former is referring the basis (gzhi), the latter is referring to the all-basis (kun gzhi). The gzhi and kun gzhi are completely different.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Namdrol can you point me to a thread or info, that explains the differences between Dzogchen and Mahamudra? Also would you say that Dzogchen is superior to Mahamudra?

Malcolm wrote:

The state of Dzogchen and the state of Mahāmudra are not two different states. They are the same thing.

The path of Dzogchen and the path of Mahāmudra are completely different.

The superior path is whichever one you will actually practice.

My initial point, which prompted this flood of comments, was to disabuse someone of the notion that the meditation of mahāmudra, dzogchen and Soto Zen are more or less the same. This assertion could not be more mistaken.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 4:23 PM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Dzogchen, Mahamudra, and Shikantaza are just same method of meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

Not even remotely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Beatzen said:

Actually, it isn't. I know from my studies of history that the Zen philosopher Mo Ho Yen was banished from Tibet by the "buddhist" government there for exactly this difference.

Namdrol said:

If you wish to be more informed, read the blog "Early Tibet" -- it will add layers of nuance to your understanding.

N

Huifeng said:

Yeah, that is a fairly complicated issue. Reading Hvasang Mohoyen as somehow representative of Chinese Buddhism as a whole is highly problematic. But, we've already discussed this one to death before ...

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Right, Hasahang only represented a strand of Northern Chan, now extinct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?
Content:
Huifeng said:
Yes, I am fairly uninformed about Tibetan Buddhism.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:
I was talking to Beatzen actually.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 7:45 AM
Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi
Content:
Nangwa said:
In my opinion Mahamudra and even more so Dzogchen have very little in common with Zazen.
So much so that I think it is really odd that folks think they have a lot in common.
If you ask me they are all three completely different animals.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, actually I disagree, I think Kagyu Mahāmudra and Chan/Zen have a great deal in common.

Dzogchen on the other hand is a different animal.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 7:36 AM
Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi
Content:
Nangwa said:
In my opinion Mahamudra and even more so Dzogchen have very little in common with Zazen.
So much so that I think it is really odd that folks think they have a lot in common.
If you ask me they are all three completely different animals.

Beatzen said:
it's probably my western naivete. I know these two things.

I thought the taoist-influence of 'naturalness' in zen meditation had some bearing on the 'natural state' that mahamudra and dzogchen allude to.

Malcolm wrote:

There is much less Taoist influence on Zen/Chan than most people realize. In particular, most people do not realize that so called Zen arts in Japan, really come from the Neo-confucian artistic revival of the Sung dynasty. Calligraphy, and martial arts such as swordsmanship and archery, as well as riding, and so on, are the arts of the Confucian gentleman.

"Natural state" is a translation of a term "gnas lugs", which in turn is a translation of the Sanskrit term "tattva" or bhutatā, both meaning "reality".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Expanding Samadhi

Content:

Beatzen said:

There's only been a few times when I've actually experienced samadhi

Malcolm wrote:

That is not true. You are experiencing samadhi all the time. Why? Samadhi is a natural function of the mind, called a "mental factor".

The problem is not samadhi, the problem is how to move your mind from its tendency to rest on afflictive objects to path objects.

But rather than worrying about all these contrived meditations it is more more interesting to discover the root of the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Beatzen said:

Just for myself, what do you mean by "sharp"?

Namdrol said:

neither agitated nor lethargic

Beatzen said:

That's what I thought you meant. What's the longest period of your life you had mental silence? (I heard an interview someone asked pema chodron this question. She said 'a year')

Malcolm wrote:

Never. The mind's job is to think and have thoughts. Thoughts are not a problem.

If what she said is true, I wonder how she managed to make to the bathroom, or eat food.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Beatzen said:

Just for myself, what do you mean by "sharp"?

Malcolm wrote:

neither agitated nor lethargic

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Beatzen said:

I don't know why, but Alan Watts is one of my heros. Next to Jetsunma Tenzin Palmo. I wish I had the balls to spend 12 years living like a hermit in a cave. That's Nuts!

Namdrol said:

I did not do 12 years, but i lived alone for three years and half years in a cabin in the woods and never left. And for the final year and a half, I spoke to and saw no one.

It is not hard, but not east to readjust find work. and so on

Beatzen said:

That, to me, is so interesting. You must have emerged from that quite changed.

Malcolm wrote:

Being in retreat was very interesting. One of the happiest times of my life. I was very relaxed. That experience has informed my practice ever since.

Most important point of practice is to be relaxed but sharp.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Pero said:
But how did you get food then?

Malcolm wrote:
It was delivered once a month.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 5:14 AM
Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi
Content:

Namdrol said:
I did not do 12 years, but i lived alone for three years and half years in a cabin in the woods and never left. And for the final year and a half, I spoke to and saw no one.

Pero said:
But how did you get food then?
It is not hard, but not east to readjust find work. and so on
Yeah that's what would worry me most if I'd go on such a retreat. Did it take long for you to get back into the rhytm of "normal" life?

Malcolm wrote:
I never did.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 4:53 AM
Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi
Content:
Beatzen said:
I don't know why, but Alan Watts is one of my heros. Next to Jetsunma Tenzin Palmo. I wish I had the balls to spend 12 years living like a hermit in a cave. That's Nuts!

Malcolm wrote:
I did not do 12 years, but i lived alone for three years and half years in a cabin in the woods and never left. And for the final year and a half, I spoke to and saw no one.

It is not hard, but not east to readjust find work. and so on

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 4:25 AM
Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?
Content:
JinpaRangdrol said:

I remember watching an old documentary following an extremely elaborate Tara puja (possibly Nyingma, but definitely not Terma) in which namkhas were used to construct a mandala of sorts. I wish I remembered more about it, but it certainly seemed to be an old Tara Tantra, just judging by the complexity of the ritual.

Malcolm wrote:

Not a tantra, a rite called "grol ma gyul ldog" i.e. The rite of Tara for repelling Armies

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Beatzen said:

I was very interested in the Vimalakirti sutra until I came across Pruning the Bodhi tree, which is based on the arguments of Matsumoto Shiro and other dissenting Soto masters

Namdrol said:

And what does it say there?

Beatzen said:

That the Vimalakirti sutra is heretical and is one of the contributing factors in the degradation of Zen Buddhism. Along with infiltration of certain Shinto influences.

Malcolm wrote:

How can a sutra be heretical?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

Beatzen said:

My understanding will change, and I may come to trust in the reality of rebirth for myself. I don't see how admitting that I don't understand it yet makes me a heretic.

Virgo said:

Forgive me if I have missed a post or two that might contain the answer, but, do you believe that nothing happens at death? It's just "black"? or do you believe in some form of permanent afterlife (perm heaven or hells)?

Either way, there is no point in spiritual (Buddhist) practice if you believe either of those.

Kevin

Beatzen said:

I haven't made up my mind. I was hoping that I would gain a meditative insight. I won't share my thoughts on the subject, first of all because I take my thoughts with a grain of salt, and secondly because I don't want to get flamed for expressing "un-buddhist" views.

Malcolm wrote:

Listen -- you will have to forgive us. These endless discussions about rebirth are tiresome. We don't care. Either you accept it or you don't. If you don't fine. But there is no doubt that rebirth was the Buddha's teaching. People who cannot accept that, cannot accept must of the other teachings of the Buddha.

And please spare us the "buddhas teachings were not written down until..."First of all, this is false. Worst case scenario, Buddha's teachings were written down 150 years after his parinirvana (dates of Asokha pillars), which best scholarship places 407-400 BCE. But it is very likely that the earliest sutras were being written down within 50 years.

Mahayana sutras were almost certainly later compositions.

Tantras later than that.

But the one thing all these teachings share is a common thread of rebirth, karma, and dependent origination which are the cause of samsara, and the breaking of rebirth and karma through understanding dependent origination, which gauranteed freedom from rebirth in this or at most seven rebirths.

All those people who think they will attain awakening withotu understanding Buddha's actual teachings on this subject are deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Beatzen said:

I was very interested in the Vimalakirti sutra until I came across Pruning the Bodhi tree, which is based on the arguments of Matsumoto Shiro and other dissenting Soto masters

Malcolm wrote:

And what does it say there?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: How is Dzogchen/Mahamudra different from Zazen Samadhi

Content:

Beatzen said:

I mean a state which is tranquil, space-like. I would almost say a fusion of subject and object, but I know from experience and from my own study that the Buddhist view on this state leaves the wiggle room for a capacity to investigate the nature of the self which experiences the state that I describe. I don't know which school characterizes what I mean.

[edit] I'd like to know, as a student, why tantric methods are any more expedient than the method I am describing.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna methods are more expedient than sutra based methods because of the profound understanding of the relationship between the body and the mind present in Vajrayāna, and the employment of that understanding in practice.

Dzogchen is more profound still.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation, Zen, etc.

Content:

kirtu said:

The perceived world is functional and is more or less really composed of atoms, etc. (essentially the Vaibhasika view but Zen is also heavily influenced by Mind Only teaching).

Beatzen said:

How does this relate to the Taoist concept of fluidity and movement? I have only been earnestly studying for two years now, and I suppose if one were to pose the model of modern physics, Zen conceives the world more as waves than particles.

I can't really respond to Namdol's question of which form of Samadhi I was talking about, since I don't completely comprehend what is meant by "tantric." Remember, I'm not familiar with that branch of Buddhist terminology. I will explain, however, that I am under the impression that we are discussing a similar experience of yogic, or non-dual awareness and eventually, certainty (perhaps ultimately, a clear comprehension of relative and absolute truth simultaneously) that arises from meditation on emptiness in whatever I mean by "samadhi"

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by nondual? From which point of view, Buddhist or Hindu; if Buddhist, Yogacara or Madhyamaka?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation, Zen, etc.

Content:

kirtu said:

Tibetan meditation runs the gamut from traditional analytic meditation, basically skips over zazen as it is presented in the Japanese and Korean traditions (but possibly not the Chan tradition - I haven't had Chan instruction) and then focuses directly on wisdom or an example wisdom experienced during empowerment. Practitioners develop familiarity with that wisdom or example wisdom during deity yoga practice where the deity is an example of a fully enlightened Buddha manifesting in some form that can be glossed as highly symbolic. The peaceful deities in particular are often more accessible as they can often be seen directly by beginners in this tradition as Buddhas and Arya Bodhisattvas. In fact they are an example of ultimate wisdom manifesting in a relative way through the mind of the practitioner. So deity yoga samadhi could just be at a mind level for a practitioner and in this sense is no different from zazen samadhi esp. if the practitioner is basically just doing samatha (so shamatha based on a mental image of a deity or on an external physical representation like a statue or a thangka). However Tibetan Buddhist meditation also directly uses the human energetic body. This is done in a different way that in yoga and in Taoism and has different results. Basically the starting point in Tibetan Buddhism is the vision of the Avatamsaka Sutra - the entire universe is a manifestation of the Buddhas and it is our perception that causes beings to experience it as a place of suffering. Interdependence is mostly but not entirely glossed - its exposition tends to be muted.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

And then of course, there is Dzogchen, which is completely different than all of this.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Blavatsky on Buddhism in America

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Of course.

Although the term "aliens" is derogatory, so better to refer to them as <http://gnosticteachings.org/topics/extraterrestrials.html>.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, if you call them aliens they will be subject to deportation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Lojong, Rushens, and Semdzins

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Do all of the explanations of the practices in The Precious Vase contain complete instructions?

...

But I'm wondering if the Six Lokas practice as presented in The Precious Vase is still complete in itself.

Malcolm wrote:

As for one, you can always find more instructions.

And for two, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation, Zen, etc.

Content:

Beatzen said:

3. Again, how is Samadhi different between Zen and Tibetan Buddhist experiences of it? Tibetan Buddhists are often quite aggressive about the superiority of their method to insight.

Malcolm wrote:

Which school of Tibetan Buddhism; do you mean samadhi in a sutrayāna sense, or in a tantric sense?

Your question is so broad as to be meaningless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation, Zen, etc.

Content:

Beatzen said:

If you do not accept rebirth, this simply represents a defect in your present understanding of Buddhadharma.

I don't think of myself as defective. But feel free to do so yourself. I'm simply open about the fact that I haven't had an insight into it's reality while in meditation, which is the way to investigate it, is it not? From one buddhist practitioner to another, I wasn't expecting to be judged like that. I think it is better if we support eachother towards realization than characterize eachother as defective.

This has nothing to do with my question.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say you were defective, I said your understanding was. You are not your understanding, no? It can change, correct?

The state of non-arising and rebirth are not contradictory. In fact, the former makes the latter possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Reincarnation, Zen, etc.

Content:

Beatzen said:

2. I read a Zen teacher on Zen International responding to Namdrol's sectarian arguments on here concerning the inefficacy of Zazen to produce "full awakening" Since Tibetan Buddhism is more of a path of moral/ethical self-edification than of self-knowing (in stark contrast to Zen), can Namdrol really make such a claim?

Malcolm wrote:

Hard for me to reply to a response of something I may or may not have said. You would need to reproduce here what I said, and their "response".

As to your second contention, Tibetan Buddhism is not a monolithic tradition.

If you do not accept rebirth, this simply represents a defect in your present understanding of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Beatzen said:

Actually, it isn't. I know from my studies of history that the Zen philosopher Mo Ho Yen was banished from Tibet by the "buddhist" government there for exactly this difference.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to be more informed, read the blog "Early Tibet" -- it will add layers of nuance to your understanding.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: what is the cause of Avidyā(ignorance)?

Content:

Huifeng said:

Avidya and samskara play a mutually supportive role, with vijnana right there too.

Try not to think of the links of pratityasamutpada as a line or circle, it isn't that simple.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is that simple.

--> Affliction -->Action --> Suffering --> Affliction...etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Huifeng said:

It's kind of interesting in one way. But what is perhaps more interesting in my mind is how many conceive of Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism as distinction from each other in the first place, and that a combination is therefore "ecumenial".

Beatzen said:

This might sound rather sectarian...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it just sounds rather uninformed about Tibetan Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Just wondering about any personal-experience stories: has anyone on this forum actually constructed and empowered a Namkha for themselves? If so, did you see a difference in your life afterwards, any noticeable benefits that you would attribute to it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Blavatsky on Buddhism in America

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

They may have written about some of their teachings in terms that 19th century scientific materialists could relate to, however to say that the Mahatmas were materialists in that sense would be incorrect.

Also, the quote you posted of the Mahatmas regarding Matter would have to be in reference to Mulaprakriti (notice how they are referring to and affirming Parabrahman, etc. as well), not mere "matter" in the 19th century 'scientific' materialistic context.

Moreover, H.P. Blavatsky would have rejected them had they been 19th century 'scientific' materialists, considering that nearly half of the content of her books is dedicated to exposing 19th century 'scientific' materialism as being actually unscientific in many ways (i.e. according to Theosophy, Occult Science is the only true science; whereas materialistic or profane science is limited at best).

For the Mahatmas to have been 19th century 'scientific' materialists, would mean that they would have had to have had rejected Parabrahman, astral projection, transmigration, reincarnation, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

I read more than a few of those letters -- they are filled with a naive physicalism.

But you have rose colored glasses on, and refuse to see what is in front of your eyes.

But there is no point in further dicussing the irrelevant opinions of invented masters and and their nineteenth century "representatives".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Acchantika said:

He encouraged actions which reduced suffering. So, if we have to choose between killing an aphid and killing a steer, we should choose whichever creates less suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Since a steer can feed many beings, and an aphid, very few, one to one, it seems the benefit of killing steer outweighs that of killing an aphid since the suffering of hunger is reduced for many by killing a steer and the killing of an aphid reduces the suffering of hunger for no one, apart perhaps from that of an aphid wasp's progeny*, oh and the humans that eat the produce from farms where aphid wasps and other creatures are employed to eradicate pests.

Your argument just does not work.

The subfamily Pemphredoninae also known as the aphid wasps...As with all other sphecoid wasps, the larvae are carnivorous; females hunt for prey on which to lay their eggs, mass provisioning the nest cells with paralyzed, living prey that the larvae feed upon after hatching from the egg.

In short, you cannot compare the suffering of one sentient being with another and state as an absolute fact, this being suffers more than that when it comes to ending the life of one given being vs another given being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

Virgo said:

As far as I know, these instructions were given to Rinpoche in a mind ter.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Oh Ok, so they are considered a proper Buddhist practice then? I just haven't seen them ever on home shrines of my friends in Nepal, etc.. is it something that used to be more widespread or is more practiced in certain areas?

Malcolm wrote:

This is something very specific to Dzogchen Community and Norbu Rinpoche's transmisson. It is not common.

Thread crosses are commonly used in Buddhist ransom ceremonies (glud) where they represent the energy of the person's five elements.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

rai said:

hello, do you think Namkha could be printed on paper (i made one in a graphic program) or it has to be made of stick/strings/threads to have a function ? thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

You need to manufacture it or have it manufactured for you. But it better to do it yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

Adamantine said:

I have the book compiling ChNN's teachings on the meaning of and how to make a Namkha. . in the introduction, it seems to imply this is primarily a Bon practice. Is this true? I was thinking of making one and getting it blessed by one of my Nyingma Lamas but if it is primarily a Bon thing he may not know much about it or even approve.. does anyone have any insight? The book alludes to similar practices being widespread among indigenous cultures around the world, which is interesting..

If it is mainly Bonpo, is there an equivalent and effective practice among Buddhists to

harmonize the elemental energies of the individual?

Malcolm wrote:

Not it is not just a Bon thing, but if you are going to make a Namkha then you should just do the right to authenticate it yourself, there is no need to bring it to a Lama at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

When someone uses one being to kill another being on purpose, how is this different than asking a butcher to kill a steer for your family?

Acchantika said:

Because unlike higher-order mammals, insects lack pain receptors, a thalamus and all the other necessary structures to enable them to experience pain and, thus, suffer.

Malcolm wrote:

Insects do not suffer? They do not feel pain? Of this you are certain?

Acchantika said:

So the question is whether it creates more suffering to indirectly encourage the killing of highly evolved mammals versus encouraging the use of organic pesticides.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't recall anywhere in Buddha's teaching where he says "You can kill all the bugs you like, there is no problem".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Universities/Buddhist Studies

Content:

lotwell said:

Dear all,

I'm interested in doing a masters in Buddhist Studies and have a few questions.

What are some of the best programs? In the US, I know Emory has a Tibetan partnership and there is Naropa. What about other countries?

It seems like you need to choose a language and a field as part of your specialization ... perhaps someone who has completed a MA in Buddhist Studies could speak to this.

Thank you!

Lowell

Malcolm wrote:

University of Virginia probably has the most balanced program. Harvard has the most language intensive, it is the most "European". Colombia's is very Gelug heavy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

wisdom said:

Think about it like this. Non local, non organic food has many harmful elements.

Malcolm wrote:

I agree with pretty much everything you have said. I just wanted to add one clarification.

Most organic farms use pesticides when necessary, they also employ insects like ladybugs and wasps to kill "pests". Organic pesticides are used to protect human and livestock health, not to protect the lives of "pests".

When someone uses one being to kill another being on purpose, how is this different than asking a butcher to kill a steer for your family?

If someone should argue that buying meat encourages the killing of steer, and so on; is it not also true that buying vegetables encourages the killing of "pests"? And if it is argued that one is participating in the killing of steer through buying meat in a market, is not also true that one is participating in the killing of pests by buying say apples and other fruit in the market?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: Blavatsky on Buddhism in America

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

...looks like it is in reference to Prakriti or Mulaprakriti.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Mahatmas were followers of current 19th century scientific materialism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

catmoon said:

All killing is not the same. There is killing in self defense, killing for survival, killing for vengeance, killing just for the sheer hell of it, killing with intent and without, with regret after and with rejoicing after. From a karmic POV they are quite different beasts.

Namdrol said:

But all lack compassion.

PadmaVonSamba said:

There is a story about the Buddha in a former life who is on a boat with many people, and he knows that one of the people is going to kill the others, so he kills that person out of compassion (before he kills anybody else) because he is aware of the suffering that person would otherwise reap from killing all the people on the boat.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not killing, that is liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Blavatsky on Buddhism in America

Content:

Will said:

Namdrol translates: " It was truly spoken 'May all rely on this in order to stop and be parted from afflictions, the cause of suffering that is not desirable in any way, and properly progress on the excellent path'"

"This" refers to what exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

I assume the book, but there is no explicit reference to a book in the Tibetan text itself.

BTW, I note that you avoided addressing the explicit materialism declared in the Mahatma letters.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 8:22 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

because virtually all instructions of yantra and tummo recommend that one eat some meat, especially lamb and yak, which are quite warming.

Virgo said:

What is the need for warming food products under these circumstances Loppon?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

well, yantra can be quite demanding physically, as can tummo, so you need rich nutritious heavy warming food to prevent vata disorders and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Erroneous views on Dzogchen of W.Y. Evans-Wentz and C.G.Jung

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you wish to believe in HPB's mahatmas, go ahead.

I think that these letters and personal accounts are part and parcel of a wide-spread nineteenth century occult literary culture that had certain norms, conventions, and experiential expectations, fueled by nineteenth century philology, and fueled by a European colonial orientalism, attitudes adopted also by Western Educated Indians.

I regard these accounts at worst delusions, and at best, fantasy writing. But I cannot take them seriously.

N

Will said:

No need to take anything seriously; but most of the witnesses were Hindus, who were

hardly Western educated or even sympathetic, at first, to theosophy or Blavatsky.

Malcolm wrote:

If they could write in English that well, they were highly educated Hindus who had excellent western educations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 8:20 AM

Title: Re: Erroneous views on Dzogchen of W.Y. Evans-Wentz and C.G.Jung

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

The Panchen Lama and H.H. 14th Dalai Lama on H.P. Blavatsky's The Voice of the Silence:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=5830#p65050> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Will said:

The late Geshe Gyeltsen translated this Panchen Lama quote for me around 1979, if I can ever find it I will post it. Or maybe Namdrol can translate it?

Malcolm wrote:

It says, " It was truly spoken 'May all rely on this in order to stop and be parted from afflictions, the cause of suffering that is not desirable in any way, and properly progress on the excellent path'"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

catmoon said:

All killing is not the same. There is killing in self defense, killing for survival, killing for vengeance, killing just for the sheer hell of it, killing with intent and without, with regret after and with rejoicing after. From a karmic POV they are quite different beasts.

Malcolm wrote:

But all lack compassion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: Blavatsky on Buddhism in America

Content:

catmoon said:

I wonder, Will, have you read the Book of Mormon? It opens with a similar testimony of multiple witnesses. They were witnessing something quite different though. This might tie in with what Namdrol said about the nature of the times.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes Will, do please compare:

<http://lds.org/scriptures/bofm/introduction?lang=eng> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

LastLegend said:

If people are going to eat meats, try halal meats by the Muslim farmers as these farmers have a special way of killing the animals. They pray for the animals for they kill them. At least that is a more compassionate way of killing.

Malcolm wrote:

Killing is killing, there is nothing compassionate about taking a life.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Erroneous views on Dzogchen of W.Y. Evans-Wentz and C.G.Jung

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to believe in HPB's mahatmas, go ahead.

I think that these letters and personal accounts are part and parcel of a wide-spread nineteenth century occult literary culture that had certain norms, conventions, and experiential expectations, fueled by nineteenth century philology, and fueled by a European colonial orientalism, attitudes adopted also by Western Educated Indians.

I regard these accounts at worst delusions, and at best, fantasy writing. But I cannot

take them seriously.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Erroneous views on Dzogchen of W.Y. Evans-Wentz and C.G.Jung

Content:

Namdrol said:

Will: As for phony Mahatmas, here is testimony of others who knew them:

http://www.blavatskyarchives.com/chelas_on_the_mahatmas.htm "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

These accounts are about as believable as Benjamin Cream's "Maitreya".

Will said:

And just what would it cost you to believe these testimonies N.? Why would all these people lie?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think they were lying, Will, I think they were deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

catmoon said:

Maybe we can shift the grounds of these arguments, since I don't see any agreements coming anytime soon. While slogging through five pages of this stuff, I could not help but wonder, since when is it Buddhist practise to correct someone over and over again, when they have made it patently clear they are not interested in the advice offered? Now, I can see it being encouraged in evangelical Christianity, or in Maoist-era "education" sessions, but in Buddhism?

It is hard to see that any good is being done by pursuing the topic. Everyone is talking, no one is changing their point of view, and animosity is encouraged. If pursued to a logical end, the arguments will not lead to resolution, but to the creation of a vegan sect, a vegetarian sect, an ovo-lactarian sect and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

This already exists.

My personal opinion is that the Vegetarianism in Mahāyāna sutras and lower tantra is largely a product of a cultural response and an appeal to dietary trends in Indian culture, and need not be taken as "gospel". They are not definitive teachings.

Thervadins, Japanese Buddhists and Tibetan Buddhists by a large eat meat.

Chinese Buddhists do not.

Many Tibetan Buddhists feel bad about it, because they also follow Mahāyāna; but because Anuttarayoga tantra is more important, they eat meat.

Chinese Buddhists are very shrill and aggressive about not eating meat and many Tibetan Lamas with lots of Chinese students have succumbed to pressure not to eat meat (which is undoubtedly better for their health).

In the US, there is trend for yoga practicing Buddhists to eschew eating meat. Also amongst some younger Tibetan Buddhists there is a trend to stop eating meat -- which is ironic, because virtually all instructions of yantra and tummo recommend that one eat some meat, especially lamb and yak, which are quite warming.

There are lamas like the Karmapa and Chatral Rinpoche, that advise everyone to stop eating meat. Then there are Lamas like Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, who advise everyone to eat meat.

I also have gone through periods of revulsion towards meat. But in the end, my conclusion is that diet is mainly important for maintaining one's health. Therefore, one should eat whatever is best for one's health, and that is a state that changes with age, with the seasons, and with illness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Erroneous views on Dzogchen of W.Y. Evans-Wentz and C.G.Jung

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

Will, I'm not sure it was Bell, I only recall it was a British officer she had tea and a frank talk with. You can look it up in:

"Tournament of Shadows: The Great Game and the Race For Empire In Central Asia", by Karl E. Meyer and Shareen B. Brysac. The same chap provides some interesting insight as to why the Roerichs weren't allowed to go to Lhasa, in spite of having a Tibetan visa that included Lhasa. The book's a good read.

Will said:

Tenzin1,

It would be so helpful if, when slandering someone, the source of the slander could be given. Where did Charles Bell write that he met Blavatsky?

Are you also "not sure" Blavatsky said she was a fake? You made the charge, you look it up & you provide the supporting quote.

As for phony Mahatmas, here is testimony of others who knew them:

http://www.blavatskyarchives.com/chelas_on_the_mahatmas.htm "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

These accounts are about as believable as Benjamin Cream's "Maitreya".

In any case, the "Mahatmas" are clearly materialists, as this letter and others show:

"In other words we believe in MATTER alone, in matter as visible nature and matter in its invisibility as the invisible omnipresent omnipotent Proteus with its unceasing motion which is its life, and which nature draws from herself since she is the great whole outside of which nothing can exist."

<http://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/mahatma/ml-10.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: The essence of Dzogchen

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek ,

Stupid question maybe, but what be the essence of the Dzogchen (Teachings)?

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Knowing your own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nemo said:

The statements about it's health benefits are rather dubious, but it is a compassionate choice.

Malcolm wrote:

For people who have severe cardiovascular disease, there is little choice -- they should immediately switch.

For people who are prone to various kinds of cancer, they should switch.

The China Study is an excellent book that demonstrates quite well that people who eat large quantities of meat and dairy have an elevated risk of cardiovascular disease and cancer.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: The Neurotic Zen of Mint

Content:

mint said:

I haven't practiced Guruyoga in a couple of days,

Malcolm wrote:

When you feel like it practice; when you don't; don't.

You better learn to enjoy groundlessness, because it your real state anyway.

Happy new eon of self-liberation!

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Metta in Theravada Vs Bodhicitta in Mahayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

By itself, metta has no force to lead to liberation, as Dharmakirti points out.

Mr. G said:

Hi Namdrol,

Do you recall which work of his that I can read this?

Malcolm wrote:

Pramanavarttika, I beleive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Huseng said:

The whole global infrastructure depends upon oil and even with alternative energy sources online they still won't pack the same power punch.

With declining standards of living we're likely to see a lot of social problems arise. The utopian ideas of some Buddhist thinkers in the past century will prove infeasible and this will visibly be demonstrated, too.

Malcolm wrote:

We agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 2:22 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

I see one extreme form of vegetarians that condemn meat eaters and consider them to not be Buddhist. And then there is another extreme of meat eaters who believe all vegetarians are really Jains and that all vegetarians are "holier-than-thou" and are not real Buddhists and need to be forced to eat meat.

Malcolm wrote:

I dont think anyone suggested that those who choose not to eat meat should be force fed meat.

Sakya Pandita pointed out that meat eating was acceptable in the Śravaka schools, forbidden in general Mahāyāna and permitted in Highest Yoga Tantra.

And in Dzogchen, there are no rules at all, other than knowing your own situation and working with circumstances.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 12:51 PM

Title: Re: Is it possible to be a Buddhist and believe in God?

Content:

Ervin said:

Peace. Thanks, PadamaVonSamba. That has cleared up a bit my knowledge. Creator of

everything that exists God is what I had in mind, omniscient and omnipotent.

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

No, does not exist in Buddhism, despite what this or that deluded person cares to believe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 12:38 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Heruka said:

Abiotic Oil

Namdrol said:

And as I showed elsewhere, this theory had been completely and thoroughly repudiated.

It is completely obsolete in Russia as well.

Heruka said:

was deepwater horizon bp oil spill an attempt to establish a deep drilling abiotic oil head? after 5,000 feet of water and then drilling is pretty deep, but not that deep.

http://www.wired.com/cars/energy/magazine/15-09/mf_jackrig "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The mother lode of oil in the deepwater Gulf is so significant that Tahiti and other successful fields in this region are expected to soon produce enough crude to reverse the long-standing decline in US oil production of about 10 percent per year.

the USA is flush rich with oil in alaska and gulf coast, but hey lets use mid east oil first...drive up the price by implying a shortage in supply with peak oil narative..

supply and demand, oldest con in the book.

Malcolm wrote:

Peak oil is a very misunderstood term. Peak oil refers not to the total amount of oil in the ground, rather it refers to the total amount of _easily recoverable oil_(or any other mineral resource).

There is a relationship between the high price of oil and drilling for oil in places where it expensive to recover, or the cost of extracting it (think shale oil and hydro fraking (which

is not just about gas)) is very high.

When the price of oil rises too high however, it triggers recession, demand drops off, prices decline, and it becomes too pricey to drill for oil in exotic places (like the deep gulf).

Basically, what peak oil is really about is the energy return on energy investment (EROI). In 19th century, the ratio was roughly 50 to one i.e. for barrel of oil or equivalent amount of energy, one could recover fifty barrels of oil. Presently, the EROI is between one to five barrels of for each BOE invested.

What peak oil theory is actually about is not the actual amount of oil that exists in the ground, it is a critique of the economic feasibility of extracting oil from ever more difficult places to reach it.

Hubbert's basic contention is sound:

"Our principal constraints are cultural. During the last two centuries we have known nothing but exponential growth and in parallel we have evolved what amounts to an exponential-growth culture, a culture so heavily dependent upon the continuance of exponential growth for its stability that it is incapable of reckoning with problems of nongrowth."

When EROI drops below one BOE, it becomes very unfeasible to invest in any new petroleum recovery. That is what peak oil is actually about. When it is no longer profitable for oil companies to recover oil, then all the dominos begin to fall...

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i always hoped that, if nothing else, Buddhists understood the importance of compassion, not as some abstract concept, but rather as concrete action in the world.

Malcolm wrote:

What we have discovered about you is that your notion of compassion is very hemmed in by conceptual limitations concerning proper diet.

But if you wish to be a disciple of Devadatta, than that is your choice.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 5:43 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil
Content:
Heruka said:
Abiotic Oil

Malcolm wrote:
And as I showed elsewhere, this theory had been completely and thoroughly repudiated.

It is completely obsolete in Russia as well.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 5:27 AM
Title: Re: distinction between common & uncommon preliminaries
Content:
kirtu said:
Manjushri is the archetype for the Shepherd Bodhisattva.
Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
That would be Avalokiteshvara, AFAIK.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 4:42 AM
Title: Re: Metta in Theravada Vs Bodhicitta in Mahayana
Content:
Namdrol said:
Bodhicitta is the direct cause of buddhahood.
By itself, metta has no force to lead to liberation, as Dharmakirti points out.

Astus said:
Bodhicitta is the intention to become a buddha, but there is a path to be followed and without that path there is no buddhahood. If bodhicitta were the direct cause of it there would be no need of a path.

Malcolm wrote:
For a bodhisattva, bodhicitta is an intention and the path as well.

This is why, in terms of relative bodhicitta, there is both aspiration and engaged bodhicitta.

In terms of ultimate bodhicitta, there is śamatha and vipaśyāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Kalu Rinpoche shocking news!

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

He's spoken publicly of sexual abuse? When was this?

Malcolm wrote:

First retreat I was ever at, 1992, Buckland.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"If peak comes around 2010, production in 2040 will likely equal something not far from production in 1980 (about 20 billion barrels). The oil produced in 2040 will have to meet the needs of a much larger global population and a world in crisis, but 20 billion barrels is still a lot of oil. In the same way, as reserves are depleted and production continues to slump over the decades that follow, the available oil will fall further and further below the levels needed to maintain a modern industrial society, but for a long time to come there will still be some petroleum available.

...

In the long term, the challenge is to get through the Long Descent with as much useful information and resources as possible, and to transmit them to the successor cultures that, to judge by past models, will begin coalescing sometime in the 23rd and 24th centuries.

John Michael Greer. The Long Descent: A User's Guide to the End of the Industrial Age

Huseng said:

This basically means energy will no longer be abundant and the cost of it will increase. Unless some miracle technology is produced, industrial civilization will over time come to an end and we will more or less return to pre-industrial conditions. No more commercial aviation, private automobiles, mass production or industrial food production.

Namdrol said:

But that will take about 300 years if you follow in reasoning in Greer's Long Descent.

Huseng said:

If I'm not mistaken he accepts Hubbert's peak oil plot:

In a few decades we'll have a lot less oil than now with a lot more demand.

The final end of industrial civilization will come later, but a lot of industrial goodies like industrial healthcare and commercial flights will become unavailable sooner rather than later.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Kalu Rinpoche shocking news!

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

Have you heard otherwise?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, otherwise, I would not mention it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Huseng said:

This basically means energy will no longer be abundant and the cost of it will increase. Unless some miracle technology is produced, industrial civilization will over time come to an end and we will more or less return to pre-industrial conditions. No more commercial aviation, private automobiles, mass production or industrial food production.

Malcolm wrote:

But that will take about 300 years if you follow in reasoning in Greer's Long Descent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: distinction between common & uncommon preliminaries

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, this is the standard presentation of two of the three main kinds of bodhicitta. In Tibetan Buddhism, we mostly use the royal bodhicitta -- i.e. I will attain buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings.

In Zen and Chinese Buddhism in general, they mostly rely on the sheperd kind.

gregkavarnos said:

Skewed from the angle that once again Tenzin is trying to set up a hierarchy: Shepherd and Helms-man like Bodhisattvas are deluded because, whether they like it or not, they will get enlightened anyway, thus king-like is (actually) the only way to go, by default.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, actually the Shepard bodhicitta is considered to most superior. The king the most practical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: distinction between common & uncommon preliminaries

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

According to this view shepherd-like bodhisattvas won't become Buddha until all beings are not totally liberated and helmsman/ship captain-like bodhisattvas won't become Buddha if all beings are not ready to be totally liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course this is your somewhat skewed view of the teaching, yes!

[/quote]

No, this is the standard presentation of two of the three main kinds of bodhicitta. In Tibetan Buddhism, we mostly use the royal bodhicitta -- i.e. I will attain buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings.

In Zen and Chinese Buddhism in general, they mostly rely on the sheperd kind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Kalu Rinpoche shocking news!

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

He said he was sexually abused. That's why this video is generating so much discussion all around the internet. It's the first time an insider, a Tibetan from a monastic

background, has spoken of this.

Malcolm wrote:

That's not true. ChNN has talked about this for many years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

even if you get eaten at a ganapuja (after all, there has been vajrayana in those parts from centuries ago)?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, first of all, this is not necessary, since you are human being -- there are other methods in Dzogchen to guarantee your samsara is finished in this lifetime.

Secondly, there are laws against cannibalism, so you have to work with circumstances, sorry.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

.

Using meat in ganapuja guarantees that animal's course in samsara is ended.

N

gad rgyangs said:

hey, maybe i'm gonna go to New Guinea like Michael Rockefeller, get killed and eaten, and then my course in samsara will be ended! fast-track!

Malcolm wrote:

No, that won't work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Metta in Theravada Vs Bodhicitta in Mahayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is actually the opposite, this passage shows that metta cannot lead to liberation since it is "is fabricated & intended".

Astus said:

Metta is not the direct cause of liberation but it leads to liberation, just as meditation and morality leads to liberation. Bodhicitta is not the direct cause of liberation either but it leads to that. The quoted sutta lists 11 different practices to attain liberation with, among them are the immeasurables.

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhicitta is the direct cause of buddhahood.

By itself, metta has no force to lead to liberation, as Dharmakirti points out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Metta in Theravada Vs Bodhicitta in Mahayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

The former does not have the capacity to bring you to liberation, since it is a mundane meditation.

Astus said:

Metta and the other three can lead to liberation.

"Then again, a monk keeps pervading the first direction with an awareness imbued with good will, likewise the second, likewise the third, likewise the fourth. Thus above, below, & all around, everywhere, in its entirety, he keeps pervading the all-encompassing cosmos with an awareness imbued with good will — abundant, expansive, immeasurable, without hostility, without ill will. He reflects on this and discerns, 'This awareness-release through good will is fabricated & intended. Now whatever is fabricated & intended is inconstant & subject to cessation.' Staying right there, he reaches the ending of the mental fermentations. Or, if not, then — through this very Dhamma-passion, this Dhamma-delight, and from the total wasting away of the first five Fetters — he is due to be reborn [in the Pure Abodes], there to be totally unbound, never again to return from that world.

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.052.than.html>

Malcolm wrote:

No, what liberates here is insight into the nature of the impermanent.

"This awareness-release through good will is fabricated & intended. Now whatever is

fabricated & intended is inconstant & subject to cessation."

It is actually the opposite, this passage shows that metta cannot lead to liberation since it is "is fabricated & intended".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, ChNN just mentioned the "miserable compassion" of sutra and lower tantra at 9:50 am ET or so in open webcast.

Using meat in ganapuja guarantees that animal's course in samsara is ended.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Huseng said:

One thinker I appreciate a lot is Michael Greer. His ideas can be summarized like this:

Malcolm wrote:

<https://thearchdruidreport.blogspot.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All your yānas are belong to us

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

tobes said:

And, that many westerners tend to adopt that stereotype, which has damaging implications on their practice.

:

Malcolm wrote:

Thankfully we have ChNN, who completely avoids this type of stereotyping.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

kirtu said:

Well they could have been following Guru Rinpoche and trying to save the world from being overrun by the rakshas living on Cannibal Island (North America and Europe).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Then they were a few centuries much too late. Fait accompli.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Adamantine said:

Or, we could all move to the mountain caves and practice chulen, live off the essences and stop harming all life-forms?

Sound like a plan?

Malcolm wrote:

The sgra thal rgyur tantra has a section on the chu len of meat.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Huseng said:

The unfortunate reality of samsara is that we must create negative karma just to survive...

Malcolm wrote:

Exactly.

Huseng said:

One other factor in support of vegetarianism is that while meat production is carried out with the express intention of killing an animal, agriculture, provided it is organic, can be carried out without having the intention to kill.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have shown, the minute you want to protect a crop for your own consumption, this is impossible. Of course, you can simply allow all your crops to be taken over by insects, rodents, and so on -- but even organic farmers will not permit this. Therefore, the idea that you can engage in agriculture without deliberately killing some being is mistaken. So this argument is rejected.

Huseng said:

The meat eater who simply buys their meat from another party may not directly participate in the act, but they are a supporting member in a collectively sanctioned intentional action (i.e., collective karma)...

Malcolm wrote:

No, not if the meat would have been slaughtered in any case. For example, I buy meat, but I do not rejoice in, support the aims of, etc. of the meat industry. So this argument is rejected.

Huseng said:

Clearly, a consumer of meat is sharing in the responsibility of the intentional act of killing when they purchase the product.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if they request or see the animal being slaughtered. So this argument has an incomplete reasoning.

The difference with agriculture is that provided it is done without pesticides then the parties involved, consumer and grower alike, are not intentionally killing sentient beings.

Huseng said:

As shown above, the production of meat is not tied to demand, at least, it is not tied to consumer demand.

Nonsense. If people didn't eat meat, there would be less meat produced.

Malcolm wrote:

This, unfortunately, is just false as I claimed above and as kirt demonstrated.

Huseng said:

Look at China or Japan -- in the last few decades they have acquired much wealth and it has enabled them to be able to afford meat everyday, and meat consumption AND production has consequently increased.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the fact of modern market economies that worldwide we discard half the food we produce.

The demand for meat is not actually tied to its production. Meat is provided to the market in large quantities which outstrip actual demand so that it is always available.

Huseng said:

Your defence of meat eating is disappointing given that some years ago on eSangha you were advocating vegetarianism and calling meat eating sinful.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is true. I still advocate vegetarianism (primarily for reasons of health). Meat eating as done by ordinary persons is a bit sinful.

But I was addressing the argument that being a vegetarian is less harmful (it isn't) to living beings and the contention that practitioners who eat meat are not assisting the unfortunate sentient being who lands on their plate, as well as the contention that eating meat ipso facto makes one culpable in the act of killing (rejected by Bhavaviveka and also by me).

If you recall, on E-Sangha, I asserted that eating meat for one's health was acceptable, and that following the protocol of the ganapuja was not negotiable, at least not for me.

I am not so much defending the eating of meat as I am pointing out the error of "the compassionate vegetarian" argument -- it is total bollocks.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 1:33 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Huseng said:

Being a vegetarian lessens harm to sentient beings in the form of helping to decrease environmental destruction which meat production contributes greatly to. Much more than vegetable gardens or wheat fields.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, industrial meat production is very environmentally destructive. So is growing corn for ethanol.

Huseng said:

If you don't eat meat, you don't contribute to the industrial production of meat, which is bad for the animals AND the environment.

Malcolm wrote:

As shown above, the production of meat is not tied to demand, at least, it is not tied to consumer demand.

BTW, personally, I do not purchase any industrially produced food stuff as much as possible. Given where I live, that is very possible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 1:16 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

Everyone who gardens does so with full knowledge they are harming living beings. The same is true of farmers -- killing is still killing whether motivated by malice, craving or ignorance. If you are arguing that meat eaters participate necessarily in the intent to kill; then so do vegetarians. Why? Because it is impossible to eat any food during the production of which no sentient being was harmed. When an organic farmer applies an organic pesticide to save his or her crop from an aphid infestation, this is no less a deliberate act of killing than leading cattle, pigs or fowl to a slaughter house.

gad rgyangs said:

killing as an unfortunate by-product of farming, and intending to minimize it as much as possible, cannot be compared to the horrors of the sufferings deliberately inflicted on animals in abattoirs.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it can -- have you ever seen an insect die from insecticide -- now you are just engaging in rationalizations.

gad rgyangs said:

plus, it is conceivable that technology, say in the form of an electromagnetic field, could be developed to repel insects from crops without harming them. you cannot eat real meat without killing.

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are engaging in fantasies -- that is not the real condition of farming -- you do know why monks cannot farm, right? Because if they dig in the ground they will harm creatures.

gad rgyangs said:

when one chooses to eat meat, there are many causes and conditions that entail from that decision. the absence of consciousness in the already-dead meat is not the point.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it is.

gad rgyangs said:

it is both the past suffering of the animal that was killed so that there would be a piece of meat for you to eat, as well as the message your eating that piece of meat.. sends into the socio-economic nexus of the food industry.

Malcolm wrote:

Then this is true of eating a veggie burger too.

gad rgyangs said:

there is no way to divorce your action of eating meat from the killing

Malcolm wrote:

Then this is true of a veggie burger too.

The fact of the matter is this, if your criteria for being a vegetarian is to lessen harm to sentient beings, than you are completely fooling yourself. The millions of birds, rodents and insects that are killed during the production of food don't really care if you are not eating meat. They still die because you eat at all. You are not saving a single animal from

a miserable death by being a vegetarian. If you think so, you are kidding yourself or living in a fantasy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 12:32 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if nobody bought meat, the industry would disappear. be the change you want to see in the world.

Malcolm wrote:

Ah, the idealism of zealotry.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 12:29 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

There are, in breif, two points, arguments ChNN makes, with which I am sure you are familiar:

One, the production of vegetables, grains, fruit and so on is not free from harming creatures, whether organic or conventonally produced. Thus the belief that one is being less harmful to living beings by being a vegetarian is a mistaken delusion.

gad rgyangs said:

this has already been easily defeated on the grounds that there is no intent to kill sentient beings in vegetable farming, indeed the intent can be to try and minimize it as much as possible.

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone who gardens does so with full knowledge they are harming living beings. The same is true of farmers -- killing is still killing whether motivated by malice, craving or ignorance. If you are arguing that meat eaters participate necessarily in the intent to kill; then so do vegetarians. Why? Because it is impossible to eat any food during the production of which no sentient being was harmed. When an organic farmer applies an organic pesticide to save his or her crop from an aphid infestation, this is no less a deliberate act of killing than leading cattle, pigs or fowl to a slaughter house.

gad rgyangs said:

On the other hand, the whole point of the exercise in meat eating depends on deliberately killing sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all, if your argument is intent, merely consuming meat does not equate with the intent to kill sentient beings. That only follows if one slays or requests the slaughter, of a given sentient being. Purchasing meat does not satisfy this criteria.

Your argument is actually the specious one, rejected quite thoroughly by Bhavaviveka. If one does not kill an animal, request its death, or see it being killed, since there is no consciousness in the flesh of dead animal, there is no karmic consequence to eating meat. Nor is there any reasonable moral reason not to eat such meat. The only reason not to eat meat under these circumstances is aesthetic choice.

gad rgyangs said:

so should we encourage butchers to kill animals..

Malcolm wrote:

Encouraging the slaughter of animals would be to engage in killing. This is forbidden. But eating meat that one has not killed, requested the slaughter of or seen slaughtered bears no fault. And, if one is a practitioner, the consumption of such meat has an added benefit of creating a positive cause for that animal.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 12:05 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Virgo said:

I hope that someday you can understand that you cannot stop butchers and other people from killing animals.

gad rgyangs said:

not as long as you keep buying the carcasses for your parties, that's true.

Malcolm wrote:

Whether you buy meat or not, the abattoirs will still keep churning out carcasses. Not buying meat does not prevent killing.

Buying it does not increase the level of killing. The meat industry has targets set for how

many animals they must kill in order to keep meat fresh in markets, and it bears no relationship, at this point economic history, with actual demand in the marketplace. Far more meat is discarded everyday than is purchased from markets.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 12:03 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

re: "my kind of vegetarianism" as "miserable compassion". i'd love to hear an excursus on that.

Namdrol said:

Someday, I am sure you will.

gad rgyangs said:

i'm ready.

Malcolm wrote:

There are, in breif, two points, arguments ChNN makes, with which I am sure you are familiar:

One, the production of vegetables, grains, fruit and so on is not free from harming creatures, whether organic or conventonally produced. Thus the belief that one is being less harmful to living beings by being a vegetarian is a mistaken delusion.

Second, when a practitioner consume the flesh of animals who have been killed it creates a cause for that animal to meet the teachings. Indeed, it is held that the animal accrues merit because it's body contributes to the well-being of a practitioner. Eschewing such food lacks compassion since no connection is made with said animal.

Therefore, ChNN desribes vegetarianism based on the idea that one is being more compassionate and less harmful to sentient beings as a form of "miserable compassion" -- his words, not mine -- wholly divorced from reality.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 11:42 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

re: "my kind of vegetarianism" as "miserable compassion". i'd love to hear an excursus on that.

Malcolm wrote:

Someday, I am sure you will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 11:11 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

As far as ChNNR goes, I'm sure he would be more open to a discussion of the issue that you give him credit for. as i said, next time i see him i will try to bring it up.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah sure, I would love to see this -- especially after he referred to your kind of vegetarianism as "miserable compassion" during the Tenerife retreat.

Yes, please, try and condition Norbu Rinpoche to your point of view, good luck.

I have heard ChNN extol the virtues of practitioners eating meat again and again since I first took teachings from him in 1992. I am quite sure you will not dislodge him from his perspective on this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you mean like swallowing a live goldfish?

Malcolm wrote:

That would equal killing, of course. So no, not like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 11:00 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Your words? Indeed. The cult of vegetarianism.

The parts of your lama's advice that don't agree with your pre-established ideas about diets are thrown away as bullshit. First and foremost: diet! Then Dzogchen and your master. You'll go far with that attitude.

gad rgyangs said:

its not a cult its called morality 101: non-killing. you've heard of it perhaps?

Malcolm wrote:

Eating meat does not equal killing -- I suggest you review Bhavaviveka's argument on this subject.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 10:56 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

are you claiming you agree with everything he says, no questions asked? do you believe he is omniscient?

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN is an awakened person, one of the few in the world and he is my root Guru.

If he is not your root Guru, it is ok.

Everyone is free. You are free not to eat meat, I am free to eat meat.

I have argued both sides of this issue extensively. In the end, however, I just follow my teacher's advice since he is an awakened person, and I am not.

As far as antinomian goes, that was not my point -- my point was to what extent you were taking your convictions. Certainly there are many now who beleive that meat as well as alchohol is not really needed in a ganapuja.

They can think that if they like. I have never agreed with this point of view. AFAIC, these two things are somewhat indispensable for various reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

this seems to be the crux of what you are saying, all I can do is remind you that this theory is far from being accepted in buddhism in general. is it true? i certainly have no way of knowing. does my teacher ChNNR teach this? yup. do I buy it? not really.

Namdrol said:

Well, that's your problem.

N

gad rgyangs said:

i got 99 problems but eatin' meat aint one.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the problem to which I was referring, this was:

"does my teacher ChNNR teach this? yup. do I buy it? not really."

But of course, you are free. But instructing people to be vegetarians in direct contradiction to what your teacher teaches...

?

And then piling another teachers POV on top of that?

?

Next you will be telling us we should eschew meat in the ganapuja...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 8:58 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

this seems to be the crux of what you are saying, all I can do is remind you that this theory is far from being accepted in buddhism in general. is it true? i certainly have no way of knowing. does my teacher ChNNR teach this? yup. do I buy it? not really.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that's your problem.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Metta in Theravada Vs Bodhicitta in Mahayana

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

According to your opinion, what are the difference among metta in Theravada vs Bodhicitta in Mahayana?

Malcolm wrote:

The former does not have the capacity to bring you to liberation, since it is a mundane meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Teachings by Khenpo Namdrol

Content:

phantom59 said:

In early 2009 Khen Rinpoche gave a commentary on a short text by Mipham, "Lion's Roar: Buddha Nature in a Nutshell" to students of the Rigpa Shedra East
<http://www.knamdrol.org/mipham-stong-thun-senge-ngaro-g.avertin.pdf> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

cloudburst said:

these teachings have many reference numbers in the three and four hundreds, do you know what they refer to? for example,

"Because in fact, there only appears to be a progressive liberation from the obscurations that veil self--- appearances (rang snang), while the actual essence remains in its primordial state free from any obscuration. [393] "

thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

Probably the page number of the edition of the text he was using.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

heart said:

But Namdrol, the so called "American Buddhists" are arrogant and think they know the Dharma better than the Tibetans and this interview was directed at them.

Malcolm wrote:

Really? Who are these so called "American Buddhists"?

heart said:

Also the whole world consider the Americans more arrogant than any other country in the world in political matters.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Don't confuse the actions of a small corporate controlled faction controlling our government with the American people. Thanks.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

Adamantine said:

There's a lot in there, what do you not accept? All of it? Or just the part about Western Dharma teachers?

Malcolm wrote:

"Because Americans are very arrogant and their capitalism's-habit is to think they are very superior to everyone else. They don't respect other races, and other cultures. They are nationalistic. National - how do you say? Chauvinistic. It is another manifestation of a nihilist view. But the West has no pure Buddhist lineage because they don't respect sublime beings, and they don't believe in teachers. Whatever they do not understand deeply, then they reject, and they say, "This is useless". The problem is how pure Buddhist teachings can flourish in the west.

...

I cannot say, neither they are or are not because I am not a sublime teacher. But main problem is that almost all Western teachers of Buddhism are nihilists.

This is what I do not accept. I know many Americans, the vast majority of them are not arrogant and do not think they are better than anyone else.

If nationalism is a fault, it applies to all -- including, and especially Tibetans.

The western Buddhists I know respect sublime persons and they do believe in teachers.

If we are not understanding some teaching deeply, that is the fault of the teachers. But the way many Tibetans want it, is that one should have total faith before receiving teachings. This will not work in the West. And this was also not Buddha's intention.

So I find myself in disagreement with this point of view.

I also do not accept the blanket condemnation that almost all Western teachers of Buddhism are nihilists.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 11:26 AM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

Adamantine said:

That's fine, but I don't think that's what was happening in this interview. I mean look at the spectrum from Stephen Batchelor to Dennis Merzel or Roach... and so many others that fall to extremes based on the underlying pervasive influence of the nihilist or eternalist conditioning of their cultural context. I think he was generalizing to make a point, based on real examples, and warn us of a dangerous trend. You don't have to make it all about you! Anyway, I have a feeling the entire interview would read differently, as Lama Tharchin expressed, and you are reacting to the manipulated-by-Tworkov fragments..

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I just don't accept TNR's analysis of our situation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 10:21 AM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

Namdrol said:

but I am neither an eternalist nor a nihilist.

Adamantine said:

Yup I wouldn't peg you as either. . . but this isn't really about you... I mean there's not too many of you around.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I object to the persistent stereotyping of Americans by Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 8:09 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Namdrol said:

But....there are two kinds of buddhahood discussed in Dzogchen; buddhahood that reverts to the cause and the buddhahood that does not revert the cause.

Those whose buddhahood was incomplete can still fall into sentient being hood if they do not recognize the arising of the basis as being their own display.

Mr. G said:

Hi Namdrol,

Why do they call the Buddhahood that reverts to the cause Buddhahood if it's incomplete? Shouldn't another term be used? Does incomplete Buddhahood put one on the path to complete Buddhahood eventually?

Malcolm wrote:

There are, if you recall, three stages of Buddhahood. Since the first two stages of Buddhahood do not realized all phenomena as the display of their own wisdom, the eleventh and twelfth bhumi are not complete buddhahood, this true even in Sarma schools.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

heart said:

Ah, I think no one have except maybe Tricycle. There was some conflict connected with this interview, can't remember what.

/magnus

Adamantine said:

You can see the conflict from reading Lama Tharchin's letter, and knowing the editorial bias of Tricycle in general, which is fairly obvious if you've ever looked at a few!

Silent Bob said:

There was actually a mini-scandal over the way the editor, Helen Tworikov, had manipulated Norbu Rinpoche's responses in the published copy of the interview to reflect badly on him and on Vajrayana in general. Tricycle lost quite a few subscribers, including myself, over that little lapse of judgement and I believe the magazine printed a carefully worded not-quite-apology afterward.

Chris

Malcolm wrote:

Yup -- you see, Tworokov, so I understand, was a disgrunteled ex-student of TNR's who had defected to Zen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

Adamantine said:

but hardly an over-exaggeration. . . at least, from my POV.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a realized person, but I am neither an eternalist nor a nihilist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 7:13 AM

Title: Re: Bodhicitta Aim

Content:

Namdrol said:

You can say the same thing about watching porn.

catmoon said:

Different intentions, different results.

Malcolm wrote:

IN both cases, limitless samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Bodhicitta Aim

Content:

kirtu said:

Mind training, the basis of all of Buddhist practice, is valuable even if it starts as a contrived method.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

we are not talking about mind training -- at least I am not. I am talking about fake bodhicitta. It is better for people to admit that they don't want to attain buddhahood for all sentient beings if in fact they really do not have that kind of compassion.

Otherwise, bodhicitta just turns into a bunch pious foppery.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 7:00 AM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

kirtu said:

That's true but I was thinking of Mahayana sutras and I also threw in the "mostly".

As a concrete example, Atisha provides a Bodhisattva Vow practice in his Lamp on the Path. He meant literally that Manjushri had a former life as a monk named Ambaraja and that in that lifetime he took the Bodhisattva Vow quoted six times a day with his right knee bent, etc. This story and this practice quoted from a sutra are meant to be taken literally both as an actual practice from Bodhisattva Manjushri's former life and as a practice for us to do as well.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am sure he did.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 6:29 AM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

kirtu said:

...but in general the second publication supported the statement in the original that basically most Western teachers were either nihilists or eternalists.

Kirt

Namdrol said:

A bit of of an over-exaggeration I'd say.

N

heart said:

I think the point is that without realization you will always tend to fall towards nihilism or eternalism.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Then the comment should have been extended to cover almost all Buddhist teachers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Bodhicitta Aim

Content:

sangyey said:

I also wanted to ask in this thread that Maitreya's definition of bodhicitta given in his Ornament for Clear Realization is to attain Buddhahood for the benefit of others but did the Buddha give a teaching on what bodhicitta is or as Kirt put it the extraordinary cause for Buddhahood? I mean Maitreya's definition is given a lot but I am uncertain where Buddha actually spoken or taught about such.

Malcolm wrote:

There are 22 types of bodhicitta mentioned in the beginning of the Abhisamaya-alamkara.

Basically, intellectually contrived bodhicitta is just a facsimile, since it does not have actual compassion as its basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

Huseng said:

Literature on precepts have seldom been taken literally, both in present times and historically.

kirtu said:

Well that depends too. The sutras dealing with precepts are mostly meant to be taken literally.

Malcolm wrote:

Not by Mahāyanists unless they are Mahāyana sutras, and even then, it depends.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: words to the west

Content:

kirtu said:

...but in general the second publication supported the statement in the original that basically most Western teachers were either nihilists or eternalists.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

A bit of of an over-exaggeration I'd say.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Long Life Practices and Rites

Content:

rai said:

thank you Namdrol! very very helpful!

also i read on your blog that "...also when we consider the winds that course through the body and regulate sensory functions, the elements are present in those winds in an even more refined manner. And finally, we can understand that since the winds and the mind are inseparable, the four or five elements are even present in consciousness."

Is this why we can visualize the absorbing/restoring of the elements and it actually works?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. As long as your practice is functioning well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Yes, the sutra's are to be taken literally?

Content:

Will said:

Most sutras these days are used as nests by insects.

N

Thus proceeds the Dharma Ending age, with Dharma Lite, denial of rebirth etc.

Malcolm wrote:

What I mean, Will, is that they are not read by anyone but people like myself, Huseng, Huifeng, and so on. There are thousands of copies of the Kenjur and Tenjur that just sit on shelves.

They are brought out once a year, their titles read, rewrapped, etc. eventually, not even this happens. Eventually, they just become bug nests. This is a commonly stated observation in Tibetan Buddhist texts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

Will said:

Namdrol: You cannot follow all sutras, much less tantras, literally. It is completely impossible.

Quite true, but I did say or think that. What I do know is true (from 30 years of feeble practice) is that "One can follow literally & practice those parts of all shastras, sutras & tantras that fit one's present point on the path of stages." Or "One can follow literally & practice primarily one sutra or shastra or tantra."

Malcolm wrote:

The original question was "are sutras to be taken literally". The answer is no. They cannot be. There is too much internal contradiction in Buddhist texts for this ever to be possible.

Will said:

I didn't say texts were useless. But they have no life on their own, dharma solely lives in practice.

You do see the high possibility Namdrol, that putting "personal experience" as most important and teaching that the Tripitaka texts "have no life of their own" can easily be misunderstood as meaning that "texts are useless"?

Malcolm wrote:

On their own, texts are of little help. One needs a teacher. Why? Because a teacher has experience.

Will said:

After all, sutra recitation & sutra copying are ancient practices and cannot be done other than "literally". I will not even accept that sutras have "no life of their own". They are hardly as powerful as being in the presence of the author, but they are not dead piles of paper.

Malcolm wrote:

Most sutras these days are used as nests by insects.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

Will said:

Then the Tripitaka was a silly notion and Nagarjuna, Asanga, Chandrakirti, Je Tsongkhapa & hundreds of sages were fools to write or have their disciples write down their teachings and further advise the close study and pondering of said texts.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say texts were useless. But they have no life on their own, dharma solely lives in practice.

I say this Will, because as you know, I have read thousands and thousands of texts, and practiced for the past two decades.

For example, the real Kalacakra tanta is not the book. It is the experience of mandala. The real Prajñāpāramita is not the several volumes of texts in the Tripitika, it is experience of inexpressible emptiness. The real Vinaya is not the rules and stories about the rules, the real Vinaya is not harming sentient beings.

You cannot follow all sutras, much less tantras, literally. It is completely impossible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 29th, 2011 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

It seems that Namdrol is dealing with all Sutra in the same manner as the 6th Patriarch Huineng, when he advised the nun seeking explanations on the MahaParinirvana Sutra to look past the finger and see the moon.

Malcolm wrote:

Not just all sutras, all written texts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

Will said:

Focusing on step one; it says put your personal experience of the literal Dharma first - not the person who explains it for you. But in order to do that, one must have enough confidence or faith in the plain sutra text as authoritative as is. The fact that we (most of us) deal with translations and much innate ignorance is no excuse for fobbing off responsibility for our initial understanding to another.

Step One: Follow the [scriptural buddha] dharma, not the person [who dazzles with his spin].

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not saying follow the literal words of a given text. Dharma does not live in texts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Bodhicitta Aim

Content:

Namdrol said:

None. Completely inauthentic and not connected at all to sentient beings real situation, which is that they are suffering because they do not know their own nature.

All the contrived conceptual wishful thinking about how nice it would be to save sentient beings does not help them, or oneself, even one little bit.

I am not saying "don't be nice to people" -- of course one should be nice. But one

shouldn't paint being decent with religious fantasies.

N

xabir said:

One of the major differences said to differentiate bodhisattva and arhat is that bodhisattva has bodhicitta, which I thought has to do with the aspiration for full Buddhahood and the wish to liberate other sentient beings. If you say bodhicitta is simply realizing one's true nature, what exactly then is the difference between an arhat and a bodhisattva?

Malcolm wrote:

You misss the point completely. Uncontrived bodhicitta is based on one's personal experience of the nature of the mind, and from that stems limitless compassion for others.

What I am saying is that intellectually cultivated bodhicitta is next to useless.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 12:52 PM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

Will said:

I am not advocating "reliance" only on scripture, but just in the four-fold sense, where the first step is literal acceptance, with deeper views coming later.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this leads to far too many contradictions because there are far too many contradictory sutras. For this reasons, in terms of sutra hermeneutics we are given the famous formula:

Follow the dharma, not the person;
the meaning, not the words;
the definitive meaning, not the provisional meaning;
wisdom, not conceptuality.

Again, the ultimate authority is personal experience.

In terms of what I offered you, since it is hard to understand the sutras and tantras, you need to rely on oral instruction. In order to rely on oral instruction, you need a teacher. But in order to confirm the teacher's instruction is correct, you need your experience of the path. So again, in the end, experience is the final authority in dharma.

And Buddha wanted it that way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 12:46 PM

Title: Re: Bodhicitta Aim

Content:

TMingyur said:

Not every concentration is right concentration

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of awakening, they are more or less the same.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 12:38 PM

Title: Re: Bodhicitta Aim

Content:

Namdrol said:

Real bodhicitta comes from realizing your nature. The rest is just contrived bullshit conceptual bodhicitta that is of no use at all.

TMingyur said:

I would not express it so drastically. There certainly has been contrivance through reification of thought and further conceptual fabrications.

However if you take into account the teachings of the Buddha then you will recognize that practicing (conceptual) bodhicitta follows the scheme of entering into samadhi in that it follows the scheme of applied thought and sustained thought (vitakka/vicara).

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

You can say the same thing about watching porn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 12:29 PM

Title: Re: Bodhicitta Aim

Content:

Jangchup Donden said:
No use at all?

Malcolm wrote:
None. Completely inauthentic and not connected at all to sentient beings real situation, which is that they are suffering because they do not know their own nature.

All the contrived conceptual wishful thinking about how nice it would be to save sentient beings does not help them, or oneself, even one little bit.

I am not saying "don't be nice to people" -- of course one should be nice. But one shouldn't paint being decent with religious fantasies.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 11:56 AM
Title: Re: Bodhicitta Aim
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Real bodhicitta comes from realizing your nature. The rest is just contrived bullshit conceptual bodhicitta that is of no use at all.

wisdom said:
Bodhicitta has many levels. The highest is "I will enlighten all beings" without any consideration of whether or not one is a Buddha beforehand. If one can't honestly cultivate this level of Bodhicitta one should still want to, and hope for a time when they have the resolve to do so.

Bodhicitta should be aroused before hearing, reading, practicing or teaching Dharma. Equally important is dedicating the merit accumulated from these actions (even reading WOMPT). In reference to why we dedicate merit and what happens if we do not, 'The Way of the Bodhisattva' says:

"All the good works gathered in a thousand ages,
Such as deeds of generosity,
And offerings to the Blissful Ones—
A single flash of anger shatters them."

And in regards to this passage, Dudjom Rinpoche states-

"It only takes a single cause for exhausting merit—a surge of intense anger directed toward a special object, or similarly a wrong view—for one's store of virtuous deeds to

be depleted. But by dedicating them to enlightenment, they will never be exhausted but grow greater and greater."

So basically even the highest Bodhicitta aspiration will come to nothing without dedication.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

Will said:

Is not putting personal experience primary and written Dharma secondary, a fundamentalist view?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. The Sakya school, for example, teaches four authorities: text, oral instruction, guru, and experience.

Of those four, it is only the last that confirms the first three as authoritative. This is why the buddha instructs us that he cannot remove our suffering, or hand us liberation, but only show us the path.

And for that reason, I instruct my students to rely on their experience rather than some words in a book. Why, because I am a practitioner who has confirmed the truth of the essence of the dharma in my own experience, and that was not based on some words in a book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Mandalas and your place in them/ Namdrol inspired thread

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Namdrol, are pure lands like sukhvati any less real to us with no realisation than places like our planet earth?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since we live here and not there and we have no realization, which means we grasp as real that which we sense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 28th, 2011 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So, like, in the good ol' days there was a fiction and non-fiction section in the Dharma library for readers to choose from then?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there was a my sutra/not my sutra section.

You see this all the time in Indian scholastic debates where one person says in such and such as sutra it says x and the reponse is "we don't read that sutra so your point is irrelevant"

Sutras and tantras are secondary to personal experience. This is why a Buddhism fundamentalism is impossible. We can certainly use sutras to illustrate our points, but there is no settled 'canon'. Gzhan stong pas have their scriptures, Gelugs have theirs, Zen has another canon; Theravada theirs, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Long Life Practices and Rites

Content:

rai said:

regarding the Long Life practices and rites i was wondering

is the life force the same as "life sustaining wind"? then how is it possible that we can restore or gather the life force (which is something physical) just by chanting or visualization?

wouldn't it have more sense to do some yoga and improve our diet instead of doing long life practices?

Malcolm wrote:

Good question.

Life force i.e. srog or jiv is connected with our tshe or ayus. Ayus refers to longevity, and to have a long life, we need to reinforce our jiv, our life force.

The reason we use an arrow during long life rites is that it is a symbol of the karmically

projected span of our life i.e. in Abhidharma is states that longevity is like an arrow shot from a bow; and when the force impelling the arrow is exhausted, the arrow falls to the ground.

Now the principle of longevity is based on three factors: merit, karma, and life force itself. If you exhaust your merit you will die. If you meet with karmic circumstances, you will die. If you exhaust your life force, you will die.

One's merit is a factor in one's longevity, and so therefore, when one's longevity is threatened, merit-making activities can reinforce it, thus practice. This can also theoretically delay a karmic disease and so on. Also since one's life force is physical, yoga, prāṇāyāma, diet, and so on can reinforce it.

To answer your first question -- no, Jiv is not the same thing as prāṇā vāyu; however, without breathing you will quickly die, and so respiration is called "life sustaining" vāyu or wind. Jiv is associated with the heat of the body. When you cease breathing, your body slowly loses its heat which is the sign that you have lost your life and your life force is gone. Actually, your body starts losing its heat even before you die, and coldness in the extremities is a sign of death. You can read about signs of death, both distant and near in texts on the bardo as well as in the chapter on the signs of death in the translations of the medicine tantra.

N

Almost all major cycles of long-life practice have prāṇāyāma, rasāyāna and dietary recommendations, and all systems of yoga are oriented towards disease prevention and life-extension. So long life practices are a perfect combination of religious practice, yoga and diet which serve to extend life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Unknown said:

Most Tibetan Buddhists I know take zero interest in things outside TB. They might be Gelug-pa and while Nyingma or Kagyu practices and teachings might be absorbed, they'd never think to go study under a Chan teacher. This isn't necessarily a bad thing, and I believe people should do what they feel appropriate given their karmic circumstances. Still, Buddhism underwent a massive holocaust in the last century (in the 19th century Buddhism was probably the largest religion in the world), and unity and fellowship is, in my mind, important to cultivate.

I suppose, though, it depends not so much on institutions, but people's karmic propensities and relations. Some feel great connection to Theravada and nothing else, others feel a connection only to TB and little else.

Malcolm wrote:

Once you have settled on whatever practice you are interested in, there is not much point, apart from academic interest, in pursuing other school's teachings.

Also there is a question of terminology and hermeneutics -- Sino-Japanese hermeneutics are not compatible to a large degree with Indo-Tibetan hermeneutics -- their interpretive criteria are simply too different to make comparisons meaningful. For example, take the perennial debate about Chan in Tibetan Buddhism. Anyone who has studied Dzogchen deeply knows that Dzogchen and Chan are not related. But for all of that, there is superficial rhetoric that causes people to consistently conflate the two.

Also the deep differences between Tibetan Buddhism and Sino-Japanese Buddhism sometimes render influences of one upon the other hard to see, for example, underlying current of debt Kagyu Mahāmudra systems own to Chan Buddhism via such texts as the Vajrasamadhi sutra. It is also a contention of certain Tibetan scholars that Chan is influenced by Dzogchen (via Tun Huang).

Whatever the case may be, what we usually observe is people moving through schools and practices until they find people they like and with whom they feel comfortable. I know many people who like Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche's teachings, but do not feel welcome in Dzogchen Community, and so they do not stay -- the DC simply does not address their emotional and social needs. And these two latter factors, the meeting of emotional and social needs, I would argue, are far more important than doctrine in terms of why people select the practices and lineages they do, over all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Origins of Amitabha

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

the pureabode isn't apart of the 3 realms of samsara; it's a place of NON RETURN
NONE RETROGRESSION,

Namdrol said:

Perhaps in Theravada it is not considered part of the three realms. However, in Sarvastivada it is.

N

Huifeng said:

Still is in Theravada, too.

Though, non-return (anagamin) ≠ non-retrogression (avinivartaniya).

The former is a term for sravaka-phala, the latter as a stage on bodhisattva path.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

right, I know, but I don't think our friend, Buddhaputra, is much interested in listening to anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Origins of Amitabha

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

then the same can be said about those in amitayus pureland because they are not enlightened they have not eradicated all unusayas they are also still apart of the triple realm.

Namdrol said:

It is difficult to say that the buddhafiels are part of samsara. They are more like an inverse image of purgatory.

N

Ryoto said:

According to Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

The notion of buddha fields is complicated -- there are pure buddha fields, like Sukhavati, and impure buddhafiels, like this Saha universe (Shakhyamuni's buddhafiels). Preparing a buddhafiels is part of the deeds of a bodhisattva -- and in the case of Bodhisattva Dipamkara, his buddhafiels, Sukhavati, came with certain gaurantees. One main difference between for example the Śuddhavasas, the realms of non-returns, and Sukhavati, is that one can take rebirth here or elsewhere.

There is of course a teaching about buddhafiels in Dzogchen, but it is quite different than this.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 1:19 PM

Title: Re: Origins of Amitabha

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

in the bdk english tripitaka the 3 pureland sutras translated inagaki hisao
on page 65 he translates amitayus pureland as PUREABODES

Malcolm wrote:

A buddha kṣetra is not a śuddhavaśa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 12:15 PM

Title: Re: Neuropathology and Buddhism?

Content:

steveb1 said:

He maintained that there is virtually nothing in the traditions/monastic orders or in the Dharma itself that deals with the mental effects of brain disease/brain injury.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because he has no knowledge of Tibetan medicine where brain injuries and nerve disorders are treated rather extensively.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 8:53 AM

Title: Re: Bodhicitta in the Lam Rim Chen Mo

Content:

Konchog1 said:

In the last chapter of the Lam Rim Chen Mo, Lord Tsongkhapa says to develop experience in Bodhicitta and confirm it "with the rite" and then study the Bodhisattva deeds, what to discard and adopt, and to take the vow of engaged Bodhicitta.

So there are two separate Bodhisattva vows? One for Aspiring and one for Engaged?
What deeds? What should be discarded and adopted?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an novel position of Tsongkhapa's. In general, in the other schools it is sufficient to take the bodhisattva vow in the Madhyamaka tradition. But in Gelug, it is considered important to also supplement that with the Yogachara system.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: Ligmincha Institute : 2 Year Yeaching on Soul and Life-Force

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

the Bonpo Soul and Lifeforce Retrieval practices could have some extra benefit that other Long-Life practices don't have.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: Ligmincha Institute : 2 Year Yeaching on Soul and Life-Force

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

The fact that this is a two-year training course that includes four five-day retreats, tells us that there's most likely more to it than what one would get out of other Long-Life practices.

Malcolm wrote:

These kinds of ritual arts are not so complicated.

Anyway people are free to do what they like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: Ligmincha Institute : 2 Year Yeaching on Soul and Life-Force

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

Sounds like anti-Bon bias, to me. Sectarian rears its ugly head.

Malcolm wrote:

Why pay hundreds of dollars to learn a rite that is a common to almost every long life practice?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Dbu ma rtsa ba shes rab kyi 'grel pa 'thad pai rgyan

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol (and others),

I came upon this text, Dbu ma rtsa ba shes rab kyi 'grel pa 'thad pai rgyan by Rma bya Byang chub Brtson 'grus, published with an English translation as Ornament of Reason. It appears to be a line by line commentary by Rma bya of the Mulamadhyamaka-karikas, and since its author is Sakya and I've become quite a fan of Gorampa's Madhyamaka, I thought it might be in a similar vein and worth reading.

Any familiarity with this text and/or this particular translation? If so, do you recommend it?

Malcolm wrote:

Good read. Pre-sectarian Tibetan Madhyamaka.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Are sutra's to be taken literally?

Content:

Huifeng said:

The only question then, is which sutras are which - and that's where most disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, duh, it is the ones I like.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 27th, 2011 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: My Reincarnation

Content:

kirtu said:

A compelling glimpse into Namkhai Norbu's life, family and activity and unintentionally an expose of the lack of maturity and confidence in many Westerners in Dharma Circles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 26th, 2011 at 1:59 PM

Title: Re: Ligmincha Institute : 2 Year Yeaching on Soul and Life-Force

Content:

phantom59 said:

Ligmincha Institute is excited to announce a new two-year training program in Soul and Life-Force Retrieval. This unique program, offered in four five-day sessions in the spring and fall of 2012 and 2013, will provide the in-depth knowledge and experience needed to perform the Bon Buddhist practice of soul and life-force retrieval for oneself or, with the instructor's permission, for others

<https://www.ligmincha.org/news-releases/soul-retrieval.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

What a ripoff.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 26th, 2011 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Curing sesame oil

Content:

Nemo said:

Who makes good Ayurvedic massage oils? I still have my stash of ancient ones. Sandalwood and camphor and Himsagar Taila were two of my favourites. I have actual snake oil as well, an old Mogul recipe. Very effective.

What I would really love right now is Mahlakshmi Vilas Ras with Gold. But you have to be very careful who you buy alchemical medicines from. I used to love taking it when I was young with chandan nadi. You would almost glow and your whole body would smell of sandalwood. Then I went into a retreat eating only black mercury and warm milk and honey. Regained my health. I was so sickly before. Does anyone still do these things? Making money and getting a career was such a mistake. Now I am just bored, worn out and old. I should go back to being a Dharma bum as soon as my youngest daughter turn 20.

Malcolm wrote:

Sarada and Tri-health make the best that are available in the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 26th, 2011 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Thanks. That also answers the point about one school's superiority over another, as Dzogchen seems outside of any school's 'ownership' and thus universally attainable with the right instruction and guru/disciple relationship.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct -- no one school "owns" Dzogchen, though since it entered Tibet in the old promulgation period, and is associated with the treasure tradition, it has come to be seen as a "Nyingma" teaching.

These days "Dzogchen" has come to be seen and treated as a "school", but this is incorrect. Dzogchen is a personal experience — not a school, not a religion, and not a philosophical position.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 26th, 2011 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Does Dzogchen rely upon attainment of the nine yanas? If not, then is it 'above' or simply 'beyond' the nine? If not linked as a progression, then are the Nine and Dzogchen complementary or not associated at all, like a staircase and an elevator?

Namdrol said:

The nine yānas is one way of presenting Dzogchen i.e. as the result of a gradual progression.

But there there is Dzogchen proper, which is beyond the nine yānas because it and of itself, Dzogchen is not gradual in anyway.

N

Blue Garuda said:

Ah, thank you. I guess that equates to 'developmental' and 'revelatory', where the latter may occur at any time?

Malcolm wrote:

The latter is dependent on the instruction of the master and the confidence of the student.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 26th, 2011 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Hormonal imbalance

Content:

Mandarava said:

Can anyone tell me if T.M can help with hormonal imbalances in women?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what kind of imbalance you mean.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 26th, 2011 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Does Dzogchen rely upon attainment of the nine yanas? If not, then is it 'above' or simply 'beyond' the nine? If not linked as a progression, then are the Nine and Dzogchen complementary or not associated at all, like a staircase and an elevator?

Malcolm wrote:

The nine yānas is one way of presenting Dzogchen i.e. as the result of a gradual progression.

But there there is Dzogchen proper, which is beyond the nine yānas because it and of itself, Dzogchen is not gradual in anyway.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

While it is good to be honest, and I commend people for being so, it is also good to be tactful. If i am not aware that this is a basic analysis found in the Nyingma teachings then when somebody makes the statement it basically just sounds like they are puffed up full of pride, boastful and demeaning. For me it is a matter of tactfulness (look who's talking, many will say). I am sure that other schools and traditions also have their hierarchical analysis where they are numero uno, but to use it as a show piece?

Malcolm wrote:

But you see, here, in this forum, Greg, there is no one who does not understand what the Nyingam POV is, so there is no point in chiding Sonam for stating what we all know to be the case i.e. that the Nyingmapas place every practice on the nine yānas, and in fact, place Dzogchen above that nine yāna scheme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Study

Content:

Sönam said:

Sure you are all right ... it's just that I had recently a "hard" discussion with a Gelugpa on what is non conditioned, pretending that Dzogchen is so and so, using HHDL quotations.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Well, a "Gelugpa", and a Gelug Dzogchen practitioner are entirely different animals. The former cannot be expected to understand Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Followers of non-sectarian Rime know the fact I posted above that Je Tsongkhapa had visions of Manjushri at least considering Yamantaka Single Hero practice of HYT.

Namdrol said:

This lineage actually starts with Lama Umapa. Nevertheless, it is preserved in Kongtrul's Dam sngags mdzod in the Kadampa section.

N

Mariusz said:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/34036423/The-Union-of-Bliss-and-Emptiness-By-Dalai-Lama> page.24; The Union of Bliss and Emptiness. Teachings on the Practice of Guru Yoga by Dalai Lama:

Here is brief explanation of the short lineage. In secret biography by Jamyang Choje

Tashi Pelden, Tsongkhapa had many visions of deities even as a child and after he came to central Tibet received many instructions from Manjushri. Then this transmission was handed down to Togden Jampel Gyatso...Then to Baso Chokyi Gyaltsen...then mahasiddha Chokyi Dorje...

Further Dalai Lama even wrote: Gelug as the practice of 3 types of Manjushris: Manjushri, Yamantaka, Kalarupa from Tsongkhapa

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, I was mistaken, the practice is preserved in Khyentse Wangpo's Collection of All Tantras, and it is as I said, the lineage starts with Umapa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen view of Pure Land practice?

Content:

heart said:

In the bardo, if you don't recognize you nature in the luminous bardo of dhamatha which is like the primordial pure ground then the sounds, rays and lights will arise along with the peaceful and wrathful manifestations and this is like the ground manifestations. I guess you can call that wisdom display.

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds, lights and rays are the bardo of dharmatā. If you do not recognize those, then you pass into the bardo of rebirth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 2:27 PM

Title: Re: Origins of Amitabha

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

DOES EVERYONE UNDERSTAND NOW????????

Malcolm wrote:

We already understood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 11:51 AM

Title: Re: Origins of Amitabha

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

majjhima nikaya mahasihanada sutta 12 the pureabodes is not apart of the 5 transmigrations of rebirth in fact once u get to the pureabodes u dont EVER have to be reborn again verse 57-59

Malcolm wrote:

Once you get to the Pure abodes you never have to be reborn in the desire realm again -- that is the meaning of "never-returner", as opposed to say "once returner". It does not mean that the pure abodes are not in the triple realm. They are.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 11:47 AM

Title: Re: Origins of Amitabha

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

the pureabode isnt apart of the 3 realms of samsarasan its a place of NON RETURN NONE RETROGRESSION,

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps in Theravada it is not considered part of the three realms. However, in Sarvastivada it is.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 11:46 AM

Title: Re: Origins of Amitabha

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

then the same can be said about those in amitayus pureland because they are not enlightened they have not eradicated all unusayas they are also still apart of the triple realm.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, the point of Amitabha's "pureland" (the term is a misnomer which derives from Chinese Buddhism) is that one does not even have to be a stream entrant to be reborn there. This, of course, is the general appeal of Buddhakṣetra buddhafiels doctrine of Mahāyāna (for example, Sukhavati), as opposed to the Pure Abodes common to the Shravaka schools.

A buddhakṣetra does not require stream entry or attainment of the first bhumi, or anything beyond faith in the Buddha that cultivated that buddhafiels. It is the same for Bhaisajyaguru's buddhafiels, Akaṣobhya's, and so on.

It is difficult to say that the buddhafiels are part of samsara. They are more like an inverse image of purgatory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 11:23 AM

Title: Re: Origins of Amitabha

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

hey namdrol

no thats incorrect a once returner comes back to the realms of human one more time one who goes to the pureabodes/pureland is a (NONE RETURNER) who will not return to samsarasana but will stay in the pureabodes till he reaches enlightenment he stays in a state of non retrogression.

Malcolm wrote:

You just agreed with what I said, only anagamins (never returners) can take birth in the pure abodes. They are still part of the triple realm however, because one has not eradicated all anusayas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 11:00 AM

Title: Re: Origins of Amitabha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In order to be reborn in the pure abodes one must be a never-returner.

N

Son of Buddha said:
hey mister g man

actually not quite in the majjhima nikaya(i used to be thervadan before i became mayahana) the pure abodes is a realm of gods JUST like amitayus pureland(we are reborn as gods in amitayus pureland as his vow we will all receive vajra god bodies)

in sources i posted in the pali in samsarasan we will be reborn in either hell,ghosts,animnals,human,gods these are the realms of samsdara the PUREABODES is seperated from the 5 transmigrations and is given its own realm (strictly for Buddhists with faith)(the desrtuction of the fetter of DOUBT)(true faith)

the pure abodes is a palce of non-retrogression just like mahayana pureland it is a place where you go and are NEVER reborn back to samsara it is a resting place for people till they become enlightened there.

the other source i gave you was of a laity man who died (killed by a cow) and was reborn in the pure abodes to stay till he became a Buddha.

the pureland and pureabodes is the same thing (abodes) TRANSLATES to (land) from sanscrit to the chinese launguge(pureland/pureabodes)
so the pureland can be found in the pali canon in every single nikaya the only thing that is different is the 5 fetters must be desroyed and the mahayana warns of the 5 burnings (same things) the amitayaus pureland is easier to get into.

so the foundation of pureland can be found in all Buddhist suttas/sutras
(amitayus cannot be found in tbhe pali canon but the pureloand(abodes) can be found in them.

peace and love

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 9:59 AM

Title: Re: How do demon like beings operate acording to Budhism?

Content:

steveb1 said:

1) But can't beings be released from Karma by a Buddha or an enlightened being?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

steveb1 said:

Didn't Buddha essentially liberate the infamous killer who made a necklace with the fingers of his victims... as well as liberating in this life... many other people?

Malcolm wrote:

All a buddha can do is give you teachings. The rest is up to you.

steveb1 said:

If the above propositions are generally correct, then is it unreasonable to think that some demons can be liberated, if not while existing in a hell realm, but - say - from a living person by way of exorcism? If memory serves, is not Tibetan Buddhism deeply infused with native Himalayan shamanism? And doesn't shamanism's chief concern lie in knowing the spirits, living, dead, good, bad, theriomorphic/totemistic, etc . . . and being deliberately possessed by spirits (the famous "Oracle" scene in Kundun comes to mind) - as well as performing exorcisms?

Malcolm wrote:

In point of fact, it is rather the other way around. Tantric Buddhist ritual provided a structure and syntax around which Himalayan "shamans" constructed many rites derived from Buddhism. But to some extent it was also a two way street, with aboriginal peoples in India and the Himalayas being influenced by Tantric ritual and influencing Tantric ritual. It is mostly the former, however, and not the latter.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Study

Content:

pemachophel said:

Sonam-la,

Someone has already answered about H.H.'s being Gelugpa and a Dzogchen practitioner/Teacher. Are you suggesting being a monk is somehow antithetical to being a "real" Dzogchenpa?

Sönam said:

Being a monk not ... being a Gelugpa possibly, because of particular Gelugpa's view about what is "real"

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Sonam,

Jigme Lingpa's Madhyamaka view was Gelug, as was Shabkar's -- so it is pretty clear

that one can hold Gelug Madhyamaka view and still be a realized Dzogchen practitioner.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Namdrol said:

People can always find a reason not to like something.

gregkavarnos said:

This is soooooooo... true, but my issue is: why GIVE them a reason?

Malcolm wrote:

Because, if you dissemble, pretend that you think everyone's practice is the same, people will eventually find out you are schmoozing and they will think you are dishonest.

If you take the other approach, which is to admit up front that our tradition has some major triumphalist rhetoric, then people may not like it, but they can't fault you later when they do find out that it is true.

In other words, since this type of hierarchical approach to Buddhist teachings exist in Tibetan Buddhism from the start, it is better to just be open about it.

Now, you personally may not buy into it, but since the nine yānas hierarchy is there, and since it is embedded into our tradition, it is a little too much to insist that people not speak from the point of view of the teachings they follow. To be quite honest with you, as far as I am concerned, it gives an honest assessment, if terse, of the key points of the teachings of various schools and shows what their limitations are.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Let's, for the sake of the discussion, say that the stated hierarchy is actually objective and valid. That it is a true hierarchisation based on objective praxis. Even if that were the case, if one was interested in a truly ecumenical approach to Buddhism based on mutual respect of each tradition and the practitioners in each tradition (individuals that

truly believe that what they are doing is valid, useful AND leading to ultimate liberation) wouldn't it be more "intelligent" or "diplomatic" to not publicly state the position?

Malcolm wrote:

All Yanas are valuable and useful, hence the term "yāna".

The best approach is honesty. Everyone thinks their version of Buddhism is the best, otherwise, they would not practice it. A true ecumenical spirit recognizes this. We are not trying to sell anything. Your stated approach seems to bear with it a concern for the consumer. The reality is that people wind up with the practice and teachers they have a connection with and no other.

Whether it is three yānas of the new tantra school, or the nine yānas of Nyingma, and so on, we don't need to worry about people being turned off to this or that. People can always find a reason not to like something.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?

Content:

Namdrol said:

He didn't. He made a standard remark about the relationship between the nine yānas and the two accumulations.

gregkavarnos said:

Yes, just that the standard remark is derogatory, since the standard is not exactly a standard, but a particular subjective view of the relationship of the nine yana to the two accumulations. One that sets a hierarchy of capacity and ability.

Malcolm wrote:

Greg:

The nine yānas sets out a heirarchy of capacity and ability. That is the whole point of the system -- to grade various Buddhist practices in a hierarchy.

They are not arbitrary assignations, incidentally, but assignations found in the tantras.

If you want to consider the Nyingma system derogatory, please go ahead by all means. And yes, Vipassana, Madhyamaka, Zen, Pure Land, Kriya Tantra, Yoga Tantra and so on all find their place within the nine yānas somewhere, and of course, none of them are at the head of it.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Tom said:

Since for Tsongkhapa the ultimate truth and conventional truth are two different aspects (conceptual identities) of one ontological entity why should this follow? Just because we see one aspect of an entity why should it follow that we perceive all the other aspects?

I would have expected instead the critique that this position holds emptiness as not beyond existence and non-existence, but as existent.

Malcolm wrote:

I was addressing the notion that the two truths were one entity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Study

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

And also be keen on distinguishing Dzogchen from the lower vehicles. Don't get caught up in the bullshit.

Namdrol said:

Lower vehicles are not bullshit.

N

asunthatneversets said:

Whoa! Never said the lower vehicles are bullshit... What's going on in this thread?! I'm in the misconstrued twilight zone

Malcolm wrote:

Your statement is not very clear.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, December 24th, 2011 at 11:24 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Study
Content:

asunthatneversets said:

And also be keen on distinguishing Dzogchen from the lower vehicles. Don't get caught up in the bullshit.

Malcolm wrote:
Lower vehicles are not bullshit.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, December 24th, 2011 at 1:24 AM
Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika
Content:

Namdrol said:

But false perception is mthong brdzun, so what Candrakirti is clearly saying is that false/faulty/incorrect perception is relative, or totally obscuring, truth.

5heaps said:

seems like this blockhead understanding of Chandra leads to the following idea:

Namdrol said:

The two truths are about how objects are perceived. They can be perceived in only two ways, correctly and incorrectly. Perceiving them incorrectly, a false perception of them is called relative truth. The word brdzun pa means "to lie" as well.

5heaps said:

for in gelugpa the two truths are divisions of reality. what do you think about the two truths being 1 entity? for me it seems super air-tight so it would be good if you could find a sharp barb to sink in!

Malcolm wrote:

If the two truths are one entity, seeing relatives truth would be seeing ultimate truth and all commoners would always have correct perception.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Things won't get fixed in the US because there is too much money to make with things being broken.

However, it is really not as bad as you think. You just happen to live in one of the the worst parts of the US.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Garlic, leeks and onions

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

You cite Hevajra as an example and write that the level is the key -just to check, would this be true for any HYT practice such as Vajrayogini?

Malcolm wrote:

I think if you are an HYT practitioner, you can eat whatever you like, meat, garlic, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Namdrol said:

The whole point of rang byung is that it arises from your own state.

N

gad rgyangs said:

ye shes/rig pa does not arise from your own state, it is your own state. since it is uncaused, it is described as "rang byung"

Malcolm wrote:

If you insist. I gave you a countervailing example -- but have it your way.

Incidentally, there is no contradiction.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

only if its a bad translation, or if the word is untranslatable, in which case it is usually left in the source language.

Malcolm wrote:

Not true. This is why the explanation of any translated Dharma text requires special skills.

One has to strike a balance between readability and over-glossing a term. In many cases, it is better to select a simple translation that indicates to the explainer a broader range of meaning, which then can act as a hook to remind the person who has received the explanation of the text in question of the broader explanation.

Take a term like mngon sum. It means completely different things depending on how it is used -- but in general, always refers to actually witnessing an event. Sometimes, as in logic, direct perception is better. Sometimes, like when discussing a visionary experience, "personally saw guru rinpoche" meaning that Guru P actually showed up and you saw him in person, as opposed to a dream. Or in Dzogchen, when discussing the first of the four visions, here it means having a personal experience of vidyā as a visual phenomena, seeing a thigle.

In the latter case, if you translate chos nyid mgon sum as direct perception of dharmatā, someone who has no idea about Dzogchen will understand this to be a reference the path of seeing (which it is not). For that matter, even the meaning of dharmatā is different, which is why in so many dzogchen texts, when discussing dharmatā ala sutra style, the term stong pa nyid is always appended i.e. chos nyid stung pa nyid, to make the distinction between dharmatā as ye shes or rig pa in the visions.

Ideally of course you would want everything to be easily understood, but in practice this is far more difficult than you imagine. Something simple has to be explained beyond the translation equivalent you select.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Anyone who really understands how rang byung is being used in these texts would read it that way. rang byung ye shes is so called because it does not arise from other than one's own experience, it is not given to you, it does not arise from someone's instruction, etc. It is the wisdom that comes from within oneself. Vida the fourth empowerment of Hevajra "You yourself are its father".

gad rgyangs said:

I'm sure that ChNNR understands how it is being used in the texts, but that is not the way he translates it.

Malcolm wrote:

How things are translated and what they mean are two entirely different things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

also, isn't saying "the wisdom that arises from oneself/one's self" problematic because A) surely it doesn't arise from the conventional self, and what other kind of self is there? and B) the whole point of rang byung is it is arisen without causes or conditions, and your rendering is in an "A arises from B" format.

Malcolm wrote:

The whole point of rang byung is that it arises from your own state.

When you have read sufficient amount of texts this will be more clear to you. For now, just go with the conventional reading.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Namdrol said:

The basis is not rigpa.

gad rgyangs said:

you said earlier:

at the time vāyu stirred in the basis, the three wisdoms were not recognized

wisdoms = ye shes? If ye shes/rig pa is a "knowingness", then who or what did or didn't recognize them?

Malcolm wrote:

Wisdom = ye shes.

This is a subtle point of Dzogchen most people do not pay attention to. There is very little difference between Dzogchen cosmology and Abhidharma cosmology. But there is a slight difference. In Dzogchen cosmology all sentient beings achieve buddhahood.

But....there are two kinds of buddhahood discussed in Dzogchen; buddhahood that reverts to the cause and the buddhahood that does not revert the cause.

Those whose buddhahood was incomplete can still fall into sentient being hood if they do not recognize the arising of the basis as being their own display.

According to the commentary on the རྟུན་ལྗོངས་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་རྒྱུ་ by Garab Dorje in the Vima Nyinthig, the basis arises because of traces of latent affliction and action left over from the previous eon. At that time, one either recognizes the stirring of the basis or not.

N

When the

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

yes like in the chod sadhana where it says that beings are in samsara due to not recognizing "rang byung gi rig pa" as the ultimate refuge,

Namdrol said:

This should be read as "the vidyā that arises from oneself", and is how I read it.

N

gad rgyangs said:

interesting. is that an original reading or would 4 out of 5 Lopons recommend it?

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who really understands how rang byung is being used in these texts would read it that way. rang byung ye shes is so called because it does not arise from other than one's own experience, it is not given to you, it does not arise from someone's instruction,

etc. It is the wisdom that comes from within oneself. Vida the fourth empowerment of Hevajra "You yourself are its father".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

If its the same, then is it holographic, as in each individual (rang) rig pa is the "same" as the whole, or is there a hypostatization of "miniature" rig pas "proceeding" from the "big daddy" rig pa?

Namdrol said:

Everyone's knowledge is unique to them, so there is no "big daddy" rigpa

gad rgyangs said:

so what is the rig pa of the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

Your individual knowledge of the basis. The basis is not rigpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

If its the same, then is it holographic, as in each individual (rang) rig pa is the "same" as the whole, or is there a hypostatization of "miniature" rig pas "proceeding" from the "big daddy" rig pa?

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone's knowledge is unique to them, so there is no "big daddy" rigpa

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

yes like in the chod sadhana where it says that beings are in samsara due to not recognizing "rang byung gi rig pa" as the ultimate refuge,

Malcolm wrote:

This should be read as "the vidyā that arises from oneself", and is how I read it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions

Content:

kirtu said:

Now Americans can't produce anything of quality because the focus is strictly on lowering costs.

Namdrol said:

Americans can't produce anything because the manufacturing jobs have all left.

kirtu said:

No - American's in general can't produce anything of quality because of the exact reasons I gave. The managers and accountants justify everything based on time to market and costs of improving quality, etc.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

This applies everywhere in the world -- the quality of goods worldwide has gone downhill, not just in the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: syllables on bell

Content:

dakini_boi said:

What are the 8 syllables that go around the the bell, and what do they signify? Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

depends on tradition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 1:15 AM
Title: Re: Is ecumenical Buddhism realistic?
Content:

gregkavarnos said:
Don't you think that it's strange that you feel justified in making derogatory comments about practitioners of other traditions

Malcolm wrote:
He didn't. He made a standard remark about the relationship between the nine yānas and the two accumulations.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 1:04 AM
Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions
Content:
Namdrol said:
And take for example the "organic" brand. Given two tomatoes in a market, side by side -
- which will you choose? Organic or non-organic?

kirtu said:
Given no other information I would pick the organic tomatos.

Malcolm wrote:
Exactly.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 1:01 AM
Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions
Content:
kirtu said:
Now Americans can't produce anything of quality because the focus is strictly on lowering costs.

Malcolm wrote:
Americans can't produce anything because the manufacturing jobs have all left.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 12:50 AM
Title: Re: Garlic, leeks and onions
Content:
Adamantine said:

It clearly makes someone super stinky, so yes, it pollutes the air. It is the equivalent to noshing on a skunk.

In addition, in Ayurvedic and yogic theory it raises the passions-- i.e. increases the intensity of desire and anger, etc. which generally for Yogis is not considered a positive thing.

If one has developed some capacity to transform the passions in the highest yoga tantras of Vajrayana, then I would imagine this is a reason why one may be encouraged to eat more meat, garlic, etc. . because you need fuel for the fire so to speak.

It is also generally considered to reduce the power of one's mantra, yes... but this is also probably due to how it affects the subtle nerves, and is related to how it is considered to raise the passions, etc.

I am sure Namdrol could explain from a Tibetan Medical perspective, if he hasn't already in another thread. In this <http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=5006&hilit=garlic> thread he mentioned it is used medicinally in Tibetan Medicine... but I suppose this may be the same as in ayurveda: it is a medicine for certain conditions but it is not considered to be a good food.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Hevajra practitioner, for example, you have no dietary restrictions at all -- you can eat anything. But if you are a lower tantra Tara practitioner, you have many. Food restrictions are specific to which level you are practicing at.

Garlic and onions are frowned upon mostly because they smell bad and are associated with lower castes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions

Content:

kirtu said:

I don't see how branding creates a perception of limited supply at all. A brand implies that there will be a continuing supply of whatever they are marketing.

Malcolm wrote:

I can't help your lack of vision.

Not necessarily.

And take for example the "organic" brand. Given two tomatoes in a market, side by side -
- which will you choose? Organic or non-organic?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: The Neurotic Zen of Mint

Content:

mint said:

I don't believe that instant presence is possible, but it makes for good reading.

Malcolm wrote:

Without instant presence, reading would not be possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions

Content:

Namdrol said:

The purpose of branding is to create demand. Branding creates a perception of limited supply, hence ramping up demand.

gregkavarnos said:

Or the perception of a qualitative difference where no fundamental qualitative difference exists.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions

Content:

kirtu said:

But supply and demand function outside of some complexity about a item for sale or trade. This has nothing whatsoever to do with branding.

If I frequent a market and tomato seller X has the lowest prices and the freshest tomatos then I buy from them one week. If next week tomato seller Y has the tomatos according to my criteria then I buy from them. The tomato sellers are trying to sell their tomatos to me in response to a perceived demand by me and others. In no way has branding taken place.

The case of branding would be if I am habitually attached to a particular seller for some reason.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose of branding is to create demand. Branding creates a perception of limited supply, hence ramping up demand.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions

Content:

Jikan said:

but merely that the intensity and the particular qualities by which this sort of thing goes on now is conditioned by commodity-logic. By consumerism, in you like that language better.

kirtu said:

Nothing has changed. Commodity logic has always driven human activities, all of them.

Malcolm wrote:

How would you define commodity logic? Just reacting by liking something or being attached to it for some reason isn't a form of logic although we can propose rules and advance explanations for this behavior (already done in psychology and economics).

Kirt[/quote]

Supply and demand...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Sex in pureland?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think that you will find that in the abovementioned tantra the yogi is to go beyond the objectification of all dualising discrimination ... 7.jpg

Malcolm wrote:

The padmini is not explicitly described in this tantra, however, like them all it says to the

male student:

"Now then, one should offer the attractive, youthful, decorated female prajñā" etc.

As to your general point, yes, all women are to be regarded as embodiments of yogini, just as all men are to be regarded as embodiments of heruka.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Namdrol said:

For the most part, in Dzogchen, rang byung often just means "comes from oneself", and rang rig nearly always just means "one's knowledge".

N

gad rgyangs said:

rung byung ye shes usually refers to the basis, no? rig pa is associated with individual sentient beings? what exactly is the relationship between the two, or are they synonyms?

Malcolm wrote:

As for one, not necessarily -- but you know, you have to find a context. As for two, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: PTSD

Content:

Paul said:

How does Tibetan Medicine deal with PTSD and how effective is it? A relative of mine may go to see a Tibetan doctor about it, so I thought I'd get some information.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no specific diagnosis for PTSD; but whatever associated disorders of the "humors" there are can be treated.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 12:18 PM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Namdrol said:

In any case, the essential point is that vidyā and avidyā are completely different. Avidyā depends on vidyā in the sense that the three wisdoms of the basis are the "cause" of ignorance. They are the cause of ignorance in the sense that at the time vāyu stirred in the basis, the three wisdoms were not recognized and samsara and nirvana started from that point.

gad rgyangs said:

If the basis is prior to rigpa/marigpa, then is there no sense of knowing-ness/awareness/cognizance/ye shes in the basis? how would one account for the innate responsiveness (thugs rje) if there is no cognizance? How does the (rang byung) ye shes (wisdom/gnosis) of the basis relate to the rang rig (pa) of sentient beings?

Malcolm wrote:

As for your first question, the basis possesses a "shes pa lung ma bstan", a neutral awareness -- when the lights are recognized as one's own appearances, that neutral awareness becomes discriminating wisdom (shes tab); when not, that neutral awareness becomes consciousness.

For the most part, in Dzogchen, rang byung often just means "comes from oneself", and rang rig nearly always just means "one's knowledge".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Sex in pureland?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nevertheless, the definition of the ideal woman partner, laid out in countless tantras, is the padmini i.e. prominent, large breasts, narrow waist, etc., i.e., completely sexist.

N

simhanada said:

i.e. Dolly Parton.....

Malcolm wrote:

I think this is more what they had in mine:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 8:34 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Namdrol said:

First, this is defining the all-basis, based on a citation from the sgra thal gyur:

The definition: "all" (kun) is a collection;
basis (gzhi) is accumulating and gathering...

So here, ignorance is being defined as the all-basis. When that all basis is divided into four, the first is "...the ever-present actual all-basis is the aspect that arose at the same time on top of vidyā from the start, like gold and tarnish, the avidyā that depends on vidyā (rig pa la ltos nas ma rig pa), i.e."

The point is not different than what I outlined above, there is never ignorance in the basis; even though ignorance can cover over the basis. That ignorance is called the "all-basis". The basis and the all-basis are completely different.

After giving the definitions of the four types of all-basis, Longchenpa then goes on to analyze assertions such as the assertion that the all-basis is stained vidyā, etc.

gad rgyangs said:

the point that interests me is the "arose at the same time" and "from the start" (ye thog dang po'i dus nas). Otherwise, there is this implicit assumption that "first" there was vidya, then there was a "fall" and then you get "avidya". To say that they arose together from the very first does not mean that there is avidya in vidya, but rather that they are inseparable. No samsara without nirvana, no nirvana without samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they arose together -- there was a state prior to both. When Samantabhadra recognized his state, we did not recognize ours.

Actually, an argument can be made that avidyā precedes vidyā because even Samantabhadra experienced the innate ignorance.

In any case, the essential point is that vidyā and avidyā are completely different. Avidyā depends on vidyā in the sense that the three wisdoms of the basis are the "cause" of ignorance. They are the cause of ignorance in the sense that at the time vāyu stirred in the basis, the three wisdoms were not recognized and samsara and nirvana started from that point.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Sex in pureland?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Funnily enough you laid the trap via your narrow definition of what the positive characteristics and attributes of a woman are. The feminine wisdom element of the dakini is to be found in ALL female forms.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, the definition of the ideal woman partner, laid out in countless tantras, is the padmini i.e. prominent, large breasts, narrow waist, etc., i.e., completely sexist.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

Tom said:

So I understood you - for you the Nirmanakaya is uncaused.

gregkavarnos said:

Seems, to me, to be uncaused. I am open to other options if you care to explain them.

My thought was that this position is difficult to hold if you consider the Nirminakaya as the appearance to an ordinary mind.

Appearance of a manifestation. Theoretically (and once again, please correct me if I am wrong) for one to sense, there has to be a sense object.

Just to be clear, I am making this s**t up as I go along based on my meager knowledge. Please feel free to prove me wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

In general Mahāyāna, the dharmakāya comes from the wisdom accumulation while the rūpakāya (both the sambhogakāya and the nirmankāya) arise from the accumulation of merit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nothing has changed. Commodity logic has always driven human activities, all of them.

gregkavarnos said:

I disagree, there were, and are, countless and constant instances of non "commodity logic" based societies (and individual actions) throughout human history.

Malcolm wrote:

Let me rephrase, in societies with markets (most agricultural societies, the only ones Buddhism has evolved in), commodity logic has driven most human activities.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Branding and Buddhist Institutions

Content:

Jikan said:

but merely that the intensity and the particular qualities by which this sort of thing goes on now is conditioned by commodity-logic. By consumerism, in you like that language better.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Nothing has changed. Commodity logic has always driven human activities, all of them.

The struggle between the terma tradition and the important new translation schools is an instance of consumer appeal.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Sex in pureland?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

but just for the firmness of their posterior, or the size of their breasts,

Malcolm wrote:

They're out there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Annihilationism is the assertion that something existent becomes non-existent.

dakini_boi said:

Thank you, Namdrol. I'm still a bit confused - I thought nihilism was defined as the view that nothing exists. (which ignores the fact that things do appear) But I gather from your posting, this is an imprecise definition?

Malcolm wrote:

Ucchedavada (literally "advocating cutting off") is the view that an entity which exists (such as a self) becomes non-existent (thus negating rebirth, karma and so on).

If you cannot find any existent there is no reason to propose non-existence.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Wisdom can serve as a "cause" for ignorance in the sense that it comes from the non-recognition of wisdom. But even the example you give shows that ignorance is not a part of wisdom no more than the tarnish is a part of the gold.

Also you did not provide enough of the citation -- you need to supply what comes after the ལྟེན་, in order for me to understand the entire sense of the passage (or a page number).

N

gad rgyangs said:

i've attached the page 53v. Isn't it saying though that the rigpa and marigpa are equally primordially arisen? like two sides of the same coin?

Malcolm wrote:

First, this is defining the all-basis, based on a citation from the sgra thal gyur:

The definition: "all" (kun) is a collection;
basis (gzhi) is accumulating and gathering...

So here, ignorance is being defined as the all-basis. When that all basis is divided into four, the first is "...the ever-present actual all-basis is the aspect that arose at the same time on top of vidyā from the start, like gold and tarnish, the avidyā that depends on vidyā (rig pa la ltos nas ma rig pa), i.e."

The point is not different than what I outlined above, there is never ignorance in the basis; even though ignorance can cover over the basis. That ignorance is called the "all-basis". The basis and the all-basis are completely different.

After giving the definitions of the four types of all-basis, Longchenpa then goes on to analyze assertions such as the assertion that the all-basis is stained vidyā, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The nature of appearances is empty, that is correct. But then you have to ask the question: do appearances arise? They seem to , but do they? Do appearances remain, they seem to, but do they? Appearances seem to vanish. They seem to, but do they? When you understand that appearances do not arise, remain, or vanish, then you understand the emptiness of appearances. If appearances do not in reality arise, remain or vanish, how could their emptiness arise, remain or vanish?

N

dakini_boi said:

Namdrol,

How is this view different from nihilism?

Malcolm wrote:

Annihilationism is the assertion that something existent becomes non-existent.

To discover whether the view above is annihilationism, we have examine how appearances arise. First, if an appearance is an existent, can it arise from another existent? Or does it arise from a non-existent? As for the first, an existent does not arise from another existent because the arising of something existent is a contradiction in terms; and the arising of an existent from a non-existent is impossible. To address this, Nāgārjuna writes:

An existent does not arise from an existent;
an existent does not arise from a non-existent;

a non-existent does arise from an existent;
a non-existent does not arise from a non-existent —
where then can there be an instance of arising?

If the arising of existents is not established, the arising of appearances is not established. If arising is not established, remaining is not established, and likewise, perishing is not established. If the three, arising, remaining and perishing, are not established, then there is no reason to accept the charge of annihilationism since I never suggested that there was an existent entity that could perish.

All we are left with is empty appearances: they are not real because no existence, etc., can be ascertained regarding them; they are not unreal since they appear. All we can say about them is that they arise in dependence.

N
N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 12:36 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
what about this from tshig don mdzod:?

Malcolm wrote:
Wisdom can serve as a "cause" for ignorance in the sense that it comes from the non-recognition of wisdom. But even the example you give shows that ignorance is not a part of wisdom no more than the tarnish is a part of the gold.

Also you did not provide enough of the citation -- you need to supply what comes after the ལྟེན་, in order for me to understand the entire sense of the passage (or a page number).

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 4:59 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
heart said:
And CC is the sock puppet of alwayson.

/magnus

deff said:
and alwayson was the sockpuppet of Enochian?

heart said:
Yeah, could be.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
And Enochian was a sock puppet of Namdrol BwaHahahahahahahahahahahah
Bwahahahahahahahahahahaha.....

(kidding)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 4:57 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:

sangyey said:
Namdrol, I know in another post somewhere on this board you had mentioned that the elements can come from conciousness but conciousness does not come from the elements. It would seem that on a large cosmic scale at some point say the earth element would have had to spun off from the basis of someone's delusional mind and become a seperate entity. For instance, right now there is a wooden chair in my room and so speaking if we trace back the origins of the elemental parts they would have had there basis from someone's mind or perhaps the solidification of one of their 5 wisdoms transforming out of delusion into say the earth element?

Malcolm wrote:
Basically, the way it works is that we do not recognize the wisdom of equality for what it is; that non-recognition solidifies our perception of the yellow radiance of the wisdom of equality, and the external earth element arises from that misperception.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 4:54 AM
Title: Re: Parting from the Four Attachments in Tibetan?
Content:

kirtu said:

Does tib_o.jpeg
always result in ö then or are there exceptions?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
Depends on suffix. O in འཁོར་ sounds like "core"; o in ཡོངས་ sounds more like so; འདྲ་ or
བློ་ sounds more like ö.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 4:14 AM
Title: Re: Parting from the Four Attachments in Tibetan?
Content:

kirtu said:
I had thought that the | marked sentence ends?

Kirt

Namdrol said:
No, they mark where one should take a breath when reading the text aloud.

kirtu said:
So text's were primarily composed for recitation?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
No, but Tibetans, until recently, did not read silently.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 4:01 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:
sangyey said:
Does everything in the phenomenal universe come from the five wisdoms becoming
more solidified due to ignorance?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything in the universe is created out of the delusion of not recognizing the basis, yes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

From the perspective of avidya(ignorance/dualistic perception) the notion that one is in 'bondage'(samsara) governs one's point of view...

Malcolm wrote:

No, generally speaking sentient beings have no idea that they are in bondage or suffering from some kind of mistaken perception about anything. The Rosary of Pearls explains:

Having been gripped by the apprehending subject and apprehended object
in the aggregates, elements and gateways,
one remains in samsara itself for a long while,
within the belly of the three realms
one is placed in the prison of name and matter, [352]
bound by the chains of ignorance,
covered with dense black darkness of samsara,
attached to the spicy taste of passion,
one is bound by the noose of confusion,
tormented by the hot fire of hatred,
one's head is covered by pride,
the gates of jealousy are locked,
surrounded by the armies of resentment and so on,
tied about the neck with the noose of apprehending subject and apprehended object,
stuck in the swamp of past traces,
one's hands are shackled with ripened karma,
the mother of karma is joined with her child,
one following the other just like a water wheel,
alternating between good and bad bodies,
born in different forms,
and through heightening one's self-grasping
one sinks to the bottom of the ocean of suffering,
one's heart is grabbed by the goad of the evil destinies,
one binds oneself with the enemy, afflictions.
Fire appears as water to hell beings,

as hunger and thirst to hungry ghosts,
as fog to animals.
the aggregates, gateways and elements appears as the five elements to humans,
those are also pleasurable, painful and neutral,
as weapons and armor to asuras,
and as desirable things to gods.
For example, just like a rapidly spinning fire wheel
one abides continuously in samsara for a long while.
Such various appearances are like seeing a snake in a rope
since what isn't there is held to be there,
both the outer and inner container and contents form,
and if that is investigated, it is a rope,
i.e. the container and contents are already empty
the ultimate with the form of the relative.

asunthatneversets said:

Dzogchen cuts straight to the point and states that experience is fundamentally pure
from the very beginning.

Malcolm wrote:

Delusion is not a part of the basis and is not fundamentally pure.

asunthatneversets said:

Dzogchen accounts for this error by discouraging futile attempts at intellectually
understanding and states that ALL is a reflection of the base and is inseparable from the
base

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen states that basis is free from ignorance from the very beginning. All of our
deluded experience comes from not recognizing the basis itself. There is no ignorance
in the basis. The Transcendence of Sound states:

“Ignorance” is not possible
in the essence, the wisdom of original purity.

The Letterless states:

Since my self-originated wisdom is pure of delusion from the start, it is beyond the
extremes of being and non-being.

Also the Luminous Clarity states:

The essence, the wisdom of original purity,
is free from the stain of ignorance

The Rosary of Pearls states very clearly:

The mere term delusion cannot be described

within the original purity of the initial state,
likewise, how can there be non-delusion?
Therefore, pure of delusion from the beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

wisdom said:

Just to play devils advocate for a moment, but also to ask a legitimate question because I don't really know the answer...

Isn't it said that appearance and emptiness are dependent on one another. Without one, the other does not exist? Wouldn't this imply causality? From emptiness arises appearances, appearances are of the nature of emptiness, which gives rise to appearance, which is of the nature of emptiness, and so on and so forth, and beyond the arising of appearance from emptiness, and beyond the emptiness of appearance, would be the unconditioned state itself (and therefore also the Middle Way), which would be free from the extremes of emptiness and appearance?

If this dependence on one another, emptiness giving rise to appearance, and appearance giving rise to emptiness, is not described as causality, what is it described as? Is this basically what is meant by DO?

I'm way in over my head with this one, thanks in advance!

Malcolm wrote:

The nature of appearances is empty, that is correct. But then you have to ask the question: do appearances arise? They seem to, but do they? Do appearances remain, they seem to, but do they? Appearances seem to vanish. They seem to, but do they? When you understand that appearances do not arise, remain, or vanish, then you understand the emptiness of appearances. If appearances do not in reality arise, remain or vanish, how could their emptiness arise, remain or vanish?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Willam Cassidy, Charges Dismissed

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

how can any of us say this is just some innocent old man tweeting then put in jail for 10 months for a suspect charge....

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that he was not guilty of the crime for which he was arrested.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: What should practitioners do when someone passed away

Content:

Jotham said:

I am sure almost (if not all) of us experience death within our home. The problem is that the deceased may be a non-buddhist or a buddhist (who have taken refuge in the Triple Gems) who does not practise diligently. They may not have received the phowa teaching and hence unable to perform the phowa themselves. Some are too sick and may have passed on in their sleep. I know qualified Rinpoches, Khenpos and Lamas may not be easily available or accessible. In this light, what should we (as practitioners) do to assist the deceased when such thing happens in the house?

Malcolm wrote:

Do shiro for them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Willam Cassidy, Charges Dismissed

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Not to get to absurd with this thing...but Bernie Madoff was released upon bail.

Malcolm wrote:

Madoff could afford his bail bond. Cassidy could not.

You can find out all the gory details of Cassidy's past conviction pretty easily if you care to look.

Basically, he was convicted of arson in Los Vegas in 2003 or so. He was put on probation for this.

<http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2003/nov/06/ex-goodman-aide-pleads-guilty-to-arson-battery-cha/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

After he first met Alyce Zeoli, he got in trouble with his probation officer (the precise details) escape me. He spent a year in jail because of that.

The other thing the prosecution was unable to prove is that a single tweet issued from an account that was opened by Cassidy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: America's Disappearing Post Offices

Content:

Quiet Heart said:

I grew up in the 1950's and 1960's in a small dairy farming village in western Massachusetts. The total population of our town was probably 1000 people at the best.

Malcolm wrote:

Where? I grew up in Ashfield, and live there presently.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Date problems

Content:

Daniel Arraes said:

How come some sources state Kamalashila lived between 713 and 763 c.e., whereas the Samye debate took place supposedly around 794 c.e?
Is there any hypothesis like there being two kamalashilas?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans were very fuzzy about dates, and imperial dates used to be considered 60 years earlier than we think of them now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Willam Cassidy, Charges Dismissed

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Then....why no bail? Why was this a cash only bail? Ten months for a stalking accusation seems a bit unusual...wouldn't you say?
What then was the bail?

Malcolm wrote:

Because it was a federal charge, because he had a previous felony conviction, and because he frequently travelled abroad, so the DA managed to convince the judge he was a flight risk, and so a rather high bail was set that he could not meet.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Willam Cassidy, Charges Dismissed

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

So that is the situation not that this person did not engage in criminal behavior....if he did not why the ten months served?

He was apparently convicted. Then released upon appeal...the appeal being of a free speech issue not on the merits of the criminality.

Malcolm wrote:

I am very familiar with the particulars of this case -- the reason he was in jail for ten months is that he could not make bail. He was not convicted of any crime in this case.

The case was tossed out because the definition of "stalking" defined by this statute was not met and the Judge decided that the prosecutor had not correctly understood the language of the statute.

Hence, no crime of cyber-stalking was committed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

In Taoism, perhaps the best way to begin to understand Chi at least intellectually would be to look at how Jing, Chi, and Shen are interrelated.

Is there a difference between Vayu and Prana in Tibetan? Or are they both translated as rLung?

Malcolm wrote:

Praṇā is srog i.e. life; vāyu is rlung i.e. air. Praṇā vāyu is the basic vāyu from which all the others arise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Parting from the Four Attachments in Tibetan?

Content:

kirtu said:

I had thought that the | marked sentence ends?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No, they mark where one should take a breath when reading the text aloud.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes and no. Yes, in the sense that the energy that new age folks are talking about is what we call "rlung", vāyu or "wind energy". No, because they do not understand this point at all.

kirtu said:

Ch'i in Taoism is physical but subtle and there are many different kinds (including geomantic). So is ch'i synonymous with rlung/vāyu or is rlung/vāyu a subset of ch'i as understood in TCM?

Malcolm wrote:

These two concepts have points of intersection, but not completely identical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Willam Cassidy, Charges Dismissed

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

That the district court judge saw fit to throw out the apparent conviction, on a point of legal consideration, free speech rights.... in no manner shape nor form infer that there was not criminal conduct being displayed.

Malcolm wrote:

That is exactly what it shows -- no criminal conduct. No crime was committed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy

Content:

mint said:

Is this energy "real" - in the sense that, though it is the manifestation of my primordial nature, it has the ability to affect me, help me, harm me? Is there any objectivity to a brick, for instance? Is there any objectivity to a brick hitting me in the head? Or is it all just a manifestation of energy from my primordial nature?

Malcolm wrote:

It is objective because you are in the grip of duality, and therefore, subject to karma.

mint said:

Second question, is there any objectivity to the people in my life?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Conventionally speaking.

mint said:

Third question, is there any relation between the so-called energy field that the new agey people talk about and the energy that Dzogchen talks about?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and no. Yes, in the sense that the energy that new age folks are talking about is what we call "rlung", vāyu or "wind energy". No, because they do not understand this point at all.

mint said:

Is it possible that all beings and all things have an energy field because all things are nothing more than the play of energy, light and insubstantial color?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything manifests through sound, light and rays.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Willam Cassidy, Charges Dismissed

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

needless to say subsequent to that I received a call from a police detective telling me that although they are hindering my ability to do business by filling my messageing with useless messages.....I may not call them back telling them repeatedly to not call me as that impinged on their ability to do business.

Malcolm wrote:

You were being scammed. Robocallers have a legal obligation to remove you from their call lists if you so request it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Willam Cassidy, Charges Dismissed

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Agreed.... but a blog may not be disregarded if there are 8000 posts

Malcolm wrote:

The 8000 number comes from the number of times Cassidy's tweets were retweeted by others, specifically Alyce Zeoli's supporters.

Of course, no one has bothered to mention the ample evidence of harassment of Cassidy by Zeoli's supporters which you can read in the comments section on his blog.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

Mr. G said:

You don't understand cessation or annihilationism.

Annihilationism is an absence of causes, by definition.

Center Channel said:

Annihilationism is the mistaken belief that an existent thing becomes non-existent, for example, a self.

But this fact has not stopped any of the Indo-Tibetan Madhyamikas from treating

emptiness as an object and running it through a 7 point Prasangika analyses (or similar) to prove that emptiness is conditioned. This is part of Madhyamaka's charm.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tarkajvala asserts the following.

"The unconditioned is the two cessations, space and suchness"

The unconditioned is analytical cessation and non-analytical cessation, space and suchness. Analytical cessation is discriminating wisdom i.e. having analyzed and extinguished the evident afflictions, that analysis and cessation is given the name "nirvana". Non-analytical cessation is when a given thing is never separate from cessation by any means. Space opens up room and has the characteristic of being unobstructed. Suchness previously did not exist, nor come to not exist through destruction, is not [presently] mutually dependent and has no basis. Those four are permanent because their nature is unchanging.

Since emptiness and tathāta are synonyms, it is a little hard to prove that emptiness is conditioned.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Space and cessation are not caused

Center Channel said:

If you are positing something that is uncaused/nonconditioned permanent, as you do here, you really lose Madhyamaka view IMO

Malcolm wrote:

Space is uncaused, unconditioned.

You are really missing the point of Madhyamaka, CC. BUt I have to go out for the day and cannot respond in more detail.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Namdrol said:
Space and cessation are not caused

Center Channel said:
Of course cessation is caused.

Malcolm wrote:
Nope. Cessation is an absence of causes, by definition.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 12:46 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Namdrol said:
Emptiness isn't a thing, it is freedom from all extremes, hence it cannot be caused, destroyed, etc.

Center Channel said:
Sure I agree with all that.

But do you agree with this statement from Madhayamaka POV? :

"There is nothing that is not caused."

Malcolm wrote:
Space and cessation are not caused, so, no, the statement is not completely correct from a Madhyamaka POV.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 12:37 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Namdrol said:
Emptiness is not caused.

N

Center Channel said:

There is nothing that is not caused.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness isn't a thing, it is freedom from all extremes, hence it cannot be caused, destroyed, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

CC,

That's a very awkward statement. Emptiness being caused... really man, what are you thinking?

Center Channel said:

In Madhyamaka, EVERYTHING is caused.....without exception.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi CC:

Emptiness is not caused.

Emptiness and DO are synonyms because whatever arises from a cause is empty by definition.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

heart said:

Exactly, and which Buddhist believe that Buddhahood results from a cause? Certainly no Vajrayana Buddhists.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

Actually most Vajrayāna Buddhists. Again, you are so conditioned by Dzogchen you cannot even imagine that there is a view different than yours. Mahāyoga and Anuyoga are both result vehicles.

N

heart said:

Well, thanks, but I still can't see Buddha teaching that anatta is produced, nor is emptiness and certainly not the buddhanature (whatever name you want to give it). The Buddhas teaching is always pointing to something that already is there.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, for example, omniscience. This is a quality of Buddhahood that Kamashila, (and numerous other masters) assert arises from a cause. The result, i.e. the two kāyas, is considered to arise from gathering the accumulations of the merit and wisdom. That is what is meant by saying the "the vehicle of the cause". The vehicle of the result is so called, because one takes the result as path in order to rapidly gather the two accumulations.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 10:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

The starting and ending point is the same space of awareness.

Namdrol said:

Nope. There is a huge difference between mind (citta) and vidyā.

N

asunthatneversets said:

I'd replace 'huge' with 'monumental'.

Malcolm wrote:

Academic, if you have not distinguished the two.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 10:08 AM

Title: Re: Parting from the Four Attachments in Tibetan?

Content:
kirtu said:
Are Tibetan cases then to be induced solely from examples?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 10:06 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The starting and ending point is the same space of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:
Nope. There is a huge difference between mind (citta) and vidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 10:03 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Understand that Dzogchen is a teaching which is meant to reveal your primordially pure enlightened state which has been absolutely perfect since beginningless time.

Malcolm wrote:
You really don't understand Dzogchen yet. But that's ok. Eventually you will. In the meantime, make sure that you pay attention to karma.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 9:57 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:

heart said:
Exactly, and which Buddhist believe that Buddhahood results from a cause? Certainly no Vajrayana Buddhists.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Actually most Vajrayāna Buddhists. Again, you are so conditioned by Dzogchen you cannot even imagine that there is a view different than yours. Mahāyoga and Anuyoga are both result vehicles.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

PS Is there anywhere we can find a translation of the gtor lung che chung gi rgyud (Major and Minor Torma Tantra)? Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

No, I do not think so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

heart said:

Well, that could well be, but that is not exactly what is written in that quote.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It means that Dzogchen should not be taught to people who are convinced that Buddhahood results from a cause.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

alpha said:

And i think that the practice of the guardians if done in a state of knowledge is the best offering one can make while the relative offerings are not that important and not really necessary .

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: ཞི་གནས་ = shiney ?

Content:

kirtu said:

ཞི་གནས་ = shiney ?

But it should be shi-na shouldn't it? shiney should be ཞི་གནས་ unless the sa actually modifies the na.

Thanks!

Hmm - the Wylie is indeed zhi-gnas. So the sa isn't really silent but modifies the na?
Are there rules for that?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, a subsequent ས་ generally modifies the "a" to "e", for example, འདས་, གནས་, བས་, ལས་, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

Center Channel said:

From a risk benefit scenario, how much better is working with the guardians than over SOV?

(Guardians can kick your butt as stated by several others.)

Noone needs to answer, I'm just thinking outloud...

Malcolm wrote:

SOV is essential, guardian practice is merely important.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Does anyone remember if he gave Lungs for Avalokitesvara Korwa Tongtrug and/or Narag Tongtrug at that retreat?

Malcolm wrote:

Both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

heart said:

The reference in Kunjed Gyalpo to the "vehicles based on cause and effect" is actually the "vehicle of gods and humans" in the ancient five path scheme. The Vehicle of Gods and Humans is where one practices good actions and abandons bad ones. So why don't the Kunjed Gyalpo that the practitioners of this path should be taught Dzogchen? Because then they will abandon doing good actions and "for a long time they would lose any possibility of meeting me".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, it refers to the eight yanas. Three causal vehicles; and five resultant vehicles.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He did. He gave lung for all protectors including long invocations for all. As for your third question, all mantras require individual transmission, but you have received those.

Lhug-Pa said:

Does anyone know if Rinpoche gave the Narag Tongtrug transmission during this retreat?

Or if he gave any of the Lungs for the main Protectors?

(With the Protectors, isn't having received Dzogchen Transmission period, enough to work with the Protectors; considering that they're part of the Tun?)

If no one knows, then I'll try to listen to the replay soon and report back.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

alpha said:

Why is it that in DC when doing TUN none of this is necessary?

Are the guardians still happy with us not offering anything whatsoever ?

Malcolm wrote:

Do you really think Guardians think in such dualistic terms?

When you do medium thun for example, it is sufficient to visualize offerings. If you want to set them up, that is ok too. Whatever you have space and time for.

In general, there are only two things that you need for offerings (apart from the Ganapuja), according to my understanding of ChNN's intent: light and incense, and even these are not absolutely required.

If you like setting out water offerings, sense offering, medicine and blood, tormas and so on -- go for it -- but it is not absolutely necessary. After all, the universe is a torma according to the torma tantra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

Namdrol said:

Equating illegal pornography with images of protectors just shows how much you like to exaggerate.

gregkavarnos said:

I did not equate illegal pornography with images of protectors, the point I was trying to make was that just because something is freely available does not make it's availability legitimate. I understand what you are saying, it does not mean that I agree with it, but could you please refrain from straw men and ad homs? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Your example was a red herring.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Ojas (general discussion)

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

And from what I've learned Semen/Suhkra can indeed be transmuted into Ojas; however that if semen sits untransmuted in the body for too long, it dies (i.e. no longer capable of creating life externally or internally), and would therefore become a waste product in this latter case.

Nevertheless, there is not necessarily any need to ejaculate it if it happens to become a waste product, because it will come out on its own with our urine during defecation, or even during urination alone. At the very least, Sukrha can also be absorbed back into and dissolved in the bloodstream.

Malcolm wrote:

You still fail to understand the different between a rāsa and a kita.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

Namdrol said:

...Greg, if your Lama thinks so, that is his opinion but has no relevance to me.

gregkavarnos said:

This is fair enough and I don't expect what my lama says to be of relevance to you but it does not answer my question: Does the fact that it is present legitimate its presence? Back in the "good ol' days" protector and yidam practices were personal and secret, you don't believe that here was a valid reason for this? Does this reason no longer have a

meaning in the "information age"? Or maybe it is even MORE important to keep ones personal practices personal?

Malcolm wrote:

The "secrecy" of practices is a much vaunted and little kept thing. There are Mahakala statues in full public view all over Katmandhu and have been for centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Or to be more precise: Does this somehow justify its existence out there in cyberland? Does the fact that it is present legitimate its presence?

Malcolm wrote:

It is simply there, it does not need justification.

You can cruise any Dzogchen Community website and find images of the protectors.

For example, the Merigar temple has all images of protectors in public view. The Merigar temples is a tourist destination.

There are many more examples.

Equating illegal pornography with images of protectors just shows how much you like to exaggerate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The links which you posted in no way invalidate my point. Just because information on the protectors is available does not mean that it should be available nor does it mean that we should make it available.

Namdrol said:

The internet routes around censorship.

kirtu said:

Tell that to Baidu users.

Anyway openness does not negate responsibility. I have no idea why Rigpawiki made entries of protectors although the three mentioned are enlightened protectors aren't they? Part of an argument for could be that most people will not encounter this information anyway. Nonetheless circumspection and discernment is needed.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

discussing the protectors and their role is not a samaya breakage. It is silly to presume so. Greg, if your Lama thinks so, that is his opinion but has no relevance to me.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Parting from the Four Attachments in Tibetan?

Content:

tantular said:

I wouldn't worry too much about English case names---they bear no relation to how Tibetans understand their own language. Even the Tibetan case names, mechanically borrowed from Sanskrit, don't explain how particles are actually used.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The links which you posted in no way invalidate my point. Just because information on the protectors is available does not mean that it should be available nor does it mean that we should make it available.

Malcolm wrote:

The internet routes around censorship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is so silly to make this argument considering that every name and picture of virtually every major protector has been spread far and wide on the internet.

gregkavarnos said:

Yes I agree, unfortunately this is very true, but we can be part of the problem or part of the solution.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with Rigpa Wiki:

<http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Ekajati> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Dza_Rahula "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Dorje_Lekpa "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Understanding emptiness

Content:

conebeckham said:

So, Emptiness is not the sole most important topic, or apex, or summit, of "sutra" doctrine.

Namdrol said:

Sure it is.

N

conebeckham said:

Okay..what, then, "realizes" emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no realizer of emptiness; when emptiness is seen, there is no seer, no object, and no seeing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

Adamantine said:

This is from the "SUPREME SOURCE" translation from ChNN and A. Clemente Pg 140

"Do not make my teaching known to those who follow the vehicles based on cause and

effect! If you do, by affirming the law of cause and effect of positive and negative deeds, they would cover my true condition with conjectures, and for a long time they would lose any possibility of meeting me."

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that liberation was a result of cause and effect. It isn't. Liberation is a result of knowledge, knowing what your actual state is and integrating that knowledge. In the meantime, while you are integrating that knowledge, it is important to recognize and observe how you are living in a dualistic condition and behaving in a manner which takes that into account, rather than slipping into the ravine of denying afflictive cause and effect which is our present condition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Accumulating merit (which is an adopted notion in and of itself) to maintain a higher rebirth (another adopted notion) in samsara doesn't free one from samsara. It's the golden cage.... but still a cage. Dzogchen is saying the cage is illusory. So why not investigate why one takes the cage to be real? Instead of polishing the cage.

Malcolm wrote:

We know why we take the cage to be real, so this is an empty question.

But hey, if you don't want to accumulate merit, and therefore, without doubt take birth in a lower realm, then please go ahead.

asunthatneversets said:

I mean in truth, these ideas like merit and rebirth are just ideas. They aren't tangible aspects of reality, one chooses to believe or disbelieve them based on opinion. And to boot they aren't even an integral part of dzogchen.... it stands with or without them.

Malcolm wrote:

You are quite wrong about this. This is why I said you are veering towards a "Dzogchen" nihilism. Merit and rebirth are both integral to Dzogchen. This is, for example, why there are so many purification practices aimed at removing causes for taking rebirth in the six realms and so on. This is why there is a detailed account of why you will achieve liberation in nirmanakāya buddhahood if you do not manage to achieve liberation in this life or in the bardo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 16th, 2011 at 12:33 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

I try to do Narag Tongtrug three times a month.

Adamantine said:

Hmmmmnnnn... I don't remember receiving a transmission of that from ChNN before, is it not one he normally gives at the end of retreats?

Malcolm wrote:

He used to give it more -- now only rarely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 16th, 2011 at 12:25 PM

Title: Re: Understanding emptiness

Content:

conebeckham said:

So, Emptiness is not the sole most important topic, or apex, or summit, of "sutra" doctrine.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 16th, 2011 at 11:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Very true and that isn't what i'm suggesting at all...

Malcolm wrote:

The potion you are missing is that as long as you are under the influence of afflictions, you will engage in actions. Actions will result in suffering. The purpose of accumulating merit (from a Dzogchen perspective) is to maintain higher rebirth in samsara and create favorable conditions for meeting the teachings, and of course, to dedicate it to others.

What you are veering towards is a sort of "Dzogchen" nihilism that will just ruin your

path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 16th, 2011 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

Namdrol said:

The idea that saying the name "rahula" breaks samaya is quite ridiculous.

gregkavarnos said:

You go with what your lama tells you, I'll go with what mine tells me.

If you believe it is quite okay and that it is valuable to plaster your protectors names all over a public board then go for it! I am not judging, I am merely recanting what I have been instructed.

Malcolm wrote:

It is so silly to make this argument considering that every name and picture of virtually every major protector has been spread far and wide on the internet.

Everyone knows knows that the ma-za-dam sum are the main protectors of Dzogchen. This is not a big secret.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 16th, 2011 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Right, so what i'm saying is that for those who fail to recognize their nature, they enter into actions and give credence to these notions such as karma, merit and rebirth which only serve to reify the seeming duality... thus never escaping from samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

You can not think yourself out of ignorance. You can not declare, "I am perfect" and then expect to awaken.

What you have to understand is the basis. The reason the basis is called "the basis" is because it has not been realized.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 16th, 2011 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

way, do any of you other ChNN students do Vajrasattva daily too?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Calling on protectors (stating their name) without appeasing breaks samaya. Frivolous talk about protectors and their practices breaks samaya.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, this all depends on the opinions of this or that Lama.

No one here is discussing the guardians frivolously.

The idea that saying the name "rahula" breaks samaya is quite ridiculous.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

I need to know this.

Having received all the usual lungs Rinpoche gives at the end of webcasts what would be the DAILY commitments i have to keep?

Do i have any samaya that i have to be aware of?

If i have broken any samaya can it be repaired with OM BENZA SATO

SAMAYA.MANUPALAYA.....given that i have received the DORJE SEMPA empowerment, lung and explanation.....?

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Yoga is the only commitment. And that is super easy to maintain.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Seems to only obscure and delay any assimilation in my eyes. I've never understood (aside from helping with ascending conduct) the presence of these notions in dzogchen. Your nature is primordially pure and perfect from beginningless time, which is what dzogchen points towards.

Malcolm wrote:

But you did not recognize your nature, and so, under the influence of ignorance, you fall into duality and enter into actions, thus never escaping from samsara.

Another way of putting it that I noticed in a Dzogchen text the other day "Vidyā is seeing the substance of the mind. Avidyā is not seeing the substance of the mind". We mostly continue in a state of avidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

Namdrol said:

So, mentioning Dzogchen and speaking about it as often as possible is a compassionate act because it creates the seed?

mint said:

Yes, if you think someone is interested. Otherwise, better not to try to condition them.

N

Malcolm wrote:

But, one should speak as much as one's knowledge allows, yes? Otherwise the wrong impression might be given thus ruining karmic opportunities for both parties.[/quote]

If you think someone is genuinely interested, suggest a book for them to read. If they buy, they are actually interested, if not, they were just being polite.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

This thread is like the samaya breaking party of the year!

Malcolm wrote:

Talking about protectors breaks samaya?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

They are meant for aid, inspiration, strength, courage and on some levels may not be anything other than archetypal in nature and implements to fortify our own intention and certainty we project into our practice and path.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not archtypes. Archtypes don't kick ass.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 13th, 2011 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:

mint said:

So, there's no guardians who can aid the beginning student of Dzogchen? or, it's useless? or, it's too harmful?

Malcolm wrote:

Guardians exist to protect the teachings and assist practitioners.

As long as you have the lung for the practices, you can do them.

There are many different traditions around how to relate to guardians, most of them based on the opinions of this or that lama. This is why there is no standard rule about it. So -- in the Dzogchen Community, if you do the short thun, then you always do guardian practice.

If you are following the ChNN's teachings, pay no attention to what those are not students of the ChNN say about guardians.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 13th, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Ojas, Shukra & Tummo

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Oh, I thought it was the ojas that was important. Do shukra and ojas have different roles in tummo, or do they act together as the basis for bliss?

Also, what is the relationship between bindu and ojas?

Namdrol said:

In tummo, what is important is bliss.

There are different kinds of bindu. The most basic bindu is the bindu of pranavayu in the heart. The so called "bodhicitta" that circulates in the body is actually ojas.

Sukra acts as the basis for bliss.

rai said:

is there a connection between sukra and being joyful or depressed for normal people (not a yogis)? thank you

Malcolm wrote:

Only if they are losing ojas. The main thing that depletes ojas however, is mental worry and stress.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 13th, 2011 at 10:56 AM

Title: Re: Rinchen Terdzod & Dudjom Tersar

Content:

Totoro said:

Well it's important for me to know since my point is to find out whether someone who has received Rinchen Terdzod but not Dudjom Tersar (explicitly) can practise or transmit Dudjom Tersar. A Lama said he is not sure but maybe when DKR or Dudjom Rinpoche might have included it when they 'edited' Rinchen Terdzod? (don't mean to add more rumor and confusion, but the Lama himself was not sure so take this with a pinch of salt) So hope someone else can have more insight?

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Tersar is not in Rinchen Terzo. A person who has not received Dudjom Tersar cannot practice or transmit it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 13th, 2011 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: This is your brain on Madhyamaka....

Content:

Namdrol said:

I don't have the temperment for the rigors of academic writing.

Mr. G said:

What do you mean Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

It requires discipline.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 13th, 2011 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is why I put འུ་ཨ་ཤེ་ཤེ་ཤེ་ཤེ་ཤེ་ in my signature. These are the representation of the six munis in the six lokas in the form of syllables. The syllables enter the eye of the person who sees them and this creates the connection for them to be liberated.

mint said:

So, mentioning Dzogchen and speaking about it as often as possible is a compassionate act because it creates the seed?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you think someone is interested. Otherwise, better not to try to condition them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 12th, 2011 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: This is your brain on Madhyamaka....

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Namdrol is as good as a academically-trained scholar except he doesn't like to give useable references unless you twist his arm.

Malcolm wrote:

No, definitely not. I am a traditionally trained acarya. I don't have the temperment for the rigors of academic writing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 12th, 2011 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

wisdom said:

The difference is that all those social interactions don't produce anything in those individuals.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it does. It creates a trace.

This is why I put འུ་ཨུ་ཤུ་ཡུ་ཨུ་ in my signature. These are the representation of the six munis in the six lokas in the form of syllables. The syllables enter the eye of the person who sees them and this creates the connection for them to be liberated.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 12th, 2011 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

mint said:

What makes this so incredible is that, as a social being, every person I mention Dzogchen to, must have great merit, and every person they mention Dzogchen to must also have great merit, etc.. It grows exponentially until everyone has heard about Dzogchen. Not a bad thing, but it just calls the issue of merit into question, I think.

Malcolm wrote:

And even more so those who practice Dzogchen...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 11th, 2011 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Etymology of "Tantra"

Content:

dakini_boi said:

How did the word tantra come to be translated in Tibetan as gyud (continuity)? I mean, what is the etymological connection between the two words?

Namdrol said:

Because in the Guhyasamaja tantra the word tantra (rgyud) is defined as a continuum (rgyun).

N

dakini_boi said:

Is there a similar etymology for the Sanskrit word tantra? (i.e. does Tantra imply continuum in Sanskrit?) Do we have access to the Sanskrit version of the Guhyasamaja Tantra?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and yes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 10:59 AM

Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Such as I asked if there's even one example of where the Dalai Lama (who is not limited in his views to Gelug or Sarma) said that it's okay to orgasm...

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL is not an authority for all Tibetan Buddhists and schools. His POV is characteristically Gelug. It is not shared by Sakya, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 10:53 AM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

My posts have been moved a number of times from the Madhyamika vs Svatantrika thread. Not my idea, and seemingly not a very good idea.

They are explicitly about the relation between emptiness and the conventions of language - and it was a while ago now, but there was fruitful dialogue on the matter.

This topic cannot in any way be "a kind of imponderable" unless you want to also classify the preoccupations of just about every Mahayana tradition as similarly futile and irrelevant to liberation.

catmoon said:

Moved posts? I did all that thinking for nothing? Oh, that's just depressing that is. I guess you'll just have to disregard the lot. Nothing else for it.

Maybe I can salvage something... when you use the phrase "This topic" in the above quoteback, were you referring to my "this topic" or yours? Emptiness is not an imponderable, but I think there is credible argument that the inner workings of a Buddha's mind often are. It could even be fitted into one of the classic 14/10/8 imponderables. (Number varies with sources used).

tobes said:

I'm referring to the topic my posts have been engaged with.

The references to a buddha's mind are merely a synonym for shunyata /ultimate reality. i.e. in relation to the two truths, the perspective of paramatha satya.

I don't think it's credible to argue that this is anything like an imponderable topic.

Malcolm wrote:

As Candrakirti makes extremely clear, the two truths are for ordinary persons and not buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection

Content:

Namdrol said:

That was not what he "revealed" -- what he discovered was its gematria value (useless number mysticism though it is)

N

wisdom said:

Gematria is useful if you study Kabbalah, its not very useful in the way Crowley used it. Its used as a mnemonic tool for making associations between ideas in a quick manner or discovering associations that you otherwise would not have discovered. Its also used as a meditation tool by Abulafia. Some Kabbalists also claim that its used to conceal information, that only someone who has received the oral tradition of Kabbalah will understand fully.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, useless number mysticism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection

Content:

Namdrol said:

Crowley was correct: the Hindu Om̐ is formed out of four components: a u m and the bindu which is pronounced ṅg.

N

wisdom said:

Interesting! Crowley displays it as his own revelation, something he realizes in

meditation. And perhaps he did, at that.

Malcolm wrote:

That was not what he "revealed" -- what he discovered was its gematria value (useless number mysticism though it is)

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection

Content:

always on said:

Seriously what is this:

<http://gnostic-community.org/distribution/topic?f=8&t=1801> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

wisdom said:

This is the same kind of crap Crowley pulled when he said AUM is really AUMNG.

Malcolm wrote:

Crowley was correct: the Hindu Om̐ is formed out of four components: a u m and the bindu which is pronounced ṅg.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Jargon

Content:

Huseng said:

Mantras in Tibetan are rendered into Tibetan pronunciation.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Tibetans may pronounce mantras however they do, but they accurately represent the long and short vowels, consonants, the the ṭ series and so on correctly.

My take on this issue (as a professional translator) is that for general translations, there should be a short list of about 20-30 terms that are back translated into Sanskrit -- dharmadhātu, dharmakāya, vajra, prajñapāramita, dharmatā, etc. Then, depending on the specific literature, there may be more technical terms rendered in Sanskrit or not

depending on circumstances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Thinley Norbu's terms for ignorance

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Are innate ignorance and imputing ignorance also sometimes translated as "cognitive obscurations" and "obscuration of afflicted emotions"?

Malcolm wrote:

Never.

However, there are two kinds of avidyā: one is non-afflictive and is a knowledge obscuration; the other is afflictive.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Etymology of "Tantra"

Content:

dakini_boi said:

How did the word tantra come to be translated in Tibetan as gyud (continuity)? I mean, what is the etymological connection between the two words?

Malcolm wrote:

Because in the Guhyasamaja tantra the word tantra (rgyud) is defined as a continuum (rgyun).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

MalaBeads said:

Isn't it possible that sudden enlightenment is only possible because of lhun grub?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a sudden awakening path. It has no grades, either sudden or gradual since it is the result that is free from a cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 9th, 2011 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Astus said:

The buddha qualities in Zen is put under the term of function that is the perfect functioning of the six sense spheres in general. There are a few detailed discussions of these functions but it is not really important as one can use them spontaneously once the nature is realised, and such functioning is exemplified in many Zen stories.

Malcolm wrote:

But this is standard sutra (chinese style). Lhun grub is not about buddha qualities per se.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 9th, 2011 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Ojas, Shukra & Tummo

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Oh, I thought it was the ojas that was important. Do shukra and ojas have different roles in tummo, or do they act together as the basis for bliss?

Also, what is the relationship between bindu and ojas?

Namdrol said:

In tummo, what is important is bliss.

There are different kinds of bindu. The most basic bindu is the bindu of pranavayu in the heart. The so called "bodhicitta" that circulates in the body is actually ojas.

Sukra acts as the basis for bliss.

Inge said:

Does it also act as the basis for the bliss that arises in the jhanas?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 9th, 2011 at 6:29 AM

Title: Re: End times propaganda in Buddhism?

Content:

Huseng said:

is problematic because Madhyamaka teaches the cessation of all views via negation, not assertion.

Malcolm wrote:

This passage does not assert a view it provides a definition.

Huseng said:

How are conditioned entities able to depend on that which is unconditioned for their existence?

Malcolm wrote:

They don't, nor did I claim they were.

Huseng said:

My contention is that you assert it is unconditioned yet still forms an essential basis for which conditioned entities arise.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Candrakirti, emptiness can be accepted as a basis for the arising of phenomena.

BTW, the characteristic of space is not the absence of form since space pervades everything.

Huseng said:

Suchness is free of characteristics like this -- it is not conditioned, it is not unconditioned. It is beyond all characteristics.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out already, suchness can be defined as unconditioned.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 9th, 2011 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Ojas, Shukra & Tummo

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Oh, I thought it was the ojas that was important. Do shukra and ojas have different roles in tummo, or do they act together as the basis for bliss?

Also, what is the relationship between bindu and ojas?

Malcolm wrote:

In tummo, what is important is bliss.

There are different kinds of bindu. The most basic bindu is the bindu of pranavayu in the heart. The so called "bodhicitta" that circulates in the body is actually ojas.

Sukra acts as the basis for bliss.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 9th, 2011 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Ojas, Shukra & Tummo

Content:

dakini_boi said:

If shukra is a waste product, and ojas is generally not lost in the discharge of shukra - then what is the rationale behind not ejaculating when practicing tummo?

Malcolm wrote:

It acts as a basis for the bliss of tummy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 7th, 2011 at 9:52 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Astus said:

At the same time, it seems that either you think that Dzogchen can be discussed only by those who have gone through rigorous training of some sort...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Dzogchen is not Buddhism as usual.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 7th, 2011 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:
alwayson said:
The only essential feature is holding the breath.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, how is also essential, If you hold your breath the wrong way, you can give yourself many serious illnesses.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, December 7th, 2011 at 4:02 AM
Title: Re: Ojas (general discussion)
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
deleted

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, December 7th, 2011 at 1:21 AM
Title: Re: End times propaganda in Buddhism?
Content:
catmoon said:
The suchness of things is conditional on the existence of things, is it not?

Malcolm wrote:
No -- since things are not established, their suchness is not established either. That is the suchness of things.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, December 7th, 2011 at 1:19 AM
Title: Re: Ojas (general discussion)
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:
Samael Aun Weor wrote about the black Tantra practice of mixing masculine Sukra with feminine Raja right here:

<http://sacred-sex.org/scriptures/western/64-samael-aun-weor-forms-of-tantra.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

alwayson said:
This Samael Aun Weor a@#hole has the most distorted and retarded understanding of Indian concepts I have seen in a while.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, what is presented there is nothing but a mishmash from his distorted confusion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 7th, 2011 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Ojas (general discussion)

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Although I highly doubt that Buddhist Root Tantras recommend such a thing.

Namdrol said:

They do, actually. Furthermore, you need to read carefully the SOV book and see what ChNN has to say about this. You will discover that what I have said is in fact the case, from a Dzogchen perspective.

N

Paul said:

Do you have a page reference for that? Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Pg. 61-62.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 7th, 2011 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

The main point behind lhundrup is practical, it is not theoretical or abstract. It has to do with how Dzogchen is practiced.

Astus said:

Then it'd good if you could give it a definition. As a start, I bring here one.

Spontaneous presence/accomplishment is an inherent aspect of buddha-mind, and means the aware side and the buddha qualities.

As such, the same teaching is found not only in Chan but in all East Asian schools following the buddha-mind teachings as found in the treatise "Awakening Mahayana Faith" and other works.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi astus:

I really suggest you learn Tibetan and learn Dzogchen teachings in a proper way. Otherwise, you are just spinning empty words.

n

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 7th, 2011 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

LastLegend said:

Dzogchen and Chan are two completely different systems of teachings. However, all the teachings that Dzogchen teaches, Chan also teaches.

Namdrol said:

No, since the basis is different, than path is different, and since the path is different, the result is different.

Jikan said:

Do both paths lead one to Buddhahood?

(even if on different time scales?)

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Ojas (general discussion)

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Although I highly doubt that Buddhist Root Tantras recommend such a thing.

Malcolm wrote:

They do, actually. Furthermore, you need to read carefully the SOV book and see what ChNN has to say about this. You will discover that what I have said is in fact the case, from a Dzogchen perspective.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Chan fails to understand cleaning or not cleaning the mirror so we have here 2 aspects or point of view. Even without cleaning the mirror, i never heard the practice or Tantra about the Bardo States in Zen, which are unique only to the Dzogchen Traditions.

Astus said:

This is a valid point here, as far as Chan is not concerned with specific practices related to the intermediate state, however, such is not unique to Dzogchen but found in other Vajrayana traditions too. Nevertheless, that is not relevant to seeing the nature of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Teachings concerning that bardo in other Vajrayāna systems are quite limited, compared to Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

LastLegend said:

Dzogchen and Chan are two completely different systems of teachings. However, all the teachings that Dzogchen teaches, Chan also teaches.

Malcolm wrote:

No, since the basis is different, than path is different, and since the path is different, the result is different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 7:52 AM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ok, then, would the light coming out of whatever-channels-it-comes-out-of be included in the rupa skandha?

Namdrol said:

Light does not come out of any channels of the human body. And that "light" to which you are referring is not part of the rupa-skandha since it is a wisdom appearance.

N

gad rgyangs said:

does it have any abhidharmic classification? and why are they called 'od rtsa then?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not, since it is part of Dzogchen teachings. It is considered by some masters that these channels are composed of "light" i.e. wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 7:29 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

I see, those colors are conditioned or unconditioned?

You can see where this is going, right? lhun grub is not conditioned. But your "function" is. So they are completely different.

Astus said:

Is rupakaya conditioned or unconditioned? Are the qualities of buddha-mind conditioned or unconditioned? Are the wisdoms conditioned or unconditioned? It is possible to argue for both actually. Still, since the conditioned is in fact unconditioned, such extremes are only pedagogic.

Malcolm wrote:

The answer to these questions depend very much on whose perspective one is considering.

However saying that the conditioned is unconditioned is unintelligible. Saying that both the conditioned and the unconditioned are not established, however, is perfectly reasonable.

The main point behind lhundrup is practical, it is not theoretical or abstract. It has to do with how Dzogchen is practiced.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

So they are completely different.

Jnana said:

Semantic nonsense. Are you really this foolish Malcolm, or is it a game?

Jinul's Complete and Sudden Attainment of Buddhahood:

It is also the perfectly bright purity of the original true nature of sentient beings which abides in pollution but is not stained, which is cultivated but becomes no purer. When defilements cover it, it is concealed; when wisdom reveals it, it appears. It is not something which comes into being due to the arising-cause; it is, rather, only understood through the understanding-cause.

If someone looks back on the radiance of his own mind's pure, enlightened nature and thereby extinguishes falsity and cleanses his mind, the myriads of images then appear together. It is just like seawater that has settled: there are no images which are not reflected. Hence it is called the ever-abiding function of the ocean-seal of all phenomena in the universe. Accordingly, we can know that the perfectly bright and self-reliant functions of the dharmadhātu which remain, including the unimpeded interpenetration of all phenomena as described in the three pervasions, are never separate from the pure enlightened nature. As explained by Uisang, the dharma-nature is perfectly interfused, has no name or sign, and is free of all relativity.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Geoff:

This is not lhun grub.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

would light coming out of the kati channels be included in the rupa skandha?

Namdrol said:

It does not come out of that channel.

gad rgyangs said:

ok, then, would the light coming out of whatever-channels-it-comes-out-of be included in the rupa skandha?

Malcolm wrote:

Light does not come out of any channels of the human body. And that "light" to which you are referring is not part of the rupa-skandha since it is a wisdom appearance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

How so? You mean you can see it with your eyes?

Astus said:

I can see colours with my eyes, also perceive and imagine colours in my mind. That is functioning.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, those colors are conditioned or unconditioned?

You can see where this is going, right? lhun grub is not conditioned. But your "function" is. So they are completely different.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: End Times NWO stuff

Content:

Namdrol said:

I mean, it is silly, calling Crowley's OTO a "black lodge" and so on. Crowley was the single most important and influential occultist of the 20th century. All this stuff and nonsense about white and black lodges amounts to nothing more than various occultists calling each other names because they disagreed.

Lhug-Pa said:

It's not about what they disagreed about so much, as it is about what they actually practiced. Although if I mention why Aleister Crowley's "X°" and "XI°" rituals are black here, the mods will most likely delete my post.

As I've said, as for the 20th century the work of Rudolf Steiner, Huiracocha, Dion Fortune, Max Heindel, Samael Aun Weor, and Manly P. Hall, is all more relevant than Aleister Crowley's.

Malcolm wrote:

We will agree to disagree. As for tenth and eleventh degree, heterosexual intercourse and homosexual intercourse are nothing to be ashamed of, and are hardly "black". This is a sort of prudish Victorianism that Crowley rightly ridiculed.

Lhug-Pa said:

Some of them were Buddhist. From what I understand H.P. Blavatsky and Henry Steele Olcott took Refuge (and H.P.B's The Voice of the Silence was approved of by the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama).

Malcolm wrote:

Not likely, and Blatvatsky was a great fraud. In fact, they all were to some degree or another, Blavatsky, Westcott, Mathers, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: End Times NWO stuff

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Haha I knew you were going to say something like that.

Malcolm wrote:

I mean, it is silly, calling Crowley's OTO a "black lodge" and so on. Crowley was the single most important and influential occultist of the 20th century. All this stuff and nonsense about white and black lodges amounts to nothing more than various occultists calling each other names because they disagreed.

If they had any common sense they would have all just become buddhists.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: End Times NWO stuff

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, who cares about any of this stuff?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

would light coming out of the kati channels be included in the rupa skandha?

On that note: what about the light produced during a visualisation? Sound does not

have an absolute speed, light does.

Cars do not have an absolute speed but they are considered to have form, so why not sound? Please note that I am playing the devils advocate here (to an extent)

PS Namdrol, could you please post a reference to the Abhidharma text where this is stated In Abhidharma, light is a shape i.e. a form.

But terms in terms of radiation, light is a product of fire or heat.

I have not come across this concept in my studies of Abhidhamma and/or Abhidharma yet.

Malcolm wrote:

Light is defined as a form, an object of the eye, in the first chapter of the Abhidharmakosha.

Fires produce light and heat, so it stands to reason light is included under the fire element.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

How is the talk of photons relevant to the OP?

tomamundsen said:

OP is asking how do formless phenomena interact with form. Someone posits that light is formless but interacts with the eye.

Also, for the record, light is not matter.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not so fast:

"In physics, a photon is an elementary particle, the quantum of the electromagnetic interaction and the basic unit of light and all other forms of electromagnetic radiation."

Since energy and matter are convertible, to say that light is "non-physical" is not really correct.

Light has form in a classical buddhist context i.e. it is defined in terms of shape; and it is material, since it is a property of the fire element.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

would light coming out of the kati channels be included in the rupa skandha?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not come out of that channel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

Does Buddhamind have color?

Astus said:

Essentially no, functionally yes.

Malcolm wrote:

How so? You mean you can see it with your eyes?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Light has a speed, right?

gregkavarnos said:

So does sound...

Malcolm wrote:

Sound does not have an absolute speed, light does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:
gad rgyangs said:
i thought "matter" was a better translation of rupa anyway.

Namdrol said:
Well it depends on whether it is rūpa skandha or rūpa-āyatana. The former is best translated as matter, and the latter, form.

N

gad rgyangs said:
so then it needs to be clear whether light as matter or light as something perceived is meant.

Malcolm wrote:
In Abhidharma, light is a shape i.e. a form.

But terms in terms of radiation, light is a product of fire or heat. In terms of what greg is referring to, the physics of light and optics are well understood.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 1:13 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan
Content:
Namdrol said:
it would be better for you to properly learn Dzogchen and find out for yourself what the difference is.

Astus said:
As you seem to already know that difference, it would be beneficial for all reading this thread if you could explain it. General statements like "that is sutra, this is tantra" and "ask your guru" doesn't help.

Malcolm wrote:
Does Buddhamind have color?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 1:11 AM
Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
i thought "matter" was a better translation of rupa anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

Well it depends on whether it is rūpa skandha or rūpa-āyatana. The former is best translated as matter, and the latter, form.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Fire is responsible for the heat of phenomena. In the kasina meditations of the Theravada tradition there is a different meditation for light and a different one for fire. So...

PS If light had form and was composed of particles (photons) how would they pass through matter? Plus we know that light can exist without heat (phosphorescence for example) and heat can exist without light (friction for example).

Malcolm wrote:

Light has a speed, right?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

it would be better for you to properly learn Dzogchen and find out for yourself what the difference is.

Astus said:

As you seem to already know that difference, it would be beneficial for all reading this thread if you could explain it. General statements like "that is sutra, this is tantra" and "ask your guru" doesn't help.

Malcolm wrote:

This has been explained many times to you and to others.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 5th, 2011 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

How does light (a formless phenomenon) interact with the eye?

Namdrol said:

It has form, called photons.

gregkavarnos said:

How can something that is massless be considered to have form?

PS If I take your statment as correct, then of which of the mahabhuta is light composed of?

Malcolm wrote:

Fire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 5th, 2011 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: End times propaganda in Buddhism?

Content:

Huseng said:

Namdrol,

You said,

Namdrol said:

Reality i.e. suchness, emptiness, etc., is not conditioned.

Huseng said:

Do you mean they are unconditioned?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course the reality of things is unconditioned, since it is not a product. Anything which is a product is by definition is conditioned; anything which is not a product is unconditioned.

Huseng said:

I said that things arise in dependence i.e. dependently, because of the reality of things i.e. the reality of things being emptiess free from extremes.

In other words, it is due to the reality of things (which you assert are not conditioned, which I'm wondering if you mean unconditioned like space), that things arise in dependence.

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, like space, the reality of things is not a product. Emptiness, suchness and so on are not produced, etc., it is in that sense along that we consider the reality of things "unconditioned".

Huseng said:

If you say that emptiness is unconditioned, then you have to explain how it has some kind of causal functionality which allows things to arise in dependence.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not an efficient cause, but it is a formal cause, like space. In other words, if things were not empty, they could not arise since they would have to exist; the arising of the existent is a contradiction in terms.

Huseng said:

If you agree that suchness is neither conditioned nor unconditioned, then there is no disagreement. If you're saying that suchness is unconditioned (like empty space), then I will disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

Suchness is not a product, therefore, it is unproduced. Whatever is unproduced is not subject to conditions. Whatever is not subject to conditions is, by strict definition, unconditioned.

If you deny that suchness is unconditioned, you also disagree with the Madhyamaka school. For example the Tarkajvala states:

"The unconditioned is the two cessations, space and suchness"

The unconditioned is analytical cessation and non-analytical cessation, space and suchness. Analytical cessation is discriminating wisdom i.e. having analyzed and extinguished the evident afflictions, that analysis and cessation is given the name "nirvana". Non-analytical cessation is when a given thing is never separate from cessation by any means. Space opens up room and has the characteristic of being unobstructed. Suchness previously did not exist, nor come to not exist through destruction, is not [presently] mutually dependent and has no basis. Those four are permanent because their nature is unchanging.

I am afraid that trying to prove that idea that suchness is neither conditioned nor unconditioned is fraught with definitional flaws.

Suchness is not a product, therefore, it is included among unconditioned phenomena, like space and the two cessations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 5th, 2011 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Does this render the Buddhism redundant?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

How does light (a formless phenomenon) interact with the eye?

Malcolm wrote:

It has form, called photons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 5th, 2011 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

The first is not lhun grub, and the second is not direct introduction.

Astus said:

Could you define the difference?

Malcolm wrote:

it would be better for you to properly learn Dzogchen and find out for yourself what the difference is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 5th, 2011 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

MalaBeads said:

I am one who happens to think that there indeed methods of direct introduction to the nature of mind in both Chan and Zen.

Malcolm wrote:

Introduction to the nature of the mind exists in sutra.

But that is not what "encountering one's own state" (ngo rang thog du sprad) aka direct introduction aka the first of the three words of Garaba Dorje, means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 5th, 2011 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Astus said:

That all comes, abides and returns to the buddha-mind is found in Chan. And the classic definition of Chan explicitly says direct pointing to the nature of mind as the hallmark of the tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

The first is not lhun grub, and the second is not direct introduction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 5th, 2011 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Religious Pluralism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

btw i am born Catholic, baptised and confirmed. i dont consider myself a christian but ill say again: its all-good in the expanse.

Malcolm wrote:

Then, no problem. As far as they are concerend, you are still Catholic.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 5th, 2011 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Religious Pluralism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

ChNNR explicitly and repeatedly said that a good Dzogchen practitioner has no problems participating in Christian (or any other non-Buddhist) rites:

Malcolm wrote:

But he would want you do it respectfully, understanding and not transgressing their limitations -- and in this case, if that limitation meant that one should not take part in the sacrements of the Church since one was not baptized, one should not. For example, I was never baptized, and I have never taken part in any Church sacrements and never would.

ChNN also makes a point about following the laws of the country one is in. Canon law specifically forbids non-Christians from participating in the sacrements.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: The hardest thing in the world

Content:

ryu said:

Hi friends,

Buddhism is such a challenge for me. I love everything it stands for but I find it challenges my comfort zone.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. And it never stops.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Religious Pluralism

Content:

mint said:

This statement seems to implicitly suggest that all religious views and philosophical systems can ultimately be incorporated under the umbrella of Dzogchen since Dzogchen is the ultimate nature of every single being.

Malcolm wrote:

What it actually means is that worldly religions such as Christianity, etc. are included in the nine yanas. The nine yanas in the root tantra of Dzogchen, the "Drathal Jyur" are a little different than in other places. Here, the first vehicle is the vehicle of gods and men, where we can include Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Confucism, Taoism, and so on.

As to your other question, yes, realizing the meaning of Dzogchen is Buddhahood.

People have to work out the implications of that for themselves.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Myth of Chan

Content:

Astus said:

A reoccurring critique and usual argument to differentiate Chan view from Dzogchen (nb. I don't say they're the same!) is that Chan knows nothing about the aware nature of mind but only the empty. That is of course not so.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the Dzogchen critique of Chan. So what is it? Chan lacks an understanding of natural formation (lhun grub). It also lacks the principle of direct introduction.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

mint said:

What is the difference between these two books, aside from price?

http://www.shangshungstore.org/index.php?l=product_detail&p=104 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

https://www.amazon.com/Cycle-Day-Night-Primordial-Essential/dp/0882680404/ref=sr_1_4?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1322956981&sr=1-4 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Paul said:

Hi mint. Out of these two, the second is the one you want. The first has the root text and compares it paragraph by paragraph to an older terma - this is interesting of course, but the second has more useful information.

I would actually buy this instead:

http://www.shangshungstore.org/index.php?l=product_detail&p=87 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

The text is not a terma -- the text is a tantra found in the Vairo gyud bum that ChNN discovered years later after writing CDN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

Food_Eatah said:

Without busy bodies to feed the trolls they could not possibly exist. Just like gangstas attract gangstas and saints attract nobel friends...

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm, you do realize this post counts as a troll, right?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 11:43 AM

Title: Re: Protective Result

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They should make a point to attend the next open webcast of ChNN.

ronnewmexico said:

I have a close relation who is exposed to many peoples in their line of work.

These people are of the shaministic type, resorting to shamanistic magic as a result of a response to their situaion of inequality discrimination and lack of opportunity.

Some may be quite malignant, and act at times for no known reason. Sickness and even death may occur as result of curse or ceremony to bring curse.

A specific ceremony is present in their faith of protective nature but not of blanket nature. As in if one was to receive a curse one would then seek and receive a cure in ceremony from a spiritual person by participating.

I think a normal protective nature commitment in tibetan buddhism would suffice for this protective issuse.as one aspires to dhama one is protected by dharma.

This is not for me but for other who has this situation.

So.....(long winded)...does anyone know a protective empowerment teaching being given in the southwest perhaps central new mexico, albuquerque, gallup, southern colorado or western arizona. This person is willing and able to establish a commitment.

I have checked locally with no result....so this is a shot in the dark. A month or two time frame would be preferable. As would a two or three day teaching on the weekend. But this shot I will take

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 11:36 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

bump: still looking for a useable reference that includes the edition, you know, like how references are given in an academic publication...

thanks in advance.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not an academic (thankfully), but here you go:

dri med 'od zer. "gsang ba bla med sgron ma dbu skor gyi gdams pa:." In snying thig ya bzhi. TBRC W12827. 4: 158 - 245. delhi: sherab gyaltzen lama, 1975.
[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0042%7CO01CT00423JT6812\\$W12827](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0042%7CO01CT00423JT6812$W12827) "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 11:31 AM
Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:
Even the Dalai Lama said something along the lines of that perhaps some 'Atoms' or 'Particles' (Ain-Soph Atoms) of the Absolute perhaps somehow originally came into manifestation in the relative Universe. I can't remember in what book, so I'll have to find it and maybe even post the quote here. Like I said, something along those lines, so I want to double check what he said not paraphrased.

Malcolm wrote:
No, what HHDL was talking about was particles of space in the Kalacakra cosmology.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 11:30 AM
Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:
I'll have to look it up again like I said to get the proper context.

Basically, it seems that in Kabbalah, AIN (Soph) is The Absolute Truth (whether with or without Paranishpanna or Paramartha) and the Tree of Life itself (Paratantra) and the Klipoth spheres (Parikalita) are of Relative Truth.

Of course all of this would likely require much deeper analysis in relation to Madhyamaka and Yogachara philosophy in order to fully qualify these statements, intellectually anyhow.

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is not how the three own natures function. The non-existence of the imagined in the dependent is the perfected nature.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 11:29 AM

Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection

Content:

wisdom said:

The foundational philosophy of Kabbalah is emanationism, but beyond that point it recognizes almost all the points of DO.

Malcolm wrote:

Let me put it to you this way: an XML scheme that is broken is not XML at all. A teaching (such as Dzogchen) is either completely in agreement with dependent origination from top to bottom, or it is not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Well I would somewhat disagree Namdrol, in that "Kabbalah" would predate the written Zohar (and even the "Chaldean Book of Numbers"), and also predates Plato, Ammonius Saccas, Plotinus, Proclus, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Thinley Norbu's terms for ignorance

Content:

MalaBeads said:

I would rather look for how it's the case.

Malcolm wrote:

His translations are overly literal.

lhan cig skyes translates sahaja, which just means innate; but it often literally translated out of Tibetan. Same thing with kun brtags, or parikalpita, a term borrowed from Yogacara in Dzogchen texts, which just means "imputed" or "imagined".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

So that you fellows know, RichardLinde has been banned. This account was a sockpuppet as many of you had already figured.

Carry on, please.

Malcolm wrote:

He'll be back.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection

Content:

wisdom said:

Atika Qadisha (Something like the primordial Buddha, literally it means "The Ancient Holy One").

Malcolm wrote:

No, nothing at all like Samantabhadra.

Kabbalah and Dzogchen could not be further removed from one another.

Kabbala is basically a mysticized neo-platonical emanationalism, Dzogchen is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection

Content:

alwayson said:

How do you reconcile the basis of Western esoterism, kabbalah, with the the fact that everything is dependently originated in Buddhism?

gregkavarnos said:

Dissociative Identity Disorder? That would be one way to deal with it!

Anyway, kabbalah is esoteric judaism, that makes it semitic, not western. I am sure there were esoteric traditions in the "west" well before esoteric judaism (13th century CE). Some examples I can think of would be: the Eleusinian Mysteries, Orphism and

Dionysian cults which existed around the 14-15th century BCE.

Malcolm wrote:

Kabbalah is esoteric Judaism with a strong shot of neo-platonic doctrine. Actually it is more neo-platonic than "semitic".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Thinley Norbu's terms for ignorance

Content:

dakini_boi said:

from Cascading Waterfall of Nectar, p.20:

Simultaneously born ignorance

Is the dispersion of mindless unawareness

All-naming ignorance

Is clinging to the duality of self and other.

These two, simultaneously born ignorance and all-naming ignorance,

Are the cause of delusion for all sentient beings.

Question:

"simultaneously born ignorance" = innate ignorance

"all-naming ignorance" = imputing ignorance

?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Curing sesame oil

Content:

Inge said:

While curing sesame oil I accidentally heated it to maybe 150 degrees celsius. Does this make it unsuitable for ayurvedic oil massage?

Malcolm wrote:

No, but why don't you just buy some high quality ayurvedic oils?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

༩༩། །གནད་ཀྱི་གཟེར་བྱ་ག།

Six Points.

མི་མཐོ་

Don't anticipate.

མི་བསམ་

Don't plan.

མི་སེམས་

Don't think.

མི་དཔྱད་

mi dpyod

Don't analyze.

མི་སྦྱོང་

mi sgom

Don't cultivate.

རང་སར་བཞག་

Stay where you are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Speaking of Santi Maha Sangha and The Precious Vase,[...] rather?

Edit (DN): As above. Please follow the advice Namdrol gave you.

Malcolm wrote:

Not an appropriate topic of discussion. If you have specific questions about topics in this book or others, best to write to Jim Valby or another SMS instructor. I am not one of these.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Protection chords

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I do recall a specific function of a cord as 'protection' prior to a specific Highest Yoga

Tantra Initiation.

Malcolm wrote:

That is different, that functions to protect one's bodhicitta element and is only necessary during the empowerment.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: End times propaganda in Buddhism?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Are there any Buddhist scriptures that mention the Precession of the Equinoxes?

Malcolm wrote:

Kalacakra takes precession into account, without mentioning it explicitly.

See Henning's book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: End of the Kali-Yuga and the Mayan-Tibetan Connection

Content:

padma norbu said:

Just found this:

"The Tibetan calendar is so similar to the Mayan that traditional scholars now speculate that they share a common origin."

from http://www.world-mysteries.com/sar_3.htm "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibeian calendar is based on calculations in the Kalacakra tantra, so, no relationship to Mayan calendar in anyway.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Protection chords

Content:

Dharmaswede said:

I am looking for information on protection chords; how they work, significance of different colors, different types of chords, exceptions to wearing them etc.

Thank you!

Best Regards,

Jens

Malcolm wrote:

Protection cords are for non-practitioners and animals. Practitioners have no need to wear them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Here is a basic point:

All living and non-living things are created from the five elements.

All living and non-living things are maintained by the five elements.

All living and non-living things are destroyed by the five elements.

There are no exceptions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Richard Linde is famous for making things up as they go along.

RichardLinde said:

That is not at all true. All I ask is that people use reason to support their arguments, rather than relying on the fallacy of appeal to authority (false authority, usually).

That's not much to ask on an academic forum, is it?

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to know what Mahāyānist believe, Mr. Trevor Solway-Linde, then you should consult texts authored by Mahāyānists, instead of making things up based on your own limited reasoning.

RichardLinde said:

Who is it who decides that the Long PP sutra is valid? And who decides which commentaries are valid? And who decides how the commentaries are to be interpreted?

Malcolm wrote:

Centuries of Mahāyānists who wrote commentaries on this sutra in India, China, Tibet and Japan.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 10:36 AM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Apparently, you are completely and totally ignorant of Mahāyāna positions.

RichardLinde said:

Where can I read the official Mahayana position? Who decides what the official Mahayana position is? Is there a team of people who get together and decide which Sutras are to be held to be authoritative, and exactly how those Sutras are to be interpreted?

Tom said:

Would you care then to provide at least one quote from a Mahayana specific commentary which explicitly supports your position.

I had thought the Mahayana position on omniscience was summed up nicely in the quote from Ornament of Clear Realisation that I referenced quite a few posts ago.

Malcolm wrote:

Kevin Solway aka Richard Linde is famous for making things up as they go along.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 10:35 AM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Apparently, you are completely and totally ignorant of Mahāyāna positions.

RichardLinde said:

Where can I read the official Mahayana position? Who decides what the official Mahayana position is? Is there a team of people who get together and decide which Sutras are to be held to be authoritative, and exactly how those Sutras are to be interpreted?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for starters you can read the Long PP sutra and its commentaries connected with the Abhisamaya-alamkara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 9:58 AM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

RichardLinde said:

It doesn't help to appeal to the imagined "Mahayana definition", which doesn't even exist.

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently, you are completely and totally ignorant of Mahāyāna positions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

Acchantika said:

If it is possible to know any detail about anything with certainty, that is a realist position...

Namdrol said:

The counter-example to your assertion is the omniscience of a buddha, which has unimpeded knowledge of all phenomena precisely because all phenomena are illusory and unreal.

N

Acchantika said:

Only if we consider unimpeded knowledge of all phenomena to be the same as knowing all details about everything with certainty.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, that is the Mahāyāna definition of omniscience.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 6:37 AM
Title: Re: Is receiving transmission via webcast a farce?
Content:

padma norbu said:
If you got any of the Longsal books, let me know what you think. I wanted to get them before they sold out, but it seemed like there was going to be an endless amount of volumes, so I just didn't even start. So many teachings and books...

Pero said:
Just FYI, Longsal volumes are now considered restricted to people who either received the respective teachings or received the Longsal root initiation.

Paul said:
When did that change happen?

Malcolm wrote:
recently.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 6:08 AM
Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism
Content:

RichardLinde said:
There are two main camps: those who believe that it is possible to perfectly know all details about everything, including future events, and those who don't.

Namdrol said:
No, the difference is that former are not realists; and the latter are realists i.e. realists in the sense of thinking that phenomena are fundamentally real (even if they try excuse themselves with the 'lacking inherent existence clause) and that there are therefore concrete limitations on what an "unimpeded mind", such as a Buddha's, can know.

N

Acchantika said:
If it is possible to know any detail about anything with certainty, that is a realist position...

Malcolm wrote:

The counter-example to your assertion is the omniscience of a buddha, which has unimpeded knowledge of all phenomena precisely because all phenomena are illusory and unreal.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

RichardLinde said:

There are two main camps: those who believe that it is possible to perfectly know all details about everything, including future events, and those who don't. The way I see it, the former are those who have "faith" in what they believe to be authority, and the latter are those who have investigated the issue.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the difference is that former are not realists; and the latter are realists i.e. realists in the sense of thinking that phenomena are fundamentally real (even if they try excuse themselves with the 'lacking inherent existence clause) and that there are therefore concrete limitations on what an "unimpeded mind", such as a Buddha's, can know.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: End times propaganda in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Reality i.e. suchness, emptiness, etc., is not conditioned. Things arise in dependence because of the reality of things. Things are conditioned, but the reality of things is not.

N

Huseng said:

You say things arise in dependence because of the reality of things -- that those arisen things are conditioned, yet they arise in dependence on the unconditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

Read it again:

I said:

Things arise in dependence because of the reality of things.

You interpreted:

"that those arisen things are conditioned, yet they arise in dependence on the unconditioned"

I never said that things arise depending on the unconditioned. I said that things arise in dependence i.e. dependently, because of the reality of things i.e. the reality of things being emptiness free from extremes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Hi

ChNN uses the term presence for what other people translated as mindfulness; and instant presence (rig pa skad cig ma) for being present in the stage of knowledge of one's primordial state. It is important to differentiate the two terms. Mindfulness is not rigpa.

N

mint said:

So, presence is not mindfulness? Experientially, they would seem to be the same thing, I would think.

Is mindfulness the natural state?

Malcolm wrote:

Presence = mindfulness

Instant presence = rigpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Deity Yoga Questions

Content:

Adamantine said:

It seems that ChNN's style is to treat everyone as if they are the highest capacity...

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a style, this characteristic of Dzogchen teachings and teachers in general. For example, Shabkar's Flight states right at the outset:

If this is practiced, all will be liberated;

there is no distinction between sharpness and dullness in capacities.

Dzogchen is not a gradual path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 3rd, 2011 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Rigpa is the knowledge you have that allows you to wake up. Rigpa is a complicated word in Dzogchen texts, and has different meanings in different contexts, but generally it just means knowledge, which in English is the antonym of ignorance (ma rig pa).

mint said:

Adriano Clemente translates 'rigpa' as 'presence' in the book "Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State." Is this the same as mindfulness?

Along those same lines, after my meditation, I have a sense of calm relaxation. No thought or sensation disturbs me. There is placidness and presence. Even when talking, knowledge of this placidness remains. Is this the natural state or rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Hi

ChNN uses the term presence for what other people translated as mindfulness; and instant presence (rig pa skad cig ma) for being present in the stage of knowledge of one's primordial state. It is important to differentiate the two terms. Mindfulness is not rigpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 2nd, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Sherab said:

To give an example, the model tries to make consistent the ideas of causality, dependent arising and lhundrup. It is still a work-in-progress though. So far I've only attempted to float the model to one person but have met with silence from that person

thus far. Not sure if it was a polite silence or a freak-out silence.

Malcolm wrote:
it is simple:

vidyā		avidyā
---		...
original purity		emptiness
natural formation		dependent origination

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 2nd, 2011 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: Is receiving transmission via webcast a farce?

Content:

mint said:

[Personally, I see the restricted texts as largely another business scheme, though I imagine it can't be very profitable considering its niche market.]

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community has never made a real profit in a material sense. In fact, the person who supports it financially the most is ChNN.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 1st, 2011 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

RichardLinde said:

I did cite the Buddha saying that he doesn't know with certainty what will happen after the Dharma is extinguished. He doesn't give the reasons why he doesn't have this certainty, but we can work the reasons out for ourselves easily enough.

gregkavarnos said:

You have cited no such thing

RichardLinde said:

See <http://www.cttbusa.org/shurangama/shurangama2.asp>.

So too, will the Dharma flare and die. After this time it is difficult to speak with certainty of what will follow.

So clearly the Buddha doesn't have the kind of omniscience that would give him certain knowledge of future events - quite apart from the fact that such things can be easily proven to be impossible.

Malcolm wrote:

This text is inadmissible because its authenticity is disputed.

In any event your remarks Buddha's omniscience are appropriate from a non-Mahāyāna point of view, but not from a Mahāyāna point of view. Therefore, there is no further basis for a discussion because there is no common agreement about what omniscience of a buddha entails, much less whether a buddha possesses concepts.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

interesting passage u got page ##s please?

Malcolm wrote:

Vima Nyinthig, volume two, starts on page 222.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Is receiving transmission via webcast a farce?

Content:

mint said:

What happens when ChNNR has his pariniravana?

Malcolm wrote:

Then you follow ChNN's children -- who have both been given mandates to teach.

For now, stop worrying so much.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 10:22 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Tom said:

. . . the elimination of all knowledge obstacles

RichardLinde said:

The "obstacles" being referred to here are those obstacles arising from delusion, and not any other kind of obstacles.

The "knowledge" being referred to is knowledge of the true nature of things. Such a knowledge does give a person a lot greater ability to predict the future than a normal person, but predictions of detailed future events can never be certain.

Malcolm wrote:

You are going to need to start providing citations for your opinions. Thus far, all you have presented are opinions -- but the rules of this specific forum require citations.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

heart said:

A single essence doesn't mean they are the same. Like the nature of mind not being the same as mind. Actually, what you say sounds more Mahamudra related than Dzogchen.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

It means there is only one vidyā that has five expressions.

heart said:

Not making a clear distinction between "sem" and "rigpa" is not the Dzogchen way, so it still sounds like Mahamudra to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with Vimalamitra. He writes about this in both the Copper Letters and the Agate Letters.

The vidyā that apprehends characteristics: “the vidyā that imputes phenomena as universals and as mere personal names”, is one’s mere non-conceptual self-knowing awareness defiled by many cognitions.

The [vidyā that] appropriates the basis creates all cognitions when present in one’s body, and is present as the mere intrinsic clarity [of those cognitions] is called “unripened vidyā”.

The vidyā present as the basis is the reality of the essence, original purity, that exists possessing the three primordial wisdoms. The vidyā which is not covered by partiality is present as the essence of omniscient wisdom. Further, that primordial wisdom is present as a subtle primordial wisdom. If that primordial wisdom did not exist, there would be no liberation from emptiness. Further, there would be no liberation from the inert. However, if vidyā exists as primordial wisdom, it would be no different than the realist’s nirmanakāya.

The vidyā of insight is those vivid appearances when the instruction is demonstrated. It is called “the essence of the self-apparent thigle”. As there are many unmixed appearances, the Teacher stated:

Everything arose from non-arising,
showing the great miraculous display in every way.

The vidyā of thögal is the absence of increase or decrease in experience having reached the full measure of appearance through practice. Having completed all the signs and qualities, also they are not established by their own nature. When self-manifesting as omniscient wisdom, it [the vidyā of thögal] is called “abandoning phenomena”, “the exhaustion of phenomena”, “beyond phenomena”, “liberated from phenomena”, and “no arising even in mere arising”.

Are those vidyās different or not? They are not different since there is nothing more than a single nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Deity Yoga Questions

Content:

mint said:

This thread was started to ask questions in relation to deity yoga:

Is a guru required before engaging in deity yoga?

Is ngondro required before engaging in deity yoga?

Does Dzogchen practice include deity yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes

No

Yes, but not necessarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

mind is the result of karmic winds mixing with the rtsal of rigpa.

N

Thoughts are the energy [rtsal] of rigpa.

N

alwayson said:

Sure I believe all that

Then what does distinguishing between rigpa and sems mean if sems is actually partly derived from rigpa.....

Malcolm wrote:

It means knowing the difference between the crystal that produces a rainbow and the rainbow projected from the crystal -- the rtsal of the crystal produces the rainbow, the rainbow comes from the crystal but is not part of the crystal. Likewise, thoughts come from the energy of vidyā, but they are not vidyā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

heart said:

A single essence doesn't mean they are the same. Like the nature of mind not being the same as mind. Actually, what you say sounds more Mahamudra related then Dzogchen.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It means there is only one vidyā that has five expressions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

conebeckham said:

From the POV of Dzokchen, would a fully enlightened Buddha have "thoughts?" I'm thinking of the Madhyamika thread.....I understand that the nature of thoughts is the energy of rigpa, but how does this impact the discussion of Buddhas being concept-free?

Namdrol said:

No impact, and no, a Buddha still has no thoughts since, from a Dzogchen POV, mind is the result of karmic winds mixing with the rtsal of rigpa.

N

Sönam said:

Then what is the rtsal of rigpa when no thoughts?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

rtsal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Sherab vs. Lodro

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Thanks, Namdrol. So, in Tibetan, do they both imply "discriminating wisdom" or ordinary intelligence? Or are they both used interchangeably for either of these?

Malcolm wrote:

They overlap.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

One can also make a karmic connection to an animal by saving it from from being slaughtered and eaten.

That's what the practice: Essence of Benefit and Joy by Jamgon Kongtrul Lodro Thaye is all about.

You can buy it here

http://www.namsebangdzo.com/Essence_of_Benefit_and_Joy_p/5324.htm "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And I have an electronic version of it available here for download

<https://dl.dropbox.com/u/9844773/Essence%20of%20Benefit.rar.exe> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; for whoever wishes.

Kyosan said:

I agree.

And what are these karmic connections from eating meat? Could it be that in a future life, the animal who was eaten is afraid of the person who ate him? Or could it be that in a future life the person is an animal and the animal is a person, and the person eats the animal? I see both of these as being negative; it would be interesting to see examples of positive karmic connections that are beneficial.

Malcolm wrote:

If you use the proper method, and maintain awareness while eating meat, that animal will be reborn as your student when you achieve awakening.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Sherab vs. Lodro

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Could someone explain the difference between these two words, which are both translated as "wisdom"? Are they used differently in Buddhist texts?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

one translates prajñā (shes rab), the other translates mati (blo gros).

One means discriminating wisdom, prajñā, the other refers more to intellectual capacity, intelligence. In Tibetan they are somewhat synonymous.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

conebeckham said:

From the POV of Dzokchen, would a fully enlightened Buddha have "thoughts?" I'm thinking of the Madhyamika thread.....I understand that the nature of thoughts is the energy of rigpa, but how does this impact the discussion of Buddhas being concept-free?

Malcolm wrote:

No impact, and no, a Buddha still has no thoughts since, from a Dzogchen POV, mind is the result of karmic winds mixing with the rtal of rigpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: End times propaganda in Buddhism?

Content:

Dharma Atma said:

As for me I believe Dharma itself is conditioned.

Namdrol said:

Reality is not conditioned. The Dharma comes from recognition of reality. So while the expression of Dharma may be subject to change and adaptation, reality is always there to be perceived. Further, all Dharma teachings stem from Dzogchen. Dzogchen will be the first teaching in any given eon and the last.

N

catmoon said:

Reality is not conditioned? How does this fit in with dependent origination?

Malcolm wrote:

Reality i.e. suchness, emptiness, etc., is not conditioned. Things arise in dependence because of the reality of things. Things are conditioned, but the reality of things is not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

For this reason we can understand that thoughts are included in rigpa.

N

alwayson said:

How can thoughts be included in rigpa??

What about the infamous distinction between rigpa (knowledge) and sems, expounded by the omniscient masters?

Malcolm wrote:

Thoughts are the energy [rtsal] of rigpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

heart said:

I am afraid that makes no sense. Does ChNN say this?

/magnus

Namdrol said:

Rig pa cog bzhag is allowing all thoughts to be as they are. Conceptual knowledge is included in thoughts.

heart said:

There is no conceptual knowledge apart from thoughts because this is the conceptual obscuration, the heart of "sem". Allowing the self-liberation of "sem" is rigpa.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

In The Lamp of Vidyā, five aspects of vidyā are described. According to Vimalamitra, the first, the vidyā which apprehends characteristics, designates general and specific phenomena, it is a non-conceptual awareness sullied by many cognitions.

When asked "Are those vidyā' the same, or are they different?", the reply is that there is nothing other than a single essence.

For this reason we can understand that thoughts are included in rigpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 30th, 2011 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Namdrol said:

If Buddhas appear to have concepts, that appearance comes from our concepts.

RichardLinde said:

There is only a problem with "concepts" if we define a "concept" to be the projection of inherent existence onto things.

Malcolm wrote:

But that is not how a vikalpa (rnam par rtog pa) is defined.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 12:07 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Rigpa is that which enables you to be astonished that there is something rather than nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

What are you, a Heidegger fan?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 12:05 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

RichardLinde said:

And Buddhas appear to have concepts, so we say they have concepts.

Malcolm wrote:

If Buddhas appear to have concepts, that appearance comes from our concepts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 8:35 AM

Title: Re: Deity Yoga Questions

Content:

alwayson said:

I thought you got Dzogchen transmission.

Forget about all this deity stuff and get some rigpa/vidya/knowledge.

As far as I understand, there are only 4 essential Dzogchen practices:

rigpa / guru yoga

Song of the Vajra

Chulen of Space

4 visions

Malcolm wrote:

Add rushen to that list and that would be about right.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 8:28 AM

Title: Re: Root Lamas

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I believe any guru giving you an HYT empowerment is considered to be a Root Guru.

Vajra Masters may receive HYT empowerment from each other and become a Root Guru for each other for those practices.

heart said:

Any master that gives you an empowerment becomes your Guru, I am with you so far. However, root in root Guru is pointing directly at your own realization. If a lama and the empowerment's he/she give you don't have a lasting influence on your own realization why would he/she be considered a root Guru? I think using the word root Guru in such a casual way degenerates the meaning of the word, using the word Guru is strong enough.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Different lineage, different terminology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Root Lamas

Content:

kirtu said:

In Sakya the root lama is the lama who bestows highest yoga tantra empowerment:

From The Questions of the Contemplative Nyimo Gomchen and the Responses of Sakya Pandita What makes a person one's true Guru? The person from whom one correctly receives the four empowerments in accordance with the Tantras in one's true Guru. A Guru from whom one has not received such empowerment – how ever good a person he might be – is one's Guru in name only, For example, the person from whom one receives monastic ordination is one's true abbot, but if one has not been ordained by someone, he is not one's true abbot. And even if he is called "Abbot", he is such in name only. Thus: "without bestowing empowerment, there is no Guru. Without monastic ordination, there is no abbot. Without precepts, there is no continuum of virtue. Without going for refuge, one is not a spiritual person." That is the meaning of the above verse.

Kirt

Caz said:

Bing Bing ! But as far as I know this is the same for all traditions

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Root Lamas

Content:

kirtu said:

In Sakya the root lama is the lama who bestows highest yoga tantra empowerment:

heart said:

All of them?

/magnus

Paul said:

I think Magnus has a point - that quote only seems to describe a tantric guru, not ones root guru.

Malcolm wrote:

for those whose view is tantra, that is their mula guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

heart said:

I am afraid that makes no sense. Does ChNN say this?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Rig pa cog bzhag is allowing all thoughts to be as they are. Conceptual knowledge is included in thoughts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: End times propaganda in Buddhism?

Content:

Dharma Atma said:

As for me I believe Dharma itself is conditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

Reality is not conditioned. The Dharma comes from recognition of reality. So while the expression of Dharma may be subject to change and adaptation, reality is always there to be perceived. Further, all Dharma teachings stem from Dzogchen. Dzogchen will be the first teaching in any given eon and the last.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

tobes said:

The direct apprehension of emptiness is pretty clearly defined as the cessation of conceptual thought

RichardLinde said:

I am suspecting that there has been an error in translation. Can you give a reference to a text that defines the apprehension of emptiness as "the cessation of conceptual thought".

I mean, I could understand if it was defined as the cessation of papanca (deluded conceptual proliferation).

Malcolm wrote:

MMK 18:

aparapratyayaṃ śāntaṃ prapañcair aprapañcitaṃ
nirvikalpam anānārthaṃ etat tattvasya lakṣaṇaṃ|

ཁགཞན་ལས་ཤེས་མེན་ཞི་བ་དང་། རྫོགས་པ་རྒྱས་ཀྱིས་མ་རྫོགས་པ།
རྒྱུ་རྟོག་མེད་དོན་ཐ་དང་མེད། འདི་ནི་དེ་ཉིད་མཚན་ཉིད་དོ།

Not known from another; peaceful; lacking proliferation with proliferations;
non-conceptual; undifferentiated — that is the characteristic of reality.

Buddhapalita comments:

"Not known from another"; here not known from another i.e. not scriptural, but one's direct perception, thus it is a convention for one's direct perception. "Peaceful" is a convention for "empty by nature". "Lacking proliferation with proliferations" is a convention for freedom from mundane phenomena. "Non-conceptual" means not designated "This is this". Undifferentiated means not different objects such as "though it this, it is also this". Why is that? Because of lacking concepts, there is no proliferation with proliferations. Why? Because there is no proliferation by mundane phenomena. Why? Because that is peaceful, it is undifferentiated. Therefore, the knowledge of such a nature is a personal knowledge, not known from elsewhere. That should be understood to be the characteristic of reality.

According to Mahāyāna, a buddha is in a state of continuous equipoise on reality. It is impossible therefore that a buddha will experience concepts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

always on said:

Of course.

Namdrol said:

In any case Yeshe Lama is kind of a beginners text. It is not that deep.

N

heart said:

I don't agree, I found it very special. But some parts are very short short and some seem to be missing.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There is a reason why there is an oral instruction lineage connected with TYL, and that is because the text itself is not complete.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Fa Dao said:

When we say "Knowledge" of the natural state is rigpa, by "knowledge" we mean gnosis not knowledge as in the acquisition of intellectual data, right?

Namdrol said:

By knowledge, we mean that you know what is being discussed. No need to gum up the works with fancy words like gnosis. In the beginning you need to acquire intellectual data. Then you need to apply it. This is all part of "rigpa".

If you say that rigpa is only a "gnosis" than this makes things more complicated --it means in order to have that knowledge you must already be awakened. But this is not the case. Rigpa is the knowledge you have that allows you to wake up. Rigpa is a complicated word in Dzogchen texts, and has different meanings in different contexts, but generally it just means knowledge, which in English is the antonym of ignorance (ma rig pa). Conceptual knowledge is included under the general definition of vidyā, this is a poorly understood point.

N

heart said:

True, but in Dzogchen Trechö rigpa is not conceptual knowledge, that also seems to be poorly understood.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Conceptual knowledge is included in rigpa in tregchö -- this is why we have rig pa cog bzhag.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

alwayson said:

Of course.

Malcolm wrote:

In any case Yeshe Lama is kind of a beginners text. It is not that deep.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Exactly what is incorrect in Sangye Khandro and Lama Chonam's most recent translation? I haven't found a single mistake. This must just be something you've heard from someone partial to Duff's work or something.

alwayson said:

Duff's version is even more recent than this.

In the intro he trashes the Snow Lion Yeshe Lama on multiple grounds including even the source texts used.

Someone gave me a copy when they shouldn't have. I have since deleted it, since I didn't feel right about having it.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such a thing as a perfect translation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Primordial stains ?

Content:

Merely Labeled said:

Why didn't a primordial Buddha (Kuntuzangpo) fall into ignorance ?

Malcolm wrote:
Samantabhadra also possessed ignorance.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 12:15 AM
Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.
Content:
Jnana said:
For example, he wants to read Maitripa and Milarepa as being proponents of gzhan stong.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, this is completely incorrect.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.
Content:
Pema Rigdzin said:
I seem to remember hearing this from someone else. Personally, I have only so much as heard of Duff's name. But I was thinking that "Wisdom Guru" sounds a bit too literal for a translation of Yeshe Lama in this context; since the aim of the text is (ideally) enabling one to attain the unexcelled stage of Dzogchen realization called "yeshe lama," translating it as "Unexcelled Wisdom" or "Highest Wisdom" would seem to make more sense to me... even if the guru, the state of Dzogchen, and the realization of that state are all one in the same ultimately.

Malcolm wrote:
It means "highest wisdom", uttarajñāna, not jñānaguru. It is a reference to the sixteenth bhumi.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 29th, 2011 at 12:07 AM
Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika
Content:
Namdrol said:
their acts of speech are not connected with concepts and signs.

RichardLinde said:
Do you mean to say that that the speech of a Buddha is not a pointer (a "sign") to the truth? That the speech of a Buddha is not a finger which points to the moon?

In the context of Western culture, a "concept" is defined as a thought or idea, according to the Oxford dictionary. Surely it wouldn't be correct to say that a Buddha has no thoughts or ideas?

Or does the word "concept" have an entirely different meaning within the context of Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:
Hi Kevin Solway:

Buddha don't have thoughts, therefore, they have no concepts. They are however omniscient.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 28th, 2011 at 11:25 AM
Title: WTF?
Content:
Unknown said:

Mr. President, I would also point out that these provisions raise serious questions as to who we are as a society and what our Constitution seeks to protect. One section of these provisions, section 1031, would be interpreted as allowing the military to capture and indefinitely detain American citizens on U.S. soil. Section 1031 essentially repeals the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878 by authorizing the U.S. military to perform law enforcement functions on American soil. That alone should alarm my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but there are other problems with these provisions that must be resolved.

Malcolm wrote:
http://markudall.senate.gov/?p=press_release&id=1746 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 28th, 2011 at 11:03 AM
Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika
Content:
tobes said:

Right - but how can any sentence that is heard be devoid of concepts?

Malcolm wrote:
Concepts are formed by sentient beings concerning what they interpret as speech acts by Buddhas.

tobes said:

What you're really saying is that vajra speech emanates from the dharmakaya right (i.e. as the sambogakaya)? So it is ontologically distinct from ordinary speech.

I would accept the argument that sambogakaya contains a multiplicity of different communicative modes, many of which are not linguistic.

But when there is linguistic communication, that involves words, symbols, signs, signifiers. So I suppose the question is: how can a signifier (or chain of signifiers which comprise a sentence) not be a concept?

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is really simple: Buddhas do not have conceptual minds, therefore, their acts of speech are not connected with concepts and signs.

[/quote]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 28th, 2011 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: TTM & herbs contra cancer

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

also to cure a tumour completely the only 100% effective way of doing that is cut it out and western surgery is more developed in this respect. traditional medicincal doctrines are better at preventing cancer because of their more developed dietary systems/advice. so to prevent cancer follow the dietary advice of those older systems but if you get cancer it is better to see an oncologist and western surgeon to try to cure it.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 28th, 2011 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Weight

Content:

Kyosan said:

You don't have to eat meat to get enough calories. Grains, legumes, many root vegetables and nuts are all decent sources of calories. Most fruits are lower in calories but avocados and durians are good fruit sources.

Ngawang Drolma said:
Thanks What's a root vegetable?

Best,
Laura

Malcolm wrote:
Carrots

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 28th, 2011 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: Weight
Content:

Ngawang Drolma said:
Aye, three meals now. Ok. I dropped another ten in a week totaling 60 in five weeks. At this point it's becoming an interference but I guess that would be obvious.

Thanks,
Laura

Malcolm wrote:
Whole grain cereals for breakfast with whole milk, pastries, etc., not yogurt and fruit
Rich, nutritious food at lunch, pasta, butter, olive oil, meat, etc.

Soups for dinner, beef barely, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 28th, 2011 at 12:46 AM
Title: Re: Weight
Content:
Ngawang Drolma said:
Namdrol la and all,

How can you at least keep your weight from dropping even if you're consuming food and nutrients and even fats?

Thanks,
Laura

Malcolm wrote:
Eat three meals a day, with your noon meal being the largest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 28th, 2011 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Restless itching sensation inside the chest.

Content:

Inge said:

Hi

At the age of 13 I started having a restless, burning and itching sensation in the chest. It is located at around four cm above the lower tip of the chestbone. It strengthens and weakens in waves, and at times it is so intense it is driving me mad, especially at night (it often begins in the afternoon, exhausts me through the night, and releases in the early morning. It is accompanied by feeling hot and dry on the body surface, itching of the skin (especially in the groin area), and excessive thirst. Holding something cool to the chest, and moving around is what I have found to ease the sensation. Often I have thought this might be heartburn, but once when the sensation was particularly tormenting I decided to lie completely still and listen to it in hope of figuring out what it was. In waves it grew stronger and stronger until at a point when I felt I was dying it exploded into blissful waves of "energy" going up and down the body, making me laugh and cry uncontrollably. After this the sensation was gone for some years, but now it is back. Do you know what this could be, and how to treat it?

I have made the following self-diagnosis: The itching sensation in the chest is in fact heartburn, probably due to a hiatus hernia that I recently learned that "everybody" on my mothers side of the family has. The blissful energy waves was bliss arising from concentration on unpleasant sensation.

Do tibetan medicine have useful treatment for heartburn?

Malcolm wrote:

You should cut down on processed foods, drink more hot water, never eat after 6, eat your main meal at noon, these habits should help reduce your acid reflux. There are also herbs that one can take such as Congzhi Drugpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 28th, 2011 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

tobes said:

Naomi Wolf gets it right again:

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/nov/25/shocking-truth-about-crackdown-occupy> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Alternet's refutation of Wolf's post:

http://www.alternet.org/occupywallst/153222/naomi_wolf%26acirc%3B%26euro%3B%26trade%3Bs_%26acirc%3B%26euro%3B%26tilde%3Bshocking_truth%26acirc%3B%26euro%3B%26trade%3B_about_the_%26acirc%3B%26euro%3B%26tilde%3Boccupy_crackdowns%26acirc%3B%26euro%3B%26trade%3B_offers_anything_but_the_truth?page=entire " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 27th, 2011 at 11:48 PM

Title: Conceptuality in Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

...how can you explain the fact that if a Buddha still speaks to sentient beings, she must apprehend the concepts which those sentient beings communicate?

Those concepts are necessarily conventional.

So, does it not follow, that a Buddha must be able to apprehend the conventional phenomena of ordinary speech?

Malcolm wrote:

First, I don't regard that as a fact. The rest of your statement depends upon me accepting that fact, but I don't.

The primary Mahayāna sutra metaphor for a Buddha is a wishfulfilling gem because a wishfulfilling automatically gem fulfills the wishes of sentient beings without concepts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 27th, 2011 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

tobes said:

Notice how you're leaning on a tantric text to support your argument?

There is nothing in Nagarjuna, nor Chandrakirti which asserts vajra speech. The assumption clearly comes from elsewhere.

Malcolm wrote:

There are sutra statements to similar effect. Anyway, it merely proves the point, which, in essence, is that people hear what they want to hear regardless of who is speaking.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 27th, 2011 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: TTM & herbs contra cancer

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

What did cause their conclusion e.g. that their treatment according the TTM would be "senseless"? Also seems it strange to me that they do not have remedies against cancer whereas TTM is/ was confronted with cancer for many centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

According to most Tibetan doctors I know, modern cancers do not really exist in pre-modern Tibet.

[/quote]

Could you give some examples about the power of TTM / Aryurveda regarding the mentioned prevention of chronic diseases?

- Further, what do you mean with a chronic disease or when is a disease chronic according TTM? [/color]

according to TM, cancers and all chronic diseases come from maldigestion -- other chronic diseases are edemas, benign tumors, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 27th, 2011 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: TTM & herbs contra cancer

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

How did you came to that conclusion, e.g. that western medicine would be better than TTM regarding the treatment of cancer?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Doctors in the Tibetan Hospital in Xining.

Cancers on the outer body can be treated, but cancers of internal organs are not really treatable with Tibetan Medicine.

Prevention is a different issue -- TTM /Ayurveda are more effective than western

medicine for prevention of many chronic diseases.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 27th, 2011 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

padma norbu said:

That's just as bad as any creation myth I ever heard.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a truncated version of a much better version:

When that is applied to the tortoise of the basis, first, out of total nothingness there is the so called "primordially existing or abiding tortoise". And from this arose, or were produced, all the Buddhas of the three times and all the sentient beings of the three realms. The example for that is the void of spacem and since the meaning is the dharmadhātu of Samantabhadra, it exists without any coalescence or separation in any of the three times. No head or tail can be seen here, no limbs are shown here, in terms of time, here it abides without abiding. Without grasping to any extremes -- Buddhas and sentient beings are in that. The dharmakāya, the sambhogakāya, and the nirmanakāya, the emanations of the body, speech, mind, qualities and activities of the Victors, male, female, neuters, moving and resting and so on -- that superior one is called the "abiding tortoise"

Second, the tortoise of formation: the seven water maṇḍalas come from the moist breath of the abiding tortoise and from the mouth of the tortoise formes a green maṇḍala of water. Above that, from the flesh of the tortoise form Meru, the oceans and major and minor continents and the golden firmament. The pores of the tortoise form as grass and trees. That is the description of the tortoise of formation.

The golden tortoise of existence is the tortoise of existence that comes from the meeting of the tortoise of abiding and the tortoise of formation. The head of the tortoise of existence faces south. The rear-end faces north. The four limbs are in the four intermediate directions.

From its white carapace, Grandfather Sky [khen pa rgad bu] formed as heaven.

Above, the region of the gods arises, the four formless realms, the great god Brahma of the pure abodes and so on. Below that arose the Trāyāstrimśāḥ gods and the Paranirmitavaśavartino gods on the top of Meru. On the slopes of Meru arose the four great king gods, the sun, the moon and all of the planets and stars.

The sun and moon arose from the eyes of the tortoise, and the sound of thunder came from the sound of his palate. Lightning flashes from his extended tongue produced thunder bolts and hail.

Wind came from the breath of the tortoise, the five external elements came from his five functional organs.

Earthquakes were caused by the movements of the tortoise's body. The golden belly of the tortoise formed or arose from Grandmother Earth [khon ma rgan mo] as the ground. And from that region of the nāgās, the eight wild nāgās and so on, arose. Furthermore, that tortoise of existence is divided into two, method and wisdom or male and female. The golden tortoise of mentation is equal with space, the nature of method, and face down. The silver tortoise of phenomenal objects is equal with the surface of the world, is the nature of wisdom and lays on its back and so on, as it is in the many methods of explanation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 27th, 2011 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

maybay said:

I haven't heard good reviews about this book.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a fine book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 27th, 2011 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: TTM & herbs contra cancer

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

We all know all the illness called cancer.

Regarding cancer there arose some questions in relation to TTM.

- How is cancer seen and general treated in TTM ?
- What are the herbs etc. which can cure what kind of cancer ?
- Where can we obtain those pills or medicines ?
- How can (what kind of) cancer be avoided regarding the TTM ?

Mutosg Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Western medicine is better than TTM for cancer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 27th, 2011 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not at all. Recall, all phenomena means all the five sense organs and sense objects, six consciousnesses, mental factors and unconditioned phenomena i.e. what is included in one skandha, one ayatana, and one dhātu.

One's own wisdom means that one encompasses all phenomena with omniscience.

Thus, no monism.

N

alwayson said:

I see.

So it is more a realization of the nature of all phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, precisely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 27th, 2011 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Since utopias are impossible

N

alwayson said:

Serious question:

Is it not possible for a rainbow body to stay in this world and help establish a better society?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, this result is called phowa chenpo. Kuzang Dechen Lingpa achieved this. Hopefully ChNN will manifest this as well.

For some time, ChNN has been emphasizing that the best way to go is personal evolution through Dzogchen -- he is convinced this will change the whole world. Revolution does not work.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Namdrol said:

one perceives all phenomena as the display of one's wisdom.

alwayson said:

Monistic tendencies strike again LOL

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. Recall, all phenomena means all the five sense organs and sense objects, six consciousnesses, mental factors and unconditioned phenomena i.e. what is included in one skandha, one ayatana, and one dhātu.

One's own wisdom means that one encompasses all phenomena with omniscience.

Thus, no monism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

tobes said:

Therefore, how can it be asserted that conventional phenomena disappear upon apprehension of the ultimate?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for bodhisattva on the stages, apprehension of the conventional occurs only in post-equipoise. Buddhas experience no post-equipoise phase, ergo, no apprehension of conventional i.e. deluded phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Unknown said:

So I don't agree. "completely non-conceptual"

Malcolm wrote:

I said "completely spontaneous" for emphasis on spontaneity; not completely non-conceptual, which would be redundant.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

tobes said:

I think there is more at stake here than the inevitable Tsong Khapa vs everyone else Tibetan framing of the problem.

I'd agree that the way a Buddha perceives a given phenomenal object is devoid of any conceptual content.

But it doesn't matter how spontaneous a Buddha's interactions with sentient beings may be: if the Buddha speaks she is using concepts. Concepts which are necessarily conventional.

How could speech possibly be non-conceptual???

Malcolm wrote:

It is simply a Tsongkhapa vs. the world argument.

As far as Buddha's speech goes, as the Guhyasamaja says, "A single vajra word is heard differently by different sentient beings". A Buddha's vocal actions are also non-conceptual.

This is a very huge polemical area in Tibetan Buddhism, but in general, Nyingmas, Sakyapas and Kagyupas hold that a Buddha's actions, whether verbal or physical are completely spontaneous and free from conceptuality and cognition of conventional signs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

alwayson said:

The utopias you guys want will only ever be unrealistic fantasies.

You want government instead of private corporations?

We already tried it. Its called Stalin.

Malcolm wrote:

Since utopias are impossible, I would like to have a strong, democratic government than can keep the economic and environmental impact of banks and corporations beneficial and in the interests of the people, and which provides a high level of educational and social welfare benefits to everyone.

But even that is utopian in this day and age of corporate rapaciousness and neo-liberal, chicago school, economic piracy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As we gather together in solidarity to express a feeling of mass injustice, we must not lose sight of what brought us together. We write so that all people who feel wronged by the corporate forces of the world can know that we are your allies.

As one people, united, we acknowledge the reality: that the future of the human race requires the cooperation of its members; that our system must protect our rights, and upon corruption of that system, it is up to the individuals to protect their own rights, and those of their neighbors; that a democratic government derives its just power from the people, but corporations do not seek consent to extract wealth from the people and the Earth; and that no true democracy is attainable when the process is determined by economic power. We come to you at a time when corporations, which place profit over people, self-interest over justice, and oppression over equality, run our governments. We have peaceably assembled here, as is our right, to let these facts be known.

They have taken our houses through an illegal foreclosure process, despite not having the original mortgage.

They have taken bailouts from taxpayers with impunity, and continue to give Executives exorbitant bonuses.

They have perpetuated inequality and discrimination in the workplace based on age, the color of one's skin, sex, gender identity and sexual orientation.

They have poisoned the food supply through negligence, and undermined the farming system through monopolization.

They have profited off of the torture, confinement, and cruel treatment of countless animals, and actively hide these practices.

They have continuously sought to strip employees of the right to negotiate for better pay and safer working conditions.

They have held students hostage with tens of thousands of dollars of debt on education, which is itself a human right.

They have consistently outsourced labor and used that outsourcing as leverage to cut workers' healthcare and pay.

They have influenced the courts to achieve the same rights as people, with none of the culpability or responsibility.

They have spent millions of dollars on legal teams that look for ways to get them out of contracts in regards to health insurance.

They have sold our privacy as a commodity.

They have used the military and police force to prevent freedom of the press. They have deliberately declined to recall faulty products endangering lives in pursuit of profit.

They determine economic policy, despite the catastrophic failures their policies have produced and continue to produce.

They have donated large sums of money to politicians, who are responsible for regulating them.

They continue to block alternate forms of energy to keep us dependent on oil.

They continue to block generic forms of medicine that could save people's lives or provide relief in order to protect investments that have already turned a substantial profit.

They have purposely covered up oil spills, accidents, faulty bookkeeping, and inactive ingredients in pursuit of profit.

They purposefully keep people misinformed and fearful through their control of the media.

They have accepted private contracts to murder prisoners even when presented with serious doubts about their guilt.

They have perpetuated colonialism at home and abroad. They have participated in the torture and murder of innocent civilians overseas.

They continue to create weapons of mass destruction in order to receive government contracts. *

To the people of the world,

We, the New York City General Assembly occupying Wall Street in Liberty Square, urge you to assert your power.

Exercise your right to peaceably assemble; occupy public space; create a process to address the problems we face, and generate solutions accessible to everyone.

To all communities that take action and form groups in the spirit of direct democracy, we offer support, documentation, and all of the resources at our disposal.

Join us and make your voices heard!

*These grievances are not all-inclusive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Wouldn't that mean then that Buddha would bump every object along his way?

Might there be the case that, at least from a Dzogchen perspective, all phenomena are recognized as ornaments, manifestation of the energy aspect and not taken as something existent? I'm just asking to see if I can make some sense out of this.

Namdrol said:

Buddhas perceive only wisdom.

tobes said:

A Buddha gets into a car. When she encounters a traffic light, does she need to distinguish between the conventional meanings of red, orange and green?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on who you ask. According to the Gelugpas, yes -- according to everyone else, no.

tobes said:

These are nothing but imputations of conventional meaning: but to say that they are not perceived is to say that the Buddha cannot function amidst the conventions of human life.

Malcolm wrote:

Conventional truths are objects of delusion. Buddhas possess no delusion, therefore, do not perceive conventional truths.

tobes said:

Surely it is necessary for a Buddha to perceive conventional meanings a/ in order to communicate with sentient beings and b/ in order to function harmoniously in the world of sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all, a Buddha's interactions with sentient beings are completely spontaneous and non-conceptual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Root Lamas

Content:

kirtu said:

Anutarayoga tantra empowerment in Sakya is relatively rare.

Kirt

Namdrol said:

What are you talking about -- this is total nonsense.

kirtu said:

In what way?

Malcolm wrote:

You made as sound as if HYT empowerments were rare in Sakya -- when what you really means is that Sakya Lamas are rare.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Root Lamas

Content:

kirtu said:

Anutarayoga tantra empowerment in Sakya is relatively rare.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

What are you talking about -- this is total nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Root Lamas

Content:

kirtu said:

In Sakya the root lama is the lama who bestows highest yoga tantra empowerment:

heart said:

All of them?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But then there is one's karmic root guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yup. I do. Eventually, you will come to understand that the type of capitalism we have today is very destructive, that is, unless, like neo-cons, you have a superstitious fetish for the so called "free market" (which we tried in the late nineteenth century -- it did not work out to well).

alwayson said:

Can anyone mention a better economic system than the "the type of capitalism we have today"

Proven in the real world of course

Malcolm wrote:

The system of capitalism we had in the United States of America between 1945 -- 1972 -
- Strong controls on financial industry, high taxes on the wealthy, etc. Better, but not perfect.

Since 1980, when Reagan began dismantling the New Deal, average Americans have gotten increasing more poor, and corporations have had increasingly high profits.

Since 1999, when the barriers between savings and loans and investment banks were dismantled, things have gotten markedly worse.

Greer's three economy analysis is very good. Read *The Wealth of Nature: Economics as If Survival Mattered*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

alwayson said:

Are you sure you want me to read those?

I actually thought *Food Inc.*, was a POSITIVE documentary LOL!

Namdrol said:

https://www.amazon.com/Shock-Doctrine-Rise-Disaster-Capitalism/dp/0312427999/ref=pd_sim_b_30 " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

alwayson said:

67 one star reviews

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. I do. Eventually, you will come to understand that the type of capitalism we have today is very destructive, that is, unless, like neo-cons, you have a superstitious fetish for the so called "free market" (which we tried in the late nineteenth century -- it did not work out to well).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

alwayson said:

I think you are conflating investment banks with corporations.

These are not the same.

Germany, the strongest country in the EU, has a ton of corporations and business incentivizing.

Malcolm wrote:

From where do you think corporations get their monetary capital?

Corporations, conceptually speaking, are not inherently bad. But you seem to have neglected the fact that banks (there is no point in talking about investment banks anymore, banks are banks) are in fact corporations. Moreover, you seem to have neglected the fact that due to moneyed interests, the market deregulate has done more to destroy our environment and economy than anything else. We can thank Reagan and his crew.

I suggest you read:

https://www.amazon.com/When-Corporations-World-David-Korten/dp/1887208046/ref=sr_1_2?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1322245235&sr=1-2 "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

https://www.amazon.com/Shock-Doctrine-Rise-Disaster-Capitalism/dp/0312427999/ref=pd_sim_b_30 " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

You need to investigate more deeply.

alwayson said:

I guess you are generating your own electricity and typing on your homemade laptop.

Malcolm wrote:

Bread and circuses again. You are missing the point -- Most of what is wrong with the world environment and economy today is precisely a result of rapacious corporate behavior.

I can't educate you about this, but you can educate yourself.

The way corporations act these days is criminal. It does not matter that they provide goods and services to privileged people in first world countries (though the US is slipping quickly into a second tier nation).

What matters is that the free marketeer, radical capitalist ideology that they have sold to the US and Europe is destroying the world.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 26th, 2011 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Democracy is not possible for as long as we allow banks and corporations to rule the world.

alwayson said:

Investment banks yes, I agree. They should be broken up into small firms or something.

I don't agree that corporations are bad.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to investigate more deeply.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Heruka said:

democracy is described as two wolves and one sheep voting on whats for dinner.

gregkavarnos said:

There are various levels and economic bases for democracy. A direct democracy with an economic base of mutual aid is not the same as a representative democracy with a capitalist economic base.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.nakedcapitalism.com/2011/11/mark-ames-austerity-fascism-in-greece-> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;--the-real-1-doctrine.html

Fascists back in power in Greece.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Again, let me clarify - my interest on this thread is basically epistemological.

Maybe I'm wrong, but it seems to me that the general trend so far has been for Buddhist's to articulate Buddhism as rationally coherent, and critique theism on the grounds that it's irrational (i.e. merely unfounded belief, assumption etc).

Therefore, there is clearly an epistemological commitment to rationality.

Before we go anywhere else, does that sound basically right?

Malcolm wrote:

We are merely following the Buddha in this assessment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Travelling with herbal medicine

Content:

Paul said:

I am currently taking Tibetan medicine and it's impressively effective. I have to go to another country soon on business and will be flying. However I'm not looking forward to getting bags of brown powder through customs. Has anyone done this? Is it best to go in my main suitcase to avoid the nonsense about not taking certain things in ones hand luggage?

Malcolm wrote:

Put it in your suitcase.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: ChNN's Vajra Armour teaching

Content:

Pero said:

Man now I'm confused. <http://www.fpmt.org/media/resources/dharma-dates.html> says it's on Friday. As well as a calendar in my language and some other stuff online. But then I also found stuff that says it's today (Thursday). Which is it LOL? I wanted to do some practice on new moon and planned it for tomorrow. But if it's today I'll try to do it today. Oh and I'm in Europe BTW...

Malcolm wrote:

Just follow calendar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

BradleyWiggins said:

Each mind stream is a condition for every other mind stream (among other things) but not itself.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is called karana-hetu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

alwayson said:

So if you are agreeing with me, you are agreeing with Namdrol LOL

BradleyWiggins said:

And this (karma and rebirth) is not something that can be objectively proven.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed -- I never claimed they could be. In fact, I have stated innumerable times that karma and rebirth can only be yogically verified, for oneself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

DO and karma require that mind-streams are unique, separate and beginningless.

BradleyWiggins said:

You are correct, but there are countless such mindstreams in you right now.

Malcolm wrote:

No.

BradleyWiggins said:

This means that each mind stream is affected by every other mind stream.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, mind streams can and do influence other mind streams.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

BradleyWiggins said:

Yet your misunderstanding of the 12 links betrays your misunderstanding of DO in general.

Namdrol said:

Why don't you state what my misunderstanding of the 12 links might be?

BradleyWiggins said:

I don't want to get in trouble with the moderators for taking this topic off-topic. So you will be personally responsible if this happens, right?

This should probably go in a separate topic.

The 12 links of DO are not about physical life and death. "Birth" is not about physical birth, and "death" is not about physical death. It has nothing at all to do with the physical human body.

You imagine that there are separate streams of consciousness, which each one associated with a particular physical body. This is not the case. It's like you are putting things in a cage, constricting them, when DO is precisely about unconstricting.

Malcolm wrote:

We simply disagree. DO also includes literal rebirth.

Buddha's teachings on DO and karma require that mind-streams are unique, separate and beginningless.

Therefore, you, Kevin Solway aka Bradley Wiggins, do not have a proper understanding of dependent origination. Your understanding of DO is distorted.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

alwayson said:

Unless you are Kevin Solway, who believes he has rigpa.

BradleyWiggins said:

I thought that Kevin Solway said that he definitely didn't have rigpa, as you define it?

In any case, I don't know why you wouldn't want to hear the views of someone who claims to know what they are talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

Because one thinks they are full of it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

BradleyWiggins said:

Yet your misunderstanding of the 12 links betrays your misunderstanding of DO in general.

Malcolm wrote:

Why don't you state what my misunderstanding of the 12 links might be?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

BradleyWiggins said:

The problem is that since you have a literal interpretation of the 12 links of dependent origination, this means that you don't understand dependent origination yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

Kevin Solway, you should understand that there are two models of DO. The twelve links are the specific theory of DO applied to the process of samsara. It is derived from the general theory of DO, "Where this exists, that exists..." and so on.

The specific theory of DO also has four variations, serial, static, momentary and simultaneous.

Now, since the Buddha admonished Ananda for thinking DO was an easy read -- what

are we to make of your claim to have "understood" it before encountering Buddhism?

In reality, DO is profound and subtle. DO is also one of those things that when we first read it, we all say, "wow, I already get that." But that does not mean we really understand DO. It merely means we recognize the concept to be true.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 25th, 2011 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

BradleyWiggins said:

How do you know? Have you done a survey of every person on earth, quizzed them as to their concept of "God", if they have any, and fully understood what they told you, regardless of what language they were speaking?

alwayson said:

LOL

Is there another one besides dualism and monism?

I would be interested if there was!

Malcolm wrote:

Don't feed trolls.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

BradleyWiggins said:

So how come I fully understood dependent origination, long before I ever studied Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

You didn't.

BTW, Hi Kev.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 11:43 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:
alwayson said:
C. Dependent Origination (Buddhism)

BradleyWiggins said:
So of all the people in the world, only Buddhists have realized the simple truth of dependent origination?

Malcolm wrote:
Yup. Them's the facts.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 11:15 PM
Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
Eeeeeerrrr... no actually, what I am saying is that they want to be actively taking part in the creation of their reality and not having it forced on them by others. That's what democracy is all about.

Malcolm wrote:
Democracy is not possible for as long as we allow banks and corporations to rule the world.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 9:16 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:
tobes said:
But it's interesting, isn't it, that we're happy to get our conceptions of theism from "ordinary definitions/common folk" but not our conceptions of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhism derives our notions of god (Prajapati, etc.) from Samkhya, etc. Not from common people.

So this is not an accurate portrayal.

Western theists and philosophers are not so original that their theologies require some sort of special reading by Buddhists when the theologians and philosophers are subject

to investigation.

In reality, there are only so many definitions of god that one arrive at i.e. creator, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

alwayson said:

Bhutan??

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer living in the US. But that does not mean it is "the best and most awesome" country.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 7:22 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

conebeckham said:

It's not simple. At all. And just because no country on Earth is "awesome," doesn't mean we should accept defeat, or ignore the conventional problems we have. Though I don't foresee Utopia in our future, frankly.

alwayson said:

This is a cop out.

You all should name a real country that is your ideal.

Malcolm wrote:

Khechari realm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

alwayson said:

99% of Americans are not homeless. Its really quite simple.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not mean america is working very well for that 99 percent.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Stat extrapolated from National Center for Homelessness adjusted for downturn.
Average number of homeless people is about 2 million. Then of course there is the inadequately housed, and that number is much higher.

alwayson said:

Isn't that less than 1% of the population??

If the American system works for 99% of the population, you don't mess with it.

Malcolm wrote:

But it isn't. Wages have not increased to match cost of living increases for 30 years. The average salary in US is 30,000 or so. That 30 grand is worth much less than it was thirty years ago.

Your argument about play stations and other consumer items is what the romans called "panem et circuses" i.e. bread and circuses to keep the masses appeased and complacent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Sönam said:

Curiously (not so in fact), poor country have less homelessness, just because peoples are much more in solidarity. The poor in those countries give food and a place to others poors ... and I speak about experience (in Africa)

David N. Snyder said:

Assuming Namdrol's statistic is correct, that would be about 1% for the U.S. From my experience in Africa, the percentage appears much higher. At night, you can literally see rows and rows of people sleeping on the sidewalks and some onto the streets, taking their chances of not getting run over by cars and taxis.

That is true about the culture of helping people, but it can only go so far when the poverty is at such a large scale.

Malcolm wrote:

Stat extrapolated from National Center for Homelessness adjusted for downturn.
Average number of homeless people is about 2 million. Then of course there is the inadequately housed, and that number is much higher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

They tend to regard all devas as protectors of one kind or another.

Yeshe said:

I can't be sure that common folk don't know the difference - they may simply propitiate both Hindu and Buddhist deities for different purposes or simply be 'hedging their bets.

However, I agree with Namdrol. It is most unlikely that they differentiate. I hope that the practices of the worldly protectors all die in time.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you want that -- some, like Virupaksha and so forth, have been with us since the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

kirtu said:

Homelessness in the US is usually a result of direct poverty.

Kirt

alwayson said:

Lets not conflate poverty with homelessness though.

VAST majority of poor are NOT homeless.

Many, but not all, homeless are drug addicts and mentally ill people who refuse all treatment.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two to three million homeless people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Jnana said:

Sounds like these ancient Indian non-Buddhists knew what a Buddhist wasn't willing to swallow. And this qualification could easily be expanded to include the rejection of atheistic/materialist views as well by surveying the extant Indian Buddhist literature which addresses these issues.

Huseng said:

Ironically in Nepal it is common for people to making offerings at a Buddhist temple and then go across the street and worship Shiva. The common folk don't necessarily distinguish between a theist Hinduism and non-theist Buddhism.

Jnana said:

Which is a good reason for not taking refuge in the "common folk."

Malcolm wrote:

They tend to regard all devas as protectors of one kind or another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Choegyal Namkhai Norbu's USA Program for 2012

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Yes and generally one can register till the day they start.

Pero said:

Actually you don't have to be a member to attend a retreat. Non-members just don't get any discounts on the price.

Malcolm wrote:

In merger they created a "temporary" membership.

But not in US.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Romney outright lying about Obama in a campaign ad
Content:

kirtu said:
People are over the Mormon thing.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
Born again Christians aren't. They make up a substantial portion of the GOP base.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 2:33 AM
Title: Re: Romney outright lying about Obama in a campaign ad
Content:
alwayson said:
You all know the one I am talking about right?

The one where they use a quote of Obama, using a quote of McCain.

But they edit out the part, where he begins with 'McCain said'

Namdrol said:
Yes, I know. It is unlikely America will vote in a Mormon. If he is picked by the GOP, Obama is looking at four more years.

kirtu said:
People are over the Mormon thing. And people like me are looking to vote Green forever now.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
I am a registered green, but the Green Party, at best, is a social ecology platform ala bookchin. I agree with the Green platform, but it does not go far enough.

Also, the Greens have been sidetracked by the labor movement.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Romney outright lying about Obama in a campaign ad

Content:

always on said:

You all know the one I am talking about right?

The one where they use a quote of Obama, using a quote of McCain.

But they edit out the part, where he begins with 'McCain said'

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know. It is unlikely America will vote in a Mormon. If he is picked by the GOP, Obama is looking at four more years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Tom said:

Namdrol,

Do you mind elaborating on the apparent contradiction...

"A correct perception takes ultimate truth as its object" and "most Madhyamikas would say that objects are not perceived at all"

Or put another way how do you equate for Candrakirti referring to ultimate truth as an object with Santideva's emphasis that it is not an object (9:2)

I understand that Gelugpa's in post meditation identify emptiness as an object and as such need to tweak Santideva's position but what about most Madhyamikas where ultimate truth is beyond any categorizations don't they need to tweak Candrakirti's assertion which refers to ultimate truth as an object?

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakirti is speaking conventionally, hence no contradiction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 24th, 2011 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Romney outright lying about Obama in a campaign ad

Content:

always on said:

You all know about this?

I've never seen anything like it.

If this is how its going to be, America is going to be tore apart.

Malcolm wrote:

It already has been.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 23rd, 2011 at 8:53 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

And wouldn't perceiving wisdom mean recognizing all phenomena as the energy aspect instead of not perceiving phenomena at all? Perceiving manifestation "as it is" instead of not perceiving manifestation? Again, just asking to see if this makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:

one perceives all phenomena as the display of one's wisdom. But this is not really part of madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 23rd, 2011 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Wouldn't that mean then that Buddha would bump every object along his way? Might there be the case that, at least from a Dzogchen perspective, all phenomena are recognized as ornaments, manifestation of the energy aspect and not taken as something existent? I'm just asking to see if I can make some sense out of this.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas perceive only wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 23rd, 2011 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

conebeckham said:

Namdrol-

Thanks. Would it be fair, then, to say that a correct perception does not see "objects," or phenomena, per se?

Malcolm wrote:

This where there is a huge divide between gelug and the rest of Tibetan madhyamakas. Gelugs would tend to say what is not perceived is inherent existence of objects; most Madhyamakas would say that objects are not perceived at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 23rd, 2011 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

conebeckham said:

I'll ask the "leading question" then...if objects can be perceived only in two ways, correctly and incorrectly, and incorrect perception is relative truth, then what is correct perception?

Or, in other words, is "perception" always incorrect?

Malcolm wrote:

A correct perception takes ultimate truth as its object.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 23rd, 2011 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Will the upcoming webcast retreat in New York on Dec 9-14 be about Tibetan language or will it be like a normal webcast retreat?

Malcolm wrote:

Strictly about Tibetan language.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 23rd, 2011 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Well, that's what I was wondering; if such personality typing holds any water in Tibetan Astrology.

Namdrol said:

It does not really exist per se. Tibetan astrology is mostly about calendar creation and figuring out whether one will have obstacles and what to do about them. There is some procedures related to marriage, how to dispose of bodies and so on as well.

padma norbu said:

Thanks! I've never bought Namkhai Norbu's calendar before... have you? If so, do you notice things move along more swimmingly by following it? I think I would feel weird about not doing something on a certain day because it's not looking like a beneficial day for it, but then again... if it works...

Malcolm wrote:

I do follow astrology and yes I use Rinpoche's calendars and yes I do find that things move along more swimmingly if I pay attention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 23rd, 2011 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Well, that's what I was wondering; if such personality typing holds any water in Tibetan Astrology.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not really exist per se. Tibetan astrology is mostly about calendar creation and figuring out whether one will have obstacles and what to do about them. There is some procedures related to marriage, how to dispose of bodies and so on as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 23rd, 2011 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

padma norbu said:

This is pretty surprising stuff for me. I wonder when these cultures came into contact with each other... ancient Greece/India connection?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are three main astronomical/astrological Siddhantas in India, Surya, Yavana (Greek) and Romish (Roman).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 23rd, 2011 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Is there any overlap with this kind of detail (rising sign, trine, square, etc.) and the elements, animals, trigram, etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

None.

padma norbu said:

Do signs like Aries, Virgo, Gemini, Libra, etc. compare roughly equivalent with anything in Tibetan Astrology or it's just completely different altogether?

Malcolm wrote:

It is part of Kalacakra astrology.

padma norbu said:

Have you ever sat down and tried to compare a natal chart from a Tropical Western Astrological perspective vs. the Tibetan Astrological equivalent based on the year, time and place of a person's birth?

Malcolm wrote:

No. I have not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 22nd, 2011 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

padma norbu said:

I am of two minds on astrology; on the left hand (passive), I regard it with suspicion and doubt (sort of the 'default' position), but on the right hand (active) I keep an open-minded and superstitious leaning in favor of it.

The interesting thing, to me, is that Tropical Astrology is supposed to be bunk according to many people out there who favor Sidereal Astrology or Tibetan Astrology, but the older I get, the more I happen to fall into conversations with people about astrology and people always say the same things regarding certain signs.

I'm just curious what anyone who's studied multiple systems thoroughly has to say. I know nothing about Tibetan Astrology.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan astrology (skar rtsi) is tropical, since the Kalacakra is based on a tropical zodiac, unlike Jyotish, which is based on a sidereal zodiac. Incidentally, Kalacakra sets out to correct the calculations of Surya Siddhanta.

Elemental calculation ('byung rtsi or nag rtsi), often miscalled "Tibetan astrology", has nothing to do with horoscopy, and so on, so the Zodiac, tropical or sidereal, is perfectly irrelevant. It is based on the five elements i.e. wood, fire, earth, metal and water; the twelve years, tiger and so on; the eight trigrams (spar kha); what we call the magic square of saturn and its nine versions (sme ba).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 21st, 2011 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Indeed. And also the inverse: why do so many western Buddhists so desperately feel the need to refute and negate the G-word whenever it appears near the context of Dharma?

Namdrol said:

Because it is a signifier that posits any number of monolithic, totalizing concepts that have nothing to do with Dharma.

tobes said:

The truth is, this requires more philosophical work than simply decreeing that the signifier has nothing to do with Dharma -

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not. And that is why this whole thread is mostly just intellectual masturbation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 21st, 2011 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thank you very much conebeckham. You have exactly the same objections to Namdrol:

Malcolm wrote:

Your objection is totally faulty since your objecting to something I never said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 20th, 2011 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Perhaps what differentiate us is that I take these so-called "objects" as pedagogical tools only, expedient meaning but not as the definitive.

Namdrol said:

As I said, you are not understanding my point, and imputing things on to me that I have never stated.

Mariusz said:

The Consequentialists (Prasangikas) are not imputing anything You presented something of Candrakirti that suggested for me: first: the objects are perceived in the ultimate, second: all the "relative" is totally faulty. So can you please write what is your understanding of what you presented?

Excuse me, here was your presentation, not mine:

But false perception is mthong brdzun, so what Candrakirti is clearly saying is that false/faulty/incorrect perception is relative, or totally obscuring, truth. The two truths are about how objects are perceived. They can be perceived in only two ways, correctly and incorrectly. Perceiving them incorrectly, a false perception of them is called relative truth.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not say that objects are perceived in the ultimate.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 19th, 2011 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Indeed. And also the inverse: why do so many western Buddhists so desperately feel the need to refute and negate the G-word whenever it appears near the context of Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

Because it is a signifier that posits any number of monolithic, totalizing concepts that have nothing do with Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 19th, 2011 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Caz said:

I take note that there seem to be very few Rime practitioners for outside the Gelug tradition who would be familiar with The Gaden oral lineage of Mahamudra perhaps this is once again because others hold Je Rinpoche's teachings to lack Authenticity ? As Namdrol has kindly elaborated people respect Je Rinpoche but apparently do not respect him enough to accord his teachings rightful authentication.

Malcolm wrote:

AFA Gaden Mahamudra goes, even within Gelug this teaching at one time was highly controversial since it first appeared with the First Panchen Lama.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 19th, 2011 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Gyalwa Gyatso / Red Avalokiteshvara / Jinasagara

Content:

Silent Bob said:

First he was asked by Marpa to go to India and receive these teachings on the nine dharmas of the formless dakinis from Tiphupa.

Namdrol said:

This part of Gampo abbey's thing is wrong. Mila asked Rechungpa to go, not Marpa. Rechungpa never met Marpa.

Silent Bob said:

You're right--that part doesn't make sense. Please try to forgive me.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not at fault, so nothing to forgive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 19th, 2011 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

You see, earlier I also was argued about definition of "the seeming" because the terms "faulty" or false" (for all the seeming) are a little tricky.

Malcolm wrote:

You are choosing to follow a very non-standard and rather modern translation for kun rdzob, samvritti -- for which the vast majority of people have for many years translated as "relative". There is no problem with this per se.

However, you are conflating two terms (mthong brdzun pa i.e. false/faulty/incorrect, etc. perception) with (kun rdzob (for which you like "seeming" following KB), the object of a false perception.

There is a breakdown of communication because we are not using the same English terms to discuss these things.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 19th, 2011 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Gyalwa Gyatso / Red Avalokiteshvara / Jinasagara

Content:

Silent Bob said:

First he was asked by Marpa to go to India and receive these teachings on the nine dharmas of the formless dakinis from Tiphupa.

Malcolm wrote:

This part of Gampo abbey's thing is wrong. Mila asked Rechungpa to go, not marpa. Rechungpa never met Marpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Perhaps what differentiate us is that I take these so-called "objects" as pedagogical tools only, expedient meaning but not as the definitive.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, you are not understanding my point, and imputing things on to me that I have never stated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Namdrol said:

In Dzogchen the method of trying to discover what your actual state is begins with

introduction. In Vajrayana, it begins with receiving some kind of empowerment, in Hinayana and Mahayana, it begins with receiving some kind of vows.

mint said:

So, the Song of the Vajra book and cultivating guruyoga are only recommendations/tools but not mandatory?

Also, how does one go about purchasing restricted books? Am I given some sort of secret password after receiving transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing is mandatory in Dzogchen, at least not the way it is taught by ChNN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

mint said:

What is a Samaya? Is Lhug-Pa per Namdrol correct that all who receive the DT will receive a Samaya?

What happens if I don't immediately act on studying the Song of the Vajra book or cultivating guruyoga?

Have I been given contradictory advice?

Malcolm wrote:

A samaya is a commitment. In the case of receiving any Vajrayana transmission, it is impossible that someone did not receive some kind of commitment. But in Dzogchen the primary commitment is to recognizing and then maintaining knowledge of your actual state. So to begin with, you should be trying to discover what that is. This is the point of all Dharma. So on this point, all Dharma teachings have the same commitment. In Dzogchen the method of trying to discover what your actual state is begins with introduction. In Vajrayana, it begins with receiving some kind of empowerment, in Hinayana and Mahayana, it begins with receiving some kind of vows.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Do you ever get the feeling you are in a room full of smokers discussing the fresh air in Switzerland?

Namdrol said:

No, I get the feeling that I am a non-smoker trying to convince smokers that they should breath fresh air.

deepbluehum said:

I meant except you of course. I'd like to read a good fishin' tale. Know any?

Malcolm wrote:

Old man and the sea?

Moby Dick?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 9:17 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Do you ever get the feeling you are in a room full of smokers discussing the fresh air in Switzerland?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I get the feeling that I am a non-smoker trying to convince smokers that they should breath fresh air.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

<http://www.dharmafellowship.org/library/texts/the-cuckoo-of-awareness.htm>,
<http://gnosticteachings.org/books-by-samael-aun-weor/cosmic-teachings-of-a-lama/1259-alaya-and-paramartha.html>, and <http://gnosticteachings.org/books-by-samael-aun-weor/cosmic-teachings-of-a-lama/1278-substances-atoms-forces.html>.

Malcolm wrote:

The three own natures are irrevelant in any discussion of Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

conebeckham said:

Perhaps we need to define what a "view" is.

Acchantika said:

View or position (Pali *diṭṭhi*, Sanskrit *dṛṣṭi*) is a central idea in Buddhism. In Buddhist thought, in contrast with the commonsense understanding, a view is not a simple, abstract collection of propositions, but a charged interpretation of experience which intensely shapes and affects thought, sensation, and action. Having the proper mental attitude toward views is therefore considered an integral part of the Buddhist path.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/View_\(Buddhism\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/View_(Buddhism)) onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;)

I personally feel this is a pretty good definition.

gad rgyangs said:

N doesn't say he doesn't have any view (*drsti*) he says he has no thesis (*pratijñā*)

Malcolm wrote:

Sure he says he has no views:

gang gis thugs brtse nyer bzung nas/ /lta ba thams cad spang ba'i phyir/ /dam pa'i chos
ni ston mdzad pa/ /gau ta ma de la phyag 'tshal lo

"I prostrate to Gotama, who, through his loving mind, taught the sublime Dharma in order to abandon all views".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Namdrol said:

So in other words, he is starting with what the opponenet takes as real, correct?

In this case, how is this a) his beleif b) a philosophical position of his? The answer is, actually, they are not his beleif nor his philosophical position.

M

gad rgyangs said:

He's accepting the validity of the two truths scheme, which (he says) is what Buddhas rely on to teach "truth". He would have to maintain either that he has already demonstrated the validity of this schema through his argumentation earlier in the book, or that he's accepting it on faith since Buddhas rely on it. In either case, its a philosophical position.

Malcolm wrote:

But if he does not accept the validity of conventional truth (he does not) how can you say he is erecting a philosophical position around the two truths?

Remember, he states "Since the Jinas have proclaimed nirvana alone is true, what wise person would not understand the rest is false?"

The two truths, are for Nāgārjuna merely a pragmatic methodology used by Buddhas to lead sentient beings from delusion to non-delusion. But they are not a philosophical system, at least, not for Nagarjuna and Aryadeva. In other words, if anything, the two truths are a pedagogical method, and that is all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

which contains all kinds of views about what conventional truth is, what the ultimate and nirvana are. In short, a whole worldview, not to mention all kinds of epistemological beliefs about what is or isn't valid reasoning etc.

Namdrol said:

All kinds of views? Describe them please and let's see if they are in fact views. For starters, what is a conventional truth according to Nāgārjuna. And why is this a thesis?

gad rgyangs said:

As it says two karikas earlier, conventional truth is worldly truth, that is, consensus reality. It isn't a thesis (neither he nor I said so), because he isn't trying to prove it: he's taking it as a given, which is even worse as it is an unproven belief.

Malcolm wrote:

So in other words, he is starting with what the opponenet takes as real, correct?

In this case, how is this a) his belief b) a philosophical position of his? The answer is, actually, they are not his belief nor his philosophical position.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

which contains all kinds of views about what conventional truth is, what the ultimate and nirvana are. In short, a whole worldview, not to mention all kinds of epistemological beliefs about what is or isn't valid reasoning etc.

Malcolm wrote:

All kinds of views? Describe them please and let's see if they are in fact views. For starters, what is a conventional truth according to Nāgārjuna. And why is this a thesis?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: The Bad and The Ugly

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Hi Ron, can you give me some sources for me to find those episodes you talk about? The maitreya revolutions thing. I never heard of it, but as this is the second time you talk about it...

Is <http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Maitreya> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" your source?

Malcolm wrote:

The phenomena of Maitreya millennialism and the vigorous violence these Chinese cults engaged in are well known to history. But they have nothing really to do with Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Namdrol said:

For example, what kind of philosophical position does Nāgārjuna hold. Please provide an example.

gad rgyangs said:

jeez, take your pick. how about 24.10 (and now thanks to Terma we have Bockling's translation to use):

"Unless you rely on the conventional truth
You will not attain the ultimate meaning.

Unless you attain the ultimate meaning
You will not attain nirvana."

Malcolm wrote:
This sounds like a prescription, not a position.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 3:32 AM
Title: Re: Ojas (general discussion)
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

My main focus is Dzogchen, yet I'm not considering to abandon Gnosis either; however I'll refrain from saying much more about this for right now, as I do not want to become somehow responsible for causing any sort of split in the Sangha (there are many other disciples of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche who post here).

If in Meditating upon it I conclude that something more should be said, then perhaps I will.

Best Regards

Malcolm wrote:
It's not about meditation or gnosis, its about physiology.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 3:01 AM
Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
three views:

eternalist - "exists"

nihilist - "does not exist"

madhyamaka - "not 'exists', also not 'does not exist'"

Namdrol said:
This last view is refuted by Madhyamaka. This is explained most clearly by Aryadeva in the Jñānasarasammucaya.

gad rgyangs said:
ok six views then.

right now im sorting out N's use of the word pratijñā in VV and its use as a technical term in the Nyaya system.... basically it seems that a distinction needs to be made between the thesis of a syllogism, which N disavows, and philosophical positions, which his texts are of course full of. You can't just sweep everything under the word "view" because he didn't.

Malcolm wrote:
For example, what kind of philosophical position does Nāgārjuna hold. Please provide an example.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 2:59 AM
Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA
Content:
dakini_boi said:
Wow, Tantular, thank you. You've cleared up my confusion.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, nice explanation.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 2:39 AM
Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika
Content:
Mariusz said:
Thank you for continuing. It will benefit all of us. Of course I took it: a correct perception of them (the perceived objects) is called ultimate truth. That's why I asked you: "Do you really think the so-called "objects", somewhere "out there", can be perceived correctly in the ultimate truth"?

Malcolm wrote:
Candrakīrti very specifically says "yang dag mthong yul gang de de nyid de" i.e. "Any object [yul] of a correct (yang dag) perception (mthong) that is real (de nyid)" i.e. an ultimate truth. Then he says mthong ba brdzun pa kun rdzob bden par gsungs i.e. "[The object of] a false perception is a relative truth."

He also specifies very precisely just before these two lines:

/dngos kun yang dag brdzun pa mthong ba yis/ /dngos rnyed ngo bo gnyis ni 'dzin par 'gyur

"Since all things are perceived correctly and falsely;
all things will possess two natures.

He then explains in his commenatary:

de'i phyir dngos po thams cad rang bzhin de gnyis 'dzin pa yin no/ /rang bzhin de gnyis
las kyang mthong ba yang dag pa'i yul gang yin pa de ni de nyid de/ de ni don dam pa'i
bden pa'o zhes bya ba'i don to/ /de'i rang gi ngo bo ni bshad par bya'o/ /mthong ba
brdzun pa'i yul gang yin pa de ni kun rdzob kyi bden pa'o/ /de'i phyir de ltar bden pa gnyis
rnam par gzahag nas/ mthong ba brdzun pa rnam la mthong ba yang dag pa dang brdzun
pa nyid las

Therefore, all things possess two natures. Also out of those two natures, any object of a correct perception means that it is called "ultimate truth". Its own nature has been explained. Any object of a false perception is a relative truth. Therefore, after having demonstrated the two truths, among false perceptions there are also true and false."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Can you specify what exactly the saying you mean? I compared only: "The two truths are about how objects are perceived. They can be perceived in only two ways, correctly and incorrectly. Perceiving them incorrectly, a false perception of them is called relative truth" with mine ""The ultimate is not the sphere of cognition ("perceptions" whatever if "false" or "correct") It is said that cognition is the seeming (only)" . I did not see agreement here.

Jnana said:

Center of the Sunlit Sky, p. 85:

There is no contradiction between, first, the explanation that the ultimate is taken as the object of the wisdom of noble ones and, second, the teaching in some sūtras and treatises that it is not the sphere of cognition.

Mariusz said:

Excuse me, I have not the book with me now to check the context. Are you quoting on the wisdom of noble ones that is beyond the perceptions of objects, beyond all reference points? If so, it agrees with Santideva saying, but not with the saying of Namdrol.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you take Namdrol to be saying? In your own words please.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 18th, 2011 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Can someone please post some works of Nagarjuna?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Bocking's Nagarjuna in China is one of the clearest. Full MMK plus commentary closely related to Buddhapalita which clearly identifies positions. Translation of Kumarajiva's translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Caz said:

Ah Now I see Thanks for that Namdrol this is probley where alot of the Anamosity toward Gelugpa's Originally arose from. So I take it on that root practitoners from Non Gelug traditions would see Lama Tsongkhapas recieved Mahamudra teachings from Manjushri as equally false and wrong then ?

Namdrol said:

Well, while it is possible for ordinary people to have pure visions, they are not usually regarded as the basis for having large amounts of faith in that person.

Caz said:

Im sure your well aware what Implication that would have for the Gelug lineage and all of its teachings and transmitted lineages then. That it would be a false lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Tsongkhapa was a good yogi, and had experience. He received the transmissions of the tantras, practiced them, was skilled in the arts of Vajramaster, and conveyed them properly, he was an interesting and novel scholar. However, it is precisely his novelty that landed him in hot water with those who were not his students.

In this instance, his students had lots of faith in him and thus there is a new lineage. Those who were not his students rather resented the Sakya sarmas as they were called for a while, these new Sakyapas later known as Gelugpas.

So while we all respect Tsongkhapa, we do not all assume that he achieved awakening.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

three views:

eternalist - "exists"

nihilist - "does not exist"

madhyamaka - "not 'exists', also not 'does not exist'"

Malcolm wrote:

This last view is refuted by Madhyamaka. This is explained most clearly by Aryadeva in the Jñānasarasammucaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: St. John of the Cross on Spiritual Materialism

Content:

mint said:

He may have even been a pratyekabuddha.

Namdrol said:

Quite impossible. Pratyekabuddhas only occur when there is no Buddha.

N

TMingyur said:

Then it would be possible because at that time there was none.

kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

No, because the Buddha's sasana remains. Pratyekabuddhas only occur when there is no Buddha's sasana, to be more precise.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sorry, my boy, that is just not the case. You can't FUD your way out of this.

alwayson said:

Thats absolutely the case.

Famed Mac security expert Charlie Miller, who won multiple years for the fast Mac hack at Pwn2Own, comments, " Mac OS X is no more secure than any other operating system. It has vulnerabilities, and it will let you download and run malware. The difference is that there simply isn't that much malware written for it. The bad guys have focused all their energies at Windows, which makes up the vast majority of the computers out there. However, as market share for Macs continues to inch up, that equation is going to change and bad guys will begin to focus in on Macs, if that hasn't already started to happen. And as I mentioned above, Macs are no more inherently secure than Windows, so when the bad guys decide to go after them with gusto, it'll get ugly fast."

Malcolm wrote:

More FUD. Same stuff we have been hearing for years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Caz said:

Ah Now I see Thanks for that Namdrol this is probley where alot of the Anamosity toward Gelugpa's Originally arose from. So I take it on that root practitoners from Non Gelug traditions would see Lama Tsongkhapas recieved Mahamudra teachings from Manjushri as equally false and wrong then ?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, while it is possible for ordinary people to have pure visions, they are not usually regarded as the basis for having large amounts of faith in that person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

Namdrol said:

All holes a fixable, the point is, there should not be so many.

alwayson said:

Lets be clear that Mac has more such holes than Windows.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, my boy, that is just not the case. You can't FUD your way out of this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 5:43 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

Namdrol said:

<http://arstechnica.com/business/news/2011/11/microsoft-fails-to-patch-duqu-but-fixes-critical-hole-in-windows-tcpip-stack.ars> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

alwayson said:

These are just typical updates that Microsoft releases. My PC automatically installs them. I don't even have to think about it.

You made it sound like there are some fundamental unfixable holes to Windows.

Malcolm wrote:

All holes a fixable, the point is, there should not be so many.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

Namdrol said:

If this were true, there would not be so many holes in Windows.

N

alwayson said:

Who says there are holes in Windows 7?

There aren't any holes on Windows 7.

Like I said, it has UAC.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://arstechnica.com/business/news/2011/11/microsoft-fails-to-patch-duqu-but-fixes-critical-hole-in-windows-tcpip-stack.ars> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: comparative sdom gsum texts

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is a section at the end of the book that details this.

xylem said:

lama namdrol...

i probably didn't make my question clear enough. kongtrul's buddhist ethics is exhaustive in presenting the three systems of vows. it is however, not exhaustive in presenting how different masters and schools understand the combined practice of these three systems of vows. jan-ulrich sobisch (copenhagen) has written about how there are very subtle but often very substantial differences in the understanding how the three vows are held and practiced by an individual. some masters, like jigten sumgon suggest that the three vows are essentially of the same nature as they are antidotes to the three poisons. others like gampopa suggest that they are very distinct because they come into existence by very different rituals. some masters suggest all the vows must be assumed together, each one supporting the other, while others suggest it is possible and even necessary to drop the outer aspects of the pratimoksha for the practice of mantra... while others see them being possessed upwardly, the higher systems perfecting the intention of the lower ones.

given the tibetan proclivities for comparative tenets and hermeneutics, it would seem natural that ethical comparative works might also be authored.

-xy

i am not overly familiar with the different genres of tibetan religious literature. are there any comparative texts on the three vow systems? i know different authors criticize and analyze different points of other authors, but are there any comparative treatments in the tradition?

-xy

Namdrol said:

Kongtruls' Buddhist Ethics is exhaustive in this respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

People use computers for three things:

Communications

Productivity

Entertainment

Most people have no need and do not want to tinker with their boxes. They just want a hassle free computer -- and for a hassle free computer, you cannot beat a mac.

wisdom said:

Like in many cases, we give up freedom for security.

Mac may be more secure, but there are far fewer variations available. When you look at things like the apps store you can see how much stricter (and therefore less free) Mac is vs. PC/Android. People who build gaming computers to my knowledge almost always do this with PCs, and most gamers own PCs and not Macs. Many games are released on Mac only after on PC. Everything Mac is more expensive. Mac is a single corporation, PC's can be (like a Dell computer), but often the parts and programs are all separate entities, so you have more choice in which companies, which hardware, and which software you want to have and support.

Basically as a Mac user you are a Mac user in its entirety, and must abide by the rules that Apple puts forth. As a PC user you can have thousands of permutations of hardware and software, and there really are no rules. You can build your own PC, have a warranty for each piece of hardware, and if any burns out you can just fix it yourself. No warranty is broken for fixing your own computer, which is cheaper and easier on every level if you know what you're doing. In terms of customization you can fit a TON Of things in a PC. Your expansion capabilities are also much higher. If you have a PC and a new better CPU comes out, you just buy a new motherboard/CPU, much cheaper than being forced to buy a whole new computer for only slightly more speed.

In terms of security a good anti-virus and spyware program, and a little forethought about what you are downloading and clicking on, will remove almost all potential security breaches from happening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

Namdrol said:

and virtually all require user permission to occur. This is not the case with Windows.

alwayson said:

Depends on the version. Windows 7 has UAC which I am sure you are aware of.

UAC prompts you every time some code wants to run.

Malcolm wrote:

If this were true, there would not be so many holes in Windows.

Face it, Windows is designed to run in a trusted enterprise. It is not safe machine. I have run my mac, without firewall or any security on the net behind a standard NAT router and have never been hacked or even tickled for years.

No workstation mac has ever been hacked. Macs that have been hacked are web servers, and only because they are running some kind of webserver with outdated code. But the OS itself is very bullet proof unless you download something on purpose and install it, like mac defender.

You just cannot make the same claim with any version of Windows.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

That's actually not so because Tsongkhapa realized emptiness directly much later when he was able to see Manjushri and receive teachings from him directly.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand that this is what you believe. You will forgive me for pointing out that Tsongkhapa is not universally regarded as someone who attained the path of seeing. We can respect Tsongkhapa as a great practitioner and scholar without acquiescing to your demand that we perceive him to be an aryan pudgala.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

at least in the early phases these were not compatible schools of thought and were in disagreement with each other.

All the best.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct; Prajñapāramitā schools, Tathāgatagarbha schools and Yogacāra schools were in some disagreement until Maitrīyanāth's synthesis. After the dust settled, it was left between the Yogacāras and the Madhyamikas to battle it out.

Then Vajrayāna made their arguments somewhat irrelevant because of the Vajrayāna synthesis of the two schools.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

always on said:

Oh really?

<http://www.dailytech.com/Apple+Orders+Technicians+to+Feign+Ignorance+About+Mac+Malware/article21693.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

MacDefender?

What a joke. There is one known exploit for the Mac, and it is more of a social engineering exploit than a true hack or malware -- it depends on the ignorance of someone to actually download a program and then physically give them a credit card

number. This is not really a malware program. This is a fraud.

Really, this is the best that windows community can do in pointing out flaws in Mac Security?

If you want to know about ongoing issues for the mac, look here:

<http://www.securemac.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

You will see that by comparison, there are very few exploits against the mac, and virtually all require user permission to occur. This is not the case with Windows.

Remember, I was a professional Windows system engineer for several years working in high security environments such as Putnam Investments, Genuity, and so on. So I am not just talking idly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

alwayson said:

Windows 7 is as secure as any other OS.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it really isn't.

Compared to a Mac, security wise W7 is terrible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

alwayson said:

Whats wrong with Windows 7?

Malcolm wrote:

The Windows part.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Best Language to Learn First?

Content:

wisdom said:

What is the best language to learn first, Tibetan or Sanskrit? Which language have the bulk of most Buddhist texts been written in? Especially the Mahayana tradition?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Perhaps you should read Karmapa Mikyo Dorje

Malcolm wrote:

I have. Thanks.

I have studied Tibetan polemical authors of Madhyamaka quite well.

The Indian masters are better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: public evaluation of teachers

Content:

xylem said:

One, I have noticed over the years on various different Buddhist forums (the old Tricycle, e-sangha and now here) that the most vitriolic and divisive threads generally involve the evaluation of the authenticity of Buddhist teachers and lineages.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, it is better to leave people to their delusions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Acchantika said:

If we consider this in terms of your examples, we remember that Nagarjuna spent the previous 23 chapters negating the possibility of a referent.

gad rgyangs said:

...which is, of course, itself a view.

Acchantika said:

Negating something does not necessarily equal affirming its absence.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed, a negation does not entail possession of a view. According to Rongzom, so called non-affirming negation is used to reject an opponents POV. The affirming negation is used to prove one's own view. According to him, Madhyamalas only use the former and never the latter in reference to reality. He also points out that they accept the consequence that their own position is harmed i.e. they do not maintain a position but purely maintain a critical stance.

But right from the beginning there was rebellion against this, for example, the harsh criticism of Candrakirti found in the colophon of the translation of Ratnakarashanti's Madhyamakalamkara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

tantular said:

Old Tibetan was not a tonal language, so this couldn't have been the difference between the ca and tsa sde, and when Lhasa dialect did develop tone, both series follow the same rules. Nowadays Himalayan peoples in Nepal write their Tibetan names in Devanagari as if ཅ = चै: for example ཅེ་རི་ཅོ་ is always written as छेरिड. I've asked people why they do this, and it's not because they're aware of the official Tibetan transliteration of Sanskrit (most have no idea), but simply because to their ears Nepali छ sounds like the closest equivalent of ཅ; certainly far better than त्ह would be.

The Tshigdzöd Chenmo states that ཅ and ཅ both have 1) the palate as place of articulation, 2) the middle of the tongue as organ of articulation, 3) contact of tongue and palate as its manner of articulation, & 4) unvoiced, unaspirated phonation, exactly

the same as Sanskrit grammarians describe च. Sanskrit-Tibetan phonological theory does not distinguish plosives from affricatives (these are both called spr̥ṣṭa/phrad pa), or the alveolar ridge and palate (both tālu/rkan). Therefore, Sanskrit and Tibetan grammarians have no theoretical framework for distinguishing the https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voiceless_postalveolar_affricate and the https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voiceless_alveolo-palatal_affricate. In India this wasn't a problem because the latter sound didn't exist. It does exist in Tibetan, however, and therefore the Tibetan language needed to have two series of letters, even if the grammarians couldn't exactly describe the difference between them. All Tibetan grammatical treatises are in agreement that the tsa sde was invented first to represent the Sanskrit ca-varga, and the ca sde was only developed afterwards, once Tibetans realized their language had an additional set of affricates not found in Sanskrit. According to legend, this happened when Thonmi had a conversation with a traveller that included the "six new letters of Tibetan":

མོ་བ་དཔོན་གྱིས། ཁྱེད་གང་ནས་བྱོན་པར། དེ་ན་རེ། ཁང་ཁྱང་ནས་འོངས་ཟེར། གང་དུ་འགྲོ་བྱས་པས། ཟ་ཉར་ཅུ་འགྲོ་ཟེར། གང་གི་དོན་དུ་འགྲོ་བྱས་པར་ང་ཉ་ཅུ་འགྲོ་ཟེར།
ནམ་སྐབས་བྱས་པས་ཅེ་ཆ་ཟེར།

dakini_boi said:

Thank you Tantular, that is very helpful. This information seems in accord with the idea that the Indians who introduced Buddhism into Tibet may have been from a region where च was actually pronounced " tsa." Would you agree with that?

Malcolm wrote:

It is the opposite. It does not accord with that idea.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 17th, 2011 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: comparative sdom gsum texts

Content:

xylem said:

i am not overly familiar with the different genres of tibetan religious literature. are there any comparative texts on the three vow systems? i know different authors criticize and analyze different points of other authors, but are there any comparative treatments in the tradition?

-xy

Malcolm wrote:

Kongtruls' Buddhist Ethics is exhaustive in this respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Namdrol said:

A view is a position concerning either existence or non-existence, that is the basis of all views. Madhyamakas do not have views concerning either.

Astus said:

Should add that it's independent existence and total annihilation. But to say that "there is no self" is not a position of non-existence, i.e. annihilation, and to say that "phenomena are inter-dependent" is not a position of existence, i.e. eternal self-sufficient being.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out from time immemorial bhāva is included with svabhāva by Nāgārjuna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Knowing Nagarjuna's arguments about emptiness does not instantly grant access to all of the world's philosophies and the arguments therein.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, it just makes them all completely irrelevant to the one thing that matters: liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

In the short lineage of Yamantaka Umapa is not listed as I know. What is the source of your statement?

Malcolm wrote:

It is based on the lineage list (volume 30, page 109 compiled by Loter Wangpo) in the

rgyud sde kun 'dus based on the lineage of Cangkye Rolpai Dorje

The close lineage is as follows:

From Vajrabhairava, Jamyang Tenpa'i Khor Lo (Mañjuśrī Sasanacakra, and Gyalba Jampal Nyingpo (Jina Mañjuśrīgarbha) or alternately, from Mañjuśrī and Vajrabhairava individually to Lama Umapa, and then all three to Tsongkhapa, then Kheydrup and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Namdrol said:

Dependent origination is not a view. It is the pacification of views. Emptiness is not a view, it is the pacification of views. This is stated countless times in Madhyamaka texts.

Where there is no view, there is no proliferation. Where there is no proliferation, there is no view.

view = proliferation.

N

gad rgyangs said:

You still haven't defined what you consider a "view" to be. If its not "a statement about the nature of reality/how things are", then what is it? And "proliferation" basically just means "other people's views that you don't agree with", so thats not a definition.

Malcolm wrote:

A view is a position concerning either existence or non-existence, that is the basis of all views. Madhyamakas do not have views concerning either.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

I don't want show you my curriculum vitae either because here I think only the investigation counts, sorry.

Malcolm wrote:

My investigation is finished. I have nothing further to investigate. I rely on my own knowledge now.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Please read the Madhyamaka Forum here in Dharmawheel.

Namdrol said:

There is no need for me read what amateurs have to say about Madhyamaka, whether Gelug or non-Gelug.

N

Mariusz said:

Upss, no comments

Malcolm wrote:

The point is, I can argue for or against any position and win. I don't really have a stake in a position. But I know perfectly well what Nāgārjuna says, Aryadeva, Buddhapalita, Candra, Jñānagarbha, Śāntarakṣita, Sapan, Gorampa, Dolbuwa, Tsongkhapa, etc. have to say.

I have studied Madhyamaka for 25 years. On this forum, the only people who have anything to share with me about Madhyamaka is Jñāna and Ratna, and even then, it is only more sources, and different information. They have nothing to share with me concerning the essential principles of Nāgārjuna and other tenet systems.

So, you can either benefit from my extensive knowledge of these teachings, honed by years of constant study with the best Tibetan lamas in the world, mastery of classical Tibetan, and personal experience in meditation, or not. It is your choice. No one is forcing you to listen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Please read the Madhyamaka Forum here in Dharmawheel.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need for me read what amateurs have to say about Madhyamaka, whether Gelug or non-Gelug.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Namdrol said:

The two truths are about how objects are perceived. They can be perceived in only two ways, correctly and incorrectly. Perceiving them incorrectly, a false perception of them is called relative truth.

N

Mariusz said:

I do not agree. Do you really think the so-called "objects", somewhere "out there", can be perceived correctly in the ultimate truth?

Malcolm wrote:

Have you ever read Candrakirti? If not, I suggest you do.

It is pointless for me to educate you. But in breif, Candra says "all phenomena have two natures, one ultimate, the other, relative" and "Whatever is correctly perceived, that is real; false perception is said to be relative truth".

Please examine these things. I'm out.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Namdrol said:

You are not at liberaty to invent your own Dharma - well you are, just don't call it Candrakirti's intent.

False, faulty, incorrect, etc. All of these apply to relative truth.

N

Mariusz said:

Khenpo Karl Brunnholzl often use a alternative term "the deceiving" which I also like because doesn't suggest useless: "Generally speaking, if a given philosophical system differentiates the two levels of seeming and ultimate reality, then in whatever way it does so, one it speaks about seeming, relative, or deceiving phenomena", it must also accept this mean that such phenomena are precisely something that is not established.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, you are not understanding something -- kiun rdzob is relative truth, but actually means "totally obscuring" in Tibetan.

But false perception is mthong brdzun, so what Candrakirti is clearly saying is that false/faulty/incorrect perception is relative, or totally obscuring, truth.

The two truths are about how objects are perceived. They can be perceived in only two ways, correctly and incorrectly. Perceiving them incorrectly, a false perception of them is called relative truth. The word brdzun pa means "to lie" as well. Further, for example, there are two schools in Yogacara rnam bden pa and rnam brdzun pa i.e. true aspect and false aspect. The latter is the higher of the two. The term brdzun pa means false.

So a false perception is relative truth.

When Shantideva is taking about the two truths, he says - ultimate truth is beyond the mind, because the mind itself is relative. The mind can never apprehend ultimate truth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

In the short lineage of Yamantaka Umapa is not listed as I know. What is the source of your statement?

Malcolm wrote:

The lineage prayers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Perhaps "faulty" is not correct here,

Namdrol said:

Faulty is quite correct, since that is what Candrakirti says i.e.:

mthong ba brdzun pa kun rdzob bden par gsungs

"False perception is said to be relative truth".

N

Mariusz said:

It is the same, false does not mean useless here I think but could suggest as it also. So I prefer the term seeming.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not at liberty to invent your own Dharma - well you are, just don't call it Candrakirti's intent.

False, faulty, incorrect, etc. All of these apply to relative truth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Perhaps "faulty" is not correct here,

Malcolm wrote:

Faulty is quite correct, since that is what Candrakirti says i.e.:

mthong ba brdzun pa kun rdzob bden par gsungs

"False perception is said to be relative truth".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Caz said:

...no wonder why the schools would have problems with each other if this is what they would say of people who did not think the same way. Considering he was a Keeper of Vinaya and certainly we all know the benefits of refuge vows with regards to spirits that line of said reasoning really does sound petty.

Mariusz said:

Followers of non-sectarian Rime know the fact I posted above that Je Tsongkhapa had visions of Manjushri at least considering Yamantaka Single Hero practice of HYT.

Malcolm wrote:

This lineage actually starts with Lama Umapa. Nevertheless, it is preserved in Kongtrul's Dam sngags mdzod in the Kadampa section.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Caz said:

yes, whereas non-Gelugpas think he was deluded by a spirit posing as Manjushri.

N

Wow Namdrol its no wonder why the schools would have problems with each other if this is what they would say of people who did not think the same way. Considering he was a Keeper of Vinaya and certainly we all know the benefits of refuge vows with regards to spirits that line of said reasoning really does sound petty.

Malcolm wrote:

Gorampa mentions this as possibility in his differentiation of views, and basically asserts that Tsongkhapa was lead astray by Umapa's channeling of "Manjushri".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:
Namdrol said:
Madhyamakas do not have views.
N

gad rgyangs said:
Ok, lets approach it this way: since Madhyamikas make all sorts of statements about the nature of reality (dependent origination, emptiness, etc), then, for you, a "view" is not a statement about the nature of reality. What is a "view" to you then?

Malcolm wrote:
Dependent origination is not a view. It is the pacification of views. Emptiness is not a view, it is the pacification of views. This is stated countless times in Madhyamaka texts.

Where there is no view, there is no proliferation. Where there is no proliferation, there is no view.

view = proliferation.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 9:57 AM
Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality
Content:

Tsongkhapa said:
Gorampa is unable to distinguish...blah blah blah

Malcolm wrote:
The Gelug misunderstanding of madhyamaka is tragic.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 9:55 AM
Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality
Content:

Namdrol said:
"It is not that we claim non-existence, we merely remove claims for existing existents"

-- Buddhapalita.

Madhyamakas do not have views.

N

Tsongkhapafan said:

Yes they do. 'phenomena do not exist inherently' is a Madhyamika view. It's not possible to follow a spiritual path without possessing correct views.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct view is no view.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

All conventional truths are objects of deluded minds' is a pretty crude and wrong statement

Malcolm wrote:

This is Candrakirti's definition in Madhyamaka-avatara.

If you want to consider it crude, as compared to a Tibetan's POV, well, that is your problem.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Namdrol said:

MMK refutes both:

"Where is there an existent not included in inherent existence or dependent existence?

If an existent is not established, a non-existent is not established.

Those who perceive existents, non-existents,

inherent existence or dependent existence do not see the truth of the Buddha's

teaching."

Madhyamaka therefore do not assert any views. Not asserting a view does not mean "incapable of engaging in conventional discourse", something you gelugpas seem to be afraid of.

N

gad rgyangs said:

Unless you rig the question by insisting that having a view can only mean accepting existence, non-existence, both, or neither, then having a view means any opinion about the nature of reality. In which case, what MMK is saying here is definitely a view: it is saying there is such a thing as the Buddha's teaching, and if you perceive X (which already assumes, and raises, all kinds of epistemological views), then you do not see it, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

"It is not that we claim non-existence, we merely remove claims for existing existents"

-- Buddhapalita.

Madhyamakas do not have views.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Sherab said:

Bodhisattvas on the 8th stage and beyond perceive appearances of buddhas don't they?
Are these appearances of buddhas deluded?

Malcolm wrote:

Their experience is divided in terms of meditation and post-meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

I like Je Tsongkhapa, as for example initiator of Yamantaka Ekavira Single Hero HYT system from Manjusri, because He wrote (in Tsongkhapa's Final Exposition of Wisdom;

page.158):

"during states subsequent to meditative equipoise on the stages of generation and completion (of Highest Yoga Tantra)
one takes suchness to mind within analyzing it...with respect to that occasion, do not posit analytical meditation
as one-pointed meditation" and there were many masters of His Yamantaka system who got Vajrayana realizations

Malcolm wrote:

Intellectual views do not count for much in Vajrayāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

mint said:

Also, as I've explained elsewhere in this thread, I just don't have the ability to watch (or understand) the webcasts when they air. This factors into my less-than-stellar attitude towards all of this, too.

Acchantika said:

If you have time, there are some ChNN videos on youtube with English subtitles, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-XrfN8TY80Y&feature=related>. This may help one get used to his manner of speech, accent etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Best is to just go meet him in person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

I very like Je Tsongkhapa because His intention was to built epistemological very complicated system, validated conceptually by valid cognition, that should fit together,

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is that pramanas and prameyas are just conventional fictions, as Nagarjuna shows in the Vigrahavyavartani. In other words, there are no ultimate pramanas, so elaborating a Madhyamaka systems which makes use of this kind of language is very faulty indeed.

In other words, valid cognitions, like all relative truths, are the objects of faulty cognitions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

alwayson said:

Any Windows lower than Windows 7 is complete crap.

I use Windows 7 Ultimate 64 Bit with Service Pack 1.

Malcolm wrote:

Revise that to "Any Windows is complete crap" and I will agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

mint said:

Wouldn't receiving the DT and then not practicing guruyoga be the karmic end of me?

Malcolm wrote:

No. If you don't want to practice Guru Yoga, you don't have to.

If you want to, you can.

But first, you need transmission.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Ok. Where can Sapan's explanation be found?

Malcolm wrote:

You can look in his collected works.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Namdrol, can you tell me what is the textual source where he explains this idea?

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't exist. Apart from two short texts, nothing of his survived. Sapan explains this quite well, but no one seems interested in taking Sapan's word for it. My explanation is based on that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

so how would using those characters have prevented Tibetans from pronouncing the Sankrit with tonal alterations?

Namdrol said:

training.

dakini_boi said:

What I meant was, how would using characters tsa tsha dza have prevented pronouncing sanskrit with tonal alterations, any more than using ca cha ja - either way, training would be necessary.

Malcolm wrote:

You will have to ask Thonmi. It was his idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Wine and Meat Offerings?

Content:

narraboth said:

I totally agree that people should follow what their master said, but i disagree that it's about "view", otherwise it will be an attack to dza paltrul rinpoche and all other nyingma monasteries/centres/groups following his trandition (or 'book').

No, preventing offer meat (at least fresh meat) is not 'lower tantra' view, because you don't even need to talk about meat to lower tantra practioners, they just don't use it. It is out of compassion and proper conducts of buddhism. Maybe just like ChNN advicing his group to 'buy meats from as many animals as possible', it's out of compassion (not because the view is higher, otherwise meat from one animal and many animals should be equal isn't it). I don't see there's right or wrong between the two methods (as i was quoting from two great masters), but it's really nothing to do with the views. I don't think dza paltrul rinpoche's view would be lower than many masters at anytime, but i very appreciate that he pointed out important things that people easily miss in so-called high views. But of course, if someone can see sh*t equally as tasty sausages, he can comfortably say whay he want to say.

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that the view of lower tantra is that it is not correct to eat meat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Wine and Meat Offerings?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

You want a beer with your burger?

Malcolm wrote:

Always, and fries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Conventional reality is only appearance, that's true, but to say that it's an appearance only for the deluded means that Buddhas do not perceive conventional reality. This is refuted by Tsonghkapa and other authors.

Malcolm wrote:

And proven by Gorampa, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Jnana said:

Okay. So what exactly is the Theos of an atheist such as yourself?

KevinSolway said:

It is the All, composed of all phenomena, all concepts, all that is unknown and beyond concepts, and all of these elements tied together and impelled by cause and effect.

Malcolm wrote:

pantheism.

of course, such a concept is absolutely foreign to Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Caz said:

Thats true Gelugpa's Believe Tsongkhapa's Doctrine distills the essence of Nagarjunas teachings.

conebeckham said:

Well, most Gelukpas do.....but see Gendun Chopel, for example....as for others- Sakayapas, Kagyupas, Nyingmapas, and Jonangpas generally do not.

Malcolm wrote:

Ganden Chopel, from the beginning, was a Nyingmapa. He was never a "pure" Gelugpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Irrelevant. Conceptual is essential even after these first two Paths according to Tsong-kha-pa.

Namdrol said:

It is fairly straightforward.

Gelugpas care very much about what Tsongkhapa says, and accept him as the supreme authority, even over Nāgārjuna.

Non-gelugpas don't, and don't accept him as an authority at all, let alone as an authority more important than Nāgārjuna.

N

Caz said:

That's true. Gelugpa's Believe Tsongkhapa's Doctrine distills the essence of Nagarjuna's teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

yes, whereas non-Gelugpas think he was deluded by a spirit posing as Manjushri.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Mariusz said:

Irrelevant. Conceptual is essential even after these first two Paths according to Tsong-kha-pa.

Malcolm wrote:

It is fairly straightforward.

Gelugpas care very much about what Tsongkhapa says, and accept him as the supreme authority, even over Nāgārjuna.

Non-gelugpas don't, and don't accept him as an authority at all, let alone as an authority more important than Nāgārjuna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Wine and Meat Offerings?

Content:

narraboth said:

I don't know how wisdom deities accept offering

Malcolm wrote:

Without duality.

narraboth said:

but if they will feel 'happy', probably won't be because you kill some animals for offering them.

Malcolm wrote:

Wisdom deities are in a state of total equanimity. If there is negative consequence to killing animals for a ganapouja, it is because the act is predicated on ignorance and falls in the class of the ten non-virtues.

narraboth said:

well, please don't take it as an attack to any group,

Malcolm wrote:

Not attacking anyone, merely pointing out that there are differences in views.

In this case, it is better for people to follow the advice of their individual teacher, rather than a teacher in a book. Every teacher has a different teaching because people are different and need different things. But if someone falls into Dzogchen Community, then it is better they heed ChNN's instructions -- the same goes for everyone else.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Monk?

Content:

Namdrol said:

They should be educated in the five major sciences, sutra, tantra, have done retreats, have gained some measure of signs of experience, skilled in giving explanations, in addition to having bodhicitta, and so on.

N

Sönam said:

And what's about Khyentse Yeshe and few others of the kind ?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Khyentse Rinpoche is not my teacher, and I don't know him as a teacher, though I have met him.

I am sure he is qualified to teach because his father, my teacher, said so.

But I am talking in general, not each specific teacher. There are always exceptions to every rule.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

two truths is a view.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That's right - it's the compatability of conventional and ultimate truths that Nagarjuna was teaching. This is correct view.

Malcolm wrote:

The two truths are part of conventional truth, not ultimate truth. Therefore even the two truths are not established. The two truths are objects of mistaken minds.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I'm not sure who you mean by "we" (paleface), but the MMK is full of all kinds of views about sunyata, pratityasamutpada, etc

Namdrol said:

DO prescribed as the end of views in the MMK, not as a view in and of itself.

A view requires an existent or a non-existent. Since MMK shows that neither can be found, upon what could any view be based?

N

Tsongkhapa said:

This is also an extreme. MMK refutes inherent existence, not existence per se. It also refutes non-existence. Views are based on mere imputation and mere appearances, that's why they exist and function. It's incorrect to assert that the Madhyamikas do not assert any views.

Malcolm wrote:

MMK refutes both:

"Where is there an existent not included in inherent existence or dependent existence?

If an existent is not established, a non-existent is not established.

Those who perceive existents, non-existents,

inherent existence or dependent existence do not see the truth of the Buddha's teaching."

Madhyamaka therefore do not assert any views. Not asserting a view does not mean "incapable of engaging in conventional discourse", something you gelugpas seem to be afraid of.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 16th, 2011 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Wine and Meat Offerings?

Content:

narraboth said:

There are really two views of this, one is mainly from great dza patrol rinpoche, as in Kunzang Lama Shelung he suggested that offering killed meat to wisdom deities is like offering a killed child's meat to his mother.

Malcolm wrote:

But of course wisdom deities do not perceive offerings in this way. This is our perception.

narraboth said:

Quite convincing i have to say.

Malcolm wrote:

If your view is lower tantra, perhaps.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Wine and Meat Offerings?

Content:

narraboth said:

theoritically they shouldn't even let outsiders see wine and meat on the shrine.

Malcolm wrote:

Those of us who follow ChNN follow what ChNN has to say. In this case, he says buy meat from markets, as many kinds as possible, sausage is better since it is made from the meat of many animals. When used in a ganapuja, it creates a cause for that animal's liberation.

Wine should be consumed in a mindful manner.

When you follow ChNN you follow the system of Dzogchen as he teaches it, since he is the only teacher that I know for a fact is a realized Dzogchen master. I am sure there are others, but I do not know that for a fact nor who they are. But I know ChNN is an awakened person and this is not because of my faith. This is because he has described his experience openly to a large extent. So I am certain he is an awakened person, beyond any doubt whatsoever.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Whether or not it includes God depends entirely on how God is defined. You are thinking of God as some sort of phenomena or concept, which is an error.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no God in Buddhism. You are not allowed to redefine Buddhist principles just as you please.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

I'm just saying, be careful of contexts (i.e. not to assume Indian cosmology is the same as Hellenic cosmology), think carefully about the metaphysics and don't assume all of this is totally nailed.

Malcolm wrote:

All you have to assume is the precise definition of cause and condition and the answer is clear -- there is no room for a creator god in Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 10:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

But we need to be a little more careful when thinking about his direct statements about the existence of the world in time. If the matter is clear cut, then why the silence?

Malcolm wrote:

He was never silent about the creation of conditioned entities. All effects must have causes, all causes are effects.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

And I do really think that there are some damn interesting dialogical possibilities with some strands within theism, which ought not automatically be closed down just because Buddhists feel comfortable enough in their own skin such that they can happily to refuse to bother with the most loaded signifier in history.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing interesting in theism at all. It is just pure delusion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 9:48 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

catmoon said:

First, Buddhism flatly denies the existence of a Creator.

tobes said:

Metaphysically, yes. But I'd be wary of the statement 'Buddhism flatly denies....' ~ the Buddha was famously silent on such questions. Strong negations come later.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha flatly denies a creator because the logic of dependent origination forbids it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I'm not sure who you mean by "we" (paleface), but the MMK is full of all kinds of views about sunyata, pratityasamutpada, etc

Malcolm wrote:

DO prescribed as the end of views in the MMK, not as a view in and of itself.

A view requires an existent or a non-existent. Since MMK shows that neither can be found, upon what could any view be based?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Paul said:

It is just for the sake of refuting non-Buddhist opponents
That the learned ones have promoted them

Astus said:

And for this purpose I'd like to see all the many reasons for the validity of the Buddhist
view vis-a-vis non-Buddhist views.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't have a view, per se, we just eliminate the incorrect views of others.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Monk?

Content:

Acchantika said:

My understanding is that traditionally, (native Tibetan) monks spend 9 years at a
monastery college studying, then 3 years doing PhD-equivalent studies, then a further 3
years in retreat in the case of Nyingma Dzogchen. At this point they receive certification
etc. So 15 years of hardcore study and retreat to become eligible to actually teach, at
least.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is good. Less is insufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: St. John of the Cross on Spiritual Materialism

Content:

mint said:

He may have even been a pratyekabuddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite impossible. Pratyekabuddhas only occur when there is no Buddha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 15th, 2011 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Monk?

Content:

Namdrol said:

They should be educated in the five major sciences, sutra, tantra, have done retreats, have gained some measure of signs of experience, skilled in giving explanations, in addition to having bodhicitta, and so on.

N

Clarence said:

Well, why don't you teach more then? You are qualified according to your own qualifications. BTW, I think you are qualified as well. Just something I have been think about lately.

Thanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe I am not so qualified, sometimes I still get mad in political discussions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Astus said:

I think this is going to an unintended direction. My question is if there are arguments to establish correct view on the conventional level.

Malcolm wrote:

In Madhyamaka, correct conventional is distinguished by efficiency. If it appears to work, it is correct conventional.

Of course, then there is famous example of a Geshe who challenged milarepa, who responded by banging on space with a stick as if it were a drum; or Candrakīrti who bumped into a pillar since he had his head in a book, and when challenged about reality of the pillar, passed his hand right through it.

Conventional reality is an appearance for the deluded.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Nagarjuna's view is the perfect union of conventional and ultimate truth.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Nagarjuna's view is the following:

"Since the Jina's have declared that nirvana alone is true, what wise person would not understand the rest is false?"

And:

"Neither samsara nor nirvana exist;
instead, nirvana is the thorough knowledge of samsara"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

edearl said:

Are there an Ultimate Buddhist Reality, a Conventional Buddhist Reality and other realities, or are other realities part of Conventional Buddhist Reality?

Do all Buddhist schools teach the same or different Ultimate and Conventional realities?

Malcolm wrote:

All expressed truths, both relative and ultimate, are part of conventional truth. For this reason, Haribhadra states that the entire path, including the attainment of Buddhahood, is completely illusory -- it is not real in anyway.

The unenumerated ultimate truth is inexpressible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Monk?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Even animals can benefit from hearing the sounds of holy Dharma, so it's not wrong to teach if your motivation is good.

Namdrol said:

An unqualified physician is the enemy of his patients, doing more harm than good.

Likewise, an unqualified dharma teacher is a mara for his students, sending both himself and his students to hell.

N

Clarence said:

Namdrol,

When do you consider someone qualified? Of course it depends on what they are teachings but I am sure some generalizations can be made.

Malcolm wrote:

They should be educated in the five major sciences, sutra, tantra, have done retreats, have gained some measure of signs of experience, skilled in giving explanations, in addition to having bodhicitta, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

There is no contradiction between the teachings of Dharmakirti and Nagarjuna.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is: Nagarjuna rejects the whole concept of pramana.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Conventional reality has gross and subtle aspects. The gross nature of conventional truth can be established by valid cognition as explained by Dignaga and Dharmakirti (this is very important) because forms such as our body are objects of valid minds and they perform the functions they appear to possess.

Namdrol said:

No, it can't. All conventional truths are objects of mistaken cognitions, per Candrakirti.

Tsongkhapa said:

It's important not to go to an extreme and negate the validity of all conventional truths.

Malcolm wrote:

Delusion is delusion. Better to recognize it for what it is, rather than making excuses for it and continuing in that way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Monk?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Even animals can benefit from hearing the sounds of holy Dharma, so it's not wrong to teach if your motivation is good.

Malcolm wrote:

An unqualified physician is the enemy of his patients, doing more harm than good.

Likewise, an unqualified dharma teacher is a mara for his students, sending both himself and his students to hell.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

catmoon said:

I wonder tho, if I start digging into Prasangika-Madhyamaka, is that going to throw me into conflict with my foundation in Gelug orthodoxy?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since you will discover that gelug "prasanga" is not the "prasanga" of the founder of Prasanga, Batsab Nyima Drag.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Conventional Reality

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Conventional reality has gross and subtle aspects. The gross nature of conventional truth can be established by valid cognition as explained by Dignaga and Dharmakirti (this is very important) because forms such as our body are objects of valid minds and they perform the functions they appear to possess.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it can't. All conventional truths are objects of mistaken cognitions, per Candrakirti.

Tsongkhapafan said:

The subtle conventional reality, that is, form being a manifestation of emptiness can also be established by the same reasons that establish emptiness, since they are one nature.

Malcolm wrote:

See above.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Monk?

Content:

wisdom said:

My only ambition in life is ... to be a spiritual teacher for others,

Namdrol said:

Big Ego Trip.

Best to give it up.

wisdom said:

Thanks Namdrol, this is sage advice.

Malcolm wrote:

The first principle is: anyone who thinks of being a teacher, must first understand there are many teachers superior to him or herself. So in this case, better to send prospective students to one's own or another teacher.

If in the end it turns out that someone really cannot enter the dharma without your help, then and only then is it really necessary for you to act as a teacher. Then it does not become an ego trip.

But even in this case, if you do not have sufficient knowledge, understanding and practical experience, you really cannot help others, you will only harm them.

In this case, it is better not to teach, even if there are no other teachers available.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Own-being cannot be cognized

Content:

Kyosan said:

I disagree that phenomena cannot be perceived.

Malcolm wrote:

He is saying there are no phenomena qua phenomena, rather, there are only appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Own-being cannot be cognized

Content:

norman said:

" Form itself does not possess the own-being of form, etc. Perfect wisdom does not possess the mark (of being) 'perfect wisdom.' A mark does not possess the own-being of a mark. The marked does not possess the own-being of being marked, and own-being does not possess the mark of [being] own-being. "

- Prajnaparamita in 8000 lines

"Own-being" is therefore not cognizable as an object of thought.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it can be an object of thought as an abstraction i.e. as a mere name. But a svabhāva cannot be perceived since there is no such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jungian Archetype thingy in my opinion is basically metaphysical nonsense.

Lhug-Pa said:

Nice^^^

Padma Norbu

Hm I remember reading where Vajranatha wrote that:

<http://vajranatha.com/teaching/Simhamukha.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

You may not agree with Vajranatha, but his and some other's exploring of these kinds of cross-cultural connections is far from "ridiculous" or "bologna".

Don't really want to debate it right now though.

May you achieve Omniscience through Dharma practice, and know if these things are true or not through direct-experience (Gnosis).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: Commie scums and capitalist pigs!!!

Content:

Acchantika said:

Economic Left/Right: -6.38

Social Libertarian/Authoritarian: -8.05

Fight the power, man.

" If you're not liberal when you're young, you have no heart.

If you're not conservative when you're old, you have no brain." ~ Anonymous

Namdrol said:

Winston Churchill.

Acchantika said:

" There is no record of anyone hearing Churchill say this. "

~ <http://www.winstonchurchill.org/learn/speeches/quotations/quotes-falsely-attributed>
" The phrase originated with Francois Guisot (1787-1874): "Not to be a republican at twenty is proof of want of heart; to be one at thirty is proof of want of head." It was revived by French Premier Georges Clemenceau (1841-1929): "Not to be a socialist at twenty is proof of want of heart; to be one at thirty is proof of want of head. "

~ https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/List_of_misquotations "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
Sorry old chap.

Malcolm wrote:

Hey, blame my dad -- he was the one that communicated it to me.

Incidentally, this does not mean that Churchill did not repeat it himself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

mantrika said:

Is there also a practice text available for Nyangyud Khorva Dongtruk?

Malcolm wrote:

not yet

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

KevinSolway said:

The Buddha had the right idea, for when he criticized things like "the All", for example, he would qualify it as "the All as a phenomena". And then he would explain the errors associated with the idea of "the All as a phenomena".

Malcolm wrote:

He did -- there is such a sutta.

"Monks, I will teach you the All as a phenomenon to be abandoned. Listen & pay close attention. I will speak."

"As you say, lord," the monks responded.

The Blessed One said, "And which All is a phenomenon to be abandoned? The eye is to be abandoned. [1] Forms are to be abandoned. Consciousness at the eye is to be abandoned. Contact at the eye is to be abandoned. And whatever there is that arises in dependence on contact at the eye — experienced as pleasure, pain or neither-pleasure-nor-pain — that too is to be abandoned.

"The ear is to be abandoned. Sounds are to be abandoned...

"The nose is to be abandoned. Aromas are to be abandoned...

"The tongue is to be abandoned. Flavors are to be abandoned...

"The body is to be abandoned. Tactile sensations are to be abandoned...

"The intellect is to be abandoned. Ideas are to be abandoned. Consciousness at the intellect is to be abandoned. Contact at the intellect is to be abandoned. And whatever there is that arises in dependence on contact at the intellect — experienced as pleasure, pain or neither-pleasure-nor-pain — that too is to be abandoned.

"This is called the All as a phenomenon to be abandoned."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Commie scums and capitalist pigs!!!

Content:

Acchantika said:

Economic Left/Right: -6.38

Social Libertarian/Authoritarian: -8.05

Fight the power, man.

" If you're not liberal when you're young, you have no heart.

If you're not conservative when you're old, you have no brain." ~ Anonymous

Malcolm wrote:

Winston Churchill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

deepbluehum said:

You don't think the idea of Jesus as bodhisattva or Buddha is interesting?

Silly.

KevinSolway said:

So you think the Dalai Lama is silly?

It's very unusual on forums such as these for anyone to say a bad word against the Dalai Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

I think HHDL understands that the word bodhisattva has come to mean "compassionate person", and that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

If someone should assert brahmin as an ultimate truth, it means they have not understood even a single word of the Buddha's teaching, let alone have any realization whatsoever.

KevinSolway said:

Buddhists do not get to define the meaning of words from other traditions. I mean that you can certainly define the word "Brahman" to mean something other than "Ultimate Truth" if you want to. You can even define it to be a tea-cup if you want to. But it is pointless to do so, since others have their own meaning for the term, which has nothing to do with the meaning you are giving to it.

Malcolm wrote:

You misunderstand -- if Hindus define brahmin as an ultimate truth, that definition will never be accepted by Buddhists. Such a person who defines brahmin as ultimate in any way, shape or form is not a Buddhist.

For Hindus atman and brahman are interchangeable.

What I am telling you is not that Buddhists are redefining brahman -- instead I am telling that we reject the Hindu ideas about what is ultimate entirely. What they consider ultimate, we consider to be a non-existent, an imputation, a false thought.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Commie scums and capitalist pigs!!!

Content:

gregkavarnos said:
there it is ladies and gentlemen our very first dharmawheel +/+.

Will said:
And probably the only one - you silly people.

Malcolm wrote:
We need a token conservative around here.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 2:55 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:
Kunga Lhadzom said:
When something that is read is also comprehended, you are the same as the one that wrote it.

KevinSolway said:
There are many different levels of comprehension. And there is also zero comprehension, which is more far more common than people imagine.

The understanding of Brahman, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brahman>, requires an exceptional type of comprehension that isn't found in everyone.

Malcolm wrote:
Brahmin is not an ultimate truth for Buddhists. It is an ultimate truth for certain schools of Hindus.

If someone should assert brahmin as an ultimate truth, it means they have not understood even a single word of the Buddha's teaching, let alone have any realization whatsoever.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 2:53 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:
Namdrol said:
You don't think the idea of Jesus as bodhisattva or Buddha is interesting?
Nope, pretty boring. But then I was never baptized and was not raised in a Christian household.

KevinSolway said:

Well I think that the recognition of a bodhisattva, and the recognition of a whole new Dharma teaching, is very significant.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't. I don't even think that is what is happening.

KevinSolway said:

While I respect your book learning, I don't believe you have anything more than book-learning regarding such matters. So I don't believe you are qualified to speak on the true nature of Brahman, or the Dharmakaya, etc. You can only repeat what you have read.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not the first person to make that error, nor the last.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

padma norbu said:

So far, it seems to me like all of these debates led by KevinSolway have been pointless. Other than the "mental rebirth" concept he introduced in the "Are Karma And Rebirth For Real?" thread, the rest have been about God, The All, Ultimate Truth and Dharmakaya... with no worthwhile point ever being made.

KevinSolway said:

You don't think the idea of Jesus as bodhisattva or Buddha is interesting?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, pretty boring. But then I was never baptized and was not raised in a Christian household.

KevinSolway said:

Or the similarities between the Hindu "Brahman" and the Dharmakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

There are no similarties— I can say that because I have studied Vedanta, Advaita, Vistadvaita, and so on quite thoroughly.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

padma norbu said:

So far, it seems to me like all of these debates led by KevinSolway have been pointless. Other than the "mental rebirth" concept he introduced in the "Are Karma And Rebirth For Real?" thread, the rest have been about God, The All, Ultimate Truth and Dharmakaya... with no worthwhile point ever being made.

Malcolm wrote:

Most of the conversations on the internet are pointless.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

oops, almost forgot...does the practice that Rinpoche gave last night work the same as Purification of the Six Lokas?

Malcolm wrote:

It is similar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Wine and Meat Offerings?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Im glad this was brought up. I am still struggling with this. Does anyone know if Shabkar Lama participated in Ganapujas?

Malcolm wrote:

He did.

Ganapujas are about going beyind limitations.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Quacks practicing without a license need to get ostracized publicly.

Malcolm wrote:

From experience, I can tell you that trying to maintain such standards on an internet board just leads to a world of conflict.

On the internet, everything is caveat emptor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Brahma-Vishnu-Shiva trinity idea comes from Samkya philosophy and three gunas.

Buddhism has a long history of easily trouncing three gunas; perhaps you are not aware.

See Bodhicaryavatara.

Namdrol said:

Yes, however, they are also adopted into Buddhism via the Kalacakra tantra as well as the Samupta tantra.

N

deepbluehum said:

Just to keep this bit going: Three Gunas = Hinduism. Three gunas has not been adopted into legitimate Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

The three gunas (rnam gsum yon tan), sattva, rajas and tamas (snying stobs, rdul, mun) are discussed at length and used as important concepts in Kalacakra as well as some other Buddhist tantras.

It's just a simple fact. The way the three gunas are used in these tantras and their commentaries is very interesting.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Commie scums and capitalist pigs!!!

Content:

Pero said:

Economic Left/Right: -8.00

Social Libertarian/Authoritarian: -4.82

So uhm, can someone explain to my uneducated self what this means?
I don't get these numbers.

Malcolm wrote:

It means you are junior tree-hugger.

The only reason my score was in the low -7s is that I did not put all strongly agree or disagree; some were only agree, disagree, since they were questions I do not have strong feelings about.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 14th, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

deepbluehum said:

All you are is a self-appointed savant.

Malcolm wrote:

That applies to us all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Occupy wall street

Content:

tobes said:

In this sense, neoliberalism is profoundly totalitarian. It does not tolerate dissent, and is brazen in its contempt for anything genuinely democratic.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, unlike totalitarian regimes, the "free-market" neo-liberal corporations blackmail nations into suppressing dissent for them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: The Dharmakaya. The Truth Body.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According Vasubandhu, the meaning of dhātu is mine i.e. source.

The definition Tibetans (such as Longchenpa and Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen) give for dbying is dbyung gnas i.e. source. The proper, though clumsy translation, of dharmadhātu i.e. chos kyi dbying in a Mahāyāna context therefore, is "source of phenomena".

In Abhidharma dharmadhātu means the object of the mind, comprised all mental factors as well as three unconditioned phenomena. To distinguish this Abhidharma concept of dharmadhātu the Tibetans translate it as chos kyi kham i.e. element of phenomena.

deepbluehum said:

Honestly, I do not ascribe to those descriptions. It's a lot of poetry only, mostly based on faulty translations of faulty Abhidharma analyses (making the basic subjects far more complicated and abstract than they need to be), that have in turn given rise to entirely faulty traditions. But you can look at the early suttas yourself to see how the Buddha used the words dharma, dhatu and ayatana.

(Mula Sutta)

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an10/an10.058.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

(Dhatu Sutta)

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn25/sn25.009.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

(Sabba Sutta)

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn35/sn35.023.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

"Space of Phenomena" is a bad translation of dharmadhatu. Then one gets into a whole bunch of stuff about space and yoga, which in my opinion is on a wrong track. I am a Vajrayana practitioner mind you, so I am not discounting the power of the path of methods.

padma norbu said:

You should be a guru then, no? It seems to me your understanding must be beyond those of the teacher you follow if you are a vajrayana practitioner.

deepbluehum said:

I cannot stress enough, one must clearly understand what "a dharma" is in Buddhist terms. This will clear up a lot. If you know in simple and clear terms what "a dharma" is, then what a "dharmakaya" or a "dharmadhatu" is will be very clear. There is no dharma apart from perception and cognition. So right there you are Xing out "outer" phenomena such as space. Also there is no such thing as "intrinsic awareness" in Buddhism, so there is no "inner space" either. Light touches the retina (phassa) and the brain constructs an image (vinnana); the mind says "this is X" (namarupa). You get some feeling (vedana) of pleasure or pain, and love or hate it (upadana), which makes you want to do something about it (tanha). In other words, 12-links is the dharmadhatu/dharmakaya. There is no "dharma" apart from 12-links, so how could there be a "dharmadhatu" or a "dharmakaya" that is something else either? Not knowing this is avidya. Knowing this is vidya (wisdom).

padma norbu said:

"Like space" is not the same as space. "Space of Phenomena" is not talking about actual space. It is likened to space because, what else could you compare it to? All the analogies, such as the crystal ball, the mirror, the sun and space are just analogies, and always explained as such.

Despite what you have just said, I see no error in the Vajrayana definitions which was supposedly pointed out in the suttas you linked. If "dharmadhatu" is exactly the same as "dharmakaya," why did he use two terms? And why are all the Tibetan gurus apparently not as knowledgeable in the matter as you are?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

KevinSolway said:

I am the Buddha of the Internet.

Malcolm wrote:

All your dharma are belong to us....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Monk?

Content:

wisdom said:

My only ambition in life is ... to be a spiritual teacher for others,

Malcolm wrote:

Big Ego Trip.

Best to give it up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Commie scums and capitalist pigs!!!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Economic Left/Right: -7.75

Social Libertarian/Authoritarian: -7.08

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Aw well the schedule said 10 - 12AM, so unless it were a 14 hour webcast, one would assume that 10PM to 12AM was meant. But that's why I sent an email asking about it. Eh... like I said, since no one responded, I should have gotten up early just in case. Well, if I get my Dzogchen Community membership-password soon, I can still watch it before the live Anniversary Transmission Webcast on the 20th.

And I'd actually purchased a copy of the Song of the Vajra book on Amazon.com a couple weeks ago. Although I didn't read it yet, and didn't intend to until after having started practice. So it's sitting on my altar right now. I figured if there's a restricted book floating around on Amazon, if someone is going to get it it might as well be me, since I knew I'll treat it with respect. Maybe that's only pride and false justification though. But what's done is done. At least it's ready to be studied as soon as Receiving the Transmission.

Malcolm wrote:

Transmission comes along with doing Guru Yoga with Rinpoche. So tune in tomorrow morning, three am your time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Lama Dawa Rinpoche Live Webcast 19-20 November

Content:

catmoon said:

Is this the same Lama Dawa that does the divinations?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Thanks Pero, Namdrol and Fa Dao

Namdrol, do you mean that the Guru Yoga Transmission Webcaste actually was early this morning in the USA time zones!?

Here's the body of an email I sent but didn't get any response:

To be sure, the next few days of the Guru Yoga Webcaste of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche from Tenerife are from 10PM to 12AM GMT?

Just want to make sure that 10AM - 12 was not meant by chance.

I'm in the Rocky Mountain timezone so figured that according to the Tenerife retreat schedule, it would be at 3PM here today.

Well it would be my fault for not getting up before 3AM just in case....

Malcolm wrote:

No, three am.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Okay so what I meant is, since the Direct Introduction is as you say the meaning of the Four Empowerments, that we are Receiving not only the Four Empowerments of Vajrayana by default, but also the very essence and meaning of them?

About Dzogchen Samaya: So then it goes back to what I'd said at first, that we basically only have one Samaya, that is, to remain in Awareness of the Natural State, but also with Awareness of that by remaining in this Presence or Awareness we are eliminating or better said Self-Liberating the poisons/afflictions (i.e. kleshas, klistas, vasanas, samskaras, etc.) that obscure or cause us to have deluded perception of our Body, Speech, and Mind?

Another critical question:

If, in attending a Transmission, our minds are suffering afflictions at the moment of the Direct Introduction, we would most likely not recognize the Natural State at that moment? So in this case would the 'seed still be planted' so to speak, so that we could proceed with Rushen or Semdzin practice as to recognize that 'seed'? Or in such a case would it better to—instead of proceeding to practice Dzogchen—wait for another Transmission and in the meantime practice Shamatha/Zhine so that the next time we attend a Transmission our consciousness is more ripe for being simultaneous with the Guru's Pointing Out of the Natural State at the moment of Direct Introduction to the Nature of Mind?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to listen to this morning's talk again. Also you should get and read the Song of the Vajra book, which is Rinpoche's best general explanation of Dzogchen anywhere.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Brahma-Vishnu-Shiva trinity idea comes from Samkya philosophy and three gunas. Buddhism has a long history of easily trouncing three gunas; perhaps you are not aware. See Bodhicaryavatara.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, however, they are also adopted into Buddhism via the Kalacakra tantra as well as the Samupta tantra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 13th, 2011 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

so how would using those characters have prevented Tibetans from pronouncing the Sankrit with tonal alterations?

Malcolm wrote:

training.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 12th, 2011 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

When we Receive the Introduction to the Natural State and Nature of Mind, I take it that the Four Empowerments of Vajrayana are included in It (?)

And if the Guru doesn't explain during the Teaching the Samaya(s) that comes with that Transmission, do we go ahead with just the one Samaya of remaining in the Natural State from moment to moment?

Or does Receiving the Dzogchen Transmission, without explanation of which Samaya(s) come with the Transmission, automatically imply the 28 Samayas of Dzogchen and/or the four Samayas of Trekchö and Thögal? (Which are listed in Enlightened Journey by Tulku Thondup)

(Of course the Samayas of Thögal wouldn't apply until we're actually at the level of Thögal)

Malcolm wrote:

,

Direct introduction is the mother of all empowerments, or so it is said. It does not contain all four empowerments. It is the meaning of the four empowerments.

As ChNN says, the principle is not empowerment and then vows; the principle is introduction and then maintaining. It does not mean you have no samaya. You do. But it is basically boils down to the body, speech and mind samayas common to Nyingma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 12th, 2011 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Nangwa said:

You get used to the accent.

ChNN's accent is actually very light in comparison.

mint said:

It's not just the accent; the accent I can work with, maybe. It's his phrasing, the stop/start of needing to be translated, the stop/start of poor buffering, etc. It's extremely difficult to comprehend such deep subject matter with such distractions. I seriously have yet to understand a single concept he's tried to convey yet because I don't know what concepts he's trying to convey.

Malcolm wrote:

Keep listening and reading.

It is not that complicated. You have a primordial state. You don't know what it is. This is how to discover it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 12th, 2011 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Thanks Namdrol. I may address this more later....

For now though, it looks like today's Webcast is audio only?

Will the Transmission on the 20th be audio and video?

Malcolm wrote:

I have video

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:
Buddhists just don't see it that way.

KevinSolway said:
It's possible that the Brahma in the Buddhist scriptures has a completely different meaning than it has in other religious traditions. But it certainly makes it confusing if the Buddha used words in his teaching that borrow from other religious traditions, but used them with a different meaning.

Malcolm wrote:
The Buddha does this all the time. For example, he terms a brahmin someone who is very virtuous; not someone from a particular family.

Mahāpitṛ Brahma (the one that is held to be the creator, so called the Brahma the great ancestor), in Buddhist texts, is understood to consider himself as the creator of the universe, but the Buddha personally ridicules him for this conceit in several places. The Buddha taught that the universe has no creator.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 9:24 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:
padma norbu said:
It's interesting how KevinSolway still does not get that dharmakaya is a state.

KevinSolway said:
I have no idea how you get to that conclusion from the fact that the Brahma of the Buddhist scriptures is an aspect of Brahman, the Supreme Godhead

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhists just don't see it that way. We don't accept the existence of brahman at all. In fact, we explicitly reject it as eternalism.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 8:55 PM
Title: Re: How Many Transmissions?
Content:
wisdom said:
How many transmissions can a Dzogchen student receive?
Should one strive to receive transmission from as many Gurus as possible when the opportunity arises?
Also assuming that you receive transmission from a Guru who is very busy and travels, how does one know when/how to progress with teachings when the teacher might be practically inaccessible due to traveling and having hundreds or thousands of students?

Malcolm wrote:
Limitless.

That depends on you. I have received teachings from perhaps forty gurus. Most of them Nyingma. I received Dzogchen transmission from seven of them. Three of them I am close to and have received many transmissions from. One is my primary root guru, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, though in reality for me they are all Vajrasattva, but in the end, I am a Dzogchen Community person.

Rely on your vajra brothers and sisters. They will help you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Namdrol said:

The Buddhist counterpart is called "demarcating the boundaries" also known as the protection cakra. It is generally done at the beginning of more elaborate practices.

Lhug-Pa said:

Is there any direct relation at all between the practices of Vajrakilaya or Guru Tragphur and Demarcating the Boundaries/Protection Chakra?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in some types of lower tantra, kīlas are used to establish boundaries.

Namdrol said:

In Dzogchen, rig pa is the ultimate protection cakra, obviating the need for any explicit rites of protection.

This I do not doubt at all; although for reference, will you please cite any sources for this?

Malcolm wrote:

The protection cakra section of many anuyoga level sadhanas make this point.

Namdrol said:

I suggest you follow Dzogchen as a path unto itself and leave off all this other metaphysical/esoteric stuff. Eventually, it will just be so much dead weight. No need to

carry it around.
That seems to be the general consensus around here.

And I agree with it to an extent. However I've addressed this in the "Rushen Preliminaries of Bönpo Dzogchen" thread.

Malcolm wrote:
Who needs anything other than the stainless teaching of the Buddha and Garab Dorje?
The rest is all just a distraction.

Studying Crowley led me to Dharma. But I don't spend much time at all thinking about or referencing Crowley and Thelema and so on. For me, it is obsolete. Likewise, the whole western esoteric tradition with its Qabala, godforms, masonic roots, tarot and so on is obsolete for me. Once I gave myself to the Dharma, these things just became irrelevant.

Your time would be better spent on getting a handle on the five major and minor sciences, the study of Abhidharma and so on. At least this is directly connected with the teachings.

N

Best Regards[/quote]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

kirtu said:

Perhaps you do not recognize homelessness. No one out on the street has asked you for money?

<http://www.coalitionforthehomeless.org/pages/basic-facts>

Kirt

alwayson said:

If you are using that criterion, I have seen some in America.

But all countries will have that. You can't do anything about it.

Malcolm wrote:

All countries do not have homelessness.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Yeah well hey if that's what you mean by point by point I can understand why you think it would be tedious bullshit.

Malcolm wrote:

The point by point thing is tedious because basically, the libertarian party will never gain power in this country.

We can agree that there is no way a third party will be a relevant force in American politics. You think it is because of "entitlement" programs and so on.

I think it is because corporations have their hands too deep in American politics and that so called free market thinking has been systematically destroying the middle class in America, a middle class that was birthed and grown under a Keynesian model.

I see the headlong rush of the rest of the world's economies to follow our example to be folly unparalleled.

Instead of increased centralization and more policies that favor growth and expansion, we need to do a global about face, reduce world populations, etc.

You know the drill.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

always on said:

Where are the impoverished masses resorting to cannibalism?

Like I said before, most "poor" people in America have air conditioning, a fridge, XBOX 360, DVD player, flat screens etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Gadgets bought on credit cards are not wealth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Hence all the armies, navies and fighter jets with Starbucks, Canon, Macy's, IBM, Microsoft, Merck, etc, logos on them. Check.

Malcolm wrote:

Only a matter of time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Hence all the armies, navies and fighter jets with Starbucks, Canon, Macy's, IBM, Microsoft, Merck, etc, logos on them. Check.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, had you studied history, you would have read about the Marine General, who upon retiring, detailed all the American adventures in Central America and elsewhere that he fought for Dole, etc.

Or the perhaps you recall the Allende government that was undermined by the CIA because Allende was going to nationalize the mines. ALCOA had a hand in that and benefitted mightly.

I could do on. The fact is that we do engage in military adventures precisely to benefit US corporations. Now that we have international corporations, we use NATO.

Lockheed Martin would be the logo you are thinking of, BTW.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Also, at a certain point, the point by point becomes tedious bullshit.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Especially when you have all the answers. Got it.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, I detest Ayn Rand. She was an evil bitch. She worshipped serial killers. Milton Friedman was her minion. Ron Paul named his kid Rand. Need I say more?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

It would certainly result in less wars.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Oh ya and wars. Right. Cause Libertarians love wars. Like, you know, Ron Paul wants to stay in Iraq forever and thought it was a really good idea to invade. Right. Forgot. Sorry. Check check.

Malcolm wrote:

War is a result of unimpeded capitalism. Wars are fought because it is profitable. When libertarian capitalist see there is more profit in a war than in peace, they will go to war likely split.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

You will be moved like cattle into large cities, warrens, really ...

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Uh this already happened it was called the industrial revolution.

Oh yeah I forgot, cities. Cities bad. Calhoun's rats. Dark Satanic Mills. Cities bad. All

that. Got it. Check. Roger.

Malcolm wrote:

Large cities are pretty horrible, most of them. They smell bad, they are polluted, people who live in them tend to be pretty stressed out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

They are all evil bastards.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

So instead of using a computer made by a corporation, using a server run by a corporation over a phone line run by a corporation, using electricity produced by a corporation, generated by power administered by a corporation, from oil mined by a corporation, strip naked and wear a grass skirt and walk to me to deliver your messages to me on tree bark. That way I'd respect your outrage.

Malcolm wrote:

tried it, no one listened.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

And yes, corporations are evil and they are basically sociopaths and serial killers.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

That is the most paranoid, deranged, pathologically insane thing I have ever heard anyone say on these boards.

Malcolm wrote:

Funny you post that -- you really want me to go through the list of labor, environmental, health and so on abuses of the corporate groups that produce all those commodities?

Just take ALCOA -- it has one of the worst pollution records. In addition, The Brazilian government used Agent Orange to defoliate a large section of the Amazon rainforest so that Alcoa could build the Tucuruí dam to power mining operations. Large areas of rainforest were destroyed, along with the homes and livelihoods of thousands of rural

peasants and indigenous tribes. They run terrible sweatshops Mexico and elsewhere:
<http://www.globallabourrights.org/reports?id=0220> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I could go on.

They are all evil bastards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

The middle class is all but dead.

alwayson said:

You are kidding me right?

Chill Namdrol....

Go to Best Buy or something. Play some Wii or Xbox 360.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, you just don't get it -- Wii etc., cheap electronic gadgets are just crack to keep the increasingly impoverished masses passive, bovine and content.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Market transparency means transparency to corporations -- we know, that like their human counterparts, they don't give a frak about anything other than enriching themselves at the expense of others.

alwayson said:

Not again with corporations being evil.

Go to India where meat is so expensive.

Corporations allow Americans to maintain a middle class lifestyle on multiple levels.

Malcolm wrote:

And yes, corporations are evil and they are basically sociopaths and serial killers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

Market transparency means transparency to corporations -- we know, that like their human counterparts, they don't give a frak about anything other than enriching themselves at the expense of others.

alwayson said:

Not again with corporations being evil.

Go to India where meat is so expensive.

Corporations allow Americans to maintain a middle class lifestyle.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they don't. The middle class lifestyle is swiftly disappearing in the US? Why? Corporations and neo-liberalization of trade. Cost of living has been rising steadily against wages for years in the US. The middle class is all but dead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Look at the American deficit, is that due to the socialist agendas of Americas political parties? NO!!!

alwayson said:

Is this supposed to be a joke?

43% (and exponentially increasing with population) of our debt in America is caused by socialistic entitlement programs such as Medicare and Social Security.

I mean, thats just fact.

Malcolm wrote:
NO, this is false.

Budget for 2011
\$2.627 trillion (estimated) [1]

Total expenditures \$3.729 trillion

There is a 1.101 trillion dollar deficit.

So, lets say we look at the numbers:

\$553.0 billion (+0.7%) - Department of Defense
\$118.0 billion (-26.0%) - Overseas Contingency Operations

Right there, you have 671 Billion. That is more than half of the deficit. All that military entitlement spending.

Medicare and Medicaid combined is like 754 Billion.

So, like most Rebuplicants, you want to keep the army and spend more money on it, but strip people of already inadequate health care.

SSI brings in \$925 billion - Social Security and other payroll tax
It spends \$761 billion

Looks to be like SSI pays for itself pretty damn well. Nothing socialist there.

The simplest thing to do, to pay for the whole thing is redistribute some wealth from the %1. Yes, raise taxes of rich people, since they are not creating an goddamned job and are just bloodsuckers, capitalist leeches.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Look at the American deficit, is that due to the socialist agendas of Americas political parties? NO!!!

alwayson said:

Is this supposed to be a joke?

Most of our debt in America is caused by socialistic entitlement programs such as Medicare and Social Security.

I mean, thats just fact.

Malcolm wrote:

These are not socialist programs, since people pay FICA out of their paychecks for them every week. We PAY for SS. Or did that little fact escape your attention.

The problem with our country is that there is no enough socialism in it; not that there is too much.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

kirtu said:

The so-called neo-liberalism thing is almost certainly on the way out. Anyway, how can you actually expect a group of social democracies to support a version of laissez-faire capitalism + fixed markets in international trade? Or do you have another view of neo-liberalism?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

My view of neo-liberalism is that WTO type agreements have basically caught everyone in a neo-liberal free trade nightmare. Look at all the so alled "austerity" measures being enforced by banks on this and that country. International capital has become a more powerful force than national governments, which is the whole point and goal of the neo-liberal agenda from the beginning i.e. less regulation, more market transparency, weaker unions, more profits, etc.

I think neo-liberalism is more powerful than ever, not weaker.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Virgo said:

I'll ask Robert Kirkpatrick because I remember discussing this with him in Thailand.

This is from wikipedia:

"Brahmā Sahampati, said to be the most senior of the Mahābrahmās, was the deity who invisibly attended on the Buddha when he attained enlightenment, and when the Buddha was meditating at Uruvelā afterwards, encouraged him to teach the Dharma to humans. According to some commentaries he was an anagami (non-returner),[2] one of the Śuddhāvāsa (Pure Abodes) deities. He was the rebirth of a monk named Sahaka, who had been in the Saṅgha of Kāśyapa Buddha.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

I just had a look around the bka' gyur and bstan 'gyur -- and it appears everywhere that Sahampati is listed with worldly gods such as Indra, the four guardians and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Virgo said:

According to Theravada Commentaries, He (Brahma Sahampati) is actually an Anagami, having attained that stage under a past Buddha, and been reborn as a Brahma.

Malcolm wrote:

That's interesting. This is a commentarial difference. AFAIK, according to Sarvastivada, etc, beings can fall into five pure abodes from the arupyadhātu, which rules out their solely being locations of aryas. I will have to find out if Sahampati is considered an arya in Sarvastivada, since I don't know.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Look at the American deficit, is that due to the socialist agendas of Americas political parties? NO!!!

Malcolm wrote:
According to Faux news, yes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 11th, 2011 at 2:46 AM
Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy
Content:
Namdrol said:
The Greek debt Crisis was caused by running large deficits

N

alwayson said:
You say large deficits.

I say socialism.

We are saying the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:
Deficits are a perfectly capitalist way of doing business. All governments run on debt.
They always have.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 11:17 PM
Title: Re: Are women conscious?
Content:
Namdrol said:
... see past the end of their own dicks.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
For the third dang time, as an inveterate wanker I take offense to the dick slandery that goes on in this forum. I personally find my dick to lead to all kinds of upaya in the name of world peace.

Heeheehehehehehehehe!

Malcolm wrote:
I wasn't slandering dicks, I was pointing out the faults of myopia-- completely different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is time for the Euro to go.

N

Sönam said:

It's time for Euro to go federalism ... altogether, European countries have no problem and are strong. When one step is made to go "One World", also when at first it's made for business purpose, it's a positive step ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

You will regret -- it would be better for European countries to return to their own currencies and dismantle the EU. The EU is actually a policy agenda of neo-liberalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Are women conscious?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Rousseau once said "Women, in general, are not attracted to art at all, nor knowledge, and not at all to genius".

Malcolm wrote:

Typical blind misogyny. Of course, if you like you can find many men whose thinking about the other sex is quite primitive and dismissive, since they cannot, in their myopia, see past the end of their own dicks.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Are women conscious?

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Before the mods ban you, I commend you. You have been running rings round everyone since you got here precisely because no one can apparently understand the fact that all of what you say is a JOKE.

Malcolm wrote:

KTD, sadly, it is not true. I first encountered Kevin and David Quinn on Buddha-l and Buddhist back in the 1990's. They have very persistent and consistent.

I don't think they are joking at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Are women conscious?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Frankly, Kevin, to be blunt -- this is a very stupid way to put things. To say that male = consciousness and female = unconsciousness is plain stupid.

KevinSolway said:

I don't know how many of the people that have been participating in this "Dharma-free-for-all" forum, since I've been here, are physically female, but I strongly suspect that the number is no higher than one or two.

I run a Youtube channel about philosophy with almost 1,500 subscribers, only 3% of which are female, and of that 3% at least half a dozen of them are male-to-female transsexuals.

This lack of interest in philosophy, and lack of interest in the realm of ideas, by those who are physically female, is no coincidence.

How many female geniuses have there been throughout the whole of human history? None, so far as any thinking being can tell. Perhaps there are one or two who are marginal.

Malcolm wrote:

Kevin:

Has it ever occurred to you once that perhaps women's general lack of interest in your philosophy has to do with its misogynistic bent?

You see, I never participate in "philosophical" discussions of mysandrous feminsists.

What would be the point?

So why should women participate "philosophical" discussions of misogynists men?

Your imputation about female geniuses is very immature. There have been countless female geniuses in all fields. For example, the first computer program was written by Lovelace. Here is a short list compiled out of 4000 years of famous woman in science.

<http://www.astr.ua.edu/4000WS/timelist.shtml> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

You are stuck, Kevin. Just accept it and move on. You are reading history through a thick lense of mysogyny.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Are women conscious?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

It's a matter of consciousness vs unconsciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, Kevin, to be blunt -- this is a very stupid way to put things. To say that male = consciousness and female = unconsciousness is plain stupid.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: "stress" in translations from Pali & Sanskrit

Content:

Aemilius said:

How does that word sound in your ear ?

Malcolm wrote:

Stupid. Effluent is better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Are women conscious?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Fortunately, this does apply to all Mahāyāna sutras, the episode with the Goddess of the Ganges being a pointed example:

KevinSolway said:

Even Hsuan Hua, the so-called "misogynist" relates the case of the dragon king's daughter:

"When Sariputra said that she could not become a Buddha, she took a precious gem, her most valuable and cherished possession, and offered it to the Buddha, who accepted it. She then asked Sariputra if the Buddha's acceptance of her offering was fast, and he replied that, indeed, it had been quick. "I shall become a Buddha that quickly," she said and then she became a Buddha. This is proof that women's lot is not hopeless. All they must do is resolve to cultivate courageously and they too can become Buddhas."

Malcolm wrote:

Not a perfect example. In the actual text of the sutra, the Saddharmapundrika, before the nāgā princess becomes a Buddha, she first transforms into a male bodhisattva and then becomes a Buddha.

KevinSolway said:

Different sutras are written for those of different capacity. Those with a misogynistic bent, are, from my perspective, written intending those of lower capacity i.e. men who suffer from mysogyny and woman who suffer at the hands of misogynistic men and wish to escape their "lower birth".

Your interpretation is mistaken. I haven't seen any sutras with a misogynistic bent. It takes but a single moment for a woman to be reborn as a man, provided the conditions are met.

Malcolm wrote:

You are a misogynist, so naturally you don't see these texts as being "misogynistic".

There is no reason why a woman should want to be a man, apart from men telling her that her state is inferior.

KevinSolway said:

Remember that rebirth is not about physical bodies, but mental ones. A woman does not require the physical form of a male to be reborn as male.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth is minds appropriating physical bodies, Kevin.

KevinSolway said:

The truth is that there is no such thing as gender in phenomena

You said yourself that different beings have different capacities. That is what we are talking about here. It's nothing to do with physical sex. A person with a woman's physical body can mentally be male. In that case she has been reborn as a man.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, there is no reason why a woman would want to be any other gender than the one she possesses, the same for a man -- unless said person has transgender impulses.

In Buddhist texts, men are considered method, but woman, wisdom. Awakening comes about from uniting means and wisdom.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Ultimate Truth

Content:

Sherab said:

Hi KevinSolway, I've a question for you:

The relative truth refers to all that is conditioned.

The ultimate truth refers to all that is unconditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

This fails the test of a basic syllogism:

All that is unconditioned is ultimate truth;

space is unconditioned;

space is ultimate truth.

Your statement is therefore false because space is definitely not an ultimate truth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Are women conscious?

Content:

padma norbu said:

So, Namdrol, do women have the 5 poisons, then? Or not? While it was traditional in Buddhism due to cultural circumstances and implications to find a male human birth most favorable, is there anything to suggest women are not conscious?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, women are sentient beings, obviously, and they have three or five poisons. No, there is nothing to suggest in traditional literature that women are not conscious, indeed, there were many female arhats during the time of the Buddha and later; not to mention female bodhisattvas and Buddhas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

catmoon said:

Source please.

KevinSolway said:

Before I go looking up sources, consider this for a moment: Do you honestly think that the Buddha, after having achieved his Great Awakening, is going to take advice from a deluded being? I think not. By commonsense alone we know that the Brahma that the Buddha confers with is no samsaric being.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha accepts requests from samsaric beings, as in this case. By definition, any being defined as a deva is samsaric since they belong to the three realms. It is not possible for brahmas to enter the Buddhist path, actually. The path of awakening is open only to human beings. While it is true that there are devas who are arhats, they must have become stream enterers, once-returners or never returners as human beings in their previous births. It is nowhere indicated that this brahma was in fact an arya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

The only reason why Brahma thought he created the universe is that he was the first being to take rebirth in the brahmaloka. When other beings popped out after him, he convinced them he was the creator since he himself did not know where he had come

from.

KevinSolway said:

You are speaking of a lower form of Brahma. The highest form of Brahma, to whom the Buddha himself turned for advice upon his awakening, is identical with Brahman.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Kevin, you are clearly mistaken on this point.

"Then Brahma Sahampati, having known with his own awareness the line of thinking in the Blessed One's awareness, thought: "The world is lost! The world is destroyed! The mind of the Tathagata, the Arahant, the Rightly Self-awakened One inclines to dwelling at ease, not to teaching the Dhamma!" Then, just as a strong man might extend his flexed arm or flex his extended arm, Brahma Sahampati disappeared from the Brahma-world and reappeared in front of the Blessed One. Arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, he knelt down with his right knee on the ground, saluted the Blessed One with his hands before his heart, and said to him: "Lord, let the Blessed One teach the Dhamma! Let the One-Well-Gone teach the Dhamma! There are beings with little dust in their eyes who are falling away because they do not hear the Dhamma. There will be those who will understand the Dhamma."

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn06/sn06.001.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

This Brahma is not the so called "ancestor Brahma". In fact there are many Brahmas, since brahma is a class of deva, and not a single deva. This brahma is just a brahma in the brahmaloka.

So you are conflating these things a bit. It can be a bit confusing, I know, but patience and attention to detail is required to properly understand Buddhism and its context within Indian religion as a whole.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Are women conscious?

Content:

Namdrol said:

How does this thread have anything to do with Buddhism?

KevinSolway said:

Amongst the writings and Buddhist quotations provided in this topic you will find much information and resources for those women who want to be reborn as men, as well as for those who want to be reborn in realms where there are no women at all. That is one

of the subjects covered in the Earth-store bodhisattva sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am aware that within Mahāyāna sutras there is some pointed misogyny.

Fortunately, this does apply to all Mahāyāna sutras, the episode with the Goddess of the Ganges being a pointed example:

Sariputra: Goddess, what prevents you from transforming yourself out of your female state?

Goddess: Although I have sought my "female state" for these twelve years, I have not yet found it. Reverend Sariputra, if a magician were to incarnate a woman by magic, would you ask her, "What prevents you from transforming yourself out of your female state?"

Sariputra: No! Such a woman would not really exist, so what would there be to transform?

Goddess: Just so, reverend Sariputra, all things do not really exist. Now, would you think, "What prevents one whose nature is that of a magical incarnation from transforming herself out of her female state?"

Thereupon, the goddess employed her magical power to cause the elder Sariputra to appear in her form and to cause herself to appear in his form. Then the goddess, transformed into Sariputra, said to Sariputra, transformed into a goddess, "Reverend Sariputra, what prevents you from transforming yourself out of your female state?"

And Sariputra, transformed into the goddess, replied, "I no longer appear in the form of a male! My body has changed into the body of a woman! I do not know what to transform!"

The goddess continued, "If the elder could again change out of the female state, then all women could also change out of their female states. All women appear in the form of women in just the same way

as the elder appears in the form of a woman. While they are not women in reality, they appear in the form of women. With this in mind, the Buddha said, 'In all things, there is neither male nor female.'"

Different sutras are written for those of different capacity. Those with a misogynistic bent, are, from my perspective, written intending those of lower capacity i.e. men who suffer from misogyny and women who suffer at the hands of misogynistic men and wish to escape their "lower birth".

KevinSolway said:

Kevin is entitled to his mysogeny.

Malcolm wrote:

Truth is not misogyny. Are you saying that all those great Buddhist minds, and perhaps even the Buddha, were misogynists?

Was the author of "The Ultimate Extinction of the Dharma Sutra" a misogynist?

[/quote]

The truth is that there is no such thing as gender in phenomena, as we see from the above exchange between the Goddess and Sariputra. Gender is an imputation.

Many great Buddhist minds seem to have suffered from a culturally embedded mysogeny, yes.

But not the Buddha himself. Why? Because he had many female arhats among his disciples, as well as some teachers, such as Dhammadinna, whose sermons may be found in the Majjhima Nikaya, quite extensive as well.

When Ananda convinced the Buddha to ordain women, while it is true that when the Buddha ordained women, he predicted it would shorten the duration of the his Dharma; it is also true that the Buddha predicted that the ordination of women would cause the Dharma to spread much wider. So all that exchanged was a bit of length for increased width. And we can understand here that what he was really referring to the ordained Sangha. Such teachings as Dzogchen are not under the same restrictions as Vinaya and lower sutrayāna.

In short, you are cherry picking citations to support your views -- you are not presenting a balanced picture, presenting both negative and positive representations of women in Buddhist texts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

catmoon said:

If we are talking about God the Father, God the Creator, God the Omniscient, Omnipresent and Omnipotent, Buddhism dismisses him as fiction.

KevinSolway said:

Buddhism doesn't dismiss Brahma the Omnipotent Creator, who convinced the Buddha to share his wisdom with others.

What makes you think that God is any different to Brahma (ultimately Brahman)?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Buddha does. The only reason why Brahma thought he created the universe is that he was the first being to take rebirth in the brahmaloka. When other beings popped out after him, he convinced them he was the creator since he himself did not know where he had come from.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

catmoon said:

Now outside of Greece, Italy and Spain, governments are not completely stupid. Aware of the fact that high debt is an unstable situation, they limit debt to avoid the above nightmare scenario. But they still want to be able to buy votes, so they skate as close to the edge of disaster as they think they can get away with. This time, it isn't working, because of a new factor.

Malcolm wrote:

The debt situation of each of these three countries is completely different and independent.

The Spanish debt crisis was caused by a building bubble that collapsed -- basically, very similar to the US.

The Greek debt Crisis was caused by running large deficits, which caused their bonds to give yields as high as %15 (meaning they are very risky).

The Italian debt crisis is being caused by rising yields on Italian bonds, which means that borrowing costs for the Italian government is rising too high to make it easy for them to borrow. Typically, when bond yields rise above %7 they become riskier. This is not happening because the Italians want this to happen, it is happening because of poorly regulated financial markets putting pressure on the price of Italian debt.

US exposure to all of this debt comes in the form of CDS -- invented by Wall Street.

It is time for the Euro to go.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

catmoon said:

Who is responsible? We are. We demand education for free, we demand unemployment insurance, we demand the most expensive medical treatments, we demand high wages, we demand military supremacy, and as a direct result governments go into debt to meet those demands.

tobes said:

Totally disagree. The responsibility lies with the finance sector and the finance sector alone. They pushed for radical deregulations in the 70's & 80's. They resisted every attempt to re-regulate - and still resist, despite the catastrophe of the GFC mark 1. They are the ones who have made tremendous, startling, amazing profits over these few decades, whilst industries which actually make real stuff have bled dry....

Malcolm wrote:

Here, here -- I completely agree with you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, the debt crises was caused by Wall Street, not by Europe.

alwayson said:

According to multiple sources the Greek debt crisis was directly caused by their socialistic policies.

I already posted links to substantiate this in earlier threads.

Or just watch the nightly news.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204644504576652781479494882.html>
l " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;::

"U.S. creditors own just 5% of direct exposure to Greek debt. But they are also indirectly exposed to at least 43% of such debt through CDSs, which total upwards of €25 billion. This equals about half of the European Central Bank's direct Greek exposure of €52 billion."

Credit Default Swaps were invented by Wall Street financial wizards. The reason we are exposed to the Greek debt crisis is because of derivatives we created in order to invest in debt. So please, don't give me a bunch of nonsense about how Greek Socialisms is destroying the American economy. The only thing destroying the American economy is the progressive deregulation of financial markets and the export of our manufacturing base, started by the GOP and continued by the Dems with NAFTA and the WTO agreements.

In short, what is destroying the world economy is nothing other than neo-liberal policies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: Are women conscious?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

How does this thread have anything to do with Buddhism?

Kevin is entitled to his misogyny. And I think that exposing him to ridicule over it is a little cruel and certainly will not make him question whether or not his biological determinism is justified.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 7:39 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

A Buddhist counterpart of this would then be Vajrakilaya, Guru Tragphur, etc.

So I asked if Guru Yoga would be sufficient for protection, because I'd remembered reading that during Guru Yoga we are in the Ultimate state of protection. Although perhaps that is just during the Guru Yoga Sadhana....

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhist counterpart is called "demarcating the boundaries" also known as the protection cakra. It is generally done at the beginning of more elaborate practices.

In Dzogchen, rig pa is the ultimate protection cakra, obviating the need for any explicit rites of protection.

I suggest you follow Dzogchen as a path unto itself and leave off all this other metaphysical/esoteric stuff. Eventually, it will just be so much dead weight. No need to carry it around.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alwayson said:

Does anyone know when the next Direct Introduction will be given?

I checked here:

<http://tsegyalgar.org/theteachings/webcastcalendar/default.htm?month=&year=2012&idlist=> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Namdrol said:

Next worldwide transmission day is march eighth --

Sönam said:

there is one before november 20th

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Oh right, I missed it in my calendar, sorry. Next one is one November 20th

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

alwayson said:

I hate the fact that the American economy is at the complete mercy of Europe's socialism/debt problems.

Europe has been causing the world's problems for centuries.....colonization of Africa, Asia, New World (slaughtering all the Mayans, Aztecs etc.)..... World Wars 1 & 2.....and now this socialism / debt stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the debt crises was caused by Wall Street, not by Europe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Sönam said:

... Proudhon's theories ...

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Property is theft huh?

Meh. I own my body therefore I own the effects of what that body produces, whether that thing is three square meals, four walls, or a murder.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, so you own your children?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2011 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alwayson said:

Does anyone know when the next Direct Introduction will be given?

I checked here:

<http://tsegyalgar.org/theteachings/webcastcalendar/default.htm?month=&year=2012&idlist=> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Next worldwide transmission day is march eighth -- but the next webcast is open:

11-17 November 2011 - TENERIFE RETREAT:

Ati Yoga retreat of Rigdzin jangchub Dorje's terma "Nyangyud Khorva Dongtruk" (Tib. Snyan-rgyud 'khor-ba dong-sprug).

Tenerife Spain- GMT (+0) - OPEN WEBCAST

11th Nov.5-7pm. Teaching start.

12th Nov.10-12am. Teaching of transmission of Guru Yoga.

13th Nov.10-12am. After Guru Yoga altogether, teaching of “Nyangyud Khorva Dongtruk”.

14th Nov.10-12am. After Guru Yoga altogether, teaching of “Nyangyud Khorva Dongtruk”.

16th Nov.10-12am. After Guru Yoga altogether, teaching of “Nyangyud Khorva Dongtruk”.
4-7pm. Gana Puja and so on.

17th Nov.10-12am. Giving some advice for daily practices and some tridlungs. We finish our retreat with Ati Guru Yoga practice altogether.

To follow the webcast please see: <http://shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Geeks 2012 Conference

Content:

Chaz said:

I made a list of recognized Buddhist teachers that have been Vince Horn's guest at least once.

Richard Reoch, Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche, Sara Harding, Surya Das, Trudy Goodman, Stephen Batchelor, Christopher Titmuss, Diane Hamilton, Bernie Glassman, Sumi Loundon Kim, Hokai Sobol, Richard Brown, James Zito, Kenneth Folk, Jiun Foster, Grace Schireson Genpo Merzel Roshi, Rick Hanson, Vincent Horn, Judith Simmer-Brown, Rodney Smith, Kenneth Cohen, Jaimal Yogis, Yongey Mingyur Rinpoche, Erik Curren, Danny Fisher, Norman Fischer, Brad Warner, Gaylon Ferguson, Tami Simon, Susan Blackmore, Daniel Ingram, Diana Winston, Richard Shankman, Gerry Shishin Wick, Joseph Goldstein, Reginald Ray, Jun Po Denis Kelly, Jeffrey Hopkins, Ven. Robina Courtin, Nova Spivack, B. Alan Wallace, Melvin McLeod, Stuart Lachs, Susan Piver, John Daido Looi, Diane Hamilton, Wes Nisker, Noah Levine, Thubten Chodron, Sharon Salzberg, Ethan Nichtern, Robert Spellman, John Travis, Annie McQuade, Fleet Maull, and Phil Stanley.

Nangwa said:

There are several people on that list that I wouldn't consider to be Buddhist teachers.

Chaz said:

Really? Care to name them?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Nova Spivak, whom I happen to know personally since 1990, is an internet venture capitalist who happens to be a Buddhist, and so on -- but he is not a Buddhist teacher. Melvin McLeod may have some role in Shambhala, but mainly he is an editor, the same with Susan Piver, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Ultimate Truth

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Define what you mean by "Enlightened" (with a capital "E", no less) and I'll attempt to answer your question in a constructive manner.

Malcolm wrote:

The minimum standard Buddhist definition of awakening (preferable to "enlightened") is that one has seen the truth of the world in such a way that one is freed from the first three of the ten fetters:

a view of personal identity

doubt concerning the meaning of the Buddha's teachings

attachment to rules and rites as effective means of liberation

When one is free from these three fetters, one can no longer be troubled by afflictions [kleshas]. According to the teachings, such a person will become an arhat within seven to one lifetimes following this one.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Everything in the sutras is written from the perspective of Ultimate Truth.

Malcolm wrote:

If that is the case then you must hold that rebirth is an ultimate truth since the Vipaka sutta states:

"Monks, the taking of life — when indulged in, developed, & pursued — is something

that leads to hell, leads to rebirth as a common animal, leads to the realm of the hungry shades. The slightest of all the results coming from the taking of life is that, when one becomes a human being, it leads to a short life span.

"Stealing — when indulged in, developed, & pursued — is something that leads to hell, leads to rebirth as a common animal, leads to the realm of the hungry shades. The slightest of all the results coming from stealing is that, when one becomes a human being, it leads to the loss of one's wealth.

"Illicit sexual behavior — when indulged in, developed, & pursued — is something that leads to hell, leads to rebirth as a common animal, leads to the realm of the hungry shades. The slightest of all the results coming from illicit sexual behavior is that, when one becomes a human being, it leads to rivalry & revenge.

"Telling falsehoods — when indulged in, developed, & pursued — is something that leads to hell, leads to rebirth as a common animal, leads to the realm of the hungry shades. The slightest of all the results coming from telling falsehoods is that, when one becomes a human being, it leads to being falsely accused.

"Divisive tale-bearing — when indulged in, developed, & pursued — is something that leads to hell, leads to rebirth as a common animal, leads to the realm of the hungry shades. The slightest of all the results coming from divisive tale-bearing is that, when one becomes a human being, it leads to the breaking of one's friendships.

"Harsh speech — when indulged in, developed, & pursued — is something that leads to hell, leads to rebirth as a common animal, leads to the realm of the hungry shades. The slightest of all the results coming from harsh speech is that, when one becomes a human being, it leads to unappealing sounds.

"Frivolous chattering — when indulged in, developed, & pursued — is something that leads to hell, leads to rebirth as a common animal, leads to the realm of the hungry shades. The slightest of all the results coming from frivolous chattering is that, when one becomes a human being, it leads to words that aren't worth taking to heart.

"The drinking of fermented & distilled liquors — when indulged in, developed, & pursued — is something that leads to hell, leads to rebirth as a common animal, leads to the realm of the hungry shades. The slightest of all the results coming from drinking fermented & distilled liquors is that, when one becomes a human being, it leads to mental derangement."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Namdrol said:

I think it is better to stick to Nagarajuna and Aryadeva. Nagarjuna and Arydeva are

straightforward and easy to understand. This is the "pedagogical tradition" of Khenpo Shenga.

Terma said:

I will take your suggestion here, Namdrol.

I have been studying Chandrakirti's madhyamakavatara, by way of a very lengthy and detailed teaching given by Dzongsar Khyentse Jamyang Rinpoche (pdf format). It is quite "meaty", and somewhat challenging. But of course, like was mentioned some of the commentary/teaching is done according to the Tibetan Shedra tradition, though I feel Rinpoche tries to keep it to its original form, rather than taking the positions of the various lineages or schools.

Has anyone studied this? Comments? (BTW, I found this much easier to digest than Mipham's commentary)

Is Chandrakirti perhaps not the best angle to take here? Do you feel that Nagarjuna/Aryadeva might present things in an easier format as suggested earlier? Can someone recommend a good starting point in terms of nagarjuna (ie. books/commentaries)

thanks,

Terma

Malcolm wrote:

Candra is fine too, but not as essential.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

padma norbu said:

<http://www.theabsolute.net/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty misogynistic, overall.

Oh well, just another day in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is the point of view of Dzogchen, not sutra.

gregkavarnos said:

So there are no formless realms in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

The class exists, but here "formless" means "very little form", similar with Theravada Abhidhamma understanding of formless realms. It is kind of like saying that you are broke, even though you can afford a cup of coffee.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

That's 7th Century stuff; a lot of water under the bridge there. I'm saying Pali Suttas are sutra stuff, and I can't find dualism in Buddha's sermons. The opposite.

Namdrol said:

The very fact that formless realms beings are immaterial proves substance dualism in sutrayāna.

gregkavarnos said:

I remember you saying in another thread that consciousness is composed of the mahabhuta of air, from which yana does this teaching come from, and if it is true (across all yana) then does this then not mean that even formless realm beings have a (subtle) physical basis (I was going to say body, but then reminded myself of name and form)?

Malcolm wrote:

This is the point of view of Dzogchen, not sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

Yes, I think you are right that I read from the top down. I never did anything except Ngondro in the Kagyu so I actually know very little about Sarma Tantra. I think ati of mahayoga sounds just great to me and in a way only the name makes a point I been

trying to make many times here.

About Anuyoga I am not so sure. This is what I been taught about Anuyoga;

"Anuyoga focuses mainly on the completion stage (Tib. རྫོགས་རིམ་, dzogrim), and emphasizes the inner yoga of channels, winds-energies and essences" (Tib. རྩ་རླུང་ཐིག་ལེ་, tsa lung tiklé). Visualization of the deities is generated instantly, rather than through a gradual process as in Mahayoga.

<http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Anuyoga> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I thought the focus in Anuyoga was on "tsa-lung"?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The main point of anuyoga is not rtsa rlung, since mahāyoga also possesses rtsa rlung as part of the completion stage.

The main point of difference between anuyoga and mahāyoga is view; the view of the basis in anuyoga dzogchen, from the beginning. For this reason there is no summoning of the wisdom being, or if there is, it is stated as a something like the commitment being and wisdom being have always been inseparable. Second, based on this, the method of creation is instant rather than gradual. That latter point is the most important difference between mahā and anu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

That's 7th Century stuff; a lot of water under the bridge there. I'm saying Pali Suttas are sutra stuff, and I can't find dualism in Buddha's sermons. The opposite.

Malcolm wrote:

The very fact that formless realms beings are immaterial proves substance dualism in sutrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2011 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

So it's clear from the above that you cannot conceive of consciousness, as you define it, as having an external cause - outside of the series of moments of consciousness. The only way this could be possible is if one of the following were true:

1. You conceive of consciousness as being inherently existent.
- or
2. You conceive of consciousness as being the only thing in existence.

Do you agree?

Malcolm wrote:

No -- Neither the first nor the second consequence are entailed.

A given consciousness is a conditioned stream, composed of moments, each moment being neither the same nor different than the previous moment (this is the solution to the problem of identity in a series suggested by Nāgārjuna).

There are infinite number of such given beginningless consciousnesses.

The status of objects in general is purely conventional, I am happy with either the relative truth model of sautrantikas or yogacara -- does not matter much to me. Which ever you like.

If you prefer sautrantika, then the stream of material existents is also without beginning. If you prefer yogacara, all material existents are mental projections and have no existence outside of the mind that perceives them.

This is all from a sutrayāna POV.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

Namdrol said:

From a Dzogchen perspective, guru yoga is better.

heart said:

From my perspective guru yoga contains the two stages. Probably the best way to practice the two stages.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

We differ on that point, probably because we practice different Guru Yogas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

Yes, but the theory of the development stage is not that "if you imagine that everything is a mandala it will become a mandala" rather it is "everything is a mandala use your imagination to discover your natural state".

/magnus

Namdrol said:

Hi Magnus:

Actually, in gsar ma schools that is exactly what creation stage means -- if you imagine it is a mandala, it becomes a mandala. This is why it is called "path of transformation". We are transforming our impure vision into a pure vision. We do this to undermine our tendency to engage in afflictive attachments. If we see everything as pure, we will have less grasping. The creation stage is conceptual, not non-conceptual. The completion stage is used to cut attachment to conceptuality of the creation stage. Eventually, we are supposed to unify creation and completion so that we are in the state of the union of illusory body and luminosity aka mahāmudra.

This is partially why one finds criticisms of the two stages approach even in Mahāmudra upadeshas.

Guhyagarbha contains the view of Dzogchen, this is why the thirteenth chapter of Guhyagarbha emphasizes that the mandala has always been naturally formed [ye nas lhun grub] . So it is a very different approach. It is not really the approach of the two stages.

You are so conditioned by Anuyoga, you have a hard time relating to mahāyoga in and of itself.

N

heart said:

Well that could well be, I can just say how I been taught to practice. I am currently reading the Guhyagarbha Tantra and, at least to me, it seem to support the

understanding my Guru given me about these matters. Guhyagarbha Tantra is classified as a Mahayoga Tantra. The fact that it contains the view of Dzogchen seems to support what I say.

I can't say I been taught much Anuyoga.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It supports what you say solely from a Nyingma POV. But Nyingma is not the end all and be all of Vajrayāna. Sarma schools have a different POV, especially Sakya and Gelug. So you need to qualify your statements.

As to Anuyoga, what you practice is mostly anuyoga. Most termas are anuyoga.

You need to be able to differentiate what you have been taught from the approach of other schools. Your reading is top down. Since your teachers are all Dzogchen practitioners, it is natural that Dzogchen colors everything they teach.

Guhyagarbha is classified as ati of mahāyoga, actually.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

For this reason if you have recognized rigpa Tantra is a really helpful as it hit the right spot.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

If you have discovered knowledge (rig pa) of the basis, you don't need creation stage and completion stage. That's the whole point of Dzogchen. Creation and completion stage are means of discovering that knowledge, but not the only means. Hence, Dzogchen and direct introduction.

N

heart said:

But discovering that knowledge doesn't mean that you are constantly in that knowledge, so for this reason also after recognizing the natural state creation and completion is very helpful.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

From a Dzogchen perspective, guru yoga is better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

Yes, but the theory of the development stage is not that "if you imagine that everything is a mandala it will become a mandala" rather it is "everything is a mandala use your imagination to discover your natural state".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

Actually, in gsar ma schools that is exactly what creation stage means -- if you imagine it is a mandala, it becomes a mandala. This is why it is called "path of transformation". We are transforming our impure vision into a pure vision. We do this to undermine our tendency to engage in afflictive attachments. If we see everything as pure, we will have less grasping. The creation stage is conceptual, not non-conceptual. The completion stage is used to cut attachment to conceptuality of the creation stage. Eventually, we are supposed to unify creation and completion so that we are in the state of the union of illusory body and luminosity aka mahāmudra.

This is partially why one finds criticisms of the two stages approach even in Mahāmudra upadeshas.

Guhyagarbha contains the view of Dzogchen, this is why the thirteenth chapter of Guhyagarbha emphasizes that the mandala has always been naturally formed [ye nas lhun grub] . So it is a very different approach. It is not really the approach of the two stages.

You are so conditioned by Anuyoga, you have a hard time relating to mahāyoga in and of itself.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 9:01 PM
Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?
Content:
Namdrol said:
Sutrayāna upholds substance dualism

deepbluehum said:
I haven't found it in the Pali Canon.

Malcolm wrote:
Examine Dharmakirti's proofs of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 8:56 PM
Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?
Content:
Namdrol said:
There cannot be an absolute cause of a beginningless series.

KevinSolway said:
There can't be a serial beginning to a beginningless series, but there can certainly be a cause to the entire series.

What is it that separates one beginningless series from another one? That would be the cause of a particular beginningless series.

Malcolm wrote:
One cannot posit a first cause of a beginningless series, that is a contradiction in terms.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 8:54 PM
Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.
Content:
heart said:
For this reason if you have recognized ripga Tantra is a really helpful as it hit the right spot.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

If you have discovered knowledge (rig pa) of the basis, you don't need creation stage and completion stage. That's the whole point of Dzogchen. Creation and completion stage are means of discovering that knowledge, but not the only means. Hence, Dzogchen and direct introduction.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Tantric generation stage is exactly imagining that all beings and the world are the mandala. It is an exercise in creative imagination. If you think, if you really think that where you are is pure and everyone you meet is a buddha deity, then you cannot possibly have any problems.

N

heart said:

I keep hearing people repeating that Tantra is just imagination but I am afraid that this isn't what is written in the Guhyagarbha Tantra. Imagination is just the means that brings people to the natural state of inseparable purity and equality which is the view of Mahayoga. Pure perception is the spontaneously occurring post-meditation. For this reason if you have recognized ripga Tantra is a really helpful as it hit the right spot.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Magnus, read what I said again: Tantric generation stage...We are not talking about a result here. Just the means.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Did I Receive Transmission?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

So my first question is: If he had received authentic Direct Introduction at some point

before this situation I'm describing here occurred, does that in itself qualify him to give others Transmission (if he was keeping his Samaya of course)?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Lhug-Pa said:

Or would have to meet other qualifications (besides simply having received the Transmission) in order to qualify for giving the Direct Introduction to other people?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Lhug-Pa said:

And if that alone doesn't make him qualified to do that, yet he for other reasons was somehow qualified to give me the Transmission (which I doubt); did it "count", since I was not fully aware of what was occurring?

In other words, has he been my Root Guru all along without me knowing it? If so, then I've been breaking Samaya innumerable times since then? (Bear in mind that this was over three years ago)

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Lhug-Pa said:

so I think he may have been or is a practitioner at some level; but was not qualified to teach others, and therefore I did not actually receive a Direct Introduction to the Nature of Mind (?)

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Lhug-Pa said:

Samaya is established only if it is made crystal clear to us everything that that specific Samaya entails, yes?

Malcolm wrote:

Samaya is established by interest in a teaching and participation. Samaya is like wine, it develops with age.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

In the case of each series, there is neither a beginning nor an end. And yet one series is not the other one. Something separates them.

Let's say that the first one is consciousness and the second one is some other infinite series. It doesn't matter, for our purposes, what the cause of the second one is (for example, whether it is caused by consciousness). The question is, what is the cause of the first one? That is, what is the cause of the particular infinite series that we call "consciousness".

Malcolm wrote:

There cannot be an absolute cause of a beginningless series. A given series however is unique because its causes are unique to it.

KevinSolway said:

You appear to be upholding the views of the "Mind only" school, which have been refuted.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am not a cittamatrin.

KevinSolway said:

Ok, I believe you are speaking something that makes more sense to me now. It's good that we can agree on something.

Rather than saying there is "mind only" you are suggesting that mind is an aspect of something we might call "matter".

Malcolm wrote:

What I am suggesting is that mind and matter are a non-dual field -- rather than one being an epiphenomena of the other. They are in fact equally products of delusion in one sense. In another, they are merely expressions of intelligent light.

KevinSolway said:

But I don't believe that Sutrayana is as mistaken as you seem to suggest.

Malcolm wrote:

Sutrayāna upholds substance dualism, conventionally speaking. Vajrayāna, and in particular, Dzogchen, do not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

See, this I just don't get. Pure perception, the way I learned it, is not imagining that the world and beings are something good and pure, rather it is acknowledging the world just as it is. It is about relaxing and not about some high level fantasy. It hit right at the view if you know Dzogchen.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

Tantric generation stage is exactly imagining that all beings and the world are the mandala. It is an exercise in creative imagination. If you think, if you really think that where you are is pure and everyone you meet is a buddha deity, then you cannot possibly have any problems.

N

pensum said:

"Furthermore, if you believe in the way ordinary people see objects, you stray into materialistic ordinariness.

If you regard them one-sidedly as either existent or nonexistent, you stray into the eternalism or nihilism of heretical extremists.

If you believe that objects exist separate from mind, you stray into being a shravaka or pratyekabuddha.

If you claim that perceptions are mind, you stray into being a Mind Only follower.

If you believe that the world and beings are deities, you stray into Mantra.

What is the use of meditation practice without knowing how to cut through these strayings!"

Padmasambhava

(my emphasis)

Malcolm wrote:

This is appropriate for someone who has stabilized their practice of Dzogchen. However, one cannot stray into Mantra if one has no concrete knowledge of Dzogchen, correct? I

think ChNN's point is that it is far better to stray into mantra if you have a tendency to demonize your vajra brothers and sisters.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Consciousness depends only on prior moments of consciousness

KevinSolway said:

Question for Namdrol.

Prior moments of consciousness are still consciousness. So what is the cause of consciousness itself? That is, what is the cause of the whole infinite series of moments of consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, there is no beginning to any given series, as the logic of dependent origination necessarily entails. In other words, consciousness is beginningless, also the other five dhātus (space and the four mahābhutani) are beginningless, since their cause, consciousness (i.e. the collective minds of all infinite sentient beings) has no beginning.

The Buddhist perspective, as indicated by the suttas and thousands of treatises, is that while consciousness contains the potentiality of all five elements, the five elements themselves do not contain the potentiality to give rise to consciousness.

However, you will find that when you move into Vajrayāna and especially the teachings of the Great Perfection, the explicit substance dualism of the sutrayāna is abandoned.

Up to this point, we have been discussing these issues from a strictly sutrayāna perspective.

In Vajrayāna there begins to be a movement which recognizes that matter is in fact intelligent, rather than something inert opposed to consciousness.

This movement in Buddhist teaching reaches its fullest expression in the teaching of the Great Perfection (Dzogchen) where matter is seen as the pure expressive radiance of the natural processes of pure "consciousness" which in fact forms a non-dual field, punctuated, if you will, on the one hand by the delusion of non-recognition (of this matrix of radiant intelligence called "vidyā and jñāna (the name for the five elements in their pure state)" because of subject/object dualism predicated on grasping identity in that which lacks identity) which creates serial point events called "sentient beings" and on the other hand, the wisdom of recognition which creates serial point events called

"buddhas" and the shades in between i.e. yogis.

Within this scheme, nevertheless, karma as well as physical and literal rebirth are still quite possible and assumed because of the delusion of self-grasping. In Buddhism, ignorance (āvidya) drives rebirth and karma, and nothing else.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

pensum said:

For Magnus and any others who are "pro" ngondro: how does doing ngondro improve or increase buddha nature? and conversely how is buddha nature negatively affected if one doesn't do any ngondro?

And for all those who are "con" ngondro: how is buddha nature diminished or degraded by doing ngondro? and how does not doing any ngondro improve or augment buddha nature?

Malcolm wrote:

It is basically a question of time. Since time is limited, it is better to strive for the essence of the teachings from the beginning. It is better to select teachings which rapidly lead to personal experience. All teachings are good, but some are more effective.

So, the main message is don't waste time.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

Virgo said:

...simply practicing trechgo creates a great deal of merit and understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

more merit, actually.

But please recall, merit really refers to what kind of body you will get as a result.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

Sönam said:

I was just reading that ChNN's point of view regarding tantra (extracted from Dzogchen Teachings) ... it can help to clarify some points.

Training in pure vision is the samaya, or commitment, of the Tantric teachings. That is good also for Dzogchen practitioners. For example, if you see your Vajra brothers and sisters as enlightened beings, as if they were your teachers, you will never have problems with them. On the other hand, if you always think they are the ones who are creating difficulties, you will always have problems. Thus, it is very useful to train a little in pure vision according to the Tantric system. This is why we also need this knowledge and understanding.

Of course, the methods of the various levels of the path are different. In tantra we use transformation methods, whereas in Dzogchen the method used is that of self-liberation. If you understand how Tantric methods work, then, when you learn the method of self-liberation as it is practiced in Dzogchen, you can better understand what the difference is between them.

heart said:

See, this I just don't get. Pure perception, the way I learned it, is not imagining that the world and beings are something good and pure, rather it is acknowledging the world just as it is. It is about relaxing and not about some high level fantasy. It hit right at the view if you know Dzogchen.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Tantric generation stage is exactly imagining that all beings and the world are the mandala. It is an exercise in creative imagination. If you think, if you really think that where you are is pure and everyone you meet is a buddha deity, then you cannot possibly have any problems.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

... unless you can prove them.

KevinSolway said:

Well it's your forum and you can run it how you see fit. I cannot force you to understand my arguments.

But I do hope you will be consistent with your rulings.

Unless a person can prove that one person can be reborn as another person, after their physical death, or that a person can be reborn as an animal, or a preta, etc, then they should not be permitted to express any such ideas here, either in their own words or in words quoted from anywhere else.

Malcolm wrote:

I suspect that by "proof", Dechen means "actually found in the teachings of the Buddha" -- not empirically proven in a scientific study.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

I consider that it is a matter of definition that the substrate or cause of consciousness is "physical", and it is ultimately the physical world, which is the cause of consciousness, which is the physical body.

Namdrol said:

The Buddha has taught us consistently that the cause of the physical world is consciousness.

KevinSolway said:

And he's not mistaken on this. In the case that we divide things up into the duality of "mind" and "matter", there are only two things, and each of these two must be caused by something. Since the only thing other than mind is matter, then matter must be the cause of mind. Likewise the only thing other than matter is mind, so mind must be the cause of matter.

Beyond the duality of "mind" and "matter" is the undifferentiated Natural World, which has various names.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Buddha all phenomena in the universe, the natural world, are categorized into six classes: consciousness, space, air, fire, water and earth. Consciousness is the cause of the other five. Consciousness has the potential to give rise to the other five, but the other five do not have the ability to give rise to consciousness. It is not a relation of mutual dependence. Matter depends on consciousness, but consciousness does not depend on matter. Consciousness depends only on prior moments of consciousness, and since there are no beginnings, according to the logic of dependent origination, there is no fault of infinite regress.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

I consider that it is a matter of definition that the substrate or cause of consciousness is "physical", and it is ultimately the physical world, which is the cause of consciousness, which is the physical body.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha has taught us consistently that the cause of the physical world is consciousness.

This, I will suggest, is the reason why your speculations are dissonate with what the majority of Buddhists understand about the Buddha's teachings.

Consciousness is the cause of matter, not the other way round.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: The matter of faith

Content:

Namdrol said:

If we know that someone is an awakened person, than as the Eastern Gatehouse shows, we can have confidence in what they say.

KevinSolway said:

Yes, but you would only know that they were awakened if you yourself were awakened.

So you would only trust them inasmuch as you can trust yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is false inference.

You can infer someone's awakening, or lack thereof, much in the same manner as a fire can be inferred from the presence of smoke.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

If dependent origination was about the physical body, then things would be in an entirely different order.

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent origination is about both mind and body -- this is why we have links such as consciousness, name and form, six sense organs, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2011 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Consciousness has a cause, but not a material cause, even though, according to them, it can be conditioned by material substances.

KevinSolway said:

Conditions are the same as causes.

Malcolm wrote:

No, conditions are not the same thing as causes.

Conditions do not bear the potential to bring about a result. for example, no matter how much it rains, without a seed, there can be no shoot.

Causes carry the potential to bring about a result. For example, even though it may not rain, as long as a seed is viable, it can produce a sprout when the proper conditions are

present.

In the example of consciousness, consciousness, according to the Buddhist model, is of six kinds: mental consciousness and five physical sense consciousness. The sole difference between these six is whether consciousness is conditioned by sense organs or not leading to the descriptors "eye consciousness" and so on. However, consciousness also exists in absence of a physical substrate, for example, arūpyadhātu beings, those beings of the four immaterial realms, have no physical bodies. In the Buddhist way of seeing things, mind and body are different substances, with different causes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 7th, 2011 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: The matter of faith

Content:

KevinSolway said:

I say that we only really have faith in that which we ourselves know.

The less we ourselves know, the less faith there is.

Malcolm wrote:

If we know that someone is an awakened person, than as the Eastern Gatehouse shows, we can have confidence in what they say.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 7th, 2011 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

that consciousness does not exist independently, but that it too has a cause, and that it's life is as fragile as that of a candleflame.

Malcolm wrote:

No one ever said that consciousness had no cause. Consciousness is a substance, conceived of by the Buddha and Buddhists to be of a different kind than matter.

Consciousness has a cause, but not a material cause, even though, according to them, it can be conditioned by material substances.

Dharmakīrti runs through these reasonings in much detail in the *Pramāṇasiddhi* chapter of the *Pramāṇavārtika*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 7th, 2011 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: The matter of faith

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Even in the case that I'm not a Buddha, I could be of a level far higher than you can conceive of.

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt it. Your knowledge of the Dharma appears very elementary, basic and utterly lacking nuance. (Note to catmoon -- now that is a qualified ad hominem statement).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 7th, 2011 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: The matter of faith

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Ironically, not according to the Kalama sutra!

Malcolm wrote:

The Kalamas were not followers of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 7th, 2011 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Namdrol said:

Khenpo Shenga's commentary on MMK has not been published yet.

gad rgyangs said:

Speaking of which, Brother Namdrol, Lotsawa Namdrol, where are your translations????? Isn't it time to make a contribution? What are you waiting for? (certainly not a six figure advance from snowlion, i hope). With your experience, expertise and insight, how can you hide your light under a basket? If you don't want to make translations and give them away, and can't or won't deal with publishers, then just make pdfs and sell them on Lulu or Amazon. I'd buy every single one. I mean, come on, bro, daylight's burning. death is certain but the time is uncertain....you know the drill.

Malcolm wrote:

I want to make sure my mango not only looks ripe, but is in fact ripe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 7th, 2011 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: The matter of faith

Content:

KevinSolway said:

In any case, the Buddha himself made his own personal experience the criterion for all his judgements, and he accepted whatever accorded with his own personal experience, and rejected what did not accord with his own personal experience.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference between you and the Buddha is just that -- you are not a Buddha and so do not have access to the same level of personal experience. A sutta to balance the Kalamas is the Pubbakotthaka Sutta:

"Excellent, Sariputta. Excellent. Those who have not known, seen, penetrated, realized, or attained it by means of discernment would have to take it on conviction in others that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed & pursued, gains a footing in the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal & consummation; whereas those who have known, seen, penetrated, realized, & attained it by means of discernment would have no doubt or uncertainty that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed & pursued, gains a footing in the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal & consummation."

What is the Buddha's range of experience, according to the Buddha?

Ten Powers of a Tathagata

9. "Sariputta, the Tathagata has these ten Tathagata's powers, possessing which he claims the herd-leader's place, roars his lion's roar in the assemblies, and sets rolling the Wheel of Brahma.[5] What are the ten?

10. (1) "Here, the Tathagata understands as it actually is the possible as possible and the impossible as impossible.[6] And that [70] is a Tathagata's power that the Tathagata has, by virtue of which he claims the herd-leader's place, roars his lion's roar in the assemblies, and sets rolling the Wheel of Brahma.

11. (2) "Again, the Tathagata understands as it actually is the results of actions undertaken, past, future and present, with possibilities and with causes. That too is a Tathagata's power...[7]

12. (3) "Again, the Tathagata understands as it actually is the ways leading to all

destinations. That too is a Tathagata's power...[8]

13. (4) "Again, the Tathagata understands as it actually is the world with its many and different elements. That too is a Tathagata's power...[9]

14. (5) "Again, the Tathagata understands as it actually is how beings have different inclinations. That too is a Tathagata's power...[10]

15. (6) "Again, the Tathagata understands as it actually is the disposition of the faculties of other beings, other persons. That too is a Tathagata's power...[11]

16. (7) "Again, the Tathagata understands as it actually is the defilement, the cleansing and the emergence in regard to the jhanas, liberations, concentrations and attainments. That too is a Tathagata's power...[12]

17. (8) "Again, the Tathagata recollects his manifold past lives, that is, one birth, two births, three births, four births, five births, ten births, twenty births, thirty births, forty births, fifty births, a hundred births, a thousand births, a hundred thousand births, many aeons of world-contraction, many aeons of world-expansion, many aeons of world-contraction and expansion: 'There I was so named, of such a clan, with such an appearance, such was my nutriment, such my experience of pleasure and pain, such my life-term; and passing away from there, I reappeared elsewhere; and there too I was so named, of such a clan, with such an appearance, such was my nutriment, such my experience of pleasure and pain, such my life-term; and passing away from there, I reappeared here.' Thus with their aspects and particulars he recollects his manifold past lives. That too is a Tathagata's power...

18. (9) "Again, with the divine eye, which is purified and surpasses the human, the Tathagata sees beings passing away and reappearing, inferior and superior, fair and ugly, fortunate and unfortunate, and he understands how beings pass on according to their actions thus: 'These worthy beings who were ill-conducted in body, speech and mind, revilers of noble ones, wrong in their views, giving effect to wrong view in their actions, on the dissolution of the body, [71] after death, have reappeared in a state of deprivation, in a bad destination, in perdition, even in hell; but these worthy beings who were well-conducted in body, speech and mind, not revilers of noble ones, right in their views, giving effect to right view in their actions, on the dissolution of the body, after death, have reappeared in a good destination, even in the heavenly world.' Thus with the divine eye, which is purified and surpasses the human, he sees beings passing away and reappearing, inferior and superior, fair and ugly, fortunate and unfortunate, and he understands how beings pass on according to their actions. That too is a Tathagata's power...

19. (10) "Again, by realizing it for himself with direct knowledge, the Tathagata here and now enters upon and abides in the deliverance of mind and deliverance by wisdom that are taintless with the destruction of the taints. That too is a Tathagata's power that a Tathagata has, by virtue of which he claims the herd-leader's place, roars his lion's roar in the assemblies, and sets rolling the Wheel of Brahma.

20. "The Tathagata has these ten Tathagata's powers, possessing which he claims the herd-leader's place, roars his lion's roar in the assemblies, and sets rolling the Wheel of Brahma.

21. "Sariputta, when I know and see thus, should anyone say of me: 'The recluse Gotama does not have any superhuman states, any distinction in knowledge and vision worthy of the noble ones. The recluse Gotama teaches a Dhamma (merely) hammered out by reasoning, following his own line of inquiry as it occurs to him' — unless he abandons that assertion and that state of mind and relinquishes that view, then as (surely as if he had been) carried off and put there he will wind up in hell.[13] Just as a bhikkhu possessed of virtue, concentration and wisdom would here and now enjoy final knowledge, so it will happen in this case, I say, that unless he abandons that assertion and that state of mind and relinquishes that view, then as (surely as if he had been) carried off and put there he will wind up in hell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 7th, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

conebeckham said:

Thanks, Namdrol--that's really interesting! Didn't know about that linguistic sleight-of-hand, and that's something most of us would never catch..... And a good example of why you stress the importance of the root (Indian) texts.

Do you know if Khenpo Shenga's commentary to MMK is in the works for publication in translation?

Also, off-topic I know, but w/ regard to Maitreya's Five Treatises, Are you familiar with this?

https://www.amazon.com/Universal-Discourse-Literature-Mahayanasutralamkara-Treasury/dp/0975373404/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1320596282&sr=1-1 "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I think Thurman was the head translator. I'm wondering if it's a good translation? (Perhaps a thread about JamChoDeNga in translation may be a good idea...)

Malcolm wrote:

It's a little wierd in my opinion, but it is consistent in its wierdness and scholarly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2011 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

conebeckham said:

I know that text isn't Madhyamika, Namdrol....also understand how Mipham labors to make it non-contradictory....I recall that Khenpo Shenga's commentary on this particular text was based on Vasubandhu, per the forward...not Buddhapalita.

Perhaps he uses Buddhapalita as a source for the true madhyamika works?

Malcolm wrote:

Right, we are not communicating well. Khenpo Shenga's commentary on MMK has not been published yet.

His commentary on the dharmadharmata vibhanga is based on Vasubandhu. It also presents Mipham's side by side. Mipham's attempt to reconcile DDV with Madhyamaka is exactly the kind of Tibetan exegesis that muddies the water because Mipham uses a couple of linguistic sleights of hand that are possible in Tibetan (suggesting that if you substitute rnam par snang ba for rnam par rig pa (vijñapti) the text can be read as Madhyamaka text) and are completely impossible in Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2011 at 7:59 PM

Title: Appeals to Fact

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Appealing to authority is something you do as a very last resort

Malcolm wrote:

IF we are talking about what Kevin Solway thinks, the first thing I will do is look up Kevin Solway's writings. When talking about what The Buddha thinks, the first thing I will do is look up what the Buddha said in that or that sutta.

If Kevin Solway claims some idea for the Buddha, if such a claim, no matter how reasonable, is not born out in an examination of the record of the Buddha's teaching, then Kevin Solway's claim must be rejected. For example, if Kevin Solway claims that Buddha intended rebirth to be interpreted figuratively but an examination of the record shows Buddha intended rebirth quite literally, then Kevin Solway's claim must be rejected, even if I myself too do not accept literal rebirth.

For example, if someone were to say "Kevin Solway believes in literal rebirth", and examination of your writings will show this to be false, therefore, that claim must be rejected.

In this case, these are not appeals to authority -- I have no interest in whether you believe in rebirth or not -- but I am interested seeing that the Buddha's teaching not being corrupted by modernist revisionism whether Buddha's teachings about this and that in the end prove to be false.

For example, Vasubandhu teaches a geocentric Meru Cosmology that is clearly at odds

with modern cosmology. I do not accept this cosmology, but if someone were to come along and try to convince me that Vasubandhu did not teach such a cosmology, I would point to the Kosha and show that Vasubandhu plainly did teach such a cosmology. This is not an appeal to authority, it is an appeal to fact.

Pointing out that Buddha universally teaches literal rebirth in the sutras is a fact. Do not think you can select one or the other of the four distinct presentations of dependent origination, serial, static, momentary and simultaneous -- they are all necessary for a proper understanding of dependent origination and karma. Part of that is the Buddhist doctrine of conception i.e. literal rebirth taught by the Buddha himself in Vinaya to Nanda and in the Suttas to Ananda.

Those who rejected literal rebirth were considered nihilists by the Buddha and his disciples.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2011 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Vasubandhu also rejected the physical existence of hell realms, but did not reject their existence altogether.

KevinSolway said:

Have you considered that ALL of the realms are not physically real. That is, they are real, but not physically real.

They are mentally real, but that is all.

That is in fact my position. Not only are the hell realms not physically real, but nor are the preta realms, the animal realms, the human realms, deva realms, etc.

They all exist within the mind, here and now.

The vast majority of homo-sapiens on earth are in fact in the lower realms, mentally, and this is very real.

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu did not reject the conventional physical existence of human realms and so on -- merely the physical existence of hells since he reasoned that hell guardians must only be mental projections of the tormented. '

It is only when discussing how phenomena exist ultimately that they are ascertained to be "mind-only".

If however you maintain that phenomena are only mental real, then you very little basis for rejecting any of the six realms, and none whatsoever for rejecting rebirth as frogs, devas, and hell beings, as well as humans.

In fact, you just sank your whole argument against rebirth. Saying that literal rebirth is not a fact when you at the same time deny that there is any physical reality at all is incoherent.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2011 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The suffering of a being experiencing a hell realm is far worse than any imaginable human suffering, however.

KevinSolway said:

And you know this how?

Malcolm wrote:

Unlike yourself, who cannot accept anything beyond your own senses, and cannot accept any authority beyond your limited direct perception, I am happy to accept the authority of the Buddha on such subjects.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2011 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Those who reject literal reincarnation do not reject serial rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact they do. If

KevinSolway said:

"Serial" means "not occurring at the same time", and indeed, the consequences of one's actions do not occur at the same time as one's actions, but they occur afterwards. For example, a teacher must first teach the students before mental activities in the students can be kindled. The one follows the other, in series. The future follows the present. This is what is meant by "serial rebirth".

Malcolm wrote:

Not according to the Buddha, and it is Buddha's definition of rebirth that are under consideration, not Kevin Solway's. In this instance, an appeal to authority is valid since the Buddha's teachings are the one's being considered. In some other circumstance, were we interested in discussing Kevin Solway's doctrine of karma and so on, then an appeal to the authority of the Buddha would be useless, since we would not be discussing Buddhism, but rather Solwayism.

KevinSolway said:

Those who reject the literal rebirth interpretation do in fact accept the teaching of the Buddha on mental causality.

Malcolm wrote:

Essentially, serial rebirth is the serial or successive appropriation of successive bodies by an afflicted mental continuum; for example, a mental continuum that in one instance appropriated the body of an amphibian, and later came to appropriate the body of a deva or a human.

KevinSolway said:

read the mahāniddana sutta

Your interpretation differs from mine. Please try to use reason rather than appealing to authority. The appeal to authority is a logical fallacy, and this should be taught by all Buddhist teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are not a Buddhist, an appeal to authority of the Buddha is of course useless. If you are a Buddhist, then an appeal to the authority of the Buddha's teaching, as recorded in hundreds of suttas, is entirely appropriate.

Essentially, it is rational decision tree:

Does mind derive from matter? Yes or no?

If one answers yes, then one is a physicalist and there is no point in proceeding further. Buddha's teachings have little value beyond their ethical content, in this instance. There is nothing particularly special about Buddhist teachings on emptiness, dependent

origination, and so on that may be not gleaned from Hume, Adorno and so on.

If no, then we can continue. If mind does not derive from matter, it must have a cause, nevertheless. If it does not have a first cause, it must have a conditioned cause. Since things like memory of past lives and so on are best accounted for through mental moments that exist in a serial continuum, two moments in a continuum being neither the same nor different from one another, things like memory of past lives and so on are easily accounted for without having to invent a self as a repository of information.

It is the nature of mind as a substance (dravya) that requires that all mind are unique-- this is well established by Vasubandhu.

KevinSolway said:

It doesn't have anything to do with people being reborn as frogs or suchlike speculative nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you can accuse the Buddha of being a speculator if you like. It is pretty clear that Buddha discussed person's taking rebirth as different forms of beings, animals, devas and so on and did so in a manner that indicates he actually beleived in rebirth as I have outlined it.

Now, you don't have to accept it, but please do not expect us to think that the Buddha did not beleive it. It is very clear that he did.

KevinSolway said:

Unless you have come up with a way to read words without interpreting them, then you are also interpreting the words.

Malcolm wrote:

There no need to interpret what the Buddha has said on this point.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2011 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

. . in an unhappy destination, in perdition, in hell...

KevinSolway said:

Do you honestly think the countless hell realms, with their mountains of red-hot iron and black flames, are physically real places? They're not. They are created by the mind

of the individual, here-and-now. The reason there are so many hell realms (countless, in fact) is because of the countless forms of suffering people create inside their own minds.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Mahāyāna perspective, this is a trivial point. Vasubandhu also rejected the physical existence of hell realms, but did not reject their existence altogether.

The suffering of a being experiencing a hell realm is far worse than any imaginable human suffering, however.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2011 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Those who reject literal rebirth don't argue such a thing.

Just as a candle can be used to light many other candles, which burn simultaneously, in just the same way mental activities kindle many other mental activities, in other physical forms, which function simultaneously. For example, a teacher can have many students, and a parent can have many children.

Cause and effect is a tree-like web of interactions, rather than a narrow linear channel.

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first point, those who reject serial rebirth do not accept the teaching of the Buddha on mental causality.

As to your second point, this is not what the Buddha meant by rebirth. What did he mean by rebirth? You can read the mahāniddana sutta.

As to your third point, you are conflating the teaching about general cause and effect with dependent origination. Whether you decide to use the model of the Sarvastivadas (six causes and four conditions) or the model of the Theravadins i.e. twenty four conditions (i.e. 6*4) matters little. The teaching of serial rebirth or reincarnation was clearly taught by the Buddha in hundreds of suttas.

You can of course choose to ignore the Buddha's teachings on this point, and try to "interpret" rebirth -- but you cannot present this modified doctrine as the Buddha's own teaching.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2011 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

We are embodied here for a reason. Explicating what that reason is precisely requires the delicacy of our current situation.

Malcolm wrote:

We are embodied here because our minds are driven by afflictions. That's it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 5th, 2011 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

KevinSolway said:

Buddhists really do believe these things.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha didn't merely believe these things, he knew these things to be so, and outlined methods through which one may come to know directly oneself.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 5th, 2011 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: are karma and rebirth for real?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For the Buddha, rebirth, punarbhāva, was a simple fact.

Either one accepts rebirth or one does not.

Arguing that the continual appropriation of new physical forms by an afflicted mental continuum that spans countless eons is not the Buddha's teaching is rather unwise, since it clearly is the Buddha's teaching.

It is unwise, therefore, to pretend that there is some other option, or that the Buddha meant rebirth only figuratively.

Arguing with people who do not accept rebirth is equally unwise because they are addicted to a trenchant physicalism and prefer a secular understanding of mind and life. However, such people, may, in a limited way, derive some benefit from Buddha's teaching of dependent origination and so on even if that teaching will not lead them to ultimate liberation in this lifetime because of their addiction to views.

The answer to the thread is that yes, for Buddha karma and rebirth are for real. And if one wishes to have a full appreciation of the Buddha's teaching, it is important to understand this fact.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 5th, 2011 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Can a complete beginner benefit from Dzogchen practice?

Content:

TravisMay11 said:

I can't remember the sources right off hand where I've read about this, at the moment, but I believe traditionally that no one ever started practicing Dzogchen right off the bat.

Malcolm wrote:

One's good fortune in meeting Dzogchen teachings in this life depend greatly upon one's merit from past lives. If you have the merit to meet a great master like ChNN, etc., don't waste your time doing other things. Merely meeting such a master is a sign that you are not a "beginner" in Dzogchen teachings, it is a sign that one is riding the crest of one's merit from past lives.

if you follow a master like ChNN -- you will become a sane human being, even without studying Abhidharma and so on.

Following Dzogchen teachings is the best mind training.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 5th, 2011 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Namkha arte-sky gazing

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Does anyone know where this practice originated from?

Malcolm wrote:

The original form of sky gazing come from the perfection of wisdom sutras.

But Namkhai arte is not just gazing at sky since it is connected with Dzogchen view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 5th, 2011 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Ah I see. Although everywhere I've searched it says that the booklet is either reserved or restricted. But since we most likely would have to sign up for at least an online Dzogchen Community membership in order to view the webcast for the Worldwide Transmission by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche, I guess it doesn't matter if it's restricted or not, since membership should grant permission to purchase the booklet or maybe even the Guru Yoga book.

Malcolm wrote:

You can get the transmission book-- you may have to call a gar to do so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 5th, 2011 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

conebeckham said:

The third alternative, and one I feel the majority of us follow, is to stick to one Tibetan pedagogical tradition.

Namdrol said:

I think it is better to stick to Nagarajuna and Aryadeva. Nagarjuna and Aryadeva are straighyforward and easy to understand. This is the "pedagogical tradition" of Khenpo Shenga.

N

conebeckham said:

...which is really just using Vasubandu's commentaries, mainly, to "flesh out" the rather terse original texts, in most instances, is it not?

I'm reading the translation of Maitreya/Asanga's Madhyantavibhaga currently, which has Khenpo Shenga's commentary as well as a commentary by Mipham. This particular text is more terse, perhaps, than Nagarjuna and Aryadeva's originals, but I'm sure glad

Mipham wrote his commentary.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Cone:

This is but one text out of many. The text you are referring has nothing to do with Madhyamaka, despite Mipham's bold attempt to make it fit into a Madhyamaka mold by riding roughshod over the text.

Shenga's MMK commentary consists of wrapping the MMK in Buddhapalita's commentary.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 5th, 2011 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

conebeckham said:

I think it is better to stick to Nagarajuna and Aryadeva. Nagarjuna and Arydeva are straightforward and easy to understand.

Jinzang said:

They aren't to me.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you find difficult about them?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 5th, 2011 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Thanks Namdrol and Sönam

Since GURUYOGA by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche is a restricted book; if we are to receive the Direct Introduction from Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche via the Worldwide Transmission, would we email a request to purchase GURUYOGA explaining that we currently do not have physical access to a Dzogchen Community center, and that we need the said book in order to participate in the Worldwide Transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, in order to purchase many book, you must be a member, If you are member of the DC, this shows your interest. Transmission will occur sometime. To do the world wide transmission, you need only the small worldwide transmission booklet -- should

be easy to get and is not restricted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 4th, 2011 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

conebeckham said:

The third alternative, and one I feel the majority of us follow, is to stick to one Tibetan pedagogical tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is better to stick to Nagarajuna and Aryadeva. Nagarjuna and Arydeva are straighyforward and easy to understand. This is the "pedagogical tradition" of Khenpo Shenga.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 4th, 2011 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

FYI, to attend the WWT you have to know what to do during it beforehand. If you don't, there's not that much use to attend.

Epistemes said:

Where do you go to learn what to do during it beforehand? Is there a code in "The Crystal and The Way of Light" that we have to crack? Not all of us have ease of access to a community. Can other practitioners e-mail you the instructions?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a new book I saw, called Guru Yoga -- it has all the instructions for each of the three international transmission days, as well as complete instructions for all the major guru yoga practices in teh DC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

Namdrol said:

We need to strive for mutual respect. That is important.

heart said:

Yes, I feel that there is a lack of respect for the traditional Nyingma style of Dzogchen practice in this and other forums. I think you do understand the point I am trying to make Namdrol.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Others feel there is a lack of respect for ChNN's style of Dzogchen and that people push this ngondro + two stages approach too hard and want to condition DC practitioners into their way of thinking.

Just accept it, we don't think tantric ngondro is that important over all. No use in trying to convince us.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

Longchenpa is not old-school enough for you Nangwa?

/magnus

Namdrol said:

Nope. He is too influenced by Sarma.

Rongzom, Aro Yeshe Jungney, Phang Mipham Gonpo, Chetsun Senge Wangchuk, now that is old school.

N

heart said:

so please post your proof that they didn't do Ngondro or Keyrim and Dzogrim before or during their Dzogchen practice. They were all pretty involved with Tantra as well, no?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There is no creation stage, completion stage or deities in Vima Nyinthig.

Rongzom states quite clearly that there is no need for the two stages in the sixth chapter of his major work -- his approach to Dzogchen works equally well if you are a tantric practitioner or not.

Plus there is a broad understanding in sems sde, klong sde, etc. that deity yoga is not necessary.

I don't think Senge Wangchuk was that involved with deity yoga -- there is no evidence that he emphasized it at all. I am sure he knew it, however. Aro Yeshe either.

What you did before you practice Dzogchen is not that important. As you agree already, Dzogchen is not gradual.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

The debate about ChNNR and ngondro has been done to death so many times before ...

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a debate. It is plain difference of style. Magnus is very Nyingma in his approach, based on his tradition and teachers. Magnus' idea is that ChNN students do not understand something important.

Personally, I think ChNN is the greatest master of Dzogchen alive. Just read my post on atikosha.org about him. But that is me.

Other people who follow other masters should feel their master and his or her approach is the best. Those of us who follow ChNN need to respect other masters and their students -- we should not get into some trip about this tradition or that tradition. Often these days ChNN is fond of saying that there is no "dzogchen tradition".

We need to strive for mutual respect. That is important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

Longchenpa is not old-school enough for you Nangwa?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. He is too influenced by Sarma.

Rongzom, Aro Yeshe Jungney, Phang Mipham Gonpo, Chetsun Senge Wangchuk, now that is old school.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In response to Geoff's question:

It is useless to read about togal without introduction to togal.

It can block your practice because it can cause strongly clinging and obsession.

Showing the postures and gazes in an incorrect way will, according to the texts, make your gaze unstable.

Tögal is not especially complicated, but if not approached in correct way, will cause problems for practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist ethics and BDSM?

Content:

Astus said:

BDSM is not intended to be a spiritual practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Tell that to the modern primitives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 4:18 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

You can of course chose to ignore that if you want.

Namdrol said:

Yes, he should, his master is not all these other teachers -- his master is ChNN.

N

heart said:

Or he could keep an open mind and realize there might be more than one path that leads to the top of the mountain.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

He can keep an open mind, but still follow his master's advice which is not the advice of all these other masters.

Face it Magnus, people in the DC are _never_ going to agree that they have to do ngondro, creation stage, completion stage, etc., since our master says that the tantric approach to these things is not our approach and are not necessary. This is not the path that ChNN has laid for us.

As you well know, our master, ChNN says the only necessary thing for his students is Guru Yoga of White A. On the other hand, he also says that since people have many conditions and circumstances, they should not limit themselves, and this is why he provides methods such as tara, mandarava, namkha, serkyem, chulen, yantra, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 4:12 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

So why would ChNN make people in the SMS do unnecessary practices?

Malcolm wrote:

SMS level one is connected with the Dzogchen sems sde system of Sogdog Lodo Gyalpo. In his system one does a short ngondro retrea before main practice.

But if you are not an SMS student, then you are free to do what you like. Not everyone is in SMS.

In General, ChNN prefers people to understand their primordial state and to do Guru Yoga (which are the same thing). This, he feels, is much superior to any of the other uncommon preliminaries. So basically, he prefers people to skip over the other uncommon preliminaries and to make Guru Yoga their main practice until they have real knowledge (rig pa) of their primordial state. For example, he considers purification of the five elements better than Vajrasattva. And if you are going to do Vajrasattva, one week is sufficient, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

You can of course chose to ignore that if you want.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he should, his master is not all these other teachers -- his master is ChNN.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

heart said:

Isn't there is Ngondro in SantiMaha Sangha also?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, one to three weeks of each for the main four, refuge and so on. But this is only for SMS people. Otherwise only rushan is considered vital.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 2nd, 2011 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well, the thread wouldn't exist if we relied only on the Indian Texts...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and that would be wonderful...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 1st, 2011 at 5:20 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I realize this thread is about Triyik Yeshe Lama, but the Bonpo Dzogchen practitioner might be interested to know that the Shardza Tashi Gyaltsen text translated as "Heartdrops of the Dharmakaya" is a very useful instruction that covers all the same topics covered in Yeshe Lama, but has the nice feature of not being wordy and being very down to earth. Of course there are those who will disagree, but I feel the description of the view in the section on Trekcho is very good. I have had the transmissions of many Dzogchen texts and I find myself coming back to "Heartdrops" more and more, especially as my practice develops, I find its simplicity to be easy to read when you need a short glance and don't want to get too heady into information.

Malcolm wrote:

Many years ago, in 1992, ChNN advised us not to look at thogal texts prior to receiving total instructions. So people in the DC should not read that or any other togal text just because they feel like it. They should wait until ChNN or some other qualified master can bestow the teaching on them in a proper way.

My point about availability is a little different, however. I feel the text classical texts should be available, since to a large extent they are self-secret. But this does not mean people should just go ahead and read them without having had the instruction from a qualified teacher. If they do, there is a good chance they will create obstacles for their practice. So people should be mature.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 1st, 2011 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: Madyamika Sautrantika vs Prasangika

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

The svatantrika and prasangika views are both "rangtong" madhyamaka views since they both state that genuine reality is self-empty.

Malcolm wrote:

This is incorrect. There is no such thing as rang stong, at least, not in real madhyamaka.

"If there were something subtle not empty, there would be something subtle to be empty;

as there is nothing not empty, where is there something that could be empty?"

--MMK

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 31st, 2011 at 4:28 PM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

Namdrol said:

...

Tenerife is awesome.

-

Pero said:

I'm glad you were able to go to these teachings!

And a little bit envious too I guess haha. One question, was it his Longsal Thogal?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 30th, 2011 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For all interested people:

ChNN is giving a wonderful teaching on tögal. He even permitted people to come who have never before received teachings or transmission. Anyone who asked him was allowed to come or so I understand. There are 1100 people in attendance from all over the world. This is probably that largest single group of people outside of Tibet to receive tögal teachings at one time.

There was no empowerment. Rinpoche did only the very simplest of introductions during the first session and has spent the last three days explaining how to do this practice very thoroughly through all four visions, how to recognize them, how to develop them and the signs of attaining each one.

Namo Guru Bhyah!

He also explained very carefully why and how Dzogchen is a separate vehicle; how and why it is also related to Vajrayāna; and how and why Dzogchen does not need to depend on the methods common to Vajrayāna. He also explained why people should not be averse to the methods of Vajrayāna and why they are useful and important. All in all a balanced presentation.

He also clearly explained the principle of rainbow body and great transference body similarities and differences.

Tenerife is awesome.

N

-

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 26th, 2011 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Lazy people should just give up, right?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Crowley rejected Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. He considered it to be a "Yellow" school, outside of western teleologies and so therefore, something to draw from, but irrelevant to his overt rebellion against Christianity.

Nothing in Buddhism to rebel against.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 26th, 2011 at 8:58 AM

Title: Re: Lazy people should just give up, right?

Content:

padma norbu said:

It's clear he has a Buddhist understanding and he applies that to Thelema for some reason. Not entirely sure why.

Malcolm wrote:
Rebranding.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, October 26th, 2011 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: Trungpa Rinpoche's "Crazy Wisdom": Padmasambhava's Crime
Content:
Caz said:
You work with convention to benefit others not against it.

Malcolm wrote:
Tell that to Tilopa.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, October 26th, 2011 at 7:03 AM
Title: Re: Trungpa Rinpoche's "Crazy Wisdom": Padmasambhava's Crime
Content:
Food_Eatah said:
Now, no one here has been in the same room with the Buddha. Yet where are all the scandals involving him?

Malcolm wrote:
Well, there was the girl who accused the Buddha of getting her pregnant for a starters....

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, October 26th, 2011 at 5:43 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism and the relation between mental and physical
Content:
coldmountain said:
yet I know Buddhism doesn't posit a dualism.

What is physical? What is mental? Are they independent? Could the physical exist without the mental? Is one metaphysically prior to or dependent on the other?

Thanks and peace.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhism does posit a substance dualism until you get to Yogacara.

Physical is anything made of the four elements.

Mental is all cognitions and their associates.

No.

Matter depends on the mind, even in Abhidharma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 26th, 2011 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Ayurveda = Smoke & Mirrors

Content:

Epistemes said:

Breathe like this, breathe like that. Stretch like this, stretch like that. Eat like this, eat like that. Drink like this, drink like that.

And you'll still get punched in the stomach by a virus.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily, and even if you do, you will recover much faster.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 24th, 2011 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

maybay said:

Ubuntu's come a long way in the last few years Namdrol. Once its setup its a breeze. Its a pity about Unity though. Gnome 2 was just fine. Hardware support is the main issue for me.

Namdrol said:

I never had problems with Linux. But for what I do, a mac is a far superior machine in terms of the support for unicode Tibetan and so on. Also I need to use acrobat quite a lot in my work with Tibetan texts. Linux equivalents won't cut it for me.

N

maybay said:

THDL provides Tibetan fonts for Ubuntu. They even package them in debians so you can download through the software center. Otherwise any font can be converted with the right program. PM me.

Acrobat reader is provided on Ubuntu. But if its straight Acrobat - for creating and editing - you can install it on Wine. Wine is a Windows emulator. Essentially you can install any Windows program. Only programs I've had trouble with are full-screen games. But I didn't give it much attention.

LibreOffice is the (free) Unix equivalent of Microsoft Office, and it exports to PDF just fine. I never had a problem. It can't edit PDFs though.

Malcolm wrote:

The best Tibetan Font, Monlam, is part of the Mac OS 10 operating system. Why bother with WINE? Windows programs leak memory like crazy and generally slow down any system they run on. Also font technology in the Mac beats Windows and Linux handily. The screen redraw programs on the Mac cannot be outdone by Windows or Linux.

I need to edit PDF, and manipulate them. Even Preview, on the Mac, is inadequate for this task. Also Mac OS 10 Lion is like 30 bucks and can be downloaded for one price on multiple machines.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 24th, 2011 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Subdivide Tibetan Medicine forum?

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Why not subdivide the TM forum so there's a section just for questions which only authorized TM practitioners can answer, but another section where amateurs who have an interest in TM can post their comments. That way, Tara wouldn't have to constantly "clean up" the board, and also, posts relating to TM would be easy to find, without getting lost in another more general category. At the same time, the rigorous standards of the TM board would be retained in the "only professionals are qualified to answer" section.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be better to have an alternative health forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 24th, 2011 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

Will said:

Too dense to understand any OS, so I stuck with Windows for years. Even after I got an "all-in-one" just so the desk would be clearer of machines. That AiO was an iMac; but I had a techie split the drive so I could have the familiar OE email etcetera. Then it got sick & died. I was going to replace it with one of the PC AiO machines now out there, but found out that Windows 7 cannot handle Outlook Express. So, what the hell, I got another iMac and am finding it not so terrible to figure out (provided I ignore 90% of its features).

I am using Snow Leopard because I heard of too many bugs in Lion. Anyone confirm or deny the flea-infested Lion rumors are true?

Malcolm wrote:

They fixed it with the iCloud release, OS X 10.7.2

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 24th, 2011 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

maybay said:

Ubuntu's come a long way in the last few years Namdrol. Once its setup its a breeze. Its a pity about Unity though. Gnome 2 was just fine. Hardware support is the main issue for me.

Malcolm wrote:

I never had problems with Linux. But for what I do, a mac is a far superior machine in terms of the support for unicode Tibetan and so on. Also I need to use acrobat quite a lot in my work with Tibetan texts. Linux equivalents won't cut it for me.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa Rinpoche's "Crazy Wisdom": Padmasambhava's Crime

Content:

Epistemes said:

So, nobody was actually (conventionally) killed?

Malcolm wrote:

It's a didactic tale, not history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa Rinpoche's "Crazy Wisdom": Padmasambhava's Crime

Content:

Epistemes said:

Huh?? Padmasambhava accidentally murders two people and karmically gets away with it?

Malcolm wrote:

If it was an accident, there is no karmic retribution. "Karma is volition and what proceeds from volition" -- this is the definition of karma given by the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, the most damaging thing to Ojas is anxiety and worry. The next most damaging thing to ojas poor food. The next most damaging thing to Ojas is releasing it along with semen during the summer when Ojas is not produced abundantly since one's food is too "pale" i.e. lacking substantial nutrition. During this season it is more difficult to separate.

Lhug-Pa said:

Agreed, about the anxiety and poor food part; but still, according to my understanding, Ojas should not be released with the semen at all, regardless of the season. Perhaps lay people were advised to, but Initiates (whether Buddhist or not) should transmute it to the Heart Center instead of expelling it.

Malcolm wrote:

But indeed it is, if imperfectly separated from sukra.

Lhug-Pa said:

As for the context of all of this in the Buddhist Tantras, I would have to study them more in order to understand the proper context, that is instead of simply taking your word for it based on your interpretations.

Malcolm wrote:

this is not my interpretation. This is what the texts actually say.

Lhug-Pa said:

So I'll reference what you've said here, and see what I come up with in comparing it to other Buddhist teachings whether Sutra or Tantra (and also what is within the Sacred-Sex link in my signature).

yet I also respect the already mentioned teachers of other traditions (Hindu, Gnostic, etc.), and want to take some time to learn more as well, before saying too much more on the topic.

Malcolm wrote:

I have no problem with Hindus. Caraka was a rishi. His authority in the matter is undisputed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Given the above citations, among others, it is well known in Indian Yoga and Tantra that the physical Bindu and/or Ojas can be transmuted into non-physical Ojas and stored in the Brain and Heart Center (again, please see the above quotes and links in my previous posts in this thread).

Malcolm wrote:

Really, prove it. Give me a source text, a direct quotation. With Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Fair enough, if we can at least explore the possibility of Ojas being both physical and non-physical.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, this is just bullshit. To be frank. It is based on a misunderstanding, someone's mystical fantasies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

And from what I understand, its not even the loss of physical semen that's necessarily the most damaging to ones storing of Ojas. It's the spastic movements of the orgasm that releases tremendous amounts of Ojas; Ojas that ought to be saved (in the heart centre as radiance, as Keith Dowman says in Sky Dancer).

Malcolm wrote:

No, the most damaging thing to Ojas is anxiety and worry. The next most damaging thing to ojas poor food. The next most damaging thing to Ojas is releasing it along with semen during the summer when Ojas is not produced abundently since one's food is too "pale" i.e. lacking substantial nutrition. During this season it is more difficult to separate.

Basically, Lhugpa-- I could care less what Sivananda and Auer say. I care what Medicine Buddha says, Padmasambhava, Caraka, Sushruta, Vagbhata, etc. People are very confused about this issue because the tantras discuss these issues in an indirect and obscure way and people ignorant of their true meaning interpret them in many incorrect ways. On the other hand the Ayurvedic traditon and Tibetan Medical tradition discuss these things clearly and openly.

For example, Padmasambhava, since he knows medicine quite well, in the text I mentioned in the KN, discusses how to divided the rasa and kitta of the bindu. Why? Because ojas is the final physical product of the digestion of food, the final rasa.

For example, the explanatory tantra states:

"The final state of the semen (sukra) of the physical constituents (saptadhātu) is the supreme one called "ojas"; located in the heart, pervading the entire body, and causing longevity, and causing a radiant complexion and a brightness."

As I said, Caraka, etc. identify this as a clear fluid in the body, surrounding the heart etc. It is physical, not non-physical.

You do not seem to understand that in the Tibetan translation of the Aṣṭangahridayasamhita, ojas is translated as mdang when it refers to ojas, and gzi mdangs when referring to a radiant complexion, and mdangs 'gyur when referring to pitta that exists in the skin, i.e. bhrajaka pitta.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 8:20 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Well perhaps some of those Lamas such as the ones you referred to as not being educated in medical knowledge, agree with teachers such as Swami Sivananda and

Samael Aun Weor, in that all of the physical semen can literally be transmuted into non-physical Ojas.

Malcolm wrote:

Ojas is a physical fluid. It is stated so quite clearly by Caraka, Sushruta, and Vagbhata. However, many people do not understand these texts because they do not understand the underlying anatomy of the body in Indian culture. I however am a fully trained Tibetan doctor, someone who has done three year retreat, have read literally thousands and thousands of pages of these texts in Tibetan.

Ojas is a physical fluid. People who think otherwise are simply mistaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Namdrol said:

The Dzogchen term, "mdangs", i.e., radiance, has nothing to do with ojas, and nor does, gdangs, i.e., luminescence.

Lhug-Pa said:

I'm sure that in Dzogchen these terms have a much deeper context and meaning than they do in Tantra; however I doubt that the said deeper Dzogchen context and meaning completely excludes the Tantric context related to Ojas.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen context completely excludes the Tantric context related to Ojas. The word mdang does not only translate ojas. It also translates chavi i.e. chavi f. skin , cuticle , Pa1rGr , iii , 12 Hariv. 15709 Sus3r. VarBr2S. lxix , 28 ff. ; colour of the skin , colour MBh. iii , 12387 Mr2icch. Megh. &c. ; beauty , splendour Ragh. ix , 34 S3is3. ix , 3 Naish. xxii , 55 ; a ray of light L. ; cf. %kRSNa-cch-}.

When you do not know Tibetan well, or lack a grasp of how Tibetans translate various different Sanskrit terms using the same word into Tibetan, you can mislead yourself into making unwarranted conclusions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

[

Namdrol said:

Conserving semen is a non-issue in Dzogchen. This is clearly explained in the Khandro Nyinthig.

Lhug-Pa said:

Are these the very words of Padmasambhava or Longchenpa? Or are they the words of another commentator?

Malcolm wrote:

Padmasambhava.

Namdrol said:

In terms of highest yoga tantra, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen and Sapan clearly explain there is no fault in ejaculating if one is not practicing the completion stage practices such as tummo and union yoga.

That may be, but I don't see any benefit in expelling the physical aspect of Thigle/Bodhicitta (semen) from one's body at all, whether in the context of Tantra or Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a very good reason: if you block or forcefully prevent ejaculation, it will result in semen stones and impotence long term. It is bad for the health of your body. If the semen moves, you should just let it go. Sukra is a kitta (snyigs ma, waste product), it is an impurity to be expelled from the body, like it's female counterpart, menstrual tissue and the oocyte, like all the kittas in the process of digestion, for example, sweat, hair, nails, rectal grease, and so on.

What is important to conserve is ojas, this is the real thigle or bindu we should care about. Ojas is most likely to be lost with semen in hot seasons like the summer (from the first day of the fourth month of the lunar calendar to the first day of the seventh month) when people are eating food with little rasa or bcud -- therefore one should only ejaculate bi-weekly during this season. In the winter one can ejaculate as much as one likes (up to five times a day) because people generally eat food that is very oily, (snum, snigdah) and nutritious (rasa, bcud) during this season. Every other day is the proper ratio during early spring and the fall.

Namdrol said:

Nevertheless, the world's spiritual traditions are unanimous regarding the benefits of the absolute conservation of semen or complete chastity (and by chastity I don't mean exoterically as in repression. I mean chastity from the esoteric viewpoint of sublimation and transmutation).

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are not. And definitely not in Anuttarayoga tantra. People who think there is something to sublimate or transform do not understand the principles of physiology that informs the tantras (and this is shockingly in common in Lamas who lack medical educations). There is something refined to retain, and something that is a residue or a

waste product (of the process of refinement) to eliminate. Ojas is the former, and sukra is the latter. Really.

Namdrol said:

Is this available in English?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am afraid it is not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Namdrol said:

The whole point of Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine is to refine and purify ojas in the body for longevity etc. In Tibetan the term ojas is translated as "mdangs".

Lhug-Pa said:

Interesting. Are mdangs and gdangs different?

And how are they related to Thugs-rJe, gDangs, Rolpa, and rTsal in the context of Dzogchen? With Ngo-bo (Ngowo) and Rang-bZhin (Rangzhin) already in mind of course.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen term, "mdangs", i.e., radiance, has nothing to do with ojas, and nor does, gdangs, i.e., luminescence.

Conserving semen is a non-issue in Dzogchen. This is clearly explained in the Khandro Nyinthig.

In terms of highest yoga tantra, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen and Sapan clearly explain there is no fault in ejaculating if one is not practicing the completion stage practices such as tummo and union yoga.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 23rd, 2011 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: So this forum is comprised mostly of former New-Age hippies?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Bah, Portishead ain't psychedelia.

gregkavarnos said:
Pedant! Trip Hop then...

Malcolm wrote:
Modern psychedelia is like the magic mushroom band, ozric tentacles, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, October 21st, 2011 at 10:59 PM
Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.
Content:
padma norbu said:
Namdrol,

Well, to be fair, I think Tony didn't want to sell it to me for good reasons; either he didn't want me to get mixed up and confused or waste my time in a practice I was not ready for or hurt myself or whatever the possible disadvantages are of starting thogal before you're ready. If you own texts about thogal would you fax me a copy? Probably not, eh?

Malcolm wrote:
You can read all about togal on the internet.

I own many texts about togal, hundreds of them. No one asked me for my credentials to buy them. Many I downloaded. Others I bought in Tibet. Others I had shipped from India.

It is appalling that books in Tibetan that freely available to anyone with a buck can are "restricted" in English.

Things will be changing soon, I guarantee it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, October 21st, 2011 at 10:46 PM
Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhist sadhana practice for non-Buddhists
Content:
padma norbu said:
Is there such a thing published anywhere?

My mother is getting a bit old and I have noticed her emails are more and more depressed sounding. I don't know if it is possible to edit out the Buddhism of a sadhana and still have it work. Has anyone ever seen a book like this? She is very Christian and supposedly gets joy from her beliefs, but I think the only joy she gets is clinging to hope. Other than that, she looks around and sees nothing but wickedness everywhere... except in little babies and animals, which she also enjoys.

I know that sadhanas really work and work quickly, but I suppose without refuge and

bodhicitta and mantra they are not going to work too well, eh? My mom wouldn't even chant anything because she thinks meditation is a way for evil spirits to enter you. It seems like she might say something like "God my creator, Jesus my savior, my wish is to be filled with love for all beings, that I may help as many as possible and leave judgement in God's hands..."

Ah, this is a stupid question, but I'm going to post it anyway just in case anyone knows of such a thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Hail Mary and the Lord's Prayer. You should buy her a really nice new rosary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 21st, 2011 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

padma norbu said:

congrats on rising to the challenge? Also... see Pero's response. I have zero remorse. Why? Because I did nothing wrong, no matter how hard you look for it. I had just read this other forum, literally, the day before this thread began and I literally posted my FIRST response from memory to help. My second response (after Heart's) was to clarify (complete with link pulled from my browser history). Yours? Just bullshit. Start to finish. Bullshit.

Case in point:

Yontan said:

Tony has some fine translations, but this is not the only of his works of texts previously translated that make a point to note how his is superior. He has a personal interest in selling his translations, I'm sure. We all need to eat. Grain of salt.

padma norbu said:

Right... I suppose that's why he responded to my request for the book with a brief dismissal. Because he wanted to sell it to me by not selling it to me, even after I mentioned that Snow Lion would sell me their version if I proved I have received transmission (which I have several times). Yeah... hmmm... Duff apparently wants to sell it so bad that his full response was a complete mystery to the uninitiated, along the lines of "there's no point in saying more than this, but I won't sell it to you" (paraphrased).

Malcolm wrote:

All this business of "restricted books" is elitist bullshit. Gyurme Dorje's translation of Longchenpa's commentary of Guhyagarbha is available for free and to anyone with a browser.

Every classical Dzogchen text can be read by anyone who knows Tibetan and can

downloaded for free from TBRC.

The time has passed for so called "restricted translations".

While I respect the right of a given tertion to maintain brand control over his treasures, in terms of classical literature, there should be no more "restricted" texts. Its a bunch of bullshit, and these days it is perpetuated mostly by westerners.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 21st, 2011 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Poll: Which Operating System Do You Use?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I use an iMac. Superior machine.

Linux is ok, but I am no longer a systems engineer and I am too busy to worry about running shell scripts, recompiling apps, and so on. I used to use linux all the time, but mostly for network hacking when I worked as a systems engineer. Also, I have zero interest in unix as a hobby. I like the user experience on OS X. I used to be a certified MSCE, but I hate Windows. Windows sucks.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 21st, 2011 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Spleen Qi Deficiency

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Couldn't you say that weak jatharagni would be the Ayurvedic equivalent of spleen qi deficiency? It's not an exact match, but I think that would probably be the closest thing.

I have more to say about spleen qi deficiency, but I will wait until the topic has been moved.

Malcolm wrote:

In Tibetan Medicine the spleen is the spleen, located on the left side of the body, above the pancreas. These are the types of spleen illnesses we identify explicitly as "spleen" illnesses: hot spleen illness, blood bloating, wind spleen, phlegm spleen, and swollen.

Weak stomach heat i.e. jaṭaragni is not related to the spleen itself in either Tibetan Medicine or Ayurveda. However, your intuition is good.

It seems that in Chinese medicine the spleen means the liver, and the liver means the spleen. The liver is indeed responsible for transformation and nourishing blood and muscles in Tibeian Medicine. So in my opinion when Chinese medicine is talking about spleen deficiencies we would understand this as a problem with the liver's ability to process nutrients. Our approach would be to restore liver heat, and then one can eat whatever one likes without avoiding anything. The possible approach to this would be to do a round of Pancakarma or failing that, a seasonal cleanse to remove lymphatic blockages, cleanse the biliary pathways, and cleanse the intestines of excess mucous which is blocking the uptake of nutrients in general.

This is essentially a cold liver disease from a Tibetan Medical POV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 21st, 2011 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: So this forum is comprised mostly of former New-Age hippies?

Content:

Tarpa said:

Old mod / traditional skinhead here,

Malcolm wrote:

I was the first old mod /traditional skinhead in Boston circa 1980.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 21st, 2011 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Spleen Qi Deficiency

Content:

Epistemes said:

Does TM have a parallel diagnosis for Spleen Qi Deficiency as in Traditional Chinese Medicine? What is it called?

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, different theory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 20th, 2011 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: So this forum is comprised mostly of former New-Age hippies?

Content:

himalayanspirit said:

What I did not like is that the hippies take up Buddhism due to their drug experiences, and also go on to preach about how drugs could be beneficial for Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

No one said this. What was said was that for many people in the west, beginning in the sixties, having some experiences with hallucinogens expanded their consciousness so they became interested in Eastern religion.

Everyone here recognizes that Buddha taught that one should avoid intoxicants.

However, everything in the world is medicine when one knows how to use it. Everything in the world is poison when one does not know how to use it. This also applies to hallucinogens. For example, there is promising research that taking LSD, etc., reduces anxiety about death in terminally ill patients. There is research that shows that MDMA helps permanently alleviate PTSD. Marijuana is proven to reduce nausea in people doing chemo-therapy, and those who have long term chronic pain, and its effects are much less destructive than opiates. Alcohol also has many medicinal effects. The Buddha permitted monks to use alcohol for medical conditions. So we must have a flexible view.

Perfectly respectable non-Buddhist people are better people because they have had spiritual experiences from taking Ayahuasca, and so on. We may not make that choice for ourselves, but we are in no position to judge them.

Some people destroy their lives with food. But no one suggests that we all stop eating.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 20th, 2011 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Spontaneous Presence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no practice of spontaneous presence [lhun grub] per se. Lhun grub in fact refers to natural [lhun] formation [grub] of the basis. There is a practice related to this aspect of Dzogchen teachings, however, called thögal. It has nothing to do with anything taught by Tolle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 20th, 2011 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: astrology

Content:

maybay said:

Most modern Indian astrologers use the sidereal zodiac which puts all the symbolism out by a sign and a half.

Some like Ernst Wilhelm say use the tropical for the signs and sidereal for the nakshatras.

Malcolm wrote:

Kalacakra uses tropical for everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 19th, 2011 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Gayatri Mantra in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

dharmasack said:

I have definitely heard recordings of Tibetan Monks chanting it, but other than that I don't know much.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, you have not. The Gayatri does not exist as a tradition in Buddhism of any kind. There may however be some Western Tibetan Buddhists that are fond of chanting it (I know one too).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 19th, 2011 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: Debunking Homeopathy

Content:

catmoon said:

So who can you trust? Sadly, you can't trust anyone all the time, but the standard doctor in a white coat does have a nearly 100% success rate with some things. You can trust him to set your broken bones, suture your cuts and scrapes, lance boils and they are pretty good with infections. But the moment he hands you a pill with a name a yard long, you're on your own. It might be good, it or might wreck your kidneys, or your liver, or send you into some psychotic hell of no return in twenty years. There's just no way to know.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference between modern pharmaceuticals and Tibetan and Ayurvedic formulas (as well as Chinese formulas) is that the former have no track record and are relatively recent. The latter have been tested on human populations for 1000 years+ and their effects, dosages, indications, and counter-indications are well known and described.

The caveat is that herbal medicines, like their allopathic counterpart, require a) a medical theory which underlies a nosology b) a clinically experienced doctor trained in

that field of medicine.

I personally have no confidence in the efficacy of homeopathic formulas. But they are also not harmful. So if people want to spend their money on them, I have no problem with it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 19th, 2011 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: Debunking Homeopathy

Content:

Epistemes said:

My girlfriend's mother is a big advocate of homeopathic medicine. I don't know even know what it is.

All I've gathered is that it is supposedly better than allopathic medicine for the sole reason that it isn't allopathic medicine and a stranger to Big Pharma.

It seems like a pretty generic term for anti-allopathic medicine.

I think my girlfriend is actually currently seeing a homeopathic doctor for her angioedema. Or maybe it's an Oriental medicine doctor? All I know is that she's taking some Chinese herbs and getting acupuncture done. It's hard to keep track since she's been to so many doctors with this thing.

Malcolm wrote:

CHinese medicine and not homeopathy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 19th, 2011 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Debunking Homeopathy

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

It is my plan along with the Humanist Society in Aberdeen city, to hold a stall advocating removing funding for Homeopathic remedies at the cost of the National Health Service. currently the uk government supports despite hard financial times funding for 4 homeopathic hospitals. Medical studies have shown no effect of homeopathy besides the placebo effect. It is my plan this Sunday to have a mass overdose of homeopathic remedies - anyone with a elementary knowledge of chemistry should understand that there is no active ingredient in these remedies.

Malcolm wrote:

You're just jealous that you didn't think of the \$20 million duck first.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 19th, 2011 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Tibetanmedicine-edu.org 3 year online course

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

How much does it cost? I have often wondered what the benefits of a dual qualification in western and tibetan medicine would be.

Malcolm wrote:

One will be able to practice Tibetan medicine without obstacles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 18th, 2011 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Tibetanmedicine-edu.org 3 year online course

Content:

Inge said:

Do you know if the three year Tibetan medicine distant learning online course of Dr. Pasang Y. Arya T. Sherpa at <http://www.tibetanmedicine-edu.org/index.php/tibetan-medicine-course> is a good program?

Malcolm wrote:

He is a qualified doctor, so I am sure it is fine.

There are two other options as well.

My Alma mater:

<http://tibetanmedicineschool.org/programs/4-year-program/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Nida Chenagtsang's program:

<http://www.thesoriginstitute.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

All three are fine programs, all have their strengths and their weaknesses. All three are run by qualified Tibetan doctors who speak english well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 18th, 2011 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Military Sangha (U.S.)

Content:

kirtu said:

I also see this hyperconservatism in... Massachusetts ..."

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe the Massachusetts in some alternate universe, but not in the Massachusetts I live in. Of course, I am merely 15 miles from the VT border as the crow flies (go bernie!).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 18th, 2011 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: longterm use of agar-35 & semde

Content:

pemachophel said:

Namdrol,

One other question: Paltul Rinpoche has had me on the same three sets of TM pills for almost a year now. Does that mean they are being absorbed as food and not as medicine?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on the medicine and depends on the disease. Some chronic diseases, like Padkan Mugpo, have to be treated for a year or more. In this case one takes usually one herb for a very long time, and other herbs are often, but not always, changed for season and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 17th, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Killing Insects and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

[quote="edearl"

...

A house mice may not be able to survive in a forest, they have adapted to living with humans and in open fields, according to Wikipedia.

edearl said:

This is an example of where Wiki and reality do not meet. The mice we have in our house _are_ field mice.

N

I checked some additional sources.

According to <http://faculty.njcu.edu/fmoran/vol4fieldmouse.htm> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; the long tailed field mouse never lives in houses.

Malcolm wrote:

They should come to my attic, then. They will understand something different.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 17th, 2011 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Ayahuasca and Buddhism

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Is there anything in experience that is not a hallucination?

I'm not much of a fan of Batchelor but he had one metaphor that I thought was good - practice is like climbing the mountain, psychedelics are like being helicoptered to the summit. Certainly for the long term it doesn't seem like a good idea to rely on the helicopter. But it may give some boost to faith.

gregkavarnos said:

Except that after taking you for a brief trip to the summit, they then drop you off at the lowest level of the subteranean cave system which exists below the mountain, rather than at the base of the mountain. Thus one requires to expend twice as much energy just to get to zero again. Then with every subsequent use they drop you even further until in the end you don't even bother trying to reach the summit anymore, you're happy enough to just briefly gaze upon the summit after every hit.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Garab Dorje, the purpose of using hallucinogens is to see that the mind is malleable, not a fixed or permanent substance. So, in fact hallucinogens do have a use in Dharma, albeit an extremely limited and narrow one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 17th, 2011 at 7:05 PM

Title: Re: Killing Insects and Buddhism

Content:

Epistemes said:

...

We've captured squirrels before in a cage, driven a few miles away, then let them out.

Pero said:

Hm yeah, I suppose I could drive them to the forest nearby.

edearl said:

A house mice may not be able to survive in a forest, they have adapted to living with

humans and in open fields, according to Wikipedia.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an example of where Wiki and reality do not meet. The mice we have in our house _are_ field mice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 17th, 2011 at 7:03 PM

Title: Re: Killing Insects and Buddhism

Content:

Ryoto said:

The other day I had mice in my house who were leaving crap everywhere and chewing into packaged foods so I got these glue traps which caught 3 of them in one night. They will die a slow death but it had to be done.

Tilopa said:

It didn't have to be done like that. There are other ways of catching mice that don't involve killing:

<http://members.aceweb.com/patrussell/mousetrap/Mousetrap.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Pero said:

That's cool, we have mice in our house too and I was thinking if there was another way instead of killing them. The thing is though, it is not a complete solution. What do you do with the mice? Throwing them out is no solution IMO, they'll just come back.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to drive them about 3 miles away from your house. Preferably across a stream. That is what I do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 17th, 2011 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: longterm use of agar-35 & semde

Content:

pemachophel said:

Namdrol,

Sorry, I did not read your previous explanation of this, but can you please explain how the body processes foods differently than medicines according to TM? My initial impression is that the body is going to process anything that is ingested p.o. in the same way via the same digestive processes. How does the body distinguish between a

food/herb and a medicine?

Sorry if I'm being obtuse here.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the four tantras, it states that medicines are completely digested within an hour or so after being ingested. Food takes seven days to fully digest. When you use herbs for too long, the herb in question is no longer digested rapidly. By digest, we mean for the rasa of the food to work its way through the blood, muscle, fat, bone, marrow and semen.

There are of course some exceptions, but not many.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 17th, 2011 at 7:59 AM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Aemilius said:

I've never read the Vedas myself, except maybe some short excerpts, but a friend of mine who works in the University Library said that in Vedas there is a description of Earth being like an iron ball in space, that is held in place by invisible magnets.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I know, this cosmological description is found in the Surya Siddhanta, which cannot be later than the 5th century. But I don't think it is found in the Vedas.

In the Surya Siddhanta, the earth is described as round, suspended in space like a piece of iron held in place by the forcefield of two magnets. Mt Meru is at the North Pole, where the gods live, and the anti-Meru is at the south pole, where the asuras live.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 16th, 2011 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: Lazy people should just give up, right?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Dzogchen way is not creative visualization.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen way does not exclude visualization. Quite the contrary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 16th, 2011 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

Namdrol said:

You are going to have to ask them. If you ask the same question over and over again, it starts to become a little annoying.

dakini_boi said:

It's impossible to tell on an internet forum if the question was overlooked, misunderstood, or if no one had the answer. In all honesty, Namdrol, you're so incredibly knowledgeable that I assumed you probably would have had an answer, and therefore must have either overlooked or misunderstood the question. I didn't mean to be annoying.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 16th, 2011 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

dakini_boi said:

But in all other cases besides the b/v issue, you can easily recover Sanskrit pronunciation just from looking at the Tibetan text - for example, even though Tibetans say "Bhekhandze" or "Sutokhayo" etc, the Tibetan text retains the Sanskrit pronunciation. So why would they have chosen to transcribe Sanskrit ँ in such a way that it is unclear whether it should be pronounced v or b? Since no Tibetan words contain ँ, then presumably this character was invented specifically to transcribe ँ. So why was it not used uniformly?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say there were no Tibetan words that use ँ, just that there are very few. If you examine that construction of ँ you will see that it is a modified ँ.

ཁ means fox, BTW. For example, I have seen varttika spelled with both a ཁ and ཁ. Just chalk it up to human inconsistency and move on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 16th, 2011 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

dakini_boi said:

So why was it not used uniformly?

Malcolm wrote:

You are going to have to ask them. If you ask the same question over and over again, it starts to become a little annoying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 16th, 2011 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Also, from this conversation it appears likely that even Guru Rinpoche himself might have said "Bajra," being that he was from the north. This would also explain why written Tibetan Sanskrit uses འ instead of ཨ for many cases where originally you would have ཨ.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is more easily explained than that: in Tibetan, འ and ཨ are pronounced the same way in some dialects such as Amdo. Also, འ following a ར is also pronounced ཨ, as in རའང་. There, it is like that at the point when Thonmi was formalizing Tibetan grammar, འ and ཨ were pronounced very similarly and were in some sense interchangeable. In fact, there were very few Tibetan words that begin with ཨ, and no words that contain it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 15th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Killing Insects and Buddhism

Content:

cooran said:

Hello all,

What are the karmic results of deliberately killing insects?

Kai said:

Just like the normal karmic effect coming from unwholesome action of killing combined

with having ill will or aversion;

Illness, disability and short life in the next rebirth, born in war zone area, unattractive, lots of enemies, etc.....

cooran said:

Thanks Kai. Though I'm not sure many people in this thread accept or believe the Teachings on this matter - as they write about intentionally killing other beings frequently.

Malcolm wrote:

Accept and beleive. Also, one must keep in mind that a karmic act is perfect only if you are happy about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 15th, 2011 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

ratna said:

Slightly off-topic -- the difference between ba and va is not as great as one might think:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gCvdZhrEmm4&feature=related> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't work on me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 15th, 2011 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

Greg said:

Do all of these things apply to "va" sounds in the middle or end of a word? It wouldn't be "Bajrasatba" would it?

Malcolm wrote:

According to my Varanasi trained Lama, Wajrasattwa. Hewajra, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 15th, 2011 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

tantular said:

To Namdrol: is Sapan's description in the Khenjug? I'd love to read it. While the absence of different characters for v and b is strong evidence that in ordinary speech these 2 consonants had already merged in Sapan's time, if he explicitly states that they were distinguished, it could indicate that in special circumstances care was taken to pronounce them correctly. And just to be clear, I wholeheartedly agree with your main point: there is such a thing as "correct" Sanskrit pronunciation, and people should make an effort to follow it. śuddham astu!

Malcolm wrote:

Sapan says that in some places va is pronounced ba, like in Kashmir.

It is in collected works, I will get you the reference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 15th, 2011 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

It is unlikely that they were reading mantras from books and pronouncing them differently than their preceptors.

Malcolm wrote:

We will agree to disagree.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 14th, 2011 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

tantular said:

There is evidence that the sound change v → b is quite old; the post-Gupta, 6--7th century CE Buddhapālita manuscript in Beijing, for example, does not distinguish the characters for b and v. This is also a standard feature for all the scripts used in 11--12th century manuscripts from north eastern India & Nepal (the earliest period for which large numbers of manuscripts survive). So I think it's quite likely that the gurus from Nepal and Pala-lands during the later transmission said "bajra."

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Pandita notes these regional differences circa 1210 ad.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 14th, 2011 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Lamrim Chenmo in Tibetan

Content:

Totoro said:

Does anyone know where I can download Lamrim Chenmo in Tibetan? I've tried TBRC but don't seem to have any scanned there. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

[http://tbrc.org/link/?RID=O00EGS10257%7CO00EGS10257365\\$W22272#library_work_Object-O00EGS10257%257CO00EGS10257365\\$W22272](http://tbrc.org/link/?RID=O00EGS10257%7CO00EGS10257365$W22272#library_work_Object-O00EGS10257%257CO00EGS10257365$W22272)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 14th, 2011 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

tantular said:

Bengalis, including educated Brahmins, pronounce vajra as bodzro (in IPA). To English-speaking ears, this does indeed sound alot like "bodzro." English speakers hear the short vowel a as a short o or u; witness loan-words like pundit, pyjamas, juggernaut, etc. In my experience Nepali and Bengali pandits are the most difficult to understand if you are only used to the "standard" pronunciation.

Namdrol said:

yes, but one cannot infer from this that Tibetan pronunciations descend from modern Bengali pronunciations.

Karma Dorje said:

I certainly wasn't suggesting that. As I said, the Tibetan's Indian gurus *might* have been closer to the Tibetan pronunciation than we would surmise taking Varanasi pronunciations as our guidepost.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is not likely. Why? Because we have on hand Sakya Pandita text on how to pronounce mantras, and he was student of various panditas from various parts of India, and his uncle and grandfather were all fluent in Sanskrit.

Tibetan pronunciation of mantras can be accounted for very easily. Most Tibetans did not know Sanskrit, and pronounced mantras in texts phonetically as they saw them, rather than as they were intended, for example pronouncing རྩ as dza rather than ja, which is what was intended, or pronouncing ཅིཌ as tsitta rather than citta.

We do the same thing to Tibetan. I know many people in Dzogchen Community who still pronounce the o in dzog as in dog, rather than as in oak. Or people who pronounce prajna as if the j were to pronounced as in ajax, rather than a gñ complex.

N

Etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 14th, 2011 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

tantular said:

Bengalis, including educated Brahmins, pronounce vajra as bōdzro (in IPA). To English-speaking ears, this does indeed sound alot like "bodzro." English speakers hear the short vowel a as a short o or u; witness loan-words like pundit, pyjamas, juggernaut, etc. In my experience Nepali and Bengali pandits are the most difficult to understand if you are only used to the "standard" pronunciation.

Malcolm wrote:

yes, but one cannot infer from this that Tibetan pronunciations descend from modern Bengali pronunciations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 14th, 2011 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

For instance, vajra in Bengali is pronounced "bozro".

.

Namdrol said:

Where did you discover this?

Karma Dorje said:

From Bengali friends in our local Kalibari. Why do you ask?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this inference of yours is a bit synchronic. Pronunciations tend to evolve over time, unless artificially frozen.

How to Bengali Brahmins pronounce Vajra in Sanskrit?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 14th, 2011 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Is Buddhism hopeless?

Content:

Epistemes said:

Vimala is a wonderful medicine.

Namdrol said:

Dharma is better. But sometimes the medicine does not appear to taste good.

Epistemes said:

I agree, but:

"It's no good building a new crystal cage out of the [Buddhist] teachings. However beautiful it might be, it's still a cage[.]"

--Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Malcolm wrote:

You have apparently mistaken me for a dogmatist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 14th, 2011 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Is Buddhism hopeless?

Content:

Epistemes said:

Vimala is a wonderful medicine.

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma is better. But sometimes the medicine does not appear to taste good.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 14th, 2011 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Gardasil and tanning beds

Content:

Nangwa said:

The simple truth is that if you are a parent and dont get your child (male or female) the HPV vaccination you are putting your child at unnecessary risk.

Malcolm wrote:

I personally think it is wrong to force children and teenagers to have vaccines for sexually transmitted diseases when they are not sexually active.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 14th, 2011 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

heart said:

I think someone told me a long time ago that Sanskrit probably never was a spoken language, is that not true?

/magnus

Greg said:

What I've been told is that for the most part there was never anyone monolingual in Sanskrit. That is, Brahmins who used Sanskrit for religious purposes would nonetheless always converse with their wives (for example) in a prakrit, and generally conduct their secular affairs in prakrit.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends, Sanskrit was like Latin. It is what educated people spoke to on another in.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Killing Insects and Buddhism

Content:

ananda said:

Since insects are ignorant of morality and we humans are the higher form of life then shouldn't we practice ahimsa towards even household flies and pests despite the problems they create for us ?

Malcolm wrote:

Up until the point that they become a problem like spreading disease, ruining our food and so on. That being said, I have not knowingly killed a single creature on purpose since I became a Buddhist 25 years ago.

However, if my house were infested with carpenter ants, for example, and so on, I would exterminate them, even though I would feel bad about it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: What body is this?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

When Buddha gave Abhidhamma teaching, he was in Tusita Heaven. Tusita heaven is a higher realm in samsara. It is not a pure land.

My question is: what kind of body did he use when he appear in front of his mother and other audiences? Is it nirmanakaya form or sambogakaya form?

Malcolm wrote:
His physical body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 7:14 PM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

dakini_boi said:

The topic about the 100-syllable mantra got me thinking.

(<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=5234> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;")

It makes perfect sense to use Sanskrit pronunciation if one is able to. At least for mantras that were transmitted in a lineage starting in India - but what about mantras originally revealed as Tibetan terma, which have no precedent in India?

Malcolm wrote:

They nevertheless are written down with the full complement of diacritics unless they are using words that are Tibetans like 'shig shig, sod sod" etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: Questions for those who prefer Sanskrit mantra pronunciation

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

For instance, vajra in Bengali is pronounced "bozro".

.

Malcolm wrote:

Where did you discover this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Cheerful Thought For The Day

Content:
Virgo said:
Impermanence.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:
Indeed, but there is no need to hasten the process through poor ecological management.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 4:29 AM
Title: Re: Is Buddhism hopeless?
Content:
Virgo said:
Hi Acchantika,

I'm not sure that differs from what I said.

Virgo:

"Samatha simply calms your mind and may temporarily suppress some gross defilements, that's about it (in general)"

Kevin

Acchantika said:
Best to ask a qualified teacher, which I am not.

According to the quote, gross defilements are not temporarily suppressed but "subside in their own place".

Shamatha is effortless, always.

Suppression requires effort, always.

So, always, suppression is not shamatha.

Therefore, the difference between the quote and what you said is the difference between shamatha and not-shamatha.

Malcolm wrote:
No, Kevin is basically correct in what he says, and it does not contradict Ranjung Dorje.

Shamatha by nature only suppresses afflictions, it does not uproot them. It doesn't

mean that when you are doing shamatha you are supressing anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Is Buddhism hopeless?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Had you not practice dharma in the past, you would not be interested in it today.

Epistemes said:

Do you mean past lives, or 12 years ago when an ex-girlfriend gave me Steve Hagen's introduction for my birthday?

If the former, I don't believe you.

Malcolm wrote:

Your conceptual limitations are irrelevant.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Is Buddhism hopeless?

Content:

Virgo said:

Samatha simply calms your mind and may temporarily supress some gross defilements, that's about it (in general).

Acchantika said:

I'm not sure what you are referring to, but shamatha as taught in the Tibetan traditions has nothing to do with this.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is the same. Please read, for example Sakya Pandita, Tsongkhapa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Is Buddhism hopeless?

Content:

Namdrol said:

But when you have Dharma, then your life has meaning, and your relationships, and your job, etc.

Epistemes said:

I, at one time, said that about Jesus Christ. Just saying.

I'm holding up one finger, not two.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is, Jesus is outside, and he does not exist [well, dead, at any rate]. The dharma is inside of your lived experience, and depends on no one but you. It lives with you and is carried with you from life to life time. Had you not practice dharma in the past, you would not be interested in it today.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2011 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Is Buddhism hopeless?

Content:

Epistemes said:

The thing which we all wrestle with is the death of our loved ones. Especially if you're strongly attached like me. You spend countless hours and dollars with them and on them, all of which has the appearance of meaning, and then it's over one way or another. I understand the Buddhist premise that we should be more emotionally available to all beings and not limited in our loving-kindness, but, while not impossible, it doesn't necessarily completely dispense with certain attachments that we're naturally going to have with our loved ones. But what do I know? I'm afflictively attached to people in my life, to myself, to "my world," and so much more, and I probably have accumulated only about 45 total hours on the cushion.

Malcolm wrote:

Life has no meaning, your relationships, your job, etc.

But when you have Dharma, then your life has meaning, and your relationships, and your job, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Is Buddhism hopeless?

Content:

Epistemes said:

Buddhists believe in rebirth. Buddhists also claim that there is no chronological first beginning to the series of past lives. We have all of us been reborn an infinite number of times. No God is needed to start the series off – for there simply was no first beginning. Things have been around (somewhere) for all eternity.

If rebirth is true, realistically we really have no hope. It is a hopeless doctrine.

I cannot imagine being reborn as a stinkbug precisely because there is nothing to

imagine. I quite simply would not be there at all. If rebirth is true, neither I nor any of my loved ones survive death. With rebirth, for me – the actual person I am – the story really is over. There may be another being living its life in some sort of causal connection with the life that was me (influenced by my karma), but for me there is no more. There is no more to be said about me.

If Buddhism is correct, then unless I attain enlightenment or something like it in this lifetime, I have no hope. Clearly, I am not going to attain enlightenment in this life. Many of you will be inclined to accept that as true about myself and about your own enlightenment, as well, since enlightenment is a supreme and extremely rare achievement - not for the likes of someone like me. So I and all my friends and family have in themselves no hope. More than that, from a Buddhist perspective, in the scale of infinite time, the significance of each of us as such, as the person we currently are, converges on nothing - for each of us lives our lives and then perishes. Then we're lost forever.

Again, if rebirth is true, we really have no hope. It is a hopeless doctrine.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Buddhism is a hopeless doctrine. Hope is bullshit. It's just the other face of fear. Joe is right, incidentally, your comments here are an expression of intense grasping at identity. Your identity is a conceptual fiction. You are attached to a delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Is Buddhism hopeless?

Content:

Epistemes said:

If rebirth is true, realistically we really have no hope. It is a hopeless doctrine.

Chaz said:

If that's what you think, then that's what it is.

For you it's hopeless.

For you it's meaningless.

For you it's pointless.

We get it.

Can we move on now?

Epistemes said:

You're about as useful as a compliment from a whore.

Malcolm wrote:

In the meantime, apart from all the hand-wringing about existential issues, you should

do something spiritually useful that requires no beliefs in anything whatsoever.

Yoga. There are several yoga studios where you live.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 9:06 PM

Title: Cheerful Thought For The Day

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We're doomed:

How bad could it get? A recent study by MIT projects that without "rapid and massive action" to cut carbon pollution, the Earth's temperature could soar by nine degrees this century. "There are no analogies in human history for a temperature jump of that size in such a short time period," says Tony McMichael, an epidemiologist at Australian National University. The few times in human history when temperatures fell by seven degrees, he points out, the sudden shift likely triggered a bubonic plague in Europe, caused the abrupt collapse of the Moche civilization in Peru and reduced the entire human race to as few as 1,000 breeding pairs after a volcanic eruption blocked out the sun some 73,000 years ago. "We think that because we are a technologically sophisticated society, we are less vulnerable to these kinds of dramatic shifts in climate," McMichael says. "But in some ways, because of the interconnectedness of our world, we are more vulnerable."

<http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/climate-change-and-the-end-of-australia-20111003> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 7:19 PM

Title: Re: Rebuilding civilization in North America

Content:

Namdrol said:

Passive solar has limited effectiveness in New England. However, you are right, new homes can be designed to maximize their solar uptake. But it is exorbitant to retrofit a home. For example, I live in a 1829 farmhouse. I would like us to refit our house with a geothermal system because I think this is the most efficient way to heat in the winter. But we do not have the money at present.

N

edearl said:

Here is a link about a passive solar home in Ontario, Canada.

<http://www.glenhunter.ca/passive-solar/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

They do not seem to have a way to seal their south facing windows, such as window blankets, which would help during the coldest weather. They report using auxiliary

heating only in January. I think anywhere in the US, except parts of Alaska. is a good place for passive solar.

Malcolm wrote:

That's not going to be useful in the majority of presently existing homes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: Rebuilding civilization in North America

Content:

kirtu said:

You should have seen when Ani Kunga told me in the 1700's Colonists clear cut the woods around their towns (and that we probably have denser forests on average on the East Coast than we've had for 200 years).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they did, they were bent on recreating England. They did it on purpose to warm microclimates. Ben Franklin talks about this.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Rebuilding civilization in North America

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Passive solar has limited effectiveness in New England. However, you are right, new homes can be designed to maximize their solar uptake. But it is exorbinant to retrofit a home. For example, I live in a 1829 farmhouse. I would like us to refit our house with a geothermal system because I think this is the most efficient way to heat in the winter. But we do not have the money at present.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Medical Studies

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Hi there,

I have training in western medicine and I am curious if there have been any randomised control studies conducted using Tibetan Medicine. I know studies have been done regarding certain chinese medical treatments. for instance the efficacy of chinese

acupuncture in rheumatic conditions has been well verified.

Malcolm wrote:

They have done some, both in China and India (Ayurveda).

But things like the three doṣas, which are fundamental to Tibetan Medicine as Ayurveda are phenomenological ways of looking health i.e. you cannot identify a substance in the body called pitta. Translating it as bile is inaccurate, since as we know, bile is an alkaline substance which neutralize stomach acids in the small intestine. But pitta, which is considered to be the heat of the body, primarily, has various functions which frankly, you can't observe. All you can do is observe, "they have this theory. Based on the this theory, are the treatment outcomes effective or not for the conditions they are treating".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: longterm use of agar-35 & semde

Content:

Namdrol said:

ONE should generally not use any herb for more than three months.

Epistemes said:

Why? Dependency?

Malcolm wrote:

No, as I explained once before, it is because the herbs are treated by the body as food, rather than medicine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: longterm use of agar-35 & semde

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Is it safe to use these formulas long-term - like for a year, or even years? This is assuming one doesn't have any major health risks.

Malcolm wrote:

ONE should generally not use any herb for more than three months.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2011 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Rebuilding civilization in North America

Content:

Namdrol said:

134-14 acres of northern hardwood stand will last such a place an indefinite period of time if cut carefully -- first taking out old tree and sick trees, leaving saplings, middle aged trees so on and so on.

If you are in NE, you can use this as a guide to figure it out:

http://extension.unh.edu/resources/files/Resource001044_Rep1200.pdf "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Common idea is that you can get 1 cord an acre. But I think this is not based on a very scientific understanding as that sheet shows.

Basically, if we are talking maple, for example, it takes 20 years for a maple tree to reach an ideal size for firewood. If you have a large enough lot you can rotate through your acreage preserving mother trees and always having abundant fuel and more for your descendants. All it takes is a little thought.

Sönam said:

In your rotation you will need some more space to let the regeneration of the earth ...

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. This is not like growing crops. This is selectively picking trees and felling them in a rotation, while trying to maintain a whole population.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Kai said:

He defined the Kadag Chenpo as the union between Kadag and lhun grub

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Rebuilding civilization in North America

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

134-14 acres of northern hardwood stand will last such a place an indefinite period of

time if cut carefully -- first taking out old tree and sick trees, leaving saplings, middle aged trees so on and so on.

If you are in NE, you can use this as a guide to figure it out:

http://extension.unh.edu/resources/files/Resource001044_Rep1200.pdf "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Common idea is that you can get 1 cord an acre. But I think this is not based on a very scientific understanding as that sheet shows.

Basically, if we are talking maple, for example, it takes 20 years for a maple tree to reach an ideal size for firewood. If you have a large enough lot you can rotate through your acreage preserving mother trees and always having abundant fuel and more for your descendants. All it takes is a little thought.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Namdrol said:

BTW:

de nas ye shes kyi snang ba la gnas pa ni
sa bcu bzhi pa la gnas pa yin no

After that, abiding in the appearances of wisdom is abiding on the fourteenth bhumi. No name is given.

Pero said:

Ahh right, I didn't pay enough attention, saw 14th and gnas pa and didn't look deeper hehe. Thanks for the correction.

Malcolm wrote:

It also means, despite my failure to examine the version in the NGB, that Carpiles is incorrect in asserting that Vajradhara is only a name for Mahayoga and Anuyoga results.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Kai said:

it is possible to reach a fifteenth level, designated as "Vajradhara level," and a sixteenth level, known as the "level of supreme primordial gnosis"[/b] (however, even when the Path is explained in terms of this multi-level optics, the individual is said not to go

through the levels in the gradual way typical of the Mahayana, but in such a way that it is not possible to pinpoint the precise level the individual is going through at any given moment)

Namdrol said:

Yes, Capriles made an small error, marked in red.

Rig pa rang shar:

"...is mounting the thirteenth stage, the wheel of letters. Next, abiding in the vision of wisdom is mounting the fourteenth stage, Great Bliss. Next, obtaining certainty in the stage of natural formation is mounting the fifteenth stage, Samadhi. Next, the non-existence of anything higher after wisdom naturally arises on the stage of original purity is mounting the sixteenth stage, Highest Wisdom."

Wheel of Letters is a synonym for Vajradhara.

Pero said:

I don't think it's a mistake by Capriles. In the version of RR I'm looking at the 15th level is called Vajradhara. 13th level is the great accumulation of the wheel of letters like yours. The 14th bhumi is strangely called just "gnas pa".

Malcolm wrote:

I take it back:

Shabkar states:

Reaching the stage of original purity after completing them is called "the Stage of the Protector Vajradhara".

Here he is referring to the 16th bhumi. The citation I was drawing from was a citational gloss in the Khandro Nynthig. It obviously is drawing on a different manuscript tradition than the version present in the Nyingma GB.

BTW:

de nas ye shes kyi snang ba la gnas pa ni
sa bcu bzhi pa la gnas pa yin no

After that, abiding in the appearances of wisdom is abiding on the fourteenth bhumi. No name is given.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Kai said:

Other than that, I presume the rest of the details is intact.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually the whole passage relates the progress of togal to the five paths of standards Buddhist systems, so Capriles apparently really does not understand the principle being enunciated here.

This passage from the rig pa rang shar:

Then, the free arising of appearances having understood the appearances of wisdom is seen to be like a cloud of Dharma, mounting the tenth stage, Clouds Of Dharma. That is the resting place of those persons who have seen the truth, without giving this up they mount the stage.

Means that in these schemata, this tenth stage is only equivalent to Mahāyāna first bhumi. In the rig pa rang shar scheme, bhumis 1--9 are equivalent to the common Mahāyāna path of accumulation and application. Bhumis 10-16 are equivalent to the Mahāyana path of seeing, cultivation and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Rebuilding civilization in North America

Content:

edearl said:

Deforestation is a major contributor to global warming. How much forest do you need to own or control to have a sustainable supply of wood?

Malcolm wrote:

According to Ben Franklin, an average home requires 13 acres of tended woods for a renewable source of wood for heat. Obviously this is not feasible as a renewable resource for 300,000,000 americans. But it can work fine as a low cost alternative for a small community living in one structure. Also, axe cutting of trees as opposed to sawing them helps. You cannot coppice a tree with a chainsaw, only with an axe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Kai said:

it is possible to reach a fifteenth level, designated as "Vajradhara level," and a sixteenth level, known as the "level of supreme primordial gnosis"[/b] (however, even when the Path is explained in terms of this multi-level optics, the individual is said not to go

through the levels in the gradual way typical of the Mahayana, but in such a way that it is not possible to pinpoint the precise level the individual is going through at any given moment)

Malcolm wrote:
[/quote]

Yes, Capriles made an small error, marked in red.

Rig pa rang shar:

"...is mounting the thirteenth stage, the wheel of letters. Next, abiding in the vision of wisdom is mounting the fourteenth stage, Great Bliss. Next, obtaining certainty in the stage of natural formation is mounting the fifteenth stage, Samadhi. Next, the non-existence of anything higher after wisdom naturally arises on the stage of original purity is mounting the sixteenth stage, Highest Wisdom."

Wheel of Letters is a synonym for Vajradhara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Pero said:

Hm I don't know but an interesting thing is that in the Rigpa Rangshar that is available in wylie on the internet there is no mention of "realization". I suppose they could have used a different version. Anyway, after looking at the Tibetan of those lines and a bit after the description of the 16 bhumis I think it really is referring to thogal and nothing else. So maybe better to not speak about it much anymore hehe.

Kai said:

Thats what I thought initially but Namdrol said that there is another interpretation out there.....oh well.....

But even if thats the case, thanks to the quotation in the previous page, I now have an general idea on how the confusing Bhumis scheme works out. Following from the previous page;

Mahayoga ==> 13th Bhumi and anuyoga==> 14th Bhumi and Atiyoga ==> 15th or 16th Bhumi

Given the fact that only Longde and Menngagde had the four visions that lead to the Full Buddhahood which is the 16th Bhumi. Its suffice to say that Semde ==> 15th Bhumi

Now, this is how it was represented in the nine yanas system and we know that after evolving for centuries, Anuttarayoga is not the same as Mahayoga, anuyoga, etc. Indeed, it has often been stated that the four yogas of Mahamudra is synonymous with the four

yogas of Atiyoga Semde and several masters and practitioners had stated the same thing over the years. Gelug and Kagyu share the same teachings on Mahamudra while Sakya integrated it into their tantric system. And the Jonang school practiced Kalachakra in which Mipham stated before that it contained the Dzogchen teachings on Trekchod. In conclusion, all the Sarma schools do contain methods and viewpoints that can bring one to the 15th Bhumi which is called "Vajradhara".

That could be the reason why over the years, several masters are so quiet about sixteen Bhumis thingy because its really a non issue as there is only a minor difference in the level of ultimate final attainment between two systems. I guess this finally (at least partially) resolves the few major discrepancies and confusion that exists between the presentations of various systems.

And had none of us been arguing, we wouldn't have known so much or that we have been doing a non argument. So everyone

Malcolm wrote:

Thirteenth bhumi is referred to as Vajradhara. The fourteenth and fifteenth bhumis have their own names, and the sixteenth bhumi is well know as Uttarajñāna, Highest Wisdom or Yeshe Lama, the realization of ka dag chen po.

The final four bhumis are termed "the bhumis of those who dwell in wisdom".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

heart said:

I am not that used to you agreeing with me.

/magnus

Clarence said:

He agrees with you when you are right.

Sorry, I have been watching "Suits" and Malcolm reminds me of one of the main characters.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as it is not Louis Litt...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Translation needed

Content:

Namdrol said:

bskyabs - protected, protection, saved, protect, SA skyob pa, past of skyob

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Thanks a lot Namdrol lak

So the translation would be saved / protected by Yungdrung Bon?

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Protected by Yudrung Bon

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Translation needed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

bskyabs - protected, protection, saved, protect, SA skyob pa, past of skyob

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Namdrol said:

WE are talking about the same thing. It is just a name for the experiencing of recognizing rigpa for real. What TNR is talkign about is not realization of the first bhumi. He is basing his presentation on this discussion about togal visions.

heart said:

That is indeed true, all the talk about bhumis and paths only appear in the togal part of Circle of the Sun.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You see, that wisdom of vidyā, which is your basis neither increases nor decreases,

hence it is said in many Dzogchen texts, there is no path, no stages, etc. On the other hand, our knowledge of that wisdom is either lacking or partial, and thus we can speak of stages, paths and practices.

Basically, you folks are having an non-argument (after pages and pages) because in Dzogchen both perspectives, gradual and non-gradual, are equally true for everyone at the same time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

heart said:

On the contrary, Tsele Natsok Rangdrol says that the bhumis, have the same name but that the meaning is exalted in Dzogchen. He also mentions that in the "Tantra of Great All-illuminating Sphere" there is a discussion how the 5 paths are related to Dzogchen. ChNN seems to favor the view of the one bhumi of Dzogchen. I am just a simple practitioner I can't say who is right in this matter. But the system of bhumis is about realization and it seems strange to say that being present at a webcast without even recognizing anything in particular would make one arrive on the first bhumi. It don't make sense to me.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

It is very simple, actually. The first vision, since that is what is being discussed, resembles the first bhumi because you are observing an actual sign of your vidyā. This is why it is termed personal experience of dharmatā. Since the thigles and so on are your actual state, you are observing, with your eyes, your real nature, or rather it's sign projected into space.

This must be introduced to you in the rig pa'i rtsal dbang. You will not understand it otherwise, as you know.

N

heart said:

Make sense Namdrol. But, Tsele Natsok Rangdrol says;

"To assimilate the introduction of Trecho and Thogal within one's being and feel extremely delighted is the first is the first bhumi of The Truly Joyous"

I think the point I am trying to make is in the word "assimilate".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

WE are talking about the same thing. It is just a name for the experiencing of recognizing rigpa for real. What TNR is talkign about is not realization of the first bhumi. He is basing his presentation on this discussion about togal visions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

mint said:

Why doesn't ChNNR require his students to take refuge in the Three Jewels prior to recieving DI?

Malcolm wrote:

Recieving direct introduction itself is going for refuge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: My chakras

Content:

Epistemes said:

What does this mean?

Malcolm wrote:

Absolutely nothing in tibetan medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 10th, 2011 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: What is your marital status?

Content:

mint said:

I'm just curious how we all here shape up in this regard.

No need to identify your choices.

2 options per person as I've tried to include all possible configurations. You can change

your answer.

Malcolm wrote:

You forgot:

unmarried/committed relationship

polyamorous

friends with benefits

etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 10th, 2011 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

heart said:

On the contrary, Tsele Natsok Rangdrol says that the bhumis, have the same name but that the meaning is exalted in Dzogchen. He also mentions that in the "Tantra of Great All-illuminating Sphere" there is a discussion how the 5 paths are related to Dzogchen. ChNN seems to favor the view of the one bhumi of Dzogchen. I am just a simple practitioner I can't say who is right in this matter. But the system of bhumis is about realization and it seems strange to say that being present at a webcast without even recognizing anything in particular would make one arrive on the first bhumi. It don't make sense to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is very simple, actually. The first vision, since that is what is being discussed, resembles the first bhumi because you are observing an actual sign of your vidyā. This is why it is termed personal experience of dharmatā. Since the thigles and so on are your actual state, you are observing, with your eyes, your real nature, or rather it's sign projected into space.

This must be introduced to you in the rig pa'i rtsal dbang. You will not understand it otherwise, as you know.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 10th, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

In the Menngagde or Upadeshavarga series of Dzogchen, the unsurpassable Fruit that the Rigpa Rangshar identifies as the sixteenth level is the final attainment of the practice of Thögel (a practice that, as we have seen, is carried out in the bardo of the dharmata or chönyi bardo though most people believe this bardo is only experienced in the second of the three stages of the process between death and rebirth, in Thögel and the Yangthik one goes through it while the organism is clinically alive).[/i]

Capriles

Malcolm wrote:

This is a novel interpretation. I have read many thousands of pages of Dzogchen texts in Tibetan and I have yet to see any of them say this. That being said, of course there is an important connection between thogal and the bardo. Doing thogal makes it easier to recognize the bardo of dharmatā, its sound, lights and rays.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 10th, 2011 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Heruka said:

i would prefer a more common sense approach.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

OK well out of curiosity which would be what - live like the lakota?

Hehe.

See as everyone is pointing out, even if all this is frak and BS, at some point, some way down the line someone has to decide what kind of goddam political way of life we're going to adopt. And the reason I have sympathy with anarchism right now is that of course it does not solve all problems but at least it solves the problem of "who watches the watchers". It lets people decide for themselves what kind of micro-associations or micro-communities they are going to set up. You don't like the one you're in, move to another one.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the problem with anarchism, like deep ecology, is that there is no clear path from

here to there.

Societies generally form based on resource availability. Ancient Celts after all were not much different than North American Indians of the Eastern Forests in their mode of life. But the way they were different can be summed up in three terms: wheel, metal, cattle.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 10th, 2011 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

if science directed policy, then we would have continued with the transition to alternative energy begun in seventies, reserved the Alaska and North Sea oilfields (rather than glutting the market with the cheapest oil (adjusted for inflation) in history).

Heruka said:

The problem here is the energy principle makes "green" technologies more expensive than what we have already, for example wind mill farms produce X amount of energy, and requires more power from the electric coal or nuclear grid to transport that wind energy into the grid than without it.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a blind advocate of wind, or solar (Point of fact, I oppose wind development in my area since it is not appropriate here nor effective). My point is that we are thirty years behind the curve of where we should be with alternative energy R&D. What you are talking about is the fact that there is no way to store power. The grid is the storage, wind and solar are not able to maintain power to the grid consistently.

But this is simply an engineering issue.

Heruka said:

Yes im aware of the grand daddy Edward Bernay and how social engineering Madison ave, Hollywood works, only need to observe from a distance to see this. The leipzig connection is a good read, im certain you have come across that.

Malcolm wrote:

Smoking is a massive (as well as expensive) public health issue. If you read Buffalo Bird Woman's Garden: Agriculture of the Hidatsa Indians (Originally published as Agriculture of the Hidatsa Indians: An Indian Interpretation, University of Minnesota, 1917), you will find that Buffalo Bird Woman commented that young men in her tribe who smoked (very few of them at that) were not able to hunt as effectively and were more easily killed in

raids simply because they could not run as fast since it ruined their breathing. Therefore, in her tribe, young men virtually never smoked, since it was recognized that smoking was bad for you. However, old men, over 60 were encouraged to smoke as much as they liked, since they were finished with hunting and warring.

Heruka said:

only people with money have a choice N.

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone has choices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 10th, 2011 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Oh, it's worse than that:

The consumed unrenrenewable materials are replaced by synthetics, the exterminated human beings are replaced by zeks, by human beings who amenable to labor-camp existence. Since even the best of zeks are not altogether amenable to the self-repression required by efficient labor-camps, they too are replaced by synthetics, by machines, namely, by things made of Leviathon's own substance (i.e. undead)...

Heruka said:

this sounds like a transhumanist's wet dream come true, after all, is it not the intent to merge man with machine? is not transhumanism the natural progression of Galton, Malthus, Darwin, Shaw and the eugenics Fabian Society?

Malcolm wrote:

I guess so, but I am not a transhumanist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 10th, 2011 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Heruka said:

you, like me, have no trust or authority to give or delegate, since we have waved our rights by entering into contracts with a power called a government. we are not free men or women, we are in fact sharecroppers on a government plantation. All delegated power is trust, and all assumed power is usurpation.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, it's worse than that:

The consumed unrenrenewable materials are replaced by synthetics, the exterminated human beings are replaced by zeks, by human beings who amenable to labor-camp existence. Since even the best of zeks are not altogether amenable to the self-repression reauired by efficient labor-camps, they too are replaced by synthetics, by machines, namely, by things made of Leviathon's own substance (i.e. undead)...

But:

In ancient Anatolia people danced on the earth-covered ruins of the Hititte Leviathan and built their lodges with stones which contained the records of the vanished empire's great deeds. The cycle has come round again. Ameruca is where Anatolia was. It is a place where human beings, just to stay alive, have to jump, to dance, and by dancing revive the rhythms, recover cyclical time. An-archic and pantheistics dancers no longer sense the artifice and its linear His-story as All, but as merely one cycle, one long night, a stormy night that left Earth wounded, but as a night that ends, as nights end, when the sun rises. (Against His-story, Perlman, Detroit, 1983)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 10th, 2011 at 8:10 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Heruka said:

at the end of the day its about who controls resources and who decides about shutting that down in the name of sustainability. Its about ideaologs cherry picking and directing the science instead of the science directing policy,

Malcolm wrote:

if science directed policy, then we would have continued with the transistion to alternative energy begun in seventies, reserved the Alaska and North Sea oilfields (rather than glutting the market with the cheapest oil (adjusted for inflation) in history).

Heruka said:

im afraid at the heart of the green movement is just more power grabing in the name of telling others what is good for the earth means austerity for you.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I agree with you because the present green movement in general works from the principles set out by the social ecologists i.e communalism. While I have no problem with people who want to live together in such a way, I do not. Bookchin writes:

Property, in this ethical constellation, would be shared and, in the best of circumstances, belong to the community as a whole, not to producers ("workers") or

owners ("capitalists"). In an ecological society composed of a "Commune of communes," property would belong, ultimately, neither to private producers nor to a nation-state.

http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Deep ecology in general does not support the notion that it is proper to own nature in any sense. This is one difference we have with social ecologists. But we live in a society governed under an inherited Roman Jurisprudence. Even so, though people think that there is such a thing as private property, in reality all people have a lease.

Heruka said:

That is also true about insider crony capitalism.

its classic pressure from above and pressure from below.

Malcolm wrote:

You and KTD often complain of regulation. Naess writes:

"Private industry is, in spite of its official "free and competitive" nature, shot through with internal regulations, mostly unknown to the general public, but no less coercive for all of that. The smaller unit industry of green societies will, because of less hierarchical power structure among other reasons, need less regulation. Much depends on the change of mentality: the less mental change in the green direction, the more regulations." (Ecology, community and lifestyle: Naess, Cambridge University Press, 1989)

What Naess is arguing here is that with the fundamental shift in ethical priorities, the need to regulate of industrial harmful side effects (pollution, deforestation, etc.,) will be ameliorated through culture change, just as less and less people smoke and drink these days, just as attitudes towards race have shifted dramatically in the past 50 years (even despite some reactionary back lash) towards egalitarianism), in the same way, cultural transformation will render these discussions we are having obsolete. Just as it is more or less second nature for most people in the US these days to avoid smoking, likewise, when we wean our culture off the crystal meth of oil, someday the idea that we would need regulation to make sure that people did not pollute the water or the air, or cut down vast swaths of forest for short term profits will seem unthinkable.

The ecological society of the future will not be a choice. The ecological society that emerges after this one, however, can scarcely be imagined. But we cannot continue the way we are moving as a civilization.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 10th, 2011 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

See N-la this is where my concern is. I mean an ant on an anthill is "part of the matrix". So I mean what's to stop a human queen bee with all her soldier ants making all of us "part of the matrix" too? This is where I still think that the Western idea of property rights is of some use because it is a safeguard against precisely that kind of concern.

I totally accept your concern about large scale rapacious capitalism. But where do we meet in the middle here? You yourself said that we could still have businesses and factories "where permissible" - again that scary word. So how do we meet in the middle here? At what point does someone trading a basket for someone else's spear become rapacious upon the environment? In other words at what point does trade that is "free" become harmful?

When I say I am an anarcho "capitalist" what I really mean is that collectivism scares me more than individualism. And being subsumed back into the "matrix that spawned us" sounds to me an awful lot like a type of collectivism that is going to have to be enforced via coercion.

I mean when we have collapsed the cave of hope and fear are we still deep ecologists? Isn't it just another reference point?

Malcolm wrote:

From my perspective, your concerns are more appropriately voiced with reference to social ecology, which for all of its pretense to be an ecological theory, is still basically marxist, still basically a collectivism, now rebranded as communalism. Trust me, I am no more interested in living on a commune, or a kibbutz, than you are.

Permissible in this context means that when the necessary cultural transformation occurs that will allow for a deep green society to unfold, people will understand what kinds of industries are appropriate and what are not. Will there be needs for some kinds of controls (regulations), sure. Everyone can see that markets, for example, are part of the commons, and therefore, also require protection. This is actually the underlying notion of a so called "free" market. It is free because everyone can participate in it. It is also something which needs protection from time to time because markets show a marked inability to regulate themselves when subject to certain pathological pressures. When you understand that markets are a commons, then you will understand why it is necessary to protect everything that can enter a market. Markets are no more self-regulating than any other natural system. Like every other natural system, they only find a balance when they are in their proper niche. When they invade other niches, other "commons", they become unhealthy and cancerous. Free Market Ideology and the ensuing liberalization of trade around the world has lead to this state of affairs. These are all faults not of regulation, but of deregulation. Cap and trade is a failure because it represents an attempt to let the market determine the price of pollution, thus leading to the atrocities mentioned by Heruka. The present form of green capitalism is doomed to failure for the same reasons the housing industry failed. It is another bubble. You heard

it here first.

Capitalism eats itself. This is the main problem with unrestricted capitalism.

So the issue comes, how do we determine how much capitalism, how much manufacturing, what kind, etc. All of these are problems for which I confess I have no solution apart from a radical change in our social values, what we find important.

Property rights translated into civil rights when the notion of ownership transitioned from "pater familias" to the individual person. We need to both extend the notion of rights to creatures (as we already do in Buddhism) and to our environment. We need to understand that all creatures have rights merely by virtue of being sentient. From a Buddhist POV, after all, this is what natural virtue and non-virtue is based on i.e. the fundamental recognition that taking the life of creatures is immoral, and so on. Sooner or later we have to realize that destroying our environment is immoral because of the "civil" rights of our environment. Our world is not inert dead matter. It is teeming with life, and it is not just there as ours to take and dispose of as we wish.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Ngondro

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Wow, you had to get the permission of four different people just to begin ngondro?!

Chaz said:

Yep. Four people.

And "just" to begin Ngondro? Well, it's only the most important step in my practice since I took my Refuge Vows. Had it been ten peoples' permission, including a trip to India to seek the Karmapa's blessing, I would have done that - "just" to begin Ngondro.

If you didn't have to jump through all those hoops, that's fine, but you did have someone's permission to begin the practice. However, it seems like there are people who have commenced the practice without permission from a lama qualified to give such blessings and I'm not sure I'm comfortable with that.

Malcolm wrote:

To do prostrations to the Buddha requires no one's permission.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Rebuilding civilization in North America

Content:

kirtu said:

This isn't impossible of course but harvesting water from precipitation may not be everyone's cup of tee.

Namdrol said:

Believe it or not, it is also illegal in most Western states.

N

edearl said:

Earthship homes do harvest rainwater as their only source of water, and according to the earthship.org website, they have been built in all 50 states. Essentially, all the fresh water we use, whether from aquifers, rivers and lakes, is rainwater or snow melt-- regardless of local laws.

Malcolm wrote:

You won't find disagreement from me about your basic premise, however:

[http://www.hcn.org/issues/40.18/a-good-idea-2013-if-you-can-get-away-with-it "](http://www.hcn.org/issues/40.18/a-good-idea-2013-if-you-can-get-away-with-it)
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

As I said...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sad but true...

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Meanwhile, back at the ranch ...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Rebuilding civilization in North America

Content:

kirtu said:

This isn't impossible of course but harvesting water from precipitation may not be everyone's cup of tea.

Malcolm wrote:

Believe it or not, it is also illegal in most Western states.

kirtu said:

Some inexpensive land in mild climates such as Maine, New York, and some of the mid-West is available. There may be land available in Canada as well.

Malcolm wrote:

The greatest ongoing cost of building a sustainable community is not land, it is labor. Combine that with the rising costs of fuel, and you have a combination that makes it very hard to succeed in building an intentional community.

What we are basically talking about is switching back to a nineteenth century economy (localized) where wood is your primary energy source, supplemented by oil, with human and animal labor as your primary labor force. In order to make this community work, you will have become largely proficient in providing the majority of your own food. This means convertible husbandry. Thus, you will need to build a manure factory. If you have 30 acres of arable land, you will need to maintain a herd of fifteen cows (one cow produces enough manure every year to fertilize two acres), manure ponds, etc. In other words, you will need to become an expert in composting manure. You will need to do this to maintain the fertility and health of your land. You will need to learn (if you don't already know) how best to can, preserve and otherwise maintain your summer and fall harvests for the winter, as well as feed your animals through the winter. And you will need a lot of committed people who are willing to live on just food and lodging to help you out in the howling wilderness we call "post-industrial" civilization. Most communes, or whatever you want to call it, fail because they do not adequately understand how to farm. In short, if you really want to make this work, you will have to become a farmer.

Good luck! Really, I mean it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Virgo said:

So it is inaccurate to say that "the ground, path and fruition is the same, but this is from the point of view of realized beings."

Malcolm wrote:

The result differs from the basis, in Dzogchen, much in the same way that butter differs

from milk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Heruka said:

you see, really, truly there has only ever been man and nature.

what makes for division and separation, is man vs nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is the basic argument of deep ecology, and ecological thinking in general. What do we do with this self-reflexivity that has caused us to imagine ourselves to be outside of the matrix that spawned us? Do we continue to use it destructively, as the Greco/Roman/Abrahamic civilization has done? Shall we exhaust our resource base, as the Mayans and Roman civilization in North Africa did? Or do we overcome the otherness our own self-awareness has spawned and understand limitations imposed upon us by our world?

I really suggest you read Greer, or at least read his blog.

"Think back, dear reader, to the time when you first became aware of peak oil. Odds are that when you first encountered the concept, you found it disquieting or even repellent, but at a certain point—maybe in that first encounter, maybe later on—something suddenly shifted. A moment later you were living in a different world, one in which earlier priorities and beliefs had to make room for the immense and terrifying fact that your civilization was in deep trouble and next to nobody was willing to see that, much less do anything about it. That was your initiation into peak oil, and the feverish reading and thinking that most of you probably did over the weeks and months that followed were the equivalent of the magical student's daily meditations and rituals, which stabilize the new pattern and begin the hard work of teaching the initiate how to make constructive use of what the initiation has provided."

<https://thearchdruidreport.blogspot.com/2011/10/peak-oil-initiation.html> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

tobes said:

What does he think the 'ultimate goals of humankind' are? How is that worked out?

Namdrol said:

Pleasure, happiness, and self-realization.

N

Heruka said:

"A" typical sociopath.

Malcolm wrote:

Guess that makes all Buddhists sociopaths then, since the point of practicing Dharma is pleasure (freedom from physical suffering); happiness (freedom from mental suffering), and self-realization (freedom from ignorance and affliction).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

But here is a quintessential and often ignored principle of Naess's thinking. Many people unfairly claim that deep ecology insists that human beings must sacrifice themselves on the cross of environmental martyrdom, and sadly, many people professing the deep ecology view do make these kinds of claims -- but both parties have either not read Naess clearly, or they are choosing to ignore him. He writes:

tobes said:

Right, I haven't read Naess directly.....my critique of deep ecology comes more from the kind of ethos I have seen expressed and embodied by people who endorse it. But like all movements, misreadings and misinterpretations are probably rife. Sounds like he's worth reading.

Malcolm wrote:

The Ecology of Wisdom in many ways is more accessible than some of his other writing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

tobes said:

What does he think the 'ultimate goals of humankind' are? How is that worked out?

Malcolm wrote:

Pleasure, happiness, and self-realization. The goal of deep ecology is to work this out, since it is obvious to me, the Dalai Lama, and so on, that the great malaise of modern industrial society is that people are not happy and they have no path to self-realization because of the alienation caused by the trenchant inversion of human relationships with the natural world.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Ng'mu said:

criticize Malcomn

Namdrol said:

That would be "Malcolm". And what is your name?

N

deepbluehum said:

He said is name dchen rinpoche

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not a name. This person claims to know me personally. I don't know anyone named dchen rinpoche.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Namdrol said:

All it is one group of people who were mad that Tibetan termas were competing with Indian nidhi (treasures).

kirtu said:

Could you elaborate on this please? Also, are Indian nidhi the same as or similar to Tibetan terma? If so, was there an entire genre of nidhi? Was this material produced by sadhu types or was it produced by people from a variety of backgrounds like in Tibetan terms (so more visionary people who were not necessarily obviously in the mahasiddha tradition)?

Thanks!

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Nidhi means treasure in Sanskrit. The standard Nyingma reply to anti-terma polemics is to point out that all Indian Mahāyāna and Varjayāna literature is also recovered from treasures troves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 9th, 2011 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

heart said:

Ng'mu, why don't we talk Dharma instead of rehashing e-sangha?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Sometimes people like to come here and bitch about my imagined sins against them, I guess they find catharsis in directly addressing the imagined source of their discontent.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Heruka said:

<http://www.questionsquestions.net/docs04/peakoil1.html>

the ebb and flow of the abiotic vs peak oil debate.

Malcolm wrote:

What a real petroleum geologist has to say about abiogenic oil (it's bullshit, of course and is only used as FUD by right wing conspiracy theorists). *Note that following paper is dated after 2004, the year of the debate among your journalists.

Geoffrey P. Glasby of the Laboratory for Earthquake Chemistry, Graduate School of Science, University of Tokyo writes:

"Summary

The preceding sections have outlined the two principal theories of abiogenic formation of petroleum hydrocarbons. The Russian-Ukrainian theory of deep, abiotic petroleum origins was an attempt to formulate a scientifically rigorous theory of hydrocarbon formation which could play a major role in the exploration and exploitation of hydrocarbon deposits in the Soviet Union in the immediate post-war period. The theory is rigorous in its interpretation of the thermodynamic data for the conversion of methane to higher hydrocarbons at high temperatures and pressures. However, the formation of higher hydrocarbons from methane is only one step in the complex chain leading to the formation of commercial petroleum deposits and there are several major objections to this theory. First and foremost is the fact that the mantle is too oxidizing for methane to form there in abundance. Furthermore, most volatiles including methane are transported from the mantle to the Earth's crust in magma and not by faults as required by the theory. The occurrence of major oil and gas fields in crystalline basement rocks was also taken as confirmation of the abiogenic theory. However, this assumption predates modern theories of fluid migration in the Earth's crust. The theory also identified a number of mechanisms by which higher hydrocarbons can be formed abiogenically, of which serpentinization of ultramafic rocks does have the potential to produce commercial oil and gas fields. Proponents of the abiogenic theory have also emphasized perceived inadequacies of the biogenic theory for the formation of petroleum hydrocarbons. However, at the time that the abiogenic theory was at its peak from the 1950s to the 1980s, it was not possible to assess the relative merits of these two theories objectively on the basis of the then existing scientific data and this only became possible with the development of much more sophisticated techniques for the analysis of the organic constituents in petroleum such as GC/MS in the 1980s. As a result, a much more detailed understanding of the pathways of organic constituents from source rocks to petroleum was established which offered convincing evidence to support the biogenic theory. By contrast, the abiogenic theory made no real

attempt to explain the formation of the very complex mixture of organic compounds which make up oil. A major claim of the Russian-Ukrainian theory of abiogenic hydrocarbon formation is that it had major successes in the discovery of oil and gas deposits in crystalline basement rocks. However, it now appears that the great oil fields of the Volga-Urals region, the northern Urals and western Siberia were discovered not as a result of application of this theory as its proponents claim but by the use of conventional exploration methods which gave "the final word to the borehole". Furthermore, recent studies of the petroleum resources of the Dnieper-Donets Basin in the Ukraine by the U.S. Geological Survey have been interpreted entirely within the framework of conventional petroleum geology with no mention made of an abiogenic source of hydrocarbons. These failures of the Russian-Ukrainian theory in areas where it has claimed its greatest successes essentially bring its role as a viable theory on which to base exploration programmes for commercial hydrocarbon deposits to an end. As a matter of fact, this theory is now largely forgotten even in the Former Soviet Union and virtually unknown in the west. The deep gas theory of Thomas Gold is based on the assumption that deep faults play the dominant role in the continuous migration of methane and other gases to the Earth's surface and that this methane is then converted into oil and gas in the upper layers of the Earth's crust. However, this reaction is not thermodynamically favourable under these conditions and can not be facilitated by the presence of bacteria. In addition, deep drilling of the Siljan Ring did not offer any convincing evidence for a dominant mantle source for hydrocarbon formation there. This theory is therefore invalid."

<http://static.scribd.com/docs/j79lhbgbjbqrb.pdf> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

(***If you quote an economist at me about anything anymore, I will vomit, since they are only useful for forensics, and should not be trusted to predict anything at all with accuracy. Economists get paid to make predictions which inevitably fail. As for people in the financial industry who crow about their predictions in terms of the housing crisis etc. Three words: "All Bubbles Pop". It does not take sophisticated computer modeling to figure this out.)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Heruka said:

<http://real-agenda.com/2011/10/04/honduran-farmers-slaughtered-in-name-of-global-warming/>

Honduran Farmers Slaughtered In Name Of Global Warming

23 farmers in Honduras were slaughtered in cold blood by hired mercenaries as they tried to protect their land from being seized by a corporation who wanted to use the land to produce biofuels as part of a United Nations-accredited EU carbon trading scheme.

“Protests erupted in July when six international human rights advocacy groups presented a report to the EP detailing what they called murders and forced evictions of peasants in El Bajo Aguán Valley of northern Honduras, ” reports the New American.

<http://www.thenewamerican.com/tech-mainmenu-30/environment/9243-honduran-deaths-trigger-eu-carbon-credit-clash> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who understands anything in the ecology movement, understands that stripping third world nations of agricultural land and pristine forests to plant monocrops for so called biofuels is a disaster. This is not an example of the failure of the climate change science, but a failure on the part of a colonized government to protect its citizens against rapacious corporate interests.

WTO and UN are in close league with one another. The WTO implements the treaties that UN engineers. The environment has largely been compromised by free trade liberalization; the UN mainly is a janitor for sweeping up the debris left in the wake of the world globalization of trade.

“People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices.”

-- Adam Smith

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Heruka said:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
```

<https://phpbbex.com/> [video]

Malcolm wrote:

Better hope so, because oil's time is running out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Ng'mu said:

critisize Malcomn

Malcolm wrote:

That would be "Malcolm". And what is your name?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Ng'mu said:

and esanhga's maric fall

Malcolm wrote:

E-sangha was hacked by tamil tiger hackers who were pissed at a debate about Sinhalese nationalism occuring on E-Sangha at the time-- then the hosting company pooched the backup when the database was corrupted. All very straightforward and nothing mysterious.

For the most part, all the other successful Buddhist boards are running under modified sets of rules developed out of their experience at e-Sangha.

E-Sangha, for the most part, failed because it tried to satisfy the competing values of three major Buddhist traditions, Thervada, Zen and Tibetan Buddhism. Now there are three boards, with three different sets of former E-Sangha moderators in these three spheres. And they all have policies more or less derived from E-Sangha with modifications made according to their own experience.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Ng'mu said:

no luv you flamed it and the account went dead... so I couldnt respond with fudo-udo

I found it odd, until I saw what happened later

then it appeared to be a habit

Must say I was once banned from esangha by my vajra bro Namdrol.

Namdrol said:

Unlikely.

Malcolm wrote:

Wasn't me. I don't flame people either. Not for incorrect opinions. If you were banned, it was by someone else. I never banned anyone for simply disagreeing with an opinion of mine. In fact, I banned very few people. People who persisted in signing in under multiple user names, who tried to get around suspensions, and so yes, but never for disagreeing with something I said. So you are mistaken. Also, when I banned someone, I always let them know why. If you did not receive an email from me informing you of why you were being banned, then I did not do it. I cannot speak for other moderators.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

tobes said:

Deep ecology is an interesting one. I'm not convinced that a Buddhist ontology naturally leads in that direction....usually there is a Spinozist kind of monism underpinning deep ecology, and/or a German romanticism which reifies "nature" to be God's playground.

Malcolm wrote:

Naess's thinking was influenced by Spinoza, Mahāyana Buddhism, eetc.

However, Buddhist ethics are not androcentric.

tobes said:

I think maybe in some of the East Asian Buddhisms, where there are Taoist influences coupled with Buddha Nature extended into the phenomenal world, a deep ecology could be defended. And I suppose within the context of Tibetan Buddhism, the kinship between humans, spirits and environment involves a very delicate interdependence. So I suppose that is where the idea is coming from.

Malcolm wrote:

Classical ecological appeals in Buddhist literature (and always to kings) tend to be social in their wording, but the assumptions they spring from are deep.

tobes said:

But I'm not sure about the Indian traditions per se. The natural world is considered conditioned like everything else. Impermanent, something to be liberated from. There is no metaphysical reason to privilege the natural or biological world ahead of the world of production and social relation. There are all imbued with the same ontology.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree. What one is liberated from are the afflictions, one is liberated in the world. The common metaphor of environmental harmony in classical Indian sources is the rishi surrounded by predators and prey in a jungle retreat where all are abiding peacefully.

tobes said:

And actually, I quite like EF Schumacher's argument: a Buddhist inspired economics would begin by an ethical consideration of what is really valuable for humans. Production is important because, not only do we need to eat, but if it is structured ethically, it offers the possibility of kusala activity.

I think maybe deep ecology devalues production too much. As far as I can see, the problem is not production per se, but how it is currently configured and what motivates it.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are conflating anarcho-primitivism with deep ecology. Deep ecology is not a form neo-ludditism.

For example, Naess writes:

"The early morning sun also lightens up a faraway (thirty miles long) string of metallic electric masts and thick wires -- hydroelectric power destined for Oslo, two hundred miles away. Each mast is an elegant structure revealing much love and ingenuity on the part of the engineers, but such a string of masts transforms the landscape. If only a few mountainous landscapes were changed in this way -- why complain and feel sorrow? But the number of landscapes without these strange beings diminishes rapidly. There are now more than two million gigantic masts around. The masts would have had a less disturbing character if the power was used to increase the quality of life. But to a large extent, the power is wasted, which contributes to making people unaware of their fantastic material richness..." (An Example of Place: Tvergastien, The Ecology of Wisdom, Naess, Counterpoint, 2008)

However, he also notes:

"The environmental crisis could inspire a new renaissance; new social forms for co-existence together with a high level of culturally integrated technology, economic

progress (with less interference), and a less restricted experience of life." (Ecology, Community and Lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy, Naess, Cambridge University Press, 1993)

But here is a quintessential and often ignored principle of Naess's thinking. Many people unfairly claim that deep ecology insists that human beings must sacrifice themselves on the cross of environmental martyrdom, and sadly, many people professing the deep ecology view do make these kinds of claims -- but both parties have either not read Naess clearly, or they are choosing to ignore him. He writes:

"The special obligation we have for our own species requires us in the long run to ensure that a population has what is necessary to provide the conditions for reaching the ultimate goals of humankind and satisfying vital needs. Beyond that, our obligation is to life in general and to the earth as a whole acquire priority."

This is an echo of Santideva's instruction to preserve one's own health in order to benefit others.

And:

"High level humanitarian norms justify ecologically negative policies. The policies however should be short-range. And often, these short-range, ecologically harmful policies can be avoided through the cooperation of rich and poor nations on a greater scale than ever before." (Sustainability! The Integral Approach, The Ecology of Wisdom, Naess, Counterpoint, 2008)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

mispost...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Kai said:

You sure that you really have no issue with that?

Malcolm wrote:

I could really care less about what Sakya Pandita or Gorampa thought of Nyingma Tantras. Sarma tantras are on no more a solid footing than Nyingma tantras. The issue of

Indian vs. Tibetan authorship is a non-starter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, most of Tibetan history is just Sarma propaganda of one type or another.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Is crying healthy?

Content:

Ng'mu said:

The Sanskrit term Rudra means to cry. So it is a fundamental aspect of samsara, suffering, sickness and death.

All of which one could argue, are not healthy.

Malcolm wrote:

Crying in the sense of yelling out....

rudra mfn. (prob.) crying , howling , roaring , dreadful , terrific , terrible , horrible

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Truthfully, deep green or left-biocentric thinking emphasizes bioregionalism, it is anti-capitalist and anti-industrial

N

Malcolm wrote:

This does not mean that people should not have businesses, or factories, but it does mean redefining what kinds of businesses and factories, as well as practices, are permissible.

Also, de-individualization is bullshit worry. Post industrial Capitalism in its present form is much de-individualizing than deep ecology ever could be. Actually, deep ecology supports species diversity, including diverse speciation of humans.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

I mean "undermines the necessity to mentally prepare"? What does that mean exactly? It's just sounding very, very dangerous to me Namdrol-la, like was said in the excerpt I posted earlier. If we say well, we mustn't be "anthropocentric" doesn't that seem like another excuse for people to "de-individuate" into a disenfranchised mass instead of empower themselves?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is a eudaemonic view, and also susceptible to reactionary appropriation. But here the author is taking pains to point out that Naess's personal take on how to best prosecute deep ecology is too polite.

In other words, he is saying that deep ecologists need to be less worried about rocking boats, or thinking that by rocking boats, they are being bad deep ecologists, he provides the answer right here:

Deep ecology presents a dominant 'social harmony' view of social change. This can smother over contradictions in industrial capitalist societies, whereas a 'social conflict' view (which Left Biocentrism takes), which has historical roots in Marx and Marxism, is needed to combat ecocide and social injustice.

In order to engage in social conflict, people need to have discipline. The social harmony view, in Orton's mind, undermines the ability of deep ecology to be relevant to the social justive issues, which he regards as unfortunate since he sees human social justice issues as unfolding out of environmental issues. If you are too concerned with social harmony, then the trenchant inequalities and social justice issues of industrial capitalist societies will just go unheeded.

But since social justive issues actually spring from our unhealthy relationship with the biosphere, Orton says:

the left-right distinction is subordinate to the anthropocentric-deep ecology divide. Coming into a new relationship with the natural world is primary, and social justice for humans must keep this in mind ...

[/quote]

In other words, if we change how we relate to the world, human social justive issues will be more easily addressed.

Further, we frequently talk past each other because of how deep ecology has redefined the right/left divide. You are still thinking in terms of androcentric right/left terms. I do not. For me, androcentric = right wing; biocentric = left-wing.

The deep ecological intuition is that true social justice for human beings will flow out of a human social and economic reorientation with the rest of our biosphere, and not until then. Since the deep ecological intuition transcends the androcentric right/left squabbles, the left biocentrism is free of the constraints of the old left/right paradigm. The struggle at present is that the green movement internationally has been largely coopted by post-marxists like social ecologists whose thinking is pervaded by moribund anthropocentrism. It is hard for people to see that deep greens are really green all the way through and not merely watermelons. Though I joke about being a watermelon, in reality, the watermelon analogy is sad. The real deep ecology approach is green all the way through.

Truthfully, deep green or left-biocentric thinking emphasizes bioregionalism, it is anti-capitalist and anti-industrial, advocates radical decentralization of power and governments, is concerned with human social justice issues because they arise out of our fractured relationship with our world etc. The underlying principle though is inclusion of all beings in all decision making, hence John Seed's Council of All Beings, etc.

Anarchism, too, is entirely androcentric, and that places it to the right of the equation.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

I would just be very, very worried and concerned about this approach instead of a social-sustainability and social-justice model.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing to worry about, it is not like deep ecology/left-biocentrism is taking the world by storm, though it would be better for everyone if it did.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

World Trade, World Bank, Privatization

IMF Chief Economist Goes Public

World Bank: Chief Economist, Stiglitz Goes Public

From The Best Democracy Money Can Buy, Greg Palast, reporter for the London Times

New York Times bestseller, part of two articles on the global economy taken from this excellent expose

The Globalizer Who Came in from the Cold: The IMF's Four Steps to Economic Damnation

"It has condemned people to death," the former apparatchik told me in a scene out of a Le Carre novel. The brilliant old agent comes in from the cold, crosses to our side and, in hours of de-briefing, empties his memory of horrors committed in the name of a political ideology he now realizes has gone rotten. Here before me was a catch far bigger than some used Cold War spy. Joseph Stiglitz was chief economist of the World Bank. To a great extent, the new world economic order was his theory come to life.

I "debriefed" Stiglitz over several days—at Cambridge University, in a London hotel and finally in Washington during a big con-fab of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in April 2001. Instead of chairing the meetings of ministers and central bankers as he used to, Stiglitz was kept safely exiled behind the blue police cordons, the same as the nuns carrying a large wooden cross, the Bolivian union leaders, the parents of AIDS victims and the other "antiglobalization" protesters. The ultimate insider was now on the outside.

In 1999 the World Bank fired Stiglitz. He was not allowed a discreet "retirement"; U.S. Treasury Secretary Larry Summers, I'm told, demanded a public excommunication for Stiglitz's having expressed his first mild dissent from globalization World Bank-style.

In Washington we talked about the real, often hidden, workings of the IMF, World Bank and the bank's 51 percent owner, the U.S. Treasury.**

In addition to the Ecuador document, I had by 2001 obtained a huge new cache of documents, from sources unnamable, from inside the offices of his old employer, marked "confidential," "restricted" and "not otherwise [to be] disclosed without World Bank authorization." Stiglitz helped translate these secret "Country Assistance Strategies" from bureaucratese.***

There is an Assistance Strategy specially designed for each nation, says the World Bank, following careful in-country investigations. But according to insider Stiglitz, the Bank's staff "investigation" consists of close inspection of a nation's five-star hotels. It concludes with the Bank staff meeting some begging, busted finance minister who is handed a "restructuring agreement," pre-drafted for his "voluntary" signature (I have a selection of these).

Each nation's economy is individually analyzed; then, according to Stiglitz, the Bank

hands every minister the exact same four-step program.

Step 1

Step 1 is Privatization—which Stiglitz says could more accurately be called "Briberization." Rather than object to the sell-offs of state industries, he says national leaders—using the World Bank's demands to silence local critics—happily flog their electricity and water companies. "You could see their eyes widen" at the prospect of 10 percent commissions paid to Swiss bank accounts for simply shaving a few billion off the sale price of national assets.

And the U.S. government knows it, charges Stiglitz—at least in the case of the biggest "briberization" of all, the 1995 Russian sell-off. "The U.S. Treasury view was this was great as we wanted Yeltsin reelected. We don't care if it's a corrupt election. We want the money to go to Yeltsin" via kickbacks for his campaign.

I have to interject that Stiglitz is no conspiracy nutter ranting about Black Helicopters. The man was inside the game, a member of Bill Clinton's cabinet as chairman of the president's Council of Economic Advisers.

Most heinous for Stiglitz is that the U.S.-backed oligarchs' corruption stripped Russia's industrial assets, cutting national out-put nearly in half, causing economic depression and starvation.

Step 2

After briberization, Step 2 of the IMF/World Bank's one-size-fits-all rescue-your-economy plan is Capital Market Liberalization. This means repealing any nation's law that slows down or taxes money jumping over the borders. In theory, capital market deregulation allows foreign banks' and multinational corporations' investment capital to flow in and out. Unfortunately, in countries like Indonesia and Brazil, the money simply flowed out and out. Stiglitz calls this the "hot money" cycle. Cash comes in for speculation in real estate and currency, then flees at the first whiff of trouble. A nation's reserves can drain in days, hours. And when that happens, to seduce speculators into returning a nation's own capital funds, the IMF demands these nations raise interest rates to 30 percent, 50 percent and 80 percent.

"The result was predictable," said Stiglitz of the hot money tidal waves in Asia and Latin America. Higher interest rates demolished property values, savaged industrial production and drained national treasuries.

Step 3

At this point, the IMF drags the gasping nation to Step 3: Market-Based Pricing, a fancy term for raising prices on food, water and domestic gas. This leads, predictably, to Step 3 1/2: what Stiglitz calls "the IMF riot." The IMF riot is painfully predictable. When a nation is "down and out, [the IMF] takes advantage and squeezes the last pound of blood out of them. They turn up the heat until, finally, the whole cauldron blows up"—as when the IMF eliminated food and fuel subsidies for the poor in Indonesia in 1998 and the nation exploded into riots. There are other examples—the Bolivian riots over water price hikes pushed by the World Bank in April 2000 and, in early 2001, the riots in Ecuador over the

rise in domestic gas prices that we found in the secret Ecuador "Assistance" program. You'd almost get the impression that the riot is written into the plan.

And it is. For example, we need only look at the confidential "Interim Country Assistance Strategy" for Ecuador. In it the Bank states—with cold accuracy—that they expected their plans to spark "social unrest," their bureaucratic term for a nation in flames.

Given the implosion of the economy, that's not surprising. The secret report notes that the plan to make the U.S. dollar Ecuador's currency has pushed 51 percent of the population below the poverty line, what Stiglitz called their squeeze-until-they-explode plan. And when the nation explodes, the World Bank "Assistance" plan is ready, telling the authorities to prepare for civil strife and suffering with "political resolve." In these busted nations, "resolve" means tanks in the street.

Each new riot (and by "riot" I mean "peaceful demonstration dispersed by batons or bullets") causes panicked flights of capital and government bankruptcies. Such economic arson has its bright side, of course—foreign corporations can then pick off a nation's remaining assets, such as the odd mining concession or port, at fire-sale prices.

Stiglitz notes that the IMF and World Bank are not heartless adherents to market economics. At the same time the IMF stopped Indonesia from "subsidizing" food purchases, "when the banks need a bail-out, intervention [in the market] is welcome." The IMF scrounged up tens of billions of dollars to save the country's financiers and, by extension, the U.S. and European banks from which they had borrowed.

A pattern emerges. There are lots of losers in this system, but two clear winners: the Western banks and U.S. Treasury. They alone make the big bucks from this crazy new international capital churn. For example, Stiglitz told me about an unhappy meeting, early in his World Bank tenure, with the president who had just been elected in Ethiopia's first democratic election. The World Bank and IMF had ordered Ethiopia to divert European aid money to its reserve account at the U.S. Treasury, which pays a pitiful 4 percent return, while the nation borrowed U.S. dollars at 12 percent to feed its population. The new president begged Stiglitz to let him use the aid money to rebuild the nation. But no, the loot went straight off to the U.S. Treasury's vault in Washington.

Step 4

Now we arrive at Step 4 of what the IMF and World Bank call their "poverty reduction strategy": Free Trade. This is free trade by the rules of the World Trade Organization and World Bank. Stiglitz the insider likens free trade WTO-style to the Opium Wars. "That too was about opening markets," he said. As in the nineteenth century, Europeans and Americans today are kicking down the barriers to sales in Asia, Latin America and Africa, while barricading their own markets against Third World agriculture.

In the Opium Wars, the West used military blockades to force markets open for their unbalanced trade. Today, the World Bank can order a financial blockade that's just as effective—and some-times just as deadly.

Stiglitz is particularly emotional over the WTO's intellectual property rights treaty (it goes by the acronym TRIPS, of which we have more to say later in this chapter). It is here, says the economist, that the new global order has "condemned people to death" by imposing impossible tariffs and tributes to pay to pharmaceutical companies for branded medicines. "They don't care," said the professor of the corporations and bank ideologues he worked with, "if people live or die."

By the way, don't be confused by the mix in this discussion of the IMF, World Bank and WTO. They are interchangeable masks of a single governance system. They have locked themselves together by what they unpleasantly call "triggers." Taking a World Bank loan for a school "triggers" a requirement to accept every "conditionality"—they average 114 per nation—laid down by both the World Trade Organization and IMF. In fact, said Stiglitz, the IMF requires nations to accept trade policies more punitive than the official WTO rules.

Stiglitz's greatest concern is that World Bank plans, devised in secrecy and driven by an absolutist ideology, are never open for discourse or dissent. Despite the West's push for elections throughout the developing world, the so-called Poverty Reduction Programs are never instituted democratically, and thereby, says Stiglitz, "undermine democracy." And they don't work. Black Africa's productivity under the guiding hand of IMF structural "assistance" has gone to hell in a handbag.

Did any nation avoid this fate? Yes, said Stiglitz, identifying Botswana. Their trick? "They told the IMF to go packing."

So then I turned on Stiglitz. Okay, Mr. Smart-Guy Professor, how would you help developing nations? Stiglitz proposed radical land reform, an attack at the heart of what he calls "landlordism," on the usurious rents charged by propertied oligarchies worldwide, typically 50 percent of a tenant's crops. I had to ask the professor: As you were top economist at the World Bank, why didn't the Bank follow your advice?

"If you challenge [land ownership], that would be a change in the power of the elites. That's not high on [the Bank's] agenda." Apparently not.

Ultimately, what drove Stiglitz to put his job on the line was the failure of the Bank and U.S. Treasury to change course when confronted with the crises—failures and suffering perpetrated by their four-step monetarist mambo. Every time their free market solutions failed, the IMF demanded more free market policies.

"It's a little like the Middle Ages," the insider told me. "When the patient died they would say, 'Well, he stopped the bloodletting too soon; he still had a little blood in him.'" I took away from my talks with the professor that the solution to world poverty and crisis is simple: Remove the bloodsuckers.

<http://www.skeptically.org/wto/id6.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Kai said:

The historical issue is that somewhere along the past in Tibet, there appeared, out of nowhere, a wide variety of Dzogchen teachings and many of these teachings were said to cause people to practice wrongly and were Bon-influenced. In retaliation to prevent further unwholesome actions and misunderstanding of the Dharma, Sarma schools started a campaign to criticize some specific false Dzogchen teachings, scholars re-examined certain tantras and discovered some of them to be fake, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just Sarma propaganda. So called tantras that were causing people to "practice wrongly" were such tantras as Guhyagarbha, Vajrakilaya, and so on. Gorampa identifies the kun byed rgyal po as a "fake" and so on.

But who cares? Really, this is just bullshit.

All it is one group of people who were mad that Tibetan termas were competing with Indian nidhi (treasures).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 8th, 2011 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.newsociety.com/Books/W/The-Wealth-of-Nature> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

<http://www.stansberryresearch.com/pro/1108PSISHOVD/PPSIM847/PR>

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, it is simple. Obviously we just renege on the debt. The Chinese are going to "repossess us"?

Simple declaring our government insolvent is the best thing to do.

Really.

Then, we enter a period of trade isolationism, rebuild our manufacturing, etc. And abandon the globalization that is actually at the root of all our problems, since Nixon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

From the late David Orton, addressing dissonances between the left, especially social ecology and deep ecology:

<https://deepgreenweb.blogspot.com/2011/01/deep-ecology-and-left-contradictions.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;::

Deep Ecology and the Left – Contradictions

“There is clearly both in capitalist and socialist politics things which can be modified and used in sane eco-politics but essentially green politics will be something deeply different.” Arne Naess, *Ecology, community and lifestyle*, p. 160.

“The most forceful and systematic critique of capitalism is found in socialist literature. This makes it natural for supporters of the deep ecology movement to use socialist criticisms of capitalism in their own work, and, looking at the slogans of green parties it is immediately clear that many of these slogans are also socialistic or at least compatible with some sort of socialism. As examples: no excessive aggressive individualism. Appropriation. Community, production for use, low income differentials,

local production for local needs, participative involvement, solidarity. On the other hand, it is also clear that some socialist slogans still heard are not compatible: maximise production, centralization, high energy, high consumption, materialism...It is still clear that some of the most valuable workers for ecological goals come from the socialist camps. One of the basic similarities between socialist attitudes and ecological attitudes in politics is stress on social justice and stress on social costs of technology.” Naess, *Ibid*, p. 157.

“Deep ecology comes home as the strategy of advanced capitalist elites, for whom nature is what looks good on calendars.” Joel Kovel, *The Enemy of Nature*, 2002, 1st Ed., p. 172.

INTRODUCTION

This blog post is an examination of the contradictions I see in the relationship between deep ecology and the Left. I contrast in this discussion the human-centered traditional Left, with the ecocentric Left which has come into a relationship with deep ecology. With some notable exceptions (e.g. Judi Bari, Andy McLaughlin, Richard Sylvan, Fred Bender, Stan Rowe, Andrew Dobson and Rudolf Bahro), the Left has been hostile to deep ecology. Why is this? Is there something intrinsic to deep ecology, which is seen as incompatible with the beliefs of a person of the Left? Arne Naess, the philosophical founder of deep ecology, had an evident sympathy towards the social justice side of socialism. The above quotes by Naess clearly show this, as does the 1973 foundational article, “The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement. A Summary.” However, for Naess and countless others, a new ecopolitics will be “deeply different” from socialist and capitalist politics and will not be some kind of add-on to socialism. The ecological question cuts across all “isms.”

The Left, no matter what its myriad forms have been, is politically associated with social justice for the human species. This is its universal symbolism and important contribution. I am a person of the Left. Concerning human-centered politics, my main sympathies are on the communist/socialist side. Anti-communism ends up signalling an alliance with Capital. There are legions of ‘Leftists’, particularly in North America, who do not share this perspective, having had anti-communism and the Cold War pounded into them and internalized from an early age. However, I believe that the ecocentric Left has to be Earth-rooted. It can be non-communist, but not anti-communist. Ecological justice for all species and the planet must be primary. For Arne Naess, this primacy of the natural world is considered an “intuition” and not logically or philosophically derived. We are first Earthlings, in personal and social consciousness, but we must also be involved in social justice issues for our own species. As the environmental cliché says, “There can be no social justice on a dead planet.”

DISCUSSION

I consider myself as both a supporter of deep ecology and a long-time Canadian leftist.

Over the years my meshed sense of being has been sorely tested by fellow leftists – as in the misleading attitude towards deep ecology, conveyed, for example, by the Joel Kovel quote above. (See my review of his book.) But my personal identity has also been tested by my own criticisms of deep ecology, made from an ecocentric Left perspective. As I have written in the past, much deep ecology writing is obscure and not particularly relevant to practical environmental or green work. Also, most deep ecology writers do not present any real political, economic or class guidelines for activists. The response of deep ecology writers to criticisms from the Left and to my own writings, has helped me work out my contribution to the left biocentric theoretical tendency within deep ecology.

As the left biocentric tendency has gathered some support (the internet discussion group “left bio”, for example, has been running for over eleven years), I have found it necessary to distance myself from a few supporters who could not ditch their anti-communism and anti-Marxism, or who have attempted to bring into contemporary ecopolitics echoes of past Left divisive battles – often, it seems, associated with Trotskyism.

This distancing has also been directed at people who could not face criticism of their social justice support, e.g. for aboriginal positions. These people are opposed to seeing Earth justice as a priority (see for one example, my recent review of *Disrobing the Aboriginal Industry*), or are uneasy about public calls for human population reduction (as in the eight-point Deep Ecology Platform. They also see deep ecology as a reformist eco-philosophy within capitalism; and are uncomfortable with my critical, yet friendly, support for someone like the Finnish eco-philosopher Pentti Linkola (see my review of his book).

Another problem for me concerns ecocentric Leftists who are stuck on being defenders of Israel and are seemingly blind to the horrible situation of the Palestinians.

Green parties have become shallow ecology defenders of industrial capitalist society, even if Arne Naess was supportive of them. The German Green Party theoretician Rudolf Bahro resigned from the party in the early 1980s, and pointed out that green party shallow ecology is content to “brush the teeth” of industrial society. Nothing happened since Bahro made this statement which calls his observations into serious question. My limited experience with the Canadian federal Green Party reinforces Bahro’s statement.

SOME LEFT CONTRADICTIONS

Why is the Left so negative about deep ecology? And why is it misleadingly alleged by ecosocialist Joel Kovel that, “Like many deep greens, however, Orton hates socialism and considers it doomed to remain in its twentieth-century form”? (Kovel, *The Enemy of Nature*, 2nd ed., p. 302)

For the traditional Left, human interests have priority, not the health of ecosystems and their non-human inhabitants. There is a basic reductionism – “we have the answers” – in

the thinking of the Left. I have found an intrinsic conservatism towards new ideas among the Left. This has always puzzled me, given that socialists want a new society, allegedly different from capitalism. Shouldn't the Left be open to and embrace new ideas? The Left has to fundamentally move beyond its traditional human-centered thinking, to see what contemporary Earth-centered ecopolitics is about. Left reductionism takes various forms, but the current eco-Marxist variant claims that Marx really is an ecologist, if only we understand him correctly and therefore he is a (or the) role model for ecological work today. The 1988 proposal for a "Left Green Network", inspired by Murray Bookchin and the ideas of social ecology, took the position that, to be a Green and also on the Left, could only mean to be a supporter of social ecology: "Left Greens are social ecologists." There was no room at this network inn for left deep ecology supporters. (As a Canadian, one has to also note that the network proposal reflected the imperial nature of U.S. society, with Canada being considered an appendage for signing-on purposes.)

There is arrogance among socialists who think that they should be leading the ecological movement, because they have a "class analysis" and are anti-capitalist. What comes across is that the Left believes it is entitled to intellectual hegemony in the green and environmental movements, by virtue of prior knowledge. The Left does not seem to be able to absorb the pluralism of green and environmental politics – as Naess informed us, "the front is long" – let alone accept the earned leadership of others by virtue of their practical or theoretical work. Ed Abbey noted, through the character Doc Sarvis in *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, the importance of practical involvement in actual environmental struggles: "Let our practice form our doctrine, thus assuring precise theoretical coherence." (p. 68) The idea that deeper environmentalists and greens can come to an anti-capitalist critique based on their own experiences, without studying Marxism or social ecology, but based on field experience, seems, apparently, difficult to grasp for the Left.

A contemporary manifestation of this Left arrogance, is their desire to define a future post-industrial-capitalist society as "ecosocialist", and not as something being struggled over by countless environmental and green activists. By using this name, ecosocialists imply that they have the answers and know the path forward. Yet there are lots of tentative ideas about the shape of future post-industrial-capitalist societies. These are being widely discussed, experimented with, and written about, but it is a work in progress. There is no "ecosocialist society" on the horizon to which we all can rally.

Ecosocialists traditionally attack the ecocentric Left around population, aboriginal issues and about being critically supportive of theorists like Pentti Linkola. (This Finnish thinker has been called an eco-fascist. I do not believe this to be true, as my review of his recent book makes clear. In my next blog post I will further examine what "eco-fascism" is all about. I have recently become aware that those sympathetic to national socialism are not adverse to "borrowing" analysis from deep ecology to further their own ends.)

Other fault lines between the "ecosocialist" and ecocentric Left concern:

a) The ecosocialist hostility toward the spiritual component of social change as well as

the promotion of an animistic spiritual/psychological transformation, so that the interests of all species override the self-interest of the individual, the family, the community and the nation.

b) Ecosocialists deny the role of individual responsibility in destructive ecological and social actions. They don't recognize the necessity to practice voluntary simplicity so as to minimize one's personal impact on the Earth.

c) A disagreement that it is not capitalism per se, but industrial societies that create the social formation at the heart of our dilemmas. The ecocentric Left believes that these societies can have a capitalist or socialist face.

Left doctrines in the past have focussed on the human condition, not on the well-being of other species and of Nature itself. From a Left perspective, nature and other species have been viewed as "resources" for human consumption. Deep ecology has zeroed in on this. John Livingston, the late Canadian eco-philosopher, who was not a person of the Left but who was a supporter of deep ecology – really Canada's Arne Naess – has laid out in his writings the implications of "resourcism" for planetary health. (See "John Livingston – An Appreciation". The benefits from this focus on human kind have been enormous for a number of us but deadly for the planet.

DEEP ECOLOGY CONTRADICTIONS

"The deep ecology movement carries an excessive amount of rubbish with it (in contravention, so to say, of its own platform). That does not imply that there is not a clean sound position to be discerned when the often inessential rubbish is removed..."
Richard Sylvan

"Personally, I agree with almost everything you say in the Left Biocentric Primer...It's a real shame that the Green parties came under the influence of Bookchin and not your version of Left Biocentrism – it's obvious that's where they need to head. So, I have no necessary bones to pick with your idea of a Left wing of the Deep Ecology movement, more power to you and your colleagues. I wonder if the word 'Left' is the appropriate one to use (as opposed to social justice)." Extract taken from a personal letter written by deep ecologist George Sessions to me, and also copied to Arne Naess, Bill Devall, Andrew McLaughlin and Howard Glasser, dated 4/19/1998.

Since coming to support deep ecology in the mid-1980s, I have tried to maintain a critical, yet supportive, stance towards it and, where it seemed appropriate, have given my dissenting views publicly. Richard Sylvan, the late "deep green" Australian philosopher and forest activist, was an early role model for me on this. In the past, I have raised various issues, for example:

a) I examined the criticisms that are raised about the key concept of Self-realization within deep ecology, e.g. that it ignores the importance of "place." I emphasized that Self-realization must avoid feeding the self-help, self-cultivation, or personal

transformation movement, at the expense of collective change. (See the My Path to Left Biocentrism document, “Notions of Self in the Age of Ecology”.)

b) I explored the confused views of Naess on ‘sustainable development’.

c) I disagreed with the view (by Naess and others within deep ecology) on the separation of the peace, social justice and ecology movements. I argued that this can feed a right-wing image and makes deep ecology supporters seem uncaring about human issues.

d) I criticized the anti-communist and anti-China attitudes of some Buddhist Tibetan supporters of deep ecology (including some left biocentrists) like Joanna Macy, past CIA employee (see my review of her autobiography *Widening Circles: A Memoir*.)

e) I exposed the self-absorption of some deep ecology-inspired academics – whose writings dominate journals like *The Trumpeter* – because the articles lack relevance to problems faced by movement activists which need deep ecology insights and analysis.

f) I supported the work of George Sessions and Bill Devall, in introducing and popularizing the thought of Arne Naess at an early stage in North America. Sessions and Devall are not of the Left and this was reflected in how they handled, or did not handle, criticisms (some justified) and attacks from Left-leaning critics of deep ecology. Note in this regard, Sessions’s uneasiness with the term “Left”, in the quote above; and Devall’s eagerness to state that the environmental movement was a “loyal opposition” and that “Political revolution is not part of the vocabulary of supporters of the deep, long-range ecology movement.” (See *Dharma Rain: Sources of Buddhist Environmentalism*, p. 386)

There are two important contradictions within deep ecology, which need to be resolved so that this eco-philosophy can further unfold its revolutionary potential:

1. Deep ecology presents a dominant ‘social harmony’ view of social change. This can smother over contradictions in industrial capitalist societies, whereas a ‘social conflict’ view (which Left Biocentrism takes), which has historical roots in Marx and Marxism, is needed to combat ecocide and social injustice. The social harmony perspective undermines the necessity to mentally prepare for the coming social strife associated with working for ecological and major social change.

Naess’s social harmony view (“Ultimately all life is one – so that the injury of one’s opponent becomes also an injury to oneself.” *Selected Works*, Volume Five, p. 26) produced some guidelines for activists which seem to be out to lunch. For example, “It is a central norm of the Gandhian approach to ‘maximize contact with your opponent!’”; or “Do not exploit a weakness in the position of your opponent.” I think this social harmony view has given an entry to those who have tried to smear deep ecology as being linked to fascism. In my tribute to Naess on his death, I quoted him as saying, when speaking of “intrinsic value” – a fundamental component of his philosophy – “This is squarely an antifascist position. It is incompatible with fascist racism and fascist nationalism, and also with the special ethical status accorded the (supreme) Leader.” (See “Remembering Arne Naess, 1912-2009”) While I unequivocally believe that deep

ecology is not “fascist”, yet it does seem to me that a social harmony view of the natural world and the place of humans within this can be used by reactionaries in a fascist manner. Thus the “fatherland” or the “motherland” can be upheld as the supreme good to which the citizen must subordinate herself or himself.

2. A key belief in the philosophy of Naess is that “The ideology of ownership of nature has no place in an ecosophy.” (Ecology, community and lifestyle, p. 175) This is a powerful weapon to undermine the “private property” legitimacy of bourgeois society and its view towards the natural world, that our species has the ‘right’ to decide life and death over other species. Yet not many deep ecology writers in North America are articulating this belief, nor is the US-based Foundation for Deep Ecology promoting it. The now defunct magazine Wild Earth, subsidized by the Foundation, had a number of articles trying to uphold the ecological nature of private property ownership, in an American context. Today the Foundation, through its publications, celebrates “private lands philanthropy”, in North and South America – that is, using and hence reinforcing, the private property laws of bourgeois society to acquire lands for restoration ecology purposes. They never mention the basic deep ecology position of Arne Naess about land ‘ownership’.

I myself have joined with others to contribute funds to buy forest land here in Nova Scotia, in order to prevent its destruction from industrial forestry. But in my writings about this project I have pointed out the contradictions of buying land, resulting from the basic tenet of deep ecology that humans cannot ‘own’ Nature. (See “Community Lands and Deep Ecology”) Industrial capitalist societies are not ecologically or socially sustainable and have to be replaced. This must be said in all our restoration work. Restoration work has no long term future, if the dictatorship of industrial capital is not finally overthrown and replaced by an ecocentric society, which upholds the welfare of all species and is also socially just for humankind.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps it needs to be emphasized that whatever the contradictions within deep ecology, the thinking of Arne Naess, as I noted in my tribute to him when he died in 2009, “has presented a needed pathway for coming into a new, yet pre-industrial old, animistic and spiritual relationship to the Earth, which is respectful for all species and not just humans”. This is the needed message for our time. For left biocentrists, the left-right distinction is subordinate to the anthropocentric-deep ecology divide. Coming into a new relationship with the natural world is primary, and social justice for humans must keep this in mind. The Left can have a meaningful contributory role in a future ecologically focused and socially just post-industrial society, if it accepts and is transformed by the contribution of deep ecology and comes to see itself, in theory and in practice, as an ecocentric Left.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

1. Left biocentrism is a left focus or theoretical tendency within the deep ecology movement, which is subversive of the existing industrial society. It accepts and promotes the eight-point Deep Ecology Platform drawn up by Arne Naess and George Sessions. Left biocentrism holds up as an ideal, identification, solidarity, and compassion with all life. "Left" as used in left biocentrism, means anti-industrial and anti-capitalist, but not necessarily socialist. The expressions 'left biocentrism' or 'left ecocentrism' are used interchangeably.

2. Left biocentrism accepts the view that the Earth belongs to no one. While raising a number of criticisms, left biocentrism is meant to strengthen, not undermine, the deep ecology movement which identifies with all life.

3. Left biocentrism says that individuals must take responsibility for their actions and be socially accountable. Part of being individually responsible is to practice voluntary simplicity, so as to minimize one's own impact upon the Earth.

4. Left biocentrists are concerned with social justice and class issues, but within a context of ecology. To move to a deep ecology world, the human species must be mobilized, and a concern for social justice is a necessary part of this mobilization. Left biocentrism is for the redistribution of wealth, nationally and internationally.

5. Left biocentrism opposes economic growth and consumerism. Human societies must live within ecological limits so that all other species may continue to flourish. We believe that bioregionalism, not globalism, is necessary for sustainability. The perspective of the late German Green philosopher Rudolf Bahro is accepted that, for world-wide sustainability, industrialized countries need to reduce their impact upon the Earth to about one tenth of what it is at the present time. It is also incumbent upon non-industrialized nations to become sustainable and it is necessary for industrialized nations to help on this path.

6. Left biocentrism holds that individual and collective spiritual transformation is important to bring about major social change, and to break with industrial society. We need inward transformation, so that

the interests of all species override the short-term self-interest of the individual, the family, the community, and the nation.

7. Left biocentrism believes that deep ecology must be applied to actual environmental issues and struggles, no matter how socially sensitive, e.g. population reduction, aboriginal issues, workers' struggles, etc.

8. Social ecology, eco-feminism and eco-marxism, while raising important questions, are all human-centered and consider human-to-human relations within society to be more important and, in the final analysis, determine society's relationship to the natural world. Left biocentrism believes that an egalitarian, non-sexist, non-discriminating society, a highly desirable goal, can still be exploitive towards the Earth.

9. Left biocentrists are "movement greens" in basic orientation. They are critical of existing Green political parties, which have come to an accommodation with industrial society and have no accountability to the deep ecology movement.

10. To be politically relevant, deep ecology needs to incorporate the perspective advanced by left biocentrism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 7:47 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Ng'mu said:

Must say I was once banned from esangha by my vajra bro Namdrol.

Malcolm wrote:

Unlikely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

padma norbu said:

Neat. I feel we have a similar history of punk, outsider art, rebellious-streaking, drug-abusing, occult-dabbling, youthful nonsense.

Did you appear on any Psychic TV or Throbbing Gristle albums?.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes we do, and no I do not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

What makes this Eco-la-la [deep ecology] especially sinister today...

<http://libcom.org/library/social-versus-deep-ecology-bookchin> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Naess needs to be read on his own. Devall and Sessions are tired. No so important--early adopters who were somewhat clumsy.

But the point that Bookchin misses is that Deep Ecology is not an ideology that can be easily summarized into a theory. Deep Ecology is more of a view, in the sense that we understand view in Buddhist terms. Bookchin is too caught up in leftist polemics to "get" Deep Ecology. There is nothing for a left-wing polemicist to grasp. Why?

The criteria of rights, for a deep ecologist is total. If you want to put into property rights terms, all sentient beings have a right to their own bodies and all the whole planet is a commons owned by none and shared by all living beings upon up. Human beings have the capacity to observe the harm we wreak on the environment, so we have a moral obligation not to do it or to allow. We have an obligation to attempt to preserve the commons of the whole environment for all beings.

Social ecology just doesn't get this.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Virgo said:

Namdrol, you were born in the Tiger year, but it was either month, day, or hour of the

Snake, right?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

June 12th, 11:30 am, 1962.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Occupational hazard of being a musician.

Virgo said:

The music of you sharing Dharma is far greater.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, the reason I ultimately wound up being a Tibetan Buddhist had everything to do with TOPY and PTV. The first time I heard a kangling was on the the bonus Themes when Force the Hand of Chance was issued in 1982. It may not have been available until 1983, and within a year I had procured my kangling and damaru, both of which I still possess and use, nearly 28 years later. Originally, I used them both in performances.

I played fiddle, guitar, synths, bass, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

And by the way you look completely wasted in that photo.

Malcolm wrote:

In those days, I was wasted a lot. Occupational hazard of being a musician.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

padma norbu said:

Cool...

Namdrol, were you ever into TOPY and that kind of stuff? See the new TOPY "Bible" he put out a year or so ago?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I was a member of TOPY, with designation Eden 59.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Virgo said:

Dzogchen, having no path

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be an idiot, Kevin. Dzogchen has a path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

You will convince yourself once you develop compassion.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Again with the pronouncement.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. Here is another one: is no such a thing as a right side in politics. Libertarians are frak, Socialists are frak, Commies are frak, Dems, Repubs, it is all bullshit.

Therefore, don't base your politics on ideology. Base it on the real world. In the real world, there are limited resources, limited energy, limited environment, limited water, etc.

Unless, one doesn't give a shit about anyone other than oneself -- then all these politics will make sense.

All of the things you are saying are just abstract talking points -- they do not relate to your

life at all. But global warming does, lack of adequate health care does, depletion of rainforests habitat does.

A Buddhist recognizes that all sentient beings, ideally, have a right to live undisturbed. When I say "preserve" the commons, I don't just means for human beings. The libertarian view, specifically, is just more of the same tired old judeo christian roman property rights bullshit. It is entirely androcentric. This is why libertarians are some of strongest foes of the environmental movement and the worst climate-change deniers. It definitely isn't Buddhist. But then neither is communism, socialism, etc. The only position that is remotely Buddhist is deep ecology. But people don't like it because it is not androcentric enough.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Rang gzhan gnyis su byung

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek dear Dzogchenpas,

Below a term used in Dzogchen which does mean translated, originate as oneself and as another

rang gzhan gnyis su byung - originate as oneself and as another.

Maybe some usefull suggestions?

Mutsog Marro

Kalden Yungdrung

Malcolm wrote:

Arising as both self and other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

And you haven't convinced me.

Malcolm wrote:

You will convince yourself once you develop compassion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Ooo love Throbbing Gristle.

Though they asserted they wanted to provoke their audience into thinking for themselves rather than pushing any specific agenda (as evidenced by the song "Don't Do As You're Told, Do As You Think" on Heathen Earth), Throbbing Gristle [was] also frequently associated with the anarchist punk scene.

Almighty Wikipedia

Malcolm wrote:

TG were hardly anarchist punks. I was there. GPO and Namdrol -- 1984:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Health care costs are inflating.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because American doctors charge more, and get away with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Virgo said:

Why is it so expensive? Well the same medicines that are sold here for 20x the price or more are sold in South America for example for much, much less.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

So let's get rid of all trade tariffs. Eeek gasp horror globalization.

And who do you think was the biggest lobbyist for ObamaCare? Big Pharma baby.

Malcolm wrote:

The Romney plan, adopted by Obama, is not health care reform. It is health insurance reform, done badly.

Single payer is the only way.

Yes, Globalization is a horror.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

And you haven't convinced me.

Malcolm wrote:

There's never a way

And there's never a day

To convince people

You can play their game

You can say their name

But you won't convince people

There's several ways

There's several ways

To convince people

It's the name of the game

It's the name of the game

Convincing people

Convincing people

There's several ways

There's several ways

To convince people

And there's several days

And there's never a way

To convince people

There's one way though
That you'll never convince people
And that's when you try
To be someone
Who's not telling
And who's not trying to compel
Who's trying to tell you
What you ought to be
Convinced of

So there's several ways
And there's several day
To convince your people
And you are the people

Convincing people
Convincing people
There's never a way
And there's never a day
To convince people

There's several ways
There's several days
We don't want to convince people
Let me tell you
I'll tell you what I want you to do
It's no way, no way, no way
To convince people

From Twenty Jazz Funk Greats, Throbbing Gristle, 1979

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Sönam said:

After you did provoke me, I'm estonished my questions are not answered ? ... are they unrealistic or even surrealistic ?

Sönam

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Sorry. I'm having rant fatigue.

Je suis desole. J'ai la fatigue de déclamation extravagante.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is no point in talking about these issues with crypto-fascist right wing nut jobs who are bent on destroying the planet because they believe in this fantasy called a free market -- even if they are our vajra siblings. We have to save them from themselves by making sure the commons is protected, that corporations are strictly limited in where they can and where they cannot do business [regulate them into submission, the bastards], and we have to make sure that everyone receives free health care, no matter who they are or where they live. But most importantly, and I shit you not, we have to save them from destroying the planet, which they will do if left to their own devices. But engage them in dialogue? There is no point.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

That by way, requires government adjudication. Legals question also require governments. etc.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

If this was true then the vast majority of disputes in the U.S. today would not take the form of some form of ADR.

Malcolm wrote:

Who do you think instituted the ADR process?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Namdrol said:

Starts next tuesday.

Adamantine said:

Namdrol, I found this below link via google, but when I hit the link it goes to the website for the anytime- cleanse and doesn't give any info about following it on these dates..

Fall Colorado Cleanse: October 11-24, 2011

http://www.lifespa.com/cc_now.aspx " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
Join our 2-week at home detox and digestive reset program this Oct 11-24, 2011 which will be guided by John Douillard, DC.

\

I assumed the fall cleanse would be different then the spring one, and the link description sounds like it is guided in real-time.. but the link goes to just the anytime-cleanse..are you following this and do you have any insight?

Also-- in regards to the two options they give you for the warm-digest formula or the cool digest-- I am not sure which would suit me because I have symptoms that could indicate either-- any thoughts?

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:
Go for the warm digest.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 1:25 AM
Title: Re: HHDL speaks about
Content:
Namdrol said:
taxes ought not be levied without consent

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Well, right on! Just insert the word "individual" before "consent", just like the original Articles of Confederation did, and we have liftoff!

Malcolm wrote:
If you want to play, you have to pay. If you owned land in the colonies, you were subject to taxes. People had some differences of opinion about what that meant, for example Shea's rebellion, which happened in the Pioneer Valley of Massachusetts, where I live. Shea lost.

There is fanatsy, and then there is reality. Libetarians are all right-wing political romantics, even the so called left-wing ones. Being allied to the right is an inevitable consequence of asserting property rights as a moral foundation for a government. It also inevitably leads to imperialism, since the commons are regarded as a resource to divided up into owned parcels. That by way, requires government adjudication. Legals question also require goverments. etc.

You will never see a human speciiies that does not have a centralized goverment. It will never happen and especially now as we are becoming more complex as a socieity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Fact check:

John Smith married Pocahontas

John Smith did not marry Pocahontas. That distinction went to one John Rolfe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Unknown said:

In particular, once a place or good has been first appropriated by, in John Locke's phrase, 'mixing one's labor' with it, ownership in such places and goods can be acquired only by means of a voluntary – contractual – transfer of its property title from a previous to a later owner.

Malcolm wrote:

And here we see why capitalism requires governments -- Capital derives from labor; to protect that capital, one must form protective associations from those who would seek to wrest the product of your labor from your grasp. As Locke points out, governments are expensive, but taxes ought not be levied without consent. Hence, is laid the ground for the citizen government that levies taxes against its own participants. Hence the fundamental requirements that a democracy have an educated citizenry. etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 7th, 2011 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

The reviewer missed the section where the book chides Americans for wishing to impose an idealized vision of Southern England onto the American landscape.

The book is well worth reading because it shows how American agriculture has proceeded along the destructive lines of southern planters, rather than mid 19th century northern restorative husbandry, despite its roots in an idealized vision of the English countryside. Restorative husbandry was introduced to the North in the mid nineteenth century because of the exodus to the west, farmers were abandoning exhausted farms

and moving by the thousands to the new territories because they would expect to grow another 20 years of crops without having to make manure.

You really need to read the book itself. It is worthwhile and interesting.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

A few more questions on this and then I will shut up about it because I admit I really am not an expert on environmentalism.

Did the pre-improver farmers deliberately and with full knowledge of the consequences predate upon their own private property? Or was this basically pretty much a kind of lack-of-knowledge problem? And were the improvers a bunch of pro-statist legislators trying to regulate their way out of trouble? I mean from what little I can glean about this at some point Roosevelt (the first one) got involved but by then the improver movement was done. Or were they a bunch of farmers who basically said, um hey listen guys look at what's happening to our land and we need to start dumping massive amounts of cow poop back on to the soil for us to stay in the game here?

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, what happened was that after the revolutionary war, people in the colonies began abandoning their farms because erosion was rampant, rivers were so polluted with run off fish were dying, and so on. In other words, the agricultural practices of colonial farming was having wide ranging impacts on the whole civilization and everyone was being negatively effected. In reponse to this, northern farmers began to adopt sustainable husbandry practices from the English, and at the same time became critical of the westward push into the midwest by people who were abandoning what these "improvers" felt was perfectly good land, it properly cared for. Indeed, the book points out that Madison himself was something of a proto-Gaiean theorist who argued that we needed to understand the world as a total environment. These folks knew that warming was a result of deforestation and so on. The improvers were people who felt that current practices in the north, the practices of southern planters, and so on were regressive and ultimately, bad for the country.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

And - I'm sure you knew this was coming - if we're talking about self-ownership and agriculture, let's talk about federal farm subsidies. There's a prime example where the privatization of the commons has been utterly buggered up by the state.

Malcolm wrote:

We have fundamental philosophical disagreement here -- the commons must never be privatized. It must be protected against privatization as well as overuse.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

It's the same kind of logical inconsistency that bothers me about "Occupy Wall Street". Here you have a bunch of Starbucks latte-sipping, iPhone using granola-heads chanting capitalism bad, capitalism bad, capitalism bad outside of Goldman Sachs ... and they don't realize that if we had pure 100% proof capitalism going on then Goldman Sachs by now would have gone the way of the dodo thank you very much. Because the only reason Goldman Sachs is still around is because of the statist policy of "too big to fail", because of statist bailouts, because it has its hands in the pockets of the state. If we can survive without Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers then why the hell can't we survive without Goldman Sachs? Well again don't ask Goldman Sachs why - all they're doing is cashing the checks the government is giving them baby, just like an old person cashes their social security checks. I mean, again, wouldn't you?

Malcolm wrote:

Your thinking is too simplistic -- like all political zealots.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

The context in which all Buddhist teachings occur is that of the sutric explanation of bhumis and paths, so it only makes sense that apologists for a particular viewpoint like Dzogchen will couch their defense in these terms, particularly when they have come in for harsh criticism as being non-buddhist. The point that I was making earlier is that the paths and bhumis themselves are conventional truth. They are perhaps useful guideposts for one's practice and can certainly inspire one to develop the tremendous scope of a bodhisattva. They are not, however objective ontogenetic stages that must be traversed in anything but a metaphorical sense. They are most certainly not necessary to awaken.

A map is not the territory itself, nor the menu the meal. They are useful tools, nothing more.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, bhumis measure qualities, paths measure realization.

Since common Mahāyāna has no method connected with the human body, progress is measured by successive appropriation [via rebirth] of ever more refined bodies which are reflected in the gradual refinement of a person's continuum through the process of eradicating the two obscurations and gathering the two accumulations. These are a hard limitation which cannot be detoured around through some conceptual and philosophical trick.

Vajrayāna, including Dzogchen has a methods connected with the body, and the the resulting paths and stages are measurable via experiences which are described in detail in both Vajrayāna texts and Dzogchen texts. Someone who does not have these experiences does not have the corresponding realizations. These are a hard limitation as well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

booker said:

Also, what you say seem to be asserting there's nothing which is not conditioned by time and space, by causes and conditions but in this way then also liberation (that is releasing from the cycle of rebirth) is not possible, since it would be just another conditioned state.

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation in Dzogchen, like all Buddhist schools, is predicated on the cessation of afflictions, and that is predicated on the eradication of ignorance (avidyā), which is the obscuration of knowledge. Therefore, liberation is not a conditioned state in any Buddhist school.

booker said:

Please, what you mean by things like "a condition beyond time, beyond dualism, pure and perfect"? Is that simply an experiential absence of perception of time, space and dualism?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

booker said:

What does it mean when it's said a particular tantra has been written beyond time therefore it can't be can answer when someone is asking when it was written?

Malcolm wrote:

It means the tantra in question arises directly out of someone's experience of being liberated. That experience of liberation may exist in time [x was liberated on y date], conventionally speaking, but it's content is not dependent on time, since it is not

dependent on really existing objects and so on, upon which time itself depends. Therefore, asking when a tantra was written is a text critical question, rather than a question of ultimate authorship.

booker said:

In Madhyamika treatises and oral traditions, dependent arising is often said to be synonymous with emptiness. The term "dependent arising" never appears in Authenticity, and in any case, it does not sufficiently characterize how things occur. They are more significantly seen to arise from wholeness through a manifestation process that gradually splits into apparent subject and object, hardening and coarsening until they become solid materiality.²⁰ To call these phenomena "dependent arisings" is not wrong in this view but fails to indicate their final nature.²¹ "Dynamic display" (rtsal) is a more precise term ontologically for Dzogchen because it indicates this connection with the base; it acknowledges the table as a spontaneous occurrence through the sound, rays, and light that move forth from the base. As the process coarsens, thought begins to designate it in certain ways. Thus, it is both spontaneous and reified due to thought processes of designating it as such.

Whereas to understand dependent arising is to understand the emptiness of Madhyamaka, such an understanding does not lead to the Dzogchen view. From a Dzogchen perspective, the same table that Madhyamaka describes as a dependent arising and therefore empty is, in addition, the dynamic display of the base (gzhi'i rtsal). The main difference between spontaneous presence and dependent arising comes not in connection with ordinary objects like tables, however, but in relation to the base itself, especially in its aspect as ultimate subject and in the way that phenomena, including thoughts, emerge from that base.

Malcolm wrote:

Bonpos can say all they like there are no processes in the basis, but then they render their whole explanation unintelligible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

booker said:

Thanks, didn't yet know Buddhists Dzogchen and Bon Dzogchen are different Dzogchen to degree of disagreement on (a seem to be) one of essential points.

About what you said on processes: whether they are casual or not - actually from the point of DO this is very important as DO is not beyond causes and conditions, that is, it

relates to dependent phenomena only. If someone says rays, light, and sound has nothing to do with causes and conditions means they have nothing to do with processes which DO is about. And how they actually possibly could, being beyond time and space? Process needs time and space, this trio is not in time and space.

How this is not relevant?

Malcolm wrote:

From a Madhyamaka pov there are no phenomena which do not dependently originate.
From a Buddhist Dzogchen pov, the basis is not established as something real.

If you think there is something real that exists outside of time, you are deluded beyond hope of recovery.

The reason we say that the basis is "outside of time" is that from the perspective of the basis itself there are no objects, and time depends on objects. If no objects or entities can be established, how can we talk about dependencies or time? But that does not mean there are no processes, because if there were no processes, the basis could never arise from the basis, and so on.

There are a lot of differences between Bon and Buddhist Dzogchen. Since Bon Dzogchen is not fully grounded in Buddhism, it is somewhat eternalistic in its presentation of these issues.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"If one is attached to the swamp of debate, it is the māra of the afflictions. "
-- Tantra of The Great Self-liberated Vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Secondly, Locke basically invented the libertarian idea of land appropriation via homesteading. His entire theory of justice pertains to taking land out of "the commons" and respecting the resulting property rights:

Malcolm wrote:

A position I heartily disagree with. Homesteading violates your non-aggression principle.

Some always claims possession of land. Your politics are entirely androcentric, as are the judeo-christian-roman underpinnings of it.

BTW, the Lockean principle of homesteading was the same used by Zionists to steal land of Palestinians. They have been working out the compensation ever since.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Finally, quoting Jefferson to support a statist position is as wierd as Ralph Nader quoting Patrick Buchanan. Jefferson was an anti-federalist.

History has informed us that bodies of men as well as individuals are susceptible of the spirit of tyranny.

Jefferson

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't quoting Jefferson to support a statist position (though he was a statist, was a president, and so on), I was quoting Jefferson to show Jefferson understood and agreed with the Lockean principle of forming goverments or commonwealths to protect property, by using nearly identical language to Locke in the cited passage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Ah, the tacit social contract. Always "tacit". Never explicit. There is no reason ever to suppose that individuals, in full possession of their natural rights, would ever in fact subordinate themselves voluntarily to a government. No government has, in fact, ever emerged from such explicit consent. The Constitution, if you read Howard Zinn, for example, was just a way for a bunch of rich human-farmers to consolidate their power into a statist entity.

Malcolm wrote:

You really don't pay attention, do you:

ec. 124. The great and chief end, therefore, of men's uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property.

Means:

"...just a way for a bunch of rich...farmers to consolidate their power into a statist entity."

Why? To protect their property. And they do so voluntarily. As I said, Buddha's protection

association principle.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

booker said:

Hmmmm, Namrdol ofen says emptiness in Madhyamaka and Dzogchen has the same meaning, however currently I'm reading "Unbounded Wholeness" by Geshe Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche and there's a part called "Core Philosophical Issues" where it's stated "Dzogchen and Madhyamaka speak of emptiness, they differ in their actual understandings of this".

Malcolm wrote:

Bon Dzogchen and Buddhist Dzogchen are slightly different.

What we say is that the main difference between Dzogchen view and Madhyamaka view is that the former is experiential and the latter is intellectual. But their content, their meaning, is the same as Jigme Lingpa writes:

“ I myself argue ‘To comprehend the meaning of the non-arising baseless, rootless dharmakāya, although reaching and the way of reaching this present conclusion “Since I have no thesis, I alone am without a fault”, as in the Prasanga Madhyamaka system, is not established by an intellectual consideration such as a belief to which one adheres, but is reached by seeing the meaning of ultimate reality of the natural great completion.

Norbu Rinpoche states in his Questions and Answers on the Great Perfection:

That view established intellectually we need to establish consciously in dependence upon one’s capacity of knowledge and on convention. The way of establishing that is the system of Prasanga Madhyamaka commented upon by the great being Nāgārjuna and his followers. There is no system of view better than that.

What the Bonpos say is that Dzogchen view of emptiness and the Madhyamaka view of emptiness are different. We Buddhists definitely disagree.

booker said:

"a vital point: only if wisdom and delusion do not exclude each other can wisdom be primordial."

Malcolm wrote:

That does not match well with this statement in the String of Pearls Tantra:

The mere term delusion cannot be described within the original purity of the initial state, likewise, how can there be non-delusion? Therefore, pure of delusion from the beginning.

booker said:

"Wisdom's status as primordial has to do with its being spontaneously arisen from the base and thus not dependent on causes."

Malcolm wrote:

The Unwritten Tantra states:

There is not object to investigate within the view of self-originated wisdom: nothing went before, nothing happens later, nothing is present now at all. Action does not exist. Traces do not exist. Ignorance does not exist. Mind does not exist. Discriminating wisdom does not exist. Samsara does not exist. Nirvana does not exist. Even vidyā itself does not exist i.e. nothing at all appears in wisdom. That arose from not grasping anything.

If it arose, that means that even in wisdom there are processes. Wisdom is the basis, BTW.

booker said:

"Sound, rays, and light are thus neither dependent on the base nor dependency arisen from the base. They are spontaneously present to it. This is not understood as a relationship of cause and effect."

Malcolm wrote:

The basis possess three wisdoms, essence, nature and compassion. They manifest as sound, lights and rays. However, the Bonpos place much more emphasis on this doctrine than Buddhist Dzogchen does (where it mainly appears as an explanation of the experience of the bardo).

My point was that there are processes in the basis, whether you want to call them "causal" or not is really quite irrelevant.

And actually Buddhist Dzogchen disagrees with this Bon assessment above.

Padmasambhava states:

"Though the trio of essence, nature and compassion exist in reality, they occur as cause, condition and result because of ignorance."

But this is partly why I did not want to get into this. This topic is very complex, and is just a bunch of intellectual proliferation if you are not a practitioner of tögal. Just understand that there are processes in the basis. You can call them spontaneous if you want.

Padmasambhava again states:

The luminous part of vidyā in the basis stirs as the five lights. The karmic winds, the condition of vidyā, cause the colors to appear as a house of light. Since that is not understood as wisdom, delusion cognizing the part of dualistic appearances produces delusion about the duality of subject and object.

Garab Dorje explains the reason why there is stirring in the basis in his commentary on The Single Son of the All the Buddhas Tantra:

At that time, from the naturally occurring blessings of the personal experience of the realization of the heart essence (snying thig), having recognized one's own state, in one lifetime, everyone will attain the result of Buddhahood. From now on, the emptied pit of samsara will not appear as the six kinds of living beings. For twenty thousand eons, sentient beings will not appear possessing a bodily form having severed the stream of samsara. After that, from the arising of the subtle latent defilements of different actions, samsara and nirvana will arise in the same way as before.

Why is this possible? Again, the String of Pearls clarifies:

Luminosity itself stores traces.

Luminosity ['od gsal], the nature [rang bzhin], which is the naturally formed [lhun grub] aspect of the basis, stores traces.

As I said, these issues are subtle, difficult and would take a long time to properly flesh out. Since these things take a long time to flesh out, and since the explanation of the basis and the arising of the basis and so on and forth is really only relevant to tōgal practice and is meant to provide a basis for understanding the result of that practice, delving into explorations of that topic prior to understanding the context of that explanation causes people to become trapped in a lot of useless conceptual proliferation.

Incidentally, I do not appreciate the tone of your comments.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

There is no question that such a life is appealing to the mind of us brooding intellectuals and arm chair farmers. No question that such a utopian vision is grand and would, no doubt, be superior to the life most lead in urban areas. No question of our inability to impose it upon a free society.

[/i]

<http://www.conservativemonitor.com/society/2002016.shtml> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

The reviewer missed the section where the book chides Americans for wishing to impose an idealized vision of Southern England onto the American landscape.

The book is well worth reading because it shows how American agriculture has proceeded along the destructive lines of southern planters, rather than mid 19th northern restorative husbandry, despite its roots in an idealized vision of the English countryside. Restorative husbandry was introduced to the North in the mid nineteenth century because of the exodus to the west, farmers were abandoning exhausted farms and moving by the thousands to the new territories because they would expect to grow another 20 years of crops without having to make manure.

You really need to read the book itself. It is worthwhile and interesting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sure, and white is actually black.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

It cannot be supposed that [the hypothetical contractors] they should intend, had they a power so to do, to give any one or more an absolute arbitrary power over their persons and estates, and put a force into the magistrate's hand to execute his unlimited will arbitrarily upon them; this were to put themselves into a worse condition than the state of nature, wherein they had a liberty to defend their right against the injuries of others, and were upon equal terms of force to maintain it, whether invaded by a single man or many in combination. Whereas by supposing they have given up themselves to the absolute arbitrary power and will of a legislator, they have disarmed themselves, and armed him to make a prey of them when he pleases ...

Locke

Malcolm wrote:

This is not an argument against having a state. This mere selective citation. You need to include the beginning of the section:

Absolute arbitrary power, or governing without settled standing laws, can neither of them consist with the ends of society and government, which men would not quit the freedom of the state of nature for, and tie themselves up under, were it not to preserve their lives, liberties and fortunes, and by stated rules of right and property to secure

their peace and quiet. It cannot be supposed ...

Locke does not in the end actually serve liberatarian ideology since he is interested in how a government will work in the interests of everyone.

His trip about private property merely is a continuation in British jurisprudence of Roman law around private property, which continues also in the American legal system.

In fact Locke says:

Sec. 123. IF man in the state of nature be so free, as has been said; if he be absolute lord of his own person and possessions, equal to the greatest, and subject to no body, why will he part with his freedom? why will he give up this empire, and subject himself to the dominion and controul of any other power? To which it is obvious to answer, that though in the state of nature he hath such a right, yet the enjoyment of it is very uncertain, and constantly exposed to the invasion of others: for all being kings as much as he, every man his equal, and the greater part no strict observers of equity and justice, the enjoyment of the property he has in this state is very unsafe, very unsecure. This makes him willing to quit a condition, which, however free, is full of fears and continual dangers: and it is not without reason, that he seeks out, and is willing to join in society with others, who are already united, or have a mind to unite, for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties and estates, which I call by the general name, property.

Sec. 124. The great and chief end, therefore, of men's uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property. To which in the state of nature there are many things wanting.

Ring any bell? "lives, liberties and estates" = property. People form states to protect it. Jikan's statement is perfectly correct.

George Mason, in his declaration of rights for Virginia wrote just that i.e. "That all men are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

Jefferson modified this in the Declaration of Independence to read the following way:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,

This is pure Locke.

Your anarcho capitalism is a desire to return to a state of nature of which, as Locke says, "there are many things wanting". It is in the end really no different than communism or any other utopian fantasy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

The whole concept that ownership of property makes people care for the environment more is complete nonsense, as anyone knows who has bothered to study the history of agricultural in the United States in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

If land is not owned by anybody, although legal formalism may call it public property, it is used without any regard to the disadvantages resulting. Those who are in a position to appropriate to themselves the returns — lumber and game of the forests, fish of the water areas, and mineral deposits of the subsoil — do not bother about the later effects of their mode of exploitation. For them, erosion of the soil, depletion of the exhaustible resources and other impairments of the future utilization are external costs not entering into their calculation of input and output. They cut down trees without any regard for fresh shoots or reforestation. In hunting and fishing, they do not shrink from methods preventing the repopulation of the hunting and fishing grounds.

Von Mises

Malcolm wrote:

You totally missed the point of my comment. I am talking about the ecological havoc wreaked upon the colonies by land--owning southern planters who had no interest in restorative husbandry at all, and land_owning northern farmers who refused to learn how engage in restorative husbandry properly. There is a vast literature in 19th century writing about these issues, should you care to read about them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Lazy people should just give up, right?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Correct me if I am wrong but isnt laziness, (like everything else for that matter) to be viewed as an ornament of ones Rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

yes, except when it is an ornament of one's marigpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Jikan said:

the state's role under capitalism is to maintain property rights

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Quite the reverse.

http://media.freedomainradio.com/feed/caging_the_beasts32.mp3

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, and white is actually black.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Lazy people should just give up, right?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just give up. There is no hope for you. You don't even have Buddha nature.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2011 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

http://media.freedomainradio.com/feed//environmentalism_part_1.mp3

http://media.freedomainradio.com/feed//environmentalism_part_2.mp3

http://media.freedomainradio.com/feed//environmentalism_part_3.mp3

Malcolm wrote:

The guy on this show is an environmental idiot and he has no clue.

The whole concept that ownership of property makes people care for the environment more is complete nonsense, as anyone knows who has bothered to study the history of agriculture in the United States in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Larding the Lean Earth: Soil and Society in Nineteenth-Century America

https://www.amazon.com/dp/0809064308/ref=rdr_ext_tmb "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Pero said:

Maybe so, but as far as I understand it, in Dzogchen they are completed instantly.

Namdrol said:

No, that is the two accumulations.

Pero said:

Well yes but in Practice of Dzogchen (p.76), Paltrul Rinpoche is quoted as writing: "In Dzogpa Chenpo these Five Paths are perfected instantly."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, then, something is not working.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Kai said:

.....A certain Indian translator in Tibet at that time "had seen certain dzogchen texts in Magadha in the possession of some learned Indian masters there. Furthermore, many excellent practitioners in Tibet have achieved advanced pathway minds (Five Paths) and bodhisattva levels (Ten Bhumis) based on dzogchen practice. Therefore repudiation of these teachings is an appropriate cause for a fall to rebirth in one of the three worse forms of life.".....

As you could see Dzogchen practitioners do follow the five paths and ten bhumis in reality regardless of what people said. And the masters' explanations are not pure diplomacy but elaboration of the actual results.

Pero said:

Maybe so, but as far as I understand it, in Dzogchen they are completed instantly.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is the two accumulations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

booker said:

Okay, but then, in causality, a certain effect can not be own cause, is that correct?

You were saying basis arises from (or out of) basis so that would mean it is own cause?

Also, typically what is illusion is "within" causes and conditions. In Dzogchen it is often said about out true condition, or true state (which I believe is equivalent terms to basis or kunzhi) which is beyond causes and conditions. Meaning basis does not depend on causes and conditions. How then you say base is illusory?

Or is simply basis name for shunyata, which means not "a thing", and means rather "how" everything works, like say a law. And in this way obviously a law has no condition, because it's just how we express the way of how stuff works. So in this case Dzogchen would not say anything above what is taught in Mahayana. Right?

But then again no, because Dzogchen speaks of rays, light and so on. And AFAIK these are beyond causes and conditions, but how they work is they manifest samsara if one has marigpa or they manifest nirvana when one has rigpa, right? But since they are essence of those, they're not conditioned by those (by samsara/nirvana).

So what happens here we have say five rays, but they're not phenomenas right? (since all phenomenas arise from causes and conditions, and they "exists" in samsara/nirvana).

Not sure what is precisely about Advaita and I do not really care, however if we say basis is empty, that would mean rays for example would arise from causes and conditions - but this doesn't make sense, since they don't, right? They're essence of elements, so they can't be conditioned by elements, or anything. No?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study this in a systematic way. It would take me days and days to fully answer these questions -- I am sorry, but I do not have the time. Perhaps one of our resident dzogchen masters is up to the task.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

However, since there is causality in the basis, it also must be empty (...)

booker said:

I heard basis is empty, however it is also said it is beyond causes and conditions, beyond time and space. What causality you mean here?

Malcolm wrote:

The causality that causes the lights to shine out of the basis, which when recognized (rig pa) results in nirvana and when not recognized (ma rig pa) results in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Why don't Tibetan Lamas resurrect the old "Kapalika" type?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

In point of fact most Hindus are scrupulously vegetarian whereas most Tibetan buddhists eat meat.

Malcolm wrote:

No, most Hindus avoid eating cows, but that does not make them vegetarians. There is still chicken, fish, lamb, goat, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Why don't Tibetan Lamas resurrect the old "Kapalika" type?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I should have put a finer point on that. Amongst spiritually inclined Hindus rather than those merely accidentally born into a Hindu family, sattvic food is the norm...

Malcolm wrote:

Hot, spicy, oily, etc., food are not sattvic at all. Even the Indian vegetarian diet is more rajasic than sattvic. Hot/pungent, oily, salty, etc., foods are rajasic, whether from animals or not. Moreover, among sattvic foods, like honey, ghee, curds, and so on, these are derived from animals, and their quality depends on the type of farm they derive from and manner of production. There are vegetarian foods that are even tamasic, eggplant dishes, etc., not to mention processed foods, frozen foods, and so on that may be "vegetarian" but are all crap.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Longde Four Da practices of Vairocana

Content:

sunjohn said:

and few people in the community (and no other Dzogchen teachers that I met) seemed to focus on longde.

Malcolm wrote:

You should communicate with Jim Valby.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Adamantine said:

Namdrol, in TM is ashwagandha also considered a helpful herb to rebuild ojas?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but better to take it in the preparation called dashmula which you can easily find which was other building herbs in it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

sangyey said:

Namdrol, in terms of cleansing the body, someone suggested to drink 8 glasses of water when you wake up (perhaps Chinese influence) and I have tried this a few times and notice that I do feel better afterwards. I have not kept up with this type of ritual but I wonder what Tibetan Medicine says about this type of water therapy as it seems that it would be naturally a rather good way to cleanse the body?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

That sounds to me like a terrible idea and bad for the kidneys, if done regularly; done on occasion, and making sure the water is warm (boiled then cooled to drinking temperature) it might be of some benefit, especially if someone is prone to stones.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

Emptiness is the same thing in Dzogchen and Madhyamaka. Even rigpa is completely

empty. But in Dzogchen we do not say that emptiness is dependent origination because of the way the term dependent origination is used in Dzogchen. Not because Nāgārjuna is wrong.

booker said:
Thanks.

You answered Rigpa is not dependent originated awareness, but you say it's empty. Obviously this is a contradiction, but you say in Dzogchen dependent origination means something else. Can you please clarify?

Also, in Dzogchen there is said "emptiness" is our real nature, but also there's term "base", then base is explained in terms of essence, nature and energy. How this is the same as Dependent Origination from Madhyamaka? Is Madhyamaka DO different to traditional Pali DO (12 links, starting with ignorance, from it fabrications, from it consciousness, from it name-and-form... and so on).

Cheers.

Malcolm wrote:

First, one has to distinguish the general theory of dependent origination from the specific theory of dependent origination. The general theory, stated by the Buddha runs "where this exists, that exists, with the arising of that, this arose". The specific theory is the afflicted dependent origination of the twelve nidanas. There is however also a non-afflicted dependent origination of the path. For the most part, Madhyamaka covers the principle general dependent origination in order to show that all dependent phenomena are empty. Since, according to Madhyamaka, there are no phenomena that are not dependent, the emptiness of non-dependent phenomena is never an issue, like hair on a tortoise or the son of a barren woman, since there are no non-dependent phenomena at all.

Nagarjuna however does discuss the twelve nidanas, ignorance and so on, in chapter 28 of the MMK.

The basis in Dzogchen is completely free of affliction, it therefore is not something which ever participates in afflicted dependent origination. Unafflicted causality in Dzogchen is described as lhun grub, natural formation. However, since there is causality in the basis, it also must be empty since the manner in which the basis arises from the basis is described as "when this occurs, this arises" and so on. The only reasons why this can happen is because the basis is also completely empty and illusory. It is not something real or ultimate, or truly existent in a definitive sense. If it were, Dzogchen would be no different than Advaita, etc. If the basis were truly real, ultimate or existent, there could be no process in the basis, Samantabhadra would have no opportunity to recognize his own state and wake up and we sentient beings would have never become deluded. So, even though we do not refer to the basis as dependently originated, natural formation can be understood to underlie dependent origination; in

other words, whatever is dependently originated forms naturally. Lhun grub after all simply and only means "sus ma byas", not made by anyone.

Rigpa is not a phenomena, it is not a thing, per se. It is one's knowledge of the basis. Since it is never deluded, it never participates in affliction, therefore, it is excluded from afflicted dependent origination. However, one can regard it as the beginning of unafflicted dependent origination, and one would not be wrong i.e. the nidanas of samsara begin with avidyā; the nidanas of nirvana begin with vidyā (rigpa).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: Creation Stage and the attainment of Bhumis

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

The bhumis are various lessening gradations of *ignorance*

Malcolm wrote:

Not so -- the bhumis are a progressive measurement of increasing qualities.

Paths measure realization.

The whole thing, however, beginning to end, is utterly illusory.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 10:36 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Tantra has "unstruck sound" like Hindu Tantra?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I would hazard a shared genesis of much of the tantric tradition and a soteriology much closer than most partisan adherents of either system allow.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely hazardous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 10:34 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

The far bigger challenge to wrestle with as an anti-statist is not nukes or large scale weapons controlled by statist but what do you want to do about the issue of private

ownership of guns - which is a better example of a voluntary exchange of goods which goods many consider to be dangerous.

http://media.freedomainradio.com/feed//guns_part_1.mp3

http://media.freedomainradio.com/feed//guns_part_2.mp3

http://media.freedomainradio.com/feed//guns_part_3.mp3

Malcolm wrote:

From a Buddhist POV, trading in arms is wrong livelihood.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 10:31 AM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The Tathagata's emptiness is not DO'd in Nagarjuna's world, and ignorance never never came into being. I think this complies quite nicely with Dzogchen's understanding of gzhi.

Namdrol said:

What do you think a tathāgata's emptiness is?

deepbluehum said:

Unafflicted so no arising, dependent or independent.

Malcolm wrote:

You are asserting that dependent origination has afflicted emptiness? How can emptiness be afflicted?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 10:29 AM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

If there is no mind, there cannot be a nature of the mind. The one depends on the other.

deepbluehum said:

This denies a conventional usage based on valid relative cognition. Everyone knows what is meant by the term "mind." Everyone has one. When describing conventionally "what is this mind like?", then we use the term "nature of mind" to describe a valid object of negation for the purpose of either analysis or meditative investigation.

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are just uttering refutations for the hell of it -- without bothering to read context.

It was queried whether the nature of the mind could exist whether there was a mind or not -- but such an assertion has obvious flaws, like asserting wetness without water, or heat without fire.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Under ahimsa, we must let that voluntary exchange occur.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it should be prevented.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

However when it comes to voluntary exchange of fissile material that type of transaction is pretty much entirely enmeshed with statist entities...

Malcolm wrote:

Not anymore, and not for some time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

You are not answering the question because even you can see that the so called principle of non-aggression is inferior to Avihimsa.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

You are the president of the United States. You have good intelligence that Iran is about to weaponize its uranium which it obtained through voluntary exchange with Russia.

You believe in the principle of ahimsa. What do you do?

I would say ahimsa gets you about as far as the principle of non-aggression in this scenario.

Malcolm wrote:

The principle of Avihimsa permits violent interventions to prevent harm to others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The Tathagata's emptiness is not DO'd in Nagarjuna's world, and ignorance never never came into being. I think this complies quite nicely with Dzogchen's understanding of gzhi.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you think a tathāgata's emptiness is?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Two people can voluntarily agree to exchange goods which are nevertheless harmful to those around them, for example, fissionable material.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

So the answer to this problem is to rely on the existing members of the nuclear club who own the existing fissile material in the first place to police this new transaction?

interesting little rant about Iran:

http://media.freedomainradio.com/feed/FDR_870_Current_Events_Sep_26_2007_Iranian_President.mp3

Malcolm wrote:

You are not answering the question because even you can see that the so called principle of non-aggression is inferior to Avihimsa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

Unknown said:

It is that everything is emptiness, including dependent origination (samsara) and nirvana (not originated).

Malcolm wrote:

There are no other phenomena apart from dependently originated phenomena. Space and the two cessations are not real.

As Buddhapalita explains. "If there is something which exists, it must originate dependently and be designated dependently. Why? There are no phenomena at all that are not dependently originated, therefore, a non-empty phenomena does not exist."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Well, it is unlikely you are going to get all those impure capitalists to go along with you.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

These things take time, it can't be implemented from the top down that's the whole point, that would just be a statist solution which would replace the old superstructure with another, like cutting off the head of the hydra and another taking its place, it can only grow from the bottom up.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as people are under the influence of the three poisons, for that long this sort of thing will never happen. You would better off abandoning libertarian social fantasies and focusing on the Dharma.

Buddha has already described how human beings devolved from a state of relatively peaceful anarchy. It all began when people began hoarding crops. As I said, states were created by a group of people to protect resources for common consumption. Corporations are formed by a group of people to exploit resources for personal consumption.

According to the Buddha, the first state was created in the form of a protection association, this is why the so called Kṣatriyas (protectors of the fields) with a rāja at its head, arose.

Anarchism is a form of political romanticism, as is libertarianism, as is my preferred pidgeon hole, deep ecology/left biocentrism.

I am a cynic. I do not believe that under present social and economic conditions, human beings are capable of living without governments. As a species, we are too

afflicted to be able to treat each other with the proper respect idealist systems like anarchy, communism, and so on imagine we ought to behave.

I guess I am a Kali Yugaist at heart and regard such utopianism as pure romantic folly.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Well, it is unlikely you are going to get all those impure capitalists to go along with you.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

These things take time, it can't be implemented from the top down that's the whole point, that would just be a statist solution which would replace the old superstructure with another, like cutting off the head of the hydra and another taking its place, it can only grow from the bottom up.

Namdrol said:

I personally do not need a principle of non-aggression, since as a Buddhist I already observe the principle of Avihimsa which more wide ranging.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

If it was more wide-ranging it would include within its scope two persons making a voluntary exchange of goods and services without the interference of a third party pointing a gun at someone's head.

Malcolm wrote:

It is more wide ranging since the principle of Avhimsa extends to any transaction which can harm others, including all economic, interpersonal, and inter-species interactions. Two people can voluntarily agree to exchange goods which are nevertheless harmful to those around them, for example, fissionable material. Under your principle of non-aggression, this must be permitted as long as those two parties are engaging in this transaction without aggression. No one should prevent this exchange.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Adamantine said:

Namdrol, in TM is ashwagandha also considered a helpful herb to rebuild ojas?

I've never had a Tibetan doctor tell me to fast/cleanse--- I've had them tell me many other things.. once I was told to definitely not have sex or drink alcohol when I was very depleted and couldn't digest food well. Is there a recommended season to do a cleanse from TM POV? And would you want to be in prime good health before attempting this? Is there a Tibetan version of a cleanse, rather than the "colorado cleanse" Is it good for anyone to do on a regular basis, or is there some sign that indicates you really need to do it...

Namdrol said:

Seasonal cleanses are recommended in the rgyud bzhi. But the Tibetans do not have the custom even though it is taught in the textbooks of Tibetan medicine.

The reason I recommend the colorado cleanse is that it is based on very sound Ayurvedic principles, and it is the one I personally use. The week long cleanse in the rgyud bzhi is fine, very simple, but, in my opinion, is a little too simple. It is for a time when people were less toxified in general.

Everyone, across the board, who is in reasonable good health, should do a cleanse in the spring and in the fall. Ayurvedic practitioners time it with two festivals, one that occurs in April, another that occurs in October. So that is when I do it to.

Adamantine said:

Great, thanks Namdrol! When is the festival in October? Maybe I will try then too.

Malcolm wrote:

Starts next tuesday.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Clarence said:

Is there a place online where one can find how to do it or does one need to buy dr. Bouillard's book? It sounds interesting.

Malcolm wrote:

you can buy it at lifespas.com

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

heart said:

So rigpa is dependent originated awareness?

/magnus

Namdrol said:

Not from a Dzogchen pov.

booker said:

If Rigpa is not dependently originated then what is emptiness in Dzogchen (since emptiness then can't be equated with DO, right)?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is the same thing in Dzogchen and Madhyamaka. Even rigpa is completely empty. But in Dzogchen we do not say that emptiness is dependent origination because of the way the term dependent origination is used in Dzogchen. Not because Nāgārjuna is wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

Different systems, different terms, different understanding. It is good to understand these differences and not conflate the terms of one system with another.

Kai said:

Agree with you.....Actually, thats what I'm trying to tell you when we discussed about "16 Bhumis and the five paths" thingy not long ago....

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but in Dzogchen, the sixteen path thing both encompasses the ten and thirteen bhumi system, as well as it is also used to describe thogal visions. It has both readings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

heart said:

So you are saying that emptiness and DO is not synonyms in Dzogchen?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Of course not.

They are synonymous in Madhyamaka.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: DO and Emptiness
Content:
heart said:
So rigpa is dependent originated awareness?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Not from a Dzogchen pov.

It would be considered something relative from a Madhyamaka POV.

Different systems, different terms, different understanding. It is good to understand these differences and not conflate the terms of one system with another.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, October 5th, 2011 at 12:10 AM
Title: Re: DO and Emptiness
Content:

Namdrol said:
If there is no mind, there cannot be a nature of the mind. The one depends on the other.

N

Acchantika said:
That which originates dependently is not "self-originated", "not created by anything whatsoever" etc.

Hayagriva said:
From Samantabhadra's prayer: The underlying basis is non-composite. It is an ineffable, self-arisen vast expanse named neither "samsara" nor "nirvana." If just that is known, such is buddha; if not, such is a sentient one drifting through samsara. May every

sentient one in the three realms know the ineffable fact, the basis.
I agree with Acchantika - this doesn't sound very dependently originated.

Malcolm wrote:

There are other texts in the cycle of the dgongs pa zang thal that define the basis further:
The Second Vairocana aural lineage from the dgongs pa zang thal cycle clarifies this:

Since the basis was understood to be emptiness that has been forever cleansed, the path was not deluded by conceptual dualism. Since the result, the great wisdom expanded, the example of the great empty essence is "like space". The example for the great luminosity of one's vidyā is like the union of the sun and moon.

The way the Adibuddha arose: that latent basis is not established at all. When the time arrived, since that previously explained trio of vāyu, vidyā and space separated, the energy of space self-originated as kayās; the energy of vāyu self-originated as speech, and the energy of vidyā self-arose as mind. Since the body, speech and mind originated as self-originated from that basis that was not established in any way, compassionate vidyā did not engage in pride, object and mind were not separated into two. The mind that grasps external and internal did not arise, there was no clinging to the non-dual, he recognized his own face, severed mental proliferation, reversed clinging into dharmatā, instantly understood objects of knowledge, and since wisdom arise in himself, he fully awakened.

The point here is that the referred to basis is emptiness and it is not established in anyway at all.

Because the basis is emptiness, dependent origination is not contradicted.

The term dependent origination is used differently in Dzogchen texts than in Madhyamaka. In Dzogchen texts it refers generally to postulating ignorance state of six realms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: DO and Emptiness

Content:

deepbluehum said:

This is a nice label to give, but it doesn't withstand scrutiny...

Namdrol said:

Sure it does.

deepbluehum said:

In your dreams.

Malcolm wrote:
Whatever arises dependently,
just that you hold to be emptiness
Lokātitastava

That is dependent origination,
that you hold as emptiness...
Emptiness is not different than things,
there is also no thing without it;
therefore, you have shown dependently originated
phenomena are empty.
Acintyastava`

I could go on in many other treatises not by Nagarjuna, but these suffice to make my point.

Dependent origination = emptiness. No ifs, ands, or buts about it.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 11:05 PM
Title: Re: DO and Emptiness
Content:

deepbluehum said:
This is a nice label to give, but it doesn't withstand scrutiny...

Malcolm wrote:
Sure it does.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 10:34 PM
Title: Re: DO and Emptiness
Content:

Kelwin said:
If there is no dependently originated mind, there is no mind at all, and hence there is
would be no nature of the mind of which to speak.

N

True, mind has of course dependently originated. But its nature hasn't, has it?
And actually, the nature of mind, or Buddha-nature, doesn't ultimately really on the
existence of mind I think.

Therefore, my position would be that all phenomena, and relative mind included, are both empty and dependently originated. And mind's nature is empty of any inherent existence, but has itself not dependently arisen. It actually is the ground within which dependent origination happens.

I must be one of the really slow ones, because I don't see where the above is wrong?

Malcolm wrote:

If there is no mind, there cannot be a nature of the mind. The one depends on the other.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is not a capitalist principle per se. It may form a part of libertarian theory, but it is naive and will not scale to whole societies.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

That's what they said about ending slavery.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is unlikely you are going to get all those impure capitalists to go along with you.

I personally do not need a principle of non-aggression, since as a Buddhist I already observe the principle of Ahimsa which more wide ranging.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 10:21 PM

Title: DO and Emptiness

Content:

Unknown said:

That which is dependent origination is explained to be emptiness.

-- Mulamadhyamakakarikas.

As you know one sentence can be taken out of context. Which this one is. But you two are free to continue with the same short shrift nonsense ad nauseam, if it makes you feel warm and cozy.

....

Readers should not think these two have settled the issue with DO=Emptiness. This simplistic formulation based on a quote taken out of context of what it was meant to teach has led apparently both of them to negate the efficacy of karma.

deepbluehum

Malcolm wrote:

I was purely responding to your assertion that dependent origination does not equal emptiness. The two terms are in fact synonyms.

I nowhere stated that I negated the conventionally observed efficacy of karma and its results, nor would I.

However, we can examine karma too if you like. Nāgārjuna states:

"Why? This action
does not arise from conditions,
and does not arise without conditions,
therefore, there is also no agent.

If there is no agent,
how can there be a result which arises from an action?
If there is no result,
where will a consumer be observed?

Just as the Teacher's emanation
is emanated through his consummate magical power,
if likewise the emanation also makes an emanation,
there is again a further emanation;

in the same way, though that agent
performs an action, it has the form of an emanation.
For example, it is like another emanation created by an emanation
making a [third] emanation.

Affliction, actions, bodies,
agents, and results
are like fairy castles
mirages, and dreams.

I take Nāgārjuna's view. All phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions.

N

*in my previously rendered verses from the 4NT chapter in the other thread, through a fault of vision I misread brten (བརྟན) as bden (བདེན) as so mistranslated "designated through relation" as "designated through truth". My apologies. I was unable to fix it as the thread is locked.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Ummmm, Huifeng, you just proved my point -- this passage comes from the 內藏百寶經, i.e. the ārya-lokānusamānāvatāra-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra or the 'phags pa 'jig rten gyi rjes su 'thun par 'jug pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.

N

Huifeng said:

By the time of your sources, it has got "mahāyāna" in the title, but not at first.

It's probably been co-opted by the mahāyāna after the fact.

Using later Sanskrit names is not going to show what it was originally recognized as.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Looks to me like Lokakṣema was primarily involved in translating Mahāyāna sūtras. My objection still stands.

Verses from it exist in the Prasannapāda(as well as Mahāvastu) but that merely shows that it may have reworked some earlier material.

It was first translated into Tibetan in 8th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

Adamantine said:

Namdrol, in TM is ashwagandha also considered a helpful herb to rebuild ojas?

I've never had a Tibetan doctor tell me to fast/cleanse--- I've had them tell me many other things.. once I was told to definitely not have sex or drink alcohol when I was very depleted and couldn't digest food well. Is there a recommended season to do a cleanse

from TM POV? And would you want to be in prime good health before attempting this? Is there a Tibetan version of a cleanse, rather than the "colorado cleanse" Is it good for anyone to do on a regular basis, or is there some sign that indicates you really need to do it...

Malcolm wrote:

Seasonal cleanses are recommended in the rgyud bzhi. But the Tibetans do not have the custom even though it is taught in the textbooks of Tibetan medicine.

The reason I recommend the colorado cleanse is that it is based on very sound Ayurvedic principles, and it is the one I personally use. The week long cleanse in the rgyud bzhi is fine, very simple, but, in my opinion, is a little too simple. It is for a time when people were less toxified in general.

Everyone, across the board, who is in reasonable good health, should do a cleanse in the spring and in the fall. Ayurvedic practitioners time it with two festivals, one that occurs in April, another than occurs in October. So that is when I do it to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 8:58 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

kirtu said:

You mean like the Dutch East India Company, or the British East India Company or Jamestown and similar ventures.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 7:30 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Since when has "pure non-aggression" ever been a capitalist principle?

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
```

<https://phpbbex.com/> [video]

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a capitalist principle per se. It may form a part of libertarian theory, but it is naive and will not scale to whole societies.

Capitalism in general, in any of its forms, right, left or center, is pernicious.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, groups _always_ form governments to protect their interests. This is why anarcho-capitalism is such a joke.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Mindstreams always form egos to protect their interests. This is why Buddhism is such a joke.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you can compare Buddhism with anarcho capitalism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

They would have crumbled into little micro-corporations - as they were meant to do, and as they would have done in a pure capitalistic system.

Namdrol said:

No, this is not correct. In a pure capitalist system, a megacorporation would have become the government by now. Why Because they would have either bought or manufactured the guns to make it so.

N

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

The it would no longer be a pure capitalist system. Whenever anyone anywhere violates the nonaggression principle, you have lost any appeal to morality and are back to lions and antelopes.

The answer to the question of "who watches the watchers" however cannot be "well, the people who had the guns in the first place". That is just coercion, which has nothing to do with voluntarism.

Malcolm wrote:

Since when has "pure non-aggression" ever been a capitalist principle?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

They would have crumbled into little micro-corporations - as they were meant to do, and as they would have done in a pure capitalistic system.

Namdrol said:

No, this is not correct. In a pure capitalist system, a megacorporation would have become the government by now. Why Because they would have either bought or manufactured the guns to make it so.

N

Virgo said:

Agreed. Greedy groups will always vie for power. Generally, whoever can muster the most force or power, wins.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, groups always form governments to protect their interests. This is why anarcho-capitalism is such a joke.

There is only one way to be any kind of anarchist, and that is to refuse to play at all.

However, no one lives in an isolated world, and we are not sufficiently advanced as species to live free of the social fiction we call "a government" since there are still resources that various groups wish to protect for their own consumption.

One can choose not to play, however, to some extent, and that is about as anarchist as most of us are going to get.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Deopendent origination and emptiness are synonyms.

N

alwayson said:

Thats what I said many times

Malcolm wrote:

Some people are a little slow, padawan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

heart said:

Just find me a quote from Nagarjuna then saying that emptiness if dependent origination or else we are finished with this discussion.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

That which is dependent origination
is explained to be emptiness.

-- Mulamadhyamakakarikas.

Kelwin said:

Ok I don't know anything like you guys do. But again, this says DO is empty. It doesn't say that all of emptiness is DO? Does it?

Could we say for example that the nature of mind is empty, but not dependently originated?

Malcolm wrote:

If there is no dependently originated mind, there is no mind at all, and hence there is would be no nature of the mind of which to speak.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The full passage, for context:

That which is dependent origination
is explained to be emptiness,
that is designated from truth,
that is the middle path.

Why? A phenomena
that is not dependently originated does not exist,
therefore, a phenomena
that is not empty does not exist.

If everything were not empty,
there would be no arising and perishing,
and the consequence would be that for you
the four truths of āryas would not exist.

Deopendent origination and emptiness are synonyms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

heart said:

And everything green is grass and Namdrol agrees with everything you say.

/magnus

alwayson said:

What the hell is that supposed to mean?

What do you think emptiness means?

"empty" = "dependently originated"

They are synonymous phrases.

This is not rocket science.

heart said:

Just find me a quote from Nagarjuna then saying that emptiness is dependent origination or else we are finished with this discussion.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

That which is dependent origination
is explained to be emptiness.

-- Mulamadhyamakakarikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

They would have crumbled into little micro-corporations - as they were meant to do,
and as they would have done in a pure capitalistic system.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not correct. In a pure capitalist system, a megacorporation would have
become the government by now. Why? Because they would have either bought or
manufactured the guns to make it so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

You peak oil doomers always say tar sand development is only happening now because
oil prices are high, but you also always say that prices are only high because of scarcity.

In which case if more crude fields are developed, prices fall and we go back to crude for a while. So what's the problem? High prices fund the development of the sands, low prices fund the development of the crude.

Malcolm wrote:

There are finite limits to both, and both, along with coal, are destroying the environment.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

This guy's notion that wealth is created out of thin air is pure Neo-con snake oil.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

I acknowledged myself he was a Tea-Partier.

So you, against Smith, basically don't agree that the means of production can produce something that is valued excess of those means?

Malcolm wrote:

One word:

Commodity fetish.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Then why bother to institute a system of redistribution if nothing excess of the means of production has been generated in the first place?

Malcolm wrote:

People do need to be fed, clothed, and housed. It is as simple as taking energy from one place, where it is stored, and expending it somewhere else.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Unless you place your confidence in as of yet undiscovered energy sources, we are

facing a wall. That energy wall will severely limit all global wealth production.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Two words for you - tar sands.

Malcolm wrote:

Peak oil does not mean there is no more easily recoverable oil. It does mean that we are past the peak where there will continue to be easily recoverable supplies of oil -- this will dwindle rapidly as our civilization requires increasingly large quantities of energy.

Tar sands merely prove my point. It is profitable now because oil is very expensive at the moment resulting from an increasing shortage of easily recoverable oil.

Oil from tar sands is very expensive to recover, compared to conventional oil. It is also an environmental nightmare.

You might want to read this:

http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/RL34258_20071211.pdf "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

There is in fact a finite amount of usable energy on the planet. It comes from burnable resources like oil, coal, wood, corn, and shit and other forms of bio-mass.

That means there is a finite amount of wealth that can be generated from the world at any given time. Since the world is also not infinite, we do not have infinite energy generators, as much as solar and wind advocates would like to imagine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2011 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Eel-wriggling.

deepbluehum said:

You are not catching my meaning friend.

I'm trying to make Gorampa's point, perhaps in an unwieldy way.

...the thought that, having broken through the reification of grasping at truth,

conceptualizes [things] to be mere imputations, is also said to be a form at grasping at the self of phenomena.

--lta ba'i shan 'byed

If you say "DO is emptiness," it is just a convention, a label. That is different than saying, "DO is emptiness. The Tathagata is emptiness. Therefore, the Tathagata is DO'd, and is just a mere label in my mind." This reasoning reifies the conventional as truth. Then, a Madhyamakan has to show that no, she or he has not made the logical argument that DO is emptiness, and that DO and emptiness are just labels. So just because that which arises conditionally is labelled "emptiness," does not mean the Tathagata is an object which we called "emptiness." In fact, the Tathagata cannot arise conditionally, because that would mean that which has transcended impermanence would not have done so. A "Tathagata" has relinquished grasping at truth and falsity, and so having cut the root of samsara, is unarisen.

"I didn't say DO is not emptiness," because first off a Madhyamakan doesn't make claims, and second of all because this conventional parlance is convenient, like bowing to a Buddha photo, because you can't bow to the nonarising essence.

"None of them said DO is emptiness," because Nagarjuna explicitly stated that "empty" and "DO" are just a labels. The key point being these labels do not justify negating the Buddha, karma, etc., by claiming the Buddha is a mere imputation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Namdrol said:

Since we do not have infinite resources, "anarcho-capitalism" aka neo-liberalism, will and is destroying the planet.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

You are quite wrong. Wealth can be generated ad infinitum, that is the whole point.

Malcolm wrote:

You are living in a fantasy.

Economic activity requires energy, of which there are only finite sources.

For example, peak oil- we are past the point of peak oil. It used to be the ratio to expenditure to extraction was 300:1 (circa 1920). It is now 10:1 and rapidly declining.

Unless you place your confidence in as of yet undiscovered energy sources, we are facing a wall. That energy wall will severely limit all global wealth production.

This guy's notion that wealth is created out of thin air is pure Neo-con snake oil.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

Huifeng said:

But, as I mentioned earlier, check out the so called Mahāsūtras (cf. Skillings). These are Sautrāntika sūtras that have some definition "all dharmas are empty" type teachings. They are not present in the Pali, and even some of them have been lost. Vasu quotes them a fair bit in the Kosa, too. And, check out the Mahāsaṅghika commentary to the Ekottarāgama in Chinese, as well. Also the Mahāsaṅghika school Lokānuvartana Sūtra 《佛說內藏百寶經》, which is heavy on the emptiness thing.

~~ Huifeng

Namdrol said:

Saying that all dharmas are empty or lack svabhava is not the same thing as saying that all dharmas are completely unreal and mere nominal designations of appearances.

Huifeng said:

So ... what do those texts I mentioned say, then?

《佛說內藏百寶經》卷 1: 「佛知諸經法本空本亦無所有。」 (CBETA, T17, no. 807, p. 752, c7)

... the Buddha knows all dharmas as essentially (?) empty, and non-existent ...

etc. etc.

Many of these texts refer to all phenomena as "merely name", non-existent, and so on.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm, Huifeng, you just proved my point -- this passage comes from the 內藏百寶經, i.e. the ārya-lokānusamānāvatāra-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra or the 'phags pa 'jig rten gyi rjes su 'thun par 'jug pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Conventional language does not recognize that all things are DO'd, but conceives of them as unitary wholes.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on the convention. That certainly is not the convention around things that are understood to possess parts, for example, machines.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Not sure if this is addressed to me, but I didn't say DO is not emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Ahem:

deepbluehum wrote:

None of them said dependent origination is emptiness.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

tobes said:

Without sovereignty to intervene, capitalism itself would have collapsed.

The fiction of state-less markets has proved to be utterly catastrophic.

A more misguided optimism, I could scarcely conceive.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

You are just worshipping a giant idol called the state that some rich dude made up.

Remove the idol and presto no more "too big to fail". No more corporate bailouts. No more lobbying. No more federal paybacks.

Statism is debt because democracy is debt. Democracy is bribery, bribery requires ever

increasing debt, ever-increasing debt always collapses. Always.

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Malcolm wrote:

Your vision is a world divided up among copoprations. It is essentially, coporate fascism meaning, that in end everything will be divided amongst corporations, with nothing to stand in their way.

States develop because people ally to protect common rescources. Corporations form in oder to exploit those resources. Without state invervention, time and again corporations have shown that they are rapacious and incapable of self-control when it comes to exhausting resources.

Since we do not have infinite resources, "anarcho-capitalism" aka neo-liberalism, will and is destroying the planet.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

tobes said:

Without sovereignty to intervene, capitalism itself would have collapsed.

The fiction of state-less markets has proved to be utterly catastrophic.

A more misguided optimism, I could scarcely conceive.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

You are just worshipping a giant idol called the state that some rich dude made up.

Remove the idol and presto no more "too big to fail". No more corporate bailouts. No more lobbying. No more federal paybacks.

Statism is debt because democracy is debt. Democracy is bribery, bribery requires ever increasing debt, ever-increasing debt always collapses. Always.

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Malcolm wrote:

Your vision is a world divided up among copoprations. It is essentially, coporate fascism meaning, that in end everything will be divided amongst corporations, with nothing to stand in their way.

States develop because people ally to protect common rescources. Corporations form in oder to exploit those resources. Without state invervention, time and again corporations have shown that they are rapacious and incapable of self-control when it comes to exhausting resources.

Since we do not have infinite resources, "anarcho-capitalism" aka neo-liberalism, will and is destroying the planet.

The only sane alternative:

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 9:40 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Virgo said:

This is what you guys should be listening to:

<http://www.stansberryresearch.com/pro/1108PSINEWVD/6PSIM903/PR>

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Porter Stansberry is an idiot. He is the guy who recently said that geology does not create oil, capital does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 8:10 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

very optimistic about the future of free-market capitalism. I'm not optimistic about the future of state capitalism—or rather, I am optimistic, because I think it will eventually come to an end. State capitalism inevitably creates all sorts of problems which become insoluble.

Rothbard

tobes said:

Good luck with that optimism! Post-GFC has seen the unimaginably utopic dream of 'pure' free market capitalism collapse into a shoddy mess of irresolvable debt.

Without sovereignty to intervene, capitalism itself would have collapsed.

The fiction of state-less markets has proved to be utterly catastrophic.

A more misguided optimism, I could scarcely conceive.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 8:09 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

None of them said dependent origination is emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

?

That which is dependent origination
is explained to be emptiness.

-- Mulamadhyamakakarikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 3rd, 2011 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

"Anarcho-communism" is just neo-liberalism without the need to actually justify its own existence in the marketplace i.e. Noam Chomsky academic ivory tower bullshit.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not even close.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 2nd, 2011 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: Why don't Tibetan Lamas resurrect the old "Kapalika" type?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Souls, of course.

alwayson said:

Well, bundles of (dependently originated) skandhas designated as mere conceptual labels.

Malcolm wrote:

designated by mere conceptual labels, not as.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 2nd, 2011 at 7:39 PM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

Huifeng said:

But, as I mentioned earlier, check out the so called Mahāsūtras (cf. Skillings). These are Sautrāntika sūtras that have some definition "all dharmas are empty" type teachings. They are not present in the Pali, and even some of them have been lost. Vasu quotes them a fair bit in the Kosa, too. And, check out the Mahāsaṅghika commentary to the Ekottarāgama in Chinese, as well. Also the Mahāsaṅghika school Lokānuvartana Sūtra 《佛說內藏百寶經》, which is heavy on the emptiness thing.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Saying that all dharmas are empty or lack svabhava is not the same thing as saying that all dharmas are completely unreal and mere nominal designations of appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 2nd, 2011 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

Huifeng said:

The status of the *Satyasiddhiśāstra is in dispute: Some Chinese took it as Mahāyāna

Malcolm wrote:

Both Vasumitra and Paramartha identify the Bahuśrutīya as pro-Mahāyāna, with Satyasiddhiśāstra as their basic text. Of course, Satyasiddhiśāstra identifies the present moment as ultimately real, so hardly a non-realist position like Madhyamaka.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 2nd, 2011 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Yes it was a silly argument.

But I stand by the rest.

This is just the old anarcho-communism versus anarcho-capitalism battle.

Malcolm wrote:

"Anarcho-capitalism" is just neo-liberalism i.e. Ayn Rand libertarian bullshit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 2nd, 2011 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

maybay said:

Which Hinayana texts teach the emptiness of all phenomena?

Jnana said:

For example, the Satyasiddhiśāstra. If more Mahāsaṅghika texts had survived, we would likely have many more examples.

Malcolm wrote:

The Satyasiddhi is a Bahuśrutīya text, an off-shoot of the Mahāsaṅghika. But it is not a representative of general Mahāsaṅghika, and it is not representative of so called Hināyāna school that fully embraces full śūnyatā since the Bahuśrutīya deliberately

followed Mahāyāna. See Nāgārjuna in Context. Instead it is yet another example of post PP sutra schools.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 1st, 2011 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

He said that since we have to live in a world in which things appear to exist...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, "things appear to exist". That is quite different than the blanket statement, "things exist".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 1st, 2011 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Breathing Ashtanga Style

Content:

Clarence said:

So, I just finished an introduction to Ashtanga Yoga this morning. Very interesting I must say. However, some question arose. We were taught the three bandhas and how to hold the two lower bandhas while performing the Asanas. Now, I was always taught (in different yoga classes and pranayama exercises) to breathe through my stomach. When holding the bandhas, one breathes in a manner they call high thoracic breathing. Is that what is called vase breathing in Tibetan Yoga and how do I reconcile the discrepancy with the earlier learned stomach breathing?

Many thanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

No.

A bum can is concentrating the vāyu below the navel. But it can involved all three locks. So there are some similarities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Why don't Tibetan Lamas resurrect the old "Kapalika" type?

Content:

alwayson said:

Why don't Tibetan Lamas resurrect the old Buddhist "Kapalika" type ascetics to compete with the Hindu sadhus in India?

Come on, its a competition and the Buddhists are losing.

booker said:

Competition for what?

Malcolm wrote:

Souls, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Buddha Nature

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

May be I will answer in this way

Even now, we are already Buddha. The difference between Siddharta Gautama and us are Siddharta Gautama is the Buddha who is already wake up from his sleep, while we are buddha who are still sleeping.

Dharmakid said:

I like this interpretation, also. It's simple and it makes sense, at least to me.

Does anyone here object to the simple explanations? And why?

Malcolm wrote:

It's a contradiction in terms.

"Buddha" means "fully awakened one". Someone who is "asleep" is therefore not a buddha by definition.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

Huifeng said:

It may just be. The Chinese and East Asian systems in general had a range of stuff across the strict Vaibhasika / Sarvastivadin to Sautrantika spectrum, such as the various sastras, the Kosa, Sara, Avatara, as well as the *Satyasiddhi and *Catursatyani sastras; not to mention the PP Upadesa.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

This still means that Sarvastivada is the gold standard for Mahāyāna authors. The Mahāvibhaṣa was the dominant abhidharma text in India for centuries. The only reason Vasubandhu's Kośa became so famous is that he did such an excellent job of summarizing its many details in a short form.

There was an attempt by Tibetans to translate the Mahāvibhaṣa, but according to tradition, only Bagor Vairocana was capable of finishing his section. This translation supposedly still existed as of early twentieth century.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

Virgo said:

What I am saying is, in Theravada paramattha dhammas have sabhava. They are said to really exist.

Jnana said:

Ah yes, you adhere to the doctrine of the "big four." Good thing that Ven. Ñāṇananda has sufficiently shredded that nonsensical commentarial tenet!

But again, none of this pertains to this thread. If you want dhammas to have sabhāva -- even though the Paṭisambhidāmagga explicitly states that dhammas are empty of sabhāva -- then that's fine by me.

Malcolm wrote:

Paṭisambhidāmagga is definitely post-Prajñāpāramita and likely post-Nāgārjuna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Virgo said:

Are you committed to Bodhicitta?

Kevin

alwayson said:

Yes

When someone teaches the full path to Buddhahood, and not piecemeal, let me know.

Even Norbu does not teach the full path by his own admission.

Essentially you got to put in a lot ngondro, retreats and money to get the full teachings right?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. ChNN does teach the complete path, the four visions, etc.

It does not mean that he teaches everything in every retreat. But webcast retreats are free for the cost of a yearly membership (180 in the US). That is many, many hours of teachings a year, plus access to many texts not otherwise available.

He will be in the US next year. I suggest you meet him in person.

Don't be like a musk hunter, leaving the corpse and stripping only the glands.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 7:35 PM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is from Tibetan Medicine as well as Dzogchen Nyinthig.

Simply put, sukra [semen], both male and female is the the byproduct [kita] that is left over when the final product of digestion, ojas, is formed. Ojas is the real "bodhicitta" in the body, and directly supports the indestructible drop in the heart. N

wayland said:

Thanks Namdrol. So I guess, on this basis, the level of Ojas has more to do with correct diet than semen loss or retention?

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on a number of factors. Ojas can be lost with semen if a man's digestion processes are not good, if they are not eating well, etc. Other causes for the deterioration of ojas is stress, worry, poor habits such as staying up to late, not getting

proper rest and so on. Also one is more likely to lose ojas with semen in the summer when one's diet is less nutritious, less oily, lighter, rougher, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: Why don't Tibetan Lamas resurrect the old "Kapalika" type?

Content:

alwayson said:

Why don't Tibetan Lamas resurrect the old Buddhist "Kapalika" type ascetics to compete with the Hindu sadhus in India?

Come on, it's a competition and the Buddhists are losing.

Malcolm wrote:

We have Chö

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

You are arguing a commonly misunderstood meaning of sunyata (emptiness).

Malcolm wrote:

You are arguing a commonly misunderstood meaning of sunyata (emptiness).

As Nagarjuna says:

Whoever sees inherent existence, dependent existence,
existence or non-existence,
that person does not perceive
the truth in the Buddha's teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

Logically you are saying that anything below the Third, is a false rigpa "known by the mind" as you put it (since no changes to the body's channels have yet occurred).

Malcolm wrote:

Not a false knowledge, an incomplete knowledge. The state it knows however is neither incomplete nor false, hence it deserves the name "knowledge" or rigpa.

Dzogchen does not work with the channels of the body in the same way as tantra, so it is a completely irrelevant point.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Kelwin said:

Bit of a miss-communication there. If you realize rigpa, you indeed realize emptiness. However, if you only momentarily experience rigpa, you don't realize emptiness. Correct me if I'm wrong Namdrol, I know you will

alwayson said:

I don't get it either.

One's mirror-like nature AND emptiness are BOTH defined as beyond conceptuality.

Namdrol said:

I did. It is pretty straight forward. To put it another way, when a person ceases to reify phenomena in terms of the four extremes, that is the direct perception of emptiness. Until that point, their "emptiness" remains an intellectual sequence of negations; accurate perhaps, but conceptual nevertheless.

N

Malcolm wrote:

Mirrors don't think about reflecting images, they just reflect images. The same thing with the mind. It is just clear. That's all. That clarity is empty i.e. images do not belong to the clarity of the mind nor are they found apart from the mind. Moreover, that clarity of the mind itself is not established in anyway. It is not real. This principle can be known (rig pa) by the mind, but cannot be realized with the mind. This is why, in Dzogchen teachings, the realization of emptiness and the so called "full measure of rig pa" occur at one and the same time. At that time your knowledge of reality becomes complete. Your rig pa, or knowledge has gone to its fullest extent. Then, after that, it is time to exhaust dharmatā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: HHDL speaks about

Content:

kirtu said:

There are no long term pacifist Buddhist states, Bhutan being the only exception.

Kirt

Sönam said:

... and there could be a lot to say about!

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

And not even then...the last war Bhutan was directly involved in was 1865. There were was a civil war between 1882-1885 as well.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhutan_War " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ugyen_Wangchuck " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Bhutan was basically a protectorate of the UK until 1947. That relationship was taken over by India in 1949 and revised in 2007 which allows India full military access to Bhutan because of a border incident in 2005 between PRC and Bhutan. Bhutan has a standing army of 16,000 troops, so it is hardly "pacifist".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, I get bored of answering the same questions by the same people over and over again. Even I have limited patience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: 5 organs, elements, spirits

Content:

Namdrol said:

"Elements", yes, for example, wood for liver, metal for lungs and so on. Spirit, no.

dakini_boi said:

So I take it, TM uses Chinese elements (wood, fire, earth, metal, water) when discussing the organs, but Hindu elements (earth, water, fire, air, space) for everything else?

Malcolm wrote:

It uses the five phases for pulse diagnosis; the five elements (India) for everything else.

dakini_boi said:

I should clarify that by "spirits of the organs" I was referring to the wu shen (5 shen) - not spirits in the sense of entities that cause disease (which also exist in TCM), but 5 aspects of consciousness of a human being that are said to reside in the 5 solid organs.

Malcolm wrote:

That concept never made it into Tibetan medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 30th, 2011 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Namdrol said:

Semen, like feces and urine, is a waste product.

wayland said:

Hi Namdrol,

I have never yet encountered any instructions which equate the qualities of semen with those of feces or urine...Just curious, is the teaching on the parity of these substances a feature of your school or is it more widespread?

Malcolm wrote:

It is from Tibetan Medicine as well as Dzogchen Nyinthig.

Simply put, sukra [semen], both male and female is the byproduct [kita] that is left over when the final product of digestion, ojas, is formed. Ojas is the real "bodhicitta" in the body, and directly supports the indestructible drop in the heart.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 29th, 2011 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Namdrol said:

No. Why? The creation stage can only bring one to the sixth bodhisattva bhumi. To progress further, the completion stage, therefore, is indispensable.

N

Kai said:

A unique Sakya school doctrine?

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 29th, 2011 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Tantra has "unstruck sound" like Hindu Tantra?

Content:

Namdrol said:

I just this moment read an explanation in Pradīpodyotanābhisaṃdhiprakāśikā by Bhavyakīrti:

"A is Bhagavan Akshobhya; O is Bhagavan Amitabha and Ma is Mahavairocana".

N

Adamantine said:

Nice.. that just leaves Ratnasambhava and Amoghasiddhi unaccounted for

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, body, speech and mind are included here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 29th, 2011 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Vimala

Content:

Namdrol said:

You should separate Vimala from Magnesium citrate by about an hour. Vimala may be used as needed. It can be made a little more effective by taking it with warm milk or a small spot of brandy, port, or other aged alcohol. Vimala may also be taken early in the morning to calm anxiety.

Epistemes said:

What are your primary reasons for suggesting that Vimala be taken separately from Magnesium citrate? Magnesium citrate has a number of benefits aside from my primary reason for making it a daily supplement. Is there something in Magnesium citrate that could counter-act Vimala?

How does one determine when Vimala is needed versus making it a daily supplement?

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly because in Tibetan medicine we don't load up on pills all at the same time.

The purpose of Vimala is to help one sleep and otherwise reduce symptoms of vata disturbances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 29th, 2011 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

So basically realizing emptiness occurs when the mind winds stop moving?

Is that right?

Malcolm wrote:

not necessarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 29th, 2011 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Vimala

Content:

Epistemes said:

Thanks for the link. I'll make sure to do a cleanse in the very near future.

But why is my solution bad, and why is being completely dependent on it not good? I currently look at it from the standpoint of 'If they keep manufacturing this or similar products, I'm good 'til death.' Plus, taking Metamucil has helped with cholesterol.

Malcolm wrote:

Because it means that you are not digesting food properly, and that will lead to major health crises later on. Better to prevent it now while you are still young.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Vimala

Content:

Namdrol said:

Why are you taking magnesium citrate?

Epistemes said:

I have to take this plus Metamucil everyday to prevent constipation. I may have some form of collitis. I went to a GI doctor about 3-4 years ago due to some problems with constipation, but by this time I had found the above remedy for preventing it. He said that if the remedy worked, he would advise against a colonoscopy unless the symptoms got worse, which they haven't.

Malcolm wrote:

This a bad long term solution. You will become completely dependent on this.

I reccomend doing some sort of cleanse. Colorado Cleanse I think is one of the best designed.

lifespa.com

This should solve your issue.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Vimala

Content:

Epistemes said:

I recently purchased some Vimala from Siddhi Energetics.

When is the best time to take it - in the morning or before bed?

If in the morning, how long before a meal?

I also take Magnesium Citrate in the evening for digestion.

Should Vimala be taken before or after taking the Magnesium Citrate supplement?

Will Magnesium Citrate reduce the efficacy of Vimala?

Malcolm wrote:

You should take Vimala about an hour before sleeping.

Why are you taking magnesium citrate?

You should seperate Vimala from Magnesium citrate by about an hour. Vimala may be

used as needed. It can be made a little more effective by taking it with warm milk or a small spot of brandy, port, or other aged alcohol. Vimala may also be taken early in the morning to calm anxiety.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Nakayamashingoshoshu Exorcism Gone Wrong - Buddhist Cult?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Exorcism by waterboarding ...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Tantra has "unstruck sound" like Hindu Tantra?

Content:

Gyalpo said:

In ChNN Rinpoche: Precious Vase, in the explanation of four understanding, there is understanding thue nature of letters. O alone stands for body, because it is something concrete, for A you dont have to do anything, just open mouth, but O we have to make some effort and so on. May be this is the point for OM. And rigpa is explained as anuswara...

Malcolm wrote:

I just this moment read an explanation in Pradīpodyotanābhisaṃdhiprakāśikā by Bhavyakīrti:

"A is Bhagavan Akshobhya; O is Bhagavan Amitabha and Ma is Mahavairocana".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

Adamantine said:

I have the book compiling ChNN's teachings on the meaning of and how to make a Namkha. . in the introduction, it seems to imply this is primarily a Bon practice. Is this true? I was thinking of making one and getting it blessed by one of my Nyingma Lamas but if it is primarily a Bon thing he may not know much about it or even approve.. does anyone have any insight? The book alludes to similar practices being widespread among indigenous cultures around the world, which is interesting..

If it is mainly Bonpo, is there an equivalent and effective practice among Buddhists to harmonize the elemental energies of the individual?

Malcolm wrote:

No, thread crosses began as Bon thing and were adapted to Buddhist practice by Guru Rinpoche.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

catmoon said:

Now who would these people of poor understanding be? Who uses the term illusion-like?

Namdrol said:

Sometimes [quite often] teachers will speak the level of their students, when their own view is in fact higher or different. Why? Because sometimes teachers realize that they must feed the truth to their students in small doses.

Some people, hearing that all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions freak out. Some people who hear that phenomena are empty, freak out. This is why it is a bohdhisattva downfall to teach emptiness to the immature.

N

tobes said:

By all means practice and teach Dzogchen, but do not pretend that every interpretation of emptiness must conform to it.

Malcolm wrote:

If an explanation of emptiness does not conform to Dzogchen, then it does not conform to Madhyamaka since the explanation of emptiness in Dzogchen and Madhyamaka are identical.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Tantra has "unstruck sound" like Hindu Tantra?

Content:

Adamantine said:

If OM represents all three kayas then why when receiving the empowerments during Guru Yoga does it relate to the body - blessing, aka nirmanakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

Om is made of three parts A O Ṃ i.e. ॐ, ॐ, and ॐ, hence it represents the three kāyas.

Though I am certain there is an explanation for why Om represents the body out of body speech and mind (om aḥ hūṃ), I don't have a ready answer.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Tantra has "unstruck sound" like Hindu Tantra?

Content:

alwayson said:

Ok thanks

Is OM associated with Dharmakaya?

I've heard that before.

Malcolm wrote:

Om stands for the three kāyas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Tantra has "unstruck sound" like Hindu Tantra?

Content:

alwayson said:

I was wondering if Buddhist Tantra has an "unstruck sound" like Hindu Tantra?

In Hindu tantra the unstruck sound is OM, and it resonates from the Heart Chakra.

P.S. If this is some top secret classified Vajrayana information, then ignore this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

The term anahata is translated into Tibetan as mi zhig, which then gets translated in English as "indestructible", as in anahata bindu i.e indestructible drop.

but the meaning is quite different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: 5 organs, elements, spirits

Content:

dakini_boi said:

I know TM is influenced by both Chinese medicine and Ayurveda. In the Chinese system, each of the organs has an elemental correspondence, as well as a "spirit" or aspect of the psyche associated with it. Was any of this integrated into Tibetan medicine?

Further, TCM describes the dying process and what happens to the spirits of the organs. For example, at least in one interpretation, the liver hun (ethereal soul) is what carries our karma/experience of past lives. Is any of this discussed in TM texts/teachings, alongside typical Buddhist descriptions of the dissolution of the elements at the time of death?

Namdrol said:

"Elements", yes, for example, wood for liver, metal for lungs and so on. Spirit, no.

nirmal said:

This may sound a little silly but it is said that if the spiritual disturbance is removed first, then medicine taken by the patient will be very effective and the road to recovery is very fast. Does TM believe in that, Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

There are some cultural differences between Tibet and China, and the way "spirits" are understood is one of them.

AFAIK, while there are spirits or demons associated with most diseases, called "disease lords", they are not specific to a given organ, but rather govern a class of disease as a whole. Religious practice is always a component in any Tibetan medical treatment. So, the answer is yes and no. Yes in general, no on the specifics.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2011 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: 5 organs, elements, spirits

Content:

dakini_boi said:

I know TM is influenced by both Chinese medicine and Ayurveda. In the Chinese system, each of the organs has an elemental correspondence, as well as a "spirit" or aspect of the psyche associated with it. Was any of this integrated into Tibetan medicine?

Further, TCM describes the dying process and what happens to the spirits of the organs. For example, at least in one interpretation, the liver hun (ethereal soul) is what carries our karma/experience of past lives. Is any of this discussed in TM texts/teachings, alongside typical Buddhist descriptions of the dissolution of the elements at the time of death?

Malcolm wrote:

"Elements", yes, for example, wood for liver, metal for lungs and so on. Spirit, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2011 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Angioedema

Content:

Epistemes said:

My partner has angioedema, including hives and swelling in the fingers and toes. Does TM cover how to treat something like this?

Namdrol said:

Yes, seeing a Tibetan doctor may be of some benefit. Exact treatment would depend on a whole host of factors I cannot begin to predict.

N

Epistemes said:

Would going to an ayurvedic doctor be of similar benefit?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2011 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: 1st Lay vow ...what is the definition of 'physical actions'?

Content:

minimayhen88 said:

The 1st lay vow / lay precept / upasaka of non violence

I was informed that"The vow or precept of not killing (harmlessness) only extends to physical actions" Do these 'physical actions' include harsh speech and the mental actions of the mind? Or quite literally only 'not killing'

Kindly,

A young lay follower, who wishes to keep their vow pure

Malcolm wrote:

Quite literally, only "not killing". The five lay precepts as a total apply only to one's physical actions (speech being a physical action).

Basically, there are ten non-virtues: killing, stealing, sexual misconduct for the body; lying, harsh speech, calumny and gossip for speech; malice, envy and wrong view for the mind.

Of these, killing, stealing, sexual misconduct and lying are covered in the vows, as well as intoxicants, for a total of five lay precepts or vows.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2011 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is the realization of your own emptiness to the fullest possible degree.

alwayson said:

Which is tactile bliss?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is a side effect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2011 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

alwayson said:

If the Dharmakaya is free from extremes.

Then logically it cannot be separate from me??

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmakāya is not a thing, It is the realization of your own emptiness to the fullest possible degree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2011 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Ankle, Knee, Elbow Itch

Content:

Clarence said:

Will a good ayurvedic store know what pitta pacifying oil to give me when I ask?

Many thanks once again,

C

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2011 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Lojong, Rushens, and Semdzins

Content:

padma norbu said:

I don't remember the exact details, but I believe what I heard is that there are 9 levels. I asked how many people have completed and was told that nobody has even passed the 3rd or 4th level (forgot). I think actually the words were that the highest level as of right now is 3rd or 4th and nobody has completed them. In other words, the other levels only exist theoretically, I guess, because they are not even written out or discussed since there are no students. I don't know. But, since SMS has been going on for quite a while and involves quite a lot of old hats at this stuff who have been sitting on their bums for quite a long time now chanting mantras, writing books translating Tibetan texts (Jim Valby), I just don't see the point of even attempting it. Why get involved in something nobody will ever likely finish?

Pero said:

Oh I see. Rinpoche hasn't taught more than the 4th level. Apparently it gets quite difficult after the second level. They are written out though. Sort of. There exists a booklet called Santi Maha Sangha (I got it in Merigar, didn't see it online) and in it all levels of SMS are outlined in the form of a poem. There you can see SMS is really something alive, it's really about your own practice developing. Looking at it, it seems to me that completing level 9 basically means achieving Rainbow body haha.

As for your question. Why do you concern yourself whether others will finish it or not? Why don't YOU try to finish it?

alpha said:
what do you learn at the second and third level?

Malcolm wrote:
1-3 sems sde
4-6 klong sde
7-9 man ngag sde

BTW, everything that Rinpoche teaches in these nine levels he also teaches in general. The difference is that SMS is more systematic and a bit more detailed. But he teaches everything to everyone.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2011 at 2:56 AM
Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality
Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Aren't you being a teenyweeny bit sneaky now Loppon?

...

Which is pretty much standard Sakya spros bral view. But now you use Buddhapalita to support mere non-affirming negation view, which slides back into Gelug emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:
No, Buddhapalita corresponds with spros bral. Buddhapalita's view and the statement gnas lugs med pa are completely consistent with one another.

You cannot ascertain Tsongkhapa's view in Buddhapalita. It is impossible.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 11:51 PM
Title: Re: Dalai Lama speaks on reincarnation
Content:

always on said:
I'm simply a supporter of HH Dalai Lama, although I am not a Vajrayanist.

Malcolm wrote:
HHDL is a self-proclaimed marxist.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 11:47 PM
Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality
Content:

Kai said:
Haribhadra, the same guy who wrote the famous Abhisamayalankara commentary?

Malcolm wrote:
indeed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 11:39 PM
Title: Re: In need of guidance about vows....
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
The vow or precept of not killing only extends to physical actions.

However, the commitment of taking refuge in the Dharma is that one must abandon harming sentient beings in thought and deed.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 11:11 PM
Title: Re: Dalai Lama speaks on reincarnation
Content:
alwayson said:
P.S. Supporting socialism on a Buddhist board is improper, considering it is pure evil.

Malcolm wrote:
Which socialism did you have in mind? You sound like a follower of Ayn Rand.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 11:09 PM
Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality
Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Why push nihilism side so hard?

Malcolm wrote:
Who's pushing nihilism? Not me, sir.

As Buddhapalita quips "We do not advocate non-existence. We simply remove claims that existents exist."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 11:08 PM
Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality
Content:

Namdrol said:
Omniscience is not as scary as it sounds. A Buddhas omniscience is predicated on the fact that all objects of knowledge, including buddhahood itself, are completely illusory.

This is also the view of Dzogchen i.e. everything, including buddhahood, etc., is completely equivalent to an illusion; not "like an illusion", as some people in Mahāyāna with a poor understanding hedge -- completely equivalent.

Kai said:
This is more extreme than some Yogacara originated schools, certainly a POV that Theravada and other Nikaya schools will never accept.....

Malcolm wrote:
This is the standpoint of Haribhadra presented his perfection of wisdom commentaries, so it is pretty standard Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 9:34 PM
Title: Re: 2 Tibetan monks self-immolate amid Dalai Lama feud
Content:

mr. gordo said:
BEIJING (AP) — Two Tibetan monks set themselves on fire Monday in a protest over China's tight rein over Buddhist practices, a rights group said as the Chinese government reiterated it will choose the next Dalai Lama.

The London-based Free Tibet campaign said Lobsang Kalsang and Lobsang Konchok, both believed to be 18 or 19 years old, self-immolated Monday at the Kirti Monastery in Sichuan province's Aba prefecture.

<http://www.seattlepi.com/news/article/2-Tibetan-monks-self-immolate-amid-Dalai-Lama-fued-2188768.php>

Malcolm wrote:

Fortunately they did not badly hurt themselves.

I don't approve of these acts of self-immolation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Aemilius said:

Another interesting point is the plurality of worlds that we find in Theravada and Mahayana buddhism. The idea was known in ancient Greek world, it was known in the islamic world, one sentence in Quran speaks of worlds, it is also present in the Thousand and One Nights collection of stories. In Europe it re-emerges during the Era of Enlightenment. Thus for example Voltaire, in his novel Zadig, says that besides Earth there are millions of inhabited planets like Earth in the Universe, each unique and different.

Malcolm wrote:

Sarvastivada Buddhist cosmology holds that there are a billion Jambudvipas, each one basically identicle.

Mahāyāna cosmology is a little more diverse, including the idea that the entire universe is contained in the body of the mahāsambhogakāya, Vairocana Himasara, with our world system being located with another world system called kusumatalagarbha alamkara which in turn is in the palm of his hand.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Aemilius said:

Another interesting point is the plurality of worlds that we find in Theravada and Mahayana buddhism. The idea was known in ancient Greek world, it was known in the islamic world, one sentence in Quran speaks of worlds, it is also present in the Thousand and One Nights collection of stories. In Europe it re-emerges during the Era of Enlightenment. Thus for example Voltaire, in his novel Zadig, says that besides Earth there are millions of inhabited planets like Earth in the Universe, each unique and different.

Malcolm wrote:

No one said that Buddhist intuitions about multiple worlds was wrong. Just that rather late Sumeru Cosmology presented Buddhist texts dating from the common era is obsolete and has been superseded.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Dalai Lama speaks on reincarnation

Content:

always on said:

WOW

HH Dalai Lama is REALLY throwing down the gauntlet with the commies / socialists here. Hopefully China becomes capitalistic, so we don't have to put up with their crap anymore.

Embrace Capitalism China!!!!:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Edf7xPbPZrc> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

narraboth said:

1. Religious freedom is not linked to socialism or capitalism. The main idea here is, Chinese Communist Party denies religion, but they want to get involved with religious issue, that's shameless.
2. China is kind of a capitalism country now, maybe more capitalist than some European countries, just China is without democracy.
3. Talking about making crap, maybe Chinese government think the US national debt they hold are more dodgy. How about thinking capitalism's own problem before raising an improper/controversial/Tea Party idea.

Malcolm wrote:

China is a mercantile state. This is a pre-Capitalist phase. Wiki states: "Mercantilism is the economic doctrine that says government control of foreign trade is of paramount importance for ensuring the prosperity and security of a state. In particular, it demands a positive balance of trade."

It continues:

Mercantilist policies have included:

High tariffs, especially on manufactured goods; [x]

Monopolizing markets with staple ports; [x, i.e. Walmart]

Exclusive trade with colonies;
Forbidding trade to be carried in foreign ships;
Export subsidies; [x]
Banning all export of gold and silver;
Promoting manufacturing with research or direct subsidies; [x]
Limiting wages; [x]
Maximizing the use of domestic resources; [x]
Restricting domestic consumption with non-tariff barriers to trade. [x]

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 8:51 PM
Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality
Content:

catmoon said:
Now who would these people of poor understanding be? Who uses the term illusion-like?

Malcolm wrote:
Sometimes [quite often] teachers will speak the level of their students, when their own view is in fact higher or different. Why? Because sometimes teachers realize that they must feed the truth to their students in small doses.

Some people, hearing that all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions freak out. Some people who hear that phenomena are empty, freak out. This is why it is a bohdhisattva downfall to teach emptiness to the immature.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 8:37 PM
Title: Re: Ankle, Knee, Elbow Itch
Content:

Clarence said:
P.S. I will look into shingles, don't know what those are off the top of my head.

Malcolm wrote:
Adult chicken pox.

Sounds to me like you might have a mild allergy to dog dander.

You need to wash all the clothes that you were wearing when you contacted the dog.

You need to rub a good quality pitta pacifying ayurvedic oil on the affected areas after you shower.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Acupuncture

Content:

Fa Dao said:

While it is obviously true that Tibet is colder on the whole, there are places in China that are bitterly cold as well. As to the moxabustion unless you were discussing this with some older precommunist practitioners your information about Chinese moxabustion will be limited. Sadly nowadays in China as elsewhere moxabustion is only used for cold and deficiency disorders. It used to be used for both hot and cold disorders as well as deficiency and excess disorders. Not a lot that are doing that nowadays. This is due to a number of factors, one of which was not its lack of efficacy. Both moxabustion and acupuncture came close to becoming lost arts in China.

Malcolm wrote:

Moxa is used in number of ways in TM -- as a therapy in and of itself, it is mostly used for cold/kapha diseases -- it is also used to dispell the vata which comes at the end of an serious heat diseases, and so on.

It is generally contraindicated as a main treatment for virtually all heat diseases, the only exception is heat being driven by vata.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Acupuncture

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Namdrol, I have to respectfully disagree...China is not only a "hot" place. In fact the weather there is quite varied. Ranging from below freezing to dry and arid to tropical. As to whether or not Tibetan moxabustion is superior to Chinese moxabustion, unless you are a practitioner of both Tibetan and Chinese medicine you cant really claim that either.

Malcolm wrote:

I have dicussed the way Chinese moxa is practiced with several OMDs and I have clinical experience in Tibetan hospitals with doctors who are fully cross trained in both systems. Tibetan moxabustion is more developed than Chinese Moxa. Acupuncture is more developed in Chinese medicine. This is just a fact, nothing to really argue about.

In general, compared to Tibet, the Chinese climate is quite warm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Ankle, Knee, Elbow Itch

Content:

Clarence said:

Ah, that is too bad, but thanks for the answer anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

Has the heat gone on?

Do you have a food allergy, new clothes, new soap, new pet, new lover, new job? What has changed besides your recent cold?

Are you getting shingles perhaps?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Ankle, Knee, Elbow Itch

Content:

Clarence said:

The last 2 nights I have been unable to sleep because I have very strong itching sensations around the ankles, on the front of my knees and at the back of my elbows. So, all places where the skin is very thin. Tonight it is also itching on my outside thighs. However, there is no rash to be found. Nowhere. I have been having a little cold the last 3 or 4 days. Nothing major and the first one in 2 years. I am generally healthy, so this is pretty strange. Any idea what this could be? Oh yeah, I don't have problems during the day. At least, nothing like when I sit down.

Many thanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

No clue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sönam said:

That I know, and Rinpoche underline it again and again, and I also say "he always teaches in "direct introduction mode"" ... what is not clear for me is why there is "special webcast session for direct introduction" as all sessions include direct introduction. And when I said there must be a trick, I was thinking Rinpoche makes "special sessions" called direct introduction for those listening could have no doubt about it (the fact that it includes direct introduction).

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

IN that case he is not only giving introduction he is giving transmission of three roots, etc., depending on the day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Acupuncture

Content:

Fa Dao said:

thanks Namdrol...was there a time when it was used for more than that?

Malcolm wrote:

Never. It has to do with the theory of needle in Tibetan medicine -- i.e. it is used mainly for inflammation and heat diseases i.e. pitta and blood. It is considered a cold and rough therapy, not good for vata and kapha at all. So I always especially recommend that vata-deranged people generally avoid acupuncture unless there is serious reason for them to use it to cut the end of a heat disease.

Tibet is a cold place, China is a hot place. There are more heat diseases in China than Tibet. Our Moxa is much more developed than Chinese moxabustion. Why? Tibet is a cold country.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

AlexanderS said:

This is one of the reasons I find it very hard to know what we working towards in buddhism and impossible to explain to anyone else.

Malcolm wrote:

All traditions of Buddhism are working towards the same goal, freedom from afflictions that are the cause of suffering. Some Buddhist traditions, from Mahāyāna on up, also aim at omniscience.

Omniscience is not as scary as it sounds. A Buddha's omniscience is predicated on the fact that all objects of knowledge, including Buddhahood itself, are completely illusory.

This is also the view of Dzogchen i.e. everything, including Buddhahood, etc., is completely equivalent to an illusion; not "like an illusion", as some people in Mahāyāna with a poor understanding hedge -- completely equivalent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Acupuncture

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I don't remember where I read it but I remember reading that at one time Tibet had as a part of its treatment therapies its own system of acupuncture. But for some reason it was banned or something. I am a Doctor of Chinese medicine primarily focusing on acupuncture and would love to know about its Tibetan counterpart.

Malcolm wrote:

We use needle on moxa as well as bloodletting points. But we generally only use needle on heat and nerve diseases, unlike Chinese medicine where they use it on everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

Acchantika said:

I mean only that in sems sde the central focus seems to be on a basic, unconditioned awareness that is free from duality, which, coincidentally, is the premise of Advaita and what "nondual" actually refers to, at least in the latter. That is where the perceived similarities end.

At the very least, I think it is understandable the two would be conflated by the untrained. Like me.

Malcolm wrote:

One: bodhicitta in sems sde is not something that is considered real; it is sat i.e. real in Advaita.

Two: there are two basic ways the term "non-dual" is used in Buddhism: free from subject and object perception (trivial) and free from ontic extremes (non-trivial).

Three, sometimes the word "non-dual" in translation is misleading. Here is an example from sem sde. This:

rgyu dang 'bras bu gnyis las 'das
sems can sangs rgyas gnyis med pas
sangs rgyas sems kyis sgrub ma byed

It might be translated as:

Beyond the duality of cause and result,
since sentient beings and buddhas are non-dual,
buddhahood is not accomplished with the mind.

But that translation would be a little wrong.

A better way to render it would be:

Beyond both cause and result,
since both sentient beings and buddhas do not exist
buddhahood is not accomplished with the mind.

What is the difference you ask? Here there is a pair, a cause and a result i.e. sentient being are a cause, buddhas are a result. But since neither exist, therefore, buddhahood cannot be accomplished with mind.

These issues are often quite subtle.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2011 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sönam said:

As far as Rinpoché is giving teaching, he gives direct introduction ... he always teaches in "direct introduction mode" (and he did confirm that in today's teaching)

Sönam

booker said:

I guess there's a formal difference in the direct transmission over the webcast, which involves extra practice (empowerment) and one needs instructions from senior students - and this happens only three times per year. Other than this there are open webcasts, like now happening from Paris or upcoming from Barcelona.

No?

Sönam said:

I must admit that something is not clear there ... as Rinpoché did repeat this w-e that he was giving direct transmission in each of his teaching (maybe there is a trick there ...).

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Direct introduction simply means the teacher teaches Dzogchen from his true knowledge of Dzogchen. It does not mean he necessarily shouts something, or holds up something, or shocks the students, and so on. These are methods that can be part of an introduction or not, at the teacher's discretion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2011 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

Acchantika said:

There is of course more than one way to interpret statements like "there is no condition or state that is free from extremes" etc.

Malcolm wrote:

The view of dzogchen is "gnas lugs med pa" i.e. no reality.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2011 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

Acchantika said:

Mistaking Advaita for Dzogchen et al is not like mistaking fire for ice...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree. It is exactly like mistaken fire for ice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Lama Migmar at Kripalu Januray 2012

Content:
Virgo said:
Hi everyone,

"Mother Tara Empowerment" by Lama Migmar Tseten

http://www.kripalu.org/program/view/MTE-121/mother_tara_empowerment

It seems that Lama Migmar will be giving empowerments for White, Gold, Red, and Green Taras in MA.

Unfortunately the page is worded slightly strangely since it is probably written by somebody from Kripalu (I don't know).

Does anybody know if these are the full empowerments for each, and will the practice texts and instructions for all these Sadhanas be given or be available?

Thank you,

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:
They are initiations. All the practice texts will be available.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2011 at 9:16 PM
Title: Re: Completion of the path of Tögal
Content:

heart said:
So you are saying he reached the third vision himself? Or isn't that necessary to be able to guide people through the visions?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
I don't know. I don't know Lama Drimed personally.

I have friend of mine who did an 8 year retreat under Chagdud Tulku focusing on thogal. But I don't think he got past the second vision himself.

It took Kunzang Dechen Lingpa seven years to reach the third vision in strict retreat.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2011 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Completion of the path of Tögal

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Not sure what to make of this couple...

On a sidenote, apparently Batman is a togal practitioner too:

<http://thelostyak.com/2010/02/25/the-comics-connection-i-batman-does-togal/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

padma norbu said:

Thank you, I was able to learn more about Tögal from that blog about batman than anyone on this board or anywhere else has been willing to share.

Malcolm wrote:

"So it might not be too far fetched to see tögal as something of a rehearsal for the events that occur during the death process.

Traditionally, however, tögal is not usually presented in this way."

In fact, traditionally, tögal is frequently presented in this way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2011 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

Namdrol said:

You are down playing something very critical.

Jnana said:

Developing an understanding of the foundational teachings is important. Whether this is interpreted through a classical Indian Sarvāstivāda filter or a Theravāda filter is not so important. By the time of the classical period (i.e. the first few centuries of the common era) both of these exegetical systems had accreted to a point where they were unnecessarily complex. Old Guatama likely wouldn't have been very impressed with any of their large classical treatises.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the point of departure for most Sanskrit-writing Mahayana Indian authors which have any relevance at all in Tibetan Buddhism, whether sutra or tantra, is the

Kosha.

Perhaps it is merely a Tibetan Buddhist thing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2011 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is no actual state or condition that is free from duality. If one should think that there is, one will have not understood one single thing about Buddha Dharma.

Because people think there is a real state free from dualistic extremes, they fall into the pit of eternalism and grasping, never even recognizing emptiness correctly, let alone realizing it, and hampering their understanding of dependent origination.

Thinking there is such a thing as a real state of non-duality is precisely the Advaita Vedanta, Trika and so on.

N

Acchantika said:

By the same token, people will read this and think it equates to nihilism, not understanding a single thing about the Buddha Dharma, falling in to the pit of nihilism and mental dullness and so on.

Language is dualistic, and as language so thought; it is better to use this to our advantage than spend our lives dodging traps.

Malcolm wrote:

As Nāgārjuna states:

By relying on the conventional, the ultimate will be understood;
by realizing the ultimate, nirvana will be attained.

It is extremely important that key concepts be treated with care. It is also very important to avoid using language shared with other philosophical systems. I know any number of people who really are under the impression that there is really no difference between Dzogchen, Advaita and so on. And mostly, it is because of this pesky word "non-duality".

There is just as much danger of mental dullness and so with an eternalist view as there is with a nihilist view. In both cases, the conclusion will be reached that view is not important, karma does not matter, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2011 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is an important issue only because it is at the root of much confusion for so many people.

Acchantika said:

Nondual means free from duality. Nonduality means the state or condition of being free from duality. Neither is a philosophical position, in any tradition that uses the terms.

I think overcomplicating the issue is what is at the root of confusion for so many.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no actual state or condition that is free from duality. If one should think that there is, one will have not understood one single thing about Buddha Dharma.

Because people think there is a real state free from dualistic extremes, they fall into the pit of eternalism and grasping, never even recognizing emptiness correctly, let alone realizing it, and hampering their understanding of dependent origination.

Thinking there is such a thing as a real state of non-duality is precisely the Advaita Vedanta, Trika and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2011 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is not really the case. There is a continuity of ideas that run through Sarvastivada right up through both wings of Mahāyāna and on into Vajrayāna.

Thervāda and Sarvastivāda tenets are very different in a number of important ways.

Jnana said:

The only Sarvāstivāda ideas that a bodhisattva aspirant would need to understand on any level is the Sarvāstivāda version of causes and conditions and the Sarvāstivāda version of the intermediate state. And in each case, one doesn't have to be a Sarvāstivāda scholar. Other areas such as the sixteen aspects of the four noble truths and the defilements eliminated at each of the four arya stages aren't really relevant to

the Mahāyāna.

Malcolm wrote:

You are down playing something very critical.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2011 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

It appears that gnyis med can also be legitimately translated "non-duality" without fear that it will be mistaken for Avdaita.

Wise and learned people realize the non-duality (gNyiś-Med) (of enlightenment and unenlightenment) ...

The Practice of Dzogchen, Longchen Rabjam, p.16

Malcolm wrote:

Appearances are often deceiving.

While Tulku Thundup is certainly a qualified teacher -- he is not a native English speaker, I don't think he knows Sanskrit all that well, and he does not edit his own material.

As I said, gnyis med is certainly used frequently in Buddhist texts, but it should never be translated as non-duality, since it is missing the -ity part i.e. nyid or tā.

Because of imprecise translations there are many people indeed who think that basic message of Mahāyāna Buddhism, Zen, Dzogchen, Mahāmudra, and so on are exactly the same as Advaita. In particular this is demonstrated the by the convergence of Zen and Advaita in such teachers as Adyashanti, etc., and some of his students, such as Loach Kelley, who also has studied Dzogchen.

Crystal is a book taught by a Tibetan in Italian, not his native language, translated on the fly by someone without deep knowledge of Buddhism in general [Barry Simmons] and edited by John Shane, also someone without a deep knowledge of Buddhism.

While Crystal is one of my favorite books of all time, it is not without its flaws, and for this and that reason it was almost allowed to die. It was re-edited quite a bit, however, and has its present form. It is still not a perfect book in every respect.

I also know a lot of people in Dzogchen Community who are confused about the difference between non-dual and non-duality.

It is an important issue only because it is at the root of much confusion for so many

people.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2011 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: Tanpai Rinpoche at Yogaville

Content:

Jikan said:

What's going on here?

Malcolm wrote:

Marketing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2011 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Again, "non-duality" is used, no need to fear the boogey-man Advaita.

Malcolm wrote:

Those who don't really know what Advaita is quickly wind up becoming crypto-advaitans by obsessing about the word "non-dual".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2011 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: What are some "must have" books?

Content:

Jnana said:

The point is this: There's no need for anyone aspiring to enter the Mahāyāna to learn two different Sthaviravāda abhidharma systems. If one has already learned the Theravāda system there is no need whatsoever for learning the Sarvāstivāda system.

All the best,

Geoff

Malcolm wrote:

Hi, Geoff:

This is not really the case. There is a continuity of ideas that run through Sarvastivāda right up through both wings of Mahāyāna and on into Vajrayāna.

Thervāda and Sarvastivāda tenets are very different in a number of important ways.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2011 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

Namdrol said:

The term non-dual (gnyis med, or advaya) is used frequently in Buddhist texts. The term non-duality (gnyis med nyid, advaita) is virtually never used, showing up only one time in the entire Kengyur, in a single passage in the Kalacakra tantra

Jinzang said:

What do you think is the distinction between non-dual and non-duality?

Malcolm wrote:

The first refers to an absence of extremes. The second is advocating a philosophical position.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2011 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Completion of the path of Tögal

Content:

username said:

Is the 9th bhumi beyond falling?

Malcolm wrote:

Eighth bhumi on up are irreversible

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2011 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Completion of the path of Tögal

Content:

username said:

It is naive and absurd to say confidently they completed the third vision or validating

their experiences as genuine thogal visions from afar in cyberspace is a complete misunderstanding of Dzogchen. All sorts of experiences and classes of beings can arise and though possible I very much doubt either of these business people who are fallen and fugitives from their lineage masters ever reached even the beginnings of the first vision.

Namdrol said:

In fact, the Old's had their experiences confirmed by their teacher, Lama Drimed, up to the second vision. But they mistakenly concluded they were finished with the four visions when they had not actually finished the second vision, or so the story runs. Then there was a disagreement and they left Lama Drimed after having spend nine years in retreat.

At this point, apparently, they do not even consider themselves Buddhists, and perhaps never did.

N

heart said:

I don't get it, Lama Drimed is capable of leading other people on that level?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. He has a number of people in retreat under his guidance doing the main practices of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2011 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

alwayson said:

There is NO such thing as nonduality in Buddhism, including Zen.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

[T]he real condition of existence appears in different forms, either pure or impure, but its real nature does not change. This is why it is said that it is nondual. "Nondual" is in fact a term that is used in dzogchen a great deal[.]

Dzogchen: the Self-Perfected State, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

You can't ape arrogance, son. You can only earn it. Then it'll be the real thing. Good luck with that.

Malcolm wrote:

The term non-dual (gnyis med, or advaya) is used frequently in Buddhist texts. The term non-duality (gnyis med nyid, advaita) is virtually never used, showing up only one time in the entire Kengyur, in a single passage in the Kalacakra tantra (hooray for a text searchable Tibetan canon!); and nineteen times in the Tengyur, the translations of Indian commentaries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2011 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

I'm pretty sure for today and for Lama Zabdon Nyingthig it said open webcast on Merigar schedule. Anyway you can try to tune in even if you're not sure if it's closed or not. If it will be a closed webcast you just won't be able to. Almost every webcast nowadays is open BTW. Maybe one per year is closed.

Epistemes said:

I tried tuning into the webcast this morning from both a PC and my iPad with no luck. There's about 6 hours difference between where I am and Paris. It's 8:39 AM here, so it's 2:39 AM in Paris. Something should be going on with the retreat by now, I would think, and something should be webcasted if it was available, right?

I'm really confused by this definition of "open." One person says I should view the open webcasts, but another says THE open webcast is the direct transmission, and then another says almost every webcast is open.

Malcolm wrote:

The evening session should start at 2:pm eastern time today.

<http://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/city.html?n=195> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2011 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Completion of the path of Tögal

Content:

username said:

It is naive and absurd to say confidently they completed the third vision or validating their experiences as genuine thogal visions from afar in cyberspace is a complete misunderstanding of Dzogchen. All sorts of experiences and classes of beings can arise and though possible I very much doubt either of these business people who are fallen

and fugitives from their lineage masters ever reached even the beginnings of the first vision.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, the Old's had their experiences confirmed by their teacher, Lama Drimed, up to the second vision. But they mistakenly concluded they were finished with the four visions when they had not actually finished the second vision, or so the story runs. Then there was a disagreement and they left Lama Drimed after having spend nine years in retreat.

At this point, apparently, they do not even consider themselves Buddhists, and perhaps never did.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2011 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

If ChNN says the brain is like an office then I don't have to accept it as a definitive truth. I can see it as a relative truth. If ChNN says the brain is appearance/emptiness inseparable then I would accept that as a definitive truth and proceed accordingly.

Malcolm wrote:

That reason why Norbu Rinpoche says this is because Dzogchen is predicated on an understanding of the human body that founded on medical ideas current in Tibet and India at that time.

In Dzogchen, the rtsal or energy of wisdom, ye shes, is specifically stated to be located in the brain. And the brain is specifically stated to be the organ that coordinates input from the five material sense organs. This is symbolized by the presence of the mandala of the 58 herukas in the brain, just as the eight consciousness are symbolized by the presence of the 42 peaceful deities in the heart.

Also, the two truths is not an important concept in Dzogchen, or as ChNN put it to me in person 19 years ago, "In Dzogchen there is only one truth, not two truths".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2011 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: They killed him!

Content:

Sönām said:

don't play it too much ! about democracy you still have a lot to do, as for exemple suppress the first item of your constitution "In God we Trust", and better to have real democratics elections, not "great" electors ... but there is no need to go further, we already had this discussion with some folks here (or there).

Malcolm wrote:

""In God We Trust" was adopted as the official motto of the United States in 1956. It is also the motto of the U.S. state of Florida. The phrase has appeared on U.S. coins since 1864 and on paper currency since 1957.[1] Its Spanish equivalent, En Dios Confiamos, is the motto of the Central American nation of Nicaragua.[2]"

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/In_God_We_Trust "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And first part of constitution:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

No mention of God.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2011 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

ajax said:

Not to suggest that there is no such thing as non-duality, no, of course not. The existence of non-duality is beyond questioning.

Namdrol said:

A) There is no such a thing as non-duality

B) The existene of non-duality is not beyond question in any sense.

N

Kyosan said:

Non-duality is part of Buddhism. It is taught in the Mahayana sutras, not just in the Zen literature. It is the middle way and it is beneficial because it helps beings overcome their attachments. It is also a term used to describe the underlying nature of all things.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-duality is not a thing. There is no non-dual thing or state and so on.

There is a difference between an absence of duality (Madhyamaka, and so on) and so called "non-duality".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2011 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: They killed him!

Content:

Sönam said:

But concerning Obama ... could he interfere? could he say, no it won't happen!, easy or not easy. If it was not for electoralist reasons, could he says no, as far as I am President no one will die from the death penalty? If he was a real great President, could he choose to act so?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

No, he can't do that. The death penalty was suspended in by the supreme court of the united states in 1972, and reauthorized by the supreme court in 1976.

It is a state by state issue and it is legal to execute prisoners for capital crimes outlined by the 1976 decision.

The President of the United States has no authority to end the death penalty unilaterally, even if he wanted to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

I don't see how -- concepts are the basic unit of measuring time in Buddhism. One concept lasts a kṣana, and a kṣana is 1/75th (00.0013) of a second.

Andrew108 said:

I'm not sure I understand. Do you mean to say that concepts are too quick to be brain-based?

Malcolm wrote:

No, neurons transmit about at .5 m/s, whereas a concept, according to this, last about 1.3 m/s.

The neurons responsible for thinking, which reside within the gray matter of the brain, are not myelinated. They are very thin, and transmit at speeds around 0.5 m/s.
<http://www.examiner.com/biology-in-chicago/how-fast-is-a-thought#ixzz1Ygy6U7fa> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

What I mean is that irrespective of whether a mind has appropriated a coarse physical body or not, this is how long a thought endures i.e. 1.3 milliseconds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: They killed him!

Content:

el_chupacabra said:

I think his name was Troy Davis btw

(not being able to find anything about Roy Davies I immediately suspected the news had chosen to bury the story!)

The jail stats for the U.S. are pretty incredible - 25% of the global jail population is in the U.S. and when you break it down according to colour/race the figures look even worse. On top of that is the work they do for very little money, its a form of legalized slavery.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, prisons are big business in the US. But our large prison population is actually a sign of wealth. Poorer nations cannot afford to keep large incarcerated populations and they cannot afford the police forces that put them there.

This article explains a bit. Salient point:

...The United States, in fact, has relatively low rates of nonviolent crime. It has lower burglary and robbery rates than Australia, Canada and England.

People who commit nonviolent crimes in the rest of the world are less likely to receive prison time and certainly less likely to receive long sentences. The United States is, for instance, the only advanced country that incarcerates people for minor property crimes like passing bad checks, Whitman wrote.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/23/world/americas/23iht-23prison.12253738.html?pagewanted=all> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: They killed him!

Content:

Sönam said:

http://www.rfi.fr/actuen/articles/104/article_1446.asp

Malcolm wrote:

That place is a condo compared to this:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Sönam said:

As ChNN explains it clearly, brain is "only" a senses storage unit.

Andrew108 said:

Unfortunately I have to disagree. I think it is more than that. I think concepts are also brain-based. Would you agree?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see how -- concepts are the basic unit of measuring time in Buddhism. One concept lasts a kṣana, and a kṣana is 1/75th (00.0013) of a second.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Me

Content:

Epistemes said:

The nuances of "me" are so incredibly subtle. The way some of you here on this forum write and answer questions displays an aspect of "me"-ness. Even our very usernames display that aspect. And more. It seems rather inescapable.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is not about losing your personality. Buddhism is about getting over false thinking about it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Zen and the dogma of non-duality

Content:

ajax said:

Not to suggest that there is no such thing as non-duality, no, of course not. The existence of non-duality is beyond questioning.

Malcolm wrote:

A) There is no such a thing as non-duality

B) The existene of non-duality is not beyond question in any sense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Ka Dag Chen Po

Content:

Kai said:

Longchenpa seem to disagree:

Namdrol said:

There is a difference between ka dag and ka dag chen po.

Kai said:

Just to ask, for sake of verification, what is the verse from the tantra that specifically state the actual difference?

Malcolm wrote:

See above.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: They killed him!

Content:

Sönam said:

USA is not the great country american citizen think it is ... that's a lie.

Malcolm wrote:
USA is pretty nice place to live, actually.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 4:58 AM
Title: Re: Wall Gazing
Content:
Astus said:
There is "wall contemplation" (biguan 壁觀) and there is "facing the wall" (mianbi 面壁).
In Bodhidharma's story the two becomes the same eventually. As for why in Soto Zen
they rather sit facing the wall and how they call it, I do not know.

Malcolm wrote:
When translated into Tibetan, "faced a wall" was translated as "faced reality".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 2:43 AM
Title: Re: Chulen
Content:

AilurusFulgens said:
Namdrol, do there exist Tibetan texts, which would deal exclusively with Chulen?

In what way does the "religious" chulen differ from a yogic one? And how does a medical
one differ from those two just mentioned?

Are the differences just in the substances employed or are there also some other
factors at play?

A. Fulgens

Malcolm wrote:
As for question one:

Yes, many.

Long life practice combined with using blessed pills, without the benefit of the medical
approach, is a kind of religious chulen.

Yogic chulen means working with prāṇāyāma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Hayagriva said:

But does God have a brain?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Buddha does not have one apparently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2011 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Schizophrenia and depression

Content:

Gyaltzen Tashi said:

Dear all,

What causes these mental illnesses - schizophrenia and depression? How are they treated in Tibetan medicine?

Regards,
Gyaltzen Tashi

Malcolm wrote:

There are many possible causes of depression. These will be treated according to their causes which are imbalances in the dośas (humors) caused by diet, behavior, season or spirits or a combination of these.

What western medicine terms "schizophrenia" will generally be considered a spirit induced disorder. This will be treated generally with massage, herbs, diet and lifestyle, depending on the type of spirit diagnosed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Chulen

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you are looking for mundane rasāyana, then taking Chavyanaprasha regularly is your best bet.

Epistemes said:

Can Chyavanprash be taken alongside Vimala?

Malcolm wrote:

yes

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Ka Dag Chen Po

Content:

Kai said:

Longchenpa seem to disagree:

Malcolm wrote:

There is a difference between ka dag and ka dag chen po.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There is definitely a sense that the realization that matters is not really human - goes beyond or steps out of the space of human cognition.

Malcolm wrote:

Or, a buddha has a mind whose cognitive range exceeds that of ordinary persons and whose realization merely expands the potential of what human cognition is capable of.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

In fact if we say something like timeless awareness

Malcolm wrote:

Please don't.

Translating ye shes as "timeless awareness" is terrible. "Ye shes" translates only the word jñāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: I am the director of the documentary TULKU. Ask me anything.

Content:

Chaz said:

Why can't a tulku live his or her life as they see fit and to hell with what everyone else wants?

Malcolm wrote:

Usually because there is money/power/property wrapped in tulku recognitions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not only that, Longchenpa is held to have been a buddha. I have some of his brain relics. So clearly, these two Buddhas had brains. (can't believe I am having this conversation).

Andrew108 said:

Well do you have any Guru Rinpoche brain relics? To what extent was Longchenpa's brain a contributory factor in his enlightenment?

Malcolm wrote:

Very important -- I dare say that without he could not have engaged in the cultivating the three prajñā: hearing, reflection and cultivation. Not to mention his memory would have been terrible without a brain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So does the practitioner who achieves 'great transformation body' and I'm thinking only of Guru Rinpoche and Garab Dorje still have a brain after this transformation?

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently the concept of a Buddha having a brain is non-controversial run a search on the following:

Buddha Kasyapa's Brain relics.

Not only that, Longchenpa is held to have been a buddha. I have some of his brain relics. So clearly, these two Buddhas had brains. (can't beleive I am having this conversation).

Furthermore, the Dzogchen tantras list a kind of ring sel, a ka ri ram, which is based on the brain and the nerves.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

A buddha without a human brain however is an impossibility since possession of a fully favored human body with all senses intact and functioning is a defined precondition for awakening.

Andrew108 said:

So was the buddha a buddha or a human?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha was a human being who fully awakened. Then he was a buddha. You can consider human beings to be larval buddhas, just as caterpillars are larval butterflies and moths.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

@ your previous post - Yes that seems to be the case - however the point with the four visions is that they are experiences that infer rather than embody. You have experience of what it is like but until the body passes away you don't embody 'the inconceivable'.

Malcolm wrote:

That is completely not true. If it were, the so called "great transformation body" ['pho ba chen po] would not be possible. Your view is more similar to the Gelug interpretation of illusory body i.e. one needs to discard this gross body at the time of death etc. Such a view is definitely not the view of Dzogchen.

Andrew108 said:

The 4 visions are a body/brain-based simulacrum until the body passes.

Malcolm wrote:

This is also not how the four visions function according to the anatomy of Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

A brain can't hold the knowledge of a buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? This is a mere assertion on your part.

Why limit one part of a Buddha's sensory apparatus when you don't, for example, limit his tongue? A Buddha's tongue, according to reports, can see and hear. Why should a Buddha's brain be restricted to some limitation if the rest of his body is not?

The reason why buddhas are omniscient is that all objects of knowledge are illusory. Omniscience is not a function of memory addresses in a chip, after all. There should be no reason why having a human brain should limit a buddha at all. A buddha without a human brain however is an impossibility since possession of a fully favored human body with all senses intact and functioning is a defined precondition for awakening. It is also a defined precondition for receiving Vajrayāna empowerments. Why? If one's organs are damaged and incomplete, it is held that ones body mandala is incomplete and that one will not be able to fully awaken in a single lifetime via Vajrayāna methods.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

That whatever my limited brain-based view perceives is not mistaken for the ultimate - and that would include the 4 visions.

Malcolm wrote:

The entire point of the detailed analysis of gestation in Dzogchen is to explain the physical development of the channels that make the four visions possible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

AlexanderS said:

So is awakening possible in Dewachen? Of course I could suppose one has a body there too.

Malcolm wrote:

Even in sutra it is stated that in order to awaken one must be a human being. Therefore, embodiment in general is precondition of awakening; human embodiment is the specific precondition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

AlexanderS said:

The 16th karmapa could teach meditation to birds. Apparently Thaye Dorje has also demonstrated this.

I honestly think some birds are more advanced meditators than I am

Point being, a bird with it's little brain can enter a state of samadhi apparently.

Malcolm wrote:

Samadhi is a mental factor present in all beings in the desire realm. So this is nothing surprising at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

His enlightenment was not brain-based.

Malcolm wrote:

The Hevajra Tantra states the following:

Vajragarbha asked: "This yoga of the completion stage, its bliss is called great bliss, completion is not a meditation,

so why do creation?”

The Bhagavan replied: “Incredible, the great bodhisattva has lost the power of faith.

Where does bliss come from without the existence of the body?

Such a bliss cannot be spoken of.

Bliss pervades all migrating beings

in the form of pervaded and pervader;

just as the fragrance present in a flower,

cannot be known without the flower’s existence.

In the same way, since form and so on won’t exist,

also bliss itself won’t be perceived.

The Vajrayāna view of awakening is that awakening is very much based in the body as this passage from the Hevajra Tantra shows. The key to awakening in Vajrayāna in general is embodiment. The mind/matter dualism (ala Decartes) we find in sutra is superseded in Vajrayāna, that is the key to why Vajrayāna is more rapid.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Pointing Out / Systematic Instruction

Content:

Astus said:

What I really admire in his approach - and Kagyu Mahamudra generally - is the detailed methodology they apply in this training.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen etc., also have very detailed methodologies. They are just less sutra oriented.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Benefits of Nagarjuna / Dangers of Existence & Non-Existence

Content:

Epistemes said:

I'm going to sound really stupid, but I'm here to learn, so:

When Nagarjuna says that there is no existence, is he claiming that the Earth, universe, and multi-verses do not exist in the sense that they cannot be sensually experienced? Or, is he, in a spirit of recognizing the universality of pratītyasamutpāda and sūnyatā, saying that the Earth, universe, and multi-verses do not intrinsically exist as such?

Malcolm wrote:

For Nāgārjuna, stating that things exist is a statement that they inherently exist.

Therefore, the only existence that Nāgārjuna was willing to grant phenomena was what we term a relative or nominal existence. Thus he is saying "...that the Earth, universe, and multi-verses do not intrinsically exist as such" "in a spirit of recognizing the universality of pratīyasamutpāda and sūnyatā".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Any type of buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty sure that Sakyamuni had a brain, just like he had a heart, lungs, liver, spleen, kidney, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

Really? The Buddha had no brain?

Andrew108 said:

And Buddha Amitahba's brain is where?

Malcolm wrote:

Which type of Buddha are you talking about?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Lungta

Content:

rai said:

hi all,

need some tips and tricks what to do to raise the lungta (or what to avoid)! it seems i am going down with everything =D

also i tried to understand the concept of Lungta relying on materials i've managed to find but still i have very vague idea so if you know any helpful materials, books in english it would be very appreciated.

thanks!

Malcolm wrote:
raise prayer flags on a proper day with a sang offering.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 8:04 PM
Title: The Buddha had no brain?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
in that buddhas don't have a brain.

Malcolm wrote:
Really? The Buddha had no brain?

(Awesome!)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 8:50 AM
Title: Re: Ka Dag Chen Po
Content:
Pero said:
Is there a difference with realization in dissolving into atoms? If one achieves the latter, is one a Buddha on the 16th bhumi as well? Or 13th at least?

Namdrol said:
Yes, there is a difference in realization. Someone who has this realization will return as a tulku. A Buddha of the sixteenth bhumi will not. Or so it is said.

Pero said:
But doesn't that mean that one can't get totally realized through trekcho alone? And consequentially one can't get totally realized through any of the other inner tantras since their completion stage is basically trekcho too?

Malcolm wrote:
The completion stages in the sarma tantras is not confined to tregchö.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is the first of the eight -- i.e. relying on an unqualified consort.

xylem said:

i'm curious which branch downfall so that i can ask my own teachers about this....

-xy

Zenda said:

Interesting. What does this mean for tantric practitioners who are married to someone from another faith tradition? Does this vary by school?

Namdrol said:

No, the vows are pretty consistent over all.

It means that they are constantly committing a branch downfall.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Chaz said:

I haven't actually asked my Lama, but I'm pretty sure he's ok with my Wiccan wife - everybody else in the Sangha is. At least they haven't taken my Super-Secret Vajra Decoder Ring away yet.

Malcolm wrote:

There is hope for Wiccans. There is hope for anyone who likes to dance nude in the woods under full moons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Ka Dag Chen Po

Content:

Pero said:

Is there a difference with realization in dissolving into atoms? If one achieves the latter, is one a Buddha on the 16th bhumi as well? Or 13th at least?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a difference in realization. Someone who has this realization will return as a tulku. A Buddha of the sixteenth bhumi will not. Or so it is said.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Is Pure Land "Buddhism" contradictory to Buddhism?

Content:

alwayson said:

Pure Lands are just bardo experiences.

Huifeng said:

Reading these words is also a bardo experience.

Which bardo are you referring to?

Malcolm wrote:

Bardo of the time of death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Zenda said:

Interesting. What does this mean for tantric practitioners who are married to someone from another faith tradition? Does this vary by school?

Namdrol said:

No, the vows are pretty consistent over all.

It means that they are constantly committing a branch downfall.

Dhondrub said:

And here we go again... reminds me of good old e-sangha

Malcolm wrote:

This issue was not a big deal in Tibet, since everyone was a Vajrayāna initiate by the time they were ten.

In India, where these vows were elaborated, it was more important.

And naturally, some Vajrayāna practitioner married to a non-Buddhist is going to get all freaked out, get all angry, tell me I am wrong, that their Lama said it was ok, blah blah blah.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Zenda said:

Interesting. What does this mean for tantric practitioners who are married to someone from another faith tradition? Does this vary by school?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the vows are pretty consistent over all.

It means that they are constantly committing a branch downfall.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2011 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: The four kayas

Content:

conebeckham said:

As for the Sambhogakaya being the "physical body in its natural state," I don't think there is such a thing as the "Natural State of the Physical body." If you're talking about Light Bodies, then it's not really appropriate to say they are "physical," is it?

Malcolm wrote:

The rūpakāya is two fold. Rūpa here means material. Light is a part of matter since it is an object of the eye.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Ka Dag Chen Po

Content:

Pero said:

...does this mean that Kadag Chenpo is attained only by completing the four visions?

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: The four kayas

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

What is then the "Rainbow Body of Great Transference" as possessed by Padmasambhava in this trikaya-doctrine?

Where does it fit in?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally considered to be a sambhogakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Ka Dag Chen Po

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Rig pa rang shar tantra states:

"Child of a good family, at the time of nirvana when wisdom moves in the sky from the appearance of wisdom rising up from the basis having slipped from grasp of the body, vidyā moves in the sky traveling through the pathway of the eye. Furthermore, it should be understood in the following way: the vidyā from the heart dissolves into a thigle. The thigle dissolves into a lamp. The lamp dissolves into light. The light dissolve into a form. The form dissolves into a cluster. The cluster dissolves into wisdom. Wisdom dissolves into natural formation (lhun grub). After natural formation dissolves into great original purity, the stages are complete. The appearance of the manner of

dissolution and the manner of liberation of those persons who have seen the truth is just like that."

The Great Tantra of Beautiful Good Fortune states:
Since the reality of vidyā and dharmatā
exist like the surface of a mirror,
never being obscured by the condition of ignorance (avidyā)
is called "great original purity".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: The four kayas

Content:

Namdrol said:

These terms get used differently in Vajrayāna systems where the three kāyas are understood as different aspects of the nature of the mind, clarity, emptiness and the inseparability of the two.

Epistemes said:

What about svabhavikakaya? My understanding of it is that it is the highest (greatest) of all the kayas and incorporates the other three - which seems to be suggesting that svabhavikakaya is synonymous with actual Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

It can be a name for the intrinsic identity of all three kāyas in Vajrayāna; in sutra, in general, it is a synonym of Dharmakāya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: The four kayas

Content:

Epistemes said:

Can someone give me some reference point for understanding the four kayas?

I've read definitions, seen the terms used in context, etc., but they don't make much sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a species of Buddhist doceticism.

Dharmakāya, in brief, has several different versions. The basis version is that Dharmakāya is the complete realization of emptiness and the omniscience that springs from that realization.

Sambhogakāya is, in this basic version, rarified form body which exists outside samsara and is responsible primarily for communicating dharma to advanced bodhisattvas.

Nirmanakāya manifest to ordinary beings.

These terms get used differently in Vajrayāna systems where the three kāyas are understood as different aspects of the nature of the mind, clarity, emptiness and the inseparability of the two.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

deepbluehum said:

...I have been drinking green smoothies and eating greens, fruits, nuts and seeds for long enough to attribute strong confidence to my account.

Namdrol said:

I predict you will have a variety of vata disorders before too long, with all due respect.

N

deepbluehum said:

It would have happened by now. Besides, I don't need cooked foods to fix a vata disorder. Raw organic cumin, cayenne, ginger and other hot plants will do.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not that simple. I wish it were.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

deepbluehum said:

...I have been drinking green smoothies and eating greens, fruits, nuts and seeds for long enough to attribute strong confidence to my account.

Malcolm wrote:

I predict you will have a variety of vata disorders before too long, with all due respect.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is a branch downfall to regard a consort who has not been ripened by empowerment as deity.

Kelwin said:

Yup, I know that, but I find that difficult to combine with other instructions. How could I possibly have sex in a state of awareness and not regard my girlfriend to be a deity? What distinction am I missing here?

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately it means that tantric Buddhists should not have sexual partners who are not also practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Raw plant foods only is an excellent support for dharma practice.

Malcolm wrote:

This diet is not good for Dharma practice since it is bad for one's health, from a Tibetan Medical POV.

Virtually all plant foods need to be cooked before eaten, or eaten with digestive enhancements like vinegar and oil, as in a salad.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Kelwin said:

1) How would you respond to Adamantine saying earlier that 'If I understand and remember correctly one of the tantric vows involves avoiding falling into the trap of

pretending one or one's partner is deity and thinking of ordinary sex as leading to enlightenment, etc..?'

Malcolm wrote:

It is a branch downfall to regard a consort who has not been ripened by empowerment as deity.

Kelwin said:

2) If the yoga of passion (which is a new term to me) is creation stage only, does this answer still apply for those doing completion stage practices?

3) Would the choice of orifice not have a significant effect on inner energies being exchanged?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "exchange" of energy in the yoga of passion.

The yoga of passion is a term from Lamdre, BTW. But it can be applied across the board to any anuttarayoga tantra practice. For example, in Cakrasamvara, ordinary intercourse without the three perceptions is a downfall.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2011 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Namdrol said:

The yoga of passion is not connected with the completion stage, it is connected with the creation stage, so there is no need to worry about losing semen and so on.

wayland said:

Hi Namdrol,

Isn't it the case that emission of semen expels the 'essence' of deities which reside at points within the subtle body of the practitioner? Does it not contravene tantric vows?

Malcolm wrote:

No. If that were true, then defecation and urination would also be a problem. Semen, like feces and urine, is a waste product.

No, not in general. However if one is engaged in karma mudra practice and so on, it does. Tantric vows are different for people doing different practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2011 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: WOMPT & Sex

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a lay tantric practitioner you need to practice the yoga of passion, perceiving yourself as a heruka and your partner as a dakini (for example, Kalacakra and Vishvamata). The yoga of passion is not connected with the completion stage, it is connected with the creation stage, so there is no need to worry about losing semen and so on.

As far as which orifice, etc., this is mainly a sutrayāna affair. There are no restrictions for a practitioner practicing the yoga of passion. The body of a deity is completely pure.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: Chronic Gastritis

Content:

AdmiralUim said:

Have you connected this inflammation to any types of food?

What time of day/ which meal to you experience it?

Before or during meals, immediately after meals, or after digesting a meal (about an hour)?

It never completely goes away. I have noticed that fatty foods upset it, specifically milk and cheese and mince, although I have noticed if the milk is used in something cooked (porridge or sauces) it doesn't have the same impact. I have also bizarrely noticed that it gets worse if I am around people who are wearing strong perfume/aftershave. I get it the worst after digesting meal a but it can happen during a meal or before too.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you should investigate whether you have a food "allergy".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Getting Real, Getting Dirty

Content:

xylem said:

people shouldn't have affairs with people in the sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

I assume by "affair" here you mean consensual relations between adults who are not otherwise in relationships already?

If so, then I think you are being very extreme.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Getting Real, Getting Dirty

Content:

Namdrol said:

PC Buddhism, yuck, spare me.

kirtu said:

What's PC about no hitting on people and trying to be welcoming to everyone and not making women do most of the cleaning?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, Buddhists, male and female, have a hard enough time getting laid.

Secondly, woman do most of the cleaning because men are slob. It is not a plot. Woman, in general, have different needs around neatness than men do. Proof? Men's bathrooms and women's bathrooms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Christian explorations of Rainbow Body

Content:

deepbluehum said:

That's apparently open to interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:
No, it isn't.

deepbluehum said:
Rainbow Body is irrelevant for some in these schools.

Malcolm wrote:
Rainbow body is a central concern in Lamdre as well as Yogini.

It is also a central topic in Cakrasamvara literature as well.

This is heading off topic.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 2:25 AM
Title: Re: Renounced Catholicism
Content:
alwayson said:
Yes exactly what are the prerequisites for webcast transmission?

Malcolm wrote:
You sign on.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 2:03 AM
Title: Re: Christian explorations of Rainbow Body
Content:
deepbluehum said:
Please keep in mind that the concept of Rainbow Body is only of particular importance to Dzogchen. Few other teachings lineages discuss it.

Namdrol said:
Not so, it is discussed in Kagyu and Sakya as well.

deepbluehum said:
True. I should have said "made into a core teaching."

Malcolm wrote:
It is a core teaching of Kagyu and Sakya as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Renounced Catholicism

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I'm too a student of Chogyal Namhkai Norbu and what you say is over simplistic and, in fact, pretty far from what he teaches.

Epistemes said:

What does he teach?

Malcolm wrote:

He is a teacher of Dzogchen. Very famous, has a number of books Crystal and the Way of Light being chief among them. He is one of my main teachers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Chronic Gastritis

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Do you have acid reflux?

when do you eat, what do you eat, how do you eat it?

?

No I don't have acid reflux. I eat three meals a day. For breakfast I eat toast and porridge (around 7am/8am), for lunch (between 12-2pm) light soup or sushi. My main meal at night (8 or 9pm), I eat a variety of things from indian/asian cooking. but usually chicken or red meat and at the weekends i eat quite lightly so usually a veg stir fry for a main meal.

Malcolm wrote:

Have you connected this inflammation to any types of food?

What time of day/ which meal to you experience it?

Before or during meals, immediately after meals, or after digesting a meal (about an hour)?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Chronic Gastritis

Content:

AdmiraJim said:

I am wondering there are any dietary changes which you would recommend to help with this condition. The doctors do not know what is causing my chronic stomach inflammation as I don't drink any alcohol or smoke and I am negative for a common bacteria that causes stomach inflammation. I have been told I will have good and bad days and given a leaflet on indigestion which isn't even gastritis grrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have acid reflux?

when do you eat, what do you eat, how do you eat it?

?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Air's function

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not to my knowledge, no.

Virgo said:

In a general sense, does the element of air ever perform the function of "pulling" per se? I know air usually has to do with movement and that is has a quality of "pushing" (or is it displacing?) due to it's function of manifesting as pressure.

I know there is the downward-clearing wind in the body, and at other times other winds move "downward" but does the wind ever perform the function of "pulling", ie. acting as a force or in conjunction with other forces to pull something to a certain destination. Pulling (attracting, bringing, causing something to tag along) it seems, would be different from pushing (repelling, moving something towards something else based on pressure exerted).

I ask this question because I am trying to understanding physics a little better (especially gravity as explained in Einsteins Theories) from the perspective of the elements.

Kevin

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Getting Real, Getting Dirty

Content:

Malcolm wrote:
PC Buddhism, yuck, spare me.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 12:55 AM
Title: Re: Is crying healthy?
Content:
Epistemes said:
A Buddhist discussion board is probably the most inane place to post a thing like this...

...but Western centers for natural healing claim that crying is a sign of emotional healthiness.

Crying most surely is a sign of attachment and samsara, as the Buddha indicates, but what if it's physically healthy?

Malcolm wrote:
Like any physical function supressing the urge is not healthy, forcing it is also not healthy.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2011 at 12:54 AM
Title: Re: Christian explorations of Rainbow Body
Content:
deepbluehum said:
Please keep in mind that the concept of Rainbow Body is only of particular importance to Dzogchen. Few other teachings lineages discuss it.

Malcolm wrote:
Not so, it is discussed in Kagyu and Sakya as well.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 11:17 PM
Title: Re: Prayers for my girlfriend
Content:
Epistemes said:
Please continue your prayers to the medicine Buddha, as I cannot.

She still suffers.

Namdrol said:
Medicine Buddha's dharani:

Oṃ namo bhagavate bhaiṣajye guru vaiḍūryaprabharājāya tathāgatāya arhate saṃyak saṃbuddhāya tadyathā oṃ bhaiṣajye bhaiṣajye mahā bhaiṣajye rājā samudgate svāhā

Anyone can recite this.

Epistemes said:

"Cannot" not just being privilege, but ability (those are some odd words) and understanding of what's being said.

Malcolm wrote:

Oṃ — auspicious

Namo — homage

Bhagavate — transcendent conquerer

bhaiṣajye guru — guru of physicians

vaiḍūryaprabharājāya — to the king of sapphire light

tathāgatāya — to the tathagata

arhate — the arhat

saṃyak saṃbuddhāya — to the true perfect buddha

tadyathā — thus

Oṃ — as above

bhaiṣajye bhaiṣajye — physician, physician,

mahā — great

bhaiṣajyerāja — king of physicians

samudgate — his special power heals disease

svāhā — well established

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Prayers for my girlfriend

Content:

Epistemes said:

Please continue your prayers to the medicine Buddha, as I cannot.

She still suffers.

Malcolm wrote:

Medicine Buddha's dharani:

Oṃ namo bhagavate bhaiṣajye guru vaiḍūryaprabharājāya tathāgatāya arhate saṃyak saṃbuddhāya tadyathā oṃ bhaiṣajye bhaiṣajye mahā bhaiṣajye rājā samudgate svāhā

Anyone can recite this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 7:47 PM

Title: Re: Christian explorations of Rainbow Body

Content:

Epistemes said:

I'm not incredibly sure what to make of this. It's the first I've ever heard of such a phenomenon, and I can't quite see how such a phenomenon fits within a Buddhist view of life, death, humanity and the cosmos.

http://www.snowlionpub.com/pages/N59_9.html "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

The notion of rainbow body is tied up with tantric concepts about the human body and the four elements which constitute it.

At basis is the idea that at the most subtle level, relatively speaking, physical matter exists as light which we reify as solid matter. When we have remove the afflictions that obscure our vision of reality, ordinary phenomena, including our own bodies, are revealed to us as compositions of dynamic light-energy and we become free of course matter since we no longer reify it.

This is possible because everything is empty, insubstantial and not real.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 7:06 PM

Title: Re: Chulen

Content:

rai said:

is the idea of rasāyana that we are eating more of things like chulen or Chavyanaprasha and less normal food?

Malcolm wrote:

The Ayurvedic/Tibetan medical idea of rasayāna is that one does a week long cleanse; then one relies on a very pure diet combined with a rasayāna preparation like Chavyanaprash.

There is also a more "religious" idea of chulen, where one, having done a similar cleanse, relies on a practice such as White Tara, Amitayus, or Mandarava combined with special chulen pills.

Finally, there are yogic chulens that depend mainly on prāṇāyama exercises.

One can consider these outer, inner and secret rasāyanas. The use of these depends on one's health and needs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

tobes said:

So maybe you're playing some upaya game here, or maybe you hold two opposing positions: one when you argue within the discourse of Madhyamaka and one when you talk about Madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

When trying to direct people to the correct aisle in a grocery store so they can buy beans, I don't send them to the meat counter.

Likewise, when trying direct people to where they can find the eight fold path, I don't send them to Santeria or Taoism, since they won't find it there.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

tobes said:

It's neither pointless nor semantic: you know very well that it is utterly arbitrary which place you put apples and which place you put oranges.

Malcolm wrote:

For intellectuals who pointlessly like to quibble with others it is arbitrary. For grocers, it is practical to place apples with apples and oranges with oranges.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Logical Fallacies

Content:

el_chupacabra said:

That seems a strange reading to me.

Malcolm wrote:

It is nevertheless, the correct one, and the only one that rescues Nāgārjuna from the fetter of being accused of being a terrible logician. In fact, the catuṣkoṭi is not all that important in Madhyamaka -- too much of it has been made by Western enthusiasts of Nāgārjuna.

In fact, the whole eight-fold negation of the mangalam is predicated on the fact that dependently arisen phenomena do not in fact arise, hence Nāgārjuna says of dependent origination: not ceasing, not arising, etc., when he praise the Buddha for teaching dependent origination.

Since phenomena do not arise , here again is a cascading negation of the other seven possibilities. If there is no arising, there can be no cessation, permanence, impermanence and so on.

In reality it is very simple, but if one should approach these texts with the wrong set of assumptions about language and so on, they will seem very strange and illogical. If you approach them with the correct set of assumptions about language (i.e. Nāgārjuna's) based on a close read of the texts in either Sanskrit or Tibetan, freed from the constraints of later Tibetan polemics or later Sino-Japanese Buddhist metaphysical speculations ala tathāgatagarbha, it is all very straight forward and somewhat boring.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Chulen

Content:

Epistemes said:

Could this replace a daily multivitamin?

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 8:29 AM

Title: Re: Logical Fallacies

Content:

Kyosan said:

All dharmas (things) are neither existent nor nonexistent.

Namdrol said:

The statement means that dharmas do not come into existence in the first place, therefore, they cannot perish and become non-existent. It is not a dialectical statement, but one meant to show that the categories of existent and non-existent do not apply to dependently originated phenomena.

el_chupacabra said:

erm... isn't this exactly the fourth proposition in Nagarjuna's dialectic?

Malcolm wrote:

No, since Nāgārjuna is not asserting some phenomena either exists nor does not exist.

The point is since no phenomena have arisen in reality there are no phenomena to which any of the four predicates in catuṣkoṭi may be applied.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 7:59 AM

Title: Re: Logical Fallacies

Content:

Kyosan said:

The original statement itself is logically inconsistent. Because existent and nonexistent are mutually exclusive, they can't both be either true or false according to formal logic.

el_chupacabra said:

Yes, according to formal logic either something is true or not. Dialectical logic adds the two other propositions of "both" or "neither".

Malcolm wrote:

The Catuṣkoṭi establishes a cascading negation where both and neither are also not true since a truth was not established to begin with.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Logical Fallacies

Content:

Namdrol said:

The statement means that dharmas do not come into existence in the first place, therefore, they cannot perish and become non-existent. It is not a dialectical statement, but one meant to show that the categories of existent and non-existent do not apply to dependently originated phenomena.

It is perfectly logical when you understand the assumptions upon which it is drawing.

Context is King.

el_chupacabra said:

yes, but that original assertion is not based simply upon assumption, the context was established through reasoning using the method of catuṣkoṭi - four members in a relation of exclusive disjunction - to which simple formal logic is inadequate.

The key phrase is "understanding of the parts requires understanding their relationship with the whole system" - a method used by the Buddha and by Nagarjuna to great effect, after all, why exclude the idea of dependent origination in the methodology itself?

Malcolm wrote:

The Caturskoti itself is based on assumptions about language and meaning, that is why it is failure when subjected to formal logic as a simple formal statement i.e. $\neg(x, \neg x, x+\neg x), \neg(x+\neg x))$.

However, the first statement (x) of the Caturskoti is not established, there is a cascading negation. This has to do with the linguistic parameters Nāgārjuna frames existence and non-existence in, in chapter 15 where he states quite explicitly that a non-existent is what people commonly call an existent that has changed its state into something else.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Logical Fallacies

Content:

Kyosan said:

All dharmas (things) are neither existent nor nonexistent.

This statement is logically inconsistent. But in Buddhism, it points to the middle way. It says that existing and non-existing are invented in our minds. It points to suchness and helps free beings from sufferings.

el_chupacabra said:

Importantly in this case, dialectical logic differs from formal logic.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialectic#Dialectical_method_and_dualism "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

"Another way to understand dialectics is to view it as a method of thinking to overcome formal dualism and monistic reductionism. For example, formal dualism regards the opposites as mutually exclusive entities, whilst monism finds each to be an epiphenomenon of the other. Dialectical thinking rejects both views...In the dialectical method, both have something in common, and understanding of the parts requires understanding their relationship with the whole system. The dialectical method thus views the whole of reality as an evolving process."

Malcolm wrote:

It is also not a dialectical statement -- context is everything.

The statement means that dharmas do not come into existence in the first place, therefore, they cannot perish and become non-existent. It is not a dialectical statement, but one meant to show that the categories of existent and non-existent do not apply to dependently originated phenomena.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: How do you know if you've recognized rigpa?

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Neither what I said nor secret refuge is a "method" since nothing in dzogchen is causal. The path in dzogchen is not based on causality, but on lhundrub, spontaneity. Rigpa sees that even the stains, confusions and obscurations of samsara were always katak, pure, and lhundrub, perfect, because nirvana and samsara are both of the nature of the Base and the Base always and forever has been katak and lhundrub.

Namdrol said:

No, this is actually not correct. In order for there to be samsara in the basis, there must be ignorance in the basis. But there isn't. This is why it is said that basis is originally pure [ka dag]. The Rosary of Pearls tantra states:

The mere term delusion cannot be described

within the original purity of the initial state,

likewise, how can there be non-delusion?

Therefore, pure of delusion from the beginning.

What you have presented above is a common mahamudra misunderstanding of what "basis" means in Dzogchen.

What you describe is the kun gzhi [ālaya] of the Mahāmudra teachings, not the "gzhi" (sthana) of Dogchen teachings.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Unfortunately I know nothing about mahamudra. Ok, now: what I am understanding from this is that I can't say that nirvana and samsara are in the base since the base is empty of both wisdom and confusion from the start - is that more or less correct?

Malcolm wrote:

What exists in the basis is the three wisdoms of the basis, essence, nature and compassion.

Ignorance has never existed in the basis, per se. Therefore, it is inappropriate to state that either samsara or nirvana have existed or will ever exist in the basis. Ignorance (ma rig pa) means not knowing what the basis is. Rig pa is knowing (rig pa) what the basis is. Realization means becoming integrated with that knowledge.

Original purity means that there has never been a time when the basis was ever stained in anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Logical Fallacies

Content:

Kyosan said:

All dharmas (things) are neither existent nor nonexistent.

This statement is logically inconsistent. But in Buddhism, it points to the middle way. It says that existing and non-existing are invented in our minds. It points to suchness and helps free beings from sufferings.

Malcolm wrote:

It is perfectly logical when you understand the assumptions upon which it is drawing.
Context is King.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: How do you know if you've recognized rigpa?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

lol this is teaching a method; where are you going with this?

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Neither what I said nor secret refuge is a "method" since nothing in dzogchen is causal. The path in dzogchen is not based on causality, but on lhundrub, spontaneity. Rigpa sees that even the stains, confusions and obscurations of samsara were always katak, pure, and lhundrub, perfect, because nirvana and samsara are both of the nature of the Base and the Base always and forever has been katak and lhundrub.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is actually not correct. In order for there to be samsara in the basis, there must be ignorance in the basis. But there isn't. This is why it is said that basis is originally pure [ka dag]. The Rosary of Pearls tantra states:

The mere term delusion cannot be described

within the original purity of the initial state,
likewise, how can there be non-delusion?
Therefore, pure of delusion from the beginning.

What you have presented above is a common mahamudra misunderstanding of what "basis" means in Dzogchen.

What you describe is the kun gzhi [ālaya] of the Mahāmudra teachings, not the "gzhi" (sthana) of Dogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Kai said:

Jamgon Kongtrul is a great Kagyu master but He is a famed Dzogchen master, so His conclusion can't be far away from the truth and it also resolves certain "dilemmas" in this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two systems. One in which the sixteen bhumis directly correspond with the thirteen bhumis + three. Another where the bhumis are given as descriptive names for experiences through the four visions.

They are both correct explanations.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: How do you know if you've recognized rigpa?

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

No duality to become free of in the first place.

Chögyäl Namkhai Norbu relates that once someone asked the famous Dzogchen Master, Yungtön Dorje Pel, what his practice consisted of, and he replied with the negative "mepa" or "there isn't."

Elias Capriles

deepbluehum said:

Quotes like this are often taken out of context, because this quote refers to the practice of nonmeditation and no one will ever know what this means without instructions and blessings from the lineage. Your comments re paths of renunciation, transformation and self-liberation are innaposite.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

No-one can "know" what non-meditation means by being "instructed" about it or via "blessings". This is the whole point of direct introduction - it can only be realized directly in that moment when my mind is united with my guru's mind. In transformation we still receive "instructions" and "blessings". Not in self-liberation. Are you saying that self-liberation is a causal path?

Malcolm wrote:

no, he is saying that a guru is a requirement.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Re Death & Wind, Bile, Phlegm

Content:

pemachophel said:

Got it. Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

I.e. ultimately, Dharma is the best medicine, and awakening is perfect health.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: How do you know if you've recognized rigpa?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I can't agree. The recognition is not always already there and must be recognized utilizing a method that must be taught.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

IMHO the path in dzogchen is not "try to recognize", that is a path of renunciation or path of transformation path - the path in dzogchen is remaining without doubt, having received direct introduction.

Malcolm wrote:

Direct introduction is not a great translation, in actuality. The phrase is "ngo rang thog du sprad" which means more like "a direct self-encounter with [one's] state [lit. face]".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2011 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Kali Yuga

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Sometimes I have intuitions though that the world is progressing toward a point of greater awakening. Is this just romantic BS or is it real?

Malcolm wrote:

In my opinion, romanticism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Angioedema

Content:

Epistemes said:

My partner has angioedema, including hives and swelling in the fingers and toes. Does TM cover how to treat something like this?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, seeing a Tibetan doctor may be of some benefit. Exact treatment would depend on a whole host of factors I cannot begin to predict.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Chulen

Content:

alwayson said:

Can a nonpractitioner take these pills?

If so, what are the highest quality chulen pills on the market?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are looking for mundane rasāyana, then taking Chavyanaprasha regularly is your best bet.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Mantra & Medicine

Content:

dakini_boi said:

I'm wondering, what makes a mantra particularly effective in treating physical imbalances? For example, the vajra armor mantra is supposed to be effective to treat the "404 diseases" - is this presumably because it repels the 8 classes of spirits? If this is the case, then wouldn't Dorje Drollo or Vajrakilaya practice be just as effective? Yet I know that accomplished Vajrakilaya or Dorje Drollo siddhas may still do vajra armor for "healing" purposes.

Another question is - in what case(s) is mantra sufficient alone for healing, and in what case(s) are physical medicines also required - how would a Tibetan doctor determine this?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

You can use the mani for healing, if you are a mani siddha. All mantras ultimately can be used for healing. But some mantras have a specialized function for this, and Vajra armor is one such mantra.

If you go to a Tibetan doctor, one assumes that your mantra is not working so well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Re Death & Wind, Bile, Phlegm

Content:

pemachophel said:

Namdrol,

When one dies and is reborn, are any imbalances in the wind, bile, and phlegm wiped clean and one starts again with these in relative balance, or does the imbalance that led to death (assuming the death was due to disease) in some way carry on? IOW, does a propensity for a certain type of imbalance carry on from life to life? Any clarification on this issue would be much appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Tibetan medicine, imbalances in the three doṣas, vata, pitta and kapha, come from the afflictions of desire, hatred and ignorance. Thus, as long as one has three afflictions there will always be imbalances in three doṣas. Not all people have the same mix of afflictions, and hence in some people vata disorders will be stronger, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: What Tibetan med is this?

Content:

threebit3 said:

Does anyone know a traditional Tibetan med, round pill, that has a white outer coating on it? I took it only on the full moon.

Malcolm wrote:

Some kind of precious pill.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

catmoon said:

If your idea above were correct, then any beginner should swiftly attain enlightenment by simply recalling past lives. It just doesn't hang together.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, this is what that Buddha himself describes.

Now, in order to recall past lives, one has to become an excellent meditator. The recall of past lives is one of the five mundane abhijñās (mundane because you do not need to be an awakened person to possess them) that arise because of developing skill in dhyana.

Of course, this suggests that a person has received teachings from a buddha in the past. Lacking that, one will never figure out the Dharma on one's own. Why? Because one cannot pull oneself out of samsara by one's bootstraps, as it were.

All Buddhas of the past had gurus. All buddhas of the future will have had gurus. All buddhas of the present had gurus.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

catmoon said:

So, why not recite mantras in English? The ancient Indians used the common language of the day, why shouldn't we? When the mantras were composed, people would not have considered Sanskrit any less mundane than we consider English.

Malcolm wrote:

Mantras are constructed according to very specific rules. They are not just "phrases in Sanskrit".

Mantras have their roots in a very specific notion of language.

As for mantras being in English, parts of mantras can be, parts of mantras that were translated in Tibetan, for example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 7:07 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Whether they can bring one to the state of perfect buddhahood, however, is a different story. Indirectly, all are capable of doing so. Only the three inner yanas can do so in a single lifetime.

Kai said:

Hmmm, I'm sure that not long ago, you mentioned that only one yana (Dzogchen Upadesha/Mennagade or Longde) can bring one to the Perfect Buddhahood while the rest are only temporal Buddhahood and are hence reversible. No? Or a change in stance?

Malcolm wrote:

From the thirteenth bhumi onwards, they are stages of "abiding in wisdom". Presuming one manages to attain the thirteen bhumi, it is unlikely that one's realization will be blocked.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

rai said:

Maybe this is stupid question but is there any connection between Ojas and Lungta?

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:
Not directly.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 4:59 AM
Title: Re: Tonglen: For the novice?
Content:
Namdrol said:
No one can ever take of the sufferings others since no one can take on the karma of others.

deepbluehum said:
This is a very excellent point, but someone practicing this can experience increased suffering and an increase in the five poisons.

Malcolm wrote:
I don't agree with this claim.

Sending and receiving is an inherently virtuous act. There is no way that this practice can increase one's own suffering since the wish to relieve others of their suffering is inherently virtuous and a negative result can never stem from a virtuous act.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 4:12 AM
Title: Re: Tonglen: For the novice?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
No one can ever take of the sufferings others since no one can take on the karma of others.

The purpose of exchanging oneself and others is develop the courage to deal with helping people in samsara. But there is no danger that one will ever actually take on the suffering of others from this or any other Buddhist practice.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 1:54 AM
Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?
Content:
Pero said:
Hmm, but if that is so, creation stage alone would be sufficient to achieve Buddhahood

no?

Namdrol said:

No. Why? The creation stage can only bring one to the sixth bodhisattva bhumi. To progress further, the completion stage, therefore, is indispensable.

Pero said:

Ah I see. But what does completion stage have that creation stage doesn't then? And also, what about common Mahayana which has no creation/completion?

Malcolm wrote:

Completion stage contains the rapid methods to eradicate the remaining knowledge obscurations as well as remove the subtle subtle afflictive obscuration required to move from the impure bhumis to the pure bhumis.

In common mahāyāna it takes two incalculable eons to attain the pure bhumis and a one more bhumi to traverse the three pure bhumis, since the only available methods for eradicating the two obscurations are the practice of the six or ten perfections.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Pero said:

What do you mean by emptiness here? Path of Seeing?

Namdrol said:

Yes.

Pero said:

Hmm, but if that is so, creation stage alone would be sufficient to achieve Buddhahood no?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Why? The creation stage can only bring one to the sixth bodhisattva bhumi. To progress further, the completion stage, therefore, is indispensable.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically there are, in the terminology of Dzogchen itself, three classes of vehicles; vehicles of the cause (śrāvaka through bodhisattvayānas), vehicles of the result (kriya tantra through anuyoga), and the vehicle beyond cause and result i.e. Dzogchen.

We can classify them by path as well, renunciation, transformation and self-liberation.

Each vehicle is so called because it offers a complete path to liberation. One can attain the stature of an ārya through any one of the nine vehicles. In this respect, all nine vehicles stand alone and are independent from one another and may be taught as self-sufficient paths.

So, it is an error to assert that Dzogchen is a separate vehicle, but the others are not. All nine vehicles have the necessary teachings to bring someone to the state of being an ārya.

Whether they can bring one to the state of perfect buddhahood, however, is a different story. Indirectly, all are capable of doing so. Only the three inner yanas can do so in a single lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

Althought he won't confirm it, I believe for Namdrol:

Realizing emptiness = the famous Clear Light OR fourth consecration

In other words it is a high tantric attainment. This is the only thing that makes sense based on his comment regarding tummo.

Namdrol said:

No, emptiness can be realized on the basis of the creation stage alone.

Pero said:

What do you mean by emptiness here? Path of Seeing?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

alwayson said:

Namdrol doesn't think Dzogchen Upadesha / Mennagade is part of "regular" Vajrayana and disagrees with the standard nine yanas classification of the Nyingmas.

Dzogchen Upadesha is an independent Buddhist vehicle.

heart said:

With all respect to Namdrol I will side with the mainstream Nyingmas in this matter. You are of course free to believe whatever you want.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

There have been epochs, traditionally speaking, where only the teaching of Dzogchen has been taught, and nothing else. In this respect, then, Dzogchen must be considered an independent and separate vehicle.

It can also be taught as the apogee of the nine yanas.

In our world system, Dzogchen is part of Vajrayana, in general.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

In that case I bow out.

I will never understand this shit.

Malcolm wrote:

it is just faster when combined with the completion stage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Prostrations - slowly or quickly?

Content:

nirmal said:

]Bhante said,"Suppose a man were condemned to death by a kind king and he came to ask him for a reprieve. Quickly, urgently, he would bow down at the king's feet." "You are quite right," said the yogi.

Should our prostrations be done quickly or slowly?

Malcolm wrote:

However you can.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2011 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

Althought he won't confirm it, I believe for Namdrol:

Realizing emptiness = the famous Clear Light OR fourth consecration

In other words it is a high tantric attainment. This is the only thing that makes sense based on his comment regarding tummo.

Malcolm wrote:

No, emptiness can be realized on the basis of the creation stage alone.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Further, the experience of emptiness, while necessary, is not at all the same thing as realizing emptiness. The experience of emptiness is experiencing an awareness [shes pa] free of concepts, often referred to as recognizing the gap between two thoughts. If you follow the teaching of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, terming this experience "dharmakāya", as some teachers do, is a big mistake. It is just an impermanent experience.

N

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Is this because awareness, whether or not it contains objects, is also itself always already empty i.e. unobstructed?

Malcolm wrote:

You should ask the great meditator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

What i am left with after his teachings is scattered pieces because he is destroying everything .

Namdrol said:

Excellent.

Clarence said:

Why is that excellent?

Malcolm wrote:

Because preconceptions are the hardest thing to drop.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

What i am left with after his teachings is scattered pieces because he is destroying everything .

Malcolm wrote:

Excellent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

No actually that is definitely not an experience of emptiness -

Malcolm wrote:

In this case I will defer to the great meditator, since you clearly are a much more realized person than I.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I'm wondering how are you supposed to help beings overcome their suffering if you don't teach dharma? How are you supposed to teach dharma if you don't realize ultimate bodhichitta? How are you supposed to realize ultimate bodhichitta if you don't receive those teachings from someone else who has? Isn't that someone else a Buddha? No Buddha ever attained Buddhahood who didn't serve countless Buddhas. Dharma is not like water. It doesn't run all over the place. It is special and precious. You have to find a rare source.

catmoon said:

Not at all. If you'll allow me to disregard former lives, the pratyakabuddha works it all out for himself, just as Buddha did. Or, you could look at it this way: It is indeed special and precious, the sources are rare, but it occasionally happens that the source is oneself.

Malcolm wrote:

Pratyekabuddha recall the teachings they received from past buddhas, and then apply them, just as Śākyamuni did. It is not the case that any person ever awakens by figuring things out on their own.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Emptiness/Rigpa or Rigpa/emptiness your choice but always always always they are together...A genuine understanding of emptiNESS is required otherwise things don't fall into themselves - no collapse.

Malcolm wrote:

A proper understanding of emptiness is required, but not the realization of emptiness. If the realization of emptiness were required to have vidyā (knowledge of the basis), no one who was not an ārya on the stages could practice Dzogchen at all.

The realization of emptiness is also not a requirement for the basic requirement of tregchö i.e. stable placement in a momentary uncontrived awareness (ma bcos pa shes pa skad gcig ma). A proper understanding of emptiness is required.

Further, the experience of emptiness, while necessary, is not at all the same thing as realizing emptiness. The experience of emptiness is experiencing an awareness [shes pa] free of concepts, often referred to as recognizing the gap between two thoughts. If you follow the teaching of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, terming this experience "dharmakāya", as some teachers do, is a big mistake. It is just an impermanent experience.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

catmoon said:

It seems to me that your position contains the assumption that only Buddhists can practice the Eightfold Path.

Namdrol said:

Yes.

The eight-fold path starts with right view, and right view, the view of middle way, belongs solely to the Buddhist school.

tobes said:

It doesn't "belong" anywhere or to anyone.

To say so contradicts the very essence of that view.

Malcolm wrote:

In reply to your pointless semantic quibble:

"Belongs" as in the sense of apples belonging in an apple bin -- an apple bin is where apples go, and it is where apples are found, and when you want to put apples in their proper place, you put them in the apple bin, and not the orange bin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Aemilius said:

If you accept the process of rebirth in the six realms to be true, then this Mt Meru map illustrates an important truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Accepting the former does not require acceptance of the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 6:26 AM

Title: Re: Lung?

Content:

kirtu said:

So is lung mostly an indulgence in distraction brought on by chi not flowing correctly in the body and causing emotional excitation issues and distractions?

Kirt

Namdrol said:

No, not at all. It is a disfunction the element of air in the body.

kirtu said:

Well what does it result in? I ask because Tsoknyi Rinpoche was excerpted recently and I read the entire question and answer series from the document that the excerpt came from and he says that Westerners have lung too high in the body and it needs to be brought down to just below the navel (the dan tien in Taoism/taiqi) and that as a result of lung Westerners seem to be excitable and easily distracted but actually he's talking to people who already seem to know what the symptoms are so he doesn't go into that too much. He did the same thing in a video.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

These are the general symptoms of a vata disorder:

wishes to move, sighing, instability in the mind; dizziness; roaring the ears; dry, red rough tongue; inclination for bitter tastes; shifting pains; cold and shivering; trembling and pervasive twinges; fatigue; stiffness; atrophy; chapping, feeling breaks, bulging, constricted; great pain when trembling; prickling; goosebumps; insomnia; yawning,

shivering; wishing to stretch; aimless chatter; feeling of having been beaten on hips, waist, bones, and all the joints; twinge and pain in the occipital notch, the chest and the jaw; the vata points become sensitive and are painful when pressed; dry heaves; in the morning, bubbly sputum; bloating, roaring, pain after digesting in the morning. The reason he says it needs to be brought below the navel is that the natural location of vata in the body is in the pelvic region.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Lung?

Content:

kirtu said:

So is lung mostly an indulgence in distraction brought on by chi not flowing correctly in the body and causing emotional excitation issues and distractions?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. It is a disfunction the element of air in the body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Kyosan said:

None of these are specifically Buddhist, but all help bring people closer to liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily, such things only lead people to higher stations in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Kyosan said:

A bodhisattva however can appear as a non-Buddhist -- but they will not teach.

Why is that? Why won't a bodhisattva appearing as a non-Buddhist teach?

Malcolm wrote:

What would they teach? They would not teach Buddhist Dharma. They might teach things non-Buddhist wish to hear. But those things do not lead to liberation. Even if a Bodhisattvas appearing as non-Buddhists teaches Dharma, the non-Buddhist will hear it as whatever teaching they are accustomed to. The limitation is not on the side of the

bodhisattva, but rather on the side of his students.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

catmoon said:

Isn't it possible to rouse bodhicitta without knowing what a Buddha is?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Not really.

However, sometimes we term the sincere wish to liberate beings from suffering (compassion) "bodhicitta", because cultivating the former inevitably leads to the latter - since compassion is the seed of bodhicitta. Likewise, we frequently term non-buddhists of exceptional compassion "bodhisattvas" without meaning they are full bodhisattvas in the formal Mahāyāna sense.

It is important to make a distinction between popular usage, and technical usage. For example, some people call certain very strong forms of Marijuana "Buddha bud".

What we here are discussing is the formal usage of terms and what they mean.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Kyosan said:

You are a follower of Tibetan Buddhism aren't you? The Dalai Lama sides with me on this.

Malcolm wrote:

People misunderstand HHDL all the time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Namdrol said:

However, there is no guarantee that one will realize emptiness merely through

practicing tregchö. Of this reason then, practices such as tummo, etc. are also recommended.

N

alwayson said:

Ok NOW I am starting to get this.

Based on this comment, realizing emptiness is some special tantric gnosis having to do with the center channel / avadhuti.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on the practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Kyosan said:

A non-Buddhist can be a bodhisattva and a Buddhist bodhisattva can appear to be non-Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

No, a non-buddhist cannot be a bodhisattva. In order to be a bodhisattva, someone must have roused bodhicitta, the wish to attain buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings. A person who has done so, is by definition a Buddhist.

A bodhisattva however can appear as a non-Buddhist -- but they will not teach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

You can believe what you wish. I have not found any evidence of the middle way, dependent origination, being taught anywhere other than in Buddhism. It is not that case that I have not bothered to look.

N

alwayson said:

um what about Bon?

Malcolm wrote:

Bon is basically a knock off of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

catmoon said:

It seems to me that your position contains the assumption that only Buddhists can practice the Eightfold Path.

Namdrol said:

Yes.

The eight-fold path starts with right view, and right view, the view of middle way, belongs solely to the Buddhist school.

KeithBC said:

The Eightfold Path is a requirement for enlightenment. No argument there. No argument either that only Buddhism teaches it.

However, there is nothing to prevent someone (with exceptionally good karma, no doubt) from discovering the Eightfold Path on his or her own and practicing it, without having encountered Buddhism. It is not the "-ism" or "-ist" that matters, but the understanding and practice. Anyone, Buddhist or not, who practices the Eightfold Path well enough can become enlightened. (I will accept a quibble that the person could be considered a Buddhist even if he or she doesn't know it.)

Om mani padme hum

Keith

Malcolm wrote:

Such a person would, by definition, be a pratyekabuddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Kyosan said:

If Buddhists can discover the true nature of all things, others can also.

Namdrol said:

Pratyekabuddhas discover the principle of dependent origination through their own

power. But they do not teach. Thus, they do not lead others to liberation. Also their liberation is not complete -- in order to become fully awakened, they must also traverse the bodhisattva path.

N

Kyosan said:

The bodhisattva path is much broader than you think it is. A non-Buddhist can be a bodhisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not really that interested in people's vague, ill-formed and speculative ideas about these issues.

I know what the great Mahāyāna Buddhist masters of India have said about these issues, have tested them with reasoning and found them to be sound. Therefore, I follow their advice on these issues. If other people wish to follow their own speculations, they are free to do so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

catmoon said:

It seems to me that your position contains the assumption that only Buddhists can practice the Eightfold Path.

Namdrol said:

Yes.

The eight-fold path starts with right view, and right view, the view of middle way, belongs solely to the Buddhist school.

catmoon said:

Nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:

You can believe what you wish. I have not found any evidence of the middle way,

dependent origination, being taught anywhere other than in Buddhism. It is not that case that I have not bothered to look.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Kyosan said:

If Buddhists can discover the true nature of all things, others can also.

Malcolm wrote:

Pratyekabuddhas discover the principle of dependent origination through their own power. But they do not teach. Thus, they do not lead others to liberation. Also their liberation is not complete -- in order to become fully awakened, they must also traverse the bodhisattva path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

catmoon said:

It seems to me that your position contains the assumption that only Buddhists can practice the Eightfold Path.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

The eight-fold path starts with right view, and right view, the view of middle way, belongs solely to the Buddhist school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Kai said:

Since Namdrol, you explicitly stated that Mahamudra and Semde give the same result which is the 13th Bhumi Buddhahood of the lower yanas. By logical deduction, Longde should also lead to the same realization as the observation shown above. Therefore its not a far stretch to conclude that only the Menngagde division is able to lead one into the 16th Bhumi.

Malcolm wrote:

klong sde has the four visions, therefore, it has the same result as man ngag sde. Sems sde does not have this, therefore, no "rainbow" body in sems sde.

Kai said:

However, when one reaches the teachings of the highest level, it is suddenly stated that there is only one or a few paths which could lead to the true and ultimate Buddhahood while the rest is just provisional and temporal ones that will eventually degenerate.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and when you read Yangti tantras, they are critical of ati and spyi ti, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Aemilius said:

Scientific cosmology supports nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no scientific cosmology in the sense that there is an Abidharma cosmology, or a Ptolmeic cosmology.

But if you wish to continue to believe that our sky is blue since the southern face of Mt Meru is made of sapphire, no one is going to stop you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Really. Please the difference between Hināyāna and Mahāyāna in Gorampa's

"Distinguishing views".

kirtu said:

I had "Freedom from Extremes" but had to give it away for the move. Ok - thanks!

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, I don't think this is accepted in Nyingma either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

kirtu said:

No that's standard across schools although I don't remember for sure if an Arhat was equated exactly with a 6th bhumi bodhisattva in terms of wisdom (it's the in terms of wisdom where the equating is done on this). So when Arhats are awakened from their samadhi and they take rebirth they are reborn as sixth bhumi bodhisattvas.

Kirt

Namdrol said:

Hi Kirt:

No, this is not accepted in Sakya, it is rejected by Gorampa. 1) Arhats do not realize emptiness free from extremes 2) They do not have the necessary merit stores.

kirtu said:

Really? I know Khenpo Kalsang has mentioned it. So this is accepted by Nyingma, Gelug and Kagyu alone?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Really. Please the difference between Hināyāna and Mahāyāna in Gorampa's "Distinguishing views".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Kyosan said:

When someone understands what the Buddha meant by "realization" then they will understand that this term does not apply to those outside the Buddhist fold.

N

catmoon said:

Stop a moment and think of all the people who might be counter examples. The silent, self-taught Buddhas. The saints. The peacemakers. Maybe the fellow down the street who runs the deli. Do you really wish to invalidate all their realizations just because they are outside the tribe?

Malcolm wrote:

They are not counter examples. And the Buddha was very specific on this point: In whatsoever Dhamma and Discipline, Subhadda, there is not found the Noble Eightfold Path, neither is there found a true ascetic of the first, second, third, or fourth degree of saintliness. But in whatsoever Dhamma and Discipline there is found the Noble Eightfold Path, there is found a true ascetic of the first, second, third, and fourth degrees of saintliness.[54] Now in this Dhamma and Discipline, Subhadda, is found the Noble Eightfold Path; and in it alone are also found true ascetics of the first, second, third, and fourth degrees of saintliness. Devoid of true ascetics are the systems of other teachers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

kirtu said:

No that's standard across schools although I don't remember for sure if an Arhat was equated exactly with a 6th bhumi bodhisattva in terms of wisdom (it's the in terms of wisdom where the equating is done on this). So when Arhats are awakened from their samadhi and they take rebirth they are reborn as sixth bhumi bodhisattvas.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Kirt:

No, this is not accepted in Sakya, it is rejected by Gorampa. 1) Arhats do not realize emptiness free from extremes 2) They do not have the necessary merit stores.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

eL_chupacabra said:

My perception of the situation in Europe is of a growth in materialism, both in the younger generations and in academia.

Kai said:

While in Americas, the sign of increasing fanaticism and religious fundamentalism is becoming a serious issue.....

Malcolm wrote:

No, there has always been a large percentage of religious wingnuts in the US and a religious zeal associated with "Democracy".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Aemilius said:

Truth is essential to BuddhaDharma...

Malcolm wrote:

But not cosmologies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

xabir said:

You guys seem to take Samantabhadra as a literal real account of what happened, but didn't ChNNR says it should be taken metaphorically?

Malcolm wrote:

That is a semi side presentation. The presentation in Man ngag side is very specific.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 7:00 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

You hating the words of the precious teacher, the Buddha, makes you the sort of person that my samaya says I cannot associate with. So either you have to recant, or you have to go or I do. The moderators need to speak up here.

alwayson said:

Do you know whats funny?

If you are a Vajrayana practitioner you are not allowed to even stay over at a regular Mahayana guy's house for more than a week.

I think Namdrol said this somewhere.

Malcolm wrote:

No, one is not allowed to remain in a temple where there is no faith in Mahayana for more than a week.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Kai said:

In the ongoing development, many Tibetan masters have been trying to get Vajrayana closer to traditional Mahayana by emphasizing that the tenth to Twelfth Bhumis in the tantras are actually equivalent to the Tenth Bhumi as stated in the Sutras. While the tantric thirteenth equates that to the sutric Eleventh, the only minor difference between the two is a formal tantra empowerment.

Malcolm wrote:

That is definitely not a POV that a Sakyapa or a Nyingmapa would be liable to accept.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2011 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

Namdrol is my signature correct?

I think it will help some confusion

Malcolm wrote:

Those sambhogakāya forms are not the real Sambhogakāya. The real Sambhogakāya can only be seen by eight stage bodhisattvas on up.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Armor

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Haha, yes that's true. Thanks for the clarification.

Just one more question about the Vajra Armor mantra - I know there's no visualization for it, but I'm curious - who is the deity associated with it? Is it Vajrapani, or Guru Dragpo? Or are these one and the same in this case?

Thanks for answering my questions, I offer you several recitations of Vajra Armor.

Malcolm wrote:

Padmashavari, a form of Vajrapani. There are in fact versions of this practice that are full fledged yidam practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Armor

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Thanks you guys. I didn't know what the 404 diseases were, your clarification helps, Pema Chopel.

Why does the text say "volume of mantras"? - I thought there was just one Vajra Armor mantra

Malcolm wrote:

There is only one mantra. Here volume is a translation of 'bum, which also means 100,000. So it means this mantra includes everything. If I translated is as "the one hundred thousand mantras of Vajra armor" you would even be more confused, in addition to such a translation being incorrect.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Kai said:

First of all, I believe that its highly speculative but I suspect the reversible effect if occurs, only lasts for a split second or less. In the book "Dzogchen practice", it was stated that the Adi-Buddha, Samantabhadra/Samantabhadri, experienced two of the three innate unelighenments at the start of universe and was able to overcome the delusions by the arising of His wisdom to recognize the eight appearances from the basis. Hence He retains his Buddhahood and become the Adi Buddha. And this might be the same event that happens to all Buddhas eventually if the Dzogchen tantras are to be believed.

Malcolm wrote:

There are three explanations possible, given that Dzogchen tantras and traditions definitely state that Samantabhadra was intially subject to either one or two ignorances (ma rig pa, avidyā):

- 1) The Dzogchen assertion that all sentient beings attain "full awakening (sangs rgyas)" at the end of a given mahākalpa requires interpetation and must not be taken literally.
- 2) Buddhahood is, up to a point, in fact reversible.
- 3) Buddhas and sentient beings newly form at the beginning of a mahākalapa.

All three possibilities present problems in terms of traditional Indian Mahāyāna Buddhology.

This controversy first came to my attention when my Sakya khenpo mentioned it in passing in the early '90's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Namdrol said:

If not, then all people who have recognized rigpa would be first stage bodhisattvas. But they are not.

Andrew108 said:

How do you know they are not?

Malcolm wrote:

I have personal experience of the subject we are discussing and I am not a first stage bodhisattva. In other words, I am relying on my personal authority to answer your question.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Armor

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Just wondering, is Vajra Armor practice used for emotional disorders?

How about lung imbalance, for example insomnia? Or would there be other practices more specific to such things?

Malcolm wrote:

The collection of activities for Vajra armor states:

"This Vajra armor volume of mantras destroys all of the four hundred and four classes of disease, the one thousand and eighty classes of spirits, the eighty-four bad omens, the three hundred and sixty calamities, the eighteen kinds of untimely death, and so on."

I'd say it is pretty inclusive.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

this is also what ChNN calls instant presence.

Malcolm wrote:

"Instant presence" is one of the ways in which Norbu Rinpoche translates the term "rig pa", in order to distinguish it from his translation of the term "dran pa", presence, which is usually translated as mindfulness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

You seem to have suggested that recognition of rigpa and realizing emptiness are different.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are quite different.

If not, then all people who have recognized rigpa would be first stage bodhisattvas. But they are not.

The second fault of your assertion above is that people who have not realized emptiness will believe that they had, and such people will then be incurable.

Andrew108 said:

I don't mind the idea that I may be wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a useful personal quality.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

This is far from being a trivial point. But as others have said it is better to check these things with a teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a trivial point because time is merely a convention. There is no time or continuity at all, other than conventionally. In Dzogchen, that which is shared with Madhyamaka can be considered trivial since we are not discussing something unique and specific to Dzogchen teachings.

Also the term "intrinsic awareness" is a translation misnomer that has, unfortunately, gained broad currency. Using the term "intrinsic awareness" for "rig pa/vidyā" is very limiting. First of all, the adjective "intrinsic" is misapplied. Intrinsic describes a quality that something else possesses. For example, diamonds are intrinsically hard; gold is intrinsically shiny; water is intrinsically wet. [X] is intrinsically aware? The intrinsic awareness of what? Of what is awareness an intrinsic quality?

There are other problems to this translation which lead people to reify rigpa as some truly existing ground ala Advaita's brahman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Aemilius said:

It gives depth to buddhism, and is therefore essential to it.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not essential to Buddhism, any more than Meru Cosmology is.

Aemilius said:

If you don't accept it you will as an implication hold that transcendental vision is nonsense, that great teachers like Karmapa, Tsongkhapa, Nagarjuna and others are liars or worse, when they perceive the events of previous Yugas and previous Kalpas. I don't think you wish this either, do you ?

Malcolm wrote:

I think they uncritically accepted the worldview handed down to them. I also think they had no tools to evaluate cosmological statements related to time and so on.

Sorry, when it comes to measuring the physical universe, we have a better understanding of it than ancient peoples.

In terms of eons, modern humans have only been out of Africa for 70,000 years or so.

The rest of it is religious speculation.

This of course does not mean that sentient life is confined to this planet, or that huge time frames mentioned in sutras are not relevant -- but there are issues with applying the fantastic numbers mentioned in sutras and so on to this planet and this crop of human beings.

On the other hand, it is fruitless to provide substitute speculations.

So we have to deal with two facts. Modern humans have only been present on the Indian subcontinent for at most 70,000 years. This fact stands in contradiction to traditional narratives about the history of Jambudvipa.

We should default to modern understanding, since it corresponds with the perception of ordinary people and is all that can be confirmed with any empirical certainty.

The beliefs of ancient Buddhist masters about the history of the world are pretty irrelevant.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 7:28 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The point is that Rigpa has no continuity or time within it..

Malcolm wrote:

This is a trivial point and does not go beyond Madhyamaka.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

A genuine experience of emptiness and a genuine experience of rigpa are the same - this experience is glimpsed during direct transmission from teacher to student.

Malcolm wrote:

Many people make this mistake. Such people never understand Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 8:29 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I say you and Namdrol are both right. You are right because the direct introduction does provide a glimpse into emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the same as the realization of the path seeing.

It is an example wisdom only.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 8:28 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The way Rigpa is defined is as self-originated intrinsic awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't.

For this reason all of your other comments are skewed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Garab Dorje Guru Yoga

Content:

Andrew108 said:

The point is to receive the direct transmission. This is a guru yoga practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Tom seem to be missing that point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Neither have you answered the question.

But that's o.k as I don't think anyone is capable of answering in an accurate way.

Malcolm wrote:

I did. It is pretty straight forward. To put it another way, when a person ceases to reify phenomena in terms of the four extremes, that is the direct perception of emptiness. Until that point, their "emptiness" remains an intellectual sequence of negations; accurate perhaps, but conceptual nevertheless.

The "recognition" of rigpa, which is simply the knowledge (rig pa) about one's state as a working basis for practice, does not require realization of emptiness as a prerequisite, and can't -- since if it did, no one could practice Dzogchen. '

In terms of the four visions, for as long as one continues to reify phenomena, for that long, one will never reach the third vision. This is the principal reason in modern Dzogchen practice, emphasis is placed on the basis through tregchö, rather the path, tögal. If you are a first stage bodhisattva and so on, then the four visions in Dzogchen will be very, very rapid. However, there is no gaurantee that one will realize emptiness merely through practicing tregchö. Of this reason then, practices such as tummo, etc. are also recommended.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It seems that we may take the notion of Rigpa and the famous concept of emptiness and think that they are something we need...

Malcolm wrote:

All very nice, but you didn't answer the OP's question.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Adamantine said:

I know south Indian food well, I have eaten it in India as well as regularly in NYC, being a vegetarian it is probably the tastiest veggie cuisine there is. However, between potatoes, basmati rice and various lentil dumplings, pancakes, and crepes

Malcolm wrote:

The crepes are fermented lentils and rice, 50/50.

Anyway, there is plenty of protein in that diet for most people.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

It is a myth that all vegetarians are healthy.

Namdrol said:

The healthiest vegetarian cuisine is South Indian cooking. It is the most balanced, the most diverse, strong on rice and bean combinations, easy to digest.

It is not Vegan since no Vedic based diet can be.

N

Adamantine said:

With all the carbs and dairy though isn't it a bit fattening? I love this food but as I get older and the metabolism slows I need to think about slimming down. Also so many Lamas have diabetes now partially from the Indian white-rice obsession when genetically they are used to whole-grain barely (tsampa).

Malcolm wrote:

South Indian food is not necessarily carb heavy. The reason many Tibetans are getting diabetes is because they like the western diet.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/South_Indian_cuisine "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Also, Tibetans ignore their own medical system and eat like crap.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

It is a myth that all vegetarians are healthy.

Malcolm wrote:

The healthiest vegetarian cuisine is South Indian cooking. It is the most balanced, the most diverse, strong on rice and bean combinations, easy to digest.

It is not Vegan since no Vedic based diet can be.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

always on said:

Seriously what is this "path of seeing?"

I'm tired of searching for reasonable info on it in books on Buddhism.

What is it already?

Namdrol said:

It is the moment your understanding of emptiness ceases to be an intellectual construct and becomes a valid direct perception.

Malcolm wrote:

The Abhisamaya alamakara will have detailed information.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 12th, 2011 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

Seriously what is this "path of seeing?"

I'm tired of searching for reasonable info on it in books on Buddhism.

What is it already?

Malcolm wrote:

It is the moment your understanding of emptiness ceases to be an intellectual construct and becomes a valid direct perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Acchantika said:

Is then the initial recognition of rigpa equal to the path of seeing/first bhumi?

Also, is it accurate to describe this as recognition of clarity, whereas "realising emptiness" is effectively recognition of the inseparability of clarity and emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first question, no.

As to the second question, yes.

As to the third question, realizing emptiness here in Dzogchen has the same meaning as

realizing emptiness in any other mahāyāna school.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Do "dzogchen practices" help or hinder your thinking ability

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

So, having a very good teacher is important, especially because western life brings a lot of challenges if we are to practice more or less "traditionally". It's not like we can go to a retreat and people take care of us while we practice.

Malcolm wrote:

It is also important to remember that we are Mahāyāna practitioners, and engaging in the activities connected with the six perfections is important.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: "On White Women and Buddhism"

Content:

kirtu said:

So why should we continue to propagate the concept...

Malcolm wrote:

People think tribally. And as long as we continue to look different from one another, for that long people will continue to think in terms of "races" because race is a an effect of culture. "Race" is a result of attraction choices, environment, wealth, and a whole host of other things which result in non-verbal behaviorial cues. These behavariial cues are utilized in establishing human dominance patterns and social heirarchies.

We are all hutus and tutsis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Delusion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi, it is sixteen consecutive mental cognitions through the four noble truths.

N

Namdrol said:

It states it to be the case in the Abhisamayālaṅkāra, and other Mahāyāna texts, as opposed to a sixteen moment path of seeing proposed in Abhidharma kośa.

N

Virgo said:

Loppon, in Abhidharma kośa, are path moments mentioned? If so do these consist of 16 actual consecutive moments? Or would the path moment be just one moment in a mind door process series of sixteen moments, each other moment in the series performing it's own separate function?

I may be off base here because I am comparing what I have learned in the Theravada Abhidhamma to what you have said above. However, even "path moment" maybe be understood very differently in the Abhidharma kośa, I'm not sure. I would really like to know more.

Thank you,

Kevin

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Kyosan said:

I'd like to clarify what I said. I think that all of us understand the Dharma at some level and that is why we are Buddhists, and that is especially true for people who choose themselves to become Buddhists. We see truth and value in the Buddhist dharma. But that doesn't mean that we understand the dharma at the same level as a Buddha does.

Namdrol said:

When someone understands what the Buddha meant by "realization" then they will understand that this term does not apply to those outside the Buddhist fold.

N

Kyosan said:

I think that the one Buddha vehicle and the way of bodhisattvas can be very broad. That is how I envision them.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a great fault in being closed minded. There are equally great faults in being overly broad minded.

In reality, without the realization of the meaning dependent origination, one is not an awakened person. Dependent origination is solely the teaching of the Buddha. Yes it is true that some persons figure out dependent origination without the benefit of being taught by a Buddha. But such people do not teach.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwaysan said:

So is it possible for this typical New Age style pseudoBuddhist guru, "Thusness," to have realized material emptiness (aka third vision / eighth bhumi) and is on the way to rainbow body?

Malcolm wrote:

Third vision = path of seeing, not the eighth bhumi.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Kyosan said:

I'd like to clarify what I said. I think that all of us understand the Dharma at some level and that is why we are Buddhists, and that is especially true for people who choose themselves to become Buddhists. We see truth and value in the Buddhist dharma. But that doesn't mean that we understand the dharma at the same level as a Buddha does.

Malcolm wrote:

When someone understands what the Buddha meant by "realization" then they will understand that this term does not apply to those outside the Buddhist fold.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

Matt J said:

....Also, I don't accept the idea that Buddhist teachers are more realized than other traditions. How do you measure realization? With a cup?

Namdrol said:

That is because you don't understand what Buddha meant by realization.

N

Kyosan said:

You are probably right that he doesn't understand. In fact, I doubt that any of us know precisely what Buddha meant by realization. For sure I don't.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you are are like a man shooting arrows in the dark.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: The Rainbow Body, Tibetan Kings, dmu-thag, Agganna Sutta

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

....

Malcolm wrote:

The actual name of the result described in Dzogchen tantras is "body of light" -- the term rainbow body is a Tibetan popular term that is at best very imprecise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 7:35 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

Namdrol said:

Basically the rang stong/gzhan stong controversy is bullshit, and so is the prasangika/svatantrika controversy.

If you want to understand Madhyamaka, don't read Tibetan accounts of Madhyamaka dating after the 13th century. And here, it is better still just to rely on Indian masters. The sole exception to this is Khenpa Shenga's treatises, which are just Indian commentaries turned into footnoted annotations of root texts.

N

Virgo said:

Keeping the above in mind, what would you recommend in English?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

The Yogic Deeds of Bodhisattvas

INTRODUCTION TO THE MIDDLE WAY: Chandrakirti's Madhyamakavatara with
Commentary by Jamgon Mipham

THE ORNAMENT OF REASON: The Great Commentary to Nagarjuna's Root of the Middle
Way

NAGARJUNA'S REASON SIXTY (Yuktisastika) with CANDRAKIRTI'S COMMENTARY
(Yuktisastikavrtti)

This is my shortlist.

Mab

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 7:31 AM

Title: Re: "On White Women and Buddhism"

Content:

Jikan said:

he'll know if he's white or black when it's night and he needs a cab.

kirtu said:

So you are agreeing with the statement that race is a social construct that others use to define you (or impose their view of you on you) and then to execute social rules or prejudices about you?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Of course "race" is a social construct, it has no genetic basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

xabir said:

<http://www.heartofnow.com/files/emptiness.html> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

alwayson said:

Namdrol,

Is this a good link or is it garbage?

Malcolm wrote:

Better to rely on traditional sources.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: "On White Women and Buddhism"

Content:

kirtu said:

And what of my non-white relatives and ancestors from my mother's family? Are they just wiped away?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

kirtu said:

Look if we assert racial silliness (and unfortunately our history does) we get in trouble. The classic examples: Barak Obama : is he black or white?

Malcolm wrote:

Black. Yes, I know he has a white mother. I know black people with white mothers and white people with black mothers and some people of mixed parentage who don't identify with either.

kirtu said:

Wentworth Miller: is he black or white? wmillr.jpeg

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know. He could be either, that is up to him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: "On White Women and Buddhism"

Content:

xylem said:

in Washington DC I find many African-American people decide upon seeing me that I am what they call "white".

Malcolm wrote:

I have met you. In this country, you are white.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

White Lotus said:

no need to see emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

You are just deluding yourself further.

You should actually study Dzogchen, learn from qualified masters for some number of years and practice it rather than belaboring others with poorly digested intellectual snippets from a febrile imagination.

In other words, you should be asking questions, not providing answers.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2011 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

White Lotus said:

...however awareness is the point within the circle. it is not empty, it resides within emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:
rigpa is also empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Delusion

Content:

Namdrol said:

Cessation occurs when, through awakened insight, one removes a cause of further arising. Without awakening, first, there is no analytical cessation.

devilyoudont said:

Thanks, but why and how are you so certain that awakening is instantaneous?

Malcolm wrote:

It states it to be the case in the Abhisamayālaṅkāra, and other Mahāyāna texts, as opposed to a sixteen moment path of seeing proposed in Abhidharma kośa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Why don't we have རྒྱུ for example?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Sometimes you see this, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

By the way, interesting to note that when ChNN was transmitting a medicine buddha mantra at one of his recent retreats, he pronounced "bhekhandze" and even mentioned that he was doing so because this was how it was transmitted to him!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct. That is how ChNN likes to do things.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

And while we're still on the subject. . .

Namdrol, do you have any idea why in most cases ऩ is used for both Sanskrit व and वः? Why don't we have वः for example?

Namdrol said:

There is a recognized regular shift from f --> v --> b in Indo European languages. For example, the Roman word for preist, "flamen", by phonetic shift becomes brahmin in Sanskrit. These shifts are regular and predictable.

In Kashmir and among Newars Sanskrit "va" often takes on a "ba" sound. Most Newars say Bajrayogini, not Vajrayogini.

dakini_boi said:

Thanks, Namdrol. I understand that the pronunciation changes - but pronunciation aside, I don't understand why written mantras wouldn't be consistent with the original. After all, the Tibetans came up with the written syllable ऩ specifically for that purpose.

So, when you come across the seed syllable BAM in a mantra, do you always pronounce it as VAM, Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on my mood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Delusion

Content:

devilyoudont said:

Serious, serious question about which I have no preconceived ideas, I swear: What is the relationship between cessation and awakening? If cessation cannot be instantaneous or gradual, temporal or atemporal, how can awakening be instantaneous?

Malcolm wrote:

Cessation occurs when, through awakened insight, one removes a cause of further arising. Without awakening, first, there is no analytical cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Delusion

Content:

devilyoudont said:

Are you awake?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Half asleep.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

Then are there two levels of realizing emptiness?

One for conceptual appearances?

And one for actual physical matter?

Malcolm wrote:

There are two levels of realizing emptiness, the emptiness of persons and the emptiness of phenomena (that includes all material and mental phenomena).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

You mean even the physical?

Usually appearances just refers to the designation of conceptual constructs

Malcolm wrote:

Appearances are both conceptual and non-conceptual.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

alwayson said:

Then emptiness must be the insight into appearances.

That would make sense that it is sort of separate.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, appearances as defined by all of one's experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: I am the director of the documentary TULKU. Ask me anything.

Content:

GesarMukpo said:

I don't think my future has going to study ... Buddhism at an institution involved.

Malcolm wrote:

What a pity.

Formal education results in disciplined thinking and expression. Not necessary for making films and music videos perhaps, but useful for communicating and teaching things like Dharma. It [Dharma] is also something best learned by adults, and not by children. Learning Dharma requires a degree of emotional maturity. Otherwise, it is just rote religion. Rote religion is not Dharma.

Edit: I don't meant you have to get a master's in Buddhism. However, studying things formally like Madhyamaka, Abhidharma, and so on in a rigorous place is very beneficial.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Annoyance :P

Content:

Namdrol said:

Awakening is not spontaneous since it does not arise without a cause. It is not gradual since it occurs in one instant.

devilyoudont said:

Is enlightenment conditioned? Is it instantaneous and not non-instantaneous?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't use the term enlightenment. Awakening however is a permanent state, from which one cannot regress.

I also don't answer pointless questions. If something occurs in an instant, it occurs in an instant, not two, three, four or sixteen instants.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Silliness

Content:

devilyoudont said:

If enlightenment is spontaneous, what practice can bring you cessation?

If enlightenment is gradual, what practice can't bring you cessation?

Malcolm wrote:

Awakening is not spontaneous since it does not arise without a cause. It is not gradual since it occurs in one instant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Delusion

Content:

devilyoudont said:

Are non-spontaneity and non-gradation the temporal properties of a non-event?

Malcolm wrote:

A non event has no temporal properties of which one can speak.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Delusion

Content:

devilyoudont said:

If cessation is spontaneous, what practice can bring you enlightenment?

If cessation is gradual, what practice CAN'T bring you enlightenment?

Malcolm wrote:

Cessation is not spontaneous since it is the absence of a cause.

Cessation is not gradual since it is the absence of a cause.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

And while we're still on the subject. . .

Namdrol, do you have any idea why in most cases ँ is used for both Sanskrit ँ and ऐ? Why don't we have ऎ for example?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a recognized regular shift from f --> v --> b in Indo European languages. For example, the Roman word for priest, "flamen", by phonetic shift becomes brahmin in Sanskrit. These shifts are regular and predictable.

In Kashmir and among Newars Sanskrit "va" often takes on a "ba" sound. Most Newars say Bajrayogini, not Vajrayogini.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: Difference between recognizing rigpa & realizing emptiness?

Content:

Namdrol said:

recognizing rigpa and realizing emptiness are different.

N

alwayson said:

What is the difference?

Malcolm wrote:

The first means you are a practitioner; the second means you are an awakened person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2011 at 7:19 AM

Title: Re: Do "dzogchen practices" help or hinder your thinking ability

Content:

padma norbu said:

??

I typically read stuff about mediation that it helps you to deal with stress and clears your head, allowing you to think much better.

Well, non-meditation might be different. How does it affect you?

I personally seem to find that my brain doesn't want to think about stuff, which is difficult when I am trying to figure out some programming stuff and my brain just seems to put on its brakes.

I don't know what's going on or if it related to my practices, but my brain is on vacation and doesn't look like it ever wants to come back.

Malcolm wrote:

Given that the practice of Dzogchen ultimately results in omniscience, it should help.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

According to traditional Sanskrit pronunciation, are seed syllables such as HUM and HRIM ever pronounced with the final sound nasalized, as in HUNG or HRING?

Namdrol said:

Yes. ṃ and ṅ are nasalized.

dakini_boi said:

What I meant to ask was, if you are trying to pronounce mantras according to Sanskrit pronunciation, would you ever use NG, as in HUNG/HRING, or would you always use M sound at the end?

Malcolm wrote:

As I hear it, sort of a mng...In the Western yoga world they seem to default to a hard mmm, but I think this is not quite correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- How do we call here the paths of those people who are dwelling below the path of seeing? Tib / Sanskr.
- How do you call the path of seeing? Tib / Sanskr.

Namdrol said:

Worldly paths:

Sambhara mārḡa; tshogs lam; path of accumulation.

Prayoga mārḡa; sbyor lam; path of application/preparation.

Transcendent paths:

Darśana mārḡa; mthong lam; path of seeing

Bhavana mārḡa; sgom lam; path of cultivation

Aśaikṣa mārḡa; mi slop pa'i lam; path of no further training (buddhahood)

Hayagriva said:

There are various schemes -- for the mahamudra scheme you can look in the mahamudra threads here. For Dzogchen, third vision of thögal = path of seeing.

How do the Dzogchen and Mahamudra path(s) fit with these framework?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- How do we call here the paths of those people who are dwelling below the path of seeing? Tib / Sanskr.
- How do you call the path of seeing? Tib / Sanskr.

Malcolm wrote:

Worldly paths:

Sambhara mārḡa; tshogs lam; path of accumulation.

Prayoga mārḡa; sbyor lam; path of application/preparation.

Transcendent paths:

Darśana mārḡa; mthong lam; path of seeing

Bhavana mārḡa; sgom lam; path of cultivation

Aśaikṣa marga; mi slop pa'i lam; path of no further training (buddhahood)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: How to know a teachers level of realization?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Rīg pa rang sharTantra states:

Without understanding, very proud,
foolish, confused, following the words,
not understanding the meaning of secret mantra,
hurting others' feelings with arrogant words,
entering incorrect paths,
not seeing the face of the mandala of the empowerment,
corrupting his commitments,
unable to respond to questions,
little education, very proud,
the unqualified master is a student's demon,
not being a master who can teach secret mantra,
he cannot teach dzogchen Ati.

Longchenpa adds:

"If one associates with such a Guru, one impairs all temporary good, and ultimately one falls into samsara and lower realms."

At least your prospective Guru must have a good education in secret mantra; that implies he has a good education in sutra. Sometimes, even a realized person is not necessarily a good teacher, more like pratyekabuddhas than bodhisattvas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Aemilius said:

creationism is still a false view

Malcolm wrote:

That is sufficient.

He knows nothing of value to any Buddhist. His books are all speculative nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: Benefits of Nagarjuna / Dangers of Existence & Non-Existence

Content:

retrofuturist said:

How does belief in Existence or Non-Existence bring suffering or put roadblocks in the way of one's spiritual progress?

Malcolm wrote:

Not escaping higher realms because one engages in spiritual practice in the context of a real self (existence); negating the effects of karma and therefore, falling into lower realms (non-existence).

It is really that simple.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Namdrol said:

ཅཅེ are tonal, in descending order. Sanskrit ca cha ja are not tonal, since Sanskrit is not a tonal language (a point Sapan makes very clear). Thonmi Sambhota wanted to make sure that Tibetans who were reading mantras were not to pronounce ca cha ja the same way they were pronouncing ཅཅེ. This led to other problems, of course, later on.

dakini_boi said:

This is quite ironic. So this leads me to wonder - when Tibetans say "tsitta" or "dza," is this because they are unable to say "citta" and "ja," or is it simply because of a misunderstanding of a writing convention. . . which has become so widespread it's become a convention in itself?

Malcolm wrote:

They can say citta, and is yes, it is because of misunderstanding a writing convention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

According to traditional Sanskrit pronunciation, are seed syllables such as HUM and HRIM ever pronounced with the final sound nasalized, as in HUNG or HRING?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes. M and ng are nasalized.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 9:57 AM
Title: Re: How to know a teachers level of realization?
Content:
Matt J said:
Whack him/her with a stick.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 9:56 AM
Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?
Content:
Matt J said:
I don't know any realized Platonist masters. When I first started to meditate, there wasn't a single Platonist master in the area.

Also, I don't accept the idea that Buddhist teachers are more realized than other traditions. How do you measure realization? With a cup?

Malcolm wrote:
That is because you don't understand what Buddha meant by realization.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 3:35 AM
Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA
Content:
padma norbu said:
lol, well my credit counselor said I didn't qualify for bankruptcy. She volunteered this info without me asking.

Malcolm wrote:
Tax debts (as long as you filed properly) and credit card debts can be discharged through bankruptcy. School loans cannot.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

padma norbu said:

Namdrol,

Could you tell me if the practice I described is basically Namkhai Norbu's Vajrasattva practice? I know there are at least 2 versions (one with mandala offering and one with Purification of Six Lokas). Trying to save as much \$\$ as I can since I just signed up for credit counseling and canceled all my cards and am in debt up to my ancestor's eyeballs, otherwise i would just go ahead and buy the book and cds and dvds or whatever.

Malcolm wrote:

Just file for bankruptcy. Practice Vajrasattva according to any ngondro text you have. Don't make things complicated.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

heart said:

I think someone told me a long time ago that Sanskrit probably never was a spoken language, is that not true?

/magnus

Clarence said:

It is still spoken in some monasteries in India.

heart said:

Where?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are 3000 families that speak Sanskrit in Varanasi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Namdrol said:

awesome

padma norbu said:

Is that pretty much Namkhai Norbu's Vajrasattva practice or is there a bunch of other stuff to it?

In the medium ganapuja there is an additional last line for the last repetition. Is that just for ganapuja or should I include it at the end of my Vajrasattva practice?

It's funny but all of a sudden I really like this mantra... even though it takes 15 minutes just to say 21x.

(LOL, I think I'm going to burn some guggulu for good measure! I got lotsa problems!)

Malcolm wrote:

just for ganapuja

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Trigeminal Neuralgia

Content:

bjf77 said:

Thank you for your time and response. We hope to find a 'root-cause' with the MRI.

B

Malcolm wrote:

If it turns out that there is no physical cause for this neuralgia, let me know.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2011 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Trigeminal Neuralgia

Content:

bjf77 said:

My wife has been recently diagnosed with trigeminal neuralgia. She has been experiencing episodes off and on for almost a year now. Recently the pain has not subsided and she is scheduled for an Brain MRI in the near future to help determine a cause. I would like to find out if there is anything we can do in the meantime to either cure this condition, or at the least treat the pain with Tibetan Medicine. Any information, suggestions, help, would be greatly appreciated.

I will put in a link to the wikipedia website that has detailed information about

Trigeminal neuralgia, and hope that this will be useful and helpful.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trigeminal_neuralgia "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Thank you!
Om ah hung
B

Malcolm wrote:

Considering what I can see about this condition there is probably little Tibetan Medicine can do more than offer minor palliative relief since this condition seems to involve an artery that presses against the trigeminal nerve. I am guessing for permanent relief, surgery is probably your most effective solution.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 11:56 PM
Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA
Content:
padma norbu said:
Namdrol,

You advised me to do Vajrasattva before and so I'm trying to do it. I am going to combine this in a Short Tun style of practice. After breathings, guru yoga, 5 elements purification and refuge, I will visualize Vajrasattva on my head in typical way and chant 100-syllable mantra many times, imagining myself filling with white light (nectar) and all negativities draining out. After the Vajrasattva portion, I will sing the Song of Vajra and after that perhaps Six Lokas practice and then dedicate merits.

Does that sound like a good practice to you?

Vajrasattva mantra is shown on page 123 of the newer Tun and Ganapuja book. Note the last line. Is that last line just for ganapuja or do you end all Vajrasattva mantras with this on the very last repetition? I also have an audio of this from downloading the mandarava ganapuja, so I know how to say the mantra the correct way.

Malcolm wrote:
awesome

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Spirit possession and/or harrassment

Content:

uslic001 said:

Lama Dawa has suspended divination's per his website except in emergencies.

Bryan

Malcolm wrote:

Good to know. Thanks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Namdrol wrote:

Because ordinary people can see a nirmankāya, but cannot see a Sambhogakāya, much less the Dharmakāya.

N.

Tashi delek,

- What are here ordinary and then following not ordinary people?

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

People below the path of seeing. Regular people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

username said:

]then there would be numerous versions even in a single generation as different people would pick different sets of Tibetan words

Malcolm wrote:

That is the present state of things, since Tibetan U, Tshan, Kham, Golog and Amdo all pronounce mantras completely differently. Add to this western mispronunciations of already incorrectly transcribed mantras (in order to follow Tibetanized pronunciations) and in the end one will wind up with mantras and dharanis as garbled if not more garbled than Chinese mantras and dharanis. So wa ka! (svāhā as pronounced in Japan).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Ālaya in Sakya

Content:

Kai said:

So ultimate alaya = Tathāgatagarbha?

I just want to make sure.....

Namdrol said:

According to the Sakya masters, ālaya has two aspects -- its ultimate truth aspect is the dharmadhātu; its relative truth aspect is the ālayavijñāna. Because the ultimate nature of the ālaya is the dharmadhātu, nirvana is possible. Because the relative truth aspect of the ālaya is ālayavijñāna, samsara is possible. Since the two truths are inseparable, samsara and nirvana are inseparable.

N

Huifeng said:

Hi Namdrol,

Is this like the Mahayanasamgraha position? (Assuming that the Samgraha exists in Tibetan.)

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so. Asanga is a realist, at least in his presentation in this text. (yes, btw).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Aemilius said:

Michael Cremo...

Malcolm wrote:

...is an avowed Vedic creationist and nothing he says about archaeology and human origins can be taken seriously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Pero said:

I still have some issues though... Like, didn't Sapan then receive the transmission of chili as well? Why would he bother to receive the alternate transmission and then pass it on if it doesn't matter?

Malcolm wrote:

While ChNN says the Sakyapas passed on the chili tradition, I have never seen such an initiation text or seen any mention of it in Khon Kilaya commentaries. Of course, what exists is not confined to what I have or have not seen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

username said:

Sassure, Levi Strauss & Chomsky, though great, are basically limited in being synchronic...

Malcolm wrote:

No, Sausurre was the one who pointed out the difference between synchrony and diachrony and elaborated the rules which govern diachronic phonetic shifts.

username said:

Also the story of how Sakya Pandita was a Sanskrit expert, overheard the guy and went to correct him. The guy said OK, you are Sakya Pandita. Did the correct Kili mantra and touched his phurba to a stone and finished and SP was happy but he was not. Then he redid it in his own way with chili and touched the phurba and it went right through the rock and said I do it my old way. SP realized this was a mahasiddha and had him transmit it to others too.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this story is famous. But I suspect it is just a didactic story.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 5:56 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

GesarMukpo said:

I always use the Sanskrit pronunciation where I know the Tibetan take is very different. They way you pronounce the mantra doesn't really make a difference, feeling bad about

it does though.....

heart said:

Good point! Fear, doubt and uncertainty is what destroys all kind of Vajrayana practice. Personally I don't care about Sanskrit or Tibetan and I am not even sure the power of mantra is in the particular combination of vowels and consonants.

I think someone told me a long time ago that Sanskrit probably never was a spoken language, is that not true?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Sanskrit was the lingua franca of educated people. Saying that Sanskrit was never spoken is like saying that Latin was never spoken.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 5:43 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

And why would they universally pick "kh" of all sounds to substitute for "sh"? It doesn't even sound remotely similar.

Namdrol said:

They did not "pick" it, anymore than Chinese decided they could not say "r" or Japanese, "l". It is a linguistic limitation inherent in their speech patterns. I am sure a professional linguist can explain this phenomena.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Haha, I don't get the Chinese difficulty with pronouncing the "r" sound in English words either. Well, I do when it comes to speakers of Chinese dialects that don't feature the sound.. But some prominent Chinese dialects have a definite "ar" sound, yet I've heard speakers of those dialects say "lice" instead of rice. At least with Japanese, I don't believe any dialect has an "L" sound. I guess a linguist expert in Tibetan would be necessary to help me understand why Tibetans naturally pronounce "kh" in this instance instead of "sh". I mean, for instance, Spanish doesn't contain a "sh" sound, generally speaking, so when native speakers who don't know how to pronounce "sh" say English words with that sound, they generally opt for the closest sound to it that they do know - "ch". Now THAT makes sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

I have tested this Tibetans, btw. It is only with very conscious effort that they can pronounce a sibilant correctly in the middle of a Sanskrit word. This issue is not as

prevalent among Tibetans that are bilingual in Hindi. In this case, their preference for fricatives is learned, rather than innate.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 5:39 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

And why would they universally pick "kh" of all sounds to substitute for "sh"? It doesn't even sound remotely similar.

Namdrol said:

They did not "pick" it, anymore than Chinese decided they could not say "r" or Japanese, "l". It is a linguistic limitation inherent in their speech patterns. I am sure a professional linguist can explain this phenomena.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Haha, I don't get the Chinese difficulty with pronouncing the "r" sound in English words either. Well, I do when it comes to speakers of Chinese dialects that don't feature the sound.. But some prominent Chinese dialects have a definite "ar" sound, yet I've heard speakers of those dialects say "lice" instead of rice. At least with Japanese, I don't believe any dialect has an "L" sound. I guess a linguist expert in Tibetan would be necessary to help me understand why Tibetans naturally pronounce "kh" in this instance instead of "sh". I mean, for instance, Spanish doesn't contain a "sh" sound, generally speaking, so when native speakers who don't know how to pronounce "sh" say English words with that sound, they generally opt for the closest sound to it that they do know - "ch". Now THAT makes sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Another thing Tibetans cannot pronounce is "hri" without a sibilant. They always say "shri".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 5:26 PM

Title: Re: Chulen

Content:

Virgo said:

<http://www.siddhienergetics.com/products/chulen>

I know these pills are connected with specific practices. Can people take these pills for health/energy reasons alone, without doing them in conjunction with any specific

practice or initiation?

Kavin

Malcolm wrote:

You can, but that is missing the point, a bit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 5:06 PM

Title: Re: Spirit possession and/or harrassment

Content:

himalayanspirit said:

I lack attention and my will power is quite weak. I am usually not able to sustain interest in worldly affairs - job, study etc.

Am I being possessed by a spirit?

Will reciting the Amitabha name ward off the spirits?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

You should go to a Tibetan astrologer or have a divination done for example, by Lama Dawa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 5:03 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

If Tibetans have no difficulty pronouncing Tibetan words like "tashi" or "geshe", how is it they have trouble saying "kosha" or "Bhaisahjye"? And why would they universally pick "kh" of all sounds to substitute for "sh"? It doesn't even sound remotely similar.

Namdrol said:

bkra shis is two words. So is dge shes.

We pronounce them as a two syllable word, Tibetans pronounce them as two one syllable words, which in fact they are.

Pema Rigdzin said:

I'm not sure I understand. I've heard Tibetans say these words millions of times and both syllables run together as if they were one two syllable word.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not hearing these words as a native Tibetan speaker would.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 5:02 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

And why would they universally pick "kh" of all sounds to substitute for "sh"? It doesn't even sound remotely similar.

Malcolm wrote:

They did not "pick" it, anymore than Chinese decided they could not say "r" or Japanese, "l". It is a linguistic limitation inherent in their speech patterns. I am sure a professional linguist can explain this phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 4:59 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

This doesn't seem logical - if they had just transliterated directly (using Tibetan ca cha ja for the same syllables in Sanskrit), it would have been just as effective in differentiating Sanskrit text since tsa tsha dza don't exist in Sanskrit. Why would the early transliterators deliberately complicate things?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the Tibetan ca and Sanskrit ca sound different.

ཅཅཅ are tonal, in descending order. Sanskrit ca cha ja are not tonal, since Sanskrit is not a tonal language (a point Sapan makes very clear). Thonmi Sambhota wanted to make sure that Tibetans who were reading mantras were not to pronounce ca cha ja the same way they were pronouncing ཅཅཅ. This lead to other problems, of course, later on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 4:51 PM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

If Tibetans have no difficulty pronouncing Tibetan words like "tashi" or "geshe", how is it they have trouble saying "kosha" or "Bhaisahjye"? And why would they universally pick "kh" of all sounds to substitute for "sh"? It doesn't even sound remotely similar.

Malcolm wrote:

bkra shis is two words. So is dge shes.

We pronounce them as a two syllable word, Tibetans pronounce them as two one syllable words, which in fact they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Kevin - I'm curious what your opinion is then, for mantras found in earth terma - for example, the sanskrit syllable "ca" will be found in Tibetan as "tsa", so you actually have "tsitta" vs. "citta." should we go back to sanskrit pronunciation in such cases, even though the written terma appeared with Tibetan misspelling of sanskrit words? This is confusing!

Namdrol said:

It is not a Tibetan misspelling.

The Tibetans deliberately employed tsa tsha dza to represent the Sanskrit ca cha and ja to differentiate Sanskrit words from Tibetan words. Thus, we are to understand that tsa tsha dza are to be pronounced ca cha and ja hence ཅེ་ཅེ་ should never be transliterated tsitta into English, it should only be transliterated "citta" since that is what is intended.

N

dakini_boi said:

How would using tsa tsha dza serve to differentiate Sanskrit words from Tibetan? After all, the Tibetan language uses these syllables as well.

If the Sakyapa tradition is to pronounce everything according to Sanskrit, then take the Vajrakilaya mantra - there are three words which in normal transliteration (both Tibetan and Roman) start with B. Do Sakyapas then pronounce these all with V?

Thank you, Namdrol. As usual, your expertise is most appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

Because བཟུང་ are never used in Tibetanizations of Sanskrit words -- never, ever, ever.

Vajra, vighnan bandha. And properly, "v" as in Latin. Wajra wighnan, bandha.

IN prattice, HHST generally uses the Tshang version of Tibetan pronunciation of mantras
i.e. Badzra, bighnan, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Why am I bringing this up? Because of the following central questions:

a.) Where does Dzogchen practised by a person who is neither Buddhist, nor accepts the doctrine of anatman or pratityasamutpada (dependent origination) lead to according to traditional textual sources and living oral tradition? Do such people simply get stuck in formless blissful realms or are they simply wasting their time or do they go to Vajra hells....?

Namdrol said:

At best, rebirth in a nirmanakāya buddhafiield.

N

dakini_boi said:

Why in this case, a nirmanakaya buddhafiield as opposed to dharmakaya or sambhogakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

Because ordinary people can see a nirmankāya, but cannot see a Sambhogakāya, much less the Dharmakāya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 8:13 AM

Title: Re: why did you 'guess' buddhism?

Content:

coldmountain said:

What convinces you that realized Buddhist masters are correct?

Malcolm wrote:

- 1) Dependent origination.
- 2) Emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Chaz said:

You may very well be right, but the anthropologist in me is a bit skeptical of that asertion. Sorry.

Namdrol said:

It's a linguistic certainty.

Chaz said:

Care to cite a study? To assert that a certain group of people over a period of time spanning many centuries said things a certain way, is without some study to back it up, is a bit of reach. So, if you don't mind

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we have a lot of evidence.

One, there is a text by Sakya Pandita that describes very well how Indians in different regions of India such as central India and Kashmir pronounced Sanskrit -- and he was personally acquainted with 30 panditas.

Two, Indians in the described regions still pronounce Sanskrit in the manner in which Sapan says they did 800 years ago.

Three, pronunciation of Sanskrit is a major obsession with Brahmins since the proper pronunciation of the Vedas and vedic rites is considered crucial for their effectiveness. The similarities and (minor) differences in Sanskrit pronunciation between different brahmin traditions in India is well understood and mapped.

Four, changes in pronunciation can be accurately mapped mathematically (and are). I am sure you have encountered structural linguistics. I am not arguing that everything Sausurre said is true, but there are regular rules to phonetic shifts in Indo-europeean lanaguages and nothing in the Indian subcontinent that makes a sibilant ş or ś shift to a fricative kh possible.

The regularity with which Tibetans mispronounce both ş and ś when they are present in the middle of Sanskrit words indicates this is a pronunciation that is not an Indo-

European language issue and instead is a Tibetan linguistic issue -- for example, I have heard Tibetans mispronounce kośa (kosha, mispronounced "kokha") with the same regularity as they mispronounce aṣṭa (saying "akha") or say Bhekhenze for Bhaiṣajye. In other words, mono-lingual Tibetans have a hard time pronouncing sibilants present in the middle of words since in Tibetan there are no sibilants present in the middle of a word. A Tibetan who has no problem pronouncing "bud shing" (firewood, and two separate words) will mispronounce kośa everytime unless they have received specific Sanskrit training.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Kai said:

There is a scholar who almost claimed that China discovered America way before Columbus but we all know that he is not to be taken seriously.

Malcolm wrote:

It is certain, however, that Vikings were present in North America. There is some reason to believe that Irish fisher folks also found their way to the East Coast, and some reason to suppose that Phoenecians may have found their way to S. America.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: ORMUS ?

Content:

Tarpa said:

Thanks, was just curious, I was checking out your link to vimala at siddhi energetics from your medicine blog and then checked out a link from there and stumbled upon this stuff somewhere, never heard of it.

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

Joeseeph is very eclectic, but his Tibetan formulas are well made.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: ORMUS ?

Content:

Tarpa said:

Thanks, was just curious, I was checking out your link to vimala at siddhi energetics from your medicine blog and then checked out a link from there and stumbled upon this stuff somewhere, never heard of it. I was put off by them referring to it as the philosophers stone wich I new was mercury, set off my new age b.s. alarm although the site seems to be based on scientific curiosity as to what this stuff is.

Incidentally Namdrol-la what would you suggest for someone that came down with extreme panic attacks and dissociation all of a sudden, no mental aspect such as fear or worry, purely physiological, and also has digestive probs and lower body heat ? Would agar-35 or vimala be better or something else ? The anxiety/ dissociation started 3 months ago and have almost gone completely other than very occasional mild dissociation/ anxiety wich I credit to increased practice and herbal supplements such as choline / inositol, valerian, and passion flower, and exercise (swimming) and drinking lots of dutsi water, but I have had digestive probs for years and lots of heat in my abdomen area, when I first started practicing meditation I used to get lots of heat in my abdomen area, I developed stomach/ digestive probs a few years later, I don't know if they are connected, I don't experience that when meditating anymore, I only had that problem when meditating for like the first year.

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

Contact me offline.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Chaz said:

You may very well be right, but the anthropologist in me is a bit skeptical of that asertion. Sorry.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a linguistic certainty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Chaz said:

Well, that's certainly possible, but by no means a certainty.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a certainty that no Indian master ever recited Bhaiṣajya as Bhekenze or supoṣyo as Supo kayo. This leaves only Tibetans to mispronounce these mantras and transmit them in that fashion. Which means if the mantra is effective for them in this mispronounced fashion, it is certain that if one receives the transmission and then corrects the pronunciation, it will be as effective.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Pero said:

Do they just simply all work if they're in Sanskrit original or something?

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, the reason why your argument is fallacious is because if you argue that a Tibetan pronunciation of a mantra is effective even though it is incorrect, then there is no fault in reciting mantras properly. Why, because presumably the mantra was communicated to a Tibetan who pronounced kili as chili, there is no logical reason why a mantra transmitted by a Tibetan as chili pronounced kili will not be equally as effective (especially since it is the original pronunciation). You are arguing that it only one way i.e. Tibetans can mispronounce mantras and gain siddhi. But we cannot. This is foolish.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

GesarMukpo said:

Namdrol...when we talked on the phone

Malcolm wrote:

We never talked on the phone. Ever.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: ORMUS ?

Content:

Tarpa said:

What's up with ormus ?

<http://www.futurealchemy.com/wetr.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://www.subtleenergies.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

No clue -- they have nothing to with Tibetan Medicine or Ayurveda. The so called philosopher's stone is mercury. Ofen, the so called "gold transformation elixir" (gser gyur rtsi) is improperly understood. What it really is, is an early process of gold plating, applying gold to copper by mixing that gold with mercury and then evaporating the mercury leaving a very smooth painted gold appearance on the copper.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Namdrol said:

In general, the Sakyapa approach is as Kevin suggested ie. Sanskrit pronunciation of Sanskrit mantras, according to all the Sakya masters I have studied with. No Bazar, Bazar, and so on.

Pero said:

Irrelevant for people who don't have the Sanskrit transmission. Supokayo is supokayo, not suposhyo.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree. Why? Originally the mantra was mispronounced by some Tibetan who got it from an Indian teacher. His teacher said supoşyo, he said Supo kaya. There is absolutely no fault in restoring the proper pronunciation. No blessings are lost, no sacred "power" is lost. In this respect I completely disagree with anyone who says one must recite mantras according to manner in which one's teacher pronounces them if that manner is not consistent with the rules of Sanskrit pronunciation. It is illogical to maintain this position. It is basically an argument for blind faith. In this respect, in my opinion, Sakya Paṇḍita's position is best. Of course people are free to choose what they wish to do.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

Chaz said:

Really? I know several Tibetans personally and they all have the same speech faulties I have. IOW, they can repeat any sound that that I can.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans have a very hard time with "sh" in the middle of words. Hence Bekhandze for Bhaiṣajya. Suṣoṣyo is another example. Other common errors come from Tibetans who have not studied Sanskrit pronouncing Tibeteanzed mantras incorrectly compared to the Sanskrit original. Pemey (as opposed to Padme) comes from the fact that in Tibetan, a consonant following a vowel often modifies "a" to "e".

Chaz said:

It's not a question of the right or wrong way to do it. It's a question of devotion.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the Sakyapa approach is as Kevin suggested ie. Sanskrit pronunciation of Sanskrit mantras, according to all the Sakya masters I have studied with. No Benzar, Bazar, and so on.

I presonally recite things as best I can according to how Sanskrit is pronounced by Varanasi brahmins. I fail of course, but I try.

Not all mantras are in Sanskrit, there are some in Tibetan, and other languages, BTW.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: 100 Syllable Mantra SUPO KAYO ME BHAVA

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Kevin - I'm curious what your opinion is then, for mantras found in earth terma - for example, the sanskrit syllable "ca" will be found in Tibetan as "tsa", so you actually have "tsitta" vs. "citta." should we go back to sanskrit pronunciation in such cases, even though the written terma appeared with Tibetan misspelling of sanskrit words? This is

confusing!

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a Tibetan misspelling.

The Tibetans deliberately employed tsa tsha dza to represent the Sanskrit ca cha and ja to differentiate Sanskrit words from Tibetan words. Thus, we are to understand that tsa tsha dza are to be pronounced ca cha and ja hence ཅེད་ should never be transliterated tsitta into English, it should only be transliterated "citta" since that is what is intended.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Spirit possession and/or harrassment

Content:

pemachophel said:

From the POV of chod, the best way to ward off attacks from spirits is to remain free from hope and fear..

Namdrol said:

Yes and no -- virtually all illnesses have a accompanying demonic component.

gnegirl said:

srsly?

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Awareness.

Content:

White Lotus said:

ha! ha! ha! and yes, i do like to read a lot.

in Rigpa there are no requirements. if the guru says that one must see ones own nature. i tell him...

why are you talking crap.

"spontaneously" complete. ordinary mind is enlightenment.

best wishes, Tom.

Sönam said:

Ordinary mind is sems, not rigpa ... at best your view is a yogacara view.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

I think he means "tha mal gyi shes pa".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2011 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Spirit possession and/or harrassment

Content:

pemachophel said:

From the POV of chod, the best way to ward off attacks from spirits is to remain free from hope and fear..

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and no -- virtually all illnesses have a accompanying demonic component.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2011 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Spirit possession and/or harrassment

Content:

Jotham said:

I came across this episode in the book "A Saint in Seattle" where the late Dezheng Rinpoche recognized that a girl was possessed and harrassed by a spirit. My questions are:

(a) How do we recognize that a person is possessed and/or harrassed by spirits and not mental problem (like hallucination)?

(b) What should or can we do to ward off or chase off these spirits?

Malcolm wrote:

As for (a), (a) can be both. People who have mental illness are more liable to spirit attacks; people suffering from spirit attacks are more liable to have mental illness as a result.

Second, for ordinary people, Tibetan astrology is the best method for recognizing what type of spirit and the required rite for driving it off.

One simple thing one can do is burn guggulu in one's house. One can do a so called "gegs tor" rite usually found in the beginning of a sadhana, especially nyingma sadhanas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2011 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Why combine Dzogchen and Mahamudra?

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

I was actually thinking of what is commonly referred to as "essence Mahamudra" and which is pretty widely considered more or less equivalent to Dzogchen's tregchod.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Four yogas = four samadhis (sems sde) = tregchö (man ngag sde).

Essence mahāmudra is completely different. It is basically a cig car method of sudden awakening. It is equivalent to direct introduction.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2011 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: God speaks about Rick Perry

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

God needs a little remedial grammar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2011 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Why combine Dzogchen and Mahamudra?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Nobody responded to me, so you probably don't care, but, I went ahead and got that Practice of Mahamudra book. \$6.50. I guess I'll do the practices if I feel like it without any connection to the lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

That would be a mistake. In order to practice this system of mahāmudra (five fold mahāmudra) you need to have the initiation of Cakrasamvara. And thsi system really stresses guru devotion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2011 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Vatta and depression?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When treating any disease one must treat all three doshas. If one is out of balance, by necessity so too will the others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2011 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Vatta and depression?

Content:

Virgo said:

Hi, I've suffered from vatta imbalances for most of my life. I've taken a number of measures to help balance it including massage oil, which was an excellent recommendation. My question is my vatta has usually manifested as nervousness, agitation, lethargy and fatigue when I expend too much energy and physical problems such as stiffness, dryness, aches, headaches, spinal discomfort, and very brittle bones, also irregularity of breathing. Sadness and depression have never really been an issue with me, save for a few months when I was about 15 or 16. Sometimes my outlook can be a little negative or dismal, at times. Sometimes I don't have a lot of "get up and go" and lack some enthusiasm for making money and stuff like that. I could be totally wrong but I usually right it off as a lack of ojas because of constitution, diet and lifestyle. Is this is what is meant by sadness or depression in vatta imbalances because I am sure I have had vatta, but do not experience "depression" per say? What I am asking is, if I have vatta how come I am not depressed, or does my slight lack of get up and go, nervousness and so forth, sometimes slightly dismal attitude, count as "depression"? I mean, I do smile a lot.

Thank you,

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

From a Tibetan medical point of view there are many reasons for depression, not just vata.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2011 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: "Mahamudra and Related Instructions," Peter Roberts

Content:

conebeckham said:

The "Lac Liquid" is, I think, a special sort of liquid, which is not really something available to us.....some Tantras talk of creating this special "salve" or substance.....I believe that's what's being discussed, though I don't have the book in front of me. I'd bet Namdrol could clarify this further.

Malcolm wrote:

Lac is the secretion of an insect that lives on the bark of Kerria lacca tree that is used in making red lacquer.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2011 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Site validation ...

Content:

Sönarn said:

I receive to day Rinchen Mangjor pills ... is there any counter-indications regarding age and previous embolism manifestation ... and others heart fragilities.

thank you in advance

Sönarn

Malcolm wrote:

Only use them twice a month at most.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Awareness.

Content:

White Lotus said:

nothing needed, naturally spontaneously complete... merits? you are too kind Sonam. rigpa may be entered with the mind seal already attained. no need for a mind seal. the mahamudra is not needed.

Kalden, it is not a matter of awareness... awareness is cool, but completely unnecessary when it is absent, eg in deep sleep, or day dreaming. the natural state is sometimes aware, sometimes not aware. just naturally as you are.

no need for talk of no mind, no self, nothingness or emptiness. you may have the seal of emptiness, you may know your own nature. these things are not necessary. the natural state is spontaneously complete.

when you taste the natural state it radiates, no need to taste the natural state. naturally complete just as you are naturally so. so when you worry, then you worry. when you are sad you are sad, suffering you naturally suffer. all complete.

best wishes, Tom.

Malcolm wrote:

When you are full of crap, you are naturally full of crap...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Prayer to be a good kind doctor.

Content:

Calahand said:

Hi , I am going to be a doctor in a few months, I am applying to internal medicine programs, but I don't know if I will get a good residency program that will make me a competent physician... i want to ask people here to please pray for me and my situation, hopefully i can get a good residency and become a competent physician that heals and not just someone who goes through the motions to do a job for the heck of it.

Malcolm wrote:

You should do Medicine Buddha practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

How would this be okay? i guess seeing the essential shakti as empty?

but how is that possible to practice SriVidya sadhana seeing shiva and shakti as empty? This was exactly my point. The questions you raised are exactly those that I have. You took the words out of my mouth. You see, I am trying to put myself in the shoes of a Buddhist and then switch the view and put myself in the shoes of a practitioner of Sanatana Dharma (commonly known in the West as Hinduism).

I want to examine things from all possible angles - or at least as many of them as possible - in order to reach deeper understanding.

Of course, this has its limits. You cannot go on examining till you are old and on the verge of dying. My aim is to do things correctly. I would not like to become some confused, half-baked New Age Buddhist, if I do fully commit to Buddhadharma. Things simply have to fit.

goldenlotus said:

There is something about buddhadharma meditation that attracts me to, i used to practice khadgamala stotram with all the visualisations, nysas, mudras etc. it's a beautiful tradition(with good visions too) but something about buddhist yoga im interested in.

good luck

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha never told brahmins to cease practicing vedic rituals. In fact he encouraged it. But what he said was that vedic ritual was not liberative. he never denied however that it was a mundane benefit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

What fascinates me is also Tibetan Medicine and it was really remarkable to see that Choegyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche is presenting it through the lens of Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Medicine is a Nyingma system, so it is not suprising that it is related to Dzogchen since it contains Dzogchen.

Tibetan Medicine is the only medical system integrated with Vajrayāna.

AilurusFulgens said:

Now, I accomplished the 10,000 recitations in 10 days. And then all these things with Buddhism started

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, your merit ripened.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Tulku Thondup explains about tulkus

Content:

kirtu said:

From the <https://blazing-splendor.blogspot.com/2011/08/what-is-tulku.html>

Malcolm wrote:

You can put your faith in tulks. I will put my faith in practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: The Vajra Guru Mantra of Guru Rinpoche

Content:

narraboth said:

Actually there's no rule saying that you can not chant mantra without initiation, except some special mantra.

Namdrol said:

yes, actually there are.

Dharanis from sutras, however are different.

narraboth said:

depends on what you mean for 'sutras'. I think we call Tara tantra 'sutra' in China... no matter what we still chant tare mantra.

Amoghapasa is a tantra, Manjusri root tantra is a tantra, they are all huge texts, and many other 'tantras'...

People, especially chinese buddhists, chant many of them without even LUNG, and there are many signs of 'siddhis'.

Yes, there is a line saying 'without initiation, getting siddhi is like pressing oil from sands'. but I don't think it can be understood as you won't be benefited by simply reciting mani, tare tu tare, vajra guru, arapachana.... at least i haven't heard any tibetan lama suggested that. (Tibetan themselves don't worry this)

Most of lama indicate that so-called practice in that saying is strictly tantric practice such as two stages. A senior Gelug-Nyingma master said as long as you don't do self generation, you can visualise dieties in front and chant mantra, it's not a problem that you haven't got initiation. There are also many similar teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

The mani is a dharani, so here is a sutra system for chanting it. Arapacana is also from sutra.

The tantras you are mentioning are so called "kalpa" tantras, sections of sutra that are also classfied as kriya tantra, so again, no contradiction. Most of the mantras that Chinese people are chanting are from sutra or dharani texts. Many of these were also translated from Chinese into Tibetan.

But this will not work with Vajrakilaya, etc. You must have the transmission.

Medicine Buddha, Tara, etc., kriya deities from the Buddha and Lotus families may not require intiation (but that depends too), but mantras from the Vajra family of Kriya tantra

definitely require initiation since they are connected with controlling Guhyakas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: The Vajra Guru Mantra of Guru Rinpoche

Content:

narraboth said:

Actually there's no rule saying that you can not chant mantra without initiation, except some special mantra.

Malcolm wrote:

yes, actually there are.

Dharanis from sutras, however are different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Ālaya in Sakya

Content:

Kai said:

Sūtra inseparability of samsara and nirvana may be found in the Heart Sūtra. The tantric view of inseparability of samsara and nirvana may be found in the Hevajra tantra.

What does you mean? There is a distinctive difference between the tantric view of inseparability and the Sutric view of inseparability?

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is one of method, not view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2011 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Ālaya in Sakya

Content:

Kai said:

So ultimate alaya = Tathāgatagarbha?

I just want to make sure.....

Malcolm wrote:

Inseparability = tathāgatagarbha.

According to the Sakya masters, ālaya has two aspects -- its ultimate truth aspect is the dharmadhātu; its relative truth aspect is the ālayavijñāna. Because the ultimate nature

of the ālaya is the dharmadhātu, nirvana is possible. Because the relative truth aspect of the ālaya is ālayavijñāna, samsara is possible. Since the two truths are inseparable, samsara and nirvana are inseparable.

Hence the special Sakya view is well known as 'khor 'das dbyer med, the inseparability of samsara and nirvana. Sūtra inseparability of samsara and nirvana may be found in the Heart Sūtra. The tantric view of inseparability of samsara and nirvana may be found in the Hevajra tantra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Initially I was not drawn to Buddhism at all. But what draws me to Buddhism now?

Malcolm wrote:

From our point of view, the ripening of merit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 10:39 PM

Title: Ālaya in Sakya

Content:

Kai said:

Alaya being the neutral ground of both Samara and Nirvana while Buddha nature, the clarity aspect of Alaya, hold the potential for sentinel beings to reach Nirvana while the alaya consciousness, dull aspect of Alaya, traps all beings within the grasp of Samara.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not how the Sakya master formulate their idea of the ālaya.

Following Sakya Pandita, Gorampa, in the first section of his three vows commentary, very clearly shows that clarity cannot be tathāgatagarbha since it is conditioned; and emptiness cannot be tathāgatagarbha, since it is the extreme of cessation.

Tathāgatagarbha, according to the standard, orthodox Sakya view is the inseparability of clarity and emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: The Vajra Guru Mantra of Guru Rinpoche

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Would this merely lead the practitioner to a qualified teacher...?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Very interesting.

I am asking all this, because of a particular interest in some Shaiva tantric teachings connected with kayasadhana.

Still in one of these Tantras it is mentioned that without having bhakti towards Shiva his Grace cannot descend and grant the siddhi in these particular sadhanas.

Is bhakti towards Shiva incompatible with simultaneously taking refuge in the Buddha as a practitioner of Vajrayana? Keeping again in my mind the adherence also to all other elements of Buddhadharma i.e. the anatman-doctrine, dependent origination, etc.

A. Fulgens

Malcolm wrote:

It is all about refuge. If your refuge is Buddha Dharma and Sangha, worldly deities like Shiva can assist one, but they cannot be refuges.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

This is highly interesting. Could you please tell me more about Shiva being converted to

Dharma by Avalokiteshvara?

Malcolm wrote:

The account is given in the Karandavyuha sūtra.

AilurusFulgens said:

What would Shiva now be from the viewpoint of Vajrayana? A Boddhisattva? Or something like the converted Tibetan deities turned dharmapalas by Padmasambhava?

Malcolm wrote:

Shiva is a Nyingma dharmapāla.

AilurusFulgens said:

I do not want to appear as obnoxious or pedantic, but if a Vajrayana practitioner (sic!) decides to receive a formal initiation or diksha (including bahiryaga in the form of worshipping a yantra, reciting a mantra, etc. as well as antaryaga in the form of inner kriyas involving breath, chakras, visualizations, etc.) into a complex of Tantric teachings such as the Sri Vidya cult from an orthodox Brahmin Guru from south India, while adhering strictly to the notions of anatman, dependent origination, 4 noble truths, etc., then this would be perfectly O.K.?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, IMO. Don't much see the point, but on the other hand, I am very interested to learn Yoga from a guy named Shrivatsa Ramaswami, and part of his program involves vedic chanting, etc. Don't know if I will ever have time or money, but he is someone I have a lot of natural confidence in.

AilurusFulgens said:

Would this be valid even in the case of a Dzogchenpa (given that he belongs to the highest yana)?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, IMO.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: The Vajra Guru Mantra of Guru Rinpoche

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Would it be pointless for me to recite the vajra guru mantra without initiation? Pointless as in little benefit.

Malcolm wrote:

If you have faith in Guru Rinpoche, you can recite it without initiation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: The Vajra Guru Mantra of Guru Rinpoche

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Your help is much appreciated, Namdrol, thank you. Please forgive me, if my questions appear somewhat odd, but I would have one additional query.

I do not want to descend into any miracle mongering or anything similar, but I do have a genuine interest in clarifying certain things.

Do in Tibetan Vajrayana exist teachings, which would make it possible to cause Padmasambhava to appear to a sufficiently accomplished practitioner not only in dreams or a meditative vision, but physically and materially in his svarupa (i.e. not under any disguise such as an old farmer, etc.)?

A. Fulgens

Malcolm wrote:

Padmsambhava made a commitment to physically visit anyone who recited his mantra or prayer every tenth day of the waxing moon. Whether you can see him or not depends on your level of obscuration.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Please forgive me my ignorance, but is a nirmanakaya buddhafiield something like a terrestrial pure land i.e. Shambhala, Copper Mountain, etc.? How is a nirmanakaya buddhafiield defined?

Malcolm wrote:

More like Amitabha's Sukhavati.

AilurusFulgens said:

I would have a further question and this time the situation is reversed. What would

happen to a Buddhist who would study Hindu Tantric teachings? Would this even be possible?

Providing of course that he stays Buddhist (this is the situation I am speaking about), how would the practice of Hindu Tantric teachings influence his meditation, inner practice, samayas, etc.?

A. Fulgens

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist can study and practice Hindu tantra (or vedas, etc., as long as it is not at expense of Buddhist training). They may not take refuge on Hindu deities however. In other words there is nothing wrong with chanting Namoh Shivaya at a kirtan as long as you are not going for refuge. On the other hand, Shiva was converted to Dharma by Avalokiteshvara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: The Vajra Guru Mantra of Guru Rinpoche

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Thank you, Namdrol for the clarification. Still at least partially the question remains i.e. let us say that your average Joe Sixpack decides one morning to sit down and commit to reciting the Vajra Guru Mantra, that he simply got from the internet and without being initiated into it, 600 million times with as much devotion as he can muster.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if he did this, it would be certain that in the due course of time he would meet a qualified teacher.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: The Vajra Guru Mantra of Guru Rinpoche

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

[Now, this would then presuppose that the above mentioned Bhutanese adept received an initiation in the Vajra Guru Mantra from someone qualified somewhere at sometime in his life.

Malcolm wrote:

From your website:

Finally, he listened to some masters' advice and decided to start reciting the Vajra Guru mantra (OM AH HUNG BENZA GURU PADMA SIDDHI HUNG)

Yes. And it is impossible that this would not happen in a country such as Bhutan where Guru Rinpoche is taught to children when they are infants.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Padmasambhava as the incarnation of Amitabha?

Content:

Nosta said:

Accordingly to buddhism, after Shakyamuni the next Buddha will be Maytreya, so i dint understand how Padmasambhava could be a incarnation of Amitabha. Can someone explain me this paradox?

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahāhyāna, there is a distinction between supreme nirmankāyas, such as Śākyamuni, and so called "variegated" nirmanakāyas such as Padmasambhava, Garab Dorje and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Padmasambhava as the incarnation of Amitabha?

Content:

Ryoto said:

Is this the view of all Tibetan schools? How was he come to thought of as that incarnation?

Malcolm wrote:

As to question one: yes.

As to question two, Amitabha is the master of the family of the lotus family. Padmasambhava is regarded as an emanation, a nirmanakāya. Therefore, his Sambhogakāya manifestation is Avaokiteshvara and his Dharmakāya manifestation is Amitabha, just as for example, Śākyamuni's family is the tathāgata family, his dharmakāya manifestation is Samantabhadra and his Sambhogakāya manifestation is Vairocana.

As for Padmasambhava, this is an idea that comes from the treasure tradition. I don't think I have seen an early pre-treasure tradition text that makes this claim.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and other traditions

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Why am I bringing this up? Because of the following central questions:

a.) Where does Dzogchen practised by a person who is neither Buddhist, nor accepts the doctrine of anatman or pratityasamutpada (dependent origination) lead to according to traditional textual sources and living oral tradition? Do such people simply get stuck in formless blissful realms or are they simply wasting their time or do they go to Vajra hells....?

Malcolm wrote:

At best, rebirth in a nirmanakāya buddhafiield.

AilurusFulgens said:

Now, do the Bonpos have the notions of anatman, pratityasamutpada (dependent origination), etc.? I mean the core notions, without which Buddhadharma is not Buddhadharma. If so, then there is no contradiction.

Malcolm wrote:

The Bonpos have Madhyamaka, a version of dependent origination and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: The Vajra Guru Mantra of Guru Rinpoche

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

a nityasiddha mantra i.e. "eternally or inherently perfect" and can yield the highest mantrasiddhi even to a person, who has not been initiated into it, but chants it devoutly?

Malcolm wrote:

This concept does not exist in Vajrayāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2011 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Astus said:

I'd argue that "small beings" and microorganisms are not the same thing. Tiny insects are one thing, bacteria are another, and the second type of beings are not filtered by a simple cloth. It's also problematic to call bacteria "sentient beings" from a Buddhist point of view.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Microorganism> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Small animals, so called "micro-animals, are included within the category of microorganism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2011 at 7:32 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

devilyoudont said:

Thanks. Was it the Buddha himself who instituted this practice? While it's unquestionably hygienic for the drinker, I'm not sure how effectively this would save the lives of even those microorganisms that can be filtered out with a cloth strainer. Was the cloth washed in a lake or stream before drying out in order to release these animalcules back into their native environment?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it was the Buddha himself who instituted the practice. It was also a practice followed by other ascetics at the time. I am sure you can read about in a Vinaya commentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2011 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Studying Nyingma

Content:

sangyey said:

How about Abhidharma study/texts/books? Does anyone have any recommendations for Abhidharma study within the Nyingma Lineage?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you can take my abhidharma course online here:

<http://rsl-ne.com/abhidharma1.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2011 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Awareness.

Content:

White Lotus said:

just be in the natural state, no worries about theories and concepts. nothing to worry about.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with sentient beings is that their natural state is afflicted.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2011 at 8:04 AM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

devilyoudont said:

Also, when he was talking about sentient beings in the water, wasn't the Buddha referring to the perspective of interdependence in which phenomena are reflected in each other?

Malcolm wrote:

No, he was talking about microorganisms -- which is why part of the gear issued to Buddhist monks back in the day was a special fine cloth which acted as a water filter.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2011 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: ChNN's Vajra Armour teaching

Content:

Fa Dao said:

My book from DC came today!!! woo hoo!! I have a question though...the part of the mantra that has "Tadyatha", the book says this may be omitted due to the mantra only supposed to have 30 syllables, but is somewhat ambiguous on this point...any suggestions from those who have heard and practiced the teaching directly from ChNNR?

Malcolm wrote:

just say tadyatha...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2011 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

when I read in the paper that he made death threats during a murder trial

Malcolm wrote:

You believe everything you read in newspapers?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2011 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Why combine Dzogchen and Mahamudra?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Ok sorry. I was intending it to be a serious post. Its one of those situations where I'm trying to be serious and it draws laughter. That makes me feel a little stupid. Please tell me what is so funny so I can laugh too.

Malcolm wrote:

I imagine it was this:

Because Togal has its own stages and explanations so if you practice Mahamudra like I have described and then go practice Togal it is like going backwards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2011 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

The rumor mills aren't exaggerating news items and arrest reports, his actual book titles and claims, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the way I see it, they actually are exaggerating the news items, the arrest reports and so on, trying to show those records in the worst possible light, and going to a lot of effort to dig up trash about one guy and publishing a lot of hearsay about him, some of which may actually be libelous.

We only really have their story here. We do not have Cassidy's side of the story, do we? That is why I am saying that you are taking a side since you are only taking one source for your information.

As I see it, there is nothing particularly wrong with writing a book about knife-fighting techniques. Not to my taste, but not illegal. Certainly I know a lot of Buddhists (including famous contemporary teachers) that are totally into weapons -- guns, knives, swords, you name it.

Basically, how Buddhist is it to put someone in jail? Bodhisattvas are supposed to free people from shackles, not place them in shackles. Bodhisattvas should exercise patience and restraint, not engage in systematic group smear campaigns.

In other words, I said he has some interesting things to say on his blog -- you come back with all this heavy stuff about why this is terrible. If Cassidy was just some schmuck claiming to be a tulku and writing a blog, we wouldn't give any of this a second thought -- it would be at best a minor disagreement. But because he has a record, and he tangled with a wealthy religious organization, he is being screwed to the wall, and this is taking on much more of a life than it really deserves. Hell, G Gordon Liddy has interesting things to say sometimes (not often these days), and he makes Cassidy look like a cub scout.

And this is a free speech issue, that is why the EFF has gotten involved.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

My responses about Cassidy's character have been purely related to the notion that his blog is worth reading. He has a violent, criminal history...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think the situation between him and his ex-wife is nearly as cut and dry as you claim. He was convicted of a crime for which he did not plead guilty. He entered an Alford plea.

Whether you like it or not, you are taking a side.

As far as E-Sangha goes, there are numerous people I know who used sock puppets for various reasons on E-Sangha who post here on Dharma Wheel. The only thing I can say about Cassidy is that when his ip was banned, he did not push it. He let it go with only minor complaints on his blog.

I have a dispassionate view about this. No one is better than anyone else. Everyone has done something frak up, either in this life or another. Cassidy has an army of people who hate him and talk shit about him. So, his karma sucks, he has pissed off a lot of people, seems to have a talent for it, and nevertheless, his blog is still of interest and has he interesting things to say, also boring things to say too. It is not like everything he ever wrote is fantastic.

He is a Buddhist outlaw, perhaps that is why I have a bit sympathy for him. He is also in poor health, in jail, and has a bad ticker.

And having been on the recieving end of quite a bit of vicious gossip myself, I know how easily rumor mongers stir up shit on the internet and how much of the rumor is complete fantasy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Why combine Dzogchen and Mahamudra?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

...because combining them necessarily mean one has to view Mahamudra as semde or as tregcho. This view is based on incomplete knowledge of Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case.

Gampopa's Mahamudra system can be regarded as an adaptation of sems sde, but that does not include all possible variations on Mahāmudra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism (Vajrayana) : Will it stick ?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

But the tradition in the Kalachakra across lineages is that the Kalachakra can be given to masses of people at once.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

This is a recent tradition, begun by the ninth Panchen Lama.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 7:42 PM

Title: We are/are not what we eat.

Content:

Karma Yeshe said:

So in most ways what we eat is not all that important. With the exception of calorie restriction which may have some impact the whole concept of "we are what we eat" is nonsense.

Malcolm wrote:

Thinking like this is responsible for many diseases that people have, which they could easily avoid.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

Anyone embroiled in this kind of nonsense is a person whose opinion is not worth a fart in a whirlwind, imo.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not mean it is proper that someone is locked up for a flame war.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

deepbluehum said:

So the tulku system is nonsense except for the case of Norbu Rinpoche? So there must be real reincarnated masters aside from him too. Or he is lying.

Namdrol said:

The only tulkus I take seriously are self-recognized tulkus. The rest is just a politics and

money game.

N

Dhondrub said:

I am sorry?! The internet is full of self recognized Tulkus and most of them are just frauds. N Norbu Rinpoche was recognized as a Tulku and later empirically as you say convinced himself that he is actually that Tulku. So if he is right the Lama who recognized him in the first place was also right, or am i missing anything?

Malcolm wrote:

The lama who first recognized him as the incarnation of Adzom Drugpa was his uncle, who achieved rainbow body. As I pointed out, he was also recognized as the reincarnation of a Sakya Lama. My point was that NNR did not accept it until he had some proof for himself. That makes him a self-recognized tulku because he is the reincarnation of Adzom Drugpa and not the reincarnation of a Sakya Lama.

Dhondrub said:

But to say only self proclaimed is real is putting things upside down.

Malcolm wrote:

The first official tulku in Tibetan history was self-recognized i.e. the Second Karmapa, although a case could be also made for Guru Chowang, or even a little earlier, Yuthog Yontan Gonpo who stated in the early 13th century to his main disciple, Sumton Yeshe Zung, that he was the reincarnation of Padmasambhava, Virupa, Srongtsen Gampo and Gampopa, among others.

But my famous opinion of the tulku system is off topic here.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

Apparently the FBI and the local police feel differently.

Malcolm wrote:

Good thing the issue of who has and who has not committed a crime is not up the FBI or the police.

Whether someone has or has not committed a crime is something that is up to the courts to decide. However, sometimes, for reasons impenetrable to others, people plead guilty to crimes they did not commit. Often, in the US, they are convicted for crimes they did not commit, while others, who are committing crimes, go unpunished,

due to reasons of status, money, power, or race.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

kirtu said:

It's the recognition and institutionalization that you don't accept.

Malcolm wrote:

It's the politics and money game I don't accept. That is the part of the dry rot that is infesting Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 9:09 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

deepbluehum said:

So the tulku system is nonsense except for the case of Norbu Rinpoche? So there must be real reincarnated masters aside from him too. Or he is lying.

Malcolm wrote:

The only tulkus I take seriously are self-recognized tulkus. The rest is just a politics and money game.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

I'm pretty sure it was more than a mere flame war.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you should feel confident in your superior knowledge of the situation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

Cassidy should totally use the defense of "that was my little sister! sorry about that!" just like the rest of the demented trolls say when they get caught.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that is was a stupid flame war. Not worth prosecuting, not worth investigating, not worth the bits the NYT spend on posting the article. Not even worth discussing here.

People say stupid shit in flamewars all the time. The protecting nyingma people embarassed the shit out of themselves for aggressively pursuing the idea that dried shit zen was cassidy. He wasn't. He was some poor bastard in Oregon that got caught in the crossfire when the KPC people aggressivley targeted him for being cassidy.

The basic point is that nobody in this story was very nice to one another. And I don't really take the claims of the protecting nyingma folks at face value as being completely credible. The difference is however that one person has spent six months in jail without committing any crime I can perceive.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

Namdrol, I was wondering if your apparent siding with Cassidy on this might have something to do with the global ire you've received in the past. Apparently people were so pissed off with the way you and the other mods ran E-Sangha that it was hacked beyond repair and there are still plenty of places where you can read people bitching about your censorship and your attitude in general. That must kinda suck. (edit: I'm not criticizing you, in case that sounds like I am; I was just brief in describing the charges they bring against you in the "court of public opinion.")

Malcolm wrote:

They bitched, they then created their own forums, and then proceeded to ban everybody we banned. Lesson learned.

padma norbu said:

Sorry to hear that you have no faith in the tulku system at all, apparently (?).

Is it wrong for me to interpret thusly (?): anyone who doesn't believe that tulkus are reincarnations is basically saying a lot of great lamas are lying. ???

Malcolm wrote:

They are satisfying the requirements of a cultural institution. Then there is the dog tooth relic story.

Padma Norbu said:

Namkhai Norbu is recognized as a tulku and in his relationship with his son/former uncle, he doesn't suggest otherwise. I have heard him laugh about how he recognized objects as a child or whatever and says "I don't know," but IMO this is skillful means.

Malcolm wrote:

I would take Norbu Rinpoche seriously. He did not believe he was the reincarnation of Adzom Drugpa for many years. He only accepted it when he had something like empirical proof -- i.e. he wrote a text. When he read Adzom Drugpa's collected works, he found the same text, more or less the same, for over a hundred pages in length. Then he decided he was actually the reincarnation of Adzom Drugpa. He is also recognized as the reincarnation of a completely different Sakya Lama.

I don't take tulku recognitions seriously, at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Namdrol said:

<http://volokh.com/2011/08/27/federal-government-prosecuting-man-for-writing-many-insulting-tweets-and-blog-posts-about-religious-leader/>

Considering that the supreme court recently ruled that a man making death threats against Obama could not be jailed because the threats were not credible, and therefore covered under free speech protections, I don't think the prosecution in Maryland has a chance of landing this, especially since the EFF is involved. And they have deep pockets.

N

Padma Norbu said:

I am genuinely surprised that you:

1. seem to be happy about the idea that this man, whom police have already traced a HUGE amount of harassment from as (directly to his computer), will likely get off and get back to his blog, which you will then be pleased as punch to read again.

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to me that the parties involved were mutually harassing one another. As far as I am concerned it was just a twitter flame war. In my 17 years on the internet, I have seen far worse from Buddhists.

padma norbu said:

Is not going to jail the yardstick by which you're measuring behavior? Because I'm pretty sure the writers at Protecting Nyingma will never even get arrested.

Malcolm wrote:

Arrests do not equal guilt in our judicial system.

padma norbu said:

I'm sure if I pressed you on this, you'd say that you believe tulkus are genuine reincarnations...

Malcolm wrote:

You'd be wrong...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

conebeckham said:

Is this Shavaripa the same as "Shawaripa," the Mahasiddha, the author of the famous prayer to Six Armed Mahakala?

Malcolm wrote:

Hard to know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Mind of Definite Emergence

Content:

Namdrol said:

What you wish to give up is suffering. Wishing to give up suffering and being free from desire, hatred and confusion are two different things entirely.

N

wayland said:

I think I see what you mean Namdrol, if you mean that 'wishing to give up suffering' is aspirational and 'being free from the three poisons' is the result. They certainly are two entirely different things.

Regarding the aspirational aspect of "nges 'byung", you wrote earlier: It is necessary to have a mind that has given up attachment to samsara in order to practice tantra, otherwise, there is no point.

To what extent would this mind have needed to give up attachment?

I'm thinking that if it's not given up enough, then it's going to slide right back into the trap it wishes to escape from. On the other hand, if it has deeply ascertained suffering within the three poisons and has developed a revulsion towards them it could pass a point where it no longer wishes (or is able) to employ tantric means. Dechen Norbu describes it as "a fight fire with fire situation", which implies that nges 'byung relies on attachment to samsara, to some extent at least.

Is this a fair conclusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Giving up attachment to samsara means that you do not want to take afflictive rebirth here anymore. If you practice tantra, it is because you realize that afflictions are too strong to make the path of renunciation of sense objects feasible, since instead you work with sense objects on the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

Namdrol said:

First of all "mind" here is short for "awakened mind" i.e. bodhicitta or the nature of the mind. It does pervade all of your own appearances. It is an all=creating king because all appearances are constructed by your mind and come from your mind, thus it is a king since it dominates all of this constructive activity. Its nature is inexpressible since it is empty from the very beginning and not established as something ultimately real in its own right.

Acchantika said:

What I am asking is: Is this conclusion a phenomenological or ontological one? Does it concern the plethora of reality as it appears, or "as it is" in non-apparent reality and apparent reality alike?

Because in both cases, the above statement would be true, but mean entirely different things. You seem to express the former, while others express the latter.

It's difficult to express myself without the trappings of dualistic language.

Malcolm wrote:

It is both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Why combine Dzogchen and Mahamudra?

Content:

mindyourmind said:
Why would you need both?

Malcolm wrote:
They are complementary practices.

A similar question is why practice creation and completion stage and Dzogchen?

Again, it is because they are complimentary practices.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2011 at 12:09 AM
Title: Re: Forgiveness?
Content:
Epistemes said:
But what do Buddhists do? Is there no reconciliation, just arising and falling?

Malcolm wrote:
Exchange of self and others.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 8:54 PM
Title: Re: Appearances and mind
Content:
padma norbu said:
Anyone who wants to get a better understanding should buy The Supreme Source and read page 95 (of course, reading everything before that would be a good idea, too, as well as everything after it).

Acchantika said:
Partly what I am trying to understand is how to read that book as not positing that there is an ineffable, non-graspable primordial basis of all existence that is spontaneously self-luminous and the source of dharmakaya, including the mountain and the mind, not simply as concepts, but in the literal sense of sourcing and pervading the entire dimension of reality, hence "The Supreme Source".

Can you suggest anything that would help me put that book in context?

Malcolm wrote:
First of all "mind" here is short for "awakened mind" i.e. bodhicitta or the nature of the mind. It does pervade all of your own appearances. It is an all-creating king because all appearances are constructed by your mind and come from your mind, thus it is a king since it dominates all of this constructive activity. Its nature is inexpressible since it is empty from the very beginning and not established as something ultimately real in

its own right.

Also this book is sems sde class, which means it is commentary on the completion stage of Mahāyoga and does not really stand as an independent tradition. No one attains rainbow body through sems sde alone.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

Namdrol said:

There are two answers to this question in Dzogchen.

a) external phenomena are projections of minds. A mind is capable of projecting an appearance for another mind: classical example, the woman who meditates on herself as a tigress and terrifies her village.

b) external phenomena are a result of causes and conditions; their appearance is a result of traces -- for example, the liquid that has six different appearances according to how it is perceived by beings of the six realms.

Pero said:

Are these two not connected?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily. Actually Dzogchen does not really provide an answer for this question that is not found also in Madhyamaka. The first example is a Yogacara Madhyamaka response. The second is a Sautrantilka Madhyamaka type response.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Painful muscle cramps

Content:

meiji1 said:

How does Tibetan medicine treat sudden painful muscle seizures in the legs (specifically in the adductors)?

Malcolm wrote:

That would depend on your age, condition, constitution, fitness level and so on. You can email me with further details if you like.

In general, massage is probably indicated, and perhaps moxabustion or acupuncture.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Mind of Definite Emergence

Content:

wayland said:

Thanks Dechen,

I was coming at it from a slightly different angle. Let me give an example - say food, there's stuff we like and stuff we don't. If we have a choice we choose the stuff we like. The 'not wanting' the other food must be similar to a renounced mind which does not want desire - perhaps has already seen the drawbacks involved.

How do you get such a mind to start working with something it no longer has any wish for at all? If, on the other hand, it still had some desire, then it would not be the right mind for tantra, as Namdrol has pointed out.

Malcolm wrote:

What you wish to give up is suffering. Wishing to give up suffering and being free from desire, hatred and confusion are two different things entirely.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 8:54 AM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

Acchantika said:

Then the premise of Dzogchen is just the observation that all you ever 'know' is a projection of your mind. But everyone knows this, no? Its perceptual theory. It's called the "epistemological problem" in Western philosophy, i.e, its a problem, not a solution. And conceding as a result of this that nothing can be known beyond the originator of this internal structure (the mind) is called 'solipsism'. Conceding instead that things can be known beyond the mind is called realism, and the only thing I understand about Dzogchen is that it is neither. So what am I missing?

I want to know how the mountain got there. The texts say, "the mountain originates from the mind". Either I read this as a kind of idealist idea, or I read it as a merely perceptual idea. Apparently neither is correct.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two answers to this question in Dzogchen.

a) external phenomena are projections of minds. A mind is capable of projecting an appearance for another mind: classical example, the woman who meditates on herself as a tigress and terrifies her village.

b) external phenomena are a result of causes and conditions; their appearance is a result of traces -- for example, the liquid that has six different appearances according to how it is perceived by beings of the six realms.

As far as the latter is concerned, Longchenpa observes that phenomena are not mental factors, as in yogacara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

Hayagriva said:

The difference between the Dzogchen view(s) and solipsism is something I'm very interested in understanding.

Acchantika said:

I second this.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen does not suggest a) that external objects do not conventionally exist b) that external minds do not conventionally exist. All that it suggests is that appearances are mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Mind of Definite Emergence

Content:

Namdrol said:

both.

wayland said:

Thanks Namdrol. I've also heard that this mind is one of five requisite conditions for a successful outcome within tantra. Would this be correct in your opinion?

Malcolm wrote:

It is necessary to have a mind that has given up attachment to samsara in order to practice tantra, otherwise, there is no point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Mind of Definite Emergence

Content:

Namdrol said:

No. It is an overly literal translation of the Tibetan term "nges 'byung", which is a translation of Sanskrit niḥsaraṇa, which in turn means "riddance".

N

wayland said:

Thanks Namdrol. Does it refer to one who is rid of the poisons or one who genuinely aspires to be?

Malcolm wrote:

both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Infinite lives - How so prior to life on Earth?

Content:

Epistemes said:

Perhaps this should be in another thread - if so, have at it.

I'm confused by the notion that we all have had infinite lives. So, I take this to mean that prior to the existence of life on Earth, we all lived lives as devas and all of those other transcendental, metaphysical beings that I don't know the Buddhist terminology for. Are there categories that I'm missing?

Malcolm wrote:

And bugs, snakes, dogs. frogs. etc. As well as on other planets, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Six Yogas of Naropa

Content:

Pero said:

at that time he told me he doesn't give pointing out at the beginning because many people get confused, like thinking every religion is the same or that everything is one, so he prefers to give it when people have some foundation (in that program it was at level 3).

Adamantine said:

Well he may be right.. I do know of at least one regular devoted student of ChNN who is pretty much a Hindu and thinks this way. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Hell I know devoted students of HHDL that are for all intents and purposes Hindus. Naropa had many Hindu disciples. Sometimes, religion does not matter than much when it comes to Guru devotion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Mind of Definite Emergence

Content:

wayland said:

I'm just looking for definitions of the above. I have an idea that it's about renunciation but is there more to it?

Malcolm wrote:

No. It is an overly literal translation of the Tibetan term "nges 'byung", which is a translation of Sanskrit niḥsaraṇa, which in turn means "riddance".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

But Huifeng, you have to admit that the sutras read as if these gazillions of eons ago all happen in the context of this Jambudvipa (the sub-continent of India).

Huifeng said:

Not necessarily. It depends on which sutras one is referring to. And even then, only some make such references to specific locations (such as Jambudvipa) while others do not. eg. the story of Dharmakara, who became Amitabha.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, many do. And there is no need to restrict ourselves to Mahayana sutras in this respect. Your response therefore does not really address the OP's question. It is a rather religious response -- to wit, "don't worry about the fact that narratives in Mahāyāna sutras contradict empirical scientific data about planet earth and evolution because we can explain our way around it with reference to other world systems...."

A better reply would be "The Indian imagination is prone to exaggeration of cosmic time periods..."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Namdrol said:

I know perfectly well that this is an awesome example of why the whole tulku game ought to be completely abandoned.

kirtu said:

Throwing the baby out with the bathwater. This is, IMHO, not a solution.

Kirt

heart said:

Also, Tibetans will continue to recognize Tulku's no matter what we think about it.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

And they (Tibetans) will continue to admit privately it is all a game of political bullshit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Evolution of humans and Mahayana Buddhism

Content:

himalayanspirit said:

There appears to be some inconsistency between theory of evolution of humans from primates and Mahayana Buddhism. Basically, in Buddhism it takes minimum three 'countless' kalpas to reach Buddhahood. Every sentient requires at least that period of time to reach Buddhahood including our very Buddha Shakyamuni. But did we even exist so long ago?

There are stories of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of many eons ago, but weren't we primates at that time?

What is the explanation of this inconsistency? Is it that when these sutras talk about civilizations many many kalpas ago, they are actually referring to another 'world-cycle' where sentient beings rose and then destroyed?

Huifeng said:

It is not an inconsistency, the problem is one of understanding what Buddhism (Mahayana or otherwise) teaches on the subject.

Add to your formulations that there are multiple worlds, and that there are multiple forms of existence in which living beings can be reborn, some of which entailing lifespans of millions of years.

So, "did we even exist so long ago?" - Yes. Just not necessarily as human beings. Or even on planet earth.

For "weren't we primates at that time?" - Who is this "we"? Maybe some were, but others may have been humans or devas elsewhere.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

But Huifeng, you have to admit that the sutras read as if these gazillions of eons ago all happen in the context of this Jambudvipa (the sub-continent of India).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Offerings and prayers: Authentic Buddhism?

Content:

Epistemes said:

I don't find many of the practices of Mahayana and Vajrayana apparent in my readings of early Buddhism, which is where I'm at right now in my so-called "random reading" and "wild guesses."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are not there in what we in the West like to call "early Buddhism". They came later. This is even acknowledged in the tradition via the hermeneutical device of situating these practices as practices the Buddha taught, which were then kept concealed until later.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Namdrol said:

All I know is that his blog often has things of interest, and her blog is super boring and pretentious.

I also know that after he outed their finances on his blog, they went to war with him, his other sock-puppetry aside.

N

Greg said:

Did he really do that though (out her finances)?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, I saw the spreadsheet myself.

Greg said:

I wish the Times would do some follow up reporting. They don't know what they have with this one - you couldn't make it up.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

daelm said:

i just don't think that it's a zero-sum game, in which if he is a douche, then she is virtuous. it is entirely possible that they can both be douches, for example. and i don't think that arguing for clarity about him somehow exonerates her and the shenanigans that have been conducted either in her name or with her blessing. for the amount of stuff that's since come to light, she's made some pretty serious mistakes. and that was a gift to him, one he's wielded with exemplary persistence for years now, until the recent discovery of all his cast-of-thousands sock puppets, all clustered around one angry man's keyboard.

Malcolm wrote:

All I know is that his blog often has things of interest, and her blog is super boring and pretentious.

I also know that after he outed their finances on his blog, they went to war with him, his

other sock-puppetry aside.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Adamantine said:

...making anonymous death threats via twitter...

Malcolm wrote:

He didn't do that -- no "I am going to kill you" stuff.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Empty Mind

Content:

Acchantika said:

This is not the same as saying they do not exist. The sutras also say that both 'they exist' (eternalism) and 'they do not exist' (nihilism) are wrong views.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhapalita puts it nicely "It's not that we make a claim for the non-existence [of existents], we merely remove claims that existents exist".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Greg said:

And that account sounds a lot like what Bill Schwartz aka "Ryder Japhy" describes happened to him:

<http://www.elephantjournal.com/2010/02/welcome-to-twitter-hell-bill-schwartz/>

Malcolm wrote:

Worth reproducing:

I had just finished reading Tyler Dewar's (@tylerdewar on Twitter) recent interview in Bodhi Magazine with the 17th Karmapa. There was a graph in which His Holiness discussed the importance of sangha [community] as a harmonious coming together. Nalanda West, Seattle, Washington (@NalandaWest), had tweeted a link to the interview, and I re-tweeted it to share with the people who follow my Twitter stream.

Then I asked the question, “What does His Holiness mean?” and people began to chime in to discuss what they thought. Much to my surprise Jetsuma chimed in with “Consistency.” I tweeted back “What do you mean?”...

...and the sh*t storm began. Maybe I missed something, but she called me an asshole and made a snide remark about my heart, which gave her devoted Kunzang Palyul Ling followers the green light to begin attacking me.

I laughed it off and mentioned it in my last Elephant Journal article—“I’m an asshole, but that’s beside the point”—and returned to my daily routine of practice and tweeting Dharma quotes and music during session breaks without giving it a second thought. I had no idea of the Twitter hell I was about to catch.

From the point of my initial exchange with Jetsuma, the attacks escalated from strangers ridiculing the fact that I’m dying of congestive heart failure to a personal threat—“I know people in Chicago”—from one of her devoted followers. I’ve always known that the Nyingma have had issues surrounding Penor Rinpoche recognizing the “actor” Steven Seagal as a tulku, but I had no idea what a pile of sh*t I had stepped into.

Thankfully, Twitter isn’t a message board, and I can block Jetsuma’s followers from seeing my Twitter stream. I’ve had to block only one person who created a shell account to spam my @Replies (Twitter inbox) with threatening messages. Why would a Dharma teacher on Twitter allow her or his followers to behave in such a shameful manner? Perhaps she didn’t know. I haven’t a clue.

Ending on a positive note...Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche (@ponlop) has followed me back; he wasn’t following anyone on Twitter when I wrote my last article. We’ve been exchanging direct messages (private tweets); he enjoyed “Bite Me, Boulder Buddhists” and mentoring me through the process of dying.

Also, Yongey Mingyur Rinpoche (@yongeymingyurrinpoche) is on Twitter now, but has yet to tweet.

What about Twitter hell? My bad; it ended in a tweet. “Founding member Chicago KTC, well regarded over 28 years, will not hesitate to take legal action against anyone stating otherwise here.” And so while we can “drive all blames into ourselves,” as the Lojong slogan goes—and while I remember to be grateful to my “enemies,” who are my greatest teacher—well, Twitter hell turned out to be for those deluded enough to think they could push Bill Schwartz around. Later.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Greg said:

from the guy who signs off "Andrew Wilson," who claims to be an innocent bystander who got mistaken for Cassidy and ended up with a gun in face in the middle of the night.

Malcolm wrote:

Crimes & Tulkus: Poisonous Snakes in Buddhist Robes

Some people have asked me if I'm the "man named Andrew Wilson" that a certain tulku is mentioning on her Web site as having had his house searched by the FBI for evidence relating to the purported crimes of another man named "William Cassidy," aka "Tenpa Rinpoche." I am that Andrew Wilson. But I don't know anything about any cyberstalking crimes by a William Cassidy.

I do know something about being criminally cyberstalked, however, because for almost a whole year two saffron-robed psychopaths stalked me (although I'd blocked them and all their ilk) through various both official and anonymous Twitter accounts and through anonymous hate blogs on which they posted many of my Zen/Taoist "tweets" accompanied by the most outrageously foolish, not to mention slanderous, commentary.

According to these two "Buddhist" stalkers -- a crazy looking lady wearing a crown and too much make-up and a mousy little man in monk's robes -- my Twitter page was actually authored by William Cassidy, and the various different handles and avatars I went through to try to get clear of their relentlessly negative attentions were all William Cassidy's "sock puppets," and my insistence on remaining anonymous behind names like "Akebonojishi" and "Mujinkyo" was all by itself absolute and conclusive proof that I must really be Tenpa Rinpoche trying to pull a fast one on the whole world. It seems not to have occurred to these racketeering co-frauds that my insistence on anonymity was precisely a way of trying to keep the emphasis off my "self" and on what I have to say (about Zen). But logic has never been the strong suit of religious fanatics.

So incensed were the two bizarre and unwholesome Bogus-sattvas by my continued presence on Twitter that last spring and summer they resorted to harassing almost every single Twitter user who RT'd or even spoke to me. Many of the people they harassed got quite spooked by it, so it became almost impossible at times for me to reach anyone with my notes and comments on Zen/Haragei. (A pity, since the techniques I show people how to do actually work, and nobody even has to pay to support my lavish Guru lifestyle.) They particularly swarmed, attacked and mocked anyone who dared to call me "Sensei" or thanked me for helping out with a specific problem. Their paranoia rose to an obsessive crescendo of mean-spirited ridicule and tiresome victim-babble that was endlessly echoed and amplified by a beggar's chorus of the organization's so-called nuns, each with her own Twitter page devoted to singing the Guru's praises and savaging the Guru's purported enemies.

I've never experienced any Internet madness quite like it. The threatening rage and vituperation on open display from a rural Maryland rattler's nest of "Vajrayana Buddhists" was surreal, David Lynch-esque even. Many of the tweets were disturbing,

threatening messages hinting obscurely at magical attacks, promising the most extreme karmic retribution, and prophesying a long stay in Vajra Hell. But there were also more routine threats of the "we-know-where-you-live" and "we-have-people-on-the-payroll-who-take-care-of-people-like-you" variety. (The "Mafia" style tweets felt especially dissonant coming from smiling nuns.) Naturally, I've already downloaded hundreds of pages of this stupefying horse-shit from Twitter and Google caches, and will be making it available to the right people as and when needed.

Those same two unbelievably sad, bewildered and angry co-conspirators now claim that even though it has been proven beyond any possible doubt that I was not, as they swore up down and sideways to everyone who would listen (including the FBI), William Cassidy himself, still I must somehow be connected to the man, who is sitting in jail right now -- and they publish their ignorant, libelous opinion about a person unknown to them along with my name on the official blog of their purported Sangha. Psychopath that she is, the tulku in question still often mentions me and sometimes RTs my tweets mockingly on her Twitter page, never mind that she is now and always has been "blocked," and uses the same type of inflammatory language about me she did all last year. Neither the mentally deranged tulku nor the emotionally and intellectually stunted monk capo have yet acknowledged any error in judgement, nor offered the barest hint of an apology. However, at some point they did quietly remove every last scrap of the "hard evidence" supposedly proving that I am William Cassidy they'd posted on their anonymous "Protecting Nyingma" attack blog. Huh! I wonder why they would do that!

"Purify your mind! Do no evil, do only good. That is the whole teaching of the Buddha."

-ANDREW WILSON

<https://diamondsutrazen.blogspot.com/2011/06/crimes-and-tulkus.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Deadly Viper Assassination Cult Buddhists

I've been posting Zen notes, poems and aphorisms on Twitter since the summer of 2009. In December of that year, two very strange people began cyberstalking and harassing me through multiple Web sites and multiple (mostly anonymous) Twitter accounts. Their names are Alyce Zeoli -- aka "Jetsunma Ahkon Lhamo," the controversial "founder and spiritual director" of an organization called the Kunzang Palyul Choling -- and David Williams, a so-called monk in that same purportedly Buddhist organization.

The reason for these two weird people cyberstalking me, and relentlessly harassing anybody with whom I interacted on Twitter, is still mysterious. Although they often claimed that since my Twitter account was anonymous (as it was at the time, though

clearly not anymore) I must have something to hide, and therefore was beyond any possible doubt an enemy of theirs named "William Cassidy" aka Tenpa Rinpoche, they also spent an inordinate amount of time and energy trying to argue with, contradict and debunk me on matters of Zen and "Buddhism." (Note: even now that they must know I'm not him, they still regularly mention and "retweet" my postings with mocking and derisory comments attached. Strange!)

Unfortunately, I did not take their many threats seriously enough, and failed to contact the police.

However, these two mentally disturbed people did not fail to collect any and every annoyed or exasperated counter-tweet of mine, some of them containing what might be considered by drawing room standards moderately rough language, though not so much so for the Internet, and these tweets they forwarded to the FBI with a complaint that I was cyberstalking Alyce Zeoli -- a person I'd never even heard about until the first of her childish insults appeared on my Twitter stream, and a person I truly wish I'd never had the displeasure of hearing about.

Naturally, the two bizarre individuals in question neglected to inform the FBI about their own incessantly negative and provocative, often quite creepy, online activities against me and a few unlucky others. However, I've since downloaded hundreds of pages from Twitter and Google caches documenting just this. I expect to soon be making all of this puerile, repugnant cult material available for easy perusal by anyone with the patience and the stomach for it.

The FBI's research department must be slacking off, because as a result of Alyce Zeoli's complaint a team of FBI agents in dark clothing broke into my Oregon home before dawn on the morning of February 15th, 2011 and handcuffed my girlfriend and I at gunpoint. This was rather traumatic for my girlfriend, who had no idea what was going on. Actually, I didn't either. The agents then read out a search warrant for our computer equipment and cell phones and questioned us both on the cheerful joint topic of "Jetsunma Ahkon Lhamo" and "William Cassidy." They also spent an inordinate amount of time searching the basement and greenhouse, as if they hoped to find explosives or a maybe a cache of Tommy guns. I told them they were raiding the wrong compound; they must have taken a wrong turn at Albuquerque, because where they really belonged was the Kunzang Palyul Choling enclave in Maryland. They informed me that the FBI agent who filed the affidavit leading to the armed invasion of my home is based, surprise, in Baltimore.

I later learned that on that very same morning William Cassidy was arrested in California and transported to Baltimore. He has apparently been sitting in the federal wing of a maximum security prison ever since, with motions for a trial on charges of "cyberstalking" Alyce Zeoli, who -- ironically -- out of her many absurd aliases and honorifics will perhaps become best known as the "Victim 1" of court documents, scheduled for this fall. (See U.S. vs. Cassidy.)

Leaving aside notable constitutional issues, the government's whole case seems to

hinge on the wild claim that Alyce Zeoli is a "victim" of cyberstalking and harassment via Twitter and various Websites run by William Cassidy. But if Alyce Zeoli and David Williams did online to William Cassidy and to others (me, just for example) precisely what they claim he did to her, the case falls apart like a gin-soaked cocktail napkin. "No crime, with no victim;/no jury will convict him."

And the truth is that these two Kunzang Palyul Choling players at one time or another mocked, stalked, harassed, or insulted every single one my friends on Twitter. Alyce Zeoli is renowned both on- and offline for her tantrums and high handed arrogance, as well as for her belittling response to the merest criticisms; while David Williams is infamous for rude, persistent, laughably obtuse attacks on all who don't fall in line with his Guru's bizarre pronouncements. If William Cassidy deserves to be sitting in a jail in Maryland awaiting trial, then clearly Alyce Zeoli and David Williams deserve to be sitting in jail in Oregon awaiting trial also. Since when does the federal government arbitrarily take sides in Internet flame wars?

I never saw William Cassidy cyberstalk anybody so I can't pronounce on that subject, but I can say this: Alyce Zeoli and David Williams are cyberstalkers extraordinaire — and by deliberately misleading the federal government in their wildly successful attempt to put my life in danger and to deprive me of all civil, political and human rights, they've downgraded their profile to felonious liars and co-conspiring domestic terrorists. Eventually, one can hope, the federal government will wake up to their vicious act, soon after which cell doors will clang shut on these two smiling, saffron-robed vipers.

<https://diamondsutrazen.blogspot.com/2011/07/deadly-viper-assassination-buddhists.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"...Heraclitus' river, the foot never truly stands on the same ground twice."

Actually, one's foot never steps in the same river once.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2011 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is obvious that anyone criticizing Cassidy for claiming to be a tulku is incorrect. Here, in an early post, he clearly claims that he is not a tulku.

kirtu said:

You know perfectly well that numerous western TB's are going to tend to react as if he were a tulku and esp. the group in Poolesville who in many cases are naive and uncritical. In many cases they are tulku worshippers.

Malcolm wrote:

I know perfectly well that this is an awesome example of why the whole tulku game ought to be completely abandoned.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2011 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Despite the "Tibetan" name by which I am occasionally known -- which is actually more of a nom-de-plume, and guess what... I might be making a literary point about blind credulity -- and which is just one of several names by which I am known, you should be very clear that I don't consider myself a "tulku," and I really don't think you should either. I have tried to make that exquisitely clear in my various books, but for some reason, people want to create something that isn't there. Also, please don't offer to send me things, because there isn't anything I need. I particularly don't need donations, students, or the adoration of syncophants. If you enjoy reading this weblog, then just enjoy reading this weblog. Please don't drag me into your fantasies."

--- William L. Cassidy, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2006

It is obvious that anyone criticizing Cassidy for claiming to be a tulku is incorrect. Here, in an early post, he clearly claims that he is not a tulku.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2011 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://volokh.com/2011/08/27/federal-government-prosecuting-man-for-writing-many-insulting-tweets-and-blog-posts-about-religious-leader/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Considering that the supreme court recently ruled that a man making death threats against Obama could not be jailed because the threats were not credible, and therefore covered under free speech protections, I don't think the prosecution in Maryland has a chance of landing this, especially since the EFF is involved. And they have deep pockets.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2011 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

wow, this is quite a neat little tale he tells prior to launching into his rehearsal chants (which sound kind of real and kind of like he's just muttering rambling syllables intentionally slurredly)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x9QF2ILirOQ> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Namdrol said:

He is reciting the seven line prayer.

Adamantine said:

Only in the very beginning, he goes on to do what seems to be a patchwork of mudras and offerings without any offering substances, but it doesn't seem at all coherent to me. . . it does appear he is just fronting. . . . unless someone actually recognizes a complete practice in there from their specific lineage

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the summoning and binding mudras are clearly there, then argham, padyam, etc. then he recites a mantra. He is following a text, towards the end he is doing a mahakala tormas offering, and so on.

And there are two kinds of offerings, mentally emanated and physical, the former are more important than the latter; the former are indispensable, the latter are dispensable (yes, you read it here, mentally generated offerings are more important).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2011 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

kirtu said:

Clearly using such a nom-de-plume in western TB circles has certain intended consequences and shouldn't be done; it's deceptive if you are not a recognized person.

Malcolm wrote:

"Orgyen Tenpa Rinpoche", if anyone had bothered to parse the words, is not the name of a person: it means "The Precious Teaching of the One From Oḍḍiyāna".

Anyway, it remains to be seen that Cassidy committed a crime here: it raises interesting issues around free speech; as does the "Protecting Nyingma" blog, which goes out of its way to slander Cassidy in no uncertain terms, pouring fuel on the fire.

One thing remains true -- Cassidy's blog was one of the more interesting blogs in the Buddhist blogosphere, and he writes well. I for one shall enjoy reading it again when Cassidy gets out.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2011 at 9:52 AM

Title: Re: Offerings and prayers: Authentic Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Mahāyāna's earliest texts are reliably dated through archaeology and text criticism from the First Century BCE, if not earlier. So, that's not it. Mahāyāna was a fully articulated movement by 100 CE.

Epistemes said:

What are these earliest texts? I have been under the presumption that the Heart and Diamond Sutras were the earliest.

Namdrol said:

Not only that, but the cultivation of love and compassion was strongly recommended by the Buddha was a very important practice in all strands of Buddhist schools.

Epistemes said:

I am aware of the Buddha advocating metta and karuna - but there is an insistence in the Mahayana school upon all actions benefitting all sentient beings that I'm not aware of in the Hinayana school.

Malcolm wrote:

Even in so called Hināyāna schools, there is the recognition that the motivation to become a buddha is predicated upon the desire to benefit all sentient beings.

Texts like the Ugraparipriccha, the Samcayagathas, parts of the Lotus sutra, and so on.

Certainly, the Perfection of Wisdom sutras were in their initial form by 100 CE, and probably earlier.

Heart and Diamond sutras are quite late. The Heart sutra probably originated in China. The Perfection of Wisdom in 8000 lines is probably the earliest of the PP sutras, as I understand things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2011 at 8:41 AM

Title: Re: Offerings and prayers: Authentic Buddhism?

Content:

Epistemes said:

The Mahayana emphasis upon compassion and loving-kindness resemble Byzantine Christianity so much in their intent that I am forced to reckon that this must be in response to missionaries and traveling Christian ascetics.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna's earliest texts are reliably dated through archaeology and text criticism from the First Century BCE, if not earlier. So, that's not it. Mahāyāna was a fully articulated movement by 100 CE.

It's most famous exponent, Nāgārjuna, dates to the middle of the 2nd century CE.

If anything, the influence is the other way around.

Not only that, but the cultivation of love and compassion was strongly recommended by the Buddha was a very important practice in all strands of Buddhist schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2011 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: Technical Point in Ascertaining the Three Vows

Content:

xylem said:

I have been studying Perfect Conduct, Dudjom Rinpoche's commentary on Ngari Panchen Pema Wangyal's Ascertaining the Three Vows. There is one section that has always perplexed me. In the section on the pratimoksha-vinaya, on p. 26, the last full paragraph, section 2.b.1(a.3.3) section (2) the root text says:

An upholder of lay ordination who is also a pure-awareness holder must, except for the signs and rituals of complete ordination, practice all that remains.

Dudjom Rinpoche follows:

An upholder of lay Buddhist ordination who has entered mantra becomes known as a pure-awareness holder, or a vidyadhara. Although it is not necessary for such an

individual to display the outer signs of full ordination such as robes, begging bowl, or shaved hair-- which are the result of receiving a specific ritual-- all remaining precepts in the vinaya system must be upheld and practiced.

This has always perplexed me because at first it has seemed in resonance with Guru Rinpoche's teaching to rise with the view while descending with the conduct. On the other hand I have yet to find a context where the vinaya and its particular forms of discipline and purification (e.g. sojong) have been encouraged for lay tantrikas. At the same time, looking at the lives of great lay masters, such as Chatral Rinpoche, they certainly do seem to embrace the whole scope of the vinaya, even as lay practitioners.

Thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

This is not definite. First of all, there is no rite by which an upasaka receives all these vows of a bhikṣu. Therefore, there is no onus to guard vows which has not taken, as Dudjom Rinpoche readily admits.

Instead we can regard this as an instruction that lay practitioners ought, in an ideal world, to emulate the disciplined behavior of a buddhist monk.

Incidentally, this instruction is rejected in the earlier Three Vows of Sapan.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2011 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

What I do know is that certain Chan claims have no basis in Mahāyāna sutra.

Astus said:

So indeed, Chan is not based on sutras, shastras, or any doctrine.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

You missed my point -- certain Chan claims seem to be based on nothing more than the personal fabrications of those who make those claims.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Permanence and Enlightenment

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Thank you for answering my questions although it doesn't address my last point of whether that contradicts voidness.

Malcolm wrote:

It does. Because of the realization of emptiness, the seeds of affliction are scorched.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Costly Situations

Content:

TheWay said:

have you personally seen there racism towards blacks ?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I have. I have also seen Tibetan racism towards white people as well, though it is less intense. I am not saying that it should daunt you, just that Tibetans, like other people, have flaws, and since Tibetans have very little experience with black people, to some extent black people are often surprised when they receive a cool reception or rude reception from Tibetans. Of course, not all Tibetans are racists. But many are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

padma norbu said:

wow, this is quite a neat little tale he tells prior to launching into his rehearsal chants (which sound kind of real and kind of like he's just muttering rambling syllables intentionally slurredly)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x9QF2ILirOQ> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

He is reciting the seven line prayer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Costly Situations

Content:

Jikan said:

what's the South Asian attitude toward nonwhite Westerners vis a vis cash expectations?
or mixed race people?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans are often pretty racist when it comes to black people (i.e. those of African descent)

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

Your non-sequiters about Vajrayāna are a distracting waste of time.

Jnana said:

And FTR, I wasn't criticizing the vajrayāna, nor even Tibetan Buddhism per se. I was criticizing this modern internet phenomenon of "Tibetan Buddhists" who have convinced themselves that they know non-Tibetan traditions better than everyone who practices those traditions, and run around shooting their mouths off all the time.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't pretend to know Chan better than Chan Buddhists.

What I do know is that certain Chan claims have no basis in Mahāyāna sutra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

Anyway, it is pretty clear you are not someone who is speaking from personal experience of the tenets which you espouse, otherwise you would not be wasting your time here.

Jnana said:

Which tenets would those be?

Malcolm wrote:

mere recognition = buddhahood.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

This does not refute the path of seeing in anyway.

Jnana said:

There's no need to refute the path of seeing. It's simply a question of emphasis. Chan emphasizes effortless recognition. The same emphasis can be found in numerous sutras, tantras, dohas, and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

Effortless recognition /= buddhahood. It just doesn't. Otherwise, Arhats are also Buddhas. Now, you might think that is true, and certainly tilt billings does, but that is not a Mahāyāna perspective on the issue.

Namdrol said:

But it certainly has nothing to do with Indian Mahāyāna nor how Chan deviates from it. Not all Chanists denied the paths and stages.

Malcolm wrote:

I know, we are concerned here with those that do, primarily.

Namdrol said:

It's a basic tathāgatagarbha view,

Malcolm wrote:

There is no one basic tathagarbha view, there are a couple.

Even here tathagatagabins in India never imagined that tathagatagarbha alleviated the need for a long, grueling, mahāyāna path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:
Namdrol said:
There is no such thing as an early, pristine Dzogchen.

Jnana said:
LOL.... Too funny.

Malcolm wrote:
There isn't.

This idea of a "pristine Dzogchen"(aka mind series) is a fantasy invented by some western translators. In reality, the mind series was a commentary on completion stage of Mahāyoga, as Rongzom makes very clear in his theg chen tshul 'jug, when he describes Dzogchen as a commentary on the tantra division.

Anyway, it is pretty clear you are not someone who is speaking from personal experience of the tenets which you espouse, otherwise you would not be wasting your time here. You might consider that unfair or ad hominem (which it is) -- but unless it is the case that you or Astus claim to persons realized in these tenets which you espouse, it really is just so much tarka.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 5:39 AM
Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan
Content:
Namdrol said:
These don't say anything, absent contextualized reasoning and explanation.

Jnana said:
Reasoning and explanation are just word play. Saraha:
Others run around in the Great Way,
where scripture turns to sophistry and word play.

Malcolm wrote:
You are mistaking songs of realization as substituting for the path that got them there.

Jnana said:
Lama Shang:
The three kāyas are primordially, naturally present
in the nature of the mind, which is like space;
the Jewel of the Buddha is completely within it...

The superior realization of your own mind as
nondual luminosity is the path of seeing,
its unbroken continuity is the path of meditation,
its effortlessness is the path of complete attainment.

Malcolm wrote:
[/quote]

This does not refute the path of seeing in anyway.

When you do not have unbroken continuity of equipoise, what then? In this respect,
there can be no discussion of complete attainment.

So, this is another example of poetic rhetoric.

But it certainly has nothing to do with Indian Mahāyāna nor how Chan deviates from it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

deepbluehum said:

It might occur to you that this instruction is a method to cause the student to give up
grasping at methods when the case is that the method has been given too much focus.

Jnana said:

Chan is all about giving up grasping at methods. The same as early, pristine dzogchen:
Seeing that everything is self-perfected from the very beginning,
the disease of striving for any achievement is surrendered,
and just remaining in the natural state as it is,
the presence of non-dual contemplation continuously spontaneously arises.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as an early, pristine Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Let's just say Chan's method of introducing is equivalent to this. I don't think so. I think
such an introduction is special to Vajrayana

Jnana said:

With Chan, everything is a direct introduction. Every moment of every experience.

deepbluehum said:

That's very poetic. But I'm talking in pragmatics.

Malcolm wrote:

Geoff seems to think that giving a blizzard of citations from some post 12th century mahamudra text is sufficient for proving the path of seeing is buddhahood.

But i doubt very much whether Gampopa himself holds this view.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Jnana said:

With Chan, everything is a direct introduction. Every moment of every experience.

Malcolm wrote:

People place too much importance on this word "direct introduction", so much so they have no idea what it means anymore.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Jnana said:

Snip citation blizzard

Malcolm wrote:

These don't say anything, absent contextualized reasoning and explanation. They certainly don't mean that the path of seeing is buddhahood.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Permanence and Enlightenment

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Upon becoming enlightened what stops ignorance from re-asserting itself?

Malcolm wrote:

Having realized emptiness, it is impossible to forget that realization.

AdmiraUim said:

If that is not possible then does that make enlightenment permanent?

Malcolm wrote:

When a seed is scorched, it is permanently incapable of giving rise to a sprout, likewise, when the seed of ignorance is scorched, it can never give rise to the result, affliction, again

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

As I pointed out, if insight into the nature of the mind was sufficient for full buddhahood, then first stage bodhisattvas would be buddhas. But they are not.

Jnana said:

This is just another lame gradualist argument.

Malcolm wrote:

And this is just another petulant complaint lacking substance and reasoning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

deepbluehum said:

This is a very interesting discussion. It is a very important discussion. Please allow a possibility that there actually is buddhahood in one life. Please consider that the powers gained on the bhūmis as described in sutras are inspirational. The actual realizations and samadhis that happen on the bhūmis or that a buddha has are completely beyond description and can only be referenced metaphorically. The realization of nonconceptual wisdom is possible even in a day or a week. Chan does not possess this method. Vajrayana does.

Then the matter of attaining omniscience is a gradual process. Because the obstacles

to omniscience are in one's elements, one has to remain in nonconceptual wisdom 24/7 for a long time, then sometime around death wisdom throws off the veil of the elements. Vajrayana has methods that make this certain. Chan does this potentially but without the specific method, it won't be as certain.

Jnana said:

You've re-emphasized my previous point: Every Mahāyāna tradition is faith based. One of the glaring shortcomings of Tibetan Buddhism is in taking a faith based, visionary tradition, and trying to interpret it literally. Of course, this began in India, with proofs of omniscience and so on. But that doesn't legitimize it. Here the Tibetans could learn a thing or two from the Chinese and Japanese masters. But this likely won't happen any time soon, since virtually every Tibetan Buddhist has already been thoroughly convinced by their tradition's self-proclaimed superiority.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not really talking Tibetan Buddhism here. We are talking about Chan Buddhism and Indian Mahāyāna. Your non-sequiturs about Vajrayāna are a distracting waste of time.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2011 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

In content it teaches the sudden enlightenment that accomplishes buddhahood directly.

Malcolm wrote:

One can say whatever one likes. For example, consider the statement "Jesus teaches a method of direct buddhahood, far superior to anything taught by any other Buddha or tradition". Who can refute this if all statements about Buddhism are to be considered valid? In other words, such claims are just so much hot air without reasons.

As we have seen, there is no precedent in Indian Buddhism from the 1st century BCE to the time supposedly Bodhidharma visited China the kind of claims some Chan masters make.

Astus said:

In method it uses immediate insight into the true nature of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out, if insight into the nature of the mind was sufficient for full buddhahood, then first stage bodhisattvas would be buddhas. But they are not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

The realisation happened on the 11th level, the first level of dwelling, and the 1st bhumi is the 41st level.

Malcolm wrote:

If that is so, it is plainly wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Costly Situations

Content:

Namdrol said:

Maybe in Chinese and Thervada Buddhism, it is possible, but not for westerners in TB. On the other side of that however, you lose a lot a freedom by ordaining in monastic scene where you are completely supported.

Huseng said:

I think it depends largely on your connections and where you are. I know one westerner in Nepal who has the option of going into permanent lifelong retreat if he wants to, but then that's because of his connections and service. Very few would ever have that option, and I think you'd have to be in India or Nepal for it to ever happen.

Maybe there is also the unspoken expectation, too, that westerners are all wealthy, so they should pay more. In India even at government tourist sites you pay 100 rupees, the locals pay 5 rupees. The cost of tuition at the Rangjung Yeshe Institute is also much more than what locals pay, and as a foreigner you pay your tuition in US dollars, too.

Tell me if I'm wrong, but in TB in Asia, I think the cost of everything increases if you're a westerner? Perhaps speaking Tibetan puts you on the cost scale of a local because they don't need to use extra services to support you (like English speaking staff and so on).

Malcolm wrote:

Americans, Canadians, and Western Europeans have more money than locals, so they should pay more. Speaking Tibetan does not bring the costs down. AFAIK.

I know a lot of broke western Tibetan Buddhist ordained folks. Some of them are quite

pathetic, like hungary ghosts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Don't confuse "characteristics" with "defining characteristics".

Since mind is infinite, it has no defining characteristics. Only "infining" characteristics.

The nature of mind, it's characteristics (space & luminosity) are infinite, not finite.

(Define:

de= "of"

fine= "end"

in other words, the end of something, it's boundaries of limitation)

Malcolm wrote:

Making up your own dharma language now?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

isn't the lack of characteristics a characteristic?

Namdrol said:

Is a "lack of money" money?

PadmaVonSamba said:

Yes...it's money that you don't have!

Malcolm wrote:

Can you spend a lack of money?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Costly Situations

Content:

TheWay said:

...and not have to worry about finances etc...

Namdrol said:
That is not going to happen.

Huseng said:
It is possible if you ordain, though maybe this isn't the case in TB.

Malcolm wrote:
Maybe in Chinese and Thervada Buddhism, it is possible, but not for westerners in TB.
On the other side of that however, you lose a lot a freedom by ordaining in monastic scene where you are completely supported. And it is not necessarily fanatastic for practicing Dharma.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 9:26 PM
Title: Re: Costly Situations
Content:
TheWay said:
...and not have to worry about finances etc...

Malcolm wrote:
That is not going to happen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 9:21 PM
Title: Re: 10 Questions for His Holiness Sakya Trizin
Content:
Kunga said:
... after the Dalai Lama, the throne holder of Sakya is the next senior figure.

J-Bird said:
Well this isn't exactly true. In the Central Tibetan political system pre-1959, the Panchen Lama was the closest in succession to retaining the political role of the executive of the central Tibetan Government. This being said however, from a religious point of view, the Karmapa incarnations, were held the 2nd highest religious throne in Tibet, aside from the Dalai Lamas.

It is an itheresting discusison though, and my understanding may be somewhat misguided. If anyone has any other info, I would be interested to better understand the heriarcy between the Glug, Sakya, Kagyu-pa and Nyigma lamas in relation to political power.

Malcolm wrote:
Traditionally speaking, in terms of the height of the seat to which a given high Tibetan

lama is entitled, the throne holder of Sakya is lower only than the Dalai Lama. All other Lamas have seats lower than the throne holder of Sakya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, we just have the usual philosophical sleight of hand I mentioned above.

Jnana said:

The sleight of hand is using a 9th century polemical argument to criticize a 2nd century conception of the bodhisattva path.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not criticizing a second century concept of the bodhisattva path.

Jnana said:

As I mentioned previously on another thread, if we were to show up in 2nd century India with our basket of tantras and claim that it's possible to attain buddhahood in one lifetime, we'd be laughed out of every vihāra on the sub-continent.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I have acknowledged this several times. The point I am making is that later Vajrayānists took this limitation seriously and proposed that early Mahāyāna was by definition a slow path, requiring incalculable eons to complete because there were no unique methods in sutrayāna to hasten progress on the path.

Since Chan, Huayen, and so on do not add any new insights into the nature of reality, nor do they add any revolutionary new methods, any claims they make to sudden buddhahood are merely rhetoric and philosophical trickery.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

No, it is a Huayen view of the initial production of bodhicitta, which is the entrance to the path of accumulation.

It says first bhumi and it means the first bhumi.

Malcolm wrote:

Which first bhumi? The traditional dasabhumi are bhumis 40-50 in in the 52 stages scheme which is a result of taking chapter 15, 21, 22, 25, 26 of the Avatamska to be descriptions or levels on the bodhisattva path. Chapter 26 however, or the ten stages is the Dasabhumika sūtra and that is what is under discussion.

Astus said:

No, since the ten stages are treated the same way. In Chinese Buddhism they are merely encased within an alternate scheme, but when I say first bhumi, I mean the first bodhisattva bhumi as described in the Dasabhumika sutra.

That's the point, it is not treated the same way. Here's Buswell's summary based on Tongxuan's work:

"The ten bhumis are the original foundation of all dharmas. Here the bodhisattva pervades all dharmas, all directions, and all positions simultaneously. Development before this stage involved some measure of effort and entailed as well the progressive development of meritorious practices. By the time the bodhisattva has reached the ten bhumis, however, he has nothing left to practice and nothing left to achieve. It is a kind of "firming-up" stage at which all the qualities and achievements attained throughout the previous levels are matured and allowed to infuse his entire being. He merges with all dharmas without, however, losing his own identity in the process. This is the stage of the unimpeded interpenetration of all phenomena- the highest expression of spiritual attainment in the Avatamsaka Sutra and, by implication, in all the Buddhist scriptures."

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, it is treated in the same way. When a bodhisattva realizes the first bhumi, there is no more emptiness to realize, all that is left to do is to complete the two accumulations, as I told you, the ten stages only map qualities, not realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

Yes, so is the whole stages system.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the bhumis are measures of qualities, the paths are measures of realization. This is why the āryan path has only three phases: the path of seeing, the path of cultivation and the path of no more training. The ten bodhisattva stages are included within both the path of seeing (first bhumi) and the path of cultivation (first bhumi to tenth bhumi). The path of no more training is Buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

kirtu said:

It seems to me to be a bit of hyperbole - Tibetan teachings do address awakening but it's all inferential and usually seems glossed as far as the Path of Preparation and bhumis are concerned (unless one takes it literally that a 1st bhumi Bodhisattva can physically emanate 100 bodies, etc.).

Namdrol said:

These are manomāyakāyas, not physical bodies.

N

kirtu said:

Tibetan teaching on the lower paths and the first bhumi can be summarized as "where there's smoke there's fire." But it's extraordinary smoke

Manomayakayas: mental bodies? For the purpose of teaching through visions or can they appear as physical bodies to aid beings directly?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

The one hundred bodies emanated by a first stage bodhisattva are for the purpose of visiting buddhas in other nirmankāya buddhafiels.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

"This is just intellectual contrivance."

Yes, so is the whole stages system. No, it is a summary of the Huayan view of the first bhumi.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a Huayan view of the initial production of bodhicitta, which is the entrance to the path of accumulation.

Astus said:

"The first of the 52 bhumis is not anywhere near the path of seeing, so there is no immediate experience of the ultimate that can even be discussed."

You make the mistake of identifying one interpretation of the bodhisattva stages with another.

Malcolm wrote:

No, since the first bodhisattva stage of the dasabhumika follows the path of seeing. It is not an issue of "mistakes" or "interpretations".

Astus said:

What I showed is that both "first stage" and "buddhahood" are relative terms that depend on interpretation. Unless you give a definition you want to base the comparison on your question can't be answered, or it can be answered in any way.

Malcolm wrote:

No, since the ten stages are treated the same way. In Chinese Buddhism they are merely encased within an alternate scheme, but when I say first bhumi, I mean the first bodhisattva bhumi as described in the Dasabhumika sutra. If you wish to be a sophist, and pretend that you do not understand this, that is your problem, but it reveals sophistry on your part and an inability to maintain a coherent argument.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

kirtu said:

So it's in this vein.

Malcolm wrote:

Which contradicts what the Buddha said about there being no persons of the four ranks of āryas outside of his dharma and vinaya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

kirtu said:

It seems to me to be a bit of hyperbole - Tibetan teachings do address awakening but it's all inferential and usually seems glossed as far as the Path of Preparation and bhumis are concerned (unless one takes it literally that a 1st bhumi Bodhisattva can physically emanate 100 bodies, etc.).

Malcolm wrote:

These are manomāyakāyas, not physical bodies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

"What then is the difference between a Buddha and first stage bodhisattva?"

It depends on how the first stage and how a buddha is interpreted. Here's one interpretation from Wonhyo's commentary to the Vajrasamadhi Sutra that is based on the Huayan view,

"the first bhûmi in fact encompasses all ten bhûmis, for in one moment one may suddenly access the ten types of dharmadharmatâs. The ten bhûmis are in fact the first bhûmi, for all [ten] may instantly be completely fulfilled at this initial gate [of the first bhûmi]. Owing to the fact that the ten bhûmis are in fact the first bhûmi, [the first bhûmi] is called the "one." But because the first bhûmi is in fact the ten bhûmis, it is also "many." Consequently, [the first bhûmi] is called the "one-and-many bhûmi."

Malcolm wrote:

This is just intellectual contrivance.

Astus said:

In a similar fashion it is discussed by those who follow (Zongmi, Jinul) who attempted to connect Chan with the doctrinal teachings, mainly Huayan. So it is not much different from what you say, however, they called sudden enlightenment not the entry to the first bhumi but the entry to the level of faith which is the first of the 52 levels. That makes your interpretation of Chan's sudden enlightenment a lot more positive than theirs. On the other hand, their interpretation is a bit more complex, as it is briefly explained by Buswell in a footnote:

Malcolm wrote:

That makes the term 'sudden buddhahood' meaningless since it is far below the path of

seeing, this so called "buddha" has not even recognized emptiness. No wonder people are confused.

Astus said:

So, even if it sounds lot of "sophistry" and "sleight of hand", Chan focuses on immediate experience of the ultimate

Malcolm wrote:

The first of the 52 bhumis is not anywhere near the path of seeing, so there is no immediate experience of the ultimate that can even be discussed.

Astus said:

and so there aren't many discussions on bodhisattva stages, because having "stages", "levels" and "grades" of enlightenment are all ideas of "how it could be", while directly attaining no-thought and maintaining it in all situations - that's why I protested against the distinction of equipoise and post-equipoise - is the essential teaching and realisation.

Malcolm wrote:

You protested, but did not answer my observation concerning the identity of the content of a first bodhisattvas realization and a buddha's realization.

In the end, all you have succeeded in showing is that Chan is systematically incoherent.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

kirtu said:

Right but Chan and Zen doctrine and teachers do address it and the result is a kind of continuum of awakening.

Malcolm wrote:

All teachings address how one can tell if one is awakened, and to a limited extent, how others can tell. It is still very difficult.

kirtu said:

Fundamentally are people naturally engaged in reducing suffering would be one response.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a good criteria. Christians will say their faith lessens their suffering. Would you then say that Christian faith is comparable to Buddhist awakening?

kirtu said:

As you have noted with Astus much of what Chan or Zen says is really about the 1st bhumi in the bhumi and paths classification.

Malcolm wrote:

That was what I said, but Astus does not accept this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

The point is to distinguish rhetoric from what is actual.

kirtu said:

Well - how do you determine if someone has attained some degree of awakening?

Malcolm wrote:

It is very difficult, virtually impossible, really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

kirtu said:

I'll have to look up the Chan explanations on this point but it comes in part from assertions in the Lanka and other sutras teaching that the whole world is mind. A lot seems to come from the Lanka + the Flower Ornament Sutra but I don't want to interject what may be more a Zen bias.

Malcolm wrote:

What the Lanka discusses is sudden or gradual entry in suchness, not sudden or gradual buddhahood.

kirtu said:

Anyway, Buddhas not being able to experience delusion: even in the Tibetan schools this can be parsed out. HHST states that this is a difference between Gelug and Sakya in that Gelug asserts that Buddhas can see suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not mean that buddhas experience delusion, merely that their omniscience, itself illusory, is capable of apprehending illuory objects of knowledge, re: Haribhadra.

kirtu said:

In Zen at least (and In am well aware that Astus set the context in Chan - but my reading of Sheng Yen seems to conform to the following as well) enlightenment is not actually the undeluded enlightenment of Shakyamuni because even after kensho and even satori people still can deepen their enlightenment and can be influenced by habit patterns. Thus the rhetoric says that one's enlightenment is that of Shakyamuni's but the experience is not quite there ranging as I mentioned from higher up the Path of Accumulation to the lower bhumis.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is to distinguish rhetoric from what is actual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

Regarding the dana-paramita (although the quoted MPPS section does not mentioned it) here is a little explanation from Dazhu Huihai:

Q: Where can one enter the doorway to this understanding?

A: Through the perfection of charity (dana-paramita).

Q: Buddha has said that the six paramitas are the action of the Bodhisattva path, so how can we enter the doorway to this understanding by practicing, as you have said, only the dana-paramita?

A: People who are confused or deluded do not understand that the other five paramitas all evolve from the dana-paramita. Therefore, in practicing the dana-paramita, one also fulfills the practice of the other five paramitas.

Q: For what reason is it called the dana-paramita?

A: "Dana" means the perfection of charity.

Q: What things can be given up in the name of charity?

A: Clinging to thoughts of duality can be given up.

Q: Just what does this mean?

A: It means to give up clinging, in the name of charity, to thoughts of good and evil, existence and non-existence, love and hate, emptiness and fullness, concentration and non-concentration, pure and impure, etc. In the name of charity, give up all of them. Then, and only then, can you attain the stage of the voidness of duality, while, at the same time, letting neither a thought about the voidness of opposites nor about charity

arise. This is the genuine practice of the dana-paramita, which is also known as absolute detachment from all phenomena. This is only the voidness of all dharma-nature, which means that always and everywhere is just no-mind. If one can attain the stage of no-mind everywhere, no form will be perceived, because our self-nature is void, containing no form. This, then, is true Reality, which is also called the wonderful form or body of the Tathagata. The Diamond Sutra says: "Those who have abandoned all forms are called Buddhas."

Malcolm wrote:

It has already been pointed how the realization of emptiness of a first stage bodhisattva is identical in content to the realization of emptiness of a Buddha. But surely you admit that there is a difference between a first stage bodhisattva and Buddha. If there is no difference in terms of the nature of reality, what then do you think the difference is?

Astus said:

The two accumulations of merit and wisdom are present in the mind. Emptiness is wisdom, function is compassion. Zen affirms that the trikaya is present in the nature of mind, so it is not that one has to develop wisdom for the dharmakaya and merit for rupakaya, but the buddha-mind is already perfect in all aspects. Still, that doesn't deny that there is also a gradual path of the bodhisattva, however, the gradual path doesn't deny the existence of a sudden path. Thrangu Rinpoche says that on the sutrayana it takes a long time to achieve buddhahood because they use analytical-conceptual meditation but Mahamudra uses an experiential method of directly looking at the nature of mind. A similar argument could be made in the case of Zen too.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is part of secret mantra. Since the methods of mahāmudra do not exist in Zen, a similar argument cannot be made.

Astus said:

This might help better understanding, here is Zongmi's differentiation between the five dhyanas, that is, the levels of practice:

5. Direct (sudden) realization of the essential purity of one's own mind, originally without defilements, itself endowed with the influx-free (non-afflicted) gnosis - this mind is Buddha, ultimate with nothing else beyond - cultivating in this manner, is the Supreme Vehicle Dhyana. It is also known as the Pure Dhyana of the Tathagatas.

Malcolm wrote:

This is no different than the realization of a first stage bodhisattva. What then is the difference between a Buddha and first stage bodhisattva? You have still failed to answer this point.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

Again, this is just philosophical slight of hand, using the teaching of the emptiness of phenomena (shown above) to try and demonstrate that conventional phenomena are not effective borders on nihilism.

kirtu said:

It is because conventional phenomena are effective that Chan doctrine is centered in the view of realization in this moment. One can attain this realization directly and suddenly because one's mind is actually a Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, buddhas that experience delusion are buddhas only by name.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

kirtu said:

No - Chan ideas about Buddhahood are largely a development of Yogacara influence and yogic experience.

Malcolm wrote:

I have read a lot of yogachara. In what Yogachara text is there anything remotely like the citations Astus as provided?

kirtu said:

They hinge the argument on the notion that the mind is a radiant Buddha and that this can be experienced directly. This view in turn is a strong influence of Yogacara.

Malcolm wrote:

This is obviously false since buddhas cannot experience delusion. The Yogachara masters such as Asanga were actually strongly critical of tathagāgarbha theory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2011 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

I see. So the problem is the lack of the two accumulations. But even in the Prajnaparamita teachings we find that one paramita includes all the other paramitas.

In the Mahaprajnaparamitasastra (30.5.3; vol. 2, p. 859, tr. Lamotte-Migme) we find even the concept of abstaining for all kinds of practices, "Furthermore, the bodhisattva acquires the Prajñāpāramitā without practicing any dharma and without acquiring any dharma. Why? All practices (caryā) are erroneous and futile: from near or far, they present faults. In fact, bad dharmas (akuśaladharma) are faulty from close up; as for good dharmas, they are transformed and modified from far away; those who become attached to them will end up by experiencing pain and sorrow; thus they show defects from far off. [Good and bad practices] are like an appetizing food and a disgusting food both of which have been poisoned."

There is also the story of Prasannendriya and Agramati (MPPS, vol. 1, p. 323ff) where the first only taught insight into the true nature of reality without renouncing the world and the other all the many practices and ascetic methods. Prasannendriya became a buddha eventually and Agramati had to undergo lot of suffering later on.

Adding the buddha-mind teachings, the nature of mind has perfect function, the functioning of a buddha, and this is the display of all the qualities. What is there to accumulate for it?

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this is just philosophical slight of hand, using the teaching of the emptiness of phenomena (shown above) to try and demonstrate that conventional phenomena are not effective borders on nihilism.

Further, this supposes that practicing dana paramita and realizing dana paramita is sufficient for full buddhahood. It is not. It is sufficient for realizing the first bodhisattva bhumi, and that is all. As I mentioned above, the emptiness realized on the path of seeing and the emptiness that a Buddha realizes is the same emptiness. There is no difference at all in the realization of emptiness of a first stage bodhisattva and a Buddha. But there is a difference in affliction and omniscience.

You might try and will it away with philosophical sophistries, but this is not the intention of Mahāyāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

Because India is the source of the Dharma, the place where Mahāyāna developed, etc., and the site of Vajrāsana.

Astus said:

Do you deny the possibility that authentic Buddhism is not bound by geographical location? You defined a "mainstream Buddhism" as all Indian Buddhists while we both know that Buddhism there was neither unified nor static. Vajrayana claims buddhahood within one lifetime, so it is not exactly true that all agreed on the time it has to take to achieve it.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are missing the point -- Vajrayānists in India accepted the lengthy time period for achieving buddhahood based on the accumulating the two collections.

Astus said:

The concept of sudden enlightenment was first taught by Daosheng (360?-434), a disciple of Kumarajiva. Because he was a Chinese master and not Indian, his view of Buddhism must be wrong?

Malcolm wrote:

Please precise with your terms -- does sudden enlightenment mean sudden buddhahood, or sudden awakening on one of the bhumis?

The doctrine here under question is the idea promulgated by some Chan masters that Buddhahood does not require the two collections. This is unprecedented in Indian Buddhism, including Vajrayāna (as well as Dzogchen).

Astus said:

Saying that Indian Buddhism is the definitive because that's where it first appeared is very much an argument based on an irrelevant fact.

Malcolm wrote:

Indian Buddhism is definitive because Buddhism developed in India. All the texts and teachings upon which all other Buddhist doctrines, whether in line or in contrast with Indian Buddhism, depend on Indian Buddhism.

Astus said:

Buddhism developed pretty much independently in China after Buddhism established itself. Why would then it be inferior only because of geographical reasons?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of inferiority - it is a question of continuity.

It is clear that certain Chan ideas about "Buddhahood" have no precedent in the Buddhism promulgated in India, including the Buddhism of Vajrayāna.

Astus said:

Just as in India so it was in China that there were different traditions and interpretations of the Buddhadharma. Sudden enlightenment might be inconceivable for the Theravada and early Mahayana followers, but not so for the Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a "sudden enlightenment" in Vajrayāna which is free from the two collections. The rapid awakening in Vajrayāna is predicated on gathering the two accumulations extremely rapidly -- not, as in some Chan formulations, dismissing their importance all together.

Astus said:

Vajrayana developed in India and Chan developed in China. Neither of them are something you could find in such mainstream schools as the Sarvastivadins or the Dharmaguptakas.

Malcolm wrote:

What Vajrayāna shares with Sarvastivadins or the Dharmaguptakas is that by normal means, buddhahood requires a minimum of three asaṃkhyakalpas to achieve. In order to bypass that requirement, Vajrayāna proposes the adoption of a specific methodology by which these two collections may be gathered in a single lifetime, and progress through the paths and stages, including all the visionary indicators of such progress that may be measured through yoga specific indications in the experience of the meditator on both a mental and physical level.

Chan masters that promulgate the extreme notions of sudden buddhahood, by contrast, hinge their arguments solely on the notion that paths, practice, merit, virtue, are part of relative truth and therefore are a waste of time even to consider as having anything to do with attaining buddhahood -- that in fact, buddhahood is not attainable by any relative means whatsoever. The consequence of course is that these extreme speculations of the part of certain Chan masters render their version of buddhahood unrecognizable as buddhahood. We can call it Buddhism since they insist they are Buddhist, but it resembles nothing at all like mainstream Buddhism.

Astus said:

But then it comes down to the spatial distance between India and China. Do you find that an important point? In my view, the source of Dharma is the Buddha and not a place, nationality, ethnicity, political system or climate.

Malcolm wrote:

What I find important is that there is a serious discontinuity between the idea of buddhahood promulgated by certain extreme Chan masters and the rest of the Buddhist world.

You seem to think the argument hinges on sudden verses slow. It does not. It hinges on whether buddhahood is accomplished by virtue of the two things all Mahāyāna sutras say it is accomplished by i.e. the practice of the perfections and the two accumulations. Vajrayāna differs solely from common Mahāyāna of India, in this respect, by virtue of the suggestion that there are means by which one can reduce the amount of time it takes to generate the complete two collections from the daunting three incalculable eons to one, seven or sixteen lifetimes.

These Chan speculations you have introduced, on the other hand, hinge on philosophical sleights of hand that I have already pointed out. My point is that these philosophical speculations have no precedent in Indian Buddhism.

Whether one accepts them or not is entirely a matter of personal choice. I don't accept them, since I think they represent a deviation from Indian Buddhism -- I do not believe that there was any person who became a Buddha without gathering the two accumulations in their entirety.

In the end it is not a question of valid or invalid, it is a question of definitions. For me, a Buddhahood divorced from the two accumulations is impossible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: The virgin birth of Gautama.

Content:

Will said:

The Lalitavistara Sutra (among others) said conception occurred after a dream of a 6-tusked white elephant. Birth was not from the womb, but from her side.

Namdrol said:

C-section, which explains why his mother died shortly after he was born.

catmoon said:

Lol. Get a copy of Gray's Anatomy and it should be pretty apparent how impossible that would be.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you take "from her side" quite literally. But I understand "from her side" to mean that she did not give birth in the usual way -- not literally as in through or above her pelvic bone. Which is even more impossible, according to human anatomy.

Or perhaps, they cut open the side of her abdomen rather than the front of her belly.

C-sections were known in India at that time:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bindusara> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

isn't the lack of characteristics a characteristic?

Malcolm wrote:

Is a "lack of money" money?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

What type of empty space are you referring, be specific. Do you mean the sky, do you mean the empty space in a box? Conditioned space and unconditioned space are different.

5heaps said:

i mean the unconditioned mere absence of physical obstruction. i dont think anyone except vaibhashika accepts that as a functioning thing, but they dont know how to posit mental labelling so its only natural that they would say something like that

Malcolm wrote:

Oh well, that type of space is merely a mental abstraction, it is unreal, no one sees it or perceives it since it lacks characteristics. So your thesis is rejected.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

Why only India...?

Malcolm wrote:

Because India is the source of the Dharma, the place where Mahāyāna developed, etc., and the site of Vajrāsana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

Hm, the current Buddhism in India or sometimes in the past? And what time? Why only India and why that time? Among the Indian schools which is mainstream and which is marginal? This is getting messy...

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are just being deliberately obtuse.

All Indian Buddhist schools until the destruction of Indian Buddhism had a similar view of the length of time of the career of a bodhisattva -- based on the Chan quotes you cited, they must have thought that Sakyamuni Buddha, Avalokiteshvara, Manjushri, Samantbhadra and so on were very stupid.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Question re: Asanga and the Bodhisattvabhumi

Content:

Sunyatavadin said:

Hi all,

I've been trying for a while to find information on Asanga's Bodhisattvabhumi. Unfortunately, both my Sanskrit and Tibetan are not so good. I can't even figure out how long it is or whether it's the same as the "Bodhisattvabhumi" contained within the "Yogacarabhumi." There seems to be no English translation except for one chapter (Tattvartha) translated by Janice Dean Willis. Are there any Tibetan-language versions of the Tengyur online in which I might find the entire text, albeit in Tibetan?

Thanks in advance.

Malcolm wrote:

The Bodhisattvabhumi is a section of the Yogacharabhumi.

It may be found online here:

<http://www.aciparchive.org/ace/#lyt%28vol%29col%28tendg%29title%282972%29>

Enjoy

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

"Mainstream" means "rest of the Buddhist world..."

Astus said:

That means a few of millions in Tibet, Mongolia and Bhutan, and the many Theravadins. In terms of the number of followers Vajrayana is not mainstream at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Mainstream means Buddhism in India.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 10:02 AM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

Namdrol said:

The difference is that the appearance and the apparent object are different, whereas in the Yogacara school, the apparent object itself is not held to exist apart from the mind, hence the sobriquet, "mind-only".

mzaur said:

What do you mean by 'apparent' object separate from appearance? Are you saying that an objective object, and thus an objective reality exists? And knowing this objective reality directly and not subjectively through the mind is 'wisdom'?

Malcolm wrote:

It's the old mode of appearance as opposed to mode of existence thing. For example, there is a glass of water -- it is perceived differently by beings of the six realms. If we say that the object, a glass of water is only a mental projection, there is no point in proposing that one object is perceived differently by different beings of the six realms.

Now then, we can dismiss the idea of an objective reality without dismissing the idea of objects per se.

Longchen rejects that idea that objects are mind because if they were, mountains should disappear when we cease to perceive them. But by the same token, objects, when analyzed, also cannot be found.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, these are often trotted out, but they do not prove anything other than that Chan Buddhists had a view of buddhahood that does not correspond to mainstream Buddhist thinking on the subject.

Astus said:

What "mainstream" actually means is debatable since Chan has been the primary doctrine of elite Buddhism in East Asia for a thousand years now.

Proving that Chan, and particularly sudden enlightenment, is a valid Buddhist teaching is the real issue then. For that we would need a couple of terms defined, especially buddhahood and buddha-mind.

Malcolm wrote:

"Mainstream" means "rest of the Buddhist world..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Pero said:

Ah. But how is killing one's mother or father connected with one's own and other's chances for attaining liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

Your father and mother gave you a precious human birth, your vehicle for liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

Some quotes on the view of Mahayana and the three kalpas long practice from different Chan works.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, these are often trotted out, but they do not prove anything other than that Chan Buddhists had a view of buddhahood that does not correspond to mainstream Buddhist thinking on the subject.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

So you basically doubt that Virupa, for example, traversed all the paths and stages in a single lifetime?

Jnana said:

I don't see any reason to take mahasiddha hagiographies literally.

I see, so for you, Virupa, Tilopa, Luipa, Ghanapāda are merely nominal "mahāsiddhas", and reports of their realization are not to be taken literally. How about reports of the Buddha's realization? Are they to be taken literally?

Look at the numbers Namdrol. Any direct equivalency is absurd on the face of it.

Malcolm wrote:

What do numbers have to do with it?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Jnana said:

[/list]

Here we have the same argument of the qualities being present in the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we just have the usual philosophical sleight of hand I mentioned above.

The point that I am really trying to make is that Indian Mahāyānists took their own tradition seriously. For example, Nāgārjuna in the Ratnavali lists in some detail how much merit is required for each of the major and minor marks, when encouraging the king to cultivate merit.

And three uncalculable eons is not even really a Mahāyāna number. It is a number which comes from the earliest ideas about the length of time it took the bodhisattva to achieve buddhahood.

So on the one hand, we have the Indian tradition (Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna and the śrāvaka traditions) insisting that in order to become a buddha one must practice the paramitas for an insanely long period of time. And on the other hand we have a tradition a tradition in China which asserts all this is so much unnecessary proliferation.

Saying that "qualities are present in the basis" is a meaningless statement. Butter is present in milk, but it does not come out all by itself, oil is present in sesame seeds but it does not extract itself. And which qualities exactly?

Of course what we are dealing with here is a species of tathāgatagarbha thinking, but even hear, I don't think that the type of instant buddhahood you see some Chan masters proclaiming can be justified on the basis of any Indian sutras, tathāgatagarbha or otherwise.

Of course, this is the realm of religion, so no one can prove anything since it all boils down to belief.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Jnana said:

[

It's a flimsy argument. There is no reason to accept that the vajrayāna rhetoric of progressing from a common person to complete buddhahood in one lifetime is anything more than a provisional teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

So you basically doubt that Virupa, for example, traversed all the paths and stages in a single lifetime?

And what about this Vajrayāna tenet makes it "provisional"? That it seems too fantastic to you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Culture should't become a trap.

Content:

Jikan said:

The trouble is going the other way: assuming that the psychologized Kornfield-Goldstein-Batchelor version *is* Buddhism or represents all or the best of what the Buddhist tradition has to offer. That would be reductive in the highest.

Huseng said:

There are some whose Buddhism more or less is that version.

Worse is that they posit their opinions as legitimate and educated, meanwhile they don't even have a basic grasp of Buddhism 101.

Malcolm wrote:

And people argue with me about whether we live in degenerate times....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Hot and Cool Drinks?

Content:

sangyey said:

Are cold drinks ever recommended to help quiet wind disorders?

Malcolm wrote:

Never, unless you have a fever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Namdrol said:

As I said, they tended to ignore Indian Mahāyāna masters, preferring their own interpretations. The only text of clear Indian origin in the short list given here is the first. The rest are native Chinese compositions.

Astus said:

Plus the Diamond Sutra. But yes, that is part of the difficulty of simply putting Chan under "sutrayana" and expecting it to conform with Tibetan views what it should be like. Therefore, if we don't count Indian Mahayana, perfect enlightenment in this life can be as valid a claim as in Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

But we do count Indian Mahāyāna, since Vajrayāna is an extension of Indian Mahāyāna.

BTW, no one said it was impossible to become a buddha in this life. The notion is "is buddhahood in a single lifetime" a possibility? In India Mahāyāna, the answer is no-- Indian Mahayāna of whatever stripe requires three incalculable eons at minimum for full awakening. In Vajrayāna, the answer is yes, since through special methods it is made possible.

It seems to me that rather than providing methods, certain Chan masters who try to prove full enlightenment in the span of a single lifetime, engage in a philosophical feints to support their conception, in general resorting to arguments by means of ultimate truth to try and prove their point, basically arguing the doctrine of paths and stages is an unnecessary conceptual limitation. However, when challenged, I don't see a coherent defense being mounted, which has lead me to believe that much like pure land buddhism, Chan is in fact a faith oriented school.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2011 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

padma norbu said:

Where do all the sentient beings and perceived objects dependently originate from if not ultimately mind? Is there not a semantic distinction between Mind and mind, one referring to dharmakaya and one referring to discursive mind? Any such perception seems to be some sort of "mind stuff," confused or otherwise. Appearances arise and are perceived entirely by the mind, the root of the minds of sentient beings are ultimately all one thing, dharmakaya, which is called Absolute Mind (sems nyid). If discursive mind collapsed, the natural state still be left.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that the appearance and the apparent object are different, whereas in the Yogacara school, the apparent object itself is not held to exist apart from the mind, hence the sobriquet, "mind-only".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: westerners living in india for many years

Content:

alpha said:

So they must have been americans all those who manged to live in india for many years....

Malcolm wrote:
Mostly Brits.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

Flower Adornment Sutra, Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith, Sutra of the Heroic March Concentration, Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment, Platform Sutra, Diamond Sutra. They are all related to Chan/Seon and Huayan/Hwaeom in different ways. No Nagarjuna, no Vasubandhu, no Haribhadra.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, they tended to ignore Indian Mahāyāna masters, preferring their own interpretations. The only text of clear Indian origin in the short list given here is the first. The rest are native Chinese compositions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

Namdrol said:

Pero is telling you is that the literal translation of tha mal gyis shes pa is "ordinary mind". It is a yogi's term. It means wisdom. So, in translations tha mal gyis shes pa is generally given it's literal rendering; but one is to understand the term through its meaning i.e. wisdom.

padma norbu said:

I understand, but wanted to make sure we were all on the same page. Thanks. My question about why they didn't just translate it as "wisdom" was meant as a kind of frustrated rhetorical question, actually. They are writing for an English audience, so it would make a lot more sense to avoid a literal translation for one that makes more sense to the audience. Nobody but a scholar would understand that "ordinary mind" is a yogi's term for "wisdom." It's funny, too, because in the Translator's Introduction, he makes the point to say he has used translated ye shes as wisdom and goes on to explain how that translation is not entirely accurate and why, but he makes no mention of "ordinary mind" whatsoever.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the reason why they continue to translate it literally is that there is an important explanation connected with tha mal gyi shes pa. In this context tha mal means something like original, or uncontrived, and shes pa means awareness. So it is really talking about being in the experience of the nature of the mind. But you won't get this from book which is why it is important also to have the oral instructions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

Therefore, to connect Chan to Indian Mahayana one has to go back in time a bit, to around the 4th century when things started to take shape. That means that the primary treatises of Chinese Buddhism are not those that are used in Tibet to understand Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is definitely not so. Sutra studies in Tibetan Buddhism is based primarily, though not exclusively on treatise authored between the 2-6th century.

What is more accurate to say is that China, being an outpost of Buddhism, was in many respects out of the main stream of the development of Mahāyāna theory in India. What is also true, is that Chinese Buddhists tended to ignore Indian sastra literature, and prefer their own interpretations of Buddhist sutras to those of Indian masters. For example, Huayen masters really looked down on Asanga.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

padma norbu said:

Why wouldn't this be translated as "wisdom" rather than "ordinary mind?" I don't understand the way things are translated sometimes...

Pero said:

Tha mal gyi shes pa means ordinary mind and not wisdom.

Namdrol said:

Mind [sems] and ordinary mind [tha mal gyi shes pa] are two entirely different things.

The latter is a yogi's term for wisdom [ye shes].

padma norbu said:

You appear to be contradicting each other. Namdrol clearly says here "that the latter is a yogi's term for wisdom."

Malcolm wrote:

Pero is telling you is that the literal translation of tha mal gyis shes pa is "ordinary mind". It is a yogi's term. It means wisdom. So, in translations tha mal gyis shes pa is generally given it's literal rendering; but one is to understand the term through its meaning i.e. wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Cultural shouldn't become a trap.

Content:

Chaz said:

Please explain what aspects of Buddhadharma are being cast off as "culture". How are they wrong?

Isn't this road of trying to differentiate between what is "culture" and what is Buddhadharma as a means of deciding what to keep and what to discard equally entangling?

Huseng said:

Some have suggested rebirth is just a cultural adornment from ancient Indian civilization, and hence proceed to craft a "Buddhism" without rebirth.

Chaz said:

Ok, that's one thing. Anything else?

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of things in Tibetan Buddhism that are more culture than Buddhism. Even Samdhong Rinpoche brought this up at Garrison Institute -- warning western Buddhists that they needed to carefully distinguish between what things were Tibetan and what things were Buddhist in Tibetan Buddhism, and preferring the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

5heaps said:

One cannot cognize that which lacks characteristics. It's impossible.

Namdrol said:

if by characteristics you mean shape, color, form, duration, etc, then its no problem to cognize it directly. for, just as empty space for example lacks all of these things and it can be cognized directly without the use of a conceptual consciousness, so too can emptiness

Malcolm wrote:

What type of empty space are you referring, be specific. Do you mean the sky, do you mean the empty space in a box? Conditioned space and unconditioned space are different.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

mindyourmind said:

... this entire discussion is one of comparison, bordering on sectarian dogma, thinly veiled as an academic discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I am questioning the entire basis of certain Chan claims to buddhahood because they broadly contradict Indian Mahāyāna.

It is a doxological discussion and therefore, about dogma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, the mind in the second dhyana is conceptual because it is maintaining equipoise on a conceptual object.

5heaps said:

consider that object, it cant be conceptual, because that object is being held by a nonconceptual mind (ie a mind free from mental images [dunchis are drachis])

Malcolm wrote:

All eight dhyanas are conceptual because their object is a concept, therefore, the mind

that holds the object is conceptual. It may not be a diffuse conceptual mind, but it is conceptual a mind since it holds a concept, for example, "infinite space".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Cause, Effect, & Holocaust

Content:

Epistemes said:

Then, taking any ethical dimension out of it:

If the situations we encounter in life don't happen by accident but rather result from actions we have done in the past, are the Jews responsible for their own deaths in the Holocaust? Are the people killed during 9/11 responsible for their deaths?

In other words, if we reap what we sow, does it not follow that the people killed during 9/11 are somehow responsible for their own deaths?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily. While in Tibetan Buddhism a hard theory of karma is often held out, in Theravada Buddhism it is considered that people can be caught up in negative situations without necessarily having done anything negative to get there. In other words, being in the wrong place at wrong time is possible without it being a karmic thing.

Being born as a human being is a result of good karma; but not necessarily everything that happens to one is a result of karma, some things are purely a result of blind causes and conditions that have nothing directly to do with one's karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

Astus said:

Vitarka and vicāra don't exist in the 2nd dhyāna already, how could then it be called conceptual? Nirvikalpa-jñāna also exists in common Mahayana.

Namdrol said:

Because it's one pointedness is a mental concept.

5heaps said:

what definition of mental concept are you using?

we cannot say there is a conceptual consciousness in the 2nd dhyana, because that mind is not using dunchis or drachis. so in what way will you explain that the single-

pointedness is conceptual?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the mind in the second dhyana is conceptual because it is maintaining equipoise on a conceptual object.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

padma norbu said:

Who in the heck has ever put forth such a notion that it would actually need to be refuted?!

Malcolm wrote:

The Yogacara school in Ancient India. They reasoned that since everything was a mental projection, when that was recognized, dualistic appearances would collapse and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: the methodology of Sakya

Content:

mzaur said:

Thank you. Is there ngondro in Sakya? How does Sakya differ from the other Sarma lineages?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is ngondro.

The teaching lineage from India is unique. Lamdre is based mainly on the teachings of the Hevajra Tantra and Virupa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Appearances and mind

Content:

padma norbu said:

It says "ordinary mind" is the dharma expanse, the victor's essence... but it says "everything is not mind" on p.224...

Malcolm wrote:

Mind [sems] and ordinary mind [tha mal gyi shes pa] are two entirely different things. The latter is a yogi's term for wisdom [ye shes].

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

the mind is buddha...

Namdrol said:

Nice, a conditioned, impermanent, afflicted buddha.

N

Astus said:

"Good sons, all hindrances are none other than ultimate enlightenment. Whether you attain mindfulness or lose mindfulness, there is no non-liberation. Establishing the Dharma and refuting the Dharma are both called nirvana; wisdom and folly are equally prajna; the method that is perfected by bodhisattvas and false teachers is the same bodhi; ignorance and suchness are not different realms; morality, concentration and wisdom, as well as desire, hatred and ignorance are all divine practices; sentient beings and lands share the same dharma nature; hell and heaven are both the Pure Land; those having Buddha-nature and those not having it equally accomplish the Buddha's enlightenment. All defilements are ultimately liberation. The reality-realms's ocean-like wisdom completely illumines all marks to be just like empty space. This is called 'the Tathāgata's accordance with the nature of enlightenment.' "

(Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment, ch. 6, tr. C. Muller)

Malcolm wrote:

Awesome, so fools are buddhas and there is no need for Buddhism at all. Nice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Love vs. Attachment

Content:

Namdrol said:

The Dharma, as I understand, begins with understanding our real state and

acknowledging it, and not having fantasies about samsara or ourselves. Dharma is not an all or nothing venture. It is progressive, and one only has to practice as much if it as one understands.

Epistemes said:

So much of what you say is precisely what I need to be reading and understanding at this stage in my life. While I'm sure that so much of what you say is based upon a synthesis of your experience, reading, learning and teaching, are there other resources available that explain the dharma as such? Or is it all based on finding the gems among the pile?

As I've already said, Buddhism for Beginners seems to suggest "Thou shalt not be angry," "Thou shalt not be attached to people, places or thing," "Thou shalt love equitably and impartially," "Thou shalt...". I, personally, am tired of all the precedents. I want to continue the relationships that I have, cultivate them through my thirst for Buddhism, cultivate myself, and see where I get. Buddhism for Beginners punches one's mind like clay, strangles it and makes it feel suffocated and threatened.

Other more advanced resources suffocate the mind with their deep experience and complexity. It seems that there is no middle way in The Middle Way.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is the problem with sorting out the Dharma for oneself. There is a Dharma teaching for whatever stage of practice one is at. But that is the point, one has to work with where one is at.

So if you read a text that seems not to address your present state, well, put it aside. And that is a middle way.

Having a teacher helps, but in the end one must integrate these things into your own practice.

Rather than looking for a "beginners" Buddhism (since there really isn't such a thing), look for Dharma teachings that speak to you, and work for you in a practical manner. Take what you can absorb and leave the rest.

In the end, great compassion is the essence of Dharma. Great compassion comes from compassion. Cultivate that, and that is sufficient.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Disposal

Content:

Jikan said:

So you're saying they R E S P E C T the word as a vehicle of the teachings of Christ?

Epistemes said:

R E S P E C T is a vast understatement. Worship or veneration is more apt.

And, as explained above, I find cultivating any practice regarding the ceremonial dissipation of materials to be counterproductive, counterintuitive and simply superfluous.

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhism, such care comes from a time when paper was rare and expensive, and books were hard to come by.

However these days you can see people releasing paper prayer flags by the thousands so that they literally cover the ground, and then walking all over them.

And, with millions of Buddhist fliers printed on colored paper with toxic ink, it is not really practical nor safe to burn this stuff outdoors. It is not like rice paper. Thus, in general, I recycle so called Dharma "garbage". And in fact everything is empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Love vs. Attachment

Content:

Epistemes said:

I also appreciate your comment regarding acknowledging attachment and living with it, rather than denying it and feigning enlightenment. Though I have much studying to do, nothing I've read yet has offered this type of unproscriptive advice. Most authors - even in the so-called beginners books - intimate "Get off your ass and get enlightened," which is very intimidating.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma, as I understand, begins with understanding our real state and acknowledging it, and not having fantasies about samsara or ourselves. Dharma is not an all or nothing venture. It is progressive, and one only has to practice as much if it as one understands.

For example, you are not ready to drink the Buddhist koolaid and buy rebirth, karma, and so on hook line and sinker -- you may not even really believe in awakening. But what you can believe is your own experience, and the painfulness of desire, hatred and ignorance, as well as the joyfulness that connection with other sentient beings can bring.

The Buddha's own advice for people who were not able to adopt his perspectives about rebirth and karma automatically is that they focus their attention on cultivating loving kindness, compassion, sympathetic joy and ultimately, equanimity.

Once, in response to a statement by Shariputra that friendship was half of the life of a Dharma practitioner, Buddha replied that was incorrect, friendship was the whole of the life of a Dharma practitioner. Thus, cultivating loving kindness, compassion, sympathetic joy, and equanimity are Dharma practice and relationships forged on these bases are deeply fulfilling and satisfying. Not only that, any relationship, positive or negative, one presently is in can be immensely transformed by these four cultivations. Positive relationships are enhanced and deepened, negative relationships will weaken their grasp and one will come to a place of evenness regarding other people's suffering afflictive behavior, an evenness suffused with genuine care for others along with a sharp recognition of one's own limitations around helping others. Equanimity is not indifference, it is recognizing what one is and is not able to accomplish.

In other words, we don't have to a) fix the world b) be emotional unavailable c) persist in unhealthy relationships -- instead we can slowly work at opening our hearts with love and compassion and work with where we are at the present moment without having to condition it with unattainable idealism.

Learning calm-abiding or shamatha meditation is very helpful, since this trains us in mental stability. Shamatha creates a container where we are able to see how the mind thrashes, bolts, revolts, jumps around and so on. It gives us a pillar through which to measure the rest of our experience. We do not have to begin with hour long sessions, we can sit for 5 minutes. Then 10. Then 15, and so on. Following the breath is an ideal practice for beginners as well.

Anyway, the main point is that Buddhist practice is not about waking up to some abstract "enlightenment". It is about knowing one's own state, right here and right now and working with that, along with various means to do so.

In short, understanding our present condition is Dharma practice, and it is the only Dharma practice we have.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Can I do this without a teacher?

Content:

Epistemes said:

I don't believe I can. Unfortunately, there are no teachers available in my area as per buddhanet. The only resources I have are books and this forum.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, my approach was reading and studying for a few years.

Then, eventually I got a teacher.

If you can travel to some retreat, then this is beneficial. And if you can't, you can still read and think about what you are reading.

In other words, there is no need to get a teacher immediately.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Devices Zen and the Direct Path

Content:

LastLegend said:

If the teachers are not enlightened, they cannot teach direct path.

Astus said:

Neither can they teach Zen.

Malcolm wrote:

Guess there are not many teachers of Zen, then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

the mind is buddha...

Malcolm wrote:

Nice, a conditioned, impermanent, afflicted buddha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2011 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

Equipoise and post-equipoise matters when there is a specific state of mind to cultivate. Zen is not about creating any mind. So it is called no-mind.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a false dichotomy. When in equipoise on reality, it is not like there is some mental focus that designates an object called "reality". Equipoise on reality is not a mental state. It is beyond mind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: "Mahamudra and Related Instructions," Peter Roberts

Content:

Sönam said:

Being not english (as you may know), can you help to decode the following ...

In The Quintessence of Nectar, page 343, within "3. Increasing the benefit of that attainment", into "a. Increasing the heat", it is said : In this "binding clasp of the knees," your legs form two triangles of "opposing hearths" ... what that "opposing hearths" means?

Thank you for helping

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

It is sort of weird translation -- it just means that you sit with your knees up usually held with your hands or with a belt. This posture is often called "stove posture".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Love vs. Attachment

Content:

Epistemes said:

...If one person is trying to be non-afflictively attached but another person is afflictively attached then this creates the illusion of being non-afflictively attached for the person who thinks they are non-afflictively attached when, in fact, because of the emotional barriers created by the one who is afflictively attached, the non-afflictively attached person is actually afflictively attached as well.

Malcolm wrote:

No, if this were so then Buddhas would be afflictively attached to sentient beings, and they are not. The afflictively-attached person owns their afflictions. There is no principle of samsaric co-dependence between Buddhas and sentient beings, which is what you are describing.

BTW, there is no such a thing as "trying" to be non-afflictively attached. One is either

afflicted, not afflicted, or possess patience regarding the arising of one's own afflictions. If one possesses affliction, it is better to recognize that fact and not pretend one is above affliction.

Afflictions (desire, anger and ignorance) generally only function freely when one is not in possession of recognition of the operation of mental factors driven by affliction and b) when one's mind lacks stability. When one attains patience towards one's the arising of one's afflictions, they arise but lack force that propels one to act upon them.

In terms of parenting or caring for others, when one is purely under the influence of affliction, to some extent that care is blind and filled with self-interest. When one's afflicted relationship is characterized with patience, one is better able to make universal choices affecting all involved without falling under the fog of blind selfish interest. When one is free from affliction, one's caring for others comes from a place of pure altruism and equanimity.

Pretending that one is free of affliction is bullshit. That is not how afflictive attachment works. A realized bodhisattva possesses non-afflictive attachment towards all sentient beings. A non-realized bodhisattva possesses bias and attachment. If one is not realized, it is better to just recognize one's own state and work with it.

I.e. if you are attached to your kids, don't pretend not to be, don't pretend you are free from suffering around it, and work with it. Bodhisattvas can work with attachment and desire -- the one thing they cannot work with is anger and hatred. From a Mahāyāna perspective therefore, attachment is workable and it is fine. If you combine your afflicted relationships with altruistic motivation, you can even bring them onto the path, and make them part of your path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

mindyourmind said:

What possible purpose can a discussion like this have?

Namdrol said:

The purpose is to distinguish what is rhetorical from what is actual.

N

mindyourmind said:

And how exactly do we, who are not realized, tell the difference? By way of a war of quotes and a nice game of "my master says"?

How can anyone meaningfully address the question of what is rhetorical buddhahood and what is actual buddhahood, other than an effort to try and define and describe that which most traditions view as indescribable?

Malcolm wrote:

If we, who are not realized, have no way to infer what is correct and incorrect regarding Buddhist doctrine, then we are really screwed, aren't we?

Citations are not sufficient, of course, one must also use reasoning, and a whole host of other things.

There is no need to use citations in this respect, it is obvious to anyone who really thinks about it --1) realizing emptiness is not equivalent with becoming a Samyak Sambuddha, 2) realizing emptiness, period, is the emptiness realized by a Buddha.

The ancient Chan masters are making the argument that the realization of emptiness is sufficient and there is not much reason to place a lot of emphasis on the path of cultivation (bhūmis 1-10). Once in possession of the Gnosis of the path, that is the main point, and that is Buddhahood.

There is a similar sentiment in Kagyu Mahāmudrā -- which is why there are so many different presentations of the way four yogas (split into twelve) are mapped to the paths and stages. But in reality, the Mahāyāna paths and stages are irrelevant in Mahāmudrā, just as they are in Dzogchen. It is not the case however that there is no gradual progression in both mahāmudrā and dzogchen. The progression is not with respect to the ultimate, but rather, with respect to the person.

Now then, the question inevitably arises "Is it possible for someone to fully awaken suddenly?" The answer to this question from a Mahāmudrā, Dzogchen and Chan POV is yes (and from a Vajrayāna POV, one's yogic progress through the stages can be accomplished in a matter of days, theoretically (for example, Saraha was someone who achieved full buddhahood suddenly; Virupa achieved the sixth bhūmi in six days)). The caveat to this is that it is so rare as to be merely an academic distinction. In other words, sudden awakeners are possible, but rarer than visible stars at noon.

The inexpressible realization of emptiness is the same in every respect from the moment of the path of seeing until full buddhahood. We can talk about afflictive obscurations and knowledge obscurations and so on, but the real difference between buddhas and bodhisattvas on the stages is whether there is a difference in equipoise and post-equipoise. Buddhas are never not in a state of equipoise. Thus the notion of the two obscurations apply only in post-equipoise, not while in equipoise on the ultimate. However, this crucial difference is responsible also for the difference in qualities of a buddha and for example, a tenth stage.

Thus, it is important to distinguish rhetoric from reality so that people do not waste their time on fantasies. And it is indeed a fantasy for 99.999 percent of people that they will be able to suddenly awaken into full Buddhahood.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

mindyourmind said:

What possible purpose can a discussion like this have?

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose is to distinguish what is rhetorical from what is actual.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Love vs. Attachment

Content:

Epistemes said:

Call me ignorant and caught in the tides of samsara, but I don't think a strict non-attachment in human relationships is possible

Malcolm wrote:

One needs to make a distinction between afflictive attachment and non-afflictive attachment. Non-afflictive attachment comes from a place of concern and caring, valuing others more than oneself. Afflictive attachment is all about "I, me and mine".

From a Mahāyāna perspective, non-afflictive attachment is perfectly appropriate, indeed necessary. Afflictive attachment is just another cause of suffering.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

Awakening in Chan means realising the nature of mind, i.e. the buddha-mind. Since the buddha-mind is perfect in qualities and omniscience, how could that awakening be limited? It is free from the emotional (klesa) and conceptual (jnaya) obscurations, how could it be bound by anything at all? Teachers of Chan were well aware of the gradual

stages and aeons of bodhisattva practice when they talked about buddhahood and claimed that Chan is a sudden path. Those who viewed it in a different way did say so.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference lies in equipoise and post-equipoise.

Frankly, it is obvious that realizing the nature of the mind does not make one a buddha. That is why I stated that "buddhahood" in Chan is a euphemism for awakening, but it does not mean that one who has awakened is a Samyaksambuddha, though I imagine there are some deluded Chan practitioners even today who think it is so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in Chan

Content:

Astus said:

The fourth principle of Chan is "see nature, become buddha" (jianxing chengfo / kensho jobutsu 見性成佛). As it's said in the Platform Sutra, "If you recognize your own mind and see the nature, you will definitely accomplish the enlightenment of buddhahood." (T48n2008, p351a, 12)

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between the awakening of a first stage bodhisattva and a buddhahood. There is a difference however in terms of qualities and omniscience.

My point still stands. "Sudden Awakening" in Chan does not mean full buddhahood.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 10:24 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Namdrol said:

So even here, Vajrayāna remain unique in asserting that one can attain full awakening 11 bhumi + in a single lifetime, soup to nuts.

Huseng said:

In your experience have you met a Vajrayāna practitioner who demonstrated that this was possible?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, or so I believe.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 4:46 AM
Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible
Content:

Tsongkhapa said:
No, because it's all a bit superficial and intellectual.

Malcolm wrote:
The whole title of this thread is wrong -- this thread was created by Huseng who split the thread off from another thread.

I never said that "renunciation" per se was impossible. The path of abandoning or renouncing sense objects what I identified as impossible in this day and age, based on many citations one can find, particularly in the tantras of Heruka and statements by Mahasiddhas such as Saraha.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 4:02 AM
Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?
Content:

Namdrol said:
Outside of Tibeta Buddhism/Vajrayāna, Chan alone proposes that it is possible to attain fullbuddhahood in a single lifetime. But it seems that in Chan, "buddhahood" is a generally a euphemism for attaining the bodhisattva stages, and no Indian Mahāyāna tradition denies that it is impossible for someone to attain the path of seeing and so on. However, they would have done so based on past accumulations. So even here, Vajrayāna remain unique in asserting that one can attain full awakening 11 bhumi + in a single lifetime, soup to nuts.

Astus said:
It is not only Chan but also Huayan and Tiantai teach sudden enlightenment - interestingly Huayan puts "sudden enlightenment" one level below its own "complete teaching of the one vehicle". As for the difference between the entry to the bodhisattva stages and full buddhahood, in Chan it is clarified with the distinction of gradual and sudden paths. Gradual means the bodhisattva stages, sudden means immediate buddhahood. Of course, not everyone among the Chan teachers agreed with this view.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think that sudden enlightenment in Chan means sudden full buddhahood.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Renunciation is completely possible to achieve. If you argue that the Vajrayana is the only path to abandon attachment, qualified Vajrayana practice depends upon sutra renunciation so without renunciation there is no Vajrayana.

Namdrol said:

You obviously have come late the thread -- renunciation and the path of renunciation are two distinct things, which has been clarified already.

N

Tsongkhapafan said:

Your definition of renunciation is still incorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't. I also clarified that the English word renunciation can be used to translate a number of terms. You are thinking that term renunciation is only appropriate for "nges 'byung". It may also be used for other Tibetans terms such as spong ba and so on.

But of course it is impossible to talk to anyone about these things because everybody on this website with just a little bit learning is convinced they are a pandita.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Renunciation is completely possible to achieve. If you argue that the Vajrayana is the only path to abandon attachment, qualified Vajrayana practice depends upon sutra

renunciation so without renunciation there is no Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

You obviously have come late the thread -- renunciation and the path of renunciation are two distinct things, which has been clarified already.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Modern Buddhist Monuments

Content:

Epistemes said:

Was it necessary to state that the monument is being built to stand for an actually indefinite period of time?

Malcolm wrote:

Don't ask me, ask the person who wrote the copy in the website.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Modern Buddhist Monuments

Content:

Namdrol said:

"built to stand for 1000 years."

Epistemes said:

What does that mean? Is there a chemical agent that will gradually erode the statue so that the last erosion will be complete during the 1000th year? do the plans for the statue indicate that it should be demolished in a 1000 years? Or, is it a simple expression to indicate its abiding, durable composition?

Malcolm wrote:

Was it really necessary to ask such a question?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Astus said:

we have East Asian and South Asian Buddhism

Malcolm wrote:

Outside of Tibeta Buddhism/Vajrayāna, Chan alone proposes that it is possible to attain fullbuddhahood in a single lifetime. But it seems that in Chan, "buddhahood" is a generally a euphemism for attaining the bodhisattva stages, and no Indian Mahāyāna tradition denies that it is impossible for someone to attain the path of seeing and so on. However, they would have done so based on past accumulations. So even here, Vajrayāna remain unique in asserting that one can attain full awakening 11 bhumi + in a single lifetime, soup to nuts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Modern Buddhist Monuments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.maitreyaproject.org> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

"As the central feature of its activities, Maitreya Project is planning to build, in Kushinagar, Uttar Pradesh, India, a magnificent 500ft / 152m bronze statue of Maitreya Buddha, built to stand for 1000 years."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Jnana said:

Sounds to me like you prefer a Tibetocentric bias.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, truthfully, only the Tibeans endeavored to preserve the successive layers of North Indian Buddhism in some semblance of how they may actually have been taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2011 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Astus said:

This is practically negating the validity of all the other Buddhist teachings

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, since if you examine things carefully, Mantrayāna is the only Indian Buddhist tradition that asserts full Buddhahood in one lifetime is actually a possibility.

All other Indian Buddhist traditions of which we have knowledge, Mahāyāna or not, assert that at minimum full awakening is impossible in less than three incalculable eons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2011 at 10:25 AM

Title: Re: DMT

Content:

xylem said:

it's one thing to engaged in a variety of activities as a "seeker". it's a different thing to engage in such activities after taking refuge and dedicating one's life to buddhist practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, lighten up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Namdrol said:

Within categories of people holding prātimokṣa vows within Buddhism, however, there are only four types of vows (eight when split by gender), upāsakas, upāvasa (fast day vows), śramaṇa and bhikṣu. Mahāyāna vows do not have the force to ordain one a pravrajita of any kind (śramaṇa and bhikṣu). All this may be found in the Kośa.

Huseng said:

The primary precepts in the Brahma Net Sutra are called prātimokṣa.

In any case this is all legal terminology and intellectual wrangling. Regardless of how others saw them, many bodhisattva renunciates of the past were, at least within their own culture, qualified to receive offerings, wear the religious attire appropriate for a monk and were considered by their peers and society to be monks. This obviously is not applicable to the wider global Buddhist world where the ancient Indian legal terminology was and still is in effect.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, we can say that there is a Bodhisattva "prātimokṣa", but it depends on śrāvaka pratimokṣa. There is a sutra in that Ratnakuta (Chang, Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras pg. 262) that discusses and contrasts the prātimokṣa of a bodhisattva with that of a śrāvaka, but there is no suggestion in this text that bodhisattvas enjoy a separate

ordination from śrāvakas -- it merely distinguishes the parameters of conduct for bodhisattvas and non-bodhisattvas.

There really is no way to get around this. There is a separate ordination for bodhisattvas distinct from that of what we generally call "buddhist monks".

You are the one who is intellectually wrangling with this.

For me, it is very simple. If you have received an ordination based on one of the eighteen schools Vinaya, you are a monk or a nun. If not, then you are lay person. Added to this are bodhisattva vows, etc.

Huseng said:

The vinayas of India are all different, hence reflecting different aspirations and intentions at work in their formulation.

Malcolm wrote:

They reflect regional separation, but not separation of difference in aspiration and intention. The vinayas of India are more similar than they are different from one another. The primary differences between them are in the number of minor rules, the cut and color of the robes, and the regional language of the school.

Bodhisattva vow systems on the other hand are quite different in terms of aspiration and intention. The Brahmajala system in China is clearly in keeping with the Yogachara model, rather than the Madhyamaka model (which is based on the Akashagarbha Sutra).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: Rinchen Terzod & Dudjom Tersar indexes

Content:

Adamantine said:

Namdrol I had a hard time locating the Dudjom tersar index in the tbrc website..

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Rinpoche's collected works including tersar (Dudjom III):

<http://tbrc.org/link?RID=W20869> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Dudjom Lingpa's collected termas (Dudjom II):

<http://tbrc.org/link?RID=W28732> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Rigzin Duddul Dorje's collected termas (Dudjom I)

http://www.tbrc.org/#library_work_Object-W22123 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: DMT

Content:

Heruka said:

what do we think?

Malcolm wrote:

It was fun, the one time I did it in 1978.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

mr. gordo said:

No one here holds the optimistic view of Kurzweil's Singularity?

Huseng said:

Computers becoming conscious means Skynet.

Malcolm wrote:

Second that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Huseng said:

Your use of the term śramaṇa is not universal. The term śramaṇa was used to refer to renunciates in general in several Āgama sūtras in classical Chinese translation I've read. Moreover, some monks, at least in China, self-identified as śramaṇa (Chn. shamen 沙門), but that wasn't because they were novices.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is true, śramaṇa was a term applied to both Buddhist and non-Buddhist mendicants. However, in the context of what constitutes a śramaṇa with the Buddhist order, it is a novice.

The appellation "buddha" was not reserved solely for The Buddha, but was a term many religious teachers applied to themselves during the time of The Buddha.

Within categories of people holding prātimokṣa vows within Buddhism, however, there are only four types of vows (eight when split by gender), upāsakas, upāvasa (fast day vows), śramaṇa and bhikṣu. Mahāyāna vows do not have the force to ordain one a pravrajita of any kind (śramaṇa and bhikṣu). All this may be found in the Kośa.

Huseng said:

However, I know by the Song Dynasty they insisted all seng 僧 had certification of their vinaya ordination, which proved to be a problem for Dogen when he went to China.

Basically in Saichō's time in China the legal terminology determining what constituted a "monk" or seng 僧 was not based on Sanskrit definitions provided in the vinaya. I understand from an Indian or Tibetan perspective this appears odd, but that's just how it developed.

Malcolm wrote:

Which means that people knowledgeable in Buddhism recognized loose definitions were a problem and fixed it. The legal terminology already existed in Vinaya, the Chinese were simply slow to adopt it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

tobes said:

I don't disagree with this. But the question is: are the causes located in an ancient Indian cosmology of time or in human intentions and actions?

If the latter, then it is clearly possible to change them.

If the former, then there is a sense in which decline is inevitable and cannot be overcome.

Malcolm wrote:

The Indian cosmology of time is predicated on increasingly contaminated human intentions and actions. In other words, decline happens because people's moral caliber is increasingly degraded.

tobes said:

Many people would argue that the obvious cause for cheap energy and infinite growth is found in the logic of capital. There is nothing inevitable or permanent about that cause and its associated logic.

Malcolm wrote:

Logic didn't cause cheap energy. Drilling depth did.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

tobes said:

As well, people in Europe and America are currently living through extremely difficult economic and political times. It is not surprising to hear sentiments of "overarching global decline." People in China do not have the same sense of pessimism.

But remember that only a decade or two ago, the nineties (for Europe and America) was a golden era of cosmopolitanism, technological innovation, globalism and "overarching global progression."

Both narratives are bogus; the reality in both decades is/was filled in equal measure with good and bad stuff.

I do however, agree that we're in for a particularly bad decade, especially in Europe. Beyond that, little is certain.

Malcolm wrote:

Have you been to China? The place is a disaster. Crowded, polluted, etc. The place is a dump. They ruined their forests centuries ago, their western border is being desertified very quickly. They are busy destroying the environment of Tibet, etc.

They can be optimistic, but then people do like to gild shit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Huseng said:

Also, let's just assume the Brahma Net Sūtra is legitimate buddhavacana...The Brahma Net Sūtra speaks of bodhisattva renunciates, which Saichō described as great monks. That's a śramaṇa in other words.

Malcolm wrote:

In order to be a śramaṇa or a bhikṣu, one needs to ordain in one of the "eighteen" schools. Otherwise, you are an upāsikā.

Apart from these categories there are no other categories of Buddhist practitioners, Mahāyāna or otherwise.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Huseng said:

I would still think that they were not bhikṣus, nor even śramaṇeras, just lay people with shaved heads in robes.

Is a śramaṇa by necessity also a bhikṣu?

Malcolm wrote:

A śramaṇa is, by necessity, a novice ordained by a bhikṣu. One does not require a quorum to ordain novices. I suspect that what happened in China was that many Central Asia and Indian monks came to China and ordained novices (śramaṇas).

I don't think you can really argue for a huge difference between Central Asian Buddhism (define were, first of all) and Indian Buddhism because of the strong Influence of Indian culture from Bactria all the way to Java and Modern Day Vietnam.

How much do we know about the state of monastic ordination in China prior to the 7th century?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Seishin said:

This may be a little off topic;... because of Saicho's reforms to ordination and subsequent other changes made to Japanese Buddhism over generations, would that mean it's better not to follow Japanese Buddhism?

Seishin.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you want to be a fully ordained bhikṣu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Huseng said:

The Buddha also gave permission for the vinaya to be reformed if need be.

Namdrol said:

I think this goes a little too far. He told Ananda that it was ok to ignore minor rules without specifying which rules were minor. One assumes he meant rules like making rude noises while chewing, slurping one's soup and so on.

But he certainly never said "If need be, revise Vinaya."

Huseng said:

In any case it was revised at some point in India. Hence we have more than one vinaya.

He also specified if his dharma was to go to foreign lands it could be modified as appropriate to the customs of those places.

Malcolm wrote:

He meant in terms of wearing wool and leather (that is the example).

Huseng said:

Like I said in the article the Brahma Net Sūtra might have been penned at a time when no Chinese translation of the vinaya existed. It is funny to think that even in the early fifth century when Kumārajīva was first stepping foot into China the monks there actually had no vinaya, or it was only then first being translated. They had monastic rules, and I imagine the monks from Central Asia and those few from India orally taught the vinaya and perhaps transmitted it to some, but there was no Chinese translation of even one vinaya system until the 5th century. Funny even Faxian in India had to write down an oral recitation of the vinaya as he couldn't get a hold of a written copy during his travels in India in the 5th century.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not know that. Interesting.

Huseng said:

Anyway, the Brahma Net Sūtra might have been written in such conditions, thus providing, at least for its time, a suitable substitute for the vinaya, but also in line with Mahāyāna ideals. Obviously later generations would not have had such ideas about the text, but they nevertheless took the text as the golden word of the Buddha. If those bodhisattva precepts are actually followed in their entirety one would be living a lifestyle in line with the vinaya. The problem is that in Japan some centuries later they decided it was optional to follow any of the prescriptions contained in any text. Even if they still transmitted the vinaya they would have had the same ideas about it, too. Everything became optional. The prescriptions in the Brahma Net Sūtra were no less sacred than those in the vinaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Even so, in India, it was necessarily the opinion of Mahāyāna Vinayadharas that Mahāyāna precepts were based on Hināyāna vows.

Huseng said:

But I do not think one can infer from this that innovations like Saicho's would be considered wise or valid.

If it wasn't for the developments in Japanese Buddhism in the last century and a half, would your opinion be different? I mean if Japanese priests were all still celibate, unmarried, etc... and living as monastics.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

I would still think that they were not bhikṣus, nor even śramaṇeras, just lay people with shaved heads in robes.

The Indian approach to these things was always layered. Whereas, the Chinese, cut off from the Mainstream of Indian Buddhism for the most part developed along lines very difficult for Indo-Tibetan Buddhists to recognize. For example, the Chinese obsession with elaborating individual sutra systems and so on. As you know, Indians, in the end, relied more on sastras than the raw material of sutras. Sutras were for devotion, sastras were for study.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Huseng said:

I was discussing this with my friends today, most of whom are in sciences. They place their faith in technological development and science (and maybe the market) saving them from such a catastrophe.

Malcolm wrote:

They are dreaming. The reason we are changing to electric cars is not because they are more efficient and less polluting. We are changing to electric cars to take advantage of the 300 years or so of coal.

Huseng said:

This is rather common amongst professional scientists, and business oriented individuals. Their faith in the market or technology is really as dangerous as faith in god. Just throw all care to the wind and assume things will work out in the end no matter what.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, foolish.

Huseng said:

I've taken an interest in organic farming, and could actually study this in India under the great Shiva Vandana.

Malcolm wrote:

Vandana Shiva is great.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Huseng said:

The Buddha also gave permission for the vinaya to be reformed if need be.

Malcolm wrote:

I think this goes a little too far. He told Ananda that it was ok to ignore minor rules without specifying which rules were minor. One assumes he meant rules like making rude noises while chewing, slurping one's soup and so on.

But he certainly never said "If need be, revise Vinaya."

Now, given that there are different ceremonies for conferring Vinaya, and different procedures for confession and so on, obviously the Buddha left much up to regional vinayadharas discretion.

But I do not think one can infer from this that innovations like Saicho's would be considered wise or valid.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Huseng said:

Curiously Amoghavajra was a Central Asian from Samarkand, not India proper.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrabodhi, his teacher, was educated in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2011 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Air is ruined, soil is ruined, water is ruined, species going extinct at rates unprecedented for millions of years, more people killed in wars in the 20th century than in any century previous, and who knows what this century will bring.

We have had limited success in stemming cosmetic pollution, but we have merely offloaded it to other places.

Huseng said:

In addition to this the problem is accelerating and increasing in severity. The "rural poor" in nations like China and India are either moving to urban areas or just building cities in hopes of living a resource costly urban lifestyle. In China especially this is particularly noteworthy because of their growing middle class and emulation of anything western. The convenience stores in Shanghai are more or less identical to what you find in Japan (Japan is mostly western). Massive amounts of plastic wrapped in plastic. More and more people want their own private cars, too, even if it is really unnecessary. The whole Chinese economic miracle is built on industrial production and social stability a matter of keeping it going.

I also heard global carbon emissions are increasing significantly year by year instead of decreasing as scientists continually beg nations to do.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, when we run out of energy, world population will collapse. Not catastrophically (well, may in some places), but what we take for granted today will be gone. Enjoy it, 'cause we live at the peak of technological civilization. Barring a game-changing breakthrough in clean energy production, world consciousness, and so on, prospects for the future of our present "level" of civilization look pretty bleak.

So my advice is: learning something useful that does not require high technology, farming, metal smithing, etc. In my case, I learned Tibetan Medicine, to practice yes, but also to preserve here as the only fully Buddhist system of medicine in the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'

Content:

muni said:

Integration.

Malcolm wrote:

Also easy to say, hard to do, as long as one is under the influence of afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'

Content:

muni said:

There is nothing to undo, nothing to transform in the nonseparation of samsara or nirvana; all arises, subsides in itself. There is no samsara to undo or nirvana to reach.

Malcolm wrote:

Easy to say...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Jikan said:

Where does the vinaya fall in the TienTai classification of the teachings? One could argue that the Brahma Net Sutra precepts are embedded in or are more amenable to an Ekayana view than the vinaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Alternately, Saicho may have been reacting against the newly imported Indian Mantrayāna sense of listing teachings in terms of their hierarchy (just as Chan reacted to Mantrayāna by inventing a lineage of patriarchs going back to the Buddha). While Kukai did not resort to the Nine Yanas scheme (yet to be elaborated by the Nyingmapas) both masters (Saicho and Kukai) were clearly aware of the four tenet system in India and the subsequent need to classify Chinese innovations in a progressive scheme, albeit differently and for different reasons. And naturally Kukai selected a nice round number for his progressive ladder of Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings in China and Japan, with Confucism and Taoism at the bottom of the rungs.

Kukai's "mantrayāna as the conclusion of all dharma teachings" is one alternative; Saicho's attempting to contextualize all teachings in light of Tien Tai Lotus hermeneutics is another. Of these two, Kukai's approach is ultimately the more Indian Buddhist, and Saicho's more reflective of indigenous developments in Chinese Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

tobes said:

Yes, I suppose if I am to adopt a position on this, it is that I do not like the political implications of assuming (without good reason) that we're trapped in inevitable decline.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this present civilization is definitely in decline. And I personally think that we are heading into a phase of global decline.

Air is ruined, soil is ruined, water is ruined, species going extinct at rates unprecedented for millions of years, more people killed in wars in the 20th century than in any century previous, and who knows what this century will bring.

We have had limited success in stemming cosmetic pollution, but we have merely offloaded it to other places.

Our civilization is predicated on two things: cheap energy and infinite growth. Both predicates, as I am sure you will agree, are fantasies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

tobes said:

If Buddhism does not teach us that we can change in a wholesome way, then....well.....really, what does it teach us?

Malcolm wrote:

That we live in shit and we need to get ourselves and everyone else out of the shit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, but there is a clear distinction between lay and ordained lamas since lama means "guru". Not all lamas are bhikṣus (dge long) and not all bhikṣus are lamas.

N

Huseng said:

I was told that Tibetan "monks" are not necessarily all bhikṣus, and that, at least around Kathmandu, most of them are not fully ordained bhikṣus with the 250 vows.

Malcolm wrote:

These are dge tshuls, śramaṇeras. They are rab byungs i.e. pravrajitas, ordained persons. They are therefore part of the ordained Sangha and can participate in posadha. Pravrajitas consist of all śramaṇeras and śramaṇerikas, bhikṣus and bhikṣunis.

Thus the term "rab byung" refers to all ordained persons. The colloquial term is "Trapa" i.e. shaveling.

A pravrajita is someone who has undertaken formal ordination beyond lay pratimoksha. But there is no such a thing as a Mahāyāna pravrajita at least not in any Indian Buddhist tradition with which I am familiar. The reason is that Indian Buddhists held that Mahāyāna vows were held to supplement or transform one's pratimoksha vows, but not that they substituted for them, as it seems some Chinese Buddhists and later Saicho held.

The literature of vows became very important in India after the 8th century because with the proliferation of systems of ethics between various of the shravaka schools, then in the two strands of Mahāyāna vows and finally within the successive layers of tantra series, it all started to become contentious and confusing. Nevertheless, Mahāyāna and later Vajrayāna vows were considered to float on the platform of Hinayāna vows

which were considered indispensable.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Namdrol said:

Right, and this is source of confusion for many people.

N

Huseng said:

In Tibetan a Lama is not necessarily a celibate monk, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but there is a clear distinction between lay and ordained lamas since lama means "guru". Not all lamas are bhikṣus (dge long) and not all bhikṣus are lamas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Huseng said:

This is indeed because bhikṣu is equated to monk in English, but the language parameters are different in Chinese and Japanese. For example a Japanese priest, a Theravada bhikkhu and a Chinese bhikṣu are all called obou-san in Japanese and senglv in Chinese.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, and this is source of confusion for many people.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Namdrol said:

Well, no. I think that he did not understand the importance of pratimoksha and did not understand that the consequences of his understanding was to relegate so called monastics to the level of lay people inadvertently. Because of Saicho, we now have Japanese priests claiming equal status with bhikṣus in Buddhist assemblies just because they shave their heads and wear religious costumes.

Huseng said:

At least in his time anyway he insisted on celibacy and abstaining from alcohol. The Brahm Net Sutra's precepts prescribe monastic regulations not so different from what a bhikṣu would be expected to uphold. That was the case at least when he was alive.

Personally I think even if Japan still had the vinaya it would have went down the route it did. Up until the 19th century most priests were in practice monks, even by law, and it was influence from protestant Christianity that had them drop the whole celibacy thing in favour of hereditary priesthoods. For most Japanese Buddhists precepts are just suggestions, and unless you do something illegal there really are no consequences for deviating from monastic precepts (at least when outside a seminary). I mean technically if you get the Brahma Net Sutra precepts you're swearing yourself to celibacy, though they read it as "no sexual misconduct" which can mean anything really.

I guess it doesn't help that everyone is aware the said sutra was probably penned in China, meaning there is less perceived need to follow any of what it says, even if your whole tradition is founded on it.

Malcolm wrote:

The Brahmajala sutra is clearly based on the Yogacara bodhisattva vow tradition which is more formal and more heavily predicated on pratimoksha than the Madhyamaka bodhisattva vow tradition. According to Bhikṣu Dharmamitra, in Chinese Buddhism one was not really permitted to take the bodhisattva ordination without being grounded in pratimoksha vows first, which is how the Yogacahara system works. The Madhyamaka system does not require a preliminary ordination. Lay pratimoksha vows are taken along with bodhisattva vows.

However, not drinking and remaining celibate does not make a one monk, nor does a shaved head. The only thing that makes a bhikṣu is receiving bhikṣu vows in a qualified way, as I am sure you agree.

Since there are no Mahāyāna bhikṣu vows, receiving a Mahāyāna ordination cannot make one a monk, in my opinion. Of course, this is a thoroughly Indo-Tibetan attitude.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: Love vs. Attachment

Content:

Epistemes said:

...you're required to walk, talk and think like a monk at all times.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are just required to understand all that is born becomes ill, ages and dies. What you do with that fact makes the difference between samsara and nirvana.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2011 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Huseng said:

This is entirely shameless self-promotion, but I penned a brief essay on Saichō's unique monastic reforms. If you're interested please have a look:

<https://sites.google.com/site/dharmadepository/writings/saichos-reforms> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Namdrol said:

Nice article.

Huseng said:

Namdrol, what do you think about his reforms? Do you think it wise to relegate the vinaya to a secondary position like he did?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no. I think that he did not understand the importance of pratimoksha and did not understand that the consequences of his understanding was to relegate so called monastics to the level of lay people inadvertently. Because of Saicho, we now have Japanese priests claiming equal status with bhikṣus in Buddhist assemblies just because they shave their heads and wear religious costumes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Saichō's Monastic Reforms

Content:

Huseng said:

This is entirely shameless self-promotion, but I penned a brief essay on Saichō's unique

monastic reforms. If you're interested please have a look:

<https://sites.google.com/site/dharmadepository/writings/saichos-reforms> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:
Nice article.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 12:08 PM

Title: Re: Introducing the practice of Daimoku to friends and relatives

Content:

Namdrol said:

Chanting Nam-myoho-renge-kyo during the physical union of man and woman is indeed what is called “earthly desires are enlightenment,” and “the sufferings of birth and death are nirvana.”

Tatsuo said:

I don't know if that is the answer to my question, but this quote is obviously not taken from the Lotus Sutra, as the daimoku (namu myoho renge kyo) is not explicitly mentioned in the text. From which text did you take the quote?

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.sgilibrary.org/view.php?page=317&m=1&q=desires> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 10:54 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & bhūmis

Content:

Greg said:

Very helpful, thank you.

Incidentally, could Dzogchen be mapped in a similar fashion? I would have thought that recognizing rigpa would be the start of the darśanamārga?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes it can be mapped in a similar fashion. You will find such a scheme in "The Practice of Dzogchen" by Tulku Thundup in the end.

And no, recognizing rigpa and realizing emptiness are different.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 10:02 AM

Title: Re: the methodology of Sakya

Content:

mzaur said:

Are you referring to generation stage and completion stage?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: the methodology of Sakya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya is all about the two stages.

mzaur said:

Hello,

I'm trying to learn more about the Sakya tradition as I just found that there's a center near me run by Lama Pema Wangdak, who I might be interested in meeting.

I've been studying Vajrayana for several years and took refuge 2 years ago. Since then I've tried practicing Dzogchen through Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche, but I feel I really want a live connection with a teacher, so I am investigating the centers around me. So far, I really like Mahamudra because it seems very similar to the view of Dzogchen but a more gradual approach, which makes me interested in Kagyu. I can't find much info about Sakya or Lamdre and its similarities/differences with Mahamudra/Dzogchen. Could someone familiar with both Mahamudra and the Sakya tradition share with me the differences? is Sakya a strictly tantric lineage with no 'direct' or 'essence' teachings?

Michael

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Economics..yes,,they are this dim

Content:

Huseng said:

he whole promise before was get educated and get a good job, but it doesn't work like that anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because conservatives do not seem to understand that higher wages result in broader prosperity for all, not more investment.

I like Robert Reich's idea of a negative income tax.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: 若提碎摩 = ????

Content:

cdpatton said:

The story tells of a brahmana discovering a Buddhist sutra on dependent origination, realizing the superior logic to it, and then arguing with his friends. In the process he refutes the logical arguments found in the Samkhya and Vaishesika philosophies. But only those two are treated, not this third, during the narrative. So we don't get any clues about the identity of 若提碎摩 through description of their arguments either. These little mystery transliterations are quite time consuming sometimes. I think I will settle on Nyaya and explain the obscurity in a footnote.

Malcolm wrote:

Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika are frequently lumped together as if they are one school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa a view ...

Content:

Sönam said:

While discussing with "knowledgeed" vajra practitioners, but not Dzogchenpa, they pretend, with many references, that rigpa is the view of Dzogchen ... maybe they are right, and I could (nor I wanted) to argue. But it seems evident, from my ignorance, that rigpa is "no more" a view as such, as others yanas use that term. Or at least rigpa is all views together ... can you help to dissipate my ignorance ?

Sönam

Namdrol said:

Rigpa is a view, in that sense they are correct. But rigpa is not some intellectual view (as Jigme Lingpa makes clear), instead it is the experience of contemplation, meditation as view, if you will.

Sönam said:

so it's also not wrong to pretend that it's no more a view, as such ... it's an experience.

Thank you

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

The best way to put it is that for Dzogchen rigpa is the view, the meditation, the conduct, and the result. Rigpa is also the basis, the path, and the result. Rigpa is hearing, contemplation, and meditation. Rigpa is shila, samadhi and prajñā. Rigpa is creation and completion. Rigpa is three series of Dzogchen. Nothing is outside rigpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Rinchen Terzod & Dudjom Tersar indexes

Content:

Adamantine said:

It also occurred to me that Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche would have the transmissions for some of the Dudjom tersar, perhaps not all.

.

Malcolm wrote:

He received the whole kit and kaboodle i.e. he is a DT lineage holder. He himself emphasizes the practice of Putri Repung as being important based on a personal communication.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2011 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & bhūmis

Content:

Greg said:

Does Mahāmudrā realization line up with the traditional Mahāyāna model of mārgas & bhūmis?

It seems to me that from the perspective of the Mahāyāna model, even a brief glimpse/recognition of thamal gyi shepa would make one a first-bhūmi ārya. But I get a sense that this assertion is generally not made from the Mahāmudrā perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and no. I have seen various schemes used.

As far as tha mal gyi shes pa being first bhumi, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Conservation Efforts

Content:

Astus said:

rural does not equal fuedal, though perhaps for Europeans this is the only equation they are familiar with. You have to bear in mind that during the 19th century, literacy rates in the United States was the highest in the world

I don't find the perspective of a peasant civilisation that enticing, even if it's sustainable. And when you keep yourself busy on the farm and you are isolated from other areas, literacy disappears as it is useless. Also, don't forget that the 19th century was already the modern age with steam power and gun powder.

Malcolm wrote:

That is completely false. American literacy is based on the notion that an educated population is necessary for full civic participation in a democratic republic.

You seem to think farmers don't need to read.

As I said, perhaps rural literacy is hard for some Eurpoeans to grasp, given their history.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Conservation Efforts

Content:

Astus said:

LastLegend,

"efficient and sustainable energy source" in my understanding - and I can be wrong of course - is the same as an infinite source of energy. Not realistic. But my knowledge is very limited here.

You may call it giving, compassion, enlightenment, etc. - these are ideas. You can't make people give - unless you start a so called "proletariat dictatorship". Since you can't make them give, can't convert them to new views either, the plan fails. That's what I was saying with the failure of religions and ideologies. Therefore, either we go medieval or new technologies. Both are mostly external (i.e. easier to recognise and accept by the

majority) forces that make people follow new rules.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think it is either or. We will continue to have a high educational culture -- rural does not equal feudal, though perhaps for Europeans this is the only equation they are familiar with. You have to bear in mind that during the 19th century, literacy rates in the United States was the highest in the world, with 80 percent literacy for adults and among non-immigrants (apart from blacks) nearly 95 percent.

As long as people stay highly educated, whatever civilization we can imagine will likely be based on agriculture and biotechnologies that require low energy inputs. But the steel and electric civilization made possible by oil will die.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Conservation Efforts

Content:

Astus said:

"Infinite source of energy" does not exist, especially not on Earth. Keeping population low (it's already too high) and living in a rural environment would mean a sustainable livelihood where small communities can live on locally produced food and move regularly to arable land until the used land regenerates. That's quite medieval and would require a global catastrophe to reduce humanity into such a culture.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so -- environmental systems and human cultures respond to inputs of energy in the same way. Slowly remove the inputs and the community falters and gradually dies back. Unless we find oil in Greenland and in the Arctic poles that is easy to recover as it was in Texas in 1880, we have reached the limit of easily extractable oil. Since that is the case, we will see a gradual decline in human population because well, there won't be enough food to feed everyone. The oceans are becoming increasingly acidic due to higher amounts of CO₂ in the atmosphere and so on. We will see industrial civilization come to a shuddering halt over the next three hundred years. We lived through the high point of industrial civilization, and it is all downhill from here, unless you follow Ray Kurzweil's theories.

But one thing is a fact, persistent 4% growth a year is an economic fantasy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Rigpa a view ...

Content:

Sönam said:

While discussing with "knowledgeed" vajra practitioners, but not Dzogchenpa, they pretend, with many references, that rigpa is the view of Dzogchen ... maybe they are right, and I could (nor I wanted) to argue. But it seems evident, from my ignorance, that rigpa is "no more" a view as such, as others yanas use that term. Or at least rigpa is all views together ... can you help to dissipate my ignorance ?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa is a view, in that sense they are correct. But rigpa is not some intellectual view (as Jigme Lingpa makes clear), instead it is the experience of contemplation, meditation as view, if you will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Limitations in TTM

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Namdrol wrote:

The second question is too vague.

Tashi delek,

Thanks for your reply.

I mean as a contra indication pregnant women in case of certain treatments, which would be allowed if the woman was not pregnant.

So there are / must be also contra indications in the treatment of TTM.

- How is this explained ?
- Where is it written ?
- Where are they different then in the western medicine and TCM ?

Best wishes

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

There are many contraindications summarizing them all would be difficult. But in short, moxa should not be used on pitta conditions or hot diseases; blood-letting and needle should be used on vata conditions, cold treatments should not be used on kapha conditions and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 2:15 PM

Title: Re: Hua Tou and Dzogchen

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Trekchod is mainly based on the emptiness aspect of the mind as well the realizing that the objects are also empty.

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

That is one way to explain it, but not the best way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 2:11 PM

Title: Re: 若提碎摩 = ????

Content:

cdpatton said:

我昔

T04n0201_p0258c16 || 曾聞，有婆羅門名憍尸迦，善知僧佉論、衛

T04n0201_p0258c17 || 世師論、若提碎摩論，如是等論解了分別。

Translating a text by Kumarajiva, I've run into a transliteration of what I would assume is a school of ancient Indian philosophy, but none that I can match up with the Chinese pronunciations. I was wondering if anyone has a better reference or knowledge than mine who could resolve the mystery. The passage above mentions a brahmana learned in the Samkyha, Vaishesika, and [mystery school]. Chinese = 若提碎摩. 若提 often equals Jnati, but otherwise I'm stumped.

Charlie.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe Nyāya?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 1:58 PM

Title: Re: Conservation Efforts

Content:

KeithBC said:

All of a sudden, the capitalists and communists will be allying with each other to oppose that idea.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, since communism is predicated on the capitalist mode of production.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 1:14 PM

Title: Re: Limitations in TTM

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

There arose some questions, namely

- In which cases is TTM limited in helping the patients?
- What are the contra indications, according TTM?

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Anything requiring major surgery.

The second question is too vague.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 12:22 PM

Title: Re: How to know a teachers level of realization?

Content:

Inge said:

Is it possible to deduce anything about a teachers level of realization just by knowing what type of instructions the teacher gives? For instance, when a Lama gives pointing out instructions and direct introductions, does this indicate anything particular about the teachers realization?

Namdrol said:

Not necessarily.

N

heart said:

To even teach Dzogchen you have to have some realization. Shaky Shri says at least third vision other say the second vision. But these days anyone seems to be giving Dzogchen teachings.

Why are you not in Italy Namdrol?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

MY father is ill and I needed to remain here in the US to care for him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Rinchen Terzod & Dudjom Tersar indexes

Content:

Adamantine said:

akin to doubting Guru Rinpoche himself and Yeshe Tsogyal herself since he was in a way an emanation of both together.

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Rinpoche's being a regent of Guru Rinpoche goes back to Rigdzin Duddul Dorje, who had a pure vision encounter in Zangdog Palri where he was predicted to be the regent of Guru Rinpoche on earth. This came after Duddul Dorje recited the seven line prayer 1 million times on the instruction of Rigzin Jatson Nyingpo.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: Rinchen Terzod & Dudjom Tersar indexes

Content:

username said:

The one clear head of DT lineage is the one Dudjom Jigdrel Yeshe determined so in his letter, ie: Chatral Rinpoche. And after him the lineage head will be the current mind emanation of Dudjom Lingpa, Dudjom's grandson, that Chatral Rinpoche has solely recognized and is training in his three year retreat currently, ie: Dudjom Sangye Pema (Osel).

Adamantine said:

This is a common misconception, because as far as I know that letter was written long before Shenpen Dawa Rinpoche was grown so yes, Chatral Rinpoche was declared his regent at a certain point, and would have been had HH passed away earlier in life. (HH planned to pass on earlier but was kept around by the many methods of his Sangyum...) However an old letter does not change that HH later declared S.D. Rinpoche his regent,

as his health deteriorated towards the end. In fact, S.D. Rinpoche very humbly always remained by his father's side, serving him and sometimes translating for him until the very end. He never publicly taught due to prophecies until he passed a certain age. Then, at one point HH was scheduled to give a wang and to everyone's surprise including S.D. Rinpoche he simply handed the implements to his son and told him to give the wang. This was a direct way of showing that there was no difference. This all happened in Europe, so I am sure there is doubt among elder Tibetans living in Asia who became accustomed to receiving wangs and teachings from T.N. Rinpoche years before according to HH's advice. And TNR already had quite a following and had established his own centers by the time HH passed on so perhaps he saw as Dudjom Lingpa foresaw with the Dudjom Tersar in relation to the Rinchen Terdzod that there was no need to include it-- likewise no need to announce Thinley Norbu in any way as he already had his own recognition and following that had its own vast momentum. This is my own understanding which may be at fault but I have learned details slowly over many years which are often glossed over for various reasons.

Malcolm wrote:

Shenphen Rinpoche, who is one of my important masters, is indeed the primary lineage holder of Dudjom Tersar, and the keeper of Dudjom Rinpoche's seat in North America where Dudjom Rinpoche concealed many precious teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: Why is possible to achieve Buddhahood?

Content:

Tsondue Sangmo said:

I am trying to understand the possibility for a sentient being to achieve Buddhahood as is view, I think, in general Mahayana Buddhism. In this sense, I do not want to imagine what a Buddha can be, but just to take and understand Buddhist scriptures in the literal sense, if this is the correct approach.

Namdrol said:

A buddha is defined as someone who has removed the two obscurations, affliction and knowledge, and gathered the two accumulations, merit and wisdom.

Inge said:

Could you give definitions of the two obscurations, merit and wisdom, or maybe refer to an english text where I can find such definitions.

I also wonder if it is possible to say anything about the personal experience from the viewpoint of a Buddha, how it is like to be a Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

The two obscurations are the obscuration of affliction i.e. desire, hatred and ignorance.

These are responsible for rebirth in the three realms. The second obscuration is obscuration of knowledge that prevent omniscience, which prevent full buddhahood.

The merit accumulation is responsible for realizing the material body of a buddha i.e. the sambhogakāya and nirmanakāy. The wisdom accumulation is responsible for realizing the dharmakāya of the buddha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Hua Tou and Dzogchen

Content:

ngodrup said:

The thing to appreciate, it seems to my mind, is that recognition according to trekchod would be essentially equivalent to the seeing of an Arya Being on the Path of Seeing or a first bhumi Bodhisattva. I very much doubt that all these facile comparisons of Dzogchen to Chan or Zen bear much resemblance to the actual seeing of an Arya. ... but I may be mistaken.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the reason is that one does not need to realize emptiness in order to properly practice tregchö, emptiness may remain an inference. But one must have experience of this unconditioned clarity in order to practice tregchö. Eventually, if you practice tregchö long enough you will realize emptiness because that insight will automatically arise within your meditation, and this is predicated on understanding the view of original purity .

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 8:00 AM

Title: Re: How to know a teachers level of realization?

Content:

Inge said:

Is it possible to deduce anything about a teachers level of realization just by knowing what type of instructions the teacher gives? For instance, when a Lama gives pointing out instructions and direct introductions, does this indicate anything particular about the teachers realization?

Namdrol said:

Not necessarily.

N

Inge said:

If some of the students "gets it" then, does that give a more certain indication?

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, it is more likely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: How to know a teachers level of realization?

Content:

Inge said:

Is it possible to deduce anything about a teachers level of realization just by knowing what type of instructions the teacher gives? For instance, when a Lama gives pointing out instructions and direct introductions, does this indicate anything particular about the teachers realization?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Hua Tou and Dzogchen

Content:

Inge said:

And what does it mean to discover this clarity? Can this clarity be seen, or is it experienced like some kind of state, or something else entirely?

Namdrol said:

Clarity is the cognitive aspect of the mind that knows objects. So in sense, what one is trying to see is the knowing knower itself, apart from what it knows.

Inge said:

Ok, that is more easy to understand. To see the knowing knower itself, is this the same as knowing the knower? Or seeing the seer, experiencing the experiencor, being aware of awareness ...?

Malcolm wrote:

The difficulty is that a knower is conditioned. This clarity is unconditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Hua Tou and Dzogchen

Content:

Inge said:

And what does it mean to discover this clarity? Can this clarity be seen, or is it experienced like some kind of state, or something else entirely?

Malcolm wrote:

Clarity is the cognitive aspect of the mind that knows objects. So in sense, what one is trying to see is the knowing knower itself, apart from what it knows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Hua Tou and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is referring to appearance and emptiness, object side.

N

Inge said:

I see. Could you explain a little what is meant by clarity?

Malcolm wrote:

"Clarity" means the fundamental aspect of the mind that illuminates objects for the mind separate from the content of the mind. That clarity is very difficult to discover.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: Hua Tou and Dzogchen

Content:

Fa Dao said:

From my limited understanding of chan realizing the nature of mind is realizing emptiness. So then in your estimation you would say it is similar to Tragcho?

Namdrol said:

The nature of the mind is not just emptiness, it is clarity and emptiness inseparable. The emphasis in tregchö is on this.

Inge said:

This reminds me of a quote attributed to Hsuan Hua:

"If you understand the Zero, you know it to be the True Emptiness, which contains Wonderful Existence, and the Wonderful Existence, which contains True Emptiness. True Emptiness does not obstruct Wonderful Existence and Wonderful Existence does not obstruct True Emptiness. True Emptiness is not empty and so it is called Wonderful Existence; Wonderful Existence is non-existent and is therefore called True Emptiness--empty and non-empty, existing and not existing."

Are you talking about the same thing?

Malcolm wrote:

This is referring to appearance and emptiness, object side.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Conservation Efforts

Content:

LastLegend said:

If they don't want to save the earth, then we are screwed.

Malcolm wrote:

They don't and we are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Hua Tou and Dzogchen

Content:

Fa Dao said:

From my limited understanding of chan realizing the nature of mind is realizing emptiness. So then in your estimation you would say it is similar to Tragcho?

Malcolm wrote:

The nature of the mind is not just emptiness, it is clarity and emptiness inseparable. The emphasis in tregchö is on this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Hua Tou and Dzogchen

Content:

Fa Dao said:

In the hua tou method one is given a meditation topic/question. For example, "Who is dragging this corpse around?" or "Who is chanting Buddhas name?" You are instructed to continually ask this question until one pointedness is achieved. Great doubt is developed from asking a question that does not have an answer that the logical/rational/thinking mind can answer. One keeps pushing and pushing to come up with an answer nonetheless. Eventually one breaks through and the separateness of mind, body and world drops away leaving one with a deep understanding of shunyata.

Malcolm wrote:

Tregcho is based on recognizing the nature of mind directly, and staying in that state.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: Conservation Efforts

Content:

Astus said:

The idea of equal distribution is great. Communism, however, didn't work out so far.

Malcolm wrote:

Screw the proletariat, the consumers must seize the means of production, and create a dictatorship of consumption...!

(oh wait...that won't work...)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 2:09 AM

Title: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

LastLegend said:

Uh nobody said it is ok to kill insects...but the karma for killing an insect is different from killing a larger animal.

Namdrol said:

This is merely your imputation. I don't think the Buddha ever made such a statement, at least I have never read such a statement by him anywhere. The only possible argument one could make for this is that killing bugs requires very little intention, and so the force of intention propelling the action is generally weaker than the force of intention it takes to kill a larger animal. But there certainly is not inherently less karma in killing a bug than an animal. That is ridiculous.

Pero said:

Considering it is more severe to kill an Arhat than an ordinary human, more severe to kill one's parents than other people and so on and so on, it is hardly a ridiculous conclusion.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason for the five uninterrupted sins has to do with one's liberation. Harming a buddha, killing an arhat, killing one mother, or father and causing a schism in the Sangha are all sins connected with one's own and other's chances for attaining liberation. It has nothing to do with the superiority or inferiority of humans in terms of some hierarchy of sentient beings based on intelligence or development. Please note that causing a schism in the Sangha is one of those five sins.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 2:06 AM

Title: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

LastLegend said:

Uh nobody said it is ok to kill insects...but the karma for killing an insect is different from killing a larger animal.

Namdrol said:

This is merely your imputation. I don't think the Buddha ever made such a statement, at least I have never read such a statement by him anywhere. The only possible argument one could make for this is that killing bugs requires very little intention, and so the force of intention propelling the action is generally weaker than the force of intention it takes to kill a larger animal. But there certainly is not inherently less karma in killing a bug than an animal. That is ridiculous.

N

LastLegend said:

Do you agree that some animals are more intelligent than others?

Malcolm wrote:

I agree that some animals have more sophisticated sense organs than others. But minds are not sense organs, are they?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 1:41 AM

Title: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

LastLegend said:

Uh nobody said it is ok to kill insects...but the karma for killing an insect is different from killing a larger animal.

Malcolm wrote:

This is merely your imputation. I don't think the Buddha ever made such a statement, at least I have never read such a statement by him anywhere. The only possible argument one could make for this is that killing bugs requires very little intention, and so the force of intention propelling the action is generally weaker than the force of intention it takes to kill a larger animal. But there certainly is not inherently less karma in killing a bug than an animal. That is ridiculous.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 1:38 AM

Title: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

* Insects (building construction and farming allowed even though they may be killed indirectly)

Malcolm wrote:

You have to include small animals, birds, snakes, and so on in this. Monks however are prohibited from farming. Lay people are not prohibited from eating "royal animals", only monks are.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 1:35 AM

Title: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

LastLegend said:

I will have to disagree. I would say a cow is more developed than an insect. Something like killing an Arhat is different from killing a human being.

Malcolm wrote:

The only difference between a fly, a cow and a human being is that a human being can attain buddhahood. Therefore, killing a human being is considered a parakija, an offense punishable by losing one's monastic vows.

The difference between an arya and a human beings is that an arya can help other human beings awaken. Thus, harming a buddha or killing an Arhat is one of the five deeds that results in immediate rebirth in lower realms.

A cow and a fly are both the same in that neither can attain buddhahood in that body, both have minds. There is no qualitative difference between a cow and a fly, only a quantitative difference in terms of sense organ development. From an ethical point of view, this means that the life of a fly and the life of a cow are equal. Moreover, there is no difference in self-awareness. Cows and flies exhibit the same degree of self-awareness i.e. when you try to harm either, they react by protecting themselves.

There is no Buddhist teaching of which I am aware that states that preserving the life of mammals is more important than perserving the life of small creatures like flies and worms because mammals are "more developed".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 1:16 AM

Title: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

LastLegend said:

...the larger the animals, the more karma because they are more developed than insects.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? Because they have more developed sense organs, brains? That is nonsense. All creatures are equal. They all have minds and feelings. Killing a cow and killing a bug is equal in terms of the karma of killing.

LastLegend said:

The issue of meat-eating is at best a distraction from what is really important i.e. practice. Not eating meat does not make someone a better practitioner, eating meat does not make one a worse practitioner. Not eating meat does not necessarily make someone more compassionate, eating meat does not necessarily make someone less compassionate.

Yes, but practice also means trying to step away from both sides of extreme. Not necessarily becoming a vegan or vegetarian, but at least we can be honest about what's going on.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, what is going on is that there isn't even a needle tip of happiness anywhere in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Hua Tou and Dzogchen

Content:

Fa Dao said:

For those who have had experience in both Chan and Dzogchen:

When one shatters the "Great Doubt" as in Hua Tou practice from the Chan lineage how would the resultant state be viewed according to Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

What does shattering great doubt mean?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 12:11 AM

Title: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

...

The issue of meat-eating is at best a distraction from what is really important i.e. practice. Not eating meat does not make someone a better practitioner, eating meat does not make one a worse practitioner. Not eating meat does not necessarily make someone more compassionate, eating meat does not necessarily make someone less compassionate.

Sönam said:

I certainly understand these arguments ... also it does not make you better, still we are living in a world where there is so much BS and so much ignorance about necessary "basic" changes (not to speak about fundamental ignorance) that every step one can make for a change is a constructive step. We are also acting for a better samsara. Therefore (most of the time) I do not eat meat, and (most of the time) I do not drink

alcohol ... and I also (definitely) do not vote and few other behaviors, but that's other stories.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but this is a different issue than whether or not veganism is compatible with Buddhism in general (apart from some Chinese texts written some time prior to the Tang dynasty stuck in the mouth of the Buddha).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2011 at 12:03 AM

Title: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

The answer to your question, then, is no.

David N. Snyder said:

Okay, thanks. Then I guess there is no real way one could be a 'devout' Jain and / or 100% ahimsa.

I suppose the only real way might be to have your own vegetable garden with subsistence farming, with no sprays of any kind, but of course, not too practical, especially for urban dwellers.

Malcolm wrote:

Avihimsa has to do with one's intention not to harm others, and very little to do with one's actions, apart from directly desisting in harming others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Adamantine said:

The only thing that makes meat consumption worse in this regard is if the livestock are eating industrially produced agriculture, then it's the bug deaths on top of the animal deaths...

David N. Snyder said:

Which is where 74% of all meat comes from, so therefore, in most cases, meat does result in the bugs death plus the animal killings. Whereas a vegetarian diet results in just the bugs death.

What about organic? I am sure that there will never be no deaths of any kind, but

wouldn't organic vegetarian farming result in even far fewer deaths? (compared to conventional vegetarian/vegan and conventional omnivore diets)

Malcolm wrote:

Not large scale organic farming. The primary difference is the type of pesticides:

ORGANIC PESTICIDES VERSUS SYNTHETIC PESTICIDES

Clearly, the less we impact our environment, the better off we all are. Organic farming practices have greatly advanced the use of non-chemical means to control pests, as mentioned earlier.

Unfortunately, these non-chemical methods do not always provide enough protection, and it's necessary to use chemical pesticides. How do organic pesticides compare with conventional pesticides?

A recent study compared the effectiveness of a rotenone-pyrethrin mixture versus a synthetic pesticide, imidan. Rotenone and pyrethrin are two common organic pesticides; imidan is considered a "soft" synthetic pesticide (i.e., designed to have a brief lifetime after application, and other traits that minimize unwanted effects). It was found that up to 7 applications of the rotenone- pyrethrin mixture were required to obtain the level of protection provided by 2 applications of imidan.

It seems unlikely that 7 applications of rotenone and pyrethrin are really better for the environment than 2 applications of imidan, especially when rotenone is extremely toxic to fish and other aquatic life.

It should be noted, however, that we don't know for certain which system is more harmful. This is because we do not look at organic pesticides the same way that we look at conventional pesticides. We don't know how long these organic pesticides persist in the environment, or the full extent of their effects.

When you look at lists of pesticides allowed in organic agriculture, you find warnings such as, "Use with caution. The toxicological effects of [organic pesticide X] are largely unknown," or "Its persistence in the soil is unknown." Again, researchers haven't bothered to study the effects of organic pesticides because it is assumed that "natural" chemicals are automatically safe.

<http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~lhom/organictext.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The answer to your question, then, is no.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Introducing the practice of Daimoku to friends and relatives

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Chanting Nam-myoho-renge-kyo during the physical union of man and woman is indeed what is called "earthly desires are enlightenment," and "the sufferings of birth and death are nirvana."

I wonder if this applies to chanting Nam-myoho-renge-kyo while watching porn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: The Rinpoche's Zen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The following is not Dzogchen.

Astus said:

"The awakening has nothing to do with our background. It has nothing to do with whether we have been meditating for a long time or not. It has nothing to do with meeting impressive teachers or gurus. It is simply dependent on whether or not we are open to it."

(No Self, No Problem, p. 4)

"In the same way, when we pay attention to our breath, body sensations, and to the awareness that arises, then all the illusions, suffering, confusion, sorrow, and personal issues, all of this begins to dissipate. We see that all of these experiences are born of delusion. This is the sense of "I." "I am real. I am truly existent." Everything is gone except this "I," this sense of self. Then, when we continue meditating, the sense of self also goes away. When we just keep meditating, when we just remain in that present awareness and observe, then the self dissolves too. When the self dissolves there is just pure awareness. When the self completely collapses, there is this inexpressible, simple yet profound and ecstatic, compassionate awareness. Nobody is there. "I" is completely nonexistent in that place. There is no separation between samsara, bad circumstances, and nirvana, good circumstances, and there is nobody pursuing the path or chasing after enlightenment. In that moment we realize the essence of the Buddha's teaching."

(p. 41)

"Suddenly, when we stop producing concepts and ideas, when we stop feeding that illusory reality, when we stop associating with ego, it is very simple. It is simple to stop associating with ego. However there are no twelve step programs in transcendent wisdom. There is only the one-step program and that is to not associate with the ego. The moment we stop associating with ego it just immediately ceases right there."

(p. 128)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Sönam said:

does your answer includes my quote too ?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, since it refers to meat that is cornfed in feed lots.

So called grass-fed meat does not require these numbers. For example, there is a local beef farm near to me. They graze all of their cattle. They do not use corn. Since their cattle is all 100 percent grass fed, antibiotic and hormone free, numbers like the ones above do not apply. But these kinds of farms are

The water of use of cattle depends on the region and intensity of the production of meat. In dry regions, like the American West, what range land there is is so over grazed that the cattle need to be fattened for market. Large-scale cattle ranching is not only environmentally damaging in terms of grain inputs required to fatten cattle, in dry ranges it is very damaging to the environment such as soil, water, and so on in terms of erosion, etc., from cattle grazing.

Moreover as we know, cattle did not evolve to eat corn. It is bad for them.

And let's not even get started with hog farming -- that is an environmental nightmare, like chicken farming and so on.

Look, no one is arguing that there are no deep ethical and environmental issues with the production of meat. Of course there are. In an ideal world, no one would eat meat. But in an ideal world, no would suffer, experiencing birth, illness, aging and death either.

What is at issue is the assertion that just because one eats meat one necessarily has less compassion, one is taking on the karma of harming sentient beings, and so on. That assertion does not stand up to reasoning. The primary argument is that because someone purchases meat to eat that they are culpable in harming animals in the same manner as a butcher through economic participation on the meat industry. Well, from the viewpoint of how things are interconnected, since the meat industry is only possible because of oil and trucking and large supermarkets, if someone buys vegetables from a supermarket that sells meat, they are just as culpable as someone who buys meat. Why? Because there is no time that non-Buddhist people will voluntarily cease buying meat that is supplied to them. if someone participates in the economy of food production

they are necessarily participating in the economy of meat production unless they have the option to eschew all contact with large supermarket chains for all their fruit and vegetable needs. The vast majority of people don't. People may even try to insulate themselves with a chain of vegan markets for example, but those markets will have to buy their food from suppliers, etc. So my point is that the economics of food production make it really impossible to say "This dollar that I am spending will not support animal husbandry in any way, shape or form".

Also, there is a lack of equanimity concerning suffering in the shrill arguments of radical vegan crew, frequent excuses about why it is permissible for pesticides to be used while slaughter is not permissible, and so on. Suffering is suffering, all of samsara is suffering down to the smallest atom.

The issue of meat-eating is at best a distraction from what is really important i.e. practice. Not eating meat does not make someone a better practitioner, eating meat does not make one a worse practitioner. Not eating meat does not necessarily make someone more compassionate, eating meat does not necessarily make someone less compassionate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Rinchen Terzod & Dudjom Tersar indexes

Content:

username said:

The obvious reason behind the reply was that other major complimentary parts of Dudjom Tersar were yet to come.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that does not make sense. The RT only contains representative transmissions from all the major terma cycles. For example, there are texts in DL's collection of termas which come from the original Dudjom, Khathog Duddul Dorje which are present in the RT, but none of DL's own termas. But when the whole Dudjom tersar is given, and not merely Dudjom Tersar i.e. Dudjom Rinpoche's pure vision cycles, it also includes the transmissions from Duddul Dorje, Dudjom Lingpa, and Dudjom Rinpoche.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

LastLegend said:

But clearly there is a difference between directly killing animals for consumption and killing animals indirectly through farming and such.

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously the Buddha felt that both were on par since digging in the ground and killing animals are both in the list of vows to be confessed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Sönam said:

Aside for sentimental or ethic reasons there is a good reason today not to eat meat ... it cost 100 times more water for 1kg meat than for 1kg cereals.
And lake of water is the coming disease.

Sönam

Huseng said:

About 14kg of grains to produce 1kg of beef.

Malcolm wrote:

This applies only to feedlot beef.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 10:34 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

LastLegend said:

Animals are meant to be in the wild.

Malcolm wrote:

Not domesticated animals. Hence the term "domesticated".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 10:28 AM

Title: Re: Best academic studies on (tibetan) buddhism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Most Interesting: Dan Martin

Most Brilliant: Matthew Kapstein

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

LastLegend said:

I would add some more thoughts to the discussion of this topic.

In US, animals are institutionally raised in cages since they are young. Basically they stay in prison for the rest of their lives until the day they are killed. The 3 poisons on their minds also create poisons in their bodies. For larger animals such as cows and pigs, there are special ways to kill to get most if not all the blood out of their tissues so that we can have fresh meats. So I will not go into details of how they are killed. But you can do some research for yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. All suffering of suffering. Very sad. So is the sufferig of insects posioned with nerve agents in soyfields. Half a million tons of pesticides are used every year in the US alone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Rinchen Terzod & Dudjom Tersar indexes

Content:

ngodrup said:

...but it may

explain what DL meant when he said DT is there
when RTD is given.

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently Kongtrul and Khyentse extended in invitation to DL to include his termas in the RT -- he refused, but said that wherever the RT spread, DT wold spread there too.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

They also developed a tradition of releasing animals (fang sheng 放生), where turtles, birds and other beings slated to become someone's dinner were purchased and released into the wild.

Malcolm wrote:

I am reminded of those people who made their living trapping fish for release by Buddhists in Japan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Namdrol said:

I like all food as long as it is cooked well and prepared in a healthy fashion. Basically, food is medicine.

N

Huseng said:

If my memory serves me I recall on E Sangha you referred to meat eating as "sinful" without specifying any caveats. Have you changed your mind since then? I just recall you being somewhat forward in your former discussions concerning meat consumptions, where you called meat eating sinful.

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that meat is slightly non-virtuous because it inevitably comes from the suffering of some animal, for example, like silk.

I have always found it a little hilarious that vegetarian Buddhists are busy swathing their statues in silk brocades while casting scathing glances at meat-eaters.

I never tried to convince you or anyone in this conversation that slaughtering animals was ok, and so on. It isn't. But we cannot have a narrow view that specifies this part of the economy is ok, and this part isn't. It is all tied together.

I think most of us recognize that the circumstances around the production of meat are rooted in non-virtue even if that karma does not necessarily transfer to everyone who eats meat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

LastLegend said:

Those who walk the path of Bodhisattva cannot eat meats. Bodhisattvas don't even tremble on green grass, why do they use meats of sentient beings for food? Monks are the ones who honor Bodhisattva precepts, and they should not eat meats. Vietnamese and Chinese monks are famous for being vegan.

We laymen can stick to 3 conditions of purity. But we can do better if we want to.

Namdrol said:

I never used the meat of sentient beings. I always make sure when I eat meat, that no sentient being inhabits the steak I am eating. Why? Because harming sentient beings is wrong. But meat is inert, like grass. It can't be harmed.

N

LastLegend said:

You like the taste of meats more than vegetarian food?

Malcolm wrote:

I like all food as long as it is cooked well and prepared in a healthy fashion. Basically, food is medicine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

LastLegend said:

Those who walk the path of Bodhisattva cannot eat meats. Bodhisattvas don't even tremble on green grass, why do they use meats of sentient beings for food? Monks are the ones who honor Bodhisattva precepts, and they should not eat meats. Vietnamese and Chinese monks are famous for being vegan.

We laymen can stick to 3 conditions of purity. But we can do better if we want to.

Malcolm wrote:

I never used the meat of sentient beings. I always make sure when I eat meat, that no sentient being inhabits the steak I am eating. Why? Because harming sentient beings is wrong. But meat is inert, like grass. It can't be harmed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

I'll leave it to vegan parents to demonstrate otherwise. You can have healthy kids raised

on a vegan diet.

Malcolm wrote:

I know many people who were raised on such diets -- they all have messed up teeth, had strange fevers when they hit puberty, and other developmental health issues.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

Um, no. I've proven that veganism existed in Buddhist cultures in East Asia. They still do. I can say this both as a scholar of Buddhism trained in Japan and with a real life perspective. I kid you not I have been to monasteries full of hundreds of nuns and a few dozen monks where no animal products are served up in the dining hall, and the arhat sandals on the feet of nuns and monks are not made of leather. I can also tell you that the issue of meat, eggs and dairy have been discussed in Chinese Buddhist literature both in ancient times and in present times, hence making it a Buddhist issue.

Malcolm wrote:

A Chinese Buddhist issue, apparently with no relevance to more universal sphere of Mahāyāna which existed in Central Asia, Tibet, India, Cambodia, Thailand, and so on. This effectively limits its relevance to Chinese and Japanese Buddhists. But in Japan, everyone now eats meat, more or less.

Don't get me wrong -- I am not against vegetarianism -- though as a doctor of Tibetan Medicine I have met lot of vegan people whose ailments were quickly eliminated by a small amount of meat (incidentally, such a phenomena is regularly reported in Yoga magazines as well). Plus, there is the factor of milk intolerance. Then there is Chinese bias against Tibetans and other dairy-consuming people on the Western frontier of China, and so on. In the end the Chinese Buddhist prohibition against dairy and cheese is more likely to be a result of cultural bias than real concern for animals since they still used animal labor for agricultural production.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

Plenty of well known monks of the past lived to ripe old ages, and their communities weren't dying off due to malnutrition.

Malcolm wrote:

They were undoubtedly raised on meat. It is well known that animal protein is more important in the diets of growing children than it is in the diets of adults.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

You should reread our discussion -- I've proven that veganism existed in Buddhist cultures in East Asia. It is a Buddhist issue, at least in this corner of the continent.

Malcolm wrote:

What you did not prove is that Veganism was grounded in Indian Mahāyāna (whose sutras you originally cited). All you proved was that some Chinese Buddhist wrote texts to support their bias against Indian dietary preferences. But that does not constitute sutrayāna support for a vegan diet. And further, in terms of Indian Buddhism, all we learned is that there is no consensus about what the Mahāyāna prohibitions against meat eating meant amongst Mahāyāna authors. So in the end you have failed to prove anything. And this is a good thing, since there is no liberation through dietary choices.

But if you harm something directly, with intention to harm, then this might interfere with your liberation, and that we have no need to establish, because it is well known.

On the contrary, what I have proven is that your thesis "All consumers or users of meat or any other animal product are by definition harmers of sentient beings" is outright false, when considered from a Buddhist perspective.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

Indian Buddhism is not the be-all and end-all judge of what constitutes Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. It is the bellweather by which all must be judged. But that is just my opinion. It is the standard by which intra-buddhist communication must occur. I don't try to convince others of things that are particular to Vajrayāna or Tibetan schools.

Likewise, it makes no sense to try to convince non-Sino-Japanese Buddhists of doctrines peculiar to Sino-Japanese Buddhism. For example, eschewing dairy.

Thus, Indian Buddhism is the basic standard.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

Since most of the sutras that teach strict vegetarianism are also tathagatagarbha sutras, this obviously means that strict proclamations made about meat eating need interpretation since you cannot have an unconditioned Buddhanature on the one hand, and one that can be destroyed on the other.

Again it is a figurative use of speech. Icchantikas are beings whose behaviour is contrary to the path and/or lack any aspirations for liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

According to you, eating meat "is contrary to the path", thus those who eat meat are icchantikas. Good thing Madhyamaka rejects this Yogacara and Tathagatagarbha sutra idea completely.

Huseng said:

No, it is the same as for shravakas. Bodhisattvas should avoid harming sentient beings where possible.

Hence bodhisattvas should avoid eating meat and contributing to the economy behind slaughter.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if shravakas need to avoid eating meat, and they do not, apart from specific conditions we have discussed.

Huseng said:

I disagree. The emphasis is on the craving for meat and consumption of it. It is worse if you kill it and eat it rather than just purchasing it and consuming it of course.

Malcolm wrote:

The notion is that eating meat causes one be more liable to harm others. But the context of the sutra has to be considered as well as the audience. In this case, non-Buddhist lay people since Buddhist monks and lay people are already prohibited from

killing animals for food.

Huseng said:

Bhavya was an Indian master. He was certainly quite aware of the issues here since he address this in his Tarkajvala in detail. He obviously thought the reasoning of the advocates of an absolute prohibition of meat eating were mistaken and unreasonable, and that their arguments did not actually adress the true intent of the Mahāyāna sutras that seem to say meat eating is never acceptable.

And Daoxuan was a Chinese master with plenty of what was for him canonical citations and reasonings to encourage his peers and laypersons to refrain from eating meat.

Malcolm wrote:

An Indian master interpreting an Indian text or doctrine will always be preferable to the interpretation of Tibetans, Chinese, and so on. Of course, there are differing opinions. Shantideva was pretty firmly against eating meat. My point is that these texts are not slam dunks "Oh, this is our book, this is what it says, therefore, this is what we have to do".

Huseng said:

These can be safely considered apocryphal since Indians would never dream of not conusming milk products.

Is a Chinese "apocryphal" text of less value than an Indian "apocryphal" text? From an academic point of view any Mahāyāna text no matter where it was penned is apocryphal.

Malcolm wrote:

Chinese sutras reflected the concerns of Chinese authors. If you go down this route, all you will wind up with is the conclusion that different communities of monks in different places wrote different texts reflecting different concerns. You then are left with the conclusion that one can only rely on one's own reasoning to decide what is correct and not correct and that there is no solid basis in citing sutras since the authority of sutra is undermined. This is actually my point, if you want to be a Vegan, go ahead. But there is no Buddhist justification for this.

Huseng said:

If you drive a car you are supporting the economy of meat production which depends upon oil from top to bottom. No oil, no huge meat industry. And that is just a fact. In fact if you shop at any market, you are supporting the meat industry, if you buy grain, you are supporting producers of grain which is fed to animals in feedlots. It is impossible to truly tease the economy of food production apart and say "If I buy this, I am not supporting that". Even if you buy organic cotton, pesticides are used in the production of that cotton, pesticides which are less toxic to humans, but no less toxic to bugs. If you decide to buy only clothes made of artificial fibers, you are supporting the oil industry which is supporting the this industry and that industry.

Those are all secondary to the actual production of a meat. If a city was to reduce meat consumption, the shops within it would order less meat from producers who in turn

would slaughter less animals because there would be less demand for their product.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is primary. Where this exist, that exists, where this does not exist, that does not exist -- basic dependent origination. Anyway, you are dreaming -- we live in a supply side economy, not a demand economy. There is demand precisely because there is supply.

Huseng said:

If you want to be a Vegan, fine, no problem -- but there is little or no justification for it from a Buddhist point of view.

From your Buddhist point of view. Things are different in the East Asian realm of Buddhism. We have texts and traditions which clearly encourage practitioners to avoid meat, and beyond that eggs and dairy as well.

Malcolm wrote:

And Chinese people do not have a deeply ingrained culture of eating everything that moves? Japanese people have not lived off of fish and other seafood for millenia? Etc.

Huseng said:

In fact all the Indian sutras encourage use of dairy, the very same ones that reject the consumption of meat.

Personally I'm not staunchly against dairy provided it is taken from a well treated animal. However, given that in the modern day so much of our dairy is produced under horrific conditions I have all the reason to boycott such products. I avoid dairy because I don't care to directly support such industries. Japan does not have a good record when it comes to animal welfare. The farmer in rural Bihar on the other hand with his herd of cattle grazing in lush green fields is not a big deal, but industrial milk production is.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't consume industrial dairy, actually.

Huseng said:

So therefore, the Vegan diet, even by strict vegetarian standards, is not supported in Buddhist sutras of Indian provenance.

Like I said in East Asia it is different. Buddhas and Bodhisattvas were and do work in a different cultural environment. If the result has been less animals suffering, then such teachings encouraging what we would call veganism in English, then all the better. That is Saddharma.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that East Asia was some Vegan paradise is utter bollocks, as per above.

Huseng said:

In the end, Veganism is merely a political salve for the consciences of granola-munching, yoga-studio going, petty bourgeois (as well as some Buddhists) in first-world countries that are completely out of touch with the realities of how things are in places like Haiti, Appalachia (where the poorest Americans live) and Golok, for example where every calory counts.

This is a bit harsh and inconsiderate of the many vegans in the world, many of whom do not fit into such a character type.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, well, I think Vegans are harsh, unkind, shrill and elitist, as well as dietarily neurotic.

Huseng said:

In other words, without the abundant waste of first-world nations, a Vegan diet is not even possible.

Nonsense. It was possible in pre-modern times, it is possible now.

Malcolm wrote:

You have no evidence of any vast community of Vegan peoples living anywhere. The fact is that animal protein in some form or another has been a substantial portion of the diet every premodern society we can think of (and for good reason, it has more energy than grain).

Huseng said:

You might argue "The Chinese Buddhists have been doing this for centuries" well, my reply to that is that people in Chinese Buddhist monasteries are not paid to work in rice paddies (they are forbidden to) they are paid to pray and be vinayadharas.

First of all, it wasn't just China. Japan, Korea and Vietnam all had Buddhists living vegan lifestyles, both for religious convictions and economic reasons.

Malcolm wrote:

They could afford to support minority populations in elitist institutions.

Huseng said:

In pre-modern Japan for example there simply was no dairy. I don't know about eggs, but I imagine with the sentiments expressed in Buddhist texts it would have been

minimal given that bodhisattva aspirants are forbidden from keeping both animals and slaves. Ruling all meat and fish, people would have been vegan. They lived just fine, both Buddhist layman and monk alike.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but Japanese people ate fish and other sea food and have done so for millenia -- and prior to the introduction of Buddhism ate many other kinds of animals as witnessed by Buddhist imperial edicts. And for example, Jodo Shinshu permits meat eating and so on.

Huseng said:

They are a supported community and their fortunes and ability to maintain the life style you admire and emulate depends completely on the wealth of the supporting population.

Any monastic population, even the meat eating ones, rely on the generosity of a supporting population.

Malcolm wrote:

Not always, in Tibet, monasteries were landed estates that produced their own grain and so on. Monasteries as farms were also common in India, according to scandalized reports about Mahayana monks met by Chinese pilgrims. Basically, the Chinese "proto-vegans" were fanatic converts.

Huseng said:

Likewise, the Vegan lifestyle depends on the choices and abundance of the very industrial agricultural system you are criticizing. Without that system, without the ability to get fresh vegetables, etc. year round, the Vegan diet is impossible. The Vegan diet is primarily an urban diet for a wealthy elite (like monks in a monastery) who can afford fresh vegetables, fruit, nuts, and grain 365 days a year (and good medical care when their health crashes from a bad diet).

None of this is true. Even in pre-modern times vegetarian populations generally got by the winters without dying off from malnutrition. This was long before refrigeration and industrial food production. Pickles, grains, dried fruits, field vegetables, noodles, teas and various other food products provided sufficient nutrition then, just as they would now.

Malcolm wrote:

You really need to read ancient medical texts from India, China, and so on. Then you will understand that this is pretty much of a fantasy.

Huseng said:

Pre-modern Buddhist communities in East Asia were effectively vegan and they existed for many centuries before any industrial infrastructure was developed.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, who lived off of the labor of meat-eating laity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2011 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

I've been using scriptural citations from canonical Buddhist texts. This is only appropriate and desirable on a Buddhist forum.

Malcolm wrote:

Reasoning is also required, and as we have seen, there are no Indian scriptures that will support a Vegan read since honey, milk, butter, cream and so on are all on the acceptable list of foods, even by strict vegetarian read of the sutras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan monk sets himself on fire in China

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hòa thượng[a] Thích Quảng Đức (/tɪtʃ kwɑŋ duk/ tích kwong duuk; Vietnamese pronunciation: [tʰĩt̚ kwāːŋ d̺ĩk̚]; Saigon: [tʰĩt̚ kwəːŋ d̺ĩk̚] (listen); Chữ Nôm:釋廣德; 1897 – 11 June 1963), born Lâm Văn Tức, was a Vietnamese Mahayana Buddhist monk who burned himself to death at a busy Saigon road intersection on 11 June 1963. Thích Quảng Đức was protesting against the persecution of Buddhists by South Vietnam's Ngô Đình Diệm administration. Photos of his self-immolation were circulated widely across the world and brought attention to the policies of the Diệm regime. Malcolm Browne won a Pulitzer Prize for his renowned photograph of the monk's death. After his death, his body was re-cremated, but his heart remained intact.[1][2] This was interpreted as a symbol of compassion and led Buddhists to revere him as a bodhisattva, heightening the impact of his death on the public psyche.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Rinchen Terzod & Dudjom Tersar indexes

Content:

vajraheart said:

Hi,

Does anyone know if the Dudjom Tersar is contained in the Rinchen Terzod ?
Also looking for the complete indexes of both.

Thank you,
Sumir

Malcolm wrote:

No -- Dudjom Tersar is not in Rinchen Terzö. The complete indexes to both can be found at [tbrc.org](http://www.tbrc.org) in the nyingma section

http://www.tbrc.org/#library_work-O3JW110253JW11050 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

rory said:

If you eat meat that's what you personally are causing.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is a false equivalence, as I have already shown.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Namdrol said:

The crux of my arguments against eating meat were similar to Huseng's environmental, cruelty of treatment of animals, and so on. I still think those arguments are a valid reason for not supporting industrial agriculture in general -- which I endeavor not to do. I agree with Huseng that as Buddhists we need to be mindful of what is harmful. But I do not buy the argument that eating meat ipso facto makes one responsible for harming animals. That extreme was rejected by the Buddha and I also reject it based on reasoning.

Huseng said:

Such a teaching was given to the śrāvakas, not the bodhisattvas. As Daoxuan in the 7th century pointed out, the prohibitions against eating meat that is impure (having it killed for you, etc...), is an indication that the spirit of the teaching is to eventually forbid the consumption of meat when the disciples are suitable vessels to receive such a teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, as we can see, there were Mahāyāna authors in India such as Bhavya who understood the Mahāyāna prohibitions against eating meat differently than the way you are portraying it. In his commentary he mentions by name these sutras: Hastikakṣya mahāyāna sūtra, Mahāmegha, Lanka, Āryāṅgulimāliya-mahāyāna-sūtra, etc.

To refute the literal interpretation of these sūtras, which he considers interpretable, he runs through the impurity argument advanced by some who assert that because the meat comes from semen and blood, it produces impurities of the body in greater excess. Bhavya points out that also milk and butter come from the bodies of animals, hence they too should produce more impurities.

He then addresses the argument consuming meat makes one a harmer of beings by necessity. As I said, he reduces the argument to whether one directly harms a being as follows "if one eats meat after creating suffering for a creature's body, it will possess a fault, but since there is no mind in the flesh of a creature's body at the time its meat is eaten, if no suffering arises where is the sin to be seen? Just as there is not the slightest suffering to a creature when one uses mother of pearl, bezoars of fish and oxen, peacock feathers, ox tails, teeth, bones, hide and so on, just as there is no harm what so ever when using fruit, water, and so on, in the same way there at the time of eating meat there is no fault because one is not engaging in harming. If there were harm, then also cremating a corpse would be sinful."

Huseng said:

The śrāvakas seek arhatship, in which case unconditional concern for all sentient beings is not a major concern. The whole point of such a spiritual pursuit is liberation for oneself, not to free all beings from suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Minds cannot be harmed, only bodies. And Avihimsa is a concern for all Buddhists. But you cannot harm something that is not alive and has no feelings.

Huseng said:

According to numerous Mahāyāna texts meat eating was forbidden by a Buddha (not necessarily Śākyamuni) as it destroys the seed of buddhahood, among other issues.

Malcolm wrote:

If "the seed of Buddhahood" could be destroyed, then you are admitting there is a class of persons called icchantika. You don't really want to do that, do you? Not only that, you are admitting that Buddhanature is something conditioned, subject to impermanence. Since most of the sutras that teach strict vegetarianism are also tathagatagarbha sutras, this obviously means that strict proclamations made about meat eating need interpretation since you cannot have an unconditioned Buddhanature on the one hand,

and one that can be destroyed on the other.

Huseng said:

This makes sense given that a bodhisattva should as much as possible avoid creating the causes and conditions for the intentional slaughter of animals.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is the same as for shravakas. Bodhisattvas should avoid harming sentient beings where possible.

Huseng said:

If you purchase meat then you are supporting the causes and conditions for the intentional slaughter of animals. Agriculture harms living beings, too, but unless pesticides are specifically applied to the crop, this killing is usually not intentional.

Malcolm wrote:

Organic agriculture uses pesticides, they are simply less toxic to people than industrial pesticides -- but no less toxic to insects. And you just made an argument for the compassion of shravakas -- bhikṣus are prohibited from a) digging in the ground since it harms animals and b) traveling during the rains seasons because of harming small creatures. But they are not prohibited from eating meat as long as it is pure in three ways. Why? Because the criteria of what is permitted and what is not permitted is directly related to personally harming sentient beings.

Huseng said:

Just as driving a car one hopefully does not have the intention of driving into and over living beings like insects.

Malcolm wrote:

The following quote from the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra merely reinforces Bhavya's point:

“Mahāmati! I see that because of the habits of sentient beings from the beginningless past to eat meat, they crave the flavour of meat and mutually kill and harm one another.

Clearly the intent is encourage lay people not to butcher meat personally.

Huseng said:

However, I'm sure you're well aware of these arguments. Whether you eat meat or not is up to you. I'm not commanding anyone here to give up meat, but providing my own opinion and citations of sūtra which I rely on.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhavya was an Indian master. He was certainly quite aware of the issues here since he address this in his Tarkajvala in detail. He obviously thought the reasoning of the advocates of an absolute prohibition of meat eating were mistaken and unreasonable, and that their arguments did not actually adress the true intent of the Mahāyāna sutras that seem to say meat eating is never acceptable.

Huseng said:

There are sūtra references in the Mahāyāna canon, at least in East Asia, which prohibit the consumption of even eggs and milk.

Malcolm wrote:

These can be safely considered apocryphal since Indians would never dream of not conusming milk products.

Huseng said:

Again, it is up to the individual. Even if you pay no karmic debt for consuming meat, by purchasing it you're supporting the economy of meat production, which requires animals to be slaughtered for profit.

Malcolm wrote:

If you drive a car you are supporting the economy of meat production which depends upon oil from top to bottom. No oil, no huge meat industry. And that is just a fact. In fact if you shop at any market, you are supporting the meat industry, if you buy grain, you are supporting producers of grain which is fed to animals in feedlots. It is impossible to truly tease the economy of food production apart and say "If I buy this, I am not supporting that". Even if you buy organic cotton, pesticides are used in the production of that cotton, pesticides which are less toxic to humans, but no less toxic to bugs. If you decide to buy only clothes made of artificial fibers, you are supporting the oil industry which is supporting the this industry and that industry.

If your criteria (and it is) is to cease using any product that harms any creature anywhere, this is impossible Even if you think there is precedent for this in a few Mahāyāna sutras, the sutras you have chosen are not sutras that are only to be read one way or can only be read one way, as Bhavya shows.

If you want to be a Vegan, fine, no problem -- but there is little or no justification for it from a Buddhist point of view. In fact all the Indian sutras encourage use of dairy, the very same ones that reject the consumption of meat. So therefore, the Vegan diet, even by strict vegetarian standards, is not supported in Buddhist sutras of Indian provenance. This being the case, if you try to justify it (a Vegan diet) on the basis of Buddhist sutras you will wind up trapping yourself in a morass of contradictions -- for example, excusing agriculture and travelling during the rains season when it is forbidden to Buddhist monks, but insisting that no one should eat meat even through it is permitted for shravakas and those who follow secret mantra.

If you want to be a Vegan, you can only "justify" it on purely secular grounds, and even then, not very adequately.

If there is no karmic debt connected with eating meat (that satisfies the criteria that one was not connected with inflicting harm on the animal), as you admit, then one can, as a Buddhist, eat meat and still engage in decisions and actions which limit one's personal participation in industrial agriculture without there being any contradiction at all.

In the end, Veganism is merely a political salve for the consciences of granola-munching, yoga-studio going, petty bourgeois (as well as some Buddhists) in first-world countries that are completely out of touch with the realities of how things are in places like Haiti, Appalachia (where the poorest Americans live) and Golok, for example where every calory counts. In other words, without the abundant waste of first-world nations, a Vegan diet is not even possible. You might argue "The Chinese Buddhists have been doing this for centuries" well, my reply to that is that people in Chinese Buddhist monasteries are not paid to work in rice paddies (they are forbidden to) they are paid to pray and be vinayadharas. They are a supported community and their fortunes and ability to maintain the life style you admire and emulate depends completely on the wealth of the supporting population.

Likewise, the Vegan lifestyle depends on the choices and abundance of the very industrial agricultural system you are criticizing. Without that system, without the ability to get fresh vegetables, etc. year round, the Vegan diet is impossible. The Vegan diet is primarily an urban diet for a wealthy elite (like monks in a monastery) who can afford fresh vegetables, fruit, nuts, and grain 365 days a year (and good medical care when their health crashes from a bad diet). If and when the industrial infrastructure that supports the present system of agricultural production collapses (and it will), there won't be any more Vegan diets.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Rocky Zen

Content:

LastLegend said:

If Dozgchen teachings direct at seeing the nature of the mind, then it is Zen just like any other forms of Mahayana..

Namdrol said:

If it were just that, than yes.

LastLegend said:

Just that...and different methods.

Malcolm wrote:

No. But you should really visit with a Dzogchen master who can explain the differences to you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Rocky Zen

Content:

LastLegend said:

If Dozgchen teachings direct at seeing the nature of the mind, then it is Zen just like any other forms of Mahayana..

Malcolm wrote:

If it were just that, than yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Huseng said:

In 845 Wuzong ordered a massive repression against both Manichaeism and Buddhism. He even ordered all Manichaen priests in the empire executed. Countless Buddhist monks and nuns were defrocked and Buddhist assets appropriated by the state.

Malcolm wrote:

He was a Taoist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Rocky Zen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Mind is not jñāna.

Astus said:

You may have noticed by now that terminology is not universal even within Buddhism. Mind (xin 心 - citta) in Zen is used not just for the deluded but the enlightened mind too, while other words like consciousness (shi 識 - vijñāna) or intelligence (yi 意 - manas) are not used in both senses.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, Dzogchen and Zen are different and are in no way equivalent, even when

one is confronted by very similar statements. The difference in these statements hinges on very subtle points. You need to seek out a teacher who can explain them to you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Rocky Zen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Don't mistake poetry and rhetoric, like the above, for what is actual.

It simply means that all objects of knowledge are the display of one's own jñāna. It does not mean that rocks, trees, and such are independently awakened.

Astus said:

That's the same point as in Zen, Huayan, etc., it's just that they might call it dharmadhatu or mind or something similar.

Malcolm wrote:

Mind is not jñāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Namdrol said:

And ironically, I know many vegans who have no qualms about killing mosquitoes. I myself have not killed a mosquito, or anything else, deliberately since I became a Buddhist 25 years ago.

David N. Snyder said:

N,

Going back to e-sangha days, were you not an omnivore, then vegetarian, then vegan, and now are you back to omnivore? Not placing any value judgment, just curious.

Malcolm wrote:

Never a vegan. Even on e-Sangha I clarified that I thought vegan diet was too extreme. For the record, I also clarified on E-Sangha that if I needed to eat for reasons of personal health, I would. As it happens, I had a surgery and since I refused to eat meat for a year, it did not heal well. When I started consuming meat again, it healed up just fine.

The crux of my arguments against eating meat were similar to Huseng's environmental,

cruelty of treatment of animals, and so on. I still think those arguments are a valid reason for not supporting industrial agriculture in general -- which I endeavor not to do. I agree with Huseng that as Buddhists we need to be mindful of what is harmful. But I do not buy the argument that eating meat ipso facto makes one responsible for harming animals. That extreme was rejected by the Buddha and I also reject it based on reasoning.

In the end, I think the essential message of all the teachings in Sutras about meat-eating boils down to intention and to mindfulness.

But the Vegan diet is not Buddhist either in intent or in application. It is just politics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'

Content:

alpha said:

can you actually see something?

because mind can only see things other than itself.

Namdrol said:

The Yogacara Madhyamakas like Santarakshita accept that mind is self-knowing (svasaṃvedana).

N

Sherab said:

Prasangika Madhyamakas do not accept that there is svasaṃvedana relatively, let alone absolutely. Makes me wonder how they explain how a mind knows that it knows. Could you throw some light on this Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

recollection.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Rocky Zen

Content:

Astus said:

"When self dissolves, everything is already awakened. Trees are awakened, rocks are awakened, birds are enlightened, and the clouds in the sky are enlightened. When the Buddha had this moment of complete realization, he discovered that this whole universe is already enlightened. More than that, he realized that every particle on the

ground is enlightened. He saw that every particle is a Buddha paradise. In each particle there are billions and trillions of Buddha paradises. In each of those particles there are billions of buddhas residing. This whole universe becomes suddenly enlightened and perfect just as it is."

(Anam Thubten: No Self, No Problem, p. 46)

Malcolm wrote:

Don't mistake poetry and rhetoric, like the above, for what is actual.

It simply means that all objects of knowledge are the display of one's own jñāna. It does not mean that rocks, trees, and such are independently awakened.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

rory said:

Huseng;

as you see people will argue, split hairs, accuse you of being 'preachy' to avoid their behavior. It's consciousness of wrong. Notice they won't argue with me. What can they say: I'm sorry I won't eat vegan food no matter how tasty & healthful it is & compassionate

Malcolm wrote:

A vegan diet is not inherently compassionate nor does it inherently make people compassionate. It also is not inherently tasty (that depends on the cook), it is not necessarily healthful (and can be quite the opposite in fact), that depends on one's constitution, age, and so on.

And quite frankly, I don't see vegans refusing to drive in cars and refusing to use public transportation because they are upset by the all the insects that are crushed and splatted by moving vehicles.

Veganism is definitely more in tune with Jain POV. But we are not Jains, we are Buddhists, and as such, Buddha rejected the extreme asceticism of Jains as well as criticisms of Devadatta.

Now, I have no problem with people choosing to be vegan, that is their choice. But I do have a problem with people asserting a vegan diet is eo ispo "Buddhist", because it is not.

Eating meat is not wrong providing you neither saw it killed, heard of being killed on your individual behalf, or was directly involved in killing it personally.

Harming sentient beings is wrong. Meat does not have sensation, it is inert. By the time meat has arrived on your plate, there is no mind there.

If your argument revolves around the process of harm caused to sentient beings by meat production, you must eo ipso apply the same argument to the production of rice, soy, and so on.

And ironically, I know many vegans who have no qualms about killing mosquitoes. I myself have not killed a mosquito, or anything else, deliberately since I became a Buddhist 25 years ago.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is no Buddhist teaching that advocates harming others as Dharma.

David N. Snyder said:

What point is that about? Who advocates harming in the name of Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

it's obvious that a butcher must cease engaging in harming others, in other words.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Namdrol said:

If butchers can't attain awakening, how then could Angulimala attain awakening?

N

David N. Snyder said:

If they change their ways, as Angulimala did, I suppose they could. But you didn't specify a "reformed butcher" who changed his ways. If you mean that, then yes, I suppose they could achieve awakening.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Buddhist teaching that advocates harming others as Dharma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Namdrol said:

Even butchers can achieve awakening.

David N. Snyder said:

Not according to the Buddha.

" Here, friend, as I was coming down from Mount Vulture Peak, I saw a skeleton moving through

the air. Vultures, crows, and hawks, following it in hot pursuit, were pecking at it between the

ribs, stabbing it, and tearing it apart, while it uttered cries of pain.

That being, bhikkhus, used to be a cattle butcher in this same Rajagaha. Having been tormented

in hell for many years, for many hundreds of years, for many thousands of years, for many

hundreds of thousands of years as a result of that karma, as a residual result of that same

karma he is experiencing such a form of individual existence."

Samyutta Nikaya 19.1

Malcolm wrote:

If butchers can't attain awakening, how then could Angulimala attain awakening?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2011 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Taoist Origin of Tantric Energy System

Content:

peteralanroberts said:

Also interesting is the specific inner anatomy of the Thogal practices in Nyingma and Bon, with a very distinctive arrangement of nadis and chakras, identical in both traditions, but as far as I know with a mysterious origin, though central asia is often

posited.

Malcolm wrote:

These nadis (aka ba men rva) are simply poetic descriptions of the optical sheath which houses the optic nerve. In Tibetan Medicine, the terms " dar skud ", silk thread, is a common alternate term for nerves (rtsa dkar po). The fact that so called " ka ti " is identified as possessing the nature of fire is merely a reflection of the fact that in Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine the eye possesses the alocaka pitta (mthong byed mkhris pa) and so on.

There is no need to posit a mysterious central asian origin. Their origin is found in the seventeen tantras. The understanding of the seventeen tantras is wedded with a Tibetan (and perhaps earlier Indian) understanding of human anatomy based on Dissection. Tibetans not only inherited descriptions of dissections from Hellenic Medicine; unlike Indians and Chinese culture, they did not have the same taboo around cutting up bodies. The Tibetan doctors therefore had a better grasp of anatomy in general than Indian and Chinese doctors from an early period in the history of Tibetan Medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

Namdrol said:

One of our contributors, Sten Anspell, did a thesis on klong sde that is very interesting.

Pero said:

Do you know where it's possible to obtain this? I could only find a Norwegian library that you can borrow from which doesn't help me obviously hehe.

Also, who is Sten Anspel here if it's not a secret (and assuming you meant contributors on Dharma Wheel)?

Malcolm wrote:

ratna

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

This isn't pre-modern times. My opposition to meat consumption is also on the grounds that it is now industrially produced, and not just a yak in the mountains licking the moss. Industrial meat production is horrible for the environment, so I would oppose it just as

much as I would oppose nuclear power and hacking down the rain forest.

Malcolm wrote:

I oppose all Industrial agriculture. Not just meat. I agree with you about this. Industrial meat production is horrible for the environment, and that is why, in general, I do not eat meat produced under those conditions.

Huseng said:

Eating meat is generally equivalent, at least in the countries we reside in, to directly supporting horrific damage to the global environment.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that depends on where you eat meat. Macdonald's yes. But not the restaurants that I frequent that eschew industrially produced meat and produce.

Huseng said:

If you think that makes me preachy and fundamentalist, then that's your perception, not mine.

Malcolm wrote:

You are sounding preachy and fundamentalist because of the way you are talking about this issue as if it were a moral campaign, for example, against homosexuality, as if people who eat meat can never achieve awakening. That of course is false. Even butchers can achieve awakening. And if they have the correct instruction, faster than a vegan Pandita.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

The Karmapa has banned consumption of meat in monasteries under him.

Malcolm wrote:

He did not tell Karma Kagyu monks that they may not eat meat. Only that KK monastery kitchens would not prepare it anymore. He clarified this in a following statement when people freaked out. He made it clear people were free to eat meat at restaurants outside the monasteries, of which there are always many. In India, monasteries still order "on the hoof".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

mr. gordo said:

What does "pure in three ways" mean?

Malcolm wrote:

It means meat that has not been killed for you (i.e. by a host knowing you are coming to banquet, for example); that you did not kill or ordered to be killed; or meat from an animal that you observed being killed.

Some people and even some masters think that meat in supermarkets is included in the second category.

As I already pointed out, the Mahāyāna master Bhavya points out in his Madhyamakahrdayakārikā:

Therefore, permitted meat, and so on,
must be held to be faultless;
eating such meat possesses no fault
because at that time no creature is harmed.

He has quite extensive reasoning for ascertaining this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Namdrol said:

You may feel free from karma, but there will never be a time when animals are not slaughtered for food. This is just a fact. Get used to it. And as long as that is true, Buddhists may continue to eat meat understanding that it is pure in three ways.

Huseng said:

Buddhists may do a lot of things that are unwholesome. The lot of them are not enlightened and still subject to extreme cravings for foods like meat. However, as has been taught in countless scriptures and treatises it is best to avoid eating meat, not only for one's own sake, but for the sake of other persons and animals. This is the conduct of bodhisattvas. Eating meat with the assurances it is pure in three ways is conduct suitable for a śrāvaka, whose purpose is personal liberation, not the liberation of all sentient beings.

You may follow the śrāvaka conduct. You may also follow the path of the bodhisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

Or I can follow the conduct of tantric practitioner, where there are no restrictions concerning diet.

That being said, if your heart does not permit you to eat meat, than don't. But don't get all preachy and fundamentalist about it -- that is the path of Devadatta.

Even so, the fundamental feature of bodhisattva conduct is intention, not rules.

Bodhisattvas engage in a lot of different conduct, some of them eat meat. For example, if eating meat makes it easier to introduce someone to Mahāyāna, then I will eat meat. I will drink alcohol. Etc.

If I need to eat meat because I am healing from an injury, I will.

If normal people think we are Hari Krishnas, they will not be interested in Dharma.

Even Shabkar, who was famous for his detailed refutation of eating meat, did not try to force people not to eat meat. One of his main concerns was the example Tibetan monasteries set when they ordered animals on the hoof for the monasteries. He felt this was very wrong (it is) and this was one of his main targets. Not nomads who could not in any case read his texts and for whom being vegetarian is really not possible.

For such people, there are Mahāyāna fast day vows. They can be vegetarian once a day. And many Tibetans do follow the practice of Tibetan Lent i.e. avoiding meat during the fourth month, Vaisaka.

It is ok to encourage people not to eat meat. But it will never work to try and prohibit it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Adamantine said:

"One should not buy meat, nor should one offer animals in sacrifice to the gods and ancestral spirits. For the Buddha never allowed "marked meat" to be eaten. And by "marked meat" he meant the flesh of animals that have been killed and purchased for food, as well as animals marked for sacrifice.

Malcolm wrote:

What this means is when you go to a slaughterhouse and pick out Bessie and order her

meat for yourself. These days it is called ordering beef "on the hoof". That is forbidden. It is also forbidden to sacrifice animals, as we know.

Meat found in a supermarket, however is not "marked meat" since one did not pick it out on a feedlot.

Adamantine said:
Kalachakra Tantra

The root tantra of Kalachakra says:

Wicked people, hard to train.
Kill harmless beasts
As sacrifice to gods and for their ancestors,
To gain protection, profit, and fulfil their aims.
To buy the meat, to wish to eat it, is indeed an evil act.

Malcolm wrote:
Same as above. Don't buy meat on the hoof.

Adamantine said:
Shabkar says: This passage shows that if one wishes to eat meat and buys what one knows has come from animals that have been slaughtered for commercial purposes, one commits a negative action.

Malcolm wrote:
It does not show that, but I understand why Shabkar wishes that it showed that.

Adamantine said:
The Lotus Net, the root tantra of Lord Avalokita, says:

Stale offerings, garlic, soiled or discarded food, meat and food from the hands of butchers, and water containing insects--all these should be rejected.

Malcolm wrote:
Kriya tantra.

Adamantine said:
Akshobya Tantra | mi g.yo ba'i rgyud

Curd, milk, butter, sweet substances, sweet fried pancakes, bread, and rice should be consumed in moderation. All evil-smelling foods should be rejected, such as meat, alcohol, garlic, and so forth.

Malcolm wrote:

Kriya tantra. For anuttarayoga tantra practitioners there are no such restrictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

Then I had enough exposure to evidence that it is horrible for the global environment and how much suffering animals go through...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Huseng said:

but it makes logical sense as a vegetarian to give up dairy and eggs too when you see how hens and dairy cattle are mistreated.

Malcolm wrote:

Unfortunately for cows bred by humans, they over produce milk as a matter of course. If they are not milked, they are miserable even if they have calves. If the whole world went vegan, that would be the end of cows and chickens.

There are solutions of course - buy local, only from farms where you can see the animals and how they are treated, etc.

Huseng said:

Giving up animal products is just as much about the producers as it is about the animals. Those butchers ply their trade (a wrong livelihood) because there is an economy for their product. Less demand, less of their product will be produced, meaning less animals raised and slaughtered. Good for the animals and good for the butchers.

Malcolm wrote:

You may feel free from karma, but there will never be a time when animals are not slaughtered for food. This is just a fact. Get used to it. And as long as that is true, Buddhists may continue to eat meat understanding that it is pure in three ways.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

As you're aware there is more than one Mahāyāna scripture forbidding the consumption of meat as per a Buddha's instructions.

Namdrol said:

Yes, I am aware that some Indian Mahāyānists composed some sutras forbidding the eating of meat, putting those words in a Buddha's mouth.

Huseng said:

Buddhavacana.

They were honouring their founder, not disparaging him. If you think the latter, then your advocacy of Vajrayāna is on shaky ground.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhavaviveka was a Mahāyānist. He analyzed the consumption of meat and concluded that as long as it was pure in three ways, eating meat was faultless.

He also did not accept the Yogacara sutras as "pure" (the primary source of the eating meat will send you to hell). So you see, in Indian Buddhism there was considerable latitude for accepting and rejecting sutras based on whether you think they reasonable or not.

Buddhists in Tibet and China, etc., lacked the sort of "on the ground" perspective of India sutra text composition, and thus tended to accept everything that came out of India and tried in various ways to reconcile Buddhists sutras.

In India therefore, we can understand that there were Mahāyānists, Madhyamakas, who adhered to one group of sutras, who ate meat; and another group, Yogacāras, who did not eat meat, adhering to another group of sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 10:32 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

As you're aware there is more than one Mahāyāna scripture forbidding the consumption of meat as per a Buddha's instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am aware that some Indian Mahāyānists composed some sutras forbidding the eating of meat, putting those words in a Buddha's mouth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 10:29 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Jnana said:

The Buddhadharma is far bigger than Tibetan Buddhism or the opinions of Tibetan Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not that large -- it consists of Theravada, various Sino-Japanese traditions, and Tibetan Buddhism.

That's it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Jnana said:

Your entire premise is not, and cannot, be supported in any way whatsoever. It's polemical bullshit. I'm tired of hearing it. It's lame.

Malcolm wrote:

We apparently do not agree on how afflicted people are in this period of time.

I think that the human history since the industrial revolution completely illustrates my point. I can bring many citations to bear from both sutra and tantra to verify that such millennial pessimism about the period of time 2500 years following the Buddha's passing is a well-established tradition, as you well know.

It is not polemics in the normal sense of the word i.e. "A polemic is a form of dispute, wherein the main efforts of the disputing parties are aimed at establishing the superiority of their own points of view regarding an issue."

Common Mahāyāna itself contains all of these pessemistic observations.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 7:59 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Jnana said:

By a Tibetan trained lopön can all too often result in Buddhists from non-Tibetan traditions dismissing Tibetan Buddhism as a lame joke.

Malcolm wrote:

You missed the point -- I was not criticizing these traditions. I was criticizing the people who aspire to follow them. Not because of their aspiration, but because human beings are more afflicted than they were even one hundred years ago. The whole premise of my statement is based on the over-whelmingly intense level of afflictions that modern people possess which renders the path of renunciation ineffective in the present day.

For example, it once was the case that many common antibiotics were very effective at removing illnesses caused by bacteria. Today those very same antibiotics are less effective to the point of uselessness because of the increasing resistance of these pathogens to older generations of antibiotics. The real problem is not the remedies, but the pathogens to which they are applied.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Jnana said:

Even when a world system is going through the bleakest age when the teaching has been destroyed and the Mahāyāna doctrine distorted, bodhsattvas are exhorted to cherish the Mahāyāna sūtras, to recite, study, and master them, and to promulgate the sūtras and explain them correctly.

Malcolm wrote:

And the common Mahāyāna explains that it is impossible to attain full awakening in less than three incalculable eons. Hence the need and reason for uncommon Mahāyāna Secret Mantra for those who wish to attain buddhahood a bit more rapidly.

So my response to this is that for study and learning, we need to preserve the textual traditions of common Mahāyāna, but when it comes to practice, we need to practice Secret Mantra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2011 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: obstacles to the spread of Veganism + their solutions

Content:

Huseng said:

That's why I don't make such equations with ordinary people, but we're Buddhists here and I should hope we can hold ourselves to a higher level of morality than the average joe on the street whose morality is generally dictated by fear of punishment and pursuit of worldly pleasures rather than unconditional compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

But not all Buddhists think that eating meat is naturally non-virtuous. Killing is naturally non-virtuous, but not what you put in your body. This is why some Buddhists continue to eat meat, and other Buddhists do not.

Ultimately, Devadatta tried to convince the Buddha to forbid all consumption of fish and meat, but the Buddha refused.

Do what your conscience tells you. But do not try to force this down the throats of others.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 15th, 2011 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Site validation ...

Content:

Namdrol said:

Agar 35 is extremely strong, should never be used by people who have edemas or who are over 70 in general.

N

Sönam said:

I am only 63... nevertheless, I'm incertain about "blood pressure" restrictions, I (recently) had a "lung embolysm" (don't know the real english designation) and I'm under a drug used to thin blood, I must regulary (at the time once each two weeks) make an blood analysis (IRN).

What are the restrictions? should I care? embolysm was not a strong one ... eventually what could be good for that?

thank you for your kind answer.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Agar 35 is not a good match for you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 15th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Garlic

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

I do not know further if garlic and onions are used in Tibetan medicine as a remedy.....

This because if something can be used as medicine the product is allowed to use.

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Garlic is a very important medicine, used in suppression of rlung disorders.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 15th, 2011 at 7:59 AM

Title: Re: Site validation ...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Agar 35 is extremely strong, should never be used by people who have edemas or who are over 70 in general.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 12th, 2011 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

mudra said:

It is basic to both Hinayāna and common Mahāyāna to regard conditioned phenomena (apart from the path) as contaminated and contaminating.

N

Malcolm wrote:

It is basic to Madhyamakans who practice the sutra/common paths to view all

phenomena as lacking inherent existence, as Chandrakirti says in Clear Words: "Those are established through mutual dependence...., ...valid cognizers and objects of comprehension, are not established by way of their [own] entities" so in this system at least the subjective is at least equally important, so your generalization of the common Mahayana path is not pervasive. So they at least, when practicing the path of renunciation are not so much worrying so much about inherent contamination of objects as they would be concerned about the reifying of any aspect of phenomena (and of course this would be quite fundamental to the real practice of Tantra).

M[/quote]

You are conflating ultimate truth analysis with conventional truth. You cannot explain away the contaminated nature of phenomena on the basis of their emptiness.

Someone who is below the path of seeing would be extremely concerned, and should be extremely concerned with the contaminated nature of phenomena since they have no methods to deal with this apart from realizing emptiness. And further, on the impure stages, in post-equipoise, they still have to cope with the fact that phenomena appear contaminated and they have no specific practices for dealing with this.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 12th, 2011 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Huseng said:

Right, but on the reverse one could say the same thing about Vajrayāna practitioners. Is it really possible to attain Buddhahood and skip past the Bodhisattva bhumis in one lifetime? There were many in the past who were sceptical about such claims.

Malcolm wrote:

Who said anything about skipping the bhumis. The bhumis are not skipped in Vajrayāna practice. They are just ascended in a single lifetime.

Huseng said:

I think there still are in the greater Mahāyāna community. If it is so easy to attain Buddhahood in one lifetime, then they have the right to ask for proof.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, this is religion, we are talking about here. If there was proof of any of this Buddhism would be world dominating, not the dwindling fourth largest religion in the

world.

Huseng said:

Well, let's see your proof for Buddhahood in a single lifetime. I don't personally deny this, but let's be fair here. If you're going to suggest that present day adepts in non-Vajrayāna traditions are just outwardly enlightened and that they're just kidding themselves, your opponents have just as much right to ask you for proof of the purported efficacy of Vajrayāna. Moreover, if there really are arhats in the world and you're claiming they're just kidding themselves, that's some wicked akusala karma.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read more carefully and with less emotion. There can be no Mahāyāna awakening to full buddhahood in one lifetime based on what Mahāyāna sutras themselves say -- so in terms of Mahāyāna there is no argument to be had.

I said if there were people these days who thought they were going to become stream entrants by practicing Theravada, they are kidding themselves. This does not mean that I am claiming there are not a few Shravaka Aryas kicking about. There may well be, but they will be as rare as stays in the daytime.

Huseng said:

Okay, you're entitled to your opinion, but you're basically saying then that present day Theravada is full of it and any of their purported adepts are just jokers. You're saying that the likes of Ajahn Brahm and Ajahn Chah are just fooling themselves and everyone else.

Malcolm wrote:

Is Ajahn Brahm as arriya? He would be forbidden from declaring it were it so.

Huseng said:

Again, there are many living cases which would prove the contrary to what you're saying. You don't have much experience with Theravada, right? So, why should anyone take you seriously when you say Theravada practitioners are deeply kidding themselves?

Malcolm wrote:

Define experience. Do you mean experience as a meditator meditating on classical topics according to Abhidharma? Or do you mean training under a Theravadin teacher at say IMS?

Then please explain what the difference might be and why it matters?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 12th, 2011 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

mudra said:

Whoa there Namdrol-lags, are we shifting the goal posts? This thread started off on the premise that renunciation doesn't work these days. Renunciation has always been an ingredient of liberation from samsara, a preliminary if you like to moving on to Buddhahood, not the final cause for Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

Path. Path. Path. Don't confuse renunciation, a necessary precondition for entering Buddhadharma, with the path of renunciation, which is characteristic of the causal vehicles.

mudra said:

The original premise was that renunciation doesn't work,

Malcolm wrote:

The original premise was that the path of renunciation does not work.

mudra said:

In fact even the view that you present above that "and common Mahāyāna which involves regarding sense objects as inherently afflictive" is actually not completely correct. If one were to follow the consequence of Nagarjuna's presentation of Madhyamaka it's clear that the affliction is not inherent to the sense object - we are talking perfection/sutra/common Mahayana vehicle here.

Malcolm wrote:

It is basic to both Hinayāna and common Mahāyāna to regard conditioned phenomena (apart from the path) as contaminated and contaminating.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2011 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Huseng said:

Mahāyāna teaches the bodhisattva stages, which means Buddhahood will take many lifetimes. However, that being said, we need to take into account how many lifetimes of practice one already has had prior to the current one.

Malcolm wrote:

Two incalculable eons to reach the seventh bhumi or so....now where are you on that scale?

BTW, three incalculable eons is the number for the best practitioner of Mahāyāna, the average person requires 25...

BTW, Jeff Huseng, we Vajrayanists don't say these things in order to make other traditions inferior. We say these things because we want people to understand the difference between a rapid path and slow path since we are Mahāyānists and we want everyone to achieve Buddhahood as fast as possible. In the end, of course, everyone is free to make up their own mind.

Buddhahood requires two accumulations, whether one does that slowly or rapidly is up to oneself. I think that people who believe they are going to realize arhatship let alone stream entry by practicing Theravada or the first bhumi in this lifetime by practicing common Mahāyāna are deeply kidding themselves.

IN terms of Mahāyāna, outside of Vajrayāna methods there is no way to accumulate the necessary merit and wisdom heaps required for full awakening.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2011 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nope, I accept that in this day and age people cannot give up attachment to sense objects, therefore, they require a different method, as Loppon Sonam Tsemö states: ...

Huseng said:

There are living examples that say otherwise, so your opinion is proven incorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

These monks, venerable though they may be, will not realize full awakening from a Mahāyāna perspective, as you will readily admit.

Many people can give up this or that thing. Ascetics in non-Buddhist religions make Buddhist monks look hedonists by comparison.

And you can't tell anything from outward appearances.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2011 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Huseng said:

So "common Mahāyāna" as it was practised by Nāgārjuna, who lived long before Vajrayāna appeared in the world, is just for accumulating good karma nowadays? What is it about the present day that makes it anymore difficult to realize emptiness using the methods as outlined by Nāgārjuna?

Malcolm wrote:

According to Nāgārjuna, one cannot attain Buddhahood at all by relying on the Sravaka canon, and it takes three incalculable eons attain awakening through common Mahāyāna. So even in his day, the idea of Buddhahood was merely a remote possibility for people and at most people could realistically hope for was first or second bhumi.

Therefore, it seem obvious that anyone who wishes to attain full awakening in this lifetime must practice Vajrayāna, which is not a path of renunciation, because paths of renunciation are too difficult, too lengthy, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2011 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: Black magic, is it Vajrayana or Bon?

Content:

Adamantine said:

SO you are claiming there is no difference between a Vedic rite of destruction and a Vajrayana rite of liberation?

Namdrol said:

Oh, the rites of liberation are different than abhicāra.

N

Adamantine said:

So what were you saying before-- they are different but the difference doesn't really matter much?

Malcolm wrote:

The abhicārakarma is purely about destruction, not liberation. It is a common siddhi i.e. worldly.

The primary difference between Buddhist and Hindu abhicārakarma is bodhicitta.

But in terms of the actual function of the rite -assuming one has common siddhis, is the same.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2011 at 7:32 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Adamantine said:

So what is the dividing line then? You were quite critical of Roach for taking a consort while still appearing as a monk (among other things of course).. so was the criticism simply that he wasn't putting on a good show? I thought it was that he was clearly breaking his vows.

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of ordinary people, he broke his vows. That was the essence of my complaint.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2011 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Black magic, is it Vajrayana or Bon?

Content:

Adamantine said:

SO you are claiming there is no difference between a Vedic rite of destruction and a Vajrayana rite of liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, the rites of liberation are different than abhicāra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2011 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Black magic, is it Vajrayana or Bon?

Content:

Adamantine said:

You can even find polemical arguments about why Buddhist fire pujas are "better" than Vedic fire pujas, when the Brahmins began to complain that Buddhists were horning in on their game.

Well they are, aren't they?

Malcolm wrote:

Since the four activities are all in realm of mundane siddhis, it does not really matter much. I am sure brahmin fire pujas are very effective.

When the Buddha was prepared for cremation he instructed Ananda to let the brahmins carry out the rites since they knew what they were doing. Obviously the Buddha was quite happy in many instances to give brahmins credit for their valuable ritual expertise. And I am sure it continued that way for a thousand years. In fact, we know that it did because even today there are families of Thai brahmins connected with the Thai Court who have Vedic ritual responsibilities to the Thai royal family.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2011 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: Akhyuk Rinpoche passed into parinibbana July 23 2011

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

pictures where the lama happened to have moved a bit on the throne when his picture was taken, so that the resulting picture looks like he's transparent, and then write under it "rainbow body!!!"

.

Malcolm wrote:

It is even worse when the Lamas in question say of their blurred photos that they were in the state of Dharmakāya at the time...charlatons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2011 at 8:38 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

mudra said:

it doesn't obliterate the spirit of renunciation.

Malcolm wrote:

Really people, why is this so hard to understand? There is a difference between renunciation, i.e., the motive to escape samsara, and the path of renunciation common to Hinayāna and common Mahāyāna which involves regarding sense objects as inherently afflictive, and therefore, necessary to abandon.

mudra said:

My point being that monks, whether they are Tibetans who practice Vajrayana or not, always get respect when they practice the vinaya well, and that respect is also something which helps them keep it.

Malcolm wrote:

That has nothing to do with what path they actually practice.

mudra said:

I don't buy that just because you practice Tantra you can just do what you like vis a vis the vinaya. If you transgress it consciously with the intent to uphold for example the Bodhisattva ethic (easy to find examples of this in the 46 secondary transgressions) then it is done in the spirit of humility. Not like some of the disgraceful examples that one sees nowadays who use the lame excuse of either being "tantric" monks or "adjusting to the times"

Malcolm wrote:

In Hinayāna and Mahāyāna one is never supposed to enjoy sense objects for one's own benefit. But in Vajrayāna, it is the complete opposite. Those who do not understand this simple point do not understand the profound meaning of the three vows.

mudra said:

I feel it would be completely presumptuous of me to even begin to speculate what HH the Karmapa's intentions are.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I tend to take people at their word. When they say they play ultraviolent videogames to relax and blow off steam, I generally beleive them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2011 at 8:26 AM

Title: Re: Black magic, is it Vajrayana or Bon?

Content:

Namdrol said:

There are four activities. The fourth, abhicāra, mngon spyod or the activity of destruction will certainly seem like tantric sorcery to anyone but Vajrayāna Buddhists. Incidentally, the four activities come from Indian Vedic culture, and in that context, abhicāra is definitely black magic.

N

Adamantine said:

They may have commonalities with other cultural rituals shared in time and space but

wouldn't you say they actually come from Buddhas?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, yes and no. Stupas comes from the Buddha, but they were adapted by the Buddha to fit a different context than their original context.

It is rather stupid to ignore the fact that Buddhism borrowed and repurposed many elements of a shared Indian cultural heritage or to try and explain it away with some complicated religious reasoning.

Sang offerings, Sur offerings and so on don't exist in Indian culture, so it would rather dull to refuse to acknowledge that many native Tibetan, as well as some Chinese rituals, were converted to Buddhist use under the general rubric of "tö" (gto) rites. There is a whole list of these things for example, in the Karling Shitro in the section on cheating death. Mipham has a book where he discloses many of these kinds of tö rites (in connection with elemental calculation) which formerly were closely guarded secrets because many of them indeed would be considered sorcery and given their worldly origin, were sorcerous at one time. Then there is the famous book of calculation called the Svarodaya tantra, a Shaivaite tantra preserved in the Tengyur, which is a work mainly concerned with military prediction, heavily used by the Fifth Dalai Lama, and extensively commented on by Mipham.

We have to recognize, if we are really being honest, that Buddhism makes use of many "cultural rituals" that do not ultimately come from Buddhas, but are adapted by Buddhas and other awakened beings to suit the needs and proclivities of sentient beings. Thus the four activities were borrowed into Buddhism when tantric Buddhism began to spread in India in the 7th century. You can even find polemical arguments about why Buddhist fire pujas are "better" than Vedic fire pujas, when the Brahmins began to complain that Buddhists were horning in on their game.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2011 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Black magic, is it Vajrayana or Bon?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Back to this

Pema Rigdzin said:

...It just seemed like you were arguing that we should somehow conditionally, or provisionally, validate the way mistaken outsiders perceive esoteric material they come across solely because their perception seems true to them.

gregkavarnos said:

Not validate, just accept the fact that that is how it seems to them. Where we go from there is a different story altogether. And I think that better than validating their ignorance, we should just try to remove it by giving them a proper explanation. No more, no less. We can try to give them the proper explanation, there is no guarantee that they will

accept it, they may even accuse us of trying to confound the true meaning of our statements!

The best thing would be to "re-secret" these practices, but this is currently impossible.

Malcolm wrote:

There are four activities. The fourth, abhicāra, mngon spyod or the activity of destruction will certainly seem like tantric sorcery to anyone but Vajrayāna Buddhists. Incidentally, the four activities come from Indian Vedic culture, and in that context, abhicāra is definitely black magic.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Akhyuk Rinpoche passed into parinibbana July 23 2011

Content:

narraboth said:

The best way for some people probably is to drag out lama's corp out and put on an iron bed, and measure it every hour.

kirtu said:

This is what modern people want and it goes back to what Pema Ridgzin mentioned.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Those crowns are about a foot high. Since the body has been set up crossed legged, and it is clearly slumped, we can some natural shrinkage from loss of fluid of the body, but the skull has not shrunk, otherwise, the crown would be in the lap of the body.

Further, the body is in a box that has a 12 inch border in front of it (the Buddha statue is 18 inch size) -- that edge is not the edge of a cushion, but is the backpeice of the alter in front of it. Using the Buddha stauas as a measure, you can see that the seated body is somewhere betwee 30 to 36 inches high. When I am seated, butt to crown, I am 39 inches.

We don't need to drag the body out, we just need to see daily pictures....

I will have to consider this "...Akhyuk Lama's kudon has shrinked to one hand high" to be a pious exaggeration. One hand high on me is 8 inches. Clearly impossible based on the photographic evidence.

Anyway, Khenpoa Achö was great practitioner.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Taoist Origin of Tantric Energy System

Content:

Astus said:

In the introduction of Peter Alan Roberts' new book "Mahamudra and Related Instructions" it says that the energy system as it appeared in India with the chakras and nadis originates from Central Asia and it has a Taoist source. Anyone to provide more information on this?

The text says,

"The candali practice also involves the physiology of sexuality, generally described from a male perspective. It corresponds with far more ancient Taoist practices, which have a greater number of pressure points in breath control, called jade locks, and a specific female morphology that has the retention of menstruation as the parallel to the male retention of ejaculation. Candali and the cakra system appeared in the Buddhist tradition subsequent to a period of Buddhist and Taoist coexistence in Central Asia. The cakras, literally "wheels," are the points where subsidiary channels branch off into the body, but they were unknown in India before the latter centuries of the first millennium, when they first appeared in both Saivism and Buddhism."

Malcolm wrote:

He is mistaken. Cakras and Nadis appear in pre-Buddhist upanishads. The famed number 72,000 nadis occurs in the Brihadaryanika, look up Hita. The early mentions of vāyus, cakras and nadis are all to be found in the twopre- Buddhist Upanishads, and perhaps other early Puranic literature I have not seen. There is no reason in this instance to assume an extra-Indian origin for these theories.

Candali Yoga is based again an Upanishadic verse from the Candoga which is frequently cited in Buddhist texts discussing the difference between Buddhist tantric practices and Hindu corollaries. In actuality, Candali Yoga is based on the Indian concept of the burnt offering.

Moreover, Indian doctors were certainly aware of arteries and veins, the difference between them and so on. If anything, the notion of channels and cakras comes from Ayurveda.

Please near in mind I am not opposed to influences of this sort on genera principle -- for example, the Chinese certainly invented pulse diagnosis, which spread to Tibet and finally to India. The Greeks inversed Urinalysis, which spread to Tibetan and India (via Unnani), and so on. Mercury preperation certainly originated in China, and only spread to India later, as David Gordon White shows, based on Needleman. But there is no valid

reason to suppose that cakra and nadi theory is based on Taoism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

mudra said:

The teachings I received on uposatha vows emphasized that the motivation for taking these vows is to generate causes to attain Buddhahood (as distinct from Sravakayana 'attasila' day vows), but the means was very much involved with renunciation. In the formula with which one takes the vows says " just as the Buddhas etc.. in the past have practiced..". There is a reference to past arhats (Buddha arhats) but it was never said or implied that the reason that one takes the vows is to honor the conduct of the Arhats.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, the Mahāyāna fast days vows also contain the intention that you mention -- but the reason for doing so is it emulate the conduct of an Arhat, at least one day a month.

But nevertheless, this is part of common Mahāyāna.

mudra said:

As to renunciation no longer being a viable method, well we better rush off and tell HHDL, HH Karmapa, and all the monks practicing in all the monasteries.

Malcolm wrote:

All of these monks are Vajrayāna monks. They may bear the external characteristics of bhikṣus, but the path of renunciation is not the path they have chose for themselves. You would have to be a monastic or a lay person in the Theravadin tradition or the Chinese tradition to follow the path of renunciation in a precise way.

mudra said:

Actually quite a few of them are doing fine as monks. Sure it is perhaps more distracting in modern settings, but then again that mostly serves to separate the goats from the sheep (or however the saying goes)...

Malcolm wrote:

We tend to think that the most important thing that monks do avoid sexual relations. Monks also are not supposed to lie, steal the slightest thing (which means paying all duty and so on when they cross borders) etc., not remain alone with women in rooms, etc. The reason why the conduct of a Tibetan monk is kept secret from lay people is so

that lay people will not criticize monks. Part of the reason behind this is that all Tibetan monks are Mahāyāna monks, and thus, if they choose to break one of their vows for a reason, some one might misunderstand. Another part of the reason for this is that all Tibetan monks are Vajrayāna monks, and so if their conduct seems to be not in keeping with Hinayāna vows, they might get into trouble. Vajrayāna monks are not under the same restrictions as Hinayāna monks.

And the Karmapa is into playing first person shooter video games like Halo to relax.

When one understands the fundamental principle of Vajrayāna conduct is to engage sense objects and enjoy them for one's own pleasure (as a mandala of deities), it changes the game of how one understands a Vajrayāna monastic's conduct. The monastic thing is merely an outer show. It is not the essence of practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

tobes said:

It is odd that bodhicitta is so prevalent in the Ratnavali, but so conspicuously absent from the MMK and Vig.

Namdrol said:

Not at all. Ratnavali is a path oriented text while MMK and Vig are critical rebuttals.

Walser reviews Tillman Vetter's work, and concludes that Ratnavali is most likely an original Nāgārjuna composition.

N

tobes said:

Well, I can't find the Vetter article, and I'm not a philologist, so I couldn't enter into the debate anyway.

But surely you must acknowledge that there is absolutely ****no**** scholarly consensus about who Nagarjuna was, where he lived, what school he followed, and what works were an 'original composition' attributed to this historical figure. There are many theories, yours/Walser's is quite legitimate.....but no more legitimate than others. And all of them are theories. No one has any real knowledge about this.

Malcolm wrote:

We have attribution and the subject matter of the texts themselves.

For example, we can safely rule out Bodhicittavivarana as a work of Nāgārjuna I since it mentions both Vajrasattva and the ālayavijñāna.

There is good reason to exclude the dharmadhātustava, the trikāyastava and so on as well.

But concerning the Mahāyānavimsika, Ratnavali, Surhlllekha, the collection of reasoning, the collection of praises, etc., we can have doubts, but in my opinion we can accept these as valid Nāgārjuniana.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 8:53 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Namdrol said:

But that statement has nothing do with renunciation or abandonment of sense objects...

Fa Dao said:

I read Padmasambhavas statement to mean exactly that. While one tries to live/Realize the View of Ati one also takes into consideration the law of karma...in other words practicing what is wholesome and abandoning what is unwholesome i.e sense objects etc. If I have misunderstood this please explain, preferably without being condescending or dismissive.

Malcolm wrote:

Taking the consequence of one's actions into consideration does not entail abandoning sense objects. Quite the opposite. If one makes offerings to oneself as the deity with all sense objects, the negative consequences of karmic acts motivated by desire and so on are transformed into merit and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

kirtu said:

Nyungney is not a renunciative method? The Eight Precepts, recommended by Dezhung Rinpoche, aren't renunciative? Practice of the Three Heap Sutra isn't renunciative? Now the later two it could be argued are strictly sutra rather than kind of bridges to

tantra but Nyungney it totally tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason one takes the Mahāyāna fast day vows is to honor the conduct of Arhats. It is a strictly common Mahāyāna practice. "Three Heaps Sutra" is a strictly common Mahāyāna practice, extracted from the Ratnakuta collection of the sutras. It is mentioned in the Shikhsasammucaya.

"Nyungne" i.e "remaining in the fast". is a Caryā tantra purification practice and like all tantra from caryā on up, one creates oneself as a deity, engages in offerings of sense objects to oneself as well as the front created deity and so on. So it qualifies as part of the "path that does not abandon the basis" i.e. Mantrayāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: The virgin birth of Gautama.

Content:

Will said:

The Lalitavistara Sutra (among others) said conception occurred after a dream of a 6-tusked white elephant. Birth was not from the womb, but from her side.

Malcolm wrote:

C-section, which explains why his mother died shortly after he was born.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

My realization is higher than the sky,

But my observance of karma is finer than grains of flour.

-- Padmasambhava

Malcolm wrote:

But that statement has nothing do with renunciation or abandonment of sense objects...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Will said:

Am familiar with the intent of LRCM. He taught it as a necessary foundation to tantric path, right? When you wrote "impossible", then "not necessary", both these statements deny the needed basis of renouncing attachment to sense objects (among other renunciations) that the great Vajrayana bodhisattva Je Rinpoche taught.

.

Malcolm wrote:

See earlier post i.e.

Also for some people in whom general afflictions are strong, and in particular, cannot give up the tormenting attachment to desire, Secret Mantra was taught intending those of sharp faculties who wished unsurpassed awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Nangwa said:

The monasteries were the economy.

Astus said:

You mean they served as manufactures, etc. to produce goods? Or they were commercial centres and stock markets? I thought Tibet had a very feudal economy.

Malcolm wrote:

There was and still is a huge amount of economic activity around monasteries. Monasteries provided services, markets, grain storage and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Will said:

Why not? Since oodles of tantric Geluk adepts have followed the vajrayana (based in renunciation) with success up to the present, they would have dropped teaching renunciation by now if they agreed with Namdrol.

Astus said:

Indeed, why the huge monastic order in Tibet if it's pointless. They could have done better building economy and such.

Malcolm wrote:

men outnumbered women 3:1

Most monks in the large monasteries in Tibet were not fully ordained anyway. They were service workers, mostly.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Will said:

Namdrol:

You are confusing renunciation as in weariness for samsara, etc., for renunciation as a mode of practice i.e. giving up sense objects, etc. They are not the same thing.

Nope.

You are confusing renouncing sense objects with renouncing craving & attachment to same.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, I accept that in this day and age people cannot give up attachment to sense objects, therefore, they require a different method, as Loppon Sonam Tsemo states: Also in general, for those of little affliction, and in particular, since they can give up the tormenting attachment to desire, it is said that the Pāramitāyāna is intended for those of dull faculties who wish awakening. Also for some people in general afflictions are strong, and in particular, they cannot give up the tormenting attachment to desire, Secret Mantra was taught intending those of sharp faculties who wished unsurpassed awakening.

And:

The Vajrapañjara-tantra states: Created by passion, the worldly shall be liberated by the same passion

And the Śrī Guhyasamāja: The passionate desiring wisdom always rely on the five desire objects.

And so on. There are many excellent explanations in the Sakya father and sons writings about the necessity of those who wish liberation in this epoch to enter into secret mantra teachings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Will said:

No need to wonder, the Gelukpas of today have not dropped renunciation as the first fundamental of the Three Principles of the Path.

Nangwa said:

That doesnt really work for me.

Will said:

Why not? Since oodles of tantric Geluk adepts have followed the vajrayana (based in renunciation) with success up to the present, they would have dropped teaching renunciation by now if they agreed with Namdrol.

Malcolm wrote:

The practice of Gelug is 100 percent Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Will said:

You are moving the goalposts again N. - as is your wont.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am clarifying for you what the intent of studying Lamrim is. Please consult pages 363-365 of vol III of Lam Rim Chen Mo.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Will said:

Why would Je Rinpoche provide lam rim teachings (not to mention being a bhikshu himself) if such a path were without value?

Namdrol said:

Lamrim is simply a preliminary study for Vajrayāna. Tsongkhapa never states that Lamrim is sufficient unto itself for liberation. In fact, the majority of his collected works are devoted to Vajrayāna topics.

N

Will said:

You are moving the goalposts again N. - as is your wont.

The nut of it is - can vajrayana path produce bodhisattvas without the preliminary practice (not study) of renunciation etc.? Buddhadharma says, IMHO, NO!

Malcolm wrote:

See previous post -- you are confusing renunciation as in weariness for samsara, etc., for renunciation as a mode of practice i.e. giving up sense objects, etc. They are not the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2011 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Will said:

I am too lazy to provide the many citations from tantric practioners saying that renunciation is not only necessary, but fundamental to success in vajrayana. Why would Je Rinpoche provide lam rim teachings (not to mention being a bhikshu himself) if such a path were without value?

Malcolm wrote:

Do you know how to distinguish renunciation (weariness for samsara, and so on) from the path of renunication (abandoning the five aggregates)?

Renunciation in the first sense is nges 'byung aka nihsarana; the latter is spangs ba, to give up, avoid like giving sweets, etc. Same English translation, different context.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Will said:

Why would Je Rinpoche provide lam rim teachings (not to mention being a bhikshu himself) if such a path were without value?

Malcolm wrote:

Lamrim is simply a preliminary study for Vajrayāna. Tsongkhapa never states that Lamrim is sufficient unto itself for liberation. In fact, the majority of his collected works are devoted to Vajrayāna topics.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

kirtu said:

Since one can be a renunciate to some degree on a rigorous retreat, then it is possible to do at least this level under the right circumstances continuously.

Kirt

Namdrol said:

You are utterly missing the point. It is not necessary to practice the path of renunciation at all anymore.

kirtu said:

Within the context of the lower tantra, some degree of mimicry of renunciation (for example following in the footsteps of Tsongkhapa and others) is an effective means of accumulation of merit and purification and can aid in accomplishment of the inner tantra.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Lower Tantra is in no way shape or form a path of renunciation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

kirtu said:

Since one can be a renunciate to some degree on a rigorous retreat, then it is possible to do at least this level under the right circumstances continuously.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

You are utterly missing the point. It is not necessary to practice the path of renunciation at all anymore.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Namdrol said:

For example, even in Theravadin countries, most of the monks do not actually practice renunciation -- they have property, cars, money, debit cards, etc.

Astus said:

But that is not a new development. It's not that monks got lax in the last centuries only.

Malcolm wrote:

More evidence for my case -- did I say this was a 21st century problem? It has been true since the 8th century C.E.

For example, this is how Candragomin presents practice:

Objects and poisons are alike, pleasing just when first tasted.

Objects and poisons are alike, their result is unpleasant and unbearable.

Objects and poisons are alike, causing one to be clouded by the darkness of ignorance.

Objects and poisons are alike, their power is hard to reverse, and deceptive...

In other words, the basis, the five aggregates, are considered something to be given up by the path of renunciation. I am asserting that practicing from this perspective is no longer possible nor does it bear fruit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Astus said:

To say that these are the ending days of the Dharma and the only path to salvation is Vajrayana and the others are pointless is pretty radical.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, that is the message of Vajrayāna, make no mistake. Even someone like Tsongkhapa, who by all accounts was a strict vinayadhara, maintains this fact.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

This view is either too pessimistic or is just more Vajrayana triumphalism.

Malcolm wrote:

All those here who actually follow the path of renunciation as laid out in Shravakayāna or common Mahayāna texts, including monks, please raise your hands.

For example, even in Theravadin countries, most of the monks do not actually practice renunciation -- they have property, cars, money, debit cards, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The point is that the path of renunciation is no longer effective. There used to be hundreds of thousands of arhats, now there are none.

Huseng said:

That is a pretty bold statement to make.

There are people in the Theravada community who might disagree with your statement that there are no arhats anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

They can disagree, but they can't trot out an arhat, can they?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

kirtu said:

Namdrol - even I can give up sense objects for a long time relatively speaking and I am clearly tightly bound to sex.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study Sonam Tsemo's treatise on General Tantra.

You also need to look at the internal contradiction in your sentence.

You cannot practice renunciation as a path, now can you?

No? I didn't think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

mindyourmind said:

My only possible gripe would be with the "impossible" part.

Difficult, damn-near impossible yes, but (hopefully) not impossible.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the path of renunciation is no longer effective. There used to be hundreds of thousands of arhats, now there are none. There used to be hundreds of thousands of bodhisattvas on the stages, now there are very few.

The Hinayāna and Mahāyāna paths of renunciation is no longer effective in this degenerate age.

That does not mean we should not have renunciation in the more general sense of a sense of renunciation of samsara and so on -- but the path of renunciation is no longer effective overall.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation not Impossible

Content:

Will said:

Namdrol, what a dopey notion that renunciation is impossible because of modern afflictions. I must be missing something.

What exactly do you mean by renunciation?

Malcolm wrote:

Giving up sense objects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

tobes said:

It is odd that bodhicitta is so prevalent in the Ratnavali, but so conspicuously absent from the MMK and Vig.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. Ratnavali is a path oriented text while MMK and Vig are critical rebuttals.

Walser reviews Tillman Vetter's work, and concludes that Ratnavali is most likely an original Nāgārjuna composition.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana and Vajrayana

Content:

Tim said:

I'm exploring Tibetan Buddhism at present and would appreciate some clarity on the following aspects:

(1) If one intends to practice Tibetan Buddhism, does this automatically include vajrayana (tantric practices)? What I'm asking is - can one practice only the Mayahana aspects and still call it Tibetan Buddhism?

(2) In my part of the world (Durban, South Africa) there is only one Buddhist centre available, namely the "Mahasiddha Kadampa Buddhist Centre" which is a member of the New Kadampa Tradition. (EDIT: I'm thinking of going here for meditation practice). In which of the Tibetan subforums on this Forum will this lineage fall?

(Note: I posted here because I couldn't figure out the correct subforum - sorry if it is in the wrong place)

Malcolm wrote:

As for question 1) Yes.

as for 2) none, anymore. Formerly, Gelug.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Worldwide Transmission in NYC, Sunday, August 7

Content:

Adamantine said:

Is there any added benefit of attending the WW webcast with the group vs. at home on the computer? (assuming one doesn't need the explanation)-- for instance, will the feed at the center be higher bandwidth, less buggy, on a large screen, surround sound? All or any of the above?

Malcolm wrote:

no idea

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Worldwide Transmission in NYC, Sunday, August 7

Content:

Pemako said:

I'm so confused.

I joined Dzogchen Community about a month and a half ago, but it's been impossible to get a logon ID. I was told this transmission is open - does that mean at the time of the broadcast there won't be a log in page? Anything else I need to worry about?

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

At time of WW transmission there will not be a log in the webcast page.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: English translation of Tibetan Shurangama Version

Content:

username said:

Several versions and file formats, just after halfway down the page:

<http://www.fodian.net/world/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

LastLegend said:

Thanks my friend.

But I don't think the Tibetan Version is there unless I am mistaken. All of them translated by Chinese.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the version that was translated into Tibetan:

<https://books.google.com/books?id=z9xjaTG9Rm8C&lpg=PA99&ots=kejYqfQTQw&dq=lamotte%20surangama%20samadhi&pg=PA99#v=onepage&q=lamotte%20surangama%20samadhi&f=false> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Dexing said:

Didn't say I could, but I won't dare to skew the teachings to accommodate my Ego.

True protection is not in violence, but in sharing Dharma.

By the way, do you have a link to the MPNS quote you posted about taking up arms?

Malcolm wrote:

No one is skewing anything. And you cannot share Dharma with barbarians.

When someone is attacking you, you have a Mahāyāna obligation to protect yourself so you can continue to help others. Hinayāna practitioners have no such obligation.

The citation is my translation from Tibetan, done this morning.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Dexing said:

In the Diamond Sutra the Buddha even talks about a time when he had his body parts cut away, but was able to keep his cool and didn't react violently. So he walked the walk, and expects anyone truly serious about awakening and the path to Buddhahood to do the same.

Malcolm wrote:

The Cakkavatti Sihanada Sutta gives this advice to the righteous king:

This, dear son, that you, leaning on the Dhamma, honoring, respecting and revering it, doing homage to it, hallowing it, being yourself a Dhamma-banner, a Dhamma-signal, having the Dhamma as your master, should provide the right watch, ward and protection for your own folk, for the army, for the nobles, for vassals and brahmans and householders, for town and country dwellers, for the religious world and for beasts and birds.[40]

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/lib/authors/harris/wheel392.html#ch2> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The buddha in the example you give was a bodhisattva on the stages. Ordinary people cannot be expected to make such sacrifices. And I doubt you could either.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2011 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'

Content:

alpha said:

can you actually see something?

because mind can only see things other than itself.

Malcolm wrote:

The Yogacara Madhyamakas like Santarakshita accept that mind is self-knowing (svasaṃvedana).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I'll take it that this is the Mahayana version of the Mahaparinirvana Su**a?

Malcolm wrote:

I would not call it a version, it is completley different in content...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'

Content:

White Lotus said:

you will have to excuse me, but in my experience non duality is a non conceptual seeing of reality, that has very little to do with dualistic opposites that we use in logic.

Malcolm wrote:

The dualistic opposites form the basis for conventional delusions, all conceptual thinking is linguistic thinking.

White Lotus said:

it is beyond existence or non existence, but saying that it exists is fine...

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Hindu, sure. But not if you are a Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyānaparinivana sūtra states:

"The Bhagavan replied to Kashyapa: "Protecting and upholding the sublime dharma, that is the cause and condition of acheiving the vajra body. Kashyapa, through the cause and condition of having protected the sublime dharma in the past, one will always possess the vajrabody and it will never perish. Son of a good family, when protecting the sublime dharma one does not protect the five disciplines (pañcaśīla); one also does not guard conduct, but instead taking up arms such as swords, bows and arrows, spears and so on is the completely pure discipline of a bhikṣu"

And:

"Son of a good family, lay persons who protect the dharma should take up arms, protecting and guarding the bhikṣus who guard the dharma. Just protecting the five disciplines does not make one a so-called "person of the Mahāyāna". Even if one does not protect the five disciplines but protects the sublime dharma, one is called a Mahāyāni. If one protects the sublime dharma, one should take up arms and protect dharma teachers."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 11:35 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

tobes said:

There are good reasons for thinking that the Ratnavali was written quite a bit later than the MMK and the Vig...

Malcolm wrote:

What reasons are those?

tobes said:

It is, as you say, clearly a Mahayana text. It seems probable that the 'Nagarjuna' who wrote the MMK and the Vig was a Mahasangika.

Malcolm wrote:

More likely, a Sammitiya monk, given that he provisionally accepts the avipranaśa theory, the one place in the whole of the MMK where he ventures an opinion

tobes said:

But one thing is for sure: there is a narrative about all of this which although clearly speculative, purports to have more coherence than it should.

Malcolm wrote:

However, it is undeniable that there is a verse in the PP in 25000 lines that is more or less identical with the mangalam at the beginning of the MMK.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 10:39 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist temples vie to recruit Mongolians

Content:

username said:

Yes it's karmic too and education's best. But no one is suggesting any legislation, merely leveling the playing ground so the facts can be presented which is what we don't have in Lhasa or in the cocooned cult members abroad. Tibetans see them as collaborators and informers which they themselves don't deny any more and if TGE did any less, there will be blood in the opposite direction. They are not a real big problem as they did their damage about 60 years ago. In a way where it matters most, Tibet, they have self destructed. Even then it wasn't just them or Mao but other forces too. As far as Mongolia is concerned, things can change either for worse or the better rapidly with populist trends and the wrong/right figurehead. Lets see, I think it will be OK there in the end but it's not key like Tibet in so many ways.

Malcolm wrote:

The real issue facing Mongolia is Uranium mining.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 9:58 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist temples vie to recruit Mongolians

Content:

username said:

The foreign office/state dept.s reps to US of certain strategic countries, like Mongolia, do have power within the country power elites.

Malcolm wrote:

Problem is, I beleive in freedom of religion (no matter now deluded), even for Dolgyal wallas. If they want to worships ghosts, well, they can. After all things like Macoumbe, Santeria, and so on are really much worse.

While I agree with HHDL's POV in principle, there are some ways in which his govt.'s handeling of the Dolgyal issue is less than skillful.

Thus my perspective is that education is the best option. Besides, if they tried to outlaw Dogyal, there would be blood running in the streets of UB, seriously.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 9:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist temples vie to recruit Mongolians

Content:

Huseng said:

Interesting short video on Mongolia's religious revival.

Namdrol said:

Lots of Dolgyal in Mongolia. It's a huge issue. So large in fact the Consul General of the Mongolia talked with me for about an hour about it and possible solutions.

username said:

Lucky for him he bumped into you as one of the few who knows what he's talking about.

Wonder whatever hapened to <http://danzanravjaa.typepad.com/> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, well, I told him since Mongolia is a democracy, there wasn't anything legal they could do about it (freedom of religion and all that) but that they could encourage _education_ about it. He was not at all happy to learn that Dolgyal as Manjushri was a concept of Mongolian origin in the 19th century.

Basically, there are few Nyingmapas in Mongolia, and there is a tremendous bias against as well as interest in Nyingma there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 8:09 AM

Title: Re: 'dze bo?

Content:

Jinzang said:

Through the help of Google, I found the term on

<http://www.rangwang.net/index.php?essayId=548>. The context is not strong enough to suggest what the term means, but I do get the idea that it is some sort of typical suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

I also saw this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

adinatha said:
Sorry can't say more.

Malcolm wrote:
Actually, you should not say anything unless you had a student you wanted to teach.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 7:53 AM
Title: Re: Why combine Dzogchen and Mahamudra?
Content:
adinatha said:
We have methods for realizing Mahamudra in half a day.

Malcolm wrote:
Then teach them, don't just brag about them and lock them away in some text that is too holy to look at.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 7:51 AM
Title: Re: Why combine Dzogchen and Mahamudra?
Content:
username said:
And numerous others like mahasiddha Shakya Shri in recent history who had two large camps side by side, one on each, all the way back through history to Kumaradza who taught both Longchenpa and the 3rd Karmapa:
<http://www.kagyu.org.nz/content/aspirationprayer.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

adinatha said:
Kumaradza did not teach Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:
Sure he did. There is an entire text devoted to Sahaja Mahamudra that cites Saraha's tradition explicitly in the Vima Nyinthig attributed to Vimalamitra.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 7:49 AM
Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

username said:

Sam is really reasonable and he changes his mind quickly on a hypothesis, like the little iffy one quoted, if someone says something sensible. Anyway we all can sort of smell dodgy texts. I always hoped, but never said to you, that you would translate some of the 17.

Malcolm wrote:

we'll see, I ain't dead yet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 7:35 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

username said:

Hi Namdrol, You have written some of these facts before for years as have Sam and Karmay and others. Also we know how texts are re-revealed sometimes often word for word. So we know what is important. However adinatha's main point you avoid is that Nubchen invented the whole Dzogchen lineage and vehicle status out of selfish ambition, as a fact.

Malcolm wrote:

Even that were SVS's POV, I would not be inclined to accept it.

As a practitioner, I accept the what the tradition says about itself understanding that there are spiritual reasons for the various accounts of the lineage.

As a scholar, I accept only what can be ascertained as a certainty according to the common perception of human beings. So for example, if I find a number of obscure tantras embedded in a terma cycle that are also found in the NGB, as I have, I have to assume the tertön is borrowing them into his collection.

I don't have a problem with awakened humans borrowing old texts and repurposing them or reviving them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2011 at 7:13 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

username said:

This is an old article I read long before and magnus, whom I agree with here in his interpretation of Sam, posted it here before too if I remember correctly. Sam is not the type of person who would draw such radical conclusions based on almost nothing. He

is very respectful and also conservative. While he hypothesizes sometimes, he never states things as fact without evidence and is always flexible. He states all the facts he deems relevant often contradictory. That's just not his style. People can post on his blog and he answers honestly, so I don't buy any of that interpretation. Also he has read widely, including Samten Karmay and others, who state the texts how Dzogchen was actually banned by local rulers in North India and never was properly established openly before it went North and lots lots more. This is a big field not just summed up in a few pages of an article. Attacking Ekajati's protected lineage merely after mis-reading a short article when someone just finished their PhD is going over the top for probably other personal reasons.

Malcolm wrote:

The seventeen tantras cannot be firmly dated earlier than their initial production by Dagma Lhungyal. Between him and Nyanban Tingzin Zangpo there is only a single master, Bey Lodro Wangchug (one Rinchen Bar is also sometimes added to the list). We can positively date the end of Chetsun Senge Wangchug's life to the early 12th century.

Supposedly, Lodro Wangchug concealed the Seventeen Tantras in Samye, and Dagma Lhungyal removed them from hiding at Samye and gave them to Chetsun.

The Vima Nyinthig is the earliest text to list the seventeen tantras and their subject matter. For the most part, the Vima Nyinthig is the terma of Chetsun. Thus, teachings like the Tshig gsum gnad rdeg, etc., also cannot be dated earlier than the late 11th -- early 12th century.

These are the kinds of facts that limit textual analysis. You can only go by when a text actually appears.

There are three masters between Vimala and Chetsun, and since tradition holds that Nyingthig tradition was a single lineage until Chetsun, we would have to accept that these three or four masters passed on several thousand handwritten folios i.e. the several hundred pages of the seventeen tantras as well as their lengthy commentaries, between roughly 800 AD and the early 12th century when Chetsun passed on his lineage to Zhangton Tashi Dorje who lived between 1097 and 1167 around 1123 when they met. Thus, the latest date for the seventeen tantras is 1123. Obviously they were composed earlier, since the Vima Nyinthig is based on them.

Zhangton's son, Nima Bum, wrote the earliest independent commentary on the Vima Nyinthig. It is a very interesting text, and is dense with citations from the seventeen tantras, and is the model upon which Longchenpa based his own Tshig Don Mdzod. Nyibum was also a disciple of Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen and was closely connected with the Sakya school. The Nyinthig teachings were a family lineage for three generations i.e. Tashi Dorje, Nyibum and his nephew, Guru Jober.

The commentaries for the seventeen tantras are first mentioned by Longchenpa and so cannot date later than he. It seems unlikely they were actually authored by Vimalamitra, but who knows. They were mostly likely composed in the early 13th century since they

must have been known to Kumararaja. Perhaps they were composed by Nyibum, since he was known to be a great scholar, his title was "Zhang mkhas pa" i.e. "Zhang Pandita". Or there were three masters between Nyibum and Kumararaja, Jobe, Sangye Gyab and Melong Dorje, all thirteen century masters. Anyone of them too could have composed these commentaries.

Jobe, was known to have many disciples. He passed away in 1258.

The Khandro Nyinthig was produced in the mid-to late thirteenth century after Jobe started teachings Vima Nyinthig widely. We do not have good dates for Pema Ledretsal, the tertön for the Khandro Nyinthig. All we know is that he was active in the mid to later thirteenth century and that he did not live a long life.

The Khandro Nyinthig presents itself as a commentary of one tantra specifically, i.e., the Longsal Tantra. Thus this tantra predates the Khandro Nything but is later than the Seventeen Tantras, it was probably composed in the early 13th century. The Khandro Nyinthig is the earliest text that mentions the Longsal Tantra. This tantra summarizes all the topics of the Vima Nyinthig and the seventeen tantras into 113 chapters, giving detailed instruction for practicing creation stage, completion stage as well as Dzogchen tregchö and thögal. Most later Nyingthig termas attributed to Padmasambhava cite the Longsal tantra extensively. The Khandro Nyinthig also begins the tradition of six short tagdrol tantras. Notably, it has a concise version of the Single Son of the All the Buddhas, originally found in Ser Yig Can of the Vima Nyinthig.

We can trace the ideas and their spread pretty well after Chetsun. We cannot trace the origin of these texts at all well, and so have to rely on the history of the seventeen tantras and the Vima Nyinthig as presented in the Lo rgyus chen mo since this is our earliest source of information about this tradition. We have to admit that objectively, we really do not know anything about this tradition prior to Senge Wangchuk.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

TMingyur said:

Harboring the idea of having said or saying anything that is of importance beyond one's own sphere would be a case of exemplifying the opposite of renunciation.

Malcolm wrote:

Truly, you are only talking to yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Perhaps one doesn't need Madhyamaka either. Masters use tools when needed. The complete path can be traversed without ever studying Madhyamaka.

Namdrol said:

Rarely.

N

adinatha said:

Really the Madhyamaka views are shastras based on the Pali suttas. There is source material for almost all Nagarjuna's points in the suttas. The Buddha said not to embrace or reject views, spelled out DO is nonself, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason Nagarjuna only cites from the Agamas in the MMK is that his audience are non-Mahayanists i.e. the person in the text with whom he is engaging in a dialogue is a non-Mahayanist (many people do not realize that MMK is written in the form of an philosophical dialogue with the opponent's position being set forth as well).

His mangalam, however, is taken right from the PP sutras. Not only this, Nagarjuna came from the hearland of Mahayana, Andhra Pradesh. His praises are clearly Mahayana works. Then there is the Ratnavali, which is a Mahāyāna work for certain, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Blue Dakini Vajravarahi (Vima Nyingthig)

Content:

Pero said:

Coming from and coming through Longchenpa are two different things. Vima Nyingthing is called "Vima" because it's a lineage from Vimalamitra. Lama, Zabmo and Khandro Yangtig are from Longchenpa. Also Longchen Nyingthig is called "Longchen" because Jigmed Lingpa received it from Longchenpa. Or am I mistaken?

So it's different saying Dudtse Jonshing is from Vima Nyingthig or Longchenpa and though it's not really important (sorry for derailing your thread), now I'm really curious where it comes from (and not through whom hehe).

Malcolm wrote:

This text is from the bla ma yang thig, volume two, and details an outer, inner and secret guru yoga and utterly secret unsurpassed guru yoga. The blue vārāhi is the secret guru

yoga.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Do any ancient Tibetan Buddhist texts give practical advice?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is the form that worldly advice shows up in Tibetan texts, for example, this slice of advice from the explanatory tantra of Tibetan Medicine:

Keep one's word. After giving one's word, it is necessary to follow through.

Even though one has promised to engage in negative actions, do the opposite.

Begin positive actions even though delayed.

Investigate in the beginning, then commit for future benefits.

Do not accept advice as true; accept it after thorough investigation.

Think about what is being said, then speak.

Refrain from telling secrets.

Do not listen to [petty] woman, and control one's gossiping mouth.

Speak freely to without deceit who view one with kindness without deceitful words.

Be steady, and be happy with present company.

Do not permit enemies to be free, tame them with skill.

Support one's relatives and employees, look for a long while at [those who have been] kind in the past.

Respect one's elders, i.e. one's teacher, father, uncle and so on.

One mind should be in accord with one's countrymen, friends, and constant companions.

In business be strict; when necessary, behave liberally.

Accept defeat if mistaken; be measured if victorious.

If one is an expert, diminish one's arrogance, if one is wealthy, understand it is sufficient.

Do not scorn inferiors, do not be jealous of superiors.

Do not depend on evil men, do not make enemies of sorcerers or priests.

Do not use the wealth of others, and avoid [causes for] retribution and taking oaths.

Plant one's feet to have no regrets.

Do not give power to evil persons.

One's mind should be honest, improve the basis of patience and openness.

It is important to accomplish most activities in a timely fashion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

TMingyur said:

How could I exemplify anything other than "postings"?

The case be yours, mine is none.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, the words you repeatedly say in this board have no meaning, no effect, no karma, no consequences....sure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Namdrol said:

If the path of renunciation were still effective, there would be no need for Vajrayāna.

TMingyur said:

Actually the path of renunciation still is very effective ... hmh ... what does this tell us about Vajrayāna then (if your logic is right)?

Malcolm wrote:

If you exemplify the path of renunciation, I rest my case -- it is not effective anymore.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Do any ancient Tibetan Buddhist texts give practical advice?

Content:

Astus said:

How about "Ordinary wisdom: Sakya Pandita's treasury of good advice"? .

Malcolm wrote:

That's true, but that is based on earlier Indian texts.

The two Nagarjuna texts you mention are mostly advice for kings, not commoners.

Three vows literature is not that practical.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist temples vie to recruit Mongolians

Content:

Huseng said:

Interesting short video on Mongolia's religious revival.

Malcolm wrote:

Lots of Dolgyal in Mongolia. It's a huge issue. So large in fact the Consul General of the Mongolia talked with me for about an hour about it and possible solutions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Do any ancient Tibetan Buddhist texts give practical advice?

Content:

Luke said:

So are there any ancient Tibetan Buddhist texts which give practical advice for ordinary people?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but they are not of much interest to scholars and so they don't get translated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

adinatha said:

What about Sam Van Schaik's theory that Dzogchen's tantras were a Tibetan creation by folks like Nubchen who were ambitious to start their own lineage?

heart said:

I can't see him writing this anywhere on his blog, where did you find that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It would be in his book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Huseng said:

The need to earn an income is tied to having to rent or upkeep a private residence, maybe drive a car, eat whatever you want rather than living on donated foods, etc... whereas a renunciate by definition is supposed to be free of such concerns.

Namdrol said:

Yes, but in this day and age the path of renunciation is impossible.

N

Caz said:

Im sure you know as well as I renunciation is a mind, Perhaps it maybe true that the lifestyle attached to one whom is a traditional renunciate may not be appropriate in the west but the mind is more then possible.

Malcolm wrote:

The path of renunciation is not effective anymore, that is the point. If the path of renuncitation were still effective, there would be no need for Vajrayāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Lhundrup in Jodo Shinshu Buddhism?

Content:

mr. gordo said:

I was leaning towards that. What do you think is the best translation for lhun grub? Effortlessly naturally established? Spontaneous presence?

Malcolm wrote:

depending on context either "effortless" or "naturally formed".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 11:39 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

adinatha said:

If a martial law is declared and the Army Reserve is ordered to fire on Americans, then you will see that, but only after a lot of civilians are killed. Actually, the US police forces, especially, have an "us versus them" mentality toward the general public. They don't really hesitate to kick Joe Six Pack's ass.

Malcolm wrote:

The police have become increasingly militarized since the 1970's. Especially these days when so many of these guys have seen tours of duty in Iraq, the police overall have an increasingly militaristic attitude and bearing. Swat teams are a large part of the problem, because of their paramilitary training.

They even send swast teams to raid milk parlors these days:

<http://www.foodrenegade.com/rawsome-foods-raided-again-by-swat/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 11:34 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

adinatha said:

If a martial law is declared and the Army Reserve is ordered to fire on Americans, then you will see that, but only after a lot of civilians are killed. Actually, the US police forces, especially, have an "us versus them" mentality toward the general public. They don't really hesitate to kick Joe Six Pack's ass.

Malcolm wrote:

Forget the reserve:

The U.S. military expects to have 20,000 uniformed troops inside the United States by 2011 trained to help state and local officials respond to a nuclear terrorist attack or other domestic catastrophe, according to Pentagon officials.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/11/30/AR2008113002217.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Ceaser has crossed the Rubicon, the Republic is all but dead.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:59 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Huseng said:

Ugly ugly situation.

Malcolm wrote:

Think Rome; think resource wars, think Gibbon's decline and fall...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: 'dze bo?

Content:

Jinzang said:

It's a collection of inspiring quotes hand written in a notebook by Lama Phurbu Tashi. So, yes, it could be a transcription error, though there have only been a one or two errors so far, missing vowel signs. The quote is from Lama Zhang, a series of analogies on how to meditate.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to find the original.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Enochian said:

Right but it hasn't been pushed down yet, and probably won't. America is still AAA.

There is a reason why everyone in the world heavily invests in American stock exchanges.

Malcolm wrote:

Standard & Poor's removed the United States government from its list of risk-free borrowers on Friday night, dropping the rating to AA+ on concerns about rising federal debt.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/06/business/us-debt-downgraded-by-sp.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: 'dze bo?

Content:

Jinzang said:

Does anyone know the translation of 'dze bo? Not in my dictionary. The complete sentence is:

'dod med 'dze bo lta bur bzhag/

Malcolm wrote:

What text is this? Seems like a misspelling to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Luke said:

so why did you...make it seem as though Tibetan Buddhism explicitly forbids ordinary laypeople from owning guns and from using them in self-defense situations?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't. I merely pointed out some statistics around gun violence, what guns are for (killing), and the consequences of using them (death and injury), and that it is much harder to use a gun for self-defense, or even hunting, than most people seem to understand. I have a lot of experience with guns, compared to most Buddhists I know.

Incidentally, Padme -- if you want a gun for self-defense, that will really work when you need it to, don't mess around with a rifle or a pistol. Get a 12 guage shotgun. Learn how to shoot it i.e. pull it tight to your shoulder when firing it, or you will get a large bruise.

Shotguns intended for defensive use have barrels as short as 18 inches (46 cm) for private use (the minimum shotgun barrel length allowed by law in the United States without special permits; most manufactures use a minimum length of 18.5 inches, to give leeway in the case of a measuring dispute). Barrel lengths of less than 18 inches (46 cm) as measured from the breechface to the muzzle when the weapon is in battery with its action closed and ready to fire, or have an overall length of less than 26 inches (66 cm) are classified as short barreled shotguns ("sawn-off shotguns") under the 1934 National Firearms Act and are heavily regulated.

Shotguns used by military, police, and other government agencies are exempted from regulation under the National Firearms Act of 1934, and often have barrels as short as 12 to 14 inches (30 to 36 cm), so that they are easier to handle in confined spaces. Non-prohibited private citizens may own short-barreled shotguns by purchasing a \$200 tax stamp from the Federal government and passing an extensive background check (state and local laws may be more restrictive). Defensive shotguns sometimes have no buttstock or will have a folding stock to reduce overall length even more when required.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shotgun> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

With a shotgun, accuracy is much less of an issue.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Padme said:

I have been tempted to get a gun and target practice in my yard for the SOLE purpose of being seen so word could spread that I now own a gun. It's rather disconcerting to know that I am known as "the one without a gun".

Malcolm wrote:

You need to do tormas offerings to Annie Oakley:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 6:58 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

adinatha said:

What about Sam Van Schaik's theory that Dzogchen's tantras were a Tibetan creation by folks like Nubchen who were ambitious to start their own lineage?

Namdrol said:

Who can question the motivations of dead men?

The truth is that there are all kinds of traditions, often contradictory -- they are not that meaningful to practitioners.

adinatha said:

The Nyingthig is not meaningful to practitioners?

Malcolm wrote:

I meant the various stories and arguments around the origins of these traditions are not that meaningful. For example, for some it is meaningful if Shakyamuni Buddha taught something, for others it is more meaningful if the Buddha didn't teach it but it somehow was communicated at the Sambhogakaya level, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Lhundrup in Jodo Shinshu Buddhism?

Content:

Mr. Gordo said:

I came across the following passage in the book "The Vision of Buddhism" by the late professor Roger J. Corless:

When the shinjin has arisen, and the nembutsu says itself, it occurs jinen, spontaneously, naturally, or automatically. Jinen is the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese tzu-jan, "selfly," which is a popular term in Taoism. It came to be used by Buddhists for the manner in which Buddhas do without doing. It is a more or less exact equivalent of the Tibetan lhundrup, the spontaneous activity of the Vajra Realm. The difference between Jinen and lhundrup is not in the spontaneity, but in how one obtains it. In Vajrayana, one must progress through the stages before spontaneous action takes over. Shinran found that, in his experience, Amitabha picked him up and placed him directly in the spontaneous energy mode.

Is there any merit in what he says or is he reaching quite a bit here?

Malcolm wrote:

He does not understand lhun grub.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

adinatha said:

What about Sam Van Schaik's theory that Dzogchen's tantras were a Tibetan creation by folks like Nubchen who were ambitious to start their own lineage?

Malcolm wrote:

Who can question the motivations of dead men?

The truth is that there are all kinds of traditions, often contradictory -- they are not that meaningful to practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

adinatha said:

What about the PP sutras, not discovered in a lake by Nagarjuna?

Malcolm wrote:

It's a nice story. But unlikely since the PP sutras show clear textual development which can be traced in their Chinese and Tibetan translations.

adinatha said:

And the tantras? Direct contact with buddhas or no?

Malcolm wrote:

I have little issue with visionary production of texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

adinatha said:

In some prev post you said you didn't think Maitreyanatha gave the five treatises to Asanga, that Asanga wrote them and attributed them.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that. This is a common opinion but it is not mine. My opinion is that Maitreyanath was a human teacher, a Pandita, who wrote the five treatises. His identification with Bodhisattva Maitreya is really quite late as is the story of Asanga's retreat and encounter with Bodhisattva Maitreya.

My opinion is that after that Maitreya chapter was added to the Perfection of Wisdom sutra sometime after the 6th century (mostly likely as a polemical response to Madhyamaka commentaries on Abhisamaya-alamkara that were critical of Yogacara), the identity of Bodhisattva Maitreya and Maitreyanatha were conflated because the Maitreya chapter adds Yogacara specific themese to the PP sutras. However, we can be sure that the Maitreya Chapter is a later interpolation because it is missing from earlier, pre-sixth century translations of the PP sutras.

Haribhadra (8th century) was the first author on record to assert the author of the Abhisamayalamkara, and by extension, the other four treatises to be Bodhisattva Maitrya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

adinatha said:

Who? What do they say?

Malcolm wrote:

Bhavabhata and Bhavyakirit both hold that "This teacher (i.e. Śākyamuni) having attained buddhahood in the beginningless past taught the Cakrasamvara tantras, but later, after becoming the son of Śuddodana, did not teach it. Their reasoning holds that since Cakrasamvara is continually practiced by the heros and yoginis of the twenty four countries, even when eon forms and perished (the twenty four countries) do not form and perish so [the Cakrasamvara] does not disappear. Even though other dharmas may have also been taught in the beginning, since they are destroyed by the formation and perishing of the eon, since they disappear during the interval, they must be taught again by Śākyamuni.

A special feature of Cakrasamvara is that unlike Guhyasamaja, Kalacakra, Hevajra, etc., the mandala of Cakrasamvara is never withdrawn it is not necessary for Śākyamuni to teach it again as it would be redundant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Luke said:

Here's a quote from the Dalai Lama which I quoted in one of my previous posts. No one has responded to it yet. What do you think are the Buddhist sources of this statement by HHDL? It's clear that he's talking about ordinary people and not just about mahasiddhas. On the other hand, the current Dalai Lama has frequently said that violent self-defense is justified when there is no other option:

"If someone has a gun and is trying to kill you, it would be reasonable to shoot back with your own gun."

<http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/220530/dalai-lamas-army/dave-kopel?page=2>
" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

It is well established that Buddhists have a right to defend themselves. That is probably why no one responded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A very technical article on the Indian and Tibetan usages of the Yogacara three natures scheme.

<http://wordpress.tsadra.org/?p=1215#more-1215> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Sure.

Namdrol said:

Then yes, from a Madhyamaka perspective, dharmakāya has (these) qualities.

N

adinatha said:

Where in the Madhyamaka literature are these qualities discussed?

Malcolm wrote:

The qualities of Buddhahood are discussed by Nagārjuna briefly in Ratnavali, Candrakīrti has a brief discussion of them in Madhyamakaavātara, Arya Vimuktasena and Haribhadra extensively discusses these in their commentaries on the Abhisamaya-alamkāra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

bulhaeng said:

Basically every buddhist school created a chart which clearly proves that a) it's teachings are the best b) the author can trace his lineage back to Shakyamuni Buddha.

Namdrol said:

B is mistaken -- Dzogchen does not trace its teachings back to Shakyamuni; the Cakrasamvara cycle of tantras do not trace their lineage back to Shakyamuni and so on.

N

adinatha said:

Re: Cakrasamvara, Guhyasamaja, etc., There is room for disagreement on this point as you know.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is no room for disagreement re: Cakrasamvara, mainly because this point is clearly commented upon by Indian masters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

booker said:

And where in the sudden approach there's place for the path of renunciation which always is said to be the basis for Sutra?

Malcolm wrote:

Sutra yāna, whether sudden or gradual, is still based on renunciation of sense objects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Here is a link to the page in his autobiography where he discusses this, on googlebooks. He does own and use a gun, not to *kill* the hawks, but to inflict pain so that they learn their lesson. So it seems HH has a different view than some of the self-proclaimed pure Buddhists here who condemn the very possession of a gun, and who claim a gun can only be used for killing, since that's what it was designed for. In the Dalai Lama's view, he is clearly protecting life with the gun, not taking life.

https://books.google.com/books?id=_3sq3rlvQuwC&pg=PA185&lpg=PA185&dq=dalai+lama+air+rifle&source=bl&ots=N9D_h53goH&sig=J_iWPtmv90mM4t8T_DajREMjLIY&hl=en&ei=mBU8Ttf_JYP4gAe1op3PBg&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=8&ved=0CFoQ6AEwBw#v=onepage&q&f=false

Namdrol said:

Let me ask you something -- have you ever shot anything? I have, it is not fun. Nor is it amusing. Also, air guns can hurt hawks, injure them quite badly. In fact, we used to hunt birds with air rifles, because it is a little more challenging than using bird shot in a 20 guage shotgun. Trust me, you can easily kill a bird with an air rifle if you are a good shot.

N

N

Adamantine said:

In the book, if you read the section, HH points out that he is a good shot, as he grew up practicing on the 13th's rifle. So because he is a good shot, he can be confident he is only inflicting pain and not killing or seriously injuring. If you have an issue with this, take

it up with HH. I have confidence in his grasp of the Dharma, I don't know about you.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have an issue with it -- everyone's karma is their own.

I also understand that once a pellet or bullet leaves a barrel it is not under your control anymore.

I asked you whether you had ever shot at anything, etc. You did not answer.

See, coming from an "sportsman" family, I am "gun literate" -- my dad took me out and taught me how to shoot, handle and clean guns when I was seven, in 1969. When I was eight, I was allowed to go out hunting by myself with a 22. I have over the years shot bb guns, air rifles, 22's, 222 deer rifles, 30-06 bolt action rifles, 20 and 12 gauge shotguns, AR-15's, and even Kalashnikov semi-automatics. I have killed birds and other small animals. I also used to fish, also. Never shot a pistol, though, not that I can remember.

One generally speaking becomes good at shooting targets, so if it every comes up, you can hit what you aim at. You usually only aim at living things either to injure or kill.

Injuring sentient beings is not generally consistent with the bodhisattva vow, though there are of course exceptions.

You keep talking about swords -- well, at least with a sword, to use one you take a lot of personal risk -- you cannot harm or kill someone at a distance with a sword. And Golog is filled with bandits.

Saraha II was a fletcher, but I don't think he was a hunter.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Book of Bodhisattva Precepts

Content:

Will said:

Rulu's latest translation, which is from the Bodhisattva-bhumi of Maitreya:

<http://www.sutrasmantras.info/sutra31.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

That would be Asanga, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Adamantine said:

ANd for all you anti-gun Tibetan Buddhist fanatics, let's not forget that our lord of refuge, HH the Dalai Lama, himself has one and uses it regularly. From an interview:

RD: Do you have a favourite animal?

Dalai Lama: Birds maybe. I feed birds, peaceful birds. I'm a non-violent person, but if a hawk comes when I'm feeding birds, I lose my temper and get my air rifle.

RD: You have an air rifle?

Dalai Lama: Yes, although I shoot only to scare the hawks.

Sönam said:

Well, I would validate that (with complete sources) ... HHDL like to make jokes (fantasy?)

Sönam

Adamantine said:

Here is a link to the page in his autobiography where he discusses this, on googlebooks. He does own and use a gun, not to *kill* the hawks, but to inflict pain so that they learn their lesson. So it seems HH has a different view than some of the self-proclaimed pure Buddhists here who condemn the very possession of a gun, and who claim a gun can only be used for killing, since that's what it was designed for. In the Dalai Lama's view, he is clearly protecting life with the gun, not taking life.

https://books.google.com/books?id=_3sq3rlvQuwC&pg=PA185&lpg=PA185&dq=dalai+lama+air+rifle&source=bl&ots=N9D_h53goH&sig=J_iWPtmv90mM4t8T_DajREMjLIY&hl=en&ei=mBU8Ttf_JYP4gAe1op3PBg&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=8&ved=0CFoQ6AEwBw#v=onepage&q&f=false

Malcolm wrote:

Let me ask you something -- have you ever shot anything? I have, it is not fun. Nor is it amusing. Also, air guns can hurt hawks, injure them quite badly. In fact, we used to hunt birds with air rifles, because it is a little more challenging than using bird shot in a 20 guage shotgun. Trust me, you can easily kill a bird with an air rifle if you are a good shot.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

booker said:

]

Again this depends what is meant by Sutra.

Namdrol said:

Sutra means the method is taught. The method of Chan/Zen is ultimately grounded in the Lanka-avatara sutra's sudden approach.

N

booker said:

Hello Namdrol

Which method do you mean?

Malcolm wrote:

The Chan sudden approach to realizing dharmatā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2011 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Word Association Game

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

haze

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Word Association Game

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

prince

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Word Association Game

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

party

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

bulhaeng said:

Basically every buddhist school created a chart which clearly proves that a) it's teaching are the best b) the author can trace his lineage back to Shakyamuni Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

B is mistaken -- Dzogchen does not trace it teachings back to Shakyamuni; the Cakrasamvara cycle of tantras do not trace their lineage back to Sakyamuni and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Renunciation Impossible?

Content:

Huseng said:

The need to earn an income is tied to having to rent or upkeep a private residence, maybe drive a car, eat whatever you want rather than living on donated foods, etc... whereas a renunciate by definition is supposed to be free of such concerns.

Namdrol said:

Yes, but in this day and age the path of renunciation is impossible.

N

Huseng said:

Why do you say that?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the power of afflictions is too strong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 12:46 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

\ and all the time you spent learning how to shoot straight and aim properly will assist even in the most miniscule way and guarantee you a positive rebirth in your next life?

Adamantine said:

WHy not? Certainly like Saraha, if you meditate while shooting targets and think of it as shooting holes through self-grasping or dualistic fixation then it could even bring

liberation in this life and you can join the ranks of the mahasiddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe if your Guru sent you off to do such a thing....but otherwise it is just a fantasy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 12:46 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

\ and all the time you spent learning how to shoot straight and aim properly will assist even in the most miniscule way and guarantee you a positive rebirth in your next life?

Adamantine said:

WHy not? Certainly like Saraha, if you meditate while shooting targets and think of it as shooting holes through self-grasping or dualistic fixation then it could even bring liberation in this life and you can join the ranks of the mahasiddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe if your Guru sent you off to do such a thing....but otherwise it is just a fantasy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Economics..yes,,they are this dim

Content:

adinatha said:

tech breakthroughs two years back make shale oil much cheaper to extract.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it used to be 2:1 and higher.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Economics..yes,,they are this dim

Content:

adinatha said:

tech breakthroughs two years back make shale oil much cheaper to extract.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it used to be 2:1 and higher.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Especially taser guns; with those there is definitely no intention of killing, they are not designed for killing at all -- just immobilizing the assailant until law enforcement can come to take him away.

The target with real guns in LE training is NOT the head or heart, but the center mass - torso since it is the largest area with the least movement, but for defense, the lower torso with a low caliber could be used. In such instances, a fatality is unlikely to occur.

Malcolm wrote:

Re tazers -- if you miss, you are screwed.

Police use tazers mostly on stationary persons who are resisting arrests.

David N. Snyder said:

the lower torso with a low caliber could be used. In such instances, a fatality is unlikely to occur.

Malcolm wrote:

A non-fatal abdomen shot with a low caliber bullet will not stop a determined attacker. And, given the poor accuracy of handguns, that person is likely to be close enough to harm you.

It is not easy to shoot someone who is attacking you, contrary to popular belief.

Attacking animals are usually easier to shoot, because they generally engage in a display of aggression before attacking.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Especially taser guns; with those there is definitely no intention of killing, they are not designed for killing at all -- just immobilizing the assailant until law enforcement can come to take him away.

The target with real guns in LE training is NOT the head or heart, but the center mass - torso since it is the largest area with the least movement, but for defense, the lower torso with a low caliber could be used. In such instances, a fatality is unlikely to occur.

Malcolm wrote:

Re tazers -- if you miss, you are screwed.

Police use tazers mostly on stationary persons who are resisting arrests.

David N. Snyder said:

the lower torso with a low caliber could be used. In such instances, a fatality is unlikely to occur.

Malcolm wrote:

A non-fatal abdomen shot with a low caliber bullet will not stop a determined attacker. And, given the poor accuracy of handguns, that person is likely to be close enough to harm you.

It is not easy to shoot someone who is attacking you, contrary to popular beleif.

Attacking animals are usually easier to shoot, because they generally engage in a display of aggression before attacking.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Padme said:

No, I have never hunted, shot an animal or killed anything intentionally.

Malcolm wrote:

Someine intent on harming you is unlikely to be stopped by a non-lethal round, and will be angered by it, actually.

If you are not prepared to kill someone with a handgun bought for self-defense, don't buy one.

If you think you can guarantee that you will be able to disable someone with a gunshot in self-defense, think again. Not only is it hard to shoot a stationary target with a handgun, it is even harder to shoot a moving target. Anyone who has handled guns knows that I am telling the truth.

Generally speaking, the outside range of accuracy of a handgun is 50 yards.

A healthy man can cover this distance in under 10 seconds.

Padme said:

wouldn't it be interesting if there were also statistics on "events avoided by deterring with a gun". But of course no one keeps such statistics.

Malcolm wrote:

You can find such statistics at the NRA website, among others. They are not impressive.

All and all, you might get lucky or you might get killed when trying to use a handgun defensively. It really does boil down to whether or not you are ready to kill someone with a gun if your survival is at stake.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Padme said:

No, I have never hunted, shot an animal or killed anything intentionally.

Malcolm wrote:

Someone intent on harming you is unlikely to be stopped by a non-lethal round, and will be angered by it, actually.

If you are not prepared to kill someone with a handgun bought for self-defense, don't buy one.

If you think you can guarantee that you will be able to disable someone with a gunshot in self-defense, think again. Not only is it hard to shoot a stationary target with a handgun, it is even harder to shoot a moving target. Anyone who has handled guns knows that I am telling the truth.

Generally speaking, the outside range of accuracy of a handgun is 50 yards.

A healthy man can cover this distance in under 10 seconds.

Padme said:

wouldn't it be interesting if there were also statistics on "events avoided by deterring with a gun". But of course no one keeps such statistics.

Malcolm wrote:

You can find such statistics at the NRA website, among others. They are not impressive.

All and all, you might get lucky or you might get killed when trying to use a handgun defensively. It really does boil down to whether or not you are ready to kill someone with a gun if your survival is at stake.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Padme said:

As I stated in reply to David, I imagine I would learn these things in training.

Malcolm wrote:

Shooting at a target is different than shooting a living, breathing person. And if you miss, well...

Good luck.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Padme said:

As I stated in reply to David, I imagine I would learn these things in training.

Malcolm wrote:

Shooting at a target is different than shooting a living, breathing person. And if you miss, well...

Good luck.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Padme said:

Good point. Even without the goggles I believe I would have an upper hand as far as darkness in the woods goes...

Namdrol said:

Wow, the fantasies about violence in this thread are really pretty amazing. Most ordinary people, when confronted with serious, life-threatening violence, freeze.

N

Padme said:

Are you implying that I am "fantasizing" about running and would just freeze? If so, let me enlighten you. In 1996 I lived in Brooklyn New York and was assaulted by a man on 4th Avenue when I got off a late night bus stop. He shoved me into an alley and assaulted me. I was able to poke him in the eyes, squeeze out from under him and escape. I ran like hell to the nearest Korean market where I called the police. Never occurred to me to freeze. How do you get this "most people" statistic? Plenty of people run from attacks, give me a break.

Malcolm wrote:

No. I am pointing out that all of this stuff about night goggles, etc., is all a fantasy.

When guns are involved, it is much harder to shoot at someone than you might imagine. We were talking about using guns to defend oneself.

Have you ever tried to shoot at an animal? Have you ever gone hunting? Killing is not so easy. I used to hunt when I was a boy. It is even harder to shoot a human being, without training that is. And what Buddhist wants training in how to kill?

Further, handguns are difficult to use. It is hard to shoot one accurately, even at close range. The larger a handgun is, the less accurate it is, without extensive, and regular training.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Padme said:

Good point. Even without the goggles I believe I would have an upper hand as far as darkness in the woods goes...

Namdrol said:

Wow, the fantasies about violence in this thread are really pretty amazing. Most ordinary people, when confronted with serious, life-threatening violence, freeze.

N

Padme said:

Are you implying that I am "fantasizing" about running and would just freeze? If so, let me enlighten you. In 1996 I lived in Brooklyn New York and was assaulted by a man on 4th Avenue when I got off a late night bus stop. He shoved me into an alley and assaulted me. I was able to poke him in the eyes, squeeze out from under him and escape. I ran like hell to the nearest Korean market where I called the police. Never occurred to me to freeze. How do you get this "most people" statistic? Plenty of people run from attacks, give me a break.

Malcolm wrote:

No. I am pointing out that all of this stuff about night goggles, etc., is all a fantasy.

When guns are involved, it is much harder to shoot at someone than you might imagine. We were talking about using guns to defend oneself.

Have you ever tried to shoot at an animal? Have you ever gone hunting? Killing is not so easy. I used to hunt when I was a boy. It is even harder to shoot a human being, without training that is. And what Buddhist wants training in how to kill?

Further, handguns are difficult to use. It is hard to shoot one accurately, even at close range. The larger a handgun is, the less accurate it is, without extensive, and regular training.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Economics..yes,,they are this dim

Content:

adinatha said:

This hell on Earth situation of sudden depopulation is what the peak oil apocalypse promoters say must happen. That populations must return to the levels they were at pre-oil, which is between 500 mil and 1 bil, because oil is the energy that led to all these births and sustained the population explosion.

Malcolm wrote:

Not everyone in the peak oil community are predicting a catastrophe, the more balanced, like Greer, predict a long, halting, grinding stop with gradual population declines over the next four centuries.

Think Rome.

Shale oil, tar sands and so on is incredibly expensive to extract, like 4:1.

Also, as demand for oil drops because of a lack of demand from manufacturing because of oil scarcity (when oil become too scarce, industries that depend on it (plastics, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, industrial agriculture, etc.) will fail unilaterally, the price of oil will drop precipitously, and this drop in price will make these hard to access types of oil even less profitable.

Barring some amazing unforeseen energy source, a long collapse is a reality, not a speculation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Economics..yes,,they are this dim

Content:

adinatha said:

This hell on Earth situation of sudden depopulation is what the peak oil apocalypse promoters say must happen. That populations must return to the levels they were at pre-oil, which is between 500 mil and 1 bil, because oil is the energy that led to all these births and sustained the population explosion.

Malcolm wrote:

Not everyone in the peak oil community are predicting a catastrophe, the more balanced, like Greer, predict a long, halting, grinding stop with gradual population declines over the next four centuries.

Think Rome.

Shale oil, tar sands and so on is incredibly expensive to extract, like 4:1.

Also, as demand for oil drops because of a lack of demand from manufacturing because of oil scarcity (when oil become too scarce, industries that depend on it (plastics, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, industrial agriculture, etc.) will fail unilaterally, the price of oil will drop precipitously, and this drop in price will make these hard to access types of oil even less profitable.

Barring some amazing unforeseen energy source, a long collapse is a reality, not a speculation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Padme said:

Good point. Even without the goggles I believe I would have an upper hand as far as darkness in the woods goes...

Malcolm wrote:

Wow, the fantasies about violence in this thread are really pretty amazing. Most ordinary people, when confronted with serious, life-threatening violence, freeze.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Also there are numerous individual stories of where law-abiding people prevented crimes with their guns.

Malcolm wrote:

Not that many, in comparison to how many crimes are committed with guns.

Of course, the US has gun insanity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Padme said:

I am reading everything in depth and contemplating all points made, even ones that I initially disagree with.

Malcolm wrote:

Weapons are big business. Follow the money.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.lcav.org/statistics-polling/gun_violence_statistics.asp#10 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Gun Deaths & Injuries

In 2007, guns took the lives of 31,224 Americans in homicides, suicides and unintentional shootings. This is the equivalent of more than 85 deaths each day and more than three deaths each hour.¹

69,863 Americans were treated in hospital emergency department for non-fatal gunshot wounds in 2007.²

Firearms were the third-leading cause of injury-related deaths nationwide in 2007, following motor vehicle accidents and poisoning.³

Between 1955 and 1975, the Vietnam War killed over 58,000 American soldiers – less than the number of civilians killed with guns in the U.S. in an average two-year period.⁴

In the first seven years of the U.S.-Iraq War, over 4,400 American soldiers were killed. Almost as many civilians are killed with guns in the U.S., however, every seven weeks.⁵

Homicide

Guns were used in 12,632 homicides in 2007, comprising over 40% of all gun deaths, and nearly 69% of all homicides.⁶

On average, 33 gun homicides were committed each day for the years 2002-2007.⁷

Regions and states with higher rates of gun ownership have significantly higher rates of homicide than states with lower rates of gun ownership.⁸

Where guns are prevalent, there are significantly more homicides, particularly gun homicides.⁹

Suicide

Firearms were used in 17,352 suicides in 2007, constituting 55% of all gun deaths.¹⁰

Over 50% of all suicides are committed with a firearm.¹¹

On average, 46 gun suicides were committed each day for the years 2001-2007.¹²

White males, about 40% of the U.S. population, accounted for over 80% of firearm suicides in 2007.¹³

A study of California handgun purchasers found that in the first year after the purchase of a handgun, suicide was the leading cause of death among the purchasers.¹⁴

Firearms were used in 45% of suicide deaths among persons under age 25 in 2007.¹⁵

More than 75% of guns used in suicide attempts and unintentional injuries of 0-19 year-olds were stored in the residence of the victim, a relative, or a friend.¹⁶

The risk of suicide increases in homes where guns are kept loaded and/or unlocked.¹⁷

Unintentional Deaths & Injuries

In 2007, guns were the cause of the unintentional deaths of 613 people.¹⁸

From 2001 through 2007, over 4,900 people in the United States died from unintentional shootings.¹⁹

Over 1,750 victims of unintentional shootings between 2001 and 2007 were under 25 years of age.²⁰

People of all age groups are significantly more likely to die from unintentional firearm injuries when they live in states with more guns, relative to states with fewer guns. On average, states with the highest gun levels had nine times the rate of unintentional firearms deaths compared to states with the lowest gun levels.²¹

A federal government study of unintentional shootings found that 8% of such shooting deaths resulted from shots fired by children under the age of six.²²

The U.S. General Accounting Office has estimated that 31% of unintentional deaths caused by firearms might be prevented by the addition of two devices: a child-proof safety lock (8%) and a loading indicator (23%).²³

Gun Deaths & Race

Firearm homicide is the leading cause of death for African Americans ages 1-44.²⁴

African Americans make up 13% of the U.S. population, but in 2007 suffered over 26% of all firearm deaths – and over 55% of all firearm homicides.²⁵

Domestic Violence

Guns increase the probability of death in incidents of domestic violence.²⁶

Firearms were used to kill more than two-thirds of spouse and ex-spouse homicide victims between 1990 and 2005.²⁷

Domestic violence assaults involving a firearm are 23 times more likely to result in death than those involving other weapons or bodily force.²⁸

Abused women are five times more likely to be killed by their abuser if the abuser owns a firearm.²⁹

A recent survey of female domestic violence shelter residents in California found that more than one third (36.7%) reported having been threatened or harmed with a firearm.³⁰ In nearly two thirds (64.5%) of the households that contained a firearm, the intimate partner had used the firearm against the victim, usually threatening to shoot or kill the victim.³¹

Laws that prohibit the purchase of a firearm by a person subject to a domestic violence restraining order are associated with a reduction in the number of intimate partner homicides.³²

Between 1990 and 2005, individuals killed by current dating partners made up almost half of all spouse and current dating partner homicides.³³

A study of applicants for domestic violence restraining orders in Los Angeles found that the most common relationship between the victim and abuser was a dating relationship, and applications for protective orders were more likely to mention firearms when the parties had not lived together and were not married.³⁴

For additional information about domestic violence and firearms, including background information and state and local laws on the topic, see LCAV's Domestic Violence and Firearms Policy Summary.

Costs of Gun Violence

Firearm-related deaths and injuries result in estimated medical costs of \$2.3 billion each year – half of which are borne by U.S. taxpayers.³⁵

Once all the direct and indirect medical, legal and societal costs are factored together, the annual cost of gun violence in America amounts to \$100 billion.³⁶

Gun Ownership

Americans own an estimated 270 million firearms – approximately 90 guns for every 100 people.³⁷

Gun Crimes

In 2007, nearly 70% of all murders nationwide were committed with a firearm.³⁸

In 2007, 385,178 total firearm crimes were committed, including 11,512 murders, 190,514 robberies, and 183,153 aggravated assaults.³⁹

Youth – Gun Violence & Gun Access

Guns cause the death of 20 children and young adults (24 years of age and under) each day in the U.S.⁴⁰

Children and young adults (24 years of age and under) constitute over 41% of all firearm deaths and non-fatal injuries.⁴¹

In the United States, over 1.69 million kids age 18 and under are living in households with loaded and unlocked firearms.⁴²

More than 75% of guns used in suicide attempts and unintentional injuries of 0-19 year-olds were stored in the residence of the victim, a relative, or a friend.⁴³

A 2000 study found that 55% of U.S. homes with children and firearms have one or more firearms in an unlocked place; 43% have guns without a trigger lock in an unlocked place.⁴⁴

The practices of keeping firearms locked, unloaded, and storing ammunition in a locked location separate from firearms may assist in reducing youth suicide and unintentional injury in homes with children and teenagers where guns are stored.⁴⁵

Many young children, including children as young as three years old, are strong enough to fire handguns.⁴⁶

Dangers of Gun Use for Self-Defense

Using a gun in self-defense is no more likely to reduce the chance of being injured during a crime than various other forms of protective action.⁴⁷

Of the 13,636 Americans who were murdered in 2009, only 215 were killed by firearms (165 by handguns) in homicides by private citizens that law enforcement determined were justifiable.⁴⁸

A study reviewing surveys of gun use in the U.S. determined that most self-reported self-defense gun uses may well be illegal and against the interests of society.⁴⁹

The Dangers of Handguns

From 1993 to 2001, an annual average of 737,360 violent crimes were committed with handguns in the U.S., making handguns seven times more likely to be used to commit violent crimes than other firearms.⁵⁰

Although handguns make up only 34% of firearms, approximately 80% of firearm homicides are committed with a handgun.⁵¹

Women face an especially high risk of handgun violence.⁵² In 2008, 71% of female homicide victims were killed with a handgun.⁵³

A California study found that in the first year after the purchase of a handgun, suicide was the leading cause of death among handgun purchasers.⁵⁴ In the first week after the purchase of a handgun, the firearm suicide rate among the purchasers was 57 times as high as the adjusted rate in the general population.⁵⁵

A 1991 study documenting the effectiveness of Washington, D.C.'s law banning handguns (this law was recently repealed following the U.S. Supreme Court ruling finding it unconstitutional in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 128 S. Ct. 2783 (2008)) found that following the enactment of the ban in 1976, there was a 25% decline in homicides committed with firearms and a 23% decline in suicides committed with firearms within the District of Columbia.⁵⁶ No similar reductions were observed in the number of homicides or suicides committed by other means, nor were similar reductions found in the adjacent metropolitan areas in Maryland and Virginia.⁵⁷

As a result of its now-repealed handgun ban, the District of Columbia had the lowest

rate of youth suicide in the nation – lower than any state.⁵⁸

For more information about the dangers of handguns, see the Violence Policy Center publication *Unintended Consequences: Pro-Handgun Experts Prove that Handguns Are a Dangerous Choice for Self-Defense*.

Dangers of Permissive Carrying Concealed Weapons (CCW) Laws

Shall-issue laws permitting the carrying of concealed firearms (CCW) (where law enforcement has no discretion in issuing a permit or license) do not appear to reduce crime, and no credible statistical evidence exists that such permissive CCW laws reduce crime. There is evidence permissive CCW laws generally will increase crime.⁵⁹

A National Academy of Sciences report reviewing existing data on the effectiveness of firearm laws, including research purporting to demonstrate that concealed carry (also called “right-to-carry”) laws reduce crime, found that the “evidence to date does not adequately indicate either the sign or the magnitude of a causal link between the passage of right-to-carry laws and crime rates.”⁶⁰

An analysis of Texas’ CCW law, (a law adopted in 1995 that overturned the state’s 125-year ban on concealed weapons), found that between January 1, 1996 and August 31, 2001, Texas license holders were arrested for 5,314 crimes, including murder, rape, kidnapping and theft.⁶¹

From 1996 to 2000, Texas CCW holders were arrested for weapons-related crimes at a rate 81% higher than that of the state’s general population age 21 and older.⁶²

Since the Texas law took effect, more than 400 criminals – including rapists and armed robbers – had been issued CCW permits, and thousands of the 215,000 permit holders have been arrested for criminal behavior or found to be mentally unstable.⁶³ The “largest category of problem licensees involve[d] those who committed crimes after getting their state” permits.⁶⁴

Florida’s CCW system had, just in the first half of 2006, licensed more than 1,400 individuals who had pleaded guilty or no contest to felonies, 216 individuals with outstanding warrants, 128 people with active domestic violence injunctions against them, and six registered sex offenders.⁶⁵

For additional information about the carrying of concealed weapons, including information on the dangers posed by carrying guns in public, see LCAV’s Report *America Caught in the Crossfire: How Concealed Carry Laws Threaten Public Safety* and our *Carrying Concealed Weapons Policy Summary*.

International/Comparative Statistics

The U.S. has the highest rate of firearm deaths among 25 high-income nations.⁶⁶ Another study concluded that among 36 high-income and upper-middle-income countries, the U.S. has the highest overall gun mortality rate.⁶⁷

The overall firearm-related death rate among U.S. children under the age of 15 is nearly 12 times higher than that among children in 25 other industrialized nations combined.⁶⁸

The firearm-related suicide rate for children between the ages of 5 and 14 years old in the United States is nearly 11 times higher than that in 25 other developed countries.⁶⁹

Americans own far more civilian firearms – particularly handguns – than people in other industrialized nations and U.S. gun laws are among the most lax in the world.⁷⁰

Guns in the Home/Safe Storage

Living in a home where there are guns increases the risk of homicide by 40 to 170% and the risk of suicide by 90 to 460%.⁷¹

Guns kept in the home are more likely to be involved in a fatal or nonfatal unintentional shooting, criminal assault or suicide attempt than to be used to injure or kill in self-defense.⁷²

Having a gun in the home is associated with an increased risk of firearm homicide and firearm suicide in the home, regardless of storage practice, type of gun, or number of guns in the home.⁷³

Rather than conferring protection, guns in the home are associated with an increase in the risk of homicide by a family member or intimate acquaintance.⁷⁴

The relative risk of dying from an unintentional gunshot injury is 3.7 times higher for adults living in homes with guns, with handguns in the home posing a particular threat.⁷⁵

States with higher rates of household firearm ownership have significantly higher homicide victimization rates.⁷⁶

People who keep a gun in their home are almost twice as likely to die in a gun-related homicide and 16 times more likely to use a gun to commit suicide than people without a gun in their home.⁷⁷

A study of firearm storage patterns in U.S. homes found that “[o]f the homes with children and firearms, 55% were reported to have one or more firearms in an unlocked place,” and 43% reported keeping guns without a trigger lock in an unlocked place.⁷⁸

A recent study on adult firearm storage practices in U.S. homes found that over 1.69 million children and youth under age 18 are living in homes with loaded and unlocked firearms.⁷⁹

Keeping a firearm unloaded and locked, with the ammunition stored in a locked location separate from the firearm, significantly decreases the risk of suicide and unintentional firearm injury and death involving both long guns and handguns. These safe storage measures serve as a “protective effect” and assist in reducing youth suicide and unintentional injury in homes with children and teenagers where guns are stored.⁸⁰

The presence of unlocked guns in the home increases the risk not only of accidental gun injuries but of intentional shootings as well. One study found that more than 75% of the guns used in youth suicide attempts and unintentional injuries were stored in the residence of the victim, a relative, or a friend.⁸¹

Guns in the Workplace

In 2009, the most recent year for which data is available, approximately 81% of workplace homicides were committed with a firearm.⁸²

While workplace homicides have decreased steadily over time, the rate of shootings committed by co-workers or former co-workers has remained steady, with an average of 45 homicides by shooting committed by a co-worker or former co-worker per year between 1992 and 2006.⁸³

A 2005 study found that workplaces where guns were specifically permitted were five to seven times more likely to be the site of a worker homicide relative to those where all weapons were prohibited.⁸⁴

Guns in Schools

A U.S. Secret Service study of 37 school shootings in 26 states found that in nearly two-thirds of the incidents, the attacker got the gun from his or her own home or that of a relative.⁸⁵

Guns on Campus

College student gun owners are more likely than those who do not own guns to engage in activities that put themselves and others at risk for severe or life-threatening injuries, including reckless behavior involving alcohol, driving while intoxicated, and suffering an alcohol-related injury.⁸⁶

One study found that two-thirds of gun-owning college students engage in binge drinking, and are more likely than unarmed college students to drink “frequently and excessively” and then engage in risky activities such as driving under the influence of alcohol and vandalizing property.⁸⁷

Approximately 9 out of 10 college students who were victims of violent crime were victimized off campus.⁸⁸ Firearms were used in only 9% of all violent crimes against college students over the period 1995-2002.⁸⁹

Fewer than 2% of students reported being threatened with a gun while at college.⁹⁰

Gun Trafficking/Private Sales

Interstate firearms trafficking flourishes, in part, because states regulate firearm sales differently and there is no federal limitation on the number of guns that an individual may purchase at any one time.⁹¹

More than half a million firearms are stolen each year in the United States and more than half of stolen firearms are handguns, many of which are subsequently sold illegally.⁹²

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (“ATF”) issued a comprehensive report in 2000 detailing firearms trafficking investigations involving more than 84,000 diverted firearms, finding that federally licensed firearms dealers were associated with the largest number of trafficked guns – over 40,000 – and concluded that the dealers’ “access to large numbers of firearms makes them a particular threat to public safety when they fail to comply with the law.”⁹³

According to ATF, one percent of federally licensed firearms dealers are responsible for selling almost 60 percent of the guns that are found at crime scenes and traced to dealers.⁹⁴

Nearly a quarter of ATF gun trafficking investigations involved stolen firearms and were associated with over 11,000 trafficked firearms – including 10% percent of the investigations which involved guns stolen from residences.⁹⁵

A 1997 U.S. Department of Justice survey found that 8.4% of state prison inmates who used or possessed a firearm during the offense for which they were incarcerated obtained the gun from the illegal market.⁹⁶

Random inspections by ATF have uncovered that a large percentage of dealers violate federal law, and that percentage is growing.⁹⁷

An estimated 40% of the guns acquired in the U.S. annually come from unlicensed

sellers who are not required by federal law to conduct background checks on gun purchasers.⁹⁸

Nearly 80% of Mexico's illegal firearms and most recovered crime guns in major Canadian cities are imported illegally from the U.S.⁹⁹

For additional information on illegal gun trafficking and gun tracing, visit the Mayor's Against Illegal Guns' Trace Data Center. For additional information about private sales, including background information and state and local laws on the topic, see LCAV's Private Sales Policy Summary.

Gun Shows

A recent study comparing gun shows in California (a state that regulates gun shows and private firearm transfers) with gun shows in states with little to no such regulation found that at gun shows in states with less regulation, straw purchases were more common, armed attendees selling guns were more common, and vendors were more likely to sell assault weapons and 50 caliber rifles.¹⁰⁰

A study by ATF found that 25% to 50% of gun show vendors are unlicensed.¹⁰¹

ATF reviewed over 1,500 of its investigations and concluded that gun shows are a "major trafficking channel," associated with approximately 26,000 firearms diverted from legal to illegal commerce. Gun shows rank second to corrupt dealers as a source for illegally trafficked firearms.¹⁰²

From 2004 – 2006, ATF conducted 202 investigative operations at 195 guns shows, or roughly 3% of the gun shows held nationwide during this period. These operations resulted in 121 arrests and the seizure of 5,345 firearms.¹⁰³

For additional information about gun shows, including background information and state and local laws on the topic, see LCAV's Gun Shows Policy Summary.

Multiple Sales/Purchases

Handguns sold in multiple sales to the same individual purchaser are frequently used in crime.¹⁰⁴

ATF crime gun trace data reveal that 22% of all handguns recovered in crime in 1999 had been transferred to a purchaser in a single sale involving multiple firearms (otherwise known as a "multiple sale").¹⁰⁵

Crime gun trace data from 2000 show that 20% of all retail handguns recovered in crime

were purchased as part of a multiple sale.¹⁰⁶

As a result of Virginia's law restricting multiple sales, the odds of tracing a gun originally acquired in the Southeast to a Virginia gun dealer (as opposed to a dealer in a different southeastern state) dropped by 71% for guns recovered in New York, 72% for guns recovered in Massachusetts, and 66% for guns recovered in New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts combined.¹⁰⁷

Jurisdictions with weaker firearms laws attract gun traffickers who make multiple purchases and resell those guns in jurisdictions with stronger firearms laws.¹⁰⁸

For additional information about multiple sales or purchases of firearms, including background information and state and local laws on the topic, see LCAV's Restrictions on Multiple Purchases or Sales of Firearms Policy Summary.

Assault Weapons/Large Capacity Ammunition Magazines

A study analyzing FBI data found that 20% of the law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty from 1998 to 2001 were killed with an assault weapon.¹⁰⁹

As of 1994, 21% of civilian-owned handguns and 18% of all civilian-owned firearms were equipped with magazines that could hold 10 or more rounds.¹¹⁰

Guns equipped with large capacity magazines were involved in 14% to 26% of gun crimes prior to the federal assault weapon ban in 1994 (the ban expired in 2004), as compared with assault weapons, which accounted for 6% of gun crimes.¹¹¹

Anecdotal evidence from law enforcement leaders suggests that military-style assault weapons are increasingly being used against law enforcement by drug dealers and gang members.¹¹²

For additional information about assault weapons and large capacity ammunition magazines, including background information and state and local laws on these topics, see LCAV's Assault Weapons and Large Capacity Ammunition Magazines policy summaries.

Non-Powder Guns

Non-powder guns, including BB, air and pellet guns, injured 25,580 people in 2006, including 17,325 children age 19 or younger.¹¹³

From July 1993 to July 2003, non-powder guns caused 40 deaths nationwide.¹¹⁴ Although injury rates for non-powder guns appear to have declined significantly since

the early 1990's, non-powder guns are becoming more powerful and more accurate, and are often designed to appear almost indistinguishable from firearms.¹¹⁵

For additional information about non-powder guns, including background information and state and local laws on the topic, see LCAV's Non-Powder Guns Policy Summary.

Personalized Firearms

Personalized firearms, also known as “smart” or “owner-authorized” guns, are firearms that can only be fired by the lawful owner or other authorized users. A 2003 study analyzing data from seven years of unintended firearm deaths or deaths of undetermined intent found that 37% of the deaths could have been prevented by a personalized gun.¹¹⁶

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am really glad I live in a place where I have no need of a gun or any other sort of weapon. I would not want to live in a place where the need to be armed was even a remote possibility.

I have not fired a weapon since the mid 80's, which is probably the last time I went target shooting with a friend. I have never personally owned a gun.

The only thing a gun is good for is killing things.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Perhaps one doesn't need Madhyamaka either. Masters use tools when needed. The complete path can be traversed without ever studying Madhyamaka.

Namdrol said:

Rarely.

N

adinatha said:

Drikungpas generally treat Mahamudra as free from extremes Madhyamaka. Or we can start a separate thread. But this one is about Western use of Madhyamaka. Here we've inherited all levels, and Madhyamaka still applies at all levels, even in Dzogchen as Mipham has written in "Beacon of Certainty."

Malcolm wrote:

The view of Madhyamaka applies for common and uncommon Mahayana, but the path of sutra and tantra are different and many concepts are different.

So here, we were discussing the idea of the three kāyas and Dharmakāya in particular from a Madhyamaka common Mahayana perspective. You might find it profitable to consult Mipham's comments in Introduction to the Middle Way, pg. 338-334.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

...the dharmakaya is caused? Or vidya?

Malcolm wrote:

It really depends on how you are defining dharmakāya and in what context.

So you need to decide whether we are talking about Madhyamaka, or we are talking about secret mantra tenets. If the latter, than we need to start a seperate thread. There is no concept of "dharmakāya of the basis" in Sutra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Perhaps one doesn't need Madhyamaka either. Masters use tools when needed. The complete path can be traversed without ever studying Madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

Rarely.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

These qualities do not arise from practice. They are truth, realized or not.

Malcolm wrote:

This sutra is talking about how to die. It is not listing qualities of dharmakāya.

The passage is not well translated, since it actually says that mind is the cause of the arising of wisdom, thus, do not seek Buddhahood elsewhere.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Word Association Game

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

sweet

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, there is no problem with dharmakaya having qualities from a traditional Madhyamaka perspective.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Don't understand. How can something free from extremes of existence and nonexistence "have qualities"? Isn't this like something Dolpopa would say? It just turns absence into an implicative negation.

Malcolm wrote:

You're confusing the gzhan stong assertion that ultimate truth has qualities with a Buddha's dharmakāya having qualities. They are not the same thing. Buddha's dharmakāya is a result of realizing the complete path, hence, it's qualities listed in that link I provided are all connected with various stages of the path that have been realized.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Statements like this about luminosity, bodhicitta and such are what mediate against the "nothingness bias" can creep in during dharma study.

Malcolm wrote:

If someone has a nothingness bias, they have not understood Madhyamaka nor have they understood the two truths. One does not need Yogacara at all. One simply needs to understand the stage of the path and even the attainment of Buddhahood is all completely relative and not ultimate at all in any way, shape or form.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Sure.

Namdrol said:

Then yes, from a Madhyamaka perspective, dharmakāya has (these) qualities.

N

adinatha said:

Okay so these qualities too:

"...all phenomena are completely pure by nature, and that being so, he shall utterly cultivate the perception of absence of things. All phenomena are contained within bodhicitta, and that being so, he shall utterly cultivate the perception of great compassion. All phenomena are luminous by nature, and that being so, he shall utterly cultivate the perception of nonreferencing. All phenomena are impermanent, and that being so, he shall utterly cultivate the perception of no attachment to anything. If the mind is realized, it is wisdom, and that being so, he shall utterly cultivate the perception that buddha is not to be sought elsewhere."

Point of Passage Wisdom Sutra

Pure. All-encompassing-Vajradhara. Luminous. Detached. Wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really sure of what your point is.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Sure.

Namdrol said:

Then yes, from a Madhyamaka perspective, dharmakāya has (these) qualities.

N

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Well wait a minute now I am confused again if we say dharmakaya has qualities that is shentong view.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is no problem with dharmakaya having qualities from a traditional Madhyamaka perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Sure.

Malcolm wrote:

Then yes, from a Madhyamaka perspective, dharmakāya has (these) qualities.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Nagarjuna also stated nirvana is peace. The Shentong point about sublime vision of the realized beings holds up. We are talking about the mind, not mental faculty, but the nature.

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of the path, there is no difference at all between the Yogacara presentation and the Madhyamaka presentation, so this is a kind of redundant thing to say.

The controversy is over whether there is a difference in view between Yogacara and Madhyamaka.

gzhan stong pas are Tibetan partisans of Yogacara who assert a)there is a difference between Cittamatra and Yogacara, and b1) Yogacara is either higher than Madhyamaka b2) or is a form of Madhyamaka with a difference in emphasis.

Basically, there are three alternatives:

Madhyamaka is higher than Yogacara

Madhyamaka and Yogacara have the same meaning with different emphasis

Madhyamaka is inferior to Yogacara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2011 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

When dharmakaya's qualities are mentioned in the literature, i.e., yogacara, what is meant?

Malcolm wrote:

Can you provide a list? Do you mean things like the ten powers, four fearlessnesses and so on?

You mean this:

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Twenty-one_sets_of_immaculate_qualities "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

Namdrol said:

My point was that prior to this there are many introductions.

gregkavarnos said:

I believe that this idea of gradual vs immediate is a null point. One must consider that for somebody to arrive at the point where they are being directly introduced to the nature of their mind "off the bat" that somewhere, during their infinite previous lifetimes, they have received instructions again and again, accumulated infinite merit, etc... Just coz it happens to mature in this lifetime, in this manner, does not mean that it happened suddenly and without a gradual progression.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

booker said:

Well, at least Zen seems to give a strong foundation for development of spiritual materialism in Vajaryanists/Maha-Mudra/Ati community

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. The point is not to convert people, or feel superior. The point is to help people wake up (if that's what they want to do) as fast as humanly possible. This is also the motivation of Chan and Zen based on the sudden approach taught in the Lanka-avatara sutra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

Would it be accurate to say that WHATEVER he says is actually pointing out?

Malcolm wrote:

Whenever Rinpoche is talking about Dzogchen, he is giving direct introduction.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

Namdrol said:

I mean that there is no rang stong at all from a Madhyamaka perspective

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Does this mean that it is not correct to say that prasangika is an empty-of-self view?

It is not correct to call Prasangika a rang stong view.

Emptiness like space (svatantrika) clearly seems to be an empty-of-self view.

Svatantrika is another Tibetan fabrication. There is no difference between the views of Bhavaviveka and Candrakirti when it comes to ultimate truth -- the difference between them is solely pedagogical.

Free from extremes beyond thought and expression - you are saying this is neither a self-empty nor an other-empty view?

Malcolm wrote:

How could freedom from extremes be intrinsically or extrinsically empty, based on the Nāgārjuna citation I provided above?

Here is another one:

Since arising, abiding, and perishing are not established, the conditioned is not established.

Since the condition is never established, how will the unconditioned be established?

Basically the rang stong/gzhan stong controversy is bullshit, and so is the prasangika/svatantrika controversy.

If you want to understand Madhyamaka, don't read Tibetan accounts of Madhyamaka dating after the 13th century. And here, it is better still just to rely on Indian masters. The sole exception to this is Khenpa Shenga's treatises, which are just Indian commentaries turned into footnoted annotations of root texts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

Acchantika said:

By equating Rangtong with a Shentong-created straw-man, do you mean that the so-called 'Rangtong' is simply Madhyamaka properly understood, or do you mean that the two views are in fact complementary and not contrasting?

Malcolm wrote:

I mean that there is no rang stong at all from a Madhyamaka perspective: Nāgārjuna states:

If there were something subtle not empty, there would be something subtle to be empty, as there is nothing not empty, where is there something to be empty?

I mean that there is no rang stong at all, apart from what the gzhan stong pas have fabricated.

The gzhan stong controversy arose out of a need by Tibetans to reconcile the five treatises of Maitreya with Nāgārjuna's Collection of Reasoning based upon the erroneous historical idea that the five treatises were authored by the bodhisattva Maitreya rather than a human being (who incidentally was probably Asanga's teacher).

In my opinion, the five treatises were a collection of texts meant to explicate the three main thrusts of Indian Mahāyāna sutras, Prajñāpāramita, Tathāgatagarbha, and Yogacāra. Four of the five are devoted to these three topics independently, with the Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra devoted to Prajñāpāramita; Uttaratantra devoted to Tathāgatagarbha; and the two Vibhaṅgas devoted to Yogacāra. The last, the Sutra-alaṃkāra is an attempt to unify the thought of these three main trends in Mahāyāna into a single whole, from a Yogacara perspective.

When these treatises arrived in Tibetan, at the same time, a text attributed to the original Bhavaviveka, but probably by a later Bhavaviveka, translated under Atisha's encouragement, called Tarkajvala, presented the broad outline of what we know call today "the four tenet systems".

In this text, the three own natures and so on were presented in a very specific way from a Madhyamaka perspective and labelled "cittamatra".

So, the gzhan stong controversy (with additional input from Vajrayāna exegesis based on a certain way of understanding the three bodhisattva commentaries) is about reconciling

Madhyamaka with Yogacara.

Personally, I see no need to attempt to reconcile Madhyamaka and Yogacara. Madhyamaka is the pinnacle of sutra explication. But Tibetans did and still seem to need to do so, and they have passed on this need to their students.

But from my perspective, one cannot go beyond freedom from extremes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

I either have a very narrow understanding of what pointing out means...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. You think that sems tri is the only way to communicate the knowledge of Dzogchen. This is not true. Sems tri is a later system borrowed from Kagyu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

Namdrol said:

One you have realized emptiness on the path of seeing, by definition you cannot have a deterioration in view.

Acchantika said:

This implies that realisation of emptiness automatically entails right view.

However, if this were so there would be no debate between Shangtong and Rangtong.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, realization of emptiness automatically entails having right view.

Your next statement presumes that those debating gzhan stong and rang stong have realized emptiness.

Since rang stong is just a strawman set up by gzhan stong pas, there is really no debate between gzhan stong and rang stong since there is no rang stong Madhyamaka except in the imagination of those who call themselves "gzhan stong" Madhyamakas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Word Association Game

Content:

Malcolm wrote:
movement

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Economics..yes,,they are this dim

Content:

adinatha said:

Yeah I've looked at that before. Really cool.

Malcolm wrote:

Their designs are energy expensive -- only possible 50 years ago.

We are heading back to a wood-based economy. The only problem with that is that we do not have good forest management skills.

We have enough coal for the next three hundred years or so, but that is not fantastic.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Economics..yes,,they are this dim

Content:

adinatha said:

Full-blown communism if not just socialism will have to be revisited. Marx predicted that communism would be preceded by a sort of technological apex of the capitalist regime. So then, previous communist regimes were premature. If you believe the futurists, they predict a techno apex this century, "the singularity." If what they are saying is so, the future will be beyond anything we can imagine now.

Malcolm wrote:

Marx thought capitalism was progressive, and you are correct, in his view, advanced capitalism was required before a successful socialism, etc.

What he did not understand was peak oil.

Same with the futurists. It used to be the case that we got a 300:1 return on energy invested in oil recovery. Now we are down to 10:1.

People who live in cities, who depend on the petro-driven civilization, are in for it. People who live in the country, who can grow food, will have more resilience.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

But does Rinpoche ever give pointing out instructions or direct introductions to rigpa as part of a webcast?

Malcolm wrote:

Always.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Word Association Game

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

prudent

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Escapism, Buddhism, and the Soul

Content:

ananda said:

1. In a few books I have read based on Vaishnavite teachings it is said that in Buddhism a soul is not said to exist is this true ?...But if an eternal soul does not exist then what is it that dies and is reborn again and what is the ultimate fate of all sentient-beings ?

2. Someone I met once commented that how he thinks that Buddhism seems to be a more escapist approach to life and he comments on how we should not cease to desire because ceasing to desire would be denying our humanity and to deny our humanity would be to reject life itself. How would I contend with this view ?

3. Does a Buddha cease to accumulate all karma ? I once read how in Jainism a siddha (liberated one) will not help a suffering being because he has gone beyond all desires

Malcolm wrote:

1: Buddha taught that there was a conventional person, but no eternal soul or self. Since rebirth occurs on a conventional level, there is no contradiction between the non-existence of an eternal soul and rebirth. What takes rebirth is a impermanent, momentary consciousness driven by ignorance.

2: That person does not understand Buddhism and does not understand the meaning of happiness. True happiness comes from being free from all bonds. Desire is a bond.

3: The Buddha ceases to engage in negative actions that bear a future result. All actions of a Buddha bear a positive result.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

narraboth said:

There are a lot of comparisons between Dzogchen and Zen in China/Chinese Buddhists since Dzogchen was introduced to China.

Surely there are lots of differences in methods, but I personally think the similarity is quite obvious,

Malcolm wrote:

Read Nubchen -- he states that Mahayoga (not to mention Dzogchen) is superior to Chan because of the means of introduction, even though Chan is a sudden school and Mahayoga is gradual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 7:28 PM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

The criticism of this view is that it is veiled nihilism. Whereby Madhyamaka must be relegated to a tool for deconstructing views. Whereas, the real "not non-being" is the Shentongpa's view.

Namdrol said:

That criticism is invalid.

On the other hand, gzhan stong is tainted with a subtle eternalism since they assert wisdom exists, and hence are realists, and in reality inhabit an intermediate place between cittamatra and madhyamaka.

N

adinatha said:

Or they are not tainted by a veiled nihilism. Does the dharmakaya have qualities?

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on what one means by qualities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 11:54 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

The criticism of this view is that it is veiled nihilism. Whereby Madhyamaka must be relegated to a tool for deconstructing views. Whereas, the real "not non-being" is the Shentongpa's view.

Malcolm wrote:

That criticism is invalid.

On the other hand, gzhan stong is tainted with a subtle eternalism since they assert wisdom exists, and hence are realists, and in reality inhabit an intermediate place between cittamatra and madhyamaka.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Never existent in the first place, seems like nihilism to me. What about the yogi's realization in equipoise? Not non-existent now.

Malcolm wrote:

Ucchedavada requires that an existent becomes non-existent, for example, a self that exists now and then perishes later.

Apart from what has been realized and has not been realized, there is no [present] realization.

As Haribhadra pointed out, the path, including the realization of buddhahood, is all completely illusory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 11:17 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Well that certainly doesn't exist. Where does the part about not non-being come in?

Malcolm wrote:

What does not arise does not perish; and not existent, cannot become non-existent.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 11:00 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

It's defined by the horizon and by its color; so, still part of rupadhātu.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh okay. So unconditioned space is just a definition?[/quote]

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 10:50 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

So when you look into space you see a definition?

Namdrol said:

That kind of space is conditioned space, defined by enclosure and area -- for example, the space of a room. When talking about space, one ought to define which space one is referring to, conditioned or unconditioned space.

But even when one "looks into space" what one is seeing is not "area" qua "area" but rather a shape defined by apparant colors which is part of the rupadhātu, the object of the eye.

N

adinatha said:
How about the wide open sky?

Malcolm wrote:
It's defined by the horizon and by its color; so, still part of rupadhātu.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 10:17 AM
Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka
Content:
adinatha said:
So when you look into space you see a definition?

Malcolm wrote:
That kind of space is conditioned space, defined by enclosure and area -- for example, the space of a room. When talking about space, one ought to define which space one is referring to, conditioned or unconditioned space.

But even when one "looks into space" what one is seeing is not "area" qua "area" but rather a shape defined by apparant colors which is part of the rupadhātu, the object of the eye.
N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 10:07 AM
Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'
Content:
adinatha said:
It is true that something false can harm me. For example, someone might see me as Osama bin Laden's cousin and shoot me. So a falsity is in the realm of being.

Namdrol said:
No, what harmed you was the bullet.

N

adinatha said:
I can't file charges against a bullet.

Malcolm wrote:
You can't file charges again a delusion, either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

Namdrol said:

And, we do not see space.

adinatha said:

Really? How do you know that?

Malcolm wrote:

Through the definition of space i.e. as unconditioned and as absence of obstruction.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'

Content:

username said:

While I am an admirer of your translation as well as Valby's more than anyone else's, both crisp precise and simple yet extremely difficult to achieve, I can't believe any other translator limits the use of non-dual only to gnyis med and it's legitimate definition to those few words. Many translators use non-dual for a variety of subjects within view and methods: emptiness & clarity, emptiness & bliss, emptiness & non-thought, emptiness & awareness, meditator & yoga/path/view, meditator & guru/deity, meditator & trikayas, Kadak & Lhundrub, etc. etc.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, whenever we say that something is inseparable or non-dual with emptiness, whether we are talking ka dag, dharmakāya, etc. we are talking about the fact that at basis, there is no being and or non-being upon which all of this clarity, appearance, path, yoga, three kāyas, you name it, etc., can be based.

And often enough translators decide to translate dbyer med as non-dual, even though dbyer med is asambhedaḥ, inseparable.

I am just a bigger pain in the ass than most translators and more insistent that translations reflect and are completely consistent with buddhist view so that crypto-hindu notions stay out of our school.

Even Norbu Rinpoche asserts that in his rdzog chen skor dris len that Dzogchen view does not go beyond Madhyamaka in terms of formal statements of the view, citing Sakya Pandita to the effect that if there would something beyond freedom from

extremes, that would be an extreme, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Perception is not a position.

Malcolm wrote:

No, but the statement "I know that I know", presented as an irreducible fact, is.

adinatha said:

What is knowing what has not been known?

Malcolm wrote:

It is part of the dialectic, something known depends on something which has not been known. What Nagarjunga is pointing out is that there is no "knowing". His dialectic serves to negate all present tense as well as infinitive verbal forms i.e. Apart from what has been perceived and not been perceived, there is no perception, etc.

adinatha said:

How do we see space? Is space an object?

Malcolm wrote:

Space i.e. akasha, unconditioned space is not an object and it is not real. When Nagarjuna analyzes the five elements, he begins with space, shows that it is unreal because everyone accepts that space (as defined by Buddhists and other Indians) is unreal and then says, apply this reasoning to the other four elements.

And, we do not see space. It is not an object. This is one of the reasons Buddhists use it as a metaphor for the mind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'

Content:

adinatha said:

It is true that something false can harm me. For example, someone might see me as Osama bin Laden's cousin and shoot me. So a falsity is in the realm of being.

Malcolm wrote:
No, what harmed you was the bullet.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 8:22 AM
Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'
Content:
adinatha said:
it also means not grasping true or false.

Malcolm wrote:
Whatever is asti is satya (true), whatever is nasti as mithya (false), so at base, it really is about freedom from asti (being) and nasti (non-being).

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 7:56 AM
Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka
Content:
adinatha said:
Not eye faculty seeing. "Seeing," as in "I know, I see." For example, how do we "see" space? Is space an object?

When there's no seeing, how do you know?

Malcolm wrote:
The same thing applies "Apart from what has been known and what has not been known, there is no present knowing".

The mental faculty is not exempt from this.

Once you take a position such as you have i.e. "I know that I know", you are dogmeat.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 7:52 AM
Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'
Content:
username said:

In translations of texts and by teachers who speak English, non-dual is often used in numerous instances of various methods and view explanations within Dzogchen alone, so it depends on the context and the stage and that particular teaching. Ultimately view-wise in English texts and teachings it is often used for non-dualness of Kadak-Lhundrob within Dzogchen though each translator or lama has his/her personal choice of words for various occasions.

Malcolm wrote:

"Non-dual" i.e. gnyis med/advaya means the absence of the duality of being and non-being.

In Yogacara, it can mean absence of subject and object, but the reason for this is that ultimately there is an absence of being and non-being.

Even when we talk about the inseparability of original purity and natural formation, kadag and lhundrup, this inseparability is actually predicated on the non-duality that I mentioned above. When we talk about freedom from the four extremes, the eight extremes and so on, it is all, in the end predicated on the absence of being and non-being. That absence of being and non-being is the essence of what the term "non-dual" means in Buddhist texts.

It is not a translation or terminology issue, it is just a basic fact of Buddhist view.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Seeing and knowing continuous and effortless.

Malcolm wrote:

Seeing without an object to see? Such seeing is useless as well as impossible. Apart from what has been seen and what has not been seen, there is no present seeing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 7:27 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:
Seeing?

Malcolm wrote:
Seeing isn't a characteristic, it is an action.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 6:42 AM
Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka
Content:

adinatha said:
So Madhyamaka is not really a view, but a destructive tactic when responding to others' opinions? Then taking evasive maneuvers when the opponent takes aim? I wonder about why one would get involved?

Namdrol said:
How could Madhyamaka be a view? What is there that can be seen? But out of compassion for others addicted to views, first Buddha, then Nagarjuna, correct views via the middle way.

N

adinatha said:
Very nice. But can't one see one's own mind?

Malcolm wrote:
Through what characteristic would it [the mind] be seen?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 5:15 AM
Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka
Content:

adinatha said:
So Madhyamaka is not really a view, but a destructive tactic when responding to others' opinions? Then taking evasive maneuvers when the opponent takes aim? I wonder about why one would get involved?

Malcolm wrote:
How could Madhyamaka be a view? What is there that can be seen? But out of compassion for others addicted to views, first Buddha, then Nagarjuna, correct views via the middle way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Is that right?

Namdrol said:

Is that wrong?

adinatha said:

I defer to you.

Malcolm wrote:

The great 11th Nyingma scholar Rongzom points out that only Madhyamaka accepts that its critical methodology "harms itself", meaning that Madhyamaka uses non-affirming negations to reject the positions of opponents, but does not resort to affirming negations to support a position of its own. Since Madhyamaka, as Buddhapalita states "does not propose the non-existence of existents, but instead rejects claims for the existence of existents", there is no true Madhyamaka position since there is no existent found about which a Madhyamaka position could be formulated; likewise there is no false Madhyamaka position since there is no existent found about which a Madhyamaka position could be rejected.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

adinatha said:

Is that right?

Malcolm wrote:

Is that wrong?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 2:48 AM
Title: Re: Word Association Game
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
witty

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2011 at 12:14 AM
Title: Re: Enlightenment of Mahayanists and Vajrayanists
Content:
sangyey said:
What constitutes attaining Bodhi (awakening)? Is it a specific level on the path, i.e.,
paths of seeing, meditation, etc?

Malcolm wrote:
The path of seeing.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 11:22 PM
Title: Re: Commitment Issues
Content:
Dechen Norbu said:
Pema,

Ah, but I think that is for good practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:
It's for any practitioner. Reading a bunch of lists about hells does not help anyone. Keep it
tight and keep it personal, then it will have a real effect on one's continuum.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 11:18 PM
Title: Re: Commitment Issues
Content:
Dechen Norbu said:
I believe most of the problem is that once one has an intellectual grasping of the 4
thoughts, one thinks one doesn't need to spend much more time with them.

Malcolm wrote:
The basic problem with the four thoughts is that they are presented in very medieval
language and people become expert in artificial contemplations that do not reach their

heart.

You are going to die, sooner rather than later.

Your friends and family are leaving you right now, not at some later time.

Right now you could be practicing dharma, but you are wasting your time with worldly foolishness [jobs, families, car payments]

There is no happiness, anywhere. Don't delude yourself that there is.

All your present happiness and suffering is a result of karma. If you do not want to suffer in future, practice Dharma.

We all know the above are true, and we all make tons of excuses for not doing anything about it.

If you are not in tears from practicing the above, your contemplation is not working into your heart.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: 'Non-duality' and 'neutrality'

Content:

mindyourmind said:

" I practice Dzogchen. I try to be in a state of non-duality. As such I try to avoid getting my mind involved in discursive thoughts. I endeavour not to get involved in judgmental decisions of right and wrong. As such, I do not approve or disapprove of the Nazi's killing millions of people during the Second World War. I therefore stand neutral as to the death of those people."

Malcolm wrote:

This is would be nihilism posing as Dzogchen. Incorrect understanding of Dzogchen.

"Non-dual" in Dzogchen in Dzogchen is no different than non-dual in Madhyamaka - it means that the categories of being and non-being are cognitive errors.

Also in Dzogchen practice one does not seek to avoid discursive thoughts. One seeks to recognize their actual state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment of Mahayanists and Vajrayanists

Content:

himalayanspirit said:

Shurangama Sutra claims that for one to attain perfect enlightenment, one has to completely eliminate all desires - especially sexual desires. Notable examples of our era is Venerable Hsu Yun who attained enlightenment.

But the Vajrayanists - especially Tibetan Buddhists - claim that indulging in sexual practices is a must for one to attain enlightenment. There are many examples of Tibetan Yogis who attained enlightenment like this.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayanists assert that in this day and age no one can give up attachment to sensual objects, therefore objects used for one's own gratification must be taken into the path. Hence the many kinds of offerings you find in Vajrayāna.

However, even in Vajrayāna the purpose is not to indulge the afflictions but rather to transform the basis from which they arise. If you truly perceive everything to be a mandala of deities, then you will cease to engage in attachment and aversion. When that happens, you will cease to activate the three poisons.

So, the approach of Vajrayāna is to transform, rather than renounce.

himalayanspirit said:

Now who is true between them? Who attains the real enlightenment? Also, what is the difference between "enlightenment" and "attaining Nirvana"? It is said in the Mahayana scriptures that one has to spend many eons and lives practicing as a Bodhisattva to attain enlightenment; yet many Chan masters attained enlightenment in one life itself?

Malcolm wrote:

Awakening (bodhi) and Buddhahood are two different things -- those who have attained awakening are nevertheless still on the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: shilajit

Content:

Adamantine said:

Great thank you, that's very informative.

Does TM also consider it a rejuvenative that increases seminal essence? This appears to be a quality ascribed to it by Auyurveda.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

booker said:

]

Again this depends what is meant by Sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

Sutra means the method is taught. The method of Chan/Zen is ultimately grounded in the Lanka-avatara sutra's sudden approach.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 12:58 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

ray said:

Going back to an earlier question, on pointing out in Dzogchen and in Zen, actually there is pointing out in Zen, and this is what the interactions in Koans are.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not what pointing out means in Vajrayāna. The koan process and the process of pointing out instruction in Dzogchen is completely different.

ray said:

An example of pointing out in Zen that is also a Koan is that the Buddha went to the front of the assembly, sat down, and held up a flower and smiled. Mahakashyapa's mind opened--he saw what was being pointed out. Sometimes a teacher would tell the students to leave.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Mahakashyapa was already awake. In Zen, transmission is given by one awakened person to another (theoretically). Transmission is never given to a complete beginner, as in Vajrayana.

ray said:

When they were all leaving, he would ask them where they were going. When they turned around, he would say, "What is it?" or shout "Katz!" When students asked a question or gave an answer and the teacher shouted, "Katz!", this functions to stop the thinking and bring awareness out clearly, serving the same purpose as "PHAT!" does in Dzogchen practice or empowerment.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but this is incorrect. Zen completely lacks the presentation of the basis, the introduction of the three kāyas, etc., etc.

ray said:

All the different ways of pointing out or direct introduction that Longchen Rabjampa mentions in the Treasure Trove of Scriptural Transmission are used in Zen for the same purpose.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is an incorrect assertion.

ray said:

But in Zen it is also said that phenomena themselves can point out the nature to us, not only a teacher. Then the teacher would confirm. But a teacher makes it a whole lot more likely it will happen, and by being around him and him or her using the methods of pointing out, we may get it. Both in Zen and Dzogchen, they say that the teacher is always pointing out the nature directly.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a misconception. Zen does not go beyond sutra. There is no experiential direct introduction in Zen or Chan.

ray said:

And after really getting the pointing out in Zen, ones practice changes completely, because then the point is to become more accustomed to ones true nature, the true nature of things, either by further koan study or just sitting and resting in that nature. Much like in Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not like Dzogchen at all.

ray said:

I say this on the basis of practice in the Zen and Vajrayana/Dzogchen traditions, getting the pointing in each (having satori confirmed by a Zen teacher, practicing koan and getting the nature pointed out, getting the pointing out in the context of the fourth empowerment).

Malcolm wrote:

There is no equivalent to the fourth empowerment in Zen. Doesn't exist.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 12:38 PM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:
adinatha said:
Madhyamaka is not true.

Namdrol said:
Madyamala has no position, true and false do not apply.

adinatha said:
Is that true?

Malcolm wrote:
In order make the evaluation "Madhyamaka is "true" or "not true", you would have to assess what a Madhyamaka position might be. If you cannot assess such a position, claiming either truth or falsity with regard to Madhyamaka is erroneous.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 6:51 AM
Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka
Content:
adinatha said:
Madhyamaka is not true.

Malcolm wrote:
Madyamala has no position, true and false do not apply.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 6:49 AM
Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka
Content:
conebeckham said:
So, does Dṛṣṭi refer to a "conceptual framework" or "approximate emptiness," or does it refer to an actual, experiential sort of "resting" in your opinion, Namdrol? I hope my question is clear.....?

Malcolm wrote:
It refers to an example emptiness arrived at through analysis when you are a common person.

One you have realized emptiness on the path of seeing, by definition you cannot have a deterioration in view.

We can therefore understand here that "view" refers to analytical emptiness since that is the only view susceptible to deterioration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

conebeckham said:

..I'd be interested to know what the original word for "The view" is in the section Namdrol quoted...as I'd bet it is not merely a conceptual assertion.

??

Malcolm wrote:

Drṣṭiḥ -- it means in this case the view of emptiness. The reasoning, according to the Indian commentaries, is that discipline is something one practices only for one's own benefit. The view of emptiness is cultivated for both oneself and others.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 5:43 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Fa Dao said:

When we say "Knowledge" of the natural state is rigpa, by "knowledge" we mean gnosis not knowledge as in the acquisition of intellectual data, right?

Malcolm wrote:

By knowledge, we mean that you know what is being discussed. No need to gum up the works with fancy words like gnosis. In the beginning you need to acquire intellectual data. Then you need to apply it. This is all part of "rigpa".

If you say that rigpa is only a "gnosis" than this makes things more complicated --it means in order to have that knowledge you must already be awakened. But this is not the case. Rigpa is the knowledge you have that allows you to wake up. Rigpa is a complicated word in Dzogchen texts, and has different meanings in different contexts, but generally it just means knowledge, which in English is the antonym of ignorance (ma rig pa). Conceptual knowledge is included under the general definition of vidyā, this is a poorly understood point.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

conebeckham said:

In general, people talk a lot about Madhyamaka but all the talk in the world won't bring one to a decisive point....though it's helpful to understand, and talk helps--to a point.

Jnana said:

Indeed. Without the integral development of appropriate ethical conduct and meditative composure and the rest of the perfections it's just talk. Apart from these components of practice it really isn't even Buddhadharma.

All the best,

Geoff

Malcolm wrote:

A deterioration in discipline is allowable,
but never the view;
discipline leads to higher realms,
the view leads to the supreme stage.

-- Aryadeva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2011 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: shilajit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Shilajit, according to Tibetan Medicine, is cooling and balancing, and is used to remove heat. It can be used as a chulen, and it is present in many medicines since it enhances their effects. It is especially good for removing heat in liver and gall bladder.

It is true that some in Ayurveda considers it to be warming, etc. However, in the treatise Astangha Hridaya it asserts that the taste of shilajit is bitter, and that it's effect is "not very hot", but its post-digestive effect is hot.

So there there some slight differences in how this herb is understood, but in the main, the two systems are not really far apart in how the prepare and use this substance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2011 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Kukai's Vajra and Bell

Content:

Huseng said:

Amazing to see these up close. I stood there a good fifteen minutes looking them over and just imagining where they came from.

Malcolm wrote:

These were mostly likely manufactured in Java. This style of bell and dorje is typical of Javanese vajras and bells cast during that period.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: the ever-changing Western view of Madhyamaka

Content:

mudra said:

Wasn't sure where to post this so if mods find a better place for it, thank you!

I came across this list by D Seyfort Ruegg from his "The Literature of the Madhyamaka School" which enumerates the various early opinions of Western scholars regarding Madhyamaka and Nagarjuna in particular:

"...nihilism, monism, irrationalism, misology, agnosticism, scepticism, criticism, dialectic, mysticism, acosmism, absolutism, relativism, nominalism, and linguistic analysis with therapeutic value."

What a loads of 'ism's!!! Of course today the debate continues, as it has ever since Arya Nagarjuna, as to what the Madhyamaka he set forth actually is. Even amongst practicing Buddhists we debate so much about it, I wonder if non-Buddhist scholars using intellect alone can possibly ever really get it?

Malcolm wrote:

"If I had a position, I would be at fault,

Since I alone have no position, I alone am without fault"

-- Vighrahavyavartani.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2011 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Word Association Game

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

lizard

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2011 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Why is possible to achieve Buddhahood?

Content:

Tsondue Sangmo said:

I am trying to understand the possibility for a sentient being to achieve Buddhahood as is view, I think, in general Mahayana Buddhism. In this sense, I do not want to imagine what a Buddha can be, but just to take and understand Buddhist scriptures in the literal sense, if this is the correct approach.

Malcolm wrote:

A buddha is defined as someone who has removed the two obscurations, affliction and knowledge, and gathered the two accumulations, merit and wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2011 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Why is possible to achieve Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Tsondue Sangmo"]How is possible for human beings (or sentient beings in general) to achieve the qualities of a perfect being called a Buddha?
/quote]

If you are going to take this approach, you need to define your goal: what do you imagine Buddhahood is? In other words, you need to define those qualities. Within that definition you will begin to discover your answer.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2011 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Cancer

Content:

Chaz said:

A few years ago, I was diagnosed with a very low-grade, Non-Hodgkins Lymphoma.

I am not symptomatic at present.

I have recieved no treatments to address this condition. We are in a watch and wait mode with the disease.

My oncologist has said that it's quite possible that I would die with this cancer rather

than from it.

A routine CT scan taken two weeks ago indicates little/no growth of this cancer in the last year. The lymph node being watched is isolated in the mesenteric tissues beneath my navel.

My question is how does/would Tibetan medicine approach such a condition? I'm not necessarily looking for cure here, but would be most interested in regimens aimed at maintenance.

If Namdrol is reading, it's my understanding that you have a colleague in Boulder CO. Is that true?

Malcolm wrote:
Hi Chaz:

Yes, Nashalla Nyinda and her husband, Tsondu have a practice in Boulder.

It could be treated with a variety of herbs and therapies, including cleanses, to try address the issue specifically by restoring balance to the lymph system, etc.

You should give them a call:

<http://holistic-health.org/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2011 at 12:16 AM
Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being
Content:

Namdrol said:
Yes. Thoughts arise from that state and return to it.

Clarence said:
So, what you are saying, if I understand correctly, is that the Natural State and thoughts are like a package which is encompassed and known by Rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:
Rigpa is knowing what reality is. Like wine, it ages and deepens. Unlike wine, it never "falls apart", though continued familiarity with it matures it faster.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Long Life Empowerment by His Holiness' Sakya Trizin

Content:

conebeckham said:

Namdrol--If I get it, I'll translate it, and you can check my translation! yes?

I have no direct contact with His Holiness, though I had one private interview years ago, but I have a friend who may be able to help.....

(I have a short phoneticized version, pretty short with the visualization description, maybe 12-16 lines, the praise, the mantra, and the dissolution.....but no English, and no real Tibetan from which to translate)....

Malcolm wrote:

Just as long as I get the text...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Martial Arts

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Most people have no reason to learn martial arts. We do not live in a country inhabited by bandits, though in some places they still exist.

It is easy to avoid personal confrontations.

That being said, of course one has the basic right to defend oneself and to defend others if need arises.

N

Namdrol said:

I find that learning martial arts, even Tai Chi, promotes basic aggressive behavior and certain way of thinking about others that involves imagining how to harm them in hypothetical situations.

mr. gordo said:

Yup, I completely agree and commented the same very early in this thread. I guess I was wondering if the general reasoning for at least learning basic self-defense would be allowed. Like in the Jataka tales (Ja.V.109), it says

"...Always protect those who live justly."

Or the Mahaparinibbana sutta:

"What have you heard, Ananda: do the Vajjis duly protect and guard the arahats, so that those who have not come to the realm yet might do so, and those who have already come might live there in peace?"

"I have heard, Lord, that they do."

"So long, Ananda, as this is the case, the growth of the Vajjis is to be expected, not their decline."

Or in the Vibhaṅga, there is no offense for a bhikkhu who, trapped in a difficult situation, gives a blow "desiring freedom."

Yoga has all the benefits of martial arts and none of the downsides.

My personal top pick of yoga traditions:

<https://vinyasakramayoga.blogspot.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

You recommended me to study at Yoga Sutra, and I'll be going for private lessons later this year to have a personalized daily practice taught to me. I'm pretty excited. Also read the Krishnamacharya bio by Mohan a couple of weeks ago and it was quite inspiring.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Clarence said:

Do I understand that right?

Namdrol said:

Yes, you do.

Clarence said:

When recognizing the Natural State, can one have thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Thoughts arise from that state and return to it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Martial Arts

Content:

Huseng said:

Buddhism teaches ahimsa or non-violence, so learning how to fight is inappropriate. Spend that time eradicating your negative emotions and greed.

mr. gordo said:

Huseng, do you think learning self-defense is to be completely excluded for Mahayana / Vajrayana lay people?

Malcolm wrote:

I find that learning martial arts, even Tai Chi, promotes basic aggressive behavior and certain way of thinking about others that involves imagining how to harm them in hypothetical situations.

Yoga has all the benefits of martial arts and none of the downsides.

My personal top pick of yoga traditions:

<https://vinyasakramayoga.blogspot.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Clarence said:

Do I understand that right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes. Mostly because you can become distracted, and that is ignorance.

Clarence said:

I think I start to understand. I am quite the same as some others here. When I look, nothing is found. Resting in that, thoughts come up. Then it is gone, until I remember.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa is something that one slowly develops over time, until one has complete confidence in the meaning of the teachings.

The term rigpa is used in different ways in Dzogchen teachings, so one has to be very specific. It does not have universally applied meaning like "consciousness" for example. This is because Rig is both a noun and a verb in Tibetan, depending on the word ending.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: This thing in my eye...

Content:

Jikan said:

I have something called Cellophane Maculopathy. (sometimes goes by the trade name "Macular Pucker.") I have likely had this since childhood, but now it is starting to interfere with my life. Eventually it will worsen to the point where I will require surgery or lose sight in the affected eye. This may take decades.

My question: can TM offer any guidance on slowing the growth of such a thing as snotty crinkly film in the macula of a man's eye?

Malcolm wrote:

These conditions are generally speaking treated with eye surgery in addition to herbal medicines. First, we would have to find out the humoral cause of the illness, and so on, then we can optimize the pre- and post surgical treatment.

See your eye surgeon. Have it taken care of.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: A Question on Shunyata and Awareness

Content:

sangyey said:

In ordinary mind terms is this clarity an aspect of mindfulness or is it vigilance?

Malcolm wrote:

Niether -- it is an instant of reflexive knowing devoid of the external object that is known. It is what allows us to perceive any object by adopting that object's aspect. When we learn to identify that reflexive knowing in itself, that is called "resting in clarity" and that is the essence of shamatha practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

[

Yes, although it's subtle and easy to miss. Your statement technically is saying that the natural state, having been correctly recognized, is rigpa, whereas Namdrol's is more precisely saying that it is actually the recognition or knowledge itself which is referred to as rigpa.

Clarence said:

At the moment of recognition, is there a difference between the two?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Mostly because you can become distracted, and that is ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Reading strategy: study widely or deeply?

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

Panditas attain enlightenment quicker than kusali's?

How is this so? could you post something in support of this

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Pandita addresses this question extensively in his reply to Nyemo Gomchen:

There are two kinds of Buddhist panditas and Buddhist kusalis i.e. the panditas and kusalis of the perfection vehicle will become Buddhas, but it takes a long time, three incalculable eons and so on. The pair of panditas and kusalis of the secret mantra vehicle quickly attain Buddhahood because of the arrangement of inner interconnections. In addition, a so called "pandita" is described as "A scholar in the foundation of outer and inner objects of knowledge." A so called "kusali" is described as "One who inwardly has the most dedication inwardly after severing all outer distractions."

In terms of actual perfect Buddhahood: first, having become knowledgeable about all objects of knowledge the pandita has severed doubt through hearing, reflection and meditation. Then, because of severing doubt through meditating which makes samadhi essential, gradually attains Buddhahood after actualizing the Dharma of realization is a pandita. A kusali necessarily has the same basis, but when considered alone, a pandita is closer to Buddhahood.

Now then, if it is wondered whether there is a conflict with the statement in The

Ratnakuta sūtra:

Compared with someone who listens for ten eons
and then gives explanations to others,
when someone who meditates for just a moment,
the merit of the latter is greater than the former.

The intent of that: the intention is that mediation is when a scholar understands the
meaning of the object of meditation, but without understanding what sort of beneficial
qualities can there be? Also Vinaya states:

Don't meditate in mountain retreats without being a master of the canon.

The Abhidharmakośa states:

Possessing basis of discipline, hearing and reflection,
is best applied in meditation.

And as the Āryācharya Nāgārjuna states:

Without relying on convention,
the ultimate will not be realized,
without realizing the ultimate,
nirvana will not be attained.

Therefore, since it is said many times "...liberation is attained in this life by listening the
categories from all the sutras", it is said that "...if one is not liberated by hearing, later on
one should meditate."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: A Question on Shunyata and Awareness

Content:

Acchantika said:

Thank you, that is a very lucid explanation.

So, I am assuming that it is incorrect to apply this to all phenomena, i.e., the
characteristic of clarity is unique to sentient beings?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the characteristic of clarity is unique to a sentient being's mind. The mahasiddha
Virupa stated that "The mind is like space, the difference [between them] is that the
mind is aware."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Long Life Empowerment by His Holiness' Sakya Trizin

Content:

conebeckham said:

He gave the Thangtong Gyalpo Tsewang, but more slowly and with more explanation this time. Very wonderful. HH is truly Vajradhara in person. He also gave a lung, I believe it was for the daily practice of Khon Luk Kilaya.

I'm looking for the Tibetan Sadhana, which is a treasure of Choje Lingpa's (Thanks, Namdrol!) if anyone has any knowledge...?? It's not in Rinchen Terdzo. I looked.

Malcolm wrote:

I suggest you ask HHST for the sadhana personally. If you get it, I will translate it for you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: A Question on Shunyata and Awareness

Content:

Acchantika said:

A phenomenon is an object of mind. Awareness, as far as I can tell, is not an object of mind. Thus, it cannot be considered essenceless from the statement 'all phenomena are essenceless', nor the reasoning that brought me to that conclusion. I can "get rid" of fixed objects, a fixed self, and so on, but I cannot "get rid" of this awareness. The flow of dependent arising appears to something, which doesn't appear at all.

Malcolm wrote:

What you are talking about is called "clarity". The mind can take its own awareness as an object. Indeed, in all Mahamudra and Dzogchen meditation, this is precisely what is taken as the object. You may not be able to "get rid" of this clarity, but you will never find it or be able to say "This is it, this is not it". This clarity is also dependently originated since the mind is dependently originated. There is no awareness or clarity separate from the mind. The characteristic of the mind is clarity. The essence of the mind is emptiness. These two are non-dual, and that is the nature of the mind i.e. inseparable clarity and emptiness.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

And Gampopa.....

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, his wife had died.

Marpa also had nine consorts. Naropa had consorts, Tilopa had consorts, etc. Gampopa did not receive Milarepa's complete teaching since he was a monk.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Reading strategy: study widely or deeply?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Study widely and deeply.

Dharma learning is like making a deposit in the bank for this and future lives.

Panditas attain buddhahood faster than kusulis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

If not. then what of Millarepa G

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, definitely. In fact, he had human woman consorts, but in the later Kagyu histories, only his relationship with the goddess Tseringma is mentioned.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: A Question on Shunyata and Awareness

Content:

Jnana said:

Mañjuśrī, enlightenment by its nature consists of luminous-clarity, because the mind's nature is luminously clear. Why is it so designated? The mind's nature is detached from any inner defilement and is like the nature of space, while encompassing space through its identical characteristics. For all these reasons it is designated as being luminous-clarity.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why the Chinese gloss of prabhasvara is interesting -- they generally gloss it as "pure".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: High altitude symptoms

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, many people do not realize this but the most important prerequisite for a successful retreat is that one is very relaxed. Also a balanced diet and lots of rest is important.

Huseng said:

Some Zen monasteries got it all wrong then.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they do. When one is quite relaxed, well rested, and with a balanced diet, one does not need as much sleep. But forcing people to subsist on lack of sleep interferes with meditative stability because it causes vata disturbances, as does poor food, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2011 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Rocky Zen

Content:

Astus said:

The reasoning is quite simple. All is mind - mind is buddha - rocks and trees are buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Piss poor reasoning.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: High altitude symptoms

Content:

Huseng said:

...provided one has sufficient isolation and quietude, which is what I don't have. ...Group retreats come with too much BS.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, many people do not realize this but the most important prerequisite for a successful retreat is that one is very relaxed. Also a balanced diet and lots of rest is important.

Groups retreats are for beginners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: High altitude symptoms

Content:

Huseng said:

Getting to the first dhyāna would be ideal.

Malcolm wrote:

Not as hard as many people beleive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: High altitude symptoms

Content:

Namdrol said:

A preperation with cordyceps will also help with altitude. It has been shown to enhance oxegyn uptake by to 25 percent, so it is commonly used for emphysema patients, the elderly and so on in China, as well as in high altitude preperations.

There is also a special type of prepared radish that even Tibetans use for crossing passes. This, according to people I know who have used it is very effective too.

N

Huseng said:

Do you know if Ginseng would help, too? I know it works with curing fatigue and has a warming effect, but I wonder if it would work in offsetting symptoms of adjusting to high altitudes.

Malcolm wrote:

My advice is to see an Amchi sooner rather than later. Many Ladhakis speak english, so there should be little problem communicating. What sort of retreat are you doing, BTW?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: High altitude symptoms

Content:

Chaz said:

ot much you'll be able to do about low-oxygen effects (short breath, etc.) at first, but depending on your physical condition, aclimating to the altitude shouldn't take too long.

Malcolm wrote:

A preperation with cordyceps will also help with altitude. It has been shown to enhance oxegyn uptake by to 25 percent, so it is commonly used for emphysema patients, the elderly and so on in China, as well as in high altitude preperations.

There is also a special type of prepared radish that even Tibetans use for crossing passes. This, according to people I know who have used it is very effective too.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Rocky Zen

Content:

Acchantika said:

Dōgen Zenji said that rocks and trees have/are the buddha-nature. Is this a wrong view?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Rocks and trees are not sentient beings, therefore, they cannot become buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

Tilopa said:

But it's important to remember that even a lay yogi has the vow not to emit semen so ordinary sexual activity is a transgression for anyone with tantric vows, monastic or not. .

Malcolm wrote:

There is very little agreement on this point among different lineages, so it is best not to generalize. In other words, this is definitely not the case for Sakyapas and Nyingmapas.

Emission of semen is only a downfall when one is engaging in completion stage practices. At other times it is not a downfall in any sense at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: How does pleasure arise?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All pleasure and all pain arises as retribution for past positive and negative actions. The rest is mere detail.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Israeli women take Palestinian women to the beach. Respect!

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

This circumstance calls for a Gandhi.

Till then apartheid round the corner.

Malcolm wrote:

Around the corner? Apartheid is already a fact in Zionist-occupied Palestine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Rocky Zen

Content:

Huseng said:

In the Treatise on Buddha Nature 佛性論 (Fo Xing Lun) buddha-nature is equated with suchness and emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Fo xing lun is mistaken, then.

Tathāgatagarbha is not merely emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Rocky Zen

Content:

Huseng said:

Buddhanature is emptiness and since all things are empty, yes a rock has Buddhanature.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not correct. Sentient beings are defined as the buddhadhātu, and rocks are not sentient. They cannot become Buddhas.

That fact that a rock is empty and a sentient being are empty does not mean a rock can also achieve awakening.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2011 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: High altitude symptoms

Content:

Namdrol said:

Very easily. You probably won't have much trouble if you relax for a few days. I never had any trouble in Lhasa, etc.

Huseng said:

Oh good. Yeah, I've heard the same. It is just a matter of taking it easy the first few days and not doing anything physically strenuous.

If I have any health problems I'll be able to consult with Tibetan docs up there. I'll be there for about five months.

Malcolm wrote:

Like Chaz said, being well hydrated is important. Don't drink much alcohol, it goes to your head faster at altitude. Don't try to push yourself. That being said, I have climbed up 14,500 foot mountains with a 101 temperature without any ill effect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2011 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I have seen dhatu translated as "matrix" in another text (can't remember where) like "the matrix of reality", I have also seen dharmadhatu defined as the space from which all

phenomena manifest, so this is the angle from where my question arises and anyway the quote says:...in the super-matrix of pure mind that is like space... which further confused me.
Excuse my ignorance but what exactly is the Tibetan term for dharmadhatu?

Malcolm wrote:

This is probably something like byang chub sems kyi klong chen i.e. "the great space of bodhicitta..." i.e. bodhicitta ala Dzogchen terminology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2011 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Tantra of the Tachikawa-Ryu

Content:

Namdrol said:

It also does not make it "tantric".

Astus said:

Depends on definition. When it has the characteristics of tantric teachings it could be called that, even if from the perspective of traditional(ist) Vajrayana they are heretics.

Malcolm wrote:

Sex and sexual mysticism does not make something "tantric".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2011 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I have seen dhatu translated as "matrix" in another text (can't remember where) like "the matrix of reality", I have also seen dharmadhatu defined as the space from which all phenomena manifest, so this is the angle from where my question arises and anyway the quote says:...in the super-matrix of pure mind that is like space... which further confused me.

Excuse my ignorance but what exactly is the Tibetan term for dharmadhatu?

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

dharmadhātu is chos dbyings or chos kyi dbyings.

In tibetan, dbyings can mean "space". But dhātu can never mean space. Dhātu, in Sanskrit, means "a mine" or "a source".

Some western translators naively translate "dbyings" as space because dbyings can

have that connotation in Tibetan.

But chos kyi dbyings is never defined in Tibetan by Tibetan masters as the "space of phenomena".

It is often defined as a chos kyi 'byung gnas i.e. a source of phenomena however. One notable example of someone who gives "a source of phenomena" for dharmadhātu would be Longchenpa in the chos dyings mdzod.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2011 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Tantra of the Tachikawa-Ryu

Content:

Astus said:

Jikan,

All the sources I've quoted above maintains that it has disappeared as a school. The practices themselves, since the texts are still available, maybe done by a few, but that doesn't make it a tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

It also does not make it "tantric".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2011 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So basically he is talking about the dharmadhatu?

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmadhātu does not mean space, and klong does not mean dharmadhātu. One of the key features of klong sde is working with space, as opposed to light ala thögal. However, in klong sde they also take about the nine spaces i.e. the space of the view, the meditation, conduct, samaya and so on. One of our contributors, Sten Anspell, did a thesis on klong sde that is very interesting.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2011 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Martijn said:

How can remembrance be forgotten? by Atmananda Krishna Menon

Every thought merges into Consciousness and remains not as thought, but as Consciousness, pure. So your searching in that Consciousness for the resurrection of any thought, merged therein, is in vain. It can only result in your first forgetting your real nature of pure Consciousness, and in the subsequent creation of an entirely new thought, as though experienced some time earlier.

[

Malcolm wrote:

This is Advaita, not Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2011 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: High altitude symptoms

Content:

Huseng said:

Next month I'll be flying into to Leh, Ladakh, which is 3524 meters above sea-level.

While I've never experienced altitude sickness before, this time it is a concern just because I am flying rather than driving into a high altitude location and will be remaining there for awhile.

In TB are there are precautions one can take? Also, is there any way of dealing with mild high altitude sickness symptoms?

Namdrol said:

A common medicine people take if they are having problems with altitude is "Dali Chudrug". It is very effective, if a bit diuretic.

N

Huseng said:

I imagine I could purchase this in Ladakh pretty easily?

Malcolm wrote:

Very easily. You probably won't have much trouble if you relax for a few days. I never had any trouble in Lhasa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2011 at 10:27 AM

Title: Re: High altitude symptoms

Content:

Huseng said:

Next month I'll be flying into to Leh, Ladakh, which is 3524 meters above sea-level. While I've never experienced altitude sickness before, this time it is a concern just because I am flying rather than driving into a high altitude location and will be remaining there for awhile.

In TB are there are precautions one can take? Also, is there any way of dealing with mild high altitude sickness symptoms?

Malcolm wrote:

A common medicine people take if they are having problems with altitude is "Dali Chudrug". It is very effective, if a bit diuretic.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2011 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

booker said:

Hold on a minute

Natural State unrecognised is a base for Samsara.

Natural State recognised is a base for Nirvana.

Right?

If Rigpa can be also dualistic and illusion it would be also a base for Samsara, but it's not. Right? Marigpa is a base of Samsara, and is never a base of Nirvana. And Rigpa is never base of Samsara, is only for Nirvana. So Rigpa can not be dualistic and illusion. Margipa is.

Right?

Namdrol said:

Natural state is not rigpa. Rigpa is one's knowledge, or recognition, of the natural state.

booker said:

Yes.

So there can't be one has Rigpa which is dualistic and illusion, right? Otherwise this doesn't make any sense.

To rephrase:

Natural State unrecognised is Ma rigpa and is a base for Samsara.
Natural State recognised is Rigpa and is a base for Nirvana.

And can't be otherwise, right?

Or do I get that wrong?

Malcolm wrote:

How about: the recognition of the natural state is rigpa, the basis for nirvana -- just a slight tweak.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

booker said:

Hold on a minute

Natural State unrecognised is a base for Samsara.
Natural State recognised is a base for Nirvana.

Right?

If Rigpa can be also dualistic and illusion it would be also a base for Samsara, but it's not. Right? Marigpa is a base of Samsara, and is never a base of Nirvana. And Rigpa is never base of Samsara, is only for Nirvana. So Rigpa can not be dualistic and illusion. Margipa is.

Right?

Malcolm wrote:

Natural state is not rigpa. Rigpa is one's knowledge, or recognition, of the natural state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

booker said:

Hm I think the problem is how is that Primordial Wisdom is obscured in the first place (what gives a rise to sentient beings like us).

Sönam said:

may by not (re) cognizing ... that's why there is innate ignorance.

Sönam

booker said:

Yes, but I guess this boils down to the fact, that since it's a self-aware wisdom, how come the ignorance could possibly happen.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is one really good reason -- there is no such thing as a "self-aware wisdom" -
- it's a translation botch.

so sor rang gyis rig pa'i ye she is the translation of a common term in Mahāyāna Buddhism namely, "pratyatmyavedanajñāna" which means "personally (pratyatmya) intuited (vedana) gnosis (jñāna)" or in simpler terms "wisdom that one knows personally", wisdom that one personally experiences, and so on.

Therefore, contradiction solved.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

whatever appears is absent in reality.

Malcolm wrote:

What in tarnations is a super matrix? Is he translating a Tibetan term here?
[/quote]

He is translating klong chen i.e. great space.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Safi: The Blood Purifier

Content:

retrofuturist said:

Greetings,

Yes, it's mainly the blood purifying properties that are of interest.

I've got one bottle of this, and I don't see that one bottle alone causing problems, but will seek out alternatives for next time around.

Thank you.

Maitri,
Retro.

Malcolm wrote:
Retro:

If you want to purify your blood, than you should take a decotion of Amla/Amalki fruit.
You do not need this Safi stuff.

B

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 6:21 AM
Title: Renunciation Impossible?
Content:

Huseng said:

The need to earn an income is tied to having to rent or upkeep a private residence, maybe drive a car, eat whatever you want rather than living on donated foods, etc... whereas a renunciate by definition is supposed to be free of such concerns.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, but in this day and age the path of renunciation is impossible.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 5:23 AM
Title: Re: recalling ...
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Canto Twenty-Four

Amazing!
Now then, sole fortunate dear children,
listen to this vajra song with joy and enthusiasm!
If realized in that way, the whole of existence
is the ultimate mandala of a book of advice
in which baseless, forever liberated non-grasping words
are written on the pages of various white and red appearances
with the pen of vidyā's self-originated primordial wisdom.

Having read the book in the state of non-dual appearance and emptiness,

the naturally formed maṇḍala of the billion world cosmos
is wetted with the water of a natural downpour of heavy rain,
the lane is marked with the natural great lines,
and one's footprints are images of colored sand.
One's body is the form of the yidam deity of appearance and emptiness,
the empty sounds of speech is vajra recitation
and the self-liberated mind of the deity does not grasp memories or thoughts.
All motions of the limbs are mudras.
All food and drink is an offering of dharmatā.
All apparent forms are the form of the deity.
All loud noises and speech are music.
Naturally occurring samaya is not protected and cannot be harmed.
No matter what such yogins do,
since their instructions and creation stage along with
commitments are perfect in the state of luminous dharmatā, [145]
there is no need to depend on dharmas of effort.
Effortless siddhi is very amazing.
Rapid attainment is a special feature
of the great perfection, fortunate heart children.

As such, if one practices with confidence,
just like clouds disappear into space,
the mass of concepts of samsara and nirvana will be purified in the original ground.
Just like the disc of the sun is clear without any obscuration,
after one's vidyā manifests the luminous dharmakāya,
one will be able to revive the dead and be able to understand what is hidden.
Having demonstrated various miraculous abilities,
one will tame migrating beings.
Having totally perfected all the qualities of the stages and paths,
the persons of the best capacity are liberated in this lifetime
and the medium are liberated in the bardo at the moment of death.
Having been liberated in the originally pure basis, after permanently dwelling
as the three kāyas and primordial wisdoms (that are never joined with one another or
separated) in the dharmadhātu,
also send forth emanations to tame whoever is to be tamed,
performing the benefit of migrating beings without interruption.

Bearing these words and topics in mind,
it is certain the sun of happiness will arise from inside.
That one who sings a song of such realization,
appears to be the renunciate, Tsogdrug Rangdrol.
By this merit, may all the stains of the conceptual affliction
of ignorance of many fortunate disciples
be quickly purified into the originally pure original dharmadhātu
and the result be attained in this life.

(This is my independent rendition that was made without depending on a prior translation; unlike Dowman, which depends on Kunsang)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: A little help?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

ok, well i guess I will just have to wait till I can get the DVD, thanks anyways

Malcolm wrote:

You don't absolutely need the melodies, you can just recite the text plainly until you can get a chance to learn the melodies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

Huseng said:

Democracy is a sacred cow and anything done in its name seems to sanitize away any and all immoral actions.

For example the democratic nation of the USA has been invading, murdering and pillaging numerous nations in both hemispheres since at least the post-War period, but this is done in the name of "protecting freedom and spreading democracy". It is no different than converting people by the sword to Christianity and making a handsome profit at the same time. Likewise communist states were insistent on class struggle and spreading "the revolution", and looked what happened as a result in places like the USSR and China.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and both of these instances are a result of capitalism...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Few indians were ever kept as slaves by the americans, which may speak a bit to their status in things.

Malcolm wrote:

Not true, many Indians were sold into slavery.

As far as slavery among North American Indians

"Many Native American tribes did practice some form of slavery before the European introduction of African slavery into North America; but none exploited slave labor on a large scale.[1]

Native American groups frequently enslaved war captives whom they primarily used for small-scale labor.[1] Some, however, were used in ritual sacrifice.[1] Although not much is known about them, there is little evidence that these slaves were considered racially inferior to the Native Americans who held power over them.[1] Nor did Native Americans buy and sell captives in the pre-colonial era, although they sometimes exchanged enslaved individuals with other tribes in peace gestures or in exchange for their own members.[1] In fact, the word "slave" may not even accurately apply to these captive people.[1] Most of these so-called Native American slaves tended to live on the fringes of Native American society and were slowly integrated into the tribe.[1]

Until European settlers arrived, these slaves were other tribesmen.[1] The situation of these enslaved Native Americans varied among the tribes. In many cases, enslaved captives were adopted into the new tribes to replace warriors killed during a raid.[1] Enslaved warriors sometimes endured mutilation or torture that could end in death as part of a grief ritual for relatives slain in battle.[1] Some Native Americans would cut off one foot of their captives to keep them from running away. Others allowed enslaved captives to marry the widows of slain husbands.[1] The Creek, who engaged in this practice, treated children born of slaves and tribal members as full members of the tribe rather than as enslaved offspring.[1] Several tribes held captives as hostages for payment.[1] Various tribes also practiced debt slavery or imposed slavery on tribal members who had committed crimes; full tribal status would be restored as the enslaved worked off their obligations to the tribal society.[1] Other such slave-owning tribes of North America included Comanche of Texas, Creek of Georgia, the fishing societies, such as the Yurok, that lived along the coast from what is now Alaska to California, the Pawnee, and Klamath.[2]

When the Europeans "discovered" the Native Americans they began to participate in the slave trade.[3] Native Americans, in their initial encounters with the Europeans, attempted to use their captives from other tribes as a "method of playing one tribe against another" in an unsuccessful game of divide and conquer.[3]

The Haida and Tlingit who lived along southeast Alaska's coast were traditionally known as fierce warriors and slave-traders, raiding as far as California.[4][5] In their society, slavery was hereditary after slaves were taken as prisoners of war.[4][5] Among some Pacific Northwest tribes, as many as one-fourth of the population were slaves.[4][5]"

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slavery_among_Native_Americans_in_the_United_States " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

LastLegend said:

Ron,

Slavery was big part of history of United States. Can you shed some lights on its effects in present days in terms of race relations in United States.

I have been told that most whites don't see non-whites as equals. Can you discuss or shed some lights on this?

Malcolm wrote:

Equality in the US, as in every other nation comes from \$\$\$.

People with more money are more equal than others.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I will also take a stab in the dark and guess that white Americans did not learn about democracy from the American Indians.

Namdrol said:

We didn't learn about from Greeks either (especially since Greek preferred Tyranny to Democracy anyway).

N

gregkavarnos said:

Preferred? And here was me thinking that Tyranny is normally imposed.

Malcolm wrote:

"Greek tyranny in the main grew out of the struggle of the popular classes against the aristocracy or against priest-kings where archaic traditions and mythology sanctioned hereditary and/or traditional rights to rule. Popular coups generally installed tyrants, who often became or remained popular rulers, at least in the early part of their reigns. For instance, the popular imagination remembered Peisistratus for an episode - related

by (pseudonymous) Aristotle, but possibly fictional - in which he exempted a farmer from taxation because of the particular barrenness of his plot."

More or less an archaic version of dictatorship of the prols.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2011 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I will also take a stab in the dark and guess that white Americans did not learn about democracy from the American Indians.

Malcolm wrote:

We didn't learn about from Greeks either (especially since Greek preferred Tyranny to Democracy anyway).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2011 at 10:12 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra : What do you plan to do after ngondro?

Content:

Jangchup Donden said:

Was Rechungpa a non-monastic?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2011 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Purification Practices in Sutra, Tantra & Dzogchen

Content:

Sönam said:

There is no purification practices in Dzogchen ... purifications practices belong to other yanas.

Sönam

Namdrol said:

Of course there are purification practices in Dzogchen, very many in fact. Vajrasattva, etc.

Sönam said:

Vajrasattva and others does not "belong" to Dzogchen, also Dzogchenpa can practice it ... the only "purification" I can imagine is reactualisation. We are back to Garab Dorje's Three Precepts.

... or ?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Or all the purification practices recommended in the Dzogchen man ngag sde tantras such as Vajrasattva practice, prostrations, mandala, Guru Yoga, etc., you name it., they are all there.

Norbu Rinpoche said it best "There is no such thing as pure Dzogchen".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2011 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra : What do you plan to do after ngondro?

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Relatedly

N..which version of Milarepa do you know or suppose as true..as sourcerer or not.

I'd guess not but am no scholar.

Malcolm wrote:

Read Peter Allen Roberts' book on the bios of Rechungpa.

The standard bio of Milarepa by Tsang Nyon Heruka, is quite late and stands a number of facts on their head when it is compared to bios composed by Gampopa, and so on (for example, Milarepa's mother is never mentioned, his father was alive, there was no evil Aunt and Uncle, etc.).

Basically, Roberts tracks all of the hagiographies of Mila in an effort to find out why Mila's main student, Rechungpa, and only complete lineage holder, was turned into an example of the "bad student" par excellence by generations of Kagyu monastics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2011 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra : What do you plan to do after ngondro?

Content:

Chaz said:

I'm strangely reminded of Milarepa building towers

Malcolm wrote:

Except that never happened.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2011 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Vimalamitra's semde pills

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

I had the same experience with them for the first 2 or 3 days, but later it leveled out and I began to feel much better than before beginning the treatment. Did you continue taking the pills until they were gone and still have that effect until the very end?

Hayagriva said:

I took them for a week and then stopped. They were certainly far more powerful than I was expecting, but I really didn't like the effect - especially as it was making meditation very difficult.

Malcolm wrote:

Cut the dose in half.

They are mainly aloeswood, with other ingrediants.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: and again ... Jesus is a bodhisattva

Content:

arjandirkse said:

Isn't the presumption that some real person is a "real" Bodhisattva overly high praise?

Bodhisattvas are supposed to be fully enlightened beings, am I correct? So how is anyone to know wether Jesus or Moses or Gandhi or whomever is a Bodhisattva?

Malcolm wrote:

No, partially awakened, not fully awakend (buddha)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Purification Practices in Sutra, Tantra & Dzogchen

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

I'm taught the three outer/lower tantras are the path of purification.

Rinpoche has referred to the "ten absences" of the Kunche Gyälpo as the equivalent of Dzogchen samaya, one of which is "there are no bhumis one has to achieve through purification."

Having said that vajra dance appears to be a six lokas practice.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN teaches purification practices like the Longsal Ngondro.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Purification Practices in Sutra, Tantra & Dzogchen

Content:

Sönam said:

There is no purification practices in Dzogchen ... purifications practices belong to other yanas.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there are purification practices in Dzogchen, very many in fact. Vajrasattva, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Norway attack.

Content:

tobes said:

Indeed. I am aware of the hermeneutical license we are all granted in these post-

modern times, but.....

Failing to recognise that JS Mill is defending individual liberty from possible external harms would be incorrect.

Or failing to recognise that Nagarjuna is denying independent existence would be incorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, actually there are many people who think that Nagarjuna's line [paraphrase] "a svabhāva is independent and does not depend on anything" serves to define what is real as opposed to what is contingent. I have heard Lama's of gshan stong persuasion give exactly that interpretation. And this is pre-modern...

And the lunatic in Norway obviously was deluded enough to think that he was protecting individual liberty...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

What about our inner Guru?

Malcolm wrote:

That the path, received from outer guru.

kalden yungdrung said:

What about Dzogchen practice in previous lives ?

Malcolm wrote:

Means that in this life it will be easier for you to meet an authentic Dzogchen guru.

kalden yungdrung said:

What about a high level of understanding and very good karma?

Malcolm wrote:

Without transmission, no Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

thigle said:

Right, you can only learn dzogchen from a book or text.

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot learn Dzogchen from a book, nevertheless, there are texts that are authoritative for Dzogchen. But to learn Dzogchne, you need a master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Safi: The Blood Purifier

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It would be fine, but without more info, it is hard to say. The arsenic seems like environmental contamination.

retrofuturist said:

Greetings,

Does anyone have any thoughts on the efficacy (or dangers) of this product from either an Ayurvedic or Tibetan Medicine perspective?

Safi: the blood purifier

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Safi_\(medicine\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Safi_(medicine)) onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;)

As far as I can tell from online sources, it seems there is benefit in the tonic, but a risk that it contains potentially high arsenic levels.

Ideally I'm after balanced and well considered views in this topic, rather than just a Eastern vs Western medicine slinging match. At what levels does arsenic become a genuine concern?

Here's the contents....

Thanks.

Maitri,

Retro.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 9:39 AM
Title: Re: Norway attack.
Content:

tobes said:
Or will you ever grant that it is not the text, but the misreading of it.....

Malcolm wrote:
That would suggest that is such a thing as a "correct" reading of any text.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 5:52 AM
Title: Re: Fukushima: It's much worse than you think
Content:
kirtu said:
the DC area which is now clearly just sprawl.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
That is for sure.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 4:02 AM
Title: Re: Thoughts
Content:
thigle said:
Last but not least, the only authentic dzogchen-mengagde book, you become public, is
<https://www.amazon.com/Heart-Drops-Dharmakaya-Dzogchen-Tradition/dp/1559391723>. I don't wanna go from here, without these pointer.

Malcolm wrote:
You cannot learn Dzogchen from a book.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 3:38 AM
Title: Re: Thoughts
Content:

thigle said:
So, what is the big secret in Dzogchen?

Namdrol said:
In other words, no Dzogchen Guru, no Dzogchen practice.

thigle said:
Don't tell the people lies, my friend.

Malcolm wrote:
It is in the original texts of Dzogchen, so what to say. A guru is indispensable for Dzogchen. If one should proclaim otherwise, one would be telling lies.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 2:33 AM
Title: Re: Thoughts
Content:

thigle said:
So, what is the big secret in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:
If someone wishes to practice Dzogchen, they must find a guru who teaches it correctly. Otherwise, "Dzogchen" is just a bunch of meaningless albeit pretty words. In other words, no Dzogchen Guru, no Dzogchen practice.

Your grudge against Tibetans is unjustified. Tibetan Gurus have taught everything there is to teach about Dzogchen to those who have been fortunate enough and interested enough to seek out and learn Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2011 at 12:22 AM
Title: Re: Thanks to everybody
Content:
Namdrol said:
Spirit of the moment, too bad mods didn't see it that way.

PadmaVonSamba said:
It was an absolutely zen moment
a whack with a stick
and impermanent!

Malcolm wrote:
It was fun while it lasted.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2011 at 11:27 PM
Title: Re: Thanks to everybody
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:
(p. off was nice too!)

Malcolm wrote:
Spirit of the moment, too bads mods didn't see it that way.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2011 at 9:17 PM
Title: Re: Norway attack.
Content:
tobes said:
Well, we've already had a long thread in which some people expressed alarm at the proliferation of anti-Islamic sentiment in Europe, and others justified it as well founded.

I don't wish to start another long, tiring debate; but I think it is worth remembering all that was said on that thread.

As one of the people expressing alarm, well, unfortunately there is now compelling evidence why such a stance is warranted.

As an aside, it is interesting how a Christian doing an unspeakable deed is characterised as "a lone psychotic gunman" (not a Christian terrorist) and no one is blaming the entire religion of Christianity for his action.

Malcolm wrote:
That's not true, Huffpo has it here:

"Anders Behring Breivik is a Christian terrorist determined to touch off a new Christian-

Muslim war that would rival medieval Crusades."

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-crumm/christian-terrorist-ramadan_b_908172.html " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And there are certainly precedents even in the New Testament for such actions:

Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. [Mt 10.34 NRSV]

For I have come to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and one's foes will be members of one's own household. Whoever loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and whoever loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me; and whoever does not take up the cross and follow me is not worthy of me. Those who find their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will find it. [Mt. 10.35-39]

Now granted, there is a preponderance of evidence that Jesus would not have approved of the various wars and so on fought in his name. However, militant Christians usually look to the Old Testament for justifications for their wars, as you must know.

Now, it is ironic that man trying to start a race war in Europe chose to murder Socialists, rather than Muslims.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2011 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: and again ... Jesus is a bodhisattva

Content:

spanda said:

A Christian View of Liberation

Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa (1401 – 1464):

"Finally, there is still a path of seeking God within yourself: the path of the removal of limits...When...you conceive that God is better than can be conceived, you reject everything that is limited and contracted..."if you seek further, you find nothing in yourself like God, but rather you affirm that God is above all these as the cause, beginning, and light of life of your intellectual soul...You will rejoice to have found God beyond all your interiority as the source of the good, from which everything that you have flows out to you."

A Buddhist View of Liberation

Buddha:

"Shariputra, this very Dharmakaya is called the realm of beings when it is concealed by a sheath of boundless afflictions, wandering repeatedly through births and deaths in

beginningless samsara, buffeted by the waves of samsara... Shariputra, this very Dharmakaya is called the Tathagata, Arhat, Samyak-sambuddha when it has become free from the veils of all the afflictions, has passed beyond all sufferings..."

Malcolm wrote:

The first is completely externalist. The later is pointing to one's inner reality of buddhanature as dharmakāya.

spanda said:

Christian Renunciation

St. Symeon (11th century):

First of all seek three things: (1) to free yourself of all anxiety regarding both real and imaginary things, (2) to strive for a pure conscience, with no lingering sense of self-reproach, and (3) to be completely detached, so that your thoughts are not drawn to anything worldly, not even to your own body.

Buddhist Renunciation

Buddha:

"Do not engage in any vices whatsoever. Devote yourself to a bounty of virtue. Completely subdue your own mind. This is the teaching of the Buddha."

Malcolm wrote:

Renunciation is not unique to Buddhism, nor is discipline, nor is loving kindness and compassion. Nor is shamatha.

Buddhist insight is unique and comes from understanding dependent origination alone.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2011 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: and again ... Jesus is a bodhisattva

Content:

justsit said:

Well, just to play devil's advocate here...

There are those who say he rose from the dead.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many people who rose from the dead after staying in crypts for three days --

common mystery cult initiation rite.

justsit said:

He did perform miracles.

Malcolm wrote:

So did Appollonius of Tyana and many other people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2011 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Fukushima: It's much worse than you think

Content:

mr. gordo said:

I take it his books are good as well? They've been sitting in my amazon wishlist for a while.

Malcolm wrote:

I think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2011 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Fukushima: It's much worse than you think

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

20 feet under water NYC for instance,

Malcolm wrote:

that's ok, new york city is a cesspool anyway.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2011 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Fukushima: It's much worse than you think

Content:

Huseng said:

Nobody is willing to sacrifice. That's the problem. We hear about "sustainable development". Japan needs to reduce energy consumption if it is going to drop nuclear energy, but those millions of vending machines keep rolling and neon lights continue to blaze.

Malcolm wrote:

What's going to happen is that we will run out of petrofuels. It will happen. But it will not be chaotic, and catastrophic. Industrial civilization will basically lurch to a halt. Read this guy, he is very bright and writes very well.

<https://thearchdruidreport.blogspot.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2011 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So what you are saying is that an unenlightened being (ie me) can have a direct (not mediated by conceptualising mind) perception via this "pramana"?

Namdrol said:

Yes.

"Experience", by which we mean experiences of which we are aware, is always conceptual. Direct perceptions are, by definition, non-conceptual. Thus, direct perceptions are never conceptually mediated even though we constantly have them.

N

conebeckham said:

So "non-mediated perceptions" can, and do, occur to all, but the moment one "experiences" the perception this is no longer non-mediated?

Malcolm wrote:

When one becomes aware that one is seeing a blue vase for example, and designates it a blue vase, at that moment one is no longer having a direct perception but a perception mediated by ideation and a number of other mental factors.

An important part of shamatha practice is allowing our mental factors to become reduced to the minimum that are present in any desire realm mind -- then we can enter the first dhyana, i.e. perfect shamatha which involve five factors associated with the first dhyana; one pointedness, bliss, ease, initial attention and sustained attention.

Perfect shamatha is basically a one pointed mind that is "non-conceptual" or rather minimally conceptual. One of the key features of Vajrayāna practice of course is that bliss can be so overwhelming that it makes our minds completely non-conceptual, likewise, the experience of khumbhaka, etc. This is one of the reasons why the Sakya

gongma maintain that Mahāmudra upadeshas all by themselves are a slow path, but when combined with the completion stage, they become a rapid path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2011 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: and again ... Jesus is a bodhisattva

Content:

Sönam said:

so what ?

A 8th bhumi bodhisattva could miss the fact that his words and actions will bring so much suffering ... holy wars, Inquisition and even holocaust having his origin in the fact that jews would have killed God (the son)?

Jesus have the compassion dimension, but where is the wisdom dimension?

Malcolm wrote:

We are not in disagreement. I personally think "Jesus as bodhisattva" is nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2011 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: and again ... Jesus is a bodhisattva

Content:

Sönam said:

Dealing with a french forum, I once more encounter the discussion on Jésus being a bodhisattva. Some "stable" vajra friends, some I know personally, pretend that His Holiness has once (Paris 2003) said that Jesus was a bodhisattva, which is for me a total nonsense. Then other members (vajra practionners) generally quite knowledgeable concerning the dharma did pretend the same, pretending that he did adapt his teaching to the peoples in Palestin in that time. Of course I did'nt agree at all, and as too many of them did pretend so, I tell them that I will ask for confirmation to a Rinpoche (Gelug) I'm in contact with. Surprisingly he says the same, that he believes that Jesus was a 8th bhumi bodhisattva, that his "real" teaching was not know, and so on.

Honestly I do not know what to say ... I need some help on that point that I could not accept. I'm lost (like a wall following on me) ?

Sönam (sorry for bad english)

Malcolm wrote:

It is just political stuff to make christians happy where it is not new age nonsense.

however, it is possible for a bodhisattva to appear in any form....so

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2011 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Enochian said:

So basically pramana = Gorampa's Ultimate Truth = rigpa for you Dzogchenpas out there

This is a question not a statement

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. A pramāṇa requires a prameya, an object of authority. Since the object of realization of Madhyamaka and Dzogchen cannot be established as an object of authority, no authority for a Madhyamaka or Dzogchen pramāṇa can be established.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2011 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

In the Yogacara eightfold classification of mind which "level" is pramanas comparable too?

Malcolm wrote:

The question should be "Which of yogacara eight consciousness are direct perceptions comparable to?" The answer is that the six sense consciousnesses are all non-conceptual direct perceptions.

In terms of the five aggregates, the aggregates of consciousness is a direct perception operating through a sense gate.

Our experience of these direct perceptions are mediated by mental factor of ideation/discernment after they have been sensed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2011 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Norway attack.

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

N...groups and organizations customarily claim certain newsworthy events. News media can discern who is and who is claiming...this is routine.

To announce a group claims this or that when they claim every tragic event happening anywhere is a dereliction of duty to report the news.

Al Queda is a terrorist group. That means they inspire terrorism in the populace, not necessarily to produce certain acts.

The acts are means to an end.... the terror. Reporting in this manner puts an al Qaeda operative behind every event and thusly works to support their aim...it is irresponsible to say the least, bad journalism without a doubt.

Malcolm wrote:

I merely pointed out that they did indeed claim responsibility. Perhaps Al Qaeda really thought it was one of their's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Norway attack.

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Initial media knee jerk reaction was to suspect Al Qaeda....

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, an Al Qaeda affiliate announced it was their work early on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So what you are saying is that an unenlightened being (ie me) can have a direct (not mediated by conceptualising mind) perception via this "pramana"?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

gregkavarnos said:

Do we have an abhidharmic reference for this term or state of mind "pramana"?

Malcolm wrote:

Pramāṇa is the study of epistemology in Buddhism and Hinduism. The earliest Buddhist text on pramāṇa was written by Vasubandhu, the Vyākhyāyukti. This was followed by the works of Dignaga and Dharmakirti. It is traditionally grouped by most Tibetan scholars under Sautrantika tenets, so called "Sautrantikas following reason".

gregkavarnos said:

Why do I not always experience perception at this level?

Malcolm wrote:

"Experience", by which we mean experiences of which we are aware, is always conceptual. Direct perceptions are, by definition, non-conceptual. Thus, direct perceptions are never conceptually meditated even though we constantly have them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

mudra said:

Pramana is referred to in various texts as prime awareness/cognition etc.

Namdrol said:

Pramana means, basically, "authoritative".

N

mudra said:

Agreed. It is a term used in "Hinduism" as well (remembering the topic of this thread.)

I looked up several Sanskrit dictionaries and they all seemed to say that "mana" is mind.

Pra can refer to primary or prime.

So rather than going into that tenet debate on whether it means first or prime in the sense of incontrovertible I think your term authoritative works quite well.

Malcolm wrote:

That is māṇa; the māṇa in pramāṇa is a completely different word.

pramANa n. (ifc. f. %A) measure , scale , standard ; measure of any kind (as size , extent , circumference , length , distance , weight , multitude , quantity , duration) Ka1tyS3r. Kat2hUp. Mn. &c. (instr. ` " on an average " Jyot.) ; prosodical length (of a vowel) Pa1n2. 1-1 , 50 Sch. ; measure in music MBh. (Ni1lak.) ; accordance of the movements in dancing with music and song Sam2gi1t. ; measure of physical strength S3ak. (cf. comp. below) ; the first term in a rule of three sum Col. ; the measure of a square i.e. a side of it S3ulbas. ; principal , capital (opp. to interest) Col. ; right measure , standard , authority Gr2S3rS. Mn. MBh. &c. (%{pramANam@bhavatl} , ` " your ladyship is the authority or must judge " Nal. ; in this sense also m. and f. sg. and pl.

e.g. $\{\text{vedAH@pramANAH}\}$, " the Vedas are authorities "
 MBh. ; $\{\text{strI@pramANI@yeSAm}\}$, " they whose authority is a woman Pa1n2. Sch.) ; a means of acquiring Prama1 or certain knowledge (6 in the Veda7nta , viz. $\{\text{pratyakSa}\}$, perception by the senses ; $\{\text{anumAna}\}$, inference ; $\{\text{upamAna}\}$, analogy or comparison ; $\{\text{zabda}\}$ or $\{\text{Apta-vacana}\}$, verbal authority , revelation ; $\{\text{an-upalabdhI}\}$ or $\{\text{abhAva-pratyakSa}\}$, non-perception or negative proof ; $\{\text{arthA7patti}\}$, inference from circumstances ; the Nya1ya admits only 4 , excluding the last two ; the Sa1m2khya only 3 , viz. $\{\text{pratyakSa}\}$, $\{\text{anumAna}\}$ and $\{\text{zabda}\}$; other schools increase the number to 9 by adding $\{\text{sambhava}\}$, equivalence ; $\{\text{aitihya}\}$, tradition or fallible testimony ; and $\{\text{ceSTA}\}$, gesture IW. 60 &c. &c.) ; any proof or testimony or evidence Ya1jn5. MBh. Ka1v. &c. ; a correct notion , right perception (= $\{\text{pramA}\}$) Tarkas. ; oneness , unity L. ; = $\{\text{nitya}\}$ L. ; m. (cf. n.) N. of a large fig-tree on the bank of the Ganges MBh. ; ($\{\text{I}\}$) f. (cf. n.) N. of a metre Col.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

thigle said:

Not necessary, to be elitist and to spread fear.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of being elitist or spreading fear. It is a question of respecting the teachings so that people actually benefit from them rather than run around with the view in the their mouth and mind full of afflictions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

thigle said:

Anyway, i spent many years under hard conditions, to come to the point, that dzogchen is easy. And that was not so easy (for a practitioner, who want to 'practice' [not easy]: 'let-it-be-as-it-is'. [easy]) and very subtle, because it is also very very easy, to fall in a cittamatra view or stuff. So, i know, what you mean.

Malcolm wrote:

You see, Dzogchen is not so easy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 10:45 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

mudra said:

Pramana is referred to in various texts as prime awareness/cognition etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Pramana means, basically, "authoritative".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 10:29 AM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Namdrol,

thank you. Unlike others that I have seen on this forum I know you are not saying these things to be a dickhead. Help me out here. If I am missing something or not understanding something please dont just point out that I am clueless, tell me how and why I am clueless and how I can correct it and get the proper understanding. If you prefer to do that in private PM me, if not tell me in the open forum.

Malcolm wrote:

It is easy to get the scent of Dzogchen. But in reality, understanding Dzogchen is much harder. The biggest obstacle to understanding Dzogchen is thinking that we understand it. I do not mean it is impossible to understand Dzogchen, of course it is possible, but that understanding can really only be predicated on personal experience, and it is the extremely rare person who can understand Dzogchen based on a few teaching and a couple of months of practice. Most of us need to spend ten or twenty years.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

Fa Dao said:

So far as a newbie I have found Dzogchen to be quite simple and direct. Garab Dorje and ChNN lay it all out very nicely. Definitely NOT easy though. Does require a certain amount of relaxed persistence. Still occasionally have that pesky feeling that I should

be DOING something if I want to progress...but supposedly that will dissolve into itself eventually too.

Malcolm wrote:

You are like a person who has smelled some wood that has been lying on the ground in a sandal wood forest, but does not realize it is just common wood. When the scent wears off you will realize you still need to get real sandalwood.

And I mean that in the nicest possible way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

thigle said:

If dzogchen is simple, why we have so many dickheads?

Malcolm wrote:

Because even though Dzogchen is simple, it is extremely subtle.

For example, you have to let go of letting go. You have to stop fabricating your non-fabrication.

You have stop affecting your non-affectation.

I know many, many so called Dzogchen practitioners in DC and elsewhere, both teachers and students. All of them are still, to some degree or another, under the influence of their emotions, their physical bodies, their karma and their circumstances.

So the problem is not with the teachings, the teachings are perfect. The problem is with the practitioners. And the problem is in general that Dzogchen is far more subtle than students understand. The teachers know this, which is why they continue to encourage people not to think that Dzogchen is something so easy. Even a teaching like dependent origination is very subtle. How much more so is Dzogchen, which is where the teaching of dependent origination leads one in the end.

So, Dzogchen words are simple, but their meaning is extremely subtle, and the practice of Dzogchen is not so easy. If you tell people otherwise, you are acting like a Mara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Physical Immortality Possible Through Dependent Origination?

Content:

platypus said:

There are a few immortal animals.

Malcolm wrote:

Only jellyfish. And no one is sure they are even sentient.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

thigle said:

It is unaffected. And that's so hard for us. But when you think, it is complicated, let it be complicated, as practice

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say that Dzogchen was complicated. Dzogchen is "simple". But it is not easy. Most of the people who study Dzogchen have no fracking clue what Dzogchen actually is...especially those who claim it is easy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Physical Immortality Possible Through Dependent Origination?

Content:

Enochian said:

I didn't phrase this thread right.

I should have asked is there any way to expand youthful lifespan to say about 400 years?

Huseng said:

Well according to the Abhidharma-kosa if you can master the fourth dhyana and covert bhoga-vipaka to ayurvipaka, then you can live an extended lifespan.

Enochian said:

By that logic, kumbhaka should work too, since kumbhaka>>>dhyana.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, works on a different theory -- arrest the karmic vāyus, one interrupts the process of karma, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

thigle said:

Dzogchen is easy.

Namdrol said:

If Dzogchen were easy, there would not be so many dickheads.

thigle said:

Yes..for dickheads, easiness seems too complicated. But we have ngöndro, so, no problem.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know, when someone like Chogyal Namkhai Norbu says Dzogchen is "...not so easy", I tend to believe him.

Dzogchen is easy to say, but the real test is whether one's afflictions have decreased. If not, then one's "Dzogchen" is not working to well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Thoughts

Content:

thigle said:

Dzogchen is easy.

Malcolm wrote:

If Dzogchen were easy, there would not be so many dickheads.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Physical Immortality Possible Through Dependent Origination?

Content:

Enochian said:
What about Nagarjuna's alchemy?

Malcolm wrote:
You met any immortals?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2011 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: Physical Immortality Possible Through Dependent Origination?
Content:
Enochian said:
Is Physical Immortality possible through Dependent Origination (buddhism)?

Any ancient accounts?

Not talking about rainbow body or other serious accomplishments.

Malcolm wrote:
Nope. All that is born must die.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 11:50 PM
Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?
Content:

mudra said:
The term pramana (prime/first mind) also refers to this direct perception free of conceptual filters.

Malcolm wrote:
"mana" means to measure, hence in Tibetan "tshad".

Pratyakṣa (mngon sum) is the word for direct perception.

Inferenece (anumana), which is not a direct perception is also a pramana.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 4:46 AM

Title: new terma

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<https://romokon.blogspot.com/2009/03/new-buddhas.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Aren't sense cognitions ultimately thought forms since (sensory) sensations pass through their respective sense-mind before we can cognise the sensory cognition? (to put it extraordinarily clumsily)

Namdrol said:

Not in the sense that Enochian is using the word i.e. as designations.

A designation requires a concept, where as a naked sense perception is, by definition, non-conceptual.

gregkavarnos said:

Okay, now I understand. Can perception ever be non-conceptual to an unenlightened being?

Malcolm wrote:

All direct perceptions are non-conceptual whether one is awakened or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Question about dharmaprotectress Achi Chokyi Drolma

Content:

adinatha said:

Achi is also practice as a deity, peaceful form of Vajrayogini.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you have received that transmission. But more commonly it is given as a dharmapala.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Aren't sense cognitions ultimately thought forms since (sensory) sensations pass through their respective sense-mind before we can cognise the sensory cognition? (to put it extraordinarily clumsily)

Malcolm wrote:

Not in the sense that Enochian is using the word i.e. as designations.

A designation requires a concept, where as a naked sense perception is, by definition, non-conceptual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Enochian said:

Doesn't appearance = thoughtform?

Malcolm wrote:

No, an appearance is a sense cognition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Enochian said:

I can state the principles of of Gorampa's Madhyamaka without getting into negation.

a. Everything exists as thoughtforms merely designated upon causes and conditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Wrong. Gorampa rejects this point. Designations are made on the basis of appearances.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Permission to practice: prerequisites?

Content:

Namdrol said:

They have all kinds of practice text listed on that page that seem not to require empowerments, but in fact most of them do.

N

Starglade said:

This is what I mean when I say "there seem to be contradictions." The FPMT site (which is all I have had to work with, until discovering Deer Park--and which I trusted, given its--lineage, for lack of a better word) indicates one thing, answers from practitioners here seem to indicate another. That, to me, is a contradiction--or, as Chaz said, at the very least a misunderstanding.

I have emailed Deer Park again with a request for specific answers about formal refuge-taking and prerequisite empowerment, and am waiting for further responses/clarifications. Thank you all, yet again. I appreciate your patience.

K

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, usually when you take a dharmapala initiation, you have commitments to make offerings on a daily or monthly basis.

Also, generally, as we mentioned, one usually needs to have received a highest yoga tantra empowerment.

But, these things are also at the discretion of the teacher.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Permission to practice: prerequisites?

Content:

Starglade said:

I also went to the FPMT website, where I found a copy of a daily Palden Lhamo practice in e-book format, listed under the heading "Not requiring empowerment" and available, therefore, to the general interested public.

There seem to be some major contradictions here. I will continue inquiring at Deer Park for specifics to make sure of things before I make that drive. Thank you all, again.

Malcolm wrote:

They have all kinds of practice text listed on that page that seem not to require empowerments, but in fact most of them do.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2011 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Question about dharmaprotectress Achi Chokyi Drolma

Content:

mad 3gem jewel said:

I am so surprised she has so little fame

Namdrol said:

Achi is very Drigung specific. If you are not a dyed in the wool Drigiungpa, there is little need to practice Achi.

N

adinatha said:

If you are not a dyed in the wool buddhist, there's little need to practice dharma. If you are not a dyed in the wool dzogchenpa, there's little need to practice dzogchen. If someone feels a connection to a practice, there's little need to discourage it.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a littel more sensative with dharmapalas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Permission to practice: prerequisites?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Shiiiiit....! It took me three years of busting my lamas chops before he gave the lung for our dhrmapala practice! Just the lung!

Malcolm wrote:

That's all you really need for most dharmapala practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Question about dharmaprotectress Achi Chokyi Drolma

Content:

mad 3gem jewel said:

I am so surprised she has so little fame

Malcolm wrote:

Achi is very Drigung specific. If you are not a dyed in the wool Drigungpa, there is little need to practice Achi.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Use of the term 'Hinayāna'

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

If we insist on using a term with a person that we know is hurtful to that person then we've determined there is some truth we need to convey which is higher than loving-kindness, and there isn't.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a truth higher than loving kindness (since loving kindness will not bring anyone to liberation). The issue is skillful means.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Permission to practice: prerequisites?

Content:

Starglade said:

Thank you both for responding.

I actually just received a reply from a member of the staff, who indicates that I can indeed take the permission to practice. "Deer Park activities are not limited to students" and if there were prerequisites, they would be mentioned in the info (which there were none called out).

Saturday could prove very interesting for me indeed.

Malcolm wrote:

It is strange to attend a permission for a Dharmapala if you have not first received a major initiation into a deity practice like Kalacakra, Yamantaka, etc. Generally, speaking, you would not normally be allowed to attend such a permission without such an empowerment as a prerequisite. You might want to inquire again.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

mudra said:

Namdrol-lags,

Actually I did already before I posted that last post.

(Sorry not to answer sooner, I fell asleep as it was 2 am my time)

What I found on p60-61, was not Je Tsongkhapa disregarding the second set of extremes, but instead saying that they need to be interpreted with (implied) qualifiers, and not literally. The emphasis is on knowing when and where to apply the "inherently existent" clause in order to avoid a contradiction.

BTW found online "Freedom From Extremes" by Jose I Cabezon and Geshe Lobsang Dargey. Any opinions on this book?

Malcolm wrote:

There are a couple of errors in translation in that book, for example, for some strange reason Cabezon thinks that Gorampa is siding with Rendawa's rather extreme refutation of gzhan stong, when actually Gorampa supports Rongton's softer refutation of gzhan stong. Otherwise, it is pretty good.

Re: tetralemma -- this is the basis of the disagreement, whether to take the tetralemma literally. Gorampa takes Tsongkhapa to task for trying to reinterpret the tetralemma. It must be taken literally, for among other reasons, [one not mentioned in the book], there are those who assert things both exist and do not exist, for example Jain and other interpretation of arising where there is an instant where something is in simultaneous state of existent and non-existence. In other words, the tetralemma is to be taken literally.

The book is ok, but really needs to be redone by Sakyapa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Napper's book Dependent Arising has a whole section devling into this issue. Look there.

N

mudra said:

Ok so checked the index in Napper's book and could not find any reference to Je Tsongkhapa disregarding the second set. All I could find was his classic emphasis on the need for qualifiers when interpreting the tetralemma (yes, all four lines). I checked back to the Snow Lion translation of LRCM and in the chapter "Production is not Refuted" (p189) found one discussion on the tetralemma which again is more of a discussion on the need for qualifiers when interpreting the four lines such as refuting essential nature etc. Nowhere have I found Je Tsongkhapa actively disregarding the second set.

Malcolm wrote:

Look on page 60 of the Napper book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Close. I don't like the fact that someone wants me to accept Western speculations on face value rather than to accept the history of my lineage as it is presented in their records - without agreeing to the fact that his argument is indeed based on speculation.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't accept the accounts presented in my own lineage as necessarily being historically accurate, why should I accept Bon accounts?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

But there is that which does not belong to materialism and which is not reached by the knowledge of the philosophers who cling to false-imaginings and erroneous reasonings because they fail to see that, fundamentally, there is no reality in external objects. When it is recognised that there is nothing beyond what is seen of the

mind itself, the discrimination of
being and non-being ceases and, as there is thus no external world of object of
perception, nothing remains but the solitude
of Reality. This does not belong to the materialistic philosophers, it is the domain of the
Tathagatas. If such things are
imagined as the coming and going of the mind-system, vanishing and appearing,
solicitation, attachment, intensifies
affection, a philosophic hypothesis, a theory, an abode, a sense-concept, atomic
attraction, organism, growth, thirst,
grasping, - these things belong to materialism, they are not mine.' Lankavatara sutra,
Chapter IV, Transcendental Intelligence

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting that you pick a cittamatra sutra rather than one more in line with
Madhyamaka.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Napper's book Dependent Arising has a whole section dealing into this issue. Look there.

N

mudra said:

Ok so checked the index in Napper's book and could not find any reference to Je
Tsongkhapa disregarding the second set. All I could find was his classic emphasis on
the need for qualifiers when interpreting the tetralemma (yes, all four lines). I checked
back to the Snow Lion translation of LRCM and in the chapter "Production is not
Refuted" (p189) found one discussion on the tetralemma which again is more of a
discussion on the need for qualifiers when interpreting the four lines such as refuting
essential nature etc. Nowhere have I found Je Tsongkhapa actively disregarding the
second set.

Malcolm wrote:

Check again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

This sums up my whole point: I am on a Buddhist forum and have to cope with materialistic science trying to debunk the authenticity of my lineage... Thanks, Sir!

adinatha said:

You are either misunderstanding the criticisms or you are being disingenuous for the sake of ranting.

Malcolm wrote:

Flow does not seem to like the fact that we are not merely accepting the authenticity of Bon accounts since they Bon accounts.

This like asking us to accept the Srimad Bhagavatam at face value when it describes Buddha as an Avatar of Vishnu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Those who assert ultimate production must assert that it withstand analysis by reasoning that analyses reality. As this is so, they must use reason to analyze production so as to discover which it is among the four alternatives ...

wrong four alternatives, he means production from self, other, both and causelessly.

N

mudra said:

Am aware of that, but I felt the implication is that for existents it would be the same approach. Am looking for a citation in which he glosses the second set of extremes but can't find one in LRCM or Ocean of Reasoning. Help me out: where does he actually actively, definitively disregard the second set?

Malcolm wrote:

Napper's book Dependent Arising has a whole section devling into this issue. Look there.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Unknown said:

Those who assert ultimate production must assert that it withstand analysis by reasoning that analyses reality. As this is so, they must use reason to analyze production so as to discover which it is among the four alternatives ...

Malcolm wrote:

wrong four alternatives, he means production from self, other, both and causelessly.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Do you actually want an answer to your rhetorical question?

I'm sure you have an idea of how we define matter.

Who is we?

Max Planck? Werner Heisenberg? Erwin Schrödinger? Dogen Zenji?

Malcolm wrote:

We Buddhists.

We define matter as the four elements: earth, water, fire, and air -- the caturmahābhūta.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

I am speaking of consciousness as the opposite of what we perceive of as matter

Malcolm wrote:

That is a non-description.

Flow said:

You stated: There is no reality at all, of any kind
I have to disagree. And Nagarjuna disagrees also:

Malcolm wrote:

You might think that Nāgārjuna disagrees, but he does not disagree. For Nāgārjuna śūnyatā is tattva, the real. If you say, however that śūnyatā is real, you have reified emptiness and are about as far away from tattva, the real, as you can get.

Flow said:

A simple reminder of Descartes should actually be enough to refute this. There is always reality. If something is – it is – and that is reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna, as well as the Buddha, reject this. There is no "is". Nāgārjuna would reject your claim the following way "Apart from what has been, and what has not been, there is no [present] being".

Reality, for Nāgārjuna is freedom from four extremes. Relative truth is free from four extremes, also ultimate truth is free from four extremes.

Flow said:

If emptiness is emptiness is. If form is form is. If form is emptiness, emptiness is form - but there still: IS. Reality won't go away.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not established. It has no characteristics. Hence, we have the discussion of the eighteen kinds of emptiness, one of the most important of which is the emptiness of emptiness.

Flow said:

The question is about what kind of reality you are speaking of. If you speak about absolute reality in the way of 'matter always existing' or 'the self' or 'the Buddha' or what not – then of course you point into the right direction. But you are not correct to assert that there is no-thing. Nothing can not be.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not assert existence, therefore, I cannot be accused of asserting non-existence. When you discover your bank account is empty, you say you have no money. When you investigate things and find out that they have no reality, that is not an assertion of non-existence. It is not my fault if things fail the reality test. Apart from things (dharma, material and mental), there is nothing else that could be real.

Flow said:

And what is not is not. This is a semantic problem. Nothing more. In Bön the concept of

aware space is utilized: Emptiness – but emptiness is not nothingness. At least not in the Bön teaching. What you proclaim here is actually nihilism. And that is not dharma. Seriously.

Malcolm wrote:

Nihilism is only the assertion that something which existed no longer now exists [ucchedavāda]. For those who do not assert existence, the fault of non-existence cannot be applied.

In order for there to be reality to be established, something must be established to exist. If nothing can be established to exist, for what reason can reality be established to exist. Likewise, Nāgārjuna has said "Since arising, abiding and perishing are not established, the conditioned is not established. Since the conditioned is not established, how will the unconditioned be established?" Likewise he states elsewhere, "If there were something slightly not empty, there would be something that could be empty; but as there is nothing that is not empty, where is there something that could be empty?"

Nāgārjuna, you see, is quite uncompromising in his anti-realism.

Flow said:

Buddhist philosophy is not afflicted with this radical dualism. Mind and matter are two sides of the same coin. Everything is part of a single continuous reality. But, of necessity, we may analyze out and abstract certain aspects of reality by way of our intellect. However, this does not make these distinct aspects separate realities or separate substances. Mind and matter are part of a single whole; they are not separate orders of being.'

Malcolm wrote:

This is all just relative truth. He is referring to the issue of Cartesian dualism. He is incorrect however in one thing -- from Yogacara on down, there Buddhist philosophy does maintain a substance dualism between mind and matter. Madhyamakas don't really care much what your correct relative truth, provided that it is efficient, i.e. when you plant a seed, it produces a sprout, while at the same time rejecting realist arguments to explain the process of germination.

Flow said:

'Mind and matter are part of a single whole; they are not separate orders of being.'
→ 'Consciousness is the 'root' of reality.'

Malcolm wrote:

How can you say that consciousness is the root of reality if you maintain that consciousness and matter are part of a single whole? Further, how can you given primacy to consciousness if you regard consciousness and matter as a single whole?

Flow said:

But please remember that we are bound by language and that language can by constitution only be the map to the territory we are speaking about... So don't get

hooked up on terms, please. Logic proving the conceptual system itself - cannot penetrate into the non-conceptual - the non-dual.

Malcolm wrote:

Not all non-dualities are the same. Buddhist non-dualism is epistemic, whereas Hindu non-dualism is ontological. What do I mean by this? Non-duality, for a Mahdyamaka means that in reality, because of dependent origination, the extremes of asti and nasti, being and non-being, are reifications (samaropa) and have no reality. This is the essence of the fifteenth chapter of the Mulamadhyamakakarikas (in addition to issuing a fundamental blow to Samkhya philosophy).

Flow said:

You having mentioned him to prove that you are not a materialist is exactly what I referred to before: that you claim to have accepted an ontology based on certain metaphysical assumptions [Buddhism] but you speak from a perspective of another one [materialism].

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have an ontology. And I am not speaking from the perspective of materialism. I just happen to think that Buddhist texts undergo clear evolution because I have been studying them since I was 16 and have read thousands of them in various translations and languages.

Flow said:

Just because there is the doctrine of dependent origination [which I have not spoken upon at all] it does not mean that this is proof of Darwinian evolution which needs to be accepted for your linguistic theory to uphold.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not arguing for the evolution of Buddhist texts because I happen to also accept natural selection as reasonable theory of how lifeforms evolve over time, not to mention the fact that such evolution is mathematically verifiable. I am arguing for the evolution of Buddhist texts based on the record of Buddhist texts and what is in them and the clear development of such texts over time.

Flow said:

Remember where we started out? I doubted that with your analytical tools borrowed from linguistics based on anthropology, based on evolution theory - you might go wrong in your assertions toward the past of Tibet - or of any other place in the world. This is what I am saying.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have any assertions about the Tibeian past apart from what can be verified for

example in Chinese annals, Indian records, Arabian Records, Tibeian Records. Everything else, which is only found in Tibetan texts that has no third party independently verifiable source I regard as "tradition". And in this respect Bonpos have their traditions and Buddhists have theirs. I thought I should have made it clear that there are traditions in both Buddhism and Bon that I do not regard as objectively factual, even though they may be spiritually meaningful. Such things as the Mt. Meru cosmology and so on. When it comes to history, in the other hand, I think that Buddhism is on much stronger ground.

Flow said:

Then I go on and make the argument that quantum physics implies that 'consciousness' is the 'base', 'root', [in lack of a better term] of reality which opens the door for different models of dependent origination concerning the appearance of life and the cosmos. Which would then be the ground to question your anthropology and hence your method of linguistical analysis. - and hence your assumptions about the history of Tibet or any other place in the world. It is as easy as that.

Malcolm wrote:

When you have studied more, you will rely less on abstract theories which are totally besides the point, and more on what your tradition actually says.

Flow said:

Or could please be so kind and show me on your language tree how proto-indian languages develop into Chinese?

Malcolm wrote:

We can infer that all human language descends from language spoken in Africa.

Quentin D. Atkinson, a biologist at the University of Auckland in New Zealand, has shattered this time barrier, if his claim is correct, by looking not at words but at phonemes — the consonants, vowels and tones that are the simplest elements of language. Dr. Atkinson, an expert at applying mathematical methods to linguistics, has found a simple but striking pattern in some 500 languages spoken throughout the world: A language area uses fewer phonemes the farther that early humans had to travel from Africa to reach it.

Some of the click-using languages of Africa have more than 100 phonemes, whereas Hawaiian, toward the far end of the human migration route out of Africa, has only 13. English has about 45 phonemes.

This pattern of decreasing diversity with distance, similar to the well-established decrease in genetic diversity with distance from Africa, implies that the origin of modern human language is in the region of southwestern Africa...

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/15/science/15language.html> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Or how Sumerian gives rise to Maya -scripts? And please remember: a resemblance does not imply causation.

This is a non-sequitor. You need some intellectual discipline. Studying tent systems will give you that.

Flow said:

The next thing is: I do not adhere to any foundation of anything. I simply make clear that there are different cosmologies available and hence it is not certain that any place in the world including his history can be accurately examined which would then let one state that one had found 'the Truth'. When Nagarjuna finds 'the Truth' he does so based on a solid system of logical reasoning.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said you are an idealist. This is a typical idealist train of thought. Buddhism, philosophically speaking, in general is species of nominalism.

Nāgārjuna did not build a system on the basis of logical reasoning. He poked holes in other people's systems because they are all based on false cognitions predicated on naive or formal assumptions of being and non-being. He himself has no system, and neither, for that matter do I. Everything we are discussing however is based on relative truth, and that, as I explained above, is predicated on efficiency. We can certainly entertain the idea that storks delivered us to our parents, and this might well be true, one might say, because after all it is but one of several theories of procreation. But after sufficient observation, you might be inclined to discard this theory for the one that suggests that sexual intercourse is more responsible for procreation.

Flow said:

What you are doing is setting up strawmen pointing to 'my bad understanding of dharma' and then starting your wordgames:

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, Flow, you were the one than came on with all the heavy bullshit about ontologies, materialism, etc., and berating us about how consciousness (which you still have failed to define for me) is the root of reality and so on, as if that explains anything.

Flow said:

'not mortal' 'without death' doesn't imply eternity? I am sorry but this is hilarious. I know about amṛta pretty well - as I mentioned I am educated in the Vedic source literature. Amṛta is the symbol for eternity. You could say it is the endless knot of Sanātana dharma... This is a semantic word game which does not lead anywhere. If 'without death' does not mean eternal what does it mean then? If something doesn't have an end is it not timeless? Since everything subjugated to time has an end? Is timelessness not equivalent to eternity?

Malcolm wrote:

Deathless does not have the same connotation in every Indian Religion. In Buddhism it means never being born again. Amrita on the other hand and in this context, based on the commentarial literature, simply means bodhi simply means elixir. If you wish to consult a good non-Gelug commentary on the Mula, Ornament of Reason is good.

Flow said:

What is it. And that describes these same eternities. It only depends on the level of relativity or absoluteness applied on this 'being-ness' whether it is really real or just phenomenally real...

Malcolm wrote:

There is no being-ness. That is just a name.

Flow said:

The same with this:

All commentarial gloss aside, it is well known that the Theravadins are slightly eternalistic in their understanding of nirvana, thus their hermeneutics. Sautrantikas, which are a higher tenet system, are unencumbered by this, but are instead encumbered by a subtle annihilationism.

I refute your point by referring to the comment that is essential to understand the verse you quoted and then you simply wind yourself out of it by exclaiming that Theravada is not developed enough and hence 'slightly eternalistic'.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is how tenet systems work. I suggest you study them. As Shantideva said, "The ultimate of the lower is the relative of the higher".

Flow said:

Thank you though for your recommendations for studies. Actually I am seriously considering to ask for acceptance as a monk at Menri monastery at some point in the future and to go through the Geshe studies there. I have the strong faith that I can better understand Bön through that than by studying Tibetan at some Western university... And there I can also learn the healing arts – not only from Doctors but also from shamanic practitioners...

Malcolm wrote:

I think you will be disappointed by Bon shamanism. It has been rather neglected by the Bonpos themselves. A lot of what they know is just book knowledge, nothing practical any more.

In order to heal anyone, you need to know how to diagnose illness, and for that you need to study the 'bum zhi'.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Lung disease unique to Vajrayana?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Classically, however, prāṇayāma practitioners are at a much higher risk for vatta disorders than other people.

N

Jangchup Donden said:

Any particular reason for that?

Is lung different than agitation (when it comes to the stages of concentration)?

Malcolm wrote:

Because you are doing very intense exercises with the breath.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Gorampa rejects that emptiness is merely the "non-affirming negation of true existence"

Enochian said:

I highly doubt Tsongkhapa held this view in the first place.

I am sure Tsongkhapa would have agreed with Gorampa that emptiness is a nonimplicative negation of all the Four Extremes, or ANY claim in general.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Gorampa analyzes this in detail.

Basically Tsongkhapa's famous formula for freedom from extremes is "not existent in the ultimate, not non-existent in the relative", he disregards the second set of extremes since they are double negatives and considers it absurd to negate things that "both and exist and do not exist" etc., since things never appear to both exist and not exist at the same time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 12:20 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Enochian said:

So basically Gorampa says that Je Tsongkhapa gets stuck on the level of mind, and what you really need to do is go beyond mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is a little more nuanced than that, but yes, one criticism of Tsongkhapa is that he holds that the intellectual apprehension of emptiness as non-affirming negation of true existence an appropriate conceptualization because it mimics ultimate truth. Gorampa rejects that emptiness is merely the "non-affirming negation of true existence" as well as the notion that an intellectual apprehension of emptiness is ok.

There are over 150 points where Gorampa criticizes Tsongkhapa's views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 12:03 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

All I am saying is that there might be the possibility for metaphysical accounts of Tibetan Buddhism and Bön to be actually true.

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of the origin and evolution of Buddhist texts? No. Nāgārjuna did not recover the Prajñāparamita Sūtras from sea monsters off of the coast of Andra Pradesh, as romantic as that might sound. Likewise, Buddha did not teach Abhidhamma pitika in one session to the gods in the thirty three heavens, as romantic as that sounds.

One of the nice things about Buddhist texts, especially Mahāyāna texts is that one can study their evolution. Why? Because they were translated into different languages over the period of a thousand years. How is the possible? For two reasons -- we have the Chinese canon and the Tibetan canon.

Buddhist sutras in the Chinese canon clearly show textual development over the many recensions of their translations. The Tibetan forms of these sutras are always in more mature forms than the earlier Chinese translations. And interestingly enough, the surviving Sanskrit copies of many sutras and tantras too show evidence of textual development subsequent to their translations into Tibetan. We can see this type of development even between translations from the Imperial period and the so called "later translation period" which begins with Rinchen Zangpo in the late tenth century.

Another thing we notice with Bon texts is that their orthography is solely post Ralpachen i.e. post 840 or so. In other words, we do not find the kinds of archaic spellings in Bon

canonical texts in general (such as the Zer mig, etc) that one would expect to find in ancient, pre-Buddhist texts.

So you can speculate all you like about Ancient Buddhas in mythical kingdoms writing down all the Buddhist sutras in independent form and depositing them in Tibet in the some prehistorical period. But the simple fact of the matter is that texts are plastic culture, they are susceptible to evolution and emendation, and in the case of Buddhist texts, these emendations are trackable to a very large degree until the Chinese and Tibetans stopped translating Indic texts. Of course, even in Tibetan Buddhist treasure literature one can find clear evolution and consolidation of language and terminology and very little in the way of truly archaic spellings, etc., spellings we have actual evidence of from texts which clearly date to that time period.

I think you ought to make yourself more useful, and go get a PhD in Tibetan studies somewhere, like Oslo - with Per Kvarne, who has a Bon studies program, university level. Then you can be really, truly insufferable as only academics can be.

Otherwise, you should study Tibetan Medicine, since you stated you wanted to be a healer. There are a bunch of Bon doctors in Nepal. Go study with them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 11:40 AM

Title: Re: Use of the term 'Hīnayāna'

Content:

Dexing said:

Not to mention, Hīnayāna used in Mahāyāna sūtras and śāstras doesn't actually refer to the Theravādins, but others like Sarvāstivādins for example.

Namdrol said:

That is not true -- it refers to anyone who follows teachings in Agamas/Nikayas and takes them being definitive.

N

Dexing said:

Most examples of direct refutations I've seen are aimed at various groups like the Sarvāstivādins. I've not seen the Theravādin group specifically targeted for their doctrine. Although, as you say the Śrāvakayāna in general is referred to as Hīnayāna.

Malcolm wrote:

There were not many Theravadins present on the Indian mainland to refute. However, the Theravadin theory of karma is rejected by Nagarjuna, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 10:11 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Gorampa is pretty much the definitive voice on Madhyamaka in Tibet.

mudra said:

From the Sakya point of view, yes.

From the Gelug pov, Je Tsongkhapa.

A matter of opinion perhaps.

Malcolm wrote:

Since the Gelugpas have never effectively answered Gorampa, Gorampa is pretty much the definitive voice on Madhyamaka in Tibet.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 9:09 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

'It is exactly due to your adherence to an idealistic view of history why you can't see that the history of Bon is totally unfounded. Your adherence to a foundation of any sort betrays an ignorance of the path. The six senses are without foundation. Nirvana cannot be established either. Buddhist histories are equally unreal.'

So the adherence to a non-foundation are signs of attainment then? Jesus... I'm going to bed. Let's see if I can wrap myself up again to comment on the other stuff you wrote tomorrow...

Malcolm wrote:

There is no foundation. It is termed "the baseless basis" in (Buddhist) Dzogchen, Mahāmudra and Madhyamaka texts. What Adinatha says is perfectly correct. Everything is not established at all in any way. There is no reality at all, of any kind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Please don't leave out half of the story...

Malcolm wrote:

All commentarial gloss aside, it is well known that the Theravadins are slightly eternalistic in their understanding of nirvana, thus their hermeneutics. Sautrantikas, which are a higher tenet system, are unencumbered by this, but are instead encumbered by a subtle annihilationism.

Flow said:

What is it that you see holding me back from understanding dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

In your case, a) you don't know Tibetan b) you have not properly studied tenet systems. c) you seem infected by idealism.

Flow said:

I have simply stated a possible opinion which so far still stands unrefuted...

Malcolm wrote:

Opinions do not need to be refuted, but merely rejected. I rejected your opinion, viz resorting to the use of textual analysis to understand the history of the Tibetan adoption of Buddhism required a materialist ontology.

The following verses cannot be parsed as you would like to parse them. However, the translation I gave you by Garfield is not, in my opinion very accurate. My apologies.

aparapratyayaṃ śāntaṃ prapañcairaprapañcitam|
nirvikalpamanānārthametattattvasya lakṣaṇam||9||

Not known from another, peaceful, not proliferated through proliferations,
non-conceptual, undifferentiated, that is characteristic of the real.

pratītya yadyadbhavati na hi tāvattadeva tat|
na cānyadapi tattasmānnocchinnaṃ nāpi śāśvatam||10||

Some thing arisen dependent on some (other) thing, that (thing) is not the same as the (other) thing,
and also is not different from it, therefore, it is neither annihilated and is not permanent
(tattasmānnocchinnaṃ nāpi śāśvatam)

anekārthamanānārthamanucchedamaśāśvatam|
etattalokanāthānāṃ buddhānāṃ śāsanāmṛtam||11||

Not identical, not different, not annihilated, not permanent,
that is the amrita (or nectar) of the doctrine (śāsanāmṛtam) of the saviors of the world,
the buddhas.

++++++

Not known from another, peaceful, not proliferated through proliferations,
non-conceptual, undifferentiated, that is characteristic of reality
Some thing arisen dependent on some (other) thing, that (thing) is not the same as the (other) thing,
and also is not different from it; therefore, it is not annihilated and is not permanent.
Not identical, not different, not annihilated, not permanent,
that is the amrita (or nectar) of the doctrine (śāsanāmṛtam) of the saviors of the world,
the buddhas.

Taken together, things are not the same, are not different, are not annihilated nor are they permanent, that is reality. When that is known directly, since it is known that things are free from extremes, also all proliferation regarding things are pacified. That is peace.

The second verse is discussing the meaning of the first verse, its implication for things, which is the summarized as being the amrita, the nectar of the Buddhas teachings. These verses do not concern a transcendent reality, though if you are conditioned by Advaita, you might be inclined to see things that way (a rabbit hole many people never escape from).

Since "not identical, not different, not annihilated, not permanent" is the nature of things because things are dependently originated, therefore, when there are no buddhas in the world to teach it, the doctrine of dependent origination can still be realized by pratyekabuddhas.

Flow said:

--> eternal truth [look back at what you wrote about: sanatana dharma, yungrung bön, 1000 Buddhas...]

Malcolm wrote:

No, not eternal, here, rather it is actually amrita, which literally means "without death" and refers to the elixir of the devas, etc. as I am sure you know. It is funny because in the Tibetan, immortal would be translated as 'chi med, but here in Tibetan the word was translated as bdud rtsi which means figuratively the "elixir that defeats the demon of

death" i.e. Yama mara.

In any event, we do not have a concept of Sanatana Dharma in Buddhism. For example, Maitreyanatha argues in the Uttaratantra (the main source of teaching on tathāgatagarbha) that the Dharma is not a perfect refuge because it is conditioned and impermanent. Etc.

So you are 25, I started learning Tibetan when I was 27. It took me ten years to read fluently and I was translating texts after three years. There is hope for you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Multiplication of merit?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I was noticing on the Tibetan calendar that on certain days merit is multiplied anywhere from 100 times to 10 million. How does that work exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, because you believe in it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Guess that makes the Buddha a materialist then:

"The Blessed One said, "What is the All? Simply the eye & forms, ear & sounds, nose & aromas, tongue & flavors, body & tactile sensations, intellect & ideas. This, monks, is called the All.] Anyone who would say, 'Repudiating this All, I will describe another,' if questioned on what exactly might be the grounds for his statement, would be unable to explain, and furthermore, would be put to grief. Why? Because it lies beyond range."

-- <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn35/sn35.023.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

LastLegend said:

We use senses to experience the world, but most of us do so with emotional reactions or biases or obscuration.

Malcolm wrote:

Flow's views seem to reflect a classical idealism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Oh, everyone that doubts that either consciousness, mind, or God is the root of reality and rather refers to his sensual perception as the means of obtaining knowledge about what is real and not real is by definition a materialist...

Malcolm wrote:

Guess that makes the Buddha a materialist then:

"The Blessed One said, "What is the All? Simply the eye & forms, ear & sounds, nose & aromas, tongue & flavors, body & tactile sensations, intellect & ideas. This, monks, is called the All.] Anyone who would say, 'Repudiating this All, I will describe another,' if questioned on what exactly might be the grounds for his statement, would be unable to explain, and furthermore, would be put to grief. Why? Because it lies beyond range."

-- <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn35/sn35.023.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I have been reading through this thread and I gotta say that is one smart kid (Flow that is) He may not always be right on the money but obviously well educated,

Malcolm wrote:

A good western education, broad familiarity with phenomenology, existentialism, physics, etc. will not necessarily help one understand the Dharma. It may in fact serve as a tremendous obstacle.

Since the anonymous authors of the Perfection of Wisdom sutras teased out the true import of the Buddha's teachings of dependent origination, commented upon by Nagarjuna, there has been no philosophical system superior in any way, shape or form.

One's time therefore is better spent on this.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Nangwa said:

I think you read the books description on Amazon, and not the actual book.

Enochian said:

I pretty much read the whole thing on Google Books

Malcolm wrote:

Gorampa is pretty much the definitive voice on Madhyamaka in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

I don't see anyone here advancing materialist philosophy. In your case Don Quixote comes to mind on this score, in other words, you are tilting at wind mills. No materialists here, not even physicalists, let alone advocates of a Newtonian clockwork universe (and Newton himself was not a materialist in any sense of the word, alchemist, astrologer, etc., but not a materialist).

Oh, everyone that doubts that either consciousness, mind, or God is the root of reality and rather refers to his sensual perception as the means of obtaining knowledge about what is real and not real is by definition a materialist...

Malcolm wrote:

What is the root of consciousness? Is this consciousness conditioned, or unconditioned. Are there discreet consciousnesses or is consciousness a single field, and so on?

What is your theory of consciousness?

Now, to begin with, we are Buddhist, so we reject outright the notion of God as the root of reality. Just to get that out of the way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Enochian said:
Namdrol,

If Vimalamitra was Indian, why do you need to rely on the Guhyagarbha tantra???

Namdrol said:
Because it had a Sanskrit original, now lost, but once extant, for sure.

N

Enochian said:
Well thats my point. Why not rely on something more concrete like Vimalamitra?

Is there doubt that Vimalamitra existed?

Malcolm wrote:
Vimalamitra actually translated the Guhyagarbha.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 12:45 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon
Content:
Flow said:

You guys should listen to yourselves: You accuse me of being a neophyte - a new age philosopher - a poser - and proud. Jeehh... All that for a simple disagreement upon Western methods of historical inquiry? Really?

gregkavarnos said:
So does this model of historical enquiry not base historical record on cross examined accounts of historical occurrences? Does it not rest in the belief that history arises from causes and conditions? That there is a chain of circumstances or situations that lead to some form of, for want of a better word, historical progress (or even historical regress)? Is everything in this method of history that you propose just made up by whoever wants to whenever they want to?

Malcolm wrote:
Flow would like the leave open the possibility that we actually descend from noble light beings that became junkies for sweet sticky stuff on the surface of the earth.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 12:40 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:
Enochian said:
Namdrol,

If Vimalamitra was Indian, why do you need to rely on the Guhyagarbha tantra???

Malcolm wrote:
Because it had a Sanskrit original, now lost, but once extant, for sure.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 12:38 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon
Content:

Flow said:

And he wants students -- and that ain't so easy either, students are a big pain in the ass - like children, only worse, since they are adults.

I am sorry, but this is plain wrong as so much that has been stated here before. Nowhere do I say that I want students. Period. I am saying that I am opening up my journey to becoming a teacher to the world.

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to become a teacher, it means you want to have students. That's fine with me.

Flow said:

And who are you to doubt anyone's qualification of becoming a teacher himself?

Malcolm wrote:

Prickly.

Flow said:

You mean Quantum Theory right? You realize it's just a theory, right? Meaning it's not a fact.

All you need to refute materialistic philosophy is the double-slit- experiment... No theory necessary.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see anyone here advancing materialist philosophy. In your case Don Quixote comes to mind on this score, in other words, you are tilting at wind mills. No materialists here, not even physicalists, let alone advocates of a Newtonian clockwork universe (and Newton himself was not a materialist in any sense of the word, alchemist,

astrologer, etc., but not a materialist).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Enochian said:

Can someone tell me why there is this lingering sentiment that Dzogchen is somehow not Indian?

Wasn't Vimalamitra Indian?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. As was Jñānasūtra.

Srī Simha was from Indochina.

Manushrīmitra was Sinhalese.

Garab Dorje was from Oddiyāna.

This is according to man ngag sde

The sem sde lineage has two Manjushrimitras and whole slew of masters between between them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

If you want to understand my reasoning at all I recommend you read a bit about ontology to understand how important ontological axioms are for your epistemology...

adinatha said:

Oh I get it, yer a new age philosophizer. You think statements can be true in themselves. You think you can think yer way to truth. That means you think there is something true in truth, which means you are a materialist thinker. Judging by the smirk on yer face, you take pride in yer notions. Mayhaps dunkin yer head in a bucket of icewater would cool yer jets.

Malcolm wrote:

If you read his blog, you can see he is intent on setting himself up as a teacher.

"So I am opening my journey of becoming a) a teacher in the spiritual, philosophical, psychological field and b) a healer with practical knowledge about healing and healthy living up to the whole world to witness and contribute."

As a trained doctor of Tibetan medicine, I can tell you, it ain't so easy healing people. And living healthy ain't so easy either -- mostly people just ignore what you recommend.

And he wants students -- and that ain't so easy either, students are a big pain in the ass - like children, only worse, since they are adults.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Actually, you need to learn Tibetan so your sources are not confined to 10 western books.

Oh, thank you for this charming statement. Actually I have already begun to learn Tibetan but I am not anywhere near being able to read scriptures. Actually I still cherish the believe that practice is much more important than scriptural studies and I do have to find the time to learn Tibetan among all the things I actually consider important. But please pardon my ignorance.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to better defend your adopted faith, you need to learn Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

conebeckham said:

There CAN be many "introductions" or investigative periods prior to the Ground being introduced as per Silent Bob's comment.....But again, such is not always the case. Even in presentations of the Four Yogas of Mahamudra, it is said that they don't necessarily occur sequentially. But when one is studying these things, as texts, or as "methods," one is introduced to them in sequence. Same with the "investigations" found in Ngedon Gyamtso, and in Dakpo Tashi Namgyal's works, and even in other Mahamudra guidance manuals.

In practice, though, the "Pointing Out" may seem like an instantaneous thing--but I think most of us have trained in methods that would be considered "preliminary investigations" on the path of Mahamudra, even though we may not realize that such methods were leading to "NgoTro." Good teachers will know where the student's minds are "at," so to speak.....

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what I meant. I meant introductions as I mentioned before, introductions to movement, to stillness, etc. All of which need to be experientially maximized which come long before mahamudra pointing out.

Mostly this kind of thing is done in retreat

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Actually, you need to learn Tibetan so your sources are not confined to 10 western books.

Oh, thank you for this charming statement. Actually I have already begun to learn Tibetan but I am not anywhere near being able to read scriptures. Actually I still cherish the belief that practice is much more important than scriptural studies and I do have to find the time to learn Tibetan among all the things I actually consider important. But please pardon my ignorance.

Still, this is not the tradition you mentioned, 1000 buddhas. That exists only in Mahāyāna.

As it says in the source: 'The 28 Buddhas are not the only Buddhas believed to have existed. Indeed, Gautama Buddha preached that innumerable Buddhas have lived in past kalpas.' This is what I was referring to...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that follows from the logic of dependent origination. The logic of dependent origination forbids the idea of ultimate beginnings and so it is only natural that there are beginningless buddhas.

Flow said:

This is described in Buddhist literature, and in fact the "devolution" you describe, is predicated on the cyclical destruction of the universe.

I know that it is - and I am not saying it is wrong: but it could be otherwise... You see - I find ultimate truths are a pretty dangerous thing.

Malcolm wrote:

The cyclical arising and destruction of the universe is a relative truth, not ultimate. This is why its narrative is not so fixed.

Flow said:

Yes, you would not arrive at your understanding of historical analysis without the aforementioned axioms which leads to the formulation of evolution theory which leads to the formulation of anthropological and linguistical theories... If consciousness were accepted as the root cause of reality there would be no need for an evolution to take place since everything would be formed from and by consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is rather imprecise. What do you mean by " If consciousness were accepted as the root cause of reality"? What kind of consciousness? Afflicted or unafflicted, one or many?

Flow said:

Anyways... We are reaching a point in this discussion where we will not be able to agree. And I don't want to be impolite by simple not answering your replies. This is developing into an argument about the nature of reality

Malcolm wrote:

Well, what we are discussing is the evolution of texts. That is a fairly narrow topic.

You want to have a discussion about the nature of reality. But there is no much to discuss on that score. My citation of Nāgārjuna summed it up.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

Jinzang said:

the typical Mahamudra pointing out instruction is long transmission that last several months

That hasn't been my experience. The pointing out is fairly brief. But I can't say if my experience is typical or not.

Silent Bob said:

In the 9th Karmapa's text, "Mahamudra--the Ocean of Definitive Meaning", which is the Kagyus' standard MM manual, the traditional 'script' for the pointing-out of ground MM is only a page long (p. 145). There are numerous vipashyana investigations that may also

be taught in order to enhance this recognition, but as Jinzang says, the actual pointing-out of the nature of mind by the teacher is brief.

Chris

Malcolm wrote:

My point was that prior to this there are many introductions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

I am surprised you do not know who Jean Luc Achard is. He is probably the most important Bon translator alive, and one of the world leading scholars of Dzogchen. He is also a serious practitioner.

Well, I haven't been around on this planet in this body for long enough to achieve ultimate knowledge upon everything... No kidding: I have not heard of him before. Probably because I mostly study the books of Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche and Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche when it comes to Bön and Dzogchen. There is enough to practice and realize in there for a whole lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, you need to learn Tibetan so your sources are not confined to 10 western books.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

It does not exist in the Pali Canon. It exists only in Mahāyāna in the Bhadrakalpa sutra. I dare to disagree: look it up https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_the_twenty-eight_Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, well, look at the note on your sources:

"This canonical text [Buddhavamsa], along with the Apadana and Cariyapitaka, has been described as hagiographical [1] as well as a "latecomer" to the Canon".

Still, this is not the tradition you mentioned, 1000 buddhas. That exists only in Mahāyāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Thus he is not eternal in the sense which you mean. His presence is based on the incalculable causes and conditions created during his career as a bodhisattva.

What about all the innumerable Buddhas of the past and the future Buddha Shakyamuni speaks about in the Pali canon? Does this not imply an eternety of Buddhism as a teaching and method?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha speaks of four or six past Buddhas in the Pali canon (Vipassi, Sikhi, Vessabhu, Kakusanda, Konagama, Kassapa), and one future Buddha, Maitreya.

However, as Nagarjuna points out (xviii.9-12)

"Not dependent on another, peaceful, and
Not fabricated by mental fabrications,
not thought, without distinctions,
that is the character of reality(that-ness).

Whatever comes into being dependent on another
Is not identical to that thing.

Nor is it different from it.

Therefore, it is neither non-existent in time nor permanent.

By the buddhas, the patrons of the world,

This immortal truth is taught:

Without identity, without distinction,

Not nonexistent in time, nor permanent.

When the fully enlightened ones do not appear,
and when the disciples have disappeared,
The wisdom of the self-enlightened ones
Will arise completely without a teacher.

(Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way)

Thus, because the nature of reality is as described here, there is always a possibility that it can be recognized someone who then becomes a pratyekabuddha.

Flow said:

And I actually just made this point with the Lotus sutra - because I do not know the exact place of where to find this enumeration of Buddhas in the Pali canon.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not exist in the Pali Canon. It exists only in Mahāyāna in the Bhadrakalpa sutra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Therefore, Flow, when it comes to history and historiography, I too, prefer to use ordinary human perception as the base line for conventional truths. Very limiting, yes. Just suppose there is actually a devolution instead of an evolution of the human species...

Malcolm wrote:

Why bother? There is no evidence of such a thing. Further, evolution and rebirth are non-contradictory. This planet is not the only place where there is sentient life in the universe, nor where there are Buddhist teachings.

These are nice myths, spiritually meaningful, but there is no reason to take the literally, any more than we need to take Vasubandhu's account of Meru and the four continents literally. Since you like to appeal to the Dalai Lama, HH has stated that he wishes that Vasubandhu would rewrite chapter three of the Kośa to bring it up to date with modern science.

Flow said:

I happen to sit in China of 500 A.D. and happen to achieve some deeper level of spiritual realization. Now I write that down onto some leaves or tablets or what have you. I call it 'The Ultimate Wisdom through Perfection in Calmness' and briefly explain which method I used to get there. Then some few hundred years later you come along and say: 'Ah, I read something similar from way back in India. This must be a derivative from it.' Clearly nonsense, isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

But we do not have any such examples. We have no lab to test this. The simple fact of the matter is that all Tibetans use, as a matter of course, linguistic constructs that

foreign to Tibeto-Burman and are only derived from translations of Indic materials -- all constructs using rnam par [vi-] and nye war [upa-], etc. Of course I am not arguing that Tibetan derived all their culture from India. Of course not. But such things as the pañcavidyāsthana, etc., these things are clearly India in origin.

Flow said:

'The world has a beginning and an end.

Malcolm wrote:

This is described in Buddhist literature, and in fact the "devolution" you describe, is predicated on the cyclical destruction of the universe.

Flow said:

The world consists of matter. Matter is the ultimate reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, you are asserting a non-sequitor.

Flow said:

'There have been various migrations of tribes upon the planet which dates we can accurately measure with various forms of datings which are always reliable. These datings give us a clear indication from when a document was written. There is no possibility that this teaching existed orally for thousands of years before. It must date from when it was written down. The scripts that tribes used were influenced by another.

Malcolm wrote:

Given the difference between how Oral Buddhist teachings look in a text, and later Mahayāna compositions, Bon literature, for the most part, fails the test. It lacks the consistent repetition, and so on, typically found in strictly orally recorded traditions.

Of course, there are many possibilities. But when it comes to what we can say is factually true, possibilities are not truths.

Anyway, you are not arguing from any concrete basis.

Flow said:

I know that in order to do historic research one has to assume all of these above mentioned things. '

Malcolm wrote:

In order to good historical research, one does not have to start with the notion that only matter is real.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

I once had an interesting conversation with John Luc Achard on E-Sangha. There he asserted, for example, that dating Shenrab to something like 16000 years BCE was an "mystery" number used in the initiation of ZZNG, and that it was considered both historical and symbolic. But since he would not divulge the meaning, as you can imagine, the conversation did not progress much further.

That sounds interesting. Too bad that there is no further elaboration on this. Was this based on his speculation or on actual transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

I am surprised you do not know who Jean Luc Achard is. He is probably the most important Bon translator alive, and one of the world leading scholars of Dzogchen. He is also a serious practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Am I wrong to assert that the Lotus sutra formulates Buddha as an eternal being? And hence isn't his method also eternal? Or would you actually argue that Buddhism is a temporal teaching? And how do you prove this with sutra?

Malcolm wrote:

I responded to this, somehow my post was lost.

In short.

The Lotus Sutra presents a situation where the Buddha achieved awakening five gazillion years ago.

But the Buddha does not present himself as "eternal" in the theistic, Sanatana Dharma, sense of the term. The Buddha states in this chapter that his continued presence at Rajagriha is based on his career as a bodhisattva:

The unlimited illumination of my wisdom
Is such that my life span is one of countless eons
Attained through long cultivation and work.

Thus he is not eternal in the sense which you mean. His presence is based on the incalculable causes and conditions created during his career as a bodhisattva.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

booker said:

How about Kunzhi as understood in Dzogchen? It is said to be the ground of being - all being sentient and insentient, and is not dependently originated. Isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

The term "ground of being" does not exist in any Buddhist text, nor any Dzogchen text. It is a western gloss, one that is inaccurate.

There is a term "kun gzhi" this is understood differently in different Dzogchen cycles and by different Dzogchen masters. So there isn't a one size fits all definition.

In those texts that speak of the so called kun gzhi -- the kun gzhi is complete free from all extremes. Whatever arises from it therefore, also must be free from all extremes. "Being and non-being" are just cognitive errors.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Use of the term 'Hīnayāna'

Content:

Dexing said:

Not to mention, Hīnayāna used in Mahāyāna sūtras and śāstras doesn't actually refer to the Theravādins, but others like Sarvāstivādins for example.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not true -- it refers to anyone who follows teachings in Agamas/Nikayas and takes them being definitive.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

And from where do you get your 'truth' then?

Malcolm wrote:

In the words of ChNN, Drung De'u and Bon, pg 156 "The Bon literature is unequivocal in recounting that the birth of the master Shenrab Miwoche took place on the fifteenth day of the wood mouse male year as we read in the above passage from the Zermig. As regards to the duration of his life there are sources that assert that he lived very many years, calculable only in 'shen years (gshen lo), each equivalent to one hundred human years. Evidently this lies beyond judgment by our limited capacities, and since history must be studied in congruence with ordinary human perceptions, i prefer not to base myself on these traditions."

Therefore, Flow, when it comes to history and historiography, I too, prefer to use ordinary human perception as the base line for conventional truths. Very limiting, yes.

I once had an interesting conversation with John Luc Achard on E-Sangha. There he asserted, for example, that dating Shenrab to something like 16000 years BCE was an "mystery" number used in the initiation of ZZNG, and that it was considered both historical and symbolic. But since he would not divulge the meaning, as you can imagine, the conversation did not progress much further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

The historical record that Bön has is its own historical writings.[/i].

Malcolm wrote:

That is not sufficient.

For example, Tibetans have a record of the Samye debate which derives from the Ba bzhad annals. It is just a political hatchet job against Chan.

Official Tibetan History has it that Langdarma destroyed Buddhism in the ninth century. But the real story is somewhat different.

Official Tibetan History has it that there was no writing Tibet prior to Srongtsan Gampo, but this is now under dispute; though whatever the case is, Tibetan and Zhang Zhung writing still clearly derive from Gupta script, which itself ultimately derives from Western Semitic, like all alphabets.

Merely having a record does not make it a historical record, nor does it make it true. For example, we have a very nice record of the Shambhala kings in the commentaries of Kalacakra. But the date of the Buddha in these texts is wrong, at least four hundred

years too early, and based on that, then we can assume that many other details of this cycle are wrong.

Zhang Zhung and Bon studies have found their Troy, but still await their Dead Sea Scrolls.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

If you accept ChNN's thesis i.e. that Bon philosophy was more or less completely derived from Buddhism, then in fact they Buddhism could not be influenced by Bon in that respect.

No, I do not accept this thesis and I doubt that this is the exact opinion of ChNN on this matter.

Malcolm wrote:

It is, but you go ask him.

Flow said:

He states in an essay about the history of Bön:

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing new here.

Flow said:

I sense you are of the Sakyapa lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

Like ChNN, I trained in Sakya for many years. I still have connections with the Sakya school.

Flow said:

Buddhism and with it Dzogchen and other practices are eternal teachings: dharma - not bound to any place or time. So why should there not be different lineages teaching the same without having substantially been influenced by another?

Malcolm wrote:

Certainly, this is a possibility. But, when it comes to Buddhism, there are very specific features that identify a teachings as Buddhist which permeate Buddhist teachings even through Dzogchen.

Though, here you are mixing up terms: Sanātana Dharma is a Hindu term.

Now, I understand the main point of your argument, namely, that Bon preserves a non-Indic form of Buddhism that in no way depends on Indic Buddhism for its nine yanas. Respectfully, I completely disagree with this assessment. In my opinion Bon completely depends on Indic Buddhism for things like Mahāyāna, Madhyamaka and so on. For example, Dan Martin recently speculated on his blog, Tibeto-logic, that Buddhist sūtras present in the Bon canon are not forgeries, but in fact earlier, abandoned translations (albeit altered to fit a Bon context).

Flow said:

Or do you actually don't think your own metaphysical system to apply [Realm of Clear Light, Gods descending from there to teach etc.]?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a Tibetan myth. I do not take it literally, even though HH Sakya Trizen may -- that is his prerogative.

If you examine the clan histories of ancient Aristocratic families in Tibet, they always are claiming to be the descendants of this or that god. The story of the origins of the Khon clan don't have anything at all do with Buddhism, per se. The story of the Khon clan serves the reinforce the notion that the Khon are special, a little extraordinary, and therefore, more suited to be lineage holders than mere mortals like you and I.

Flow said:

I sense some heavy Western materialism there...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are writing it to entertain yourself with your own hyperbole, which you obviously relish.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Because there are no copies of the scriptures that by some method can not be dated farther back than 1000 AD.? Is this reason enough for you to deride a complete lineage and refuse to accept that Tibet had a religion before Buddhism came there? "

Virtually all Bon texts that we have, even most of ZZNG, is terma. That is fine, but you can't date terma texts earlier than their discovery unless you have some earlier texts to compare them to.

You will note that I have not impugned the spiritual value of any of the Bon teachings. Not once.

You will also note, for example, that I do not think it is very likely that Sakyamuni Buddha taught the Lanka. The Lanka, and indeed all Mahāyāna sūtras, tantras, etc., are in my opinion, later compositions. I think there is ample reason to think this is so. I also think it does not destroy their spiritual value at all. I apply the same standard to Bon.

As such, I regard Bon as more or less one more branch on the Buddhist tree, albeit a rather late one, and one that has largely forgotten and neglected its autochthonic teachings, favoring ones imported from India.

Naturally, I expect Bonpos to disagree. They are entitled to. But as you note, there is little, if no, proof of Bon claims to the contrary. That does not mean Bon claims are necessarily false (though in the case of things like borrowed Buddhist texts, this is indisputable), it just means that Bonpos have no record to fall back on in history and archaeology.

Re: Zhang Zhung -- yes, there was a place named Zhang Zhung. It collapsed because of climate change, if you follow Belleza's argument. Also its last king, Lugmincha, was assassinated on the orders of Songtsan Gampo in the 7th century. At this point very little archaeology has been done and we have yet to find any cache of Zhang Zhung texts. If and when we do, then we can rewrite early Tibetan history. Until then, we are left only with fragmentary reports in texts written in a different language. Anything else is either speculation or blind faith.

Incidentally, history and realization are two different things entirely. You should be grateful for materialist science, without it you would not have a web forum to be outraged upon.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Bon has no such historical record.

I stated earlier that most of the traces of Bön are lost to history.

Malcolm wrote:

Can you please tell us what the difference is between these two statements?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 10:04 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

What's going on is that there are a lot of people who take what their traditions report as being to be true, as you yourself are.

So these traditions state that Bön should be disregarded as superstitious nonsense?

Malcolm wrote:

Some of them. You can choose to disregard what they say.

Flow said:

Surely you do not mean to imply that Buddhist Dzogchen derives from Bon?

Surely you want to imply that it was the other way around, yes?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen as clear antecedents in Indian Buddhist texts such as Guhyagarbha, etc.

Flow said:

On page 31-33 of the aforementioned book by ChNN you can read what he has to say about that... Or you could go on and claim that he refuted all of that by now.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN once speculated that perhaps Zhang Zhung Garab and Garab Dorje might be the same person. I don't believe he presently holds that view. You should ask him.

Flow said:

Buddhism per se ie. core doctrines have not been influenced by Bon at all.

How could they - if they were the same?

Malcolm wrote:

If you accept ChNN's thesis i.e. that Bon philosophy was more or less completely derived from Buddhism, then in fact they Buddhism could not be influenced by Bon in that respect.

Flow said:

This whole debate is basically pointless.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, which why I am surprised you are bothering with it. Buddhism has a very clear historical record. Bon, unfortunately, does not. What Bon has is a large number of texts,

none of which can be dated earlier than the 10th century CE. That is the physical limitation imposed by the physical record of Bon culture. The rest is speculative.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 8:26 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhism and Bon

Content:

Flow said:

Well, in lack of a copy - I have to assume that what you write is correct. Given that I still see no indication of the above statement that we were actually discussing to be true: that Buddhism was not influenced by Bön and that rather Bön was influenced by Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism per se ie. core doctrines have not been influenced by Bon at all.

Flow said:

Dzogchen was originally a Bön practice

Malcolm wrote:

Surely you do not mean to imply that Buddhist Dzogchen derives from Bon?

Flow said:

What is going on here? Seriously? And I don't mean you now, Namdrol - since you made a remark which is valid and has no further implications - until one imposes them. But this is not the first time I read and heard people talk like this about Bön ['Bön is a degenerated teaching' etc.] - and actually ChNN also reports about this contempt toward Bön from different Tibetan schools of Buddhism. And that is what shocks me - regardless whether I practice it myself or not.

Malcolm wrote:

What's going on is that there are a lot of people who take what their traditions report as being to be true, as you yourself are.

B

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 6:58 AM

Title: Re: "Theravada and Mahayana Buddhism"

Content:

Flow said:

I do not expect you to believe me. That is why I gave you the link to the book of your venerable and beloved teacher.

And just to let you know: There are at least three lineages of Dzogchen... One of them is described in the Zhang Zhung Nyan Gyud - one of the classical Bön teachings....

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know. I have the entire ZZNG in Tibetan. I am capable of reading it in the original. It is a very wonderful teaching.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: "Theravada and Mahayana Buddhism"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"He makes it very clear in this particular essay that he sees Bön as the original teaching in Tibet which already was fully established before Shakyamuni's Buddhism came to Tibet."

Yes. But not in the form you imagine.

You need to read his Drung De'u and Bon. Then you will find out that ChNN thinks that the original, pre-Buddhist Bon was divided into twelve lores, etc.

He says in this book, ppg. xvii-xviii: "The five Bon of the Fruit contain mainly teachings that can be found in Mahāyāna and Tantrayāna Buddhist traditions, so one can assume that they were introduced into Bon in a period later than that of the twelve lores; the authenticity and originality of the nine and last "way", comprising the Dzogchen teachings, alone is beyond doubt as its historical inception can be correlated with the kingdom of Shang Shung. In any case we can hypothesize that the Bonpos absorbed elements of Buddhism without recognizing them as such, as some scholars maintain, or that they did so in order to survive to counter the great success of the Buddhist faith. The fact remains that in the contemporary Bonpo canon can be found some of the most important Buddhist texts albeit with different titles, and even the biography of Shenrab Miwoche emulates that of Shakyamuni Buddha. There may have been valid reasons for this work of transforming and adaptation of Buddhist elements, perhaps for the very preservation of the authentic Bon teachings, but this principle was soon forgotten and the importance of the original traditions was neglected in favor of the philosophical teachings derived from Buddhism."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: "Theravada and Mahayana Buddhism"

Content:

Flow said:

I do not except you to believe me. That is why I gave you the link to the book of your venerable and beloved teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

I have it, I have read it. I happen to know there are some opinions in it which ChNN no longer stands by.

He mostly wrote that book to open up debate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: "Theravada and Mahayana Buddhism"

Content:

Flow said:

Such unsubstantiated claims are of no avail.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course I am going to believe you, rather than what my own teacher has said in my presence many times.

If you are really curious about what ChNN thinks, go ask him. Apparently you will very surprised to find out what he thinks about modern day Bon (as opposed to original Bon which had no Abhidharma, Tantra, Perfection of Wisdom, etc.).

Yes, he thinks that there was Dzogchen in Bon prior to Buddhism. But he thinks that is confined to twelve short lines that do not constitute a complete path. You can read about them in his Precious Vase.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

I am not disagreeing with you that in terms of samsara, karma is the manifestation of volition.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is only volition. Apples don't have that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: "Theravada and Mahayana Buddhism"

Content:

Flow said:

I know that this topic was discussed a while ago - but I have to add something to this discussion. The way Bön is presented here is not acceptable. I practice Bön and are pretty well educated about its history and teaching - and what I have read in this thread is - stating it plain and simply: wrong.

Things that have been said here are for example:

'It would more or less be the other way around Bon is more influenced by Buddhism '

'For Buddhism in Tibet to become influenced towards Bon would make it degenerate wouldnt you agree ?'

Wow. This must come either out of complete ignorance or out of ill intention. If the author of these statements would stop speculating in his delusion about other Buddhist teachings and simply ask an authority on that question or look it up - he knew that this is utter nonsense.

Somebody else referred to Chögyal Namkhai Norbu's writings. I will restate this again: Please educate yourself before you spread such misleading claims. The writings of Chögyal Namkhai Norbu are always recommended - but especially when it comes to the history of Tibet, Bön and Zhang Zhung... This offensive behavior does not only harm your spiritual practice but may also mislead others. So please refrain from it.

For the sake of setting the record straight in this thread I will post a short introduction into Bön along with a short historic overview:

Malcolm wrote:

In the interest of setting the record straight:

This statement "It would more or less be the other way around Bon is more influenced by Buddhism '", happens to be Norbu Rinpoche's opinion, one which I have personally heard him state on many, many occasions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Why does an apple suddenly fall from a branch at the very second that it does, and not one second earlier and not one second later? The wind, the Sun, the season, all these and millions of other factors interact, and these are all the causes that result in that apple dropping. Oh yes, and let's not forget gravity. This, in the simplest sense of the word, is karma.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not karma, this is cause and condition.

Karma, the Buddha said, is volition and what proceeds from volition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Use of the term 'Hinayāna'

Content:

Namdrol said:

He did, but he was corrected on this point by Gorampa.

Tsongkhpa is not Candrakirti.

Astus said:

OK, so it is not that there isn't such form of Madhyamaka but rather that you take a view that doesn't accept it just like many others don't agree with the Gelug interpretation (not to mention those who have never even heard of it). No big deal really, there are many views in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa asserted that what you report as Candrakirti's view. But he did so by ignoring other things that Candrakirti said which bring focus on what Candra was actually intending.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Mag761138 said:

There is no "my mental continuum" or "your mental continuum", there's just a mental continuum.

Namdrol said:

If you accept that there is a mental continuum, and you accept that mental continuum is afflicted, you have a sufficient basis for accepting rebirth without any need to imagine an integral self driving the process.

N

Mag761138 said:

Not at all. I am thinknig far more of A.N. Whitehead's concept of "Objective Immortality" in his Process metaphysics far more than Buddhist notions of rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

The doctrine of Karma in Buddhism is an aesthetic moral theory. Moral actions garner pleasant results, immoral actions garner unpleasant results. Therefore, all happiness and all suffering is result of one's own moral or immoral acts in this or in past lives.

If you can't accept that, than Buddhism will be a constant source of frustration for you and you will waste a lot of intellectual energy trying to get Buddhism to fit your needs. In the end, you will give up Buddhism. So, it is better perhaps not even to start. One does not need to be a Buddhist to meditate, or be a nice person, or even a profoundly spiritual, compassionate person etc.

If you wish to be free of suffering and its causes, however, then Buddhism is your only solution.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

what is incense other than a blend of fragrant herbs, spices and resins?

Malcolm wrote:

Incense is medicine, and to be made properly it needs to be compounded properly, with the proper rites, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Mag761138 said:

There is no "my mental continuum" or "your mental continuum", there's just a mental continuum.

Malcolm wrote:

If you accept that there is a mental continuum, and you accept that mental continuum is afflicted, you have a sufficient basis for accepting rebirth without any need to imagine an integral self driving the process.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Use of the term 'Hinayāna'

Content:

Namdrol said:

We don't agree that a certain Madhyamaka teaching teaches this.

Astus said:

Didn't Tsongkhapa argue that even sravakas realise the emptiness of both personality and phenomena?

Malcolm wrote:

He did, but he was corrected on this point by Gorampa.

Tsongkhpa is not Candrakirti.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nope, absolutely not -- they are referring gla rtsi, which comes from the so-called "musk deer", *Moschus moschiferus*.

gregkavarnos said:

How incredibly unfortunate! So how do they justify putting it in riwo sang cho incense then?

That's why, in 99% of cases, it's always better to make ones own incense, especially for ritual use.

Malcolm wrote:

Musk and musk deer leather, tusks, and so on, and so on are also very antiseptic and used for dispelling negative spirits. It is one of the main medicines used to repel spirit provocations too. Musk deer tusks at one time were used as needles for blood-letting since they will not cause infections.

For sang offerings, it is not necessary to use an incense. One can use herbs, sage, juniper, etc.

There are some incenses made for use in lower tantra that do not have musk. People who follow the system of lower tantra should use these.

Generally musk, gugul and so on are used in anuttarayoga tantra incense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

Namdrol said:

Vegans and vegetarians should never, ever, use Tibetan Incense, because all good quality Tibetan incense has quite a bit of real musk in it.

Musk is also a very important substance in Tibetan and Ayurvedic medicine.

N

Huseng said:

I didn't know that. That's a useful piece of information, indeed.

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, the smell of musk is not attractive of certain kinds of provocations and so on, which is one of the reasons why it's use is so prevalent in Tibetan incense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I would have to say that the positive aspect of getting everybody to wear Dharma clothes (especially the pants/skirt) is the fact that no one will turn up wearing hot pants or super mini skirts which can be awfully distracting for a lusty character such as myself! Boy have I seen some super sexy clothing at Dharma centres over the past few years! <-

-- that's me the chauvanist pig

Malcolm wrote:

Consider an offering, sense object goddesses making offering to sense organ god.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Use of the term 'Hinayāna'

Content:

Astus said:

Based on a certain Madhyamaka teaching if we agree that arhats realise the same emptiness as bodhisattvas and buddhas

Malcolm wrote:

We don't agree that a certain Madhyamaka teaching teaches this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The musk they are referring to may be plant based (*Pelargonium odoratissimum*, *Geraniaceae*) like that used in

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, absolutely not -- they are referring *gla rtsi*, which comes from the so-called "musk deer", *Moschus moschiferus*.

The musk deer belongs to the family *Moschidae* and lives in India, Pakistan, Tibet, China, Siberia and Mongolia. To obtain the musk, the deer is killed and its gland, also called "musk pod", is removed. Upon drying, the reddish-brown paste inside the musk pod turns into a black granular material called "musk grain", which is then tinctured with alcohol. The aroma of the tincture gives a pleasant odor only after it is considerably diluted. No other natural substance has such a complex aroma associated with so many contradictory descriptions; however, it is usually described abstractly as animalic, earthy and woody[3] or something akin to the odor of baby's skin.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Musk> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Vegans and vegetarians should never, ever, use Tibetan Incense, because all good quality Tibetan incense has quite a bit of real musk in it.

Musk is also a very important substance in Tibetan and Ayurvedic medicine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Use of the term 'Hīnayāna'

Content:

ananda said:

What is your opinion ?

Should Hīnayāna continue to be used to refer to the Theravāda teachings or should it be avoided ?

Do you think the term is derogatory ?

Dexing said:

I learned the terms Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna as "Small" and "Large" Vehicles due to the scope of their doctrines on Śūnyatā.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not how the term is applied in Mahāyāna sūtras and treatises themselves. This is gloss used in the term in countries where is no pure Nikāya school Sangha.

Dexing said:

In that sense they are Small and Large Vehicles respectively, and the term Small Vehicle (Hīnayāna) is not derogatory, but descriptive.

Malcolm wrote:

It is still derogatory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol and/or others knowledgeable about this practice -

I recently received the transmission of a sang practice (from ChNN)... It so happens I purchased some "Riwo Sangchod" incense a while back and when looking at the box noticed it contains musk. Is this a problem? Do sang offerings need to be free of animal products?

Also, can sang be offered any time of day or must it be morning?

Malcolm wrote:

Sang does not need to be free of musk. But don't use that stuff for Naga Pujas!

Sang is usually offered in the morning. But can be offered at other times as well.

You can use any fragrant herbs or sage, etc., for burning in sang. It just has to smell nice, does not have to be juniper, etc.

Juniper however is used because of its antiseptic properties and sang does mean "to cleanse".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: Use of the term 'Hīnayāna'

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The term Hīnayāna, inferior vehicle, is derogatory, and in terms of the way it is used in Mahāyāna sūtras, intentionally so.

Since all Tibetan Buddhists are Mahāyānis, they don't feel slighted by the term and even go to some lengths to try and give "hīnayāna" props.

However, Tibetan Buddhists are notoriously ignorant of the actual content and context of many of doctrines to which they adhere. Why? Because they rely on abstracted commentaries on India sutra material, such as Sutra-alaṃkāra etc., rather than actual sutras.

A quick read of the Sutra-alaṃkāra will quickly demonstrate to any clear thinking person that the author of that text had a definitely low opinion of non-Mahāyāna schools.

The question is, is the Mahāyāna use of the term justifiable?

Well, if you turn away from intending to achieve full buddhahood [as defined by Mahāyānists], then you are turning to an inferior yāna, from a Mahāyāna perspective. There are a number of other reason why the doctrine the Buddha taught in the Agamas/Nikayas are regarded as inferior as well. Not in the sense that any of the Buddha's teachings are inferior, but in terms of the intended audience. Mahāyānists use the term to describe an inferior motivation, cessation, arhatship, etc., in an effort to dissuade those who might abandon the heroic eons long mission of attaining full awakening.

On the other hand, it is also important to bear in mind that Vajrayāna texts are similarly critical of those who avoid or do not have faith in Vajrayāna -- for example, the Hevajra Tantra refers to those Buddhists who follow lower tantra and ordinary Mahāyāna as "tirthikas", a term usually meant for non-Buddhists.

So when these terms are used, they are not meant to be categories for ranking teachings overall (and this is the great Tibetan Buddhist hermeneutical error). Instead, the term hīnayāna should only be used with Mahāyāna audiences when the teacher in question is describing the inferiority of the desiring to attain the result of an arhat or a pratyekabuddha as opposed to full buddhahood.

In terms of the whole of Buddhism, however, we are only the fourth largest religion of the planet. In ecumenical Buddhist gatherings it is skillful to avoid using the term "hīnayāna" because it is intentionally derogatory and because there are those who find it offensive, understandably so. We also run the risk of insulting aryas by using the term carelessly.

It does not mean however that when we are discussing with other Mahāyānists where Theravāda would be placed in the Mahāyāna scheme of things, that we should pretend that Theravāda is something other than a Hīnayāna school.

This being said, just because someone has ordained in Theravāda does not mean that they are necessarily a hīnayāna practitioner. Just as there were Mahāyānis in other Hīnayāna schools, likewise there have been and are Mahāyanis in Theravada.

But Theravāda itself, like Mulasarvastivada, etc. is a hīnayāna school when considered from the perspective of Mahāyāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Enochian said:

I have yet to see someone tell it like it is, like I do in my signature.

Pema Rigdzin said:

This is because you haven't yet received Dzogchen transmission and you've read very few Dzogchen texts. The explanations about the mirror and kadag and lhundrub and their inseparability are skillful means to bring about understanding and possibly trigger insight, but they are not meditated upon. So from that point of view they are not the main point. Instead, one relaxes with an utter lack of modification or fabrication or placement or objectification of any kind; though even these words can be misleading because there can be a great resemblance between rigpa and the state of non-conceptual quiescence, even though in reality there is the most profound difference between the two. This is of course why the guru is indispensable: first in terms of helping one recognize one's primordial state and then guiding one so one can stay on

course and not fall into deviations that can be difficult to apprehend.

Enochian said:

Well let me ask you or anyone else this.

The key thing in Dzogchen is distinguishing sems from rigpa.

Thus you need some sort of obvious characteristic of sems to distinguish it.

Do any Dzogchen teachings point out the obvious distinguishing characteristic of sems i.e. sems (mind) is always on the Three Times?

I haven't read anything regarding this in Dzogchen material, even though it is quite obvious.....

Malcolm wrote:

The most obvious distinguishing characteristic of sems is conceptuality. Time is not established per se, it is a conceptual construct.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

But if I were attending one of ChNN's centers, for instance, it seems like it would be more appropriate to just wear comfortable western style clothes and blend in that way.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, wearing Ngagpa gear is sure to provoke stares and eye-rolling. Of course, you can wear Vajra dance supervira costume if you are a vajra dancer and no one will blink.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Enochian said:

But so is Dzogchen with its endless mirror analogies, and intellectual concepts such as kadag, inseparability etc.

Namdrol said:
That's not Dzogchen.

Enochian said:
Ok I have to take your word for it, since I am not a Dzogchen practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:
The difference is that Dzogchen is experiential while Mahdyamaka is analytical.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 3:09 AM
Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?
Content:

Enochian said:
But so is Dzogchen with its endless mirror analogies, and intellectual concepts such as kadag, inseperability etc.

Malcolm wrote:
That's not Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 2:29 AM
Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?
Content:

Enochian said:
I am an obsessed follower of Mādhyamaka philosophy...

Malcolm wrote:
Then there is no hope for you at all. Madhyamaka is not to followed, it is to be used to pacify proliferations, including the one called "Madhyamaka".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 1:24 AM
Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?
Content:

Serenity509 said:
Why is belief in reincarnation a requirement of following the Buddha? Must one believe in reincarnation to attain supreme joy and peace of mind?

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

"Dharma Lite" Versus "The Real Thing" Dharma

http://www.berzinarchives.com/web/en/archives/approaching_buddhism/introduction/dharma_lite.html

Malcolm wrote:

The only problem with this Article is that the term "Dharma-lite" was not coined by Berzin -- I remember seeing it bandied about back in the hoary days of Buddha-L.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

mindyourmind said:

If the Mahamudra POI is a process that takes months, how is Mahamudra supposed to be so well suited for Western students?

Malcolm wrote:

Kagyu Mahamudra is gradual and experiential, so some people think it is a more suitable instruction for acquainting people with the nature of the mind.

Dzogchen introduction is also experiential, but it really depends on the student's acumen to get it since it is not as gradual and step by step.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2011 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The closest thing to collective or social karma I've ever seen, can be found in Jamgon Mipham "Gateway to Knowledge Vol II" Rangjung Yeshe Publications.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, all of this action is individually engaged in and accumulated. Nations, states, towns, cities, villages, and hamlets do not have their own karma, so to speak.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 18th, 2011 at 10:11 PM
Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes
Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Hm, societies have no karma of their own?

Malcolm wrote:
Nope.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 18th, 2011 at 8:22 PM
Title: Re: Chosing the right master
Content:
spanda said:
Hi

From what i understood, in Vajrayana tradition, it is important to have a fully prepared master. I remember that I read that the process of "testing" the master (to see if it is a genuine one or a fake one?) before embarking on the path could take even 12 years (!). Is this true? Can someone give me some quotes, or some tittles to read in detail about this?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:
Well, in the beginning, a safe bet is to pick a lineage head like HH Dalai Lama, HH Sakya Trizen, one of the Karmapas, etc.

Then, later, when one has more knowledge and so on, one can choose other teachers.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 18th, 2011 at 7:36 PM
Title: Re: Thoughts
Content:
muni said:
One fixated thought =phenomenon is born.
Focus by following thought = me is born.

Malcolm wrote:
Pretty sure you have the order reversed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2011 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Animal By-products & Karmic Debts

Content:

Kyosan said:

Whether there is a karmic debt or not, one of the practices in Buddhism is to avoid causing other beings to suffer. Using animal byproducts causes animals to suffer, maybe not directly but certainly indirectly.

In addition to thinking about our own karma, I think it's also important to think about the suffering of others. That is compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course we need to think of the suffering of others.

The question, as always, is motivation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2011 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Commitment Issues

Content:

Namdrol said:

Most people have this idea that their root guru is the one who gives them their main practice. That is not true. The root guru is the one who gives someone their understanding of the nature of their mind, which is what makes all practices fruitful.

N

mr. gordo said:

Hi Namdrol,

Question for you, what does it mean if a person finds a practice they like, but doesn't feel a strong connection to the Guru? Can a strong preference for a practice over-ride the lack of having a strong connection to a teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

All Gurus are reflections of your root guru.

So yes, practice what you are attracted to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2011 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

If in each new life, you are born with no memories and bad habits of the past, that's like a new chance to live the dharma each time. Eventually, you would live a life that attains nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

That however is not how it works in Buddhism. This sutta is instructive:

At Savatthi. Then, early in the morning, Cala the nun put on her robes and, taking her bowl & outer robe, went into Savatthi for alms. When she had gone for alms in Savatthi and had returned from her alms round, after her meal she went to the Grove of the Blind to spend the day. Having gone deep into the Grove of the Blind, she sat down at the foot of a tree for the day's abiding.

Then Mara the Evil One, wanting to arouse fear, horripilation, & terror in her, wanting to make her fall away from concentration, approached her & said, "What is it that you don't approve of, nun?"

"I don't approve of birth, my friend."

[Mara:]

Why don't you approve of birth?

One who is born

enjoys sensual pleasures.

Who on earth

ever persuaded you:

'Nun, don't approve of birth'?

[Sister Cala:]

For one who is born

there's death.

One who is born

sees pain.

It's a binding, a flogging, a torment.

That's why one shouldn't approve

of birth.

The Awakened One taught me the Dhamma

— the overcoming of birth —

for the abandoning of all pain,

he established me in
the truth.

But beings who have come to form
& those with a share in the formless,
if they don't discern cessation,
return to becoming-again.

Then Mara the Evil One — sad & dejected at realizing, "Cala the nun knows me" —
vanished right there.

<http://www.accesstosight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn05/sn05.006.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

As is this one:

I have heard that on one occasion the Blessed One was staying near Savatthi in Jeta's Grove, Anathapindika's monastery. Then Subha the student, Todeyya's son, went to the Blessed One and, on arrival, exchanged courteous greetings with him. After an exchange of friendly greetings & courtesies, he sat to one side. As he was sitting there, he said to the Blessed One: "Master Gotama, what is the reason, what is the cause, why baseness & excellence are seen among human beings, among the human race? For short-lived & long-lived people are to be seen, sickly & healthy, ugly & beautiful, uninfluential & influential, poor & rich, low-born & high-born, stupid & discerning people are to be seen. So what is the reason, what is the cause, why baseness & excellence are seen among human beings, among the human race?"

"Students, beings are owners of kamma, heir to kamma, born of kamma, related through kamma, and have kamma as their arbitrator. Kamma is what creates distinctions among beings in terms of coarseness & refinement."

"I don't understand the detailed meaning of Master Gotama's statement spoken in brief without explaining the detailed meaning. It would be good if Master Gotama taught me the Dhamma so that I might understand the detailed meaning of his brief statement."

"In that case, student, listen & pay close attention. I will speak."

"As you say, Master Gotama," Subha the student responded.

The Blessed One said: "There is the case, student, where a woman or man is a killer of living beings, brutal, bloody-handed, given to killing & slaying, showing no mercy to living beings. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation, the bad destination, the lower realms, hell. If, on the break-up of the body, after death — instead of reappearing in the plane of deprivation, the bad destination, the lower realms, hell — he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is short-lived wherever reborn. This is the way leading to a short life: to be a killer of living beings, brutal, bloody-handed, given to killing & slaying, showing no mercy to living beings.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man, having abandoned the killing of living beings, abstains from killing living beings, and dwells with the rod laid down, the knife laid down, scrupulous, merciful, & sympathetic for the welfare of all living beings. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination, in the heavenly world. If, on the break-up of the body, after death — instead of reappearing in a good destination, in the heavenly world — he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is long-lived wherever reborn. This is the way leading to a long life: to have abandoned the killing of living beings, to abstain from killing living beings, to dwell with one's rod laid down, one's knife laid down, scrupulous, merciful, & sympathetic for the welfare of all living beings.

"There is the case where a woman or man is one who harms beings with his/her fists, with clods, with sticks, or with knives. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is sickly wherever reborn. This is the way leading to sickness: to be one who harms beings with one's fists, with clods, with sticks, or with knives.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is not one who harms beings with his/her fists, with clods, with sticks, or with knives. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is healthy wherever reborn. This is the way leading to health: not to be one who harms beings with one's fists, with clods, with sticks, or with knives.

"There is the case, where a woman or man is ill-tempered & easily upset; even when lightly criticized, he/she grows offended, provoked, malicious, & resentful; shows annoyance, aversion, & bitterness. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is ugly wherever reborn. This is the way leading to ugliness: to be ill-tempered & easily upset; even when lightly criticized, to grow offended, provoked, malicious, & resentful; to show annoyance, aversion, & bitterness.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is not ill-tempered or easily upset; even when heavily criticized, he/she doesn't grow offended, provoked, malicious, or resentful; doesn't show annoyance, aversion, or bitterness. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is beautiful wherever reborn. This is the way leading to beauty: not to be ill-tempered or easily upset; even when heavily criticized, not to be offended, provoked, malicious, or resentful; nor to show annoyance, aversion, & bitterness.

"There is the case where a woman or man is envious. He/she envies, begrudges, & broods about others' gains, honor, respect, reverence, salutations, & veneration. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the

human state, then he/she is not influential wherever reborn. This is the way leading to not being influential: to be envious, to envy, begrudge, & brood about others' gains, honor, respect, reverence, salutations, & veneration.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is not envious. He/she does not envy, begrudge, or brood about others' gains, honor, respect, reverence, salutations, or veneration. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, he/she is influential wherever reborn. This is the way leading to being influential: not to be envious; not to envy, begrudge, or brood about others' gains, honor, respect, reverence, salutations, or veneration.

"There is the case where a woman or man is not a giver of food, drink, cloth, sandals, garlands, scents, ointments, beds, dwellings, or lighting to priests or contemplatives. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, he/she is poor wherever reborn. This is the way leading to poverty: not to be a giver of food, drink, cloth, sandals, garlands, scents, ointments, beds, dwellings, or lighting to priests or contemplatives.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is a giver of food, drink, cloth, sandals, scents, ointments, beds, dwellings, & lighting to priests & contemplatives. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is wealthy wherever reborn. This is the way leading to great wealth: to be a giver of food, drink, cloth, sandals, garlands, scents, ointments, beds, dwellings, & lighting to priests & contemplatives.

"There is the case where a woman or man is obstinate & arrogant. He/she does not pay homage to those who deserve homage, rise up for those for whom one should rise up, give a seat to those to whom one should give a seat, make way for those for whom one should make way, worship those who should be worshipped, respect those who should be respected, revere those who should be revered, or honor those who should be honored. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is low-born wherever reborn. This is the way leading to a low birth: to be obstinate & arrogant, not to pay homage to those who deserve homage, nor rise up for... nor give a seat to... nor make way for... nor worship... nor respect... nor revere... nor honor those who should be honored.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is not obstinate or arrogant; he/she pays homage to those who deserve homage, rises up... gives a seat... makes way... worships... respects... reveres... honors those who should be honored. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is highborn wherever reborn. This is the way leading to a high birth: not to be obstinate or arrogant; to pay homage to those who deserve homage, to rise up... give a

seat... make way... worship... respect... revere... honor those who should be honored.

"There is the case where a woman or man when visiting a priest or contemplative, does not ask: 'What is skillful, venerable sir? What is unskillful? What is blameworthy? What is blameless? What should be cultivated? What should not be cultivated? What, having been done by me, will be for my long-term harm & suffering? Or what, having been done by me, will be for my long-term welfare & happiness?' Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she will be stupid wherever reborn. This is the way leading to stupidity: when visiting a priest or contemplative, not to ask: 'What is skillful?... Or what, having been done by me, will be for my long-term welfare & happiness?'

"But then there is the case where a woman or man when visiting a priest or contemplative, asks: 'What is skillful, venerable sir? What is unskillful? What is blameworthy? What is blameless? What should be cultivated? What should not be cultivated? What, having been done by me, will be for my long-term harm & suffering? Or what, having been done by me, will be for my long-term welfare & happiness?' Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is discerning wherever reborn. This is the way leading to discernment: when visiting a priest or contemplative, to ask: 'What is skillful?... Or what, having been done by me, will be for my long-term welfare & happiness?'

"So, student, the way leading to short life makes people short-lived, the way leading to long life makes people long-lived; the way leading to sickness makes people sickly, the way leading to health makes people healthy; the way leading to ugliness makes people ugly, the way leading to beauty makes people beautiful; the way leading to lack of influence makes people uninfluential, the way leading to influence makes people influential; the way leading to poverty makes people poor, the way leading to wealth makes people wealthy; the way leading to low birth makes people low-born, the way leading to high birth makes people high-born; the way leading to stupidity makes people stupid, the way leading to discernment makes people discerning.

Beings are owners of kamma, heir to kamma, born of kamma, related through kamma, and have kamma as their arbitrator. Kamma is what creates distinctions among beings in terms of coarseness & refinement....

When this was said, Subha the student, Todeyya's son, said to the Blessed One:

"Magnificent, Master Gotama! Magnificent! Just as if he were to place upright what was overturned, to reveal what was hidden, to show the way to one who was lost, or to carry a lamp into the dark so that those with eyes could see forms, in the same way has Master Gotama — through many lines of reasoning — made the Dhamma clear. I go to Master Gotama for refuge, to the Dhamma, and to the Community of monks. May Master Gotama remember me as a lay follower who has gone to him for refuge, from this day forward, for life."

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.135.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2011 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: DC Kalachakra 2011

Content:

kirtu said:

Kalachakra surprises

Malcolm wrote:

There were some other surprises as well.

Apart from the Namgyal monks, etc., on the stage, all the ordained people were required to sit behind lay people.

Mr Kalden Lodoe, the event organizer, had the president of the Tibetan Youth Congress, Tsewang Rigzin, physically expelled from the venue. See:

[http://www.phayul.com/news/article.aspx?id=29752&article=TYC+demands+apology+\(Updated\)](http://www.phayul.com/news/article.aspx?id=29752&article=TYC+demands+apology+(Updated)) "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

It seems the organizers made this one of the least non-sectarian Kalachakras in many years, at least this was the impression conveyed to me by a Tibetan monastic in attendance at the event.

Other masters who have traditionally assisted HHDL with Kalachakra were not invited to attend this year, for example, HHST.

This Kalachakra has emerged as one which marks tumultuous events in the exile Tibetan Community. Tibetans on web forums such as Phayul are spitting mad about what happened to Tsewang Rigzin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Unknown said:

Serenity509: With an infinite amount of time, won't nirvana happen eventually? How is the person then able to recall a past life?

Malcolm wrote:

Without following the path, no. Nirvana will never happen on its own. Nirvana requires discriminating insight which uproots afflictive emotions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Namdrol said:

First you are able to recall your own past lives, then eventually, you can know the minds of others and also see into their past lives.

Serenity509 said:

What is the evidence of this, of one being before the other?

Malcolm wrote:

The evidence of course, is all anecdotal. Nothing you can empirically test.

Normally however, they appear in a list that is not ordered or ranked.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Animal By-products & Karmic Debts

Content:

Dexing said:

Is there an extant Sanskrit version of it?

Malcolm wrote:

There are two Surangama samadhi sutras. One was composed in India, and was among the first sutras translated into Chinese. This one that you are citing from was composed in China in around the eighth century.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Namdrol said:

If one develops sufficient powers of samadhi, one can also examine other people's minds and see into their past lives as well.

N

Serenity509 said:

Like I asked before, how do you know then if you are examining your own past life instead of someone else's?

Malcolm wrote:

Knowledge of other people minds is a more developed type of clairvoyance that recall of one's past lives. First you are able to recall your own past lives, then eventually, you can know the minds of others and also see into their past lives.

This is all predicated on skill in samadhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 12:55 PM

Title: Re: Animal By-products & Karmic Debts

Content:

Dexing said:

Several months ago in the

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=3474&p=31274&hilit=connection+with+the+animal#p31274> thread I raised this question:

Where is it taught the use of animal products, and likewise meat-eating, creates a karmic connection with the animals in intentionally using their bodies to fulfill your "needs"? This may not be the karma of killing, but it creates a debt that must be repaid to them, which may result in rebirth as a service animal— a cow or such that is worked and exploited for milk and eventually meat, clothing, etc.— to rectify the outstanding balance due them.

To this Namdrol replied;

By the time the remains of an animal wind up on your plate, their consciousness is long gone, reborn. This is one of the reasons why Bhavaviveka rejects the idea that meat eating is necessarily bad karma. The meat on your plate, from his perspective, is inert.

It is hard to prove this karmic debt exists, through it is a popular idea.

I have come across the source text again that makes this statement on creating relationships with animals by using their by-products. It is in the Śūraṅgama Sūtra on the Four Clear and Decisive Instructions on Purity - killing.

"Bhikshus who do not wear silk, leather boots, furs, or down, whether imported or found locally, and who do not consume milk, cream, or butter, can truly transcend this world.

When they have paid back their past debts, they will not have to re-enter the Triple Realm. Why not? When someone wears anything taken from a living creature, he creates relationships with the creature, just as when people ate the hundred grains, their feet could not leave the earth. Both physically and mentally one must avoid the bodies and the by-products of beings, by neither wearing them nor eating them. I say that such people have true liberation. What I have said here is the Buddhas' teaching. Any explanation counter to it is the teaching of Papiyan(demon king)."

Malcolm wrote:

I assume this the Chinese Surangama and not the Indian one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 12:50 PM

Title: Re: affirming mind in an intellectual climate of materialism

Content:

coldmountain said:

Anyone have any advice for a fellow sojourner trying to navigate the maze that is the philosophy of mind with the simple aim of maintaining a spiritual practice?

Mike

Malcolm wrote:

Study Abhidharma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 12:49 PM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

How is the person then able to recall a past life?

Malcolm wrote:

Your question implies you believe there must be something real or ultimate to convey memories from instant a to instant b.

I answered your question above.

The serial moments of a mind stream carries past impressions. Under the power of samadhi these impressions will unlock one's pastlife experiences.

If one develops sufficient powers of samadhi, one can also examine other people's minds and see into their past lives as well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 12:34 PM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Enochian said:

Yes but according to every level of buddhism, you need to have something called the divya caksus to have PERSONAL EXPERIENCE with rebirth.

Huseng said:

Not necessarily. With sufficient mastery of dhyāna one will recollect past lives.

Enochian said:

The divya caksus IS used from within dhyāna, the fourth dhyāna to be exact.

My whole point is though is that one cannot have PERSONAL EXPERIENCE with rebirth unless one has these abilities.

Malcolm wrote:

The divine has to do with seeing gods, not recalling past lives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 12:33 PM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

How can one recall the memories of past lives if there is no enduring self?

Malcolm wrote:

A given stream of consciousness composed of a unique series of moments which are neither the same as nor different from one another. Therefore, memories, thoughts, and so on can be communicated down this unique mind stream without this mind stream bearing a real intrinsic identity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 12:12 PM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

I think this is relevant to almost any discussion we have:

Namdrol said:

Buddhism is not a "invent it was we go along" type of religion.

Also, insisting on the vital role rebirth plays in Buddha's teaching is not the same thing as speculatively insisting that one's own views are correct where everyone else's are wrong.

N

Serenity509 said:

Did Buddha say think and discover for yourself or accept his teaching based on hearsay?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha said that one must hear the teachings, reflect on their meaning, and meditate upon them.

But that does not mean that Buddha did not set out the path and the nature of consciousness, and so on in a very precise and detailed way. He drew the map, it is up to those who wish to follow it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 11:52 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

I think this is relevant to almost any discussion we have:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is not a "invent it was we go along" type of religion.

Also, insisting on the vital role rebirth plays in Buddha's teaching is not the same thing as speculatively insisting that one's own views are correct where everyone else's are wrong.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa is not knowledge of emptiness

Content:

xabir said:

Sorry a noob question (if this has been discussed before please point out).

If Dzogchen does not admit the two truths, how does it explain dependent arising?

Malcolm wrote:

Relative truth is not true.

But even Nāgārjuna rejects the two truths:

"Since the Jina proclaims that nirvana alone is true,
what wise person would not reject the rest as false?"

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 10:56 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Namdrol said:

But that is not Buddhism. Buddhism is predicated on the goal of ending rebirth in samsara through the eradication of the three poisons, desire, hatred and confusion, which arise because of ignorance.

Serenity509 said:

Is this true? -

In Buddhism the concept of liberation is Nirvana. It is referred to as "the highest happiness" and is the goal of the Theravada-Buddhist path, while in the Mahayana it is seen as a secondary effect of becoming a fully enlightened Buddha (Samyaksambuddha).

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moksha#Buddhism> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

In order to become a fully awakened Buddha one must eradicate the three poisons caused by ignorance which result in rebirth in samsara.

There are two obscurations, the afflictive obscuration caused by the three poisons, and the knowledge obscuration. To attain the result that is the desiderate of Theravada, one must only remove the first. From a Mahāyāna perspective, one must remove both completely in order to become a Buddha.

But in both cases, it is necessary to cease having rebirth in samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Whether or not you believe in it, why not look at reincarnation as a net positive? Why not appreciate the journey?

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth happens because our minds are tainted with three poisons.

Serenity509 said:

As a Westerner, I have trouble believing in any concept of the afterlife without sufficient evidence.

Malcolm wrote:

That's fine but that is not the point.

The point is that Buddha not only taught rebirth, but he defined the four types of awakened people [stream entrants, once returners, never returners and arhats] by how many rebirths they had remaining before they would achieve nirvana.

It is true that he did not equate worldly happiness with belief in rebirth, since there were plenty of people in India during his day who also did not believe in rebirth. That is why he taught the brahmaviharas to lay people. The practice of them guarantees mental happiness whether one should accept rebirth or not.

But that is not Buddhism. Buddhism is predicated on the goal of ending rebirth in samsara through the eradication of the three poisons, desire, hatred and confusion, which arise because of ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 9:35 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are many so called "Buddhists" who pervert the Dharma for their own ends.

Rebirth is not an option in Buddhism, despite what some deluded fools might think.

Serenity509 said:

There is no question that many Buddhists, East and West, continue to believe in individual reincarnation. Parables from the sutras and "teaching aids" like the Tibetan Wheel of Life tend to reinforce this belief.

The Rev. Takashi Tsuji, a Jodo Shinshu priest, wrote about belief in reincarnation:

"It is said that the Buddha left 84,000 teachings; the symbolic figure represents the diverse backgrounds characteristics, tastes, etc. of the people. The Buddha taught according to the mental and spiritual capacity of each individual. For the simple village folks living during the time of the Buddha, the doctrine of reincarnation was a powerful moral lesson. Fear of birth into the animal world must have frightened many people from acting like animals in this life. If we take this teaching literally today we are confused because we cannot understand it rationally.

"...A parable, when taken literally, does not make sense to the modern mind. Therefore we must learn to differentiate the parables and myths from actuality."

What's the Point?

People often turn to religion for doctrines that provide simple answers to difficult questions. Buddhism doesn't work that way. Merely believing in some doctrine about reincarnation or rebirth has no purpose. Buddhism is a practice that enables experiencing illusion as illusion and reality as reality.

<http://buddhism.about.com/od/karmaandbirth/a/reincarnation.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Shin Buddhists

Malcolm wrote:

"The bodhisattva who established the vow to liberate all sentient beings in the universe through the utterance of his name and who became Amida Buddha through its fulfillment. The Primal Vow and the aeons of religious practice that was necessary for its fulfillment are, strictly speaking, those of Bodhisattva Dharmakara."

Without rebirth, there would have been no Amitabha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

One does not have to believe in rebirth in order to follow the teachings of the dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no point in following Buddhadharma if you do not accept rebirth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

While I do not believe in reincarnation...

Namdrol said:

Then Buddhism is definitely not for you.

Serenity509 said:

If there is no other world and there is no fruit and ripening of actions well done or ill done, then here and now in this life I shall be free from hostility, affliction, and anxiety, and I shall live happily. - Siddhārtha Gautama

Malcolm wrote:

He was not teaching the Kalamas transcendent Dharma. He was teaching them the worldly dharma of the four brahma viharas.

As I said, if you don't believe in rebirth, Buddhist Dharma is not for you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

platypus said:

I see the dharmakaya explained as where all buddhas emanate from like a ground of being...

Namdrol said:

Buddhism does not propose a truly existent ground of being.

platypus said:

So all dharmas do not arise from dharmakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

No, they do not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

That is a contradiction in terms -- from what causes and conditions would such a ground of being originate?

Buddhist logic on this is airtight. There is nothing in the universe that is not dependently originated. Whatever is dependently originated is free from the extremes of existence and non-existence. Since there are no beings in a dependently originated universe, there also no ground of being. What is the use of a ground of being if there are no beings for which it is purported to be a ground?

N

platypus said:

that's what advaita says too, that jiva are ultimately one with brahman and simply maya.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no jiva, from a Buddhist POV. Nor is there Brahmin.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation: A gift or a curse?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

While I do not believe in reincarnation...

Malcolm wrote:

Then Buddhism is definitely not for you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Lung disease unique to Vajrayana?

Content:

Jinzang said:

Rlung disorders do not just happen to pranayama practitioners. Hakuin is a famous example of Zen practitioner who developed a rlung disorder as a result of his strenuous meditation. He describes it in his autobiography, Wild Ivy, and how he was taught a meditation to cure it by a cave dwelling ascetic.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, vatta disorders can be caused by straining too hard in meditation, thinking too much, not getting enough sleep, too much sex, all kinds of things.

Classically, however, prāṇayāma practitioners are at a much higher risk for vatta disorders than other people.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

platypus said:

I see the dharmakaya explained as where all buddhas emanate from like a ground of being...

Namdrol said:

Buddhism does not propose a truly existent ground of being.

Enochian said:

What about a dependently originated ground of being?

Malcolm wrote:

That is a contradiction in terms -- from what causes and conditions would such a ground of being originate?

Buddhist logic on this is airtight. There is nothing in the universe that is not dependently originated. Whatever is dependently originated is free from the extremes of existence and non-existence. Since there are no beings in a dependently originated universe, there also no ground of being. What is the use of a ground of being if there are no beings for which it is purported to be a ground?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: "Ego" and Buddhism

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Language is not a fixed thing. It is a constantly changing, ever-redefining process of communication.

Most words undergo a series of rebirths, taking on a variety of meanings until sometimes their original meaning is lost.

This is very common in all languages. it is just the way words are.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, "dashboard".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

platypus said:

I see the dharmakaya explained as where all buddhas emanate from like a ground of being...

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism does not propose a truly existent ground of being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

Namdrol said:

... Societies are biological entities that use all available resources until they are exhausted. Then they die and something else comes along to feed off of the corpse. ...

Inge said:

Do they have an identity, a sense of "I"?

Malcolm wrote:

No more than a plant does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Dynamic of being

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Erik Pema Kunsangs translation is basically the same...

"The ground of self-existing awareness is like a sphere of crystal,
The emptiness of the crystal sphere is the nature of dharmakaya,
Its natural expression of clarity is sambhogakaya,
Its unobstructed basis for manifestation is nirmanakaya."

Malcolm wrote:

Downmans is basically a rewrite of Eric's.

My translation is a little different:

"The basis, one's vidyā, is like a crystal ball;
its emptiness is the nature of the dharmakāya;
its self-revealing clarity is the sambhogakāya;
and the door of unceasing arising is the nirmanakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Expulsion for raped Buddhist nun !?!

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Is this a standard interpretation of the rules in Vajrayana...

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2011 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Enochian said:

Namdrol,

Would you admit that everything is "connected"?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is a condition for everything but itself.

Since the Buddhas have realized the nature of reality which pervades everything, theoretically, there are no limits to what a Buddha can know. If something can be known by a consciousness, it can be known by a Buddha .

The subject of the omniscience of a Buddha is quite complicated.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Schizophrenia

Content:

The Ticking Man said:

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Incidentally, my real name is Malcolm, when you talk to them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Schizophrenia

Content:

The Ticking Man said:

Would seeing a doctor of Tibetan medicine be worthwhile? The one that might be willing to do it lives in Boulder, CO. I saw a few DTMs in that area on the internet. Can you recommend a practitioner from that area?

I think he has been taking anti-psychotics on and off for 15 years, but that is a guesstimate. I would need to ask him.

Malcolm wrote:

Check out these two people:

<http://holistic-health.org/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I went to school with Nashalla.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Schizophrenia

Content:

The Ticking Man said:

I have recently been reading The Crystal and the Way of Light. In the book, ChNN says that his uncle was cured of his mental illness by following practices that were prescribed by Adzom Drugpa.

Does anyone know what practices were prescribed? It is implied in the book that one of the practices was Chod.

I ask this because I have two friends that suffer from schizophrenia. One was drug induced and the other I am not sure about. Can schizophrenia be truly treated through Tibetan medicine or Tibetan practices.

Thank you in advance for your reply.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on the patient, how long they have been using antipsychotics and a whole host of other factors. So the correct answer is maybe.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

kirtu said:

Americans are not nearly as individualistic as they believe although it is part of the national myth.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends very much where you live in America. You live in the South (Yes, Virginia is part of the South, so is Maryland). Southerners and Midwesterners tend to be more socially conforming and class conscious than Yankees and Westerners.

kirtu said:

It's very funny seeing American's claim the "Don't Tread On Me" line while actually in general being hyperconservative and being afraid to take action individually

Malcolm wrote:

Don't confuse lack of media reportage for absence of direct action. Again, that really depends on where you live. You live in the DC area, which is hyper-conservative compared to where I have lived all my life i.e. Massachusetts and Vermont.

Also there is an urban/rural difference. American individualism was/is based on

American rural culture -- it is true that economic pressures have lead to a severe decline in rural America.

Urban Americans have always been more conformist. Rural Southerners are also more independent minded than their city cousins.

Most of the race laws in the South were passed to drive a social wedge between poor whites and poor blacks to keep rich whites rich.

As far as the gay personhood thing goes, don't worry eventually civil rights laws will make their way through the courts and gay people will be entitled to spousal privileges like anyone else. It is happening. Feminism, gay rights, etc. are all born of the civil rights movement, ultimately.

kirtu said:

BTW this is not me ragging on America's - these tendencies actually exist in the culture and are pervasive. And both the belonging need /clique behavior AND criticizing people for how they dress is explained through it.

Malcolm wrote:

Most of the political issues in this country are a hang-over from the Civil war.

kirtu said:

We still have a long way to go before becoming a less harmful and more helpful society.

Malcolm wrote:

That is samsara. There is no such thing as a "helpful" society. Societies are biological entities that use all available resources until they are exhausted. Then they die and something else comes along to feed off of the corpse.

But as you know, I do not share your utopian idealism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

Namdrol said:

I've never seen an American walk around with one of those.

Jikan said:

Ever been to Portland?

I've been jabbed in the ribs on the subway with more than one of these sorts of bags on

the metro in DC lately. Something must be going on downtown to bring the Buddhists who can afford to accessorize in.

Malcolm wrote:

Never been to Portland, OR.

I am sure the accessorized Buddhists are out in full force in DC.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Many people these days in Zen understand terms like "One Mind" exactly in the same sense as Advaita. Which is why we see cross-over teachers like Adyashanti and so on.

Enochian said:

How is this different than what you said about all Buddhas sharing the same one mind?

Also, since according to Mādhyamaka philosophy, there is actually NO difference between a Buddha and a sentient being, wouldn't EVERYONE share the same one mind?

Malcolm wrote:

As for your first question: all Buddhas share the same realization. In this sense they "share" the same mind. The wisdom of a Buddha is free from being one or many. Since the dharmakāya is free from all extremes, it does not make sense to assert that Buddhas have differentiated mind streams. Their omniscience is identical because, to put it into relative terms, their minds and the object of their realization, emptiness free from extremes, have merged since Buddhas are in a constant state of equipoise on reality.

In terms of Madhyamaka, Buddhas and sentient beings are the same in so far as neither are ultimately established. Conventionally speaking, however, sentient beings have not abandoned everything to be abandoned and realized everything to be realized, but Buddhas have. That constitutes the difference between buddhas and sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

Namdrol said:

Funny thing is, a lot of Americans probably regard their dharma gear as a sign of their individualism, whereas in its Asian context, it has the opposite meaning.

=

Huseng said:

Have you ever seen any native in India, Nepal, Tibet, Bhutan, Mongolia, etc... walk around with one of these?

Malcolm wrote:

I've never seen an American walk around with one of those.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 12:12 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 12:08 PM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

Namdrol said:

Because we Westerners, especially we Americans, are pathologically individualistic. Asians tend not to be, they are culturally more group and class oriented, pathologically so.

Huseng said:

I dunno ... I think most Canadians unconsciously follow a set pattern of behaviour and abide by the status quo.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, I did write a clause in brackets that said (Canadians are not included under the rubric of Americans...). Thought better of it and deleted it.

Funny thing is, a lot of Americans probably regard their dharma gear as a sign of their individualism, whereas in its Asian context, it has the opposite meaning.

=

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: "Ego" and Buddhism

Content:

Greg said:

Very helpful all, thanks.

However, even if we allow that "ego" could be a reasonable term for "self-grasping," I'm still seeing an issue with the quotes. Suppose we substitute "self-grasping" for ego as follows:

"In the third stage, self-grasping develops three strategies or impulses with which to relate to its projections: indifference, passion and aggression."(The Myth of Freedom)

"The problem is that self-grasping can convert anything to its own use, even spirituality."(Cutting through Spiritual Materialism, pg 15)

To me, they don't make a whole lot of sense now. How can an action/process--a present participle verb, if I'm not mistaken--scheme, strategize and make projections, as described above? In other words, how can a verb be the subject of another verb?

Namdrol said:

Do you understand what Trungpa is saying (I assume that you do). If so, then just chalk it up to a non-native speaker with an amateur editor and get the gist.

N

Greg said:

Well, I understand that self-grasping is said to be a problem for all sorts of reasons. But I'm not convinced this is just a matter of mistaken grammar. His use of ego seems to suggest something other than a process, it seems to suggest some sort of active, diabolical agent at work. Now I have a sense that that was his own spin on it, for better or for worse.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in Indian and Tibetan literature, "grasping at identity" is, in this case, an active, diabolical agent. In Sanskrit and Tibetan "self-grasping" can be a noun subject of a sentence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Commitment Issues

Content:

Clarence said:

Are you talking deity differences here or Lam Dre vs. 6 Yogas vs Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Practice what you have instructions for, and that for which you have a predilection. Lamdre, 6 Yogas, and Dzogchen have slightly different toppings. But basically the practice is all the same.

Clarence said:

I think you are spot on here. Any suggestions on how to best proceed?

Malcolm wrote:

Visit many of them.

Clarence said:

Would you mind elaborating on that? I don't understand it at all. Wouldn't you practice what the root Guru tells you to practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Most people have this idea that their root guru is the one who gives them their main practice. That is not true. The root guru is the one who gives someone their understanding of the nature of their mind, which is what makes all practices fruitful.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

pemachophel said:

Part of why I posted my query was wondering why so many Westerners (at least in my experience) seem to reject the notion of wearing such costumes.

Malcolm wrote:

Because we Westerners, especially we Americans, are pathologically individualistic. Asians tend not to be, they are culturally more group and class oriented, pathologically so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: "Ego" and Buddhism

Content:

Greg said:

Very helpful all, thanks.

However, even if we allow that "ego" could be a reasonable term for "self-grasping," I'm still seeing an issue with the quotes. Suppose we substitute "self-grasping" for ego as

follows:

"In the third stage, self-grasping develops three strategies or impulses with which to relate to its projections: indifference, passion and aggression."(The Myth of Freedom)

"The problem is that self-grasping can convert anything to its own use, even spirituality."(Cutting through Spiritual Materialism, pg 15)

To me, they don't make a whole lot of sense now. How can an action/process--a present participle verb, if I'm not mistaken--scheme, strategize and make projections, as described above? In other words, how can a verb be the subject of another verb?

Malcolm wrote:

Do you understand what Trungpa is saying (I assume that you do). If so, then just chalk it up to a non-native speaker with an amateur editor and get the gist.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2011 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Commitment Issues

Content:

pemachophel said:

Clarence,

If you want to stick with Longchen Nyingthig, consider Loppon Rechung at Mipham Shedra in Boulder, CO or Anyen Rinpoche in Denver, CO. Both are resident in the U.S. and work with Their students on an on-going day-to-day basis. If you don't mind switching to Dudjom Tersar, consider Lama Pema Dorje in Oakland, CA or His brother, Lama Dawa, in Lansing, Iowa (see <http://www.saraswatibhawan.org> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"). Both also are resident in the U.S. If Bhutanese Drukpa is not a deal-breaker, consider Lama Karma at Mila Druk in Longmont, CO; again resident in the U.S. Then there's Loppon Jigme, Chatral Rinpoche's disciple in Marin county, CA (I don't remember the exact town), or there's Tulku Jigme Tromge at the Padmasambhava Peace Institute in Cazadero, CA. Bhaka Tulku is not personally teaching anymore (or so I've heard), but He has a couple of Tibetan disciples teaching in the SoCal area. Another good Nyingma Lama (Longchen Nyingthig & Dudjom Tersar) is Khenpo Sonam in Santa Monica, CA. If being a gringo is no problemo, there's Tulku Sherab Dorje in upstate NY (the Catskills) and Lama Rangbar who's soon moving to nearby Poughkeepsie (spelling?). Of course, Tulku Sang-ngak is excellent. He lives in Santa Fe, NM. However, he's out of the country approximately half of each year (or at least he has been the last couple-few years).

Just a few Lamas who come to mind Who live in the U.S. and are very accessible to Their students on an on-going basis.

Good luck and best wishes.

Clarence said:
Hi Pema Chophel,

Many thanks for that. It is nice to see such a big list of Nyingma teachers. Unfortunately, at the moment, I am living in Europe. So, although some of your suggestions sound great, I don't think they are feasible at this moment. Of course, I could travel regularly to the U.S., but I would hope to find someone closer to Belgium/Netherlands. Many thanks again. Sorry I can't follow up on your suggestions.

- C

Malcolm wrote:
Basically, you are not going to find any differences between one practice and another, not really. Tibetan Buddhism these days is like Baskin Robbins, 31 flavors, but they all ice cream.

Forget about lineages and find a _guru_.

And keep in mind that often your root Guru may be in a completely different lineage than the one you actually practice in.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, July 15th, 2011 at 8:48 PM
Title: Re: Lung disease unique to Vajrayana?
Content:

Jangchup Donden said:
Is lung disease unique to the Vajrayana, or does it also happen in other meditative traditions?

Malcolm wrote:
rlung disease (vatta disorders) can happen to anyone, given improper diet, behavior, etc. Vatta disorders are more likely to occur in the early summer and the late fall, they are more likely to show their symptoms in the early morning and late afternoon.

People who engage in intense pranayāma practice are more at risk for these kinds of illnesses. Yantra Yoga and Hatha yoga are important for correct faults that come from mistakes made in completion stage practices.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2011 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: "Ego" and Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

I think it is extremely misleading, and should be abandoned.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed.

tobes said:

I think that is the sense in which Trungpa uses the term, and it is somewhat helpful.....but ultimately I think that using the term in that way simply leads to a reification of something which in every respect, never existed in the first place: there is no ego, in any of the senses I've just mentioned, so what point is there speaking as if there is?

Malcolm wrote:

Ego simply means 'I' in Greek and Latin. However, we use it in English as a term derived from Freudian analysis (primarily). In this respect, this use of the term does not exist in Buddhism. In Buddhism, (as you note) there is no concept like the Western psychoanalytical personality per se -- only a sense of a mundane person or a transcending person, a virtuous person or a non-virtuous person, driven by positive, negative or afflicted mental factors. There is no idea of a balanced personality, per se, apart from a person in good health whose dhātus (vatta, pitta, kapha) are well balanced.

However, all people are egoistic, since we all have our self-interest at heart, and atma-graha and bdag 'dzin can easily be translated as "egoism". Egotism, is mostly what Buddhist texts means by "pride".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2011 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

pemachophel said:

Thanks for the replies. I'm sorry the words "Dharma clothes" seemed wrong to some. I usually reserve the word "robes" for monks' and nuns' robes and I was thinking of the shamgyur and zens worn at many Nyingma centers in the U.S. and abroad by non-monastic practitioners. I was just curious to see what people's ideas about these are. Like everything else, there are a variety of opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

No need to apologize, some people like costumes.

Tibetans tend to think their costumes give them some juice. For example, you can read in some terma cycles that you should never be naked -- with elaborate and necessary clothing described. Yet when you read Indian cycles, you are supposed to give tormas naked. Then you have guys like Tsnang Nyon who like to dress in blood and entrails.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2011 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Destroying ancient Buddhist shrine for copper mine.

Content:

Huseng said:

This upset me reading it. They're going to destroy an ancient Buddhist temple to get at the copper. Firstly they destroy a jewel in humanity's history and then they're going to cause untold environmental damage with such a mine. They're converting a holy site into what will be a toxic hell hole.

Also given the amount of corruption that probably exists in Afghanistan, do you think much of the concession money will benefit the people?

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, Samsara does not get worse, we merely become more sensitive to it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2011 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Vimalamitra's semde pills

Content:

Hayagriva said:

Thanks for the help, loppon.

One if its main uses is for disorders of the prana vāyu which often results in cycling depression.

This seems to be the main purpose looking at internet TB medicine stores, although they may obviously not be very accurate or complete. I genuinely don't feel depressed at all (quite the opposite in fact) but maybe I looked miserable to the lama that I talked to. I was absolutely exhausted.

If you have trouble with rlung/vatta, one of the best treatments you can have is massage, especially ayurvedic massage with the proper oil. Also your diet should have a moderate amount of lamb, you should regularly take small quantity of ghee, avoid all caffeine, etc. Follow a diet and behavior for vatta person.

I have some serious lung problems, with my body feeling tight and unpleasantly quick and jumpy a lot of the time. A neurologist I don't particularly have a lot of confidence in thinks I may have a minor genetic startle reaction disorder. I think it's more like the after effects of problems I had with anxiety in the past that have imprinted themselves on my nervous system. I don't feel emotionally unwell at all - by which I mean unhappy or over-

stressed. Will the medication I have work on this?

I will certainly look at your diet/massage recommendation.

Thanks again.

Malcolm wrote:

The main use for a medicine does not obviate its uses in other conditions. The semde will work on the condition you describe, but herbs work much better in conjunction with therapies, diet and behavior. Yoga should also help.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2011 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Vimalamitra's semde pills

Content:

Hayagriva said:

I spent quite a lot of time with a Tibetan lama this week who recommended that I take some specific Tibetan medicine - he said it was a recipe created by Vimalamitra and is called semde. There are two types, and these are in the photo attached.

Can anyone tell me what they are and what they're used for? I know they're meant to be good for lung disorders, which I have real trouble with. I'm going to be interested in what they are like - I've never taken Tibetan medicine before.

A good UK/European supplier would be welcome, too.

Malcolm wrote:

Vimalamitra did not create sems bde. He created a formula which is popularly called "Vimala".

sems dba occurs in 18th century Treasury of Beneficial Jewels by the eastern Tibetan doctor, karma nges legs bstan 'dzin phrin las rab rgyas. So it is a relatively recent formula.

One of its main uses is for disorders of the prana vāyu which often results in cycling depression.

Vimala (Nutmeg 25) on the other hand is a medicine also used for vāta disorders, but mainly for sleep disorders. Vimala was originally created by Vimalamitra to combat provocations by Gyalpos.

If you have trouble with rlung/vatta, one of the best treatments you can have is massage,

especially ayurvedic massage with the proper oil. Also your diet should have a moderate amount of lamb, you should regularly take small quantity of ghee, avoid all caffeine, etc. Follow a diet and behavior for vatta person.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2011 at 12:10 PM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2011 at 11:53 AM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

username said:

The best is probably that of a simple loosely clad wandering hermit who is indistinguishable from his surroundings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2011 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

alpha said:

there is no beauty in lay people in the west wearing wrap around type of cloths .
is just pure arrogance.

Nangwa said:

If I could get away with it I would wear one of those skirts all the time.

It would have nothing to do with dharma whatsoever. It would be all about airflow.

Malcolm wrote:

You can, its called a dhoti:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2011 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Views on Dharma clothes

Content:

conebeckham said:

Are you talking about robes?

In my experience, every Dharma Center with Tibetan roots has a different position on

this issue. Some Nyingma centers practically require all participants to wear them during some rituals. Some only allow Lamas, monks, and nuns, to wear them. Some are more flexible.

In my center, monks wear Shamtab, Zen, etc. all the time. Lamas usually wear Shamtab, or a Shamgyur (wrap-around skirt-type thing) and zens....striped zens for Western three year retreat graduates, solids otherwise...though Tibetan Lamas usually wear solids. Some of us wear Shamgyurs, etc., during Druppas or retreats, but may not always.

Malcolm wrote:

Calling these things dharma clothes is a bit of a stretch. These things are Tibetan custom.

In reality, there are only two kinds of clothes that can be called Dharma" clothes i.e. white clothes for lay people, and dyed robes for monks. To this one might add blue shirts for Vajrayāna practitioners.

The rest is all based on custom.

Apart from this however, are articles of samaya connected with empowerments that one may be asked to maintain. These are also not "dharma clothes".

"Honey? Where did I leave my bone ornaments...?"

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2011 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

Huseng said:

I'm starting to seriously examine the literature of tantra after spending several years grounding myself in sūtra, abhidharma and Mahāyāna śāstras. I've had exposure to it before, but found I could not wrap my mind around it or appreciate it. Now I'm re-examining the material and thinking that it might very well be an advanced form of practice as it claims.

Malcolm wrote:

The fundamental reason Vajrayāna stakes a claim to rapidity is method. Those methods corral a person's embodiment and experience into practice in ways that sutra does not. Sutra is entirely a path of renunciation. Vajrayāna is a path of non-renunciation.

Huseng said:

I'm trying to understand why a non-conceptual samadhi would be better suited to realizing emptiness than conventional dhyāna.

Malcolm wrote:

That is simple enough -- a conventional dhyana is conceptual. The realization of emptiness is non-conceptual. The more direct route one has to a repeatable experience of non-conceptuality, the easier it is to realize emptiness non-conceptually. Shamatha practice always possesses concepts. Shamatha is a conceptual meditation. Sutrayāna vipashyana, below the path of seeing is also conceptual. Sutra does not possess any methods to approximate the experience of non-conceptual emptiness. Vajrayāna does.

Huseng said:

The claim, though, that I'm trying to understand is that the nirvikalpa samādhi achieved in tantra is superior to the one achieved through conventional dhyāna.

Malcolm wrote:

It is easier train in the experience of non-conceptuality in Vajrayāna. Sutra has no specific methods to train in non-conceptuality, and one should not train in nirvikalpa samādhi below the path of seeing in Mahāyāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2011 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

Astus said:

Vitarka and vicāra don't exist in the 2nd dhyāna already, how could then it be called conceptual? Nirvikalpa-jñāna also exists in common Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Because it's one pointedness is a mental concept.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

Huseng said:

Thank you for taking the time to answer my many questions, Namdrol.

Namdrol said:

Plus, you have to understand, that this experience is what is introduced during empowerment, and further, since the channels have been purified, the movements of winds are more subtle; and hence the mind is more subtle; hence the emptiness realization is more profound and more rapid.

Huseng said:

Is this why Buddhahood is said to be immediately possible in a lifetime in tantra? By virtue of the emptiness realization being more profound and rapid than in sūtra? How does the accumulation of merit factor into this? Tantric methods produce more merit?

Malcolm wrote:

Tantric methods produce more merit, more rapidly using special methods such as mandala offerings. Typically, the merit and wisdom accumulation sections of any anuttarayoga tantra sadhana are theoretically capable of producing the equivalent of three incalculable eons worth of the two accumulations in a single session. Your individual milage may vary.

Huseng said:

Monastics are prohibited from sexual intercourse, but is the visualization of the activity equally as efficacious as the physical act? I understand Je Tsong Khapa decided to forego the act of coupling out of concern for disciples and achieved his liberation in bardo.

Malcolm wrote:

There is very little agreement on this issue among Tibetan lineages. There is also considerable disagreement about this issue in Indian sources. So this is a difficult point. Some masters assert that a monastic may use a consort having achieved the path of seeing. Other masters assert that it is fine for them to use a consort upon attaining patience on the path of application.

However, auto-erotic techniques may also be applied in absence of a consort. This is the usual mode of practice for single practitioners and monastics. For example, Vajraghantapada (a bhikṣu) asserts, in connection with the practice of Cakrasamvara, that while sexual misconduct is not a practice recommended in the tantras (because you must protect the bodies of others, etc.), non-celibate conduct (abrahmacarya) is.

Jeff's (Jnana) posts on this subject exhibit a specifically Gampopa/Kagyu POV on this issue.

In general, the Sakya school and Nyingma schools place much more importance on erotic practices than do the Kagyus. However, in the Nyingma school they are not generally considered indispensable for awakening in this lifetime. In most of the Tantric lineages within Sakya, they are considered indispensable for awakening in this lifetime. The exception to this would be the oral instructions of Naropa's Khechari -- where a type of pranāyāma practice is said to result in a state of bliss equivalent to the bliss of sexual

Congress and therefore obviates the need for a consort (also partially accounting, I feel, for the reason the Naropa Khechari instructions have attained the popularity they have). Thus, there can be differences between specific oral instruction lineages as well. This is why the instruction of a properly qualified guru is key on this point -- since there are so many lineages, and differences in practices even of the same deity in different instruction lineages.

The Kagyus and Gelugs have skeptical attitudes towards erotic practice grounded in Kadampa opinions. However, of the latter two, the Gelugs also generally maintain that erotic practices are indispensable for awakening in this lifetime.

Huseng said:

Is the amount of merit a practitioner has from past lives taken into account when it is said that Buddhahood is possible in one life using tantric methods?

Malcolm wrote:

No. The statement that someone could achieve complete Buddhahood in one lifetime through Vajrayāna methods refers to a beginner on the Mahāyāna path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2011 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nirvikalpana

Huseng said:

In what way is the realization of emptiness made superior through nirvikalpana as opposed to dhyāna? Is it faster, deeper, more likely?

As Nāgārjuna explained the realization of ultimate truth is based on the foundation of conventional truth. I'm trying to understand why a non-conceptual samadhi would be better suited to realizing emptiness than conventional dhyāna.

Malcolm wrote:

Because the experience of non-conceptuality more closely resembles the experience of emptiness. In other words, in sutra there are no methods for approximating the experience of realizing emptiness. In tantra there are many.

Plus, you have to understand, that this experience is what is introduced during empowerment, and further, since the channels have been purified, the movements of winds are more subtle; and hence the mind is more subtle; hence the emptiness realization is more profound and more rapid.

We are not asserting that the ordinary bliss of an average couple's intercourse could ever lead to the realization of emptiness more rapidly than dhyana. However, when connected with the method, it does.

This does not contradict Nāgārjuna's intent, since the experience of non-conceptuality is relative, and that relative experience is being used to point towards the ultimate.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2011 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: Encyclopedia of Bodhisattvas, Dharmapalas, Yidams, etc?

Content:

Kalagni said:

I'm sorry if this question has been asked/answered before, but I checked the forum and didn't see it.

I was wondering if anyone has any resources, print or online, that is essentially an encyclopedia of the different Bodhisattva, Dharmapalas, Yidams, Saints, etc etc? No book I have mentions more than a handful at a time. I'd just like a resource to turn to when I encounter one I'm unfamiliar with, or just curious about attributes, practices, mythology, etc. I say encyclopedia to refer to depth of information, cause I'd like more than just a list of names, but anything to the right direction would be great, thanks.

~Kalagni

Malcolm wrote:

Oracles and Demons of Tibet, for dharmapalas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2011 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss

Content:

Huseng said:

But why in Vajrayāna would tantric bliss be considered superior to the bliss of dhyāna?

Namdrol said:

The former is non-conceptual and the latter is conceptual.

N

Huseng said:

What is the Sanskrit term for non-conceptual in this context? Asaṃjñā? Asaṃskṛta?

Malcolm wrote:
Nirvikalpana

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2011 at 3:20 AM
Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer
Content:

Will said:
This is a fine answer and I, being an old creature, understand. But if this attitude is the rationale for someone under 50, who never studies the root texts of ID (or any notion that is rejected), then I still chalk that up to laziness, peer pressure & other intellectual vices.

Malcolm wrote:
I guess I don't qualify, being 49.

That being said, Will -- there are numerous articles on the web written by Meyers. You don't have to read his book to become very familiar with his thinking. There are 85 of them here:

<http://www.discovery.org/scripts/viewDB/index.php?command=submitSearchQuery&query=Stephen%20C.%20Meyer&orderBy=date&orderDir=DESC&searchBy=author&searchType=all&includeBlogPosts=true> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 11:39 PM
Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
It is interesting to note that the Templeton Foundation, one of leading science/religion interface foundations, regards intelligent design as a political movement.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 11:36 PM
Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer
Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Why is it better to talk about all this eon nonsense than about flying spaghetti monsters?

Malcolm wrote:

You will have to ask yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"The hallmark of the intelligent design movement, however, is that it purports to rise above the level of personal skepticism. It claims to have found a reason why evolution could not have produced a structure like the bacterial flagellum, a reason based on sound, solid scientific evidence.

Why does the intelligent design movement regard the flagellum as unevolvable?

Because it is said to possess a quality known as "irreducible complexity." Irreducibly complex structures, we are told, could not have been produced by evolution, or, for that matter, by any natural process. They do exist, however, and therefore they must have been produced by something. That something could only be an outside intelligent agency operating beyond the laws of nature – an intelligent designer. That, simply stated, is the core of the new argument from design, and the intellectual basis of the intelligent design movement.

The great irony of the flagellum's increasing acceptance as an icon of anti-evolution is that fact that research had demolished its status as an example of irreducible complexity almost at the very moment it was first proclaimed. The purpose of this article is to explore the arguments by which the flagellum's notoriety has been achieved, and to review the research developments that have now undermined their very foundations of those arguments.

...

This, however, is not what is meant by "intelligent design" in the parlance of the new anti-evolutionists. Their views demand not a universe in which the beauty and harmony of natural law has brought a world of vibrant and fruitful life into existence, but rather a universe in which the emergence and evolution of life is made expressly impossible by the very same rules. Their view requires that the source of each and every novelty of life was the direct and active involvement of an outside designer whose work violated the very laws of nature he had fashioned. The world of intelligent design is not the bright and innovative world of life that we have come to know through science. Rather, it is a brittle and unchanging landscape, frozen in form and unable to adapt except at the whims of its designer.

...

Against such a backdrop, the struggles of the intelligent design movement are best understood as clamorous and disappointing double failures – rejected by science because they do not fit the facts, and having failed religion because they think too little of God."

<http://www.millerandlevine.com/km/evol/design2/article.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: beings from ???

Content:

Namdrol said:

Basically, what happens is that at the end of the last eon ...

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

So time exists?

Malcolm wrote:

You really need me to answer that question for you?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

No Namdrol, my concern is with lack of fairness, equanimity or truth valuing on the part of many online Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

MYM answered this adequately.

Will said:

And what would Meyer's arguments be, pray tell; page number refs will be accepted. Meyer does not hide his Xtian beliefs, but his arguments for ID are not theological.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they are, since they are bound up speculation. His tests at the end of the book are silly.

Will said:

If Newton, a devout theist, were alive today none of his insights would be tolerated, much less promulgated by the bigots of science.

Malcolm wrote:

Newton was more interested in Alchemy than math. And he, like many of his contemporaries, believed in a designer aka god. Darwin permanently upset that apple cart by showing why the appearance of design in fact is just a sign of natural selection. Meyers and his whole crew of ID people are all just passing off speculations as science.

Will said:

This notion that religious beliefs trump or motivate every other thought on any subject, especially science, is true for some Buddhists, Xtians, Jews et al. But there are plenty (the majority?) of people of varied faiths who can think and chew gum at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, basically Meyers is a fellow of the Discover Institute. They have an ideological agenda which is contra evolutionary biology. They are about as anti-scientific as one can get. He is absolutely intent on proving that God created life. He wrote in 1999:

Physics and cosmology suggest intelligent design as a highly plausible and arguably best explanation for the exquisite fine-tuning of the physical laws and constants of the universe and the precise configuration of its initial conditions. Since the fine-tuning and initial conditions date from the very origin of the universe itself, this evidence suggests the need for an intelligent as well as a transcendent Cause for the origin of the universe. Since God as conceived by Christians and other theists possesses precisely these attributes, His creative action can adequately explain the origin of the cosmological singularity and the anthropic fine-tuning. Since naturalism denies a transcendent and pre-existent intelligent cause, it follows that theism provides a better explanation than naturalism for these two evidences taken jointly. Since pantheism, with its belief in an immanent and impersonal god, also denies the existence of a transcendent and pre-existent intelligence, it too lacks causal adequacy as an explanation for these evidences. Indeed, a completely impersonal intelligence is almost a contradiction in terms. Thus, theism stands as the best explanation of the three major worldviews theism, pantheism, and naturalism for the origin of the Big Bang singularity and anthropic fine-tuning taken jointly.

<http://www.discovery.org/articleFiles/PDFs/ReturnofGdHypth.pdf> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Face it, Will -- this is his strategy:

a) Try to get intelligent design accepted as a plausible and "scientific" explanation for the origin of life, alongside Darwin's natural selection

- b) Having done so, then it is a short step to getting theism accepted as the best inferable explanation for intelligent design
- c) Introduce creationism into the schools via the backdoor of ID.

His book has been well cleansed on his theistic predilections. But his agenda is perfectly clear, he is anti-evolution, anti-science. He studied the philosophy of science in order to undermine one scientific theory, as far as I can tell, Darwin's theory of natural selection.

Furthermore, the Discover Institute promotes that most un-Buddhist idea: "human exceptionalism" the idea that human beings are "exceptional" among living creatures and morally superior to all, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Prayer to protect the earth by one of the Dudjom Tulkus

Content:

Aemilius said:

I hope you are right, and we can easily turn the majority or whole of humanity to vegetarian diet through education, advertising etc...

Malcolm wrote:

It will never happen. We live in the Kali Yuga. Things will not get better, so it is foolish to hope they will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu's Vajra Armor text/practice

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

When it is said that during the initial three-day retreat one should not recite anything but the Dorje Kotrab mantra, does this include even prayers, such as like the 7-line prayer and lineage prayers, gurus' long-life prayers, the alikali/Vajrasattva/D.O. mantra, and dedication prayers & mantras?

Malcolm wrote:

Ask rinpoche.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: uncomfortable mantra question

Content:

Aemilius said:

To understand the deep and profound truths of the Prajnaparamita, Yogacara, and Madhyamaka, you must first understand the basic teachings. They have been very clearly taught in the sravakayana teachings. This has been said by many tibetan teachers, for example by Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso.

Even in the basic Theravada teaches that thoughts create karma, there is nothing exceptional in that!

Sönam said:

It seems that you are ignorant of the teachings.

If there is a Hinayana and a Mahayana it's because it exists differences ... It is a fact that for sravakas some events like thunder and other events are not related to karma and that simply thinking about an act is not creating karma ... which is not the case for mahayana practitioners.

this is not questionable, it is so.

Sönam

Aemilius said:

I'm sorry if this is too much of a sidetrack...

best wishes!

Malcolm wrote:

What does this have to do with the original poster's question?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

Namdrol: The book has been soundly trashed by real scientists, not to mention the fact that ID and Buddhism are not compatible.

Many of whom (maybe most) never read the book - now that is "science".

Malcolm wrote:

Venema, a geneticist, read the book and it was his review I provided for you.

His conclusion is that the book is not science.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 9:49 PM
Title: Re: Tantric sexual bliss vs. dhyanic bliss
Content:

Huseng said:
But why in Vajrayāna would tantric bliss be considered superior to the bliss of dhyāna?

Malcolm wrote:
The former is non-conceptual and the latter is conceptual.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 11:17 AM
Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer
Content:
Nangwa said:
We already know ID is wrong view.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, it would seem Will's crusade for this book has more to do with his own prejudice and bias against what he perceives to be "scientific" materialism than anything else.

He seems unable to accept that despite Meyer's protests, all of Meyer's arguments are in favor of a supernatural intelligent agent.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 10:49 AM
Title: Re: 5 Wisdoms
Content:
Namdrol said:

It depends on the Vajrayāna school to which one adheres. For example, the Sakya school teaches that all the qualities of the three kāyas are naturally present in sentient beings originally, and that this natural presence does not conflict with transformation.

Daniel Arraes said:
Then what would be the difference between this Sakya POV and Shentong?

Malcolm wrote:
Sakya view -- butter comes from churning milk

Shentong view -- butter is fully formed in milk already.

In other words, the Sakya POV is that the qualities of butter must exist in milk from the beginning, otherwise, one could never get butter out of milk. Likewise, the qualities of buddhahood must exist in sentient beings from the beginning, otherwise, sentient beings could never be the cause of buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 10:47 AM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

Nangwa: wants folks on a Buddhist forum to read a book about ID

To be correct, "wants folks on the Book Review section of a Buddhist forum to read this book about ID, before trashing it"; that is the main thing.

Malcolm wrote:

The book has been soundly trashed by real scientists, not to mention the fact that ID and Buddhism are not compatible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 10:45 AM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

The practice of buddhadharma removes much of our ignorance, but not all.

Malcolm wrote:

It removes all. Otherwise, there is no point in practicing Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

In other words, Namdrol, this book is like all the other ID writing out there; unread by you because of unwarranted assumptions & prejudice.

As for the Judge's & PBS rulings - that is no more definitive against Meyers version of ID, than Pope Whatever's bull against Galileo.

Is there no one here with the gonads (thus including ladies) to read the frigging book or

at least those final chapters I suggested? If not, chalk up another victory for modern Victorianism or laziness or PC or moral cowardice or Buddha knows what....

Malcolm wrote:

"Like Edge of Evolution before it, Signature in the Cell represents a layman's attempt to overturn an entire field of research based on a surface-level understanding (and, at times, significant misunderstanding or ignorance) of the relevant science..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: 5 Wisdoms

Content:

Kunzang said:

This is why Jesus's birth is "immaculate", no sperm involved.

In Catholic dogma, "immaculate" is associated with Mary, not Jesus. "Immaculate conception" means that Mary was, from conception, without the stain of Original Sin. Though it had been a belief in Catholicism for centuries, it was only officially made a dogma in 1854.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is because she was also conceived "immaculately". Same rule applies i.e. no sperm.

Original sin was defined in this way by Augustine in Civitas Dei.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2011 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

For those whose prejudice against ID prevents them from reading Meyer's entire book, I would suggest studying only chapters 15-20 + the Epilogue and the notes. That is about 150 pages.

These chapters are more general in content and easier than the difficult science chapters preceding.

"Although other flaws are less serious in and of themselves, they are still indicative of the level of argumentation in the book, as well as of the quality of its peer review. For example, it was in chapter three that I first arrived at what I now call a "Behe

moment” when reading antievolutionary literature. In Michael Behe’s book *Edge of Evolution*, he makes a few obvious “rookie errors” when discussing how probabilities work in population genetics.³⁴ This, for me, was the clear signal that the book was written by an amateur in the field and not adequately peer reviewed. In *Signature*, this moment arrived when Meyer calls *Pneumococci* a bacterium and a virus in the same paragraph.³⁵ This impression was confirmed anew when Meyer describes, over the course of several pages, his epiphany that DNA bases do not have bonds between them and thus cannot selforganize into specified sequences. This “epiphany” is something that biology majors learn (or at least, should learn) in their introductory courses. This theme continued apace in the figure describing translation. ³⁶ *Signature* shows tRNAs aligning to the mRNA in a 5' to 5' orientation, tRNAs with codon instead of anticodon sequences, and several inappropriate nucleotide pairings: all very basic mistakes. In short, *Signature* clearly was not written or peer reviewed by individuals with a working knowledge of molecular biology. Now, these issues in and of themselves would not be a serious problem for *Signature*, if not for the fact that the strength of Meyer’s argument rests entirely on his assertion that he has made a thorough search through all proposed mechanisms for generating biological information through natural means and found them lacking. Meyer is asking his audience to trust him that his analysis is thorough and sound. However, that Meyer’s understanding of molecular biology appears to be at or below a first-year college level should give even the most pro-ID reader pause here. It means that Meyer, well intentioned though he may be, is simply not equipped to grapple with these issues beyond an introductory textbook level. Nor has Meyer sought the advice of those who are able to do so. And as we have seen, Meyer has made neither a thorough search for the origin of biological information by natural mechanisms, nor a fair assessment of current origin-of-life research. ...

While popular-level books written by nonspecialists can be very helpful to a lay audience if they are carefully reviewed by experts and adhere to consensus

science, Signature is not such a book. Like Edge of Evolution before it, Signature in the Cell represents a layman's attempt to overturn an entire field of research based on a surface-level understanding (and, at times, significant misunderstanding or ignorance) of the relevant science, published in a form that bypasses review by qualified peers, and that is marketed directly to a nonspecialist audience. This is not good science, nor science in any meaningful sense. If ID is going to advance as an intellectual framework, it simply must do better. I, for one, would be fascinated by a scientifically plausible design argument. It would demonstrate that something is fundamentally wrong with the interpretation of very wide swaths of data across numerous disciplines. That would not be a scientific problem, but rather a monumental scientific opportunity that would reshape research for decades to come. Such times are the occasions of scientific legend—careers to be made, Nobel prizes to be won. Alas, Signature is not that argument. I do recommend it for those who follow the ID literature, for it represents the current state-of-the-art in ID thought for an important area of biology. However, for those of us waiting for the science behind ID, it looks as if the wait goes on.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2010/PSCF12-10Venema.pdf> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

In other words, Will, this book is like all the other ID writing out there i.e. unscientific.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2011 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: 5 Wisdoms

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

In case of Tantra mostly the Sambhogakaya is realised. [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

In the case of Buddhahood, all three kāyas are fully realized, whether through sutra or tantra (including Dzogchen).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2011 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: What to Do With Offerings

Content:

dontknowmind said:

I'm just curious what all of you do with your offerings once they've been used. I'm guessing that offerings and their uses differ by sect, so I would love to know what they are and what happens to them.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything comes from emptiness and dissolves back into emptiness, so it does not matter much what one does with offerings. Some people have elaborate rules, some people don't.

As for me, food (torma) offerings are put in a high clean place (a stump in my back yard actually), water offerings are tossed out the window into plantings in front of my house. Flowers go in the compost heap for next year's garden.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2011 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: 5 Wisdoms

Content:

mudra said:

The potential to attain the three kayas is there "within" the minds, but the three kayas are certainly not inherently within the mind. We need to purify obscurations and develop our qualities (that we have the potential for, yes). But implying that it is all ready made within us and waiting for us to uncover it is simplistic, at least from the Vajrayana pov.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the Vajrayāna school to which one adheres. For example, the Sakya school teaches that all the qualities of the three kāyas are naturally present in sentient beings originally, and that this natural presence does not conflict with transformation.

mudra said:

As to the statement that the "sambhogakaya arises out of the dharmakaya"

Malcolm wrote:

That is exactly what the Sarvatathāgata-tattva samgraha states.

mudra said:

this is a bit problematic because in the buddha state the kayas (the rupakayas

[nirmanakaya and sambhogakaya] and the dharmakayas [svabhavakaya and jnanadharma], plus in certain systems the vajrakaya) are actually inseparable.

Malcolm wrote:

They may be inseparable, but they do not necessarily all appear together at the same time. In any event, there is no fault in asserting that sambhogakāya arises from the dharmakāya -- there is a saying in Dzogchen -- at the time of the basis, all kāyas are the dharmakāya; at the time of the result, all kāyas are the nirmanakāya.

The three kāyas always exist on the basis of a sentient being's mind. If not, then the inseparability of samsara and nirvana would not be possible, and there would be no way for the three kāyas to manifest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2011 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: 5 Wisdoms

Content:

mudra said:

The only reason I am taking issue with this is that one runs the risk of making people who are not familiar with Buddhist view think that 'originally we were pure, then we messed up so the Buddha in us is all covered up by our sin'. That's more like original sin in Catholicism.

Malcolm wrote:

"Original sin" in Catholicism means you were physically conceived with sperm. This is why Jesus's birth is "immaculate", no sperm involved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2011 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: The 1000 Buddhas

Content:

Namdrol said:

We are four buddhas down, 998 left to go. Then the universe will be destroyed.

Silent Forest said:

This seems to imply several consequences which I don't quite understand: Having the universe destroyed would mean, that the cycle of birth and rebirth would come to an end? Does this mean that all beings are enlightened at this point?

The fact that there are predefined 998 to come and if I understood right predefined in which timeframe they are supposed to come would imply that it doesn't matter what people do or how they behave and everything is predefined?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, most of the physical universe will be destroyed. There will remain a few "god" realms where sentient beings hang around until the container universe reforms.

The 1002 buddhas are discussed in a specific mahayana sutra attributed to Shakyamuni. But this does not mean that all of reality is predetermined.

It just means that according to this sutra Buddha made a prediction about the 998 buddhas to follow him. The next one, Maitreya, is expected to appear when the life span of human beings again increases to the span of 8,000 years (after it decreases to an average of ten years, etc.).

These kinds of cosmic epicycles are very characteristics of Indian religious thinking in general, and not particular to Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2011 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: The 1000 Buddhas

Content:

Silent Forest said:

I didn't study Buddhism, so I might be wrong

Namdrol said:

You are.

...but my own interpretation is that the idea behind 1000 is that it stands for "countless". In this eon there will be 1002 Buddhas, actually. Beginning with Krakuchandra and ending Adhimukhta, all together there will be 1002 buddhas.

We are four buddhas down, 998 left to go. Then the universe will be destroyed.

N

Adamantine said:

I understand this history/prophecy, but could you clarify how a Buddha is defined in this context? It seems that Nirmanakayas like Padmasambhava and Garab Dorje are not included in this count, (although many call Padmasambhava the 'second Buddha') nor the 84 mahasiddhas, Longchenpa, Dudjom Lingpa, etc. So far Krakuchchanda, Kanakamuni and Kashyapa, and then Shakyamuni we call Buddhas explicitly, because they revealed the relative methods to attain enlightenment when there was no prior Buddha's teachings left in this world-system? Is that the correct reason? And so each of the coming 998 will only appear once all traces of Shakyamuni's initial turning of the

wheel have disappeared?

Could you outline the scale of time we are considering from now until the appearance of Adhimukhta? And which sutra can all of this info be found in?

Malcolm wrote:

They are supreme nirmanakāyas as opposed to varigated nirmankāyas. They each appear after the shasana of the previous supreme nirmankāya has more or less disappeared.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2011 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: The 1000 Buddhas

Content:

Silent Forest said:

I didn't study Buddhism, so I might be wrong

Malcolm wrote:

You are.

Silent Forest said:

...but my own interpretation is that the idea behind 1000 is that it stands for "countless".

Malcolm wrote:

In this eon there will be 1002 Buddhas, actually. Beginning with Krakkuchandra and ending Adhimukhta, all together there will be 1002 buddhas.

We are four buddhas down, 998 left to go. Then the universe will be destroyed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2011 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: The 1000 Buddhas

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- How many names do we know of those 1000 Buddhas?

All of them.

- What would be the name of that Sutra, if mentioned somewhere?

Bhadrakalpika sūtra, volume forty-five in the Derge version of the Buddhist bka' 'gyur. This sutra was translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan in 8th century. It has been translated into English under the title "Fortunate Eon".

There is also a similar sutra in Bon but I do not know its name and it has not been translated.

N

N

- Do those Buddhas know each other?
- Can we speak here of a "person" with "name"?
- Are the 12 vows of a Buddha based on the person?

Best wishes
KY[/color]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2011 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Knowing the energy of the svābhavakāya
as their own appearance produced buddhas;
being mistaken about their own appearance produced sentient beings.

Pero said:

Is there a difference between svabhavakaya and svabavikakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2011 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

In order to understand this, you need to study the process of Samantabhadra's liberation. When you do so, you will discover that Samantabhadra was not always liberated. Then you will understand that Samantabhadra possessed innate ignorance,

but not imputing ignorance. Innate ignorance is simply unknowing. Imputing ignorance causes dualistic vision.

N

booker said:
Hello Lupon

Where can I read about the process of Samantabhadra's liberation? I could not find anything like that in the Kunjed Gyalpo, can you point me to the passage saying about this process?

In conclusion, at the end of this book ChNNR says Samantabhadra was never stained, nor it would know the limiting concept of liberation, or "first".

Malcolm wrote:

The process of the liberation of Samantabhadra is proper to man ngag sde. You will not find anything about it in sems sde, at all, not even a little bit. You can read about it in the eleven topics of Dzogchen Nyinthig.

The innate ignorance is not a "stain" per say. It is not an afflictive ignorance, it is a simple absence of knowing.

Basically, at the point the basis arises from the basis, there is a neutral awareness present in the basis. That neutral awareness has no self-knowledge until the basis arises. While it is not aware of itself, it is in a state of non-afflictive ignorance.

When it apprehends the five lights, it apprehends them either as its own display, resulting in nirvana, Samantabhadra, etc., or it does not, resulting in samsara. The Tantra That Uproots Delusion:

Knowing the energy of the svābhavakāya
as their own appearance produced buddhas;
being mistaken about their own appearance produced sentient beings.

Afflictive ignorance comes from the dualistic vision produced by imputing ignorance.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, July 8th, 2011 at 10:50 PM
Title: Re: Wisdom aspect in Tantra and Dzogchen
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Inside Dzogchen some Master(s) adhere to the opinion, that if the emptiness aspect of the thought is caught / realised etc. then the karmic seed will be 100% destroyed.

Malcolm wrote:

Not all at once. Just gradually.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2011 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Wisdom aspect in Tantra and Dzogchen

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- Thoughts
- Dissolving of thoughts / or the elimination by realising their emptiness, done in the pre-Trekchod State. Karma seeds are here eliminated.

Malcolm wrote:

if this were the case, then there is no need for the rest.

In reality, karmic seeds or traces, are not eradicated by the above. If they were, one's impure vision would vanish.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2011 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Wisdom aspect in Tantra and Dzogchen

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

[

- By what method are the emotions reversed into the Wisdom aspect according the path of Tantra and how realised?

Malcolm wrote:

The two stages.

kalden yungdrung said:

- What is your opinion about how would be done the realisation in Dzogchen of the 5 Wisdoms, or when does this happen ?

Malcolm wrote:

Tregchö and tögal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2011 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Tsalung Trulkor and Yantra Yoga

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

But in Bon is also a Tsalung Trulkor lineage and that differs great from Yantra Yoga (lineages). Yantra Yoga is what is done inside the tradition of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche and seems to be based on hatha yoga mainly with counting.

Malcolm wrote:

Yantra is just a name. The name of Norbu Rinpoche's system is known in Tibetan as "Bairo Trulkhor". He chose to back translate the name into Sanskrit. There are many different systems of Yantra/Trulkhor in Tibet. Sakya Lamdre has one; Nyingma has many; Kagyu has the Trulkhor from Naropa. Gelugpas have one related to Vajrabhairava as well as Naropa's system. Then there is a specific tradition of Trulkhor associated with Kalacakra. Then there is Trulkhor associated with Shangpa Kagyu, I would imagine. They are all a little different, but have the same basic principle in mind i.e. freeing up knots and kinks of the body and removing disease.

They all have similarities, and they all have differences. Bairo Trulkhor is the one that most resembles Hatha Yoga overall. It is perhaps the oldest one we have, as well.

kalden yungdrung said:

Further maintain we inside Bon Dzogchen, the famous 5 postures for Thodgal and they are not at all similar to the other yoga styles i (did) practice.

Malcolm wrote:

You asked about preparation, not main practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2011 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Tsalung Trulkor and Yantra Yoga

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

- In what can we see similarities between Yantra Yoga and Tsalung Trulkor?

Malcolm wrote:

"Trulkor" is the Tibetan translation of the word "yantra". They are same thing. Different lineages of yantra/trulkor have differences.

kalden yungdrung said:

- What is the origen of Yantra Yoga and Tsalung Trulkor?

Malcolm wrote:

Indian Yogis.

kalden yungdrung said:

- Is Tsalung Trulkor/Yantra Yoga used in Thodgal preparations?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2011 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Hot and Cool Drinks?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I've noticed that many Tibetan Lamas, and even layfolk, steer clear of many cold drinks, preferring warm or hot beverages. In fact, I've been told that cold beverages cannot be tolerated by some folks.

What is the reasoning behind this, according to Tibetan medicine?

Chaz said:

I've been toldd that the Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche's preferred beverage is Coke. I don't know if he takes it cold or at room temp though.

I recall seeing a picture of the Karmapa on his 2008 visit to Boulder with a Coke in hand, although when he taught at Mackey Auditorium he had a venti Starbucks with him.

Namdrol-la what the TM view on cafinated drinks?

Malcolm wrote:

Hard on the kidneys.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Dualistic vision arises from the second ignorance, the imputing ignorance; not from the

first ignorance, innate ignorance.

booker said:

That would mean the primordial understanding has the innate ignorance. Right? Which is quite a contradiction. Since Samantabhadra is "the one who is in the state of instant presence from the beginning and is never distracted " how can it ever had any ignorance in the first place?

Malcolm wrote:

In order to understand this, you need to study the process of Samantabhadra's liberation. When you do so, you will discover than Samantabhadra was not always liberated. Then you will understand that Samantabhadra possessed innate ignorance, but not imputing ignorance. Innate ignorance is simply unknowing. Imputing ignorance causes dualistic vision.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2011 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Agganna Sutta - human origins

Content:

Will said:

Namdrol: Not necessarily. In any event, that is a species of mythology.

What is "mythology" - the sutta? What is "not necessarily"? You are devolving into incoherence.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the sutta is a mythology.

It is not necessary for the mind to provide a "blueprint".

By design, the ID people mean "planned". Cellular life is not random (since it requires certain causes and conditions), but it is not planned. Human beings and other forms of life on this planet as well as the rest of the cosmos were not created or designed by anyone.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2011 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Even Samantabhadra first possessed ignorance.

booker said:

Hello Lupon

How do you relate to what you just said the following from ChNNR (in "Dzogchen Teachings"):

ChNNR said:

Generally speaking, it is explained that one who is in the state of instant presence from the beginning and is never distracted has knowledge or understanding. Thatat primordial understanding is called Samantabhadra, which is the symbol of the Ati Buddha—the primordial Buddha that since the beginning has never been conditioned by dualistic vision. If we don't have this knowledge or understanding, there is no way we can realize or get into that state

Malcolm wrote:

Dualistic vision arises from the second ignorance, the imputing ignorance; not from the first ignorance, innate ignorance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2011 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Agganna Sutta - human origins

Content:

Will said:

Namdrol: In any event, that so called body has no cells, etc.

True, but what are the following devolving steps? At some point the subtle body becomes flesh, which latter requires cells and growth from tiny to our "fathom long" body. The mind is surely involved at that point - maybe not "creating" but supplying a blueprint or image that can be copied.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily. In any event, that is a species of mythology.

Will said:

At any rate this Buddhist devolve-evolve notion, with human life never ending, but transforming from subtle to gross & reverse, is not only very different from the conventional scientific idea, but suggests to me that mind or consciousness rules somehow.

Malcolm wrote:

"Design" suggests intention. Buddha rejects the idea that the universe was designed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2011 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Hot and Cool Drinks?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Thanks, Namdrol....Some have claimed cold drinks make them sick....what's TM's take on this?

Malcolm wrote:

Same reason, kill digestive heat, makes your immune system compromised, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2011 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Agganna Sutta - human origins

Content:

Will said:

...what "mind-made" means in this sutta passage.

Namdrol said:

Mano-maya kāya -- it means that the body in question here is from an apparitional birth; not womb, egg or moisture birth.

N

Will said:

Above is one definition, yet there are others. The Lankavatara Sutra and some of the suttas say it is also "will-made" ie, magical, siddhi created.

Here is a short paper on the subject: <http://skb.or.kr/down/papers/129.pdf> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Not in this context. In any event, that so called body has no cells, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2011 at 10:09 AM

Title: Re: Hot and Cool Drinks?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I've noticed that many Tibetan Lamas, and even layfolk, steer clear of many cold drinks, preferring warm or hot beverages. In fact, I've been told that cold beverages cannot be

tolerated by some folks.

What is the reasoning behind this, according to Tibetan medicine?

Malcolm wrote:

Habitually using cold drinks kill digestive heat. However, when it is very hot, it is fine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2011 at 10:06 AM

Title: Re: Agganna Sutta - human origins

Content:

Will said:

...what "mind-made" means in this sutta passage.

Malcolm wrote:

Mano-maya kāya -- it means that the body in question here is from an apparitional birth; not womb, egg or moisture birth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2011 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Agganna Sutta - human origins

Content:

Will said:

10. 'There comes a time, Vasettha, when, sooner or later after a long period, this world contracts. At a time of contraction, beings are mostly born in the Abhassara Brahma world. And there they dwell, mind-made, feeding on delight, self-luminous, moving through the air, glorious — and they stay like that for a very long time. But sooner or later, after a very long period, this world begins to expand again. At a time of expansion, the beings from the Abhassara Brahma world, having passed away from there, are mostly reborn in this world. Here they dwell, mind-made, feeding on delight, selfluminous,

moving through the air, glorious--and they stay like that for a very long time.

"Mind-made" I bolded, suggesting to me that we divine-like humans use some higher function of mind to intelligently design ourselves - from the 4 higher skandhas to cells to big toes. No Creator God needed. This is why the hyperventilating over ID as meaning ONLY "God the Creator" is silly.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we don't intelligently design ourselves. According to the Buddhist model, we stupidly degenerate by being attracted to physical food because of our afflictive patterns. There is nothing intelligent about it.

There is no higher function of mind at all involved here. Just affliction and action driving

samsara. There is nothing at all intelligent about samsara; actually, samsara is driven by ignorance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 6th, 2011 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Mercury Amalgam Fillings

Content:

Soar said:

Does Tibetan Medicine have anything relevant to say about mercury amalgam fillings?

Afaik the accepted dental understanding is that mercury amalgam fillings are much better for big fillings on back teeth for example and pose no health risks. So getting white fillings in this case would be a weaker option and could not seal the tooth as well leading to easier decay.

I'm not sure what to make of modern views against using mercury fillings, mercury is obviously toxic but really does anything close to an effective amount get released into the body, or is just having the filling in the mouth going to cause problems?

The clearest advice I've had against metal in the mouth has been with implants and posts as these go into the body more and disrupt chi flow from a TCM perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

The mercury in fillings is bonded to other metals, hence it is held to be inert. The problem is leaching, from what I understand.

In general, one can chelate mercury out of the body using a sea buckthorn decoction for one week.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 6th, 2011 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: uncomfortable mantra question

Content:

Aemilius said:

Barak Obama has declared himself to be a murderer because he said that he rejoiced over a killing, but in our social unit it is not permissible to call him a murderer.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 6th, 2011 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

Your unwarranted assumption led by your prejudice against theism makes you think that the main purpose of the book is to ruin the splendid, "objective" science of origins this day.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't assume Meyers is out to ruin science.

He wrote the book, clearly to reconcile cellular evolution with theism.

And that, from a Buddhist point of view, is unacceptable. Karma and evolution get along just fine, however.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 6th, 2011 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

Firstly, Signature in the Cell is not "stealth theology".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is:

“Those who believe in a transcendent God may, therefore, find support for their belief from the biological evidence that supports the theory of intelligent design”

-- Signature in the Cell

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 5th, 2011 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

mudra said:

but also intrigued by your interpretation of Je Tsongkhapa stating that humans are just devolved gods. Is there a citation, and in what context?

Malcolm wrote:

This is not Tsongkhapa's idea. It is sourced from the Pali Canon, in the Digha Nikāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 5th, 2011 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: uncomfortable mantra question

Content:

Aemilius said:

Sure, but you are also all the other things that you have done. The first precept is not the only cause of identity.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, people's karma is mixed -- I already pointed this out.

However, you asked the question "what makes a murderer a murderer".

I answered it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 5th, 2011 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Re:

Content:

Will said:

OK I will re-read it. But the Kosa and you have just described "first" beings, in any kalpa, which is what I meant - not any other "first". The process sound similar to an individual's rebirth; body dies but mind does not and during bardo (an "upper" realm) waits until "traces of action" reform our "container" and the mind descends. But all of us "being born from the upper two form realms" does not explain the origin of life & beings on this Earth planet.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it does. The outer elements gradually come together again after the universe cools off, forms solar systems, planets that are capable of bearing life and then life forms evolve on the planets.

It does not require design.

Buddhism does not describe outer dependent origination in detail. But as long as one's version of the universe's formation does not included a creator or a first cause of any kind, then that version will be acceptable to Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Prayer to protect the earth by one of the Dudjom Tulkus

Content:

Aemilius said:

Nietzsche wrote in Twilight of the Idols, "Mankind does not strive for happiness; only the Englishman does that."

This is quoted and its meaning explained by Stuart Jeffries in the article Why happiness is overrated

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2006/jul/11/whyhappinessisoverrated>

Malcolm wrote:

The usual word for happiness in Tibetan is "bde ba" -- which is a translation of sukha, ease. It does not mean the kind of emotional "happiness" we think of in the West. It just means a situation of less stress and more comfort.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: beings from ???

Content:

Will said:

If so, what explains the existence of the godly-humans in the first place?

Namdrol said:

Karma; and karma is not "intelligent design".

N

Will said:

How does karma bring the first beings into appearance - do tiny wind wheels spin and presto Adi Buddha & Adi Gandharva & Adi fill-in-the-blank pop up?

At least give me an English source to read that describes this process of appearance of beings - not cosmology, I have such already.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no first beings.

Please read the third chapter of the Kosha where the collapse and formation of the universes is described.

Basically, what happens is that at the end of the last eon, all sentient beings are reborn in the upper two form realms while the rest of the container universe is destroyed. There is a period of twenty dark eons, and then due to the traces of action the wind mandala forms again, and after the container universe forms due to the traces of karma of sentient beings, a being is born from the upper two form realms into the brahma loka. He looks around, and being unable to remember the loka from which he took rebirth, and being unable to perceive it, thinks he is both self-created, created the whole shebang, and manages to convince everyone else who is reborn afterwards that he did create it all.

The point, Will, is that dependent origination does not permit there ever to be a first anything.

Adibuddha simply refers to the first Buddha of a given eon i.e. the Sambhogakāya. It does not mean some creator buddha, as you know.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: beings from ???

Content:

Will said:

If so, what explains the existence of the godly-humans in the first place?

Namdrol said:

Karma; and karma is not "intelligent design".

N

mindyourmind said:

And in any event, how does positing an "intelligent designer" (aka God) explain anything?

Malcolm wrote:

Just recall "The variety of the world is created by karma". This is the Buddhist "Intelligent designer" -- not to bright, if you ask me.

It doesn't. It just allows us to collapse into intellectual stupor and relief.

I am betting Will might be a freemason, though, and while masonry is supposedly open to all of any faith (upon invitation, of course), one of the principle requirements is belief

in a GAU, a Grand Architect of the Universe. Since Buddhism does not accept a GAU, Buddhists would be technically excluded from masonry on principle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: beings from ???

Content:

Will said:

If so, what explains the existence of the godly-humans in the first place?

Malcolm wrote:

Karma; and karma is not "intelligent design".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Why isn't Tendai popular in the West?

Content:

ryokai said:

The New York Betsuin

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to know the story on Prosser, talk to Monshin.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 7:00 AM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

An essay on ID by a theosophist that rejects the one God in favor of intelligent beings as the architects & builders:

<http://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/sunrise/52-02-3/sc-wtst3.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Endless regress -- who designed the designers?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 6:59 AM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

A 2009 title from Harper; this work is important. It's subtitle is "DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design". Some chapters are difficult for those of us poorly educated folk, but overall it is a good look at the arguments for and against ID. It is not a work about evolution, but just focuses on the arising of life via the first cell. Also impressive is his unbiased, close examination of the evidence against ID. He is not a preacher for ID who ignores evidence against it in favor of a pre-conceived notion.

Namdrol said:

ID is just stealth theology. Total speculative junk.

Will said:

Have you read the book? If not, who cares what your uninformed opinion is.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't need to read the book, the idea of ID is hogwash -- God dressed up in science. We are Buddhists. We do not accept such silly theories on principle. Dependent origination is a much better explanation that allows for natural selection and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Human cost of cheap leather shoes.

Content:

Huseng said:

Samsara is getting worse and worse. We're on a downward spiral.

I'm working on bailing out of samsara. The flaming wreck doesn't have many positive prospects to it.

Malcolm wrote:

Samsara never gets worse, we just get more sensitive.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Human cost of cheap leather shoes.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Samsara.

Huseng said:

Setting aside the fact that immeasurable numbers of cows are killed to produce leather, there is also a human cost.

This is really sick. Bangladesh lets their workers treat leather with a well known carcinogenic chemical. They produce the leather for the big name brands of the world.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2XclGcuWwYg> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

The injustice being committed against humanity, animals and the environment is simply unspeakable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu's Vajra Armor text/practice

Content:

padma norbu said:

I can contact an archangel and have him tell me what to do to solve a problem pretty easily, in comparison.

Malcolm wrote:

Working with worldly spirits is always easier.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Is Pure Land "Buddhism" contradictory to Buddhism?

Content:

Enochian said:

Namdrol explained that Pure Lands are actually Bardo realms for those who cling to the idea of a buddhist heaven.

Namdrol said:

Bardo experiences, not bardo realms.

There is a lot of slippage here, actually. There are so-called buddhakṣetras, our solar system is one of them. There are pure ones, and impure ones.

But when people die, what most people are experiencing as "birth" in a pure realm is a bardo experience.

I

Adamantine said:

Could you please elaborate further and provide some sources for this interpretation?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, Sachen remarks that Khechari, the pure land of the dakinis, can be a name for the bardo. So when people gain liberation in Khechari, it can mean they are actually mother tantra practitioners attaining awakening in the bardo.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Is Pure Land "Buddhism" contradictory to Buddhism?

Content:

Enochian said:

Namdrol explained that Pure Lands are actually Bardo realms for those who cling to the idea of a buddhist heaven.

Malcolm wrote:

Bardo experiences, not bardo realms.

There is a lot of slippage here, actually. There are so-called buddhakṣetras, our solar system is one of them. There are pure ones, and impure ones.

But when people die, what most people are experiencing as "birth" in a pure realm is a bardo experience.

I

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2011 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Why isn't Tendai popular in the West?

Content:

Huseng said:

They are quite insistent that you will receive no serious training unless you ordain.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, Yoga tantra on down arose in monasteries. Anuttarayoga tantra arose in the margins of the monasteries.

Huseng said:

Japanese Mikkyo is kept away from anyone but the initiated.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is fair to say that Shugendo was a reaction against this - but if one were to make a parallel with Bon, it would be Shugendo.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Why isn't Tendai popular in the West?

Content:

Seishin said:

Why isn't Tendai popular in the West?

Namdrol said:

For the same reason that Yoga Tantra is not popular in Tibet -- anuttarayoga tantra is alive and well in the West.

N

Huseng said:

I think Shingon, which is yoga-tantra, would be found appealing to many people outside of Japan if it were actively translated and taught outside of Japan. It isn't anuttarayoga-tantra (I don't think it was even developed in India at the time Shingon was being transmitted to Japan from China), but the model presents a path to Buddhahood in a single lifetime. It is a model of tantra without Bon elements like in Tibet, though the Chinese influences are clearly present.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no Bon elements in Buddhist tantra in Tibet. There are a few rites, such as sang offerings, etc. that Tibetans use that ultimately derive from bon, but that are not "tantric". Many local deities were absorbed as protectors, however this phenomena is

common in all Buddhist countries and is not unique to Tibetan Buddhism.

Huseng said:

But not a lot of people want to go to university in the small town of Koyasan on top of a mountain. Here is a university with superb resources for the study of not just Japanese Shingon, but Tibetan and Sanskrit tantric literature as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Yoga tantra requires a kind of ritual specialization for regular practice not needed in Anuttarayoga tantra. This is the main reason why it declined in Tibet. Yoga Tantra is more external.

Also I agree that in general, the elitism of the Japanese priesthood around Mikkyo in general will contribute to its eventual decline.

On the other hand, there is also a growing interest in Anuttarayoga tantra and so on in Japan too.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Why isn't Tendai popular in the West?

Content:

ryokai said:

Jion Prosser is no longer teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Largely because he was exposed on E-Sangha to be someone who falsely claimed to be a Tendai Acharya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Why isn't Tendai popular in the West?

Content:

Seishin said:

Why isn't Tendai popular in the West?

Malcolm wrote:

For the same reason that Yoga Tantra is not popular in Tibet -- anuttarayoga tantra is alive and well in the West.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 7:08 AM

Title: Re: HIDDEN BON TREASURES

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Adhi Nath wrote:

I wouldn't say that. I would say that the people who brought the Vedas to India were from the region of Rishikas where Dzogchen may have originated. It could mean that the Maharishis were Dzogchenpas and the people who said the Vedas were trying the best they could to preserve some of that knowledge. Perhaps they did not succeed, because the Vedas are not Dzogchen. But when you look at the Gayatri mantra and its inner and secret meanings, one could get the impression that there is a direct connection between the sun, the mantras and the mind. In any event the people who transmitted the Vedas were from Rishikas/Kambhojas aka Olmo Lungring.

Tahsi delek,

According to Bon sources, did Bon originate in Tazhik a Persian like area. That is the outer area or seen area from Olmo Lungring.

People out of these outer areas are still called today Tazhiks.

Rishikas, where is that situated? Or do you mean Rishikesh the city of the Rishis or seers meant in the Vedic culture? Maybe are these Rishis connected to the Dzogchen cycle of teachings of Prahevajra, that could be, but according to Bon we are not informed about a connection with the Rishis.

Best wishes

KY

adinatha said:

Rishikas and Kambhojas is the area of what is now called Tazik-Uzbek. Tazik-Uzbek was called Rishikas/Kambhojas maybe 3000-5000 years ago. It was not a Persian like area then. It was proto-Vedic and Proto-Persian. If we are talking 18,000 years ago like the Zhang Zhung texts indicate, we are talking about Rishikas and Kambhojas. These names are mentioned in the Mahabharata describing the peoples from this area who settled in Punjab and what is today Pakistan (where Udyana was). This group transmitted the Vedas. According to the Mahabharata the Maharishis responsible for discovering the Vedas were from Rishikas (land of the Rishis) and Kambhojas.

Incidentally there is a township in Tazik known as Almalyk which sounds like Olmo Lungring. Strangely it is one of the most polluted places on Earth.

Malcolm wrote:

And Sudakshina, the king of the Kambhojas, O ruler of men, accompanied by the Yavanas and Sakas, came to the Kuru chief with an Akshauhini of troops.

Yavanas = Ionians. Sakas = Scythians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: Alternative biographies of the Buddha.

Content:

adinatha said:

Mahaprajapati was also considered the mother goddess of the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

I know a guy whose dog is named Buddha...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Alternative biographies of the Buddha.

Content:

Huseng said:

As he points out, this is quite different from the more common account of the Buddha's life. For example his mother is alive when he departs the home life. That's in stark contrast to the popular account where his mother is said to have died. He also is a boy when he departs into homelessness.

Namdrol said:

A boy with a beard?

By his "mother" he could have been referring to Mahaprajapati, his nanny.

adinatha said:

Is it just me, but isn't it obvious, at least these names are entirely allegorical? His mother was "Maya" his nanny "Mahaprajapati?" The "mother" of "buddhas" is realization that all is "maya." And a "buddha" appears in the universe aka the deity "Mahaprajapati" and by seeking shelter in her mountains and forests is "raised" by her?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think a mountain goddess went to Ananda to be admitted to the Sangha as a nun.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Tradition in the West

Content:

Pero said:

I wonder what these guys talk about when they get together like that.

Malcolm wrote:

Girls...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Alternative biographies of the Buddha.

Content:

Huseng said:

As he points out, this is quite different from the more common account of the Buddha's life. For example his mother is alive when he departs the home life. That's in stark contrast to the popular account where his mother is said to have died. He also is a boy when he departs into homelessness.

Malcolm wrote:

A boy with a beard?

By his "mother" he could have been referring to Mahaprajapati, his nanny.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu's Vajra Armor text/practice

Content:

padma norbu said:

A friend of mine was advising that I should do this. He learned it on a 3-day retreat. I found that Namkhai Norbu offers a text on this practice, but the explanation is a little confusing to me. I am not sure if I need more than the general transmission in order to practice it.

So, I'm just wondering if I have permission to do Namkhai Norbu's "Vajra Armor" text/practice or if I need something more.

I looked at the list of lungs Namkhai Norbu read on the last day of retreat and I see that I wrote down "Protection Mantra - may be activated by 3-day retreat." I did not write down "Vajra Armor" anywhere, but that does not mean Namkhai Norbu didn't say that's what it

was. I was struggling to hear what I was receiving and writing down as fast as possible.

Malcolm wrote:

This is vajra armor, so you have transmission.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Drikung Dzogchen Lineage

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

dzoki wrote:

Depends on which lineage you want to know. There are several lineages of Dzogchen in Drikung Kagyu, all of them are terma.

These are the tertons of Drikung Kagyu:

Drigung Gyalwang Rinchen Phuntsog also known as Drigung Ratna (16th Century).

Drigung Orgyen Nüden Dorje also known as Drigung Lho Jedrung or Lho Bongtül.

Drigung Zhabdrung Chetsang, Konchok Rinchen (16th Century).

Drigung Chungtsang, Chokyi Dragpa (17th Century).

Drigung Özer Dorje of Dri-Matak Göñ

Garnor rinpoche

I don't know whether Garnor Rinpoche has revealed any dzogchen cycle, he has a terma of wrathful Achi Drolma and Vajrakilaya.

Rinchen Phuntsok revealed the famous Damcho Gongpa Yangzab.

Tashi delek,

Thanks for your replies.

Finally did i expect an unbroken Dzogchen lineage here like stemming from Samantabhadra in this case to the actual Lineage Master.

But this could be true in the Drikung Dzogchen lineage maybe ?

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Yangzab lineage is Samantabhadra, Vajrasattva, Garab Dorje, Shri Singha, Padmasambhava, Prince Mutig Tsadpo (Senalak) --> Drikung Rinpoche Phuntsok etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, July 3rd, 2011 at 12:42 AM
Title: Re: Zhang Zhung and the Tibetan alphabets
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
ZHANG ZHUNG AND TIBETAN ALPHABETS
by
the Ven, Geshela Chapur

According to Bon history, the original Tibetan alphabet was copied from the ancient Zhang-Zhung alphabet before the reign of the 2nd Tibetan king, Mukri Tsedpo.

Malcolm wrote:
All Alphabets, including Sanskrit, are based on western semitic script. Writing was introduced to India by the Greeks. If anything, the possibility is that Zhang Zhung borrowed the greek alphabet.

Tibetan is definitely based on Gupta script.

N

kalden yungdrung said:
The minister then reputedly devised a new script for Tibetan based on the Devanagari model

Malcolm wrote:
Devanagari did not exist in the 7th century. Earliest examples of what we now term date from the 11th century. It was made the standard script of Sanskrit and Hindi only after the invention of a movable type for Devanagari in the 19th century.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2011 at 8:38 PM
Title: Re: Drikung Dzogchen Lineage
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
- To what do these Termas belong, Semsde, Longde or Mengagde?
-

Malcolm wrote:
Yangzab is described by the tertön, Rinchen Phunstok, as an appendix of the Khandro Nyinthing, so it is classed as Manngag sde.

However, it mainly consists of mahāyoga and anuyoga sadhanas (three roots, shigro, protectors etc.), with only a short snying thig text for the Dzogchen section. In other words, it was used as a supplement to Khandro Nyinthig.

One of the features of Yangzab is that it has many very, very wrathful practices.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2011 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Tradition in the West

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Adamantine...exactly what I meant..certain mantras etc due to vibrational quality, or as you said meter etc are best left as is.

Namdrol...dude, that guy is REALLY scary looking..like Night of the living Dead scary...where do you find these pics anyways?

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.adolphus.nl/sadhus/index.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2011 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Tradition in the West

Content:

Sönam said:

classical tantrism traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

But I like classical tantra traditions...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2011 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: What is Ka'Go Blessing?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Tonight HH Sakya Trizen participates in this event at NYU and gives the blessing of ka'go. Does anyone know more about what this blessing is? The evening will be the meeting of Tibetan indigenous doctors with His Holiness in a panel discussion where His Holiness will give a keynote speech on healing through Medicine Buddha and Tibetan medicine.

The evening will conclude with His Holiness bestowing the blessings of healing and overcoming obstacles called ka'go.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a rite which invokes the blessings of the lineage lamas in order to command the protectors to protect the participants in the rite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 1st, 2011 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Digital Tibetan Buddhist Altar

Content:

udawa said:

For what its worth, Namdrol has a link to the site from his own Tibetan Medicine blog.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because his blog was often interesting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 1st, 2011 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

Darkness is conditioned because it is impermanent.

PadmaVonSamba said:

When something is regarded as conditioned,
do you make a distinction between
that which simply undergoes transformation and is thus subject to gradual change
and that which undergoes total annihilation?"

In other words, absolute darkness is not subject to change, only to annihilation.

A room is either totally dark or else it isn't ..

That darkness is destroyed by the faintest illumination.

So due to external circumstances it may not be permanent

but it has no characteristics which arise dependent on anything else.

Only the duality of light and dark is dependent.

Malcolm wrote:

Darkness is part of the rūpa āyatana, it is considered part of matter. It is a color, from a Buddhist point of view. It is therefore, impermanent and conditioned.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 30th, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

When we get down to the basic problem, we have an appearance. Then we give it a label. Identification follows appearance. Then conventional discourse can ensue. Underneath the all identifications is the idea of "is".

PadmaVonSamba said:

Well, you are saying that underneath the all identifications is the idea of "is", but still, you begin with appearance.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

PadmaVonSamba said:

I am thinking here that "is" or "is not" are conceptual, and only follow the initial arising of an appearance, the raw arising of appearance to the senses.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, all views are conceptual in nature.

PadmaVonSamba said:

What about total darkness? Total darkness is a complete lack of light.

Malcolm wrote:

That means it is still conditioned.

PadmaVonSamba said:

there is nothing actually causing darkness, yet that darkness can be directly witnessed because there is still the functioning of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Darkness is conditioned because it is impermanent.

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, perhaps sunyata can be directly experienced, precisely as both the non-arising of an

experiencer and the non arising of an object of experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Then it cannot be experienced since neither an object nor an experiencer of an object arose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 30th, 2011 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: uncomfortable mantra question

Content:

Aemilius said:

For how long is a person a "murderer"?

Namdrol said:

For as long as he is satisfied with his action, does not regret it and confessed it.

Aemilius said:

How about his other deeds that he has also performed or committed? Do they not count as a basis for designation? Like a poet, a calligrapher, a father, a teacher, and so on ? If you consider the political aspect, influential persons are also called reformers, like Mao Zedong by the Time Magazine. Or they are called mr President or something, how do you call Him? - Murderer ?

Malcolm wrote:

A person's karma can be mixed. A leader can be a murderer, for example, many people think George Bush is a war criminal.

But you asked a very specific question, and I gave you a very specific reply. If you kill someone, and do not regret it, etc., than for that long you are a murderer.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 30th, 2011 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: The importance of lineage in Dzogchen

Content:

mindyourmind said:

How important is lineage in Dzogchen? As a Dzogchen practitioner, do you regard your lineage to be Nyingma, Dzogchen Community, something quite distinct, something completely irrelevant?

What about the so-called "blessings of (the) lineage"? Is lineage in Dzogchen important to you, or not?

Malcolm wrote:

Lineage is indispensable.

Dzogchen is principally a Nyingmapa teaching, but I consider myself a Buddhist first and foremost. The four schools are a Tibetan thing. There was no "Sakya, Kagyu, Gelug, Nyingma" etc., in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 30th, 2011 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Reincarnation

Content:

kirtu said:

How can we help all the beings?

Malcolm wrote:

Practice harder. Nothing else does them any good in the end.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana Mantras

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nope.

ChangYuan said:

Great! Would you happen to know of a good site to get the english translations of these, as well as a pronunciation guide?

Malcolm wrote:

They are pretty much pronounced as they are spelled.

All 'a' sounds in Sanskrit sound as in "fall", only difference is in length ā is twice as long as a. 'i' sounds like "ee" as in "he" again, if there is a macron i.e. ī, double the length.

"ai" sounds like a cross between "bye" and "bay", it is kind of in between those two depending on region.

When reciting mantras sutra style, sing them out loud melodiously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana Mantras

Content:

ChangYuan said:

Are there any mantras that people use regularly in the Mahayana traditions besides the Amitabha's name, and the daimoku in Nichiren? I personally find chanting practice to be very focusing, and am always interested in what others do for that type of practice.

Namdrol said:

Om mani padme hum -- Avalokiteshavara

Om täre tuttäre ture svāhā -- Tārā

Om a ra pa cha na dhiḥ -- Manjushri

Om muni muni mahāmuni śākyamuni svāhā -- Buddha

Tadyatha gate gate paragate parasamgate bodhi svāhā -- Prajñāparamita.

Tadyatha om bhaisajya bhaisajya mahābhaisajya rājā samudgate svāhā -- Medicien Buddha

ChangYuan said:

Aren't the Manjushri, Medicine Buddha and Prajñāparamita mantras that require empowerments?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Mahayana Mantras

Content:

ChangYuan said:

Are there any mantras that people use regularly in the Mahayana traditions besides the Amitabha's name, and the daimoku in Nichiren? I personally find chanting practice to be very focusing, and am always interested in what others do for that type of practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Om mani padme hum -- Avalokiteshavara

Om täre tuttäre ture svāhā -- Tārā

Om a ra pa cha na dhiḥ -- Manjushri

Om muni muni mahāmuni śākyamuni svāhā -- Buddha

Tadyatha gate gate paragate parasamgate bodhi svāhā -- Prajñāparamita.

Tadyatha om bhaisajya bhaisajya mahābhaisajya rājā samudgate svāhā -- Medicien Buddha

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

seraphim said:

So Tokdens are different from repas? They all engage in extensive Tsa Lung retreats right?

Malcolm wrote:

Togdens are usually monks, who do not cut their hair after retreat. But not always.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

This is very well put, thank you.

But I wonder (meaning, politely, that I am not disagreeing with your main point) if the root of the mistake might actually be starting with the assumption of "I", which is only then later subject to the question of "is" or "is not".

Malcolm wrote:

When we get down to the basic problem, we have an appearance. Then we give it a label. Identification follows appearance. Then conventional discourse can ensue. Underneath the all identifications is the idea of "is".

PadmaVonSamba said:

I have found that a hurdle for some new students of the dharma is approaching the understanding of sunyata from a sort of deconstructionist starting point. For example, they might say "here is a table but it doesn't have any real existence" and then try to talk themselves into the idea that somehow the table isn't there.

Malcolm wrote:

Notions of 'is' and 'is not' lead us swiftly away from dependent origination. That is why Buddha and Nagarjuna criticized them.

PadmaVonSamba said:

If they approach the situation a little differently, saying, "there is nothing inherently there which can be (in essence) found to be a table" then the idea that we merely put labels on composite phenomena makes more sense, and the question of "is" or "is not" becomes moot, because, beginning with that understanding, no presumption of an object has been made.

Malcolm wrote:

Differentiating essences and existences is no different than trying differentiate things and their characteristics.

There is no table in a a table. Some people are helped with the idea there is no inherent table on a table, but then what often happens, is that they get hung up on the table, just the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 10:04 AM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

[

and so what you are saying is that if it is not the result of cause, it cannot be experienced.

Malcolm wrote:

"it cannot be experienced..." by something arisen from causes.

PadmaVonSamba said:

If we refer to the 12 links of dependent arising and say that they are beginning-less, how does beginningless-ness differ from what we would refer to as being eternal?

Malcolm wrote:

Relatively speaking, every instant is impermanent, even though the 'chain' of instants has no beginning. The point of dependent origination is that no conditioned entity can arise from anything other than another conditioned entity. All causes are themselves effects, and all effects are themselves causes. There is no room in the logic of dependent origination for a cause that is not an effect of some other cause -- hence there can be no beginnings of any kind at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 6:36 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

There is a Prajapati lineage 2500 years. Anyway who has the repa lineage in Kagyu? I think Drukpa. It think it's small now.

dzoki said:

Not really, Drukpas mostly have togdens nowadays, Barom Kagyu is really a repa lineage.

Even today there are several repas of Barom Kagyu in Tibet.

Namdrol said:

Nyingmapas never had repas. That is strictly a Kagyu thing.

N

dzoki said:

What about Dungtso Repa, the later?

Malcolm wrote:

Not familiar with his Namthar.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

Nyingma and Kagyu produce more realized masters. It's not a bunch of crap.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a bunch of crap. You only say this because you are completely unfamiliar with the annals of Gelug masters.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Other Buddhists would say they are experiencing the eternal Buddha.

Namdrol said:

One cannot experience anything that is eternal.

PadmaVonSamba said:

what about sunlight?

Malcolm wrote:
Sunlight is not eternal since it is produced.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 5:35 AM
Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen
Content:

adinatha said:
If it is, I'm sorry. I'm not afraid to call it like I see it. Not all lineages are equal, I'm sorry to say. That's just a fact.

Malcolm wrote:
All four lineages have produced masters of high realization and will continue to. Somehow, Kagyus and Nyingmapas always propagate this bullshit that their lineages produce more realized persons. What a bunch of crap.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 4:29 AM
Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen
Content:

adinatha said:
Perhaps it's just spin but the Kagyu don't think the Sakya have the ultimate realization lineage anymore.

Malcolm wrote:
Sectarian bullshit.

adinatha said:
What is more likely the case is that Repas did not form institutions since they were basically Buddhist sadhus.
So then where's his sadhu lineage? Indian sadhus have really old lineages.

Malcolm wrote:
The repa lineage still exists in Kagyu. Anyway, Tibet is not India. And, there is no sadhu lineage older than 1500 years. I doubt many are any older than three or four hundred years.

adinatha said:

So what? He didn't have enough power to grow his own lineage. To hell what the monks say, even if he was vilified if he had the mojo he could have carried on with his repa lineage. Nyingmapas have repa masters still.

Malcolm wrote:

Nyingmapas never had repas. That is strictly a Kagyu thing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Other Buddhists would say they are experiencing the eternal Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot experience anything that is eternal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2011 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

Rechungpa's lineage which includes this stuff when to Drukpa Kagyu, AFAIK. You can get these docs and read them. Known as "Rechungpa's Hearing Lineage."

Malcolm wrote:

I was responding to your assertion that after Tilopa, karmamudra practice was not important. But this is clearly false given all the lineages from Tilopa that are present in Sakya.

adinatha said:

The problem I see with the path of desire is lineage. I don't think folks have lineage that combines the path of desire with the lineage of blessings and the lineage of ultimate realization. At least, not in the Kagyu/Gelukpa/Sakya world. IMHO.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite alive and well in Sakya and Nyingma. Sakya lineages in particular have been preserved by the Khon family who have always been lay people.

adinatha said:

For the most part, the sarma path of desire is a dead lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Sakya.

adinatha said:

You can only look to Drukpa, Drikung and to some extent Karma Kagyu to get a real full fledged sarma lineage of transmission, blessing and realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Or, you can receive Lamdre or the Sakya Cakrasamvara and Yogini transmissions, where this practice is alive and well.

adinatha said:

Look what happened to Rechungpa's lineage. It's basically dead too. Rechungpa did not have the karmic power to create something vast and long lasting, even though he spent his whole life with Milarepa.

Malcolm wrote:

What is more likely the case is that Repas did not form institutions since they were basically Buddhist sadhus.

adinatha said:

Gampopa who was with Mila for only one year, went on to establish enormous lineages which is awesome. So the Kagyu position makes sense, that Mila foresaw that Rechungpa wasn't going to be a big guru, and gave his lineage of blessing and ultimate realization to Gampopa who was peerless in his morality, trust and faith.

Malcolm wrote:

Its pretty clear to me that Kagyus white washed tantra ala Kadampa.

You can believe Tsang Nyon Heruka's Bio of Mila. I don't.

I am not saying that Gampopa was not an important student of Milarepa. He is definitely the founder of the Kagyu school. But he was not Milrepa's most important student. Mila's most important student, Rechungpa, was vilified by his monastic competition.

https://www.amazon.com/Biographies-Rechungpa-Routledge-Critical-Studies/dp/041559622X/ref=tmm_pap_title_0 " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

I think 'are' is the plural form of 'is'.

If you say that asserting something is (or is not) a wrong view,
doesn't that assertion that it is a wrong view thus establish a wrong view?

Malcolm wrote:

I have already answered this and won't do so again.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: uncomfortable mantra question

Content:

Aemilius said:

For how long is a person a "murderer"?

Malcolm wrote:

For as long as he is satisfied with his action, does not regret it and confessed it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Report from the 2011 Buddhist Teachers Cinf.

Content:

kirtu said:

<http://www.buddhistchannel.tv/index.php?id=6,10263,0,0,1,0>

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

They did not invite a single Sakyapa, Asian or Western.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: bloody Hindu Tara??

Content:

udyan said:

In any case be it same mantra or not from what I understand Hindu Tara was derived from Buddhist Tara. I read about a Hindu story that shows that Tara came from Buddhism. One of Hindu sages who's practice was not going anywhere was told to recite Tara's mantra to help with that. He had to travel to the region where only Visnu in his form as Buddha (Buddha is an avatar of Visnu in Hinduism) would be able to teach him proper method, he was told to go to that region (China or Tibet). Once there he received tantric teachings from Buddha and became a great practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

There is considerable intertextuality between Hindu and Buddhist tantra. One cannot state that one definitively comes from the other. They borrowed from each other.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

cloudburst said:

Will you give a clear definition of the difference between a "view,"...

Malcolm wrote:

A view is a fundamental belief one holds about reality. For example, "everything exists" (sarva asti)

cloudburst said:

How can we know when something is presented as a view and when something is being presented as conventional discourse?

Malcolm wrote:

One can easily observe that common people, not educated in tenets, generally believe their statements about the existence and non-existence of things. When a pot is broken, for them it is not a pot anymore. It may have become a broken pot, or shards, but for them the pot that was there is no longer there and has thus become non-existent in their mind.

Likewise, they believe in simple reality of a pot that they can see. For them the pot "is".

When it comes to people trained in tenet systems, this question is easier, because of course, those who subscribe to various Buddhist and non-Buddhist tenet systems subscribe to various sets of beliefs such as those who assert arising from an existent, those who assert arising from a non-existent and so on.

The Buddhas and Nagarjuna's target at based was really more oriented at the sort of naive realism that people have, especially in regards to rebirth. Naively, some people believe that they exist, and that they will continue to exist after death. Other people, on the other hand, think that after death, they will not exist anymore.

The root of both these mistaken positions is "is" and "is not" -- for example "I exist now, and I will continue to exist after death" or "I exist now but when I die I will cease to exist".

We can assume then, based on people's statements and training whether they are naive realists or not, or are trained in some tenet system.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

When "is" and "Is not" are views, then they are wrong views and only wrong views.

PadmaVonSamba said:

When "is" and "Is not" are views, then they are wrong views?

...what does "are" mean?

Malcolm wrote:

it is a form of the verb "to be" used to make intelligible sentences.

The question you should really be asking is "What constitutes a view"?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

cloudburst said:
...please demonstrate my error.

Malcolm wrote:
When "is" and "Is not" are views, then they are wrong views and only wrong views. This of course is the reason for parsing "is" and "Is not" in quotations.

When used simply in conventional discourse and not as views, then of course 'is' and 'is not' are not wrong views since they are not being presented as views.

Your error is conflating the former with the latter.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 4:51 AM
Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
I will not respond to sophistry on your part.

Unknown said:
What is a view of 'Is not', according to you?

Malcolm wrote:
A view of "is not" is "this thing that existed, this no longer exists now", as Nagarjuna points out:

The transformation of an existent into another
is the non-existent mentioned by people.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 3:35 AM
Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination
Content:

cloudburst said:
When i saw this claim with your 'signature' attached, it naturally occurred to me that you were representing your own position.
According to you, whose position is "is-and-is-not are wrong views?"

Malcolm wrote:

"Is" leads to the view of eternalism. "Is not" leads to the view of annihilation.

Nāgārjuna states:

'Is' is holding to permanence,
'Is not' is an annihilationist view.
Because of that, is and is not
are not made into a basis by the wise.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

cloudburst said:

When you said "is and is not are wrong views," is and is not became your position,
becasue you claim here there are wrong views...

Malcolm wrote:

No, since I am not reporting my own position. I have not advanced either position, so I
do not accept the fault that you ascribe.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2011 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Unknown said:

Of course I generally agree, but the problem that you seem stuck with is that not only
are you using illusory language in order to escape an illusory prison, you are using it in a
way that violates your own purpose. Once you accept contradiction in your own system,
you have stripped the screw of your reasoning and can no longer make it turn.

Malcolm wrote:

The case you are making is that using forms of the verb "to be" amounts to making a
philosophical commitment. But it does not.

Unknown said:

If "is" is wrong view, then you could also say that darkness comes from bright light.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a non-sequitor. You cannot force this consequence.

Unknown said:

If there is no necessary reason to avoid self-contradiction, anything can be claimed, and there can be no valid reason adduced to show that it is incorrect, as these reasons win conventional discourse depend on the law of non-contradiction, or excluded middle. You lose the liberating path.

Malcolm wrote:

"Is and is not" are not my positions. They are the positions of others {Samkhya, etc.}. Therefore, the fault of self-contradiction is not entailed. Either you accept the dualistic position of others and defend them, or you accept that asti and nasti are wrong views described by the Buddha as such.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 27th, 2011 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

Well I guess politics aside, the question would be at what stage did Naropa practice karmamudra? Was it from the start or at a late stage?

Namdrol said:

I would imagine after he started showing signs of heat on the path of application.

adinatha said:

Well if the oral tradition is correct it would have been a time analogous to when Milarepa was joined by Tseringma and her four sisters.

Malcolm wrote:

Peter Alan Roberts notes that the later Kagyu tradition scrubbed the names of Milarepa's consorts. He also points out that sexual yogas were such an important part of Milarepa's transmission that Rechungpa refused to teach monks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 27th, 2011 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

Well I guess politics aside, the question would be at what stage did Naropa practice

karmamudra? Was it from the start or at a late stage?

Namdrol said:

I would imagine after he started showing signs of heat on the path of application.

adinatha said:

Well if the oral tradition is correct it would have been a time analogous to when Milarepa was joined by Tseringma and her four sisters.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, heat on the tantric path of application is when one starts engaging in conduct such as wearing bone ornaments, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 27th, 2011 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

Well I guess politics aside, the question would be at what stage did Naropa practice karmamudra? Was it from the start or at a late stage?

Malcolm wrote:

I would imagine after he started showing signs of heat on the path of application.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 27th, 2011 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

And the Kagyu lineage basically doesn't have a consort practice lineage anymore.

Namdrol said:

Yes, this is true. This is based on many arguments you will find in Moonbeams of Mahamudra, for example.

adinatha said:

I should add, Drubpon Rinpoche also said Tilopa is the one who expressed to Naropa that karmamudra is a low level practice. Kagyu are not saying Gampopa monkified tantra. Rather, they are saying from the onset, Tilopa downgraded karmamudra and upgraded samayamudra and mahamudra. Also that this has its foundation in Saraha through Maitripa as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Tilopa must have thought that Naropa was a low-level practitioner then, since Naropa practiced karmamudra and so on. Actually, we know that Tilopa's attitude toward Naropa was not that great since Tilopa told Naropa that he would not achieve supreme siddhi.

I think the Kadampas "monkified" Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 27th, 2011 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

And the Kagyu lineage basically doesn't have a consort practice lineage anymore.

Namdrol said:

Kunzang Dechen Lingpa emphasized that these practices were really quite important.

adinatha said:

But as you said it's a very different practice in the sense of one is working with the tiple descending, retaining, reversing and spreading. Right? In Nyingthig, the four blisses and bliss clarity and non-thought are at the moment. Again, it's a preliminary, right? If you have been introduced to rigpa, what's the use, really?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, in the Nyinthig practice, one is working with the four blisses, descending, etc., just like the normal completion stage practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

but I am partial to the idea of a first cause.

Namdrol said:

The logic of dependent origination rejects first causes. This is the principle reason your view is not compatible with Buddhadharma. Buddha rejected first causes.

Serenity509 said:

What is the universe dependent on for its origination?

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained this, the collective karma (actions) of the sentient beings from the previous universe, ad infinitum. This is all very clearly and consistently explained in Buddha's teachings. We can understand that this really is the teaching of the Buddha because Hindus used to argue against dependent origination and so on, trying to prove that Ishvara creates the universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

And the Kagyu lineage basically doesn't have a consort practice lineage anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is true. This is based on many arguments you will find in Moonbeams of Mahamudra, for example.

However, the lineage of these kinds of practices are still quite active in Sakya and Nyingma; and presumably, Gelug and Jonang.

Kunzang Dechen Lingpa emphasized that these practices were really quite important. In Nyingthig, the preliminary practice of cultivating bliss in the trio of bliss, clarity and non-conceptuality is consort practice, and Longchenpa devotes an entire text to it alone in Lama Yangthig.

In the system of Ghantapada's five stages, first you work with a samayamudra (a visualized consort), then eventually you work with a karmamudra in the third, fourth and fifth stages.

What has happened in Tibet is that the three gsar ma schools have each taken a monolithic approach to the raw material of the writings and teachings of the Indian siddhas and masters. These monolithic approaches ride roughshod over the intricate details and variety found in Indian Buddhist siddha praxis. Also, the dim view that Tibetan kings took of mother tantra, and the practices of "union" and "liberation", etc., really affected the way the Kadampas interpreted the Dharma.

As far as Gampopa was concerned, he is really more into tattva than mahāmudra and so on, following the treatises of Maitripa. His nephew, Gomstul asked:

"In terms of the view, what is common and what is superior?"

Gampopa replies:

"In common with cittamatra, everything is gathered into the mind. Cittamatrins however assert the mind as ultimate. Since the essence is that mind does not arise, [our view] is superior. Free from proliferation is common with Madhyamaka, [our view] is superior

because of wisdom. The great vehicle of mantra does not assert aspects as true in common with the path of liberation; the mother tantra practitioners meditate making bliss into the object. The practitioners of the great perfection meditates through making emptiness into an object. The practitioners of mahāmudra meditate through making equanimity into an object. Those are mental fabrications.

Since reality (the essence that is not fabricated with the mind) is meditated, the essence is superior.

The parts in common can be seen for yourself. If you understand what that practice has in common, the blessings are great."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

And the result innate is the three doors of liberation i.e. "Because the samadhis of the trio of pleasure, clarity and non-conceptuality occur, the three *ṇāḍīs* and the three *vāyus* are brought under control; one is liberated from the illnesses and the three types of spirits, and one actualizes the three doors of liberation."

All this can happen on the basis of shamata practice or with the recognition of the nature of mind, nondual.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in one lifetime. Here, we are in a simple disagreement. If it were true, then there would be no need for empowerment, etc. *Sutrayāna* would by itself be sufficient.

adinatha said:

Lord Jigten Sumgon teaches otherwise, that Sahaja Mahamudra is beyond Naro Chodruk.

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty certain that Naro Chodruk is used a support.

adinatha said:

The tradition teaches that Naropa prophesied that all of Marpa's descendants would be greater than the previous.

Malcolm wrote:

You missed the point.

adinatha said:

Anyway, Gampopa began teaching Mahamudra without channels and winds.

Malcolm wrote:

According to both Kongtrul and according to what Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso told me personally when I asked him about so called "sutra mahāmudra", they both say that Gampopa taught a non-tantric mahāmudra in order to pacify people he felt were not ready for Vajrayāna practice. So he taught them shamatha and vipashyāna in terms of mahāmudra view. But I have also ready passages in Gampopa's works where he criticizes mahāmudra as well.

adinatha said:

Basically, you didn't explain blessings. There's something more, related to interdependence and association with realized beings, elimination of doubt, etc., along with methods that allows one to realize the innate faster. Then, bliss clarity and nonconcept states are like pointed out directly. That alone calms the channels and winds.

Malcolm wrote:

I felt I explained it adequately. There is nothing more than meeting one's guru, time etc., and one's karmic readiness for the teachings. What more could you need?

Everything else has to do with Guru Yoga, which I already mentioned above (according to the Guhyasamaja system). Guru Yoga is the practice for the best student that bypasses the need for the two stages and working with channels and cakras. People think that there is only a devotional aspect to Guru Yoga, but that is not true. Guru Yoga works directly with the anahatabindu in the heart and can directly cause the winds and so on to withdraw into the central channel.

There are two paths to realizing mahāmudra, the path of the two stage, or the path of guruyoga. Otherwise, there is no other path for realizing mahāmudra.

adinatha said:

Milarepa explained it as "bliss waves."

Malcolm wrote:

This is probably a bad translation. I would have to see the Tibetan passage.

adinatha said:

The master's state, and our mirror-like awareness should be sufficient for recognition of the nonconceptual state.

Malcolm wrote:

This is what the Nyingmapas and the Kagyus maintain. It is hard to test, since as we know, no one gets through being a Tibetan Buddhist for long without taking a major empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

Emptiness is the abandoning of wrong views itself.

But there are only two wrong views i.e. "is" and "is not".

N

cloudburst said:

Wrong view.

Can't say "is" is wrong view while saying "Emptiness is..."

Self contradiction.

Malcolm wrote:

Such is the nature of language and the reason conventional discourse, however necessary, is predicated on cognitive error. Relative truth, such as it is, is a product of a deluded cognition. The error that relative truth rests on are the two views "is" and "is not". Nevertheless, we need to resort to conventional discourse in order to communicate the flaws of conventional discourse and so it is necessary to resort to the use of the verb "to be" in all its many forms in order to form intelligible sentences.

Blame the game, not the player.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: 'death meditation'

Content:

Will said:

Thanks Kirt, but I was thinking of an obscure aspect of phowa that Mullin translates as "forceful projection" (grong 'jug). One can actually revitalize & thus inhabit a corpse (recently dead I guess).

Malcolm wrote:

right, but you do leave your own body behind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: 'death meditation'

Content:

Will said:

I do not get this practice.

Is the fact of the body being held back from normal dissolution a side-effect of the subtle mind meditation or a deliberate part of the practice? If the latter, to what end & purpose is the body held back from its return to the elements?

Namdrol said:

As long as the mind is certain dhyānas, the body will not decompose.

There is no purpose per se.

Will said:

Thanks Malcolm; but does this suggest that time spent in "certain dhyanas" will forstall some of the aging process and thus lengthen life of the body somewhat?

Could there be also a purpose, for very advanced practitioners, that those days or weeks of tukdem be used to seek another physical body to transfer to? I have forgotten the name of this practice, from the Six Yogas of Naropa, I recall.

Malcolm wrote:

For as long as the life indriya is not separated from the body, it will not decay. The separation of the life indriya is prevented by being in a state of samadhi at the time of death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

but I am partial to the idea of a first cause.

Malcolm wrote:

The logic of dependent origination rejects first causes. This is the principle reason your view is not compatible with Buddhadharma. Buddha rejected first causes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

I see. Then, there's the Co-Emergent Mahamudra which is less gradual than Five-Fold Path.

Malcolm wrote:

There is not one monolithic sahajamahamudra. For example, most texts in Kagyu called "sahaja mahamudra" concern the four yogas. Gyalpo Rinpoche says in the mahamudra section of his book on five-fold mahamudra:

Maitripa, the lineage holding disciple of the main disciple of master Nagarjuna, Savaripa, asserts that one should introduce the path of means to the person of gradual capacity, and introduce [mahamudra] directly to the person of immediate capacity.

adinatha said:

Why would it be less gradual if it doesn't make use of channels? Or it does but as a function of the deity and guru yogas, which brings on bliss, clarity and nonthought and on that basis Mahamudra can be recognized?

Malcolm wrote:

It is because the creation stage of the five-fold mahāmudra is considered profound. Gyalpo Rinpoche considers this to be a really important point in his book:

Since that deity, the clear appearance of instantaneous awareness [rig pa skag gcig ma] includes all of the crucial points of the creation stage into one, the profound creation stage is mahamudra.

This is also the case in Sakya. Sachen says:

As such, if one understands the dharmadhātu,
spiritual practice possessing characteristics is not possible;
if one also meditates the creation stage with that [understanding],
[the creation stage] is spiritual practice without characteristics.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

In Five-Fold Path, Six Yogas are not practiced. Thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

Five-fold mahāmudra is less gradual. Naro chodrug is more gradual.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

All masters will tell you that the reality of Mahamudra and Dzogchen are identical. What is the difference between Mahamudra without a base of tantra and Dzogchen?

Namdrol said:

Method: mahamudra without tantra is just perfection of wisdom.

Method, ultimately, is the most important difference between sutra and tantra.

If you argue that the difference between mahāmudra and perfection of wisdom is guruyoga, I will just respond that guruyoga is a unique method of Annutarayoga tantra.

So it all boils down to method. Likewise, the difference between Dzogchen and Mahamudra is method. There are also differences in the way the basis is explained and so on, but mostly, the difference is in method. If you are not using Dzogchen methods, you are not practicing Dzogchen. For example, in Kalacakra one works with visions, but it is not the same as thogal, as Dudjom Rinpoche clearly points out in his book.

N

adinatha said:

Okay. Thank you for your continued patience and time. How do you explain blessings? They are just method? You've cited dohas which say the innate cannot be taught. The Kagyu teach that the innate can be discovered through blessings.

Malcolm wrote:

The Hevajra Tantra explains it very nicely:

Here there is no method and wisdom,
the appearance of true reality,
can't be described by another, the innate
cannot be found anywhere,
but one can understand it in dependence on the Guru,
time and method, and from one's merit.

For example, Dombhi Heruka divides the innate into three aspects: cause, method and

result.

The cause innate is the nature of the mind.

The method innate is fifteen innate dharmas:

...the innate three ṇāḍīs in the body, innate trio of exhalation, inhalation and abiding of the breath; and the innate as the three poisonous afflictions of the mind⁶; nine dharmas. In those innates, there is the inner obstacles, the innate three combined diseases; the outer obstacles the innate three demons.

Now then, the diseases are one, vata; pitta and blood both are counted as one; and kapha are three. The three demons are male class, female class, and nāgā.

Now fifteen dharmas exist from the beginning of the body's development, and therefore are the fifteen innate dharmas.

The three innate experiences of bliss, clarity and non-conceptuality arise on the basis of these fifteen dharmas.

And the result innate is the three doors of liberation i.e. "Because the samadhis of the trio of pleasure, clarity and non-conceptuality occur, the three ṇāḍīs and the three vāyus are brought under control; one is liberated from the illnesses and the three types of spirits, and one actualizes the three doors of liberation."

Often people have a very restrictive concept of what "sahaja" means. Also the channels in your body are sahaja, the fact that you have one face and two arms is "sahaja" -- that is why two armed, one faced forms of Cakrasamvara and so on are called "sahaja" i.e. natural. In sahaja practice, unlike lower tantra and sutra, we do not reject anything.

Also, for example, the third Karmapa's commentary on Sahaja Mahamudra remarks that Sahaja Mahamudra is practiced in conjunction with Naro Chödruk.

Etc.

Finally, people have a funny idea for example that Tilopa hitting Naropa on the head was the end of Naropa's path. They don't realize that that was the beginning and it was only after that that Tilopa gave Naropa empowerments, practices connected with the channels and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Refutation of Advaita

Content:

vinodh said:

Hi,

I had been reading Adi Shankara's refutation of the various Buddhist Theories.

I want to know, if there are any Buddhist Texts which directly refutes Advaita (as propounded by Adi Shankara).

Thanks

V

Namdrol said:

Not directly.

vinodh said:

Does that mean, the Buddhists of Shankara's time didn't attempt to hit back at Advaita directly :-/ ? while the Advaitin-s were aiming directly at the Buddhists !!

V

Malcolm wrote:

The Tarkajvala contains a general refutation and complaint about Advaita (basically saying, the Buddha asserted non-arising first, so why aren't you guys Buddhists) declaring that it was in the end very hard to distinguish Advaita from Madhyamaka.

Shantarakshita's Tattvasamgraha contains a rebuttal of the Advaita notion of permanent citta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Refutation of Advaita

Content:

vinodh said:

Hi,

I had been reading Adi Shankara's refutation of the various Buddhist Theories.

I want to know, if there are any Buddhist Texts which directly refutes Advaita (as propounded by Adi Shankara).

Thanks

V

Malcolm wrote:

Not directly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: 'death meditation'

Content:

Will said:

I do not get this practice.

Is the fact of the body being held back from normal dissolution a side-effect of the subtle mind meditation or a deliberate part of the practice? If the latter, to what end & purpose is the body held back from its return to the elements?

Malcolm wrote:

As long as the mind is certain dhyānas, the body will not decompose.

There is no purpose per se.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2011 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Does Dzogchen actually "abandon" or does it just "see through/go beyond/transcend?"

Malcolm wrote:

Discards, abandons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

conebeckham said:

...Depends on how you understand the "two truths," but no, Dzokchen does not abandon the two truths.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:
conebeckham said:
aha, so-called "Ordinary Mind" is beyond mind!

I never liked that translation of Tamal Gyi Shepa anyway. That paper on Gampopa, in the Dzokchen/Tsong Khapa thread, had a better translation.....though I can't remember it right now.

What's interesting, at least to me, is that "Rang Jung Yeshe" or Tamal Gyi Shepa or whatever you want to call it is actually coemergent with conceptuality....like water and milk mixed. Yet not the same...

Malcolm wrote:
tha mal in this context means "completely unmodified", "left in its original state".

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 10:43 PM
Title: Re: Differences between the schools
Content:

kirtu said:
As far as the nature of mind goes: most Gelug and Sakya teach that Buddha Nature is a seed...

Malcolm wrote:
The official Sakya view is that the qualities of buddhahood are naturally present [lhun grub] from the beginning in sentient beings, but that transformation [of a sentient being into a buddha] and natural presence [i.e. of buddha qualities] are non-contradictory. So the Sakya view is a little more nuanced than merely saying tathāgatagarbha is a "seed".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 9:08 PM
Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen
Content:

adinatha said:
All masters will tell you that the reality of Mahamudra and Dzogchen are identical. What is the difference between Mahamudra without a base of tantra and Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:
Method: mahamudra without tantra is just perfection of wisdom.

Method, ultimately, is the most important difference between sutra and tantra.

If you argue that the difference between mahāmudra and perfection of wisdom is guruyoga, I will just respond that guruyoga is a unique method of Annutarayoga tantra.

So it all boils down to method. Likewise, the difference between Dzogchen and Mahamudra is method. There are also differences in the way the basis is explained and so on, but mostly, the difference is in method. If you are not using Dzogchen methods, you are not practicing Dzogchen. For example, in Kalacakra one works with visions, but it is not the same as thogal, as Dudjom Rinpoche clearly points out in his book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

TMingyur said:

Even in the General Mahayana forum all there is is the talk in terms of tibetan buddhism and vajrayana. Vajrayanists seem to have acquired Mahayana in public media. But I think that they are just the loudest maybe also the proudest.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, just the only ones that present Mahāyāna based on Indian commentarial sources.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

kirtu said:

Shaking one hundred world systems and illuminating a hundred world systems refers to wisdom attainment and can also refer to one hundred rebirths at the level of the 1st bhumi. So it depends on how this sutra was actually intended.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Mahasiddha Virupa, it means in one's lifetime, not in one hundred lifetimes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 8:59 PM
Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen
Content:

adinatha said:

Then I read that in the Oral Instructions of Zhang Zhung Nyen Gyu that visions and natural state are not practiced separately. Only two of thirty something masters in Zhang Zhung even mention visions.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are a smart guy, but I also think you jump to unwarranted conclusions. I don't have time to address the rest of your post point for point. In short, you have written many things in it with which I am not in agreement.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 10:04 AM
Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen
Content:

adinatha said:

Perhaps yours doesn't. Ours does. And my teacher got another outline of the pith instructions from His Holiness Taklung Matul Rinpoche and theirs has the same breakdown.

Malcolm wrote:

The inferior intellect thing is in a previous section.

adinatha said:

Not so. The part about the winds is for medium capacity, and karmamudra for inferior capacity.

Malcolm wrote:

Then according to you all Indian mahasiddhas are inferior capacity since they all used karmamudra for realization. Tibetan siddhas are somehow superior since the Kadampas discarded it. Even Milarepa and Marpa are inferior, according you, since they used karmamudra for realization.

adinatha said:

That is not the same thing. Besides, the name Thogal and separating it out from Tregcho is sort of a new fangled invention.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, you heard that from me. Still, there is no thogal in the dohas.

adinatha said:

Why not? Padmavajra was circa 700-800 CE and so was Saraha I.

Malcolm wrote:

Padmavajra is mid 9th century -- 150 years after Saraha I. Saraha I did not have a human guru.

adinatha said:

That might be a nice point for discussion, and/or might impact what someone is practicing at lineage X, but I don't agree there are different 'od gsal types.

Malcolm wrote:

That's your bad, then.

adinatha said:

We have already discussed this. As I pointed out to you, Gyalwa Yangonpa points out that Mahamudra is superior to 'od gsal because in the state of 'od gsal as described in sarma tantras and the six yogas of Naropa, there are no appearances.

'od gsal is being used in different ways as relates to methods. I'm talking beyond two stages here.

Malcolm wrote:

Too late to change your tune.

adinatha said:

This supports what I'm saying.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

adinatha said:

Dzogchen has been inventive. Then, there's this stuff Saraha says in his Doha.

Malcolm wrote:

You are seeing mirages.

adinatha said:

I don't know.

Malcolm wrote:

All four schools have the Sahaja Mahamudra lineage. That is why a discussion of it is included in the Vima Nyinthig.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is no Dzogchen in Saraha's tradition.

dzoki said:

This is of course true, however it is possible that Saraha and other mahasiddhas practiced atiyoga. For example in a personal conversation Lobpon Ogyan Tenzin mentioned to me that there is a sanskrit text on three inner tantras written by Naropa which was discovered in Nepal.

Malcolm wrote:

The terms "Anuyoga" and "atiyoga" are not unique to the Nyingma tradition. I have found them sprinkled about other texts. The way they are used in the Nyingma tradition is unique to that school and are not used in the same way in any gsar ma text I have ever read.

dzoki said:

He also said that the reason why there was no atiyoga in gsar ma wave is that first of all new translators inaccurately translated some of the sanskrit texts

Malcolm wrote:

Sectarian Bullshit.

dzoki said:

and second of all since most of them came to India for rather brief periods Indian

acharyas did not see it fitting to transmit such precious precepts to the students from the land of barbarians.

Malcolm wrote:

As above.

dzoki said:

One of the examples of such incomplete transmissions might be kye'i rdo rje rgyud kyi rgyal po in two chapters.

Malcolm wrote:

No. This is a text I am very familiar with in terms of its Indian commentarial tradition. Indian commentators also had to explain why there were only two sections.

dzoki said:

Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche once mentioned that he had a series of dreams where he read two additional chapters of this tantra, which makes it Hevajra tantra in four chapters, chapter number 3 was concerned with anuyoga and chapter number four was concerned with atiyoga.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. I know.

dzoki said:

It is possible that in our dimension only first two chapters of this tantra were revealed, but it is also possible that Tibetans were able to procure only these two from their Indian teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

Originally, the longer one supposedly was available, we have some citations of it sprinkled in various commentaries, notably, Vajragarbha's commentary. But in general, all we have in India is the two sections.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Yeah but why not refer to an image of a mahasiddha looking Buddhist, rather than a Hindu Baba? Unless you're saying the Buddhist of the west will be Hindus? Or maybe you know something special about that Baba. . .

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that you won't be able to tell whether someone is hindu, buddhist, or whatever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

kirtu said:

However I agree that that spirit will be the heart of Tibetan Buddhism esp. in the West going forward.

Malcolm wrote:

You have understood the point of the photo. I would modify your statement a little however e.g. "that spirit will be the heart of Tantric Buddhism..."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

Finally, Moskaragupta indicates day and night yogas with visual signs.

Namdrol said:

This refers to the signs of smoke, fire flies, etc., the signs of the dissolution of the elemental vāyus in the central channel

adinatha said:

Are you familiar with Moksaragupta or are you speculating? Because the Doha and commentary are not about path of channels and winds. It's about the innate. And Saraha and commentators all trounce the path of means.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am familiar with Moksakaragupta. It is as I said the signs I mentioned are the signs being referred to.

Sahaja is the result, among other things. As the Hevajra Tantra says "The innate is said to be awakening".

Completion stages are the means to realize that.

I don't believe that Saraha really slighted creation and completion stage. If he did, why would he have bothered to pass on Guhyasamaja, Cakrasamvara and so on?

Also Virupa, for example says:

Some are completely tortured with empowerment rites,
some always count their rosary saying hūm phat,
some consume shit, piss, blood, semen and meat,
some meditate the yoga of nadi and vāyu, but all are deluded.

But we know quite well that Virupa attained realization with a karmamudra. So there must be another meaning. It is as Tilopa says

If one relies on a karmamudrā, the wisdom of bliss and emptiness arises,
...
if one has no desire the wisdom of wisdom of bliss and emptiness will not blaze.

He also says:

Practitioners of mantra, of the perfections,
of discipline, and of the sutras and so on
do not see the luminosity of mahāmudra,
with their own texts and theories;
luminosity is not seen, obscured with such wishful thinking.

All of these warnings are in place so that practitioner does not lose the main point in getting attached to various experiences that arise in creation and completion stage. They are not informing people to abandon the practice of the two stages.

adinatha said:

Sixth, the fruit is the rainbow body. Isn't this Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Dzogchen in Saraha's tradition.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

Adamantine said:
Is that Baba really a Buddhist?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 1:40 AM
Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
An important consideration, is what we need in the West, as opposed to what Tibetans need on their own cultural context.

Me, I like a stripped down, tantric cultus form of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 1:30 AM
Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"
Content:
Adamantine said:
It is clear in the case of reincarnation lineages where Tibetans are adamant that there can not be more than one, such as the Karmapa-- that they are not referring to nirmanakaya in the proper sense...

Malcolm wrote:
There has been more than one Karmapa several times in history. But because of the money and power game, only one can be put on the Tshurphu throne.

Adamantine said:
So Namdrol even if some of these reincarnation lineages are 1st, 4th, and 7th level Bodhisattvas are they still not of benefit to beings? And because they can still lose clarity and "fall", isn't it more important to recognize them and give them the proper training from an early age to increase the likelihood of continuing the ascent through the Bhumis rather than falling?

Malcolm wrote:
Sapan writes:

"It is taught in the Sutra of the Ten Stages that because of being born for an instant, one hundred twelve qualities are attained; one hundred samadhis are attained, in that equipoise, one sees one hundred Buddhas; one understand their blessings; one shakes one hundred world realms; one goes to one hundred Buddhafields; one hundred world realms are made to appear; one thoroughly ripens one hundred sentient beings; one lives for one hundred eons; one enters the upper and lower limits of the one hundred eons; one opens one hundred doors of dharma; one teaches in one hundred bodies; also each body teaches a retinue having a hundred Bodhisattvas..."

I think most Tibetans would imagine that the person above was a fully awakened Buddha, and not a mere first stage bodhisattva.

N

Adamantine said:

And if an 8th level Bodhisattva teacher has many students that break their samaya in serious ways, this will not affect the teacher at all, not even the appearance of the teacher?

Malcolm wrote:
How could it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Karma

Content:

mudra said:

"Therefore whatever originates dependently,
Though primordially free of intrinsic existencee,
Appears as if it does [possess intrinsic existence],
So you taught all tnhis to be illusion-like."

In Praise of Dependent Origination, Je Tsongkhapa

Crypto-realist is your label. I don't see Je Rinpoche as being a 'concealed/hidden' realist at all - but this is of course an old debate. As you well know Je Rinpoche devotes a huge portion of the Lam Rim Chen Mo to a discussion of sunyata and the conventional.

Malcolm wrote:

"As the relative is merely an illusion, the true relative's efficient ability of arising from cause and condition [55/a] is satisfactory when not investigated; but if investigated cannot bear the weight of reasoning."

-- Rongzom

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Karma

Content:

mudra said:

I think I'm the guy who is always parroting "illusion-like not illusion"

Namdrol said:

This kind of view is crypto-realisms. Things are either illusory, or they are real. There is no middle ground of "illusion-like".

N

mudra said:

Karma gives results that are experienced. Illusions do not function, except perhaps as deception. Doesn't mean that just because karma exists that it has to have it's own inherent existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Dreams give results that are experienced. Illusions appear to function. That is all. Now, if you are a Gelugpa, your view is ok, since their view is crypto-realist. But if you are a Nyingmapa, your view is very poor. Rongzom Chopan devotes an entire book to proving that all phenomena (including full awakening) are completely equivalent with illusions and criticizes the notion that they are only "like" illusions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2011 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Namdrol said:

However, Buddhism and the Buddha explicitly rejects the notion of design.

Serenity509 said:

Does the universe appear to be a cosmic accident or does it appear designed?

Malcolm wrote:

It appears to have arisen based on causes and conditions -- that is all. In other words, everything in the universe is dependently arisen, also the universe is dependently arisen.

Namdrol said:

We don't care about "transpersonal" experience in Buddhism.

"Transpersonal" means beyond the personal. I think Buddhism could agree that whatever spiritual essence there might be to the universe, it is not a personal God.

Malcolm wrote:

The universe as no essence, that what "dependent origination" means "no essence".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

It also explains the apparent design we observe in the universe and what we encounter in mystical experience, the transpersonal presence.

Malcolm wrote:

However, Buddhism and the Buddha explicitly rejects the notion of design.

The beginningless cycles of the universe, according to Buddhism, arises because of the beginningless collective karma of the limitless sentient beings in the universe.

Thus the creation and dissolution of the universe is not determined, but it is also not random. It is the outcome of all the infinite karmic decisions made by all sentient beings.

We don't care about "transpersonal" experience in Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Theists that use buddhism as means may certainly do so allowably. Those same theists to then claim buddhism as religion to be theist...that is in error.

Serenity509 said:

I never claimed that Buddhism is theist. I did claim that Shin Buddhism's concept of Amida views Amida as an "other-power" that we can supplicate, which is true.

Malcolm wrote:

Amida's aspiration was simple -- "if anyone says my name, they will be reborn in Sukhavati, otherwise, I will not become a Buddha." Since Amitabha Buddha became a Buddha, ergo, his aspiration is true, and everyone who says his name creates a cause for rebirth in Sukhavati.

Now then, the whole concept of "other-power" in Jodo shin shu is really based on this

simple principle. A person of shinjin is someone who implicitly trusts Amitabha's aspiration and says his name once. This is the basis of the debate between "once-calling" and "many-calling".

You will find all of Shinran's collected works here:

<http://www.shinranworks.com/sitemap.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The real source of this doctrine is not theistic on any level, but is related to the Buddhist concepts of "words of truth".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

If God could voluntarily limit himself in becoming man...

Malcolm wrote:

More gibberish.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Pandeism asserts that God was at one point distinct from the universe, but for the sake of experiencing evolutionary existence, God became the universe.

Pure gibberish.

Serenity509 said:

How so?

Malcolm wrote:

God is always defined as permanent and unconditioned. The universe is impermanent and conditioned. By definition then, God cannot "become" the universe. Hence, this intellectual rabbit hole you are presented us with is pure gibberish.

Actually, not only can God not become the universe, he could not create the Universe either, because a conditioned result cannot have an unconditioned cause and so on.

If you study Abhidharma, Yogacara, Madhyamaka, and so on, you will discover why Buddhists consider all of this deism, theism, and so on, incoherent rubbish that does

not lead to liberation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

Nangwa said:

The tulku system is extremely limiting.

It limits the way we perceive non-titled teachers and it limits the capacity of qualified practitioners to transmit what they have experienced.

The tulku system is a big obstacle to so-called "Western" practitioners learning how to stand on their own two feet and confidently transmit the teachings to the next generation.

I don't have any use for the tulku system and have every intention of putting my teachers teachings in to practice so I can play an active roll in the transmission for the future generations of my family.

Malcolm wrote:

The primary reason the tulku system continues is that common Tibetans have faith in it. Monasteries that have no tulku also have no money since no one will make donations to them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

kirtu said:

I don't think that it is true overall that Westerners "love pomp and personality cults".

Westerners are coming to terms with a spiritual view utterly foreign to what they have been taught and have to form an accomodation with rationalism and karma and rebirth. Secondly Westerners really do not like pomp (except maybe the English).

dzoki said:

...Also many people are ready to accept vajrayana empowerment, transmission and instruction from whomever without doing a serious research on who the Lama is, whether he/she is genuine or not, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

I agree -- in 1998 I watched a crazy person sit on Penor Rinpoche's throne in Green, NY, claim that Penor Rinpoche had told him in a dream the night before to announce that he was a tulku, and observed 200 westerners give this crazy guy prostrations while I sat in

astonishment, apart from preventing the western student sitting around me from prostrating.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Unknown said:

Pandeism asserts that God was at one point distinct from the universe, but for the sake of experiencing evolutionary existence, God became the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

Pure gibberish.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Saraha, Moksaragupta and Dzogchen

Content:

adinatha said:

Finally, Moskaragupta indicates day and night yogas with visual signs.

Malcolm wrote:

This refers to the signs of smoke, fire flies, etc., the signs of the dissolution of the elemental vāyus in the central channel

adinatha said:

Sixth, the fruit is the rainbow body. Isn't this Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

heart said:

Since this is the Bon part of this forum I guess the Buddha you are discussing in this thread is the Bon Buddha Tonpa Shenrab Miwoche. His life is incredibly similar to Buddha Shakyamuni, he was born a prince, had a wife and kids, left them to renounce the world and practice austerities. I take it that all caveman's remarks in this thread

apply to Tonpa Shenrab Miwoche or did I miss something?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, he/she was asking about Shakyamuni Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Karma

Content:

mudra said:

I think I'm the guy who is always parroting "illusion-like not illusion"

Malcolm wrote:

This kind of view is crypto-realisms. Things are either illusory, or they are real. There is no middle ground of "illusion-like".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

Adamantine said:

But I also understood that in general a highly realized Lama may also lose clarity...

Malcolm wrote:

Reincarnations (yang srid) are one thing, Tulkus (sprul sku), nirmanakāyas are another.

I do not have as high expectations for reincarnations (basically none) as I do for tulkus.

Above the eighth bhumi, a reincarnation cannot lose clarity since they have no more afflictive obscuration to lose. On the impure bhumis one still has afflictive obscurations.

The idea that someone achieves the upper bhumis through Vajrayāna methods, and then "loses" clarity, however, is an impossibility.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: What brought you to the Dharma?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

What were the things that led you to the Dharma? Was it a book or a movie? A personal encounter? How old were you when you found yourself interested in Buddhism, and how many years has it been since?

I sure am nosy!

Malcolm wrote:

My good fortune and nothing else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 8:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Conclusion: any system that abandons conceptuality, seeing it as faulty, will never lead to liberation and enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

And because you have this opinion, you will never understand Tsongkhapa's actual view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Does Clear Light of Sleep = Jhana?

Content:

Enochian said:

Because its mental?

.

Namdrol said:

Because it is not grounded in a physical sensation.

Enochian said:

I think you can't give full detail because of samaya, so I concede.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not that, it is that meditative bliss is not bliss grounded in a physical sensation, therefore, one will never realize mahāmudra.

The Hevajra tantra states:

Where does bliss come from without the existence of the body?
Such a bliss cannot be described.
Bliss pervades all migrating beings
in the form of pervaded and pervader;
just as the fragrance present in a flower
cannot be known without the flower's existence;
in the same way, since form and so on won't exist,
also bliss itself won't be perceived.

The embodiment of bliss is a fundamental point in Vajrayāna. This is yet another reason Vajrayāna methods are faster and more profound.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Does Clear Light of Sleep = Jhana?

Content:

Enochian said:

Because its mental?

.

Malcolm wrote:

Because it is not grounded in a physical sensation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Does Clear Light of Sleep = Jhana?

Content:

Namdrol said:

It's not the same kind of bliss.

N

Enochian said:

Because its not from within the center channel?

Malcolm wrote:

Because it is not physical.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Does Clear Light of Sleep = Jhana?

Content:

Enochian said:

Thats what I thought until I read part of this book online:

Mindfulness, Bliss, and Beyond by Ajahn Brahm

He basically uses nonconceptual bliss like Vajrayana. For God's sake Bliss is in the title
LOL

Namdrol said:

No, that is not possible.

Enochian said:

I don't know if you have access to this book, but you can read part of it online.

Bliss is the main focus of the book, without a doubt.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not the same kind of bliss.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: Does Clear Light of Sleep = Jhana?

Content:

Enochian said:

Thats what I thought until I read part of this book online:

Mindfulness, Bliss, and Beyond by Ajahn Brahm

He basically uses nonconceptual bliss like Vajrayana. For God's sake Bliss is in the title
LOL

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

conebeckham said:

Excellent, thank you.

One more, somewhat tangential, question, Namdrol, if I may....."Thamel Gyi Shepa." ?
SNIP

Namdrol said:

tha mal gyi shes pa, according to Gyalwa Yangonpa, is a yogi's term for ye shes.

conebeckham said:

Is ye shes "beyond mind?"

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

username said:

I wouldn't use such phrases when questioning the recognition by great masters, school heads, or even in case of discussion regarding any person.

Malcolm wrote:

There is only one person who for sure I accept as the reincarnation of the person they are supposed to be the reincarnation, and that person is Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. That is based on events I have related elsewhere.

As for the rest of them, well you know what I think of the tulku system in general.

I am not in the habit of accepting things merely because some person with a high worldly position [and yes, by that I mean all the high lamas in Tibetan Buddhism] says it. I keep my own counsel with regards to these things, keeping Tibetan cultural institutions like tulku recognitions separate from the Dharma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Regarding the terminology used.."story".

Perhaps this is unintended but the way this is being used infers some differing tale.

Past lives being perceived by one may indeed, as most here know, be a progressive thing for some.

With more spiritual understanding comes more recollection.

On occasion a circumstance may also presents in which the elicitation of a memory of past lives ensues.

A past spiritual life of attainment is perhaps replicated in this life. As that replication occurs prior capacity may also occur.

So I would say it is quite normal for one to have them not one day and have them the next.

Just to clarify that as the term seemed or could be taken to infer a story was being told.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas have perfect recall of their past lives. In fact, any highly realized bodhisattva on the stages will.

My point is that tulkus with no or hazy memories of past lives does not make for impressive tulkus.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Also, not to quibble, but aren't there wrong views #3 and #4 (namely, "both is and is not" and "neither is nor is not")?

Malcolm wrote:

3 is just a restatement of 1, as 4 is merely a restatement of 2. They are necessary because there are some who suppose that an instance of become involves being both existent and non-existence at one and the same time.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

ratna said:

Dan Martin, The Early Education of Milarepa:

http://www.thlib.org/static/reprints/jts/JTS_02_03.pdf

R

Malcolm wrote:

That's the one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Bon and the karmic problems of Tibet

Content:

Namdrol said:

My statement is a common truism in archaeology i.e. plastic culture does not allow one to extrapolate very much about the people who made this or that thing.

Tenzin1 said:

Patience, patience. They're working on it. The field of Zhang Zhung archaeology is still in its infancy.

Namdrol said:

There are no Celts in the Danube today, that is the point. Likewise, people have this idea that somehow the key to early Tibetan history is locked away in Zhang Zhung archaeology -- but they are looking in the wrong place. The Tibetan people moved into the Tibetan plateau from the lower valleys of the east. This is clearly recorded in Tibetan migration legends of the four major clans.

N

Tenzin1 said:

Oh. Silly me, I thought they were researching Zhang Zhung for the sake of learning more about Zhang Zhung on its own merits.

Malcolm wrote:

These days, the motivation for backing research in Zhang Zhung mostly has to do with the ancient origins of Tibetan culture.

Tenzin1 said:

The origins of the Tibetan people are much more complex than simply migrations from the east. Current scholarship also postulates a migration from the north or north-east as well. Genetic analysis shows that Tibetan nomads have Altaic ancestry as well as Iranian or Indo-European, while sedentary Tibetans have mainly Sinitic ancestry. And linguistic analysis confirms this north Asian/South Asian ethnic split; the vocabulary is largely Sinitic, while the grammar has Altaic features.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Nomads and the people of the Yarlung Dynasty are two distinct peoples, we agree. Tibetan nomads adopted Tibetan language, but in areas where they are stronger, places such as Golog, their language has more variance from standard Tibetan. We also know that people from Kham do not consider themselves "Bod pa", Tibetans.

But this is precisely my point, pots are not people. We are not going to learn very much about the roots of Tibetan culture and so on by looking at Zhang Zhung archaeology. We will probably not even learn very much about Bon.

Bon however is a religion that calls itself "The original pre-Buddhist religion of Tibet" and therefore, since it sites itself in Zhang Zhung, the motive for doing archaeology in that region is, at this point, inextricably bound up with the question of Bon in Tibetan culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

'never went away' means he was fully enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

The Shakyamuni Buddha was an emanation. This means his apparent career of taking birth nirvana was all a drama, a play, like Ron said, a movie meant to edify and encourage others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The Mahayāna account is that Buddha achieved full awakening countless eons ago.

David N. Snyder said:

If the Buddha was fully awakened eons ago, what happened on the Full Moon day of Vesakha, approx. 528 BCE in Bodh Gaya? (according to the Mahayana)

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha enacted full awakening for the benefit of others, as part of his twelve deeds.

http://www.berzinarchives.com/web/en/archives/sutra/level2_lamrim/initial_scope/safe_direction/twelve_enlightening_deeds_buddha.html

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2011 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

Namdrol said:

I have not seen the movie, but I remember our argument on E-Sangha. At best, Gesar is ambivalent about the tulku system -- but when push comes to shove, he believes he is a tulku of an awakened master even though he has no memories of his past life, and so on. So his faith in the tulku system is not really an issue.

username said:

That is not true.

Malcolm wrote:

On E-Sangha he denied have memories of his past life when I challenged him about it -- that is a fact.

Whether he has changed his story since then is another matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

conebeckham said:

Thanks, Namdrol...any chance your work will be published? Shri Chakrasamvara is a primary interest of mine.

Malcolm wrote:

Only here or on my blog.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Does Clear Light of Sleep = Jhana?

Content:

Enochian said:

Does Clear Light of Sleep = Jhana?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Namdrol said:

present at Shri Parvata (Sri Sailam in modern India) in Andhra Pradesh as a sambhogakāya.

Enochian said:

You mean right now?

I've been there!

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, right now and for as long as the sun and moon exist.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

It seems to me though that if we are not at a certain stage of realization, we have to approach "emptiness" conceptually, at least so we can know what it is not. Though understanding via concept and definition are not finally prajna, we still may need them as signposts.

There's a difference between understanding emptiness and realizing emptiness. The former by nature implies concept and even the idea of self. (There has to be someone who "stands under" it).

Concept, though, necessarily involves distance -- to conceive of something means you are regarding it (from outside). So it follows that a person who "conceives" emptiness cannot be realizing it fully.

Not meaning to be pushy, but might anyone here have a take on my question above? Can we posit emptiness simply as a subtractive process -- i.e. as the result of abandoning all wrong views?

Malcolm wrote:
Emptiness is the abandoning of wrong views itself.

But there are only two wrong views i.e. "is" and "is not".

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 10:34 PM
Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Update:

Have been working on an interesting text by Sakya Pandita on the history of Cakrasamvara.

According to this history, the first human being to receive Cakrasamvara was Saraha I, the teacher of the tantric siddha, Nāgārjuna. In terms of when Saraha lived, he does not really say, apart from asserting that Saraha is present at Shri Parvata (Sri Sailam in modern India) in Andhra Pradesh as a sambhogakāya.

Luhipa was the disciple of Saraha II aka Shavaripa. Sapan definitely situates him during the reign of the famed Buddhist king of Bengal, Shri Dharmapala, whose reign extended circa 775 to 810 CE.

Luihipa was a scribe in the court of Dharmapāla until he met Savaripa. We do not know when Luhipa was active during this 35 year period, but since his retreat was 9-12 years, and since legend holds that Dharmapāla became a disciple of Luhipa, we assume a later date for Luhipa and put his encounter with Dharmapāla around 810. Supposedly Dharmapāla left his kingdom and took a job as a pounder of rice in what is now known as Orrisa becoming known as the siddha Demgipa.

From Demgipa on, a significant feature of Cakrasamvara practice is the requirement that high cast practitioners take low caste occupations under low cast woman.

In any event, we have a fairly firm range to date the Cakrasamvara tantra from -- given this we can presume that the Cakrasamvara must date to the early 8th century CE. Since it mentions the Guhyasamaja and a number of other tantras, we can date those, as well as Saraha I, the first Siddha, to the late 7th century CE.

Also Situ Panchen asserts that Lohipa revealed the Yoginisamcarya tantra, which details the process of the sadhana practice.

This has a happy consequence for the Mahamudra text in the Vima Nyinthig which

mentions Saraha by name.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Differences between the schools

Content:

dzoki said:

Nyingmapas engage in sex.

Malcolm wrote:

You forgot booze.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Bon and the karmic problems of Tibet

Content:

Namdrol said:

Pots are not people. For example, would we expect to find Celts today living along the Danube?

Tenzin1 said:

?! Non-sequitur. We do find the descendants of Celts in the Danube region today, and that is determined by genetic studies, but what does that have to do with dating Zhang Zhung culture? Carbon-dating pots is one way archeology is done. Stay tuned for further developments.

Thanks for the link, k-y.

Malcolm wrote:

My statement is a common truism in archaeology i.e. plastic culture does not allow one to extrapolate very much about the people who made this or that thing.

There are no Celts in the Danube today, that is the point. Likewise, people have this idea that somehow the key to early Tibetan history is locked away in Zhang Zhung archaeology -- but they are looking in the wrong place. The Tibetan people moved into the Tibetan plateau from the lower valleys of the east. This is clearly recorded in Tibetan migration legends of the four major clans.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

dzoki said:

Definitely dpal zla gsang thig le rtsa ba'i rgyud has a short passage on tummo, also sgyu 'phrul rgya mtsho rgyud has the following passage, according to Gyurme Dorje's translation:

Malcolm wrote:

It is hard to date these texts too. So we really cannot say anything conclusive with regard to gtum mo based on these texts. Further, we know that karmamudra practices predate gtum mo. So, pranāyama combined with karmamudra practices are present from a very early period. The point is, however, we don't know when gtummo practices entered Tibet.

Quite early, if we accept most of the Kilaya tantras, etc as authentic. If not, then quite late.

Davidson, I believe as reference to this fact.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Siddhartha was not enlightened when he left the palace.

Namdrol said:

According to the shravakayana only.

N

kalden yungdrung said:

According the previous 254 lives of the Buddha Shakyamuni as a Bodhisattva, written in the Jatakas, is it difficult to say that he was already before enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, according to the shravakayana only.

The Mahayāna account is that Buddha achieved full awakening countless eons ago.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

samdrup said:

Thanks Namdrol,

I found the Harvard paper by Trungram Rinpoche called 'Gampopa, the Monk and the Yogi, His Life and Teachings' I haven't had a chance to go through it yet. Is this the paper you mean or is there another one, more specific to Milarepa?

best wishes,

s.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe it is another paper I read.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: HIDDEN BON TREASURES

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

I notice that the texts are written in Tibetan, not the Zhang Zhung script. Do you know if the Zhang Zhung language was pre-Tibetan, and if so, to what language family it belonged? Is there linguistic information available on the Zhang Zhung language?

The film comes to the conclusion that ancient Bon did include "ultimate teachings". But the texts are said to date only to approx. 1400 AD, which is quite late in Zhang Zhung history. This is hardly proof that early Bon contained teachings about liberation. More research needs to be done. In any case, why should Bon practitioners feel that they need to somehow measure up to Buddhism? The shamanic tradition is worthy of respect in its own right.

The Karmapa's website used to have information on Zhang Zhung that said it had been a matriarchal society. Even though the tradition now appears to be controlled by monks, could that have been a later, Tibetan-influenced phenomenon? Practitioners of the older, shamanic traditions, according to film footage I have of Ladakhi "oracles" practicing their craft, are women. Do you have any information on matriarchy in Zhang Zhung, or in Bon traditions, kalden yungdrung? Thank you for posting this film.

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/West_Himalayish_languages "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

It is a relative of Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Namdrol said:

That is an interesting question. We actually have complaints by Nyingma authors from the tenth century expressing concern about new-fangeled, new-age clap trap yoga practices using cakras, and so on, borrowed from Hindus and being imported from India. It suggests that tummo was adapted from the mother tantras when they came to Tibet.

dzoki said:

What about Guhyagarbhatantra? No tummo there? I mean in particular in dpal gsang ba'i snying po de kho na nyid rnam par nges pa'i rgyud chen po

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

dzoki said:

also I would expect he ru ka gal po che'i rgyud to have some of this stuff, since it said to be just like mother tantras of sarma in many respects.

Malcolm wrote:

Supposedly, according to Dudjom, this is the base of Lamdre.

dzoki said:

Also Vairochana's thrulku has a practice with chakras and channels, unfortunately at present we have only two of the three texts regarding this topic from Vairo Nyengyu. The third one was supposed to deal with the tummo itself. The first one deals with yantras and tsa lungs (which have practices with channels and chakras), second is dealing with removing obstacles and gaining benefits.

Malcolm wrote:

Very hard to date these texts.

[/quote]

Do Sakya Vajrakilaya and Vishuddha have dzogrim with characteristics? [/quote]

Not that I know of.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Siddhartha was not enlightened when he left the palace.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the shravakayana only.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

samdrup said:

Hey Namdrol,

Could you please give us a brief overview of Sakya Pandita's view of Dzogchen, also Gampopa?

Also, when you have time, could you talk more about Milarepa's Dzogchen Gurus/practice.

Many thanks,

s

Malcolm wrote:

Sapan's view of Dzogchen was that it was the name of the completion stage practice of the Nyingma school. As far as I know, Sapan had only received sems sde.

He rejected a so called "pure dzogchen" as an independent yana.

Gampopa considered Dzogchen to be a bit one sided also, too much emphasis on emptiness.

There is a paper written about Milarepa's gurus, I think by Trungram Rinpoche while he was at harvard -- look for that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2011 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

conebeckham said:

Oh, forget it.

Malcolm wrote:

Exactly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Deities / Protectors

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- What are here the practical remedies / punishment to get again a good service?

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, only shamans torture spirits.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

You will never see emptiness in meditation directly for emptiness is a not a thing that can be seen.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Would it be more accurate to say,

"In meditation, you can never find a thing which you can point to and say, 'that's emptiness'?"

Malcolm wrote:

When you don't find anything, that not-finding is finding emptiness.

When you don't see anything, that not-seeing is seeing emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Deities / Protectors

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Thanks for your correct answers N.

I heard in case a human would die, who did not had a malicious harmful mind during lifetime, could be become a demon in the Bardo.

- What are here the causes?

Malcolm wrote:

Fear of the bardo experiences.

kalden yungdrung said:

- How long does this karma last ?

Malcolm wrote:

Difficult to say -- depends on the sentient being.

kalden yungdrung said:

- Is the only way here to get released / liberated to become a Protector?

Malcolm wrote:

No, there are a number of bardo rituals one can do for such beings

kalden yungdrung said:

- In case i would subjugate a demon would he/she then be my property?

Malcolm wrote:

Your servant, yes. But in Dharma we don't keep slaves.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

username said:

Also saying, without reference, Tsongkhapa did not think Dzogchen practice is

appropriate is an insult in the Dzogchen sub-forum.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa criticized Dzogchen in his commentary on Madhyamaka-avatara for abandoning the two truths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 7:51 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Deities / Protectors

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- How can somebody become a demon?

Malcolm wrote:

By cultivating a malicious harmful mind --that's all you need to do. It's easy.

kalden yungdrung said:

Can such a converted Demon again be excommunicated or of no more use anymore and put aside as an empty bag?

- Who can proclaimate a converted demon as a Tantric Deity?

- Who can excommunicate or punish a Tantric Deity like in this case a Protector?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, awakened protectors like Mahakāla and so on are tamed by Vajradhara. Worldly deities are tamed by powerful yogis.

kalden yungdrung said:

- What will happen if a converted Demon / Tantric Deity / Protector breaks the law/oath of the subjugation?

Malcolm wrote:

They will go to hell as samaya breakers.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Namdrol said:

The yogas underpinning the mahāmudra movement and tantras and their terminology as we know have non-Buddhist origins and are heavily informed by Ayurveda, etc.

N

Enochian said:

Why do you say this?

Do you have something more than Alexis Sanderson's work?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, the sadanga yoga in Guhyasamaja, five vāyus in Ayurveda etc., all of these things are found in the pre-buddhist Upanishads.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

You will never see emptiness in meditation directly for emptiness is a not a thing that can be seen.

PMTF said:

Namdrol

I am unable to understand what you have said here. Have you said a mind cannot abide in emptiness? In my Hinayana studies, emptiness is referred to as "a mode of perception". Refer to Thanissaro monk. If emptiness cannot be experienced then how can it be known?

Malcolm wrote:

Unconditioned space cannot be experienced, nor cessations. Emptiness is like that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

mudra said:

In the schools of individual liberation such as Theravada, I always had the impression that they discuss "selflessness/anatta" - mainly that of persons.

Lazy_eye said:

I'm embroiled in a huge angry discussion on another forum, and the argument seems to be that Shakyamuni Buddha's teaching of dependent origination (in the nikayas/agamas) did not necessarily extend to all phenomena -- whereas sunyata clearly does. Therefore, the argument goes, sunyata represents an unwarranted ontologization of D.O. and thus a departure from the Buddha's intent.

Malcolm wrote:

DO extends to all conditioned phenomena. There are only three kinds of unconditioned phenomena -- space and the two types of cessation.

Further, you must ask them, if shunyata does not extend to all phenomena, than selflessness should not either. If selflessness extends to all phenomena, also sunyata does as well, since they are synonymous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

conebeckham said:

Excellent, thank you.

One more, somewhat tangential, question, Namdrol, if I may....."Thamel Gyi Shepa." I know you're a Dzokchen guy, but you've studied some Mahamudra....do you feel this term refers to something "beyond" mind in the sense that we're talking about it here?

Malcolm wrote:

tha mal gyi shes pa, according to Gyalwa Yangonpa, is a yogi's term for ye shes.

I am not a "dzogchen guy" actually. I have studied not just "some" mahamudra, I have studied and practice mahāmudra for 20 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

caveman said:

How is it that simple words can throw so many people off their meditation cushions.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you should concern yourself with your own cushion, and not the cushions of others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

conebeckham said:

So that I understand you correctly, the "Abiding in Mind without objects" is the method, and involves the mind (Mental consciousness), which is "what we work with" when meditating on emptiness, but the "results" of such method are beyond mind. Yes?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, to paraphrase Nāgarjuna, one must comprehend the ultimate through the relative, and through realizing the ultimate, nirvana is attained.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

alpha said:

And on the label it says "HELL"

The anger burned for 5 hours and it produced 3 pages.

Maybe Mucho Demdrug and Sangwa Ngangring can purify this place.....

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe Bonpos with chips on their shoulders about the Buddha should take it somewhere else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

caveman said:

[vitriol deleted]

Malcolm wrote:

You could have just been honest from the beginning that you had a sectarian Bonpo agenda of criticizing the Buddha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

conebeckham said:

Right, but then....

Namdrol said:

Abiding in the mind without objects

has the characteristic of space;

that meditation of space is

held to be the meditation of emptiness.

conebeckham said:

doesn't this imply that in "the meditation of emptiness" (equivalent to "realization?")

one "abides" in the mind without "objects?"

In what way, then, is it "going beyond mind" rather than "abiding in the mind without objects?"

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not equivalent with realizing emptiness. This is a method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

conebeckham said:

Namdrol, if, as Shantideva says, the "realization" is beyond mind, I can understand how the presence or absence of thoughts as contents of consciousness makes no difference.

Is it not, then, the very Space-like" nature of consciousness, which may or may not contain the clouds of thoughts, at any given moment, and, if so, how is this "beyond mind?"

Malcolm wrote:

Shantideva said the ultimate is beyond the range of the mind because mind is relative.

Also signs and characteristics are relative. In order to realize emptiness one must go beyond signs, beyond mind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

conebeckham said:

In other words, "Conceptualization" is not the coarse level of "mulling it over," which you claim some have "put aside."

Instead, it's the entire contents of the mental consciousness, I think. Mental images of perceptions, intuitions, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Here, when we say non-conceptual, we do not mean a mind in which there is an absence of thought.

When consciousness is freed from signs and characteristics, this is called the realization of emptiness. An non-conceptual mind may still indeed be trapped by signs and characteristics. Thus, the Bodhittavivarana states:

Abiding in the mind without objects
has the characteristic of space;
that meditation of space is
held to be the meditation of emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

caveman said:

As would anyone who was abandoned by the person they thought loved them and married them.

Malcolm wrote:

People trapped in samsara have a very narrow view of reality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Actually, Rahula was pretty pissed at his father, in fact.

N

conebeckham said:

Yeah. Initially, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, then he calmed down, ordained, and became an arhat, eventually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

caveman said:

And you Sir are only guessing about why the buddha did what he did.

Deeds Speak and you can make up all the reasons but Sir you will never convince a woman that leaving your wife and child for the dharma is OK.

They do not consider this enlightened or compassion in action.

They call it cowardly!

conebeckham said:

Of course I'm guessing! But, sitting here in the 21st Century, I have the good fortune to see what the results of the Buddha's actions were. Seems to me he made the right choices. From what I've read and studied, it seems to me that his family felt the same way. Do you think Sakyamuni's wife and child called him "Cowardly?"

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Rahula was pretty pissed at his father, in fact.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

caveman said:

Sorry Namdrol but you are

Can you or anyone address the REAL LIFE ACTIONS of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

I did. Buddha had twelve deeds. So did Tonpa Shenrab. But they are different twelve deeds, because they are different emanations who lived at different times and served different cultures.

For example, the past Buddha Sikhin did not form a monastic Sangha. So none of his

followers were monastic. He was not a monastic.

Whether one has a family or not has nothing to do with whether one is a fully awakened buddha.

In this case, you are barking up the wrong tree. Sakyamuni Buddha was fully awakened because he was a *_nirmanakāya_*. His specific manifestation, being born as a Kṣatriya, leaving home, was all part of his display relevant to Indian culture in 5th century BCE.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: World's oceans in 'shocking' decline

Content:

Huseng said:

Makes me wonder where we'll be in ten, twenty and thirty years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2011 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

caveman said:

"I think your Bonpo lama was overlooking the fact that a) the Buddha was married b) he had a child."

Yes he was married BUT---

Did the Buddha return to his wife as her husband and to his son as his father?

Malcolm wrote:

They both eventually ordained and became arhats.

caveman said:

Was married life too hard for a totally enlightened buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni Buddha was an emanation. He emanated a type of *Nirmanakāya* suitable for that particular culture.

Your Bonpo friend does not seem to understand the principle of emanations, or he is conveniently forgetting it for the purpose of polemics.

According to Mahāyāna accounts, Śākyamuni Buddha did not "achieve" awakening. He

was awakened many countless eons ago.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2011 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Was the Buddha "FULLY" enlightened?

Content:

caveman said:

I hope we can have a polite yet critical discussion on this topic.

I was once talking to a Bonpo Rinpoche about enlightenment and the Buddha.

Rinpoche stated that the Buddha was enlightened but not fully enlightened.

He stated that to be a fully enlightened Buddha you had to be a "Married Buddha" with children.

....

What do you think my friends?

Malcolm wrote:

I think your Bonpo lama was overlooking the fact that a) the Buddha was married b) he had a child.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2011 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Prayer To Achieve The Rainbow Body

Content:

Sönam said:

who wrote it ?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

It is part of the Yangzab Dzogchen Ngondro practice. It is from Drikung Kagyu.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2011 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:
Namdrol said:
You should read Karmey's article.

heart said:
Ok, I did, and he is not saying that he isn't the Dalai Lama:

"The official Tsawa Kachu of the Ganden Palace showed me statues and rosaries (that belonged to the Fourth Dalai Lama and other lamas), but I was unable to distinguish between them! When he left the room I heard him tell the people outside that I had successfully passed the tests. Later, when he became my tutor, he would often admonish me and say: "You must work hard, since you were unable to recognize the objects!"

You might want to interpret it like that, or not.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
The Dalai Lama was never a tulku lineage like the Karmapas were once i.e. self-recognized.

So, I don't think that the fifth Dalai Lama is actually the reincarnation of the fourth. But I do think the 6th, 13th and 14th are the reincarnations of the fifth.

N

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2011 at 8:55 PM
Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination
Content:
Namdrol said:
If shunyata is a characteristic of things, all people at all times would cognize emptiness conventionally.

PadmaVonSamba said:
why do you assume that?

Malcolm wrote:
Here a characteristic (lakṣaṇa) refers to something like heat of a fire, wetness of water etc. If emptiness is a lakṣaṇa, then just as everyone who feels water will feel wetness, everyone who sees any object will see emptiness.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2011 at 10:18 AM
Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, I suggest that sunyata can be experienced, but it can't be experienced as a thing in and of itself, because it isn't a thing in and of itself.

It has no defining characteristics because it is a defining characteristic.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot divided a thing and its characteristics. If shunyata is a characteristic of things, all people at all times would cognize emptiness conventionally. Since they do not, we can rule out your proffered solution.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2011 at 8:27 AM
Title: Re: Merigar West Retreat
Content:

Fa Dao said:

Cool..thank you so much..I have my sons and so many other people who want to see this...is it going to be at 10 am to noon local like the others?

Malcolm wrote:
Except first day, yes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2011 at 7:42 AM
Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination
Content:

Namdrol said:

It means you must have a sense organ, an object and a consciousness meeting together.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Thank you.

Can the activity of the mind function as all three of these, as when dreaming?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a mental organ, mental objects (memories) and a mental consciousness.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2011 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

"Realizing" emptiness means the mind becomes free from the proliferation of the four extremes [is, isn't, both, neither]. That is not a cognitive event since it [the mind] has now become free from all apprehended characteristics. At this point, the mind has been transcended.

N

conebeckham said:

So, is there such a thing, in your view, as a "direct cognition of emptiness?"

Or, another way of asking, what is it that "realizes" emptiness if not the mind?

Malcolm wrote:

I will answer your first question, according to Santideva:

"The ultimate is beyond the experiential range of the mind,
the mind is conventional."

So no, there cannot be a direct cognition of emptiness, since emptiness is ultimate and the mind is relative.

However when the mind is freed from all characteristics, then that can be considered the realization of emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2011 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

"To cognize" means to have a mental recognition.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Uhhhhhhh...yeahhhhhh --but....what...exactly...does...that....mean...?

Conceptual recognition? Spontaneous reaction?

Can you provide a hypothetical example of one?

Malcolm wrote:

It means you must have a sense organ, an object and a consciousness meeting together.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is also the issue of the sixth Dalai Lama and the Seventh Dalai Lama living at the same time. The sixth was not killed. He was banned to Amdo. His autobiography has appeared. The present HHDL has indicated that he feels a strongest affinity to the second, fifth, sixth, and thirteenth Dalai Lamas, who all have strong connections with the Nyingma practice.

N

mudra said:

So that autobiography has finally been published? Who published it? I heard about the manuscript several years ago from my lama, who said that apparently after quite some time in what is today inner Mongolia (his Mongol 'executioners' released him after they were a good distance from Lhasa) the 6th returned to central Tibet, and that the 6th and 7th actually saw and recognized each other at least once in Lhasa, but Rinpoche was not sure if they actually talked.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.wickhamsmith.net/sixthdalai/sixthdalai.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

If not, then can one really experience any cessation of thought?

And if so, then does that experience fall under the definition of 'cognition'?

Malcolm wrote:

"To cognize" means to have a mental recognition. That can only occur based on

characteristics.

One cannot experience a cessation. By definition, cessation is a suspended mind. This is undesirable from a Mahāyāna pov.

"Realizing" emptiness means the mind becomes free from the proliferation of the four extremes [is, isn't, both, neither]. That is not a cognitive event since it [the mind] has now become free from all apprehended characteristics. At this point, the mind has been transcended.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: New statue

Content:

davcuts said:

Can anyone get a statue made of themselves?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. Just takes \$\$\$.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

5heaps said:

is a thing that cannot be cognized? what would you say you are supposed to do with it then?

Namdrol said:

Emptiness cannot be cognized directly. It has no characteristics, no shape, color, form, duration, etc.

5heaps said:

only hinayanists have a problem with saying that negatives cant be cognized explicitly..but even they would say it can be cognized directly, where directly is taken to mean free of conceptuality ie. without conceptual consciousness, needing to rely on a mental image. do you understand what i mean by explicit vs implicit?

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot cognize that which lacks characteristics. It's impossible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

I see you share this ideas with the Western Shugden Society.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

Hi Magnus:

Actually, the Fifth Dalai Lama notes in his own autobiography that his recognition was faked. What people do with this information is something else altogether.

heart said:

The recognition being faked don't exactly mean that 5th is saying that he isn't the correct tulku of the Dalai Lama. Or does he say "I'm not the Dalai Lama"?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You should read Karmey's article.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Serenity is not listening to any of your well intentioned advice and has shown that he has no intention of listening to reason.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 9:35 AM

Title: Re: impermanence

Content:

Namdrol said:

When it ceases to appear, we assign an end to it, nominally saying "this that existed no longer exists".

5heaps said:

but the assignment of having ended has to accord with reality... with how the thing in fact ended up being unable to appear.

how is it that things end up like that?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it merely has to accord with how it appears to us.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: Bon in Toronto?

Content:

caveman said:

Are there any Bonpo Lamas or temples in Toronto?

Malcolm wrote:

May this lama goes to toronto:

<http://www.sherabchammaling.com/biography.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

5heaps said:

a long time before we see emptiness directly in meditation s

Namdrol said:

You will never see emptiness in meditation directly for emptiness is a not a thing that can be seen.

5heaps said:

is a thing that cannot be cognized? what would you say you are supposed to do with it then?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness cannot be cognized directly. It has no characteristics, no shape, color, form,

duration, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

5heaps said:

a long time before we see emptiness directly in meditation s

Malcolm wrote:

You will never see emptiness in meditation directly for emptiness is a not a thing that can be seen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: impermanence

Content:

adinatha said:

His question was about things.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I was answering him.

When a thing appears, we label it "a given thing" and we assign a beginning to it. When it ceases to appear, we assign an end to it, nominally saying "this that existed no longer exists".

Of course, in reality, this idea, if taken literally results in views of existence and non-existence.

Impermanence then is understanding that nothing that appears to us can remain the way it is.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: impermanence

Content:

5heaps said:

Does it imply that things end simultaneous with the last moment?

adinatha said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in NYC

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://tsegyalgar.org/localcenters/kundrolling/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

this should work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

conebeckham said:

Luipa does have the Four Great Yogas, which are completion stage practices, I think.

Tsong Khapa commented on them, I believe, as well.

I don't know if they're an existing lineage though. Seems the Gelukpas practice Ghantapa's Completion stage, mainly....I don't know about the Sakya practice, though I think it's based on Luipa's?

Kamtsang Kagyu practice is based on Luipa and Krishnacharya, though it's a unique transmission stemming from Marpa and subsequent masters.

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakya school has three separate transmissions of Cakrasamvara, and three separate traditions of Vajrayogini.

All of the Cakrasamvara transmissions come through Naropa. They are Luyipa, Ghantapada and Krishnacarya. Of these, the Luyipa and Krishnacarya traditions are more widely practiced. And of these two, the Krishnacarya tradition is the most popular. It also has the largest number of commentaries.

The Ghantapada tradition is more emphasized in the Gelug school, this tradition

nevertheless comes from Sakya.

As far as the completion stage practice of Luyipa goes, Luyipa did not write a completion stage text. There are only five or six texts attributed to him in the Tengyur. This does not mean he did not have completion stage instructions -- it just means he did write them down. Luyipa's disciple was Darikpa, and Darikpa's disciple was Ghantapada.

You are correct, Tsongkhapa did write a commentary on completion stage of this system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

In 1970, American TV producer Jerry Thorpe saw the unique entertainment potential that the teachings of the Buddha, (especially as interpreted by the Chinese Shaolin school) could have if carefully scripted into the plots of a weekly show about cowboys, but featuring a wandering monk who was a master of the martial art known as Kung Fu. the show bore that name, was a hit, and actually drew millions of Americans to begin to seriously study the dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Was definitely my first exposure to Dharma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Something I appreciate about the Urantia Book is its view of God as both the loving parent of the Bible and the all embracing Oversoul of Eastern philosophy, both being different aspects of the same being. Furthermore, like Hinduism, the Urantia Book teaches there is an indwelling fragment of God in each person, and that the purpose of life is to attain unity with this fragment. The Urantia Book also compares the indwelling Buddha nature to the fragment of God within.

Malcolm wrote:

An idea explicitly rejected in many Buddhists sutras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2011 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

I see you share this ideas with the Western Shugden Society.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

Actually, the Fifth Dalai Lama notes in his own autobiography that his recognition was faked. What people do with this information is something else altogether.

However, there is actually no real reason to presume that a line of tulkus is the reincarnation of the same person. Case in point -- Trungpa Rinpoche told some friends of mine that he was not in fact the reincarnation of previous Trungpa, but was in fact that reincarnation of the previous Trungpa's attendant. Now, I have no idea if he was f%^ing with my friends or not, but they were long time students of his, and one had been his "sku sung", his personal attendant for some time, and this is what they told me.

There is also the issue of the sixth Dalai Lama and the Seventh Dalai Lama living at the same time. The sixth was not killed. He was banned to Amdo. His autobiography has appeared. The present HHDL has indicated that he feels a strongest affinity to the second, fifth, sixth, and thirteenth Dalai Lamas, who all have strong connections with the Nyingma practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is all in the thun instruction book.

N

Pema Rigdzin said:

Yeah, that's one of the books I'm waiting on. I seriously think I'll order from the SSI in Europe from now on. SSI USA still hasn't gotten my order in the mail, even after telling me they would a second time on the 14th, and they don't ever respond to emails. So it's been a total of 17 days since I placed my order. If there were another SSI USA branch, I would go through them and never deal with the one in Massachusetts again, seriously. This is ridiculous.

Malcolm wrote:

Unfortunately, you cannot order from Europe, they will just send you to USA. I have alerted the board of SSI to your complaint, it is just one among many, unfortunately. So, please exercise patience and understand that they are severely understaffed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Democracy in excile

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Regarding Tibetans and their "new form of democracy" in excile, there arose also the question by me how does that function ?

- Is it true that the rulership of the Gelug is now official ended?

Malcolm wrote:

That ended in 1959.

kalden yungdrung said:

- Who is the new "Boss" of all the Tibetan traditions?

Malcolm wrote:

No one was ever the boss of all traditions.

kalden yungdrung said:

- Is the Kashag renewed, e.g. "democratic"?

Malcolm wrote:

Kashag is now democratic. But so what -- they are a government in exile. Only for Tibetans in exile, not for Tibetan Buddhists nor for Tibetans in Tibet and China. The have

no real power.

That answers all the rest of your questions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: Mantra Recitation Out-loud or Silently?

Content:

The Ticking Man said:

Thank you for the feedback. I appreciate it.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, in Dzogchen Community deity mantras like Simhamukha, etc are done quietly, under the breath, not out loud.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

samdrup said:

Hey Namdrol,

So even though he never taught Dzogchen, do sources confirm he did practice it? Is there any other texts that directly mention Tsongkhapa's view on Dzogchen? If so what are his comments?

Malcolm wrote:

No, he never practiced Dzogchen. His views on Dzogchen tended to follow the standard Sarma discomfort with Dzogchen, and he refuted some Dzogchen ideas that he felt were too close to so called "Hashang" view.

samdrup said:

Does Atisha speak much about Dzogchen? Comments?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Theravadans That Believe in the Bardo

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Yes, indeed i could read a lot of books more about this topic, but my free time is sometimes limited.

Easier would be, if you could give the short (cut) / answer to my done question, if possible of course.

Your answer / reply is here not so clear to me whereas you made a statement of the Indian Bardo which i also know that it would be a part of the 6 Yogas of Naropa or of his karma mudra / sister / partner, the Yogini Niguma, and they are members of the Indian Mahamudra Tradition.

Best wishes

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

right, so if you read a book on the six yogas of naropa, it will be discussed there and you will clearly see how different it is from bardo teachings in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Theravadans That Believe in the Bardo

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

But how is Bardo here experienced? Is the root or source here related to Indian Dzogchen or Indian Mahamudra?

We know all that Mahamudra is very near to Dzogchen, but the lights (Todgal) or the Lamps are missing here.

So i guess that the Bardo States here, are explained according the Indian Dzogchen Tradition.....

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

You can read any number of books about it, actually.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

conebeckham said:

Namdrol-

You said Ghantapada's was the first known Completion Stage commentary for Chakrasamvara....but didn't Luipa write on the completion stage as well? My understanding was that Luipa was the first or earliest of the Chakrasamvara Siddhas. Some say he "discovered" the tantra itself?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but that does not mean he wrote down completion stage instructions. AFAIK, he just composed a sadhana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Caz said:

I find this part interesting it has previously been suggested that the reincarnation lineage of the Dalai lama was tampered with.

So if exactly he was a great tertön who was he a reincarnation of because this certainly suggests that it wasn't the previous 4th ?

Namdrol said:

I mentioned before, Trisong Detsen, etc.

Caz said:

Interesting so I wonder what happened to the actual 4th Dalai lama ? If the 5th was actually a reincarnation of Trisong Detsen and not actually Avalokiteshvara then this would seem to explain a bit from a historical POV. Cheers for clearing that up Namdrol.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the Fifth also claimed to be the incarnation of Songtsen Gampo as well as being the emanation of Avalokiteshvara. The idea that the Dalai Lamas are emanations of Avalokiteshvara begins with him.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Enochian said:

Ok how can someone learn about him?

Namdrol, do you have any good Internet or book sources?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a book by templeman that has his biography.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Why is Buddhism so appealing to educated Caucasians?

Content:

Luke said:

My point is that you study at a university and most universities are run by leftist elites, so one has to kiss up to them and their viewpoints in order to succeed there.

Malcolm wrote:

Boy, are you out of it. In general the academic establishment has not been "left" since the 80's, apart from a few parts of the US like Berkley. Harvard has shifted totally to the right [i.e. to the money \$\$\$], so has Colombia, Princeton, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Enochian said:

There is very little info on Krishnacarya on the internet

1. Who was he?

Malcolm wrote:

An important Mahāsiddha who is well attested to.

Enochian said:

2. Did he really exist?

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely.

Enochian said:

3. What are the top 3 teachings of his commentorial tradition?

Malcolm wrote:

I mentioned a couple of them -- he figures large in the Yamari lineages as well.

Enochian said:

4. Why does he have a name of a Hindu god in his name?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

he doesn't. Krishna means "dark" i.e. the black-skinned acarya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is in the commentaries by Sachen on the Krishnacarya corpus that we find the clearest indication of the process of attaining rainbow about according to the Cakrasamvara system in the Sakya school.

adinatha said:

Would it be tummo, illusory body yoga and chulen?

Malcolm wrote:

Tummo is a part of the process. Illusory body is a father tantra thing. Chulen does not figure large in Sachen's commentaries but the Indian texts are chalk full of dietary and herbal recommendations for supporting the completion stage all of which would make a vegan cringe.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Caz said:

I find this part interesting it has previously been suggested that the reincarnation lineage of the Dalai lama was tampered with.

So if exactly he was a great tertön who was he a reincarnation of because this certainly suggests that it wasn't the previous 4th ?

Malcolm wrote:

I mentioned before, Trisong Detsen, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- What did the 5th Dalai Lama as a Tertön discovered?

Many cycles including Dorje Drollo, Tara, etc. Many of them are included in the Rinchen Terzö.

- What was his previous reincarnation in those days when he did hide teachings?
Trisong Detsen.

- In how far is it trustable all the informations of the 5th Dalai Lama?

Malcolm wrote:

Completely trustworthy. He was not responsible for war with the King of Tsang, Karma Tenkyong Wangpo. The history of Central Tibet from 1621-1642 is roughly the history of warring Mongol factions, one side backing the Kagyus, the other side backing the Gelugpas, fighting over central Tibet. All of this happened while the Fifth was a child and a young man. He was born in 1617. He had very little to do with the suppression of the Kagyu school. This was done in his name by the regent Sonam Chopel. It was not until Chopel died 1658 that the Fifth began to exercise any real power on his own.

Samten Karmey has an interesting article here:

http://www.iias.nl/nl/39/IIAS_NL39_1213.pdf " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 19th, 2011 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Theravadans That Believe in the Bardo

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Please tell me more about Indian Vajrayana outside the Tibetan Dorje Thekpa.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, we have the bardo teachings connected with the six yogas of Naropa and so on. You can look there -- we have firm Indian sources for these.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

- Are those Dzogchen teachings authentic?
- What Dzogchen teachings did he teach?

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa never taught Dzogchen. The incident in question is when he was visiting a Nyingma master who had a vision of Vajrapani, and in that during that time, Tsongkhapa asked whether Dzogchen was authentic and Vajrapani replied that it was.

kalden yungdrung said:

- The 5th Dalai Lama was also fond of Dzogchen, he knew what was good ! Is he therefore a Dzogchen Rigdzin?

Malcolm wrote:

The Great Fifth was an important tertön. He wrote a detailed manual on Dzogchen practice as well.

kalden yungdrung said:

Yes the main point here is that if one doesn't belong to an unbroken Dzogchen lineage as follower then the Dzogchen teachings are not 100% and I understood that Gelug or Kadampa was the lineage here with Dorje Chang as the head and not Kuntu Zangpo.

Malcolm wrote:

There is really no difference between Samantabhadra and Vajradhara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Theravadans That Believe in the Bardo

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

So the Bardo teachings seem to be of Tibetan origin because I never heard something of that written in Pali or Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

There are bardo teachings in Indian Vajrayāna. They do not come from Tibet.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Why is Buddhism so appealing to educated Caucasians?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Now, Buddhism is going gangbusters in S America, so that is not an issue there.

Daniel Arraes said:

In most cases among South american upper middle class, who are mostly "white" (not pure caucasians, but fair-skinned mestizos).

Malcolm wrote:

So you are saying Buddhism is just an elitist fad? I could have told you that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Enochian said:

Only later did this tantra come to be interpreted through creative commentary as being about tummo.

From what I can tell, tummo as practiced today has no textual justification save for a couplet from the Hevajra tantra.

Not that it matters, since these things were taught by omniscient Mahasiddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

As I mentioned, the tummo in the new tantra schools for the most part depend on Krishnacarya's instruction. However, tummo also shows up in the Sahajasiddhi of Dombhi Heruka.

It seems that indeed Tummo was adapted to Cakrasamvara from the Hevajra system, perhaps because the Samputa tantra is a common commentary to both. The Tummo instructions which are given a verse in Hevajra are elaborated in the Samputa tantra in a section called the Vasantatilaka (which is also a meter in Sanskrit poetics), "the ornament of spring" which may be found in the sixth kalpa of the Samputa (the Samputa is divided into ten kalpas, each having four sub-sections, for a total of roughly forty chapters).

The earliest completion stage manual we have on Cakrasamvara is Ghantapada's five stages (not to be confused with Nagarjuna's five stages connected with Guhyasamaja). Caṇḍali yoga (gtum mo) is distinctly absent from that text. However, in the outer five deity sadhana written by Chogyal Phagpa, the completion stage given for that sadhana is directly based on subsection two of the sixth section of the Samputa. Perhaps it is because this tradition comes from Mardo Lotawa who also translated Krishnacarya's Vasantatilaka.

The completion stage manuals of Krishnacarya all center around the concept of the Vasantatilaka, and one of them is explicitly named as such. Krishnacarya writes that vasanta, spring, means "when the wind ceases, after the breath of the right and the left goes into the nostrils". This Vasantatilaka was also translated by Mardo.

As a testament to the enduring popularity of the Vasantatilaka system, Vanaratna, the last Indian Mahasiddha to visit Tibet (15th century) wrote a commentary on Krishnacarya's text some 40 folios in length which is also preserved in the Tengyur.

It is in the commentaries by Sachen on the Krishnacarya corpus that we find the clearest indication of the process of attaining rainbow about according to the Cakrasamvara system in the Sakya school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Hinduism regarded the Buddha as an Avatar of Vishnu.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in particularly flattering way -- according their account, Buddha was Visnu's avatar sent to deceive the Asuras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Why is Buddhism so appealing to educated Caucasians?

Content:

Luke said:

Have you ever actually taught Dharma in a non-white area?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't actually teach that much. However, if someone invited me, I would go.

Luke said:

No, I'm just trying to illustrate an important issue in modern Buddhism. I think not caring about teaching Buddhism to other races and ethnic groups shows a lack of compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, as far as that goes, as I said before, it is a matter of karma. As the saying goes, you can lead a horse to water but you cannot force them to drink.

In terms of traditional black and latino communities, what is it that Buddhism is going to bring them that Christianity does not already supply?

Now, Buddhism is going gangbusters in S America, so that is not an issue there. There is very little Buddhism in Africa, however.

But in the long run, it is based on interest. If people are interested, than Buddhism will spread. If there is no interest, than not. So education is the key.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Bon and the karmic problems of Tibet

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

Radiocarbon date results for Zhang Zhung say the culture existed at least as early as 1000 BCE, per recent studies by Belleza.

Malcolm wrote:

Pots are not people.

For example, would we expect to find Celts today living along the Danube?

Tenzin1 said:

In any case, this may be why some say that Bon didn't exist before the 11th Century. It depends on how one defines Bon.

Malcolm wrote:

What they mean is that we do not have a single Bon text which can be dated earlier than the 11th century.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Why is Buddhism so appealing to educated Caucasians?

Content:

Namdrol said:

2. What can be done to make Buddhism more popular with other races of people and with less-educated people?

Educate them.

Luke said:

Now that sounds like a good answer on the surface, but I think it may hide some rather racist assumptions...

Malcolm wrote:

In general, in order for people to become interested in Buddhism, first they need to be educated about Buddhism. Nothing racist about that.

Luke said:

You have your own sangha, don't you? Do you feel any need to reach out to other races and ethnic groups? Would you ever give a dharma talk in a tough, but diverse area like Lawrence or Lowell, Massachusetts?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not an evangelist. But I would teach Dharma wherever there was interest.

Luke said:

I think that part of the problem may simply be that white Buddhist teachers are simply unwilling to step out of their comfort zones to try to speak to new audiences; it's far easier for them to keep worshipping the Asians and to keep lecturing to the whites.

Malcolm wrote:

We're full of piss and vinegar today, aren't we?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 7:35 PM

Title: Re: Dhewa Dhakini

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

If you think that this is a problem you should check out some of Namkhai Norbu's transliterations!

Malcolm wrote:

His are based on a kind of Pinyin.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 11:24 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

adinatha said:

The only thing that matters here is that Sunyata and DO are the same thing.

Lazy_eye said:

If that's the case, though, why not just call it paticcasamuppada and leave it at that?

Why use another term for it?

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent origination is correct relative truth; by understanding that, one is lead to correct understanding of ultimate truth, emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 9:41 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Enochian said:

You feel it in the classical chakras like throat, heart etc.

Malcolm wrote:

where there are a lot nerves...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Namdrol said:

The principle unique development in Buddhist Indo-Tibetan Yoga seems to be Dzogchen.

N

Enochian said:

There was actually a recognition school of Trika shaivism. Surprisingly there is zero information about it on the internet. But in Gavin Flood's book "The Tantric Body", he talks about it. They even had a mirror analogy like Dzogchen.

But the Muslims destroyed this tradition along with Vajrayana (in India).

Namdrol said:

There are some similarities with Trika, but they are quite superficial. However, there was a lot of interaction between Kashmir and Tibet, and before Katmandhu became the major place for Tibetans to go, Kashmir was the place in the late tenth century.

Malcolm wrote:

To add a bit -- we just don't know a lot. All we have is the texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 8:38 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Namdrol said:

The principle unique development in Buddhist Indo-Tibetan Yoga seems to be Dzogchen.
N

Enochian said:

There was actually a recognition school of Trika shaivism. Surprisingly there is zero information about it on the internet. But in Gavin Flood's book "The Tantric Body", he talks about it. They even had a mirror analogy like Dzogchen.

But the Muslims destroyed this tradition along with Vajrayana (in India).

Malcolm wrote:

There are some similarities with Trika, but they are quite superficial. However, there was a lot of interaction between Kashmir and Tibet, and before Katmandhu became the major place for Tibetans to go, Kashmir was the place in the late tenth century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 8:37 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Namdrol said:

The principle unique development in Buddhist Indo-Tibetan Yoga seems to be Dzogchen. If we ignore traditional accounts, text critically speaking the yogas we know about from Dzogchen all seem to date after 950 CE., developed in Tibet and never existed in India, apart from proto-thogal of the type we find in the Kalacakra "empty forms" [shunyatā bimba] practice.

adinatha said:

Well that can't be if Dzogchen learned about channels and chakras from Hindu Indians.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there are traces of post-Indian adaptation nadi theory in the Vima Nyinthig material. For example, in one Vima nyinthig text in a passage describing the central channel, it uses the term avadhūti, but in another passage directly related, it describes a different channel as the kun 'dar ma. The problem with this is that kun 'dar ma is the Tibetan translation of avadhūti.

The point I was making was that Buddhist Yogis in India adapted Hindu yogic terms to Buddhism. Then, in Tibet, Nyingma Yogis adapted newer tantric materials [i.e. mother tantra] being brought into Tibet after 950 and used this material as the basis for reformulating their yogic traditions, including Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

adinatha said:

Well, that and the Yoga Sutras, where other common terms were. Then, it would seem these do not show up in buddhist literature until later too.

Malcolm wrote:

What it basically looks like is that Buddhists first appropriated the external Vedic rituals after the Gupta period [lower tantras up to Yoga tantra]. Then, slowly, Buddhists began to adopt the language of the Pan-Indian yogic tradition as well.

The principle unique development in Buddhist Indo-Tibetan Yoga seems to be Dzogchen. If we ignore traditional accounts, text critically speaking the yogas we know about from Dzogchen all seem to date after 950 CE., developed in Tibet and never existed in India, apart from proto-thogal of the type we find in the Kalacakra "empty forms" [shunyatā bimba] practice.

The yogas underpinning the mahāmudra movement and tantras and their terminology as we know have non-Buddhist origins and are heavily informed by Ayurveda, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Please stop pretending that I have no idea what I am talking about. I might not have a degree in Buddhist studies, but I know a thing or two. .

Malcolm wrote:

You don't really know what you are talking about. Though you get points for persistence.

You don't have any idea about the intricate intellectual history of things like the three kāyas in Mahāyāna Buddhism. You don't understand emptiness. You don't understand dependent origination. You don't understand Yogachara. You don't understand Theravada. In short, if you want to learn about Buddhism, you have a lot to learn. Good luck.

Thanks,

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

adinatha said:

Clearly the early Ati masters knew about channels and chakras.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what you mean by "early".

adinatha said:

They were aware of the bindu in the heart, the central and side channels, the crown, throat and heart chakras at the very least? Thogal practices are dependent on this knowledge, no?

Malcolm wrote:

These seem to make their first appearance with tantras such as Hevajra and Dakarnava, etc. Mid 9th century or so.

adinatha said:

But you are saying it's hard to know when these truly appeared, because they don't appear until Chetsun Wangchuk 10th Cen, and there are uncanny similarities between practices in Nyingthig tradition and Kalachakra which arrives also around 10th Cen and thrived in a nearby or same region as Nyingthig?

Malcolm wrote:

The seventeen tantras do talk about the three channels, four cakras, and so on. But as we know, Chetsun was mid 11th -- early 12th century. As I mentioned to you, he met with Zhangton Tashi Dorje in 1123 and passed away (i.e. rainbowed) shortly thereafter.

Cakras and so on do not figure much into Guhyasamaja practice at all. So while Guhyasamaja practice entered Tibet very early, during the eighth century, its completion stage practices were not well developed until ninth century in India (i.e. the Pañcakrama, etc.).

Three channels and four cakras is, in Indian Buddhist tantra, apparently a mother tantra sort of thing. Seems to show up first in Hevajra (Cakrasamvara root tantra is arguably older than the Hevajra), then in other Cakrasamvara commentary tantras and so on.

Kalacakra arrives in Tibet in 1027 CE i.e. early 11th century. 1027 is the first year of the sixty year cycle of the Tibetan calendar. One of the reasons dates before this time are so sketchy is that well, 1027 CE is the first totally reliable date we have in Tibetan history and everything is calculated from that date. Tibetans themselves are quite unclear about dates, and for many dates in the Imperial period we have had to rely on external documents from Chinese records to date events in Tibet History. Western scholars too did not invent this system. This approach to fixing Tibetan dates by using Chinese annals is also used in the Blue Annals by the 15th century Kagyu historian Go Lotsawa Zhonnu Pal. A good book about early Tibetan history is The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia by Beckwith.

But limitation of the text critical approach is that you cannot measure the age of an idea, only the age of the first text in which an idea appears. As we know, the ideas of channels and so on is much older in Hindu literature. For example, the Chandogya Upanishad discusses nadis including a nadi that seems to resemble the central channel.

<http://www.ashtangayoga.info/philosophy/upanishads/chandogya-upanishad/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

There are many ideas in the Buddhist tantras that make their first textual appearance in the pre-Buddhist Upanishads.

But in terms of when these ideas first appear in Buddhist texts, they seem to appear extremely late in Buddhist history.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

It must be time to change the subject to "Dog in Buddhism".

PadmaVonSamba said:

If there was no god, then dog spelled backwards would have no meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you quite sure it isn't the other way around?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It must be time to change the subject to "Dog in Buddhism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Serenity, have you ever had beef jerky?

Beef jerky is made by taking strips of steak, salting them or soaking them in brine and then hanging them up in the sun to dry.

Every Sunday, millions of Catholics around the world take the Eucharist, where they believe they are eating the body of Christ.

Christ was also hung up out in the hot sun.

So, can you please explain to me what is the difference between Jesus and beef jerky?

Malcolm wrote:

Romans?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

Women were believed to have transformational spiritual power, as well as generative power, so mixing sexual fluids and then consuming them was one way men believed they could gain this power for their own purposes.

Malcolm wrote:

Certainly, but this does not really encompass the meaning of this tradition. The meaning of this tradition is attaining buddhahood.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Amida Buddha is Nirvana personified. How is this drastically different from a personal God, aside from the fact that Amida is not a Creator God?

PadmaVonSamba said:

What does "a personal God" mean?

Malcolm wrote:

It means a god who is a person i.e. Jesus, Krishna, etc. i.e. a god who acts though a persona, unlike for example Brahmin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Namdrol said:

That is not a Mahāyāna idea. That is also present in the *karana hetu/adipati pratyaya* principle of the Sarvastivadins i.e. all phenomena are the cause and condition of all phenomena but themselves.

Lazy_eye said:

It looks like we posted at around the same time. So the Sarvastivadins did play a role here, then? Would Nagarjuna have been opposing them, agreeing with them, partially opposing them, or using them as a framework for his own thinking?

Malcolm wrote:

Nagarjuna would have agreed with Sarstivadans conventionally, but would have rejected their notions ultimately.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Mahayanists sometimes get accused of misinterpreting paticcasamuppada (dependent origination).

PMTF said:

Hello Lazy Eye

What specifically is the basis for Mahayanists sometimes get accused of misinterpreting paticcasamuppada (dependent origination)?

Lazy_eye said:

The complaints seem to center around the idea that Mahayana turns paticcasamuppada into some kind of cosmic principle -- interconnectedness of all phenomena, etc. Kumbayah!

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a Mahāyāna idea. That is also present in the karana hetu/adipati pratyaya principle of the Sarvastivadins i.e. all phenomena are the cause and condition of all phenomena but themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Amida Buddha is Nirvana personified. How is this drastically different from a personal God, aside from the fact that Amida is not a Creator God?

Malcolm wrote:

Seems to me you should study Buddhism with a real Buddhist teacher.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

I am not the first person to have interpreted Eastern philosophy in light of the Urantia Book.

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares? It has nothing to do with the Dharma. In fact, very little that you have written about here has the slightest thing to do with Buddhism at all. Instead, it seems you are intent in broadcasting new age and theistic ideas that really do not have anything in common with what Buddhists understand Buddhism to be about. As such, I question why you bother us with this nonsense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

That's sort of like saying since all binary code is made of 1's and 0's, and since the concept 'zero' (as having numeric value) was an Arabic concept, that the internet is half Arabic.

Malcolm wrote:

The zero was invented in India, actually.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2011 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Karmamudra-the reality, the myth

Content:

Astus said:

An interesting case of karmamudra:

...

Malcolm wrote:

Chapman, in general, does not know what he is talking about. Please, out of respect for Tibetan Buddhism, let us cease discussing this issue once and for all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Karmamudra-the reality, the myth

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Many posts seem to be bleeding over into this subject with a lot of people totally freaking out about it. So I thought why doesn't someone who actually knows about this subject lay out what Karmamudra is and isn't? The process, practice, and purpose of it. Of course I am not asking anyone to break samaya or anything but perhaps if people actually understood it better there would be less dissension, freaking out, slander, etc etc

Malcolm wrote:

Those of us who actually know this practice, understand it, and can explain it cannot because we have samaya. And in any event, it does not help because it merely makes the emotionally immature more hysterical.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

alpha said:

Why is only men discussing karmamudra ?

Namdrol said:

Because women are prajñā by nature.

gnegirl said:

i was gunna say its because guys forget the brain above their necks at times.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a particularly male fault, actually. Anyone with genitals can suffer from this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is pretty clear indications that Amitabha literature and modes of conceiving and writing Amitabha's pure land are very influenced by Persian culture.

Astus said:

The most important parts are the vow and the buddha-land as a safe place for liberation because these are the essentials for attaining enlightenment in that way. Other details make little or no difference at all. And the Pure Land school with focus on recitation and the 18th vow is quite an East Asian thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Walled garden forts are pretty safe places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Astus said:

It is a bit funny that God can be seen in the Shin school of Buddhism. What I mean is that Shinshu is a very, if not the most simplified form of Buddhism where the primary goal is to attain birth through faith. Now, this whole God concept is a load of misguided interpretation that has nothing to do with attaining birth in the Pure Land of Amita Buddha. Since it has nothing to do with it there is no point in assuming any relevance to Jodo Shinshu. The Pure Land sutras don't talk about any God, neither do the seven patriarchs. What basis is there of this abstract conceptual proliferation within the Pure Land context? Nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

There is pretty clear indications that Amitabha literature and modes of conceiving and writing Amitabha's pure land are very influenced by Persian culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

adinatha said:

It is not through creative commentary, but the oral tradition that accompanies the dissemination of a tantra

Malcolm wrote:

I would argue it is both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

username said:

Chakrasambhava, always interesting and probably the most discussed tantra in terms of origin. Even the Hindu scholars come into this picture regularly. And the ever flexible Nyingmas...

Malcolm wrote:

Not vague at all. Some Nyingmapas were quite hostile to the new spread of tantras.

username said:

Plus, almost all was deeply hidden within inner chambers back then, unlike last few centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so -- otherwise there would be no reason for Lha Lama Yeshe Od to complian about corrupt tantric practices, and his nephew would have had no reason to write Atisha explaining that while mother tantra was excellent, maybe Atisha should not bring it to Tibet, etc. This suggests a much higher profile than "hidden in back chambers" indicates.

username said:

David Gray's book

(<http://www.kamakotimandali.com/blog/index.php?p=643&more=1&c=1&tb=1&pb=1> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;") is basically his PhD thesis:
http://vajrayana.faithweb.com/rich_text_1.html " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

alpha said:

Why is only men discussing karmamudra ?

Malcolm wrote:

Because women are prajñā by nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Might it be the case that no emphasis is given to these teachings by these traditions since it would be taken for granted that a Buddhist accepts and applies the 4NT? And why do you say that the 4NT are a purely renunciative practice? Due to the wording? Coz it seems to me that right effort, for example, is not purely renunciative and anyway when one "renounces" wrong doing essentially what one is doing is accepting virtuous/wholesome actions.

Malcolm wrote:

The 4NT are actually a diagnostic heuristic. All traditions have this. All traditions start with suffering, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Adamantine said:

So what's the source of Tummo in Nyingma then?

Malcolm wrote:

That is an interesting question. We actually have complaints by Nyingma authors from the tenth century expressing concern about new-fangled, new-age clap trap yoga practices using cakras, and so on, borrowed from Hindus and being imported from India. It suggests that tummo was adapted from the mother tantras when they came to Tibet.

However, it is very hard to be certain because Tummo and so on are mentioned in various Nyingma tantras which are hard to date.

Interestingly, Guru Chowang has a terma of the six yogas of Naropa which is in the Rinchen Terzö.

The opinion of several western scholars is that Nyingmapas borrowed many practices from the mother tantras, such as body mandalas and so on forth after the 11th century. Or for another example, the notion of the twenty four pithas is entirely based on the Cakrasamvara/Hevajra tradition. While it is possible that this idea was introduced to Tibet with Padmasambhava (these two tantras were certainly extant in India during the eighth century), or later in the ninth century or tenth century (because we have Cakrasamvara completion stage documents at Tunhuang that may date to the mid tenth-century) we don't really see this idea expressed, so far as I know, in the the classical set of Nyingma tantras. However, the caveat is that the 40 or so volumes of Nyingma tantras have been largely unexplored.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 11:25 AM

Title: Re: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Enochian said:

Only later did this tantra come to be interpreted through creative commentary as being about tummo.

From what I can tell, tummo as practiced today has no textual justification save for a couplet from the Hevajra tantra.

Not that it matters, since these things were taught by omniscient Mahasiddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

well, this is not exactly true -- for example, in Yoga Tantra they practice an "inner fire puja" and the chapter on the fire puja in Cakrasamvara is understood to indicate tummo practice.

The common source of tummo in Kagyu, Sakya and Gelug is the tummo instruction from Krishnacarya. This is the origin of tummo in the six yogas of Naropa, and is preserved as an Independent instruction in Lamdre.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

kirtu said:

I'd go so far as to say that Mahayana doesn't have to include the 4NT's at all and that historically it was relegated to the Southern School for the most part. Now with Buddhism developing into a kind of pan-Buddhism it is often referred to in teachings in many places. But it is superseded for the most part in the common and uncommon Mahayana.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

4NT are covered in detail in Avatamska, the Bodhisattva Pitika, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 7:08 AM

Title: Sakya POV on the origin of the Cakrasamvara Tantras

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is what Indian scholars say about the identity of the teacher who taught the Cakrasamvara Tantras, according to extensive history of Cakrasamvara written by the great Sakya Polymath and 28th throne holder of Sakya, Ngawang Kunga Sonam (1597-1659/1660, <http://tbrc.org/link?RID=P7900> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;).

He writes: "Bhavabhata and Bhavyakirit both hold that "This teacher (i.e. Śākyamuni) having attained buddhahood in the beginningless past taught the Cakrasamvara tantras, but later, after becoming the son of Śuddodana, did not teach it. Their reasoning holds that since Cakrasamvara is continually practiced by the heros and yoginis of the twenty four countries, even when eon forms and perished (the twenty four countries) do not form and perish so [the Cakrasamvara] does not disappear. Even though other dharmas may have also been taught in the beginning, since they are destroyed by the formation and perishing of the eon, since they disappear during the interval, they must be taught again by Śākyamuni.

The commentary on the root tantra by Indrabhuti II gives a citation:

"Having tamed the maras, which shows the manner of awakening,
having seen the strength of the activity of the Sugatas,
in the place called Mt. Dhanyakata
the source of the dharma that exhausts passion,
in the mandala circle the hero well taught
the great secret to a countless assembly
eight hundred million yoginis and more..." etc.

Guided by this, first, the Cakrasamvara tantra is taught without interruption in the Akaniṣṭa, the location of the buddhas (as opposed to the god realm Akaniṣṭa); in middle, having emanated on the peak of Sumeru, and later, having manifested the twelve deeds in Jambudvīpa after turning the three wheels of Dharma, for the benefit of fortunate disciples the Bhagavan entered into the samadhi of Śrī Cakrasamvara on the mountain of Śrī Dhanyakataka, emanated the mandala circle and taught the Cakrasamvara tantras to eight hundred million yoginis. Having also demonstrated the method of taming Rudra-Bhairava with his retinue, he [Indrabhuti II] holds that once again it was recited and taught by Śākyamuni

The Ḍākārṇava Tantra (one of the commentary tantras of Cakrasamvara) states:

In the kali yuga this will
be taught by countless bhagavans.
The tantra taught by Śākyasimha

carry one to the other shore of yoga.

The Commentary on the Ḍākārṇava tantra [by Padmavajra] states, "Again, in the kali yuga, three million, six hundred thousand major tantras were taught by Śākyasimha."

Therefore, after having first been explained by the heruka of the cause, the sambhogakāya, it explained that it was repeated again and taught.

The commentary by Master Vajra states, "During the Dvāparayuga, Rudra Maheśvara was tamed. Though it [the root tantra] was taught at that time, here, the one to tame, Íśvara also arose at the beginning of the Kaliyuga. After they were tamed by Heruka with his retinue, the tantra was taught as it was stated in the Ḍākārṇava tantra.

Now the reason for teaching [the root tantra] in the Kaliyuga is stated in The Vajrapātāla Tantra:

Time is divided into four ages
the tantra division is divided into four sections.

The four tantra divisions are taught intending disciples of the four ages. Also the reason the anuttarayoga is taught in Kaliyuga is that the disciples of that age are very afflicted, it is intended for those with coarse three poisons to take the path or root of awakening, as it is stated in the Herukābhyudaya Tantra:

Having been cared for by Śrī Heruka,
there will be success in the degenerate age.

Therefore, in terms of the [perfect] time, when it was time to tame Rudra with his retinue in Jambudvīpa, inside the mandala emanated in Mt. Meru, Bhagavan along with his retinue were arranged in the mandala wheel. According the explanatory tantras, after Śrī Vajrapāṇi offered a ganacakra, since he requested that the root tantra be explained, in the perfect place, the peak of Mt. Meru, the nature of the teacher's body, speech and mind, the result Heruka, Cakrasamvara, placed the tamed retinue, Rudra Bhairava with retinue into the mandala. And he taught the perfect Dhama the trio of extensive, medium and concise root tantras of Cakrasamvara to the deities of the five wheels, and moreover, the buddhas and bodhisattvas equal with the atoms in Mt. Meru, the fortune gods and humans, the retinue, the petitioner and the collator, Vārāhī, and so.

However, Vajrapāṇi's [i.e. the tenth stage bodhisattva] Commentary on the Upper Section explains the petitioner for that mandala demonstrated above was Vajravārāhī and also she was the teacher of the Cakrasamvara tantras. Vajrapāṇi's Commentary on the Upper Section states:

In this time of the five degenerations,
in order to attain the result of merit and wisdom,
Vārāhī made a supplication, and the one with the vajra
clarified this concise tantra.

And the Herukābhyudaya Tantra states:
After that, after all the heros stood
the hero Vajrapani and so on,
and made a request to the lady of the mandala.

Having called on the mother to intercede, it is explained that she was requested to teach the tantra.

Though it may be so that someone explains she taught the Vārāhī tantra, and Vajradhara is the petitioner, Buton Rinpoche explains there is no contradiction because of the vision of the individual person to be tamed.

Therefore, Bhavyakirti and so on's explanation that this tantra was not repeated again by our teacher (Śākyamuni) as it was shown above and the citation from The Ḍākārṇava Tantra i.e. "In the kali yuga this will be taught by countless bhagavans" may seem to be in conflict but in reality they are not in conflict. The former positions intends that this teacher (Śākyamuni) did not again recite and teach the tantra after having performed the twelve deeds in Jambudvipa. The latter citation intends a time in the Kali Yuga prior to performing the twelve deeds. When it is explained that the tantra was taught after [Sakyamuni] performed the twelve deeds, though Śākyamuni himself taught many tantras of secret mantra to the uncommon disciples and the some like Guhyasamaja were by taught by other emanations of the powerful Muni, the Tattvasaṃgraha and the Cakrasamvara tantras were not taught at that time as it is explained by Loppon Sonam Tsemo, "Other than his general activities, he did not recite or teach later on. Having taught the Tattvasaṃgraha in the beginning, after completing that tantra he arrived in human lands..." and so on.

Likewise, "...he performed the deeds of arriving in Jambudvipa, etc., but he did not recite or teach the Śrī Cakrasamvara Tantra later on" is the position of master Bhavyakirti. Since his commentary on the root tantra starting from "The category of Dharma has a continuity of beginningless time, taught by the Bhagavan Śākyamuni in the past..." to the end of that citation "...like it is explained", the position of Bhavyakirti is made our position. Having summarized the meaning of those, also the The Clear Ornament of The Three Modes states "...not including the Tattvasaṃgraha and Cakrasamvara". So there you have it, according to the Sakya school, the Cakrasamvara Tantra (and the Tattvasaṃgraha) was not taught this time around by Śākyamuni Buddha.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 1:32 AM
Title: Re: Zhang Zhung Namgyal
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Taoism has in her philosophy regarding emptiness very near similarities with the Dzogchen aspect Trekchod or the Longde aspect e.g. the emptiness

Malcolm wrote:
Absolutely false.

kalden yungdrung said:
Taoism has also similarities with their Pa Kua regarding the Bon Ba Gua.

Malcolm wrote:
The so called spar kha are the Bagua. These are common to the Tibetan astrological system called ""byung rtsi". They ultimately come from Chinese culture.

kalden yungdrung said:
So the emanation from the dualistic principles out of the Wu Chi (emptiness) is nearly equal to the Dzogchen view of the Base or gZhi.

Malcolm wrote:
Not even remotely similar.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 12:36 AM
Title: Re: Sunyata and dependent origination
Content:
mudra said:
IMHO Nagarjuna deals with this in the most succinct, to the point manner in the Mulamadhyamakakarika/Foundation of the Middle Way.

Malcolm wrote:
Even more succinctly here:

What are the twelve different limbs
the Muni taught as dependent origination?

Those are exhaustively included in three,
defilement, action and suffering.
The first, eighth and ninth are defilement;
the second and tenth are action;
also the remaining seven are suffering;
twelve dharmas are gathered into three.

Two are produced from three;
seven are produced from two;

three are produced from seven;
that is the wheel of existence,
it is turned again and again,
all living beings are causes and results.

There are no sentient beings at all,
empty dharmas are entirely produced
from dharmas strictly empty,
dharmas without a self and [not] of a self.

Words, butter lamps, mirrors, seals,
fire crystals, seeds, sourness and echoes.
Although the aggregates are serially joined,
the wise are to comprehend nothing has migrated.

Someone, having conceived of annihilation,
even in extremely subtle existents,
he is not wise,
and will never see the meaning 'arisen from conditions'.

Here, nothing at all is to be removed,
nor is anything to be added;
having truly seen reality,
when reality is perceived, liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2011 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Sönam said:

Therefore, all teachings that bring to the only identity Buddha is told by Buddha ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Right. But some people really have a need to make sure that Buddha's name is
"Shakyamuni".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

For example, Vasubandhu points out if something is well spoken, is virtuous and does not conflict with dependent origination, it can be accepted as Buddhavacana, the word of Buddha.

pueraeternus said:

Brings to mind something Jan Nattier mentioned in a clip. Initially the earliest inscriptions proclaim that "Whatever the Buddha said is well-spoken.", but overtime it became "Whatever is well-spoken, was said by the Buddha".

Malcolm wrote:

I would like to modify that again:

"Whatever is well-spoken, was said by a Buddha."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

What of people at the time of Shakyamuni receiving the teaching, in a visionary manner, Sambhogakaya dimension from Shakyamuni?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this supposedly happened in the case of Indrabhuti the first, the account which I gave above. Buddha manifested the mandala of Guhyasamaja. This is also held to the case in Kalacakra, where Buddha manifested the mandala in Dhanyakata Stupa in South India at the same time he was supposedly teaching the perfection of wisdom sutras at Rajagriha.

Sonam Wangchug said:

Also what of the view that the Tantras were taught in secret so they were concealed for some time even though they were taught at the time of Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

That is also classical view not only of Vajrayāna but of Mahāyāna. Mahāyāna monks explained that Mahāyāna sutras were held by Nāgās for safe keeping until they could be distributed. There are many mystical ideas about text production. In short, the so called "treasure" tradition really begins with Mahāyāna sutras, not with Padmasambhava, many centuries later.

Sonam Wangchug said:

In either case whether People agree Buddha Shakyamuni taught them, can't Validity be established in terms of Guru rinpoche teaching the mantrayana?

Tulku urgyen rinpoche said for the 1000 buddha's there will be 1000 guru rinpoche's ... I wonder if then the guru rinpoche's will primarily teach secret mantra and the buddha's teach sutric, and if Maitreya will not be teaching Tantra, will the guru rinpoche be teaching it in other realms for example..

Malcolm wrote:

I read in interesting opinion this morning that holds that when the Guhyasamaja claims that only Sakyamuni Buddha will teach tantra, this is more about the greatness of Guhyasamaja. A counter citation is produced from the Mayajala tantra which states that secret mantra will be "Taught by the past buddhas, taught by the future buddhas, taught by the present buddhas, taught again and again..."

I am writing a post on the origins of the Cakrasamvara found in India sources. I will put it up later. I was wrong in asserting that no India masters claim that Sakyamuni taught Cakrasamvara. Some do.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

For example, Vasubandhu points out if something is well spoken, is virtuous and does not conflict with dependent origination, it can be accepted as Buddhavacana, the word of Buddha.

N

Sönam said:

This is to be related to an other thread where a post states that "if it does not contradict the 4 NT it is a teaching of Buddha" ... or ?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Sure...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Oh hey, Namdrol. Would you mind PMing me a few words on the mantra of the five elements, such as how many times it's supposed to be recited in a session and if there's anything special I should be considering or visualizing while reciting it? I would be so appreciative. I know you're busy though, so if you don't have time, I understand.

Nangwa said:

I don't know if Namdrol got back to you on this or not but the Short Tun book is a good one for this kind of question. Even though it takes a long time to get a copy.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Nah, haven't heard back from him. I'm sure he'll respond eventually if he notices and has a free moment. Otherwise I'll just have to exercise some patience til the books get here. The instructions of the short tun is one of the books I ordered.

Malcolm wrote:

It is all in the thun instruction book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Vajrayana

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

"There is a common misconception among many non-Buddhists (and even among certain Buddhists) that the Tantras are late and corrupt additions to the Buddha's Teachings. This is false. The Tantras are genuine teachings of the Lord Buddha, and they occupy a paramount position within the overall framework of Buddhist doctrine. "

Malcolm wrote:

There are many ways to claim a teaching of the Buddha's, and not all of them require that Buddha actually spoke the teaching in question.

For example, Vasubandhu points out if something is well spoken, is virtuous and does not conflict with dependent origination, it can be accepted as Buddhavacana, the word of Buddha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Adamantine said:

Why would a Buddha need to receive teachings from a Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, this happens a lot. In Guhyasamaja, for example.

There are all kinds of literary devices the authors of the tantras use to communicate things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 7:39 PM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

I talked to my teacher about this. He explained Chakrasamvara was taught by Buddha Shakyamuni in that Pitha in Pakistan to bodhisattvas.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, the nirmanakāya that teaches Cakrasamvara is Shri Heruka. Not a sambhogakāya, but a nirmanakāya.

adinatha said:

Bodhisattvas see Shakyamuni in Sambhogakaya form. Only "Buddha to Buddha" can see Dharmakaya Buddha Vajradhara. Tilopa went to this place where the teaching is kept to this day by dakinis. Tilopa was Buddha level so he could see pure nature of mind, time and space had no limitation, and received the teaching directly from Dharmakaya Buddha Vajradhara, who is Shakyamuni.

Malcolm wrote:

Tilopa received the Cakrasamvara empowerments from a siddha named Kuśalana. He certainly also received the transmission directly, just as Naropa received the transmission for Vajrayogini directly from Vajrayogini, etc. Why do we know this? Because Sakya has detailed lineage lists and histories of the masters of Cakrasamvara.

And with all due respect to your teacher, Vajradhara is a sambhogakāya embodiment of

the dharmakāya. The dharmakāya is called Samantabhadra, as I mentioned now several times, in Yoga tantra as well as Guhyasamaja.

And Shakyamuni is an emanation of Vajradhara, as is Garab Dorje, etc. All nirmanakāyas are emanations of the Sambhogakāya. Likewise, Shri Heruka is a nirmanakāya emanation of the Sambhogakāya.

In short, you are merely reciting an opinion usually found in Kagyu and Gelug than in Nyingma and Sakya. In Nyingma for example, they hold that Shakyamuni never taught tantra above kriya tantra, and that it was Padmasambhava who spread the tantras in Jambudvīpa.

There are conflicting accounts of the genesis of the Hevajra tantra.

So it is better to leave these histories (often mutually conflicting) at the level of legend and not presume they refer to historical facts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

My point is that it seems the standard position of tibetan masters is that he did.. therefore to those who said he did if you are saying he did not you are denying their omniscience?

Malcolm wrote:

Never met an omniscient master yet. Omniscience is overrated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

You are saying The historical buddha did not teach them, at that time out of his mouth.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. And there is no valid reason to presume that he did apart from someone's opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 9:17 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

If HH, and undoubtedly many others guru's say your position is wrong, how can you continue?

Malcolm wrote:

You really have not paid attention to what I actually have said, have you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

I never said Buddha authored a single text. Authorship is not the issue.

Yes, actually, it is what we have been discussing.

adinatha said:

No. Authorship is writing. The Buddha never held a writing instrument, at least that's the tradition. He only spoke. Writing would have come later.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I wasn't going to point this out to you -- but Mahāyāna sutras self referentially (in the Buddha's own words) refer to themselves being written down, copied, etc.

adinatha said:

For example, supposedly the Buddha gave the Guhyasamaja initiation to the first Indrabhuti. He wrote the text down and taught it to everyone in his kingdom who achieved liberation. Then Oddiyāna basically disappeared. Then, sometime later, since a lake developed there, many nāgās were born in that lake. And eventually they moved to the shore and founded a city. At the same time, Vajrapani, who was safe guarding the tantra, taught it to these nāga people. Then a south Indian King, Visukalpa had a dream -- he travelled to Oddiyāna, where there met an old lady, who gave him the initiation, and from this point then supposedly Vajrayāna started to spread in India starting in South India.

Sounds crazy. You don't honestly believe that shit do you? Crazy Indians and their magical thinking. I'm telling you, there's another reason why this is the story. Indians are basically no bullshit people. There is a secret symbolic meaning to all this that applies to the method of the tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

It is meant to be taken as history, at least that is how Tibetans take it.

adinatha said:

This applies to all Indian mythology.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, you just sunk your own argument.

adinatha said:

You have to talk to a learned Brahmin to know these things. In the case of the tantras, perhaps some of these lineages are broken.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this lineage is still quite alive and well.

adinatha said:

For example, in Mahabharata or Ramayana, the characters and battles related to channels and chakras. And names relate to mantras.

Malcolm wrote:

In the tantric period of Indian history, post Gupta, everything that could be made tantric was made tantric.

adinatha said:

According to Nyingma, a bunch of texts fell on a guys house -- he did not understand them, and took them to Kukuripa who sorted them out understood them, practiced them etc.

In other words, these are all legends. As for Cakrasamvara, it is as I said. Someone in Kagyu may have decided to adapt some other story -- but there is nothing in the Cakrasamvara literature itself to indicate that Sakyamuni had anything to do with it. Instead, Shri Heruka is regarded as a separate Nirmanakāya in the twenty four lands who is presently still active to this very day.

You have to take into account the oral heritage that accompanies the text. If you try to sort out dharma from texts, you will be lost forever.

Malcolm wrote:

That is exactly the point, you must sort out the Dharma from the non-essentials. If you do not, you will lost down a rabbit hole of fundamentalist literalism.

adinatha said:

You can say whatever you want, and no one can do anything about it. For me, the question is not whether it makes sense, but whether the account plays into a method of ultimate realization. In the case of Kagyu there is like a fractal picture of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing to do with some Unique Kagyu spin on things.

adinatha said:

Self-similar wheels within wheels, and mandalas within mandalas. By connecting to the teacher...

Malcolm wrote:

Irrelevant to the point we are discussing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

You are being selective about how you apply Occam's Razor, and that selectivity masks a bias.

Malcolm wrote:

Merely point out to you that there are other ways to see the shortest path.

adinatha said:

Approximations can be made.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think we are pinpointing a publication date here.

adinatha said:

Well, the Buddha could have taught this stuff to someone, right?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not found in the Bhaisajya vastu, which is a large collection in Vinaya which records Buddha's medical treatment of monks. There is a definite record of Buddha practicing some pranayāma techniques we find even today in Yantra Yoga in the Majjima Nikāya.

adinatha said:

I never said Buddha authored a single text. Authorship is not the issue.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually, it is what we have been discussing.

adinatha said:

It amounts to the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

In the hands of some western scholars, sure. As far as I am concerned, I am just calling it the way I see it.

adinatha said:

A lot of people like to play the association game here. It's quite Jungian, nay... Freudian, perhaps Gestaltian.

Malcolm wrote:

Just telling you how you sound. It is up to you what to do with it.

adinatha said:

There's nothing like good old standard falsifiability: the ultimate Occam's Razor. If one cannot formulate a test of the falsifiability of one's theory, it's just metaphysical. This is quite liberating, because so much is just metaphysical.

Malcolm wrote:

I agree -- it is also liberating when one does not have to explain away all the hermeneutical difficulties of explaining how one guy in 460-407 +- BCE explained a whole bunch of teachings, 3/4's of which (and millions of words) were then concealed in some other dimension only to be revealed mystically some hundreds of years later.

For example, supposedly the Buddha gave the Guhyasamaja initiation to the first Indrabhuti. He wrote the text down and taught it to everyone in his kingdom who achieved liberation. Then Oddiyāna basically disappeared. Then, sometime later, since a lake developed there, many nāgās were born in that lake. And eventually they moved to the shore and founded a city. At the same time, Vajrapani, who was safe guarding the tantra, taught it to these nāga people. Then a south Indian King, Visukalpa had a dream -- he travelled to Oddiyāna, who there met an old lady, who gave him the initiation, and from this point then supposedly Vajrayāna started to spread in India starting in South India.

According to Nyingma, a bunch of texts fell on a guy's house -- he did not understand them, and took them to Kukuripa who sorted them out, understood them, practiced them etc.

In other words, these are all legends. As for Cakrasamvara, it is as I said. Someone in

Kagyu may have decided to adapt some other story -- but there is nothing in the Cakrasamvara literature itself to indicate that Sakyamuni had anything to do with it. Instead, Shri Heruka is regarded as a separate Nirmanakāya in the twenty four lands who is presently still active to this very day.

And as someone who was trained in Sakya, I prefer the Sakya account -- a) Sambhogakāya is the author and source of all Vajrayāna teachings, when it says thus have I heard, it means it was spoken by the Sambhogakāya and heard by Vajrapani, not by Ananda. B) "The single vajra word is heard differently by those of different capacity". This means a) we do not need to be worried about whether Sakyamuni had anything to do with the tantras, or Mahāyāna, since Manjushri is the one who heard Mahayāna, according to this understanding b) it allows for the evolution of dharma according to the needs of people and their capacity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

For example, the Hevajra Tantra mentions Vaibhashika, Sautrantika, Yogachara and Madhyamaka. One might suppose that in Buddha's omniscience he predicted these schools; or occams razor style, one might just understand that the Hevajra tantra was composed after the catusiddhanta system was finalized sometime in the mid sixth century with Madhyamaka at the top.

adinatha said:

So you apply Occam's Razor to whether the Buddha was omniscient? The obvious application of Occam's Razor here would be omniscience is impossible. So...

Malcolm wrote:

No, the obvious application is that the Hevajra tantra was written after the four siddhanta system came into being. There were no Vaibhashikas during the time of the Buddha because the Mahavibhasa had not been written and would not be written for 500 years.

I do not think that it impugns Shakyamuni Buddha's omniscience to imagine that he did not speak every text attributed to him whether directly or indirectly.

adinatha said:

I made no assumptions about which sutras and tantras are reliable. Also your dating of texts is based on assumptions. Dating of texts is notoriously impossible.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, here is a big difference, for you it seems "reliable" means "taught by a known

historical Buddha with a name".

As for dating of texts, it is not nearly as hard as you think. Dating people is harder than dating texts, actually.

adinatha said:

You know what they say about those who assume? It's not like the notions of vayus and bindus, etc., was unknown generally by the yogi world in the 10th Century. It seems that this knowledge MAY have been well developed even in the Buddha's time.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually the ten vāyus are all mentioned by name in the pre-Buddhist Candogya Upanishad. The first Buddhist text they appear in is the Buddhist Ayurvedic treatise Asthanga Hridaya Samhita.

adinatha said:

the Buddha talked about mind-made body and upanishads, etc., talk about bindu and vayu. The Buddha's tantras just apply this knowledge to freedom from extremes liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. I still don't think this is sufficient to attribute authorship of 9th century CE texts, or even 100 BCE Mahāyāna texts to the Buddha.

Namdrol said:

I could care less who it was supposedly taught by.

That's your opinion. But authenticity does play a role in a consideration of reliability.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, this is just a political game Tibetans play with each other. The Indian Mahasiddhas did not give a shit about all this crap.

Namdrol said:

Authorship is who wrote it down. Who knows who finally wrote down an oral transmission or saw a vision of a transmission? By the time someone writes it down it's passed through several ears and mouths anyway. The question is did the Buddha Shakyamuni transform his body and speak words about dakinis and sex for someone to hear. That is strictly a faith question, and no evidence will ever come out to say otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

You sound like a Christian defending creationism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

This still holds true for Dzogchen vis Garab Dorje and the masters who have attained the Body of Light.

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, the most important lineage in Nyingma is the very, very, very short lineage:

My three kāya guru, me.

Don't need all that historical bullshit. That is for people who lack confidence.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

That might be your interpretation re yanas. That view is not shared by Kagyu. I mentioned Garab Dorje in my passage is the Nirmanakaya who brought Dzogchen here. You skimmed. According to the Chakrasamvara Shakyamuni is transformed into Heruka to subjugate Mahadeva and Kalaratri. It is his connection that makes the tantra a possible continuum.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this not so and not one single Indian commentary maintains this (out of thirteen commentaries on the root tantra alone). This is just later Tibetans freaked out the heterodox nature of the tantras, trying to whitewash all of this to fit their preconceived notions. Moreover, Cakrasamvara does not even begin with evam māyam srutam.

And then what about the tantras that begin "This at one time did I teach..." like guhyasamaja which are all set in Akanistha Gandavyhua.

adinatha said:

Also Hevajra explicitly begins, "thus I heard," indicating Shakayamuni will speak according to the tradition of nidana

Malcolm wrote:

This does not prove that Shakyamuni Buddha taught the text. But hey, your faith is yours. You keep it. If you want to be snowed by literary conventions -- that is your business.

There are suttas in the Pali Canon that explicitly date from after Buddha's parinirvana that begin with *evam māyam srutam*. There is one such text in the *Majjhima Nikāya*. Not every text that begins with *evam maya srutam* issued from the mouth of Sakyamuni -- for example, all of the Dzogchen tantras -- not a single one was ever taught by our pal Gotama Buddha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

To the contrary, it IS the standard for truth. I'm not saying it is true Gautama taught tantras. I'm saying there is no fact either way. So how can you conclude one way?

Namdrol said:

It is an inference based partly on the appearance of sutras in translation into Chinese, the noted evolution of these sutras in Chinese translation, comparisons with their late and in many cases final forms in Tibetan translation; the clear evolution of Indian tantras in Sanskrit, and in Tibetan translation, differing versions of the same text between new and older recensions, etc. The gradual evolution of tantra, *uttaratantras*, etc. The evolution of commentaries on these tantras, when they first appear, etc., intertextuality with non-buddhist tantras, and so on. The mutual rise of Buddhist and non-Buddhist tantra, etc.

There are very many excellent reasons to assume that both *Mahāyāna* literature and *Vajrayāna* primary literature evolved in a manner that is simply absent in *Nikāya/Agama* sources. There is no evidence whatever to suggest that any *Mahāyāna* texts ever were communicated through an oral lineage like the *Nikāya/Agamas*. Even the so called *gatha* portion of these texts it turns out are generally *_later_* in composition than the prose portions they summarize.

adinatha said:

This assumes that what was found is all there is to find, that what was written encompasses what was said, or that what was written was written at the time it was said.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all, it merely assumes that we have what we have, and we can examine what we have, study what we have, and limit our knowledge to what real evidence we do have.

It does not presume "new" tantras cannot be written (they can and are).

But there are obvious flaws in your view, not present in the view of those who regard Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna texts as results of (inspired) literary production -- one, your view cannot explain the definite use of literary artifice and style in Mahāyāna sutras, cannot explain the codification and stylization completely absent in the Nikayas/Agamas; cannot explain the explicit addressing of sectarian points by Mahāyāna sutras to Abhidharma concepts which are definitely found only in texts that post date the Buddha by many centuries.

For example, the Hevajra Tantra mentions Vaibhashika, Sautrantika, Yogachara and Madhyamaka. One might suppose that in Buddha's omniscience he predicted these schools; or Occam's razor style, one might just understand that the Hevajra tantra was composed after the catuṣṣiddhanta system was finalized sometime in the mid sixth century with Madhyamaka at the top. Even further, there is no evidence that categories such as "kriya, carya, and Yoga" tantra existed prior to the ninth century, since such categories are completely absent in tantric taxonomical commentaries written in the eighth century, and only really appear with Vajramālā tantra (the main commentary tantra on the Guhyasamaja) which was not composed prior to the beginning of the ninth century based on its own appearance in Tibetan translation as well as its commentary. And we have a lot of information about the primitive i.e. pre-Vajramālā Guhyasamaja tradition.

For me it does not matter at all whether it was "revealed" or composed. It is a very interesting text that introduces most of doctrine we have about the ten vāyus, the notion of "bindu" and so on forth. My personal assumption is that it was composed by a yogi/yogis.

I could care less who it was supposedly taught by.

One of the things that shows a shift about tantric milieu among Indians is the relocation of the scene of the teachings from Nirmanakāya locations that we find in lower tantras up to Yoga tantra to Sambhogakāya dimensions like the "bhaga of the mother" and so on in Hevajra and other tantras, or Akanishtha Gandavyuha in Guhyagarbha, etc. (which is very influential on Tibetan composition Dzogchen tantra milieu).

I have translated a lot of Indian Tantric Material and Nyingma tantric material. There are stark stylistic differences between tantras composed in India and tantras composed in Tibet. Most Nyingma (but not all) tantras were definitely composed in Tibet by Tibetans.

So again, I restate my POV. Authorship does not matter. This is a worry for fundamentalists, not scholars, and not yogis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

That unbroken lineage must go back to the Nirmanakaya, Shakyamuni, because he was the first to bring dharma here since the time of the last Nirmanakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

This is Hinayāna perspective, it is not even Mahāyāna, definitely not Vajrayāna (for example, according to the Cakrasamvara cycle of tantras, there are Nirmanakāyas teaching this tantra in the 24 pithas even today which accounts for the power of this cycle. It is the only mandala that was never withdrawn, and there is no suggestion in any history of the practice that it ever was taught by Shakyamuni, unlike Kalacakra and Guhyasamaja, for example).

Further, Sakyamuni never breathed a word of Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

LastLegend said:

I am not questioning the validity of Tantrayana, I am just questioning the understanding of the practitioners on this forum regarding certain components of teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not in a position to question anyone's understanding of Vajrayāna buddhism since you are not a Vajrayāna practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2011 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

To the contrary, it IS the standard for truth. I'm not saying it is true Gautama taught tantras. I'm saying there is no fact either way. So how can you conclude one way?

Malcolm wrote:

It is an inference based partly on the appearance of sutras in translation into Chinese, the noted evolution of these sutras in Chinese translation, comparisons with their late and in many cases final forms in Tibetan translation; the clear evolution of Indian tantras in Sanskrit, and in Tibetan translation, differing versions of the same text between new and older recensions, etc. The gradual evolution of tantra, uttaratantras, etc. The evolution of commentaries on these tantras, when they first appear, etc., intertextuality with non-buddhist tantras, and so on. The mutual rise of Buddhist and non-Buddhist tantra, etc.

There are very many excellent reasons to assume that both Mahāyāna literature and Vajrayāna primary literature evolved in a manner that is simply absent in Nikāya/Agama sources. There is no evidence whatever to suggest that any Mahāyāna texts ever were communicated through an oral lineage like the Nikāya/Agamas. Even the so called gatha portion of these texts it turns out are generally later in composition than the prose portions they summarize.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

The most common fact is that there is no fact supporting anything the whole school of thought relies upon. When that is the case, chop chop.

Malcolm wrote:

Right. Therefore, the idea that Shakyamuni Buddha taught the tantras is best treated as a legend, with no more objective truth value than the Theravadin legend that he taught Abhidhamma in the heavens.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

Also my belief is that making scholarly opinions about what is authentically taught by the Buddha and not creates problems for people. It can harm someone's faith. That's bad. It's one thing to show someone the truth, even if it hurts. But it's entirely another to present scholarly opinions disguised as facts. I will stomp on that every time, because it's misleading.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you should be stomping down on all four lineages presentation of history of Buddhist tantra since all of them are in conflict, use different indian sources or engage in pure speculation, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Zhang Zhung Namgyal

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

This is fascinating. It almost sounds taoist: the Natural State, the Tao.

Malcolm wrote:

It has nothing to do with Taoism. It is an instruction on togal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 8:38 AM

Title: Re: Sogyal Rinpoche

Content:

adinatha said:

I'm not saying it proves he taught Mahayana. I'm saying you cannot disprove it. If you cannot disprove it, it's not false.

Malcolm wrote:

This is specious reasoning, as you know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 8:33 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

Actually, it comes from Yoga tantra.

N

adinatha said:

Not all say the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra as dharmakāya makes his first appearance in the Sarvatathāgata Tattvasaṃgraha, the root tantras of Yoga Tantra. This is just a fact, there is nothing to argue about. He makes his next appearance as Dharmakāya in the Guhyasamaja. Again, fact, nothing to dispute.

In this I prefer to follow the Sakya school's point of view, i.e., the definitive rūpakāya is Sambhogakāya. And in reality, there is only one teacher, the Dharmakāya Samantabhadra, since dharmakāya is the mind of all buddhas.

Gorampa points out that the relationship of the Sambhogakāya to the nirmanakāya is that of an illusionist to an illusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 8:26 AM

Title: Re: Sogyal Rinpoche

Content:

adinatha said:

Gampopa affirmed he was this bodhisattva disciple. So this would mean that he was present when Gautama taught Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it just means that Gampopa decided that this person referred to himself.

adinatha said:

The Mahayana texts we have are just as old as any.

Malcolm wrote:

Some date to around 100 BCE. Not many.

adinatha said:

There is no reason to conclude the Buddha's words were limited to sravakayana, at least not based on real evidence.

Malcolm wrote:

There are actually a lot of reasons to think this is so. The Agamas/Nikayas are, for the most part, clearly based on an oral tradition. The Mahāyāna sutras are all literary compositions.

adinatha said:

Most importantly, that Buddha was omniscient with miracle powers is basically required belief to be a Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

The conclusion you are drawing from your premise is erroneous.

The fact that Buddha claimed omniscience for himself in some Pali text does not prove he personally taught even one Mahayāna text.

My approach to this is to toss out authorship as a valid criterion for judging the validity of a given Buddhist text. Instead I look at the text itself, rather than its putative author. In other words, judge the text by what it says, not by who supposedly said it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 8:09 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

I think they both depend on the Sambhogakāya, Vajradhara, and he in turns depends on Samantabhadra.

adinatha said:

That's the Dzogchen mandala.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it comes from Yoga tantra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

In Austria they will be closed from the 10th of June to the 10th of July and informed on norbunet. I wonder if it's a similar situation.

Why don't you mail them or call the office?

Pema Rigdzin said:

Lol I have been. I emailed them on June 9th and got no word and then there was the weekend, so I waited til the following Monday (yesterday) and called and left them a voicemail but got no reply, so I called back today and got a live person finally lol. So they've been on a retreat since June 1, so they just hadn't gotten around to shipping my order. Well, gotta be happy that they were up to such worthwhile activities, but it would have been nice if they'd have announced that they'd be out of commission for a little while during the retreat or something. Oh well.

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is that the retreat was in the same building as the bookstore. And you can bet the bookstore was open during the retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

adinatha said:

The visualizations help to redirect the "winds," you know what I'm saying?

Malcolm wrote:

Not needed from a Nyinthig POV.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

Tilopa said:

There's still a huge difference between those who are really qualified to transform desire on the path and those who merely think they are and then engage in ordinary sex while claiming to be practicing karma mudra.

Malcolm wrote:

If they are Vajrayāna practitioners, meaning they have the empowerments, the vow and instructions, then they are qualified. If not, then not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

Namdrol said:

Then of course, in Dzogchen Nyinthig, things are a bit looser and not as uptight as in gsar ma presentations of karmamudra practice.

adinatha said:

Really the sarma presentations, originally, weren't uptight either.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogically speaking, pretty uptight, many more visualizations, etc.

adinatha said:

Since when did they stop dropping semen and menstrual blood in the mouth of the initiate? That was tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Not referring to that.

adinatha said:

The Dzogchen approach is laid back, but doesn't really have the same four-joys practice either, no?

Malcolm wrote:

It does.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

adinatha said:

See? Disrespect flows from the Western rational attitude, "the guy." Geez. You guys are hopeless. That "guy" taught us liberation. No other "guy" did that.

Malcolm wrote:

He taught the Hinayāna path.

adinatha said:

If you think the "guy" who taught Samantabhadra's realization didn't depend on "the guy" who came before, you are missing a key fact.

Malcolm wrote:

I think they both depend on the Sambhogakāya, Vajradhara, and he in turns depends on Samantabhadra.

adinatha said:

It's in the Abhidharma. Buddhas don't appear in one place at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Hinayāna. Not according to Mahāyāna, etc.

adinatha said:

All of which was complete to a tee in that sramanera in the forest.

Malcolm wrote:

What he knew and what he actually taught with his own mouth are two entirely different things.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

LastLegend said:

I think the issue here is honesty with oneself and about what to expect on the path. It's no secret that sex brings pleasure, and this is what we are attached to.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna is a path of non-renunciation. Never forget that.

Now, if you are into renunciation and so on, cool. But that is not our path. In Vajrayāna we do not renounce sense pleasures, etc. Instead we take them into the path.

So, you practice your path, we will practice ours.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

Tilopa said:

So called sexual yoga is not ordinary sex at all but a transformation of sexual energy into extremely powerful states of subtlety and bliss, something which can only be achieved by very advanced practitioners through manipulation and control of the channels, winds and drops.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just propaganda to keep monks monks.

While I agree karmamudra is not ordinary sex in so far as one needs to be somewhat adept at creation and completion stage, not only is there so called "karmamudra" there is also the so called "yoga of passion" which is connected with the creation stage.

Then of course, in Dzogchen Nyinthig, things are a bit looser and not as uptight as in gsar ma presentations of karmamudra practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

Tilopa said:

I'm not disputing the validity of consort practice for those who are qualified. I just happen to think most people who claim sex is a traditional/important/necessary/legitimate part of the Vajrayana path are attempting to justify an attachment to ordinary pleasure.

Malcolm wrote:

In order to practice karmamudra you need ordinary desire. Then you need to inflame it, then you need to inflame it more.

People who say that to practice karmamudra you need to be free from desire have no understanding of Vajrayāna at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

adinatha said:

Dzogchen's use of sensation to introduce dzogchen is not karmamudra.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, actually it is.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana
Content:
adinatha said:
The written account comes from an oral account, not the other way around. LOL.

Malcolm wrote:
That's what you think.

adinatha said:
I don't think in Buddhism or Indian history generally, there is anything like a "historical fact."

Malcolm wrote:
Then why pretend there is?

adinatha said:
You Westerners are very fond of and proud of your historians, but India did not have a practice of keeping track of details.

Malcolm wrote:
You are a westerner.

adinatha said:
It was always about an inner journey, and therefore a mythological history which corresponded to define signs of the path, channels, chakras, etc.. The Hindu sadhus are masters of this.

Malcolm wrote:
Then why object when I say that things like Buddha teaching the tantras are myths and legends?

adinatha said:
Just like Padmasambhava hid so many teachings and manifested so many things, Shakyamuni did too.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, perhaps the Shakyamuni of someone's vision, but not the guy who died of dysentery around 407 BCE.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Sogyal Rinpoche

Content:

adinatha said:

I have to disagree with Namdrol. The Buddha was an omniscient being. He talked about all kinds of magical things, like beings from the six realms, like going to see Baka-Brahma, etc., He had this power of co-location. That is part of the Pali.

Malcolm wrote:

On this we agree.

adinatha said:

The Prajnaparamita, some of it, was discovered by Nagarjuna when it was given to him by a Naga.

Malcolm wrote:

Myth, legend, but not historical fact.

adinatha said:

The Buddha had hidden, just like a terma, the prajnaparamita sutras. If you believe in buddhahood, which all buddhists would, then why wouldn't this magical possibility be real? Why couldn't he have taught the tantras in his co-located form, and those were kept hidden until much later?

Malcolm wrote:

He could have, but it is unlikely. In any case, the definitive Buddha is Samantabhadra, not Shakyamuni.

adinatha said:

So that leads me to conclude that the written record is not reliable.

Malcolm wrote:

The why assume that part of the written record is reliable (i.e. traditions around the Nāgārjuna, nāgās, etc.)?

adinatha said:

The oral account has all the contexts to explain why the methods, and culture of dharma evolved the way it did.

Malcolm wrote:

The so called oral accounts you have received are all based on Texts translated by Tibetans. I have researched this area extensively.

adinatha said:

There is a saying in dharma, it is wrong view to hold that only hard facts proven by external sources are true, because you are locking yourself into a subject object dualism and the path is the opposite.

Malcolm wrote:

IMO, the tantras do not depend on any version of the historical record for their validity. My argument is that they are valid because their source is awakened, but I do not need that source to be Shakyamuni -- Virupa, Garab Dorje, Padmsambhava, Sachen, Jigme Lingpa, Namkhai Norbu, Khenpo Jigphun, etc, are good enough for me.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Defining Buddhism - Theravada/Mahayana/Varayana

Content:

Nangwa said:

I am always baffled by Buddhists who limit their access to methods and teachings based upon arbitrary, polemical dating of texts.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2011 at 8:35 AM

Title: Re: 999 members!

Content:

kirtu said:

Hey - we have 999 members! Who'll rollover that digit?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

only 49.000 members to go until e-Sangha style collapse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2011 at 8:27 AM

Title: Re: Sogyal Rinpoche

Content:

fragrant herbs said:

I would like to see proof that Shakyamuni Buddha taught the Tantras and that he had sex with a consort to become enlightened. I met no one here can prove it.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no proof that the Buddha even taught the suttas, let alone the tantras.

However, we have a text, the Candamaharoshana tantra, and it indeed explains that the Buddha achieved his awakening by taking the farm girl who gave him rice porridge as his consort.

So, my advice to you, since you are a Thervavadin, is that you should not participate in Vajrayāna threads. Period. It is not appropriate.

I will be certain to alert the powers that be when you do.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2011 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Sherab said:

Say person A is knew person B is looking for a thing Y. Person A intends to give person B the thing Y and left it in a place X. Person B went to place X and saw thing Y and took thing Y. In this instance, is there no offering of thing Y by person A to person B? Is there no receiving of thing Y by person B from person A?

Namdrol said:

Your example is irrelevant to empowerments and transmissions.

Sherab said:

My post is not meant to be an example but an attempt to strip down the argument to the essentials to see where, if any, the problem of any definition of transmission lies.

Back to my "example": If it is agreed that there is a giving by A and a receiving by B, then

it that a "transmission"?

If you impose the condition that the teacher must be present for the transmission to take place, then what you are essentially saying is that "thing Y" is something that can only be transmitted personally by the teacher. If so, then what is this "thing Y" that is being "transmitted" in an empowerment? Certainly not the words of the vajra master during an empowerment because words can be transmitted via a recorder too. If you say it is to establish a "connection", then reasons should be provided as to why the "connection" cannot be established via a third object like a recorder.

Malcolm wrote:

I have explained this ad nauseum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2011 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

adinatha said:

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner karmamudra is not important.

Namdrol said:

It can be.

adinatha said:

Cool. I won't put my tool in cold storage.

Malcolm wrote:

Longchenpa has extensive karmamudra instructions that go with the Lama Yang tig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2011 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

adinatha said:

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner karmamudra is not important.

Malcolm wrote:

It can be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2011 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Mosquitos

Content:

Pero said:

Anyone know of any good ways to repel/prevent them from entering one's room? Other than a net? Here I'm in a kind of swampy area and there's no end to them. Just in the past 30 or so minutes I killed 6. I tried to be careful not to have lights on when the window is open but they still get in somehow. The worst part is not so much if I get bitten but that I can't get much sleep when they're around. Little bastards are just killing me.

Malcolm wrote:

The more you kill, the more they bite you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2011 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

That's somewhat similar to the view that the eternal Buddha became man in Siddhartha Gautama so that we could attain Buddhahood.

Namdrol said:

There is no such view in Buddhism.

N

Serenity509 said:

I've read it from several Buddhist sources. You might disagree with the view but that doesn't mean it doesn't exist.

Malcolm wrote:

You have either misunderstood what you were reading, or you were misled by someone else who does not understand what they were reading.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2011 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

That's somewhat similar to the view that the eternal Buddha became man in Siddhartha Gautama so that we could attain Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such view in Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

Enochian said:

Tenzin1 is a compete moron.

Malcolm wrote:

That's a little harsh.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

Well, I think it's fascinating that tantric techniques...

Malcolm wrote:

Exist only in Indian culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: My dramatic attention whore exit...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="padma norbu"]

Thank you for that. That's what I had originally thought, but it seems like every time I turn around on this forum people are disagreeing about something, usually rather adamantly and intensely.../quote]

That's Buddhism for you. Going strong for 2500 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Sherab said:

If a teacher intends to transmit via a recording and acts on that intention and make the recording, then according to you there can be no transmission despite the intention of the teacher to transmit and the intention of the student to receive, if the student listens to the recording made by the teacher since "the act of speaking and the act of listening happening together at the same time .. constitutes a transmission".

Namdrol said:

Correct. There has never been an instance of an empowerment delivered via a recording. Why is that?

N

Sherab said:

Say person A is knew person B is looking for a thing Y. Person A intends to give person B the thing Y and left it in a place X. Person B went to place X and saw thing Y and took thing Y. In this instance, is there no offering of thing Y by person A to person B? Is there no receiving of thing Y by person B from person A?

Malcolm wrote:

Your example is irrelevant to empowerments and transmissions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Vajrahridaya said:

Also, these beings, like Amitaba were regular human beings like us, who attained Buddhahood, and now work on liberating others, they're are not representations of a source of the entire universe. They are representations of the source of certain teachings, but it's not the same as Monotheism or Monistic Idealism.

Shin Buddhism entrusts in the "Other Power" of Amida Buddha's Wisdom and Compassion and does not rely upon our self-centered attempts to attain Enlightenment.

The Historic Buddha, Sakyamuni Buddha, is recognized as a human manifestation of Amida Buddha who appeared to share the Nembutsu Dharma or Teachings of the Nembutsu. In Shin Buddhist Temples, Amida Buddha is the Object of Reverence.

http://www.moililihongwanji.org/Information_Files/object_of_reverence-amida_buddha.htm " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Serenity509 said:

Shin Buddhism views Amida Buddha as something or someone which can actually bestow wisdom and compassion to the individual. Please correct me if I'm wrong. This would have nothing to do with Abrahamic monotheism.

Malcolm wrote:

Wisdom cannot be bestowed on another. Compassion can.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Sherab said:

If a teacher intends to transmit via a recording and acts on that intention and make the recording, then according to you there can be no transmission despite the intention of the teacher to transmit and the intention of the student to receive, if the student listens to the recording made by the teacher since "the act of speaking and the act of listening happening together at the same time .. constitutes a transmission".

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. There has never been an instance of an empowerment delivered via a recording. Why is that?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 9:35 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Right, I think they are lying. You don't want to know Genden Chopel's opinion of George Roerich.

N

Tenzin1 said:

Well, that's one way to quash a debate-- to refuse to believe the other side's source. I do know Chopel's opinion of the Roerichs. That doesn't mean they're lying, it just means they didn't pay him fairly for his translation services. "Fragrant herbs" raises a good point: monks/lamas lie to protect secrets. Also, more recently when someone went to Hemis monastery asking about the text, they weren't told it didn't exist, they were told the abbot was away in Lhasa and had given strict instructions not to open the library while he was away.

Malcolm wrote:

Excuse me? "Away in Lhasa"? Are you people actually Tibetan Buddhists?

Tenzin1 said:

But we digress. Here's some interesting info on the tantric front in Judea:

Malcolm wrote:

None of this is "tantric".

Tenzin1 said:

Just for clarification, I'm not implying that tantra in Judea necessarily came from Eastern influences. (Tantra AFAIK didn't exist in India in Jesus' time, but possibly some seeds of tantra had been planted back then, idk.) I'm only pointing out some interesting parallels between Judeo-Christian practices and Indo-Tibetan. Egypt surely knew about the Kundalini, as practices to raise the Kundalini for healing purposes go back eons in Africa, and there's some speculation that Jesus went to Alexandria during his youth and young adulthood (the "lost years"), where there was also a Buddhist community.

Malcolm wrote:

New age bullshit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

fragrant herbs said:

And maybe I am thinking of the wrong Chopel

Malcolm wrote:

No, you have the right one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

fragrant herbs said:

Well, I know Ganden Chopel's views on children and tantra, and I don't think he is a good source to be bringing up.

Malcolm wrote:

He worked with Roerich directly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

fragrant herbs said:

Well, I know Ganden Chopel's views on children and tantra, and I don't think he is a good source to be bringing up.

Does this also make the swami at the Ramakrishna Order a liar when he said that he went to India and saw the text on Christ?

While the Hemis monastery didn't exist in Christ's time, the texts could have been taken there at a later time, coming from elsewhere.

Malcolm wrote:

You guys are pretty gullible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

adinatha said:

So you are an expert in refuting opinions too? That would be an unorthodoxist. Then, it doesn't take any knowledge of others opinions to be a Madhyamakan. You just need the non-affirming negation and a little socratic Q & A to uncover others' assumptions.

Malcolm wrote:

The only reason to learn opinions is to negate them if necessary, or to understand how they are not consistent with dependent origination. If they are consistent with dependent origination, then there is no reason to negate them.

Another reason to learn opinions is to be able to contextualize concepts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

I've read that the text in Ladakh was a copy of one in Lhasa, but the supposed original has never been found, so idk. However, by the time Jesus arrived in India, Pali was heavily Sanskritized and was no longer a spoken language. Scholars say that North India recorded events in their own dialects, and that would have been true of Kashmir, certainly. Or Sanskrit could have been used. We don't know the language of the original recording of the events of Jesus' life in the East. I don't see how Pali is relevant to this question.

I've read the denunciations of Notovich, I'm not going to comment on him. However, if you don't believe that the Roerichs, who are highly reputable, found and translated the text, and published news of their finding in US newspapers, call the Roerich Museum. You don't have to take my word for it.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I think they are lying. You don't want to know Genden Chopel's opinion of George Roerich.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

adinatha said:

WTF? This is the first time I've seen this word. Online dict says, an expert in liturgies and hymns? You must be joking.

Namdrol said:

Doxology is the study of opinions, from the Greek "doxa" as in orthodox.

N

adinatha said:

I am an expert in refuting opinions. That makes me your nemesis.

Malcolm wrote:

If I had an opinion, perhaps. But I don't. As Nāgārjuna says:

"If I had a thesis, I would be at fault; as I alone have no thesis, I alone am without fault."

A little understood point of the difference between an affirming negation and a non-affirming negation is that the former is used to defend one's own position while the later is used to reject an opponents position. Since a Madhyamaka has no opinions, only non-affirming negations are utilized in Madhyamaka.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

fragrant herbs said:

As for the teachings being much alike, that would have to be another thread, but there is a book titled, The Original Jesus, The Buddhist Sources of Christianity. This has nothing to do with the story of Jesus going to India but that the teachings were already in existence where Jesus lived. The book gives side by side teachings of Jesus and Buddha.

Namdrol said:

The Teachings of Jesus are sourced in Talmud. No need to imput Buddhist origins.

fragrant herbs said:

Some of them are, but most not, or why would Jesus be any different than the Talmuds?

Malcolm wrote:

Jesus was a rabbi. He was not a Buddhist.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

fragrant herbs said:

As for the teachings being much alike, that would have to be another thread, but there is a book titled, The Original Jesus, The Buddhist Sources of Christianity. This has nothing to do with the story of Jesus going to India but that the teachings were already in existence where Jesus lived. The book gives side by side teachings of Jesus and Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

The Teachings of Jesus are sourced in Talmud. No need to imput Buddhist origins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

adinatha said:

The Abhidharma and Dzogchen is like this to me. That doesn't mean we can invent all kinds of things. We have to maintain those working definitions that are necessary for the

system to work. But we are not wedded to those definitions and assumptions that are not important for the system. Dzogchen cosmology falls into this category for me.

Namdrol said:

The point is that in Buddhism in general, matter comes from mind. Not the other way around.

N

adinatha said:

But doesn't explain where beginningless minds come from. That's the question. Actually, there's no this before that. This before that is just by way of explanation to neophytes. It creates the semblance of order, generates confidence and one enters the path. The path itself, none of this applies.

Malcolm wrote:

The logic of dependent origination forbids beginnings, as you know.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

fragrant herbs said:

namdrol, how do you know that it is false.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for one there are no translations from Pali in Tibetan.

Two, any such translation could only have been done at earliest in 650 AD. We have no record of such a translation.

Three, there were no Buddhist monasteries in Tibet or Ladakh 2000 years ago.

fragrant herbs said:

it doesn't take away from the fact that the gospels are replete with teachings of buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Yeah. So, why all that stuff about the mind evolving from elements and materialist theoretical science?

Malcolm wrote:

Because mind in Dzogchen comes from vāyu's interaction with the energy of the noetic principle we term vidyā.

One important point I forgot to mention is that consciousness in the scheme of the six dhātus refers to contaminated or impure consciousnesses. The consciousnesses of buddhas and arhats are outside of the six dhatus.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

adinatha said:

The Abhidharma and Dzogchen is like this to me. That doesn't mean we can invent all kinds of things. We have to maintain those working definitions that are necessary for the system to work. But we are not wedded to those definitions and assumptions that are not important for the system. Dzogchen cosmology falls into this category for me.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that in Buddhism in general, matter comes from mind. Not the other way around.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

Namdrol said:

[Minds (plural) don't need a material substrate. They are not, from a common Buddhist point of view dependent on matter -- for this reason in Abhidharma through anuttarayoga tantra formless realm beings have no location and are really without material attributes of any kind.

adinatha said:

The formless realms are what a yogi errantly enters; they depend on a yogi. This is going to get me into something we have discussed before, that the material is not what it appears. Physical and mental have no discrete boundaries. The formless realm beings do have attributes of attachment, an attraction to and grasping of the formless realm state and are thus temporal-spatial and impermanent. Space has no location, so all sentient beings fall into the category of no location. Abhidharma says many useful things, but I don't think it is always authoritative.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not authoritative, but it is foundational. It provides the basic definitions that inform many assumptions that inform all the so called higher yānas. The extent to which people do not actually grasp those definitions and the assumptions which they spawn lead many people to grossly misunderstand things like Dzogchen and Dzogchen cosmology, Madhyamaka, Perfection of Wisdom etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

Namdrol said:

You need to read Abhidharma, where this is explained very clearly.

adinatha said:

BTW, Abhidharma, for me is not a valid source, because the way it describes atoms is wrong. It says atoms are partless. HH the Dalai Lama has admitted this and says there must be room for buddhism to accept its own limitations and incorporate the findings of hard science. To the extent the Abhidharma sought to show that atoms have no inherent existence it is on the right track. But its error in facts shows that it did not originate in an omniscient mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, there are assumptions present in Abhidharma texts which are present even in Dzogchen texts, things like the structure of atoms, Sumeru cosmology, etc.

Don't confuse evolving conventional descriptions with a limitation on omniscience.

Abhidharma is extremely important for understanding the context of wide variety of concepts in Buddhism, including, for example the two truths, afflictions, karma etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Naropa's Khechari's Intimate Instructions - What are they?

Content:

Karma Sherab said:

Further to what Namdrol said, we have a sort of linguistic issue here. Unlike in Tibet, where there is one translation of the word upadesha as "menga" in English there is not yet an agreed protocol to follow in translation so often familiar words become unfamiliar when used by a different translator.

Even in Tibetan there are so many closely related words. For example Upadesha some times comes out as a rather vague "Oral transmission" which strictly is closer to ka-gyud or "line by mouth", "nyen-gyud" or "whispered line" amongst others.

The problem is (i) humans are imperfect (ii) tend to be imprecise and and moreover like like to do things their own way.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two translations at least for the word upadesha in Tibetan man ngag and gdams ngag.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

Tenzin1 said:

Nicholas Roerich and his son, George, who earned a PhD in Oriental Studies from Harvard and read Sanskrit and Tibetan, went to the monastery in Ladakh in the 1930's, found the "Notovich" text, translated it and sent news of the document and Jesus' activities in India to the US, where the news made headlines across the country. Copies of those newspaper reports can be seen at the Nicholas Roerich Museum in Manhattan. The next person to seek the text out a few decades later said it had disappeared or been stolen.

Malcolm wrote:

This is false information. If you want to believe lies and fantasies, I can't stop you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

adinatha said:

And this is exactly why it can't be true.

Malcolm wrote:

The tree of life thing is just a theosophical crib. The genesis of the elements and their order is a Pan-indian concept, not confined to Buddhism per se.

adinatha said:

The past. There is no origin. The buddha was specific about no origins. If you need a quote search around <http://www.accesstoinight.org> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;". To really and truly understand no origins you have to understand the nonarising nature of interdependent relations.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. There is no origin -- cosmic cycles have no origin and no end.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 13th, 2011 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

adinatha said:

It's true, but that does not mean the universe arose from mind...

Namdrol said:

That is not what I meant. I.e. some sort of Advaita idea.

When we say that matter comes from mind, it is very simple: physical matter arises due to the traces of action and affliction collectively aggregated in all minds every time the container universe forms.

N

adinatha said:

I get that. This explanation doesn't work for me. In the situation of a vacuum, there are no minds. From Abhidharma, mind of retribution belongs to the grasper. There's no substrate field where these retribution minds stay. The Alayavijnana is not like Brahman, not a common field.

Malcolm wrote:

Minds (plural) don't need a material substrate. They are not, from a common Buddhist point of view dependent on matter -- for this reason in Abhidharma through anuttarayoga tantra formless realm beings have no location and are really without material attributes of any kind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

THOSE WHO SEE THIS SCRIPT WILL NOT EXPERINCE THE THREE LOWER REALMS AND WILL BE LIBERATED FROM THE FEAR OF FALLING INTO THE LOWER REALMS; WILL BE PURIFIED OF THE FIVE POISONS, AND WILL BE FREED FROM THE RESULTS OF ONE'S KARMA; WILL BE FREED FROM THE FEAR OF REMAINING IN SAMSAARA.

THIS IS A "TERMA REVELATION" WRITTEN IN DAKINI SCRIPT BY TERTON MIGYUR DORJE.

(If this is not a transmission....then what exactly is happening as you look at this Dakini script ???) liberation upon seeing.jpg

Malcolm wrote:

This script is a symbolic representation of the buddhas of the six lokas. These seeds syllables enter the eyes of fortunate sentient beings and create a dependent origination for them to be free of the six lokas in the future.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

adinatha said:

It's true, but that is does not mean the universe arose from mind...

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what I meant. I.e. some sort of Advaita idea.

When we say that matter comes from mind, it is very simple: physical matter arises due to the traces of action and affliction collectively aggregated in all minds every time the container universe forms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

adinatha said:

The scientific explanation and the buddhist understanding mesh well. Consciousness evolves from the elements...

Namdrol said:

Actually, it is the opposite, matter comes from mind...

adinatha said:

Nope.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read Abhidharma, where this is explained very clearly.

But more importantly the evolution of the six dhātus occurs in the following order: consciousness, space, air, fire, water and earth. Their dissolution happens in reverse order.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have not seen the movie, but I remember our argument on E-Sangha. At best, Gesar is ambivalent about the tulku system -- but when push comes to shove, he believes he is a tulku of an awakened master even though he has no memories of his past life, and so on. So his faith in the tulku system is not really an issue.

Adamantine said:

Perhaps for the sake of Dharma itself he is attempting to assist in the dismantling of the tulku system and the mystique around it, for similar reasons Namdrol is fed up with it/// and this was his intent in the film.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Is there a spiritual layer to existence that we all can experience or is Nirvana simply nothingness? If you believe that the goal of religion is to attain nothingness, why have a religion at all?

Malcolm wrote:

I could care less about the goals of religion -- the goal of Buddhism is simply to overcome ignorance with knowledge. No spiritual layers necessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Nangwa said:

It is antithetical to liberation.

Serenity509 said:

Not if you believe liberation to be oneness with the cosmic Self.

Meher Baba and the Evolution of Consciousness

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uNEkQmxM4d0> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Malcolm wrote:

Meher Baba is not a Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Can we ever really understand consciousness?

Content:

adinatha said:

The scientific explanation and the buddhist understanding mesh well. Consciousness evolves from the elements...

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it is the opposite, matter comes from mind...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

adinatha said:

You won't find buddhists going around telling christians or hindus what to think.

Serenity509 said:

When did I tell you what to think? It's a fact that many Buddhists have turned to the twelve step program for help. "Higher power" or "a power greater than ourselves" can be defined so broadly, even metaphorically, as to include your practice of the Dharma, the compassion of a bodhisattva, or the universe itself. It's not my problem if you can only imagine applying the term "higher power" to Abrahamic faith.

Malcolm wrote:

If they would just practice Dharma, they would not need 12 steps.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

fragrant herbs said:

And yet a swami in the Ramakrishna Order...

l

Malcolm wrote:

Bullshit. There were no Buddhist monasteries in Ladhakh when Jesus was alive.

" That text has been translated from Tibetan at least twice and was published in entirety about 100 years ago by a Russian writer, Nicholas Notovitch, and then again in the 1920's by Hindu Swami Abhedananda, a direct disciple of Ramakrishna of impeccable reputation."

There is evidence that either of these men knew a single word of Tibetan. This is just new age bullshit fantasy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Chotse said:

My post re ChNN and Sogyal Lakar appears to have been removed. Is there censorship of "controversial" issues here? If so why? I would be grateful for an explanation.

Malcolm wrote:
look here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=4408> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 3:29 AM
Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?
Content:

adinatha said:
My friend Rinchen went to the monastery in Ladakh where the alleged evidence of Jesus' visit was kept. But he said there was nothing there. The story of Jesus' visit to India is fiction.

Malcolm wrote:
Wasted trip -- the head of the monastery wrote an letter denouncing notivitch as a fraud as early as 1894.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 3:23 AM
Title: Re: God in Buddhism
Content:

gregkavarnos said:
A badly put together jigsaw of traditional and pseudo-scientific views blended with 12 step theory which does justice to none of the three. Hardly evidence of a higher power in Buddhism.

Serenity509 said:
Do you have an objection to Buddhists being in the twelve step program?

Malcolm wrote:
People are free, they can do what they like, including calling all kinds of crazy shit "buddhism".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 3:22 AM
Title: Re: God in Buddhism
Content:

Namdrol said:
People believe all kinds of crazy shit and call it "buddhism".

N

Serenity509 said:

I don't know if you actually read what I posted. "Higher power" is such a broad term that it can include the Dharma, the Buddha, or anything beyond your egoistic self that you resign to.

Malcolm wrote:

As I was saying...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is such a thing is innate wisdom. This is not a higher power, however. I

Serenity509 said:

There are Buddhists who've found their own understanding of a higher power.

Malcolm wrote:

People believe all kinds of crazy shit and call it "buddhism".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Naropa's Khechari's Intimate Instructions - What are they?

Content:

adinatha said:

It probably doesn't, but does this have anything to do with the Kechari Mudra?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

adinatha said:

, Kechari, translated as "the siddhi of flying in the sky," could be a euphemism for dakini as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Among other things, it is a euphemism for achieving liberation in the bardo.

adinatha said:

So this could just be a method about mahamudra, too. There are also Tilopa's "Bodiless Dakini" instructions that made it into Drukpa Kagyu.

Malcolm wrote:

Naro Khacho is the command seal single disciple for seven generation lineage instructions in Sakya that are Naropa's special Vajrayogini instructions that were never given to anyone but the Phaimthing brothers and then passed down into Sakya having been brought to Tibet by the translator Mal Lotsawa. They are the most essential teachings of the Sakya school. The first master to teach these to more than one disciple was Sachen's son, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

In the twelve step program, you are required to find a higher power according to your own understanding. How would a Buddhist recovering from addiction describe his higher power? Believe it or not, there are Buddhists in AA.

The 12-Step Buddhist: Enhance Recovery from Any Addiction

<https://www.amazon.com/12-Step-Buddhist-Enhance-Recovery-Addiction/dp/1582702233> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

There is such a thing is innate wisdom. This is not a higher power, however. It refers to the non-conceptual clear and empty nature of the mind of which is permanently free from afflictions and the source of all qualities associated with awakening.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Did Jesus Have A Consort? Was Tantra A Christian Practice?

Content:

Huseng said:

This is a really weird thread and if it continues I hope participants be reasonable and

cite their sources.

Jikan said:

This is usually the first source cited (either Prophet or one of her followers) in support of claims that Jesus spent time in Tibet, &c.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elizabeth_Clare_Prophet "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Malcolm wrote:

The earliest English language reference that Jesus was anywhere near the Himalayas is Isis Unveiled, published in 1877.

Based on this, one Nicolas Notovitch concocted the *La vie inconnue de Jesus Christ*, published in English in 1890 as *The Unknown Life of Christ*.

Then finally, this book was composed, *The Aquarian Age Gospel of Jesus, the Christ of the Piscean Age*, written by Levi H. Dowling (May 18, 1844 - August 13, 1911) and first published in 1908.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Naropa's Khechari's Intimate Instructions - What are they?

Content:

Karma Sherab said:

Mr. Gordo, the "intimate instructions" I think may refer to those instructions referred to as "uncommon"

Why intimate? - Maybe because they are to be transmitted to very few people at a time - like three or two or one - hence intimate.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a translation of upadeśa. Upa means "near", deśa means instruction. In this context upadeśas are instructions heard at the feet of one's master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Is Brahman ultimately a void? Is the personal aspect of Brahman an illusion to

accommodate human needs? ?

Malcolm wrote:

The nature of brahmin is sat, cit, ananda, i.e., being, consciousness and bliss. Brahmin is not ultimately empty. Everything but brahmin is empty.

There are two kinds of brahmin, nirguna (without qualities) and saguna (with qualities). The former refers to brahmin as pure being, consciousness, and bliss. The latter refers to the personification of Brahmin as a godhead for those in the state of illusion (maya).

In Mahāyāna Buddhism, even ultimate reality is unreal.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2011 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

but did Buddha deny the existence of a supreme force or higher power?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

As I said, your basic predisposition is Vedic/Advaita.

Serenity509 said:

I agree more with Mahayana Buddhism than I do with Hinduism.

...

Malcolm wrote:

You think you do, but you clearly have not studied enough about Mahāyāna Buddhism to really understand what we Mahāyāna Buddhist think.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

adinatha said:

WTF? This is the first time I've seen this word. Online dict says, an expert in liturgies and hymns? You must be joking.

Namdrol said:

Doxology is the study of opinions, from the Greek "doxa" as in orthodox.

N

gregkavarnos said:

Δόξα ("doxa") means to praise, honour or glorify. Ορθόδοξος (orthodox) is the combination of two words "ορθό" meaning correct and "δοξος" meaning he who praises. To be orthodox means to practice the correct method of praising or glorifying.

Doxology would be the study/word (logos, λόγος) of how one praises, honours, or glorifies (doxo, δόξα). This would include liturgies and hymns but also icons, literature, sculpture, architecture and even forms of theology.

Malcolm wrote:

Middle English orthodoxe, from Old French, from Late Latin orthodoxus, from Late Greek orthodoxos : Greek ortho-, ortho- + Greek doxa, opinion (from dokein, to think; see dek- in Indo-European roots).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Monks can't get full enlightenment?

Content:

heart said:

A Nyingma monk told me that taking a physical consort is only necessary in the Sarma schools...

Almost nothing is translated on the practices of the third empowerment.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

As for the first point, it very much depends upon what system one practices. If one is practicing according to the instructions of Naro Khachod, for example, no consort is

necessary for realizing mahāmudra. It describes two paths, one for those who lack desire, and one for those who possess desire.

As for the second point, the practice of the third empowerment has been translated from Lamdre. There is not much variation over all in the consort practice instruction in different schools. In general, consort practice is a feature of mother tantra, and not so much a feature of father tantra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Who are the tulkus in the documentary "TULKU"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just get rid of the whole damn tulku thing once and for all. It is a completely corrupt system based on money and power.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 7:51 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Properly speaking, I am Buddhist doxologist -- someone who is who studies and is fairly expert in various Buddhist doxologies.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Thanks, doc. just wondered. So, to relate that to this topic, do you think something is conveyed in liturgical singing or chanting that goes beyond the mere words that are being sung?

Not to suggest that this would in itself be an example of "transmission", but merely to suggest that something intangible can also be presented, along with the words?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a mixup -- there are two words, same spelling, differing meanings depending on context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

adinatha said:

WTF? This is the first time I've seen this word. Online dict says, an expert in liturgies and hymns? You must be joking.

Malcolm wrote:

Doxology is the study of opinions, from the Greek "doxa" as in orthodox.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Serenity,

perhaps it would be better for you to approach Buddhism without any preconceived ideas whatsoever.

Serenity509 said:

If I have a preconceived idea, it's the concept of Brahman, which has definite parallels in Buddhism. What is Amida? What is Adibuddha?

Malcolm wrote:

Amitabha (Amida) was a guy, Bodhisattva Dipamkara, who made aspirations, and became a Buddha called Amitabha.

An Adibuddha is the first buddha of this eon. But that does not mean the Adibuddha is something like brahmin or paramashiva.

There is no corollary to brahmin in Buddhism because Buddhism, even in the Mahaparinirvana sutra, rejects all non-Buddhist definitions of self, including Brahmin.

As I said, your basic predisposition is Vedic/Advaita.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: Is the 'e.coli' epidemic a gNyan disease caused by Spirits?

Content:

narraboth said:

I still say, if you want to avoid risk in food, do it with scientific common sense, don't do it with organic myth such as 'the natural-er the better' 'we should go back to our grand-grand parents' eat-drink-farming habit'.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, organic farming is safer than conventional farming, gives higher yields per acre, and so on.

No one but an idiot puts raw manure on crops meant for humans. Manure has to be composted properly.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Namdrol said:

"This is generally explained as...."

N

PadmaVonSamba said:

Just curious, do you consider yourself to be a dogmatist?

Malcolm wrote:

Properly speaking, I am Buddhist doxologist -- someone who is who studies and is fairly expert in various Buddhist doxologies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

...none of which are compatible with Buddhism.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Please clarify what you mean by "compatible".

Malcolm wrote:

If it is not compatible with dependent origination, it is not compatible with Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 7:29 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

That is not true. Besides theism, there is pantheism, pandeism, panentheism, deism, etc., which all use the term "God".

Malcolm wrote:

...none of which are compatible with Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

In bardo you have no physical sense organs, only a mental body.

N

Enochian said:

Ok let me ask you this.

According to Nagarjuna, the self is merely a conceptual construct imputed upon causes and conditions (which are also conceptual constructs).

What is to prevent one from imputing oneself upon the whole universe, rather than just one's body?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing -- but such a self is just as much a false imputation as the other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

This does not mean that Buddhist view of reality in general is monist or solipsistic.

Enochian said:

Only in the bardo then?

Bardo is fundamentally different than regular life?

Malcolm wrote:

In bardo you have no physical sense organs, only a mental body.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Enochian said:

Ok Namdrol, let me ask you this.

In the Bardo you are encouraged to view everything as oneself.

How is this not monism?

Malcolm wrote:

You are asked to understand all of your perceptions as your own display. When you do not understand your own perceptions as your own display, then you engage in deluded subject and object perception.

It is not monism because there is no suggestion that you are perceiving anything external to your own cognition of events as they unfold. This does not mean that Buddhist view of reality in general is monist or solipsistic.

Plus in the bardo, you are discussing the bardo of dharmatā. In the bardo of existence one seeks one father and mother, etc., and takes rebirth again, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Enochian said:

Hi Namdrol,

There are certain scholars (Thurman, David Gray) that suggest that body mandalas, are used to promote personal identity with the Universe i.e. Heruka.

How is this not monism?

Namdrol said:

Well, this does not work, for example, the body mandala of heruka merely reflects the idea that the twenty four pithas in Jambudvipa (merely one continent out of eight) exist in the human body of the initiated person. It is more of an interiorized pilgrimage.

N

Enochian said:

Ok let me ask you this.

In the finality of Dzogchen, one sees the 5 wisdoms lights everywhere. Everything is the five lights, which are recognized as oneself.

How is this not monism?

Malcolm wrote:

There are five lights, not one, correct? Plus one knows the minds of others correct? So how can this be monism?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Enochian said:

Hi Namdrol,

There are certain scholars (Thurman, David Gray) that suggest that body mandalas, are used to promote personal identity with the Universe i.e. Heruka.

How is this not monism?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this does not work, for example, the body mandala of heruka merely reflects the idea that the twenty four pithas in Jambudvipa (merely one continent out of eight) exist in the human body of the initiated person. It is more of an interiorized pilgrimage.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

It might be a matters of semantics. Is there a primordial force that the universe emanates from?

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhism, the creation of this universe results from the the collective karma of all sentient beings together. So, no primordial force, unless you are willing to call ignorance that primordial force.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

LastLegend said:

All is equal...how can there be a higher one?

Serenity509 said:

Is there a spiritual reality both within and beyond your individual self?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no self that is either the same as or separate from the aggreates, so it is an irrelevant question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

adinatha said:

I have also found that transmission is not indispensable for gaining experience with practices. For example, no teacher gave me transmission for deity yoga X or guru yoga Y, but I practiced these with devotion and the signs of accomplishment arose nonetheless.

Namdrol said:

This is generally explained as the blessings of māra.

N

adinatha said:

Sure. But that's just general. With the lineage mind transmission one has power to overcome four maras.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you are a buddha, and I imagine you are not really willing to claim that status for yourself. Only a buddha has overcome the four māras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Are you willing to recognize that your views may not be universally shared within Buddhism?

Namdrol said:

What I described to you above is a normative definition shared by all schools of Buddhism grounded in Mahāyāna sutra.

Serenity509 said:

The idea that there is no higher self or all pervading spiritual reality that can be personally experienced isn't universally shared in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

All Mahāyāna schools maintain that dharmakāya can only be seen or experienced by Buddhas. So, if you are a Buddha, you can personally experience dharmakāya. Otherwise, you can only experience nirmanakāya or sambhogakāya.

Some schools give the name "experience of dharmakāya" to an experience of

emptiness, but they do not mean the actual resultant dharmakāya, since that latter experience is an experience of total unceasing omniscience that is beyond limitation. That is the experience of buddhas alone.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Are you willing to recognize that your views may not be universally shared within Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

What I described to you above is a normative definition shared by all schools of Buddhism grounded in Mahāyāna sutra, including Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is no god in Buddhism. Dharmakāya is not God.

Serenity509 said:

Dharmakaya is not a theistic God. Is Dharmakaya a compassionate presence that can be personally experienced?

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmakāya is beyond mind. So it cannot be experienced with the mind. It is a state of realization. It can only be seen by Buddhas. The limitless compassion of a buddha unfolds upon the realization of dharmakāya. But dharmakāya is not itself something real.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

adinatha said:

I have also found that transmission is not indispensable for gaining experience with practices. For example, no teacher gave me transmission for deity yoga X or guru yoga Y, but I practiced these with devotion and the signs of accomplishment arose nonetheless.

Malcolm wrote:

This is generally explained as the blessings of māra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Believing in a force higher than ourselves isn't automatically theism.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no higher and lower forces: there are only sentient beings in samsara, bodhisattvas on the path out of samsara and buddhas who show the way out of samsara having traversed that path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Would you consider Soyen Shaku, who was greatly responsible for introducing the Western world to Zen Buddhism, a reputable source?

I would not. Japanese scholars of his era were too much enamored of western philosophy.

Serenity509 said:

If that is your opinion, perhaps we should agree to disagree in peace then. One of the things I appreciate about Buddhism is that a wide variety of interpretations about God are tolerated.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no god in Buddhism. Dharmakāya is not God.

All Hindu theistic notions are refuted in Buddhism since they contradict Buddha's basic insight into reality, dependent origination.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2011 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Unknown said:

Would you consider Soyen Shaku, who was greatly responsible for introducing the Western world to Zen Buddhism, a reputable source?

Malcolm wrote:

I would not. Japanese scholars of his era were too much enamored of western philosophy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Astus said:

[If I read the 5 precepts and keep them is not the same if I hear and then keep them - no reason why.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think that you can just decide to be a bhikṣu, shave your head, put on robes, and that is sufficient. Do you think you can be a monk or a nun without being ordained?

You have to receive them (precepts) from someone who holds those precepts. You cannot take them on your own. Keeping the five precepts does not have the force of the vows unless they are received according to the rite of either an upasaka, shramanera or bhikṣu.

Why is so? It is so because the Buddha set the system up. It is true that the ordination of monks evolved from a simple declaration "Now you are bhikṣus" to an elaborate rite of bestowing the vows with a quorum of monks and so on during the Buddha's lifetime. Differences in vinayas arose because monks were being ordained by senior Arhats hundreds of miles from where the Buddha was living and differences crept into the ritual for bestowing vows. But the key point is that one must receive the vows from someone who holds them. You cannot receive pratimoksha vows from a video, not can you take them on your own. All vows come from the Buddha. If you want vows, you must take them from a Buddhist who holds them.

The exception to this is bodhisattva vows (in the madhyamaka system). In the Madhyamaka system, if there is no preceptor available to grant bodhisattva vows, one may take them through a visualization.

Otherwise, all Pratimoksha vows and Vajrayāna vows must be received from a preceptor

or guru, each according to its own proper rite.

Vajrayāna teachings may only be given to people who hold Vajrayāna vows. This is why the first portion of any empowerment is conferral of the basic Vajrayāna vows; with more vows being conferred with each successive level of empowerment. In this context, it is like preparing a field before you plant.

Transmission is a living thing, not something one can receive from relic.

Sherab criticized the seal and impression. But he/she does not understand a critical point -- thinking that one can receive transmission from a recording is like imagining that a rubbing done of a an impression is equivalent to act of stamping an impression with a seal. In this case, the problem is that there is no transmission since there is only one person involved i.e. the person playing the recording. Transmission requires two people, a person giving transmission and a person receiving transmission. They must somehow be related to each other through the act of delivering the substance of transmission which is act of communication by a speaker to a hearer via sounds, words and symbols at minimum. In Vajrayāna there is are further experiential transmissions which come about when the teacher deliberately induces specific experiences in a student. But again, it is through sound, words, and symbols. Taste, sight, touch, etc., these experiences are symbols.

So in summary, Astus, transmissions is nothing mystical, but it does require two parties who are engaged in an the act of transmission, one giving, the other receiving, at the same time. Without this, there is no transmission.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Serenity509 said:

My belief in God is similar to Hinduism. It could also be termed panentheism. I believe that God is the oversoul of the universe. I believe that God, while ultimately transpersonal, can be related to on a personal level. I believe that there is a piece of God within us all and the purpose of Enlightenment is to become one with God.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is not for you. You are a Hindu by disposition.

Try out non-dual Shaivism. It will be more to your taste.

Buddhism will constantly disappoint you.

For we Buddhists, there is no oversoul, undersoul or middle soul. There is no soul at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think you'll find you got a lot of answers, just that you don't want to agree with any of them!

Astus said:

True, because I don't see them as answering the question, but rather avoiding it.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I answered your question, in detail, without avoiding anything. You just don't like the answer because you are stuck in an intellectual game.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Sherab said:

You have to reply to my post as a whole because my argument depends on the three parts of my post. If you look at my argument carefully, you have not addressed the issue my post. Why? The seal in your reply is not the teacher if it is the words that he spoke that is important. Therefore a recording of the spoken words could be the seal as well. If you insist it is the presence of the teacher that is important and not the words that he spoke, then something else must be taking place.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Recorded words are not the same. They are a recording of an act of speech, but not the act of speech itself. Teaching and bestowing transmission are acts.

The words recorded are divorced from the act of speech. They are relics, not alive.

It is the act of speaking and the act of listening happening together at the same time that constitutes a transmission.

Now, this discussion is boring me to tears so I am not going to continue jousting with people's intellectual foppiness any further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

From what you describe, a transmission is no different from a teaching. is that accurate?

Namdrol said:

In terms of Dzogchen, yes. There is no magical "transmission" fairy dust.

N

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, are you saying that anyone who ever went to any sort of teaching or public talk by a lama received a transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Listening to a recording however has no transmission.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

From what you describe, a transmission is no different from a teaching. is that accurate?

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of Dzogchen, yes. There is no magical "transmission" fairy dust.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Sherab said:

...one should be able to get transmission from a recording.

Malcolm wrote:
Nope.

Sherab said:
If the presence of the teacher is required in a transmission, something else (other than the teacher speaking and the students listening and understanding) must be happening that cannot happen in a recording.

Malcolm wrote:
Yup. Communication between two people.

Sherab said:
Therefore to say that a transmission is that a teacher speaks and the students listen and understand and then to insist that a transmission can only be a transmission when the teacher is present just does not gel.

Malcolm wrote:
When a seal makes an impression, one must have two things present, a seal and the wax. In your example, it is like have a seal in one place, and the wax somewhere else.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 7:14 AM
Title: Re: What is Transmission?
Content:

Astus said:
If that was it all I wouldn't raise the issue at all. But then there's exactly what Cone said about an unbroken lineage.

Malcolm wrote:
Correct. There is an unbroken lineage. In Vajrayāna is goes Dharmakāya, Sambhogakāya -- then some mahāsiddha, etc.

All these lineages are unbroken. Chan did not invent the idea of "lineage" until they were put in competition with Vajrayāna in the late seventh century.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

gee ya think?? I just KNEW the moment I clicked "submit" that someone would respond like that. Nice to see the great scholar has a sense of humor

Perhaps a bit more specificity?

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, I have no clue what Rinpoche is teaching. He often does not specify a text.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

ok, I called and left a message. BTW, does anyone know what will be covered in this upcoming webcast?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I first applied at DC West about almost a month ago. Still havent heard back from them. Then after 2 weeks I applied at the main Tsegylgar East and payed my membership dues through paypal. That was over a week ago. Still havent heard anything from them either. I am not pissed or anything, I realize these things sometimes take time. But if you all think I should call or email them I will. Thanks for your concern and help

Malcolm wrote:

call the main office. That is best thing to do, Be persistent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:
the present webcast is open.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I joined DC weeks ago and have not heard anything back yet. How do I get on the mailing list for the webcasts in the meantime? Sonam, thank you so much for posting this as I would have missed it if you hadn't.

Malcolm wrote:

Webcast Team <mailto:webcast@shangshunginstitute.org>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Sanskrit translations for Dang, Rolpa, Tsal?

Content:

adinatha said:

Do Dang, Rolpa and Tsal have sanskrit roots?

Malcolm wrote:

svarata, lila, vikrama

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2011 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

conebeckham said:

One proviso, though, Namdrol.....the "Transmitter" must "hold" the transmission in order for it to be valid.

Malcolm wrote:

That's a given.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Astus said:

And I'm asking about this second form, whether it's the transmission of precepts (as in the Fundamentalists? topic) or the transmission of something Tantric.

Malcolm wrote:

This has been explained already a hundred time: a teachers talks from his experience and realization using words and similes. You actively listen and understand.

That is all there is to transmission. It's not telepathic, it is not a substantial "something" you can put in a box.

Transmission means direct communication from one person who has some knowledge (in this case, creation and completion stage, dzogchen, etc) to someone who wants to develop that knowledge themselves. There are different methods for giving transmission. But they all share one thing in common -- a realized teacher communicates using words and similes and a student listens and understands at the same time. This is really not so fricking hard to understand. So I don't see why you are wasting people's time with this inane question anymore.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Astus said:

Compared to that, insisting on a personal transmission

Malcolm wrote:

Without personal transmission, you will never practice Vajrayana or Dzogchen. Ever. Instead, you will lead yourself and your students into hell.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Unless someone might have an allergic reaction to taking vows or precepts, I think they

should be given to those who want them, and let them get on with the business of keeping them.

Namdrol said:

Sure, providing they come from a living lineage.

N

PadmaVonSamba said:

What lineage did Sakyamuni come from?

Malcolm wrote:

That all depends upon which yāna you are considering. Which account would you like?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Ngondro

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

]Don't forget that you are in the Kagyu forum Dechen and that each tradition has its own "version" and approach to ngondro and that they are not really interchangeable.

Malcolm wrote:

The real meaning of "ngondro" is Guru yoga. First it is guru yoga to a guru in front of you; then on top of your head; then in front you to whom you make offerings; then in front of you from whom you receive empwornments.

As long as it is understood that ngondro is guru yoga in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end, then this should remove obstacles to practice.

There is no practice more profound than Guru Yoga, it is the defining practice of Vajrayāna which is not present in Mahayāna or lower tantras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

adinatha said:

Group karma is similar results from similar causes. Each individual has its own continuum, suffering alone. It is like a mirroring effect. The nature of awareness is mirror-like. If I hold up a mirror, and you hold up a mirror while standing nearby one

another, we will reflect one another. And so it goes on down the line through space and time. The master/disciple dynamic is just this with regard to body, speech and mind of Buddha.

Astus said:

The nature of awareness being mirror-like doesn't mean that we keep reflecting everything we see. Reflecting to whom, anyway? But this is just a metaphor and it may not necessarily be about the reflective attributes of mirrors. If I sit in front of a person that person's body won't appear as my body, nor will that happen with speech or mind. Where is the mirroring effect then?

Malcolm wrote:

Your mind is the surface of a mirror.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Namdrol said:

A common example is a seal and its impression.

Astus said:

Would that mean that the teacher/preceptor directly inputs certain mental patterns from his mind to the receiver of the transmission? That would be like reprogramming somebody's mind. That sounds to me contrary to common sense and karmic integrity.

Malcolm wrote:

Obustus, I have already explained this to you a hundred times: transmission means a teacher speaks, in words and similes according to his realization. You actively listen and understand. That is transmission. This why, for example, at the end of transmitting vows, the officiating upadhyaya asks you "Are you happy"? This means, "did you really participate in this ritual of transmitting the precepts?"

This is all there is to transmission. It cannot be gained from a book. It must be gained from another living, breathing human being.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Yontan said:

It might be helpful to explain the term "ignorance."

There is a not recognizing, separate from and anterior to a mistaken grasping.

Malcolm wrote:

The nature of innate ignorance and imputing ignorance is the same. They are both absence of knowledge.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A common example is a seal and its impression.

N

gregkavarnos said:

Since you have not "perceived" transmission so how can you understand it? Through metaphor of course! Everybody here is using metaphors to try to explain to you what transmission is otherwise the conversation will be kind of like this:

Astus: What's an apple?

Everybody else: It's an apple!

Kinda stoopid, huh?...

Astus said:

So you say that it can't be explained what is being transmitted because "you have to experience it"? Even about <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apple> there is quite a lot to say, and this is just Wikipedia. If somebody asks about selflessness it would be a weak and dismissive answer to say "you have to experience it" or give a few metaphors as if one were talking about human reproduction to little children. Fortunately there are many teachings on selflessness to provide a clear and lucid explanation to anyone interested. Anything even close to that on transmission?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: What is Transmission?

Content:

adinatha said:

There is both individual and common karma, right?

Astus said:

Only beings can have karma. A group has no karma of its own only its members, since a group is not a being to have a will.

Malcolm wrote:

There is common karma when similar causes bear similar results. You need to read Abhidharma again.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Unless someone might have an allergic reaction to taking vows or precepts, I think they should be given to those who want them, and let them get on with the business of keeping them.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, providing they come from a living lineage.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The key point is this: the Mūlasatvastivadas, the Theravadins and the Dharmaguptakas all have their own Vinaya tradition. They are not interchangeable, though some wish it were so.

Traditionally, each vinaya tradition came from one of Buddha's arhat disciples. So for example, Mulasarvastivada came from Rahula; Thervada from Upali, and so on.

Each vinaya has its own oral tradition and explanations of the vows, as well as procedures for ordination. They are not interchangeable.

pueraeternus said:

Just a thought: in all the sutric accounts of the Buddha's parinirvana, he said the sangha is free to remove the minor rules if they so wish after his death. This would mean he

gave the permission to alter the vinaya. Would this be a valid reason to recreate the Theravadin and Mulasarvastivadin bhikshuni lineage by altering the existing bhikshu vinaya vows of the respective sects?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha never told Ananda which minor rules. Therefore, no one ever removed any.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Everything is useless if you don't learn from it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so you must take your own advice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2011 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

...He is not saying that Greg ill willingly means to scrap the monastic tradition of TB, but that his proposition is equivalent to doing just that.

gregkavarnos said:

Except that I didn't make a proposition but a supposition and I had to blatantly state three times that I was not trying to do anything more than understand the situation. So really there was a fair quantity of projection happening, and anyway since when were you Namdrols lawyer DN?

PS Lets not derail the thread any further.

Malcolm wrote:

Greg:

There was not projection, it is a way of showing you the consequences of your suggestion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you say "....." this is the same as suggesting"

PadmaVonSamba said:

I deleted the specifics.

Practicing right speech can also mean not putting words into the mouth of someone else. If you disagree with what someone asserts, don't argue about comparisons and analogies that you yourself assume. Take time to understand what the other person is really saying and refer to that, or explain why you disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty useless post.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The key point is this: the Mūlasatvastivadas, the Theravadins and the Dharmaguptakas all have their own Vinaya tradition. They are not interchangeable, though some wish it were so.

Traditionally, each vinaya tradition came from one of Buddha's arhat disciples. So for example, Mulasarvastivada came from Rahula; Thervada from Upali, and so on.

Each vinaya has its own oral tradition and explanations of the vows, as well as procedures for ordination. They are not interchangeable.

Astus said:

That can be said supposing that there is something more to those precepts besides what is actually written down. But there isn't.

Malcolm wrote:

Astus:

Based on this statement, and your confusion about Dzogchen in the other thread, one

thing is clear: you do not understand the concept of transmission. You cannot get transmission from a book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you say "adopt reduced set of vows" this is the same as suggesting we scrap the monastic tradition of Tibetan Buddhism.

gregkavarnos said:

Dear Namdrol,

1. During this whole discussion I have been talking within the context of the hypothetical situation I formulated way back here
<https://www.dharmawheel.net/posting.php?mode=quote&f=66&p=43512#pr43488> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"
2. If you don't want to help me understand that's fine, but there is no reason to generate hostility/conflict where none exists.

Malcolm wrote:

The key point is this: the Mūlasatvastivadas, the Theravadins and the Dharmaguptakas all have their own Vinaya tradition. They are not interchangeable, though some wish it were so.

Traditionally, each vinaya tradition came from one of Buddha's arhat disciples. So for example, Mulasarvastivada came from Rahula; Thervada from Upali, and so on.

Each vinaya has its own oral tradition and explanations of the vows, as well as procedures for ordination. They are not interchangeable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

So you are suggesting we scrap the monastic vows of Tibetan Buddhism.

gregkavarnos said:

You gonna stop with the projections at some point in time or what?

I repeat(for the third time): I ain't suggesting nothing, I'm just trying to understand the issue.

PS What is the nature of the 30 extra vows for monks? Is it like a whole section (a unit of extra vows) or are they spread amongst the other "categories" of vows. I have read the Theravada vows but have not seen the lists of vows from the other lineages.

Malcolm wrote:

If you say "adopt reduced set of vows" this is the same as suggesting we scrap the monastic tradition of Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

They can't recite posadha together because the vows are given in different orders...

gregkavarnos said:

This is hardly a problem, I mean will the vows lose their significance if they are recited in a different order (like if they changed the order so they could recite it together)?

Malcolm wrote:

The vows are significant as a whole, they cannot be traded out like playing cards, for one's convenience. This is why for example, Atisha was never able to recite posadha vows with monks in Tibet.

gregkavarnos said:

...and in the case of the Theravada vows, there are 30 or so less vows.

So I guess they could only be ordained based on the smaller set of vows.

Malcolm wrote:

So you are suggesting we scrap the monastic vows of Tibetan Buddhism.

gregkavarnos said:

By the way, how did you arrive at the 500 year figure for the collapse of the monastic sangha?

Malcolm wrote:

Educated guess.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

IF they can't recite posadha together [they can't], then what makes you think they can transmit vows together, and whose would they transmit? The reduced rule set of Theravada, or the expanded rule set of the other two?

gregkavarnos said:

Why can't they recite the posadha together? Language differences?

I imagine they would have to transmit the reduced set since all three would hold all the vows (again I imagine) contained in the smallest set.

Malcolm wrote:

They can't recite posadha together because the vows are given in different orders, and in the case of the Theravada vows, there are 30 or so less vows.

So what you are basically suggesting is that we scrap Mulasarvastivada and Dharmaguptaka. But if you do that, you will scrap the nuns vows in Dharmaguptaka, since they died out in the other two orders (and the reason for their dying out is a gender issue). If you want nuns vows in Theravada and Tibetan Buddhism, either Theravada and Mulasarvastivada needs to be scrapped, or, things remain at the status quo i.e. nuns who want a valid ordination get that from the Dharmaguptaka lineage.

Someone mentioned that monks from Tibetan Buddhism and Theravada were present at these nuns ordinations -- yes, they were, but not as members of the required quorum. They were present as guests and observers.

Then there is the additional gender issue of the 80 odd extra vows nuns must keep in addition to the monks vows. This is unfair. But will these be scrapped? No. Should they be scrapped, no.

Are all monastic sanghas going to collapse in the next 500 years? Definitely.

Should we be sad? No.

Will there still be Buddhist practice even though the monastic sangha is no more? Yes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Ngondro

Content:

Adamantine said:

Ngakpas are the tantric-lay-householder-yogis who are said to have kept the Vajrayana Dharma alive during the purges of the monasteries. .

Malcolm wrote:

The monasteries were not purged, they were shut down because they are a huge burden on the Tibetan govt. Langdarma shut them down because the Tibetan Kingdom could not afford to run them anymore nor pay for the monks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Ngondro

Content:

Jangchup Donden said:

Further, if it wasn't for lay Buddhists, Buddhism in Tibet wouldn't have survived Langdarma.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Langdarma was unfairly maligned and murdered without good cause.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Origin of the Direct Introduction with Syllable Phat

Content:

Namdrol said:

In reality, what ChNN did was free Dzogchen from Tibetan politics and money games.

Adamantine said:

Do you believe there's no politics or money games in the Dzogchen Community?

Why are people turned away from retreats that genuinely can only afford to pay most, if not the entire amount requested, due to financial hardship?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, there are politics in the DC, but not money games. What politics there are in the DC are not around Dzogchen. Mostly they are around differing opinions of ChNN's intentions.

It is simple, if you are poor, you get a poor persons membership (\$85.00 per annum) which gives you a %50 discount on retreats. If you are not a member of the DC, well,

what can I say? If you want teachings from ChNN you can always attend _free_ webcasts, as many as you like, you just might have to lose a little sleep. In reality, it is expensive to put on retreats, and every community is independent financially from the others. So, if you can't pay, stay home and watch webcast. If you can pay, go to retreat and enjoy.

Adamantine said:

Yet in the Indian heart of Tibet-in-exile, large scale retreats and empowerments are regularly given to all who come completely free of charge?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not an Indian heart. In India and in ancient Tibet, masters charged large fees for empowerments. These fees come directly from the tantras themselves.

And if that is where people want to go, spending thousands of dollars on flights to India for these free retreats, then they should. But don't complain that DC retreats are not free when you are spending large sums of money to travel to India for your "free" retreat.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

While I agree that there must be some kind of continuity in the ordination lineages isn't it enough to just get three or more precept holders, regardless of lineage, to bestow the vows?

Malcolm wrote:

IF they can't recite posadha together [they can't], then what makes you think they can transmit vows together, and whose would they transmit? The reduced rule set of Theravada, or the expanded rule set of the other two?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

All the vows come from the Buddha, they are just different transmissions.

Astus said:

Since the vows are different the transmissions are corrupted...

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is merely due to regional differences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Origin of the Direct Introduction with Syllable Phat

Content:

adinatha said:

But isn't obvious he's taken controversial approaches to the teachings and broken with tradition?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, it is not obvious at all. I have been his student for 19 years. He is actually a pretty conservative teacher. His attitude toward Bon is no different than the attitude of Guru Chowang, the immediate incarnation of Nyangral, and the tertön who revealed the seven line prayer. Guru Chowang wrote in his "Great Origin of Treasures:

"First: the two the supreme of all beneficial qualities, [5/a] the treasure of the true words of Bon emanations: the way the compassionate body came from the pure dimension of the ultimate nature [bon nyid i.e. chos nyid] and the after the treasure of body, speech and mind arose, the way the teaching was spread, i.e. the way a treasure descends from a treasure.

First: the pure dimension of the ultimate nature completely free from falling into any parts or divisions was singular and unique, the treasure of the hidden Bon dharmakāya [bon chos sku] which has nothing to give up, appeared from pure activity to tame beings as the sambhogakāya Shenlha Wodkar [gshen lha 'od dkar]. The way his compassion was moved is that in general he thought of all migrating beings. Specifically, he thought of beings in Jambudvīpa.

Second: after the treasure of the body, speech and mind was produced, the teachings were widely spread. The way the treasure descends from a treasure is that in order to tame the the confusion of ignorance, the root of samsara, at Wolmo Lungring in the land of Zhang Zhung the hidden treasure of compassion arrived in the form of Shenrab Miwoche [gshen rab mi bo che, i.e. the supreme one of the Shen clan, the greatest of men]. The hidden treasure was concealed in a single intention by all the Tathāgatas in the mind of Shenrab, and he taught the nine vehicles of Bon.

Afterwards, Shenrab's words were collected by the fortune Bonpos and placed in a catalogue. The cause Bon tamed ordinary beings, and result Bon tamed intelligent beings.

The teachings were spread in Tokharistan, where people wear silk turbans, the land

India and the border lands and also spread in dPur rGyal in Tibet and Bon was disseminated in the beginning.

The King was given the name as the Elder Brother of Bon because he made sure the teaching did not decline, and also he concealed the Bon treasures of cause and result in Zhang Zhung the temple of Shampo Lhatse. Furthermore, as they were spread in the mountain of white peaks in Oddiyana, the Chinese mountain Dru Dzin [5/b] and in southern and northern Tibet, having concealed treasures which descended from treasures, the Bon texts were not destroyed, and the Bonpos became renowned.

Also I, Chowang, say that the profound teaching of Bon is uninterrupted."

If ChNN is to be faulted for respecting Bon Dzogchen, how much more so the master who originally revealed the seven line prayer? Obviously, Nyingmapas who do not respect Bon also do not respect their own lineage masters.

In reality, the only novel thing ChNN does is not pay lip service to the gradual approach of the gsar ma schools. And even this is not novel, but rather a return to the old Nyingma way of doing things, rather than this neo-Nyingma gradualism.

In reality, what ChNN did was free Dzogchen from Tibetan politics and money games. And for that, some worldly tibetans and westerners wearing robes, who bilk their students of their wealth and rob them of their precious human birth, who bear the title of this and that rinpoche hate ChNN. Well, f76k them.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2011 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Astus said:

Considering that there are quite a few Vinayas and pratimokshas it is a bit naive to think that all of them are directly from Shakyamuni himself. Understanding the history of Buddhism can actually facilitate the weakening of sectarianism, like <https://sites.google.com/site/sectsandsectarianism/> by Bhikkhu Sujato. This crossing the barriers I think is a major task of 21st century global Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

All the vows come from the Buddha, they are just different transmissions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Caz said:

So if one vows to keep a precept, but however doesn't receive it from the correct place in question then even if it is kept it is not actually existent ?

Namdrol said:

correct

Caz said:

Okay Is there a source one can cite where Buddha explains as such ?

Malcolm wrote:

This is all very clearly explained in Sakya Pandita's analysis of the three vows, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Urgyen Chodron said:

But to tell others about the practice is a big downfall, many moons in hell, to even read it without being initiated the same. I can see why teachers often say it is not about sex. At least Namdrol has been honest about it here.

Malcolm wrote:

Sex is part of tantric practice, but so is eating, sleeping, walking and talking. Tantric practice is designed to include all elements from our life as part of the process of waking up.

Either you can accept this; or if not, it is better for you to practice Theravada or a Mahayāna form of Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Caz said:

So if one vows to keep a precept, but however doesn't receive it from the correct place in

question then even if it is kept it is not actually existant ?

Malcolm wrote:
correct

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The vows then are just natural virtues, they do not have the force of continuous practice behind them, and since the lineage is broken, they no longer come from the Buddha.

Caz said:

Well if you make and keep vows then they certainly have the force of continous effort behind them.

Malcolm wrote:

Not without a valid ordination. Without a valid ordination, you don't actually have the vows in question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Authority in dzogchen

Content:

Caz said:

Everyone is entitled to practise the way they see fit and according to who evers view they want...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. In the end, even if one states the Guru is the supreme authority, in the end it all boils down to oneself.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Astus said:

Magnus,

As the quotes themselves explain, "re-enlightenment" is meant within the context of Samantabhadra as the primordially enlightened buddha and the teaching of original wakefulness. Nobody said that it implies we were all once buddhas then became ordinary beings even if the explanation is given again and again how one keeps straying from buddha-mind every moment.

Malcolm wrote:

Even Samantabhadra first possessed ignorance. Re-enlightenment is an impossibility.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

I like how this conversation has turned. If Buddhists won't confront gender issues, who will?

Namdrol said:

It is not a gender issue. it is a transmission issue. Completely different issues.

Caz said:

So what exactly would be the problem with giving them these vows even if it is a dead transmission ? when one decides to keep morale discipline surely this helps toward mind training...

Malcolm wrote:

The vows then are just natural virtues, they do not have the force of continuous practice behind them, and since the lineage is broken, they no longer come from the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Authority in dzogchen

Content:

Caz said:

Im not sure about anyone else but my it has been advised to me by some that if one is going to have multiple teachers they should be within the same tradition and hold the same view as ones primary teacher to avoid this sort of confusion.

Malcolm wrote:

In my opinion this approach leads to narrow-mindedness. For example, this was not

Sakya Pandita's approach, nor Longchenpa's, nor even Lama Tsongkhapa's approach.

In the end, Sakya Pandita, Longchenpa and Tsongkhapa each had to make up their own mind about what to accept and what to reject. I recommend everyone follow this approach.

Even if we accept that the Guru is the supreme authority, in the end, oneself is the final authority.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Authority in dzogchen

Content:

sherabpa said:

I know this matter annoys a lot of people, but I'm not sure why its so annoying, yet, so here goes.

The source of authority in dzogchen and vajrayana is one's guru, I am told. If one's guru presents the teachings in one way, and another guru presents it in another, contradictory, way, how should one regard this situation?

Malcolm wrote:

One should follow the advice of one's root guru.

sherabpa said:

I'm thinking here of the ngondro, of course, and the different views on its importance among dzogchen lineages. But it also applies generally to, say, Sakya Pandita's views on Mahamudra and Vajravarahi.

You can see how this is essential to understand if one has received teachings of both lineages, or if one wishes to do so.

Malcolm wrote:

I am someone who has done a three year Sakya Lamdre retreat, has translated many Sakya texts, I am also a Dzogchen practitioner, and have translated many Dzogchen texts.

In Lamdre there is a teaching called the four authorities. The principle authority which is the root of the other three is the authority of the Guru i.e. "Since all previous and subsequent authorities depend on this, the authority of the Guru is supreme."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

if it involves gender, it's a gender issue.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you are narrow minded.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Not sure about the technical aspects of the Mahayana vinaya, but if what you have is correct, what about when there was no majority? I am certain at some point in history on at least one occasion there were not a majority of "real" monks present. Again, the broken line.

In the Theravada vinaya, there must be at least 5 monks present who do not have the parajika offense for the ordination to be valid (Mahavagga, chapter 9, vs 4.1–4.4).

Again, realistically, some where along the line, it has been broken, if you take a literal view.

What matters is their conviction and adherence to the precepts, not the outward ceremony.

Malcolm wrote:

If that were the case, than that vinaya lineage transmission would be broken and beyond reviving.

We should not expect everything to last forever, including the monastic sangha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Origin of the Direct Introduction with Syllable Phat

Content:

Vajrahridaya said:

Well, to have ChNNR confirmed by historical or older present Masters of high esteem is pretty good for faith I would think. For you it's a given, but for plenty of us new to the world of Vajrayana in this life, it's an excellent thing to know that...

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chatral_Rinpoche is cool with ChNNR. That's awesome to me.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN never needed any confirmation in the past, he does not need any now, and he won't need any in the future.

If some tibetan asked me that question I would say, "ask him yourself if you really care".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: Origin of the Direct Introduction with Syllable Phat

Content:

rai said:

I am just curious how do you know all those details? first hand informations or some Buddhists forums?

username said:

What details? About Chatral Rinpoche being very conservative yet a guru of ChNNR who is one of the few living people to have a long life prayer by CR? These are all well known general facts in DC. Tell me which other living tertön's terma has been verified by him?

Malcolm wrote:

more importantly, who gives a rat's ass.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is not about gender, it is about transmission.

David N. Snyder said:

Even among the male monk lines, it would be quite naive to think that all the ordinations from the time of the Buddha were "unbroken". It is much more likely that in fact, there were several ordinations performed by monks who were later discovered to have

committed a parajika offense entailing defeat from the Sanha. Thereby, making all future ordinations in that line broken, according to a literal interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so, even if there is a unknown parajika among the quorum that was later revealed, all that matters is that the majority of the monks had fully intact vows. This idea about one parajika was a novelty introduced by Sangharakshita. It is a false assertion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

The outward form of the rite, ritual, and ceremony is not important.

Malcolm wrote:

What is important is the transmission. If the transmission is broken, then it is dead.

Fortunately for women, there exists the Dharmaguptaka ordination.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, they are Dharmaguptaka nuns. But there is still no surviving ordination of nuns of Theravada and Mulasarvastivada. There are only Dharmaguptaka nuns.

David N. Snyder said:

In your opinion.

In my opinion, the women who took the Theravada ordinations are Theravada bhikkhunis and the women who took the Tibetan vows and vinaya are Tibetan nuns. They follow their respective traditions. The outward form of the rite, ritual, and ceremony is not important. What matters is their devotion and acceptance of the vinaya of their respective traditions.

But even that outward ritual and ceremony included monastics from their own traditions and acceptance from their monk preceptors of their traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't understand. In Tibetan Buddhism, those woman who became bhikṣunis took the Dharmaguptaka ordination since it did not survive in Mulasarvastivada. Those woman in Thailand have a broken ordination. I understand the reasons behind it, but it is not a proper ordination if they did not ordain with Dharmaguptaka nuns.

This is my position. If the male monastic ordination died out, it would be inappropriate to "revive" it. Why, because the direct transmission from the Buddha would have been broken.

It is not about gender, it is about transmission.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

won't happen.

David N. Snyder said:

It already did. There are now over 1,000 fully ordained nuns in Theravada and Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are Dharmaguptaka nuns. But there is still no surviving ordination of nuns of Theravada and Mulasarvastivada. There are only Dharmaguptaka nuns.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

This discussion on nuns shows how the literal word can work to the detriment of Buddhism and is not what the Buddha intended.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot invent one's own traditions. It is not a gender issue. Since there is a Vinaya ordination for women in Dharmaguptaka, they are free to take it if they wish. But one cannot invent one for Theravada and Mulasarvastivada. Presumably, for these women, beings bhikṣunis is more important than which vinaya lineage they belong to, right?

David N. Snyder said:

Due to attachment to rites, rituals, and ceremonies...

Malcolm wrote:
This does not apply to Vinaya.

David N. Snyder said:
Again, shows the flexibility of the Buddha, even allowing the abolishing of some rules as needed.

Malcolm wrote:
I doubt Buddha would approve of inventing ordinations.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 5:36 AM
Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being
Content:
Namdrol said:
There is no term or concept in Dzogchen as being "re-enlightened". Does not exist and does not make sense.

Astus said:
Nevertheless, the above authors did use it with the same meaning in a Dzogchen context. If it is not a traditional term it might be a new one.

Tulku Urgyen's "Repeating the Words of the Buddha" has a whole chapter entitled "Re-enlightenment".

At the second movement, the delusions are dispelled and the (perfection) of primordial wisdom develops. That is the development of the basis (itself) as the result (of enlightenment). It is called the re-enlightenment (or self-liberation) through the realization of the essence, the primordial Buddhahood.
(Longchen Rabjam: The Practice of Dzogchen, p. 207)

Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche said, "The confusion that arose in ... the path can be cleared away. When we remove the temporary stains from primordially awakened rigpa, we become re-enlightened instead of primordially enlightened. This is accomplished by following the oral instructions of a fully qualified master."
(Nyoshul Khenpo: Natural Great Perfection, p. 71)

We should train in the state of rigpa that is originally pure. Although the essence is primordially enlightened, the yogi has to be re-enlightened. We have fallen into delusion. Attaining stability in non-delusion is called re-enlightenment.
(Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche: As It Is, vol. 2, p. 67)

Malcolm wrote:
First of all, Tulku Urgyen never spoke English in his life.

When translators translate things in this way, they cause decades of confusion.

There is no such thing as "re-enlightenment", not in Dzogchen, and not in any other Buddhist school.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

I like how this conversation has turned. If Buddhists won't confront gender issues, who will?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a gender issue. it is a transmission issue. Completely different issues.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Is the 'e.coli' epidemic a gNyan disease caused by Spirits?

Content:

Caz said:

Apparently it was a Bean Sprout.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, now it seems to be a massive conspiracy aimed at organic agriculture.

But, still this kind of outbreak is definitely provocation related.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Astus said:

In other words...

Malcolm wrote:

There is no term or concept in Dzogchen as being "re-enlightened". Does not exist and does not make sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

dzoki said:

I think there is no problem with reintroducng bikshuni lineage. Because in the time of Buddha for certain time there were no bikshunis, so the first group of bikshunis had to be ordained without any bikshunis present. I imagine two possibilities:

1. Reinstate vows based on the example of Buddha, that is some realised monk will simply give the vows to the bikshuni aspirant the same way Buddha gave them to the first bikshunis.

2. Some realised shikshamana would receive this vows in a vision.

Of course there is a problem with that how such ordinations would be accepted by both ordained and lay public.

Malcolm wrote:

won't happen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Origin of the Direct Introduction with Syllable Phat

Content:

heart said:

Yes, that's him.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

He is back in Nepal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Origin of the Direct Introduction with Syllable Phat

Content:

pemachophel said:

So that I can better counter the arguments of potential critics, can you tell me what Lama(s) has/have verified ChNNR's terma? This very conversation came up not even

two weeks ago with another Lama. Frankly, I was at a loss as to what to say. I would prefer not to be caught in the same situation again.

Thanks

heart said:

Ask Yeshe Dorje, I think he mentioned to me once that ChNN brought a Terma to Chatral Rinpoche for verification. I might be wrong but that is what I recall.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN verifies his own terma. You can read the account of how he verified Mandarava for example, in his account of the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Origin of the Direct Introduction with Syllable Phat

Content:

pemachophel said:

So that I can better counter the arguments of potential critics, can you tell me what Lama(s) has/have verified ChNNR's terma? This very conversation came up not even two weeks ago with another Lama. Frankly, I was at a loss as to what to say. I would prefer not to be caught in the same situation again.

Namdrol said:

Tell them to mind their own f^&%ing business.

N

dzoki said:

Well that wouldn't be a very polite answer to your lama.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is not a very goddamn polite question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Cannot revive vows since the lineage is dead.

Could only decide to adopt Dharmaguptaka lineage. This means that monks from Thervada and Mulasarvastivada would have to reordain.

N

pueraeternus said:

Ah well, that would indeed be impossible.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why there is a bit of a difficulty.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Origin of the Direct Introduction with Syllable Phat

Content:

pemachophel said:

So that I can better counter the arguments of potential critics, can you tell me what Lama(s) has/have verified ChNNR's terma? This very conversation came up not even two weeks ago with another Lama. Frankly, I was at a loss as to what to say. I would prefer not to be caught in the same situation again.

Malcolm wrote:

Tell them to mind their own f^&%ing business.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Gut Flora

Content:

BuddhistPariah said:

Lately I've come to the conclusion that many of my health problems are coming in part from a weak intestine, very probably from a weak intestine flora.

I have been looking on internet and the most interesting article for me is this one:

<http://www.gutsense.org/gutsense/flora.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

That's why I am tempted to buy the book: <https://www.amazon.co.uk/Fiber-Menace->

ebook/dp/B004J8HVV0/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&m=A3TVV12T0I6NSM&qid=1307385858&sr=1-1 " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

But I am also open to opinions and suggestions coming from you.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

You should do the colorado cleanse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Thanks Namdrol. Still can't see how the technicalities of one ordination could hinder practice of another lineage's praxis, but I understand if it's too technical to go into details here.

Namdrol said:

It does not.

It just means that ordination rites are kept separate i.e. the method of ordination of Theravada is different than that of Mulasarvastivada. So for example, since the vows are different, different monks in different lineages cannot recite posadha with one another.

N

pueraeternus said:

Earlier you mentioned that the vinayadharas could consolidate the lineages. In this case, could the re-established bhikshunis decide to "consolidate" their lineages to exactly fit those of the lineage they want affiliation with? For example, the Dharmagupta nuns in the Theravadin countries - could the most senior amongst them decide to "consolidate" or fold themselves into the same Bhikkhuni vows that the old Theravadin nuns kept? Since the Vinayadharas appear to have the ability to change the vows according to consensus, would this be a viable method? In any case, isn't this how the various sects grew out of each other? They just changed their ordination procedures to their liking.

Malcolm wrote:

Cannot revive vows since the lineage is dead.

Could only decide to adopt Dharmaguptaka lineage. This means that monks from Theravada and Mulasarvastivada would have to reordain.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The Buddha was not a "Buddhist" ...

Malcolm wrote:

Sure he was, since he, by his own admission, was following the path blazed by past buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2011 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Thanks Namdrol. Still can't see how the technicalities of one ordination could hinder practice of another lineage's praxis, but I understand if it's too technical to go into details here.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not.

It just means that ordination rites are kept separate i.e. the method of ordination of Theravada is different than that of Mulasarvastivada. So for example, since the vows are different, different monks in different lineages cannot recite posadha with one another.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

It would fall into the wrong view of clinging to rites and rituals as a source of liberation. I believe that you might admit that we see this amongst Buddhists quite often.

Malcolm wrote:

Clinging to rites and rituals is a criticism of Vedic practice and certain kinds of ascetic practices like standing on one leg for whole life.

It does not refer to Vinaya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2011 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

Namdrol said:

It has to do with the way the different ways different schools conduct rites of ordination. They cannot be mixed.

N

pueraeternus said:

Could you quote just a brief example? Just trying to understand the various reasonings from different angles.

Malcolm wrote:

I mean that procedures and so on for each of the ordination lineages is different. They could only be integrated if all of the Vinayadharas decided to consolidate the three remaining ordination lineages. And that won't happen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2011 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

A recent example is over the bhikkhuni issue in Theravada and the bhikkshuni issue in Tibetan Buddhism. For some, it has been felt that the female nun lineage cannot be reinstated since there are no female nuns to ordain the new novices. But this is mistaken when considering that the Dharmaguptaka line has remained unbroken and nuns from that lineage can be used (and in fact have been used and today there are over 1,000 Theravada and Tibetan nuns). But some of the more literal interpreters

Namdrol said:

Well, they are still Dharmaguptaka nuns. You cannot mix monastic ordination lineages.

pueraeternus said:

What is the reason for not mixing the ordination lineages? Would a Dharmagupta nun be

hindered in practicing Mahaviharin praxis? Also, would non-Mulasarvastivadin nuns be prevented from practicing Mahayana/Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

It has to do with the way the different ways different schools conduct rites of ordination. They cannot be mixed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2011 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I believe that the term "fundamentalism" has come to mean something different in our society (though it includes the definition you have offered) and that is a tenacious grasping to ones tenents or system of belief as the only valid form of truth and a denigration of all other belief systems, in which case I believe that I have met (and continue to meet) a number of Buddhist fundamentalists.

Malcolm wrote:

By that token then, you would assert the Buddha was a "fundamentalist" since he was clear there was no liberation at all outside of his dharma and vinaya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2011 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist fundamentalists?

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

A recent example is over the bhikkhuni issue in Theravada and the bhikkshuni issue in Tibetan Buddhism. For some, it has been felt that the female nun lineage cannot be reinstated since there are no female nuns to ordain the new novices. But this is mistaken when considering that the Dharmaguptaka line has remained unbroken and nuns from that lineage can be used (and in fact have been used and today there are over 1,000 Theravada and Tibetan nuns). But some of the more literal interpreters

Malcolm wrote:

Well, they are still Dharmaguptaka nuns. You cannot mix monastic ordination lineages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2011 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

adinatha said:

But the way they actually are is the arteries beating out and down are on the right, the veins returning up are on the left and the spine with movements of mind going up and down is in the middle. (perhaps I have these flipped but the point is the same). But I can see how with respect to Toga, there is the "channels others don't know about," the winds gathering in the heart and all that...

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever you may like to think, but that is not how it is in fact, at least not from viewpoint of Tibetan medicine, etc.

The way it is arranged is that the aorta, etc, is the main avadhuti, the vena cava, etc. the rasana, and the spinal column, etc. is the lalana. The reason why it must be so is that lower end of the lalana and rasana is the urethra, and the lower end of the avadhuti is the rectum according to Kalacakra. Anyway, these things are not so important in Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2011 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

adinatha said:

But the bilateral symmetry is not just a visualization the systems are physical situated as I described.

Malcolm wrote:

It is well understood, at least in Tibetan medicine (which is based in Dzogchen) that the three channels do not exist in the way in which they are visualized, which has lead the famed doctor, Zurkhar to state "All channels of air (i.e. beating channels, arteries) are the avadhuti, all channels of blood are rasana, and all channels of water (nerves, etc.) are the lalana." This statement is in part based on the Karmapa III's zab mo nang don.

Some westerners think the central channel is the spinal column, but it is not, in general considered to be that. The spinal column, the bones, etc., all develop from the white substance of the father. The spinal column and the brain is considered part of the lalana system in general Vajrayāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2011 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

Namdrol said:

In human body it is about bilateral symmetry, only when visualized. But in Ati, there is no visualization of these channels.

Spinal column and nerves develop from father white element, hence they belong to the lalana system. Venous belongs to rasana system. Arterial belongs to Avadhuti system. This is more or less how it is understood in Tibetan medicine

However, there are different ways of explaining avadhuti, outer, inner secret, unique to certain Dzogchen systems.

OTOH, this is not so important -- these channels are only explained in order to differentiate the kati from them and explain that it is not a blood channel or lymphatic channel. Also the element of the kati is fire in Dzogchen, unlike other three which are considered earth (lalana), water (rasana) and air (avadhuti). Confusing, no? Also in some Dogchen texts, lalana is red, rasana is white, so even more confusing.

N

adinatha said:

Element kati is fire was surprising at first when I read it just now. Then I remembered someone explaining to me a Togal practitioner has to be careful, because the head can overheat, leading to injury. Which also kind of corresponds to why there is a brief Tummo instruction in Yeshe Lama. Perhaps acclimatizing the body to higher heat will condition it and therefore help to prevent this problem of overheating in the head and eyes.

But the bilateral symmetry is not just a visualization the systems are physical situated as I described.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to understand, there is a kind of bile in the eyes called alocaka pita -- this is the composed of the fire element. If you put too much heat in the eyes, it dries out the moist tissue and damages one's eyesight. Actually, it is important to use special eyedrops regularly to induce tearing to protect the eyes because the alocaka pita itself can dry out the eyes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

adinatha said:

Tibetan yogis were pretty good at anatomy (better than Indian yogis, actually), but not perfect -- so yes, Vagus nerve connects to the so called "precious heart" (tsitta rinpoche, in which is located the anahata bindu) from the brain , the basis for the visions.

N

I'm sort of trippin' out about this stuff right now... very cool.

With regard to the colors. I was just noticing that perhaps the Bonpos have it right: Red-fire, blue-water, yellow-earth, green-air, and white (clear)-space.

This schema just seem to correspond more accurately to space... What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is a little arbitray, I perfer space as blue because of sky. Water as white because of limpidity of water.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

adinatha said:

So then what goes down the sides of the neck and into the heart? I see vagus and phrenic nerves. Vagus powers the heart; phrenic the diaphragm.

Namdrol said:

Optic nerve connects directly into the brain. The way it is described is that this channel is in the central channel. it goes up into the brain and then branches out to the eyes.

Tibetan yogis were pretty good at anatomy (better than Indian yogis, actually), but not perfect -- so yes, Vagus nerve connects to the so called "precious heart" (tsitta rinpoche, in which is located the anahata bindu) from the brain , the basis for the visions.

N

adinatha said:

Well vagus is attached to the cranial nerve nucleus along with the optic, and the phrenic

is not. But the phrenic and vagus seem to work together with regard to cardio-pulmonary motor function. So there may be a combination of function described here.

You've said before that the central channel is the arterial system, and the side channels are the venal system and spinal cord. Is this a Dzogchen special description?

Just from looking at them; it appears right and left channels are venal and arterial systems respectively; central channel would be the spinal cord. This would account for the interaction with the optic, vagus and phrenic nerves in the function of Ati yoga sadhana.

Malcolm wrote:

In human body it is about bilateral symmetry, only when visualized. But in Ati, there is no visualization of these channels.

Spinal column and nerves develop from father white element, hence they belong to the lalana system. Venous belongs to rasana system. Arterial belongs to Avadhuti system. This is more or less how it is understood in Tibetan medicine

However, there are different ways of explaining avadhuti, outer, inner secret, unique to certain Dzogchen systems.

OTOH, this is not so important -- these channels are only explained in order to differentiate the kati from them and explain that it is not a blood channel or lymphatic channel. Also the element of the kati is fire in Dzogchen, unlike other three which are considered earth (lalana), water (rasana) and air (avadhuti). Confusing, no? Also in some Dogchen texts, lalana is red, rasana is white, so even more confusing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

adinatha said:

So then what goes down the sides of the neck and into the heart? I see vagus and phrenic nerves. Vagus powers the heart; phrenic the diaphragm.

Malcolm wrote:

Optic nerve connects directly into the brain. The way it is described is that this channel is in the central channel. it goes up into the brain and then branches out to the eyes.

Tibetan yogis were pretty good at anatomy (better than Indian yogis, actually), but not perfect -- so yes, Vagus nerve connects to the so called "precious heart" (tsitta rinpoche, in which is located the anahata bindu) from the brain , the basis for the visions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: "Everything is perfect"

Content:

catmoon said:

Everything is perfect?

How do we square that with the teachings that samsara is impermanent, unsatisfactory and of the nature of suffering? Isn't it the goal of every Buddhist to leave this unsatisfactory situation, and take as many sentient beings with them as they can?

Malcolm wrote:

Samsara arise from ignorance. Ignorance is not perfect. Remove ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

Namdrol said:

You misread -- it is channel that is not filled with blood or lymph. The reason it is called "a white silk thread" is because it is a nerve. This is common euphemism for nerves.

N

adinatha said:

Thank you for that clarification. Which nerve are we talking about then? Vagus?

Malcolm wrote:

Altogether, the optical housing and the optical nerve.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

TMingyur said:

Until then everything is speculation.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so, since you accept already the testimony of the Buddha as a pramana, as you state above. Based on this we can develop an inference. This gives us more confidence in the Buddha's teaching of rebirth. This leads to the development of the five faculties, five of the eight indriyas of nirvana, etc. Inferential pramana is extremely important in Buddha's teachings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

TMingyur said:

To validly infer rebirth therefore would have as prerequisite the possibility to directly perceive re-birth at some places and times. But what can be directly perceived is just birth, but not re-birth.

So putting the "homogeneity and material" stuff aside according to Dharmakirti's own logic inference of rebirth is utterly impossible.

kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, even commoners can directly perceive their own past lives and those of others. Proof of this can be found in Buddha's own liberation where he intuited the truth of dependent origination prior to full awakening by remembering his past lives.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

TMingyur said:

Side note to Dharmakirti:

Basis of valid cognition is direct perception. Even inference may be valid only if an instance ("particular") of the inferred ("universal" or "generality character") can be directly perceived at other times and/or in other places.

Malcolm wrote:

An inference is based in a valid pratyaksha, but not all pramanas are pratyakshas. You are arguing for validity of rebirth based solely on the third, a Buddha's testimony. I am

asserting rebirth can be logically inferred for oneself, based on Dharmakirti's reasoning set forth in the Pramanasiddhi chapter of the Pramanavarttikas.

The basis for this inference is the logical exclusion of rūpa as the cause of citta and caittas. Once one has ruled out a material cause for the mind, one must accept rebirth or accept causeless arising for the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

TMingyur said:

Now that is a definition never given before. Obviously Namdrol has take the term "material" for granted.

Malcolm wrote:

I use the Buddha's definition: rūpa i.e. the four mahābhūtanis -- all states of matter are included . Nāma refers to all mental phenomena.

This split is basic to Buddha's phenomenolgy, and is basic to India pre-Buddhist phenomenology as well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

TMingyur said:

Why? Because there is neither valid reason for "homogeneity" nor valid reason for "non-homogeneity" of cause and effect.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is a valid reason i.e. observation. Rice seeds produce rice sprout and not wheat. Wheat seeds produce wheat sprouts and not rice.

It is foolish to suppose, based in observation, that causal homogeneity is unreasonable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: How does pleasure arise?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The sensations of pleasure and pain from all of these activities are solely the ripening of karma and nothing else.

Karma of course begins with intention, but it ripens on both mind and body.

N

xabir said:

Interesting... but how do you explain this:

"Produced by (disorders of the) bile, there arise, Sivaka, certain kinds of feelings. That this happens, can be known by oneself; also in the world it is accepted as true.
Produced by (disorders of the) phlegm... of wind... of (the three) combined... by change of climate... by adverse behavior... by injuries... by the results of Kamma — (through all that), Sivaka, there arise certain kinds of feelings. That this happens can be known by oneself; also in the world it is accepted as true.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite simple really -- the body you appropriate at birth has the three humors, it is born in certain climate that has changes, one's conduct is definitely karma, injuries, etc., all of these things are ultimately produced by and a result of karma.

So no contradiction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

TMingyur said:

...there is no valid inference for rebirth...

Malcolm wrote:

There is certainly a valid inference for rebirth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 12:25 PM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

Enochian said:

This doesn't make sense at all in the light of Dzogchen's crystal channels.

Namdrol said:

Of course it does. But I am not going to discuss that here more than to say this kind of anatomy is wrapped in metaphor. When one has studied Tibetan medicine, many things become obvious that seem mysterious and mystical in Dzogchen.

Here is a hint "white silk thread" is common Tibetan medical term for nerve fibers in the body, for example, that run from the brain to all the internal organs, etc.

But in reality, it is all about physical structures in the body and how to manipulate them.

adinatha said:

The texts on crystal kati say it is primordially pure, not polluted by red or white. I thought this indicated it was not a nerve or a blood vessel, but something else, similar to the eye faculty.

Malcolm wrote:

You misread -- it is channel that is not filled with blood or lymph. The reason it is called "a white silk thread" is because it is a nerve. This is common euphemism for nerves.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 12:22 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

TMingyur said:

If gamma-ray radioactivity is considered "material". Or visual rays like visual light are considered "material".

Malcolm wrote:

Light has mass.

TMingyur said:

So you admit that your reasoning is based on an arbitrary assumptions that actually is

not different from the alleged "inference". Circular reasoning.

Malcolm wrote:

I assume you are not a stupid person and are capable of filling in the blanks. Perhaps I have overestimated your intelligence.

TMingyur said:

Yes, rebirth can be "inferred" if one assumes that

1. there is rebirth

Malcolm wrote:

Non sequitor.

TMingyur said:

2. the supporting factor is what is called and known as "consciousness"

Malcolm wrote:

You deny you are conscious?

TMingyur said:

3. rebirth is based on a continuity of what is called and known as "consciousness"

Malcolm wrote:

You deny your consciousness has continuity?

TMingyur said:

4. that the arbitrary categorization of "material" and "non-material" is a valid one

Malcolm wrote:

You can question Buddha's differentiation between matter and mind if you choose.

TMingyur said:

5. based on 4 that "homogeneity between causes and effects" is required.

Malcolm wrote:

If you think that wheat can come from apple seeds, then you gave a problem.

TMingyur said:

But I reject dishonest reasoning which discredits reasoning and which also discredits Buddhism if conducted in the context of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not shown Dharmakirti's logic is invalid. You merely claim it be so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2011 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Agar 35 - strongest stress reliever?

Content:

The Ticking Man said:

I have to take warfarin (coumadin) everyday to prevent blood clots due to my mechanical heart valve. I am interested in taking something like Agar-35 for occasional anxiety, will Agar-35 interact with my warfarin? Besides taking warfarin due to my mechanical heart valve, I am in good health and take no other medications.

Also, where would be the best place to purchase Agar-35 or something similar to it online ?

Thank you in advance for your help.

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/406896_2 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

You would be better off receiving massages for your anxiety on a regular basis, IMO.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Recognition comes before knowing. I.e., if you don't recognize, you don't know.

N[/quote]

Lets say the teacher introduces you ,you cant see it and then you go and practice and then you see it.

That to me is identification of something which was explained to you but not seen at that moment.Once you identify in your experience what the teacher said then the knowing comes.

once you know it then you can recognize it over and over again...[/quote]

When you are introduced, then you recognize, then you know. Game over.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 10:06 PM
Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"
Content:

TMingyur said:
But rebirth neither can be validly proven nor validly disproven. Obviously this causes discontent in the minds of some so that they are willing to even discredit logic.

Malcolm wrote:
Rebirth can be inferred, and inference is a type of pramana. The only people who reject inference as a pramana are materialists and some modern so called "Buddhists" who have a hard time giving up their materialist views.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 10:04 PM
Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"
Content:
TMingyur said:
[

Matter can be transformed into non-material energy. Why shouldn't it be possible that matter is transformed into consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:
There is no such thing as "non-material" energy.

Namdrol said:
The first moment of mind in this life therefore must be dependent on a previous moment of mind from the last life.

Ergo, it is proven through inference that rebirth is a valid teaching.
Now that's a logic that is based on presuppositions that beg the question themselves.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, that is the point. Either one assumes mind has a material cause or not. If not, rebirth is proven.

If so, rebirth is disproven.

It is very simple.

N

Kind regards[/quote]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

kirtu said:

Therefore monotheism does not inevitably lead to warfare and genocide, even through any faith can be corrupted under the right circumstances.

As for war and genocide, please remind us of the Sakya-Drikung war, Mongolian troops traipsing through Tibet *after* their taming began, and so forth. Clearly the followers of Shakyamuni (at least some who profess to follow his teachings) are not immune to instigating warfare.

Malcolm wrote:

Monotheism was born of war and genocide; perpetuates war and genocide, and ends in war and genocide.

Christian monotheism was tempered by accommodation with Pagan cults; but not in its protestant form.

The history of monotheism is the history of the destruction of anything in its path. This is irrefutable. All those minor Christian sects you mention are irrelevant, eddies in the river of destruction monotheisms have wrecked upon human history. Monotheism is inherently imperialistic. If you don't see it, you just don't see it. I don't really have a need to convince you.

During the present day, Islam is the strongest form of monotheism -- it therefore the most dangerous; seconded only by Christian fundamentalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Agar 35 - strongest stress reliever?

Content:

padma norbu said:

I got 2 different pills a while back and just started taking them. "Happiness of Mind" is one pill (for daytime) and Agar-35 is the other pill (for night time).

I had to leave work early due to stress today and decided to take some Agar-35 when I got home. It seemed to calm me down before I even finished the cup. So, now I guess I am a real believer. What I want to know is if this is the strongest stress-reliever in Tibetan medicine. It seems to be more popular than "Happiness of Mind" because I can find a lot of places online that sell Agar-35. I'd like to have the strongest stuff possible to keep at work so that maybe next time I don't have to go home early. It would also be grand if there was something I didn't have to soak in boiling water for 15 minutes and then scoop out and pulverize in a mortar and pestle and then scrape back in, mix up and end up with a very dirty-looking mouth, since this isn't super convenient in an office environment... but, if it's all there is (as opposed to teas or pills you swallow), then it'll do.

Malcolm wrote:

"Strongest" is not how you approach Tibetan herbs. You approach herbs, any herbs, based on your humoral imbalance and what is appropriate for that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul's opinion

Content:

sherabpa said:

Here is a retranslation of a passage from the biography of Jamgon Kongtrul (p.86) in which he laments the way in which people in his time viewed and regarded other traditions. The original translation does not quite make sense.

"These days, even among famous lamas and teachers, there are not many who have a pure regard for the teachings of the sage in general, apart from their own traditions and a few scriptures. There are few who have been willing to study with everyone, whether exalted or lowly, and there is little real knowledge of the dharma. Especially in these later times there are a great many who, while they themselves are not perfectly upright and do not have a spiritual outlook, talk like arrogant bullies about whether a particular teaching tradition is any good or whether a lineage is pure. Never mind other traditions; they are full of qualms and doubts about the basics of their own tradition, like the proverbial one-eyed yak who startles himself."

Malcolm wrote:

You seem really worried about other people's traditions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Namdrol said:

You presented PR as a definitive authority. He is not. The only definitive authority in Dzogchen is one's own guru.

N

sherabpa said:

Is that a particularity of dzogchen or does it apply to dharma in general? Because in general, my understanding of authority in dharma is that it derives from scriptures and reasoning.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Vajrayāna. In Vajrayāna, the authority is one's guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 11:51 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

mudra said:

but then you ended that paragraph with Islam never went through an Enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. It didn't.

mudra said:

You forget, for Moslems, all non-Moslems are automatically "others". You would do well never to forget this.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, for them, we Buddhists are kaffirs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 11:11 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

mudra said:

You say I made a cheap emotional appeal when I asked if my background made me tainted - actually I was referring back to the beginnings of this tangent when it was discussed how the overwhelming numbers of MUSLIMS (not the Qur'an) in Europe posed some kind of threat. I spoke from my personal experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, what was suggested was that the increasing immigration of Muslims into Europe made Europeans feel threatened, thus leading to the present xenophobic reactions of some Europeans that reminds some other Europeans of the fascist era.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 10:49 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

kirtu said:

Methinks your suspicions re: monotheism has run away with you. Monotheism is a perfectly valid and valuable medicine when not used by people intoxicate with power lust.

Malcolm wrote:

Monotheism inevitably leads to warfare and genocide.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2011 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

kirtu said:

But don't you think that these claims of hegemony are serious exaggerations? After all, Christianity is no longer trying to take over the world.

Malcolm wrote:

Been to the bible belt lately? The imperial ambitions of Bush Admin. was intimately tied to a Fundamentalist read of history.

kirtu said:

Why do you think that Islam in general has that as a serious goal?

Malcolm wrote:

Empire is a meme built in all Abrahamic religions. All it needs a little water, and sunlight, and it comes right out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, single payer in VT is awesome. The insurance companies have long avoided VT because VT insisted years ago they could not discriminate on a whole list of criteria. So very few companies will do business in VT -- proving these companies are only interested in ripping people off.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: single taste of freedom

Content:

Will said:

One of the flaws (fatal it could be) in the USA republic is that it requires an active, informed citizenry. When only 50% (maybe less) of voting age people vote and understanding of the basics of American history & government is feeble (and getting more so), then we get what we deserve. Indifference & ignorance rule; (not to mention our old friends greed & anger.)

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but I don't agree with this pov. I vote, and every time either the person I voted for turned out to be a fraud or was cheated out of office.

So, I am educated and informed and has decided that governments in general, in this day and age, are not good for democracy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

sherabpa said:

No one was angry because of Patrul Rinpoche's point of view. Some people might have been annoyed because of how you presented Patrul Rinpoche POV.

Please can you explain the distinction? I'm not aware I added to or subtracted from Patrul Rinpoche's advice. On the whole I merely quoted him.

However I understand this topic is sensitive, and I don't want to be accused of attacking anyone and nor do I intend to violate the rules of the forum, so if there is any danger of that please just let me know and I will behave accordingly. I would like to understand the acceptable parameters of debate here.

Malcolm wrote:

You presented PR as a definitive authority. He is not. The only definitive authority in Dzogchen is one's own guru.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

I make no statement on you.

I plainly don't know you at all, not enough certainly to make judgements on your personal perspectives.

YOur statement in the context it is found can certainly be read as I read it. I explain and do attest to that.

This is exactly, without qualification a tea bagger statement..."..." Anyway, what we can agree on is that the US govt. can screw up any good idea. Our entire government is completely incompetent on the federal level.

Any tea bagger would be quite OK with that statement. NOt just OK fervently support it. You qualify it now...good. Then I do agree...that is a qualifiable statement to which must be added this additional context displayed so it may not have unintended consequence of interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

I have decided that federal govt has been kidnapped by aliens (corporations) and I no longer will support it in any way. Elections do not work, the whole electoral process is corrupted completely. It has become a total joke.

Politics in this country is a complete charade.

I voted for Obama, but he was replaced by a pod person.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Not to be able to rest in Trekchod is not (abiding in) the natural State, with the result no visions.

Namdrol said:

Visions can arise even without tregchö. This is why tregchö is so important for severing attachment.

N

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Yes without the base Trekchod is no visions possible.

This because the appearing of visions is due to emptiness aspect which is inseparable connected to the visions.

People who would practice only Trekchod would disappear without leaving a trace. Here is the emptiness aspect seen whereas I thought in the Thodgal is the clearness aspect like lights seen..... So I try to say that they are not as a "not union" seen Trekchod and Thodgal and so without Thodgal no visions.

People who dwell in the mood of dualistic things like attachment should return to the kordo Rushens and Semdzens etc. and set up here more herewith their base more than used as Trekchod as a remedy against attachment etc.

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Tregchod is not a remedy against attachment. Tregcho is complete freedom from all attachments.

But if one is working with for example second vision and one loses one mindfulness and becomes attached to visions, this is a big problem, and it does happen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

Why do you think the Dalai-lama is wrong on this issue?

Namdrol said:

HHDL is about as expert on Islam as Dechen is by your standards outlined above. You just happen to like what he says.

N

tobes said:

Is Dechan going to Harvard to meet with top scholars of Islam? Having conversations about Islamic jurisprudence?

No?

Then there is a pretty manifest difference in terms of knowledge.

This may be more speculative, but I would say in terms of insight as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing that Dechen cannot also read.

I have read many books about Islam. Virtually all sympathetic or written by scholars fluent in Arabic. I have many friends who are ex-Muslims, Iranian and otherwise.

Their attitude about Islam is much different than yours. They regard the religion of their birth with horror.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

I agree with all those statements, singularly considered... however this is your initial point..." Anyway, what we can agree on is that the US govt. can screw up any good idea. Our entire government is completely incompetent on the federal level.

The US government at the present time is a homogenization of past effect and present cause. Social security veterans affairs and others are well functioning well run programs. It is not the government that is screwing up good ideas nor is the entire government incompetent.

That is confusing present intent and partial result with completely fulfilling intention and result.

MORE aptly it would be called corporate influence on governmental affairs to a negative effect result of means of governmental operations and capacity.

Identifying it in the preceeding manner does infer and continue the pretense of government being innately inefficient and inept.
Governments are neither necessarily by design intention nor result.

The innateness of present government inefficiency is a self induced one. YOur statement does not infer any of that initially.

Malcolm wrote:

Inefficient does not mean inept that is not an equation I drew. You inferred incorrectly from my statement, assuming that I was coming from a teabagger fox "news" perspective.

I am not.

I am a deep ecologist/left biocentrist. A hippy tree hugger.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

Why do you think the Dalai-lama is wrong on this issue?

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL is about as expert on Islam as Dechen is by your standards outlined above. You just happen to like what he says.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 8:58 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Not to be able to rest in Trekchod is not (abiding in) the natural State, with the result no visions.

Malcolm wrote:

Visions can arise even without tregchö. This is why tregchö is so important for severing attachment.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Well I still disagree..

if you want government to be perceived as inefficient and inadequate you create the mechanisms where as it fulfills your prophecy.

A katrina happens you make FEMA such a corrupted organization filled with political appointments it can not serve in the least to fill its function.

YOu dessimate a SEC so it cannot for a moment stop a inexorable bend of the corporate community to corruption in things financial.

.

Malcolm wrote:

You are proving my point.

Our government is corrupt. Not the least of which is because the "two" party system is a complete joke. Only wealthy people can get elected, etc.

So, I turn my back on the feds. They can't help anyone. You wait, it is only a matter of time before they dismantle Social Security, etc.

Big Gvt. is in cahoots with Big Business. It is not like it was in the 40's and 50's.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

So support this thing, this notion of government inefficiency at your peril.]

Malcolm wrote:

You don't understand my POV.

Govt. Inefficiency is fine. It was designed into the our system of govt on purpose.

But at this point our govt. has gotten way out of control, patriot act, this act that act, tax laws no one can understand that change every year and consistently favor the wealthy and corporate interests., etc.

Defense budgets that are way out of control, etc.

The whole edifice is built on years of incompetence.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

ChNN also uses example of tuning in a radio or a TV to proper station.

Astus said:

And if we use that example it's the radiowave I don't really see.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to be tuned to the right channel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Namdrol wrote:

Teaching tregcho and thogal as separate is a later expedient. It was not taught that way in the beginning.

Tashi delek,

Wat would be the advantage of teaching Trekchod and Thodgal as separate or sequential?

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:

It is felt that for some people, there will be too much attachment to appearances unless they are very stable in tregcho first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Adhinatha wrote:

This part is weird, because it seems like seeing the basis in Tregcho is the path of seeing and the lights in the first appearance would be the path of meditation.

Tashi delek,

The meditation in Dzogchen is to be in the Natural State, which is united with Thodgal.

That is the base to experience the first Lamp with its related Visions.

I guess that would be the right following order of Trekchod and Thodgal. I know that some schools teach Trekchod and Thodgal as separate, but i did learn this as united in the Bon Dzogchen. This means that within the abiding of the Natural State the Visions are self emanated and are in that way inter related.

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Teaching tregcho and thodgal as separate is a later expedient. It was not taught that way in the beginning.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

My statement is not that corporations want or do not want to privatize.....some things they do and some they do not. As general ideology they want to privatize all that is not defense.

My statement is that I find things federally not incompetant. To my opinion that is corpratese, indoctrination by the media interests to serve corporate interest, that way of thinking. I see this overtly and covertly all the time.

A example of a finely administered program or two is...the veterans adminstration and social security. Social security provides the exact amount of monies to the right peoples very many million times a month with hardly a error year after year.

Incompetant....no way under the sun.

Media has us think government is incompetant. For agenda

Malcolm wrote:

Programs are one thing -- but when I say government, I means the lunatics in charge of the asylum on capital hill. I mean that in a completely bipartisan way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

adinatha said:

This part is weird, because it seems like seeing the basis in Tregcho is the path of seeing and the lights in the first appearance would be the path of meditation. I'm not versed in the traditional breakdown of the four appearances and the five paths, but I've heard it said the correspondence is loose, because Toga/Yangti is so fast. No?

Malcolm wrote:

The first vision resembles the path of seeing because one is seeing "dharmata" directly. It is actually heat on the path of application because at this stage one's understanding of emptiness is still inferential, according to Khenpo Ngawang Palzang, Chatral Rinpoche's guru.

One reason it is considered "like" the path of seeing, etc. is that when one is engaging in the first two visions, one's coarse obscurations dissolve. In common mahayana and vajrayana this only happens after one realizes the actual path of seeing. This is a special feature of togal.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

catmoon said:

Ok fine. Nonetheless there must have been a moment when the pickup truck came into existence. That first moment of existence must have had a cause. By the law of similar causes, the cause in question must have been a pickup truck, not a daffodil. Therefore the pickup truck had a prior existence, a previous life.

Malcolm wrote:

In reality "pickup truck is, like "catmoon", a designation. Pickup truck designates as an assemblage of parts. Those parts are all based on serial process and continuity. The

steel in a pickup truck cannot come from plastic, etc.

The difference between a pickup truck and a mind is that a mind is a single substance (dravya). You can assemble a pickup truck out of parts where there was no pickup truck before, only parts. Minds however, are not like that, they are naturally arising entities, not constructed entities. When we talk about "namdrol" or "catmoon" we tend to be referring to all five aggregates, not just the mind that we possess.

Our mental aggregate does not arise from our material aggregate because there is a difference of kind in terms of substance. A pickup truck will never give rise to a mind stream. Without our interference in metals and plastics, there would never be a pickup truck.

No one however created our mind, at least, not as far as anyone can tell. We can rule god out, evil demons ala Descartes, chance (since then a mind could arise from a pickup truck and daffodils from cobras), etc. Since our mind is not a fabricated entity (unlike a truck, but like a metal ore) its causation and result is a pure result of its own natural processes. Since it has no beginning, so far as anyone can tell, its past cause must be a moment of mind.

Now, you might feel that mind arises because of neural activity of the brain and nervous system. You can believe that if you like, but there is no proof for this. If you do not accept that mind has material causes, then it must have a mental cause.

According to the Buddhist logical model, a person who does not accept a material cause for the mind (and in ancient India there were many people who asserted physicalism) must accept that mind has a mental cause. Since another mind cannot be the cause of our own mind (for all kinds of reasons) the only possible remaining alternative is that a previous moment of mind lead to this moment of mind in a serial continuity which has no beginning.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

catmoon...that is the standard buddhist rationale for rebirth.

catmoon said:

Sorry but I'm not buying any arguments from authority, nor am I interested in following lemmings off a cliff. Let's see some logic here.

Malcolm wrote:

you can figure it out for yourself. The principle is homogeneity between causes and

effects.

It is very simple. Work it out on your own.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is based on the logical notion of homogeneity between causes and effects.

So yes, this instance of a pickup truck is based on a previous instance of a pickup truck and not a honda or a mind.

N

catmoon said:

So you believe that there is rebirth of pickup trucks? That perhaps a pickup truck might come back as a semitrailer if it is very good?

If not, why not?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say I believed in the rebirth of pickup trucks.

What I said was that there is a serial continuity between the previous instance of a pickup truck and this instance. Pickup trucks do not have minds, since they are solely material entities i.e. non-sentient.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

catmoon said:

Even recalling past lives is not proof of rebirth. If you can somehow do a double blind experimental verification of what you recall, (preferably with the verification done by honest skeptics) that might constitute proof.

Namdrol said:

Rebirth is proven through inference in the following way:

Mind has either a material cause or a non-material cause.

If mind has a material cause, one has to prove this, etc.

Buddhists reject that mind has a material cause, and assert it has a mental cause i.e. a previous moment of mind.

The first moment of mind in this life therefore must be dependent on a previous moment of mind from the last life.

Ergo, it is proven through inference that rebirth is a valid teaching.

N

catmoon said:

I do not find this at all convincing, because the same line of reasoning can be applied to a pickup truck, ie

Buddhists reject that the truck has a mental cause, and assert that it has a material cause, i.e. a previous moment of truck

The first moment of the truck's existence must be dependent on a previous truck-existence

Ergo, it is proven through inference that rebirth of pickup trucks is a valid teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

It is based on the logical notion of homogeneity between causes and effects.

So yes, this instance of a pickup truck is based on a previous instance of a pickup truck and not a honda or a mind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

IN fact if all in the purview of the federal government was privatized and run by corporate interest

Malcolm wrote:

Why would the corporations want to privatize everything? It is much better for them to

externalize costs of doing business on taxpayers. They run things without having to be responsible. And the incompetent boobs in the house and senate let them get away with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

sherabpa said:

I am sorry to hear people behaved in that way. It is a shame because the discussion was interesting. I must admit I was a little surprised when some members started getting quite angry as a result of mentioning Paltrul Rinpoche's views on ngondro practice.

Malcolm wrote:

No one was angry because of Patrul Rinpoche's point of view. Some people might have been annoyed because of how you presented Patrul Rinpoche POV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

catmoon said:

Even recalling past lives is not proof of rebirth. If you can somehow do a double blind experimental verification of what you recall, (preferably with the verification done by honest skeptics) that might constitute proof.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth is proven through inference in the following way:

Mind has either a material cause or a non-material cause.

If mind has a material cause, one has to prove this, etc.

Buddhist reject that mind has a material cause, and assert it has a mental cause i.e. a previous moment of mind.

The first moment of mind in this life therefore must be dependent on a previous moment of mind from the last life.

Ergo, it is proven through inference that rebirth is a valid teaching.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

TMingyur said:

There is no valid inference of the truth of rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

If course there is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

Will said:

Heruka: the amount of tyranny you tolerate, is equal to the amount of tyranny you get. And when people are used to countless little coverings before tyrannical officials, and those officials have nothing to fear from plain folks, then real intolerable tyranny will begin.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean that way it has been since Kaiser introduced the concept of private HMO's to america?

Anyway, what we can agree on is that the US govt. can screw up any good idea. Our entire government is completely incompetent on the federal level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

Heruka said:

John D. Rockefeller IV wants it, obama presents it.

Why is that so hard to understand?

ive done my research....the insurance companies on the bailout government doll, wrote

the bill.
lol.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, to protect their profits. SO therefore,there is no single payer bill.

But VT has passed a mandate to put single payer into practice. The HMO's are freaking out at this. This is not what they want. Managed care is a total joke. Anyway, millions of americans already get single payer health care -- they just has to just join the US armed forces.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

adinatha said:

I'm trying to understand you, Namdrol la, correctly here. Correct me if I don't have this right, please. Body of light is an inner realization where nothing changes in the physical body, right?

Malcolm wrote:

As I understand it, yes.

adinatha said:

One can achieve dzogchen's definition of samyaksambodhi by realization of the body of light, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

adinatha said:

So one would have a physical body just like before, and one would have attained the non-abiding buddhahood of kadag chenpo in this body on this Earth. Is this right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

adinatha said:

Then, the body of great transference or the body shrinking at death, for example, is the natural dissolution of the elements into the five wisdom lights; it is at this point when one, according to the texts, looks at the lights in one's hand and maintains a form, or

one doesn't do that and the form is gone. Is this right?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the elements are already in the form of the five lights of wisdom even now. The only difference is that we don't perceive their actual nature. Body of light is our perception of the elements reverting to wisdom light.

adinatha said:

Then what accounts for the omniscience?

Malcolm wrote:

The six abhijñās that develop naturally as one works through the four visions. The third vision corresponds with path of seeing in common mahayana.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: lower back pain

Content:

alpha said:

it is in lower back ...yes...and it concentrates in the middle of the lower back...

Malcolm wrote:

Moxa, massage or acupuncture or a combination will help this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Plugging it in makes it work. Transmission is like the plugging in a device. Here you are plugging in your continuum to the living continuum of realization which comes from Samantabhadra to you.

Astus said:

Very plastic metaphor, and lineage is central in Vajrayana, I understand that. I was looking for a different kind of explanation but I can accept that it is something that doesn't exist. Thanks for the help.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN also uses example of tuning in a radio or a TV to proper station.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

You don't think what is relevant?

Astus said:

My personal relationship with Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

it is very relevant. In fact it is the key to the whole discussion.

You have not understood in fact what transmission means.

You can think of it like this. You have a device, it has a plug. If it is not plugged in, even though it has all potential to function it will not function.

Plugging it in makes it work. Transmission is like the plugging in a device. Here you are plugging in your continuum to the living continuum of realization which comes from Samantabhadra to you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: lower back pain

Content:

alpha said:

I have no back injury...

The pain usually occurs when i bend in particular way and then i get stuck .It is a very sharp pain .Is so sharp that i cannot stand straight and i usually let myself fall...I cannot really say with accuracy what sort of bending causes it...because it is a little different every time..it could be forward...on one side...etc..

And Is not related to physical work....heavy lifting...etc...

Malcolm wrote:

Is it in lower back?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

I've participated in Dzogchen transmission both face to face and DC's webcast, but I don't think it is relevant.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't think what is relevant?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: lower back pain

Content:

alpha said:

About twice a year i experience severe lower back pain ,pain that it is so severe that i am imobilized in bed.When in bed there is no pain...

This pain shoots down the leg ,on the extremities and sometime on the front part of the legs..

When this happens i go and see an osteopath and that seems to fix it...They think its a mechanical problem and related to stress also..

I would like to know if there is a remedy from the tibetan medicine perspective for this problem and whether can be treated ?

Is this an energy imbalance, or spirit possession...i would be curios to know?

Thanks..

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have a lower back injury?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Pero said:

The teacher is not necessarily in that state all the time. So if you listen to a recording,

who knows what the teacher is doing. Without the teacher there cannot be a direct transmission. I'm repeating myself but I'm not sure how to explain it otherwise to you.

Astus said:

OK, the teacher has to be in the state for the transmission. Why? What difference does it make from the perspective of the student who either gets it there or not, perhaps realises it months later without the presence of any teacher. Why is a teacher needed there? Is there no explanation? Just because?

Malcolm wrote:

Astus:

You are wasting everyone's time with this question.

Dzogchen is a Vajrayana system. The Guru is indispensable.

If you want transmission, you must get it from a Guru. Live.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

No, it is because I see very clearly that the religion contains a deep and systematic moral theory of virtue ethics, a political philosophy of community harmony and a fundamental soteriological message of **universal** peace.

Namdrol said:

Right, one peaceful, ethical, harmonious world under Islam.

No thanks.

N

gregkavarnos said:

Oh I dunno, one peaceful harmonious world under Sufism wouldn't be that bad!

Malcolm wrote:

Not into religious hegemony of any kind, including Buddhist religious hegemony.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

No, it is because I see very clearly that the religion contains a deep and systematic moral theory of virtue ethics, a political philosophy of community harmony and a fundamental soteriological message of ****universal**** peace.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, one peaceful, ethical, harmonious world under Islam.

No thanks.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

Absolutely I admit this.

The distinction between us, which I think is very profound, is that whilst I am attributing these rhetorical movements to perverted, extremist and very marginalised interpretations of the text, you have consistently claimed that these interpretations are central to the text and the religion itself.

:

Malcolm wrote:

That is because you are an apologist for a pernicious religion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

You're murdering the very idea of history here....and, I might add, the logic of dependent origination.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all -- I just don't subscribe to effete and ineffectual "nuanced" politically correct interpretations of Christian and Moslem history.

And history, as we know, is written by the conquerers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, it just means that two people have to be in a process of communication with each other.

Astus said:

In response to this (phone call) I said that at the time of a webcast (or even in a live session) the audience listens to the teacher and does not talk to him/her, so there is no communication between two people but communication from one person to the others. Of course, there is a room later for a Q&A part.

Malcolm wrote:

That is communication between two people, a speaker and a listener.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

padma norbu said:

Nature of Mind to nature of Mind... There is reflection. Reflection means instantaneous sparks of awareness. It might last. It might not last. Mind to Mind transmission means that the nature of the teacher's mind and the nature of the student's mind are identical in that moment.[1] The noise produces the shock that creates the space in the mind for transmission to occur.

So someone said before that space is not a concern, but time is an issue and for that reason you can't learn from a recording. This is a mind-to-mind transmission, right? So,

what if we compare it to telepathy (for kicks). If you accept the idea that someone can mentally "speak" to you, would you expect also that they could put that on tape for you to listen to later?

I know this isn't a brilliant point and has nothing to do with the three kayas and how transmission actually occurs, but if you think of it this way, it's not very hard to understand, imo.

[1] I got this from Aro website, which may or may not be suspect (I don't know), but this made sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:
IT's bullshit.

Mind transmission simply means that the student understands the point of master is making at the same time the master is in that state. They are in the same recognition or understanding. There is telepathic communication or anything like this.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 3:41 AM
Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen
Content:
Namdrol said:
Who said that Dzogchen is not communicated through conventional means?

Astus said:
Webcast happens in a video format. If it must be live and can't happen through a record there must be some extra beyond conventional means. That's what I'm inquiring about, that non-conventional part.

Malcolm wrote:
No, it just means that two people have to be in a process of communication with each other.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 3:12 AM
Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen
Content:
Nangwa said:
How then can the Dzogchen transmission communicate something without conventional means? I know you said it's difficult to explain, but perhaps it's not impossible.

Malcolm wrote:
Who said that Dzogchen is not communicated through conventional means?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes.

Astus said:

What?

Malcolm wrote:

What transmission means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

Is it something I'm not getting?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2011 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Space and Dzogchen

Content:

Hayagriva said:

No one have something to say? I thought it was an interesting topic...

Malcolm wrote:

it is, that is why can't say much about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Nyingma practices in Sarma lineages?

Content:

conebeckham said:

It is said that Marpa did not fail to recite the Tsik Dun Sol Deb (7 Line Prayer to Guru Rinpoche) daily.

.

Malcolm wrote:

That's funny, since it had not been revealed yet when Marpa was alive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

This is just nonsense.

Absolutely no understanding of the theological underpinnings of monotheism, and perversely, the intense kinship all three traditions have had ostensibly through Aristotle.

Namdrol said:

Who cares what philosophical justification Christianity and Islam use? Theological underpinnings have nothing to do with the systematic ethnic cleansing that both Christians and Muslims have engaged in. Theology is just their excuse. Theology is bullshit anyway.

tobes said:

Fine, so if it is not theology motivating violence, then what is it?

Political causes and conditions?

If that is the case, then your argument should not be against Islam or Christianity as religions, but the historical-material-political forces which produce violence.

That would be a wise position: for example, the current instability in the Middle East therefore related to colonialism, the west's addiction to oil.....realist politics. Islam thus playing merely a rhetorical role in all of this. In which case, why are you attacking it, and not colonialism, American consumption and geo-political strategies?

Malcolm wrote:

Christianity and Islam are both based on an historical interpretation of the role of God in human history and lay claim to a unique and privileged position vis a vie divine sanction. Much of their respective theologies is organized around justifying their respective claims to empire based on a specific reading of history that stems from the divinely sanctioned ethnic cleansing found in the old testament.

Islam and Christianity both attempt to seal their dominance by declaring an end to

divine revelation, thus securing themselves the position of final authority in all matters both religious and mundane.

Both C and I are reactions and accommodations to the Hellenization of the Ancient World.

As for your last point, I have and do attack "...colonialism, American consumption and geo-political strategies".

However, "...colonialism, American consumption and geo-political strategies" is just an outgrowth of the Western Spirit, and thus the endgame of Christian empire politics. The religious impulse driving these politics is not longer relevant, but the ethics and the precedents driving them are still in force because of protestant values that drove the rise of capitalism to begin with. Like monotheism, capitalism and communism are both hegemonic economic systems driven by economic imperatives which derive from the same religious psychology that drives their predecessors, Christianity and Islam.

The impulse to both religious and mundane empire is present in the Koran.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

I'm sure you'll find a way to say that this is irrelevant, but it's not. There's far more cross fertilisation than most people assume, and any knowledgeable person from those three traditions recognises and appreciates this.

Namdrol said:

The nature of monotheism is imperialistic in general. Where only one god is regarded as valid, everything else is false.

N

Pero said:

Hehe well Buddhism is not a monotheistic religion and it regards everything else as false too.

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. Part of Buddhism is the vehicle of gods and men. It leads to higher rebirth. These are not false, just not liberative in an ultimate sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

What's astounding about this is your sense that all monotheists work with the same (imperialistic) conception of god.

Malcolm wrote:

The monotheistic impulse is merely a reflection of the human desire for empire. One ruler. Concentrated Power. Hegemony.

tobes said:

Forget about thousands of years of debate, and an almost infinite collection of positions on what the idea of god might actually mean.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all just intellectual bullshit. There is no god. So who cares what arguments people have about it. It is like arguing over the horns on a rabbit.

All that is of interest is the fact that given a chance, Muslim culture will seek to obliterate all others in its centuries long quest for world domination. And those it choose to permit to exist, get taxed. Can you imagine? Taxing others because they follow a faith different than yours?

At least Christianity has been neutered by secularism. That was my point in the beginning. I still stand by that point. Why do you think Christian fundamentalists in the US are trying to put Christian theology back into the school system as "creationism" etc.? Fundamentalist Christians know their balls have been cut off by science. So they are trying to destroy science. Next step: The Theocratic States of America.

All of this stems, as I said, from the human quest for empire.

At least materialism is more honest.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:
username,

Thanks for the long response. Unfortunately, and this may be my fault, I don't see how it explains what I'm asking about. What I'm asking is simply the connection. It's like there are two computers and I'm asking how they are connected. I can't find in your answer that connecting relation. This I assume is important because that's why a live transmission is OK but not its recorded version. So it is the connection, not other parts I'm asking about.

Malcolm wrote:
Hi Astus:

Can you have a phone conversation with a recording?

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:34 PM
Title: Re: Nyingma practices in Sarma lineages?
Content:

udyan said:

I want to find out which Sarma schools/sub-branches or particular teachers are known to incorporate Nyingma teachings ?

Malcolm wrote:
All of them.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:24 PM
Title: Re: Is the 'e.coli' epidemic a gNyan disease caused by Spirits?
Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Do you have any idea on how is the process, Namdrol? This spirit influences the generation of this new aggressive type of e. coli? Is it something intentional or just a by product of the activity of this sort of spirits? Can you explain this a little further? Let's imagine such is not a coincidence and in fact there's a connection. How would that work? The spirit's activity influences the characteristics of the bacteria when it reproduces bringing about a new strain or something?

Malcolm wrote:
By product.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

4. The statues were not blown up during the Taliban reign (nor during the Mujahadeen reign) they were blown up well after the US invasion (during the reign of Karzais puppet government) as a reaction to, and a "ha-ha-suck-on-that" move against, the American invaders.

Malcolm wrote:

What are you talking about? The Bamiyan Buddhas were destroyed in march 2001. Months before 9/11.

Get yer facts straight.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

So my logic is a thinly disguised psychologism, and yours the word of truth. How very convenient.

Malcolm wrote:

I will say it again, Abrahamic religions started out on the basis of ethnic cleansing. They still do it where ever they can, whenever given a chance.

Yawheh etc., are tribal gyalpos. Shugden on steroids.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

This is just nonsense.

Absolutely no understanding of the theological underpinnings of monotheism, and perversely, the intense kinship all three traditions have had ostensibly through Aristotle.

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares what philosophical justification Christianity and Islam use? Theological underpinnings have nothing to do with the systematic ethnic cleansing that both Christians and Muslims have engaged in. Theology is just their excuse. Theology is bullshit anyway.

tobes said:

Al Farabi (and other Islamic scholars) influenced Maimonides (Jewish who wrote in Arabic, deeply engaged with Muslims) - both influenced seminal Christian theologians such as Aquinas.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know, and so what?

This has nothing to do with the main point, which is that monotheisms are pernicious ideologies that ultimately cannot permit other religions to flourish around them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

I'm sure you'll find a way to say that this is irrelevant, but it's not. There's far more cross fertilisation than most people assume, and any knowledgeable person from those three traditions recognises and appreciates this.

Malcolm wrote:

The nature of monotheism is imperialistic in general. Where only one god is regarded as valid, everything else is false.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:35 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

adinatha said:

But I would never live in a Muslim country. It would be impossible to be Buddhist there.

One of the conditions of a precious human life is living in a place where Buddhism may be practiced. Living in a Muslim country would prevent that.

Malcolm wrote:
Exactly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:33 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

adinatha said:

Note the prefix: re-cognition. One can only recognize what has already been seen. Perhaps introduction, then knowledge, then practice would be the recognition.

Or, there is a background knowing--The Mother. And then teacher pointing is re-cognizing--The Son. Then ignorance would be knowing, but ignoring. But it can't be ignoring to the point of forgetting with impossibility of remembering, because the buddha-nature has no coming or going. It can't be lost.

Buddha-nature is not like memories. It doesn't accumulate or dissipate. Therefore, recognizing in the sense of re-knowing is right.

Malcolm wrote:
Whatever, introduction, etc.

The point is aimed at the idea that we somehow forgot our real condition which we somehow knew before.

My point is that this is impossible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Is the 'e.coli' epidemic a gNyan disease caused by Spirits?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:
deleted

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Is the 'e.coli' epidemic a gNyan disease caused by Spirits?

Content:

orgyen jigmed said:

According to a seminar given by the late Dr. Trogawa (2005) alleges that: " The ancient medical scriptures consists of 18 Chapters dealing with gNyan diseases and speaks about 4 or 5 in detail; it lists a total of 7 diseases that would emerge in modern times, the first being cancer, the second being AIDS". He then goes on to say that " Violent and aggressive gnyan diseases are always caused by spirits ".

Can we hypothesise that this mysterious bacterial 'e.coli' epidemic as being one of these "7 diseases" caused by the gNyan?

And would someone knowledgeable possibly elaborate more on these "7 diseases that would emerge in modern times "?

Reference:

<http://www.rinpoche.com/teachings/nyen.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

All rims gnad are caused by provocations. It is axiomatic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

James418 said:

I'm not really that far from this position. I think if people reject the teaching outright, they are wrong. But I would add that people who "believe" it are also wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

Inferential acceptance of rebirth is not a belief, per se. It's a kind of pramana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Astus said:

Dzogchen teaching recalls us to the open nature of all things, the natural state we have never left, yet have somehow forgotten."/i]

Namdrol said:

This is a stilly statement. We never knew this natural state, had we known it, we would have never entered into samsara.

N

Sherab said:

'Known' but not recognized and thus forgotten?

Malcolm wrote:

Recognition comes before knowing. I.e., if you don't recognize, you don't know.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 7:59 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[

ronnewmexico said:

A example...a secular nation with equality of religion. Balance upset by british and US intervention. A dictator is enthroned. The result of this mileau, the dictator is overthrown....a theocratic totalitarian regime is result with a drastic interpretation of Islam.

Speaks to the nature of the religion???

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, of course.

ronnewmexico said:

Does the present theocracy believe it is right on the mark as far as the koran is concerned...certainly. Do the Tamils think they are right on the mark as concerning the buddhists of sri lanka...sure they do. Did the Christian crusaders think they may get papal dispensation enableing them to kill and eat muslim bodies when in need...sure they did.

None of this nor other speaks of the religions and what may be found or not found in them.

Malcolm wrote:

it is pretty clear that Mohammed was not a nice person. Not sure Jesus was such a nice guy either.

I don't really give a flying crap about these religions since they are based on delusion anyway.

I do care about the incredible harm both Xianity and Islam have wrought on the world throughout history. In particular I care about the fact that Islam hates Buddhism:

In Islam, širk (Arabic: شرك) is the sin of idolatry or polytheism. It refers to the deification of anyone or anything other than the singular God.[18] Shirk is also associating partners with him, giving his characteristics to others beside him, or not believing in his characteristics.[18][19]

Within Islam, širk is an unforgivable crime; God may forgive any sin except for committing širk.[18][20] It is the vice that is opposed to the virtue of tawhid, literally "declaring [that which is] one", often translated into the English term monotheism.[18][19]

As in the other Abrahamic religions, in practice the term has been greatly extended and may be used very widely within Islam to describe behaviour that is deprecated, including the use of images in a way that is seen as un-Islamic, but does not literally constitute worship.

For example, terming the Buddha omniscient is an example of "shirk".

So now a) can't leave Islam. Islam is a prison sentence for anyone born in a Muslim country. B) Buddhists and Hindus are all going to hell. Not even God can forgive us. Nice religion. Perfect control structure. if you can control people with their beliefs, you don't need external power structures.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 7:19 AM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

"... the natural state we have never left, but have somehow never known" would have been good, though.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am happy to call respected teachers wrong if they are wrong, tell people who do not know enough they do not know enough, etc.

Rebirth is not an option in Buddhism. Any one who says it is, is teaching Dharma incorrectly.

N[/quote]

Well, to be clear I'm not saying that rebirth is an optional part of the teaching. I'm simply saying making it a bar to people being Buddhists is wrongheaded. As long as it remains part of the teachings, they will have to learn to live with it. In other words it's up to them and their practice. I have just never known a teacher being happy ever to come in and demand belief is all.[/quote]

Telling people that reject rebirth they are not really Buddhists is ok. But one cannot force anyone to believe anything. People believe whatever they want.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

Heruka said:

key word is controlling costs...i.e.....controlling your health care, what you have access to.

Malcolm wrote:

That how it is now.

The reality is that the health care system in our country is not oriented towards giving health care. It is oriented toward profit.

Private healthcare has resulted, over all, in less accessible health care for everyone but the wealthy.

For a tiny fraction of the amount of money we spend on war every year, we could give every person in this country full cadillac health care plans for free.

Why is that so hard to understand?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 6:46 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

James418 said:

By implication what he is saying is that he knows better than respected teachers, and that has been what I find hard to stomach. If you don't agree, you are a heretic. When you challenge his views your teachers are wrong, or heretics, or you don't know enough, and the Dharma is coming to an end and it's all terribly sad and so on. It really is silly.

Malcolm wrote:

I am happy to call respected teachers wrong if they are wrong, tell people who do not know enough they do not know enough, etc.

Rebirth is not an option in Buddhism. Any one who says it is, is teaching Dharma incorrectly.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

Maitreya is specifically a buddhist figure and that example was used for purpose to exemplify that.

There is no way under the sun the chinese revolts of those days cannot be seen as directly related to buddhism as the figure the future buddha is exactly a invention of buddhism. And scale....I have already described the scale....dwarfs the US and other revolutionary wars.

Malcolm wrote:

The Maitreya Millenialism in 6th century China was not Buddhist.

ronnewmexico said:

Monastic infighting....can be found in many areas and times as you well know.

Malcolm wrote:

Very rarely did such infighting lead to wholesale wars anywhere but in Japan. Never in India. Almost never in Tibet.

ronnewmexico said:

A war to spread buddhism.....depends upon perspective. The tamil tigers will and their supporters do in fact state that.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tamils were introduced to Shri Lanka by the Brits as workers. This is much more like Northern Ireland than anything else. Eventually it became about religious identity. But it did not start that way. There was no war to spread Buddhism. There was a war to protect a Buddhism country, from the perspective of the Sinhalese.

ronnewmexico said:

That speaks not of the religion nor of the wars...neither is found either to be what it is stated to be.

Malcolm wrote:

Muslim religious wars were fought to make converts as well as \$\$\$.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Ron,

There is just the Teachings of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, and that includes rebirth. Without rebirth, Buddhism is just a new age fad.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 6:32 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

James418 said:

In later philosophy the Middle Way, as defined by Nāgārjuna at least, was that which is dependently originated is empty and that in itself is the Middle Way.

Malcolm wrote:

This idea is not original to Nagarjuna but comes directly from the The Inquiry of Katyayana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: What is your feeling on other traditions?

Content:

Pero said:

"All" does not include teachers not related to dharma.

Namdrol said:

It does. It includes whatever beneficial knowledge you are received in your life. At some level, it is all Dharma.

You are confusing this idea of unifying all teachers into Guru yoga with the principles of refuge. Not the same. Your refuge is the three jewels, you are unifying all teachers and knowledge into the three jewels, so there is not problem.

Pero said:

Hmm, you have an interesting take, could you please provide something to back this up? Because I'm afraid that I otherwise can't change my mind so easily since in the Precious Vase kun 'dus yid bzhin nor bu is mentioned in two places. Ironically (since you say I'm confusing GY with refuge), one is in the section on Mahayoga Guru yoga (p223) and there the note says to look in the section on refuge (p103). And there it doesn't say what you're saying at all, there is no mention of anything not related to Buddhadharma.

Next to that, Norbu Rinpoche said this many times, yes, but never have I heard him say to unify teachers not related to transmission. In fact I heard the opposite, that we don't have to unify for example our carpenter teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

We do not have to do anything. In any case, I have personally heard him say that one can unify all one's teachers, including non-Buddhist teachers, in the three jewels. He said this in the 1992 SMS base retreat. Perhaps he has changed his opinion since then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

The politicians control the interpretaion of the koran as they see fit to enforce their totalitarian rule.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just an apology because you cannot refute what is a fact in the hadiths. Can't come up with a good response? Blame politicians since we all know they are crooks.

Anyway, Islam is quite totalitarian. Since there is no priesthood in Islam, the injunction to kill apostates is a duty which any moslem can take upon themselves. Put them in a

room. Give them three days to recant. Then if they do not, murder them. Nice. Definitely keeps Muslim exfiltration low.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

The extension of that thinking may be found in the book zen at war which I think is still in print. It provides the basic rational and point of view of the Japanes invasion of the chinese mainland and other areas of asia in recent days prior too ww2 from those buddhists who supported those things that resulted in much hatred and violence.

A minority certainly. But Buddhists of lineage did support that thing.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think they used the jataka tales to support their POV. Brian Victoria's book pretty clearly lays out how they perverted Buddhist teachings with a nihilist interpretation of Zen. This aberration has far more to do with Meiji restoration cultural instability than Buddhism per se. A better example for your thesis would have been the monastic wars of the 12th and 13th century in Japan.

In any event, such occurrences are notable exceptions.

For example, you earlier brought up Chinese Maitreya millennialism; again, this type of aberration is a huge exception and had more to do with Chinese culture than Buddhism.

Certainly Buddhist have engaged in waging wars, but I cannot think of a single historical example of Buddhist waging a religious war against non-Buddhists. Can you?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

That tale is used to support violence.

Malcolm wrote:
Please provide an example.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 5:32 AM
Title: Re: What is your feeling on other traditions?
Content:

Pero said:
"All" does not include teachers not related to dharma.

Malcolm wrote:
It does. It includes whatever beneficial knowledge you are received in your life. At some level, it is all Dharma.

You are confusing this idea of unifying all teachers into Guru yoga with the principles of refuge. Not the same. Your refuge is the three jewels, you are unifying all teachers and knowledge into the three jewels, so there is not problem.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 5:30 AM
Title: Re: What is your feeling on other traditions?
Content:

Pero said:
It contradicts our teachers instructions, as far as I've understood them anyway, and it doesn't really make much sense.

Malcolm wrote:
Hi Pero:

it is what ChNN has said, many times.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 5:25 AM
Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?
Content:

ronnewmexico said:
So, now it's up to you to provide us scriptures from the Buddhadharma that incite

people to violence and hatred out of superiority. This is a dare.

Best wishes, my friend!

But this is so easy as to be pathetic...

.

Malcolm wrote:

You did not refute the point. There is nowhere in Buddhadharma where people are incited to violence and hatred. The Sea Captain Jataka tale is not an example of violence and hatred, rather it is the opposite.

On the other hand, apostate Muslims run the risk of being executed if they should declare their conversion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Please provide a citation for that claim, Namdrol. It would be good to back up such statements, yes?

Malcolm wrote:

Qur'an

The Qur'an states that God (in Arabic, Allah) despises apostasy, with severe punishment to be imposed in the hereafter, but not mentioning explicitly any earthly penalty for apostates. Except 16:106-109, the verses that discuss apostasy all appear in surahs identified as Madinan, that is, they belong to the period when the Islamic state had been established, whereas traditional Islamic scholars have proposed that the prophet needed more time and/or power to legislate death as the penalty for apostasy.[citation needed]

The Qur'an contains verses from which it can be inferred that apostasy is not a capital offence.[33]

[edit]Sunni hadith

Examples of Sunni Hadiths that sanction the death penalty for apostasy include passages in the Sahih al-Bukhari include Sahih al-Bukhari, 9:83:17, Sahih al-Bukhari, 4:52:260, Sahih al-Bukhari, 9:84:57, Sahih al-Bukhari, 9:84:58 and Sahih al-Bukhari, 9:89:271.

The two most popular Hadiths usually cited by orthodox Islamic clerics to support the

death penalty for apostates are:

"Allah's Apostle said, "The blood of a Muslim who confesses that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that I am His Apostle, cannot be shed except in three cases: In Qisas for murder, a married person who commits illegal sexual intercourse and the one who reverts from Islam (apostate) and leaves the Muslims."Sahih al-Bukhari, []

"Whoever changed his (Islamic) religion, then kill him" Sahih al-Bukhari, 9:84:57

[edit]Shia hadith

Some Shia Hadiths also sanction the death penalty for apostasy. For example, one of the shia Imams has been asked about a Muslim who has converted to Christianity, he answered "he should be killed not called to repent", and when asked about a Christian converting to Islam then converting back to Christianity, he answered "he should be given the chance to repent, otherwise killed" (Al-Kafi 7:257 | 10), (Men la Yahthuruh Al-Faqeeh (Whom an Islamic Cleric is not attending) 3:91 | 341), and (Tahtheeb Al-Ahkam (Rectification of the Rules) 10:140 | 554).[34]

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apostasy_in_Islam "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Apparently Mohammed advocated killing apostate muslims.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Any Muslim can do the same. Nobody is forced to belong to a certain religion... or is it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, Islam forbids conversion to other faiths. It is an offense which carries capital punishment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Jangchup Donden said:

Don't get me wrong. I'm well aware of the problems facing Islam (as well as the other monotheistic/abrahamic religions) as a whole, as well as the problematic things in their scriptures. I just don't think you're particularly skillful in discussing it.

Malcolm wrote:

No need to be "skillful", just need to speak plainly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

This is really a repugnant analogy: you're suggesting that there is something inherent in the nature of Islam...

Namdrol said:

Yes, there is: monotheism i.e. a totalitarian utopian fantasy. Monotheism in all of its forms is the scorpion which stings any population upon which it rides.

Monotheistic religions are inherently violent and wicked. The fact that there are kind, intelligent people in monotheistic faiths just not change the basic imperialistic and totalitarian aspects of these faiths. Islam is just another of these. The reason why it is in competition with Christianity is that two monotheistic faiths cannot long accommodate each other without one asserting dominance over the other. But neither has room for religions like Hinduism or Buddhism.

Islamic accommodation and tolerance of other faiths, like that of Christianity, is pragmatic -- it is about money. That's it.

N

gnegirl said:

Actually, i think its all about power. Religion with political stuff all mixed up in it is rather dangerous. Pick any religion with an enshrined power structure, and you'll see what i mean.

Its like tribal politics all blown way out of proportion and taken to the ridiculous with the abrahamic religions.

Malcolm wrote:

It's worse with monotheistic faiths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2011 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Looking for seeds

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

BT world seeds is a very good company.

arisaema81 said:

I have done a quick search and could only find a bulk supplier and the site looked a bit suspect (B and T World Seeds). Where do you live? It appears that it is a Zone 10 plant using the USDA system which means that it is only hardy to 30 F or -1 C , or in other words it is not hardy for toffee. If you are able to get some fresh seed or plant material then you may be able to grow it as a house plant but I guess that you will have to prune and train the plant due to its large stature.

It may be easier to try and buy a plant itself and go from there. Good luck in your search..... I love plants

Arisaema

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2011 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: What is your feeling on other traditions?

Content:

padma norbu said:

1. In Dzogchen we visualize the guru as all our teachers. I have asked numerous times if this means people from other traditions as well and the answer I invariably get is: "ALLLL teachers."

Malcolm wrote:

it means all teachers and all knowledge, not just Buddhist knowledge.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2011 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

alpha said:

then how can you "recognize" the natural state since you have never know it before..?

Malcolm wrote:

You receive an introduction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2011 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

Astus said:

Dzogchen teaching recalls us to the open nature of all things, the natural state we have

never left, yet have somehow forgotten."[/i]

Malcolm wrote:

This is a stilly statement. We never knew this natural state, had we known it, we would have never entered into samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2011 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

This is really a repugnant analogy: you're suggesting that there is something inherent in the nature of Islam...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is: monotheism i.e. a totalitarian utopian fantasy. Monotheism in all of its forms is the scorpion which stings any population upon which it rides.

Monotheistic religions are inherently violent and wicked. The fact that there are kind, intelligent people in monotheistic faiths just not change the basic imperialistic and totalitarian aspects of these faiths. Islam is just another of these. The reason why it is in competition with Christianity is that two monotheistic faiths cannot long accommodate each other without one asserting dominance over the other. But neither has room for religions like Hinduism or Buddhism.

Islamic accommodation and tolerance of other faiths, like that of Christianity, is pragmatic -- it is about money. That's it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2011 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Doctors, please read

Content:

Namdrol said:

The instructions are for precious pills. These are not precious pills.

Agar 35 should be taken in the evening before bed. Sems bde or "happiness of mind: should be taken in the morning. Both with hot water, half an hour before a meal.

If you do not have anxiety, depression or some other mind disorder, you don't need these.

Pero said:

Do these pills have an expiration date? I still have some Agar 35 that I got a year or two ago and never finished because I disliked the taste too much hehe. Vimala was much easier to swallow.

Malcolm wrote:

Roughly four years

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2011 at 10:52 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Doctors, please read

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The instructions are for precious pills. These are not precious pills.

Agar 35 should be taken in the evening before bed. Sems bde or "happiness of mind: should be taken in the morning. Both with hot water, half an hour before a meal.

If you do not have anxiety, depression or some other mind disorder, you don't need these.

N

padma norbu said:

I got these Tibetan medicine pills called Agar-35 and "Happiness of Mind." They are supposed to help balance everything out and put one in a calm state which is conducive to meditation, basically. They work gradually over time and it's not like you pop a pill to chill out. It balances pitta and whatever (I'm no doctor).

Check out these instructions: There are specific guidelines given in preparation for taking the different Tibetan pill formulas and specifically the Precious Pills. Among these are that this pill should not be exposed to direct sunlight or bright artificial light, it should be taken on days with no extreme output of energy for three days prior to beginning and four days following taking the precious pill. Refrain from sex & excessive exercise, coffee or black/green tea or alcohol, red meat, eggs, shell fish, raw fruits or vegetables, fried, pungent or sour foods, smoking extreme hot or cold baths or showers. Mild intake of food, avoiding garlic, onion and black olive.

Prepare a room by blocking the windows and doors so that direct light cannot enter. A candle may be used for light when necessary. The night before, remove and crush the Precious pill or pills and then place in boiled water in a clean unchipped glass and cover with a white cloth and place it at your bedside allowing it to soak over night. On this evening it is particularly important to dress warmly and be warm during sleep. Early the next morning one should drink the mixture after stirring it thoroughly with the clean ring finger while reciting the Medicine Buddha Mantra. This should then be followed by drinking a cup of warm, boiled water. All the while not leaving the darkened room for

twenty four hours. Bathroom should be darkened (candle is ok) when needed.

Reciting the Mantra of Medicine Buddha is suggested while opening and taking the medicine. The mantra is: Om Bekanzi Bekanzi Maha Bekanzi Bekanzi Radza Samu Gate Soha! (phonetically ~ OM beyconzee beyconzee Mawhaw Beyconzee Beyconzee Rawdza Sawmoo Gawtay Sohaw). Reciting this mantra 108 times in a series of seven times 7x108 is also recommended during this 24 hour period. A mala would be needed for this to help you count and keep track of the mantra count.

Remember when taking this precious pill it should be a time of deep rest and gentle meditative contemplation ~ this attitude will assist in the alchemy of healing involved. I am supposed to take 2 pills a day of each over a long period of time, like a few months. Based on these instructions, that is something that could only possibly be achieved by people with no job or who are on a long vacation like a 3-month retreat (and hopefully it's a Medicine Buddha retreat).

Additionally, it seems they got the Medicine Buddha Mantra wrong, didn't they? Here's the one I'm familiar with: Tayata Om Bekandze Bekandze Maha Bekandze Radza Samudgate Soha.

Here's theirs: Om Bekanzi Bekanzi Maha Bekanzi Bekanzi Radza Samu Gate Soha
I have bolded the differences. Google turns up no results at all for their version of the mantra.

My question for the doctors is: is this a bit extreme overkill here?

Agar-35 can be bought a few different places, so I assume some Tibetan Doctors are familiar with it, if there are any doctors here. I can't imagine a regular medicine such as this requires you to block a week off your calendar and 24 hours in a dark room every time you take a pill which you are supposed to take consecutively for a few months.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2011 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

ronnewmexico said:

I say stop this nonsense talk about islam.....or prove what is contended is true.

Malcolm wrote:

Islam, like the other two monotheistic religions, has a violent past.

Just read history.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2011 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A frog and scorpion were trapped on a island in a flood and the water was rising fast. The scorpion, being unable to swim, asked the frog, "Please let me ride on your back, as I will surely die if you don't".

At first, the frog refused "If I let you ride on my back, you will sting me!"

The scorpion replied "Why would do that? If I sting you, I will certainly drown".

Somewhat reluctantly, the frog agreed and allowed the scorpion to scuttle onto its back and set off across the water.

Halfway across, suddenly the scorpion stung the frog. While dying the frog asked "Why did you do that, you have condemned us both to die!"

Before slipping under the water, the scorpion replied "I could not help it, it is my nature."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2011 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

You can have a recorded teaching -- but you cannot receive transmission from a recording.

Astus said:

That's why I ask what the difference is between a live webcast and its record. If no transmission is possible through a record what makes the live one special? IIRC there were video cassettes used before online transmission. But even if the teacher simultaneously takes part without being seen or heard by the student, how is that relevant to those sitting in front of a screen?

Malcolm wrote:

The recording merely served to synchronize the teacher and student in time.

The live webcast means everyone is participating at the same time. And please, let's not get into silly discussions about network latency and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2011 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:
Astus said:
Namdrol,

So technically it is OK to have a recorded teaching, right? Then books are practically the same.

DN,

Intention is quite an internal thing, I don't see how its simultaneity has any relevance. Plus there is always a delay in transmission, even if just a few seconds.

Malcolm wrote:
You can have a recorded teaching -- but you cannot receive transmission from a recording.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 30th, 2011 at 9:55 PM
Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen
Content:
Astus said:
How does a live webcast differs from a record, if at all?

Malcolm wrote:
A recording is not alive.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 30th, 2011 at 9:43 PM
Title: Re: Why is Buddhism so appealing to educated Caucasians?
Content:
Luke said:
1. Why do you think it is that Buddhism is so popular among educated white people?

Malcolm wrote:
It is because we are educated.

Luke said:
2. What can be done to make Buddhism more popular with other races of people and with less-educated people?

Malcolm wrote:
Educate them.

Luke said:

At first, the effort to "liberate all sentient beings" is mere words, but we have to strive to live up to it as closely as we can by continually developing our ability to benefit and feel compassion for more and more types of sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Interest in Buddhism is an issue of one's karma it has nothing to do with race, education, or even culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Now my question is really this : can one really be said to be practicing a path as sophisticated as Dzogchen via book and webcast?

Namdrol said:

Yes.

mindyourmind said:

Would the student not reach a stage where s/he would have to get person-to-person teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

Define "person to person".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2011 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Electronic Dzogchen

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Now my question is really this : can one really be said to be practicing a path as sophisticated as Dzogchen via book and webcast?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2011 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Pero said:

Is there any particular reason for that?

Malcolm wrote:

Gnosis is probably a better word, but out of habit I use wisdom.

But both are just placeholder terms to some extent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2011 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Islam must be understood on the basis of what it is, as presented objectively in the Koran, Hadith and Sira

heart said:

Let apply that to Vajrayana and see what you get

http://www.trimondi.de/EN/Kalachakra_2011.htm "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; . In an other thread here someone wondered why Sakya Trizin didn't kill the Chinese army since he is a Hevajra practioner, with a clear reference to the Hevajra Tantra. Go study Islam with a qualified teacher is my advice if you want to understand the meaning and make the kind of statement that you do about Islam and the Quran, reading hateful rubbish on the internet is not the way to study any religion.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The failure of your critique here is that there are no non-definitive statements in the Koran, nor is it a coded text, nor of indirect meaning and so on. The only defense Muslim scholars have these passages is that they are related to historical episodes during the life of Mohammed. But this is not really made clear in the Koran itself, a book supposedly written by Allah whose every word is held to be infallible.

You cannot say the same of most Buddhist highest yoga tantric texts i.e. they are coded,

not be taken literally, etc. Now, we can argue about whether they once were meant to be taken literally -- but it seems unlikely.

So, there is miles of difference between the false critiques of the trimondis and cherry picking statements out of the Koran and hadith that encourage violence against kaffirs like we Buddhists.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2011 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Pero said:

Well I guess the problem is similar as with rig pa. What translation do you like instead of wisdom?

Is primordial knowledge better?

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2011 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

We are convinced that the word knowledge has something to do with memory and intelligence and that is all based on the Mind of Karma.

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

rig pa does have something to do with dran pa, actually.

For example, in this passage from the dgongs pa zang thal explanatory tantra:

For both of that, first, because memory (dran pa) arose, there no terror through panic or fear. Since vidyā (rig pa) recognized itself (rang ngo shes), there was no grasping to clarity. Since wisdom arose to vidyā, [12/a] it naturally formed as the dharmakāya. Since the energy of that wisdom arose in the ten directions, the sambhogakāya arose...

But this is not based on karma.

Further, clear memory arises through being moved by wind that rises in the basis that is not established as any sort of entity. Vidya arises without being lifted by the vāyu of conceit. Since it is not moved by the wind that causes movement, objects and mind are not divided into two. Since it is not moved by the karmic vāyu, samsara does not develop.

There is a clear progression in the snying thig texts that describes first memory (dran pa), then rig pa, and in this case, this memory and knowledge is not involved in samsara in any way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2011 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

Just a quick question:

I sent an email last week to my local DC chapter about membership and the precious vase, but haven't received an answer yet. Does DC membership go through the local communities or do I have to send an email to an other higher gar?
I can't order the book until I am a member.

Thanks,

Malcolm wrote:

If you are in US etc, you can become a member here:

<http://Tsegyalgar.org/support/onlinemembership/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

In Europe including UK:

http://www.dzogchen.it/registration/index.php?metodo=new_reg&lang=en "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2011 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is that you and mudra do not fully understand what term "awareness" really means in English. So therefore, you are stuck on an obsolete translation.

So, there is no point in further discussion.

As long as you understand what rig pa means for yourself, you can call rig pa "george".

N

kalden yungdrung said:

Namdrol wrote:

If you are aware of the basis as a something, then you immediately fall into samsara.
This is the problem with using the term awareness for rig pa.

Tashi delek,

- If Awareness of the Natural State is seen, with a non-egocentric mind, then this does belong to Fruition Rigpa. Fruition Rigpa is Awareness that has had a direct and stable experience of Emptiness.

- The mind of karma has an ego-centric mind, this does belong to path Rigpa. Path Rigpa has a mind which has intellectually understood emptiness and here does Rigpa mean, Intelligence.

Here is for me clear that Rigpa can be understood with the intelligence and the related knowledge OR be experienced which mean to be Aware of the Natural State.
Aware of that Natural State is not seeing that State as done with object and subject.

One special thing of the Natural State is that the Wisdom is self-emanating and is not caused like we know with an object and subject.

Emptiness is like we should know a not born case. So it is always without interruption there, but how do we experience that Awareness which is Yermed with Emptiness. Is it intellectual Rigpa or Awareness Rigpa?

I can imagin myself that intellectual Rigpa can never be Aware or experience the lights of the 4 Lamps.....

Best wishes

KY

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2011 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

Such a narrative requires a bizarre view of causality which demonstrates that all political actions (empires rising and falling etc) stem from texts, and not from an unbelievably complex and infinite chain of events (of which, ideas are only one element).

Malcolm wrote:

All it requires is an understanding that texts are products of cultures which then reinforce and support cultural norms. In a world where there was only Islam, everyone would get along just fine.

No one is pretending that there were not interesting philosophers, physicians, historians and poets produced by Islamic high culture. Genocidal Hebrews also wrote the Song of Solomon.

Human cultures contain contradictions.

Some of those contradictions are deadly to cultures around them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2011 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

muni said:

Rigpa on it; knowledge for schoolstudents. There are many Rigpa's and combinations. In 'naked awareness' I see clear as emptiness and awareness. Pure awareness as Rigpa here.

Maybe self-"arising" (already is) gnosis= empty awareness.

Ma Rigpa = state sentient being. (not knowing)

I think the linguistic meaning is less important. Also nature is not in text revealing.

Ah.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Muni:

One of the problems you will face if you insist on translating rigpa as a awareness, is that you will be able to differentiate Dzogchen, etc. from the hindus who are always waffling on about "pure awareness". In reality, "awareness" is a word in english which requires an object.

"Awareness is the state or ability to perceive, to feel, or to be conscious of events, objects or sensory patterns. In this level of consciousness, sense data can be confirmed by an observer without necessarily implying understanding. More broadly, it is the state or quality of being aware of something. In biological psychology, awareness is defined as a human's or an animal's perception and cognitive reaction to a condition or event."

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Awareness> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I know you are not a native English speaker, and so you may not be tuned into usage of English terms. Awareness is always an awareness of something. The basis is not a something. If you are aware of the basis as a something, then you immediately fall into samsara. This is the problem with using the term awareness for rig pa.

Knowledge in the other hand is more ambiguous word in English which actually involves real philosophical issues hence the discipline of epistemology i.e. the study of knowledge qua knowledge.

Rig pa in every sense of the word as it is used in opposition to ma rig pa has to do with knowing as opposed to ignorance. Some have described as the intersection between belief and truth, or "a justified true belief."

In this case, rig pa is justified, because it is based on a personal experience, true, because that experience can be verified by anyone, and a belief because in this case personal experience has lead us to a state personal verification of something that before hand be merely believed.

Anyway, people are free to believe what they wish, justified or not. It is my belief, one I think justified and true, that the English word awareness is not an adequate translation of rig pa almost every case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2011 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Namdrol said:

Ye shes is normally translated as wisdom or primordial wisdom, but some people these days, following John Pettite and Richad Baron are liking primordial awareness for this.

Pero said:

To me, "wisdom" was always very ambiguous, primordial awareness is much clearer.

Malcolm wrote:

It isn't really, since ye shes is not an awareness of any kind, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Do not know about right or wrong here, sorry.

But JLA knowing, he is seldom "wrong".

Best wishes

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

IN this respect, he is wrong. Completely wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

If JLA could prove his case then what would be the result?

[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

As i have explained, Achard is wrong. ChNN does not translate rigpa as "presence".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

But if the Lopons take over a word without knowing that word, that is what i doubt.....

Malcolm wrote:

That is what Achard accuses ChNN of doing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Coming back on Rigpa in the sense of Rigpai Yeshe.

- rig-pa'i ye-shes - the knowledge which is immediate Awareness

- Can one compare this Knowledge with the self illuminating Wisdom which is aware of itself?

- It seems to originate out of the Base / Zhi, when abiding in the Natural State, when i understood it well

Best wishes

KY

Namdrol said:

rig pa'i ye she, the wisdom of knowledge.

This wisdom only arises after there is recognition of the basis and the knowledge of the basis that ensues from that recognition.

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek

See in in another following order.

At first learning and studying the Dzogchen (Rigpa = Intelligence). Then practice like Kordo Rushan etc. and the Natural State.

Then Awareness comes with the 4 visions related to the lamps. This experience cannot be seen as based on knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

People are aware of the four lamps all the time without knowing (avidyā, ma rig pa) what they are. We all have eyes, channels, inner dimension and outer space and these four always produce wisdom appearances whether we know what they are or not.

It is only when they know (vidyā, rig pa) what they are and how to use them in practice, that wisdom develops or rather, is unveiled.

But you see, the reason why when this type of practice is presented to people, we

always start with describing the basis. So they will understand the difference between vidyā and avidyā.

Conversations like these remind me of why it is useless to have them. I have my idea, you all have yours, and never the twain to meet.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Vajrayana practice and psychological disorders

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Must read book:

The Normal And The Pathological:

<https://www.amazon.com/Normal-Pathological-Georges-Canguilhem/dp/0942299590>
" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

"The Normal and the Pathological is one of the crucial contributions to the history of science in the last half century. It takes as its starting point the sudden appearance of biology as a science in the 19th-century and examines the conditions determining its particular makeup. Canguilhem analyzes the radically new way in which health and disease were defined in the early 19th-century, showing that the emerging categories of the normal and the pathological were far from being objective scientific concepts. He demonstrates how the epistemological foundations of modern biology and medicine were intertwined with political, economic, and technological imperatives. Canguilhem was an important influence on the thought of Michel Foucault and Louis Althusser, in particular for the way in which he poses the problem of how new domains of knowledge come into being and how they are part of a discontinuous history of human thought."

orgyen jigmed said:

"gregkavarnos wrote Unfortunately doctors here in Greece dish out anti-psychotics and tricyclics as if they are candy!

Although I need to be careful not to be dangerously irresponsible particularly towards damaging the confidence of service users pertaining the competence of psychiatrists in general, or the reputation of psychiatry, it remains a fact that there exist hidden personal financial rewards and incentives meant for those psychiatrists who can increase sales for the pharmaceutical industry – especially from the promotion of antipsychotic drugs.

Without a doubt, there is a greater role for the pharmaceutical industry in supplying drugs to treat these 'new' disorders. For example, there is now evidence that "every psychiatric expert involved in writing the standard diagnostic criteria for disorders such as depression and schizophrenia has had financial ties to drug companies that sell

medications for those illnesses" (Washington Post, April 2006).

On the other hand mental illness is real, and most psychiatrists neither misuse nor abuse psychiatry. As can be testified by many service users and their families' psychiatry have been found of increasing value. However, while antipsychotics and tricyclics have been claimed to have specific action against psychotic symptoms, some critics also argue they act in a much cruder way by producing a chemical lobotomy or a "chemical straight jacket" which inhibits all creative thought processes.

Nevertheless, it must be emphasised that in severe cases of depression or other serious mental illness these drugs are a necessity not an option, and until they 'kick in' other forms of therapy including psychotherapy such as MBCT - cannot be useful. What I am arguing here is only that while psychiatry and Mental Health Services all over, applauds the role of such drugs in emptying the hospitals, critics such as Moncrieff (1997) argue that they merely helped to replace expensive custodial care with long-term drug-induced control.

References:

Washington Post, April, 2006. "Experts Defining Mental Disorders Are Linked to Drug Firms". <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/04/19/AR2006041902560.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Moncrieff, J. (1997, Summer). Psychiatric imperialism: the medicalisation of modern living. Critical Psychiatry Network. Reprinted from Soundings, 6. <http://www.critpsynet.freeuk.com/sound.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

tamdrin said:

...but I never saw you say anything about Namkhai Norbu's translation of rigpa as "presence" which is really a lackluster translation, many will agree.

Namdrol said:

He does not translate rigpa as presence, as I have explained before. The word he is translating for presence is dran pa, mindfulness.

The word he uses for rig pa is knowledge.

tamdrin said:

While many of his other students who post around here think that he does translate

rigpa as presence. Again awareness can be of relative objects (i.e. being aware of some object).. knowledge can also be of relative objects, having knowledge of such and such field of knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

Also rig pa can mean knowledge. As a verb, it means "to know" when it is used as a verb in Tibetan, never "to be aware". Then there is the rig gnas lnga i.e. the five sciences, the pañcavidyāsthana.

The use of the term vidyā as the opposite of avidyā is very deliberate in Dzogchen texts and relates to the beginning of the cycle of dependent origination. When Samantabhadra knew his own state, the chain of dependent origination, which begins with ignorance, never started for him.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Rigpa in the sense of intelligence, could be equal to knowledge and this is the opposite to no intelligence,

Malcolm wrote:

The opposite of intelligence is absence of intelligence or in this sense, the insentient, the inert.

kalden yungdrung said:

But i cannot help it that many Geshelas, Khenpos, Lopons, Rinpoches etc. maintain the meaning of Awareness when in the Natural State as a word to express Rigpa

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, they do. They are not native English speakers. Not their fault. They do the best they can. The reason every one in the bon po world uses awareness is mainly due to John Reynolds.

But now more and more people are moving away from that translation, in the Buddhist world at any rate.

The bon world is much smaller, and therefore, it will more resistant to change. Also fewer western translators.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

tamdrin said:

...but I never saw you say anything about Namkhai Norbu's translation of rigpa as "presence" which is really a lackluster translation, many will agree.

Namdrol said:

He does not translate rigpa as presence, as I have explained before. The word he is translating for presence is dran pa, mindfulness.

The word he uses for rig pa is knowledge.

tamdrin said:

While many of his other students who post around here think that he does translate rigpa as presence. Again awareness can be of relative objects (i.e. being aware of some object).. knowledge can also be of relative objects, having knowledge of such and such field of knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, he is using the term rig pa to describe one's knowledge of the basis i.e. essence, nature and energy/compassion. When you have that knowledge (vidyā/rig pa) you no longer wander in samsara. When you do not have that knowledge (avidyā, ma rig pa) then you wander in samsara endlessly.

As far as what other people may say who do not know Tibetan, and do not follow his teachings with text in hand, all I can say is that they are mistaken.

Sometimes Rinpoche will translate "shes pa skad gcig ma" as "instant presence", because this uncontrived momentary awareness is the basis of tregchö etc. Then in this case one uses mindfulness as a support for uncontrived momentary awareness so that you do not wander in distraction. In this respect, there is basically difference between mahāmudra meditation, dzogchen and the Sakya "khordey yerge" i.e. the view of inseparability of samsara and nirvana -- they all are talking about the same thing in this respect tha mal gyi shes pa so called "ordinary mind" or "basis awareness".

But rigpa is something else. Rigpa is the knowledge of your state. When you have recognized uncontrived momentary awareness, the knowledge that ensues from recognition is rigpa. When you have recognized the meaning of sound, lights and rays, the knowledge that ensues from recognition is rigpa. Why, because you are no longer in a state of ignorance. The opposite of ignorance is knowledge. The opposite of ma rig pa is rig pa, the opposite of avidyā is vidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

tamdrin said:

...but I never saw you say anything about Namkhai Norbu's translation of rigpa as "presence" which is really a lackluster translation, many will agree.

Malcolm wrote:

He does not translate rigpa as presence, as I have explained before. The word he is translating for presence is dran pa, mindfulness.

The word he uses for rig pa is knowledge.

Why do I know this? Because I frequently follow him with the Tibetan text he is teaching in hand.

But I am not saying that knowledge is the best translation for rig pa in general because he is using it. It is because I have been reading Dzogchen texts for 20 years and finally concluded on my own that "knowledge" was best.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Coming back on Rigpa in the sense of Rigpai Yeshe.

- rig-pa'i ye-shes - the knowledge which is immediate Awareness

- Can one compare this Knowledge with the self illuminating Wisdom which is aware of itself?

- It seems to originate out of the Base / Zhi, when abiding in the Natural State, when I understood it well

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:
rig pa'i ye she, the wisdom of knowledge.

This wisdom only arises after there is recognition of the basis and the knowledge of the basis that ensues from that recognition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 10:20 PM
Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation
Content:
muni said:

Yes, the word what can help the most clear to express its' meaning, is what one can apply. No idea make wholes in "naked awareness", a word of Lama Surya Das.

Malcolm wrote:
IMO opinion the word "vidyā" does not mean "awareness", as I have explained. The term "shes pa" can mean awareness depending on context. It can also mean "to recognize" depending on whether it is being used as a noun or a verb.

Having translated and read thousands of pages of Dzogchen texts, I am very dissatisfied with the use of awareness for rigpa. It should be deprecated, like HTML 1.0.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 10:12 PM
Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Yes the term Rigpa, is a very difficult word to translate, sure when it is related to awareness.

Also is it clear that Rigpa could also be intelligence, that was also one of my earlier suggestion.

Malcolm wrote:
In my opinion, translating rigpa as "awareness" is simply wrong. Intelligence is also not good, again IMO.

In this case, knowledge is best. Why? Because rigpa is opposite to ma rig pa. Knowledge is the opposite of ignorance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

muni said:

Awareness with an added word. Like Selfsprung Awareness, Pristine Awareness, 'inner Pure Awareness and Knowledge', and other to express completeness.

Malcolm wrote:

I know what Sogyal says, and translating rig pa as "awareness" is passe.

Further, just as a simple point of Tibetan grammar, rang gi rig pa means "one's own rigpa", not self-awareness.

rang byung rigpa means "knowledge that comes from oneself i.e. it is based on one's own direct experience.

Ye shes is normally translated as wisdom or primordial wisdom, but some people these days, following John Pettite and Richard Baron are liking primordial awareness for this.

I back translate rigpa in Sanskrit generally, as vidyā unless it is being used as a verb "to know". Adriano Clemente has stopped translating it altogether, which I approve of. However, since we use terms like dharmakāya, etc., for Buddhist Dzogchen texts at any rate, vidyā is another word that is preferable.

On the other hand, we are still very much in the experimental stage and every translator and and so on has their own ideas based on what they understand about the teachings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: How does pleasure arise?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

When we say that the feeling experienced is a consequence of the ripening of karma it may be as simple as saying that if you make the effort to go get a massage from an experienced and capable masseur this action will ripen in a pleasant bodily feeling (unless it is thai massage!) which may then lead to the formation of a positive impression towards the object (the massage) an attachment to the feeling and further

karma (intentional action) on our behalf to repeat the sensation/feeling.

Malcolm wrote:

It is even simpler than that -- since the six sense organs are also a result of ripening, the sensations we experience through them (pleasant, painful, neutral) are a result of ripening.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 9:17 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Nosta said:

Why is it english very precise?

In fact, some languages seem to have lots of more words and that can increase precision on such languages

Malcolm wrote:

Because English has more synonyms than just about any other language in the world because of its diverse roots.

Also it is easy to create English words or adapt English words.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

- First how is knowledge seen of a State which is without recognizing or is more experienced in the sense of " self-iluminating " ?
- So i guess that "knowledge" has the meaning of be aware of that State by study or by realisation of the Natural State which is without "knowledge" of that State.
So Rigpa can/ has also here above mentioned, the meaning of the knowledge which one must have to be able to regognize a certain degree in the Dzogchen Yogas / "meditations".

Further is English sometimes not good enough to make some uusefull Dzogchen translations.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Knowledge comes from recognition. Without recognition, no knowledge.

English is actually a very good language for Dzogchen translations -- it is very precise.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

heart said:

Secondly, disrespecting the second largest religion in the world is a threat to freedom of religion.

Namdrol said:

Now, this is just talking from fear. In a free society one has the right to criticize whatever one likes.

heart said:

I don't know Namdrol, you never seemed very open to criticism yourself so it sounds a bit odd. Criticism without respect, what is that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Magnus:

There are things about the Bible as a whole I do not respect on any level. And I freely criticize them. The same goes for the Koran, or the Talmud, etc. For example, the Talmud opens with all the different ways one may take a wife. One of them is through rape. Can't respect that and won't pretend to. Likewise, I don't respect the Koran when it says that all kaffirs should be killed unless they plead for mercy. I don't respect the endless stories of the Hebrews engaging in ethnic cleansing in the Old Testament, etc. I don't respect the Bhagavad Gita when Krishna tells Arjuna he must fight the Pandavas, his cousins, because it is his "dharma" to be a warrior. etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Nosta said:

After all what exactly is rigpa? Whats the difference between rigpa and nirvana?

Namdrol said:

Rigpa is just your knowledge of your primordial state.

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Rigpa could also be awareness about the / "our" Natural State?

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:

There can be awareness without knowledge but there cannot be rigpa without knowledge. So no, rig pa is knowledge of our state, whatever adjective you wish to use to describe it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Cancer in Tibetan Medicine

Content:

Huseng said:

Are nāgā of the same quality as preta? In that they are non-physical?

Namdrol said:

Nāgās basically belong to the animal realm. They are shaped like frogs, snakes, fish and tadpoles. They are water spirits. In Tibetan medicine, native tibetan ideas about them had intersected with Indian ideas.

Huseng said:

Sounds a lot like the Chinese concept of "dragons" or long 龍 as they are called in Chinese. Some translators used long 龍 when translating nāgā in the past.

In the Chinese concept long 龍 can be responsible for rains, floods and other aqua-related phenomena such as hurricanes. Traditionally rural people would maintain shrines to the local dragon king. I'm unaware if Chinese Medicine ever identified them as provocative entities causing disease. Still, the resemblance is noteworthy.

Malcolm wrote:

it is similar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Cancer in Tibetan Medicine

Content:

Huseng said:

Are nāgā of the same quality as preta? In that they are non-physical?

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgās basically belong to the animal realm. They are shaped like frogs, snakes, fish and tadpoles. They are water spirits. In Tibetan medicine, native tibetan ideas about them had intersected with Indian ideas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Guenther

Content:

kirtu said:

I think he was a practitioner for a German academic of his time.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

he was not a practitioner in any sense at all. He himself even remarked that his books should not be considered representative of Dzogchen itself in anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Cancer in Tibetan Medicine

Content:

kirtu said:

Do the nagas inflict illness on specific people for things they have done or on people less generally in a region or on all people everywhere?

Then how can people pacify the nagas?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgā provocations are pretty random. If you live in an area where there is severe environmental contamination, nāgā diseases can be wide spread.

If someone thinks they have a problem with nāgā there are many things one can do. There are special nāgā pujas, one can practice garuda, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

heart said:

Secondly, disrespecting the second largest religion in the world is a threat to freedom of religion.

Malcolm wrote:

Now, this is just talking from fear. In a free society one has the right to criticize whatever one likes.

heart said:

They are attacking the Quran in it self not how it is interpreted.

Malcolm wrote:

In a secular society, religion is not a sacrosanct dimension immune from critical evaluation. I stand by my right to criticize what it says in the Bible, the Koran, or any other damn book I please.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Nosta said:

After all what exactly is rigpa? Whats the difference between rigpa and nirvana?

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa is just your knowledge of your primordial state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2011 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The US population is mostly Christian. The US Government is not Christian, however. This is well established going back to John Adams, etc.

conebeckham said:

Not entirely clear or well-established, Namdrol...there was no real agreement, and much discussion and debate, about this. Read Founding Faith.

Malcolm wrote:

It is very well established in US Treaty Law. You will recall that whatever is stated in a treaty is regarded as defacto US Law: Adams' Treaty of Tripoli states:

As the Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion,—as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquility, of Mussulmen,—and as the said States never entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mahometan nation, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Most of the info comes from the movie Angry Monk (2005) a biography of Gendun Chopel. There is no mention in the movie about a civil war.

Malcolm wrote:

I was referring to the feudal reaction that was spawned by Chophel leading a nascent democratic movement in Lhasa in the 1940's.

gregkavarnos said:

1993 population statistics show 69% Buddhists, 15% Hindu, 8% Muslim and 8% Christian. So what is the government based on those stats?

Malcolm wrote:

The US population is mostly Christian. The US Government is not Christian, however. This is well established going back to John Adams, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Of course there are degrees of tyrannical oppression. But for me the fact that there was

a subteranean dungeon for dissenters in the Potala palace says quite a bit about the state of affairs in pre-occupation Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he was imprisoned on the Sheol jail. Not in an underground dungeon in the Potala. Who is feeding you this nonsense?

gregkavarnos said:

Anyway, do you think that as Tibet moved into its own secular enlightenment it would not have sparked off a civil war between supporters of the theocratic feudal society and progressive democratic forces?

Malcolm wrote:

This was already happening, why do you think Ganden Chopel was tossed in jail?

gregkavarnos said:

Relic or not it was a Buddhist government (and their Tamil enemies) that were responsible for 26 years of civil war and bloodshed (80-100,000 dead, 60,000+ wounded).

Malcolm wrote:

Sri Lanka does not have a Buddhist government. The situation in that country is complicated. This situation resembles Northern Ireland more than anything else.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Cancer in Tibetan Medicine

Content:

Namdrol said:

Cancers, according to common Tibetan medicine, are mainly caused by maldigestion, injuries and disturbances of the humors.

However, there are another class of cancers that are caused by nāgas and so on. So it depends on the type of cancer. Malignant cancers are often considered to be driven by provocations.

rai said:

Would any wrathful yidam practice be a ultimate panacea for all negative provocations or it should be particular deity connected to the class which caused the provocation? For example would you advise someone who is doing practice of Hayagriva to do

additional practice of Red Garuda if he has being diagnosed with cancer?

Thank you again!

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Dragphur is a kitchen sink deity for all. Otherwise, Red Garuda is best.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Cancer in Tibetan Medicine

Content:

Namdrol said:

Malignant cancers are often considered to be driven by provocations.

kirtu said:

What are provocations?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

When nāgas and so on are provoked, they respond by inflicting illnesses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The question remains will Muslims in the long run value a secular society more than a religious one? If so, then there is no worries. If not, then we should be worried. The same thing goes with Fundamentalist Christians in US trying to turn US into a "Christian" nation. There are many places in US where I am not comfortable admitting I am a Buddhist.

N

heart said:

Yes, this is the real problem, protecting the secular state. Freedom of religion within the confines of a secular states laws will in the long run protect the religions from becoming political.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

This is what I was trying to point out above. We have a secular tradition in the west

brought about first by the Enlightenment and then supplemented by the Scottish Enlightenment based on a long history of documents like the Declaration of Independence, the English Bill of Rights, and so on.

What worries everyone is the strong theocratic tendencies evinced by modern fundamentalists.

I am also suspicious of Buddhist utopian fantasies like the Shambhala mythos which seems tailored right out of Plato's Republic. I am not in favor of rule by so-called philosopher kings. While I love HHDL as a person, the political institution of the Dalai Lamas was a grand failure in every sense of the word for Tibet. The government of Tibet by high lamas proved inadequate to conditions on the ground.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Cancer in Tibetan Medicine

Content:

rai said:

Dear Namdrol,

Could you please write something about causes and conditions of cancer according to Tibetan Medicine? Is cancer mainly caused by provocations from one of the 8 classes?

Thank you!

Rai

Malcolm wrote:

Cancers, according to common Tibetan medicine, are mainly caused by maldigestion, injuries and disturbances of the humors.

However, there are another class of cancers that are caused by nāgas and so on. So it depends on the type of cancer. Malignant cancers are often considered to be driven by provocations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Huseng said:

The darker the night, the brighter a spark seems to glow.

Why the pessimism in this regard? You don't think Chinese and Theravada groups in the west are thriving?

Malcolm wrote:
Ethnic Buddhism does not have a future in the West.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 9:24 PM
Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
For all those doubting Buddhists capacity for concentration camps I would recommend anything by, or about, Gendun Choepel

Malcolm wrote:
Oh come on, the Kashag's imprisonment of Gendun Chopel may have been wrong, but it is a far cry from Dachau.

gregkavarnos said:
(and I won't even go into the Sri Lankan treatment of the Tamil minority).

Malcolm wrote:
Another relic of British Colonialism...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 8:46 PM
Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?
Content:
Pero said:
If I remember right, Norbu Rinpoche has a past life memory of him and other dharma practitioners around him at the time being massacred by Muslims. And considering this religious freedom you speak of is not so easily available where Islam reigns I don't think it's hard to understand why he says so. (edit: btw, what I remember is him saying "be careful")
You can't compare him to Ole though. Rinpoche's advice was just to keep one's practice/orientation secret, and I think this was also in general not just because of Muslims, so that people from other religions don't cause problems for you. Ole on the other hand seems to speak with delight about stuff he did to cause problems for Muslims.

heart said:
I am NOT comparing ChNN to Ole. I consider ChNN one of my teachers, since I practice some of his stuff every day. Ole is a bad joke for me.

What I said was that Ole is echoing (and most probably distorting) what some of the older and younger Lamas also say. Even if they are my teacher, like ChNN, I still think that saying these things is something that will threaten religious freedom and a secular society that protect the rights of everyone. Going down that road means opening up concentration camps and doing mass deportations and most possibly a global war. That makes me sad. However I still trust his Dharma teachings. It is a long time since I expected my teachers to be omniscient.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The question remains will Muslims in the long run value a secular society more than a religious one? If so, then there is no worries. If not, then we should be worried. The same thing goes with Fundamentalist Christians in US trying to turn US into a "Christian" nation. There are many places in US where I am not comfortable admitting I am a Buddhist.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

The jury is still out about the pretended effectiveness regarding the destruction of Tibetan Buddhism. Only time will tell. Western society fails to deliver many of the conditions that existed in Tibet.

Huseng said:

Outside the Tibetan Buddhist community, Chinese and Theravadan groups seem to be doing reasonably well in western countries.

Malcolm wrote:

The darker the night, the brighter a spark seems to glow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 11:18 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Jangchup Donden said:

You can either beat them with wisdom and compassion...

Namdrol said:

That really did not work too well for Buddhists against the Huns, Hindu Kings, Muslim invaders and the PLA.

N

Jangchup Donden said:

We're still around aren't we?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, scattered like ants when their home is destroyed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 10:12 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Jangchup Donden said:

You can either beat them with wisdom and compassion...

Malcolm wrote:

That really did not work too well for Buddhists against the Huns, Hindu Kings, Muslim invaders and the PLA.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 10:07 AM

Title: Re: How does pleasure arise?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, are you saying that the things we experience are pleasant, unpleasant, and neutral , or that in our mind the experience is pleasant, unpleasant, and neutral (because of our own karma)?

Malcolm wrote:

Our sensations of phenomena are pleasant, painful or neutral because of our past actions.

All sensations are a ripening of action.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 5:04 AM
Title: Re: Spreading the Dharma in Africa?
Content:

Luke said:
Buddhists need to remember to care about all races of people. The desire to help liberate ALL beings from sufferings shouldn't just be mere words we recite.

.

Malcolm wrote:
If Africa as a place has the merit to support Dharma, then it will flourish there. If not, then not.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: H.H. Sakya Trizin - Cambridge, MA
Content:
Namdrol said:
He will give the lung for these prayers, and an empowerment of Padmasambhava, cycle TBD.

mr. gordo said:
Do you know which long life empowerment will be given on the last day?

Malcolm wrote:
From Thanthong Gyalpo

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 2:52 AM
Title: Re: How does pleasure arise?
Content:
catmoon said:
Consider the blazing hot food some people enjoy so much.

Consider the rugby player enjoying his rough and frequently painful game.

Or consider that there are people who actually dislike chocolate.

The pleasure and the torment are all in the mind. One way or another we choose it to be as it is.

Malcolm wrote:

The sensations of pleasure and pain from all of these activities are solely the ripening of karma and nothing else.

Karma of course begins with intention, but it ripens on both mind and body.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: How is "Self-Originated" Defined in Dzogchen?

Content:

mr. gordo said:

How are the definitions for "self-originated" explained in terms of dependent origination? I may be misreading it, but it seems to go against dependent origination if for example, "X" arises without causes and conditions.

Pero said:

Could you clarify this Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

Self-originated here is referring the dharmakāya. It is not dependently originated. The term svayambhujñāna, self-originated wisdom (self-originated wisdom), also means a wisdom that comes from your own state, that cannot be created, cannot be shown to you, and comes from oneself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: How is "Self-Originated" Defined in Dzogchen?

Content:

mr. gordo said:

For example, as you know in some of ChNN's practices, there are mantras that are "self-originating"...So how does Dzogchen explain "self-origination" in that context?

Namdrol said:

They arise directly from the sound of dharmatā. For example, song of the vajra is the dgongs pa, samati i.e. transcendence or realization of Samantabhadra.

mr. gordo said:

Thanks Namdrol. Do you know why this differs in Sarma lineages?

Malcolm wrote:

Mantras in sarma lineages are either invocations of a samboghakāya dimension, like for

example the Hevajra mantra, or action mantras.

Dzogchen mantras are not invocations nor are they for actions. They are a direct means of being in in one's primordial state.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: No Proofs of Successful Rebirths?&Are Pure Land sutras real?

Content:

Nosta said:

Yes, i agree with Lastlegend: well spoken Rory

Rory, did you have more "evidences" of pure land/Amida/Medicine Buddha existence, besides the ones you told us (about your health problem and healing, etc)?

The ones i had i already told them here. But i can resume it again. I also must tell that in my case they are not exactly what i would call as "strong" evidence.

Anyway, here goes:

1- There was a time when my recitation was intense and then i had a very detailed dream of something that happened. The dream was about something improbable to happen and a few hours later it happened. This thing (dream & happen) occurred 2 times. And when i say 2 times i am talking about dreams about very specific and improbable things.

2- When i do nembutsu i feel some kind of inner peace that i wouldn't consider normal, because it's almost like a "physical" peace, peace that is really touching me. I can't explain.

3- I had a physical problem (tinnitus) and maybe because of my recitations (Medicine Buddha mantra) i got healed. I didn't expect to get healed of such problem, given many aspects of the disease itself. But as i said, i cannot say exactly what was behind the healing process (pharmacology? Medicine Buddha Mantra? etc).

Malcolm wrote:

it is said that if one recites the dharani of Bhaisajyaguru Buddha seven times everyday, one will be reborn in Medicine Buddha's pure land.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2011 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: How is "Self-Originated" Defined in Dzogchen?

Content:

mr. gordo said:

For example, as you know in some of ChNN's practices, there are mantras that are "self-originating"...So how does Dzogchen explain "self-origination" in that context?

Malcolm wrote:

They arise directly from the sound of dharmatā. For example, song of the vajra is the dgongs pa, samati i.e. transcendence or realization of Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: How does pleasure arise?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

I hope more people bring their own thoughts to this discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

It is really quite simple, all pleasant, unpleasant and neutral experiences are "retribution" i.e. the ripening of past karmic acts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2011 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: How does pleasure arise?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All pleasurable, painful and neutral sensations are the ripening of karma.

N

reynard80 said:

Lately, my mind has been full of this question: what is pleasure? How does it arise?

How is it possible that I experience an object as either pleasant or not-pleasant? If all objects are inherently empty, there can be no inherent pleasure or non-pleasure in objects.

Then, is pleasure only a thought of the mind? I.e. I experience an object, then *think*

'this is pleasant', resulting in a 'pleasant' feeling? If so, why do I think some objects as pleasant, and others as non-pleasant?

Of course, these questions are probably ultimately irrelevant, but they have been bothering me for some time now. Maybe someone can shed some light, in terms of buddhist philosophy.

Thank you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2011 at 7:13 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

benchen said:

The female tulku Jetsuma in USA is doing it.

She is fake tulku or real tulku ?

And some high tulkus , nyingma yogi lama with consorts whom I do not want to name here , is ordaining monks and nuns.

You guys information are not updated.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not real monks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2011 at 7:12 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

catmoon said:

A couple of additional thoughts...

As our world steadily becomes faster, noisier, and more hectic, the monasteries may become the only places one can go for some spiritual peace.

Malcolm wrote:

Spiritual peace comes from freedom from afflictions, not from buildings, monastic or otherwise.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2011 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Community in Western Buddhism

Content:

Jñāna said:

The Ugraparipṛcchā Sūtra also goes on at some length instructing the householder Ugra on how a householder bodhisattva should reflect upon the many drawbacks and faults of the household life, as well as how to reflect in order to develop detachment from one's wife and son. None of the reflections are flattering (to put it mildly).

All the best,

Geoff

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, I have read it. But attitudes of Buddhists and the attitude of the Buddha are two different things:

Husband & wife, both of them
having conviction,
being responsive,
being restrained,
living by the Dhamma,
addressing each other
with loving words:
they benefit in manifold ways.
To them comes bliss.
Their enemies are dejected
when both are in tune in virtue.
Having followed the Dhamma here in this world,
both in tune in precepts & practices,
they delight in the world of the devas,
enjoying the pleasures they desire.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an04/an04.055.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

"In five ways, young householder, should a wife as the West be ministered to by a husband:

- (i) by being courteous to her,
- (ii) by not despising her,
- (iii) by being faithful to her,
- (iv) by handing over authority to her,
- (v) by providing her with adornments.

"The wife thus ministered to as the West by her husband shows her compassion to her husband in five ways:

- (i) she performs her duties well,
- (ii) she is hospitable to relations and attendants[10]
- (iii) she is faithful,
- (iv) she protects what he brings,
- (v) she is skilled and industrious in discharging her duties.

"In these five ways does the wife show her compassion to her husband who ministers to her as the West. Thus is the West covered by him and made safe and secure.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.31.0.nara.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

V

Mother, father well supporting,
Wife and children duly cherishing,
Types of work unconflicting:
This, the Highest Blessing.

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/posting.php?mode=quote&f=77&p=41238> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Of course there are other texts in which the Buddha criticizes remaining as a lay person.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2011 at 11:55 PM
Title: Re: Community in Western Buddhism
Content:
Namdrol said:
This is what he said in an apocryphal Chinese sutra.

Huseng said:
It is no more apocryphal than the Dhammapada. It is a collection of quotes from various scriptures.

We translate jing 經 as sūtra, but in this period just referred to scriptures of any sort like that Daode-jing 道德經.

It is just as legit as the Dhammapada.

Malcolm wrote:

Has anyone done analysis to track the various passages in it?

Anyway, it depends on who the audience is. For monks, the Buddha had one message. For lay people, another.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2011 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Community in Western Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Buddha supported the institution of marriage.

N

Huseng said:

He also said wife and child were like the jaws of a tiger.

From the Sūtra in Forty-Two Sections: 佛言：人繫於妻子、寶宅之患，甚於牢獄、桎梏、銀鐺。牢獄有原赦，妻子情欲雖有虎口之禍，己猶甘心投焉，其罪無赦。

The Buddha said, "The misfortune of being tied to wife, child, treasures and estate is greater than being in prison fettered and in chains. In prison there are pardons given. The feelings for wife and child, though as dangerous as a tiger's mouth, one willingly leaps into it. That fault is without pardon."

Malcolm wrote:

This is what he said in an apocryphal Chinese sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2011 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Community in Western Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha supported the institution of marriage.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2011 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

Pero said:

From my memory the discussion was more about whether or not it's good to translate sems nyid with "nature of mind"...

Namdrol said:

That's ok, sems nyid is a translation of cittatā or citta dharmatā.

Pero said:

Well yes but it seemed to depend on context, sometimes it means byang chub sems. If sems nyid were just "nature of mind" always, then there is a problem when there is sems kyi rang bzhin (=nature of mind). It seems to me that translating both as nature of mind brings us into a bit of a pickle.

Malcolm wrote:

English sometimes lacks good equivalents.

Depending on context, sometimes sems nyid means "the mind itself".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2011 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Military jobs: Which are less unethical?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The main point is whether you actually agree with the goals that a military force has in mind. From a Buddhist POV, if you do, you share in all the negative actions of the whole army. This is very well detailed in the karma chapter in the Abhidharmakoshabhasyam.

N

lukejmo said:

Since I don't have the Abhidharmakoshabhasyam handy at the moment, could you cite that? What is the implication of this? I think I've heard of this group-karma thing, and I always wondered about what the exact requirements were. What about tax-payers? What about people who are in the military and disagree? I could see how if you had a mob of people running around that killed someone, sure, that'd be easy to figure out.

If some one sees the goal of a military as just keeping the peace and protecting people (naive, sure) what then?

Malcolm wrote:

The idea is that if you are in a military force and you approve of its goals i.e. killing people, you share in all of the karma of all acts of killing multiplied by the number of people in that army. So if you are in a million man army, and you approve of the goals of that army, every time one person is killed by that army, the karma for you is multiplied by a million, thus it becomes very heavy karma indeed.

Taxpayers are generally forced to pay taxes under duress or threat. However, if you are cheerfully sending in your taxes the govt. and support its goals in the army it supports, then also you share that karma X however many people are supporting that army whether civilian or not.

It is hard to be a conscientious objector in the military, but yes, I suppose you could belong to an army and yet be completely opposed to its overall mission.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2011 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

People don't have time for numerous commentaries.

N

Clarence said:

I have read you saying this before, and I think that is why you are propagating Dzogchen practice so strongly. However, you managed to get a Lopon degree, become a Tibetan doctor, and do a 3-year retreat and you still have 30 yrs of practice left. So, don't you think that if people were really willing, they would find the time? Even for the commentaries.

Malcolm wrote:

I have had the good fortune to have more time than most people.

Clarence said:

Do you really think that people who don't have time to engage in study and regular vajrayana practice will be able to make the time to practice dzogchen (asked in serious, non-argumentative tone)? Now, I know in Dzogchen it is all about one thing, but before recognition, still a lot of time needs to be spend on regular, sitting practice, no?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not how things are done in Dzogchen in general -- for example, you may recall that ChNN's text he taught recently recommended doing many very short sessions moving from one place to another rather than staying in a single place i.e. sitting here for five minutes, there for five minutes, moving frequently. This is completely opposite of how meditation is done in most other schools, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2011 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

Clarence said:

I know you don't want to rehash your old argument, but maybe you could say what you think is important to know for us relative newbies?

Malcolm wrote:

The nature of the mind is one thing, rigpa or vidyā is used in several different ways in Dzogchen texts. It is defined in as many as five different ways in the Vima snying thig teachings.

So, vidyā/rig pa cannot be simply reduced to "the nature of the mind".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2011 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

Pero said:

From my memory the discussion was more about whether or not it's good to translate sems nyid with "nature of mind"...

Malcolm wrote:

That's ok, sems nyid is a translation of cittatā or citta dharmatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2011 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

benchen said:

dzoki

you have been ill -informed.

Lay high tulkus lamas do ordained monks and nuns.

This is disallowed in Mahayana and Theravada but in Varjayana , they are doing it.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they don't. If they claim to, they are frauds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you want liberation in this life, at the time of the bardo, it is much better to practice Vajrayāna.

There is no point at all in this time of the Kali yuga to waste one's effort with practice connected with lower vehicles at all.

Jñāna said:

The Tibetans embedded all of the eight lower yānas within ngöndro, kyerim, and dzogrim. There are numerous commentaries on everything from the four thoughts that turn the mind, on up. Sachen Kunga Nyingpo's Parting From the Four Attachments was one of the first teachings I ever received, followed shortly thereafter by Atiśa's Jewel Rosary and Gampopa's Jewel Ornament. All precious teachings which I still reflect upon; which help one to simplify this life in order to be able to engage in solitary practice.

All the best,

Geoff

Malcolm wrote:

These things are all fantastic. More fantastic still is to get to the essence of the vehicle beyond cause and result.

People don't have time for numerous commentaries.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Unknown said:

How then will the practice not result in rebirth in higher realms or the pure lands? Are you denying karma or denying that the practice will deposit positive seeds in one's mindstream?

Malcolm wrote:

Causes of lower realms are many, cause of higher realms are few. Therefore, one needs a more direct method than fast day vows, etc.

If you do not want to take rebirth in six lokas for example, then it is much more effective to practice purification of six lokas than taking posadha vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

This will not cause one to be reborn in pure lands, nor will it assure rebirth in higher realms.

I'm mildly taken aback at this - if you take the eight vows according to the Tibetan ritual an mean it then you are raising bodhicitta, accumulating merit, etc (the etc are the advantages listed in mt post on this minus the result of being reborn in the Pure Lands for the sake of argumentation) - it can be argued that the ritual is mildly esoteric on the basis of the dharani of pure morality recitation and people are instructed to view themselves taking the vows in the presence of all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas and can view themselves as taking the vows from them (making the force of the vows stronger). You are also supposed to do purification practice, usually the 35 Buddhas Recitation.

The power of this sincere practice has been describe as a cause of rebirth in higher realms or the pure lands (rebirth in higher or lower realms isn't that difficult as Shakyamuni outlined numerous methods and results of practices). Shakyamni said that the result of doing the uposatha practice is virtuous and would result in higher rebirth and better circumstances including rebirth the deva realms. The teachings concerning nyung nay practice clearly describe the result as a fast track to the pure lands (although not a definite track) and a major component of the nyung nay practice is holding the eight vows, and doing 35 Buddha purification (and it's other major component is praise to Avalokiteshvara).

Malcolm wrote:

You just answered your own question.

kirtu said:

If everyone were to just do dzogchen then we run the risk of making the same mistake the very great masters of the Kamakura period made. And for people with dzogchen practice then any activity can be proper dzogchen practice anyway (not any activity but any dharmic activity).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

If everyone were to just do Dzogchen then their practice would be perfect, without needing anything else at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Atisha wanted to teach the Dohas of Indian Mahasiddhas like Saraha. But he was prevented from doing so by Dromton.

kirtu said:

Dromtom muzzled Atisha !? Malcolm that strains credulity. How do you muzzle a mahashiddha? Given the standard teaching practice of the time Atisha could have just taught other people the dohas and kept the bodhicitta emphasis lineage with Dromton. Did he do something like that?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

read Davidson. He explains the situation between Dromton and Atisha quite well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

Did Milarepa elaborate on this? Dohas by Atisha - are they recorded?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No, he just described Dromton as a great māra.

Atisha wanted to teach the Dohas of Indian Mahasiddhas like Saraha. But he was prevented from doing so by Dromton.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

Living like a gomi has the following force: if one is sincere and serious then it helps purify karma, it is a method of merit accumulation, it is a method of wisdom accumulation, and deposits seeds into one's mindstream that will bear positive fruit esp. wrt encountering the Dharma in the future lives and reengaging in practice and at death one will be reborn in higher realms or in Pure Buddha Lands (and rebirth in the Pure Lands is the primary benefit for oneself in this practice).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

This will not cause one to be reborn in pure lands, nor will it assure rebirth in higher realms.

If you want liberation in this life, at the time of the bardo, it is much better to practice Vajrayāna.

There is no point at all in this time of the Kali yuga to waste one's effort with practice connected with lower vehicles at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Jñāna said:

Sure, but not for lamrim and lojong, and so on, or even group pūja recitation. All of these teachings and practices can benefit from the challenges of living in a monastic house of mirrors.

Geoff

Namdrol said:

Not very partial to the Kadampa approach.

kirtu said:

Well that's it in a nutshell. The Dharma has many flavors. Some of those flavors will disappear over time. You don't like the Kadampa (Atisha) flavor and do primarily like the Dzogchen flavor. Okay. But while dzogchen is unexcelled excellence, it's not a flavor for everyone.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Milarepa once quipped that Dromton was a great māra who interrupted the proper propagation of Dharma in Tibet. Definitely, the historical record shows that Atisha was far more interested in teaching dohas and so on. But Dromton interfered with this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Throw Out Buddhist Philosophy / Phenomenology / Psychology

Content:

tamdrin said:

There is a line in Gongchig that says "tsad ma dre bu zab mo stong nyi ton" or something like that.. meaning the result of valid cognition is the profound-emptiness. All that means is that valid cognition leads to a theory of emptiness. No where does Jigten Sumgon say that this is sufficient for Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

"The result of pramana is shows profound emptiness."

What else leads to Buddhahood other than profound emptiness?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Throw Out Buddhist Philosophy / Phenomenology / Psychology

Content:

adinatha said:

Logic is errant.

Namdrol said:

According to Jigten Sumgon, logic leads to Buddhahood. I don't agree -- but his views about Buddhist logic informed the Gelugpa enthusiasm for logic.

tamdrin said:

I don't think this is true. Why don't you just tell us where Jigten Sumgon said this. The Gelukpa enthusiasm for logic and epistemology came from Dharmakirti and Dignaga, ancient Indian masters etc.. I don't think it was any specialty of Jigten Sumgon.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Tsongkhapa learned most of his logic while he stayed at Drigung. There is a statement in Gongchik where Jigten Sumgon describes Buddhahood being achieved by a perfect pramana.

Thus there was a tradition at Drigung about the efficacy of Buddhist pramana for attaining awakening based in the second chapter of the Pramanasiddhi.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

heart said:

But in the Dzogchen teachings (the Menagkde) one also say that mind (sem), our thoughts and emotions, is the expression of awareness (rigpa).

Malcolm wrote:

This is misleading.

In Upadesha, mind is variously said to be the mixture of the rtsal energy of vidyā and the karmic vāyus, the vāyu itself, and so on. Mind has a different location in the body than vidyā; different pathways than vidyā, and so on.

Whereas in sems de the nature of the mind is considered to be bodhicitta.

So this question really does depend on what Dzogchen teaching one is discussing it cannot be simplistically reduced to the statement "rigpa is the nature of the mind."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2011 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

catmoon said:

People accumulate the most merit by meditating correctly.

N

.....aaaand of course nobody meditates as correctly as the average monastic....

Malcolm wrote:

That is completely false.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Jñāna said:

Sure, but not for lamrim and lojong, and so on, or even group pūja recitation. All of these teachings and practices can benefit from the challenges of living in a monastic house of mirrors.

Geoff

Malcolm wrote:

Not very partial to the Kadampa approach.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Jñāna said:

I've stayed in a number of monasteries and lived in one for a couple of years (as a layman). This type of communal life is challenging on many levels, including the almost total lack of privacy much of the time. But a balanced monastic model is one which supports solitude within community (regular daily silent group sitting in addition to chanting, etc., group silent retreats, as well as periodic individual solitary retreat, and so on).

Geoff

Malcolm wrote:

I don't like group retreats. Too much bullshit.

"Communal Dharma" living is not for me. Not very interested in supporting such communities either. But people who are into it are free to do as they please.

Solitary retreat is the only way, for me.

I don't mind collective practices now and again, ganapujas etc.

But the monastic model is quite foreign to Dzogchen teachings, oil and water.

There is also no monastic tradition in Dzogchen. Dzogchen, unlike Mahāmudra and Indian Vajrayāna in general, did not develop in proximity to monastic centers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Unknown said:

You're promoting an extreme supersessionist ideology.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with Garab Dorje.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Jñāna said:

... and goes on to refute the claim that it's unnecessary for householders to practice in solitude.

Geoff

Malcolm wrote:

I never stated that doing solitary retreats was not important. Of course it is important. I just question your definition of "sustained".

But we do not need to support monastic institutions for this purpose. Monasteries are hardly solitary, and the ratio of monks who actually do real retreat in monastic retreat centers to the number who are just there to do rituals and so on is very low. I am not saying "don't support monasteries" but I am pointing out that the reality of monastic life is quite different from the western fantasy of monastic life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Military jobs: Which are less unethical?

Content:

lukejmo said:

I can't imagine how meditation would make you a better killer.

Malcolm wrote:

It makes you more relaxed over all and better able to handle intense stress, for example,

fire fights.

lukejmo said:

, your statement would imply that great yogins and meditation masters are the most effective combat force known to man.

Malcolm wrote:

Zen practice and Samurai culture in Japan were closely interlinked.

Huifeng said:

So, please, dissuade me from chaplaincy! Tell me I'm wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

The main point is whether you actually agree with the goals that a military force has in mind. From a Buddhist POV, if you do, you share in all the negative actions of the whole army. This is very well detailed in the karma chapter in the Abhidharmakoshabhasyam.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Also Dzogchen and tantric teachings do not require a monastic Sangha for support. During most eons when Dzogchen was taught, it was taught separately from any kind of sutric teaching at all.

Jñāna said:

This kind of dzogchen-centric viewpoint is problematic for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that the vast majority of Buddhists in the history of the Buddha's dispensation never heard of dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

So what? That is their lack of fortune. Now they have a chance to hear about it, and if they are interested, practice it. And from this Dzogchen centric POV, a monastic Sangha is not necessary for the Dharma. It also was not necessary during Sikhin's dispensation. He had no monastic Sangha. On the other hand, even though Buddha himself mentions Sikhin, etc. there is no reason for any contemporary Buddhist to submit to Buddha's mythology of the four or seven past Buddhas, unless of course they choose to.

Jñāna said:

and to this day this dzogchen narrative would not be accepted as authoritative by many

(most) Buddhist traditions in East Asia and SE Asia.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, so what? This is just a question of authority and as we know, that lies in oneself.

Jñāna said:

Even in Tibet the historicity of the dzogchen tantras was questioned.

Malcolm wrote:

In India the historicity of Mahayana sutras were questioned. In Tibet, the historicity of Kalacakra was also considered suspect. Again, so what?

Jñāna said:

Therefore there is no reason whatsoever for any contemporary Buddhist to submit to this particular mythological narrative.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no reason for any contemporary Buddhist to submit to any mythological narrative of any kind other than personal choice.

Now then, back to what I was saying. When all is said and done, the only teaching that will be left and widespread will be Dzogchen teachings. That will be the Dharma which people will know and which will have survived. The reason is very simple. Dzogchen is the real essence of Dharma, the vehicle beyond cause and effect.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

heart said:

Not right, nature of mind is rigpa at least in a Nyingma context. Check out Longchenpa.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

This is more according to sems sde. Man ngag sde is a bit different.

heart said:

It is not that different since also in Semde the differentiation between rigpa and sem is also of critical importance.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi MAgnus:

We already had this discussion on e-sangha. Pointless to rehash it again. Believe whatever you like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

As KDL says in notes in a sadhana: "save as many as you can". I think we have to do the best we can on this point esp. as the 21st century is clearly becoming as much a river of blood as the 20th was. Just little drops of Dharma can help many people I think.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Best way to save others is to become realized yourself, like KDL. Otherwise, it is not much use trying to help anyone in more than a temporary way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 9:32 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

People raised in bad societies, or with bad teachers, or in bad historical situations. People in Nazi Germany, or Poland during WWII, Serbska and Croatia predominately during the 1990;s, Anguilimala, Rwanda, any country during wars or anywhere during economic depressions, anyone raised in a mind controlling situation dominated by others (there is a short teaching about this by Asanga).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma will never exist in these places with these conditions. So what's the point of even bringing it up?

Angulimala acheived Arhatship very quickly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

That's quite different from actually not having been practiced. It's a point of Indian Buddhism that didn't get copied in some form to Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

They were never practiced in our ordination lineage, Mulasarvastivada.

kirtu said:

Some people really don't know that killing is wrong. American's and countless other societies enshrine killing one's enemies as a virtue. History is replete with this.

Malcolm wrote:

Those people don't generally take Buddhist vows. They are not even Buddhist

kirtu said:

Similarly for all the other five precepts. You may not have needed moral instruction on this but really many people in many societies really do.

Malcolm wrote:

Listen, you cannot fix samsara. You will never convince everyone to stop killing.

kirtu said:

Then the practice of the eight vows is a mildly ascetic practice and comes directly from Shakyamuni Buddha over his previous lives. It is an ancient Indian pre-Buddhist practice adapted for Shakyamuni's teaching. And the upshot of the practice is to accumulate merit and to raise mindfulness of body, voice and mind.

Malcolm wrote:

It is something quite relative. If you want to do posadha fast day vows, great. If you want to be a monk, fine. But it is not essential. It is not essential to accumulating merit, and it is not essential to realization. If it was, all Buddhas would have taught Vinaya etc., but they do not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

Nosta said:

Is rigpa = nibbana?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Throw Out Buddhist Philosophy / Phenomenology / Psychology

Content:

adinatha said:

You've been grossly misinformed. The Drikung Kagyu lineage is the experience lineage of nonconceptual dharmakaya realization. Lord Jigten Sumgon teaches that the dharmakaya is beyond logic, and that buddhahood arises from lineage blessings and practice, not logical reasoning.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, you just have not studied as much about Drikung as you would like us to believe.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

Vasubandhu where?

Malcolm wrote:

Karma chapter. He mentions them, and then points out they do not exist in Sarvastivada and its offshoots.

kirtu said:

Sapan in the "Three Vows"?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he points they never existed in Tibet.

kirtu said:

Even though the Sravaka schools assert vows as a physical thing

Malcolm wrote:

Only Vaibhashika. Sautrantikas reject theory of avijñapti.

kirtu said:

the whole point of vows are to practice mindfulness. They are an aid to mindfulness. That is their purpose.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

It is better to just be mindful. Vows don't really help mindfulness - it is a myth that they do. I never needed a vow not to kill. Once I decided killing was a bad thing, I stopped killing things. Taking a vow of not killing did not make me better at it. Etc.

The difference we are having is this. I don't think that these things are really helping people. You have a more conservative take on it. But I don't think vows are that essential. Not harming others, helping others, and realizing the nature of our minds. This includes all vows of three yānas. There are no vows not included in this. So who needs more than this? No one.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 6:57 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

It's not made up at all. It's mentioned in Kongtrul's "Ethics" and it's also mentioned as a possibility in every Sakya overview of pratimoksha vows I have ever been at (taking the eight vows for an extended period or life and the phrase "like how Chandragomin lived" is often explicitly added).

Malcolm wrote:

It is rejected by Vasybandhu and also Sapan points out there is no Gomi ordination. Sakyas also ordain "nuns" even though Gorampa explicitly rejects the practice as corrupt.

kirtu said:

That's true. That's my point. People really do need the vows. Most people can't jump into Ati mode immediately.

Malcolm wrote:

That's up to them. If they want to, they can.

kirtu said:

Thus the vows free people from negative karma and negative behavior that would otherwise tend to keep them from developing inwardly and really meditating.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. They actually make negative behavior heavier in karma since no one was ever prevented from engaging in negative behavior by a vow. Mindfulness is what prevents negative behavior, not vows.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Urgyen Chodron said:

So you can all say that these sources are bogus.

Malcolm wrote:

The Trimondi book is a smear job. But you have decided to believe it. That, at this point, is your problem.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

Hayagriva said:

Is rigpa a term that's even used much in semde? Seems that semde talks about chang chub sem.

Malcolm wrote:

No it is not used that much in primary sems sde texts, but is used more in commentaries on those texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Urgyen Chodron said:

This thread has made it clear to me that there is a lot of truth to The free online book

Malcolm wrote:

I am telling you that the Rottgen's do not understand this tradition and have twisted things to show them in the worst possible light.

But go ahead and believe whatever suits you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

It doesn't matter as Chandragomin is the model and people cannot be prohibited from privately taking the eight vows daily on their own or, if their teacher supports it taking the eight vows permanently, and thus reestablishing the tradition in a de facto manner.

Malcolm wrote:

It has no force. It would be a made up ordination. No lineage. Therefore, useless. But if you want to take the fast day vows everyday for your whole life, I won't stop you.

kirtu said:

But anyway we are living in a time where many people go through a mini-rudra period where they emphasize practice and still pursue an outwardly worldly life and don't really tame their minds or behaviour although they honestly think they are practising correctly. The restraint of the precepts is still very much needed.

Malcolm wrote:

If you need a vow, take a vow. If you don't, no point.

kirtu said:

Then for monastics they are the models of Buddha and should be modelling all of their behaviour on the behaviour of Buddha, being a model for everyone.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot model the Buddha through characteristics since the Buddha is not something definable by characteristics.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

tamdrin said:

all this distinction is not really necessary.. Even the distinction between sem and rigpa is just a method, provisional at best. What we need is direct perception (ngon gsum)

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, the differentiation between sems and rigpa is critical. Not just method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

Clarence said:

Is there a difference? Or just a different way of translating things?

I don't know how much we can ask here about specific ways of looking at the mind or not, so I will wait with those.

Hayagriva said:

It's my understanding that the Nyingma separate mind, the nature of mind and rigpa. The nature of mind is emptiness whereas rigpa is emptiness, clarity and energy. From what I can tell this differentiation isn't made in in more informal teachings where the discussion is just about sem and rigpa.

heart said:

Not right, nature of mind is rigpa at least in a Nyingma context. Check out Longchenpa.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

This is more according to sems sde. Man ngag sde is a bit different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

If someone really has the wish to be a bhikṣu or a bhikṣuni, they can do that. But in the end, it will not prevent the predicted disappearance of Shakyamuni's Dharma sasana.

kirtu said:

Well no, but as Gelek Rinpoche said there will be ups and downs before the Dharma actually disappears.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

The dharma won't disappear. Dzogchen teachings will be around for much longer than the Buddhist monastic Sangha. In fact, eventually, that is mainly what people will identify as Dharma i.e. Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: rGyud-bzhi' and the Bumshi medical texts

Content:

orgyen jigmed said:

Although I find your arguments plausible, nevertheless the Bon maintains a different position as to the origin of the rGyud bzhi.

Malcolm wrote:

yes.

orgyen jigmed said:

For example, in contrast to your argument in favour that the rGyud bzhi being a translation of an Indian work,

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that. The rgyud bzhi is definitely not a translation of an India work. It is a native Tibetan composition. More importantly, the text itself never pretends to be a translation. Unlike the rgyud chung, the rgyud bshi lacks a translator's colophon in every single edition, of which we have twelve. Not only does it lack a translator's colophon, it lacks a treasure colophon as well. The rgyud chung i.e. the minor tantra, the Amritahridayaguhyapadesha tantra on the other hand claims to have been written by Candrānanda (the author the major commentary of the Aṣṭanga hridaya samhita) and having been passed in a single lineage from one emanational person to another, found its way into the hands of Yuthog. This text is absolutely the basis for the man ngag rgyud and phyi ma rgyud and their 'bum bzhi corollaries.

orgyen jigmed said:

the Bonpo Ga-rgya Khyung-sprul 'Jigs-med namkha'i rdo rje (1897-1957) claims that the rGyud bzhi was written in the Zhang Zhung language. Whatever your opinion may be to his claim, what is known for certain is that medical texts believed to be of Zhang-zhung origin have been found among the Dunhuang manuscripts (PT 127), which asserts that it was based on the Zhang-Zhung medical tradition (Karmay, 2009).

Malcolm wrote:

These texts that mention Zhang Zhung do not mention the 'bum gzhi.

orgyen jigmed said:

To reach an understanding how the Bon could have come to such a conclusion, one must consult with the Zhiji...

Malcolm wrote:

gzi gjid is quite late. And I have consulted it. It's discussion of medicine is very limited. It revealed after the rgyud bzhi was composed.

orgyen jigmed said:

What I do find interesting according to this account, is not only that the doctrine of Tonpa Shenrab was spread by "six-great translators" to adjacent countries which included: Zhang-Zhung, Sum-pa (East of Zhang-Zhung), Phrom (Mongolia) China, Kashmir, India and finally Tibet, but that these teachings have also spread to India by Lha-bdags sNgags-grol ; presumably these included medical knowledge, considering that all cultures have shared ideas of what makes people sick, what makes well and how people can maintain good health through time, and therefore may have also included the Variegated Collections of Therapies (dPyad 'bum Khra bo) and the White and Black Collection of Medicines (sMan 'bum dkar nag), although I must concur that I do not have any evidence in favour or against to further support these claims.

Malcolm wrote:

Ayurveda comes from the Atharva Veda. Not from Tazig. Caraka Samhita is a late commentary compiled between 200 BCE -- 200 CE, with large and significant portions reconstructed at a later date. The text around which Caraka was compiled is a text called Agnivesha tantra.

orgyen jigmed said:

But on the other hand, if this hypothesis is correct, it is not so difficult to understand how traditional medical knowledge and practices could have also entered India from the North (something the proud Indians would not so easily submit), as well as other neighbouring countries.

Malcolm wrote:

it is quite easy to understand northwestern influences on Indian culture i.e. Bactria.

orgyen jigmed said:

This migration could have been part of pastoral adaptation in search of subsistence in different ecological environments. As a result of this process of syncretism with the multi-Hindu cultures and worldviews, Aryurveda, may have evolved as its own tradition. Thus, one must take into consideration this dynamic circular process instead of a static one way process.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no doubt that knowledge spread widely in the Ancient world along trades routes that had been well established for centuries. Who knows what interesting texts were in the library at Alexandria?

orgyen jigmed said:

Another divergance in opinion held by the Bon is that g.Yu-thog Yon-tan mgon-po is considered to be not other then the Bonpo gter ston Khu-tsha Zla-'od (Karmay, 2009). However, as I am neither a scholar nor can I claim any competence in Tibetan Medicine and its history I must remain open to more expert views.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

I find this quite unlikely simply due to the fact that most of the major elements of Yuthog's life and his immediate students are well attested. For example, in the mid-12th century, Chomden Rigpa'i raltri's commentary on the Aṣṭāṅga hridaya samhita criticized the rgyud bzhi tradition directly, see my blog entry here:

http://www.bhaisajya.net/2008_09_01_archive.html

There are two articles I wrote that bear on our discussion. I did make one mistake in this article that was corrected by Dan Martin. Chebu Trishe is mentioned in the mdo 'dus. This is from the tenth century perhaps. But it is deprecated in Bon because it describes Shenrab as having a human mother and father, etc. It is not as grand as Ziji or Zermig.

Even more importantly, if Yuthog was also known as Khu-tsha Zla-'od, his grandfather was still a direct disciple of Rinchen Zangpo and heard the Aṣṭāṅga hridaya samhita from that translator. There is no possible way that the explanatory tantra and the 'bum khra bo are not based on Aṣṭāṅga hridaya samhita.

Basically, Bon claims to origins of brgyud bzhi simply do not stand up to text critical analysis. This is not personal, and I have no axe to grind. Bonpo physicians are just as good as Buddhist ones. We use the same basic text. But the text does not originate in Bon. Even so, if it did, it would still depend on the Aṣṭāṅga hridaya samhita for many things.

Further, I could give you a hundred words in the brgyud bzhi/'bum bzhi that are direct derivatives from Sanskrit i.e. tigta (tikta which means bitter in fact in Sanskrit i.e.

swertia chirata), shing kun (a Tibetan mispronunciation of hing gu, i.e. asafeotida), Manupatra/puṣkarmūla i.e. inula racemosa etc. I really can go and on and on. There are very few words in this text from Zhang Zhung language -- hong len (Lagotis brevifolia, which may actually be a Chinese word), tre sam, etc., these are just a very few of the few words left over from Shang Shung language in this the rgyud bzhi/'bum bzhi.

Moreover, for example, the sngo 'bum chapter of the explanatory tantra definitely depends on two texts described in my blog article here:

http://www.bhaisajya.net/2009_01_01_archive.html

For the most part, the whole of the Tibetan textual tradition about herbs depends on the two texts described in that article. There are no corresponding Bon sngo 'bums.

Anyway, this is my conclusion and in my opinion, the Bonpos do not have good support for their counter arguments.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Paths of renunciation cannot bear fruit in the Kaliyuga. At best, it is a show for posterity.

kirtu said:

This is the case for most people but most people are not going to even raise interest in entering the sangha. For those that do their practice can be very beneficial for themselves and for others who have a similar bent but haven't decided to enter the sangha. And they can remind other people to be virtuous and just remind them of positive values.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe. Most of the people I know who take monastic vows just take vows to create a lack of merit since they cannot keep their vows.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

kirtu said:

Sure I remember. Care to show me the expiration date? Sutra can be read variously on this point.

Malcolm wrote:

About 2500 years.

kirtu said:

A revival of the tradition of Chandragomin in very much in order, IMO.

Malcolm wrote:

The gomi ordination never existed in Tibetan Buddhism or Mulasarvastivada. There is no tradition for it, do cannot be revived.

kirtu said:

Having said that, the merit is still exceeded by monastics and people very much need merit.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

People accumulate the most merit by meditating correctly.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Namdrol said:

One should pay attention to what one is doing, that is all presence means. When you can join presence with instant presence, than your presence becomes a truly liberative practice.

Dzogchen practice means you are a) trying to understand Dzogchen practice b) you understand Dzogchen practice and are moving ahead.

Clarence said:

With a., that is listening to the webcasts and practicing the Lojongs, Rushens, Semdzins, and GuruYoga of white A? Do you know whether or not we have the permission to

practice those?

With b., well, I will see when the time is right.

Malcolm wrote:

Regarding a) merely by attending a retreat, you have permission. Get the Precious Vase. Study it. Apply it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Especially in this era, bhikṣus and bhikṣunis are museum pieces.

This is the Kali Yuga, monasticism is obsolete.

kirtu said:

No and no. Pure monasticism in the Kali Yuga esp. is vital to the survival of Buddhism. And anyway, it is useful for the monastics themselves because of the vast accumulation of merit.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

In case you did not remember, sutric Buddhism as a religion has an expiration date. This is not true of Dzogchen and tantric teachings however. Also Dzogchen and tantric teachings do not require a monastic Sangha for support. During most eons when Dzogchen was taught, it was taught separately from any kind of sutric teaching at all.

As I said however, people are free -- if they want to spend their money supporting monasteries, that is their business. It is not a bad thing to do, of course. I just don't really see much hope in it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhist View of Zen

Content:

tamdrin said:

cool

how long is this text? Maybe tibetans should become more Chan friendly. I don't think the Buddha himself would have advocated either the gradual or the instantaneous

paths.

Malcolm wrote:

It is about 12 folio sides, not that long. I will probably translate it since it is useful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Also, receiving transmission for the rushens and lojongs and then doing them thoroughly is really important.

Clarence said:

I thought we got that as well? Or are we not allowed to practice them? I don't want to order the wrong booklets.

BTW, just wondering about something: Rinpoche kept saying to be present, which, if I read Namdrol right, just means being mindful. If one is not yet sure about the Instant Presence, then what is one mindful of during daily life? I can imagine that if one is sure about Rigpa, one tries to abide in that state as much as possible. But, if one is not sure, then being mindful is just regular Sutra practice (still useful), so surely there must be something one can be mindful of in daily life-- until one has reached a state of certainty-- which is still Dzogchen practice?

Hope that is clear enough.

Very happy I attended the webcasts and looking forward to the next.

Malcolm wrote:

One should pay attention to what one is doing, that is all presence means. When you can join presence with instant presence, then your presence becomes a truly liberative practice.

Dzogchen practice means you are a) trying to understand Dzogchen practice b) you understand Dzogchen practice and are moving ahead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

You've said that in Tibetan medicine spirits can be the cause of illness. In the Tibetan

medicine community, is there any sense that such cases are more common than they used to be?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes definitely.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 12:30 AM
Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.
Content:
Namdrol said:

When I read ancient predictions attributed to Padmsambhava and so on, I see them born out in the reality of our world. People think that the mass genocides of the 20th century, i.e. Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot, the Armenian genocide, etc. cannot happen again. They can, and they will.

We have strange new diseases, etc. I could go on but it would be boring.

Huseng said:
Is this in reference to the text outlined here?

http://www.khandro.net/stupa_Boudhnath_KD.htm#kaliyuga "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:
Not this specific one, but yes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 12:09 AM
Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?
Content:

freethinker108 said:
Lama Ole is mostly disliked and smeared in the US because he supports Karmapa Trinlay Thaye Dorje and thwarted an attempt by the Shambala organization to co-opt the seat of the Karmapas after the 16th passed in the 80s.

Malcolm wrote:
No, Ole was disliked before that. Trungpa thought he was an idiot.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

The Muslims I have encountered in various parts of the world have been almost universally good natured, kind, hospitable, charitable.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

tobes said:

They deserve at least not be judged on what a few bad eggs have done. If you do not know their tradition, as I assume neither of us & Ole really do, we have no basis on which to criticise. A basic standpoint of respect is warranted.

Malcolm wrote:

We can respect Islam and not be blind to a Islamic history, both the good parts and the bad parts, and the imperialistic nature of monotheistic religions in general.

Religion, in the end, is about money and power.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2011 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

We have to be realistic.

Anders Honore said:

'Being realistic' would tend to imply not taking prophecies or ancient historical classification as established fact. But you seem to be taking these as your baseline for your monastic prescription.

Malcolm wrote:

When I read ancient predictions attributed to Padmsambhava and so on, I see them born out in the reality of our world. People think that the mass genocides of the 20th century, i.e. Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot, the Armenian genocide, etc. cannot happen again. They can, and they will.

We have strange new diseases, etc. I could go on but it would be boring.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Urgyen Chodron said:

What interests me is that often on these boards it is denied that this book has any validity, and yet in this thread it is obvious to me that it does.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with the Trimondi book is that it is a vilification of HHDL and Tibetan Buddhism in general. They take bits of facts out of context and then distort them with lies.

it is not a serious work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhist View of Zen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="tamdrin"]

I just read it. It is a very nice short text. It has many citations from many different sutras, especially the Lanka, proving that Cig car is a superior method to the gradual path. I translate a bit of it below. It uses many sūtras translated from Chinese which raises the interesting possibility that Indian Dzogchen masters were sympathetic to Chan in general.

This is one of the nicest citations, taken from the Arya-candragarbha-prajñāpāramitā-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Just as a spark
cannot dry an ocean,
likewise, relative truth
cannot dry one's afflictions,
what need to mention those of others?

Also it has a nice take on practicing the six paramitas, etc.

If it is said by someone 'It is necessary to practice the six perfections and so on', the

explanation for that in the Vajrasamadhi sūtra is:

"The six perfections are all included in the emptiness of the mind" and in the Brahmaviśeṣacintiparipīcchā sūtra: "No thought is generosity. Non-abiding is discipline. Total non-differentiation is patience. Not accepting or rejecting is diligence. Lack of desire is samadhi. Not serving is prajñā. The Lankāvatara sūtra states: "For as long as the mind is engaged, for that long one is a worldly materialist". Since mere generosity and so on exist for thirtikas, if one follows signs, there is the fault of not leaving saṃsāra.

Someone claims "There is no greater merit than reciting and copying [sūtras]. The explanation for that in the Samādhirāja sūtra is "If someone, very faithful to awakening and has regret towards the conditioned, should take seven steps in direction of retreat, the merit is supreme over that [of reciting and copying texts]." The Mahāuṣṇiṣa sūtra states: "Meditating on stainless prajñā for a single day or night has infinitely more merit than reading and reciting the sūtra division of dharma for as many eons as there are atoms." If it is asked why, it is said "In order to be far from birth and death" but this is not said of reciting and copying the sūtras.

Someone claims "There is no method of benefitting sentient beings in non-conceptual meditation." The explanation for that is in the Prajñāpāramitā sūtra: "Subhūti, here, dwelling in the three samādhis of a bodhisattva mahasattva and a sentient being engaging conceptuality, those are placed in emptiness." A sentient being engaged in signs joined to signs. A sentient being who aspires for a result is joined to the aspiration. Subhūti, in the same way a bodhisattva mahasattva is engaged in perfect wisdom and dwells in three samādhis, and totally ripens sentient beings." Therefore, the benefit of sentient being is performed by non-conceptuality.

Demonstrating the dharma through signs is the work of māra and is a companion of sin. The Buddhakośa sūtra states "One who does not understand the dharma who demonstrates it to others causes sentient beings to be born in hell." If it is asked why it is because they are demonstrating the dharma incorrectly. "Explaining dharma incorrectly" means "demonstrating through things and signs", therefore, sentient beings are benefitted without being perceived.

Some one claims "There is no non-conceptual confession of sins". The explanation for that is in the Bhṛīcaphulu sūtra: If one wishes to purify through confession, sit straight, gaze properly, and look at reality correctly [yang dag la yang dag lta], having seen reality, one is liberated. This is the supreme purification through confession." Therefore if one sits with an unmoving mind it is said to be the supreme purification through confession."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

That is Surya Suddhanta. Not really in step with Buddhist cycles of time. In any case, it is obviously the Kali Yuga now.

Huseng said:

Sure, but at what point did Buddhists start recognizing a kaliyuga to begin with? There is no mention made of kaliyuga anywhere in East Asian Buddhism, though the idea is clearly there in Tibetan Buddhism. Indian time cycles (kaliyuga, satyayuga, etc...) seem to have been adopted by Buddhists rather than innovated by them. The Buddha is not on record having taught them either.

Malcolm wrote:

We generally consider in Tibetan Buddhism the kali yuga more or less starts with the last 500 years of the Dharma. We term this time period, rtsod ldan, "the time of war".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

dakini_boi said:

haha, well yes, why not, a certificate would be nice!

but seriously, from reading about dzogchen I understand that direct pointing-out from a teacher is absolutely necessary. - however, my ability to "rest in the natural state" seems no better or worse than before watching the webcast. so my question was to clarify that I had indeed received "pointing out." Not that I had particular expectations, but it seems as if having a master like ChNN explain dzogchen in a live webcast is not really qualitatively different than reading his book or seeing a video. I recognize that this view is most likely due to my own ignorance, but I just want to be clear on what the process is about - since the webcast only broadcasts one way, i must therefore post my questions in this community.

Malcolm wrote:

You received permission to meditate on Dzogchen to best of your capacity and to practice Guru yoga, the main practice of Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Namdrol said:

...I have been to Italy. In Tuscany, Catholicism is dead. It is completely Socialist there...

gregkavarnos said:

And you will see those same socialists in church every sunday morning. Guaranteed!

And if they are high level socialists politicos they will be sitting in the front row.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

gregkavarnos said:

But the last gasp of a dying person does not mean they are alive. Christianity was destroyed by science. No matter how much there may be come reactionary elements that won't let go.

Last time I checked christianity was the religion with the highest number of believers globally.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in Africa, South America and in Asia.

gregkavarnos said:

As for those other places, no. I have no been there. But that does not mean Christianity is vital there either.

Reminds me of kids that think if they close their eyes others can't see them. Oh it is vital my friend. VERY vital.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

We can ask Dechen -- how vital is Catholicism in Portugal?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

I grant you that I'm imputing more on your statements than you intend: but that is because you're making rather robust and unfounded claims.

Malcolm wrote:

The Enlightenment did not begin and end in Locke. There is for example Voltaire, every bit as important as Locke. Then there is David Hume, more or less an atheist, etc.

tobes said:

The Enlightenment was deeply theological. When you speak of the turn from Christianity to secularism, probably the most influential figure was Locke, who provided the revolutionary fuel not just for England, but also for both France and America. That is, more than anyone else, he established the liberal political foundations which the west in general leans upon now.

Malcolm wrote:

And also Voltaire, etc.

tobes said:

But go and read him. Read his Two Treatises.

He asserts, plain as day: "God gave the earth to Adam, Adam gave it to human kind."

Malcolm wrote:

Been there, done that.

tobes said:

Hence the conception of natural property rights, and the legitimacy of sovereignty based on protecting them.

...

In this sense, the enlightenment did not destroy Christianity, it has rather successfully embedded its core metaphysical and ethical assumptions into a political-economic structure.

Malcolm wrote:

What you are mistaking for Christianity is Roman property law.

In any event, I will grant you that Pilgrims decision to ethnically cleanse New England, and all encroachments of Europeans on the Americas took precedent from the Old Testament, just as Israel often asserts its right to Israel in similar terms today.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Urgyen Chodron said:

The person who wrote the book above has no insight in Vajrayāna. He is coming from the Zen tradition. This is fine, but there it is not appropriate to apply his point of view to Vajrayāna.

N

The persons who wrote the book were students of the Dalai Lama and published his texts and then began reading them. Did they misinterpret them? Another person who followed the Dalai Lama, said, yes, they are sexual. But I don't believe now that all teachers follow the same form of practice that is engaged in by some lineages.

I also do not believe that you have to practice the sex in order to become enlightened as some have said here.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many people who are students of the Dalai Lama who are not Vajrayāna practitioners. That person is a Zen practitioner.

What tamdrin was saying is that there is a Vajrayāna tradition i.e. that our Buddha, in a past life, took a goddess named Tilottama as his partner and achieved awakening together with her through advanced completion stage practices.

You have to understand the theory. The theory is basically that ordinary, sūtrayāna meditation does not still the wind in the body sufficiently so that one can experience the most subtle level of mind which is necessary to recognize emptiness at the most subtle level. One way of accessing a more subtle mind is through the experience of bliss with a partner. The point is not the bliss itself, the point is to go beyond the bliss in a very direct, visceral way, using bliss to go beyond bliss into the union of great bliss and emptiness. This is what deities in yabyum mean i.e. using sensation of bliss to realize emptiness.

When ever you take a major anuttara yogatantra empowerment, you are symbolically introduced to this practice in the higher three empowerments. Also this kind of empowerment is very much connected with the stages of gestation of human beings and that dependent origination. So it is really not about sex per se. Even the use of sexuality in these practices has more to do with reversing dependent origination of one's conception, gestation in the womb, and so on, than anything else.

Whether or not one uses a partner depends a) whether there is a qualified partner (you cannot have just any partner) b) whether one is a lay person or not (this is an area of controversy where some, for example in the Gelug school, claim is it ok for a monk to have a partner solely for this kind of practice, there are differing opinions about this) c) and you ideally should be between 16 and 26 years old for this kind of practice anyway. I have heard it said by Lamas -- when we are this age, no one will teach us this sort of practice and by the time we learn, we are too old to practice it.

There is also another path in Vajrayana, very wide-spread in the Sakya and Gelug school, in the Vajrayogini tradition i.e. the path for those "who do not enjoy desire", equally effective for realizing mahāmudra based solely on meditation and pranāyama

(breathing) exercises.

Then there is Kagyu style mahāmudra -- no need for consort practice in general, though it is present in the six yogas of Naropa.

Then there is Dzogchen. In Mahāmudra and Dzogchen use of partners is not considered essential on any level. It is mainly in Sakya and Gelug that use of partners is considered essential. Tsongkhapa himself wrote that without using a partner, complete liberation was impossible.

The great Nyingmapa master, Longchenpa, on the other hand, wrote that such practices were for people who had a lot of lust who needed something to until they got over it and that that such practices were just a diversion in reality -- not invalid, just a diversion and a possible distraction to the direct path of Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhist View of Zen

Content:

tamdrin said:

That is probably a dzogchen text, I dont think Vimalamitra taught zen.

Jñāna said:

It's a Sūtrayāna text advocating sudden entry practice.

All the best,

Geoff

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, Lanka-avatara teaches sudden awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Paths of renunciation cannot bear fruit in the Kaliyuga. At best, it is a show for posterity.

N

Huseng said:

According to the Sūrya Siddhānta, a key Indian astronomical treatise, kaliyuga started on February 18th, 3102 BCE. This would mean nobody's practice of renunciation in Shakyamuni's Sangha has bore fruit at any point? Why did the Buddha teach it if it would not bear fruit?

Malcolm wrote:

That is Surya Suddhanta. Not really in step with Buddhist cycles of time. In any case, it is obviously the Kali Yuga now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not necessarily.

Jñāna said:

The vast majority of practitioners are not "Indrabhūti" types.

Malcolm wrote:

They don't need to be.

Jñāna said:

Whether you're wumming or not, there's no need to propagate this attitude. All supports -- including the monastic lineages -- are helpful. Far better to emphasize this than dismiss the paths of renunciation with blanket statements.

Malcolm wrote:

Paths of renunciation cannot bear fruit in the Kaliyuga. At best, it is a show for posterity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Buddhism has been on the verge of collapse for some centuries.

Institutions, in the end, are always about power and money.

N

Huseng said:

So if monasticism is obsolete as you insist, what do you suggest? We do away with it or try to revive it so that the Buddha's Dharma in the world is not lost just yet?

Malcolm wrote:

People will do as they please, of course.

If someone really has the wish to be a bhikṣu or a bhikṣuni, they can do that. But in the end, it will not prevent the predicted disappearance of Shakyamuni's Dharma sasana.

We have to be realistic.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is the Kali Yuga, monasticism is obsolete.

Huseng said:

Some weeks ago you stated the following at

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=3681&p=32883&hilit=namdrol+discipline#p32873>:

From the point of the view of the spirit of the thing, perhaps -- but standards must be maintained. There are many people who are capable of upholding their vows -- so it is not impossible. Since there are such people, I think it is important their discipline be recognized and honored -- and it is not honored by allowing just anyone to call themselves or demand they themselves be treated as a fully ordained person just because they wish to have that status. People you are talking about won't care one way or another what they are called. But Bhikshus are the ambassadors of Shakyamuni Buddha. When his monastic sangha disappears, his dharma will be on the verge of collapsing.

Is there not a contradiction between what you said now and then?

If we do away with monasticism, will not the dharma then be on the verge of collapse? If it already is on the verge of collapse, then shouldn't strengthening the monastic institutions be encouraged?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism has been on the verge of collapse for some centuries.

Institutions, in the end, are always about power and money.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Hi,

I watched the first couple nights of webcast, but missed it after that cause it was interfering with my sleep schedule. Could someone please tell me if CNNR gave pointing out yet? If he may give pointing out today or tomorrow I would like to attend, and then watch the replays of what I missed.

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

The whole retreat was pointing out. Tonight will be general advice and lungs of practices. He finished the text last night.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Especially in this era, bhikṣus and bhikṣunis are museum pieces.

Jñāna said:

The optimal conditions for meditative development are provided by extensive and sustained immersion in intensive retreat practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily.

Jñāna said:

The monastic tradition provides the basic supports for this type of lifelong training funded by lay donors.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

Jñāna said:

Without monastic ordination lineages peopled by well trained homegrown monks and nuns we end up with the type of dharma-lite represented by much of what is being packaged and sold in the West as Zen and Tibetan Buddhism these days.

Malcolm wrote:

That will happen anyway and since religion, including Buddhism, is driven by money, we will just have wealthy monks and nuns just like in Thailand.

This is the Kali Yuga, monasticism is obsolete.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

kirtu said:

It produced radical materialism resulting in capitalism,

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, that was a product of Protestantism.

kirtu said:

communism, nazism and fascism.

Malcolm wrote:

Facism began as a left wing movement, then got religion. Nazism started out in Catholic Bavaria. Communism is another story.

kirtu said:

It also immediately undercut the traditional view of the intrinsic value of the person (as that was viewed in Christianity)

Malcolm wrote:

Where the princes of the Church were lords of all, and everyone had his special place ordained by god? Please.

kirtu said:

and resulted in even more mass murder than before in European history with the excesses of the French Revolution.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that was a result of the reaction against the corruption the Ancient Regime When you starve people for a couple hundred years, they get angry.

kirtu said:

Aggression and hatred found a way to pervert Christianity into a tool of power used by unscrupulous people. But with the Enlightenment reason was the standard and unscrupulous people found it even easier to pervert to accomplish murder.

Malcolm wrote:

Christianity was perverted by Constantine. Actually, even before that.

kirtu said:

Not so much if they use it to invent enemies and indulge in killing and enslavement. This is the very real dark side of secular societies.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Religious societies are much worse, IMO.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Namdrol said:

It was successful in destroying Christianity, intentionally or not.

gregkavarnos said:

You obviously have never been to Italy, Greece, Portugal, Spain, Norway, Ireland...

Malcolm wrote:

I have been to Italy. In Tuscany, Catholicism is dead. It is completely Socialist there.

But the last gasp of a dying person does not mean they are alive. Christianity was destroyed by science. No matter how much there may be come reactionary elements that won't let go.

As for those other places, no. I have not been there. But that does not mean Christianity is vital there either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: rGyud-bzhi' and the Bumshi medical texts

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

There is in the Tibetan Medicine like the Gyud gzhi a collection of foreign elements like already is mentioned:

Indian, Greece, Chinese and Bon.

All those elements have / own also a whole medical system Like the Chinese have with their TCM and Bon their own medical sources.

But slowly we get some standards in Tibet which results in the TTM we know today.

If the Gyud gzhi would be a copy of the Bum Gzhi that is not true what is true imo would be that the Gyud gzhi contains certain Bon medical texts.

But if that would be like with the Medical Bon Texts, that is what i doubt (If they would contain Aryurvedic elements etc . But i am not sure and will ask this to some Bon Medicine Geshelas.

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:

The rgyud bzhi contains no Bon medical texts. The Bon canon is very poor in specific medical texts, in reality. In reality the Bon canon has only two medical texts. The 'bum bzhi and a modern synthetic (i.e. also using Buddhist sources) commentary by the famed Bonpo doctor and astrologer, Khyung trul Jigme Namkhai Dorje (1897-1956).

By contrast, the Buddhist Tengyur has five volumes of medical texts.

However, there are some uniquely Bon medical texts that do not seem to have survived to the present day. There is a famous commentary on poisons attributed to dbyad bu khri shes mentioned by De'u Mar Geshe Tenzin Phunstog. There are perhaps Bon medical terms not included in the present Bon canon. I don't know. There are doubtless some tantras in the Bon canon which preserve medical knowledge. But the Bonpo do not have an extensive collection of medical texts in their canon. This is easy to discover. Just read the catalogue.

Khyung trul's commentary writings seem to be the source of the sustained contention that 'bum bzhi was translated from Zhang Zhung language. However, there are many more loan words from Sanskrit in the rgyud bzhi than from Zhang Zhung language in fact. Couple this with the fact that Tibetans typically misidentify words taken from any foreign language other than Sanskrit as "Zhang Zhung" these days and you can see there is a whole lot of confusion among Tibetans about the origins of this text.

But the fact is that Bon in general has fairly paltry resources on medicine apart from 'bum bzhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: rGyud-bzhi' and the Bumshi medical texts

Content:

orgyen jigmed said:

In all likelihood, the 'Bum bzhi is later than the rgyud bzhi and derives from it.

This appears to be another controversial 'historical' topic, and in all likelihood it seems that it shall always remain an open one.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

orgyen jigmed said:

Going by the conclusions of Dr. Tsering Thakchoe Drungtso, in his book 'Tibetan Medicine: The healing science of Tibet (2008) it seems that he does not share your entire opinion.

Code: #

Although he is in agreement that it is almost impossible to credit the origin of Tibetan Medicine to any one particular source, he notes that while the authorship of the present version of rGyud-bZhi remains highly controversial, he nevertheless brings scriptural evidence to support his claims, that the Last Tantra of the present version of the rGyud-bZhi are derived from the Bon Zhang Zhung texts, such as the sMan-'Bum-dKar-Po, sMan-'Bum-Nag-Po and sMan-'Bum-Khra Bo (p.32).

Malcolm wrote:

He is just giving into a sort of Tibetan nationalism. It is not supported by textual analysis. I have these texts. The 'bum dkar po corresponds with the phyi ma rgyud. The phyi ma rgyud contains the so called las lnga. This presentation of the las lnga (pañcakarma) closely follows the presentation of pañcakarma in the Aṣṭāṅgahridaya Samhita. Embryology and signs of death in both the bshad rgyud and the 'bum khra bo closely follows the Sarira sthana of the Aṣṭāṅgahridaya Samhita. The same goes for chapters of the progress of disease, diet, lifestyle, etc. The similes of the body are straight out of the Yellow Emperor's classic adapted to Tibetan architecture.

All I can say is that Dr. Tsering Thakchoe Drungtso is either very poorly read in Ayurvedic texts in Tibetan translation or he is suffering of nationalistic bias.

You should examine the research of Yanga Tsarong, the world's leading expert on this subject, who is the dean of students at Lhasa Mentsee Khang. When he was at Harvard, he did line by line comparisons with the rgyud bzhi, 'bum bzhi and the Aṣṭāṅgahridaya Samhita as well as extensive research into the history of Ancient medicine in general. He concluded a) rgyud bzhi was composed either by Yuthog Sarma or a circle of his close disciples. b) 'bum bzhi is quite late comparatively and derivative of rgyud bzhi. He has no axe to grind, he is not anti-bonpo. c) rgyud bzhi depends heavily on

Aṣṭāṅgahriḍaya Samhita and other Indian, Chinese and Galenic sources. c) the text itself in its present form cannot be older than circa 1200 CE. +- 30 years.

The sman dbyad zla ba rgyal po is older, certainly dating to the tenth century if not earlier. Also Dr Ronit Yoeli-Tlalim has shown that the outline of urinalysis in this latter text (which is the source for urinalysis in the rgyud bzhi/'bum bzhi) is matched very closely by the section on urinalysis in the Canon of Medicine by Ibn Sina (980-1037).

I myself, as a translator of these texts, frequently resort to the Tibetan recension of the Aṣṭāṅgahriḍaya Samhita and so on to resolve issues. Not only this, but there are direct citations of Caraka embedded with both the brgyud bzhi and the 'bum bzhi, also in the called man ngag rgyud or 'bum nag po. I could go on and on but I don't want to bore you.

orgyen jigmed said:

both Tibetan versions of the Man-ngag-rgyud expands them to eighteen.

Malcolm wrote:

This follows the presentation in the Aṣṭāṅgahriḍaya Samhita in the Uttarasthana see the bhūta vījñānāya chapter (Murthy, vol three, pg. 36, Krishandas Ayurvedic Series, 2005) "They (bhūtas) are of eighteen kinds..."

orgyen jigmed said:

From this we can conclude that not all medical knowledge originates from Indian sources, but that some must have been inherited from the old shamanic Bon.

Malcolm wrote:

Some, but not nearly as much as many people imagine. I agree that not all medicine comes from Indian sources in the brgyud bzhi. Much of the knowledge in the brgyud bzhi, while not Bon in particular, is Tibetan. Some of it is from Greek medicine. For example, the method of finding hairline fractures in the skull comes straight from Hippocrates. Pulse diagnoses ultimately derives from Chinese medicine. Moxa is probably of Tibetan Origin. Bloodletting comes from Ayurveda. The surgical implements chapter in the bshad rgyud/'bum khra bo is borrowed directly from Sushruta down to the name of the implements, their shapes and uses.

orgyen jigmed said:

While summarizing the origin and historical development of Tibetan Medicine, Drungtso (2008) argues: "it can be concluded that the Tibetan Medical system has an indigenous origin and, over time, shared knowledge with many neighbouring cultures and kingdoms, which culminated in the compilations of sMan-'Bum-dkar-Nag-Khra-gSum and the two versions of rGyud-bZhi by Yuthok Yonten Gonpo the Elder and Younger, which reflected medical knowledge of the first millennium BCE, the 8th and 12th centuries of the modern era" (p.32).

Malcolm wrote:

Yuthog Nyingma is a fiction. The sole evidence we have for his existence is the 17th century bio composed by Darpo Menrampa (5th Dalai Lama's personal physician). His existence was rejected by doctors at Palpung for this very reason. You can talk about this with Professor Thubten Phuntsog (who himself is an advocate of the 'bum bzhi theory).

Prior to this text, there is not a single mention of an elder Yuthog in any historical document connected with Tibetan medicine. I have done a great deal of primary text research in this area. More importantly, Yuthog's grandfather was a direct disciple of Rinchen Zangpo. As I said, the brgyud bzhi was composed based on the rgyud chung and augmented with theory primarily drawn from the Aṣṭāṅgahridaya Samhita. The 'bum gzhi is a derivative text revealed as Bon terma certainly no earlier than the mid 12th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is easier to understand cause and effect by looking at a plant.

Huseng said:

I would agree with that.

Still, some people like studying the Vinaya. It is Buddhadharma and was taught by the Buddha, so we should respect that.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, scholars and monks.

Yes, one can respect it, and one can also understand what is necessary and not necessary. Vinaya is not intrinsic to Buddhadharma. Many Buddhas taught dharma without teaching a Vinaya. Especially in this era, bhikṣus and bhikṣunis are museum pieces.

Things like Vinaya and so are are very relative.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2011 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Vinaya is for monks and scholars. It is not for lay practitioners.

N

Huseng said:

Some scholars of the Vinaya in China commented that one can study cause and effect as well as dependent origination by looking at the case examples present in the Vinaya coupled with the Buddha's explanations.

Malcolm wrote:

It is easier to understand cause and effect by looking at a plant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Huseng said:

If the motivation is driven by genuine compassion or need for practicality in aiding sentient beings, then the Vinaya-based śīla can be overridden or modified appropriately.

Malcolm wrote:

It can also be ignored completely if you are not a monk or have a superior understanding based on yogic accomplishment.

Vinaya is for monks and scholars. It is not for lay practitioners.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Conventions contrary to scripture.

Content:

Astus said:

S. Dhammika's book <http://www.buddhistische-gesellschaft-berlin.de/downloads/brokenbuddhanew.pdf> (PDF) addresses this issue in detail within the Theravada tradition.

There are precepts against magic and all sorts of rituals but at the same time it is found everywhere in Buddhism. There are precepts against music, dancing, working and games while monks may do all that in East Asia.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna is not bound by Hināyāna rules.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhist View of Zen

Content:

tamdrin said:

There were Zen practitioners in Tibet. The Drikung Kyabgon Rinpoche has written a book about this, but I don't believe it has been translated into English.

Malcolm wrote:

Adriano Clemente's has translated portions of Nubchen related to Zen, etc. It should be out this year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 5:02 PM

Title: Re: English w/diacritics for Sanskrit, please.

Content:

ratna said:

The second reads Revatīgraha. According to Monier-Williams, it's the name of a demon presiding over diseases in Buddhist sources.

For Tibetan-Sanskrit, I don't think there's one single good source for everything. There's Mahāvyutpatti, which is available online at

<http://texa.human.is.tohoku.ac.jp/aiba/archive/mvyut/open> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;". Otherwise, there are Tibetan-Sanskrit indexes for specific texts, etc.

R

Malcolm wrote:

You are right, it is 5 am where I am and I was on autopilot.

Revati, Remati are synonyms. Revati/Remati is a title of Palden Lhamo/Shri Devi. She is responsible for illnesses also.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 2:55 PM

Title: Re: English w/diacritics for Sanskrit, please.

Content:

trinle thaye said:

I would like to use the proper Sanskrit with diacritics for the two terms below, but I don't read Sanskrit. Any help much appreciated. Further, if anyone knows of resources for

Tibetan-Sanskrit, that would be much appreciated. I have Tibskrit which is great for names of Indian masters w/diacritics, I have Illuminator dictionary also, but it is limited. Is there another resource I might find helpful? Thank you.

'bigs byed.png
rnam gru'i gdon.png

Malcolm wrote:
Vindhya

Rematī bhuta

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 9:46 AM
Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?
Content:

conebeckham said:
Very much agree--with the proviso that far fewer people can take sexual activity, alcohol intoxication, and such on the path immediately without training in renunciation and all the other trainings that are known to be "preliminary" to "entering the action," "Karmamudra," etc., than those who need to work with "sutra style renunciation" prior to such practices.

Then again, maybe you've met more mature Dharma practitioners than I.....

Malcolm wrote:
Different strokes for different folks.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 8:30 AM
Title: Re: rGyud-bzhi' and the Bumshi medical texts
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Bon has so its own sources for their Tibetan Medicine.
Undermentioned link is written by Colin Millard, with whom i came recently in contact.

- Key points are here the rGyud-bzhi' and the Bon Zhang Zhung Bumshi

<http://www.bodyhealthreligion.org.uk/BAHAR/bon-medical-tradition.html>"
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:

In all likelihood, the 'Bum bzhi is later than the rgyud bzhi and derives from it.

This area is something in which I am somewhat expert, having compared these texts with Tibetan translation of the Aṣṭāṅga hridaya samhita, one of the main Ayurvedic treatises. Both the rgyud bzhi and the 'bum bzhi depend on this text as an antecedent, especially most of the explanatory tantra (bshad rgyud) or the bon version, the multicolored volume ('bum khra bo) -- there are many, many passages derived directly from the Aṣṭāṅga hridaya samhita in both texts.

There is another text called "the minor tantra" (rgyud chung) which is preserved in the cha lag bco brgyad which is a miscellany of texts composed by Yuthog Sarma and others (the evidence of for a Yuthog Nyingma is lacking and he probably was invented by Darpo Menrampa in the 17th century) in the late 12th, early 13th century. The the minor tantra, in my opinion, is the source of both the man ngag rgyud (clinical medicine) and the phyi ma rgyud (therapeutics) as well as the black volume and the white volume ('bum nag po, 'bum dkar po).

The "minor tantra" was received by Yuthog Sarma. He expanded it with his main disciple, Yeshe Zung into the present Four Tantras we have today by composing the root tantra and abstracting major portions of the sutra sthana and sarira sthana out of the Aṣṭāṅga hridaya samhita. Moreover, whole chapters of the Uttara sthana are reproduced word for word in the Man ngag rgyud/'bum nag.

Moreover, there is a detailed tantric system called the Yuthog Nyingthig which is associated with this tradition that share significant intertextuality with the four tantras themselves -- in particular the conduct of the doctor -- which itself is abstracted in large measure from the Aṣṭāṅga hridaya samhita. There is to my knowledge (I could be wrong) no such corresponding tantric system associated with the 'Bum bzhi in Bon which is practiced only by Bon doctors.

Now then, do medical traditions from Bon and Shang Shung exist in the four tantras? The answer is yes. The system of compresses and medicinal baths and so on, as well as many remedies, some names of herbs, and so on derive from Shang Shung and Bon.

But to claim that the rgyud bzhi really is a text converted from a Bon original means the original Bon author copied and abstracted large sections of a Buddhist Ayurvedic text, Aṣṭāṅga hridaya samhita that was only translated into Tibetan in the 980's by Rinchen Zangpo.

Personally, in this instance I think it is clear that 'bum bzhi depends on the rgyud bzhi, and that the rgyud bzhi is the earlier text.

In any event, the main point is that both text teach an identical system of medicine i.e. the system of Tibetan Medicine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Swelling

Content:

Nangwa said:

the moxa treatment is remarkable.

Not only did it diminish the swelling in my knee, but my comfortable range of motion was significantly increased.

thanks again for the recommendation Namdrol.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Theoretically,

However I don't agree with the view that renunciation is not necessary especially for beginners. I think it is.

Malcolm wrote:

It very much depends on who the beginner is, and who their teacher is, and what tradition they choose to follow.

Not everyone needs to follow sūtra style renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

I am bringing into question your fundamental assumption that the European enlightenment was successful and needs to be emulated in the Islamic world.

Malcolm wrote:

It was successful in destroying Christianity, intentionally or not. That is all I said it was successful at doing. Islamic nations need a similar secular revolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Yes I agree, one will find more satisfaction meditating in the mountains than wandering the cities- mind full of the 3 poisons...

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is not objects, said Naropa, the problem is the attachment. If you spike the root of attachment, the leaves of the three poisons wither on their own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Buddhists in America get political

Content:

Seishin said:

I believe that these guys are in some way related to Enjitsu, who has caused a storm everywhere he goes, including on this forum.

Jikan said:

Yes, I suspect we've met this individual before.

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=64&t=2448> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

As an American, I propose instead we consider the World Party.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LMtZOXnavWA> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

As a Buddhist, I suggest we regard all politics as manifestations of the Kali Yuga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

kirtu said:

Saudi Arabia is an example of a fundamentalist Muslim state. Most Muslim societies are not fundamentalist.

Indonesia is the world's largest Muslim country and it says it guarantees freedom of religion and generally tolerates freedom of religion for Hindu's, Buddhists, Christians and a very small Jewish community.

Malcolm wrote:

In practice, however it is different:

<http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2010/11/04/indonesia-uphold-religious-freedom> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

kirtu said:

Iran before the revolution was a good example of a kind of working multiculturalism.

Malcolm wrote:

Sort of. It is true that the Shah repatriated Parsees who wanted to return to Iran etc.

kirtu said:

India *after* the invasions, under the Mughals was broadly tolerant.

Malcolm wrote:

After Buddhism was totally destroyed.

kirtu said:

Morocco, Tunisia

Malcolm wrote:

Close to Europe. Too much money to lose by being fanatics.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 5:10 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

Fine minds have made the argument: Fromm, Adorno, Agamben.

I agree that it's very reductive, but their point is not that the Enlightenment caused the Holocaust; but more that the Holocaust stands as very compelling evidence that its political idealism (especially Kant's cosmopolitanism) did not prevail in reality.

Malcolm wrote:

You still missed the point of my bringing up the Enlightenment.

And you have hoisted yourself on your own petard. Political idealism never prevails in reality.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 5:02 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

compassion, not division.

muni said:

Agree here with you. Awareness' impartiality.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of compassion -- one will get you killed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 5:00 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

Fine, but I don't see Lama Ole making a subtle argument about the juridical system.

He's not saying "sovereign law should be equally applied to all citizens. I am troubled by the friction between the proper functioning of a law and minorities."

Nor are many of the right in Europe, for that matter.

They are, in fact, talking about 'wearing foreign garb.' Legislating to ban it in fact.

Malcolm wrote:

Look, American Politics is still about the civil war. European Politics is still about the crusades.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 4:55 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

Well, if Europe was really enlightened in the Kantian sense, wouldn't Europeans be genuinely cosmopolitan in orientation? What about Locke and tolerance?

Malcolm wrote:

Compared to US, it was/is. And even the US is more tolerant than any Muslim nation today. Go and try to practice Buddhism in Saudi Arabia, for example. It is illegal to practice any religion in Saudi Arabia other than Islam. But I am sure you know this.

tobes said:

It is the greatest of ironies that this problematic gets caught out in liberal-enlightenment terms, when it is in fact profoundly psychoanalytic: irrational to the extreme. The identifications people make to nation-states are constructed and without substance: Buddhists should be well aware of these processes, and the dangers they contain.

Malcolm wrote:

My purpose in bring up the Enlightenment was to point out that it led to the intellectual decline of Christianity, not that it removed people's cultural biases.

tobes said:

Robust nationalism was the core reason for the failure of the Enlightenment as a political project,

Malcolm wrote:

As I said above, you missed the point of why I introduced the Enlightenment.

tobes said:

and the failure persists in the present day defence of good civilised, white, Frenchness, Dutchness, Austrianess et al, all of which, can only exist if 'the other' is demonised, made alien, scapegoated.

Malcolm wrote:

You forget, for Moslems, all non-Moslems are automatically "others". You would do well never to forget this.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 4:51 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

tobes said:

Right, the same Enlightenment which lead directly to the genocide of six million Jews? Europe: civilised. Middle East: barbarian.....c'mon, this is nonsense. You know better.

Malcolm wrote:

You can hardly blame the Enlightenment for the Holocaust. Instead you can blame a millennia of institutionalized Anti-semitism in Christian Europe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 4:45 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

heart said:

Should payback be something we serve on the basis of peoples religion? I find that very frightening and without doubt the reason ChNN is warning against showing our beliefs to openly. The fascist will start with the Muslims but it will not take long before other "strange" religions like Buddhism go the same way.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I am not unaware of this. But this does not mean that we need to understand that Islam is our friend.

I agree however with your general idea that civil rights of people everywhere need to be respected, including Moslems. It is a pity that in general this sentiment is not shared by Islamic governments.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 7:13 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

What is the reason behind tankrikas drinking alchohol exactly? Like, copious amounts?

Malcolm wrote:

Conducts are in general used to test one's "heat" on the path of application.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Jikan said:

I disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok.

Jikan said:

It's true that many European cities are ringed by impoverished suburbs dominated by immigrants from their former colonies by virtue of their own policies: guest worker programs and the distribution public assistance on one hand, and refusal of full political and social enfranchisement on the other. It's worthwhile to compare the experience of Sweden, where immigrants are taught the language and better encouraged into the mainstream, to that of France or the Netherlands, where immigrants are effectively ghettoized and have little else to do than practice "la perruque" if employed at all. Sweden's system isn't perfect, but it seems to produce better results.

Malcolm wrote:

In Sweden that openness is ending.

Jikan said:

The question of Enlightenment is a debatable one historically. The debate on it is

irrelevant to the thread, so I'll just say that if there is something analogous to an enlightenment in the Islamic world, it's happening right now, starting in Tunisia.

Even if you bracket all that, I think my broader point stands: it's counterproductive to use us-against-them rhetoric to build yourself up as a popular One of Us. It's analogous to the teabagger treatment of Latinos in the U.S., who are also said to overrun our cities and dilute our culture like a contagion, all the while relying on familial bonds and medieval superstitions such as saint worship. I find that nonsense objectionable too, as it incites violence (literal and otherwise) against the Other.

Malcolm wrote:

Latins who come here do not have at their back an alienated culture that has been historically in conflict with all cultures surrounding it since the 7th century.

Jikan said:

That's not to say I think Islam as a religion or body of doctrine is above criticism. It's not an accident I'm not a Muslim. I'm just suspicious of the kinds of rhetorical moves Nydahl is making in order to win friends and influence people, and their consequences.

Malcolm wrote:

Ole is a dumb guy. But his concerns, while phrased in right wing terms that I do not particularly admire show that there is an underlying problem with the assimilation of Muslims in Europe. Of course we can point to colonial policies in various colonies, etc., but ghettos form for two reasons, one because ghettoed communities themselves tend to practice cultural exclusion (Muslims and Jews are perfect examples of this i.e. Hallal, Kosher, refusing to eat with gentiles) and are also ghettoized because they are "others". The fact that Christians broke this trend was key to the success of Christianity among Greek slaves in the Roman empire.

Also, I stand by the historical record that shows that Muslims barely tolerated Buddhists in places they conquered and often slaughtered us wholesale and went to great lengths to erase all evidence of Buddhism in Central Asia.

I am pretty sure that the "revolution" in Muslim countries now will wind up with the creation of Islamocracies like Iran. I don't see these revolutions remaining progressive for very long. The world is in for one long drawn out conflict between the Muslim world and everyone else. You may not like it, you may not believe it, but it is going to happen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Urgyen Chodron said:

My feeling about lamas and other gurus is that I think they could be married and still be a lama. It is the secrecy that I don't like because it harms the sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

Sometimes, when you are an advanced practitioner, there are kinds of conduct you must keep secret until you have mastered stability in your practice. For example, eating meat, drinking wine, etc. these things were very shocking in ancient Buddhist India.

Now of course many of these things have become kind of a ritual divorced from their real context.

However, if you are a Lama and you are sleeping with someone other than your wife secretly, this is hard to justify. It is quite another thing if it is all out in the open.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Urgyen Chodron said:

If you don't like the idea of sex as practice and want to practice Vajrayana your best bet is with the Gelukpa sect as they, in general, follow the example of Je Tsongkhapa who maintained pure monastic vows, thus he didn't use a consort, and consequently he was said to have achieved enlightenment in the bardo instead of in this life. Although there are always exceptions, in Gelukpa too.. Stuff happens in secret, people aren't perfect. And this type of consort practice that is found in vajrayana is not a teacher taking advantage of a student, or at least it shouldn't be- I agree with you there! What pisses me off is the monks who pretend on the outside that they are monks- but in secret they take women.. This is pretty common in Tibetan Buddhism-unfortunately. Maybe you should question yourself as to why you feel such an aversion to people using sex on the path if it is a consensual relationship?

Thank you so much for this post. Even my teacher said that they do not practice in the way I feared and that they keep monastic vows. I thought it was all the same.

Thank you all for your posts since I last posted, as it cleared up many misconceptions.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a monk, it is considered that you should not break your monastic vows.

However, most mahāsiddhas who were monks left their vows and took up with female partners. For example, Saraha, Naropa, Virupa, etc., the list is quite long.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: lacking the capacity

Content:

alpha said:

time is another factor...

i wonder if i still have time left to achieve the rainbow body in this lifetime given that i am 37 already...considering that i have received everything one needs to get there..

i know about a rinpoche -shardza rinpoche -who decided relatively late that he had enough of samsara and went into retreat when he was 34 or 35 and he still achieved rainbow body...

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, yes. You have time. If you have all the instructions, it is purely based on your diligence, and nothing else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Olmo Lungring: The imperishable sacred land

Content:

tamdrin said:

Bonpo's really did just copy everything from the Buddhists, and gave it a flavor of eternalism.. the "eternal bon sku".. lol

Malcolm wrote:

That is not true, we also consider dharmakāya to be "eternal".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

Jikan said:

I still object to the way in which Nydahl attempts to flame up anti-Islamic sentiment as a way to curry favor with his readers and listeners. Counterproductive is the gentlest term to use for it.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't live in Europe. So we don't see things the way they do. We are not having our cities overrun with Moslems who have no interest in integrating with our society (not yet, anyway). I don't particularly like nationalism, but Islam is a religion based on cultural warfare and ethnic cleansing, just like Christianity and Judaism. However, Christianity was ultimately neutered by the end of the 19th Century because of the forces of The Enlightenment. Islam never went through an Enlightenment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

LastLegend said:

Hopefully you will transform the lust and don't let the lust transform you

And what how does this transformation work? Does the transformation of this lust happen during the process of realizing enlightenment or when you are enlightened?

Malcolm wrote:

It is the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Fundamentally, Vajrayāna is a path of non-renunciation. In other words, in Vajrayāna we are not rejecting any dimension of our experience on the path. Therefore, since we do not reject any of our experience, we have to integrate all of our experience on the path, including our sexuality. If we do not, our path is not complete and our sexual experience continues to be a cause for more samsara.

LastLegend said:

Experiment yes but at the end you have to get rid of it completely if you want to achieve enlightenment, then you have to uproot the anchored habit of lust as this is one of the chains in DO. I am talking about birth.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not a Vajrayāna practitioner, you don't understand. Vajrayāna is not a path of renunciation. Desire is not "uprooted", it is transformed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ole Nydahl, what do you think?

Content:

mudra said:

Actually Pero it's not BS because what you are doing is creating a prejudice.

Malcolm wrote:

Islam, Christianity, Judaism, not to mention Capitalism and State Socialism, and even "Hinduism" and "Buddhism", are undead leviathans who will eat everything in their path and spare no one.

For a good history of the rise and fall of Leviathans since the city state of Ur, see "Against His-story, Against Leviathan" by Fredy Perlman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Has the text that Rinpoche has been teaching from "Jangchub Semgom" been translated into English? and if so where can it be found?

Malcolm wrote:

A related text, rdo le ser zhun has been translated into English as Primordial Experience. It is not an easy read because the translators tried to be very experimental in their approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

I wonder if they had some technical difficulties because there was a pause in the broadcast for about 25 min or was it just me having this problem?

Malcolm wrote:

The connection was dropped for about 20 minutes by my notes.

Too bad, because that twenty minutes explained the guts of meditation from sems sde POV.

See, have to become a member than no

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Urgyen Chodron said:

I understand things better now, and so I am not leaving. My teacher doesn't practice it as such.

I also learned from a reliable source, an atheist Buddhist, that the Trimondi's book is not to be taken seriously, and I wish the OP to know this.

I do not have weird protestant morality. Just because I don't believe that teachers should be sleeping with their disciples or that sex should be used to reach high states of meditation, does not make me a weird protestant. You don't need the use of sex to reach enlightenment, and I also agree with Dechen, that most flock to tantric teachings for the wrong reason, and that too is materialism. Sometimes, they may wind up with teachers who do take advantage of them, but maybe that is what they wanted too. The book, Sex and the Spiritual Teacher, is a good read.

Malcolm wrote:

Fundamentally, Vajrayāna is a path of non-renunciation. In other words, in Vajrayāna we are not rejecting any dimension of our experience on the path. Therefore, since we do not reject any of our experience, we have to integrate all of our experience on the path, including our sexuality. If we do not, our path is not complete and our sexual experience continues to be a cause for more samsara.

If you are practicing any kind of mandala yoga for example Kalacakra or Vajrayogini, it is a 24/7 practice.

The person who wrote the book above has no insight in Vajrayāna. He is coming from the Zen tradition. This is fine, but there it is not appropriate to apply his point of view to Vajrayāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Buddhists in America get political

Content:

Seishin said:

<https://www.facebook.com/TheBuddhistParty#!/TheBuddhistParty>

I have to say that the Buddhists behind this campaign are coming off as fundamentalists.

Malcolm wrote:

Ignore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 2:54 PM

Title: Re: 'agod pa

Content:

Nangwa said:

Well, what the heck does it mean?

Pero said:

That doesn't seem to be anything according to either of my dictionaries (assuming you put it in Wylie). But god pa is decreased, diminished, lost.

edit: Just remembered. Perhaps you misread the Tibetan and it says 'god pa?

Nangwa said:

I thought of that. I checked the text again and it seems like I have it right.

I haven't been able to find anything either. Although the closest I have gotten is lost, diminished, etc.

The text I am looking at definitely has an a chung before the ga.

Malcolm wrote:

"establish", etc it is not 'agod but rather simply 'god.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

Hey Malcolm,

You mean the one with Drupon Rinchen Dorje on Saraha's Doha's, etc?? What exactly are Adinatha's pronouncements? Yeah there is secret stuff in the Kagyu that no one has access too.. not me, not him, almost no one..

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is secret stuff in all lineages. But when you find out what it is, you find out it is not really so secret. What makes it secret is that usually it is a form of oral instruction that clarifies a key point which is only useful to someone who has experience in a given practice. There are many such instructions like this in Sakya,

Nyingma, Kagyu, Gelug, etc. Experiential instructions.

But there is not such thing as a secret instruction that grants anyone instant buddhahood.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

There are secret things you don't know. And I can't say. Kagyu is different.

tamdrin said:

Yeah don't think you know everything... I just learned in reading some of the teachings of Bardor Tulku that there are lineages of the 6 yogas that are secret too- it is only a more common one that is passed on in 3 year retreats etc..

Malcolm wrote:

Anyway Sean, apparently David is having a real interesting program in VT in early June. You can ask that Lama about some of adinatha's pronouncements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

And I remember one time on E-Sangha that there was some mention of a teacher who said you can get his lung from CD too, I don't remember who it was though.

Malcolm wrote:

Dodrupchen used to send tapes of lungs to his students in US.

Each master has different idea.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2011 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Dechan Jueren and Hanmi Buddhism

Content:

Jikan said:

I think I'm less skeptical about the claims of institutional Vajrayana lineages than Astus is. I don't think it's possible to put projects like this, or Aro gTer, or the Mahajyra people, in the same category as Shingon or Nyingma for instance.

Astus said:

I think the emphasis is on institutional. These small (or not so small) groups lack the institutional system that the "old churches" have. But besides that I find their ways of presentation and spreading similar to those groups (not necessarily Vajrayana related) that are now the great institutions. Just think how many schools started as unorthodox sects with questionable practices from India to Japan.

Malcolm wrote:

I know a whole crew of people who know this guy personally, who were his students for quite a long period of time. He is not a scrupulous person.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

That is why Rinpoche has been stressing that the space between thoughts is NOT Rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Space between thoughts/concepts is not _dharmakāya_. It is just an experience of emptiness. Not same emptiness as dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: The man Padmasambhava killed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The acts of mahāsiddhas are inconceivable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So our "nature " is beyond mind or is it a level of mind like the alayavijnana?

Malcolm wrote:
Beyond mind.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 7:47 AM
Title: Re: Attainment of Buddhahood is impossible
Content:
Sherab said:
Is Buddhahood a state then?

Namdrol said:
Good question: we treat buddhahood as if it were a state -- the term state implies something steady -- when one thing changes into another thing, we call that a "change of state". But buddhahood is no more a state than ignorance is. In other words, ultimately there is no buddhahood. Buddhahood is just a name for a relative appearance. When the causes and conditions that support that appearance cease, so does buddhahood.

Buddhahood is just the realization of that principle.

N

Sherab said:
So when ignorance ceases, Buddhahood ceases. What is left then is just is. Is that what you mean?

Malcolm wrote:
When there are no more sentient beings, there are no more buddhas either.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 6:36 AM
Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
[quote="adinatha"]

Not sure what that quote shows. Vajra wisdom empowerment is not a ceremony.

[quote]

It can be. It also might not be. But it is a transmission. The masters intends to transmit something, the disciples intends to receive. It is a fancy name for direct introduction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

NN kept talking about secondary causes "refracted" through our crystalline "pure" nature giving rise to manifestations, but he did not give an example of what a secondary cause is. Can somebody furnish some examples?

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

Everything belong to mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

tamdrin said:

But what Namdrol is implying that Garchen Rinpoche is less realized than Gyalpo Rinpoche because he has taken empowerments from him (if he has) is not exactly true..

Malcolm wrote:

NO, what I was implying was that Gyalpo Rinpoche is so highly respected, that Garchen Rinpoche received the transmission of Yamantaka from Gyalpo Rinpoche. They are both Gurus of mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 6:29 AM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

adinatha said:

Of course Gyalpo Rinpoche is a nice master. Drikung has two lineages in it. The first is the lineage of empowerment people, like His Holiness Drikung Chetsang Rinpoche and Garchen Rinpoche. They can only give empowerments and teachings, but not retreat stuff like Six Yogas. .

Malcolm wrote:

Gyalpo Rinpoche is qualified to give all. More importantly he is the probably the main master for Yangzab.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

rai said:

Dear Namdrol,

Would practices like Yantra Yoga or other yogas have any beneficial influence on increasing or maintaining the Ojas? is there any connection?

Thank you again!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for maintaing very important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

adinatha said:

I appreciate you've had all kinds of teachers. My little unknown lama descends from Pachung Rinpoche and Yeshe Rinpoche. These people are not khenpos. They are realized siddhas and 3-year retreat masters. Their teachings come from the perspective of experience. I'm pointing out that there is a way of demonstrating the Four Yogas in one's immediate direct realization of mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

You will find it very hard to find someone in Drikung more qualified than Gyalpo Rinpoche. Even Garchen Rinpoche has taken empowerments from him. He is renowned among other things for his expertise in the Yamantanaka cycle. He is an emanation of Rigzin Godem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

The wisdom vajra empowerment is not an introduction.

Namdrol said:

Yes it is. The procedure for conferring the empowerment of the wisdom vajra is described in detail in chapter seventeen of Indrabhuti's Jñānasiddhi. This is the original source.

adinatha said:

Maybe that's what it says in a text, but as you may know the lineage develops over time and the nature of wisdom blessings becomes more direct. Milarepa has specific teachings about this. Jnanasiddhi is only referred to now as a source of support for the existence of the vajra wisdom empowerment to deal with critics. Jnanasiddhi text is no longer used in practice.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no contradiction. Guru, disciple and dependent origination = empowerment. It is not an elaborate empowerment with many words and so on. But there is an intention to transmit and an intention to receive. That is required.

The last chapter says:

Meditating the mandala of mudras, colors,
arms, seats,
meditating the three samadhis, the four mudras,
three faces, six arms,
this is just the outer bark,
the intimate instructions of various elaborations
all of them are explained to be inferior,
all of them are just methods of simulation, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

Namdrol said:

As I said, there is no real contradiction. We call Vajradhara dharmakāya because Vajradhara is the dharmakāya manifesting as sambhogkāya to give teachings.

N

adinatha said:

That's true. All I'm noticing is that I never saw the name Samantabhadra in connection

with Drikung except when referring to the bodhisattva Samantabhadra. And in the pith instructions it is stated that Vajardhara is the nature of mind, dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, I can understand that. In any case, it is as I said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

The wisdom vajra empowerment is not an introduction.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes it is. The procedure for conferring the empowerment of the wisdom vajra is described in detail in chapter seventeen of Indrabhuti's *Jñānasiddhi*. This is the original source.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, it is true there are many things in common between sems sde and kagyu mahamudra. Also for example, Adzom Drugpa's major commentary on rdzog chen presents the four yogas of mahāmudra as sems sde.

N

adinatha said:

There are many different ways to describe the four yogas. Perhaps one way is comparative with the sems de. But there are others that are equal to the ultimate mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, four yogas are considered part of sutra mahāmudra. We say "sutra", but in reality, explanation of sutra mahāmudra is mixed up with tantras as well.

You should understand I have had in-depth personal instruction on the similarities and differences between mahāmudra and dzogchen from Lamkhyen Gyalpo Rinpoche. I

translated his book on Five Fold mahāmudra for him and edited it with him and his student, Khenpo Tenzin. Gyalpo Rinpoche was the dean of the Drikung Shedra for many years. For me, he is an awakened person. He is one of my important teachers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

adinatha said:

Vajradhara is to Kagyu as Samantabhadra is to Dzogchen.

Namdrol said:

Not really, it just seems that way. Also the Guhyasamaja, etc., refers to the dharmakāya as Samantabhadra. However, in new tantra system of Sakya, Kagyu, Gelug and Jonang, Samantabhadra is never represented with form since he is the mind of all the Buddhas. Only Vajradhara has a representation since he represents the principle of the manifestation of the dharmakāya as a teacher.

In Dzogchen however, the dharmakāya is represented as a Buddha free from ornaments, where as the sambhogakāya is represented as possessing ornaments.

In the system of the nine kāyas Vajradhara represents the dharmakāya sambhogakāya, whereas Samanabhadra is the dharmkāya dharmakāya.

adinatha said:

There are many different representation traditions. In Drikung, Vajradhara is synonymous with the dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in reality, Dharmakāya does not have form, ornaments, etc. Vajradhara is Sambhogakāya manifestation of dharmakāya. This is clearly explained in the new tantra system. Original source of Samantabhadra as Dharmakāya is from Yoga tantra, Tattvasaṃgraha. Also is present in Guhyasamaja, the main father tantra the same way. In the new tantra schools, Vajradhara is considered the source of all teachings. Even so, when depicted with ornaments, etc., Sambhogakāya. As I said, there is no real contradiction. We call Vajradhara dharmakāya because Vajradhara is the dharmakāya manifesting as sambhogkāya to give teachings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2011 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

BTW, this real mahāmudra is beyond so called "essence" mahāmudra since essence mahāmudra depends in an introduction.

adinatha said:

What are you referring to when you say "essence mahamudra"? What introduction?

Malcolm wrote:

Essence mahāmudra as described by Kongtrul.

This depends on the descent of the wisdom vajra empowerment:

The essence is the descent of the vajra of pristine awareness (ye shes rdo rje)...

See page 225-226 Esoteric Instructions, volume of Treasury of Knowledge series.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

So, even just after today's teachings, if we become members of DC, we can start practicing the Semdzins, Lojongs and Rushens to take away all doubts?

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have to become a member of the DC to do that. But in general, yes, if you are interested you can buy books, and so on after becoming members of DC. Song of the Vajra, incidentally, is a perfect semzin. You should purchase precious vase, also there are short booklets that explain these things very well. Then you try to meet people who are nearby who are in DC and ask for their help in showing you how to do things, or you buy DVD's etc, for those practices in which you are interested.

Clarence said:

Is that what you would recommend for someone who is still unsure about Rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Practice Guru yoga.

Clarence said:

Do the booklets provide accurate enough descriptions of HOW to do them?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Clarence said:

For example, with the Guru Yoga of the white A, is there a special place on visualises the A or not at all? I didn't completely understand that.

Malcolm wrote:

Center of your body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Madeliaette said:

Did you experience any problem? The video froze for a while,
Ah, so there was a video problem then - I thought the 'cut out' was because it transferred to secret teachings rather than general at that point, so I turned it off! Silly me!

I tried to watch it - and got the begining where they were all getting ready and the first 50-55 minutes of the talk - at which point it froze and went black/blank. Even that short attempt to tune in was interrupted - my dad woke up from his nap and was neing sick and so I had to hop downstairs for ten minutes... Oh well, it seems there are teachings given a couple of times a year - maybe next time, I will have better luck, not have a sick father and remember that tip on how to fix the video!

Malcolm wrote:

There are teachings more than a couple times a year. So you listen tomorrow morning as well.

They never turn off camera during a webcast for that reason.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

is ati guru yoga part of short thun practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. It is also a stand alone practice.

alpha said:

If this ati guru yoga is the most essential possible guru yoga then is it enough that one does only this type of guru yoga? i take "most essential possible" to mean most important...is that correct?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. It is sufficient.

alpha said:

is the short thun practice a kind of preliminary type of practice?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a complete practice that integrates Ati yoga and Anuyoga. The medium and long thun integrate Mahayoga, Anuyoga and Atiyoga.

alpha said:

i must admit that i have difficulty in 1.understanding rinpoche and 2.understanding where would these practices fit in?

Malcolm wrote:

You will get used to Rinpoche's English and his terminology over time. Primordial state = gzhi i.e.basis; presence = mindfulness, dran pa; instant presence, knowledge = rig pa. essence nature and energy = ngo bo, rang bzhin and thugs rjes.

alpha said:

i still see things in a kind of gradual fashion and all my questions stem from this ..
At what point one does this thun practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Whenever you have more time. No time, White A; more time, short thun, even more time, medium thun, etc. There is no specific preliminary practice to do in Dzogchen Community. Perhaps one should learn how to sing song of the vajra properly. A sample practice might run -- purification mantra of five elements; guru yoga of white A and Song of the vajra, dedication. This is a pure Atiyoga practice. But Rinpoche has remarked there is no such a thing as "pure" Atiyoga. Why? Because practitioners have needs since we have dualistic vision. Therefore, we need things like Mandarava practice for long life, Garuda for cancer, etc. But the one thing that is indispensable is Guru Yoga of White A.

If you like gradual style, than I encourage you to study for the base level exam of Santi Mahāsaṅgha. Obtain the book Precious Vase.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Must say that Dzogchen and Mahamudra differ.

Namdrol said:

You missed the point. The state of dzogchen and the state of mahamudra are the same.

The paths of dzogchen and the paths of mahamudra are completely different.

dzoki said:

Well, it depends on what you compare, I found the instructions of 9th Karmapa's Ngedon Gyatso and the instructions on Kham Lug Semde compiled by Yungton Dorje Pal to be identical.

Malcolm wrote:

That is interesting.

Yes, it is true there are many things in common between sems sde and kagyu mahamudra. Also for example, Adzom Drugpa's major commentary on rdzog chen presents the four yogas of mahāmudra as sems sde.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 5:14 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine vs Ayurveda

Content:

seraphim said:

Great Info, thanks! So can we say that most Tibetan doctors are Nyingmapas, and to what extent is the Yuthog Nyingtik practiced today as a Dzogchen practice (not as a medicine practice)?

Malcolm wrote:

Most Tibetan doctors should be practitioners of Yuthog Nyinghig. No one practices Yuthog Nyinthig who is not a doctor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 5:11 PM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Must say that Dzogchen and Mahamudra differ.

Malcolm wrote:

You missed the point. The state of dzogchen and the state of mahamudra are the same.

The paths of dzogchen and the paths of mahamudra are completely different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 5:08 PM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

adinatha said:

Vajradhara is to Kagyu as Samantabhadra is to Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, it just seems that way. Also the Guhyasamaja, etc., refers to the dharmakāya as Samantabhadra. However, in new tantra system of Sakya, Kagyu, Gelug and Jonang, Samantabhadra is never represented with form since he is the mind of all the Buddhas. Only Vajradhara has a representation since he represents the principle of the manifestation of the dharmakāya as a teacher.

In Dzogchen however, the dharmakāya is represented as a Buddha free from ornaments, where as the sambhogakāya is represented as possessing ornaments.

In the system of the nine kāyas Vajradhara represents the dharmakāya sambhogakāya, whereas Samanabhadra is the dharmkāya dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Is the text above published in English somewhere? I would like to hunt down a copy. Wonderful!

Malcolm wrote:

Only in my incomplete and unedited rendering.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

What's in a name? that which we call a rose

By any other name would smell as sweet;

Malcolm wrote:

"A rose is a rose is a rose".

-- G. Stein.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Funnily enough Namkhai Norbu, in his teaching today, basically said that dzogchen, primordial state and bodhicitta are, well, interchangeable terms.

Nangwa said:

Its used differently.

It plays a big role in the Semde literature.

Namdrol, is the term used as frequently and in the same way in the other two classes?

Malcolm wrote:

Not so much.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Dechan Jueren and Hanmi Buddhism

Content:

Astus said:

A fascinating new Chinese derived Esoteric and Zen group: <http://www.dari-rulai-temple.org/index.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Historically, Chinese Esoteric Buddhism, or the Hanmi Mystery School, was thought to be lost when Emperor Tang Wuzong banned the teaching. Huiguo, the last known disciple of Amoghavajra, had left China and went with Kukai to Japan to establish the Japanese Esoteric school of Buddhism, later known as the Shingon sect. Unknown to history, Amoghavajra had another disciple, Huisu, who received all the religious instruments and dharma transmission. He then became the Dharma Lineage Bearer. Since then, Hanmi has been underground for over twelve centuries.

The Hanmi lineage has been passed on through one master per generation. Master Yu

Tian Jian is the highest and only living master of Hanmi, the Honorable Abbot of the 1000-year old LongQuan Temple in Chifeng, Inner Mongolia, a doctor of Chinese medicine, and acknowledged as a Living Buddha in China.

Malcolm wrote:

I know several people that have had a very bad experience with this person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2011 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Funnily enough Namkhai Norbu, in his teaching today, basically said that dzogchen, primordial state and bodhicitta are, well, interchangeable terms.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but by bodhicitta he explicitly stated it is not the bodhicitta of sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2011 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

Namdrol said:

Vajradhara is the Sambhogakāya emanation of Samantabhadra.

dzoki said:

Also in Kagyu texts they are sometimes conflated into "Kunzang Dorje Chang".

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra = mind

Vajradhara, Odra Shenkar, etc. = speech

Shakyamuni, Tonpa Shenrab, Garab Dorje, Padmasambhava, etc = body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2011 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Does Rinpoche usually give the lung for the Song of the Vajra during these types of teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

Always

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2011 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Adhi Buddha(s)

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Since a long time am i interested to know,

- Why there is the Adhi Buddha who is called: Dorje Chang / Vajradhara
 - How to see this in relation to: Kuntu Zangpo
 - Do we mean here also the same entity like Dorje Chang = Kuntu Zangpo = Samantabhadra?
 - Or can one speak here about only different lineages with a different source?
 - In relation to the above mentioned Adi Buddhas, is therefore Mahamudra = Dzogchen?
- KY

Malcolm wrote:

Vajradhara is the Sambhogakāya emanation of Samantabhadra.

Samantabhadra is the name of the dharmakāya or the mind of the Buddhas. Vajradhara is the name for Samantabhadra's manifestation in Akaniṣṭha ('og min).

All lineages begin in Samantabhadra, but the Sambhogakāya who communicates this is called Vajradhara, Vajrasattva, etc. Sometimes you see texts in Dzogchen where Samantabhadra is directly teaching Vajradhara.

The state of the mahāmudra and the state of mahāsaṃdhi (rdzogs chen) are absolutely identical. The paths are very different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2011 at 7:05 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

Inge said:

According to the divination of Lama Dawa I need to commission Lamas to perform Naga offering puja 100 times in my name. Do you think I could do this myself instead based on the teaching in ChNN Rinpoche's "The practice for the Naga" booklet?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, just make sure you do it on proper days.

Also you should probably do practice of Garuda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2011 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Rigdzin

Content:

username said:

Rig is not originally Tibetan either. It is from one of Old Persian languages, Pahlavi IIRC, meaning ultimate knowledge and wisdom.

Namdrol said:

Where did you learn this?

N

username said:

I, not expert in the field, used to read various books on the Gathas/Avesta/etc. and was given rare and new books on them by an expert author friend often when I was interested back then. So long before being a Buddhist knew what rig meant. A few years ago reading an article on Bon, can't remember whose, it stated the etymology of the word from there as a given. I think most Shangshung experts know this if you email one.

Malcolm wrote:

interesting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2011 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Or at least that is how it seems to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is liberation through recognition. That is all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2011 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Rigdzin

Content:

username said:

Rig is not originally Tibetan either. It is from one of Old Persian languages, Pahlavi IIRC, meaning ultimate knowledge and wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

Where did you learn this?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Namdrol,

for those of us not as well versed in Dzogchen would you mind explaining some of the terminology? for example:

"tridlung of Short Thun practice" and

"Ati Guru Yoga" how is this different from regular Guru Yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

Trilung = khrid lung i.e. an oral transmission of a basic short practice which includes refuge, guru yoga, deity yoga practice, dedication, etc.

Ati guru yoga means a kind of Guru yoga done in the most essential way. It differs from regular guru yoga in that it is the most essential possible guru yoga apart from being in the state of the realization of the guru.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: lacking the capacity

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- Who are meant with "they"?

Malcolm wrote:

All Tibetans.

kalden yungdrung said:

- Why do you think that "they" know him as "Kuntu Zangpo" rather than Samantabhadra?

Malcolm wrote:

Because they are Tibetans.

It is only in the West that Kun tu zang po is more commonly known as Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

The state of Dzogchen, your state, is already beyond cause and effect. Practicing will not make it so. The sole purpose of practice is to remove obscurations. Not to attain something new.

gregkavarnos said:

Going beyond something (as I stated) is not, in a sense, attaining something though the subjective notion of difference can be conceived of as an attainment.

To say though that Dzogchen is not about practice is bit, well, misguided. To say that it is a practice without an object is possibly closer to the truth. It is though, a way of being, thus a way of practicing (in the sense of a form of activity). But now I am splitting hairs.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

There is no way to improve on something perfect already i.e. your primordial state. But there is something to do in terms of removing your ignorance of that fact. That is what I was trying to communicate with you. The difference between a buddha and sentient being is only recognition and integration with that state or not.

Dzogchen is not "a way of being" per se. It is not a "style". It is remaining in a state of knowledge about one's primordial state, that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Attainment of Buddhahood is impossible

Content:

Sherab said:

Is Buddhahood a state then?

Malcolm wrote:

Good question: we treat buddhahood as if it were a state -- the term state implies something steady -- when one thing changes into another thing, we call that a "change of state". But buddhahood is no more a state than ignorance is. In other words, ultimately there is no buddhahood. Buddhahood is just a name for a relative appearance. When the causes and conditions that support that appearance cease, so does buddhahood.

Buddhahood is just the realization of that principle.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So Dzogchen is not about enlightenment (going beyond cause and effect)?

Malcolm wrote:

The state of Dzogchen, your state, is already beyond cause and effect. Practicing will not make it so. The sole purpose of practice is to remove obscurations. Not to attain something new.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

Namdrol, I understand that you are saying that Dzogchen is superior.

Malcolm wrote:

A text from the Vairocana aural lineage states:

Otherwise, at that time, Vajrasattva emanated Garab Dorje from his heart and he arrived in the presence of five hundred Indian panditas, "My teaching is superior to your eight vehicles, more amazing than the view of mahāmudra, union. If it is understood in the morning, buddhahood in the morning, if understood in the evening, the dharmas of buddhahood in the evening. It is the essence of all views, the intention of all buddhas, the apex of all yantras, the dharma of the true meaning, called "the great perfection".

Sonam Wangchug said:

In what specific way is Dzogchen superior to mahamudra?

Malcolm wrote:

When we say Dzogchen is superior to mahāmudra, we are referring to paths. In general, we are referring to sutra mahāmudra and mahāmudra of the two stages. Ultimately however, the state of Dzogchen, the state of Prajñāpāramita, and the state of Mahāmudra are not different.

Dzogchen offers a more detailed explanation of what this state entails, how Samantabhadra's liberation occurred (yes, Samantabhadra is the name for Dharmakāya in gsar ma tantra as well, originating in Yogatantra, actually), how the delusion of sentient beings occurred and so on, as well as many explanations specific to the path.

Sonam Wangchug said:

Secondly about the buddha-hood that reverts to a basis, What is the tibetan term for this? What exactly does reverting to a basis entail, and could you provide a quote from a dzogchen text, that states that non-dzogchen paths (including mahamudra) Revert to basis? Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

I'll have to get back to you on that:

Meantime, the notion of a primordial Buddhahood is directly refuted by Shri Singha in this text.

This is acceptable since a so called “primordial buddhahood” is not asserted. Full awakening is not possible without being free of the five afflictions. Both śravakas and pratyekabuddhas abandon afflictions. Cittamatra and madhyamaka stop afflictions. Kriya, upa and yoga purify afflictions and transform them. The trio of mahāyoga, anuyoga and the view of union (mahāmudra) take afflictions into the path. The great perfection places afflictions a state of ceaseless objectlessness. It is not possible for wisdom to increase without giving up afflictions. Wisdom will not arise without purifying afflictions.

And, in giving advice about how Tibetans do not understand Dharma he states:

"Since you Tibetans are small-minded, you are newly associated with dharma. Since you make new friends easily, you become biased towards dharma. Since you are fickle, māras and gongpos will enter your hearts. In terms of great perfection, the dharma of the unsurpassed result, one is bound in fabrications by dharmas bound in concepts. Since you have not differentiated views, you grasp your own opinions. Since you have not differentiated what to accept and what to reject, you do as you please. Since you have not differentiated the basis and the dharmakāya, you are not free from hope and fear."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

adinatha,

that is your own made up conception, mahamudra is the indivisible union of emptiness and clarity. read the prayer that jigten sumgon got from Tara when he was enlightened the kyab dun ma ni

Malcolm wrote:

Adinatha is just going to tell you this is mahamudra for sissies and girly men.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 9:45 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

We say different. The union of this and that is common of the Rime movement. We don't say union of anything. We don't rely on anything.

Malcolm wrote:

The Drugpa master, Gyalwa Yangongpa states in The Treasury of the Essential Meaning: The Stages of the Four Yogas of Mahāmudrā

Now then, first it is necessary to recognize “mahāmudra” or phyag rgya chen po. In the sutras and tantras of the Sugatas and the instructions of the siddhas of the past a sequence of four mudrās is taught, since mahāmudrā manifests independent on the three other mudrās. Here, [4/a] the sequence of those instructions, the stages of the three mudrās are complete with meaning by power of blessings. Since one is caused to recognize mahāmudra with a special method, it is an immediate path.

Now then “mahāmudra”: one person claims “Phyag is appearance, rgya is emptiness, chen po is union.” But this is a term for dharmamudra, not our term “mahāmudra.” All terms for clarity and emptiness are terms of samayamudrā. All terms of bliss and emptiness are terms for karmamudrā. Mahāmudra is the position of the Brahmin Saraha, whose position is that it is free from three conditions, beyond the four joys, and alone is distinct from luminous clarity. Since mahāmudrā does not depend on the

condition of bliss, does not depend on the condition of clarity, and does not depend on the condition of non-conceptuality, it does not depend on the three conditions. From among the four joys, since the innate joy is demonstrated by the Guru, exists as it understood by the disciple, [4/b] it is an example wisdom with a demonstration and a demonstrator.

But mahāmudra cannot be shown by a Guru, and cannot be understood by a disciple. It is not soiled by experience and sensations, it is not corrupted by realization and certainty, it is not divided by view, meditation and conduct, it is not sectioned into a basis, path and result, all of these phenomena of appearance and existence, samsara and nirvana are neither removed or added, bound or freed, are fixed with an antidote. Recognition of and self-liberation into one's own state is called "mahāmudrā." Luminous clarity is without appearances and free from extremes but mahāmudra is fresh appearances and knowing (rig pa), and because proliferation is self-liberated it is different than luminous clarity.

This is the real mahāmudra.

BTW, this real mahāmudra is beyond so called "essence" mahāmudra since essence mahāmudra depends in an introduction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: Vajrapani vs Vajrakilaya

Content:

adinatha said:

Anyone here actually uses Vajrakilaya as deity?

Malcolm wrote:

Many people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 9:02 AM

Title: Re: Attainment of Buddhahood is impossible

Content:

Namdrol said:

A nature is either substantial or it is not a nature.

Sherab said:

Substantial as in physically substantial or mentalistically substantial or both?

Malcolm wrote:

Either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

Namdrol will never quit...

Namdrol said:

Not when someone else has a misunderstanding.

tamdrin said:

You better contact Tulku Thondup and tell him.

Malcolm wrote:

Tulku Thondup has no misunderstanding. He is referring to what is popularly termed "rainbow body".

Keep reading on bottom of page 83 into page 84.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

Namdrol will never quit...

Malcolm wrote:

Not when someone else has a misunderstanding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

You did not read carefully. People call the result of tregchö "rainbow body", but it is not real rainbow body. ChNN, KDL have both discussed this and made it very clear that tregchö does not result in rainbow body.

Pero said:

Actually it also says that in "The Practice Of Dzogchen". As stated before, there are two main forms of dissolution of the mortal body: the attainment of the dissolution of the atoms or the most subtle particles (total dissolution) of the mortal body, popularly known as the attainment of Rainbow Body ('ja lus), through training in Threkchod (Cutting Through), and the attainment of the Light Body (a'od lus) or the Great Transformation ('pho ba chen po) through training in Thodgal (Direct Approach).

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, "popularly" read further. In any case, I know perfectly well what my teachers have said on this issue. Tregchö does not result in rainbow body. It only results in the dissolution of the elements. Some people call that "rainbow body" but it is a mistake. You don't believe me, take it up with ChNN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Attainment of Buddhahood is impossible

Content:

Sherab said:

If your nature is changeable, buddhahood is not attainable since if your nature is changeable, the buddhahood attained could also change.

If your nature is unchangeable, no amount of practice will enable you to attain buddhahood, since your nature is unchangeable.

Yet Buddha taught that there is path to buddhahood.

And Buddha also taught that buddhahood is not attained.

Namdrol said:

Your whole line of reasoning is predicated in the idea of buddhahood being a thing.

There is no substantial person, and no substantial buddhahood. Therefore, ignorance is possible, and also liberation.

Sherab said:

I don't think my line of reasoning requires the assumption that buddhahood is a thing.

Malcolm wrote:

A nature is either substantial or it is not a nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

actually namdrol,
rainbow body is precisely the result of trekchod ('ja lus)
the result of thogal is the body of light (od lus)

Namdrol said:

I don't know who told you that, but it is wrong. Tregchö results in the dispersal of the body into subtle particles since it is the realization only of dharmakāya.

Rainbow body and body of light are synonymous.

You can check this out in Tulku Thudup's book.

N

tamdrin said:

I read that in Tulku Thondups' book masters of meditation and miracles about the longchen nyinthing masters.. that is what is written there..

Malcolm wrote:

You did not read carefully. People call the result of tregchö "rainbow body", but it is not real rainbow body. ChNN, KDL have both discussed this and made it very clear that tregchö does not result in rainbow body.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

actually namdrol,
rainbow body is precisely the result of trekchod ('ja lus)
the result of thogal is the body of light (od lus)

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know who told you that, but it is wrong. Tregchö results in the dispersal of the body into subtle particles since it is the realization only of dharmakāya.

Rainbow body and body of light are synonymous.

You can check this out in Tulku Thudup's book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sometimes, the biggest obstacle to understanding Dzogchen that people have is Buddhism, so they constantly try to compare Dzogchen with the vehicles of cause and result. This causes them to automatically deviate. Dzogchen is completely beyond cause and result. All notions of paths and stages are completely irrelevant in Dzogchen.

adinatha said:

The same is true of essence mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Sometimes I really get the feeling that essence mahāmudra is just a Kagyu theory, a sort of an idealized mahāmudra that is basically unobtainable. Held out as a possibility which no one ever realizes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

[

There is no liberation through giving up samsara.

tamdrin said:

theres a lot of little things to be given up that will help lessen ones over all karmic baggage.. Living simply is a start, drinking pure water, eating healthy food, and generally avoiding alchohol will be good for ones overall health

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree -- I eat homegrown food, do chulen, drink only moderately, our well is pure, mostly do not eat meat, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

The common opinion among Dzogchen yogis I talk to is that essence mahamudra is at the level of tregcho.

Namdrol said:

Tregchö = sems sde.

adinatha said:

Tregcho is mengagde.

Malcolm wrote:

yes, the word comes from Man ngag sde (actually, to be perfectly accurate, it comes from the klong sde tantra, klong chen rab 'byams).

But the meaning of sems sde and tregchö is the same -- again, this is not just my opinion -- this has been enunciated by various masters such as ChNN, Khenpo Palden Sherab, etc., masters who have a very broad and comprehensive understanding of textual systems of Dzogchen.

You cannot achieve rainbow body with tregchö -- this is why Longchenpa among others spends a lot of time criticizing tregchö in comparison with Thögal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

yeah thats a nice saying.. people that live in the cities should spend more time in nature..

Malcolm wrote:

I agree, that is why I live in a town of less than 1600 people, way up in the hills, surrounded by forests and fields.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

this debate is stupid.. comparison is stupid.. milarepa gom.. milarepa sol wan deb..

Namdrol said:
Mllarepa, another Dzogchen master.

tamdrin said:
Milarepa, a person who became happy... by giving up samsara

Malcolm wrote:
There is no liberation through giving up samsara.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 5:50 AM
Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity
Content:
tamdrin said:
this debate is stupid.. comparison is stupid.. milarepa gom.. milarepa sol wan deb..

Malcolm wrote:
Mllarepa, another Dzogchen master.

All your siddhas are belong to us....

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 5:43 AM
Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity
Content:
adinatha said:
The common opinion among Dzogchen yogis I talk to is that essence mahamudra is at the level of tregcho.

Malcolm wrote:
Tregchö = sems sde.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 5:42 AM
Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity
Content:
Namdrol said:
Then those people do not understand the theory. If method does not work, than view is faulty.

Clarence said:
How can we reconcile that with the illiterate Dzogchen masters attaining rainbow body?

How can one come to understand the theory? Is it hard?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not rocket science. It is very easy to understand if you have an open mind and you do not go around complicating things.

Sometimes, the biggest obstacle to understanding Dzogchen that people have is Buddhism, so they constantly try to compare Dzogchen with the vehicles of cause and result. This causes them to automatically deviate. Dzogchen is completely beyond cause and result. All notions of paths and stages are completely irrelevant in Dzogchen.

There are mainly one thing that matters in Dzogchen -- whether or not you are a fortunate person. If you are a fortunate person you will meet a master who has experience who can demonstrate to you your real condition and the methods to discover that for yourself. You do not have to be an educated person like me who has studied way too many books. There is a saying in Dzogchen, an illiterate person who has personal experience of their real state will gain liberation far sooner than a Pandita who is expert in a hundred dharma systems but does not have that experience. Dzogchen is not intellectual. It is based on personal experience. You do not have to be literate, or particularly well educated to have that experience. Our friend adinatha will tell you that realization of Dzogchen based on the blessings of the lineage. But actually, it is based on recognizing a personal experience. Maybe we mean the same thing. Certainly having that recognition is wonderful thing, inexpressible, a cause for faith and a great blessing. But collecting blessings and reciting supplications will never get you that experience. Only an experienced master who has that experience will be able to introduce it to you in a direct personal way. That is the best blessing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Method is just method. Mileage varies. Some people spend whole life on the faster direct methods and don't realize the full extent. Method is no guarantee.

Malcolm wrote:

Then those people do not understand the theory. If method does not work, than view is faulty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

It seems to be more a matter of personal choice. Rainbow body is rainbow body, whether you go longde, togal or yangti. Perhaps a yangti practitioner is going to say yangti is higher. But why would it be higher if the fruit is the same?

Malcolm wrote:

Faster, more direct, more methods.

adinatha said:

Aside from rainbow body, there is also the fruit of complete manifest buddhahood, like Longchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Same thing. Can't attain rainbow body without being a Buddha. As far as that Abhisambuddhahood [complete manifest buddhahood] in Dzogchen is considered a lesser result compared with Samyaksambuddhahood. The former is with remainder, the latter, without remainder.

adinatha said:

Re mahamudra: The co-emergent unification oral instructions say explicitly that the fruit is unlimited. Rainbow body is not a concern.

Malcolm wrote:

Does not go beyond sems sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Enochian said:

Hi Namdrol,

What is the tibetan word for 'basis' that you have been using in this thread?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on context.

The basis is gzhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Yangti higher than togal? Who told you that?

Namdrol said:

The yangti tantras.

adinatha said:

So what makes it higher than togal?

Malcolm wrote:

More methods, special methods, not taught in tögal. Even so, there has been some bleed over. One finds some methods of Yangti in cycles like Gongspa Zangthal and so on. Tögal is like the base for Yangti.

The simplest way to put it is that sems de works on with mind, but not with visions. In terms of the four visions klong sde works with space, but not with light. Tögal works with light, but not with dark. Yangti works with dark and other special methods which work with light. Since klong sde works with the four visions, this is why it is asserted that one can obtain rainbow body with klong sde. One cannot obtain rainbow body with sems sde.

This also the reason why it is asserted that one cannot obtain rainbow body with mahāmudra lacking tantric practices connected with the wisdom winds. I don't expect you to agree, but you should be aware of the reasoning.

Further, the yangti tantras assert that yangti is utter pinnacle of Dzogchen practice and theory. Perhaps the most famous yangti cycle is that of Dungsö Repa. The late Khetsun Zangpo was famous as one of the main promulgators of the Dungsö Repa Black Yangti teachings.

There are yangti cycles by Guru Chowang, Ngala Padma Dudul, Rigzin Chanchub Dorje, and so on.

As I keep stressing, there is a lot more to Dzogchen than Yeshe Lama and Thigle Gyacän. Can people obtain awakening from Yeshe Lama? Of course. Is there always more to

learn, etc. Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Yangti higher than togal? Who told you that?

Malcolm wrote:

The yangti tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

It contains termas that range from anuyoga practices like Mandarava, Gomadevi and so on to yang ti. It includes all three series of Dzogchen.

adinatha said:

Yangti, what about Tögal?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, yangti is higher than tögal, but yes, also that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

My impression was that NNR's termas were all Longsal. His mengagde teachings are from his master Changchub Dorje. That's what I thought. I could be wrong; I'm not an expert on his stuff.

Namdrol said:

The full title of Rinpoche's cycle is klong gsal 'od gsal mkha' 'dro snying thig, "Longsel" for short.

It contains terms that range from anuyoga practices like Mandarava, Gomadevi and so on to yang ti. It includes all three series of Dzogchen.

N

adinatha said:
the 8 volumes right?

Malcolm wrote:
Eight that have been published so far.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 13th, 2011 at 12:05 AM
Title: Re: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Pero said:
I was just about to post this hehe. This belongs to sems sde and it seems Manjushrimitra wrote his rdo la gser zhun based on this?

Malcolm wrote:
yes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 11:20 PM
Title: Kunsangar South Retreat with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Kunsangar South Retreat
OPEN WEBCAST
14th-20th May 2011 (Crimea GTM+3)

The teaching is Dzogchen Ati Yoga "Jangchub Semgom" (the Instruction of Primordial State)
14th May 4-6pm.
Introduction about this retreat's teaching.

15th May 10-12am.
Introduction about the Three Transmissions in Dzogchen and the real state of Ati Guru Yoga. Giving tridlung of Short Thun practice.

16th May 10-12am.
After practicing the Ati Guru Yoga altogether, how is the non correct or correct way of doing meditation and being in the authentic Primordial State (P.1-4). Giving tridlung of

Short Gana Puja.

17th May 10-12am.

After practicing the Ati Guru Yoga altogether, how we recognize the defects of our meditation and how should correct the defects with the way of practice (p. 4-8).

17th May 12,30-1pm.

We do a Short GanaPuja for the full moon.

18th May 10-12am.

After practicing the Ati Guru Yoga altogether, how we should integrate the practice in our attitude and how manifest the signs of the practice is maturing (P.8-11). Giving tridlung of Medium Thun and Medium Gana Puja.

19th May 10-12am.

After practicing the Ati Guru Yoga altogether, how is the perfection beyond purification and accumulation and how manifest the all qualifications (P.11-15).

19th May 5-7pm.

We do a Medium GanaPuja for the end of this retreat.

20th May 10-12am.

Giving advices for how integrate daily life, giving tridlungs of Thun book and many other practices circulating booklets in Dzogchen Community. We finish our retreat with an Ati Guru Yoga and dedications.

Note: A text for this retreat will be available soon on the webcast files page.

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

The reality of dzogchen, free from an object of meditation and a meditator, the authentic condition unsullied with deluded objectifications, is naturally sustained; since just this is one's own condition, The root Guru, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa cannot be elsewhere far away, but is discovered within oneself.

Pero said:

I really like this, is it your own composition?

Malcolm wrote:
My translation, KDL's composition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 9:33 PM
Title: Re: Attainment of Buddhahood is impossible
Content:
Sherab said:

If your nature is changeable, buddhahood is not attainable since if your nature is changeable, the buddhahood attained could also change.
If your nature is unchangeable, no amount of practice will enable you to attain buddhahood, since your nature is unchangeable.

Yet Buddha taught that there is path to buddhahood.
And Buddha also taught that buddhahood is not attained.

Malcolm wrote:
Your whole line of reasoning is predicated in the idea of buddhahood being a thing.
There is no substantial person, and no substantial buddhahood. Therefore, ignorance is possible, and also liberation.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 8:05 PM
Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity
Content:
tamdrin said:

The story about the Phagmodrupa and Sakya thing goes something like, if I am remembering correctly, that Phagomodrupa thought he had realized the path of seeing and his Sakya Lama confirmed it... Then he went to Gampopa and Gampopa said his path of seeing wasn't worth the tsampa ball in his hand... so from then on he followed the Gampopa rather than the Sakya Lama...

Malcolm wrote:
In an autobiographical note, Dorje Gyalpo mentions that after Gampopa passed away (recall, Phagmo Dru spent only a single year with Gampopa) he returned to Sakya, but that from his perspective Sachen seemed disinterested in seeing him. After that, he travelled to the place from which he derived his nickname, Phagmodru.

The relationship between Sachen and Phagmo Drupa is related in the Stearns book on the early history of Lamdre. Much of what was compiled into the famed Lamdre Yellow Book (Pod gser ma) was originally compiled by Phagmodrupa.

It is likely that the tension between Sakya and Drigung that exploded through someone

misunderstanding a remark made by Sakya Pandita really stems from the soured relationship between Sachen and Phagmodrupa.

BTW, if Sachen said that Phagmodru had attained the path of seeing, he did. You like paths and stages, Sean -- Lamdre has unmistakeable signs of all the paths and stages laid out in detail. If you don't have that sign, then you don't have that realization. This sort of very detailed presentation of the paths and stages of the Vajrayāna path is a speciality of Lamdre.

Phagmodru's presentation of Lamdre is the only surviving lineage of Lamdre outside of Sakya. It is considered perfectly valid by Sakya and was reincorporated into Sakya at some point.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 7:13 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

My impression was that NNR's termas were all Longsal. His mengagde teachings are from his master Changchub Dorje. That's what I thought. I could be wrong; I'm not an expert on his stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

The full title of Rinpoche's cycle is klong gsal 'od gsal mkha' 'dro snying thig, "Longsel" for short.

It contains termas that range from anuyoga practices like Mandarava, Gomadevi and so on to yang ti. It includes all three series of Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 8:05 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

And Vimala...what stopped you from doing KDL guru yoga? Or did it not?

Malcolm wrote:

KDL was Vimalmitra's emanation.

The reality of dzogchen, free from an object of meditation and a meditator, the authentic condition unsullied with deluded objectifications, is naturally sustained; since just this is one's own condition, The root Guru, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa cannot be elsewhere far away, but is discovered within oneself.

I am never removed from KDL's guru yoga no matter what practice I do. Words are secondary.

I have had now three important gurus die. The first one was Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje, his death propelled me into three year retreat (1993-1997). When KDL died in 2006, it was very sad for his students. Also when Khenpo Jigme Phunstok died, I was very sad since I did his practices in my retreat.

Nevertheless, they all are important, and I try to honor them with my study and practice. You might have figured out by now that I am a serious person. In that respect, I follow CHNN's temperament. We are both tigers.

I also like good wine, good scotch in moderation, good food, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

KDL recommended Guru Rinpoche sadhana in Nyingthig practice didn't he?

Malcolm wrote:

Having received at various times Chetsun Nyinthig, Nyinthig Yazhi, Thigle Gyacan, and so on from him, as well as most of his various terma transmissions, while driving him to VT one time I asked him once which of these practices he thought I ought to do. He responded by saying that all of the samayas of these practices were no longer perfect. He then said I should do his guru yoga. He then went on to explain that a) it was better to practice new termas b) while the tertön in question was still alive since it would be more powerful. He then supplemented his comments by remarking that ChNN was an incredible [ngo msthar che] master of Dzogchen.

KDL gave different advice to different people. But his main focus was always on Dzogchen. He considered all his students to be Dzogchen practitioners, first and foremost. He did not stress preliminary practices for Westerners, but instead emphasized some light sadhana like Drollo, Chö practice, etc., and Dzogchen first and foremost.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Love and family feeling is so precious. We had to learn to wear pants and collared shirts. Now you all have to learn to touch the father guru's feet. Then get up and take his hand with both hands and touch it to your forehead and kiss it three times. It immediately brings out a feeling of humility and love and tears will come out by themselves. And the guru softens and will share things that he never thought he would. You should try it. It opens you both up to an unbelievable possibility for the most precious dharma exchange. I swear. This is wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

You really do not need to lecture me about guru devotion. I explained this to you already.

I am not demonstrative, especially online. I choose not to discuss these things online because I don't discuss my experience online. I understand your desire to want people to see things from your perspective. But you do need to allow that people are different and experience things in their own way. You have an effusive style. It would not get you very far with CHNN or KDL IMO, or maybe it would -- CHNN sees through people. If they are doing something which is not real, something contrived, he knows. When I first met ChNN privately, before offering a kata, I went to offer prostrations as is customary. He yelled at me, prevented me from doing them. But he accepted the kata. I will share only this much. After I met him, I was in a state of bliss for many weeks. High on Dzogchen. I am not an automaton -- just undemonstrative.

And as you know, we do not do prostrations to our teacher in Dzogchen Community by his express wishes.

I honor and respect my teachers through my persistent devotion to the Dharma they have taught me. That is sufficient, don't you think?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

You Indians are a very dramatic bunch.

adinatha said:

I know. "Oh, how droll. Quite unseemly." You New Englanders sure are dry. It's difficult for non-Indians to understand the Indian heart. Our love is extreme.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not so much dry as undemonstrative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

You mean like in the Prajnaparamita Sutra of a Single Letter? Just kidding. I get it. Primordial potentiality... Is the Guru Yoga of A in the VN or KN?

Malcolm wrote:

It is ChNN's terma. There is a text with it, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Buddhism is knowledge and personal direct experience.

Malcolm wrote:

I can agree with this. The rest of it is your trip. Not saying it is wrong, I just don't parse these things to myself in this way. I have confidence in the teachings of my Gurus and the Dharma I have received from them. That is sufficient for anyone else to know about me.

adinatha said:

Many Western families cannot date back far because this deep love and respect for mother and father is lacking.

Malcolm wrote:

No, mostly it is because economic and geopolitical conditions in Europe were very unstable for many centuries. Also the feudal system made it difficult to track families since people were treated as serfs, and surnames are a relatively modern thing.

In my case, my family is older than most Tibetan families. I can trace my direct ancestry back to Kenneth Mcalpine, the first King of united Scotland, eight century AD. This is because of the strength of the Scots clan system.

adinatha said:

In my culture, we touch our elders feet and never contradict them. Many Indian family lineages are thousands and thousands of years old.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, human beings all come from one place: Africa. Maybe we should give Africa some props.

adinatha said:

Westerners think this "bhakti" attitude is silly or beneath them. Westerners have a huge devil of pride. I marvel whenever I see one bow down before the teacher. I have never seen one grab the master's feet and press forehead down in earnest supplication to the great wonder of dharma with tears welling up.

Malcolm wrote:

You Indians are a very dramatic bunch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: lacking the capacity

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

So the endconclusion could be that Samantabadhra = Kuntu Zangpo.
But in Bon Dzogchen is no Samantabadhra known.

Could it be that Samantabadhra does belong to the Indian Dzogchen cycle and Kuntu Zangpo to the Tibetan Dzogchen cycle?

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Samanta = kun tu

bhadra = bzang po

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Enochian said:

How do the 3 wisdoms of vidya (kadag, lhun grib, and thugs rje)

relate to the 3 wisdoms of the basis (Essence, nature and compassion)?

Malcolm wrote:

They are the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

But the other levels of Guru Yoga NNR teaches are not in that category.

Malcolm wrote:

Not sure what you mean. More or less there are four basic guru yogas in the DC practice. Mahayoga style with Guru Padmasambhava; Guru Yoga of Ngondzog Gyalpo connected with Longde; Anuyoga style with Garab Dorje which is related to Yangti, and then Guru Yoga of White A.

Then there are many others, connected with various other transmissions and so on Rinpoche has given over the years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 5:43 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

If there is a realized master in an unbroken lineage, even a sutrayana practitioner can realize buddhahood in one life.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean a realized sutra master?

I don't think so. But we can agree to disagree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

No. It is all-encompassing, from sems sde to yang ti. There is no other guru yoga better than it, IMO. Of course, that does not mean one needs to remain in a state of limitation, if one has transmission for Thigle gya can, Chetsun Nyinthing, etc., it is also wonderful to do these more anuyoga style practices when time permits.

N

adinatha said:

Song of Vajra is yes I looked that up.

Malcolm wrote:

Song of the vajra is not guru yoga.

This is guru yoga: ཨྱ

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

It's about merit.

Malcolm wrote:

Merit gets you a good rebirth to meet Dzogchen. Once one has received Dzogchen teachings (or anything else for that matter) in a complete way and one understands one is doing, it is only up to oneself.

adinatha said:

Thinking of the guru and the wonders of the lineage is too hard.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is easy. Why do you think I have spent the past twenty years primarily devoted to learning and practicing? It certainly isn't because I want to write a book.

adinatha said:

One needs a deep relationship with a realized master.

Malcolm wrote:

I am all set here, thanks.

adinatha said:

I would just leave it alone if condition one is not met.

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone has a body that begins to fall apart when the four elements begin with fight rather than cooperate.

adinatha said:

He was a Lamdre practitioner until he went to Gampopa and got Zen slapped by the lineage wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

He never stopped practicing Lamdre.

adinatha said:

Namdrol la, you've given me a lot to think about, and I appreciate that.

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you.

adinatha said:

I can point to passages galore that bear out the importance of guru.

Malcolm wrote:

I have read them. I just don't talk about it. My root gurus are my root gurus. They are realized people. I just leave it at that. I don't really discuss that part of my experience. It's personal and not for public consumption.

adinatha said:

...union with the guru's mind.

Malcolm wrote:

I have said repeatedly that guruyoga is essential in Dzogchen -- this is basic, so basic it really does not bear repeating. But I am not much into so called bhakti style "devotion". I don't need it. I have firm confidence, so what do I need with faith? Of course, everything depends on a Guru. I just don't have any need to discuss it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

I've heard you say that Yeshe Lama is a beginner's text. That contradicts what different masters have told me. That it is the best treatise on Tögal.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, that's what they say.

adinatha said:

Also, that its descriptions of method alone are sufficient for attaining the Rainbow Body.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it and a hundred other tögal texts.

adinatha said:

In the description of the fourth appearance of Tögal, there are the two possible routes, you either look at your hand, etc. etc. I know that there are lineages that rely entirely on this text for the practice of Tregcho/Tögal and yogis in Tibet who only practice this and nothing else. It is supposed to be the foremost instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, that is true. There are other lineages. All of them produce realized persons.

adinatha said:

Is it your position that the Song of the Vajra is mengagde? My impression was that it is semsde.

Malcolm wrote:

it is not a position -- song of the vajra comes from the man ngag sde tantra Union of the Sun and Moon.

adinatha said:

I assume you hold Tögal in high esteem. But then you somehow also think you still need to do chulen to dissolve the elements and attain rainbow body, right?

There are many reasons for chulen in Dzogchen. But yes, based on the teachings of both ChNN and KDL, chulen is a necessary secondary condition for attaining rainbow body. This is not just their teaching however, chulen is mentioned in the sgra thal gyur etc.

This means that Yeshe Lama is lying when it says its instructions result in Rainbow Body, because there is no mention of chulen in there.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the importance of chulen is commonly understood by Tibetan yogis. They do not need to have everything explained. For example, there is a bcud len text connected with Dechen Gyälmo in the klong chen snying thig called the Amrita of the Three Kāyas

Chulen. In there it specifies that yogis who have abandoned activities must practice chulen continuously and that it is contributing factor to awakening. It also specifies, among other things, that dharmakāya chulen has the power to separate the impurities of mind from the pure essence of rigpa. Perhaps you might want to revise your definition of chulen?

adinatha said:

I gather this is your position. However, there are high level masters in the Nyingma lineage who would take umbrage with this statement.

Malcolm wrote:

There is always someone to take umbrage with any statement. In the end, the only authority that counts is oneself.

adinatha said:

Guru Yoga in Dzogchen three levels and the third has four levels right? NNR's guru yoga appears to fall into the semsde or longde category.

Malcolm wrote:

This kind of ranking is more tantric style.

No. It is all-encompassing, from sems sde to yang ti. There is no other guru yoga better than it, IMO. Of course, that does not mean one needs to remain in a state of limitation, if one has transmission for Thigle gya can, Chetsun Nyinthig, etc., it is also wonderful to do these more anuyoga style practices when time permits.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

...involves entering the mahayana five path system by cultivating earth like bodhicitta as opposed to the hinayana system of the five paths.. otherwise there is no other basis to form the intention to buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

The five paths are irrelevant in Dzogchen practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

You mean the opposite. But don't worry, when you become a Buddha on the stages, then you will have ample time to perfect your realization.

adinatha said:

See. A buddha is omniscient and beyond time, by definition. I realize you are interpreting Dzogchen to assert there are levels of Buddha. Did Shakyamuni just think he was omniscient but didn't actualize it until practicing Dzogchen after "parinirvana"?

Malcolm wrote:

Irrelevant. Buddha was an emanation of Vajradhara, in turn, an emanation of Samantabhadra.

adinatha said:

This goes back to the Third Turning examples. When the clouds part and the sun shines through are the sunbeams developing? It's kind of silly to think so. When the crust of dirt around a gold nugget is chipped off, is the gold nugget developed? Also silly to think so. This is inside out level.

Malcolm wrote:

You are still conflating the basis and the result. Generally, ore needs to be smelted to bring out the gold. As for a gold nugget in a rock, still, something needs to be removed before the value of the gold can be actualized.

adinatha said:

The channels and winds depend on mind's condition, so a permanent rest in the mind's true condition automatically fixes and optimizes the vajra body.

Malcolm wrote:

if that were true, even sutrayāna practice would be as fast as Vajrayāna. But it isn't because actually it is the opposite, mind depends on the condition of the body.

adinatha said:

I really want to emphasize there is transcendent level of practice, transcendent because it does not operate by any worldly way of thinking, requires the blessing of the guru and then it's all automatic.

Malcolm wrote:

Nice theory -- I hope it works out for you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Essence mahāmudra is a slow path, like sems sde.

This will depend on the lineage. I don't see how enlightenment in one life is a slow path. Even Manjushrimitra or was it Vimalamitra had to practice outer rushen six months of the year and togal the other six for fifty years or something like that. Time is totally relative anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not utilize vāyu yogas on any level, unlike Dzogchen Nyinthig. It depends on yoga, not on lineage. If things depended on lineage, rather than practice, there is no reason why we all would not be buddhas by now.

adinatha said:

However I think that Dzogchen is faster, easier and has more detailed explanations of what is happening.

This will also depend on the lineage re faster. I don't know about easier. You have mentioned one needs to do togal, then rasayana and chulen.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, it depends on yoga and nothing else. Not a strong believer in blessings as a short cut. Yes, I know this is a Kagyu perspective. But I am not a Kagyu. I also understand that for some fairly rare people, serving their Guru is a sufficient path.

adinatha said:

I forgot to mention that yes, I think Tilopa realization is perfect, etc. Also there is chulen associated with the lineage of Tilopa, Naropa, etc.

Yes, but it is not included in the oral instructions that comprise the most secretive level of Kagyu. There chulen is explicitly said to belong to a lower level of practice, basically the two-stage yoga level with tummo and karmamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, chulen something related to relative condition. It is also important for the reasons I have specified.

adinatha said:

No. The outer part of the method does indeed work from interdependence. Drikungs are particularly partial to interdependence. Lineage blessings are not to be underestimated. They are the source of power. But the inner realization is beyond interdependence. There's no latter without the former. Period.

Malcolm wrote:

There are five levels of dependent origination. The final one is called ultimate dependent origination. This exists in Kagyu because Phagmodru was a Lamdre practitioner for his entire life. His Lamdre texts were directly written down from the mouth of Sachen. Before Phagmodru met Gampopa, he was Sachen's main student.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 4:13 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

There are many signs that one would reach if one had even gotten to the end of the path of accumulation, or even entered into the path of accumulation by cultivating bodhicitta that would let one know one was on the right path... A Buddha knows he is omniscient because he has seen directly the past and future lives of not only himself but of every being in existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Signs of the path differ in different systems. The signs of the path of hinayāna are not the signs of the path of Mahayāna; the signs of the Secret Mantra are not the signs of the path of Mahāyāna; the signs of the path of Dzogchen are not the signs of the path of Secret Mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

But here we are at where we started. Buddha Shakyamuni and Vajradhara cannot revert. I would argue then a master like Tilopa who realized the level of Vajradhara also cannot revert. His methods to realize Vajradhara prohibit reversion to the basis. Perhaps there are those Mahamudra traditions that do not have the capacity to realize Vajradhara's nature fully. But there are those that do.

Namdrol said:

I have mentioned elsewhere many times, and perhaps you have not seen, that the main difference between a practice of tantric Mahāmudra and a practice of Dzogchen is that the former works from the outside in via the two stages, whereas the latter works from the inside out via the four visions. Both systems have the capacity to produce rainbow body.

Essence mahāmudra is a slow path, like sems sde.

However I think that Dzogchen is faster, easier and has more detailed explanations of what is happening.

I forgot to mention that yes, I think Tilopa realization is perfect, etc. Also there is chulen associated with the lineage of Tilopa, Naropa, etc.

mr. gordo said:

But you did say, and it is a bit depressing to hear, that Vajrayana practice does not revert back to the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the opposite. But don't worry, when you become a Buddha on the stages, then you will have ample time to perfect your realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

But here we are at where we started. Buddha Shakyamuni and Vajradhara cannot revert. I would argue then a master like Tilopa who realized the level of Vajradhara also cannot revert. His methods to realize Vajradhara prohibit reversion to the basis. Perhaps there are those Mahamudra traditions that do not have the capacity to realize Vajradhara's nature fully. But there are those that do.

Malcolm wrote:

I have mentioned elsewhere many times, and perhaps you have not seen, that the main difference between a practice of tantric Mahāmudra and a practice of Dzogchen is that the former works from the outside in via the two stages, whereas the latter works from the inside out via the four visions. Both systems have the capacity to produce rainbow body.

Essence mahāmudra is a slow path, like sems sde.

However I think that Dzogchen is faster, easier and has more detailed explanations of what is happening.

I forgot to mention that yes, I think Tilopa realization is perfect, etc. Also there is chulen associated with the lineage of Tilopa, Naropa, etc.

adinatha said:

The methods that reach the level of Vajradhara are extremely abstract and profound, something like magic. So there is that.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I think they are very straight forward and practical, nothing abstract about them at all. It all works based on dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:
adinatha said:
What does Vima Nyingthig say?

Malcolm wrote:
Well, I have not found a chulen text in this cycle-- but I also have not looked, frankly -- though as I mentioned, chulen is mentioned as an important practice in the root tantra, sgra thal gyur and other places. In Vimalamitra's commentary on the sgra thal rgyur devotes more than forty pages to explicating a single verse on various chulens and concludes that chulen "...ultimately perfects the qualities of buddhahood".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2011 at 1:29 AM
Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:
adinatha said:
Won't there be another universal cycle at the end of this one? So sentient beings will continue to be reborn and thus are endless? And previous cycles have gone on indefinitely prior to this one as well right? Beginningless and endless.

Malcolm wrote:
Sentient beings will arise again. Necessary precondition for samsara.

adinatha said:
Even if you are right, and Buddha Shakyamuni and Vajradhara have to revert to the basis,

Malcolm wrote:
These are nirmanakāyas of compassion -- they are emanations of dharmakāya. They will never revert.

adinatha said:
according to the law of karma, they could never lose their statuses as buddha could they? Same for any buddhas of the previous cycle right? Again beginningless and endless.

Malcolm wrote:
Sentient beings who attain incomplete buddhahood revert to the basis. The basis arises because of left over traces since they did not finish their job, then samsara arises again. Then new sentient beings arise from the traces of affliction left over from the previous eon. In this way Dzogchen Nyinthig reconciles all sentient being attaining buddhahood with cyclical samsara. The basis itself of course is never altered nor does it change in anyway.

adinatha said:

It doesn't say in the Vima or Khandro Nyingthig that chulen is a prereq for rainbow body does it?

Malcolm wrote:

The KN recommends a chulen among whose benefits is "purifying rigpa", "removing obstacles of the elements" etc.

Chulen is important in Dzogchen practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2011 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

There is enough of tshig don mdzod translated to get the gist. There is a non-temporal understanding that underlies Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the basis i.e. essence, nature and compassion is atemporal. However, in terms of explaining why there is samsara how to become free of samsara, there is a temporal explanation. Without understanding that, one will not understand what one is doing in practice.

adinatha said:

Whose commentaries are you referring to? Vimalamitra's?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

adinatha said:

Only a tiny, tiny portion of original Dzogchen texts have been published in English. When the Khandro Nyinthig is translated, then people again will have to revise what they think, etc.

Or it will just screw up what is already understood better. Because Longchenpa took all these and compiled the Nyingthig Yabshi, then Jigdral Lingpa discovered the Longchen Nyingthig and the essence of the essence is Yeshe Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree. But again, we are free to disagree (in a friendly way).

adinatha said:

The point is that all these various Nyinthig transmissions were refined and the best was extracted and refined finer and finer. This is an important point.

Malcolm wrote:

This happens in all schools. Much is lost in this process, IMO.

adinatha said:

Once one gets the clear understanding of the path of Tegal, there's no point in doing anything else.

Malcolm wrote:

That's not true. It depends person to person.

adinatha said:

For example, I take issue that chulen is important for attaining the Rainbow Body,

Malcolm wrote:

Ok. Noted. Not what my teachers or Dzogchen tantras and upadeshas say. But suit yourself. I can name three masters who attained rainbow body for whom chulen was critical -- Shabkar Natsog Rangdrol, Ngala Pema Duddul and Changchub Dorje. There are many more. Chulen is critical for breaking attachment to food, among other things. But you can do as you please.

adinatha said:

The whole point of Dzogchen is that it is effortless.

Malcolm wrote:

Effortlessness does not mean what people thinks it means.

adinatha said:

All kinds of complicated steps and detailed knowledge screws it up.

Malcolm wrote:

If one's knowledge is not practical for oneself, or useful in clarifying things for others, agreed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2011 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Is there a calendar of scheduled future open webcasts somewhere? I've tried to locate one before so I can make arrangements to participate, but I can't seem to find a schedule.

Malcolm wrote:

Webcast Team <mailto:webcast@shangshunginstitute.org>

Write them and they will keep you up to date.

also see: <http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Next webcast begins May 14th. For those on the East Coast the US it will likely run most days @ 2:00 AM.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2011 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Pure Lands

Content:

Madeliaette said:

Perhaps we should help to purify the land we already have birth in...?

Aemilius said:

The Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sūtra, in chapter one, says that this world is pure, but because your mind is not pure you see it as impure and containing all kinds of suffering and unpleasant nasty things.

Malcolm wrote:

That is correct and the reason why Vimalakirti nirdeśa says this is by nature a pure realm is that is that there are other Mahāyāna sūtras that identify this loka as an impure realm.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2011 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Incidentally, I think this citation show how sugatagarbha is understood in Dzogchen. The Lamp of Wisdom in the Gongpa Zangthal (Terma of Rigzin Godem) states:

"Therefore, the basis of all sentient beings is the primordial cause of buddhahood."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2011 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: lacking the capacity

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Well i can fully agree that Kuntu Zangpo would be here the source of the Dzogchen cycle of teachings and i guess that is common in as well Bon as well Nyingma.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Samantabhadra is the ultimate source of all Dharma teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2011 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: lacking the capacity

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

My question was better said, which Buddhist elements are inside Dzogchen philosophy or which are in a certain way common. One suggestion would be Sugatagarbha?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness, dependent origination, karma, rebirth, five elements, eight consciousnesses, five wisdoms, five aggregates, etc.

kalden yungdrung said:

Garab Dorje is an emanation of Shakyamuni Buddha.

This is new to me. Is this somewhere in a Dzogchen teaching from Prahevajra mentioned, or somewhere else in Garab Dorjes commentaries?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Shakyamuni Buddha is an emanation of Vajrasattva. Garab Dorje is an emanation of Varjasattva. Shakyamuni predicted Garab Dorje. This is detailed well in the lineage historys in Dzogchen Nyinthig.

kalden yungdrung said:

Yes i know that Kuntu Zangpo is here the primordial source and that would not be Buddha Shakyamuni[./color]

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra is the dharmakāya of all Buddhas.

Anyway, we don't have to get too linear about all of this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2011 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Oh. So he didn't dig a hole back behind the monastery and throw all the pecha in, then.....that's good!

Malcolm wrote:

He interred them in a stupa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

conebeckham said:

OH! Literally "buried," Namdrol?

A while back you commented that the Yangdak completion stage of the Khon/Kama might have been "buried." I thought you were speaking metaphorically!

Malcolm wrote:

'Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Lookin' for a copy of the Orgyen Menla Sadhana

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Whoops my mistake, the lung I received was for the sadhana of Sangye Menla from Mingyur Dorje, the Orgyen Menla sadhana lung (as I have been informed) is from Ngari Panchen.

Malcolm wrote:

You received both. CHNN always gives them together.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: CNN teaching Changchub Dorje's Medicine Terma

Content:

Pero said:

Oh man, there was a also lung for a tantra on the last day? It was the only day I couldn't participate because of mandatory school obligations. And this was the only day that I could participate coz I didn't have obligations (or more to the point: I reneged on all my

obligations!) so I got the lung and not the explanation

Anybody have any idea where can we can get a copy of the sadhana for the Orgyen Menla text and from which terton/terma it was from?

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

You would have to write Shang Shung bookstore. This tradition comes from the termas of Ngari Panchen.

The tantra in question was quite short, six lines. No explanation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Namdrol, I think I understand you a little better. You rely primarily on the Dzogchen tantras for your view and practice rather than on the terma cycles of the various gurus, except for your root guru, Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche. Is that about right?

Malcolm wrote:

I have relied principally on my gurus, ChNN and KDL, their teachings and personal experience. After that, tantras, upadeshas, etc.

adinatha said:

I see you believe Guru Rinpoche is reliable, perhaps not all termas claiming to be from him are reliable for you. I would assume Vimalamitra is a reliable source of wisdom, no? Then, for you lineage is not that important.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not read all termas, but as we move down the road in time, termas about Nyinthig become more and more condensed since they are like refreshers. In terms of tantras, I primarily rely on the seventeen tantras, in of termas, I rely primarily on Vima Nyingthig, Khandro Nyinthig and Gongpa Zangthal. I also like Shabkar's teachings on Dzogchen; it and Ye shes bla ma are good beginner's texts.

adinatha said:

What's important is direct perception of Samantabhadra via the Song of the Vajra.

Malcolm wrote:

Song of the vajra is a supreme Dzogchen method, as it is stated in the Nyi zla kha byor tantra and in the earlier terma cycles of Nyinthig.

adinatha said:

I assume you hold Tögal in high esteem. But then you somehow also think you still need to do chulön to dissolve the elements and attain rainbow body, right?

Malcolm wrote:

There are many reasons for chulön in Dzogchen. But yes, based on the teachings of both ChöNN and KDL, chulön is a necessary secondary condition for attaining rainbow body. This is not just their teaching however, chulön is mentioned in the *sgra thal gyur* etc.

adinatha said:

Probably Yantra Yoga too?

Malcolm wrote:

Yantra is important because it helps regulate the karmic winds. Not completely necessary, but important.

adinatha said:

That would mean you don't think Yeshe Lama is the best source of information about Tögal and Rainbow Body.

Malcolm wrote:

Ye shes bla ma is a wonderful text, but like all summaries, there are many important things it leaves out. It is a text for beginners. This is what earlier I mentioned that Khenpo Ngachung's commentaries on Ye shes Bla ma which derived from supplementary oral instructions of the cycle are very important since they clarify many things in Ye shes bla ma that are not fully explicated.

adinatha said:

I assume you resort to a tantra about that? A medical tantra?

Malcolm wrote:

The tantra which best explains rainbow body at death is the Cremation of the Remains Tantra (*sku gdung 'bar ba*).

adinatha said:

For me, tantras and sutras are descriptions, but they can't get you into the practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed.

adinatha said:

You have to have a guru for that, by way of guru yoga sadhana as the head of a session. Then, because of that, some guru yoga sadhanas are supreme, where the master has completely invested his mind into it, and the sadhaka can Yog to him. Then, all that guru's wisdom is complete in that sadhaka. Lineage, guru yoga and sadhaka Yog to that is nirmanakaya, sambho, dharmakaya. Without these combined there's no possibility of

realization. YOU've said that Namkhai Norbu stresses knowledge over devotion, but this is like a chicken and egg thing for me. There's only a stepped down version of knowledge from just resting in that nature that's pointed out. Guru yoga from a lineage has a power that's supreme in ripening beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is the main practice of Dzogchen, agreed. Like all students of ChNN, I do guru yoga in the most essential way. If I have time, then with more elaborations.

adinatha said:

You've also said that anyone can do Dzogchen, but how do you explain the extremely few rainbow bodies going on?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for the first part: whether or not someone meets Dzogchen teachings depends on their karma. Dzogchen teachings themselves teach that one should not make distinctions in capacity. Dzogchen practice is based on a personal experience, not concepts -- I think you will agree. That personal experience can be shown to anyone. Everyone has the same basis. But if they have the karma for Dzogchen, then everyone has the same basic capacity and the rest depends in their personal diligence.

That depends on diligence -- most Dzogchen practitioners attain buddhahood in the bardo. Only those of best diligence attain buddhahood in this body in this lifetime.

adinatha said:

How do you explain the fact that there are really probably about a couple handful of yogis who actually do Tögal seriously. Also of them, most find it extremely difficult and don't reach fruition.

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who even begins the practice of tögal will achieve full awakening in at most three lifetimes, if not during the bardo of dharmatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

No sentient beings are endless...

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously, this is not held to be true in Dzogchen.

adinatha said:

An explanation is not a path.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen explanation of the basis informs the path. There are two explanations of the basis in Dzogchen: the general basis and the body as the basis. The second depends on the first, and the path depends on the second.

adinatha said:

Uttaratantra at the level of completion stage is just elements. But that is nonsense at the level of nonconceptuality, because there bliss is nonconceptual and not a vedana.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not what is being indicated. What is being indicated is that wisdom has a physical basis in one's body.

adinatha said:

I don't see a master who matches Longchenpa. His teachings are so awesome, because they blow out anyone's dogmas.

Malcolm wrote:

I am glad you are a Longchenpa fanboy but...his two most important Dzogchen commentaries (tshig don mdzod and theg mchog dzod) have not made it into complete English translation yet. When they do, a lot of people will have to revise what they think about Dzogchen. Beyond that, we now have 6 of the original 17 commentaries of the 17 upadesha tantras - including the root tantra, sgra thal gyur. When these are published, people will have to revise their understanding of Dzogchen. These commentaries are far more interesting than Longchenpa, indeed they are what Longchenpa read.

Only a tiny, tiny portion of original Dzogchen texts have been published in English. When the Khandro Nyinthing is translated, then people again will have to revise what they think, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

Namdrol said:

So, having received the Mahāmudra teachings of both Kagyu (Karma and Drikung) and Sakya (Lamdre/Yogini) and also many Dzogchen teachings, I decided for myself that Dzogchen was best, not because someone told me it was best, but because there are too many special features of Dzogchen that are unique and cannot be found elsewhere.

Nevertheless, all of these Vajrayāna teachings are profound.

mr. gordo said:
Namdrol,

Can you say something on the Khon Vajrakilaya practice in terms of it's influence in Sakya? If there are pointing out instructions for Kilaya, I'm surprised that there wasn't more of a Dzogchen paradigm influence in Sakya.

Malcolm wrote:
Khon Konchog Gyalpo buried most of the ancestral teachings of the Khon.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 9:24 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?
Content:

tamdrin said:
the idea that dzogchen is an "easier path" than Mahamudra is complete and utter hype!... The nyingmapa's do more ngondro's by far than any other sect to begin with.. Even in drikung the yangzab is traditionally done 400,000 times for each exercise, as opposed to 100,000 of each in the Mahamudra, then there are tons of Mantras for the 3 roots and everything that goes with it.. etc. just making a point

Malcolm wrote:
That is in Drikung.

In dgongs pa zang thal the original texts state one week of refuge, twenty one days of vajrasattva, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 9:22 AM
Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity
Content:

adinatha said:
For the reasons we have discussed above, I feel that the explanations Shakyamuni's sutras are more profound than the tantras sometimes. Consider how tantras arise. People want buddhahood now. Also some are not satisfied with what the buddha said earlier and demand more precision. Doubt gives rise to these in depth explanations of where everything comes from and where it is all going. Reading is not going to dispel that obscuraton. It's a habit born from beginningless time. I contend that the buddha was never holding back. The ultimate fruit was always the same thing, because what's

time got to do with it. If we want to get really down to it, this is all about love and what's that anyway? If Garab Dorje is right and we will all be enlightened, I don't mind going on and on and on. I can just practice love. Love is fantastic, miraculous; it actually has an energy wave to it. How pure this land would be if we only practice metta sadhana until the final eon. Such karma cannot be lost, so why not? Compassion cannot exist without sentient beings to liberate. Without compassion, there is no buddha. This buddha dynamic requires samsara. So what's the point abandoning it? Actually there is no point without it. Samsara is endless; therefore so is buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is the difference between you and me. I consider Dzogchen alone to be definitive. Everything else is either provisional or intentional.

Compassion does not require sentient beings. A Buddha's compassion has not objects.

Compassion is part of the natural state of the original basis whether there are sentient beings or not.

Dzogchen answers the questions: how do sentient beings arise? Where does mind come from? Dzogchen is fundamentally different because of the range of questions it answers, answers often fundamentally in opposition to long cherished sutra dogmas.

Dzogchen is different because of its explanation of the basis.

Texts like Uttaratantra do not even approach the explanation of the basis given in Dzogchen -- none of the Sarma tantras do. And so on, et al. Blah blah blah.

Uttaratantra says sugatagarbha is dharmakāya; Dzogchen says that sugatagarbha is the four elements in one's body.

This is one reason why sometimes I don't like Longchenpa's explanations -- he is a scholar used to defending Dzogchen against critics, and sometimes he uses sutra doctrines from a Dzogchen perspective but does not inform people what he is doing. One of those uses is sugatagarbha doctrine. He uses it to try to get people to understand a particular point -- but in my opinion, not so successfully.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Part of what we've been debating about is the inseparability is why buddhahood is primordial and eternal. I take all my lessons from Vimala and Longchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

I have been discussing with you why I think that taking the examples of in Uttaratantra literally is a mistake.

Basically, you are conflating the original general basis which we can term "natural buddhahood" with resultant buddhahood.

Padsambhava states:

Since The Rosary of Pearls also states “The stage of liberation is first”, there is liberation into the primordial original basis, that is called “the result of original purity exhausting phenomena”, that demonstrates the manner of the liberation of the final result.

This is subtle point, easily misunderstood.

The original basis, essence, nature and compassion, is termed "Buddhahood" since that is what is realized at the end of the path. But this is not what the Uttaratantra examples mean if taken literally. Essence, nature and compassion are one's potentiality. This is why Guru Rinpoche says:

After the mass of traces and the whole physical body of elements self-purifies, since the essence develops into kāyas (forms), it is not parted from nor put together with the three kāyas. Since the nature develops into omniscient wisdom, it is not parted from nor put together with the three wisdoms. Since compassion develops into activities of deeds, compassion is unceasing. Also that is stated in The Luminous Space:

The essence is the luminous empty jñānakāya,
nature and compassion are without partiality,
as they are totally inseparable, already Buddhahood.

So, in terms of a person's path, we can see that here there is a process of maturation of a potentiality.

Again:

As such, having given up the attached grasping of body, voice and mind with it's physical matter, the body, speech, mind, qualities and activities develop and having given up the grasping of the five kāyas, there is self-arisen intrinsically clear self-liberation into the total original purity of the original basis. The Self-Arisen states:

The samsara of grasping at concepts is cleansed,
developing into the meaning of the jñānakāya itself,
that is to be called “Buddhahood.”

This is why, in this instance, the discussion about the liberation of Samantabhadra contrasted with the delusion of sentient beings is critical. If one does not understand this, and tries to apply the sugatagarbha teachings too literally to Dzogchen, then it

becomes something very strange. And if one takes them literally in non-Dzogchen context, how is one different from the eternalist tirthikas?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Really? Luminosity of Togal is clarity, rig-empty tregcho is basis...

Namdrol said:

Not really. These two things are not actually separate. They were only separated by later teachers.

adinatha said:

Obviously they are not actually separate, the distinction is made for purposes of explaining different stages of practice to people who have no experience.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not different stages of practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 8:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

Jinzang said:

And my experience has been that I haven't gotten anything out of Dzogchen that I haven't also found in Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

From the POV of meditation, there is very little difference in meditating tregchö, inseparability of samsara and nirvana and mahāmudra.

There are differences in explanation and emphasis, but main point is more or less the same: equipoise in tha mal gi shes pa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

Pero said:

That's not what I meant or thought I was saying. What I meant was that as far as I remember Milarepa achieved Buddhahood before Marpa did. However according to you that shouldn't be possible since you think that a student cannot surpass his teacher. In other words, Milarepa would only have been able to achieve Buddhahood only after Marpa had already achieved it.

Namdrol said:

Impossible, Marpa died before Milarepa attained realization.

Pero said:

Hmm, I don't remember that (or perhaps never knew). In any case it's not really clear to me what you're saying. Marpa died and achieved Buddhahood while Milarepa was still alive and he hasn't achieved it?

Malcolm wrote:

Just that Marpa died while Mila was shortly into his 12 years of retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Then, you attain another buddhahood that reverts to the basis. If you have a view that does not care what time it is, then what's the diff man?

Malcolm wrote:

There are many things about Dzogchen teachings that do not fit into the normative Indian Buddhist model. This is not the case with Mahāmudra teachings which are rooted into Indian tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

your still not explaining what is the "reality of the basis" and what reverting to the basis means clearly?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is the three wisdoms: essence, nature and compassion. "Reverting to the

basis" means that you have not eradicated all the most subtle traces in the elements of your physical body.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

Pero said:

That's not what I meant or thought I was saying. What I meant was that as far as I remember Milarepa achieved Buddhahood before Marpa did. However according to you that shouldn't be possible since you think that a student cannot surpass his teacher. In other words, Milarepa would only have been able to achieve Buddhahood only after Marpa had already achieved it.

Malcolm wrote:

Impossible, Marpa died before Milarepa attained realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

According to Dzogchen teachings, all sentient being attain Buddhahood by the end of the eon -- this is very clearly stated by Garab Dorje in the commentary above.

adinatha said:

I was just thinking that this is very comforting; although it can't be the case. Then, there is no reason to practice anything, because I have a set destiny. I will be enlightened at the end of the eon.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is still reason to practice -- you have to attain a Buddhahood that does not revert to the basis. If you are passive, then...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Generally, alaya vijnana is karmic. Whether you say the undeluded version is "alaya" is of little importance. Guru Rinpoche explains this in his famous direct introduction.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean in the dgongs pa rang grol cycle?

adinatha said:

Really? Luminosity of Tegal is clarity, rig-empty tregcho is basis...

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. These two things are not actually separate. They were only separated by later teachers.

adinatha said:

You're wrong. He never said Arhatship was buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, in the Pali canon, he even terms arhats Tathāgatas. Go argue about this with some learned Pali scholars.

adinatha said:

Omniscience was never possible for an Arhat. Hiniyanas interpreted Arhatship as the limit of accomplishment. The Buddha explains in Pali how buddhahood arises, due to bodhisattva practice and attending innumerable buddhas. None of this is contradicted by any of the higher vehicles.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you will find the Agamas and Nikayas nearly as pliable to Mahayana interpretation as you like.

adinatha said:

There is no actual Vajradhara, just like there is no real Samantabhadra.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and no.

adinatha said:

...Samantabhadra is the nature of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Only in a very coarse presentation.

adinatha said:

You can't go shake their hand. Buddha is buddha. There is no level higher than omniscience.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there is -- as Samputa clearly explains. But this is something Sakyas/Nyingmas and Kagyus do not agree on. Kaguyus basically assert what you just have -- there is only one level of buddhahood, the eleventh bhumi. When we see breakdowns into more bhumis, these are just refinements of bodhisattva levels -- but still only one level of Buddhahood.

Sakyas and Nyingmapas do not see it that way. So we will agree to disagree. we see qualitative differences in the omniscience of the three levels or six levels of Buddhahood. The funny thing is meditatively, and in terms of direct introduction and so on Kagyu and Nyingma are closer. But in terms of philosophy and basic attitudes about the path and so Sakya and Nyingma are closer. This is why when one leaves Sakya or Kagyu, there is only one place to go.

Moreover, in Dzogchen there is a further distinction between Abhisambudhas and Samyaksambuddhas.

adinatha said:

This teaching makes absolutely no sense in the context of an infinite universe situation where there is no possibility that it all has an expansion and contraction. All sentient beings includes beings in all infinite universes. There must be something more to understand about Garab Dorje's explanation.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, I am merely reporting what Garab Dorje says. Perhaps all infinite triple dhātu world systems are part of one universe. There is a lot of slippage in the way we use the term "universe" and world system in relationship to Indo-Tibetan cosmology.

adinatha said:

What Lord Jigten Sumgon means is that the highest possible limit of a view is nongrasping. If a practitioner says, my view is Great Completion, Mahamudra or Madhyamaka is a grasping of the subtlest kind which prevents supreme realization. What he is saying is a conceptual view is garbage.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote][/quote]

I understand what he means. I think the way it is comes across however is that this sentiment causes Kagyupas to see all the Vajrayāna methods as just various options, more or less equal, whether from Sarma or Nyingma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

Dhondrub said:

I cant believe you guys are having this conversation. This teaching is better... no, my teaching is better... i came to the conclusion my teaching is the best.

And who said Marpa wasnt enlightend?

Malcolm wrote:

This is normal. Used to happen on e-Sangha all the time. This is one reason we shut the Dzogchen forum down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

conebeckham said:

Alaya is not always considered alaya vijnana in Kagyu Mahamudra teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I thought so -- but there are also Kagyu teachings where they are more or less are the same.

conebeckham said:

I think Luminosity is Sambhogakaya, yes? Empty nature is Dharmakaya....though I don't claim the Dzogchen usage of the term "luminous clarity" is the same as any meaning in Mahamudra, necessarily.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

If you read the Guysamaja tantra sixteen bhumi's are also mentioned so this is not something that is exclusive to "dzogchen".. In the Guhyasamaja it is said that the 15th bhumi is "wisdom" and the sixteenth bhumi is left un named..

Malcolm wrote:

It is a different arrangement. This arrangement comes from the one of the Dzogchen tantras. And of course the sixteenth bhumi is termed yeshe bla ma.

In Anuyoga, there is a system of twenty one bhumis, for example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Take the following into consideration about whether Garab Dorje was making illustrations or saying something quintessential. The account of the rise of the universe and the enlightenment of Samantabhadra would only hold true in itself if there was only one universe that expands and contracts. But, even Shakyamuni knew and all buddhas know, there are infinite universes. For every universe that expands, another contracts and vice-versa. This would mean, if you take Garab Dorje literally, that there is one Samantabhadra per universe. It would also seem to mean a buddha's omniscience is limited to one universe, which contradicts the meaning of omniscience. This is absurd. The nature of mind transcends temporarinesses.

Malcolm wrote:

There can be infinite Samantabhadras in infinite expanding and contracting universes. Garab Dorje was only taking about the first Buddha in our particular series of eons and the lineage of Buddhas of Dzogchen teachings in this universe. "Adi" does not mean primordial, it means "first". This is why the Tibetans translate "adi" as "thog ma".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

Namdrol,

its true that it is not possible for there to be a basis beyond dharmakaya...

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say this.

I said that there is a basis that is beyond the nature of the mind in Dzogchen. In mahāmudra, the basis is luminosity as in the luminosity of the mind.

Not so in Dzogchen.

In Dzogchen, 'od gsal is not considered dharmakāya -- this is a Sarma school consideration. This is not how Dzogchen parses things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Alaya is deluded.

Malcolm wrote:

For sure in Dzogchen.

But this is a standard (non-Kagyu) mahamudra terminology. Here ālaya just means the inseparable clarity and emptiness of the mind.

It is true that the alāya is deluded in Dzogchen. It is true the terma ālaya it is considered the ālaya vijñāna in Kagyu mahāmudra teachings, but in other texts, for example, the Seven Points of mind training ālaya is not considered to be the same as ālaya vijñāna.

adinatha said:

The dharmakaya is not the alaya.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Dzogchen perspective, agreed. But the term is used differently in different schools.

adinatha said:

It's impossible there is a basis beyond the dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Dzogchen perspective, agreed. But what is understood as luminous clarity in mahāmudra, which is taken as the basis [gzhi] and is taken as dharmakāya, is quite different than what is understood as luminous clarity in Dzogchen. Same word, very different meanings.

Same thing with the term "ālaya" -- yes in Drikung Mahāmudra, influenced a little by Dzogchen, they make a distinction between ālaya and the the basis.

adinatha said:

The mahamudra lineage is the dharmakaya lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

The various mahāmudra schools make the clarity, emptiness and inseparability of the mind into the three kāyas. They may term the basis differently, etc. But the meaning is that same.

This is not, ultimately, the approach of Dzogchen.

adinatha said:

Story about the universe and all that, sounds nice, but it makes Shakyamuni a liar, that his teachings don't end the cycle of birth and death, because a reversion to the basis of alaya would entail being returned to the cycle of samsara in the following universal cycle.

Malcolm wrote:

I am simply reporting what Garab Dorje, Padmasambhava, Shri Singha et al actually say. I don't need to interpret anything.

In Hinayāna, Shakyamuni taught arhatship as buddhahood. In Mahāyāna, he taught that arhatship was not buddhahood, and was inferior to buddhahood. And that in fact, after attaining arhatship, arhats would be roused from their nirodhasamapatti at some point and then they must traverse the paths of stages of Mahāyāna. So, was the Buddha lying in Hināyāna when he told his followers that arhatship was it?

In Vajrayāna, in the Samputa tantra it is clarified that there are three stages of Buddhahood. Two stages of Buddhas who do not recognize all phenomena as being the display of their own wisdom and the thirteenth bhumi, Vajradhara, where all phenomena are so recognized. Does this make the Buddha a liar about Mahāyāna?

In Dzogchen, there are enumerated another three stages, three more stages of those who dwell within wisdom, rendering the thirteenth bhumi a lower stage of buddhahood. Does this make the Buddha a liar about Vajrayāna?

In any event, this notion of "Buddhahood that reverts to the basis [gzhi, not kun gzhi]" as an inferior buddhahood that is not complete is well attested in Dzogchen. It has to be the case because as Garab Dorje points out, all sentient beings in the previous eon attain buddhahood by the end of the eon. This is explicitly stated by Garab Dorje in the commentary I mentioned to above.

But to illustrate my point further, the Drikung view is Dzogchen is definitely subordinated. For example, Jigten Sumgon states in Gongcik: "The supreme realization is not touched by the three great ones." This is echoe of a statement by Gampopoa to his nephew, Gomchung.

But I don't during Jigten Sumgon's time Nyingthig was wide spread. At this point in history Nyingma was very much on the decline.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

To be serious I am a bit surprised at this thread. I don't think ChNN needs so much advertisement, pretty sure he wouldn't like it. I wonder why you think it is important to do it?

/magnus

mr. gordo said:

Hi magnus,

This thread isn't so much an "advertisement" as much as a space where students of Namkhai Norbu can discuss practices within their community and help other members. Threads of other communities and teachers are welcome as well.

heart said:

I am pretty sure ChNN expressed dislike with discussing DC practices online. But never mind it is not a big deal, whatever you like is ok but I doubt there will be other threads like this for other communities in this forum.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

We are not discussing DC practices.

That depends on whether people wish to discuss these things amongst themselves. So if there are more than a few Gomde people here, I see know reason why there would be such a thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

adinatha said:

Well, the counter of this among high Kagyu lamas is that the realization of Dzogchen masters is rather small compared to the realization and activities of the great Kagyu masters. There's always another side, and it's not universally accepted that Dzogchen is the highest or the equal of Mahamudra. Not so much because the teachings are better or worse, but because the samayas and the power of Kagyu lineages are supreme.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and the Sakyapas say that both the Kagyus and the Nyingmapas exaggerate their masters realizations, blah blah blah, and that the Samaya of Sakya lineages is the purest, blah blah blah...

I base my understanding on what these teachings actually say. Not on gossip and competition.

So, having received the Mahāmudra teachings of both Kagyu (Karma and Drikung) and Sakya (Lamdre/Yogini) and also many Dzogchen teachings, I decided for myself that Dzogchen was best, not because someone told me it was best, but because there are too many special features of Dzogchen that are unique and cannot be found elsewhere.

Nevertheless, all of these Vajrayāna teachings are profound.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

OK will do, thanks. Tsch, I knew I should've listened to it, sgra thal 'gyur is my favorite tantra and I think I didn't have any big obstacles other than being an idiot.

Nangwa said:

I'm not 100% on the level of sgra thal gyur content in that day. I'm pretty sure thats the correct day but even if I am mistaken its still well worth a listen. I have to listen to it again to be sure.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a section of sgra thal 'gyur commentary he was talking about actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

conebeckham said:

SNIP

Thanks Sean -- from a Dzogchen perspective, one must differentiate between the ālaya and the basis. The ālaya is talking about the nature of the mind i.e. inseparable clarity and emptiness. But the basis is beyond the mind -- it is talking about the basis of everything, mind, the five elements, etc.

So there is a basis beyond the mind from a Dzogchen POV.

N

Could you perhaps explain this "basis-beyond-the-mind"? Or is it not suitable for public consumption?

Malcolm wrote:

Essence, nature and compassion is the basis for all phenomena including the mind. It is quite different than the ālaya which is a key feature of Sakya and Kagyu Mahāmudra teachings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

I don't think so.. The nature of mind is emptiness and clarity.. this "basis" you are describing is "emptiness and clarity".. something beyond the ultimate is a fabrication of the conceptual mind.

Namdrol said:

Hi Sean:

For you, the mind is the basis.

For Dzogchen, the mind is not the basis.

N

tamdrin said:

No Malcolm:

This is not about me. It is about your distinction between the ultimate nature of the mind and the basis and then failing to make any distinction.

Have a nice day!

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks Sean -- from a Dzogchen perspective, one must differentiate between the ālaya and the basis. The ālaya is talking about the nature of the mind i.e. inseparable clarity and emptiness. But the basis is beyond the mind -- it is talking about the basis of everything, mind, the five elements, etc.

So there is a basis beyond the mind from a Dzogchen POV.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

I dont think so.. The nature of mind is emptiness and clarity.. this "basis" you are describing is "emptiness and clarity".. something beyond the ultimate is a fabrication of the conceptual mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Sean:

For you, the mind is the basis. This is standard Mahāmudra view. You are talking about the kun gzhi, the ālaya.

For Dzogchen, the mind is not the basis. This is not talking about the kun gzhi, the ālaya, this is talking about the gzhi, the basis i.e. ṣṭhiti. Completely different.

(To be fair, in some Dzogchen cycles the term kun gzhi is used as a synonym for the gzhi, but it is clearly differentiated from mind as the ālaya)

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

tamdrin said:

if you state that one can be liberated from possibility of rebirth in the lower realms other than the standard path it is realized on in sutra then I thought you could explain how this is.. It is not asking about arbitrary comparisons exactly..

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but it involves discussing things connected with thögal and I would rather not do this publicly. Dzogchen cosmology is one thing, this is different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Two things always cause arguments on Tibetan Buddhist boards:

- 1) Talking about the special features of Dzogchen not shared in other systems.
- 2) Talking about Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

you seemed to be implying that there was a basis beyond emptiness/clarity/ and compassion -which are basically the 3 kayas.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a basis beyond the nature of the mind. That's the point.

As to your other objection. I am presenting this for information. People do not understand these things well, primarily because most of this information is still locked away in Tibetan and historically it has been kept under lock and key by the Gelugpas i.e. they liked to control information, especially about Dzogchen and there is a tacit agreement not to rock the boat with radical upsetting Dzogchen doctrines.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

tamdrin said:

oh yeah, then what does ati say about it?, lets see some convincing quotes if u don't mind

Malcolm wrote:

I am not really into using the teachings for proving and negating. Only for clarifying what is unclear in people's minds.

If you are interested you can listen to webcasts with ChNN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

To be serious I am a bit surprised at this thread. I don't think ChNN needs so much

advertisement, pretty sure he wouldn't like it. I wonder why you think it is important to do it?

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, ChNN likes advertising very much. I remember when I was president of Gakyil at Tsegyalgar, I said we must advertise transmission days. People said, oh no, ChNN won't like that. So I wrote him, and he loved the idea. After that, membership in DC exploded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

pemachophel said:

My point is that you should try to find a Teacher who completely sees you inside and out, knows all your good and bad points, knows all the ways you habitually con yourself, knows all the ways you habitually protect and aggrandize your ego, who can and does dismantle your kleshas with totally compassionate but also totally unwavering ruthlessness. When you find this kind of Teacher, then you simply do what the Teacher tells you to do.

Namdrol said:

2 more cents: the only person who dismantles your afflictions is you. No guru can do that for you. The best they can do is be a mirror.

N

Dhondrub said:

In an ultimate sense that's true. In real life: unless you have that trust in your Guru, who also has the qualities described by Pemachopel, you easily just stray from the path and become a great meditator with an equally great ego.

Malcolm wrote:

This is my view:

In a relative sense that is true. Everything about your path is up to you. Your path, your responsibility. No?

If you want certain teachings, then you fearlessly seek a guru who will impart them to you. If you have to go through a hundred gurus, then you do. When you meet a guru who will give you the teachings for which you yearn -- your job is to put them into practice. It is not disrespectful to your other gurus to move on until you find the one who give you

the teachings you desire. As you practice more, you learn more, and often you have to move on to find teachings you need. This is normal. Sometimes you have to get teachings from some other teacher to make sense of the teachings you originally got. Etc. But the point is you must never be passive. When you understand more or less perfectly the teaching you desire, then you must put it into practice. You have no excuse of you don't.

A guru's job is not to deal with our neurotic bullshit. It is amazing that they put up with any of it at all. A Guru's job is simply to give teachings for our own liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

What happens if, after practicing until death, one still hasn't recognized diddly squat? Would it not have been better to practice the gradual path? At least one has some mantra accumulations to count on in the bardo.

Namdrol said:

If you receive Dzogchen teachings and apply them, you will have nothing to worry about at death. I guarantee it, or money back.

tamdrin said:

anyone can potential be reborn in the lower realms until you attain the patience level of the path of joining..

Malcolm wrote:

That might be true in sutra, but it is not true in Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

tamdrin said:

So you are saying that vidya is something relative, how then can realization of it be "the ultimate Buddhahood of Dzogchen".

Malcolm wrote:

Vidyā is recognition of the basis. Avidyā is non-recognition of the basis. The basis is essence, nature and compassion.

tamdrin said:

And what is this "basis" that is beyond even rigpa itself?

Malcolm wrote:

Essence, nature and compassion which are present whether they are recognized or not.

tamdrin said:

if there was a buddhahood that reverted it wouldn't be called Buddhahood now would it...

Malcolm wrote:

What lower yānas terms "Buddhahood" is what Dzogchen terms "buddhahood that reverts to the basis".

tamdrin said:

it doesnt make sense because sense both mahamudra and dzogchen have described the ultimate nature of mind to be the inseparable union of emptiness and clarity..

Malcolm wrote:

It makes sense. The nature of the mind is not all there is to Dzogchen. If it were, I agree it Dzogchen and Mahāmudra really would be no different.

tamdrin said:

Only the Nyingma school accepts the division of all systems into the so-called nine yanas, so where does this leave the Buddhahood of the sarma which is the perception of ultimate reality by all means..

Malcolm wrote:

A Buddhahood that reverts to the basis. The Buddhahood of all nine yānas is a buddhahood that reverts to the basis.

tamdrin said:

It is funny to impute a basis beyond a basis (which would be rigpa itself.)>. This is a dzogchen-centric world view and does not take into account the importance of the enlightenment of Buddha Shakyamuni, for without him there wouldn't have been any turning of the dharma wheels, and thus no base of buddhist awareness for the later teachers to make their cases...

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni Buddha is the twelfth of the so called "twelve teachers" of Dzogchen prior to Garab Dorje. If you add Tonpa Shenrab into the mix, then Shakyamuni Buddha is

important, but there have been many times in the past in this eon when Dzogchen teachings have been taught -- and often enough, without sutrayāna etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2011 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

What happens if, after practicing until death, one still hasn't recognized diddly squat? Would it not have been better to practice the gradual path? At least one has some mantra accumulations to count on in the bardo.

Malcolm wrote:

If you receive Dzogchen teachings and apply them, you will have nothing to worry about at death. I guarantee it, or money back.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

pemachophel said:

My point is that you should try to find a Teacher who completely sees you inside and out, knows all your good and bad points, knows all the ways you habitually con yourself, knows all the ways you habitually protect and aggrandize your ego, who can and does dismantle your kleshas with totally compassionate but also totally unwavering ruthlessness. When you find this kind of Teacher, then you simply do what the Teacher tells you to do.

Malcolm wrote:

2 more cents: the only person who dismantles your afflictions is you. No guru can do that for you. The best they can do is be a mirror.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

So, even once one has become sure about what Rigpa is and is just working on stabilising that knowledge, nothing "cool" will happen?

Malcolm wrote:

What could be cooler than that? Everything else is just bells and whistles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: lacking the capacity

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

What does Buddhism incorporate inside the Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Not a clear question.

kalden yungdrung said:

- Is Dzogchen based on teachings stemming from Buddha Shakyamuni?

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje is an emanation of Shakyamuni Buddha.

kalden yungdrung said:

- In case of yes how is this Dzogchen lineage called and which Dzogchen Masters are included?

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra, Vajrasattva, etc., Garab Dorje, Manjshruimitra, etc.

kalden yungdrung said:

- Can one practice Dzogchen without being a Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Whoever follows the teachings of a Buddha is a Buddhist.

kalden yungdrung said:

- What is a Buddhist or when can one call oneself a Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

When one goes for refuge to any Buddha, his Dharma and his Sangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

How come these people don't get what they are looking for? Are they all practicing wrong? You yourself said it is so subtle that it is hard to understand.

Malcolm wrote:

People do not understand what a "result" is. If they are happier, more mindful and more relaxed, what other result do they want?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

Great. Thank you.

Now, there is not just 1 site where Rinpoche's retreats and webcasts are located, right?

Another thing I was wondering about though. Will practicing the methods described in the Precious Vase allow me to recognize Rigpa, even without having any further close contact to Rinpoche? How does that work exactly?

And, you told Mr. Gordo it all comes down to interest and diligence, but there seem to be so many people who practice Dzogchen, who then just give up because they don't get results. How come these people don't get what they are looking for? Are they all practicing wrong? You yourself said it is so subtle that it is hard to understand. Doesn't one need a kind of close relationship with a teacher then?

Many thanks once again,

Clarence

Malcolm wrote:

This is the main webcast site.

Rigpa is just your knowledge of your state. So yes, practicing this methods in these books will bring you to that knowledge.

You try to listen to as many retreats as you can.

They are mostly being broadcast without restriction these days and if you become a member you can listen to replays.

You just need to hear the teachings a lot -- that is the advantage. If you have serious question, you can always email Rinpoche.

And you must try to go meet him in person.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

How does on go about getting pointing out in the Dzogchen Community? I saw there is a retreat in Merigar from 14th to 20th of this month with a webcast. Where can I sign-up or listen to the webcasts?

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Now, if I don't recognize during pointing-out through the webcast, do I then have automatic permission to practice the methods to recognize?

Yes.

Clarence said:

You said they are the Lojong, Semdzins and Rushens, right? Are there more? How do I know how to practice them? Does DC have teachers available who can help or how does this work?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are teachers of SMS who teach Rinpoche's Precious Vase. You can study with them.

Clarence said:

Is it possible to purchase and practice the Semdzins, Rushens, etc. booklet having received pointing out from other masters?

Malcolm wrote:

No, in order to purchase any restricted book, one must be a member of the DC. That is not so expensive and has many benefits.

Clarence said:

So, basically, how should a newcomer to the DC go about his way?

Malcolm wrote:

You should listen to webcast, see if ChNN inspires you. If so, become a member of DC in your local region. By books for practices that interest you. Learn them well. In particular, you must buy Precious Vase. As well as sadhana book called the Thun Book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Primordial Buddha: beginningless vidya. Youthful vase body. Five lights. Self-sprung simultaneous appearances of samsara and nirvana. Samsara spontaneously emptied because no three times, due to immediate responsiveness of dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, it is important to understand three things: the general original basis, the reality of the basis, and how ignorance manifests. In addition to that it is necessary to know that Garab Dorje's commentary on the Single Son of the Buddha's tantras supplies a necessary understanding I will address below at the section on the arising of the basis.

The Unwritten Tantra (Yi ge med pa describes how the general original basis exists:

“There is no object to investigate within the view of self-originated wisdom: nothing went before, nothing happens later, nothing is present now at all. Action does not exist. Traces do not exist. Ignorance does not exist. Mind does not exist. Discriminating wisdom does not exist. Samsara does not exist. Nirvana does not exist. Even vidyā itself does not exist i.e. nothing at all appears in wisdom. That arose from not grasping anything.”

This is the state of original purity, The Blazing Lamp says:

Within initial original purity

the nature is like so:

not made by anyone, manifesting naturally,

the nature is already just so.

In this state, The Rosary of Pearls states:

The mere term delusion cannot be described

within the original purity of the initial state,

likewise, how can there be non-delusion?

Therefore, pure of delusion from the beginning.

The Heart Mirror states “ All phenomena of the basis must be understood as the trio of essence, nature and compassion. All phenomena of the essence must be understood as emptiness. All phenomena of the nature must be understood as luminosity. All phenomena of compassion must be understood as pervading all sentient beings. ”

So, of course, there must be essence, nature and compassion, timelessly present as the basis. Without these wisdoms, there can be no nirvana and no samsara. We can term these three "sugatagarbha" if we like. Padmasambhava states in the Clear Mirror:

Those three wisdoms pervade Samantabhadra and sentient beings down to the tiniest creature without any discrimination of good or bad, high or low.

Since these three wisdoms are themselves not established in anyway at all, we can be sure we are free from eternalism. Since these three natures always appear, we are free from annihilationism.

adinatha said:

Vidya arises simultaneously with 8 vijnana. A moment of nonapprehension: sentient being. A moment of apprehension: Samantabhadra. No two moments, even though deluded discriminating mind sees two moments and re-liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

In the system of the Dzogchen Nyingthig three causes of ignorance are described -- those three are essence, nature and compassion. This is why there are three ignorances in this system. The system of explanation of Gongpa Zangthal is a little different, with only two ignorances -- we will continue with the Dzogchen Nyingthig system.

According to Garab Dorje, prior to the arising of the basis which is latent during the dark eon interval, nevertheless there are traces of affliction and action remaining from the previous eon. Because of these traces, the basis is stirred, the five lights appear and so on (this is why the Dzogchen doctrine of two different kinds of Buddhahood is critical -- the first, the buddhahood that reverts the basis is the buddhahood asserted by all lower vehicles. The buddhahood that does not revert to the basis is the preserve of only Dzogchen).

The Gongpa Zangthal cycle supplies that during the arising of basis there is a neutral awareness (shes pa lung ma bstan) in the basis that does not recognize itself. This non-recognition is the innate ignorance. When this neutral awareness cognizes the five lights there is a dividing line between nirvana and samsara. When a neutral awareness recognizes the appearance of the basis as its own appearances it is prajñā and is immediately liberated. That is Samantabhadra. A neutral awareness that does not recognize appearances as its own appearances immediately is the imputing ignorance, and samsara begins (again) because subject and object is imputed. This is all very clearly explained in detail in the eleven topics of Dzogchen Nyingthig. This is also clearly explained by Khenpo Ngawang Palzang.

adinatha said:

Key point: innate enlightenment arises simultaneously with innate ignorance.

Malcolm wrote:

After the basis arises, innate ignorance is first and even Samantabhadra has it. There is period where a neutral awareness does not recognize itself in anyway. That is the innate

ignorance. It (the neutral awareness) can only recognize itself through the display of five lights. When it recognizes that display as its own display, then this is the liberation of Samantabhadra without the performance of an iota of virtue. We on the other hand did not recognize these five lights as our own display, and for us, samsara began, without even an particle of non-virtue having been done.

According to Dzogchen teachings, all sentient being attain Buddhahood by the end of the eon -- this is very clearly stated by Garab Dorje in the commentary above. But there are two kinds of Buddhahood, and as I said above, there is only Buddhahood that does not revert to the basis, and that is the Buddhahood attained through Dzogchen methods. The Buddhahood of other vehicles reverts to the basis, without the corresponding result.

Now then, the reason why we cannot take these metaphors in Uttaratantra literally is that the basis is not Buddhahood. If the basis were Buddhahood, there would be no need for any kind of recognition.

In Dzogchen, there is a difference between the basis and the result. The difference is simply vidyā and avidyā and the recognition and non-recognition that comes from those.

Further, it is not enough merely to understand the general original basis. One must also understand the human body as a basis.

I will not discuss this here since it is not a proper topic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

heart said:

If your Guru can't cut through your ignorance his teachings are just words. You need a killer.

Pero said:

Hmm I'm sorry but I don't see how that's an answer to my question.

heart said:

What I am trying to say is that you should you choose your Guru on the base of how clearly and deeply he/she can show your faults because then the path will have both depth and heart. For sure it is a karmic connection I am talking about here. Choosing what seems like just an easy path is not so clever.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

This is sort of a Kadampa view.

We choose Vajrayāna because it is better, faster, easier. Then among Vajrayāna teachings, we choose better, faster, easier. This is in line with Triptikamālā's statement:

"Although the goal is the same, since it is unconfused,
with many methods, not difficult,
and mastered by those of sharp faculties,
Mantrayāna is superior."

There is no reason to choose a teacher other than to gain liberation as fast as possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

Jinzang said:

Yes, your Drikung Kagyu teachers.

And my Dzogchen teachers.

Pardon me for stating the obvious, but:

Dzogchen is an important part of Drikung Kagyu through the Yangzab cycle of termas. And there are qualified Dzogchen teachers within the Drikung. So it has no reason to denigrate Dzogchen or elevate Mahamudra. Both are a part of Drikung.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Jinzang:

I also have Drikiung teachers such as Gyalpo Rinpoche and Traga Rinpoche. He and Traga Rinpoche are the premier qualified Dzogchen teachers within Drikung, IMO.

Dzogchen may be a part of Drikung, but it is generally encased in the overall Drikung approach. This is not a bad thing, per se -- that depends on the student. However there is a need among Sarma teachers to make their completion stage practices equivalent on some level with Dzogchen teachings -- we see this in the writings of Sakya Pandita, we see this with HH Dalai Lama's teachings, etc.

Side note: Yangzab, in the Tibetan context, largely considered an "Ani practice", and was mostly practiced in nunneries. Yangzab is a pure Nyingma cycle. The best commentary on Yangzab was not written by a Drikung master, it was written by one of Dudjom Lingpa's sons for which Traga Rinpoche gave the transmission.

Yangthang Tulku, when giving the preliminary practice section for Yeshe Lama many years ago, remarked that for Mahāmudra you have to be very smart, because there are not so many methods. Dzogchen was easier (hence better as easier is always better)

because it had many methods.

You may not like this fact, but indeed there are many Dzogchen teachings that assert that Dzogchen is superior to Mahāmudra, identified in this context as the view that arises from anuyoga.

You do not have to believe it. But do not make the mistake of thinking that the Dzogchen tradition does not hold itself as unique and superior, for it does.

The point of my saying this is not to make other people feel bad. The point of my saying this is let people understand that while it may be the case that in the Kagyu schools there is an general consensus that Mahamudra and Dzogchen are just different ways to get to the same result, this consensus is not shared by the Nyingma school or by the textual system of Dzogchen. I am not suggesting that one must agree with the Dzogchen POV, merely that it exists.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Namdrol said:

And even better, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu really is an awakened master.

rai said:

1.Would you advise people who are following other teachers , maybe in different traditons to receive transmission from Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche , just to make the connection?

2.How do I keep the transmission afterwards if I am not doing any Dzogchen Community practices? just by doing any Guruyoga?

Malcolm wrote:

As to question one, yes.

As to question two, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

pemachophel said:

"I don't want to do ngondro. So I'll become Lama X's student because He/She doesn't

require ngondro." To me, that's not a very intelligent way of choosing one's Guru. Having chosen your Guru and been accepted by Them as a student, one simply does what one is told to do.

.

Malcolm wrote:

The teacher/student relationship is not a servile or feudal contract.

If you don't like the way a given teacher or lineage approaches Dharma you are free to leave.

If you find a given yidam is not to your taste, you are free to stop practicing that yidam.

Etc.

If you don't do a traditional Ngondro, you don't have to. And you can find teachers like Kunzang Dechen Lingpa and ChNN who will teach you with making any prerequisites at all apart from your interest in the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2011 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Thank you for your concern for my understanding and for your support. I will take this under advisement and give it the due consideration it deserves.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, the liberation of Samantabhadra and the delusion of sentient beings is found among classical eleven topics of Dzogchen Nyingthig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Lung

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Is the Lung known in Tantra the same Lung we know in TTM?
When there is a difference why would that be?

Best wishes

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is the same. Never different, always the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

You can't answer the question because you have not faced the fact that even Samantabhadra once possessed ignorance. The answer is that Buddhas cannot make mistakes, and this is why we cannot take the symbols in Uttaratantra literally.

adinatha said:

Faced the fact? How do you take a gestalt literally or nonliterally? It's just a wrong approach altogether. There's no timeline. Samantabhadra once possessed ignorance? Ummm... primordially pure. Buddhahood has no beginning. Was that perhaps a typo? You are Dzogchenpa right? I'm talking about an intuitive truth, not a logical one. The logical one is a sheep being eaten by a lion.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study Samantabhadra's liberation then you will understand things a little better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is why Dzogchen is better. It can be demonstrated to anyone.

adinatha said:

Oh boy... I don't think so. Not based on what I see.

Malcolm wrote:

I am just reporting what both Dzogchen tantras and upadeshas maintain.

I don't follow the words I hear in the marketplace. I follow what Dzogchen teachings actually say.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 7:57 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?
Content:
adinatha said:
Saraha

Malcolm wrote:
It is impossible that Saraha was prior to Guru Rinpoche.

It is probable that there was more than one siddha called Hūṃkāra.

It is a fact that Indian lineage lists are hopelessly confused.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 7:47 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?
Content:

adinatha said:
Huh? I don't follow this at all. Sorry. Don't termas originate with Padmasambhava?

Namdrol said:
No, not all. Vima Nyinthig is in a large part Chetsun Senge Wangchuk's terma -- no relationship to Padmasambhava at all.

adinatha said:
ummm. khandro nyingthig? hello...

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, Khandro Nyinthig is a terma credited to Padmasambhava-- I was merely making the point that not all so called "gter ma" are connected with Padmasambhava.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 7:46 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?
Content:
adinatha said:
Excuse me username. It's not just me who thinks these things. I discuss stuff like this with my teachers all the time.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, your Drikung Kagyu teachers.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 9:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?
Content:
tamdrin said:
One is not better than the other that is ridiculous..

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, people who feel that way never become Dzogchen practitioners. Why would they?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity
Content:

adinatha said:
So yes, the total field of emptiness has both ignorance and buddhahood.

Namdrol said:
You did not answer the question:

Either you are not a Buddha because you made a mistake, or Buddhas make mistakes.

adinatha said:
Your question is a nonstarter, because it's limited to temporal contingent logic. Your question assumes a before and after or a yes or no. Before you can become a buddha you have to stop making a mistake. Or you were a buddha, but then you made a mistake. But there is no before or after, no sentient beings or buddha.

Look at the faces and vase gestalt. Which comes first the face on the left, the face on the right or the vase in the middle? Are they simultaneous or none at all? Is black first or white? Is the vase correct and the faces incorrect or vice versa? Is it right to not make these discriminations and wrong to do so? Where is the vase or faces, really? So do you actually see these somewhere? These discriminations are no where and yet there somehow; that's the unavoidable reality. It is a most profound and deep mystery. Pure magical display. But it's not a mistake. Even the discriminations are just like the gestalt display, absent yet apparent.

A Buddha doesn't conceptualize these forms or a buddha seer, and just leaves it all be. Yet the whole gestalt of emptiness and forms appears magically. Once you see how this

is the case, you will be in the Ati dimension of instant intuition. A sentient being sees this or that and holds to it. But it's not right or wrong. Consistently trying to hold to one side would go against its real nature, and would result in a consistent exertion of energy that results in suffering. A sentient being isn't making a mistake; it's suffering. But just like there are two faces, there is suffering and nirvana.

Perception's fact is not touched by time or logic. Using the word as a verb instead of a noun, "to buddha" is to see the gestalt-like quality of all appearances and possibilities, where there is arising of form, no arising of form, seeing and no seer, all at once and not at all, just pure magical display with no trace of a source. Appearance is no appearance.

In the example of the Buddha inside the decaying lotus. You see the Buddha inside the decaying lotus. The decaying lotus is not hiding the buddha. The decaying lotus is luminous too. Even though the lotus emits a foul odor, there's buddha. In the example of Indra's face reflecting in all realms, every reflection is this gestalt-like buddhahood in action. You have to see that emptiness encompasses both extremes of ignorant sentient being and omniscient buddhahood. It is one total tathagatagarbha.

This vision is the fruit which is inseparable from bliss and equanimity. It's not possibly the wrong path, because it is the end of the path. Once understood, there's nothing left to do, one's instant intuition is inseparable from omniscience and sentient beings are liberated in natural course.

Malcolm wrote:

You can't answer the question because you have not faced the fact that even Samantabhadra once possessed ignorance. The answer is that Buddhas cannot make mistakes, and this is why we cannot take the symbols in Uttaratantra literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

coldmountain said:

I appreciate the response. As I've said before, by way of being forthright about where I'm coming from, I really don't believe in mind or matter - I don't know what those words actually refer to. All I know is experience and reason, I don't have any access to any reified stuff called mind or matter. What I'm really caught up in is evidence. And I wouldn't dismiss the validity of analysis/reductionism too much since Buddhism has employed it since the very beginning to establish anatta.

You think, therefore you have a mind. That mind perceives matter as color, shape, sound, taste, odor and texture.

I'm honestly confused about your ontology here. First you said you are not a dualist, then you claim that mind "inhabits" a body/brain and that the body/brain are conduits of mind. What is this if not classical dualism in a nutshell?

No, it is not. It is more like talking about a flower and its scent.

Again, first you say that cognition is dependent on the brain and then that cognition does not take place in the brain. If words have any meaning, then there has to be some reconciliation here. Is it your view that matter is mind -- that they are ontologically identical -- or is it your view that they are different? If they are different, on what grounds are the two distinguished?

Sentient beings think. It is a function of their being sentient. Their minds and their bodies form a non-dual continuum. Mind and matter are inseparable. There is never any mind in absence of matter. We talk about them as separate, but they are not really separate. The reason is that we do not conceive that matter thinks. But those who assume mind is a material process do not understand thought as anything more than a bunch of chemical reactions in a nervous system and therefore, they cannot imagine anything beyond this. We talk about mind and matter dualistically because it is obvious that thought influences matter and matter influences thought. But they are no more separate than heat and your body.

Buddhism seems to impose a problem I otherwise would not even have any inkling of: rebirth.

Buddhism makes no sense without rebirth.

I do not approach reality so dualistically. Let me put it this way: if someone gets a disease, is that the result of karma? I was diagnosed with diabetes a couple years ago. Is this the fruit of a past life? Or is it genetics? My father was diagnosed around the same age. Genetics suffices to explain this, and modern medicine is what keeps me going - whereas a Buddhist living in the pre-scientific world might believe such an occurrence to be the result of karma. And conversely, believing in karma never resulted in finding a cure/treatment for the actual cause of disease, which is not the result of a moral cause but a, well, physical one - whatever "physical" really means. Clearly one of these theories about the cause of disease is right and one is wrong. One is relevant and the other superfluous.

They can both be right, both karma and genetics. Your karma was to be reborn a human being, and you selected parents in the bardo, one of whom had a predisposition to diabetes. Both explanations are true.

I understand, at least in some measure, and I take seriously the truth that there is more to reality than can be objectified. If I didn't then I couldn't take many of the Buddhist ontological claims seriously, and I do. Perhaps "reality" in the reified, abstracted sense can be called the "surface", but it seems to me that one who rejects science wholesale in such a way is really imposing a deeply dualistic conception of reality where the "outer" reality apparently has nothing to do with the inner.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say outer has nothing to do with the inner, I said science only explains the surface of reality. It does not plumb the depths.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 9:32 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

adinatha said:

Huh? I don't follow this at all. Sorry. Don't termas originate with Padmasambhava?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not all. Vima Nyingthig is in a large part Chetsun Senge Wangchuk's terma -- no relationship to Padmasambhava at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

adinatha said:

Then there is an older tradition of instantaneous mahamudra that is not taught anymore, but is subsumed within Longchenpa's interpretation of immediate Atiyoga taught in his Treasuries.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not even slightly.

adinatha said:

The true sahaja-mahamudra is only possible with an exceptional guru and an exceptional disciple.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why Dzogchen is better. It can be demonstrated to anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Yes my sentiment all alone, well said!

Malcolm wrote:

This is because you and adinatha are both Drikung Kagyus.

Anyway, Adzom Drugpa presents the four yogas of mahamūdra as sems sde in his major commentary on Dzogchen, as does Tulku Orgyen.

Even so, four the yogas are not really the same as the four samadhis of sems sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

username said:

ChNNR uses the term "presence"...

Malcolm wrote:

Is ChNN's translation of dran pa i.e. mindfulness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2011 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

tamdrin said:

The difference between "tantric Ngondro" and "dzogchen Ngondro" as I have seen it presented in longchen nyingthig and drikung yangzab is mere chose of words- it is stylistic more than anything (not talking about rushen etc..)

Malcolm wrote:

Longchen Nyingthig ngondro is outer ngondro. The inner ngondro of Longchen Nyinthig, the actual Dzogchen ngondro, is called "Stairway of Liberation" i.e. the seven mind trainings, rushan, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Pure Lands

Content:

tamdrin said:

The teachings of Guru Rinpoche say that this world is the pure land of Buddha Shakyamuni.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is not Guru Rinpoche's teaching, this is standard.

Basically, the term is buddhakṣetra, buddhafield. The Sāhā universe is Shakyamuni's buddhakṣetra or zhing khams. Zhing khams is mistranslated as "pure land" - but there are actually two kinds of zhing khams, pure and impure. Sukhavatu vyūha, Bodhisattva Dipaṃkara's buddhakṣetra, Sukhavati, is a pure buddhakṣetra; the Sāhā universe is impure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, what about these things? You have to discern what is culture and what is dharma for yourself. But when you do, make sure you are not excluding what the Buddha actually taught.

coldmountain said:

It is not very simple to discern what the Buddha "actually" taught.

Cognition is not located in the brain.

At a certain point, these questions are useless. They are not helping you.

Apparently that certain point is very easily crossed, and it appears to be where dialogue ends and religious faith picks up. As soon as I read "questions are useless" I know I have reached the end of the conversation.

Thanks for your input.

Peace.

Malcolm wrote:

It is very simple to discern what the Historical Buddha actually taught. It is in the Pali canon.

When I said these questions are useless, they are useless for getting closer to the meaning of liberation.

My point was that no one can answer these questions for you in a satisfactory way.

You are trying to reconcile an experiential phenomenology with reductionist science. It won't work. You are too caught up in matter. Matter is intelligent, this is obvious because your body is made of matter and you are also a thinking being. Human consciousness is a function of the whole complex of what we call human. The same goes for bats, and so on. Your cognitive limitations are imposed by the body you inhabit unless you cultivate samādhi. If you won't train in samādhi, there is no way you can ascertain the Buddha's teachings about such things as rebirth and karma. If you need someone else to sign off on the truth of your experience, you will never attain awakening. Of course we can engage in lengthy sociological analysis of karma and how it is used as a power structure to keep people in their place. No doubt those cloaked in the mantle of

Buddhism have used this teaching to try and keep people in their place. However, karma is not fixed, and it can be changed. This is what I mean when I say these questions are not helping you. They have nothing to do with your experience as a practitioner. There is only one way that experience can be gained -- through cultivating practice.

Until you break through doubt, your meditation practice will never advance to insight and will remain at the level of shamatha. Shamtha is great, but until you cut through doubt, it will never advance to Vipashyāna. You will never remove your doubts about such things as rebirth and so on until you have personal experience of rebirth, memories of past lives you could not possibly invent.

Buddhadharma is deeper than science. Science only explains the surface of reality, it does not explain reality.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: CNN teaching Changchub Dorje's Medicine Terma

Content:

seraphim said:

Wonderful! And a question to those who have attended; on the last day during lung, there were several last minute lung additions, one was for Orgyen Menla and Medicine Buddha, and one I wasn't sure seems to be for Sangye Seychig Gyud, can anyone confirm please?

Malcolm wrote:

it was the sras gcig pu rgyud tantra from Khandro Nyinthig/Gongpa Zangthal

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 7:00 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

coldmountain said:

But even the Buddha said to not accept teachings just because he said them, but only if they agree with experience and reason (do you think the Buddha would turn someone away from the sangha just because he is not convinced of a specific theory?) For instance, it makes sense that, just as the Christian church did, Buddhist culture eventually came up with absolutely horrific ideas of hell regions with punishments well beyond what any unbiased person can consider reasonable.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha taught the hells. They are present even in the earliest Buddhist sutras.

coldmountain said:

...What about buying blessings by donating to the temple? Is that a good use of the doctrine of karma? What about the ethical implications of karma when taken too literally - it completely drains any concern for social justice. Why help the poor, the sick and abused when that's their karma? What about the outmoded cosmologies which can only be accepted as symbolic today? What about the exclusion of women from monastic practice in traditional Buddhism? Are these too to be accepted as justified beliefs and expressions of enlightened wisdom, much less actually desirable to believe? What a way to burden masses of people based on very slim evidence, based on interpretations of the private experiences of just a select few.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, what about these things? You have to discern what is culture and what is dharma for yourself. But when you do, make sure you are not excluding what the Buddha actually taught.

Cognition is not located in the brain.

At a certain point, these questions are useless. They are not helping you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 6:54 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

Pero said:

This is something I haven't quite understood. Is it that upon completion of a major deity retreat one can give lungs of any kind? Or is it just of that deity?

Malcolm wrote:

Lungs of any kind that you have received.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 9:33 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Fa Dao said:

common misconception....

"if you meet the Buddha on the road, kill him!!" is not meant to be taken literally...it simply means that you will only find the Buddha within...if you see a Buddha in your mind, cut the delusion down...the Buddha is within

Malcolm wrote:

It's actually a reference to the Angulimala story.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: Is there a Soul in Buddhism?

Content:

caveman said:

Stripping everything from Buddhism and Hinduism you have the transmigration of the soul, PERIOD.

Namdrol said:

There is no soul, person, atman, sattva, jiva, you name it -- it does not exist.

catmoon said:

Unless of course you read a lot of Bob Thurman. He uses the term "soul" quite freely.

Malcolm wrote:

He is a popularizer, and he ought to know better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

adinatha said:

Believe it or not, in the Drikung Kagyu tradition, there is pointing out and the "ngondro" come after as a way to fully recognize it, particularly guru yoga, vajrasattva and mandala. Here the practice is to be in the state of mahamudra while you do these practices and one's mind becomes much more vivid and relaxed. Namkai Norbu also says that doing a practice like vajrasattva can increase clarity after a pointing out or direct intro.

Malcolm wrote:

Any practice one does can increase clarity after receiving transmission.

The question however was why our teacher in the Dzogchen Community does not approach ngondro the way it is done in other dharma communities. So when we do Vajrasattva practice, for example, or the Longsal preliminary practice which is connected with Vajrasattva and the purification of the six lokas there is never any idea that we have to accumulate a certain number or do it for a certain length of time. Same thing applies to deity yoga -- there is never any suggestion that it is important to do one hundred thousand per syllable of a given mantra, for example. What it is important is connecting with one's primordial state. If there is a yidam in Dzogchen Community, it is that. So therefore, reciting a certain number of mantras to finish a deity retreat as in Tantric practice is not the principle in our community because our teacher approaches the teachings differently than do other teachers.

There are certain exceptions to this related to SMS training. But SMS is an option, not a requirement. SMS was originally designed as a teacher training program. According to Rinpoche, to be able to give lungs, one must complete a major deity retreat in a proper way, very precisely. So in SMS there is a very modified tantric ngondro, as well as a three roots requirement.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

So yes, the total field of emptiness has both ignorance and buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

You did not answer the question:

Either you are not a Buddha because you made a mistake, or Buddhas make mistakes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen with or without ngondro?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I have always been curious as to why some masters require ngondro prior to Dzogchen teachings/pointing out and others do not. One of my old masters from many years ago required it, Chagdud Tulku Rinpoche. During that time though after reading Master Namkhai Norbu's books it appeared that he did not require it. (Loved his books by the way)

Malcolm wrote:

Norbu Rinpoche emphasizes Dzogchen ngondro i.e. seven mind trainings, rushan, sems dzins, etc. not tantric preliminaries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 7:46 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

That's the six million dollar question. In other words, there is no such account. The reason we do not utilize this talent is because we are mistaking the illusion for fact. It is only a misdiscrimination. A mistaken distinction does not exist. So it can't cease or be purified. This is crucial. We can say, "I no longer make this distinction, so I purified this thought," but that is just saying something without referring to anything. So it's not meaningless. We do understand a horn on a hare, but it is referenceless. Then a nonreferencing mind is the Buddha in the decaying lotus, the true meaningfulness.

Malcolm wrote:

You still have not resolved the issue. How can Buddhas mistake illusions for facts?

Either you are not a Buddha because you made a mistake, or Buddhas make mistakes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 6:57 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

I'm asserting the decaying lotus constitutes a mistake of fact, and the Buddha inside is the fact. The lotus represents impermanence, an illusoriness. The Buddha inside represents our true condition of the inseparable three kayas.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you must give an account for some reason why we are not all omniscient already. If our true condition is the resultant three kāyas, it makes no sense that we are deluded and buddhas at one and the same time. There are a number of unfavorable consequences that will ensue.

Unless of course you mean something else by "three kāyas".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Not so, otherwise you get distortion.

Namdrol said:

This is not the case -- when you take something intentional at face value, then you create distortions.

adinatha said:

You keep using this word "intentional," what do you mean by this?

I'm saying these examples are necessary to understanding the Ati and Mahamudra meaning of dharmakaya as the totality of "appearances and possibilities." The totality of all appearances and possibilities has two purposes, the picture of total completion subsuming the three times, and the inner practice of nonattachment and effortlessness. These two go together, and the examples open up these meanings on many many levels. These examples are extremely profound and should be contemplated often.

Malcolm wrote:

Intentional means "says one thing, means another". It is different than provisional and not definitive.

If you are asserting that the husk or decaying lotus is an appearance, for example, and the Buddha inside it is a possibility, then you are asserting that the examples may not be taken literally, and that they merely point to a possibility for a sentient being to awaken despite his/her appearance of suffering.

Kagyus tend to very enthusiastic about Uttaratantra since for them it is a very important text. Your mileage will vary in the other three schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Throw Out Buddhist Philosophy / Phenomenology / Psychology

Content:

adinatha said:

Logic is errant.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Jigten Sumgon, logic leads to Buddhahood. I don't agree -- but his views about Buddhist logic informed the Gelugpa enthusiasm for logic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Not so, otherwise you get distortion.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the case -- when you take something intentional at face value, then you create distortions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

In the example from the Tathagatagarbha Sutra of the fully formed buddha inside the decaying lotus, the decaying lotus doesn't cause the Buddha. Wind blowing clouds doesn't cause a sun. The aspiration and effort doesn't create a Buddha. That's what these examples from the third turning mean. The thinking, "well, they cause them to appear to me," is a misunderstanding of causality. One thing following another is not one thing causing another. This is not me reading something into these Sutras that isn't there. It is the case of not misunderstanding the examples and not being a literalist. Longchenpa's explanations of spontaneous presence of appearances and possibilities is completely explained in the third turning sutras with examples like the Indra's reflection in all realms, and the like. We are talking about our true and complete condition in every moment.

Namdrol said:

if you take these examples literally, you will go down a wrong path.

adinatha said:

These examples are to be understood in the context of the path. And on the vajrayana path, they are made very clear.

Malcolm wrote:

Even in terms of Vajrayāna, if you take these examples literally, you will go down a wrong path. The examples have an intentional meaning. They are not meant to be taken at face value.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

In the example from the Tathagatagarbha Sutra of the fully formed buddha inside the decaying lotus, the decaying lotus doesn't cause the Buddha. Wind blowing clouds doesn't cause a sun. The aspiration and effort doesn't create a Buddha. That's what these examples from the third turning mean. The thinking, "well, they cause them to appear to me," is a misunderstanding of causality. One thing following another is not one thing causing another. This is not me reading something into these Sutras that isn't there. It is the case of not misunderstanding the examples and not being a literalist. Longchenpa's explanations of spontaneous presence of appearances and possibilities is completely explained in the third turning sutras with examples like the Indra's reflection in all realms, and the like. We are talking about our true and complete condition in every moment.

Malcolm wrote:

if you take these examples literally, you will go down a wrong path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

There's a funny story that I'll tell here to illustrate the importance of keeping an open mind and having a solid theoretical background even before starting to practice meditation.

I met this guy from Argentina, deep into the psychedelic scene, who was absolutely convinced he had gained enlightenment while listening to trance music under the influence of psychedelic substances. His conception of enlightenment was quite simple and had more to do with getting euphoric and dazed, thus not suffering, than anything else.

Now, he was completely convinced he was enlightened. Unmovable about it. It was impossible to argue with him since he thought he had "The Experience". I think he was just tripping.

This is a clear example of how delusion makes us go AWOL and why we shouldn't trust the blind to lead the blind. Materialist scientists, concerning the nature of consciousness, are no different than this guy. Just a different sort of blindness, that's all. They speculate that consciousness is an emergent property of the brain. I think they are

just tripping.

Malcolm wrote:

The truth is that mind and matter are emergent properties of one another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

coldmountain said:

And yet when the spinal cord is severed we lose experience of the body - but the mind still works. It is only when the brain is damaged that the mind follows suite (or vice-versa). You can literally poke the brain to alter and generate different experiences.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and in Tibetan medicine, for example, we recognize that brain is the conduit for sense organ cognition and have for a thousand years.

coldmountain said:

This is strongly suggestive of identity between mind and brain, not only to a physicalist but to anyone who looks at that fact objectively.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it suggests that self-perception is dependent upon sense organ cognition and when those are disrupted at the brain or nerve level, the mind is disrupted since it functions in the brain as well as the rest of the body provide it has a conduit. There are more ways than one to skin this cat.

coldmountain said:

At this point I do not see any form of dualism very convincing.

Malcolm wrote:

Me either. Matter and mind form an experiential continuum. Nāma and rūpa are inseparable.

coldmountain said:

If reality itself is experiential (which it seems to be); then the brain might be considered a very complicated experiential structure.

Malcolm wrote:

A human brain coordinates human sense experience. But experience is not reducible to

the brain. The psycho-somactice continuum is more complicated than that.

coldmountain said:

When you're talking about other realms, don't they have structure? If not, then in what sense can they exist; if so, then why aren't they objectively verifiable as such? Is structure itself a private reality?

Malcolm wrote:

Have you heard of the principle of cognitive closure?

coldmountain said:

Yet rebirth seems to play no role in actual, publically verifiable biological science. Evolution is based on the simpler evolving into the more complex, with humans representing the most complicated we know of. There are more humans now then there have ever been. It seems that human life operates according statistical and biological means and rebirth and karma have no observable role to play in that. For instance, think about how there are billions of more humans on earth now then there were in the Buddha's time. Is that because of good karma that beings have accumulated? If so, why does it happen to coincide with purely statistical/biological reasons relating to reproduction rates/population growth?

Malcolm wrote:

False objection. Human beings do not always take rebirth as human beings. Not only that, beings do not only take rebirth on this planet. There is no evolutionary drive in rebirth that necessitates evolving from a lower state to a higher state.

It is not necessarily "good karma" just to be reborn a human being.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Namdrol said:

That being said, I have some unclear recollections of past lives. Those experiences where stronger during the time I spent in Central Tibet.

Huseng said:

Were you as a child attracted to Tibetan or perhaps Indian culture, languages, arts, etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. But i was into science fiction and fantasy. Around 13 I became aware of Eastern

Religion and at 16 had my first real exposure to it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2011 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

coldmountain said:

I do try to avoid ethnocentrism, but it is also important not to underestimate the force (and virtues) of scientific understanding. Whereas karma adds nothing to explaining earthquakes and sexual reproduction, it is Western knowledge that has explained them with demonstrable, verifiable, public means. If I dismissed that achievement I might be ethnocentric, so its important to walk a middle way, I think.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is not meant to explain earthquakes or sexual reproduction.

Science is fine for explaining outer dependent origination. Even though there are limits to how well it explains outer dependent origination.

But science does not explain inner dependent origination and that is the domain of Dharma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Caz said:

So you move on and learn, I know some saw E-sangha as Iron fist policies and Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

The interesting thing was all the bizarre fantasies and projections that some people engaged in about our motivations for doing this or that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Loppon,

Just for clarification, what you explained above is a distinctively Vajrayana perspective, right? Is anything similar found in (sutric) Mahayana or Theravada?

My studies, such as they are, have mostly been in Ch'an and Theravada and I don't recall encountering a similar schema. In Theravada, as I understand it, consciousness re-arises along with the material aggregates -- there's no point at which it can be said to be separated from them, unless one is reborn into a "formless realm". Even those Theravada teachers who accept an intermediary or bardo-like state insist it involves some sort of subtle body.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that subtle body is constituted from vāyu. In the bardo, one has all five aggregates - one's rupaskandha is made of vāyu which also has the potentiality of the other four elements.

Sūtra does not provide an adequate account of the mechanism of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

coldmountain said:

Perhaps I still haven't gotten far enough from physicalism.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

coldmountain said:

I noted the complexity of the brain also for another reason: it challenges any naive realism. Someone who isn't aware of how complex the brain is might uncritically believe that some experience or some memory belongs to a past life or whatever. There's also the fact that all of our experiences seem to have neural correlates...

Malcolm wrote:

If course, mind and body are inseparable.

coldmountain said:

...which strongly suggests mutual identity between mind and brain.

Malcolm wrote:

Only to a physicalist. To a Tibetan Doctor it suggests that mind inhabits the brain as well as the rest of nervous system and has no fixed location within the body, moving about the body wherever there is a pathway.

coldmountain said:

As for rebirth, there are many questions as to how the process could actually take place. What is it that transfers from one life to the next?

Malcolm wrote:

The Vajrayāna answer for that is that the mind is inseparably wed to a function of matter called *vāyu*, wind. The *alāyavijñāna*, bound to the *mahāprāṇavāyu* transfers through the *bardo* from one body to the next. That wind/mind is also impermanent in the sense that it is momentary.

coldmountain said:

How does one's mind transfer, when the brain undeniably has a lot to do with what is experienced in the mind?

Malcolm wrote:

As above it leaves the body mounted in a *vāyu*.

coldmountain said:

What testable evidence is there that there is such a transfer (you would expect information to pass from one life to the next, and information is measurable).

Malcolm wrote:

Impressions scored on the *alāyavijñāna* is the standard mechanism to account for karmic ripening. Memory is considered a form of karmic ripening since it is a mental sensation.

coldmountain said:

The questions seem to stack up with little explanatory power within the theory itself. How do moral choices (karma) impact which life one is reborn into?

Malcolm wrote:

They affect one's overall aesthetic inclinations in the *bardo* determining the place of one's next rebirth.

coldmountain said:

Is it limited to a choice of beings on earth?

Malcolm wrote:

No. The options for rebirth in the universe are infinite.

coldmountain said:

If so, how does the mechanism responsible for rebirth choose which life one is born into on earth? All life on earth is readily explained in evolutionary biological terms and does not need any such superfluity to explain how things work.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth and evolution are non-contradictory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

coldmountain said:

My only question in response to this is, is this something you have verified in personal experience or is all this itself an expression of a belief?

Malcolm wrote:

To preface, everything involving one's mind involves belief. The idea that one has "personal experience" of anything is a belief system. Mental experience is always a meditated second-order cognition. Sense cognitions are non-conceptual.

That being said, I have some unclear recollections of past lives. Those experiences were stronger during the time I spent in Central Tibet.

I am certain that given sufficient time, and opportunity I could enhance those memories. But having memories of past lives is not the point of Dharma practice. But if you do sufficient practice, then you will verify the existence of dhyana realm devas too, and so on, as have many people who have spent time cultivating the jhanas in the Vipassana system. This is because cultivating dhyana affects one's sense organs and puts their experiential sphere in the form realms even though someone is physically located in the desire realm. I have a little of this experience as well. However, nothing that will stand up to so called "empirical" double blind studies. Recall of past lives cannot be scientifically tested for because it depends on developing certain meditative skills. But enough people have developed those skills and confirmed similar phenomena over the course of Buddhist history.

Of course, skeptics will dismiss such findings as narrative driven.

But beyond that, you have to recall that Buddha's insight into dependent origination was predicated on his recollection of his own past lives. This is an unalterable fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 1:52 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

LastLegend said:

Namdrol what you are saying is the Chinese got the Sutra first, then it got translated into Tibetan from the Sutra.

My claim is they came from the same original source, and whether the source is still with the translation as you said is not the case for one of it. If you implied that the one without the original is the fake one, then we can make comparison in meanings to see if they are basically saying the same thing.

For Huseng, if you have two different versions in the two different languages and if these people don't get it from each other, my claim is they have to come from the same source. Namdrol said that is not the case as the Chinese got it first, then got translated into Tibetan if I understand what he said correctly...now whether the original is still with us today is not what I am saying.

Malcolm wrote:

One was written in India, one was written in CHina.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 9:52 AM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Chaz said:

Must a person actually believe in Rebirth and Karma to be a Buddhist?

Namdrol said:

Yup. It's called "taking refuge in the Dharma".

N

coldmountain said:

Well, if that's the case (and I wouldn't say it is), then it doesn't look too good for Buddhism, since according to this understanding it has hinged itself upon a totally unverifiable belief, in which case the entire dharma is reduced to one giant appeal to authority. This seems to be one of the things that the Buddha himself rejected from vedantic religion: unverifiable claims to revelation. If you already have to be a Buddha before you can get any kind of verification of a claim, then I can't see what good it does

anybody.

Peace,
Mike

Malcolm wrote:
Hi Mike:

Past lives are verifiable. You just have to meditate a lot. Just as the Buddha did. You don't have to be a Buddha to verify rebirth. You just have remember your past lives very well, as the Buddha did prior to his awakening. Recall of past lives is a mundane skill accruing from meditation. It does not require attainment of awakening. It does require some degree of attainment of meditative stabilization.

Dharma is not solely based on appeals to authority. The Buddha suggested that anyone can develop these powers of the mind -- such as recall of one's past lives and so on -- such teachings are too pervasive in Buddhist literature to be doubted that this is really what the Buddha intended i.e. that the Dharma was taught in order to free people from continual rebirth in samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 9:47 AM
Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?
Content:

LastLegend said:
Where else could it come from if not Sanskrit edition? I know the Chinese has a version of Shurangama Sutra in Chinese and Tibetan got one in Tibetan.

Malcolm wrote:
There are two Shurangama sutras in Chinese, only one of these two is in Tibetan and that one has a Sanskrit Manuscript, one does not.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 8:19 AM
Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"
Content:

Chaz said:

Must a person actually believe in Rebirth and Karma to be a Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. It's called "taking refuge in the Dharma".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Huseng said:

The text itself strikes me as being an indigenous product of domesticated Buddhism rather than being a translation. Some sources during the Tang Dynasty say it was a translation and that an original Sanskrit edition actually existed, but scholars doubt the validity of such claims given the Sino-Buddhist content of the text. I also look at the Chinese text itself and sense it isn't a translation given the way it is written. One scholar Dr. Ishii Kosei has suggested the text is a hybrid containing both translated sections from an original Sanskrit text and indigenous Chinese additions.

In any case, I don't think said text espouses eternalist doctrines.

LastLegend said:

Take Shurangama Sutra for example, it was also translated to Tibetan. So the Sanskrit edition of this text really existed.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two: one was translated into Tibetan, one was not.

This however is not a certain test of whether a text has a Sanskrit original. The Vajrasamadhi sutra was also translated into Tibetan. However, it was composed in Korea.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Andreas Ludwig said:

but it didn't work in the end.

The policies and standards didn't work?.

Malcolm wrote:

They created, unintentionally, many enemies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: dumb question

Content:

kirtu said:

So perhaps we will just dissolve rupakaya forms with only the Dharmakaya left. Last person to leave the Pure Lands - please turn off the lights!

Kirt

dakini_boi said:

But this is where logic was breaking down for me. . . my understanding is that there can be no dharmakaya without rupakaya. . . i.e. the kayas are inseparable.

kirtu said:

The kayas are inseparable - the rupakaya emanates in order to teach, there is no other reason. If everyone attained perfect and completely enlightenment then the rupakayas would no longer have a reason for existing since there would be no more unenlightened beings. So the rupakayas should dissolve.

The kayas are inseparable but the the rupakayas manifest as needed to tame beings. So I would argue that there can be a Dharmakaya without rupakaya in the case that every mind is really perfectly enlightened.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen resolves this perfectly -- at the time of the basis, all kāyas are the dharmakāya; at the time of the path, all kāyas are the sambhogakāya; at the time of the result, all kāyas are the rūpakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: Swelling

Content:

Nangwa said:

Hi Namdrol and anyone else who is interested in what our resident doctor has to say about it.

I recently had a couple of operations to repair my knee. The meniscus was badly torn and my ACL had to be completely replaced.

The most recent operation was about a month ago and recovery is going well. I am about to start physical therapy and there is one area that I was hoping to get some advice on.

The knee is still quite swollen, this is totally normal but the healing/physical therapy process will go smoother and faster if I can diminish the swelling.

What are my options from a the TM point of view? Suggestions for both external and dietary remedies would be greatly appreciated.

thanks

nangwa

Malcolm wrote:

Moxa will reduce the swelling immediately -- provided it is not an inflammation/infection. Otherwise try cold compresses. Way to find out is apply hot, see it is more comfortable. If not, then apply cold. Or reverse. whichever your instinct sends you. Then, apply corresponding diet and behavior.

if it is red an angry looking, it is probably hot. If not, cold.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2011 at 12:02 AM

Title: Tibetan Rap group Green (Turquoise) Dragon

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Yes like Namdrol wrote, we will get a hard time with the import of herbs / precious pills / TCM patent pills here in the Netherlands c.q. Europe.

Further can these TCM pills be stored for about 3 - 5 years.

I import my medicine normally out of China (patent pills) and can help my patients very good with these herbal pills.

But what to do at the moment, in case of a prohibition, i have no idea.

Maybe one of you has some smart suggestions? That would be welcome

Then in case that a smoke like weed/pot could be a medicine then it could be used. I guess that to smoke it is permitted, but if it would then be a medical subject, so that it would be allowed in TCM and TTM, i don't know.

Best wishes for our practice
KY

Malcolm wrote:
It is difficult. Going underground may be the only way.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 11:45 PM
Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?
Content:
Namdrol said:
pretty hard to tell that from the extant english translations, both Suzuki's and Hakeda's.

Plus, in some Shingon Literature in English, Mahāvairocana is definitely given a theistic slant lacking in Tibetan or Indian sources.

Huseng said:
Interestingly I recall seeing Hakeda's Kukai: Major Works classified under the category of "Pantheism".

I think the problem is that in Hakeda's time he was writing for a community of predominately Christian scholars and had to make use of the standard religious studies lexicon of the time. Other authors who wrote on Buddhism used words like "the Church" when referring to Buddhist institutions. Using words from Christian theology only compounded misunderstandings and the presentation of Buddhism in the west.

Malcolm wrote:
Many people these days in Zen understand terms like "One Mind" exactly in the same sense as Advaita. Which is why we see cross-over teachers like Adyashanti and so on.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 11:33 PM
Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?
Content:

Huseng said:
The text itself strikes me as being an indigenous product of domesticated Buddhism rather than being a translation.

Malcolm wrote:

I was referring to Suzuki's text. And yes, I agree it is a Chinese text. Not indian. Post Paramartha.

Huseng said:

In any case, I don't think said text espouses eternalist doctrines.

Malcolm wrote:

pretty hard to tell that from the extant english translations, both Suzuki's and Hakeda's.

Plus, in some Shingon Literature in English, Mahāvairocana is definitely given a theistic slant lacking in Tibetan or Indian sources.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

samdrup said:

Good afternoon Namdrol,

I posted this yesterday, but think it got lost in the thread, would be interested and appreciative of your advice and opinion.

"Thanks again N,

What's your opinion of the Men Tsee Khang precious pills? Can you recommend any other authentic source? Dr Dhonden did warn me against inferior sources. Especially from some of the little clinics around Dharamsala.

About 12 years ago I actually had some that were made by Khenpo Troru Tsenam, but they are long used.

Thanks,

s."

Malcolm wrote:

Precious pills last for centuries, properly made

They should be fine. I know the both the former head pharmacist of Mentsee khang and one of their senior doctors.

There are better ones made in Tibetan by the Jiumai (jigmed) company in Xining, but they will be hard to get now in EU.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It may be the case that a certain eternalism creeps in at the hands of translators like Suzuki, nevertheless many people read these translations without knowing original language and take them at face value.

Bad translations die hard too.

N

Namdrol said:

As I said, "as translated" --

"all dharmas entirely all true/real thus"

This is definitely off. Not Buddhist.

Huseng said:

"all dharmas entirely all true/real thus"

That last character reading as "true/real" (zhen 真) might be an abbreviation for zhenru 真如 which is suchness. Given that the sentence pattern here is made up of four-character segments this is probably the case. In Literary Chinese they have a habit of maintaining four-character segments and will abbreviate binomials to make them fit into the sequence. It leads to a lot of confusion as one might imagine.

So it would probably be best read as:

"all dharmas entirely all suchness thus"

Looking at the Chinese a bit closer I'm sure that the zhen 真 here is an abbreviation for zhenru 真如 because in the following sentence you get the other half of the binomial appearing (ru 如).

This section of the text is saying that all dharmas are suchness, therefore they need not be rejected or affirmed (pointed to). They conventionally exist and their conventional existence need not be rejected or affirmed when the principle is understood.

Do you see anything wrong with saying that all dharmas are entirely suchness?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, "as translated" --

"all dharmas entirely all true/real thus"

This is definitely off. Not Buddhist.

Namdrol said:

"therefore all things from the beginning transcend all forms of verbalization, description, and conceptualization and are, in the final analysis, undifferentiated, free from alteration, and indestructible. They are only of the One Mind; hence the name Suchness."

As translated, very similar to Advaita.

Huseng said:

I'm looking at the Chinese and that last sentence has an additional part.

《大乘起信論》卷 1：「唯是一心故名真如，以一切言說假名無實，但隨妄念不可得故。」 (CBETA, T32, no. 1666, p. 576, a12-14)

"They are only just one mind ergo the name suchness because all language and provisional appellations have no reality only accompanying delusional thoughts which are unattainable. "

The "they" at the beginning is referring to "all dharmas" (一切法). "Transcend" is also not a good translation for li 離 which just means "apart from".

This is really just a Cittamatra position. Such remarks are made in the context of epistemology and not ontology. Mind here is equated to suchness. Is that really eternalist?

"But the essence of Suchness itself cannot be put an end to, for all things in their Absolute aspect are real; nor is there anything which needs to be pointed out as real, for all things are equally in the state of Suchness. It should be understood that all things are incapable of being verbally explained or thought of; hence the name Suchness."

As translated, this is a form of realism very similar to Kashmiri Shaivism.

《大乘起信論》卷 1：「此真如體無有可遣，以一切法悉皆真故；亦無可立，以一切法

皆同如故。當知一切法不可說、不可念故，名為真如。」 (CBETA, T32, no. 1666, p. 576, a14-18)

[3]極 = 相 【金】。

Unfortunately you are relying on a bad translation.

This line ...
for all things in their Absolute aspect are real
...is an interpretation rather than a translation.

If you look at the Chinese and literally translate it word for word it sounds like this:

以一切法悉皆真故
[instrumental particle] all dharmas entirely all true/real thus

I don't see where the translator got "Absolute aspect" from. This section of the text is talking about how conventional phenomena and the principle behind them complement each other.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 10:09 PM
Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?
Content:

Huseng said:
And what part of said text has eternalist elements creeping in?

Malcolm wrote:
"therefore all things from the beginning transcend all forms of verbalization, description, and conceptualization and are, in the final analysis, undifferentiated, free from alteration, and indestructible. They are only of the One Mind; hence the name Suchness."

As translated, very similar to Advaita.

"But the essence of Suchness itself cannot be put an end to, for all things in their Absolute aspect are real; nor is there anything which needs to be pointed out as real, for all things are equally in the state of Suchness. It should be understood that all things are incapable of being verbally explained or thought of; hence the name Suchness."

As translated, this is a form of realism very similar to Kashmiri Shaivism.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 9:32 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

In Chinese Buddhism it is interpreted more literally, in texts such as Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna, and in some currents of Sino-Japanese Buddhism it is indistinguishable from Advaita. The Chinese had no experience with Hindus, really, and did not guard as well as the Tibetans against eternalism creeping into their Buddhism.

Huseng said:

Precisely what did you have in mind concerning eternalism creeping into Chinese Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we can start with Awakening of Faith in Mahayāna and it just gets worse from there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

coldmountain said:

To what does the term refer to, then? I'm not clear how a belief in an unconditioned, immutable anything fits with the teaching of conditioned-arising.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on who you ask. In Tibetan Buddhism, according to the Sakya school, tathāgatagarbha is the union of the clarity and emptiness of one's mind. According to the Gelugpa school, it is the potential for sentient beings to awaken since they lack inherent existence; according to the Jonang school, it refers to the innate qualities of the mind which expresses itself in terms of omniscience, etc, when adventitious obscurations are removed. In Nyingma, tathāgatagarbha also generally refers to union of the clarity and emptiness of one's mind.

There is only one Indian commentary on this issue -- the Uttaratantra and its commentary by Asanga.

In Chinese Buddhism it is interpreted more literally, in texts such as Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna, and in some currents of Sino-Japanese Buddhism it is indistinguishable from Advaita. The Chinese had no experience with Hindus, really, and did not guard as well as the Tibetans against eternalism creeping into their Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

Namdrol said:

it's a joke adapted from the stoner movie "Dude, Where's My Car?".

kirtu said:

No, I mean why do the sadhus smoke marijuana or whatever they smoke?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

because they think Siva was a stoner too. It is their creation stage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

coldmountain said:

Thanks for your response.

Astus said:

The difference in brief. Those who believe there is an actor behind action think there is a self/soul. Those who realise that the mind is empty, without a self, understand that it is buddha-nature.

coldmountain said:

What, then, is Buddha-nature? Is it an unconditioned substance? Does it exist independently of change and plurality?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, not an unconditioned _substance_.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: buddhist hinduism?

Content:

Astus said:

The difference in brief. Those who believe there is an actor behind action think there is a self/soul. Those who realise that the mind is empty, without a self, understand that it is buddha-nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Paradoxically, in Tathāgatagarbha literature, that mind that lacks identity and is empty is

being called "self". It is standard Buddhist subversion of Hindu norms, once again. The Tantras do it with Samkhya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 5:36 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

Huseng said:

What do you think of those sadhus in India who smoke weed?

Namdrol said:

"Dude, where's my chillum..."

kirtu said:

What is that all about?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

it's a joke adapted from the stoner movie "Dude, Where's My Car?".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Hashang went on to Dunhuang where he had a successful teaching career and wrote an alternate account of the debate. Also Nubchen Sangye Yeshe and the Padma Khatang report the opposite, namely that Hashang won and was expelled because of politics.

kirtu said:

Namkhai Nyingpo was supposed to have also been a Chan practitioner. So how was it that Chan died out in Tibet shortly after the Samye debate? Or did it? How long did it take for whatever version of Chan in Tibet to actually die out?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

It probably continued for another 40 years among Tibetans after the so called debate. Then Langdarma defunded all the monasteries primarily, in my estimation, due to the economic crisis due to political instability in China.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

samdrup said:

Dear Namdrol,

I am aware of the view of tobacco, but what is the TM opinion of Marijuana? Both recreational and medical uses?

Namdrol said:

Herb does not have many medical uses in TM -- and it is very bad for meditation. Stoners can't meditate well since herb messes with short term memory. If one is a stoner, and thinks one can practice, one is suffering from delusion.

Also, what exactly is in Ayurvedic cigarette?

Herbs which are quite good for the lungs.

<http://www.madanapalas.com/nirdosh-herbal-cigarettes-10-packets-100-herbal-cigarettes-p-9.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Smoking healing herbs has an ancient tradition in Ayurveda, it is mentioned in the Caraka Samhita.

When you see people smoking in Mad Men they are smoking some kind of herbal cigarettes.

N

maestro said:

Don't mean to get off topic here but I've been having this on again off again cough for quite some time now. Would you recommend these?

Malcolm wrote:

You can try them, see how they work out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

samdrup said:

Thanks N, very interesting.

On a side note, do you mind if I ask you a question please?

Dr Dhonden and Akong Rinpoche advised me to take Rinchen Ratna Samphel pills, along with my other medicines, about once or twice per month. So I got a large stock from Men Tsee Khang in Dharamsala. I take these as advised and prescribed. My question is: How long can I keep these pills? Do they have a shelf life?

Thanks for your time.

s.

Malcolm wrote:

Precious pills last for centuries, properly made

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

samdrup said:

Dear Namdrol,

I am aware of the view of tobacco, but what is the TM opinion of Marijuana? Both recreational and medical uses?

Malcolm wrote:

Herb does not have many medical uses in TM -- and it is very bad for meditation. Stoners can't meditate well since herb messes with short term memory. If one is a stoner, and thinks one can practice, one is suffering from delusion.

samdrup said:

Also, what exactly is in Ayurvedic cigarette?

Malcolm wrote:

Herbs which are quite good for the lungs.

<http://www.madanapalas.com/nirdosh-herbal-cigarettes-10-packets-100-herbal-cigarettes-p-9.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Smoking healing herbs has an ancient tradition in Ayurveda, it is mentioned in the Caraka Samhita.

When you see people smoking in Mad Men they are smoking some kind of herbal cigarettes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Namdrol said:

And even better, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu really is an awakened master.

rai said:

Dear Namdrol,

I remember you wrote on E-sangha that although in general you are sceptical about tulku system you think that Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche really is a tulku of Adzom Drukpa. I never had a chance to ask what make you think so. Could you please write something more?

Rai

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, it is simple. Norbu Rinpoche wrote a long commentary when he was younger. Later on, when he had a chance to obtain all of Adzom Drugpa's collected works, he chanced to find a text in Adzom's collected works that was for over a hundred pages identical in topic, outline and structure. Apart from minor differences in grammar, the words are the same.

Based on that, Norbu Rinpoche himself decided that it must be true that he is the reincarnation of Adzom Drugpa.

Adzom Drugpa was the most important Dzogchen Guru of the early twentieth century for many reasons, not least of which he was the main Dzogchen disciple of Khyentse Wangpo. Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is the most important Dzogchen master alive today. Of course, there are many Dzogchen masters, and to their own students, they are the most important. But in terms of service in spreading Unsurpassed Secret Treasury of Mahasamdhhi teachings, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is in truth the Second Vajrasattva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Lust or compassion? How do we know?

Content:

Namdrol said:

And even better, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu really is an awakened master.

Nangwa said:

No doubt.

I want to be just like him when I grow up.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess this is a little off topic.

We need a thread, fanboys for ChNN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Lust or compassion? How do we know?

Content:

Namdrol said:

And even better, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu really is an awakened master.

Clarence said:

What about his son? Have you ever met him?

Malcolm wrote:

I have met Yeshe, but I have no idea about him. Of course, he is a nice person, and supports his father's work with his whole heart.

People who consider themselves his students feel very enthusiastic about him.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

We had one of those in e-sangha, but it turned out a bad idea. Instead of becoming a good space for debate, it was used mostly by people who wanted to proselytize others.

Regarding what you said, here's an article you might find interesting:

" Is Buddhism Really Nontheistic?" here:

http://www.alanwallace.org/Is%20Buddhism%20Really%20Nontheistic_.pdf "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

"However, a careful analysis of Vajrayana Buddhist cosmogony, specifically as presented in the Atiyoga tradition of Indo-Tibetan Buddhism, which presents itself as the culmination of all Buddhist teachings, reveals a theory of a transcendent ground of being and a process of creation that bear remarkable similarities with views presented in Vedānta and Neoplatonic Western Christian theories of creation."

This is complete nonsense on Wallace's part.

There is no such a thing as a transcendent ground of being in Dzogchen. The cosmology of Dzogchen is almost exactly like that of Abhidharma with slight differences.

He has obviously never read Garab Dorje's commentary on the Sras gcig bu rgyud in the Vima snyin thig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2011 at 12:43 AM

Title: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dechen said:

What next?

Namdrol said:

Dzogchen Community.

<http://www.dzogchen.org.au/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Nangwa said:

I second this recommendation.

The Dzogchen Community offers something structured and international that is very comfortable, highly accessible, and full of extraordinary practice and study opportunities.

My experience with them has been really wonderful.

Malcolm wrote:

And even better, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu really is an awakened master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

rai said:

Hi all,

What is Tibetan Buddhism approach towards smoking tobacco. Please write whatever you've heard or read. I am struggling with casual smoking and need some good motivation to give up completely. I've read HH Dudjom Rinpoche' teachings on smoking tobacco but 1) I saw it on Aro website and i am not sure is it authentic or not and 2) the description of the plant are more like a Opium not tobacco, maybe someone read it in Tibetan and could confirm.

Thanks,

Rai

Namdrol said:

Smoking is stupid, bad for your health, bad for your practice. If you want to smoke, smoke Ayurvedic cigarettes.

Huseng said:

What do you think of those sadhus in India who smoke weed?

Malcolm wrote:

"Dude, where's my chillum..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

Namdrol said:

I prefer the hermeneutics of Guhyasamaja i.e. "The single vajra word was heard differently by those of differing capacities."

gregkavarnos said:

I ilke that one. Unfortunately one can then start value judgements on the higher and lower of the differing capacities. Well, that's samsara for you!

Malcolm wrote:

It just means that people hear the dharma they want to hear, and they block out the dharma they do not want to hear or cannot hear.

For me it means that the three turnings of the wheel are not effective hermeneutical criteria. Anyway, Maitreyanath points out in the Mahayanasutraalamkara that the three turnings all occur at the same time. They are not spread out over the teaching career of the Buddha as a kind of sequence of teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

rai said:

Hi all,

What is Tibetan Buddhism approach towards smoking tobacco. Please write whatever you've heard or read. I am struggling with casual smoking and need some good motivation to give up completely. I've read HH Dudjom Rinpoche' teachings on smoking tobacco but 1) I saw it on Aro website and i am not sure is it authentic or not and 2) the description of the plant are more like a Opium not tobacco, maybe someone read it in Tibetan and could confirm.

Thanks,

Rai

Malcolm wrote:

Smoking is stupid, bad for your health, bad for your practice. If you want to smoke, smoke Ayurvedic cigarettes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

rai said:

I read on some Ayurveda forum that the best way to restore ojas is to restrain from sex for some time or have a longer breaks between. Is that correct according to Tibetan Medicine? I believe there is substitute to ojas in TM?

Thank you

Namdrol said:

Yes, that is correct. Actually, there is more to it than that. Ojas is the final product of digesting food. So, for this reason one needs to periodically do cleanses, and engage in the practice of rasāyana".

Nangwa said:

Hey Namdrol,

What kinds of cleanses are prescribed by TM?

Are specific details on how to carry them out available?

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

I like the colorado cleanse.

It is every effective, has excellent herbs and can be adapted to many people's needs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

rai said:

I've just read this on Lama Zopa website, about the sexual intercourse: "Besides this, it is one of the greatest disturbances and barriers to opening the chakras and to gaining control over the winds—it causes us lose the pure ability or power of the body and therefore the mind. Being situated in the body, the mind is therefore dependent on it. This is like pouring water into cloth that can't retain it. From the Mahayana tantric yoga practice point of view sexual intercourse is the worst disturbance."

<http://www.lamayeshe.com/index.php?sect=article&id=236&chid=381> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Is it connected to loosing the Ojas when ejaculates? Any comment on it would be very appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the view of a monk. This is not a tantric view.

He is asserting that sex disturbs the winds in the body. It can, but only if too much.

No need to pay attention to this unless you are a student of Lama Zopa's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

It's true, as you say, that Western metaphysics influenced the development of science, but the latter has really taken off on its own wings and even devoured its parent, so to speak. It's radically different paradigm.

You must be living in a different world, then. Some parallel universe perhaps, where science isn't influenced by metaphysical predilections. By chance our dimensions must have connected in this board.

Science and scientific circles are deeply influenced by the metaphysics of ontological naturalism, which in turn is mistaken by being a fact instead of a metaphysical predilection.

Instead of going over it again, I recommend the following essay:

<http://www.alanwallace.org/Introduction%20to%20Buddhism%20&%20Science.pdf> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

My point is made in page 10, but perhaps reading it all could be informative.

Best wishes.

Malcolm wrote:

Personally, I find Wallace's thinking to reflect a sort of crypto-theism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: eczema

Content:

upasaka said:

What is an approach of tibetan medicine to eczema? Is there any?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course -- it depends on the cause but there are very effective medicinal baths, sometimes, it is pitta related, then bloodletting can be very effective.

Also ayurveda has very effective remedies for excema, there are specially formulated medicinal oils that work very well.

Also you need to think about your diet, behavior, etc. in this case, please consult an Ayurvedic or Tibetan doctor.

Whatever you do, do not start down the path of steroids.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

remm said:

Hi Namdrol,

Apparently he did commit suicide from the sources that I've read.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not read enough sources. Hashang went on to Dunhuang where he had a successful teaching career and wrote an alternate account of the debate. Also Nubchen Sangye Yeshe and the Padma Khatang report the opposite, namely that Hashang won and was expelled because of politics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Astus said:

"The attitudes of the Tibetan Lamas from the eleventh century until today toward Chan have been, by and large, exceedingly negative, except for certain Nyingmapas like Longchenpa and Urgyan Lingpa. The Tibetan Lamas are content with their Indian-derived traditions as representing the authentic corpus of the Buddha's teachings. They have had absolutely no interest in the post-eighth-century developments of Buddhism in China, including Chan, and have had little or no contact personally with the Chinese teachers of Chan and the Japanese teachers of Zen. ... This Olympian disinterest, if not disdain, for non-Tibetan manifestations of Buddhism clearly represents a feeling on the part of Tibetans of their cultural superiority more than anything else. "

(John Myrdhin Reynolds: The Golden Letters, p. 223)

remm said:

One thing I took into consideration was the Samye debate between Kamalāśīla and Héshang Mófēyǎn. The fact that Mófēyǎn lost and ultimately "suicided" showed how inferior the Northern Ch`an school was compared to the lineage of Indian Buddhism. I mean, this could be a major reason as to why Tibet seems to have disinterest in Buddhism in China.

Malcolm wrote:

it is not at all clear that Hashang "lost". He definitely did not commit suicide.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 9:59 AM

Title: Re: Is there a Soul in Buddhism?

Content:

adinatha said:

I know. I'm drawing attention to the minority of statements that turns the others upside down.

Malcolm wrote:

This merely points to the certain fact that these last paragraphs you cite are

interpolations since they radically contradict the entire tone of sūtra up until that point. And the fact that there are passages subsequent to them that reverse their statements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 9:52 AM

Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

Like him, in a way which is effortless
and from this dharmakaya, which is without birth or death,
buddhas engage in activity, such as manifestation,
for as long as conditioned existence continues [forever].

-Uttaratantra

As long as there are sentient beings, buddhas will reflect in their minds. This does not mean a buddha is caused. The manifest appearance is interdependent, like a moon in water. Like Indra's reflection in all lower realms. But a Buddha does not have skandhas so cannot be caused.

Malcolm wrote:

Why not try presenting some citations about the rūpakāya?

Where did you get the idea that a nirmanakāya buddha does not have skandhas?

Anyway, I forgot to mention, I don't find the hermeneutics of the three turnings very convincing on any level, either doctrinally, since the third turning sutras often contradict each other, or historically.

I prefer the hermeneutics of Guhyasamaja i.e. "The single vajra word was heard differently by those of differing capacities."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

I am just saying that your presentation is not consistent with Tathāgatagarbha sutra theory. It does not have to be.

The two aspects which Victors manifest
are like a moon in water.

-Uttaratantra

adinatha said:
Supports my presentation of Tathagatagarbha Sutras

Malcolm wrote:
You are missing the point -- the rūpakāya is clearly presented in UT as a result of efforts and aspiration. It is really not possible to cherry pick citations to refute this. Well you can try but you won't be successful.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 9:42 AM
Title: Re: God in Buddhism
Content:

adinatha said:
The main point is Tathagatagarbha Sutras are definitive.

Malcolm wrote:
Only Dzogchen tantras are definitive AFIAC.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 5:19 AM
Title: Re: God in Buddhism
Content:

adinatha said:
Okay self-intuited. Same point.

Namdrol said:
It is an important point.

adinatha said:
Words are nuanced with several overlapping meanings. Translator get stuck on definitions.

Malcolm wrote:
You have a philosophy degree, so you can appreciate that in technical language, a certain precision is required. And some terms are just not nuanced -- like this one.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 5:12 AM
Title: Re: Tathagatagarbha and Eternity

Content:

adinatha said:

One word: jnana

Jnana is directly perceived and self-aware(intuited).

A non-phenomenal existence.

And it is endowed with compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not an existence, as the passage you cite above from the UT shows. Jñāna is free from extremes. It is inappropriate to call it an "existence".

Further, Jñāna is not an object, so it cannot be directly perceived (in sūtra). It is the personal intuition of reality, however.

You will agree that it is always important to frame your context.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

adinatha said:

Okay self-intuited. Same point.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an important point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is the case, but now you have left the teaching of the Tathagatagarbha sutras behind. That is not how they present the arising of the rūpakāya.

N

adinatha said:

The case is the case, reinterpret on down.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what level. The way Dzogchen presents the three kāyas is incompatible with sūtra, but sūtra is not necessarily incompatible with Dzogchen. I understand that when one starts learning Dzogchen, it is a temptation to always explain everything in that way. But it confuses issues because in reality, according to Dzogchen classification scheme in Nyinthig, Dzogchen is really part of Abhidharma, and not sūtra.

I am just saying that your presentation is not consistent with Tathāgatagarbha sutra theory. It does not have to be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

adinatha said:

I bow down to the sun of dharma,
which is neither existence nor non-existence,
nor a combination of existence and non-existence,
nor something other than existence and non-existence:
the unexaminable, beyond all verbal definition,
self-cognisant, peace,
stainless, brilliant with the light jnana,
which completely destroys craving for,
aversion to or dullness toward mental objects.

-Uttaratantra

Key-word: self-cognisant

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, this is not really translated correctly. The Sanskrit for this is "pratyātmavedyaḥ", this means "personally intuited", not self-cognizant. This is a common mistake made by translators when they do not realize that མོ་མོ་རང་གི་རིག་པ། (so so rang gi rig pa) is not a translation of svāsamvedana (self-reflexive or self-cognising). The two terms are very different in meaning. You could say "self-cognized" i.e. meaning something you personally understood.

The commentary on this passage by Kontrul bears this out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

adinatha said:

If kayas were caused they'd be impermanent.

Namdrol said:

In your opinion, the rūpakāya has no cause?

N

adinatha said:

Spontaneous appearance.

Cause and effect appear dualistically in the mode of deluded perception.

aka Bingo

Malcolm wrote:

This is the case, but now you have left the teaching of the Tathagatagarbha sutras behind. That is not how they present the arising of the rūpakāya.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

None of these statements ... can be taken literally.

adinatha said:

This is the abiding condition.

Malcolm wrote:

They still cannot be taken literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

adinatha said:

If kayas were caused they'd be impermanent.

Malcolm wrote:

In your opinion, the rūpakāya has no cause?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Is there a Soul in Buddhism?

Content:

adinatha said:

746. The ego (atma) characterised with purity is the state of self-realisation; this is the Tathagata's womb (garbha) which does not belong to the realm of the theorists.

Lankavatara Sutra

Malcolm wrote:

Lankavatara:

27. An ego-soul is a truth belonging to thought-construction, in which there is no real reality; the self-nature of the Skandhas is also a thought-construction, as there is no reality in it.

121. [According to the Buddha,] there is nothing in the world but the Mind itself, and all that is of duality has its rise from the Mind and is seen as perceived and perceiving; an ego-soul and what belongs to it—they exist not.

(211)...Mahamati, at the eighth stage the Bodhisattva-Mahasattvas, Sravakas, and Pratyekabuddhas cease cherishing discriminative ideas that arise from the Citta, Mana and Manovijnana. From the first stage up to the sixth, they perceive that the triple world is no more than the Citta. Manas, and Manovijnana, that as it is born of a discriminating mind there is no ego-soul and what belongs to it, and that there is no falling into the multitudinousness of external objects except through [the discrimination of] the Mind itself.

(220)...The Blessed One said this to him: Mahamati, the Tathagata-garbha holds within it the cause for both good and evil, and by it all the forms of existence are produced. Like an actor it takes on a variety of forms, and [in itself] is devoid of an ego-soul and what belongs to it.

(225)...Said the Blessed One: Mahamati, the ignorant cling to names, ideas, and signs; their minds move along [these channels]. As thus they move along, they feed on multiplicities of objects, and fall into the notion of an ego-soul and what belongs to it, and cling to salutary appearances. As thus they cling, there is a reversion to ignorance, and they become tainted, karma born of greed, anger, and folly is accumulated. As

karma is accumulated again and again, their minds become swathed in the cocoon of discrimination as the silk-worm; and, transmigrating in the ocean of birth-and-death (gati), they are unable, like the water-drawing wheel, to move forward. And because of folly, they do not understand that all things are like Maya, a mirage, the moon in water, and have no self-substance to be imagined as an ego-soul and its belongings; that things rise from their false discrimination; that they are devoid of qualified and qualifying; and have nothing to do with the course of birth, abiding, and destruction; that they are born of the discrimination of what is only seen of the Mind itself; and assert¹ that they are born of Isvara, time, atoms, or a supreme spirit, for they follow names and appearances. Mahamati, the ignorant move along with appearances.

281. There are no Skandhas in Nirvana, nor is there an ego-soul, nor any individual signs; (302) by entering into the Mind-only, one escapes from becoming attached to emancipation.

739. Those theorists who are without knowledge are frightened at eternalism and nihilism; (357) the ignorant are unable to distinguish between the Samskrita, the Asamskrita, and the ego-soul.

851. The ego-soul is not, and the mind is born; how does this evolving come about? Is it not said that its appearing is like a river, a lamp, and a seed?

Obviously, the treatment of Atman in the Lanka is complicated and cannot be neatly summarized in one sentence.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

adinatha said:

No. It's eternal, not impermanent, permanent.

Namdrol said:

Buddhadhātu, tathāgatagarbha, is not a substantial thing. It is, for example, described as the dharmakāya encased in obscurations in the Śrīmālādevi sūtra.

It is styled "permanent" for the reasons I gave above which you can easily find in the Uttaratantra.

adinatha said:

Buddhadhatu is endowed with qualities.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

The dharmakāya possesses the qualities of liberation; the rūpakaya possess the qualities of maturation such as the major and minor marks.

All of this is clearly explained in Uttaratantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

adinatha said:

The tathagatagarbha is eternal.

Namdrol said:

Maitreyanatha clarifies that the buddhadhātu is called "permanent" because it is beyond all extremes of permanence and impermanence.

He makes the same observation about "self": it is called a self because it is beyond extreme of identity and absence of identity.

adinatha said:

Second turning's meaning. Third turning's is definitive.

Malcolm wrote:

Ahem -- this is what he says in Uttaratantra, the only commentary on the tathāgatagarbha sutras we have. This is the third turning POV. Read Uttaratantra. For example, he says that kāyas of the buddhas are permanent because their causes are endless based on the two accumulations.

He explains that the dharmakāya is permanent since the non-duality of samsara and nirvana has been realized.

None of these statements of purity, bliss, self and permanence can be taken literally. Otherwise, one will be no different than a tīrthika.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: CNN teaching Changchub Dorje's Medicine Terma

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

UPDATED SCHEDULE OF KUNSANGAR RETREAT

Moscow Time GMT+4

May 3

10:00 - 12:00 – Dzogchen Teaching

12:30 – 13:00 – Short Ganapuja

May 4

10:00 - 12:00 – Dzogchen Teaching

May 5

10:00 - 12:00 – Dzogchen Teaching

17.00 Ganapuja

May 6

10:00 - 12:00 – Dzogchen Teaching

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

adinatha said:

No. It's eternal, not impermanent, permanent.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadhātu, tathāgatagarbha, is not a substantial thing. It is, for example, described as the dharmakāya encased in obscurations in the Śrīmālādevi sūtra.

It is styled "permanent" for the reasons I gave above which you can easily find in the Uttaratantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

adinatha said:

The tathagatagarbha is eternal.

Malcolm wrote:

Maitreyanatha clarifies that the buddhadhātu is called "permanent" because it is beyond all extremes of permanence and impermanence.

He makes the same observation about "self": it is called a self because it is beyond extreme of identity and absence of identity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Keshin said:

The way you guys have presented it is not the Dharma I was learned, I know that much. The way I am told Buddhism is here, like other forms of nihilism and embracing nothingness, are certainly not the beautiful Dharma I learned.

Malcolm wrote:

You are free to believe whatever you wish, of course.

But when you cite a Dzogchen text to support views that do not accord with Dzogchen, don't be surprised if someone points that out to you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Keshin said:

Honestly, it doesn't feel that way here, at all. It's come across like I've committed a thoughtcrime.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you just are laboring under misapprehension about what Buddhism in general teaches.

Namdrol said:

There is no basis. Dharmakāya is not something which exists. It is something, according to Dzogchen, that completely lacks any basis or foundation. Dharmakāya is a complete and total emptiness. It is not however a void emptiness, like space i.e. mere absence.

Dharmakāya is original purity.

That doesn't make sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen, of which kun byed rgyal po is a key text, does not make sense to a lot of people. This is why you need transmission to understand it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2011 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

Keshin, first post said:

but I do believe in a transcendent all-pervading unity...

Keshin said:

This is not the message of the Kun byed rgyal po. A transcendent all-pervading unity is Advaita Vedanta or Kashmir Shaivism.

and I don't believe in a "soul" that is separate from this Unity.

Advaita or Kashmir Shaivism again.

I'm also one of those people who seems to be pre-programmed by his mind to believing in something that could be called as "God". I'm a panentheist and see everything as what I consider as God, but that God to transcend everything too, and that our "souls" are a part of that being.

Advaita or Kashmir Shaivism again.

I'm comfortable using the term 'God' when referring to the Adibuddha/Dharmakaya Unmanifest/Amitābha (*from the "Eternal Buddha" perspective), and I'm comfort able using the term 'True Self' or 'Soul', when referring to the Buddha-nature/Mindstream & Base Consciousness together. I use "God", because that's an immediately accessible term for me - but I use it in a panentheistic (God is in all and beyond all) and transpersonal (does not intervene and make prophets and stuff, but is not an unfeeling, personality-less, non-sapient entity).

You are not using these terms as intended.

Regarding Soul: Effectively, it's our "True Selves", free some skandhic-ness: one with the Dharmakāya, our Buddha-nature, and pretty much the Buddha-nature/Mindstream & Base Consciousness together. Possibly even a Self of Nirvāṇic permanency beyond the skandhic mundane world, but I'm not sure at the moment.

There is no basis. Dharmakāya is not something which exists. It is something, according to Dzogchen, that completely lacks any basis or foundation. Dharmakāya is a complete and total emptiness. It is not however a void emptiness, like space i.e. mere absence.

Dharmakāya is original purity.

Soul = Buddha-nature from a Tathāgathagarbha Sūtra and Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra interpretation. Not an "I" or ego-self.

The Lanka-avatara sutra was written to correct the misunderstanding that some gained from the ten tathāgathagarbha sutras that tathāgathagarbha was equivalent to a soul.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Is there a Soul in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Actually, this what Shankaracarya writes about rebirth and I have seen it reproduced more or less verbatim by neo-Hindus like David Frawley.

Keshin said:

Sounds like you're missing the metaphors of things and taking them literally if that is the case.

I've heard no Hindus who believe this is what happens. Considering I visit mandir on a regular basis and chat with a lot of Hindus, why is this the first time I've actually heard of it? Can you give some sources for this?

Malcolm wrote:

Dig around, you will find it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Is there a Soul in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The Hindus have a very strange idea of reincarnation from a Buddhist point of view. They believe that when you die, your atman ascends a kind of vapor which travels to the moon. There, you hang out for a while and eventually, you descend into the clouds, where your soul, mixing with the water vapor in the clouds, is rained down onto earth where your soul become embodied in plants, eventually climbing through the animal kingdom, etc.

N

Keshin said:

No offence, but this is completely wrong.

I don't know from what kind of Hindus you have learnt this, but it ain't the same ones as I have.

I have NEVER, EVER heard this view, and I visit mandir regularly and have a lot of Hindu friends. You are taking the Vedas at face value to claim this, which is not the case, especially now.

Maybe they believed this in 2500BCE, but they certainly don't now.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, this what Shankaracarya writes about rebirth and I have seen it reproduced more or less verbatim by neo-Hindus like David Frawley.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Exploring Buddhism

Content:

Keshin said:

Define soul

Malcolm wrote:

Permanent essence in an individual. This does not exist.

Keshin said:

It may also help people to know I can't not see what I use the "God" for. I take a closer affiliation with the Jonang and Pure Landers than I do other groups, especially ones who focus on absolute non-self-ness.

Malcolm wrote:

Jonangpas are not theists. Their argument is quite different. They are arguing that qualities of buddhas are naturally present in sentient beings, albeit covered up. That emptiness is not just a blank void, but is endowed with qualities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

spanda said:

A quote from "The Authority of Empiricism and the Empiricism of Authority: Medicine and Buddhism in Tibet on the Eve of Modernity" by Janet Gyatso

Malcolm wrote:

The only quibble I have with Janet is her referring to the srog rtsa dkar nag as white and black "soul" channels. That is ridiculous. srog means "life" and these two channels provide the basis for life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Exploring Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Bodhicitta aka Kun byed rgyal po

Keshin said:

Bodhicitta is jang chub sem, isn't it?

For one, the Kulayaraja Tantra (Kunjed Gyalpo) is "All Creating King". Raja = King after all.

Or am I missing what you are trying to say, that Bodhicitta is the All Creating King?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, bodhicitta (as defined in its rdzog chen sense) is the all-creating king, the kun byed rgyal po or as Norbu Rinpoche translates it, the supreme source.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Exploring Buddhism

Content:

Keshin said:

That's not a sort of Buddhist theism?

What kind of theism are you thinking of that this is not? Because from my angle, this is definitely panentheism.

Malcolm wrote:

It is talking about what happens when you don't recognize the nature of the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 11:38 AM

Title: Re: Is there a Soul in Buddhism?

Content:

conebeckham said:

When you light a new candle from a burning candle stub, by holding the the flame of the burning soon-to-be-burned-out stub next to the wick of the new candle, just as the stub goes out, is the flame of the new candle the same as the flame of the old candle?

We can say there is a "cause and effect" relationship at work here, but we cannot point to anything in the nature of the flame, or in either candle, that is unchanging and uniquely defining. Nonetheless, there is some continuum of energy or heat which was "passed" from the stub to the new candle....though that energy or heat can't be isolated.

Rebirth is the same.

Pero said:

Thanks! How would you make an example for Hindu reincarnation?

Malcolm wrote:

The Hindus have a very strange idea of reincarnation from a Buddhist point of view. They believe that when you die, your atman ascends a kind of vapor which travels to the moon. There, you hang out for a while and eventually, you descend into the clouds, where your soul, mixing with the water vapor in the clouds, is rained down onto earth where your soul become embodied in plants, eventually climbing through the animal kingdom, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 11:25 AM

Title: Re: God in Buddhism

Content:

moksha said:

Thanks, everyone. I have to admit to being slightly overwhelmed by the responses to this topic. There seems to be so many different paths and branches to Buddhism, as well as that, a lot of the terminology here has no meaning to me as yet. I suppose I should start by reading the Kunjed Gyalpo. I hope it's easy to get hold of, there's a lot here I don't understand.

As for how I would define God, I would define God as the power and force existent in all things to whom we are ultimately answerable and who has complete control over the universe. So I mean God in a very absolute sense. I have always felt a connection with that God - or what I would define as such. And God has always been good to me when I have needed help [for which I ask very very rarely]. So when one says "what has God ever done for you?" I would answer with, "the things I have asked for".

Malcolm wrote:

There is no God. It doesn't exist. There is no force that has complete control over the universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 11:24 AM

Title: Re: Exploring Buddhism

Content:

Keshin said:

I don't find the view of God and Buddhism, or even True Self ("soul") to be against Buddhism.

It may be worth reading the Kunjed Gyalpo (aka Kulayarāja Tantra). That's like, a

goldmine. Here's two excerpts:

" ... everything is Me, the All-Creating Sovereign, mind of perfect purity ... I am the cause of all things. I am the stem of all things. I am the ground of all things. I am the root of all things ... There is no other Buddha besides Me, the All-Creating One."

"I am the core of all that exists. I am the seed of all that exists. I am the foundation of all that exists. I am the root of existence. I am 'the core', because I contain all phenomena. I am 'the seed', because I give birth to everything. I am 'the cause', because all comes forth from me. I am 'the trunk', because the ramification of every event sprout from me. I am 'the foundation', because all abides in me. I am called 'the root', because I am everything."

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a sort of Buddhist theism.

Bodhicitta aka Kun byed rgyal po gives rise to everything when it is not recognized for what it actually is i.e. the nature of one's mind. Very similar statements are found in Mahāmudra literature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Purchasing Guggul

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Ok, just ordered some. Two quick questions: 1) is it only used to dispel obstructors, or is it also used as offering to wrathful yidams? 2) also, do you need to burn it on charcoal or something or can you just stick it in an incense burner and light it?

Malcolm wrote:

Need charcoal -- will not burn on its own.

However you can get gugul essential oil, and use in an aromatherapy kit

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: H.H. Sakya Trizin - Cambridge, MA

Content:

mr. gordo said:

I just got a notification in my email:

His Holiness the Sakya Trizin will confer the empowerment of Guru Rinpoche Padmasambava for the first time in America.

The Guru Rinpoche empowerment and transmission of Barche Lamsel and Sampa Lhundrub to help overcome obstacles and fulfill one's wishes.

I looked up Barche Lamsel and found the following:

Barché Lamsel (Wyl. bar chad lam sel) — the outer practice of prayer from Lamé Tukdrup Barché Kunsel (The Heart Practice of the Lama: Averting All Obstacles on the Path), which was revealed by Chokgyur Dechen Lingpa together with Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo.

Sampa Lhundrub (Wish Fulfilling Prayer) is a powerful protection prayer written by Guru Rinpoche. This practice is said to be effective in helping one achieve good fortune and protection from calamities. It also effective in helping one attain their wishes quickly and also, overcome all kinds of obstacles on their path to enlightenment

So does this empowerment have two different mantras?

Malcolm wrote:

He will give the lung for these prayers, and an empowerment of Padmasambhava, cycle TBD.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Bothering things about Vajrayana and Dzogchen

Content:

Enochian said:

Ok forgot about the nature of mind stuff. I really don't care about validation. Its not like I am going to set myself up as some sort nonduality guru like Eckhart Tolle or Adyashanti.

If I was going to do something like that, I would have done it years ago.

But back to OBE....

I see absolutely no difference between certain types of phowa and the high level projection technique in Astral Dynamics, first edition. Even the purpose is the same, to access high level planes such as the heavens. And both involve essentially a crown center exit.

And also Dalai Lama mentions in relation to these things, the ability to become a "perfect spy." If that is not OBE, I don't know what is.

Malcolm wrote:

OBE is a conceptual exercise. Phowa (at death) is deliberately severing the connection of your wind/mind with your body. When you train in this, there is no concept of access

to some heaven. The purpose of it is integrate one's mind with the Guru's mind -- it is just that outer phowa one is doing this very dualistically. But that is not the main point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Pure Lands

Content:

username said:

Shambhala is in a physical location on earth...

Malcolm wrote:

This is not my teacher, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's, understanding. His understanding is that Shambhala once existed, and now no longer exists, having been destroyed by Muslims.

As AFAIC the whole thing "Shambhala" war thing is a metaphor. "Barbarians" are the afflictions, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 7:28 PM

Title: Re: Do not rejoice any killing!

Content:

narraboth said:

We say we will have compassion on EVERY sentient being, especially including those who are in lower realm, we will not give up any of them.

So, even someone is a notorious terrible criminal, we should feel sad about what he's definitely going to suffer. Remember, when we generate compassion to beings in Hell, they probably did lots of bad thing in previous life too (that's why they are in Hell realm now).

Killing is killing. Do not rejoice it just because the one who being killed is a criminal or your enemy.

I hope he would give up his wrong view if he would have chance to gain human body again, I wish he and people who suffered from him will all go on the right path in the end.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. Osama Bin Laden was an evil man. But we should not rejoice in his killing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 7:23 PM

Title: Re: Bothering things about Vajrayana and Dzogchen

Content:

dingirfecho said:

Enochian, what I don't get is, if you're an academician, why don't you subscribe to one of the many academic forums for buddhism? Vajradhara knows the net is full of them, and this line of inquiry will be better supported by, say, Richard Hayes than Namdrol.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, if you want to listen to the screeds of a materialist raconteur who has decided to fall in line with Batchelorism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 7:21 PM

Title: Re: Hypoglycemia

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Thanks very much for this link, Namdrol. This looks like something I would love to try. However, the next cleanse isn't happening until next Fall and my hypoglycemia has really been flaring up lately. In the meantime, would you recommend the following Sorig tea to tide me over until I can do the cleanse?

http://www.tibetarts.com/product.info.php?cPath=38&products_id=494 " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Or perhaps this one?

http://www.tibetarts.com/product.info.php?cPath=38&products_id=510&lof_website=bb658f59c7ea145f38c113698b4b974b " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have to wait until the fall. You can buy the package and do it yourself. Email them for more info.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: lacking the capacity

Content:

rai said:

when one knows that there is time to go back to more gradual path? if few years passed and there is no real recognition, would it be wise to consider oneself as not having high capacity and try to find more gradual teacher? I remember someone was writing on e-sangha that some people stick with DC for too long without any progress. PS it is not so easy to check with the teacher as there are thousand of students.

Thank you!

Namdrol said:

Capacity depends on personal interest and diligence -- nothing more.

N

mr. gordo said:

Oh, I thought it was based on the intelligence of the practitioner to grasp the teachings.
Thanks for the clarification.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, it is based solely on your karmic connection with the teachings. If you have that, then you have capacity -- whether it is high, low or medium capacity depends solely on your efforts and interests.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 5:43 AM

Title: Re: Bothersome things about Vajrayana and Dzogchen

Content:

Enochian said:

Is Dzogchen beyond even this?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: Bothersome things about Vajrayana and Dzogchen

Content:

Enochian said:

If you 100% NEED a transmission to understand Dzogchen, that means it is conditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it just means that people are conditioned.

Dzogchen is a personal experience of one's actual state. For that you simply need someone who has that knowledge to show you the same. It is not something you will ever figure out on your own. That is your limitation, not the limitation of the teachings.

It is for example like a beggar who uses a rock for a pillow, never dreaming that inside the rock is a precious diamond.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: lacking the capacity

Content:

rai said:

when one knows that there is time to go back to more gradual path? if few years passed and there is no real recognition, would it be wise to consider oneself as not having high capacity and try to find more gradual teacher? I remember someone was writing on e-sangha that some people stick with DC for too long without any progress. PS it is not so easy to check with the teacher as there are thousand of students.

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

Capacity depends on personal interest and diligence -- nothing more.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Bothersome things about Vajrayana and Dzogchen

Content:

Enochian said:

Why would I understand Dzogchen? I never had transmission.

Malcolm wrote:

Then it is pointless for you to make any proclamations about it or imagine it is "limited" and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

adinatha said:

=

then there most certainly is development.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever you want to believe.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 2:43 AM
Title: Re: Pointing out instructions
Content:

adinatha said:

Okay you are mixing up apples and oranges, pointing out and path. Pointing out is just recognition. You still have to remain in that until it fully develops. That is true for Dzogchen too. The question is whether Mahamudra like Dzogchen has a shazam of pointing out leading only to recognition and contemplation. No one gets a direct intro in either of these lineages and blink, omniscient.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing to develop in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: Bothersome things about Vajrayana and Dzogchen
Content:

gnegirl said:

Its kinda funny, 'cause even the direct-transmissions schools like Rinzai Zen require a Zen master to facilitate the process.

Enochian said:

I understand this. But Dalai Lama himself gives 50% of it away when he says there is a discrepancy between thoughtforms and reality. And this is in every nonrestricted book in the bookstore by him.

Malcolm wrote:

You might have some idea about emptiness. But you don't understand Dzogchen at all.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2011 at 1:59 AM
Title: Re: Pointing out instructions
Content:

adinatha said:

The shazam method in the mahamudra tradition is explained in the Eighth Tai Situpa's commentary on the 3rd Karmapa's Aspiration Prayer of Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

The descent of the wisdom vajra empowerment originally comes from the Mahāmudra

chapter of the Jñānasiddhi written by Indrabhūti. Tai Situ's presentation is completely based on this. In fact, the whole Kagyu essence Mahāmudra tradition uses this text to justify its approach.

However, the Jñānasiddhi still presents a gradual path. In the very next chapter after the Mahāmudra chapter in this text, Indrabhūti states:

"One whose yoga engages the mind
through the application
of gradual training becomes a buddha,
there is no other way to accomplish Buddhahood."

So, it is pretty clear that Mahāmudra in general is considered a gradual path.

However, in regards to so called Cigcarwas, those whose awakening is sudden, merely through an introduction -- an early Nyingma master of the twelfth century, Zhigpo Dudtsi remarked, "Apart from Saraha in India, and Lingje Repa (founder of Drugpa Kagyu), I have never heard of any other cigcarwas. Maybe they exist, but I have never met one."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Medicine Buddha mantra, sanskrit romanization

Content:

gnegirl said:

Ok....

How does one pronounce 'Bhaishjaye '? (pretty sure 'bekanze' is probably close, but not exact...)

Malcolm wrote:

Bhai as in "buy"

sha is in "sharp"

jye as in "Jye"

I.e. very roughly buy-sha-jye

As it is spelled. Tibetans cannot, in general, pronounce the Sanskrit Ś or Ṣ syllable when it is inside of a word. So they substitute a "kh" syllable i.e. akha for aṣṭa, eight.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment according to Hinayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

Theravadins are considered to be substantialist by Tibetan Buddhists.

Kare said:

If that really is the case, it is sad, since it seems to indicate that Tibetan Buddhists who hold this view, live in their own separate bubble of misunderstandings. They need to break through this bubble and discover the real world.

Malcolm wrote:

I have read Theravadins who definitely hold what I would consider substantialist views. I have read Theravadins who do not. I find some Abhidhamma to be very substantialist in tone.

Mahāyāna bodhicitta does not exist for most Theravadins, and the narrow criteria for who can generate something resembling Mahāyāna style bodhicitta is so strict as to discourage anyone from trying (one reason, you see, why the Saddharmapundarika predicts everyone for full buddhahood as conceived by the authors of the Pundarika).

Kare said:

There once were schools - like the Sarvastivada and the Pudgalavada schools - that might be called substantialist (although I am not quite sure if that would be a correct description of them, either).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is. They really do assert things really exist on some level or another -- atoms, moments, persons, etc. Early Buddhists went crazy with a proliferation of dharmas to explain everything, just as Mahayanists went crazy with cosmic narratives ala Puranas.

Kare said:

If those schools were denounced as substantialists by the Mahayana/Vajrayana - and subsequently called "Hinayana" - and if then afterwards a further misunderstanding led to Theravada being identified as "Hinayana", that might perhaps explain how such a bizarre view arose.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in my opinion the distinction between Mahāyāna and Hināyāna really hinges on how vinaya was interpreted more than anything. Mahāyānists consistently maintain that intent is more important than the vow. That under certain circumstances a monastic could even kill a human being, lie about miraculous powers, etc. without losing his monastic vows. Mahāyānists felt that many monastics used their vows as an excuse to disengage from the world. There is element of "engaged" Buddhism in the formation of early Mahāyāna that has been overlooked. Of course, at the same time, there also trends in Mahāyāna that suggest withdrawing from the world.

Mahāyāna is not a coherent, monolithic entity either. This is perhaps the most important thing to recognize -- apart from distinct features common to all Mahāyāna

schools, the development of Mahāyāna was not a rational evolution, the development of any system of thought with many contributing thinkers never is (including Theravada).

So called Modern Mahāyāna is basically a scholastic fabrication every bit as much as Modern Theravada is.

The fact is that circumstances on the ground are not so easy -- there used to be Mahāyāna Theravadins until they were crushed in Shri Lanka. So, in general the main line of division is that all monastic orders belong to a so called "hināyāna" because their goal and intention is inferior and lower. The vows of monk are the essence of "hināyāna" because they are so restrictive. Theravadins, etc., thought it was scandalous that so called Mahāyāna bhiksus would freely handle gold, sometimes go to bars, and generally mix with the population. In some ways the monastic orders were too elite oriented and this created a vacuum where the populist Mahāyānis could easily fill. It is often easier to get your spiritual milk from the guy you drink beer with than a priest. This also explains the popularity of the siddha movement later on.

Mahāyāna was originally sub-altern movement that was bucking the monastic establishment while at the time trying to co-opt it. It also did not develop rationally, but was rationalized by later Mahāyānis once certain Mahāyāna trends were set as "establishment" and gained royal support post Nāgārjuna. Nāgārjuna's secured his place in history no so much because of what he wrote, but because of who his friends were (kings). This is the way of samsara.

Then Mahāyāna grew stale, abstract, irrelevant to needs of normal people and we have another sub-altern movement, anuttarayoga tantra (I exclude lower tantras because these were never sub-altern movements -- but from the beginning grew out of a need to parallel the replacement of brahmins in the burgeoning context of a growing Puranic culture for ritual needs of the aristocracy and commoners).

Finally, the Huns, then Hindu Kings, and finally Persian Moslems burnt, dismembered and interred Buddhism in its homeland over a period of 700 years.

We need to not forget that -- and we need to make sure our Buddhism, whatever it is, is as relevant to the beer drinker (without of course insisting that he give up his beer) as it is to a scholar.

Kare said:
Well said.

Malcolm wrote:
Thanks.

Buddhism is a vast tree planted in the soil of India, which shot out runners in many different directions. All of our Buddhist teachings are shoots from that tree, at least in this era. There were other Buddhas, other eras. But root, trunk, branch, leaf, and flower all lead to but one result. Awakening. And that is the most important thing to recall

when conversing and discussing with our fellow Buddhists.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment according to Hinayana

Content:

retrofuturist said:

Which is interesting, because I'd suggest the suttas themselves...

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhists, obviously, don't consider the Buddha to be a substantialist. And as you know, Nāgārjuna cites this sutta as a criticism of Sarvastivadin substantialism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Purchasing Guggul

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol,

Is there a reliable store online where I can purchase guggul to burn in my home? To your knowledge is it common for people to sell some knockoff substance as guggul?

Malcolm wrote:

Tsegylgar has gugul.

And no. Not to my knowledge. It smells like hash, so pretty hard to fake.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Hypoglycemia

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol,

Can you offer any advice from the TM POV about stabilizing chronic hypoglycemia. All I currently know to do is eat smaller, more frequent meals, eat plenty of fiber, and avoid refined sugars and foods with a high glycemic index. I also tend toward whole and

sprouted grains and breads made from them, etc., and I'm tending toward eating locally-grown, organic veggies. Oh and of course I know to exercise and try to slim down some. Anything else I can do, or anything I've mentioned that I should change?

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to fix your hypoglycemia, do this cleanse:

<http://www.lifespa.com/coloradocleanse.aspx> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I have done this cleanse. It is based on Ayurvedic principles, is intelligently put together. This is the system I use.

It is highly effective and also very gentle.

Really, I mean it.

You will lose 8-15 pounds while eating three healthy meals a day.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Bon and the karmic problems of Tibet

Content:

heart said:

He is saying "The conclusion I'd like to draw is that at least some Buddhists, by the end of the 10th century and perhaps earlier, thought of the funeral rituals practised in earlier times by Tibetan ritual specialists as a religion called Bon." . It is clear enough.

/magnus

Enochian said:

In this sentence, he is saying 10th century buddhists RETROACTIVELY applied the term "Bon"

Why not try reading it?

heart said:

Yes, but of course it is retroactively since the text are from the 10th century, but according to normal scientific approach that is a confirmation of the theory that there was a religion called Bon before the 10th century.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Troy existed 900 years before the Illiad and for 2600 hundred years all we knew of it was a story -- then someone tracked the story down and found a city buried where the story said it would be three thousand years later.

There certainly was a religion in Tibet we can call "Bon" prior to Buddhism. The first Tibetan king live circa 120 BCE. Prior to that there were many generations of Zhang Zhung kings. Zhang Zhung fell not because of Tibetan aggression -- the kingdom of Zhang Zhung failed because of overgrazing and climate change (for which there is both archaeological evidence and climate evidence).

Bon claims to had a transmission of Dzogchen, etc., independent of Shakyamuni Buddha and Garab Dorje's lineage according to their tradition coming from a teacher Shenrab Miwoche. They place the origin of Tonpa Shenrab in Western Central Asia. This is reasonable since it is a certainty that the Zhang Zhung people migrated to the high plateau of western Tibet from somewhere else, most likely the west and they were not Tibetan, so did not come into Tibet through the low country in Kongpo like the early Tibetan tribes.

After the fall of Zhang Zhung, some Zhang Zhung people continued to migrate east into eastern Tibet and western China, settling in the border lands there. The Naxi people are among the remnants of this migration.

Some Zhang Zhung people stayed behind and moved south into the lower more fertile valleys around Kinnaur. There exists is a small population that continues to speak a descendent of Zhang Zhung language. In my opinion, because Tibetan became the dominant tongue in Western Tibet, the Zhang Zhung people lost their original grammar and thus the small Kinnauri population that speak "Zhang Zhung dialect" of Tibetan now speak a kind of colonial patois of Tibetan with many Zhang Zhung words.

The real facts are lost to history. But we can respect Yungdrung Bon as a fellow tradition that shares the ideals, goals, and essential doctrines of Buddhism. We also should respect Bon because it is important to Tibetan culture.

Did Bon borrow extensively from Buddhism? well, in my opinion, it is very likely. Does this matter? No. Does it matter if it can all be pinned down definitively? No. Do Bonpos attain liberation through Dzogchen teachings? Yes. That, in the end, is all that matters (if you are a Dzogchen practitioner).

Do people sometimes get confused about all this? Often. Is Buddhist behavior towards Bon often despicable? Yes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

rai said:

what period of celibacy would make a difference in rebuilding the ojas for someone who had a draining lifestyle for some time? (i know nothing about rasayana but will try to improve my diet).

how long breaks between sexual intercourses are advisable for maintaining good health?
is it the general rule - the less sex the better?

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes -- here is a general guideline for men. Though this has changed a bit with modern diet and availability of foods around the seasons from all over the world, there are still some trends we can observe -- when it is hot, we tend to eat much lighter and lighter, less nutritious food, and when it is cold, we eat heavier, oilier, more nutritious food. When people ate according to the cycle of the year, this was much more pronounced. Therefore, in the winter months, when it is cold and one is eating a lot of heavy food, one can ejaculate as much as five times a day with no health problem. As one moves through spring, this reduces to every two days, and finally in summer only every two weeks. When one starts to increase one's intake of nutritious foods in the fall through harvest and slaughter season (which happens in late fall in Tibet), then one can increase to every other day.

Now, if someone is depleted, they should not have sex because in this case, as in summer, one loses a little ojas with ejaculation. If one is healthy, winter time, eating well, etc., there is no danger of losing ojas because one has excess.

While women do not have the same issue -- menstruation can be a cause of depleting ojas if they are not careful with their diet.

Ojas is mainly depleted by stress. A lot of autoimmune disorders come from depleted ojas because of modern lifestyle.

B

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Namdrol said:

When the basis arises out of the basis, i.e. when the five lights of wisdom are stirred by vāyu after the shell of the youthful vase body is rent there is a neutral awareness [shes pa lung ma bstan] that does not recognize itself. That simple non-recognition is the innate ignorance. That neutral awareness has two options either it recognizes itself [vidyā], becoming Samantabhadra, or it does not, and through imputing self and other onto the appearance of the basis, creating samsara. That imputation of self and other is the imputing ignorance.

Hayagriva said:

This sounds very, very similar to the instruction/explanation of a type of ignorance that's mentioned at the beginning of Mipham's "Torch of Certainty". Is it the same?

Malcolm wrote:

Probably.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment according to Hinayana

Content:

Namdrol said:

Just as you will not find any Sakya or Nyingmapa agreeing that common Mahāyān is capable of producing complete buddhahood either.

mr. gordo said:

Do you mean in one lifetime, or ever? I always thought it just took longer (eons).

Malcolm wrote:

Ever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 11:28 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment according to Hinayana

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Interesting food for thought.

Nomenclature notwithstanding, I have a follow-up question. From a Mahayana perspective, it sounds as if the Hinayana-type "Nirvana" would NOT be a permanent state - but perhaps a long but temporary stay in the formless god realms. Is this correct?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Five-Long Life Sisters and Tseringma

Content:

Jinzang said:

I checked the book before posting. I missed two brief passages which, thanks to Google, I could find in the <http://bit.ly/k9sT3A>. The more relevant of the two goes, Then came the Goddess Tseringma to test me by displaying various super-nornal powers.

The other passage is

Coming thence to Chubar, he preached three sermons regarding Tseringma.

So while it's fair to say that the story of Tseringma is mentioned in Milarepa's most famous bography, don't think it's correct to say that it's in Milarepa's biography. But words are slippery and you are entitled to your interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

The point was two-fold. Tseringma had been tamed by Padmasambhava, not Mila. Second, that Tseringma appeared to test Mila's yogic power.

Thanks for reinforcing my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: Pointing out instructions

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Heres a question...

I have read a little about Dzogchen. Only had one teaching on it from a qualified Lama, definitely not an expert though. What is the difference (if any) between pointing out instructions and what is called the "Mind to Mind transmission" found in Chan? Would be nice to get some answers from those who are knowledgeable in both traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

The basic difference is as follows. With Dzogchen, right in the very beginning your primordial state is pointed out to you with words, symbols and personal experience. You then work with this, integrating into this knowledge.

In Zen, you practice for many years, discover your real nature, awaken, and then your awakening is signed off on by an awakened master, someone who is capable of recognizing the experience you have had and verifying it for you.

So, completely different.

I should clarify that there are lots of different traditions of "pointing out". And the way "pointing out" is done in Dzogchen is very different than the way it is done in Mahāmudrā -- the latter is far more gradual, in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Bon and the karmic problems of Tibet

Content:

adinatha said:

The notion that ancient Tajiks had A path to buddhahood ...

Namdrol said:

I see you are keeping up the long Drigung tradition of anti-Bon polemics.

adinatha said:

Honestly I had no idea there was a long Drigung tradition of anti-Bon polemics. I'm just kiddin ya. I'm sure the Tazik people had a 20,000 year old high culture.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the first Buddhist polemical mention of Bon occurs in the initial commentarial literature of dgongs gcig by rdor she. The earliest Buddhist account of Bon was penned by Jigten Sumgon. Most other Buddhist presentations of Bon follow his rough outline.

There are other presentations of Bon which are more favorable, notably Guru Chowang's Great History of Treasures where he describes Tonpa Shenrab as a nirmanakāya. Guru Chowang is the original tertön who revealed the seven line supplication to Guru Rinpoche.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: Bon and the karmic problems of Tibet

Content:

adinatha said:

The notion that ancient Tajiks had A path to buddhahood ...

Malcolm wrote:

I see you are keeping up the long Drigung tradition of anti-Bon polemics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Namdrol said:

Important point: the nature of the two or three ignorances are the same.

Pero said:

What does that mean?

Malcolm wrote:

They lack knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment according to Hinayana

Content:

Kare said:

I know. And Nikaya Buddhists have very specific ideas about Mahayanists being tricked and deluded by false teachings and fraudulent texts.

Until some respected leaders in both camps have the wisdom and courage to cut through this sectarian silliness, I suppose it may go on for ever ...

Malcolm wrote:

It is a little hard to ask Tibetans to come up with a different translation for theg dman or theg che chung.

It is equally naive to pretend that Tibetans did not understand that these terms included Theravadins. You might want to argue Tibetans had very little experience with Theravadins. And this is so to an extent -- but Tibetans were not completely unaware of their neighbors, were aware of Burma (part of the region Tibetans call Mon yul which extends from Bhutan to roughly the Irrawady), etc. and were certainly aware of Nikāya/Agamic monks in India and their tenets.

But the thing is, the term nyan thos (śravaka) suffers not so well either in hands of Tibetan commentators being another catch phrase for "those who just don't get it".

I don't think you will ever get any Tibetan master to agree that the realization of an arhat is functionally equivalent to that of a Buddha. Just as you will not find any Sakya or Nyingmapa agreeing that common Mahāyāna is capable of producing complete buddhahood either.

Theravadins are considered to be substantialist by Tibetan Buddhists.

In the end, the best we can do is agree on the basic principles of Buddha's teachings and leave it at that and try to collaborate despite our differences, since there are not many Buddhists in the world, and many in other religious and secular ideologies who would happily see Buddhism as a whole destroyed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Heruka said:

Namdrol, im trying to seperate how the bright flickering of self knowing in the sterile ground of all, pollutes it, simply by this cognition. It seems this simple energy of cognition dulls awareness, and it unfolds and spreads out coemergent, rigpa/marigpa.

is it worth while trying to seperate to understand?

a bit lost in the terminology.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two ways to explain this -- one discusses three ignorance: innate, resembling the cause, and imputing ignorances respectively alternately, one discusses two ignorances, innate and imputing. I will stick with the latter explanation for ease.

When the basis arises out of the basis, i.e. when the five lights of wisdom are stirred by vāyu after the shell of the youthful vase body is rent there is a neutral awareness [shes pa lung ma bstan] that does not recognize itself. That simple non-recognition is the innate ignorance. That neutral awareness has two options either it recognizes itself [vidyā], becoming Samantabhadra, or it does not, and through imputing self and other onto the appearance of the basis, creating samsara. That imputation of self and other is the imputing ignorance.

Most people do not realize that Samantabhadra initially possessed the first ignorance. He never possessed the second.

Important point: the nature of the two or three ignorances are the same.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment according to Hinayana

Content:

Kare said:

Before discussing the Hinayana any further, I suggest that this article may be useful:

<http://www.lienet.no/hinayan1.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

I would suggest that the usage of "hīna" hīnayāna, while derogatory, is derogatory primarily in one of its specific senses you can easily find in the Pali Dictionary -- i.e. hīnāya āvattati, to turn to the lower, to give up orders, return to secular life.

From a Mahāyāna point of view, rejecting Mahāyāna is exactly "turning to the lower" in exactly the same sense that it was used in Pali canon.

There is no question that in Tibetan Buddhism, all Nikāya tenet systems are regarded as inferior and flawed by substantialism of one kind or another, and the Nikayas/Agamas, incomplete and provisional.

In other words, Mahayanists had very specific ideas about Buddhahood and found those that did not agree with them wanting in their understanding.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Enochian said:

You are the one who specifically asked bro.

:

Namdrol said:

I didn't ask you to be disrespectful about things which, according to your own admission, you know little.

N

Enochian said:

I apologize. Greg gets on my nerves. Honestly.

Malcolm wrote:
forgiven.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 3:08 AM
Title: Re: Elements
Content:

Enochian said:
You are the one who specifically asked bro.

:

Malcolm wrote:
I didn't ask you to be disrespectful about things which, according to your own admission, you know little.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: Elements
Content:
Enochian said:
To tell me more conditioned INFERIOR METHODS plus samaya?!

Malcolm wrote:
Remind me not to answer your questions either.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 2:34 AM
Title: Re: Elements
Content:
adinatha said:
There were so many illiterate enlightened masters. The studying part is small compared to listening and contemplation. It just seems big when you're stuck in your head.

Malcolm wrote:

Suit yourself. Just don't bother me with anymore questions. Thanks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Enochian said:

1. One cannot realize rigpa without transmission. That implies Dzogchen is conditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

False implication. Rig pa is not the same as the basis. Rig pa is one's knowledge of the basis. That basis is perfectly complete.

Enochian said:

2. I was working with chakras for my OBE and astral projection practice, before I even heard of "completion stage". You raise energy through your chakras in a trance state, and then you do a exit technique. No bullshit visualizations either, you just use body awareness and FEEL to manipulate the chakras. The chakras are already there, so why visualize? Where do you think you feel your emotions in your physical body?? The chakras.

Malcolm wrote:

I am very familiar with WET tradition, particularly the Crowleyan tradition. It is not even remotely the same.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Enochian said:

So if one does not know Tibetan, one CANNOT practice Dzogchen to completion?

gregkavarnos said:

C'mon Enochian, it's high time you got your shit together and found yourself a teacher coz all this questioning of yours means nothing without practice (unless of course you are going to write a thesis about it all). Do yourself a favour: practice practice, practice!

Enochian said:

There are some things that bother me about Vajrayana and Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:
Do tell.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 1:14 AM
Title: Re: Elements
Content:
Namdrol said:
Reflection, reading and studying the most ancient Dzogchen texts is reflection. It is paramount.

N

Enochian said:
So if one does not know Tibetan, one CANNOT practice Dzogchen to completion?

Malcolm wrote:
One can, but one will not be able to explain Dzogchen to others very well.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 1:03 AM
Title: Re: Elements
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 12:45 AM
Title: Re: Elements
Content:
Namdrol said:
Ye shes bla ma is only sufficient to begin practice.

adinatha said:
You're a funny guy. This is bullshit. There are oral instructions of Togal even briefer than this.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, for example in Yangzab. As I said, insufficient for perfect understanding.

BTW, I meant Khenpo Ngachung's commentaries related to ye shes bl ma, of which there are several.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

adinatha said:

ChNN will talk about appearances of tiple and what they mean. Tiple comes even after five lights. So this mum about my question is bullshit.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has advised his students not to discuss these issues. He is my root guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

username said:

On getting the fourth vision without rigpa

Namdrol said:

It's not possible. There are many technical reasons why this is so.

adinatha said:

Can the five lights arise without Toga?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not going to answer this question, not because I can't, but because the answer will involve discussing things not appropriate to discuss with strangers.

Many times I have heard teachers say one should not discuss things like toga in bars.

That does not mean you cannot mention the name "toga" in a bar -- but to explain it, etc., is inappropriate. In this instance I will follow the instructions of my teachers and disengage from this line of discussion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 11:20 AM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

rai said:

Thank you Namdrol. Could you please advise any good literature in english to learn more about this subject?

Malcolm wrote:

There really is not much on this in English, or even in Sanskrit or Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 11:17 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

username said:

On getting the fourth vision without rigpa

Malcolm wrote:

It's not possible. There are many technical reasons why this is so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 11:15 AM

Title: Re: Five-Long Life Sisters and Tseringma

Content:

Jinzang said:

The story of Tseringma is in the Hundred Thousand Songs, not Tsang Nyong Heruka's biography.

Malcolm wrote:

It's in both places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

adinatha said:

This is a lower vehicle explanation.

Malcolm wrote:

You are a funny guy.

Anyway, I am quite sure in Drigung the 37 bodhipakṣa dharmas are considered important. Even high and mighty Dzogchen practitioners like you have mental factors.

Anyway, whatever happened to your dgongs gcig attitude? Remember, according to Jigten Sumgon, all yānas have the same intention.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

adinatha said:

As a side note, it is possible to get to the fourth appearance of Togal, not having been in rigpa...

Namdrol said:

No, it isn't.

adinatha said:

I think explanations differ drastically on this point. I understand your perspective of the systematic approach. I feel that it would be wonderful if things were this well modeled. But I'm afraid I don't agree they are.

Malcolm wrote:

As in so many things, we will have agree to disagree on this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Namdrol said:

It can be a sign of faith. .

adinatha said:

Here's what I mean. What the HELL is faith? It's not even a thought. What is it? It's

nothing... But it connects you to the dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Faith is part of the samskara skandha. It is also part of the five powers, the five strengths. Faith is connected with the indriyas that lead to nirvana.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

adinatha said:

Okay but what happened to KDL's body?

Malcolm wrote:

It is encased in a stupa.

adinatha said:

As a side note, it is possible to get to the fourth appearance of Togal, not having been in rigpa...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't.

adinatha said:

I know of two such practitioners who this happened to. When they went to their lama and told them they'd finished, they were laughed at. 12 years of solitary retreat, wasted. That's so scary, I can't stand it.

Malcolm wrote:

They mistook increase of experience for exhaustion of dharmatā. They got impatient, and then published a nice picture book. Now they are running workshops on Dzogchen.

adinatha said:

I don't doubt KDL did it all the right way. He was a master...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he taught me everything, soups to nuts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Namdrol said:

Well, we don't agree that the reason is good. I am a trained doctor. Allopathic medicine is not all it is cracked up to be.

N

Enochian said:

I greatly respect TM from the viewpoint of tantric anatomy and relation to Dzogchen etc.

But when you get to treating disease.....

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, what do you think Tibetan Medicine is for?

In Xining, a huge Chinese City, we treat many illnesses allopathic medicine cannot treat at all, in modern hospitals, with the latest equipment and training. Allopathic Medicine is good for trauma, cancers, strong bacterial infections, and surgery. Beyond that, it is not good for much. It has no idea how to treat autoimmune diseases, digestive diseases, chronic diseases, etc. There are many, many illnesses that Allopathic Medicine sucks at treating. Also, Allopathic medicine is expensive, causes lots of other diseases as a consequence of treatment. I am a responsible person -- I never take patients who would be better off seeking allopathic remedies. But I get a lot of patients whose health has been damaged by allopathic remedies and more than that -- I have treated people successfully for conditions they have never found relief from via allopathy.

Open your mind, man.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, but I am not allowed to prescribe them for "Western" illnesses. In China and India,

this is not a problem. The reason that I can't is because a bunch of Capitalists have locked up what can be used in the treatment of a disease and what cannot i.e. the AMA and Big Pharma, as well as Big Insurance. And, there is legislation pending to make everything subject of FDA testing. The previous standard which we now have is that if one is going to market some herbal "supplement" based on a traditional formula all one had to do is a tox test (which itself is stupid because pharmaceuticals are often quite toxic). The new laws will require FDA testing for everything. Herbalists will have no choice but to go underground again. And this is because of Big Pharma wants to control everything, and they already control the FDA.

N

adinatha said:

You should move to Mexico City. Tibetan doctors make a KILLING! out there. I know probably only one out there. His patient is the president of Mexico. Think about it. That's big money...

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting idea -- my girlfriend was born in Mexico and speaks fluent Spanish.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, but I am not allowed to prescribe them for "Western" illnesses.

N

Enochian said:

For good reason. And not because "capitalism" is out to get you.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we don't agree that the reason is good. I am a trained doctor. Allopathic medicine is not all it is cracked up to be.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:
Malcolm wrote:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:56 AM
Title: Re: Elements
Content:
adinatha said:

Here's what I just don't understand at all. How is it that like in Lord Jigten Sumgon's version of the 7 Limb Prayer "Ser Khangma," just by reading, one's achieves a very high samadhi, which is blissful and you don't feel hungry?

Malcolm wrote:
Not feeling hungry can be a symptom of a vata imbalance.

It can be a sign of faith.

It can be a sign of balanced doshas because of samadhi.

There are many reasons why one might not feel hungry.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:53 AM
Title: Re: Elements
Content:
tamdrin said:

KDL was cool for sure, and he had a very powerful blessings.. He probably got to the 3rd vision or so.. I dunno I don't think he manifested RB from what I heard although it was his wish.. Anyway I have recieved more teachings from the Drikung Kagyu this life.. and I view there approach as being equal with Nyingthig, despite what Longchempa might have to say about that.

Malcolm wrote:
KDL went though all four visions to the end. He told me this personally. Not only me, but others. He did realize rainbow body. Rainbow body, in Dzogchen, does not mean that your body disappears. This is a huge misconception.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:51 AM
Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines
Content:
Enochian said:

the dietary supplement manufacturer is responsible for ensuring that a dietary supplement is safe before it is marketed.

-FDA

manufacturers do not need to register their products with FDA nor get FDA approval before producing or selling dietary supplements

-FDA

Malcolm wrote:

They will soon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Enochian said:

Hi Namdrol

I agree with you. But the herbs themselves are available at any GNC or Vitamin Shoppe.

Namdrol said:

Some, but mostly dead, processed to death in lifeless factories.

I wouldn't give those kinds of herbs to anyone. Herbs need life, ritual and myth to be effective. Each herb has a story, each herb is living medicine.

Enochian said:

And again this is a different issue.

You can grow your own herbs legally.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but I am not allowed to prescribe them for "Western" illnesses. In China and India, this is not a problem. The reason that I can't is because a bunch of Capitalists have locked up what can be used in the treatment of a disease and what cannot i.e. the AMA and Big Pharma, as well as Big Insurance. And, there is legislation pending to make everything subject of FDA testing. The previous standard which we now have is that if one is going to market some herbal "supplement" based on a traditional formula all one had to do is a tox test (which itself is stupid because pharmaceuticals are often quite toxic). The new laws will require FDA testing for everything. Herbalists will have no choice but to go underground again. And this is because of Big Pharma wants to control everything, and they already control the FDA.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

tamdrin said:

yeah , so what! receiving the teachings is not that difficult, but accomplishing one of the paths is difficult.

Malcolm wrote:

Sean, my point is that it is quite possible that meaning of the teachings adinatha is talking about are just different terms for essentially the same principle.

Anyway, what I mentioned above is the statement of KDL. KDL was a Buddha, someone who finished all four visions and realized rainbow body.

This is a Buddha that we both knew personally.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Enochian said:

Hi Namdrol

I agree with you. But the herbs themselves are available at any GNC or Vitamin Shoppe.

Malcolm wrote:

Some, but mostly dead, processed to death in lifeless factories.

I wouldn't give those kinds of herbs to anyone. Herbs need life, ritual and myth to be effective. Each herb has a story, each herb is living medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

tamdrin said:

I pay homage to Lord Jigten Sumgon, Ratna Shri, the Peerless One, who is the incarnation of Arya Nagarjuna, and who is the embodiment of the Buddhas of the three

times: Lurigdron and Marme-ze in the past, Maitreya in the future, and Shakyamuni in the present era..

At least that is how Drikungpa's see him,
and he was born into a Nyingma family His dad was an accomplished Yamantaka practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not mean he received for example, snyin thig teachings -- which at this point were still family lineages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

Well. The wisdom of omniscience certainly can't hurt. According to him, the teachings in his "Profound Inner Teachings" came after he was enlightened, he saw precisely the interdependence of all things. Then, he saw the Seven Taras and all these teachings came out.

Malcolm wrote:

That is very interesting. Well, in gsar ma, pure vision, in snying ma, gter ma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sorry, I do know what I am talking about because I have to be careful about telling people what a given herb does. If I tell them that for example that X herb will reduce their cholesterol, this is, in their mind, a medical prescription. They forbid this.

I have studied very closely the FDA regs on herbs.

N

Enochian said:

You are steering into different territory i.e. "prescribing drugs" and so forth. You need to have a license to prescribe drugs.

I almost graduated dental school, before getting my ass thrown out.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you see, if you are an herbalist, you have to give herbs to be people to remedy illnesses. As long as all the diseases I describe are in Tibetan medical terms, there is no problem (yet, it's coming). But if for example, I say oh, you have high blood pressure, but taking this rhododendron based medicine will lower it -- then bam, busted for practicing medicine without a license.

So, we must disengage the State. The State, whether Capitalist or Socialist (two sides of same coin) is the source of all social ills. Revolutionary socialism of the 19th and 20th century was a movement of people without power speaking truth to power. When socialists took power, they immediately became corrupted by the very power they previously had been struggling with. Capital, in the deformed "socialist" states, was position and status. But in the end, States are engines of commerce and so it is that the great Socialist experiments begun in the late nineteenth centuries and early twentieth centuries ended in disaster, famine, and general slaughter, of tens of millions of innocents. The fault lies not with the basic ideals of Socialism, the fault lies within the apparatus of industrial society and the State that supports it. The blind spot of socialism is this idea that they could use the tools of the oppression of common people i.e. factories, et al, to free themselves, when in fact, the whole industrial mode of production simply enslaves human beings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Namdrol said:

They are lax when it comes to Big Pharm -- they are quite uptight when it comes to supplements. If you even hint that some herb actually does something, they are on your ass in a new york minute.

Enochian said:

I'm sorry Namdrol

But you don't know what you are talking about.

I have an avid weight trainer for YEARS and know all about supplements.

FDA does NOT regulate herbal supplements. Only for anabolic steroids and ephedra. But in fact the BETTER ephedrine is completely available at any CVS and Walgreens.

That's why we have huge GNC and Vitamin Shoppe stores.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I do know what I am talking about because I have to be careful about telling people what a given herb does. If I tell them that for example that X herb will reduce their cholesterol, this is, in their mind, a medical prescription. They forbid this.

I have studied very closely the FDA regs on herbs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

Here we must disagree.

Namdrol said:

You are entitled to disagree with Garab Dorje, Longchenpa, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa and Chogyal Namkhai Norbu if you like.

Longchenpa terms it chulen of cittavāyu (rlung sems). This is taught in the sgra thal gyur.

As I said, it seems your view of these things is very influenced by your experience in Drikung. I have many Drikung teachers, but primarily for Yangzab.

adinatha said:

It's not me. It's Lord Jigten Sumgon. He disagrees.

Malcolm wrote:

He can disagree if he wants -- if he wants to call samadhi "chulen" it is fine by me. What is more likely the case is that there is just a different emphasis, different terminology. I don't think that Jigten Sumgon was a recipient of many Dzogchen teachings. But I am not completely sure.

Things like qualities of food are explained very well in Ayurveda and so on. He was unlikely to have had much exposure to the Four Tantras tradition of Tibetan Medicine, because at that point it was still a family lineage in the Yuthok clan. He was a little younger than Yuthok. Tibetan Medicine originally was very secret, and is connected with Dzogchen as well. But like any educated Lama of his day, he certainly had access to various medical traditions and chulen traditions coming from India like the Amrita siddhi tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Enochian said:

Then how come America doesn't have all this nonsense the Europeans have to put up with?

gregkavarnos said:

The US doesn't have the FDA?

Enochian said:

They don't regulate supplements.

And if you know anything about the FDA, they are EXTREMELY lax.

Malcolm wrote:

They are lax when it comes to Big Pharm -- they are quite uptight when it comes to supplements. If you even hint that some herb actually does something, they are on your ass in a new york minute.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Namdrol said:

Ah....this is being rolled through the EU by major corporations. Capitalism is the problem here, not socialism. What you have not figured out, yet, Enochian, is that Capitalists use Socialism in order to keep their pet skilled labor pool content and docile while they rape the rest of the world.

Enochian said:

Then how come America doesn't have all this nonsense the Europeans have to put up with?

America is also capitalist

Malcolm wrote:

America also uses Socialist policies to keep people in line. And they give free handouts to corporations to the tune of trillions of dollars.

Enochian said:

EU has MUCH tougher standards for everything. Its like a nanny state. They even make Microsoft bundle alternative web browsers with Windows in the EU. Its stupid.

Malcolm wrote:

That has much more to do with the European character and much less to do with Socialism than you might imagine.

Enochian said:

P.S. I am again shocked you rail against capitalism. Would you as a tibetan buddhist like to move to China?

Malcolm wrote:

I have been in China for extended periods of time. People in China actually have a lot more freedom than you might think. Yes, they cannot speak out against Govt. But in many ways, people in China have a lot more freedom than we do in US, as surprising as that sounds. I was surprised. Unfortunately for the Chinese, they are moving in the direction of creating a federal style government modeled on ours. Why? because it makes it easier to collaborate with large corporations.

Anyway, your simplistic cold war rhetoric betrays a lack of study of sources in leftwing literature. As for myself, I have read Hayek, Nozak, etc., a great deal of conservative writing. They are romantics, as are you --thinking that an unthinking beast like Capitalism won't eat their children. It will. And it will eat yours.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

In 3 days, the EU will ban much of herbal medicine, pressing more of us to take pharmaceutical drugs that drive the profits of big Pharma.

The EU Directive erects high barriers to any herbal remedy that hasn't been on the market for 30 years -- including virtually all Chinese, Ayurvedic, and African traditional medicine. It's a draconian move that helps drug companies and ignores thousands of years of medical knowledge.

We need a massive outcry against this. Together, our voices can press the EU Commission to fix the directive, push our national governments to refuse to implement it, and give legitimacy to a legal case before the courts. Sign on the right, then forward

this campaign to everyone, and let's get to 1 million voices to save herbal medicine:

To sign the petition follow this link

https://www.avaaz.org/en/eu_herbal_medicine_ban/?cl=1042047785&v=8982 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Enochian said:

Hi Greg,

Now do you see why socialism sucks?

Malcolm wrote:

Ah....this is being rolled through the EU by major corporations. Capitalism is the problem here, not socialism. What you have not figured out, yet, Enochian, is that Capitalists use Socialism in order to keep their pet skilled labor pool content and docile while they rape the rest of the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

Here we must disagree.

Malcolm wrote:

You are entitled to disagree with Garab Dorje, Longchenpa, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa and Chogyal Namkhai Norbu if you like.

Longchenpa terms it chulen of cittavāyu (rlung sems). This is taught in the sgra thal gyur.

As I said, it seems your view of these things is very influenced by your experience in Drikung. I have many Drikung teachers, but primarily for Yangzab.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

it is important because in order to achieve rainbow body one must purify the body through rasāyana. For example, prior to attaining rainbow body, Ngala Pema Dudul was living merely off of essence of vāyu in addition to drinking a little water for the last three

or four years of his life.

The practice of chulen is most important in Dzogchen.

adinatha said:

That is nirmanakaya or sambhogakaya chulen, right? There is chulen of god and naga realms, and chulen of space, as well. Then there is dharmakaya chulen. Ati is dharmakaya chulen, isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, living off the essence of vāyu is dharmakāya chulen. I.e. you are taking the pure five elements directly from breath.

Chulen of space is what we are taking about since space is the basis of the other four elements. It means the same thing. But in order to do this in a pure way one must build up through nirmanakāya and sambhogakāya chulen, respectively eating a sattvic diet combined with pills, in the second eating only pills, and perhaps flowers -- there are variations.

This chulen of space is the an important supporting condition of body of light realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

Okay so the bliss of ojas, a physical bliss, is a facsimile of the blisses that are inherent within rigpa. So the tantric process is like familiarizing yourself with mother of pearl so that when you see a real pearl you can understand "pearl." Is that about right?

Yes, that is an adequate analogy. But as I indicated elsewhere, ojas is something important, also is important to understand in terms achieving rainbow body, etc.

adinatha said:

I don't understand this. Is it that it is important to cultivate ojas to achieve rainbow body? Or is it that during the process of effortless nyingthig, ojas naturally percolates. For example, the practice of Tregcho/Togal, profound bliss arises, but not because of volitional sadhana.

Malcolm wrote:

it is important because in order to achieve rainbow body one must purify the body through rasāyana. For example, prior to attaining rainbow body, Ngala Pema Dudul was living merely off of essence of vāyu in addition to drinking a little water for the last three or four years of his life.

The practice of chulen is most important in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

So, bliss in Guru yoga is just a vehicle. In my own practice it is just not an important feature. Bliss is just an experience. But the total bliss described as part of the result, is merely another what of describing a state which is free from all impure conditions -- sort of like saying "healthy" because one is not sick.

Any, as you know there are four stages of bliss i.e. the three relative bliss — bliss, supreme bliss, the bliss of being free of bliss; and beyond all, innate bliss. And these four get divided up in sixteen etc., since there is a relationship with the sixteen moments of the path of seeing.

The trio of bliss, clarity and non-conceptuality are experiences that need to be recognized so that they do not serve as a basis for deviation.

N

adinatha said:

Okay so the bliss of ojas, a physical bliss, is a facsimile of the blisses that are inherent within rigpa. So the tantric process is like familiarizing yourself with mother of pearl so that when you see a real pearl you can understand "pearl." Is that about right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is an adequate analogy. But as I indicated elsewhere, ojas is something important, also is important to understand in terms achieving rainbow body, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

adinatha said:

Averting your mind to polemical risk assessments generates the cause of their fruition.

Malcolm wrote:

Not worried about myself. It is others who I care about. We cannot use Dzogchen teachings to be indifferent, I think you will agree.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Ojas

Content:

rai said:

I read on some Ayurveda forum that the best way to restore ojas is to restrain from sex for some time or have a longer breaks between. Is that correct according to Tibetan Medicine? I believe there is substitute to ojas in TM?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct. Actually, there is more to it than that. Ojas is the final product of digesting food. So, for this reason one needs to periodically do cleanses, and engage in the practice of rasāyana. This is more effective than mere celibacy because you are cleansing the digestive channels and tract, increasing your ability to absorb rasa, the broken down food, and then having a fairly pure diet where one is mainly relying on essence foods such as ghee and honey, with a sattvic diet.

The whole point of Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine is to refine and purify ojas in the body for longevity etc. In Tibetan the term ojas is translated as "mdangs".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

adinatha said:

This is part of a global plan. But I have serious doubts it will really be enforced. The market for herbals and supplements is HUGE. Even cops use the stuff. No one leaves money on the table. Big Herbal will come back swinging, you can count on it.

Malcolm wrote:

Big Herbal, in my opinion as a doctor of Tibetan Medicine, is just another phace of Big Pharma.

Resist, my brothers and sisters.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

In reality, the three channels meet in each of these five (or six) locations in the body, according to the presentation I gave above from Kalackara. This simply means you will find clusters of arteries, veins and nerves at these locations in the body. Again, to restate, when we are doing deity yoga, our bodies are conceived to be hollow -- thus we visualize the channels in various ways depending on what system we are practicing. Hence, according Menpa Tenzin, et al, our visualization does not correspond with the manner in which the three channels actually exist in the body, and more importantly, it does not need to.

The reasons behind this again become very clear when one studies embryology according to Tibetan Medicine, Kalacakra, or Dzogchen Nyinthig. A very good book on this subject has been published by Francis Garret.

adinatha said:

That was very clear and descriptive. Thank you. I'm very interested in the highlighted portion. Can you please explain that just a bit more. Why do our visualizations not need to correspond to the way these actual exist in the body?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is because our visualization of our bodies as deities also does not correspond to our bodies in a real sense either. For example, when we visualize ourselves as Vajrasattva, in Vajrasattvas body there is no heart, no lungs, no liver, spleen/pancreas or kidney, no stomach, intestines, gall bladder, urinary bladder, ovaries or seminal vesicle, etc.

We primarily use the three channels as a visualization guide for the prāṇa vāyu in our bodies that we breath in. For example, we use the visualization of the lower ends of the three channels to focus our attention below the belly, for example -- through muscular contraction of the mulabandha and the uddiyāna bandhas we collect and force vāyu into arterial system and cause it to supersaturate our cells, capillaries, etc. with vāyu and ojas (the real bodhicitta element within our body) that it pumps. Simultaneously, our heart rate slows, and this means for a time not only is our consciousness "slowing down" i.e. because the karma vāyus are now suspended, but the venous blood is returning less impurities into the blood stream temporarily while the ojas is flushing and restoring the cells. This is why Khumbaka, for example, is the hidden secret to longevity in both Hatha Yoga of the Nathas, and in Vajrayāna. Through the two lower locks, we slow blood flow into the vena cava, saturate blood with prāṇa vāyu and send it into the arteries, etc. Ojas itself has two stores within the body -- the heart and also the brain.

This is why we do the visualization of blazing and dripping, etc.

This is just a rough approximation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

PS And remember to keep a smile on your lips and a song in your heart as you smash the state!

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think smashing is going to do much good. Collective disengagement is more effective, I am thinking. And more conducive to singing and dancing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

Again, to restate, when we are doing deity yoga, our bodies are conceived to be hollow -- thus we visualize the channels in various ways depending on what system we are practicing. Hence, according to Menpa Tenzin, et al, our visualization does not correspond with the manner in which the three channels actually exist in the body, and more importantly, it does not need to.

mr. gordo said:

Hi Namdrol,

If one is visualizing the channels incorrectly, then is this not a problem? Would this be an issue that would affect one's practice?

Malcolm wrote:

In Sakya, for example, they place great emphasis on visualizing the channels very precisely. In Dzogchen, according to the Khandro Nyinthing, it is enough to have an idea of the channels. The same is true for deity yoga and the same difference applies.

However, you must apply the method of the system you are practicing. So for example, if you are practicing Naro Khachö it is considered very important to have a very precise visualization, very clear, very vivid. You apply the method of the school which you are following at any given time for any given practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

adinatha said:

1. All prior scriptures are not first person buddha perspective; they are deluded perspective. 2. I can't violate any samaya, because I have no samaya to keep, other than the nature of mind which is impossible to break. I'm talking about the Apex, not some method or routine from the standpoint of a someone with distorted vision. I'm sorry if I sound gruff: I don't want the inner secret to be lost or diluted. Total freedom is a right, but still a right one has to earn by letting everything go, even dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Longcheпа also writes in the Ocean of Liberation from the Lama Yangthig:

"Now then, although there is nothing to damage or transgress, the natural great perfection being beyond a boundary to protect, since it is necessary for yogins on the path of practice to abide in commitments, in order to purify one's continuum there are the three root commitments. There are twenty five branch commitments as well i.e. what to understand, what not to avoid, what to adopt, how to act, what to accomplish which are taught in the great tantras. The branch commitments are taught as mere assistants for protecting the root commitments since they possess accepting and rejecting, effort and practice."

This itself is a commentary on the more elaborate commentary concerning Dzogchen samaya in the Vima sNying thig, the Analysis of Samaya. It says:

"If one dwells in the samayas of the body, it will not be difficult to obtain the unchanging body vajra of all the buddas. If one dwells in the samayas of the voice, it will not be difficult to obtain the unchanging speech vajra of all the buddas. If one dwells in the samayas of the mind, it will not be difficult to obtain the unchanging mind vajra of all the buddas."

As for Greg's point, Longchenpa here states that among the 27 root commitments (9*3):

"The outer of the inner [is not to ridicule] speaking the words of the teachings..."

This certainly means that while one may not find a given passage relevant to one's own condition, one should not hubristically dismiss the teachings of the Buddha as if they are as you put it "...from a deluded perspective." All Buddhist teachings are for deluded people, yes, even all Dzogchen texts. From that perspective, even Dzogchen tantras are from a deluded perspective. This is not to say of course there are not teachings for people of greater and lesser delusion. This is not to say that we need to follow Nikaya

teachings as if they are of the same value as Dzogchen teachings, etc. But that depends on the practitioner. If someone does not have transmission, then all Dzogchen texts are meaningless aside from being used as bhakti objects.

Undeluded people do not need teachings of any kind. They also are in great or total samaya, always. total samaya is just another word for "dzogchen", mahāsaṃdhi or santimāha in the language of Oḍḍiyāna.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

Namdrol said:

Educate yourself -- grow your own, learn how to diagnose diseases, especially chronic diseases. I have been thinking about a conversation we had sometime ago. There is no hope at all in States. So, we must resist Leviathan. Becoming self-sufficient in terms of medicine and food is the first step.

gregkavarnos said:

I already grow and gather most of my herbs. In the market area of the town there are assorted old guys selling bunches of freshly cut medicinal herbs. I have spent some time researching traditional local usage of many plants and have used them medicinally. I wish I had more time to spend with people my parents age, they have an amazing knowledge of local medicinal and edible plants. A twenty minute walk with my mother through my olive groves was an educational experience, she could pick out various edible plants that all looked merely like green leafy grassy plants to me. The problem is not for rural dwellers like myself that can take a short walk in the surrounding hills and mountains and gather whatever they need, the problem is for all the city dwellers, especially as go further into northern Europe where the climate is not conducive to the growth of many herbs. And then of course there are medicinal plants that have to be imported.

Now I am not sure if the bans are only on pre-prepared herbal pills and medicines, many of which are prepared by large pharmaceutical companies anyway, or on the herbs themselves. The good thing about a disorganised and corrupt place like Greece is that it is easy to flout and bypass European laws AND many times the Greek state refuses to or is incapable of enforcing those laws anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is easier to get seeds and grow things than import whole plants.

You should make a project, document their knowledge.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: EU to Ban Herbal Medicines

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

In 3 days, the EU will ban much of herbal medicine, pressing more of us to take pharmaceutical drugs that drive the profits of big Pharma.

The EU Directive erects high barriers to any herbal remedy that hasn't been on the market for 30 years -- including virtually all Chinese, Ayurvedic, and African traditional medicine. It's a draconian move that helps drug companies and ignores thousands of years of medical knowledge.

We need a massive outcry against this. Together, our voices can press the EU Commission to fix the directive, push our national governments to refuse to implement it, and give legitimacy to a legal case before the courts. Sign on the right, then forward this campaign to everyone, and let's get to 1 million voices to save herbal medicine:

To sign the petition follow this link

https://www.avaaz.org/en/eu_herbal_medicine_ban/?cl=1042047785&v=8982 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Educate yourself -- grow your own, learn how to diagnose diseases, especially chronic diseases. I have been thinking about a conversation we had sometime ago. There is no hope at all in States. So, we must resist Leviathan. Becoming self-sufficient in terms of medicine and food is the first step.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

Something doesn't make sense to me. What is a channel exactly? Air goes into the lungs, the oxygen is taken into blood stream. The yogic method of channels and winds uses channels that are not lungs or blood vessels. How the three channels meet at the base of the body is not connected to a cavity or passage where gas could travel.

Malcolm wrote:

A channel is a channel: veins, arteries and nerves. You can add to this the lymphatic system, though they are considered to act as a support for bring moisture to the

nervous system among their other functions.

A cakra in this view is any place in the body where there are clusters of arteries, veins and nerves. You can readily see five such clusters in the body. There are many more.

The channels we visualize are just a method -- why? because when we are visualizing ourselves as a deity, we visualize our bodies as completely hollow, made of light, with no internal organs.

The explicitly stated point of view of Tibetan Medicine is that the avadhūti is all channels of air i.e. arteries; the rasanā is all channels of fire i.e. the blood vessels, and the lalanā all channels of water i.e. the nerves in the body. This is detailed at length by Zurkhar Lodo Gyalpo, is based primarily on the understanding of the anatomy of the body indicated by the Third Karmapa in his Zabmo Nangdon and reinforced by Desrid Sangye Gyatso. The latter two were both great Dzogchen masters as well though, Zurkharwa was not.

For example, the Kagyu Historian, Thubten Phunstog, has written an interesting commentaries on Tibetan Medicine, Six Yogas of Naropa, and well as Zabmo Nangdon. He makes the case that if channels are not physical structures in the body, then practices like gtum mo would have no effect. Then there is the very interesting doctor in Golok, Menpa Tenzin, who wrote a book based on doing many years of dissection of cadavers which contain very detailed drawings of his research. One may think this unnecessary given Netter's Anatomy and so on, but it is interesting -- and his dissections were guided from a Tibetan Medical perspective. He really explained this principle to us very well when we are interning in Xining. He is a disciple of Khenpo Munsel and In Tibet, he is a well respected Dzogchen master.

In reality, the three channels meet in each of these five (or six) locations in the body, according to the presentation I gave above from Kalackara. This simply means you will find clusters of arteries, veins and nerves at these locations in the body. Again, to restate, when we are doing deity yoga, our bodies are conceived to be hollow -- thus we visualize the channels in various ways depending on what system we are practicing. Hence, according Menpa Tenzin, et al, our visualization does not correspond with the manner in which the three channels actually exist in the body, and more importantly, it does not need to.

The reasons behind this again become very clear when one studies embryology according to Tibetan Medicine, Kalacakra, or Dzogchen Nyinthig. A very good book on this subject has been published by Francis Garret.

However, again, in the West, our idea of nāḍis has been very influenced by the acupuncture idea of "meridians" as well as Hindu ideas of cakras and nāḍis. The Upanishadic idea of cakras and nāḍis is related to the concept of pañcakośa originating in the Taittiriya Upanisha (which makes this idea a bit older than the Buddha's teaching), where they are explicitly connected with the prāṇamayakośa. On the other hand, the Upanishads are very important to understand, because they contain many ideas and

concepts which reappear in altered form (i.e. revised in accordance with Buddha ideas) in Vajrayāna, Ayurveda/Tibetan Medicine, and even in Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 11:04 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Namdrol said:

You don't feel that the five elements taught by the Buddha can be applied below the atomic level, or even at the atomic level.

Sherab said:

Despite my posts here and elsewhere, you have not got what I thought. Therefore it is better for us to leave it as it is.

Malcolm wrote:

After a certain point, one must assume if one is not getting one's point across, either the other person is hopelessly stupid (which I am not), or that one is not explaining one's point clearly (which seems to be the case).

Incidentally, I understand that people trained in hard sciences would find it very difficult to take my point of view seriously re: the above.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Namdrol said:

You are missing the basic point of what I am saying.

Sherab said:

And you have missed mine. Let's just leave it as it is.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I understood your point very clearly. You don't feel that the five elements taught by the Buddha can be applied below the atomic level, or even at the atomic level. You feel my assertion that they can points to a lack of understanding physics on my part.

I understood your point. I simply don't agree with you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Elements

Content:

Sherab said:

Because of that, he is not able to see that words, such as solidity, motility etc, that are used to represent the Buddhist elements cannot possibly carry the same meaning when they are used in the context of modern science.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't presume that they would.

You are missing the basic point of what I am saying. What I am saying is that if it is mental or material in any sense it is subsumed under the categories outlined by the Buddha. The description of the four elements describe all material states.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: Five-Long Life Sisters and Tseringma

Content:

adinatha said:

Milarepa tamed them...

oh what's the use.

Namdrol said:

You are basing this on a biography that was written five hundred years after the fact.

adinatha said:

So let me get this straight. The Nyingmpa texts are reliable and the Kagyu texts are not.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsang Nyong Heruka's bio of Mila is an inspired piece of historical fiction based on the many oral traditions he collected travelling all over the Himalayan regions where Milarepa wandered. While I have no doubt that Mila adopted the Tsheringma sisters as guardians since the presence of the five Tseringma sisters as guardians in the Kagyu school is well attested, I don't see any reason to accept Tsang Nyon's narratives at face value.

Further, the permission ritual of Tseringma in the Kagyu sNgags mDzod clearly explains

how Padmasambhava bound Tseringma under the secret name "Vajrasamantabhadri", and later how in particular Tseringma was made a specific guardian of Kagyu school by Milarepa.

As I read the account given in this permission ritual, Tseringma was testing Milarepa's yogic ability.

Finally, there is no contradiction between stating, for example, "...among non-human disciples, Tseringma was Milarepa's chief student" and understanding that the twelve tenma were Dzogchen guardians from the beginning.

Generally, however, for Dzogchen, among the twelve Tenma, Dorje Yudronma is regarded as more important. For the Kagyus, Tseringma is more important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Five-Long Life Sisters and Tseringma

Content:

adinatha said:

Milarepa tamed them...

oh what's the use.

Malcolm wrote:

You are basing this on a biography that was written five hundred years after the fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Five-Long Life Sisters and Tseringma

Content:

adinatha said:

Oh now I remember. The Mila story says they were almost tamed by Padmasambhava but he didn't give them deep dharma teachings so they went back to being bad. Then, they badgered Mila and he gave them teachings that finally turned them into dharma beings. Is that about right?

Namdrol said:

The twelve Tenma are protectors of the Dzogchen teachings.

So that detail is not correct.

adinatha said:

This based on your scholarship that the Mila songs are what a lie? Oh I forget everything written in a Dzogchen text is true, everything else is a lie.

Malcolm wrote:

The twelve tenma have been protectors of Dzogchen teachings since Padmasambhava tamed them and entrusted them with various cycles of Dzogchen teachings that are under their care.

Whether you choose to accept this or not is of little concern to me.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Five-Long Life Sisters and Tseringma

Content:

adinatha said:

Oh now I remember. The Mila story says they were almost tamed by Padmasambhava but he didn't give them deep dharma teachings so they went back to being bad. Then, they badgered Mila and he gave them teachings that finally turned them into dharma beings. Is that about right?

Malcolm wrote:

The twelve Tenma are protectors of the Dzogchen teachings.

So that detail is not correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 6:36 AM

Title: Re: Five-Long Life Sisters and Tseringma

Content:

adinatha said:

Was wondering if anyone knows the history of how the Five Long Life Sisters joined with Nyingmapa. I'm only familiar with how they became disciples of Milarepa.

Malcolm wrote:

Mmmmmm, they were tamed by Padmsambhava?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

That's fine. Again, I take the unique position that models are useless.

Malcolm wrote:

Sadadhātu is the teaching of the Buddha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

Sure. My point was to leave aside all levels except "unsurpassed utterly secret" level. Longchen Nyingthig is the Nyingthig of the Nyingthigs, because Longchenpa gathered all the Nyingthig transmissions and took the essence.

Malcolm wrote:

Many other masters have done this as well. Jigme Lingpa simply is one of the most famous due mostly to his recent appearance and the fame of some of his disciples and recognized incarnations.

Other transmissions, for example, Dudjom Lingpa's Gnas lugs rang byung are every bit as profound as anything in Klong chen snying thig.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

Okay. There are the three series of Ati right? Then, in the third, there are also three.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the upadeshas series is divided into four cycles: outer, inner, secret and unsurpassed utterly secret.

adinatha said:

Longchen Nyingthig is the highest.

Malcolm wrote:

Parts of klong chen snyin thig are connected with the unsurpassed utterly secret cycle.

Most of klong chen snying thig is mahāyoga sadhanas.

adinatha said:

This is how it is explained at Ontrul Tenpa'i Wangchuk's monastery in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo explains that among snying thig teachings, the dgongs pa zang thal is the most profound.

Khyentse's Chetsun Nyingthig cycle declares "'E ma, e ma. In the future, in later times, yogins practicing the heart of the heart essence wishing liberation at this time should only meditate on me, Chetsun Simhesvara."

Yeshe Lama is basically a commentary on the Lama Yangthig. Wonderful, to be sure.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

I get it. You are reasoning from the tantras. I understand how the dzogchen tantras explain wisdoms correspond to lights and lights to elements. The last statement you made is a conclusion drawn from these premises. I'm saying that science will laugh.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't care if scientists laugh -- their knowledge is as the coarsest, grossest level.

adinatha said:

I've devised an explanatory and experiential model that can deal with today's facts. I see why one would reason as you do, because there is evidence of physical bodies dissolving, and the five lights very clearly do arise to Atiyoga practitioner. The lights are a primordial existence and have no causal basis. The elements arise due to deluded mind of grasping at truth. That's just a why, not a how. How is what I said, and it closes the circle between yesterday and today.

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot separate the pure sadhadhatu (wisdom and five lights) from the impure sadadhātu (consciousness and five elements). The difference is only vidyā or avidyā.

The sadadhātu are a model that is capable of encompassing any state of matter or mind, no matter how subtle or gross, macro, micro, nano, subatomic, etc.

It is inconsistent to say that the five elements function at the macro level of matter and are irrelevant at the subatomic level. The five elements are properties of all matter, period. The medicine tantra states:

"No formation without earth, no cohesion without water, no maturation without fire, no development without air, and no room for development without space."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

I will answer myself and refute you. Solidity in matter is an illusion caused by the spinning an electron, which creates an energetic cloud, and thus the mere appearance of solidity. There is no solidity in fact. It is just a charge. A charge is just a positive or negative. An electron is not technically a particle. So there is no atomic solidity.

At the level of subatomic particles, there are spins and lower than that waves. Not a wave in the motion sense. But a wave in the geometric sense. One can never detect motion and position simultaneously at this level. Again, no solidity. There is also no mass. Quantum people have no idea what accounts for mass. All they have are mathematical models.

Without motion, solidity or mass, the whole phenomenal world collapses. So there is certainly no possibility of observing liquidity, gaseousness or heat. At this level even space is not space. It all converges with information: constants and probabilities.

What does remain are charges: Positive (attracting), negative (repelling) and neither (neutral). These do have a correspondence with the three poisons. To my satisfaction, this here provides perfect explanatory and experiential understanding of why consciousness arises as an interdependence of these three things, why there is no such thing as a universal consciousness, and why there is liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

The five elements are inherent in consciousness; consciousness is inherent in the five elements. There are no levels of subatomic anything which exist outside the sadadhātu, consciousness, space, air, fire, water and earth.

If you want to go further, we could discuss how these gross expressions of the sadadhātu have their corollaries in terms of wisdom and the five lights.

Now you can see that even the subatomic level must have the five elements in order to be material, physical (rūpena).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Will said:

Will: New Age is full of hooey - but in the case of cosmic or universal prana notion - they are innocent. The Upanishads taught it - not saying they are right, just a universal prana teaching goes way, way back.

Namdrol: It depends on whether you take the Brihadaryanka as allegorical (it is) or literally.

So the Prasna <http://www.celextel.org/108upanishads/prasna.html> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; and the Chandogya are also allegorical?

Fiddlesticks - Swamis teach cosmic, universal prana all the time.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know the Prasna. One it is a late Upanishad. Second, it is still metaphorical. It is not prāṇa in the sense you take it to mean.

You have to understand, that for Ancient Indians who wrote the upanishads, the world was alive. The sun was a living being, but not the moon. It is very complicated.

But the ancient Indian idea of prāṇa was nothing like the new age idea people have now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Brain Surgery in Ancient Tibet

Content:

kirtu said:

But none exists in traditional Chinese medicine or it was lost. So the Maya, Aztecs, maybe Incas and Indians had surgery?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Never existed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Will said:

N: The idea that prāṇa is some universal life force is exactly the new age idea that I am criticizing.

I get it - the non-universal notion - not sure I agree yet. Will have to look again at the Chi of China & Prana of Indian thought for support for non-universal notion. Prana is in the Sun for example, where there is no air or breath.

New Age is full of hooey - but in the case of cosmic or universal prana notion - they are innocent. The Upanishads taught it - not saying they are right, just a universal prana teaching goes way, way back.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on whether you take the Brihadaryanka as allegorical (it is) or literally.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

Your claim that the inner winds are the same as the outer winds has not been borne out, despite various lines of argument. That is my contention.

Malcolm wrote:

My claim is that the winds in the body are based on the process of respiration. I never asserted that they do not undergo change and refinement in the body, of course they do. The function of the lungs is to bring air into body and pass it into the channels, refining it along the way. This vāyu, like any other of the four elements that are taken up by the body, undergoes a process of digestion. Breath is a kind of food. This is why we have rasāyanas of air, which involve prāṇayāma practices to extract the rasa of the vāyu directly and so on.

Anyway, this understanding comes from Tibetan Medicine. For example, one of my teachers, Tamdrin Gyal from Amdo, when explaining topics from Rangjung Dorje's famed Zabmo Nangdon to us asserted that while the vāyu/vatta of the body comes from external element of air conducted into the body through breathing, the air element outside the of body does not possess all seven characteristics of vāyu present in the body i.e, rough, light, cold, motile, subtle and hard.

When we talk about the five elements in the body, we always refer to them as the five refined elements. But, for example, Padmsambhava is very clear that the five refined elements in the body come from the five gross elements upon which we depend for life.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is nothing mysterious. Unfortunately, Buddhists have been unwittingly influenced by new age concepts about channels, cakras and so on.

gregkavarnos said:

Bloody long haired hippy new agers!

Malcolm wrote:

Greg -- I am not saying that there there are no cakra and channels and so on -- of course there are.

What I am saying is that the way Western Buddhists relate to these things has been very much filtered through a new age lens. Part of the reason for this is that in Tibet, there is an understanding of physical anatomy which supports how so called "tantric anatomy" is understood. These kinds of issues are discussed in great detail in Tibetan medicine.

But we lack this background, culturally speaking. So we come up with many strange ideas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2011 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Will said:

N: The idea that prāṇa is some universal life force is exactly the new age idea that I am criticizing.

I get it - the non-universal notion - not sure I agree yet. Will have to look again at the Chi of China & Prana of Indian thought for support for non-universal notion. Prana is in the Sun for example, where there is no air or breath.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have a citation for this?

The meaning of prāṇa is "life". If there life in the sun?

The Vajramālā states very plainly:

The characteristic of the the element of air (vāyu)
is the vāyu (air) pervading the six cakras,
always present in the dharmacakra,
called prāṇa since it pervades migrating beings"

And:

The wheel of vāyu is explained to be prāṇa.

And apropos of the Kalacakra citation in the last post it states:

Depending on upper or lower,
the major vāyus, prāṇa and apana are located.

Prāṇa vāyu is further defined in this text:

From the traces of the all-basis consciousness
arises the stream of consciousness;
the affliction [consciousness] is the prāṇa vāyu.

So at least in Buddhist texts these things are very precisely defined.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

If you read the discussion carefully, you will see that you are precisely making my point here, please direct this comment to Namdrol.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a given. Non-controversial. Within the body there are five elemental vāyus. All material phenomena contain all four elements in some proportion. I was under the impression I was not talking to Buddhist Kindegardeners where every detail has to spelled out in order to prevent someone from having an objection.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

so it is your claim that you actually fart out your downward-voiding wind? Interesting proposition. What happens when you ejaculate, also caused by the downward-voiding wind?

Namdrol said:

Not my claim -- clearly explained in Kalacakra, etc. And yes, ejaculation, urination, menstruation, happen because of the apana vāyu (thur sel rlung)

It seems you are overly literal when claiming that there is no difference between inner and outer wind.

No, I am just well trained in both Vajrayāna (Lamdre, Dzogchen) and Tibetan medicine.

N

cloudburst said:

So the Kalachakra Tantra explains that when you fart, you expel your downward-voiding wind? Would you care to cite a few lines?

Also, I can see how you may have misunderstood my question above. I was asking... since ejaculation (and of course urination etc) are caused by the dwv, what are you proposing in these cases? In the case of flatulence, you explain that the dwv moves downward and leaves the body. What is your proposition with respect to any of the other eliminations through lower doors, as they are not composed of air?

Of course they "happen because of the" dwv, but your claim that the dwv is actually the air that moves when we are flatulent is a misleading example as it does not map on to any other function of the dwv. My question is: how to explain in the case of movement that is not physical air, but rather liquid, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not communicating well.

That flatus is the downward voiding wind is a fact. The apana-vāyu is also responsible for moving liquids out of the body such as sperm, urine and so forth, as well as solids such as feces. Its location in the body is the pelvic region.

There is a passage in the Kalacakra that describes the anus as being the lower end of the central channel. The famous Doctor Zurkar Lodo Gyalpo explains the following in his "Oral Advice of the Grandfathers", his commentary on the formation of the body chapter in the Explanatory Medicine Tantra

This verse (from the Explanatory Tantra) "The channels of formation divide into three

from the navel" demonstrates the lalanā, rasanā and the lower end of the avadhūti. The channel that creates kapha, etc., is the lalanā through which the element of water moves. The channel that creates blood and so on is the rasanā through which the element of fire moves. The channel that creates vāyu and so on is the lower part of the avadhūti. The lower ends of the rasanā and lalanā are demonstrated through implication. These three tips both below and above the navel are applied according to the intention of the Shri Kalacakra i.e. the Adibuddha states:

Those have three tips below,
likewise, three tips above.
The tip of Rahu is present in the center,
the tip of Surya is on the right,
the tip of Candra is on the left.
The vāyus of water, fire and space
move feces, urine, and sukra
through the bottom of the right, left, and central [channels].
The channels interlaced like a chain
are the three pathways of the prāṇa and the apaṇa.

The great commentary states "In terms of the the so called 'channel interlaced into a chain which runs to the location of amrita', the amritaṇḍī is in forehead. "Moving there" is moving into the location of amrita i.e. the lalanā, the rasanā, and the avadhūti. Since those are interlaced like a chain, having made three pathways between the navel and the heart, once again they intersect in the center of the heart in the center of the avadhūti. The lalanā and the rasanā move to the right and left sides. After that, between the heart and the throat, they make three paths. In the same way they are three paths between the throat and the forehead, and likewise between the forehead and crown. Having made three paths four times, the lalanā ends in twelve different locations other from the left nostril. The rasanā from the right (nostril). The avadhūti leaves simultaneously from both nostrils. Likewise, having made three paths below the navel and again below the secret cakra, between feces and urine moving from the right and the left, and in the center of the secret lotus there is the conch nāḍī. Below the conch nāḍī, the mahāmalā (great waste i.e. rectum) channel moves from the center. From penis or the vagina, the urine channel moves from the left, and the seminal channel from right."

Incidentally, in the Blue Beryl, Desri Sangye Gyatso reproduces the above passage more or less in its entirety without comment.

I should think the meaning of all of this is rather clear.

There are three vāyus that are subsets of the apana vāyu. The apāna vāyu in general governs the lower ends of the three channels. The three lower channels are the rectum i.e. the lower end of the central channel; the urinary tract i.e. the lower end of the lalanā, and the channel which emits semen or ovum i.e. the lower end of the rasanā channel.

When someone has an excess of apana vāyu, they fart, or have diarrhea, etc. There are many disorders they have have connected with the three lower passages. We take wind in, some of it is expelled from the lower end of the body as flatus.

However, I will allow that my understanding of many tantric topics has been altered considerably through my studies of Tibetan medicine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Brain Surgery in Ancient Tibet

Content:

Astus said:

<http://www.buddhistchannel.tv/index.php?id=7,10079,0,0,1,0>

"Brain surgery was practiced by doctors at least 2,900 years ago, a specialist on Tibetan culture and literature said Wednesday after four decades of research on the Tibetan Tripitaka, an ancient encyclopedia."

Does anyone have some background information about the reliability of this claim?

Malcolm wrote:

This is quite a misleading heading -- the brain surgery in question would have been in Ancient India.

There is a tradition of surgery in Ayurveda.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Will said:

But prana could be with or within water or deep in the earth or on Mars; it need not be confined only to the air on the surface of this planet? As for slight respiration through the skin; what about yogis buried for 2 or 3 months, surely they would have used up all the air-prana by then.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Will,

There is no "prāṇa" out there in genera separate from the vāyu element. Prāṇa is just a name for the vāyu that supports life in the body of a sentient being.

The idea that prāṇa is some universal life force is exactly the new age idea that I am criticizing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

It doesn't hold up in subatomic land.

Namdrol said:

Of course it does.

adinatha said:

How? ...

Malcolm wrote:

Because there is motility, solidity, heat, and moisture (cohesion) even at these levels of observation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 10:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

It doesn't hold up in subatomic land.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 10:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Will said:

Namdrol: prāṇa is a vāyu i.e. prāṇa vāyu (srog dzin rlung) aka "the life sustaining wind". This comes from our breath and no where else.

Not sure about the prana source being only breath. That would mean a deep samadhi state where breath stops, could not last that long - but it does - many hours, days & beyond. Since prana pervades the atmosphere around us, that prana is somehow absorbed during samadhi, without the lungs functioning.

Malcolm wrote:

There is also respiration through the skin.

There is no prāṇa as a separate entity. This is a huge misconception. There is a prāṇa vāyu i.e. the breath we inhale.

As far not breathing during certain states of samadhi -- during these state the respiration is so slight it is not noticed. It is still happening however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 10:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

so it is your claim that you actually fart out your downward-voiding wind? Interesting proposition. What happens when you ejaculate, also caused by the downward-voiding wind?

Malcolm wrote:

Not my claim -- clearly explained in Kalacakra, etc. And yes, ejaculation, urination, menstruation, happen because of the apana vāyu (thur sel rlung)

cloudburst said:

It seems you are overly literal when claiming that there is no difference between inner and outer wind.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am just well trained in both Vajrayāna (Lamdre, Dzogchen) and Tibetan medicine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

adinatha said:

I have always found that wind, fire, water and earth are confusing terms. I prefer motility, temperature, liquidity and solidity. These are retained by basic physics and tend to make the yogic practices jibe with modern understandings. Furthermore, going beyond these gross elements are the subtle "elements" of the sub-atomic world, those would be attraction, repulsion and neutrality (space). I have found these to be extremely apropos, because the three poisons of samsara are attachment, aversion and ignorance. I feel these are a perfect correspondence. Thus, in the realization of Atiyoga or Mahamudra, when grasping has ceased by recognition of the nature of basic space dharmadhatu, attachment and aversion have ceased; thus, the basic cause of matter, that is, attraction, repulsion and deluded space are unbound. Because dharmadhatu has qualities deluded ordinary space does not, there are the three kayas and the body, speech and mind of buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Earth, air fire and water in one sense refer to the three states of matter with the presence or absence of heat being responsible for phase transition between states.

This replicates down no matter how far you go in physical reality.

But for our purposes, for example, discussing pranayāma and other such issues -- it obvious that vāyu is a name for the air that we are breathing in.

Basic space, incidentally, is a very bad rendering of dharmadhātu, and is not supported by commentaries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 7:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

So you ARE saying that which flows through the channels is Nitrogen, Oxygen etc?

Namdrol said:

Well, we don't breath anything else, do we?

What flows through the channels in our body is vāyu (air) that has been refined in our lungs.

Otherwise, practices like caṇḍali yoga would make no sense, would they?

prāṇa is a vāyu i.e. prāṇa vāyu (srog dzin rlung) aka "the life sustaining wind". This comes from our breath and no where else.

N

cloudburst said:

That all seems rather unlikely to me. For example, the very subtle wind that becomes the

illuory body is part water vapor?

Nitrogen is the substantial cause of the rupakaya?

The very subtle wind that goes from life to life is part Argon?

I'm sure I am misunderstanding your point here, I must be.

Malcolm wrote:

There are five elements: earth, water, fire, air and space -- they are material, whether coarse or subtle.

When transmigration happens at the time of death, the mind/wind leaves specific orifices of the body, or channel openings. This would bot be necessary if the wind upon which the mind is mounted was not itself physical and material.

For example, when you have flatulence, this comes from the apana vāyu, the downward-voiding wind. That flatus is apana-vāyu.

Vāyu in the body is coarse or subtle depending upon how much it is moving. But it is still something physical, part of the rūpa skandha.

If you cannot accept this explanation, then you have to invent terms that do not exist in the original Tibetan and Sanskrit texts, such as the Vajramālā tantra that explain things like vāyus and so on.

I prefer to not to interpolate new age ideas onto Vajrayāna. So, I accept that vāyu in the body comes from the breath. If you think about it long enough, you will understand that I am correct. You need to study tantric embryology. When you do, this will make more sense to you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

You have a lot of karmic connection with Dzogchen. But you can screw it up in three ways: not protecting your samaya, not practicing in a careful and precise way, and giving too much weight to conceptual experiences.

N

adinatha said:
I'm aware of all this.

Malcolm wrote:
Excellent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

KDL was a tertön, so of course it is not unusual for tertöns to have many experiences of visions of Guru Rinpoche even at quite a young age.

Nevertheless, it was not until he met his own root Guru, Dudjom Rinpoche, that his capacity to reveal termas was opened in this lifetime. Had he met the right consort, he would have had many earth termas, but there was an obstacle and so it did not happen. Nevertheless, he had many dgongs gter.

Having visions of Guru Rinpoche, as KDL did throughout his life, does not necessarily mean one is receiving teachings. However, KDL told me that he could communicate directly with Guru R. Of course, KDL was someone who had reached the complete end of the Dzogchen path. So this should not come as a surprise.

adinatha said:

I've had five clear visions beginning with my first memory. I have always had a nonstop fascination with crazy yogi sadhus and an aspiration to be one. Before I met any Dzogchen teachers I found the Seven Line Prayer and instantly started reciting it and felt intense natural rigpa blaze. Friends like Tony Duff helped me out with texts and deepened my experience. Yogini Changchub Palmo, student of Chatral Rinpoche, gave me a lot of affirmation. Over the years I've spent thousands of hours on listening and re-listening to ChNN. I've wondered if that Ati master is coming or what? Then, I'm also the "heart-son" to a Drikung lama, and that makes the situation weirder. Then I practice Dzogchen dedicatedly. I can't help it. I had a clear dream recently after practicing Togal similar to one KDL describes with a message from Ekajati. I received Tigle Gyachen without a reading transmission and definitely powerful blessings and I started to see signs in my dreams too. I'm puzzled by this. I feel Ekajati is throwing me blessings. The only connection I can make is that my family lineage ancestral homeland is the area that would now be considered Swat and all that surrounds it. My family heritage is that we were the kings of the land. The Puru. The Puru are the oldest living family lineage on

the planet. It goes back 5000 years so I don't know. There's actually a Wikipedia article about it. I have no idea who wrote it. I know from family we have an intensely spiritual history, that includes Hindus, Buddhists and Sikhs. There must be a past life connection somewhere. I want you to know that for me Ekajati is a teacher; at least I feel it if I'm doing something wrong by Ati. I physically will feel sick. It's like a barometer. What I'm saying here is from my heart of hearts. No bullshit. That's where I'm at. I'm gauging.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a lot of karmic connection with Dzogchen. But you can screw it up in three ways: not protecting your samaya, not practicing in a careful and precise way, and giving too much weight to conceptual experiences.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

So you ARE saying that which flows through the channels is Nitrogen, Oxygen etc?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we don't breath anything else, do we?

What flows through the channels in our body is vāyu (air) that has been refined in our lungs.

Otherwise, practices like caṇḍali yoga would make no sense, would they?

prāṇa is a vāyu i.e. prāṇa vāyu (srog dzin rlung) aka "the life sustaining wind". This comes from our breath and no where else.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 4:25 AM

Title: Elements

Content:

cloudburst said:

So you are saying that which flows through the channels is Nitrogen, Oxygen, Argon and Carbon Dioxide?

Malcolm wrote:

Vāyu is part of the rūpa skandha. It is one of the four mahābhutani, great elements. When we breath in, the air we breath is vāyu. In the body, that vāyu that we breath in becomes the ten vāyus depending on how vāyu is functioning in a given part of the body.

This is nothing mysterious. Unfortunately, Buddhists have been unwittingly influenced by new age concepts about channels, cakras and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

Also Kunzang Dechen Lingpa said he couldn't find a teacher so he sat outside some monastery and prayed like mad to Guru Rinpoche, then he appeared to him. How is this not teacher?

Namdrol said:

I am a very close disciple of KDL, one of his main US students. So, I will explain. He told me that he had received the Nyingthig Yazhi the first time when he was five.

He had transmission already.

adinatha said:

I see so because of this he was later able to pray to Guru Rinpoche and have him appear?

Malcolm wrote:

KDL was a tertön, so of course it is not unusual for tertöns to have many experiences of visions of Guru Rinpoche even at quite a young age.

Nevertheless, it was not until he met his own root Guru, Dudjom Rinpoche, that his capacity to reveal termas was opened in this lifetime. Had he met the right consort, he would have had many earth termas, but there was an obstacle and so it did not happen. Nevertheless, he had many dgongs gter.

Having visions of Guru Rinpoche, as KDL did throughout his life, does not necessarily mean one is receiving teachings. However, KDL told me that he could communicate directly with Guru R. Of course, KDL was someone who had reached the complete end of the Dzogchen path. So this should not come as a surprise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

That's good to know. So why is 10 minutes of a Song of Vajra better than 10 minutes of some other Atiyoga guru yoga mantra and visualization? And then how is that better than just resting in rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the song of the vajra has another name "The primordial state of Samantabhadra".

When relying on a non-conceptual continuum,
at this time one should sing...

If concentration is not occurring for someone,
with this it occurs naturally...

When a yogin has lethargy,
when revived with this, samadhi is excellent...

Therefore, sing the song of the vajra.

-- Tantra of the Union of the Sun and Moon.

Song of the Vajra is ChNN's main practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

Also Kunzang Dechen Lingpa said he couldn't find a teacher so he sat outside some monastery and prayed like mad to Guru Rinpoche, then he appeared to him. How is this not teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

I am a very close disciple of KDL, one of his main US students. So, I will explain. He told me that he had received the Nyingthig Yazhi the first time when he was five.

He had transmission already.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

In one's sadhana.

Malcolm wrote:

One can sing the Dzogchen song of the vajra, any version one has transmission for, whenever one likes to identical effect.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

What I meant was guru yoga is indispensable. After that, Song of the vajra is indispensable. But one cannot just sing song of the vajra out loud anywhere. it would be strange. Of course, you can mentally sing it everywhere.

adinatha said:

Well I didn't mean sing it anywhere. In one's sadhana.

Song of the vajra is not just ChNN's terma tradition. It is very important. Key in Dzogchen teachings. I cannot emphasize how much how important it is.

The one in the Tun book differs from the one in the Tantra of Union of Sun and Moon. I asked Jim Valby about this. He told me the version in the Tun Book came from ChNN's dream.

Malcolm wrote:

That is correct, there are many different versions of the Song of the Vajra, in many different termas. They all share basic characteristics, however.

The one ChNN uses is more or less identical to the version Longchenpa presents in the Theg mchog mdzod apart from one or two syllables, differences that can be accounted for through scribal transcription errors from umed to uchen when the original blocs were prepared.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

lovely.

So the coarse freedom from grasping of sutra becomes progressively more subtle.

It seems to me that the freedom from grasping explained in sutra becomes more subtle

as the energy winds supporting the view gather and are pacified, so perhaps clear light and Dzogchen view differ in presentation only.

Namdrol said:

What I meant was that freedom from grasping is progressively more and more subtle as one moves through the practices of the nine yānas.

No need to add "energy" to winds. The composition of vāyus is vāyu, the element of air. We term them "winds" in English because they move through the channels of body. Wind is moving air -- no movement, no wind.

N

cloudburst said:

so dzogchen view is sutra view of freedom from grasping made more and more subtle as one moves through the yanas. This is description also aptly describes the mind of clear light.

the purpose in adding "energy" to winds is to differentiate "moving air" from moving energy. If you already understand this, there is as you say no need for this term. There is however no fault in adding it for purposes of clarity.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I am not explaining this clearly: dzogchen view is the ultimate freedom from grasping, quite beyond sūtra.

The only difference between wind in your body and wind outside your body is that it is in your body. There is no "energy" apart from vāyu. There are ten vāyus. The less those vāyus move in the body, the more subtle the mind becomes.

I don't think adding the term "energy" makes the concept about what is happening in the human body any clearer, and rather more muddled.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you would like to believe that whatever it is in Greek Orthodoxy you are calling "rainbow body" is absolutely equivalent with achieving complete Buddhahood, that's up to you. I don't buy it.

gregkavarnos said:

You don't believe that a serious [insert religious label of choice] ascetic practitioner can achieve the state of a pratyekabuddha (for example)? Or maybe that some teachings may have leaked (snuck) into other religious traditions? Or maybe [insert religious label

of choice] practitioners do not possess the tathagatagarbha?

Malcolm wrote:

Prayetkabuddhas do not achieve rainbow body.

And no, I don't believe that Dzogchen leaked into any tradition other than Bon.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

Depends on the practitioner. Depends on what they feel they need to do. The only thing that is absolutely essential is guru yoga followed by song of the vajra.

N

adinatha said:

That is ChNN talking. Jim Valby told me the Song of Vajra is his terma tradition. I took this to mean Song of Vajra is not indispensable, because there are so many guru yoga methods. Whether you sing a song, visualize a picture or hum a mantra, you are doing something to get into not doing something. What that doing something is, is blessings.

Malcolm wrote:

What I meant was guru yoga is indispensable. After that, Song of the vajra is indispensable. But one cannot just sing song of the vajra out loud anywhere. it would be strange. Of course, you can mentally sing it everywhere.

Song of the vajra is not just ChNN's terma tradition. It is very important. Key in Dzogchen teachings. I cannot emphasize how much how important it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:46 AM

Title: Is there a Soul in Buddhism?

Content:

caveman said:

Stripping everything from Buddhism and Hinduism you have the transmigration of the soul, PERIOD.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no soul, person, atman, sattva, jiva, you name it -- it does not exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

No teacher, no practice of Dzogchen. Period.

adinatha said:

What you don't believe in divine revelation?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I'm sure the Christians will give you the same answer but merely substitute the word Christian Orthodox(y) for the word Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

If you would like to believe that whatever it is in Greek Orthodoxy you are calling "rainbow body" is absolutely equivalent with achieving complete Buddhahood, that's up to you. I don't buy it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

Besides, what do you think ChNNR places all those mantras and visualizations in the Tun book?

Namdrol said:

Because sometimes, when people have more time and leisure, they can do a more elaborate secondary practice.

adinatha said:

What for? If you have knowledge and are in guru state, why bother?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on the practitioner. Depends on what they feel they need to do. The only thing that is absolutely essential is guru yoga followed by song of the vajra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

No doubt about it. Live teacher is indispensable. Sometimes a no teacher faulty practice blooms into a master in your face before you can blink your eyes.

Malcolm wrote:

No teacher, no practice of Dzogchen. Period.

adinatha said:

Really because hearing, studying and contemplating are the three mutually self-reinforcing ways to practice dharma. In Ati especially, I feel this is key. And here we are sangha. This ain't Showtime.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, AFAIC, people should not discuss Dzogchen too much in places like this.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

He is not a "John Reynolds" style "Jesus got Rainbow Body" type.

gregkavarnos said:

There are rainbow body practices in the Eastern Orthodox church and a number of accounts of ascetics achieving the rainbow body, so...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so. Rainbow body in Dzogchen is something very precise, connected with the teachings. No teachings, no rainbow body from a Dzogchen POV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

Besides, what do you think ChNNR places all those mantras and visualizations in the Tun book?

Malcolm wrote:

Because sometimes, when people have more time and leisure, they can do a more elaborate secondary practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

What you are saying here seems obvious.

Malcolm wrote:

Obvious to some, but you would be amazed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

If you hear ChNN talk you can easily get this idea too. He talks about how he reads the Bible and understands the Trinity to be Dzogchen, and the one God to be Unity.

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of someone who understands the real meaning of Dzogchen, everything looks like Dzogchen, even nursery rhymes.

But this does not mean that the Bible contains some profound insight in Dzogchen.

In this case it is a question of what kind of glasses you have on. If you are wearing Dzogchen glasses everything can seem like Dzogchen.

But it is funny, ChNN occasionally says things like this, and IMO, immediately people completely misunderstand the meaning he is trying to convey.

He certainly does not mean that there are secret Dzogchen practitioners in the Catholic or Lutheran Church from time immemorial.

He is not a "John Reynolds" style "Jesus got Rainbow Body" type.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Enochian said:

Adinatha talks a LOT about guru yoga, but is he aware than in Dzogchen that guru yoga is nothing other than abiding in the natural state?

Maybe Namdrol can verify.

A lot of people misunderstand the symbolism of the A in the thigle at the heart (Dzogchen guru yoga).

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure he has some idea since he has attended webcasts. He probably also knows that in the community, Norbu Rinpoche never stresses devotion as the key point of guru yoga, rather he stresses knowledge as the key point of guru yoga.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

lovely.

So the coarse freedom from grasping of sutra becomes progressively more subtle.

It seems to me that the freedom from grasping explained in sutra becomes more subtle

as the energy winds supporting the view gather and are pacified, so perhaps clear light and Dzogchen view differ in presentation only.

Malcolm wrote:

What I meant was that freedom from grasping is progressively more and more subtle as one moves through the practices of the nine yānas.

No need to add "energy" to winds. The composition of vāyus is vāyu, the element of air. We term them "winds" in English because they move through the channels of body. Wind is moving air -- no movement, no wind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

There is Atiyoga language synonymous with experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you have this experience.

Otherwise, Dzogchen texts are confusing bullshit.

Re: ad hominem -- I didn't attack you, I expressed an opinion about what you wrote here, qualified with "seems".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

I suppose I do not know if this is what I mean, as this terminology falls outside my experience. How is this uncontrived momentary awareness different from my moment to moment uncontrived awareness?

Namdrol said:

The difference is summed up nicely by "Parting From The Four Attachments" "If grasping arises, it is no the view."

N

cloudburst said:
The Glorious Sakya. Unstoppable.

However, from my pov, we cannot equate a view free from grasping with the very subtle mind of clear light. It is possible to have view free from grasping as a result of following the sutra path, whereas clear light depends upon empowerment.

Do you say this parting from the four attachments expresses the Dzogchen view? "Free from grasping" is the dzogchen view? Is that adequate, or do you add something?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, the final line in Parting expresses Dzogchen view. But this is not an intellectual "freedom from grasping". The freedom from grasping of sutra is a coarse freedom from grasping. Freedom from grasping becomes progressively more subtle.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 2:14 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa
Content:

cloudburst said:
I suppose I do not know if this is what I mean, as this terminology falls outside my experience. How is this uncontrived momentary awareness different from my moment to moment uncontrived awareness?

Malcolm wrote:
The difference is summed up nicely by " Parting From The Four Attachments "If grasping arises, it is no the view."

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 1:57 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience
Content:

adinatha said:
Let me be really specific now. Longchenpa says it is possible to be liberated just from reading his words.

Malcolm wrote:
This does not mean that one will manifest buddhahood immediately.

There are many texts in Dzogchen which stated "merely by reading these words one will

be liberated". There is also "merely by hearing this one will be liberated", "merely by tasting this one will be liberated", "merely by seeing this one will be liberated", "merely by smelling this one will be liberated", "merely by touching this one will be liberated", etc.

This is all part of the six liberations traditions in Dzogchen. It means you have created a good cause for liberation in your continuum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

I wonder if you feel that very subtle mind of clear light and view of Dzogchen are same? If not, what is difference?

Malcolm wrote:

If by "subtle mind of clear light" you mean an "uncontrived momentary awareness" (ma bcos pa shes pa skad cig ma), then the view is similar.

But prasanga can never lead to that so called "subtle mind of clear light" -- it lacks the method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

This shouldn't take long then, I'm waiting...

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that Dzogchen language is very misleading unless grounded in personal experience.

One either has that personal experience or one does not. It is not the kind of thing one can brag about on an internet forum and expect it to be convincing to others. Mostly, they will just think you are full of sh!t.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:
Enochian said:
We know that Sarma material affected the Old School Dzogchen.

What about the other way?

Dzogchen influence on Sarma?

Malcolm wrote:
yes, it exists. Dzogchen masters present gsar ma material very differently than those without training in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 1:40 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience
Content:

adinatha said:
The main point is well represented in English.

Malcolm wrote:
We will have to disagree.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 1:39 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa
Content:

cloudburst said:
It's an interesting opinion. Often these things just come down to the way you slice the pie. Prasangika is indeed an analytical method, but one could also say that the prasangika methodology produces an experiential understanding. So prasangika was both created from and is productive of experience of the Ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:
It is not the same as Dzogchen.

cloudburst said:
Jigme Lingpa's presentation of emptiness in Treasury of Precious Qualities is wholly concordant with the presentation of Je Tsongkhapa. Your useage may seem a little unclear, as "derived from" could be taken to mean he came up with terms that were derived as part of a process that began with Gelug yigcha, whereas, and I am sure this is

what you mean, the terms he used were taken directly from these yigcha and pressed into service without adulteration.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I am concerned, saying that view of Dzogchen and the prasanga view of Tsongkhapa are the same goes too far, is overly simplistic at best. Jigme Lingpa does not go this far at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

You don't know what I am primarily.

Malcolm wrote:

I have only your verbal opinions to go on.

You have bandied about a bunch of slogans, combined them with frequent references to Gampopa, etc.

As I said, based on what you have shared, your view seems very Kagyu influenced.

This is not a bad thing, but Kagyu is a sngags gsar ma school, and they tend to subordinate Dzogchen as just another "means".

Based on what you have said, I don't think we share a similar understanding of Dzogchen.

Oh certainly, I can agree with superficial slogans, but that is not the essence of the teachings.

Dzogchen language is very simple -- for this reason it is difficult to understand correctly for it is very profound.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

adinatha said:

Atiyoga tantras are well published, public and stand on their own. I'm just bringing them

up.

Malcolm wrote:

They are published in Tibetan, not in English.

There is a paltry few that are available in translation.

adinatha said:

My premise is that there is a profound inner meaning of effortless without paths or progression that underlies all three series of Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Slogans are easy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2011 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

It is interesting in the context of this discussion to not that Jigme Lingpa himself understood and presented the view from the point of view of Je Tsongkhapa's presentation, so we must accept that the view of Lama Tsongkhapa and the view of Dzogchen are harmonious at very least.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to qualify this -- Jigme Lingpa presented Prasangika Madhyamaka in terms derived from Tsongkhapa since he was in fact educated with a Gelug yigcha.

While he opined that from an analytical point of view that Dzogchen and Prasangika could be regarded as equivalent in terms of how they presented freedom from proliferation, he clarified that Dzogchen is experiential, whilst prasangika is wholly analytical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Maybe Namdrol could clarify this.

Malcolm wrote:

It appears to me that our friend, adinatha, is a primarily a Kagyu practitioner.

I don't find his statements especially compatible with Dzogchen as I understand it and practice it.

But I also think that engaging in proofs and refutations using Dzogchen tantras is an abuse of the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Vajrayana practice and psychological disorders

Content:

spanda said:

Now I see that Namdrol is a Doctor in Tibetan Medicine. Could you clarify for us please this "lung disorder"?

In your opinion, it is possible that in this case, to be something like this involved? What would be the best approach in this case, from the point of view of Tibetan Medicine?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

A vata disorder occurs when one of the five vāyus in the body becomes deranged.

Simply put frequent massages, rich food, dark, quite, pleasant companions, no stress.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 9:36 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

None of the citations you have provided contradict the basic point Longchenpa is making above

But if you want to consider your discursive thoughts to be dharmakāya, go ahead and be my guest. It's your practice and not mine.

N

adinatha said:

What that means is if the master's direct introduction and blessings haven't entered your mindstream, then one is an elephant if he thinks thoughts are dharmakaya. But in the vastness of the view, everything is.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever you like to think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

adinatha said:

It will be supplemented by teachings from Lord Jigten Sumgon's collection of profound secret methods (like chulen of god realm and naga realm), which will never be published, but have been printed in gold and will be held under lock and key.

Malcolm wrote:

They have been published. But not easy to procure.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

adinatha said:

Atiyoga masters say in many places that when the view is actualized, all appearances shine forth as the liveliness of dharmata or as the ornamentation of dharmata or as dharmakaya itself. All namthog means all appearances must be recognized as maya as self-appearance. The appearance of a thought or vedana here is not conceptualized...

Malcolm wrote:

You seem to think appearances are mental factors, such as vedana, etc., based on your comments. Please correct me if I am wrong.

Longchenpa rejects this idea, and rejects the mentalism you seem to be advocating.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

Mind is always impure, from a Dzogchen point of view, in fact. This is why there are Dzogchen criticisms of the nine yanas.

adinatha said:

That's part of a nyingthig methodological jargon that makes a mind/rigpa distinction.
What's rigpa, space? Not.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa (vidyā) simply means knowledge, as opposed to avidyā, ignorance.

But I am not going to argue you with about these things. It appears that you are an expert in Dzogchen. Fantastic. We shall be looking for your rainbow body soon.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

Mind is always impure, from a Dzogchen point of view, in fact. This is why there are Dzogchen criticisms of the nine yanas.

adinatha said:

That's part of a nyingthig methodological jargon that makes a mind/rigpa distinction.
What's rigpa, space? Not.

If you think concepts are dharmakāya, your practice is screwed before it has even begun.

In Ati these days, conceited elephants [claim]
the mass of discursive concepts is bodhicitta.

chos dbying mdzod

N

This is what happens when you take a provisional understanding to be final.

Malcolm wrote:

None of the citations you have provided contradict the basic point Longchenpa is making above

But if you want to consider your discursive thoughts to be dharmakāya, go ahead and be my guest. It's your practice and not mine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

conebeckham said:

I assume the Heruka Gyalpo Tantra is included in the Nyingma GyuBum, and is part of the Kama Transmission....anyone????

Namdrol said:

The root tantra is a terma, there are many terma tantras in the Nyingma Gyudbum.

conebeckham said:

Ok! Interesting.

So.....I'm assuming that within the Kama there is some Tantra or material relating to Vishuddha/Yangdak, as one of the Kagye deities. Does any of that material relate to so-called "Completion Stage with Characteristics?"

Namdrol, in the Sakyas the Khon family are known as holders of the Yangdak as well as the Kilaya. I understand the Khon Kilaya is Kama.....I assume the transmission of Yangdak comes from Kama as well? I know it's not really practiced, as it's similar to Hevajra from what I've heard.....but this would also lead me to believe that Yangdak does, indeed, contain a Completion Stage with some of the features of Hevajra, Samvara, Mahamaya, Etc.....

??

Malcolm wrote:

yes, Kilaya and Yangdag are both Kama. Neither really has a completion stage to speak of. If there was one, it was buried.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

tamdrin said:

based on the discussions happening here I'm starting to feel Sarma Tantras have things to offer that Nyingma tantras do not...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there was a reason that Tibetan went back to India to gather more teachings. The Vima Snyin thig was probably the last stage in the development of Dzogchen that was not influenced by gsar ma developments, if one is going according to present text critical understanding. But keep in mind, that could easily change with the discovery of some cache of texts, etc. Western textual scholarship is good a useful, but like science,

it has stark limitations.

gsar ma has many interesting things, definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 7:00 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

In Dzogchen, mind and matter exist because of avidya. When there is no more avidyā, for you there is neither mind nor matter.

But to get back to the main point -- for example we talk about "subtle minds". What are subtle minds, what makes them subtle? The reduced frequency of spanda, pulsation, movement of the vāyu in the body. When the vāyu moves, concepts arise -- no movement, no concepts. No concepts, nothing really we can all mind at all. When the vāyu moves very little, then we call that "a subtle mind". Sutra for example, has no methods to reduce the movement of vāyu to such an extent that such "subtle minds" are accessed. In sutra methods, the movements of mind are always coarse -- apart from that fact that as a bodhisattva moves through the paths and stages the physical body they appropriate becomes ever more refined and thus the movement of vāyu becomes ever more subtle and unobstructed, especially after the eighth bhumi. But this is a very external approach, taking a long time.

N

adinatha said:

This is mind/subtle mind in the impure sense or in the mind/nature of mind dichotomy.

Malcolm wrote:

Mind is always impure, from a Dzogchen point of view, in fact. This is why there are Dzogchen criticisms of the nine yantras.

adinatha said:

But the view is all namthog are dharmakaya

Malcolm wrote:

If you think concepts are dharmakāya, your practice is screwed before it has even begun.

In Ati these days, conceited elephants [claim]
the mass of discursive concepts is bodhicitta.

chos dbying mdzod

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I tried many times to get in the habit of drinking a little red wine during meals. It's excellent for one's health. The problem is that when I drink the good stuff, I get lazy as hell and don't feel like working. Portugal has an excellent whine, by the way. Usually I end up drinking a glass or two when I have dinner with my parents. And I really like it, accompanying food. But at my place, and since my wife doesn't drink (because of the flavor), I end up drinking zilch. And this is not the best thing for my health. I remember doctors saying when my grandfather died, (stroke due to arteriosclerosis) that if he drank a little his life could have been longer. Spirits only produce the dilation of blood vessels, but red wine has twice the effect and is filled with anti oxidants. If one doesn't have the precept, a glass of red wine a meal is a favor one does to his health. This is why I would like to gain such habit, but I'm not seeing it happening. Not that I don't like it, but I don't like the numbness I feel mixed with having to work or whatever. Nice at a dinner at the weekends, but not everyday...

Of course there are people who drink too much. It's a real problem, mostly when they decide to drive afterwards.

I think people should take a vow if they fear not being able to hold the drink. So they take a vow: I'll never drink, and stick to it. But if people can perfectly moderate their intake, why the need of a vow? Is it something symbolic? I mean, they can always take the vow, but is there such need? Why would one impose such a thing to oneself? There may come a time at a wedding or something and one will have to refuse a harmless cup of champagne, risking offending others, because of a vow that could be unnecessary right from the start. I think we should only take vows if we feel there's the absolute need. Otherwise we just act wisely, no vows needed.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a bias in the Buddhist tradition that the merit of an act is reinforced if connected with a vow.

But vows are just something we decide to follow or not. There is no magical force in a vow. It is an intention, that is all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: What are the contents of this?

Content:

Enochian said:

http://www.npm.gov.tw/exh100/dragon_sutra/html/page_en_01.html

namely the Rgyud (esoteric teachings) part

Malcolm wrote:

It is just a bkengyur is fancying calligraphy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

conebeckham said:

I assume the Heruka Gyalpo Tantra is included in the Nyingma Gyubum, and is part of the Kama Transmission....anyone????

Malcolm wrote:

The root tantra is a terma, there are many terma tantras in the Nyingma Gyudbum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2011 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

tamdrin said:

I thought it was just that the Buddha's penis isn't circumcised.. nothing more than that.

Malcolm wrote:

Nobody's penis was circumcised in ancient India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

...This text is quite late. Likely by the same Nāgārjuna that wrote the Pañcakrama.

adinatha said:

And this is not mere speculation, because...?

Malcolm wrote:

Because Guhyasamaja and Vajrasattva were not extant in 200 CE.

Not only this but the Bodhicittavivarana mention the ālayavijñana and the three natures. AFAIK, it is unlikely that Sandhinirmocana was fully composed until the 3rd Century CE, the Lanka is definitely post-Nāgārjuna, and the Maitreya Chapter in the PP sutras was a later Yogacara interpolation.

The author of the Bodhicitta Vivarana was the disciple of Saraha. In the Sakya version of sahaja-mahāmudra, this text and one of the dohas of Saraha (which one I forget) are critical commentaries. So from a Sakya POV, the Sahaja-Mahāmudra lineage of Saraha and NāgaArjuna is very connected with Guhyasamaja.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

adinatha said:

So which masters exactly manifested full and complete buddhahood not at death but in life? As far as I can tell it was Tilopa, Naropa and Milarepa.

Malcolm wrote:

Chestun Senge Wangchug, Khyentse Wangpo, Longchenpa, many others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

adinatha said:

So which masters exactly manifested full and complete buddhahood not at death but in life? As far as I can tell it was Tilopa, Naropa and Milarepa. I'm not sure about Marpa. I'm not sure about Gampopa or Phagmo Drupa, but Drikung people say Jigten Sumgon manifested the topknot, the swirly eyebrow, the penis in the sheath and was a fully realized buddha after he overcame leprosy with his bodhichitta meditation. What they don't say is that they have methods for doing the same thing. Anyone who manifests buddhahood in life, according to them, is because of past life karma, being a bodhisattva in a previous life, and all that.

On the Dzogchen side, Garab Dorje and Padmasambhava were born nirmanakayas. The rest manifested buddhahood at death. If anyone can correct me here that would be delightful.

Malcolm wrote:

Countless Dzogchen masters realized full awakening in this body.

Rongzom states that the atiyoga path is so swift, that these relative signs manifested by Sapan, etc., don't appear on the body, but when the shell of the body breaks at death, these fully developed qualities are evident at that time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yogacara, sutras and tantras share the same view, that matter and consciousness are one thing, mind.

This may be true of sngags gsar ma, and certainly this is how Khyentse Wangchuck seeks to resolve the issue (unsatisfactorily in my mind) in his commentary on the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana.

adinatha said:

The one vehicle approach is very prevalent in Jigten Sumgon's Gongchig. Kagyu people herald this work as representative of all Kagyu lineages.

Malcolm wrote:

The one vehicle view does not imply that all yanas have the same intention.

The one vehicle approach is just a kind of Mahāyāna triumphalism that asserts the ultimate goal of all buddhist paths is true perfect full awakening as conceived in Mahāyāna.

Also Sakya heralds the ekayāna, but this does not mean, for example, that hinayāna vows have the same intention as Mahāyāna vows and so on and so forth. I understand that Drikungpa may feel differently about this.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you don't mind my asking, who is your teacher?

adinatha said:

I went to answer this yesterday, but then the thread was frozen. I took it as a sign. I do

have teachers and retreat, but I'm thinking it's better to keep it mum for now. I didn't want you to think I was avoiding this question.

Malcolm wrote:
That's nonsense.

It is good to know who one is talking to.

Internet anonymity is bullshit in Buddhist forums.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 10:09 PM
Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth
Content:
Namdrol said:

In Dzogchen, mind and matter are regarded as seamlessly welded, not that mind has primacy over matter. Dzogchen texts even go so far as to reject the formless realm as truly formless.

This is why for example the Khandro Nyinthig states very clearly "Sometimes we say "citta", sometimes "vāyu", but the meaning is the same." Vāyu is just the element of air i.e. motility present in matter. This also accounts for rebirth. In the Guhyasamaja, for example, the ālayavijñāna is wedded to the mahāprāṇavāyu -- this union allows rebirth to happen.

Mind and matter are inseparable from a tantric point of view. Your view reduces the tantric view of mind and matter to the level of sūtra, in my opinion. I take the unpopular stance (according to standard Tibetan orthodoxy ala Sapan, et al) that the view of tantra regarding these kinds of issues is superior in every respect to that of sūtra, and Dzogchen even more so than tantra. The view and practice of tantra and Dzogchen has been crippled in Tibetan discourse by a need to justify everything according to sūtra.

N

adinatha said:

This is a method wisdom thing. Sometimes we say "citta" and sometimes we say "vayu" is saying that wind and mind is wind-mind. So the motility of air is the motility of consciousness. Inseparability and unity is a distinction without a difference. For example in rigpa the empty quality, the clarity quality and the energy qualities can be looked at separately, like looking separately at the facets of a gem, but their inseparability means unity, one rigpa. It is often said rigpa has many faces, but all those faces are on one head. So this is a method wisdom thing, because a view like this doesn't mean anything useful unless it is to get a yogi to see something important in samadhi. Your worry about Dzogchen being crippled by sutra must be coming from a standpoint that a method involving channels and winds is depreciated when yogis have an ecumenical view. I'm curious why you think this when the method of Togal depends

on direct introduction (and devotion), postures and gazes, and knowledge of channels and winds is really just for the sake of background information to explain why Togal works better than a volitional sadhana involving channels and winds, like tummo. What Togal does par excellence is highlight tsal aspect of rigpa, but that's a highlight, the overall light is rigpa complete. There is also realization that is rigpa everywhere including as mountains, rocks, trees and houses. Maya. One can either be non-abiding and take a form body or dissolve into dharmata. Finally, everything exhausts into dharmata which is not non-existence. If it is not non-existence, well?...

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, mind and matter exist because of avidya. When there is no more avidyā, for you there is neither mind nor matter.

But to get back to the main point -- for example we talk about "subtle minds". What are subtle minds, what makes them subtle? The reduced frequency of spanda, pulsation, movement of the vāyu in the body. When the vāyu moves, concepts arise -- no movement, no concepts. No concepts, nothing really we can all mind at all. When the vāyu moves very little, then we call that "a subtle mind". Sutra for example, has no methods to reduce the movement of vāyu to such an extent that such "subtle minds" are accessed. In sutra methods, the movements of mind are always coarse -- apart from that fact that as a bodhisattva moves through the paths and stages the physical body they appropriate becomes ever more refined and thus the movement of vāyu becomes ever more subtle and unobstructed, especially after the eighth bhumi. But this is a very external approach, taking a long time.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

Namdrol said:

As for the rules, I had already reduced my drinking to zero for some time BEFORE taking the precept. It seemed logical to me to take the precept "formally" (coz, it seems,

Malcolm wrote:

Taking hinayana refuge has three commitments and five vows that are automatically taken. Then one has a choice to follow no vows, and just commitments, two vows, three vows or all vows.

Taking bodhisattva vows converts those vows into the Mahayana vows.

Taking tantric vows converts those in the tantric vows.

Where the lower contradicts the higher, one follows the higher vow.

There there is the principle of refuge according to Dzogchen. In this case, there are no vows in particular, but the person judges for himself what is necessary for his path, what helps it and what hinders it. I.e. taking the essence of refuge as committing to a given path (in this case Dzogchen) and doing what is necessary for achieving the goals of that path and avoiding what is harmful to it. That is something each person must discover for themselves. If it involves giving up wine and rich food because it is fattening and leads to ill-health, than that is what you do. If it involves drinking a glass of wine and eating rich food because one has a tendency towards vata disturbances, than that is what one does. If it involves taking psych meds to maintain a stable mind, than that is what one does. And of course, because harming others leads to states of bad rebirth, etc., than one avoids actions with true negative consequences. But none of this is based on a vow. It is based on recognition of one's state and the wish to help others recognize their own state.

Now, of course, this does not mean that one does not have vows. Of course one has vows. But vows are not the main point. It is not good to go to one extreme and proclaim "vows are all bullshit" and pretend one is an atiyoga practitioner. It is also not good to take a rigid approach to vows and turn them into a kind of pretty golden cage inside of which you lock yourself.

Not only that, not all buddhas teach vinaya and have a sangha. For example, Sikhin. Sikhin's pratimoksha was simply:

Avoid evil,
do good,
observe your mind
this is the teaching of the buddhas.

So we have to understand the Vinaya, vows and so on, these are something relative. They are not absolutely essential, at least, not in my opinion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

mr. gordo said:

Interesting, thanks.

Due to this lack of the use of nadis, cakras, etc., can we still classify practices that don't possess these characteristics as tantra? Is it because they require initiation allow us to still classify practices lacking completion stage as tantra?

Malcolm wrote:
Sure.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:52 PM
Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me
Content:

conebeckham said:
Well, what about the completion stage of Yangdak?

Malcolm wrote:
What about it?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:27 PM
Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me
Content:
Namdrol said:
Actually, we have eleventh century Nyingma masters complaining about all this new-fangled stuff with cakras, and nadis and so on that was a Hindu corruption of Buddhism. They reacted quite negatively to Hevajra, Kalacakra, Cakrasamvara and so on at first.

mr. gordo said:
Does the Khon Vajrakila not have completion stage with cakras, nadis..etc.?

Malcolm wrote:
No, there is no real completion stage with characteristics for the Khon Kilaya, AFAIK, apart from Dzogchen. Even if there were one, it would be hard to tell when it entered the practice. Of course there are kilaya tantras that have these things, but from a text critical point of view, their date of composition is difficult to ascertain.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:24 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience
Content:
Sherab said:
Thought I throw this into the discussion:
Nagarjuna seemed to be saying that mind and matter are inseparable even conventionally, no? Or was he speaking from an ultimate point of view?

gzung dang 'dzin pa'i ngo bo yis
rnam shes snang ba gang yin pa
rnam shes las ni tha dad par
phyi rol don ni 'ga' yang med

As to the appearance of consciousness under the form of subject and object, [one must realize] that there exists no external object apart from consciousness.

de phyir dngos po'i ngo bor ni
phyi don rnam pa kun tu med
rnam shes so sor snang ba 'di
gzugs kyi rnam par snang bar 'gyur

In no way at all is there an external thing in the mode of an entity. This particular appearance of consciousness appears under the aspect of form.

ji ltar skye bo sems rmongs pas
sgyu ma smig rgyu dri za yi
grong khyer la sogs mthong ba ltar
de bzhin gzugs sogs snang ba yin

The deluded see illusions, mirages, cities of gandharvas, and so forth. Form manifests in the same way.

bdag tu 'dzin pa bzlog pa'i phyir
phung po khams sogs bstan pa yin
sems tsam po la gnas nas ni
skal chen rnams kyis de yang spangs

The purpose of the [Buddha's] teachings about the skandhas, elements, and so forth is [merely] to dispel the belief in a self. By establishing [themselves] in pure consciousness the greatly blessed [Bodhisattvas] abandon that as well.

Nagarjuna's Bodhicittavarana, verses 22-25
"Master of Wisdom", Lindtner

Malcolm wrote:

One, this Nāgārjuna is not the Nāgārjuna that wrote the collection of reasonings. According to tradition, the Bodhicittavivarana is a commentary on the Guhyasamaja. This text is quite late. Likely by the same Nāgārjuna that wrote the Pañcakrama.

The view here is Yogachara Madhyamaka, similar to Shantarakshita.

"Pure consciousness" is not a good rendering for sems tsam po (cittamatra) -- i.e. mere mind.

The normative Madhyamaka view re: consciousness would be that a consciousness

arises conventionally only if there is an object and an organ meeting. Hence, conventionally speaking, normative Madhyamaka allows for the existence of external phenomena.

So does Dzogchen.

Citta-matra is a method, not a view, in this respect. The view is still madhyamaka.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Namdrol said:

He considers the four yogas of Mahamudra to be Gampopa's unique system developed out of Gampopa's own experience on the basis of sahaja mahamudra.

adinatha said:

That's what Jigten Sumgon says too re Gampopa's own experience. However, that doesn't hold up re Four Yogas because, while Gampopa stated the four yogas in a variety of ways, Mila had a song of four yogas and Saraha has a four yoga-like presentation too. Clearly to me four yogas comes from Saraha and is based on the Hevajra Tantra four moments, four blisses, and all those fours. Basically, based on Gampopa's own experience, he did what Mila told him not to do and that was teach sahaja mahamudra independent of tummo.

Malcolm wrote:

Have you considered the possibility that the Mila song is a later composition?

It is far more likely that the four yogas were adapted from Ratnakarashanti's Madhyamaka-alamkara and its upadesha where four yogas are explicitly taught. Alternately, they were adapted from the four samadhis of Semsde. Adzom Drugpa, when presenting Semsde, actually uses the scheme of the four yogas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:56 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Enochian said:

Didn't Nyingmas have tummo before Sarma?

Namdrol said:

Tricky question. Tummo appears to have originated in the Hevajra tantra. We have tummo texts ala Krishnacarya in Dunhuang, but these are somewhat late.

The fact is that unless we accept the terma tradition as having probative value for dating practices in Tibet, it is hard to know.

adinatha said:

Then the termas which transmit tummo, being post-Hevajra means Guru Padma felt it better these should be revealed after Hevajra? Or it also implies the termas with tummo are Hevajra knock-offs.

Malcolm wrote:

That all depends on whether you are text critical scholar or not, or even care. I think the western scholarly consensus is that channel and nadi theory was borrowed by Nyingmapas from sngags gsar ma tantras, especially Vajramala.

But the dating of Tantric material in India is very problematical, as you know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

adinatha said:

My feeling is this is Saraha's stand-alone mahamudra as clear light lineage.

Namdrol said:

Perhaps, but Yangongpa, writing on sahaja-mahāmudra is critical of 'od gsal and rejects the idea that mahāmudra and ābhāsvarāḥ are synonymous because luminosity lacks appearances.

adinatha said:

I'm not familiar with Yangongpa, but I don't see how anyone gets around inseparability.

Malcolm wrote:

You will have to read Yangong yourself. He is an extremely important Drugpa Kabgyu master who exclaimed "This begger's realization came from Dzogchen" and wrote one of the defining treatises on Mahamudra and the four yogas of Mahamudra. He considers the four yogas of Mahamudra to be Gampopa's unique system developed out of Gampopa's own experience on the basis of sahaja mahamudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Enochian said:

Didn't Nyingmas have tummo before Sarma?

Malcolm wrote:

Tricky question. Tummo appears to have originated in the Hevajra tantra. We have tummo texts ala Krishnacarya in Dunhuang, but these are somewhat late.

The fact is that unless we accept the terma tradition as having probative value for dating practices in Tibet, it is hard to know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:29 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

adinatha said:

My feeling is this is Saraha's stand-alone mahamudra as clear light lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but Yangongpa, writing on sahaja-mahāmudra is critical of 'od gsal and rejects the idea that mahāmudra and ābhāsvarāḥ are synonymous because luminosity lacks appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Namdrol said:

Mila had ten Nyingma masters before he met Marpa.

N

adinatha said:

That's interesting and makes plenty of sense. What's the deal with his relationship with

Marpa? He did consider Marpa his root guru no? It's funny, because Gampopa asked him, hey what's all the fuss about Dzogchen? Gampopa quotes Mila in one of the Kagyu's more cherished teachings of Gampopa, that Dzogchen is for 8th Bhumis and up. Then, that becomes Kagyu dogma.

Malcolm wrote:

There is another place, in Gampopa's advice to Gomchung, where he pretty much eviscerates mahāmudra, dzogchen, and so on in favor of what he terms "tathatā".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, that is not so -- there was a lot of gsar ma material in Tibet when Mila was a youth. He just happened to have had Nyingma masters.

Enochian said:

Sarma material, of course I agree with that.

But is there anything unique about Sarma material?

Bottomline of Sarma is tummo and karmamudra which is probably present in the Nyingma beforehand, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, we have eleventh century Nyingma masters complaining about all this new-fangled stuff with cakras, and nadis and so on that was a Hindu corruption of Buddhism. They reacted quite negatively to Hevajra, Kalacakra, Cakrasamvara and so on at first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:04 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

adinatha said:

For what it's worth... Mila said...

Namdrol said:

"...stabbed from the front by mahāmudra, stabbed from the back by Dzogchen."

Mila had ten Nyingma masters before he met Marpa.

N

Enochian said:

Well by default they had to be Nyingma, since the other schools didn't exist yet.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not so -- there was a lot of gsar ma material in Tibet when Mila was a youth. He just happened to have had Nyingma masters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Enochian said:

From what I understand 99% of Milarepa material is made up

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what material. Are all the songs in the Gur 'bum Mila's? Probably not. Are many of them? Yes.

There is an older unexpurgated version of the Gur 'bum. In order to establish which songs are authentic and which are psuedographia or adaptations, a lot of research is needed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

adinatha said:

For what it's worth... Mila said...

Malcolm wrote:

"...stabbed from the front by mahāmudra, stabbed from the back by Dzogchen."

Mila had ten Nyingma masters before he met Marpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

conebeckham said:

Oh, I didn't know that story was supposed to pre-date the rule, and was supposed to be the "reason." Interesting.

I do know that Buddha's "rules" always came from some specific occurrence, though. So, chicken killing and sleeping with women were rules prior to the ban on intoxicants, eh?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, killing animals is a rule requiring expiation, and sexual intercourse is a parajika. So the monk took the only course he could. But it ended badly for him -- since he obviously could not hold his booze.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

conebeckham said:

Milarepa was able to shrink himself down so he could hunker down in a conch shell during a storm or something, as well...right?

And both he and Padampa Sangye were able to balance on stalks of grass.....

Would these events have occurred to the vision of mundane sentient beings? I don't know. I think we'd need to see citations with regard to those issues you raise, but doctrinally, I've stated what has been asserted.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, that is a silly story. If Milarepa could fit his body in a conch shell, he could certainly keep the rain off by other means.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

conebeckham said:

But vows are only for those who have taken them, eh?

Malcolm wrote:

There was no rule against consuming intoxicants -- this is the episode that caused the Buddha to issue such an edict.

He issued the edict because he observed some of his disciples behaving like fools when they drank.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

Namdrol said:

You understand how the rule came about, no? It came about because some fool did something stupid as an ordained bhiksu.

N

Nangwa said:

I would love to hear the story behind this. Is there a reference to a specific drunken bhiksu somewhere?

We usually hear the stories about the great disciples etc. it would be fun to learn more about the foolish ones as well.

Malcolm wrote:

The story runs something like this: there was a monk who was quite handsome and a housewife enamored of him. She trapped him in her house and gave him three choices: kill a chicken, sleep with her, or drink some alcohol.

He thought that perhaps the booze was the best choice-- drank it, lost his shit, slept with the woman, and butchered the chicken too. In some versions, he murdered the woman's husband.

You see, a rule for fools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

Namdrol said:

You understand how the rule came about, no? It came about because some fool did

something stupid as an ordained bhiksu.

gregkavarnos said:

It may well be the case that this was the reason the rule was formulated, but to then say that all that abide by the rule are fools that cannot moderate their alcohol intake?

Malcolm wrote:

If you like having a rule that tells you not to drink, then follow it. Just understand why and for whom the rule was composed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Enochian said:

ok i see what you are saying. but is this canonically accurate?

Nangwa said:

As far as I know.

I'm sure someone will hit this thread and give more details than I can on how the attainments of annutarayoga tantra manifest but I do know that jalu or rainbow body is very specific and only a part of Dzogchen. Its even specific and unique to mengagde.

Malcolm wrote:

One can attain rainbow body through long sde as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Enochian said:

A jalu is nothing other than Sambhogakāya. Even Rechungpa, Marpa etc. bodies disappeared at death. Wouldn't you call that jalu?

Malcolm wrote:

A body disappearing does not equal rainbow body. Often, when people realize rainbow body, their bodies just shrink.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

You may be quite wrong about this. For example, it used to be very unhealthy to drink plain water in most places. Why? because there were no waste water treatment plants, etc. Alcoholic beverages were free from the risk of many types of microbes that can cause serious illness. This is the reason primarily for example that no-one in the American colonies ever drank plain water. They would only drink various types of fermented beverages.

Oh, I don't know about that, the American Indians seemed to do pretty well on plain water. Actually, if I remember my history correctly alcohol was used as a weapon against them by the settlers.

Malcolm wrote:

I said colonies, no?

gregkavarnos said:

The rule against alcohol is a rule for fools that cannot moderate their intake of alcohol. I'm sorry but that is just BS.

Malcolm wrote:

You understand how the rule came about, no? It came about because some fool did something stupid as an ordained bhiksu.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Enochian said:

ok i see what you are saying. but is this canonically accurate?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. It also makes common sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Enochian said:

These guys were not emanations.

They were regular humans like us that worked hard to obtain Sambhogakāya.

There is a contradiction here which is disturbing.

Malcolm wrote:

All Sambhogakāyas have a nirmankāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

adinatha said:

Hey guy. Who made you judge? That's between me and my guru. Understanding stands under ununderstanding.

Enochian said:

Namdrol wasn't judging you.

His point was that it is pointless to use EXPERIENTIAL Dzogchen arguments on an internet discussion forum.

adinatha said:

First off

But experience is all that matters. Poor discussion forums.

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot convey experience on a discussion board. It just does not work. Anyway, you can say anything you like, quote it right out of a hundred texts -- that is all just words.

Ok.. back to the discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

adinatha said:

Well if you say so. I say it's the mark.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no rebirth in reality -- this is why your addition misses the mark of the conversation.

The two truths are not for buddhas, incidentally, they are for sentient beings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

adinatha said:

Actually takes place? PHAT! I'm saying there are no two truths. Conventional level is not a truth level, but a totally screwed up level. Nothing actually takes place in the totally screwed up fantasy dream, except for mistakes.

Malcolm wrote:

If you suffer from delusion, then you are still beholden to the two truths. It is inescapable.

adinatha said:

You are reducing all of this to a sūtrayāna tenet system e.g. yogachara.

Is that what Longchenpa does in his Ati explanations of the Buddha's maya analogies that appear in all three vehicles? I'm talking about a yogi's cara. I care nothing for a "sūtrayāna tenet system e.g. yogachara."

Malcolm wrote:

There is a very big difference between how Dzogchen deals with illusion and the lower vehicles. Nevertheless, call it illusion or call it "relative truth" that is still the plane upon which rebirth occurs. This is why your elevation of this discussion to such heights misses the mark.

adinatha said:

Atiyoga is nonpractice. It is automatic...Atiyogacara is the cara of spontaneous luminosity.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said to the other guy -- these are nice slogans. But I don't know if you really understand what they mean.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa Contradiction that Bothers Me

Content:

Enochian said:

Something that bothers me.

Did Naropa, Marpa, Milarepa have physical bodies after Buddhahood?

If so that contradicts Vajrayana itself. After Buddhahood is obtained, one should no longer have a physical body.

Malcolm wrote:

If this was the case, there could be no nirmanakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Enochian said:

Adinatha,

Aren't you just saying something that is in every book by the Dalai Lama?

That there is a discrepancy between every thoughtform and reality.

adinatha said:

Actually I don't read much Dalai Lama. Again this is description. The Ati guru's pointing out direct perception is beyond explanations, and the samadhi is involuntary, without effort or examination.

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't mind my asking, who is your teacher?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

adinatha said:

This gets to the crux. They exist as magical illusions. Artificial fictional words are blotched onto these deceptions. This is maya. A deception is not a reality at any level. Where is an illusory thing? Nowhere. Only in citta. What makes this more profound than a description of a method is that it relates to the ultimate teaching which is the yogi's direct experience of reality. Even if you want to say they exist at the conventional level, the conventional level the Buddha is talking about here is how things appear in perceptions. Again, citta, maya. What is the final appearance of Togal? Exhaustion of appearances. Of appearances. Maya yoga. The one vehicle.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you must be missing my point -- even in Yogachara, prior to analysis via the three natures, mind and matter are taken as conventionally real. They are also taken as separate and unique. The imputed nature is the triple realm and all external appearances.

adinatha said:

How this relates to rebirth, because pinpointing in the anatomy where rebirth happens is hardly as profound and immediate as the direct experience of rebirth. A yogi doesn't experience a wind.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe your yogis don't.

Anyway, your argument is a little mismatched to what I am talking about. I am not talking about ultimate truth. I am talking about the mechanisms described in Vajrayāna in general for how rebirth actually takes place. That requires, on a conventional level, that mind and matter must be inseparable. Cartesian dualism will not work in this instance.

You are reducing all of this to a sūtrayāna tenet system e.g. yogachara.

I don't happen to think Yogachara is very useful for understanding Dzogchen. That is my opinion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 11:24 PM

Title: Yogacara, Dzogchen, Experience

Content:
Enochian said:
This is all silly.

Once you distinguish pristine rigpa from sems (mind), the view becomes like a thirsty elephant running to water. There is no need to argue, judge etc.

All right and wrong views are self-liberated

Malcolm wrote:
These are nice slogans, but I am not certain you really know what they mean (since I don't know you, don't know who your teacher is, etc.).

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 11:04 PM
Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.
Content:

gregkavarnos said:
I am not going to deny the problems associated with food (obesity and anorexia) especially in developed nations, but the comparison is invalid because one needs to eat a certain amount of food in order to support bodily function, whereas one does not need intoxicants in order to survive.

Malcolm wrote:
You may be quite wrong about this. For example, it used to be very unhealthy to drink plain water in most places. Why? because there were no waste water treatment plants, etc. Alcoholic beverages were free from the risk of many types of microbes that can cause serious illness. This is the reason primarily for example that no-one in the American colonies ever drank plain water. They would only drink various types of fermented beverages.

Wine is a food.

But at this point in my practice, I know what is good for me and what is not, and I don't need a rule to tell me what I can eat and drink and what I can't. The rule against alcohol is a rule for fools that cannot moderate their intake of alcohol.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 10:58 PM
Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth
Content:

Huseng said:

Namdrol, would you say your position is one of panpsychism?

Namdrol said:

It is a better position than the crypto Saṃkhya that most Buddhists advocate.

But not exactly panpsychism.

Jikan said:

might the world be better off with more emphasis on positions such as the Sautrantika view that (as far as I understand it...) suggests that things really do exist at the conventional level, as an antidote to nihilism?

Malcolm wrote:

The Madhyamaka approach is to accept whatever people accept as conventionally real without analysis, and to disabuse them of notions that contradict either dependent origination or emptiness (i.e. first causes and natures).

Of course, once the conventional is analyzed it is a different story.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

adinatha said:

Vyavahāraḥ means conventional.

I'll need you to show me where the Buddha uses this language. I've never seen this in the Sūtras.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not been looking for it, this is why.

For example, the Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra discusses conventions (vyavahāraḥ) extensively. Consult the Powers translation, *Wisdom of the Buddha*, and look up "conventions" in the index and you will find several discussions about what a convention is and how it is related to the three natures of Yogācāra, etc. This is apropos:

"Guṇākara, if it is asked what the imputed characteristic of phenomena might be, [it is that] which is defined as a name or a symbol for the nature or feature of phenomena in order subsequently bestow a convention."

(see pg. 81 for Powers' rendering)

N

(no more book dancing for me today).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Huseng said:

Namdrol, would you say your position is one of panpsychism?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a better position than the crypto Saṃkhya that most Buddhists advocate.

But not exactly panpsychism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

Heruka said:

Mezze night with free flowing ouzo.....

oh boy..what a hangover!

thank goodness the med has warm seas to relax into.

gregkavarnos said:

I'm not in the Mediteranean, I am in the Aegean!

PS Namdrol, I think it is misguided and a little dangerous to compare the use of intoxicants to eating food, ie I don't believe your example is valid.

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Malcolm wrote:

There are, in the US, 300,000 deaths annually from Obesity and about 100,000 deaths a year from Alcoholism. Draw your own conclusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:
Namdrol said:
No, it is not a problem at all.

Matter possesses the capacity for intelligence.

Anders Honore said:
Sure, but this can not account for the qualitative experience of consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:
Qualitative experience of consciousness is mediated by sense organs. No sense organs, no cognitions.

Namdrol said:
Consciousness and matter are inseparable.

You are merely restating the lower Buddhist position regarding substance dualism ala Descarte.

From a tantric perspective, for example, thoughts (citta) are movements of vāyu in the channels of the body.

There is only a contradiction if you regard mind and matter as different in some essential way.

They are not.
Again, you have the same problem as the radical physicalists with such an explanation. You may be able to account for the process in a physical sense, but nevertheless can not account for how this physical process gives rise to, or is, the qualitative experience of something mental.

Malcolm wrote:
The problem is yours merely for framing the question in that way. There are six dhātus -- earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness. They form a continuum from gross to subtle. But even so called consciousness has the properties of the other five, so it stands to reason that the other five have the properties of consciousness as well. Hence, nāma and rūpa are completely inseparable -- not because "everything is mind" as our friend adinatha would have it, but rather because the six dhātus themselves describe six different fields which are completely intermeshed and interrelated. In other words, the physical universe innately possesses the capacity for intelligence. There is no consciousness at any time, anywhere that is free from matter.

Namdrol said:

I'm not actually restating any sutra position here. This is such a basic philosophical issue of continual relevance in the face of modern science that hasn't produced a satisfactory answer so far, and you're basically trying for a freebie pass on this by re-hashing totally standard failed arguments on this topic under the guise of 'it's nondual man'. What you have advanced so far is no different really to the debunked scientific claims of "aside from c-fiber stimulation, there is no such phenomena as pain."

Malcolm wrote:

It's different in that it is based on the most subtle Buddhist principles that discuss these things. This point of view that I am enunciating it not physicalism.

Namdrol said:

It still doesn't account for the connection between the epistemic experience of mentality and the physical process this is supposedly the same as. It remain a 'magic' factor here and this isn't changed by going nondual on it without accounting for how it is supposedly so. It is the basic question the philosophical zombie can not ask: If mind is something physical, how is it that my experience is something mental? Claiming it is nondual simply moves the obvious problem of dualist mind-body causation in a lateral and less obvious direction, but it doesn't resolve the problems of it.

Malcolm wrote:

It completely resolves the problem. Matter is intelligent. If it was not, then we would be inert corpses. Assuming that mind and matter are somehow uniquely different in an absolute substantial sense is Cartesian Dualism. In fact, you can either say matter is the gross manifestation of consciousness or that consciousness is the most subtle manifestation of matter, it does not really matter. The sadadhātu has one cause — avidyā. When that cause, avidyā is removed, all six sadadhātus vanish. In the meantime, consciousness is not separable from the pañcamahābhutani. This nature of consciousness argument engaged in by Chalmers, and the physicalists is pretty boring. There is no split between mind and matter -- thinking there is one is a double delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Requesting a rundown on Bön

Content:

Keshin said:

Respected Bönpos,

I would like to know more about Bön's beliefs in a nutshell.

For example, belief in afterlife, nature of the "soul" or True Nature or anything of the sort, if there is a relationship between Dzogchen and Adibuddha, how emptiness is seen, etc.

Is anyone willing to provide such information? I seem to encounter a lot about Bön's historical origins and so on, but not much about its beliefs.

Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

Bon is very similar to Tibetan Buddhism, in many respects, identical i.e. they have equivalents to Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna, Vinaya. They have bodhicitta, creation stage, completion stage, three kāyas, etc.

They assert however the origin of their teachings are 18,000 years old, with the personage of one Tonpa Shenrab, as he is known in Tibetan. They look for their cultural origin not to ancient Tibetan culture -- which originated more or less in Kongpo and moved west into the Yarlung valley, but rather than ancient culture around Kailash known as Zhang Zhung Kingdom which dominated central Tibet, Western Tibet and surrounding regions for many centuries until 7th century C.E.

You can read a book called "Nine Ways of Bon" for an account of Bon teachings by Snellgrove. You can also check several of Samten Karmey's articles and so on.

You also might check out Drung, De'u and Bon by Professor Namkhai Norbu which presents an alternate view of Bon history and its relationship to Tibetan culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nope. Conventionally, Yogacara accepts matter and mind as distinct and separate phenomena.

adinatha said:

Samvrti means "hypocrisy, obstructed, occluded" not "conventional."

Malcolm wrote:

Vyavahāraḥ means conventional.

adinatha said:

The Buddha never taught a shared consensus or linguistic reality. He certainly never taught an existent discrete material reality.

Malcolm wrote:

That's quite debatable.

adinatha said:

The Buddha never taught a reality outside of phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed, all phenomena are included in the six elements.

adinatha said:

How things appear is how things appear to the mind only. For the yogi, facticity never goes beyond appearance. This is very well stated by the Buddha in the Third Turning Sutras and the Yogacara taught by Bhagavan. So there is no mind/matter dualism in the Sutrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

There is, at the conventional level.

adinatha said:

For a yogi, consciousness is not a mere potential that emerges from matter. That is the classical western materialist and scientific view.

Malcolm wrote:

It is, in the same sense that scent emerges from a flower. For example, Sachen Kunga Nyingpo writes in his seminal Notes on the Ālaya "Mind and matter bear the same relationship as a scent and a flower."

adinatha said:

Yogacara, sutras and tantras share the same view, that matter and consciousness are one thing, mind.

Malcolm wrote:

This may be true of sngags gsar ma, and certainly this is how Khyentse Wangchuck seeks to resolve the issue (unsatisfactorily in my mind) in his commentary on the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana.

adinatha said:

The issue of vayu is the same. There is no wind apart from movement. There is not fire apart from heat. There is no earth apart from solidity or water from wetness.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed -- yet these are the basic constituents of the rūpaskandha, the aggregate of matter.

adinatha said:

It is how these appear to the senses that makes them elements, not that they are the basic parts of matter.

Malcolm wrote:

Disagree. All material things possess these four qualities in some mix. Take notice, I am not arguing for these as ultimate realities.

adinatha said:

What makes it Yogacara is when in direct yogic perception you see what is most fundamental, pure awareness is at the base, and there are no phenomena there. In post-absorption, phenomena clearly emerge from consciousness and thereby appear in their true form as maya.

Malcolm wrote:

Prior to analyzing phenomena as mind-only, mind and matter are conventionally regarded as a dualism even in Yogacara. Why, because the imputed nature is exactly the conventional world.

Also in standard Madhyamaka, on the conventional level mind and matter are regarded as distinct.

While the annutarayoga tantras move in the direction of dissolving the distinction between mind and matter, the substance dualism in Buddhism is only satisfactorily resolved in Dzogchen (but not by regarding all phenomena as mind-- which is a point of view rejected by Longchenpa incoherent).

In Dzogchen, mind and matter are regarded as seamlessly welded, not that mind has primacy over matter. Dzogchen texts even go so far as to reject the formless realm as truly formless.

This is why for example the Khandro Nyinthig states very clearly "Sometimes we say "citta", sometimes "vāyu", but the meaning is the same." Vāyu is just the element of air i.e. motility present in matter. This also accounts for rebirth. In the Guhyasamaja, for example, the ālayavijñāna is wedded to the mahāprāṇavāyu -- this union allows rebirth to happen.

Mind and matter are inseparable from a tantric point of view. Your view reduces the tantric view of mind and matter to the level of sūtra, in my opinion. I take the unpopular stance (according to standard Tibetan orthodoxy ala Sapan, et al) that the view of tantra regarding these kinds of issues is superior in every respect to that of sūtra, and Dzogchen even more so than tantra. The view and practice of tantra and Dzogchen has been crippled in Tibetan discourse by a need to justify everything according to sūtra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Anders Honore said:

This doesn't really solve the problem as much as move it to a different sphere. From what you present here, you still have the problem of explaining how something physical, a wind, can produce or translate into something mental. It's the same old issue that gnaws at modern psychology and neuroscience and we still haven't come up with much better than 'it's magic'. Incidentally, immaterialism seems to be the only position that neatly sidesteps this issue. Well, radical physicalism would too if it were even actually imaginable, let alone moderately coherent.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness and matter are inseparable.

You are merely restating the lower Buddhist position regarding substance dualism ala Descarte.

From a tantric perspective, for example, thoughts (citta) are movements of vāyu in the channels of the body.

There is only a contradiction of you regard mind and matter as different in some essential way.

They are not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Astus said:

Namdrol,

You say that in Vajrayana they add a third - not known before component, vayu, what makes a dualist view monist? I'm not sure if monism is really a better concept than dualism when both are pretty much substantialist. Also, if dharmas are understood not as ultimate realities but provisional categories of multiform functions within the realm of experience there is neither dualism nor monism.

Namdrol said:

Vāyu is the material element of air (part of the rūpaskandha). Specifically, the mind and the prana vāyu are merged and inseparable.

The Mind/body problem is one that plagues rebirth explanations because Sutrayāna Buddhists are unable to give an account of the medium through which a mind passes from one body to the next. Vajrayāna in general solves that problem through vāyu. Such

an account simply does not exist in sutra.

In sutrayāna mind and matter are different substances.

N

Anders Honore said:

This doesn't really solve the problem as much as move it to a different sphere. From what you present here, you still have the problem of explaining how something physical, a wind, can produce or translate into something mental. It's the same old issue that gnaws at modern psychology and neuroscience and we still haven't come up with much better than 'it's magic'. Incidentally, immaterialism seems to be the only position that neatly sidesteps this issue. Well, radical physicalism would too if it were even actually imaginable, let alone moderately coherent.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not a problem at all.

Matter possesses the capacity for intelligence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Astus said:

Namdrol,

You say that in Vajrayana they add a third - not known before component, vayu, what makes a dualist view monist? I'm not sure if monism is really a better concept than dualism when both are pretty much substantialist. Also, if dharmas are understood not as ultimate realities but provisional categories of multiform functions within the realm of experience there is neither dualism nor monism.

Malcolm wrote:

Vāyu is the material element of air (part of the rūpaskandha). Specifically, the mind and the prana vāyu are merged and inseparable.

The Mind/body problem is one that plagues rebirth explanations because Sutrayāna Buddhists are unable to give an account of the medium through which a mind passes from one body to the next. Vajrayāna in general solves that problem through vāyu. Such an account simply does not exist in sutra.

In sutrayāna mind and matter are different substances.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Anders Honore said:

Is this really novel though? Hasn't Yogacara already covered this?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Yogacara accepts matter and mind conventionally as distinct and separate phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Anders Honore said:

this is a bit 'whoosh' for me (no pun intended). How is sutrayana's bodymind view Cartesian? Or should I ask how it is Cartesian in contrast to Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Nāma is imagined to have no material causes, as we can see from the above reasoning by Brunholz. In Sutrayāna, mind and matter are regarded as different substances.

Vajrayāna begins to move away from mind/body dualism, and finally in Dzogchen, it is completely abandoned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Akashagarbha Sutra ?

Content:

Namdrol said:

These texts are not so easy to understand if one does not know some Tibetan or Sanskrit even if they are in English translation.

Anders Honore said:

I don't get it? Are such sutras difficult to understand for Tibetans too if they can't read sanskrit?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, without some Sanskrit and a lot of study of general Dharma, these texts are very impenetrable to average Tibetans.

Anders Honore said:

What's the score here? Are practitioners, Western, Tibetan, Chinese and whatever alike, inescapably secluded from these teaching short of learning the liturgical language? If this is the case, is this not really the fault of the translators?

Malcolm wrote:

One should never expect to be able to pick up a sutra in English, for example, and immediately understand what it means. Of course, it somewhat depends on the sutra. Some sutras have a narrative style that is conducive to relatively easy understanding, like the Saddharmapundarika. But this is not the case with most sutras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: prayer flags

Content:

Karma Yeshe said:

The Lama's from my Monastery have requested that people save images of the Buddha etc until a Fire Pudge where they can be burned. I would assume that this would hold true for Prayer flags as well.

I would avoid simply disposing of them in the Regular trash.

All The Best

Malcolm wrote:

With all the dharma advertising in this day and age, that is impractical.

I recycle such images if they are paper.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2011 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Perhaps you are not in a position to judge anyone, apart from yourself, that is.

gregkavarnos said:

Perhaps judge is too strong a term. I would say though, that anybody that has passed

through, or is stuck at a certain obstacle can benefit from the advice of somebody that has passed through or has overcome the same obstacle, especially if they ask for the advice.

Maybe you have had the extremely positive karma to have not run into (or have been) a boastful, hypocrite, sycophantic or judgemental Vajrayana practitioner, I personally have not had such karma. As for not being in the position to judge, well, my job puts me into direct contact with tens of people at a personal level, every week. After a while you get pretty good at spotting BS. Maybe this has made me judgemental, or maybe this has just made me perceptive, time will tell!

Malcolm wrote:

99% is a pretty large number.

We only have three states: deluded, partially deluded, and free of delusion.

Which are you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Akashagarbha Sutra ?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Yes,

Basically one must spend years studying in Asia to become fluent in classical and colloquial.

Malcolm wrote:

Colloquial yes, classical, no.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Akashagarbha Sutra ?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Yes and that does most westerners no good, Namdrol . While there is some hope with the translation work being done over the next 100 years or so, the project 84000- Translating the words of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

They can learn Tibetan if they want to.

These texts are not so easy to understand if one does not know some Tibetan or Sanskrit even if they are in English translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you have a sūtrayāna attitude towards the Dharma, all of what you say is perfectly reasonable.

But there are alternatives.

gregkavarnos said:

Of course there are alternatives, I didn't say they were no alternatives and I did not say that the alternatives are invalid. My statement is in regard to mere posing, or lip-service regarding the options. I am not judging the practices, I am judging the practitioners. And since I am one of them (a Vajrayana practitioner), I am also judging myself.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps you are not in a position to judge anyone, apart from yourself, that is.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

In my time as a distiller I saw four people, that I knew personally, die slowly and painfully from alcohol related diseases.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup -- and I know a bunch of people who have died and are dying of obesity. That will not stop me from eating food. The principle is to recognize your own capacity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Will said:

This is simple and clear and the nut of it:

In Buddhism, it is not really a question of just believing or not believing in the law of karma or former and later lifetimes. Rather, if we generally accept the process of cause and effect, we must acknowledge that it does not make sense to arbitrarily exclude some causal phenomena—that is, certain or all of our physical, verbal, and mental actions—from this general principle.

In other words, "karma works during this life, but not before nor after" is an arbitrary & silly argument against rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

Right negate rebirth, you negate karma. Materialists by definition, since the earliest days of Indian religion, negate karma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So give me a non-fanatical, non-literal, flacid, non-limiting interpretation of right livelihood (for example).

Nangwa said:

Working with your capacity and conditions.

Working a job or career that does as little harm as possible yet allows you to function in your community and society.

Its not that hard.

An example of a rigid view in my opinion would be to say that a 23 year old dharma practitioner living in America is practicing wrong livelihood if he or she works at a wine shop or something like that. That would be rigid and would not accept the current condition of the individual in question or his or her capacity to work with that condition.

Malcolm wrote:

I worked in a wine shop a few years ago to pick up some extra cash while in school. It was fun.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Akashagarbha Sutra ?

Content:

kirtu said:

Does the Akashagarbha Sutra still exist in Sanskrit, Tibetan or Chinese?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

it's in the Kangyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

michaelsmcalister said:

With respect, it seems that my counterpoint to Ms. Fox's article is being misrepresented by these responses. If you read my piece,

<http://www.infinitemile.org/2011/04/cultivating-a-sloppy-spirituality/>, you'll most likely find that I'm arguing for a middle way between rigidity and a sloppy spirituality. If you don't find this to be the case, I'd welcome your critique.

Bows.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Buddhist POV, this is the epitome of sloppy spirituality:

"While his teaching is Zen-inspired, he works to integrate several of the Nondual teachings from the contemplative traditions of Vedanta Hinduism, Christianity, Kabbalah, and Sufism."

Non-dual (advaya) in Buddhism has a completely different meaning than non-duality (advaitā) in Vedanta, etc. The ein, ein sof and ohr ein sof of Kabbalah is not related to emptiness in Buddhism, but it is theological attempt by Kabbalists to explain ex nihilo creation, etc.

The above biographical statement of yours informs this statement:

"We begin to see that this whole beautiful dance is only ever Spirit seeing itself through us..."

While among Vedantists, Sufis, Kabbalists and so on there may be much to discuss, Buddhists will have little to share with them apart from a shared interest in compassion.

There is no middle way in theistic traditions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: prayer flags

Content:

Keshin said:

Two questions, if people don't mind.

1. How do I hang them up? With like, nails and stuff? I don't want to really use something inappropriate, like nailing them when you aren't supposed to, or bluetacking them or something. I have some just sitting there quietly and I want to use them. I have some mini ones I want to put in the house somewhere, and some huge ones.
2. Where should I hang these average sized ones (there's 30... too many to put in the house short of having them going all the way around a room). Should I hang them outside, even though it rains a lot? (Don't want them damaged)
3. Where can I find this Tibetan calendar?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

The function of prayers flags is to harmonize one's local surroundings. Thus, it is necessary to allow them to be hung outside on a strong string or rope between two locations where they will not get caught up in branches.

They are designed to disintegrate. Ideally, one would hang them once a year.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: A teacher's teachings

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Wow! Quoting himself to support his view to himself and then commenting postively on his own view! .

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be so hard on TMingyur.

He is on a quest for some "original Buddhism".

So for him, the Agamas/Nikayas are definitive. He finds them to be something he can verify for himself with ease. That makes him feel comfortable. There is nothing wrong with this.

I personally think his "Dharma language" language is labored and clumsy, and he thinks I am hopelessly ensconced in intellectual views (he's wrong on that point). But otherwise, he is perfectly harmless.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sutra is sutra. It only can carry one so far.

gregkavarnos said:

To me it seems that it is this this attitude that is the source of the of the Tibetan Buddhists lack of interest in EA Buddhism.

Now why do I choose to use the word attitude instead of the word statement? Because the statement may actually be true. I cannot judge its veracity. But the reality of all I have seen thus far, in terms of the results of practice (not only for myself but for 99% of other TB practitioners) is that the "so far" of sutra based practice is "so far" out of reach for the majority of TB practitioners that it is silly to even begin to judge (and criticise) the practice of other traditions as limited, or merely a step along the path. We are so far from reaching even that step that we have no right to criticise the EA path (or any other path for that matter). I severely doubt whether most practitioners have passed the second jhana of meditative concentration, yet we are quick off the mark to condemn the spiritual practice and level of the Arhats.

We say our practice will lead us to the state of Bodhisattva, but most times we use our Bodhisattva Vow to merely justify our incapacity to act within the moral/ethical guidelines established by Theravada practice. Then we have the gall to stand on the tip of Mt Meru and condemn the Bodhisattva path when the only Mt Meru most have us have ever seen is the centre of the universe that exists in our underpants!

Oooops... I think I am ranting!

Malcolm wrote:

If you have a sūtrayāna attitude towards the Dharma, all of what you say is perfectly reasonable.

But there are alternatives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 7:51 PM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not that impressive, IMO.

Also it is a strictly sutrayāna approach.

Somehow, there is this tendency among the Sarma schools to make Sutrayāna the standard by which every thing is measured, even though, for example, the trenchant mind/body dualism of Sutra is discarded in Anuttarayoga tantra, especially in Dzogchen.

Enochian said:

So when Madhyamaka says that the self is imputed upon the aggregates of body and mind, it is unnecessary to speak of mind since the mind is merely a wind in the physical body?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a mind, it is simply a function of vāyu. Nāmarūpa is still a fact. Just not in the Cartesian sense imagined by those who adhere to the sūtrayāna view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: Reasons for Rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not that impressive, IMO.

Also it is a strictly sutrayāna approach.

Somehow, there is this tendency among the Sarma schools to make Sutrayāna the standard by which every thing is measured, even though, for example, the trenchant mind/body dualism of Sutra is discarded in Anuttarayoga tantra, especially in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Nonmental Indestructible Element

Content:

Anders Honore said:

So Nagarjuna repudiates eternalists in drag, the Sarvastivadins, but is actually an admirer of Pudgavaladin tenets?

It's like ten thousand spoons when all you need is a knife...

Malcolm wrote:

It has been suggested that Nāgārjuna was monk of this school.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Question concerning Dzogchen practice of Dream Yoga.

Content:

Madeliaette said:

If this is necessary again in this life, would it need to be from someone of my own lineage, or from anyone suitably qualified in this practice?

(I ask, because there are two people I know (that are both from different lineages to me) that I could approach, but I do not yet know of anyone in my own lineage, as I have only just learned of my former lineage and attempted to make contact with an appropriate center.)

Malcolm wrote:

well, if you receive transmission from ChNN -- then you automatically have transmission for dream yoga.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Question concerning Dzogchen practice of Dream Yoga.

Content:

Madeliaette said:

I began to read a book called 'Dream Yoga and the Practice of Natural Light' by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu yesterday. I have now read the intro & first two chapters. Whilst there is plenty more yet to read, I have already found much material to ponder.

I have been able to enter the 'dream zone' level and participate fully - whilst awake & meditating - for some time, but have had little ability to be aware whilst actually dreaming/sleeping itself – I thought that this book might assist me, as this seemed to be the proper way to practice, rather than whilst awake. I intend to follow the instructions given in chapter two and continue to read onward also - however, I have a question that remains.

Is it suitable/proper practice to use my ability to live and learn in this 'dream zone' whilst

awake & meditating until I perfect doing so during sleep?

Before practicing Buddhism, I called it my 'spiritual life zone' and instead of considering myself to be meditating, I assumed I was 'contemplating philosophy' & 'living on a spiritual level' as an escape because real life sucked - since taking up Buddhist practice, I have changed my understandings and activities in this area from 'fun & freedom' to 'learning and understanding' - but I am wondering if I should focus solely on perfecting the 'asleep' dream zone practices, or if it is 'ok' to continue to participate whilst awake?

Malcolm wrote:

Dream yoga is something connected with transmission. So, you need transmission to really practice dream yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2011 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Nonmental Indestructible Element

Content:

Astus said:

I might be mistaken here but it wasn't Nagarjuna who mentioned that element but Tsongkhapa. Also, it seems quite unnecessary to explain the efficacy of karma. Third, it is not explained in the text itself nor does it sound really convincing how such an element exists.

Malcolm wrote:

It is indeed Nāgārjuna's position, the name of the dharma in question is avipraṇāśa. MMK 17:13-20 explicates this doctrine. Candrakīrti clarifies. This is not an invention of Tsongkhapa's. Nāgārjuna affirms in verse 17:20 "The avipraṇāśa of karma is the teaching of the Buddha."

This is the sole place in the MMK where Nāgārjuna actually advances a śrāvaka position he likes. See Mabja, ppg. 353-359.

As I said, this is originally a Sāṃkhya doctrine. See also Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa, ppg. 87-91 for a translation of Candrakīrti's take.

Nevertheless, even though among various śrāvaka theories that Nagarjuna examines, this is one he apparently likes, still, from a Madhyamaka perspective he finds the idea of this avipraṇāśa unnecessary even though it is a teaching of the Buddha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2011 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: The place of Buddhism in Indian thought

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yoga predates Buddhism.

Enochian said:

No, not the formal Hindu school of yoga founded by Patanjali. That came after buddhism with heavy buddhist influence. But of course yoga in general did exist before Buddha.

Namdrol said:

Samkhya predates Buddhism.

Nyaya predates Buddhism.

Enochian said:

Where is the evidence for this?

Malcolm wrote:

Oral tradition. Also there is a species of Samkhya in the Candoga, at least according to Thanissaro Bhikku.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2011 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: prayer flags

Content:

lisehull said:

Hi everyone. My prayer flags are starting to fade dramatically and are looking a bit tired. When does one replace them with newer versions, how does one dispose of the old flags and is there a particular time of the year to do this?

Lise

Malcolm wrote:

You can either leave them up and hang new ones or take down the old and burn them.

Normally, prayer flags are hung on the third day after Tibetan New Year or any other day that is auspicious and indicated according to Tibetan calendar.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2011 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: A teacher's teachings

Content:
TMingyur said:
As an amendment:

The above illustrates what I have experienced to be a very reliable approach:
The "gold standard" is the Buddha's teachings in the sutta pitaka. Every teaching that does not have "a correlate" there either has to be handled very very cautiously or - maybe better (safer) in many cases - has to be rejected.
So the basis necessarily has to be one's own experience. Therefore it is very problematic to surrender one's own experience to someone who does not teach "the gold standard" in the first place.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:
Good luck with that.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2011 at 9:56 PM
Title: Re: The place of Buddhism in Indian thought
Content:
Enochian said:
Most upanishads came after Buddha

All orthodox schools of hindu philosophy came way AFTER buddhism

patanjali ripped off buddhism. this is the academic consensus

so that link is 100% BS

Malcolm wrote:
Probably not.

Samkhya predates Buddhism.
Vedanta predates Buddhism since the Brihadaryanaka and the Candoga predate the Buddha by three hundred years.
Nyaya predates Buddhism.
Vedic ritualism (Mimamsa) predates Buddhism
Yoga predates Buddhism.

Only Vaisheshika can be plausibly dated after Buddhism.

Now, Puranic religion obviously comes after Buddhism i.e. Nikāya Buddhism, but the elements that informed Puranic religion were already in play. Puranic Hinduism is just a

little older than Mahāyāna.

Advaita is a later development.

The formal arrangement of the six darshanas, granted is quite late. It arose at the same time as the four tenet system in Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2011 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Moving on

Content:

TMingyur said:

It is the clinging aggregates (clinging self-referentially to themselves) that manifest as the deluded sub-conceptual identification "I" and "mine" in the context of these process-like phenomena (i.e. the aggregates). Active conceptual imputation thinking "I" and "mine" only is the peak of this sub-conceptual ("intuitive") error.

Malcolm wrote:

You have the cart before the horse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2011 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Nonmental Indestructible Element

Content:

Astus said:

In "Ocean of Reasoning" (p. 355) Tsongkhapa says in the commentary to MMK 17:14,

"Although all virtuous and nonvirtuous actions cease immediately upon their completion, they are not without effects, because when the karma arises, a nonmental compound called an indestructible element associated with karma arises in the continuum of the agent like a promissory note."

What is this nonmental element associated with karma? It sounds like an abhidharmic teaching, however, from the text it appears to me that Tsongkhapa actually accepts the existence of such an element. Could anyone explain please?

Malcolm wrote:

This is an Abhidharmic concept, from the Sammitiya school. It is Nāgārjuna's preferred mechanism for explaining karma and results. Preferred, for example, to the Sautrantika cittaparinama theory, which he (Nāgārjuna) rejects as incoherent.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2011 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Mandalas and your place in them/ Namdrol inspired thread

Content:

kirtu said:

Right - which is why Zandog Palri is not meant to really be Madagascar and praying for rebirth in Chamara will not result in rebirth in Madagascar (to extend slightly a debate from a previous forum)

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Kirt:

If you pray to be reborn in Shambhala, you will not take rebirth in Afghanistan either, but that is where the original Shambhala was, thereabouts.

But the four continents mythology is definitely an Indocentric cosmology, and India, not the whole planet, is Jamdudvipa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2011 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Moving on

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

There's a joke in my country that goes more or less like this:

There was this bloke who craved for ...

TMingyur said:

Craving actually is no joke ... it is the root of all misery ... clinging aggregates are the root of clinging to views and tenets ... from my "personal experience" perspective the Buddha was right.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

No, the root of clinging to views and tenets is the mistaken imputation of identity. That mistaken imputation is the cause of addiction to the aggregates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2011 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: Mandalas and your place in them/ Namdrol inspired thread

Content:

Namdrol said:

Copper colored mountain and Sukhavati are basically bardo experiences.

Rael said:

Copper coloured mountain is in Africa and it is not a Bardo experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Madagascar, to be precise. But if you go Madagascar, you will never find Zangdog Palri.

Rael said:

The Bardo is place of confusion and fear for most. It reminds me of heroin withdrawal....except it gets worse instead of better...

Malcolm wrote:

The bardo is the place where medium practitioners attain liberation.

Rael said:

Are you saying that Sukhavati is the ramblings of some mad man....

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is Buddhist heaven for those who want a Buddhist heaven.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2011 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhist View of Zen

Content:

Astus said:

It seems to me, as it appears in the Namkhai Norbu and Chögyam Trungpa quotes, that they take Zen to be only about emptiness and based on prajnaparamita. It is actually a strange interpretation to me since one of the most fundamental tenets of Zen is "mind is Buddha" and it is actually based on tathagatagarbha teachings. Why they still think that Zen is only about emptiness is a mystery to me.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an interpretation based on Chan as it was presented to Tibetans by a number of

Chinese masters of the Northern school. There are a few Chan texts authored by Tibetans in Dunhuang corpus. One of them is by Trisong De'utsan.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2011 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Metaphysical tendency in Mahayanists

Content:

Namdrol said:

When we talk of the base being the two truths are we not doing metaphysics?

Tom said:

Nope, we are talking about the difference between undeluded and deluded cognitions. That's all.

Malcolm wrote:

Okay.

It does seem though that even a division based on mind might have some significant ontological implications, for example the two truths being ontologically distinct and even hierarchical. Maybe such implications are superfluous to the Buddhist endeavor, though a lot of fuss seems to be made over them!

- Sorry quote names are wrong - am new to this![/quote]

The two truths are not ontologically distinct because emptiness is not a form of being, and appearances are not either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2011 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Buddhist View of Zen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are three basic Tibetan views of Zen:

- A) It is a subtle deviation from the Buddha's teachings (i.e. Hashang's Chan)
- b) It is the most profound sutra teaching, but only that.
- c) it is Chinese version of Yogacara (Thukwan)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2011 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Metabolic rate

Content:

Huseng said:

Namdrol, in Tibetan Medicine how is metabolic rate viewed? Is it better to have a low or high metabolic rate?

My resting metabolic rate is around 2011 calories per day, but even then I still think I require far less than that. I can put on weight very quickly. I don't really need much food to get by.

Namdrol said:

If you put on weight quickly, this means, from our point of view, your metabolism is low.

N

Huseng said:

Is that generally okay for long-term health?

Malcolm wrote:

Better to encourage your metabolism to be higher. Low metabolism leads to chronic cold diseases.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2011 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Vajrayana practice and psychological disorders

Content:

Inge said:

The ngondro I have started is one from Karma Kagyu. I did the refuge and bodhicitta part for a little while, but have not been able to continue due to lack of faith. Thank you for the tip of the chest feeling and dark moon, I haven't encountered such phenomena.

I also do a daily sadhana practice. Do you think that is a problem?

Generally I experience a lot of resistance to practice, except for reading, and going to teachings and retreats.

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot force faith. But you can grow it.

Faith is just a positive mental factor that brings clarity to your mind. Faith here does not mean blind devotion. It means having confidence in the personal transformation that

Dharma practice engenders. Reading is part of that Dharma practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Metabolic rate

Content:

Huseng said:

Namdrol, in Tibetan Medicine how is metabolic rate viewed? Is it better to have a low or high metabolic rate?

My resting metabolic rate is around 2011 calories per day, but even then I still think I require far less than that. I can put on weight very quickly. I don't really need much food to get by.

Malcolm wrote:

If you put on weight quickly, this means, from our point of view, your metabolism is low.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Mandalas and your place in them/ Namdrol inspired thread

Content:

Namdrol said:

As physical places one can take rebirth in? Not really.

As wisdom displays of Amitabha, etc. That's different.

mr. gordo said:

Hmmm....I'm not sure I understand. Is there a difference between the two? I always figured they were places created by Guru P or Amitabha, and that they were wisdom displays. I think I'm not understanding how you're using the term "wisdom display"

Malcolm wrote:

Copper colored mountain and Sukhavati are basically bardo experiences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Mandalas and your place in them/ Namdrol inspired thread

Content:

Namdrol said:

Just what i said. Pure lands are not interesting to me. All of space is a pure land, for those who know how to see.

mr. gordo said:
Hi Namdrol,

Do you believe that Pure Lands like P's Copper Mountain, or Sukhavati exist? Or do you take these as metaphors for a mind purified of afflictions like the mind only school?

Malcolm wrote:
As physical places one can take rebirth in? Not really.

As wisdom displays of Amitabha, etc. That's different.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 8:14 PM
Title: Re: Moving on
Content:
Will said:
TM: I will be loosing all the help
Before you move on to Dhamma Wheel, please try to remember, and this applies to all who read this:

"Loosing" might mean making something more loose, it does not mean "losing" something that was once not lost.

One of Will's pet peeves.

TMingyur said:
Oh thank you for hinting at the typo.

Actually what I meant was "losing".

Tibetan buddhism has helped me very much. But if I ever get involved with tibetan buddhism again I will be losing all the help I have received.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:
You should probably drop to the Tibetan nym.

Go with something more Prakrit.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 7:42 PM
Title: Re: Metaphysical tendency in Mahayanists
Content:

Tom said:
...your state as a sentient being...
A metaphysical topic, no? Are you suggesting a more phenomenological perspective?

When we talk of the base being the two truths are we not doing metaphysics?

Malcolm wrote:
Nope, we are talking about the difference between undeluded and deluded cognitions.
That's all.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 10:45 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism
Content:

Sherab said:
Ever considered the possibility that the suttas/sutras do indeed point to buddhahood
being non-dependent on mind?

Malcolm wrote:
Pointing is one thing, taking one there directly is another.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 10:43 AM
Title: Re: Metaphysical tendency in Mahayanists
Content:

Tom said:
When we talk about the intricacies of svabhava etc. are we not discussing metaphysics?
and when we talk about the ignorance that leads to suffering are we not discussing
epistemology? If the Buddhist description of the problem of suffering and its cause is so
involved with metaphysics and epistemology how is it that its solution avoids it? I am
open to answers.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhism is about knowing your state as a sentient being, doing something about it,
and freeing oneself. No svabhāvas need apply.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Metaphysical tendency in Mahayanists

Content:

conebeckham said:

Mahayana, and in my opinion, all Buddhism, tend toward metaphysics, as they must.

Malcolm wrote:

I could not disagree more. Buddhism is graveyard of mysticism and of metaphysics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Mandalas and your place in them/ Namdrol inspired thread

Content:

Rael said:

but in that moment when the teacher is teaching and the student is absorbing ...mind to mind....is there still not a hierarchy...

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on the teacher and depends on the student.

Teachers have only one job -- lead students to liberation. If they cannot do that, they are stealing people's precious human birth.

Most of the hierarchy in Buddhism comes from Asian cultural forms. It can be dispensed with in the modern world.

Of course, we need to respect people and their choices -- so if someone is keen on a super-hierarchical school like Shambhala International, we should respect their choice. Of course if I am going to see some traditional Asian teacher, I will do prostrations out of respect. When you have respect, you can't have pride. Respect is the real prostration. When ever you respect someone, then you are prostrating to them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Mandalas and your place in them/ Namdrol inspired thread

Content:

Rael said:
from another thread....please explain....

Namdrol said:
I have no interest in infantile fantasies like pure lands.

N

Rael said:
yikes a roonie...talk about changing me pardigms....

this has to go to that thread....

and thanks for this N

r

Malcolm wrote:
Just what i said. Pure lands are not interesting to me. All of space is a pure land, for those who know how to see.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 1:59 AM
Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism
Content:

Rael said:
samsaric Schooling is a lose term i used when thinking about the entire purpose to samsara..

Malcolm wrote:
I understand. But samsara has no meaning. But if you have Dharma, then maybe samsara is meaningful.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 1:47 AM
Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism
Content:

Rael said:

i did mention that it was convention to view the student teacher relationship in the pure land...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you did,
but i still insist your wish can't happen in this mundane world of suffering...

the nature of the beast on this plane of existence is not going to evolve to that point...

I don't agree. We are not merely the sum of our biology.

Rael said:

the entire purpose for samsaric schooling would be lost....

Malcolm wrote:

There is no purpose to samsaric schooling.

Rael said:

you can't have an entire world of enlightened beings living on an organic planet....lol.....

Malcolm wrote:

I am not talking about a planet of enlightened beings. I am talking about a planet of balanced beings. Two different things altogether.

Rael said:

i don't even think Karmicly it is possible to have an earth like pure land...the Alchemy is all off....lol

Malcolm wrote:

I have no interest in infantile fantasies like pure lands.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Rael said:

Well when i enter a Buddha's mandala, or the Dalai Lama visits Toronto , i know my place in both....

there is a hierarchy in the pure lands as well....you have teacher and student relationships....

Malcolm wrote:

That is relative. Students are not lower than masters, masters are not higher than students. The primordial state of a master is no different than that primordial state of a student.

Rael said:

i realize i'm looking at this from a conventionalist view...but we are talking anarchy in the real world we live in and i'm saying there can be no true anarchy as well as real communism...

Malcolm wrote:

I have higher expectations of human potential than to think that we forever are going to be locked into primate hierarchical stations.

Rael said:

i like, no, make that adore your flag and what it stands for....but it can't happen....except in a persons mind set and how they view their place in society....

Malcolm wrote:

All you have to do is speak truth to power while respecting wisdom. If you can do that, then you are beyond hierarchy of every kind.

Rael said:

and yes it suits my Buddhist mind set as well namdrol

Malcolm wrote:

The label anarchist does not interest me. Establishing a world where there is an organic natural interrelated web in which all parts that make the whole are given the room to flourish, human and non-human, that is what I see. This is not anarchism, green or otherwise. It is not utopian -- it is our eventual future if we as a species survive long enough to socially evolve beyond our present primate instinct social order. At our worst, we are just naked chimps with guns.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Rael said:

:

large corporations=large governments

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, the massive wealth accumulations in US when the West was opened in the 19th century also gave rise to a need for a larger bureaucracy hence, the massive expansion of the federal government between 1870-1914.

Rael said:

why are you ignoring me....is this some i know something you don't thing so i will stay quiet and appear clever...

Malcolm wrote:

No, please restate the question.

Thanks,

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

ZenLem said:

Hey guys, just some spiritual issues, basically the first article argues for not adhering to strict spiritual practice, while the second sort of pokes holes in that as missing the point

Cultivating a sloppy spirituality

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/meimei-fox/the-life-out-loud-where-s_b_844670.html "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

The response

<http://www.infinitemile.org/2011/04/cultivating-a-sloppy-spirituality/> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Personally, it sounds like a middle way issue. I personally know the difference between enjoyment and addiction, or at least I hope I do. Anyway, something to chew on.

Namdrol said:

They both miss the point completely and neither of them are buddhists.

N

ZenLem said:

Alright, you gotta elaborate on this one.

Malcolm wrote:

One is a spiritual dilettante and the other is into "Spirit" whatever that is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2011 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Namdrol said:

The problem is that corporations have gotten so large that only a large government can control them. However, when corporations and govt. get in bed in the manner that they have in this country, then everyone loses.

The solution to big govt. is to severely limit corporate growth.

N

Rael said:

Corporations prefer smaller governments....less governance so they can rape more....

Now that would appear to be the reason for larger governments but it is not...

Malcolm wrote:

As you can see, the history of large governments has paced the rise of large corporations. There is a corollary if not a direct cause and effect.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Pure Land, Chan, and Tientai are sutrayana.

Shingon is Vajrayana up to yogatantra.

Jikan said:

True doctrinally. Although you'll find the same level of esoteric practice in Tendai (the stream from Jikaku Daishi basically) as in Shingon.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that Tendai subordinates Mikyo to sutra exegesis. Shingon is a pure

Vajrayana school.

Tendai is more like Gelug. Shingon is more like Sakya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Then there is the other issue e.g. we are convinced that the highest Buddhist teachings exist in Tibetan Buddhism and nowhere else.

Sherab said:

Playing the devil's advocate:

For the most spiritually gifted, the lowest teaching is sufficient to bring them to Buddhahood. For the most spiritually-challenged, even the highest teachings could not budge them.

Lowest teaching has the least explanation of the ultimate truth and least of method to reach there. So only the spiritually gifted could use it as a vehicle to Buddhahood. The highest teaching has the most detailed explanation of the ultimate truth and the most methods to reach there. So it is vehicle for the least spiritually endowed.

Spiritual triumphantalists, beware.

Malcolm wrote:

If buddhahood depended on mind, this might be true. But since buddhahood is not dependent on mind...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 7:28 PM

Title: Re: Naturally occurring

Content:

TMingyur said:

Just try and experience for yourself whether it is wholesome or unwholesome to practice accordingly.

gregkavarnos said:

A little difficult when one considers that most of us here are steeped in ignorance, it would be better to report feelings/experiences to a teacher with some level of experience and realisation.

TMingyur said:

Sounds strange that someone would not be in a position to assess their own feelings

and well-being.
But there are all kinds of people ... who knows.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:
As you know there are four basic mistakes that people make:

mistaking the painful for pleasure;
the impermanent for permanence;
suffering for happiness,
with lacks identity for identity.

So it is no surprise that ordinary people are unable to assess their own feelings and well-being. We have much evidence that they cannot.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 7:23 PM
Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism
Content:
Namdrol said:

The problem these days is corporate Capitalism and their incessant need for growth.

The problem is not small scale capitalism of the kind described by Adam Smith. Smith would regard modern corporate Capitalism with horror, as would Jefferson, and so on.

Heruka said:
I agree, im much more in favor of decentralization of federal government reach, and much more interested in local co-ops, local trade and barter, local farm produce and states trading with each other, the amish have managed quite well, but unfortunately the federal government is encroaching on that too.

I mean you can go to jail for selling raw unpasteurized milk, or even raw bees honey with all its goodies and benefits to someone who wishes to buy it. Free market has really gotten squashed under the wheels of industry.

remember, a government big enough to give you everything you need, is big enough to take everything you have.

i think we are all interested in social justice to one shade or another, but just not socialism as presented.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is that corporations have gotten so large that only a large government can control them. However, when corporations and govt. get in bed in the manner that they have in this country, then everyone loses.

The solution to big govt. is to severely limit corporate growth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Enochian said:

This guy wants to establish a socialist utopia know as sharia throughout the world:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HD4OeSoi6xs> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-ZCDO5Jp6ic> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Apparently everyone will live in peace sharing all resources if you watch all his interviews on youtube.

Malcolm wrote:

Islam is one type of utopian vision. Shambhala is another.

I don't have much patience for either of them.

The problem these days is corporate Capitalism and their incessant need for growth.

The problem is not small scale capitalism of the kind described by Adam Smith. Smith would regard modern corporate Capitalism with horror, as would Jefferson, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

conebeckham said:

...or a later bedtime.

Do you think that lone spot of light in the North is Kim Jong Il's house?

Malcolm wrote:
Probably the security lights.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 7:10 AM
Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism
Content:
David N. Snyder said:
Korea at night:

North = Communist.

South = Capitalist.

Any questions?

<http://www.peacethroughwealth.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:
Nope. South Korea has a much larger carbon footprint than the north.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 5:39 AM
Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
Some Facts (from Wiki):
growth...

Malcolm wrote:
This is just a capitalist trap, as you know.

The capitalist growth fetish is destroying the world.

what we need is a zero growth steady state economy, world-wide.

<http://limitstogrowth.net/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 5:18 AM
Title: Re: New Century Foundation / Lama Norbu
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
it's obviously bullshit. Shiva garuda.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 5:08 AM
Title: Re: New Century Foundation / Lama Norbu
Content:
Jikan said:
My wife noticed a flier for an event featuring this fellow at a local yoga center.

<http://www.ncfinternational.org/norbu.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

What's going on here?

At first glance this appears to be a case of an authentically-trained Geshe "going Galt" and taking the spiritual alternative route. Or... ? I don't get it and I don't want to be presumptuous.

Malcolm wrote:
Who knows if this guy is really a geshe.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 4:28 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism
Content:
Will said:
I have yet to find online Namkhai Norbu's "Dzogchen and Zen" booklet. If anyone knows where it (a PDF?) might be or can summarize his points about the differences or similarities, that would be helpful.

Namdrol said:
It is a summary of Nubchen Sangye Yeshe's position on the gradual path, Chan, Mahayoga and Dzogchen.

N

Will said:

So Chan is Dzogchen lite? or a needed (or helpful) preliminary to DZ?

Malcolm wrote:

Any meditation one does will be useful as a preliminary to Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: north/east in tibetan

Content:

Namdrol said:

Great. The rest is delusion.

devilyoudont said:

Thanks.

PS. Can't you give me any hints at all?

PPS. It is completely metaphorical, you know, so "delusion" may not be the word for it. I'm trying to convey my meditative experiences in this language, in which I have no training.

PPS. So yes, the end result may indeed be delusional when other beings read it.

PPPS. But would it be out of the question to read it with a bit of charity (by trying to see it from my non-standard, ignorant point of view) and correcting some of the most glaring misconceptions?

PPPPS. I can see you're still here, so maybe you're working on it. Grind me well and good. Thanks again!

Malcolm wrote:

Well, get some training. At least attend some webcasts with Norbu Rinpoche and receive the transmission for cho practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 4:13 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

My mistake, there are six we have access to:

One commentary on sgra thal gyur

One on mu tig phreng ba
One on yi ge med pa
One of kun tu bzang po klong drug
One on the sgron ma 'bar ba
One on the sku gdung 'bar ba

They are all attributed to Vimalamitra.

Eleven remain missing.

Pero said:

Oh so no Rigpa Rangshar commentary? Wow I could swear that I once read there is a commentary. Perhaps I read there was a commentary and my memory mixed things up.

Malcolm wrote:

There was such a commentary. It is still missing. Perhaps it will turn up in the library of Drepung.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Astus said:

So it is possible to restrict one's knowledge to just the essentials. But those who have the time and energy should learn a lot more.

Pero said:

A lot more doesn't necessarily mean learn EA Buddhism. I don't know why you think it should. Tibetan Buddhism is vast. A life time is perhaps not sufficient to learn everything there is in it (nor is it necessary), so why would people bother learning other forms of Buddhism? It's a different matter if you have some intellectual curiosity or some other special reason but in general I think there is no need. Better to study one thing and study that well.

Huseng said:

Bodhisattvas, at least in East Asia, vow to study all dharma gates.

Malcolm wrote:

gcig shes kun drol, my friend, "knowing one, all are liberated".

And you better get hopping on your studies of Anuttarayoga tantra, and the nyingma inner tantras. Time is passing!

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 3:47 AM
Title: Re: north/east in tibetan
Content:
devilyoudont said:
A moment by moment Chod practice.

I reaffirm my bodhicitta aim.

Malcolm wrote:
Great. The rest is delusion.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 3:29 AM
Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism
Content:

Rael said:
interesting choice....

worthy of my approval...lol....how are you on arrogance and ego...lol....

it can't be though....

for the life of me i can't vision a world with no hierarchical form.....

even the Mandala of a Buddha has hierarchy... yes no....

it would be interesting to see your comment on that...

it might even change a paradigm or two around here...

as an added thought;

the flag and what it implies is best served as a personal view to be taken so as to not be fooled into the propaganda and it's wrath as displayed by the eunichian poster.....

Namdrol said:
There is no hierarchy in a mandala, only a center and a periphery. But all peripheries can move to the center, and all centers can move to the periphery.

Rael said:

was thinking more in terms of the dakinnis and the lesser and greater gods and different characters involved in...

Malcolm wrote:

All functions of one complex. Nothing is high, nothing is low.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Which five early commentaries are you referring to Namdrol?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

My mistake, there are six we have access to:

One commentary on sgra thal gyur

One on mu tig phreng ba

One on yi ge med pa

One of kun tu bzang po klong drug

One on the sgron ma 'bar ba

One on the sku gdung 'bar ba

They are all attributed to Vimalamitra.

Eleven remain missing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

I was fortunate to have attending Tulku Nyima Gyaltsen Rinpoche's transmission (lung) of the Nyingthig Yabzhi. It took 15 days. I guess I am authorized to read those texts now...

Namdrol said:

Yes, you are.

Malcolm wrote:

but you would also be authorized to read them if you had attended the Yashi empowerments of Kunzang Dechen Lingpa where he gave the pelung wang for the whole cycle at the end of the empowerments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

I was fortunate to have attending Tulku Nyima Gyaltzen Rinpoche's transmission (lung) of the Nyingthig Yabzhi. It took 15 days. I guess I am authorized to read those texts now...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Rael said:

interesting choice....

worthy of my approval...lol....how are you on arrogance and ego...lol....

it can't be though....

for the life of me i can't vision a world with no hierarchical form.....

even the Mandala of a Buddha has hierarchy... yes no....

it would be interesting to see your comment on that...

it might even change a paradigm or two around here...

as an added thought;

the flag and what it implies is best served as a personal view to be taken so as to not be fooled into the propaganda and it's wrath as displayed by the eunichian poster.....

Malcolm wrote:

There is no hierarchy in a mandala, only a center and a periphery. But all peripheries can move to the center, and all centers can move to the periphery.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Khandro Nyinthag is also very interesting.

Pero said:

I don't doubt that, it's just that almost since the beginning I wanted to receive and read the root tantras in general. Also I think root texts are important, terma is cool and all but it comes from root texts.

[

Malcolm wrote:

First off, the seventeen tantras are termas themselves.

Secondly, termas like Vima Nyinthag, Khandro Nyinthag, and Gongpa Zangthal, etc., are indispensable for understanding the material in the tantras.

However, that has changed a little now that we have five early commentaries on major Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Will said:

I have yet to find online Namkhai Norbu's "Dzogchen and Zen" booklet. If anyone knows where it (a PDF?) might be or can summarize his points about the differences or similarities, that would be helpful.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a summary of Nubchen Sangye Yeshe's position on the gradual path, Chan, Mahayoga and Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Rael said:

and yes it was Namdrol's comment that got me to thinking....but i ask you
Namdrol....why the waffle....

Malcolm wrote:

Waffle about what? Not sure what you mean.

Socialism was an important movement, but is not relevant anymore.

Why? Because socialism is too human-centric. The distinctions between Marxist, Reformist and Utopian forms of socialism are academic. They are no longer relevant.

The older I get the more I am moving towards a sort of anarcho-green position or left-biocentrism. I think this political form is the most consistent with Buddhist principles and especially with Dzogchen, which has always been anti-hierarchical.

Rocking the green and black, baby!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Rael said:

USofA 's AAA rating has been considered strongly lately to be pushed down to AA....within 2 years is the estimate for those who do that sort of thing....it was actually on the news yesterday

Enochian said:

Right but it hasn't been pushed down yet, and probably won't. America is still AAA.

There is a reason why everyone in the world heavily invests in American stock exchanges.

Malcolm wrote:

S&P switched the US's rating yesterday to negative:

"NEW YORK (Standard & Poor's) April 18, 2011--Standard & Poor's Ratings Services said today that it affirmed its 'AAA' long-term and 'A-1+' short-term sovereign credit ratings on the U.S. Standard & Poor's also said that it revised its outlook on the long-term rating of the U.S. sovereign to negative from stable."

<http://www.standardandpoors.com/ratings/articles/en/us/?assetID=1245302886884> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sang Chod

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Which tradition?

heart said:

It is under offerings <http://monlam.org/moreprayers.html> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

It is Kagyu and Nyingma tradition.

In the sang I do it is quite clear that the reason to do it is to benefit sentient beings and making offerings to the Buddhas and three roots. In general that is the point with all Vajrayana rituals it seems to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what sang. The real purpose of sang is to purify. That is what the word "bsangs" actually means -- to cleanse. In this case we are cleansing with smoke.

Many sangs are quite specific, restricted to one location, one local guardian and so on. General sangs offerings, like Riwo Sangcho, are purification rites focused on the four guests.

The original sang offering left by Padmsambhava in Tibet i.e. Kama tradition, is the famous Nol sangs i.e. "purifying pollution". Lamas frequently combine this with Riwo Sangcho for a more full effect.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Astus said:

Kyosan,

I don't think they should convert to any EA school, that's not really the question I think. But rather the interest in other forms of Buddhism. For instance I've heard about a plan that they translated the Pali Canon to Tibetan. That's great. However, I don't see Tibetan teachers addressing the issue of other Buddhist schools outside of the Tibetan ones. They are good to discuss Hinayana, Mahayana, Kagyu, Sakya, etc. but no mention of Pure Land, Chan, Tiantai or Shingon. Maybe they haven't heard about them? I doubt that, especially as many know English and even Chinese. To give an example, it is not expected at all from a Nyingma master to become a Gelug or Kagyu lama but definitely he should be somewhat familiar with their teachings, especially when they do some comparisons between the teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Pure Land, Chan, and Tientai are sutrayana.

Shingon is Vajrayana up to yogatantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Anders Honore said:

Tibetan Buddhism strikes me as more doctrinally fixed/focused than east-Asian Buddhism. And thus, is probably more reluctant to absorb new input to its doctrinal outlook. And probably doubly so considering such input is informed by the lower sutrayana, itself a fixed lens for analysis that in many ways fails to capture the intricacies of east-Asian Mahayana. And in many cases, Indian Mahayana too, for that matter.

Chinese Mahayana is in many ways a more diffuse entity than Tibetan Buddhism and thus probably more receptive to new influences, of which Tibetan Buddhism present a wealth of to draw from.

Malcolm wrote:

Sutra is sutra. It only can carry one so far.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Because India is the source of Buddhism. Not only that, Tibetan historical consciousness did not allow for an "eighth century Indian Buddhism". Of course they were aware that Mahayana and Vajrayana texts were not present from the beginning, but they still trace everything more or less back to the Buddha.

Huseng said:

Right. However, these sentiments still seem to largely exist in the Tibetan Buddhist community and have been transferred to non-Tibetan practitioners of TB.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. Even if unwarranted. Then there is the other issue e.g. we are convinced that the highest Buddhist teachings exist in Tibetan Buddhism and nowhere else.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: SkAB KRGYAD

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Can anybody here from you elucidate the Nyingma text "Kabje" (sKab krgayd) ?

Am interested too about the contents of this text.

Thanks in advance for your attention

Kalden Yungdrung

Namdrol said:

Are you certain of the spelling?

kalden yungdrung said:

Yes i am it is also a wellknown text within the Bon tradition and this would in Bon stem from Drenpa Namkha

KY

Malcolm wrote:

The reason I ask is that there is this is in incorrect spelling krgyad -- k is never used as a prefix letter. Do you mean to spell brgyad i.e. "eight"? IN which case the translation would be "eight delays" or something like that.

I think you must mean bka' brgyad i.e. the eight transmissions i.e. Yamantaka, Hayagriva, Heruka, Amritakundali, Kilaya, Matarah, etc. These are the eight sadhana cycles belonging to anuyoga system (according to Longchenpa) brought by Guru Padmasambhava to Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Astus said:

Why is it that Tibetan Buddhists are hardly ever care about East Asian Buddhism?

Namdrol said:

Because it does not come from India to Tibet directly. In the Tibetan point of view, Chinese Buddhism was a second-hand Buddhism. Buddhism, yes, but not as pure as Buddhism Tibetans were receiving directly from Indian Panditas.

N

Huseng said:

I wonder, though, why is 8th century-onward Indian Buddhism perceived as more legitimate or pure than Chinese Buddhism?

Tian'tai, Huayan and Chan were all legitimate developments of Buddhadharma. They might not have been Indian, but then why would teachers from India be perceived as purer than their neighbours to the east? Why was nationality an issue?

Malcolm wrote:

Because India is the source of Buddhism. Not only that, Tibetan historical consciousness did not allow for an "eighth century Indian Buddhism". Of course they were aware that Mahayana and Vajrayana texts were not present from the beginning, but they still trace everything more or less back to the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: SkAB KRGYAD

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Can anybody here from you elucidate the Nyingma text "Kabje" (sKab krgayd) ?

Am interested too about the contents of this text.

Thanks in advance for your attention

Kalden Yungdrung

Malcolm wrote:

Are you certain of the spelling?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Heruka said:

btw, i once knew an ex-solider from Romania, from under the Ceașescu regime. I have never met a more scared, bipolar wreck of a person in my life. and this is what the communists did to him from his cradle, and tragically to his grave. the stories he had shared were truly the stuff of nightmares.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, you can find stories like that all over america too. Indian reservations, in black and latino communities. Repression of brown and black people in this country is still intense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Our economy has no foundation anymore. That is what "free market" capitalism did for us. We live in perpetual bubbles that are not propped on real assets.

N

Heruka said:

this is what the globalists wanted and did to national economies. now socialists are also expansionists, they may call it imperialism to jab the other side of the equation, but theirs is liberation and repatriation back to the motherland etc, same thing but different word magic. we have to stop and consider that this is an old game of colonization, or

even the mercantile model of consolidation of wealth and power...ie the banks are the winners here. namdrol laments that usa has no manufacturing base, this is true to a certain degree, but in the old system of mercantilism, the colonies were only used for raw materials, and were never allowed to make "finished goods" ie usa is a colony of global one worlders system, only to be used for raw materials, and china is used for the finished goods. it is planned that way for sure. it was clinton and gore that removed glass stegal act that allowed wall street gamblers to leverage money and loans, to create derivative fraud that we have today. it was gore taking ENRONs energy supply and demand model fraud to set up the global warming carbon tax exchanges,,again a massive fraud.

socialists can only maintain that failed idealog by control, whether a hardcore year zero, pol pot style, or an iron fist in the velvet glove.

there is no socialist utopia...a myth and mass fraud, there is only freedom and liberty.

Malcolm wrote:

The point that sparked this thread is that conservatives are intellectually moribund in general. The left is for all of its pie in the sky idealism, at least intellectually engaged, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Interest in EA Buddhism

Content:

Astus said:

Why is it that Tibetan Buddhists are hardly ever care about East Asian Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Because it does not come from India to Tibet directly. In the Tibetan point of view, Chinese Buddhism was a second-hand Buddhism. Buddhism, yes, but not as pure as Buddhism Tibetans were receiving directly from Indian Panditas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Naturally occuring

Content:

TMingyur said:

Certainty! The counterpart of doubt and wavering is at stake ... so whoever wants certainty to counter doubt which is a hindrance has to rely on own experience primarily.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

The Eastern Gatehouse sutta provides much needed balance to this sutta targeted directly to non-Buddhists.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 9:45 AM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

Enochian said:

This doesn't make sense at all in the light of Dzogchen's crystal channels.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it does. But I am not going to discuss that here more than to say this kind of anatomy is wrapped in metaphor. When one has studied Tibetan medicine, many things become obvious that seem mysterious and mystical in Dzogchen.

Here is a hint "white silk thread" is common Tibetan medical term for nerve fibers in the body, for example, that run from the brain to all the internal organs, etc.

But in reality, it is all about physical structures in the body and how to manipulate them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Enochian said:

I'm not a republican.

I am an American.

I voted for Obama and will vote for him again.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh right, you voted for the craven, spineless party. So did I, because I thought the man had values. He turned out to be a republican.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Capitalism is the problem, my friend, and nothing else.

N

Enochian said:

For the sake of argument lets accept this.

You do realize like 99% of people live in a nice home with flat screen TV's, laptops, Blu-Ray players?

If capitalism is the problem, we all want MORE!

America pays the LEAST amount of our income percentage wise for food. Because "evil" corporations made food so cheap.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we don't. We live this way because we each have 50,000 slaves in other countries working their asses off for nothing.

We pay the least amount for our food because our food is produced by cheap labor by impoverished migrant workers, where it is not farmed in Mexico etc. Our TVs are manufactured in sweatshops in China (so is the Mac I am writing this on). We live a "great" life because corporations have gutted the manufacturing sector of the US economy, sent it overseas and now they just use us as bovine cattle to feed commodities to -- having reduced our economy to services and consumerism. Our economy has no foundation anymore. That is what "free market" capitalism did for us. We live in perpetual bubbles that are not propped on real assets.

And the food that evil corporations "made so cheap", as I pointed out above comes at the price of terrible suffering. Moreover, most of that cheap "food" is not even edible. It's crap. Most of what you get in normal supermarkets in the US is inedible, un-nutritious, chemically farmed on dead soil with toxic pesticides and herbicides. It is unhealthy "food".

I could go on but there is no point. You are welcome to your Neo-con fantasy, but that is all it is. I hope you wake up from your republican dream.

BY the way, when the bubble busts, and the US Govt. can no longer bail out the capitalists (nice socialist game they have going on there), shit is really going to hit the

fan in the US -- and people who think they way you apparently do won't even see it coming --glued to your fancy tv and junk food.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Namdrol said:

You said "all this financial mess". One assumes you were talking about the meltdown. Not the radioactive steam released before hand.

Enochian said:

yes I was.

And the root cause was poor underwriting, giving mortgages to poor people.

Securitized instruments inherently have no problem.

Housing bubble caused the financial meltdown.

Malcolm wrote:

Securitized instruments inherently have problems when they are composed of valueless crap.

And the root cause was poor underwriting, giving mortgages to poor people, by banks for large, short term profits.

Capitalism is the problem, my friend, and nothing else.

"Free market system" is as much a religious ideology as communism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 8:22 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Enochian said:

You do realize that the housing problem that created all this financial mess came directly from giving mortgages to poor people?

Namdrol said:

No, it came because wall street traders securitized bad loans and good loans bundled together without vetting the loans individually and then gambled on those securities, selling them to pension funds, etc. Makes Madoff look like a prankster in comparison.

Enochian said:

No that caused the financial meltdown. The housing problem that occurred a couple of months before hand was caused by giving mortgages to poor people.

Malcolm wrote:

You said "all this financial mess". One assumes you were talking about the meltdown. Not the radioactive steam released before hand.

Even so, the banks are responsible for this as well. Why? Because the banks were giving employees incentive to make as many loans as possible.

You can point your finger in any direction, and it all winds up back at Wall Street and their lackeys. The GOP is stupid, greedy and callous, and the Democrats are craven, spineless and vapid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Is there a Western medical equivalent to the vayus? In other words, in Western terms, what is it that gathers into the aorta?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no equivalent. However, what gathers is the element of air in the body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

kirtu said:

People can't afford education anymore either.

Kirt

Enochian said:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OwEbO_t30cg "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Socialism is to blame

Malcolm wrote:

Peter Schiff is a wall street crook.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Enochian said:

You do realize that the housing problem that created all this financial mess came directly from giving mortgages to poor people?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it came because wall street traders securitized bad loans and good loans bundled together without vetting the loans individually and then gambled on those securities, selling them to pension funds, etc. Makes Madoff look like a prankster in comparison.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Capitalism, as it exists today, is simply the privatization of fascism.

gregkavarnos said:

I think you are referring to Corporatism, Mussolinis wet dream!

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, this is in fact what Neo-liberalism is.

Franklin D. Roosevelt in an April 29, 1938 message to Congress warned that the growth

of private power could lead to fascism:

"The first truth is that the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than their democratic state itself. That, in its essence, is fascism—ownership of government by an individual, by a group, or by any other controlling private power"

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corporatism> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Pero said:

From Nyingthigs other than Norbu Rinpoche's Longsal I'm mainly interested in Vima Nyingthig because all the root upadesha tantras are there. Is anyone transmitting that in Europe? Preferably without having to have finished ngondro first hehe.

Malcolm wrote:

Khandro Nyinthig is also very interesting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Rael said:

yet Wall Street has no problems with social assistance....lol....but heaven help the poor.

Malcolm wrote:

In American we have socialism for capitalists, but not for ordinary people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: From a Namdrol post: socialism/capitalism

Content:

Enochian said:

I don't care about "global capitalist hegemony" as long as American quality of life is WAY better than socialist/communist countries.

In fact I say thank you global capitalist hegemony for doing a great job!

Actually can't believe Namdrol is defending the Chinese Communist Model, since he knows very well what they still continue to do against Tibetan buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

Global capitalist hegemony brought us mass extinctions and global warming.

It also resulted in Hitler, Stalin and Mao.

Socialism brought forty hour work weeks, emancipation of woman, child labor laws, to a lesser extent the civil rights act. Etc.

Now, socialism /= equal Marxism. Marx was just one among many socialist and anarchist theorists.

I am not a socialist per se. But it is stupid not to recognize that most of the brilliant minds in the western world in the last century came from the left and not the right.

Capitalism, as it exists today, is simply the privatization of fascism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

Enochian said:

What is the TM view of the center channel versus the Hindu view?

Namdrol said:

It is a physical structure in the human body. In general, the central channel can be considered the entire arterial system.

dakini_boi said:

Wow, this is something I have never heard. With this understanding, could you explain what would be meant by gathering the winds into the central channel? And furthermore, what the 2 side channels would be? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

The two "side" channels are the venous system (roma or rasanā) and the spinal column and nervous system (rkyang ma or lalanā).

It means that the vāyus gather in the aorta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

In order to use "is" I just have to know the term "is" and the context it "is" applied. There "is" a direct experience because there "is" a correlated of what "is" called direct experience.

Namdrol said:

So for you there is a correlate of "being" and likewise a correlate of "non-being"

This makes you a substantialist, caught up in the trap of duality.

TMingyur said:

Oh man, time to de-condition yourself ... delete the tenet operating system ... it is compatible with tenets but nothing else.

Try some poetry ... that may loosen your clinging to fixed ideas and projecting those onto words and it may enhance your intuition for the variety of meanings in language.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

I am merely pointing out the contradictions in your statements. I don't have a position.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2011 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sang Chod

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So my lama says that one cannot do sang for others, that others can practice with you but that you cannot do this practice on behalf of another as it draws the source of the others obstacles to you.

Malcolm wrote:

I would not go along with the second part of his belief. But it is true that sang is something you are doing primarily to harmonize the area you are in. You don't do sang for others in the same sense you might do a prayer of twenty one taras.

Of course, in monasteries that make a living selling rituals, anything is possible.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: The value of non-Buddhist literature?

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm working my way through Slavoj Zizek's _The Parallax View_ right now...

Namdrol said:

I like Adorno's Negative Dialectics, not least of all because it exposes the inherent fascism in eternalist thinking.

Jikan said:

One of Adorno's contemporaries, Karel Kosik, put together what may well be the closest position to dependent origination I've seen outside of Buddhist literature in _Dialectics of the Concrete_. It put Kosik in real difficulties with the Soviets though (he was a Czech writer)... so he's not well known at all. (Official philosophy in the Soviet Union at this time was itself eternalist in the sense of being idealistic, reductive, speculative, and constipated.)

There's something inherently anti-authoritarian in anti-eternalist, anti-idealist thinking. Lenin's materialism shows this up too (and he has a sense of humor about it), but at the fault not of nihilism, but of accepting the reality of objects outside the mind. That is: Lenin was too simplistic a materialist in my opinion. Even if objects are reducible to nothingness or their constituents, they're still real objects and not only conventionally. The rationale is that you need an ontology if you want an ethics (actions have to matter) and a politics (some object of public concern).

Following this argument, Zizek assumes that because Buddhists understand objects to be empty, we have no basis for ethics or politics. This is an error in my view. Zizek has a good handle on new-agey stuff, "conscious capitalism" and workplace meditation workshops, but a poor handle on Buddhism proper. (Is it obvious I'm working on a dissertation proposal about this? or rather procrastinating...?)

It seems strange that hundred year old debates in philosophy (Lenin tearing the Ken Wilbers of his day a new one) are relevant again now. Interesting world we inhabit.

Malcolm wrote:

This is due to the fact that all of the economic struggles waged by Socialists that led to the great freedom of thought that flourished in the mid-twentieth century have largely been undermined in the global capitalist hegemony.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: The value of non-Buddhist literature?

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm working my way through Slavoj Zizek's _The Parallax View_ right now...

Malcolm wrote:

I like Adorno's Negative Dialectics, not least of all because it exposes the inherent fascism in eternalist thinking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 6:58 PM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

In order to use "is" I just have to know the term "is" and the context it "is" applied. There "is" a direct experience because there "is" a correlated of what "is" called direct experience.

Malcolm wrote:

So for you there is a correlate of "being" and likewise a correlate of "non-being"

This makes you a substantialist, caught up in the trap of duality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 6:55 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Pero said:

I wish I had the merit to be following Rinpoche at that time already.

Though at 15 years old it's pretty unlikely my parents would let me go abroad alone anyway hehe.

Mariusz said:

Hope ChNN will transmit the cycle of Nyingthik again soon and wish to go there. But H.E. Gangteng Tulku transmit full cycle of Khandro Nyingthik every 5-7 years, also with Thogal. In Poland it started in 2009 and now soon will be second Khorde Rushen but in Taiwan has already started Trekcho retreat. I guess the similar will be with Khandro Rinpoche who invited Kyabje Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche last year to start the cycle of Nyingthik too. Not to mention other masters. Many possibilities

Malcolm wrote:
Of course.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 6:53 PM
Title: Re: Vajra Hell
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Vajra hell is Avici hell.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 7:33 AM
Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen
Content:
Namdrol said:
Short form, in 2006.

Pero said:
That's great but hmm, now I'm not sure if we're thinking the same thing. I meant the formal Gomadevi initiation, it took about 2 hours. I don't know if that's short or long, I thought there was just one way hehe.

Malcolm wrote:
There is also a don dbang. Meaning empowerment.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 7:05 AM
Title: Re: Norbu House & Domo Geshe Rinpoche
Content:
Jikan said:
Curious: a few hours ago I made a comment on the IndieGoGo link for this project that included a link to this DharmaWheel thread. It's since been taken deleted...

Caz said:
No surprise there...People should really investigate her thoroughly.

Tilopa said:
There's no shortage of fake lamas around in this degenerate age.

Malcolm wrote:

There never has been [a shortage of fake lamas], this is why the tantras are full of instructions to about the qualifications of a proper guru, as well as a proper student.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

However, for longde you must attend a longde retreat because there is an indispensable empowerment into the cycle of Ngondzog Gyalpo you must receive to practice longde.

Pero said:

I think that's just for his Longsal Longde. Because recently he taught the essence of Dzogchen sde gsum by Chogyur Lingpa and while there was an essential teaching on the 4 brda of Longde there was no initiation for it.

And he has not done a major cycle of empowerments since 2002 when he gave a long transmission for many cycles of his own termas known as the klong gsal mkha' 'gro snying thig.

I wish I had the merit to be following Rinpoche at that time already.

Though at 15 years old it's pretty unlikely my parents would let me go abroad alone anyway hehe.

BTW, did you receive the Gomadevi Initiation Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

Short form, in 2006.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

Enochian said:

What is the TM view of the center channel versus the Hindu view?

Namdrol said:

It is a physical structure in the human body. In general, the central channel can be considered the entire arterial system.

Enochian said:

What would be the corresponding Western medical term?

Malcolm wrote:

The arterial system, all the arteries in your body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

It is about the validity of terms, not about "existence" or "non-existence" ... you won't understand.

Malcolm wrote:

Terms are valid or invalid solely in relation to their efficiency at communicating concepts to another.

Since I don't have a view of either "existence" or "non-existence", your statement is irrelevant to me. You are the one obsessed with "existence" or "non-existence", not me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

I never had the slightest thought of "existence" or "non-existence" when writing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you did. You have to in order to use the verb "is" or as in "I never had the slightest thought" indicating that as you write, you have a thought of "existence" and "non-existence". Also when you write "but there is a direct experience..."

Having a thought of "is" or "is not" is requirement for using any form of the verb "to be".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Naturally occurring

Content:

TMingyur said:

Kalama sutra says: Own experience has to validate what "the wise" say. No validity per se.

Malcolm wrote:

Have you validated what the Buddha was taught?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: What is the TM view of the center channel?

Content:

Enochian said:

What is the TM view of the center channel versus the Hindu view?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a physical structure in the human body. In general, the central channel can be considered the entire arterial system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

Firstly you really have a splendid fantasy, secondly you obviously do read your own mind but not what I have written.

I did not say that nirvana can be directly perceived. What I did say is that there is a correlate of this term "nirvana" in direct experience which is nothing other than cessation of attachment or obscurations.

Kind regards

Namdrol said:

There is no such thing as an experience of a cessation.

N

TMingyur said:

You are right, a cessation qua cessation is not experienced but there is a direct experience that correlates with the term "cessation".

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is not. There is no direct experience that correlates with term "cessation". Why? Because a correlate of the term "cessation" would be completely unreal. There is no correlate to the term "cessation". When there is cessation or to use your clumsy terminology, the correlate of a cessation, there is not even a non-existence which can be predicated of that correlate of a so called cessation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Naturally occurring

Content:

TMingyur said:

Still this is only one of three pramanas.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you accept that testimony is a pramana, as you stated below:

Namdrol said:

Materialist views have begun to make inroads into Buddhism; for example insisting that direct perception alone is valid. You seem to follow the latter line of thinking.

Huh?

I follow the buddha who says that experience is decisive.

Malcolm wrote:

And whose experience? An ordinary deluded persons experience? Is the direct perception of ordinary persons to be trusted? Knowing that you possess the three afflictions, how certain are you that your direct perceptions are to be trusted, since you never experience them directly. All direct perceptions are non-conceptual, uninterpreted; all so called "experience" is conceptual, interpreted. In order for a direct perception to be experienced there must be a reflexive awareness capable of recognizing that direct perception and framing it as an experience, for example, pleasant, unpleasant, neutral and so on. Why? Because direct perceptions are not self-reflexive. They are not aware that they are cognitions. We can know this because we have direct perceptions of many things in our visual field, for example, which we do not notice. We either process them out or cannot recognize them. Thus they are not part of our "experience". Experience is conceptual. And for ordinary persons, afflicted. So I would hesitate before declaring that the Buddha claims experience is decisive. Decisive for whom is the question. Experience is certainly not decisive for ordinary persons. If it were, then there would be no need for a path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Articles to read, Living out loud, vs a Rigid Spirituality.

Content:

ZenLem said:

Hey guys, just some spiritual issues, basically the first article argues for not adhering to strict spiritual practice, while the second sort of pokes holes in that as missing the point

Cultivating a sloppy spirituality

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/meimei-fox/the-life-out-loud-where-s_b_844670.html "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The response

<http://www.infinitemile.org/2011/04/cultivating-a-sloppy-spirituality/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Personally, it sounds like a middle way issue. I personally know the difference between enjoyment and addiction, or at least I hope I do. Anyway, something to chew on.

Malcolm wrote:

They both miss the point completely and neither of them are buddhists.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2011 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Does Chögyal Namkhai Norbu also transmit the complete cycle of Dzogchen initiations, up to Thogal, during several days, like other Dzogchen masters? As for example several days of initiations of Künzang Gongpa Zangthal by Kyabje Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche or Künzang Gongpa Kundu by H.E. Gangteng Tulku Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

Norbu Rinpoche always teaches the essence of the three series.

However, for longde you must attend a longde retreat because there is an indispensable empowerment into the cycle of Ngondzog Gyalpo you must receive to practice longde. He has taught longde many times, and according to him it is sufficient for total liberation.

He almost never transmits teachings like thogal and yangti, though he has given the lungs for these practices any number of times with the proviso that he is not teaching thogal or yangti.

And he has not done a major cycle of empowerments since 2002 when he gave a long transmission for many cycles of his own termas known as the klong gsal mkha' 'gro

snying thig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Naturally occurring

Content:

Namdrol said:

I know of no Buddhist school that rejects this third pramana.

TMingyur said:

If you refer to Buddha Shakyamuni exclusively then you may be right. However since there is no tape recording and not all scriptures are generally accepted or interpreted the same way. Considering this this pramana is not worth much.

But then you also have to add that the other two pramanas are not necessarily accepted by all schools in addition to that one as equally valid

So it again boils down to one of many conventions being accepted or not.

kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

This sutta is shared by all canons of early buddhists.

You misunderstood -- all Buddhist schools accept three pramanas. They may disagree about what texts can be considered Buddhavacana, but they all accept sutras as authorities.

There are certain Buddhists, who recognizing that non-Buddhists will not accept vacana as authorities try to prove the buddha is authority through direct perception and inference so that they will accept vacana as an authority. These scholars themselves accept vacana as an authority.

The third category are the non-Buddhist lokayatis, materialists. Materialist views have begun to make inroads into Buddhism; for example insisting that direct perception alone is valid. You seem to follow the latter line of thinking.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2011 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

Firstly you really have a splendid fantasy, secondly you obviously do read your own mind

but not what I have written.

I did not say that nirvana can be directly perceived. What I did say is that there is a correlate of this term "nirvana" in direct experience which is nothing other than cessation of attachment or obscurations.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as an experience of a cessation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2011 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Naturally occurring

Content:

TMingyur said:

Listen "there are ... in buddhism ..." is invalid phrasing.

Kind regards

Namdrol said:

Don't be silly.

TMingyur said:

There is a variety of views within buddhism. You know that.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

That the testimony of reliable witnesses is accepted even in the Pali Canon can be ascertained in the Pubbakotthaka Sutta.

I know of no Buddhist school that rejects this third pramana.

Further, of the two remaining pramanas, only materialists reject inference as pramana.

Sadly, there is a disturbing and pernicious trend in modern Buddhism which is taking a crypto-materialist approach by abandoning inference and testimony as pramanas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2011 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

Language necessarily implies fabrication. However within language there are terms that correspond to direct experience and there are terms that do not correspond at all.

Namdrol said:

Then it follows, that you, TMingyur, can and should never discuss nirvana, liberation, cessation and detachment, since these cannot serve as an objects of direct perception.

N

TMingyur said:

"cannot serve as an objects of direct perception" may be correct in meaning.

However "cessation (of attachment, of obscurations)" (i.e. what is called "nirvana") has a correlate in direct experience, i.e. there is a direct experience that corresponds to the term.

Malcolm wrote:

That's the whole point, TMingyur, nirvana cannot be directly perceived, it also cannot be directly experienced (direct perception = direct experience). However, those who have an eternalist view of Nirvana, like the Theravadins and the Sarvastivadins, may assert the opposite.

So now we have discovered that not only are you a substantialist, you are also an eternalist.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2011 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Naturally occurring

Content:

TMingyur said:

And one may agree to "testimony of reliable witnesses" being valid cognition or not and the question also is "what is a "reliable witness"?" and "is scripture the same? "

Malcolm wrote:

If you accept a given text represents the words of the Buddha, then you may accept it as an authority.

Of course, this only functions for Buddhists. Non-Buddhists will never regard Buddhist texts as authorities.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2011 at 8:56 PM
Title: Re: Naturally occurring
Content:

TMingyur said:
Listen "there are ... in buddhism ..." is invalid phrasing.
Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:
Don't be silly.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2011 at 8:32 PM
Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness
Content:
TMingyur said:
Language necessarily implies fabrication. However within language there are terms that correspond to direct experience and there are terms that do not correspond at all.

Malcolm wrote:
Then it follows, that you, TMingyur, can and should never discuss nirvana, liberation, cessation and detachment, since these cannot serve as an objects of direct perception.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2011 at 8:29 PM
Title: Re: Naturally occurring
Content:

TMingyur said:
However if you define valid cognition in a way that includes knowledge of scripture then you can argue that because scripture says so you practice and foster compassion.

Malcolm wrote:
There are three pramanas (authorities aka valid cognitions) in Buddhism: direct perception of a non-defective sense organ; inference based on such direct perceptions; testimony of reliable witnesses, such as āryas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2011 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

Namdrol said:

You should not have that much trouble finding someone to help you, depending on where you live.

Mariusz said:

When tibetan masters are teaching openly or private dzogchen or tantra in tibetan and it is translated for westerners, do you often notice something important is lost in translation? It is possible to completely practice dzogchen and tantra in english?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and yes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2011 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: So I talked to my teacher about leaving the Zendo.

Content:

ZenLem said:

Or am I just suppose to shut up and keep sitting?

Chaz said:

That's never a bad idea.

If you feel that it's time to move on, move on.

Nangwa said:

In this context its a very bad idea.

ZenLem needs a teacher who will actually guide him, speak to him plainly, and help him progress on the path.

"Just sitting" without these things will just lead to further frustration in my opinion.

This "just sit down and shut up" business is really weird if you ask me.

Malcolm wrote:

I like Aleister Crowley's meditation instruction he gave once to someone on a transatlantic voyage: "Sit down, shut up, and get out."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2011 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

Namdrol said:

I can assist people who already have basic Tibetan if they have questions. But to learn grammar and so on, you really need an in person instructor. You can try to learn Tibetan through Shang Shung, or a university.

N

Mariusz said:

I don't know the basic, but thank you to be willing to help me if I would know.

Malcolm wrote:

You should not have that much trouble finding someone to help you, depending on where you live.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2011 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

Namdrol said:

Well, from a Vajrayāna perspective it is more subtle than that i.e. mind and body have the same relation as a flower and its scent. They are inseparable; without one, there is not the other.

The mind/body dualism is a sutrayāna thing.

In Vajrayāna mind (མིམས) and the vāyu (རླུང) are completely inseparable. In the teaching of Dzogpachenpo, not only are they inseparable, but Guru Rinpoche remarks to Yeshe Tsogyal that mind and vāyu are synonymous with one another. You can discover this by reading the མཁའ་འགྲོ་ལྷིང་ཐེག་རྒྱུ་ཚེས་.

N

Mariusz said:

Excuse me for offtopic.

Namdrol, can you teach us tibetan via internet, mails or skype, to study tibetan texts, for basic talking and so on?

Malcolm wrote:

I can assist people who already have basic Tibetan if they have questions. But to learn grammar and so on, you really need an in person instructor. You can try to learn Tibetan through Shang Shung, or a university.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2011 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

conebeckham said:

TMingyur wishes to avoid "Dharma Language" or the conventional vocabulary in use (here and elsewhere) when discussing the Dharma, because he feels that such language all-too-easily allows for reification.

TMingyur said:

No. It is about language, terms and terminology, manifesting mere fabrication or not.

However if one assumes that mere fabrication is liberating then it may appear appropriate.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Your use of language has no less danger of manifesting "fabrications" than any other. Your theory of "correlates" does not save you from this.

You're just busy reinventing the wheel.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2011 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

That is another absolutist argument: To claim that oneself possesses authority of some "convention" while simply ignoring the variety of contexts conventional language can be applied and the impermanence of meanings.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Tmingyur: if you want to talk Italians, speak Italian. If you want to talk to Russians, speak Russian. If you want to talk to Thervadins, use their dharma terminology. If you have to speak to Mahāyānists, use their terminology.

Otherwise, you meet with little success in your attempt to corral others into understanding your point of view. People don't have the time, generally, to deal with each and every person's private linguistic hell.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2011 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Tib.meds take on plantar warts

Content:

Adamantine said:

So then should I assume that Tibetan Medicine has no theory of nor treatment for warts?

Malcolm wrote:

We burn them out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2011 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

but you seem to insist on one generally valid context containing all other contexts. A sort of "absolutist" perspective often coinciding with the belief in some thought "absolute".

having conversation with you is not un-complicated but worthwhile nevertheless and good practice.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

There is conventional language, and private language.

You prefer the latter, I prefer the former. It makes it easier to get across to people what

they need to understand for their liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2011 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

Language is not cumbersome but a means to express "aspects" or different perspectives.

Malcolm wrote:

Your use of language is cumbersome and unnecessarily conceptually reified.

TMingyur said:

Obviously you are seeing "more" in language than just this.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I see language as an interference, and find your language use to more interfering than normal. Language is inherently conceptual.

TMingyur said:

Your conclusions are not valid since you are presupposing the intent of my words to be what you are deciding at will.

Malcolm wrote:

My conclusion is valid, since they suppose the evidence of what you have said.

TMingyur said:

You are actually insisting on your idea of reified "conditioned."

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am insisting that in common discourse there are accepted definitions of terms. If you try to redefine "conditioned" to mean something other than what people commonly understand, then you are only talking to yourself.

I conclude therefore, that you are not actually having conversations with people, but are merely engaged in a self-involved dialogue with yourself.

Oh, the misunderstood genius, Tmingyur.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Vajrayana vs Theravada

Content:

Huseng said:

My guru cautions his students that Buddhahood in a single lifetime, while possible, is unlikely for most of us.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence, Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

You are wrong in that if the correlate of what is called "cessation" would not be caused then it would be manifest in the first place.

Malcolm wrote:

The consequence of your assertion is that the putative correlate of a "cessation" is conditioned, and therefore impermanent. Therefore, the correlate of "nirvana" would be conditioned and impermanent. Thus you are in contradiction with the Buddha's teaching that the correlate of the term "nirvana" is unconditioned and permanent. Since the putative correlate of a "cessation" ceases due to an absence of a cause, the correlate of a "cessation" cannot be predicated until such putative correlates of a "cause" are no longer present.

This use of language is cumbersome.

In plainer language, since you assert that a cessation is caused, cessations as a consequence would be conditioned. The negative consequence that you have to accept is that nirvana would be conditioned.

Accept the three wheels. Anything that arises from a cause is a conditioned dharma. If you assert that cessations are caused, you are asserting they are conditioned.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Strengthening Energy Channels

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Gentle persons:

Diagnosis and treatment of spirit possession or attacks are actually an integral part of Tibetan Medicine. According to both Tibetan Medicine there are four main causes of disease: diet, behavior, season and spirits.

While I understand your wish to help and mantra healing is an important part of treating such diseases -- such diseases need to be diagnosed properly. Not just any mantra will necessarily work.

I can understand that some people wish to take psychological perspective about spirits, but this is not the view of Tibetan Medicine or Tibetan Buddhism in general. Giving people advice from Chö teachings is not really suitable and possibly dangerous since it can cause people to ignore dangerous symptoms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Strengthening Energy Channels

Content:

deff said:

my teacher is Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche... though I'm fairly new with him, I'm enrolled in his 10-year north american dharma gar. I sent an email to him about this situation through the dharma gar coordinator but I haven't heard back yet.

we're doing ngondro practice right now, but I've heard that when we get to yidam practice it might be Hayagriva which would be great

what's a wind/pacifying diet exactly? also, do you just burn gugul in bulk like incense?

I would ask Lama Dawa about the class of spirit, but I'm out of work and broke right now, so that'll have to wait unfortunately.

thanks for the help namdrol!

Malcolm wrote:

You need to see an Ayurvedic practitioner or a Tibetan doctor.

Yes, you burn gugul in your house. This can help dispell spirits.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

Well then ... I wonder what is so attractive about all these tenets about and around "emptiness" which are mere "intellect & ideas".

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

There are no tenets around emptiness. Emptiness is not a view. It is the antidote to views, the antidote to tenets.

Views are only "asti" and "nasti" i.e. "is", or "isn't".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

I have never been talking about "my ideas".

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Your ideation is all you have talking been about all along.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 6:57 AM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Right, but this chapter three of the Kosha, and we know that the kosha's cosmology cannot be taken literally as written.

Astus said:

Yes, that's my point too, that we can't take traditional view literally. So the question, what is it that we can accept?

Malcolm wrote:

Meditative experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

Enochian said:

One cannot achieve Buddhahood on physical earth using Vajrayana?

I am confused

Malcolm wrote:

According to general Vajrayāna teachings, Buddhahood, still occurs in Akanistha via a mental body.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Astus said:

A being cannot see those who live in a higher realm except by magic or other aid, says the Kosha in reference to gods of different heavens. This is actually the answer for not being able to see them normally.

But my question touches upon the issue of the relationship between cosmology and theology (god-lore). As we have a different view of the world where can we position the beings of other realms?

As for the literal nature of the teachings on the realms of gods, in vol. 2 p. 463-464 of the Kosha, Vasubandhu discusses at length the spread of the fragrance of the flowers of a certain magnolia tree situated in the world of the Thirty-Three Gods.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but this chapter three of the Kosha, and we know that the kosha's cosmology cannot be taken literally as written.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Astus said:

A being cannot see those who live in a higher realm except by magic or other aid, says the Kosha in reference to gods of different heavens. This is actually the answer for not being able to see them normally.

But my question touches upon the issue of the relationship between cosmology and theology (god-lore). As we have a different view of the world where can we position the beings of other realms?

As for the literal nature of the teachings on the realms of gods, in vol. 2 p. 463-464 of the Kosha, Vasubandhu discusses at length the spread of the fragrance of the flowers of a certain magnolia tree situated in the world of the Thirty-Three Gods.

Malcolm wrote:

The Kosha says that someone who is in dhyana can see the beings belonging to the equivalent realm because their organ of sense has been subtly transformed by dhyana. See the discussion at verse 1:45c-d.

I.e. their body can belong to the kamadhātu, but their organ of sight can belong for example, to the first dhyāna, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

maestro said:

The body of light aka rainbow body is simply the body reverting back to the five lights of wisdom. The sign of this is that at death the body shrinks to a very small size.

Probably a dumb question. I don't know much about Vajrayana. Once rainbow body is achieved does it revert back to human form if it decides to? Not out of Bodhisattva compassion but just a natural process of being of created from the five wisdom lights and then reverting back and forth.

Malcolm wrote:

Since you are realizing the nature of your own wisdom, your body, externally, won't

change at all. But your inner experience will be completely transformed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

TMingyur said:

"Entrance" is a metaphor because it is not like "to enter a room", i.e. first being "outside" and then - having passed the entrance - one is in the room. It is not like this. "Entrance" is the collection of causes and conditions that lead to cessation of past, cessation of future and cessation of present.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

This is one root of your various misunderstandings. Cessations cannot be caused nor conditions. Causes and conditions do not lead to cessations, they only lead to further causes and conditions. A cessation is the absence of causes and conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: Strengthening Energy Channels

Content:

deff said:

Hi,

I've been possessed by a spirit(s) for the past 16 months, which has made my life and specifically my meditation practice quite difficult. I had a mirror divination done by my Lama Dawa when it first started and was told:

Question: I feel there is a demon or entity harming my life and my practice. It frequently deludes me and seems to possess me. Is this a real entity, and if so, what type of entity?

Answer: Your energy channels are very weak, which allows for different spirits to possess you. In particular you are being affected by a spirit named 'Batarey Pandey'.

In a later question he told me wearing a Hayagriva amulet should repel him, so I tried this, but to no avail. So then I decided I should try and strengthen my energy channels to prevent possession altogether, but I'm not sure how this might be accomplished. Is there any link between diet/behaviour and energy channel strength perhaps? Or maybe would hatha yoga or something similar be effective? Any help is greatly appreciated, thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

You probably have a wind disorder. You should try a wind/pacifying diet. Regularly burn

gugul. You should practice something like Hayagriva, Guru Dragpo, or Vajrakilaya. You should find out from Lama Dawa what class of spirit Batarey Pandey belongs to (i.e. gyal po, tsan, etc).

Who is your teacher?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Nangwa said:

If not ideas, what?

If not yours, whose?

TMingyur said:

Just that:

"What is the All? Simply the eye & forms, ear & sounds, nose & aromas, tongue & flavors, body & tactile sensations, intellect & ideas. This, monks, is called the All. [1] Anyone who would say, 'Repudiating this All, I will describe another,' if questioned on what exactly might be the grounds for his statement, would be unable to explain, and furthermore, would be put to grief. Why? Because it lies beyond range."

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn35/sn35.023.than.html> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Kind regards

Nangwa said:

The same quote again, that everyone knows and nobody disputes.

Talk about clinging. You're drowning in it.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you know that TMingyur is a one trick pony, a substantialist one at that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

TMingyur has world split into, shall we say "represands" and "representations". He feels for every valid representation there must be an truly existent represand, otherwise, that representation is invalid. It is a very substantialist view.

He rejects madhyamaka because Madhyamaka renders all representations invalid since there are not actual represands, only conventional represands.

N

TMingyur said:

You are totally conditioned by your learned thinking. That is the effect of philosophy.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a philosopher. I don't have any views. But it is interesting to see how yours are exposed at every turn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

Therefore it is better to stay in the conventional sphere of the aggregates: perception, consciousness, feeling

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

but you don't.

There is a Dharma language used for discussing Dharma. It is very precise. I suggest you learn it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not, I did not misread you.

Bodhisattvas are not arhats in any sense until they become Buddhas.

LastLegend said:

Ok you are talking about 10 titles of Buddha. Then yes. But I was not talking about the title of Arhat as in Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahayana, bodhisattvas are not arhats, not even remotely. They only become arhats when they achieve full awakening.

Stages 1-6 are the stages of stream entry. Stage 7 is a once returner. Stages 8-10 are never returners. Stage 11 is full buddhahood. There are no arhats in this scheme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

conebeckham said:

TMINGYUR-

Is your "Correlate" what I would call the "mental image" of the direct perception by the sense faculty and consciousness?

In other words, the image that exists in the mental consciousness? Do you understand my question?

TMingyur said:

Don't know if I understand your question.

"correlate" is a "stirring".

The term "mental image" feels like there already being some sort of "intuitive" (re-)cognition which is kind of "subtle" fabricating thought and is somewhere "in between" this "stirring" and full-fledged thought.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Part of the problem here, TMingyur is that you are using this invented made up Dharma language. So largely, people have to spend a lot of time trying to figure out what the hell you're actually saying, apart from your standard retort about clinging. You would be out of your mind at a dinner party.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:

what's a repesands...

Malcolm wrote:

It is a word I made up for the object of a representation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Good old allergies

Content:

Jikan said:

Interesting.

I get seasonal allergies if I'm in a part of the world that is new to me (contains pollen I'm not particularly accustomed to). I grew up in Oregon, where there's no ragweed, and conifer trees overwhelmingly outnumber elms. Here in Virginia, my face is definitely swollen and drippy. Each year is less troublesome, though.

Does this phenomenon of becoming acclimated to an allergen over time and exposure sound reasonable from a Tibetan Medicine POV, or is there something else going on?

PS: I find it helpful to eat local honey as well, but this may be my way of justifying a sweet tooth to myself

Malcolm wrote:

No, eating local honey is one of the best ways to acclimatize your body to allergens.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Good old allergies

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Behavior such as ?

Malcolm wrote:

(Diet) and Behavior in your case that causes your digestive fire to be weak. Could be behavior for many years running. Being around industrial pollutants, tainted water, etc. Most people who have allergies are from the city. I personally think chlorinated water has a lot to do with it, these days.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Astus said:

This is also a question because gods below the formless realm have some kind of physical body thus they're supposed to be somewhere. But where is it?

Huseng said:

Deva are said to be shining ones or beings of light. One might imagine their physical bodies are composed of light.

Some adepts claim to be able to see them.

One senior monk I spoke to India visited a mountain and in his meditation he said he sensed them. He described them as goddesses who long ago had been present at the Buddha's teachings and being in their presence was an indescribable joy.

I don't think you'll find much more of an answer than that. You cannot go out into the mountains with a camera and hope to snap a photo of a deva.

Malcolm wrote:

Their bodies are composed of light.

Achieving the ability to see devas is a result of change in the optical nerves, etc., under the influence of dhayna, etc. This is not a path phenomena, but a mundane phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

Nangwa said:

Kind of mixing threads here but I found this conversation from the "Yidam and Dzogchen" thread to be really fascinating and I think it is relevant here.

Namdrol, in that thread you made this post:

"It is because buddhahood of lower yānas is incomplete and does not reach the stage of ka dag chen po, great original purity. The simplest way to explain it is that after the this universe dissolves and the next one arises, those beings who have not achieved the stage of ka dag chen po start all over."

Now, are both abhisambodhi and samyaksambodhi at the stage of kadag chenpo? And also, since the primordial wisdoms, elements etc. are present in every sentient being and are fully integrated at this stage, how does one who attains this stage escape returning to samsara when this universe dissolves and a new one comes into being? Is it

simply that kadag chenpo is beyond any and all implications of a "universe"?
thanks for any more details you can provide on this.

Malcolm wrote:
Only samyak.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 15th, 2011 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception
Content:

LastLegend said:
What is your idea about what an Arhat is?

Namdrol said:
Arhats are those who have eradicated all afflictive obscurations, have not necessarily gather the merit and wisdom accumulations needed for full buddhahood.

Bodhisattvas are not arhats until they become full buddhas i.e.tathāgatas, arhats, samyaksambuddhas. And they do not eradicate all afflictive obscurations until the end of the 7th bhumi.

N

LastLegend said:
You misread me.
Bodhisattvas are not Arhats but Arhats with vows to help others are Bodhisattvas.

Malcolm wrote:
Not, I did not misread you.

Bodhisattvas are not arhats in any sense until they become Buddhas.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 11:29 PM
Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception
Content:

Namdrol said:
The body of light aka rainbow body is simply the body reverting back to the five lights of wisdom. The sign of this is that at death the body shrinks to a very small size.

Nangwa said:

Hey Namdrol,

There are varying degrees of this are there not?

I cant really remember without looking it up (and I wouldnt post anything from it publicly anyways) but if I remember correctly at least one version of complete attainment in the Yeshe Lama leaves no trace. Maybe hair and nails or something.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen describes two states of final Buddhahood: abhisambodhi and samyaksambodhi. The former is with residue, the latter without residue. The latter turns Mahāyāna buddhology on its head again, by asserting there is an abiding Buddhahood as opposed to the common Mahāyāna ideal of non-abiding Buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

According to Vajrayana, no one has ever achieved Buddhahood any place on Earth or any place else, nor will they ever. If one is to say it's attained anywhere, it's Akanistha.

Enochian said:

Now this is an embarrassingly wrong statement

Maybe he meant sutrayana

Malcolm wrote:

No, Indian Vajrayāna more or less follows sutra in terms of basic Buddhology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

Enochian said:

Namdrol,

You agree with the part where he said "So far there is no human who has become Buddha on Earth"???

Or are you simply saying that is the view of sutrayana?

Namdrol said:

I am saying this is the view of sutrayāna cf. Lanka-avatara sutra, to paraphrase "The real Buddha attains full awakening in Akanistha, an emanated one attains Buddhahood here".

Enochian said:

Gotcha. We are on the same train of thinking now.

This is sort of the entire point of the thread, that common sutra Mahayanists can't achieve Buddhahood on physical earth according to their own teachings.

Thanks for confirming

Malcolm wrote:

Not true of Dzogchen, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Astus said:

I'd say that there is no Mt. Meru on Earth because none can fit the description. It makes little difference if we identify any ordinary mountain as the "real Meru" since there are no terraces on it where gods live their lives, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Not that many Indians in the old days every trekked to Meru. For them it was a distant mountain, seen from the plains of India. easy to imagine terraces.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Astus said:

I'd say that there is no Mt. Meru on Earth because none can fit the description. It makes little difference if we identify any ordinary mountain as the "real Meru" since there are no terraces on it where gods live their lives, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you would be wrong. You are being to literal.

For example in the Mahabharata, it is regularly described as a place where, for example, Arjuna can picnic, etc.

And for example, the Uttarakurus live to the north of Meru. Ptolemy mentions a people called the Kurus that live to the north of the region of Afghanistan.

So it is pretty certain, I would say. Ancient Indo--Aryans always selected an Axial mountain to center their cosmology around. There is a mountain in Iran that is described in similar terms to Meru, four rivers coming from it in the four directions, etc etc.

These myths always have a basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

LastLegend said:

What is your idea about what an Arhat is?

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats are those who have eradicated all afflictive obscurations, have not necessarily gather the merit and wisdom accumulations needed for full buddhahood.

Bodhisattvas are not arhats until they become full buddhas i.e.tathāgatas, arhats, samyaksambuddhas. And they do not eradicate all afflictive obscurations until the end of the 7th bhumi.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

Enochian said:

Namdrol,

You agree with the part where he said "So far there is no human who has become Buddha on Earth"???

Or are you simply saying that is the view of sutrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying this is the view of sutrayāna cf. Lanka-avatara sutra, to paraphrase "The

real Buddha attains full awakening in Akanistha, an emanated one attains Buddhahood here".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Astus said:

Well, it doesn't look like thousands of yojanas high and there are no surrounding mountains of different metals plus the inner oceans, etc. So it is mount Meru in name only.

Being all metaphorical, well, no, I don't think it was all intended as a big over-complicated metaphor. And metaphor for what?

Malcolm wrote:

No, Kailash is Meru. Geography mythologized until it was not very recognizable in comparison with landscape features.

The inner oceans are not oceans, they are lakes and rivers.

Meru in traditional maps is surrounded by a box like shape of mountains. That certainly describes the Tibetan plateau in general.

Ptolomey, for example mentions the Uttarakurus.

So we can understand that Meru and four continents is a mythologized understanding of terrestrial geography and that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Where are the Gods?

Content:

Astus said:

Traditionally it is described that gods live on mount Meru and above in the sky. There are actual distances given and so on. But where are the gods now that we have no mount Meru and even the sky ends at one point and there is just empty space left? This is also a question because gods below the formless realm have some kind of physical body thus they're supposed to be somewhere. But where is it?

Malcolm wrote:

We have a Mt. Meru -- it is Kailash.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

LastLegend said:

So far there is no human who has become Buddha on Earth. In other words, what human can achieve is Arhat (level of attainment) and an Arhat with vows to help other sentient beings is known as a Bodhisattva, and this Bodhisattva will continue the work to become Buddha.

Enochian said:

This is 100% wrong. You are greatly confused. Or maybe you should indicate these are your own personal heretical views.

Malcolm wrote:

This is one hundred percent a standard Mahāyāna view, apart from the confusion about what an arhat is.

I must say though, at this point people need to start giving citations. Otherwise it is just an opinion fest.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body Misconception

Content:

heart said:

I think there are all kinds of misconceptions going on in this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

heart said:

It is only a problem if you are a Dzogchen practitioner and I know a few of those that also doubt in the rainbow body.

Malcolm wrote:

The body of light aka rainbow body is simply the body reverting back to the five lights of wisdom. The sign of this is that at death the body shrinks to a very small size.

heart said:

I think we all have to realize that the schedule of the nine yanas with Ati-yoga as the highest and fastest teaching will not be accepted by all Buddhists and to try to convince them of this is just ridiculous and also lacks merit.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, though it is ok to mention that this is what we think. Some people instantly become interested, other people are indifferent. We think that people who become interested in Dzogchen have very fortunate karma as opposed to those who are disinterested in it. But it is not our job to condition others.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

conebeckham said:

TMINGYUR-

Is your "Correlate" what I would call the "mental image" of the direct perception by the sense faculty and consciousness?

In other words, the image that exists in the mental consciousness? Do you understand my question?

Nangwa said:

Maybe Tmingyur is using "correlate" in the sense of pramana or valid cognition.

Malcolm wrote:

Direct perceptions do not cling. There is no clinging in sparsha, contact. Clinging arises following the second order cognition which we call craving; which itself follows sensation i.e. when a direct perception registers as pleasant, unpleasant or neutral to the manas.

This makes it impossible for clinging to ever be a direct perception or experience. There is no correlate to clinging, clinging is just clinging.

TMingyur has world split into, shall we say "represands" and "representations". He feels for every valid representation there must be an truly existent represand, otherwise, that representation is invalid. It is a very substantialist view.

He rejects madhyamaka because Madhyamaka renders all representations invalid since there are not actual represands, only conventional represands.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Direct perceptions are non-conceptual i.e. apriori to mental images.

This is as I understood, thanks.

Clinging does not occur until after the unmediated "image" becomes a "mental image," I think...correct?

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

If this were possible we would be able to break the chain of dependent origination at the point of contact (phassa), but according to D.O. craving gives rise to contact (via feeling) so basically we have a mental effect before the contact, ie contact itself is an outcome of mind. I guess that makes direct perception out of the question.

This (if it is correct) gives rise to another question: without ignorance there is no perception?

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry greg, you have your nidanas backward -- it is contact --> sensation --> craving --> clinging -- becoming -- etc.

We can break DO at sparsha. We can break it at any point. It is easiest however to break it at vedana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Namdrol-

Aggregates involved in "direct perception" would depend on what is being perceived, yes?

So, for example, a direct perception of form would involve the eye consciousness. But this is immediately followed by the "image" in the Mental consciousness, and any "thinking" or "cognition" involving the form is based on the "image" in the mental consciousness, and not on the direct perception of the eye consciousness...in fact, I don't know that we can claim to have a direct perception of form by the eye consciousness prior to that perception being "registered" by the Mental consciousness?

(Edited for clarity)--

Malcolm wrote:

,

Direct perceptions are non-conceptual i.e. apriori to mental images.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Clinging, upadāna, is not a direct experience. It is a mediated experience. With what is it mediated? imputations of identity.

TMingyur said:

It is not, yes. But a correlate of it can be directly experienced. Actually not only "can" but this correlate has to be directly experienced before a labelling thought can arise.

Malcolm wrote:

Your assertion was that clinging can be directly experienced, now you are claiming a correlate of it can be experienced. What correlate, does it have a name?

If not, you are spinning fantasies.

Namdrol said:

In direct experience there is no identity. "Identity" is a fabrication following in the wake of attachment.

Then there can be no direct experience of clinging, since clinging depends, like all afflictive states, on a mistaken perception of identity.

A directly experienced correlate that can develop (but not necessarily does) into the labelling thought.

Malcolm wrote:

I understand this is your theory, but it finds no support in the teaching of the Buddha.

Namdrol said:

Therefore, your contention that clinging can be directly experienced or is a direct experience is completely negated.

Not so. The effect is characterized (i.e. labelled) as its cause.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, you are refuted on two counts. One) for fabricating correlates where none are necessary. Two) for asserting that clinging is a direct perception.

There is no correlate needed for clinging. This like imagining that motion needs a mover.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

A synonym for "direct perception", i.e. "perception perceives" ... without fabricating synthesizing thought.

Namdrol said:

Which aggregates are involved in a direct perception?

TMingyur said:

Invalid question.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a perfectly valid question. If you refuse to answer it means you do not know.

TMingyur said:

No. You are confusing our talking and applying terms with direct experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Clinging, upadāna, is not a direct experience. It is a mediated experience. With what is it mediated? imputations of identity.

TMingyur said:

In direct experience there is no identity. "Identity" is a fabrication following in the wake of attachment.

Malcolm wrote:

Then there can be no direct experience of clinging, since clinging depends, like all afflictive states, on a mistaken perception of identity.

Therefore, your contention that clinging can be directly experienced or is a direct experience is completely negated.

Next.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Is the Lotus Sutra just fiction

Content:

Rael said:

Namdrol...you have my attention and respect...

i implore you to tell me.

what you think the LS really is

who do you think wrote the thing....

Malcolm wrote:

It was first translated into Chinese between 265-317 CE. Generally it is assumed that Sutras predate their Chinese translation by fifty to one hundred years. But since this sutra is early in the Chinese canon, it could have been composed as much as 400 years before its transmission to China. Broadest range the Saddharmapundarika could have been composed in would be in the range of 100 BCE to 150-200 CE. Since it was one of the earliest sutras translated into Chinese, these indicates its importance to early Mahāyānists. As it stands, it was not composed all at once and comprises several layers.

As to its origin, it is fair to say that it is an inspired vision.

Rael said:

and where did Medicine Buddha originate....

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we have the Lotus Sutra, the Medicine Buddha Sutra, and the presence of Medicine Buddha's dharani in the fifth century Buddhist Ayurvedic text, Aṣṭāṅgahridayasamhita.

Again, its author is anonymous and its origin is inspired. As a doctor of Tibetan Medicine, I practice Medicine Buddha everyday.

Rael said:

Dzogchen eh...so you are Nyingma then...i believe this is exclusive to them...yes /no....

or you were

Malcolm wrote:

I am a Dzogchen practitioner, I don't feel like I belong to any school. I had a lot of training in Sakya. But I don't feel connected with any one school more than any other school. Instead I feel connected with the Dzogchen teachings more than any particular school. If you have to give me a tradition, Tibetan Medicine has an independent tradition of practice that only doctors undertake. It is also connected with Dzogchen. I guess technically you could say I am a Nyingmapa, but I don't feel like I really belong to this school or that school. I am a Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Remember when...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...teachers, public employees, Planned Parenthood, NPR and PBS crashed the stock market, wiped out half of our 401Ks, took trillions in TARP money, spilled oil in the Gulf of Mexico, gave themselves billions in bonuses, and paid no taxes?

Yeah, me neither.

(If you're inclined to agree, re-post, please.)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2011 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Corrupt government and taxes.

Content:

Namdrol said:

So the only hope for you, Jeff, is to become a Dzogchen practitioner and leave this Sahaloka either in this life, at the time of death or in the bardo. That is the fastest, most effective way to become an expatriate from samsara.

N

Huseng said:

Is not Vajrayana or Chan sufficient for such purposes?

Malcolm wrote:

Not as fast or direct, in my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Corrupt government and taxes.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Correct, if you cannot in good conscience continue to live in your nation, then you must either change it or leave. For example, Nazi Germany caused almost everyone to become evil. But no one knew it at first.

But still, you need to understand the previous post. For example, all the money we are using for Afghanistan, Iraq, etc., is money borrowed.

The other thing you have to keep in mind is that one cannot fix samsara.

N

Huseng said:

Are not the tax payers eventually held to pay the bill for the borrowed money?

I mean many nations are still paying off the war debt from WWII.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, you can never escape the web of international finances that is funding the war economy. In Nāgārjuna's day, it was easy -- you moved a hundred miles and you were in a different country, different king, etc.

Now, everything is tied together by international banks that fund the wars and prop up every government on the planet.

So the only hope for you, Jeff, is to become a Dzogchen practitioner and leave this Sahaloka either in this life, at the time of death or in the bardo. That is the fastest, most effective way to become an expatriate from samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Corrupt government and taxes.

Content:

Will said:

If one does not want to do or not do something, but is forced to do or not do something, then the merit or demerit of the act would be much reduced, maybe zero.

Huseng said:

Right. But I'm talking about refusing to cooperate with and bow down to evil authorities.

In Nagarjuna's Tree of Wisdom there are some interesting quotes:

If your wife is evil and your friend evil,
If the King is evil and your relatives evil,

If your neighbour is evil and the country evil,
(Then) abandon them for a distant (land).

The clever, the disciplined,
The contented and the truth-tellers,
It is better for such to die
Than (to live in) the kingdom of the evil.

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/bud/srdb/srdb.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, if you cannot in good conscience continue to live in your nation, then you must either change it or leave. For example, Nazi Germany caused almost everyone to become evil. But no one knew it at first.

But still, you need to understand the previous post. For example, all the money we are using for Afghanistan, Iraq, etc., is money borrowed.

The other thing you have to keep in mind is that one cannot fix samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Corrupt government and taxes.

Content:

Namdrol said:

As a Buddhist, you are expected to follow the laws of the nation you live in.

Huseng said:

Right. But in some cases the laws of one's nation force citizens to do immoral and wrong deeds (conscription to fight wars is one example). Moreover, if a tyrant or evil party are in command of the state they derive power through a tax-base and the cooperation of the citizenry.

If your federal government is using your taxes to actively kill people in a foreign country to further corporate interests, are you not obligated to disobey the laws and refuse to financially support the government?

Malcolm wrote:

At this point, even so, you still have to follow the laws of the nation you live in. You may disagree with a given policy of one's nation, for example, but the only time it would be permissible to completely break with one's civil government is if they were so tyrannical they were not even providing any services to the people at large.

Now, for example, take the US Government, since that is who you are really talking about: tax revenues for 2010 were 2.16 trillion dollars. the federal deficit was 1.3 trillion dollars. Military spending is roughly eight hundred billion dollars a year.

This means basically that US government is not spending tax dollars to prosecute its wars around the world, it is borrowing money to prosecute its wars around the world.

This means that still people should pay their taxes and at the same time work to have a functional government that refuses to engage in the type of military adventurism we have seen since the Bush Administration.

It is simple numbers. Since the US Government still provides essential services, is not a complete tyranny (yet, though it seems with each year we keep sliding ever closer to fascism, no matter who is power, Republican or Democrat, but this is largely because of the corporatocracy), US Citizens still need to pay their taxes as mandated in federal law from a Buddhist point of view. I am sure that Buddha would not have recommended that the subjects of Ajatasatru refuse to pay their taxes, for example.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: The entrance of wishlessness

Content:

muni said:

Consciousness is not a derivation of material. Therefore I wrote 'we' are not the body.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, from a Vajrayāna perspective it is more subtle than that i.e. mind and body have the same relation as a flower and its scent. They are inseparable; without one, there is not the other.

The mind/body dualism is a sutrayāna thing.

In Vajrayāna mind (མིམས་) and the vāyu (རླུང་) are completely inseparable. In the teaching of Dzogpachenpo, not only are they inseparable, but Guru Rinpoche remarks to Yeshe Tsogyal that mind and vāyu are synonymous with one another. You can discover this by reading the མཁའ་འགྲོ་ལྷོང་ཐིག་རྒྱུ་ཆོས་.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Good old allergies

Content:

Namdrol said:

Let me ask, did you never not have allergies, if so when and where?

mindyourmind said:

I've pretty much always had them in mild form as a child, but now, at age 47, they seem to have become worse, if stabilized.

As a layman I experience a change in weather conditions and temperature as having a big effect on my sinuses / allergies. Is that possible?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, definitely. Allergies always indicate a imbalance. Imbalances are caused by season, diet, behavior, and spirits.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Corrupt government and taxes.

Content:

Huseng said:

Is a citizen really morally obligated to pay taxes and/or cooperate with a government they feel is largely corrupt and/or committing evil?

One example that comes to mind is that if your government is waging an unjust war and you are a proponent of ahimsa (non-violence), are you not obligated to refuse paying taxes as those taxes would be used to support ongoing violent military operations?

I think from a Buddhist perspective this can get interesting because of the historical precedents between governments and the sangha in many different nations in various time periods.

In any case, as an individual how do you feel?

Malcolm wrote:

As a Buddhist, you are expected to follow the laws of the nation you live in.

Of course, this does not rule out civil disobedience, but when you engage in civil disobedience, you have to understand the possible consequences of it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

A synonym for "direct perception", i.e. "perception perceives" ... without fabricating synthesizing thought.

Malcolm wrote:

Which aggregates are involved in a direct perception?

TMingyur said:

As "this" and "that" it can only be known through labelling. If there is no labelling as "this" and "that" then there is either "direct experience" (s. above) or stupor/dullness.

Malcolm wrote:

This means that clinging cannot be a direct experiences in any way, since clinging itself is a conceptual state produced through "fabricating, synthesizing thought". Direct perceptions are completely non-conceptual. The remedy to clinging therefore is recognizing the object clung to, as well as the clinging, and the clinger to be empty of identity. This recognition in turn leads to the cessation of clinging through the direct perception of the absence of identity in the tricakram, the three wheels.

One can however directly know that one is engaged in clinging. But clinging itself is fabricated, synthesized state that occurs through ignorance of identitylessness. One can cling to existence (appearance) or non-existence (disappearance) -- the middle way is realizing that in reality phenomena neither appear nor disappear, but are wholly constructed through, in your words, "fabricating, synthesizing thought".

What it all boils down to, in the end, is accepting and rejecting. The narrow path through the Scylla and Charybdis of accepting and rejecting, existence and non-existence, etc., is the realization of inseparable dependent origination and emptiness. There is no other path, no other middle way than this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 11:22 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

The Buddha taught "If there is this then there is that" or "with the cessation of this there comes the cessation of that" You can validly label "this" and "that" and verify that the Buddha was right. And since you know "this" and "that" through direct experience you can validly confirm the lack of "this" and "that". But what is mere thought in the first place cannot be confirmed to be absent later on because there has not been a link to direct experience and confirming absence presupposes to know that (through direct experience) which is allegedly absent.

Malcolm wrote:

What, precisely, do you mean by "direct experience"?

How can "this or "that" be known without labeling "this" as "this" or "that" as "that"?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 11:08 AM

Title: Re: Is the Lotus Sutra just fiction

Content:

conebeckham said:

Is Dharma Wheel just fiction?

Is conebeckham just fiction?

is Rael just fiction?

Is the Real just Fiction?

Namdrol said:

Yup. A novel written by discursive mind.

Rael said:

so the lotus sutra is really not even Buddhist...

and what of Medicine Buddha where does that originate...

please

Malcolm wrote:

I was kidding around.

The Lotus Sutra is Buddhist.

There is no such thing as original Buddhism.

This is a total invention of western Protestants projecting their own neurosis about text and authenticity.

Mahāyāna is just Buddhists doing Buddhism. The Lotus Sutra is one version of that. If you don't like the Lotus, move on. You will find another sutra you like.

Me, I just stick with Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

This is our dissent. I say that it is "attachment" (or "clinging") that can be directly experienced but you prefer "thinking about" and infer "it must be existence that is 'felt' and that causes the clinging". I consider this to be philosophical fabrication deviating from direct experience and leading to further deviating fabrications and ... to "the thicket of views".

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

You seem to be clinging tightly to a thicket of views in an attempt to avoid that thicket.

"It exists", "it does not exist" is an ingrained habitual imputation -- that is a view, that is also a thought. Apart from these two views, there are no other views since all views can be summarized into these two positions or thoughts.

The ingrained habitual imputation "It exists" or "it does not exist" is the cause of clinging or attachment. There is no existence to be "felt". Existence/non-existence is an imputation that lacks a basis.

From another perspective, clinging can never be an unmediated experience since it is following craving, which follow sensation. When there is no craving, there can be no clinging. When there is craving, this is accompanied by the thought, "I want this", "I don't want that".

A sensation on the other hand, does not necessarily involve clinging since sense consciousnesses are wholly non-conceptual, and their object is in the present moment. Clinging is an operation of the manas, and therefore, constantly involved with past moments of sense perception. Hence clinging is a wholly conceptual state, divorced from non-conceptual sense cognitions, based on craving. Craving is also

function of manas, and is also supported on a past object, the object of sensation produced during contact.

So, while it is possible to experience an attachment directly that experience is based on a thought, divorced from the sense percept of that object of attachments. Attachment therefore, cannot be direct experiences, although they themselves can be directly experiences as mental objects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 9:33 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Therefore, appearances are neither something (existent) nor nothing (non-existent), but are empty of these two extremes.

This is the middle way.

TMingyur said:

For this kind of middle way the mere thought "existence" is introduced in the first place and the mere thought "emptiness" is produced in its aftermath. Thoughts spinning around.

Without clinging in the first place neither extreme nor middle.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

TMingyur:

In order to be free from clinging, first there must be clinging from which to be free. In order for clinging to occur, the thought "this exists" or "this does not exist" must arise concerning some apparent phenomena. In order to be free from clinging, the thought, "this is empty" must arise.

There is no such a thing as "without clinging in the first place" because sentient beings, in the first place, appropriate aggregates based on clinging to aggregates they apprehend as existent.

In order to be free from clinging to these addictive aggregates (all conditioned appearances, both mental and physical) apprehended as existent, one must learn to see these as aggregates of empty of identity and whatever pertains to an identity. When one has seen that the aggregates are empty of a identity and whatever pertains to an identity, at that point, and at that point alone, will one be "without clinging". Without seeing the absence of identity of apparent phenomena, there is no way in which one can be free from clinging.

In other words, without eradicating the afflictions (moha, rāga, dveśa) that drive the cycle of samsara, one will never eliminate the instantiation of affliction called "clinging". Without seeing the emptiness of phenomena i.e. their absence of identity, one will never eradicate the afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Is the Lotus Sutra just fiction

Content:

conebeckham said:

Is Dharma Wheel just fiction?

Is conebeckham just fiction?

is Rael just fiction?

Is the Real just Fiction?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. A novel written by discursive mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2011 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds like you're stuck on Heidegger's question: "Why is there something rather than nothing"?

Appearances are not nothing, since they appear, but they are not something, since they are not findable.

Therefore, appearances are neither something (existent) nor nothing (non-existent), but are empty of these two extremes.

This is the middle way.

norman said:

There is no emptiness, nor any "structural relationship". In counterpart to Form, to the universe, we have emptiness or voidness, which is Nothing, because the world is Everything that appears to be. It is the absence of everything, which is Nothing at all, that implies its positive aspect, so that Nothing, being that which is not, is also that

which appears to be. Appearance, that which appears to be, is nothing in itself, because it can only be apparent, as such, when implied as being counterpart to nothing, which is not.

Objects have no objective qualities. Any perceived attribute is all it is as an object. Its attributes and its objectivity are identical, they are two side of the same coin. Its objectivity is therefore only an appearance, since all it is, is whatever we perceive it to be (the qualities, attributes).

The notion that the earth is round is essentially no different than the notion that the world is flat. Neither has any existence as objects, since the perceived qualities (shapes, substances, etc) are identical with its appearances. We cannot separate the perceived roundness from the appearance of the earth, as such. Therefore no deductions or syllogisms can be made that would define it objectively, since all we have are separate qualities and attributes, concepts or dharmas. The object is a convention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Good old allergies

Content:

mindyourmind said:

I have one and one only health issue that can be quite invasive and a pain in the sitting area - those good old allergies.

My life is just structured in such a manner that I cannot in any significant way avoid the triggers - I am outside every day, I work in various offices and buildings, I have the odd smoker around me, lots of pets, pollen - you name it.

Any ideas or remedies from the Tibetan medicine pov? Any suggestions on diet?

Thank you

Namdrol said:

You can try applying ghee or sesame oil inside of your nostrils before you go outside, create a barrier in this way.

Avoid dairy, and get an oil called "anutailam" from Trihealth or otherwise, nasya oil from Banyan Botanicals. Use a neti pot, then nourish the membranes with the oil. It is important to use the oil after cleansing with neti, because otherwise, you will inflame and dry out the membranes.

A lot of allergies are actually a side effect of weak metabolic heat. So, check with an local experienced Ayurvedic practitioner -- they generally have more experience with

allergies than Tibetan doctors at present.

Allergies are an urban illness. They do not affect people raised in the country so much.

mindyourmind said:

Thank you very much.

I have tried the neti pot briefly, without the oil so maybe that is worth a new attempt. I realize that dairy is a Bad Thing, and I try to cut down on that.

The other remedies, especially the oils, seem quite positive. I will certainly try that.

Does the "weak metabolical heat" mean that if my metabolism gets given a boost, say by exercise, that this will assist in combating the problem?

Send me your bill, doctor

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, exercise, a metabolism increasing diet, or rectifying metabolism.

There are three different types of allergies based on your phenotype, i.e. vata, pitta and kapha. So the type of exercise and diet you have should be seasonally changed, in accordance with your type. You cannot fix allergies from outside, you can only fix them from inside,

Let me ask, did you never not have allergies, if so when and where?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Good old allergies

Content:

mindyourmind said:

I have one and one only health issue that can be quite invasive and a pain in the sitting area - those good old allergies.

My life is just structured in such a manner that I cannot in any significant way avoid the triggers - I am outside every day, I work in various offices and buildings, I have the odd smoker around me, lots of pets, pollen - you name it.

Any ideas or remedies from the Tibetan medicine pov? Any suggestions on diet?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

You can try applying ghee or sesame oil inside of your nostrils before you go outside, create a barrier in this way.

Avoid dairy, and get an oil called "anutailam" from Trihealth or otherwise, nasya oil from Banyan Botanicals. Use a neti pot, then nourish the membranes with the oil. It is important to use the oil after cleansing with neti, because otherwise, you will inflame and dry out the membranes.

A lot of allergies are actually a side effect of weak metabolic heat. So, check with an local experienced Ayurvedic practitioner -- they generally have more experience with allergies than Tibetan doctors at present.

Allergies are an urban illness. They do not affect people raised in the country so much.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Sanskrit Romanization

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I use a mac.

On the mac, if one uses the the extended keyboard and a unicode font like Gentium, etc., it is easy. A macron is shift+option+a; ś is s, then type shift+option+e, the ñ is n, then type shift+option+w; for ṭ etc, type the retroflex of choice, as well as ṣ , type letter and then type shift+option+x. For ṛ, same as the last, for ṝ , type r, then shift+option+x, then shift+option+a. More or less this covers everything. Then for n -- for ṇ, type n, then shift+option+w; for ñ, type n shift+option+n.

These rules apply to both upper and lower case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Is Nagajuna just fiction

Content:

Rael said:

i recall Namdrol on esangha once said a lot of stuff is done in the name of the Buddha is similar to all the Hindu teachings done in the name of Krishna...they do that to give it weight is what i surmised from that post in a galaxy a far far far away now...

Malcolm wrote:

There are a group of texts that all are clearly authored by one person. These texts all cover various topics related to, but not necessarily covered in detail in the Mulamadhyamaka Karikas. The person to whom authorship of this group of texts is attributed is one Nāgārjuna.

Nāgārjuna is mentioned by name as being from South India in the Lanka-avatara sūtra. Traditionally, this was held to be a prediction of Nāgārjuna by the Buddha -- western scholars of course tend to think this dates the Lanka's composition after the second century CE.

There are many many texts attributed to Nāgārjuna. It is likely that there were several Nāgārjunas, at least three, not to mention texts authored under his name.

But the collection of texts I mentioned above, the so-called collection of reasoning, as well as three or four praises he wrote, and the Ratnavali and Suhrleka are all certainly by one and the same author, and that person we call Nāgārjuna. His direct disciple, Aryadeva, wrote a supplement to the Mulamadhyamaka Karikas, called 400 Verses, as well as a couple of other minor pieces. These two authors' works mentioned above form the core of the so-called "Father and Son" Madhyamaka. These texts form the real core of Madhyamaka teachings.

Unfortunately, today most people read Nagarjuna through the lens of the four Tibetan schools, rather than reading Indian Madhyamaka authors themselves.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: No Killing

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Some of what I am hearing makes no sense to me.

namdrol said:

However, the consciousness of the fetus would again find itself in the bardo, where it will experience great suffering, etc.

gregkavarnos said:

As far as I have understood through my studies all samsaric existence is a bardo of one type or another. Why would the suffering that consciousness experiences during the bardo of death be any less or any more than the suffering experienced during the bardo of life?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what you mean by suffering -- the suffering of a fetus in the womb prior to contact is suffering in the sense of the all-pervasive suffering of conditioned phenomena, but this suffering is divorced from sensation. No one "feels" this kind of

suffering.

What I am pointing out is that that until a certain stage, fetuses do not have sensations, and therefore, experience no sensations, for example, as a result of an abortion until they take rebirth in the bardo.

Don't confuse things by introducing the Nyingmapa doctrine of four or six bardos. This is the uncommon bardo teaching of Dzogchen, but this schemata of bardos is not shared with Anutarrayoga tantra on down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: No Killing

Content:

Will said:

Another reason killing (of a nacent creature or otherwise) is bad, is because it screws up the immediate karmic future of the being killed. Whether the being would have gained merit in the life that is now no more or racked up even more demerit or something in between - all is more complicated than usual, karmically speaking.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, it is the same. The only reason that aborting human beings is worse, is that only human beings can directly become buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

mr. gordo said:

Namdrol, is there anything you can comment upon regarding the Khon Vajrakila practice and Dzogchen? Is there any relationship between the two even though it's a kama teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure the essence of Vajrakilaya is Dzogchen, and the result of Khon Kilaya should be the state of Dzogchen. There are dzogchen instructions associated with Kohn Kilaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Is Nagajuna just fiction

Content:

Rael said:

ok thanks for this...i was somehow led astray by something Namdrol posted both here and at the other place....

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you can blame me for leading you astray.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: No Killing

Content:

Pero said:

Doesn't Tibetan medicine says that there's no consciousness till after three months or something like that? So killing the fetus before that would be more or less like cutting down a tree.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Medicine asserts that the sense faculties are not active until the nineteenth week, well into the fifth month. There is a vinaya controversy about whether a monk who causes an abortion (for example, knocking a woman down, etc.) is guilty of the parajika offense of killing a human being. Some hold he would be, others hold he would not be.

Certainly, when the fetus is new, it possesses only three indriyas: consciousness, life force and the body. Lacking sensation indriyas, an abortion would cause no physical pain to the fetus since the five indriyas of sensation do not exist until the nidana of contact arises.

However, the consciousness of the fetus would again find itself in the bardo, where it will experience great suffering, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Bodhidharma & Padampa Sangye. Same person?

Content:

Jikan said:

Well, you've never seen them photographed together, right?

The Phadampa Center website (a group based in California) claims that Padampa Sangye *was* Bodhidharma, that is, the person known as Bodhidharma was Dampa Jakar while teaching in China. (Evidently, he did teach in China.)

I find this claim unconvincing because the chronology seems off... Bodhidharma was appealed to as an authority in China at least a century before Padampa Sangye was said to have visited China.

Thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

This is clearly a Tibetan sectarian polemical hagiographical statement. It is not to be taken seriously. Just as the person of Bodhidharma was wildly inflated by the Chinese, so too has the person of Padampa been wildly inflated by Tibetans.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Buddha Shakyamuni did not hold back anything when teaching the Dharma. He boasts this several times, about Himself and about His teaching. Tantrikas and vajrayanists do not seem to understand this statement, which is a great pity.

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni did not hold anything back. But this does not mean he taught everything to everyone.

He taught was useful to his students at that time and that place, without holding anything back. Those teachings are the ones contained in the Agamas and Pali Canon.

You seem to forget that Shakyamuni also compared what he taught to his disciples with a handful of leaves, and compared what he knew with all the leaves in a forest.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Oh, probably longer than that. That nirodhasamapatti is permanent in the sense that when an arhats enters that kind of suspended animation, he has no particular intention of rousing from it again.

Mariusz said:

Don't trivialize it, please. It does not change the topic. Arhats can be in the state of non return by their own "power" alone, without any help from Buddhas. Moreover they will never return to Samsara but are "awaken" for Mahayana Buddhahood only, as I remeber.

Is really ending of universe has something to do with it?

Malcolm wrote:

It is basically useless to try and explain anything on an internet forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

conebeckham said:

I've heard this said or quote before but...after "3 incalculable eons" or something, right, Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, probably longer than that. That nirodhasamapatti is permanent in the sense that when an arhats enters that kind of suspended animation, he has no particular intention of rousing from it again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Even the arhat path leads to buddhahood, the question is, how long?

Mariusz said:

Not kidding? I guess this question could be only from Thirtika's eternalistic or nihilistic point of view.

Malcolm wrote:

The arhat path leads to buddhahood because arhats are roused from nirodhasamapatti by a Buddha and placed into the bodhisattva path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2011 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

Namdrol, do you feel that Mahamudra does not lead to full and complete enlightenment? If so what aspect of lack thereof do you feel prevents if from doing so?

Also, what aspect of aspects of Dzogchen lead to complete and full enlightenment as you say is not the case with some other systems?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Even the arhat path leads to buddhahood, the question is, how long?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 11th, 2011 at 7:18 PM

Title: Re: No Killing

Content:

shel said:

I heard ya. You weren't sure that making abortion illegal is effective. Well, statistically it is proven effective. There are less abortions where abortion is illegal. Studies suggest that there is also more crime where abortion is illegal.

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, where abortion is illegal there are less legal abortions. Where abortion is illegal, all abortions are crimes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 11th, 2011 at 7:13 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Most people think that Buddhahood is irrsible; Dzogchen on the other hand asserts that the buddhahood of the lower yanas is reverts into the basis, and only Dzogchen results in complete and irreversible buddhahood.

N

Mariusz said:

How it is possible?

Is it somehow related to "Youthful Vase Body" (Wyl. Gzhon-Nu Bum-sku) which can be "broken" even after the buddhahood, when from it will arise the Appearances of the Basis (Wyl. Gzhi-sNang) and they will be not spontaneously accomplished (Wyl. Lhun-Grub) because of Unenlightenment (Wyl. Ma-Rig-pa) again?

Malcolm wrote:

It is because buddhahood of lower yānas is incomplete and does not reach the stage of ka dag chen po, great original purity. The simplest way to explain it is that after the this universe dissolves and the next one arises, those beings who have not achieved the stage of ka dag chen po start all over.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 11th, 2011 at 7:10 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Heruka said:

i once read that the bhumis relate to the stages and development of a fetus in the womb.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is another metaphor found not only in Dzogchen, but also in Kalacakra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 11th, 2011 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

"therefore, basic space- naturally occuring timeless awareness-is referred to as the ground when distortions are involved, as the path when they are being refined away, and as the fruition when all of these limitless distortions have been removed. It is extremely important to distinguish between the terms "the ground of being" and "the level of freedom". These days, however, such precise analyses are few."

Longchempa in treasury of philosophical instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, that self-originated wisdom (rang byung ye shes, svayambhu jñāna) is never modified or altered in anyway, present from the very beginning in all sentient beings individually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 11th, 2011 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Poll: Do You Practice in English or Tibetan?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan, Sanskrit, and Oddiyāna language.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 11th, 2011 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

Also Namdrol,

Before I mentioned about people who thought they were going to attain the rainbow body having to get to the first bhumis first, which involves progressing through the experiences of all the stages of the path of accumulation and also the stages of the path of preparation. You went on to say that Dzogchen doesn't really follow the path of the stages (gradual)- an assertion I don't agree with for many reasons. Then you mention that dzogchen has 3 extra bhumis- sure sure of course then dzogchen makes more use of stages than even the other vehicles haha... also why the fuss of making correspondences between the four stages of the vidyadhara and the bhumis...

Malcolm wrote:

You gave to understand that there is a passage in the rigpa rangshar which delineates these paths and stages, but they are not the real paths and stages according to the vehicles of cause and result. They are just names for progress in the four visions. So for example, when has knowledge of rigpa initially, this is called "Pramudita". But this does not mean that person has realized emptiness (that does not occur until the third vision). So these paths and stages named in Dzogchen just serve as metaphors. Thus Zhabkar states:

"Though these stages are individually divided out of the apparent aspect of the single stage (upon which there is no progress or training) of the luminosity of the fundamental vidyā;
in reality, the stage of vidyā is single
but there is no need for specific training on causal stages for obtaining the stage of Buddha Mahāvajradhara.
The manner of obtaining each stage through the stages of the cause and result of the common vehicles,
likewise the stage obtained through the effort and practice of creation and completion according to outer and inner secret mantra,
here do not exist as [stages] upon which to train or make progress.

In reality, all vehicles are included, and the paths and stages are complete within the single stage of one's pure vidyā."

So you can disagree with Zhabkar, etc. if you like.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 10th, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

Many many other masters point out that the difference lies in the path or method not in the base or fruit..

Malcolm wrote:

There are two ways these things are explained, the common way, which accords with lower vehicles, in which the basis and the result are more or less the same.

Then there is the uncommon way Dzogchen explains these things, in which the basis and the result are different from that of the lower vehicles.

For example, in general, the nine yānas approach is to assert that all-basis is dharmakāya. In the special Dzogchen view, asserting that dharmakāya is the ālaya is a "Buddhist deviation". In Dzogchen, the ālaya is, as stated in the Mind Tantra of Vajrasattva:

The all-basis is the bardo of everything,
unconsciousness, unclear, and inexpressible.

The example for the ālaya is space. The example for the dharmakāya is celestial bodies.

So you see, it is really not so simple as proclaiming that the basis and the result are the same for all schools, only the result differs.

For example, the Samputa maintains there is a distinct difference in omniscience between an eleventh and twelfth stage buddha, and a thirteenth stage Buddha. Related to this, Dzogchen refers to the 13-16 bhumis as those that "dwell in wisdom". Why? Because only 13th stage Vajradhara's on up understand that all appearances are the display of their own wisdom.

Most people think that Buddhahood is irreversible; Dzogchen on the other hand asserts that the buddhahood of the lower yanas is reverts into the basis, and only Dzogchen results in complete and irreversible buddhahood.

These are the kinds of things you discover when you read Vima Nyingthig, Khandro Nyingthig, Gongpa Zangthal, the Seventeen tantras and so on.

The later in Tibetan history you go, the more homogenized the presentation of the four schools becomes. When you exam the texts of the Pre-Sarma period, then you find Dzogchen is really very different from what was introduced from India during the time of Rinchen Zangpo onwards.

Dzogchen did not spread widely in India, neither did anuyoga. The main tantric teaching of India was Yoga Tantra/Mahayoga.

Many masters do not present whole picture of Dzogchen. HHDL's agenda, which I respect, is to bring harmony to all schools.

My interest is a little different -- I am interested in what makes Dzogchen so unique and so powerful. I know the difference between what is commonly stated as a nice political thing so Sakyas, Gelugpas and Sarma-oriented Kagyus don't feel bad, and what the real teachings of Dzogchen say, but are not so publicized. I don't owe allegiance to any school. My interest these days in particular is solely anuyoga and Dzogchen teachings.

That being said, don't think that I consider Lamdre, etc., as lacking depth, efficacy, or profundity -- they are profound, interesting, and wonderful teachings. I just think Dzogchen is more profound, more efficacious, and deeper. This is just my opinion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 10th, 2011 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Of course it is like this. Still as Nyingma practitioner the main view I been thought is from the Nyingthik tradition. The way to practice Mahayoga that I been taught is to aim for the inseparable two stages, as for example taught by Karmey Khenpo in his commentary on the Mawey Senge sadhana, Brilliant light, from Tukdruk Barche Kunsel. There is also an other text from that Terma where Guru Rinpoche says that the practice of Dzogrim in this tradition should be Semde.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and this is something which has been repeated by ChNN (so much for radical Dzogchen).

heart said:

The two stage in this context combine Dzogchen view and Mahayoga means. This seems to me to be the same meaning as for example Mipham has in his commentary on the Guhyagharba, Luminous emptiness, where he condense the commentaries of Longchenpa and Rongzom Pandita on the Guhyagharba.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, this is the system of three stages -- creation, completion, dzogchen.

heart said:

So even if there are no two stages in Dzogchen, Dzogchen can be a part of the two stages in Mahayoga. This is a very practical and helpful approach but of course Dzogchen should also be practiced according to its own methods as a main path.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as I have said many times. So we are in agreement on two counts (finally, actually don't know that we disagreed really): one Mahayoga and Anuyoga take Dzogchen as result, Dzogchen can be approached this way.

Two, Dzogchen is an independent path with its own means.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 10th, 2011 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Excuse me, I was asking you, why Mahayoga is superior to HYT, although the same two stages?

Malcolm wrote:

Not really the same with respect to the two stages. Mahayoga has three stages; creation stage (bskyed rim), completion stage (rdzogs rim), and the great perfection (rdzogs pa chen po).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 10th, 2011 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Restricted books

Content:

pemachophel said:

Narraboth,

What is the name of the wang which empowers one to read any text, lung or no lung? Sounds like something useful to ask for at an appropriate time and place.

Malcolm wrote:

It is called the poti lung dbang or "text transmission empowerment". It is the system of Sangye Lingpa, coming from the Lama Gondu cycle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 10th, 2011 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Reconsiderations on Not-Really-Buddhism

Content:

Rael said:

i reject all such until there are verified enlightened beings...everyone else is just one or two shades up or below.....

Namdrol said:

Not even the Buddha was a "verified" enlightened being.

Rael said:

i should have made clear that it would have to be a face to face....

Malcolm wrote:

Not even then. Countless people met the Buddha and had no idea he was any different than countless other teachers.

Rael said:

usually someone who knocks me for me grammar....clue one...the person is tainted

Malcolm wrote:

You don't blame yourself for seeing defects in others. Why then should you hold others to a different standard and blame them when they point out to you your own defects, whether of character, deed or even grammar?

Rael said:

now my criteria for enlightenment is such...and i know it when i see it when i spend enough time with someone if they are....

Malcolm wrote:

Until you yourself are an awakened person, you will not be able ascertain the awakening of others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Reconsiderations on Not-Really-Buddhism

Content:

Rael said:

i reject all such until there are verified enlightened beings...everyone else is just one or two shades up or below.....

Malcolm wrote:

Not even the Buddha was a "verified" enlightened being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

About Abhisheka

According to certain authorities there is formal initiation and informal intitation (abhisheka).

I would not have believed that people really believe that placing objects on their heads is the all-decisive thing! But this seems to be the case, is it?

Malcolm wrote:

Abhisheka is method of arranging the dependent origination of a person's basis with the result so the result can be taken as the path. This is the unique feature of abhisheka in Vajrayana.

Aemilius said:

Chogyam Trungpa refused to give abhishekas for a long time, he said that everything a true Guru does is an abhisheka.

Malcolm wrote:

he gave them a lot early on, then stopped because he saw that people were only relating to them as a kind of ritual, not understanding the real meaning.

However, in his Vajrayāna seminars he always gave a transmission called "direct introction" which is characteristic of Kagyu Mahamudra and Dzogchen.

Aemilius said:

In Dhagpo Kayu Ling Gelongma Rinchen said that Initiation means that you are taught a spiritual practice. She said that even teaching Tongleng is an initiation in the full sense of the word.

Malcolm wrote:

Teaching someone a practice is not an abhisheka. There is no initiation for tonglen, since it is sutrayāna. Merely teaching someone a practice is not an "initiation". You either misunderstood what she meant, or she is wrong.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The thirty seven bodhipaksha dharma do not imply that there was Vajrayana present in Buddhism from earliest times.

Chanda simply means that one desires one-pointed concentration. It does not mean that one is taking sexual intercourse, food, etc., onto the path.

N

Aemilius said:

If Chanda were just what you say the Four Bases would be just any normal path of morality, meditation & wisdom. The case is that this is the special path that produces the supernormal powers, and here Chanda has more meaning than elsewhere. People who know what are the real bases of miraculous powers would know this, like Suniti K Pathak. This topic is somewhat esoteric, if you think that you can fly in space through mindfulness of breathing it is up to you ofcourse.

Malcolm wrote:

Samadhi alone produces supernormal powers. There is no transmutation of passion implied in chanda. The four iddhipadas are parts of samadhi. That's it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 7:02 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

BTW, all this endless taxonomy is not really that useless for your practice.

Pero said:

You actually mean it's not that useful right?

Malcolm wrote:

indeed

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 5:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Posted here from another thread...

Namdrol said:

Then you will be awfully surprised when you read the texts I have read.

N

Mariusz said:
What texts?

Malcolm wrote:
well, for example, the " The Essence of the Critical Point of Memory " in the Vima Nyinthig, has a footnote on this passage "Though one seeks vidyā with words, the meaning is not touched..." that says "Through the assertions of the nine yānas".

For example, in a teaching of Shri Singha to Vairocana found in the dgongs pa zang thal, the three inner tantras are listed as follows: mahāyoga, anuyoga and the view of the mahāmudra of non-dual appearance and emptiness. Following this, Dzogchen is listed separately from the nine yanās.

Or there is a tantra called The Self-Arisen Great Perfection from the Kadag Rangjung Rangshar which states:

I demonstrated the definitive meaning, the self-originated primordial wisdom
for those of the best fortune.

I demonstrated the Dharmas of the nine vehicles
for those of medium fortune.

I demonstrated the outer Dharma of the provisional meaning
for those with average fortune.

And there is an interesting text in the Gongpa Zangthal called The Mind Tantra of Vajrasattva which extensively differentiates the great perfection from the nine yanās. It begins:

In the demonstration of the eight intimate instructions that are superior to the nine yānas, the intention of all teachings of the great perfection...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 5:28 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol,

Re: the original question about what characteristics make a Buddhist teaching "tantra," what about the ten topics (i.e. empowerment, mandala, samaya, offerings, etc) as mentioned in the Guhyagarbha, among tantras? Or does the complete list only pertain to anuttarayoga tantra?

Namdrol said:

The ten tattvas which make a teaching a guhyamantra teaching are valid in general. All tantric systems have some kind of samaya, but not necessarily the 22 samayas of HYT.

Pema Rigdzin said:

So basically this settles it, then? If a teaching does not include these ten aspects, it is not tantra? (Keep in mind I'm including Dzogchen in this because of its own explanation about how these are primordially complete)

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 5:26 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, all this endless taxonomy is not really that useful for your practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 5:25 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Excuse me, I was asking you, why Mahayoga is superior to HYT, although the same two stages?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the view of nyingma mahayoga is dzogchen. In other words, HYT is more or less dependent on Madhyamaka for its view. Mahayoga takes its view from Dzogchen, specifically the Dzogchen as presented in the Guhyagarbha tantra, exemplified in the rosary of views intimate instruction. The main difference between mahayoga in this respect, however, and Anuyoga, is that Mahayoga takes the Dzogchen to be the result (more like mahamudra as conceived in Sakya) as presented in the sems sde system. Anuyoga takes Dzogchen as the basis.

Still we have to distinguish that while ground mahāmudra of the Kagyu school and sems sde bear some similarities, they also end in Sems sde. It is the opinion of ChNN that the four yogas of mahāmudra were borrowed from sems sde by Gampopa, and certainly he was a Nyingma practitioner before he met Milarepa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 5:14 PM

Title: Re: The thicket of views

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

'Scuse me if I am wrong but maybe the nama-rupa combination is just for human and animal existence? Even in Theravada there exist formless realms (god realms for example) where mind exists without dependence on form. Or am I mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

In early Theravada, it is asserted that formless realm beings have a very subtle form.

Also, in Dzogchen it is asserted that formless realm beings actually have subtle form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 5:12 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Hi Magnus:

The point is that inner tantras, nyingma mahayoga and anuyoga, have Dzogchen as their aim. But this does not mean that Dzogchen itself does not find these inner tantra approaches wanting in all respects. For example, there is the famous citation from Kunbyed Gyalpo.

Of course a practitioner of Dzogchen can practice whatever he or she likes or needs. But at base, Dzogchen practice is not involved with the two stages. The other day ChNN stated that even Anuyoga is not really predicated on the two stages.

Mariusz said:

So why Mahayoga which contains the two stages leads to the realization of Rigpa but HYT which has also these two stages does not lead to it?

Malcolm wrote:

Clear light and rigpa are not the same thing. But rigpa and self-originated wisdom are the same thing.

I never stated that practicing HYT does not lead to awakening. But you have to understand that HYT is a gradual path. Dzogchen is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 5:05 PM

Title: Re: Tulku Ugyen

Content:

Mariusz said:

More on analogies between Dzogchen of 9 yanas and HYT. As for my later post the note 25 of the book said:

Atiyoga is taught to practitioners of mahayoga and anuyoga who are attached to effort and striving toward a goal; it is the way to self-liberate that attachment. What is set forth in this citation is not a direct relationship between mahayoga, anuyoga, and atiyoga and the mother tantra, father tantra, and nondual tantra of the new schools but is instead a simple analogy: Just as father tantra emphasizes the phase of generation, and mother tantra, the phase of completion, mahayoga emphasizes the phase of generation, anuyoga, the phase of completion, and so on.

I have never found such thing as "Dzogchen outside 9 yanas". All teachings of Buddhism are included in 9 yanas. For me all teachings of Buddhism should be taken as a whole.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you will be awfully surprised when you read the texts I have read.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 5:02 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol,

Re: the original question about what characteristics make a Buddhist teaching "tantra," what about the ten topics (i.e. empowerment, mandala, samaya, offerings, etc) as mentioned in the Guhyagarbha, among tantras? Or does the complete list only pertain to anuttarayoga tantra?

Malcolm wrote:

The ten tattvas which make a teachings a guhyamantra teaching are valid in general. All tantric systems have some kind of samaya, but not necessarily the 22 samayas of HYT.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 4:57 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Never mind all the various categorizations that one can do about the various Tantras,

they can for sure look like a bad fit like Namdrol says. But once you achieved the ultimate result, who knows what your experience of the various Tantras are. After all, all these texts are there just to make us realize what our confused mind really is, nothing else. It also occurred to me that, particularly in the Termas, everything is a bit mixed. Ati combined with Maha, Maha containing Ati instructions, Maha but the sadhana is Anu and so on. Also when Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche gave the Lama Gondu he said "this is a wonderful and complete Terma. It contains complete instructions on the three inner Tantras and are not incomplete like other Termas. Some only contain a little piece of Maha or Anu or Ati, almost none are complete like this." That is also a perspective worth contemplating. But most Nyingthik tradition has Ngondro and Yidams, the 17 Tantras mention Yidams, Longchenpa added various Guru, Yidam and Dakini practices to the Vima and Khandro Nyingthik. Things are not as clear-cut as one would like in order to make everything fit in the ladder perspective of things. How about this thought: The nine yanas are not a ladder?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

The point is that inner tantras, nyingma mahayoga and anuyoga, have Dzogchen as their aim. But this does not mean that Dzogchen itself does not find these inner tantra approaches wanting in all respects. For example, there is the famous citation from Kunbyed Gyalpo.

Of course a practitioner of Dzogchen can practice whatever he or she likes or needs. But at base, Dzogchen practice is not involved with the two stages. The other day ChNN stated that even Anuyoga is not really predicated on the two stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 4:50 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

Ok but the basis is the basis. All the Buddhist practices in the tantras are supposed to lead to the basis of the mind which is the Dharmakaya which is Buddhahood. The fact that they use different terms doesn't mean that they are talking about a different ontological thing.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis for one system is not always the basis for another system. For example, the basis in Dzogchen teachings is not the mind.

Dzogchen distinguishes various kinds of basis depending on whether we are talking

about sems sde, klong sde or man ngag sde.

So in Dzogchen man ngag sde the basis is vidyā (rig pa), and not mind. Mind is an adventitious obscuration to be given up. As Longchenpa states in the Lama Yangthig:

"The essence of mind is the all-basis and the group of eight. The essence of vidyā is beyond the all-basis and the group of eight."

So you cannot be hasty and just lump everything together in a sort of a putanesca sauce of teachings.

Dzogchen is not easy. It is very subtle, and so hard to understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 4:20 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Suniti K. Pathak doesn't really spell it out what he means. He presumes too much, namely that people would understand from a mere hint that the path of the Four Legs of Miraculous Powers utilizes desire and passion. One of the four legs is even called Chanda, that is Desire. Because this teaching exists in the Theravada and Mahayana canons, it is an evidence that the path of tantra or utilizing the passions existed already in the early buddhism. This is what he says by implication.

Thanissaro Bhikkhu's Wings To Awakening has a good description of the Path of Four Bases Of Miraculous Power that consists of passages taken from the Suttas. That it is a path in itself is quite clear from it.

Malcolm wrote:

The thirty seven bodhipaksha dharmas do not imply that there was Vajrayana present in Buddhism from earliest times.

Chanda simply means that one desires one-pointed concentration. It does not mean that one is taking sexual intercourse, food, etc., onto the path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

tamdrin said:

Also I think that maybe in Sakya and Gelugpa they don't accept the pointing out of the "4rth empowerment" so their understanding of it may be different than the Kagyu. But I

am not sure on that.

The Gelugpas don't. The Sakyas explicitly do. In fact, they do so to the point that you might consider a little extreme. Gorampa's perspective is that the pointing out in the third and fourth empowerments makes one's post-meditation view irrelevant, whether Cittamatra or Madhyamaka, since the experience of pointing out and the sadhana method ensure correct view while practicing.

What the Sakyas do not accept that is the idea that someone who has not received the four empowerments is a suitable candidate for pointing out.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: Lamdre.

Content:

Namdrol said:

But it helps.

narraboth said:

Do you feel that 3 years retreat helped your practice or mind a lot?

Malcolm wrote:

My retreat was a wonderful experience. Should do it again. Only this time I would focus exclusively on Dzogpa Chenpo.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

That is not how it is presented in the Treasury of Philosophical Instructions. Nyingma and Sarma Tantras are discussed separately.

Malcolm wrote:

I am searching for citation. The citation I have in mind is one where he refers to Hevajra as an outer tantra.

I agree that in shing rta chen po, grub mtha' mdzod, he gives the division set forth by Rangjung Dorje of:

maha = father
anu = mother
non-dual = ati.

But it does not really follow if you analyze well even Nyingma mahayoga.

And yes, he also covers sarma and snying ma separately -- however he does not present father, mother and non-dual tantra as equivalents with maha, anu and ati in the sarma section. He only presents this scheme in the rnyingma section of grub mtha' mdzod. You can check, sarma inner tantra section starts on 1095; nyingma inner tantra starts on 1110. He gives a citation from the seng ge rtsal rdzogs:

"Creation mahāyoga is like the basis of dharmas,
Agama anu yoga is like the path of dharmas,
perfected atiyoga is like the result of dharmas."

But moreover, most of the tantras we normally consider mahayoga tantras, such as the eight pronouncements, Yamantaka, Hayagriva, Yangdag, etc. are listed by Longchenpa as anuyoga tantras -- normally people are accustomed to thinking of these deities as Mahāyoga cycles.

Another feature that Longchenpa mentions is that creation is present in Anuyoga, but deemphasized. This is not the case with mother tantra in HYT. He mentions none of the root tantras one might expect for Mahāyoga, namely Guhyagarbha, etc.

And of course he states that in Dzogchen, there is no creation stage whatsoever, pg. 1121:

"The essence of the dhātu of luminous natural great perfection is self-originated wisdom. Here, since there no cause and result of an object to create or an agent creating along with conditions, it has always existed [ye nas yod pa] as nature like space."

Moreover, we cannot consider this similar in anyway to the non-dual tantras of Hevajra because on page 1122 Longchenpa explicitly rejects that in Dzogchen there is any cause and result or that the basis can made into a path:

"Since there is no cause and result in the essence [ngo bo, svarūpa), it cannot be determined to be samsara or nirvana at all. Since whatever arises is made into a basis, that which is the wide open space of the dhātu and wisdom, or the source or foundation of all phenomena, is the basis. The lower vehicles that engage in effort, practice, accepting, rejecting deviate through dualities and are obscured. Further, if is claimed that "...since the basis is made into a path, it is a path"; since the basis is uncontrived and unaltered, it cannot be made into a mere thing, the basis cannot be made into a path, thus a basis and a path are in contradiction..."

In Vajrayana in general, the basis, which consists of the five aggregates, five sense

objects, and so on are made into the path. In Dzogchen, the basis i.e. the uncontrived nature of the mind that is like space, to paraphrase Longchenpa, does not need fabrication or alteration -- creation and completion conceived in the HYT system are precisely alterations. So one can never say that non-dual tantra in sarma schools are equivalent with Dzogchen.

In general, such formulas lead to more confusion than clarity since they are badly misunderstood, in my opinion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

The fact is that Longchenpa, etc. all treat HYT as "outer tantra".

N

tamdrol said:

This is not really true. Longchenpa said for Sarma any empowerment that contains the full 4 empowerments is HYT as opposed to lower tantra which only has 1 or 2 empowerments I think. Also that if the deity is practiced in yabyum it is HYT solo deities are lower tantra. Also I think that maybe in Sakya and Gelugpa they don't accept the pointing out of the "4th empowerment" so their understanding of it may be different than the Kagyu. But I am not sure on that.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, you did not understand -- Longchenpa distinguishes between outer tantra i.e. kriya, carya, yoga and anuttarayoga tantra (which by earlier classification can actually be classified under yoga tantra) and inner tantra i.e. mahayoga, anuyoga and atiyoga.

I

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Are plants sentient?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

There are teachings though which "forbid" monks from needlessly destroying vegetation

or digging around in the dirt.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because they might harm creatures who live in the soil or are who have made homes in foliage, etc. In other words, plants, from an Indo-Tibetan Buddhist point of view, while alive, are not sentient. They are part of the container. But the container must be respected, as well as the contents.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Are plants sentient?

Content:

JeffC said:

Is there is simple answer to this?

Jellyfish do not have 'brains' but are sentient beings. They have basic reactions for survival, but that is true of plants as well.

Thank you,
Jeff

Malcolm wrote:

For the sake of Vegans, I hope not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Posted here because it is not really on topic elsewhere.

Mariusz said:

"In the system of the New Schools, there are first of all the four tantras of Kriya Tantra, Charya Tantra, Yoga Tantra, and Anuttara Yoga Tantra. The fourth is divided into Father Anuttara Tantra, Mother Anuttara Tantra and Nondual Anuttara Tantra. This correspond exactly to the structure of the Old School, Nyingma, in that father tantra of Anuttara is Mahayoga, mother tantra is Anu yoga and the nondual tantra is Ati Yoga, [Dzogchen].

Namdrol said:

This quite arguable. Chogyal Namkhai Norbu explains that this equation of the three inner tantras with father, mother and non-dual tantra was a political gesture. He definitely does not agree with this sort of statement.

The fact is that Longchenpa, etc. all treat HYT as "outer tantra".

N

heart said:

Well Tulku Urgyen wouldn't get along with a lot of things ChNN says. Still, they got along very fine and ChNN used to visit Tulku Urgyen when he was in Kathmandu. Interesting, no?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It's the sort of statement that does not stand up to analysis very well. The reason it is repeated so often is that it is a sort of political statement made first by the third Karmapa.

one: mahayoga has two stages

two: anuyoga is does not really have two stages

three: there is no explanation of the basis that corresponds with Dzogchen teachings in Anuttarayoga tantra. But this explanation does exist in Anuyoga.

For example, I practiced Hevajra for many years. This is considered one of the two "non-dual tantra", the other is Kalacakra.

I can assure you, there is no atiyoga in the Hevajra systems extant in the world today (who knows what is in the Hevajra in 500,000 lines). Hevajra is based completely on the two stages. Of course there are some statements in the Hevajra which resemble statements in Sem sde. Certainly Hevajra is the basis of the idea of sahaja, certainly the final goal of Hevajra is mahāmudra, and there is no doubt that Hevajra is profound. But, I have some expertise in this tantra, I also know Dzogchen pretty well. Saying that the non-dual tantras equal atiyoga is really a stretch; there is no anuyoga in it, let alone atiyoga. But it is a nice politic thing to say which makes people in the new translation schools feel better.

Mipham seemed to feel that the wisdom chapter of the Kalacakra was equivalent to thogal. But Dudjom Rinpoche rejects this idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Well Sönam in the 17 tantras of the Instruction section there is yidam practice. There is also things like prostrations, mandala offerings, guru yoga and so on I been told. How do you explain that if it is your opinion that yidam practice belong to the lower yanas? Also it always been obvious, to me at least, that the Kunjed Gyalpo teaches in a way that can only be understood fully by very seasoned mahayoga practioners.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

I think you are referring the klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma rgyud. This tantras has a fully articulated preliminaries etc., up to thogal, and is mentions Hayagriva/Vajrayogini for the deity. It is the root tantra for which the Khandro Nyinthig is the main commentary.

I have seen mention of Vajravarahi pratice in the commentary of sgra thal gyur attributed to Vimalamitra, but there is no deity yoga practice per se, as far as I am aware, in any of the standard seventeen tantras.

As for the Vima Nyinthig, again there is no explicitly mentioned deity practice that I have noticed, but I have not read all of it. Of course, one might consider the three roots in Lama Yangthig as connected.

Generally however, the deity retreats in these systems never amount to more than 7 days to 21 days.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Tulku Urgyen

Content:

Mariusz said:

"In the system of the New Schools, there are first of all the four tantras of Kriya Tantra, Charya Tantra, Yoga Tantra, and Anuttara Yoga Tantra. The fourth is divided into Father Anuttara Tantra, Mother Anuttara Tantra and Nondual Anuttara Tantra. This correspond exactly to the structure of the Old School, Nyingma, in that father tantra of Anuttara is Mahayoga, mother tantra is Anu yoga and the nondual tantra is Ati Yoga, [Dzogchen].

Malcolm wrote:

This quite arguable. Chogyal Namkhai Norbu explains that this equation of the three inner tantras with father, mother and non-dual tantra was a political gesture. He definitely does not agree with this sort of statement.

The fact is that Longchenpa, etc. all treat HYT as "outer tantra".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: The thicket of views

Content:

TMingyur said:

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

The point of dharma is give sight to the blind, not lead them, still blind, along a path to a destination they still can't see.

This thread is just a bunch of useless verbal proliferation.

In this case, there is no use in getting involved in this briar patch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Astus said:

. If there is a need to refresh Buddhist philosophy it should be done based on proper foundation in the Buddha's teachings. When it is done based on others' interpretations that is already following a lineage, a school.

Namdrol said:

The problem with Buddhist Philosophy is Buddhist Philosophy. There is only one way to "refresh" the teachings -- realization.

Rael said:

as in mish mashing Sunyata teachings with your knowledge of of misleading Sunyata teachings all in one formula....

taking things that point directly to it...

followed by things said by Nargajuna not to use.....all in one unexplained paragraph....

Malcolm wrote:

Rael -- what I said was perfectly correct -- non-empty phenomena are non-dependent.

That does not mean there are such phenomena. This is why Nagarjuna also makes statements to precisely the same effect. The point is that if there were something that was not empty, it would also be non-dependent. Since we do not see, experience or otherwise encounter such non-dependent phenomena, we can rule them out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Namdrol said:

The problem with Buddhist Philosophy is Buddhist Philosophy. There is only one way to "refresh" the teachings -- realization.

Astus said:

But I assume you don't mean that since the 15th century there has been no enlightened being in Tibetan Buddhism, do you?

Malcolm wrote:

No, however, a lot more people would have been realized if they had not been obsessed with schools and philosophy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Vegetarianism vs. Veganism

Content:

KeithBC said:

Huseng, first of all, congratulations on your decision to go vegan. I totally agree with your reasoning.

Animal husbandry is a form of slavery. Gone are the days when "good Christian" owners of human slaves could justify human slavery on the grounds that they treated their slaves well. As Buddhists, we consider all sentient beings to be of equal value. It follows that, if keeping human slaves, however well treated, is wrong, then so is the keeping of animal slaves.

Malcolm wrote:

So, no pets than either, correct?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2011 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Vegetarianism vs. Veganism

Content:

Namdrol said:

One Buddhist argument I've heard from Chinese Buddhists in particular is that the consumption of eggs and milks entails a violation of the precept prohibiting theft. The Buddha never made such an argument.

Huseng said:

Sure, but commentary literature on Bodhisattva precepts (particularly on the Chinese Brahma Net Sutra) discuss this as it relates to the prohibitions concerning trading and raising animals.

Malcolm wrote:

For me, this is not an important sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Astus said:

. If there is a need to refresh Buddhist philosophy it should be done based on proper foundation in the Buddha's teachings. When it is done based on others' interpretations that is already following a lineage, a school.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with Buddhist Philosophy is Buddhist Philosophy. There is only one way to "refresh" the teachings -- realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Vegetarianism vs. Veganism

Content:

Huseng said:

Given that much of the meat consumed in our present day is a result of grotesque and ghoulish industrialized cruelty, it follows that the Bodhisattva aspirant would avoid directly supporting such an economy as much as possible.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. Don't buy commercial agricultural products at all.

Huseng said:

The problem for the vegetarian is that milk and eggs are produced in a likewise fashion.

Malcolm wrote:

Not all.

Huseng said:

Dairy cows are often pumped full of steroids to increase milk production beyond natural levels. The cow's calf is likely to be taken away and turned into veal.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what farm you buy your milk from.

Huseng said:

If a cow stops producing milk they are slaughtered.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily. But yes, sometimes.

Huseng said:

Hens used for egg production are more often than not crammed into cages and slaughtered when they cease producing eggs. Even free range hens will be removed and killed when they cease producing eggs as a result of old age or illness.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on how local your eggs are.

Huseng said:

In some ways dairy cattle and hens face worse fates than cows and chickens raised specifically for their meat.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends.

Huseng said:

So, does it not follow that it is best to abstain from dairy and eggs as well?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily.

Huseng said:

One Buddhist argument I've heard from Chinese Buddhists in particular is that the consumption of eggs and milks entails a violation of the precept prohibiting theft.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha never made such an argument.

Huseng said:

For these reasons I've personally decided to go vegan.

Malcolm wrote:

The most important thing here is observe whether you are healthy or not.

I would recommend instead you adopt more of a south Indian style diet. It is more balanced. Vedic eating, if you will.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: The thicket of views

Content:

conebeckham said:

Out of compassion?

TMingyur said:

When a "real" blind man who cannot see asks you how to get to the railway station that you can see because you are not blind, would you then point to the station that you can see using your hand's finger and say "There it is"?

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

The only reason a blind man (sentient being) knows there is a train station at is is that someone sighted (a buddha) informed him of the fact. They of course then provide the means (the path of cultivation, seeing, etc.) to get to the train station (nirvana).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Restricted books

Content:

tamdrin said:

some people practice but according to Wallace's reading of the Buddhist scriptures in general it is important to cultivate shamatha up to and approaching the first dhyana to be succesful in the other practices in general and this level of concentration is not easy to achieve,

Malcolm wrote:

There is shamatha and then there is shamatha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not all Kagye cycles are mahāyoga. Which one do you mean?

N

Mariusz said:

Your right. I mean those with anu and ati yoga. Nevertheless it is ati yoga of 9 yanas, it is not Dzogchen outside 9 yanas. Is it not?

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

However, the rigpa they are referring to is the same thing. However, clear light of HYT is not rigpa. The term clear light is used in a different way in Dzogchen as well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Restricted books

Content:

tamdrin said:

Hi Heart,

Yes I am glad to hear that it is being published! Scarily enough I have seen parts of it are published by the controversial group (i think they are) american buddha, and can be found by doing a google. search.. Alan Wallace is big into it yes and he has done the translation.. He said this text has everything one would need to achieve the rainbow body.

Namdrol said:

Yes, it does -- so do a thousand others.

kirtu said:

Then "let 1000 rainbow bodies bloom!" to paraphrase another text. "Why aren't they blooming?" was asked of Wallace himself in an interview a while ago.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

People don't practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Britain to blame for worlds troubles

Content:

Caz said:

There are no solutions to samsara in samsaric means.

Malcolm wrote:

There are solutions, just not permanent ones. Still, you take medicine when you are sick, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: The thicket of views

Content:

TMingyur said:

No I am honest ... listen ... I am convinced that Mahayana can be "true Buddhism" (to borrow your words).

Namdrol said:

What defines "true" buddhism?

TMingyur said:

I borrowed Rael's words.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

If you are convinced that Mahayana is not "true" buddhism, what is?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: The thicket of views

Content:

TMingyur said:

No I am honest ... listen ... I am convinced that Mahayana can be "true Buddhism" (to borrow your words).

Malcolm wrote:
What defines "true" buddhism?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: Restricted books
Content:

tamdrin said:

Hi Heart,

Yes I am glad to hear that it is being published! Scarily enough I have seen parts of it are published by the controversial group (i think they are) american buddha, and can be found by doing a google. search.. Alan Wallace is big into it yes and he has done the translation.. He said this text has everything one would need to achieve the rainbow body.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, it does -- so do a thousand others.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 2:02 AM
Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen
Content:

Mariusz said:

please be patient. If Clear light in Highest Yoga Tantra, Ordinary Mind in Mahamudra Tantra and Rigpa in Dzogchen present evidently "the same nature of mind" and we can recognize it immediately, why are you writing that Dzogchen is different "outside" these Tantras (HYT or Maha Yoga, Mahamudra)?

Namdrol said:
Because rigpa in Dzogchen and 'od gsal in HYT are not the same thing.

N

Mariusz said:
Is Rigpa in Dzogchen and Rigpa in Maha Yoga (equivalent of HYT) not the same thing?
For example 8 Kagye initiations of Maha Yoga contain also Rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:
Not all Kagye cycles are mahāyoga. Which one do you mean?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Britain to blame for worlds troubles

Content:

Caz said:

People are always looking for something to blame, Funnily enough they never look for solutions...

Malcolm wrote:

In order to cure someone of a disease, one must first ascertain why they have it. As long as the disease's cause remains undiagnosed, the disease cannot be cured.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

please be patient. If Clear light in Highest Yoga Tantra, Ordinary Mind in Mahamudra Tantra and Rigpa in Dzogchen present evidently "the same nature of mind" and we can recognize it immediately, why are you writing that Dzogchen is different "outside" these Tantras (HYT or Maha Yoga, Mahamudra)?

Malcolm wrote:

Because rigpa in Dzogchen and 'od gsal in HYT are not the same thing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Britain to blame for worlds troubles

Content:

plwk said:

Israel?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, and India, China, Burma, S. Africa, Iraq, Afghanistan...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2011 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Can you elaborate?

Malcolm wrote:

There are many theories of how mantras work. However, at basis, if you do some long retreat on a wisdom deity, any retreat, and gains signs of success, then chances of these others kinds of mantras working for you are much better.

At any rate, this is my personal experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

So what is the point? Is really Clear Light or Ordinary Mind not "self-liberated" but "transformed"?

Namdrol said:

Sorry, perhaps I was not clear. What I was referring to was the principal of Dzogchen that is beyond the nine yanas.

Mariusz said:

Sorry Namdrol, but it is not the answer of the same kind of question: how Dzogchen "self-liberation path" is not like Tantra "the transformation path" but beyond this tantra (9 yanas).

Malcolm wrote:

I really do not understand your question. I know you are not a native speaker of english. Please rewrite in a more understandable form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Britain to blame for worlds troubles

Content:

KwanSeum said:

David Cameron has suggested that Britain and the legacy of its empire was responsible for many of the world's historic problems
(<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/politics/a-world-of-troubles-ndash-all-made-in-britain-2264328.html>).

Discuss.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a no-brainer for anyone who has studied history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Namdrol,

In your opinion does the hocus pocus of using various mantras to attract a worldly boon work?

Malcolm wrote:

If you produce the function of mantra in your speech, then mantras work. They do not have any magic power of their own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The Avatamsaka sutra is not found in the rgyud sde of the Kangyur, I can assure you since I have access to several versions. There is a two volume collection at the end of the rgyud sde where all dharanis from both sutra and tantra are collected. The dharanis in the Avatamska are also found there.

The abhisheka mentioned in the Dasabhumisutra and the Lanka-avatara is only bestowed upon tenth stage bodhisattvas. It is not a method that is taught for ordinary people.

These kinds of misconceptions have been put to bed by Indian tantric scholars 1200 years ago. Tripitakamala is one person you should read to understand the difference between sutra and tantras, as well as many others.

Aemilius said:

You should read Lankavatara Sutra Chapter 2.40 ;Two kinds Of Buddha's Sustaining Power (Adhithana)

This subchapter is about two and half pages, the verse at its the end goes:
163.The sustaining power is purified by the Buddhas' vows; in the baptism,
Samadhis,etc., from the first to the tenth stage, the bodhisattvas are in the embrace of
the Buddhas.

"Baptism" means abhisheka, obviously.

This means that Bodhisattvas are conferred the Buddhas' sustaining power through
their whole career, not just on the 10th Bhumi.

"By the power of the Buddha" occurs repeatedly through the Avatamsaka Sutra. It must
be the same Adhithana that is discussed in Lankavatara?

Adhithana is also present in Diamond Sutra when it says that "Tathagata blesses
bodhisattva-mahasattvas with the greatest of blessings"

Malcolm wrote:

Adhithana and abhisheka are not the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Moreover when I met ChNN in 1998 He also distinguished: Dzogchen is the "self-
liberation path" not like Tantra "the transformation path". I guess He suggested "outside
9 yanas approach" but did not mention it. Maybe it deals with His terma-teachings that
He discovered as I read somewhere but not sure if it?

Namdrol said:

This is not ChNN's idea. It is present in the basic tantras of Dzogchen.

Mariusz said:

So what is the point? Is really Clear Light or Ordinary Mind not "self-liberated" but
"transformed"?

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, perhaps I was not clear. What I was referring to was the principal of Dzogchen
that is beyond the nine yanas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Moreover when I met ChNN in 1998 He also distinguished: Dzogchen is the "self-liberation path" not like Tantra "the transformation path". I guess He suggested "outside 9 yanas approach" but did not mention it. Maybe it deals with His terma-teachings that He discovered as I read somewhere but not sure if it?

Malcolm wrote:

This is not ChNN's idea. It is present in the basic tantras of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 7:51 PM

Title: Re: Lamdre.

Content:

narraboth said:

Blessing or not, you still need to do daily practices after that!

I think daily practice is a basic requirement and it's better to do retreat, although I doubt how many could do that nowadays.... (Another question is, how beneficial a full Lamdre teaching can be if people won't do a retreat to put all those teachings into practice?)

Malcolm wrote:

Whether you do daily practices after receiving Lamdre depends on the master giving the teaching.

You don't need to do a retreat to practice the full Lamdre.

But it helps.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 4:13 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

Non-grasping, non-attachment, non-craving. No agent experiencing.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Exactly that is the emptiness taught first by the Buddha, and reinforced by Nāgārjuna when Abhidharma speculations deviated into substantialist speculation. There is no other emptiness apart from selflessness. Selflessness = emptiness = dependent origination.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

They correspond to the three characteristics selflessness, impermanence and dukkha.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

How do you understand selflessness?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

Of course there are different meanings of the term "emptiness".

Namdrol said:

Where do the three gates of liberation, śūnyatā, alakṣaṇa, and apranidhana, fit in your scheme?

You see, nirvana, according to your presentation of the Sabba sutta, seems to be excluded.

TMingyur said:

The times I have had a scheme I've been completely lost. So I better refrain from fabricating a scheme in order to meet your expectations.

One can rid oneself of obscurations ... be it with or without the Sabba sutta. If this is what you refer to with "Nirvana" then I cannot understand your 2nd sentence. If your "Nirvana" refers to something else other than that then I cannot understand you either.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

To rephrase: do you understand the three gates of liberation? If so, how?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Approaching Nagarjuna and the Mulamadhyamakakarika...

Content:

dharmapracaya said:

Thank you, you are helping me to clarify a basic confusion: from what you say, I gather that Pingalo's commentary is *not* the Chinese version of the Akutobhaya. For some reason, I was under that (wrong) impression.

However, if it is close to the Bv., it means it must be relatively concise and to the point: maybe Bocking's book may indeed be a very good first step in reading the MMK? (Going back to the initial topic of the post).

Malcolm wrote:

I've never really looked at Akutobhya -- but I have read significant portions of the Buddhapalita -- both P and B parse the MMK as a dialogue between Nag and an opponent who is gradually lead to understanding the real meaning of the Buddha's teaching.

It is fairly, and a good job, I think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Approaching Nagarjuna and the Mulamadhyamakakarika...

Content:

dharmapracaya said:

That's true - I wasn't thinking about Bocking's translation. Thank you for mentioning it: I haven't read it - if you have, may I ask you, what was your impression? It's translated from the Chinese rather than from the Tibetan version, if I am not mistaken. If it's a good translation, perhaps that could be a viable starting point for reading the MMK.

I also heard about John Dunne's project, which has been going on for several years, but so far I don't know whether he has completed it or not. It is something to look forward to!

Malcolm wrote:

Bocking considers this to be largely the work of Kumarajiva -- but it definitely comes from the same milieu as the Buddhapālita vritti -- the main difference is the presence of Mahayāna citations.

There is no Tibetan version of this commentary. But is close to Buddhapālita.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2011 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Approaching Nagarjuna and the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā...

Content:

dharmapracaya said:

It has been mentioned that it is a pity, and it may be strange, that Kumārajīva's commentary hasn't been translated – considering that at least two major Tibetan commentaries to the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā have.

I personally agree: also, I'd like to notice that not even one of the Indian commentaries has been translated in its entirety. There are a few:

The Akutobhaya, which is concise and ascribed to Nāgārjuna himself by some traditions; even if one does not accept it as an auto-commentary, it remains the oldest available commentary on the text;

Buddhapālita's commentary;

Bhāvaviveka's commentary;

Candrakīrti's commentary.

If I am not mistaken, there is also a commentary by Sthiramati, the great Yogācāra commentator.

Hopefully in the next years some of these crucial commentaries will be translated. I am familiar with only one of them, Candrakīrti's own, and I can say it is truly remarkable in pointing out the connections between the MMK and a very broad literature, spanning from non-Mahāyāna Sūtras, to different schools of Abhidharma, and so forth. I trust that most traditional commentaries share the same familiarity with the broader context of the root text.

Malcolm wrote:

Prasannapada is being done by John Dunne and Sarah McIntock, or so I understand.

Brian Bocking translated Kumarajiva's translations of the Pingalo commentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: cosmic evolution

Content:

ram peswani said:

...and Mahyana needs for one to walk alone and accumulate creativity and Wisdom...

gregkavarnos said:

This is pure nonsense. A teacher is a pivotal factor on the Mahayana path. Look at all the icons of the Bodhisattvas, why do you think they have their teachers sitting on a lotus above their head or in their usnisha?

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly to show what Buddha family they emanate from.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

Of course there are different meanings of the term "emptiness".

Malcolm wrote:

Where do the three gates of liberation, śūnyatā, alakṣana, and apranidhana, fit in your scheme?

You see, nirvana, according to your presentation of the Sabba sutta, seems to be excluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Sherab said:

Agreed. Nothing's wrong with simulated practice. Modern commercial pilots have to fly in a simulator before they qualify to do the real thing.

Malcolm wrote:

There maybe nothing wrong with flight simulators, but we don't have those in Vajrayana.

You either are a real practitioner or you are not a practitioner at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you worked with the realization of emptiness, you'd be a first stage bodhisattva right?

No, here we are taking emptiness into the path through our knowledge.

N

Sherab said:

Yes, I was thinking that only someone on the path of seeing and above could do the actual rather than a simulated Vajrayana practice.

I suppose that when you use the term Vajrayana practice, you don't distinguish between simulated and actual practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Practice is practice. The experiences we are taking into the path in sadhana practice come to us through the experiences of the empowerment -- there is no such thing as "simulated practice". You either practice or you don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Sherab said:

Beings processes, kadag and lhundrub are not identical in Dzogchen. It is correct to say this? If yes, how is kadag equivalent to emptiness and lhundrub equivalent to dependent origination since in Madhyamaka, emptiness is identical to dependent origination according to your earlier reasoning.

Malcolm wrote:

Kadag and lhundrub are completely inseparable.

Lhundrub is kadag, kadag is lhundrub i.e. original purity has self-perfected qualities; these self-perfected qualities are originally pure.

So, it is precisely the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 8:04 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is it means one adds tantric methods like tsalung only to be prepare onself in case of "get it" during future initiation with intro in Rigpa, to perfect somehow one's own qualities/openess for introduction?

Namdrol said:

What it means is that the methods of Dzogchen are completely different than the methods of the two stages.

The two stages are always involved with trying to discover something with the mind, peeling away the layers of one's body, speech and mind trying to reveal its most subtle nature.

With Dzogchen practice, you are working with that knowledge, the goal of the two stages, right from the beginning. This is why Dzogchen is referred to as the vehicle beyond cause and result.

Likewise, in sutra, you are always practicing and trying to discover emptiness. But in Vajrayāna, you work with that knowledge of emptiness right from the very beginning. Emptiness is the result, from the sutra point of view, so in Vajrayana one works with the principle of the result of sutra right from the beginning.

N

Sherab said:

Could you clarify? You said that In Vajrayana, one works with the knowledge of emptiness from the very beginning. I thought that the actual practice of Vajrayana (as opposed to a simulated practice), one works with the realization of emptiness rather than the knowledge of emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

If you worked with the realization of emptiness, you'd be a first stage bodhisattva right?

No, here we are taking emptiness into the path through our knowledge.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Bikram Yoga

Content:

mr. gordo said:

Namdrol, I saw this:

http://www.kripalu.org/program/view/YY-111/yantra_yoga_in_the_manglam_tradition "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Yantra Yoga is designed to help you awaken fully to your Buddha nature through the use of physical postures (asana), breath-control exercises (pranayama), and meditative practices. Introduced to Tibet by the Mahasiddha Virupa in the tenth century, the practice of Yantra Yoga can help reduce your stress, improve your health, and deepen your meditative experience through techniques that positively affect your body and mind.

This highly experiential workshop will be led by Lama Migmar Tseten of Harvard University, and David Magone, the founder of PranaVayu Yoga. You will take part in a traditional Yantra Yoga initiation ceremony and learn to work directly with the body's energy systems by using Yantra Yoga postures, breathing exercises, and mantras.

Yantra Yoga was traditionally considered a secret teaching, offered to initiates of Vajrayana Buddhism only after many years of intensive preparation and meditation. For this reason, it has rarely been offered in the West. Given the nature of these teachings, at least one full year of yoga experience is required to participate.

Is this practice taken out of Lam Dre? Do you know if they will be going over or reviewing Kumbhaka (vase breathing)?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is from Lamdre -- I translated the basic texts for this with Lama Migmar.

Yes, it has pranayāma. They should be going over khumbhaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:

the formula posed this way is deceptive in my opinion...

Malcolm wrote:

Ok. I heard you. I don't agree. But that's ok.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 2:04 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?
Content:

Namdrol said:
The earliest bio we have of him, AFAIK, is in the Vima nyinthig, the lo rgyus chen mo.

Nangwa said:
Is there an English translation of this available?

Malcolm wrote:
Valby translated it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:56 AM
Title: Re: Reconsiderations on Not-Really-Buddhism
Content:

Jikan said:
I've been as critical as anyone of New Agey product lines that are presented as Buddhist teaching but aren't. Here's an example.

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=2061&start=0&hilit=kuji#p14097>
" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

These situations are problematic if people get stuck in them, and develop long-term confusions and attachments as a consequence (the confusion of thinking one is enlightened when one is really not, for instance). I still think it would be better to work an honest job than to try to make an easy living selling phony Dharma. But it may well be that, for some, there is no getting stuck: they get started, read the fine print, and move on shortly after. If you're in El Paso, Texas, say, you might spend a moment or two here...

<http://www.sukhidevi.com> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

...before you move on and get settled in practice here:

<http://www.ctbcc.com> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Getting acquainted with Buddhist practice and Buddhist cultures can be tricky for many. I'm speculating that a transitional phase might be useful, although I'm not comfortable with the profit/prophet motive behind some of these in-between groups. I've seen this happen in Tendai-shu in North America, where people come in with a head full of ideas they've absorbed from different martial arts manuals and YouTube videos on Reiki and

Instant Karma, which bridge the gap from Guy-On-The-Street-Mind to In-The-Know-Practitioner-Mind.

Thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

This is another person bounced from e-sangha for failing to satisfy ordination and or permission to teach requirements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:

you are now agreeing with meWTF

Namdrol said:

As I said, before deciding someone does not understand something, ask first.

Rael said:

oki doke here's one for ya...

why enter the jaberwockey in a paragraph of teaching about emptiness when you knew it was actually something that should be addressed separate....or did it sort of blur into your post.....and like you gotta leave it there now cause your infallible....

questions questions....

Malcolm wrote:

It's a formula, incomplete unless all terms are stated.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

Yeah Sonam,

I'm sure the TOKDEN just did all those practices because it was the culture he was born into... That makes a lot of sense while we can find every excuse to be lazy here in the western countries and then expect realization of the rainbow body (wouldn't you have to get to the first BHUMI first) sitting around on the computer deciphering the "highest view" from the scriptures..

Malcolm wrote:

According to Khenpo Ngachung, the paths and stages don't really map to Dzogchen, but you can explain things that way:

Visions 1 & 2, below the path of seeing.

Vision 3; path of seeing and path of cultivation (bhumis 1-7)

vision 4; end of path of cultivation and path of no more learning (stages 8 to 16).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

it just not a "Tibetan habit" or a cultural thing and it surprise me that you would defend someone who said like that about Togden Rinpoche.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't. I was explaining a little about some of the background, linking practice with our condition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

People in truth have some fantasy about what Garab Dorje must have been like. WE really know very little about what his historical life may have been like. I actually seem to recall that he liked practicing om ah hum vajra recitations and that he meditated in samadhi for like 30 years in retreat.. So actually he probably didn't just miraculously become this great master and his 3 words, although the essence of his teaching are his pointing out instructions and they aren't probably all the t, actually most definitely..

Malcolm wrote:

He was a "nirmanakāya of compassion" i.e. a direct emanation of Vajradhara. According to legend, we know that he uttered the rdo rje sems dpa' nam kha che when he was eight -- this sort of rules out "becoming" a great master.

We know that he is a first human master in one kama transmission of Yamantaka.

We know he freaked out "500" hundred Indian Panditas, headed up by Mañjuśrimitra. Maybe there were two, the later one, Śrī Singha's teacher, was the reincarnation of the first, Garab Dorje's disciple.

The earliest bio we have of him, AFAIK, is in the Vima nyinthig, the lo rgyus chen mo.

As far as the rest goes, it is shrouded in legend and fable. It is all very uncertain. Norbu Rinpoche would like to place him circa 55 CE. based I think on the Sem sde lineages. There are all kinds of problems trying to date this person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:

you are now agreeing with meWTF

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, before deciding someone does not understand something, ask first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:

there is no such thing as "The Nature of non-empty"

Namdrol said:

Some people think there are non-empty things, such people think those things lack dependence -- for example, the Nyaya school. They are very opposed to the idea of emptiness and maintain that non-empty things are non-dependent things.

You might want to read chapter 15 of the MMK where Nāgārjuna addresses the idea of non-empty, non-dependent phenomena.

Rael said:

oki doke...but can we skip to the part where i tell you that he was addressing this as the wrong way of looking at things.....

that it is totally going to throw you off.....

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not going to throw me off in the least -- I know that Nāgājuna is rejecting non-empty, non-dependent things completely. That is the whole point, non-empty, non-dependent things don't exist at all -- they are mere abstractions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Nangwa said:

This is a pretty clear and pithy teaching on the Three Statements.

"A Dzogchen Master STARTS with "direct introduction" with everyone. If they don't "get it" then one starts to use all the infinite methods and means to help bring about the experience of Rigpa. When one has the experience of Rigpa, then one confirms the validity of one's path now being "remaining with Rigpa" as path. Then, one simply continues in that state. Rigpa is the view to be experienced, Rigpa is the path to be followed, and Rigpa is the fruit of the path. There is no change in Rigpa, either in the beginning, middle or end. The fruit is your first realization of Rigpa. There are no Stages of Rigpa. Thogel does not modify Rigpa."—Dudjom Rinpoche on the Three Statements of Garab Dorje

Malcolm wrote:

Precisely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:

there is no such thing as "The Nature of non-empty"

Malcolm wrote:

I agree with you. That line was a formal statement to show that a non-dependent thing would have to be non-empty. Such things do not exist, therefore there are no things that are not empty.

Some people think there are non-empty things, such people think those things lack dependence -- for example, the Nyaya school. They are very opposed to the idea of emptiness and maintain that non-empty things are non-dependent things.

You might want to read chapter 15 of the MMK where Nāgārjuna addresses the idea of non-empty, non-dependent phenomena.

Before you decide people are in error, you might want to find out if you have understood what they are saying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Once you have knowledge of your state (rigpa), and it is concrete, you have no more doubt, then you proceed in the confidence of liberation. That does not mean you are liberated, just you are certain that for you it will happen, based on your knowledge, your rigpa.

So, I guess I agree more with Sonam.

However, until you have firm knowledge (rigpa) of your state free from doubts, then you need to use various methods to reinforce that knowledge (rigpa).

Introduction --> recognition --> confidence --> liberation.

N

heart said:

Our understanding of the three words obviously differ. It gets a little too personal to continue the discussion at this point and I know from experience that I can't beat you with words. Anyway what Sönam is saying is that once you sat through a direct introduction you don't need anything because you are all the time in rigpa because that is what he read in the Dzogchen Tantras. You agree with him, it is fine with me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

When you have received direct introduction:

- a) you do not have recognition.
- b) you have recognition.

If a) proceed to use methods to discover the state of that introduction; then proceed to b.

If b) proceed to removing doubts

c) stabilize that knowledge.

d) continue in that state.

I don't think there is anything controversial about the aforementioned breakdown.

d) continue in that state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

You think so? Plato was trying to prove the (pre-)existence of a permanent notion called "cupness" and Diogenes challenged this by bringing pointing to the fact that it was all merely a (foolish) mental fabrication.

Rael said:

interesting...my take on it was Plato saw that our mind formulates the things around us and gives them a label.

he wasn't talking about the fact that ultimately there is no cup....

your projecting....

Malcolm wrote:

The point greg was making is that plato theorized there was a ideal cup that informed all instances of cups. That ideal cup is ultimate, all cups that derive from that ideal are relative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I also want to add it is not necessary to become an expert in Dzogchen texts to realize Dzogchen. It is not about intellectual learning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

I just tell you what I been taught and what seems incredibly supported by the tantras of Dzogchen.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

How many of them have you actually read?

heart said:

Well, apart from the Kunjed Gyalpo and a few private publication, not that much. However, many Dzogchen texts by for example by Longchenpa quote heavily from various Tantras. The same is true in various guidance manuals. Anyway, I don't read Tibetan as you well know.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Right, and you understand that a lot of what Longchenpa wrote was defensive, meant to prevent criticisms of Dzogchen from those who adhered to the gradual path?

I would be quite hesitant to make proclamations about what the Dzogchen tantras say and do not say if you have not read them in a comprehensive way. I don't mean this is a mean way, or to suggest you are stupid -- I am not mean, and you are not stupid. But the real teaching of Garab Dorje is surprising in many ways. Not least of which is pretty constant refrain that the real meaning of Dzogchen cannot be approached through the nine yantras.

I don't want to get into providing voluminous citations -- because I think this is abusing the teaching, turning it into a book dance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:

non empty.....i mean there is a reason you never read a teacher saying this before....lol

edit....the nature of non- empty is even worse.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read Nāgārjuna again:

"If there were something a little not empty, there would be something to be empty;
as there is nothing that is not empty, where is there something to be empty?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

You know, after reading through the last three pages of this thread the following question came to mind:

Is the dog chasing its tail or is the tail chasing the dog? dog.jpg

Woof!

Rael said:

the only problem i see is using the names of the likes of Nargajuna to impute ones own
obscured view unto the philosophy of Sunyata...

Sunyata is best left to someone who has realized it...not just understanding it's
implications....and parroting quotes ...

any device used in this thread that in the slightest way deviates the reader from coming
to the true experience is dangerous both for the author and the reader....

Malcolm wrote:

Guess we should just all shut up and go home.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2011 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

I just tell you what I been taught and what seems incredibly supported by the tantras of
Dzogchen.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

How many of them have you actually read?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Bikram Yoga

Content:

mr. gordo said:

I'm signing up for Bikram yoga classes and was wondering if there are health issues from a Tibetan Medical perspective in doing asanas in a room heated to 105°F ($\approx 40.6^{\circ}\text{C}$) with a humidity of 40%. Does the heat really make this form of yoga superior to other forms of yogas like hatha or ashtanga? Are there potential health issues that could arise if the temperature of the room is that high?

Namdrol said:

Yes, Bikram can be bad for you if you have a pitta constitution.

The heat does not make it superior other forms of yoga.

mr. gordo said:

Thanks Namdrol.

If you are in new york, I would recommend Yoga Sutra.

Oh, the Krishnamacharya Lineage! I had no idea this was being taught in NY! It's in the city, but I've done similar treks and it looks worth it. The Bikram school is like 15 minutes away from me...Yoga Sutra is like 90 minutes.

Malcolm wrote:

Yoga sutra is better. More diverse and they invite Shrivasta Ramaswami, a master I would like very much to learn from.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Astus said:

"Hi Astus, perhaps I'm misunderstanding, but when speaking of the material aggregate, it is composed of the 5 sense organs and 5 sense objects. So for example the sense organ of smell is composed of a patch of atoms that detects the different odors. The sensory data would be the sense object of odor."

That is all right. The disagreement is simply on the nature of the aggregates whether they're things to be experienced or philosophical concepts.

Malcolm wrote:

The skandhas, āyatanas and dhātus are phenomenological categories i.e. headings for experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

I heard so many things about my own Guru before I managed to get a little closer to him. People were putting him down in many ways. But I stuck with him because he made a very strong personal connection with me when we met that left me wide open. I wanted to practice Dzogchen but it seemed he only taught Mahamudra, or so people told me. I just kept doing my Ngondro. Then one day many years ago he said to me "you need the pointing-out" and gave it to me. Since that day he been the most marvelous Dzogchen teacher you can imagine. He is like Longchenpa or Manjusrimita. He done such things, you would not believe me if I told you.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

So who is your root Guru?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

This is not just my observation -- this is an observation I have heard Norbu Rinpoche make many times, as well as Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, and so on. So, it should be taken to heart. There are many lamas these days using the name "Dzogchen" to sell their teachings.

heart said:

The question is who are these Lama's?

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to receive Dzogchen teachings, go find a real Dzogchen master. You have to decide for yourself who is real and who is just a salesman. No one can do that for you. But you will know the difference, eventually. So choose well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Restricted books

Content:

Hayagriva said:

Thanks Namdrol.

I was talking to a dharma friend and I mentioned that one of my favourite dharma books I've ever come across is 'Buddhahood Without Meditation' - a freely available text. They were very adamant I shouldn't read it without a long and full teaching on it. They went so far as to say it would be completely unintelligible to someone who hadn't had these. I can see merit in this position, but it seemed to go way too far in my opinion.

Obviously that's just my take on the conversation, but what's your view on this kind of position? I know there would be many out there in agreement, and many others who'd object.

Malcolm wrote:

I think that there are some people who would understand, other people who would not.

I think there is a lot of fanaticism around these things that is unhealthy and counterproductive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

so please don't interpret this as criticism of him but rather of what Namdrol said.

Malcolm wrote:

Rather than criticizing what I say, you should open your ears and listen; there are two approaches to Dzogchen:

1) gradual i.e. the nine yānas approach

2) non -- gradual i.e. Dzogchen's own approach to itself as teaching independent of the nine yānas.

In the second approach, you use what you want/need from lower vehicles. In the first approach, each level is necessarily preceded by the earlier.

This point of view is not my fabrication.

It is pointless to talk about these things with people -- since people just stubbornly cling to whatever idea they start with, and get involved with trenchant disagreements that last for years. It is pretty stupid really. Better not to say anything and keep one's understanding to oneself.

BTW, this is not about what Norbu Rinpoche says or does not say. These things are plainly stated in the basic texts of the tantras of Dzogchen. You can read them there. Over and out.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Sönam said:

Once more I never say Dzogchen has problem with something, and certainly not with ngondrö and Yidam ... as for Chnn's uncle he was (like our others masters) born in that "culture of the practice" which is the tibetan buddhism, so he spent his live to practice those "techniques" ... it does not mean that it "brought him to the rainbow body". Others techniques (or non-techniques) would have "brought him" to the same result.

Sönam

heart said:

Seriously, how do you know that? Are you about to attain the rainbow body or do you know someone that is? In my ears it sounds very arrogant to say that.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, you have to understand one thing about Togden Rinpoche, when he was young, he suffered from mental illness. As I understand it, a lot of his practice was oriented towards removing the causes of his underlying health problems, chö, yantra, prostrations, etc. This is the reason, for example, that his main Yidam practice was Takhyung Barwa. We practiced this in the community for many years until Norbu Rinpoche switched to Guru Dragphur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

What you need to do is go to a dzogchen master and do what they ask you to do. There are many styles of dzogchen masters out there. Some are not as "Dzogchen" as others

even though they use the name "Dzogchen" to sell teachings.

heart said:

I really hope no one listen to this. Don't let intellectual ideas like "who is the most and purest Dzogchen teacher" lead you when connecting to a teacher.

Maybe you should speak up Namdrol and say which teachers exactly you consider "not so Dzogchen".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

This is not just my observation -- this is an observation I have heard Norbu Rinpoche make many times, as well as Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, and so on. So, it should be taken to heart. There are many lamas these days using the name "Dzogchen" to sell their teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

I don't think you are really communicating with one another.

heart said:

"Once you have recognized rig-pa, "life change", and nothing "leads" to rig-pa, because the "practice" is only "no to" fall in ma-rigpa"

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Once you have knowledge of your state (rigpa), and it is concrete, you have no more doubt, then you proceed in the confidence of liberation. That does not mean you are liberated, just you are certain that for you it will happen, based on your knowledge, your rigpa.

So, I guess I agree more with Sonam.

However, until you have firm knowledge (rigpa) of your state free from doubts, then you need to use various methods to reinforce that knowledge (rigpa).

Introduction --> recognition --> confidence --> liberation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Lamdre.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Lam 'bras, the path together with the result is the main teaching of the Sakya school....

mr. gordo said:

I've heard the daily practice takes about 2 hours? Is that about right?

narraboth said:

Depends on what length of text you will be doing, also how familiar you are with the practice, could be from 20 min to 4 hours. Usually a lamdre teaching will give you the right and obligation to do three of '4 unbreakable' daily; people should consider this before receiving.

It's not really about three years retreat; it's a complete path leads to enlightenment; people are encouraged to do retreat but not necessary (depends on what you would be asked by your lama). I believe Sakyapa emphasize daily practice more than retreat, if you are not going to be a dorje lopon.... and I have heard that Sakya retreats are more 'number' retreats than 'time' retreats (you fulfill certain amount of mantra chanting during retreat rather than set a time).

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. It is the three year retreat that I did. As to your second observation, I would disagree. Sakyas are encouraged to do retreats. But doing daily practice is also very important. Sakya retreats are number retreats for beginners and time retreats for the more experienced. And for those of best capacity, they are "sign" retreats i.e. you stay in until you have signs.

These days Lamdre is usually given as a "blessing".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Restricted books

Content:

Hayagriva said:

What makes a text or teaching 'restricted'? Are there any uniform guidelines?

I find it interesting that there are two English translations of 'Flight of the Garuda' out there, one being restricted and the other being open.

Malcolm wrote:

Eric Pema Kunzang's is restricted because he was following the advice of Dilgo Khyentse. Dowman's is not restricted, I assume, because he felt comfortable publishing it.

There is no central authority or committee that determines these things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The citation means that "empty" and "dependent" are completely interchangeable terms. It can be expressed as follows:

Something empty is something dependent;
something dependent is something empty;
something not-empty is something non-dependent;
something non-dependent is something not-empty.
The nature of the dependent is to be empty;
the nature of the empty is to be dependent;
the nature of the non-dependent is to be non-empty;
the nature of the non-empty is to be non-dependent.

In other words, dependent origination and śūnyatā are precisely the same thing.

N

Sherab said:

How is Dzogchen beyond cause and effect if emptiness is identical to dependent origination?

Malcolm wrote:

Sort of off topic-- but to answer the question: Dzogchen is a way of realization that is beyond cause and effect i.e. which does not require causal accumulations of merit and wisdom. It is not an ontological state beyond cause and effect. The reason that Dzogchen does not propose an ontological state is that since no phenomena at all are established in the basis, there are no ontological states at all, either existent or non-existent. In Dzogchen, the term "dependent origination" refers solely to the process initiated by the knowledge obscuration of avidyā which falsely imputes identity to person and things onto the appearance of the basis. Kadag and lhundrup may be understood as how non-afflictive or pre-afflictive processes in the basis are described in Dzogchen teachings.

Vidyā | Avidyā

kadag | emptiness

lhundrub | dependent origination

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

In other words, dependent origination and śūnyatā are precisely the same thing. The nidanas explain the dependent origination of kleshas. They are if you will, the special theory of dependent origination.

But what I am discussing here, and what Nāgārjuna is actually talking about generally is the general theory of dependent origination.

TMingyur said:

Interesting. I would say that "the dependent origination of the nidanas" and the "general theory of dependent origination" " are precisely the same thing " (to borrow your own words).

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

The nidanas are a specialized account of the process of samsara, there can be as many as thirteen and few as eight, depending on what sutra one is reading.

The general theory of dependent origination runs something like the following:

Where this existed, that exists;
with the arising of that, this arose;
Where this does not exist, that does not exist,
with the cessation of that, this ceased.

In for the above to function, the above must all be empty, as Nāgārjuna extensively shows. As substantialist explanation of the above formula does not work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 10:22 AM

Title: Re: Bikram Yoga

Content:

mr. gordo said:

I'm signing up for Bikram yoga classes and was wondering if there are health issues from a Tibetan Medical perspective in doing asanas in a room heated to 105°F (≈ 40.6°C)

with a humidity of 40%. Does the heat really make this form of yoga superior to other forms of yogas like hatha or ashtangha? Are there potential health issues that could arise if the temperature of the room is that high?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Bikram can be bad for you if you have a pitta constitution.

The heat does not make it superior other forms of yoga.

If you are in new york, I would recommend Yoga Sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 10:11 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

retrofuturist said:

Greetings Namdrol,

Namdrol said:

In other words, dependent origination and śūnyatā are precisely the same thing.

retrofuturist said:

In what sense are you referring to dependent origination here?

Malcolm wrote:

In the general sense. The nidanas explain the dependent origination of kleshas. They are if you will, the special theory of dependent origination.

But what I am discussing here, and what Nāgārjuna is actually talking about generally is the general theory of dependent origination. It is for this reason he spends so much time discussion external phenomena such as the six causes and four conditions, the five elements, time, etc., as well as things like karma, four noble truths, etc.

All of these phenomena are dependent phenomena; all of these phenomena are also empty. To the extent they are empty, they are dependent; to the extent they are dependent, they are empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 9:09 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Sherab said:

Does the quotation contradict my proposed answer? If yes, please elaborate.

Namdrol said:

The inherent meaning of dependent origination is emptiness. Whatever is empty dependently arises; whatever dependently arises is empty, according to Nagarjuna.

In other words, there is nothing not empty that arises at all, and all that arises is empty because it dependently arises. There is no emptiness apart from dependent origination, and no dependent origination apart from emptiness.

Sherab said:

Doesn't "Whatever arises in dependence does not in truth arise" refer to the nonduality (inseparability) of dependent origination and emptiness? In other words, the quote does not refer to the equality of emptiness and dependent origination and is instead referring to emptiness and dependent origination as "aspects" of the ultimate. If so, the explanation given by you refers to just this nonduality (inseparability) isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

The citation means that "empty" and "dependent" are completely interchangeable terms. It can be expressed as follows:

Something empty is something dependent;
something dependent is something empty;
something not-empty is something non-dependent;
something non-dependent is something not-empty.
The nature of the dependent is to be empty;
the nature of the empty is to be dependent;
the nature of the non-dependent is to be non-empty;
the nature of the non-empty is to be non-dependent.

In other words, dependent origination and śūnyatā are precisely the same thing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

With Dzogchen practice, you are working with that knowledge, the goal of the two stages, right from the beginning. This is why Dzogchen is referred to as the vehicle beyond cause and result.

N

Mariusz said:

So how can we practice for Dzogchen when we have already failed the introduction in Rigpa in the past initiation by our masters in the first place? Dzogchen can not start from nothing (when for example we have never had connection with Dzogchen in previous lives)? Is failed introduction enough only? Sorry, I'm trying to understand this seems to paradox

Malcolm wrote:

No such thing as a failed introduction. The introduction is based on your experience. You will always have an experience in introduction even if it passes you by so quickly you cannot recognize it. This is why you work with this first.

Maybe you need some secondary practice, like two stages, tsalung, etc., or you have a problem an obstacle you need to remove.

However, you will not understand this very well talking to me or anyone else on the internet. This is not something that can be understood intellectual sans experience. It is like trying to explain to someone who has never encountered a lemon what a lemon tastes like. Even if you tell them it is sour, their "sour lemon" is just an intellectual concept.

What you need to do is go to a dzogchen master and do what they ask you to do. There are many styles of dzogchen masters out there. Some are not as "Dzogchen" as others even though they use the name "Dzogchen" to sell teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

heart said:

Sorry if I misquoted you, but what would be the point of doing these practices if they don't lead to the recognition of rigpa? It is pretty clear to me that what makes you recognize your own nature is nothing but the accumulation of merit and wisdom. Without that accumulation it is impossible to even find your root Guru. Then after recognition it is still incredibly important because there are almost infinite ways of straying from the path, misunderstanding the path or just **** up.

There are so many Nyingthik cycles and Yangti cycle that contain all these practices, are you suggesting that Guru Rinpoche, Vimalamitra and so on was mistaken?

/magnus

Sönam said:

magnus,

the ambiguity is on "to lead to" ... when you view in term on linearity, you have to considere accumulation of merit. Because of that accumulation one come to a point of recognition of rig-pa. With that view, one may say accumulation of merit (yidam, ngondrö, or else and so on) "leads" to the recognition of rig-pa (Dzogchen). Once you

have recognized rig-pa, "life change", and nothing "leads" to rig-pa, because the "practice" is only "no to" fall in ma-rigpa (which in "reality-fact" is totally impossible). Of course, in that "space", when it is in the here and now, one can practice Yidam, ngondro and so on, and it 'fit' energies, but even there, the practice is slightly different, there is no more "2 phases", but only one, the "immediate and spontaneous" completion one ... but then it is not "a lead", it's spontaneous and immediate.

Sönam

heart said:

Seriously Sönam, I don't know how to tell you this in a soft way, but this is not how you practice Dzogchen. I told you many times now, if you try to prolong the recognition it is just mind, just a thought. Not that I am an expert or anything but as my teacher say "short moments repeated many times", compassion and devotion come in very handy there if you want to repeat it "many times".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you are really communicating with one another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is it means one adds tantric methods like tsalung only to be prepare oneself in case of "get it" during future initiation with intro in Rigpa, to perfect somehow one's own qualities/openess for introduction?

Malcolm wrote:

What it means is that the methods of Dzogchen are completely different than the methods of the two stages.

The two stages are always involved with trying to discover something with the mind, peeling away the layers of one's body, speech and mind trying to reveal its most subtle nature.

With Dzogchen practice, you are working with that knowledge, the goal of the two stages, right from the beginning. This is why Dzogchen is referred to as the vehicle beyond cause and result.

Likewise, in sutra, you are always practicing and trying to discover emptiness. But in Vajrayāna, you work with that knowledge of emptiness right from the very beginning. Emptiness is the result, from the sutra point of view, so in Vajrayana one works with the principle of the result of sutra right from the beginning.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Sönam said:

sorry to be late ...

Mariusz said:

Thank you Namdrol and Sonam. I hope it will help me in my retreat this year

Nevertheless, can we use in Dzogchen Nyinthig the tsalung practice to enter this very recognition of Rigpa (when failed Initiation) in the same manner as in completion stage in HYT, like the machine made of cannals/winds/drops to generate 4 empties and 4 joys with final clear light? I thought Dzogchen Nyinthig deals with methods of separation the Mind from Rigpa (Rushen) but tsalung is used in Anu Yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

One way to understand it is that process of two stages works from the outside in.

Dzogchen works from the inside out.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Transmission is a bad word. Direct introduction or pointing-out instruction is actually better. Anyway, recognizing the natural state is the beginning not the end.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are three so called lineages (brgyud), but this word, brgyud, may also be understood as transmission.

Really, the best way to put it, (since we are here distinguishing talking about Dzogchen) is "unmediated encounter with one's own state" or "direct self-encounter". "rang ngo" means one's face, literally; thog du sprad means "direct encounter".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Looking for info on Tibetan demonology

Content:

Dharmaswede said:

gregkavarnos wrote:

Scuse me for being nosy, but, why?

Many reasons, but at this point mainly because I have an interest in Machik's teachings – and I think it is then pertinent to mull over what the terms demons and demonic denote. Furthermore, as an absolute beginner I find it intriguing that there is not consensus among some senior Western practitioners as to whether demons are conventionally real, i.e. 'real' entities, or not.

Best Regards,

Jens

Malcolm wrote:

This is because those that negate the conventional existence of the genii locorum in general are not understanding how the six realms actually function.

For the most part, the experiential realm of gods and demons is the same as ours, but it is cognitively closed to most human beings.

Those people who negate the existence of such non-human beings completely are like ants on a leaf arguing about whether humans exist or not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Lamdre.

Content:

conebeckham said:

Namdrol-

Is this path of practice the basis for a 3 year retreat in the Sakya system? Are other

practices, outside this path, added?

And could you elucidate the difference between the Lam Dre TsokShay and the Lamdre Lobshay for us?

Malcolm wrote:

Usually, people who do three years retreat will start with Vajrapani or Vajrakilaya; Hevajra creation and completion in the middle; some end with Mahakala, others with Yogini. It depends. Three retreat is a new addition to Sakya, actually.

There is not that much difference between the two systems, in reality. The basic difference is that the Tsogshad is more scholastic. The Lobshad is based on some manuals written by Tsarchen's disciple, and is a bit more experiential.

You will get the same result from either system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Lamdre.

Content:

Caz said:

Could someone please kindly explain what Lamdre is and how it is practised.

Malcolm wrote:

Lam 'bras, the path together with the result is the main teaching of the Sakya school.

The core of it is a concise set of instructions termed "vajra verses" written by the Mahasiddha Virupa for his disciple Krishnapa and brought to Tibet by Gayadhara, bestowed upon Drogmi Lotsawa.

The main practices of Lamdre center on the creation and completion stages of the Yidam Hevajra. Nevertheless, it is a gradual instruction, containing the entire Mahāyāna path of sutra and tantra.

One of the best features of lamdre is that it has a very detailed description of the precise experiences of traversing the paths and stages through the yogas of the completion stage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

To Be Curious, if can I ask. Can this mind transmission happen even after a long time the initiation was given by the master and one was failed to recognize Rigpa at that time,

for example after many days when you are no more with the master you finally somehow "get it" home alone?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is exactly how it can happen. Recently, in Australia, CHNN explicitly stated this to be the case.

This is why in Dzogchen there are many methods to work with -- different than sadhanas and deity yoga to be sure, but the principle is the same.

The terms of the two stages, you receive an empowerment: but if you do not attain awakening during the empowerment, then you have methods to reach that state.

Likewise, in Dzogchen, you have three transmissions: oral, symbolic and direct aka realization. If you do not experience realization on the basis of the oral and symbolic transmission right away, then there are many methods one can use to discover this state of realization.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

conebeckham said:

I agree that "non-dual" is a bad translation of "Yer May," I thought the same thing when I read it.

Aside from appearances, what about the mind itself which "experiences" these appearances? Does it differ from those appearances?

Malcolm wrote:

This is the great controversy about Yogacara. Asanga maintains that in order for there to be an appearance of deluded perception, even though the appearances do not exist, there must be an existent basis for those false appearances -- for example, even though there is no real existent image on the screen, there is nevertheless a projector through which a film is running. When the film is done, so are the images. Likewise, when the traces are finished, so is the false projections.

The real controversy is how far to extend that "existence" i.e. is the projector more real or less real than the projected images.

According to the way Yogacara is presented in orthodox tenet systems (Which all are based on Bhavaviveka II's Tarkajvala), this basis is the ālayavijñāna. When the seeds are

removed, the ālaya is held to transform into wisdom. I.e. this existent wisdom which is ultimate, has to be predicated on an existing consciousness in order to account for the transformation of consciousness to wisdom.

In other words, conventional truth, in this way of presenting Yogacara, is the imputed projections. They all function, work quite well, until the basis of their reality is questioned. The ālaya projecting this is also understood to be relative. But when the traces are removed, the ālaya transforms into wisdom, and thus becomes ultimate.

Then there is the gzhan stong way of understanding this. According to their presentation, both ālaya and the projected images are conventional. Wisdom is ultimate and merely covered over by the conventional.

Then again, among gzhan stong pas, there are different ways of understanding the ultimate -- some seem to hold that it really exists. Others seem to hold it too is merely a yogic convention which when in equipoise is not needed and so on.

Etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

conebeckham said:

I must confess I've not seen the "dual/nondual" dichotomy focus on Existence and Nonexistence. It's interesting.

In my experience, the term "nonduality" usually refers to a mind or consciousness (or wisdom?) that has transcended subject/object duality.

Namdrol, perhaps those who are "upset" with your "trivialization" of nonduality are referring to the term from this POV...what do you think?

I just happened to be reading Rigpa's Tibetan pocket calendar this morning..the Sakya lineage is featured this year, and Sogyal Rinpoche (or whoever wrote the content) claims the Sakya Philosophical View of "Khorday Yermay" is "the non-duality of Samsara and Nirvana," which "posits a non-dual luminosity-emptiness ("Saltong Yermay) beyond all extremes."

Care to comment?

Malcolm wrote:

dbyer med means inseparable, not non-dual.

non-dual in yogacara, referring to absence of subject and object comes about because

appearances which are mind-only lack both existence and non-existence in and of themselves.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Who said "mind transmission of Dzogchen is something a teacher places in your head"?
It is ridiculous.

Malcolm wrote:

You would be amazed at what people think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2011 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Signature in the Cell by Stephen Meyer

Content:

Will said:

A 2009 title from Harper; this work is important. It's subtitle is "DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design". Some chapters are difficult for those of us poorly educated folk, but overall it is a good look at the arguments for and against ID. It is not a work about evolution, but just focuses on the arising of life via the first cell. Also impressive is his unbiased, close examination of the evidence against ID. He is not a preacher for ID who ignores evidence against it in favor of a pre-conceived notion.

Malcolm wrote:

ID is just stealth theology. Total speculative junk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

muni said:

The truth itself doesn't change. The Buddha told us not about a truth which suit us. If there is by the many offered styles of practices clinging to the practices themselves, we can make a mistake and take them as the truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Muni-la:

What I am talking about is the fact that people think there is an ideal Buddhism somewhere. It is like a perfect form, unchanging, eternal, etc.

In reality Buddhism just reacts to people's circumstances. The Dharma is never completely taught, because people's conditions are endlessly various. And when someone becomes a Buddha, then for them Dharma is complete, since it has been realized.

The problem I am identifying is that Buddhism these days resembles a debate court, where people trot out obsolete problems (like how many sides an atom has) and then expend great deal of energy trying to disprove that atom. This amounts to disproving hair on a tortoise.

Now, I am not saying we should not study these things. But we need to study them with a view to their relevance. We know, through common observation, for example, that Vasubandhu's cosmology in the third chapter of Abhidharmakośa is wrong. This is not a mystery. We have known that it is wrong since at least 16th century, at least in the West. but still people are arguing about these things as if they are real.

I am not suggesting that we negate the two stages, toss out Dzogchen, etc. What I am suggesting however is that much of what is taught in Buddhism today are intellectual museum pieces that have no relevance to anyone's life.

There is always a role for historical scholarship, it can be interesting to learn how to debate like a monk in the fifteenth century. But we always must check the dharma that is being taught, and which we are learning, to see if it really has any value in our life.

Life is short and samsara is long.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

TMingyur said:

Well then you continue fostering attachment. It's up to you.

kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

You utterly missed the point. Non-attachment is remedial. It contains the seeds of its own defeat.

If you have attachment, then you need non-attachment. It is better to cut these things at the root, rather than the leaf.

The root is wrong views of existence and non-existence. That is dualism as defined by the Buddha. The absence of duality is when one's has no wrong views concerning "it is" and "it is not".

Every other dualistic pair stems from these two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Here is a short essay of Suniti K.Pathak, whose opinion is that has tantra existed from the earliest period of buddhism onward

http://www.thlib.org/static/reprints/bot/bot_1989_02_03.pdf

Namdrol said:

There is one important point in this you are missing. The earliest known text in India we know of that is referred to as a "tantra" is the Agniveśa tantra -- which is the core of the important ayurvedic treatise, the Caraka Samhita. The composition of the CS is hard to date, but likely was compiled between roughly 200 BCE -- 200 CE. Before there were distinct Buddhist texts called tantras, was another ayurvedic treatise called the Aṣṭāṅgahridayasamhita penned by a Buddhist physician named Vagbhata in roughly the fifth century CE -- this text refers to itself as a tantra in the colophon.

Pathak's thesis is not that tantra existed in Buddhism from the beginning. His thesis is that elements existed in Buddhism from the beginning which are consistent with later developments called Vajrayāna. I don't disagree with this thesis. I think it is correct.

However, Vajrayāna is a mature path. Reciting a mantra to remove snake venom is not a path.

N

Aemilius said:

Suniti K. Pathak says more than that. It is interesting to see what things he associates with tantrism, things that are present in our general view of early buddhism. The snake venom removing mantra is important because it is in Vinaya Vastu and it is connected to a known tantric deity !

Malcolm wrote:

The Vinaya Vastu is a complicated text. We cannot assume that its entire contents date from the time of the Buddha.

I prefer to interpret these instances differently. I think that there is an underlying Pan-Indian culture, based on vedic ritualism, cosmology and medical ideas, that people mistakenly term "tantrism". Buddhists were first and foremost Indian, and they utilized their culture in their practice of Buddhism. Proof of this for example may be found in the Mahaparinibbana sutta where Buddha informs Ananda that "the faithful brahmins" will take care of his cremation and so on, because they know the proper rituals for interring a Cakravartin. Or, in the beginning of the same sutta, he informs a minister of Ajasatru that it will be hard to invade the Koasilians, because among other things, they have maintained their traditional shrines and modes of worship.

All of this is not what we in Vajrayāna understand "tantra" to be. Of course we recognize that there are great similarities between non-Buddhist practice such as Shaivaite use of ganacakras, certain types of yoga, channels and cakras; secular practices such as royal coronation and so on. But just as the elements of Caitya or Stupa are all named after the ritual precinct of the Agnihotra, fire oblations, likewise, when these elements are taken up in the tantras they are repurposed if you will.

You can see seeds of this or that development in later Vajrayana in early Buddhism -- for example, the cult of Dharmapalas is present from the very beginning in the Dighanikāya, but the way these things exist in a piecemeal fashion in early Buddhism means that they are not a path.

Vajrayāna is a fully mature path, as opposed to the various miscellany found in various places. Also, even if Mahāmayuri is a deity in lower tantra, the practice of Mahāmayuri is also not a path. This deity is for temporary benefits, not for liberation. In lower tantra deities like Mañjuśrī, Avalokiteśvara and Vajrapani are for complete realization. Lower tantra has hundreds of minor practices and mantras for various boons. Not many practices for complete realization.

So we either have to redefine what "tantric" means, specify what we mean when we are using the term "tantric" in terms of Buddhism, or restrict the definition to Vajrayāna Buddhism from the 7th century to the present in its various manifestations in Esoteric Buddhism of China and Japan and Vajrayāna in Tibet.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

TMingyur said:

It is good to return to the suttapitaka and skip all this philosophical scholarly fabrication.

This is my lesson learned from tibetan buddhism.

kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Some people's idea is to return to some imagined "original" Buddhism. However, there is no such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

devilyoudont said:

I mean it! You see, I have a theory. You know why Buddhist philosophy was vibrant in India? Because Indians had the strength to abandon Buddhism rather than betray their true understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist philosophy was also vibrant in Tibet once too -- then sectarian politics sealed the new translation schools in intellectual mausoleums.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Namdrol said:

That is quite an exaggeration -- basically it is not true.

Tibetan medicine is still continuing to evolve in ways in which Dharma tenet systems does not.

devilyoudont said:

You know more about it than I do.

(Hold on, was this also the case in Tibet?)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that was part of my point -- but also that in studying Tibetan medicine, I realized that the way we are receiving Tibetan Buddhism is very static and taxonomic, and in more dynamic Dharma systems like Dzogchen and mahāmudra, the desiccated approach of tenet systems is very bad for explaining process and transformations. Meditation is actually a transformative process. Not a tenet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 8:05 AM

Title: Re: Brain vs. mind

Content:

Sherab said:

So mind and certain part of the body are inseparable?

This would allow for the possibility of an aspect of mind that is directly connected with the brain and another aspect that is independent of the brain. This is my preferred view at the moment.

Malcolm wrote:

Mind and vāyu, the air element are inseparable. In turn, as long as the life organ is function, the vāyu pervades the entire body. Thus, when you damage nerves, the vāyu can no longer travel in those regions of body, and one has no sensation, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Brain vs. mind

Content:

Sherab said:

From a Vajrayana perspective, mind and body are inseparable, so no dualism.

Malcolm wrote:

The ordinary body is left behind at the time of death. So are we leaving behind a part of our mind when we die?[/quote]

No, we are taking part of the rūpa aggregate when we go, namely the pranavāyu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

devilyoudont said:

How do Tibetans compare to this parable? They invite doctors from the four corners of the world, let them have a debate, systemize their methods, and close the book. "Okay, that's Medicine, folks! Nothing else to see here!"

Malcolm wrote:

That is quite an exaggeration -- basically it is not true.

Tibetan medicine is still continuing to evolve in ways in which Dharma tenet systems does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Namdrol said:

On the contrary, Tibetans have managed to do so with spectacular success. There has not been a new idea in Tibetan Buddhism since about 15th century. Tibetan Buddhism is intellectually frozen. I would venture it is the same with all forms of Buddhism.

Pero said:

What do mean by a "new idea"? What kind of new idea would you like? I don't understand.

Malcolm wrote:

Meaning that intellectual development of Tibetan Buddhism is frozen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Will said:

Skip the metaphors Malcolm, just give a sappy solution to the problem as defined by you.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, in order to become expert in Madhyamaka, first you have to become expert in Abhidharma. Now, Abhidharma is interesting, but at least in Mahayāna, no one practices according to Abhidharma any more.

Many parts of the Mula require that one becomes educated in tenets no one accepts anymore anyway.

There are many other problems of this sort.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Namdrol said:
Yes, you remove deadwood.

gregkavarnos said:
Live branches as well. If the tree does not have the right shape and size you can't climb it to pick the olives.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, proper proper pruning is necessary for a healthy productive shrub or tree.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 4:51 AM
Title: Re: Non duality.
Content:
Namdrol said:
When the basis for attachment has ceased, also the basis for detachment has ceased: detachment is also trapped in dualism.

TMingyur said:
It may appear so due to the terms being thought. However non-attachment does not "feel" "trapped" but attachment does.

Malcolm wrote:
Nevertheless, non-attachment is a more subtle trap.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 4:49 AM
Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy
Content:
Namdrol said:
Not talking adding and subtracting. Talking about sapwood as opposed to dead wood.

gregkavarnos said:
I have olive tree orchards which I tend in my exceedingly limited spare time, and I can assure you that the only way to keep trees alive is to prune them, add fertiliser, dig around the roots (and when they are young) give them water.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, you remove deadwood.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Astus said:

1. Don't you think it is through studying the Buddhist heritage that it can be gradually understood? Simply by translating a text to another language is a major part of the process and when a term like dukkha is rendered into suffering/stress/unsatisfactoriness/dis-ease/pain/etc. it is already an acculturation and transformation.

Malcolm wrote:

I am suggesting that there is a constant danger of "Dharma ossification".

Astus said:

In fact, it is quite impossible to present Buddhism as if it were a frozen object.

Malcolm wrote:

On the contrary, Tibetans have managed to do so with spectacular success. There has not been a new idea in Tibetan Buddhism since about 15th century. Tibetan Buddhism is intellectually frozen. I would venture it is the same with all forms of Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I was talking one time to a Ngakpa friend of mine and we were discussing his foray into Hindu Tantra, mainly studies of the cult of Kali, the discussion then got around to various teachers here in Greece that were attempting to meld Buddhism with other European mystical religions: ancient Greek cults, freemasonry, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

Not what I am talking about.

gregkavarnos said:

I believe that Buddhism in the West will "evolve", but you can't make it evolve, it will evolve through our continued practice. When we reach a certain level of attainment in our practice then we will also have the wisdom to add and subtract from Buddhism. It's no use doing it prematurely though.

Malcolm wrote:

Not talking adding and subtracting. Talking about sapwood as opposed to dead wood.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 2:29 AM
Title: Re: north/east in tibetan
Content:
devilyoudont said:
Thanks!

The language is Classical Tibetan, right? To be honest, I have no lama, initiation or knowledge regarding the Tibetan language. I know nothing about this stuff at all!

Malcolm wrote:
Yes. And, well, if you are interested in such things, then it is better to go about it the proper way.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 2:27 AM
Title: The Problem With Buddhist Philosophy
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

The problem with Buddhist philosophy in general (I only really understood this after studying Tibetan Medicine) is that Buddhists often become stuck in dry, fixed categorizations. The way it is presented, there is very little engagement with process in Buddhist dharma language.

Dharma language is often quite presented overly taxonomical ways, and as such, people who indulge in Buddhist philosophy tend to resemble brittle taxidermists or dry intellectual morticians -- always trying to pretty up the cadavers of Buddhist tenets of which they are fond.

Buddhism is a living tradition -- not a bunch of tenet systems in a book. It is an evolving system, the sum of two and a half millennia of both awakened and unawakened people engaging with the meaning of Buddha's awakening, and the awakening of those who came after the Buddha.

Buddhism did not spring out fully formed, like Athena from Zeus' forehead. It evolved, slowly, adapting itself to time and place.

If Buddhism is to survive and continue to be relevant, it must evolve and meet the demand of those who are newly trying to engage with the meaning of awakening.

Otherwise, Buddhism is in danger of becoming a museum piece.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: north/east in tibetan

Content:

devilyoudont said:

Short version: "Shang shog" or "shar shog", which means east in Classical Tibetan?

Long version: Take a look at pages 8 and 9 of the Chod practice on this page:

<http://www.zangthal.co.uk/files.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

As you can see, it translates "shar shog dor je khan dro me" as "The vajra dakini of the east" and "shang shog le kyi khan dro me" as "The karma dakini of the east". Surely one of these should read "north", right?

Malcolm wrote:

She just made a cut and paste error. Forgot to remove east and put north for karma dakini.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2011 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Brain vs. mind

Content:

LastLegend said:

If we practice separable (in aspects I talked about), then it is not Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

For Mahayana and Hinayana, nama and rūpa are a substance dualism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2011 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Brain vs. mind

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Sorry to be the one to tell you this but physical damage to any part of the body causes a change in consciousness.

Lazy_eye said:

Sure, but that just restates the question in broader terms.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Vajrayana perspective, mind and body are inseparable, so no dualism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Looking for info on Tibetan demonology

Content:

Heruka said:

oracles and demons of tibet, by rene de nebesky and wojkowitz

Malcolm wrote:

right.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2011 at 1:40 PM

Title: Re: Looking for info on Tibetan demonology

Content:

Dharmaswede said:

I am looking for good sources on information on Tibetan demonology. (I here use the term "demon" in the widest sense; including the four demons of Dharma, the four Demons of chö, rudras etc. etc.)

Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jens

Malcolm wrote:

the book "Gods and Demons of Tibet".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2011 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

TMingyur said:

In contrast to this what is called "attachment" does have a correlate in direct experience. Consequently its absence has a correlate too. Therefore "non-attachment" applies, whereas "nonduality" or "emptiness (of what??)" do not apply but are mere fabrications.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

It is the same, now attached, now detached; now full, now empty; now exists, now does not exist; these are all dualities.

When the basis for attachment has ceased, also the basis for detachment has ceased: detachment is also trapped in dualism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2011 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Phenomena are by necessary of free of duality, since they originate in dependence. That absence of duality also has a correlate in direct experience

TMingyur said:

No because you cannot directly experience duality in the first place.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you can -- now it exists, now it does not. That is the experience of duality being discussed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2011 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

TMingyur said:

Which however has a correlate in direct experience. And I assert that there is no such correlate as to "emptiness" or "non duality".

Malcolm wrote:

So you have never experienced an empty bank account? An empty larder? Because certainly in this instant there is a correlate with direct experience. The old "village is empty of a city, city is empty of a village" trope from the suttas i.e. the Cullasunnata sutta, major and minor.

Phenomena are by necessary of free of duality, since they originate in dependence. That absence of duality also has a correlate in direct experience -- see Kaccaayanagotto Sutta i.e. "Everything exists,' this is one extreme [view]; 'nothing exists,' this is the other extreme. Avoiding both extremes the Tathaagata teaches a doctrine of the middle".

The middle way view is by necessity a non-dual view, avoiding these extremes of dualism. That is also emptiness; emptiness cures the views of existence and non-existence -- that can be correlated in one's personal experience.

Apatheia, on the other hand, vairāga, non-attachment, is not a particularly unique Buddhist principle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism-as-a-religion vs Buddhism-as-Dharma

Content:

TMingyur said:

Considering that "The Dharma" displays itself in "dharmas" the "Dharma permeates everything", you are "absolutely" right ... "absolutely" to be understood in a relative sense.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

I hope to you don't walk around repetitively punctuating your comments in meatspace like this:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: FB Interfaith group on capitalism?

Content:

Caz said:

We live in samsara...expect life to be crap, Getting what you dont want is standard here. Did Buddha ever attempt to implement a political system for others benifit ? Or is it that there is no real benifit to be gained from politics if we seek happiness and better standards of living I think its far better to start cherishing others and developing Bodhisattva like qualities.

Malcolm wrote:

Well you have to remember that Buddha, according to Digha Nikāya, was the first human king of this eon in a past life...so yes, actually.

The problem is this -- Capitalism is a system where one cherishes oneself and develops mara-qualities. Bodhisattvas really ought not support such a system even if there is little they can do about it.

But if they have the chance, then they should try and act like Ashoka (after he figured

out he was a mass murderer) Srongtsan Gampo, Trisrong De'utsan, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nirvana, for stream enterers and so on, is an object of their consciousnesses since it is included in the dharmāyatana/dhātu.

gregkavarnos said:

Does that mean that Nirvana is/can be an object of "ordinary" consciousness or can it only be perceived at the level of alayavijnana/arya consciousness? Sorry if the question seems clumsy but I can't really think of any other way to state what I am thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

It is only on object of an arya's mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Here is a short essay of Suniti K.Pathak, whose opinion is that has tantra existed from the earliest period of buddhism onward

http://www.thlib.org/static/reprints/bot/bot_1989_02_03.pdf

Malcolm wrote:

There is one important point in this you are missing. The earliest known text in India we know of that is referred to as a "tantra" is the Agniveśa tantra -- which is the core of the important ayurvedic treatise, the Caraka Samhita. The composition of the CS is hard to date, but likely was compiled between roughly 200 BCE -- 200 CE. Before there were distinct Buddhist texts called tantras, was another ayurvedic treatise called the Aṣṭāṅgahridayasamhita penned by a Buddhist physician named Vagbhata in roughly the fifth century CE -- this text refers to itself as a tantra in the colophon.

Pathak's thesis is not that tantra existed in Buddhism from the beginning. His thesis is that elements existed in Buddhism from the beginning which are consistent with later developments called Vajrayāna. I don't disagree with this thesis. I think it is correct.

However, Vajrayāna is a mature path. Reciting a mantra to remove snake venom is not a

path.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

muni said:

By Namdrol: "...nondual, but it is not a nonduality"

clarity! Here is the key of the misunderstanding of the misunderstanding. and shows poor limits of language once more. ism, ity..."a"

Thank you.

With respect without language limits, to teachings and what is meant.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CauF1rAHJfU> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

DKR's talk can be summarized as follows:

He for whom emptiness is possible,

for him everything is possible.

He for whom emptiness is not possible,

for him nothing is possible.

-- Nagarjuna

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

TMingyur said:

"Non duality" ... "emptiness" ... mere thoughts, ideas ...

I'd suggest "non-attachment" ...

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Also a thought.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

heart said:

Namdrol,

I don't think I am presenting any modern conventional Nyingma view, I am not a scholar at all, I just state what I see. The Vima Nyingthik is not free from the nine yanas according to what I have heard. To consider it free of the nine yanas you would have to weed out some parts, accept and reject to make it fit your view. So this subject about a "pure" Dzogchen free from the nine yanas feels very idealistic to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you just go with what you understand, I will go with what I understand. Our understandings clearly differ. I am not going to abuse the teachings of dzogchen to "prove" my point by barraging you with citations that you will inevitably try to parse in a fashion according to however you see things.

So, this is the thing --there are some people who consider that there are two streams: one, outside the nine yānas; one, part of the nine yānas. Then there is another party -- they assert the whole of Dzogchen teachings belongs to the nine yānas.

I belong to the former group, you the latter. I respect your point of view, I just don't agree with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Sherab said:

Does the quotation contradict my proposed answer? If yes, please elaborate.

Malcolm wrote:

The inherent meaning of dependent origination is emptiness. Whatever is empty dependently arises; whatever dependently arises is empty, according to Nagarjuna.

In other words, there is nothing not empty that arises at all, and all that arises is empty because it dependently arises. There is no emptiness apart from dependent origination, and no dependent origination apart from emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

conebeckham said:
Titles, such as "Gen," "Gen-la,"

Malcolm wrote:
Actually, as a doctor of Tibetan Medicine, the proper mode of address for me is Gen or Gegen. Gegen Namdrol, hmmm, could get used to that....Or Gen Malcolm....

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 8:17 AM
Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?
Content:

Luke said:
His main point is that the Buddhist concept of emptiness is really the interdependence of all things. Do you agree with this?

.

Sherab said:
Getting back to the OP here's my proposed answer:

Emptiness is the label representing the inexpressible, the nature of the uncategorized ultimate.

Emptiness is also the label representing the expressible nature of the categorized ultimate, i.e. the no-nature of all phenomena.

Dependent origination is the label representing the expressible, the nature of the relative.

Therefore the inherent meaning of emptiness is not the inherent meaning of dependent origination.

The nonduality (or inseparability) of emptiness and dependent origination is the meaning of the ultimate.

Comments?

Malcolm wrote:
"Whatever arises in dependence does not in truth arise."

PP sutras.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 7:58 AM
Title: Re: Non duality.
Content:

Anders Honore said:

In lieu of same we should say (as as done of course) that emptiness is empty but it is not an empti ness.

Namdrol said:

On the contrary, emptiness is śūnya tā.

Anders Honore said:

sure, but in terms of meaning surely you are not saying there is an actual state of emptiness as the ultimate reality anymore than you would say there is a nondual state of ultimate reality?

Malcolm wrote:

The nice thing about śūnyatā is that you can stated that it is ultimate reality without committing oneself to an ontological position. Hence the tā suffix.

Three gates of liberation are a little different: śūnya, alakṣana, apranidhana, empty, without characteristics, without aspiration.

They are not states, they are entries. Emptiness is the bhutatā, the actual nature of the things. Also emptiness has no nature, since it is free from extremes.

This is the beauty of Madhyamaka. You can assert emptiness as a nature, and no one can fault you. If you assert non-duality as a nature you have already committed an epistemological blunder.

As Nagarjuna really said:

If I had a position, I would be at fault.

Since I alone have no position, I alone am free from fault.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 7:29 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Anders Honore said:

In lieu of same we should say (as as done of course) that emptiness is empty but it is not an empti ness.

Malcolm wrote:

On the contrary, emptiness is śūnya tā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Anders Honore said:

It can hardly be said there is a philosophy of signlessness or wishlessness either. And arguably it is a great mistake to construct a philosophy from emptiness as well.

Malcolm wrote:

One can argue from the point of view of emptiness. One cannot argue from the point of view of non-duality and remain a Buddhist.

Anders Honore said:

And as regards Madhyamika, Nagarjuna (in the mahaprajnaparamitaupadesha) wrote of it:

Dharmas are included in non-duality (advayapatita), but although they are without duality, they are not, however, single. Seeing all dharmas in this way, without developing them in one's mind or in one's firmly held views, is what is called dharmakṣānti.

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt this text is by Nāgārjuna.

Advaya-patita means "not broken into two parts", better to say, "...all phenomena are not divided into two, though they are not divided into two, they are not, however single".

Anders Honore said:

Finally, the Pou-eul-jou fa-men (Advayapraveśadharmaparyāya) or the 'Teaching on the entry into nonduality' [the chapter in the vimalakīrti nirdesha] is the doorway to the true nature of dharmas (dharmāṇām bhūtalakṣaṇa). Variety (nānātva) is duality (dvaya), and duality is wrong view (mithyādr̥ṣṭi). But the Buddha is not a deceiver (amāyāvin) and cannot commit a deception (māyā). He always applies the Teaching on the entry into non-duality, and deception is variety. That is why he has no notion of variety.

Malcolm wrote:

Better translation of the title would be the dharma discourse on entering the absence of dualism.

But the absence of dualism here is the dualism of "exists" and "does not exist".

Also the absence of the tā particle in Buddhist renderings of the term advaya is significant, even though usually over looked. "Tā" bears the meaning it "ity" in English, for example, reality. Non-duality means literally, "a state of being in which there is no dualism".

Emptiness is nondual, but it is not a nondual ity.

Anders Honore said:

I agree. I do think you may be a bit too eager to flush the baby out with the bathwater in the way you go about asserting this however.

Malcolm wrote:

The amount of trouble this simple word causes is incalculable -- the mistranslation of advaya as non-duality is responsible for huge misunderstandings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Namdrol said:

The purpose of emptiness is to cure views. Emptiness is not a view. "Non-duality" is a view. That is why Vimalakirti kept his trap shut.

Anders Honore said:

The purpose of 'nonduality' is, of course, the very same. And equally so 'emptiness' can also amount to a view. As views, they both point to the same, an ineffable reality. The only difference really is that 'nonduality' says something more about how the mind tends to fabricate views, in patterns of opposite polarities. Like the three doors of liberation, 'nonduality' and 'emptiness' are just different aspects of the same fundamental approach - which is freedom from all views and extremes.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is one of three doors of liberation; non-duality is not. The other two being lack of aspiration and the signless.

There is no philosophy of non-dualism in Buddhism. This is wholly the invention of western scholars. For example, Madhyamaka rarely uses the term "non-dual".

When it is used in Yogacara, it is meant to describe lack of a real subject and object in perception (vijñaptimatra), and hence the absence of existence and non-existence in those imagined phenomena as well.

It does not get used at all in the Nikaya schools.

I think westerners are over-invested in this word.

But a word that is frequently brought up, over and over again, is anutpāda, non-origination, non-arising. This word is much more important for we Buddhists.

☞

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism-as-a-religion vs Buddhism-as-Dharma

Content:

shel said:

You suggesting that the point of 'religious' Buddhism is not the cessation of suffering?

Namdrol said:

Yes, because it is entirely focused on externalities.

shel said:

"Externalities" is a little vague. If you know that the point of religious Buddhism is not the cessation of suffering then you must know what the point of religious Buddhism is, so what is the point of religious Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Higher rebirth, primarily. Also success in business, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Anders Honore said:

Though I agree that nonduality is, to generalise, often overrated and overused, I won't go as far as saying that it is travel.

shel said:

Me either. For one thing, there has to be a here and a there in order to travel, which is like totally dualistic, dude.

Anders Honore said:

'Trivial'. damn you autocorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

"Non-duality" is trivial in general because is just an intellectual trip.

The nature of things is "non-dual", simply meaning free from existence and non-existence. Great, now one knows this. Then what? How are you going to use this fact? How do you integrate this into your practice? Better not do so conceptually, since that will just result in taking rebirth as a formless realm god.

The purpose of emptiness is to cure views. Emptiness is not a view. "Non-duality" is a view. That is why Vimalakirti kept his trap shut.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

muni said:

You are Malcolm Smith, ah well!

I see. Than you got Chod from Chogyal Namkhay Norbu La?

Malcolm wrote:

I have received many teachings from ChNN, that, among others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Anders Honore said:

Though I agree that nonduality is, to generalise, often overrated and overused, I won't go as far as saying that it is travel.

Baizhang Huaihai opined that it was a most efficient gateway for clarifying the way, of course the Vimalakirti Nirdeśa devotes a fair few words to the topic. But I see it more as a useful tool in regards to ironing out hidden conceptualisations than as ontological schematic. For the latter its usage is quickly exhausted.

Malcolm wrote:

And in the end, after everybody has spouted off, Mañjuśrī asks Vimalakirti what the gate to non-duality is, and he replies by saying nothing whatsoever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Mariusz said:

It is not something new or revolutionary, only pure Buddhism beyond all extremes, agreement with Madhyamaka and Yogacara. Is it?

Malcolm wrote:

I can't really discuss this any further. It would not be appropriate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

heart said:

I know we had this discussion before and that you probably is thinking that I am clinging to the lower yanas, but I also know you been a bit ambivalent about this in the past.

Malcolm wrote:

No -- I think you are just presenting a very modern and conventional Nyingma view. Which is fine, but you need to recognize how much influence this modern, conventional Nyingma view has been defensively shaped by polemics against the trends like Aro lugs sems sde, early Nyingthig and so on that developed in an environment free of such polemical constraints. The most important polemicist in this respect would be Sapan. I understand his point of view very well, but I think he is biased.

I have been ambivalent about this, not because I don't accept the idea, but because people who declare these things usually don't why they are saying it, just repeating things they have heard, like parrots.

heart said:

Anyway, feel free to suggest cycles that is completely free from the nine yanas.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the first that comes to mind would be the Vima Nyinthig.

heart said:

Like I said many times ChNN is not an example of this since he teach many things from the nine yanas.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he does. However, don't believe for a second that you can peg ChNN in this way just because he teaches a lot of secondary practices.

heart said:

Looking for such a teacher you just end up with Jax (a person from esangha that now gives direct introductions and teach an approach free from the nine yanas).

Malcolm wrote:
Not necessarily, some people wind up with ChNN.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 3:39 AM
Title: Re: Other Buddhas
Content:

Astus said:
I don't know if there is actually any Buddhist canon that is closed. Just in the 20th century new, revised versions of both East Asian and Theravada canons were published. In fact, in East Asia there is no ultimate canon only groups of texts published at different times.

Malcolm wrote:
In the case of the Pali canon, did they add new texts?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 3:37 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism-as-a-religion vs Buddhism-as-Dharma
Content:

shel said:
No, I wouldn't. I see people failing to meet the practice of their religion all the time. It's quite noticeable.

Namdrol said:
I misread your statement.

My point however is a little different. There is a kind of Buddhism that is religious and so on. But it misses the point of the dharma's essence.

shel said:
You suggesting that the point of 'religious' Buddhism is not the cessation of suffering?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, because it is entirely focused on externalities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism-as-a-religion vs Buddhism-as-Dharma

Content:

shel said:

No, I wouldn't. I see people failing to meet the practice of their religion all the time. It's quite noticeable.

Malcolm wrote:

I misread your statement.

My point however is a little different. There is a kind of Buddhism that is religious and so on. But it misses the point of the dharma's essence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism-as-a-religion vs Buddhism-as-Dharma

Content:

TMingyur said:

I guess "Buddhism-as-a-religion" stands for wholesome fabrications, wholesome thoughts and believes, conceptuality, views and dialectics.

For "Buddhism-as-Dharma" I would apply the ambiguity of the term "dharma" meaning "the teaching" and meaning "phenomenon". Combining both entails sort of "the teachings displaying itself through phenomena" and refers to a direct approach not based on conceptuality, non-discursive.

Kind regards

shel said:

Again basically logos/praxis.

I guess my critique is that this difference is not the least bit difficult to see.

Malcolm wrote:

You might be surprised.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism-as-a-religion vs Buddhism-as-Dharma

Content:

TMingyur said:

I guess "Buddhism-as-a-religion" stands for wholesome fabrications, wholesome thoughts and believes, conceptuality, views and dialectics.

For "Buddhism-as-Dharma" I would apply the ambiguity of the term "dharma" meaning "the teaching" and meaning "phenomenon". Combining both entails sort of " the teachings displaying itself through phenomena" and refers to a direct approach not based on conceptuality, non-discursive.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

However you would like to parse to yourself as long as it is not some intellectual theory.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism-as-a-religion vs Buddhism-as-Dharma

Content:

shel said:

You're basically saying that the difference between Buddhism-as-a-religion and Buddhism-as-Dharma is that the latter is practiced and the former is not?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, because there are many religious practices one can do, blindly, like making donations to a monastery because some Lama told you to accumulate merit. What I am saying is that Buddhism-as-Dharma is integrated into your personal experience. It means you know why are doing what you are doing when you are doing it. No blind faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism-as-a-religion vs Buddhism-as-Dharma

Content:

shel said:

In another topic Namdrol wrote that:

Namdrol said:

That would be the difference between Buddhism-as-a-religion and Buddhism-as-Dharma. It is sometime very difficult to differentiate that. So, we are heavily pressured to believe that we are not swans, and are not capable of separating the milk of Dharma from the water of religion.

shel said:

What does that mean?

Malcolm wrote:

The former is a morass of intellectual opinions, views and beliefs. The latter is something that one has integrated into one's personal experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Excuse my ignorance!

So you are saying that the "ultimate Dhamma" mentioned in the Dhammapada quote is, in the dhatu categorisation scheme, the dharmadhatu? It seems to make sense but the commentary to the Sutta quoted by TM states: Thus it seems more this discourse's discussion of "All" is meant to limit the use of the word "all" throughout the Buddha's teachings to the six sense spheres and their objects. As the following discourse shows, this would also include the consciousness, contact, and feelings connected with the sense spheres and their objects. Nibbana would lie outside of the word, "all." This would fit in with another point made several times in the Canon: that dispassion is the highest of all dhammas (Iti 90), while the arahant has gone beyond even dispassion (Sn 4.6; Sn 4.10).

Thus Nibbana IS beyond the "All" and incapable of expression or perception at the relative level.

This seems to be contradictory, because isn't the dharmadhatu the source of all phenomena: Relative and Ultimate?

So either we are steeped in (or ultimately are) dharmadhatu and thus, being inseparable from it, we can perceive the Ultimate which also arises from dharmadhatu (when the veil of ignorance is lifted) or phenomena are separate to the dharmadhatu and thus have no contact with the ultimate. But, then again, I guess if I take the Middle Path approach then this contradiction will be erased.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that may be how Theravadins approach that sutta -- but some tendencies in Theravada are slightly eternalist. We also have that Sutra in the Agamas, and the way the twelve āyatanas are described by Vasubandhu and the way I have outlined this is completely normal and consistent with that sutra. Nirvana, for stream enterers and so on, is an object of their consciousnesses since it is included in the dharmāyatana/dhātu.

There are no phenomena that lie outside the twelve āyatanas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

muni said:

Look to the teachers of the real Namdrol. What a joke!

Malcolm wrote:

Huh?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

AND this ultimate reality or the "ultimate Dhamma" does not (seem to) fall within the range of the "All" mentioned in the quotation that TM likes to flap around in peoples faces (continuously).

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually it does. The Sabbasutta is just a description of the twelve āyatanas. The twelve āyatanas contain all conditioned and unconditioned phenomena, including the supreme Dharma, nirvana.

The twelve āyatanas:

eye | form

ear | sound

nose | scent

tongue | tastes

body | tactiles

mind | dharmas

That is it. There are no phenomena taught in any buddhist teachings that can go beyond this list. The dharma āyatana contains the aggregates of sensation, ideation and formations (vedanasamjñāsāṃskarakandha), as well as space and the two kinds of cessation. When the twelve āyatanas are broken out in to the eighteen dhātus, the dharma āyatana changes its name to the dharmadhātu. Mano āyatana, the mind āyatanā is the aggregate of consciousness, vijñāna skandha, and the ten material āyatanas, eye, form, etc, are the rūpaskandha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

It is organised so that everyday common people cannot gain a depth of knowledge, knowledge that may even liberate them (and take the \$\$\$'s somewhere else). You can see the same scam with the Greek Orthodox church here in Greece, the Catholic church in Italy and (dare I say it and draw the ire of all) the Buddhist "church" that existed in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

That would be the difference between Buddhism-as-a-religion and Buddhism-as-Dharma. It is sometime very difficult to differentiate that. So, we are heavily pressured to believe that we are not swans, and are not capable of separating the milk of Dharma from the water of religion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

conebeckham said:

He's talking about Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche, Namdrol....I think.

The first post has a Youtube vid--I think it's DKR....but Youtube is blocked here where I presently am.....

Malcolm wrote:

I see. Well, its true, some people need teachings from DKR.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

plwk said:

Very thoughtful discussions thus far but I guess on top of what the OP has laid out, out there in the competitive world, it's not a matter of whether there are Buddhas mentioned or not but rather perhaps more confined to whose list of Buddhas are more 'authentic' and then we find that it turns into another sectarian mud slinging session of whose list is the IT.... and that's where I think what huseng had posted would be a good counter to such nonsense...

Namdrol said:

The Nyingmapa tradition never closed their canon. Granted, there are still issues of "authenticity", but nevertheless, we find, for examples, in the teachings of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu transmissions recovered from other world systems via his impressive

skills in the dreamtime.

Huseng said:

I personally know one bhiksuni who says she has received direct teachings from Bodhisattvas before. She doesn't advertise this or generally tell people about it, but being a friend and fellow Buddhist she revealed to me some exquisite poetry written in Classical Chinese verse which she claimed was transmitted to her through Bodhisattvas. It all contained references to Buddhist concepts and having a background in Classical Chinese I found it impressive.

So this is not necessarily an issue of canons, but at times a matter of experience. Those who have visions of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas need not be convinced of their existence. They already have direct teachings and take them as seriously as they would any canonical text. It is not really uncommon for high-calibre practitioners to have such visions. You might have difficulty meeting them and hearing about their experiences though.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes of course. None of the above is meant to question the sincerity of Mahāyāna sūtras, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: How to practice?

Content:

TMingyur said:

I never heard about "Mindfulness meditation" using these things but if you derive benefit from mantras then why not use them?

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

It is a kind of Buddhānusmṛti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Huseng said:

It also mentions that even if one is incorrect, then one has much to gain from practising Buddha remembrance in this fashion. On the other hand, if one is correct that other Buddhas do indeed exist then there are undesirable consequences for having outright denied the existence of them.

Namdrol said:

Guess we have to rename Pascal's wager.

Huseng said:

It would pre-date Pascal by many centuries indeed.

The reasoning actually would spark some concern in most Buddhist practitioners as one does not want to outright deny the existence of Buddhas. One has nothing to lose by affirming their existence and much to lose by denying it.

Malcolm wrote:

At best, no one wants to be a frog in a well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

plwk said:

Very thoughtful discussions thus far but I guess on top of what the OP has laid out, out there in the competitive world, it's not a matter of whether there are Buddhas mentioned or not but rather perhaps more confined to whose list of Buddhas are more 'authentic' and then we find that it turns into another sectarian mud slinging session of whose list is the IT.... and that's where I think what huseng had posted would be a good counter to such nonsense...

Malcolm wrote:

The Nyingmapa tradition never closed their canon. Granted, there are still issues of "authenticity", but nevertheless, we find, for examples, in the teachings of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu transmissions recovered from other world systems via his impressive skills in the dreamtime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Huseng said:

It also mentions that even if one is incorrect, then one has much to gain from practising Buddha remembrance in this fashion. On the other hand, if one is correct that other Buddhas do indeed exist then there are undesirable consequences for having outright denied the existence of them.

Malcolm wrote:

Guess we have to rename Pascal's wager.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Ego cosmic energy

Content:

Rael said:

I'm hedging ram peswani is the only guy gonna gets laid from this thread....

don't Buddha's have these huge penises...is that not one of the attributes of the Buddha...?

maybe there is something to penis envy after all....

and i thought Buddha did give females equality and he got in trouble for that...or was that Gakki propaganda?...

Malcolm wrote:

No, Buddha's male member withdrew into a sheath within his body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

muni said:

The afflictions will automatically be undone when there is this very understanding. Such need for Rinpoche his teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Rinpoche are you referring to?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

muni said:

...since they divide these (Space and Awareness) into two, they fall into deviation. If these two do not become one without any duality, you will certainly not attain Buddhahood". Padmasambhava.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, correct and those who do not understand what the meaning of dhātu and vidyā (dbying/rig) are, will not understand what Guru Rinpoche is actually talking about.

But this statement does not have anything to do with emptiness free from extremes since that is not what dbying, dhātu, is referring to here.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

heart said:

I don't know Namdrol. I am practicing a cycle belong to the "utterly secret unsurpassed cycle" it for sure has a yidam practice. You take refuge and so on, just in a different way. There might be a few text that don't mention these practices of the lower yanas like the Yeshe Lama, but when Jigme Lingpa explain how he applied these teachings in retreat all the lower yanas comes up. I like Norbu Rinpoche but I am not exactly convinced by your arguments.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There is yang gsang bla med, and then there is yang gsang bla med.

These are not arguments, magnus. These are just statements of facts.

These are things stated in many places in many Dzogchen tantras and upadeshas, kama and terma.

I have no need to convince you. This is what I have discovered to be true. And I have verified this in the teachings of Garab Dorje personally, in a number of cycles of dzogchen teachings. This is not something I am repeating merely on the basis of ChNN's words, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

muni said:

Never met a tibetan teacher talking like you, acting like you.

Namdrol said:
I am not Tibetan.

muni said:
I see. Dual American Buddhism. You are contradicting the Tibetan Masters, Vietnamese and so on.

Malcolm wrote:
I am not contradicting anyone. Emptiness is a cure for views, not a view.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:54 PM
Title: Re: Non duality.
Content:
muni said:
On top the responsibility of the importance for this teaching.

Malcolm wrote:
You might consider this -- I have spent 25 years reading Madhyamaka, learning Madhyamaka, debating Madhyamaka. Yes, I can even teach Madhyamaka.

However, even Madhyamaka as a teaching has limitations.

Furthermore, emptiness is an antidote. Why be interested in a medicine you do not need?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:48 PM
Title: Re: Non duality.
Content:
muni said:
Never met a tibetan teacher talking like you, acting like you.

Malcolm wrote:
I am not Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:41 PM
Title: Re: FB Interfaith group on capitalism?
Content:
kirtu said:

I'm considering starting a FB interfaith group on capitalism and how to reform it from an American perspective. Marxism formed a useful critique of capitalism and it's exploitations (although I far prefer Dickens) but the resulting solutions usually brought misery to the world. The sole successful counter to capitalism, social democracy, cannot be adopted in it's European form in the US.

Capitalism has become the central ideology in the US. However the pursuit of profit without recourse to it's moral and social effects is an actual evil. Socialists and labor activists in the US in the 20's-40's did form an effective criticism of capitalism and did have some influence on introducing humanizing reforms to the US labor environment. However socialism as a political force was eliminated and labor itself became corrupted. More recently some religious groups have been present during anti-globalization and esp. anti-war protests but as these have become dominated by starkly materialist organizations like ANSWER most of these religious groups have not made their voices heard on an ongoing basis.

This interfaith group will address these issues and attempt to reform capitalism so that it can become a force for good in society rather than mindless profit.

What should such a group be called? What should it's guiding principles be, etc?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
Capitalism cannot be reformed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:39 PM
Title: Re: Non duality.
Content:
muni said:
"Yes, emptiness, the absence of the four extremes, is non-dual. But only trivially so".

In no understanding.

Namdrol said:
Think what you like.

muni said:
Listen to the youtube. Then what is for you more important, the welfare of others or rightness? This itself is an example. Rinpoche says: there is no Buddhism without.

Just look to Tibetan Buddhism, look to Zen, Mahayana, it is included in all these. How can there be the practice of Transcendent Perfections?

A Tibetan doctor has this in his guidance as well to can act purely altruistic what is part of the medicine.

Malcolm wrote:

That emptiness is non-dual (i.e. free from extremes) is a fact. But it is not, for me, at any rate, a very important fact since it is just a bunch of words. Yes, of course as Tibetan doctor, our view is Madhyamaka. My view is Madhyamaka. Not because I am attached to the middle way as a religion, but because this is just how things are.

Therefore, I think "emptiness as non-duality" is pretty trivial. Like a rock, a stone. It is just there -- nothing worth getting excited about. Well, you could get excited about a rock or a stone, but not because it is empty. You get excited about it because it is useful for something. could help some sick person, could be tied to the end of rope and used as a anchor, etc. But its emptiness is not that exciting or that interesting. Neither is the emptiness of all phenomena in general. Now, the wisdom that intuits the emptiness of persons and phenomena and burns away afflictions, that is a little more exciting. But on its own, non-dual emptiness is trivial and totally uninteresting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

muni said:

"Yes, emptiness, the absence of the four extremes, is non-dual. But only trivially so".

In no understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Think what you like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Jikan said:

Hold on. What are we talking about in this thread when we talk about "nonduality"? Buddhahood or Buddha-nature? Emptiness? "Great Madhyamika" as Dolpopa understood it or the Middle Way in Chih-i's terms (apropos of the comments on the middle way earlier on...)? cessation? Rigpa? anatta? Boredom?

Nonduality is usually understood as a way to compare different religious or mystical traditions in one trope (nonduality in Vedanta, in Buddhism, in Sufism, &c). So it's a term that is very loosely staked out semantically. It can map out on a few things in Buddhist theory, or none of them, and nothing perfectly.

I'd like to know what is meant by 'nonduality' to those who use the concept and those who do not. I'm assuming I'm not the only one out in the weeds on this one.

muni said:

Emptiness is nondual. I write here Longchenpas' words which are of course only offering a light on it. "Appaerances, experiences" may arise in mind but they are neither mind nor anything but mind".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, emptiness, the absence of the four extremes, is non-dual. But only trivially so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: How can we help dead animals in the bardo?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Cool. Yes, this is in fact the meditation taught by Tulku Thondup that I was referred to the book for.

- Tom

Namdrol said:

You can do Shitro.

tomamundsen said:

Thank you, Namdrol. Could you suggest any sources for this practice?

Thanks,

Tom

Malcolm wrote:

You can try to receive the transmission for the short Shitro of Norbu Rinpoche. Then you can get the text. Learn the melodies, etc. It is very easy to do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Jikan said:

Hold on. What are we talking about in this thread when we talk about "nonduality"? Buddhahood or Buddha-nature? Emptiness? "Great Madhyamika" as Dolpopa

understood it or the Middle Way in Chih-i's terms (apropos of the comments on the middle way earlier on...)? cessation? Rigpa? anatta? Boredom?

Nonduality is usually understood as a way to compare different religious or mystical traditions in one trope (nonduality in Vedanta, in Buddhism, in Sufism, &c). So it's a term that is very loosely staked out semantically. It can map out on a few things in Buddhist theory, or none of them, and nothing perfectly.

I'd like to know what is meant by 'nonduality' to those who use the concept and those who do not. I'm assuming I'm not the only one out in the weeds on this one.

Malcolm wrote:

I am pointing out that there exists a little known criticism of non-dual equipoise i.e. one in which there is no perception of subject and object, in Dzogchen teachings, which, it is asserted can cause one to slip into nirodha-sampatti, and thence, into a annihilationist view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Will said:

Buddha's principle, if I recall aright, was to make a new rule only after a problem appears that cannot be solved under existing rules. In this case, let us wait until an "ordained" one requests his own forum.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, that is exactly what happened at e-sangha -- problems arose, we tried to deal with it with a policy. Eventually, it collapsed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Caz said:

As you say there where problems on E-sangha because of this and many other issues because it claimed to be an open and non sectarian forum and yet posters where expected to maintain standards that where not exactly always what you would expect from the front label, So again with ordination ones own personal opinions have to be overcome in order that the same flaw be not repeated.

Malcolm wrote:

The initial problem came in this way -- people claiming to be monks (Zen priests) who were married, had kids, drank and held jobs, as well as some people posing as Lama "so and so" with no credentials.

The majority of people at the E-sangha team, including but not limited too, the several bhikshus from three distinct monastic lineages (Theravada, Chinese and Tibetan) we had on staff at the time, thought that this idea of a monk or lama was not correct.

We observed many beginners being very confused. So we tried to help by creating a protocol for properly identifying monastics as opposed to "alternate" ordinations and lay teachers. but it didn't work in the end.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: A Garland of Jewels by Jamgon Mipham

Content:

Will said:

Nirvanavishakhambin says Namdrol - close, a tad off. The book says Sarvanivaranavishkambhin meaning "complete remover of all obstacles." This is the one I have the most trouble remembering.

In the selection about this bodhisattva, another very impressive and powerful one is mentioned, the sister of a tathagata, Dispeller of Obstacles. Her Sanskrit original is not given.

Malcolm wrote:

Type -- often his name is given sans sarva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

muni said:

Why is it inexpressible? Because one fall in nihilism?

Malcolm wrote:

Because ontological predicates of phenomena are all erroneous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

muni said:

There is no any slipping in correct understanding! There is no any possibility to understand Dzogchen when we see it as wrong. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rigpa> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://www.theawakenedeye.com/view.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; just two websides I clicked on.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, there is a certain trend in Dzogchen tantras which regard these definitions as incomplete, and which warn that without supplementary understandings, a practitioners can err into cessation since the extreme of clarity is cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Well, since you have convinced yourself, far be it from me to condition you otherwise.

Mariusz said:

By saying "wishful" I meant just practice according to one's own master of Dzogchen, without be "conditioned" for instant or for gradual. Is your "instant" or "outside 9 yanas" helpful for your practice in your daily life?

Malcolm wrote:

It is based on personal experience. If you have it, then you have it. And if you don't, you don't. There is no point in arguing about it or speculating.

There is a Dzogchen path that is not gradual, and is outside of the nine yānas, as hard as it may seem to be able to understand this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: A Garland of Jewels by Jamgon Mipham

Content:

plwk said:

Mahastamaprapta doesn't seem to be on the list of the 'asta maha bodhisattvas' or 'asta utaputras' and Maitreya is instead listed... see
http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Eight_great_bodhisattvas and
http://www.khandro.net/deities_bodhisattvas.htm

I recall in many past Mahayana ES threads that Mahastamaprapta is the peaceful form of Vajrapani...

Malcolm wrote:

Interestingly, Samantabhadra is definitely considered to be a peaceful form of Vajrapani.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Non-duality is very boring and easily becomes a deviation.

muni said:

Very boring.

Student: Rinpoche, is buddha nature an actualization of nonduality?

Dzongzar Khyentse Rinpoche: Yes. They are same thing. Exactly same thing. Very good question.

Silent Bob said:

Namdrol, your assertion is puzzling to say the least, and one which is at odds with my own experience. With all due respect, sir, I just don't get it.

Chris

Malcolm wrote:

According to the dzogchen tantras, a non-dual equipoise can easily lead to a deviation into a non-buddhist nihilistic view since there is a possibility of slipping into a meditative absorption of cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

Namdrol,

Yes, I can agree with that. But it's still not like a living being's evolution as certain teachings can not just go extinct but resurrect too, not to mentioned cases when one teaching is integrated into another and thus lives on as part of a bigger organism from what later it can break off. So much for applying biology to Buddhism. Whether dependent origination is what to be identified as the core, well, if that equals for instance the "tolerance of no-birth", "seeing the nature" and "unity of samsara and

nirvana" than sure.

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent origination is exactly the meaning of non-arising -- Manjushri states in PP sutras "Whatever arises dependently, just that does not arise in truth."

"Whoever sees the Dharma, sees dependent origination; whoever sees dependent origination, see the Dharma". etc.

It is only through dependent origination that we can come to an unerring understanding of emptiness, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: A Garland of Jewels by Jamgon Mipham

Content:

plwk said:

Mahastamaprapta doesn't seem to be on the list of the 'asta maha bodhisattvas' or 'asta utaputras'... see

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Eight_great_bodhisattvas and

http://www.khandro.net/deities_bodhisattvas.htm

I recall in many past Mahayana ES threads that Mahastamaprapta is the peaceful form of Vajrapani...

Malcolm wrote:

You are right, Maitreya -- damn I get a D. Not because I got seven right, but because I got one wrong. (you are slipping, Namdrol).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Caz said:

Depends what your Idea of authentic is, Generally speaking I think if someone turns up claiming to be ordained and has in reality never been bestowed ordination from an order but is self proclaimed ordained then it would not be good to recognise a person as such. And then we get on to the issue of personal judgment a few western orders do not ordain people according to the full vinaya but these people are still ordained and as everyone who takes these vows seriously tries to live by them to the best of their ability...So long as one doesn't operate their own personal prejudice as to whom is keeping moral discipline then there shouldn't be a problem.

Namdrol said:

Right, that was where the problem began at e-sangha. We would ask, people would get offended, etc. Then, in trying to establish international standards of ordination we ran into issues, such as Zen priests demanded to be treated and considered exactly the same as fully ordained bhikshus and so on. Our basic policy became that if you are not a shramana or bhiksu, you are not a member of the monastic sangha. You could be considered "ordained", but not as a monk. We drew a strong distinction, and a valid one at that, between lay "ordinations" and monastic ordinations.

This was what lead to the Zen debacle at e-sangha. It caused many other problems as well.

Caz said:

Well I wouldnt see there being an issue as far as recognising someone as ordained if one wishes to say they are a monk when following more or less vows, then there is no problem in my opinion as monk or nun in the classical western sense is easily applicable to those whom dont follow the full vinaya...There are not many these days who can remember the full ordination vows let alone keep them all, It is far better in my opinion to have morale discipline codes that are keepable and provide the much needed foundation of mind training. Extensive or condensed It matter not so long as good conduct is kept for focusing the mind.

Perhapes it should just be common courtesy to treat anyone who abides by morale discipline with respect regardless of what ones views are on how many vows there should or should not be afterall the basis of friendship is having a respect for one and other.

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of the view of the spirit of the thing, perhaps -- but standards must be maintained. There are many people who are capable of upholding their vows -- so it is not impossible. Since there are such people, I think it is important their discipline be recognized and honored -- and it is not honored by allowing just anyone to call themselves or demand they themselves be treated as a fully ordained person just because they wish to have that status. People you are talking about won't care one way or another what they are called. But Bhikshus are the ambassadors of Shakyamuni Buddha. When his monastic sangha disappears, his dharma will be on the verge of collapsing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

The word "beyond" in the context of affirmation seems to be the pillar of all these ideas. A pillar that is a mere concept itself.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, reality is inexpressible. Now we can all go home.

But your sabbasutta citation is not relevant. Why? Because nirvana, the supreme dharma, part of the dharmadhatu, is an object of the mano-dhatu.

This is why the Buddha states "Monks, there is an unborn, etc..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: A Garland of Jewels by Jamgon Mipham

Content:

Will said:

In 2008 this book of 333 pages was translated by Yeshe Gyamtso and published by KTD Pubs. The subtitle The Eight Great Bodhisattvas tells all. Mipham spends almost half the book quoting from sutras inspiring passages about the vows & teachings of Manjushri. The other seven members of the Arya Sangha are given around 20 to 40 pages of sutra quotes each.

Can you name them all; without looking them up? Avalokita is one... who else?

Malcolm wrote:

Manjushri, Avalokiteshvara, Vajrapani, Samantabhadra, Ksitigarbha, Akashagarbha, Nirvanavishakhambin, Mahasthamaprapta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Caz said:

Depends what your Idea of authentic is, Generally speaking I think if someone turns up claiming to be ordained and has in reality never been bestowed ordination from an order but is self proclaimed ordained then it would not be good to recognise a person as such. And then we get on to the issue of personal judgment a few western orders do not ordain people according to the full vinaya but these people are still ordained and as everyone who takes these vows seriously tries to live by them to the best of their ability...So long as one doesn't operate their own personal prejudice as to whom is keeping morale discipline then there shouldn't be a problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, that was where the problem began at e-sangha. We would ask, people would get

offended, etc. Then, in trying to establish international standards of ordination we ran into issues, such as Zen priests demanded to be treated and considered exactly the same as fully ordained bhikshus and so on. Our basic policy became that if you are not a shramana or bhiksu, you are not a member of the monastic sangha. You could be considered "ordained", but not as a monk. We drew a strong distinction, and a valid one at that, between lay "ordinations" and monastic ordinations.

This was what led to the Zen debacle at e-sangha. It caused many other problems as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

To add another view, it is not evolving I believe in but simply adapting (related terms nonetheless).

Malcolm wrote:

I think evolution is more appropriate. There is a core DNA, if you will, dependent origination, that makes all these speciations of Dharma related to one another. But some forms of dharma continue to evolve, others are on the verge of extinction, or are functionally extinct (i.e. Huayen, etc.), and so on., and some are simply better adapted to survive in the modern world than others.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Yes. For instant realization one has to be instant realizer. Who are instant realizers in Buddhism these days? Are you ready for the mind direct Dzogchen transmission of the buddhas (Tib. gyalwa gong gyü; Wyl. rgyal ba dgongs brgyud) from the dharmakaya Samantabhadra or the sign Dzogchen transmission of the vidyadharas (Tib. rigdzin da gyü; Wyl. rig 'dzin brda brgyud) from Vajrasattva in this very instant, here and now. So called Dzogchen outside all 9 yanas is wishful only.

Moreover, the thinking on Gradual or Instant is the matter not only Dzogchen in

Buddhism. Even Yogacara agrees it is possible, when instant realization "beyond all reference points" outside the Mind - so called mental non-engagement, let alone Mahamudra HYT realization of Clear Light "outside" any effort, and so on. These all are the buddhist wishes only, whatever Dzogchen or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, since you have convinced yourself, far be it from me to condition you otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

heart said:

I am sure that is correct. Maybe you can define the view beyond the nine vehicles but how can you define the Dzogchenpa beyond the nine yanas?

Malcolm wrote:

The texts of the utterly secret unsurpassed great perfection place itself outside the nine yānas.

heart said:

As you yourself said before they all take refuge, arouse bodhicitta and practice various yidams and so on. Almost all Dzogchen cycles also contain various Tantric practices and Mahayana attitudes.

Malcolm wrote:

For people of the best fortune with intermediate capacity -- who need an anuyoga approach.

heart said:

This goes for the Nyingthik and Yangtik and so on also. Something that believes itself to be independent and free from the "conceited vehicles of the nine yanas" should not lean so heavily on those vehicles.

Malcolm wrote:

The utterly secret unsurpassed cycle does not. It does not make use of them at all.

heart said:

Like the Kunjed Gyalpo, it is a Dzogchen Tantra pointing out the ultimate view of

Dzogchen for the practitioners of the lower yanas, in particular the Mahayoga and Anuyoga, so it is solidly within the tradition of the nine yanas.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed, it is not part of the utterly secret unsurpassed cycle. However, if you understand the meaning of the utterly secret unsurpassed cycle then it opens up the meaning of texts like Kun byed rgyal po causing them to be read differently. Just as, for example, sems sde allows one to read tantras like the Manjushrinamasamgiti differently.

heart said:

Or else all these people like Jax and Sönam that reads the Kunjed Gyalpo as basically a good reason to consider the nine yanas as unimportant and unnecessary are correct.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not an "either or" thing. It is a question of good fortune and past accumulations. That's it. Anyway, I agree with you that for the most part, no one is free from a mind and a dualistic vision. Therefore, we have the nine yānas to address this condition, depending on practitioner and capacity. But also, as you know very well, the real practice of Dzogchen has nothing to do with mind, and therefore, nothing to do with the nine yañas.

The true practice of Dzogchen is based on wisdom. The nine yānas is based on mind. That is the basic difference.

This is not my idea, magnus. This is what is explained in many Dzogchen texts and upadeshas. Moreover, this is also explained by our mutual master, Norbu Rinpoche. It may be hard to understand, but it is true. There is a Dzogchen practice that is not part of the nine yānas approach. Norbu Rinpoche has dedicated his life to explaining this properly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Namdrol said:

We can speculate all we like.

But there are some salient points to bear in mind. It was not imagined by Mahāyānists that there were persistent oral lineages of Mahāyāna teachings in Jambudvīpa.

Quite the contrary. Mahāyāna is the original treasure tradition. Mahāyānists came to believe that their texts had been laid away for four centuries or more and then revealed by such masters as Nāgārjuna and so on, kept by Bodhisattvas such as Mañjuśrī for safe keeping until the time was right for them again to be promulgated. Therefore, any honest person whose mind is not clouded by the delusion of religious zeal and fervor has to admit that it is unlikely that the detailed and highly complex literary compositions which we now know as Mahāyāna sūtras could not possibly have been composed in any

thing other than a visionary manner at a much later time than their purported setting. Moreover, they would have to admit that these detailed literary compositions, (even as early as the Dīgha Nikāya), betray evidence of extensive editing and development over many centuries, as is proven by the layers of such texts in Chinese translation. For example, the Maitreya Chapter, so important to gzhān stong exegesis, is completely missing in Chinese sources, proving that it was a Yogacara addition to the PP corpus.

Pema Rigdzin said:

You make a good case, and what you say is probably the most likely explanation. Since we've already established that these texts' provenance is beside the point (aside from the enlightened nature of that source), my continued participation here is just for the sake of it being interesting to me and because I may learn new things as I continue to probe.

With that in mind... It was my understanding that the PP sutras were rediscovered by Nagarjuna, and Maitreya's five treatises were kind of like pure vision teachings received by Asanga, etc., but are all of the Mahayana sutras said to have come to us in a similar way? Were none said to have come to us in a long lineage from the Buddha (a la kama)? If there are cases where a "kama" lineage of certain Mahayana sutras is claimed traditionally, is it not possible that the historical teachings spoken of in these sutras did in fact take place, were faithfully transcribed and hidden, and later edited and added to throughout the centuries following their rediscovery? Again, I acknowledge that it really doesn't matter, but I am curious.

Malcolm wrote:

It is highly unlikely.

No Pali suttas of which I am aware are so highly self-referential, making constant references to worshipping themselves in book form, or constant references to the doctrine they contain, or defensive remarks about criticizing their contents. In other words, the Agamas and Nikayas seem to lack any anxiety at all; whereas Mahāyāna sūtras seem to be filled with anxious polemics about their authenticity.

This anxiety that is so noticeable in early Mahāyāna texts begins to vanish when India authors, copying a strategy of the Theravada Abhidhamma pitika authors, hit on the strategy of ultimately siting the original source of Mahāyāna sūtras in the person of Tathāgata Vairocana in Akaniṣṭha Gandavyuha.

Now freed from the spatio-temporal constraints of Kapilavastu, Rajagriha, etc., and utilizing docetic strategies of transmission (the three kāyas), these texts were now immune to hermeneutical critiques of authenticity based on their composition as texts ultimately voiced by Shakyamuni located within the lifetime and career of Shakyamuni. Shakyamuni's role, in India, as the proponent of Mahāyāna was subordinated to that of Vairocana. Shakyamuni-as-nirmanakāya now appears more as a shepherd of the Dharma, rather than its ultimate source. There are many other threads one can work out from this basic premise.

This did not happen without some dissenting backlash, of course i.e. the Saddharmapundarika can be seen as a reaction to this firm trend, with the ultimate result that in India the Saddharmapundarika was completely sidelined since it did not fit into the innovative Yogacara docetic model of sūtra transmission with the sambhogakāya acting as an intermediary between the dharmakāya and the nirmanakāya.

Yogacara doceticism is a vital key also in the composition and dissemination of Vajrayana. Now, freed utterly from the dictates of the career of Gautama, Buddhist authors/mystics could fearlessly compose tantras free of concern about their historicity. The only evidence of anxiety in the tantras is that they would fall into improper hands.

The Agamas, Vaipulya-sūtras, and tantras should be seen as a successive record of the religious experiences of people who attained awakening in some measure, starting with The Buddha. When the main themes of Indian compositional strategies in Mahāyāna had been set down, these themes adopted to compose original sūtras in Chinese, Tibetan, Khotanese, etc. These themes of composition were so strong, so compelling, that even nominally non-buddhist peoples such as Bonpos adopted them hook, line and sinker, developing a religion in Tibet that is virtually indistinguishable from Tibetan Buddhism other than details of narrative origin, and used these narrative strategies to express their own spiritual evolution.

I am a firm believer in evolution. I personally think that Buddhism is a religion that underwent and is undergoing significant evolution, reaching its high point in the teachings of the great perfection, and adapting itself to various cultures in an evolutionary manner according to the environment in which it found itself.

The reason Buddhism was able to undergo this evolution without its core being destroyed, but rather revealed and expressed with greater and greater clarity as successive generations of buddhas refined its essential message, is that the essence of the dharma is dependent origination.

Ok, said enough, now have to get back to work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

plwk said:

Inspired by the sister site... <http://dhammawheel.com/viewforum.php?f=30> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

I should think that by now, having been here from its days of infancy, under two profiles (the other one given a funeral) until now, Dharma Wheel perhaps has attained some sort of maturity (I believe we do have Ordained members in here) to have a forum of its own on Ordination.

If not mistaken, when Ordination comes to mind in the Mahayana/Vajrayana contexts, one is looking at:

- a. the monastic and non-monastic systems (Dharmagupta/Mulasarvastivada and Bodhisattva/Tantric Vows/Precepts)
- b. the East Asian Mahayana and its affiliates, the Japanese and its affiliates, the Tibetan Vajrayana and its affiliates

Then, this Forum should be an avenue to discuss and exchange ideas on:

- a. Ordination
 - i. General discussions (typical Q&As, specifics on robes, fake monastics, customs/protocol of the Ordained and etc)
 - ii. The Experiential (from the fully Ordained to those who participated in short term monastic retreats and those who disrobed)
 - iii. Legal/Administrative issues (e.g when ordaining in a foreign country or when foreigners ordain in one's country)

- b. Resources on Ordination

What do you think Admin/Mods/Members?

The above suggestions are not exhaustive and ideas are welcomed to improve and enhance further.

Malcolm wrote:

One of the main causes of people thinking we were fascists at e-sangha was when we tried to impose some order in validating who was actually ordained and who was not.

Sooner or later some clown who is not actually an authentic lama/monk/ etc. will show up here and it will cause problems.

Having an ordained forum will create this problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:08 AM

Title: Re: Open Webcast with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu: Mandarava

Content:

Jikan said:

Oh, because it's already tomorrow in Singapore. Because the world is round or something.

thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

I should have updated....tonight rinpoche's is giving a formal empowerment -- these cannot be webcast since it is a different type of transmission. Requires in person attendance.

However, the open retreat resumes tomorrow night.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:37 AM

Title: Re: Ego cosmic energy

Content:

Jikan said:

I certainly don't disagree there, Namdrol.

I just think we'd be better at the whole Buddhist thing if we avoided going into group ridicule mode when a stranger from out of town walks into the room. And I mean this as a self-criticism first and foremost.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but ram seems pretty unfazed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

Pema Rigdzin,

What you mean is the Yogacara teaching of the five gotras, and it is not relevant to the question here.

Namdrol,

Yes, there were some Hinayana schools, the Mahasamghikas for instance, who had some concept of other buddhas. So maybe this problem never occurred in India or anywhere else. Still, in the agamas/nikayas there is no sign of other buddhas and those are the texts said to be preached for the sravakas. Consequently, since in the Mahayana sutras sravakas are also present, they should have known about other buddhas.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Haha sorry, what I wrote about the five gotras was just the set-up to my main point which I obviously forgot to make... however, now in light of my reflection upon what Namdrol has suggested, I have to rethink the point I was going to make. Maybe he's right, which doesn't matter because as he mentioned, the liberating power of the Mahayana sutras is in their Dharma, not their supposed historicity. But I'd like to look further into

this for myself, and hopefully it'll be stimulating convo for others as well. So, before I abandon the possibility that the Mahayana sutras did indeed literally fall off the lips of the Buddha himself as we're lead to believe, I'll start with this question:

First, I'm assuming those Arhats in attendance during the Buddha's supposedly historical Mahayana teachings conceived the mind for enlightenment. Might not they have nonetheless recognized that some future beings would also have an affinity for the Bodhisattva vehicle, while others would only be attracted to the individual liberation vehicle? If that were the case, wouldn't they have been selective in who they passed either vehicle on to once they began to teach after the Buddha's death? Then, accordingly, wouldn't two different narratives and Dharmas have developed over the hundreds of subsequent years before it was decided to commit the Buddha's teachings to writing? And by that time, wouldn't one lineage have maintained their Mahayana focus while appreciating the upaya of having two different paths for beings of two different affinities, while another lineage would have held only to the authenticity of the Shravaka approach, committing to writing only the teachings they viewed as authentic and pertinent to their goal?

Malcolm wrote:

We can speculate all we like.

But there are some salient points to bear in mind. It was not imagined by Mahāyānists that there were persistent oral lineages of Mahāyāna teachings in Jambudvīpa.

Quite the contrary. Mahāyāna is the original treasure tradition. Mahāyānists came to believe that their texts had been laid away for four centuries or more and then revealed by such masters as Nāgārjuna and so on, kept by Bodhisattvas such as Mañjuśrī for safe keeping until the time was right for them again to be promulgated. Therefore, any honest person whose mind is not clouded by the delusion of religious zeal and fervor has to admit that it is unlikely that the detailed and highly complex literary compositions which we now know as Mahāyāna sūtras could not possibly have been composed in any thing other than a visionary manner at a much later time than their purported setting. Moreover, they would have to admit that these detailed literary compositions, (even as early as the Dīgha Nikāya), betray evidence of extensive editing and development over many centuries, as is proven by the layers of such texts in Chinese translation. For example, the Maitreya Chapter, so important to gzhan stong exegesis, is completely missing in Chinese sources, proving that it was a Yogacara addition to the PP corpus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

Namdrol,

Sure, and that is exactly the historical point. But since, just as you said, Mahayana followers in the past (and present) think that the sutras were spoken directly by the Buddha, thus I was wondering whether there is an explanation from their side on the lack of other buddhas in the agamas. Although it is possible there isn't such an answer.

Anders Honore said:

Isn't it obvious? Th Mahayana sutras reveal things that weren't spoken in the agamas, either because it wasn't needed for the time or because it is not suitable for the Hinayana. Standard explanation for any addition the Mahayana sutras make to early Buddhism really.

Malcolm wrote:

Astus' question is different -- why did those named Shravakas not know about these other Buddhas since they are present in both Nikaya and Mahayana settings?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Ego cosmic energy

Content:

Jikan said:

Hi Ram,

I don't know the answer to the questions you pose. I don't know if the answers are necessarily related, or are discontinuous.

I don't know if everyone piling on in mocking these questions is a particularly helpful tactic either.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to admit, his initial post was pretty hilarious, even if unintended.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Unknown said:

Of course you can think and label descriptions of the ultimate truth as you wish, but that doesnt make the ultimate truth a "mere fiction".

Views and other conceptual ideas about the ultimate truth are conventional but this has no impact whatsoever on the ultimate truth.

Malcolm wrote:

TM is a little right, and a little wrong.

On the one hand, in absence of the cognition that is undeluded regarding the nature of its object, ultimate truth is a complete fiction, being a mere conceptual contrivance.

He is a little wrong, assuming such undeluded cognitions are possible: when one is directly experiencing such an undeluded cognition regarding the nature of its object, that is an ultimate truth of the unmediated or non-enumerated type.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Ornament of Reason

Content:

Will said:

This is a new translation, from Snow Lion, of Nagarjuna's Root of the Middle Way with an extensive (over 500pp) commentary by Mabja Jangchub Tsondru (d. 1185). The main translator is Thomas Doctor, part of the Dharmachakra Translation Committee. The root text stands alone, and later each verse or line is commented on.

I am only 100pp or so into it, so these first impressions may change. It is an excellent, very clear and helpful commentary. Mabja's detailed outline is included, but not displayed in the usual indented lines, with italics and oodles of 2.2.A.b.x stuff. The outline has little boxes with text connected by lines; sounds primitive, but much easier to use.

The only small quibbles I have are the translation of almost every term. This would be fine if there were a glossary or the index had the Sanskrit equivalent next to the translated word - but neither is in this book. When mentioning some old Indian schools - Enumerators is probably the Sankhya school and the Ritualists is Mimamsa, but "Far Throwers" ???

Another question that is not answered in the book is more biographical info on Mabja bodhisattva. Maybe there is little or none, but considering his detailed, precise, scholarly and wise comments (plus relying on Chandrakirti) leads me to guess Sakya roots for him.

Anyone else started reading it?

Namdrol said:

Not really a Sakya pa. He was scholar at Sangphu, a contemporary of Sonam Tsemo, probably knew him well. Died 1185.

"Far throwers" means Carvaka/lokeyati, i.e. materialists who deny rebirth and ripening of karma.

We know virtually nothing about him apart from the fact that he was in the immediate

circles of Patsab, the main translator of Candrakirti's material into Tibetan.

Will said:

So maybe he was part of the original Kadam school? No Geluks for 200 years or so. Or maybe Sangphu was a non-attached or independent sort of monastery or center?

Malcolm wrote:

Sangphu was an original Kadampa school that became politically allied with Sakya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Ornament of Reason

Content:

Will said:

This is a new translation, from Snow Lion, of Nagarjuna's Root of the Middle Way with an extensive (over 500pp) commentary by Mabja Jangchub Tsondru (d. 1185). The main translator is Thomas Doctor, part of the Dharmachakra Translation Committee. The root text stands alone, and later each verse or line is commented on.

I am only 100pp or so into it, so these first impressions may change. It is an excellent, very clear and helpful commentary. Mabja's detailed outline is included, but not displayed in the usual indented lines, with italics and oodles of 2.2.A.b.x stuff. The outline has little boxes with text connected by lines; sounds primitive, but much easier to use.

The only small quibbles I have are the translation of almost every term. This would be fine if there were a glossary or the index had the Sanskrit equivalent next to the translated word - but neither is in this book. When mentioning some old Indian schools - Enumerators is probably the Sankhya school and the Ritualists is Mimamsa, but "Far Throwers" ???

Another question that is not answered in the book is more biographical info on Mabja bodhisattva. Maybe there is little or none, but considering his detailed, precise, scholarly and wise comments (plus relying on Chandrakirti) leads me to guess Sakya roots for him.

Anyone else started reading it?

Malcolm wrote:

Not really a Sakya pa. He was scholar at Sangphu, a contemporary of Sonam Tsemo, probably knew him well. Died 1185.

"Far throwers" means Carvaka/lokyati, i.e. materialists who deny rebirth and ripening of karma.

We know virtually nothing about him apart from the fact that he was in the immediate

circles of Patsab, the main translator of Candrakirti's material into Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Tatsuo said:

Couldn't the passage of the Lotus Sutra about the lifespan of Shakyamuni be also valid for the view, that many Buddhas exist in the universe (and therefore the guidance by a Buddha is always available)?

"Good men, the Thus Come One observes how among living beings there are those who delight in a little Law, meager in virtue and heavy with defilement. For such persons I describe how in my youth I left my household and attained anuttara-samyak-sambodhi. But in truth the time since I attained Buddhahood is extremely long, as I have told you. It is simply that I use this expedient means to teach and convert living beings and cause them to enter the Buddha way. That is why I speak in this manner. (...) Why do I do this? Because if the Buddha remains in the world for a long time, those persons with shallow virtue will fail to plant good roots but, living in poverty and lowliness, will become attached to the five desires and be caught in the net of deluded thoughts and imaginings. If they see that the Thus Come One is constantly in the world and never enters extinction, they will grow arrogant and selfish, or become discouraged and neglectful. They will fail to realize how difficult it is to encounter the Buddha and will not approach him with a respectful and reverent mind."

(Lotus Sutra, chapter 14)

Malcolm wrote:

Well, at the risk of a citation war....The Vajracchedika sūtra states:

Those who by my form did see me,
And those who followed me by voice
Wrong the efforts they engaged in,
Me those people will not see.

From the Dharma should one see the Buddhas,
From the Dharmabodies comes their guidance.
Yet Dharma's true nature cannot be discerned,
And no one can be conscious of it as an object.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

]

Rael said:

hey ..i think i'm going to get one of these for me wife to give me more spare time for you guys

Malcolm wrote:

My sentence would have been clearer had i written:

"In other words, from a Madhyamaka perspective all cognitions of relative truths are deluded even if they are conventionally true."[/quote]

I lied, a little bit.

I dropped out of school when I was 15, more or less.

But I did two years of non-credit coursework at Harvard Extension (night school) between 1986-1988, focusing on writing, history and religion. I then rejected pursuit of more academic Buddhist education because I wanted a more traditional approach.

This is what I meant by "adult improvement". I was 24 when I took these courses.

Now, of course, I am an acharya and a doctor of Tibetan Medicine -- all in all about 11 years of work all together. 6 Years of Buddhist education including a three year retreat, five years of education to obtain my degree in Tibetan medicine. I have been studying Buddhism now in one way or another for 25 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:

so like your saying basically cognating is a Samsaric event...

Namdrol said:

Yes, basically, that is what Nagarjuna, etc. is saying.

Rael said:

thanksif you knew how many times i had to read what you wrote in order to post that....

and you only like me have a grade nine education...

well you have done well....

i appreciate your form Namdrol...it forces me to use me noodle....

and you were right....it's no excuse i should try harder.....

if you only knew how many times in each sentence Google Chrome corrects stuff for me....

hey ..i think i'm going to get one of these for me wife to give me more spare time for you guys

Malcolm wrote:

My sentence would have been clearer had i written:

"In other words, from a Madhyamaka perspective all cognitions of relative truths are deluded even if they are conventionally true."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:

so like your saying basically cognating is a Samsaric event...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, basically, that is what Nagarjuna, etc. is saying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists

Content:

Rael said:

But...does that mean we are to shut down knowledge of other systems...explore the beauty of the human spirit.....

Nangwa said:

Not at all.

Buddhism has a long history of investigating and analyzing other traditions in a

meaningful way.

Usually of course asserting eventually that Buddhism is "the best" but that's to be expected from Buddhist scholar-monks.

Malcolm wrote:

Meaningful to Buddhists at any rate -- I don't think Hindus feel well represented by Buddhist tenet system literature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: The Medicinal Value of Incense

Content:

Kyosan said:

I'm concerned that frequent burning of incense may increase the risk of cancer. They say that the combustion produces carcinogens.

<http://web.bsu.edu/IEN/archives/110306.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

The main point is to fill the room with fragrance, if you are offering incense devotionally. Therefore, I recommend you use an aromatherapy nebulizer.

You can then procure pure sandalwood essential oil, or agarwood, etc., add a couple drops to your nebulizer, and enjoy the benefits of the aroma and none of the downsides. You could even experiment with creating blends of essential oils for your needs.

A nebulizer works by creating water vapor via ultrasound.

Keep in mind that burning wood for fires, etc, also produce the same compounds. As well as cars, city traffic, etc.

As long as your house is well ventilated, you use vetted pure incenses from a reliable sources that uses no accelerants, etc., then I think then there is no additional risk to your children that is not already present from our toxic industrial environment as a whole.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

"Well, what sort of text critical conclusion can you draw from that, Astus?"

I'm not looking for text critical conclusions, for that there are some fine scholarly works like "The concept of the Buddha: its evolution from early Buddhism to the trikāya theory" by Guang Xing. Also it's possible to go for a conspiracy theory that the sravakas deleted all the other buddhas but that's just non-sense to me. That's why I'm looking for another perspective on this. Of course, there's always the option to say that buddhas are upaya and such, but that doesn't answer a few things.

Malcolm wrote:

Well how about the obvious answer? The Mahāyāna sutras were written after the Agamas. That answers all questions concerning why this is not present in that, etc

I understand that there are some people who wish to dearly maintain a death grip on the idea that Mahāyāna sutras are literally, historically, the words of one Gautama Buddha physically uttered sometime between his awakening at 35 and his passing at age 80 -- but that is just religion, that is not Dharma. Dharma lies in the truth of the words, not the mise en scène.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Story of a Vajra Guru mantra siddha

Content:

narraboth said:

well, if it's what happened on him, then it is.

Some Bonpos are against guru rinpoche and ofcourse that's not good.

Namdrol said:

From their point of view, there were two Padmasambhavas; a nice one and one, a an evil Nepalese sorcerer, that persecuted Bonpos. They just think Nyingmas are confused about history.

dzoki said:

Interesting I thought that this was actually a gelug story of Padmasamabhava which was made up by a certain "scholar" who criticized both terma and kama traditions. So it seems that he was not so original after all, he just borrowed from bonpos.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

Pema Rigdzin,

What you mean is the Yogacara teaching of the five gotras, and it is not relevant to the question here.

Namdrol,

Yes, there were some Hinayana schools, the Mahasamghikas for instance, who had some concept of other buddhas. So maybe this problem never occurred in India or anywhere else. Still, in the agamas/nikayas there is no sign of other buddhas and those are the texts said to be preached for the sravakas. Consequently, since in the Mahayana sutras sravakas are also present, they should have known about other buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, what sort of text critical conclusion can you draw from that, Astus?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Non-duality is very boring and easily becomes a deviation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So, for example, if an undeluded cognition comes to the conclusion that black is white then that means it is an ultimate truth?

Malcolm wrote:

Candra defines two natures for every object, one relative, one ultimate. Undeluded cognitions are predicted on seeing the ultimate nature of a given object.

Black and white are relative aspects.

In other words, all cognitions of relative truths, even if conventionally true, are, from a Madhyamaka perspective, deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Story of a Vajra Guru mantra siddha

Content:

narraboth said:

well, if it's what happened on him, then it is.

Some Bonpos are against guru rinpoche and ofcourse that's not good.

Malcolm wrote:

From their point of view, there were two Padmasambhavas; a nice one and one, a an evil Nepalese sorcerer, that persecuted Bonpos. They just think Nyingmas are confused about history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

What is the traditional explanation for the lack of other buddhas in the agamas? It doesn't seem valid to say that teaching about other buddhas is only a bodhisattva matter since in Mahayana texts it is all fine for sravakas to learn about them and even to aspire for other buddha-realms. So why are there no other buddhas mentioned in the Hinayana teachings, only some buddhas of the past and the next future buddha? Again, it is not the modern historical explanation what I'm looking for here but the addressing of it from a traditional Mahayana perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

There is an argument in the Katavattu where some other nikaya Buddhists assert Buddhas in other world systems. This rejected, saying that if there were such Buddhas, one should know their names and so on.

So speculations about other Buddhas in other worlds was an early feature of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Ego cosmic energy

Content:

ram peswani said:

WHY, WHY ,WHY?

Why does dragon girl turns into MALE before becoming Buddha?

Namdrol said:

Why does the goddess of the Ganges turn Shariputra into woman?

Why Purna has only Male members in the universe which he will rule in future?

Imagine, a universe full of penises.

Why does Guatam Buddha bestow prophesy of Buddhahood to Male members only?

Obviously, it is because only penises can become buddhas.

ram peswani said:

NO PENISES ONLY UNISEX , NO GENDER FAVOURITISM

Bible says Adam created EVE from one of his ribs as a playmate

Unisex male (pure ego) created penis male and @\$% female

And they create so many emotions and mental mess (i see one here) that Buddhas thought it fit NOT to take them to Buddhaholands

Malcolm wrote:

Ram,

You may not be aware of this but "male member" is a polite euphemism for penis. I was just kidding around with you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The object of an undeluded cognition is an ultimate truth

'Scuse my ignorance but wouldn't that then imply that all objects of an undeluded cognition are expressions of ultimate truth? ie All objects per se? I cannot imagine an enlightened being having an instance of deluded cognition in regards to any type of object.

Malcolm wrote:

It means that all objects of undeluded cognitions are ultimate truths.

For example, a bodhisattva on the paths and stages has undeluded cognition in equipoise, but deluded cognition in post-equipoise; though that deluded cognition is qualitatively different than an unawakened person's in terms of intensity.

Buddhas only undeluded cognitions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Let just clarify a point in general -- I was not saying that "Dzogchen is restricted to the nine yanas gradual approach".

There are many Dzogchen texts that explicitly place the path they teach, as opposed to outer common atiyoga, outside the nine yanas.

Even so, this does not render Dzogchen sans Buddhism.

heart said:

If it was outside the nine yanas it would be outside Buddhism. The whole idea of the nine yanas is an Ati perspective anyway. "Outer common atiyoga" what is that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

The system of the nine yānas is actually an Anuyoga perspective, where Dzogchen is conceived of as the result of Anuyoga practice.

However, since the dgongs pa zang thal cycle, the Vima snying thig cycles, etc., frequently define the most secret unsurpassed great perfection cycle as not part of the nine yānas I am pretty comfortable in asserting there is a dzogchen that lies outside the nine yānas. This is the source of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's assertion that there are two approaches to Dzogchen, one gradual, based on the nine yānas; and one which does not depend on the nine yānas at all, Dzogchen as a completely self-contained system of realization that does not depend at all on the vehicles of cause and result.

The Lamp The Severs Proliferation from the Copper Lettered Collection in the Vima snying thig has the following passage which will put things in context:

"The conceited vehicles of the nine yānas do not depart even a an iota from eternalism and annihilationism."

The two can be taught separately, interwoven, or side by side.

Saying that the utterly secret unsurpassed cycle of Dzogchen is outside the nine yānas is the teaching of Nirmanakāya Garab Dorje. Therefore, since it is the teaching of Nirmanakāya Garab Dorje, it is not outside the pale of Buddhism.

Common Atiyoga is the basically sems sde, in this scheme of things.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

Actually this means the "ultimate nature of all things" is a mere thought. I think that's the point if one harbors the thought "ultimate nature of all things".

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no -- actually Candarkirti defines a truth as an _object_ of a cognition. [/quote]

Well, yes ... however one may share his view or not.

I have just picked this sentence out of the context with which you might have referred to Candrakirti's view exclusively (without wanting to assert that yourself).

[/quote]

The point is whether the cognition is deluded or undeluded in a definitive sense. The object of an undeluded cognition is an ultimate truth. The emphasis lays on the cognition apprehending the object, not the object. But since there cannot be a cognition at all sans an object, it is important to include an object in the formulation of how a truth is defined.

I select Chandrakirti for convenience since he is generally regarded as the authoritative commentarial voice concerning Nagarjuna's corpus of Madhyamaka works.

If we were talking about the two truths in other systems, for example, Sarvastivada, I would cite Vasuybandhu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 10:58 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Emptiness is the ultimate nature of things. That is why it is called ultimate truth.

TMingyur said:

Actually this means the "ultimate nature of all things" is a mere thought. I think that's the point if one harbors the thought "ultimate nature of all things".

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no -- actually Candarkirti defines a truth as an object of a cognition. Depending upon whether that cognition is deluded or undeluded, the object in question is either an ultimate truth or a relative truth.

The thought "things are empty is just an enumerated ultimate, a conceptual ultimate. This must be distinguished from the non-enumerated ultimate truth that is a veridical cognition of the object, the ultimate nature of a given thing, i.e. its emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

"Emptiness is not a quality or a nature of things"

This is the main one.

Sherab said:

I am not too sure about that.

Things ultimately have no nature. Emptiness itself is also empty. So how can emptiness be a nature or quality of things in the ultimate sense.

Conventionally, things have nature. So if emptiness is the nature of things, it must be in the conventional sense. But to say emptiness is the conventional nature of things also does not make much sense to me. It would be like saying water is (conventionally) wet and empty at the same time. "Wet and empty" makes no sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is the ultimate nature of things. That is why it is called ultimate truth.

Candrakirti said, all things possess two natures, one relative, one ultimate.

Incidentally, emptiness is termed "the natureless nature".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Sherab said:

Please explain what you think Norman was trying to say. Thanks.

Namdrol said:

I said I tried... when I parsed it, I came up with contradictions. Better to let Norman reinterpret for us.

Sherab said:

What are the contradictions that you discovered?

Malcolm wrote:

"Emptiness is not a quality or a nature of things"

This is the main one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Astus said:

Do they have the same Vajrasamadhi Sutra in Tibet as in East Asia? I mean, the one commented by Wohyo and translated by Robert E. Buswell Jr.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, indeed they do, translated from Chinese.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Did I miss the bunfight?!

Damn! I luv a good bunfight! Did anybody get a nosebleed?

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, just usual internet schoolyard recess behavior.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The main point is that the method of meditation is not put into the mahayana sutras in any extensive, or detailed manner.

dzoki said:

I am no expert on this topic, but I think Samadhiraja and Vajrasamadhi sutras might have some instructions on meditation.

*edited for doublequoting

Malcolm wrote:

Quite detailed in the case of the latter -- as well as the Samdhinirmocana, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: How can we help dead animals in the bardo?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Cool. Yes, this is in fact the meditation taught by Tulku Thondup that I was referred to the book for.

- Tom

Malcolm wrote:

You can do Shitro.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists

Content:

Rael said:

.did i tell you i'm mad as a march hare...and speak me mind far to openly...lol...in real life too it seems

modding is such sweet sorrow...i loathe itlol

welcome a bored

Malcolm wrote:

You didn't have to tell me...

Plain speaking is a virtue.

It is sad when people see you through a reputation they have projected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists

Content:

Rael said:

Namdrol i think you want to be a mod...

from your e-sangha comment...and member ridicule fun stuff deal....

Malcolm wrote:

Not on your life. Being a moderator is just a headache. People engage in amazingly irrational projections about your person, etc.

Anyway Rael, I did not ridicule anyone's person, though I did offer my thoughts about ram peshwar's ridiculously sexist post.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Sherab said:

Please explain what you think Norman was trying to say. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

I said I tried... when I parsed it, I came up with contradictions. Better to let norman reinterpret for us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Ego cosmic energy

Content:

ram peswani said:

WHY, WHY ,WHY?

Why does dragon girl turns into MALE before becoming Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

Why does the goddess of the Ganges turn Shariputra into woman?

ram peswani said:

Why Purna has only Male members in the universe which he will rule in future?

Malcolm wrote:

Imagine, a universe full of penises.

ram peswani said:

Why does Guatam Buddha bestow prophesy of Buddhahood to Male members only?

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously, it is because only penises can become buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Jikan said:

In this thread...

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=3556> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

...the question of whether nembutsu (reciting the name of Buddha Amitabha) is in itself a tantric practice. It's OT to that thread, so here it is in a new one.

Tantric Buddhism (Vajrayana, Mikkyo) is a form of Mahayana practice that necessarily involves several elements. Among these are abhiseka (empowerment), qualified guru... and a certain way of understanding reality. (tantra means "continuum.")

Not all these elements are present in nembutsu practice, so it makes no sense to say it is in fact a tantric practice. It is like tantric practice in some respects, however.

Questions, comments, or corrections?

TMingyur said:

Only one comment:

One may become obsessed with the finger pointing to the moon if there is much thinking about the finger, identifying with the finger thinking "This finger is 'mine', 'I' am the finger. By means of the finger I will attain such and such." Based on this the finger is investigated and studied in great detail.

In that way one may become an eloquent finger expert.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

The old finger and the moon snub...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists

Content:

plwk said:

It's all... <http://freedomforall.net/the-problem-with-buddhists/>

What do you think? A valid observation or just a rant or both?

Malcolm wrote:

Proof of rebirth -- this guy was bounced from e-sangha. And what do you know, here he is again...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Let just clarify a point in general -- I was not saying that "Dzogchen is restricted to the nine yanas gradual approach".

There are many Dzogchen texts that explicitly place the path they teach, as opposed to outer common atiyoga, outside the nine yanas.

Even so, this does not render Dzogchen sans Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: The Medicinal Value of Incense

Content:

plwk said:

Interesting Namdrol...

Is incense effective for skin conditions like eczema or fungal infections?

Malcolm wrote:

Certain skin conditions induced by vata, rough, dry skin, for example, will be helped over all by a vata-reducing regimen. If it is pitta related, then burning sandalwood can be effective.

Sandal wood essential oil may be helpful for certain skin rashes; for fungal infections, try using refined sesame oil. Sesame oil has anti-fungal properties. But it depends on the dosha involved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: The Medicinal Value of Incense

Content:

plwk said:

How is it utilised in Tibetan Medicine?

Malcolm wrote:

There are many different formulas for incense on Tibetan Medicine.

However, there is one brand called sold under the name "Nirvana" which is actually the formula called Agar 31. It is used for Vata disturbances (i.e. high wind or rlung), insomnia, to induce calm, and so on. This can be crushed as used as an oral medicine as well (under prescription from doctor).

Properly formulated Tibetan incense is held to repel bhutas, and so on. In other words, it can be used for aromatherapy.

Properly formulated Tibetan incense is like good wine or ghee, it's medicinal value is enhanced by aging.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Garab Dorje was an emanation of Vajrasattva/Vajradhara. He was not an ordinary human being, according to the Dzogchen tradition. He possessed all of the infinite

qualities of a nirmanakāya. Padmasambhava was predicted by Shakyamuni in the sutras to be greater than himself, according to many biographies of Padmasambhava.

Mariusz said:

So why they are not listed among the 1000 Buddhas of time of existence of our fortunate universum?

Malcolm wrote:

Hinayana Sutras do not list the Buddhas who teach Mahayana. They list only seven or four buddhas. Mahayana sutras do not list the teachers of Dzogchen, nor the eons in which they occur.

Namdrol said:

The so called "mind transmission" of Dzogchen is not something a teacher places in your head. It is your knowledge of the real meaning of Dzogchen teachings. That happens whenever you awaken that knowledge after you have received Dzogchen transmission in general.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Kongtrul the Great the mind transmission of Dzogchen can happen directly from Samantabhadra to high-level bodhisattvas without Garab Dorje or other Teacher.
[/quote]

From the point of view of Dzogchen, attaining buddhahood is the state of Dzogchen. But from the point of view of Dzogchen, the vehicles of cause and effect cannot result in buddhahood. They are of provisional meaning or of indirect meaning.

[/quote]

Nevertheless it was transmitted to Garab Dorje and other "twelve Dzogchen teachers" and Padmasambhava only as I remember. According to terms of Pema Lingpa Padmasambhava had Samantabhadra and Vajrasattva, not only Garab Dorje, as His Teachers of Dzogchen.[/quote]

There are a few lineages of Dzogchen man ngag sde -- Garab Dorje, Manjushrimitra, Shri Singha, Jnanasutra, Vimalamitra;

Garab Dorje, Shri Singha, Vimalamitra in tandem with Padmasambhava;

Garab Dorje, Manjushrimitra, Shri Singha, Vimalamitra;

Then Garab Dorje, Shri Singha, Padmasambhava;

Then Garab Dorje, Padmasambhava;

Garab Dorje, Shri Singha, Vairocana;

There is also a lineage of Samantabhadra, Vajrasattva, Padmasambhava -- for example, the Khon Vajrakilaya gives this lineage. This just means that Padmsambhava was a full vidyādhara, a buddha possessing all three kāyas completely. So yes, there are terma systems where the lineage of Dzogchen teachings is as you describe, even so, believe it or not, Padmasambhava declares to Yeshe Tsogyal that Vimalamitra, and not he, is the main regent of Dzogchen teachings in Tibet. The reason Padmasambhava teaches her Dzogchen is that she did not have the karmic connection with Vimalamitra to learn Dzogchen from him, or so it is stated in the dgongs pa zang thal.

And lots of other lineages too numerous to mention both long and short, kama and terma.

In any case, Dzogchen is not subject to the criteria of sutra. Things such as Supreme Nirmanakāyas and all this stuff is just a conceptual limitation created by trying fit Dzogchen within the narrow hermeneutics of Mahāyāna sūtra dogmatism. That is like trying to fit Mahāyāna sutra criteria into Hīnayāna sūtra dogmatism.

Just as Mahāyāna shares some features with Hīnayāna, Dzogchen shares some features with Mahāyāna, but just as Mahāyāna cannot fit inside of the narrow criteria imposed by the Hīnayāna conception of the personage of buddhas; likewise, Dzogchen cannot fit inside the broader, yet still limiting conception of the personage of buddhas imposed by common mahāyāna. In other words, if you try to impose a common Mahāyāna hermeneutical framework on Dzogchen, it does not work. It is best to abandon that framework since it is not important in Dzogchen and does not work at all. So while Shakyamuni is considered one of the twelve historical teachers of Dzogchen prior to Garab Dorje for reason we have already discussed (he predicted the arrival of the effortless vehicle in the future), our teachings of Dzogchen do not come from Shakyamuni and there is no evidence that he ever taught it on Jambudvīpa.

Nirmanakāyas do not have the certainty of place, time, teacher, teaching and retinue. Just accept that and move on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

Pero said:

And what are they? Ngondro?

Malcolm wrote:

I think you have to write them and ask.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Garab Dorje is not a tulku in the Tibetan cultural sense of the term. He is a tulku in the Padmasambhava and Shakyamuni sense of the term i.e. a nirmanakāya of compassion.

Mariusz said:

As I know Garab Dorje realized the Body of Light (Wyl. A'od-Phung) and Padmasambhava the Great Transference Body (Wyl. Pho-Ba Ch'en-Po).

So are Garab Dorje and Padmasambhava the same Supreme Nirmanakayas as Buddha Shakyamuni and Buddha Maitreya who have limitless qualities (as 64 main features of Buddhahood, 18 distinctive qualities of Buddhahood, 32 physical marks of the Perfect One, 64 verbal marks of the Perfect One, 9 qualities and skills of Perfect One's enlightening influence and so on)?

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje was an emanation of Vajrasattva/Vajradhara. He was not an ordinary human being, according to the Dzogchen tradition. He possessed all of the infinite qualities of a nirmanakāya. Padmasambhava was predicted by Shakyamuni in the sutras to be greater than himself, according to many biographies of Padmasambhava.

Anyway, this sort of limitation is unnecessary. Both Shakyamuni Buddha and Garab Dorje are emanations of Vajradhara -- their historical manifestation and set of teachings is different, but their continuums ultimately the same. Even so, in terms of historical manifestation, Garab Dorje is more important for Dzogchen practitioners. Thus we have many dzogchen guru yogas of Garab Dorje, no dzogchen guru yogas of Shakyamuni at all. Not even one. Why? Because the historical manifestation, Shakyamuni, is not in the lineage of Dzogchen. This is not a criticism of Shakyamuni, not at all. It is just a recognition of how the teachings come to us.

Namdrol said:

Maitreya won't even teach Vajrayāna, let alone Dzogchen.

Again, can we be absolutely sure Buddha Maitreya Supreme Nirmanakaya will never teach any transmission of Dzogchen to anyone human or non-human anywhere in Human Realm or elsewhere it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I think so. The issue of the rarity of Vajrayāna teachings is a common issue. Not uncommon.

However, there are twelve other world systems besides this one where the Dzogchen teachings exist presently according to Dzogchen tantras.

Namdrol said:

Moreover, I suspect here and now is the mind transmission of Dzogchen for us, even without Garab Dorje, but we are simply not ready for it. This kind of "thing" is beyond any identity, time and place.

Malcolm wrote:

The so called "mind transmission" of Dzogchen is not something a teacher places in your head. It is your knowledge of the real meaning of Dzogchen teachings. That happens whenever you awaken that knowledge after you have received Dzogchen transmission in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

muni said:

Can the nature be accomplished by/through 10 buddhist tantra techniques, or maybe must add "only" along them.

Dzogchen only possible through Mahayana-Vajrayana? still in no way Dzogchen exclude any fruit of teaching, as all inclusive spontaneous.

Just clarity, no

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen does not require the ten tattvas described by the Anutarrayoga tantras, at least not according to Kun byed rgyal po rgyud.

Dzogchen does not require the methods of the vehicles of cause and the vehicles of result.

Even so, these two fact mention above do not place any teaching of Dzogchen "outside" Buddhism even though utterly secret unsurpassed Dzogchen is outside the nine yānas.

As it is said, sems sde is for intellectuals; klong sde is for those who like to meditate; man ngag sde is for those who practice according to intimate instructions.

Then among man ngag sde cycles there is outer, inner, secret and utterly secret, etc.

Still, even the most advanced Dzogchen practitioners go refuge, cultivate bodhicitta and dedicate merits i.e. use the three sublime principles of the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:49 AM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

Namdrol said:

http://www.nitarthainstitute.org/publications_nitartha.shtml "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; at the bottom.

Pero said:

Is this useful for all Vajrayana students? Are there any restrictions on its purchase?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Heruka said:

this is a great quote.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, opening maṅgalaṃ from the mūlamadhyamakakarikas.

Heruka said:

sound, light and rays!

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Heruka said:

are you saying that the beyond or as you imply and bait, the quintessential essence, the mother milk of prajñāpāramita and mahdhyamaka is a proper object of study?

Malcolm wrote:

No you missed my point -- if you feel that being in a state of great equanimity free from

coming and going and so is a unique point of Dzogchen, it isn't.

There are unique points in Dzogchen, of course -- but none of them place Dzogchen outside the pale of Buddhism, and are actually just answers to the basic questions Buddhism presents, just variations on Buddhist answers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:42 AM

Title: Re: Approaching Nagarjuna and the Mulamadhyamakakarika...

Content:

dumb bonbu said:

hi folks, in a couple of weeks or thereabouts i'm going to be picking Garfield's translation of 'The Fundamental Wisdom..' up off the shelf....or perhaps not lol! because firstly (aware that many find it a notoriously difficult text) i want to prep myself as much as is possible so i have a few questions -

Malcolm wrote:

It is not all that hard if you have studied Abhidharma first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:40 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

It is as similar in that it is Buddhist meditation involving Shamatha and vipashyana.. just like all the Buddhist schools but other than that it is much more similar to the rest of Tibetan Buddhism than anything found in Chan - koans and the like.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Koans and the like is Post Sung Dynasty Chan.

Kagyu Mahāmudra is very similar to original Chan. This is not a bad thing, this is good thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Umm no its really not.. I've heard several Dzogchen Masters say that Dzogchen goes along the 5 paths and 10 stages also... How you can say it doesn't is beyond me. cig char ba has to do with the person, not what tenet system one clings to...

Malcolm wrote:

Well you have your masters, and I have mine. According to my masters, Dzogchen is not a gradual path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:24 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Nangwa said:

Has anyone tried to understand what Norman was trying to say?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Heruka said:

remaining in the state of great evenness beyond coming and going, their minds beyond clarification or obscuration and so on....

Malcolm wrote:

This is no different that prajñapāramita and mahdhyamaka.

I pay homage to him,
the best of teachers, by whom dependent origination --
not ceasing, not arising;
not annihilated, not permanent;
not going, not coming;
not differentiated, not identical --
was taught as peace to to pacify proliferation.

So you need something a bit more than that statement if you are to demonstrate some teaching that renders Dzogchen "not Buddhism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:13 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Kagyu Mahamudra is nothing like Chan. Usually its Dzogchen that gets compared with Chan, but actually sense all Tibetan schools assert that one must follow the gradual path of the 5 paths and the 10 bhumis to achieve enlightenment they are in accordance with the traditions of the Dharma preserved by the Indian panditas at the likes of Nalanda and Vikramashila monasteries and not like the Buddhism that went to China and was influenced by Daoism and Confucianism.

Malcolm wrote:

Kagyu Mahāmudra in many respects is very similar to Chan, and even uses Chan sūtras like the Vajrasamādhi sūtra to support its dkar po gcig thub presentation. When Sapan was criticizing a "Chinese Dzogchen" he had in mind dkar po gcig thub i.e. Lama Zhang's presentation of Gampopa's Mahāmudra system. He does not criticize Dzogchen, actually since he regards it as part of the Nyingma completion stage.

Not all Dharma systems in Tibet assert that one must follow the five paths and ten stages approach. For example, Dzogchen. Dzogchen is definitely a cig char ba presentation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

conebeckham said:

Namdrol wrote: Yes, Zabmo Nangdon has been translated by E. Callahan.

Really? What's the English title, if you know?

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.nitarthainstitute.org/publications_nitartha.shtml "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" at the bottom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

mr. gordo said:

Thanks Nangwa, dzoki and Namdrol.

Perhaps I should have been more specific when I said "detailed". I'm not looking for

diagrams of all 72,000 channels. I'm more concerned with the 3 major ones. Specifically how they link to the crown of the head, between the eyes and below the naval. Also I think I've been misunderstanding how (and if) they connect to the urethra and anus. This misunderstanding is a bit disturbing to me as I'm concerned about the status of my practice now. That's why a side view is important for me since the front view diagrams I have aren't that clear. This is in reference to Sarma tradition too. PM's would be much appreciated.

There is also the Third Karmapa's book, zang mon nang don i.e profound inner topics. I don't suppose this is in English Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Zabmo Nangdon has been translated by E. Callahan.

According to the Kalacakra, three channels in question govern feces elimination (avadhūti); ejaculation/menstruation (rasanā) and urination (lalanā).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

dzoki said:

Hi Gordo,

there will soon be a book on this topic published by Shang Shung publications. It is a translation of the text by Gyalwa Yangongpa called Rdo rje lus kyi sbas bshad which was done by Elio Gaurisco. This text is supposed to be a complete description of all the 72000 channels, but I have no clue whether there will be illustrations of all of this. It should be out this year, but who knows?

Malcolm wrote:

This is an interesting book. It does not describe 72,000 channels in detail however.

People should however know that it is Sarma tradition. There is also the Third Karmapa's book, zang mon nang don i.e profound inner topics.

People should understand that the presentation in Nyingma is different in important ways.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Heruka said:

dzogchen in its purest form is beyond buddhist concepts, yet buddhism in its purest form is dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of dharma: dharma of text and dharma of realization.

There are two kinds of buddhism: buddhism of text and buddhism of realization.

There are two kinds of dzogchen: dzogchen of texts and dzogchen of realization.

In order to establish that "dzogchen" is "without buddhism"; one would have to identify something in Buddhism that Dzogchen is missing; or conversely, something in Dzogchen that Buddhism is missing.

In reality, Dzogchen is just another way of explaining śūnyatāprābhāsvarāśambhedaḥ in relation to the trikāya. No matter how profound Dzogchen may be (and it is the most profound teaching of Buddhism), it does not go beyond explaining how to realize the trikāya state through knowledge (vidyā,) of one's own basis (sthāna):
emptiness (śūnyatā, stong pa nyid; svarūpa, ngo bo; visuddha, ka dag; dharmakāya)
luminosity ('od gsal, prābhāsvarā; prakriti, rang bzhin) nirabhogana, lhun grub;
sambhogakāya)
inseparability (āśambhedaḥ, dbyer med; karuna, thugs rje; nirmanakāya)

Since śūnyatāprābhāsvarāśambhedaḥ is nothing more than what the Buddha taught, even Dzogchen cannot go beyond being a teaching of a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: meaning of amrita, rakta and bhalinta

Content:

mmm said:

Dear friends, can anybody share teachings on outer, inner and secret meaning of offering od maha pantsa amrita, rakta and bhalinta in regard to kjerim, dzogrim and great perfection? thank you, good bye, mmm

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Not appropriate. If you are in Dzogchen Community for example, there are many books which explain these things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

conebeckham said:

This Kagyupa would just like to point out that, in practice, I don't think there is anyone who practices only the so-called "Sutra Mahamudra." The way it is taught, these days, incorporates elements of Tantra Mahamudra and even, in some cases, aspects of "essence" mahamudra.

And as for "Essence Mahamudra," there is, in fact, a "Practice"--if you want to call it that. It is the path on which one receives a special kind of empowerment, that's the "method."

Most, if not all, Kagyupas engage in some form of deity yoga, and even pranayama, as well as vipassana and samatha, and we apply these methods in combination with the "View" of Mahamudra. I have never met a Kagyu Lama who does not embrace Vajrayana methods. Then again, I haven't met every Kagyu Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, but they are explained separately. For example, the four yogas of mahāmudra along with the detailed introduction of the nature of the mind, for example, like in Bokar Rinpoche pithy condensation, are explained separately from the six yogas of Naropa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Nangwa said:

Its really much better.

"Matter" allows for the much more inclusive meaning you posted in this quote:

"The rūpa in question here is rūpaskandha i.e. "so too sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness"".

Making what is already an incredibly pithy quote much more encompassing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since the rūpaskandha includes all material five sense organs and all five sense objects i.e. everything made of the four elements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Open Webcast with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu: Mandarava

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Singapore is exactly twelve hours ahead of US Eastern Standard Time, thus 10 am on

March 31st is 10 PM March 30 EST.

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

=====

here is the schedule of next retreat,

****WE CANT CONFIRM THE WEBCAST**** since we don't have info about internet connection at the venue where the retreat will take place. Updates will be sent as soon as we receive that info.

31-3-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN
1-4-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN
2-4-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN
3-4-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN
1-4-2011 Ganapuja ,14:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN
4-4-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Nangwa said:

There are lot of unnecessary elaborations going on here when one of the most famous sutra quotes of all time pretty clearly represents all the necessary information to answer the question.

"Form is emptiness, emptiness is form."

Interdependence/dependent origination is how we understand the appearance of forms etc. and since form is non other than emptiness.....

There is no need to draw complex philosophical distinctions when the teachings are quite clear.

Namdrol said:

Please revise your translation

"Matter is emptiness..."

The rūpa in question here is rūpaskandha i.e. "so too sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness".

And yes, whatever "arises together" (samutpāda) "in dependence" (pratītya) is empty.

Nangwa said:

Consider my translation revised. That makes the sutra quote even more clear on the point.

thanks N.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I am a little wrong,

it is really is "Matter is empty, emptiness is matter" that is the most precise rendering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Questioning Height

Content:

Namdrol said:

Saraha did not only write nice dohas. He also wrote an extensive and detailed commentary on the Buddhakāpala tantra (now rather obscure), and a number of sadhanas.

gregkavarnos said:

Care to let us in on some details about the subjects of the sadhanas?

Malcolm wrote:

He wrote a sadhana of Buddhakāpala, a sadhana of Vajrayogini, and a sadhana of Mahakala, and so on, as well as a commentary on completion stage called Svādhiṣṭhanakrama. Who knows, maybe there other works.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Nangwa said:

There are lot of unnecessary elaborations going on here when one of the most famous sutra quotes of all time pretty clearly represents all the necessary information to answer the question.

"Form is emptiness, emptiness is form."

Interdependence/dependent origination is how we understand the appearance of forms etc. and since form is non other than emptiness.....

There is no need to draw complex philosophical distinctions when the teachings are quite clear.

Malcolm wrote:
Please revise your translation

"Matter is emptiness..."

The rūpa in question here is rūpaskandha i.e. "so too sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness".

And yes, whatever "arises together" (samutpāda) "in dependence" (pratītya) is empty.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 10:16 PM
Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?
Content:

Namdrol said:
Perhaps, but none of them are tantric.

Aemilius said:
What makes you think teachings are "tantric" if they are rGyud?

On what grounds do you decide whether oral teachings in Kenia, Uganda or Ethiopia are tantric or not ?
Surely it is not dependent on the word "tantra" ?

Malcolm wrote:
We have been over this one. I am not into repeating myself.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 10:14 PM
Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?
Content:

Aemilius said:
The point is that if you attain dhyana, samadhi and samapatti you attain whole universes of knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:
No. Without vipaśyāna, dhyana, samadhi and samapatti just led to rebirth in deva realms.

Aemilius said:

This knowledge has existed much before what you call "the advent of tantra", it has existed from the beginning, This is the inner experience area, it is also the area of tantra. It seems that there developed some schools that consciously deny the inner experience aspect of Dharma, in name only they accept that there is "enlightenment", their "enlightenment" is without knowledge and without experience, only then is it "true" enlightenment.

In the history of Dharma there is inner experience from the very beginning, therefore there is also tantra, or the likeness of tantra, from the very beginning. But then there are people with authority and power who want to decide what "true " enlightenment is, and hence they start their own schools whose main purpose is to wipe out some irritating persons and their influence who actually attained dhyana, samadhi and samapatti. I think that for example Buddhaghosha had a wealth of inner the Dharma, I would even say that innerly he was a tantric, this is because of the necessary dynamics of the dhyana process.

Is this so difficult to understand?

Malcolm wrote:

I understand your point of view, though I do not agree with it. I don't agree with your conspiracy theory either.

You seem think that Vajrayāna is all about dhyāna, samapatti and samadhi. It isn't.

Vajrayāna practice is a method of reversing dependent origination. Of course, in that process we need to use samadhi and samapatti. But not in the way it is used in sutrayāna methodology.

There is a school in Tibetan Buddhism called the Kagyu school. They teach a system called mahāmudra. They assert that mahāmudra is also found in the Mahāyāna sūtras (but not, of course in Hīnayāna sūtras. And they teach, in their mahāmudra, a system called sūtra mahāmudra which is the basis of the famed four yogas of mahāmudra of Gampopa. They emphasize the practice of dhyana in their system of mahāmudra

They also clearly recognize a mahāmudra that comes from Vajrayāna practice. They further recognize a type of mahāmudra that comes from sudden insight based on a kind of introduction by a master, called essence mahāmudra.

They clearly differentiate sūtra mahāmudra and "tantric" mahāmudra by the methods that are used. The methods used in tantric mahāmudra are things like creation stage (visualizing oneself as a deity), mantra recitation, working with prāṇayāma (not mindfulness of breathing), "erotic" yogas, yogas connected with sleep, waking, etc.

The methods used in sutra mahāmudra are solely śamatha and vipaśyāna combined with the four yogas -- which are really stages in the deepening of śamatha and

vipaśyāna.

Essence mahāmudra has no methods.

Vajrayāna is different than sūtra teachings because the methods of deity yoga, prāṇayāma, etc., are never taught in sūtra. No cakras, no ṇāḍīs, etc. None of that newage hippy Vajrayāna stuff is found in the sūtras, nor explained by sūtra masters -- not in India, not in China, not in Japan.

We Vajrayānists assert that all of our hippy methods, deity yoga, and so on, cause our path to be faster than the pure Mahāyāna sūtra route. These criteria did not evolve in Tibet, they evolved in India. Of course, there is some internal debate as I mentioned above. The Kagyu school in many respects is close to Chan school and even uses some Chan scriptures as a basis for their arguments.

You can accept or reject Vajrayāna claims -- but at least you should clearly understand what they are -- a clarity that thus far has been absent in your presentation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Questioning Height

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Apparently he was an abbot at Nalanda and teacher to Nagarjuna!

The question though is what did he learn and what did he teach?

Malcolm wrote:

Saraha did not only write nice dohas. He also wrote an extensive and detailed commentary on the Buddhakāpala tantra (now rather obscure), and a number of sadhanas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The main point is that the method of meditation is not put into the mahayana sutras in any extensive, or detailed manner.

It is neither there in the Lotus sutra, but the Lotus sutra schools have an immense amount of oral instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but none of them are tantric.

Aemilius said:

Same is true with regard of Amitabha sutras, and Avatamsaka sutra school which also has important oral teachings connected to the Sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but still none of them are tantric.

Aemilius said:

The method existed as oral instructions within the Mahayana movement for more than one thousand of years.

Even now the method has never been wholly put into a bookform.

Consequently true Mahayana has not existed without a method or upaya.

You can't say that method is absent in Mahayana when it is an oral tradition.

It is ridiculous to say that the method is absent in the Mahayana, which is what you seem to imply, am I right ?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyana has methods, but they are not tantric, and will not lead to full awakening in a single lifetime.

Aemilius said:

Another point I was making is that tantra did not exist as a separate school, but rather as an inner aspect of the Mahayana.

This is said by Guru Rinpoche, i.e. that tantra is an inner aspect of the Mahayana, and sutra is its outer aspect, (in one of the books translated by Eric Pema Kunzang).

I also pointed out that only recently has tantra become something that exists as an outer public school and as public teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Mantrayāna is sometimes referred to as uncommon Mahāyāna.

Aemilius said:

If someone attains full awakening within the Mahayana then he has received the Abhisheka, right? Are you happy with that ?

Malcolm wrote:

After three incalculable eons.

Aemilius said:

Or do you want to grasp at some fundamentalist tantrist view in which "no one outside my guru's lineage has ever attained enlightenment because they have not received His

abhisheka"? -or something similar?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyanists certainly attain awakening -- after three incalculable aeons. If they enter into the method of secret mantra, then they can shorten that duration to one, three, seven or at most sixteen lifetimes.

Aemilius said:

If I have got it right this is what bigoted tibetans want to say, or they say it in a roundabout way, and they want You to say that!

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it is what "bigoted" Indian acaryas claimed for secret mantra teachings in distinction to common Mahāyāna teachings like the Lanka, Avatamska, etc. Tibetans, Chinese, and Japanese Buddhists just accepted their word for it. As so I -- but not without good reason.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Let us put it this way -- there is no record of a nirmanakāya known as Shakyamuni teaching Dzogchen. None of the Dzogchen teachings that we have presently come from Shakyamuni. They all, every last one, come from the nirmanakāya known as Garab Dorje.

Garab Dorje is the predicted teacher of Dzogchen, not Shakyamuni.

Mariusz said:

Could be but irrelevant Can Shakyamuni as the Supreme Nirmanakaya be compared with Garab Dorje as only a tulku (trans. Nirmanakaya)? I guess Garab Dorje is only a tulku, somehow "the predicted teacher" particularly "emanated" to teach Dzogchen, because the next supreme Nirmanakaya will be Maitreya Buddha only. The Supreme Nirmanakaya is limitless, not only particular for any class of teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Maitreya won't even teach Vajrayāna, let alone Dzogchen.

Garab Dorje is not a tulku in the Tibetan cultural sense of the term. He is a tulku in the Padmasambhava and Shakyamuni sense of the term i.e. a nirmanakāya of compassion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 8:09 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

tamdrin said:

Namdrol,

In one of your posts you mentioned that people here could be guilty of tawa chogs dzin.. Holding views as supreme or something like that.. I believe that tawa chog dzin refers to holding asceticism and ritual/discipline to be supreme methods of liberation . Certainly the Buddha held views that were correct to be superior to views which were incorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two terms -- one is ལྟ་བུ་ཕྱགས་འཛིན་ -- holding a biased view. What you are taking about is ལྟ་བུ་མཚན་ཏུ་འཛིན་པ་, dṛṣṭiparāmarśaḥ -- this is simply holding something inferior or hīna as good or high. They sound very similar in Tibetan, and it is possible that in common language they have become somewhat interchangeable.

What you mention above is in fact śīlavrataparāmarśaḥ as well as mithyādrṣṭi i.e. false views. While we are at it, the other two, just to round things out are satkāyadrṣṭi and antagrāhadrṣṭi respectively, holding a view of personal identity and holding a view of extremes (either existence or non-existence).

I was just saying that people are often chauvinistic about this issue of eating meat, almost becoming like Devadatta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

The idea of Buddhism without Buddhism is the idea of making ones religious practice to be primarily based on looking within, as the Tibetan term ngang pa- inner person denotes, rather than becoming Buddhist by accepting a prescribed set of beliefs about reality and then engaging corresponding set of rituals for dealing with that reality.

Namdrol said:

I would the former is Buddhism with Buddhism (i.e. nang pa (ནང་པ་)) whereas that latter is Buddhism without Buddhism.

What you describe in the latter half of your post is vedic ritualism, shamanism, etc.

tamdrin said:

not if it is embraced by buddhist views and goals.. perhaps it would have been better to

have said practices...

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhist view is essentially that all situations of samsara and nirvana come from inside and are resolved by looking inside. You cannot say that there is one kind of Buddhism which is "insider", and another kind of Buddhism that is "outsider". The essence of the Buddhist view is in "insiderness". There isn't other kind of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

The idea of Buddhism without Buddhism is the idea of making ones religious practice to be primarily based on looking within, as the Tibetan term ngang pa- inner person denotes, rather than becoming Buddhist by accepting a prescribed set of beliefs about reality and then engaging corresponding set of rituals for dealing with that reality.

Malcolm wrote:

I would the former is Buddhism with Buddhism (i.e. nang pa (ནང་པ)) whereas that latter is Buddhism without Buddhism.

What you describe in the latter half of your post is vedic ritualism, shamanism, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Need help identifying deity

Content:

pemachophel said:

This thangka does not look PRC-made to me.

Malcolm wrote:

I saw tons of thangkas of similar type when I was in Tibet in 2009 in tourist "Tibetan" shops run by Chinese merchants.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: H.H. Sakya Trizin 2011 Tour -- Boston

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

May 26 Padmsambhava Empowerment

May 27 Chakrasamvara in the Vajra Gantipa Tradition – Day 1

May 28 Chakrasamvara in the Vajra Gantipa Tradition – Day 2
May 29 Long-Life Initiation and Changchog Rite (purification ceremony for the dead)
Holiday Inn Convention Center
242 Adams Place, Boxborough

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Conze remarks that there is very little actual meditation practice instructions, or none at all, in the Mahayana Sutras.

Namdrol said:

Conze must not have read many Mahayana sutras, then.

Aemilius said:

You know the basic instructions about sitting posture, breathing, gaze, etc...!? You don't find them in The Diamond sutra or in other Prajna Paramita sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

But they exist in many other sutras.

Aemilius said:

I can't remember where in the Lankavatara Sutra Bhagavan talks about the abhisheka of the Tenth Bhumi? I do know that he talks in several times about "baptism by the buddhas" (in words of T.D. Suzuki), this must be the abhisheka you mentioned?

Malcolm wrote:

I can't tell you exact location -- but it is something cited frequently in Tibetan sources to show that abhisheka is indispensable for full awakening.

Aemilius said:

Besides Avatamsaka Sutra there is in Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sutra "Consecration into independent knowledge" (Robert Thurman's translation), which sounds like an abhisheka.

Then there is "receiving prediction (vyākaraṇa)" that seems like an initiation, it is mentioned in Mahayana texts, like the White Lotus of the True Law.

Malcolm wrote:

In Vajrayana, abhisheka is a method of attaining full awakening from Yoga Tantra on up.

If you do not attain full awakening, then you have methods of sadhana, creation stage, completion stage and so on.

These methods are all completely absent from sutrayāna teachings. Sutrayāna is vehicle of the cause; Vajrayāna is the vehicle of the result.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Need help identifying deity

Content:

Dhondrub said:

looks like guru dragpo

Inge said:

From what I have been told, Guru Drakpo has a nine-headed scorpion in his left hand.

Malcolm wrote:

In these kinds of PRC fakes, they never get any of the details correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Will said:

Greg,

No argument from me. But rediscovery of an ancient path, suggests to me a path found again in meditation; not found in an existing school or from a guru. So no contradiction at all. Gautama did visit a couple of respected gurus of the day, but there was nothing spiritually real there that he sensed.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, Buddha discovered the ancient dharma path through recalling his past lives. Then he applied that view in the third watch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I believe the use of the word Buddhism is quite complicated and polemic as it is a

western neologism. What Buddhism are we talking about? Dzogchen differs a lot from some schools.

The path taught by the Buddha leads one beyond concepts too. We can't assume Sadharma is Buddhadharma. It's its fruit. Sadharma is beyond "Buddhism" too, and it's the fruit of practicing Buddhadharma.

Don't assume I don't like Jim Valby. I don't know him, but knowing he is a cherished disciple of my lama, I naturally feel respect for his methods, although in this particular case it is not the sort of presentation that rings my bell (the title, note, because the rest I don't know). I'm just trying to dissect Namdrol's position, as for him too I feel great respect. It's not a matter of confrontation, but of my own understanding. It may even be the case that one of them is wrong (or not). It really doesn't matter much to me. I have great respect for both (although I owe Namdrol much more, since I've been learning from his explanations for a long time now).

Malcolm wrote:

I know Jim quite well. We are friends. He lives about 6 miles from my house.

But I am not addressing his teachings in particular. I was addressing this mistaken notion that many people have that Dzogchen can be delinked from Buddhism. It can't. It does not work. Dzogchen only makes sense in light of Buddhism as a whole.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

To say that Shakyamuni did not teach Dzogchen means that the words never left his lips while there was a Shakyamuni Buddha living in Jambudvīpa.

Mariusz said:

This seems to be too radical statement and need to be historically "proofed". Can you source any sutra/tantra/terma for this "never"?

Moreover, can you proof historically:

- the supreme Nirmanakaya Shakyamuni lips were nor ordinary as human and have limitless qualities
- there are also mind and symbol transmission of Dzogchen that could be taught by Shakyamuni
- students of Supreme Nirmanakaya are limitless and not only human (as I posted using Yogacara argument)

Malcolm wrote:

Let us put it this way -- there is no record of a nirmanakāya known as Shakyamuni teaching Dzogchen. None of the Dzogchen teachings that we have presently came from Shakyamuni. They all, every last one, come from the nirmanakāya known as Garab Dorje.

Garab Dorje is the predicted teacher of Dzogchen, not Shakyamuni.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Kyosan said:

I agree that if another religion doesn't lead to purification it won't be the same as Buddhism, but there can be another religion that leads to purification.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if that religion teaches dependent origination as well as emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

That's the way I see it. Your feedback will be appreciated.

DN

Malcolm wrote:

A Dzogchen without Buddhism is impossible for the simple reason that Dzogchen is a method of becoming a Buddha and nothing else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: To cultivate good: non-evil, non-unwholesome?

Content:

starter said:

Hello Teachers/Friends,

I've been wondering about the real meaning of the "good"/"wholesome" which we should cultivate according to the teaching of the Buddhas:

The Teaching of The Buddhas

Not to do evil,

To cultivate good [the Chinese translation: to do all the good],
To purify one's mind –
This is the Teaching of the Buddhas
-- Dhammapada 183

After studying the Buddha's teaching, especially the Noble eight-fold path, I came to the understanding that the "good"/"wholesome" the Buddhas would like us to cultivate is non-evil/non-unwholesome (non-sensuality/non-greed, non-ill will/non-aversion, non-cruelty, non- wrong speech/action/livelihood...) instead of doing all the good like a world saver. If my understanding is correct, then I worry about the Chinese translation/interpretation/practice of "To do all the good" instead of "To cultivate non-evil/non-unwholesome".

I'd like to know your opinion about it. Metta to all,

Starter

Malcolm wrote:

I think good here means the opposite of the ten non-virtuous deeds i.e. not killing, sexual misconduct, and stealing; speaking truthfully, gently, purposefully, and without calumny; and to avoid thoughts of malice, greed and ignorance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Need help identifying deity

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is a Chinese Forgery. The deity seems to be a version of Guru Dragpo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

PMTF said:

(1) it does not accord with logic or reality;

(2) it finds fault with those who are faultless in terms of their representation of Shakyamuni Buddha.

I would suggest we be humble enough to acknowledge the spirit & compassion of the cultural Buddhist religion is broad minded enough to include teachings the Buddha himself did not teach or teachings that do not represent his central message.

Dear Namdrol

The above articulates what I am trying to say.

I am forbidden to disagree with your point of view?

Malcolm wrote:

It is easy to say something does not accord with logic or reality and refuse to explain anything. Point one simply is a claim. Ok, you have made an unsubstantiated claim.

Vasubandhu clearly states that whatever accords with dependent origination, etc., can be accepted as "buddhavacana" even if not spoken by Shakyamuni.

However, some narrow-minded people make assertions such as "Dzogchen is not buddhist because it was not taught by Shakyamuni Buddha." Other narrow minded people say "Anuttarayoga tantra is not buddhist because it was not taught by the Buddha", etc. .Still other narrow minded people say "Mahāyāna was not taught by by the Buddha", etc.

Yet in each case, Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna and Dzogchen are successively held by their adherent not only to hold the central message of Buddhism, but illustrate the most essential and salient part of Buddhist teachings not expressed in "lower" yānas. Of course, these adherents can also be accused of narrow mindedness too (even if they are correct).

So, yes, there are narrow minded people who reject teachings based on biased criteria. And for that they are at fault.

As Shantideva points out, the ultimate of the lower system is the conventional of the higher system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

In general, the point of view of narrow minded people is that if something is not taught by Shakyamuni Buddha, it is not the teaching of the Buddha.

PMTF said:

Dear Namdrol

The spirit of Buddhism is not about fault-finding. Buddhism, as a spiritual & religious vehicle for the diversity of humanity, has certainly evolved since Shakyamuni Buddha, to accommodate the needs of the human & cultural diversity. Most good Buddhists accept this. Most good & well-meaning Buddhists do not find fault with this.

But, to assert:...the point of view of narrow minded people is that if something is not taught by Shakyamuni Buddha, it is not the teaching of the Buddha... falls down in two ways:

(1) it does not accord with logic or reality;

(2) it finds fault with those who are faultless in terms of their representation of Shakyamuni Buddha.

I would suggest we be humble enough to acknowledge the spirit & compassion of the cultural Buddhist religion is broad minded enough to include teachings the Buddha himself did not teach or teachings that do not represent his central message.

Namaste

Malcolm wrote:

What are you trying to say?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdryn said:

Hey bro Im just posting what Nyshol Khenpo said Im not implying any fault of yours.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the point of view of narrow minded people is that if something is not taught by Shakyamuni Buddha, it is not the teaching of the Buddha.

Nyoshul Khen's approach is a bandaid applied to Nyingma Hermeneutics to avoid Gelug refutation. He is basically claiming -- since the dharmakāya of all buddhas is the same, any teaching of Samantabhadra is a teaching of Shakyamuni Buddha. The converse would also have to be true, since Garab Dorje is a nirmanakāya, Shakyamuni's teaching of Vinaya is also Garab Dorje's teaching. Thus, this idea is only formally true -- it is not historically true.

For example, both Shakyamuni and Garab Dorje are nirmanakāyas of Vajradhara. Vajradhara is an emanation of Samantabhadra. But Shakyamuni and Garab Dorje are not the same person. They lived in different bodies, at different times, and taught different teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

According to Nyoshul Khenpo,

"Samantabhadra and SHakyamuni are both aspects of a single state of Buddhahood. This buddhahood in the context of dharmakaya is Samantabhadra; in the context of the sambhogakaya, it is Vajradhara; and in the context of nirmanakaya, it is Shakyamuni. And so we need to understand the three kayas as inseparable. Otherwise we could reach some kind of erroneous conclusion, such as, "Dzogchen is not the teaching of the Buddha Shakyamuni." Misconceptions such as this develop out of ignorance of this inseparability of the three kayas"

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, not all Nirmanakāyas give the same teachings. For example, Anuttrarayoga tantra will not be taught during the dispensation of Maitreya, so they say. Vipasi, Sikhin, Krakucchamunda are not mentioned in the lineage of teachers of Dzogchen -- and yet they too have all three kāyas. And yet Kashyapa and Shakyamuni Buddha are.

To say that Shakyamuni did not teach Dzogchen means that the words never left his lips while there was a Shakyamuni Buddha living in Jambudvīpa.

Kashyapa actually taught Dzogchen, Shakyamuni predicted Dzogchen. None of the other past buddhas are mentioned at all in that lineage.

So I don't accept the fault you are implying (i.e. that I am suffering from a misconception about the inseparability of the three kāyas). On the contrary, you are not making a proper distinction between the five certainties possessed by Sambhogakāyas and the lack of those five certainties for Nirmanakāyas (time, place, teacher, retinue, and teaching).

Incidentally, it is also the position of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu that Shakyamuni never taught Dzogchen. His role in being mentioned as one of the twelve teachers of Dzogchen is a result of his having predicted the effortless vehicle. But he did not teach it, according to ChNN. I concur since in general the nirmanakāya for Dzogchen is Garab Dorje, and not Shakyamuni.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

The practice I mentioned above is very attainable. No point in being a Buddhist otherwise. Milarepa was in his forties when he met Marpa. Mipham Gonpo in his eighties when he met Vairocana. So, never too late.

gregkavarnos said:

If the practice was so attainable I imagine they would have all the monks in the monasteries doin' it just to bring down the overhead costs! (and Tummo, as well to, reduce heating costs)

You are right about the age thing though... it's definitely got (much) more to do with how much I am willing to exert myself rather than how old I am.

PS Four ounces (112 gram for us metric types) is an incredibly small dose when it comes to a meat portion, especially over the period of a week! I am surprised at how "strong" meat is as a medicine. I take it that it's 4 ounce without bone and fat?

Malcolm wrote:

Four ounces a week is sufficient if you need meat in your diet. Fatty is good. Of course, it depends on constitution. Also, when meat is used medicinally, like any other sman -- it fast tracks through one's metabolic pathways very rapidly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Creating medicines and elixers

Content:

Rael said:

Namdrol i hope you let loose in this section with some secrets and medicines maybe we can all try out ourselves.....

.

Namdrol said:

Like Ayurveda, the most important features of Tibetan Medicine are diet and lifestyle. There are secrets in Tibetan Medicine, but they are mostly related to creating mercury sulfide compounds. While the process is described in detail, still you need to have personal instruction. I know a couple of doctors who know how to make so called detoxified mercury, but it takes a long time and many people working together to do it safely.

You should examine David Gordon White's book on Indian Alchemy. You will find it interesting.

Rael said:

Ta for the tip...

methinks if you show us your hand we will find you know about alchemy

there are mercury stones that some create ...the essence of mercury etc....yikes....but you can blow yourself up and the neighborhood trying to distill it....

Malcolm wrote:

I find things like Spagyrics interesting and plan on doing some elementary distillations of oil and hydrosols this summer. We can thank Jabir for inventing perfume, and you will be interested to learn there is a system of completion stage yoga which was brought to Tibet in the 16th century by one Vajranatha which claims to originate with Jabir.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Will said:

Pema Rigzen: Not sure how anything I said could seem to suggest I thought otherwise. Or maybe you're suggesting that some beings might just spontaneously become Bodhisattvas on their own outside of any connection to a Buddha's Dharma. Is that what you're suggesting?

I was responding, in the main, to your notion of "as defined by Mahayana doctrine". There are ages when there is no such doctrine, nor Theravada, nor any school of Buddhism. So Namdrol's point about compassion is important. There must be some powerful wish within a person that leads to actions, when there is no teachings of a Buddha around, that lead that one to strive to help others beyond one lifetime. Whether that inner drive is based on some old vasanas from previous contact with a Buddha or his teachings, I do not know. Vasubandhu & Nagarjuna (and others) have laid out the root causes & conditions for one's original bodhicitta vow or aspiration, but no time right now to look them up. Memory says that compassion for others is the best motive, but other motives can result in bodhisattva-hood.

Malcolm wrote:

Nagarjuna states in the Mula that since suchness of phenomena is always present, there is always a basis for the arising of buddhas, even when there is no buddha present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

well, eskimos, mongolians, Tibetans, many Northern Europeans, etc. you might be surprised at the large numbers of people who have evolved with a high percentage of

animal protein in their diet. I am quite certain these people really need some quantity (not large) of meat in their diets to be healthy.

kirtu said:

In general how much meat is needed by these peoples to remain healthy? I know this is impossible to quantify but in general could you feel comfortable saying something like the average Northern European needs to eat a small steak every month for optimal health? Could you posit a very general rule of thumb on this matter?

My former Taoist teacher (a Westerner) was told by his teacher (a well known Taoist Chinese martial artist) to eat some meat every once in a while for years. He didn't follow this advice (very uncharacteristic for him as he usually followed everything his teacher told him) until one day at a party he sort of accidentally ate some lamb (actually his teacher basically fixed this situation) and the effect on him was so galvanizing that he felt like he was superman. So he now follows his teacher's advice even on his diet.

This story did arise in the context of karmic consequences of meat eating many years ago (I haven't studied with my former Taoist teacher for at least 15 years now) but the Taoist view on this is different from the Chinese Mahayana view to begin with.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Four ounces of meat a week would be sufficient as a medicinal dose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

tamdrin said:

Still it would be hard to understand great compassion without the blessings of a highly realized being.

the buddha shakymuni met the Buddha Shakyamuni? That is interesting...

Malcolm wrote:

right, our Buddha Shakyamuni is the second of the name.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Creating medicines and elixers

Content:

Rael said:

Namdrol i hope you let loose in this section with some secrets and medicines maybe we can all try out ourselves.....

.

Malcolm wrote:

Like Ayurveda, the most important features of Tibetan Medicine are diet and lifestyle. There are secrets in Tibetan Medicine, but they are mostly related to creating mercury sulfide compounds. While the process is described in detail, still you need to have personal instruction. I know a couple of doctors who know how to make so called detoxified mercury, but it takes a long time and many people working together to do it safely.

You should examine David Gordon White's book on Indian Alchemy. You will find it interesting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Or maybe you're suggesting that some beings might just spontaneously become Bodhisattvas on their own outside of any connection to a Buddha's Dharma. Is that what you're suggesting?

Namdrol said:

Happened to the Buddha, so why not?

tamdrin said:

No, Buddha had made vows to previous Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, according to Sonam Tsemo, what actually happened was this: when the Buddha was a hell being he aroused great compassion for other hell beings, and asked the yamas whether he could take on the sufferings of other hell beings. In doing, after his head caught fire and he died, he was born first as a deva of Trāyāstrimśā heaven, then as the son of the a potter in Jambudvipa. At that time, he met the ancient Buddha Shakyamuni and, offering that Buddha some porridge, generated bodhicitta.

So while one may technically claim that one must by necessity generate bodhicitta in the presence of a buddha in the past, the necessary precondition for bodhicitta is compassion, and it is for that reason that Candrakīrti cites compassion as the cause of all bodhisattvas.

Whether the above events are true or are a parable is irrelevant -- the point is that

compassion is the cause of bodhicitta and so therefore it is possible to say that one can become a bodhisattva without having ever met a Buddha. I would rate compassion as more important than a vow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Or maybe you're suggesting that some beings might just spontaneously become Bodhisattvas on their own outside of any connection to a Buddha's Dharma. Is that what you're suggesting?

Malcolm wrote:

Happened to the Buddha, so why not?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

Changing one's diet will not lead to realization. If it did, all vegetarians would be buddhas.

gregkavarnos said:

Who said it did?

Malcolm wrote:

The practice I mentioned above is very attainable. No point in being a Buddhist otherwise. Milarepa was in his forties when he met Marpa. Mipham Gonpo in his eighties when he met Vairocana. So, never too late.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

yes, if you practice properly, then you can reduce your attachment to food, eventually you can do the rasāyana of space. Then you won't need anything but a little water, like Nyagla Pema Dudul.

gregkavarnos said:

Don't know if I can get that far this lifetime, I left Buddhist practice a little too late (spent a

fair bit of time on sex, drugs and rock'n'roll though, does this count as Buddhist practice?) At this point in time I would be happy to be able to generate the favorable conditions so that, at the very least, I will be able to remain a vegetarian 'til the end of this lifetime. I like to set realistic goals for my practice, ones that are based on my current level of understanding and practice. It lessens the feelings of disillusionment that may arise due to failure to achieve stated goals, feelings that can easily lead to abandonment of the path.

Malcolm wrote:

Changing one's diet will not lead to realization. If it did, all vegetarians would be buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Creating medicines and elixers

Content:

Rael said:

now in the actual making of your medicines do you combine the process with that path...

Malcolm wrote:

No, only in the rite to empower medicines. The process of the rites of blessing medicines is part of the path.

Being a doctor itself is the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine vs Ayurveda

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Hi,

Being located inbetween China and India, Tibetan Medicine makes use of a range of medicinal substances, indigenous, Chinese and Indian.

There are other differences in how some of the treatments are now done, but the differences above seem to be the most prominent.

Wishing you all the best.

Malcolm wrote:

Not a bad summary. There are also differences in Anatomy -- Tibetan Medicine has many influences from Galen; and through Galen, influences that go back as far as Hippocrates.

Whereas internal anatomy in Ayurveda is not terribly well developed, it is very well developed in Tibetan Medicine. Further, since Tibetan Medicine is also a tantric system, it is integrated completely with Yuthog Nyinthing (as well as other related systems), and as such has deep connections with the teaching of the great perfection.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Creating medicines and elixirs

Content:

Rael said:

How much of this is the same in Tibetan medicines and it's production of medicines and elixirs?

Malcolm wrote:

In Tibetan medicine, we use rites to empower the medicine. In general, making medicine itself is not regarded as a spiritual metaphor.

Being a doctor however is regarded as a deeply spiritual occupation. The best medicines come from those doctors with the best Buddhist practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Regardless of HH's level of realization, it can hardly be said he consumes meat in excess.

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite sure that from now on all the websites patronized by followers of Voldemort, it will be asserted that Harry Potter is oppressing the practice of Voldemort because HP eats a little meat while traveling around representing Hogwart's Government in Exile.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 11:58 PM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:

Yeshe said:

I implied it was a daft remark to generalise about Tibetans in this way, and used the example of HHDL's meat eating as 'reductio ad absurdum'.

Malcolm wrote:

Not very clearly. And for the record, I stated that cultures where lots of red meat is commonly eaten in toto tend to be more aggressive cultures. I was not singling Tibetans out for special treatment.

We Americans are also very aggressive -- red meat is a main staple in our diet.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 11:54 PM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:

Yeshe said:

Well here it is, together with Namdrol's denial. He talks of Tibetans per se, and by pointing out that this must also mean HHDL as a 'reduction ad absurdum' response I received a flurry of ad homs from those who had previously wanted to bash Pabongka and thought it was a good time to put the boot in while I was asleep.

Quote Namdrol:

ASSERTION

"I merely pointed out to you that Tibet has a fairly violent culture -- there is no doubt in my mind that their excess fondness for lamb and yak contributes overall to the cultural violence which is fairly common in Tibet"

AND THE DENIAL, WITH ATTITUDE:

(Yeshe wrote: So you contradict yourself. HHDL says he needs meat yet you claim he is not affected by it . Illogical as you just claimed Tibetan violence was partly due to meat. If he needs it then he is subject to its effects .)

"You were not paying attention -- I pointed out that excesses of meat could cause a humoral imbalance of pitta. So can excesses of chili peppers. Tibetans in general eat excessive amounts of meat. I have been there. I know. So, rather than finding fault where none exists, read more carefully."

I read it carefully alright, Namdrol: "their excess fondness for lamb and yak contributes overall to the cultural violence.."

Just clearing the decks as I leave.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, "contributes" does not mean "sole cause".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Medicine subforum

Content:

retrofuturist said:

Greetings,

I suspect that if there started to be subjects created on the topic of Tibetan Medicine, the administrators would be more inclined to consider such a request to accommodate such topics. To date though, I've hardly seen it discussed at all.

Metta,

Retro.

Malcolm wrote:

Supply creates demand. Since I am an actual doctor of Tibetan Medicine, I think I can provide assistance here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Divination

Content:

Inge said:

How much weight should one put on the result of Lama Dawa's divinations?

I was told that I should practice the Dudjom Tersar lineage, and that my perfect guru is Lama Tharchin Rinpoche. Would it be most sensible to follow this advice?

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on how much faith you have in Lama Dawa's mo.

Of course, there is nothing wrong with either Dudjom Tersar or Lama Tharchin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

pemachophel said:

Inge,

How do you know the condition(s) is/are caused by nagas?

Inge said:

I was told so by Lama Dawa Rinpoche.

Are such fungal infections always caused by nagas?

Malcolm wrote:

As I said above, not always. The main cause of illness is the three doshas. There are four contributing factors, diet, lifestyle, season and spirit provocations.

Another thing you can do is try to find the "five nectars" herbal bath.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

Namdrol said:

Tibetan medicine is very balanced about it. The name of spirit illnesses is Tibetan is termed ལུན་སྐྱེས་གདོན་ནད་ i.e. imputed spirit illnesses. I.e. when you have run out of other causal factors, then provocations are one's last resort diagnosis.

Adamantine said:

Do Tibetan amchis ever use MOs to help with diagnosis?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But spirit illnesses are generally diagnosed with elemental calculation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nirmanakāyas are emanations i.e. they only are a facet of full awakening display to sentient beings based on their karma. Thus the teachings they bestow are also based on the karma of those sentient beings.

Heruka said:

does tsal have a hand in this?

Malcolm wrote:

rtal is the basis for the arising of pure emanations, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

tamdrin said:

Tibetans have spirits as an explanation for almost everything.. There is even a god(s) that makes the sun and moon work lol..

Namdrol said:

That is a quite an exaggeration.

tamdrin said:

I think both Tibetan Doctors and Western Doctors need to arrive at a balanced perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan medicine is very balanced about it. The name of spirit illnesses is Tibetan is termed ཀླན་སྐྱེས་གཏོན་ནད་ i.e. imputed spirit illnesses. I.e. when you have run out of other causal factors, then provocations are one's last resort diagnosis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Kyosan said:

have discovered the same truth as Buddha did and are using what they feel are the best expedients.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you have to decide what truth Buddha discovered, and then compare.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

So you contradict yourself. HHDL says he needs meat yet you claim he is not affected

by it . Illogical as you just claimed Tibetan violence was partly due to meat . If he needs it then he is subject to its effects .

Malcolm wrote:

You were not paying attention -- I pointed out that excesses of meat could cause a humoral imbalance of pitta. So can excesses of chili peppers.

Tibetans in general eat excessive amounts of meat. I have been there. I know.

HHDL does not eat meat when in Dharamsala. He only eats meat when he travels. His kitchen is vegetarian.

And, what affects ordinary people adversely often has no effect of realized people. HHDL is certainly the latter and not the former.

So, rather than finding fault where none exists, read more carefully.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Go Vermont!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

tamdrin said:

Tibetans have spirits as an explanation for almost everything.. There is even a god(s) that makes the sun and moon work lol..

Malcolm wrote:

That is a quite an exaggeration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

pemachophel said:

Inge,

How do you know the condition(s) is/are caused by nagas?

Malcolm wrote:

All of this information is included in the four medicine tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

i can't stand by and just watch you tell us that Tibetans are violent race all due to their meat eating habits....

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say they were violent because they ate meat. What I said was that meat eating, in excess, makes people more aggressive. This is actually taught in the sutras that people bring to bear to criticize the habit of eating meat. If you read back in the thread, you will read some of those statements.

The sutras however do not really give a precise reason why this is so. The reason is that anger cuts the root of compassion. The meat the people tend to like are warming meats like lamb, buffalo, or aged meats and so on. All of these things reinforce pitta dosha, which increases the klesha of devsha i.e. hatred/anger. When the klesha of anger increases, it is more difficult to give rise to compassion.

You brought in the example of Tibetans.

I merely pointed out to you that Tibet has a fairly violent culture -- there is no doubt in my mind that their excess fondness for lamb and yak contributes overall to the cultural violence which is fairly common in Tibet. But it is not the sole reason, the only reason, or even the main reason. It is one contributing factor. Meat eating is also a contributing factor in the aggressive nature of Western Culture especially Northern European culture.

We are what we eat, to invoke a cliché.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Abolish Money for Buddha's favors....

Content:

Rael said:

and second....do you think it is time for like the clergy of all Buddhist sects to stop

accepting money for Buddha's favours...

Malcolm wrote:

No one accepts money for "Buddha's favors".

Anyone who thinks they are giving money to a temple, etc., for "favors" is mistaken. No favor will be forthcoming. It does not work like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

the man is saying a people is violent due to meat eating....

Namdrol said:

The same is true of hot peppers.

Nangwa said:

bummer.

How do we determine appropriate amounts of certain foods in order to maintain balance?

Are there simple guides or does each individual need personal prescriptions etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, Ayurvedic practitioners are a bit more tuned into Western diet than Tibetan doctors-- they have I think better general practices regarding diet and behavior on an outer level. Tibetan Medicine's strong point is inner tantric related stuff.

Of course, if you are healthy, you adapt your diet according to season and tastes. In the fall one begins to eat more warming, nutritious food emphasizing sweet, salty, sour through the winter, then in spring begin to add more bitter and astringent food for cleansing, relax the nutritious, warming and sweet foods, etc. and in the summer eating cool, sweet, sour foods, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

Inge said:

Do you know if Tibetan medicine has a specific treatment for fungal infections of the

skin (athletes foot, jocks itch, ringworm, etc.) that are caused by the nagas?

Malcolm wrote:

Most nāgā illness are connected with lymph. However, generally for what you are talking about, Tibetan medicine would use sulfur based and orpiment based herbal powders on the skin. So, in this day and age, it would be advisable if this is serious condition to go to a dermatologist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

the man is saying a people is violent due to meat eating....

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is right. I am asserting that red meat, in excess, increases people's pitta dosha, and reinforces their klesha of hatred and anger. The same is true of hot peppers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

anger is such a horrid thing to see in type....

Malcolm wrote:

I am not angry with you, not in the least. My recommendation to you is for your benefit, not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

alpha said:

So all these lamas and teachers who give teachings indiscriminately, publicly and regardless of time, place, retinue, teachings are in fact nirmanakayas?

And the ones who give restricted teachings based on time, place, teacher, retinue and teaching are sambogakaya??

Alpha

Malcolm wrote:
Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

As for Shabkar, he was not an ordinary person -- I doubt he was at risk from starving at any time. Same goes for Nyala Pema Duddul.

gregkavarnos said:

I consider all these extraordinary people merely ordinary people that make extraordinary efforts. That gives me a sense of "hope" that I too will one day be able to become extraordinary.

Malcolm wrote:

yes, if you practice properly, then you can reduce your attachment to food, eventually you can do the rasāyana of space. Then you won't need anything but a little water, like Nyagla Pema Dudul.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

. It also makes people very aggressive. We can easily see that cultures where people eat a lot of red meat, cow, yak, etc., that people are more aggressive, etc.

Rael said:

i'm really lousy at being tactful... my debate nuance is best served in deletion...lol....

Malcolm wrote:

You need to learn how to write and post without emotion, and without making pointless ad hominem remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

LastLegend said:

Most of the energy from food that we eat is spent on thinking or illusion. Monks only eat one meal per day.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is not exactly true. Most Tibetan monks eat three squares.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

His Holiness does not come off as aggressive....A Rinpoche i was taught under grew up with herders in urt tents and lived off this stuff all his youth...the guy does not come across as aggressive...

I know a lot of meat eaters who are not aggressive at all...my wife eats tons of it as does me mum and neither are anything but wall flowers socially....welcome mats have been used to describe them....

Malcolm wrote:

You know, in Tibet, when Lamas give advice to Tibetans, especially in Eastern Tibet, they frequently recommend in their Dharma talks that Tibetans should avoid killing each other.

When is the last time you heard a Lama in the west telling us we should avoid murdering one another?

I have been in Tibet. I have seen how violent Tibetans can be, and how quickly Tibetans will turn to violence to settle disputes amongst themselves. And how proud of it they are, especially Khampas.

Many people are not aware of how violent the culture of Tibet actually is -- not to mention the horrendous way they treat animals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So I have not really changed my view that much. I still think that meat industry is an environmental disaster from every point of view. I still think that eating meat is over all a negative habit. Etc.

Well... truth is that I first heard of Shakbar through your "fanatical" diatribes on the correctness of vegetarian/vegan diets!

Malcolm wrote:

I definitely do not think vegan diet is good. To restrictive. Of course, we have to be mindful of where our dairy and honey comes from -- but their POV is too extreme in my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So I have not really changed my view that much. I still think that meat industry is an environmental disaster from every point of view. I still think that eating meat is over all a negative habit. Etc.

Well... truth is that I first heard of Shakbar through your "fanatical" diatribes on the correctness of vegetarian/vegan diets!

Malcolm wrote:

I definitely do not think vegan diet is good. To restrictive. Of course, we have to be mindful of where our dairy and honey comes from -- but their POV is too extreme in my opinion.

As I have said, it is better to not eat meat. Eating meat is negative -- but what I do not accept is many fallacious consequences people dream up about meat eating.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

To give an example, pork greatly increases kapha (bad kan), therefore, it reinforces

ignorance. It is commonly held that chicken and eggs increase desire; snake meat increases anger, and pork ignorance ala the diagrams of the six realms.

But in a general way, the three doshas increase the three kleshas, and the three kleshas support the three doshas.

Adamantine said:

Why would you ever want to eat any of these things, considering we are trying to go beyond these negative emotions? In tantric practices where you are transforming anger or desire would you want to increase the intensity of these emotions for fuel? I understand many yogis would only eat lamb meat, as it is one of the few meats that doesn't add to obscuration. . .

You say 'it is commonly held that'; but do you believe that eggs really increase desire?

Malcolm wrote:

When three doshas are in balance, they are also called dhatus in this sense, constituents. The health of our body is based on having a proper balance of the three dhatus -- when vata, pitta and kapha are balanced, we are healthy. So for example, if someone has a severe vata imbalance affecting the heart, one of the main remedies for this condition is a eaglewood formula that contains yak heart. It works beautifully. I have used this for patients experiencing severe heart issues connected with edema.

As far as lamb goes -- lamb or any food overused will lead to increased afflictions. In the case of lamb, it is very warming which is why Tibetans like it so much. Same with Yak.

Eggs are pure reproductive tissue. So, I think there is something present as a "prabhava" in eggs that does indeed increase desire when overused.

The main point I am making is that there is relationship between any food we eat and the three doshas and three afflictions. Too much red meat increases pitta dosha and vitiates blood -- leading to high blood pressure, heart attacks and so on. It also makes people very aggressive. We can easily see that cultures where people eat a lot of red meat, cow, yak, etc., that people are more aggressive, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Guru

Content:

Alaya7 said:

Can some one explain to me how the Guru pervades in all phenomena?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

Context please?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: All Sentient Beings are equal?

Content:

LastLegend said:

Are all sentient beings equal? Based on what are they equal?

Is possible to discuss this?

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by "equal"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Dexing said:

Your statements in these two cases seem contradictory. How do you reconcile the apparent discrepancies?

Malcolm wrote:

I used to be plagued by this issue as well. But then I realized -- we have the capacity (mostly undeveloped) to know the minds of others and communicate through the mind.

Consciousness is a field. It is one of the six aggregate fields that make up the universe i.e. the sadadhātu:

the field of earth

the field of water

the field of fire

the field of air

the field of space

the field of consciousness

Consciousness is limited only by the delusion of matter. In reality, one's mind has the capacity to be anywhere in the universe. Therefore, it does not matter where any sentient being may be located after that being leaves the body of this lifetime.

By thinking of that being and making a connection through certain mantras that directly spring from dharmatā, we create a positive cause for that sentient being to attain full awakening. This kind of method is a special feature of the teachings of the great perfection. You will not find this kind of teaching in other yanas. If our knowledge and wisdom are sufficiently developed, even mantras are unnecessary.

As a result, there are two benefits -- one, the mind of that being of the animal realms is benefitted. Second, their karmic body does not go completely to waste merely to feed others who are not on a path and have no concept of a path.

Everything in Dharma practice works because of the mind. When for example we do the Jvalamukha water tormas -- in reality pretas cannot drink water. But through our intention we bring them to mind and briefly influence their minds so that they see a stream of nectar with everything they could ever want contained in the water we pour from our hands.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

Different meats affect different doshas, as do different diets in general. For example, if one's diet is too poor, this leads to an increase of vata dosha (rlung) and correspondingly one experiences an increase of desire ('dod chags, rāga). Likewise, a diet that is too spicy, too much red meat, alcohol, etc, increases pita dosha (mkhris pa) and this reinforces hatred and anger.

In particular, if we are tantric or dzogchen practitioners, it is very important to understand our diet in terms of the three doshas and the remedies prescribed for them in various tantras and upadeshas.

Of course, if we are common Mahayana practitioners without any methods of transformation, etc., then it is better we do not eat meat at all save conditions of illness.

Inge said:

Could you give advice for some introductory reading material about proper diet and the doshas?

Malcolm wrote:

You know, Norbu Rinpoche's book Birth, Living and Death presents these issues from the point of view of Tibetan Medicine.

To give an example, pork greatly increases kapha (bad kan), therefore, it reinforces ignorance. It is commonly held that chicken and eggs increase desire; snake meat increases anger, and pork ignorance ala the diagrams of the six realms.

But in a general way, the three doshas increase the three kleshas, and the three kleshas support the three doshas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Inge said:

All the stories we make about the sense-objects we experience, are they not just mere thoughts - fiction? Thinking that the meat on the plate came from such and such animal, who experienced such and such misery throughout its life, ending in such and such horrors in a slaughterhouse, is this not to add fantasy to perception?

I have once read that the actual reason for abstaining from meat is that its consumption leads to an increase of desire and anger. For those practitioners who skillfully apply the suitable methods from the path of transformation or the path of self-liberation, such increase of defilements should not be a problem. Is this correct?

Malcolm wrote:

Different meats affect different doshas, as do different diets in general. For example, if one's diet is too poor, this leads to an increase of vata dosha (rlung) and correspondingly one experiences an increase of desire ('dod chags, rāga). Likewise, a diet that is too spicy, too much red meat, alcohol, etc, increases pita dosha (mkhris pa) and this reinforces hatred and anger.

In particular, if we are tantric or dzogchen practitioners, it is very important to understand our diet in terms of the three doshas and the remedies prescribed for them in various tantras and upadeshas.

Of course, if we are common Mahayana practitioners without any methods of transformation, etc., then it is better we do not eat meat at all save conditions of illness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: How to overcome attachment to our partners?

Content:

wanderer said:

How to overcome attachment to our partner, lovers, wives and husbands? How to overcome fear of loss? How to overcome time of long separation and irrational doubts?

Malcolm wrote:

Contemplate death and impermanence.

Reflect on the fortune of a precious human birth.

Be grateful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Earthquake - Burma/Thailand border...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to the advice of the late Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, when natural disasters occur, the following verse of Sampa Lhundrupma should be recited:

ས་ཁྱ་མེ་ལྷུང་འབྱུང་བའི་བར་ཆད་ཀྱིས་མུ་ལམ་ཉེན་ཅིང་འཛིག་པའི་དུས་བྱུང་རྗེས་
ཡིད་གཉིས་ཐེ་ཚོམ་མེད་པར་གསོལ་བ་འདེབས་མུ་ འོ་རྒྱན་འབྱུང་བ་བཞི་ཡི་སྒྲ་མོ་བཅས་མུ་
འབྱུང་བ་རང་སར་ཞི་བར་ཐེ་ཚོམ་མེད་མོ་རྒྱན་པ་རྣམས་འབྱུང་གནས་ལ་གསོལ་བ་འདེབས་མུ་
བསམ་པ་སྒྱུན་གྱིས་འགྲུབ་པར་བྱིན་གྱིས་རྒྱོབ་མུ་

SA CHU ME LUNG JUNG WEY BAR CHEY KYI/

When the illusory body is endangered and a time of destruction occurs

GYU LUS NYEN CHING JIG PEY DU JUNG TSE

by obstacles of the elements of earth, water, fire and air;

YID NI THE TSOM MEY PAR SOL WA DEB

by offering a supplication without hesitation or doubt

ORGYEN JUNG WA ZHI YI LHA MOR CHEY

to Padmasambhava with the goddesses of the four elements

JUNG WA RANG SAR ZHI WAR THE TSOM MEY

without doubt the elements will be naturally pacified.

ORGYEN PADMA JUNG NEY LA SOL WA DEB

I supplicate Padmasambhava of Oddiyāna,

SAM PA LHUN GYI DRUB PAR JIN GYI LOB

bless us that our wishes be effortlessly accomplished!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Will said:

Before the Dalai Lama left Tibet he thought Buddhism was the "only true religion". But his attitude changed when he visited India in 1956. What happened in India?

My visit to the Theosophical Society in Chennai (then Madras) left a powerful impression. There I was directly exposed to people, and to a movement, that attempted to bring together the wisdom of the world's spiritual traditions, as well as science...

After more than three months in what was a most amazing country ... I was a changed

man. I could no longer live in the comfort of an exclusivist standpoint that takes Buddhism to be the only true religion.
From Toward a True Kinship of Faiths

Many Western Buddhists have scorn for the Theosophical Society, founded by Upasika Blavatsky. The Presence looked a little deeper.

muni said:

In understanding is unconditioned love. Was so reflecting: If I am considering myself to be a buddhist and reject others approach to peace, what kind of narrow understanding I than have other than grasping to correct philosophical ideas, my opinion?

"Harmony among the major faiths has become an essential ingredient of peaceful coexistence in our world. From this perspective, mutual understanding among these traditions is not merely the business of religious believers - it matters for the welfare of humanity as a whole".

<http://dalailamacenter.org/blog-post/many-faiths-one-truth-dalai-lama> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

What HHDL means is that among religions there is no shared authority, no central committee deciding for everyone what is true and what is false. Recognizing the subjective nature of religious opinion, HHDL offers a more secular view. This is correct. To protect everyone's liberty, it is necessary to subordinate religious views to secular law i.e. insist on separation of church and state.

Since there can be no agreement among various religions around which is the "true" religion -- tolerance is required. This however does not mean that if you are a Buddhist you are required to think that Christianity makes truths claims that are as valid as Buddhist truth claims. All that needs to be recognized is that all religions make truth claims that cannot be verified by any mutually agreed upon standard.

So, I know for a fact that HHDL feels that Buddhism is the best religion. He also recognizes that this is just an opinion and insisting on this opinion to someone who does not share the same idea leads to strife and war. So rather than insisting that Buddhism is the best religion for everyone, he merely asserts it is the best religion for himself.

Then, when we cross that divide, we try to look at people from the point of view of their goodness. We try to meet people at that point.

Since we cannot make all religions the same, we need to recognize where it is that people are the same. Where they are the same is that they want happiness and freedom from suffering -- and religions evolve to provide those answers, differently for different people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

I heard some Buddhas do not teach tantras and so on, but this reffers to the Nirmanakayas only I guess. It seems strange to me, if They are completely enlightened, not be different from other Buddhas, and the possibilities to teach in Samsara/Nirvana by means of 3 Kayas are limitless, why the need to hide suitable something, for example Dzogchen instructions? Whatever if mind, symbol or oral transsmision of Dzogchen? I'm sure, according to the logic, Buddha Shakyamuni, by means of 3 Kayas, taught somewhere Dzogchen although suppose not in Human Realm.

Malcolm wrote:

The teachings a given nirmanakāya buddha teaches depends on the student. That is why it is taught that in contrast to the sambhogakāya five certainties (time, place, teacher, retinue and teaching) nirmanakāyas do not have certain time, place, teacher, retinue and teaching. For example, Sikhin Buddha never taught vinaya. He did not have a sangha of ordained bhiksus, etc.

Nirmanakāyas are emanations i.e. they only are a facet of full awakening display to sentient beings based on their karma. Thus the teachings they bestow are also based on the karma of those sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Dear namdrol,

You have posted a vast array of valid and pertinent points, before continuing I will draw your attention to the fact that I consider eating meat in order to overcome sickness/illness can be valid, but I want to ask a question (that of course you do not need to answer):

To me the points you are presenting here veer widely from the position you used to post on e-sangha where you quoted from practitioners like Shakbar, who out of his boundless compassion for all sentient beings reached the verge of death from starvation (a number of times) on the plateaus of Tibet, rather than consume the flesh of sentient beings; to your current more "practical" position, based on research from the Medicine Buddha Sutra (and other teachings obviously), where you believe that the

flesh of sentient beings may be consumed for medical purposes.

I am not going to go into the karma vipakka of consuming flesh as I believe that the teachings of the Buddha (both in the Suuta and Sutra Pitaka) are quite clear.

My question is how much of this change in view rests on a wish to increase your capacity for boundless compassionate action and how much on a more (again logical) self-centred attempt to preserve this impemanent illusory body?

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

As for Shabkar, he was not an ordinary person -- I doubt he was at risk from starving at any time. Same goes for Nyala Pema Duddul.

You will recall I maintained quite consistently on e-sangha that meat as medicine was perfectly allowable.

So I have not really changed my view that much. I still think that meat industry is an environmental disaster from every point of view. I still think that eating meat is over all a negative habit. Etc.

What I was negating here was that meat-eating necessarily has a karma vipaka of killing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

Gotta love the internet, post on Dharmawheel for one day and two people in one day call me a liar...

Adamantine said:

good thing you're not concerned about praise or blame!

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Gotta love the internet, post on Dharmawheel for one day and two people in one day call me a liar...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Kyosan said:

Here is venerable Chan master Hsu Yun. I feel a closeness to him because his works are one of the first things I read when I first became interested in Buddhism. He advocated vegetarianism and was a vegetarian himself. He lived from 1840 to 1959. He lived to the amazing age of 119 years so I guess being vegetarian didn't hurt his health.

Namdrol said:

Sure, and Chang Chub Dorje live to estimated 145 years, ate meat his whole life.

Kyosan said:

What I said is the truth. You are making things up. I encourage people to check for themselves and see who is telling the truth and who isn't. Google is your friend.

I'm not saying that master Hsu Yun lived to that age because he was vegetarian. Some people live long and healthy lives whether they are vegetarian or not. I don't think that being vegetarian as a big factor. Eating healthy is a factor, but both vegetarians and non-vegetarians can eat healthy.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I was a little wrong, off by ten years.

Nyagla Changchub Dorje was a Tibetan doctor and tertön who lived near the Dege region of Tibet. He lived from 1826 to 1961. His main student in the west is Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Lama Wangdor also took teachings from him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

There is no fallacy - you are creating a premise in assuming that the plants are grown with harmful chemicals etc. whereas it is a certainty that all meat requires death, and almost always in the human context, deliberate killing for that purpose.

Malcolm wrote:

It is always certain that modern agriculture requires harming millions upon millions of creatures, both deliberately in the case of pesticides, and unintentionally.

Yeshe said:

Earlier in the thread you claimed intention (re. karma) was a key. So how do you now arrive at the conclusion that the intention to feed yourself is unconnected to the intention to eat a being reared and killed to satisfy your demands, and that this is not worse than a vegetarian diet.

Malcolm wrote:

No being has ever been reared and killed to satisfy my demands. Ever.

Yeshe said:

You also want to tie the plant based diet to your assumptions about it, deliberately killing with pesticides etc, as this suits your argument. I know no vegetarians who wish for beings to die in order to feed them.

Malcolm wrote:

And yet, they regularly support an agriculture system where millions of beings are killed deliberately in order to meet their demands for food. Blindness at best.

Yeshe said:

I know no meat-eaters who can think otherwise - they desire a killing as it is the only way to create the food they crave.

Malcolm wrote:

False connection -- I don't desire any animals to be killed at all. At all. Yet they are, all the time. Whether I eat a little meat or not is irrelevant. Your imputation of intention is based on a false premise i.e. "If you eat meat, you necessarily desire that an animal has been killed for you."

Yeshe said:

I feel you are also incorrect in that the meat is free of any connection to the consciousness of the being it once was.

Malcolm wrote:

Once there is no vāyu in that body, there is no consciousness. Consciousness is inextricably bound to vāyu (rlung). Once an animal has been butchered, etc., that sentient being's consciousness is not longer connected with that body in anyway.

Yeshe said:

You cannot be sure at what point the bardo being is truly separated from its former life -

up to 49 days I believe, during which that bardo being can be very much attached to its former 'form' and need help through Phowa to move on.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you can. You can be absolutely certain. If an animal or a human dies on its own, within three days or less its inner breath will have ceased. At that point, its consciousness will have left its body; in the case of a butchered animal, as soon as it is eviscerated and its heart is removed. The only beings exempt from this in our dimension are yogis in thugdam.

Once you are in the bardo, you are no longer connected with your former body. Full stop. You have a new body, since you are now a ghandharva. The gandharva might linger in the place where it died, but not in the body it has separated from and left behind.

In any event, "49" days is a symbolic number. There is no guarantee that any ghandarva will remain in the bardo for 49 days.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Kyosan said:

Here is venerable Chan master Hsu Yun. I feel a closeness to him because his works are one of the first things I read when I first became interested in Buddhism. He advocated vegetarianism and was a vegetarian himself. He lived from 1840 to 1959. He lived to the amazing age of 119 years so I guess being vegetarian didn't hurt his health.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, and Chang Chub Dorje live to estimated 145 years, ate meat his whole life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

LastLegend said:

Ignorance conditioned what according to Dependent Origination? If not self and others?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not that ignorance. That is afflicted ignorance. The knowledge obscuration of ignorance is the mistaken apprehension of an identity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, the goal is to be free of obscurations of affliction (in common with Theravada) and knowledge.

LastLegend said:

What is the cause of obscurations of affliction? Is arrogance a part of this cause?

Malcolm wrote:

The knowledge obscuration of ignorance, primarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana Compassion?

Content:

alasdairyee said:

Something I've wondered about,

Since Mahayana Buddhism places firm emphasis on compassion, why don't we see monks and mahayana buddhists rush to disaster sites, doing voluntary work to help others? Why only meditation and cultivation to create this mind only "Bodhicitta"? Is this true compassion? When we compare this to Christians who go all out to help disaster victims, 3rd world countries?

I'm not only talking about organisations here, I'm also talking about YOU.

Namo Amitufo!

Malcolm wrote:

I can set you up with some people in Haiti, if you want to walk the walk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

I think you are missing the point. There is nothing in the world that cannot be medicine for some illness somewhere, if you know how to use it.

N

Yeshe said:

No, on the contrary, I think that just because something can be used for medicine, even if effective, it does not mean that we should use it. My guess is that the tigers massacred for Chinese medicine may agree.

The same argument obtains with our sources of food.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not medicine. That is superstition (tigers, etc, poached for male potency formulas in China).

Agreed, people should start growing more of their own food to limit the harm caused by industrial agriculture, both organic and non-organic, to "pests" and to the environment as a whole.

However, in my pervious post I was addressing the fallacies inherent in asserting that a modern vegetarian diet is inherently "more compassionate" than a diet in which some meat is consumed. There are people who think that we should just wear only plastic (whoops,BP), or soy based "plastics (Whoops, Monsanto), etc.

Of course, if we abandoned milk and dairy there are also consequences. Animals that humans don't eat wind up on extinction lists sooner or later.

Personally, I think we need deep ecological solutions to these issues, managed non-catastrophic scaling back of human populations to a hundred million would make this world a much nicer place. If we don't manage it, catastrophe will, sooner or later.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

tamdrin said:

did buddha intend for everyone to become "Buddhists" ???

Malcolm wrote:

In general, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

No traditional medicine should be frozen, and should always consider contemporary availability.

Namdrol said:

Guess I have more confidence in rishis than scientists.

Yeshe said:

If an Ayurvedic practitioner went into the forest and discovered a plant which would cure a headache he would use it.

You are surely not suggesting that he should ignore it. If that was the approach, they would make scant progress.

Equally, if a 'scientist' discovers a plant-based cure for a headache (aspirin) the Ayurvedic practitioner should close their minds?

By all means have faith in Rishis but don't deny them the opportunity to continue their learning. When, exactly should they decide that they know everything and close their minds to new cures?

In terms of what humans are intended to eat or use as medication, I would hope that the over-arching consideration in all such choices would be Compassion. Should an Indian or Tibetan medical practitioner really be so arrogant as to assume they know everything? After all, what is a traditional healer in search of natural medicines other than a scientist?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not suggesting that we turn our backs on modern medicine. But it has serious limitations.

As far as plant based medicines go -- they are wonderful of course. We use more plants in Tibetan medicine than meat.

I think you are missing the point. There is nothing in the world that cannot be medicine for some illness somewhere, if you know how to use it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

LastLegend said:

We Buddhists often possess the attitude of Mahayana versus Theravada as one is

superior to the other. Surely we can extend this attitude to non-Buddhist also.

Namdrol said:

Depends on what result one wants. Non-Buddhist religions do not result in Buddhahood, it is not their goal. Buddhahood is not the goal of Theravada either.

LastLegend said:

Is the goal not to break the barrier of self and others as a Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the goal is to be free of obscurations of affliction (in common with Theravada) and knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

LastLegend said:

We Buddhists often possess the attitude of Mahayana versus Theravada as one is superior to the other. Surely we can extend this attitude to non-Buddhist also.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what result one wants. Non-Buddhist religions do not result in Buddhahood, it is not their goal. Buddhahood is not the goal of Theravada either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Will said:

Before the Dalai Lama left Tibet he thought Buddhism was the "only true religion". But his attitude changed when he visited India in 1956. What happened in India? My visit to the Theosophical Society in Chennai (then Madras) left a powerful impression. There I was directly exposed to people, and to a movement, that attempted to bring together the wisdom of the world's spiritual traditions, as well as science... After more than three months in what was a most amazing country ... I was a changed man. I could no longer live in the comfort of an exclusivist standpoint that takes Buddhism to be the only true religion.
From Toward a True Kinship of Faiths

Many Western Buddhists have scorn for the Theosophical Society, founded by Upasika Blavatsky. The Presence looked a little deeper.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by "true".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

No traditional medicine should be frozen, and should always consider contemporary availability.

Malcolm wrote:

Guess I have more confidence in rishis than scientists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

If someone had a digestive problem, if a goat was tethered in front of them, I wonder how many would ask for its slaughter 'for them'.

Malcolm wrote:

No buddhist of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

I guess it comes down to 'need'. The peoples you cite eat that meat because they is often little else available there. However, IMHO that is viable more because as omnivores we are wonderful at surviving on practically anything. I don't think these peoples have evolved so differently from the rest of humanity that they 'need' meat. Your case is based on 'animal protein' as if it alone has the amino acids necessary for humans.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not it. Like anything in nature, there are synergistic properties in meat that cannot be reduced to mere "amino acids" etc. I am not making that argument. You are.

Yeshe said:

Health, I agree, is a vague measure, but healing a wound is not. Since vegetarians heal, I see no evidence that meat is required.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on the kind of injury.

Yeshe said:

Again, digestive problems which respond to meat may also respond to soya etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not -- for example, for certain kinds of ulcerative conditions, pork works where other things do not.

I'm not for one minute, btw, seeking to challenge the effectiveness of your treatments, or your qualification to administer them and be curative, so apologies if that is how it appeared. I am myself a practitioner of holistic medicine, so try not to be reductionist.

Yeshe said:

I just don't accept that it is the only way. I have seen wounds healed with plant poultices for example,

Malcolm wrote:

External wounds, yes. However, pork fat mixed with a specific himalayan fern will all but erase scars and burns, etc.

Yeshe said:

as they used to deride the neem tree I mentioned - which instantly cured several of my students with bad stomachs in India. So, I'm not sceptical of your methods per se, just that meat is essential.

Malcolm wrote:

Meat is not essential for everyone nor essential all the time for those whom it is important. Not saying that. I am saying that meat has properties which are much more effective at treating certain conditions than plant based medicines. For example, certain kinds of meat are very beneficial for reproductive issues, etc. Can you find something else to use? Perhaps -- but the materia medica of meats is more or less the same in Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine, with similar explanations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

meat eating is bad karmically all around....

i insisted that transporting the stuff and vegetables is killing insects and we all should realize we are acquiring karmic retribution...

my point is to make people aware of the horse Hockey and hypocrisy that is being pushed around....

Malcolm wrote:

Bluntly -- you do not understand karma as taught by the Buddha.

Read chapter four of the Abhidharmakosha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

Well, that's proof that some of your patients believe that it has helped.

Malcolm wrote:

No, because I am diagnosing their problems, and following up, through classic pulse, urine analysis and so on.

Yeshe said:

There is no evidence that it is not a placebo effect, really. Yet there are many thousands who are healthy and heal well as evidence of the opposite. Meat as a useful component of diet is not at question here, just that it is needed as it has some exclusive healing property. Did you give them other treatments with amino acids, iron etc, or just use meat as that's what you were taught?

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but this is a reductionist view. We do not analyze things in this way. We understand diet and medicines through five elements and three doshas. If you want iron and amino acids, go to an allopathic practitioner. In this case, I am referring to patients who have had problems for years, for example with digestion, that no western doctor can fix. I have my experience, that is all.

Yeshe said:

The sort of proof I am after is scientific evidence that people need meat to heal wounds, which was your assertion.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the person -- not everyone would. Many people do. In Tibetan Medicine and Ayurveda it is believed for example that if there is a problem with bone breaks, bone broth is very important. If one has kidney damage, eating kidneys of certain animals is very important, etc. Similar tissue will build similar tissue.

[/quote] Where are these people who must have meat instead of other food sources ?[/quote]

well, eskimos, mongolians, Tibetans, many Northern Europeans, etc. you might be surprised at the large numbers of people who have evolved with a high percentage of animal protein in their diet. I am quite certain these people really need some quantity (not large) of meat in their diets to be healthy.

"Health" however is not a scientifically targetable state. "Health" is a complicated state of mental and physical balance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Pero said:

edit: Oh wait, you meant the "founding teacher of Dzogchen" part?

Malcolm wrote:

Right.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

rainbowtara said:

Polite reminder

'Meat eating'

Regards,
rt

Rael said:

i know...sorry....but there is always going to be a drift....people like me go nutso at times...and well....

i like to keep things honestpeople cracki'm hedging Namdrol won't be teaching people to eat meat in order to create future Buddhists anymore....

Malcolm wrote:

This is a teaching that is very common in Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

Please address the assertions you made concerning meat as essential to healing and health. I have refuted it, as have others on this thread, yet you offer no research or evidential basis for the claims.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you accept as criteria for rebuttal?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Pero said:

He is a teacher. Whether you don't want to take him as your teacher is another matter.

Malcolm wrote:

People are very emotional about this issue. They have strong feelings. There are many different views. Not just one.

The most difficult issue about this question is the question of harm as opposed to negative karma.

According to Sakya Pandita -- In Hinayana, meat-eating is permitted. In Mahayana, it is prohibited. In Vajrayana it is permitted.

Rael's issue is with the Hinayana/Vajrayana permission around eating meat. I can see why he thinks Buddhism is hypocritical on this issue -- I don't agree with him, but I can see why he has his point of view. He just does not understand the niceties of karma in such an instance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

You also posit that people need meat to build tissue after operations, or for their health. Now, I can see how in Tibet in the last century, village folk medicine would maybe suggest that, but do you have proof which explains precisely how the body needs meat to create our human flesh, and that no other source of amino acids etc. will do. I am vegetarian and heal very quickly - a balanced human diet does not need meat for health. I know hundreds of vegetarians who are also healthy, which in research terms is a good sized sample. Anecdotaly, I know some very well, such as one at my gym who is a retired world class cyclist and still marathon runner and is strictly vegan. You've also had research quoted to you on this thread. Where is your proof of the necessity of meat. please?

Yeshe

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Yeshe:

I generally eat a very healthy and balanced vegetarian diet. Mostly based on S. Indian cooking.

I have my experience as a practitioner of Tibetan medicine, one. I have treated many people who are quite unhealthy, taking all kinds of supplements, eating balanced vegetarian diets who still have many health problems. They add a little meat to their diet -- health problem solved. I have seen this many times, not only once. You can criticize and imagine that such people are not really eating properly, but you would be wrong.

Such people are generally of European descent, but not only.

What sort of proof do you want? Nutritional scientists are all over the map on this one. You can find studies to prove you have to eat meat, studies that prove that you don't and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

if he is right he will clarify it and i will admit i'm wrong....

Malcolm wrote:

Clarify what?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

your everything thats wrong with Buddhism.....

yikes have i overstepped the boundaries of decent debate.....

Malcolm wrote:

Yup -- you have.

This is quite normal in internet conversations -- unable to reply reasonably, one resorts to ad hominem remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Nangwa said:

Shakyamuni is looked at as a "founding teacher of Dzogchen" because of his realization of his true condition and that he taught certain methods that can lead others to that same realization.

Malcolm wrote:

That should apply to all buddhas, but it doesn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

I don't accept the lame monastic excuse about accepting meat in the offering bowls - I believe that to be added by monks who wrote the sutras, for their own benefit, but the thread is thankfully not about their predilections.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have to accept the converse, all passages written against meat-eating were written by monks according to their own predilections.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

tamdrin said:

Namdrol the difference is bugs and so forth are killed as a natural by product of producing vegetarian foods.

Malcolm wrote:

So you are saying that killing "pests" to raise food is less harmful to the "pests" that are harmed since you did not intend to harm them? I doubt they would agree.

tamdrin said:

Animals raised for slaughter are raised up specifically to be killed for human consumption.. They are bread this way, their whole life they are fed with the intention of making someone a tasty hamburger or slab of bacon.. Also as we know many of these animals are treated horrendously and tortured look at the videos about the chickens raised for Kentucky fried chicken for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. Terrible.

tamdrin said:

Although it may not be considered non virtuous to eat this meat according to Buddhism.. It would be considered virtuous to avoid creating a demand for it by not eating it and thus protecting animals from abuse, torture, and death..

Malcolm wrote:

So it is irrelevant in the case of vegetables and grain? We don't care what happens to insects, mice and so on?

Is it different when one kills gophers, mice and rats, aphids, etc. with pesticides and herbicides used on crops because we don't intend to eat these creatures?

If you reply, "Use organic crops", this does not help matters at all. Organic food production, especially at the scale we produce food in the US for the organic market requires the use of a whole range of organic pesticides and herbicides.

In order for these pests to die, isn't it so that someone must intend to kill them? And isn't it so that by ordering such vegetables and grain you are creating a demand for a food that involves abusing, torturing and killing animals such as gophers, rats, birds, and insects? Since we are not raising pests for food, when we kill them, this is just a "by-product" of a vegetarian diet?

tamdrin said:

Ps the notion that the animals you eat are going to be reborn as your students seems absurd.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with Guru Padmasambhava. It's his teaching, not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thanx. I suppose this is taken from rigpawiki.org where "Twelve teachers (Wyl. ston pa bcu gnyis) — the founding teachers of Dzogchen, also known as the 'twelve Dzogchen teachers'".

So here Shakyamuni is linked to the Buddha Shakyamuni (tibetan. Sangs-rgyas shakya thub pa) according to rigpawiki but maybe He did not teach Dzogchen, as Namdrol mentioned, but only some kind of initiated (manifested) it only to be later revealed by future masters, as in the case of HYT?

Namdrol said:

Shakyamuni is listed because Shakyamuni predicted that Dzogchen would be taught, he however never himself taught it in Jambudvīpa.

Mariusz said:

Is it means He taught himself Dzogchen outside Jambudvīpa and from there it was moved by other masters to Jambudvīpa and therefore He is also "the founding teacher of Dzogchen"?

Malcolm wrote:

no

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

teeth are not for eating the product of suffering...

Malcolm wrote:

Then we are pretty much condemned to starve...sarva dukham

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Sönam said:

1. Khyeu Nangwa Dampa (ston pa khye'u snang ba dam pa)
2. Khyeu Ö Mitrukpa (ston pa khye'u 'od mi 'khrugs pa)
3. Jikpa Kyob (ston pa 'jigs pa skyob)
4. Shyönnu Rolpa Nampar Tsewa (ston pa gzhon nu rol pa rnam par brtse ba)
5. Dorje Chang (ston pa rdo rje 'chang)
6. Shyönnu Pawo (ston pa gzhon nu dpa' bo)
7. Drangsong Tröpé Gyalpo (ston pa drang srong khros pa'i rgyal po)
8. Ser Ö Dampa (ston pa gser 'od dam pa)
9. Tsewé Rolpé Lodrö (ston pa brtse bas rol pa'i blo gros)
10. Ösung Drepo (ston pa 'od srung bgres po)
11. Ngöndzok Gyalpo (ston pa mngon rdzogs rgyal po)
12. Shakyamuni (ston pa shAkya thub pa)

Mariusz said:

Thanx. I suppose this is taken from rigpawiki.org where "Twelve teachers (Wyl. ston pa bcu gnyis) — the founding teachers of Dzogchen, also known as the 'twelve Dzogchen teachers'".

So here Shakyamuni is linked to the Buddha Shakyamuni (tibetan. Sangs-rgyas shakya thub pa) according to rigpawiki but maybe He did not teach Dzogchen, as Namdrol mentioned, but only some kind of initiated (manifested) it only to be later revealed by future masters, as in the case of HYT?

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni is listed because Shakyamuni predicted that Dzogchen would be taught, he however never himself taught it in Jambudvīpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The source for the information that Avatamsaka sutra is somewhere in Kangyur,

classified as a yoga tantra text, comes from some book about the 14th Karmapa, Jamgon Kongtrul. Jamgon Kongtrul namely quotes Avatamsaka sutra in his works, certainly in Myriad Worlds for example, and this author explains that the text that Jamgon Kongtrul has read is found in yoga tantra category (I can't remember its actual name). (And I'm sorry again for the inaccuracy about this source!) (I was astonished that it is not common knowledge!)

Malcolm wrote:

The Yoga tantras make use of the Buddhist cosmology first laid out in Avatamsaka, but Avatamsaka is not a Yoga tantra. He cites Flower Ornament three times, but never as a yoga tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Unknown said:

Also, what karma are you creating by consuming meat?

Malcolm wrote:

Me? Zero.

Unknown said:

Every action has an effect, so what do you suppose the karmic effect of consuming the bodies of others unnecessarily is going to create?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know about you, but when I eat meat, the sentient being associated with those remains has long since exited the bardo. When I eat meat, I am not torturing anyone. There is no magical trace on the corpse of that animal. There is no magic connection. When I eat meat, I understand that the animal of course did not want to die. I feel compassion for that animal.

Nevertheless, that animal would be dead no matter whether I eat its remains or not. This is a fact.

At least when I eat the remains of an animal, I have a direct representation of a suffering sentient being to work with -- and to the bargain, its death is not completely wasted. At least its remains, its physical elements, are reinforcing the life and practice of a Dharma practitioner.

When I eat meat, I have a mind, the animal has a mind -- and through my intention in considering that animal's plight in samsara, I make a connection with that animal through the mind. That connection is made stronger because now I have a direct

representation of that animal. Thinking of that animal, I can recite a healing mantra. By thinking of that animal, I make a connection. And that animal, according to the teachings, will eventually be reborn as my student. By eating meat, I am using meat as a means for increasing compassion.

And since, at this point the animal's mind is no longer connected to that piece of meat in front of me, the sentient being that used to own that flesh is not harmed at all when I consume that left over meat from its corpse. Whatever harm it experienced had already happened. It is somewhere else in the three realms, it is not a ghost inhabiting the dead flesh in front of me. There is no shamanistic trace of the animal left on that dead corpse once the mind has parted the body. At that point, it is just an inanimate collection of four elements.

When I eat plant based food, it is the same. I know for a fact that many beings were harmed in the process of bring that food to my plate. So I also consider that when I am eating an apple, for example. Or an orange. Etc. So I bring awareness to that act of eating, recite a healing mantra, make a connection with all the beings harmed and destroyed by harvesting of that plant-based food.

Living in samsara necessarily involves harming other living beings. But harming other living beings does not necessarily involve negative karma. Buddha understood this distinction; Mahavira and Devadatta did not.

For example, many kinds of beings make homes in trees, in plants, and so on. When we destroy their homes and bodies to harvest plant food, or build a house, or mow our lawn, etc., we are contributing to their suffering -- but we don't care. Somehow, this escapes the attention of some strict Buddhist vegetarians. Somehow, they don't seem to care about the poisons used in agriculture that poison not only insects, but birds, small animals, and so on.

The illogic of your point of view is that when someone eats meat they are necessarily 1) responsible for the karmic acts of another (already rejected) 2) contributing to the suffering of the animal (already rejected). Neither of these arguments is valid.

It is certain that when you slaughter meat, or order it from a butcher directly, you are contributing to that suffering -- but that is all. It is also a certainty that when you harvest plants you will kill some creature. There is no doubt. And you will also be robbing many others of their homes. Not only that, you will be stealing the food of many other creatures. Oh, for sure you can claim -- "This is my food, I planted it, the birds, deer and insects are stealing it from me" -- but they do not see it that way.

So we can imagine a perfect samsara where no one is suffering -- but of course such a samsara is just a fantasy.

Unknown said:

I don't believe that consuming the bodies of others is conducive to attaining enlightenment; the Lankavatara Sutra agrees, saying that the consuming of meat

harms the development of compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

Right and the Hevajra tantra says that those with compassion eat meat. So? You can follow provisional sutras like the Lanka-avatara, I will follow tantra. And yes, I am aware of what Kalacakra says on the subject. I have also read Shabkar.

Unknown said:

If you think about it, it makes perfect sense. If we want even the tiniest thing from others, much less disregarding their pain so that we can consume their bodies, a supremely compassionate mind will not be forthcoming.

Malcolm wrote:

Who's disregarding pain and suffering? When I eat meat [the little meat that I do eat], it is a conscious choice, and serves as a cause for compassion, as I have explained.

In reality, my body is made of four elements, a plant is made of four elements, the bodies of sentient beings are made of four elements. There is no difference in this respect. We use different combinations of the four elements for different purposes, depending on our constitution and our health.

You may claim that no one needs to eat meat to maintain a healthy body -- but then you have to explain why Medicine Buddha explains the use of so many different kinds of meat in our diet as well as in medicine.

So as I have said, the main point is to be aware of what you are doing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

As for myself, due to a surgery I had slow healing injuries that required that I eat meat.

gregkavarnos said:

Get well soon! Tayatha om bekhandze bekhandze maha bekhandze raja samudgate soha! medicine-buddha.jpg

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks, that surgery was a couple of years ago. But it took a long time to heal -- somehow, since I did not eat any meat for the first year afterwards, it is still not perfect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

...Due to this the thread snapped and the robber fell back into the Hell realms.:

Malcolm wrote:

And all of this was directly connected with the robber's intention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

As an aside: I have noticed Namdrol that you have changed your opinion on vegetarianism since your e-sangha days. Have you stopped being a vegetarian/vegan?

Malcolm wrote:

Fair question.

I have said repeatedly in this thread that eating meat is not good. That in general it is negative.

What I have rejected is that meat eating has a moral i.e. karmic consequence even though one is not involved in killing animals and do not ask people to do so on one's behalf.

I also made this clarification on e-sangha.

As for myself, due to a surgery I had slow healing injuries that required that I eat meat.

However, I maintain a vegetarian kitchen, and never cook meat at home.

I do eat meat in restaurants provided that the meat is not raised inhumanely.

So, while I do not claim to be a vegetarian -- my diet is 95 percent plant based. I eat perhaps at most a pound of flesh a month on average.

When I do eat meat, I employ a method to make a connection with the creature in question, so I do not remain indifferent or unaware.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: I need a job

Content:

tamdrin said:

Hi,

I recently graduated from University with a degree in Religion and Philosophy. Not much I can do with that I know, but I did it because it was my area of interest. Now I am faced with the "real world" and the necessity of making a living for myself. I am having trouble finding work and want to find the best job I can or make one up (gotta be creative sometimes) without settling for something totally crappy. Do you have any ideas what is a good way to make a living for a Buddhist?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Wait tables, serve meat and alcohol?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

if an entire communal village living next to general store does not eat meat.....less meat will be delivered to that general store.....If they are not vegetarian meat will be upped...

Malcolm wrote:

That might have been true even 50 years ago, but with the modern grocery store system....

Not really -- more meat and vegetables both are thrown away by supermarkets every day than are actually purchased. The amount of waste in the Western food supply chain is astonishing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

your trying to refine the laws of Karma to suit the western modern world Namdrol

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, just explaining Karma the way Buddha did in the 5th century BCE.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

Frankly, there are other issues of more pressing importance.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Not if you are a cow, pig, fish, lamb or any other animal consumed by human beings. It's uncompassionate not to be concerned about their lives.

Malcolm wrote:

"Eating meat" does not mean one is not concerned.

We do not eat the minds of sentient beings -- we eat their bodies which have been separated from their minds. What suffers is the mind, not the body. It is quite possible to eat meat and be a supremely compassionate person, for example, HH Dalai Lama, etc.

Somehow, we think it is ok to be indifferent if one animal kills and eats another for food - but somehow it is worse when humans kill and eat animals. We don't spend much time worrying about spiders feeding on flies, etc. We think it is "natural", part of samsara, part of their suffering. Well, the suffering of animals is to eat one another. In this respect, human beings eat animals, and always have. Of course there are some exceptions, but virtually everywhere we go in the world, we find human beings are consuming animals. This is part of Samsara. Are we indifferent to suffering? No. Can we fix that suffering? No. No one can stop the suffering of another being. It is impossible. Not even Buddha can stop the suffering of the six realms. If he could have, he would have.

So we are left with samsara. It is suffering. We are trying to end that suffering. If one thinks that refraining from eating meat is stopping some animal's suffering in a real sense, one is deluded. By the time its remains come to your plate, it is already reborn, lunch for something else. This is not indifference, this is reality.

There is only one way to stop suffering. Meet Dharma, reflect on Dharma, realize Dharma. That's it.

So, whether we eat meat or not, we try to be compassionate and move on to more important issues.

Some Buddhists turn vegetarianism into kind of a political party, spending lots of time trying to condition others with their views: "We are the fantastic vegetarians, true

followers of Buddha". All this amounts to is "lta ba phyogs 'dzin", grasping onto biased views.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

you can't hide and say you do not know if you are killing....

Malcolm wrote:

You need to distinguish between "taking a life" which is an act that has a karmic result from "killing", which is not necessarily a karmic act in the Buddhist sense of term. If people going to slaughter animals whether I eat them or not (all evidence suggests they will), than there is very little reason to assume my eating meat is "creating" demand.

"Taking a life" i.e. killing in this sense is an intentional act. You have a being, you have motivation (you want to kill this being), you have the act itself, and then you are happy you did it. This is a perfect act of killing i.e. taking a life. This is explained very well by the Buddha.

Eating meat does not satisfy any of these criteria of necessity. Hence, you can eat meat without it necessarily being an act that produces some kind of huge negative karmic burden.

Frankly, there are other issues of more pressing importance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

tamdrin said:

Sorry, But that is nonsense... Don't by and don't consume the meat and you are not supporting thier meat sales..

Malcolm wrote:

Supply creates demand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Astus said:

Aemilius,

Could you brush up your sources? I mean, when you refer to a text as a source you should have access to it and be able to give an exact citation. First you say Wayman said the Avatamsaka Sutra is among the tantras, now that Conze was unaware of the large number of meditation texts. Both are unlikely statements.

"As a more or less public system of thought, the Tantra gathered momentum after 500 or 600 A.D. Its beginnings do, however, go back to the dawn of human history, when an agricultural society was pervaded by magic and witchcraft, human sacrifice and the cult of the mother goddess, fertility rites and chthonic deities. The Tantra is not really a new creation, but the result of an absorption of primitive beliefs by the literary tradition, and their blending with Buddhist philosophy."

(Edward Conze: Buddhism - Its Essence and Development, p. 176-177)

Later he lists three practices specific to Tantra:

1. the recitation of spells
2. the performance of ritual gestures and dances
3. the identification with deities by means of a special kind of meditation

Malcolm wrote:

This characterization of tantra by Conze is naive and silly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

green peace co-founder patrick moore lamented that the group had been co-opted by hardcore communists, hell bent on shutting down western industry and resources.

gregkavarnos said:

Damn green-commies (red and green together, that would make a nasty shade of pooh brown right?), always f*****g up the program of merciless profit generation at the expense of global well-being!

Should be shot! Or sent to Gulags!

Malcolm wrote:

The proper term is "watermelons" -- green on the outside, red on the inside.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Conze remarks that there is very little actual meditation practice instructions, or none at all, in the Mahayana Sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Conze must not have read many Mahayana sutras, then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is in these Nyingma sources mentioned if Śakyamuni also manifested there, for example as Vajrakīlaya, as was in the case of Kalachakra and Vajrabhairava?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no involvement with Shakyamuni in any Mahayoga Tantra in Nyingma. It is not necessary. Teaching of tantras is mainly a Sambhogakāya teaching. Nirmanakāyas do not possess the five certainties.

In my personal opinion, these "proofs" that Shakyamuni Buddha was directly related to disseminating Anuttarayoga tantra are baseless.

As I said, we have example where according to tradition, the Buddha manifested the mandalas of Kalacakra and Guhyasamaja. But manifesting a mandala and teaching are two different things altogether. Even here, while Indrabhūti spread the Guhyasamaja in his kingdom eventually the lineage died out. It was later revived by a Dakini who received it from Vajrapani, and bestowed both the Tattvasamgraha and the Guhyasamaja to King Visukalpa, who then spread it very widely in South India. In reality the author of the present recension of the Guhyasamaja Tantra is Indrabhūti. The author of the present recension of the Hevajra is Mahasiddha Virupa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Water offering mantra translation?

Content:

conebeckham said:

...pronounced, by most Tibetans, "Sapariwara" as the V becomes a "W" (and is usually written with a བ (ba)

dakini_boi said:

Thank you. On the topic of transliteration, why is the Sanskrit वा (va/wa) often transliterated into Tibetan as བ when the Tibetan script has བ (va/wa) specifically for the purpose? ex. Skt. Vajra वज्र becomes Tib. བཞེ Bajra - not བཞེ Vajra. This is not a question of pronunciation, but of transliteration - other sounds that are pronounced differently in Tibetan are still transliterated according to the Sanskrit. Is this just an error made in early translations that was repeated until it became convention? Anyone know?

While I'm at it, in the water offering mantra above, where is the stress placed in "saparana"? is it "saPARana"?

Thanks for continued help

Malcolm wrote:

བ is can be pronounced either as ba or as wa in Tibetan. In Amdo dialect which is very ancient all བ instances are pronounced wa.

Also in Nepal where most Tibetan translators learned to pronounce mantras, Sanskrit "va" is pronounced "ba". It is the same in Kashmir. Sakya Pandita notes this regional variation in his "how to pronounce mantras" guidebook.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thank you Nevertheless Samantabhadra is not included in the lineage of Guhyasamaja as I checked the middle length sadhana translated by Alexander Berzin but Vajradhara.

Malcolm wrote:

Irrelevant -- Guhyasamaja tantra mentions dharmakāya Samantabhadra by name.

Vajradhara is related to transmission, Samantabhadra to essence.

Mariusz said:

But I don't know details how Ratna Lingpa proof them. Could you write more how They managed it?

Malcolm wrote:

Some people, like Go Khugpa Lhatse, etc., negated Guhyagarbha -- later a Sanskrit copy of Guhyagarbha was discovered at Samye. Same with Vajrakilaya -- some gsar ma scholars negated Vajrakilaya until a yogi presented Sakya Pandita with a text written in Padmasambhava's own handwriting in Sanskrit, the Kilaya Fragment Tantra, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 12:03 PM

Title: Re: Water offering mantra translation?

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Thank you!

So should it be SAPARIWARA or APARIWARA?

Malcolm wrote:

Saparivara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 12:02 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

CO2 is only one of the greenhouse gases -- there are many others more pernicious.

Heruka said:

can you site sources for this.

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Sulfur hexafluoride, for example.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sulfur_hexafluoride#Greenhouse_gas "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 10:03 AM
Title: Re: Water offering mantra translation?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
SAPARIWARA -- retinue

ARGHAM -- drinking water.

PRATITSA -- receive

PUDZA -- offering

MEGHA -- cloud

SAMUDRA -- ocean

SAPARANA --spreads

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 9:49 AM
Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.
Content:
Heruka said:
green peace co-founder patrick moore lamented that the group had been co-opted by hardcore communists, hell bent on shutting down western industry and resources.

also still waiting for clear empirical data to show anthropogenic global warming is a real issue. the earth in past times has had much greater c02 levels than at present, and life in those times exploded in variation scope and size since c02 consumed by plant life and release oxygen. the carbon cycle on earth can handle massive c02 out gassing from volcanoes, on the scale many times that of human activity.

carbon monoxide however is a different animal.

Malcolm wrote:
CO2 is only one of the greenhouse gases -- there are many others more pernicious.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 3:26 AM
Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen
Content:
muni said:
Pointing "out"? miss the language feeling.

Make Dzogchen??

Maybe transmission is suiting label.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I don't understand how you write.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Caz said:

What would a deep Green awakening entail ?

gregkavarnos said:

This does it for me, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep_ecology "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; , especially the social ecology of Murray Bookchin.

Malcolm wrote:

Check out David Orton's Left Bio Centrism Primer:

Left Biocentrism Primer

March 15, 1998

The following Primer is a result of a protracted collective discussion among a number of those who support left biocentrism and deep ecology.

- Left biocentrism is a left focus or theoretical tendency within the deep ecology movement, which is subversive of the existing industrial society. It accepts and promotes the eight-point Deep Ecology Platform drawn up by Arne Naess and George Sessions. Left biocentrism holds up as an ideal, identification, solidarity, and compassion with all life. "Left" as used in left biocentrism, means anti- industrial and anti-capitalist, but not necessarily socialist. The expressions 'left biocentrism' or 'left ecocentrism' are used interchangeably.

- Left biocentrism accepts the view that the Earth belongs to no one. While raising a number of criticisms, left biocentrism is meant to strengthen, not undermine, the deep ecology movement which identifies with all life.

- Left biocentrism says that individuals must take responsibility for their actions and be socially accountable. Part of being individually responsible is to practice voluntary simplicity, so as to minimize one's own impact upon the Earth.

- Left biocentrists are concerned with social justice and class issues, but within a context of ecology. To move to a deep ecology world, the human species must be mobilized, and a concern for social justice is a necessary part of this mobilization. Left biocentrism is for the redistribution of wealth, nationally and internationally.
- Left biocentrism opposes economic growth and consumerism. Human societies must live within ecological limits so that all other species may continue to flourish. We believe that bioregionalism, not globalism, is necessary for sustainability. The perspective of the late German Green philosopher Rudolf Bahro is accepted that, for world-wide sustainability, industrialized countries need to reduce their impact upon the Earth to about one tenth of what it is at the present time. It is also incumbent upon non-industrialized nations to become sustainable and it is necessary for industrialized nations to help on this path.
- Left biocentrism holds that individual and collective spiritual transformation is important to bring about major social change, and to break with industrial society. We need inward transformation, so that the interests of all species override the short-term self-interest of the individual, the family, the community, and the nation.
- Left biocentrism believes that deep ecology must be applied to actual environmental issues and struggles, no matter how socially sensitive, e.g. population reduction, aboriginal issues, workers' struggles, etc.
- Social ecology, eco-feminism and eco-marxism, while raising important questions, are all human-centered and consider human-to-human relations within society to be more important and, in the final analysis, determine society's relationship to the natural world. Left biocentrism believes that an egalitarian, non-sexist, non-discriminating society, a highly desirable goal, can still be exploitive towards the Earth.
- Left biocentrists are "movement greens" in basic orientation. They are critical of existing Green political parties, which have come to an accommodation with industrial society and have no accountability to the deep ecology movement.
- To be politically relevant, deep ecology needs to incorporate the perspective advanced by left biocentrism.

David Orton
 Coordinator, Green Web
 R.R. #3 Saltsprings, Nova Scotia, Canada B0K 1P0
 mailto:greenweb@fox.nstn.ca

Author: Malcolm
 Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 3:22 AM
 Title: Re: Meat Eating
 Content:
 Malcolm wrote:

These kinds of things we have to understand in an interpretive way.

Definitive, according to Akshayamatinirdesha means no mention of persons, beings, self, other, etc. Provisional means discourses concerning self, persons, beings, living creatures, etc.

Did not think you are imposing, just adding that as it is important component to these discussions.

We Buddhists don't kill -- this is axiomatic. It is the first rule. Second, we try to limit harm (ahimsa).

There is never a time when meat, in the medicine tantras, is absolutely endorsed or prohibited. It is regarded as a normal part of human diet. Sometimes eaten, sometimes not.

It is clear to me that eating meat is not "good" for all the reasons many have given. In our culture, eating industrial meat is very bad, actually in terms of grain, water, fuel, cruelty, etc.

In more ancient cultures, people were closer to the source. If a monastery wanted meat, they had to order it directly from the nomads that butchered the meat and so on. So there is a little bit of difference. etc.

Namdrol said:

First of all, this objection has been addressed by Bhavaviveka.

You have to understand -- we are under no obligation to regard all sutras as definitive except those sutras defined according to the criteria of Akshayanirmatinirdesha sutra. So there is a limit to how much citations can serve you.

Adamantine said:

Not serving me, these are citations Chatral Rinpoche uses. Apparently he is not that concerned with the criteria of the Akshayanirmatinirdesha sutra? What are these criteria?

Medicine Buddha taught the four tantras of medicine, also he included meat as part of diet, not just medicines.

I am assuming, as with ayurveda, that prescriptions of meat in the diet are for those with particular constitutions, not for everyone-- therefore it still functions as a type of medicine. Or do the tantras prescribe dietary meat across the board? And btw, what is the history of the Medicine Buddha tantras? Why would we accept these over the sutras cited above?

When you go a restaurant. You have a menu -- on it are several items beef, lamb, fish, poultry, and some vegetarian items. Merely going to the restaurant that serves meat means that you are participating in the negative karma of eating meat. Why? Because they are preparing meat whether you eat it or not.

When you go a market that sells meat -- whether you buy their meat or not you are supporting them, thus you are supporting their meat sales. And on and on it goes. I totally agree, I used this same argument in a similar way in another thread because I also believe fanatics should walk their talk in this regard. And while I do accept there are certain conditions where meat eating is acceptable and should be used as medicine, or in particular cases for diet, and for ganapuja-- I also think there is certainly a web of interconnection in the marketplace and we can't ignore that even a drop in the water creates ripples that may become quite vast. Because of this, whenever possible I try to eat at vegetarian restaurants and shop at vegetarian marketplaces. I realize this may be hard to do in certain locations, however it is not difficult where I live. Ultimately, it'd be great if some Buddhist-ethic farms developed here where bugs were not intentionally killed and dairy animals were treated with love like pets and never killed. I did meet a couple old ladies in an LA farmers market once who had a goat-dairy business, they make nice cheeses and all the goats are treated this way-- they just live till old age and die of natural causes.. none are ever sold for slaughter..

In the end, you have to do what you feel is right.

Sure.

But also you have to be aware enough that you are not imposing your idea on others. Conditioning others through your own moral sense never works.

I believe having discussions like this to clarify Buddhist views is only a positive thing. I didn't feel I was trying to impose my own view on others, however, there are Tibetan lineage masters who certainly feel strongly about this issue such as HH the Karmapa and Chatral Rinpoche, HH the Dalai Lama, Paltrul Rinpoche, Shabkar, etc. not to mention the lesser known ones. However, since there are other great teachers who hold a different view I try not to impose or judge anyone. Because there is a lack of consensus among the masters themselves we are left to our own reasoning, by sharing the views of some of these teachers, or my own thoughts with others it is not an attempt to impose my view! Debate is always meant to clarify, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Dexing said:

Where is it taught the use of animal products, and likewise meat-eating, creates a karmic connection with the animals in intentionally using their bodies to fulfill your "needs"? This may not be the karma of killing, but it creates a debt that must be repaid to them, which may result in rebirth as a service animal— a cow or such that is worked and exploited for milk and eventually meat, clothing, etc.— to rectify the outstanding balance due them.

Malcolm wrote:

By the time the remains of an animal wind up on your plate, their consciousness is long gone, reborn. This is one of the reasons why Bhavaviveka rejects the idea that meat eating is necessarily bad karma. The meat on your plate, from his perspective, is inert.

It is hard to prove this karmic debt exists, though it is a popular idea.

You probably owe the bugs on your car grill a debt, though.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Dear namdrol,

Where can we find this sutra: Akshayanirmatinirdesha sutra? A web search turns up absolutely nothing. Is it available in English? If not can you give a (brief) outline of the qualities it mentions?

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

My bad:

Akshayamatinirdesha sutra...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

Also, No meat can be regarded as pure if it was premeditated, asked for or desired; therefore refrain from eating meat --

How many people eating meat can with full honesty say while ordering meat at a restaurant or buying it at the market they are not asking for it or desiring it? Obviously a monk begging door to door that get's some meat gruel dropped in their bowl is free from these faults, but how is that possible for people handling money in the market economy?

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, this objection has been addressed by Bhavaviveka.

You have to understand -- we are under no obligation to regard all sutras as definitive except those sutras defined according to the criteria of Akshayanirmatinirdesha sutra. So there is a limit to how much citations can serve you.

Medicine Buddha taught the four tantras of medicine, also he included meat as part of diet, not just medicines.

When you go a restaurant. You have a menu -- on it are several items beef, lamb, fish, poultry, and some vegetarian items. Merely going to the restaurant that serves meat means that you are participating in the negative karma of eating meat. Why? Because they are preparing meat whether you eat it or not.

When you go a market that sells meat -- whether you buy their meat or not you are supporting them, thus you are supporting their meat sales. And on and on it goes.

In the end, you have to do what you feel is right. But also you have to be aware enough that you are not imposing your idea on others. Conditioning others through your own moral sense never works.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

This isn't a statement of karma? Those sentient beings who feed on one another will be reborn as carnivorous animals.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is a statement about karma. Just not about the karma of killing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

muni said:

Namdrol: "The Buddha did not teach Dzogchen".

Merely " 'teaching' Dzogchen ", of course, if so, why should there be any need to study sutras, tantras, shastras... Should be any need to say: it is not this, it is not that...

Not sure he was teaching "Buddhism".

Namdrol said:

Not really sure I understand the point of your comment.

muni said:

Thanks for patience. Only pointings regarding "real nature" (Dzogchen). If he said I never

spoke, is this pointing, like terma.

Malcolm wrote:

"Pointing out" does not make something "Dzogchen", for example, the pointing out instructions in Kagyu Mahamudra is not Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

Eating meat does not equal the act of killing. It is really quite simple and there is nothing to argue about. Killing is the taking of a life intentionally. Eating meat is just like eating any other kind of food, when one gets right down to the basics. Eating meat does not possess the karma of killing. This is just a fact, from a Buddhist point of view, take it or leave it.

Adamantine said:

Namdrol, I appreciate you sharing your knowledge, you are perhaps the most widely read one among us here. But how do you reconcile the above statement with the excerpts of sutras quoting Buddha that Kyabje Chatral Rinpoche refers us to?

Malcolm wrote:

All of these sutra passages state that eating meat is objectionable. Not one of them states that eating meat bears the karma of killing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

KeithBC said:

I agree with Namdrol that the karma of wearing leather shoes, for example, is not the karma of killing. Knowing that they are made from killed animals and not caring is the karma of not caring. Avoiding knowledge of where they come from is the karma of willful ignorance. Wearing them just because you like them is the karma of craving. None of them is the karma of killing, but none of them is wholesome either.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said Keith, the point is to be aware. To understand your world. Then, if you are aware, you can understand why Buddha permitted monks in cold places from far away to wear leather. Also plastic is not better -- proof of that is BP and a chemicals industry poisoning the waterways and air.

Buddha's path is not ideological. It is about awareness. To not be indifferent. Often we must do things that are not ideal -- so, we do not remain indifferent, we do not remain ignorant, and we do not just give into craving. We bring awareness to our state.

Using electricity brings one problem; burning wood brings another. Driving a car brings one problem, riding a bike, another. Everything we do harms something else. Impossible to live completely without harming others. This is why Ahimsa from a Buddhist point of view does not involve living in a desert starving oneself to death -- it involves being aware.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

My point about the untouchables....obviously they considered the act of fishing and slaughtering and such karmically bad and somehow they figured out an angle to not get the karma....Your intent stuff is similar to their attitudes...it's hypocrisy at it's worse... How can you say wiping the bugs of your windscreen is unconscious....and then talk of the bugs you missed...

Malcolm wrote:

Either you accept the Buddha's teaching about karma or you do not. You either think it is hypocritical or you do not. It's up to you.

Not everything that we do is karma, since not everything we do is linked with a specific intention. Karma is only linked with specific intentions. If I harm a bug because I am walking -- this is not karma. It is impossible to walk without harming something, let alone drive.

If you like the jain theory, then be a jain. Definitely, Jains criticized the Buddha because they decided his theory of karma was too loose.

Eating meat does not equal the act of killing. It is really quite simple and there is nothing to argue about. Killing is the taking of a life intentionally. Eating meat is just like eating any other kind of food, when one gets right down to the basics. Eating meat does not possess the karma of killing. This is just a fact, from a Buddhist point of view, take it or leave it.

Of course, we can criticize eating meat for all kinds of reasons -- it creates demand, causing others to kill and so on and so forth. But Buddha was clear -- we do not share karma. Karma is personal, and individual. If I kill an animal and sell its meat to you, I alone am responsible for that act of killing -- and not you.

རྒྱལ་པོ་

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

it's like the Japanese and the untouchables then....you let them do the dirty work and we are cool and pristine....

Malcolm wrote:

That depends -- if you treat butchers as inferior because they make a living by slaughtering animals, then you have a problem with attachment and aversion. That has its own karma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Sorry, but I have quite certainly read that Avatamsaka sutra is there, with some name or another, in the class of yoga tantras if I right remember, unfortunately Alex Wayman is deceased, he would certainly know this topic.

Sorry, but I have analyzed in detail the contents of the bka' 'rgyur personally, so I will have suggest that my direct experience of reading many texts in this collection sutras and tantras supersedes your second hand report.

You can of course choose to read through it yourself to prove me wrong:

http://www.tbrc.org/#library_work-O3JW118743JW21498 "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

There are six bka' 'rgyurs at the end of this link. Look there.

The only text, as I have said, in the rgyud 'bum from Avatamska is the dharani:

[http://www.tbrc.org/link/?RID=O1GS12980%7CO1GS1298001JW14118\\$W22084#library_work_Object-O1GS12980%257CO1GS1298001JW14118\\$W22084](http://www.tbrc.org/link/?RID=O1GS12980%7CO1GS1298001JW14118$W22084#library_work_Object-O1GS12980%257CO1GS1298001JW14118$W22084) "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I don't claim to say that there is no difference between them. But when you read and hear various definitions of initiation, -and they are many and various-, it is not so obvious what is and what is not Tantra?

There are four types of initiations in Vajrayana. There are no types of initiations at all in Sutra, apart from the name "abhisheka" found in the sources referenced above, and I am sure, others Mahayana sutras that talk about the transition from tenth bhumi to buddhahood.

The four types of initiations found as described in Indo -- Tibetan sources are:

a rig gtad i.e. the simple entrustment of a vidyāmantra -- this system belongs primarily to kriya tantra.

rje gngang: this is permission right, which is a blessing of body, speech and mind. This is comes from Caryā tantra, and can be applied to most deities.

There is abhisheka [dbang skur] -- this comes from Kriya tantra, is more developed in Yoga tantra.

byin rlabs -- this is a type of blessing ritual specific to Anuttarayoga tantra -- it is an abbreviated form of dbang skur, abhisheka where the outer vase empowerment is significantly shortened and the main emphasis is on the three higher abhishekas.

We might add to this, the so called rig pa' rtsal dbang of Dzogchen Atiyoga.

The names may be different in Shingon and Tendai, but the basic principles will be the same up to Yoga tantra.

Other than these aforementioned types of initiations, there are no other types of initiations in Vajrayana.

What is your opinion, is Vairocana Abhisambodhi a Sutra when it is called by that name ?

Also some Dzogchen tantras are given the name "sutra". What counts is content and method.

When we say "Sutra" and "Tantra" we are making a distinction between methods. This does not mean that every tantric text must be called a "tantra" to be in fact a tantric text.

This is mostly confusing when we are talking about early transitional texts in the evolution of the Buddhist tantras -- for example, the Mahāvairocana abhisambodhi tantra is called a sutra in earlier, Japanese recensions.

Tantra is not dependent on the word tantra, or the word rgyud!

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily what distinguishes a tantra from a sutra is method.

Anyway, if you are still confused about this I suggest you try to read Jamgon Kongtrul's Systems of Buddhist Tantra where he makes it quite clear what the difference between sutra and tantra is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Astus said:

But what is the definitive attribute of tantra that makes it separate from sutra? Like, for instance, according to Kukai it is that exoteric teachings were taught by rupakaya buddha and they're all upaya, while the esoteric teachings are from the dharmakaya buddha and they convey the truth as it is. Although it's possible to argue with that but I guess that's a start.

Malcolm wrote:

Tripitikamala's famous statement is:

"Although the goal is the same, since it is unconfused,
with many methods, not difficult,
and mastered by those of sharp faculties,
Mantrayāna is superior."

In terms of methods, the Vajrapanjara states:

"Created by passion, the worldly
shall be liberated by the same passion."

Etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

But the same is in HYT where is for example "only" Vajradhara as the Dharmakaya.

Namdrol said:

This actually not true -- the Guhyasamaja tantra also refers to the dharmakāya as Samantabhadra, as does the yogatantra Sarvatathagatatattva-samgraha.

Mariusz said:

But we can not say "The Buddha did not teach HYT" because Samantabhadra did it. The same is in case of Dzogchen. Can we?

Malcolm wrote:

When I said "The Buddha" I was referring to The Historical Buddha, Shakyamuni.

Even so, Shakyamuni did not actually teach the anuttarayoga tantras. He gave the empowerment of Guhyasamaja to Indrabhuti. Indrabhuti achieved awakening. Indrabhuti wrote down the Guhyasamaja after that point. Kalacakra is similar. Buddha manifested Kalacakra mandala in the Dhanyakataka stupa. Others wrote the tantra down at a later time. Chakrasamvara has never been connected with Shakyamuni indirectly or directly. Of course some scholars, mainly Gelugpas, in the past have gone to much trouble to prove otherwise.

If you follow Nyingmapa tradition, you understand that King Jah received some text somehow, practiced Vajrasattva, had a vision and received the mahayoga tantras in that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

But the same is in HYT where is for example "only" Vajradhara as the Dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

This actually not true -- the Guhyasamaja tantra also refers to the dharmakāya as Samantabhadra, as does the yogatantra Sarvatathagatatattva-samgraha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

muni said:

Namdrol: "The Buddha did not teach Dzogchen".

Merely " 'teaching' Dzogchen ", of course, if so, why should there be any need to study sutras, tantras, shastras... Should be any need to say: it is not this, it is not that...

Not sure he was teaching "Buddhism".

Malcolm wrote:

Not really sure I understand the point of your comment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

It depends on how you see it; "sutra" is merely a word, "tantra" is merely a word. In Tibet they have a translation of the Avatamsaka Sutra in Kangyur, but they felt it belongs to the category of Tantra, and so it is found in the Tantra section of the Kangyur, not in the Sutra Section. Similarly in Japan the Vairocana Abhisambodhi Tantra is classified as a Sutra. And so on,... The Sutra Of Golden Light has also been classified a Tantra by some tibetan scholars,(this is told in a work translated by Alex Wayman).

Obviously there is oral transmission in all of the Mahayana schools, it is not something peculiar to tantras only.

Avatamsaka sutra speaks of abhiseka or initiation in the career of a bódhisattva, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

The Avatamsaka sutra is not found in the rgyud sde of the Kangyur, I can assure you since I have access to several versions. There is a two volume collection at the end of the rgyud sde where all dharanis from both sutra and tantra are collected. The dharanis in the Avatamska are also found there.

The abhisheka mentioned in the Dasabhumisutra and the Lanka-avatara is only bestowed upon tenth stage bodhisattvas. It is not a method that is taught for ordinary people.

These kinds of misconceptions have been put to bed by Indian tantric scholars 1200 years ago. Tripitikamala is one person you should read to understand the difference between sutra and tantras, as well as many others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

I know Jains well, and how they live according to 'ahimsa', and also the difference between creating a demand for meat which is a direct cause of death, and accidentally killing creatures which MAY happen to get in the way when we drive a car. The Jains I know best live in the desert where any food is scarce, so I also reject the argument that some people 'have to' eat meat. I also reject the argument that an omnivore must have meat for good health.

Malcolm wrote:

Rejecting that argument that meat is medicine is to reject parts of the Vinaya (Bhaisajyavastu), where meat is recommended as medicine. It also is to reject the dietary and formula recommendations in the four medicine tantras where various kinds of meat, bones, etc., are often prescribed as medicine.

Some people must have meat for good health. Other do not require meat for good health. Some people require meat for repairing tissues after surgeries, others do not. There is no golden standard.

The issue is not "death" -- that is inevitable for all creatures. The issue is whether eating meat involves the karma of killing. The answer is that eating meat is not necessarily involved in the karma of killing. It can be or not depending on circumstances.

As to whether it is better not to eat meat, yes, of course it is better not to eat meat. In some places Buddha said it is ok to eat meat under three criteria. In other places he said it is not ok. And in still other places, he said it is ok. In the end it is up to each person individually. But in terms of karma, as long as you are not directly involved in slaughtering animals or happy about it, then you are free from the karma of killing -- this is what the famed Madhyamaka scholar Bhavaviveka determined.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

common sense! yes, but this does not get you off the drive your car and kill aspect.....it's like the manslaughter angle...you did not plan or intend to kill the guy but you did and are responsible for it...more than likely cause it could have been avoided

Malcolm wrote:

In order for a karma to be perfect, it must have four things, intent, object, act and satisfaction. Harming insects while driving a car satisfies none of these.

Rael said:

The fault of the Jain pov is that it assigns absolute moral values to unconscious events. From a Buddhist POV this is an extreme and unreasonable view.

If you know you are going to kill insects whilst driving it is not an unconscious event

Malcolm wrote:

It is unconscious because you do not have intention, and not only that, you mostly do know what bugs are being harmed, which are slipping past you unharmed and so on.

We have draw a distinction between harmful activities one cannot avoid (limiting their harm when one can i.e. driving slower, and so on) and activities that bear a karmic result.

The latter requires four things: intention, object, act and satisfaction -- thus the Buddha taught, and thus we listen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 10:39 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

i dont care for dennis politic, but sometimes hes sharp as a laser on the issues.

so Obama playing the centrist?

only giving the left the cover of humanitarian speak, which was my point in post one.

Malcolm wrote:

Obama is very right wing, from where I sit. Kucinich is very moderately left. Bernie Sanders is more my cup of tea.

The truth of the matter is that American politics is all right wing. Just shades of conservatism.

What we really need is a deep green awakening. Not this namby pampy green capitalist bullshit.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Malcolm wrote:

Can't be very left if Kucinich is criticizing it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Jikan said:

In this thread...

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=3556> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

...the question of whether nembutsu (reciting the name of Buddha Amitabha) is in itself a tantric practice. It's OT to that thread, so here it is in a new one.

Tantric Buddhism (Vajrayana, Mikkyo) is a form of Mahayana practice that necessarily involves several elements. Among these are abhiseka (empowerment), qualified guru... and a certain way of understanding reality. (tantra means "continuum.")

Not all these elements are present in nembutsu practice, so it makes no sense to say it is in fact a tantric practice. It is like tantric practice in some respects, however.

Questions, comments, or corrections?

Malcolm wrote:

Nembutsu is not a tantric practice, requires no transmission, belonging to sutra. It absolutely does not resemble a tantric practice in anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

How does grasping after a taste-sensation
at the expense of sentient life accord with
Dharma?

Namdrol said:

This can be applied so widely as to be meaningless. Vegetarians who use expensive brocade are responsible for thousands of dead worms directly. People who wear leather shoes, eat vegetables protected by pesticides. Etc. This kind of thinking is too extreme.

If Chatral Rinpoche wants people to stop eating meat, he better want them to stop using expensive brocades, wearing leather shoes and so on. But I don't see any Tibetan lamas who religiously avoid eating meat avoiding silk with the same fervor.

N

Adamantine said:

Well I'm no fan of silk and many of these things you mention are purely cultural: it is up to us as the transmission takes place in our culture if we choose to rely on silk brocade or, since we are familiar with the expense of life involved, to decorate with something else. I don't choose to wear leather shoes for the same reason, but regardless buying one pair of shoes, or even silk that lasts for years is hardly comparable to buying meat on a daily or weekly basis. And as I pointed out already-- far more bugs are killed in the process of raising livestock to feed meat eaters than in feeding vegetables to people directly. So if the goal is to minimize harm and killing then what I'm saying is far from nonsense, it is common sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is common sense. But this does not mean that one has the intention to kill, merely because one is wearing leather shoes, or killing weevils because one is wearing non-organic cotton* etc.

The point is what at what point does eating meat become negative karma? Abhidharmakosha states "Karma is volition and what proceeds from volition". When someone else kills an animal, this is not necessarily my volition.

Bhavaviveka addresses this issue at length from a Mahāyāna point of view and concludes (Yogacara Sutras notwithstanding) that meat which you did not see slaughtered, did not order to be slaughtered or was not slaughtered specifically for you by another person could be eaten with fear of karmic consequences.

This does not mean that one should not take into consideration other factors when considering one's decision to eat meat or not. It does mean that however wrong eating meat may seem to us, as long as these three criteria fulfilled we cannot say the act of eating meat is an act of negative karma.

Furthermore, of course, in Dzogchen teachings we also have methods which we can use to benefit animals whose remains find their way to our plate. Depending on our capacity, we should use them.

*organic in general does not necessarily mean pesticide free. It means that one is not using petrochemical pesticides -- it does not mean that one is not releasing ladybugs to kill aphids and so on and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

How does grasping after a taste-sensation
at the expense of sentient life accord with
Dharma?

Namdrol said:

This can be applied so widely as to be meaningless. Vegetarians who use expensive brocade are responsible for thousands of dead worms directly. People who wear leather shoes, eat vegetables protected by pesticides. Etc. This kind of thinking is too extreme.

If Chatral Rinpoche wants people to stop eating meat, he better want them to stop using expensive brocades, wearing leather shoes and so on. But I don't see any Tibetan lamas who religiously avoid eating meat avoiding silk with the same fervor.

N

Yeshe said:

There is the difference here of intention.

I know that eating meat creates the demand for animals to be killed. Meat is evidence that killing has taken place and a person buys it intentionally to benefit from killing. There is no other way to produce meat.

In the case of vegetables etc. the intention is not to create death, nor is there direct evidence of causing killing.

If a bug flies into your windscreen when you are driving, then their karma is partly the cause of their death.

If an animal is dragged off to be tortured and slaughtered in an abbatoir, karma is very different with respect to the killing.

Malcolm wrote:

When you make silk, you are intending to kill some being to make clothes, no less than hunting a tiger for its skin, or a musk deer for its musk gland.

When you grow vegetables, for example, and use pesticides, you are intending to grow food, and not kill -- nevertheless, if you use pesticides, you are intending to kill something for your convenience.

When someone eats that vegetable, by your logic they are also sharing the karma of the killing since in general it is impossible that some being is not killed and so on in the production of vegetable food.

Of course, it is easier to sympathize with animals in a slaughterhouse -- it is easier to imagine our culpability because of their suffering, so close to our own. But the fact remains that while buying meat in the market is negative, it is not a negative act of killing -- you simply cannot connect the two correctly.

Of course, if you stand by the butcher, cheer him on, then of course, it is different, you are sharing in that karma, multiplying it.

This is why I said, some of us need to eat meat, for many reasons. When we eat meat, we need to understand that it is negative and not make excuses, but it is not the case that we are intending to kill animals. It is subtle point, but necessary to understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

How does grasping after a taste-sensation
at the expense of sentient life accord with
Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

This can be applied so widely as to be meaningless. Vegetarians who use expensive brocade are responsible for thousands of dead worms directly. People who wear leather shoes, eat vegetables protected by pesticides. Etc. This kind of thinking is too extreme.

If Chatral Rinpoche wants people to stop eating meat, he better want them to stop using expensive brocades, wearing leather shoes and so on. But I don't see any Tibetan lamas who religiously avoid eating meat avoiding silk with the same fervor.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

All that is left, in that moment, is that you must have the intention for the animal to have been killed in some place in time for you to eat it right there and then.

This is not how karma works. You cannot intend for an act committed by someone else

in the past.

Yeshe said:

No, but if you plan on carrying on eating meat you create the demand for killing. If a monk decides he will continue to accept meat in his bowl, he creates the demand for killing, which poor villagers will continue to supply and create the negative karma involved .

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is not transferable. Each person is responsible for his or her actions alone. That is how karma works. There is no other way it works.

Not everything that is negative is necessarily negative karma.

Eating meat is negative, for the reasons you mention -- but this does not mean that someone who eats meat necessarily bears the karma of killing. It just does not work in that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Unknown said:

All that is left, in that moment, is that you must have the intention for the animal to have been killed in some place in time for you to eat it right there and then.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not how karma works. You cannot intend for an act committed by someone else in the past.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

śama said:

No.

By eating meat, you make it available in the market. By eating meat you encourage others to slaughter meat. At least in a society where there is supply and demand. That is proof that your intention is to kill.

/śama

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot absolutely infer that someone wants or intends others to slaughter meat just because someone will buy or eat meat that has become available. For example, Buddhist monks will eat whatever is placed in their bowls. If there is meat, they will eat it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Adamantine said:

Well the Dzogchen master Khamtrul Rinpoche gave a remarkable teaching on the first words of Shakyamuni after enlightenment: Profound, peaceful, free from elaboration, luminous, uncompounded:

Like deathless nectar is this Dharma that I have found.

Yet whoever I reveal it to, they will not understand, and so

Without speaking, in this very jungle I should remain.

He explained how this first utterance was actually an expression of Dzogchen, and elaborated on it to give us an extended Dzogchen teaching. And this was clearly coming from lineage understanding. But of course, this is not how Dzogchen is usually historically referenced.

Pero said:

What do you mean? Even though he never taught Dzogchen explicitly, Shakyamuni is counted as one of the 12 Primordial Buddhas in Dzogchen that came before Garab Dorje.

Adamantine said:

I mean precisely what you said "even though he never taught Dzogchen".

Since this post-enlightenment utterance was recorded, it was either heard by others or he himself recounted it (I'm not aware of the sutra source, anyone?)

So either way, the fact that it's been transmitted to us through the ages means it is a form of teaching-- the above explanation describes it as a Dzogchen teaching therefore he did teach Dzogchen, although not in an obvious way, and without the label.) However this is not a standard account

of Dzogchen teaching in our world-system..

Malcolm wrote:

The source is the Lalitavistara sutra.

These kinds of statements and teachings are referred to "ldem dgongs" i.e. "indirect intention" in Dzogchen literature. They can be interpreted from a Dzogchen pov to

support Dzogchen teaching without actually being Dzogchen.

This statement however fails to provide us with a path to realize that result in the direct manner that we refer to as "Dzogchen". Hence it is not Dzogchen.

We can also interpret Manjushrinama samgiti as a dzogchen text. It is not however as Dzogchen text and does not explain Dzogchen directly.

The Buddha did not teach Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

śama said:

That is funny! What kind of meat are you eating? Meat that is alive? Otherwise, if you want to eat meat, you must first have an intention for the animal to be killed. No?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

There is a difference between eating meat because it is available and wanting to kill something to eat its meat. Again, it boils down to intention. If you eat meat when it is available, and do not eat meat when it is not available, and make no effort to either slaughter meat for yourself or encourage another to do so, then this is proof enough that your intention is just to eat, and not to kill.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is better not to eat meat.

But if you eat meat, be aware. When you are aware, there is benefit. Understand why you are eating meat. Since there is nothing that cannot be used as medicine, if you are using meat as medicine, there is benefit -- therefore, understand that in general food is just medicine to cure the illness of hunger.

When you eat meat, take care -- try not to foolishly waste meat that you have purchased, or for that matter, any food.

If you are a tantric practitioner, always do ganapuja.

Understand that the principle underlying abstaining from meat is Ahimsa, non-harming. The principle of non-harming is more important than whether or not one is eating meat. But, it is better not to eat meat.

Rael said:
I realize you people are right....

My christian Judaic guilt is alive and well.....hence my participation in the thread....

my justification is also alive and well.....

i feel there are validity to my points though....

If your going to take the podium and tell me not to eat meat...then live like a Jain....In the sense that they seem to be more concerned with harming sentients to the point of a fault.....

so how's my guilt trip doing as per driving cars and killing insects.....

any chance of getting Namdrol to avoid cars and buses....

yikes there is a fruit truck coming to a grocery store with a bug screen one inch thick with dead bugs....

DO NOT BUY COMMERCIAL FRUIT OR VEGETABLES.....

Malcolm wrote:

Killing, from a Buddhist POV, requires the intention to kill. When I drive from point a to point b -- I am not intending to kill anything. Of course, it is impossible to live without harming something unintentionally. This is why the Buddha's point about karma is completely involved with intention.

Killing is the intention to end a life.

Eating meat, etc. is the intention to preserve a life.

Two different intentions, hence two different karmas and two different results.

The fault of the Jain pov is that is assigns absolute moral values to unconscious events. From a Buddhist POV this is an extreme and unreasonable view.

Still, it is better not to eat meat -- and any rational person can see that if they just stop to think about it for a second.

Of course, it is better not to drive cars too -- and any rational person can see that.

We live in the society we live in -- we can either be indifferent, defensive, or try to justify what we do -- or we can simply be aware of ourselves and how we affect the world -- limiting what is harmful, emphasizing what is beneficial.

The main point is simply being aware of yourself. That awareness is the essence of all mindfulness practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Rituals, Practice for Beginners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just attend a webcast by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Then you will have plenty to practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is better not to eat meat.

But if you eat meat, be aware. When you are aware, there is benefit. Understand why you are eating meat. Since there is nothing that cannot be used as medicine, if you are using meat as medicine, there is benefit -- therefore, understand that in general food is just medicine to cure the illness of hunger.

When you eat meat, take care -- try not to foolishly waste meat that you have purchased, or for that matter, any food.

If you are a tantric practitioner, always do ganapuja.

Understand that the principle underlying abstaining from meat is Ahimsa, non-harming. The principle of non-harming is more important than whether or not one is eating meat. But, it is better not to eat meat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

from my uneducated understanding,

tariffs are an extension of the law of admiralty, to regulate commerce, since most commerce is done by shipping, and then onto land, the law of admiralty continues along with the "vessel" on land, i.e. by truck (thats why you have insurance). the ancient law of mortgage and lien, means the owner, or loaner i.e. the bank, has 100% lien on the goods, the money, the vessel etc, the tariff means the loaner, makes money at both ends, from the purchase and the sell.

the central banks control commerce, and they by definition of the law of admiralty, remain offshore. BTW when i say offshore i mean the "district of columbia", or the "square mile" of london, or "vatican city" or "wall street".

but we already see that the central banks are the problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Historically, perhaps but since the establishment of the US, tariffs have been the means whereby the US protected it's fledging economy from the kind of commodity dumping the sparked the original Tea Party (remember, the East India Tea Company obtained permission to dump tea on the colonies at a much cheaper price than they were allowed to sell their tea for in England).

Farming in the US was healthy until Butz changed the structure of farm subsidies in the 1970's. America was wealthy until Reagan.

Now 400 people own as much wealth as 150 million Americans. Sickening.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Gfreg:

The term neo-liberal is not an American term. It has only been recently employed US discourse. It was formerly used primarily outside the united states to refer to the new liberalization of international trade under the WTO. Neo-liberalism is term used to describe neo-conservative free market corporatist ideology.

gregkavarnos said:

Isn't it funny how Americans have made the terms liberal and conservative have the

same meaning just by adding a neo- before them? In Australia there are two major political parties (which once had very separate ideologies) the Australian Labour Party (socialist politics) and the Liberal party (free market politics). The socialists had a radical social agenda whilst the free marketeers had a conservative social agenda.

In America both the major parties are free marketers, just that the Democrats seem to have a more radical social agenda. Seem to. So I guess that makes the Democrats social liberals AND economic liberals and the Republican party social conservatives and economic liberals. Of course it is almost impossible to separate the social from the economic so the outcome is the current American reality.

On a more humorous note the word Democrat (from Greek) and the word Republican (from Latin) both actually have exactly the same meaning. Democracy is the Greek word for republic, in Greece we do not use/have the term republic because we use/have the term democracy.

So the next time you go to vote in America you are now aware of the fact that, in reality, you are voting for the same thing either way! (I can assure you, the same thing stands for all of the world's "two party democracies").

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Second, there is no such thing as intrinsic true value -- all value is conventional and imputed (can't believe I have to point this out to a Buddhist).

N

Heruka said:

the intrinsic value is its conventional value, its leverage value is its imputed value.....

we can agree a conventional base value by some arbitrary reference point, its weight, size and so on. silver for instance has a base value by its troyness and its purity and so on, its imputed projected value is based on future sales on the market. since the imputed projected price is what is traded and sold, its imputed value is inflated or deflated in day to day trading, but its rareness and conventional value, slowly and steadily increases.

most old ladies at a supermarket are not buddhists, they only know food prices have risen 30% under globalization.

Malcolm wrote:

The solution to globalization is not an ideology that informs it. The solution to

globalization lies in the dismantling of corporatism, the establishment of bioregional governments, separate currencies in these regions (i.e. no world dollar), managed trade between them and so on.

As for intrinsic value, this is an incorrect term. What you mean is a standard value. That is also an imputation since it cannot be fixed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

"Letting markets set values" is allowing the irrationality of impulse guide economic life.

Heruka said:

quite the opposite, true market value is based on logic and not some mathematical complex con of leverage. if we take the market today, it is enjoying a fixed playing field, of artificial interest rates and pumped in liquidity, and not its intrinsic true value, but a created inflationary leveraged bubble. your argument is based upon the rigged casino gulag of global markets by jp morgan, goldman sachs and so forth. mine is more local and decentralized market, to hell with globalism, where the price of milk is set by the local farmer, and if another farmer lowers his price to compete, the buyer wins.

There are always limitations on markets because out of control markets can be very socially disruptive.

I agree.

Malcolm wrote:

Decentralization requires regional controls (tariffs and so on) to prevent market marauders from upsetting local exchanges and always has -- for example, corn dumped on mexico after NAFTA that forced 50,000 small farms to close, forcing people off the land into cities, then subjecting them to higher corn prices due to upward price pressure from ethanol production making it impossible for them to ever return to their farms and make a living because the investment is now too high, now that they have lost their traditional farms.

So you see, markets are not logical, they are not intelligent, and require regulation and maintenance to function beneficially.

Second, there is no such thing as intrinsic true value -- all value is conventional and imputed (can't believe I have to point this out to a Buddhist).

The reason why neo-liberal/neo-conservative free market ideology ala Austrian school is dangerous is that it eschews all market controls anywhere to ensure that market marauders can always take profits anywhere it is convenient for them to do so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

would be good topic to discuss, the merits/demerit of the Keynesian vs Austrian models of economics, i personally lean towards a individual libertarian Austrian "let the market set the value" system, rather than the gross manipulation of the other. Whether it is collectivism or capitalism, the banks get the loot.

I wonder whatever happened to code pink?

Malcolm wrote:

"Letting markets set values" is allowing the irrationality of impulse guide economic life. Limiting economic irrationality too much is not a good thing, and giving it total free reign is also not a good thing -- in the latter scenario, all that happens is the wealthy become wealthier and wealthier until the poor kill them and divide the spoils, beginning the cycle again.

There are always limitations on markets because out of control markets can be very socially disruptive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Rightwing "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

The present free market ideology of Ayn Rand, Milton Freedom, Hayek and so on is bankrupt and morally bereft. It is just another fatal and dangerous utopian fantasy like communism.

Heruka said:

I agree with you using the words "present free market ideology". and the key word is present. Pre 1913 america was a free market system. however the rise of the present coporate personhood and the federal reserve's (in fact a private bank cartel not federal at all) fiat ponzi fraud, no such free market exists today.

Malcolm wrote:

No it wasn't. Markets were controlled by moneyed interests and banksters then too. There has never been a free market, ever. For example, from 1863 to 1913, the US instituted as system of high tariffs on goods imported from Europe and so on.

Free market ideology is the very backbone of neo-liberalism. It is a fallacious doctrine, very damaging to the environment, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Rightwing "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

a neoliberal, corporate lackey who believes in fantasies like "free markets" and so on; and who suckered the Democrats and other progressive by running on a platform of progressive promises he never intended to keep.

Heruka said:

Yet demonstrates cronyism and not free market.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a "free market" -- free markets don't exist, never existed, and never will exist. The present free market ideology of Ayn Rand, Milton Freedom, Hayek and so on is bankrupt and morally bereft. It is just another fatal and dangerous utopian fantasy like communism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

Jikan, the point is whether under Bush's neocon group in the pentagon, or Obama's neolib group in the pentagon, these are just two wings on the same bird of war.

Malcolm wrote:

neo-con = neo-lib.

The term "neo-liberal" was coined in European discourse to describe neo-conservative policies encouraging corporate globalization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Rightwing "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

Obama's Pentagon are firing missiles at Libyan forces. The Nobel peace prize winner has now expanded US military action more than at anytime in US history. The democrat ministry of truth is spinning the expanded wars as humanitarian, to give the liberal left the cover it needs to present to its idealog base that war really is peace.

pray for the Libyan people.

Malcolm wrote:

Obama is not left, and he is not liberal. He is right-wing, a neoliberal, corporate lackey who believes in fantasies like "free markets" and so on; and who suckered the Democrats and other progressive by running on a platform of progressive promises he never intended to keep.

The present wars were started not by the liberal left, but by the neo-conservative right who bullied and fear-mongered Congress into approving these wars. If you think otherwise, you are tripping.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2011 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Nyala Pema duddul's Tulku

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

How many tulkus can fit on the head of a pin?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can dance on books all day,
but don't neglect going out to play;
you can see but you cannot say,
rainbows in space simply fade away.

-- Namdrol

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 11th, 2010 at 9:30 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Even Namdrol who is very well learned to a certain degree did not have insight into Dzogchen, so he opened that Dzogchen forum to get informed.

Malcolm wrote:

For the record, that is not why I opened the Dzogchen forum on E-Sangha.

I opened the Dzogchen forum on E-Sangha because there are practitioners of Dzogchen in Sakya, Kagyu, Gelug, Nyingma and Bon who, at the time seemed to need a place to discuss things separate from the Nyingma forum

The Dzogchen forum was closed because the discussion was becoming completely dominated by people from Dzogchen Community.

The Bon forum was closed primarily because one: the narrative histories of Bon and Buddhism in Tibet are largely incompatible with each other, despite many doctrinal similarities, and two: E-Sangha was a Pan-Buddhist Web site.

N